OCT 14 1948

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 94—PART 1

JANUARY 6, 1948, TO FEBRUARY 19, 1948
(PAGES 1 TO 1434)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1948

The 6th of January being the day provided by Public Law No. 358, Eightieth Congress, first session, for the meeting of Congress, the second session of the Eightieth Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan, President pro tempore of the Senate, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offer the following

PRAYER

Our Father, who art Lord of heaven and of all the earth, Thou knowest the difficulties these men have to face and the grave decisions they must make.

Have mercy upon them, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Robertson, Va.
Baldwin	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Ball	Holland	Russell
Barkley	Ives	Saltonstall
Brewster	Jenner	Sparkman
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Bushfield	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Langer	Taylor
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McCarran	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ferguson	Martin	Vandenberg
Flanders	Millikin	Watkins
George	Moore	Wherry
Green	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	O'Conor	Williams
Hatch	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hayden	Reed	Young
Hickenlooper	Revercomb	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are necessarily absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent on official business of the Committee on Public Lands.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is detained because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

Alabama.—Lister Hill and John Sparkman.

Arizona.—Carl Hayden and Ernest W. McFarland.

Arkansas.—John McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

California.—Sheridan Downey and William F. Knowland.

Colorado.—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

Connecticut.—Brien McMahon and Raymond E. Baldwin.

Delaware.—Clayton Douglass Buck and John J. Williams.

Florida.—Claude Pepper and Spessard L. Holland.

Georgia.—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

Idaho.—Glen H. Taylor and Henry C. Dworshak.

Illinois.—Scott W. Lucas and C. Wayland Brooks.

Indiana.—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

Iowa.—George A. Wilson and Bourke B. Hickenlooper.

Kansas.—Arthur Capper and Clyde M. Reed.

Kentucky.—Alben W. Barkley and John Sherman Cooper.

Louisiana.—John H. Overton and Allen J. Ellender.

Maine.—Wallace H. White, Jr., and Owen Brewster.

Maryland.—Millard E. Tydings and Herbert R. O'Conor.

Massachusetts.—Leverett Saltonstall and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

Michigan.—Arthur H. Vandenberg and Homer Ferguson.

Minnesota.—Joseph H. Ball and Edward J. Thye.

Mississippi.—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

Missouri.—Forrest C. Donnell and James P. Kem.

Montana.—James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton.

Nebraska.—Hugh Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry.

Nevada.—Pat McCarran and George W. Malone.

New Hampshire.—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

New Jersey.—Albert W. Hawkes and H. Alexander Smith.

New Mexico.—Carl A. Hatch and Dennis Chavez.

New York.—Robert F. Wagner and Irving M. Ives.

North Carolina.—Clyde R. Hoey and William B. Umstead.

North Dakota.—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

Ohio.—Robert A. Taft and John W. Bricker.

Oklahoma.—Elmer Thomas and E. H. Moore.

Oregon.—Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse.

Pennsylvania.—Francis J. Myers and Edward Martin.

Rhode Island.—Theodore Francis Green and J. Howard McGrath.

South Carolina.—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

South Dakota.—Chan Gurney and Harlan J. Bushfield.

Tennessee.—Kenneth McKellar and Tom Stewart.

Texas.—Tom Connally and W. Lee O'Daniel.

Utah.—Elbert D. Thomas and Arthur V. Watkins.

Vermont.—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

Virginia.—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

Washington.—Warren G. Magnuson and Harry P. Cain.

West Virginia.—Harley M. Kilgore and Chapman Revercomb.

Wisconsin.—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

Wyoming.—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Edward V. Robertson.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think it well to announce that it will be the intention to follow the precedent established as a matter of courtesy to the President of the United States that the Senate transact no business in the way of the introduction of bills or resolutions and take no action on any matter other than the adoption of the necessary privileged resolutions incident to the opening of a session until the President shall have delivered his annual message.

It is my understanding that the President's message will be ready for presentation tomorrow at 1:30 o'clock p. m. Therefore, it is my purpose to move, after the conclusion of the routine business today, that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock p. m.

It is the intention to have the Senate reconvene immediately after the President's message shall have been delivered, when the Senate will proceed with business, at which time the introduction of bills or resolutions or the transaction of any other business will be in order.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 182), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Under the foregoing resolution, the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WHERRY and Mr. BARKLEY the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 183), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 184), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian unless otherwise ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 7, 1948, at 1 o'clock p. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 6, 1948

This being the day fixed by Public Law 358, Eightieth Congress, enacted pursuant to the twentieth amendment to the Constitution for the meeting of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following

PRAYER

Thou blessed Lord, the way, the truth, and the life, our times are in Thine hands. Where human judgment misleads, where emotion withers and the will of man seems a broken reed, be Thou our guiding light and lead us on. Take away our mantle of self-esteem; cast aside all hurtful differences and widening conflicts which threaten the safety and security of a strong America and a peaceful world.

"I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God."

Let us pray together our Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory for ever and ever.

Amen.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 30, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to advise you that I have this date tendered to the Governor of New York my resignation as Representative of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of the State of New York in the Congress of the United States, such resignation to take effect as of midnight of December 31, 1947.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN J. RABIN.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to determine whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Abernethy	Almond	Andrews, Ala.
Albert	Andersen, H. Carl	Andrews, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Anderson, Calif.	Angell
Allen, Ill.	Arends	Arnold
Auchincloss	Gwinn, N. Y.	Murray, Wis.
Bakewell	Gwynne, Iowa	Nicholson
Banta	Hagen	Nixon
Barrett	Hale	Nodar
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norblad
Battle	Hall, Leonard W.	Norrell
Beall	Halleck	O'Brien
Beckworth	Hand	O'Hara
Bender	Hardy	Owens
Bennett, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Pace
Bishop	Harrison	Passman
Blackney	Hart	Patman
Bland	Hartley	Patterson
Bloom	Harvey	Peden
Boggs, Del.	Havenner	Peterson
Bolton	Hays	Pfeifer
Bonner	Hedrick	Philbin
Bradley	Heffernan	Phillips, Calif.
Brehm	Herter	Phillips, Tenn.
Brooks	Heselton	Pickett
Brophy	Hess	Plumley
Brown, Ga.	Hill	Poage
Bryson	Hoffman	Potter
Buchanan	Holmes	Potts
Buck	Hope	Preston
Buckley	Horan	Price, Fla.
Buffett	Huber	Price, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Priest
Burke	Javits	Rains
Burleson	Jenison	Ramey
Butler	Jenkins, Ohio	Rankin
Byrne, N. Y.	Jensen	Rayburn
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Camp	Johnson, Ind.	Rees
Canfield	Johnson, Okla.	Regan
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Rich
Carroll	Jones, N. C.	Riley
Case, N. J.	Jones, Wash.	Rizley
Chadwick	Jonkman	Robertson
Chelf	Judd	Robsion
Chenoweth	Karsten, Mo.	Rockwell
Church	Kean	Rogers, Fla.
Clason	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Clevenger	Kearns	Rohrbough
Coffin	Keating	Rooney
Cole, Kans.	Kee	Ross
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Russell
Cole, N. Y.	Kelley	Sadlak
Colmer	Kennedy	St. George
Cooper	Keogh	Sanborn
Corbett	Kerr	Sarbacher
Cotton	Kilday	Sasscer
Coudert	Kirwan	Schwabe, Okla.
Courtney	Klein	Scoblick
Cox	Knutson	Scott, Hardie
Crawford	Kunkel	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Crosser	Landis	Scrivner
Crow	Lane	Seely-Brown
Cunningham	Lanham	Sheppard
Dague	Latham	Short
Davis, Ga.	Lea	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Wis.	Lewis	Smathers
Dawson, Utah	Lichtenwalter	Smith, Kans.
Deane	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Delaney	Love	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Lucas	Smith, Va.
Dirksen	Ludlow	Smith, Wis.
Dolliver	Lusk	Snyder
Dondero	Lyle	Somers
Donohue	Lynch	Spence
Dorn	McConnell	Stefan
Doughton	McCowen	Stigler
Eaton	McCulloch	Stratton
Eberharter	McDonough	Sundstrom
Ellis	McDowell	Taber
Elsaesser	McGarvey	Talle
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	Teague
Engle, Calif.	McMahon	Thomas, N. J.
Evins	McMillan, S. C.	Thompson
Fallon	Mack	Tibbott
Fellows	Macy	Tollefson
Fenton	Madden	Twyman
Fisher	Mahon	Vail
Flannagan	Maloney	Van Zandt
Fletcher	Manasco	Vinson
Folger	Martin, Iowa	Vorys
Foote	Mason	Wadsworth
Forand	Mathews	Weichel
Fulton	Meade, Ky.	Welch
Garmatz	Meade, Md.	Wheeler
Gary	Merrow	Whitten
Gathings	Meyer	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Michener	Williams
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Wilson, Ind.
Gillette	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Tex.
Goff	Mills	Winstead
Goodwin	Mitchell	Wolcott
Gordon	Morgan	Wood
Gore	Morton	Woodruff
Graham	Muhlenberg	Worley
Grant, Ind.	Multer	Youngblood
Griffiths	Murdock	Zimmerman
Gross		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 313 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PROVIDING FOR RECESS TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, Wednesday, January 7, 1948, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 415) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communications he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 416) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communications that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 1:30 o'clock p. m. January 7, 1948, to a joint session of the two Houses.

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 417) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 7, 1948, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. ROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

INVESTIGATE FUEL OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, the fuel oil shortage in the northeastern seaboard area has reached a serious stage. It is particularly serious in metropolitan New York. During the most severe snowstorm New York City has ever experienced, hundreds of large apartment houses, as well as individual homes, were without heat for days.

Fuel oil supplies were just not adequate. Black markets have sprung up and price gouging has become rampant. I have received reports of consumers being charged double what they paid 3 weeks ago. Veterans living in flimsily constructed temporary houses, most of the houses not even weather stripped and all supplied with oil-burning stoves, are, when they can get it, forced to pay 7 to 10 cents more a gallon for kerosene than was the price on December 15.

I urge that the proper House committee make an immediate sweeping investigation of the entire fuel-oil situation. Let us find out if there is a genuine shortage of fuel oil in this country. If there is, why and who is responsible? Is the shortage on the eastern seaboard because of a transportation bottleneck as some claim? If so, let us take action to see that this bottleneck is broken.

Another severe snowstorm or prolonged period of subzero weather in the New York City area could be disastrous unless adequate fuel oil is assured. Let us not fiddle while we have no fuel oil to burn.

HON. SAM RAYBURN

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no opjection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to say to my colleagues in the House that today is the birthday of our very esteemed and most highly respected Member the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

I am not quite sure just which anniversary this day marks. Possibly if I did know I would not say. However, I must make the statement that instead of his getting older he seems to me to be getting younger every day. We are all happy about that. Of course, I do not want him to get too vigorous because I have enough trouble with him on occasions now.

Mr. Speaker, we enter upon this final session of the Eightieth Congress with great and momentous problems confronting us. Undoubtedly there will be many times when the minority leader and I will not see things quite alike, but I am quite sure that in all the days to come there will be that fine comradeship, sportsmanship and spirit of fair play that has always characterized our relations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that recognition of this important event should have first been taken by the majority leader of this House.

I think I know this distinguished American to whom he pays tribute quite as well as any Member of this body. I know that every piece of timber used in the structure is sound. There is not a faulty piece in it.

Mr. Speaker, I have served here for many years. I am confident I do not exaggerate when I say that during the time I have been a Member of this body there is not one who has come or gone who has held and enjoyed a larger measure of the confidence and the affection of his colleagues than has SAM RAYBURN. Sam is gentle, strong; he is wise and good; he is truly, Mr. Speaker, a very great American, and I am happy to join with my colleagues in saluting him on this occasion.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps a little out of order for a second Member of the Republican group to rise to express appreciation of the man whose birthday it is today, but I cannot refrain from so doing. We, on our side, have learned during the years that he is not only a Member of Congress and a statesman but he is also a man of vision, a

man who recognizes the very grave responsibilities that this country has been hurled into, a man who is willing to assume responsibility, a man with whom one can counsel without fear of partisan advice or partisan attitude. Nor does he fail to look at the question under discussion from the widest possible angle. Recognizing the need of the world for mutual understanding, knowing how important it is that the issues coming before this House and before the other body be considered with careful, cooperative consideration and cold-blooded reasoning, he makes his contribution to this end with humility, clear vision, and the courage of action.

I congratulate you, Mr. RAYBURN, on your birthday. I trust the years will rest easily upon you, and I hope that you may have many more among us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorial matter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, over the ABC radio network last night with reference to his bill H. R. 4579.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable Alexander L. De Maioribus.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each, newspaper articles.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him over the NBC radio network.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Governor of California, Hon. Earl Warren.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Republican broadcast last night participated in by Chairman Reece of the Republican National Committee, Speaker Martin, Majority Leader Halleck, Senator Taft, and Senator Millikin.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Sumner Welles.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, and in the other an address he delivered before the surgeons and physicians committee in Chicago.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PANAMA CANAL

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted Public Law 280, which empowered the Governor of the Panama Canal to make studies of the present Panama Canal, of its future possibilities, and of other possible canal locations.

The Governor has submitted a report of this study, a report which advocates the replacement of the present canal by a sea-level canal at an expense of some $2,500,000,000.

The Republic of Panama has just unanimously refused to ratify a treaty with the United States which would have allowed us to maintain strategic bases within Panamanian territory for the protection of the Canal.

The United States is withdrawing its forces from all outlying bases in the Republic of Panama.

This series of events presents a most serious problem to the United States. The continued functioning of a canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific is a matter of vital importance to us and to the world as a whole. Certainly it would be the height of foolishness to commence the expenditure of billions of dollars to modify the present canal or to construct a new sea-level model if, due to our exclusion from the use of Panamanian soil for defense bases, we cannot properly defend the Canal Zone and its installations. Certainly it would be ridiculous to even consider the investment of more billions in Panama, even if we can protect our interests, unless we are convinced through thorough study by competent and experienced officers of the various branches of the national defense services, that such an immense investment is justified by real necessity. Certainly in these days when we are being asked to put up untold sums for the relief and rehabilitation of other parts of the world, we should not lightly enter into further commitments without deep thought and the exploration of every detail connected with the proposed work.

With these thoughts in mind, I have introduced a bill which would create an Interoceanic Canals Commission, composed of commissioners drawn from the armed services and civilian life, for the purpose of thoroughly exploring the whole canal problem and of making recommendations in the premises. I am aware that many other commissions and boards have covered this field in the past but we have so many new developments, such as the atomic bomb, marked increase in the size of ships, air transport and air combat, the refusal of the Republic of Panama to allow us sites in its territory for the defense of the canal, the expected increase in world waterborne commerce within the next few decades, that I believe another commission is needed to take recognition of all these vital factors.

In matters of this magnitude we should make haste slowly. I hope the Congress will see fit to create a new Interoceanic Canals Commission from the viewpoint of economy, national safety, and common sense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include excerpts in each.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and include certain newspaper editorials.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by Samuel B. Pettengill entitled "Plug This Rat Hole."

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he made on the Panama Canal.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remark in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials in each.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a most enlightening and admirable statement by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial that appeared in last Sunday's Boston Post.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech delivered by him.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials and comments.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered in Chicago by Hon. William O. Douglas.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts in both.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. GORE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts from certain newspapers.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Shipping—Foreign Trade," by Stanley Ferguson, and further to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "The Panama Canal—Operations or Engineering?" which appeared in the United States Naval Institute proceedings of December 1947. I am advised by the Public Printer that the article included in the second extension will make three and one-third pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $260.34, but I ask that these articles be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extensions may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by a veteran news commentator, George E. Reedy, over station WOL this morning.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House, I have just completed a hearing in Chicago with respect to the strike which has been conducted in that city by Local No. 16 of the International Typographical Union against six of the major newspapers of Chicago. Just as soon as the balance of the exhibits are presented to the subcommittee and the testimony transcribed and analyzed, a complete report will be made to the committee, and in turn to the House. However, at this time I would like to make a few brief remarks.

At the close of the hearing last Friday I complimented the newspapers for the very fair way in which the proceedings of the hearing had been published in Chicago. It was not until I arrived in Washington that I learned for the first time of radio reports and published accounts in certain sections of the country of remarks that were purported to have been made by me when, as a matter of fact, they constituted distortions or abbreviations of my true remarks.

I wish to state right here and now that I am not in favor of the repeal of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. I believe that it is very beneficial to the workers of the country and I so stated at the time of the hearings in Chicago. I then supplemented such a statement by saying that even though the leaders of the ITU might desire to have the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 repealed—which would mean the repeal of the entire National Labor Relations Act, because the present act virtually replaced the Wagner Act—that it represented approximately 85,000 workers as compared with the millions of other workers throughout the Nation, but that I would gladly report their stand to the full committee. I also stated that if it were definitely determined that the workers of the Nation, as well as the labor leaders, wanted the act repealed that it was my personal opinion that it should be done, and that other Members of Congress, in my opinion, would feel likewise. However, I added emphatically a number of times during the course of the hearing that the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 (Taft-Hartley law) was very beneficial to the workers of the Nation. I stated that when the original labor act was passed by Congress that it was done for the purpose of equalizing the rights of labor with those of management and for the purpose of helping the worker. That law set specific restrictions upon management, which restrictions were continued in the amended act of 1947.

I said, during the course of the hearings, that the present act was passed to remedy many of the evils which had sprung up under the old act as the result of the actions of a number of unscrupulous and unprincipled labor leaders, sometimes in combination with employers, and that such actions had to be curbed for the benefit of both employers and employees, primarily to help the workers.

It was also pointed out during the course of the hearing in Chicago, that the old law had resulted in an increased number of strikes each year so that by 1946 there were 116,000,000 man-days of labor lost throughout the country because of strikes which included a Nation-wide strike that darkened the entire country for a period of time. The present law was aimed at ending such a loss of time if it was at all possible to do so, and that the act appeared to be accomplishing that purpose; therefore, it should be given a reasonable opportunity to prove that it was for the best interests of the workers of the Nation. I remarked that no act should be beneficial only to employers and that it was my opinion that if a choice were to be made that it would be the employers who would desire to have the act repealed rather than the workers of the Nation to whom it has been so helpful. The members of the subcommittee feel that much was accomplished by the hearings in developing the meaning of the law so as to allay unnecessary fears which had arisen in the minds of the respective parties to the strike. It is to be regretted, therefore, that incomplete reporting may overcome the otherwise good results of the subcommittee's work.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why was it that the radios broadcast that the gentleman is in favor of the repeal of that law?

Mr. OWENS. It is just the same as if I were to have a conversation with the gentleman from Pennsylvania wherein I said, "I was just speaking with a certain man and he said to me 'I will kill you'." If someone were repeating the conversation I had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and made a statement that I had said "I will kill you," he would be making a correct statement, but by leaving out the words preceding the remark, he would be changing the entire context of my statement. The preceding remarks of mine before I mentioned that the act could be well removed from the books, included the fact that it should be done if it were determined that labor leaders and workers of the country wanted the act repealed. However, that statement was based entirely on the fact that the act was not passed for the benefit of the employers, but for the workers, and for the general welfare of the people of the Nation.

POULTRY PRICES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, after due investigation, I think I have found an answer to the old question of which comes first, the chicken or the egg.

The "new look" on the poultry question proves that first comes the egg. After that, much later, comes the chicken.

During the month of December, for 4 weeks I watched the poultry and egg prices as quoted by my home-town newspaper, the Minden Courier. Eggs ranged in market price from 40 to 50 cents per dozen. And running a tired second were the chickens—hens ranged from 13 to 20 cents a pound, and roosters stayed throughout the month at the one price of 7 cents a pound.

There is no doubt that these are not inflation prices. Seldom in a decade have poultry prices been lower as far as the farmer's market price goes. Yet, in this same past month I have bought poultry in Washington at the lowest-price stores and paid prices for live chickens ranging from 39 to 52 cents per

pound. Prices for dressed chickens were even higher.

Some place along the line someone is making a great deal of profit. Obviously it is not the farmer. And as we all know, it is not the consumer or retail buyer.

I should like to know the answer. I am sure that each of us here assembled can find by comparing notes from the family grocery lists that poultry prices are high beyond reason. If Nebraska, from which I quote current poultry prices, were thousands of air-miles away from Washington, we could find some excuse for these prices to be exorbitantly high. But today the shipping distance between this farm State and Washington, D. C., is a matter of hours by modern transportation.

In calling your attention to these prices, I should like to ask the Congress these two questions, in the general consideration of present inflation.

They are: First, How can farmers continue to produce poultry at these low market prices yet pay the prices they must for freight charges and feed? and, second, Why do not the consumers get the benefit of the low prices farmers are now getting for hens and roosters?

There is an answer around the price corner. I am sure we would all like to have it.

A FREE PRESS AND FREE SPEECH ARE THE SAFEGUARDS OF A REPUBLIC

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, free speech and a free press are the safeguards which make possible the continuation of a representative republican form of government such as that which has prevailed in this land of ours since the adoption of the Constitution.

Apparently so well known was this truism to the founding fathers that it was not thought necessary to incorporate any provision in the Constitution, as first adopted, guaranteeing freedom of speech and of the press.

But the very first amendment to the Constitution remedied that omission and expressly provided that "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."

Unfortunately, all too many individuals and a segment of the press have misconstrued that guaranty to mean that the right to criticize was exclusively theirs; that the right to criticize the critic did not exist.

In more recent years, the Congress, which, after all, is the people's Congress and the servant of the people, and its committees have been pilloried, not only by those who are honestly critical but by those who, through propaganda, seek to impose their opinions upon the people and the Congress.

Many of these individuals, and that part of the press which follows their line, not only through fair criticism but through the use of abuse, half-truths, and sometimes falsehoods, use to the utmost their right to free speech and a free press, but the moment any one of their utterances is criticized become hysterical and yell to high heaven that they are being denied a constitutional right.

One of the more recent examples of this was the attitude of the 10 Hollywood writers and actors. Called before a congressional committee—as was the right of the committee, affirmed by the opinions of the courts, including the United States Supreme Court—they set up a howl of simulated indignation when they were asked whether they belonged to a party which openly advocates the overthrow of this Government by force.

They claimed their constitutional rights were being taken from them. They argued that it was no one's business whether they belonged to that organization. They denied the right of Congress to learn what they were saying and writing and the purpose of their sayings and their writings, and in the same breath insisted upon full freedom to say and write what they pleased, even though the purpose was the destruction of the Government whose protection they were claiming.

To put it briefly, they claimed the unhampered right to speak and to write as they wished, but denied to the people and the Congress the right to criticize them, to make reply to their utterances, after it had been ascertained what they were saying and writing by making direct inquiry of them.

Another illustration is that furnished by the recent inaccurate and repeated comments of editors and columnists who attempt to show that the action of a House subcommittee was an attempt to restrict the right of free speech, of a free press. The basis for their charge grows out of the following facts:

The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman, acting through a subcommittee, of which I am also chairman, is charged by statute with riding herd on the exercise of the powers given executive departments and agencies and the manner in which funds appropriated are spent.

It came to the knowledge of that subcommittee that the Civil Service Commission, through an expenditure of public funds, had compiled and had in its possession an "investigators' leads" file consisting of some 750,000 cards, among which there were cards carrying not only information but rumor and gossip which reflected upon the loyalty and the patriotism of Senators, Senators' wives, Congressmen, and—believe it or not—prominent individuals who were not Federal employees and who could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be classified as applicants for Federal jobs.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CSC

The Civil Service Commission has no authority to expend one cent in investigating, compiling, or maintaining a file bearing upon the loyalty, the patriotism, or any other attribute or characteristic, of a Senator, a Senator's wife, or a Congressman. Nor has it any similar authority to make any such compilation bearing upon the activities or opinions of any other citizen, unless that citizen be an employee of the Federal Government or an applicant for a position under the Federal Government.

Investigating and keeping a record of the words and acts of Senators, Congressmen, or others, which indicate a violation of the law, is the duty of the local and State law-enforcement officials, of the FBI, and of the Department of Justice, not the Civil Service Commission.

Complying with its duty, the subcommittee called as witnesses Mr. Mitchell, the president, Miss Perkins, and Mr. Flemming, the three individuals in charge of the Civil Service Commission. Each testified that the Commission had no authority to compile or maintain such a file, that he did not know it had compiled or was maintaining such a file, that all information contained in it which referred to Senators, Senators' wives, or Congressmen, would be destroyed; that the practice of compiling and maintaining such a file through the expenditure of public funds would be discontinued.

THE FREE PRESS ANGLE

Reporters were present during the taking of the testimony. The purpose of the investigation and the result were known to the Washington Star, which publishes several daily editions circulating in the city of Washington and vicinity.

One of the editors of that paper, exercising his right of free speech and of free press, wrote an editorial captioned "Disloyal Congressmen." The first paragraph of that editorial—which is hereafter quoted in full—carried the charge that there were—and I quote—"Disloyal Congressmen" in Congress and that their names "may have been filed away by the Civil Service Commission."

I do not challenge the right of the Star to make that charge. I assume that the only purpose of making a charge that there are disloyal Congressmen was to bring to the attention of the people and of the Congress the fact—if it were a fact—that some of the people's servants were disloyal, so that they might be defeated at the next election or, more properly, tried by the House on that charge of disloyalty and, if found guilty, at once expelled by the House.

The making of such a charge, if true, would be the rendition of an outstanding public service.

If false, the making of such a charge cannot tend but to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress and, hence, impair its usefulness.

Now note, the Star and its editor exercised the right of free speech and of a free press, but became incensed when the congressional committee, which had been performing its duty, sought to follow through and ascertain whether there was any truth in the charge. The Star might well have welcomed the opportunity to expose disloyal Congressmen, if any there were.

The writer of the editorial and the editor of the paper, appearing before the committee on invitation, were resentful because a committee of the Congress asked them to lay their cards on the table and to name to the committee the

disloyal Congressmen to whom reference was made.

And what was the answer? The editor said that he was not referring to anyone in Congress. What an absurdity for the Star to waste valuable space on its editorial page to caption an editorial "Disloyal Congressmen," to assert in the first paragraph that there were disloyal men in Congress, and then, when called upon to name those men and produce the proof of their disloyalty, to answer—as the editor did—that he was not referring to anyone, not even to the mythical "Senator Claghorn."

Because, subsequently, so many radio commentators, editors, and columnists, free-lance writers—who apparently are more interested in the number of words they can get into the paper than they are in factual statements or accurate conclusions—have falsely charged that the committee was attempting to limit or suppress free speech, these remarks are made. Attached hereto is a reprint—carried in the Friday, November 21, 1947, issue of the Star—of the editorial and that part of the testimony taken at the hearing which is pertinent to the subject discussed.

THE APPARENT FAIRNESS OF THE STAR

Permit me to add that I am deeply appreciative of the courtesy, generosity, and fairness of the Evening Star for this reprint. The testimony clearly shows the purpose of the investigation, and it not only shows that the committee was not attempting to, in any way, limit free speech or a free press, but that the Star had no reason whatever to even hint that there were disloyal men in the Congress.

Unfortunately, the Star could not forget the personal element and was not content to let the public judge the committee or the speaker solely upon the reading of the editorial and the testimony.

On the same day that it printed the testimony and reprinted the first editorial, the editor could not resist the opportunity to take another dig at me. A second editorial, published in the Star on the 21st of November, was captioned "Mr. HOFFMAN and the Star."

The first paragraph reads:

> The Star does not believe that Representative HOFFMAN, of Michigan, is endangering the freedom of the press. He is not big enough to do that. It does not believe that he is intimidating editors and reporters by a disposition to put them on the witness stand before his committee and interrogate them about what they write. Mr. HOFFMAN's abilities as an intimidator are not without their limitations.

Instead of frankly admitting that, as the testimony shows—and you may read for yourself—there was not the slightest thought of attempting to intimidate anyone, rather an effort to ascertain the truth or the falsity of a widely published, serious charge which had been made against the Congress—a charge that there were disloyal individuals within its ranks. This second editorial is merely an attempt to belittle me.

Fortunately—at least for me—the Constitution provides for the election of Congressmen from congressional districts. One of the reasons for that is that the people of a district, presumably knowing the candidates for office, are better able to judge of the candidates' ability, integrity and loyalty than is the editor of a metropolitan newspaper who cannot be expected to know the true character of the 435 Members of the House whom the people are, every 2 years, required to select as their servants.

Nor was the editor of the Star, in this second editorial, content to confine his efforts to derogatory statements about me. Rather, he adopts the Walter Winchell line—you may remember that Walter, after the 1942 election, bemoaned the fact that the people lacked the intelligence to select qualified Congressmen when they reelected those for whose defeat Winchell had campaigned.

In true Winchellian style, the editor writes:

> When one thinks of Congress, one does not think of Mr. HOFFMAN. When one thinks of Mr. HOFFMAN, one thinks of other things—confusion, verbosity, a futile fretfulness, the seniority rule and the sometimes curious manifestations of popular government.

Because the people for whom I work are so kind and so generous to me, the Star's gibes do not greatly worry me, and they are only repeated here to give emphasis to the Star's conclusion that being, in its opinion, lacking in so many qualifications, the people of my district are so dumb that they refuse to accept the dictation of the Star and exhibit "curious manifestations of popular government" when they elect me. The Star feels sorry for the other 528 Members of Congress. The Star feels sorry for the thousands of individuals who elect me. I should feel sorry for the Star. I would, were it not for the fact that I am sure the editor's confidence in his own infallibility and omnipotence will sustain him, and that my sympathy would be wasted.

The testimony and the first editorial are marked "Exhibit A." The second editorial is marked "Exhibit B."

EXHIBIT A

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of November 21, 1947]

REPRESENTATIVE HOFFMAN AND THE STAR

Representative HOFFMAN, Republican, of Michigan, yesterday on the floor of the House described a Star editorial, entitled "Disloyal Congressmen," as "not only inaccurate, unfair, but tends to create lack of confidence in Congress; to impair its authority."

The Star editorial appeared October 6 and Mr. HOFFMAN's remarks yesterday were an amplification of previous criticism. On October 7, John H. Cline, the Star's chief editorial writer, was invited to appear before the House Expenditures Committee, of which Mr. HOFFMAN is chairman, for discussion of the editorial. He was accompanied by B. M. McKelway, editor of the Star. Following is a transcript of the questioning at that time, printed so that the public may have a complete understanding of the points involved:

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, I think that Mr. McKelway has something to say. Will you identify yourself?

"Mr. MCKELWAY. I am B. M. McKelway, editor of the Evening Star. I have come here with Mr. John H. Cline, the chief editorial writer of the Star, and I merely wish to make it plain, sir, that both of us have come in response to the committee's invitation and out of respect to a committee of the Congress. We have nothing to defend or explain, but Mr. Cline will be glad to help the committee if he can.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is my understanding of it. Mr. Cline was invited and I assume that he asked you to come along, which is very agreeable to us.

"May I also say that there has been no charge made against anyone. We are merely seeking information. That is why Mr. Cline was asked to come. Will you give your name, please?

"Mr. CLINE. My name is John H. Cline.

"The CHAIRMAN. In last night's Star this editorial appeared captioned 'Disloyal Congressmen.' Did you write that, Mr. Cline?

"Mr. CLINE. Yes, I did.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, the caption, in the opinion of some, leads to the conclusion that there are in Congress disloyal Congressmen. Was that your intention, to say that there are Members of Congress who are disloyal?

"Mr. CLINE. No, sir. I think that the text of the editorial makes it very clear that I did not intend to say that and in fact it does not say it.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then the editorial continues:

" 'Very few people share the reported indignation of certain Members of the House at the discovery that the names of disloyal Congressmen may have been filed away by the Civil Service Commission.'

"What do you mean by the expression 'disloyal Congressmen?' Identify them, if you will.

"Mr. CLINE. As I said, I do not know of any disloyal Congressmen. As I understand it, this hearing is based on the assumption that the names of certain Members of Congress appeared in this file and that there has been a suggestion that they may have been affiliated with some Nazi, Fascist, or Communist organization."

HAS NOT EXPLAINED FILES

"The CHAIRMAN. Let me interrupt you right there. Mr. Flemming (Civil Service Commissioner), have you examined the files sufficiently to know whether the names of Senators and Congressmen are in the files?

"Mr. FLEMMING. Mr. Chairman, I have not. The information that I have is the information that was divulged to me at the hearing yesterday.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then, to make the record complete, I wish you would send us up a letter stating whether it is or is not true the names of Senators, Senators' wives, and Congressmen appear in those files.

"Mr. FLEMMING. I think, Mr. Chairman, we agreed yesterday after we had made a search of the files we would make such a report, and we will do that.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, in your opinion would not the average reader reading that first paragraph, and I will repeat it—

" 'Very few people will share the reported indignation of certain Members of Congress at the discovery that the names of disloyal Congressmen may have been filed away by the Civil Service Commission'—

"Leads to the conclusion that you were stating that there were disloyal Congressmen?

"Mr. CLINE. I certainly do not think so, and if you read the next sentence, I am sure that you will not think so.

"The CHAIRMAN. And that paragraph standing alone does not state, in your opinion, that there are disloyal Congressmen?

"Mr. CLINE. It conveys there may be, I will agree to that.

"The CHAIRMAN. Not that there may be disloyal Congressmen, but the names of disloyal Congressmen—that is a statement of fact—may have been filed away. The word 'may' relates to the filing away, do you not agree with me on that?"

DOES NOT AGREE ON WORD

"Mr. CLINE. I do not agree with you on that. If you want to construe it that way, you can.

"The CHAIRMAN. I just want to construe it as the average reader would. You say that

that sentence does not convey the impression that there are disloyal Congressmen?

"Mr. CLINE. It would not convey it to me.

"The CHAIRMAN. All right; and you say this:

" 'It is not certain that the names of any Congressmen are in this file, but if there are any they got there in the course of investigations which the Commission has been directed to make.'

"Now, that is a statement that the Commission has directed the making of these investigations.

"Mr. CLINE. No; it is not.

"The CHAIRMAN. It is not?

"Mr. CLINE. It is a statement that the names got there in the course of an investigation which the Commission was instructed to make. I refer there to the President's Executive order directing the Commission to make this investigation.

"The CHAIRMAN. What order?

"Mr. CLINE. I do not know the number of the order.

"The CHAIRMAN. When was it made?

"Mr. CLINE. Within the past few years.

"The CHAIRMAN. But this file dates back to 1943, Mr. Cline, so that answer is not any good, is it?"

DIRECTION OF PRESIDENT

"Mr. CLINE. The Commission has been directed by the President throughout the war to make an investigation, a series of investigations.

"The CHAIRMAN. You mean the Civil Service Commission?

"Mr. CLINE. That is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. If you know of any such order that applies to anybody in Congress we will be glad to have it.

"Mr. CLINE. I did not say that it applied to anybody in Congress.

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes; you do. You say, 'Actually it is not certain that the names of any Congressmen are in the files.'

"Mr. CLINE. Why do you not read the whole editorial?

"The CHAIRMAN. I will get to it in a minute, but I am getting to it sentence by sentence and paragraph by paragraph. You say, 'But if there are any, they got there in the course of investigations which the Commission has been directed to make.'

"Now, you heard Mr. Flemming testify that the Commission has no authority to make any such investigation. Where do you get your authority that the Commission had?

"Mr. CLINE. The editorial says that the names, if they are there, got there in the course of investigations that the Commission should make.

"The CHAIRMAN. In spite of the statement that Mr. Flemming said that they had no authority."

SEES NO CONFLICT

"Mr. CLINE. I see no conflict between the two statements at all. The Commission was certainly directed to make investigations and in the course of those investigations these names may have gotten into the files.

"The CHAIRMAN. It is a good thing that your reporters do not proceed by the same mental processes.

"Mr. CLINE. That may be.

"The CHAIRMAN. I will say it is.

"Then you say, 'The Commission, of course, does not investigate the Congressmen as such, but for example it does investigate Federal job applicants.'

"And now this is the important part: 'In the course of such investigation it might discover that the applicant had signed some Communist or Fascist petition.'

"Of course, the members of the committee and the Congressmen generally conceive that it is their duty; that is, if the applicant had signed a Communist petition, the fact would be recorded in the files and the other names on the petition would go into what is called a lead file. I think that no one will disagree that the procedure is not correct, but assume that John Doe applies for a Federal job, over which the Civil Service Commission has jurisdiction and in support of his application he presents 10 letters of endorsement and that one of the letters is from a Communist. Is it your opinion that the name of the other nine letters should be placed in the files of the Commission with a notation to the effect that they had endorsed an applicant for a job who is also endorsed by a Communist?"

DO YOU ASK MY OPINION?

"Mr. CLINE. Do you ask is it my opinion that they should be put in?

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

"Mr. CLINE. I should not think so.

"The CHAIRMAN. Here is another paragraph:

" 'Why should immunity from an investigation, especially from what is purely an incidental investigation, extend to Congressmen and to no one else? What is there so sacred and untouchable about the position these gentlemen happen to hold?'

"Yesterday it was stated here, and I have never heard it questioned by any Member of either the Senate or the House, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, and the Police Department of the city of Washington, the State police and any law-enforcing agency, has the right to investigate Congressmen or Senators, or even the President, if they want to. Where did you get the idea that this committee, or any member of it, was objecting to any investigation other than the one under discussion, the one conducted by the Civil Service Commission which admits that it had no authority to do?

"Mr. CLINE. This is the investigation that I am talking about.

"The CHAIRMAN. Where did you get the idea that any Congressman or Senator claims immunity from investigation by any agency other than the Civil Service Commission?

"Mr. CLINE. I did not say they did.

"The CHAIRMAN. You do not think that editorial leaves that impression?"

DOUBTS SUCH IMPRESSION

"Mr. CLINE. I do not think so. This editorial is directed exclusively to this particular investigation.

"The CHAIRMAN. If that is so, to what Congressmen were you referring in the caption 'Disloyal Congressmen'?

"Mr. CLINE. I was not referring to any particular Congressman.

"The CHAIRMAN. Senator Claghorn?

"Mr. CLINE. I was not referring to Senator Claghorn.

"Mr. STONE (reporter for newspaper PM). What is your authority to investigate the press? What is this all about? What authority does this committee have?

"The CHAIRMAN. Put that man out if he does not keep still.

"You are not objecting to coming up here, are you, Mr. Cline?

"Mr. CLINE. No.

"The CHAIRMAN. Certainly not, and the editor has no objection?

"Mr. MCKELWAY. No.

"The CHAIRMAN. As I have stated before, we are only trying to get this thing straight so that the Star editorial writers as well as the reporters will know what we are objecting to.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. We are anxious to find out.

"The CHAIRMAN. For myself—and I think I speak for every Member of the House—I have no objection to the FBI, the sheriff, the policemen who are charged by law with making an investigation to make an investigation, but what I am objecting to—and I think the committee—is the fact that money has been appropriated by the Congress that has been used without authority of law to make an investigation, an investigation which was made by the Civil Service Commission which every member of the Commission says it had no authority to make, and who say that they did not know that the information was in the files.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. That is the only basis of your objection?"

FURTHER OBJECTION

"The CHAIRMAN. And the further objection that the information in there consists largely of rumors, hearsay, reports about this, that, or the other, some of which are responsible and some of which are irresponsible, and are known the country over as being unreliable and smear articles.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. The editorial is not based on hearsay.

"The CHAIRMAN. I thought that you were talking about the investigation that the Civil Service Commission made. That is what I was talking about, not about your editorial. You say the editorial is not based on hearsay, but the editorial is captioned 'Disloyal Congressmen.' Maybe I am entirely wrong, but my thought was that the average reader would at once reach the conclusion that the Star and the editors of the Star were announcing it as a fact that there were disloyal Congressmen and that the Congressmen who had been referred to in this file were objecting to the publicity given them; is that clear?

"Mr. MCKELWAY. Your point is clear. The caption refers to the names of disloyal Congressmen that might be in these files.

"Mr. HARDY (Representative from Virginia, member of the committee). I think the key to that is this—the fact that there are names in that file does not indicate that the information contained on those cards is either accurate or justified.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. Would that apply to all names?

"Mr. HARDY. I think that it would from the investigation yesterday, and the assumption that the existence of these cards in that file indicates that a Member of Congress or anyone else is disloyal is an erroneous concept.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. Yes; the same principle applies to all the names that might be in the file.

"Mr. HARDY. Some of the information on those cards may be substantiated. Most of it, as I understood the testimony yesterday was not substantiated information and the thing that I objected to was the possible publicity of information contained on those cards, which information had not been authenticated in any way.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. You are speaking, sir, of Congressmen only?"

SPEAKING OF ANY CARDS

"Mr. HARDY. I am speaking of Congressmen, and I am speaking of any other cards in there that contain information that is not verified.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. But in the case of Congressmen, there would be no opportunity to verify it because the Commission had no right to make such an investigation?

"The CHAIRMAN. Then the answer to that is it has no right to receive a complaint as long as the individual name is not an applicant for a job.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. Has no right to receive a complaint against a Member of Congress?

"The CHAIRMAN. Against anyone who is not an applicant for a job that comes under such civil-service jurisdiction. Do you not see?

"Mr. HARDY. May I say this? I am sure it 's not the attitude of the chairman, and I know it is not my attitude, to shield anyone who is disloyal, whether he be a Member of Congress or otherwise; but it is not the function of the Civil Service Commission to indicate whether a Congressman is subversive or not, and it certainly is not a function of the Civil Service Commission, or any other agency of the Government to possess unauthenti-

cated information which might cast a
flection upon the loyalty of a Membe
Congress.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. I think that there
cases where, as you say, information w
has not been authenticated, relating to
people than Members of Congress, has
made public.

"Mr. HARDY. From the Civil Service C
mission's records?

"Mr. MCKELWAY. No, sir, from other rec

"Mr. HARDY. That should not be done
gardless of who the individual is.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. I agree with you."

MENTIONED NAMES

"The CHAIRMAN. You see, my point
further than just to Congressmen. I
tioned names here yesterday. For inst
I think that I named Henry Kaiser and
less and half a dozen men who are pr
nent in our national industrial life, an
point was that if none of those gentle
had applied and would not be apt to a
for a job it was not right or fair to
their names in there on the cards, ch
that they might be this, that, or the o
any more than it would be fair to you.
pose that your name appears down t
Who says so? Oh, some Congressman
that I was such-and-such and so-and-so
doesn't make any difference that a Cong
man said it, but the fact that they p
in a Government file lends dignity to it
authority to it.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. I think that everyone
be glad to hear you say that.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is it. The Con
is the judge of the qualifications of its M
bers. It is not the business of the
Service Commission whether I am a c
disloyal, or anything else. It is the
ness of the FBI, the Committee on Un-Am
can Activities, and it is your business a
editor to expose me, if you desire,
nobody complains about that. That
with the job, and that is not what we
complaining about. What I am complai
about here is the inaccuracy of this edit
and how it would be understood by the
age reader, because when you put it in
paper some fellow will say, 'Well, it appe
in the Star.' For instance, a radio
mentator said after 1942, 'What are you g
to do with the eight saboteurs in Congr
He did not have anything. That was ju
smear.

"Mr. MCKELWAY. Of course, the edit
did not say that.

"The CHAIRMAN. The editorial said
loyal Congressmen.'

"Mr. CLINE. On the point of how the
age person might react to the editorial, m
interpret the editorial, I have a letter
Congressman MCDOWELL, whom I do
know. It came in this morning in the co
of the mails. May I read it?

"The CHAIRMAN. If you think it is
tinent."

READS M'DOWELL LETTER

"Mr. CLINE. It reads:

" 'I read with a great deal of interest
original story saying that somebody has
a fuss about a report of an investigatio
the files of the Civil Service Commission,
named some Members of Congress, and,
sequently, your editorial of Monday, Oc
6, entitled "Disloyal Congressmen."
editorial is very good and very logical
states the case exactly.

" 'I doubt if very many people will b
dignant in that the Civil Service Com
sion has somewhere in its office inform
regarding Members of Congress. As a
ber, I do not see why any Member of a
lative body of the Nation should mind
investigated. Without exception, each o
us campaigns vigorously for our seats,
it has become traditional in American po
that if your background cannot stan
vestigation, it would be very unwise to
the political arena.

what it was all about, the text of the editorial and the transcript of the hearing which its publication provoked are reprinted on page A-16. Nothing that Mr. HOFFMAN said at the hearing or yesterday in the House affects the honesty or the validity of the Star's comment or the Star's right to make it.

As for Mr. HOFFMAN'S fears that the editorial may have shaken public confidence in Congress, they are not well founded. When one thinks of Congress, one does not think of Mr. HOFFMAN. When one thinks of Mr. HOFFMAN, one thinks of other things—confusion, verbosity, a futile fretfulness, the seniority rule, and the sometimes curious manifestations of popular government. But one does not necessarily think of Congress. There are 529 Members of Congress, but there is only one Mr. HOFFMAN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business re Atomic Energy Committee.

To Mr. GAMBLE (at the request of Mr. LEONARD W. HALL), for 2 days, on account of attendance at former Representative Hancock's funeral.

To Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for the balance of the week, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. CRAVENS (at the request of Mr. GATHINGS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. COLE of New York and Mr. ANDREWS of New York to attend the funeral of Hon. Clarence E. Hancock.

To Mr. BLATNIK, for 5 days, on account of business in his district.

To Mrs. DOUGLAS, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. REEVES.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to announce the death of Clarence E. Hancock, who for nearly 20 years was a Member of the House of Representatives and was one of its most distinguished members. For many years he was the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which is the position he held at the time of his retirement on the 3d of January 1947.

Mr. Hancock was an able speaker. The occasions were too rare that we had the opportunity to listen to him here. But every time he spoke, what he had to say carried great weight. In my opinion, he was one of the fairest, ablest, keenest, as well as one of the most influential Members of the House. I regret to say that he was compelled to retire because of ill health, which took him away from us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, as the leader of our delegation has announced, Hon. Clarence E. Hancock has passed from this life. Those of us who knew him, and I am sure there are many in the House, would agree with the statement on my part that if he were here he would not want this. As a mutual friend of ours said to me a few moments ago if Hancock were here he would say, "Please don't do that to me." Suffice it to say that we were old friends for over a period of thirty-odd years. Our military service together included service as enlisted men on the Mexican border as noncommissioned officers, and as officers of the front line with the Twenty-seventh New York National Guard Division in France, and we enjoyed a long period of association together here in the House. I think it is safe to say that rarely has one been among us who walked so humbly and who was so little given to show or extravagant statement. His rare sense of humor and cordial good friendship for Members of both sides of the aisle were fitting characteristics to top off his truly fine character, his unusually clear and analytical mind for legislative considerations. We grieve with the members of his family in the loss of our dear friend—a real soldier and a gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, when the late Representative Clarence E. Hancock announced his intention to retire from Congress, I made some remarks in the House and said in part:

> Mr. Hancock retires of his own volition. Possessed of one of the best legal minds in the Congress, endowed with plenty of courage, he commands the respect and confidence of all of us. Never offensively partisan, he is a good Republican, believing thoroughly in the American way of life. When he speaks in Congress, people listen because he says something worth while. He is never a demagog. Many a law is a better law because Clarence Hancock helped write it, and in his retiring we lose a most valuable member of the Judiciary Committee and one whose services the country can ill afford to lose in these trying days. The country is safe with men like Mr. Hancock at the legislative helm.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that I made those remarks when Clarence Hancock was living and could appreciate how his colleagues, and especially his teammates on the Committee on the Judiciary felt about him. I can add nothing.

To his splendid wife and son I extend my most genuine sympathy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS].

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1946, when word came to me that Clarence Hancock would not seek reelection to this body, I took occasion to make this statement upon the floor of the House:

> In this decision I sense a loss to this country which cannot be measured by any expression of my personal regret, keen though it be, for I value beyond words the privilege of his friendship.
>
> Modest, kind, clean, able, he has served his State and country with distinction for 20 years. We all have ideals, from which most of us fall terribly short, but if I were asked what qualities of brain and heart best fit a man to represent a great district of intelligent people, I could do no better than point to the gentleman from New York, Clarence Hancock.

It is fitting that the usual proceedings of this body should be interrupted today—that for a few moments we record the passing of our former colleague.

To those who possessed the privilege of his friendship, he was ever a comfort and a joy. Let others bear testimony to his abilities as a lawyer and legislator, true to duty, loyal to the truth. The flower of sweet friendship is all I seek to lay upon that "covered bridge" through which Clarence Hancock has passed to his eternal—his heavenly—home.

He was modest, companionable, loyal and brave.

His modesty was not the least of his charms. He had no pride of opinion. He demanded of his party and his country no honors for the unquestioned talents he exercised in their behalf. He asked only the opportunity to serve. The State of New York, his Committee on Judiciary, the Republican Party and the country accepted his services and his sacrifices, and "he gained from Heaven—'twas all he wished—a friend."

He was a companionable man. His wit was keen, but never barbed. Many sided and magnanimous, malice and revenge he knew not. Trouble has his sympathy, stupidity his kind reproof. Kindness was his daily habit, and generosity almost a fault. He loved his friends. He knew that the only way to have a friend is to be one.

He was loyal.

His pleasure in his ability to serve his people knew no bounds. It is a wonderful—yes—inspiring thought, that since God created man there has never been an edifice erected, a statue placed, a memorial tablet framed to any man who only got and kept.

Religion, literature, poetry, and the consensus of mankind have all united in this—that the highest honor known to man shall be only won by those who have given consecrated service to their fellowmen.

He was a brave man.

In the days when it is easy to be brave in the support of measures that are sure to command the assent of the majority, when so often men shrink from opposing what they fear they will be out-numbered in opposing, the courage of Clarence Hancock—the dauntlessness with which he hewed to the line as he saw it—is the trait I believe most needed and most lacking in public life. He possessed it, he exercised it, and he did so to the end.

He was content to dwell in the serene minority with truth and with the right.

If he were sitting before me today, I would say, "Clarence, I do not care where my fireplace is or my garden, if only you will put on the logs for me and pick my roses."

He will live in the hearts of his friends.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of pure crass materialism, the compensation for service as a Member of Congress is of no great moment, but from the standpoint of spiritual and moral values, the position pays handsomely; the dividends are rich and priceless. Outside the personal satisfaction which one derives from his devotion to duty in the public service, the really great reward for service in Congress is the opportunity it affords

each of us to work and live and play with fine, able, and noble characters—such a person as was the former Member of the House, Clarence E. Hancock, whose passing we mourn today.

Two years ago, when Mr. Hancock announced his decision not to seek reelection because of ill health, it came as a distinct shock to the legion of his friends in the Congress, for it was generally recognized that he possessed in an unusual degree those statesmanlike qualities so desirable in a representative of the people in the National Legislature. In fact, the feeling of loss in the realization that his services would no longer be available here in the Halls of Congress was so acute that a most unusual step was taken by his colleagues here in the House. All of the Republican Members from New York State joined with all the Republican members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, with the then minority leader and present Speaker and other Republican leaders, to petition Mr. Hancock and the party leaders of his district and State seeking a reconsideration of his decision and an arrangement which would make possible the continuation of his services here. This action in itself was a great tribute to Mr. Hancock and speaks more forcibly than any words which we might utter here today of the high regard and esteem in which he was held by the Congress. Unfortunately, he knew better than any of us what was best for him and his constituency; typical of his constant forthrightness and sincerity of purpose, his people were allowed a new representative and he was free to concentrate on the recovery of his health, which had been so severely undermined in the public service. It is tragic that his efforts were unsuccessful.

The first time I became acquainted with Mr. Hancock was in 1934 at the Republican State Convention at Rochester, N. Y., when he delivered the keynote address in which was clearly evident the great talents as a legislator and statesman which he possessed. Subsequent years of association with him in the House substantiated that first impression. Narrow partisanship was not in his book; demagoguery was his mortal foe; political expediency he constantly shunned; devotion to duty, honesty of purpose, intellectual sincerity, impassionate patriotism, courage, simplicity, kindliness, and habitual frankness were the signposts that marked his path of life.

Already his absence from us has been notable, now that he has moved along into the eternal life to welcome our arrival, his presence here is all the more keenly missed. His spirit will remain with us forever and, to me at least, constantly serve as an inspiration for greater efforts in the public service and the living of a more noble life. All of us are better persons because of our association with Clarence; though we shall miss him greatly we are profoundly grateful for the opportunity to have known him and to have loved him.

But Clarence Hancock was more than an outstanding legislator and statesman. He was a good soldier in the military service of his country; he was a devoted father, leaving behind a son, the pride of his life, possessing most of his own admirable traits, and a widow who was his inspiration and whose sweet, kindly understanding and Spartan character arouse the love and admiration of all who know her.

Whenever Clarence wished to pay an unusual compliment to a person in recognition of that individual's ability, intellect, courage, and character, he would say that the person was a "stout fellow." It was an expression which was used by him with great discretion, discrimination, and infrequency. No finer tribute could he pay to any person than to say that he was a "stout fellow." Clarence Hancock was just such a person himself. He was the kind of man whom all men admire. He was the kind of person who inspires confidence and emulation. He was the kind of person who leaves the world better than he found it. His was a noble life, overflowing with brilliant public service, abounding with innumerable fast friendships and rich with the devotion of a happy home and family. Clarence E. Hancock was truly a "stout fellow." We admire his character, we cherish his friendship, and we honor his memory.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I shall always cherish as one of the finest possessions of my congressional experience my close personal friendship with Clarence Hancock. He was one of the strongest, most able, and most honest men whom I have ever known. He was resourceful in debate, vigorous in his advocacy of any cause in which he believed, but with all of that he was one of the most kindly gentlemen I have ever known.

He also possessed in the highest degree one of the finest characteristics that any man can ever have, great humility. Clarence Hancock had much of which to be proud, but he never evidenced that sort of feeling. Rather he was humble, always possessed of that humility which, in my opinion, is one of greatness.

A great American once said that everything he was and everything he hoped to be he owed to his mother.

As for myself I can say that for everything I am, and everything that I ever hope to be, I owe a deep and sincere and real measure of gratitude to Clarence Hancock and to his fine influence on my life.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of distinct loss that I speak of the death of my very dear friend, Clarence Hancock, who served his State and his Nation for 20 years as a Member of this House from the Thirty-fifth District of the State of New York, which later became the Thirty-sixth District under the Reapportionment Act.

Mr. Hancock was born in the city of Syracuse February 13, 1885, attending the public schools of that city, and later graduating from Wesleyan University with the degree of bachelor of arts. He then started his chosen profession of the law, attending New York Law School, from which he graduated in 1908 with the degree of bachelor of law. During the years that he was a practicing attorney of the city of Syracuse, on two occasions he left his practice and entered the service of his country—the first time as a member of Troop E, First New York Cavalry, serving on the Mexican border, and the second time as a member of the One Hundred and Sixth Machine Gun Battalion, Twenty-seventh Division, New York National Guard, in the First World War, serving with the American Expeditionary Forces in France with great distinction.

It was while he was a member of the First New York Cavalry that I first became acquainted with him, both he and I serving in that regiment on the border during 1916 and a part of 1917. Throughout the years we kept up our friendship, and in 1943, when I first became a Member of the Congress of the United States, it was he who offered me the advice necessary for the general welfare of a new Member.

Mr. Hancock in 1926–27 was corporation counsel of the city of Syracuse and was gifted with that particular type of a legal mind necessary to give true and accurate legal decisions arising from the problems that daily came to him as such counsel.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House and later as its ranking member, he was respected and admired by all Members for his calm and dispassionate analysis of the many problems which came before that committee. His voice on the floor of this House brought attentive and respectful listening from his colleagues, and his word was unquestioned.

As a friend I shall miss him, and to his family I can only express from the heart my deepest sympathy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply shocked this morning. I had not known of Clarence Hancock's death until my arrival this noon.

Nineteen years ago I first met him, and during the years of my husband's service in this House he was one of those most frequently in my home. When I came in as a Member of this body he was one of the few to whom I felt I could go with all the many questions of a new Member without any sense of embarrassment, certain of helpful comment and advice, often couched with humor, and always with understanding.

Clarence knew me well, and I knew him, and loved him even as I love his wife.

A conversation which he and I had once down on a Florida beach when he and other members of a small group of this House were staying with my husband and me comes to me very vividly today. We were discussing life and death, the meaning of life, the possibilities in death; where did it come from, where does it go? I have always read much in the philosophies of the various races and nations of the world. We had looked up and discussed some of the passages that had meant much to me. The passage which I want to read into the

RECORD appealed to Clarence so very much that several times in the years afterward he would speak of it. When some of our close friends went on he would say, "Frances, let me read that again. I hope you will always carry it in your purse. I like to know it is there."

This is from the ancient Aryan Vedas, translated by Sir Edwin Arnold:

IMMORTALITY

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;
Never was time it was not: "End and Beginning are dreams."
Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;
Death hath not touched it all, dead though the house of it seems.

Nay, but as one who layeth his worn-out robes away,
And taking new ones, sayeth "These will I wear today!"
So putteth by the spirit lightly its robe of flesh,
And passeth to inherit a residence afresh.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Hancock was a great man because he combined kindliness, friendliness, tolerance, understanding, simplicity, and judgment with sheer downright ability. I shall always treasure the benefits of my too brief association with a man who merited both love and respect in such abundant measure.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday I took up the paper and noticed an article stating that Clarence Hancock had died. I mentioned it to my wife, who is a great friend of Mrs. Hancock. We could hardly realize that he had passed. He was such a fine fellow. We attended the funeral services yesterday and heard Dr. Montgomery quote the scriptures which were so appropriate with reference to the life of Clarence Hancock. When I looked in the room and saw the beautiful flowers that were sent there as a tribute by his friends, I thought of how much his friends thought of Clarence Hancock and what he must have meant to them during his life. Such beautiful flowers would be a tribute to anyone on his passing. And today I think of the many Members of Congress who want to say a word about him and of their association with him. I always honored and respected Clarence Hancock for his gentleness and his ability. He stood out among the Members of the House as one who was considerate, kind, honorable, and just—a man whom we could respect. Clarence Hancock has left us, but we shall always cherish his fine attributes and the spirit in which he associated with his fellow men. While he has gone to his great reward, he will always be remembered as a man. What a wonderful thing it is to have associated with men who leave their marks in life as Clarence Hancock has. He has done honor to the people of Syracuse and the people of his district who knew him and loved him. The country is better because of him. I think the finest thing that can be said of anyone after he is gone is that he was everybody's friend. He tried to do everything he could to make life brighter and sweeter and happier for those who knew him and associated with him. We extend our sympathy to Mrs. Hancock and their son.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a Member of the House with whom I served from the time that I came here in the Seventy-sixth Congress and subsequently until his retirement. It was a great shock to me when I heard of Clarence Hancock's passing. I cherished him as one of the finest friends that it was my opportunity to make. His was one of the finest associations I have had while I have been a Member of the House. I recall one summer when my daughter and I were visiting the northern part of my district. Clarence Hancock's summer residence is in Cazenovia, N. Y., in Madison County, which is in my district. I had been a speaker at one of the meetings there and that evening we were entertained by the most gracious of hosts, Clarence and Mrs. Hancock. That visit will remain indelible upon my memory as long as I live. Even in the early years of my service in the House, Clarence E. Hancock was looked upon as one of the outstanding leaders of upstate New York and of this body. He was very well thought of throughout the southern tier and the people of Syracuse had enough faith and confidence in him to send him to Congress for 20 years.

Any man who can remain in this body and serve as diligently and faithfully as long as he did possesses an intangible something which many of us yearn to possess but which escapes many of us.

Few of us appreciate the good things of life while they are evident, and it is especially true of friendship. Often death's door has to be closed before the real loss becomes apparent.

In paying tribute to our former distinguished colleague, when a friend such as Clarence Hancock is taken away, we can use the words of the poet:

For it so falls out that what we have we prize not to its worth while we enjoy it;
But being lacked and lost, why then we rack the value;
Then we find the virtue that possession would not show us while it was ours.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve in this House with our beloved friend and colleague, Clarence Hancock, for almost 20 years. He was one of the best friends that I have ever had in Congress, both at work and at play. His death is a tremendous personal loss.

Clarence Hancock had a long record of distinguished service, both to his State and to the Nation.

He served on the Mexican border in 1916. He served in World War I as a captain of a machine-gun battalion in the Twenty-seventh Division. He served as corporation counsel for the city of Syracuse. He served in this House from the Seventieth through the Seventy-ninth Congress.

A fine lawyer, the ranking member on the powerful Judiciary Committee, he served America with great ability and great fidelity.

Of the highest character, possessed of qualities which endeared him to all those with whom he came in contact, he will be greatly missed, I know, by every one of us who served with him here in the Congress, and by his wide circle of friends.

I join in extending my heartfelt sympathy to all his family, and particularly to his devoted wife and to his son of whom he was so proud.

America needs more public servants like Clarence Hancock.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker—

A king once said of a prince struck down,
Taller he seems in death;
And this speech holds true, for now, as then,
'Tis after death that we measure men.

No man with whom I have served in this House during the last 26 years was more popular, regardless of his political affiliations, than Clarence Hancock, of New York. He will grow in stature with the passing years.

I believe it was Thomas Jefferson who once said there are three questions to ask an applicant for public office: Is he honest; is he qualified; is he faithful? Clarence Hancock measured up to that standard set by Jefferson, one of the greatest statesmen of all time.

We all join in mourning his passing, and I, for one, feel a keen personal loss in the death of one of the best personal friends with whom I have ever served.

There comes to my mind the words of William Cullen Bryant in his Ode to a Waterfowl, where he said:

Thou'rt gone, the abyss of heaven
Hath swallowed up thy form; yet, on my heart
Deeply hath sunk the lesson thou has given,
And shall not soon depart.

He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will guide my steps aright.

Clarence Hancock's life will always be to me a guiding light which I trust may help to keep my footsteps in the right path.

He was one of the finest Americans I have ever known. I not only join in mourning his passing, but extend to his bereaved family my heartfelt sympathy in their great sorrow.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, after all the fine things that have been said of Clarence Hancock, for me to speak is not to add more to his honor but is a great comfort to me.

In my first year here in Congress in the summer of 1939 I lived with Clarence Hancock and a group of Congressmen and got to know him and his gentle humor and his keen mind and his unswerving integrity. It was then that I

learned his definition of a "stout fellow" which has already been quoted. By that he meant, among other things, one who puts intellectual honesty always above political expediency. I saw him through the years live out in his own life his definition of a stout fellow. This was an inspiring lesson to me in my service here, however much I may have faltered and fallen from the example he gave. I have missed him in the last year. I shall miss him in the years ahead. My heart goes out to Emily, his fine wife, and to John, his fine son, in their loss. We are all better for having known him.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand here with a very full heart on this occasion. Within the last few days I have suffered terribly because of the loss of one of the dearest friends I have ever had among men. It was my opportunity to know Clarence E. Hancock for the past 35 years. He was a grand man, and as you all know he was a man of extraordinary ability and a man of great patriotism, a man who has left behind him a monument of conspicuous public service.

I know something of how the people of Syracuse felt toward Clarence Hancock. I know that city is in mourning today, and I regard the city of Syracuse because of the character of its citizenship, as a great city. How do you measure it?

What makes a city great?
Huge piles of stone heaped heavenward?
Vast multitudes who live within wide circling walls?
Palace and throne and riches past the count of man to tell?
No; these the empty husk.
True honor dwells where noble deeds are done
And great men rise whose names
Athwart the dusk of misty centuries gleam like the sun.

Clarence E. Hancock was modest in every respect, yet he has added to the greatness of his home city. I want to measure his true worth by a standard that never fails; that is, no man is worth more than he contributes to the social, civic, and spiritual progress of the community in which he lives. I happen to know what he has done for his home city with the aid of his splendid and beautiful and self-sacrificing wife. They were active in every organization that tended to strengthen the spiritual and civic spirit of their home city.

He served with distinction as a corporation counsel of that great city. The people knew him before they sent him here; they knew they were sending a man of great ability and fine character to represent them.

It has been said many times by men on the floor of this House that they loved and respected this fine legislator. He has made a permanent place for himself in the hearts of the legislators of this House. He has left a great heritage of achievement, not only in legislation but in the influence for good which he has bequeathed to this and future generations of men. Clarence carried with him an atmosphere of sunshine and good will. He displayed great courage when controversial public questions were before this House. His was a useful and patriotic life.

So, in conclusion, I want to say to you today, my good friends, that I mourn the death of Clarence Hancock and my heart pours out an understanding sympathy to his fine wife and his splendid son and his wife and the relatives of this splendid, distinguished man.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may have the right to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members of the House may have the right to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Hancock will long be remembered in this House, not only because of his value as a legislator but also because of his qualities as a man.

His work on the Judiciary Committee was of a very high order. He was an excellent lawyer with a real understanding of legislative problems. Over the years the Members of the House came to have complete confidence in him. He displayed rare skill in explaining a complicated legal proposition so that all could understand. That was due to his habit of putting aside nonessentials and concentrating on the real point at issue.

Clarence Hancock was a real Congressman because he was a real man. He never engaged in pussy-footing or demagogery. He thought things through and his final decision was never affected by consideration of what it might do to him personally. One of his conspicuous traits was modesty. He never pushed himself forward, nor did he ever turn from the path of duty to seek popularity. Yet who in this House has been more universally admired, more generally loved? A capable and devoted legislator, a true and loyal friend, and citizen of the highest character—that was Clarence Hancock.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in a testimonial of the worth and character of Clarence Hancock. My service here antedates his service. I remember him from his first day's service in this House. He and I and one or two other Members sat down together to lunch on his first day's attendance. I was so impressed with the fine quality of his mind at that our first meeting that I have always remembered that meeting and the impression he made on me.

Later I grew to know him intimately. I found then that he was a man of sterling character. His children have every reason to be proud of him. When he decided to retire from membership in this House, I felt that the House was losing one of its most brilliant and most worthy Members. To his family I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a mighty oak has fallen. When I came to Congress a year ago from upstate New York, on all sides, my colleagues here, particularly those on the Judiciary Committee, where he had labored so effectively and faithfully for many years, told me of the extremely high respect and regard which Clarence Hancock enjoyed among the Members of this body.

I had known him as a leading practicing lawyer of my neighboring city of Syracuse. Down here I came to the realization that, in his quiet, pleasant, and efficient manner, during his service as a legislator he had gained national stature and made a contribution over the years second to none in the life of our Nation.

To Mrs. Hancock, his family, and to the thousands throughout the land, especially in his well-beloved home in Syracuse, who mourn his passing, I express my deepest sympathy, both in a very personal way and as the Representative of the neighboring county of Monroe, N. Y. We feel keenly the loss of this distinguished public servant, but even more of this true and loyal friend.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were colleagues of Clarence Hancock in the Seventy-ninth Congress remember well the deep concern we felt when he announced that he would not be a candidate for election to the Eightieth Congress. The news of his decision came to us suddenly and we could scarce understand it. Many of us, conscious of his remarkable value as a legislator, endeavored to persuade him to change his mind, and many of his constituents in and around Syracuse made a similar effort—all to no avail. I cannot be certain of my conclusion, but I suspect very strongly that Clarence Hancock reached that decision because he realized that he was facing a hard battle for survival—a battle against a physical disability which he knew would last a long time and require all his strength. None of us realized the seriousness of the menace which faced him at the time of his retirement, but those of us who kept in touch with him from time to time in the months that have intervened came to realize the nature of the struggle in which he was engaged. And let me say to my colleagues that no man ever showed greater courage and cheerfulness in the midst of physical weakness, pain, and distress than did Clarence Hancock. Literally, it was amazing. Now that battle is ended and he has passed away. I will not concede for one moment that he suffered defeat. Rather, I visualize him as having scored triumph after triumph—spiritual triumph—during a long siege until, finally, a higher power, in its wisdom, decreed that it should end.

A knowledge of Clarence Hancock's life should bring encouragement to every young American who cares for his country. In many respects his life was the kind which all of us, beginning in our youth, would like to lead. He grew to prominence in the city where he was born. He earned his way by sheer ability founded upon character. At every rung of the ladder up which he climbed his contacts with his contemporaries were intimate and enjoyable. He was a good student at school and at college and in his later years delighted in the memories of those days of his youth. The fact that he was a snappy infielder on the Wesleyan College baseball team back in

1906 kept those memories fresh in his mind, and I happen to know that he liked nothing better in his later years than to "talk baseball." Those who have played the game and loved it will understand this. His liking for teamwork among younger people, together with his sense of obligation to his country, prompted him to enlist in a National Guard troop of cavalry stationed and maintained at Syracuse as an element in the First New York Cavalry. He did this at a time when he was just embarking upon the practice of law and it meant a considerable sacrifice—something which should not be forgotten by the young men of today. In those good old days cavalrymen were mounted upon horses and every trooper, if he were a good one, had a sentimental feeling for his mount. A little later, in 1916 to be exact, the First New York Cavalry, including the Syracuse troop, was sent to the border and there served for approximately 9 months. There were no barracks. The men were sheltered under tents. There were no stables. The horses were hitched to picket lines laid along the ground in the open. Truly, it was an outdoor life. Clarence Hancock proved to be a faithful and an enterprising soldier and began rising through the grades of noncommissioned officers. He returned North with his troop in the early spring of 1917, ready to return to the practice of law. But on April 7 of that year we went to war against the German Imperial Government, with the result that, with scarcely any intermission, Clarence and his men were remobilized and, a little later, sent to a big encampment at Spartanburg, S. C. During that period they lived the lives of cavalrymen, still devoted to their horses—training hard. Suddenly a bitter blow fell upon them. The horses were taken away and the old First New York Cavalry was reorganized into machine gun battalions. I happened to be at Spartanburg when this thing occurred. The men had been ordered to move the horses to a corral situated not far away and to leave them there. They obeyed orders, cussing under their breaths. Someone left a gate open at that corral and next morning the horses were all back on their old picket lines. They had returned on their own initiative and stood there waiting to be fed and groomed by Clarence and his fellow troopers. Many of the men were crying, but of course orders were orders and the horses were taken away for keeps.

Many years later, during World War II, Clarence Hancock observed to me one day that he did not see how anybody could get sentimental about a tank. And he remarked, further, that men who served in tanks smelt of gasoline, whereas the real cavalryman smelt—otherwise. Clarence went to France in World War I as a machine gunner. He and his men, having had thorough basic training, much of it with lighter weapons, picked up the machine-gun technique very quickly and the battalion in which he served, an element in the famous New York Twenty-seventh Division, did excellent work. Hancock and his men were in the thick of many a battle. The Twenty-seventh Division, along with the Thirtieth Division, serving in the British Fourth Army, cracked the famous Hindenberg Line—an astonishing performance. I went over that ground myself shortly after the battle. To this day I cannot understand how men could attack a determined enemy in those trenches and long tunnels and come out alive. Clarence Hancock came out of that war a captain, proud of his outfit and adored by his men. This is an all too hasty sketch of Hancock's younger days. But I think we should be reminded of his life in those days for it spells patriotism. The people of Syracuse and its neighborhood are thoroughly familiar with his services to the city. When World War I was over and Clarence was discharged he jumped back into the practice of law, and before long he held the office of corporation counsel of the city of Syracuse. His record in that office is known to be excellent. Then he came to the House of Representatives, a mature man and, as it turned out, remarkably well equipped to perform the duties of a legislator. I shall not attempt to catalog his achievements in the House but merely to emphasize some of those qualities of mind and heart which made him a leading figure in this institution. He was possessed of a remarkably alert and incisive mind. You could place before him what seemed to be an exceedingly complicated problem and ask for his help. In an astonishingly short space of time he would push aside the nonessentials, dig down and find the root of the matter. Having found it, he would expose it, analyze it and give you an absolutely logical solution of the whole problem. He did this time and again, especially during the meetings of the Committee on the Judiciary of which he was a member for many years and of which he would have been chairman in the Eightieth Congress had his physical condition not forced his retirement. I say that he exposed and analyzed the roots of problems. Upon many an occasion this required political courage and complete candor. Never was he lacking in those qualities. As a result of them he contributed enormously to the work of the Congress. All his colleagues, Democrats as well as Republicans, respected him. Not only did they respect him but they were very fond of him. He was a genial soul, witty, tolerant, and delighting in friendships. His wit often took the form of kidding—good-natured kidding—which we all enjoyed even though upon occasion we were its targets. Perhaps he acquired that talent on the baseball field and as an enlisted man in the Army. Be that as it may, ask any Member of the House and he will tell you that Clarence Hancock's career, founded upon unimpeachable character, was American at its best.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to represent the Thirty-sixth Congressional district since January 3, 1947, when Clarence Hancock retired. I have known him for a long time and have been closely acquainted with him the last few years. I have regarded him as one of the ablest legislators in the House of Representatives, a fine, clear-thinking man who was devoted to the welfare of the country. Onondaga County never has had a more public-minded citizen nor one who took a greater interest in the welfare of the people that he represented. He was uniformly kind and courteous to those with whom he had to deal but above all there was in the background a great patriotic spirit which we will all remember and cherish.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Hancock and I came here together in the Seventieth Congress. He was one of the first Members with whom I became acquainted. From the beginning I was impressed with his fine qualities of heart and mind. I saw him advance to a position of influence and leadership. Like all of his associates, I had a feeling of deep regret when ill health forced him to retire at the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress. His retirement was a real loss, not only to his constituents, but to the country as a whole.

I know of no relationship which serves to bring to his associates the real worth and value of a man like service here in Congress. We do our work in a glass house. After a man has been here for any considerable length of time, his fellow Members learn a great deal about him. They know his strength and his weakness. They get a pretty good idea of his character, of his ability, of his industry, of his sincerity of thought and purpose, and of his moral strength. Judged by these standards, his fellow Members considered Clarence Hancock an outstanding Member of Congress. He was a gentleman in the finest sense of the word, a man of integrity and keen intelligence, one who gave his best to everything he undertook. For all his gifts and ability, he was a modest man.

It was a privilege, as well as an inspiration, to serve in Congress with Clarence Hancock. He set an example in the way of sincere, conscientious service which could not help but raise the general level of Congress, not only in our own eyes but in the estimation of the public. My sympathy goes to his wife and son in this dark hour. I hope and pray that they may be given the strength to bear their heavy burden.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may be given leave of absence because of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today mailing to the entire membership of the two Houses a memorandum prepared by a very able and distinguished Swiss citizen who stands high in the business life of that country, analyzing the situation in Europe. I think that fine statement should also be inserted in the RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the statement even though it may exceed by a few dollars the statutory length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE PATRICK HENRY DREWRY

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House since it last met, the death of PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, a former Member of this House from the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia.

When I arrived at my office on Monday, December 22, 1947, I was shocked by the sad news that on the preceding Sunday night our beloved colleague from Virginia had passed away. He died at his home in Petersburg, Va. I believe that if he had been given his choice of going, he would have preferred to go as he did. A few days previously he had returned to his home in Petersburg from Washington.

I felt peculiarly close to Mr. DREWRY. His district joined mine for a short distance. I came to this House for the first time on July 3, 1918. When I was sworn in the Honorable Walter Allen Watson, an outstanding man, beloved and respected by all, a lawyer of rare ability, a judge of distinction, a legislator of great merit, and a man beloved by all, was the Member from the Petersburg district. I served with him from the 3d day of July 1918 until he passed away on December 24, 1919. I attended his funeral. He was succeeded by PAT DREWRY who was a very worthy successor of Judge Watson and of the other splendid men from the Fourth District of Virginia who had served in Congress. Representative DREWRY was elected to Congress on April 27, 1920, and was sworn in to enter upon his career here on May 10, 1920; from that time until his death on Sunday, December 21, 1947, we served together. He was far more than a colleague from the same State. He was a very dear friend, an adviser in many respects and a beloved companion. The day's service was not complete unless its duties were brightened by his cheerful greeting.

Since I have been a Member of the House, I have seen many Members come and go. They were men of ability, men of the greatest merit, faithful, industrious, patriotic, all imbued by a single purpose to do their duty as God gave them the light to see that duty. To name some of them is to attest the truth of what I say though I fear to name some lest I omit others equally deserving, and what I say applies equally to both sides of the aisle, and to all parties or shades of parties represented here. When I came, there were here Clark, of Missouri, then Speaker of the House; Gillette, of Massachusetts, majority floor leader; Mann, of Illinois, the ablest parliamentarian ever to hold a seat on the floor; Longworth, of Ohio, later Speaker of the House; and Kitchen, of North Carolina, who is the ablest debater I have ever heard. There were here when DREWRY came many other men of commensurate caliber with those I have mentioned. The delegation from my own State has entirely changed, but in the period of my long service for almost 30 years, I have seen none more faithful to his duties, more loyal, more industrious, more companionable or more capable than PATRICK HENRY DREWRY.

He served with rare distinction. He was devoted to all of the interests of his native State, and he had served her in her legislative halls. He was well qualified for his duties here.

I wish to pause a little while to express my concluded opinion after a service of nearly 30 years here—30 years on July 3 next, if I shall be spared that long—and I can count on the fingers of one hand men who proved themselves to be unworthy. The caliber, intellect, and patriotism of the men with whom I have served attest indisputably the worth of our form of government. They served as a representative cross-section of America acquainted with her problems, diligent to know her needs, studious of her problems, and alert to the needs of all kinds, character and description of her citizens. Those who laid the foundations of our America built well—far better than even they knew or could have suspected. To those who would change the form of government fixed by the fathers, I would urge that they do not disturb that structure. It is flexible and elastic, far more so than we know.

DREWRY was brought up in this philosophy and he adhered to it throughout his life. He served his party with distinction as chairman of its Democratic National Congressional Committee for many years, ever diligent, alert, capable, intimately acquainted with its wishes and with its general structure in every district in the Nation, but he never lost sight of the old moorings, of the philosophy of government as it had existed and developed from the earliest days of the Republic.

Mr. DREWRY was made chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee in 1935, and was reelected every 2 years thereafter upon the organization of the committee. He worked untiringly and his thorough grasp of particular situations in the various districts rendered his work invaluable.

Before Mr. DREWRY entered the House of Representatives he represented the city of Petersburg and the county of Dinwiddie, constituting a State senatorial district for 8 years in the Senate of Virginia.

Mr. DREWRY's work in the Senate of Virginia was very constructive. He was active in the passage of laws promoting the health, education, and comfort of the State and their political and moral uplift and welfare. A leading newspaper of Virginia referred to the vital statistics bill, of which Senator DREWRY was author, as "one of the real constructive pieces of legislation enacted in Virginia in years." As chairman of the fish and game committee of the senate, Senator DREWRY was active in the passage of laws which could protect our wild game and yet give the fullest recreational facilities to the people of Virginia. He helped to enact legislation that would give Virginia better schools and more and better teachers.

Mr. DREWRY was chairman of the State auditing committee, and his experience on that committee afforded him an opportunity to acquaint himself thoroughly with the State's finances and he was the author of the bill providing for an economy and efficiency commission which was enacted. He was made chairman of that commission. That commission worked for 2 years without pay. It made a full survey of the State government and submitted a report to the legislature of 1918. That report formed the basis of several succeeding reports and much legislation was based upon the suggestions of that report. This commission drafted what was known as the budget bill, which was approved in 1918 and was adopted as the model budgetary system by many States of the Union. The Governor of the State of Virginia appointed Mr. DREWRY as chairman of the advisory board on budgets which put the law into effect, and the very satisfactory results obtained as a result of that legislation were due in large part to Mr. DREWRY's wisdom and work.

In the Congress of the United States Mr. DREWRY gave his constituency prompt, energetic, and efficient attention to all matters in which they were interested. He was instrumental in securing various public buildings in his district, notably at Petersburg, Hopewell, Emporia, Blackstone, and Lawrenceville; in securing the establishment of the Petersburg National Military Park and the Appomattox Military Park.

For many years Mr. DREWRY served on the Naval Affairs Committee, attaining the rank of ranking member and vice chairman of the committee. His work there cannot be overestimated. Several years ago Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd wrote "We would not have the wonderful Navy we have today had it not been for the untiring efforts PAT DREWRY made year after year to build up our great naval forces."

Another unsolicited statement which attests Mr. DREWRY's great work for the Navy came from the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House. He wrote to Mr. DREWRY:

> As the ranking Democratic member of the House Naval Affairs Committee you have been a tower of strength in the formulation of a strong naval policy. I have relied upon your judgment and your ability more than upon any other member of the committee. Your keen analytical mind, with its legal training, has been most helpful in solving many difficult problems. Among many other tasks, you served as chairman of subcommittees to investigate the sinking of the *Normandie*, and the failure of production at the Brewster Aeronautical Corp. You did a fine piece of work in both assignments and earned the thanks of your Government. Your great talents have been recognized and applauded by your colleagues irrespective of party affiliations.

Mr. DREWRY's efforts helped to build up the United States Navy and he contributed to the great victory won by the United States in the last World War.

From the day that he first qualified as a Member of the House of Representatives to the day of his death, I can say with knowledge whereof I speak, that PATRICK HENRY DREWRY represented the people of his district, the State of Virginia, and the Nation faithfully, ably, and with rare distinction. He did not spare himself in any way in their behalf.

His representation was with dignity. He ignored the playing of petty politics or political favoritism. He gave all the energy and faithfulness of service in his power, and in keeping with the splendid service that had been rendered by illustrious Virginians in the past.

In all truth I say to him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. May your slumbers be sweet."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep personal loss that I speak of PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, late Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia.

I was closely and intimately associated with him through the years of my service in the House. He was one of those rare persons whose high character and splendid qualities are appreciated and evaluated more with each passing year.

He was quiet, unassuming, and modest, but with a sense of humor and a human tolerance toward the shortcomings of his fellow beings that endeared him to all who knew him.

He was inherently a philosopher; and no argument, however cogent, had weight with him unless it was bottomed on sound logic.

In all the years we were associated and during all the confidences we exchanged, I never knew him to do or say a mean or malicious thing. The controversies and vicissitudes of political strife never lowered his high principles or tempted him to indulge in petty practices. He pursued his even course, undaunted and undeterred by either praise or criticism.

Few men have ever held the confidence of their constituents so completely and consistently as to effect their election to Congress for 14 consecutive terms without opposition. That PAT DREWRY accomplished this feat attests more than words can speak, his character, his integrity, his ability, and his qualities of statesmanship.

Practically all the years of his adult life were given in unselfish service to his State and to his country. He served for 10 years in the State Senate of Virginia, where his work was of such outstanding quality that, when a vacancy occurred in the House of Representatives from his district, he was elected to the Congress without opposition.

He served on the Naval Affairs Committee of the House through the two major wars, and much of his vitality and energy was devoted to bringing the United States Navy to its position of superiority among the navies of the world.

He enjoyed the confidence of his Democratic colleagues in the House to such an unusual degree that he was chosen as chairman of the Democratic Congressional Election Committee for several consecutive Congresses, and was devoting most of his time to that position at the time of his death.

He will live long in the hearts of his colleagues in the Congress and in the affection of the people of his congressional district who honored him with their confidence for the 28 years of his service in the House of Representatives.

I think none of his colleagues will miss him or mourn his passing more than I.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ALMOND].

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, with silent but relentless tread the Grim Reaper, who is no respecter of persons or the evenescent sovereignty of human life, has again invaded our ranks to deliver the inevitable and mandatory summons to a great colleague of sterling quality and commendable virtues, beloved by all who knew him—PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, of Virginia.

I think that I can say without doing violence to the accepted tenets of modesty and decorum, that he who measures up to Virginia's standards of loyalty, fidelity, and greatness in public service needs no further eulogy. In life PAT DREWRY met the test without stint of energy or mental reservation. In death he passes on to those who may succeed him through the years a rich heritage of constructive public service gilded with that patriotism which he poured from a noble heart imbued with unflagging love for his country.

Modest, retiring, jovial, good natured, earnest, sincere, wholesome, able, courageous, zealous in friendship, devoted to duty, kindly and considerate, his record of nearly 28 years of unbroken service in this body without serious challenge from any source conducively attests the love, esteem, and confidence of an enlightened constituency.

PAT DREWRY served Virginia and the Nation long, faithfully, and well. He was ever true to his trust. His shield of service is without tarnish or blemish. He fought the good fight. He kept the faith.

His country will miss him, and beset by peril, can ill afford to lose him.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point on the death of our beloved colleague, PATRICK DREWRY.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, PAT'S death was a great blow to me. Yea, more; it was a great personal loss, because he was my friend and I entertained for him a fondness that was akin to love.

Only yesterday, it seems, we were seated in the reading room of the House engaged in one of our many frequent, friendly, and intimate conversations. It is hard for me to believe that our chats are at an end. I rather believe—I do believe—that our chats have only been suspended for a season, and that sometime in the future we will meet again and chat and chat to our hearts' content. Yes; I believe that the joy and happiness of heaven will be added to by a friendly chat with dear old PAT now and then.

He was a Virginian of whom all Virginians were proud. He was made of the fiber from which real men are woven. Pure in heart, sound in judgment, loyal, courageous, patriotic, he faithfully served his people with an eye single to the general welfare of the country he loved. His departure is a great national loss at a time when we need men, real men, men like PAT, in high places.

May his loved ones reap real solace and comfort from the life that he lived, and may his soul rest in peace, is the supplication of one of his many friends.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, Representative of the Fourth District of Virginia for 27 years, the people of his district, of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and of the United States have lost an able servant. His long record of service is one of quiet efficiency, high honor, and distinction.

Mr. DREWRY had many close relatives in my district. Some of these are very dear friends of mine, and through them I have known him casually for many years. As a freshman Member of the Eightieth Congress it was my privilege to enjoy a more intimate association with this quiet Virginia gentleman, whose friendly help and cooperation have meant so much to me. PAT DREWRY was my friend.

In tribute to PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, and in memory of this man whose ability was recognized and known in many areas of the country, I include in my remarks an editorial from the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot of December 23, 1947:

PATRICK HENRY DREWRY

Representative PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, of Virginia's Fourth Congressional District, who died Sunday night at his home in Petersburg at the age of 73, had served continuously in the House of Representatives since 1920, when he was elected, without opposition, to fill the unexpired term of Representative W. A. Watson, deceased. At the time of his death Mr. DREWRY was dean of Virginia's congressional delegation. The last few years have brought a new group of Virginia Congressmen to the front—HARDY, GARY, STANLEY, ALMOND, HARRISON. Mr. DREWRY belonged to the older group whose survivors are Representatives BLAND, FLANNAGAN, and SMITH. He was, in length of service, the senior of this company, his tenure topping by 2 years, at the time of his death, the quarter-century service of the First District's Representative BLAND.

An examination of the House roll calls between the time of Warren Gamaliel Harding and the time of Harry Truman would disclose a DREWRY voting record marked by a high degree of party regularity touched, during the second half of the Roosevelt tenure, with increasing divergence from the philosophy of the New Deal. An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the same period would disclose very little DREWRY speech making, for the Petersburg Congressman, although an able public speaker when moved to take the floor, was never entranced with the sound of his own voice. His preference was for quiet work in committee and in the party organization—at both of which he excelled. Since 1933 he had been ranking Democratic member of the House Naval Affairs Committee. His service on this committee fell during a period of great naval expansion. The Hampton Roads area found in him an alert and sympathetic student of its expanding naval requirements.

Since 1935, Mr. DREWRY had been chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. In this post, he once remarked, it was his job to elect 435 Democrats to the House of Representatives. With the considerable aid of President Roosevelt, he came as near doing that in 1936 as any chairman of the party's congressional campaign committee had done since the House membership was increased to 435 following the 1910 census. At the 1936 high-tide mark in the party's national fortunes, the Seventy-fifth Congress opened with 333 Democrats in the House to 89 Republicans and a small scattering of independents.

There is something revealing in the fact that the Hoover inundation of 1928 swept every Virginia congressional district into the Republican Presidential column except Representative DREWRY'S Fourth. He had a remarkable talent for political welding. It was founded on personal integrity, on a surpassing gift for making and holding friends, and on meticulous attention to the district's interests. There was no beating this man in the Fourth District. He had served part of the district for 8 years in the State senate before he began serving the whole district in the House of Representatives. In both the State and national legislatures he commanded respect.

Party regularity and responsibility Mr. DREWRY practiced almost as a political religion, but of his own choice—not as anybody's yes-man. He could never be counted in on a party maneuver until he made up his own mind on it. Sometimes—but not often—he parted company with the party's high command. He was a friendly, soft-spoken, and slightly withdrawn member of the State's Democratic hierarchy, far less often in the spotlight than outside it, but he kept his eye on the ball and nearly always emerged with an impressive score. If there are no bold pioneering achievements in his long legislative record, there is plenty in it that reflects the work of an old-school Virginia conservative tackling the problems of a changing period with intelligence and industry, and with unfailing urbanity and good manners.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, my predecessor served in this body for 8 years. During that time there was only one change in the Virginia delegation. Including his resignation, in less than 3 years, there have been six changes in the delegation. Two-thirds of the delegation has changed within that time, which is the largest turn-over certainly within my memory, and possibly within the history of our State.

Let me say to you that of those who have gone the State and Nation could ill afford to lose PATRICK HENRY DREWRY. He was a distinguished Virginian who gave the greater part of his life to the public service. He served with distinction in the State legislature before he came to this body. There he sponsored some of the most important legislation enacted. He introduced legislation that was the forerunner of the State budget in Virginia. He patroned the bill that established the Vital Statistic Bureau of the State, and his name was attached to other important legislation.

From the State legislature he came to this body. Here he served in many important capacities. As a high-ranking member of the Committee on Naval Affairs he contributed substantially to the building of our Navy. He can be counted among those whose efforts brought victory to our Nation in World War II.

But with it all, PAT DREWRY was a kindly man. He had many friends as is evidenced by the fact that he was returned to this body session after session for 28 years without opposition. That is a record which speaks for itself. He was beloved by his own constituency and by the people of the entire State.

As one of those who count themselves proud to be numbered among the friends of PAT DREWRY, I wish at this time to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family in this hour of their deep bereavement, and to express the hope that they will receive great comfort from the knowledge that he lived a noble and useful life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Richmond News Leader of Monday, December 22, and an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Tuesday, December 23.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODRUFF). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader of December 22, 1947]

AN EMINENT CONGRESSMAN PASSES

Virginians will read with deep regret today the announcement of the death of one of their most devoted and, in point of service, one of their oldest public men, Congressman PATRICK H. DREWRY, of the Fourth (Petersburg) District. His colleague of the First District, OTIS BLAND, took the oath July 2, 1918, about 21 months ahead of him and, for that reason, is fifth on the list of those "M. C.'s" who have survived all the fluctuations of opinion, and all the changing whims of voters who follow strange gods, economic and political. Mr. DREWRY'S membership began April 27, 1920, after the death of the scholarly and beloved Judge Walter A. Watson. This Congress was the fifteenth in which Mr. DREWRY had represented Virginia. Ten Members, 10 only, remain of those whose names were on the roster the day his was added.

To say this is to pay tribute to Mr. DREWRY'S character and constancy. A less worthy man would not have enjoyed for almost 30 years the unwavering support of such a constituency as that of southside Virginia. He possessed the art of eliminating possible competitors, but it was an art more personal than tactical. It consisted, fundamentally, of deserving and of holding the full confidence of his people both by what he did and by what he left alone. "PAT" DREWRY'S vote always was cast with care. Never was his voice given to any political fad or vagary or act of vengeance. One would not err greatly in setting down the list of his votes on major issues, and in saying of them, "This is what Virginia believed in 1920–47."

Satisfied as all of us were when he was elected to succeed Judge Watson without opposition, some of us regretted deeply his retirement from the State senate where he served magnificently from 1912 to the time he was chosen Congressman. This newspaper can attest that throughout those 8 years Virginia had no legislator more diligent, more definitely open-minded, more discerning, or more courageous. Senator DREWRY was patron of the historic bill for the State registration of vital statistics. His, too, was the responsibility for the creation of the commission on economy and efficiency, whose report of 1918 was the basis of the Conference on Governmental Efficiency, November 1921. The recommendations of that conference took form in the act of March 24, 1922, for the establishment of the Commission on Simplification and Economy of State and Local Government. This Commission, in turn, under the chairmanship of Senator (now Judge) Julien Gunn, presented the renowned report of 1924 that contained the ground plan, so to say, of the Byrd Reorganization Act of 1927. It is proper to write down, therefore, that PAT DREWRY was one of the earliest and most conspicuous of those to whom Virginia owes thanks for the great forward movement in administration that began in 1918 under Gov. Westmoreland Davis.

In Congress Mr. DREWRY was a specialist on naval affairs. These represented an absorbing interest of his alert mind. Few Members of Congress knew more about the technical aspects of ship design, none was more attentive to proper organization and training. In seniority he was second only to CARL VINSON among Democratic members of the Armed Services Committee and was one of its most influential spokesmen. This activity mirrored PAT DREWRY'S long devotion to all that concerned the history of America and in particular of the region where he lived. Essentially an intellectual man, he had much discernment as a student. If he had selected a different career, he would have been distinguished in the teaching and writing of history.

The "Petersburg" District, which now extends from Sussex to Buckingham, has had eminent representation for many years. In the round half-century since the Fifty-fifth Congress three men of outstanding ability have served Southside Virginia—Francis Rives Lassiter (1899–1909), Walter Allen Watson (1913–19), and Patrick Henry Drewry (1920–1947). Fortunate are voters—aye, fortunate and wise—who choose such men. Each of that trio is honored by being mentioned with the others.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of December 23, 1947]

REPRESENTATIVE PATRICK HENRY DREWRY

Representative PATRICK HENRY DREWRY had not been in robust health for some years, but his sudden death came as a shock to the people of Virginia.

He was the oldest member of the Virginia congressional delegation in point of service, as well as in years, with the single exception of Representative S. OTIS BLAND, of Newport News. Mr. DREWRY was 72 and had been in the House since 1920, when he succeeded the late Representative Walter A. Watson. Mr. BLAND is 75, and has been in the lower branch since 1919, when he took the seat of the late Representative William A. Jones. Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, who will soon be 65, is next in age and service and has been in the House since 1931, the same year that retiring Representative JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., of Bristol, soon to be 63, entered that branch of the National Legislature. The two Virginia Senators are both 60, and both were born, by a strange coincidence in Martinsburg, W. Va., within a few weeks of one another. The remainder of the Virginia delegation at Washington is in a somewhat lower age bracket.

Representative DREWRY had a fruitful service of several sessions in the State legislature before he went to Congress, upon the death of Representative Watson. His progressive approach to State issues was well exemplified in his sponsorship of the resolution setting up the first of the commissions on simplification and economy to survey the State government and make recommendations for improvement. This report, made in 1918 by that pioneer agency, began a trend toward better government in Virginia which is still being felt and which at this moment is being exemplified in the

studies being made by the Burch commission. As patron of the budget act, giving the Commonwealth a budget for the first time, "PAT" DREWRY rendered another notable service.

Mr. DREWRY's excellent record in the State senate gave him an ideal springboard to Congress. In that body he was particularly active in the field of naval affairs, and was chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee at a time when the United States Navy was expanded more rapidly and effectively than ever before in the country's history.

He was a wheelhorse in the Democratic Party nationally, for he was chosen in 1935 chairman of the Democratic National Congressional Committee, an agency charged with the task of returning a Democratic majority in Congress every 2 years. His 12-year tenure in this post was longer than that of any of his predecessors, and his success was remarkable, since the party retained its majority in five of the six elections held during the period of his chairmanship.

But although Mr. DREWRY was a key figure in party councils in Congress, he was not "on the inside" to the same extent in Virginia. He seems to have got at cross purposes with the State Democratic organization, and his relations with it were not altogether cordial, although he was respected by its leaders. He was never a member of the inner circle, despite the fact that he seems to have voted with the majority of the organization representatives in the Senate and House on most measures. His blast in opposition to poll-tax repeal in 1945 was likewise in line with the attitude of the machine at the time.

Mr. DREWRY was a useful and effective man in both the State and National Legislatures. A bibliophile and man of scholarly instincts, he viewed the issues of the day with a greater measure of perspective than some of his colleagues. Not spectacular or scintillating, he was thorough and painstaking. He has left the impress of his record and his personality both at Washington and at Richmond, as well as throughout the Fourth District of southside Virginia, where he was a popular and admired figure.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, a Sunday during the Christmas recess, there passed from this body PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, of Virginia. Quiet, unassuming, modest, not given to extreme and extravagant statements or self-display, PAT DREWRY served the State of Virginia here long and well. Entering upon his duties as a Member of the House April 27, 1920, he was one of its oldest Members and No. 10 among the membership in point of continuous service.

For many years he served at the right hand of the long-time chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, during which period he likewise contributed immeasurably to the development of our modern Navy in the war just past, and I know that Mr. Vinson will attest to this fact today. He had the great quality of deliberate consideration and wise counsel, and with these he was of inestimable value a year ago in the formation of the present Armed Services Committee. We of this committee valued his heavy contribution to our work in the first session, and I valued him as a great friend of unfailing courtesy and fairness. Virginia has lost a real public servant.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, as we are assembled in one of the most critical times in our Nation's history, our hearts are still saddened by the passing of one of the finest gentlemen, one of the most unselfish and devout Americans and one of the ablest Members of this or any other Congress, our beloved friend, the late PATRICK H. DREWRY, of the Fourth District of Virginia.

PAT, as he was known to all of us, was elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress at a special election on April 27, 1920, to succeed the Honorable Walter Allen Watson, and he was reelected to each Congress to and including the Eightieth. With one exception he was elected without opposition.

At the beginning of his congressional career, he was assigned to the Naval Affairs Committee of which I was a member. He and I served side by side for over 27 years. During 16 years of that period I was chairman and I soon began to rely upon his considered opinions and upon his quiet but most effective service. While we were preparing to meet the world-shattering crisis culminating in World War II, no man was more familiar with our naval establishments, and no man did more to build and maintain the truly great Navy which did so much to win the war.

I came to know PAT DREWRY and to love him. I could depend upon his unwavering support in every movement to build our national defense. He was tolerant toward the opinion of others but was most tenacious in his championship of what he believed to be right.

To me he was like my right arm, and I shall ever cherish the memory of this great friend, loyal patriot, and outstanding citizen.

I join with his constituents, his State, and our Nation in extending to his bereaved widow and his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, PAT DREWRY measured up to the finest traditions of his historic State. He was an earnest, sincere, conscientious public official. He was a man whose intense patriotism, whose votes and actions, were guided by a sincere purpose to make this a better America.

In these trying and chaotic days, the death of a man like PAT DREWRY is a great national loss.

Our country has always been proud of the fine type of men Virginia has contributed to the service of the Nation. From the very beginning of the Republic, Virginia has had outstanding public officials. They contributed materially to the founding of the new Republic and have had an important part in shaping the onward march of our Nation, and our deceased colleague's service maintained the high idealism of his State.

PAT DREWRY was a kindly man. It was my privilege, in a visit to Virginia, to enjoy his fine southern hospitality at his home. There was revealed to me the fine traits that endeared him to his multitude of friends.

We who were privileged to claim him as a friend join with his family in mourning the death of a fine Christian gentleman, an able statesman, and a stalwart American patriot.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most profound shocks I ever received was the news of the untimely passing of my distinguished friend, PAT DREWRY, one of the few men left who were Members of the House when I first came to Congress.

At that time his office was only a couple of doors from mine. I learned to love him then and to appreciate his great character. My esteem and admiration for him grew steadily with the passing years.

Other Members have spoken of his services to the Nation and especially of his services on the Committee on Naval Affairs. I wish to speak of PAT DREWRY as a Christian gentleman, the highest type of American citizenship. I do not believe I ever met a finer type, a finer exemplification of a Christian life, than PATRICK DREWRY, of Virginia.

I am reminded of the lines of Scotland's immortal poet, Charles Mackay, in which he said:

Tell me, ye winged winds,
That round my pathway roar,
Dost thou not know some spot
Where mortals weep no more?
Some lone and pleasant dell,
Some valley in the west,
Where, free from toil and pain,
The weary soul may rest?
The loud wind softened to a whisper low,
And sighed for pity as it whispered "No!"

Tell me, thou mighty deep,
Whose billows round me play,
Know'st thou some favored spot,
Some island far away,
Where weary man may find
The bliss for which he sighs—
Where sorrow never lives,
And friendship never dies?
The loud waves, rolling in perpetual flow,
Paused for a moment, and signed to answer "No!"

And thou, serenest moon,
That with such holy face
Dost look upon the earth,
Asleep in night's embrace,
Tell me, in all thy round
Hast thou not seen some spot,
Where miserable man
Might find a happier lot?
Behind a cloud the moon withdrew in woe,
And a voice sweet, but sad, responded "No!"

Tell me, my secret soul,
O, tell me, Hope and Faith!
Is there no resting-place
From sorrow, sin and death?
Is there no happy spot,
Where mortals may be blest,
Where grief may find a balm,
And weariness a rest?
Faith, Hope, and Love—best boons to mortals given—
Waved their bright wings, and whispered, "Yes: in Heaven!"

PAT DREWRY has gone to the undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns; but none who knew him doubts that he will safely anchor in a peaceful harbor where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary shall find rest.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, "life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights, we cry aloud and the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry. From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead there comes no answer, but in the night of death hope sees a star and listening love can hear the rustle of the wing." Even the skepticism of the famous agnostic melted when confronted by death itself. It was Robespierre, if I recall correctly, who said, at the height of the French Revolution, when the gospel of atheism was being preached: "If there were no God we would have to create one."

And it was St. Augustine who uttered the immortal truth: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee."

It only goes to show that heart has reason, that reason knows not of, and that life after all is deeper than logic.

The greatest Teacher of all time once said:

I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live:

And whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.

PATRICK HENRY DREWRY is not dead, because he had supreme faith in Christ. He has left us for a little while, but it will not be too long before each and all of us here this afternoon will shuffle off this mortal coil to join him. It is so reassuring to hear the unshakable faith expressed by Judge FLANNAGAN here this afternoon and we rejoice in the hope that in the not distant future we will be reunited with loved ones and dear ones gone on before.

What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god!

William Shakespeare must have had PAT DREWRY or his prototype in mind when he wrote those words. And magnificent and strong as words are, they are, after all, rather feeble instruments by which to express the deepest longings and feelings of our heart. "I would that my tongue could utter the thoughts that arise in me."

Those of us who were privileged to know PAT DREWRY know this world is better because he lived in it. No person could know PAT DREWRY without liking him. All the kind and generous words spoken here today were so well merited by him. His simplicity and sincerity carried conviction and what he was spoke so loud that I could hardly hear what he said.

He did rank high on the old Naval Affairs Committee. He did much for the Navy. For these many years he sat by the very able chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], on that committee. Since the old committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs have been merged into the Armed Services Committee, it has been my privilege to sit through long and exhaustive hearings and always I have been impressed by PAT DREWRY because I cannot remember him ever asking an irrelevant question on any bill. The questions he asked were pertinent ones. He was quiet, modest, humble, but his imperturbability, his sweet serenity, his sound reasoning, and his eminent sense of fairness and justice, particularly his charity for those who held views different from his own, will always be remembered and cherished by every single member of our great committee.

PAT DREWRY possessed a good mind. It was a silent mind, but a very efficient one; and he kept his tongue still long enough for that mind to work. He did have courage, he was devoted to duty, and for over one-third of a century, nearly 36 years, he stood in the public arena with the pitiless searchlight of publicity turned upon him; but year after year, time and time again, the intelligent, patriotic citizenry of the Fourth Virginia District returned him to this body, which in itself is sufficient tribute to the greatness and goodness of any man.

We shall miss him, but we shall thank God that it was our privilege to have served and worked with him, and I, too, feel, as his friend, Judge FLANNAGAN, and as many of his other friends here today feel, that in the future we might be permitted to sit down and have another chat with Pat.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I can add to these glowing tributes that have been paid to this wonderful man, our late departed colleague. It was my privilege to have been intimately associated with Mr. DREWRY during all of his service in the House. It was my high privilege to have been a guest in his home more than one time. His was a lovely home, his was a lovely family and family life because he was a man who knew how to love and who was a lovable man. This world is richer for his having lived in it. Today it is much poorer that he has passed from its activities and from its scenes. He was a man of character, fundamental character. He was a gentleman in the truest sense of the word. He was a statesman who loved his country, and during all the time of his service he hoped to serve to make it better while he lived and left it better when he died. He did that, in my opinion, to the fullest measure. To his lovely and bereaved family I extend my deepest and sincerest sympathies.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, for most of us the glad tidings of the Christmastime from which we have all returned to renew our labors in the quest of solutions to the manifold problems which beset our Nation and the world were marred by the sudden and shocking news that one of our beloved colleagues was without warning snatched from us and gathered into the protective arms of the Almighty Father. Only the day before his passing, the Honorable PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, known to his friends and colleagues as PAT, had been with us in this very Chamber during the closing hours of the recent session, going about the customary conscientious performance of his public duty which was so characteristic of him.

Although he himself will no longer be with us in person, the spirit of PAT DREWRY will remain forever with those of us who knew him, serving constantly as an inspiration to guide us in our day-by-day dealings with one another and to influence our deliberations as we face the arduous tasks of the future. We must meet those responsibilities with the same degree of forthrightness, the same breadth of vision, the same measure of understanding and kindness, and the same unswerving patriotism which were so characteristic of him.

For over 10 years it was my privilege to have served with PAT on the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, an assignment which he had filled with distinction for nearly 3 decades. During that period of association with him, a rich treasure of fraternal relationship was made available to me which I value among my most precious possessions. For him, his country came first, ahead of self or family, ahead of church or State, ahead of friends or party. Steeped in the rich historical lore of the section of Virginia from which he came, all of his decisions were molded by considerations of what was best for his native land; his constant patriotism qualified him as the namesake of his great forebear, Patrick Henry.

Calm, temperate, reflective, and modest, PAT was never ruffled, never angry, never impetuous. He never spoke an unkind or harsh word to or about his fellow man. Sweet, simple, generous, and considerate and yet with a sparkle of humor and wit, he was the kind of man whose companionship one always enjoyed and whose association with him always left one a better man because of it.

Though all of us will miss PAT, miss his smile, miss his sober judgment, I cannot grieve too deeply in the realization that he has moved along life's eternal pathway a bit ahead of me and the rest of us. My profound gratitude for having known him, for having been exposed to his outstanding manly qualities, for having found him to be a man of God in the body and the spirit, in the flesh, and in the soul, leaving me a better person because of it, outweighs any deep sorrow or sadness I may possess because he has been taken from us. Our country, the State of Virginia, the Congress, and we ourselves are better because PATRICK HENRY DREWRY lived; his memory will always be revered as one of the noble men of America.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of great sorrow to me and I know to all the Members of this House when we realize that our distinguished colleague PATRICK HENRY DREWRY has gone from this earth to that "city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Mr. DREWRY and I were born not

far apart, and for many years we have had the honor of representing congressional districts in Virginia and North Carolina adjoining and extending more than 50 miles along the States' line.

PAT DREWRY was a gentleman of the type of which any section of this Nation would be proud. He came into this world with a bright and incisive intellect and it remained until the day of his death. As a member of the legislature of his beloved State his rank and esteem have never been surpassed. As a Member of this body his intellect and approach to public matters, both great and small, weighed heavily with his fellow legislators, inspired the confidence of his fellow workers, and won the respect and esteem of the membership of this House, irrespective of party affiliation. He was a partisan, but that characteristic never obscured his patriotism and his love of country. His greatest object in life was to render that service in this biological world which would uplift his fellow man to that relationship which God intended he should attain. His home life was ideal. I join with every Member of the House in the expression of deepest sympathy for his lovely helpmeet, his two fine boys, and their fine families.

What the Old Dominion thought of PATRICK HENRY DREWRY is written in the history of this Republic and can never be effaced as long as that history exists. I am proud that he was my friend. I am proud of my close relationship with him in this great body, and I shall cherish and esteem his fine character and his fine fellowship until I too shall go to that "city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my brief word to the many eulogies that have been spoken. I feel that I have had a part of the heritage of old Virginia. My maternal grandmother came from Virginia to Kentucky. My mother went from Kentucky into Missouri. From Missouri where I was born I went into the far West, thus typifying that which is true of so many Americans—moving west. So I come from the far West to add my feeble word now in praise of a great Virginian.

When I came to this body, only recently it seems, I felt that I should get acquainted at once with Members of this body from Virginia. Before I met the man—the name PATRICK HENRY DREWRY intrigued me. I made haste to meet him, for which I am very, very thankful. I found that he perhaps was not as dramatic as that other great Virginian after whom he was named, but I found that the earlier Patrick Henry could not surpass our friend whom we mourn today in patriotic devotion and zeal for the public good.

We are told that we are a part of all that we have met. We may not be able to assess the contribution to us of those with whom we associate, but I feel that I am a greater man and a better American because I knew and associated with PATRICK HENRY DREWRY. The words of the poet come to me now more fitting than any words that I could frame:

> Green be the turf above thee,
> Friend of my better days!
> None knew thee but to love thee,
> Nor named thee but to praise.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House were profoundly saddened during the course of the holidays by the death of our friend, PAT DREWRY. He had been a Member of the House of Representatives since the Sixty-sixth Congress; and we had learned to know and love this quiet son of the State of Virginia.

I, especially, had come to know PAT, as we all affectionately called him, extremely well. I sat next to him on our Committee on Armed Services at its sessions which were held from day to day and time to time. I often sat next to him on the floor of this House; and had occasion to discuss informally with him the many affairs of the committee and the many problems of Congress.

He was always quiet and unassuming. He was always affable and friendly. His views were sound and his judgment good. During the course of the critical war years, and then subsequently during the troublesome postwar period, he always kept his feet on the ground, so to speak. He was not swept away by the turbulent emotions of the crowd; but maintained a calm, sound judgment as others were carried away by the emotions of the moment.

I think Congressman DREWRY was a real credit to his congressional district, his great State, and to the Nation. He will be missed during the course of the debates of this session when dispassionate views will be sorely needed. We have lost PAT DREWRY here; but he has gone to a higher realm where his personality, judgment, and high character will be deeply appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the State of Virginia continues to send to the Halls of the National Legislature men of the type of PATRICK DREWRY, its place in the annals of history remains secure.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I could not permit this sad occasion to pass without paying my humble tribute to the memory of my good friend, PATRICK H. DREWRY. To me he typified, he personified, everything that is expected in a perfect gentleman. PATRICK DREWRY was moreover a statesman, scholar, a forceful and productive Member of Congress. As I tender my sympathies to the Virginia delegation, the good people of his district, and to the great State of Virginia, I express the hope and the prayer that God will rest eternally his weary and noble soul.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, beginning March 4, 1911, no State has been more ably represented than the Commonwealth of Virginia. It has always had a delegation of strong, able, courageous, and faithful Representatives. Same can be said of her Senators.

The Inspired Writer said:

> Behold the perfect man, and mark the upright, for the end of that man is peace.

Judged by that standard, PATRICK HENRY DREWRY certainly would qualify as among the truly great. I never knew PATRICK HENRY DREWRY to say or do a foolish thing. I have known him from the time he first entered the House of Representatives. We lived in the same hotel last year, and I learned to know him better and admire him more. He was a man of great ability, diligent, faithful, and courageous, and the more you associated with him the more you admired him. He was a truly great Representative in every sense of the word. He honored his district, his State, and the Nation by serving them faithfully and serving them well.

His passing is not only a great loss to the membership of this House and to the Congress of the United States, but to the country which he served so long, so faithfully, and so well.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of the late Representative PATRICK H. DREWRY the House has lost another of its outstanding Members. PAT DREWRY was a typical Virginia gentleman, a man of personal charm, strong character, rugged honesty, and a fighter for any cause in which he believed, yet always tolerant of the political and economic views of others. In short, he was an effective and worth-while representative of his people. He occupied a unique position in the House and the center aisle was an imaginary line so far as his friends were concerned.

I join with those who have preceded me in paying tribute to the life, character, and public service of this distinguished man.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I speak to the House on the sudden passing of PATRICK HENRY DREWRY.

Mr. DREWRY was a colleague in this House and an intimate friend of my father. Mr. DREWRY came to this body in 1920 and there grew between him and my father an inseparable companionship.

This friendship was renewed and continued between Mr. DREWRY and me. My father knew him as a young man of promise who would win his spurs in the Congress. I knew him as an elder statesman to whom I could turn for counsel and advice. Both of us knew him as a man of impeachable character, absolutely true to his principles, independent and fearless in his judgment, and filled with love of his fellowman.

The Nation and the Commonwealth of Virginia has suffered a grievous loss.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, the passing of PATRICK HENRY DREWRY has brought deep sadness to his colleagues in the House of Representatives and has deprived the Virginia delegation of a true friend and a wise counselor.

PAT DREWRY understood the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia. He understood their needs and problems, and he served them with unswerving devotion. They appreciated him as evidenced by the fact that he was elected to 15 consecutive Congresses. He brought to the House of Representatives a vigorous mind and a grand personality. He was possessed with an extreme amount of common sense, always looked upon as one having strong convictions, and above all, was honest and sincere.

When I entered Congress 9 years ago, PAT DREWRY was one of the first Members I had the privilege to meet. He made a profound impression upon my mind. I shall always cherish his memory. His passing is a personal loss, not only to his colleagues of the House and the State of Virginia, but to the entire Nation.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 419) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PATRICK H. DREWRY, a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 7, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1160. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the fourteenth annual report, covering the activities of the Authority during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1946, and ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

1161. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1947; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1162. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report, as required by Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress, approved August 1, 1947, which authorized the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1163. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 5 of the act of May 28, 1908, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1164. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Leopold Tracevskis from those 1,479 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of November 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1165. A letter from the Acting Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a fifth supplementary report with respect to chemical plants and facilities, which supplements the report submitted November 12, 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1166. A letter from the Acting Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for the disposition to States, political subdivisions, and municipalities of surplus real property for public park, recreational, or historic monument purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1167. A letter from the People's Counsel, Public Utilities Commission, District of Columbia, transmitting a report of his official activities for the year ended December 31, 1946, supplementing the report of the Public Utilities Commission submitted on September 22, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1168. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to the Helium Act, the report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, concerning the special helium-production fund; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1169. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting information required by Public Law 301: the number of such officers, by rank and age groups, above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander of the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1170. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1947, including a full and complete report of receipts and disbursements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1171. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 12, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach-erosion study, south shore of Long Island, N. Y., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Public Works.

1172. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1173. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of Thor Wilhelm Rostad from those 151 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of April 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1174. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the case of William Henry Dollah from those 1,479 cases involving suspension of deportation referred to in letter of November 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1175. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1176. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting information with respect to the Coast Guard, relative to Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1177. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission, covering the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1178. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting copy of a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and supplementary acts, and title 1 of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, authorizing payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1179. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of hoof-and-mouth disease under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, for the month of November; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1180. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting in compliance with requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a list of reports (H. Doc. No. 491); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1181. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Thirty-first Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1182. A letter from the Chief Clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended November 30, 1947, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1183. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by this Department in the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1184. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1185. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensations, including clerks to Members; the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; to the Committee on House Administration.

1186. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines for the period ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1187. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report concerning operations under the Federal Airport Act during the fiscal year 1947, including an appendix containing a brief résumé of developments since the end of the fiscal year and up to November 30, 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1188. A letter from the president, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1189. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, transmitting a report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 492); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4832. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of McKane's Bay, a branch of the Rappahannock River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 4833. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4834. A bill to provide aid for persons who served in the United States merchant marine during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4835. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide a standard for determining the continued absence of parents from the home in cases of aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 4836. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 4837. A bill to provide an engineering study of the mine-water problem of the Pennsylvania anthracite-mining area for the purpose of obtaining information and presenting a solution relating to the health, safety, and economic conditions of the area, State, and Nation as affected by the encroachment of water that progressively floods the mines, threatens to destroy the anthracite reserves of the Nation, contributes to a waste of a valuable natural resource, and seriously affects the whole economy of the anthracite-mining area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4838. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 4839. A bill to extend further the period during which the admission into the United States of alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States may be facilitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 4840. A bill to promote the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through necessary economic and financial assistance to foreign countries which undertake to cooperate with each other in the establishment and maintenance of economic conditions essential to a peaceful and prosperous world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 4841. A bill to grant hospitalization and medical treatment to veterans of occupation forces following World War I on a parity with war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4842. A bill to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4843. A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1936, so as to broaden the application of laws governing the inspection of steam vessels to vessels propelled by internal-combustion engines; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 4844. A bill to appropriate funds for the extension of the 9-foot channel of the Mississippi River above St. Anthony's Falls, Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4845. A bill to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4846. A bill to amend section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. R. 4847. A bill to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4848. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 328 of subchapter III of title I of the act of October 14, 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4849. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prepare plans and subsequently construct a divided highway in Foundry Branch substantially in line of Arizona Avenue between Canal Road and Tenley Circle (Wisconsin Avenue), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4850. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 4851. A bill to release and to discharge the Republic of Finland from further financial liability to the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4852. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 4853. A bill to extend veterans' benefits to certain members of the Civil Air Patrol who performed submarine patrol duty during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 4854. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 4855. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the entry free of duty of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4856. A bill to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. J. Res. 285. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution directing the executive departments herein named to make available to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments certain information in their possession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. Res. 418. Resolution to express the sense of the House that the United States should resettle Hebrew displaced persons in the American zones of occupation by providing for their transportation to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 4857. A bill for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 4858. A bill for the relief of Pietro Fazzalari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Clarence King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 4860. A bill for the relief of Catherine S. Tremayne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4861. A bill for the relief of A. I. Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1019. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 12 residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District, urging that legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men be enacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1020. Also, petition of 21 residents of California, urging that a system of universal military training be enacted during the second session of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1021. Also, petition of 36 voters of the Eighteenth Congressional District, urging that legislation for the enactment of a system of universal military training for American young men be passed by the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1022. Also, petition of 40 residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District, urging that legislation for the establishment of a system of universal military training for American young men be enacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1023. Also, petition of 25 residents of California, urging that legislation establishing a system of universal military training be enacted for American young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1024. Also, petition of 42 residents of California, urging that legislation establishing a system of universal military training be enacted for American young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1025. Also, petition of 134 residents of California, urging that legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men be enacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1026. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of Mrs. James Thomas, chairman of the constitution and bylaws committee of James L. Noonan Unit, No. 1186, American Legion Auxiliary, containing signatures of 72 residents of the city of New York, urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1027. Also, petition of Garland H. Williams, chairman, national defense committee of Alexander Hamilton Post, No. 1594, American Legion, and 26 residents of New York City, urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1028. Also, petition of 50 members of Watkins-Kellet Post, No. 277, American Legion Auxiliary, of Great Kills, Staten Island, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1029. Also, petition of Clyde Crouch, commander of Beaubais-Hudson Post, No. 126, American Legion, and 102 residents of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1030. Also, petition of 515 residents of Staten Island, N. Y., many of them employees of the United States marine hospital at Stapleton, urging the enactment of legislation to increase salaries of all employees of the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1031. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of 58 members of the American Legion in Rhode Island, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1032. Also, petition of Mrs. Evelyn D'arcy and 19 members of William Shields, Jr., Unit, No. 43, American Legion Auxiliary, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1033. Also, petition of Mrs. Katherine Naumann and 35 members of National Defense Unit, No. 66, American Legion Auxiliary, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1034. Also, petition of Miss Nina Ryder and 15 members of Blackstone Valley Women's Post, No. 94, American Legion Auxiliary, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1035. Also, petition of Miss Elsie L. Mitchell and 32 members of Riverside Unit, No. 10, American Legion Auxiliary, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1036. Also, petition of Miss Florence Grenier and 43 members of Belhumeur-Duhamel Unit, No. 62, American Legion Auxiliary, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1037. Also, petition of Miss Lenora Walsh and 28 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1038. Also, petition of Miss Mary Boyce and 19 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1039. Also, petition of Miss Evelyn Thompson and 26 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1040. Also, petition of 90 residents of the State of Rhode Island, urging adoption of House Resolution 46 (the Sabath resolution) to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

1041. Also, petition of Miss Catherine C. Fratus and nine others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1042. Also, petition of Mrs. Lucy M. Thomas and 28 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1043. Also, petition of E. Raymond Carpenter and 54 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1044. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 36 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1045. Also, petition of 16 residents of Harrisville, Pa., urging the passage of legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1046. Also, petition of 51 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1047. Also, petition of 34 residents of Butler County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1048. Also, petition of 94 members of the American Legion and Auxiliary No. 642, of Chicora, Pa., in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training for American young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1049. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of 36 citizens of Kosciusko County, Ind., opposed to compulsory military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1050. Also, petition of 16 citizens of Demotte, Ind., favoring the establishment of a system of universal military training for American young men as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1051. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Miss Jennie Camerrer and 23 other residents of Caldwell, Kans., and vicinity, against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1052. By Mr. MANSFIELD: Petition of Ervin D. Chester, Helena, Mont., and others, with reference to endorsement of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1053. By Mr. McDONOUGH: Petitions concerning rehabilitation for the Navajo Indians, submitted by Ed Vierheilig, of the student senate, University of Southern California, and which contain the signatures of approximately 700 students of the university; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1054. By Mr. MONRONEY: Petition of John W. Hunt, Jr., and other citizens, of Norman, Okla., protesting the action of the Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

1055. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of East Troy, Wis., and vicinity, urging passage of legislation to establish universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1056. By Mr. TOWE: Petitions of Anson W. Martin, adjutant, American Legion Post No. 40, Ridgefield Park, N. J., and 118 other members of that post; Mrs. Louis Klein, Jr., legislative chairman, American Legion Auxiliary Unit No. 1, Leonia, N. J., and 18 other members of that auxiliary; Garret J. Eelman and 72 others from Wallington, N. J.; Unit No. 128, American Legion Auxiliary, Teaneck, N. J., containing 43 signatures; Mrs. Florence Christie, legislative chairman, Alex. P. Stover Unit, No. 37, American Legion Auxiliary, North Arlington, N. J., and 68 other members of that auxiliary; Col. H. F. Elkan, American Legion Post No. 244, Palisade, N. J., and 125 citizens; General George W. Goethals Unit, No. 90, American Legion Auxiliary, containing 28 signatures; Parkyn-Schaffroth Post, No. 48, American Legion, Palisades Park, N. J., containing 74 signatures; all in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1057. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Association of Assessing Officers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to removing prohibitions against the taxation of Federal property and that all Federal officials be made to furnish information to all local assessment offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1058. Also, petition of Zephyrhills Townsend Club, No. 1, Zephyrhills, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to signing of Discharge Petition No. 7, relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1059. Also, petition of members of Townsend Club No. 84, of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1060. Also, petition of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the universal military training bill, H. R. 4278; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1061. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting establishment of price controls on foodstuffs and other necessities of life; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1062. Also, petition of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for amendment of laws governing communications so that television will be free from all kinds of advertising of beverage alcohol, of whatsoever degree of alcoholic content; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1063. Also, petition of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing its desire for the resumption of the census of religious bodies for 1946, and for adequate appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1064. Also, petition of John M. Sobieski and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the need for an American loan and relief to Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1065. Also, petition of George F. Breitbach, county clerk, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to request for suitable legislation to authorize the creation of a national cemetery to be located at some appropriate location in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1066. Also, petition of Bradenton Townsend Club, No. 1, Bradenton, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to signing of Discharge Petition No. 7, relative to the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1067. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Norton, secretary, Townsend Club No. 1, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1068. Also, petition of George Waters, president, Ruskin Townsend Club, No. 1, Ruskin, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1069. Also, petition of Tampa Townsend Club, No. 8, Tampa, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to signing of Discharge Petition No. 7, relative to Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1070. Also, petition of O. L. Williams, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1071. Also, petition of Miss Alice E. Fogleson, Lake Worth, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1072. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Norton, secretary, Townsend Club, No. 1, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1073. Also, petition of human relations commission, the Protestant Council of the City of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to equality in naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1074. Also, petition of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for careful consideration of the appropriation of adequate funds for the support of the Public Health Service research grant-in-aid program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1948

The Senate met at 1 o'clock p. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour of the world, Thou who hast a plan for peace and a program for all the nations, make it plain, and make us see it clearly, that we may find that which will work and will have Thy blessing.

Save us from hot heads that would lead us to act foolishly, and from cold feet that would keep us from acting at all.

May Thy Holy Spirit work among us to lead us into all truth. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire; C. WAYLAND BROOKS, a Senator from the State of Illinois; HARRY FLOOD BYRD, a Senator from the State of Virginia; JAMES P. KEM, a Senator from the State of Missouri; GEORGE W. MALONE, a Senator from the State of Nevada; BURNET R. MAYBANK, a Senator from the State of South Carolina; FRANCIS J. MYERS, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania; CLAUDE PEPPER, a Senator from the State of Florida; and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, a Senator from the State of New Jersey, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 6, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House was present and that the House was ready to proceed with business.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker, on the part of the House of Representatives, to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 7, 1948, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The message communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Patrick H. Drewry, late a Representative from the State of Virginia, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. BARKLEY advanced to the center of the aisle, and Mr. WHERRY said: Mr. President, I wish to announce that the committee appointed by the President pro tempore to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Congress had assembled and was ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make to it report that they have performed that duty and that the President has indicated a desire to address the two Houses of Congress in person today at 1:30 p. m.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Ball	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Barkley	Ives	Russell
Brewster	Jenner	Saltonstall
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Brooks	Kem	Stennis
Buck	Knowland	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lodge	Taylor
Cain	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Thye
Connally	McKellar	Tobey
Donnell	Malone	Tydings
Dworshak	Martin	Umstead
Ecton	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Millikin	Watkins
Flanders	Moore	Wherry
George	Murray	Wiley
Green	Myers	Williams
Gurney	O'Conor	Wilson
Hatch	O'Daniel	Young
Hayden	Pepper	
Hickenlooper	Reed	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent on official business of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained consent that he be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on Friday, January 9, 1948, and Monday, January 12, 1948.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, January 7, 1948, at 1:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is the intention, and I ask that Senators take notice, that the Senate shall return to its Chamber after the joint meeting shall be dissolved.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes it proceed to the consideration of morning business, so that all Senators may have opportunity to introduce bills or resolutions as they may desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. The hour of 1 o'clock and 12 minutes having arrived, under the practice heretofore followed I ask that the Senate do now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for

the joint meeting of the two Houses pursuant to the provisions of the concurrent resolution just agreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that procedure will be followed, and the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint meeting with the House to receive a message from the President of the United States. Senators will remember that the Senate is to reassemble at the conclusion of the joint session.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler), its Sergeant at Arms (Edward F. McGinnis), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the annual message of the President of the United States.

ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 493)

(The annual message of the President of the United States this day delivered by him to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress appears at p. 33 of the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and I may be excused from the Senate at this time, in order to attend a hearing by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5 OF THE ACT OF MAY 28, 1908, RELATING TO YACHTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act of May 28, 1908, as amended, to remove the present discrimination against yachts which do not belong to regularly organized yacht clubs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, information as to rank and age of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast Guard on duty involving flying with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6 months ended December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 116)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, as president of the National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, information as to rank and age of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy on duty involving flying, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6 months ended December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC PERSONNEL IN THE NAVY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the filling of three positions in the professional and scientific services of the Navy, together with statements of qualifications and duties performed in each case (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Leopold Tracevskis from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on November 15, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON HELIUM PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the amount of moneys credited to the helium production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FINAL REPORT OF PHILADELPHIA NATIONAL SHRINES PARK COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the Philadelphia National Shrines Park Commission concerning the establishment of a national historical park in the city of Philadelphia (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON INSPECTION OF COAL MINES BY THE BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the inspection of coal mines by the Bureau of Mines for the period ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ISLANDS IN RED RIVER, OKLA.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the public land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in the United States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the Regional Research Laboratories, calendar year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico on the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of November 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, fiscal year 1947, including an appendix containing a brief résumé of developments since the end of the fiscal year and up to November 30, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirty-first annual report of that Commission for the year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation and its subsidiaries up to and including June 30, 1947, together with consolidated balance sheet and financial statements of operating results (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON TIN SMELTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION ON CHEMICAL PLANTS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth supplemental report of that Administration with respect to chemical plants and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the receipts and disbursements of the Secretary of the Senate for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REPORT OF FINANCES OF AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the financial statement of the Legion up to and including October 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 115)

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended November 30, 1947, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the year 1947 (December operations estimated) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the People's Counsel of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report of the Public Utilities Commission, transmitted on November 17, 1947, of the official activities of the People's Counsel for the year ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Ohio Bell, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation for redress of certain grievances denied him under Public Law No. 12, Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Resolutions adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis.; the Adult Education and Social Action Committee, the Anti-Inflation Council, and the Vladeck Houses Tenants Council, of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to control prices and the cost of living; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Simon Bass, of Culver City, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to set aside Finland's future payments on its World War I debt to the United States for the education of Finnish youth in the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Executive Board of the National Lawyers Guild, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation to make lynching a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from The Ruling Archbishop and Diocesan Council, American and Canadian Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Greek-Catholic Church, Inc., New York, N. Y., signed by Archbishop Vitaly, relating to the displaced-persons problem (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Assessing Officers, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to make available all information in the possession of Federal departments, agencies, and corporations necessary to the local assessment officers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, Atlantic City, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the laws governing communications so that television will be free from all kinds of advertising of beverage alcohol and that advertisements of liquor be prohibited from all the media of communications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Managers of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, Washington, D. C., favoring aid to war-blighted countries, especially to children and teachers; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, Washington, D. C., favoring a program of grants for research in the field of environmental sanitation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the creation of a national cemetery at some appropriate location in the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Assessing Officers, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing that whenever the United States or any of its agencies acquire land for the purpose of setting such land aside or for use as a site for private enterprise, such land and any buildings, structures, or fixtures attached to and forming a part of such land, shall be subject to taxation by the several States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

The petition of Josef and Eugenie Geiger, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a Nation-wide health, safety, and atomic age cultural Federal building program, to protect the civilian population against atomic bombing and germ warfare; to the Committee on Public Works.

PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE—TELEGRAM FROM TOM LINDER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting telegram from Tom Linder, prominently connected with the agricultural industry of Georgia, in which he expresses some interesting views on the problems of agriculture. I present the telegram for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., *January 6, 1948.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

Member, United States Senate:

My information is that during 1947 Anderson-Clayton Cotton Co. were 20,000 bales long and 3,020,000 bales short in cotton futures. The evil of futures trading is in permitting short sales.

If a man were permitted to sell Ford cars on a futures market and then if called on his sales he were permitted to deliver old dilapidated, worn, and discarded Fords so as to force the manufacturer to take less than cost of production, you would have a situation analogous to permitting delivery of any and all grades at 10 different points in the United States in order to force the farmers to produce cotton at less than cost.

The same thing applies to futures of other farm commodities. The records in the office of Commodity Credit Corporation showed that Anderson-Clayton Cotton Co. sold to the Government 255,000 bales of cotton on or about January 29, 1944, at approximately $13 a bale above the market price on the date of sale.

Why not investigate and see what Commodity Credit Corporation was allowing the farmers for their cotton at the same time?

The most important thing to determine while investigations are being made, is to find out who was short on the futures markets. The short sellers are the enemies of agriculture.

The Commodity Markets Act should be so amended as to prohibit short selling. Hedging should be put on the same basis as straight out buying and selling of futures. Under present arrangement big dealers who are also spot buyers or spinners can sell the market short under pretext of hedging.

It is a well-known fact through the cotton belt that Anderson-Clayton Cotton Co. and McFadden Brothers have what amounts to a corner or monopoly in buying the farmers' cotton. This has been well known for years.

Cotton futures were originally designed by British cotton spinners for the purpose of selling futures to speculators in order to take speculators out of the market for actual cotton, thus giving the British spinner a free field to buy the farmers' cotton without speculative competition.

It is ridiculous to permit foreign capital to be used in selling the farmers' crop short.

Only the fact that the farmer does not understand these things has made it possible for this great injustice to be continued. While the iron is hot, why not straighten this thing out?

Every reasonable man knows that the spot house processor and manufacturer could not sell hedges were it not for the speculators to buy those hedges.

When the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials of the Government lend themselves to try to force speculators out of the market they are simply trying to help steal the farmers' crop and they should be stopped by the Congress by whatever means is required to stop them.

Please note Georgia market bulletin of Wednesday, January 7, 1948.

TOM LINDER.

REDUCTION IN COSTS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that many have fixed ideas as to the basic causes of the present high living costs and inflation, and the remedies. I have read no article anywhere which more forcefully sets out the causes and the remedies than does a very short editorial appearing in the Omaha World-Herald of December 29, 1947. I agree with the editorial in toto, and ask that at this point in my remarks it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT WILL TAKE SOME GUTS

The other day an official Soviet spokesman, irked by American comment on Russia's confiscation of rubles, retorted that the United States has money troubles, too.

The dollar of 1947, he said, is really worth only 50 cents. Thus the American people have been "taxed" by inflation, just as the Russian people were "taxed" by seizure of the rubles.

He was as right as can be.

The American who had saved a little money prior to the war, or who now is living on a fixed income of prewar dollars, has been taxed approximately 50 percent of his holdings or his income.

The unfortunate thing about the American capital levy is that the Government, which caused the inflation, refuses to accept the blame. It denounces business for charging high prices. It threatens to reimpose controls. But it declines to face the fact that inflation is the product of national fiscal policy.

Inflation results from an excess of buying power. Buying power is a result of money in circulation, and money and credit in banks. Both are directly controlled by the Government.

During the war money and credit were vastly inflated by Government borrowing and spending. Government bonds were stuffed into banks, thereby automatically creating more credit and forming the basis for issuance of more currency. Thus the real value of the dollar was deflated.

Now, in a relatively free market, the dollar is seeking its level. Already some prices have become virtually stable. Others—on products that are in the greatest demand—are still advancing. Those will continue to go up—either in a free market or a black market—until the surplus of buying power has been soaked up; until the dollar reaches its new par.

Currently the Government has stopped its borrowing. Thus it no longer is pumping inflation into the economic system. If that policy is continued, stability should be near at hand—on the basis of a 50- or perhaps a 45-cent dollar.

What can the Government now do to hasten stabilization?

Nebraska's Senator WHERRY answered that question last week, candidly.

The administration and the Congress, he said, can join forces "in a statesmanlike slash in the huge cost of the Federal Government." Such a policy, he admits, "is going to take some guts." But it is the only effective anti-inflationary policy.

And the Senator concluded:

"All this talk about price controls and rationing completely misses the primary causes of inflation. They aim at treatment of the symptoms rather than the disease."

Treating the symptoms, rather than the disease, has one inevitable result: Trouble always breaks out in a new place. The people discovered that in the days of OPA.

Actually, responsible officials of Government don't want to bring back the 100-cent dollar. If they did, and if they should succeed, the national income would diminish, dollarwise, so greatly that the national debt could not be financed. Either the country must put up with the cheap dollar for many, many years or it will have to repudiate its debt—and thereby bring on the most devastating depression ever known.

The thing that can be done and should be done is to stabilize the dollar at something like its present actual value.

That can be done by reducing the cost of government, by making prudent payments on the national debt, and by reducing taxes to such an extent that Americans again will have an incentive to work and produce.

Such a program doesn't have much political glamour. In Senator WHERRY's words, it will take some guts. But it is the only program that offers a prospect of success.

THE KANSAS CITY SCANDAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Kansas City Scandal," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 18, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KANSAS CITY SCANDAL

The investigation of Attorney General Clark's handling of the Kansas City vote frauds case which Senator KEM is urging should by all means be made.

Mr. Clark whitewashed the scandal by declaring it had been thoroughly investigated when, as was subsequently brought out, nothing had been done worthy of the name of investigation. He continued to stall until so much heat was put on him that he was forced, belatedly, to appoint a special prosecutor.

Senate Democrats aided and abetted Mr. Clark in this political maneuver against the impartial operation of justice. They filibustered to death Senator KEM's resolution at the last session of Congress for an investigation of the Attorney General. The present move for investigation is designed to bypass the filibuster by having it done by an existing committee without a further vote by the Senate.

The investigators should not be content to discover why no more has been done in the past. They should inquire why more is not being done now. Here was a primary election in which a grand jury investigation found wholesale fraud. The grand jury returned several indictments and the ballot boxes containing the evidence to support the indictments were impounded. The safe in the Jackson County courthouse was blown open and the ballot boxes were stolen.

The earmarks were those of an inside job performed by a few men who knew exactly how to get in and what boxes to take. This shouldn't be a hard case to solve, yet the FBI, which is supposed to have been on it for months, hasn't caught the safe blowers yet, though it is nabbing culprits in intrinsically more difficult cases all over the country every day.

Altogether, the Kansas City scandal cries for exposure in all its aspects.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably with amendments the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, and I submit a report—No. 810—thereon.

I wish to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which the joint resolution was referred, approved the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin project, with the exception of certain provisions thereof, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating, and for other purposes. The committee recommends that the joint resolution be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Subsequently, Mr. LODGE submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on the foregoing joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111), which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 810.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA PROGRAM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 811)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, otherwise known as the Voice of America program. I ask unanimous consent to file the report to accompany the bill when the report is prepared within the next day or two.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report may be filed as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

TABLE RELATING TO COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a table prepared by the Legislative Reference Service. The table deals with Senate committee assignments during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and Senate committee assignments during the Eightieth Congress, after the Legislative Reorganization Act went into effect. The data are taken from the official records of the Senate. The table shows that the total number of Senate committee assignments has decreased from 1,030 during the Seventy-ninth Congress, to 516 during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, or a reduction of 50 percent. It also shows that the average number of committee assignments of all kinds for each Senator has decreased from 10.7 to 5.4 since 1946. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate committee assignments

	Standing committees	Subcommittees	Special committees	Total	Average seats per Senator
79th Cong.	472	466	92	1,030	10.7
80th Cong.	201	288	27	516	5.4
Change	−271	−178	−65	−514	−5.3

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DECEMBER 31, 1947.

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

J. George Stewart, chief clerk; rate of gross annual salary, $8,023.09; total salary received, $4,011.54.

James R. Kirkland, counsel; rate of gross annual salary, $8,971.11; total salary received, $4,485.55.

Edna L. Ward, stenographic secretary; rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $1,813.28.

Ruth W. Wood, stenographic clerk; rate of gross annual salary, $3,295.51; total salary received, $1,647.75.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance remaining July 1	$7,882.14
Amount expended July 1 through Dec. 31, 1947	361.38
Balance unexpended	7,520.76

C. D. BUCK,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1925. A bill to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1926. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nagibe Chalhoub;

S. 1927. A bill for the relief of Adaniandos C. Arakas;

S. 1928. A bill for the relief of Tanios Elias Rahme; and

S. 1929. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Christoforatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN (by request):

S. 1930. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the Federal Government and of the government of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1931. A bill to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1932. A bill for the relief of Dorothea Singer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1933. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to school district 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1934. A bill relating to the leasing of Indian lands;

S. 1935. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Paul Afraid of Horses a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1936. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Cora M. Rogers a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1937. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Todd Edward Fast Wolf a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1938. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Voice a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1939. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to George G. Nichols a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1940. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Julia Richard Red Willow a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1941. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John F. Compton, formerly John Crazy Bull, a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1942. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Wallace Gilbert Nichols a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1943. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to George Swift Bird a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 1944. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Burning Breast a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 1945. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph War Chief a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1946. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Carvelas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1947. A bill authorizing a review of the report on the Interoceanic Canal across Nicaragua contained in House Document No. 139, Seventy-second Congress, first session; and

S. 1948. A bill relating to the construction, maintenance, and operation of an interoceanic canal over Nicaraguan territory; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. BALDWIN introduced Senate bill 1949, to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1950. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 1951. A bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to provide for administration of all public lands therein by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior, or by the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to finally determine the area to be included within the exterior boundary of the Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

INCREASE IN WAGES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which provides additional compensation for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. I think there can be little doubt among the Members of the Senate that the present economic conditions have reduced considerably the purchasing power of the present-day salary dollar. I am firmly convinced that of all Federal employees postal workers are most in need of an increase.

The bill I have introduced provides for an increase of $800 per annum for those employees whose compensation is fixed at an annual rate. Postal personnel paid by the hour, or part-time workers, would receive an additional 40 cents an hour. I have given considerable thought to the figures included in my bill, and I feel that the proposed increases will scarcely do more than permit postal workers to keep abreast of their economic problems. Certainly, they will never accumulate any great wealth as a result of the provisions of this bill.

It has been my happy experience to note that the average postal worker is an industrious, faithful, and efficient public servant. Most of the postal personnel have made a career of the post-office service, and I think a review of their wages down through the years will show that they have never been high-salaried employees. As I recall, there was a period just prior to 1945 when postal employees had not been given a salary increase for almost 20 years. Yet during that 20-year wait postal wages were reduced when times were bad, both in dollars and cents and by payless furloughs. So they entered the present period of high prices at a lower level than most any other workers. Consistency would seem to indicate that consideration should be given postal employees in the matter of wages when prices are beyond the reach of their salaries. I do not think this necessarily applies to other Federal employees.

It would be repetitious at this point to say that food prices and costs of clothing and other essentials are almost beyond the reach of the low-salaried postal worker, and this includes workers at all levels, because none of the salaries are high and never have been. The postal worker must be considered as belonging in the wage-earner group. His average gross income, I am told, is approximately $2,708 per annum, and he has not received during the past year increases that have been granted to other groups of workers.

When we consider that postal workers contribute 5 percent of their salary for retirement purposes in addition to the authorized withholding tax, it is easy to see that their average gross income is considerably less in take-home pay. I think it is common knowledge that $2,100 is the starting wage for letter carriers and postal clerks. I need not elaborate on the difficulty a $2,100 postal worker must have in living today.

I have talked with numerous postal people in my State of Connecticut. In every instance the topic of their conversation was the difficulty they are experiencing in stretching their salary to meet present-day costs.

It is my sincere belief that postal workers have suffered too long; that they have been left behind in the wage increases which have been granted during the recent years and during the war years; and that a further delay in granting them what need demands would be highly unjust.

The bill (S. 1949) to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service, introduced by Mr. BALDWIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. TOBEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 185), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 186), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 17, 1947 (authorizing an investigation of the appointment of postmasters), is hereby amended by striking out the date "January 15, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "February 28, 1948."

INVESTIGATION OF THE FUEL OIL SITUATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution and express the hope that it will receive immediate consideration. I read from the resolution:

Resolved, That the special committee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed, in connection with its study of problems of American small business enterprises, to make a full and complete study and investigation of shortages in, and methods used in distributing, fuel oil, especially fuel oil for heating purposes. In view of present seasonal needs for fuel oil for heating purposes the committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

It is not my intention to prejudge the oil industry or any company or group of companies. However, there seems to me sufficient justification to at least suspect the existence of a highly organized and effective conspiracy to restrict and curtail independent oil producers and distributors, with resulting hardship and higher prices to the consuming public and with severe financial losses or bankruptcy to the independent operators.

I suggest that the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, under the authorization and direction of this resolution, enlist the assistance of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. It is my opinion that these agencies can furnish considerable information and data from current files and can facilitate the collection, assimilation, and evaluation of new evidence by inquiry and investigation. These agencies should, in my opinion, be directed to report to the committee conclusions drawn on the basis of their experience and knowledge and to make recommendations for corrective action by the Congress or appropriate executive department.

The resolution (S. Res. 187) submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed, in connection with its study of problems of American small business enterprises, to make a full and complete study and investigation of shortages in, and methods used in distributing fuel oil, especially fuel oil for heating purposes. In view of present seasonal needs for fuel oil for heating purposes the committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

THE MARSHALL PLAN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him entitled "The Marshall Plan," which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him entitled "Universal Military Training," which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE SENATOR DAVIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorial to the late Senator James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania, published in the Moose magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC NATION-WIDE RADIO RALLY—COMMENTS ON ISSUES BY DEMOCRATIC LEADERS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the transcript of a Democratic Nation-wide radio rally, containing comments by Democratic leaders, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF SENATOR WILEY'S BOOK, LAUGHING WITH CONGRESS, IN AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION JOURNAL

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review of Senator WILEY's book, Laughing With Congress, published in the December 1947 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

BENEFITS OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY PROGRAM—LETTER FROM E. R. DEAVER

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him from Mr. E. R. Deaver, of Knoxville, Tenn., describing the advantages which have come to the people of the Tennessee Valley as a result of the program carried out by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPEAL OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE TRAINMAN NEWS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "AFW: 'Repeal That Law,'" published in the Trainman News of December 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR HATCH

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate several years ago it was the custom, when a Senator desired to address the Senate, to so advise the Chair, and make a public announcement. In recent years that custom has been superseded by a private list submitted to the Chair, which frequently causes embarrassment to the Chair and to Members of the Senate who desire to speak and who do not know that a previous commitment has been made.

Mr. President, I prefer the former custom. I understand that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow. In accordance with the previous custom, I announce that on Friday, at the first opportunity, I shall seek recognition from the Chair to address the Senate on what I consider to be the most important subject before the Congress and the country at this time.

WISCONSIN STATE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, would it be in order to address the Senate for 5 minutes in relation to the centennial anniversary of our State?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, January 5, the State of Wisconsin began observance of its centennial year, marking its admission into the Union on May 29, 1848, as our thirtieth State. As my colleagues may recall, on July 22, 1947, I called attention in the Senate to the wonderful plans being laid for our centennial year.

The celebration on January 5 at the State Capitol, which was addressed by Mr. Charles E. Bohlen, of the State Department, was the opening gun of a year that will see countless splendid celebrations throughout my State. On the actual anniversary date, May 29, a parade and pageant will be held in the State Capitol. Starting August 2, a multimillion-dollar centennial exposition will run for 23 days at State Fair Park, in West Allis, Wis.

COOPERATION IN CENTENNIAL

Later I plan to report in more detail on the extensive plans being made by the University of Wisconsin, by historical societies, school groups, women's clubs, and countless other State organizations in contributing to the centennial observation. This year, too, will see the issuance of a special postage stamp celebrating the centennial, on which I have been in contact with the Post Office Department. In Washington, a gala exposition will be held in the Library of Congress. This exhibition will feature many valuable historical documents relating to Wisconsin history and growth.

A special centennial art collection has been planned by Mr. Charles Zadok, of Milwaukee, and it is my privilege to serve as chairman of the sponsoring committee. Governor Rennebohm is the honorary chairman of this committee, and other committee members include my colleague the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]; Mayor Bohn, of Milwaukee; President Fred, of the University of Wisconsin; Father Brooks, of Marquette University; and other distinguished citizens.

It has been a pleasure for me to aid in some small way in these various centennial plans and to cooperate with the

group of excellent men and women who comprise our State centennial committee. My one regret is that the President unfortunately vetoed the Wisconsin centennial coin bill which I originally introduced in the Senate. Proceeds from this coin might have been used to help defray the expenses of the centennial observation.

GENERAL MAC ARTHUR'S MESSAGE

To return for a moment to the January 5 celebration at Madison, it was marked in particular by a great message received from Wisconsin's most illustrious son, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our supreme commander in Japan. This message saluting Wisconsin's one hundredth anniversary was read by Chief Justice Marvin Rosenberry, of the Wisconsin Supreme Court, during the exercises held in the University of Wisconsin's field house. The words of General MacArthur speak for themselves, and I should like to quote briefly from them:

There can be no greater satisfaction than such as comes from the confidences reflected in the selection by one's neighbors for public service—no more challenging responsibility than lies in the fulfillment of their trust.

SEAWAY BILL

As we in Wisconsin know, perhaps the greatest tribute that can be paid to our State and to the entire midwestern region, of which it is a vital part, is the passage later this month of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, which has been endorsed by every Wisconsin State Legislature in the past two decades.

INVITATION TO WISCONSIN

Our fellow citizens of the other 47 States are cordially invited to visit this year, and every other year, the magnificent paradise which is the Badger State—56,000 square miles of "heaven on earth"—a State evenly balanced in industry and agriculture; known, too, for its great pulp and paper industry, its mining, and its many tourist attractions. The name of Wisconsin and the fame of Wisconsin have encircled the globe. Her cheese, and all her other dairy products, her heavy industrial equipment, to cite but a few examples, have become the synonyms of high quality and outstanding integrity.

As I previously stated, I hope to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at an early date a more complete report on our centennial program.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DREWRY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 419), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PATRICK H. DREWRY, a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask to have it read and immediately considered.

The resolution (S. Res. 188) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. PATRICK H. DREWRY, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BYRD. As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Friday next at noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 9, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all love and of all mercy, who canst alter the minds of men according to Thine own purpose, do Thou direct the Congress this day; so rule in our hearts that these chosen servants of our Republic may seek the honor and welfare of our people. Reveal unto us that pretense may endure but for a day, and that the power of our country is in that tempered justice which gives every man a due share of peace and contentment. Direct our search for that which is true; for honesty, integrity, and reverence for the holy things of life; herein lies the lasting triumph of a free people. Be with us, that Thy will may be magnified in all decisions. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 182

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. WHERRY and Mr. BARKLEY were appointed members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 183

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
Frankfort, January 6, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my office as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Second District of Kentucky.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Governor of Kentucky.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 7, 1948.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The President pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints the following members of the committee to conduct the President of the United States into the Chamber: The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

At 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. I sincerely hope that all of you had a pleasant holiday season and that you will not have too much hard work in the coming year. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Eightieth Congress, we are here today to consider the state of the Union.

On this occasion, above all others, the Congress and the President should concentrate their attention, not upon party but upon country; not upon the things which divide us but upon those which bind us together—the enduring principles of our American system, and our common aspirations for the future welfare and security of the people of the United States.

The United States has become great because we, as a people, have been able to work together for great objectives even while differing about details.

The elements of our strength are many. They include our democratic Government, our economic system, our great natural resources. But these are only partial explanations.

The basic source of our strength is spiritual. For we are a people with a faith. We believe in the dignity of man. We believe that he was created in the image of the Father of us all.

We do not believe that men exist merely to strengthen the state or to be cogs in an economic machine. We do believe that governments are created to serve the people and that economic systems exist to minister to their wants. We have a profound devotion to the welfare and rights of the individual as a human being.

The faith of our people has particular meaning at this time in history because of the unsettled and changing state of the world.

The victims of war in many lands are striving to rebuild their lives, and are seeking assurance that the tragedy of war will not occur again. Throughout the world new ideas are challenging the old. Men of all nations are reexamining the beliefs by which they live. Great scientific and industrial changes have released new forces which will affect the future course of civilization.

The state of our Union reflects the changing nature of the modern world. On all sides there is heartening evidence of great energy—of capacity for economic development—and even more important, capacity for spiritual growth. But accompanying this great activity there are equally great questions, great anxieties, great aspirations. They represent the concern of an enlightened people that conditions should be so arranged as to make life more worth while.

We must devote ourselves to finding answers to these anxieties and aspirations. We seek answers which will embody the moral and spiritual elements of tolerance, unselfishness, and brotherhood upon which true freedom and opportunity must rest.

As we examine the state of our Union today, we can benefit from viewing it on a basis of the accomplishments of the last decade and our goals for the next. How far have we come during the last 10 years and how far can we go during the next 10?

It was 10 years ago that the determination of dictators to wage war upon mankind became apparent. The years that followed brought untold death and destruction.

We shared in the human suffering of the war, but we were fortunate enough to escape most of war's destruction. We were able through these 10 years to expand the productive strength of our farms and factories

More important, however, is the fact that these years brought us new courage and new confidence in the ideals of our free democracy. Our deep belief in freedom and justice was reinforced in the crucible of war.

On the foundations of our greatly strengthened economy and our renewed confidence in democratic values, we can continue to move forward.

There are some who look with fear and distrust upon planning for the future. Yet our great national achievements have been attained by those with vision. Our Union was formed, our frontiers were pushed back, and our great industries were built by men who looked ahead.

I propose that we look ahead today toward those goals for the future which have the greatest bearing upon the foundations of our democracy and the happiness of our people.

I do so, confident in the thought that with clear objectives and with firm determination, we can, in the next 10 years, build upon the accomplishments of the past decade to achieve a glorious future. Year by year, beginning now, we must make a substantial part of this progress.

Our first goal is to secure fully the essential human rights of our citizens.

The United States has always had a deep concern for human rights. Religious freedom, free speech, and freedom of thought are cherished realities in our land. Any denial of human rights is a denial of the basic beliefs of democracy and of our regard for the worth of each individual.

Today, however, some of our citizens are still denied equal opportunity for education, for jobs and economic advancement, and for the expression of their views at the polls. Most serious of all, some are denied equal protection under our laws. Whether discrimination is based on race, or creed, or color, or land of origin, it is utterly contrary to American ideals of democracy.

The recent report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights points the way to corrective action by the Federal Government and by State and local governments. Because of the need for effective Federal action, I shall send a special message to the Congress on this important subject.

We should also consider our obligation to assure the fullest possible measure of civil rights to the people of our Territories and possessions. I believe that the time has come for Alaska and Hawaii to be admitted to the Union as States.

Our second goal is to protect and develop our human resources.

The safeguarding of the rights of our citizens must be accompanied by an equal regard for their opportunities for development and their protection from economic insecurity. In this Nation the ideals of freedom and equality can be given specific meaning in terms of health, education, social security, and housing.

Over the past 12 years we have erected a sound framework of social-security legislation. Many millions of our citizens are now protected against the loss of income which can come with unemployment, old age, or the death of wage earners. Yet, our system has gaps and inconsistencies; it is only half finished.

We should now extend unemployment compensation, old-age benefits, and survivors' benefits to millions who are not now protected. We should also raise the level of benefits.

The greatest gap in our social-security structure is the lack of adequate provision for the Nation's health. We are rightly proud of the high standards of medical care we know how to provide in the United States. The fact is, however, that most of our people cannot afford to pay for the care they need.

I have often and strongly urged that this condition demands a national health program. The heart of the program must be a national system of payment for medical care based on well-tried insurance principles. This great Nation cannot afford to allow its citizens to suffer needlessly from the lack of proper medical care.

Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health.

Another fundamental aim of our democracy is to provide an adequate education for every person.

Our educational systems face a financial crisis. It is deplorable that in a nation as rich as ours there are millions of children who do not have adequate schoolhouses or enough teachers for a good elementary or secondary education. If there are educational inadequacies in any State, the whole Nation suffers. The Federal Government has a responsibility for providing financial aid to meet this crisis.

In addition, we must make possible greater equality of opportunity to all our citizens for an education. Only by so doing can we insure that our citizens will be capable of understanding and sharing the responsibilities of democracy.

The Government's programs for health, education, and security are of such great importance to our democracy that we should now establish an executive department for their administration.

Health and education have their beginning in the home. No matter what our hospitals or schools are like, the youth of our Nation are handicapped when millions of them live in city slums and country shacks. Within the next decade, we must see that every American family has a decent home. As an immediate step we need the long-range housing program which I have recommended on many occasions. This should include financial aids designed to yield more housing at lower prices. It should provide public housing for low-income families, and vigorous development of new techniques to lower the cost of building.

Until we can overcome the present drastic housing shortage, we must extend and strengthen rent control.

We have had, and shall continue to have, a special interest in the welfare of our veterans. Over 14,000,000 men and women who served in the armed forces in World War II have now returned to civilian life. Over 2,000,000 veterans are being helped through school. Millions have been aided while finding jobs, and have been helped in buying homes, in obtaining medical care, and in adjusting themselves to physical handicaps.

All but a very few veterans have successfully made the transition from military life to their home communities. The success of our veterans' program is proved by this fact. This Nation is proud of the eagerness shown by our veterans to become self-reliant and self-supporting citizens.

Our third goal is to conserve and use our natural resources so that they can contribute most effectively to the welfare of our people.

The resources given by nature to this country are rich and extensive. The material foundations of our growth and economic development are the bounty of our fields, the wealth of our mines and forests, and the energy of our waters. As a Nation, we are coming to appreciate more each day the close relationship between the conservation of these resources and the preservation of our national strength.

Yet we are doing far less than we know how to do to make use of our resources without destroying them. Both the public and private use of these resources must have the primary objective of maintaining and increasing these basic supports for an expanding future.

We must continue to take specific steps toward this goal. We must vigorously defend our natural wealth against those who would misuse it for selfish gain.

We need accurate and comprehensive knowledge of our mineral resources and must intensify our efforts to develop new supplies and to acquire stock piles of scarce materials.

We need to protect and restore our land—public and private—through combating erosion and rebuilding the fertility of the soil.

We must expand our reclamation program to bring millions of acres of arid land into production, and to improve water supplies for additional millions of acres. This will provide new opportunities for veterans and others, particularly in the West, and aid in providing a rising living standard for a growing population.

We must protect and restore our forests by sustained-yield forestry and by planting new trees in areas now slashed and barren.

We must continue to erect multiple-purpose dams on our great rivers—not only to reclaim land, but also to prevent floods, to extend our inland waterways, and to provide hydroelectric power. This public power must not be monopolized for private gain. Only through well-established policies of transmitting power directly to its market and thus encouraging widespread use at low rates can the Federal Government assure the people of their full share of its benefits. Additional power—public and private—is needed to raise the ceilings now imposed by power shortages on industrial and agricultural development.

We should achieve the wise use of resources through the integrated development of our great river basins. We can learn much from our Tennessee Valley experience. We should no longer delay in applying the lessons of that vast undertaking to our other great river basins.

Our fourth goal is to lift the standard of living for all our people by strengthening our economic system and sharing more broadly among our people the goods we produce.

The amazing economic progress of the past 10 years points the way for the next 10.

Today 14,000,000 more people have jobs than in 1938.

Our yearly output of goods and services has increased by two-thirds.

The average income of our people, measured in dollars of equal purchasing power, has increased—after taxes—by more than 50 percent.

In no other 10 years have farmers, businessmen, and wage earners made such great gains.

We may not be able to expand as rapidly in the next decade as in the last, because we are now starting from full employment and very high production. But we can increase our annual output by at least one-third above the present level. We can lift our standard of living to nearly double what it was 10 years ago.

If we distribute these gains properly, we can go far toward stamping out poverty in our generation.

To do this, agriculture, business, and labor must move forward together.

Permanent farm prosperity and agricultural abundance will be achieved only as our whole economy grows and prospers. The farmer can sell more food at good prices when the incomes of wage earners are high and when there is full employment. Adequate diets for every American family, and the needs of our industries at full production, will absorb a farm output well above our present levels.

Although the average farmer is now better off than ever before, farm families as a whole have only begun to catch up with the standards of living enjoyed in the cities. In 1946, the average income of farm people was $779, contrasted with an average income of $1,288 for nonfarm people. Within the next decade, we should eliminate elements of inequality in these living standards.

To this end our farm program should enable the farmer to market his varied crops at fair price levels and to improve his standard of living.

We need to continue price supports for major farm commodities on a basis which will afford reasonable protection against fluctuations in the levels of production and demand. The present price-support program must be reexamined and modernized.

Crop insurance should be strengthened and its benefits extended in order to protect the farmer against the special hazards to which he is subject.

We also need to improve the means for getting farm products into the markets and into the hands of consumers. Cooperatives which directly or indirectly serve this purpose must be encouraged—not discouraged. The school-lunch program should be continued and adequately financed.

We need to go forward with the rural electrification program to bring the benefits of electricity to all our farm population.

We can, and must, aid and encourage farmers to conserve their soil resources and restore the fertility of land that has suffered from neglect or unwise use.

All of these are practical measures upon which we should act immediately to enable agriculture to make its full contribution to our prosperity.

We must also strengthen our economic system within the next decade by enlarging our industrial capacity within the framework of our free enterprise system.

We are today far short of the industrial capacity we need for a growing future. At least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our productive facilities over the next few years. But this is only the beginning. The industrial application of atomic energy and other scientific advances will constantly open up further opportunities for expansion. Farm prosperity and high employment will call for an immensely increased output of goods and services.

Growth and vitality in our economy depend on vigorous private enterprise. Free competition is the key to industrial development, full production and employment, fair prices and an ever improving standard of living. Competition is seriously limited today in many industries by the concentration of economic power and other elements of monopoly. The appropriation of sufficient funds to permit proper enforcement of the pres-

ent antitrust laws is essential. Beyond that we should go on to strengthen our legislation to protect competition.

Another basic element of a strong economic system is the well-being of wage earners.

We have learned that the well-being of workers depends on high production and consequent high employment. We have learned equally well that the welfare of industry and agriculture depends on high incomes for our workers.

The Government has wisely chosen to set a floor under wages. But our 40-cent minimum wage is inadequate and obsolete. I recommend lifting the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.

In general, however, we must continue to rely on our sound system of collective bargaining to set wage scales. Workers' incomes should increase at a rate consistent with the maintenance of sound price, profit, and wage relationships and with increasing productivity.

The Government's part in labor-management relations is now largely controlled by the terms of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947. I made my attitude clear on this act in my veto message to the Congress last June. Nothing has occurred since to change my opinion of this law. As long as it remains the law of the land, however, I shall carry out my constitutional duty to administer it. [Applause.]

As we look ahead we can understand the crucial importance of restraint and wisdom in arriving at new labor-management contracts. Work stoppages would result in a loss of production—a loss which could bring higher prices for our citizens and could also deny the necessities of life to the hard-pressed peoples of other lands. It is my sincere hope that the representatives of labor and of industry will bear in mind that the Nation as a whole has a vital stake in the success of their bargaining efforts.

If we surmount our current economic difficulties, then we can move ahead to a great increase in our national income which will enable all our people to enjoy richer and fuller lives.

All of us must advance together. One-fifth of our families now have average annual incomes of less than $850. We must see that our gains in national income are made more largely available to those with low incomes, whose need is greatest. This will benefit us all through providing a stable foundation of buying power to maintain prosperity.

Business, labor, agriculture, and government, working together, must develop the policies which will make possible the realization of the full benefits of our economic system.

Our fifth goal is to achieve world peace based on principles of freedom and justice and the equality of all nations.

Twice within our generation, world wars have taught us that we cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of the world.

We have learned that the loss of freedom in any area of the world means a loss of freedom to ourselves—that the loss of independence by any nation adds directly to the insecurity of the United States and all free nations.

We have learned that a healthy world economy is essential to world peace—that economic distress is a disease whose evil effects spread far beyond the boundaries of the afflicted nation.

For these reasons the United States is vigorously following policies designed to achieve a peaceful and prosperous world.

We are giving, and will continue to give, our full support to the United Nations. While that organization has encountered unforeseen and unwelcome difficulties, I am confident of its ultimate success. We are also devoting our efforts toward world economic recovery and the revival of world trade. These actions are closely related and mutually supporting.

We believe that the United States can be an effective force for world peace only if it is strong. We look forward to the day when nations will decrease their armaments. Yet, so long as there remains serious opposition to the ideals of a peaceful world, we must maintain strong armed forces. [Applause.]

The passage of the National Security Act by the Congress at its last session was a notable step in providing for the security of this country. A further step which I consider of even greater importance is the early provision for universal training. There are many elements in a balanced national-security program, all interrelated and necessary, but universal training should be the foundation for them all. A favorable decision by the Congress at an early date is of world importance. I am convinced that such action is vital to the security of this Nation and to the maintenance of its leadership. [Applause.]

The United States is engaged today in many international activities directed toward the creation of lasting peaceful relationships among nations.

We have been giving substantial aid to Greece and Turkey to assist these nations in preserving their integrity against foreign pressures. Had it not been for our aid, their situation today might well be radically different. The continued integrity of those countries will have a powerful effect upon other nations in the Middle East and Europe struggling to maintain their independence while they repair the damages of war.

The United States has special responsibilities with respect to the countries in which we have occupation forces: Germany, Austria, Japan, and Korea. Our efforts to reach agreements on peace settlements for these countries have so far been blocked. But we shall continue to exert our utmost efforts to obtain satisfactory settlements for each of these nations.

Many thousands of displaced persons, still living in camps overseas, should be allowed entry into the United States. I again urge the Congress to pass suitable legislation at once so that this Nation may do its share in caring for homeless and suffering refugees of all faiths. I believe that the admission of these persons will add to the strength and energy of this Nation.

We are moving toward our goal of world peace in many ways. But the most important efforts which we are now making are those which support world economic reconstruction. We are seeking to restore the world trading system which was shattered by the war and to remedy the economic paralysis which grips many countries.

To restore world trade we have recently taken the lead in bringing about the greatest reduction of world tariffs that has ever occurred. The extension of the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which made this achievement possible, is of extreme importance. We must also go on to support the International Trade Organization, through which we hope to obtain world-wide agreement on a code of fair conduct in international trade.

Our present major effort toward economic reconstruction is to support the program for recovery developed by the countries of Europe. In my recent message to the Congress I outlined the reasons why it is wise and necessary for the United States to extend this support.

I want to reaffirm my belief in the soundness and promise of this proposal. When the European economy is strengthened, the product of its industry will be of benefit to many other areas of economic distress. The ability of freemen to overcome hunger and despair will be a moral stimulus to the entire world.

We intend to work also with other nations in achieving world economic recovery. We shall continue our cooperation with the nations of the Western Hemisphere. A special program of assistance to China, to provide urgent relief needs and to speed reconstruction, will be submitted to the Congress.

Unfortunately, not all governments share the hope of the people of the United States that economic reconstruction in many areas of the world can be achieved through cooperative effort among nations. In spite of these differences we will go forward with our efforts to overcome economic paralysis.

No nation by itself can carry these programs to success; they depend upon the cooperative and honest efforts of all participating countries. Yet the leadership is inevitably ours.

I consider it of the highest importance that the Congress should authorize support for the European recovery program for the period from April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1952, with an initial amount for the first 15 months of $6,800,000,000. I urge the Congress to act promptly on this vital measure of our foreign policy—on this decisive contribution to world peace.

We are following a sound, constructive, and practical course in carrying out our determination to achieve peace.

We are fighting poverty, hunger, and suffering.

This leads to peace—not war.

We are building toward a world where all nations, large and small alike, may live free from the fear of aggression.

This leads to peace—not war.

Above all else, we are striving to achieve a concord among the peoples of the world based upon the dignity of the individual and the brotherhood of man.

This leads to peace—not war.

We can go forward with confidence that we are following sound policies, both at home and with other nations, which will lead us toward our great goals for economic, social, and moral achievement.

As we enter the new year, we must surmount one major problem which affects all our goals. That is the problem of inflation.

Already inflation in this country is undermining the living standards of millions of families. Food costs too much. Housing has reached fantastic price levels. Schools and hospitals are in financial distress. Inflation threatens to bring on disagreement and strife between labor and management.

Worst of all, inflation holds the threat of another depression, just as we had a depression after the unstable boom following the First World War.

When I announced last October that the Congress was being called into session, I described the price increases which had taken place since June 1946. Wholesale prices had increased 40 percent, and retail prices had increased 23 percent.

Since October prices have continued to rise. Wholesale prices have gone up at an annual rate of 18 percent. Retail prices have gone up at an annual rate of 10 percent.

The events which have occurred since I presented my 10-point anti-inflation program to the Congress on November 17 have made it even clearer that all 10 points are essential.

High prices must not be our means of rationing.

We must deal effectively and at once with the high cost of living.

We must stop the spiral of inflation.

I trust that within the shortest possible time the Congress will make available to the Government the weapons that are so desperately needed in the fight against inflation.

One of the most powerful anti-inflationary factors in our economy today is the excess of Government revenues over expenditures.

Government expenditures have been and must continue to be held at the lowest safe levels. Since VJ-day Federal expenditures have been sharply reduced. They have been cut from more than $63,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1946 to less than $38,000,000,000 in the present fiscal year. The number of civilian employees has been cut nearly in half—from 3,750,000 down to 2,000,000.

On the other hand, Government revenues must not be reduced. Until inflation has been stopped there should be no cut in taxes that is not offset by additions at another point in our tax structure.

Certain adjustments should be made within our existing tax structure that will not affect total receipts, yet will adjust the tax burden so that those least able to pay will have their burden lessened by the transfer of a portion of it to those best able to pay. [Applause.]

Many of our families today are suffering hardship because of the high cost of living. At the same time profits of corporations reached an all-time record in 1947. Corporate profits totaled $17,000,000,000 after taxes. This compared with $12,500,000,000 in 1946, the previous high year.

Because of this extraordinary high level of profits, corporations can well afford to carry a larger share of the tax load at this time.

During this period in which the high cost of living is bearing down on so many of our families tax adjustments should be made to ease their burden. The low-income group particularly is being pressed very hard. To this group a tax adjustment would result in a saving that could be used to buy the necessities of life.

I recommend, therefore, that, effective January 1, 1948, a cost-of-living tax credit be extended to our people consisting of a credit of $40 to each individual taxpayer and an additional credit of $40 for each dependent. [Applause.] Thus the income tax of a man with a wife and two children would be reduced $160. The credit would be extended to all taxpayers, but it would be particularly helpful to those in the low-income group.

It is estimated that such a tax credit would reduce the Federal revenue by $3,200,000,000. This reduction should be made up by increasing the tax on corporate profits in an amount that will produce this sum—with appropriate adjustment for small corporations. [Applause.]

This is the proper method of tax relief at this time. It gives relief to those who need it most without cutting the total tax revenue of the Government.

When the present danger of inflation has passed we should consider tax reduction based upon a revision of our entire tax structure.

When we have conquered inflation we shall be in a position to move forward toward our chosen goals.

As we do so let us keep ever before us our high purposes.

We are determined that every citizen of this Nation shall have an equal right and equal opportunity to grow in wisdom and in stature and to take his place in the control of his Nation's destiny.

We are determined that the productive resources of the Nation shall be used wisely and fully for the benefit of all.

We are determined that the democratic faith of our people and the strength of our resources shall contribute their full share to the attainment of enduring peace in the world.

It is our faith in human dignity that underlies these purposes. It is this faith that keeps us a strong and vital people.

This is a time to remind ourselves of these fundamentals. For today the whole world looks to us for leadership.

This is the hour to rededicate ourselves to the faith in mankind that makes us strong.

This is the hour to rededicate ourselves to the faith in God that gives us confidence as we face the challenge of the years ahead. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President of the United States be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of the grain situation.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CHADWICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column from the Washington Post.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered in Chicago, Ill., by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States in connection with the observance of the one hundredth anniversary of the birthday of John Peter Altgeld.

I have secured an estimate from the Public Printer and have been informed that this manuscript will make approximately 2⅔ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $189.34. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask that it be included with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE ISSUE IN 1948

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has stooped to political expediency by recommending purely political solutions to basic economic problems.

To overcome the Wallace threat, he would out-deal the New Deal with a program that would mean a misdeal to the American people.

The adoption of the Truman program would mean an increase in the cost of government by billions and billions of

dollars and our people would be burdened for generations with taxes and more taxes.

The issue in 1948 is now clear: It is between new dealism and Americanism. He would have us adopt the very type of socialistic program that has contributed to Europe's present desperate plight. Our people want less government, not more government. They want less taxes, not more taxes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the message of the President of the United States on the state of the Union.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Truman has just about out-Wallaced Wallace. If Mr. Wallace can make a more socialistic or communistic speech than Mr. Truman has just delivered, he can accomplish what I believe to be the impossible.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, I telegraphed to the President of the United States asking him on account of the shortage of fuel oil in many parts of the country to prohibit by embargo shipments of oil from the United States to foreign countries and to direct the United States Maritime Commission to sell tankers to Americans and not to foreign persons or governments. The President has neither replied to my telegram nor taken the action requested although the oil shortages increase each day. I am informed that the mayor of New York has requested additional tankers of oil owing to the need there. I believe the President should issue the embargo at once and direct the United States Maritime Commission to cooperate in every possible way in this emergency. The fuel oil is needed in the United States and the tankers are needed for its transportation. For months hearings and investigations have been held without accomplishing any relief. Our people are confused and have lost confidence in being asked to change from oil to coal and then from coal to oil and back again from oil to coal. Too much fuel oil and too many tankers are being sent to foreign countries. Embargo is necessary to provide fuel oil for our people in proper and necessary amounts and at fair prices. The President should act immediately.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an address by Mr. E. H. Taylor. I have been informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make three and one-third pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $236.67.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT IN THE RECORD

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce is one of the progressive organizations of southern California. It is the spark plug for industries of many kinds, such as shipbuilding, ocean shipping, aircraft building, oil production and refining, fishing, soap manufacturing, and a multitude of others.

The Long Beach Chamber of Commerce is fully conversant with the fact that control of the air is one of the prime essentials for a nation of the importance of the United States both in peace and in war. In its efforts to have us maintain that degree of supremacy which is so essential to us, the chamber recently approved a resolution addressed to the Congress of the United States urgently requesting that an adequate national air policy be adopted.

The resolution is as follows:

LONG BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Long Beach, Calif.

WE MUST REGAIN AIR SUPREMACY

Whereas the United States has demonstrated its desire to live in peace with the world; and

Whereas in every generation it has been drawn into a terrible war for which it was unprepared; and

Whereas this unpreparedness has cost many thousands of lives and billions of dollars; and

Whereas the security of our homes, families, property, and Nation depends upon adequate national defense; and

Whereas an air force superior to that of any enemy is the strongest deterrent to aggression and the best immediate means of defense: Therefore it is hereby

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urgently requested to adopt promptly a national air policy which will assure:

1. A modern powerful air force in being.
2. Enough trained personnel to man this air force.
3. Sufficient research and development to guarantee that America remains first in this field.
4. Strategically located bases of operation.
5. An adequate system of air transportation which in effect is an auxiliary and supplement to the air force.
6. A strong independent aircraft industry capable of rapid expansion.
7. Designation of stand-by plants from those already constructed to provide a stronger basic production nucleus to meet any national emergency.
8. Creation of an additional separate stock pile of critical materials for aircraft manufacture and maintenance.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
LONG BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
Adopted December 29, 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Arthur Krock, of the New York Times.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 8, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1190. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Navy Department, transmitting information that there have been no agreements, purchases, or condemnation proceedings entered into under the reference authority during the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1191. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1192. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as required by paragraph (e) of that section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1193. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the utilization of certain surplus military real property as national cemeteries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4862. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of Powder River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4863. A bill granting the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code to members of the armed forces taken as prisoners of war in Java or French Indochina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4864. A bill to authorize States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities to elect coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance benefit provisions of the Social Security Act for their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4865. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Powells Bay, Accomack County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 4866. A bill to amend sections 210 and 209 (f) of the Social Security Act so as to increase the benefits payable to veterans of World War II and their survivors and to remove the 3-year limitation upon survivors' insurance benefits in the case of deceased World War II veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4867. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the postwar construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4868. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the postwar construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4869. A bill to authorize the construction of a building adjacent to the Roosevelt Park Parcel Post Station at Detroit and for the remodeling and modernization of present facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4870. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 328 of subchapter 111 of title 1 of the act of October 14, 1940, relative to registry of aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 4871. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Dosoris Creek, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4872. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4873. A bill to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4874. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the county of Del Norte, State of California, to Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 4875. A bill to increase the fees and mileage allowances of jurors in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 4876. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4877. A bill to provide for assistance by the Federal Government in the repair of damage caused by erosion by waves and currents to the shores of the State of Florida and in the prevention of future damage to such shores; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 4878. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant allowances for the feeding of seeing-eye dogs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TWYMAN:

H. R. 4879. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal-savings deposits to 1 percent per annum; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. J. Res. 288. Joint resolution directing all executive departments and agencies, other than those exempted herein, to make available to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments information which may, by either of said committees, be deemed necessary to enable it to properly perform the duties delegated to it by the Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution directing the Civil Service Commission to make available to the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments certain information in its possession; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 420. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate and study the distribution and sale of fuel commodities and the rising prices in same commodities in New England; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4880. A bill for the relief of Antonio Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4881. A bill for the relief of Dimitri Petrou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1075. By Mr. KILDAY: Petition of Victor Keller, of San Antonio, Tex., and 42 others, urging legislation to establish a system of universal military training for American young men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1076. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mrs. Margaret C. Springer and sundry citizens of Massachusetts, advocating enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1077. By Mr. MULTER: Petition of 65 residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging that legislation establishing a system of universal military training in America be enacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1078. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Evansville, Wis., and vicinity, urging legislation to establish universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1079. Also, petition of members of Zilmer-Riley Post, No. 84, of the American Legion, Monroe, Wis., urging legislation to establish universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1080. Also, petition of members of Kelly Gardner Post Auxiliary of the American Legion, Elkhorn, Wis., urging legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1081. Also, petition of members of Joseph Bailey Ingalls Unit, No. 102, American Legion Auxiliary, Walworth, Wis., urging legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1082. Also, petition of members of American Legion Auxiliary, Beloit, Wis., urging legislation establishing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O brooding Spirit of the Most High, each day be Thou our decisive authority. Silently steal into our breasts; rebuke our tendencies and give our tongues a ministry of thought and discretion. If we seem to wander, harken to our appeal for a wise pathway, neither weary of the day nor fearful of the night. O refresh our Nation with the spiritual wellsprings of life, and may there be an awakening of patriotic fervor that will persuade all minds that happiness outside of goodness is vanity and that happy is that people whose God is the Lord. In our Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 188):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. PATRICK H. DREWRY, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn until Friday next at noon.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, 1947, the Senate asked for a conference on the bill S. 1317. I now ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1317) to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents, with House amendments thereto, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WELCH, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. SOMERS.

EXPORT OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN MERCHANDISE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, January 7, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to House Resolution 366, I am transmitting the following documents:

Set of Bureau of the Census Export Report FT 410, United States Export of Domestic and Foreign Merchandise—Commodity by Country of Destination Arrangement, for each of the months January through October 1947, marked to show the commodities in which the House may be interested.

Set of Bureau of the Census Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States, covering the months January through August 1947, and similarly marked. This report contains the same information as the FT 410 report but in summary form and without a break-down by countries, and contains also a summary of exports to various destinations without break-down by commodity.

Set of Bureau of the Census Export Report FT 420, showing country of destination by commodity.

Special Foreign Trade Report A, showing dollar summaries for exports for selected countries, January 1947 through October 1947.

It is believed that the above reports, particularly the marked copies mentioned, fulfill the requirements of the first paragraph of House Resolution 366. In a letter of this same date to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we are describing at some length additional data which it may be possible for us to provide and the measures which will be necessary if this data is compiled and transmitted. In that letter, a copy of which is attached for your information, we request an interpretation of the intention of the House concerning the additional data mentioned above.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my purpose to rise to a question of personal privilege, but there being no special orders I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the 1-minute speeches I may be recognized for so much of an hour as I care to use.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE STEAMSHIP "PRESIDENT CLEVELAND"

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, progress has been made in the building of the postwar merchant marine. The steamship *President Cleveland* recently steamed through the Golden Gate on its maiden voyage bound for the Hawaiian Islands and ports in the Philippines, China, and Japan.

I was invited aboard the ship by officials of the American President Lines for which it was built by the Maritime Commission and spent several hours on it. It is a beautifully appointed vessel of 15,000 tons, capable of transporting more than 500 passengers and a quantity of cargo. While it is beautiful, it is equally practical and efficient. The members of the crew with whom I came in contact seemed proud of their ship and endeavored to show it off in its best light.

It is a beautiful ship and Americans can be pleased with it. It is, however, the only one of its kind in operation.

It is the only fine, fast passenger-carrying ship built since the war. One more will follow it shortly. The steamship *America*, which is larger, is its only equal. Obviously we must go further in the building of our postwar merchant marine.

THE FUEL-OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard the President deliver an address on the sorry state of the Union which 16 years of New Deal misadministration has got us into. Here is another instance.

Mr. Speaker, New York is experiencing a critical fuel-oil shortage. I know because I live there.

Yesterday I received a telegram from the mayor of the city of New York requesting my strong and immediate support to secure prompt action by the Congress to extend the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate tankers so as to relieve the situation.

Upon inquiry, I was informed that the Maritime Commission has sold all of its serviceable tankers, so that an extension of time for the commission to operate ships would be to no avail.

The real reason for the shortage is not a lack of tankers but the refusal of the Administration to limit exports of petroleum products. I said before and I repeat that at hearings before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries early last year, administration spokesmen appeared and testified that there would be a critical fuel-oil shortage on the east coast. At that time the newspapers were full of reports of shipments of oil leaving the west coast for Russia.

When it was suggested that these exports be banned pursuant to export controls which the administration was armed with, the committee was told that the administration had no intention to do so.

Thereafter in July of last year, this House passed a resolution to require the Secretary of Commerce to certify that on any exports of petroleum products, they were not needed for the defense of the United States or for domestic consumption, but despite that shipments are yet permitted to go out of the country to Russia and with full knowledge of our urgent needs.

I insist that fuel oil is needed for domestic consumption and in this New York's mayor agrees, but the administration turns a deaf ear to the pleas of New York's very cold residents.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

DETROIT POLLS OVERWHELMINGLY AGAINST GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, during the special session which terminated recently I presented to the House some figures on a poll being taken in my district, especially at Pontiac, Mich., on the simple question whether or not the people were in favor of the reestablishment of governmental control over consumer credit. It was done by the Buckner Finance Co. They have sent me the last tabulation, and on that question, here is the result: There were 494 ballots or answers received, of which 418 were opposed and 76 in favor.

Also at Pontiac, Mich., another company, the Home and Auto Loan Co., received 176 answers, of which 152 were opposed and 24 in favor. In Detroit, Mich., the following three companies, Peoples State Loan Co., with three offices in Detroit, Service Loan Co., Detroit, and Protection Loan Co., Wyandotte, held a similar poll. They received 1,124 replies. Out of this number 998 were opposed to the reestablishment of governmental control over consumer credit, and only 126 were in favor.

It seems to me from this poll the people of the country, at least in my section of the country, do not favor the reestablishment of governmental control over consumer credit.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the people and the Congress expected and were entitled to something better than they received in President Truman's message on the state of the Union.

He handed out a political sop to every group of people in the United States except the Navajo Indians. There was very little in his speech that even the Democrats could applaud. Never before has any person addressed the Congress for 30 minutes without at least some applause.

He definitely was announcing his candidacy for reelection by indulging in the cheapest of demagogery which was far beneath the dignity of a President of the United States. It was a feeble attempt to outdo the Roosevelt New Deal and Henry Wallace, and was a definite bid to keep the Communists and followers of Henry Wallace in the Democratic Party next November.

He repeatedly referred to our democracy and our democratic government, when as President he must know we have a republic and ours is a republican form of government.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the problems of the physically handicapped, and, Mr. Speaker, if the House is not in session on Tuesday, I ask that the order go over until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he made last evening.

THE FOOD-CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. The President, in his address on the state of the Union, said that "inflation holds the threat of another depression," but he failed to say anything about one of the potent weapons with which to fight it, a weapon which he is just taking out of the hands of the American people—an effective food-conservation program—and incidentally jeopardizing the European recovery program in the process. In my city of New York, for example, the food-conservation program is falling apart with most of the restaurants and hotels refusing to go along with it and housewives, bitterly disappointed, paying little attention to it. Regardless of how I feel about it—and I stated at the close of the special session that I favored the authorization by Congress itself of rationing and price controls on key items like steel, grain, butter, milk, and meat—I know that any kind of rationing and price-control program for food faces a hard fight, but voluntary conservation administered on a big scale will get the prompt support of the whole country. Instead of disestablishing the President's Citizens Food Committee, there should be immediately established a national food-conservation administration, and Congress should adequately finance such an agency. This House has shown its attitude on this question by the insertion in the version of the foreign aid bill of 1947, which we approved, of a provision for a national citizens' food-conservation committee, but it was stricken out in conference. The provisions of the recently passed anti-inflation bill for voluntary agreements should be used to get the support of food producers and processors, distributors, and consumers. City people whose standard of living is being undermined by inflation should be given a weapon with which to help themselves now.

An editorial from the New York Times of January 7, 1948, on this subject follows:

A FAILURE OF LEADERSHIP

When we pause to reckon how completely world reconstruction depends on a wise distribution of food supply, and how gravely Europe's own share in her recovery will be jeopardized if her people do not have enough food to maintain the strength to produce, then the break-down of our voluntary food-conservation program in this country must be a source of great concern. The Government itself had long since abandoned the poultryless day, and admits that the pledge from poultrymen on which it so acted has not been fully honored. Now eggless Thursday has also been dropped for seasonal reasons. About all that is left of the voluntary program, the meatless Tuesdays, had already been scuttled by general noncompliance, and some restaurant and hotel associations have told members that it would be impractical for a few establishments to continue the voluntary program when it was being ignored widely throughout the country. Reports from other major cities confirm that the program, initiated with much enthusiasm from Washington only 3 months ago, is now largely forgotten.

It was on October 5 in a radio speech to the Nation that President Truman said that "an essential requirement of lasting peace in the world is the restoration of the countries of western Europe as free, self-supporting democracies. * * * They must do most of the job themselves. They cannot do it if thousands of their people starve." Secretary Marshall on that same evening supported this appeal by the President in saying that "food is a vital factor in our foreign policy," that the attitude of Americans toward food "can make or break our efforts to achieve peace and security throughout the world."

What President Truman and Secretary Marshall said in early October is as true now as it was then. But the administration in Washington must substantially share the blame if the voluntary food-saving program has increasingly lost popular support. For it has failed itself to provide the continuing leadership to make that program work. Since Charles Luckman resigned in late November as Chairman of the Citizens Food Committee virtually no appeal has been made to the public except by way of warning on price inflation. The fact is that many housewives have forgotten there is such a thing as a meatless Tuesday. The public has to be told continuously and eloquently of the need for food saving and what is to be done with the food saved by American abstention. It has not been so told. The administration has apparently felt that a 2-month job of selling the program would be all that was necessary. If so, it made a colossal misappraisal of human nature.

The Marshall long-term aid plan, which will now be under discussion in Congress, assumes a level of production in Europe that will strain every human resource in those countries taking part. They will not be able to hold up their end of the bargain unless they are reasonably well fed. It is essential that our Government resume its responsibility of leadership if the food-saving program is not to degenerate completely into a farce of nonobservance.

THE ISLAND OF GUAM

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1898, a full half century ago, the United States took possession of the island of Guam. For 50 years the Chamorro people of Guam have been ruled by America—the great emancipator, the champion of government by law rather than by orders or decrees. It is 50 years since the Stars and Stripes replaced the royal banner of the Kingdom of Spain over that far-distant land. Yet, today, as yesterday, and the day before back through some three centuries, the people of Guam are not citizens of the state of their overlords—they are merely subjects of a conquering people—subjects now of the American democracy. Yet, today, after all these 50 years, the people of Guam are not protected in their persons or their property by the majesty of the law such as is extended to even the most despicable wrongdoers of the United States. Instead, they, and all they have, are subject to the despotic orders—wise or foolish as they may be—of the Governor of Guam, an individual whose acts seek the plane of his own character and intelligence, as is the case in all such dictatorial governments.

Now, after the release of Guam from temporary bondage to Japan, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Congress of Guam are in substantial agreement on an organic act for the island—an act which will authorize citizenship and a measure of home rule under the jurisdiction of such governmental department as the President may designate. This act should not be further delayed.

In the light of an appreciation of American justice, I ask that a proposed organic act for the island of Guam be brought before the House. I ask that this be done soon so that the people of that island may receive their just reward during this year, in which the fiftieth anniversary of American occupation of Guam will be observed.

LEGAL FARM PRICES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while our friends from the cities complain about the cost of food, the other side of the picture is that the fellow that produces some of the foods is not even getting what the law says he should obtain. The President has the power and the authority and he has the money to control prices, whether they are low prices or whether they are high prices. For several weeks I have tried to get the Department of Agriculture to do something about chicken prices. If the administration is not going to pay any more attention to the Steagall amendment than it has paid to it in the last 90 days, we might as well take it off the books. I do not care to hear about the Steagall amendment just during election time; I would like to see it put into operation in between elections. The Steagall amendment allows the minimum wage to the rural people of this country, but 7-, 10-, and 15-cent chickens gives the workers on the farm a mighty low minimum wage. I would like to know if you believe the Secretary of Labor would sit and let the minimum wage fall below the 40 cents per hour provided by law without offering any protest. I have been carrying on considerable correspondence with the Under Secretary of Agriculture, and the more letters I receive the less I can follow the ambiguous replies. Possibly the Committee on Agriculture will feel that it should insist that the Steagall amendment be religiously followed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a letter I received from Mr. Dodd, and my answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The letters I refer to are as follows:

DECEMBER 23, 1947.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of December 8 commenting on various features of the Department's fowl-purchase program.

In the development and operation of its support programs for poultry products the Department has continually aimed at maintaining prices of these commodities at levels necessary to reflect a national average of 90 percent of parity. It has done so because parity is a national average and there is no other yardstick used to measure the percentage of parity which farmers receive for their commodities. In other words, parity is not calculated on the basis of individual communities, States, or regions. This is true of all agricultural commodities for which a parity calculation is made each month or annually.

In developing its price-support programs for poultry products it is necessary for the Department to give recognition to the historical differences which have prevailed and which will likely prevail currently in price levels between regions if its programs are to be as accurate as possible in reflecting any given percentage of parity on a national basis. We know, for example, that historically, egg and poultry prices to producers in the deficit producing areas such as the east and west coasts, have always averaged substantially higher than prices received by producers in the Midwest which is our vast surplus producing poultry area. We find, for instance, that during the 1942–46 5-year period average yearly prices for eggs in individual regions varied from 5 cents per dozen below the United States average to 11 cents per dozen above that average. A more current example can be cited the first 11 months of the current year wherein egg prices in the West North Central States have averaged 6 cents per dozen below the national average and egg prices to producers in New England have averaged 17.6 cents per dozen above the national average. A similar situation prevails with respect to poultry prices although the spreads between regions are not as extensive.

You can readily understand from the above comments that if the Department were to support prices to all producers at the national average level required to reflect 90 percent of parity, the effect of such a program would be to maintain prices at a level far above 100 percent of parity. Furthermore, and importantly so, it would necessitate tremendous expenditures of public funds in meeting obligations beyond those set forth in the Steagall amendment. We should also point out that such a program would, without doubt, substantially increase poultry and egg production rather than bring some downward adjustment in the industry toward peacetime requirements.

In the operation of our price-support purchase programs for poultry products we have fully recognized that each and every producer in a given State or area in which purchases are being made would not be assured of a specific price but rather that we were providing a market outlet for surplus poultry on an area basis. We recognize that within that area or region wide differences would prevail between producer location, quantity of product sold, methods of handling, quality of product sold, and distances from markets. These are circumstances which have always prevailed in producing areas and they are fundamental to the wide differences which have and do prevail in egg and poultry prices to producers in any region. Price differentials prevail within the community, within the State, and between regions throughout the Nation, and have become well established over the years. Should we fail to recognize these differences and attempt to guarantee a specific price to each and every individual poultry producer, the problem of support would become an impracticable one.

With respect to the revision of the current fowl-purchase program wherein the processing margins were increased, this was done in order to assure cooperation in the program on the part of poultry processors, cooperative associations, as well as individual producers dressing their own birds. The original processing margins provided in the program were found to be inadequate in view of rising costs of packaging materials, labor, and grade loss. We have always followed a policy of establishing processing margins on all poultry commodities purchased in order to keep such margins at a minimum and thus prevent insofar as possible excess-profit margins to handlers of the commodities.

I trust that the above explanation of the Department's price-support objectives with respect to poultry products will prove adequate for your purpose. I can assure you that much thought and planning has gone into the price-support operations on poultry products because of the many complex problems which prevail in the marketing of these commodities.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

JANUARY 7, 1948.

Mr. N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary of Agriculture,
United States Department of
Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DODD: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 23, 1947, in regard to the fowl purchase program.

In a previous letter you stated that 90 percent of parity was 24.8 cents per pound. Your letter seemed to indicate that by some process or other the Department was justified in instituting a purchase program based on 15 cents per pound. The more I try to get the facts in connection with this situation the more confusing the picture becomes. I feel that the chickens will all be killed before any action will be taken. If they are killed. I would like to see the poultrymen receive the legal, lawful price for their birds. Evidently the poultrymen will be "bushed" out of millions of dollars while we will be hearing of the wonders of the Steagall amendment.

I note that your letter did not state any provision of law where the Department has any authority to announce any support program below the 90 percent of parity. I fail to find any mention of the question as to where the Department obtained its authority to tell the processor what the processing margin should be on chickens. There will probably be an effort made on the part of some to blame the processor for low poultry prices. There is no doubt but what they can profit handsomely if the Department of Agriculture sets up a purchase program based on 50 to 60 percent of parity. No doubt the handsome profit will be made on the roosters selling in the West and Midwest for 7 to 10 cents per pound. This will be especially true if the propaganda is further emphasized to the effect that there will be less or no meat to eat in the United States by next spring.

It will not be necessary for me to write you any more letters about this chicken situation, because there are too many inconsistencies embodied in the replies, and in fact the replies are altogether too confusing.

I note that next Thursday will be the last eggless Thursday, and, of course, the chickenless Thursdays were discontinued some time ago.

I have no way of knowing how much meat or protein foods the people are going to have next spring, but it is evident that if all animal food producers are subjected to the same working over that the chicken producers have been subjected to there could sometime be a shortage of animal proteins for human consumption. The Department is asking for 8 percent less eggs, 8 percent less hens and pullets on farms, 7 percent less chickens, 12 percent less turkeys, 9 percent less sows to farrow, 6 percent less spring pigs, 6 percent less cattle, 11 percent less cattle slaughter, and 3 percent less sheep and lambs—although the sheep numbers have been reduced 35 percent during the last 4 years. Incidentally, less milk is to be provided for the babies, as the goal is 120,000,000,000 pounds, the same as for 1947, and, of course, we have a large increase in the number of babies to feed.

With all these activities detrimental to the livestock industry of this country, no doubt we will hear more about the fertility of our soil. After all, there are two points that are missed by most of the food planners. One is that millions of pounds of human food are secured from lands that are not adapted to grain or crop farming. Second, that millions of pounds of human food are produced from feeds or fodders that have little or no value for human consumption.

With best wishes for the New Year, I am,

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Sun under date of January 5 by Phelps Adams.

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President made the following statement, and I quote:

> On this occasion, above all others, the Congress and the President should concentrate their attention, not upon party but upon country; not upon the things which divide us but upon those which bind us together—the enduring principles of our American system, and our common aspirations for the future welfare and security of the people of the United States.

With a national debt of $257,000,000,000, he made these recommendations without saying one word as to where you are going to get the money, except three billions from corporations. Where will the balance come from? I would like to ask the Congress if that is political or sound? You be the judge.

	Estimated cost
To protect and develop our human resources by increasing social-security benefits	$500,000,000
Broadening social-security coverage	250,000,000
Medical-care insurance	750,000,000
Federal aid to education	700,000,000
A Department of Health, Education, and Security	50,000,000
A long-range housing plan	1,000,000,000
Extending and strengthening rent control	10,000,000
An extended reclamation program	500,000,000
Increasing annual output by one-third	5,000,000
Price support for farm commodities	500,000,000
More crop insurance, annually	50,000,000
Minimum wage, 75 cents per hour	1,000,000
Encouragement to farm cooperatives, loss in taxes	100,000,000
School-lunch program	50,000,000
Support the United Nations, annually	1,000,000,000
Maintaining a strong armed force	15,000,000
Universal military training, annually	3,000,000,000
Admitting displaced persons to the United States	100,000,000
Extending reciprocal trade agreements program, loss in duties	200,000,000
European recovery program, Marshall plan (over 4-year period)	18,000,000,000-20,000,000,000
Providing special assistance to China	1,000,000,000
Cut in taxes of	3,000,000,000

This would require an annual expenditure of at least $20,000,000,000 and the President did not say how you would get the money, or where you will get the money, for all these things, or how much additional it will cost the American people in taxes. His budget, I will bet, will be for nearly $30,000,000,000. He would drive America into bankruptcy. He certainly was saying, "Henry, come back home." He talked like one who would destroy the private enterprise system and bring us to dictatorship; or like one who has gone through bankruptcy and does not care if everyone else had the experience.

What a pity America has such leadership. Wake up, America, if you value your liberty, your freedom, your independence, and your form of government. Time is the essence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Milwaukee Sentinel.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio commentary by George Reedy over Station WOL this morning.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. HAYS, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. McGARVEY asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

FOOLING THE PEOPLE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's tax proposals by the President may fool a portion of the people. They will not fool the fifteen or twenty million Americans who, through self-denial, thrift, and savings, have become the owners of American corporations. Among those stockholders are some Democrats.

INCOME-TAX REDUCTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when this House passed Senate Joint Resolution 167 on the last day of the special session, I said at that time that it was a fraud and a hoax on the American people. I said further:

> It will no more stop the tides of inflation than Canute could have stopped the waves of the sea. As long as this Congress has failed in its duty to legislate in behalf of the American people and curb inflation I shall, at the opening of the regular session in January, introduce an income-tax reduction measure which will, if passed, be of benefit to the people in the lower-income brackets and will help them, in part at least, to alleviate the high cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 4882, a bill which allows income-tax exemptions for single persons at $1,500 and for married couples at $2,500, with $500 for each additional dependent. I submit that this measure will be of extreme benefit to all people, and certainly will be most equitable and fair. It is among the small-income groups, Mr. Speaker, that tax relief is needed the most and, as long as this Congress refuses to pass legislation to lower the high cost of living, I feel that it is vitally necessary that these people be given this consideration. Recent statistics indicate that a $3,400-a-year income is necessary, at present prices, to sustain life for a man, wife, and two children. Certainly this should bring added support to my bill and I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure so as to give income-tax relief to those who need it most.

DIVERSION OF GRAIN TO MANUFACTURE OF BEVERAGE ALCOHOL

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution to extend the President's authority to prevent diversion of grain to the manufacture of beverage alcohol from January 31, the date prescribed by the recent anti-inflation law, to December 31.

It is apparent from the fact developed in the debate upon this measure that executive authority is needed to prevent the diversion of grain desperately needed for food in Europe and other parts of the world. Congress conveyed this authority upon the President while withholding authority as to other commodities only because we were convinced that the liquor manufacturers are unable or unwilling to prevent the use of an inordinate amount of grain for intoxicants. The Secretary of Agriculture was rebuffed by the distillers and it is obvious that voluntary agreements will not suffice. During the so-called liquor holiday 8,000,000 bushels of grain were used by the makers of neutral spirits in one city and the good purposes of the holiday were defeated by this single action.

It was urged during the debate on the anti-inflation bill in December that the President's authority is unduly limited but proponents pointed out that Congress would have an opportunity during this month to extend the date. It was

probably assumed that this extension could be included in over-all legislation but it is now apparent that such general legislation cannot possibly be enacted prior to January 31. Therefore, this particular section of the law should have special treatment and Congress should promptly extend the President's power so that the Government will not be powerless to prevent the misuse of basic foodstuffs. We must decide whether to have liquor in abundance or minimum food supplies for our fellowmen.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, had President Truman and his palace guard tried, they could not have come up with a better proposal to complete the drying-up process of venture capital for American business. The President's proposal would further aggravate the inflationary problem by stimulating demand and at the same time would provide a road block for any increase in production.

This country needs real tax reduction and this Republican Congress is determined to meet that need.

Our income-tax laws today—almost 3 years after the war—are still at a level that was not even considered approachable by the Socialists 25 years ago. Today, America's tax bill is bigger than its food bill.

Everywhere—except in some Government and in some labor circles—it is recognized that in order that one factory worker may be employed, an average capital investment of $8,000 or more is required; that without capital investment, factory workers will not be employed, and that without wage earners, there will be no production, with the result that our present economy will cease to exist.

Shortages exist today in many industries because of the lack of production facilities to meet the demand. Steel shortages are hindering production in many fields. Lack of boxcars and other types of transportation equipment are aggravating the fuel shortages that exist over the country, including my own State of Indiana.

Expanded plants are needed to produce the materials necessary to a world that is rebuilding from a destructive war. More machinery is required with the expansion of the plants. America's industrial machine is wearing out.

Billions of dollars for capital expansion must be poured into American industry over the next few years. That money can come from only two sources—the people or the Government.

The penal tax system, continued long, will bring pure and unadulterated state socialism. The Government, through its taxing powers, will provide that capital and eventually run that business.

On the other hand, we can make it possible, through real tax reduction now, for new capital again to come from the savings of the people. That is the American system to which we are committed.

I include herewith an editorial that appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

BID FOR VOTES

The President's plan for reducing individual income taxes and offsetting the resultant revenue loss of $3,200,000,000 by increasing taxes on corporations is only explicable as a transparently political move—and a crude one at that—to keep in the Democratic ranks certain left-wing groups that might desert to third-party candidate Wallace. Of course, the President reiterates previous warnings that Government revenues should not be reduced until inflation has been stopped. But his words have a hollow sound in view of the character of the recommended tax adjustments. For he is proposing to put more than $3,000,000,000 of additional purchasing power in the hands of consumers by means of income-tax credits of $40 for each individual taxpayer and each of his dependents. The remission would benefit particularly the lower-income-tax groups and would result in dropping from the tax rolls between nine and ten million individual income-tax payers. Hence the proposal has a demagogic appeal that may commend it to the short-sighted.

However, the President's plan creates grave doubts as to the sincerity of his professed desire to follow anti-inflationary fiscal policies, since it would stimulate consumer buying at a time when buying restraint is being urged by the President's own advisers as a check to price increases. Moreover, the proposal to levy an additional tax on corporate profits to compensate for revenue losses would not neutralize the inflationary effect of the lowered income taxes. On the contrary, it would make heavy inroads on corporate reserves accumulated out of profits, and consequently tend to curtail expenditures for the replacement of obsolete equipment and installation of new production facilities. In other words, the President's tax-adjustment program will stimulate demand for goods and at the same time hinder efforts to increase the production of goods by taxing away savings from profits that would otherwise be available to finance industrial expansion. It is, in short, a first-rate method of fanning inflationary fires.

The plan cannot even be defended on the ground that profits are excessive in relation to other types of income. For the Department of Commerce states that the distributive share of business income going to profits is currently the same as in 1929 (that is 12.9 percent). If account is taken of the substantially increased profits-tax liabilities over this period, the department adds, profits after taxes and inventory valuation adjustment are seen to represent about 7 percent of total income originating in business as compared with 11 percent in 1929. On the other hand, labor's share of income originating in business rose from 56.1 percent of the total in 1929 to 59.4 percent in 1947. Moreover, the share of corporate profits is lower now than it was in 1941, while labor's share of total income from business is higher.

These data, in our opinion, dispose of the argument that current business profits are so excessive as to justify a form of tax adjustment that would shift tax burdens from individuals to industry. Already business concerns are feeling the pinch of capital shortages that have resulted in rapidly growing demands for bank loans of an inflationary type. Inflationary credit expansion of this kind would be ecouraged by heavy increases in taxes on corporate profits—a large part of which would otherwise be saved and invested in productive facilities.

If the President had stood by the principles that he has indorsed so courageously in the past, and refused to countenance any form of tax reduction calculated to increase consumer spending, he might have rallied sufficient support to defeat the Republican tax-reduction program. As it is, his opportunistic bid for labor votes, implicit in his proposal to reduce income taxes at the expense of industry, will be regarded as a go-ahead signal by the Republican advocates of immediate tax reduction.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Congress will receive another message from the President of the United States on Monday next.

After that, and for the balance of the week, it is proposed to call up the bill H. R. 2575, which is a bill from the Committee on Armed Services, having to do with the revision of the Army court-martial system. The next bill we propose to call up is H. R. 2759, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges or overcharges by or against common carriers. The next bill is H. R. 4071, also from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to amend section 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a speech by John C. Cooper on aviation.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mr. Walter Lippmann.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's speech before the joint session of Congress was definitely political, very weak, and did not touch on the real cause of inflation, the great threat to our Nation today.

Everyone would like to see the idealistic picture drawn by the President brought into reality. We would all like to know that every family had the kind of a home every man dreams of providing for his loved ones. We would all like

to know that every child in America had the advantage of the best educational facilities available anywhere in the world. We would all like to know that every American could have the benefit of the best medical and hospital care, as well as the guaranty of security in old age. A very small percentage of the people in the Seventh Congressional District come under the Social Security Act.

However, we are faced with the grim, realistic picture presented in the problems of inflation, a forty-thousand-million-dollar governmental budget, a stupendous national debt, and a foreign situation which is anything but bright, and which will necessitate strong national-defense measures for years to come.

The President said we must keep the Nation strong but said nothing about the production—and more production—which I believe is the only answer to inflation. Rationing would only make a bad matter worse and the black markets would flourish.

If the administration would cooperate with Congress, there would be ample surplus this year to make a generous reduction in the tax burden, as well as to whittle a slice from the national debt, and provide foreign aid.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have no hesitancy in saying that the administration has at least 300,000 people on the Federal pay roll whose services are not required. The President indicated that the administration anticipates adding tens of thousands to the rolls. If the people of America want taxes reduced, we must have economy in Government. We, as a nation, cannot spend and spend and reduce the tax load at the same time any more than we, as individuals, can live beyond our means and put aside anything for a rainy day.

The speech made by the President was weak in that it was based on a foundation of financial insecurity for our Nation. The cornerstone of our national security, economy, was missing from his address to the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Des Moines (Iowa) Democrat on the liquor question.

CONTROL DANGEROUS INFLATION AND PREVENT DISASTROUS DEFLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my sympathy to the Members of the majority party in both Houses, who are ostensibly trying to control inflation by fixing prices or rationing purchases.

They remind me of the man in Gulliver's Travels who was trying to manufacture gunpowder out of ice, or to extract sunbeams from cucumbers.

You might as well attempt to weld a wooden handle on a pewter spoon, graft a dead bough to a living trunk, and make it blossom as the rose, mix oil and water together placidly in the same bottle, make boon companions of the spider and fly, or promote the agricultural prosperity by teaching the farmers how to milk ducks, as to control inflation by fixing prices or rationing purchases.

You remind me of the old woman who tried to heal the wound in the boy's foot by putting ointment on the instrument that made the wound, instead of on the wound itself.

I am voicing the opinion of every first-class economist in the world when I say that prices in a free economy are governed by two things, the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

In 1920, at the peak of high prices, we had $8,000,000,000 in circulation, for the first time in history, and prices soared to levels never known before.

In 1930 our money in circulation had gone down to $4,426,000,000 and the depression reached its worst.

The other day I quoted you the figures of October 31, 1947, showing that our currency in circulation had gone up to $28,551,870,056, of which $24,283,461,535 were Federal Reserve notes.

The last report came to me on yesterday, and it shows that the money in circulation on November 30, 1947, amounted to $28,765,640,996, of which $24,474,706,235 were Federal Reserve notes.

In other words, it went up $200,000,000 while you were talking about doing something about inflation.

The same Federal Reserve banks that are inflating the currency through the issuance of Federal Reserve notes through the Federal Reserve System, have the power to deflate that currency and bring about such a depression as they created in 1921, and with which they wrecked the Hoover administration in 1929 to 1933.

I appeal again to the Committee on Banking and Currency to bring out a bill to restore to the Congress the power given it by the Constitution of the United States "to coin money and regulate the value thereof," provide for stabilizing the currency at a given point, and let the American people know what they may depend on.

That is the only way ruinous inflation can be stopped and disastrous deflation prevented.

This is not a political question. It is an American question that involves the welfare and the prosperity of every individual and also the integrity, as well as the life, of the Republic itself.

It is the most serious question with which we have to deal; and I again appeal to the Committee on Banking and Currency not to waste any more time talking about regulating inflation by holding down the prices of individual articles, or rationing purchases. It cannot be done. The only way in which you can check inflation is to stabilize the currency and assure the American people of a reasonable measure of prosperity and safety, now and in the years to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for such part of 1 hour as he desires to use.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain newspaper articles and court records.)

LOYALTY OF CONGRESSMEN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose today in calling attention to the message on the state of the Union to say anything that might be construed as being political in its nature. I may, however, state that to me it seemed to be an invitation to everyone in this country, and perhaps to people wherever they may live in the world, even though they do not realize that they need or want anything, to think it over again and see if there is not something that Congress could do for them.

If Congress does not do all of the things that everyone wants, then—and this is the point of my remarks today—the Congress as a whole is no good and individual Congressmen are greedy and selfish; they are skunks and rats; they are everything disreputable in the opinion of those who ask.

Now, why do I say that? Some of you babes in arms who served in the last World War, as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], who sits just before me here, you have not been here—it is true you were in the war and you were shot at and perhaps they tried to drown you and blow you out of the sky, something like that—but while that was going on, and even before that, you know, Members of Congress were under a different kind of fire, harmless but unpleasant.

The reason I speak of what happened then is because history will repeat itself, and unless the Members of Congress do not do exactly what the Washington Post and some of the other papers want them to do—and you can find out in the morning if you will get your paper and turn to the editorial page, you can find out just exactly what you ought to do on every measure that is coming before the Congress; and if you do not do it, you are a bad egg, you are disloyal, you are seditious, you are subversive; in fact, you are no good. If you do not support every measure advocated by some section of the press, then get ready for the smear campaign.

And the Post goes so far—and the Star does, too, in a recent editorial—as to wonder what in the world is wrong with the people who elected you. The paper felt sorry—the Star said it felt sorry—for the people of my district—and I know they felt the same way about some of the rest of you—because my people did not know any more than to elect me to Congress.

If the Star and the Post and these other editorial writers would go out—but they do not have the courage or perhaps they do not want to give up their income to go off in some district and run for Congress, but they want to dictate to every Congressman here just what he should do. Their abuse would have some point. They want to tell us what to do but do not wish to assume the responsibility of office.

The Star said it felt sorry for my folks. Well, I do, too, but it is the best they could do; and, after all, here I am, and when they discharge me they will have to give me, according to this congressional action, I understand if I pay for it, a pension, and they will have to pay my successor; and my folks are shrewd enough to know that it costs them at least $3,000 less to keep me in Congress than it would to keep a new man here. My folks are not just so dumb as some of these editorial writers think they are. And it is just possible that I accurately represent my folks and that they, in spite of the editorial opinions of the Washington writers, may, after all, have the correct solution to some of the questions which the Congress is called upon to answer.

Now, way back 4 or 5 years ago the Washington Post started out on a great crusade, so they called it, and they bragged they had a nice young fellow down there named Dillard Stokes, who used the alias of Jefferson Breem, and Quigley Adams, about what they were doing for the country. He wrote out all over the country, to some old folks and people of one kind or another. Some folks said some of them were a little weak in the head but that is no crime, there are a lot of others that way, including a few editors, you know. He wrote out and asked them to write to him. So they did.

There was Elizabeth Dilling out there in Chicago. What was the matter with Elizabeth? Well, she talked an awful lot, she talked incessantly; but in addition to talking differently than some people who talk so much—and I will not say who I am thinking about now—she was bright, intelligent, and aggressive, and she was among other things bitterly anti-Semitic. Some of these other folks were anti-Semitic. That makes me pause a moment to think of this message yesterday. We must not discriminate against any one we were told. I try not to.

There is one thing I cannot understand, and I wish someone would tell me about it. Why is it, if we are to have no discrimination in this country, that we have a Jewish veterans' organization? Why do we have a Catholic veterans' organization? Why do we split up that way? Is a Catholic or Jewish veteran any different than a Methodist, Episcopal, Lutheran, or Baptist veteran? Is he? I do not know. I cannot understand these folks when they get on both sides of this fence. Why not end discrimination among veterans? Why not have just veterans' organization?

Anyway, Mrs. Dilling and a bunch of these other people were anti-Semitic. So the Washington Post conceived this great idea of getting a reporter to write, to entrap them into a situation where they could be brought within the jurisdiction of the Washington courts, and he does. These people answer him and send the pamphlets of an anti-Semitic nature here to Washington. Do you see the point? They lay the jurisdiction here in Washington to bring those people in from all over the country and charge some 20 or 30 of them with a conspiracy. A conspiracy to do what? Well, the real charge was that they were anti-Semitic. That is wrong, of course. None of us wants to be anti-anything.

According to that message yesterday, we all want to be for everything. Why the President wanted to discriminate I do not know, and I think he did a little bit. He said when a fellow had an income tax he should have a $40 rebate, and if he had two or three more children, $40 for each one. That is all right. But the President said that the corporations, the nasty, wicked, dirty corporations, should be made to pay the tax which the other fellows escape because of the $40 exemption.

If a man has an income and is to be excused because it is small, then does it not follow that, if he has no income at all, he ought to have a direct payment from the Federal Treasury? Why did not the President go a little further and say that he would give $40 to every fellow who did not have an income and $40 for each child he did not have? This would hit the bachelors who never marry. That omission was real discrimination. Here is a happy couple who have been married maybe 30 years. They have done their best in every way, but they have neither chick nor child, they have an income, but they do not get any exemption. Why not give them an exemption based upon their real efforts? What is the matter with the administration?

I want to be fair. I want to be reasonable. Let us go further. I will go the President one step farther if it is going to be political and say that we should exempt everybody from taxation. I would be in favor of that if I knew any way of getting my salary or getting government without the people being taxed.

Let us go back to Dillard Stokes and the Washington Post. There was another leg on that stool—William Maloney. They got him in there. So they called these people down here and they prosecuted them—persecuted them, some would say—for four and a half years. William was a great lawyer. The Post just bragged him to high heaven for his ability and integrity. Of course, they did not say anything about his being arrested for being disorderly and fighting in the street and fined $10 on March 21, 1945.

But the Supreme Court had something to say about him. In judicial and polite language, the Supreme Court characterized him as a pettifogging shyster, if any of you know what that means. That is everything which is disreputable, mean, low, and contemptible when it is practiced by one who has been admitted to practice before the Court.

This is a part of what the United States Supreme Court, on March 1, 1943, had to say of William Power Maloney:

> At a time when passion and prejudice are heightened by emotions stirred by our participation in a great war we do not doubt that these remarks addressed to the jury were highly prejudicial, and that they were offensive to the dignity and good order with which all proceedings in court should be conducted.

In another case where Mr. Maloney was one of the United States district attorneys prosecuting the case his conduct came up for review, and the judge writing the opinion, among other things, said:

> Even from the printed record we can see the vigor with which the prosecutor pressed the case, vigor which at times went beyond the canons of decorum and dignity which an officer of the United States should observe. The prosecutor was not averse to indulging his talent for spectacle: Chorus girls and movie stars were paraded to the stand to prove only minor portions of the Government's case. Theatrical demonstrations, however diverting to the spectators and jury, have no place in a United States courtroom. Nor was the intemperance of several attacks made upon defendants and their counsel in keeping with the Supreme Court's reminder that the prosecutor is to regard himself as "the servant of the law." (*United States* v. *Buckner* (108 Fed. (2d), 921, 928).)

And the one-worlders who wanted to establish a super United States of the World, surrender our sovereignty, haul down the Stars and Stripes; the Post and Stokes and Maloney tried to link me with the so-called seditionists; charged me with being disloyal, seditious. It is to warn you against what you may have to meet that these remarks are made.

But the situation got so bad that even the Washington Post could not take it, and here is what they said about the trial, about the case that they had worked up by fraud and chicanery and all sorts of disreputable practices:

For example, after bragging and patting itself on the back day in and day out, week in and week out, for a year or more, about how it—the Post—had brought about an investigation and caused the indictment of some 33 persons for sedition, and printing articles like the following—and I quote:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 5, 1943]

ISOLATIONISTS CRIED "SMEAR"—GRAND JURY INDICTS 33 PERSONS, NEW YORK PAPER FOR SUBVERSION

(By Dillard Stokes)

Three women, thirty men, and a New York paper were indicted here yesterday for conspiring with the Nazi propaganda boss, Ulrich Fleischauer, to stir up mutiny and disloyalty in the United States armed forces.

The District grand jury added six defendants to the 28 who were accused last July 21 of weaving scores of organizations into a vast Nazi network. Named as tools of the conspirators were groups ranging from the America First Committee to the Black Legion, from Hamilton Fish's Committee To Keep America Out of Foreign Wars to the Ku Klux Klan.

HOWLS OF "SMEAR"

The prosecution touched off angry protests from isolationists in Congress, which hit crescendo 2 months ago when Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge, Chief of the Department of Justice Criminal Division, sent his crack squad of special prosecutors back to the grand jury with new evidence.

While Senators and Representatives cried "smear!" and clamored for congressional investigation of the case, Prosecutors William Powers Maloney, John T. M. Reddan, and

Miss Jean R. Meyer presented a score of witnesses and stacks of new exhibits.

The indictment handed up in district court yesterday by Grand Jury Foreman Harry Boss demonstrated that the probers had dug far beneath the surface of the Nazi propaganda operations first exposed by a special grand jury 6 months ago. Named for the first time, as coconspirator of the 33 agitators who were operating in this country, was the Nazi Fleischauer, who is boss of the mammoth propaganda press at Erfurt, Germany.

REICH CHECKED CLOSELY

Disclosed for the first time was the close check kept by the Wilhelmstrasse upon the success of its American operations. Quoted in the indictment, as an overt act to carry out the plot, was a letter from George Sylvester Viereck to Dr. Hans Heinrich Dieckhoff, chief of the German foreign office propaganda section. Viereck, an admitted Nazi agent now in jail for violating the Foreign Agents Act, told Dieckhoff that a radio speech by President Roosevelt was enthusiastically received in the press, which had "joined the New Deal dance of death."

GRIFFIN EDITORIAL REPRINTED

But said Viereck: "* * * there were a 'few notable exceptions—the Chicago Tribune, Mr. Hearst personally (his papers are not entirely under his control), Griffin's Enquirer, etc., etc.' "

In the same letter to his chief in Berlin, Viereck reported that an editorial by William Griffin (Enquirer editor and one of the alleged conspirators) "appeared not only in his own paper, but was reprinted as a paid advertisement in the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, the Hearst papers in Chicago and San Francisco. * * *"

Somebody spent several thousand dollars to reprint this editorial.

Viereck wrote a speech which the late Senator Ernest Lundeen (Farmer-Labor), of Minnesota, gave in the Senate, after which the speech was issued as a book by Flanders Hall, Inc., a publishing house controlled by Viereck. The title was Lord Lothian vs. Lord Lothian.

Viereck reported that "Mr. Hearst gave it (the book) a great deal of space—nearly half a page—in his own column, which reaches at least 20,000,000 people."

Viereck's letters to Berlin were seized by the British Intelligence.

The six defendants accused yesterday of conspiring with Griffin, Viereck, and the other 26 indicted in July were:

1. Franz K. Ferenz, a Nazi Party secret agent who distributed books, films, and other Nazi propaganda in California and was jailed a few weeks ago under the California Anti-subversion Act. Ferenz was active in the seditious Friends of Progress and a spark plug of isolationist agitation. He plugged the America First speech of Senator Burton K. Wheeler (Democrat), of Montana, in Los Angeles, on October 2, 1941.

(Senator Wheeler is one of those who called the conspiracy prosecution a smear and wrote Attorney General Biddle, "I cannot believe some of them (the alleged plotters) are guilty." When asked, the Senator admitted this was just "conjecture," because he knew none of the facts and none of the alleged plotters. He publicized his letters to Biddle a few days after the grand jury revealed that Ferenz was a suspect.)

2. Mrs. Lois de LaFayette Washburn, alias T. N. T., a promoter for the National Liberty Party and a distributor of Yankee Freemen, one of the publications named as tools of the conspirators.

3. Frank W. Clark, alias G. P., another Liberty Party organizer and commander in chief of the League of War Veteran Guardsmen.

4. Paquita de Shishmareff, alias Mrs. Leslie Fry, organizer of Militant Christian Patriots in this country and England and publisher of the Christian Free Press, another alleged tool of the conspirators.

5. George E. Deatherage, leader of the Knights of the White Camelia, who once plotted seizure of this Government and was a conferee at the Nazi Embassy here.

6. New York Evening Enquirer, Inc., a corporation headed by the defendant William Griffin, which issued the Enquirer, another alleged tool of the conspirators.

The other defendants included Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, alias the Reverend Frank Woodruff Johnson, Chicago antiwar agitator and "Mothers" group promoter; William Dudley Pelley, the Silver Shirt chief, now in prison for sedition; David J. Baxter, chancelor of the secret "Socis," an armed revolutionist band; Gerald B. Winrod, Kansas agitator whose oratory won him the name of the "Jayhawk Hitler"; Prescott F. Dennett, who ran the Washington headquarters of the Nazi agent Viereck, getting Viereck's material into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the aid of Representative Hamilton Fish's secretary, George Hill (now in prison for perjury), and Charles B. Hudson, circulator of the seditious V card and of the "Roosevelt Is a Judas" speech of Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

The indictment was in two counts, one charging that the conspiracy against the Army and Navy was carried on before the war, the second charging that the plot went on after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

The first count listed 20 overt acts alleged to have been done to carry out the plot. These included letters to and from German officials; Hudson and Mrs. Dilling coming to Washington on isolationist junkets and mailing of seven propaganda items to "Jefferson Breem" and "Quigley Adam" in Washington. These mailings were the seven overt acts set out under the second count.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—"Jefferson Breem" and "Adam Quigley" were names adopted by Dillard Stokes, Post reporter, in his investigation of subversive activities.)

AMERICA FIRST AMONG GROUPS CALLED TOOLS

Forty-one groups which blatantly extolled their own patriotism while their spokesmen beat the drums of isolation were branded the tools of a Nazi network in the seditious conspiracy indictment returned by the District grand jury yesterday.

Biggest was the America First Committee, set up by well-meaning Americans to serve their country's interests as they saw them, but widely invaded by pro-Nazis to serve Hitler's interests as his agents set them out. Even Laura Ingalls, the America First ace spellbinder, was shown to be a Nazi mouthpiece, paid and directed by Baron Ulrich von Gienanth, of the German Embassy. She is in prison.

Another was Representative Hamilton Fish's National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars, which he set up in 1939 just before he went to Germany and came away declaring Hitler's demands on Poland were just.

Others were the Silver Shirts, Knights of the White Camelia, Black Legion, American Nationalist Confederation, Ku Klux Klan, Militant Christian Patriots, German-American Bund, National Liberty Party, National Workers League of America, Friends of Progress, Citizens Committee to Keep America Out of War, Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling's Patriotic Research Bureau, Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee and two other debt committees set up by the Nazi agent Viereck, National Gentile League, Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Pelley Publishers, Crusading Mothers of America, Pan Aryan Conference, Citizens No Foreign War Coalition, Capital News and Feature Service, American Guards, Yankee Comrades, Social Republic Society (Socis), Committee of Patriotic Societies, Protestant Gentile League, League of War Veteran Guardsmen, Pioneer News Service, Crusader White Shirts, James True Associates, Women Investors of America, Constitutional Education League, We, the Mothers United, Flanders Hall, Inc., United Mothers of America, Purdy Publishing Co., We, the Mothers Mobilize for America, and American Mothers.

The indictment declared the Nazi network made use of 42 publications, many of which were sponsored by these groups. Included were books, papers, and magazines which advanced in unison the theme that America was safe between two oceans and that anti-Nazi views came from warmongers.

The Post, on July 16, 1944, in an editorial, had this to say:

MASS TRIAL

The severance of three cases from Washington's mass sedition trial is the best news that has come out of this dreary affair in Judge Eicher's court. It clearly suggests belated recognition of the mistake that was made in bringing 30 individuals of widely varying temperaments and backgrounds to trial at the same time and place for a series of alleged offenses classified as sedition.

One defendant recently died. Another is too ill to attend court sessions regularly. A third found it difficult to follow the proceedings because of limited hearing. A fourth proved to be so obstreperous as seriously to interfere with the progress of the trial. In other words, the exigencies of human life are such as to defeat most any attempt to dispose of complicated criminal charges en masse with both fairness and dispatch. It is a pity that the Department of Justice did not foresee this elementary objection to mass trials before embarking on such an adventure.

The fact that four cases have been eliminated from the trial is overshadowed, therefore, by the larger fact that 26 cases remain before the court. We hope that better progress can now be made but no end of even the presentation of evidence by the prosecution is in sight after 13 weeks. How can the jurymen be expected to remember testimony given many weeks before their verdict will be rendered? How can they, in these circumstances, distinguish the varying degrees of guilt, if any, among the 26 remaining defendants? We fear that whatever may be the outcome of this trial it will stand as a black mark against American justice for many years to come.

Still later and on the 28th of the same month—July 1944—the Washington Post printed this editorial, and I quote:

COURTROOM FARCE

For weeks Washington has been aware of the farcical nature of the sedition trial that is droning on from one weary session to another in Justice Eicher's court. Everyone who reads the newspapers knows that the trial has been characterized by obstruction, unruly conduct on the part of some of the defendants, unreasonable delays, prolongation of the testimony and cross-examination and laxity of control or direction. If there were any lingering doubts as to the farcical nature of the trial, they must have been removed by James E. Chinn's factual account of the proceedings on the "third day of the fifteenth week" in the Post yesterday.

Justice Eicher has undoubtedly tried to make the best of a bad situation. He has attempted to prevent the trial from being turned into a comedy of errors; he has tried to keep it moving toward a conclusion. But the very nature of the case has thwarted his efforts. Mass trials may possibly be successful where the issues are simple and the testimony is brief—or where the Russian technique of condemning the defendants first and putting on a trial for show is used. But where the issues are complicated and defendants who have not been browbeaten stand on their democratic rights, a trial involving more than two dozen individuals is almost certain to be a fizzle.

We think the time has come to recognize the unlikelihood of securing any fair approximation to justice from this unhappy experi-

ment. The end of the Government's testimony is nowhere in sight. Prosecutors have 4,000 exhibits to offer in evidence and only about one-eighth of them are in the record at present. Then each of the 26 defendants will have to present his case. At its present rate of progress, therefore, the trial may run on for several years after the war is over. Meanwhile it is gravely undermining confidence in American justice.

Apparently it would be impossible now to end this sorry spectacle and try the individual defendants separately. But the court could probably sever additional cases and insist that the testimony be stripped down to essentials. After all, this is a trial of men and women accused of sedition, not a contest in befuddlement. In our opinion, the trial can continue its present course only at the cost of serious impairment of our judicial system and the reputations of those responsible for this travesty.

It got down to be a dreary affair by that time. Then, later on, the Washington Post had something else to say about the persecution it had carried on.

Still later and on the 23d of November 1946, the Post editors wrote:

SORRY EXPERIMENT

The Department of Justice had been unconscionably dilatory in handling the sedition cases which Chief Justice Laws threw out of the district court yesterday. Nearly 2 years have elapsed since the death of Chief Justice Eicher halted the notorious mass trial. At that time, Government witnesses had been giving testimony for more than 7 months and vast piles of so-called evidence remained to be read into the record. When the war in Europe was over, the Department sent its prosecutor, O. John Rogge, to Germany in search of additional evidence. On his return, despite his sensational innuendoes against various prominent citizens, he recommended dismissal of the sedition cases. Mr. Rogge was later dismissed for disclosing confidential material in his report. But the Department of Justice still insisted on keeping the cases open and was found in opposition when Chief Justice Laws finally brought this sorry incident in our judicial history to a close.

Whether the Government might have convicted some of the defendants if they had been tried individually is a question that can never be settled. But one conclusion is obvious. It was a colossal blunder to herd 30 persons of widely differing backgrounds and no specific relation to one overt act into a single trial. The unwieldy character of the trial contributed in no small measure to the farcical aspects which it soon developed. The effect was to bring American justice into contempt. But at last the court has acted to end that deplorable experiment in circumstances which should make it stand out as a warning against any similarly hysterical move if we are again involved in war.

Many other papers had something to say about the trial of the so-called seditionists.

On the same day that the Post editorial was written, that is, November 23, 1946, in the Washington Times-Herald, Frank C. Waldrop had a piece. That piece reads this way:

THE CHEAPEST ACT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

For disgrace and cheapness can you name anything by our great United States Government throughout its history to equal its performance in the so-called sedition case?

Chief Justice Bolitha J. Laws, of the United States District Court here put the Department of Justice out of its misery yesterday by granting defense motions to dismiss the case. He said:

"In the circumstances, to permit another trial, which conceivably would last more than a year, with new prosecutors and newly appointed counsel for the defendants, with the eventual outcome in serious doubt * * * would be a travesty on justice."

That it would be. But no worse a travesty than the record to date. Except for the cold, official, provable facts of public record, anybody would be justified in thinking the whole story is a joke or a lie.

The great sedition trial's history is sordid in every line. No single person who had a part in bringing it on can point with pride to an accomplishment of worth to grow out of it, for all the money it cost, for all the reputations it smeared or for all the unsuspecting American minds it poisoned.

The story begins—oh, we'll never know exactly all about that until the secret archives of the Department of Justice are broken open, as they should be—but for a formal date, put down July 1941.

That was when a special prosecutor for the Department of Justice, one William Power Maloney, went before a District of Columbia grand jury to allege some people had been violating the Espionage Act of 1917, and the Alien Registration Act of 1940.

Maloney charged a conspiracy to violate the seditious propaganda sections of these acts. Sedition is the high crime of inciting resistance to the Government. It is just one slight step short of treason, which is giving open aid and comfort to an enemy.

Naturally, anybody accused of sedition any time is on a hot spot. Friends avoid him. Acquaintances know him not. And given the state of public feeling in July 1941, all is multiplied.

Obviously, the United States Government and its special prosecutor, Mr. William Power Maloney, had upon them at that time a tremendous responsibility to protect innocent good names and observe common decency just as they had a tremendous responsibility to protect the Nation from any internal enemies.

But what happened?

Well does this writer remember the day when some terrified lady members of the America First Committee were summoned to appear before the grand jury.

One was a Senator's wife. The others were private citizens. Against none could doubts of loyalty to the United States be raised by even the remotest suggestion. Their crime was that they were exercising their constitutional right to differ with the administration in the great foreign policy debate then raging in America.

Still they felt Mr. Maloney's heavy hand upon their shoulders. So did many another. The grand jury proceedings were a scandal and an outrage. Secrets of the jury room leaked in a steady stream to Mr. Maloney's favored reporters, columnists, and gossipmongers.

Well, finally an indictment was returned on July 24, 1942, and the real legal war began.

But for all his performance, Mr. Maloney's indictment was no good. In fact, the Department of Justice had to go back and do the whole thing over twice, so that not until January 4, 1944, was an indictment brought down that the Government cared to test in court.

Meanwhile, Mr. Maloney had been tested in court, also. The United States Supreme Court reversed his preliminary canter in the field with language that would blister the hide of a rhinoceros.

That was on March 1, 1943, in the matter of George Sylvester Viereck, a German agent convicted of improperly registering with the State Department.

Maloney had prosecuted Viereck in a warm-up for the main event of the sedition trial. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction, 5–2, on the ground that Viereck was being tried for acts committed before the law was passed under which he was accused.

In the course of the reversal, the late Harlan F. Stone, then Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, had this to say of Maloney:

"He indulged in an appeal wholly irrelevant to any facts or issues of the case, the purpose and effect of which could only have been to arouse passion and prejudice.

"At a time when passion and prejudice are heightened by emotions stirred by our participation in a great war, we do not doubt that the remarks addressed to the jury were highly prejudicial and that they were offensive to the dignity and good order in which all proceedings in court should be conducted * * *."

Only once before in its history had the Supreme Court ever so directly and fiercely reprimanded an attorney and never before had it ever felt the need to do so with a United States prosecutor.

That was nothing, however, to what followed.

The third indictment came on for trial April 19, 1944, with 30 defendants. For 8 months it ground away getting nowhere and ended in a mistrial when the presiding judge dropped dead. The Government has not dared since to do anything positive about it one way or the other.

Two of the defendants have died, also, and O. John Rogge, the special prosecutor who succeeded Maloney, has been fired by the Department of Justice for shooting off his mouth.

There just was no luck in that case for anybody. And why? Because it was a case bred in malice, prosecuted in hate, and pursued in bigotry. It had purposes far wider than the mere trial of people accused of a crime.

It was a disgrace to America.

The Chicago Tribune, 2 days later, on November 25, 1946, carried an editorial which reads:

A TRAVESTY ON JUSTICE

Chief Justice Laws, of the District of Columbia Federal court, dismissed the mass sedition case with the remark that to bring it to trial again would be a travesty on justice.

That is true, and he could have gone further. The case, from its very inception 4 years ago has been a travesty on justice. It was conceived dishonestly and conducted dishonestly to the last. The sedition indictment was a tyrannical attempt by Roosevelt and his henchmen to suppress criticism of the administration. By proceeding against a group composed largely of harmless and relatively helpless crackpots, the administration sought to intimidate more reputable and influential critics.

Everything that was done in contempt of law at Nuremberg was foreshadowed in the sedition cases. The prosecutors attempted a proscription within the framework of American law and the American Bill of Rights. They failed because that law and those rights were too strong for them. Biddle and Jackson at Nuremberg cast American concepts of justice into the discard from the beginning. They hanged the defendants, who deserved hanging on other grounds, but they convicted themselves as unfit ever again to take part, in any capacity, in the American judicial process.

The new law that they asserted they were establishing at Nuremberg was nothing more than the destruction of existing law. Transplanted to America, their new law could become an instrument for the destruction of American liberty at the hands of a world tyranny. The election of November 5, and now the sedition case dismissal, blighted those hopes. Americans, as the Washington court has held, still enjoy the constitutional and legal safeguards which their fathers died to establish and maintain.

Mr. Roosevelt in 1942 had his war, but the way in which he got it was proving increasingly embarrassing politically. Four out of

five Americans hadn't wanted war, and all the powers of wartime censorship had not been sufficient to still questions of Roosevelt's conduct in bringing the war about. That was the real reason for the sedition case.

The original indictment named 27 defendants. Some of them previously convicted, may have been guilty of sedition or they may have been railroaded. Their cases must be reviewed. They were merely window dressing. The rest of the defendants were crackpots. Some of them were violently anti-Semitic; others preached other forms of religious hatred; a few were sponsors of fantastic monetary and economic schemes. None of them was known nationally. Almost without exception, these defendants got more advertising and notoriety out of the indictment than they had been able to win by their own efforts which, in many instances, had covered periods of years. They were little people, and had they done all the conspiring they were charged with, their influence was so slight that they still would have been harmless to the Nation.

None of the defendants knew all the others. There was never the slightest evidence that they had any concerted plan of action. The one thing that they had in common was that they all spoke or wrote violently against Franklin D. Roosevelt and his warmongering. Nevertheless, they were all grouped together in a conspiracy indictment.

The purpose of this indictment was, first, to make it difficult for the defendants to defend themselves by bringing them to trial in a strange city; and, second, by the old trick of grouping the lot of small fry together, to make the case look important. The indictment was returned in Washington, where the preponderance of New Deal payrollers made it easier for the prosecutors to find a subservient jury. The technical grounds for trial in the District were that a reporter for the Washington Post had, by provocative correspondence, persuaded most of the defendants to send their literature to him in Washington. Later the Post was to regret the villainy.

Few of the defendants had any means. They were transported from their homes for trial in Washington, where a number of them were kept in jail because they couldn't post bail. Others of them had to live in cheap lodging houses and support themselves by odd jobs during the months and years through which the trial dragged itself. One of them, an old man, died during the trial, virtually of starvation.

Every power of government was used to deny them a fair trial. The first indictment was defective. A second, and then a third one, were returned. The case was so flimsy that Government counsel delayed it as long as they could, continuing their harassment of the defendants. Most of them had no funds to employ counsel, and lawyers had to be appointed by the court. Some of the latter were as erratic as their clients. The trial, when it got under way, was vaudeville. It lasted through 8 months of disorders such as no other courtroom in this country, probably, has ever seen.

At the end of that period the judge, tormented by conscience and worn out by the strain to which he had been subjected, died. A mistrial was declared and the New Dealers never dared bring the case to trial again, until they were forced to do so last week. Neither would they dismiss the charges, holding them instead over the heads of the defendants.

Every prosecutor who took the case destroyed his reputation. Williams Power Maloney, the first of them, was last heard from as counsel for the Garssons. O. John Rogge, who held the position until recently, wrote an official report based, so it was said, on the supposed testimony of dead Nazis, in an attempt to justify the prosecution. Although the report was presumably secret, Rogge quoted from it in a public speech and was fired because he attacked John L. Lewis, whom the administration was trying at the moment to mollify.

When Theron L. Caudle, who succeeded Rogge, was asked by Chief Justice Laws if he had any reasons why the case should not be dismissed, Caudle attempted to give the court Rogge's report for private inspection, but refused to let defense attorneys see it. The report was not so secret but what parts of it could be used for a New Deal political speech, but Caudle wanted the judge to read it without allowing counsel for the defendants whom it attacked to know what was being charged against their clients. The judge, naturally, refused the offer. Chief Justice Laws' final comments should have burned the ears of the prosecutors.

"The defendants," he said, "have bee before the court upon these charges for nearly 4½ years. All of them were brought here from other parts of the country to stand trial. Because of the impoverished state of 18 of the defendants, they were represented by counsel not of their own choice but appointed by the court to serve without compensation.

"As in all long-delayed cases, the witnesses now are scattered; some are not accessible, more particularly to the defendants who are without funds; the memories of witnesses as to events occurring many years ago are not clear. It is for these reasons, among others, that the Constitution requires a speedy trial and that the Congress has imposed a statute of limitation to prevent long-delayed prosecutions. I do not see how these defendants can now possibly obtain fair trials."

Every American may take comfort in these remarks. All the guaranties of a fair trial which the Constitution vouchsafes still live. The Nuremberg tyranny can never be brought across the Atlantic so long as these principles persist and courts have the courage to apply them.

Many other papers and periodicals carried similar denunciations of the trial. And remember that was the case which the Post and its reporter, with the aid of disorderly, pettifogging William Power Maloney, had conceived and wetnursed until it had secured the indictment and arrest of some thirty or more citizens who, with the exception of five or six, had never been convicted of any crime, were not shown to be guilty of any criminal offense or of any misconduct other than that of being anti-Semitic.

In dismissing the case, Mr. Justice Laws wrote the following opinion:

[In the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, *United States* v. *Joseph E. McWilliams et al.* Criminal Nos. 70153, 71203, 73086]

MEMORANDUM ON MOTIONS TO DISMISS

These cases are before me upon motions to dismiss, lately filed by permission of the court.

Until yesterday, so far as the court has been informed, the prosecution has been chiefly entrusted to O. John Rogge, special assistant to the Attorney General. On January 25, 1946, when the court heard previous motions to dismiss, Mr. Rogge stated that in view of late decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, he felt doubtful as to whether a conviction of the defendants could be sustained. Counsel explained this was his personal opinion, that the Department of Justice had not taken a position in the matter, and for this reason he was not at liberty to state its opinion. Two weeks later Mr. Rogge again appeared before the court upon further hearings of the motions to dismiss. The court asked whether he then was in a position to tell whether the prosecution wished to proceed with the case. The court was requested to give the Government a reasonable amount of time to answer this question; however, on this occasion the chief prosecutor again stated that after considering Supreme Court decisions in comparable cases it was his personal view that it was doubtful whether a conviction would be sustained. The Court then took the question of dismissing the cases under advisement.

On March 1, 1946, while the matter was pending under advisement, counsel for the prosecution applied to the Court to postpone its ruling for a period of 30 days, alleging it was believed certain testimony might be available from witnesses in Germany which would directly establish guilt of certain of the defendants. When this application was presented it was stated the Attorney General wished to send Mr. Rogge to Germany to make an investigation. Counsel for defendants objected. While unusual in the midst of a long pending criminal case to permit an investigation to endeavor to build up a doubtful case, I decided, because the charges were serious and access to possible evidence previously had been foreclosed by the war with Germany, I should permit time for the investigation. Accordingly, the prosecution was granted until April 30, 1946, a longer time than had been asked. A written memorandum filed by the court granting this time stated that "On or before April 30, 1946, counsel for the prosecution will be expected to advise the court in writing (copy to be sent to each defendant) whether prosecution of the cases is desired, also whether in his judgment, a conviction of defendants, if one is obtained, may be sustained under controlling decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States."

On April 30, 1946, a memorandum was filed by one of counsel for the prosecution, stating that prosecution was desired, "provided the prosecutor's investigation being presently conducted in Germany elicits additional evidence of guilt of defendants." This memorandum stated that the investigation had not been completed and that 45 days additional time would be required.

While I did not specifically grant the additional time to complete the investigation, it eventuated that Government counsel were able to secure this time, because it was not until May 18, 1946, that the motions to dismiss the indictments were overruled.

The case was called on September 20, 1946, for the purpose of setting a date for trial. On this occasion, Chief Prosecutor Rogge, being asked the third time in 8 months the attitude of the prosecution, stated that there still remained in his mind the question whether there was sufficient evidence to meet the test of the Supreme Court cases. He said he had serious doubts on this point, as he previously had advised the Court, but that the Department of Justice wished to suggest a trial date in December. Mr. Rogge informed the Court that an analysis he had made of evidence found in Germany had been turned over to the Department of Justice the previous week. Inasmuch as Mr. Rogge on three occasions, one after a lengthy investigation in Germany, had stated to the Court his serious doubts of a successful prosecution, a renewal of the motions to dismiss was permitted. The motions to dismiss now under consideration then were filed.

On yesterday, at the time of the hearing upon these motions, Mr. Rogge was not present representing the prosecution. Thereon Lamar Caudle, Assistant Attorney General, for the first time entered his appearance in behalf of the prosecution. Mr. Caudle stated the Department wished to prosecute all of the cases and to have a date set for trial; that the Department did not share the

doubts of Mr. Rogge. The Court requested Mr. Caudle to state his reasons why those now in charge had a different view from Mr. Rogge. In answer, Mr. Caudle made no statement of reasons. However, he offered to submit to the Court a trial brief which had been prepared and a written report of Mr. Rogge made to the Attorney General. Asked whether these documents would also be made available to the defendants, the prosecutor stated they would not. Counsel for defendants objected to the Court's examining the documents without copies being furnished them. The Court then informed counsel that by reason of the recent condemnation by the Conference of Senior Circuit Judges of the United States, at a meeting presided over by the Chief Justice of the United States, of the practice prevailing in some districts of trial judges' receiving from the prosecutor a brief or other documents not furnished opposing counsel, he was not in a position, over objection, to consider the trial brief and the report of Mr. Rogge.

The defendants have undergone before a court and jury part of a trial which ended on November 29, 1944, by reason of the sudden death of the presiding justice. The prosecution was still in progress at the conclusion of this trial, which had been under way for 8 months. Eighteen thousand pages of testimony were taken and eleven hundred documents were introduced in evidence. The prosecution was formally brought to a close on December 7, 1944. Beginning on December 9, 1944, and from time to time thereafter, various defendants have sought a speedy trial of their cases. For nearly 2 years such a trial has not been made possible for them. Their constitutional right to a speedy trial has been denied.

I can reach no other conclusion than that there is a serious doubt as to the validity of these cases. More than 8 months is an abnormally long time to be required by the prosecution to establish guilt in a clear case. One would expect convincing testimony of guilt to be fully adduced long before the expiration of such a length of time. When a retrial was in prospect the chief prosecutor, who more than any other person is familiar with the cases, expressed his doubts as to sustaining a conviction, and because of these doubts made the unusual request for permission to hold the question of their retrial in abeyance until he could make further investigation into the facts. Not only two times before this request was made, but on one occasion lately, after a lengthy investigation had been completed in Germany, this court asked the prosecution whether it desired to retry the cases; until yesterday there was no answer that it did. If these defendants are guilty, it would seem that any serious doubt as to their guilt would be resolved in more than 5 years of intensive investigation by able counsel and investigators of the Department of Justice. If they were clearly guilty the prosecution should have unwaveringly assured the court to this effect at least upon completion of the investigation in Germany.

Usually the court will permit the prosecutor to decide whether he will bring a case to trial. But where it appears, as here, there is serious doubt as to the success of the case, and that the defendants, because of long delays granted over their objections, cannot obtain a fair trial, the court should exercise its discretion to deny prosecution. It would be both unjust and un-American to do otherwise.

The defendants have been before the court upon these charges for nearly 4½ years. All of them were brought here from other parts of the country to stand trial. Because of the impoverished state of 18 of the defendants, they were represented by counsel not of their own choice but assigned by the court to serve without compensation. As in all long-delayed cases, the witnesses are now scattered; some are not accessible, more particularly to the defendants who are without funds; the memories of witnesses as to events occurring many years ago are not clear. It is for these reasons among others that the Constitution of the United States requires a speedy trial and that the Congress of the United States has imposed statute of limitations to prevent long-delayed prosecutions. I do not see how these defendants now can possibly obtain fair trials.

Under the circumstances, to permit another trial, which conceivably would last more than a year, with new prosecutors and newly appointed counsel for defendants, with the eventual outcome in serious doubt, as Mr. Rogge has stated to the court on three occasions, would be a travesty on justice. I have no doubt the cases should be dismissed and an order to that effect will be entered as to all defendants.

The question of terminating these cases is one of importance. If the dismissal I shall order is sustained, new prosecutions may not be started, because they will be barred by the statute of limitations. The court feels that the prosecution should have opportunity, if so advised to take action by way of application to appellate courts to review my order dismissing the cases. While this seems to me to be possible after final judgments of dismissal, nevertheless in order to safeguard the interests of the prosecutor against any doubt, the final order of dismissal will not be entered by this court until December 2, 1946.

The court should and does acknowledge with gratitude the services of counsel who served in behalf of the defendants without compensation. Their sacrifices were extensive; their financial losses were great. Specifically the court thanks for their services in these cases W. Hobart Little, Frank H. Myers, Elizabeth R. Young, J. Austin Latimer, M. Edward Buckley, Orille C. Gaudette, P. Bateman Ennis, John S. Hillyard, Ethelbert B. Frey, Harry A. Grant, James A. Davis, Ben Lindas, Frank J. Kelly, Arthur Carroll, Charles E. Morganston, Claude Thompson, William Gallagher, Joseph H. Bilbrey, Rees B. Gillespie, L. J. H. Herwig, John B. Gunion, and George B. Fraser.

BOLITHA J. LAWS,
Chief Justice.

NOVEMBER 22, 1946.

That decision was later affirmed by the appellate court.

Why do I call this to your attention now, as long as it is water over the dam or under the bridge?

Just because, if you oppose the Marshall plan, if you fight any of the international schemes advocated by the Post, you may expect a similar smear campaign, although it is extremely doubtful whether the Post, having once burned its fingers, will again go so far as to attempt to procure the indictment of the critics of its internationalism; of its efforts, which, all too often, regrettably fan the flames of racial prejudice.

In the message yesterday, something was said about discrimination. We all abhor discrimination, that is, unfairness, inequality, under the law. But let me give you an example of effective discrimination.

One of the Members of the House talked to me about a soldier; a married man. He was in the Army. He had a wife, and a baby was coming along, so he took some Government sheets over home, and somebody found out about it and they called him on the carpet for it. But, before they got him up there for court-martial he had taken the sheets back, but they gave him a year, the "brass" did, and he is serving it.

Well, there were those four fellows who belonged to that Capone gang, that crime syndicate, and they were convicted of a conspiracy to extort—not a sheet, nor a pillowslip, nor a wash rag, oh, no—$1,000,000 out of reputable business concerns. The judge said, "Ten years for you boys." They served a little while, the minimum term, and then less than 30 days after they became eligible for parole they got out on parole, and one of them testified before one of our committees that for 30 years he had not had any business except an illegal gambling business, and the others along similar lines. And that is a long period. Not only that, but while they were in prison there was good, reliable evidence that their businesses, their illegal businesses, were carried on.

One of your committees, a subcommittee of the Executive Expenditures Committee, when those paroles were granted, had its attention called to the matter by letters from people throughout the country, especially by letters from people who were in jail and wanted to get out. They thought in some way the hinges and locks would come off the doors, and if these big boys had gone out they ought to get out. They were just dumb folks, those fellows who were in there. They did not realize that if you are going to steal money you want to make it worth while, you want to get up in the aristocracy of the thieves and the racketeers and the crooks, where you will get some attention when an application for parole comes along. You want to have some friends in high places.

So complaint was made to our committee, and this subcommittee got into this thing, and naturally, then, the committee wanted to know, these paroles having been granted, what was the theory on which these people should be restored to society, and by what means did they get out.

My thought was that if the President did not want any discrimination, he ought to leave those experts in vice and gambling in prison and let the little fellows get along a little bit, if he did not want to discriminate in favor of the big boys.

We in this committee wanted to know what these people had been doing while in prison and what the man who had carried on their business while they were in prison, their legal business, was making. We wanted to know what those fellows had been doing and how much they had been making.

So we asked the Secretary of the Treasury to tell us about it. You know what he did? "Oh, no," he said, "you cannot have the information. We won't tell you. We deem it would not be proper to tell your committee whether Mr. Campagna and Mr. de Lucia, and the other two, or their lawyer, Mr. Bernstein"—who said under oath that people came into his office, people who were unknown to him; he did not know whether they were men, women, or children; black, white, or yellow; but they came in and

just slapped down $5,000 and $10,000 until he had more than $100,000 there—all the people said was, "Now, use that for Louie, Louie Campagna; use it for Louie." And he used it, and they paid $15,000 of it on a tax penalty.

The tax they paid, in all I think was about $120,000, toward a half-million-dollar-tax penalty, seemed rather small. That proved that either the Government claims were exorbitant or that there is something rotten about the settlement, because these men had property all this time out of which the tax could be obtained.

So we said, "Let us see those tax returns, let us see Mr. Bernstein's return, let us see if those fellows who were convicted of this thing had money of this kind." We wanted to know whether those paroles should not be revoked, because all the time these men were in jail we had found they were still engaged in criminal activities, and they were still engaged in the same line of business for which they were sent to jail. We thought they ought to stay there, at least, until they had reformed.

We went to the Internal Revenue Bureau and asked them for information, but they would not turn over that information to a committee of Congress, or anybody else, for that matter. They would not turn over the information because that would send a fellow to jail for a violation of the law. The Internal Revenue Bureau says, "We are satisfied if you pay the tax." Now they say to us, "Here are these four gangsters." They say to us, "Why, sure, they are out. That is all right. They paid a sum to us in settlement."

When we asked the Attorney General, your friend, Tom Clark—when we asked him about it, what did Tom say? "No, no; you cannot have the information from the Justice Department; you cannot have it; no, sir."

We want to know on which side, or which team, he is playing. Is he running interference for the four Chicago gangsters, or is he with the Department of Justice to prosecute and keep in jail people who are violating the law? Who is he working for? Who is he siding with? You get the point?

That is why I introduced a resolution yesterday asking this Congress for the passage of a resolution so that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Department of Justice can turn over to us that information.

I asked the Department of Justice, and J. Edgar Hoover told us, "No, we cannot do it. It is turned over to the Department of Justice." We asked Mr. Clark, and he said, "No, I cannot do it. I cannot give it to you. I will not give it to you." Do you see where it gets?

That is not all. Not so long ago someone came up to the committee and said, "Well, down here they have a file in the Civil Service Commission, the 'investigators' leads' files of some 750,000 cards." I had some of the cards given to me. So we asked the Civil Service Commission—Mr. Mitchell, Miss Perkins, and Mr. Flemming—to come up, and they were very nice about it. They came up before the committee. The three of them were sitting together, and I said, "Will one of you speak for all?" They said, "Yes." They were asked, "Well, where did you get the authority to compile this file?" They said, "We never knew it was there. We did not have any right to make it."

What was in that file? There were cards there which described Congressmen as Communists and Nazis, which referred to Senators as being disloyal, which referred to the conduct of Senators' wives, which referred to the activities and opinions of citizens of prominence who were not applicants for Federal jobs and who did not hold Federal jobs, and every one of these Commissioners admitted, and admitted freely, that they did not know those cards were there and did not know such a thing existed, although we did drag out of one of them a little later on that he O. K.'d $10,000 to make it.

So they said, "We will destroy those cards." Now, the Civil Service Commission has authority, of course, to investigate applicants for Federal jobs and Federal employees, and that is proper and right. But they have no business to investigate you or me unless we are applying for jobs or holding jobs which fall within their jurisdiction.

But the papers took it up right away and said, "Oh, well, you are trying to protect Congressmen and Senators." That was not so at all. We are trying to protect everyone and trying to safeguard the use of Federal funds and trying to prevent the misuse of Federal power.

Then we asked, "You say you will destroy this file?" And they said, "Yes." They were then asked, "Will you let some representative of the Congress go down and see that these cards are destroyed?" They said, "No." They said, "You can take our word for it. Why will you not take our word?" My answer to that is, "You say you are not dressed and that you do not know if you have any clothes on. You say you do not know that you have them and you say that you are going to take them off." My answer is, "How are you going to take them off, how will you know whether they are off if you do not know you have them?" Do you not see? Why should we trust the Civil Service Commission to destroy something that they did not know they had?

Do you know where they got this information which is on these cards—from the Anti-Defamation League and from some law firm of Mintzer & Levy, in New York. And they have these cards not only here in Washington but have them in the regional offices throughout the country, in New York and other places.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. If I understand the gentleman, these cards were made by the Civil Service Commission and $10,000 were expended for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBSION. Were they not then the records of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBSION. Is there any law that would permit them to destroy those records belonging to that department or to any department?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Except it is something that they had no right to have there, that is all; just the same as if a stray skunk came in there and they would chase it out.

But think of it, now, think of putting in the records of the Government a bunch of cards which reflect on the character—you do not know, any one of you here do not know whether your names are there or not—of individuals who are neither Federal employees nor applicants for Federal jobs. I know that some of your names are there. Is there any reason why they should not be taken out? What is on the cards? Statements that reflect upon your loyalty and your patriotism. Where do those cards come from? Where did that information come from? I said a moment ago from the Friends of Democracy and similar organizations, and from a law firm in the city of New York, a private law firm which is counsel for the organization the Anti-Defamation League. They collected all that stuff and as they were asked by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] when they were here, "Has that information ever been checked? Has it ever been verified?" The answer was, "No, no."

Then, when I asked them if we could go down there and look at it—and the President backed them up, and we have his letter—he said, "No. You cannot look at it, because I am relying upon the Civil Service Commission." You cannot have that file. You cannot see that your names are out of there.

So there is a resolution in to make that available. That will be brought up. I hope when it comes that you gentlemen will give it serious consideration. I hope that no one is going to be frightened into supporting the Marshall plan or any other administration measures that come here by the knowledge that, before the session is over, unless he goes along with the Washington Post, the Washington Star, and the News, his loyalty, his patriotism, his common sense, and his good judgment will all be questioned.

Now, do not be frightened, because, after all, neither the Washington Post, nor the Star, nor the News, nor the New Republic, nor the Daily Worker, nor the New Masses, nor any other communistic rag has very much influence back in your district.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think you should go more into detail in connection with these trials about which you spoke. There was a man who sometimes lived in my district and sometimes in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], who surrendered himself as soon as he discovered by reading in the papers that they wanted him. He was brought here manacled, helpless; an extremely uninfluential gentleman. When he came here, I think you should say that these men were all refused their own witnesses. If they brought witnesses, they would have had to bring them at their own expense all the way from Cal-

ifornia, and they were refused aid until it was granted through other sources.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not only that, while the Government spent the taxpayers' money to persecute, they had—many of them—no money to defend themselves. But here is another angle to the situation which should be remedied by an act of Congress: Almost all of these people were without funds. They were brought here from California, from other States—thousands of miles from home, as the gentleman says. They did not have the money to hire attorneys. They had to go to work to support themselves to pay their room rent and food bills. The court down here appointed—I have forgotten how many—Washington lawyers to defend them. I would say there must have been 15 or 20, or perhaps more. Some of those lawyers spent more than 2 years in defending those people under the order of the court. They had to defend them or go to jail for contempt of court. Do you know what the lawyers got out of it? Nothing. They did not get a nickel out of it. There is no law that pays those lawyers anything. Now, that is a fine how-do-you-do. I imagine the President did not know about that, or he would have advocated taking care of those lawyers, and I would have gone along with him on that, because when a person is appointed by the court to defend a man charged with crime, he certainly ought to get his board and room out of it, if nothing else, other than experience. That is the situation those gentlemen are in.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman referred to the Washington Star and the Post and News, and various other newspapers, and then concluded by saying, "Any other communistic rag." The gentleman does not mean to include those papers in that statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not the Washington papers. Oh, in between there, if you had listened—I know you are a great supporter of the Star. You even wrote a letter of approval when I found fault because they characterized Members of Congress as being disloyal. I think if you will read my remarks you will find in there—no, I am not charging the Washington papers with being communistic. I think they would get along all right if they did not have your support, but I did not charge them with being communistic. In between there I mentioned several others, the Daily Worker, the New Masses, but if they—the Star and the Post—want to insult and abuse Congressmen and you want to approve of it, that is your business and not mine. If you want to submit to their charges of being disloyal and not knowing anything, that is your business, but I will resent it. I will leave it to my people whether I know anything or not, but I know very well that I am just as patriotic as the Washington Star or the Post or the News. The trouble with these papers is, I know that you cannot win any fight that you get into with them. The only time I ever got a break was when the Star got after me and then after a while they printed the whole testimony bearing on the incident. They wasted a lot of valuable space, but it was all right with me. It set the situation on the record and for that I thank them.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has discussed discrimination. I wonder if the gentleman would discuss the discrimination in connection with the disbarred lawyers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is my experience that if a Member talks more than 10 minutes—except Members who are really up and coming—he is out of luck. So I will let the gentleman from Illinois do that.

My purpose, and the only purpose, in speaking here today is to recall to your minds the fact that, if you oppose the Marshall plan or any part of the Marshall plan; if you oppose any part of the program suggested by the internationalists, by the one-worlders, by those who believe it to be our duty to take on the burden of supporting and clothing and educating and directing the political thought of all the rest of the world's people; if you oppose any domestic scheme to waste the taxpayers' money—in short, if you do not go along, become a part of a rubber-stamp Congress, a me-too, bipartisan Republican, toe the mark, bend the knee, bow the head, get on your sackcloth and wallow in the ashes, you will be smeared and charged with being not only dumb, idiotic, unintelligent, but perhaps even seditious and disloyal.

Serve your people in the way they want to be served; run counter to what the Communists, the New Dealers, or the one-worlders want, and you are out of step.

But do not let it worry you overmuch. Your duty is to your people and, as long as we are honest and sincere, just fairly intelligent and represent their thought and convictions, although we may not enjoy it, we may consider the abuse and the vilification as needed remedies to prevent us becoming too egotistical, too conceited, too stubborn.

More than 50 years ago, I learned that, if one listened to his friends and neighbors, considered their advice, used his own judgment, and endeavored conscientiously to do the right thing, he would please and earn the respect of more people than he would if he gave heed to and followed the advice of everyone who talked to him.

Now that we know what is coming, thicken up your hides and, instead of waiting for the attack, carry the battle to our opponents.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] at Guilford College, N. C., recently.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Look magazine of December 9, entitled "We Are Preparing for the Wrong War," by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the entertaining talk of the gentleman from Michigan—and with a great deal of his conversation today I agree, but I do fear, Mr. Speaker, that if we haul up the FBI here before the committees of Congress and make them divulge all that they know and their sources of information, most of which is given them in confidence, that we may cripple the FBI to the point where they will not be able to get the necessary information they need in trying to enforce the laws of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In my letter to the FBI and to all these other agencies I expressly waived any request for information as to the source of their information. I agree with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman did not make that clear in his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

EVERETT DIRKSEN

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the 24 years that I have labored here on Capitol Hill, 17 as a congressional secretary and 7 as a Member of this body, I have never seen a more dynamic character, a more prodigious worker, a more effective advocate in the well of the House, than the gentleman from Illinois, EVERETT DIRKSEN.

I am among the many Members of this House and the thousands and thousands of our people who regret exceedingly that physical misfortune has caused him to decide to retire as a Member. There is, however, a silver living to the clouds that disturb this distinguished statesman whom Bruce Barton once called a potential Abraham Lincoln. His doctors have a prescription, and the prescription is this: he needs adequate rest, he needs a prolonged rest period—not too long, I understand, and he can become well.

I therefore join the Speaker and others in hoping that the draft DIRKSEN movement in the Sixteenth District of Illinois will prevail and that his constituency will send him back to the House of Representatives which he has served so well.

LAW LIBRARY FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

We can ill afford to lose EVERETT DIRKSEN.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I just want to say in endorsing everything the gentleman from New Jersey has said about the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, that of course, as far as I am concerned I never did want too many Republicans around here, but if they are going to send Republicans to Congress then let them send Republicans of the EVERETT DIRKSEN kind.

Mr. CANFIELD. Very good. That sentiment is typical of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include therein two editorials appearing in Washington newspapers in credit to our distinguished colleague, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

(The editorials referred to follow:)

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., January 5, 1948]

MR. DIRKSEN WILL BE MISSED

There is a marked tone of genuine regret in the comments following Representative DIRKSEN'S statement that he will not be a candidate for reelection in the April primary.

That is easy to understand. An able, hard-working Member of Congress since he first came to Washington, Mr. DIRKSEN has steadily risen in the esteem and respect of his colleagues and has become an outstanding Member of the House. His loss would be shared on both sides of the aisle. For while he has made himself a great asset to the majority, he was never a narrow partisan and always constructive in committee and in debate.

Some of his friends have known of the affliction to his eyesight which had caused him trouble last year and have hoped that treatment and rest would find a cure. If his decision to retire means that he will devote himself to that end now, retirement might be temporary—something to be desired in his own and the public's interest.

Here in Washington it is only natural that we should be selfishly concerned about Mr. DIRKSEN. His chairmanship of the District Committee, preceded by so many years as one of its most useful members, has been a boon to this community. The Star joins his other friends in regretting his decision to retire but in hoping that it will give him the opportunity—which he has been unwilling to take for himself—to get well again.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 5, 1948]

DIRKSEN'S MISFORTUNE

The misfortune which has impelled Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN to announce that he will not be a candidate for renomination in 1948 will arouse profound regret among a vast number of Americans. By dint of hard work, native intelligence, and a commendable flexibility of mind, Mr. DIRKSEN has become one of the most powerful and highly esteemed leaders in the House of Representatives. In large measure he has achieved the happy feat of looking forward without losing touch with current realities. And his dynamic personality, his skill in debate and his habit of informing himself on every major public issue have given his influence a contagious quality.

The District of Columbia and the Sixteenth Congressional District of Illinois will be especially loath to lose the services of Mr. DIRKSEN. Since he first came to Congress in 1933 he has taken a keen interest in District affairs. His fights for fair and progressive legislation applicable to the Capital City have frequently been unsuccessful. But he has stood out as a tower of strength against the angry and uninformed waves of sentiment that sometimes sweep the House when District legislation is under debate. It is with his aid and sympathy, moreover, that the Auchincloss plan for home rule in the District has been worked out by a subcommittee of the House District Committee over which Mr. DIRKSEN presides.

In recent months Mr. DIRKSEN has given a large measure of his energy to support of the Marshall plan. Touring Europe last fall to get a first-hand view of the recovery problem of that shattered continent, he went into the homes of the people, into the factories, and business establishments. In Germany he talked with the people in their native language. He sought facts instead of broadcasting advice and came home a determined advocate of ample aid to insure the survival of freedom in the lands that we helped to rescue from Hitlerism. His idea of Government insurance to protect private American capital invested in new European enterprises against sudden nationalization of industries and to insure the conversion of profits from foreign currencies into dollars has found a definite place in the ERP recommendations sent to Congress by the President. We are glad that Mr. DIRKSEN will continue to be in the House for the momentous debate on the Marshall plan and sincerely hope that the impairment of his sight at the early age of 52 will not make it necessary for him to terminate his public career.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. HORAN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 12, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1194. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1195. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation relative to its operations for 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1196. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting various documents pursuant to House Resolution 366; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1197. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1198. A letter from the president, Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, Inc., transmitting the Twentieth Annual Report of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 4882. A bill to provide assistance against the high cost of living to low-income families under the individual income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4883. A bill authorizing a review of the report on the interoceanic canal across Nicaragua contained in House Document No. 139, Seventy-second Congress, first session; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4884. A bill defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4885. A bill relating to the construction, maintenance, and operation of an interoceanic canal over Nicaraguan territory; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 4886. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, so as to provide priorities for veterans in the purchase of surplus residential real property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 4887. A bill to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4888. A bill to name the reservoir to be created by the construction of the Fort Gibson Dam on the Grand River, in the State of Oklahoma, Lake Chouteau; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 4889. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4890. A bill to provide for the utilization of certain surplus military real property as national cemeteries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4891. A bill to amend the act of February 10, 1920, in order to provide for the free distribution to veterans' organizations of blank ammunition for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4892. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409) (Public Law No. 219 of the 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4893. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 4894. A bill to release and to discharge the Republic of Finland from further financial liability to the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution to amend section 4, paragraph (b), of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress (ch. 526, 1st sess.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4895. A bill for the relief of Adam Artur Wandzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4896. A bill for the relief of Louis Serlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 4897. A bill for the relief of Francis Doman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 4898. A bill for the relief of Casimir (Kazimierz) Stanislaw Skowyra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4899. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Czerwinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1083. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition signed by 11 members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Unit No. 20, Bloomfield, N. J., and petition signed by 9 members of Peter S. Hotalen Unit, No. 157, American Legion Auxiliary, Branchville, N. J., urging the adoption of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1084. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Petitions of citizens of Cambria County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1085. Also, petition of citizens of Armstrong County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1086. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Alta L. McAllister, San Antonio, Tex., petitioning consideration of her resolution with reference to requested removal from office in the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Texas of Judge Ben H. Rice, Jr., and District Clerk of Court Maxey Hart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou wilt still be here after this prayer is said, and we would have it so, for we know deep down in our hearts that without Thy help we can do nothing abiding.

Without Thee we shall discuss more and more and settle less and less.

Unite, we pray Thee, the leaders of our Nation behind the right way to achieve a just and lasting peace in our land and in all the world, that we may win it together, lest we lose it apart. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. IVES thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

JAMES O. EASTLAND, a Senator from the State of Mississippi; ALBERT W. HAWKES, a Senator from the State of New Jersey; JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, a Senator from the State of Wisconsin; and JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 7, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1317) to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WELCH, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. SOMERS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Malone
Baldwin	Hatch	Maybank
Ball	Hawkes	Millikin
Barkley	Hayden	Moore
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	O'Conor
Brooks	Hoey	O'Daniel
Buck	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Ives	Pepper
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Capper	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Connally	Langer	Russell
Donnell	Lodge	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Lucas	Smith
Eastland	McCarran	Sparkman
Ecton	McCarthy	Stennis
Ferguson	McClellan	Stewart
George	McFarland	Taft
Green	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah	Vandenberg	Williams
Thye	Watkins	Wilson
Tobey	Wherry	Young
Umstead	Wiley	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent on account of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent on official business of the Committee on Public Lands.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent on official business of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the information of the Members of the Senate I think it would be well to announce at this time that, if it meets with the approval of the membership of the Senate, it is intended, until further notice, that the Senate shall meet on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. That will leave Tuesdays and Thursdays open for committee work. Many committees are now functioning, and there is a desire that as many of their members as possible may be present at the committee meetings. It is proposed that the program I have suggested be followed until further notice. It is my feeling that until some legislative proposal is brought upon the floor of the Senate for consideration, the program I have just announced should not be changed.

With respect to the program for next week, I announce that, if it shall meet with the approval of the Senate, it is intended that the Senate shall proceed with the morning hour and the consideration of routine business on Monday. I ask unanimous consent that when the morning business shall have been concluded the legislative calendar shall be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection. I make that unanimous-consent request for the

reason that unless it is granted the calendar will be called under rule VIII.

Mr. BARKLEY. When is that to be?

Mr. WHERRY. Monday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the intention to have a morning hour on next Wednesday, following the Monday session, and dispose of routine business, and at the conclusion of the routine business I shall move that Calendar No. 861, House bill 3342, the bill providing for legislation with respect to the Voice of America, be made the unfinished business. As I stated, it is my intention to make the motion at the close of routine business on next Wednesday, and it is proposed that the bill shall be taken up for consideration by the Senate on the following Friday, which will be a week from today.

Mr. President, let me restate that proposed program. At the conclusion of the consideration of routine morning business by the Senate on next Wednesday, it is my intention to move to make the unfinished business Calendar No. 861, House bill 3342, the measure dealing with the Voice of America, and it is proposed that it shall be brought up for consideration by the Senate the following Friday, which is 1 week from today.

I have made this statement respecting the legislative program because many Senators have asked what the program for next week is to be. The statement is made for the information of all Senators so that they may arrange their office work and make plans with respect to attendance on committee hearings on the basis of the program I have outlined.

MEETING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at 2 o'clock today the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will continue to hear the testimony of Ambassador Douglas. I ask unanimous consent that if the Senate is still in session at 2 o'clock the Committee on Foreign Relations be permitted to sit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF ROBERT L. NORTON, WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT OF THE BOSTON POST

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it saddens me greatly to announce to the Senate the death on January 7 of the distinguished Washington correspondent of the Boston Post, Robert L. Norton.

He and I had been friends for years, going back to my early days as a newspaper reporter when he helped me unstintingly and in many ways. I had recently seen him at the Gridiron Club, where I had several times been his guest. He was an able newspaperman, and his writings were of high quality. He was a most shrewd observer, and many men in public life confided in him and set great store by his judgment. He had many friends in this body and throughout the Government. My deep sympathy goes out to his family. I shall miss him and think of him often.

DEATH OF CHARLES MICHELSON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the death of a very outstanding American who for many years was connected with the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable Charles Michelson, who died on yesterday at the age of 79. Mr. Michelson was for many years publicity director of the National Democratic Committee and though always a partisan Democrat he was broadminded in his approach to problems and enjoyed the respect of the entire community and of all those who knew him or knew of him. I do not know of any man in the newspaper field or in the field of politics who was more active, who was more beloved, who was more greatly respected, and who enjoyed a greater reputation for fairness in his dealings even with partisan matters, than did Mr. Michelson. We all regret to know of his death. We respect the great record he made as a newspaper correspondent and as a publicity director, and we wish to express to his family and to his friends our profound regret at his death on yesterday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of certain aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, heretofore transmitted by him to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation relative to its operations for the year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OPERATION OF AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of the operation of the agricultural conservation program for the program year 1946, together with a financial report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act by the Department of Agriculture for the period August 2, 1946, to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF LABOR

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

A letter from the Director of Naval Petroleum Reserves, reporting, pursuant to law, that there have been no agreements, purchases, or condemnation proceedings entered into within naval petroleum reserves during the calendar year 1947 under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1938, as amended by the act of June 17, 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition(with accompanying papers); to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Camp No. 28, St. Paul Island, Alaska (Pribilofs), Alaska Native Brotherhood, favoring the enactment of legislation correcting certain alleged wrongs, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

THE MARSHALL EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the outstanding organizations of our splendid citizenry in Maryland is the Italian-American Civic Club, which is composed of professional and business men of high standing.

At a recent meeting the membership unanimously adopted a resolution recommending favorable action by the Congress upon the Marshall plan.

I present for appropriate reference a letter from the Italian-American Civic Club of Maryland, signed by Samuel M. Campanaro, president, advising of the adoption of the resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALIAN-AMERICAN CIVIC CLUB
OF MARYLAND, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., January 6, 1948.

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: At the regular meeting of our organization, held on Monday,

January 5, a resolution was unanimously adopted by the body recommending the passage by Congress of the Marshall plan.

I have been directed to convey to all the Members of the Maryland congressional delegation our feelings with respect to this most humanitarian plan in behalf of the suffering people of western Europe, so that in casting their votes in this matter our representatives would feel certain that they were voicing the sentiments of their constituents.

We feel that the adoption by Congress of the Marshall plan bill will be by far this country's most generous and effective contribution toward world peace. We sincerely hope that you in your wisdom will exert every effort possible to the end that this plan may be enacted into law by Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL M. CAMPANARO,
President.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of December 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
January 5, 1948.

To the Senate:

In compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319 agreed to August 23, 1944, the Committee on Finance submits the following report of persons employed by the committee during the month of December 1947 who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee, together with a statement of the department by whom the persons are employed and their annual rate of compensation:

Mrs. Leona V. McKinnon, Washington, D. C., Federal Security Agency, $5,905.20 per annum.

Mr. Milton Mayer, Washington, D. C., Public Housing Administration, $7,341 per annum.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
January 5, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the above-mentioned committee submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947, together with funds appropriated to and expended by it.

Sherwood B. Stanley, clerk, gross amount, annual rate, $7,549.09.

Elizabeth B. Springer, assistant clerk, gross amount, annual rate, $5,116.32.

Fred W. Peel, research clerk, gross amount, annual rate, $5,281.84.

Janice M. Everly, stenographer, gross amount, annual rate, $3,626.56.

Bernice Crouze, stenographer, gross amount, annual rate, $3,626.56.

Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk, gross amount, annual rate, $3,129.98.

Funds appropriated, $10,000.

Funds expended:

During period January 1 through June 30, 1947, previously reported, $4,643.68.

During period July 1 through December 31, 1947: travel expenses, $183.77; telephone charges, $56.65; photostat service, $25.83; total, $266.25.

Unexpended balance of appropriated funds, $5,090.07.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
RULES AND ADMINISTRATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES
AND ELECTIONS,
December 31, 1947.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by its subcommittee for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by its subcommittee:

Mary D. Almond, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,226.56; total salary received, $171.25.

Irma Anderson, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $1,859; total salary received, $866.98.

Fannie Angelos, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,226.56; total salary received, $633.58.

Thomas P. Baldwin, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,226.56; total salary received, $231.63.

John W. Benson, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $3,792.09; total salary received, $1,537.87.

Arianna Blizzard, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $593.23.

A. J. Bosica, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $3,047.22; total salary received, $1,032.64.

Arthur R. Breor, Jr., chief investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,695.66; total salary received, $2,521.53.

Jack C. Brown, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,447.37; total salary received, $1,890.19.

James F. Carr, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $625.32.

James H. Cunningham, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $3,792.09; total salary received, $1,367.47.

Lillian D. Dornbusch, typist, rate of gross annual salary, $1,859; total salary received, $144.58.

Virginia M. Dornbusch, typist, rate of gross annual salary, $1,859; total salary received, $165.23.

Bernard J. Dugan, checker, rate of gross annual salary, $3,792.09; total salary received, $474.

Betty J. B. Du Jack, secretary, rate of gross annual salary $3,461.04; total salary received, $1,311.46.

Helen Earp, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $98.11.

Kelso Elliott, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,695.66; total salary received, $1,787.77.

B. B. Gilchrist, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,695.66; total salary received, $2,847.78.

Margaret C. Guthridge, typist, rate of gross annual salary, $1,859; total salary received, $58.

Mary L. Green, administrative assistant, rate of gross annual salary, $3,792.09; total salary received, $1,896.

Jack W. Hardy, counsel, rate of gross annual salary, $7,549.08; total salary received, $807.09.

Evelyn M. Hearsey, typist, rate of gross annual salary, $1,859; total salary received, $273.75.

George Curtis Hartman, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $1,492.20.

Marie A. Heid, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $191.40.

Camille Jeneau, administrative assistant, rate of gross annual salary, $3,792.09; total salary received, $1,896.

Grace E. Johnson, financial clerk, rate of gross annual salary, $6,357.78; total salary received, $3,006.46.

Sylvan Katz, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

Francis T. Kelly, chief investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $6,257.78; total salary received, $3,178.86.

Joseph F. Kelly, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $1,591.74.

Henry P. Kiley, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,695.66; total salary received, $2,847.78.

Fred H. Kohler, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $2,089.16.

Joseph F. Langan, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,281.84; total salary received, $2,102.95.

David Laupheimer, checker, rate of gross annual salary, $3,792.09; total salary received, $450.

Judd Leighton, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $724.81.

Robert K. Lyle, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $4,288.68; total salary received, $2,082.25.

Joseph V. McCann, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,281.84; total salary received, $2,585.74.

Robert J. McElroy, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

John N. Maguire, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

Anna Mae Melvin, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $324.50.

Leah G. Miller, typist, rate of gross annual salary, $2,222; total salary received, $440.63.

Theodore P. Mullan, guard, rate of gross annual salary, $2,881.69; total salary received, $1,200.70.

Paul A. Newland, guard, rate of gross annual salary, $2,881.69; total salary received, $146.06.

Richard J. Oppitz, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

Joseph G. Cronson, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

Alice J. Pentz, typist, rate of gross annual salary, $1,859; total salary received, $113.60.

David A. Pollock, checker, rate of gross annual salary, $3,792.09; total salary received, $474.

Jack M. Poorbaugh, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $2,558.16.

Martha Pringle, secretary, rate of gross annual salary, $3,212.74; total salary received, $576.84.

David H. Putnam, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $4,288.68; total salary received, $652.69.

Elda G. Quast, typist, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

William F. Reed, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $2,089.16.

Emory P. Roberts, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $653.75.

Charles R. Rouse, Jr., challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $130.95.

Dorothy A. Sailors, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $261.90.

George D. Solter, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $60.44.

William E. Stevenson, investigator, rate of gross annual salary, $5,116.32; total salary received, $1,279.08.

Alfred L. Wiepert, guard, rate of gross annual salary, $2,881.69; total salary received, $152.08.

William W. Williams, guard, rate of gross annual salary, $2,881.69; total salary received, $1,200.70.

Allan M. Winner, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

M. J. Yamin, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

Gerald J. Zeller, challenger, rate of gross annual salary, $3,626.56; total salary received, $433.16.

Funds on hand July 1, 1947, plus funds authorized by Senate Resolution 142, agreed to July 23, 1947, authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, $161,998.81.

Amount expended, $89,929.57.

Balance unexpended, $72,069.24.

W. E. JENNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee,
Privileges and Elections.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
January 9, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from June 30, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

H. C. M. Case, consultant, rate of gross annual salary, $10,000; total salary received, $2,499.99.

James M. Kendall, clerk, rate of gross annual salary, $7,075.06; total salary received, $3,537.53.

Joycette K. Jones, clerk, rate of gross annual salary, $6,026.72; total salary received, $3,013.36.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, $10,000.

Amount expended, $636.55.

Amount expended as of June 30, 1947, $1,780.35.

Balance unexpended, $7,583.10.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND
FORESTRY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON
LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM,
PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 147,
January 9, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from June 30, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, $15,000.

Amount expended, $5,345.46.

Balance unexpended, $9,654.54.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 1952. A bill for the relief of W. Garland Lillard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 1953. A bill to amend the act of February 10, 1920, in order to provide for the free distribution to veterans' organizations of blank ammunition for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 1954. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

S. 1955. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings, and for other purposes; and

S. 1956. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building in South Charleston, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1957. A bill to establish two additional offices of Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MOORE:

S. 1958. A bill to provide for the designation of the reservoir formed by the dam on the Grand River near Fort Gibson, Okla., as Lake Chouteau; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1959. A bill for the relief of Marthe Camille Bisby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MCCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 1960, to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1961. A bill to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1962. A bill to extend further the period during which the admission into the United States of alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States may be facilitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1963. A bill to provide for the utilization of certain surplus military real property as national cemeteries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1964. A bill for the relief of Walter Werner Tech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 171, to establish a commission to revise and codify the general and permanent laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

FULL-FAITH-AND-CREDIT CLAUSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to further implement the full-faith-and-credit clause of the Constitution, and I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution, with footnotes, together with a memorandum, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill together with the memorandum and footnotes will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 1960) to further implement the full-faith-and-credit clause of the Constitution, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and (with an accompanying paper), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That where a State has exercised through its courts jurisdiction to dissolve the marriage of spouses, the decree of divorce thus rendered must be given full faith and credit in every other State as a dissolution of such marriage, provided (1) the decree is final; (2) the decree is valid in the State where rendered; (3) the decree contains recitals setting forth that the jurisdictional prerequisites of the State to the granting of the divorce have been met; and (4) the State wherein the decree was rendered was the last State wherein the spouses were domiciled together as husband and wife, or the defendant in the proceeding for divorce was personally subject to the jurisdiction of the State wherein the decree was rendered or appeared generally in the proceedings therefor. In all such cases except cases involving intrinsic fraud the recitals of the decree of divorce shall constitute a conclusive determination of the jurisdictional facts necessary to the decree.

The memorandum and footnotes presented by Mr. MCCARRAN were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

POWER OF CONGRESS TO PRESCRIBE THE EXTRATERRITORIAL EFFECT OF A DIVORCE DECREE; PROPOSED STATUTE TO ACCOMPLISH THIS PURPOSE

Soon after the adoption of the Constitution, the first Congress exercised some of the power conferred upon it by article IV, section 1, of the Constitution [1] and enacted a statute which, with some supplementation and revision of phraseology, exists today as 28 United States Code, section 687, Revised Statutes, section 905. This section reads as follows:

"The acts of the legislature of any State or Territory, or of any country subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, shall be authenticated by having the seals of such State, Territory, or country affixed thereto. The records and judicial proceedings of the courts of any State or Territory, or of any such country, shall be proved or admitted in any other court within the United States, by the attestation of the clerk, and the seal of the court annexed, if there be a seal, together with a certificate of the judge, chief

[1] "Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof."

justice, or presiding magistrate, that the said attestation is in due form. And the said records and judicial proceedings, so authenticated, shall have such faith and credit given to them in every court within the United States as they have by law or usage in the courts of the State from which they are taken."

Writers and commentators on the subject generally agree that 28 United States Code, section 687, represents only a partial exercise of the congressional power under the full-faith-and-credit clause; and that both the words of the clause and its historical background fully sustain the view that Congress can go much further than it has gone and that Congress has broad power to prescribe the extraterritorial effect of a judgment.[2]

Outer limits of the congressional power under the full-faith-and-credit clause never have been determined by the Supreme Court; and in *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (II)[3] Mr. Justice Frankfurter, for the majority, expressly stated: "The reach of congressional power given by article IV, section 1, is not before us."[4] The majority opinion in *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (I)[5] is to the same effect.

Mr. Justice Jackson, delivering the annual Cardozo lecture before the bar of the city of New York in 1944, indicated that Congress may properly fix the standards for extraterritorial effect and recognition of State judgments, saying:

"The Court has had no occasion to decide such questions, but I should say that it has been fairly ostentatious in leaving the way open to sustain such enactments without embarrassment."[6]

Mr. Justice (later Chief Justice) Stone, dissenting on other grounds in *Yarborough* v. *Yarborough*[7] declared:

"The mandatory force of the full-faith-and-credit clause as defined by this Court may be, in some degree not yet fully defined, expanded, or contracted by Congress. Much of the confusion and procedural deficiencies which the constitutional provision alone has not avoided may be remedied by legislation. Cook, Powers of Congress under the Full Faith and Credit Clause, 28 Yale Law Journal, 421; Corwin, The Full Faith and Credit Clause, 81 University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 371; compare 33 Columbia Law Review 854, 866. The constitutional provision giving Congress power to prescribe the effects to be given to acts, records, and proceedings would have been quite unnecessary had it not been intended that Congress should have a latitude broader than that given the courts by the full-faith-and-credit clause alone. It was remarked on the floor of the Constitutional Convention that without the extension of power in the Legislature, the provision "would amount to nothing more than what now takes place among all independent nations." Hunt and Scott, Madison's Reports of the Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787, page 503. The play which has been afforded for the recognition of local public policy in cases where there is called in question only a statute of another State, as to the effect of which Congress has not legislated, compared with the more restricted scope for local policy where there is a judicial proceeding, as to which Congress has legislated, suggests the congressional power."

With particular respect to divorce decrees, the authorities seem again agreed that Congress has the power under the full-faith-and-credit clause of the Constitution to prescribe the conditions under which such decrees shall be given extraterritorial recognition and to compel that recognition.[8] Corwin, in his article, The Full Faith and Credit Clause,[9] stated that "* * * Congress may, under the clause, describe a certain type of divorce and say that it shall be granted recognition throughout the Union, and that no other kind shall." In The Supreme Court and Full Faith and Credit, by Moore and Oglebay,[10] it is said:

"The migratory divorce is a matter having large social and moral implications upon which an informed legislative directive is needed. The States are probably impotent to give the directive. Congress, however, has the power to set up minimum legislative standards relative to divorce jurisdiction as a prerequisite before a decree is entitled to full faith and credit. And some such congressional directive is probably desirable.

* * * * *

"We do not care to suggest that Congress can or should provide upon what grounds divorce may be granted. Our thought is that it may deal with the relationship, such as domicile or residence (and what shall constitute these relationships), which one or both of the parties to the divorce proceeding must bear to a State before its courts can have jurisdiction to proceed to grant a divorce which is entitled to full faith and credit."

There are fairly strong suggestions also that the Supreme Court would sustain such legislation. Mr. Justice Jackson, in the Cardozo lecture previously referred to, stated in effect that Congress can proceed "to prescribe the type of divorce judgment that is entitled to extraterritorial recognition," and then suggested, as already pointed out herein, that the way was open for the Supreme Court to uphold such an enactment. (It should be borne in mind that Mr. Justice Jackson was with the majority in *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (II).)

These remarks were referred to by way of general citation in *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (II) (note 5 of the majority opinion) wherein Mr. Justice Frankfurter disclaimed any effort in the decision to determine the reach of congressional power. Justices Black and Douglas, dissenting in the same case, expressly remarked as to the broad power of Congress to act, though admittedly it had not done so.

Obviously a congressional statute prescribing the extraterritorial effect of divorce decrees, so that a divorce valid in one State must be given full faith and credit everywhere, faces the necessity of overruling the majority view in *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (II), that a State may apply its own local policy regarding the jurisdictional fact of domicile and refuse credit to the concededly valid decree of another State. And in *Andrews* v. *Andrews*[11] the court permitted the later impeachment of recitals by a defendant who appeared in the proceeding. On the other hand, any proposed statute must allow for the application of procedural due process in testing the divorce proceeding. Warnings are to be found in Supreme Court decisions[12] and in the dissenting and concurring opinions in *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (II), that a State judgment, notwithstanding full faith and credit, is always subject to the principles of due process.

With these propositions in mind a draft of a suggested statute prescribing the extraterritorial effect of divorce decrees is submitted herewith. This language could be added to the present 28 United States Code section 687, or could be a separate section of the code.

This suggested statute, it is believed, would entitle other States to question a decree based on fraud, for such a decree would not be valid in the rendering State. The suggested statute would, however, give full recognition to decrees based on constructive service where the rendering State was the last place of domicile with respect to the marriage relationship; and would also permit a State wherein only one spouse is domiciled to determine its jurisdiction to grant the divorce, and to render a decree conclusive against everyone, where the defendant appears or is validly personally served with process. A default judgment, entered without such appearance or service, against a spouse not domiciled in the State, where the State was not the last State of marital domicile, would be open to attack and refusal of recognition; but certainly not to any greater degree than under the present state of the law.

Suggested statute

"Where a State has exercised through its courts jurisdiction to dissolve the marriage of spouses, the decree of divorce thus rendered must be given full faith and credit in every other State as a dissolution of such marriage, provided (1) the decree is final; (2) the decree is valid in the State where rendered; (3) the decree contains recitals setting forth that the jurisdictional prerequisites of the State to the granting of the divorce have been met; and (4) the State wherein the decree was rendered was the last State wherein the spouses were domiciled together as husband and wife, or the defendant in the proceeding for divorce was personally subject to the jurisdiction of the State wherein the decree was rendered or appeared generally in the proceedings therefor. In all such cases except cases involving intrinsic fraud the recitals of the decree of divorce shall constitute a conclusive determination of the jurisdictional facts necessary to the decree."

COMMISSION ON CODIFICATION OF UNITED STATES LAWS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a commission to establish and codify the general and permanent laws of the United States. This proposed joint resolution has been under study for a considerable time by myself, by members of the Judiciary Committee staff, and many outside qualified organizations and individuals. Copies of a draft of the joint resolution were submitted to numerous Government departments, and I am glad to say that it has won very widespread endorsement

---

[2] Costigan, The History of the Adoption of Section 1 of Article IV of the United States Constitution and a Consideration of the Effect on Judgments of That Section and of Federal Legislation (1904) 4 Col. L. Rev. 470; Cook, The Powers of Congress Under the Full Faith and Credit Clause (1919 28 Yale L. J. 421; Ross, "Full Faith and Credit" in a Federal System (1935) 20 Minn. L. Rev. 140; Moore and Oglebay, The Supreme Court and Full Faith and Credit (1943) 29 Va. L. Rev. 557; Corwin, Out-Haddocking Haddock (1945) 93 U. Pa. L. Rev. 341.

[3] 325 U. S. 226 (1945).

[4] Footnote 5 of the opinion.

[5] 317 U. S. 287 (1942).

[6] Jackson, Full Faith and Credit—The Lawyer's Clause of the Constitution (1945), 45 Col. L. Rev. 1, 21.

[7] 290 U. S. 202, 215, n. 2 (1933).

[8] This, of course, would follow in any event from the propositions already stated herein. See Corwin, Out-Haddocking Haddock (supra); Corwin, The Full Faith and Credit Clause (1933), 81 U. Pa. L. Rev. 371, 388; Husserl, Some Reflections on *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (II) (1946), 32 Va. L. Rev. 555; Moore and Oglebay, The Supreme Court and Full Faith and Credit (supra).

[9] Supra.

[10] Supra.

[11] 188 U. S. 14 (1903).

[12] *Hansberry* v. *Lee* (311 U. S. 32 (1940)).

by them and by many State bar associations, in addition to the American Bar Association.

I am hoping that favorable action on this joint resolution will be taken by the Congress at an early date.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) to establish a commission to revise and codify the general and permanent laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT-LABOR RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Role of Government in Management-Labor Relations," delivered by him at the round-table discussion at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., December 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The National Science Foundation, delivered by him before Pi Gamma Mu, National Social Science Fraternity, at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D. C., December 30, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS FACING THE CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator Hill on January 2, 1948, in a discussion of critical problems which face the Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE WAY AMERICA CAN HELP—STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "One Way America Can Help," prepared by him, and published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, December 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALTGELD CENTENARY BANQUET—ADDRESS BY CARDINAL STRITCH

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by His Eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch, of Chicago, on the occasion of the Altgeld centenary banquet, at Chicago, Ill., on December 30, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY DO WE STAY IN NEW ENGLAND?—EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY EDWARD WEEKS

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from and address on the subject Why Do We Stay in New England? by Edward Weeks, editor of the Atlantic Monthly, before the advertising Club of Boston, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETERANS' ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM—LETTER AND ADDRESS OF RAY H. BRANNAMAN

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Ray H. Brannaman, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, together with a radio address by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

HENRY A. WALLACE—ARTICLES BY ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD articles by Eleanor Roosevelt dealing with Henry A. Wallace and published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News, on December 31, 1947, under the heading "Henry Wallace has always been politically inept"; on January 2, 1948, under the heading "Wallace's approach like Chamberlain's with Herr Hitler"; on January 3, 1948, under the heading "Wallace wouldn't be so cocksure if he were President"; and on January 5, 1948, under the heading "Conclusion—Wallace has done country and world a disservice," which appear in the Appendix.]

GET TOGETHER ON THE BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM THE WORCESTER (MASS.) TELEGRAM

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Get Together on the Budget," published in the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

BE A LEADER: THEY'RE NEEDED—EDITORIAL FROM THE WINDOW SEAT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Be a Leader: They're Needed," by Hon. W. D. Jamieson, published in the Window Seat, a weekly newspaper, in its January 7, 1948, issue, which appears in the Appendix.]

SIDE SHOW—EDITORIAL FROM THE PALM BEACH POST-TIMES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Side Show," by Charles Francis Coe, editor and publisher of the Palm Beach Post-Times, Palm Beach, Fla., which appears in the Appendix.]

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1948.*

(Enclosure: Report Concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.)

MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 8, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate pro tempore,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am attaching hereto a draft of bill to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, without affecting his military status and perquisities. I contemplate designating Major General Kuter as Chairman of the Board.

The draft of bill would provide that Major General Kuter would continue, while serving as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to receive his military pay and allowances, with Department of the Air Force appropriations being reimbursed therefor from appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Board, but that, in the performance of his duties as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Major General Kuter would be subject to no supervision or control by the Department of the Air Force, the National Military Establishment, or the armed services of the United States. The bill provides that in the event the civilian salary of a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board should at any time exceed Major General Kuter's military pay and allowances, the difference would be paid to him from Civil Aeronautics Board appropriations.

I would appreciate your aid in having the bill introduced in the Senate. Since it is desirable to send Major General Kuter's nomination to the Senate at an early date, I would appreciate your aid in securing the passage of the bill as soon as practicable.

I am writing a similar note to Speaker MARTIN.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES DURING FIRST HALF OF FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has just completed a summary of budget receipts and expenditures and the national debt for the second quarter of the present fiscal year. Heretofore this summary has been made available only to Members of the Senate. However, there seems to be no good reason why the public should not have the facts contained in it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the comparative statement of the public debt, budget receipts and expenditures, as of December 31, 1947, and a short accompanying statement.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR GEORGE D. AIKEN, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 8, 1948.—The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has just completed a summary of budget receipts and expenditures during the first half of fiscal year 1948. This report shows that on December 31, 1947, the public debt totaled $256,899,844,854, which is $22,864,524,494 less than the peak total of $279,764,369,348 on February 28, 1946, and $1,476,058,437 less than the total on June 30, 1947. The interest paid on the public debt during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year totaled $2,273,019,677, or an in-

crease of $46,706,349 over the corresponding period for last year.

According to information obtained from the United States Treasury, the total budget receipts during the first half of the year were $19,184,411,749, compared with a total of $18,466,138,389 for the period ending December 31, 1946. The expenditures reported for the same period this year totaled $17,525,221,067, as compared with $18,487,075,734 a year ago. Receipts exceeded expenditures by $1,659,190,682, thereby creating a surplus of this amount for the period, as compared with a deficit of $20,837,345 during a similar period a year ago (July 1 to December 31, 1946).

An analysis of the expenditures reported by the Treasury Daily Statement for the period ending December 31 indicates that of the $17,525,221,067 expended, over 79 percent was charged to five agencies of the Government and three functions or objects of expenditure. In other words, over 79 percent of the total Federal expenditures fall under the categories listed below:

Social Security Administration	$428,025,765
Department of the Army	3,691,842,348
Department of the Navy	2,141,284,404
Railroad Retirement Account	[1] 568,072,493
Credit to United Kingdom	1,400,000,000
Interest on public debt	2,273,019,677
Tax and duty refunds	425,347,845
Veterans' Administration	3,042,974,443
Total	13,970,566,980

[1] Transferred from general fund to trust account by the U. S. Treaury.

From these figures it will be observed that the four largest items of expenditure result either directly or indirectly from World War II.

These totals do not include $540,000,000 appropriated by Congress under the Interim Aid Act approved on December 23, 1947, nor any funds for the permanent European recovery program now being considered in Congress.

Comparative statement of the public debt, budget receipts and expenditures as of Dec. 31, 1947

Total public debt, Dec. 31, 1947	$256,899,844,854
Interest on public debt:	
Interest paid (July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947)	2,273,019,677
Interest paid (corresponding period last year)	2,236,313,328
Net increase this year	46,706,349
Interest rate on total debt, 2.144 percent.	
Reduction of public debt since war peak (Feb. 28, 1946)	22,864,524,494

Period	Amount	Per capita	Interest paid on public debt	
			Fiscal year	Amount
WORLD WAR I				
Prewar (Mar. 31, 1917)	$1,282,044,346	12.36	1917	$23,232,376
War debt (Aug. 31, 1919)	26,596,701,648	250.18	1920	1,020,251,623
Postwar (Dec. 31, 1930)	16,026,087,087	129.66	1931	611,559,705
WORLD WAR II				
Before defense program (June 30, 1940)	48,499,935,184	367.73	1940	1,040,935,697
Pre-Pearl Harbor (Nov. 30, 1941)	61,363,867,932	459.69	1942	1,260,085,336
War debt (Feb. 28, 1946)	279,764,369,348	1,989.76	1946	4,721,957,683
Postwar (June 30, 1947)	258,375,903,293	1,795.62	1947	4,957,922,484

	This year	Last year
Budget receipts (July 1 to Dec. 31)	$19,184,411,749	$18,466,138,389
Budget expenditures (same period)	17,525,221,067	18,487,075,734
Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	+1,659,190,682	−20,837,345

PROBLEMS WITH RESPECT TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a Senate resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 101), submitted by Mr. BYRD on April 1, 1947, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States representative to the United Nations organization bring before the United Nations organization immediately, for its immediate consideration, the present problems which have arisen with respect to Greece and Turkey with a view to having said organization take such action with respect to such problems as it may deem necessary for the immediate solution thereof.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], without objection, the resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

Morning business is concluded.

PROBLEMS ON THE FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC FRONTS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the opening of this, the second session of the Eightieth Congress, also marks the opening of a new year. The year and the session both will, in my judgment, go down in history as fateful times, times filled with fate for our Nation and for all the world. Even as we begin our labors in this new session, already grave and serious problems pend and await solution. These problems exist on both the foreign and the domestic fronts—and they are fronts—fronts against which enemies are dangerously pressing. Almost immediately we are faced with decisions to be made, decisions which will not only shape the course our country shall take and follow for many years to come, but decisions which can well shape the course other nations must adopt and follow. It is not alone legislation dealing with foreign affairs that will affect other nations. Decisions on domestic matters will likewise affect all nations and all peoples. For example, should inflation proceed unchecked and economic collapse occur at home, it would not only affect economic conditions abroad, but the world-wide repercussions of such a collapse would create unthinkable and dangerous political conditions in almost every country of the Old World.

From the heavy responsibility which rests upon us in these days there is no escape. That responsibility is here now. It is ours. It cannot be shifted to anyone else. There can be no buck passing—there should be no procrastination or delay. The issues are squarely before us. They should and must be met frankly, courageously, and with all the wisdom we possess.

It takes no high degree of intelligence to know that world conditions cannot forever continue as they now are. The widening chasm between eastern and western Europe must somehow be spanned and bridged. The already tense political and economic strife on that continent and elsewhere must end, as it surely will end some day and in some way. When it will end and how it will end depend in large measure on what we of this Congress do in this new year.

Grim and dark as the situation may appear now, to me it is not hopeless. The political and economic warfare which presently exists—and without question it does exist—can end in peace with a reconstructed, recovered, revitalized and restrengthened Old World. But that happy end, Mr. President, is not a certainty at this moment. Evil portents are everywhere. With wrong decisions and wrong action, or if there be no decision, if there be inaction, it is not at all impossible that the present political and economic discord and dispute can end in complete disaster, approaching actual anarchy and chaos.

Between the two extremes there is a choice to be made. Fortunately, today is not too late to choose. We and other nations yet have time and opportunity to make the right choice. Tomorrow—and I mean tomorrow literally—it may be too late to choose. The onrushing tides of conflicting interests are moving so swiftly that tomorrow, next week, or next month the time to choose may have passed. Our decision may be made for us before we act ourselves. Yes, it could happen that a decision might be forced, as it was at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. President, must it always be necessary that we wait for decisions to be forced? Must we always wait for a Pearl Harbor or the sinking of a *Lusitania*? Can we not exercise wisdom and discretion in advance and prevent forced decisions, decisions forced by cruel and ruthless war? There is wisdom enough in this Government of ours, with all of its branches working together, to decide in advance and before it is too late.

That is the reason, Mr. President, why I am speaking today, in the early days of the session, hoping that we may act before the bitter and unwelcome cry, "Too late, too late," is heard throughout the land.

It is not necessary for me to relate or detail to any extent whatever the precarious conditions which now prevail everywhere in the world. But it is not alone the international scene which has a somber aspect. On the domestic front there is a problem almost as serious as are matters of foreign concern. I shall not dwell on the grave domestic situation, except to say that the inflationary trend and spiral can become as deadly and disastrous in its effect on our economy at home and our way of life, and perhaps even our institutions of Government, as any issue of foreign affairs. Already that trend of ever-rising prices is well on the way toward getting beyond control or remedy. Here again it takes no high degree of intelligence to foresee the inevitable catastrophe which is bound to come unless prices soon become adjusted to a level upon which men and women in every station in life can live and retain that sense of safety and security which a stable economic position gives to all and which does not exist today.

The issue of foreign affairs and this domestic problem of inflation are the two things which prompted me in the beginning to call this session and this year "times filled with fate." Yet I do not want to sound merely a note of alarm; rather I would speak with a strong voice of hope, faith, and confidence, for if the problems are faced frankly and honestly with strong, united effort to meet and overcome all the evil potentialities contained within these issues, this Congress can, I am confident, win the battles on both the domestic and foreign fronts. With united effort, this Congress can overcome all obstacles and go down in history as one of the greatest Congresses of all times. On the other hand, if we procrastinate, if we delay, if we quibble, and if we divide, historians of the future may write that such discord, disunity, indecision, and inaction by us marked the beginning of the downfall of the Republic. Never before in the Senate have I used words such as these. Yet I use them today deliberately, and in saying them I speak not my own thoughts alone, for it is the prevailing opinion among students of government and of history that these two issues which confront us are as grave and serious as any which have come before any Congress since the beginning of our country's history. With the exception of that unfortunate period of civil strife which once existed, times have never been fraught with more evil possibilities than they are today. Yet I hasten to add that these same times are also filled with promise of good for all, for us and for the world, if we but act wisely and with complete fidelity to the Nation's good.

I am not dismayed by these issues or the necessity for the decisions to be made. I am not afraid that we do not possess the wisdom and ability to meet and solve correctly all the tremendous problems of this day. Within the membership of the present Congress there is ample wisdom and courage on both sides of the aisle, cooperating with the executive branch of Government, to meet and solve all problems.

Notwithstanding this faith and confidence in our Government, there is one thing I fear—one thing of which I am afraid, and I do not hesitate to confess this fear. I am afraid of—I do fear—the deadly, destructive effect of party politics in this year of fate and decision. Always a menace in some degree to well-considered legislation, party politics in election year develop an atmosphere of strife, contention, discord, and disunity, to which may be added selfishness and greedy ambition, all of which make wise and sound legislation almost impossible.

It is not my intention to assume the role of critic, nor to place blame or responsibility upon anyone or upon either party, but there is no use disguising the facts or mincing words. We all know that in the session just recently adjourned, the approach of the Presidential election year did exercise a baneful influence. While we passed the interim-aid bill, it was not enacted with that high degree of enthusiasm and faith required to make it strong and effective. By quibbling—and it was quibbling—its passage was needlessly delayed; things were said in debate which would have been better left unsaid. Without question some of the things which went on tended to weaken, if not to destroy, some of the best and most effective results we hoped to obtain by our action.

It was with genuine regret, Mr. President, that during the progress of that debate I heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. VANDENBERG] chided by some members of his own party. He was even accused of having embraced some strange New Deal doctrine or policy of foreign affairs, whatever that may be. Certainly a New Deal policy of foreign affairs was something none of us had ever heard of before, let alone embraced, and least of all, the Senator from Michigan. Actuated and moved solely by an overwhelming purpose to aid in bringing some degree of order and peace to this disordered, warring, and unhappy world, the Senator from Michigan has given as fine an example of nonpolitical and nonpartisan approach to these world-wide issues as has ever been given by any man or statesman anywhere.

I cannot pay this small tribute to the Senator from Michigan without also giving like commendation to the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. During the past years, regardless of which party was in the majority in the Senate, and whether it was the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Texas who presided over the Foreign Relations Committee, I often had a strong feeling of gratification as I watched these two stalwarts of the Senate stand shoulder to shoulder, fighting together, without regard to political affiliation, for the common cause of their country's good.

It is for just this kind of nonpolitical, nonpartisan approach to these two weighty and menacing issues that I plead today. Let party politics prevail—no, they need not prevail—merely let party politics enter into our debates, deliberations, or decisions on these problems of inflation and foreign affairs, and our battle in each instance is already lost. If party politics guides or directs any of us in these critical days of destiny, only disaster can or will result.

It is of this partisan division that I am afraid, and I have strong cause to be afraid. Already I have mentioned the disturbing conditions which prevailed to some extent as we discussed the interim aid bill. Those political influences were even more evidenced as we sought to enact legislation to curb inflation. Does any Senator question but that party politics did enter into that discussion?

Again, I do not want to play the role of critic or fault-finder; rather I would speak of what the people of the country are saying. They think party politics prevailed altogether in our discussion and decision on measures to stop inflation. In fact, many people with whom I talked during the vacation frankly said they thought the Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, and even the President, were playing football with inflation issues. The people with whom I talked said the Democrats tossed the ball to the Republicans, who first refused it, and later fumbled the entire issue. All the time, so the people say, the Republicans were shouting that theirs was not the responsibility, that the President was solely to blame. For partisan reasons they tossed the ball back to the Democrats, who in turn juggled and bounced it back to them. The Democrats were also loudly disclaiming responsibility, and sought to place the blame on the Republicans. None of the people with whom I talked had any confidence that the measure finally passed would have beneficial results. All expressed a feeling of distaste at the way we handled the situation, and especially at the attempt to shift blame and responsibility from one party to the other. The people are not interested in fixing blame. They want constructive action.

One man said the charges and countercharges of who killed OPA reminded him very much of the nursery story Who Killed Cock Robin? "Not I," shouted the Democrats. "Not I," echoed the Republicans, and all the time prices were, and are, going higher and higher.

It is against all of this kind of thing and against the creation of such an impression throughout the country that I speak today. Early as it is in the session, it is not too early to speak and to voice our views against partisan politics in connection with these matters. Already there are trends which indicate that party lines are being drawn on both these issues. Even this week, I understand, the Republican Policy Committee has met to determine Republican policy and attitude on these questions. Soon the Democratic Policy Committee, of which I am a member, will in all likelihood meet, perhaps to determine the Democratic policy or position.

Last week in New Mexico I read an Associated Press story to the effect that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was urging the Republican Members of the Senate to present a Republican European recovery program. It is true, Mr. President, that the news

article itself hardly bore out the headlines, which indicated the impression of the story as I have given it; but unfortunately a great many people read only headlines, and from the headlines which appeared in the paper I read, it was plainly expressed that the Republican members of this body were to submit a separate, Republican program for European recovery.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement in regard to what he has just said?

Mr. HATCH. I prefer to wait until I complete my statement, and then I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. President, such a party program, whether it comes from the Republicans or whether it comes from the Democrats, is exactly what this country does not want and does not need. The people do not want a Republican European recovery policy. With equal vigor I assert that the country does not want a Democratic European program. What the country wants and what the country needs and what the people are demanding is a united American program. Not only is this true as to the European recovery program, but the people also want an honest effort made to halt the boom which nearly all people are beginning to believe will sooner or later result in the "bust" of which they are afraid, and upon which some countries are relying to force us to withdraw from Europe.

Is it necessary to say, Mr. President, that on these highly important issues there is no room for party politics? Of course there is a time, a place, and a season for party politics, just as there is for everything; but on these issues, in this session of the Congress, in this new year of 1948, it is not the time, it is not the season, and it is not the place for party politics. Politics naturally must prevail on some issues. National campaigns are a necessary part of our system of government. I would not abolish politics, but I would confine politics to proper issues. They should never, Mr. President, enter the life stream of the Republic.

On other issues and lesser matters we can draw party lines, if we desire; but not on these. There is too much at stake here to indulge in political bickering or jockeying for position in the Presidential race.

I have said what people are thinking. It is not only the rank and file of the people who are having these disturbing thoughts. Practically every editor, every columnist, and every commentator in the country has pointed out the danger of politics in the consideration of these matters. All deplore the situation, and nearly all are calling for what Mr. Lippmann calls an agreed national policy. In his article he points out, on the inflation issue, that if measures for allocation, priorities, and rationing recommended by the President, were adopted, against the opposition of most of the business communities and of the Republican Party, they would be unworkable, and it would be dangerous for the administration to possess such powers if they could not be used successfully. He also said, and now I quote his exact words:

> The Republicans, on the other hand, realize that to refuse these powers would be dangerous too. For then if the inflation gets out of hand and brings on an economic crisis, they will be the popular scapegoats.

Mr. Lippmann adds that hesitation and reluctance could lead only to "indecision, inaction, and so far as the inflation goes, to a policy of let her rip." He further suggests, and I quote his words:

> But it can also lead to an agreed national policy—which is the only kind of policy that can be made to work.

Others have made similar suggestions. One newspaper, the Detroit Free Press, in an excellent editorial on the inflation issue, asks Congress to seek the best expert advice and guidance from the top-ranking authorities of the Nation, representatives of every shade of economic thought, and to have those authorities selected by a nonpolitical agency, such as the Brookings Institution. The editorial suggests that with such advice and with such a united effort of Congress and the administration, business and labor and all the public would accept the advice as the best possible way out of a dangerous situation.

I agree wholeheartedly that what this country needs more than anything else on both of these issues is an agreed national policy. With such an agreement in the Congress and with cooperation from the executive branch on both issues, whatever decision they reached could be placed before the American people and before the world as one strong, united, national policy having the support of Republicans and Democrats alike. Inevitably such a policy, so adopted, would soon be accepted and would have the support of the people of America. By such a process we could remove the threat of partisan politics; and whatever the final outcome might be, whether of credit or of blame, neither party would gain and neither party would lose. After all, it would be the smartest and best politics both parties could play.

But how all this is to be brought about is a perplexing question. How will it be possible to achieve such an agreed national policy? Wise indeed it would be to call in the experts and to confer with a nonpolitical organization, such as the Brookings Institution, from which as to administrative matters of the Marshall plan the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has already requested advice. Wise as is that procedure, it is not enough. There must be some medium or method by which party lines may be obliterated, some opportunity given for the leadership from both parties to get together, resolve their differences, and decide on an agreed national policy. I say leadership, because it is manifestly impossible to invite all the committees or all the members having to do with these important subjects to one conference.

In this regard I have a suggestion to make, Mr. President. It is only a suggestion—something to ponder over and think about. If anyone else has a better idea or thought, I hope it will be forthcoming quickly.

On foreign affairs—which will be the first issue we shall consider—the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations rightfully has exclusive jurisdiction. Incidentally, I should add here that I have no fear that party politics will enter into the discussions in the Foreign Relations Committee. Always in that committee—at least, since I have been a member of it—party politics have seldom appeared, if ever, and have had little, if any, weight. However, to reach an agreed national policy, others should be called into consultation, to work out and determine what that agreed national policy should be.

It will be recalled that under the Reorganization Act the law sets up policy-making committees. One is the Democratic policy committee, the other is the Republican policy committee. It has never been my thought that these policy committees were set up solely to promote party-policy programs. Such would be a prostitution of the purposes of the Reorganization Act. Regardless of the intention of the authors, those should be instruments to determine policies for the welfare of the country, not for parties alone. In my judgment, it was the necessary recognition of party dividing lines that called for two committees, rather than one general policy committee, composed of both Democrats and Republicans. But on the two issues of which I speak, why not strike out that party line and have agreement between and with the two policy committees? Let us unite them for this purpose, and have one policy committee for the Nation.

That is my suggestion: That the two policy committees, Republican and Democrat, join with the Foreign Relations Committee and sit with it throughout the hearings and discussions on the European recovery program. Of course, under the Senate rules and the terms of the Reorganization Act, Senators who are not members of the committee could not be permitted to vote or otherwise exercise full powers as committee members. Were it otherwise, I would suggest that the members of the two policy committees be given equal authority with members of the Foreign Relations Committee; but of course that is impossible. However, that is no particular deterrent to what I have in mind. If the members of the two policy committees would forego all other duties and would give their full time to the committee hearings, in completely unprejudiced and unbiased consideration of the facts adduced at the hearings, I cannot help but believe, Mr. President, that under such circumstances, and foregoing, of course, political considerations, all would reach approximately the same conclusion. There is no reason why men of equal ability, equal integrity, equal patriotism, and proceeding without any consideration of politics, should widely differ in ultimate conclusions. Of course, sometimes there is a small minority which honestly differs from the majority. Unfortunately, such differences cannot always be avoided, but, on supreme issues such as the ones I have mentioned, I cannot help entertaining strong faith that differences could be resolved and agreement reached.

It would even be my hope that with a full, frank, and nonpolitical approach, it would be possible to reach an almost unanimous decision. If such agreement could be reached, those powerful committees could come to the floor of the Senate and throw the strength of their united decision and action behind the

plan agreed upon. Without any doubt, whatever, I say, unhesitatingly, such a plan so agreed upon would be adopted, and in all probability the House would concur. Likewise, the President would, in my judgment, cooperate to the fullest degree, and for once we would have an agreed national policy. Furthermore, it would be one which would be accepted by the country. On both issues, with such passage and support, any plan could be administered without the opposition and griping which inevitably follow any measure half-heartedly and unenthusiastically passed. Moreover, the whole world would know that the full strength of America and all her resources were behind and strongly supporting without division the national policy, or better, the American plan.

The same procedure could be followed with legislation to curb inflation. The only difference would be the substitution of the Committee on Banking and Currency for the Committee on Foreign Relations. The best advice and help in America could be obtained for such a nonpolitical effort. Difficult as it may be to stop inflation without promoting deflation, it could be done by a united, unselfish, and nonpolitical approach. But it is also as true as that I speak today, that without such approach, a disastrous crash is bound to come. Let that happen, let depression sink to the depths where it may well go, and there will be no escaping responsibility. Democrats and Republicans alike may and perhaps should feel the righteous wrath of an outraged public—a public which is already sick and tired of politics taking precedence over the country's welfare.

Mr. President, it has not been my purpose today to argue for or in support of any plan, either for European aid or to curb inflation. My only desire is to urge avoidance of party politics and to plead for united support on both these issues for whatever plan may be finally agreed upon in the manner suggested.

While I have spoken rather frankly, I have not said one-half of what I wanted to say or perhaps should have said. Not my words, but the situation before us, presents a challenge to the Congress. It is not a challenge to Republicans any more than it is a challenge to Democrats. It is a challenge to us all.

I have tried to meet that challenge by offering the suggestion made today. It is not proposed as a final answer. It is made as a tentative proposal, to be adopted only if something better cannot be found or devised. It is the objective to be achieved that I emphasize, rather than the method.

I realize full well that the suggestion made or any other similar suggestion may not be heeded. Such is usually the case when anyone attempts to resist or uproot the political party system, which is so deeply entrenched in every governmental activity, especially when a Presidential election year presents so many tempting political morsels. Generally, efforts to avoid politics are called impractical and unrealistic. Too often, and because of so-called realism and practical politics, efforts to unite upon any subject without regard to political considerations fail. Such fate may await the proposal made today.

I do not know whether the suggestion is politically realistic and practical or not; frankly, I do not care. I do know that the people of America want action on both the problems I have discussed and that they want it now. The man in the street, who is not too much interested in practical politics, is vitally interested in the cost of living, which is already far too high. Why should he not be interested? Many of our citizens, both men and women, I am told, are selling war bonds to meet living expenses. And the man in the street is also firmly grounded in the belief that conditions abroad contain the seeds of another terrible and deadly war. He wants something done about that; and he should want something done, for, if worst comes to worst, it is the average American citizen who will furnish the material, do the work, and pay the taxes. It will be the sons of the men in the street who will be called into service to fight and perhaps die upon inglorious and unnecessary battlefields.

In these most grave matters, the citizen can look only to his Congress and to the Executive to find the right and proper answer to his and to the Nation's problems. In his search he is looking neither to Republicans nor to Democrats. He looks to his Government, composed of both Democrats and Republicans, and there he has a right to look. To the average citizen, the man who represents all America, we are under heavy responsibility in this hour of crisis—for such it is. Our high obligation is to discharge our duty to him and to all the country, without thought of political gain or advantage. That obligation transcends party loyalty or party gain. Our duty to him and all Americans can best be summed up with a quotation from one of America's greatest, the founder of the Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln. The words were brought to memory by a Christmas card sent out this year by one of our own Members. In a time of great crisis, when the possibility of war threatened and the fate of the Union hung in the balance, Mr. Lincoln, speaking in Cooper Union Hall, New York City, on February 27, 1860, said:

> Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

In that same spirit, in this hour of crisis, when again the fate of our country may hang in the balance and when the threat of war hangs heavy over all the world, may we also have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, to the end, may we also dare to do our duty as we understand it.

Nothing more than intelligent performance of simple duty is required of us. We dare do nothing less.

Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks, but, as I left my office, I picked up several recent editorials commenting on the present situation. I ask unanimous consent to have three of them printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks. One of them I wish to read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibits A, B, and C.)

Mr. HATCH. The editorial which I desire to read is entitled "Challenge to Congress," from the Christian Science Monitor of January 6, 1948. It reads as follows:

The session of Congress opening today is going to enable us to tell men from boys. The National Legislature faces tests such as it has rarely known in peacetime—and all the harder because not dramatized by war. Also at the very time when partisanship is particularly tempting—an election year—petty politics has become most dangerous.

The times cry out for men. For men with vision enough to grasp world issues. For men with patience enough to persuade opponents and the uninformed—and persuade again. For men with courage enough to stand against the demagogue. For men with compassion enough to feel humanity's need. For men with wisdom enough to cleave through confusions. For men with godliness enough to put principle before party.

We hope the event will prove that many of the "boys" in Congress have grown up. For puerile qualities—heedlessness, ignorance, rashness, irresponsibility—will not meet the challenge of today. America has come of age as a world power, indeed, as a world leader. Those who would lead America must display the bigness, the judgment, the steadiness of maturity.

Of course, the challenge is not alone to Congress. The people of the United States as a whole have suddenly been thrust into the midst of tremendous events. Without the centuries of preparation other nations have had for a role of world leadership, they find themselves pushed upon the stage.

In an election year the temptation to dodge that role is going to be doubly strong. The high cost of living at home will be much closer to most citizens—and may appear more dangerous—than the hunger and desperation which foster communism abroad. The desire for tax cuts may seem to many to outweigh the advantages of defending democracy by aiding the reconstruction of Europe. And always there will be the temptation to put politics ahead of patriotism, self-interest ahead of the general welfare.

The Marshall plan will be the biggest single question before Congress. And the big question about the Marshall plan is whether it is going to be too little, too late. We can't guarantee that it will succeed. But as Warren Austin, United States representative to the United Nations, said, a farmer doesn't know that he is going to get a crop when he plants, but he can be sure he won't get one if he doesn't.

The Marshall plan should be put first. It should be rigorously examined and perfected—although it has had 6 months of study and revision. And it is well for the American people to realize that they will have to put more than dollars into it. They will have to put imagination, courage, unselfishness, and understanding into their new world role. But mere doubts, mere appeals to prejudice or selfishness which would dangerously delay or hamstring an effective recovery program—those things the American people should reject emphatically.

Let the people insist that Congress and the administration measure up to the challenge which now confronts them. Doing so they can turn danger into opportunity.

EXHIBIT A

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 4, 1948]

UP TO THE PEOPLE

What will the second session of the Eightieth Congress be?

Will it be a shining demonstration of democracy at work—the kind of performance which will impress weary peoples abroad that we practice what we preach about representative government?

Or will it be merely the warm-up for the 1948 Presidential race with all the playing of politics that habitually has preceded such campaigns?

Will Republican and Democratic Party leaders recognize the tinder-box state of the world? Will they accept their obligation to work together in the solution of pressing domestic and international problems for the benefit of peoples everywhere?

Or will the chief aim of these party leaders be to put the other in the hole, to pass the buck, to unload responsibility—all with one purpose and one purpose alone, to get the most votes in November?

Every Member of the Eightieth Congress and every member of the Truman administration, from the President down, whose duty it is to work with Congress should ask himself such questions as the session convenes.

Now is the time—now and in the first few days of the session. It will be too late 2 or 3 months from now after interparty warfare and personal ambitions have been allowed to compile a bitter political record.

There is no doubt as to the kind of session the country will be saddled with if our political leaders are left to their own devices. The usual disposition of professional politicians is to do as little as possible and to play politics in any event. Such a disposition will be all the more pronounced in a Presidential year which sees Congress in the hands of one party and the Presidency in the hands of the other.

The timid, feeble approach to inflation is more than enough evidence of this. As everyone knows, the price spiral and all that it entails is the No. 1 domestic problem. It has ramifications which reach around the world.

Yet even though the Truman administration came up with an inadequate program of inflation control, the Republican congressional leaders would not go that far. The intent of each party in the special session was to commit itself as little as possible and to make it appear that the other party was responsible for not halting the upward rush of living costs.

Bad as it is for politics to be played on vital domestic issues, it is worse to mix Presidential campaign maneuvers into international problems. Yet clearly there are those who would not stop short of that. Already we have the announcement by the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that it is doubtful whether the Marshall plan can be fully considered by June 1.

For many citizens the question about the Marshall plan is whether it should not be in operation before April 1 if it is to be effective. Certainly it will have no chance at all if it is delayed and delayed into the future all the while the Communists are infiltrating themselves as they are throughout Europe today.

This session of Congress is an instrument of the people just as the executive branch of the Government is also an instrument of the people. Neither has any validity except as it comes from the citizens. Both will stand in judgment before the voters this year.

But the people do not need to wait until November to exert their control. They—individually and collectively through groups and organizations—can advise Congress and President alike that first things are to be put first in Washington. They can demand a higher level of political performance than they have had in Presidential election years.

They can order it and they can get it if they will use the power of public opinion.

EXHIBIT B

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 5, 1948]

STATE OF THE NATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The whole atmosphere in Washington now is heavily political. A dozen Presidential aspirants, a hundred Vice Presidential aspirants are maneuvering for the inside lane. Both parties and the liberal and conservative forces within both parties are maneuvering for what they consider the most advantageous positions. The record of the President, whether supported or rejected by Congress, and the record of Congress, however much vetoed by the President, are seen as contributing major campaign ammunition for this fall.

Only if the country makes it unmistakably clear that it wants the best from Congress, not the political worst, will there be much chance of Congress giving it the best in 1948—the year of great decision.

EXHIBIT C

[From the Washington Daily News of January 6, 1948]

THE BEST POLITICS

The Eightieth Congress begins its second regular session today. It faces many tough problems, many grave responsibilities. The way it tackles the problems, the way it shoulders the responsibilities, may spell the difference between prosperity and depression for America, between peace and war for the world.

Republicans control House and Senate, and a Democrat sits in the White House. And 1948 is a Presidential election year. So there are predictions that this session of Congress will be a continual struggle for political advantage—that everything done or attempted will be influenced by partisan motives.

We do not expect Congress or the President to forget the campaign or to eschew partisanship.

But we believe the American people do expect Republicans and Democrats alike to remember that neither party can win worthwhile advantage by scheming to put the other into a hole unless the country is kept out of one.

To ask for no politics would be too much. It is not too much to ask for the kind of politics which puts the true welfare of the United States above the ambitions of any and all politicians. That is the best politics, in any year. It is the only sort of politics which seems likely to insure that, to either party, next November's election will be worth winning.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe I understood the Senator from New Mexico to say at one place in his remarks that he had read in a newspaper a statement that the question of foreign policy had been discussed in a Republican policy committee meeting or in a meeting of the Republican conference.

Mr. HATCH. No; that was not it. The headline or caption of the article I read was not borne out by the statement which appeared in the body of the article itself. I regret that apparently I did not make that clear. The headline said the Republican policy committee was going to meet in order to determine a Republican European recovery program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that I am a member of that committee, and I have attended most of its meetings. When I have not attended its meetings I have checked on what occurred at them. The question to which the Senator refers has never been discussed in that committee's meetings. We have not discussed foreign policy in the committee, except when we listened to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] last spring.

Mr. President, I wish to say that with much of what the Senator from New Mexico has said I am in hearty accord, and I commend him for his high ideals, for the high plane on which he has placed the question of the determination of our foreign policy, and, if there has been a misapprehension in his mind respecting the matter to which he alluded, I should want to correct that misapprehension.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it was not a misapprehension on my part. I thought I made clear that the body of the article did not bear out what was said in the headline. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his statement.

AMERICAN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN ISSUES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have all been very much interested in the remarks which were just made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. It is the American way that Congress and the people should be given the viewpoint of all those who are to provide the leadership in the Senate and country to effect a settlement of our domestic policy, as well as our foreign policy. Senators have not only heard the great address just delivered by the Senator from New Mexico, but also heard what was said by the President of the United States at the joint meeting of the House and Senate last Wednesday, when the President delivered his message on the state of the Union.

Last night there was broadcast over the ABC network a very able address to the American people by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who also expressed his views on the great issues, both domestic and foreign, now before the American people, upon which we all desire as much light as possible. I ask unanimous consent that at this point, following the address delivered by the Senator from New Mexico, the most able address delivered last night by the Senator from Ohio over the radio be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator if he can assure us that the address in question was a nonpartisan one.

Mr. WHERRY. I can assure the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that it was just as nonpartisan as the speech delivered by the President of the United States before the joint session of Congress Wednesday and the speech just made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, it was delivered over the radio as part of a sort of joint debate between the President

and the Senator from Ohio, who aspires to occupy the place now occupied by the President of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say that I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. BARKLEY. As to his candidacy? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. No; with respect to the statements made by him in his radio address. I am glad to say that I am convinced that the distinguished Senator from Ohio is one amongst many in the Republican Party who, if he were elected President of the United States, would grace the President's chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say that far be it from me to throw a straw in his way as a candidate for the Republican nomination.

Mr. WHERRY. We on this side deeply appreciate that statement, and I hope the Senator from Kentucky will go further and say that a great man like the senior Senator from Ohio might also be acceptable to him as President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. That calls for further discussion. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask my able friend just one question, whether or not the Senator from Ohio, in delivering his radio address last night, spoke as a candidate for the Presidency or as an individual Senator, or did he speak as a result of action taken by the Republican policy committee of the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have not consulted with the able Senator from Ohio as to whether he spoke as a candidate, or in his capacity as chairman of the policy committee. I am, however, quite satisfied that if I were to put the question to him he would very frankly state that the views he expressed last night represented his deep convictions on the paramount domestic and national issues involved.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield in just a moment. I am satisfied that the distinguished Senator from Illinois will agree with me that when it comes to a decision on a nonpartisan basis respecting our foreign policy, the cooperation of the Republican Party on these great issues can be assured. No one would deny the high purposes expressed by distinguished statesmen in presenting their views on the great issues now before the Senate and the country. Naturally, however, there are those who believe that the issues involved should be settled in accordance with the respective questions involved. My purpose in asking that the address made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio be printed in the RECORD is of a constructive nature, namely, in order that the views of the Senator from Ohio may be made available to readers of the RECORD. It is my thought that this very forcible and clear analysis of the issues should follow the able address made by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, so the public can read the RECORD and see how these leaders present their viewpoints and offer solutions of the important problems now confronting us.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to say to my able friend from Nebraska that I heard on the air last night the very pleasant, refreshing, and dulcet voice of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio. He speaks frequently over the air in answer to what the President of the United States has said. I wonder whether the acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska, would care to tell us if there is anyone else on the Republican side interested in the Republican nomination for President who sometimes may have an opportunity to answer the President of the United States, or does the Senator from Ohio have a monopoly on that privilege?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not speaking in behalf of any individual who may aspire to the office of the Presidency. We have in the Republican Party a number of men who might aspire to be President of the United States, who could very ably answer the President of the United States or the Senator from New Mexico, or even my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, on the great issues now before us.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska, and I simply wonder why answer is not made once in a while by others than the Senator from Ohio. I see in the chair, presiding over the Senate, my good friend the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] who was sent to the Senate from the great State of New York. He has made an enviable and commendable record in the Senate. He comes here through the grace and good will of the distinguished Governor of New York, who, I understand, is a candidate for nomination on the Republican ticket.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair regrets that the Chair cannot enter into the debate. The Senator from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair can call some other Senator from the floor to take his place and then enter the debate. That is the Chair's privilege, under the rules.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is doing very nicely.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are so many outstanding Republicans mentioned as candidates for nomination for the Presidency on the Republican ticket, including the Senator from Nebraska, I have often wondered why it is that the Senator from Ohio is the only one who apparently ever answers any of the arguments which have been presented by the President of the United States. I do not think it is fair to Governor Dewey, I do not think it is fair to Governor Stassen and other distinguished individuals who are out in the open seeking nomination on the Republican ticket for the Presidency, that our distinguished friend from Ohio should consume all the time that is being taken to answer the President of the United States. As a matter of fair treatment, I am interested in Governor Dewey, and I am interested in Governor Stassen and others having an opportunity to reply to the President. I cannot understand why the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] who is my close personal friend, and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who now occupies the chair, do not interest themselves to see that the candidates from their respective States or some of their capable representatives are given the privilege of answering the President of the United States. In view of the fact that the Senator from Nebraska has made much ado about the speech which was delivered last night, I thought perhaps he could throw a bit of light on that situation, because I am sure the country is more than anxious about it.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I could throw a little light on it by asking the Senator from Illinois a question. The Senator from Illinois is speaking as a Vice Presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket?

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I did not know he had such a warm interest in the political side of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois is much concerned about the problems of the Republican Party, but I think that party will take care of itself. I was wondering if the Senator from Illinois was not worrying about the Democratic Party, and if the needling which comes from my distinguished friend is not due, perhaps, to the fact that he also is in the limelight as a candidate—a candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Nebraska has a right to draw any assumption he desires. As usual, he reaches erroneous conclusions upon supposed facts about which he knows nothing.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the Senator is not a candidate?

Mr. LUCAS. It is slightly premature to discuss something about which the Senator knows nothing.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, the Senator does not know anything about it?

Mr. LUCAS. While speaking of candidates, may I remind my good friend that I remember distinctly that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], in the early part of the Eightieth Congress, said on the floor of the Senate that if a reporter from the Press Gallery threw a pebble down on the other side of the aisle, whatever Republican Senator it might strike would be found to be a candidate for high office, either for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency. The Senator from Nebraska, I believe, was present and did not deny that assertion. I presume, in view of the tremendous leadership he is exerting here as the acting majority leader, that probably if such a pebble were to hit him he would become a candidate without serious protest.

Mr. WHERRY. We will let that leadership take care of itself. As far as candidates from either party are concerned, in due time they will be able to take care of themselves.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator from Nebraska will

permit the Chair to interrupt for a moment, the Chair will act on the request made that the address delivered by the Senator from Ohio be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the address will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT, BROADCAST OVER ABC NETWORK JANUARY 8, 1948

I listened with great interest to the message of the President of the United States on the state of the Union. The message states in general terms the ideals and principles and program of the present administration. The detailed specifications for some actions have been already filled in by measures proposed, or presumably will be filled in by later messages. No one can fail to agree with most of the ideals expressed by the President. No one can fail to agree with his general desire to bring about improved conditions in this country and throughout the world. No one can fail to agree with the five goals which he seeks. We all join with him in wishing the country a happy new year and a happy new 10 years, happier than the 15 years of New Deal administration.

But when the President comes to fill out the measures by which he hopes to accomplish this happiness and these great purposes, while he still speaks in general terms, we see that, under the guise of American ideals the old New Deal has been revived in a more global form than ever before. In this message the Federal Government comes forward as Santa Claus himself, with a rich present for every special group in the United States, and for everyone else who may not be included in any special group.

If anyone has expressed a desire in a letter to Santa Claus, that desire is to be promptly fulfilled.

One cannot but feel that the recent announcement of Mr. Henry Wallace has had a substantial effect on the state of the Union. Henry himself will have a hard time to find anything to promise the people of this country which is not promised in this message.

The President is apparently determined that the right wing of the American Labor Party and its labor union friends throughout the country shall be bound to him and shall have no excuse to stray into the Wallace camp. He has raised all the ghosts of the old New Deal with new trappings that Tugwell and Harry Hopkins never thought of.

The first point that occurrs to me is that the New Deal administration has been in control of this Government for 15 years. If the country is crying for all these improvements in social welfare and every other field, what has the New Deal administration been doing for 15 years? They demanded and obtained from Congress infinite power so great that President Roosevelt said it would only be safe in his hands and not in those of the Republicans. They demanded and received huge sums of money. Plenty of that money was spent, but apparently little was accomplished. The President admits it. He says our social-security system has gaps and inconsistencies and is only half finished. As a matter of fact, the old-age-insurance system is utterly and completely inadequate. Today, men who have contributed to that system all their lives receive less in their old age than many receive from old-age assistance who have contributed nothing.

The President says there is still "lack of provision for the Nation's health," and "that most of our people cannot afford to pay for the care they need." This is a gross exaggeration, but what has the New Deal been doing with all our money?

He says that millions of children do not have adequate schoolhouses or enough teachers, and that millions of our youth live in city slums and country shacks. Surely, this is a more severe indictment of the Roosevelt administration than any Republican has made, for that administration had more power and more money to accomplish its purposes, widely advertised for political effect, than any administration in the history of the United States.

Of course, the problem is not so simple as that. An improvement in social and economic welfare depends on intelligent planning, wise leadership, sound principles, and sound constructive work. Those we have not had. Both parties—and Henry Wallace—wish to improve the condition of the people in the United States. That can be the only aim of anyone truly interested in government. The Republican Party is just as much concerned as Mr. Truman with speeding up and stabilizing the great economic machine which creates prosperity for this country. It wishes to adopt those measures which will bring the greatest good to the greatest number of people, and then alleviate the condition of the few who, through misfortune, may not benefit from that prosperity. There are few indeed in public life who have the slightest interest in whether a few rich men prosper or do not prosper, whether corporations make profits or don't make profits, except as their status may affect the people of the country and the welfare of their employees. There are few indeed who don't equal the New Dealers in their sincere and earnest desire for uplift and progress in America.

But we do question the effect of New Deal measures and philosophy. Most of their plans are more likely to interfere with prosperity than they are to bring it about, first, because they ignore the fundamental economic principles necessary for prosperity, second because they promise something for nothing, and third because they ignore the vital necessity of maintaining the principles of freedom and justice to which they give a general lip service. Measures which destroy the freedom of the individual, freedom of States and local communities, freedom of the farmer to run his own farm and the workman to do his own job, in the end do more harm than good, even to those supposed to be benefited. Measures which reduce the field in which the free competition of private enterprise can operate, reduce both freedom and production. Measures which ignore justice for social ends destroy the fundamental purpose of the American Government.

The first principle of the New Deal was the spending of money. This message, in tax recommendations, admits that taxation is already too heavy on millions of people. Yet, strangely enough, the message proposes additional expenditures far beyond the $40,000,000,000 which is said to be included in the budget still to come. Nothing is said of additional taxation to take care of all the handouts that are proposed. The people are to get something for nothing from dear old Santa Claus.

What are these proposals likely to cost? They are so vague it is impossible to do more than make an intelligent guess. The level of benefits is to be raised for all unemployment compensation, old-age benefits, and survivors benefits. In years to come this would amount to billions of dollars, mostly to be collected from employers, employees, and general taxation.

The national health insurance system, which is not insurance at all, but the providing of free medical care to all the people of the United States, would require taxes, probably pay-roll taxes, in the neighborhood of four or five billion dollars a year.

The President says: "Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health." This seems to be a kind of catch-all Beveridge plan for the United States which would take about 18 percent of pay roll, or about $20,000,000,000 (including health insurance and present levies for old-age insurance and unemployment compensation). Of course, it would be taxation, not insurance.

The various proposals for aid to education are vaguely stated, but I would guess they might amount to a billion dollars a year. The housing program might cost two hundred million. From the message we cannot judge the estimate of the additional public works, but the reclamation program is to be expended, although the Republican Congress in 1947 appropriated more money than has ever been appropriated before in a single year. In some manner not defined, the average income of farmers is to be raised well above that which exists at present. Any such agricultural program as the President seems to envision will certainly take cash from the Federal Treasury in large hunks. More money is asked for the school-lunch program, the electrification program, the soil-conservation program, and adequate diets for every American family.

Then in the field of foreign affairs we come to the Marshall plan, involving about $3,000,000,000 a year more than we are now spending, but apparently included in the new budget. The President states that we must maintain strong armed forces and must add to our present system at least compulsory universal military training. The cost of that is estimated anywhere from two billion to four billion dollars. The President's Air Commission is about to recommend an increase of $2,000,000,000 a year in the expenditures for our Air Force. If war with Russia is our present concern, then certainly the Air Force is going to play a much more effective part both in defending this country and attacking Russia than universal military training.

Altogether, I would estimate that if we follow the President's recommendations we would spend almost at once $10,000,000,000 a year more than we are now spending, with later increases to come. Where is this money coming from? We raise today about $20,000,000,000 from the personal income tax. If we want to get the money from that personal tax, we will have to increase it by about 50 percent. Since you can't increase by 50 percent the taxes of the wealthy, who pay 80 percent already, most of the burden will have to fall on the lower- and middle-income groups. If the money is collected from more pay-roll taxes, it will certainly fall on the lower incomes. If more business taxes and taxes on corporations are levied, they are paid in the last analysis by individuals, through higher prices or otherwise. So in one way or another the 60,000,000 workers in this country are going to pay those additional taxes, either directly or through a further increase in prices. In short, the President is simply following the old New Deal principle of promising the people something for nothing without telling them of the real cost. I do not mean to say that all the features of the President's program are to be condemned. I only point out that taken together they add up to national bankruptcy.

The President in some parts of his message compares the condition of our people favorably with 1938, incidentally in the midst of a New Deal depression. At other points he pictures the condition of our people as about equal to what prevails in Russia. What have we got for all the New Deal spending of the past 15 years, except taxes and rising prices and war? Now the President talks about a new 10-year plan, doubling Joe Stalin's bid. What reason have we to think that the social welfare of our people would improve any more in the next 10 years than it has in the last 15 years?

The other feature of the message which stands out is the New Deal request for more power and more interference with the daily lives of the people. The message asks again for rationing, for price control, for wage control, and for complete power to allocate the products of industry.

It asks again the power to draft 1,200,000 boys a year out of their homes and schools and trades and professions into military training.

It asks again for power to socialize and nationalize medicine. Under the President's health program three or four billion dollars would pour into Washington from pay-roll taxes or other taxes to be used by a Washington bureau to pay all the doctors in the United States to give free medical service to all the people in the United States. That means, in effect, that all the doctors would become employees of the Federal Government. It means that the Government by regulation would determine when any family could have a doctor come to his home, and when they would have to go to the clinic or the hospital, whether they could have X-ray treatments or special medicine and the whole character of their medical treatment. Certainly, nothing could more intrude into the freedom of the American family than Government medicine of this kind.

Throughout the message all the emphasis is on action by the Federal Government. Not a word is said anywhere of preserving the power of the States and local communities to improve their own affairs or direct their own education, health, welfare, and housing. The message follows the standard New Deal line that places all power in Washington bureaus. If we destroy the independence of our communities, I don't believe we can retain any real popular freedom in a country the size of the United States. Again, I do not mean to condemn all of the projects. I only point out that taken together they will add up to a totalitarian state.

The Truman plan for control and rationing would leave about as much freedom in this country as Stalin's 5-year plan has left in Russia. Not only do control measures destroy freedom, but they don't get the results. President Truman himself said that rationing and price control are police state methods. Such methods won't work in the United States in peacetime, as we saw under OPA. They can't be enforced. Black markets spring up overnight.

If these controls could be enforced they would stifle production as they have in Europe and did here—and more production is the ultimate solution. Freedom and free competition made America the greatest producer in the world; and have made it possible for us to help Europe. The President shows no sense of the real causes of inflation. Prices go up when there is more money to buy things than there are things to buy. We are producing more today than ever before, but the Government has created still more paper dollars. The ultimate solution of inflation is to increase production and that is what controls always prevent. Then, while you are increasing production, you have to cut down spending; and that is what price control has always encouraged.

The President doesn't say a word about the need for economy. He claims credit for cutting the budget from 63 billion in the fiscal year 1946 when we were engaged in war against Japan, to 38 billion 2 years later when we are in peace. Not much credit in that. In 1948 we are still spending four times what was ever spent before the war.

The first step to stop spending is for the Government to stop spending. That will set an example and enable it to get some cooperation from the people so that they can spend less and save more. The biggest inflationary element has been the export of goods and services in 1947 up to $18,000,000,000 against only $8,000,000,000 of imports. Ten billion dollars came in here, mostly loaned by us, to compete with our citizens for goods and services produced here. Of course prices have gone up. Of course wheat is at $3 a bushel. The President had full power to limit exports, but he hasn't used the power and he doesn't say a word about using it in his message.

Furthermore, the administration let bank loans increase in a year by $5,000,000,000, creating that many more paper dollars, and failed to use the powers it has always had to restrict bank credit. The President doesn't say a word about any of these American methods of preventing inflation.

Outside of controls, his only suggestion is that taxes must remain high. Our tax burden today is about $40,000,000,000. With the State and local taxes, it amounts to about 30 percent of our national income. This cost of Government is a burden on the other 70 percent of the productive workers. The tax burden is passed on for the most part into higher prices paid by every consumer for the food, clothing, and shoes that he buys. Less Government spending and less taxation are the most obvious of the methods of dealing with the price situation. The President recognizes that taxes are unbearably high and proposes a credit of $40 to each individual taxpayer plus $40 for each dependent. This will take about 11,000,000 taxpayers off the rolls altogether. It is equivalent to a $200 additional exemption for persons in the low-income groups and less than $50 additional exemption for those in the higher groups. It is about as discriminatory a proposal as could be made, and if followed to its logical conclusion will ultimately exempt a large proportion of all income and shift all taxes into a very small proportion of the population. Up to now we have gone on the theory that each citizen owes an obligation to his Government to contribute according to his means.

The President says a straight tax reduction would be inflationary, but if so, his proposal is equally inflationary at this crucial time because the reduction takes effect at once, whereas the proposed increase in corporation taxes won't be paid until 1949. In any event it is the total tax burden which increases prices, and that the President refuses to lower.

Of course, the increase in corporation taxes from 38 to 50 percent is another discouragement to any increase in production needed for full employment and lower prices. New enterprises are less likely to be started if persons feel that the Government is going to take half the possible profits. Of course, many new enterprises fail and the people who start them lose all the money they have put in. It would be "heads you win, tails I lose." In one place in his message the President says: "We are today far short of the industrial capacity we need for a growing future. At least $50,000,000,000 should be invested by industry to improve and expand our productive facilities over the next few years." In his midyear economic report last July the President said: "High corporate profits have provided funds for a substantial proportion of the heavy volume of business investment during the first half of 1947."

How does the President expect business to make this great investment of $50,000,000,000 if taxes take away the profits and makes it unprofitable for new money to go into business? It is estimated today that it costs $6,000 of new investment to create one new job in industry. If we want to keep full employment going, that investment must continue. I suppose it is smart politics to take money out of corporation profits and divide it up among the voters at $40 a head, but sometimes I doubt whether smart politics is smart.

Twice last year President Truman vetoed tax reduction bills on the pretense that they would increase inflation. Now in a message in which he says inflation is worse, he asks for tax reduction. Probably you will get tax reduction now, but what about the reduction you were entitled to last year and didn't get? The President has followed the prediction of every Member of Congress, newspaper correspondent, and radio commentator. They all said that Truman vetoed the tax bills last year because of Republican sponsorship and that he would try to get credit this year—election year—for cutting taxes. It looks to me like playing politics with your money.

The Republican Congress proposes to go on with its program. It has consistently given the President all the powers he needs to stop inflation by American methods. We have given him everything except the OPA and wage fixing and rationing, police-state methods. All the important powers he has had ever since the war, but he hasn't used them. It doesn't look as if he wanted to reduce prices. Whenever any food price starts going down, or even threatens to go down, some Government department steps in and starts buying to keep up the price.

We will make every effort to cut Government expenditures, and really cut all taxes and the tax burden, and cut them for good.

We will scrutinize every expenditure, including the Marshall plan, so that it may include nothing which is not absolutely necessary.

We will proceed with a program of social welfare in health, education, and housing and social security. But our program will be based on State and local administration and control, and Federal aid in reasonable sums will be limited to those fields where the States and communities cannot adequately do the job which ought to be done, for the benefit of those of our population who cannot earn their own way. We will insist upon sound fiscal policies to keep the economic machine running at full speed to provide employment and prosperity on a permanent basis. We will work out our program of progress along those American lines, within the principles of freedom and justice which we followed for 150 years, and which have made this country the happiest on the face of the globe.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad to enter into the debate. I think the request made by the Senator from Illinois was a fair one. I believe the American people are entitled to know from the candidates representing both parties how they stand on the important issues of the day. I also believe that those who are candidates for other offices than that of the Presidency, including the Vice Presidency, should make known their views to the people.

Mr. President, in order that there shall be no misunderstanding, so far as I am concerned, I wish to make one statement. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois is a candidate or not. If he is, I think he should speak out for himself. But right now, so far as the Democrat who is now addressing the Senate is concerned, I am for Secretary Marshall, and for no one else.

Mr. WHERRY. As the debate proceeds we receive a number of ideas, and we are all glad to have them.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I beg of Senators not to begin enumerating the names of prospective candidates for President and Vice President. If that is done, we shall not get through until the early hours of the morning.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield the floor, so that the able Senator from South Carolina may address the Senate.

IMPORTATION OF JAPANESE TEXTILES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and myself, to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Jap Cottons Head for United States Market," published in the Journal of Commerce of January 8, 1948. I intend to speak at length on this subject, because it affects the textile mills of New England and the South, the cotton farmers, and the textile workers throughout the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAP COTTONS HEAD FOR UNITED STATES MARKET

(By Daniel Small)

For the first time since before the war, Japanese cotton textiles are to be made available for sale to domestic users. Prices will be competitive with comparable constructions in the domestic market, it was learned yesterday.

Civil affairs officials of the Department of the Army in Washington confirmed that cotton goods no longer need be brought here for reexport only but will be sold in the American market. This decision to remove domestic restrictions was reported to have been arrived at after joint conversations between Army, Agriculture, and State Departments.

RAYONS, SILKS IMPORTED

Under previous arrangements only rayon-finished fabrics, raw silk, silk habutai had been permitted entry for use in this country. Cotton goods of all descriptions have been traded through United States firms, but have been only for export to other countries either directly from Japan or by passing through this country.

At present, it was learned, about 2,000,000 yards of Jap cotton goods have been passing through the United States in bond each month. Government officials agreed that this figure could be easily increased and some spoke in terms of reaching about 10,000,000 yards per month for use in this country.

Government officials believe that the goods now in bond, which include sheetings, poplins, print cloths, and other cheap carded constructions may be made immediately available for sale in this market although they had been brought here with the intention of reexporting them.

Although some Army spokesmen declared that the quality of most of these goods was too poor to attract much attention in this market, private traders who have been surveying the Jap industry recently stated that quality is far better than before the war, inspection is up to American standards in most instances and constructions can easily be made suitable for the American market if SCAP officials in Tokyo decide to really shoot for sales here.

BETTER FINISHES

In certain types of finishing, the Japs have also advanced considerably over prewar standards, traders asserted, and finished goods may also be adapted to American needs if this business is found desirous.

The decision to permit Jap cottons to be sold here has been made over heavy opposition from United States millmen who remember vividly the flood of cheap Jap goods which were endangering domestic manufacturers in the years immediately preceding Pearl Harbor.

This opposition has come from many industry spokesmen and because of them it was understood that at least one of the departments whose approval was needed has held up the decision until now.

RESULT OF STEADY PRESSURE

The pressure to permit such a move has been building up steadily, however, and the final decision in the form of a new directive should be issued shortly, it was reported yesterday.

In view of the fact that cotton goods have been scheduled as the principal export item for Japanese industry, SCAP has been hard-pressed to secure sufficient dollars to keep this industry going and the sale of textiles here has presented itself as the most obvious method, it was pointed out.

With the Jap industry depending largely upon American cotton to keep it going, the need for American dollars has become acute at times. In order to obtain these dollars, even cottons for reexport have been sold only to those countries which could pay for them in dollars. It has become increasingly difficult in recent months to find sufficient dollars to pay for all of the Jap textiles available, although world demand for textiles is still very great.

REVISING PRICES

In order to bring cotton goods into a more salable position in the domestic market, it was understood that SCAP officials in New York are revising price lists to bring quotations more into line with those of selling houses in the Worth Street market. These new price lists will probably supersede the current ones which were prepared by USCC some time back.

The revisions will mean that some prices will be brought up while others will be reduced somewhat. Currently, private traders are quoting such prices as the following for goods to be shipped from Japan to the country of destination. These prices include C & F plus a profit of about 3 percent on gray goods but do not include a duty of about 15 percent which would have to be added on most types of cloth if sold here:

For a 38-inch 64-by-56 5.19-yard print cloth, 21 to 21¼ cents.

Thirty-eight-inch 60-by-48 5.72-yard print cloth, 19 to 19¾ cents.

Thirty-seven-and-one-half-inch 100-by-60 broadcloth, 28½ cents.

Thirty-six-inch 45-by-44 3.30-yard sheeting, 27½ cents.

Thirty-inch 70-by-48 drill, 24¼ cents.

Thirty-inch 131-by-71 combed broadcloth, 54¾ cents.

While some of these prices will be revised they can be considered fairly indicative of prices which will be quoted here with a duty of from 2 cents to 4 cents added to most staple constructions.

Mr. MAYBANK. The newspaper story which appeared in the Journal of Commerce of New York in the issue of January 8, 1948, announced the decision of the Departments of State, Agriculture, and the Army to authorize the sale of Japanese textiles in this country.

I have been much interested in this subject since the beginning of the rehabilitation of Japanese industry, when the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] asked me to serve on a subcommittee to study the plan for sale of American raw cotton to the Army for use in making cotton cloth in the Japanese industry.

At that time it was generally agreed that none of the cloth made from American cotton would be sold back in this market. The reason for such a provision was simply that every yard of Japanese-made cloth which is sold in the United States would obviously replace a yard made in this country and would therefore reduce the domestic market for American cotton and reduce the jobs for American textile workers just that much.

It was my hope, and that of my distinguished colleagues who served on the subcommittee with me, that in rehabilitating the Japanese industry that our efforts would result in restoring the normal and natural markets of the Japanese in the Orient, where they are sorely needed, rather than in dumping Japanese goods on the American market.

I am particularly surprised, therefore, and deeply concerned, to read the announcement currently made that these three departments of the Government of the United States, without exhausting the possibilities of sale of products made in this captive country in its normal oriental markets, where the Japanese goods are greatly needed, are suddenly dumping them here in the United States, where there is much less need for them and where their only effect will be to demoralize the American market.

It should be remembered that never in the past have textiles from Japan been sold in this market successfully except when sold at a cut price. They are relatively inferior to our American textiles.

Mr. President, I am deeply sympathetic with the problem which those who operate the Japanese industry find in locating a market which will pay United States dollars for Japanese textiles. We all know that, if the Japanese industry is to use American raw cotton, it must pay United States dollars for our cotton, for our American farmers cannot and should not accept any other payment except United States dollars for the cotton which they sell. However, in my judgment, those who sell Japanese textiles can find dollar markets in the Orient in the very markets which were formerly normal Japanese markets. We know that our American industry is selling American textiles in export and in quantities far exceeding the proposed Japanese exports; and with modern merchandising methods our industry is finding many times the dollars which the Japanese need for the purchase of American cotton. It seems to me that it is simply a question of expert merchandising and selling to private interests in the export market, concerns which historically and professionally have bought and sold world textiles, including Japanese textiles.

Mr. President, I submit that probably the principal reasons for the failure of our governmental agencies to exhaust the normal market resources in the Orient are the inability of any army to convert itself into a skilled expert merchandising organization; the tendency of a government department, inexperienced in selling, to seek the easy, simple method of allocating goods to countries rather than selling them to private interests which operate professionally in the field, and possibly the attitude of our allies who have interests in the oriental markets, and who may be reluctant to cooperate with us in the rehabilitation of Japanese industry, which we as lovers of democracy know is absolutely necessary for the peace and security of the world.

As a Senator from a cotton-producing and manufacturing State, I am unwilling, without raising my voice in protest, to stand by and see departments of our

Government plan to jeopardize the interests of the cotton farmers of America and the jobs of the cotton-mill workers of our country by encouraging a flood of goods made by a captive industry in our domestic market.

Our textile workers cannot compete for the world market against the cheap wages of the Japanese workers, and we cannot help our American cotton farmers by bringing their cotton which is sold in foreign markets back into the American market to compete with the American cotton which is sold here.

At the outset the Japanese volume may be relatively insignificant, but when we let down the bars and establish a precedent, there is no telling how fast it will grow. Furthermore, Mr. President, if the Japanese demonstrate that they can find American dollars here at the expense of the American market, it will encourage every other impoverished nation in the world to do likewise, and we shall soon reduce our domestic market to a veritable hodge-podge of foreign merchandising throat-cutting which will demoralize the nearest, biggest, and best market which the American farmer has for his cotton, and the result will be a steady elimination of thousands of jobs of our American textile workers.

Mr. President, our Department of State and our Army may, if they wish, publicly show their compassion for the foreign governments which wish to keep the Japanese from reclaiming their oriental markets and force them into our own domestic market; but as for me, my compassion is for the American cotton farmer and the American textile worker, both of whom merit our full sympathy and protection.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to voice my protest against the announced determination of these three governmental departments. I insist that before taking such a step they should first exhaust every market resource in the areas where Japanese goods have always in the past found their natural markets.

In conclusion, I remind the Army, the State Department, and the Congress that it was our American textile mills which clothed the armies of all the Allies during the recent war. They furnished the cloth and much of the machinery needed in that branch of the war effort. They furnished the materials for tents for the armies of our allies and materials required by paratroops. The importation into this country of Japanese goods made from American cotton supplied by the Commodity Credit Corporation can have but one result, and that is to depress and destroy our textile industry, causing the loss of thousands of our good textile workers, and ruining an industry which, as I have said, clothed our allies in the war which has just ended.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina in the views which he has just expressed. I think it is important to this country and vital to the cotton industry—both the producers of cotton on the farm and the manufacturers, as well as those who work in the mills—that our market be preserved. I think it is a mistaken policy to undertake to permit Japan to unload her manufactured goods on the American market in competition with the products of our own manufacturers. I believe that nothing but detriment would result, both to our producers and to our manufacturers, as well as to those who work in the mills. I am glad the Senator has presented this subject fully, and I heartily endorse what he has said.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate what the Senator from North Carolina has said. I remind my friends across the aisle that the great textile industry of New England will suffer severely when these Japanese goods enter our market.

INVESTIGATION OF THE APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably Senate Resolution 186, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 186) submitted by Mr. LANGER on January 7, 1948, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the last paragraph of Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 17, 1947 (authorizing an investigation of the appointment of postmasters), is hereby amended by striking out the date "January 15, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "February 28, 1948."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, in line 5, to strike out "February 28, 1948," and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1948."

At the time the investigation was ordered the expiration date for the making of a report was January 15, 1948. I may add that the overwhelming majority of the nominations of postmasters have already been reported and confirmed. There is some additional work to do with respect to approximately 37 nominations. A little time will be required to complete the work.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there apparently being no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 12, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 9, 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Wilson C. Flake, of North Carolina.
Nelson R. Park, of Colorado.
Carl W. Strom, of Iowa.
William T. Turner, of Georgia.

Glen W. Bruner, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Delano McKelvey, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

William L. Hamilton, Jr., of Iowa.
James L. Meader, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Linton Crook, of Alabama.
Philip Ernst, of New York.
George F. Kelly, of Massachusetts.
L. Pittman Springs, of the District of Columbia.

Leslie A. Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Bernard Gufler, of Washington.
Oscar W. Meier, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Francis O. Allen, of Pennsylvania.
Bryant Buckingham, of Illinois.
Wesley C. Haraldson, of Virginia.
John B. Holt, of Maine.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mark Edwin Andrews, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Burton N. Behling, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1952.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Wayne Coy, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1944, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

George E. Sterling, of Maine, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of seven years from July 1, 1943, to which office he was

appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

HOUSING EXPEDITER

Tighe E. Woods, of Illinois, to be Housing Expediter, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

J. Alston Adams, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for the term expiring June 30, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

William K. Divers, of Ohio, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1951, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be War Assets Administrator, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, United States Navy, retired, to be Associate War Assets Administrator, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT

George B. Gillin, of San Francisco, Calif., to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., in place of Neal H. Callaghan, deceased.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Walter R. Sturr, of Florida, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York, in place of Harry M. Hickey, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Joseph A. Ziemba to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill. (Reappointment.)

Alden H. Baker, of Noblesville, Ind., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind. (Reappointment.)

Elaine Beadling to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 12, with headquarters at Pittsburgh, Pa. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective January 5, 1948:

Jack Masur

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective January 5, 1948:

Robert L. Cherry

Senior surgeon to be temporary medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective January 5, 1948:

Jack Masur

Surgeon to be temporary senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective January 5, 1948:

Robert L. Cherry

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Senior assistant dental surgeon to be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective December 24, 1947:

Herbert A. Spencer, Jr.

Senior assistant surgeon to be temporary surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective December 24, 1947:

Herbert Tabor

Assistant surgeons to be temporary senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective December 24, 1947:

Elroy G. Burgwald

John H. Miller

(The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

To be ensigns in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated:

Eugene W. Richards, December 20, 1947.
Samuel D. Parkinson, December 30, 1947.
Harrison F. Dunbrook, January 7, 1948.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Percy C. Fountain, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama, vice Albert J. Tully, term expired.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Felipe Sanchez y Baca, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico. (Mr. Baca is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Homer N. Wallin, United States Navy, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

The following-named staff officers for appointment to the permanent grade of rear admiral in the Navy:

OFFICERS OF THE SUPPLY CORPS

Capt. Howard M. Shaffer

OFFICERS OF THE CHAPLAIN CORPS

Rear Adm. William N. Thomas
Capt. Thornton C. Miller

OFFICERS OF THE DENTAL CORPS

Rear Adm. Alfred W. Chandler
Capt. Spry O. Claytor

The following-named staff officers for appointment to the temporary grade of rear admiral in the Navy:

OFFICERS OF THE MEDICAL CORPS

Rear Adm. Herbert L. Pugh
Capt. Bertram Groesbeck, Jr.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPPLY CORPS

Capt. Howard M. Shaffer
Capt. Herbert C. Lassiter
Capt. John Ball

OFFICERS OF THE DENTAL CORPS

Capt. Clemens V. Rault

Midshipman John C. Shannon (Naval Academy) to be ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 6th day of June 1947 in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June 1947:

Charles R. Mischke
Charles B. Teal

Jerry W. Bates to be an ensign in the Navy from the 6th day of June 1947 in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

Edward F. Krueger to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948 in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lowell K. Cunningham	Robert W. Jessee
	Lee W. Stewart

James H. Harris

Marshall V. Perry (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Thomas H. Boothman	Fred L. Cofer, Jr.
James C. Carroll	Charles R. E. Deily
Earl F. Liebtag, Jr.	William D. Warne
Harold H. Reichert	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Robert C. Doerpinghaus
William E. Nims

Patricia L. Ratcliffe to be ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of name.

The following-named officers of the grades indicated in the line of the Navy:

COMMANDER

William L. Eagleton

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Roger VanN. Powelson
Gerald V. Reynolds

LIEUTENANTS

Harold M. Gutekunst
Dick M. Wheat

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Joseph A. Forte, Jr.
Henry W. Miller

LIEUTENANTS

Alfred J. DelRey
Dominic A. Kuljis

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Jay S. Broadbent	John M. Jones
Carleton J. Brown	James M. Keirman
David M. Butler	Jay R. Longley
Richard B. Connor	John S. Neill
Kevin A. Doyle	John M. Packard
Adolphus W. Dunn	Bernard H. Pender
John G. Esswein	Robert W. Ratton
Frederick L. Evans	Stanley E. Reese
Mack M. Hill, Jr.	Lawrence F. Smith

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

John E. Carson
John R. Wible

LIEUTENANTS

William J. Harrison	Grant A. MacLean
James F. Keenan	Joe A. Teaff

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Malcolm E. Boone	Charles E. Oxar
William J. Carter	Eugene P. Weigand, Jr.
Blayne A. Gumm	

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

William P. Briggs

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Gladys LaV. Kennedy
Ruth C. Vickers

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, we need Thy power, obtained through prayer, to solve problems, decide issues, and to do Thy will. But let us not imagine that this formal prayer can take the place of private petition. May there arise from every desk

the silent prayer that seeks to know Thy will. We long for such guidance that when a thing is right, we shall all know it; and when it is wrong, it will not be proposed. We would not run away from truth, but find a refuge in it. We would not avoid the discipline of hard thinking, but deliver us, O Lord, from wrong thinking that leads to wrong conclusions. Guide us this day, for Thy mercy's sake. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KNOWLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 9, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

HUGH BUTLER, a Senator from the State of Nebraska; HOMER E. CAPEHART, a Senator from the State of Indiana; SHERIDAN DOWNEY, a Senator from the State of California; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, a Senator from the State of Louisiana; J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, a Senator from the State of Arkansas; J. HOWARD MCGRATH, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island; BRIEN MCMAHON, a Senator from the State of Connecticut; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Senator from the State of Washington; and WAYNE MORSE, a Senator from the State of Oregon, appeared in their seats today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I find it necessary to go to Florida tomorrow upon public business. I may not be able to return before the end of the week. Therefore, I ask consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the time of this necessary absence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF CARL A. LOEFFLER

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, birthdays are happy occasions when they present themselves each year. Today marks the seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of a man with whom we have all been closely associated for many years, Carl A. Loeffler, our distinguished Secretary.

Of his 75 years, he has served the Senate well for a total of 59 years. He first came to the Senate as a page in 1889 from the State of Pennsylvania and continued to serve in close relationship with the Republican Members of the Senate until his election as Secretary of the Senate on January 4, 1947. His devotion to duty has been constant and his friendship loyal.

I know I speak the sentiments of the entire membership of the Senate when I say to Mr. Loeffler that we extend to him our congratulations and good wishes and express the sincere hope that he may continue to enjoy the good health and happiness which have been his for so many years.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it gives me pleasure to join with the distinguished acting majority leader in paying tribute to Carl Loeffler and the high public service he has rendered to his country for such a long space of time. While I have not been a Senator as long as many of my colleagues, yet during my period of service I have not hesitated to seek Mr. Loeffler's counsel and advice on numerous occasions, not only while he was serving the minority party, but also during the time when the Republican Party was in the majority. I am happy to say that at all times Mr. Loeffler has uniformly been kind, courteous, and affable. During all the 9 years I have served as a Member of the Senate, I have never heard one unkind word spoken about him.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations investigating commodity speculations be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

THE BUDGET

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 97.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON INSPECTION OF COAL AND LIGNITE MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second report covering conditions in all underground bituminous-coal and lignite mines inspected by Federal coal-mine inspectors during the 6-month period July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF WAGE AND HOUR AND PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor for the year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., pursuant to law, for the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions and a memorial, which were referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by Hugh A. Carlisle Post, No. 13, the American Legion, Albuquerque, N. Mex., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish a commission to hear and adjudicate claims of American nationals who were prisoners of war of the Japanese; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the National Governors' Conference, Chicago, Ill., relating to the shortage of oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring adoption of measures recommended by the Special Committee on Living Costs and Food Conservation for the city of Milwaukee (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the National Congress of American Indians, of Claremore, Okla., signed by Ruth Muskrat Bronson, secretary, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 162, to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted by the Hawaii Young Farmers Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., requesting the Congress to reconsider its action of 1945 by extending the time limit for local participation in Federal highway funds from June 30, 1948, to June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

RENT CONTROLS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I believe that the veterans of the United States and the people generally are of the opinion that rent controls in some effective manner should be continued. I have good evidence of that before me, in the form of a resolution from the Edward C. DeSaussure Post, No. 9, of the American Legion, at Jacksonville, Fla., which is the largest veterans' organization in northern Florida. The resolution asserts that rent controls should be continued with proper adjustment of rent levels in hardship cases. I ask that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following these remarks by me, and that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Duval County Rental Advisory Board is now considering the question of recommendations to be made to the Federal Housing Expediter regarding changes in rent levels or even the complete decontrol of all rents in this area; and

"Whereas the Edward C. DeSaussure Post, No. 9, of the American Legion, the largest veterans' organization in northern Florida, believes that the question of rent controls is a matter of vital concern to the veterans of this community: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the Edward C. DeSaussure Post, No. 9, of the American Legion go on record as favoring, in the interest of veterans, the continuance in Duval County of rent controls at the present levels under the existing laws and regulations, with the adoption of a liberal policy of adjustments of rent levels in hardship cases: Be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forthwith sent to the Duval County Rental Advisory Board, the Federal Housing Expediter, the Congressman from this District, and the Senators from Florida."

I, F. Tom Nooney, adjutant of the Edward C. DeSaussure Post, No. 9, of the American Legion, certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly and unanimously passed at a regular meeting of said post held at Jacksonville, Duval County, Fla., on the 4th day of December 1947.

[SEAL] F. TOM NOONEY,
Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 12, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Anna Baca	Clerical	$3,626.56	$1,813.28
Lorena Betsch	do	3,626.56	141.04
Frank Burnett	Staff member.	7,075.06	2,947.94
Costas D. Chrissos	Clerical	3,626.56	1,339.81
Thomas F. Fox	do	4,288.68	95.30
Colette E. Homan	Chief Clerk	5,695.66	2,847.83
Mary Irwin	Assistant Chief Clerk.	4,288.68	1,953.73
Dorothy Lynott	Clerical	3,626.56	1,813.28
Esther Petersen	do	3,626.56	1,662.17
John D. Phenix	Actuary and statistician.	10,000.00	5,000.00
William Posey	Staff member.	7,075.06	589.59
George D. Riley	Staff director.	10,000.00	5,000.00
Frank A. Vogel	Staff member.	10,000.00	5,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	6,503.02
Balance unexpended	3,496.98

WILLIAM LANGER, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE—SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE INVESTIGATING APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 81

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 12, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
H. Ralph Burton	Chief investigator.	$7,628.08	$3,199.53
Thomas F. Fox	Investigator	5,530.14	2,642.15
John M. Henshaw	Research worker.	6,540.00	50.27
Arthur P. Lamneck, Jr.	Investigator	5,695.66	1,392.25
Emil Levin	Counsel	10,000.00	777.76
Myrtle Paynter	Clerk	2,964.65	1,235.15
John R. Risher, Jr.	Assistant investigator.	5,116.32	1,776.50
Dillard C. Rogers	do	5,116.32	1,478.04
Mrs. Jennie Ulsrud	Clerk	2,964.65	1,548.03
Walter K. Van Olinda	Assistant investigator.	5,116.32	2,060.74

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$35,000.00
Amount expended	18,584.15
Balance unexpended	16,415.85

WILLIAM LANGER, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 5, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Orren L. Jones	Clerk	$10,000.00	$4,326.65
Wm. A. Stevens	Assistant clerk.	10,000.00	4,871.07
Eloise Porter	do	5,281.84	2,640.86
Frances Stovall	do	4,619.73	2,309.86
Jeanette Grooms	do	2,964.45	1,482.22
Mary Batalo	do	2,964.45	494.00
E. W. Bassett	Professional staff.	10,000.00	5,000.00
Ronald Moist	do	10,000.00	5,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended (previous to June 30, $2,251.62) since June 30, $105.96	2,357.58
Balance unexpended	7,642.42

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 31, 1947.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteenth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Albert L. Seidel	Chief Clerk	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Nelson Deranian (July 17, 1947.)	Professional staff.	10,000.00	4,555.53
George J. Nilles	Assistant clerk.	6,522.05	3,261.03
Ela N. Hathaway	Clerk (research.)	3,461.04	1,730.52
Phyllis M. Wherry	Clerk (stenographic.)	3,129.98	1,564.99
B. Floye Gavin	Clerk (research.)	4,868.02	2,434.01

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure remaining July 1, 1947	$9,414.17
Amount expended July 1, 1947, through Dec. 31, 1947	7.30
Balance unexpended	9,406.87

C. WAYLAND BROOKS, *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1965. A bill to provide for the payment of Sioux benefits to certain women of the Sioux Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1966. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with the city of Astoria, Oreg., in the improvement and expansion of its water-distributing system for the purpose of assuring an adequate supply of water for the Tongue Point naval base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. MORSE also introduced Senate bill 1967, to provide for a coordinated anti-inflation program, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BALL introduced Senate bill 1968, to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of State, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills, and at the request of the Public Health Service I introduce for appropriate reference a bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. TAFT (by request):

S. 1969. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III; and

S. 1970. A bill to provide for the refund of the taxes deducted pursuant to the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, from the wages of Mexican railroad workers employed in the United States under the agreement of April 29, 1943, between the United States of America and the United Mexican States and for other purposes; and

S. 1971. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. FLANDERS introduced Senate bill 1972, to amend the Social Security Act to permit an adopted child of a deceased individual to receive benefits thereunder without

regard to the period during which he shall have occupied such status, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1973. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1974. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1975. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1976. A bill to amend section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to provide for learners' permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COORDINATED ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a coordinated anti-inflation program. The bill proposes to set up an economic stabilization coordinator, and I have these comments to make on the bill in explanation.

During recent weeks the lack of coordination among the Government agencies that are supposed to be fighting inflation has become increasingly evident. In their appearances before congressional committees, agency heads have given conflicting testimony and contradictory interpretations of President Truman's program.

If there is such a lamentable lack of coordination in testimony before congressional committees, what but confusion can be expected in the administration of the anti-inflation program? That is just exactly what we have—utter confusion.

Irrespective of what specific anti-inflation measures are passed by Congress—and it is obvious that some measures which really will be effective should be enacted—it is essential that there be a coordinated administrative set-up. Otherwise, any acts that Congress may pass are doomed to failure. This is a problem that calls for high-minded, nonpartisan action by the Congress.

It is ridiculous to think that a coordinated program to fight inflation can be developed merely by giving separate jobs to the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury Department, and other agencies as the administration apparently proposes to do. It will result in a most noneffective program, as the administration's program has been to date.

It is just as ridiculous to assume that the President can take on the full-time task of coordination. Nor can any coordinator operating merely under an Executive order be expected to do an effective job. What is needed is an Economic Stabilization Coordinator set up under congressional authority to sit in the executive offices and keep all the agencies working together as a team under principles of administration laid down by Congress. This was the lesson learned during the war. If it is forgotten now, our program of aid to Europe may be wrecked by rampant inflation in America and our free-enterprise economy may once again go down the boom-and-bust road to economic collapse.

My bill does not give the executive branch any price control, rationing or allocation powers. Its purpose is to provide for the coordinated administration of emergency powers already exercised by the executive branch or to be delegated to the executive branch under future emergency legislation, so sorely needed.

Nor does the bill provide for setting up a large superagency. The Economic Stabilization Coordinator is to work through the existing departments and agencies. His major responsibility would be to plan a consistent attack on inflation, to provide a clearinghouse for plans developed by individual executive agencies, to issue directives to individual agencies and settle disputes among them, and to prepare legislative recommendations to Congress. He would also be required to submit a full report to Congress every 3 months.

The Coordinator would be subject to Senate confirmation, and hold office until December 31, 1949.

The bill also sets up an Anti-Inflation Advisory Board composed of 12 persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Three would have special experience in business, three in agriculture, three in labor, and three would be chosen as public representatives without reference to any special field. The Board would advise with the Coordinator in the preparation and administration of the anti-inflation program.

The bill (S. 1967) to provide for a coordinated anti-inflation program, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOME RULE AND REORGANIZATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia. It is a bill, I may say, which was drafted by the Subcommittee on Home Rule of the House District Committee headed by Representative AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, as a result of extensive hearings and a quite extensive study by the staff of that subcommittee. For the information of the Senate, I will say it is the plan of the Home Rule Subcommittees of the House and Senate District Committees to hold joint hearings on this bill beginning February 2, and to attempt to secure enactment of legislation granting home rule to the District at this session of the Congress. I think it is becoming more and more apparent to all of us in the Senate that Congress is too busy with national affairs to devote to the problems of the District the attention which they deserve and need.

The bill (S. 1968) to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. BALL, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO ADOPTED CHILDREN OF DECEASED INDIVIDUALS

Mr. FLANDERS. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit an adopted child of a deceased individual to receive benefits under the act, without regard to the period during which he shall have occupied such status. I will say, briefly, that there are a number of serious injustices in connection with adopted children, and that in attempting to remedy them by this bill I have the support of the Social Security Administration.

The bill (S. 1972) to amend the Social Security Act to permit an adopted child of a deceased individual to receive benefits thereunder without regard to the period during which he shall have occupied such status, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CHANGES OF REFERENCES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1657) to enable veterans who are civil-service employees to take advantage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1458) providing for the continuance of compensation or pension payments and a subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I or II during education or training, and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. With respect to the two referrals, does the Senator from Ohio think that under the rules of the Senate the Presiding Officer has the power to change the reference of a measure?

Mr. TAFT. I have consulted the Presiding Officer and the Parliamentarian, and they feel the bills should be referred to the two committees I have indicated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MOTION PICTURES, RADIO BROADCASTING, AND COMIC STRIPS IN RELATION TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. FREUND

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Arthur J. Freund at a meeting of the criminal-law section of the American Bar Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on September 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATE FACES THE ATOMIC FUTURE—VALEDICTORY ADDRESS BY JAMES D. DANLEY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a valedictory address entitled "The High-School Graduate Faces the Atomic Future," delivered by James

D. Danley at the commencement exercises at the Turkey Creek High School, Hillsborough County, Fla., on December 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO CONFEDERATE VETERANS OF THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN H. PINSON

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. John H. Pinson before the Alabama House of Representatives on June 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE NETHERLANDS IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD—ADDRESS BY DR. A. H. PHILIPSE

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Some Economic Problems of the Netherlands in the Postwar Period," by Dr. A. H. Philipse, commercial counselor of the Netherlands Embassy, delivered before the Women's National Democratic Club on December 8, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

EVERETT DIRKSEN'S ANNOUNCEMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE PEORIA JOURNAL-STAR

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitld "EVERETT DIRKSEN'S Announcement," published in the Peoria Journal-Star for January 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. TRUMAN'S PLATFORM—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Platform," from the Evening World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., of January 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND ONE DISPLACED PERSONS VERSUS SIXTY MILLION EMPLOYED

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "One Hundred and One Displaced Persons Versus Sixty Million Employed," by William E. Zipp, president of the Ceco Steel Products Corp., of Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOD BLESS AMERICA—ARTICLE BY REV. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "God Bless America," by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, published in the Washington Sunday Star for January 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRADING IN GRAIN FUTURES—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Grain Trading Cuts Your Bread Bill," by Harry A. Bullis, and an editorial entitled "Trading in Futures," from the Washington Post of January 11, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S 1949 BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have made regarding the budget.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, ON THE PRESIDENT'S 1949 BUDGET ESTIMATES, JANUARY 12, 1948

A budget of nearly $40,000,000,000, 3 years after the war, compared with nine billion before the war, is a dangerous gamble with our national solvency, especially with the continuation of imprudent and wasteful expenditures which are contemplated.

The failure of the President to recommend retrenchment in the existing bloated Federal spending places the job of eliminating wasteful and unnecessary expenditures squarely upon the shoulders of Congress, and unless there is a reduction in Federal expenditures, a financial crisis in America such as now exists in England is within the realm of possibility. This would mean world chaos.

To emphasize the fact that we are skating on thin fiscal ice, a 10-percent recession in the national income (the aggregate income of all citizens)—and this is more than likely in the near future—would mean a loss of $5,000,000,000 in Federal tax revenue. Such a reduction would put us in the red again on the basis of the President's budget estimates today, and that makes no allowance for any tax reduction.

Our greatest responsibility is to keep America strong at home. Fiscal instability here would serve the enemies of democracy far more than any weapon that could be devised. Our financial soundness is the only hope for world stability. Without it there would be no bulwark against communism and freedom could not survive either here or elsewhere.

ACTION BY UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION ON GRECIAN-TURKISH PROBLEM—RESOLUTION POSTPONED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to advise the Senate that with respect to Senate Resolution 101 coming over from a previous day, favoring action by the United Nations Organization looking to a solution of the Grecian-Turkish problem, submitted by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Virginia has requested that the resolution be indefinitely postponed. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. Under the order of Friday last, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there may be no objection, beginning with the first order number thereon. The Chair calls attention to the fact that, under the rule, a Senator is entitled to speak once and for 5 minutes only upon any question.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Gurney
Ball	Connally	Hatch
Barkley	Donnell	Hawkes
Brewster	Downey	Hayden
Bricker	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Brooks	Eastland	Hill
Buck	Ecton	Hoey
Bushfield	Ellender	Holland
Butler	Ferguson	Ives
Byrd	Flanders	Jenner
Cain	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Capehart	George	Johnston, S. C.
Capper	Green	Kem
Knowland	Moore	Stewart
Langer	Morse	Taft
Lodge	Murray	Taylor
Lucas	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	O'Daniel	Thomas, Utah
McCarthy	O'Mahoney	Thye
McClellan	Pepper	Tobey
McFarland	Reed	Vandenberg
McGrath	Revercomb	Watkins
McKellar	Robertson, Va.	Wherry
McMahon	Robertson, Wyo.	Wiley
Magnuson	Russell	Williams
Malone	Smith	Wilson
Maybank	Sparkman	Young
Millikin	Stennis	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent on official business of the Committee on Public Lands.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

For the benefit of Senators who were not present when the previous announcement was made, the Chair will state that under the order of Friday last the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there may be no objection, beginning with the first order number thereon. The Chair calls attention to the fact that under the rule a Senator is entitled to speak once and for 5 minutes only upon any question.

The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS IN LIEU OF COINS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 865) to provide for the striking of medals in lieu of coins for commemorative purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I urge the passage of this bill, which is a bill to end all bills for the striking of

commemorative coins. It provides for the striking of medals in lieu of coins for commemorative purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Am I to understand that this bill is one of a number of such bills?

Mr. FLANDERS. No. This is a bill to end special coinage bills.

Mr. LUCAS. I am in favor of such a bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote uniformity in the designs of the various coins of the United States, to facilitate their proper use as circulating media, to enable counterfeit pieces to be readily detected, and to avoid the confusion which arises from special issues of commemorative coins, it is declared to be the policy of the United States to authorize the striking of commemorative medals in lieu of commemorative coins and to discontinue the striking of such coins.

SEC. 2. The director of the Mint shall enter into contracts subject to such terms and conditions as the Director shall prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the striking and furnishing of such commemorative medals as may be authorized from time to time by law. The striking and furnishing of medals pursuant to this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes, except that the dies necessary for the preparation of such medals may be prepared at the mint, with the machinery and apparatus thereof, from suitable models submitted to and approved by the Director of the Mint. The Director of the Mint shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3552 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 369), all proceeds received from the manufacture of such medals shall be credited to the appropriation against which the cost of manufacture has been charged.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 669) to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) amending rule XXII relating to cloture was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Let the resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 354) to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and other Senators: Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we hope to call up this bill or the Stevenson bill sometime during the month of January. However, I believe that this bill should be passed over at the present time.

The bill (S. 408) to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 309) designating American Indian Day was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have heretofore objected to this bill, and there has been some question as to why I objected to it. On a previous occasion I stated that I would be glad to honor the Indians by designating some special day for paying proper tribute to them. However, until the obligation which this Government owes to the Indians in my State and elsewhere throughout the Nation is fulfilled, I do not feel that the passage of a bill setting aside an Indian Day means anything. It is but an empty gesture. I do not wish to make empty gestures. Therefore I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXPENSES OF SEVENTEENTH TRIENNIAL CONVENTION, WORLD'S WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

The bill (H. R. 1179) to aid in defraying the expenses of the Seventeenth Triennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators. Over.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator who objected to consideration of the bill withhold his objection for just a moment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, this is a very small and unimportant bill from the standpoint of the money proposed to be appropriated. However, it is an exceedingly important bill from the standpoint of what we have done in the past, and the reason for which the appropriation is asked.

For more than 51 years international conferences of women who have been working for temperance throughout the world have been held. This is the second time the conference has come to the United States. The first time the Congress of the United States appropriated $10,000 to help defray expenses. This time the State Department recommended an appropriation of $5,000, which would be adequate, because fewer persons attended the conference.

The House passed the bill. The Secretary of State recommended passage of the bill, and in its recommendation attention was called to the fact that we are trying to teach democracy throughout the world, and that international conferences of people always contribute to that end. I think it would be extremely improper, and not the right thing to do on the part of the Senate, to hold up this small appropriation. I trust that objection will be withheld, and that the bill will be passed. The appropriation asked for is $5,000. The convention has already been held. However, certain obligations were incurred, and I think we owe some sort of moral obligation, in view of what the House of Representatives has already done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator tell me why Congress should pay the expenses of any private group which might see fit to hold a convention? Why do we not pay the expenses of other international conventions?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Congress has paid the expenses of other international conventions. This is no new thing. The idea of international conventions has been to bring together the peoples of many nations to discuss problems which are common to all of them. While most of the international meetings are official in nature, many international meetings are unofficial. Very often the problems discussed in international meetings affect the governments themselves. Nearly always the purposes of the meetings are for the benefit of the people of the various countries. I hope there will be no objection to the passage of this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a Senator who had previously objected to consideration of the bill has stated to me that if he were present he would ask that the bill be passed over. Under the circumstances I regret that I feel obliged to ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1125) to amend the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE IN PER DIEM SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 544) to further amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, is repealed and that this act may be cited as the "Subsistence Expense Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(1) The term "departments and establishments" means any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, or other establishment of the Government, including the services included in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, and including wholly owned Government corporations and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "subsistence" means lodging, meals, and other necessary expenses incidental to the personal sustenance or comfort of the traveler.

(3) The term "actual expenses" means the actual amounts necessarily expended by the traveler for subsistence.

(4) The term "per diem allowance" means a daily flat rate of payment in lieu of actual expenses.

SEC. 3. Officers and employees of the departments and establishments, while traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed, in lieu of their actual expenses for subsistence and all fees or tips to porters and stewards, a per diem allowance at a rate not to exceed $8 within the limits of the continental United States and in case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States not to exceed rates to be established by the Director of the Budget under authority of this section. Such allowances shall be uniform for all officers and employees of the departments and establishments, and shall be established by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget after giving due consideration to geographical location and cost of living studies and to type of work of the traveler and conditions under which the traveler operates.

SEC. 4. The fixing and payment, under section 3 of this act, of per diem allowances, or portions thereof, shall be in accordance with regulations which shall be promulgated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 5. The heads of departments and establishments, under regulations which shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury for the protection of the United States, may advance through the proper disbursing officers from applicable appropriations to any person entitled to per diem allowances under this act such sums as may be deemed advisable considering the character and probable duration of the travel to be performed. Any sums so advanced and not used for allowable travel expense shall be recovered from the person to whom advanced, or his estate, by deduction from any amount due from the United States or by such other legal method of recovery as may be necessary.

SEC. 6. This act shall not be construed to modify or repeal any act providing for the traveling expenses of the President of the United States.

SEC. 7. The following acts and parts of acts and all other acts, general or special, which are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this act (except such acts or parts of acts as specifically fix or now permit rates higher than the maximum rates established under this act), insofar as they provide for per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence, including mileage allowances, are hereby repealed or modified but only to the extent of inconsistency or conflict with the provisions of this act: The Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended.

SEC. 8. Wherever provision is made in any law for the payment of per diem allowances to officers and employees in any branch or establishment of the Government not covered by this act, in accordance with the rates provided in the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, such law is hereby amended to provide for payment at the rates prescribed in or under this act.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any department or establishment to exceed its appropriation for subsistence expense in any fiscal year.

SEC. 10. This act shall take effect upon the expiration of 90 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has submitted several amendments to the committee amendment. The bill had been objected to by the armed services. The amendments submitted by the Senator from Ohio were aimed at meeting the objections of the armed services. On behalf of the Senator from Ohio, I offer the amendments which he has submitted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a committee amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting new language. The amendments offered by the Senator from Vermont on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 14, after the comma, to strike out the phrase reading, "including the services included in the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, and."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 25, to insert the word "civilian" before the word "officers."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 9, to strike out section 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 7. All acts, general or special, which are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this act (except such acts or parts of acts as specifically fix or now permit rates higher than the maximum rates established under this act) are hereby repealed or modified but only to the extent of inconsistency or conflict with the provisions of this act.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, is repealed and that this act may be cited as the "Subsistence Expense Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(1) The term "departments and establishments" means any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, or other establishment of the Government, including wholly owned Government corporations and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "subsistence" means lodging, meals, and other necessary expenses incidental to the personal sustenance or comfort of the traveler.

(3) The term "actual expenses" means the actual amounts necessarily expended by the traveler for subsistence.

(4) The term "per diem allowance" means a daily flat rate of payment in lieu of actual expenses.

SEC. 3. Civilian officers and employees of the departments and establishments, while traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed, in lieu of their actual expenses for subsistence and all fees or tips to porters and stewards, a per diem allowance at a rate not to exceed $8 within the limits of the continental United States and in case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States not to exceed rates to be established by the Director of the Budget under authority of this section. Such allowances shall be uniform for all officers and employees of the departments and establishments, and shall be established by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget after giving due consideration to geographical location and cost of living studies and to type of work of the traveler and conditions under which the traveler operates.

SEC. 4. The fixing and payment, under section 3 of this act, of per diem allowances, or portions thereof, shall be in accordance with regulations which shall be promulgated by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 5. The heads of departments and establishments, under regulations which shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury for the protection of the United States, may advance through the proper disbursing officers from applicable appropriations to any person entitled to per diem allowances under this act such sums as may be deemed advisable considering the character and probable duration of the travel to be performed. Any sums so advanced and not used for allowable travel expense shall be recovered from the person to whom advanced, or his estate, by deduction from any amount due from the United States or by such other legal method of recovery as may be necessary.

SEC. 6. This act shall not be construed to modify or repeal any act providing for the traveling expenses of the President of the United States.

SEC. 7. All acts, general or special, which are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this act (except such acts or parts of acts as specifically fix or now permit rates higher than the maximum rates established under this act) are hereby repealed or modified but only to the extent of inconsistency or conflict with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. Wherever provision is made in any law for the payment of per diem allowances to officers and employees in any branch or establishment of the Government not covered by this act, in accordance with the rates provided in the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, such law is hereby amended to provide for payment at the rates prescribed in or under this act.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize any department or establishment to exceed its appropriation for subsistence expense in any fiscal year.

SEC. 10. This act shall take effect upon the expiration of 90 days after the date of its enactment.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to regulate subsistence expenses of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government while absent from their designated posts of duty on official business."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to direct a question to the Senator

from Vermont. As I understand, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] had two amendments to this bill. Am I wrong in that statement?

Mr. AIKEN. They were just alike. There were two copies of one amendment. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] worked on the bill with the Senator from Ohio, and I would like to ask him to confirm the statement. I thought there were two amendments, but when I looked into it I found I had two copies of the same amendment.

Mr. HOEY. The Senator is correct.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 140) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The bill (S. 1297) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, Senate bill 1297 was introduced by me last June at the direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The subject matter of the bill was included in the general bill extending the war powers of the President, so that it is unnecessary to pass this bill. The same extension of the President's war powers was made at the extra session of the Eightieth Congress, and there is no necessity for this bill to be kept on the calendar. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 18) to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order .

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The bill (S. 489) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (h) of section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1085; 8 U. S. C. 806), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(h) Who is a veteran of the Spanish-American War, of World War I, or of World War II, his wife, minor children, or dependent parents."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 518) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 612) to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1634) to amend section 1 and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of chapter III, and provision (c) of section 47 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the author of the bill is not here, and it is a bill which has had considerable study in the District Building, I suggest that it go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1038) to amend the Federal Airport Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture was announced as next in order.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there is no need for Senate Concurrent Resolution 11. It has been taken care of by another Senate concurrent resolution, and for that reason I ask that this resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we hope we may be able to work out something on this subject in connection with the possible amendment of the La Follette-Monroney Act, to postpone the date on which the budget resolution is to be passed, but at the present time I agree that the resolution should go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 493) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, after the bill went through the committee, I became convinced that while there were persons who were improperly classified for veterans' preference, there were also in the Coast Guard Reserve officers who were properly classified as qualified for veterans' preference. I therefore ask that the bill go over until I can investigate the matter further.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PAYMENT OF SALARIES COVERING PERIODS OF SEPARATION FROM GOVERNMENT SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1486) to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. THYE. The purpose of the bill is to provide that in the case of a Federal employee whose service has terminated and the Civil Service Commission has found that such termination was in error, and the individual has been reinstated, he can then be paid without a bill being introduced to cover the matter. It is a simple amendment of the law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555; 5 U. S. C. 653), is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "Any person removed or suspended without pay from the classified civil service, who upon appeal through proper authority is subsequently reinstated or restored to duty on the ground that such removal or suspension was unjustified or unwarranted, shall be entitled to compensation for the period of such removal or suspension less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period of discharge or suspension, and shall for the purpose of the civil-service rules be deemed to have rendered service during such period."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall take effect, retroactively, as of January 1, 1947.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 249) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and

for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1502) to authorize contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROMOTIONS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1454) to amend the Public Health Service Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 3, page 2, line 2, to strike out "subsections" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 25, to strike out "allowances," and insert in lieu thereof "allowances."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 6, to strike out "officers" and insert in lieu thereof "Assistant Surgeons General."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 8, to strike out "either."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, between lines 23 and 24, to insert the following:

(g) Subsection (b) of the section herein redesignated as section 208 is amended to read:

(b) Reserve officers, except when otherwise provided by law, shall receive the same pay and allowances when on active duty as commissioned officers of the Regular Corps, including allowances for travel and transportation of household goods and effects.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 24, to strike out "(g)" and insert in lieu thereof "(h)", and on page 9, line 3, strike out "(h)" and insert in lieu thereof "(i)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, between lines 5 and 6, to insert the following: "Professional categories."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 23, line 20, to strike out "subsections (b) or" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 23, line 24, to strike out "renumbering" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 711 and 712, and references thereto, as sections 713 and 714, respectively,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 24, to strike out lines 24 and 25; on page 25, to strike out lines 1 to 10, inclusive; and on page 25, line 12, to strike out "713" and insert in lieu thereof "712."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this bill, which amends the Public Health Service Act, is mainly a technical bill to aid the Public Health Service in overcoming its professional personnel problems. Most of these problems relate chiefly to the difficulties experienced by the Service in securing and retaining adequately trained physicians and other technical and professional personnel for work in the field of public health.

In the past, the Congress has kept the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service on a parity with the Army and Navy in regard to rates of pay and rates of promotion. The Public Health Service Act provides specifically that Public Health Service officers shall be promoted after the same length of service as officers of the Medical Corps of the Army. The Army promotion bill—H. R. 4830—recently passed by the Congress provides substantial revisions of the Army system, and a substantial portion of the amendments proposed by S. 1454 are attributable to these revisions. The bill as reported also requires some additional amendments necessitated largely by failure to obtain its enactment during the last session of the Congress and to correct obvious typographical errors. Additional minor amendments of substance are also recommended to make S. 1454, as reported, conform generally with H. R. 3924, as reported.

I have certain recommended amendments which are purely technical, and which I should like to have stated, in the hope that we can get the bill passed. Let me say that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considered this matter, referred it to its staff, and had it carefully checked, and the members of the committee felt that they were prepared to report the bill with the recommendation that it pass. I offer these technical amendments in order to perfect the bill, and I ask that the amendments be read at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will send the amendments to the desk, they will be stated.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to have the amendments considered and adopted en bloc. If that is done, I shall have a final amendment to offer, in addition to the others.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, have the committee amendments been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. They have been agreed to. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments offered en bloc by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendments were read, as follows:

1. Page 1, line 7, insert immediately after the semicolon and before the quotation marks: "opiates (as defined in section 3228 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code):".

2. Page 3, line 7, strike out "officers" and insert in lieu thereof "Assistant Surgeons General."

3. Page 4, line 21, strike out "surgery" and insert in lieu thereof "surgery,".

4. Page 7, line 11, strike out the word "plus."

5. Page 17, line 9, insert after the word "corps" the following: "(above the grade of junior assistant)."

6. Page 24, line 4, strike out "such subsection (b)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (b) of such section."

7. Page 24, line 8, strike out "as" and insert in lieu thereof "to."

1. Page 8, line 8, strike out "January" and insert in lieu thereof "July."

2. Page 19, line 12, strike out "January" and insert in lieu thereof "July."

3. Page 19, line 19, after the period, insert the following new sentence: "Any officer holding, on June 30, 1948, an appointment pursuant to such section to a higher temporary grade shall continue in such grade until such appointment is terminated, as the President may direct."

4. Page 19, line 20, through page 20, line 2, amend subsection (c) of section 6 to read:

"Effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act, each officer of the Regular Corps on such date, in addition to the credit he has under preexisting legislation for purposes of promotion, shall be credited with 3 years of service."

5. Page 20, lines 3 to 21, amend subsection (d) of section 6 to read:

"(d) (1) Officers of the Regular Corps who have, or who on or before July 1, 1948, will have, the years of service prescribed in paragraph (2) of section 210 (d) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act, for promotion to the senior assistant, full, or senior grade, shall be recommended to the President for such promotion, to be effective as of July 1, 1948, whether or not vacancies exist in such grade. Such promotions shall be made without examination, except that no promotions shall be made to the senior grade or any grade immediately below a restricted grade until the officer is found qualified for promotion pursuant to subsection (c) of section 210 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this Act. No promotion shall be made pursuant to this paragraph to any grade in any professional category if such grade has been made a restricted grade pursuant to subsection (b) of section 210 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this Act. For purposes of seniority an officer promoted under this paragraph shall be credited with the years of service in the grade to which promoted equal to the excess of his years of service on the date of promotion over the years of service required for promotion to such grade under paragraph (2) of section 210 (d) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this Act.

"(2) Officers in the junior assistant grade in the Regular Corps who have, or who on or before July 1, 1948, will have four or more years of service in the junior assistant grade, shall be recommended to the President for promotion to the assistant grade, to be effective as of July 1, 1948, without examination and whether or not vacancies exist in such grade. For purposes of promotion and seniority in grade, an officer promoted under this paragraph shall be credited with the years of service equal to the excess of his years of service on the date of promotion over 4 years."

6. Page 21, line 5, strike out "January" and insert in lieu thereof "July."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands from the Senator from New Jersey that these are a series of technical amendments which he desires to have considered and adopted en bloc.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct. All of them are set out on the memorandum which has been furnished me by the Public Health Service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask whether the amendments have been considered by the standing committee which reported the bill.

Mr. SMITH. All of them have been considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We referred all these amendments to our staff, for the

staff to check up on them. The staff reported to the committee that all the amendments were technical, having to do with typographical changes, and modifications of that nature, in order to make the bill conform, first, to the Army promotion bill, and, second, to House bill 3924. We are trying to make the bill conform to them.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to the Senator's purpose; but the question in my mind is whether the amendments were approved by the committee or were approved by the staff. Those are different things.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to make a statement in regard to this matter?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that the amendments were presented to the committee by the staff, and the committee approved the amendments. These amendments are purely technical in nature. There are one or two other amendments which the committee recommended, which make slight changes in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee then took formal action in approving the amendments; did it?

Mr. TAFT. That is my recollection.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that is my recollection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I submit that it is not good parliamentary practice to pass on a bill in this way during the call of the calendar. I respectfully suggest that the bill should be reprinted, so that all Members of the Senate may see it in its final form, with all the so-called technical amendments printed and the bill prepared in its final form with the amendments. I do not think there will be a very costly lapse of time if we proceed in that way.

So, Mr. President, although I am in favor of the bill, I am opposed to having the Senate follow the procedure presently being followed; because when we begin to adopt amendments en bloc in the Senate of the United States, it is time to call a halt. Therefore I object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me suggest that the amendments be adopted and the bill printed with the amendments appearing as if they were committee amendments, and then the bill can be considered at the next session.

Mr. MORSE. I think the procedure suggested by the Senator from Ohio is proper. It gives the Senate a chance to object to the bill when the question of its final passage is before the Senate, if Senators do not like the bill as they see it when it is reprinted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments which have been offered en bloc by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to know whether the bill will remain on the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will remain on the calendar, with the amendments printed.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted en bloc by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc, and the bill was ordered to be reprinted showing the amendments, and to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 84) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1372) authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell tribal cemetery, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 116 was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let the resolution be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 966) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope this bill may be passed at this time. It simply provides that these veterans, who have been given the run-around by various agencies of the Government, shall be able to go to someone to see about getting jobs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that the Chair is advised by the clerks that this bill is a companion measure to Senate bill 1494, which has already been passed and has become law.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is an entirely different bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is marked on the Senate Calendar as being a corresponding bill to Senate bill 1494, which has become Public Law 325.

Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to have that matter checked, and to have the bill passed over temporarily? There would be no reason to pass it, if it is identical with the other bill.

Mr. LANGER. Let me inquire who objected to the other bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No one has objected to the other bill. The Chair is advised by the clerks that it is their information that the companion bill has already been passed and has become law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota check on that matter; and if he finds, before the call of the calendar is concluded, that the bill has been passed, as has been stated by the Chair, then I assume there would be no objection to having this bill passed over or indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the circumstances, the bill will be temporarily passed over, so as to give the Senator from North Dakota an opportunity to examine into it.

The bill (S. 1089) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FACILITATION OF PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES BY THE WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

The bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall ask that this bill be passed over today, not because I object to it so far as it goes, but because there are other agencies of the Government which also should have the same right to make purchases in case of an emergency.

If this bill is passed over today, by the time the calendar is next called we can have those additional matters ironed out. But other agencies are concerned; some of them buy technical materials for the development of air transportation, for instance. I may also cite the Department of Agriculture and the Public Health Services, which ofttimes have to purchase serums or medicines in a great hurry. Provision for such matters and similar matters should be included in the bill.

So, as I have stated, I have no objection to the bill so far as it goes, but I hope we may postpone the passage of the bill until provision for the additional matters is included, so that it will not be necessary for us to introduce two or three other bills, or even one other bill, in order to cover other departments or agencies of the Government in connection with this matter.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I had understood in advance that the Senator from Vermont had the intention of adding to the bill a provision to include the Treasury Department along with the National Mili-

tary Establishment. I am wondering whether the Senator is familiar with the fact that the Treasury Department now has before the Bureau of the Budget, and probably will present to us soon, its idea regarding the modernization of its procurement system.

Mr. AIKEN. No; I have not. In fact, I had not given this bill a single thought until I saw it on the calendar today.

I have no objection to the provisions of the bill. I simply hope that we can iron out the situation so that other departments which have to make emergency purchases, or purchases of a technical nature, or purchases of such nature that there cannot possibly be any competition in the bidding, may also come under the bill. I hope we can get the matter straightened out by the next time the calendar is called.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Vermont rather objects to the present consideration of the bill than to the bill itself.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; and I wish to explain that my objection is not to the provisions of the bill itself.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Vermont has yielded to me, I should like to suggest that he have such amendments as he has in mind ready as soon as possible, for the passage of the bill is important to the armed services. Certainly we cannot expect them to carry on much longer without this authority. So I should like to give notice that I shall seek to have the bill called up in the very near future, in case there is too long a delay on the part of the other departments.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that if the matter cannot be ironed out at a reasonably early date, I shall not continue to object to the passage of this bill.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Vermont will withhold his objection, in order to permit me to offer some amendments, all of which are of a technical character, except for one amendment which relates to subcontractors, an amendment designed to remedy the situation created by General Meyers in connection with the fraud he perpetrated on the Government. The only purpose is to offer the amendments in order to have them adopted at this time, and then to let the bill remain on the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. That will be satisfactory.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to call attention to the fact that prior to the consideration of amendments, it will be necessary to have the bill considered by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection, with the understanding that the technical amendments may be adopted, and that the bill then will be passed over.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I also ask that the bill be printed, with the amendments appearing as committee amendments, and that the bill then remain on the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator now send the amendments to the desk?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I now submit the several amendments and send them to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "War Department" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of the Army."

On page 15, line 20, strike out "and" and insert in lieu thereof "the Department of the Air Force."

On page 15, line 21, immediately following "Coast Guard", insert a comma and the following: "and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

On page 15, line 22, immediately following "any," strike out "of."

One page 17, line 4, strike out "or" and insert in lieu thereof "for."

On page 18, line 16, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

On page 22, line 17, add a new sentence as follows:

All cost and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts shall provide for advance notification by the contractor to the procuring agency of any subcontract thereunder on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis and of any fixed-price subcontract or purchase order which exceeds in dollar amount either $25,000 or 5 percent of the total estimated cost of the prime contract; and a procuring agency, through any authorized representative thereof, shall have the right to inspect the plants and to audit the books and records of any prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of a cost or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract.

On page 25, line 17, strike out "War" and insert in lieu thereof "the Army."

On page 25, line 17, strike out "or" and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

On page 25, line 17, strike out "and" and insert in lieu thereof "or of the Air Force" and a semicolon.

On page 25, line 18, immediately following "Treasury Department", insert a semicolon and the following: "and the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics."

On page 28, line 12, strike out "War Department" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of the Army."

On page 28, line 13, strike out "Navy Department or" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force" and a comma.

On page 28, line 14, immediately following "Treasury Department", strike out the colon and insert "or the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics" and a semicolon.

On page 30, line 24, strike out "War" and insert in lieu thereof "the Army."

On page 30, line 25, strike out "War Department" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of the Army."

On page 31, line 3, strike out "War" and insert in lieu thereof "the Army."

On page 31, lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "on October 1, 1947" and insert in lieu thereof "90 days after the date of enactment."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the Departments of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes."

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the desire of the distinguished Senator from Virginia that the amendments be adopted, and that the bill then go over until it is printed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendments were agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be printed as amended, will remain on the calendar, and will be passed over.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 144) authorizing an investigation of law enforcement and police administration in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 48) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 551) for the relief of the Tivoli Brewing Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT—RESCISSION OF PRIOR AGENCY ACTION

The bill (S. 1644) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 so as to permit rescission of prior agency action in complying with recommendations of the Civil Service Commission pursuant to appeals taken by preference employees was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. O'CONOR. The purpose of the bill is to grant authority to any Federal agency to rescind its order terminating

the service of a veteran in its employ. As the law now stands, as interpreted by counsel for the Civil Service Commission, there is no authority for the agency to rescind its order, even though it may desire to do so. It must reemploy the veteran as if he were a new employee, as a result of which he would lose a number of within-grade increments and other benefits that would accrue from the length of his service. The bill merely gives the agencies the right to rescind the order if they desire to do so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the bill improve the position of the veteran?

Mr. O'CONOR. It does, appreciably. It is sponsored and approved by veteran's organizations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387) is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end of such section a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That any recommendation submitted to a Federal agency by the Civil Service Commission, pursuant to an appeal by any preference employee or former employee, shall be complied with by such agency; and any such Federal agency may, or shall if so directed by the Civil Service Commission, rescind any previous action taken by it as to any preference employee or former employee."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3051) to amend the act of July 19, 1940, and to amend section 2 and repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS BY THE NAVY

The bill (S. 1675) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop naval installations and facilities by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities; or by the completion of such construction, installation, or equipment specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy and heretofore undertaken as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Naval air station, Alameda, Calif.: Test cells for turbine engines; $230,000.

Naval research laboratory, Anacostia, District of Columbia: Correction of deficiencies in existing utilities; $340,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.: Chapel; $205,000.

Marine training and replacement command, Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif.: Acquisition of land, 575 acres; $46,500.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md.: Wind tunnels and associated facilities; $1,410,000.

Naval aviation ordnance test station, Chincoteague, Va.: Acquisition of land, 6,740 acres; completion of range facilities; $1,648,800.

Naval amphibious base, Little Creek, Va.: Acquisition of land, 4,000 acres, on Bloodsworth Island, Dorchester County, Md.; $120,000.

Naval supplementary radio station, Dupont, S. C.: Radio operating building; $74,000.

Naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, Calif.: Acquisition of land, 60,000 acres; aerodynamics field laboratory (aerodynamics range), ground range, external ballistics, and electronics experimental installation; 115 duplex houses (230 family units); $5,303,000.

Naval aircraft modification unit, Johnsville, Pa.: Acquisition of navigation easements over approximately 250 acres of land in runway approach zone; $103,500.

Naval air station, Key West (Boca Chica), Fla.: Acquisition of land, approximately 1,000 acres; $60,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Jersey City, N. J.: Liquid fuel rocket test laboratory; $306,000.

Naval Reserve Armory, Lawrence, Mass.: Acquisition of land, 5.7 acres; $100.

Naval Reserve Armory, Lowell, Mass.: Acquisition of land, 4 acres; $800.

Naval ammunition depot, Mare Island, Calif.: Vacuum system housing, building A-216; $64,000.

Naval air station, Mojave, Calif.: Acquisition of land, 28 acres; $500.

Naval magazine, Montauk, Long Island, N. Y.: Acquisition of land, 44 acres; $53,300.

Postgraduate school, Monterey, Calif.: Development of postgraduate facilities, including buildings and accessories; $2,500,000.

Amphibious training base, Morro Bay, Calif.: Acquisition of land, 96.23 acres; $12,500.

Naval auxiliary air station, Oceana, Va.: Acquisition of navigation easements over approximately 400 acres of land; $46,000.

Naval air station, Patuxent River, Md.: Facilities for bombing target; $309,000.

Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Sea test range, and test and evaluation facilities, including supporting facilities, services, and accessory construction; $34,520,000.

Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Acquisition of land and improvements, 62.45 acres; $150,000.

Naval electronics laboratory, Point Loma, San Diego, Calif.: Laboratory supply and utility buildings, including services and accessories; $2,590,000.

Norfolk naval shipyard, Portsmouth, Va.: Acquisition of land, 4.857 acres; $4,370.

Naval research laboratory, Chesapeake Bay Annex, North Beach, Md.: Correction of deficiencies in existing utilities at Randle Cliffs, Md.; $340,000.

Special devices center, Sands Point, Long Island, N. Y.: Acquisition of land and buildings, 161.54 acres; $350,000.

Naval radio station, Skaggs Island, Sonoma, Calif.: addition to radio-operating building; $315,000.

Naval supply annex, Stockton, Calif.: Acquisition of land (small island), 3.88 acres; $1,800.

Aeronautical turbine laboratory, Trenton, N. J.: Laboratory buildings and facilities, including collateral equipment and accessory construction; $26,750,000.

Naval ordnance laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Completion of supersonic wind tunnels and aerodynamics range; explosives research facility; $2,275,000.

Naval unit, White Sands Proving Ground, Las Cruces, N. Mex.: Additional housing facilities; instrumentation of the 100-mile range and camp facilities; facilities for pilotless aircraft test range; $8,936,630.

Radio transmitting station (location to be determined): Radio transmission facilities, including collateral equipment and accessory construction; $7,000,000.

Naval research laboratory (location to be determined): Underwater sound reference laboratory; $1,120,000.

For correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto within the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1948; $3,000,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Naval operating base, Adak, Alaska: Ship-repair facilities; cold-storage building, ice-cream plant and milk facilities; two storehouses; dispensary; utility distribution systems, including water, sewer, electric power, heating plant, roads, walks, and drainage; $11,296,000.

Naval supplementary radio activity, Adak, Alaska: Operations building and associated facilities; $2,500,000.

Naval radio station, Adak, Alaska: Consolidated communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $2,395,000.

Naval operating base, Argentia, Newfoundland: Facilities for fixed operation of mobile ground approach unit; water-treatment plant; $109,200.

Naval radio station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Consolidated communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $2,385,000.

Submarine base, Balboa, C. Z.: Fire-alarm and sprinkler systems for buildings and piers; $222,500.

Naval radio station, Greenland, Consolidated communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $1,020,000.

Naval operating base, Guam: Dredging and filling at Apra Harbor; utility distribution systems, including electric transmission, steam-generating plant, island water supply system, water storage and distribution, sewage and drainage systems, and extension of roads; barracks, mess hall, and galley; $24,040,000.

Naval medical center, Guam: Development of hospital facilities, including buildings and accessories; $30,000,000.

Naval air station, Guam: Facilities for fixed operation of mobile ground control approach unit; $16,500.

Naval ammunition depot, Guam: High explosive storage facilities and accessories; $14,000,000.

Naval supplementary radio activity, Guam: Bombproof communication facilities and accessories; $6,750,000.

Naval radio station, Guam: Permanent communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $5,750,000.

Naval supply center, Guam: Permanent facilities, including storage buildings, fuel pipe lines, and accessories; $14,675,000.

Fleet Marine Force base, Guam: Development of facilities, including buildings, service depot facilities, and accessories; $9,823,000.

Submarine base, Guam: Marginal bulkhead, including base site preparation and accessory construction; $1,670,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, Hawaii: Acquisition of land, 520 acres at Waikele and Kipapa Gulches; acquisition of land at West Loch for barricaded sidings, 159.14 acres; $270,000.

Naval air station, Kodiak, Alaska: Facilities for fixed operation of mobile ground control approach unit; $16,500.

Naval radio station, Kodiak, Alaska: Consolidated communication facilities, including buildings and accessories; $2,225,000.

Naval shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Fire protection for drydock No. 2; modernization of water-front lighting, $143,700.

Naval base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: Water pumping station at Wahiawa Gulch; $3,575,000.

Naval station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Acquisition of land, Culebra Island; $110,000.

Naval operating base, Saipan: Air intercept training facilities; facilities for fixed operation of mobile ground approach unit; $165,000.

Naval radio station, Summit, C. Z.: Increase transmitter power output; $612,000.

Supplementary naval radio activity, Wahiawa, Hawaii: Permanent facilities for supplemental radio activity and accessories; $3,000,000.

For correction of deficiencies in existing or approved facilities, for emergency projects authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, and repairs incident to casualties thereto outside the continental United States, for the fiscal year 1948; $3,000,000.

SEC. 2. To accomplish the above authorized construction the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, or otherwise.

SEC. 3. Family quarters for personnel of the Navy constructed on or subsequent to the effective date of this act whether heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized shall not be of greater net floor area per unit than the following:

For flag officers, 1,100 square feet.

For captains, 1,670 square feet.

For commanders and lieutenant commanders, 1,400 square feet.

For warrant officers, commissioned warrant officers, and commissioned officers through the rank of lieutenant, 1,250 square feet.

For enlisted personnel and noncommissioned officers, 1,080 square feet.

For the purposes of this act, net floor area is defined as all floor space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement (or service space in lieu of basement), attic, garage, and porches.

The above area allowances shall supersede the limitations contained in the Act of July 8, 1946 (Public Law 492, Seventy-ninth Congress), and may be increased by not to exceed 10 percent for all quarters outside continental United States and by not to exceed 10 percent for quarters of commanding officers of stations or installations over and above that to which his rank would entitle him. Quarters for civilians shall be limited to conform to the allowances for officers or men of comparable status according to responsibility, rating, and pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be appropriate.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but not to exceed $69,800,000, for public works in continental United States during the fiscal year 1948, and $59,971,160 for public works outside continental United States during the fiscal year 1948. With respect to projects within and without continental United States, the approximate cost for each project enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward 10 percent, but the total cost of projects in continental United States authorized by this act shall not exceed $100,185,800, and the total cost of projects outside continental United States authorized by this act shall not exceed $139,769,400. Any such appropriation shall be available under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for expenses incident to construction including administration, overhead, planning, and surveys, and shall be available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS BY THE ARMY

The bill (S. 1676) to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to establish or develop military installations and facilities by the construction, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities; or by the completion of such construction, installation, or equipment specifically approved by the Secretary of War and heretofore undertaken as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alamogordo Army Airfield, N. Mex.: Family quarters, rocket-firing facilities, and utilities; $1,622,720.

Andrews Field, Md.: Family quarters and utilities; $3,143,630.

Army War College, Washington, D. C.: Family quarters and utilities; $125,700.

Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark.: Family quarters, barracks, and utilities; $852,100.

Army and Navy Medical Procurement Office, Engineering and Development Division, Fort Totten, N. Y.: Medical equipment laboratory; $390,000.

Anniston Ordnance Depot, Ala.: Waste disposal facilities; $60,000.

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,188,570.

Fort Benning, Ga.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,466,050.

Bergstrom Field, Tex.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,501,970.

Biggs Field, Tex.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,310,800.

Fort Bliss, Tex. (including William Beaumont General Hospital): Family quarters and utilities; $2,000,200.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,778,400.

California Institute of Technology, California: Completion of supersonic wind tunnel; $410,700.

Chanute Field, Ill.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,310,800.

Craig Field, Ala.: Crash station; $26,370.

Camp Detrick, Md.: Family quarters, munitions-loading building, crop research and decontamination facilities, and utilities; $1,115,330.

Edgewood Arsenal, Md. (including Technical Command, Army Chemical Center, and Chemical Corps School): Family quarters, chemical laboratory facilities, and utilities; $959,950.

Eglin Field, Fla.: Family quarters, dock-warehouse facilities and utilities; $3,136,980.

Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver, Colo.: Family quarters and utilities; $611,500.

Forest Glen, Md.: Complete plans and specifications for construction of an Army Institute of Pathology Building and a new 1,000-bed general hospital (on a 1,500-bed chassis), including all necessary auxiliary facilities; $850,000.

Goodfellow Field, Tex.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,310,800.

Hamilton Field, Calif.: Family quarters, additional fire station, and utilities; $1,372,600.

Fort Hamilton, New York Port of Embarkation, N. Y.: Family quarters and utilities; $575,230.

Camp Hood, Tex.: Family quarters and utilities; $4,455,950.

Fort Sam Houston, Tex. (including Brooke Army Medical Center): Family quarters and utilities; $2,009,900.

Huntsville Arsenal, Ala.: Reservation fencing; $20,600.

Fort Jay, N. Y.: Family quarters and utilities; $682,700.

Kearney Army Airfield, Nebr.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,511,840.

Keesler Field, Miss.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,356,700.

Kelly Field, Tex.: Helicopter engine testing facilities; $152,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Family quarters and utilities; $4,595,300.

War Department New Receiving Station, La Plata Md.: Family quarters and utilities; $52,330.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Printing plant, library addition, cell-locking system, electrical supply and distribution facilities; $1,714,500.

Camp Lee, Va.: Family quarters, bachelor quarters, barracks, and utilities; $4,202,600.

Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco, Calif.: Family quarters and utilities; complete plans and specifications for construction of a new 1,500-bed general hospital, including all necessary auxiliary facilities; $1,392,820.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Family quarters and utilities; $4,244,450.

Lexington Signal Depot, Ky.: Garage and equipment storage facilities; $25,000.

Lockbourne Army Airfield, Ohio: Family quarters and utilities; $739,840.

Lowry Field, Colo.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,310,800.

MacDill Field, Fla.: Family quarters, control tower, crash station, and utilities; $1,030,380.

Madigan General Hospital, Fort Lewis, Wash.: Family quarters and utilities; $565,000.

Malta Test Station, N. Y.: Hydraulic test laboratory; $205,000.

Marieta Army Airfield, Ga.: Control tower; $54,500.

Fort Mason, San Francisco Port of Embarkation, Calif.: Family quarters and utilities; $401,750.

Fort McPherson, Ga.: Family quarters and utilities; $541,350.

Fort George G. Meade, Md.: Family quarters and utilities; $995,800.

Mountain Home Army Airfield, Idaho: Family quarters and utilities; $940,880.

Muroc Army Airfield, Calif.: Family quarters, rocket static test facilities, control tower, all-altitude speed course and utilities; $4,057,300.

Fort Myer, Va.: Replace field commissary refrigerator facilities; $108,000.

Oakland Army Base, San Francisco Port of Embarkation, Calif.: Family quarters, barracks, and utilities; $907,580.

Oliver General Hospital, Augusta, Ga.: Family quarters and utilities; $231,000.

Percy Jones General Hospital, Battle Creek, Mich.: Family quarters and utilities; $231,000.

Picatinny Arsenal, N. J.: Research and development facilities for high explosives, completed bombs, rockets, and rocket powders, and laundry; $1,978,800, of which $1,228,800 is authorized to be expended during the fiscal year 1948.

Presidio of San Francisco, Calif.: Family quarters and utilities; $709,750.

Randolph Field, Tex.: Family quarters, control tower, and utilities; $1,465,300.

Rapid City Army Airfield, S. Dak.: Development of facilities for VVHB, including family quarters, and utilities; $6,501,970.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Family quarters and utilities; $826,300.

Roswell Army Airfield, N. Mex.: Training facilities; $95,790.

Sacramento Signal Depot, Calif.; Irrigation and sprinkling; $47,970.

San Antonio Army Airfield, military training center, Texas: Family quarters and utilities; $1,310,800.

Scott Field, Ill.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,316,500.

Selfridge Field, Mich.; Family quarters, crash-truck station, and utilities; $800,840.

Fort Sheridan, Ill.: Family quarters and utilities; $360,900.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Family quarters and utilities; $765,000.

Camp Stoneman, San Francisco port of embarkation, Calif.: Family quarters and utilities; $878,570.

Tinker Field, Okla. (including Oklahoma City Air Depot): Jet engine test facilities; $362,000.

Two Rock Ranch station, Calif.: Family quarters, water pipe line, and utilities; $149,800.

United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.: Family quarters and utilities; complete plans and specifications for a new academic building; $3,249,750.

Valley Forge General Hospital, Phoenixville, Pa.: Family quarters and utilities, $231,000.

Vint Hill Farms station, Va.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,319,100.

Watertown Arsenal, Mass.; Magnesium shop building; $87,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.: Family quarters, laboratory, storage and testing facilities for rocket development, administration facilities, central fire station, hospital expansion, and utilities; $3,887,430.

Williams Field, Ariz.: Single-engine gunnery range; $51,500.

Wingate Ordnance Depot, N. Mex.: Additional well; $20,000.

Fort Worth Army Airfield, Tex.: Family quarters, ammunition storage, training facilities, and utilities; $2,394,770.

Wright Field, Ohio: Rotor wing-testing facilities, testing laboratory facilities, central heating plant, and scavenging building for wind tunnels; $2,038,500.

Yuma test branch of the Engineer Board, Arizona: Family quarters, bachelor quarters, infirmary, post exchange, roads, and utilities; $488,850.

Various Army Air Forces stations: Removal of flight hazards, and construction of night lighting systems, low approach instrument landing systems, high frequency direction finding systems, radio range stations, sprinkler systems, and fire-prevention facilities; $5,085,500.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Whittier, Alaska: Development of port facilities; $5,332,277.

Army Airfield at Mile 26, near Fairbanks, Alaska: Family quarters, barracks, and utilities; $2,021,118.

Ladd Field, Alaska: Family quarters, bachelor quarters, barracks, operational facilities, hospital, community facilities, and utilities; $20,694,850, of which $11,694,850 is authorized to be expended during the fiscal year 1948.

Fort Richardson-Elmendorf Field, Alaska: Family quarters, bachelor quarters, barracks, storage facilities, communication facilities, school, motor pool facilities, and utilities; $10,190,375.

Adak Army Base and Airfield, Aleutian Islands: Family quarters, barracks, communication facilities, and utilities, $4,334,600.

Army airfield, Fort Yukon, Alaska: Establishment of fighter field with necessary operational facilities, bachelor quarters, barracks, mess hall, and utilities; $4,160,950.

Army airfield, Nenana, Alaska: Operational facilities, barracks, and utilities; $505,000.

Adak ACS station, Aleutian Islands: Family quarters, operational buildings, garages, and utilities; $950,050.

Anchorage ACS station, Alaska: Family quarters and utilities; $514,280.

Big Delta ACS station, Alaska: Family quarters and utilities; $57,410.

Ketchikan ACS station, Alaska: Family quarters, operational buildings, and utilities; $114,160.

Cathedral Bluff ACS station, Alaska: Family quarters and utilities; $56,160.

Fort Randall ACS station (Cold Bay), Alaska: Family quarters and utilities; $57,410.

Juneau ACS station, Alaska: Family quarters and utilities; $56,160.

Northway ACS station, Alaska: Family quarters and utilities; $56,160.

Naknek ACS station, Alaska: Family quarters, operational buildings, garage, and utilities; $79,760.

Skagway ACS station, Alaska: Family quarters, operational buildings, and utilities; $107,750.

Lena Point ACS station, Alaska: Operational buildings, quarters, and utilities; $46,000.

ACS station between Haines and Juneau, Alaska (location to be determined): Operational buildings, quarters, and utilities; $46,000.

Bethel ACS station, Alaska: Operational buildings; $30,000.

Kodiak ACS station, Alaska: Operational buildings; $14,420.

Nome ACS station, Alaska: family quarters, operational building, and utilities; $77,944.

Sitka ACS station, Alaska: Operational building and garage; $8,600.

New Tripler General Hospital, Territory of Hawaii: Family quarters, bachelor quarters, and utilities; $3,472,960.

Hickam Field, T. H.: Family quarters (conversions) and barracks (reconstruction); $2,242,200.

Fort Armstrong, T. H.: Telephone-exchange building; $55,000.

Helemano, T. H.:Family quarters and utilities, $473,415.

Waipio, T. H.: Family quarters and utilities; $207,760.

Fort DeRussey, T. H.: Family quarters and utilities; $528,220.

Army Ground Force bases, Marianas: Housing, storage, technical and operational facilities, and utilities; $5,983,720.

Army airfields, Marianas: Housing, storage, technical and operational facilities, and utilities; $12,270,677.

Clark-Stotsenberg area, Philippine Islands (Army Security Agency): Barracks and utilities; $669,300.

Kadena Field, Okinawa: Barracks and utilities; $3,681,000.

Sukiran, Okinawa: Barracks and utilities; $1,320,350.

Albrook Field, C. Z.: Sewerage; $310,400.

France Field, C. Z.: Family quarters and utilities; $172,120.

Howard Field, C. Z.: Operational facilities, supply and maintenance building, and rehabilitation of gasoline storage and distribution system; $714,800.

Fort Davis, C. Z.: Family quarters and utilities; $1,753,800.

Fort Brooke, P. R.: Family quarters, water storage, and utilities; $324,100.

Fort Buchanan, P. R.: Bachelor quarters, water storage, refrigeration plant, and utilities; $1,267,000.

Borinquen Field, P. R.: Water storage and distribution facilities; $165,000.

Henry Barracks, P. R.: Barracks, water storage, and utilities; $716,200.

Salina training area, Puerto Rico: Rifle range and training area; $82,400.

San Jose Island, Republic of Panama: Family quarters, utilities, and dock; $221,830.

Panama Canal Zone and vicinity: Regional project for malaria control; $195,400.

Keflavik Airport, Iceland: Development of Keflavik Airport, $10,352,100.

Harmon Field, Newfoundland: Family quarters, operational facilities, laundry, and dry-cleaning facilities, warehouses, and utilities; $12,087,100.

Frobisher Bay (Upper Frobisher), Canada: Family quarters and utilities; $396,905.

Fort Chimo, Canada: Family quarters and utilities; $214,570.

Kindley Field—Fort Bell, Bermuda: Family quarters (including conversions), water evaporation building, and utilities; $2,359,938.

Alaska: Classified installation for Army Air Forces; $5,000,000.

Newfoundland: Two classified installations for Army Air Forces; $3,500,000.

SEC. 2. To accomplish the above-authorized construction the Secretary of War is authorized to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interest therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended, in administering the provisions of the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654; 43 U. S. C. Supp. 315q).

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary toward meeting the purposes of this act, but not to exceed $100,000,000 for public works in the continental United States during the fiscal year 1948, which includes $5,000,000 for emergency projects within the United States as may be authorized by the Secretary of War, and $125,000,000 for public works outside continental United States during fiscal year 1948, which includes $20,000,000 for emergency projects outside the United States as may be authorized by the Secretary of War. With respect to projects within and without continental United States, the approximate partial cost for each project enumerated and authorized in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be varied upward or downward 10 percent, but the total cost of the work on the projects in continental United States authorized by this act shall not exceed $107,280,960 and the total cost of the work outside continental United States authorized by this act shall not exceed $140,249,699. Any such appropriation shall be available under the direction of the Secretary of War for expenses incident to construction, including administration, overhead, planning, and surveys, and shall be available until expended: *Provided*, That any work undertaken under this authorization may be prosecuted by direct appropriations, or by both direct appropriations and continuing contracts subject to the availability of subsequent appropriations: *Provided further*, That no money from current or future appropriations for the Army shall be expended for the construction of family quarters for personnel of the Army of greater net floor area in square feet per unit than the following:

For enlisted men, 1,080.

For warrant officers, flight officers, and commissioned officers of and below the rank of captain, 1,250.

For majors and lieutenant colonels, 1,400.

For colonels, 1,670.

For general officers, 2,100.

For the purposes of this act, net floor area is defined as the space inside the exterior walls, excluding basement (or service space in lieu of basement), attic, garage, and porches: *Provided*, That these areas may be increased not to exceed 10 percent at activities outside the continental United States, and not to exceed 10 percent for quarters of commanding officers of stations, bases, or installations based on the normal rank of such officers: *Provided further*, That quarters for civilians shall be limited to conform to the allowances for officers or men of comparable status according to responsibility rating, and pay as determined by the Secretary of War to be appropriate.

SEC. 4. The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed: That part of the act of March 2, 1905 (33 Stat. 836; 10 U. S. C. 1331) reading as follows: "No military post within the United States shall be established without the express authority of Congress"; that

part of the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 74; 10 U. S. C. 1333) reading as follows: "No expenditure exceeding $5,000 shall be made upon any building or military post or grounds about the same without the approval of the Secretary of War, upon detailed estimates submitted to him"; that part of the act of February 27, 1893 (27 Stat. 484; 10 U. S. C. 1336) reading as follows: "The erection, construction, and repair of all buildings and other public structures in the Quartermaster Corps shall, as far as may be practicable, be made by contract, after due legal advertisement"; and that part of the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 58; 24 U. S. C. 21), reading as follows: "No building or structure of a permanent nature, the cost of which shall exceed $30,000, shall be erected for use as an Army hospital unless by special authority of Congress." Revised Statutes, 1136, as amended by section 1 of the act of February 27, 1877 (19 Stat. 242; 10 U. S. C. 1339), is hereby further amended by deleting the figure "$20,000" and inserting the figure "$100,000." The following parts of acts are hereby repealed, and shall not be applicable to contracts or expenditures under the appropriations "Engineer Service, Army," contained in the Military Appropriation Acts, 1946 and 1947: That part of section 1 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 721), which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That hereafter no money appropriated for military posts shall be expended for the construction of quarters for officers of the Army, or for barracks and quarters for the artillery the total cost of which, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, shall exceed, in the case of quarters of a general officer, the sum of $15,000, of a colonel or an officer above the rank of captain, $12,000, and of an officer of and below the rank of captain, $9,000," as modified by section 1 of the act of February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. 1235), which reads as follows: "*And provided further*, That hereafter no part of this appropriation or any appropriation hereafter made shall be expended for the construction of quarters for officers of the Army in the United States or its possessions, the total cost of which, including heating and plumbing apparatus, wiring and fixtures, shall exceed in the case of an officer above the rank of captain, $14,500, and of an officer of and below the rank of captain, $12,500."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1493) to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. IVES. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1356) providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, not that I am opposed to it, but because the Committee on the Judiciary has had difficulty in establishing a policy under which such groups would be allowed incorporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 430) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm loan associations and production credit associations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1557) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I make the same objection I made to the former bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1375) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I make the same objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3978) to provide for the temporary advancement in ranks and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia, serving as supervisors of certain squads, was anounced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

SURVEYS OF NAVIGABLE STREAMS

The bill (H. R. 3146) to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Would the Senator who made objection permit an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw his objection temporarily?

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw the objection temporarily.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time, under the law the Secretary of War is authorized to make surveys of navigable streams to determine whether improvements should be made upon those streams for purposes of navigation and flood control. The bill simply authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to examine and report upon watersheds affecting such streams, so that the Congress and its committees dealing with the subject may know whether or not there is work that should be done with respect to conserving the waters, and whether legislation should be enacted with respect to water upon those watersheds affecting agriculture. At one time in the past I think such a report was made by the Secretary of Agriculture, but for some reason the provision was omitted from one of the later bills. At the present time, unless authorization bills dealing with flood control specifically authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make surveys, they cannot be made. The bill would permit them to be made upon the request of committees dealing with the subject. In the light of that explanation, does the Senator desire to object?

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether or not the Senator from West Virginia has discussed the matter with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, yes. The bill was considered before the committee of which the Senator from Louisiana was a member. I do not have the record before me, and I do not recall the discussions that were had at the time. I note the presence in the Senate Chamber of the chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with the subject and which reported the bill. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether or not the Senator from Louisiana participated in discussions of the matter.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Louisiana was present. This particular measure would empower the Secretary of Agriculture to make the surveys, but, in the absence of the words "or hereafter", he was not sure of his authority with respect to anything that might arise subsequently. The amendment of the law would clarify the matter, so that the Secretary could make such surveys, that having been intended, obviously, by the original bill. Through a weakness in the wording of the law, there was confusion as to whether the Secretary was authorized to make such surveys following the passage of the act, or was limited to making surveys previously authorized. The pending measure clarifies the matter so that the Secretary would know he could make the surveys independently.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to inquire whether the Senator from Louisiana approved the pending bill.

Mr. MALONE. I am sure he approved it; otherwise, it would not be here.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not so sure of that, since the Senator from Louisiana is but one member of the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is entirely satisfactory with me to have the matter go over. May I suggest that it go over temporarily until the Senator from Illinois can be advised from the record vote of the committee whether or not the Senator from Louisiana acted upon it?

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1663) to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 968) to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of taxicabs licensed and operated in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4042) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline

and petroleum products from the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1653) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that both bills are covered by the general extension of power to control exports, so they are unnecessary. Neither of the bills is necessary, and I think perhaps they can be removed from the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, with respect to Calendar No. 732, House bill 4042, and Calendar No. 733, Senate bill 1653, what the Senator from Ohio has said may be accurate; I am not sufficiently advised upon the question involved to determine whether it is. It does seem to me, however, that the bills should not be stricken from the calendar at this time without consultation with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who reported both bills from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and who is author of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois desire that the action by which the bills were removed from the calendar be reconsidered?

Mr. LUCAS. I think I should like to make such a motion. I see the Senator from Indiana now in the Chamber. I did not know he was present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should say that I did not move that the bills be postponed indefinitely. I simply suggested that they might be. I was going to say that perhaps the bills could be removed from the calendar if that would be agreeable to the proponent of the bills, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By indirection the Chair made the order.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it all occurred by indirection. The Senator from Indiana is present and can speak for himself.

Mr. CAPEHART. By indirection I suggest that the Chair withdraw his order, and that the action which was taken be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana asks that the action by which the bills in question were removed from the calendar be reconsidered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bills will be restored to the calendar, and will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1350) to amend the act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1015) to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal-savings deposits to 1 percent per annum was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1826) making it a petty offense to enter any national forest land while it is closed to the public, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the bill originated with the Department of Agriculture and has the hearty support of the Department. The bill was passed by the House without objection. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was unanimously in favor of it. It really is important that the bill be passed. I certainly hope the objection will be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? Is this the Stevenson bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I make the request that the bill go over temporarily in order that I may be able to orient myself with respect to the general situation in connection with similar legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

BOUNDARY OF THE UINTAH AND OURAY INDIAN RESERVATION IN UTAH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1698) to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first committee amendment was on page 3, line 2, after "quarter", to strike out "said."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, line 18, after "quarter", to strike out "said."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was page 3, line 20, after "quarter", to strike out "said."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 5, line 25, after "quarter", to strike out "said."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 11, line 7, after the word "along" to strike out "Mill" and insert "Hill."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in keeping with the objection I raised a while ago I ask that the bill, as it is now amended, be reprinted with the amendments, and that it be returned to the calendar for consideration at the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the bill as it is now printed contains the committee amendments. The amendments which have been acted upon are all committee amendments.

Mr. MORSE. I spoke under a misapprehension. Then I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1698) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Grand and Uintah Counties, in the State of Utah, for the benefit of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, is hereby extended to include the following area:

Beginning at the northwest corner of section 18, township 9 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian, and running thence west to Green River;

Thence northeasterly up Green River approximately thirteen miles to a point where said river intersects the north line of section 11, township 8 south, range 20 east;

Thence east along said section line seven miles to the northeast corner of section 12, township 8 south, range 21 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence south along section line two miles to the northeast corner of section 24, township 8 south, range 21 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence east one mile to the northeast corner of section 19, township 8 south, range 22 east; thence south one mile to the southeast corner of said section 19; thence east two miles to the northeast corner of section 28;

Thence south six miles to the southeast corner of section 21, township 9 south, range 22 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence west eleven miles to the northeast corner of section 27, township 9 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence south eight miles to the southeast corner of section 34, township 10 south, range 20 east;

Thence west one and one-half miles to the south quarter corner of section 33;

Thence north one-half mile to the center of said section 33;

Thence east one-fourth of a mile to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter northeast quarter, said section 33;

Thence north one mile to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter northeast quarter, section 28;

Thence west one-quarter of a mile to the center of said section 28;

Thence south one-fourth of a mile to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter southwest quarter, said section 28;

Thence west one-fourth of a mile to the north rim of Big Pack Mountain;

Thence southwesterly along said rim approximately one and one-half miles to the north quarter corner of section 4, township 11 south, range 20 east;

Thence south three-fourths of a mile to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter southwest quarter, said section 4;

Thence west one-fourth of a mile to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter southwest quarter, said section 4;

Thence south one-half mile to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter northwest quarter, section 9;

Thence west one-half mile to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter northeast quarter, section 8;

Thence south three-fourths of a mile to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter southeast quarter, said section 8;

Thence west three-fourths of a mile to the northeast corner of section 18;

Thence south along section line to the southeast corner of said section 18;

Thence southerly along the west rim of Big Pack Mountain approximately three and three-fourths miles to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter southeast quarter, section 1, township 12 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence south along the township line five and one-fourth miles to the southeast corner of township 12 south, range 19 east;

Thence following the north and east boundary of Indian Allotment Numbered 353 Uncompahgre on Hill Creek to the southeast corner of said allotment;

Thence along the east line of township 13 south, range 19 east, approximately one and one-half miles to the north rim of East Squaw Canyon;

Thence southeasterly along said rim and up said canyon approximately three and three-fourths miles to the northeast corner of section 33, township 13 south, range 20 east.

Thence south along the section line 6 miles to the northeast corner of section 33, township 14 south, range 20 east;

Thence along the north rim of Flat Rock Mesa approximately six miles to the west quarter corner of section 24;

Thence easterly along the north rim of Ute Canyon approximately two miles to the north quarter corner of section 19, township 14 south, range 21 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence continuing along the north rim of said canyon approximately three miles to the center of section 21;

Thence south one mile to the center of section 28;

Thence west one-half mile to the west line of said section;

Thence south one and one-half miles to the southeast corner of section 32;

Thence west along the south line of said township two miles to the southwest corner of township 14 south, range 21 east;

Thence south six miles along the east line of township 15 south, range 20 east, to the southeast corner of said township;

Thence east one-half mile to the center of the north line of section 33, township 15½ south, range 21 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence south approximately one and one-half miles to the south quarter of section 4, township 16 south, range 21 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence west one-half mile to the southwest corner of said section 4;

Thence north one-fourth of a mile to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter southeast quarter, section 5;

Thence west one-half mile to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, said section 5;

Thence south two and one-fourth miles to the south quarter corner of section 17;

Thence west one-half mile to the northeast corner of section 19;

Thence south one-half mile to the east quarter corner of said section 19;

Thence west one-half mile to the center of said section 19;

Thence south two and one-half miles to the south quarter corner of section 31;

Thence west one-half mile to the southwest corner of said township 16 south, range 21 east;

Thence south one and one-half miles to the east quarter corner of section 12, township 17 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian.

Thence west one mile to the east quarter corner of section 11

Thence south one-half mile to the southeast corner of said section 11;

Thence west one-half mile to the south quarter corner of said section 11;

Then south one mile to the south quarter corner of section 14;

Thence west one-half mile to the southwest corner of said section 14;

Thence south one mile to the southeast corner of section 22;

Thence west one mile to the southwest corner of section 22;

Thence south approximately one and one-half miles to a point where the section line intersects the ridge between Supply Canyon and West Willow Creek;

Thence southwesterly along said ridge approximately two and one-half miles to the south quarter corner of section 8, township 18 south, range 20 east;

Thence south to the center of section 17;

Thence east one-half mile to the east quarter corner of said section 17;

Thence south to the southeast corner of said section 17;

Thence east approximately one-third of a mile to the top of the ridge between Clear Creek and West Willow Creek;

Thence southerly along the top of said ridge approximately three miles to the center of section 33;

Thence south one-half mile to the south quarter corner of said section 33;

Thence east one-fourth of a mile;

Thence south two miles to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter southeast quarter, section 9, township 19 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence east one-fourth of a mile to the northeast corner of section 16;

Thence south one mile to the southeast corner of said section 16;

Thence west three miles to the southwest corner of section 18;

Thence north 2 and three-fourths miles;

Thence west one-fourth of a mile.

Thence north one-fourth of a mile to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter southeast quarter, section 36, township 18 south, range 19 east;

Thence west three-fourths of a mile to the southwest corner of said section 36;

Thence northwesterly along the watershed divide of Book Cliff Mountains approximately twelve and one-half miles to the east quarter corner of section 6, township 18 south, range 19 east;

Thence southwesterly down Coal Creek Canyon approximately thirteen miles to Green River at a point approximately one-fourth of a mile west of the southeast corner of section 18, township 18 south, range 17 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence northerly up Green River to a point two and one-half miles north eighty degrees west from the southwest corner of section 7, township 12 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence southwesterly along the east rim of Main Tabyago Canyon approximately three and one-half miles;

Thence south five-eighths of a mile to the rim of the ridge;

Thence southwesterly across West Tabyago Canyon approximately one-half mile to the ridge;

Thence southwesterly along the north rim of the ridge approximately two and one-fourth miles to Rock House Canyon;

Thence southwesterly across Rock House Canyon approximately three-fourths of a mile to the top of knoll in Rock House Canyon;

Thence southeasterly along the south rim of Rock House Canyon approximately two and three-fourths miles to a point approximately one mile north of Gray Knoll;

Thence south one-half mile across bench to north rim of Big Canyon; thence southeasterly along the north rim of Big Canyon approximately two miles to the head of draw approximately one mile east of Gray Knoll;

Thence southeasterly one-fourth of a mile across bench to the north rim of Big Canyon Flat;

Thence southeasterly along north rim of Big Canyon Flat approximately three and one-fourth miles;

Thence east approximately one-fourth of a mile across bench to the north rim of Big Canyon Flat;

Thence southeasterly along the north rim of Big Canyon Flat approximately one mile;

Thence east approximately one-fourth of a mile across bench to north rim of Big Canyon Flat;

Thence southeasterly along the north rim of Big Canyon Flat approximately two and one-half miles;

Thence east approximately one-fourth of a mile across bench;

Thence southeasterly along the north rim of Big Canyon Flat approximately one and three-fourths miles;

Thence east to northwest corner of section 31, township 13 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence east one mile;

Thence south one mile;

Thence east one mile to the southeast corner of section 32;

Thence east on section line to CCC road;

Thence northerly along said CCC road to point where said road intersects rim of a mesa south of the north line of township 13 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence northeasterly along said rim to the northeast corner of section 26 of said township and range;

Thence north one-fourth of a mile;

Thence east one-fourth of a mile;

Thence north one-fourth of a mile to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter southwest quarter, section 24;

Thence northerly along Hill Creek approximately one and one-fourth miles;

Thence west one-fourth of a mile;

Thence south one-fourth of a mile to the quarter corner between sections 13 and 14;

Thence west two miles to the quarter corner between sections 15 and 16;

Thence north along the section line one-half mile to the southeast corner of section 9 to the top of the ridge;

All of the foregoing descriptions being in township 12 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence northerly along the top of said ridge three and three-fourths miles to the center of section 28, township 11 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence northwesterly to the CCC road;

Thence northwesterly along said road to the top rim of Wild Horse Bench;

Thence northeasterly along the top rim of Wild Horse Bench to the southeast corner of section 21;

Thence north one mile;

Thence diagonally northeast to the southwest corner of section 1;

Thence northeasterly to the north quarter corner of said section 1;

Thence east one-half mile to the intersection of CCC road at the northeast corner of said section 1;

Thence northeasterly along said road approximately four miles to where said road intersects the east line of section 20, township 10 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence north along said section line to the east quarter corner of section 8, township 10 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence northeasterly to the northwest corner of Indian Allotment Numbered 326 Uncompahgre;

Thence east to Willow Creek;

Thence northwesterly down Willow Creek to the west line of section 4, township 10 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence south along said section line to the southwest corner of section 4, said township and range;

Thence west one mile;

Thence north four miles to the northwest corner of section 20, township 9 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian;

Thence west one mile;

Thence north one mile to point of beginning.

Valid rights and claims of individuals initiated under the public-land laws or otherwise involving any lands within said boundary shall not be affected by this Act.

The foregoing reservation shall only include, in areas where there has heretofore been reserved by the Federal Government oil, gas, or oil shale, the nonmineral uses of the land.

There is hereby reserved, within the area above described, for the benefit and use of grazing-district permittees, a free right-of-way for trailing and watering purposes, subject to the usual and customary rules and regulations concerning stock driveways within grazing districts, the use of said right-of-way for watering purposes being limited to the usual and customary use of grazing-district permittees adjacent to said right-of-way, over the following lands:

(a) A stock driveway one mile wide along the north side of the White River Road running east from Ouray;

(b) A stock driveway described as beginning at the east quarter corner of section 3, township 9 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian; running thence south eleven and one-half miles to the southeast corner of section 34, township 10 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian; thence west to Willow Creek; thence northerly down Willow Creek to Black Bridge situated in the northwest quarter northeast quarter, section 22, township 10 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian; thence northwesterly following the north and east boundaries of Indian allotments and tribal lands on east side of Willow Creek to the southwest corner of section 32, township 9 south, range 20 east, Salt Lake meridian; thence north five and one-fourth miles to Green River; thence up Green River and White River and on the south side of Indian allotments to point of beginning;

(c) A stock driveway one-half mile on each side of the road running southwesterly from what is known as Squaw Crossing on Willow Creek to the south rim of Wild Horse bench insofar as said road enters or crosses the said reservation;

(d) A stock driveway running from the head of Brown Canyon near the northeast corner of township 11 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake meridian, southeasterly down Brown Canyon across Hill Creek to Big Pack Mountain;

(e) A stock driveway one mile wide across Hill Creek immediately south of Rock House situated in the south half of section 13, township 12 south, range 19 east, Salt Lake meridian.

There is also reserved a watering right on Hill Creek between the Black Bridge and the Brown Ranch for the permittee using the public domain immediately west of said water place.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to revoke the order dated September 26, 1933, temporarily withdrawing in aid of legislation certain lands in the former Uncompahgre Indian Reservation.

SEC. 3. The State of Utah may relinquish to the United States for the benefit of the Indians of the said Ute Reservation such tracts of school or other State-owned lands, surveyed or unsurveyed, within the said reserved area, as it may see fit, reserving to said State, if it so desires, such rights as it may possess to any minerals underlying such State lands as may be relinquished, and said State shall have the right to make selections in lieu thereof outside of the area hereby withdrawn, equal in value to the lands relinquished, from the vacant, unappropriated, nonmineral public lands, within the State of Utah, such lieu selections to be made in the manner provided in the enabling Act pertaining to said State, except as to the payment of fees or commissions, which are hereby waived. The value of improvements owned by the State on lands relinquished to the United States for the benefit of said Indians shall be taken into consideration and full credit in the form of lands shall be allowed therefor. Authority is hereby granted for the purchase of privately owned and State-owned lands, including the improvements thereon, and improvements heretofore placed on public lands, together with water rights and water holes, within said boundary: *Provided*, That title to lands purchased under this authorization may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be taken for the surface only.

REHABILITATION OF CERTAIN WORKS OF THE FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT IN NEW MEXICO

The bill (H. R. 3834) to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HATCH. The bill has been on the calendar for some time. It is merely an authorization bill. It has been passed by the House. I should like very much to have it passed at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the bill deal with an irrigation project which has been considered and approved by the Reclamation Bureau?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. It is a private project which the Bureau is considering taking over.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator say the bill had been passed by the House?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I take it the Committee on Public Lands has approved the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3834) to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

PROPOSED INCORPORATION OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS OF WAR VETERANS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before we proceed to consider the bills placed on the calendar after the call of the calendar on July 26, 1947, I wish to say that when it was reached on the call of the calendar I objected to Senate bill 1356, Calendar No. 696, a bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans, and I also objected to Senate bill 1557, Calendar 702, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, and Senate bill 1375, Calendar No. 704, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

At that time I said I had no objection to the three bills, but based my objection on the ground that the Committee on the Judiciary was considering several similar bills and was attempting to determine upon a policy with respect to bills of such a nature. I have since been informed that toward the end of the session of Congress last July a policy with respect to such matters was determined upon, and several other veterans' organizations were incorporated. In view of that fact, I now withdraw my objection to the three bills to which I just referred and ask that they may be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state by title Senate bill 1356, Calendar 696.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1356) providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the bill, but I will say that if we should pass the bills now we would set a precedent under which practically any veterans' organization in America, regardless of its size, regardless of its membership, would be able to come to the Congress of the United States and obtain a charter of incorporation.

I know how difficult it was in the beginning to secure a charter from Congress to incorporate the American Legion, which has since been recognized, of course, as one of the great patriotic organizations of the country. I do not question the patriotism of any of these groups which are seeking recognition in the bills before us. No doubt the members of all the groups in question are all good Americans. The point I make, however, is that by passing these bills we will be setting a precedent whereby we shall not be able in the future to deny any organization, whether it be the Thirty-third—Illinois—Division, the Thirty-second Division, or the Thirty-fourth Division, or any other group which acted together in the last war, which covers thousands of different organizations, to come to Congress and obtain charters of this nature.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to say a word on this particular subject. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] were in my State during the Christmas holidays. They took time off at that particular period to go down and listen to tales of woe from boys of my State who had been prisoners of the Japanese in the Philippine Islands and in Japan. Some of those boys told stories which were pathetic, to say the least, but none of them said they were fighting in the Philippine Islands, or on Bataan Peninsula, as Spanish-Americans, Italian-Americans, Chinese-Americans, or as anything other than as Americans. The bill in question may eventually be passed, but not today. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and Senate bill 1356 will be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in order that the record may be made consistent, I then ask for the present consideration of Senate bill 1557, Calendar No. 702, to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, which is a bill similar to that just passed over, and also Senate bill 1375, Calendar No. 704, to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. I presume, of course, the same objection will be made, and that the two bills will also be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, both bills will be passed over.

SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS FOR WATER FLOW RETARDATION AND SOIL EROSION PREVENTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for reconsideration of the action previously taken with respect to House bill 3146, Calendar No. 713, to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Nevada that when the bill was reached on the calendar it was passed over. The bill was not passed.

Mr. MALONE. Am I out of order in asking for reconsideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary that the Senator who objected when the bill was reached on the calendar withdraw his objection, in order that consideration may be given to the bill.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw his objection?

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have made a check of what is involved in connection with the bill, and can say that the only matter at issue is as to whether or not the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] objected to the bill. The senior Senator from Louisiana himself signed the favorable report on the measure. I ask for present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 3146?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very much for the bill, but it is my recollection that in addition to the objection raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] against consideration of the bill, another Senator registered objection. I want to make certain that the other Senator who objected is on the floor. Can the Chair advise the Senate as to which other Senator it was who made objection to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that he is moving very slowly in the matter of objections to bills in order to make sure that no objection is overlooked. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object I will say that is not the point I am raising. It is now proposed to consider a bill to which objections had previously been made. Objections were raised against the bill when it was reached on the calendar. I do not know whether the Senator, other than the Senator from Illinois, who made objection, has left the floor or not. If he has left the floor, I think he is entitled to be called back by way of suggestion of the absence of a quorum, if necessary, in order that the Senate may be advised as to whether any Senator other than the Senator from Illinois has objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no record at the desk of any objection other than that made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. MORSE. That is what I sought to find out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3146) to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2029) to provide for the free importation of synthetic rubber scrap was announced as next in order.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO INDIAN WARS VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4055) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "any", to insert "public."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RUTH GROSSMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 922) for the relief of Ruth Grossman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,463.09", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth Grossman, of Miami Beach, Fla., the sum of $5,463.09. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ruth Grossman against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on May 9, 1944, when a United States Army truck collided with an automobile at the intersection of Meridian Avenue and Sixteenth Street, Miami Beach, Fla., overturned and fell upon the said Ruth Grossman, a pedestrian: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORAN CURRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 944) for the relief of Oran Curry, which had been reported with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$652.17" and insert in lieu thereof "$587.33"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "through", to strike out "November" and insert "March"; and on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

SEC. 2. No charge shall be made against the disbursing officer or the certifying officer nor shall any claim be made against Oran Curry, for the amount of the overpayment of $35 made on certificate of settlement No. 0858898, dated August 21, 1944.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Oran Curry, of Neola, Utah, the sum of $587.33, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States as compensation for quarters in connection with services rendered the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, at the Uintah-Ouray Indian Agency and Reservation in Utah, from May 1926 through March 1933, inclusive, this being the amount due him and remaining unpaid under his contract of employment, as certified by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. No charge shall be made against the disbursing officer or the certifying officer nor shall any claim be made against Oran Curry, for the amount of the overpayment of $35 made on certificate of settlement No. 0858898, dated August 21, 1944.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO ZAMORA AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1031) for the relief of Antonio Zamora; Mrs. Antonio Zamora; Antonio Zamora, Jr.; Mrs. Juan Chavez; John Chavez, Jr.; Roland Chavez; Helso Trujillo; and Dr. M. G. Wright, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if Senators will turn to page 2, line 6, they will note that the committee struck out item numbered (8), for Dr. M. G. Wright, of Winslow, Ariz., in the sum of $516.

This is a bill involving the claims of several persons who were injured at the time an Indian Bureau truck, being

driven by a drunken Indian, ran into several persons. The Interior Department has accepted the liability, and has submitted the figure which it thinks each individual claimant should receive. I have agreed to those figures, notwithstanding the fact that I believe the original figures were correct.

As a result of the accident in which these persons were injured, liability for which the committee and the Interior Department accept, they had to call a doctor. They called a doctor in the vicinity of the little town of Winslow, Ariz. Those persons would have had no need to call a doctor if they had not been injured. The Government was liable for the injury. I believe it is very unfair to Dr. Wright to eliminate from the bill payment for his services. I do not know the gentleman. I do not know any of the claimants, but I believe it is very unfair to say to Dr. Wright, "This Indian was drunk. He was driving a Government truck and he injured seven persons. You attended them, but we are not going to pay you." I hope the committee amendment on page 2, line 6, relating to Dr. M. G. Wright, of Winslow, Ariz., will be rejected.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. That sum will have to be paid by the injured persons.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. It will be noted that the committee amendments have reduced the awards to the minimum. It is very unfair to ask the injured persons, among whom $6,500 is to be divided, to pay Dr. Wright, of Winslow, the sum of $516 when the Government accepts responsibility for the injuries.

Mr. President, I hope the committee amendment on page 2, line 6, will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments one by one.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 1, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 2, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 3, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 4, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 6, after the word "and," to strike out "(6) Dr. M. G. Wright, of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $516."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this is the amendment to which I am objecting. I hope the committee amendment will be rejected. This poor man went to the expense of treating several persons who were injured in an accident for which the Government was responsible. I ask that the Senate disagree to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not hear all the explanation from the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. As I understand, these amendments have all been approved by the committee. Is that not true?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 6, relating to Dr. M. G. Wright, of Winslow, Ariz.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, returning to the amendment which has just been disposed of, what is the amount remaining in the bill, now that the committee amendment in question has been rejected?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amount for non-Indians is $6,500.

Mr. WHERRY. I was referring to the amendment just disposed of.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amount is $516.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 7, after the numerals "$516", to insert "(8) the heirs of Keith Lane (Gray Whiskers), Navajo Indian Census No. 91989, the sum of $5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the second item numbered "(8)" will now become "(9)", now that the previous committee amendment has been rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be appropriately amended so as to bring the item numbers into line.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, the only change is in the total figure. There is no addition to the bill except the $516.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 15, after the numerals "1940", to strike out ", and of the claim of the said Dr. M. G. Wright against the United States for payment for medical services rendered by him to said seven claimants in the treatment of injuries sustained by them as a result of such accident."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 18, to insert "and in full satisfaction of the claim of the heirs of said Keith Lane against the United States for compensation for the death of said Keith Lane who was killed while riding as a passenger in such truck."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Antonio Zamora, of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $2,500; (2) Mrs. Antonio Zamora, of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $1,500; (3) Antonio Zamora, Jr., of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $500; (4) Mrs. Juan Chavez, of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $1,000; (5) John Chavez, Jr., of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $250; (6) Roland Chavez, of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $250; (7) Selso Trujillo, of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $500; (8) Dr. M. G. Wright, of Winslow, Ariz., the sum of $516; and (9) the heirs of Keith Lane (Gray Whiskers), Navajo Indian census number 91989, the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of the respective claims of said seven first-named claimants against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by them when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by an Indian Service truck about 5 miles east of Winslow, Ariz., on August 6, 1940, and in full satisfaction of the claim of the heirs of said Keith Lane against the United States for compensation for the death of said Keith Lane who was killed while riding as a passenger in such truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Antonio Zamora; Mrs. Antonio Zamora; Antonio Zamora, Jr.; Mrs. Juan Chavez; John Chavez, Jr.; Roland Chavez; Selso Trujillo; Dr. M. G. Wright; and the heirs of Keith Lane."

DEPENDENTS OF CARL B. SANBORN

The bill (H. R. 389) for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELEONORE M. HANNON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1267) for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,601" and insert "$1,101", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eleonore M. Hannon, of Coquille, Oreg., the sum of $1,101, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries to Eleonore M. Hannon as the result of the crash of a United States Navy airplane on October 15, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BURKS L. FIELDER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1347) for the relief of Burks L. Fielder, which had been reported from

the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the words "the sum of" to strike out "$789.15" and insert "$699.15", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed (1) to cancel all claims for repayment of the sum of $699.15, representing the aggregate of amounts erroneously paid to Burks L. Fielder, assistant postmaster at Vicksburg, Miss., for the period from December 1, 1942, to August 12, 1946, as a salary increase under the provisions of section 3 of the act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1058; U. S. C., title 39, sec. 92); and (2) to pay to the said Burks L. Fielder, out of any money available for the pay of employees in the postal service, an amount equal to any portion of such sum heretofore repaid by him pursuant to such claims.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM P. GILLINGHAM

The bill (H. R. 1531) for the relief of William P. Gillingham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVA L. DUDLEY AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the numerals "$2,000" to strike out "to pay to Grace M. Collins, of Lima, Ohio, the sum of $2,000, and to pay to Guy B. Slater, of Ada, Ohio, the sum of $2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Eva L. Dudley."

WILLIE RUTH CHAPMAN

The bill (S. 1411) for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Willie Ruth Chapman, of Ethridge, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by her as a result of an accident which occurred on December 2, 1944, in Lawrenceburg, Tenn., when the automobile driven by her was struck by a United States Army vehicle: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BEN W. COLBURN

The bill (H. R. 645) for the relief of Ben W. Colburn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. C. BATEMAN

The bill (H. R. 2056) for the relief of J. C. Bateman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF RUTH HORTON HUNTER

The bill (H. R. 769) for the relief of the estate of Ruth Horton Hunter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF DAPHNE WARD POPE

The bill (H. R. 1175) for the relief of the estate of Daphne Ward Pope, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALVIN J. FREDERICK

The bill (H. R. 1319) for the relief of Calvin J. Frederick was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELIZABETH F. McCOMBIE

The bill (H. R. 1933) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth F. McCombie was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES J. SMITH

The bill (H. R. 2348) for the relief of Charles J. Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFRED THOMAS FREITAS

The bill (H. R. 3068) for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF W. H. RODGERS

The bill (H. R. 1155) for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LEONA McMINN WINKLER

The bill (H. R. 1645) for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATTIE A. HORNER

The bill (H. R. 2891) for the relief of Mattie A. Horner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS H. DEAVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 311) for the relief of Louis H. Deaver, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "the" to strike out "United States Employees' Compensation Commission" and insert in lieu thereof "Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OSCAR AND ANNA CARLBLOM

The bill (H. R. 3754) for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. IOLA VEACH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1716) for the relief of Mrs. Iola Veach, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of" to strike out "$5,200" and insert "$1,186.55," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,186.55 to Mrs. Iola Veach, of Louisville, Ky., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses, and property damage sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle on North Third Street, Louisville, Ky., on April 7, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MASSMAN CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$88,000" and insert "$28,623.12."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this seems to be an unusually large sum of money, and since these are the days of economy, I should like to listen to an explanation of the bill.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I did not know that the bill was coming up today. I have not the exact facts in mind, but they are approximately as follows: The Massman Construction Co. was the successful bidder in connection with a certain public improvement. After the work was undertaken it was found that a mistake had been made in preparing the specifications. Through no mistake of the bidder, the specifications had been misunderstood. The Committee on the Judiciary has gone into the question, and has found that there was an error for which the Massman Construction Co. should not be held responsible; and in fairness and equity it should be reimbursed.

Mr. LUCAS. I know how much interest the Senator from Missouri has in looking into the facts. Since he has made a satisfactory explanation, I have no objection.

Mr. KEM. I think the claim is just and fair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COMPENSATION TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES FOR LOSSES AND DAMAGES CAUSED BY UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1605) to provide for payment of compensation to the governments of foreign countries for losses and damages inflicted on neutral territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, this is a bill reported out of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It speaks for itself. It is very short, and reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized to pay to the governments of foreign countries such sums as the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of National Defense, shall determine to be necessary to provide compensation, including interest, for losses and damages inflicted on persons or property in neutral territory during World War II by units of the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights: *Provided, however,* That no compensation shall be paid under this act unless the claim shall have been presented prior to July 1, 1948: *And provided further,* That the total amount of compensation authorized herein shall not exceed $21,000,000.

SEC. 2. Appropriations are hereby authorized to carry out the purpose of this act.

The Swiss claims amount to $19,500,000, and since we have admitted liability for $16,000,000 already, part of which has been paid, but the bulk of which is due, I think the Swiss Government is entitled to immediate consideration, because we admit we should at once pay them in the neighborhood of $10,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator say that we have admitted liability for approximately $16,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. The status of the claims at the present moment may be summarized as follows: Switzerland has claimed $19,500,000 of which the United States admits to date a liability for $16,000,000. Portugal has presented claims for $800,000, of which the United States has offered to pay $300,000. The Vatican City has requested $750,000, and San Marino $1,200,000. These last two sets of claims are in the process of investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire what the evidence before the Committee on Foreign Relations showed with reference to what agency of the Government made the examination and agreed upon the amount for which the Senator now says the United States is liable?

Mr. SMITH. The Senator's question is a very appropriate one. The Swiss nationals who were injured made their claims against the Swiss Government. The Swiss Government set up a commission to recognize the claims and determine them, and when the Swiss Government had recognized the claims, it made a corresponding claim to the United States Government. As it was admitted that our bombers had inflicted damage, we set up a regular Army claims commission.

The record shows that on December 21, 1945, the Secretary of War of the United States proposed that an Army claims mission be sent to Switzerland to determine the amount of damage done by American Air Forces during the war. The necessary arrangements were made by the Secretary of State with the Swiss Government, and an Army claims mission, under the Chief of Claims, European theater, began its investigations in May 1946 with a study of the bombing damage done.

The procedure followed was for the commission to select certain claims, which were then checked by its experts. The findings of the experts in general agreed with the claims submitted by the Swiss Government, and the United States liability was fixed accordingly by the Army claims mission. Reports were made, and certain advance payments were made, with an admission of a liability of approximately $16,000,000 out of a total claim of $19,500,000.

Mr. LUCAS. May I further inquire as to what kind of property was damaged by our bombers, and as to whether there is any question in the minds of the members of the committee that this country is responsible?

Mr. SMITH. There is no question whatsoever. Here is the story of what happened. The intent was to bomb some strategic areas in Germany close to the Swiss border. Unfortunately, we did some damage to the city of Schaffhausen. That is where the damage was done. The claims were very carefully studied, and the committee was satisfied that there should be no further delay in compensating the Swiss Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I notice, from what appears on page 1 of the report, that originally the Department intended asking for an appropriation amounting to $10,000,000, but because of certain claims processed since that time they have felt since that date they should ask for a ceiling of $12,000,000. It is now estimated that the total of claims to be compensated under this authorization will not exceed $21,000,000. What was the cause of the change in the recommendation from $12,000,000 to $21,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that originally a bill for an appropriation of $10,000,000 was introduced to cover what was thought to be the claim of Switzerland. It was then discovered that there was further and more extensive damage done, and the question was whether we should simply pass legislation to take care of the Swiss Government and try to ascertain the extent of the total damage done by accidental bombings during the war. The Army reported that other claims had been filed. Therefore we have prepared an over-all bill, with a ceiling, covering all those claims, leaving it up to the Secretary to adjust damages.

Mr. WHERRY. On page 3 of the report there is apparently a conclusion drawn by the committee, that the United States admits a liability for $16,000,000.

Mr. SMITH. That relates to Switzerland.

Mr. WHERRY. What makes up the difference between that amount and the $21,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. Portugal has presented claims for $800,000.

Mr. WHERRY. But they have not been considered?

Mr. SMITH. The claims are pending. We want in one piece of legislation to have an over-all ceiling and to fix a date for the claims to be filed, and to cover the whole subject with one piece of legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not objecting to paying any claims which the United States should pay. As I understand, the Committee on Foreign Relations has voted unanimously that we owe this money. But I am at a loss to understand why the amount has risen from $12,000,000 to $21,000,000. I can see that other claims have been added. I can see that the over-all amount is $16,000,000. Portugal has presented a claim which is not admitted. Vatican City has requested $750,000, and San Marino has presented a claim for $1,200,000. It seems to me that if we are intending to pay, we should pay what has been definitely agreed upon after the committee has studied the situation, which amount should not be in excess of $16,000,000.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that there will not be more than $10,000,000 asked immediately from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, I realize that this is only an authorization, but I know the distinguished Senator will agree with me that when the claim comes before the Committee on Appropriations, of which I happen to be a member, he will say that Congress authorized it and therefore we should have the money for it. It seems to me the proper place for inquiry is on the floor of the Senate, where the authorization is made. Is there anything in the report to indicate that there has been any agreement that the United States owes the difference between $16,000,000 and $21,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. I do not think I get the point of the Senator's question.

Mr. WHERRY. On page 3 of the report it is stated:

> Switzerland has claimed $19,500,000, of which the United States admits to date a liability for $16,000,000.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator stop there? It will be noted that those claims are being studied at this time. We expect that we shall have to pay the full amount. The Army estimates that the final total of all claims will not exceed $21,000,000, of which it is expected $19,500,000 will be paid to the Swiss Government. Those claims are being studied right now. All we are trying to do is to authorize the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, working with the Army, to determine what the figures are and to make settlement. The Committee on Appropriations will have to be satisfied that the amounts which are asked to be appropriated are proper.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not want to detain the Senate longer. I do not wish to put my judgment up against that of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I do not understand why there is an appropriation

asked for a greater amount than is involved in the claim submitted. I would not be averse, in view of the statement of the Senator and of the committee, to our acknowledging a claim of $16,000,000. But why make a ceiling of $21,000,000 when the admitted claim to date is only $16,000,000?

Mr. SMITH. Let me call the attention of the distinguished Senator to this language of the bill:

That the Secretary of State is authorized to pay to the government of foreign countries such sums as the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of National Defense, shall determine to be necessary to provide compensation—

And so forth. Then it is provided—

That the total amount of compensation authorized herein shall not exceed $21,000,000.

We are not authorizing the payment of $21,000,000, but are simply saying that that amount shall not be exceeded.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator cannot say what the additional amount will be until the claims are all accepted?

Mr. SMITH. We are authorizing the Secretary of State to settle these matters, which are now 2 or 3 years overdue, especially having in mind the situation of the Swiss Government, which is a friendly government, and which has been asking us why they cannot receive a payment on their claims.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not objecting to the judgment of the committee or to the argument presented by the distinguished Senator, but it seems to me that we would simply be taking a leap in the dark if we were to make a ceiling appropriation of $21,000,000 or $25,000,000 or $19,000,000, or whatever the proposed amount may be. It seems to me that the proper procedure would be to pay the amount which the Foreign Relations Committee has now decided is due, and then make further investigations in regard to any other cases which may arise. Such matters must come before the Foreign Relations Committee, anyhow, for its approval.

Mr. SMITH. Then the procedure the Senator suggests is that each time one of these claims is settled, if another claim is made, another bill should be introduced; is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. Our feeling was that we should give an over-all authorization, with a ceiling, to the Secretary of State, to permit him to act in connection with the Secretary of Defense, so as to enable them to settle these routine claims, which we do not doubt for a minute we are liable for.

Mr. WHERRY. That would simply establish a precedent; and if thereafter any country thought it had even a color of title under the $21,000,000 ceiling so authorized, it would make the claim.

It seems to me that the proper procedure is to settle the present claim, and then let other claims be handled as they may arise.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether I am correct in my understanding that this measure proposes an over-all authorization, and would apply equally to nations that are not cited in the bill at present, should they in the future find that they have claims for damages against the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMITH. If they file such claims prior to July 1, 1948; yes. The bill provides a final date, as well as a ceiling as to the total amount of dollars.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. But any other nation that might be damaged is to be included under the provisions of the bill, although that nation has not filed its claim today; but it would have until July 1, 1948, in which to do so; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I wish to say to the Senator that we asked the National Military Establishment carefully about that matter. They have not had other claims filed, and they say there is no possibility that other claims will be filed, except those set forth in the report.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. But under the provisions of this measure, if other nations have such claims, they may file them at any time prior to July 1, 1948; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; they can make such claims, of course.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotions of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skill between people of the United States, and other countries, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

That concludes the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—THE MUNDT BILL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the RECORD, and also to point out the program again to the Members of the Senate who are present at this time, let me say it is our intention, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, at the close of the session of the Senate on Wednesday, just before a motion to take a recess is made, to move that Calendar No. 861, House bill 3342, be made the unfinished business, so that at the next session following the recess on Wednesday, which we anticipate will be on Friday, the debate on that measure will occur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to request unanimous consent for that purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; I simply make that statement for the RECORD, so that Senators who are making their plans may know what the intention is.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The bill to which the Senator has referred is generally known as the Mundt bill; is it not?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. In order that Senators may be informed, I make this announcement for the RECORD, and I also make it to the Senators who are present at this time, namely, that at the conclusion of the session on Wednesday, just before the recess is taken, we propose to make that bill the unfinished business, and have the Senate take a recess until Friday; and it is intended that the bill will be taken up at the beginning of the session on Friday.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1426) to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 14, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

JANUARY 12, 1948.

I hereby designate Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, infinite and eternal, in an olden time Thou didst speak, "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee. For I am the Lord thy God, thy Saviour." Speak to us now, as we bow a moment in prayer; speak to us and shed light upon the problems that perplex us. Help us to be worthy of those who love us and ready to forgive those who wrong us. Write the spirit of benevolence in our hearts, that we may be the helping hand to the weak and a comfort to the afflicted and the distressed. O may the whole human

race be filled with the blessings of Thy truth and the vision of Thy approaching kingdom. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 8, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Army.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of State.
6. Department of the Treasury.
7. Civil Service Commission.
8. Federal Works Agency.
9. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
10. National Archives.
11. Office of Government Reports.
12. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
13. United States district court (eastern district of North Carolina).
14. Veterans' Administration.

RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file any rules or reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

> The President is in no wise satisfied with his own positions. First he takes up one, and in attempting to argue us into it he argues himself out of it, then seizes another and goes through the same process, and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he snatches up the old one again, which he has some time before cast off. His mind, taxed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle and be at ease.
>
> * * * He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man.

Mr. Speaker, those are not my words. I am echoing the words of Abraham Lincoln which he uttered on the floor of the House of Representatives 100 years ago, January 12, 1848. I think if he were here today he would repeat them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SARBACHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered last Friday.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial, and in the other an article.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a letter from the Dairy Commissioner of the State of North Dakota, and in the other an editorial by David Lawrence.

CHARTER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this brief time in order to announce to the Members of the House that I have this day introduced a bill which in accordance with its short title will be known as the Charter of the District of Columbia. This bill is the product of work which has been done during the past 8 months by the Subcommittee on Home Rule and Reorganization of the District of Columbia of the House District Committee, and was authorized by the House of Representatives under House Resolution 195.

The subcommittee first addressed its attention to a review of the previous studies of the District government, and an up-to-date report on the present organization and administration of the government was prepared. After intensive study of this report, the committee and its staff considered the problem of not only simplifying the government in the District, but also the adoption of what are considered good practices in the management of municipal affairs.

From the beginning the subcommittee had three objectives in mind: First, the relief of Congress from the burdensome housekeeping functions of the District of Columbia while still retaining its control over District affairs as required by the Constitution of the United States; second, the creation of a representative local government for the District by qualified electors; and, third, the provision of an efficient and economical government for the District of Columbia. It is obvious that if all three of these objectives are to be achieved the problems of home rule and reorganization of the District government are inextricably tied together. Home rule by itself might accomplish the first and second objectives but not necessarily the third, while reorganization by itself might achieve the third but not effect the first or second.

A complete report of the work of the subcommittee will be submitted to the Congress in about a week or 10 days, and I urge that every Member of Congress read this report. I feel it safe to say that due to the work of the subcommittee an opportunity will be offered to the Congress to enact a sensible, modern, and American plan of government for the Capital City of the United States, and I am pleased to announce that the corresponding subcommittee of the District Committee of the Senate has agreed to work wholeheartedly to that end with your committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein a report entitled "Report on the United Public Workers—CIO and Its Affiliates." I had an original estimate from the Public Printer estimating the cost at $301.75, but since then the material has been shortened and the cost should run considerably under that amount.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF WATER, POWER, AND OIL

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the most serious problem facing large sections of our Nation today is the proper development and conservation of water, power, and oil. There is a critical shortage of water and power from one end of the State of California to the other. There is an absolute shortage of power in the States of Oregon and Washington.

The population of the State of California has increased 43 percent since 1940 and it continues to increase at the rate of more than 6,000 persons per week. The population of the State of Oregon has increased 39 percent and the population of the State of Washington has increased 29 percent during the same period.

California produces no coal, and the State's known oil reserves will be exhausted within 10 years; therefore there is an urgent necessity for impounding every acre-foot of water and developing every possible potential kilowatt of hydroelectric power in the State.

Mr. Speaker, there is at the present time a critical shortage of power in the States of Oregon and Washington, and a severely critical shortage of both water and power throughout the entire State of California.

For years past, men of foresight and vision saw the need of greatly increasing our hydroelectric power potential. They not only urged maximum expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority,

and the completion of such projects as Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Colorado River-Hoover Dam, and Shasta Dam, but sought to persuade the private power companies to increase and expand their facilities to meet the growing demands for power.

Production necessary to win the war would not have been possible without the electric power generated by public hydroelectric power projects. Power plants throughout the West are producing at their full capacity at present but are far short of meeting the demand. This is particularly true in California, Oregon, and Washington. No appreciable amount of coal is produced in California or Oregon. Some coal of an inferior grade is mined in the State of Washington. Washington and Oregon produce no oil. California's known oil reserves will be exhausted within 10 years.

Every kilowatt of hydroelectric power that can now be produced in the Government-built Grand Coulee and Bonneville power plants on the Columbia River is already under contract, and there is great demand for more power to meet the fast-growing needs of the two States of Oregon and Washington.

In the State of California where there is almost entire dependency upon seasonal rain and snowfall, water must be stored for continuous availability throughout the entire year for both the development of hydroelectric power and irrigation of otherwise semiarid lands.

A primary cause of the growing demands for both water and power in the Pacific Coast States is the tremendous increase in population taking place in California, Oregon and Washington. Census statistics for July 1, 1940, show there were 6,907,387 persons in the State of California. By July 1, 1947, this population had increased 43 percent to 9,876,000 persons, and it continues to increase at the rate of more than 6,000 persons per week.

The State of Oregon had a population of 1,089,684 people on July 1, 1940. By July 1, 1947, its population had increased 39 percent to 1,517,000. The State of Washington had a population of 1,736,-191 in the census of July 1, 1940, and it increased 29 percent to 2,233,000 by July 1, 1947.

This large movement of population westward has increased the need for both water and power beyond expectancy to an alarming degree. Increases in population mean an increase in the industrial economy and the demand for both water and power. The tremendous demands for power during the past year have necessitated the use of some 40,000,000 barrels of oil for the production of electrical energy, a large part of which should be produced by hydroelectric power plants. Our national petroleum resources are limited and every barrel of oil taken from the ground is gone forever. It is a woeful waste of irreplaceable oil to use it for manufacturing electricity in areas where hydroelectric power can be developed. Hydroelectric power is inexhaustible. Every reclamation, conservation project developing hydroelectric power builds our national peacetime economy just that much stronger and strengthens our national defense.

The use of oil to generate electricity, or the shipment of oil out of the United States to foreign countries, weakens our national defense and dissipates our known oil reserves to just that extent. During the past year we have been shipping irreplaceable oil to foreign countries at the rate of 140,000,000 barrels a year. The American Petroleum Institute estimated that known petroleum reserve deposits in this country at the end of 1946 amounted to 20,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil. It has been testified before congressional committees that we are now consuming 2,000,000,000 barrels of oil each year and this consumption is increasing. This means that our known oil reserves will be exhausted in 10 years or less.

It is time for action.

INCOME-TAX REDUCTION

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, all taxes are, in the end, paid by the people and cannot, in reality, be shifted to artificial entities. The only sound method of tax relief is to subtantially cut the total amount of taxes paid to the Government.

As often as a part of our tax burden is attempted to be shifted to imaginary taxpayers, as has recently been suggested, just that often will the same tax burden come back to the people, hidden in the price of food, clothes, and other commodities that average people buy.

Experience has proven that increased taxes on the cost of production result either in higher prices or inferior merchandise and as usual the people again pay the bill. There is only one answer for actual tax relief to the people and that is, I repeat, to cut the total amount of taxes and not by foolishly trying to shift tax burdens.

Whatever amount of tax that is actually cut from the total taxes paid to the Government can never boomerang to the people.

As a result of the cuts in appropriations made by the Eightieth Congress, together with additional unestimated revenue, the Federal surplus for the current fiscal year will be approximately $5,000,000,000. This surplus should unqualifiedly be passed along to our own people in the form of tax relief and should positively not be given away by our Government in the form of blank checks under the guise of foreign relief.

In February 1947, I introduced an income-tax reduction bill known as H. R. 2171. My bill would increase all Federal income-tax exemptions from $500 to $700, thereby giving substantial tax relief to those of the lower income groups. My bill would also cut all Federal income taxes by 10 percent, thereby relieving taxpayers in the upper income brackets. Such a tax reduction would amount to a sum greater than the total cost of all bread and wheat products purchased by our people. It would also encourage venture capital and be an incentive to new enterprise and consequently result in additional jobs. This plan could not result in higher prices or inferior merchandise because taxes would be actually cut and not just temporarily shifted.

I have been working for such a tax reduction plan for the past 10 months and I am delighted that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is about to report a bill that substantially follows the plans of tax reduction that I have outlined.

When this bill is enacted into law, I am confident it will result in a substantial and actual tax reduction for all our people.

AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include two articles. Should either of these articles slightly exceed the two-page limit I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have the following letter addressed to me from my district:

Hon. CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed news item would indicate that the dictatorial methods of a police state are being extended to welfare and relief work. We are doing our best to check it. Can you help?

Sincerely,

W. E. SHACKLEY.

For the benefit of the House, may I say that this is from the city of Van Wert, in my district. For a number of years this city of some 10,000 people has raised the funds for the Red Cross, and for the YWCA, the YMCA, the Boy Scouts, and the general charities by a Community Chest drive. Unlike the city of Washington, theirs is oversubscribed. However, the American Red Cross have refused to have their funds raised in this way and have canceled the charter for the Red Cross in the county of Van Wert, not bebecause they did not raise the quota but because they did not dot their i's and cross their t's in accordance with the control of the National Red Cross. I extend under consent these articles from the Van Wert Times-Bulletin—can the top command of Red Cross be losing their sense of proportion?

NO ONE CAN BLAME THE NAM FOR THIS ONE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I repeat there is not any doubt but what the President has the power, the authority, and the funds to control food prices.

Example No. 1 was when Mr. Luckman was projected into the poultry picture. What happened to poultry prices? Week after week chickens have been selling for 50 to 60 percent of parity when the law states "not less than 90 percent of parity." Eggs are on this day and hour selling in the West and Midwest at 50 to 60 percent of parity. Nothing is being done about it either. This is an example of what happens to a livestock product.

Let us take a look at another product. On January 10, 1947, the Secretary of Agriculture announced a $6 per bushel support price for flaxseed. On that date the parity price of flaxseed was $3.63 per bushel. This support floor was 165 percent of parity on January 10, 1947. The parity price of flaxseed today is $4.14 per bushel and the support price is continued at $6 per bushel. What effect did this 165 percent of parity have on the price of other grains? What do you think? What effect did it have on other vegetable oils?

This $6 floor price on flaxseed provides a 25 to 30 cents per pound floor price on linseed oil. Do you think that a 25- to 30-cent support price on this vegetable oil had any influence on the price on other vegetable oils? Vegetable oils and animal fats like lard have always had a close price relationship. Do you think the 25- to 30-cent support price on a vegetable oil strengthened or weakened lard prices? Last spring lard was 17.5 cents per pound and advanced to 27 cents per pound or by over 50 percent. There were, of course, other contributing causes for the price advance.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is that the administration dominates the food prices—whether one thinks they are too low or whether one thinks they are too high.

There is not much sense to be blaming the NAM, nor any sense in wishing to restore the police state OPA. Again I state that the President has the power, authority, and the money, as long as it lasts, to control prices, and he has the responsibility if and when he wishes to assume the responsibility.

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a statement containing the flood-control and river and harbor projects which were approved by the Budget and which will be considered in the budget hearings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message is coming up today. I am placing into the RECORD the list of the projects of both rivers and harbors and flood control which were approved by the Budget and showing the amounts which were approved for each project. I am doing this with the distinct understanding that the committee and the Congress are not bound by the Budget, and that Congress and the committee will write their own bill. I am placing this list into the RECORD to make it unnecessary for Members to come to the committee or to the War Department to find out what has been approved for a particular project. I feel they are entitled to that information.

Last year—fiscal year 1948—Congress approved $415,553,525 for rivers and harbors and flood control, this included construction, maintenance, planning, and so forth. The President's budget for 1949, including all the above items, totals $663,219,000, or an increase of $247,600,000 over 1948 fiscal year. Congress approved $116,718,700 for rivers and harbors for 1948 fiscal year. The President is asking for $191,267,000 for 1949, an increase of $74,548,300 over 1948 fiscal year. Congress approved $298,835,000 for all items of flood control for 1948 fiscal year.

The President is asking for $472,000,000 for the same purpose for 1949, an increase of $174,000,000 over 1948 fiscal year. While I feel that some increase is justified, I have a firm conviction that it will be difficult to justify an increase of a quarter of a billion dollars even for flood control and rivers and harbors.

River and harbor construction

PROJECT AND AMOUNT	
Portland Harbor, Maine	$1,600,000
New Haven Harbor, Conn	1,500,000
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn	100,000
Hudson River, N. Y	269,000
New York and New Jersey channels	2,200,000
Delaware River—Philadelphia to the sea	1,051,000
Schuylkill River, Pa	1,295,000
Baltimore Harbor and channels, Maryland	871,400
Norfolk Harbor, Va	108,000
Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington	1,264,500
Winyah Bay, S. C	856,600
Charleston Harbor, S. C	176,000
Savannah Harbor, Ga	1,563,000
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean	1,201,600
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney	255,100
Hollywood Harbor, Fla	376,000
Tampa Harbor, Fla	918,300
St. Josephs Bay, Fla	376,400
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla	5,000,000
Pearl River, Miss., and La	3,509,500
St. Thomas Harbor, Virgin Islands	1,006,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (New Orleans district)	3,370,700
Calcasieu River and Pass, La	1,000,000
Waterway from Empire, La., to Gulf of Mexico	638,000
Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex	460,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (Galveston district)	2,119,000
Brazos Island Harbor, Tex	325,000
Dam B—Neches and Angelina system, Texas	1,818,100
Mississippi River (Ohio River to Missouri River)	10,000,000
Mississippi River (Missouri River to Minneapolis)	2,000,000
Missouri River (mouth to Kansas City)	2,500,000
Missouri River (Kansas City to Sioux City)	4,500,000
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont	4,200,000
Ohio River (open-channel work)	199,500
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va	1,400,000
Two Harbors (Agate Bay), Minn	1,000,000
Keeweenaw Waterway, Mich	$75,000
Manistee Harbor, Mich	255,500
St. Marys River, Mich	3,000,000
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio	2,000,000
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y	193,000
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif	253,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay, Calif	1,300,000
Crescent City Harbor, Calif	600,000
Sacramento River, Calif	2,500,000
Napa River, Calif	865,000
Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg	900,000
Columbia River:	
Umatilla (McNary) Dam	30,000,000
Vancouver to The Dalles	200,000
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland Oreg	929,000
Columbia River at Bakers Bay, Wash	60,000
Yaquina Bay and Bar, Wash	109,400
Coos Bay, Oreg	2,000,000
Wrangell Narrows, Alaska	1,038,000
Subtotal, rivers and harbors construction	107,350,000

Flood-control construction

PROJECT AND AMOUNT	
Union Village Reservoir, Vt	$1,500,000
Birch Hill Reservoir, Mass	100,000
Blackwater Reservoir, N. H	231,000
Franklin Falls Reservoir, N. H	150,800
West Peterboro Reservoir, N. H	600,000
Holyoke, Mass	755,000
Springdale, Mass	315,300
Chicopee, Mass	256,000
Norwich, Conn	320,000
East Sidney Reservoir, N. Y	3,602,300
Whitney Point Reservoir, N. Y	57,700
Almond Reservoir, N. Y	1,808,200
Elmira, N. Y	1,175,200
Almond, N. Y	113,900
Sunbury, Pa	1,390,600
Williamsport, Pa	2,244,400
York, Pa	263,100
Savage River Dam, Md	500,000
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C	10,200,000
Philpott Reservoir, Va	2,200,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C	8,400,000
Macon, Ga	419,000
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga	9,900,000
Narrows Reservoir, Little Missouri River Basin, Ark	3,600,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark	4,000,000
Memphis, Tenn	640,000
Bayou Teche and Vermilion River, La	600,000
Mermentau, La	2,500,000
Texarkana Reservoir, Tex	4,350,000
Aloha Rigolette area, Louisiana	1,049,600
Pineville, La	60,800
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La	1,000,000
Shreveport, La	1,475,000
Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute, and Loggy Bayou, La	34,700
Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, La	1,040,000
Colorado Springs, Colo	605,600
Benbrook Reservoir, Tex	4,950,000
Lavon Reservoir, Tex	3,200,000
Grapevine Reservoir, Tex	4,300,000
Whitney Reservoir, Tex	5,172,000
Hords Creek Reservoir, Tex	280,000
San Angelo Reservoir and floodway, Texas	5,360,000
Nimrod Reservoir, Ark	75,000
Clearwater Reservoir, Mo	1,367,100
Norfolk Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	1,100,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo	17,000,000

Flood-control construction—Continued

Crawford County levee district, Arkansas	$600,000
Carden's Bottom drainage district No. 2, Arkansas	700,000
West of Morrilton, Ark	985,000
Conway County levee district No. 6, Arkansas	33,000
Conway County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 8, Arkansas	390,000
Little Rock, Ark	310,300
Little Rock to Pine Bluff, Ark	400,000
East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff, Mo	153,400
Eufaula Reservoir, Okla	3,000,000
Wichita and Valley Center, Kans	490,000
Kaw, Arkansas River, Okla	102,000
Canton Reservoir, Okla	700,000
Oklahoma City floodway, Oklahoma	800,000
Great Salt Plains Reservoir, Okla	125,000
Polecat Creek, Okla	750,000
Fall River Reservoir, Kans	4,400,000
Hulah Reservoir, Okla	3,000,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla	9,000,000
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, Okla	3,600,000
Wister Reservoir, Okla	4,000,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	500,000
Wood River drainage and levee district, Illinois	2,000,000
East St. Louis and vicinity, Illinois	1,000,000
Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district, Illinois	64,000
Stringtown-Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district, Illinois	730,000
Perry County Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Mo	500,000
Degognia and Fountain Bluff drainage and levee district, Illinois	240,000
Grand Tower drainage and levee district, Illinois	730,000
Prairie du Rocher and vicinity, Illinois	1,100,000
Harrisonville and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district, Illinois	323,500
Baldhill Reservoir, Sheyenne River, N. Dak	784,500
Park River Reservoir, N. Dak	478,300
Red Lake and Clearwater Rivers, Minn	1,200,000
Lac qui Parle Reservoir, Minnesota River, Minn	113,200
Dry Run, Iowa	320,000
The Sny Basin, Ill	1,500,000
Red Rock Reservoir, Iowa	1,200,000
Coralville Reservoir, Iowa	700,000
Elkport, Turkey River, Iowa	30,100
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans	8,000,000
Kanopolis Reservoir, Kans	48,000
Harlan County Reservoir, Nebr	9,000,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to mouth	10,000,000
Indianola, Nebr	13,000
Bartley, Nebr	96,000
Charlton River, Iowa and Mo	950,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak	20,000,000
Denison, Iowa	52,000
Missouri River, Kensler's Bend, Nebr., to Sioux City, Iowa	700,000
Omaha, Nebr	2,900,000
Council Bluffs, Iowa	886,000
Forsythe, Mont	74,200
Hot Springs, S. Dak	117,400
Hazen, Knife River, N. Dak	35,500
Beulah, N. Dak	87,000
Cherry Creek Reservoir, Colo	8,500,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak	30,400,000
Mandan, N. Dak	334,000
Berlin Reservoir, Ohio	204,300
Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pa	276,200
Youghiogheny River Reservoir, Pa	299,200
Johnstown, Pa	$402,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa	7,875,000
Punxsutawney, Pa	1,428,100
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir, Pa	2,000,000
Olean, N. Y	733,000
Latrobe, Pa	146,000
Muskingum River Reservoirs, Ohio	1,600,000
Bluestone Reservoir, W. Va	5,713,000
Delaware Reservoir, Ohio	1,494,900
Massillon, Ohio	2,000,000
Dillon Reservoir, Ohio	3,000,000
Parkersburg, W. Va	2,450,900
Dewey Reservoir, Ky	2,071,000
Portsmouth-New Boston, Ohio	2,407,300
Burr Oak Reservoir, Ohio	239,400
Point Pleasant, W. Va	1,100,000
Cincinnati, Ohio	285,000
Muncie, Ind	78,000
Jeffersonville-Clarksville, Ind	235,000
Louisville, Ky	4,500,000
Newport, Ky	1,800,000
New Albany, Ind	1,500,000
Cannelton, Ind	640,000
Mounds and Mound City, Ill	884,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek section, Indiana	1,624,000
Cagles Mill Reservoir, Ind	2,500,000
Uniontown, Ky	350,000
Taylorsville, Ky	80,000
Covington, Ky	1,200,000
Levee unit 8, Indiana	243,000
Shufflebarger levee, Indiana	420,000
McGinnis levee, Indiana	420,000
West Fork Reservoir, Ohio	1,300,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn., and Ky	200,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn	9,565,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky	19,687,000
Farm Creek Reservoirs, Ill	3,000,000
Lacey, Langellier, West Matanzas, and Kerton Valley drainage and leevee districts, Illinois	$617,000
Coal Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois	1,021,800
Mount Clemens, Clinton River, Mich	284,000
Lancaster, N. Y	40,000
Mount Morris Reservoir, N. Y	5,000,000
Syracuse, N. Y	1,100,000
Montour Falls, N. Y	1,130,000
Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif	5,000,000
Merced County stream group, California	1,000,000
Sacramento River minor tributaries, California	500,000
Isabella Reservoir, Calif	3,000,000
Folsom Reservoir, Calif	3,370,000
Redmond, Utah	125,000
Pajaro River, Calif	$185,000
Los Angeles County drainage area, California	4,138,000
Prado Dam, Calif	263,500
Ventura River, Calif	960,000
Holbrook, Ariz	30,000
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg	3,500,000
Lookout Point Reservoir, Oreg	7,000,000
Heise-Roberts area, Idaho	351,000
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg	3,500,000
Willamette River, Oreg. (bank protection)	500,000
Fern Ridge Reservoir, Oreg	155,000
Multnomah drainage district No. 1, Oregon	83,800
Diking and improvement district No. 4, Washington	70,400
Amazon Creek, Oreg	67,000
Pudding River, Oreg	29,000
Mill Four drainage district, Yaquina River, Oreg	22,000
Umpqua River and tributaries, Oregon	116,000
Coquille River, Oreg	93,000
Arlington, Oreg	35,000
Nehalem River, Oreg	15,000
Tacoma, Puyallup River, Wash	650,000
Mud Mountain Reservoir, Wash	543,700
Snagging	1,000,000
Emergency bank protection	$1,000,000
Subtotal, flood control, general construction	381,895,000
Flood control, Mississippi River construction	56,000,000
Flood control, Sacramento River construction	1,815,000
Grand total, construction	547,060,000

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit during this week while the House is in session at such times as the House shall be engaged in general debate or on special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Rolla Daily News.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, the 20th of January, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy and the recommendation of 53 members on how to combat inflation in the United States, and the first way is a radical reduction of Government expenditures. I hope the membership will read the statement when it is printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times on oleomargarine and in a second instance to include an article from the New York Journal of Commerce.

SHOCKING WASTE OF WHEAT AND FLOUR

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, to save grain the Secretary of Agriculture, pursuant to Public Law 395, has limited the production of distilled spirits. I salute him.

A more fruitful field for saving wheat and flour, however, has yet to receive the attention it deserves. A sizable segment of the baking industry sells bread on consignment which means that retail outlets are constantly oversupplied. Unsold bread returned by retailers entails, I am advised, a loss of some 5 percent of total production or roughly 600,000,000 loaves of bread a year. Enough flour is therein contained to feed hungry people for a substantial period.

Voluntary agreements to end this practice are permissible under Public Law 395. Accordingly, I have called upon the American Bakers Association to take the initiative in the premises. I have also asked the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce to encourage and implement such agreements. The support of Members of the House in this endeavor is solicited.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by Gen. H. H. Arnold.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order assigned to me for today be vacated, and that I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune, of Gary, Ind.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Maj. Alex P. de Seversky, We Are Preparing for the Wrong War. I have an estimate from the printer that it will cost $195.25. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this week more than 700 delegates, representing postal employees from 44 States, are convening in Washington. The National Association of Letter Carriers wish to bring to the attention of Congress the total inadequacy of their present wage and salary income to cover the inflationary high cost of living. Today the postal employee on the beginner's salary of $2,100 a year, finds that it is impossible to provide his family with the bare necessities of life. The Members of Congress realize how much the cost of living has skyrocketed in the last 18 months since price control was removed. In June 1946, the cost of living was then unreasonably high and up until that time the postal employees of this country had received but one salary raise in 23 years. The postal employees during the war, contributed greatly to America's victory. Owing to depleted personnel who were called to the armed services, thousands of postal employees carried on the added burden of delivering the mail and other duties incident thereto. During the war rush period, they willingly worked overtime to a degree that impaired the health of a great number of postal employees. I think every Member of Congress who is familiar with the postal service in metropolitan areas, realizes that special consideration should be given toward increasing the salary in order to meet the present inflationary prices.

Legislation to increase retirement annuities which have not been increased since 1930 will also be considered by the convention this week. Because of inadequacy of present retirement rates, thousands of carriers, clerks, and other postal employees are remaining in service despite their eligibility for pensions. Should this be corrected, thousands of jobs will be opened for younger men who thus far have been unable to get into the service. The morale of employees in post offices throughout the country is running at a very low ebb and our postal service is not up to standard because of economic conditions under which so many postal employees are now struggling.

DISCHARGE PETITION, UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that I have this morning placed on the Speaker's desk a discharge petition on the bill known as the universal military training bill. This bill is the version approved by the American Legion. I understand the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the AMVETS have also approved this draft.

I am filing this discharge petition in the hope that a majority of the Members of the House who are in favor of this legislation will sign this discharge petition in order that the matter may be brought to the floor of the House without further delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

THE LATE HONORABLE GUINN WILLIAMS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is my unpleasant duty to announce to the House the death on Friday last, of the Honorable Guinn Williams, a former Member of this body from the State of Texas. Mr. Williams was first elected a Member of the Sixty-Seventh Congress from the Thirteenth Texas District, and was reelected four succeeding times after that.

He voluntarily retired from the House in 1933 to become the director of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, in San Angelo, a loan agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which saved many farmers and ranchmen from bankruptcy during the depression. Before that time his home had been at Decatur, Tex.

In Congress, Mr. Williams served as chairman of the House Committee on Territories and he was sponsor of a bill to grant independence to the Philippines.

A native of Calhoun County, Miss., Mr. Williams settled in Texas in 1877. He served in the State Senate of Texas before coming to Congress. In private life he was a successful banker, farmer, and ranchman.

This distinguished Texan will also be remembered for his fraternal interests. He once served as grand master of the Masonic Order in Texas, and was honored with a thirty-third degree in the Scottish Rite.

Mr. Speaker, Guinn Williams was not a seeker of praise. He lived the simple American life, measuring any right to fame in the amount of service he could render to his fellow man, and that was done in great abundance.

America has lost a great man, and I and many of you have lost a friend. Few men have contributed more to the preservation of our institutions than Guinn Williams. We can all be inspired by the high principles to which he devoted his long and useful life.

To the widow and the family I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, that during the 10 years of the service of Mr. Williams, of Texas, I was a Member of this House. In my opinion he was one of the most typical Texans I have seen on this floor. He was a man of sterling character, a splendid legislator, fair, and a wonderfully fine gentleman. In time like these we can ill afford to lose men of the high character and patriotism of Guinn Williams.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It was my pleasure and privilege to serve with Guinn Williams for 10 years in this House.

Instead of being a typical Texan, Mr. Williams was a typical Mississippian who went to Texas and helped upbuild that great State.

He was one of the finest men with whom I have ever served, and one of the most conscientious public servants. When he left this House it was a great loss to the country.

His passing is mourned by everyone who knew him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address made in New Orleans on January 8.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial and in the other to include a newspaper article.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include editorials.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio speech.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD covering the activities of the Butte High School band in Salt Lake City, Las Vegas, and Los Angeles, where they participated in the Tournament of Roses.

BUDGET MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting my recommendations for the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, together with revised estimates for the fiscal year 1948. This Budget includes estimates to carry out both existing laws and proposed legislation.

The realities of our existing international and domestic requirements account for the size of this Budget. It affords essential support to the foreign policy of the United States by encouraging widespread international economic cooperation while maintaining our armed strength. It affords essential support to our domestic policies by advancing the development of human and material resources within a fiscal plan designed to help combat inflation.

The expenditures of the Federal Government are still inescapably dominated by the war and its aftermath. In the fiscal year 1949, 79 percent of our expenditures directly reflect the costs of war, the effects of war, and our efforts to prevent a future war: National Defense—International Affairs—Veterans' Benefits—Interest on the Public Debt—Tax Refunds. This should be a sobering thought to all of us as we strive for the creation of lasting peace among the nations of the world. Only 21 percent of our expenditures finance the Government's programs in the broad areas of: Social Welfare—Housing—Education—Research — Agriculture — Natural Resources — Transportation — Finance — Commerce— Industry— Labor—General Administration.

In the 2 years since the surrender of the Axis Powers, expenditures of the Federal Government have decreased sharply from 63.7 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1946, to 42.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1947, and an estimated 37.7 billion dollars in the current fiscal year. Were the Budget for the fiscal year 1949 to be confined solely to carrying out existing laws, there would be a further decrease to slightly below 34 billion dollars.

It would be gratifying if I could say to the American people and to their Senators and Representatives in the Congress that our existing programs fulfill our national requirements. But this is not the case. Our national and international responsibilities demand that we undertake new activities and expand some activities in which we are already engaged.

Expenditures of 5.7 billion dollars will therefore be required for the fiscal year 1949 to finance programs under proposed legislation. Of this, 4.4 billion dollars is needed for our aid to the European recovery program and for aid to other countries, including China. Most of the remainder is for the development of our human and material resources through universal training, aid to education, expansion of social security, health insurance, housing, and scientific research.

Thus the Budget for the fiscal year 1949 calls for total expenditures of 39.7 billion dollars. Receipts during this period are estimated under existing tax laws at 44.5 billion dollars. This will balance the Budget and provide 4.8 billion dollars which should be used to reduce the public debt.

For the current fiscal year, 1948, the revised estimates included in this Budget indicate expenditures of 37.7 billion dollars and receipts of 45.2 billion dollars. This indicates a surplus of 7.5 billion dollars which should be used to reduce the public debt.

Our 1949 Budget reflects a number of important decisions involving Government policies which deserve special attention.

National defense, amounting to 11 billion dollars, accounts for 28 percent of the 1949 Budget, as it will in 1948. The net increase over 1948 is 279 million dollars, which is less than the amount needed to inaugurate the program of universal training. The total for all other defense activities has been held below the 1948 level. Increases in the most essential activities, such as aircraft procurement and civilian reserves, will be offset by economies and reductions elsewhere. This Budget emphasizes progress toward a modern and balanced armed force.

International affairs and finance, amounting to 7 billion dollars, accounts for 18 percent of Budget expenditures in 1949 as compared with 15 percent in 1948. The cost of the new aid programs will be largely counterbalanced by completion or sharp reduction of expenditures for the British loan, UNRRA, post-UNRRA relief, and certain other programs. There will therefore be a net increase in this category of less than 1.5 billion dollars. The new international program is our answer to an unprecedented challenge. We are undertaking it under conditions basically different from any which we have experienced before. I have repeatedly stressed the critical importance of our aid to European recovery, which represents the bulk of this expenditure. The sums requested are vital to the success of this program.

The budgetary implications of failure to achieve recovery in Europe and other crucial areas deserve additional emphasis. Should failure of these programs result in a further extension of totalitarian rule, we would have to reexamine our security position and take whatever steps might be necessary under the circumstances. The costs of added military strength, if Europe should succumb to totalitarian rule, would far exceed the costs of the program of economic aid now before the Congress.

Expenditures for national defense and international activities constitute 46 percent of the total Budget for the fiscal year 1949. The increases in national defense and international aid programs total almost 1.8 billion dollars, which is close to the increase of the entire Budget over 1948.

All other expenditures of the Government in the fiscal year 1949 are estimated at 21.6 billion dollars, about the same as the 1948 expenditures in these categories. Within this total, which includes 6.1 billion dollars for veterans, over 5.2 billion dollars for interest, and nearly 2 billion dollars for refunds, there are a number of reductions resulting from declining programs and a number of increases to finance activities which should not be deferred.

During the fiscal year 1949, fewer veterans will be requesting educational aid and needing unemployment compensation benefits than in 1948, but expenditures for hospital construction will increase, leaving a net reduction of 530 million dollars for veterans' activities. This reduction contemplates continuation of existing veterans' programs with the same types of benefits as have been available this year. The surplus property disposal program is nearing completion, and under revised legislation should cost about 200 million dollars less than in the current year.

New legislative proposals, together with expansions in present programs

necessary to carry out the intent of existing laws, account for the increases in expenditures.

Failure to improve our educational system or to expand flood-control work would mean risking the loss of precious resources—human and material. Failure to adopt a program of health insurance would mean that many families will continue to go without adequate medical care. Failure to broaden the coverage of present social insurance and to increase benefits on a permanent basis would mean too much reliance upon relief, whereas more reliance on insurance is our national objective. Failure to adopt a long-range housing program would mean further delay in achieving decent housing standards. Failure to devote needed sums to our atomic plant would mean that we would be derelict in the use of one of our most valuable resources. Each of these proposed new and expanded programs has been most carefully weighed. All these programs directly support the twofold objective of building economic and individual strength and health in this Nation, and of better preparing this Nation to discharge its increased responsibilities in the family of nations.

We are all aware of the imperative necessity for preventing further inflation. Both the expenditure and revenue proposals of this Budget are designed to avoid inflationary effects wherever possible.

To this end, Government purchases of materials in short supply are being deferred where feasible. The expansion of Government credit and of Government guarantees of private credit is being restricted. Further, I am not recommending at this time cost-of-living increases in pay for military and civilian Government personnel, nor cost-of-living increases in benefits for our veterans, social insurance beneficiaries, retired Federal employees, and other similar groups.

The rapid increase in living costs during the last 18 months has placed a serious burden on these groups. Yet, to offset the cost-of-living increase since the last time pay or benefit rates were advanced for each group would add at least 2.4 billion dollars to Budget expenditures in 1949—apart from increases that would be paid from the trust funds. This large expenditure would add greatly to the inflationary pressures in our economy.

The wiser approach, which I have proposed to the Congress, is to enact a comprehensive program to hold living costs down. Enactment of that program will give relief not only to Federal personnel and annuitants, but to our citizens generally. In the event that the Congress does not provide controls adequate for this purpose, I may have to recommend further adjustments in pay and benefit rates.

The question of taxation must be considered in the framework of the budgetary program and the danger of further inflation. One of our most effective weapons in fighting inflation is a substantial Budget surplus for reduction of the national debt. If we make this protection less effective, we shall have to rely much more heavily on direct price, wage, and rationing controls, which we all agree should be held to a minimum.

Some readjustment is required to afford relief to many families who are suffering great hardship from the present tax structure. But total receipts should not be reduced, and the surpluses for 1948 and 1949 should be used to decrease the national debt.

This Budget reveals the magnitude of the problems with which the Federal Government must deal. It demonstrates alike the heavy responsibilities of our international position and our concern for the maintenance of a sound domestic economy. The plain fact is that our Budget must remain high until we have met our international responsibilities and can see the way clear to a peaceful and prosperous world. Prudence demands that we plan our national finances in full recognition of this fact.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Net tax revenues for the fiscal year 1949 are estimated at 1.3 billion dollars higher than the present estimate for 1948, and 3.7 billion dollars higher than in 1947. The estimates assume continuation of the present high levels of business activity and incomes, continued full employment, and stable prices close to the present level. These assumptions presuppose an effective anti-inflation program.

Budget receipts, however, will decline from 1948 to 1949, because of an estimated reduction of 2 billion dollars in miscellaneous receipts, most of which is due to a decline in receipts from sales of surplus property.

The tax adjustment I am proposing will mean a reduction in personal income taxes and a corresponding increase in corporation taxes. The estimates in the Budget for these taxes are based on existing legislation.

Budget receipts

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Source	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949
Direct taxes on individuals:			
Individual income tax	$19,629	$21,951	$22,506
Estate and gift taxes	779	842	816
Direct taxes on corporations:			
Corporation income tax	6,055	9,222	10,000
Excess profits tax and other	3,621	326	158
Excise taxes	7,270	7,320	7,476
Employment taxes:			
Existing legislation	2,039	2,409	2,493
Proposed legislation			350
Customs	494	394	378
Deduct (appropriations to trust funds):			
Existing legislation	1,459	1,627	1,672
Proposed legislation			350
Subtotal, net tax revenues	38,428	40,837	42,155
Miscellaneous receipts	4,831	4,373	2,322
Budget receipts	43,259	45,210	44,477

Between 1947 and 1948, revenues from corporation and individual income taxes combined increased by 5.5 billion dollars, more than offsetting the decline of 3.2 billion dollars in excess profits tax revenues. Between 1948 and 1949, revenues from the two types of income taxes will increase by an added 1.3 billion dollars. These increases are largely the result of inflation during the past 18 months, which has swelled corporation profits and aggregate personal incomes. Because the increase in tax collections lags behind the rise in profits and incomes, the 1948 increase in tax collections will be followed by a further rise in 1949.

Excise tax and employment tax receipts are expected to increase slightly in the fiscal year 1949 as a result of continued high levels of production and income. Receipts from customs, however, have been declining in recent months. The international trade agreements which recently became effective may cause a further slight drop in these receipts in 1949.

The expansion of existing social insurance programs and introduction of a health insurance program, under proposed legislation, will add an estimated 350 million dollars of employment taxes to gross Budget receipts, but this will all be transferred directly to the trust accounts without reflection in Budget totals.

RETIREMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

The public debt on June 30, 1947, was 258 billion dollars. Budget surpluses of over 7 billion dollars in the current fiscal year and nearly 5 billion dollars next year should permit further reduction to 246 billion dollars by June 30, 1949. As long as employment and income continue at record levels—and especially while inflationary dangers threaten—we must make the most of our opportunity for debt retirement.

The retirement of public debt held by banks, other private institutions, and individuals will be considerably greater than the 12-billion-dollar reduction in the total, since trust accounts and other Government agencies will accumulate about 6 billion dollars during the two fiscal years. The investment of these accumulations in Federal securities will permit the Treasury to retire securities in the possession of other holders.

In management of the public debt, the major goal will be the achievement of the maximum anti-inflationary effect. This has been our policy since the debt reached its peak in February 1946.

Debt held by the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks has been repaid out of excess Treasury balances, the Budget surplus, trust fund accumulations, and the sale of savings and investment bonds to the public. The whole process reduces the volume of private bank deposits and so combats inflationary pressure.

At the same time, we shall do our utmost to increase voluntary savings in all forms, particularly the purchase of savings bonds.

To curtail bank credit expansion, the Federal Reserve System and the Treasury have progressively tightened the money market. This has been reflected in an adjustment in interest rates and a better balance between short- and long-term rates. However, by refunding long-term securities into short-term securities we have minimized the increase in the average interest rate paid by the Government on market debt.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES AND APPROPRIATIONS

The Budget total includes expenditures from the general and special accounts of the Treasury and also the net expenditures from checking accounts of

Government corporations and enterprises. It does not include trust account expenditures.

Budget expenditures and appropriations by major programs

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
National defense	$14,281	$10,746	$11,025	$10,295
International affairs and finance	6,540	5,533	7,009	2,104
Veterans' services and benefits	7,370	6,632	6,102	5,154
Social welfare, health, and security	1,379	1,960	2,028	2,077
Housing and community facilities	403	113	38	292
Education and general research	76	77	387	407
Agriculture and agricultural resources	1,248	614	906	655
Natural resources	628	1,179	1,626	1,581
Transportation and communication	887	1,563	1,646	1,549
Finance, commerce, and industry	238	372	190	171
Labor	120	97	116	117
General government	1,318	1,473	1,157	1,065
Interest on the public debt	4,958	5,200	5,250	5,250
Refunds of receipts	2,897	2,049	1,990	1,990
Reserve for contingencies	-------	120	200	225
Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis	+464	-------	-------	-------
Total	42,505	37,728	39,669	32,930

Expenditures in relation to authorizations: Expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 will exceed appropriations for that year by 6.7 billion dollars. Of the 1949 expenditures, 28.4 billion dollars will be made from appropriations recommended in this Budget, including 5.4 billion dollars under permanent appropriations. Expenditures of more than 10.5 billion dollars, including 5 billion dollars for international programs, will be financed by appropriations for 1948 or earlier years. The remaining expenditures of about 700 million dollars, principally net expenditures of Government corporations and credit agencies, will be made under other types of congressional authorizations.

The Budget also includes recommended new authority for Government agencies to make contracts amounting to 1.9 billion dollars. Before expenditures are made in payment of these contracts, the funds must be provided by appropriations, but this will not be necessary until later years. Within the 32.9 billion dollars of appropriations recommended for the fiscal year 1949, nearly 1.7 billion dollars are for the liquidation of prior contract authorizations.

Changes in expenditures: The major reasons for the changes in the national defense, international, and veterans' programs have already been summarized.

The 1949 Budget expenditures for social welfare, health, and security involve increases for the public health and public assistance programs, and initial administrative costs of the proposed health insurance program. Trust account expenditures for benefit payments will also increase.

Expenditures for housing and community facilities decrease. Completion of veterans' re-use housing and curtailment of mortgage purchases more than offset the first-year costs of the proposed long-range housing program.

The increases for education and general research result mainly from the proposed grants by the Federal Government to the States to aid elementary and secondary education, and from the proposed establishment of the National Science Foundation.

The increase in expenditures for agriculture is accounted for mainly by decreased net receipts of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Proposed revisions in price support will bring some savings in 1949. More adequate provision for the conservation and use program is recommended for the 1949 crop year.

Natural resources expenditures will increase chiefly because of higher expenditures for atomic energy, flood control, and reclamation.

Major increases in expenditures for transportation are in grants for highway and airport construction, and direct improvement of rivers and harbors. These are offset in part by lower Maritime Commission expenditures.

While the anti-inflation program will require higher expenditures, the total for finance, commerce, and industry will fall sharply because the current year total includes the nonrecurring payment of war damage insurance profits to the Treasury.

The increase for labor is required to carry out the provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, to restore essential services in the Department of Labor, and to cover increased costs of the public employment offices.

General government expenditures will decrease, chiefly because of lower expenditures for the disposal of surplus property.

Although the public debt will be lower, interest payments will increase somewhat, chiefly as a result of higher accruals on savings bonds as they approach maturity.

Tax refunds will decrease mainly because of lower refunds arising from adjustment of wartime corporate tax liabilities.

In the preparation of this Budget I directed all departments and agencies to plan to continue their programs for the fiscal year 1949 at or below their operating levels in 1948. Exceptions were made only where activities could no longer be deferred. Many departmental requests to perform desirable services have been refused. Throughout the Federal Government changes in activities will be made to achieve the rigid standards of operating economy which have governed the preparation of this Budget.

SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

National defense

Since the close of hostilities, we have reduced our armed services to a small fraction of their wartime strength. Nevertheless, national defense remains the largest single Government program. The defense of the United States and the task of administering the affairs of 140 million people in the occupied areas require heavy expenditures.

The enactment of the National Security Act of 1947 will enable us to move more rapidly toward an integrated and balanced national defense program. The amounts we can afford to spend for national defense, as for any other program, are necessarily limited. The Secretary of Defense and the coordinating agencies provided by this act are now engaged in reviewing the missions and programs of the services in order to attain the most effective defense possible within these limits.

In this Budget, we provide only for the minimum requirements of the National Military Establishment. For the Air Force, the Budget will permit a higher level of maintenance and operation, with a considerable increase in aircraft procurement. For the Army, it will provide for improved equipment for small, highly mobile tactical ground forces, as well as for occupation troops and their support. For the Navy, it will provide for maintaining the fleet and naval aviation at the 1948 strength, but with increased aircraft procurement.

One basic element of a balanced national security program which I have repeatedly urged—universal training—is still lacking. A national program of broad training for all young men is necessary to provide a firm base for small standing forces to be augmented, when necessary, by trained reserve components. Such training should make possible an ultimate reduction in our standing forces. In anticipation of early approval by the Congress of a program of universal training along the lines recommended by the Advisory Commission on Universal Training, I have included 400 million dollars in the expenditure estimate for the fiscal year 1949. This is the first-year cost of a program which in full operation will cost about 2 billion dollars annually.

National defense

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Direction and coordination of defense	-------	$2	$11	$11
Air and Army defense:				
Pay and maintenance of military personnel	$4,326	3,325	3,128	3,100
All other (present programs)	1,968	2,879	2,904	2,752
Reserve components (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	13	16
Public works (proposed legislation)	-------	30	140	20
Naval defense (including naval air arm):				
Pay and maintenance of military personnel	2,374	1,659	1,581	1,569
All other (present programs)	3,184	2,458	2,535	1,938
Public works (proposed legislation)	-------	9	26	25
Activities supporting defense:				
Terminal-leave pay for enlisted personnel	1,998	283	5	-------
Lend-lease liquidation (excluding National Military Establishment)	340	83	-------	-------
Military stockpiling (Treasury)	11	110	305	360
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	49	−102	−28	-------
Other	31	9	4	4
Universal training (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	400	500
Total	14,281	10,746	11,025	10,295

Expenditures: A net increase of 279 million dollars in total national defense outlays is estimated in fiscal year 1949. Apart from readjustments in the expenditures of the Air Force, Army, and Navy, the most substantial increases are for universal training and stockpiling, and the largest decreases are in terminal-leave payments and other war liquidation expenses.

This Budget is the first to provide for a full year's operation of the facilities established by the National Security Act of 1947 for coordination and direction of our defense, both within the National Military Establishment and by the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

Expenditures for Air, Army, and Naval defense are estimated at more than 10.3 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1949—slightly less than in the present year. These expenditures cover pay and maintenance of military personnel, civilian-reserve components, research and development, aircraft procurement, naval ship construction, and military and naval public works, as well as other equipment and general operating expenses. Each of these is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Pay and maintenance of military personnel, excluding civilian reserves, in the fiscal year 1949 will require an estimated 4.7 billion dollars, or 45 percent of the 10.3 billion dollars. This estimate will provide for an average military strength of 1,423,000 officers and enlisted personnel in the Air Force, Army, and Navy for the fiscal year 1949, about the same as the current strength of the armed forces. Existing recruitment inducements appear to be adequate to maintain these forces. Pay, subsistence, travel, welfare, training, clothing, and medical expenditures will average about 3,300 dollars a man in the armed forces—nearly two and one-half times the cost a decade ago.

For the civilian-reserve components, estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 are nearly 600 million dollars, an increase of about one-half from the present year. This includes 13 million dollars under proposed legislation, mainly for additional drill pay. These organizations are also being provided with equipment, facilities, and supplies procured and paid for during the war.

Expenditures for military research and development—exclusive of those for atomic weapons, construction of facilities, and pay of military personnel engaged on research projects—will remain at about 550 million dollars in the coming year. A large proportion of these expenditures will be in aviation and related fields.

Increased replacement of aircraft is essential in the fiscal year 1949 to support our air arms at the planned levels. Wartime reserves of planes and parts are becoming depleted or obsolete. Expenditures for procurement of complete aircraft in fiscal year 1949 are estimated at 900 million dollars—an increase of about 150 million dollars over the current year. Expenditures in 1950 for this purpose will rise again as a result of the proposed increase of over 30 percent in 1949 authorizations. The plans for the Air Force contemplate operation of 55 combat groups and 17 separate squadrons.

Estimated expenditures for naval ship construction will amount to 312 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949, an increase of 34 million dollars over 1948. At present the Navy is required by law to complete certain ships authorized and started during the war. To assist in modernizing the fleet, I recommend that this provision be repealed. The partially completed ships would then be held in reserve. I also recommend that 230 million dollars of the money that would have been spent to complete these ships and convert them to advanced design be used for the construction, during the next few years, of improved types of vessels. This substitution will mean a more efficient fleet.

For construction of military and naval public works, expenditures for fiscal year 1949 are estimated at 334 million dollars, as compared with 409 million dollars in the current year. Both estimates include anticipated expenditures under legislation now pending before the Congress to provide essential housing for troops in the United States and overseas and other construction of high priority, such as research facilities.

The remaining expenditures of about 2.9 billion dollars for the defense activities of the National Military Establishment are for equipment, supplies, and civilian pay roll for maintenance and operation. In the fiscal year 1949 the bulk of this expenditure will be to pay civilian workers engaged in industrial, supply, maintenance, and administrative activities, overseas and in the United States, on defense programs. About 40 percent of all Federal civilian employees will be engaged in defense activities. Procurement of equipment and supplies other than aircraft will be limited chiefly to developmental and test items and some new equipment for ground force units. Limited provision is made for the maintenance of stand-by plants and facilities and for industrial mobilization planning.

Aside from the National Military Establishment, the most important expenditures for defense activities in 1949 will be for military stockpiling, particularly to build up reserves of those raw materials and supplies which must be obtained from overseas sources that might be cut off in time of war. Although procurement of materials for the strategic stockpile is behind schedule, the estimated expenditures for procurement in the fiscal year 1949 are held to 285 million dollars because of the urgent need for such materials to promote world recovery, and the prevailing shortages with attendant high prices. In addition to the new procurement, transfers from Government-owned stocks to the stockpile which began in 1947 will continue, with expenditures of 20 million dollars for processing in fiscal year 1949. The value of these transferred materials will amount to an estimated 400 million dollars in all by the end of the fiscal year 1949.

Appropriations and other authorizations: Appropriations of 10.3 billion dollars will be necessary for national defense in the fiscal year 1949. This amount includes estimates of 500 million dollars in appropriations for universal training and 61 million dollars for other proposed legislation, largely for military construction.

Excluding 565 million dollars in appropriations to liquidate obligations under prior contract authorizations, the new appropriations recommended for the fiscal year 1949 amount to 9.7 billion dollars. In addition, new contract authorizations of about 1.2 billion dollars are required—923 million dollars for aircraft procurement, 65 million dollars for public works, and 230 million dollars for naval ship construction.

Thus, I am recommending new authority to obligate totaling 10.9 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1949, which will permit expenditures both in 1949 and later years. Of this amount nearly 50 percent will be devoted to defense aviation. For 1948, the corresponding total authority to obligate is 10.4 billion dollars. The increase is mainly for the proposed universal training program and for strategic stockpiling.

I am also requesting authority to continue available for expenditure an estimated 380 million dollars of appropriations obligated in the fiscal year 1946 and earlier years, largely for aircraft procurement contracts and for military construction. This extension will permit liquidation of outstanding contracts on which deliveries have been delayed.

Appropriations for major activities of the Air Force and the Army have not yet been separated. In addition to obligations under direct appropriations to the Department of the Air Force, about half of those by the Department of the Army in the fiscal year 1949 will be for the Air Force. The complete recasting of the appropriations structure necessary to separate the accounts of these two Departments is now in process, but could not be completed in the short time since the passage of the National Security Act.

International affairs and finance

Our new international programs for European aid have been fully presented to the Congress in recent messages. The appropriation already enacted will provide "stopgap" assistance through next March to the European countries in most urgent need—France, Italy, and Austria—as well as aid to China. It is essential that we move as soon as possible to a positive program for promotion of European recovery.

In addition to the European recovery program, other international-aid programs for several countries, including China, are provided for under proposed legislation. Definite recommendations on these programs will be transmitted shortly. Also, I urge again enactment of the inter-American military cooperation bill proposed last May. Estimates of appropriations and expenditures for this group of programs have been included in the Budget.

Expenditures: By far the largest international expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 will be under the European recovery program—4 billion dollars, in addition to 500 million dollars in the fiscal year 1948. Expenditures under other proposed legislation for aid are estimated at 60 million dollars in the fiscal year

1948 and 440 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949.

The Export-Import Bank will continue in the fiscal year 1949 to make loans to expand international trade and promote economic development, particularly in the Western Hemisphere. The need for such loans will decline, however, when the dollar problem of Western Hemisphere countries is eased as a result of purchases in these countries under the European recovery program. Disbursements of the Bank's funds will also decline because its large loan authorizations to several European countries are rapidly being exhausted during the current fiscal year. Plans for the European recovery program call for use of the Bank's facilities to administer loans made under the new program.

The largest expenditures for foreign relief now fall under the occupied-areas program. These expenditures are handled by the Army and are chiefly for shipments of goods to prevent disease and unrest. They will increase in both the 1948 and 1949 fiscal years. The increase in 1948 will be caused largely by sharply higher prices, a severe German crop failure, extensive storm damage to Japanese crops, and the British dollar shortage. Since the United Kingdom is no longer able to meet dollar costs for essential supplies for the bizonal area of Germany the United States is now assuming this expense. The British will continue to finance purchases from sterling areas. Expenditures under this program will increase still further in the fiscal year 1949 because all dollar costs of imports for relief in the bizonal area must be paid by the United States for the entire fiscal year.

International affairs and finance

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Reconstruction and stabilization:				
European recovery program (proposed legislation)	-------	$500	$4,000	(1)
Other proposed aid legislation	-------	60	440	[2] $450
Export-Import Bank loans	$937	736	500	-------
Treasury loan to United Kingdom	2,050	1,700	-------	-------
Subscriptions to International Bank and Fund	1,426	-------	-------	-------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to United Kingdom	−38	−40	−40	-------
U. S. Commercial Company	−47	63	-------	-------
Greek-Turkish aid (act of 1947)	-------	275	119	-------
Foreign relief:				
Foreign (interim) aid (Foreign Aid Act of 1947)	-------	375	165	-------
Army (occupied countries)	514	998	1,250	1,250
Relief assistance to war-devastated areas (post-UNRRA)	-------	272	60	-------
UNRRA	1,489	201	1	-------
International Refugee Organization	-------	71	71	71
Other	3	(3)	-------	-------

[1] A 1948 supplemental appropriation of $6,800,000,000 is anticipated for the period from Apr. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949.

[2] A 1948 supplemental appropriation of $300,000,000 is also included in this budget.

[3] Less than one-half million dollars.

International affairs and finance—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Philippine war damage and rehabilitation:				
Present programs	$73	$95	$180	$116
Proposed legislation for veterans' benefits	-------	-------	16	16
Membership in international organizations:				
Present programs	17	25	24	24
Proposed legislation	-------	15	34	4
Foreign relations:				
Department of State:				
Present programs	111	160	164	151
Proposed legislation	-------	20	16	20
Other	6	7	7	1
Total	6,540	5,533	7,009	2,104

Expenditures under the interim-aid and post-UNRRA programs will be completed in the fiscal year 1949. Most of the shipments under these programs will be made in the current fiscal year, but expenditures lag behind shipments.

Payments to the Philippine Republic to make partial compensation for war damage and to aid in its rehabilitation are now increasing. I renew the recommendation that the Congress enact legislation to carry out our pledge to provide certain benefits to Philippine veterans.

Estimates for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 for membership in international organizations include disbursement of part of a proposed loan to the United Nations for construction of permanent headquarters.

The budget for the Department of State includes amounts needed under proposed legislation to carry out an effective foreign informational and cultural program. This program is essential in order to present to the world an accurate picture of United States policies and to counter misleading propaganda. An adequate information program will greatly increase the effectiveness of our international political and economic policies, especially in Europe.

Appropriations: A supplemental 1948 appropriation of 6.8 billion dollars is included in this Budget for the first 15 months of the European recovery program. This appropriation would be available for obligation through the fiscal year 1949, and would be used mainly in that year. Experience with programs involving similar procurement problems indicates that the margin between the recommended appropriation and the 4.5 billion-dollar expenditure estimate during the same period is reasonable. To permit systematic and economical placement of orders for later delivery, appropriations must be substantially greater than expenditures in the initial phase of the program. In addition, bills for a portion of the goods shipped in one fiscal year are not paid until the following year, and this lag of expenditures is particularly significant in a large new program.

Other recommended 1948 supplemental appropriations, to be spent mainly in 1949 and later years, include 300 million dollars for other foreign-aid programs, 65 million dollars for the loan to the United Nations for headquarters construction, and smaller amounts for Department of State programs.

Because of the large supplemental appropriations for international activities recommended for the fiscal year 1948, appropriations for 1949 total only 2.1 billion dollars. The two main items are 1,250 million dollars for the Army programs in occupied areas and an estimate of 450 million dollars for aid programs under proposed legislation. Recommended appropriations totaling 133 million dollars for Philippine programs are below estimated expenditures because a portion of the appropriations for the current year will remain available for expenditure next year.

Veterans' services and benefits

During the past year about 900,000 World War II servicemen returned to civilian life, increasing the number of World War II veterans to 14.7 million and the total veteran population to 18.6 million. Within a decade, veterans and their immediate dependents will constitute more than two-fifths of our entire population. Many of our veterans have rights under more than one provision of Federal law and, although the readjustment program has now passed its peak, veterans' benefits will remain a large part of the Federal Budget for many years to come.

Veterans' services and benefits (excluding trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Readjustment benefits (Veterans' Administration):				
Education and training	$2,122	$2,532	$2,029	$1,971
Unemployment and self-employment allowances	1,444	669	412	
Loan guarantee	75	79	87	
Other	-------	71	67	
Pensions (Veterans' Administration)	1,929	2,055	2,105	1,948
Insurance (Veterans' Administration)	840	154	60	58
Hospitals, other services, and administrative costs:				
Construction:				
Veterans' Administration	19	50	112	230
Corps of Engineers (Army)	9	77	300	-------
Federal Works Agency	26	52	6	-------
Current expenses:				
Veterans' Administration:				
Hospital and medical care	425	520	615	639
Other activities	472	368	308	306
All other agencies	9	4	2	2
Total	7,370	6,632	6,102	5,154

While the veterans' program has largely accomplished its original purposes, certain aspects of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act need modification. The law is being used in some cases to provide training for avocational or leisure-time activity at high cost to the Government and without commensurate benefit to veterans. The Veterans' Administration does not have adequate authority to limit the expenditure of funds under this act to constructive educational and vocational programs. A reexamination of the basic purposes of the law and suitable modification of its provisions should result in substantial savings. These savings should more than offset

such limited increases of other benefits as may be justified.

Expenditures: Expenditures for readjustment benefits in the fiscal year 1949 will amount to an estimated 2.6 billion dollars—a decline of 756 million dollars from expenditures in the current year.

College, school, and job training is now expected to reach its peak in the fiscal year 1948, with an average of 2,250,000 veterans enrolled. For the fiscal year 1949, average enrollment is expected to fall to 1,730,000 students and trainees. The number will decline in all programs except institutional on-the-farm training.

In recent months the number of veterans drawing unemployment and self-employment allowances has been substantially smaller than previously expected. The 1948 appropriations approved by the Congress provided for an average of 925,000 on the rolls. The present estimates provide for an average of 625,000 in the fiscal year 1948, with a further reduction to 390,000, on the average, in the fiscal year 1949.

Under the loan-guarantee provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, veterans obtained about 635,000 loans amounting to 3.6 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1947. About 90 percent of the loans are on residential property and the remainder are for business or farm purposes. The Government's obligation under the guarantee and insurance provisions runs to nearly one-half of the face value of these loans. In addition, the Government makes on behalf of the veterans a principal payment equal to 4 percent of the guaranteed portions of the loans. The estimates provide for continuation of the 1947 rate for the loan-guarantee program in both the fiscal years 1948 and 1949. However, in both years higher expenditures will be required to meet losses and to permit property acquisitions under loan defaults.

Compensation and pension payments to veterans and their dependents are estimated on the basis of an average of 2,923,000 claimants in fiscal year 1948 and 3,010,000 claimants in fiscal year 1949. The expenditure estimate of 2.1 billion dollars for 1949 includes 242 million dollars for subsistence allowances for disabled trainees and students.

New hospitals and domiciliary facilities are necessary to provide for the increasing number of veterans who apply for care. The construction and improvement of facilities to cost over 1.1 billion dollars has already been authorized by the Congress, but has been delayed by unduly high bids and by shortages of materials. The present expenditure estimates assume that one-half of the work on the total-authorized program will be completed by the end of the fiscal year 1949.

The operating expenses of the medical, hospital, and domiciliary-care program of the Veterans' Administration will increase substantially again in the fiscal year 1949, largely because of the steady rise in patient load, which will average 148,000 in fiscal year 1949. The out-patient care program will cost slightly less in the fiscal year 1949 than in the current year, but will provide treatment for over 6,000,000 veterans.

Declining work loads and improvements in administrative procedures will reduce operating and administrative expenditures for other programs.

Expenditures for insurance, mostly transfers to the national service life insurance trust fund, will continue to decline in 1949. The cumulative cost to the Government of insurance due to war hazards in World War II will exceed 3.6 billion dollars by the end of the fiscal year 1949.

Trust accounts: Premiums from veteran policyholders, supplemented by Government payments to cover war hazards, have resulted in substantial accumulations in the national service life insurance and Government-life insurance trust funds. The assets of the national service-life insurance trust fund will reach an estimated 7.3 billion dollars by June 30, 1949.

Veterans' life-insurance funds (trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949
Receipts:			
Transfers from general and special accounts	$822	$147	$46
Premiums, interest, and other	816	659	698
Total	1,638	806	744
Expenditures for benefits, refunds, and other (deduct)	349	372	376
Net accumulation	1,289	434	368

A dividend estimated at between 1 and 2 billion dollars will probably become payable to the servicemen who hold or have held national service life insurance. This dividend cannot be paid, however, until the financial liabilities of the fund and its legal status are determined. Because of these uncertainties, the payment of the dividend is not now included in estimated trust account expenditures. The Veterans' Administration is gradually catching up on the processing of the basic insurance records. The general contingency reserve includes expenditures to administer payment of the dividend if the exact status of the fund is clarified during the fiscal year 1949.

Appropriations and other authorizations: To cover the expenditures necessary for veterans' programs, appropriations of 5.2 billion dollars are recommended for the fiscal year 1949. The difference of about 950 million dollars between estimated expenditures and appropriations will be covered by unexpended balances from fiscal year 1948 and prior appropriations.

The appropriations estimated for the fiscal year 1949 include 230 million dollars to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authorizations for the hospital and domiciliary construction program. New contract authorizations of 43 million dollars are also requested, in part for modernization of hospital facilities and in part to cover the increased construction cost of previously authorized hospitals.

Social welfare, health, and security

In the existing social security programs we have a tried and successful framework within which to construct an integrated, comprehensive system providing for all citizens some protection against the major economic hazards of our society. We have made real progress toward our objective, but it is still far from realized.

From time to time I have proposed measures which, taken together, would complete our present system to a substantial degree and would provide protection increasingly on a social insurance basis. I intend shortly to discuss this legislative program in a special message to the Congress. Some of the proposals would have immediate fiscal effects, and I have accordingly included estimates for the following items:

Old-age and survivors insurance: Extension of coverage to all gainful workers, including agricultural and domestic employees, farmers, and other self-employed persons.

Increases in individual benefit amounts and in the maximum amount of earnings taxable.

Health program: Provision of a national system of health insurance and improved services and facilities for public health and medical care.

Unemployment compensation: Extension of coverage to employees of small businesses and as many other groups as feasible.

Public assistance: Broadening of Federal aid to include general assistance, and allotment of Federal grants for public assistance so as to relate them to the financial resources and needs of each State.

Other proposals, such as temporary and permanent disability insurance benefits, would not affect estimates for the fiscal year 1949.

Social welfare, health, and security (excluding trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Unemployment and accident compensation:				
Federal Security Agency	$78	$82	$88	$88
Railroad Retirement Board	14	15	14	15
Retirement and dependency insurance:				
Railroad Retirement Board	303	764	579	642
Federal Security Agency and other	3	3	6	6
Assistance to the aged and other special groups:				
Federal Security Agency:				
Present programs	662	758	827	822
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	100	100
School lunch (Agriculture)	76	62	66	65
Promotion of public health:				
Federal Security Agency:				
Present programs	140	163	211	222
Health program (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	15	15
Stream pollution abatement (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	1	1
Federal Works Agency and other	13	15	24	15
Crime control and correction	79	87	84	82
Other	12	11	13	4
Total	1,379	1,960	2,028	2,077

Expenditures: My recommendations for legislation involve Budget expenditures estimated at 116 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949, mainly for revisions of public assistance and initial administrative costs of the medical-care program. The other proposals would be self-financed through trust accounts.

Federal grants to States for the administration of unemployment compensation—the only Budget expenditure for this Federal-State program—are projected for fiscal year 1949 at slightly above the level for the current year. This rise reflects higher State salaries and operating costs.

Railroad retirement expenditures for retirement and dependency insurance, which consist almost entirely of transfers to the railroad retirement trust account, are determined by railroad pay-roll tax receipts. These are expected to remain at their present high level throughout the fiscal year 1949. The estimate for the current year is unusually high because it includes approximately 200 million dollars properly allocable to previous years' operations which could not be transferred until the necessary appropriation was enacted early in the fiscal year 1948.

An increase in expenditures for assistance to the aged and other special groups in the fiscal year 1949 is occasioned by higher anticipated public assistance payments. Recently the Congress extended until 1950 the temporary increase in the Federal share of these payments. In view of the upward trend in both benefit levels and case loads, the Federal expenditures for this purpose under existing legislation are expected to continue to rise. An additional 100 million dollars for public assistance has been included as an estimate of expenditures under the proposed legislation for improving this program.

An increase in Federal Security Agency expenditures for public health work in 1949 results primarily from progress in the Federal-aid hospital construction program, and from some expansion in other grants-in-aid and in research activities. The expenditure estimates include 1.4 million dollars for surveys under the stream pollution abatement program now under consideration by the Congress. The rise in Federal Works Agency expenditures for health purposes is in items for construction of hospital and research facilities in and near the District of Columbia.

Trust accounts: All social insurance benefit payments are made directly from trust funds. The handling of contributions varies. Thus, the pay-roll taxes collected by the States to finance unemployment compensation are deposited directly in a Federal trust account, as are nearly all the taxes collected for railroad unemployment insurance. For the railroad retirement system, pay-roll tax collections are included in Budget receipts and the transfers to the trust account appear as Budget expenditures. The proceeds of Federal pay-roll taxes which finance old-age and survivors insurance are transferred to the trust account without affecting expenditures; the transfer is made through a deduction from receipts and an equal credit to the trust account.

Social welfare, health, and security (major trust accounts)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Fund and item	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949
Unemployment trust fund:			
Receipts:			
Deposits by States and railroad unemployment taxes	$1,143	$1,238	$1,231
Interest	147	166	186
Extension of coverage (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	20
Payments: State and railroad unemployment withdrawals	869	814	906
Net accumulation (including proposed legislation)	420	590	531
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund:			
Receipts:			
Appropriation from general receipts	1,459	1,627	1,672
Interest and other	163	193	222
Extension of coverage and raising of tax base (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	200
Payments of benefits and administrative expenses:			
Existing legislation	466	556	649
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	175
Net accumulation (including proposed legislation)	1,157	1,264	1,270
Railroad retiremen' account:			
Receipts:			
Transfers from Budget accounts	298	758	575
Interest	24	40	55
Payments of benefits	173	229	232
Net accumulation	149	570	398
Federal employees' retirement funds:			
Receipts:			
Salary deductions and transfers from Budget accounts	483	470	465
Interest	95	105	11
Payments of annuities and refunds	323	241	250
Net accumulation	255	333	330
Health insurance trust fund (proposed legislation):			
Receipts from pay-roll contributions	-------	-------	150
Payments of benefits	-------	-------	-------
Net accumulation	-------	-------	150

All major social welfare trust funds will continue to accumulate assets in the fiscal year 1949. Excepting the unemployment trust fund, they are retirement funds which will, for some time, accumulate reseves against future benefit payments. By the end of the next fiscal year, these assets should reach 16 billion dollars.

The unemployment insurance system is related more immediately than the others to the level of economic activity. With continuing full employment, its assets should continue to accumulate, bringing the total up to approximately 9 billion dollars by the end of fiscal year 1949.

Broader coverage under old-age and survivors insurance would be financed by extending the pay-roll tax at the rates provided by present law to the newly insured persons and their employers. These old-age pay-roll tax collections would suffice for several years to finance more liberal benefits for both present and prospective beneficiaries.

The estimates for the health insurance program assume a total initial pay-roll tax of one-half of 1 percent of individual salaries up to 4,800 dollars a year, effective January 1, 1949, to furnish a basis for establishing eligibility for benefits and to build up an operating reserve. After a year or two of accumulation at this low rate, the permanent contribution rate would go into effect and the system would begin to provide benefits on a basis which is mainly self-financing.

The recommended broadening of social insurance would increase both the receipts and expenditures of the trust accounts over what they otherwise would have been. For the immediate future, however, these increases would be greater in pay-roll contributions than in benefits. This net accumulation is useful at this time as an anti-inflation measure.

Appropriations and other authorizations: Appropriations recommended for social welfare, health, and security exceed estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 principally because the appropriation requested for the Railroad Retirement Board includes authorization to transfer to the trust account during the current fiscal year part of the taxes to be collected in this year. Wage increases in the railroad industry have resulted in higher pay-roll tax collections than were estimated when the appropriation for the current year was enacted.

Besides the appropriations, contract authorizations of 119 million dollars are recommended for public health programs. This total includes 75 million dollars for the Federal-aid hospital construction program, 26 million dollars for research and hospital facilities for the Public Health Service, and 18 million dollars for the District of Columbia hospital center. Included in the recommendations for 1949 is an appropriation of 60 million dollars to liquidate the prior year's contract authorization for Federal-aid hospital construction.

Housing and community facilities

Since last fall the number of dwelling units built has been greater than in any comparable period in our history. But many families most in need of housing, particularly veterans, cannot afford to pay present high prices.

The Federal housing program, under present legislation, places primary emphasis upon assuring adequate credit through guarantees of mortgage loans for builders and veterans—including guarantees by the Veterans' Administration, classified under veterans' pensions and benefits. These credit aids have accelerated construction and increased the proportion of old and new homes going to veterans. These emergency aids have temporarily replaced most of the activity under the permanent mortgage insurance program.

In recent months, however, available credit has tended to outrun available production, and thus has helped to keep construction costs and housing prices at unreasonably high levels. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, with the assistance of the National Housing Council, is tightening standards employed in administration of existing loan-guarantee programs—including guarantees of loans both on new construction and on existing homes. He is also preparing legislative proposals designed to strengthen the permanent programs and to taper off

the special credit aids necessary during the war and reconversion periods. As long as inflation persists, such emergency aids should be limited to the types of construction most urgently needed, particularly rental housing and lower-cost housing.

Both private enterprise and local public agencies need a broader long-range program of assistance from the Federal Government. I again recommend enactment of comprehensive housing legislation. Besides establishing a better basis for Government assistance to private enterprise, such legislation is necessary to provide Government assistance through local public agencies for the sizable minority of our people whose incomes are insufficient to pay the full cost of decent housing. The Budget includes estimated first-year expenditures under such proposed legislation. These expenditures would largely prepare the way for later expansion in loans and grants for low-rent housing, urban redevelopment, and farm housing; for insurance of direct investments in large-scale rental housing; and for basic technical and economic research.

Fundamental to all progress in raising the housing standards of our people is a substantial reduction in the current excessive level of housing costs. While cost reductions are primarily the responsibility of private industry and labor, the Federal Government should provide assistance wherever possible. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is organizing a series of conferences with representatives of local government, industry, and labor, designed to speed the removal of existing obstacles to lower costs.

The greatest promise of additional cost reduction lies in development and use of improved materials and methods, and in revision of obsolete building codes to permit their use. With the assistance of the Bureau of Standards and other Federal agencies, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is working out a program of technical research to supplement industry programs. The Administrator will make the results of these studies available in usable form to builders, local public agencies, and others who can translate them into actual cost savings or quality improvements.

I also urge the Congress to authorize the Federal Works Agency to make additional commitments for repayable advances to States and localities for planning community facilities and other nonhousing public works. This would revive the authority which expired on June 30, 1947. Detailed public works plans are indispensable if State and local governments are to apply public funds efficiently in construction work. Only through such advance planning can useful public works be ready to initiate when needed, and when conditions are favorable for their construction.

Expenditures: All Federal programs to furnish financial aids to private housing will show net receipts in the fiscal year 1949. With continuing high prosperity, liquidation of previous loans will remain high, and disbursements to cover losses on guarantees of private loans will be low.

The 1949 budget of the Federal Housing Administration assumes that new insurance commitments will be limited to mortgages which do not exceed a reasonable percentage of long-run value. The emergency program permitting insurance of mortgages on the basis of current costs expires on March 31, 1948. It is my hope that, if further extension proves necessary, it will be for a very limited period and that the emergency program can be progressively curtailed. Even with more conservative operations, the Federal Housing Administration expects to aid in financing almost a quarter of the houses built in the fiscal year 1949. As long as employment and income continue high, foreclosures will be few, and receipts from insurance premiums and other sources will continue to exceed expenditures (excluding investments). Thus, further substantial additions can be made to reserves available to meet future losses.

Housing and community facilities

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Aids to private housing:				
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
Federal Housing Administration	−$1	−$9	−$6	-------
Home Loan Bank Board:				
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	−200	−159	−127	-------
Transfer of Federal Home Loan Bank stock	-------	123	-------	-------
Other	1	(1)	(1)	-------
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:				
Mortgage purchases (net)	59	70	−8	-------
Premium payments and other aids	24	10	(1)	-------
Transfer of Federal Home Loan Bank stock	-------	−123	-------	-------
Public housing programs:				
Public Housing Administration:				
War housing	108	58	47	$213
Veterans' reuse housing	365	69	7	14
Low-rent housing	(1)	10	27	6
Defense Homes Corporation:				
Return of capital	-------	12	-------	-------
Other	−1	−11	-------	-------
Other	−5	1	(1)	(1)
Other housing services:				
Housing and Home Finance Agency	8	1	1	1
Housing Expediter (excluding rent control)	5	4	-------	-------
Provision of community facilities:				
Federal Works Agency:				
Present programs	31	21	15	1
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	10	20
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8	37	32	-------
Long-range housing program (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	40	37
Total	403	113	38	292

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, under the supervision of the Home Loan Bank Board, now insures over 7 billion dollars in share accounts of savings and loan associations. The Federal home loan banks, also under the supervision of the Home Loan Bank Board, supervise the operations of member savings and loan associations and provide a reservoir of credit to meet the needs of such associations. To minimize demands upon the Corporation and the banks in future years, extension of excessive or unsound mortgage credit must be avoided. As part of the anti-inflation program, I have requested the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to review existing regulations and policies with the Home Loan Bank Board and to propose any legislation that may be necessary to strengthen this important part of our financial structure.

Repayments are continuing on the depression loans made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, but at a diminishing rate as the outstanding loans decrease. By the close of the fiscal year 1949, borrowers will have repaid all but 309 million dollars of the 3.5 billion dollars advanced by the Corporation.

The new charter of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation drastically curtails the Corporation's authority to purchase mortgages. The authority to make premium payments to stimulate building-materials production has expired.

Management and disposition of war housing accounts for most of the expenditures estimated for public housing programs in the fiscal year 1949. Almost all of the 18-million-dollar increase of expenditures for low-rent housing represents net purchase of local housing authority obligations in order to refinance war-built projects on a permanent basis. Annual contributions to local authorities will increase moderately as projects are returned to low-income occupancy.

Federal expenditures for construction of public housing in the fiscal year 1949 will be limited to small amounts for resumption of a few low-rent projects authorized before the war. Construction of temporary re-use housing for veterans will be virtually completed in the current fiscal year.

Liquidation of the Defense Homes Corporation will be completed by the end of the current fiscal year. The Corporation will return to the Treasury the entire capital investment of 10 million dollars and also an estimated earned surplus of more than 2 million dollars.

This Budget provides for a small staff under the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to coordinate Government housing activities and to make technical information and assistance generally available to the housing industry and State and local officials. Except for proposed extension of rent control, classified under finance, commerce, and industry, the functions of the Housing Expediter terminate in the current fiscal year.

Repayable advances under the original authorization by the Federal Works Agency to State and local governments for planning nonhousing public works projects will amount to 16 million dollars

in 1948 and 12 million dollars in 1949. The Budget provides for an additional 10-million-dollar expenditure under the proposed renewal of this authority. Other community facility programs of the Agency are relatively small.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in the fiscal year 1949, will disburse an estimated 32 million dollars in excess of repayment on loans to local public agencies for public works construction.

Appropriations: Of the 292 million dollars in appropriations required to finance existing and proposed programs in 1949, an estimated 57 million dollars will be necessary to inaugurate the proposed long-range housing program and to make advances for State and local public works planning under proposed legislation. Annual appropriations of 8 million dollars are recommended under existing legislation mainly to provide for annual contributions for low-rent housing projects.

Five permanent indefinite appropriations account for the remaining 227 million dollars. Of this total, 54 million dollars covers current expenses for management and disposition of war housing and veterans' re-use housing. The remaining 173 million dollars in the permanent indefinite appropriations is the estimated excess of current receipts from rental and sales of war housing and veterans' re-use housing over current expenses, to be deposited in miscellaneous receipts in the fiscal year 1950 without being reflected in expenditures.

Education and general research

The American people have long recognized that provision of an adequate education for everyone is essential in a democratic system of government. It has become evident in recent years that the financial resources of many States and their subdivisions are not sufficient to meet minimum educational standards. Therefore, I urge the Congress to take prompt action to provide grants from the Federal Government to the States for elementary and secondary education. The Budget estimates provide for beginning this program in the fiscal year 1949.

The Budget estimates also assume the creation of a National Science Foundation. In the Budget message last year, I recommended the establishment of an agency to encourage fundamental scientific research. The Congress passed a bill to create a National Science Foundation, but the bill included unacceptable administrative provisions and I was obliged to disapprove it. I hope that the Congress in this session will pass a bill for this purpose in keeping with the principles of responsible and efficient administration.

Expenditures: Apart from the proposed grant program, nearly all the estimated increase in 1949 in expenditures for the general promotion of education is due to the increase in vocational education grants authorized by the Congress in 1946. Expenditures of the Federal Works Agency for the maintenance and operation of schools in war-affected communities will be practically completed during the current fiscal year.

Education and general research

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Promotion of education:				
Office of Education (Federal Security Agency):				
Aid for education (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	$290	$300
Present programs	$28	$34	42	44
Federal Works Agency and other	5	4	(1)	(1)
Educational aid to special groups:				
Bureau of Indian Affairs (Interior)	11	12	12	12
Howard University (Federal Security Agency) and other	3	4	7	4
Library and museum services	8	9	10	10
General-purpose research:				
Department of Commerce:				
Radio propagation building (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	1	1
Other	15	15	19	20
Office of Scientific Research and Development (Office for Emergency Management)	5	(1)	-------	-------
National Science Foundation (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	5	15
Other agencies	(1)	(1)	1	1
Total	76	77	387	407

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

The increase in expenditures for library and museum services is due to a slight expansion in activities in the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution.

For general-purpose research, the principal expenditures are by the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Standards, both in the Department of Commerce. The increase for the fiscal year 1949 arises chiefly from preparatory work in the Bureau of the Census for the seventeenth decennial census in 1950 and from expenditures for the research and standards work of the radio propagation laboratories of the Bureau of Standards.

In addition to the expenditures for general and multipurpose programs included in this function, many agencies of the Federal Government carry on education or research activities which are a part of their specialized activities and which are, therefore, included as expenditures for other functions. For example, there are the education benefits of the Veterans' Administration, the scholarship programs of the State and Navy Departments, the Agricultural Extension Service, the fellowship program of the Public Health Service, and the research activities of the National Military Establishment, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

Appropriations: For the fiscal year 1949, the total of appropriations for education and general research is 407 million dollars, of which 316 million dollars is an estimate of supplemental appropriations which will be required under proposed legislation and 91 million dollars is for programs under present law. The estimated appropriation for the National Science Foundation is 10 million dollars above the estimated expenditure because contracts to be made in the first year of operation will require expenditures in later years. Only 3 million dollars of appropriations is required for Howard University, since expenditures for construction will be financed in part from earlier-year appropriations.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

At the present time, American agriculture is in the best financial condition in history. Agricultural prices in recent months have been at an all-time high—nearly three times the level of 1940. Net farm income in 1947 was approximately 18 billion dollars—three and one-half times the average net farm income in the years 1935–39. Farm debts were reduced greatly during the war years and have remained at low levels.

The Government's present commitment to support the prices of most agricultural commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity will continue until December 31, 1948. At present, however, the world-wide shortage of food has raised the prices of all but a few agricultural commodities well above support levels.

Price support will be needed in the future, but the parity formula should be revised to reflect basic changes in price relationships and improvements in agricultural technology. Price supports should be regarded chiefly as devices to safeguard farmers against forced selling under unfavorable conditions and economic depression. However, they should be revised so as not to be so high as to encourage overproduction of particular commodities, which sometimes can occur even under conditions of full employment.

The authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is the principal agency for carrying out our price support programs, was temporarily extended to June 30, 1948. I recommended a year ago, and I recommend again, that the Corporation be rechartered by act of Congress with a Federal charter in place of its present State charter, and that its present capital and borrowing authority be renewed.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Loan and investment programs:				
Department of Agriculture:				
Commodity Credit Corporation:				
Present programs	$264	−$247	$12	-------
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	−50	-------
Farmers' Home Administration (including Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds)	7	75	113	$115
Rural Electrification Administration (including Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds)	185	305	325	5

Agriculture and agricultural resources—Con.

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Loan and investment programs—Con.				
Department of Agriculture—Con.				
Return of capital to miscellaneous receipts	$3	$31	$68	-------
Other corporate transactions	−93	−78	−30	$7
Other	−3	−1	−2	1
Other financial aids:				
Department of Agriculture:				
Conservation and use	339	227	176	150
Exportation and domestic consumption	77	57	47	[1] 135
Sugar Act	55	55	69	72
Food subsidies (Commodity Credit Corporation and Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	222	8	-------	-------
Agricultural land and water resources	49	50	51	50
Development and improvement	142	131	125	121
Total	1,248	614	906	655

[1] Rescission of 91 million dollars of this permanent appropriation is proposed.

Expenditures: The largest factor in the fluctuation of total agricultural expenditures is the change in the various price support, supply, and purchase programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Advances under the contract to purchase Cuban sugar in June 1947, for example, largely account for net expenditures of 264 million dollars in the fiscal year 1947, and likewise, the subsequent sale is largely responsible for the net receipts now expected for 1948.

By 1949, net cash outlays for price support and supply programs will be small because agricultural prices on the whole are expected to be above support levels, and reimbursements from other agencies and cash-paying foreign governments should offset expenditures for procurement of agricultural commodities. However, price support will probably be required for commodities such as potatoes, eggs, wool, and tobacco.

Under proposed legislation, a saving of 50 million dollars has been included as an estimate of the possible effects of revision of the parity formula and the level of price support.

The programs of the Farmers' Home Administration were greatly curtailed during the war period. I am asking for a small increase in administrative funds and a 15-million-dollar increase in funds for production and subsistence loans in order to meet a small part of the need for essential production credit for low-income farmers. The increase in expenditures of the Farmers' Home Administration does not reflect changes in its program, but is due primarily to changes in the method of accounting for loan repayments by farmers. In 1949 such repayments, made directly to the Treasury, will amount to an estimated 111 million dollars.

Electrification of rural areas, held back during the war years, has greatly accelerated since 1945, and will continue to expand in the fiscal year 1949 as rapidly as materials become available. Except for administrative expenses, the entire expenditure figure represents loan disbursements to local cooperatives and other borrowers.

Other corporate transactions reflect the high level of farm prosperity, which has enabled farmers in recent years to make large repayments on their mortgage indebtedness. Repayments will continue in 1949, though at a reduced rate.

In accordance with the 1948 Agriculture Appropriation Act, commitments for payments to farmers under the conservation and land-use program will be reduced for the crop-year 1948, causing a decline in expenditures in the fiscal year 1949. It is necessary, however, that this program be restored in order to prevent a serious reduction in the fertility of our soil as a result of the high production induced by heavy foreign and domestic demands for agricultural products. I therefore ask the Congress to make more adequate provision for the conservation and use program by authorizing a 300-million-dollar program for the 1949 crop year. Expenditures under this program will occur largely in the fiscal year 1950.

With the present high agricultural prices, expenditures for various surplus disposal programs under the permanent appropriation for exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities can be reduced in the fiscal year 1949. On the other hand, expenditures under the Sugar Act of 1948 will be increased to make payments to sugar growers at the rates specified in the act and to cover payments owed to sugar producers in Puerto Rico—payments which were not made because of the appropriation limitation of 55 million dollars previously in effect.

The programs of the Federal Government to encourage research, education, and demonstration work, which are carried on by the Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service, and the scientific research agencies of the Department of Agriculture, are included in "agricultural land and water resources" and "development and improvement." Expenditures for these two categories show a small net decline in 1949.

Appropriations and other authorizations: To carry out our agricultural programs, I recommend that the Congress appropriate 655 million dollars for the fiscal year 1949. This includes 150 million dollars for conservation and use to carry out the commitment authorized by the Congress for the 1948 crop year. In addition, I recommend new borrowing authority of 300 million dollars to finance Rural Electrification Administration loans—an increase of 75 million dollars over the amount authorized for 1948. On the other hand, since not all of the permanent appropriation of 135 million dollars for exportation and domestic consumption of surplus agricultural commodities will be required, I recommend the return to the Treasury of 91 million dollars of this permanent appropriation.

The recommended appropriation of 121 million dollars for the various programs included in development and improvement of agriculture reflects several changes. It contemplates an increase of 10 million dollars for grants to States, marketing research, and other research under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. This increase will be offset by a decline of 10 million dollars in the appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry. Other increases and decreases will be small.

Natural resources

The key objectives of the natural resources program in the fiscal year 1949 are to find new reserves, to reduce destruction and waste, to discover new applications of resources, to promote greater reliance on resources known to be abundant, and particularly to develop the use of atomic energy.

Heavy demands on our natural resources during and since the war have made it necessary for us to take action aimed at more careful husbandry of these resources. In achieving new high levels of industrial production we have depleted our storehouse at a faster rate than ever before. In addition, our soils, water supplies, minerals, and forests available for constructive use are being diminished by avoidable wastage.

Our heritage is not so great that we can afford to overlook the growing deficiencies. Although some of our resources are practically inexhaustible, others are rapidly being depleted. Still other resources we possess only in insignificant quantity or lack completely.

The expenditures included in the Budget for 1949 are not sufficient to provide all the conservation and new development necessary to prevent a further decline in our available resources. They will, however, enable us to make moderate progress toward a more nearly sustaining basis.

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Atomic energy:				
Atomic Energy Commission	[1] $170	$456	$660	$625
Other agencies	4	20	14	-------
Land and water resources:				
Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions)	180	314	449	472
Bureau of Reclamation (Interior)	121	183	268	269
Bonneville Power Administration and southwestern power transmission system (Interior)	16	20	32	27
Tennessee Valley Authority	18	46	35	35
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico (State)	2	4	9	3
Bureau of Land Management and other (Interior)	8	10	13	14
Other	−2	[2]	[2]	[2]
Forest resources:				
Forest Service and other (Agriculture)	50	55	55	55
Department of the Interior	3	4	4	3

[1] Includes expenditures only after Dec. 31, 1946, when program was shifted to Atomic Energy Commission.
[2] Less than one-half million dollars.

Natural resources—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Mineral resources:				
Bureau of Mines and other (Interior)	$19	$24	$25	$25
Department of the Navy and other	5	5	5	(1)
General resource surveys (Geological Survey, Interior)	10	10	15	16
Fish and wildlife resources (Interior and other)	11	12	19	21
Recreational use of resources (Interior)	11	17	23	16
Total	628	1,179	1,626	1,581

Expenditures: Our responsibilities for safeguarding the national defense and developing peacetime applications of atomic energy require new laboratories, new production plants, and training of an increasing number of scientists and technicians. Increased expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 are required.

Last July the Congress provided for acceleration of our program for flood control and stream-flow regulation. This action was based in large part on the recommendations which I submitted at that time. The increases estimated for the Corps of Engineers in the fiscal year 1949 are needed for the orderly execution of this program. Almost all of the expenditures will be required to carry forward projects under way in the fiscal year 1948.

The reclamation program brings new resources into use. The base has already been set for this program. Even without the addition of any new major projects, expenditures of the Bureau of Reclamation will increase by 85 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949 if construction is to proceed at a rate which will yield irrigation and power benefits without undue delay.

In order to distribute hydroelectric power as it becomes available from Government dams, expansion of transmission facilities is needed by the Bonneville Power Administration and certain extensions should be made in the southwestern area, also by the Department of the Interior. These facilities, for which increased expenditures of 12 million dollars are estimated for 1949, are essential to deliver power to areas of shortage.

Net expenditures for the Tennessee Valley Authority program in 1949 will decrease from the 1948 level. Estimated net proceeds of 750,000 dollars from power operations will be paid into miscellaneous receipts in 1949, as compared with 8 million dollars in 1948. This reduced payment is recommended in order to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to retain corporate funds urgently needed to finance facilities required to avoid power shortages.

Construction will go forward more rapidly on the Rio Grande dams provided for in the 1944 treaty with Mexico. This will mean increased expenditures by the International Boundary and Water Commission in 1949.

Ownership of large public-domain and acquired-land holdings places on the Federal Government a direct responsibility for land conservation and management. Most of the lands administered by the Department of the Interior are unforested range lands. Expenditures on these lands in the fiscal year 1948 are inadequate for proper conservation and protection. Outlays for the land-management activities of the Department of the Interior increase from 10 million dollars in the fiscal year 1948 to 13 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949.

Our national forests, which are mostly under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, must be protected from fire, disease, and other losses, and administered so as to yield an assured timber supply for the future. Expenditures for these resources are continued at the 1948 level.

Depletion of our petroleum reserves is one of our most serious and far-reaching problems. Although discoveries of new oil pools are being made each year, reserves are becoming inadequate to match our rapidly growing requirements. Fortunately we have large supplies of coal and oil shale and moderate supplies of natural gas, which can be converted into liquid fuel. The Budget contemplates appropriation to the Bureau of Mines in 1949 of all the remaining funds authorized for the present 5-year synthetic liquid fuels program which expires in the fiscal year 1949. I recommend extension of this program for a period of 3 years and an additional authorization of 30 million dollars.

Knowledge of our natural resources is still far from complete, and cannot be made complete in a single year or even several years. The 1949 Budget provides for basic mapping and investigations only as part of a long-term program. An increase from 10 million dollars in 1948 to 15 million dollars in 1949 is needed for the basic surveys and mapping of the Geological Survey. Expenditures of the Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey for limited exploration and development, mostly for strategic and critical mineral supplies, will continue in 1949 at a slightly increased level. Since these efforts cannot result in the discovery of resources for all foreseeable requirements, we must supplement them by stockpiling materials likely to become deficient, as I have already stated in reviewing the national defense program.

Development and upkeep of our national parks, fish hatcheries, and wildlife reservations have been deferred because of the requirements of war and postwar adjustments. Increased expenditures are needed for administration and maintenance of the national parks as well as for improvement of roads, trails, parkways, and other facilities for public use and safety. The additional outlays for fish and wildlife are needed for the preservation and development of these valuable resources, including the salmon and fur-seal resources of Alaska.

The expenditure estimates for 1949 include increased allowances for development of the strategically important Alaskan area, where proved and probable resources may help to compensate for shortages in the United States.

Appropriations and other authorizations: Of the total 1.6 billion dollars of appropriations recommended for 1949, 338 million dollars will be required to liquidate prior-year contract authorizations, largely by the Atomic Energy Commission. New contract authorizations recommended for 1949 include 400 million dollars for the Atomic Energy Commission, 13 million dollars for the Bonneville Power Administration, and 4 million dollars for the National Park Service. Estimated expenditures for natural resources are 45 million dollars above the recommended appropriations, because of the carry-over of funds for some programs.

Additional contract authority of 200 million dollars is recommended for the Atomic Energy Commission in 1948 to supplement the part-year appropriation allowed by the Congress.

Transportation and communication

The current high level of economic activity makes heavy demands upon the Nation's transportation system. To meet these demands, the Federal Government must not only perform its regulatory functions but must provide basic facilities and services on an expanded scale for highway, air, and water transport. Most of the Government's activity in these fields since the war represents deferred maintenance. Little has been done so far to effect the long-run improvements that are needed.

The country's airways system is in urgent need of improvement. The installation of landing aids and the modernization of other aids to air navigation must be accelerated in order to assure increased safety and regularity of air transportation, and thus provide a solid foundation on which private capital investment can carry this industry forward. I strongly urge the Congress to provide the funds recommended for this purpose.

Expanding aviation activities also have rendered inadequate many existing airports and have pointed up the need for new ones. The amount in the Budget for the Federal-aid airport construction program represents the minimum level consistent with continued aviation development.

The Nation's highway system needs extensive improvement and modernization. While expenditures under the present Federal-aid program will continue at a high level through 1950, the fiscal year 1948 is the last for which new contract authorization is provided. The development of an adequate highway system will require continued Federal aid. In order to assure continuity in programing, I shall submit at an early date specific proposals designed to meet this need.

New ship construction by the Maritime Commission has been limited in this Budget because of the present scarcity

of steel, the large surplus of war-built tonnage, and uncertainties regarding the future economic requirements for shipping. Expenditures, though somewhat higher than in 1948, will be largely for construction previously authorized. In view of present uncertainties, it would be unwise for the Maritime Commission to start construction of ships unless it had already concluded contracts for their sale to private operators.

In the 1948 appropriation act, the Maritime Commission was placed on an annual appropriation basis and its revolving fund was abolished. As a result, the Commission has general authority to enter into long-term subsidy contracts under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but has neither specific authority to incur financial obligations extending into future years nor funds for payment of them. Although the Commission could still enter into long-term contracts contingent upon implementation through future appropriations, the Commission considers that this might have an adverse effect on ship construction. While restoration of the revolving fund is not recommended, I urge the Congress to provide for the financing of long-term contracts under the 1936 act. The present Budget includes an amount for operating subsidies to cover obligations under these contracts in 1949.

The subject of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and its location is under study, and my recommendations thereon will be submitted to the Congress at a later date.

The St. Lawrence waterway and power project is needed for both transportation and industry. As an important step in advance planning, the Congress should now authorize this project in order that international treaty provisions and other arrangements can be worked out.

Expenditures: To a large extent the increase in Maritime Commission expenditures after 1947 reflects the elimination of its revolving fund, and is offset by increases in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Continued emergency conditions, including the large-scale relief shipments to Europe, make it necessary for the Maritime Commission to continue to operate, sell, and charter war-built vessels beyond February 29, 1948, when its present authority expires. The estimates for 1949 assume extension of this authority to June 30, 1949, as recommended in my recent message. The drop in expenditures below 1948 is due largely to an anticipated reduction in operation under general agents. Such operation is now limited to a few specialized services, and these will be terminated as rapidly as possible. In the coastwise and intercoastal services, the Commission has entered into special chartering arrangements looking toward the eventual return to completely private operations.

The maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors by the Corps of Engineers will call for an increase in expenditures in 1949, principally for projects already under way. Only a very few urgently needed new projects are proposed to be started in 1949.

Transportation and communication

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Promotion of the merchant marine:				
Maritime Commission	—$282	$328	$222	$122
Inland Waterways Corporation (Commerce)	-------	-------	3	-------
Provision of navigation aids and facilities:				
Panama Canal (Army)	10	19	20	16
Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions)	88	131	171	192
Coast Guard (Treasury):				
Present programs	142	121	109	106
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	12	13
Department of the Interior	(1)	(1)	1	-------
Provisions of highways:				
Public Roads Administration (Federal Works Agency)	405	400	478	461
Forest roads and trails (Agriculture)	18	18	17	17
Alaska roads (Interior)	6	9	19	13
Promotion of aviation:				
Civil Aeronautics Administration (Commerce):				
Present programs	80	117	158	156
Alaska airports (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	2	2
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:				
Present programs	25	42	49	48
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	2	10
Regulation of transportation	23	15	15	15
Other services to transportation:				
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	—30	(1)	(1)	-------
Coast and Geodetic Survey (Commerce)	9	10	10	11
Alaska Railroad (Interior)	12	15	27	26
Postal service deficit (Post Office)	242	323	321	326
Regulation of communication (Federal Communications Commission)	6	6	6	7
Other services to communication	1	2	2	3
Proposed legislation not included above	-------	-------	2	3
Total	587	1,563	1,646	1,549

(1) Less than one-half million dollars.

The reduction in Coast Guard expenditures is due principally to a lower level of construction activity in 1949. Pending legislation, for which expenditures are included in this Budget, would give the Coast Guard specific authority to operate additional ocean weather stations. This program is important to safe and regular overseas air operations and is provided for in an international agreement to which the United States is a party. I urge the Congress to take early action.

The postwar highway aid program, which has been retarded by high costs and material shortages, is now more fully under way, as is evident in the sharp increase in expenditures above the 1947 level. To avoid bidding up costs, however, the expenditures contemplated for 1949 are at a level somewhat lower than could be supported by existing authorizations.

The Budget provides for additional highway construction in Alaska and for the improvement of the Alaska Railroad. These transportation facilities are essential in the development program for the Territory.

An increase is required in expenditures of the Department of Commerce for civil aviation in keeping with the growing importance of this industry to the Nation's economy and security. The establishment and operation of air navigation facilities, and grants-in-aid for airport construction, account for most of this increase.

A moderate increase is recommended in expenditures for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The basic aeronautical research program of the Committee is of vital importance to the development of advanced types of civilian as well as military planes. The 1949 estimate also include first-year expenditures of 2 million dollars under a proposed program for construction facilities required for research in supersonic aeronautics.

The many economic problems faced by all forms of transportation and communication since the end of the war have imposed an unusually heavy work load upon the regulatory agencies in this field. Moderate increases in staff are provided in order to permit more rapid handling of regulatory proceedings.

The postal deficit is running higher in the current year than was previously anticipated. This results from a larger volume of mail, much of which is carried at rates which do not cover operating costs. Recent price advances for supplies and services have also added to the postal deficit. In addition to the deficit specifically included in the Budget, provision is made in the contingency reserve for 1948 and 1949 to cover pending increases in rail and air charges. I strongly urge early action on the recommendation contained in last year's Budget message that postage rates be revised so as to permit operation of the postal service without a deficit.

Appropriations and other authorizations: For carrying out the transportation and communication programs, I am recommending appropriations of 1,549 million dollars for fiscal year 1949, including 28 million dollars in supplemental appropriations which will be submitted upon passage of proposed legislation. Appropriations are running somewhat lower than expenditures principally because of the carry-over funds in the Maritime Commission shipbuilding program and the liquidation of prior years' obligations by the Commission. In 1948, a supplemental appropriation of 89 million dollars will be needed for the postal service, in addition to the amount included in the contingency reserve for the increase in rail and air charges.

The Budget for the fiscal year 1949 includes recommended contract authorizations of 15 million dollars for shipbuilding, about 7 million dollars each for Alaska highways and the Alaska Rail-

road, 11 million dollars for Alaska airports under proposed legislation, and 48 million dollars for construction of facilities for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (including 30 million dollars under proposed legislation). The appropriation recommended for Public Roads Administration and part of the appropriation for the Department of the Interior are for liquidation of prior years' contract authorizations.

Finance, commerce, and industry

The need to control inflation has made it impossible to eliminate the few wartime controls that still remain in force. Consequently I have requested legislative authority for their extension and for the provision of additional, more effective, and urgently needed anti-inflation measures.

Legislation is now under consideration to extend rent controls, to restore controls over consumer credit, and to provide on a limited basis for mandatory allocations, price controls, rationing, and wage controls. The Congress has already extended export and import controls. Budget expenditures for administering all these controls are reflected in the estimates for this function.

While the immediate emergency of inflation demands our primary attention, we must not neglect our programs for protecting and encouraging competition and individual initiative through the established regulatory and promotional programs.

Finance, commerce, and industry

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Promotion and regulation of business:				
Wartime and other temporary controls:				
Office of Temporary Controls	$118	$2	(1)	-------
Housing Expediter:				
Present programs	2	18	$1	-------
Proposed legislation	-------	4	28	$30
Department of Commerce	1	2	5	5
Department of Agriculture	2	3	-------	-------
Proposed anti-inflation legislation	-------	20	80	85
Continuing programs:				
Antimonopoly programs (Federal Trade Commission, Justice)	5	5	7	7
Other regulatory programs (Federal Power Commission, Tariff Commission, etc.)	9	6	6	6
Department of Commerce:				
Present programs	18	21	20	19
Proposed census legislation	-------	-------	9	13
Business loans and guarantees (Reconstruction Finance Corporation):				
National defense loans	−36	−19	−22	-------
Other loans to business	42	96	70	-------
Retirement of Smaller War Plants Corporation capital stock	136	15	5	-------
Aids to private financial institutions (Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	−66	−38	−25	-------

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

Finance, commerce, and industry—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
War damage insurance (War Damage Corporation):				
Payment of profits to miscellaneous receipts	-------	$210	-------	-------
Other	$1	20	-------	-------
Control of private finance (Securities and Exchange Commission)	6	6	$6	$6
Total	238	372	190	171

Expenditures: Expenditures for finance, commerce, and industry will fall sharply in the fiscal year 1949, primarily because of the 210-million-dollar payment in 1948 of war damage insurance profits to miscellaneous receipts. The proposed anti-inflation program accounts for the major increases.

The Office of Temporary Controls was abolished June 1, 1947. All remaining wartime controls administered by this Office have been transferred to other departments or agencies. Estimates for these programs for the 1948 and 1949 fiscal years are included principally in the budgets of the Housing Expediter and the Department of Commerce.

With the housing shortage still acute, the extension of rent control beyond the present expiration date of February 29, 1948, is essential. The estimates assume that these controls, administered by the Housing Expediter, will be strengthened and will remain effective throughout the rest of the current fiscal year and for the fiscal year 1949.

In addition to expenditures of 33 million dollars for rent and export controls, an estimated 80 million dollars will be required to administer and enforce the rest of the anti-inflation program. Price and rationing controls, together with allocation and inventory controls, account for almost all of this total, with minor amounts for wage control and the regulation of speculative trading on the commodity exchanges.

I am requesting further increases for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to strengthen enforcement of the antitrust laws, and resist the growing concentration of economic power in many important industries. The increased funds requested for the Federal Trade Commission will also permit inauguration of a new research program designed to develop more effective techniques for identifying and combating monopolistic practices.

I repeat my earlier recommendation for passage of legislation authorizing the Department of Commerce to conduct a new census of business and other surveys. Legislation embodying this recommendation has been approved by the Senate and now awaits consideration in the House. Up-to-date information in this area is essential to assure intelligent action by both business and Government.

New authorizations of Reconstruction Finance Corporation business loans and participations in private bank loans, while somewhat higher than in the fiscal year 1947, are being held down to levels consistent with the anti-inflation program. It would be inappropriate for the Government to restrain inflationary increases in private credit while permitting a substantial expansion in its own credit aids. The Board of Directors of the Corporation has instructed its loan agencies to scrutinize all applications in order to avoid direct loans or guarantees of private loans which create inflationary pressures.

The Corporation is also continuing to press for the early retirement of preferred stock and capital notes in banks and trust companies. Repayment of defense loans made to business is progressing. Prompt repayment of these loans and investments is not only sound business practice, but is also anti-inflationary.

Accumulated profits of the War Damage Corporation totaling 210 million dollars have already been paid to the Treasury. All remaining obligations, including those owed to participating insurance companies, will be liquidated and the Corporation dissolved before June 30, 1948.

The Budget provides for a small increase in personnel for the Securities and Exchange Commission to improve handling of its continuing heavy work load.

Appropriations: Appropriations of 171 million dollars for the fiscal year 1949 are recommended for these programs. This total includes 133 million dollars in supplemental appropriations—5 million dollars for export and import controls under legislation recently enacted, 115 million dollars for rent control and other proposed anti-inflation activities, and 13 million dollars for new censuses of business and mineral industries. Expenditures for loans and investments by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation do not require appropriations.

During the current fiscal year, supplemental appropriations of 29 million dollars are recommended to continue some of the anti-inflation controls and to initiate others.

Labor

The training and placement of workers, the promotion of sound labor relations, and the maintenance of safe and healthful working conditions are of special importance in this period when uninterrupted full production is so vital to the United States.

The reduced appropriations to the Department of Labor in the fiscal year 1948 have impaired its capacity to perform some of its statutory functions. I am recommending increases in the Department's total appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 sufficient to enable it to carry out efficiently its statistical and labor information services to the general public and to the labor mediation and regulatory agencies, and also to carry out adequately its functions in connection with the administration of the State employment offices.

As I have previously indicated to the Congress, there is a need for legislation to establish a Federal program for the elimination of discriminatory employment practices based on race, religion, color, or national ancestry. A year ago I recommended to the Congress that funds be authorized for grants to States for a program fostering safe working conditions. This Budget includes estimates for this proposed legislation.

Expenditures: Expenditures of the National Labor Relations Board will rise considerably from the fiscal year 1948 to 1949, because of the expanded responsibilities placed upon this agency by the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947.

Labor

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Mediation and regulation:				
Department of Labor:				
Present programs	$12	$6	$6	$6
Industrial safety program (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	6	6
National Labor Relations Board	5	6	9	9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	-------	2	3	3
National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment (proposed legislation)	-------	-------	1	1
Other	3	4	5	5
Training and placement:				
Public employment offices	87	69	77	77
Other	2	2	2	2
Labor information, statistics, and general administration	11	9	8	8
Total	120	97	117	117

Expenditures by the State public employment offices, which are fully financed by Federal funds through the fiscal year 1949, will rise by about 10 percent, or 7 million dollars. More than 2 million dollars of the increase is required to finance on a full-year basis the operation of the farm placement program. In addition, State salaries, rentals, and other costs have increased materially.

The apparent decrease for 1949 in the estimated expenditures for "labor information, statistics, and general administration" results from reclassification to specific programs of certain expenditures which for 1948 are shown under general administration.

Appropriations: The 117-million-dollar appropriation recommended for fiscal year 1949 includes 6.2 million dollars for proposed legislation, of which 5.6 million dollars is for the safety program.

Because of the expanding activities of the National Labor Relations Board and the difficulty of forecasting the size of its case load, I am recommending that the Congress appropriate 9.4 million dollars at the present time, with the entire amount made available for obligation if needed prior to April 1, 1949.

When the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service came into existence in August 1947 it was granted a part-year appropriation, which will be exhausted during February 1948. The appropriations recommended in this Budget include a supplemental appropriation of 1 million dollars for the remainder of the 1948 fiscal year.

General government

"General government" comprises most of the expenditures of the legislative and the judicial branches of the Federal Government, as well as some expenditures of the executive branch. The costs of financial management, the Government payment toward the civilian employees' retirement system, and nonrecurring expenditures for certain war liquidation programs make up the greater portion of the total.

The major legislative recommendation in this category relates to surplus property disposal. By the end of the present fiscal year the disposition of war surpluses will have been nearly completed. The inventories of surplus personal property will then have been so reduced that costs connected with the disposal of this property under the provisions of existing legislation will approach and may even exceed proceeds from their sale. There will remain, however, certain surplus real properties which will present problems in lease and property management and require a continuing disposal program.

The time is now at hand to liquidate the temporary disposal agencies, further consolidate and improve the central supply services of the Government, and establish a permanent, modern, and economical system of property management. A program for the accomplishment of these objectives will be submitted to the Congress at an early date.

Expenditures: In view of the administrative changes to be recommended, no estimates are included in the 1949 Budget for the continued operation of the present surplus property disposal agencies. Instead, 94 million dollars is included under proposed legislation as an estimate of the expenditures that will be required for surplus disposal activities in the fiscal year 1949 under the new system of property management and disposal. Of this amount, 81 million dollars is for domestic and 13 million dollars for foreign disposal programs. In addition, 56 million dollars will be spent to liquidate obligations incurred during the current year by the present disposal agencies.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue still has a large volume of work, not only in handling current collections, but also in reviewing wartime tax returns before statutory limitations intervene. Expenditures for tax collection are presently estimated at the same level as in the current fiscal year. I am confident that this level of expenditures is not sufficient to assure complete and equitable application of the tax laws, but the matter is now under investigation by congressional committees as well as by staff of the executive branch. I hope that these studies will result in recommendations for improving tax administration.

General government

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Legislative functions	$28	$34	$33	$33
Judicial functions	16	19	19	19
Executive direction and management	7	7	7	7
Federal financial management:				
Bureau of Internal Revenue	200	199	187	188
Other Treasury bureaus	171	136	130	132
General Accounting Office	39	37	33	33
Other	5	4	4	1
Government payment toward civilian employees' general retirement system	220	244	259	259
Other general government:				
Surplus property disposal, foreign and domestic:				
Present disposal programs (mainly War Assets Administration)	440	357	56	-------
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	94	105
Deposits and transfers of receipts, foreign sales (Army, clearing account)	−19	75	30	-------
Federal Works Agency (mainly Public Buildings Administration)	67	78	75	65
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:				
Payment of interest to miscellaneous receipts	91	97	2	-------
Other	−76	−17	−12	-------
Cemeteries and return of war dead (Army, civil functions):				
Present programs	12	80	77	46
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	2	2
Other:				
Present programs	118	133	164	174
Proposed legislation	-------	-------	1	1
Total	1,318	1,473	1,157	1,065

Estimated expenditures of the other Treasury bureaus engaged in financial management are reduced slightly for the fiscal year 1949. The organization and operating procedures of the Customs Bureau are the subject of a special survey which will soon be completed. The findings should be helpful to both the Bureau and the Congress.

The cancellation of notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which I recommend elsewhere in this Message, will almost eliminate payments of interest by the Corporation to miscellaneous receipts.

The estimate for the Government contribution to the Federal employees' retirement system for the fiscal year 1949 is based on an increase in the number of Federal civilian employees who have served in the Government for 5 years and have thereby become potential applicants for benefits.

Expenditures estimated for other general government activities in the fiscal year 1949 include an increase of over 6 million dollars in expenditures of the

Civil Service Commission to verify the loyalty of persons entering the Federal service. Also included is 10 million dollars to augment the working capital in the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply.

Appropriations: Anticipated supplemental appropriations based on proposed legislation amount to 108 million dollars of the appropriation total for general government for the fiscal year 1949. The total of estimated expenditures for the year is considerably above the appropriation total, principally because it includes expenditures to liquidate obligations against appropriations of prior years for the disposal of surplus property and for bringing home our war dead.

Interest on the public debt

Interest on the public debt represents a fixed obligation of the Federal Government, subject to change only as securities are retired or refunded and interest rates changed. Assuming continued high employment and present tax rates, debt retirement will be substantial during the fiscal years 1948 and 1949. However, other factors will cause some increase in interest payments.

Interest on the public debt

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Treasury Department...	$4,958	$5,200	$5,250	$5,250

Expenditures: The increase in interest costs in 1948 and 1949 is the net result of divergent trends in payments on the various types of debt. Interest on nonmarketable obligations, principally savings bonds, and special issues to Government trust funds is rising. Interest on marketable debt is declining.

Increasing numbers of savings bonds purchased during the war are now reaching higher accrual brackets. At the same time net accumulations of Government trust funds will cause further increases in the amount of special issues outstanding. The relatively high rates on these issues are for the most part fixed by statute. Interest payments on nonmarketable debt during 1948 also reflect nonrecurring interest payments on the large volume of armed forces leave bonds redeemed during the year.

The decline in interest payments on the marketable debt arises from two factors. In addition to the substantial debt-reduction program, maturing bonds with high coupon rates of interest are being paid off where possible, or are being refunded into issues with lower rates. On the other hand, short-term interest rates have increased. About 40 percent of short-term Treasury bills, certificates, and notes are held by the Federal Reserve banks. A considerable part of the interest costs on these securities will come back to the Government, since in effect about 90 percent of Federal Reserve bank earnings are currently being paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Appropriations: Interest payments represent contractual commitments which are financed by permanent indefinite appropriations not requiring annual congressional action.

Refunds of receipts

The principal items under refunds of receipts are corporate profits tax refunds and individual income tax refunds.

Refunds of receipts

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Agency	Expenditures			Appropriations, 1949
	Actual, 1947	Estimate, 1948	Estimate, 1949	
Treasury Department...	$2,897	$2,049	$1,990	$1,990

Expenditures: Estimated refunds for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 are more than 800 million dollars below actual refunds in 1947. This decline results principally from the estimated drop in corporate income and profit tax refunds arising out of the adjustment of wartime tax liabilities. These corporate refunds, which were 1.1 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1947, are not expected to exceed one-third of this total during each of the fiscal years 1948 and 1949. Estimated refunds to individuals—mainly due to overpayment of individual income tax under the current payment system—which totaled 1.7 billion dollars in 1947, are estimated to be slightly less in 1948 and 1949. This decrease is due to accelerated refund payments in the fiscal year 1947.

Appropriations: The specific appropriations of 1,254 million dollars for refunds in the fiscal year 1948 will be inadequate and a supplemental appropriation of 800 million dollars will be required.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

The Government Corporation Control Act requires that no wholly owned Government corporation not now possessing a Federal charter shall continue after June 30, 1948, unless reincorporated by act of Congress. Two of the State-chartered corporations, the Export-Import Bank and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, have already been reincorporated by the Congress. I recommend early action by the Congress on pending legislation to reincorporate the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Virgin Islands Company, and on legislation which will be introduced to recharter the Panama Railroad Company.

I recommend extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation beyond the present expiration date of June 30, 1948. In revising the Corporation's charter last year, the Congress restricted its lending authority mainly to business and financial institutions, the area of its major prewar activities. I also recommend that the Congress authorize cancellation of an estimated 9.3 billion dollars in the notes of the Corporation held by the Treasury Department. This cancellation, representing in amount the unrecovered costs to the Corporation of its wartime and reconversion operations through June 30, 1947, will permit a clearer appraisal of its active programs. Since the cancellation is merely a bookkeeping operation, it will have no net effect on the Budget.

In accordance with the provisions of section 107 of the Government Corporation Control Act, the Bureau of the Budget will soon complete studies of all wholly owned Government corporations to determine in which cases, if any, their fiscal affairs could be handled more appropriately as regular agencies. The Bureau is also studying agencies engaged in business-type activities to determine whether they might administer their programs more effectively and provide better service to the public if they had some or all of the attributes of corporations. These and future studies are designed not only to develop specific recommendations for submission to the Congress, but also to establish guides for determining when the corporate form of organization should be used.

As a part of the program to secure a more uniform approach to the Government's business activities, I recommend legislation to place the Federal Housing Administration under the Government Corporation Control Act. Under existing law, this agency possesses many of the significant attributes of a corporation and, in nearly all major respects, is treated as such by both the executive branch and the Congress.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION—A SUMMARY

Expenditures and appropriations for proposed legislation—apart from the extensions of authority for Government corporations—are listed in the following table. Expenditures under extensions of existing legislation are included. The proposed extensions of old-age and survivors insurance and unemployment compensation would be financed through trust accounts.

Proposed legislation (summary of amounts included in Budget)

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function and program	Expenditure estimate, 1949	Anticipated supplemental appropriations	
		1948	1949
National defense:			
Universal training program	$400	-------	$500
Drill pay for military reserve components	13	-------	16
Military and naval construction	166	$165	45
International affairs and finance:			
European recovery program	4,000	6,800	-------
Other foreign aid (including China)	440	300	450
Foreign informational and cultural program	17	6	20
Loan for United Nations headquarters construction	30	65	-------
United States participation in international organizations	4	-------	4
Philippine war veterans' benefits	16	-------	16
Philippine rehabilitation	(1)	-------	(1)
War damage claims	-------	17	-------
Social welfare, health, and security:			
National health program, administrative expenses	15	-------	15
General public welfare program, public assistance benefits	100	-------	100
Stream pollution abatement	1	-------	1

Footnotes at end of table.

Proposed legislation (summary of amounts included in Budget)—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Function and program	Expenditure estimate, 1949	Anticipated supplemental appropriations 1948	Anticipated supplemental appropriations 1949
Housing and community facilities:			
Long-range housing program	$40	-------	$37
Advances for public works planning	10	-------	20
Education and general research:			
Aid for elementary and secondary education	290	-------	300
National Science Foundation	5	-------	15
Radio propagation building National Bureau of Standards	1	-------	1
Agriculture and agricultural resources: Revision of price support program	−50	-------	-------
Transportation and communication:			
Increase in postage rates to eliminate postal deficit [2]	-------	-------	-------
Alaska communications system	(1)	-------	1
Construction of Federal Communications Commission facilities	(1)	-------	(1)
Addition to Post Office equipment shops	1	-------	1
Coast Guard—additional ocean weather stations	12	-------	13
Census of transportation	1	-------	1
Extension of Maritime Commission's authority to operate and charter vessels [3]	-------	-------	-------
Alaskan airport construction	2	-------	2
Research facilities—National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2	-------	10
Finance, commerce, and industry:			
Census of business	9	-------	12
Census of mineral industries	(1)	-------	(1)
New anti-inflation program	80	$24	85
Extension of rent control	28	4	30
Labor:			
National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment	1	-------	1
Industrial safety program	6	-------	6
General government:			
Surplus property disposal	94	-------	105
Army cemeterial expense	2	-------	2
Weather Bureau—observers for additional ocean weather stations	1	-------	1
Total	5,735	7,381	1,811

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.
[2] Not included in Budget totals.
[3] Included with estimates for Maritime Commission programs under present laws.

This Budget is the measure of our responsibilities at home and abroad. Although these responsibilities are heavy, the economic strength of this country and the resolution of our citizens are great enough to permit us to discharge them.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 6, 1948.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget calls for $43,182,000,000 in appropriations as against $36,100,000,000 last year, an increase of $7,082,000,000. We were able last year to cut $2,967,000,000. It is my expectation and my hope that we can do better this year. Every single departmental item has been padded with less to do. The solvency of the United States and the employment of our people at regular jobs depends upon our reducing the inflationary effect of the President's budget to the limit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an article.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

"COMING EVENTS CAST THEIR SHADOWS BEFORE" OR "OBSERVATIONS ON THE MARSHALL PLAN"

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard such sayings as, "Coming events cast their shadows before," and "History repeats itself." These sayings simply mean that if we want to know what the future holds for us we had better study the past. In my remarks today I propose to review the immediate past in the hope some light may be cast upon the immediate future.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest idealists this country ever produced was Woodrow Wilson. As President he persuaded this Nation to join in a crusade to "make the world safe for democracy." That crusade took the form of a "war to end all wars." After expending blood, sweat, tears, and lives, in addition to some $35,000,000,000, we "made the world safe for democracy" by winning the war to end all wars—at least that is what we thought. Then we washed our hands of it all, shrugged off all further responsibility, and turned our attention back to our own affairs, full of satisfaction in a job well done.

What happened? Four of the leading nations of the world—Russia, Germany, Italy, and Japan—immediately proceeded to set up dictator governments, the direct antithesis of democracies. By doing so they proved that the world had not been made safe for democracy, and they also set the stage for World War II. Russia, Germany, and Italy set up one-man dictatorships, but in Japan a military dictatorship was set up, using Emperor Hirohito as a puppet to carry out the program of the military clique.

Germany, Italy, and Japan based their expansionist ambitions on the claim that they were "have-not nations" and it was a matter of life and death with them to expand in order to obtain necessary raw materials. So, Japan proceeded to capture and overrun Manchuria, taking it by force from a weakened China, weakened by internal dissensions. Italy expanded in Africa, taking over Ethiopia. Germany pushed her boundary line outward in all directions—north, south, east, and west. Russia, although a "have nation," emboldened by the success that crowned the efforts of her three dictator partners, decided that she might as well get while the getting was good, so she proceeded to attack little Finland, and then Stalin teamed up with Hitler in the dismemberment of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, what were the so-called liberty-loving nations doing in the meantime? What were those nations doing that thought they had made the world safe for democracy? Well, our Mr. Stimson did register a protest in connection with Japan's unwarranted attack upon China, and he did urge Great Britain to join us in that protest. But Great Britain turned her back upon us and Secretary Stimson's protest was of no avail. From then on our foreign policy became a policy of appeasement, appeasement, and appeasement, in the hope that the dictator nations might be satisfied and a war might be averted. This appeasement program was carried on with Japan, with Italy, with Germany, and with Russia, until Chamberlain and his umbrella became synonomous with the weakness and indecision of all democracies. The result, of course, was inevitable. It was World War II.

Mr. Speaker, during all the time this was going on Franklin Delano Roosevelt, another American idealist, was in the White House. He took office at about the same time that Hitler grabbed power in Germany. F. D. R.'s first move was to appease Stalin by recognizing the Soviet dictatorship as a Soviet Republic entitled to representation among the family of nations. F. D. R. collaborated with Chamberlain in the appeasement program; but after war broke out he teamed up with Churchill. We were then led into World War II under the slogan, "Nazism is a threat to the world. We must help destroy it." Nothing was said about destroying communism.

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of F. D. R. we again expended blood, sweat, tears, and lives, plus some $300,000,000,000, and again we won a war. By doing so we destroyed nazism in Germany, facism in Italy, and militarism in Japan. We rid the world of these three threats to democracy, but while doing so we built up Stalin and communism. We gave Stalin $11,000,000,000 worth of precious war material, scarce war material, war material we needed badly ourselves, especially in our war activities in Asia. We did this when Stalin had his back to the wall, when Moscow was threatened, when Stalingrad was in rubble, and we saved Stalin and communism for the world. Today communism is as great a menace to the peace and happiness of the world as nazism ever was.

Mr. Speaker, in our efforts to appease Stalin at Tehran, at Cairo, at Quebec, and again at Potsdam, President Roosevelt, and later on President Truman, made mistake after mistake, all of which have now become history. As a result of these mistakes we have thrown away in the two short years since hostilities

ceased almost every advantage we won in the war, and we have already handed out something over $20,000,000,000 to try to correct those mistakes. Now we are told that in the cold war in which we find ourselves, largely as a result of the mistakes our leaders made, we must adopt the Marshall plan and give away at least $25,000,000,000 more.

Henry Hazlitt, an international authority in the fields of politics, economics, and finance, writing for the Foundation for Economic Education, under the title "Will Dollars Save the World?" has the following to say concerning this proposal:

> The most important point in any foreign-aid program is to know where to begin. Marshall plan or no Marshall plan, Europe will not recover as long as European governments retain the economic policies they have been following since the end of the war.
>
> As long as socialization, general price-fixing, exchange control, etc., are retained any amount of dollars we pour in will be more than offset and neutralized by stifled production and chronic crises. Our experience with Great Britain will only be repeated on a much vaster scale. Europe will be in a much worse situation after our help is poured in than it was before it began. * * * What is most important to the revival of Europe is not American loans, but a complete change in the internal economic policies of Europe. Unless the political conditions of revival exist in Europe itself, Europe will not revive. There is only one way to restore production, and that is to restore the freedom to produce and the incentives to produce.

I am in full accord with Mr. Hazlitt's brilliant analysis of the European situation, and with his suggested remedy. I recommend it to my colleagues as must reading.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all we are accomplishing by our generous gifts to European countries is to cushion for them the impact of socialism and communism. We are, I believe, weakening their moral fiber and encouraging acquiescence in "things as they are" instead of stimulating resistance to the spread of communism. I believe that unprejudiced records will show that France, for example, has been flirting with communism and radicalism for a long time—she is obviously decaying at the top. Germany is, as one of my refugee friends put it, "now little more than a stinking corpse," which can probably never be resurrected into anything but a second- or third-rate nation. The middle European countries have already been almost completely absorbed by Russia, and they, as well as others, will naturally tend to affiliate themselves with the strongest power which lies closest to them—that is, Russia.

I believe also, Mr. Speaker, that Americans have been sold one more false and misleading program: That if we do not throw substantial and continuing aid into the various European countries they will all go communistic, but that they can be saved from this fate by the extension of such aid. This line of chatter seems to me almost an insult to real intelligence, in view of the well-known long-time trends to the left in most of these countries.

In this connection I call to your attention the case of our mother country—England. Although for the second time in a generation we helped her win a world war, which initially was of no major concern to us; although we extended her between $25,000,000,000 and $30,000,000,000 of lend-lease goods, services, and munitions; although we have forgiven her all the debts of the previous war, and have made her an additional loan of $4,000,000,000, yet the good people of England saw fit to kick out the Churchill government and to vote in by an overwhelming majority the most radical government in her history—sworn to nationalize all the leading industries of Great Britain.

Furthermore, I also call your attention to the fact that many of the leaders of the Church of England, even before the Second World War began, had affiliated themselves closely with communism, and passed resolutions, made statements, and wrote books in favor of Moscow. In fact, the best-selling book ever written defending the Soviet philosophy of government and economics was written by the Dean of Canterbury, the titular head of the Church of England.

In view of all these things, why should any sane man believe that a few more millions or billions of dollars scattered around the fringes of Europe will save those countries from communism?

The conclusion of the matter, as I see it, Mr. Speaker, is that, if we continue to relieve Europe at anything like the present rate, we shall within a short time have a return of allocation and rationing in the United States, and probably many new drastic controls over industry and prices. Such moves are already being carefully considered and examined by various high officials in Washington and, as you know, were recommended by the President last Tuesday.

Our present strangely illogical and financially unsound policy can, in my judgment, lead to only one end—an undermining of the social and economic structure of the United States and a progressive strengthening of the Russian system. Russia has already taken over and expects to hold virtually all of the surplus producing territory of central Europe, including the agricultural territory of Germany. She can afford to be stubborn and to wait, knowing that her population is increasing very rapidly and that she can make full preparations for war behind the iron curtain; while we western peoples have no unanimity of policy or action and are floundering about in a bottomless sea of impractical idealism, which we still futilely believe can be imposed on an ancient world which has never understood any policy but the rule of force, or the Machiavellian duplicity of diplomats.

Mr. Speaker, if history does repeat itself, if coming events do cast their shadows before, then in the light of the events of the immediate past, as I have presented them to you, what can we expect to happen in the immediate future if we adopt the Marshall plan? Will the present cold war turn into a shooting war? Will the spread of communism in the world be checked? Or will we so weaken ourselves in our efforts to help others that we in turn will fall an easy victim to the Communist octopus? These are pertinent questions for the Congress to face, and for which we must find correct answers. Our future welfare, yes, our future existence, is at stake. I pray to God that we make the right decision.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from from Illinois [Mr. MASON] for one of the finest speeches I have ever listened to on the floor of the House. It is only too bad that every American could not have heard it.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman. I have about 10 minutes left for questions if any one has questions on this matter. It is questions I want.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. We have before this Congress two momentous problems, tax reductions and the Marshall plan. Does the gentleman think that we can have both a tax reduction and the Marshall plan?

Mr. MASON. We cannot have both. We all know that. The question we must decide is which one, in the light of these past events, is the one that will strengthen and keep America strong, and not waste our substance in trying to do an impossible thing in Europe, which the people there do not want to have done judging by their past actions.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois knows that one of the United States delegates to the United Nations organization, Mrs. Roosevelt, within the last 36 hours advocated that we make one more overture to Russia and send another economic mission to Russia to help strengthen her? That recommendation was made just a few hours ago by one of the United States delegates to the United Nations organization. What does the gentleman think of that?

Mr. MASON. I did not know that that had been done, but personally I feel that it is just another step in our program of appeasement which has gotten us into the position we are in today.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. In approaching aid to Europe through the Marshall plan we are constantly told that it will stop the march of communism in western Europe. From my observation and information I got from Europe, if we were to build up western Europe through this aid we still would have little hopes of stopping the expansion of communism to the west; we would have to rely largely on whether or not those directing the affairs of government in Russia wanted to come on west, because we would be left with western Europe clicking at the expense

of the United States, if it did click, without any armies or without any military force to prevent any further expansion to the west. Then I ask the question: Can you stop communism going west in Europe unless you have the power to stop the Russian Army?

Mr. MASON. Your question, really, summed up, means this: If we can—and I doubt if we can—but if we can strengthen western Europe and get it clicking, as the gentleman says, what is to stop communism or Stalin or the forces of the Soviet Republic from coming over and taking advantage of that added strength that we have given to them by weakening ourselves? Is that the sum and substance of your question? There is nothing that I can see, only our strength, which would prevent them from doing it, and we had better preserve that strength and get ready for the time we will need it, because communism today, in my opinion, is a much greater menace to the world and the peace and happiness of the world than nazism was even at its height.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. What does the gentleman have to say about communism in China?

Mr. MASON. Well, we all know that Communist influence has been permeating China for a good many years and has now taken over practically the whole of Manchuria, the best part of China, and from what we can see now Russia has practically got as much of a strangle hold upon China as it has upon eastern Europe. Personally I am more concerned with the situation in Asia, so far as the threat to the future peace and happiness of the United States, than I am with the situation in Europe.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Before this Congress votes billions of dollars to aid these foreign countries, should they not be required to use up their investment of billions of dollars which they have in these United States today?

Mr. MASON. Yes, I would say that I would treat them as I have treated both of my sons, make them do everything possible they can to solve their own problems, and then maybe be ready to help them a little to carry on, but not before.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Does the gentleman believe the nations of the world outside of our own country could believe that those who dropped the atomic bombs on two cities of Japan could be taken, with respect to Europe, as having true charity in their hearts?

Mr. MASON. Of course I could not say that because I cannot put myself in their place. I would have my doubts, though, that they could take us, and they are not taking us at face value.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How can we honestly and conscientiously try to drive communism out of foreign countries when we have a whole lot of it in our own country?

Mr. MASON. I would answer that by saying that charity begins at home, and so does housecleaning begin at home. That is where I, as one member of the Dies committee, tried to start it some 8 years ago, and we are just beginning to get around to the job now.

Mr. RICH. If it had not been for the members of the Dies committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities getting this thing started, we would be taken over by communism, because there was no one I could find in the administration that was trying to clean it out of this country. I take off my hat to the Dies committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Insofar as the last observation of my friend from Pennsylvania is concerned, the gentleman overlooks the fact that over 10 years ago a bill passed this Congress compelling foreign agents engaging in propaganda to register. That is the McCormack Act. I say it with pride, being the author of that act. A bill was also introduced to make it a crime for any individual knowingly or wilfully to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. I also introduced a bill giving the Army and the Navy power to control subversive activities in camps and on ships. It took me 3 years to get that out of committee. I could not get two of the bills out of committee, and I had to wait until there was a bill before the House to which I could offer them as amendments. I was chairman of the first committee. We recommended legislation after a 6 months' investigation, and we got it through after 3 years.

Mr. MASON. That is history, that is a matter of record. I think the McCormack committee did do excellent work in getting a job started that needed to be started.

I also say this in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Dies committee did two things at least. One was to arouse the Nation to the Red menace. They perhaps did that with some spectacular work. The second thing they did the Nation does not even know about yet as a Nation. That was to compile, while they could get at the records, a card-index system naming these un-American activities groups and the members of them. This system contains over 1,000,000 card-index records. The very next day after Pearl Harbor happened, and every day, Sundays included, for the next year or more, there were special agents of the FBI, of military intelligence, of naval intelligence, and of the Secret Service combing those files for the information that was needed to go out and pick up these suspects and put them where they belonged. That was a job well worth doing. It was worth more than all the money that was appropriated for the Dies committee during the 6 years I was on it.

AMENDING VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H. R. 1426, an act to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following: '(5) widowed mothers (if they have not remarried and were widows at the time of the death or disability of their ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter)—

"'(A) of deceased ex-servicemen or ex-servicewomen who lost their lives while on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized), or

"'(B) of service-connected permanently and totally disabled ex-servicemen or ex-servicewomen,'

if said ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman was separated from such armed forces under honorable conditions; and (6) a mother of a deceased ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman who lost his or her life while on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized), or if a service-connected permanently and totally disabled ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman, if (A) said ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman was separated from such armed forces under honorable conditions, (B) the mother was divorced or legally separated from the father of said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter, and (C) said ex-serviceman son or ex-servicewoman daughter is the only child of said mother.

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended by striking out 'and (3),' after the second comma in the first sentence, and inserting the following: '(3), (5), and (6).'

"SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 is amended by striking out 'and (3)' and inserting '(3), (5), and (6).'"

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE ROBERT L. NORTON

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to include with my remarks an editorial and an article which recently appeared in the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last there was buried in Boston one of the most constructive figures in the molding of sound public opinion, a truly great newspaperman, Robert L. Norton, familiarly known to his many friends as Bob Norton. He was possessed of a brilliant and logical mind. For years Bob Norton's special articles appearing in the Boston Post wielded a powerful influence in the molding of sound public opinion. As a political commentator and analyst of international and national affairs, he was one of the outstanding members of his profession. Bob Norton was a constructive writer and constructive critic and by means of his pen and keen mind produced constructive results. In his chosen field, he was one of its leaders. He stood at the top of his profession. With years still ahead of him in which to carry on his outstanding work, his sudden death, particularly at this time in the world's history, will be felt keenly. His passing leaves a gap in an important field that will be hard to fill. His death is a distinct loss to our country and to the newspaper profession, as well as to the loved ones he leaves behind, Mrs. Norton and their children, his many friends, and to the thousands of readers of his frequent articles. To me, his death is a personal loss. In the death of Bob Norton, one of the mental giants of journalism has passed on. It is fitting and proper that we pause in our deliberations to pay tribute to such a man and to the contributions he has made during his span of life. To his widow and children I extend the deep sympathy of Mrs. McCormack and myself in their great loss and sorrow.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Post]

HAIL AND FAREWELL

Robert L. Norton, political commentator and analyst of national and international affairs, he was to the world. But to an army, truly a vast army of firm friends, he was always "Bob." He was a great newspaperman. Presidents and potentates, statesmen and business leaders, the man in the council chamber and the man in the street, respected him as such. For the same ability, fellow craftsmen of size on the Nation's leading newspapers, admired him. On the laurels in journalism which he accumulated through a long, topline career in that exacting profession, he merited the toasts and tributes raised to him in death.

But "Bob" Norton was more than that. A gentleman of high integrity, a gracious companion who would always aid a friend, kindly and generous, back from Washington, a swing of the Nation or a trip to Europe, he would rather discuss how a fellow reporter's children were getting on in school than relate what Baruch said or how fared it in the Balkans. At home in palace or White House, he enjoyed more leaning across someone's desk in the Post city room, chatting of spring on his farm in New Hampshire or describing the big one that got away on a far West fishing trip.

To his associates, he was truly the man Kipling praised, who walked with kings, yet kept the common touch. For them, in his going, there is a deep sense of loss, alleviated only by the thought that his was the good life. In that life was first his family and then his friends. The Post was the breath of being. His stellar "pieces for the paper," keen, capable, and outstanding, fashioned from vast experience in affairs of the Nation and the world, had warmth and vigor, penetration and astuteness, an ironclad regard for truth, fierce fire for the malefactor, unstinted applause for the good deed, and an abiding faith in his country. The devoted father, the talented newspaperman, the true American and fine human being—there was only one Bob Norton.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include a tribute to the late Robert L. Norton of the Boston Post, written by Joe Harrington, an associate for years of the late Bob Norton:

[From the Boston Post of January 3, 1948]

AN ASSOCIATE'S TRIBUTE

(By Joe Harrington)

For a dozen years we shared an office in the Post with Bob Norton and a sturdy bridge of affectionate friendship grew between the two desks. The cluttered room didn't change when the news of his death came over the phone, but it will never be the same.

Though writing words on copy paper is the way we make our living, they turn out to be a feeble medium for expressing our appreciation of Bob. We cannot capture in a few paragraphs the essence of hundreds of conversations, jam sessions, arguments, and the views we swapped on everything from the price of a pair of shoes to what was happening to the world at the moment.

In an attempt to appraise an old friend objectively, we'd say that graciousness was his outstanding characteristic. His first words on entering the room on his return from a trip to Washington, a political conference or a swing around the doubtful States in an election were: Hello, you old Boll Weevil. * * * How are things with you? * * * Then: How's the family * * What are the kids doing?

We are sure everyone who knew Bob Norton will have the same report to make about this side of his character.

STOOD ALONE

He carried out his thoughtfulness in little things, too. He'd come back from a luncheon at the Parker House, where his opinions were frankly sought by bankers and industrialists, and patiently listen to a garrulous ward heeler, who wanted to tell him what was wrong with the country. He'd hear the fellow out, then pat him on the shoulder and thank him for his information.

Professionally, he stood alone. Commentators blossomed in droves during the war years, on the radio and in newspapers, and most of them remained with us. But none of them could approach Bob Norton's incisiveness in dealing with an involved situation where the arguments pro and con were flavored with the political considerations of the people involved. He had an amazing faculty for cutting through the hokum that beclouded an issue and serving up the meat to the readers of this newspaper, stripped of the confusing garnishes and sauces.

Always articulate, he talked like he wrote. His conversation, as well as the "pieces for the paper" as he called them, were frequently highlighted by parallel background incidents—something that happened in a previous administration or a remark that had been made to him by a President, for Bob was a top newspaperman.

DECIDED GREATNESS

There was a decided greatness about the man. Nothing irked him more than instances of human meanness or petty graft. Time and again when he was scanning the days' news, he come across an item from here in the city or from some distant capital that caused him to explode with wrathful indignation. With the prelude: "Listen to this * * *" he'd let himself go with a searing identification of the perpetrators involved. It wasn't the act so much as the small spirit behind it that always got him.

Not only will Bob be grievously missed in the room, in the building and wherever good newspapermen gather, but assorted down-and-outers in these environs will note his absence on the streets. Through his years in writing politics from the City Hall reporters' room to the international press galleries, he had a long list of fellows who had seen better days. For them he was a soft touch.

If you questioned the wisdom of his generosity he'd remind you that at one time the recipient was a nice fellow and quote the words of Joaquin Miller:

"For all that you hold in your cold, dead hand, is what you have given away."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may address the House for 15 minutes on Wednesday next after any other special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. MacKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each instance to include a petition.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial; also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article from the Virginia Quarterly Review, although the estimated cost of the printer was $430; and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address which he made on needed anti-trust program.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to the United States Housing Act of 1937. We all know that under the terms of the act, public housing which was intended to be available to people of the lower-income groups throughout the country, there is a definite maximum income that those people may have before they are eligible to come under the terms of this housing act and occupy low-rent living quarters. The unfortunate effect of that is that many disabled veterans who are receiving disability payments from the Government cannot get into these houses because the disability payment is included in their income, which takes them outside of the benefits of the act. That takes out the very people who need help most. Many of those veterans have been badly wounded. They cannot get apartments in these public housing projects. I think that is a crying shame and I am sure the Members will agree with me. My amendment would simply exclude from the income limitations of the act the amounts these people are receiving as disability payments from the Government as a result of the war. In other words, the amendment would read:

Excluding any amounts received from the United States Government for disability and disabilities incurred in connection with military service.

I think everybody here must agree with me on that, and I hope you will support this amendment when the matter comes up on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] has expired.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was terribly disappointed, listening to the President's budget address this afternoon; to find that the President did not say something about economy in government shocked me. I wanted him so much to do so. After the Clerk read that document this afternoon, we find that the President has asked for more money than he did last year. The Republicans last year tried to cut that down by four or five billion dollars—last year's budget. Now it is up to the Republicans to cut this $39,700,000,000 budget, and take out all of the excess waste, extravagance, incompetence, and many functions that are requested in this budget and get it down so that we can save this Government from going into bankruptcy and ruin. It is only by the efforts of the Republican Party that that will happen. You can now depend on that. His whole theme is to spend, spend, spend, and elect, elect, elect.

I pray God that we will all get busy and sharpen up our knives and try to economize in the affairs of this Government by cutting out all unnecessary expenses of government that we can do without. The time is now.

JUVENILE HEROISM

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of you in the past few days have been very much discouraged by reading in the papers the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency. In practically every paper you see that there is an upsurge in this sort of thing. Accounts of vandalism are increasing at a most unusual rate. This no doubt is the aftermath of war; nevertheless, we must do something in order to impress upon the youngster of today that a Christian life is the only safe pattern to cut for his future.

Yes, we older folks are to blame and for this reason we must all follow the teachings of the Bible and let our light so shine that they might see our good works and glorify our Father who art in heaven.

Having seen so much bad publicity about teen-agers of late, it was therefore quite refreshing and greatly encouraging for me to see on the front page of the Louisville Courier-Journal some good publicity in the form of a statement about a youngster 9 years old. That news release bears repeating here at this particular time, for this youngster 9 years old saved a little girl aged 5, down at Aiken, S. C. I read from the article:

Tommy Gibbs, 9, was credited today with starting the New Year right by snatching a tiny playmate from death under the wheels of a speeding freight train.

Tommy and 5-year-old Pattie Luntz were playing near the tracks, which Pattie started to cross. As she reached the middle, she noticed the engine rushing toward her and became so terrified she was unable to move.

Calling to her and tugging at her sleeve, Tommy began to run to safety. Discovering she was not following him, he ran back to her side, grabbed her up, and began a second successful dash to safety.

I was so very much impressed with this article that I wrote this youngster a letter commending him for his action. I said:

DEAR TOMMY: I have just finished reading in the Louisville Courier-Journal the Associated Press story about your saving from certain death your little 5-year-old playmate, Pattie Luntz. I feel sure that my reaction to your daring deed of heroism represents that of all America. You are to be congratulated and commended for your presence of mind, your swiftness, and great courage. In my opinion you represent the caliber and fiber which is the pattern of our citizens of tomorrow. I shall be very happy if my little son, Frank, Jr., will grow up to be as brave, as fine, and as considerate of his fellow playmates and his fellow men such as you have demonstrated. Wishing you all of the success, happiness, prosperity, and good fortune possible in the years to come, I am genuinely yours,

FRANK L. CHELF,
Member of Congress.

I say to you quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time for the Congress of the United States to give encouragement and some inducement to these brave youngsters who have the character and moral fiber which makes up the citizenry of tomorrow; and who will be the backbone of America. I say to you that on the one hand we have juvenile delinquency, and on the other juvenile heroism. In order to lend encouragement to juvenile heroism, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the Attorney General of the United States to award on behalf of the Congress of the United States a medal for outstanding bravery to any youngster who at the risk of his own life attempts to save the life of a fellow man or playmate. We want more citizens like little Tommy Gibbs.

JUVENILE BRAVERY

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] on this noble effort on his part and also that he took time out from his duties to write a young citizen of South Carolina. I concur in what he says today and will support the legislation he is introducing. I commend him for his interest in youth.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that there is no such thing as juvenile delinquency; as far as I am concerned, it is parental delinquency. This is a problem that warrants the attention of Congress and a prayerful approach by every parent in America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Houston Post of December 28, 1947, concerning Jesse H. Jones and the RFC.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for today, to attend the funeral of a friend.

To Mr. HOBBS (at the request of Mr. MANASCO), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 13, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1199. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the opera-

tion of the agricultural conservation program for the program year 1946, with a financial report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1200. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of Agriculture for the period August 2, 1946, to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1201. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Extension Service for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1202. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report of activities of the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Sixth intermediate report relating to investigation of the proposed sale of Naylor Gardens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 251. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 422. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2759, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1237). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 423. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4071, a bill to amend section 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1238). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SARBACHER:

H. R. 4900. A bill to increase World War I and II disability and death compensation and pension rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4901. A bill to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4902. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 4903. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading with the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4904. A bill to provide for the inspection and transportation of clothing and food to encourage voluntary contributions to persons in occupied areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4905. A bill to provide that the rate of interest charged veterans of World Wars I and II on loans secured by their Government life insurance shall not exceed 3 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 4906. A bill to incorporate the Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4907. A bill making an initial appropriation to enable the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry on certain studies of the soft-shell clam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 4908. A bill to provide for nautical education in the Territories, to facilitate nautical education in the States and Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4909. A bill directing the Fish and Wildlife Service to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell clam in Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 4910. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the compensation of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4911. A bill to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until May 31, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4912. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4913. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations and on luggage, purses, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4914. A bill to establish a presumption of service connection for functional disorders of the nervous system and psychoses for certain veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4915. A bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding, courageous young Americans a medal for heroism, known as the Young American Medal of Honor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4916. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to exempt from family-income requirements amounts received for service-connected disability or disabilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 4917. A bill to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim January 13, 1948, Haym Salomon Day for the observance and commemoration of the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of the death of Haym Salomon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the 7-day period beginning May 31, 1948, as National Airwomen's Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution requesting the President to provide suitable recognition for persons serving as members on local draft boards of the Selective Service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 421. Resolution providing additional funds for the conduct of the investigation and study of reorganization and home rule for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 4918. A bill to amend the act entitled "'An act to provide for the acquisition by the United States of certain real property in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

H. R. 4919. A bill for the relief of Alfred Brauchle, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4920. A bill for the relief of Stefan Seidler and Klara von Csorba Seidler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of C. T. Maddrix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Tanios Elias Rahme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4923. A bill for the relief of Mihran Moses Koeroghlian, also known as M. M. Koeroghlian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4924. A bill for the relief of Nagibe Chalhoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4925. A bill for the relief of Frank Healy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4926. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1087. By Mr. COLE of Kansas: Petition of Marvin Goebel and others, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1088. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 63 members of the Christian Temperance Union, of Mars, Pa., urging the adoption of the Christian amendment, House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1089. Also, petition of 83 members of Perry S. Gaston Post, No. 343, American Legion, of New Castle, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1090. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Rev. Ruth S. Larmer and 12 other residents of Arkansas City, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1091. Also, petition of Mrs. Edward J. Staadt and 61 other residents of Tribune, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1092. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mrs. Henry R. Passey and sundry

citizens of Massachusetts, advocating enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1093. By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania: Petition of K. McNally, legislative chairman of the American Legion Auxiliary, No. 592, White Haven, Pa., containing the signatures of 62 residents of White Haven, urging the enactment during the Eightieth Congress of legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1094. Also, petition of 43 residents of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1095. Also, petition of Black Diamond Post, No. 395, American Legion, Kingston, Pa., urging enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, containing 56 signatures of members of that post from Forty Fort and Kingston, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1096. Also, petition submitted by Jean A. Lehnler, 315 Church Street, Kingston, Pa., containing the signatures of 30 residents of Edwardsville, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1097. Also, petition of 36 residents of Glen Lyon, Pa., urging that a system of universal military training be established, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1098. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Chariton, Iowa, urging passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1099. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Humeston, Iowa, in the interest of the establishment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1100. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Garden Grove, Iowa, in the interest of the establishment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1101. Also, petition of members of the American Legion Post at Centerville, Iowa, urging adoption of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1102. Also, petition of members of Newton Post, No. 111, American Legion, Newton, Iowa, urging adoption of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1103. Also, petition of a number of citizens of southern Iowa, urging support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1104. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Creston, Iowa, urging enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1105. Also, petition of 261 citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1106. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Grinnell, Iowa, urging support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1107. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, Iowa, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1108. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Oskaloosa, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1109. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of 85 citizens of Snow Hill, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1110. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of M. L. Johnson, Jr., Texarkana, Tex., and a number of other people, urging the Eightieth Congress to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1111. Also, petition of Mrs. Bruce Bland, Clarksville, Tex., and a number of other people, urging the Eightieth Congress to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1112. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of East Troy, Wis., and vicinity, urging legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1113. Also, petition of residents of Kenosha, Wis., urging legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1114. Also, petition of residents of Burlington, Wis., urging passage of legislation to strengthen the United Nations Organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1115. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles F. Darden and others, of Beaumont, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an amendment to the oath of allegiance to the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1116. Also, petition of Joseph E. Geiger and Eugene Geiger, of Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a Federal building program for the next 20 years; to the Committee on Public Works.

1117. Also, petition of W. A. Smith, Frostproof, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the amendment of the oath of allegiance to the United States of America, in United States Code, 1940, title 8, section 735b; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1118. Also, petition of Archbishop Vitaly for various members of the Russian Orthodox Greek-Catholic Church, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the displaced-persons problem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

JANUARY 13, 1948.

I hereby designate Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who knowest our necessities, as we unburden our minds in Thy presence, help us to perceive that which we really need. Do Thou quiet all restless thought and direct us in that which is good for humanity, and thus keep America strong and courageous, that she may fulfill her assigned destiny. In every crisis of our country, vouchsafe to make us free from weakness and uncertainty, and constrain us to do the right in all ministries of Christian service. O give our land a release from the confusion of tongues, and to all doubting ones send the challenge that in the encroachment of any pagan philosophy America is in the hands of a good God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLES OF WAR

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 424, Rept. No. 1239), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Ben. W. Colburn;

H. R. 769. An act for the relief of the estate of Ruth Horton Hunter;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased;

H. R. 1175. An act for the relief of the estate of Daphne Ward Pope, deceased;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Calvin J. Frederick;

H. R. 1531. An act for the relief of William P. Gillingham;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth F. McCombie;

H. R. 2056. An act for the relief of J. C. Bateman;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Charles J. Smith;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Mattie A. Horner;

H. R. 3068. An act for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas;

H. R. 3146. An act to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3754. An act for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1799. An act for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 3111. An act for the relief of Louis H. Deaver; and

H. R. 4055. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 489. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents;

S. 544. An act to regulate subsistence expenses of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government while absent from their designated posts of duty on official business;

S. 865. An act to provide for the striking of medals, in lieu of coins, for commemorative purposes;

S. 922. An act for the relief of Ruth Grossman;

S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry;

S. 1267. An act for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon;

S. 1347. An act for the relief of Burks L. Fielder;

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman;

S. 1486. An act to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service;

S. 1644. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 so as to permit rescission of prior agency action in complying with recommendations of the Civil Service Commission pursuant to appeals taken by preference employees;

S. 1675. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

S. 1676. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

S. 1698. An act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; and

S. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Iola Veach.

TAX GONE TO EUROPE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, when the President sent his spendthrift budget to the Congress yesterday asking for $39,700,000,000 to pay the expense of the Government for the coming year, he and his New Deal crowd who made up the budget asked for the biggest peacetime budget in the history of the Nation. His budget is heavily padded in every department of government.

His budget message was a masterpiece of confusion against the Congress and the American people. If he runs true to form he will spend $41,000,000,000 instead of $39,700,000,000 by reason of over a billion carried over from the last year which is not included in the figure he presented.

When he presented this budget he tried to throw the possibility of tax reduction out the window when he included $6,800,000,000 to supply the first-year funds for the Marshall plan. He, in fact, served notice on our taxpayers, "your tax cut will go to Europe."

Of course the President, even though he recommended a political tax bill has no intention of allowing the overburdened taxpayers a reduction in taxes in 1948. In fact, the bill he threw in was another piece of confusion to prevent a real tax-reduction bill being enacted by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, last year when the Republican Congress fought to reduce the President's budget by $5,000,000,000, the President and his bureaucrats in government opposed the reduction of the cost of government on every occasion. Try as hard as we did, we were only able to reduce the cost of government by about $3,000,000,000. This year he asks for $2,000,000,000 more than he asked for last year. His budget, if he had cooperated with the Congress, could have been cut to $31,000,000,000 last year.

If the people could be brought to understand the connivance and extravagance of this administration they would drive it out of power at the November election by an overwhelming majority. This New Deal crowd is determined to continue their policy of tax and tax, and spend and spend without any regard for the 140,000,000 people whose pockets are drained needlessly year after year of billions of dollars taken from them in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, if the President would cooperate, Federal pay rolls could be reduced, which would save $4,000,000,000 a year. But he will not. He apparently wants to keep these pay rolls padded for the next November election. This administration, if it would adopt a policy of economy in operating the Government, could save many more billions of dollars during the coming year. But there is no hope for that.

Mr. Speaker, nothing will bring this Government back to sound governmental policies and the reduction of cost of government short of driving these wastrels out of power by the election of a Republican President and Congress in 1948.

I have watched their operations here for the past 5 years, as have other Members of the Congress. I am discouraged to the point which has caused me to make the above statement, "That we cannot get good sound economical government that will reduce its cost by many billion dollars a year unless this administration is driven out of power. By their actions they have proved to every Member of the Congress, regardless of whether they be a Democrat or a Republican, and by this time they should have proved to the American people that they are only interested in continuing themselves in power.

Mr. Speaker, we Republicans owe a duty to the people which we must try to fulfill. That duty is to cut this budget by $5,000,000,000 or more if possible. The American taxpayers are expecting us to do it. They are demanding economy in government that will make it possible for them to have a reduction in taxes. We must get out our paring knives and start cutting and cutting on every appropriation bill that comes before this House. I know under the able leadership of the gentleman from New York, Congressman TABER, of the Appropriations Committee, and the Republican leadership of the House that every effort will be made in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, if we can cut this budget $5,000,000,000 we can give the American taxpayers $5,000,000,000 in relief. That will mean less money taken out of the pay checks of 50,000,000 workers, less money taken from the professional and little-business man, less money taken from the white-collar workers, school teachers, and annuitants. And less money taken from bigger business which needs to turn capital back into their business organizations, thereby investing risk capital that will expand business which is absolutely necessary to keep 50,000,000 wage earners employed.

Mr. Speaker, we who have fought for economy in government for the past number of years have a great responsibility and a heavy task ahead. That is to continue our fight for the reduction of the cost of government in the interest of all of the American people. We must pass a tax reduction bill fair and just to all taxpayers in the hope this time we can get a majority large enough to override a Presidential veto.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Rotary Club, Ogdensburg, N. Y., endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Washington Star, and in the other an address delivered by Mr. Arthur J. Freund before the American Bar Association.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by him entitled "Aggression Is on the March."

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Lawrence Ferdy on the needs for tools and machinery in this country.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my

remarks in the RECORD and include remarks of Wally Boren, author of Wally's Wagon column of this week's issue of This Week magazine. For once someone said something nice about the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial, and in the other an address delivered by Ned Dearborn.

THE WORKINGMAN AND THE FARMER PAY THE PRICE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday the President addressed the joint session of the Congress on what was supposed to have been the state of the Union. After a limited study of his proposals, one is impressed with the fact that he failed completely to address himself to this subject and that probably a more appropriate title would be "The State of Mind of the Democratic Candidate for President."

Reaction to the President's message the past week was quick and varied with most of the comment following the expected pattern. The most notable reaction was the lack of strength from the President's own party and from the press which usually supports the administration.

It is recognized that the subjects involved cannot be thoroughly discussed in a short statement of this nature, but the one fact that stands out in the overall picture, and on which there is almost unanimous agreement, is that Mr. Truman and his advisers have decided beyond all doubt that their political future lies in holding the support of the left-wing radicals, parlor pinks, Communists, and the international cabal of counterfeit Americans generally referred to as internationalists or "one-worlders." He gave notice to all other segments of people in America that henceforth he is in opposition to free enterprise, decentralization of Federal power, economy in government, and tax reduction. If his proposals were carried out, it would call for the expenditure of $60,000,000,000 or $70,000,000,000 in addition to normal expenses for the next 4 or 5 years, and he failed to tell us how we can give away our own substance at this rate along with the proposed increases in Federal operation expenses without adding momentum to the inflationary spiral which will insure higher prices and greater scarcity of consumer and durable goods.

When goods are exported, labor is exported. When they give away goods, they give away labor. When they give away labor, the workingman and the farmer pay the bill. They pay it through higher prices and higher taxes. All in all his program is contrary to every known sound business principle and inconsistent with the economic practices that have made this Republic the greatest Nation in all history.

He asks for wartime controls, wartime spending, and wartime confiscatory taxes. We cannot have independence without self-dependence. We cannot maintain that self-reliance individually that has meant so much to our progress without constant agitation for personal responsibility. Paternalistic government and democratic independence are as unmixable as oil and water. The real strength of any nation is in the self-reliance of its citizenship. Mr. Truman's preachment strikes at the very foundation of our constitutional government and throws to the wind the sacred principle that the state is the servant of the people.

His program would make financial disaster and bankruptcy almost a certainty and lay the foundation for a police state. Russia is a police state. He does not make clear why it is necessary to set up a police state in America in order to abolish police states in Europe. He places himself in a very precarious position when he tries to justify his creation and support of communism's twin brothers, the socialistic states of Europe and a controlled economy in this country while he is showing his teeth at all other forms of totalitarian governments.

Mr. Truman's tax plan is a feeble effort to play both sides of the political street, and it is so recognized by practically all Members of Congress excepting only a few left-wingers.

The only way tax relief can be afforded the American people is to reduce the total amount assessed. This simple arithmetic is understandable by any high-school student. The over-all tax load in the United States is approximately $52,000,000,000 annually. This sum is anchored in the cost-of-living bill and no power can get it out except by reducing the total tax burden. This tax load is one-fourth of the national income. Consequently, 25 percent of every dollar we spend goes for taxes. No matter where you are or what you do, if you make a dollar and spend it, you pay taxes. If you make $40 per week and spend it, $10 of the amount goes into the tax till. Notwithstanding, you may be exempt from all direct tax payments. No one that receives money and spends it escapes taxes.

The most serious indictment of the Truman proposal is that despite the superficially plausible statement of the President to the contrary, such legislation would be inflationary in character. Which is another way of saying that instead of helping the victims of high prices for whose benefit it is professedly offered, it would actually intensify their problem by adding new impetus to the inflationary spiral. When the President vetoed the tax bills last year, he thereby added $4,500,000,000 to our cost-of-living bill for the year 1947. When he bludgeoned the Congress into voting for the British loan of approximately $4,000,000,000, that sum was added to our cost of living and the same holds true of all foreign loans and grants and excess Federal expenditures. All of this spending is reflected in the high cost of living and high taxes—the people paying the bill.

The taxpayer is not being fooled by any double-talk on taxes. The only forthright approach to the inflationary, high-priced problem, is to materially reduce all taxes, reduce the proposed Federal budget of $39,700,000,000 by at least 20 percent, reduce Federal spending, hold exports within the bounds of reason, and do it now.

GRATING ON THE NERVES OF THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am getting some wonderful publicity these days.

On yesterday there came out in the Washington Daily News 10 pictures of individual Americans that are said to have been selected by the Academy of Vocal Arts as having outstanding voices. They were: Secretary Marshall, General Eisenhower, Senator Owen Brewster, Kate Smith, Cardinal Spellman, Lauren Bacall, Ralph Edwards, Secretary Forrestal, Jay Jostyn, and your humble servant.

They said my voice was the "most grating." I did not understand just whom my voice was grating on until I read this Associated Press article from Moscow, which I want to read to the House.

It says:

> Boris Izakov, writing in Pravda, the Communist Party organ in Russia, described present-day life in the United States as similar to that in Nazi Germany before the war.
>
> Izakov said the United States was caught in the meshes of the FBI, and that a small-scale reign of terror gripped the people.

Then he said:

> There have been no mass executions yet in the United States of America, such as are being carried on in Greece with the blessings of American generals and diplomats, but the fate of any American nowadays is in the hands of the notorious Fascist [Representative JOHN E.] RANKIN (Democrat of Mississippi) and any detective in the FBI.

So it seems that the Communists are the ones on whom my voice grates the most.

They seem to be trying to make the people of Russia believe that I have as much power over the American people as Stalin has over them, and that I am using the FBI as my gestapo.

The truth is that I am speaking for a majority of the real Americans in this country in my efforts to expose the Communists who are plotting the overthrow of this Government, and in demanding that they be driven from every position of influence in our national life.

Of course, the FBI agrees with me on that issue.

The sooner we clean house and fumigate, the better it will be for the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several editorials.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding a bill he is introducing today.

LIFT EMBARGO ON ARMS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the embargo on arms to the Middle East must be lifted. Palestinian Arabs are getting not only arms but armed men from neighboring Arab States. The British are either unable or unwilling to maintain order.

The United States joined with more than a two-thirds majority of the United Nations to set up and maintain a Jewish state. No state surrounded by hostility can be created without arms. The embargo has the effect of nullifying our action at the United Nations General Assembly.

The United States has a great responsibility in this matter. She took the lead in setting up the Jewish state. She cannot wash her hands of this matter by setting up an embargo and letting it go at that.

Neutrality is inconsistent with our affirmative action in the United Nations. Neutrality in this instance is a one-way street. Arms are denied Jews which are supplied the Arabs. Arab sovereignties can get all the arms the Palestinian Arabs need. The Jewish state is not yet sovereign, and therefore cannot negotiate for their purchase.

The embargo must be lifted.

MANUFACTURE OF INTOXICATING BEVERAGES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1947, near the close of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, when the House had up for consideration Senate Joint Resolution 167, which ultimately became and now is Public Law 395 of the Eightieth Congress, I voted for the measure. I stated then, and am now all the more convinced, that the terms of the act were inadequate to meet the situation. One of the main reasons which induced many of us to vote for the bill was the fact that authority was given to the President to limit the amount of grain used in the manufacture of distilled spirits and for other beverage purposes. The authority thus granted to the President expires on January 31, 1948, only a few days away.

With the selfish and greedy attitude of distillers and brewers so well known, it is imperative that at least the controls provided for in Public Law 395 be extended for sufficient time to permit the Congress to enact its will on this vital subject.

I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 294 which, if passed by Congress, will extend the authority of the President as provided in section 4, subdivision b of Public Law 395 until January 31, 1949. This 1 year's period will give us time to work out proper legislation to deal with one of the most controversial issues that has ever confronted this country.

It is, indeed, a strange paradox that the brewers and distillers of this country are determined to gobble up as much grain as possible to be used in the manufacture of intoxicating beverages, while at the same time we struggle to provide sufficient food to save human lives both here and abroad.

MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I note that through some error my special order of 30 minutes for today has been omitted from the first page of the calendar. I take this opportunity merely to tell the friends of the merchant marine that I have not walked out on them, but that I intend to speak on the merchant marine as soon as the time for the special orders arrives.

AID TO GREECE

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, about 10 months ago President Truman called upon the United States to be an international fireman in Greece. At that time the fire hoses were filled with American dollars. It appears that before long they may be filled with American blood.

In the meantime Congress may be interested in knowing how well we have done in stopping inflation in Greece. By the International Monetary Fund, I am told, on February 28, 1947, the Greek drachma was quoted at 140,000 to 1 gold sovereign. This last week the Greek drachma was quoted at 215,000 drachmas to 1 gold sovereign, so that inflation in Greece during that 10 months has increased 53 percent while we have been running that show.

Mr. Speaker, they say that in heaven the angels all rejoice at the conversion of a single soul. In a similar vein I should like to read a couple of sentences from a recent column by Walter Lippmann. He says:

> We are morally and politically overextended. * * * We are at a point where the Truman administration cannot please all the services, all the departments, all the specialized divisions of the State Department, all the countries to which by its unconsidered and no doubt well-intentioned declarations it is morally committed.

To that statement, Mr. Speaker, I add a fervent amen.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the ground for the question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the December 15 issue of In Fact, which the editor, George Seldes, describes as "an antidote for falsehood in the daily press," there is this statement:

> All during the war and since its end, HOFFMAN's record has been one of constant support for the crackpot fringe of native fascism. A report on his activities by the Friends of Democracy (vol. 3, No. 20) says:
>
> "America's Fascists, pro-Fascists, isolationists, and labor-baiters have long recognized Representative HOFFMAN as one of their most influential spokesmen. The sharp-tongued Congressman first gained attention from Fascist circles in 1937 when he had served in Congress 3 years. From that time on, HOFFMAN, whose arch enemies have been Roosevelt, Stalin, Britain, world cooperation, labor, and aliens, has steadily risen to top prominence with the Nazi lovers."
>
> * * * * *
>
> Today, this same Congressman is embarked on the boldest campaign of intimidation of newspapermen yet undertaken by any individual or group in the Congress, including the Committee on Un-American Activities. With few exceptions, the press whose freedom he would curb maintains a monumental silence.

Mr. Speaker, those statements reflect upon the integrity and loyalty of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District in his official capacity as a Representative from Michigan and raise the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope the gentleman will withhold his point of order, as this will only take 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order. I thought the gentleman wanted an audience.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, no; I do not want an audience. My purpose today is to make a record.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought the gentleman ought to speak to the Members of Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Members should know of the methods used by this man

Seldes, for he is a vicious, lying tool of the Communists. I do not want an audience. I am just putting this reliable information in the RECORD at the request of some very reliable Americans who want to keep the record straight. I am not alone in this. The gentleman himself has the same reputation along the same lines with the same people as I have. We are not alone. I notice here that the American Legion is characterized by this same person as being a sort of Fascist organization, and he said Mr. Dulles, who stands behind Secretary of State Marshall, had the same reputation.

Mr. RANKIN. I think he also makes the same attack on the Daughters of the American Revolution. While everybody knows that the Daughters of the American Revolution are patriotic and loyal, it is generally understood that Seldes has long been recognized as a Communist propagandist.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If previous issues of In Fact are read, it will be found that Seldes has attacked and vilified practically every individual who was energetic, aggressive, and persistent in speaking and acting for America and who was not either a Communist, a left-winger, or a New Dealer.

Just as an illustration, in his issue of December 8 he writes:

> Year after year the American Civil Liberties Union reports listed the Legion as the most powerful force in the Nation working against the civil liberties of its citizens.

In the same issue he writes:

> The man behind Secretary of State Marshall at the present conference in London which may settle the fate of Europe and which will affect the future of the United States is John Foster Dulles.

He then proceeds with a subhead which reads, "Relationship of Dulles firm and Nazi firm," in his attempt to show that Mr. Dulles is not a good, loyal American and that he and his associates are linked with the Nazis.

Seldes is a talented writer and, as a mass producer of falsehood and vilification dressed in attractive language, it is doubtful whether he can be excelled.

To show his complete disregard for the truth let me repeat one of his later references to me:

> Today, this same Congressman is embarked on the boldest campaign of intimidation of newspapermen yet undertaken by any individual or group in the Congress, including the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Everyone cognizant of the facts in connection with the two incidents to which he makes reference knows there has never been any attempt on my part to intimidate anyone, much less newspapermen.

Last fall, as a subcommittee of the Labor Committee, I held certain hearings in the Midwest. At those meetings the reporters were given every facility for their work. They were seated at the same table as was the committee, its counsel, and the witnesses. On one or two occasions they were called upon for assistance in the asking of questions in order to clear up some point that was in doubt. When "goon" squad leaders or certain publications charged that the hearings were unfair, the union's representatives were given an opportunity to fully and freely express themselves. On one occasion, that is, at Galion, Ohio, the following occurred:

> Mr. HOFFMAN. Gentlemen, we will come to order. Preliminary to the opening of the hearing, I most respectfully call the attention of the reporters, some eight in number, who are present, to an editorial in the Detroit Free Press of October 23 referring to the investigations which have been held and in which the editor joins William McAuley, the regional director of the UAW-CIO, in his statement presumably referring to the hearings which were held at Clinton, St. Joseph, and Dowagiac, Mich., and I quote:
>
> "The hearings are unfair to all concerned."
>
> There are several other statements in the editorial reflecting upon the investigation and those who are conducting it.
>
> My purpose now is most respectfully to request that you reporters be on the lookout for any evidences of unfairness, any improper conduct, any violation of the rights of citizens generally and, in particular, employees and union officers and representatives and State authorities, and request that, if you find any evidence of unfairness, you emphasize it. Send it in and have it printed in bold-faced type and underscore, because the people are entitled to know if any of their representatives are acting in an improper manner.

The purpose of these remarks today is to once more call the attention of the Members of the House, of the press, and of the public to the fact this man Seldes is a falsifier and a prevaricator, that he has not the slightest regard for the truth, that his love of the dollar and his perverted mind induce him to use his undoubted talent to create material which, because of its sensationalism and its charges against people and organizations which enjoy public confidence and which are engaged in a public service, finds a market with those who are attracted by his outrageous nature.

Some information bearing upon Mr. Seldes' unreliability will be found in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 10, pages A1078–A1081.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is headed by a man who is known throughout the world for his investigatory powers and for his reliability. So, instead of citing instances of Mr. Seldes' lying, let me read you what J. Edgar Hoover had to say about this gentleman, and then let me add information from other sources.

I quote from Mr. Hoover:

> FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
> UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
> *Washington, D. C., August 27, 1941.*
>
> Mr. GEORGE SELDES,
> *Editor, In Fact, New York, N. Y.*
>
> DEAR MR. SELDES: I wish to acknowledge your letter of July 21, wherein you refer to a letter which I directed to Mr. Thomas A. Murphy. I did state in my letter to Mr. Murphy, in response to his request, that the May 12, 1941, issue of In Fact contained a collection of "lies and falsehoods." I made this statement since I had no other choice in view of the obvious inaccuracies of the statements appearing in In Fact.
>
> You state that it is your purpose to publish the facts, that you keep your columns open to correction, and that if I will point out "one statement or one word in In Fact which is not true * * *" you will print a correction. I am not so much interested in a correction as I am in keeping the record straight, and accordingly I wish to advise as follows with reference to the statements appearing in the May 12 issue of In Fact:
>
> In Fact says, "Bridges case seen as opening FBI gun against labor and civil liberties in preparation for war."
>
> This statement is incorrect, inasmuch as the FBI is a fact-finding organization which has for its objective the preservation and protection of civil liberties. It does not inject itself into the employer-employee relationship. The FBI is charged, however, with carrying out the will of Congress and the instructions of the Attorney General of the United States and the President of the United States. The investigation of Harry Bridges, which resulted in a recent hearing afforded Mr. Bridges, was made on the specific instructions of the Attorney General.
>
> In Fact states: "That in preparation for entering the war the majority of American citizens who want peace are being intimidated and harassed by J. Edgar Hoover, who did the same job for Attorney General Palmer in World War I."
>
> This statement is false. No citizen has been harassed or intimidated by any special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or by me. As a matter of fact, my duties in the Department of Justice during the First World War could not by any stretch of the imagination sustain the charge which you have made. I was not connected with any activity wherein there was an opportunity to carry on such work, for it was not until August of 1919 that I was appointed a special assistant to the Attorney General, which position I held until 1921. The record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation since I assumed its directorship in 1924 speaks for itself. During that period, a persistent and successful effort has been made to lift the standards of law enforcement by first illustrating through the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that law-enforcement work could be carried on in an orderly and impartial manner and that its activities could be kept on a high plane. At no time has the Federal Bureau of Investigation violated the civil liberties of any person. As a matter of fact, over a period of years 96 percent of the persons arrested and charged with violations of Federal offenses were found guilty when tried in Federal court. This record in itself disproves the charge of intimidation and violation of civil liberties.
>
> In Fact says, "That the FBI has sought to frame progressive unionists."
>
> This is a gross and malicious misstatement of fact, although I am, of course, cognizant that this charge has been made before by Communists and their fellow travelers. However, it is untrue. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has never sought to frame "progressive unionists" or any other individuals.
>
> In Fact says, "That the FBI has cooperated with labor's worst enemies in an effort, so far singularly unsuccessful, to break strikes."
>
> This statement is false. While In Fact does not name "labor's worst enemies," nevertheless the FBI does not cooperate with anyone or any organization to break strikes. It never has and it is not contemplated that it will at any time in the future.
>
> In Fact says, "That a witch-hunt against civil liberties is being instituted, without any official wartime legislation, by Hoover and the FBI."
>
> This statement is false. The FBI has as one of its functions the maintenance of civil liberties, and as a matter of fact, I have been subjected to considerable criticism by reason of a stand which I have taken against the creation of vigilante groups. The record will show that from the very inception of the emergency I have constantly called upon law-enforcement officers and citizens alike to handle matters coming to their attention in a calm and impartial manner. Your conclu-

sion, which is set forth as a statement of fact, is not supported by the record.

In Fact states, "Bridges said, 'The FBI is now performing antilabor espionage for nothing which was formerly done for pay by company hirelings.'"

While it is true In Fact is quoting Bridges, I must point out that the statement by Mr. Bridges is a falsehood and as In Fact pointed out, it would be hard to substantiate, because it is false. The FBI does not perform antilabor espionage and as I have already indicated it is an established policy of this Bureau to refrain from having any connection with employer-employee relationships.

In Fact, in referring to the difficulty to substantiate the Bridges statement without a congressional investigation, states that my "love of publicity * * * has recently been replaced by a tight-lipped reticence. The FBI's current activities seldom get into the newspapers. However, from the Nation's labor and periodical press, In Fact has collected numerous illustrations of the FBI's pronounced antilabor bias."

The activities of the FBI have always been open and aboveboard. It is true that the FBI has not been making blanket charges and, incidentally, it has never sought publicity or headlines, your statements to the contrary notwithstanding. It is rather odd, since In Fact admits that current FBI activities seldom get into the papers, that in the next breath the statement is made that it has collected numerous illustrations from the papers. For your information, every activity of the FBI is scrutinized at periodic intervals by the Attorney General, the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and later by the Congress of the United States. Thus, it is readily apparent that the FBI's activities are well known by the governing forces of the United States.

In Fact states that Joe Mason drove his fiancée from her home in Spokane, Wash., to Kellogg, Idaho, to be married. "Two days after the ceremony he was seized by the FBI and accused of violating the Mann Act."

The facts are that charges were made against Joe Mason for violation of the White Slave Traffic Act, which charges reached the FBI on September 30, 1940. The FBI was advised that Mason had transported a girl from Spokane, Wash., to Kellogg, Idaho, and thence to Butte, Mont. On the night of September 21, 1930, Mason, the girl, and another individual wrecked their car at Kellogg and all three stayed in a hotel before proceeding to Butte, where Mason and the girl registered at a hotel on September 23, 1940, as Mr. and Mrs. Joe Mason, occupying the same room. They paid rent up to, and including, October 10, 1940. When the facts were presented to the United States Attorney, who is the prosecuting official for the United States Government, he issued instructions to file a complaint against Joe Mason for violation of the White Slave Traffic Act, which was done on October 11, 1940. Mason was never arrested by the FBI; he was not seized by the FBI; he was not even questioned by the FBI but voluntarily appeared at his arraignment on October 16. On October 19, the complaint was dismissed by the prosecuting attorney inasmuch as Mason had married the girl subsequent to the time of the alleged violations. Mason's attorney exhibited a marriage certificate which revealed that Mason and the girl were married at Dillon, Mont., on October 14, 1940. Thus it will be noted that the marriage took place 3 days after the complaint was filed.

In Fact states that 85 FBI agents were known by the miners' union to have visited Butte in 6 months, and some 15 or 20 are estimated to be stationed there at the present time.

The FBI maintains a field division in Butte covering the States of Montana and Idaho. However, the number of agents, and there were not 85, who visited Butte is immaterial and not pertinent to the issue. The number of agents presently assigned to Butte likewise has no bearing. The number varies from time to time in proportion to the amount of work in the Butte district.

In Fact refers to two FBI agents armed with revolvers who pushed their way through a mine, mill, and smelter workers' picket line at the Public Service Brass Co. in Los Angeles, blustering and making unjustified and unwarranted antilabor statements.

It is true that two special agents drove up to the Public Service Brass Co. in Los Angeles on January 30, 1941. The agents were seeking an individual who reportedly was armed and naturally the agents were armed in order that they might protect themselves if necessary. They did not, however, know that a strike was in progress until they stopped their car in front of the Public Service Brass Co. One of the agents got out of the automobile and was stopped by the leader of the picket line. However, he passed the agent after the latter had identified himself. The other agent remained in the car until he noticed that the first agent was stopped, at which time he too got out of the car. The agents made no blustering statements when stopped by the picket leader. Neither did they make any statements that could be regarded as antilabor.

In Fact refers to a case in Ducktown, Tenn., wherein the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union requested "the FBI to investigate when strikers' homes were dynamited but no investigation was made till TVA power lines were blown up." The statement is then made that "working with the county sheriff, FBI agents arrested 22 strikers, held them incommunicado on company property and after 6 days of intimidation secured several 'confessions,' which were later repudiated."

The facts are that the TVA power lines were blown up and that this malicious destruction of Government property constituted a violation of the laws of the United States coming within the primary investigative jurisdiction of the FBI. Accordingly, an investigation was conducted. With reference to the dynamiting of the strikers' homes mentioned in In Fact, I wish to advise that such action would constitute a violation of State laws and under the circumstances would not constitute a violation of Federal laws. Thus the FBI would have no authority to investigate such action. Following the investigation of the destruction of the TVA power lines, 21 individuals were taken into custody. Five of these individuals were arrested by local officers at the request of the FBI, and as a matter of fact, none of the others were apprehended by special agents of this Bureau. As a matter of fact, the five individuals arrested at the request of special agents were not held incommunicado.

After hearing the evidence, a Federal grand jury at Chattanooga, Tenn., in an indictment charged the 21 individuals with conspiracy to willfully injure and commit degredation upon the property of the Tennessee Valley Authority. This, of course, proves that there was a legal basis for the investigation. In connection with this case, several of the defendants expressed their satisfaction with the treatment received from FBI agents. The fact that some of the defendants later denied their statements in court does not sustain a charge of intimidation or duress. As a matter of fact, this issue was raised during the trial of the case and the court did not find after hearing the evidence that any illegal or improper methods were employed.

In Fact states that Anderson and six other strikers were convicted in February, receiving 2-year sentences and fines up to $5,000. As a matter of fact, Anderson did receive such a penalty following his conviction. However, 7 others were convicted, 6 of whom received sentences of 2 years and a fine of $1,000. The seventh individual received a sentence of 15 months without the imposition of a fine. In all, 8 of the 21 individuals indicted by the grand jury were found guilty. In Fact's statement quoting an FBI representative as saying to a striker, "Anderson is the man we want" is untrue.

In Fact refers to the strike of the National Association of Die Casting Workers and charges that the Department of Immigration broke up the strike.

Inasmuch as the Immigration and Naturalization Service is not connected with the FBI, this reference in In Fact has no bearing on the FBI.

In Fact states that during the Allis-Chalmers strike "the auto workers' union charged the FBI with sending agents to the homes of strikers to intimidate them into signing back-to-work petitions."

This statement is false for FBI agents at no time intimidated workers. Neither did agents go to the homes of the strikers in an effort to have them return to work.

In Fact refers to the International Harvester strike in Chicago and to a bulletin issued by the Chicago International Labor Defense stating, "Hundreds of Chicagoans have come face to face with America's Gestapo—J. Edgar Hoover's FBI—working hand-in-hand with Chicago's notoriously antilabor police force." The statement is then made that "agents of this new Gestapo have knocked on doors, forced entrance into homes, intimidated people into answering questions, and frightened them with fifth-column accusations; agents have visited factory foremen and workers using thinly veiled threats of reprisals against anyone who refused to stool and answer the questions of the investigators."

This statement is likewise absolutely false. No agent of the FBI committed the acts charged.

In Fact refers to an item appearing in the New York Sun on November 1, reporting that "the FBI was shadowing John L. Lewis."

This statement is so false that its re-publication appears maliciously deliberate. In Fact further states that the New York Post reported that "numerous G-men were devoting their full time to taking down the license numbers of cars parked outside CIO meetings called by Lewis." This statement is absolutely false. At no time have special agents been assigned to such activities.

In Fact states that when the "United Electrical Workers began organizing the Levene Motor Co. in Philadelphia several months ago, the company president called the men together and said that the FBI had instructed all companies with defense contracts to warn their employees against 'Communist agitation'." Continuing, In Fact states that the president "fired the union organizer 'by order of the Navy Department'."

This statement is untrue, insofar as the FBI is concerned. While the FBI does make surveys of the protective facilities of industries having large national defense contracts at the request of both the War and Navy Departments, these surveys do not contemplate or go into the employee-employer relationship. As a matter of fact, the Levene Motor Co. has not been surveyed by special agents of the FBI. What instructions the president of the Levene Motor Co. gave, of course, are something with which I am not familiar. At any rate, any instructions which he did give were certainly not on behalf of the FBI.

In Fact refers to an address of Congressman ANDERSON, who "quoted from official file No. 654,632 of the Department of Justice." The article states that Joseph Curran took this up with the President, who replied that Paul Mallon, "who has good connections with the FBI," cleared up the confusion by revealing that the report referred to was a part of the FBI's report on Harry Bridges.

The facts are that the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not release its investigative reports for publication. Copies of the FBI's reports in some instances are furnished

to other Government agencies, and in the event the other Government agencies give out the report this is a matter over which the Bureau has no control. The Federal Bureau of Investigation gave no such report as referred to in In Fact to Congressman ANDERSON.

In Fact states that "many heads of company police and labor-spy outfits exposed by the La Follette committee in recent years have been former FBI men."

This statement, of course, has no bearing upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation today, as this organization does not have any control over any individuals who formerly were in its employ. Former special agents of this Bureau, insofar as official records, files, and other matters are concerned, are treated exactly like any other citizen.

In Fact states that the closest I "came to working openly with an employer's association was with the Cleveland Industrial Safety Council * * *."

The facts and records conclusively show that the FBI opposed the organization of the Cleveland Industrial Safety Council and its development inasmuch as it was in conflict with the President's directive of September 6, 1939. I have always felt that the handling of national defense matters was a job for the constituted authorities and not one to be handled by private groups of well-intended citizens or vigilantes.

In Fact states "two union steelworkers were arrested 'under orders of the FBI' for photographing an antilabor billboard in Weirton, W. Va."

The facts are that three individuals were arrested at Weirton, W. Va., by local authorities on March 19, 1940. The arrests were made without the knowledge of the FBI and the first information which the FBI had of these arrests was on March 21, 1940, when a letter was received from the local law-enforcement officer. The arrests were not made upon the orders of this Bureau.

In Fact states that in August of 1940 I "used the American (magazine) to denounce as saboteurs AFL aircraft workers at the Boeing plant in Seattle, one of the most profitable in the country, who were endeavoring to avoid a wage cut."

I did write the following paragraph in the August 1940 issue of American Magazine:

"Sabotage does not always consist of actual physical damage in plants. Sometimes more subtle methods are used. As this is written, a group of Communists are reported to be attempting to force a local labor union to take steps which would result in closing down a large airplane factory in America if the company takes contracts for the construction of planes for the Allies."

I did not name the factory involved. Neither did I state that the group consisted of AFL aircrafts workers at the Boeing plant in Seattle. This reference, together with others, appears rather inconsistent with your statement that you seek to print the truth, when, as a mater of fact, you print a statement which could be very easily checked by reference to American Magazine.

In Fact states, "One of Hoover's ambitions is to fingerprint every person in the United States." The article then goes on to refer to the matter of fingerprinting generally.

The facts are that fingerprints constitute an infallible means of identification. Likewise there is no difference between a set of fingerprints and a signature, except that fingerprints cannot be forged. No one objects to signing a marriage license or an application for an automobile driver's permit, for which reason it is rather difficult to reconcile the objections which you raised regarding fingerprinting unless it is the view of In Fact that a person has a right to conceal previous activities of a questionable nature. As a matter of fact, the use of fingerprints has grown in popularity annually for a long period of time. It is true that this method of identification does present a means of identifying an individual regardless of the number of times he has changed his name. By the same token it also is a positive means of protecting the innocent. The mere fact that I have publicly discussed the benefits of fingerprinting doesn't mean, however, that it is my ambition to fingerprint everyone in the United States.

In Fact states that the FBI "has all the prints ever taken by local police."

This is incorrect, because the FBI has not received every set of fingerprints ever taken by the local police.

In Fact refers to Estolv E. Ward's recent articles, whose inaccuracies closely parallel the May 12 issue of In Fact, and states, "Any militant unionist who has been arrested on a picket line is thus represented on a national antiunion blacklist."

This statement is incorrect since identification data in the FBI files are made available only to constituted authorities and the FBI has no antiunion blacklist. Any notations appearing upon fingerprints, of course, are made by local law-enforcement authorities in accordance with local procedures.

In Fact states, "the clerks in the FBI fingerprint file room are among the most overworked Government employees."

This is false. FBI employees, by reason of the present emergency, obviously are working hard in order to keep abreast with current needs. Limited overtime is necessary during the present emergency not only on the part of employees of this Bureau, but of many Government bureaus and departments. Unfortunately, it is not possible to compensate employees for overtime services inasmuch as the laws of the United States, as passed by Congress, do not so provide. The fact is, however, that the employees of the FBI, as well as the employees of other Federal agencies performing overtime, are doing their work not for any personal gain but for the benefit of the people of this country at large. They are loyal, patriotic citizens serving their country at a time when everyone should be doing his share. They are working no more overtime than many other Government employees and less than some.

In Fact states that clerks are clocked on their visits to rest rooms.

This is a malicious lie.

In Fact states that the following sign hangs in a training room: "If you must grumble or complain about your treatment by your superiors get out and complain from the outside."

In the event you should ever desire to make any further reference to Elbert Hubbard's motto on loyalty, which does hang in some of the classrooms, I am enclosing a copy of this motto in order that you will at least be able to quote it correctly.

In Fact states, "Hoover has ruthlessly suppressed organization among his employees."

This is an obvious falsehood when it is considered that Bureau employees boast of having the most active association of employees in the Government service. As a matter of fact, a high Bureau official is an officer of a labor union of Government employees.

In Fact states, "In 1936, 38 clerks were fired for joining the American Federation of Government Employees. At Hoover's insistence they were blacklisted by other Government agencies."

At no time has any employee ever been dismissed from the service of the FBI because of his joining a labor union. At no time has any employee ever been blacklisted with other Government agencies by reason of his affiliation with a labor union. In 1936, several former clerical employees of this Bureau stated they had been dismissed because they were members of a labor union. However, the FBI had no information or knowledge that they were members of a labor union until after they had left the Bureau's service and until they had so stated in their false charges. Strangely, several of those who protested had resigned voluntarily. A few others were requested to resign because of their inefficiency. Many of these individuals are now working in other Government agencies, which would not be the case had they been dismissed with prejudice from the FBI. Thus your false charges of blacklisting are proven to be maliciously untrue by the record.

In Fact states, "The FBI has the biggest labor turn-over in Washington."

This statement is false. As a matter of fact, most individuals leaving the Bureau's employ do so on their own volition to accept positions which are more remunerative in private industry. Likewise, scores of individuals who are employed by other Government agencies call at the FBI daily to make application for positions.

In Fact states, "The Palmer raids of 1919, during which 5,000 persons were arrested in one night, were conducted on Hoover's orders."

This statement is untrue. The raids were conducted by the Bureau of Investigation, which at that time was under the direction of Mr. William J. Flynn. At the time I was a subordinate official in the Department of Justice assigned as a special assistant to the Attorney General. In connection with these raids, my only assignment was to correlate the evidence to be used in prosecuting the deportation proceedings.

In Fact incorrectly and only partially quotes from page 173 of the Attorney General's Annual Report.

Had In Fact been correct, the statement quoted on the next to the last page in the fourth paragraph would have stated, "While the work of the General Intelligence Division was at first confined solely to the investigations of the ultraradical movement, it has now expanded to cover more general intelligence work, including not only ultraradical activities but also the study of matters of an international nature as well as economic and industrial disturbances incident thereto." Had In Fact correctly and completely quoted from the Attorney General's Annual Report, the impression would have been conveyed that any economic and industrial disturbances which were investigated were investigated solely as an incident to matters of an international nature. The references to the 1919 steel strike and the 1922 railroad strike are matters of public record which do not reflect to the discredit of the Bureau of Investigation or to my own activities. Any action that I might have taken in connection therewith was solely pursuant to congressional enactment and in furtherance of governmental policy.

In Fact states, "Most of the FBI's more recent violations of civil liberties have had antilabor implications." The article then refers to the Detroit arrests following the indictment of individuals recruiting volunteers to fight with the Spanish Loyalists.

At no time did FBI agents engage in antilabor activities. Their sole function was to serve the warrants which were issued by the Federal district court after the grand-jury indictments had been returned. In Fact does not refer to the investigation which was conducted by the Civil Liberties Unit of the Department of Justice following the Detroit arrests. In this connection, Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, who then was Attorney General, stated, "I am, of course, anxious, as you are, that in law enforcement we do no violence to our traditional civil liberties. I am convinced that if those liberties are generally endangered in this country it is not by the FBI." Mr. Henry Schweinhaut, Chief of the Civil Liberties Unit, who conducted the investigation, on page 16 of his report states, "* * * the conduct of the agents is not subject to justifiable criticism."

In Fact refers to the statements of the Attorney General of the United States regarding the Vultee aircraft strike and states, "Jackson got his information about the strike

from Hoover, who got his from Capt. William F. (Red) Hynes."

Naturally the Attorney General of the United States is advised in detail regarding each and every item of information and evidence that comes to the FBI in which he might be interested. The FBI naturally receives information from citizens. The FBI cooperates with all law-enforcement agencies and officers and will receive information from any of them pursuant to the instructions of the President of the United States, who called upon all law-enforcement agencies on September 6, 1939, to report information in their possession pertaining to espionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of neutrality statutes. By accepting such information, the FBI does not endorse any law-enforcement officer, and accordingly, the comments pertaining to Captain Hynes in In Fact are not pertinent.

In Fact states, "For many years Hoover has conducted a National Police Academy at which representatives of local police forces were given target practice."

It is true the FBI did establish the FBI National Police Academy in the summer of 1935 in order that select representatives from law-enforcement agencies might be equipped to return to their communities to instruct their brother law-enforcement officers. Approximately 1 week of the 3-month period of instruction is devoted to defensive tactics and the use of firearms. Thus In Fact obviously seeks to convey an erroneous impression when it states that members of local police forces are given target practice and does not state that they are also given instruction in all phases of scientific law-enforcement work and in legal and ethical procedures.

In Fact states that since the President "proclaimed a limited emergency and designated the FBI as a clearinghouse * * * Hoover has expanded the curriculum." In Fact refers to a mayor of a small western town who writes that "the FBI has asked him and his chief of police to keep a file of everyone in town who spoke in favor of peace, and to notify the FBI of any labor trouble at the town's only plant. 'This has happened in every town in the State,' writes In Fact's informant, whose name naturally cannot be used. 'I told them to go to hell.'"

This statement is false in its entirety. The FBI has never made a request such as the one set forth by In Fact. The President of the United States in his directive outlined the nature of the acts which were to be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At no time has the FBI exceeded the President's directive, nor has it exceeded its jurisdiction prescribed by law. If In Fact desires to print the facts, I would appreciate being advised of the identity of the town, the identity of the State, the identity of the mayor, and the identity of the informant in order that the facts insofar as the FBI is concerned may be revealed. If In Fact declines to give this information, then, of course, it places itself in the position of not being desirous of correcting a condition, if it exists, and it would appear that the rights of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are being violated in falsely misrepresenting its activities unless an equal opportunity is given for it to correctly set forth its activities.

In Fact refers to a columnist who wrote regarding the cooperation of the American Legion and the FBI and states "In Fact is informed the unofficial merger has been completed."

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has been most appreciative of the splendid cooperation which it has received, not only from the American Legion but from civic groups throughout the country as well as individual citizens. This assistance has been most helpful to the FBI in the orderly handling of complaints pertaining to national defense matters and by reason of this cooperation it has been possible to hold down an outbreak of mob spirit and the unbridled activities of vigilantes. The assistance of civic groups and the American Legion, however, is limited to passing on to the FBI information which their members possess pertaining to unlawful activities. In no instances do they conduct investigations relative to the information which they pass on to the FBI.

In Fact states "The FBI's principal anti-labor activity in 1940 was the preparation of the Bridges report, which took several hundred agents 3 months."

The facts are that following the passage of the Smith Act, the Attorney General of the United States ordered the Bridges' case reopened, and at his direction FBI agents did investigate the allegations pertaining to Mr. Bridges. However, several hundred agents did not work on the case for 3 months. As a matter of fact, a squad of a score of agents handled the investigation. The statements appearing in In Fact pertaining to the pronouncements of the Bridges' defense committee are false.

In Fact quotes Harry Bridges as saying, "The new evidence Hoover has secured we know to be faked. It was secured by bribery and intimidation."

Mr. Bridges' statement is false, and if he had evidence to sustain this charge, he had an opportunity to present it at the recent hearing which was afforded him by the Attorney General. The evidence obtained by the FBI in the course of the investigation was admitted during the hearing and certainly had the evidence been secured through bribery and intimidation the issue could have been raised. Had the charges been sustained, the evidence would have been inadmissible.

With reference to the third paragraph of your letter referring to Mr. Bridges' statement that he had furnished the FBI with evidence of espionage by Nazis in Douglas and other airplane plants, and that the FBI not only refused to act but went after the CIO union instead, I wish to advise that this statement is false. Harry Bridges did send a telegram to the President of the United States on January 23, 1939, wherein he charged that Nazi agents and sympathizers were working on airplanes for the United States Government. Each charge, however, was carefully investigated and each charge was found to be untrue.

With reference to the fourth paragraph of your letter, wherein you refer to Joseph Curran as denouncing the FBI for antilabor activities and urging the FBI to fight enemy spies, I wish to advise that the FBI has been doing exactly what Mr. Curran in the latter statement urged it to do, namely, it has been counteracting the actions of foreign agents within the United States. At no time has the FBI engaged in antilabor activities.

You state that the American Civil Liberties Union in its 1941 report accuses the FBI of invading the field of opinion, and says the FBI requires constant watching and checking because it interferes with the rights of citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution.

The charges are false and I must call your attention to page 16 of the annual report of the American Civil Liberties Union, which does not support your statement. The report states, "We have also opposed the extension of powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation into the field of opinion, which the Attorney General has sanctioned under a general authority to investigate 'subversive activities,' not defined." I want to assure you, however, that the FBI does not conduct investigations in the field of opinion.

I likewise must refer again to page 16 of this report wherein is stated, "The FBI is rapidly extending its powers in the emergency of war preparations, and needs constant watchfulness and checking to curtail its tendencies to assume the role of a political police." This does not say, as you do, that the FBI interferes with the rights of citizens as guaranteed by the Constitution. Neither does it say that the FBI has engaged in activities which would violate constitutional civil liberties.

I have taken the liberty of writing you somewhat in length in view of your statements which, on their face, indicate a desire on your part to correctly report the facts. I have attempted to do so in an impartial and factual manner. I shall now observe with interest the action which you will take since being advised of the facts, and of course, I shall be very glad for you to quote my letter in whole in a subsequent issue of In Fact.

May I also make the observation that in the future should you desire to correctly report the activities of the FBI, I shall be very glad indeed to hear from you on specific matters in order that specific activities of the FBI in question may be explained to you if consistent with the public interest, because naturally it would not be possible to give out information of a confidential nature obtained in connection with pending investigations. I have taken you at your word, and as I said, shall observe with interest the action you take.

Very truly yours,

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

From one of the most efficient and reliable investigatory organizations in the world comes the following information on the record of this Red smear artist, George Henry Seldes.

BACKGROUND

Who's Who in America, volume 24, 1946–47, contains the following biographical data concerning Seldes:

Georges Seldes, writer, was born at Alliance, N. J., on November 16, 1890, the son of George Sergius and Anna (Saphro) Seldes. He received his preparatory education at the Vineland (N. J.) High School and East Liberty Academy in Pittsburgh, Pa. He was a student at Harvard from 1912 to 1913. He married Helen Larkin Wiesman. He was a reporter for the Pittsburgh Leader in 1909–10; night editor, Pittsburgh Post in 1910–16; managing editor, Pulitzer's Weekly, New York City, 1916; war correspondent with the American Expeditionary Forces, 1917–18; head of the Berlin bureau of the Chicago Tribune, 1920–25, and the Rome bureau, 1925; war correspondent during the French campaign in Syria, 1926–27; war correspondent for the New York Post in Spain, December 1936 to May 1937; has engaged in writing since 1928; editor of In Fact, weekly newsletter, since 1940. He is a member of the Farmers' Union (Brooks County, Mont.) and a committee member of the National Citizens Political Action Committee. He is author of the following: You Can't Print That, 1929; The Truth Behind the News, 1929; Can These Things Be, 1931; Sawdust Caesar, 1932; World Panorama, 1933; The Vatican and the Modern World, 1933; Iron, Blood, and Profits, 1934; Freedom of the Press, 1935; You Can't Do That, 1937; Lords of the Press, 1938; The Catholic Crisis, 1939; Witch Hunt, 1940; The Facts Are—, 1942; Facts and Fascism, 1943.

It was stated that Seldes, while an assistant in the London office of the Chicago Tribune, was expelled for releases and news that were reportedly true but highly unfavorable to the country reported. He was expelled from Fiume in 1920, from Moscow in 1923, and from Rome in 1925.

The first issue of Ken magazine—Red front—listed George Seldes as editor, but because of a disagreement on policy as

to what could be printed, he tendered his resignation.

During its existence, Seldes was a regular contributor to Fight magazine, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism, a Red front organization, later known as the American League for Peace and Democracy, a Red front organization.

PRESENT OCCUPATION AND RESIDENCE

George Seldes is editor of In Fact, a weekly newsletter, with offices at 280 Lafayette Street, New York, N. Y. He resides on Grist Mill Road, Norwalk, Conn.

A mailing leaflet advertising In Fact contains a statement by George Seldes, in which he says:

I belong to no party or political organization, but I am willing to join with any individual or society in fighting fascism, which is the enemy of all progressive mankind. By fascism I mean not only far-away fascism in Nazi Germany, Mussolini Italy, and Hirohito Japan, but the fascism of the Cliveden set in Britain and its counterparts among the ruling families of America.

In Fact characterizes itself as "antidote for falsehood in the daily press."

MEMBERSHIP AND SPONSORSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONS, COMMITTEES, AND ACTIVITIES

Seldes was reportedly a member of the International Committee for Political Prisoners in 1937, a Red front.

In 1938 he was a signer of a statement by American progressives on the Moscow trials. It is reported that in December 1938 he was a member of the National Committee for People's Rights—a Red front—and in 1942 his name appeared on a list of sponsors of the National Committee for People's Right, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York City.

Reportedly, Seldes was in 1939 a member of the National Committee, American Boycott Against Aggressor Nations—a Red front organization. In March of that year he was said to be a member of the organizational committee of Films for Democracy.

A press release issued by the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy—a Red front—on March 14, 1939, announced a meeting opening a drive for the relief of victims of "Franco's conquest" on the night of March 15, 1939, at which time there would be discussed The Spanish Conflict and Its International Significance. George Seldes was one of the speakers scheduled to address the meeting.

A circular distributed in February 1940, entitled "In Defense of the Bill of Rights," was signed by Seldes. The signers denied therein that they were Communists but pointed out that they were interested only in the tradition of free speech and that the suppression of the Communist Party in European countries was only a beginning, followed by a campaign against trade unions, cultural groups, Jews, Catholics, Masons, and ending with destruction of all freedom.

Seldes was a member of the Writer's Emergency Committee to Save New Masses—a Red front—in April 1940 and was reportedly one of the sponsors of The Call to a Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America—a Red front—held in Washington, D. C., June 7, 8, and 9, 1940.

A mass meeting styled "Keep America out of war" held in Greenwich Village, New York City, public school No. 3, on June 13, 1940, under the auspices of the Greenwich Village Chapter of the New York Peace Association, was reportedly sponsored by George Seldes, among others.

Seldes was allegedly a member of the executive board of the United American Spanish Aid Committee—a Red front—200 Fifth Avenue, New York City, in July 1940, and one of the sponsors of the Call to the Emergency Peace Mobilization—a Red front—in Chicago from August 31 to September 2, 1940. He is also said to be or have been a member of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born; Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and the American Council on Soviet Relations—Red front organizations.

REFERENCE TO SELDES IN COMMUNIST NEWSPAPERS

George Seldes was listed in an item in the Daily Worker for June 11, 1938, as one of several prominent intellectuals who had endorsed a campaign launched by the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade—a Red front—to bring home several seriously wounded Americans from France.

According to the Daily Record of Chicago, defunct Communist daily newspaper, for October 27, 1938, Seldes and others interested themselves in the Committee to Aid Excluded Loyalist Veterans—a Red front. The committee was created to bring pressure to bear on the Secretary of Labor to permit returning Spanish Civil War veterans to enter the United States from Ellis Island.

The People's World—a Red front—for November 21, 1938, stated that—

Thirty-six American authors, representing the finest in the Nation's present literary production, have added their voices to the clamor of labor, progressive, peace, religious, and other groups, demanding that President Roosevelt rebuke the Nazi reign of terror by closing the doors of America to Nazi trade.

The demand referred to was in the form of a letter signed by 36 American authors including George Seldes.

On January 12, 1939, the Daily Worker reported Seldes to be a member of a defense committee to save George Roth, a naturalized American sailor who had been arrested by the German Gestapo in Hamburg on a charge of importing anti-Nazi literature.

The Daily Worker for February 2, 1939, reported that George Seldes, together with Richard Wright, Dr. Margaret Schlauch, and Kyle Crichton, was scheduled to appear at the Delphic Studios in New York City on February 6, 1939, to participate in the Pink Slip Cabaret, organized to raise money to support dismissed WPA writers.

Seldes was a sponsor in a campaign to raise $160,000 for a disabled veterans' fund launched by the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, according to the Daily Worker for March 22, 1939.

The Daily Worker of December 3, 1940, contained a news item captioned "Britain's treatment of Jews hit here. Twenty noted citizens signed protest to Lothian." George Seldes was listed as one of the 20 individuals.

Seldes' name was listed by the Daily Worker for December 19, 1940, as one of 165 "nationally prominent representatives of every field of public life" requesting Gov. Culbert Olson, of California, to dismiss immediately charges against Sam Adams Darcy, Communist leader.

In the Daily Worker of June 9, 1941, there is a news article reading:

Writer's congress adopts firm antiwar program. America's best and bravest writers and artists went on record against the imperialistic war at the American Writer's Congress (a Red front) at the Hotel Commodore last night.

The article quotes the writer as follows:

We pledge ourselves to speak the truth about the criminal war.

Among the writers was the name of George Seldes, editor of In Fact, who, according to the article, was elected vice president.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES BY SELDES—LORDS OF THE PRESS

Seldes' book Lords of the Press was reviewed in the Sunday Worker—a Red front—for November 27, 1938, by Howard Rushmore. The following is quoted from the book:

The press lords of the United States in 1 year made this great record: Fought all issues where their profits were involved; led the attack against a real pure food and drug act; opposed the Wagner Act; urged amendment of the proposed social-insurance legislation, putting newspapers in a special class; proposed outlawing of strikes, favored child labor; and frowned at the Securities Act.

WITCH HUNT

Witch Hunt, written by George Seldes, was published in 1940 and carried the subtitle "The Technique and Profits of Red Baiting." Seldes states therein that the most prominent "Red baiting" is attributable to the American Legion, chambers of commerce, the Catholic hierarchy, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Ku Klux Klan, and the Nazis. The book was reviewed by Ernest Moorer in the Daily Worker of November 11, 1940.

THE FACTS ARE

In the Daily Worker for January 3, 1943, Charles S. Seeley reviewed The Facts Are—, by George Seldes. The last paragraph of the review states:

Incidentally, The Facts Are— closely indicates why those seeking the truth should read the Daily Worker and other papers and magazines which are sympathetic toward the common man of whom Mr. Wallace speaks.

COMMENTS CONCERNING SELDES AND IN FACT IN OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Frederick Woltman, of the staff of the New York World Telegram, is the author of an article in the November 19, 1943, issue of the American Mercury magazine entitled "The Camouflaged Communist Press." The article states that George Seldes' In Fact provides a case study of the Communist press. It says the "newsletter In Fact, founded and edited by one George Seldes, at present provides the outstanding example of ingenious and agile toeing of the mark in conformity

with the party line." By quoting directly from the contents of In Fact, Woltman endeavors to show how In Fact has consistently adhered to the Communist Party line. On page 586 Woltman states:

Small wonder that the Daily Worker praises Seldes and his dope sheet. It merely returns the compliment. In a signed article in the New Masses just before he launched his own paper, Seldes attested that "it now becomes imperative to read the Daily Worker for the actual information about Europe."

The New Leader for April 22, 1944, volume XXVII, No. 17, contains an article by James A. Wechsler, national editor of PM. This article is a reprint from the Guild Reporter. In this article the author attempts to explain Seldes' position over a period of several years. There is also a part captioned "Seldes the Fanatic," under which it is stated that the only charitable explanation for George Seldes' actions is that he is "congenitally and temperamentally a fanatic." It is stated:

All through his career he has struck a "holier than thou" pose, deriding practically every newspaperman in the country and suspecting everybody else's motives.

The article continues:

At present Seldes is running In Fact, a tout sheet for the liberals which seek to cash in on the sucker strain in American life by claiming to give the inside dope.

Seldes started In Fact in 1940, announcing in his prospectus that "I belong to no party, no organization." But, he continued, "I will expose the warmongers." And he has lithely traipsed along the Communist Party line in every little twist and turn. His first associate editor was Bruce Minton, an editor of the New Masses. His first exposés were the plans of the British to trap America into war. In 1940 In Fact lauded a pamphlet, Lothian versus Lothian, which was published by Flanders Hall, a pro-Nazi publishing house secretly supported by George Sylvester Viereck; Seldes ran such headlines as "Britain Burns Food While Millions Starve"—this during the onslaughts by the Nazis; he supported the American Peace Mobilization (a Red front) and publicized the report of Appeaser Joseph Kennedy that "Britain Is Going Fascist in Wartime." Came the June 22, 1941, dawn, and George Seldes became as fierce a warmonger as J. P. Morgan—even fiercer.

But these strange reversals are characteristic of the surrealist strain in Seldes. In 1923 George Seldes was the Chicago Tribune's correspondent in Russia, until he was expelled by Lenin for smuggling out stories.

Seldes left Russia and sent several dispatches and letters to his employer, Colonel McCormick. These letters were released, and in a story in the New York Times of June 18, 1923 (p. 15), Seldes' letters are reprinted. Here is what Seldes wrote:

"Believe me, if bolshevism ever comes to America nothing would please me more than a nice corner post on a roof overlooking two main streets, and a nice large machine gun with unlimited belts of ammunition.

"I am convinced more than ever that Russian bolshevism will never be satisfied until it carries world revolution to other countries, but the country they want most is America. I certainly believe it is the duty of every man who cares the least bit for his own liberty or for the most fundamental rights to fight the greatest force today of anticivilization."

Eyewitness Seldes has never returned to Russia after 1923.

Sure a man has a right to change his opinions. But with Seldes' gyrations in view, can you trust his judgments?

VIEW OF ANTICOMMUNIST WRITERS

Eugene Lyons, in an article entitled "Red Mouthpiece" published in the March 1947 issue of Plain Talk, charged that the subject's newsletter In Fact is a "Communist Party line publication" and that Seldes "has been for at least 10 years a prominent and active fellow traveler of the Communists."

Lyons quoted Louis F. Budenz, former editor of the Daily Worker, who declared that—

In 1940 when I was named president of the corporation publishing the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party, the then secretary general, Earl Browder, stated that the political committee of the party was prepared to name George Seldes as editor of the Daily Worker. Later I was advised that Seldes felt that he should not be associated with such an open Communist publication as the Daily Worker. The party leaders, too, I was told, now felt that he would be more useful as an ostensible non-Communist journalist. * * * As to In Fact, the entire plan for that venture was submitted to me by the ninth floor of the Communist Party—the national headquarters, that is to say. * * * Incidentally, William Browder's wife, Rose, subsequently became business manager of the Seldes publication. * * * I can state that Seldes was one of those men without an open Communist label who was regarded by the national leaders of the Communist Party as one who would always act as a Communist under any given circumstances.

Seldes, when questioned by reporters, declared that he never met Budenz and that the charges were outright lies. In saying that he was not a Communist, Seldes added the only party he ever belonged to was the Democratic Party, but had joined anti-Fascist organizations as had so many other people.

The charge by Lyons that In Fact was printed on the same presses as a number of Communist publications was referred to by Seldes and he answered to the effect he has had three different printers and he did not know of the other jobs they did. Lyons also charged that In Fact employed Communists, to which Seldes answered the newsletter employs 17 persons "and we don't ask them what their race, creed, color, or political beliefs are."

Lyons concluded his article by stating:

Week after week Seldes presents a brew of synthetic scoops, exposés, accusations—spiced with those self-righteous liberal clichés certain people find irresistible. His four pages overflow with the nefarious plots of big business, attacks on the Vatican, Red-baiters, imperialists, and other stock villains of the Muscovite melodrama.

AVAILABLE INFORMATION ON SELDES' RELATION WITH COMMUNIST PARTY

The most recent recorded statement of Seldes that he is neither a Communist nor a red-baiter appeared in the March 31, 1947, issue of In Fact.

The Daily Worker, however, quotes liberally from In Fact. In February of 1946, In Fact devoted its entire issue to an attack on the United States Department of Justice for the alleged suppression in its files of so-called documentary evidence to the effect that Father Coughlin was a paid Nazi agent. The byline of the article was Albert E. Kahn, who is a close friend of Seldes, is said to be a Communist Party member and was co-author of The Great Conspiracy. The day after Kahn's sensational article appeared in In Fact, it appeared in the Daily Worker.

Seldes has been closely associated with Richard Bransten, alias Bruce Minton, in the publication of In Fact. Bransten for a time, at least, was coeditor of this publication. Mrs. Richard Bransten, also known as Ruth McKenney, authoress of the successful play, My Sister Eileen, and Richard Bransten were expelled from the Communist Party for left-wing deviationism.

Mrs. William Browder, sister-in-law of Earl Browder, is the business manager of In Fact. It has been stated that Mrs. Seldes, nee Helen Larkin Wiesman, was carried on the record book of dues and attendance for 1944 as a member of the Norwalk-Westport, Conn., branch of the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, from another reliable source comes the following statement bearing upon the activities of Mr. Seldes. Pull off the sheet and take a look at the real George Seldes and his bedfellows. I quote:

MEMORANDUM ON GEORGE SELDES

Seldes, George: Writer, born Alliance, N. J., November 16, 1890, son George Sergius and Anna (Saphro) Seldes; education, Liberty Academy, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Harvard University, 1912–13. Reporter for Pittsburgh Leader, 1909–10; night editor Pittsburgh Post 1910–16; managing editor Pulitzer's Weekly, New York City, 1916; war correspondent for Marshall Syndicate, 1917–18; from 1919 to 1928 member Chicago Tribune foreign news service, serving as head of Berlin bureau, head of Rome bureau, and war correspondent French campaign in Syria, 1926–27; contributed articles on Spain from Loyalist territory to New York Post, 1937. Author: You Can't Print That (Payson & Clarke, 1929); Can These Things Be? (Warren & Brewer, 1931); World Panorama (Little, Brown & Co., 1935); The Vatican, Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow (Harper & Bros., 1934); Iron, Blood, and Profits (Harper & Bros., 1935); coauthor, Not To Be Repeated (Long & Smith, 1932); We Cover the World (Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1937). Married Larkin, daughter Samuel Wiesman, St. Louis, Mo., address, care of Nannine Joseph, 200 West Fifty-fourth Street, New York City. (From Who's Who in American Jewry, 1938–39.)

His own self-serving biography, as given on the jacket of his latest book, Facts and Fascism, which book runs true to the Seldes untruthful form, is as follows (1944):

"George Seldes began his newspaper career in Pittsburgh in 1909, worked in the United Press office in London, was editor of the United States Army edition of the Chicago Tribune, then a member of General Pershing's G2–D, the press section of the United States Army in the World War.

"He was Berlin, Rome, Dublin, Moscow, and Baghdad correspondent for the Chicago Tribune for 10 years, 1919–29; he and his wife, Helen Seldes, were in Madrid as war correspondents for the New York Post in 1937.

"In 1929 he wrote his first book, "You Can't Print That," which told the truth about the stupid and deliberate suppression of foreign news, during his years as a war correspondent. Since then he has written a dozen books. His Sawdust Caesar is the only true full-length portrait of Mussolini; his Lords of the Press tells who bosses our newspapers; last year he published The Facts Are—, a

guide to falsehood and propaganda in wartime. Since 1940 he has been editing the weekly news letter In Fact."

Issues of In Fact from volume 1, No. 1, May 20, 1940, to date, are on file. Its present address is 280 Lafayette Street, New York 12, N. Y.

Seldes endorsement of The Soviet Union; Defender of Democracy and Peace, appears in the Soviet's magazine Soviet Russia Today, November 1938.

He has long been a contributor of articles to the left liberal New Republic, classified by the New York State Lusk Committee as an advocate of revolutionary socialism, by Benjamin Stolberg as a Stalinoid weekly.

When demanding an embargo on Nazi goods was part of the Communist Party line, he was a demander (Communist Party's Daily Worker, November 18, 1938). When fighting Germany and Italy as aggressor nations was part of the party line, he was one of the national committee of the American Boycott Against Aggressor Nations (July 7, 1939). After the line changed with the Nazi Soviet pact (September 1939), he was praised by the Communist Party's Daily Worker (February 3, 1940) for exposing the warmongering lies of the capitalist press.

When the Moscow-Stalin purge trials had shocked all but the hardest of Communists, Seldes signed a statement upholding the trials (Daily Worker, April 28, 1938), saying that the Moscow trials "have by sheer weight of evidence established a clear presumption of the guilt of the defendants" (Communist Party's Midwest Daily Record, April 26, 1938). This was before the assassination of Leon Trotsky.

He is head of the New York branch and was elected a vice president (Daily Worker, June 6, 1939) of the League of American Writers, organized, backed, and controlled by the Communist Party. Seldes endorsed its affiliation with the celebration of the Communist May Day (Daily Worker, April 20, 1940), which he praised as peace day.

To describe his activities for Loyalist (Red) Spain would require a chapter. He has been on the jump, as backer of the rally for the communistic Abraham Lincoln Brigade (Daily Worker, June 22, 1937); sponsor of a dinner for Loyalist Spain (New Masses, September 28, 1937); speaking to raise funds for the communistic North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (Daily Worker, March 16, 1939); denouncing the French Government for ordering Spanish Reds to return to Spain (Daily Worker, March 22, 1940); defending the communistic Abraham Lincoln Brigade (Daily Worker, March 11, 1940).

His books Lords of the Press, You Can't Print That, Sawdust Caesar are puffed by the Communist Party press and their loyal aide, the American Civil Liberties Union. Praising his book Lords of the Press, the Daily Worker (November 25, 1938) said that Seldes pays tribute to the Daily Worker and to the organ of the Communist unit of the New York Times, called the New Times; he has sent eulogies to other Communist papers.

His article condemning Donald Day's anti-Soviet Chicago Tribune articles was printed in New Masses and reprinted in the Communist Party's Record Weekly (February 3, 1940), page 11. He was one of those at the dedication of the Soviet pavilion at the New York World's Fair (Daily Worker, June 30, 1939). He was one of those headlined in the Daily Worker (May 13, 1940) as blasting the Dies committee and demanding that it be dissolved and investigated by Attorney General Robert Jackson.

He was a scheduled lecturer for the pro-Communist New School of Social Research starting February 7 (Daily Worker, January 31, 1939); also, sponsor of the communistic American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (March 1940), which fights for admission and retention of alien Reds of all nations in the United States of America; signer of the American Civil Liberties Union telegram to Gov. Lehman urging him to repeal the Devany civil-service bill barring Communist advocates of overthrow of the United States Government from holding civil-service positions (ACLU Bulletin May 27, 1939).

His article, Hero Loyalists Vets Held for Deportation, calls for floods of protests to free these Reds, in the organ of the communistic International Labor Defense (November 1938), the Russian section of this world-wide organization being MOPR. He was a speaker and was at the reception when a portrait of the Communist John Reed was presented to New Masses (Daily Worker, June 6, 1939).

He contributed (1937–38) to Fight, magazine of the American League Against War and Fascism, which Dies' publicity forced under cover. He was a speaker with Communist Party leaders at the convention of the International Workers Order, communistic fraternal insurance society (Daily Worker, June 12, 1940). The Daily Worker, May 29, 1940, announced his new weekly news letter In Fact.

He was elected vice president to the Communist-controlled American Writers' Congress (June 7, 1941).

"Seldes resigned his Berlin post in the fall of 1926. In a letter to the Chicago Tribune on November 11, he said he was in New York and was entering a hospital for an appendix operation. On December 12, the then new executive of the Tribune ordered that Seldes be paid 'until he recovers.' This was done. Meanwhile Seldes' place was filled and when he asked reemployment he was refused because the man who had been hired to replace him was doing satisfactory work. Seldes became resentful at not getting his job back." (Chicago Tribune, May 24, 1942.)

The revolutionary Socialist Joseph Freeman, in his An American Testament (Farrar & Rinehart, 1936) stated: "George Seldes, one of the founders of the utopian colonies of New Odessa, Oreg., and Stelton, N. J., was the father of Gilbert and George Seldes, both of whom subsequently became well-known journalists" (p. 282). Comment is almost unnecessary, but, as for the sons becoming well-known journalists, neither, after 1936, enjoyed employment as correspondents of the regular secular press.

Eugene Lyons, erstwhile Socialist, former Moscow correspondent, when writing his The Red Decade (Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1941) devoted quite some space to George Seldes:

"Writing at this time, in Can These Things Be, George Seldes gave pages to exposing such an 'out and out call to treason' on the part of the Russians. (This was before Seldes, growing more communistic as Russia grew less so, changed from a good reporter into a poor politician (p. 90).

"The variety of the signers (Seldes was one of them, Ed.) of this amazing whitewash of Stalin prepared by movie actors and scientists must stand as a symbol of the Red decade. Its insanity was surpassed only once, 15 months later, by 400 experts who publicly denied the possibility of any common ground between Russia and Germany—9 days before the two nations made their alliance in the Kremlin. Here, for the record, is the distinguished list, exactly as published by the Daily Worker of April 28, 1938, pages 247–249:

"Take the case of George Seldes, celebrated in the ideological history of the period. For 12 or 13 years he devoted himself to exploding the myth of Soviet socialism before Stalin and after. * * *

"* * * But suddenly, around 1937, George popped up far inside the Communist orbit, a regular contributor to Stalin's American press, gunning for the hides of colleagues who were quoting his own stuff on Russia. * * *

"No, there is no clue in logic to the change. The transformation had clearly occurred on a level beyond logic, beyond common sense. George, poor boy, had caught communism as one catches the flu in an epidemic. * * * Currently he is editing a pro-Soviet party line sheet called In Fact; until the breach between Russia and Germany, it was loudly anti-British and opposed to our defense efforts (p. 313).

"Among the signatories (Seldes was one of them—Editor) of the 400 signature letter were at least 29 who had also graced the famous 150-signature letter whitewashing the Moscow trials and purges. To have given support to two such documents rates them a special listing as stooges-cum-laude, so here they are * * * (pp. 348–349).

"These dauntless 29 deserve to lead all the rest when diplomas are handed out to the prime window dressers of the Red decade. Not only had they condoned the blood purges in Stalin's domain, but they had attested that the quality of his oppression was unique and not to be lightly confused with the lines offered by Hitler and Mussolini. Those who joined in the latter public testimony, released to an indifferent world just 9 days before Moscow announced its newfound love for Hitler, are listed herewith—precisely as published by the dependable Daily Worker on August 14, 1939." (Seldes was one of them.—Editor.) (Pp. 349–350.)

Seldes was in complete harmony with the Communist Party line before the breach of the Nazi-Soviet pact on June 21, 1941, when the Nazis invaded the U. S. S. R.

Seldes, in June and July of 1942, through form advertisements appearing in issues of In Fact, solicited subscriptions from "the boys in uniform." Subscription solicitation for In Fact has been carried on with regularity at the Communist Modern Book Store, eighth floor, 64 West Randolph Street, Chicago (now at 180 West Washington Street) and no doubt this same system for broadening the scope of In Fact is carried on from the headquarters of Communist book stores in all the metropolitan cities of the Nation.

When the Communist successor of the American League for Peace and Democracy, namely, the American People's Mobilization, held its meeting at the Chicago Stadium, August 31 to September 2, 1940, no less than 20,000 copies of a reprint of the August 26, 1940, issue of In Fact were distributed. This particular issue inveighed against the so-called Selective Service Draft Act, which was described as "conscription." Seldes opined that conscription was fascism.

The esteem in which George Seldes was held by the international pacifists, when the latter were having their field day, during two decades, is testified to by the fact that his book, Iron, Blood, and Profits, was blurbed by the peace-at-any-price Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which, for a time, was affiliated with the Communist-conceived and controlled American League for Peace and Democracy, so roundly exposed by the Dies committee that it was finally forced to liquidate.

Seldes contributed an article to the February 1, 1940, issue of The Review, official organ of the Young Communist League of America. The article was titled "George Seldes Debunks News From Finland: Headline Hysteria." At the time world sympathies were with Finland, when it was being raped by the U. S. S. R., Seldes was one of the pro-Soviet journalists who constantly upheld the cause of the Soviet Union.

J. B. Matthews, chief investigator of the Dies committee, in his Odyssey of a Fellow Traveler, makes the following observation:

"Of course, the classic smearing campaign in which the Communists of this country have engaged is that which they have directed against their foremost journalistic critic, William Randolph Hearst. The Communists have found writers like Ferdinand Lundberg and George Seldes especially useful in this business of answering anti-Communist facts with scurrility" (pp. 250–251).

The Communist Progressive Weekly Daily Record for January 21, 1939, in an article by Seldes, entitled "Columnists: From Left to

Right," the following self-revealing quotation appears:

"A wide gulf separates Heywood Broun from Mark Sullivan, Jay Franklin from Walter Lippmann. On the left, says Mr. Seldes, is truth and progress; on the right ride the knights of reaction."

The left-wing, liberal magazine Direction, volume 3, No. 2, February 1940, was sent to every Senator and Congressman. This issue contained an article by George Seldes captioned "Why has Roosevelt surrendered?"—two paragraphs from which are quoted below:

"In 1938 the President bestrode the earth like a colossus; he had won the hearts and minds of the people, incurred the hatred of all Americans who were enemies of America, and notably big business and the publishers. Critics placed Franklin Roosevelt alongside Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

"But in 1940 we behold one of the most astonishing, disgraceful, and disheartening spectacles in our history; the spectacle of cowardice, betrayal, surrender. We see the leader of the people for no apparent reason abandoning all that was making him a great man. And looking backward we find that all the signs of mistrust were right (p. 2)."

Of great significance is the fact that Seldes' book Lords of the Press was considered by the Communist Party of such propaganda importance that the party's book store stocked the book and the Daily Worker gave it much free advertising. (Daily Worker, November 25, 1938.)

His book Witch Hunt was published by Modern Age Books, Inc., 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York City. Congressman SHAFER, of Michigan, on March 1, 1939, page 2990 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, has the following to say about Modern Age books:

"Modern Age books are advertised in all Communist publications and find a wide market among the Reds in America. The official organ of the Young Communist Pioneers, the New Pioneer, contained a page advertisement of Modern Age books in its issue of May 1938. In that issue an appeal was made to the Communist International Workers' Order to obtain subscriptions to the Modern Age book service. The advertisement states that the 'Modern Age book service has become a sensation.'

"Another advertisement for Modern Age books is found in the Communist publication Soviet Russia Today, December '938. Among the books advertised are those by John Strachey, the British Red, who was recently halted at the gates of America by the Department of Labor; School of Barbarians, by Erika Mann; I Like America, by the avowed Communist, Prof. Granville Hicks; One-fifth of Mankind, by Anna Louise Strong, editor of the Moscow News, a Communist publication printed in Moscow, Russia; Japanese Terror in China; Practical Birth Control Methods; from Spanish Trenches, the Wall of Man, favoring the Spanish Red front; Labor Spy Racket; Red Feather; and Adventure in Steel."

In addition to Seldes' affiliations with left-wing organizations as already noted, the following might be added as of the same general stripe and character, veering from definite Communist control to Socialist, intellectual and the utopian-intelligentsia-do-gooding type:

Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges (June 2, 1941).

Foster Parents' Plan for War Children (April 4, 1941) (which grew out of Foster Parents' Plan for Spanish Children).

Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War (July 20, 1940) (Mobilize for Peace Rally).

National Emergency Committee Conference for Democratic Rights (August 1940), which later became National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Washington Committee for Spanish Refugee Aid (August 20, 1940), local affiliate of United American Spanish Aid Committee.

American Investors Union (May 10, 1941).

Consumers' Union of United States (1938).

International Committee for Political Prisoners (1937).

Marcus Graham (anarchist) Freedom of the Press Committee (1938).

In an article in Dan Gillmor's Communist Party-line magazine Friday (September 6, 1940) (now defunct), Seldes wrote: "No American mother is willing to have her son killed defending American oil corporations operating south of the border."

"A HIGH CRITIC OF PRESS IS VIEWED BY A CRITIC

"(James Wechsler, in Newspaper Guild publication, New York City, May 12, 1944)

"The article:

"Several years ago a refugee from the Chicago Tribune named George Seldes set himself up in business as high critic of the American press.

"He has been trading at that stand ever since, persuading innocent clubwomen and serious-minded school teachers that he is the voice of truth. Maybe he himself really believes it by now.

"While these dispatches have frequently included harsh words about American publishers, I have always read Seldes' In Fact sermons on the subject with very mixed feelings. For I suspect he is a sedative to the conscience of the newspaper barons.

"Every time a publisher broods about his own errors he must look smugly in the direction of Seldes and say to himself: 'He's dirtier than I am.' For every legitimate exposure of press corruption, Seldes had provided some sensational sham that makes the publishing fraternity feel virtuous and virginal.

"Brother Seldes invariably pictures himself as the lone independent thinker of our time, nature's noblest crusader against fraud and suppression. But the same George Seldes has been demonstrating a humbleness which matches that of any wage slave inhabiting the darkest pastures of the newspaper field. Mr. Seldes speaks (and apparently thinks) as the Communist Party, a ruthless and exacting boss, does.

"Every item in his recent career proves that point.

"I have no evidence that Brother Seldes is a dues-paying member. I have never inquired; if he isn't the party is getting more than its money's worth anyway out of his labors. Whether he is a card-carrier or 'kibitzer,' he has steadily followed the leader.

"Consider his public career. Until August 1940, Seldes was an ardent advocate of collective security. He was all for joining up and trouncing the Nazis with one big coalition of anti-Fascist forces.

"Comes the dawn.

"The Nazis sign a pact with the Soviet Union and one George Seldes, independent spirit and torch bearer for truth, discovers that he has been lying all along.

"Did somebody say that the Nazi advance menaced democracy? A British imperialist speaking.

"Did somebody suggest that the American strength should be rallied against the Nazi night riders? A warmonger, he, and to be exposed in next month's issue of George Seldes' In Fact, a Fascist plot.

"Let us then sneer at embattled Britain, expose the war plans of the Roosevelt administration, join in chanting a hymn under the guidance of Reverend Browder, called The Yanks Aren't Coming.

"Brother Seldes, valiant warrior against the imperialists fills his newsletter with exclusive revelations. In July 1940 we are given this glimpse of the future, through In Fact's reliable informants. 'By the middle of August the present European war will be ended.'

"Seldes saw no Nazi peril.

"Seldes, self-appointed critic of the American press, was really going to town denouncing conscription, exposing imperialism, faithfully reciting the line of the Nazi and domestic Communist propagandists. Seldes (with the help of Daily Worker) was telling all.

"Suddenly Seldes lost his voice. The Nazi had attacked Russia.

"Seldes was shaken but not overcome. He had worked for the Chicago Tribune; he was resilient. Exit Pacifist Seldes. Enter Warmonger Seldes.

"Had he defended Wheeler and Nye? He had given us the low-down on the plotting of the interventionists. Had he written, on July 15, 1940, that every newspaperman in Washington knows that the closest thing to a native American Fascist is Wendell Willkie?

"Good-by to all that.

"We have with us now, on June 23, 1941, a new George Seldes, valiant anti-Nazi, the man who will give us the low-down on isolationists conspiracy. Mr. Seldes had gone to war.

"Which brings us to the present.

"The courageous spirit who exposed conscription is now the lustiest voice in the chorus for national unity. He is against defeatists.

"What concerns us most is that this fabulous faker, with a record of complete and continuous devotion to the Communist Party line, is still selling his wares as objective, independent, and purer-than-snow analysis of the venal press.

"When Seldes draws an independent breath and sings a tune of his own, he deserves a hearing. Until then he is a liability of major proportions to those who favor free and independent criticism of the American press.

"A few years ago Seldes wrote a testimonial for the Daily Worker, declaring it was imperative to read that journal to get the actual information about Europe.

"Seldes can tell an independent newspaper when he sees one."

Seldes praises or condemns in accordance with the Communist Party line—having no regret for what happens to be true.

[From the Muncie Press of January 28, 1944—Comment by Wilbur E. Sutton]

"IN FACT IS FALSE

"The notorious New York radical pamphleteer, George Seldes, whose printed letter is issued every week, says it is 'an antidote for falsehood in the daily press. Its latest collection of falsehoods is a diatribe against the Muncie Press for its original publication of the now nationally famous article by 'Irish' Walsh, the Muncie seaman, which has been read by millions of Americans and favorably commented upon in letters and telegrams by thousands. Probably it is dignifying it even to mention a publication of the Seldes type, these days, but there is a trifle of humor in his calling his literary effluvia, In Fact, when it is filled with surmises and falsehoods. Not long ago it said in some kind of an attack whose subject has been forgotten that the Muncie Press was a member of the Scripps-Howard League of newspapers. The only trouble with that 'fact' was that there was not a word of truth in it, although we have high respect for the Scripps-Howard folks. In the latest effusion it seeks to make its subscribers, if any, believe that the Walsh article is the latest trick of the corrupt American press in its campaign against American labor, and that it is a Fascist plot. Wonder how 'Irish' and millions of his buddies fighting their lives out in behalf of all the rest of us react to that? Oh, well, in a real democracy such as ours, maybe it is all right to have folks named George Seldes."

A few excerpts from an editorial titled "A Statement of Fact," appearing in Collier's for November 9, 1946, may give some additional truth and fact on the Seldes side:

"Collier's, however, gets these mistaken and false accusations from fanatics on both sides of the road. George Seldes, who once was a reporter on the staff of the Chicago Tribune, gets out a weekly newsletter that he calls In Fact. This generally follows the Communist Party line.

"In a recent issue he publishes an untrue and irresponsible attack on Collier's as an agency of J. P. Morgan and Co. * * *

"There is not a single word of truth in George Seldes' attack on Collier's or the American Magazine. J. P. Morgan and Co. never directly or indirectly controlled the Crowell-Collier Publishing Co. * * *

"* * * We are not upset by George Seldes who takes the Communist line."

In listing "Books: free" in the February 10, 1947, issue of In Fact, he has the following interesting item:

"The following books are offered free to readers who obtain new subscriptions or buy subscription cards:

"ROOSEVELT BOOK FREE

"As He Saw It by Elliott Roosevelt is a Nation-wide best seller. It contains the most important disclosures of our time; it tells what happened at the meetings of F. D. R., Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin; tells how Churchill sabotaged great war plans; a hundred inside stories. Original $3 edition. Free for six $2 subscriptions to In Fact."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article published in a paper in his district.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the petroleum shortage.

REFUNDS, ALLOWANCES, AND ANNUITIES IN CONNECTION WITH THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT DISABILITY SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 497)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 9, 1948.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE FOR VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain a request for 3 minutes at the present time, but will entertain a request for 1 minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, according to a story that was handed to me which appeared in the Washington Star by George Beveridge, the President has come out against a small increase in the subsistence allowance for the GI's taking institutional training. As the House knows, the Senate has already passed a bill granting a small increase of $10 a month to single men and a small increase up to $105 for a married man with one child and an additional amount of $120 in the case of a married man with several children, which is little enough to grant these men. The House bill, the Meade bill, is on the calendar ready for action.

We passed the GI bill of rights giving them their training. In the first place, we provided what we thought was enough, perhaps, to help them get along, but the cost of living has gone up and $50 today does not begin to buy what it did when we originally passed the bill. I think there would be no objection—I doubt if a single Member on the floor of Congress would vote in opposition—to this legislation. The other body in its wisdom passed it last spring. These veterans have made a very fine showing in their classes; they stand very high scholastically. We should now give them an opportunity to finish their courses by giving them a little more subsistence, something to help make up for part of the time they lost through their war service. Many of these men are having to drop out because they cannot exist on the meager amounts they receive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table showing comparative tax rates as between the United States and Canada.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR RECOVERY OF UNDERCHARGES OR OVERCHARGES BY OR AGAINST CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 422 making in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2759, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 2759 reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This bill amends the Interstate Commerce Act to provide a 2-year limitation within which actions may be brought against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders, and other common carriers for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges. At present there is no uniform statute of limitations on actions brought by or against common carriers by motor vehicle or freight forwarders or other common carriers to recover alleged overcharges by common carriers. The statute of limitations of the individual States are applicable, and this results in a great deal of confusion.

I understand the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and that there is little if any objection from any quarter.

Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time on the rule I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2759, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the legislation which is now before us for consideration, H. R. 2759, was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce after hearings had been held. This bill also has the approval of the Interstate Com-

merce Commission, likewise the shippers' organizations and the different carriers which will be affected by passage of the legislation.

The purpose of the bill now under consideration is to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders.

The time within which such actions may be brought under the provisions of the pending bill is 2 years. This is the same time within which similar actions may be brought against common carriers by rail under Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act. Thus, uniformity of time is provided by the amendment of Parts II, III, and IV of the Interstate Commerce Act as contemplated by this pending legislation. This is highly desirable. There is no essential difference in the character of service rendered by railroads, motor vehicles, water carriers, and freight forwarders that would make plausible or necessary any difference of time limit within which actions for undercharges or overcharges could be brought by or against them.

In the absence of any action by Congress in fixing a time limit for the bringing of suits of this character, then the time limit fixed by statutes in the several States prevails. The result is one of great confusion and uncertainty as to the time within which such actions shall be brought. This period of time in different States varies from 2 years in some to as high as 10 and 15 years in others. Furthermore, uncertainty and confusion also results from a difference of opinion as to the statute of which particular State will apply; that is, as to whether a statute in which the shipment originates applies, or whether a statute of the State in which the shipment terminates applies.

In testifying before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, F. F. Estes, vice chairman of the legislative committee of the National Industrial Traffic League, expressed the favorable opinion of that organization toward the legislation now under consideration. In fact, he said:

> The National Industrial Traffic League, as its name implies, is a national organization of shippers and receivers of freight, embracing in its membership individual shippers and representatives of shippers, such as various types of associations, chambers of commerce, and so forth, which shippers utilize each and all of the various transportation agencies, including the railways, motor carriers, water carriers, and freight forwarders.
>
> The National Industrial Traffic League long ago went on record officially by a vote of its members in annual meeting in favor of a uniform statutory period of limitation covering overcharges, undercharges, and reparations for all four parts of the Interstate Commerce Act; and that position has been reaffirmed at each annual meeting of the league, including that held in New York City in November 1946 which was attended by over 659 members.
>
> In our opinion, no justifiable reason can be advanced for any inconsistency in such statutory period as between the various types of carriers, and it is the considered judgment of the league that this statutory period should be established as 2 years, as now provided in section 16, part I, of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to shipments via rail carriers.
>
> The reasons why the league favors this remedial legislation, while not numerous, are most important and of far-reaching effect on shippers and receivers of freight. For example, in the absence of a definite provision in the Interstate Commerce Act for a statutory period with respect to, let us say, motor carriers, it is not uncommon for a shipper of freight via a motor carrier to be confronted with a bill for undercharges some 3 or 4 years, or even longer, after the shipment is made, depending upon the State laws covering the particular shipment, because in the absence of any Federal statutory period the State laws, of course, apply.
>
> This means that a shipper under such conditions is required for his own insurance to maintain shipping records far beyond any reasonable periods of time and after the transaction has long been forgotten and even after the parties who were involved in the transaction may have gone out of business.
>
> Further to complicate the situation, there is wide difference in the statutory period in the various States, varying all the way from 2 to 10 years. There frequently is difference of opinion as to the statute of which particular State will apply; that is, as to whether a statute of the State in which the shipment originates applies, or whether a statute of the State in which the shipment terminates applies.
>
> It is, of course, true that a statutory period, whether it be federally prescribed or a State statute, applies with similar force with respect to overcharges as well as to undercharges. However, we have had long experience insofar as the rail carriers are concerned, with respect to the 2-year statutory period provided for in part I of the act, and it has operated most satisfactorily both so far as the railroads and the shippers are concerned.
>
> We believe that your committee and the Congress will agree with our position that a shipper using more than one type of transportation agency or different shippers using different types of transportation agencies should enjoy the same and a uniform statutory period in which to file claims; and at the same time the respective transportation agencies which they use should enjoy the same statutory period to file their claims for undercharges. Particularly is that true where the governmental agency administering the Federal regulatory statutes is the same, namely, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

For many years the Interstate Commerce Act has contained provisions prescribing periods of limitation for the bringing of such actions by or against railroads, express companies, sleeping-car companies, and pipe lines. Those are the carriers which are now covered by part I of the act. Similar provisions are contained in part III of the act, which covers water carriers, but the periods of limitation differ from those prescribed in part I. Part II of the act, which covers motor carriers, and part IV, which covers freight forwarders, contain no limitation provisions at all.

This bill makes no change whatever in the present law as it applies to railroads, express companies, sleeping-car companies, and pipe lines. All it does is to change the limitation periods already prescribed in part III to conform to those prescribed in part I and to incorporate into parts II and IV limitation provisions similar to those already contained in part I.

The desirability of uniformity in such limitation periods as they relate to all types of carriers covered by the act is quite generally recognized. The bill has the approval of shippers generally and of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In fact, the bill as reported by the committee seemed to be so free from controversy that it was originally brought up on the Consent Calendar. When it came up on the Consent Calendar at the last session, question was raised whether the limitation periods which it prescribes would or would not apply to actions of the sort to which they relate when such actions are brought by the United States.

I think it clear that the limitations for which the bill provides would apply to the United States as a shipper, just as to any other shippers. The Interstate Commerce Commission so held 25 years ago with respect to similar provisions then in the act—*United States* v. *Director General* (80 I. C. C. 143). The Government did not seek review of that decision by the courts, and it has stood all these years without challenge in the Congress. I think, too, that there is every reason why these limitations should apply to the United States the same as to any other shipper.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has expressed the same view in the letter to the committee, from which I quote one paragraph:

> Manifestly it would not be desirable merely to exempt the Government without fixing some period of limitations, for under our regulations the records of the carriers may be destroyed after a prescribed period, and relevant evidence may, of course, become unavailable because of the death of witnesses and other causes. We see no reason for allowing the Government more time for presentation of its claims than is granted to other shippers.

The purpose of the limitations is to relieve both carriers and shippers of the intolerable uncertainties that they would face if constantly confronted with possible liability under undisclosed claims running back over long periods of years and involving sums of money which cannot be calculated or estimated. This purpose would be to a large extent, defeated if an exception were made with respect to the Government which is one of the largest shippers in the country. Certainly ordinary justice demands that carrier and shipper alike be protected from stale claims long undisclosed because of the failure of the claimant to exercise reasonable diligence. In a commercial transaction, such as transportation for hire, there is no conceivable ground for distinction between the Government as a shipper and any other shipper, so far as concerns a reasonable limitation of the time within which a claim should be asserted.

Speaking of limitations of the character provided in this bill, the Supreme Court has said that they "are vital to the welfare of society"; that "they promote repose by giving security and stability to human affairs"; that "an important public policy lies at their foundation"—*Wood* v. *Carpenter* (101 U. S. 135, 139).

The promotion of security and stability of the kind to which the court referred is

of the greatest importance in the field of transportation. It is essential that carriers be able to determine, with a reasonable measure of accuracy, their financial condition at any given time. It is of the utmost importance that they have information concerning their resources and liabilities. Otherwise they cannot be in a position to program expenditures for maintenance, improvements, and so forth, or to make decisions with respect to their rates and charges. The Interstate Commerce Commission would likewise be handicapped in the exercise of its rate-making power, and the other powers which have been confided to it, by a situation which would make it possible to recover from carriers large sums of money on old claims concerning which there had been no notice or warning of any kind. Thus I believe it can be said that the failure to provide a period of limitation for claims by such a large shipper as the Government would result in a situation of uncertainty which would adversely affect the national transportation policy as declared by Congress in the Interstate Commerce Act.

The bill should be passed in the form reported by the committee.

In conclusion I wish to bring to the attention of the membership that the proposed legislation was suggested by, and has the approval of, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and likewise all organizations of shippers and the carriers affected. I trust that the bill will be given your unanimous approval.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been very adequately explained by the chairman of the committee. It simply makes all sections of the Interstate Commerce Act conform with respect to the time limitation for the filing of actions for overcharges and undercharges. It has the support of the Commission and all witnesses representing the various interests that appeared before the committee. It has a unanimous report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I hope the bill will be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say may not be entirely germane to the bill but has to do with the subject of transportation, which is the ultimate object of the current bill. I refer to the Floyd Bennett Field, which is in my district of Brooklyn. We have had many catastrophes at LaGuardia Airport in the borough of Queens, New York City, which is the New York City airport. Those catastrophes have been due to the overcrowded conditions at LaGuardia Airport. It is essential for safety of New York civilian air transportation that we have an additional airport. The Navy controls Floyd Bennett Field. The city of New York made an earnest request of the Navy to have transferred to the city of New York's jurisdiction three-fourths of Floyd Bennett Field, leaving one-fourth of the field for Navy installations. Negotiations were in process when the city turned over its jurisdiction to the Port of New York Authority, which continued the negotiations, but the Navy asked an extortionate amount of money for leasing portions of the Floyd Bennett Airport to the Port of New York Authority. As has been stated, the Navy asked a gold-plated rental—a rental all out of proportion to the value of the subject of the lease.

The situation at LaGuardia Airport is deteriorating daily. We are very much concerned that there may be a terrible tragedy there because of the congested conditions. The attitude of the Navy Department, to my mind, is unfair. It contains elements of obstruction and obstinacy. There is an officers' club at Floyd Bennett Field, and some of the officers may be reluctant to give up their privileges at that field. I say the officers can drink their cocktails elsewhere. Whisky is just as potent in a parlor or in a woodshed. I hope some wisdom will descend upon the appropriate officials of the Navy Department to the end that there may be consummated a lease between the Port of New York Authority and the Navy Department concerning Floyd Bennett Field, so that the conditions that now obtain at the LaGuardia Airport may be alleviated. I hope Mr. Sullivan, head of the Navy Department, will see that light and force upon his recalcitrant subordinates an agreement with the Port of New York Authority as a fair rental for the facilities at Floyd Bennett Field.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to allude to only one feature of this bill which I believe should be further emphasized in order that the House and the committee may know the real background of the legislation.

At the present time there is in the interstate commerce law a similar statute of limitations with regard to overcharges and undercharges by rail common carriers. That limitation is a 2-year period. The common carriers by methods other than rail are controlled as to the statute of limitations on overcharges and undercharges by the statutes of the various States. No two of the statutes of the 48 States are identical. The statutes of limitations in Iowa are different from those of New York and those in Oklahoma are different from those in Tennessee. That is the situation that exists clear across the country.

One of the major purposes of this bill is to end that confusion. As is stated in the report, at present in the case of actions of this character brought by or against common carriers by motor vehicles or freight forwarders, these periods of limitations provided under the State laws are applicable.

This results in confusion because of the great variety in the periods provided under the laws of the various States. The purpose of the pending bill is to bring order out of this confusion. It makes the limitation statute uniform all over the country and uniform as to the various types of common carriers.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to propound a few questions to the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee who is in charge of the bill on the minority side. We all know of the acute emergency situation existing with relation to fuel oil and kerosene and the condition in general along the east coast and certain parts of the interior. We know that the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey is chairman has been looking into this very thoroughly. I wonder if the gentleman has any information with reference to that which he can give to the House concerning the study that his committee has made and whether or not there is any likelihood of action being taken in the near future, which action would have to be taken by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON. In reply to the question of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts who has been interested in this subject over a long period of time, I wish to say that as he has indicated, the committee has given considerable time in hearings to a study of this important subject. The committee has had before it some of the outstanding individuals in this country who we think know most about the situation and who could probably be most helpful in proposing a remedy. During the recess of the Congress, this study was further carried on by our staff of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the end that some results might be achieved instead of merely having an expression of opinions and high hopes. I am happy to report that in some particulars this has been accomplished. On Thursday of this week there will gather in the Department of the Interior the coordinators of the several States. There will probably be some 30 of them who will be present representing the States where this problem of an inadequate fuel supply is most acute. A program has been worked out whereby we anticipate that through these agencies of State governments cooperating with the Federal Government officials, as well as representatives of the industry, much of the difficulties which now exist will be eliminated, or at least some material relief obtained, if not complete relief.

Mr. MCCORMACK. As I understand it, the question is a serious one, and we can anticipate that the demand will be greater than the supply during this winter as well as the next winter.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am fearful that that will be true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. And this meeting, in connection with the supply available, is to direct itself to the question of the efficiency of transportation, and within the State, the effectiveness of the allocation within.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The question of transportation is equally important with the question of supply. It has been the cause in no small part in producing the unfortunate situation that confronts so many of our districts throughout the country. The question of supply to meet

the unusual demand, together with more efficient use of our transportation facilities, will be subjects of consideration on Thursday next at the meeting called by the Department of the Interior, and is the method which is being pursued by Federal and State officials to get the relief that is sought by stricken areas.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman's committee looked into the question of whether or not legislation is necessary to authorize some Federal agency—for example, the Maritime Commission—to direct American companies who have purchased tankers from the Government through the Maritime Commission to use those tankers to transport fuel oil or kerosene to certain sections of the country where emergency within the emergency may exist?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The committee has given very careful consideration to that phase of the problem. During the recess additional attention was given to it by our committee staff. We have sought to obtain all the available information with respect to the number of tankers in use in foreign trade as well as in domestic trade, and also to ascertain how many of the tankers could be transferred to routes that would relieve those areas of our country that are particularly distressed at this time. We have been promised the cooperation of not only the agencies of Government but also companies that control or own the tankers that would be utilized in such a service. We are hopeful that it will produce the result which the gentleman and others are so anxious to attain.

Mr. McCORMACK. My interest is wherever the emergency exists, as well as in our particular section.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I realize that.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the committee has under consideration the giving of authority at least in relation to those tankers that the Government owned and sold, to some agency having the power during a limited time, to issue directions, if necessary?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Unfortunately, there is much that could have been done in June last, for instance, that cannot be done now. It was very unfortunate that this situation was not revealed at an earlier date. I think somebody is at fault in not having known the possibility of the situation that now confronts us and taken means to prevent it from creeping up upon us as it has. I assure the gentleman from Massachusetts and all others in the House that your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will do everything possible to relieve the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, there is no further application for time on this side. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] has no requests for time, the Clerk may read.

Mr. PRIEST. I have no requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 204 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 204a. (1) All actions at law by common carriers by motor vehicles subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(2) For recovery of overcharges, action at law shall be begun against common carriers by motor vehicle subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (3) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(3) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in paragraph (2) a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to this part begins action under paragraph (1) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier.

"(4) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the carrier, and not after.

"(5) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for transportation services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(6) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this section."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of this section the term 'carrier' means a common carrier by water."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (f) (1) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) (A) All actions at law by carriers subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(B) All complaints against carriers for the recovery of damages not based on overcharges shall be filed with the Commission within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subdivision (D).

"(C) For the recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun or complaint filed with the Commission against carriers subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subdivision (D), except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(D) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in subdivision (B) or the 2-year period of limitation in subdivision (C) a carrier subject to this part begins action under subdivision (A) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the carrier."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Paragraph (5) of subsection (f) of section 308 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. Title IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 406 thereof a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 406. (1) All actions at law by freight forwarders subject to this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(2) For recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun against freight forwarders subject to this part within 2 years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to paragraph (3) of this section, except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the freight forwarder within the 2-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include 6 months from the time notice in writing is given by the freight forwarder to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(3) If on or before expiration of the 2-year period of limitation in paragraph (2) a freight forwarder subject to this part begins action under paragraph (1) for recovery of charges in respect of the same service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include 90 days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the freight forwarder.

"(4) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the freight forwarder, and not after.

"(5) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section shall be deemed to mean charges for service in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(6) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cases in which the cause of action may accrue after the date of the enactment of this section."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the word "vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof the word "vehicle."

Page 5, line 3, strike out "406" and insert "406a)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2759) to provide limitations of time for recovery of undercharges or overcharges by or against certain common carriers, pursuant to House Resolution 422, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 423, making in order the bill H. R. 4071.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 4071, reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, amends sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The proposed amendments are necessary to permit Government seizure of contaminated food and drugs in interstate commerce, and thereby protect the consuming public from a possible menace to health.

Under the original Food and Drug Act of 1906, the Government was empowered to seize and condemn foods and drugs that became adulterated or misbranded after interstate movement had ceased if they remained unloaded, unsold, or in original unbroken packages. The provision proved most successful in protecting the public health and safety. But the language in the 1906 bill was thought to confer powers of seizure which were too broad, and when the act was revised in 1938 language was inserted to guarantee against unreasonable and arbitrary exercise of this authority to seize and condemn interstate shipments.

The language of the 1938 bill limited to a single interstate shipment seizure action on misbrandings that were not genuinely serious and that had not been the subject of a prior court decision in favor of the United States.

Even this restricted language continued to be effective until 1946 when the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit held that the present terms of the law did not authorize seizure and condemnation of food which became contaminated while stored in a warehouse where it was placed after its interstate journey. Since this court decision the Government has been handicapped in its enforcement of the Food and Drug Act.

It was testified before the Rules Committee by members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that for a period of some 40 years the Government had exercised the authority which this act would give them. That is, that it had the right to seize contaminated food in protection of the public interest and the public health. But because of this court decision the hands of the enforcing officials of the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Agriculture were tied so that they cannot now protect the public interest and the health of the people.

The rule which we have before us making this bill in order is an open rule providing for 1 hour general debate. As far as I know, there is no opposition either to the rule or to the bill itself.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the presentation which the gentleman from Indiana has just made is fair. This was the testimony given to the Rules Committee by members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which committee was unanimous in reporting the bill. It seems to be desirable legislation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4071, with Mr. RIZLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as has already been stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] this legislation comes before the House with the unanimous report and approval of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce after hearings had been held.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 4071 is a very simple one. It is designed to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in two respects. First, section 304 (a) which gives the Food and Drug Administration authority to seize adulterated or misbranded goods. The section now authorizes such seizure when the articles are introduced into interstate commerce, while being in interstate commerce and while held for sale. The bill proposes to clarify the words "while held for sale." This clarification is necessary in view of a recent decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in United States against Phelps-Dodge Mercantile Co. Certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court in that case. The circuit court of appeals held that under the terms of the present law the Government was not authorized to seize and condemn a food which became contaminated while stored in a warehouse where it was placed after completion of its interstate journey. The bill, therefore, contemplates making clear that the Government has such power by inserting after the words "while held for sale" the following: "(whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce."

The legislative history of the 1938 act which supplanted that of 1906 makes it clear that Congress intended to extend the protection of the law to consumers in cases of adulteration and misbranding, regardless of whether the forbidden act occurred before the article was sent on its interstate journey, while it was in transit, or upon completion of its interstate journey when it was placed in a warehouse waiting for sale.

The testimony presented showed that some 20 percent of the seizures of adulterated and misbranded foods instituted during recent years involved cases where the adulteration clearly resulted from insanitary conditions or other causes during storage after interstate shipment. In a great many other cases, it would have been impossible to prove that contamination or deterioration occurred before the interstate journey ended. The great bulk of the commodities involved in this problem are those which become contaminated by rodents, insects, and other vermin.

The second amendment concerns section 301 (k). This section prohibits the doing of any act with respect to any food, drug, or cosmetic while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce, if such act results in the article being misbranded. Here, again, a recent court case, Jordan J. Sullivan against United States, makes a clarification of the statute desirable. The question in that case was whether the statute was limited to the first sale after shipment in interstate commerce. The bill would resolve the doubt by adding the words "(whether or not the first sale)."

In addition, the bill would extend this subsection by making it applicable to adulteration as well as misbranding, thus making the section coextensive with the seizure section, section 304 (a), which I mentioned before. Both amendments are designed to protect consumers against adulterated and misbranded products. Without these amendments, serious enforcement problems are presented. The national grocery and pharmaceutical organizations are supporting the bill because it protects their nationally advertised and distributed products against adulteration and misbranding while awaiting sale.

It should also be emphasized that the State food and drug officials, at their fifty-first annual conference at Carls-

bad, N. Mex., in June of 1947, adopted a resolution supporting in every way the present bill. The resolution reads as follows:

In the matter of H. R. 3128 and 3147 and S. 1190 now pending before the Congress:

Whereas recent decisions by the Federal courts have seriously restricted the applicability of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, to interstate shipments of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices that become adulterated or misbranded after the completion of their interstate transportation, thus drastically curtailing the public protection heretofore afforded under the Federal act; and

Whereas the States and local authorities have, by common understanding, come to rely in great measure upon the Food and Drug Administration for the inspection and supervision of interstate shipments of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices to insure that, from these sources, only products that are free from adulteration and misbranding are delivered to consumers, thus permitting the assignment of the inspectional staffs of State and local agencies to problems more particularly concerned with the commerce of the States; and

Whereas the activities of the Food and Drug Administration in connection with such goods have been very effective against products which have become contaminated with filth, or otherwise adulterated or misbranded at destination; and

Whereas the Food and Drug Administration has successfully maintained a program of surveillance over commodities falling within this category without friction or conflict with State law-enforcement agencies exercising like functions with respect to products in the commerce of the State; and

Whereas the funds and facilities of State and local agencies are generally inadequate to afford satisfactory consumer protection from abuses which occur in this field unless their efforts can be supplemented by enforcement activities under the Federal act; and

Whereas it has long been the policy and practice of the various State and local agencies and the Food and Drug Administration to plan their respective programs so that the regulatory activities of each will harmonize with and supplement the operations of the other, through the pooling of resources for concerted action where conditions require, or the planning for careful division of work so that personnel can be deployed for maximum coverage to give the consuming public and responsible industry the greatest degree of protection possible within their respective and concurrent jurisdictions: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Association of Food and Drug Officials of the United States in Annual Conference assembled in Carlsbad, N. Mex., express its firm belief in the soundness of the proposal to amend section 304 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to extend the jurisdiction of the act to products shipped interstate which may become adulterated or misbranded after the interstate transportation has been completed; and that such jurisdiction be extended to the limit of the constitutional authority of the Congress so as to include not only the first sale but subsequent sales as a means of consumer protection and to prevent undue burdens on legitimate interstate commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the belief of this association that the provisions of section 301 (k) should be extended to prohibit acts which result in adulteration as well as misbranding and should be so framed as to be coextensive in all respects with the amended seizure provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as above proposed: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by air mail to Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives; to Hon. ROBERT HALE, chairman, subcommittee of the House; and to Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate.

The Congress has time and again given expression to its interest in enacting laws that will adequately protect the consuming public against improper food, drugs, and cosmetics. This bill seeks to do that. It is necessary because of the unexpected decisions already referred to. I ask for the unanimous approval of this bill by the House so that there may be no doubt as to the desire of the House to provide adequate and effectual means of protecting the public against impurity of food, drugs, and cosmetics.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the purpose of this legislation has been well emphasized and the need of it fully explained by the chairman of the committee. It has a unanimous report. I believe the bill is in the public interest and hope that the House will support the committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], have already given you an explanation of this legislation, and I presume no further remarks from me are necessary. But, as I had the distinction of being the chairman of the subcommittee before which this bill was heard, I would like to make a few comments of my own.

The bill makes two amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. It amends, in the first place, section 301 (k) of the present law, which is enforceable by criminal and injunction proceedings, and prohibits the doing of any act with respect to an article of food, drug, device, or cosmetic, while it is held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce. The bill adds the words "(whether or not the first sale)."

Under the decision on May 12 last of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, in Sullivan against the United States, the court restricted the power of the Federal authorities to seize contaminated, misbranded, and so on, drugs, to the time of the first sale after shipment in interstate commerce. Under this bill the Federal authorities could seize contaminated goods until they came into the hands of the ultimate consumer.

Similarly this bill, H. R. 4071, amends section 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which now authorizes, among other things, seizure and condemnation of any article of food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded when introduced into or "while in interstate commerce." Section 2 of the bill amends this provision by inserting after the words "while in interstate commerce" the words "or while held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce."

This language is also, apparently, necessitated by the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the so-called Phelps-Dodge case referred to on page 2 of the report— *United States* v. *Phelps Dodge Mercantile Company* (1946, 157 Fed. 2d, 453, certiorari denied (67 S. Ct. 675)).

The report on this bill is, in my opinion, an admirable document. It has been prepared with great care. I am at liberty to say this because I had nothing whatever to do with its preparation.

The point of these amendments is that they greatly facilitate the enforcement of this legislation by the Federal authorities, as to which the courts have rendered what we believe to have been unduly narrow and restrictive decisions.

As the distinguished chairman of our committee has pointed out, there is no opposition to the bill. As a matter of fact, it was on the Consent Calendar last spring but was challenged, I think entirely due to the fact that it was a little complicated and probably not fully understood, when it came up on the Consent Calendar. The bill is cordially received by the trade. See in this connection an article in the Food, Drug, Cosmetic Law Quarterly for September 1947. I think the bill should receive the unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us—H. R. 4071—makes two amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which are vitally important to continued effective operation of that act.

Section 301 (k) of the present law prohibits the doing of any act with respect to an article of food, drug, device, or cosmetic, while it is held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce, if such act results in the article being misbranded. The first section of H. R. 4071 amends the subsection by inserting "(whether or not the first sale)" after the words quoted above, so as to make it clear that the subsection is not limited to the case where the act occurs while the article is held for first sale after interstate shipment. This section also extends the coverage of the subsection to acts which results in adulteration as well as to those resulting in misbranding.

Section 304 (a) now authorizes, among other things, seizure and condemnation of any article of food, drug, device, or cosmetic that is adulterated or misbranded when introduced into or while in interstate commerce. Section 2 of the bill amends this provision by inserting after the words "while in interstate commerce" the words "or while held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce." The language added, except for the parenthetical expression, is identical with language now contained in section 301 (k).

The necessity for the amendment to section 304 (a) of the act arises from a Circuit Court decision in the so-called Phelps-Dodge case which case the Supreme Court refused to review. The decision in the Sullivan case makes necessary the amendment to section 301 (k). These decisions will be discussed by

other members of the subcommittee to which this bill was referred.

The Phelps-Dodge decision brought to an end an important protective public service that has been carried out for 40 years under the present law and the original Food and Drug Act of 1906.

The hearings on the subject matter of this legislation were held during the last session on H. R. 3128 and H. R. 3147. Those bills proposed to amend only section 304 (a). It was after the introduction of those bills that the decision in the so-called Sullivan case was rendered. As a result of that decision and discussion during the hearings, your committee decided on the advisability of introducing the bill here reported amending both sections 301 (k) and 304 (a).

The testimony before the committee, including testimony of representatives of the food and drug industry, was overwhelmingly in favor of the legislation on which the hearings were held. We feel satisfied that there will be no substantial opposition to the further changes made by the bill now before us.

The enactment of the proposed amendments will not have the effect of excluding State authority. The Federal Food and Drug Administration has worked cooperatively with the several States and these amendments should not disturb that excellent relationship. The Federal Food and Drug Administration presents us with an excellent example of the good results that can flow from proper cooperation between Federal and State agencies working in the same field of endeavor. They should be commended.

These proposed amendments were approved unanimously on June 20, 1947, by the Association of Food and Drug Officials, primarily made up of State and city enforcement officers, in its annual conference attended by representatives of 32 State-enforcement organizations.

The amendments are also strongly supported by the Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., and the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association.

During the hearings the committee did receive a letter from the Indiana Canners Association, Inc., signed by A. F. Dreyer, secretary, in opposition to the proposed amendments. This association does, however, recommend certain other amendments to the Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. As an indication of the attitude of this association toward the problems of public health I wish to read just one sentence from their recommended amendments. They suggest:

> The law be amended so as to prohibit the destruction of food which is admittedly fit for food, and prohibit the condemnation of food which is fit and suitable to feed to inmates of charitable institutions.

To the everlasting credit of those who administer our Pure Food and Drug Act, let me remind you that this agency adheres to but one standard of inspection and that standard applies equally to those who buy expensive foods and those who must eat the food served to inmates of charitable institutions. Food is fit for all human consumption or it is not fit for any.

I will not discuss the constitutional questions raised during the consideration of these amendments. Suffice for me to say that I am confident that the Congress wishes to go as far as constitutionally permissible in protecting the American consumer. There is certainly ample authoritative precedent for these amendments, both within and without the Pure Food and Drug Act.

Section 301 (k) of the act now prohibits "the alteration, mutilation, destruction, obliteration, or removal of the whole, or any part of the labeling of, or the doing of any other act with respect to a food, drug, device, or cosmetic, if such act is done while such article is held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce and results in such article being misbranded."

Our proposed amendment to section 304 (a) gives the seizure law precisely the same jurisdiction as that which Congress gave to the misbranding law in section 301 (k) in 1938. To disapprove this amendment is to argue that the protection of the purity of food is less important than the honest labeling of food.

We find precedent for this amendment outside the act in two supplemental enactments by Congress. The first is the Seed Act of 1912, as amended in 1926, which provides that misbranded seed shall be liable to a Government seizure proceeding if it is being, first, transported in interstate commerce; or, second, held for sale or exchange after having been so transported.

The second precedent is the Caustic Poison Act of 1927, which provides that a misbranded dangerous caustic or corrosive substance shall be liable to such a proceeding if it is being, first, shipped in interstate or foreign commerce; or, second, held for sale or exchange after having been so shipped.

Consequently there is nothing new about this jurisdictional amendment of section 304 (a) now before you because Congress wrote an identical seizure authority into the supplemental acts to which I have just referred. No one can reasonably argue that such acts should have a stronger seizure law than the far more important Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

It is difficult to visualize the magnitude of the breech in consumer protection that has occurred since the Phelps-Dodge decision. A spokesman for the Pure Food and Drug Administration testified before our committee that it is a conservative estimate to say that an average of more than 20 tons of contaminated articles would be seized daily except for the immunity conferred by this court decision. The committee in its files had several photographs that show very graphically just how our food supply can become contaminated. I don't think it is necessary to display these pictures in order to impress the House with the necessity of the early enactment of these proposed amendments.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, reliable reports indicate that Communist leaders, meeting in Milan, have decided on a Communist uprising in April for the purpose of setting up an independent popular republic in north Italy unless Moscow gives a counter order.

Top Communist leaders from all parts of Europe have been attending a congress of the Italian Communist Party in Milan. It is reported that Palmiro Togliatti, head of the Italian Communists, informed a small circle of top Communists that a new regime could be set up at Milan within 6 days and that Russia would give it unlimited support.

I have thought for some time that a serious attempt would be made by the Communists in the early spring of this year to capture the governments of France and Italy by internal force. The strikes and riots of last December were, I believe, only a forerunner of what we may expect. Serious strikes in Italy at this very moment are the cause of great concern.

Mr. Chairman, we must address ourselves not only to the economic recovery of Europe, not only to an effective, energetic, and resourceful information program, but also to the problem of somehow bolstering the police in these countries in order that they shall not become police states. This is the responsibility of the administration. We must help to preserve these bastions of liberty against the onslaughts of Red fascism.

Communist domination would jeopardize the European recovery program, the national security of the United States, and the peace of the world.

We must resist the conquest of Europe by internal force just as we would resist overt acts of war.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (k) of section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 331 (k)), is amended to read as follows:

"(k) The alteration, mutilation, destruction, obliteration, or removal of the whole or any part of the labeling of, or the doing of any other act with respect to, a food, drug, device, or cosmetic, if such act is done while such article is held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce and results in such article being adulterated or misbranded."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 304 of such act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 334 (a)), is amended by inserting immediately after the words "when introduced into or while in interstate commerce" the following: "or while held for sale (whether or not the first sale) after shipment in interstate commerce."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. RIZLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 423, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—FOLSOM DAM (H. DOC. NO. 496)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The estimates of appropriation for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, in the 1949 Budget, include $3,370,000 for beginning construction of the Folsom Dam on the American River in California. This project was authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers in the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, "substantially in accordance with the plans contained in House Document No. 649, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable * * *."

The Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and the State of California are agreed that the initial plans for a reservoir of 355,000 acre-feet capacity should be revised to provide a reservoir of 1,000,000 acre-feet. This will not only provide more adequate storage for flood control but will also provide adequate storage at the Folsom Dam site for irrigation, hydroelectric-power production, and other uses consistent with the conservation of water resources in the Central Valley area. The Corps of Engineers is completing construction plans for the dam on this revised basis and work can be started promptly.

The Folsom Dam and Reservoir is a key unit in any plan for the full development of the water resources of the Central Valley. There is an urgent need for this structure, not only from the standpoint of flood control but also to provide additional electric energy and conservation of water to meet growing demands in the area. The Corps of Engineers should therefore be given funds to start building the dam at once under the authority of existing legislation. At the same time the authority contained in existing law for the construction of Folsom Dam should be expanded to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to construct and operate a power plant.

The power plant at Folsom must be integrated with the hydroelectric-power plants at Shasta and Keswick, constructed and operated by the Bureau of Reclamation, and with the Delta-Mendota pumping plant of the Central Valley project—all of which must be operated as a unit. To achieve such coordinated operation, the Folsom Dam and Reservoir, once constructed, should be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance. After the transfer, the dam would be operated for flood control in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of the Army, as provided in section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation would assure that Folsom Dam and its important related developments would be operated in coordination with other Federal conservation structures in the Central Valley to yield the greatest possible benefits. Power produced at the Folsom Dam would be used as a second source of energy for the Delta-Mendota pumping plant and for other irrigation pumping. The income from the disposition, under Federal reclamation laws, of the power there produced would assist not only in amortizing the cost of the Folsom Dam and power plant, but also in paying an appropriate share of the cost of irrigation canals and other works needed to distribute water from Folsom Reservoir to irrigation districts, cities, and suburban areas. Unless this income from power revenues is provided for in accordance with established practice under reclamation law many related developments proposed in the Central Valley, particularly in the American River basin and nearby areas of California, will not be financially feasible.

I recommend therefore that the Congress expand the present authorization for the construction of Folsom Dam to provide, (1) For the transfer of the dam and reservoir, upon its completion, to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance as a coordinated unit of the Central Valley project under the Federal reclamation law; (2) for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of a power plant, afterbay and necessary transmission lines; and (3) for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of irrigation canals and related works needed to deliver water from the reservoir to irrigation districts, cities, and suburban areas. There are pending in the Congress two bills (H. R. 4152 and H. R. 4157), either one of which, if enacted into law with appropriate amendments, would accomplish these purposes.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1948.*

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article, Natural Gas Shortage in Pennsylvania Is Not Improving.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial and a newspaper article.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include two articles.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes today after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OCEAN SHIPPING AND RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, within the limits of time I shall be glad to yield to any Member at any time for question or comment, and to answer any question within the limits of my ability.

Mr. Speaker, the funeral of an adequate American merchant marine has been arranged by the State Department. The pallbearers may well be some 16 foreigners. The mourners will all be Americans. The Outline of a European Recovery Program prepared under the direction of the State Department, aims a near mortal blow at our present merchant marine. It may be that this Congress can save the patient's life and disappoint those who hopefully anticipate the reading of the last will and testament.

I intend to speak briefly of the ocean shipping section of this proposed recovery program, to outline the events which preceded these proposals and to give my reasons for believing them thoroughly unsound.

I want it clearly understood that I favor reasonable help to western European nations, and to their citizens to enable them to regain their economic footing even though such help is an additional burden upon our taxpayers. But I do not comprehend, as a part of that help, a program which will strip us of a part of our principal defense assets and will relegate our entire shipping industry to a very inferior standing among the fleets of the world.

Under the proposals of the State Department we shall sell to European nations some 200 ocean-going steamships, and, in addition, transfer to them on a temporary basis up to 300 more bulk cargo ships under bare-boat charter. In substance, Mr. Speaker, this is a proposal to transfer 5,000,000 tons of American ships—about 25 percent of our reserve dry-cargo fleet—to foreign nations under the Marshall plan. It is a proposal to transfer foreign about half as many ships as now constitute our entire privately owned ocean-going merchant marine. This astonishing proposal has come forth even though the merchant fleets of the 16 Marshall-plan nations will exceed the level of their prewar capacity when their present construction programs are completed. This proposal is made notwithstanding the fact that in 1951 these same nations expect to have 10,000,000 tons—over 20 percent—more shipping than they had prewar. It is made notwithstanding the fact that even after allowing heavy withdrawals for obsolescence in 1951 they will still exceed their 1938 capacity by the equivalent of

750 ships of an average of 10,000 dead weight tons each. This proposal is made notwithstanding the fact that the United States has already made a material contribution toward increasing the postwar tonnage of these nations by selling them over 750 of our war-built ships.

The genesis of the State Department proposal was this: Last summer, following the invitation of the Secretary of State made in his Harvard commencement speech, 16 European nations met in Paris to discuss what they considered to be their requirements in the way of friendly aid from the United States. A committee, known as the Committee on Maritime Transport, was formed for the purpose of analyzing availabilities and requirements with respect to ocean shipping. Because the United Kingdom anticipated operation of a fleet some five times as large as that of any other participating nation, a British subject, Percy Rogers, was designated chairman of the committee.

In its report, issued in September 1947, and released by the State Department in October 1947, the Committee on Maritime Transport outlined its concept of future participation in ocean shipping by the fleets of the United States and the 16 Marshall-plan nations. Although our merchant marine carried less than 30 percent of our foreign commerce in 1938, although through heroic wartime efforts and at tremendous expense we built the greatest merchant fleet ever assembled under any one flag, and although these Marshall-plan nations projected for themselves fleets more than 20 percent larger than prewar, the report of the Maritime Transport Committee suggested that participation of United States-flag vessels in trade with these nations should be at substantially the same or even less volume than prewar.

They suggested also that to enable these nations to build up their fleets and to reduce American participation in trade with them, we should transfer to them 3,000,000 dead-weight tons of shipping; that is, about 300 ships. This number of ships was more than the entire tonnage which they planned would be operating under United States flag in trade with these nations in 1951.

At the same time, these 16 participating nations outlined proposals for new-ship construction on their part during the 4¼-year period under consideration. They plan to build some fifteen and a half million tons of new shipping, an amount which will require more than one-half of the proposed imports of steel from the United States or almost 5 percent of the entire steel requirements embodied in the Paris proposals.

During the preparation of the report of the Committee on Maritime Transport, an American committee, known as the Harriman committee of 19, was appointed for the purpose of determining "the facts with respect to the character and quantities of United States resources available for economic assistance to foreign countries and to advise the President on the limits within which the United States might wisely and safely plan to extend such assistance."

After receipt of the Maritime Transport Committee's report, the Harriman committee met with representatives of the Marshall-plan nations, including Percy Rogers, and discussed the possibility of limiting the proposed ship-construction programs.

A reading of the Harriman committee report makes it obvious that the Marshall-plan nations were adamant in defending their new construction programs. Suggestions that transfers of ships might be made in exchange for reductions in ship construction were rejected. The Harriman committee suggests that the Paris nations had in mind something over and above emergency rehabilitation of their shipping industry when it stated:

> Neither in Paris nor Washington have the European maritime representatives shown much disposition to look upon the next 4 years as an emergency in which means must be contrived to make do with the facilities we have at our disposal rather than to embark on longer-term building programs.

All in all, from reading the ocean-shipping analysis of the Harriman committee, I get a clear impression that these nations have indulged in a degree of opportunism in laying out their own programs, and in projecting the prospective requirements of American tonnage to be engaged in trade with them.

The report of the Harriman committee is plain-spoken. It deals with these proposals realistically. It says:

> It is pointless for Europe to be building up a world surplus of vessels at this juncture. It would be equally pointless for us to transfer large numbers of dry cargo vessels during the period of European surplus build-up.

But this analysis by the Harriman committee, a group of eminent businessmen, appears to have been more than ignored in the present proposals of our State Department. The transfer of the 300 ships which the Harriman committee termed "pointless" has been expanded by the State Department into a proposed transfer of 500 ships.

Americans do not understand that the transfer of 500 vessels wil result in elimination from trade with these European nations of some 500 vessels presently operated under the United States flag and manned with American officers and crews. Even if the transferred vessels are taken from lay-up, their participation in the trades will result in a corresponding reduction in the United States flag tonnage which would otherwise be engaged.

Right now, there appear to be ample ships in trade with western European nations to carry all the tonnage expected under the relief program. The use of additional American vessels will not add to the shipping capacity now engaged, but will result in the transfer to foreign flag, foreign crews, and foreign management of ships now operating under the United States flag with United States personnel and United States management.

Even now we are carrying only the surplus of cargoes which the European nations are unable to lift themselves. The number of American ships in operation increases or decreases with the ebb and flow of cargoes to be moved. The Paris report, the Harriman committee report, and the State Department report of January 7, 1948, all proceed on the assumption that as tonnage becomes available to the 16 nations, American-flag tonnage will be withdrawn from the trade. Recent experience seems to confirm this assumption, since about 200 war-built vessels chartered to United States operators have been returned to the Maritime Commission within the past few months as a result of lack of sufficient business to warrant their further operation.

The net result of the transfer proposed by the State Department, would be the withdrawal of 500 American-flag ships from the European trade.

The Harriman committee emphasized the serious national defense aspects of this European scheme when it said:

> The United States needs an active merchant marine for national defense and we must not create conditions in which that merchant marine cannot survive.

The President's advisory committee on the merchant marine, in its report issued in November, said, "Security requirements can be met only through the existence of an efficiently operated merchant marine of such size as to meet the initial military and naval demands. Unless the shipping and shipbuilding industries are maintained above some minimum level, the country will lose that vital nucleus of know-how which is essential to enable rapid expansion to meet emergency or wartime needs."

The proposal of the State Department cannot be regarded as a constructive effort toward the maintenance of our shipping industry at the minimum level required.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Captain, do you not feel that the shipping clause as it is presently written in the European recovery program is in direct contradiction of an attempt by some of the other Government agencies to subsidize the construction of new ships?

Mr. BRADLEY. It is completely in opposition. With one hand we try to build up a merchant marine. We pay subsidies for ship construction and operation. With the other hand we try to do everything humanly possible to drive our ships off the seas. That is exactly what the State Department is trying to do—drive them off the seas, and put them under foreign flags.

Furthermore, every safeguard which we have heretofore established in order to protect ourselves against foolish destruction of our merchant marine would be completely eliminated under the current proposal of the State Department. In the Ship Sales Act of 1946, section 6 (2), the Congress required that the Secretary of the Navy must be consulted as to whether any vessel proposed for transfer to a foreign country is "necessary to the defense of the United States." Under the State Department scheme no such consultation is required. Transfers are to be made whenever the Administrator of the European recovery program determines that the sale "would be in furtherance of this Marshall plan act," if his

action is approved by the President and the vessel is available for such transfer. National defense considerations are eliminated. The Maritime Commission is bypassed. Government-owned ships become pawns in the play of the Administrator of the European recovery program.

What reason is offered by the State Department for ignoring the analysis of the Harriman committee? It emphasizes possible dollar savings for the foreign countries or for the American taxpayer. When analyzed, the savings which would be available as a result of the proposed transfers amount to less than $213,000,000 even if foreigners operate most of the ships without dollar payment for cargo carrying. This saving would amount to a maximum of only between 1 and 2 percent of the cost of the proposed Marshall plan program. The Harriman committee dealt realistically with this particular phase of the argument when it said:

> The limited financial savings are not sufficient to justify the drain on United States resources for national defense which such transfers would involve.

It is impossible for me, Mr. Speaker, to understand how the State Department of this Government, with the analysis of the Harriman committee before it, can recommend the transfer of 500 more American ships to European nations. I do not believe that my long service in the Navy causes me to overemphasize the value of our merchant marine for national defense, although I concede that I may be more sensitive to its importance than are those who have had less contact with affairs at sea. Then again, the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine points out that "the American people believe America should lead in shipping as it is expected to lead in other world affairs," and I do not believe that any of our citizens, or any of their representatives in Congress, can believe that the interests of the United States will be served if we have a merchant marine which carries less than 30 percent of our own commerce.

Exactly that, however, would be the inescapable result of carrying out the proposals in the report of the State Department. I believe that is the hope of many European nations.

Wholly aside from the commercial aspects of the proposal of the State Department, the international situation certainly does not justify the risk involved in the proposed transfer of ships. Approximately only 2,000 dry-cargo merchant vessels suitable for national defense purposes remain in this Government's possession. There is grave doubt if the vessels remaining after the proposed 500 were transferred would be a sufficient stock pile of national defense merchant ships for the security of the Nation.

Time after time it has been demonstrated that we have never had sufficient ships in time of war. Now, the report of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine points out that we are already short of the minimum of 11,400,000 tons of active shipping deemed necessary by the Navy for military purposes.

Let me set forth our requirements for merchant ships in the event of another world upheaval. At the impact of the emergency an active merchant fleet, fully manned, and in operation, is vital to our military forces. The Navy has indicated that a minimum of 11,400,000 tons of shipping will be required for handling cargo movements during the impact period. This minimum is more than our present privately owned fleet, and is more than the total tonnage which would be in operation under the American flag if these 500 ships are turned over to the European nations.

Second. We must have a reserve fleet of substantial proportions to replace casualties, furnish transport of men and materials, and support generally our striking forces as they are increased. It is for this reserve fleet that we have ships in lay-up today. It takes time, however, to break such ships out of lay-up, and a reserve is in no way a substitute for an adequate active merchant fleet.

Third. An emergency requires ship production in volume. A period of from 12 to 18 months may be required before our shipyards can get into production, and it is to bridge the gap between our active merchant fleet and our new construction that the reserve fleet is essential.

Twice, within the present generation, we have been called upon to build a national defense fleet hastily and extravagantly. At the impact of both emergencies we were woefully short of merchant vessels in every category. A saving of 1 percent or 2 percent of the cost of the Marshall plan does not justify a repetition of the extravagant unpreparedness which in World War II alone cost the American taxpayer some $15,000,000,000 for ship construction.

It is recognized that foreign-flag ships, with their low-wage crews and low standards of living, are able to compete more than successfully against American shipping. In recognition of this fact, Congress wrote into the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provisions for subsidy on established trade routes.

The creation of a surplus of active world tonnage can only have the effect of creating conditions where the forces of supply and demand will make it still more difficult for a United States flag fleet to participate in world trade. This will be particularly true in the bulk-cargo trades, where, in general, no subsidies are provided by law.

As a result, we can look forward, if we follow the proposals of the State Department, to such vigorous foreign competition that the greater part of our merchant marine will be driven from the seas.

The inescapable conclusion is that, if we transfer our ships to foreign flags in accordance with the recommendations of the State Department, we shall not be able to maintain the minimum active American merchant marine required for impact requirements of our military forces.

We must not be blinded by diplomatic language intended to cover up the inevitable results of the proposed transfer, by language suggesting that such transfer might reduce or defer European ship construction. The State Department, for example, in a report issued January 7, 1948, says:

> It is not suggested that foreign shipbuilding now under way should be stopped, but it is thought that a portion of the projected building could be deferred until the emergency is over.

Mr. Speaker, European nations are not disposed to curtail their ship-construction programs.

If I am correct in sensing underlying opportunism in the Paris report, any endeavor on our part to impose curtailment of construction as a condition of aid will be met with charges that the United States is seeking to interfere with the internal economy of foreign nations. That argument goes over in a big way with our international do-gooders and it is usually effective. To expect curtailment in foreign ship construction programs is just unrealistic.

The safe way of preserving our merchant marine for national defense is to defend the shipping industry against the inroads of competition created by our own stupidity. In comparison to the $15,000,000,000 which we spent for ship construction during the last war, the possible saving on paper of less than $213,000,000 is of small importance when we think of the ships it will take from under the American flag and the men it will throw out of work.

To keep us secure and to provide us with the implements for effective participation in world affairs, I suggest that we actually save 1 or 2 percent of the costs of European rehabilitation by cutting off some real money where it will not imperil the security of America.

Then let us keep a strong, healthy merchant marine in active operation. Let us do so with a realistic understanding of its importance to the safety of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we should refuse to approve further transfer of American ships to foreign nations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman what he feels about the arrangement for the sale of tankers to foreign countries or foreign firms? I do not know whether in California the gentleman's constituents are suffering from lack of oil, but as the gentleman knows, the people in New England are suffering from a shortage of fuel.

Mr. BRADLEY. Personally, I do not like to see the sale of any of our ships to any foreign countries. I think the gentlewoman has spoken about Russia. From the last reports I know of, we had some 96 ships running under the Russian flag—ships turned over to the Russians by the Department of State as a part of lend-lease. In order to get these ships for Russia, the State Department bought them from the War Shipping Administration with lend-lease funds, so the Maritime Commission, successor to the War Shipping Administration, does not have any financial interest in them. Then the Department of State turned the ships over to Russia and, after that, handed Russia bills of sale so that the ships would be safe from capture. Now

we talk about getting them back. The Russians, however, think that the ships belong to them, and I believe that we have at least two strikes on us because they are in possession of the ships.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They have title to the ships?

Mr. BRADLEY. They have actual title to the ships, but of course they never paid anything for the title. As far as I know, the understanding, or rather the belief, was that the title would not be good after the war and that we would get them back.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the President should put an embargo on tankers going abroad at the present time carrying oil, even with the permission of some of our own oil companies, at least during the period of the emergency?

Mr. BRADLEY. Of course, my opinion is that we should look out for our own people first. I think that answers the gentlewoman's question fully.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The people are suffering from a lack of fuel in other sections of the country as well as in New England. It is not purely a local or sectional problem with us.

Mr. BRADLEY. People in several parts of the United States are cold because they do not have fuel, and I think we ought to look out for the necessities for our own people before we ship fuel abroad.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from California for the fight that he has made to maintain an adequate Navy, as well as an adequate number of officers and Reserve officers.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I remember the gallant fight that the gentleman made on the floor in an effort to obtain recognition for the work done by the Reserve officers. Ninety percent of the fighting was done by the Reserve officers and men.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentlewoman very sincerely.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I was very much interested in what the gentleman had to say about those 96 ships which we handed over to Russia. Does it not seem to the gentleman that certainly in this case the old adage would apply that "Possession is nine points of the law"?

Mr. BRADLEY. I think that in this case it is 99.9 percent of the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of special orders already granted I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the American Legion.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent article from the Boston Post.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sioux Falls Daily Argus showing that South Dakota ranks first in the Nation in the purchase of Government Savings bonds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in this huge Federal Government of ours it is next to impossible for Members of Congress to keep in touch with the work of all the agencies and committees we create. Every once in a while, however, our attention is attracted to the fine work being done by a group of men and women in some department or agency of the Federal Government. It is for the purpose of discussing the excellent results being obtained by such a group that I have asked for this time today.

In August 1945 the Seventy-ninth Congress approved a House joint resolution to designate as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week the first week of each October. The resolution provided that during that week appropriate ceremonies were to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which would be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified but physically handicapped workers.

In 1945, 13,439 handicapped persons were placed in jobs, of whom 8,141 were disabled veterans. The following year, 1946, 29,439 handicapped were placed, of whom 19,200 were disabled veterans. In 1947, 30,765 handicapped were placed, of whom 17,802 were disabled veterans. In all, since the passage of the resolution to which I referred, 73,643 handicapped have been placed in suitable employment, of whom 45,143 have been disabled veterans. It will thus be seen that there has been a steady increase each year, which augurs well for future observances of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

No doubt you have all by now received copies of the minutes of the meeting of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, which was held in Washington last November 4.

This Committee has been established by the President for the purpose of bringing together representatives of organizations outside the Government and among the one-hundred-and-thirty-odd groups are some of the most powerful organizations in the United States, representing industry, business, labor, veterans, women, religious, fraternal, and other organizations, with a combined membership of more than thirty million.

When one stops to think that one and a half to two million handicapped applicants for work have registered in employment service offices across the country, one must come to the conclusion that it is going to take more than the observance each year of a National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week to solve this problem.

In order to solve the problem the work of this national Committee must be supplemented by work on the local level. A great deal of the work on the local level can be done by volunteer workers. In fact, in many instances the volunteer worker can do the job better than a professional worker. Finding the right job for a physically handicapped person is pretty much a case of making the right personal contacts.

If I may be pardoned a personal reference, I would tell you that I never see a physically handicapped person who has decided that there is nothing useful for him to do and that he is going to just sit around for the rest of his life, but what I think that I might have made the same decision but for friends or relatives who just would not permit that to happen.

Anyone who suffers a serious physical disability goes through a period when he needs friends, and the right kind of friends, as never before. Having gone through a period of uncertainty as to his ability to look out for himself, the time soon comes when he is ready for a job. It is at that point that the work performed by the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week has its greatest value.

This Committee is deserving of our stronger support, because its purpose is not only to restore unfortunate, suffering people to usefulness and happiness but to render them productive citizens who can and will take up their share of our tax load by becoming taxpayers, instead of tax eaters themselves.

This Committee was formed to better carry out the purposes of Public Law 176 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which is the House joint resolution to which I previously referred. The Committee will formulate a year-round program of public information and public education toward rehabilitation and employment of America's handicapped millions.

The recommendations of this Committee include:

First. Management-labor institutes throughout the country to secure employer acceptance of handicapped workers, emphasize availability and advantages of Federal-States Employment Service facilities, prepare a typical in-plant plan for employment of disabled, and secure increased employee interest from disabled and nondisabled alike;

Second. Investigation of, and assistance to, present and future community rehabilitation centers, formed to rehabilitate and employ the disabled at community level;

Third. Collaboration with governors' committees in the States;

Fourth. Local, State, and National essay contests to stimulate the thinking of students, parents, and teachers.

Fifth. Expositions showing the handicapped at work to arouse public interest and knowledge while educating employ-

ers to the value and variety of talents possessed by handicapped workers;

Sixth. Awarding of certificates of merit to individuals and organizations who have cooperated in the employment of handicapped;

Seventh. Study of workmen's compensation laws; and

Eighth. Study of schools for handicapped in order that curricula might bear a direct relationship upon future employment possibilities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman spoke of his own case, of his relatives and friends coming to his aid.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. And some Congresswomen.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman did it himself without any suggestions or assistance from anybody else and is an inspiration to everybody. He has been an enormous help, I know, to those who have had a disability with which to cope.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts I could tell some things about her fine work in the early twenties. I can remember when she too spoke of discouragements and wondered if she could do useful work back in the early twenties, but I do not want to disclose her age.

For the benefit of the Members who may desire to read the full report of the President's committee I extend as part of my remarks the report of this committee for their consideration.

(The matter referred to follows:)

I. BACKGROUND

Three consecutive annual observances of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress and proclaimed by the President, have conclusively demonstrated the usefulness and necessity of such a campaign or program for employment of handicapped persons.

Each annual observance has been marked by increased interest in employment and rehabilitation of the handicapped, on the part of the public, officials, and media of information. Each year, however, statistics have shown a general "falling off" of calls for and placement of handicapped workers, shortly after observance of the week.

Today, in a period of 60,000,000 Americans being at work, in an era of full employment, it is estimated that at least 500,000 handicapped applicants, registered in employment-service offices across country, are still out of jobs, about 135,000 of whom are war-disabled veterans, while from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 more handicapped persons could and should be rehabilitated for employment.

The work of this committee must be designed to continue the Nation-wide observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, so that its observance and the results obtained therefrom will contribute to the full employment of the physically handicapped.

In order to assure an effective annual observance and real results in jobs for the handicapped, the committee must continually keep before the public through public information and education, a day-by-day, month-by-month effort to support the program of all public and private groups in their programs of rehabilitation and employment of handicapped citizens.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE COMMITTEE

To attempt to outline, at this time, the whole future development of the work of this committee is neither practicable nor reasonable. Much time and study is needed to evaluate present systems, facilities, carry on research, and suggest improvement in our present programs. We understand our function primarily concerns itself with the suitable employment of handicapped people. In order to achieve a reasonable goal in this direction we are well aware that we shall come into frequent contact with other phases of the program for the disabled. Men or women permanently or temporarily handicapped cannot perform much, if any, work, unless adequate physical restoration is accomplished; therefore, our program will necessarily be closely related to the medical services.

The handicapped may require education and training, or retraining, or vocational guidance; all such programs deserve our close study.

Procedures applying to the development of proper means of placement of handicapped are inextricably bound up with a continual study and revision of what are termed "physical demands"—the new science of matching men with jobs—the committee must give careful study to the question of how best to increase the present approximate 8,000 jobs from the estimated 27,000 different types of employment in America. The handicapped can fill more jobs, and ways and means must be devised to open the possibilities for their increased placement in these jobs.

Cooperation must be obtained, and maintained, from all public and private groups in the field, including those operating at Federal, State, and municipal government levels, as well as the great organizations of industry, business, labor, veterans, religion, women, education, farm, fraternal, civic, medical, welfare, scientific, and professional groups, and other interested organizations or individuals.

At the Federal level there now exists a coordinating and cooperating group—The Federal Interagency Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, with official representation thereupon from the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, War, Navy, Veterans' Administration, Federal Security Agency, United States Civil Service Commission, et cetera.

This committee was established a year ago by Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, USMC—then Administrator, Retraining and Reemployment of Vocational Rehabilitation, who declared there was a great need for coordination of the multitude of activities carried on in the Federal field. Investigation shows there are some forty-odd such agencies.

This committee has among its membership the Disabled American Veterans, the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, and the National Association for Employment of the Handicapped, as representing the viewpoint of outside organization.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that a subcommittee of the Committee on NEPHW meet in joint session with the Federal Interagency Committee, on December 11, 1947, when the Interagency Committee, doubtless will have received complete reports from all States and cooperating public and private agencies and organizations, as to this year's results on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week. We can then see, in all likelihood, those areas in which effective work is being done, as well as others, perhaps, in which additional effort is required.

Also that the committee concentrate its attention on encouraging the development of local committees, composed of local representatives of essentially the same groups which constitute the National Committee. These local committees would have the same objectives as the National Committee and would provide the local organization necessary to stimulate employment of the physically handicapped through specific projects such as the following:

A. Management-labor institutes, to stimulate interest on the part of both employers and employees. Such institutes, in general, to provide a means—

1. To secure employer acceptance and effective utilization of qualified handicapped workers, both disabled veterans and civilians.

2. To emphasize use of Federal-State Employment Service facilities for recruitment and selection of workers.

3. To provide employers with facts regarding productivity, absenteeism, and low-accident incidence of handicapped people.

4. To illustrate by a typical in-plant plan for employment of disabled.

5. To demonstrate the advantages of the selective-placement approach to hiring the handicapped—particularly the method of making physical-demands analyses and physical-capacity appraisals.

Since many plants already have labor-management committees, many of these no doubt can be utilized. Where such do not exist, it would be advisable to ask that there be joint action of employer and employees, so that studies and pilot demonstrations might proceed simultaneously, to the advantage of both groups.

To the employee group it should be demonstrated that—

1. Special services are available to handicapped through USES-State employment offices.

2. Applicants, already handicapped but otherwise capable, should secure the various tests and vocational-guidance procedures of State employment and rehabilitation services necessary for satisfactory placement.

3. An in-plant plan should demonstrate to employees the possibilities of increased employment by rearrangement of machines—grouping of certain related plant activities which may be carried on by handicapped, etc.

These management-labor employment institutes may be conducted as a joint endeavor of the Federal-State employment services or at the local office level.

B. Community rehabilitation centers:

The committee should thoroughly investigate possibilities and potentials of community rehabilitation centers.

Although some steps in this direction have already been taken, as far as is known, there is no national policy or program, and most of the work has been done by private groups. If a practical program has been, or is being, developed, which can be adapted to the needs of the times, such should have the careful attention by this committee, with the objective of ascertaining what developments of such community rehabilitation and employment centers in many cities throughout the Nation, through the collaboration of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the United States Public Health Service, and the USES-State Employment Services, which are necessary and need implementation by this committee.

C. Collaboration with governor's committees: In many States, as a result of joint efforts of public and private agencies, the respective governors have established Committees on NEPHW activities. In most instances, such committees are composed of State officials of the agencies having primary jurisdiction, but in a few instances governors have appointed public-spirited citizens to head such committees, from outside the official family.

We believe our committee should offer full cooperation to the governor's committees, and endeavor to supplement, implement, and complement their labors.

D. Local, State, and National essay contests:[1] In the 127,000 school districts in the

[1] It was voted that items D, E, and F be referred to appropriate subcommittees, to be appointed by the chairman, for implementation.

United States there are millions of pupils who, we believe, furnish the best possible means of developing an intelligent understanding of the problems of handicapped people—especially on a continuing, all-time basis.

If, for example, an education subcommittee of this committee, if such were appointed, would devise a means whereby the high-school students throughout the country could participate in an essay contest, the subject of which might well be "The Place of the Physically Handicapped in Our Economic System," we would, thus, undoubtedly, stimulate the thinking and comprehension of the problem of not only the students themselves but also their teachers and parents.

It should be stressed that if the younger generation can be brought to a point of understanding and proper evaluation of the handicapped—then our future programs will be greatly accelerated in all fields of treatment, training, and placement.

E. Expositions for handicapped:[1] In larger cities throughout the Nation there should be a general program of development and presentation of exhibits made by handicapped people and further, actual showing of the handicapped at work in industry and other fields.

Such exhibits might well take the form of annual expositions, in which local concerns employing handicapped, or schools specializing in vocational education might combine to present interesting and informative programs.

All this would add greatly to public interest and knowledge of the subject and would serve to educate employers on the value and variety of talent possessed by handicapped workers.

Industry, labor, and veterans organizations could well be asked to cooperate in this endeavor.

F. Awards of merit:[1] An annual certificate of merit will be issued to those individuals and organizations who have cooperated in the employment of the handicapped. Such awards will be made by the committee after standards of performance set by the committee have been met.

G. Study of workmen's compensation laws: There should be an exhaustive study of workmen's compensation laws with a view to ascertaining their relation to the problem of employment of handicapped people (advising employers of the facts), and to develop suggested means of improving these statutes.

H. Study of schools for handicapped: A study and evaluation, in collaboration with professional bodies interested, should be made of all schools in which the handicapped are taught, both children and adults. The curricula of these schools should, in part, bear a direct relationship to fields of employment possibilities.

I. Employment of handicapped in Government: The chairman of the President's committee should be empowered to appoint a subcommittee to investigate the possibility of the employment of handicapped people in all governmental agencies at all levels (Federal, State, and municipal).

IV. SUBCOMMITTEES

It is recommended that if the committee approves this report that the chairman be authorized to appoint appropriate subcommittees and chairmen to implement the recommendations of this report.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the report to which I have referred.

[1] It was voted that items D, E, and F be referred to appropriate subcommittees, to be appointed by the chairman, for implementation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FUEL-OIL SHORTAGE IN MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am talking again for just a minute or two on the question of oil, the very improper distribution of oil today as I see it, and the great difficulty we are having in finding out the true facts of the oil situation both as to production and distribution, and as to price. There are places in Massachusetts where oil without any reason that we can see has doubled in price and in some instances trebled. I was in Massachusetts to attend the funeral of a dear friend yesterday and everywhere I went taxicab men and everyone spoke of the high price of oil and how impossible it is going to be for veterans and people with small incomes to get along if the price continues high, even if they can secure the oil.

In other communities in the country the same situation exists, one family can secure oil and the family in the next house cannot secure oil. One oil dealer seems to have a great deal of oil while the next oil dealer has not any oil at all.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the President to act on the 3d of December, last year, requesting that he declare an embargo on oil going out of the country and on the tankers taking the oil out of the country. Certainly that should have been done at least until the emergency is over. I do not believe anyone in this country feels we should let the people of the United States get cold in order to send our oil to other countries. As a matter of fact, most of it, I understand, is not going to those who are cold over there.

The President has the power to act and he should act immediately. It is obvious we are not going to arrive at any solution immediately unless he does act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHO IS GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, who is going to get the money? Upon many occasions I have asked the Congress, "Where are we going to get the money?" The answer is that we have been putting a mortgage on our grandchildren in order to get the money. We have run this country into the greatest debt that has ever been placed upon any nation in history—a greater debt than any nation has ever seen fit to place upon its people—$257,000,000,000 today.

I want to call your attention to the fact that if the so-called Marshall plan goes through, it may be well to ask, "Who is going to get the money?"

The Marshall plan is being sold to the American farmer on the basis that he is going to have a greater market for his products. However, the following article taken from the January 3 issue of the reliable Washington Farm Reporter would indicate that the farmers of some other countries are going to get most of the money:

MARSHALL PLAN EXPORTS

The Marshall plan is not to be the farm price bonanza that some had expected. It could be a boomerang.

A break-down study of President Truman's proposal discloses that Canadian and Latin-American farmers will get most of the Marshall plan dollars.

The President asked for $6,500,000,000 to finance aid from April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949 * * * approximately two-thirds of which would be for foods.

The 15-month food budget is $4,163,000,000. Of that amount $2,785,000,000 would be spent outside the United States, but only $1,378,000,000 for domestic purchases.

Here is a break-down of food-spending plans:

Grain: United States, $840,000,000; elsewhere, $1,300,000,000.

Sugar: United States, $28,000,000; elsewhere, $268,000,000.

Fats and oils: United States, $122,000,000; elsewhere, $450,000,000.

Meat: United States, $7,000,000; elsewhere, $385,000,000.

Dairy and poultry products: United States, $271,000,000; elsewhere, not estimated but probably not considerable.

A total of $382,000,000 is included for coffee and other foods abroad. For fruits, vegetables, and other minor items the United States total is $110,000,000.

Farm machinery valued at $136,000,000 would represent a sharp increase in United States exports. About $22,000,000 would be spent in Canada and Latin America for farm machinery to be sent Europe.

In addition, the Marshall plan calls for expenditure of $20,000,000 in the United States for fertilizer; $22,000,000 elsewhere.

The point I am going to try to drive home is the fact that we are furnishing all the money for this Marshall plan and giving everything away. We are not trying to make a business deal, we are giving away our birthright. Now, I just want to call the attention of the House again to this: Whatever happened to the United Nations? Why do they not function? Why should America do it all? Why? Whatever happened to the Organization that we have been working for for two and a half long years, trying to get it built up? The United Nations organization; are you bypassing it? Several years ago we established the Bretton Woods bank which had a capital of $9,100,000,000. The United States subscribed for $3,175,000,000 and paid the money in. Then we had the stabilization fund amounting to $8,800,000,000. The United States subscribed for $2,750,000,000 of that. That was for the purpose of helping these nations stabilize their currencies and get on their feet. But, we are not trying to take advantage of the great promises made for that organization that was set up by vote of the Congress, and paying in money according to the rules and regulations laid down. These other countries are not now coming in to borrow that money from this organization; oh, no! They want to come over here under the Mar-

shall plan and get a hand-out—something for nothing. Everybody's doing it.

When Secretary Marshall made his proposal to those countries to get together and discuss the items they wanted, they got together in Paris, and after discussion for a few weeks, what happened? They told Mr. Marshall they wanted $42,000,000,000 worth of equipment and merchandise and material from the United States. Well, it pretty nearly scared Mr. Marshall to death. He did not want to present that figure to the United States Congress, so he said, "Go back and sharpen your pencils and do a good job; do it over again." Then they came back and asked for $22,000,000,000. Mr. Marshall was still scared to death, and finally he sharpened his pencil as much as he could and he said that he thought they ought to have about $17,000,000,000 or $18,000,000,000, over a 4-year period.

Now, Mr. Marshall is one of the finest men and one of the greatest army officers that we have ever had. He did a wonderful job. We gave him everything he wanted under the sun to win the war. We gave him all the money and all of the materials, all the men and everything. He did a fine job. Nobody could criticize him, and I would be the last one to do so. But, Mr. Marshall has got a new job today. He is Secretary of State. He is not in the Army now. He is over there dealing with a lot of foreigners that he has never had experience with, and they are asking him for this, that, and the other thing, and he thinks maybe they ought to have it, because every time one of his generals asked him for something that they needed to win the war, he gave it to them. Because the American people furnished it to and for him. Now, he is going to probably see how much he can get for those people over there. From the American people. His heart is bigger than the American's pocketbook. His schooling is not the one for Secretary of State.

I say to you that we want to put the Herter plan into effect so that we will have somebody besides the State Department handing out the money of the people of this country. We must have proper supervision. I want to tell you that you are going to ruin this country; you are going to wreck it; you are going to put it into bankruptcy as sure as little apples grow. It is in the making. What we have got to do is to put some screws on Mr. Marshall; plan too. We must scale it down, way down. Further, Mr. Marshall says he wants all that money or none. Well, let me tell you, if those people over there are starving to death, or if I was starving to death, and somebody gave me a sandwich, I would take that sandwich and think that was a pretty good meal. But, Mr. Marshall says, "No," he wants $17,000,000,000 or nothing. That shows right on the face of it that he is not the man that ought to be at the head of the distribution of all this money of the taxpayers. He must know how to compromise, he didn't do it in the Army, here he must take it and like it. That is my answer to him.

If this was in the Army and he was a four-star general and I a private I would not dare say such a thing or I would be in the brig.

Then, we not only have that to contend with, but goodness gracious, lo and behold, yesterday the President came in asking for that great, large budget of $39,700,000,000 for this year. Why it would scare almost any one of you until your fingers froze clear up to your shoulders, or your feet almost up to your knees, and if you are frozen that far you will probably not get along without them, and you have to stand still, and the first thing you know you will find yourself with a bald pate in a huckleberry patch. In other words you are gone. You are through.

What you have to do here is to trim the Marshall plan down to what it ought to be. You have to cut the President's budget down to what it ought to be. When you do that you are going to save about fifteen or eighteen billion dollars out of this. That is the only thing that is ever going to keep America solvent. That is important. You cannot keep solvent otherwise.

I say to Congress now, let us get busy. Let us sharpen our wits and sharpen our ax and take care of America and the American people. Be wise and economize. That budget of the President means $240 for every man, woman, and child in America. Think of it. Is not that a terrible amount for the President of the United States to ask to put into effect a lot of these New Deal ideas he is talking about now? Just for 1 year. We have had enough New Deal during the last 10 or 12 years, and we have got this country just about wrecked, with a $259,000,000,000 debt.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I defy the gentleman or anybody else on that side to tell how you are going to work or get us out of the New Deal mess. The philosophy of everybody living off the Government. If the gentleman is going to give me something constructive in that line, if he is going to tell me how you are going to cut this extravagance down, I will yield.

Mr. REDDEN. Is the gentleman going to qualify his yielding or is he going to yield?

Mr. RICH. I will yield to the gentleman for a question. Do not make a speech, just ask a question.

Mr. REDDEN. I want to know how much the gentleman thinks the Marshall plan ought to be for. He said it ought to be cut down to some figure. What ought that figure to be?

Mr. RICH. I am very happy to have that question. If I were appropriating the American people's money for the aid and assistance of Europe, I would not give them over $10,000,000 at first. Then I would give them two or three million dollars at a time, and I would say, "That is a lot of money. That is more money than I ever saw in all my life, and more than I hope I will ever have an opportunity to see." I would say to those fellows over there, "Here is a million dollars. That ought to make a lot of sandwiches." Then I would say to the American people, as Drew Pearson did, "Let us get out and of our own hearts give things to the churches, to the Red Cross, and to the Salvation Army to help those people over there until they can get on their feet themselves." We never did such a thing before in history as that proposed in the Marshall plan, we never even dreamed of such a thing before the New Deal started to give us away.

This country is in such an awfully difficult position or financial situation now, and I am afraid the President is going to put into effect some of the New Deal ideas again, and then you will swamp America. We will be bankrupt. We will not be any good to ourselves or any good to anybody else. You have to be careful of that, for that is just what will happen unless you economize. I say it is time to economize.

Mr. Speaker, you ought to do everything you can to aid and assist us on this side of the House in cutting that budget to the very bone. Cut down the Marshall plan to a reasonable amount, and then make no commitments or permit any commitments by the President, the State Department, or anybody else longer than 1948. Let us keep on our own feet. I am afraid the President, with his enormous budget, Secretary Marshall with his extravagant ideas will knock the feet out from under us and down we will come. Down America will fall. When our country is down, what good are we? Be wise and economize.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 489. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 544. An act to regulate subsistence expenses of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government while absent from their designated posts of duty on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 865. An act to provide for the striking of medals, in lieu of coins, for commemorative purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 922. An act for the relief of Ruth Grossman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1267. An act for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1347. An act for the relief of Burks L. Fielder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1486. An act to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1644. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 so as to permit rescission of prior agency action in complying with recommendations of the Civil Service Commission pursuant to appeals taken by preference employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1698. An act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Iola Veach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 14, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1203. A letter from the president, the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting a report pursuant to the fifth section of the act of incorporation approved September 26, 1888; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1204. A letter from the Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, United States Department of Labor, transmitting the report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor for the year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1205. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of Labor for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1206. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the second report covering conditions in all underground bituminous-coal and lignite mines inspected by Federal coal-mine inspectors during the 6-month period July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, inclusive; all recommendations and notices sent to the mine owners or operators and State agencies; and the action taken by mine owners or operators and State agencies with respect to the Federal inspectors' findings and recommendations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1207. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1208. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to create a Committee on Capital Clearance for the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 424. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2575, a bill to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1239). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 4927. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide readjustment insurance for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARSON:

H. R. 4928. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4929. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to restore the mineral rights, including oil and gas, to former Indian owners of certain lands on the Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 4930. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4931. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code entitled 'Copyrights'," approved July 30, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4932. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 4933. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government while absent from their designated posts of duty on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 4934. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the use of the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4935. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of World War I under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4936. A bill relating to the war tax rate on retail sale of furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4937. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 4938. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with reference to platinum foxes and platinum fox furs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 4939. A bill to adjust compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 4940. A bill to amend the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1948, by removing a limitation contained therein upon overtime compensation of employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4941. A bill to amend Public Law 368, Eightieth Congress, first session, approved August 5, 1947, so as to provide for allowances for private interment of repatriated war dead of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 4942. A bill to amend section 23 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4943. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution to amend section 4, paragraph (b), of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress (ch. 526, 1st sess.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 4944. A bill for the relief of Douglas S. Williams, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4945. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 4946. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Chang Ha Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 4947. A bill for the relief of Miss Ethel S. Wakeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1119. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of citizens of Knox County, Ill., in support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1120. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Edwin S. Pink and sundry citizens of Massachusetts, advocating enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1121. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Legion, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the treatment of men who were at Bataan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1122. Also, petition of Boston Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Most Reverend Alois Stepinac, archbishop of Zagreb, Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1123. Also, petition of Gary B'nai B'rith Lodge, No. 831, of Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1124. Also, petition of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to measures recommended by the Special Committee on Living Costs and Food Conservation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1125. Also, petition of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of its resolution with reference to traffic relief through the construction of express highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We are glad, our Father, that troubles are cannibals—the big ones eat up the little ones.

But may it not be so with our duties and responsibilities. Help our Senators to keep a sane perspective, lest the big issues overshadow the lesser ones, and they fail to do Thy will with them. In all things, big and little, reveal to us Thy wisdom and Thy love.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY P. CAIN, a Senator from the State of Washington, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CAIN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 12, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2759. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; and

H. R. 4071. A bill to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Ben W. Colburn;

H. R. 769. An act for the relief of the estate of Ruth Horton Hunter;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased;

H. R. 1175. An act for the relief of the estate of Daphne Ward Pope, deceased;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Calvin J. Frederick;

H. R. 1426. An act to extend veteran-preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen;

H. R. 1531. An act for the relief of William P. Gillingham;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth F. McCombie;

H. R. 2056. An act for the relief of J. C. Bateman;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Charles J. Smith;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Mattie A. Horner;

H. R. 3068. An act for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas;

H. R. 3146. An act to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3754. An act for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JOHN H. OVERTON, a Senator from the State of Louisiana, appeared in his seat today.

NECESSITY OF AN ADEQUATE AIR FORCE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in this morning's paper is the announcement by the President's Air Policy Commission that our present Air Force, with its 55 groups of 580 heavy bombers, 2,300 fighters, and 8,000 other planes, is inadequate even today and would be hopelessly wanting in 5 years.

This is the latest survey affecting the defense of the United States and, of course, it is completely authoritative. It is of particular interest to note that the Commission recommends as a first step the building up of a first-line force of 12,400 new planes organized into 70 regular Air Force air groups. Added to that would be 27 National Guard and 34 Reserve groups.

In the Boston Herald of last Sunday appeared an article by Gen. H. H. Arnold, wartime chief of our Air Force, which states:

Any potential enemy knows our military situation; the only ones who do not realize it are our own people. The cold truth is that at present we are almost as badly off, in a military sense, as we were before Pearl Harbor. * * * Our Air Force today is a one-punch outfit. * * * We are little better than a third-rate power in the air. * * * In a very few years, every last airplane will be obsolete.

Of course, we say we have the atomic bomb. We comfort ourselves by stating over and over that it would take Russia 2 or 3 or 4 years to get that bomb into mass production. But do we remember how long it took us, last time, to get ourselves ready? If we started rebuilding at full speed, tomorrow morning, we would require several years to reach our full fighting strength. * * * Five full years were consumed last time in reaching our maximum in air power.

General Arnold makes precisely the same recommendation as is made by the President's Air Policy Commission in the paper this morning. He makes this statement:

The minimum requirement for the Nation's air security is an air force in being of 70 combat groups.

Late at the last session of Congress, I offered an amendment to the Army appropriations bill which would have provided the funds for 70 air groups. It received a good deal of support on the floor of the Senate, but it was not adopted. I rise this morning to express the hope that at this regular session of Congress the Appropriations Committee will not be bound by any short-sightedness or lack of understanding on the part of the Bureau of the Budget, and that it will include in the appropriation bill adequate funds for 70 air groups. We must have an air force in being, an air force which is immediately ready, not a skeleton air force. For this reason 70 air groups are the minimum.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article by Gen. H. H. Arnold, entitled "We'll Lose the Next War."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'LL LOSE THE NEXT WAR

(By Gen. H. H. Arnold)

We won the last war. And it's the last war we'll ever win. If we have another, this Nation will lose.

We'll lose, and the enemy we fight will lose, because victory in atomic warfare is no longer possible. One nation cannot defeat another nation today. That concept died with Hiroshima. War is like fire: you can prevent a fire, or you can try to put it out, but you can't "win" a fire, because fire is destruction.

If we fought Russia, the best we could hope to achieve is a moral victory, and that would be small comfort to the remnants of our people, crawling amid the burnt-out foundations and charred chimneys of a ruined nation.

So we must not, we cannot, talk about waging war with Russia. Even if we wiped out Russia, we would be wiped out in the process. War itself is defeat. We must talk about waging peace. We must wage peace with all the air power, with all the machines and money and men that we used to fight Germany and Japan. We must be stronger than any other nation in the world, because I am convinced we are one of the few nations in the world today that genuinely, devoutly, and unselfishly want peace.

Where do we stand, then, at this most critical moment in our Nation's history?

How does our air power compare today with that of other nations, either potential allies or potential enemies? Are we strong enough to prevent another war?

ONE-PUNCH OUTFIT

During the war, as commanding general of the Army Air Forces, I was responsible for two and a half million men. I still feel a deep responsibility toward these men, and I believe they want to know the facts.

That is why I am breaking a 2 years' silence to state these facts frankly. Any potential enemy knows our military situation anyway; the only ones who do not realize it are our own people. The cold truth is that at present we are almost as badly off, in a military sense, as we were before Pearl Harbor.

If another attack comes, the first blow will again fall through the air. Our Air Force would hit back with all the power it has. It could probably hit the enemy a staggering blow. But then it would be all over for us. Our Air Force today is a one-punch outfit. Without the ability to launch a sustained counteroffensive, we would have to surrender—or be annihilated.

We are little better than a third-rate power in the air. We have about 3,700 first-line aircraft in flyable condition, but more than half of these are being used for training and are not ready for combat. We have another 5,900 or so first-line planes in storage, but to put them in combat readiness would take from 3 to 6 months. And, remember, for many of our first-line aircraft in operation, and for all of our aircraft in storage, time is running out fast. In a very few years, every last one will be obsolete.

IT TAKES TIME

Of course, we say, we have the atomic bomb. We comfort ourselves by stating over and over that it would take Russia 2 or 3 or 4 years to get that bomb into mass production. But do we remember how long it took us, last time, to get ourselves ready? If we started rebuilding at full speed, tomorrow morning, we would require several years to reach our full fighting strength.

All the planes and all the engines we used in World War II were on the drawing boards or in actual production at the time of Pearl Harbor, yet American aircraft production did not reach its peak until 1944.

Five full years were consumed last time in reaching our maximum in air power. And at that time we had strong allies to help give us the needed time. Our own factories were never under enemy bombardment. There were no atomic missiles to slow or cripple our production. Even at that, we barely made it: if we had been just a little more tardy, Germany's V–2 program would have been successfully launched, and we would probably still be fighting today. Our margin of victory was perhaps only a matter of weeks.

When Germany surrendered, the Air Force had more than 43,000 combat aircraft. What is more, there were 14,000 fighter pilots and 21,000 highly trained air crews to man our bombardment-type planes. At the time of Japan's surrender, we had 2,865 of the B–29 Superfortresses that had smashed and seared Japan's war economy to a state of impotence.

American air power hovered for a moment at that magnificent height. Then, with the war over but with the peace yet to be won, the cries for demobilization mounted in America and echoed around the world. They did what the guns of the enemy had never done. Within a few short months, precipitous demobilization had so riddled the Air Force's wings that not one group was fit for combat.

To be sure, we have made some recovery since that low ebb of our national strength. America is beginning to realize that its part in the Allied victories has placed us inevitably in a position of world leadership. We have begun to rebuild our military position.

But we are doing it far too slowly to be safe. The minimum requirement for the Nation's air security is an air-force-in-being of 70 combat groups, supported by the necessary number of service organizations. Although the Air Force was able to activate 55 of these groups by the end of last year, there are funds to sustain the remaining 15 on a skeleton basis only. And a glance at the future is even less encouraging. The Air Force budget for 1948 will permit the maintenance of only 40 combat groups—not much better than half the minimum requirement for the safety of the country.

WE'RE STALLING

Nor does the picture become any brighter when we look at aircraft production. The current Air Force budget allows us to purchase less than 1,500 aircraft of all types this fiscal year. This is just half of the 3,000 new aircraft the Air Force has stated must be procured each year to defend our shores.

Worse even than the decline of our military strength is the deterioration of our national pride. We are growing apathetic toward all national security matters. We hesitate and fumble and stall. We let the Congress cut military appropriations drastically, we debate endlessly over universal training, we let our strength dwindle a little more each day.

These are the plain and chilling facts. We have no time to lose; this golden opportunity to rebuild our military power may not last much longer. It will be too late to start after we are attacked. There are several basic steps that we must take at once to insure the prompt recovery of our former position as the strongest nation in the world. These may be summarized under four headings:

1. A balanced national defense

We must maintain an adequate Army, Navy, and Air Force as a deterrent to any potential aggressor, and as a power actually to stop war. If war does come, our first major task will be the air defense of the United States, its Territories and possessions. After that, it would be the task of the Air Force to blunt the enemy's offensive capability through strategic bombardment. This would give us time to build our strength to the point where we could take the initiative.

Once this build-up of offensive strength had been attained, our Air Force would have to launch a full-scale strategic offensive to destroy completely the war industry and the war economy of the enemy nation. Then, when this phase was completed, our Air Force would join with our ground and naval forces to exploit the effects of our offensive, and to establish control over the enemy nation.

Our Air Force today is woefully inadequate to perform this task. There is no threat to American sea power in the world; but American air power is dangerously below par. To give America a balanced defense, therefore, we must first of all increase the Air Force's share of our defense budget so it can perform its duty the way it is expected to.

2. Industrial preparedness

The heart and sinews of modern war lie in a nation's production. We must inaugurate a program of industrial preparedness, which will enable industry to maintain pilot plants, to stock pile machine tools, to redesign weapons and adapt them to mass production—in short, to take all steps necessary to insure volume output in a minimum time if another war should ever start.

3. Reserve program

We must support a Reserve program which will enable our Army, Navy, and Air Force-in-being to expand rapidly in the event of war. The Air Force budget for 1948 will allow some form of training for only 50,000 members of all three civilian components—the Air Reserve, the Air National Guard, and the Air ROTC. While over 100 Air Reserve training detachments are needed, budget cuts have reduced our Reserve training facilities to 42. These budget cuts must be restored at once. Training takes time; and there may not be much time.

We must change many other old ideas, and fit them to the modern concept of war. Our commercial air lines, for example, form a very important part of our whole Reserve system. We must keep our air lines healthy and strong, because we may need them in a hurry if a Pearl Harbor happens again.

4. Universal training

Last, but not least, we must establish a program of universal training, to give the three services the trained manpower they need to insure peace. This program has been called for repeatedly by leading statesmen, clergymen, and military men. The temper of the times makes imperative that we set it in motion without further delay.

We cannot win another war. No one can win another war. Therefore, we must not fight another war. Our only hope in this atomic age is to apply our strength firmly and steadily for peace among nations. This is in keeping with our history, our traditions. We must maintain our strength—not to use as a belligerent, but to buttress our position as the world's referee for peace. That means that what we built up together for victory should not be allowed to go to seed. We must work for peace as wholeheartedly, as devotedly as we worked for victory.

FOLSOM DAM ON AMERICAN RIVER, CALIF.—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 496)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(For President's message, see yesterday's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 137.)

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT (H. DOC. NO. 498)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1948.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

TAX REFUNDS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of refunds of internal revenue in excess of $500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, on account of taxes illegally or erroneously collected, showing the names and addresses of the individual taxpayers and the amounts refunded, which, with an accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated:

A petition signed by the officers of the Buncombe County Unit of the Southern Pension Association and sundry citizens, all in the State of North Carolina, praying an amendment to the Social Security Act providing relief for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Los Angeles (Calif.) Branch of the National Customs Service Association, favoring the enactment of legislation beneficial to Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., favoring statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

HIGH PRICES OF FOOD PRODUCTS—LETTER FROM MELVIN E. TESKE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting letter from a Kansas farmer, Melvin E. Teske, of Wheaton, Kans., which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate. I therefore send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have it published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEATON, KANS., *December 12, 1947.*

DEAR SIR: I wish to give you my view of conditions. Conditions are tough. People are complaining about the high price of meat. This is all wrong. Let's take poultry for instance. I'll give 1941 prices with 1947 prices.

1941: Eggs, 45 cents; corn, 60 cents; hens, 14 cents; roosters, 20 cents.

1947: Eggs, 43 cents, 5 percent down; corn, $2.52, 425 percent up; hens, 13 cents, 6 percent down; roosters, 16 cents, 20 percent down.

We pay 4 times as much for our feed now than in 1941 and get 2 cents less per dozen eggs than in 1941. The last 2 years we have had droughts in this community. Our cattle is all that keeps us going. In 1941 and 1942 we raised 1,000 chicks yearly. Last year we had 100 hens left. I switched to raising cattle as the price of feed increased and egg prices declined. Last spring chicks were burned by the million because no one would buy them. Then the papers put out eggs would be $1 a dozen by fall. Some of us suckers fell for it. I now have 175 hens. They eat twice as much as they bring in. The neighbors and us don't know what to do with our chickens. Old hens are cheaper than tankage in the long run so we feed them to our hogs. We butcher them and pack them in lockers. We did not raise feed so we have to buy it all. If poultry and eggs are high priced when the city people buy them it's because of the middleman, not the farmer. When eggs get to $1 a dozen, we will raise chickens again, not before, if the price of feed stays as high as it is: 1946, $1.12 to $1.20; 1947, 80 cents to $2.52.

DAIRYING

A year ago we got $1.12 per pound of butterfat. Now we get 80 cents. Last year corn was $1.20 and now it is $2.52. Can't something be done to balance these? This is outrageous. This does not bother me much because I switched to beef and ranching, but if I had kept on raising chickens and dairying, I would probably be going broke like some other small farmers.

I think the AAA is a good administration and should be extended through 1948 with a few added provisions. If the farmer will have his prairie sod tested to find what it lacks, the Government should pay for half the fertilizer he puts on. This would boost meat production from grass and save grain which is badly needed. Cattle fattened on grass tastes just as good as corn-fed ones. No big shot needs better meat than the farmer and the farmer always butchers a grass-fed one. Next fall we'll remember Mr. Truman's eggless Thursday. It's the "bunk."

Sincerely,

MELVIN E. TESKE.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 773. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary E. Leaf; with an amendment (Rept. No. 820);

S. 1485. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 814);

S. 1733. A bill to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 815);

H. R. 1049. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota; without amendment (Rept. No. 816);

H. R. 2361. A bill to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818; with amendments (Rept. No. 821);

H. R. 3153. A bill to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota; with amendments (Rept. No. 822);

H. R. 3322. A bill to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 823); and

H. R. 3326. A bill to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 817).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1591. A bill to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 812).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 400. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mabel Townsend Pretty on Top; with an amendment (Rept. No. 818); and

S. 401. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott; with an amendment (Rept. No. 819).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1407. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Robert E. Doyle; with amendments (Rept. No. 824); and

S. 1517. A bill authorizing the issuance to James Perry Doyle of a patent in fee to certain lands in Big Horn County, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 813).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 12, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox	Chief of staff	$10,000.00	
Richard H. Heindel (appointed Oct. 23, 1947).	Professional staff.	10,000.00	
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi.	do	9,129.12	
C. C. O'Day	Clerk	[1] 7,549.08 [2] 8,576.10	
Emmett M. O'Grady.	Assistant clerk.	[4] 14,040.38 [2] 4,536.97	
Isabel M. Smith	do	[3] 3,378.27 [2] 4,040.38	
Morella R. Hanson	do	[1] 2,964.45 [2] 3,709.33	
Mary Shepard	do	[3] 3,461.04	

[1] Through Dec. 9, 1947.
[2] Beginning Dec. 10, 1947.
[3] Resigned Dec. 15, 1947.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended during period Jan. 1 through June 30th, previously reported	2,138.66
Amount expended during period July 1 through Dec. 31st, 1947	4,650.76
Balance unexpended	3,210.58
Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee under provisions of S. Res. 161	$25,000.00
Amount expended	4,307.98
Balance unexpended	20,692.02

A. H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 13, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Edward Jarrett	Clerk	$8,339.10	$4,169.55
Edward Cooper	Professional staff member.	8,339.10	4,169.55
Halford G. Davis	do	8,339.10	4,064.18
Vera Burgess	Clerical staff	4,619.73	2,240.85
Harriet Gray	do	3,626.56	1,623.56
Dorothy Prout	do	3,626.56	1,623.56
Martha Shaffer	do	3,212.74	821.00
C. H. Dolan	Air accident investigator (temporary).	8,339.10	4,169.55

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$29,687.56
Amount expended	3,256.36
Balance unexpended	26,431.20

WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 13, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1

to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Philip R. Rodgers	Clerk	$9,050.11	$4,465.77
Earl B. Wixcey	Assistant clerk.	7,549.08	3,774.54
Paul Sample	Clerical assistant.	4,702.50	2,351.28
Crawford C. Heerlein.	do	4,123.08	2,027.06
Vivien Harman	do	3,212.74	1,606.42
Dorothy Murphy	do	2,964.45	1,482.18
Francis G. Cornell [1]	Professional staff member.	9,050.11	2,262.51
Gerard D. Reilly [2]	do	10,000.00	833.33
Thomas E. Shroyer.[2]	do	10,000.00	833.33

[1] Employment terminated Sept. 30, 1947.
[2] Employment terminated July 31, 1947.

Jan. 1–June 30, 1947	$10,000	
July 1–Dec. 31, 1947	8,000	
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure		$18,000.00
Jan. 1–June 30, 1947	$3,660.00	
July 1–Dec. 31, 1947	3,533.35	
Amount expended		7,193.35
Balance unexpended		10,806.65

ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January —, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Richard Arens	Professional staff (legal).	$7,944.09	$3,972.05
Maurice Covert	do	7,944.09	3,899.94
Joseph A. Davis	Assistant clerk	7,944.09	3,972.05
Miriam O. Fox	Stenographer	4,040.38	2,020.19
Helen W. Ganss	do	3,461.04	1,730.52
Margaret Holland	do	3,212.74	1,592.58
Mary Rogers	do	4,040.38	2,020.19
J. Carlisle Ruddy	Professional staff (legal).	7,944.09	3,972.05
H. R. Wilde	Clerk of committee.	10,000.00	5,000.00
Robert B. Young	Professional staff (legal).	7,944.09	3,972.05

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure		$35,000.00
Amount expended		10,081.00
Balance unexpended		24,919.00

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 137, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 9, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Thomas J. Davis	Investigator	$5,695.66	$1,993.44
John A. Loftus	do	5,695.66	1,898.52
Guy M. Massey	do	5,695.66	1,993.44
Fred M. Mesmer	do	5,695.66	1,993.44
Margaret P. Hogan	Stenographer	3,626.56	1,440.53
Lois C. Odham	do	3,626.56	1,259.20
James C. Messersmith.	Clerk	5,695.66	1,993.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure		$50,000.00
Amount expended		16,962.79
Balance unexpended		33,037.21

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. KEM introduced Senate bill 1977, to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1947, so as to permit State and local taxation of property leased thereunder, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1978. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1979. A bill directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell clam in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Maine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1980. A bill for the relief of George M. Vaughn;

S. 1981. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Michimoto; and

S. 1982. A bill for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1983, to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BUSHFIELD, and Mr. YOUNG) introduced Senate bill 1984, to authorize an appropriation for the immediate relief of the Indians of North and South Dakota, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1985, to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act", approved July 19, 1940, which was referred to the Committee on Public lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1986. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake fish-cultural station to the Fish and Game Commissions of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1987. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LOCAL TAXATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize local taxation of certain Government-owned property. The bill would add a new section to the existing law authorizing the Army and Navy to lease all or part of surplus properties, to provide that any such property, or portion thereof, leased to private business shall, during the period of such lease, be subject to taxation by the State and local political subdivisions in which the property is located to the same extent as privately owned property. Provision is made for the taxes to be withheld from the rents collected and paid directly to the local taxing agencies.

As a part of the war effort the Government acquired numerous parcels of real estate, and on many of them costly buildings were erected. As a matter of convenience title to these properties was frequently vested in a Government corporation. In this way Reconstruction Finance Corporation has held title to several large defense plants. So long as the RFC owns title ad valorem taxes on the property are paid by the RFC to the units of local government.

Section 3 (a) of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress, approved August 5, 1947, provides that all right, title, and interest of the RFC to any plants or facilities shall be transferred by it to the United States for the use of the War or Navy Departments upon certification by either of these Departments that the retention of such plants and facilities is necessary for the maintenance of an adequate Naval or Military Establishment, including industrial reserves. When title is in the United States, in accordance with general law, the property becomes tax exempt.

Properties acquired in this manner by the Navy and Army from the RFC are located in or near Kansas City, Mo., Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Columbus, Ohio, Grand Prairie, Tex., Trenton, N. J., Los Angeles, Calif., and Rockford, Ill. I am informed that consideration is being given to the acquisition of properties from the RFC at St. Louis, Mo., Cleveland, Ohio, Euclid, Ohio, Detroit, Mich., and New York, N. Y.

The situation as to taxes follows a general pattern in each instance. By way of illustration, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the effect of one of these transactions on the administration of local government in my home county, which is Jackson County, Mo.

In this county, the Pratt & Whitney aircraft-engine plant, located outside the city limits of Kansas City, Mo., was built and fully equipped by the Defense Plant Corporation during World War II at a cost of over $80,000,000. It consists of a group of brick, steel, and concrete

buildings containing over 3,000,000 square feet of floor space. Until recently title to this plant was in the RFC. It was declared surplus for disposal by the War Assets Administration in December 1946. While the RFC owned the plant, portions of it not needed for the public business were leased to some 22 firms engaged in private industry. During the period of ownership by the RFC taxes were paid to the local governmental agencies based upon the assessed valuation. During the year 1946 the total tax payment on the property amounted to $191,109.99. On December 31, 1947, title to this property was transferred to the United States upon certification of the Navy that it desired to retain this plant as a part of its industrial reserve. The Navy does not now intend to use all this plant for its operations. Its present purpose is to hold the property for possible future use. The Secretary of the Navy has stated that an effort will be made "to find a single tenant who may be permitted by the Department to sublease those portions of the plant for which he has no use." In other words, all or a substantial portion of this plant will be put to private use by private industry. It will not be used for public business, and yet it will be free from taxation by the local governmental units.

The Pratt & Whitney works are located in the Center school district. From 1942 to 1948 the population of the school district was almost doubled, the school enrollment increasing by an additional 735 pupils. The budget requirements of the school district have increased over 100 percent. The increase in number of students and in cost of operating the school district can be attributed almost entirely to the presence of this great industrial plant in the district. While title to the property was held by the RFC, the school district received approximately $80,000 a year in taxes. Now these revenues have been cut off, but the number of students in the district and the cost of operating the school district have not been reduced, since the plant is being used by a large number of business concerns engaged in private industry whose employees live in the district and whose children attend the public schools. The school district is faced with bankruptcy. The county charged with the responsibility of furnishing police protection and other governmental services is severely handicapped by this loss of revenue. The State of Missouri is also a loser.

This story will be found to be substantially the same in every area where the Federal Government is taking title to defense properties, thereby preventing taxation of the property by local governments.

The bill I am introducing is designed to provide revenue to the State and local governments from that part of property owned by the Federal Government and used by private industry. The existing law granting authority to the Army and Navy to lease this property specifically states that each lease shall contain a provision that if Congress makes the property taxable by the State and local governments the terms of the lease shall be renegotiated.

Thomas Jefferson described the New England township system as the "wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government," and likened our Government to the planetary system with each unit revolving within its own proper constitutional orbit. If we are to maintain our American system of local self-government, the local government units must not be starved into nonexistence by the Federal Government denying them revenue with which to carry on their functions.

The bill (S. 1977) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1947, so as to permit State and local taxation of property leased thereunder, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 2 there was submitted to the President pro tempore of the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John W. Snyder, containing a draft of a bill for amendment of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944. The purpose of this draft is to provide that claims under section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act are to be filed within 6 months in order to be allowable and the further purpose is to stop further accruals of such claims.

The afore-mentioned letter and bill were transmitted to me as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am, therefore, now introducing, at the request of the Treasury Department, this measure. I have not had the opportunity to study it or to evaluate the merits of the bill, but I do believe that it should receive the consideration of my committee and, for that purpose, and I am introducing it by request.

I ask that, immediately following my statement, there be reprinted in the RECORD the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury describing the purposes of this bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 2, 1948.

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes."

Section 17 of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 deals with an entirely different subject matter from the remainder of that act. It requires contracting agencies to pay fair compensation to any person who has arranged to furnish or furnished materials, services, or facilities for the prosecution of the war without a formal contract or pursuant to written or oral instructions or request to proceed from a contracting agency. It further requires contracting agencies not to take advantage of formal or technical defects in prime contracts or in the authority of officers or agents who order materials, services, or facilities, to amend, confirm, or ratify contracts or commitments in order to cure such defects and to make fair settlement of obligations created or incurred. It is by now well settled that this section not only permits the enforcement of contracts not evidenced by writing, but creates new classes of obligations when there were mere requests or instructions to proceed and no contracts even of a defective or informal nature.

Claims totaling approximately $65,000,000 have been filed against contracting agencies under section 17, and it is believed that claims for many further millions exist but have not yet been disclosed. There appears to be no Federal statute which would stop the presentation of such claims perhaps even as long as 10 years after their alleged accrual. This situation may result in a serious detriment to the interests of the Government. Frequently the evidence which controls the decision of a section 17 claim consists of oral testimony. Some of the claims are against agencies which are now being or have been completely liquidated, for example, the Civilian Production Administration (formerly WPB); others, although against permanent agencies, are found on the alleged acts of bureaus or divisions no longer in existence, or of personnel no longer in the service of the Government. Under these circumstances the possibility of successful enforcement of fraudulent claims tends to increase as time passes. Therefore, after consulting the Contract Settlement Advisory Board created by section 5 of the act, I have decided to request the Congress to amend section 17 by cutting off any claim under section 17 not presented in writing to the contracting agency in the form required by regulation 12 of the Office of Contract Settlement, within 6 months after approval of the amendment. The enclosed draft of a bill would, if enacted, accomplish that purpose.

I have also considered the allied question of whether it would be possible for any new claims under section 17 to accrue at the present time. I am advised that according to the better view this would not be possible. However, there may be some doubt as to this because of the fact that legally the war has not ended and to a limited extent war powers are still being exercised. Therefore, the draft also includes a clause providing that no further section 17 claims shall accrue after the date of the amendment. Of course, no admission is or should be implied that any claim could accrue up to the date of the amendment and a section is included in the bill to that effect.

It is respectfully requested that you lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I would be pleased to furnish any further information which the Congress may require in connection with this bill.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The bill (S. 1983) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF INDIANS OF NORTH AND SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the senior and junior Senators from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY and Mr. BUSHFIELD], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize an appropriation for the immediate relief of the Indians of North and South Dakota, and for other purposes.

I might say, Mr. President, that last week a meeting was held at which were present the Commissioner, as well as members of the Bureau of Indian Affairs stationed in North and South Dakota, together with members of two welfare boards. It was then stated that the only money available for the relief of the Indians was the sum of $10,000, which has already been allocated. The States of North and South Dakota cooperate with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and are furnishing funds to help the Indians. In addition to that, Benson County, N. Dak., where one of the tribes of Indians is located, has appropriated $1,500. Owing to the severity of the winter and the unusual amount of snow in that region, these Indians are really hungry, and in some instances do not have enough to eat or enough to wear. Therefore, on behalf of myself and the other Senators I mentioned, I introduce the bill and ask that the appropriate committee give it immediate consideration, so that hunger and want may be alleviated among the Indians of North and South Dakota.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I did not catch the purpose of the bill. What does it provide? I am very much interested in the matter dealt with by the bill.

Mr. LANGER. The purpose of the bill is to help the Indian tribes of North and South Dakota. It is a bill similar to that introduced by the Senator from New Mexico to help the Navajo Indians of New Mexico and Arizona.

Mr. HATCH. I supposed that was the purpose of the bill. Does the bill call for an appropriation of money?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Does the bill request an appropriation by the Federal Government to provide adequate assistance to the suffering Indians of the States of North and South Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. The total sum asked for in the bill is $250,000, of which $150,000 would be made available immediately, and $100,000 would be used to provide useful employment on permanent construction projects by the Indians of the two States.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield further, I will say that I assume the Senator, by taking this position, is following the long-established and well-known policy that the welfare of the Indian is a primary obligation of the Federal Government.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. I may say that I did all I could to assist the Navajos, when the bill which would provide aid to the Navajos was before the Senate, because I knew the great interest of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico in that problem. I was delighted to do what I could to help in the passage of that bill.

Mr. HATCH. I appreciate the attitude taken by the Senator from North Dakota in respect to the Navajos. I want to help the Senator in the passage of his bill. I assert here and now, as I have heretofore, and as I shall on every occasion I can, that the problem of the American Indian, wherever he may be, is a problem for the Federal Government.

Mr. LANGER. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the position taken by the Senator from New Mexico. I want to call attention to the fact that Texas has a very small Indian population. We have a little colony of Indians in Texas called the Alabama Indians. Until a few years ago the Federal Government did not give them a dime. The State of Texas appropriated money to pay for lands and build houses, and furnish such aid as those Indians received. We were finally successful in inducing the Bureau of Indian Affairs to make some sort of allowances. I am not now familiar with the details. Of course, it is a Federal responsibility to give the Indians such aid as they may require. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LANGER. Knowing the warm heart of the distinguished Senator from Texas and his interest in the downtrodden, the poor, and the Indians, I am delighted to note his support for this measure.

The bill (S. 1934) to authorize an appropriation for the immediate relief of the Indians of North and South Dakota, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BUSHFIELD, and Mr. YOUNG), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

SCHOOL CONDITIONS AT GRAND COULEE AND BOULDER DAM

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as we construct great hydroelectric, storage, and reclamation projects throughout the country, we encounter difficulties in connection with caring for service communities. At Grand Coulee and at Boulder Dam there is a pressing condition with reference to the school children who belong to communities serving those great projects. There is in the State of Nevada today a question of taking care of the schools of Boulder City, which is a service community, and a very beautiful community, constructed around and depending upon Boulder Dam. In the near future there will be similar communities created in the State of Nebraska, perhaps in Montana, and I know in connection with Davis Dam in Arizona. We shall face in connection with each of these projects a question similar to that which exists today at Grand Coulee and at Boulder City.

During the years Boulder City has been in existence, the school problem has been dealt with from year to year through congressional action. However, during the consideration of recent appropriation bills, it has become increasingly manifest that a basic law must be devised which will provide adequate support for the schools. With that in mind, I draw to the attention of Senators from Nebraska, Washington, Oregon, and other States in which reclamation projects are contemplated, the bill I am now about to introduce, dealing exclusively with the community of Boulder City. While it is a bill designed to take care of the school problem in that particular community, a similar condition is expected to arise in each of the other communities to which I have referred. I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill dealing with the subject.

The bill (S. 1935) to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. AIKEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 189), which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 75, Eightieth Congress, agreed to February 21, 1947, which is hereby made available for the purposes of this resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, ETC.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BALL submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2759. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against com-

mon carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; and

H. R. 4071. A bill to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BROTHERHOOD WEEK—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on the subject of Brotherhood Week, the week of February 22–29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMISTICE DAY ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. John L. Sullivan, Secretary of the Navy, at Armistice Day ceremonies sponsored by the American Legion, at Arlington National Cemetery, on November 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PALESTINE SITUATION—ADDRESS BY DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman of the American Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and of the American Zionist Emergency Council, delivered in New York City on December 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BYRD

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Economy in Government," written by Senator BYRD and published in the Elks magazine for December 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD PEACE—ARTICLE BY MISS NELL BATTLE LEWIS

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Miss Nell Battle Lewis dealing with world peace, published in a recent issue of the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARDS TO HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS FOR ACHIEVEMENTS IN SCHOLASTIC JOURNALISM—ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with awards presented to two honor high-school students for achievements in the field of scholastic journalism, published in a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FINAL CHOICE—ARTICLE BY W. T. HOLLIDAY

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Final Choice," by W. T. Holliday, president of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, published in the January 1948 issue of the Reader's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

THIRD PARTY THEME SONG: "I'M WILD ABOUT HENRY"—EDITORIAL BY DANIEL M. KIDNEY

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Third Party Theme Song: 'I'm Wild about Henry,'" by Daniel M. Kidney, from the Indianapolis Times of January 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

HENRY WALLACE'S THIRD PARTY—EDITORIAL BY DANIEL M. KIDNEY

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Henry Wallace's Third Party," by Daniel M. Kidney, from the New York World Telegram of January 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar on Monday last, when Calendar No. 591, House bill 966, a bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), was reached, the question arose as to whether or not an identical Senate bill had previously been passed by both the House and Senate and approved by the President. House bill 966 went over pending investigation, on the query of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I am told that an examination of the records in the Secretary's office discloses the fact that Senate bill 1494, introduced by the Senator from North Dakota, was passed by both Houses, and signed by the President on August 4, 1947. It is now Public Law 325. I ask the Senator from North Dakota if that statement is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Nebraska is correct. Senate bill 1494 was passed some time ago.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to clear the calendar, inasmuch as an identical Senate bill has been passed, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 966 be indefinitely postponed and taken from the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DREDGE "AJAX"—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on July 23, 1947, the Senate passed House bill 4229, providing that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States. There is now pending on the Senate Calendar, under the heading "Motions for reconsideration," a motion to reconsider the vote by which this bill was passed.

A bill ipsissimis verbis with House bill 4229 has already been enacted into law. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill passed the Senate be reconsidered, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the vote is reconsidered, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

REHABILITATION OF THE FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate passed House bill 3834, to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes. I desire to spread on the RECORD a motion to reconsider in due course of time, at a later date, the vote by which the bill was passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

AMERICA'S WINTER OLYMPIC TEAMS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments of the Senate's time to try to direct the attention of its Members and the country to a situation involving a group of America's most effective ambassadors of good will, good sportsmanship, and peace.

America's winter olympic teams are now on the European Continent preparing to compete with the representatives of other nations in the first postwar olympic contests. America's skating team is now participating in the meets at Prague and our skiing team is practicing for participation in the meets to be held at St. Moritz. The members of these teams are America's outstanding participants in skating and skiing. On their uniforms they wear the American flag, and they are in these war-torn countries abroad as the worthy representatives of American youth and as the skilled representatives of the American people as a whole.

My reason for calling the attention of the Senate and of the country to our Olympic teams today is that I have received word that they are without the financial support which is necessary if they are to go through as America's representatives in the first postwar Olympic games. I am sure all Senators will agree with me that at a time when all the world needs a vivid demonstration of the good sportsmanship and friendly competition which is so typical of our American Nation, it would be sad indeed if American representatives were forced to withdraw from Olympic competition because of the lack of financial support. Financial backing for our Olympic teams is not the province of our Government. That is understood by those who will compete at Prague and St. Moritz in America's name. The financial support for American participation in this finer phase of good neighbor relations must come from the American people. My thought is that a friendly voice in the United States Senate today might help arouse the interest of our people in the good will undertaking of representative American youth in the winter Olympic competitions, and lead to the financial support which is vitally needed at this moment. I am sure that if the people of our country are informed regarding the need for their help they will back these young Americans fully in order that we who have fought for and now work for peace may have the benefit of the help which members of American Olympic teams can give our vital cause.

My State of New Hampshire is famous, among other things, for its winter sports, and I know first-hand the good that is accomplished at home and abroad by those who engage in friendly skiing and skating competition. I hope the American public will back these American winter Olympic teams so that our competition from the United States may be effective in promoting good sportsmanship and good will and that our teams may be couriers of peace abroad.

SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES TO VETERANS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe that all Members of the Senate fully appreciate the fact that in politics one must have a good sense of humor in connection with criticisms, attacks, and "smears" which appear from time to time in the press and elsewhere. I do have such a good sense of humor, and I think I have demonstrated that I can "roll with the punches." However, there are times when one must fight back a little. There are times when it is important that one keep the record clear.

As a result of certain stories which are appearing in the press today I have received a considerable amount of joshing from some of my colleagues because of the fact that my name has been linked with a lobbying project which is being conducted on Capitol Hill this week, known as Operation Subsistence. Thus a story appeared this morning in the Times-Herald of this city which indicates that the promoters of this particular lobby have linked my name with it.

I know nothing about the facts, but it is alleged in the press that at least there is a Communist source and inspiration for what is known as Operation Subsistence. It is alleged in the press that some veterans in institutions of higher learning have been encouraged to come to Washington to carry on lobbying in support of certain bills pending before the House relating to veterans' subsistence. It is alleged in the press that some of these veterans who were persuaded to come to Washington by the promoters of this lobby called Operation Subsistence have expressed to Members of the Senate—and one of them expressed the opinion to me personally—that they now believe that they were duped into coming to Washington as a part of some Communist propaganda. As I say, I know nothing about the facts, because I know nothing about the origin of the plan for the lobbying movement which is being referred to as Operation Subsistence. I have no connection with it whatsoever.

It is alleged in the press today that these veterans have been told—and one of them has stated to me personally that he has been told—that one of their friends behind this movement of Operation Subsistence is the junior Senator from Oregon. There is no basis in fact for any such representation. I do not criticize the press for carrying such a story because I have no doubt that such a representation has been made, but I do wish to point out that it is a false representation.

Hence, Mr. President, I wish to keep the record perfectly straight. I say for the record here and now that I know nothing about the movement called Operation Subsistence other than what I state in this speech. I am in no way connected with it, directly or indirectly.

Further, in regard to the veterans' legislation itself, I am very proud of the fact that my name appears on the legislation. If what is being attempted is to give the impression that I am a friend of the veterans, that is absolutely accurate, but apparently an entirely different motivation, judging from the stories in the press, is behind this particular lobby. I suppose the fact that my name appears on the veterans' legislation which is involved in this discussion serves as a springboard for creating a false impression as to my connection with some subversive element, if a subversive element in fact is attempting to carry on lobbying activities in connection with my veterans' legislation.

Let me relate a little history in regard to this legislation. Day before yesterday I was called to the reception room by a group of veterans, just as were a good number of other Senators on Monday afternoon. There I met a group of veterans, as some of the rest of the Members of the Senate did, who represented that they wished to discuss the status of my veterans' legislation. I said to those veterans exactly what already appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and what I placed in the RECORD in my last speech on veterans' legislation, last July. I pointed out to them that I had done all that could be done in the Senate regarding my legislation, because it had already passed the Senate. I am perfectly willing to stand on my record as to what happened in the United States Senate in connection with that legislation.

I state today what I stated last July on the floor of the Senate, that the destiny of the legislation now rests with the leadership of the House of Representatives. It has passed the Senate. It cannot go to the White House until it is passed by the House of Representatives. That simply happens to be a parliamentary fact, and I pointed that out in my Senate speech in July.

So when the veterans who called me to the reception room on Monday asked me, "What can we do?" I said, "The problem rests with the House of Representatives and not with the Senate, unless an attempt is made further to amend the legislation." I said to them what I said to a large group of veterans in Oregon last week, that, so far as I am concerned, in view of the changes in the cost of living since the measure was passed in the Senate last July, I think a good case can be made for increasing the subsistence allowance in the legislation by approximately 10 percent, making it an increase of 25 percent instead of 15 percent. But I also advised the veterans whom I met in the reception room day before yesterday, as I advised the veterans in Oregon last week, that I thought the possibility of amending the legislation in any respect was a most remote possibility, and that the proper course to follow would be to get the measure pending in the House passed and on its way to the White House.

Of course, Mr. President, in my speech of last July I said, and I say now, that the responsibility for the quick passage of the pending veterans' bill rests on the leadership of the House of Representatives, and I hope they will proceed quickly to pass it. I certainly hope that they will not permit any attempt on the part of any subversive element in this country to smear any of us, either in the Senate or in the House, if such an attempt is being made, to cause them to hesitate for a moment in putting sound and needed veterans' legislation through the House just as rapidly as possible.

I make this statement today because I want my Republican colleagues in the Senate, as well as in the House, to know that my position on the legislation in question was made perfectly clear last July, perfectly clear last week in Oregon, and perfectly clear when I talked to the group of veterans day before yesterday. It has no connection whatsoever, may I say, Mr. President, with any lobbying tactics on the part of any group of Communists of non-Communists. I simply say now, as I said last July, that I think it is our duty, as representatives of the people of this county, to see that justice is done in the interests of our veterans by the passage of this veterans' legislation through the Congress and by the signing of it by the President of the United States.

I repeat now what I said last July, that I shall take my chances on the legislation being signed when it reaches the White House, because a large majority of Democratic Senators voted for it. Any argument to the effect that because the President, in his message on the state of the Union in January 1947, recommended against the passage of any veterans' legislation, I think is not applicable to this particular type of legislation. But if it is, I shall take my chances with a Presidential veto, because I think we have the votes to override a veto.

I say to the leadership of my party that this is a grand opportunity to make clear to the veterans of this country that we stand for fairness and justice for the veterans, and it is a grand opportunity to make clear to the President of the United States that when we give him an opportunity to sign fair and just legislation in the interest of the veterans he can either sign it or run his chances of a veto being overridden by the Congress. However, I am convinced that President Truman will agree with us on the merits of this legislation if the Congress gives him a chance to sign it.

Mr. President, there is another point I wish to make in regard to any Communist smear of me, and that is that I know of no one in the Senate of the United States who, on the record, has made more clear his unequivocal and absolute opposition to communism in all forms than has the junior Senator from Oregon. I know of no man in the Senate of the United States, without exception, who has made it more perfectly clear on the record that he is opposed completely, thoroughly, and absolutely to the international policies of noncooperation of Soviet Russia. I said to a very large audience in the State of Oregon last week that I wanted it definitely understood that, so far as the junior Senator from Oregon was concerned, he intended to go right down the line, point by point, with that great leader in the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in support of the objectives of the Marshall plan. I shall remain open-minded, as I am sure Senator VANDENBERG will, to suggestions for improving the Marshall plan, but I shall support its basic objectives.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that one of the things which commends the Mar-

shall plan most highly to the Senate and the American people is the fact that Soviet Russia has announced her intention to sabotage, defeat, and prevent any effective operation of that plan. I do not know how anyone can make himself more clear in regard to his opposition to the policies of Soviet Russia and everything for which communism stands than I.

Mr. President, the position of the junior Senator from Oregon on communism is not of recent date. Go back through the record over the years, and I defy anyone to find in it a scintilla of evidence that would support any criticism or charge against the junior Senator from Oregon that he favors in any shape, way, or manner Communist principles in any form whatsoever. I say with all my vigor and with whatever ability I may possess that I intend to oppose in every form whatsoever all communistic technique, principles, and policies, not only in my own country but as a world policy.

I close, Mr. President, by saying that I think the chips are down on the table of international gambles, because—and let us be frank about it—no one can foresee with certainty what the future holds for the destiny of our Nation. But there is certainly much evidence that we are confronted with a world situation today in which one great power, possibly capable of becoming the greatest power in all history—Soviet Russia—is not giving us a demonstration of cooperative relationships as an ally, but is indicating along many fronts that she holds an unfriendly attitude toward the United States.

I lay down one simple little test which Russia can meet if she wants to demonstrate to us and to the world that she intends to promote the peace of the world. Just let her lift the iron curtain of nonaccessibility. Let her move in the sunlight of world observation. That is the first step she has to take to demonstrate that she intends to assume friendly attitudes toward us and the rest of the world. Until she does that, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon will take the position in the Senate of the United States and on the platforms of America—because I think a great job of public education has to be done in the immediate months ahead in regard to this problem of foreign policy and relations with Russia—that we must keep ourselves as a nation so strong that at a moment's notice, day or night, we can demonstrate to Russia our intention and our determination to preserve the peace. Until she meets that very simple test, it will be my position that we must proceed in Europe, irrespective of Russian policy, toward the development of a sound, efficient, and workable Marshall plan which will give to the people in Europe who still are fighting the fight for freedom an opportunity to live as free men. Such an objective means, of course, that Europe must be economically rehabilitated, and the people of Europe must have an opportunity once again to sustain themselves. That is why, Mr. President, I am going to fight in this session of Congress for a workable Marshall plan. It is because I think it is essential not only to the prosperity of America but to the maintenance of peace throughout the world.

But, as I said before—and I close with this thought, Mr. President—the very fact that Soviet Russia is out to sabotage and destroy the successful operation of the Marshall plan should commend the plan to every American. Russia's opposition should lead us to pause and consider whether that opposition itself is not one of the soundest arguments for going forward without costly delay in putting the Marshall plan into operation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say that no person could be more right than the Senator from Oregon is right in the remarks he has just made. Certainly his attitude toward having Russia lift the iron curtain should be generally adopted. What he has said about maintaining our armed forces to the highest possible strength is also right. I agree wholeheartedly with what the Senator has said; but I deplore the condition of the world which forces such a policy.

Mr. President, the Marshall plan must be enacted into law. We must maintain our armed strength.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. On yesterday it was reported to me, by an authority who seemed to know, that after the disposition of the so-called Mundt bill, the Senate would proceed to consider the St. Lawrence waterway treaty or agreement. I wonder whether the Senator from Nebraska can tell me anything about that.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that the St. Lawrence seaway legislation will not be taken up next week. It is my understanding that before it comes before the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who now is conducting the hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations, would like to be heard. With that in mind, I think the Senator from Illinois can rest assured that there is little likelihood that the St. Lawrence seaway legislation will be taken up next week.

However, I feel that in keeping with an announcement made here recently by the chairman of the steering committee, it should be said that it is likely the bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act will be taken up for consideration next week. I make that statement at this time for the information of all who are interested. This is not an announcement that the bill will definitely be considered at that time, for I am not sure that that can be done, inasmuch as two bills on the subject have been introduced, and I think an attempt will be made to report to the Senate the bill which most Senators will find they can support. But I certainly would take the responsibility of saying that the St. Lawrence seaway matter will not come up for consideration next week.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for that information.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, and I ask the Senator to excuse me for not noticing when he entered the Chamber. I should like to have him speak for himself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me say that the St. Lawrence seaway bill is in charge of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I do not know what final arrangement he has made; but it is my understanding that not later than the week after next, the seaway bill will be on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank both Senators for that information.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Mark Edwin Andrews, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, ETC.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as it seems to me that the work of the Senate for today is about concluded, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3342, Calendar No. 861, a bill popularly designated as the Voice of America or the Mundt bill. I wish to have that bill made the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3342), which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Friday next, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 16, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 14, 1948:

COMMISSIONER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Guy Mason, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Walter M. W. Splawn, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1954.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Charles Oliphant, of Maryland, to be assistant general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in place of John Philip Wenchel, resigned.

Mortimer Jordan, of Alabama, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Alabama, in place of Henry J. Willingham, resigned.

John T. Jarecki, of Illinois, to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Illinois, in place of Nigel D. Campbell, resigned.

(These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the last recess of the Senate.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Martin R. Bradley, of Michigan, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Howard L. Doyle, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois. (Mr. Doyle is now serving under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Benjamin F. Ellis, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Alabama. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Gerald K. Nellis, of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Theodore B. Werner, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be captain

Gordon M. Johnson, AGD, O29406.

To be first lieutenants

George W. Gorman, AC, O43058.
Paul N. Harlow, AC, O31590.
Benjamin G. Musser, MC, O56894.
Howard R. Schroeder, AC, O56518.

To be second lieutenant

Kenneth B. Smith, AC, O49722.

NOTE.—The above listed officers were serving in the Regular Army in incorrect grades due to discrepancy in original records of birth. These officers were discharged from their incorrect grades on December 29, 1947, and were given recess appointment in the proper Regular Army grade on December 30, 1947.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as Commander in Chief, Pacific and United States Pacific Fleet.

Vice Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commander United States Naval Forces, Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. John D. Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Vice Adm. Harold B. Sallada, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commander Air Force, United States Pacific Fleet.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from the 1st day of February 1948.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, as we come into Thy holy presence, be Thou the master light for all our ways. Direct us and enjoin us to be brave and calm in the discussion of every question. In our valley of decision, lead us to acquit ourselves as true Americans, cognizant of our own defects and patient with the errors of others. We pray Thee to bless our Speaker with renewed strength, and for all who bear the authority and responsibility of leadership, may they and all citizens make the great adventure of faith, and, believing, find the inspiration to labor on. We pray in our Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the United Mine Workers Journal.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ruth Finney entitled "Public Power Lauded," which appeared in the San Francisco News.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Dairy Industries Association.

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BRAMBLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a speech made by Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE, of Indiana, chairman of the special House Subcommittee on Foot and Mouth Disease, before the forty-eighth annual conference of the Veterinary Alumni Society, University of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia on January 6, 1948.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter she received from the White House regarding the oil situation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 10 minutes following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Armed Forces magazine.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, of Illinois, relative to the Marshall plan.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Explosives for Palestine."

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Senator IVES on the occasion of a farewell dinner to Dr. Silver.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each instance to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and all other special orders, my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute on the subject of The Road to Socialism and to extend and revise my remarks and include a short statement from David Lawrence on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the streams of American risk capital are rapidly dry-

ing up. Our people are saving and investing very little these days. During the prewar days we saved 25 percent of our national income and invested those savings in ever-expanding American business enterprises. Today we are saving only 6 percent of our swollen national income; therefore, the streams of risk capital needed for the expansion of industry, the creation of jobs, and the production of scarce goods have become tiny trickles and are rapidly drying up altogether.

Great Britain, before World War I, also saved 25 percent of her national income. After World War I, Great Britain's savings kept dwindling until they became almost nil. As a result, her industrial plants and her mines—for lack of new capital—deteriorated and became obsolescent. The strain of World War II was too much for these starved industrial plants, and so we had to come to her rescue with over $30,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease materials. After World War II, Great Britain was forced into Government ownership and socialism, because the Government was the only source from which capital could be secured for the rehabilitation of British industry. What is true of Great Britain is also true of France and Italy.

Mr. Speaker, are stifling taxes, bureaucratic restrictions, and Government encroachment upon American business forcing American industry to travel today along the same road Great Britain and France have traveled, the road that leads to socialism? Is not it about time for our bureaucrats in Washington to stop, look, and listen?

David Lawrence speaks with authority when he says:

> If the risk capital system is to survive, and private individuals, instead of a socialistic government, are to furnish the capital for improvement of our plants and productive facilities in order to produce more goods and bring down prices, there must be savings over and above the needs for household expenses. It is from the savings of the investor class that funds must be obtained for working capital in American enterprises.

WISCONSIN NEWSPAPER OPPOSES MARGARINE TAX

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, even Wisconsin, claimed to be the greatest dairying State in the Union, is beginning to see the light on margarine. I append an editorial advocating removal of all Federal margarine taxes which appeared in the December 20 issue of—believe it or not—the Milwaukee Journal:

THREE QUESTIONS ABOUT OLEO

> A Milwaukee housewife, who finds it impossible to provide near dollar butter for a family of six on a meager budget, asks three questions about oleomargarine:
>
> Why it is impossible to buy oleo in many Milwaukee stores? Why, when you can get it, is the price so much higher than in Illinois? And why don't the manufacturers color the margarine themselves and save the housewife a messy job?
>
> Those are all good questions. They merit a frank and clear answer.
>
> The reason many Milwaukee stores do not sell oleo is that, to do so, they must have both a State and a Federal license. The State license costs $25; the Federal $6. A store has to be sure of selling considerable oleo before it buys these licenses.
>
> The reason the price is higher here than in Illinois is that Wisconsin has a tax of 15 cents a pound on all oleo sold in the State. Furthermore, a wholesaler, in addition to paying the Federal license fee of $200, must pay a Wisconsin license fee of $500. The high State fee, added to the high tax, means a considerable boost in price.
>
> The reason oleo comes to the consumer white lies in the fact that there is a special Federal tax on colored margarine. There are also special fees for wholesalers and retailers of the colored product. The Federal tax on white margarine is ¼ cent a pound. The tax goes up to 10 cents a pound if the margarine is yellow. The Federal license for wholesalers is $200, if they sell only white oleo; if they sell the colored, the fee is $480. The Federal retail license similarly goes up from $6 to $48.
>
> The way to get manufacturers to color their margarine at the factory is to get the special Federal tax and license fee repealed.
>
> The way to get cheaper oleo available in more places is to get both the State and the Federal taxes and license fees largely reduced or removed altogether.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I also on December 21 read the same editorial. Now, the Milwaukee Journal has the right to express itself on this oleo business if they wish to do so. They have expressed similar opinions for several years. There is no law against it. The gentleman from New York should be advised that when it comes to the time when he needs someone to help him put over this oleo business, I hope he will not have to depend upon a Democratic paper to do it. That does not mean anything up in Wisconsin coming from a Democratic paper, but I ask the gentleman to find any similar editorial from a Republican paper in the State of Wisconsin—yes, one—that gives any credence to this product, this concoction known as oleo.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Are the oleo taxes paid by Democrats or Republicans or both?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I presume most of them are paid by the Republicans, because they are the ones who make the money. The Democrats spend the money.

OLEOMARGARINE—DISCHARGE PETITION NO. 12

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the subject of oleo is a very vital subject to me. I rise to tell my distinguished colleague from the State of New York that I have today placed on the desk a petition to discharge my bill on this matter. Naturally, I do not want any of you to get killed in the rush to sign that petition, but you had better sign it, for you will need it, that is the only way under God's sun you will be able to get the bill pried loose from a committee on which the gentleman from Wisconsin holds membership.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address he delivered recently.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable Henry A. Wallace on December 29.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report from the Soil Conservation Bureau.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a program adopted by the Association of Letter Carriers which has just concluded a meeting in Washington.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one of which I show that over a billion dollars' worth of automobiles were shipped out of the United States last year, and in the other an article from Rhode Island showing that even they feel the ill effects of the new New Deal agricultural approach.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, in the President's budget message under the subheading "Budget receipts," the President makes the comment that estimated revenues for 1949 will be greater by $1,300,000,000 than the 1948 estimate. On that prognostication, the 1949 budget is greater by almost $2,000,000,000 than the present year.

The President goes on to say that the estimates assume continuation of the present high levels of business activities and incomes, continued full employment, and, mind you, stable prices close to the present level. That to my mind indicates that the President intends to keep present inflation and terrifically high prices as they now exist. I do not think that the people of the country are going to accept that position.

But the double talk is in the words which immediately followed the President's assumption and those words are as follows:

> These assumptions presuppose an effective anti-inflation program.

So that in the one paragraph you have a Presidential comment that his budget is dependent on stable prices close to the present level, and therefore inferentially he will do everything to maintain that level, and at the same time that his assumptions presuppose an effective anti-inflation program which, to the collective mind of the people, I am sure would indicate that something ought to be done to bring down present high prices. It seems to me that the President's straddle of the political horse is a lopsided one.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a communication from the Honorable CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star of last Sunday announced that officials from the District of Columbia and 22 States now adversely affected by the fuel-oil shortage would meet here in Washington next Thursday. According to the Sunday Star, the board of managers of the Council of State Governments called on Congress to provide for administrative authority to control the shipment of oil.

This statement from the board of managers of the Council of State Governments follows:

> In the face of the fact that the supply of fuel oil is ample to satisfy the demand, the crisis that has been permitted to arise has apparently been brought about by a lack of administrative authority.

Based on that misinformation, the board then adopted a resolution urging that prompt remedial legislation be passed to assure transportation of an adequate supply of fuel oil to American homes and businesses.

It is becoming more apparent each day that someone here in Washington is deliberately misleading the oil coordinators and the Governors of States now suffering from a lack of fuel oil. The record is amply clear that the President now has complete control over the shipments abroad of fuel oil. With the exception of shipments to Canada, all other exporters must secure an export license.

As early as last June committees of this Congress made formal inquiry into the possibility of a fuel-oil shortage during the present winter. On page 11747 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 19, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] covered the situation very thoroughly. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] quoted from testimony presented before three different committees of the House of Representatives, proving beyond any shadow of a doubt that the executive branch of the Government now has, and has had for some time, ample authority to control shipments of fuel oil from the United States.

As a result of the suggestion made by a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, conferences have been held with the proper representatives of the Canadian Government with a view of reducing our shipments of fuel oil to Canada for the time being. The Canadian Government seemed more than willing to reduce their imports of fuel oil from the United States by at least 50 percent.

The blame for the present shortage of fuel oil cannot be laid at the door of the Eightieth Congress. I hope that Members whose States will be represented in the Washington fuel-oil conference next Thursday direct the attention of their governors to the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

THE ECONOMIC REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 498)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1948.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

INCREASES IN THE RATES OF PENSION PAYABLE TO VETERANS OF INDIAN WARS

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4055) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Line 5, after "any", insert "public."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLES OF WAR

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on instructions of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 424 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2575, to amend the Articles of War, as just read by the Clerk.

The rule is an open one. After 2 hours of general debate the bill will be read for amendment and the usual privilege will be extended to all members of the Committee of the Whole to express their opinions if they so desire.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to discuss the detailed provisions of this bill at the present time. I may say with much satisfaction that the discussion held in the meeting of the Rules Committee, upon which occasion representatives of the Committee on Armed Services were present and explained this bill, gave us much encouragement.

As will be remembered, toward the close of hostilities and subsequent to the close of hostilities a considerable wave of complaint was heard all over the country with respect to the court-martial system then prevalent in the Army. The Armed Services Committee embarked upon a very

thorough study of the whole question and this bill is the result of that study.

I desire to make but one other observation. The study made by the Armed Services Committee commenced long before the passage of the so-called unification bill and was finished before the passage of that bill. To all intents and purposes the Subcommittee on Armed Services had reached, generally speaking, a decision as to what should be done with reference to the court-martial system in the Army. Obviously it was impractical for that committee to embark upon a new study and endeavor to merge together legislation with respect to the Navy and its court-martial system with that of the Army.

My information is that the Armed Services Committee is embarking upon an investigation or inquiry into the necessity, perhaps, of revising the Navy procedure, and upon a later date, perhaps, the House will receive recommendations on that subject. In any event, this bill, in my humble judgment, and that of the members of the Committee on Rules who heard the discussion, accomplishes a great reform and is entitled to the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time. Under the rule, the minority is entitled to some time, if it desires it. Hearing no requests, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2575, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] is entitled to 1 hour and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is entitled to 1 hour.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the time on the minority side be controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will be recognized.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I understand that both sides of the committee are in favor of this bill. I am opposed to the bill in its present writing. I should like to have some time for the opposition, and will ask either one of the gentlemen in control of the time to yield some time for the opposition, so that both sides may be stated.

Mr. ELSTON. We shall be very glad to yield some time to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 2575 is to amend the Articles of War and improve the Army system of justice.

In order that the Members may have a full appreciation of the importance of the legislation which is presented here today, I consider it both advisable and necessary to relate, in a general way, the events which have brought the subject of military justice to our attention.

During the course of World War II approximately 11,000,000 men saw service in the United States Army, and of that number approximately 80,000 were convicted by general courts martial. Even before the cessation of hostilities it was apparent to the War Department and to the Congress that a detailed study of the Army system of justice was appropriate, if not mandatory. Accordingly, in 1944 and 1945, the War Department sent Col. Phillip McCook, former prominent New York jurist, to various theaters of operation to conduct such studies. Additional reports were submitted to the War Department from other sources.

Within a few months after the end of hostilities the matter was brought to the attention of the American Bar Association, and on March 25, 1946, the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice was appointed by order of the Secretary of War. The committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Arthur T. Vanderbilt, and referred to as the Vanderbilt committee, consisted of nine outstanding lawyers and Federal jurists from eight States and the District of Columbia. From March 25, 1946, until December 13, 1946, a period of almost 9 months, the members of that committee engaged in studies, investigations, and hearings, and availed themselves of voluminous statistical data of the Judge Advocate General's Department and other sources.

At full committee hearings in Washington the Secretary of War and Under Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, the Commander of the Army Ground Forces, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General, numerous other officers, and the representatives of five veterans' organizations were heard. There were numerous personal interviews, supplemented by letters, and the digesting of 321 answers to questionnaires from both military and nonmilitary personnel. Additional widely advertised regional public hearings were held at New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Raleigh, Atlanta, Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle. The subsequent report of the committee was based on these extensive inquiries.

During the Seventy-ninth Congress, a Military Affairs Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. CARL T. DURHAM, devoted more than 1 year to detailed study of the Army system of justice. The report of the Durham committee has been thoroughly considered in our deliberations.

Additional studies have been conducted by special committees of the American Legion, VFW, AMVETS, AVC, the New York County Lawyers' Association, the War Veterans' Bar Association, the Judge Advocate Generals' Association, and the Phi Alpha Delta law fraternity. The reports and recommendations of each of these groups were made available to the Armed Services Committee and representatives of each of the organizations appeared before the committee in public hearings in support of their recommendations. Other witnesses, who had particular knowledge of the subject by virtue of their service and experience in the recent war, were heard.

In our opinion, the combined efforts of these organizations and individuals represented the most comprehensive study of military justice that has been conducted in the history of our country.

In general, the main accomplishments of the bill may be outlined as follows:

First. Enlisted men have been authorized to sit as members of a courts martial.

Second. It subjects officers to trial by special courts martial.

Third. It prohibits the unlawful influence of courts martial or the members thereof.

Fourth. Warrant officers are authorized to sit as members of courts martial.

Fifth. An accused, if he so desires, may have counsel at the pretrial investigation.

Sixth. Authority to grant a bad-conduct discharge has been granted to general and special courts martial.

Seventh. The review and appellate provisions have been strengthened.

Eighth. A lesser punishment than death or life imprisonment for murder or rape has been provided.

Ninth. A lesser punishment than dismissal from service for officers drunk during time of war has been provided.

Tenth. The authority of commanding officers under the one hundred and fourth article of war has been increased so far as it pertains to officers but not to enlisted men.

Eleventh. A separate Judge Advocate General's Corps has been established.

From the foregoing general summary, the following points merit additional consideration:

First. Should enlisted men be authorized to sit as members of a courts martial in the trial of other enlisted men?

The Army agrees that they should, at the option of the appointing authority. Our committee agrees that they should, at the option of the defendant and has amended section 3 accordingly. We seriously doubt that the inclusion of enlisted men as members of the court will benefit enlisted men who are defendants. However, the choice is properly a right of the defendant. Once having exercised that right he must assume the responsibility for the results of his choice.

Second. Should the trial judge advocate and defense counsel be attorneys, if available?

There is unanimous agreement that such personnel must be attorneys and we have so provided in section 8.

Third. A greater equality in the treatment of officers and enlisted men should be provided.

The committee agrees that a greater equality must be attained and has accordingly amended section 10, making officers subject to trial by special courts martial. Heretofore, the President has had authority to exempt such classes as he may designate from trial by special and summary courts martial and under that authority has exempted officers from trial by these two courts. As a result, officers have been triable by general courts martial only. This resulted in a reluctance on the part of superior commanders to subject officers to trial and possible dismissal for comparatively minor offenses for which enlisted men were tried and convicted. Section 21, page 16, provides that, in time of war, an officer, in lieu of a dishonorable discharge, may be reduced to the grade of private.

Since a commanding officer's authority under the one hundred and fourth article of war has been increased in this bill so that he may forfeit one-half of an officer's pay for 3 months, rather than 1 month, a far greater restraint on officers will be the inevitable result. Enlisted men are not subject to this increased power of forfeiture.

Fourth. Should the pretrial investigation be made mandatory and should accused be furnished counsel at such investigation?

This question presents a more difficult problem than is apparent. In our consideration of the subject of military justice we have been guided by the principle that the basic rights of an accused should be protected without encumbering the military system in such a maze of technicalities that it fails in its purpose. Upon this premise we have concluded that an investigation should precede every general courts-martial trial but that the investigation should be considered sufficient if it has substantially protected the rights of the accused. To hold otherwise would subject every general courts-martial case to reversal for jurisdictional error on purely technical grounds.

Our committee has added another safeguard in amending section 22 by providing counsel in every pretrial investigation upon the request of the accused. As a matter of custom the Army already provides such counsel in serious cases. It now becomes a matter of right, at the option of the accused.

Fifth. A more adequate review should be provided.

Any system of judicial review is complicated, technical, and difficult to understand. The principal provisions of judicial review are presently contained in Articles of War 50 and 50½. In an attempt to clarify these sections they have been rewritten in section 26 of the bill. The new section provides for a new judicial council of three general officers, in addition to the present board of review, and defines the action to be taken upon cases examined. The judicial council is vested with a very broad confirming authority. The three members of this council would be chosen upon the basis of their judgment, experience, and knowledge of the law. Whereas the board of review is chiefly concerned with the legality of the case, the judicial council is concerned not only with the legal sufficiency but with the weight of the evidence of any case which may come before it on review. The broad powers of confirmation which have been heretofore vested in the Secretary of War are now vested in this council and the Department of the Army subscribes to the propriety of this change. Except for the clemency power still vested in the Secretary of the Army and the President, which authority we have not disturbed, we may properly refer to the judicial council which we propose to create in this bill as the supreme court of the Army.

Under the present Army system it is possible for a defendant to be convicted and dishonorably discharged without having had an appellate review of the dishonorable discharge portion of his sentence. Not only is it possible, there have been many such cases, resulting in extensive criticism of the Army system. This has been corrected in section 26 (e) of the bill.

Section 28 of the bill provides that the Judge Advocate General shall have clemency power, such power to be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Army. This matter was considered by the legal subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee in connection with the powers of reviewing authorities. The practical result of the law is that the Judge Advocate General becomes a recommending officer and has no independent authority to exercise the power of clemency. Due to the wide disparity in sentences given for similar offenses, it was the conclusion of the subcommittee that the results which could normally be expected to come from a proper and thorough exercise of the clemency power in the office of the Secretary of War had not been obtained. This resulted in widespread criticism of the Army system and prompted the subcommittee to give the Judge Advocate General this clemency power, to the exclusion of the Secretary of War. When the matter was presented to the full committee, the then Secretary of War appeared in opposition to the committee amendment and urged that the final power of clemency be restored to his office. After due deliberation, the full committee restored the power to the Secretary of War. It is a recognized fact that administrative failures of this nature are usually the result of the stress of wartime. The increased responsibility of every higher official makes it inevitable that certain duties be delegated to subordinates, and unless those subordinates have the capabilities to meet the delegated responsibilities, the desired results will not be obtained. In restoring final clemency power to the Office of the Secretary of War, it is to be hoped that the appropriate officials will take such steps as they may deem necessary to insure that any future delegation of the power of clemency will be safeguarded by selecting the best qualified delegates of the power obtainable.

Sixth. Should command influence, with respect to the judicial acts of courts martial, military commissions, and the members thereof, be curtailed?

There is unanimous agreement that command influence has been improper and must be stopped. In addition to the provisions of section 33 of the bill, our committee has accepted that section of the Durham bill which provided for a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps. We consider these provisions adequate to stop this phase of command influence.

This brings us to the final and by far the most controversial question which our committee has considered: Should an independent Judge Advocate General's Corps, with a separate promotion list, be established?

The Department of the Army opposes the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps. However, our committee, favors such a corps. It is important to note that every organizational representative and every individual who testified before the committee, except Army witnesses, not only favored but urged the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's' Corps with a separate promotion list.

Under present law command has an abnormal and unjustified influence over military justice. In opposing our decision Army authorities stressed the necessity for preserving proper discipline and for giving line commanders authority which is commensurate with their responsibility. We fully agree that discipline is of the utmost importance and must be preserved. However, we feel equally certain that in the administration of military justice there is a point beyond which the considerations of justice are paramount or at least equal to discipline. Under present law and under this bill, as amended, command has abundant authority to enforce discipline. It refers the charges for trial, convenes the court, appoints the trial judge advocate, law member, and defense counsel who must now be qualified personnel and, after the trial, reviews the case with full authority to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence.

We contend that command should ask for nothing more in the furtherance of discipline. At the conclusion of a trial, under the present system, the same officers who conducted the case return to the command of a line officer who has full authority over their efficiency ratings, promotion recommendations, leaves, and duty assignments. These officers, many of whom have families and have chosen the Army for a career, would be less than human if they ignored the possibilities of such influence. We contend that those who are charged with the impartial administration of military justice must have sufficient freedom of judicial determination to meet the responsibility.

During the course of the lengthy hearings by the legal subcommittee it became apparent that it was the majority desire to establish a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps with a separate promotion list. The then Under Secretary of War, Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, and Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins requested the opportunity to be heard in opposition to such a provision. Both of these witnesses appeared before the subcommittee and ably presented the views of command officers in opposition to a Judge Advocate General's Corps. In

spite of this testimony by these able and respected witnesses the subcommittee was still of the opinion that a separate corps should be established. When the matter was brought before the full committee for final action the then Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, and the Chief of Staff, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, requested that they be permitted to appear before the full committee in opposition to a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps. Even though the request was unusual and was at variance with the established procedure of the committee in its consideration of subcommittee reports, the request was granted and both the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff appeared before the committee and voiced their strenuous objections to the curtailment of the clemency power in the Office of the Secretary of War and the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps. As hereinbefore stated, the clemency power was restored to the Secretary of War. However, the full committee endorsed the action of the subcommittee in voting to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps with a separate promotion list.

The use of the term "independent Judge Advocate General's Corps" has been rather loose and has resulted in some unfortunate and unjustified conclusions. The primary mission of every member of the armed forces of the United States is the winning of battles in wartime and the preparation to win them in peacetime. Regardless of their technical status in the armed forces, members of the Judge Advocate General's Department or Corps have that same primary mission and we do not intend that it shall be changed. Judge Advocate officers are properly members of the Department of the Army team, and, while the duties of their assignments are necessarily noncombatant in nature, it seems wholly unjustified to say that they are less interested in the primary mission of the Army than any other member of the armed forces.

It has been said that this is another attempt to establish special privileges for another professional group. Nothing could be further from the truth. During the entire hearings, which began on April 18 and were not concluded until the latter part of June, no member of the subcommittee nor any witness who appeared before it gave the slightest intimation that he was interested in legislating for lawyers as a class. As a matter of fact, there is a shortage of qualified legal talent in the Army, and it seems inevitable that if we are to attract qualified personnel into the Judge Advocate General's Department that we must do more than has been done heretofore. The Vanderbilt committee states that approximately 25,000 lawyers applied for duty with the Judge Advocate General's Department, but less than 10 percent were accepted. The evidence was undisputed that many line commanders declined to use such legal talent as was available to them in matters of military justice, and even went so far as to reprimand those lawyers who made an honest attempt to serve the cause of justice in military trials. Even if a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps is established, the Army will have great difficulty in obtaining qualified personnel to staff such a corps. The Army will find itself in somewhat the same position as it now finds itself with respect to doctors. They are in great demand in civilian life, and it is certain that the emoluments of civil practice exceed those offered by the Army. Some inducements must be offered to retain the qualified officers now on duty and to attract qualified graduates of our law schools into the service. The present condition does neither.

The Secretary and the Chief of Staff have criticized a separate promotion list for the Judge Advocate General's Corps, stating that it is contrary to the basic provisions of H. R. 3830, the promotion bill, which was recently passed by the House and Senate. It is admitted that there are humps in certain grades in the Judge Advocate General's Department. However, any objective study of this matter will reveal that the same situation exists in other branches of the service, particularly the Air Corps. It is important to note that it is not mandatory that the Secretary of the Army fill all grades under the promotion bill. He may do so at his discretion, and it is inconceivable that he would take any action in this respect which was not uniform throughout the other branches of the service.

It seems apparent that "command" considers the Judge Advocate General's Department to be composed of a nonprofessional group, whereas we are of the opinion that the Judge Advocate's Department must be a professional group, especially trained in order that it may properly perform its function. We have been reliably informed that approximately 90 percent of the field work of the Judge Advocate's Department consists of matters relating directly to military justice and that more than 50 percent of its work in Washington is of the same nature. Another considerable function consists of the investigation and adjustment of claims. It can hardly be expected that unqualified personnel can handle these assignments. If they could, this subject would not be before us today.

The Secretary stated that the creation of a separate corps of the Judge Advocate's will not decrease the load on combat officers. We think that the creation of a separate corps would inevitably result in lessening the burden on combat officers. It is an indisputable fact that throughout the war the trial judge advocates, law members, and defense counsel, in addition to officers who investigated claims, were largely drawn from officers of the line. This resulted in those officers having a dual function and the testimony before our committee made it very apparent that the added function of military justice and claims was held to be of secondary importance.

It is difficult to determine the costs which would be incurred by the enactment of this legislation. The War Department estimated that the enactment of H. R. 2575 without our amendment would require a total of 937 officers and a comparable number of enlisted men, at a cost of $3,200,000. Our amendment proposes a corps of 750 officers and warrant officers and enlisted men in such numbers as the Secretary of the Army may determine. Since we are asking for 180 less officers than the War Department itself asked for, it is my judgment that the cost of this legislation would not be $3,200,000 but would be something less than $2,000,000. In any event, we are of the opinion that the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps would cost considerably less than the enactment of the original provisions of this bill.

I cannot guarantee that this bill, if enacted into law, will cure all of the evils and inequities of the existing system, but I do say that, in my opinion, the bill represents the minimum action we should take. For those who may feel that we have gone too far in our efforts to revise the existing system I wish to state that the only criticism that we have received of our action, which was taken more than 5 months ago, is that we have failed to go far enough.

We are now on the threshold either of universal military training or of the maintenance of a professional army at least five times larger than that maintained before the last war. The future Army, no matter how it may be raised, will be composed of the physically fit youth of the country. The first contact with any judicial system for the overwhelming majority of these young men will be their experience with the administration of military justice. We believe that it is our duty, so far as lies within our power, to see that the system to which they are exposed is reasonably designed to achieve justice.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I have been either the president or lay member of a division general court for over a year. My only criticism would be that you have not gone far enough, particularly in divorcing the operation of military justice from the chain of command. If I understand correctly, the commanding officer still convenes the court, appoints the personnel of the court, and confirms the sentence. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. ELSTON. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. From that confirmation is there any appeal under the provisions of this act to your judicial council; that is, any automatic appeal?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; section 26, article 50 (f), provides that every record of trial by general court martial, the appellate review of which is not otherwise provided for, shall be examined in the office of the Judge Advocate General, and if found legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, shall be submitted to the Board of Review for appropriate action. Subsection (e) of the same section provides that no authority shall order the execution of any sentence of a court martial involving dishonorable discharge, bad conduct discharge, or confinement in the penitentiary until the appellate review provided in that section shall have been completed and unless and until any

confirming action required shall have been completed. In fact, every record of trial by general or special court martial involving a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad conduct discharge, whether such discharge be suspended or not suspended, and every record of trial by general court martial involving a sentence to the penitentiary shall be examined by the Board of Review.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. He has the right of appeal from the confirmation of the sentence?

Mr. ELSTON. He has.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Secondly, is there any restriction upon the right of the commanding officer to appoint and dismiss the court at his whim? I speak in that respect from knowledge of the fact that when a court does not please the commanding officer in the sentence imposed, that it finds itself dismissed, a new court appointed, and frequently the officers are detailed on rather undesirable assignments as the result of their action on the court.

Mr. ELSTON. I will say to the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that prohibits that, except the provision that we have written into the bill to the effect that any effort on the part of an officer to improperly influence the court in any manner whatsoever is punishable. Under the circumstances, if it can be shown that the convening authority was dissatisfied with the verdict and assigned officers to unpleasant duties because of that dissatisfaction, that in itself would constitute a violation of one of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. There was another point I had in mind, and that is, I do not see anything in the bill, as I read it rather cursorily, with respect to the time within which trial must be had. I believe there are others who have that same idea in mind. Nowhere in here do I find that trial must be had within a definite period of time; in other words, the correction of the situation, which I think many of us know about, where enlisted men have been held for months without being brought to trial.

Mr. ELSTON. Of course, there might be circumstances under which an accused could not be brought to trial immediately. There is no provision as to exact time, but section 31, amending article 70, provides that when a person is arrested or confined immediate steps must be taken to try the accused, and that if there is unnecessary delay, the officer who is responsible therefor shall be punished.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Would the committee be willing to accept an amendment setting a time limit within which trial must be had, subject to such discretionary authority in the convening authority as the exigencies of the service might warrant?

Mr. ELSTON. We will be very glad to consider it, but I believe the section to which I refer is adequate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise primarily to commend the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the members, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, and the members of his subcommittee, for what appears to me to be a magnificent job. I have gone over this bill and the report with some care. It seems to me that there has been nothing of greater importance come before us, and certainly it would appear that the committee has given the most minute study to the details of this legislation. I am very happy to support it in general principle. There may be some little minor details which could still be improved, but I certainly feel that we ought to, all of us, let the committee know how grateful we are to them for this help.

Mr. ELSTON. I am sure all the members of the committee appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I join with the previous speaker in complimenting my colleague from Ohio on the presentation of this splendid piece of legislation. I am certain all the veterans and the friends and families of the veterans will appreciate the untiring efforts of this subcommittee chairman and of the full committee in behalf of the veterans.

I know the gentleman is familiar with the fact that some months ago I introduced a bill that was submitted to his committee under which the defense attorney would be of the same rank as the attorney for the prosecution. That bill was caused by some cases of which I have personal knowledge, where I feel that an injustice was done to the defendant through his attorney because the attorney happened to be of lower rank than the attorney for the prosecution. I feel certain that my distinguished colleague has given that some consideration, and I should like to have his report on it.

Mr. ELSTON. This bill provides for the selection of counsel for an accused having the same legal qualifications as the law member of the court, although both lawyers may not be of the same rank.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. I have some questions which are purely technical.

In the first section, apparently for brevity and clarity and simplicity, the word "soldier" is defined as including a noncommissioned officer, a private, or any other enlisted man or woman. Then the bill later apparently abandons that term and uses the terms "enlisted persons" and "enlisted men" throughout. Will the gentleman explain why, after having made that definition available, the subsequent provisions of the bill appear to have abandoned it and other terms are used?

Mr. ELSTON. This section merely amends existing law, which section would necessarily refer to many other articles of war not amended by this bill.

Mr. MATHEWS. You would not have to use it also. I thought the purpose of defining the term "soldier" was to make one word cover the whole works.

Mr. ELSTON. The use of the word "soldier" may appear in other articles of war. We refer, I believe, only to enlisted men or to officers.

Mr. MATHEWS. The definition of the word "soldier" excludes an officer.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think I can clarify that.

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. This is the amendment of an existing Article of War. It is carried in this bill in order to add "woman." The balance of the bill may relate to enlisted men. Some of the other articles of war refer to soldiers.

Mr. MATHEWS. That is one of the questions. Now, this one has probably been taken care of, but I do not know just where. We amalgamated the services. Now we have a separate Air Force. The Articles of War, as I understand, apply only to the Army. How is the Air Force taken care of?

Mr. ELSTON. It is taken care of in this way:

The question has been raised as to whether or not the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Department of the Army may properly review courts-martial cases which originate in the Department of the Air.

At the time of the passage of the Unification Act which is now Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress, and properly referred to as the National Security Act, it was realized that there would be a period of adjustment during which time it would be determined which services within the Army should remain entirely with the Army, which services should be completely transferred to the Air Department and which services should be handled on a temporary basis by the Department of the Army for the Department of the Air. In view of this realization, section 305 (a) was included in Public Law 253 and this subsection, together with succeeding subsections, specifically provides that for a period of 2 years from the date of enactment of the bill the Secretary of Defense may designate the manner in which the transfer of particular services would be treated. It is a matter of fact that the Secretary of Defense has not transferred the functions of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army to the Department of the Air. At the present time the functions of military justice in the Air Department are being handled in approximately 90 percent of the cases by Air Force personnel. However, the judicial review of general courts-martial cases must be referred to the Board of Review of the Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army. There are about 40 such cases per month. There is no question about the legality of this procedure.

Mr. MATHEWS. Did the amalgamation bill provide that the Articles of War should continue to apply to the Air Corps?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes, to the extent I have just indicated.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, in peacetime the Army experienced practically no difficulty in the administration of justice. Prior to the war when the Army was composed of professional soldiers, all of whom knew the rules under which they were living and working, they experienced practically no difficulty. The difficulty arose when millions of civilians went into uniform, both as officers and enlisted men. Of course, these new officers and enlisted men were not professional soldiers, and they were not as familiar with the rules of the game as their professional predecessors had been. Therefore, even before the termination of the war, there was a very distinct demand that something be done toward revising the administration of military justice. This bill is a result of that demand, and the result of a study made of the subject by the committee, which indicated that revisions were essential. I want to point out that this is not a revolutionary rewriting of the Articles of War nor of the court-martial procedures. I believe that the American Bar Association studied the matter objectively. They came forward with a very detailed study of the matter and with a proper appraisal of the situation. In their report they stated:

> The Army's system of justice in general and as written in the books is a good one * * * It is excellent in theory and designed to secure swift and sure justice * * * The innocent are almost never convicted and the guilty seldom acquitted.

So we do not attempt to tear up the body of the law and the precedents which have been established since the beginning of the Nation in this revision.

The gentleman from Ohio referred to a separate judge advocate general's department. I want to make it clear at the outset that I am supporting this bill in the form in which it has been reported by the committee. I do not propose to offer any amendments to take out of the bill any of the major provisions included in it. At the present time I do not contemplate offering any amendments.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. NORBLAD. The fact is that this bill, as written, was very satisfactory to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Bar Association Committee.

Mr. KILDAY. That is my understanding. However, in view of the fact that I have not agreed with the creation of a separate Judge Advocate General's Department, I would like to state my position very briefly. I believe in the democratic system, and I offered my amendments in the committee, which were overwhelmingly defeated. I abide by the decision of the majority. I agree with the end desired to secure equal, impartial, and uniform justice. I do not believe that the creation of a separate Judge Advocate General's Department will add anything to the provisions that we have in the bill for that purpose. I do not believe they are designed to assist in improving the administration of justice. During the past 9 years I have been on the subcommittee which has worked on each promotion bill and each pay bill. I have seen every branch of the armed services ask for a separate promotion list—every branch, that is, except the fellows who do the fighting. They are the only ones who have been able to see their way clear to do the fighting and carry the guns and take care of the heavy artillery and fly the airplanes and whatnot without a separate promotion list. It is also very interesting to note that in each instance those groups which seek to secure a separate list come from well-organized professions and occupations in civil life. Of course, the infantryman has no counterpart in civil life. I do not see where making the Judge Advocate General, who is going to serve only as a law member, the trial judge advocate, the defense counsel, and reviewing authority, independent, is going to lend anything to the impartiality of the trial.

I very heartily endorse the provisions of the bill which require defense counsel to be either a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department or a qualified member of the bar of the Federal courts or of the highest court of one of the States in all instances in which the trial judge advocate holds such qualifications. I heartily endorse also the provisions which prohibit the commanding officer from intimating or directing the disposition which should be made of a case or the penalty to be imposed. Likewise, the provision which prevents him from reprimanding a member of the court for any action taken by that member while sitting on the court.

Those are things which I believe will lend themselves to fair and impartial administration of justice without interference of command, rather than the creation of a separate Judge Advocate General's Department. Of course, the enlisted men will now have the right to have members sit on their courts. I believe our report states that we doubt whether that will be resorted to very frequently. I believe it will be developed as time goes on that it was something that was desired in the abstract more than something that would be desired when an enlisted man is facing trial before a court martial. However, he does have the absolute right, when he so requests, to have not less than one-third of the members of the court be enlisted men. Of course under no circumstances can a court martial convict except on the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of the court present and voting.

Another thing that will add to the administration of military justice is the provision contained in this bill recognizing the law member of the court as the real judge of the law of the case. Under the provisions of this bill the law member has the exclusive right to rule on interlocutory questions, except on challenges, for the direction of a verdict or a finding of insanity. So that there could be no possibility of members of the court, not trained in the law and the law of evidence, passing upon what would be regarded as competent, relevant, or material evidence. That will be passed on exclusively by the law member of the court. I think that greatly strengthens the administration of military justice.

There is another provision in this bill about which nothing has been stated, and there is nothing in the report about it. It is a very important matter. Under the GI bill of rights we included a provision creating a board of review in the various departments to review discharges other than honorable, but we limited that to the so-called blue discharge, the bad-conduct discharge, and specifically prohibited the board from reviewing dishonorable discharges issued by direction of a court martial. In expanding the review facilities of the Army in this bill we have given the judicial council the power to review any court martial within a period of 1 year after it becomes final. In the case of courts martial resulting in dishonorable discharges during World War II, that year will not begin to run until the termination of World War II. So that we now have a provision which was found to be necessary in administering the discharge review board set up under the GI bill of rights, a comparable provision for the review of dishonorable discharges. That right has not existed heretofore. Many people lose sight of the fact that a court martial is a court, the same as any civil court. When its judgment becomes final, it is a final judgment, and no longer subject to review. A person who has been convicted by it, after sentence has been served, has only the remedy which exists through executive clemency. In this bill we have provided a means by which for 1 year after the termination of World War II—and of course it is not yet terminated officially—those discharges may be reviewed.

There is another matter that caused some considerable comment, not perhaps so much by those who had served in the Army and had seen or thought they had seen grave injustices committed, but by those in the higher echelon, who knew more of the technicalities of the procedure. It has been possible in the past for a man to be dishonorably discharged from the service without his case ever having been reviewed by a board of review. A reading of the Articles of War would have indicated that was not legally possible; but it was.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

In the event the convening authority on the first approval suspended execution of the dishonorable discharge under the present Article of War, that case did not come before a review board for review. The dishonorable discharge was suspended, review was not required, and immediately thereafter the dishonorable discharge was carried out. So that it has been possible in the past to carry out dishonorable discharge without review by a board of review. That is prevented by this bill.

I think we should remember that no bill that we write, no penal code, no code of criminal procedure in the civil courts will be any better than the manner in which it is administered. There is no provision that we can write to effect the manner in which men will administer laws; it will depend upon their personality, their judicial temperament, their sense of fair play, and those are things that we cannot inculcate in the individuals.

I was interested in some of the questions asked of the gentleman from Ohio a while ago with reference to the time of trial and matters of that kind. It is not possible for us to write here a method of procedure which will be so bound up and ironclad as to secure all of these things and at the same time be workable. The only means by which it could be done would be to make those things that you desire matters of jurisdiction and the judgment void in the event they are not carried out. That is not feasible, especially in time of war when men are moving about—for instance, as to the time of trial. The provisions of the present bill do call for an expeditious trial, as quickly as possible, but that is as far as we can go. If we say that if he is not tried within the period of 3 months, 5 months, or 6 months he is to be released, there would, of course, be instances in which men palpably guilty would go free without any punishment.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Along the lines of what the gentleman is now saying, that is purely an administrative matter, is it not?

Mr. KILDAY. It is purely a matter of administration. The same situation exists in our civil courts here. You will find in some jurisdictions and some courts and, I am sorry to say, even in some Federal courts, advocates sitting on the bench who do not have the sense of justice and the judicial temperament that men ought to have to hold that position. You will find the same thing existing with reference to prosecuting officers and investigative officers.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. As a matter of fact, the inclusion of any such provision in this proposed bill would work harm to the individual who was being tried, would it not?

Mr. KILDAY. Very definitely so. I myself have tried a few criminal cases on both sides of the table. When I was on the defense side I never was very anxious for a prompt trial. That is one constitutional right that I think is rarely sought by a defendant. There is no better lawyer or witness in a criminal case than the lapse of time when a man is charged with a criminal offense.

I believe that all in all we have made a reasonable approach to this proposition and we have brought here a bill which will eliminate those things which are substantially objectionable in the operation of our system of military justice. I hope you will take time to read at least part of the hearings because I believe you will see there that the matter was approached by a subcommittee composed entirely of lawyers of excellent training and wide experience in both civil and criminal fields. It was approached from an understanding standpoint and with a knowledge of the technicalities of law and of trial procedure, and that there was a sincere effort made to get to the bottom of those things which were substantial and which caused the difficulties. We approached it without any hysteria or feeling of rancor about what may have happened during the time when so many civilians were in the armed services. I believe the bill is reasonably sufficient for this purpose and that we will do well to adopt it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. With reference to section 46 I gather that the gentleman is not in agreement with it although he is not planning to offer an amendment to modify it or strike it out. I understand an amendment will be offered to strike it out. Is it not a fact that the Air Corps had a separate promotion list all during the last war?

Mr. KILDAY. During the war nobody had a promotion list, I may say to the gentleman from New York. Promotions were made by reason of the necessity for service in a higher rank. A promotion list as such has not been operative for practical purposes since about 1940 or 1941.

Mr. KEATING. When the gentleman spoke of the promotion list, he means the Regular Army promotion list?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, since we have gotten into that question, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Of course, up until the last day of the first session of the Eightieth Congress promotions in the Army and Air Corps were made by reasons of years of service in grade. Prior to that they were made on the basis of a vacancy in the next higher grade. On the day we adjourned the first session of the Eightieth Congress we passed a new promotion bill under which promotions will be made in a different manner in the future. They will be both selective and based on years of service in grade.

When we refer now to the Judge Advocate General's Corps set up in this bill, we refer to permanent promotions within the Judge Advocate General's Corps, not temporary promotions or temporary rank held during the war or during the national emergency, but to permanent rank that those officers will secure and be entitled to retain until retired or promoted to a higher grade.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand there is no such separate promotion list for any other branch of the Army?

Mr. KILDAY. There is a separate promotion list under the new bill for doctors, dentists, chaplains, and nurses. Of course, the nurses are very limited in their length of service. They do not serve as long as the male members of the service.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I would like the gentleman's explanation of the appellate review of the records of courts martial provided in section (g) on page 29 and how it is that an appellate group can review the credibility of witnesses by reading the printed page? Why would not the court martial itself, in looking at the witness, his demeanor, his actions on the stand, and so forth, be the proper place to give credence to the testimony of witnesses?

Mr. KILDAY. I agree with the gentleman, and in the first instance that is true. In other words, where a witness is shown to be highly contradictory or not to have been in a position to have seen the things about which he testifies, and so forth, the credibility of the witness may be passed on by the reviewing authority from the printed page. I think, however, the significance of the inclusion of those words in this section is that we have made the review just as broad as it can possibly be made. Heretofore, members of review boards have found that they were too restricted in the things which they could review on a court martial when it came to them. It was our purpose to open it up as wide as it possibly could be opened so that they could pass upon the weight of the evidence, the credibility of witnesses, the legal sufficiency of the evidence, and the legal technicalities in the whole record. In other words, that there would be a true and actual review and that there would be no technical rules to prevent the review board and the Judge Advocate from going into the whole case.

Mr. BURLESON. May I ask this further question, knowing the gentleman's experience and qualifications, he having been a district attorney and also experienced in civil matters, if he believes that under this bill a boy charged with an offense before a court-martial board has to a very great degree the same opportunity to defend himself as is given the common criminal in most of the State jurisdictions of this country?

Mr. KILDAY. I believe the bill, as written, and in connection with the other Articles of War and laws controlling the procedure, does give him that opportunity. Again I must say that no law can control the conduct of officers discharging their official duty. There is no means by which you can control their administration. As written, the boy would have the presumption of innocence and all of his constitutional rights protected the same as any civilian in the most carefully operated court. Whether there would be instances in which there would be men who would not so administer the law, of course, I do not doubt, but that is not caused by the bill that has been written or by the Articles of War now in effect. It would be due to human frailty in the administration of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, because of an affair to be held in New York this evening, I am asking permission to speak out of order and invite your attention to an unfortunate situation. I come from Idaho, where we are very much interested in winter sports. We have one of the finest winter sport centers in the world at Sun Valley.

Many people throughout the country have been shocked to learn that the United States has sent an Olympic team to Europe to compete against teams from some 20 other nations, with the United States team inadequately financed. And the question is, Why has this happened?

There are some 50 young men and women, our finest athletes, in Switzerland now. Our Olympic teams always are backed by voluntary subscription. In this case, only about half the necessary funds were raised. These young men and women carry the American flag, in fact even wear it on their uniforms. In a way they are our ambassadors. They are our representatives in international competition, and we are proud of them. We not only want them to win if they can, but, above all, we want them to make a good impression. How can they do this if they are in Europe with inadequate finances?

Certainly this is something of a national oversight.

All this is causing much comment both over the air and in the press. I hope the difficulty can be quickly overcome. A few enthusiasts are trying to remedy the matter by holding an emergency benefit in New York at Carnegie Hall this Thursday afternoon which should be helpful.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. For a question.

Mr. FULTON. This is in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry. I have said that I am opposed to this bill, and I have been hearing nothing from both sides but the ones who are for it. How does the time now stand between the ones who are for it and the ones who are against it? How much time has been taken by the ones for it, and when do the ones against it get a chance?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been equally divided between the majority and the minority, and it is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], chairman of the committee, has an understanding with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], as to recognition.

Mr. FULTON. How much time has been used in this period, may I ask?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has 24 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has 40 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I shall address myself to two phases of this bill. With usual clarity my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has very, very explicitly explained this bill to you, I think, with a master's voice, and he was ably assisted by my good friend over here, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who likewise has made a great contribution. What I shall say will naturally be somewhat repetitious of what they have said. Consequently I will just address myself to the above two phases.

Let me begin by saying that every Member of this House, during the war years, has been deluged with complaints of autocracy in the handling of these courts martial throughout the Armed Forces. Everybody has had complaints, and they were just complaints. So much so did these things come to pass that the American Bar Association and the former Secretary of War convened the Vanderbilt Committee. The American Legion, the AVC, the Amvets, the VFW, and the New York County Bar Association and every legal organization of any real influence in this Nation has been clamoring, along with the American people, for a change in the situation. We had to make a change, and here it is today. It may be imperfect, but we labored hard, and we hope we did not bring forth a mouse; at least, we do not think we did. Certainly, we tried not to. We brought this measure out in the face of the opposition of the Secretary of War and General Eisenhower. We had more opposition than ever did a committee which finally succeeded. They brought the most glamorous gentleman down there, one of the ablest speakers I ever saw, and he could not prevail on us. The facts were on our side, and we had to do something. Of course, we started off on the right side. That is the reason this bill is here today.

I want to impress these things on you. First, as to the interlocutory power of the law member. He passes on the admissibility of evidence. That is a very important thing. There are many good lawyers in this body. That law member tells you what is admissible. Heretofore, when a court martial was convened, if the man were guilty in the eyes of the commanding officer they did not have a court martial, and woe be unto those who did let that boy get off. They got a whipping of the tongue and they caught the works. A member of our committee, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] was one of the law officers in the Air Corps. He said whenever they acquitted somebody the law members took a severe tongue lashing from the commanding officer. Those are the things with which we were confronted. Heretofore, when the court was convened the accused were deemed guilty. They were not guilty without trial, they were guilty. So remember that.

There is another thing I want to impress on you. We have separated the Judge Advocate General from the hierarchy, the Chief of Staff, whatever you want to call it, of the Army. He has an independent organization now. With the exception of the promotion, he is like any other organization of the Armed Forces; he is independent. The law officers are like the men in the Department of Justice; they are trained. They have to be trained before they can hold these jobs. You do not have the case of a man not knowing law trying these cases.

The peculiar thing about this is that whenever there is a case contemplating the tainting of a man's reputation forever, for instance, in a court martial where he can be kicked out of the Army, whenever such a thing as that occurs and that commanding officer approves that court martial finding—of course, if he changes it the man is free, but the minute it goes out, and it has to go out, he cannot stop it if he wants to enforce the punishment, the hand of the Chief of Staff is forever taken off and the Judge Advocate General then is the sole judge of the facts in the case. He is the sole judge in any trial where some innocent young man, as he thinks, may have his reputation forever and forever tainted because of some miscarriage of judgment, as he saw it.

I want to tell you a story General Bradley told me. I went to Europe with him this summer. He said the Russians were coming over to the American occupation zone and raping the German girls time and time again, and they had many, many complaints, and there was a very serious situation. He said they would arrest these Russians and send them back to the Russian zone, and nothing happened. In this particular instance, he arrested a half dozen of them. I do not recall the number and I do not care, because the only good Russian I know at present is a dead Russian. So he sent this group back over there and along with it he told the commanding general, "These boys are committing all kinds of terrible offenses in our zone. I do not like it." The Russian said, "I don't either. Take them out and shoot them." But that is not the way we do in our Army. Every American boy in this Army is somebody's son, a legitimate son, somebody's loved one, somebody's husband, somebody's sweetheart. We want him protected by the constitutional guaranties. We are trying to do it under this bill.

He is not a mere automaton or the property of the state. We think he is a human being and this bill protects him when charges are made against his character and reputation. That is the American way because after all when he serves in the Army, he is serving a heritage and we believe this fulfills that basic American heritage.

Before I do close, I want to ask you all to read page 4, which will give you a pretty fair conception of what this bill does. It is very clearly outlined there, and we feel that that will give you a really fair conception of what we have endeavored to do to protect the guarantees about which I have just spoken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am sure I can add but little to what has already been stated here. It was my pleasure to have served with a subcommittee during the Seventy-ninth Congress, in which we reviewed the matter of court-martial procedure, and possible changes required to administer

justice more equitably by the military courts.

We again took that matter up in this Congress following a few bad experiences that we had in courts martial during the recent World War. I am one of those who believes that substantial justice was administered by the courts-martial system as it has existed up to the present time. There were not a great many cases, in proportion to the total number of cases, in which there was a miscarriage of justice.

There are, in my opinion, some serious fundamental defects in the administration of military justice because of the mechanics through which this administration is carried out. One of those, and the major one in my opinion, is the fact that the military courts were not independent in the sense that civil courts are independent. The very man who appointed the members courts martial was the one who had to review and pass on the efficiency record of the members of the court he appointed and into the efficiency record of such a member could go the bias and the prejudice and even the misunderstanding of the appointing officer of what a courts-martial member should do.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. May I preface my remarks by stating that I happen to have served with a general courts martial during World War I. My observation of some of the courts-martial sentences handed out during the recent war has left me shocked and amazed by reason of their severity when compared to sentences handed down by civilian courts. In one particular case which was called to my attention, a boy from my district was given 3 years for an offense which probably in civilian life would have resulted in a sentence of from 10 to 30 days. Perhaps that is not the fault of the courts-martial system. But I do say that if the Army does not do a better job than they have done in some of these cases, the Congress is going to have to rewrite the penalty sections a little more stringently than they have been written in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the gentleman that there were some very severe sentences for minor offenses. If the gentleman had pursued those cases, he would have found that in 98 percent or more of the cases the sentences were greatly reduced. Some of these officers seemed to have the idea that to show their authority and to render strict justice, they have to throw the whole book at the man. I think they should decide at the beginning what would be a fair punishment and not rely on some other body or individual, hoping that they would reduce the punishment.

Mr. O'HARA. In the particular case to which I have referred the offense for which the man was convicted was that he was a. w. o. l. for something like 30 minutes. Instead of the man being given 10 days or 30 days in the brig, or something of the kind, the final result was that the man got 3 years and was dishonorably discharged. When I took that case up with the Judge Advocate General's office, they said nothing could be done. They said the sentence was a fair one and the man would have to serve it out.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the gentleman should not generalize from one case that goes wrong. We have had some terrible abortions in the criminal law of the civil courts as well.

What I want to impress upon you is that we have put into the law the fundamental American principle that the courts must be independent. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] said, no matter how good the technique may be on the law books, unless we have men with understanding, learning, ability, and courage on the courts, we will not get the best administration of justice. I believe the set-up we have here is fundamentally sound and in accord with American traditions and American concepts, and in that respect is better than we had before. Therefore, I believe we will get better results.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] I know something about the prosecution of criminal cases, having been district attorney of my county for a great many years. There is no comparison, as far as severity is concerned, in the sentences handed out by courts martial and those in civilian life for the same offenses. I do not think this bill will change that. It still deals with the human element of the individual who is on the court.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think this will change it in this way: We have men who are trained in the law and they will be much more judicial in their attude than men who are not trained in the law. Many men on courts martial are military men, and they look on a court martial not as a court of justice but as the disciplinary part of the Army.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me it should be said, in all fairness, although I have experienced exactly what the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] have experienced, of what seemed to be severe penalties. Yet, of course, sometimes it was the fault of the present court-martial law itself. For instance, take this change which you are making in the law relating to rape. I defended an officer who was charged with rape and who was convicted and sentenced, because he had to be. He either had to be hanged or imprisoned for life. He was imprisoned for life, but the commanding general cut it down to 7 years, and I understand that later, after 2 years, he was restored to service so that he could work out a discharge. So I think there are two sides to that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. I think you will find fewer of these excessive sentences if you have trained lawyers on the courts martial and you have defense counsel who are lawyers. That was one of the weaknesses heretofore.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman has said that at all times the administration of court martial was handed out by military men. That is true. I am wondering if this bill does not further implement that authority. On page 45, section 47, it requires that Regular Army officers be permanently appointed by the President to the Judge Advocate General's court. I do not know. West Point may have a very good law school. I never heard of it. They may realize that some civilians had something to do with this last war and that they may have something to say in court-martial procedures from here on.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If you will read the entire bill, you will find that the Judge Advocate and the defense counsel must be lawyers. Heretofore they may have been laymen. The administration of justice, in my opinion, is just as technical as practicing medicine. We want to get men who know how to handle the tools and who know something about the specific technical field they are covering. That is what this bill is designed to do. It is patterned exactly after the American system of justice, where you have trained men on the bench who are independent and juries who are advised by a jurist. After sitting through long hearings on two subcommittees, I was impressed by the fact that this bill and a previous one follows straight through the system we have had for 175 years in America, of getting independent judges, and having full and free hearings, and according to the accused every single possible right that a civilian has accorded to him.

We were convinced that we were right when an eminent committee of the American Bar Association, after a prolonged, dispassionate, and independent study of the matter, recommended practically the very identical things which we have in this bill. Our committee, I think, was very tolerant. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], whom I admire tremendously, wanted a few changes in the bill, but the committee decided they were perhaps unwise, or at least that they would rather have the bill in the form in which it is now before us; but I am sure the Members all noticed how the gentleman from Texas today made a very fine lawyerlike argument for this bill.

I believe we will more definitely approximate 100 percent justice under the mechanism and the plan we have set out in this bill than we have had before or could have under any other type of bill. Practically every Judge Advocate who had experience in this last war favors this bill. If I have talked to one, I have talked to dozens, and perhaps hundreds, but have not found one who was not heartily in favor of this bill. One point they all stress is that we must make the Judge Advocate's department an independent department and have the court free from the domination, if you please, or the influence, of line officers. They must be a separate, independent corps where a man's main duty is to carry out the duty of sitting as the judge or acting as counsel and doing those little jobs which only a lawyer can do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to review somewhat the history of this legislation and also to compliment the present committee which brought this bill before us for consideration at the present time. They have done an excellent job in my opinion. In the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1945 this House adopted House Resolution 20 which placed authority in the hands of the old Military Affairs Committee to investigate the war effort and other matters. Immediately thereafter this committee was set up. At that time I was serving as chairman. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] also was a member of the committee, as were the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD], and the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. We became a kind of clearing house for the complaints of Members of Congress as to what was happening under our system of military justice. I suppose something like two or three thousand cases were reviewed by this subcommittee. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] at that time was serving on the subcommittee. Hearing after hearing was held with the War Department and eventually the War Department set up the review boards. Experience showed that something was wrong, for the review boards' reduction of sentences ran something like 70 to 85 percent. Also, about that time the War Department began to take this matter very seriously and asked the American Bar Association to study this problem and make recommendations. They did. Those recommendations were brought before the committee and in the first session of the Eightieth Congress I introduced a bill, H. R. 576.

The present committee headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] in my opinion has taken most of the complaints and abuses that came out of the hearings before the American Bar Association—the hearings, the extensive hearings which number thousands of pages, which still are to be obtained from the Armed Services Committee today—and have brought to you what I believe to be an improvement in the Articles of War system for the armed services.

The American people are proud of their Army. They realize its stupendous achievements in the recent war. They know that it was a small Army and, in many respects, unprepared for the great struggle, not through its own fault but because of the blindness of the Nation to the world situation that was developing. They watched our little Army expand into a force of many millions with an amazing absence of confusion and uncertainty. They saw it adjust itself to unprecedented conditions and win victories. They observed that where changes were needed there was in most respects a remarkable readiness to discard the traditional for the sake of meeting new exigencies effectively.

It has not failed to be noted, however, that this adjustability has not extended to military justice. In that field no improvements were made. There is no question that discipline must be preserved in our armed services. Discipline, however, must not be made as a cloak to cover arbitrariness and injustice. Discipline is sound only when those who are subject to it know that it will be fair, that the accused will have his side properly presented, that punishments imposed will be equal, that those who are not guilty will not be treated as if they were guilty.

It is a matter of record that the injustices that have already been spoken of were evident in all the hearings held by our subcommittee. Some of the legal technicalities of this bill, and it is a very technical matter, I personally am not qualified to talk about because I am not a trained lawyer. The Armed Services Committee and the chairman of that committee were very wise in selecting and placing on the committee a number of trained lawyers who brought to you what I feel, as I said before, is a very excellent improvement in our Articles of War.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman says he is not technically qualified to pass on this bill. I may say that in 1946 he was wise enough to realize that we had to have an independent system of justice. As chairman of the previous committee he recognized that fact very promptly.

Mr. DURHAM. Well, after studying the whole matter for 4 or 5 years I feel that most of our trouble stemmed from this problem. As to whether or not it will correct all of the trouble, I am not in position to say. I believe, however, that we have placed this matter now in the hands of trained personnel if this measure is adopted. I think we recognize that in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is almost necessary to have trained lawyers to handle this problem. In many cases where an individual was brought before a court-martial hearing the person who acted as counsel in the defense of the man was not a trained lawyer, but was in some other profession and had no legal training. There are many instances of that kind of record. I feel this will to some extent cure the abuses.

Of course, there are other problems connected with the services also. This bill does not go into the judicial system of the Navy. I am hopeful a continuation of this subcommittee will study the problem and bring to the House legislation that will cure some of our problems which today we face in the Navy. I am satisfied they will do that because at the present time we are in a different position from what we were in the early days when the old Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee handled these problems separately. We can now get the facts and bring them together in closer connection so that it will be far better administration of justice than it has been heretofore.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending measure and also should like to take advantage of this opportunity to commend and congratulate the members of the Subcommittee and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives for bringing forth this measure for consideration and passage. I have carefully studied this bill, the report thereon, including much of the testimony taken at the hearings, as well as reports of special committees concerned with and interested in this legislation. The bill as reported contains numerous improvements over the present system of military justice and provides needed safeguards looking toward insuring and protecting the rights of soldiers in our armed forces who are subject to a system of law and judicial procedure different from that in civilian life.

The historical and accepted purpose of our courts-martial system is to maintain discipline in the service and to administer justice within the Army. The procedure, needless to say, is unique and different from our system of law enforced in our civil courts. The system has many worth-while features, which in the main, serves its dual purposes, but which nevertheless is far from perfect. The entire system should not be condemned, neither should the evils known to exist be condoned. The good should be retained and the bad features eliminated with improvements substituted therefor. There are doubtless many minor matters which can be corrected administratively and concerning which the Judge Advocate General of the Army and officers in his department are fully cognizant. Much praise has been given and rightly so to leaders of our Army for the great successes and victories which, through their leadership, they helped to achieve for our country. But in the achieving of these victories mistakes and errors were made. Some mistakes and errors were to be expected, but we should profit by our mistakes and try to see that they do not occur again. We must make improvements wherever possible. Such a situation applies especially with respect to our archaic and outmoded system of military justice in the Army.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill before the House today is to amend the Articles of War and to improve our system of military justice in the Army. Much has been written on this subject, and much has already been said, concerning the need for improvement of military justice in our armed forces. This fact has been clearly demonstrated during the late war. Almost everyone agrees that there is a real need for effecting improvements both by legislation and through administration. During World War II approximately 11,000,000 men saw service in the United States Army, and of that number approximately 80,000 were brought to trial and convicted by our Army courts martial.

A far larger number than this were convicted by special and lower military courts. Even before the cessation of hostilities it was apparent to officials of the War Department and to Members of Congress, and others, that a detailed study of the system of Army justice was needed. Accordingly, during 1944 and 1945, the War Department secured the services of Col. Philip McCook, former prominent New York jurist, to visit various theaters of operation and to conduct studies of our system of military justice in operation. As a soldier and member of the staff of the Assistant Judge Advocate General in the European Theater of Operations during the recent war, I had occasion to meet Judge McCook and to know something of his work, and also to have had an opportunity for first-hand observation and experience in the workings of our system of military justice. Like others, I saw the great need for effecting its improvement. Shortly after the end of hostilities, the American Bar Association recommended to the War Department that our system of military justice be overhauled and improved.

Accordingly, the Secretary of War appointed an advisory committee on military justice for the purpose of studying this problem and presenting recommendations. This committee consisted of outstanding lawyers and jurists throughout the country and they engaged in studies, investigations, and hearings and availed themselves of voluminous statistical data within the Judge Advocate General's Department and other sources concerning the operation of our military courts. Following the holding of hearings and receipt of information from questionnaires and after exhaustive study, this committee filed its report recommending changes and needed improvements. It was obvious to the advisory committee after the hearing of many witnesses that there was great need for providing of safeguards to insure that men called into the military service of our country should have their rights protected.

In addition, there have been many detailed recommendations made and which have been carefully studied by the Committee on Armed Services of the House. The one principal question which goes to the heart of the whole problem, however, is whether military justice is to remain essentially military or whether it is to be essentially justice administered within the Military Establishment; whether there is to be a separation of command and judicial functions in our system of Army courts. The eminent committee of the American Bar Association is of the opinion that the right of command to control the prosecution should be retained only, through the right to name the trial counsel to prosecute the case, to refer charges for trial and to review the case thereafter, and that the Judge Advocate General's Department should become an independent branch of the Army with appellate reviewing authority independent of the command.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and the full Committee on Armed Services have agreed with this principle, namely, that if real justice is to be obtained in connection with the trial of an accused that officials charged with reviewing the case should be independent and free to exercise their judgment without restraint and control from the commander in the field who appointed the court, and prosecutor, and referred the case for trial. In other words, the principal question boils down to this fact—Should the field commander be within himself both the prosecutor, judge, and jury or should there be a separation of functions of prosecution and judicial review? The report of the Committee on Armed Services submitted in connection with this bill goes into detail in supporting the latter view, that there should be a separation of functions to insure justice. The Committee effectively has answered all arguments advanced in favor of retaining complete control over the handling of a case by a single command. In this connection, the report of the committee states that—

> There is unanimous agreement that command influence has been improper and must be stopped.

Thus, if improvement is to be effected, there must be a separation and divorcement of authority so that the Commander in the field may not serve as prosecutor, judge and jury and maintain complete control over the military trial and review of the record of trial of an accused soldier. The committee has therefore recommended, and in my opinion properly so, the establishment of a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps to continue as a part of the military establishment along the lines of the Medical Corps of the Army but with separate and independent functions of review to insure justice in our system of military courts. In opposing this recommendation, certain high ranking military leaders have stressed the necessity for preserving discipline in the Army. Certainly there is a need for maintaining discipline in the Army. However, in the administration of military justice, there is a point beyond which the consideration of justice becomes paramount to discipline. Under this bill, line commanders have abundant authority to enforce discipline as such Commanders have the authority to refer charges for trial, to name the members and convene the court, to appoint the trial judge advocate, the law member and the defense counsel, and after trial to review the original record and to approve or disapprove, in whole or in part, the sentence.

Certainly this is ample authority for the commander to have in connection with maintaining discipline within his command. At the conclusion of the trial, however, it is proposed that the Judge Advocate General's Department, acting independently, shall serve as the appellate reviewing authority to set aside any errors of law, to weigh the evidence, and to judicially and impartially determine the guilt or innocence of the accused, based upon the record of trial. The committee has well pointed out in its report:

> We are now either on the threshold of universal military training or of the maintenance of a professional army many times larger than that maintained before the last war. The future army will be composed of the young men of our country. The first contact with any judicial system for the overwhelming majority of these young men will be their experience with the system of military justice in the Army.

We, as Members of the Congress, would be derelict in our duty if we fail to provide the necessary legislation to insure that the rights of these young men are insured and protected. We should see to it that the system of military law to which they are exposed is designed to achieve and promote justice. The system presently in effect has demonstrated in many instances that justice has not always been insured and human rights have not always been protected. This bill goes far toward improving this condition—there is more good than evil in the measure. It is designed to bring about safeguards and protection of the rights of men in the service, to strengthen our military law, and to insure that these rights are guaranteed and preserved. I do not pose as an expert on the subject of military justice. Certainly a detailed discussion of the technical aspects of the bill at this point is unnecessary. However, I do wish to summarize and set forth the main accomplishments which the enactment of this bill provides:

First. Enlisted men have been authorized to sit as members of our Army courts, thus insuring that enlisted men may serve upon a court when an enlisted man is tried, thereby making our military courts more democratic in composition.

Second. It subjects officers to trial by special courts martial.

Third. It prohibits the unlawful influence of courts martial or of the members thereof.

Fourth. Warrant officers are authorized to sit as members of a courts martial.

Fifth. An accused, if he so desires, may have counsel at the pretrial investigation.

Sixth. Authority to grant a bad-conduct discharge has been granted to general and special courts martial.

Seventh. The review and appellate provisions have been strengthened.

Eighth. A lesser punishment than death or life imprisonment for murder or rape has been provided.

Ninth. The authority of commanding officers under the one hundred and fourth article of war has been increased so far as it pertains to officers but not to enlisted men.

Tenth. A separate Judge Advocate General's Corps has been established for the purposes above indicated, namely, of insuring independent exercise of judicial judgment and discretion in arriving at decisions affecting the rights of our men in the armed forces.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the establishment of an independent Judge Advocate General's Corps for the purposes indicated, I wish to especially point out two or three other features of the bill which I consider meritorious, namely, that provision providing for enlisted men to sit as members of Army courts martial; the mandatory provision that the appointing authority

shall detail as law member of the court an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department. This provision will serve to insure that a trained and experienced and capable law member, who is familiar with the rules of law with respect to the reception of evidence, shall serve on our courts and thereby serve in the capacity as a judge in courts-martial proceedings.

Another major improvement provided in the bill is that section prohibiting the unlawful interference and influencing of members of the court. This section provides that—

> No authority appointing a general, special, or summary court martial nor any other commanding officer, Judge Advocate General, or other officer shall censure, reprimand, or admonish such court, or any member thereof, with respect to the findings or sentence adjudged by the court, or with respect to any other exercise, of its or his judicial responsibility. Any person subject to military law who attempts to coerce or unlawfully influence the action of a court martial or any military court or commission, or any member thereof, in reaching the findings or sentence in any case, or the action of an appointing or reviewing or confirming authority with respect to his judicial acts, shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

This is a most worth-while and needed provision. As has been pointed out in most of the hearings and from reports of questionnaires sent to persons familiar with the operation of the system of the military justice and who have observed and witnessed our military courts in operation, most all agree that there have been instances of improper influence exercised by commanders upon the decisions and sentences of the courts. Under the present system a commander exercising courts-martial jurisdiction names the members of his court from his command, and such persons appointed to serve on the court are subject to removal at the discretion of the commanding general. Although the members of the court are theoretically independent, nevertheless, every member of an Army courts martial knows that he was appointed by his commander and that if his action is not in accordance with the commander's wishes that he may be removed.

Aside from this fact there are other considerations which either consciously or subconsciously enter into the minds of the members of the court in arriving at their decision. The members want to do only what their commanding officer wishes in the way of rendering a sentence, and as they do not want to take any action which would jeopardize the possibility of their own promotion or assignment, they, therefore, often render a prejudiced or controlled decision, one in line with what they know their commander wants, and their decisions are often harsh and excessive and unjust.

Many officers presently charged with the handling of our courts-martial system and as advisors to commanding generals in the field are Regular Army officers, many of whom have families and have chosen the Army as a career. They would, therefore, be less than human if they ignored the possibilities of the influence of their commander. Those who are charged with the impartial administration of military justice must have sufficient freedom of judicial determination to meet their responsibility. There have been many cases in which our Army courts have imposed lenient sentences and thereafter the members of the court have been reprimanded by their commanding general and removed from the courts. Orders have been handed down in effect requiring that more excessive sentences be imposed.

I recall a specific instance in which a lieutenant colonel who was a member of a general court in the European theater informed me that the court of which he was a member tried a soldier for an offense not too serious, following which the court imposed what, in its opinion, was a just and fair sentence. The decision—rather the sentence imposed—did not please the commanding general. As a result a few days thereafter the court received a reprimand—a "skin letter" as it is popularly referred to in the Army—from the commanding general criticizing the members of the court for their leniency and stressing the importance of imposing heavy sentences. After this reprimand a few days later another case was tried by the same court which involved a minor offense, at least an offense of less gravity than the preceding one, and the court imposed a gross and excessive sentence. This later action was, in the opinion of my informer, a direct result of the reprimand which the court had received from the commanding general. In the first instance the members of the court used their own judgment as to what constituted a just and fair sentence and they were criticized for their action. In the second instance an injustice resulted because of the commanding general's dictation to and control of the court. This situation illustrates the evil which should be corrected. All too often it has been cases of this character that have brought our system of military justice into disrepute.

The enactment of the pending measure and the accomplishment of the objectives herein outlined will serve to protect and insure the rights of accused soldiers and will also serve as a guidepost to those officials charged with administering and enforcing our military laws, by indicating to them the views of the people of our country that the men serving in our armed forces shall not be treated unjustly or tried by "kangeroo courts" or subjected to "star chamber" proceedings, but that American soldiers shall be treated as human beings with their just rights protected and preserved. The approval of this bill, which includes the proposal that there be a total separation of appointing and reviewing authority, will go far toward eliminating present evils in our court-martial system and will serve to effect an improvement in the present system of military law and justice. Although this measure may not contain all the improvements needed, the bill goes far toward effecting genuine improvements. Especially is this true with respect to the expanded and improved appellate review provided. Provision is made for full and adequate review through constituted channels within the Judge Advocate General's Department, the Office of the Secretary of War, and ultimately the President of the United States, who, of course, is the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. Adoption of this measure is therefore urged by the Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for whatever bill comes out of this committee, but I am not supporting the bill. I would like to make that distinction. In other words, I assume the attitude of the old gentleman who said that he was not as good as he should be and he was not as good as he wants to be, but, thank God, he is better than he used to be. That is about the way this bill is here. It certainly is an improvement, but it reminds me somewhat of the Doolittle report. The Doolittle report was a public appeasement. It did not go down to the fundamentals involved, and I think this bill here is somewhat of an appeasement measure. I am not criticizing the committee at all, because I join in complimenting you upon having done something, but I think this is an Army bill; it is a military bill. There will always be military bills when the Army or the Navy has anything to do with it. They are going to bring in those bills to make sure that they keep the authority unto themselves.

As my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Texas, has said, the administration of military justice has a great deal to do with the results, but the trouble here is that too much of it is being administered by the military, and this bill furthers that perspective in rendering decisions in matters dealing with the lives and the liberty of boys in service charged with an offense. I say, under this bill, that a boy in military service charged with an offense does not have the same right to defend himself as the most hardened and vicious criminals in most of the jurisdictions of our State courts. There is hardly a jurisdiction that I know anything about—and I have given study to a number of them—which does not extend the theory of reasonable doubt, and juries are instructed that if they have a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in his favor. Such is not the case in so-called military justice.

Take, for instance, challenges to the members of the court-martial board. There is a provision in here, of course, for challenges, but it is vague, indefinite, and ineffective. That provision should be spelled out in understandable terms.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. The statement that the gentleman has just made with respect to reasonable doubt is exactly contrary to my understanding.

Mr. BURLESON. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. MACKINNON. I believe it to be a fact that the doctrine of reasonable doubt is applicable in military law. Does the gentleman have any support for a contrary statement?

Mr. BURLESON. The only support is the bill itself. If you can read me any

place in here that it definitely directs the court-martial board to resolve a doubt in favor of the accused, I have not seen it.

Mr. MACKINNON. That is part of the fundamental law. It need not be restated here as the Constitution of the United States contains such protection, as I understand it.

Mr. BURLESON. It is fundamental; definitely it is fundamental. It is also fundamental that the theory of presumption of innocence shall be given also, but it is not in here and how can you presume that every person who serves on court martial to know the law under the Constitution unless it is given to him in application. In all of the jurisdictions in the State courts, the burden of proof, of course, is on the prosecution.

Mr. MACKINNON. But you do not find that in your State courts solely by virtue of a statutory declaration.

Mr. BURLESON. Oh, yes, you do. In most jurisdictions it is so spelled out. That is just the point that I am making. We are leaving loose ends in here to be interpreted by men in military. Ordinarily they are not trained lawyers, and in the case of this last war some have recognized the fact that Reserve officers and other people had something to do with winning the war beside the Regular Army and the Navy. For instance, in here it provides that no one shall serve upon court-martial boards—"if practical" it says—if they have had less than 2 years of service. Where does that leave the people who have just come into the service while the war has been going on? It does not make sense to me. In fact, the people that have just come into the service may know something about it, and they might be able to render more military justice than those of the Regular Army or those who have already spent considerable time in the service.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I would like to inform the gentleman that under the statutes of the State of New York the defendant in a criminal action is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty.

Mr. BURLESON. Of course, that is the very point. He shall be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence, and you will find that situation to exist in most of the State jurisdictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, in our own State of Texas that is statutory. I believe it is in all the 48 States. The gentleman is complaining that it is not contained in H. R. 2575. I want to call attention to the fact that H. R. 2575 does not constitute the Articles of War. H. R. 2575 amends certain of the Articles of War, and the great body of the criminal law of the military remains as it has in the past. It is only amended in certain particulars in which it appears in H. R. 2575. Of course, the military law is that a man is presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, and that the presumption shall remain with him until overcome by legal and competent evidence. It is as strongly a part of the military law as it is of the civil law.

Mr. BURLESON. I think perhaps you can find by reading between the lines—at least one can who is on the defense side in a court-martial proceeding, and I have been on both—some of those things, and you might point them out, but I say that in court-martial proceedings, it should be spelled out word for word to have a decent administration of it, and in this bill it is not.

Mr. NORBLAD. If the gentleman will yield, I have the entire data the gentleman wants right here. If the gentleman will refer to the Manual of Courts Martial, corrected to 1943, the latest one, beginning on page 62 he will find two solid pages on the rule of reasonable doubt.

Mr. BURLESON. Yes, I have read that from cover to cover many times. I do not hold myself up to be an expert but I do know something about how it works in practical application. I have tried it on both sides.

Let me point out another matter, the concurrence of the court in finding guilty, a boy charged with a crime. Only in matters of a death sentence is it necessary that it be unanimous. Then it drops down to three-fourths when a bad conduct discharge is involved, and then it gets down to just a majority in some decisions.

Mr. KILDAY. I hope the gentleman will correct the statement he has just made. It requires two-thirds.

Mr. BURLESON. Is two-thirds the minimum?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. BURLESON. However, it has been a majority where it is a lesser offense. Is not that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. That is not my understanding.

Mr. BURLESON. That is my understanding, and I have read it. The real catch in the language providing for the number for decision, are the words, "those present." They should be "be present" and no speculation about it.

I see no reason why that should not be unanimous, for that matter, upon a decision of the court-martial board. It is that way in criminal jurisdictions in the State courts. That is one of the things I am talking about. The boy charged with crime does not have the same right to defend himself as common criminals in civilian life.

There is a provision also that the accused shall have the right of peremptory challenge of members of a court-martial board. It is not spelled out in this bill. When a boy goes before a court-martial board he is afraid he will antagonize them if he says, "Have you a fixed opinion in this case? Have you ever heard the circumstances of this case discussed, and if so, do you have a fixed opinion, and will it take evidence to remove that opinion?" You know it is not in this bill, and it should be in here. It is a shame that it is not. This has gone on for too long now, and in the name of decent justice, it should not be continued.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES].

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of H. R. 2575. To my knowledge it has the support of all of the service organizations and opposition from none. The American Bar Association has approved it, as have various civilian organizations. It is recognized as meeting in part, at least, the objections which developed during our experience in World War II with respect to the administration of military justice.

This measure, as amended, follows closely the recommendations of the War Department Advisory Committee on Military Justice contained in its report dated December 13, 1946. This group is usually referred to as the Vanderbilt Committee in tribute to its chairman, the distinguished Arthur T. Vanderbilt, a former president of the American Bar Association and now dean of one of the great law colleges in the United States. The high caliber of the members of the committee is manifest. The following comprised it:

Mr. Arthur T. Vanderbilt, Newark, N. J., chairman.

Mr. Justice Alexander Holtzoff, Washington, D. C., secretary.

Mr. Walter P. Armstrong, Memphis, Tenn.

Hon. Frederick E. Crane, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Joseph W. Henderson, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. William T. Joyner, Raleigh, N. C.

Mr. Jacob M. Lashly, St. Louis, Mo.

United States Circuit Judge Morris A. Soper, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Floyd E. Thompson, Chicago, Ill.

It was the function of this committee, as prescribed by the Secretary of War, to recommend "changes in existing laws, regulations, and practices which the committee considers necessary or appropriate to improve the administration of military justice in the Army."

The excellence of the report of the committee reflects the elaborate care with which it accomplished its work. By a series of specific recommendations the committee undertook to provide corrective measures for what it called a disquieting absence of respect for the operation of our present system of military justice. The results of its study and conclusions are substantially embodied in H. R. 2575. It may not be a perfect bill, and further changes may be indicated by experience, but no one can deny that it represents a forthright and conscientious effort to correct the deficiencies in and objections to our existing system of military justice by implementing the recommendations of the Vanderbilt committee. I join with my colleagues in commending the Armed Services Committee and its subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], upon a hard task well done.

I think the differences between the views of the War Department on the one hand and the views of the Vanderbilt committee and civilian groups generally on the other may be explained by their

very different concepts of the function which justice should perform in the Military Establishment. In the Army the emphasis is upon discipline, of which the system of military justice is largely an instrumentality. The civilian concept is based upon the Anglo-American ideals of equal justice under the law, and the independence of the courts and judiciary. It is not easy to reconcile the differences between these two positions.

But it is clear that a fundamental requirement for any system of justice is an impartial court which is free from influence and any possibility of intimidation or control. That requirement can be met only by separating the administration of military justice from command control. Until the commanding officer no longer has the right to select judge, jury, prosecutor, and appellate tribunal, no court martial can be regarded as altogether freed from the suspicion and the possibility of influence, however indirect it might be.

The gist of this bill is found in its treatment of that situation. It undertakes to separate military courts, so far as practicable, from the chain of command, by authorizing enlisted men to sit as members of courts martial at the option of the accused; by specifically prohibiting any attempt to influence a court martial or its members; by strengthening review and appellate procedures; by prescribing professional qualifications for the trial judge advocate and defense counsel; by establishing a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps with a separate promotion list; and by other provisions.

It seems to me that this is the heart of the bill, although there are other provisions of importance which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has already detailed. I believe that H. R. 2575, as amended by the committee, will bring the system of military justice into a more consistent relationship with the fundamental principles of American jurisprudence, and will better adapt it to the needs of the citizen armies which comprise the great bulk of our forces in times of national peril.

I earnestly urge the House to consider the measure carefully and to pass it by a decisive vote.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in substantial agreement with many of the things the gentleman from Texas who spoke just a moment ago has said, but I do want to compliment the subcommittee and the committee for attacking a problem that has been crying for attention for a long, long time. I think the discussion here has demonstrated the need for this attention. I do not think a person can serve as a Member of Congress for very long before there are called to his attention many evidences of injustice in the administration of military justice.

I am not one to condemn the military and rave about outlandish actions of brass hats, and so forth. I have a very high regard for these men. I think they do a splendid job and render noble service. But as was pointed out in the discussion earlier by the chairman of the subcommittee, the military is primarily responsible for winning battles during a war and preparing to win battles in case of a potential war. This bill deals with administering justice, with determining guilt or innocence, and punishment for violation of regulations, and so forth.

I have taken this time primarily to ask the chairman of this committee whether or not any consideration was given during the course of considering this question to the possibility of establishing a civilian review board of some kind as a final board of review.

Mr. ELSTON. There was some consideration given to the question, but the committee decided against it. As a matter of fact, I think we had a bill before us which provided for a review in the Federal courts of the United States of the court martial convictions. We felt it best to leave the review in the hands of the Board, the judicial council set-up, in the Judge Advocate General's department.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In 1946 we had a subcommittee consider the same matter very exhaustively. They have a somewhat similar provision in England. After thinking it over carefully we decided to reject it in favor of the provision such as is contained in the bill before us.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I do think, however, and I want to express my view, that at least some type of civilian review should be incorporated in the bill. I want to call the attention of the House to what we did in the Seventy-ninth Congress in connection with the Legislative Reorganization Act. Prior to the passage of that act and its adoption as the rules of the House, there was the possibility for correction of a military record by a civilian group. The Congress had that power. Final power to correct injustices in military records was vested in the Congress. The Reorganization Act, in an attempt to reduce the legislative work load, banned the introduction of private bills of this character. This prohibition is set forth in section 131 of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. That section provides:

> No private bill or resolution * * *, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, authorizing or directing. * * * (3) the correction of a military or naval record, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

As a substitute the act empowered the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Treasury, with respect to the Coast Guard, to create boards of civilian officers or employees of their respective departments, and through them to authorize the correction of any military or naval record where in their—the Secretary's—judgment such action was necessary to correct an error or to remove an injustice. That authorization is contained in section 207 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. In other words, the Secretaries of the various departments were given the same jurisdiction as had formerly been possessed by the Congress in this respect. But what has happened? The effect of these provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act has been, in practice, to deny the veteran's right of appeal. By leaving the power of review at the discretion of the Secretaries of the Departments, Congress has, in effect, asked the impossible. It has asked that a fair and impartial review be granted by the same judge who has previously approved of the decision in the case.

The present state of the law vests final jurisdiction entirely in the armed services and thereby breaks an historic precedent in the sequence of military appeal. This is a situation which I believe should be corrected at the earliest possible date.

I called the attention of the House to a bill which I introduced last June, H. R. 4019, which would create a civilian board of final review of armed forces discharges and dismissals. I do not contend that the machinery provided for in H. R. 4019 is perfect. But I believe that the subject matter of the bill should be given early consideration in order that some method may be provided whereby a final review of discharges and dismissals will be obtained by a board, commission, or court that is not under the influence of the military.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I am one of these people who feel that the bill does not go far enough, and that it can be improved over its present form by amendment and also by administrative order in the War Department. Of course, there are some things here that have to be written into law for protection and there are other things that are details which should be handled by administrative order. The one thing that the bill lacks, to me, is an emphasis on what might be called a bill of rights for the serviceman, which would protect him and show that he has affirmative protections and will insure that he, after all, is to be tried as a citizen of the United States with certain inherent rights. This bill and the courts-martial procedure seem to me to have come down through the law in the traditional way; the way a great many of the criminal laws have come down to us in our States. That is, we emphasize the penalty, the confinement, and the severity of the punishment.

My feeling is that we ought to look toward the rehabilitation of the serviceman, giving him hope that when his sentence has been served he can build himself up again so that he can be restored to active duty, and by good conduct remove maybe this one blemish on his service. For example, many of us have been in the service and have seen men who have been subject to strains so that when they got out they got drunk and did some things they usually would not do. Then when they come back in a general court martial is called, and they, having had a perfect record previously in civil life or in the Army or Navy, find themselves with a dishonorable discharge that cannot be removed, and that affects them in

their economic life thereafter, and it prevents them from ever being restored to duty. It forever blemishes these men so that they are always trying to get the dishonorable discharge changed. You Members know that has taken place. You have had people of sterling character, from fine families, come to you, saying, "This has been the one thing in my life that has completely blighted me." As Congressman from Pittsburgh, I have had men from the first war come to me and say, "Here, you are a new Congressman, perhaps you can think up something that will remove this stain from my family, because I would give anything to get it removed."

The emphasis should be on rehabilitation and the taking away of the stigma of punishment after the penalty has been met.

In many of our State courts and in many of our Federal courts, the people are put through what is called a psychological clinic, where it is necessary. Many times those people do things when they are probably in the condition of the young fellow I saw in Italy this last summer. He would not talk to anybody. He would not look at anybody. He was confined in a barbed-wire enclosure, without shelter during the day, he had nothing but a board to sleep on, with two blankets, and no bed. He would not discuss anything with anybody. When we asked who he was and what he was, they said he was under some punishment of 50 or 60 years; that he would not cooperate. He evidently felt he never had a chance. So that he was just going from one offense in this particular disciplinary training center to another, with the result that he stood no chance of getting out. We Congressmen who were on the trip insisted that he be brought over to us and that he talk to us, separate and apart from the personnel in charge of this particular camp. He finally talked with us. He was a psychological case if I ever saw one. I said to him, "If you have any idea of ever getting out of here, or of ever trying to better yourself, let us hear what you have to say." The only word I have ever had is something from his mother saying that he is up here in a Federal penitentiary.

When we left, that young man said, "I have been misused." He said, "I came in without a chance, because I had a record against me and was known to have been paroled to the Army. The first thing that came up when something was wrong, they blamed it on me." He said, "I did not do it." He said, "From there on I did the things they are saying," and he said, "I am going to continue to do them."

Now, perhaps a sentence of 50 or 60 years for that young man in his early twenties is not quite the solution. Perhaps rehabilitation, perhaps a feeling that there is a chance in the United States for him will take that young man off the backs of the taxpayers back to self-support in civil life. I do not want 80,000 young men in the prime of their manhood and in the prime of their productive years kept in the prisons of this country and either kept out of the Army or kept out of productive employment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that the Army has now established certain rehabilitation centers where the very thing is being done that the gentleman is seeking.

Mr. FULTON. I may say to the gentleman that I have talked to the Secretary of Defense about such rehabilitation centers and will continue to make suggestions for rehabilitation centers that can be used so that these men we are speaking of will not go right out of the Federal penitentiaries with the prison brands on them into civil life. Those rehabilitation training centers, however, should be distinct from the Army disciplinary training centers. Disciplinary training centers should be used for small offenders.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Is the gentleman not aware of the fact that of the 80,000 convicted of court-martial offenses, 33,000 were restored to duty after being assigned to rehabilitation centers?

Mr. FULTON. I am very well aware that a good start has been made but there is still quite a large problem remaining. I spoke of the total number of people who had been sentenced by Army court martial, and I am pointing it out to show the size of the problem. As the gentleman from Ohio points out, a very good start has been made in this particular. I will have some amendments to offer a little later under which a young man sentenced for anything under 5 years as a minimum sentence may choose an Army disciplinary training and rehabilitation center as the place to serve his last year and that if he comes out with satisfactory conduct he will be eligible for an administrative discharge as distinguished from a bad-conduct discharge that would haunt him all his life.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Would not that very probably be more appropriate in a separate bill? In my State we have a penal code that lays down the provisions of the administrative penal law and the fundamental law, and we have a separate one on parole, probation, and those things, entirely separate. It does not seem to me that what the gentleman seeks is appropriate in this particular bill.

Mr. FULTON. That may be a good idea to consider. If it is refused at the present time then it might be done as the gentleman from California suggests, in a separate bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the gentleman in his idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Because I am one of the few Members opposed to the bill in its present form, may I not ask that a little more time be allotted to me?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON. I think with 2 hours allotted for the discussion of this bill that for a Member opposed to the bill to be given 9 minutes plus 5, totaling 14, is not asking too much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been allotted five additional minutes and is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. I suggest that the gentleman use the 5 minutes to speak on the bill. It may then be that additional time remains.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I have been reliably informed by the Army, and I know from cases I have had in my own office that not only youngsters who have been sentenced for a term of 5 years or under, but in one instance I know of a term of 40 years, where the individual was sent to a disciplinary battalion and 18 months thereafter was restored to full duty and upon the completion of his term of enlistment was given an honorable discharge.

Mr. FULTON. That is fine and I think that opportunity should be given every young man. He should have the choice between finishing his term in prison and going to one of these Army rehabilitation centers and not have it remain for someone else to say who of the enlisted men are to be given the opportunity to make such choice.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to add to what the gentleman from New York has said, that I know of a similar case where a young man was given life as an original sentence, but later was restored to duty, not in his same grade, but restored to duty. Therefore, I am sure that the Army has a program along these lines. Whether it is exactly the right one or not, certainly it cannot be charged with not thinking along these general lines.

Mr. FULTON. No. As a matter of fact, I am not charging the Army with being in the position of not thinking about the matter. I am trying to be constructive in reference to a program that will lead in a certain direction toward rehabilitation. I think the Army generally has done a fine job, and that also applies to the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. May I ask the gentleman if he has ever heard of the special clemency board that was set up by the Secretary of War, of which Justice Roberts was chairman?

Mr. FULTON. Yes. I know quite a bit about that.

Mr. GOFF. May I inform the gentleman that my last military duty during the recent war was as a member of one of these special clemency boards under Justice Roberts. The reference has been made here to knowing one case. I know some 35,000 cases where the very thing the gentleman has been talking about has been done.

Mr. FULTON. But now that board has completed its job.

Mr. GOFF. That board does not exist in that name, but there is at the present time in the War Department a board actually functioning at this time which reviews these sentences and has the power to recommend reductions to the Secretary of War and it actually has a continuous process of arranging for the rehabilitation of these men. The bill under consideration is one that certainly has my unreserved support.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman has taken the trouble to inform himself on the subject. I may say that I went to Europe several months ago and visited the Army disciplinary barracks and I think I know something about it. If the gentleman would like to hear some more about this investigation I can tell him about it.

I found people who were confined under physical punishment conditions for 7 months without a trial. They were held without being able to get a trial when they asked for it. For example, on March 19, 1946, I wrote to Washington asking where a particular young serviceman was and I was advised they had no record of his being up for general court martial in Washington. I then found out on July 26, after he had been arrested on January 3, that this young man who had just turned 21 was sentenced to 30 years at hard labor. His father had a stroke shortly after because of shock, and it was a great shock when he felt his son was right on duty as usual.

When I went over to the Army disciplinary training center I found enlisted men there without beds, sleeping on boards with spaces so wide between them I could put four fingers in the spaces. I asked the people in charge of the camp to stand aside and let me talk to the men alone, which I did. Eighty percent of them said they were cold and needed blankets.

If that is one example of Army justice maybe we need some corrections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, anyone who has ever had any part in the administration of justice has always been most regretful to see what happens to a young man who becomes embroiled with the law. Also those of us who have had experience know that quite frequently the greatest punishment falls on the innocent members of the family rather than on the wrongdoer. Those are things which are inherent in society and our way of life. No matter what we may do they cannot be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, whether men are sleeping on the floor or not has nothing to do with the type of bill that we can write on the administration of justice in the Army. I condemn any such practices on the part of any commanding officer. In my opinion he should be brought before a court martial himself if he permits things of that kind to take place. However, that has nothing to do with the procedure before courts martial.

This bill attempts to do exactly the things that the gentleman from Pennsylvania says he would like to see incorporated into the administration of military justice. It is true that during the war rehabilitation battalions were organized by the Army, and I believe that 33,000 of the 80,000 were given the opportunity to go to rehabilitation battalions and secure honorable discharges. In this bill for the very first time we make it a part of the law of the United States by incorporating it in the Articles of War that it can be done.

I call your attention to page 30 of the bill, line 22:

> The authority which suspends the execution of a sentence may restore the person under sentence to duty during such suspension—

There has not heretofore been any such statutory authority for that to be done. It was done during the war while the War Powers Acts were in effect, and things of that kind—

> and the death or honorable discharge of a person under suspended sentence shall operate as a complete remission of any unexecuted or unremitted part of such sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

So, you see that we are now providing that even though the judgment becomes final, if a man goes to a rehabilitation battalion and secures an honorable discharge, it is automatic in setting aside the previous judgment of the general court martial. So, in this bill we are taking care of that very thing.

Now, in the case of the young men whose lives were blighted because they received dishonorable discharges, for the first time in this bill we are giving an opportunity for the review of a fully executed judgment of a general court martial. Heretofore that power only existed in the President under his constitutional power of Executive clemency. In this bill the judicial council in its review has the right at any time within a period of 1 year after the judgment becomes final to review the court martial and to set aside even a dishonorable discharge. That was excepted from the GI bill of rights where bad-conduct discharges could be reviewed. In addition, as to any offense for which a man was convicted during World War II there is a period of 1 year after the termination of the war—and the war has not as yet terminated and we do not know when it will officially terminate—in which those discharges can be reviewed. So, rather than criticize matters about which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has spoken, I think the bill deserves support for the very reasons he has given, because the bill for the first time incorporates in statutory law all of the things which he advocates.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. As a matter of fact, the bill provides that the judicial council may weigh the evidence, power which does not vest in even some of our appellate courts with respect to civil cases.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. ELSTON. So, as a matter of fact, the bill gives to the soldier convicted in every general, special, or summary court martial, more consideration than is given to a civilian who may be placed on trial in any State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Now, very conscientious members of the boards of review have told me of the difficulty which faces them and the terrible mental anguish that it caused some of them because of the technical rules which bound them in reviewing courts martial; the fact that they could not consider the weight and the sufficiency of the evidence, and the credibility of the witnesses, and that there were technical rules by which they were deprived of the right to consider certain questions of law, because certain preliminary motions had not been made during the trial and things of that kind. This bill does away with a lot of that.

Of course, there has been a good deal said here about uniformity of sentence. I say to you, as my considered opinion, that whenever you get a system of jurisprudence which gives the same penalty for the same charge, then you have no system of justice. If theft is going to take 10 years in every case of theft, you do not have an administration of justice; you have a robot turning out automatically machine-produced things. In the administration of justice you will never reach the point that every charge of the same character of offense will receive the same penalty. It should not be. All of the circumstances must be taken into consideration; the individual himself, his intelligence, his opportunities, his environment, premeditation, acts of passion, whether done in anger, or things of that kind. So long as you do have varying penalties, then you have a system of justice. When you find a situation in which each charge of the same character receives the same penalty, then justice has left your system of administration of justice.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. My purpose is to bring out some of these points in order to see that they are covered by the bill. I think the gentleman has made an adequate explanation on the review and remission features. Will the gentleman show me something in the bill that will provide the thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS] and I are very interested in, and that is prompt trial? Is there anything in the bill that will insure these men having a prompt trial? Let me give the gentleman my situation. I found a young man who was denied a trial for 7 months. Is there anything in the bill that will prevent that in the future?

Mr. KILDAY. It is most reprehensible that a man should be held for a period of time such as that or for any unreasonable period of time. I think the bill does all that you can possibly do in a code of criminal procedure in a State in accomplishing that. Where are

you going to state your limit as to when he shall be brought to trial?

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman object to an amendment that had in it a provision that general courts martial in the usual run should be held within 60 days after the service of charges upon the defendant, except where the Judge Advocate General shall grant an extension of time under special circumstances?

Mr. KILDAY. I would have to oppose that, because the military very frequently is on the move. Suppose during the past war a division was in England on its way to the Continent and a man was charged there with some heinous crime, and shortly thereafter the division went to France, went into the front line, was up in Belgium or Luxemburg, or further up the line. I do not know that they could get the witnesses in 60 days, I do not know that they could get them in 90 days. They might be able to get them in 10 days. There is no way to tell. Our Constitution saw fit to say that a man was entitled to a speedy trial, and went into no further detail. That is the only right the gentleman or I have as civilians in regard to a trial.

This is what we put into the bill, and I do not think you could be any more specific, because if you attempt to be you are going to have to say that a man not brought to trial within 60 days shall be released and not tried. Whenever you do that, you have to have the procedure so hide-bound that you are not going to be able to administer justice.

Page 18, line 12, is where it begins:

When a person is held for trial by general court martial, the commanding officer will, within 8 days after the accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and furnish the accused a copy of such charges. If the same be not practicable, he will report to superior authority the reasons for delay.

Again, we must depend upon those administering any law.

The trial judge advocate will cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had, and a failure so to serve such charges will be ground for a continuance unless the trial be had on the charges furnished the accused as hereinbefore provided. In time of peace no person shall, against his objection, be brought to trial before a general court martial within a period of 5 days subsequent to the service of charges upon him.

The latter provision is regarded as the one that is important. The code of procedure of my State does not say the time within which a man shall be tried, but it is very positive in saying that he shall not be tried quicker than 2 days after the indictment is returned, or in cases of capital punishment not within 2 days after the indictment has been personally served on him. That is the thing that has been regarded as deserving of protection from the Government, that is, a quick trial without opportunity to prepare.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I want to know what the gentleman's attitude would be relative to the suspension of sentence by the court martial itself, not waiting until higher authority reviews it.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know that I have any definite opinion on that. It might be one way or the other. The gentleman's opinion on that would be as good as mine.

Mr. BURLESON. That is another thing that contributes to the statement I made before, and I repeat it: The boy in the Army who is charged with an offense still does not have the opportunity to defend himself in a court-martial trial comparable to that of the most hardened criminal in State jurisdictions.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman may be correct, but that has not been my experience, having observed the Army rather closely all my life. We have laws which are just as strict as they can be made to secure for him that right. I have seen men butchered by district attorneys; there is no doubt about that. I have seen them butchered by trial judges. What are you going to do about that in writing laws? It is something that just cannot be done. The best you can do is to put them under oath that they will fairly and impartially administer the law. After you have done that there is no way in the world that you can make a man be fair and impartial, no more than you can make him love his neighbor or keep him from hating another man. That is the human equation which exists in the administration of justice by human beings. The best we can do is to come as close to it as we possibly can, and I think that in this bill we have done so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Articles of War (41 Stat. 787 to 811, as amended) are hereby amended as follows:

Article 1 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The word 'officer' shall be construed to refer to a commissioned officer.

"(b) The word 'soldier' shall be construed as including a noncommissioned officer, a private, or any other enlisted man or woman.

"(c) The word 'company' shall be construed as including a troop, battery, or corresponding unit of the Ground or Air Forces.

"(d) The word 'battalion' shall be construed as including a squadron or corresponding unit of the Ground or Air Forces.

"(e) The word 'cadet' shall be construed to refer to a cadet of the United States Military Academy."

SEC. 2. Article 2, subparagraph (a), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) All officers, members of the Army Nurse Corps, warrant officers, flight officers, and soldiers belonging to the Regular Army of the United States; all volunteers, from the dates of their muster or acceptance into the military service of the United States; and all other persons lawfully called, drafted, or ordered into, or to duty or for training in, the said service, from the dates they are required by the terms of the call, draft, or order to obey the same;"

SEC. 3. Article 4 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 4. Who may serve on courts martial: All officers in the military service of the United States, and officers of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on courts martial for the trial of any persons who may lawfully be brought before such courts for trial.

"All enlisted persons in the active military service of the United States or in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of enlisted persons and persons of these categories shall be detailed for such service when deemed proper by the appointing authority.

"When appointing courts martial the appointing authority shall detail as members thereof those officers of the command and when eligible those enlisted persons of the command who, in his opinion, are best qualified for the duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament; and officers and enlisted persons having less than 2 years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the service, be appointed as members of courts martial in excess of minority membership thereof. No person shall be eligible to sit as a member of a general or special court martial when he is the accuser or a witness for the prosecution."

SEC. 4. Article 5 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 2. General courts martial: General courts martial may consist of any number of members not less than five."

SEC. 5. Article 6 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 6. Special courts martial: Special courts martial may consist of any number of members not less than three."

SEC. 6. Article 8 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 8. General courts martial: The President of the United States, the commanding officer of a Territorial department, the Superintendent of the Military Academy, the commanding officer of an Army group, an Army, an Army corps, a division, a separate brigade, or corresponding unit of the Ground or Air Forces, or any command to which a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department is assigned as staff judge advocate, as prescribed in article 47, and, when empowered by the President, the commanding officer of any district or of any force or body of troops may appoint general courts martial; but when any such commander is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried, the court shall be appointed by superior competent authority, and may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable.

"The authority appointing a general court martial shall detail as one of the members thereof a law member who shall be an officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department or an officer admitted to practice law in a court of the judicial system of the United States or in the highest court of a State of the United States and certified by the Judge Advocate General to be qualified for such detail: *Provided*, That no general court martial shall receive evidence or vote upon its findings or sentence in the absence of the law member regularly detailed. The law member, in addition to his duties as a member, shall perform the duties prescribed in article 31 hereof and such other duties as the President may by regulations prescribe."

SEC. 7. Article 9 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 9. Special courts martial: The commanding officer of a district, garrison, fort, camp, station, or other place where troops are on duty, and the commanding officer of an Army group, an Army, an Army corps, a division, brigade, regiment, detached battalion, or corresponding unit of ground or air forces, and the commanding officer of any other detached command or group of

detached units placed under a single commander for this purpose may appoint special courts martial; but when any such commanding officer is the accuser or the prosecutor of the person or persons to be tried, the court shall be appointed by superior authority, and may in any case be appointed by superior authority when by the latter deemed desirable."

SEC. 8. Article 11 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 11. Appointment of trial judge advocates and counsel: For each general or special court martial the authority appointing the court shall appoint a trial judge advocate and a defense counsel, and one or more assistant trial judge advocates and one or more assistant defense counsel when necessary: *Provided*, That the trial judge advocate and defense counsel of each general court martial shall, if available, be members of the Judge Advocate General's Department or officers admitted to practice law in a court of the judicial system of the United States or in the highest court of a State of the United States: *Provided further*, That in all cases in which the officer appointed as trial judge advocate shall be a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department, or an officer admitted to practice law in a court of the United States or in the highest court of a State, the officer appointed as defense counsel shall likewise be a member of the Judge Advocate General's Department or an officer admitted to practice law in a court of the judicial system of the United States or in the highest court of a State of the United States: *Provided further*, That when the accused is represented by counsel of his own selection and does not desire the presence of the regularly appointed defense counsel or assistant defense counsel, the latter may be excused by the president of the court: *And provided further*, That no officer who has acted as member, trial judge advocate, assistant trial judge advocate, defense counsel, or assistant defense counsel, in any case shall subsequently act as a staff judge advocate to the reviewing or confirming authority upon the same case."

SEC. 9. Article 12 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 12. General courts martial: General courts martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense made punishable by these articles, and any other person who by the law of war is subject to trial by military tribunals: *Provided*, That general courts martial shall have power to adjudge any punishment authorized by law or the custom of the service including a bad-conduct discharge."

SEC. 10. Article 13 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 13. Special courts martial: Special courts martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided*, That the President may, by regulations, except from the jurisdiction of special courts martial any class or classes of persons subject to military law: *Provided further*, That the officer competent to appoint a general court martial for the trial of any particular case may, when in his judgment the interests of the service so require, cause any case to be tried by a special court martial notwithstanding the limitations upon the jurisdiction of the special court martial as to offenses herein prescribed, but the limitations upon jurisdiction as to persons and upon punishing power herein prescribed shall be observed.

"Special courts martial shall not have power to adjudge dishonorable discharge or dismissal, or confinement in excess of 6 months, nor to adjudge forfeiture of more than two-thirds pay per month for a period of not exceeding 6 months: *Provided*, That subject to approval of the sentence by an officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and subject to appellate review by the Judge Advocate General and appellate agencies in his office, a special court martial may adjudge a bad-conduct discharge in addition to other authorized punishment."

SEC. 11. Article 14 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 14. Summary courts martial: Summary courts martial shall have power to try any person subject to military law, except an officer, a member of the Army Nurse Corps, a warrant officer, flight officer, or a cadet, for any crime or offense not capital made punishable by these articles: *Provided*, That noncommissioned officers shall not, if they object thereto, be brought to trial before a summary court martial without the authority of the officer competent to bring them to trial before a special court martial: *Provided further*, That the President may, by regulations, except from the jurisdiction of summary courts martial any class or classes of persons subject to military law.

"Summary courts martial shall not have power to adjudge confinement in excess of 1 month, restriction to limits for more than 3 months, or forfeiture or detention of more than two-thirds of 1 month's pay."

SEC. 12. Article 16 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 16 Persons in the military service—how triable: Officers shall be triable only by general and special courts martial and in no case shall a person in the military service, when it can be avoided, be tried by persons inferior to him in rank. No enlisted person may sit as a member of a court martial for the trial of another enlisted person who is assigned to the same company or corresponding military unit."

SEC. 13. Article 22 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 22. Process to obtain witnesses: Every trial judge advocate of a general or special court martial and every summary court-martial shall have power to issue the like process to compel witnesses to appear and testify which courts of the United States having criminal jurisdiction may lawfully issue; but such process shall run to any part of the United States, its Territories, and possessions. Witnesses for the defense shall be subpenaed, upon request by the defense counsel, through process issued by the trial judge advocate, in the same manner as witnesses for the prosecution."

SEC. 14. Article 24 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 24. Compulsory self-incrimination prohibited: No witness before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before any officer conducting an investigation, or before any officer, military or civil, designated to take a deposition to be read in evidence before a military court, commission, court of inquiry, or board, or before an officer conducting an investigation, shall be compelled to incriminate himself or to answer any question the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue when such answer might tend to degrade him.

"The use of coercion or unlawful influence in any manner whatsoever by any person subject to military law to obtain any degrading statement not material to the issue, or any self-incriminating statement, admission, or confession from any accused person or witness, shall be deemed to be conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, and no such statement, admission, or confession shall be received in evidence by any court martial."

SEC. 15. Article 25 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 25. Depositions—when admissible: A duly authenticated deposition taken upon reasonable notice to the opposite party may be read in evidence before any military court or commission in any case not capital, or in any proceeding before a court of inquiry or a military board, if such deposition be taken when the witness resides, is found, or is about to go beyond the State, Territory, or district in which the court, commission, or board is ordered to sit, or beyond the distance of 100 miles from the place of trial or hearing, or when it appears to the satisfaction of the court, commission, board, or appointing authority that the witness by reason of age, sickness, bodily infirmity, imprisonment, or other reasonable cause, is unable to or, in foreign places, because of nonamenability to process, refuses to appear and testify in person at the place of trial or hearing: *Provided*, That testimony by deposition may be adduced for the defense in capital cases: *Provided further*, That a deposition may be read in evidence in any case in which the death penalty is authorized by law but is not mandatory, whenever the appointing authority shall have directed that the case be treated as not capital, and in such a case a sentence of death may not be adjudged by the court martial: *And provided further*, That at any time after charges have been signed as provided in article 46, and before the charges have been referred for trial, any authority competent to appoint a court martial for the trial of such charges may designate officers to represent the prosecution and the defense and may authorize such officers, upon due notice, to take the deposition of any witness, and such deposition may subsequently be received in evidence as in other cases."

SEC. 16. Article 31 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 31. Method of voting: Voting by members of a general or special court martial upon questions of challenge, on the findings, and on the sentence shall be by secret written ballot. The junior member of the court shall in each case count the votes, which count shall be checked by the president, who shall forthwith announce the result of the ballot to the members of the court. The law member of a general court martial or the president of a special court martial shall rule in open court upon interlocutory questions, other than challenge, arising during the proceedings: *Provided*, That unless such ruling be made by the law member of a general court martial, if any member object thereto, the court shall be cleared and closed and the question decided by a majority vote, viva voce, beginning with the junior in rank: *And provided further*, That any such ruling made by the law member of a general court martial upon any interlocutory question other than a motion for a finding of not guilty, or the question of accused's sanity, shall be final and shall constitute the ruling of the court; but the law member may in any case consult with the court, in closed session, before making a ruling, and may change any ruling made at any time during the trial."

SEC. 17. Article 36 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 36. Disposition of records—Special and summary courts martial: After having been acted upon by the officer appointing the court, or by the officer commanding for the time being, the record of each trial by special court martial and a report of each trial by summary court martial shall be transmitted to the headquarters of the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command, there to be filed in the office of the staff judge advocate: *Provided, however*, That each record of trial by special court martial in which the sentence, as approved by the appointing authority, includes a bad-conduct discharge, shall, if approved by the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction under the provisions of article 47, be forwarded by him to The Judge Advocate General for review as hereinafter in these articles provided. When no longer

of use, records of summary courts martial may be destroyed as provided by law governing destruction of Government records."

SEC. 18. Article 38 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 38. President may prescribe rules: The President may, by regulations, which he may modify from time to time, prescribe the procedure, including modes of proof, in cases before courts martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and other military tribunals, which regulations shall, insofar as he shall deem practicable, apply the principles of law and rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the district courts of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing contrary to or inconsistent with these articles shall be so prescribed: *Provided further*, That all rules and regulations made in pursuance of this Article shall be laid before the Congress."

SEC. 19. Article 39 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 39. As to time: Except for desertion or absence without leave committed in time of war, or for mutiny or murder, no person subject to military law shall be liable to be tried or punished by a court martial for any crime or offense committed more than 2 years before arraignment of such person: *Provided*, That for desertion in time of peace or for any crime or offense punishable under articles 93 and 94 of this code the period of limitations upon trial and punishment by court martial shall be 3 years: *Provided further*, That the period of any absence of the accused from the jurisdiction of the United States, and also any period during which by reason of some manifest impediment the accused shall not have been amenable to military justice, shall be excluded in computing the aforesaid periods of limitation: *Provided further*, That this article shall not have the effect to authorize the trial or punishment for any crime or offense barred by the provisions of existing law: *And provided further*, That in the case of any offense the trial of which in time of war shall be certified by the Secretary of War to be detrimental to the prosecution of the war or inimical to the Nation's security, the period of limitations herein provided for the trial of the said offense shall be extended to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter."

SEC. 20. Article 43 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 43. Death sentence—when lawful; vote on findings and sentence: No person shall, by general court martial, be convicted of an offense for which the death penalty is made mandatory by law, nor sentenced to suffer death, except by the concurrence of all the members of said court martial present at the time the vote is taken, and for an offense in these articles expressly made punishable by death; nor sentenced to life imprisonment, nor to confinement for more than 10 years, except by the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members present at the time the vote is taken. Conviction of any offense for which the death sentence is not mandatory and any sentence to confinement not in excess of 10 years, whether by general or special court martial, may be determined by a two-thirds vote of those members present at the time the vote is taken. All other questions shall be determined by a majority vote."

SEC. 21. Article 44 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 44. Officers—reduction to ranks: When a sentence to dismissal may lawfully be adjudged in the case of an officer the sentence may in time of war, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, adjudge in lieu thereof reduction to the grade of private."

SEC. 22. Article 46 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 46. Charges; action upon:

"a. Signature; oath: Charges and specifications must be signed by a person subject to military law, and under oath either that he has personal knowledge of, or has investigated, the matters set forth therein and that the same are true in fact, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

"b. Investigation: No charge will be referred to a general court martial for trial until after a thorough and impartial investigation thereof shall have been made. This investigation will include inquiries as to the truth of the matter set forth in said charges, form of charges, and what disposition of the case should be made in the interest of justice and discipline. At such investigation full opportunity shall be given to the accused to cross-examine witnesses against him if they are available and to present anything he may desire in his own behalf, either in defense or mitigation, and the investigating officer shall examine available witnesses requested by the accused. If the charges are forwarded after such investigation they shall be accompanied by a statement of the substance of the testimony taken on both sides.

"c. Forwarding charges; delays; service of charges: When a person is held for trial by general court martial, the commanding officer will, within 8 days after the accused is arrested or confined, if practicable, forward the charges to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction and furnish the accused a copy of such charges. If the same be not practicable, he will report to superior authority the reasons for delay. The trial judge advocate will cause to be served upon the accused a copy of the charges upon which trial is to be had, and a failure so to serve such charges will be ground for a continuance unless the trial be had on the charges furnished the accused as hereinbefore provided. In time of peace no person shall, against his objection, be brought to trial before a general court martial within a period of 5 days subsequent to the service of charges upon him."

SEC. 23. Article 47 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 47. Action by convening authority:

"a. Assignment of judge advocates; channels of communication: All members of the Judge Advocate General's Department will be assigned as prescribed by the Judge Advocate General after appropriate consultations with commanders on whose staffs they may serve; and the Judge Advocate General or senior members of his staff will make frequent inspections in the field in supervision of the administration of military justice. Convening authorities will at all times communicate directly with their staff judge advocates in matters relating to the administration of military justice; and the staff judge advocate of any command is authorized to communicate directly with the staff judge advocate of a superior or subordinate command, or with the Judge Advocate General.

"b. Reference for trial: Before directing the trial of any charge by general court martial the convening authority will refer it to his staff judge advocate for consideration and advice; and no charge will be referred to a general court martial for trial unless it has been found that a thorough and impartial investigation thereof has been made as prescribed in the preceding article, that such charge is legally sufficient to allege an offense under these articles, and is sustained by evidence indicated in the report of investigation.

"c. Action on record of trial: Before acting upon a record of trial by general court martial or military commission, or a record of trial by special court martial in which a bad-conduct discharge has been adjudged and approved by the authority appointing the court, the reviewing authority will refer it to his staff judge advocate or to The Judge Advocate General for review and advice; and no sentence shall be approved unless upon conviction established beyond reasonable doubt of an offense made punishable by these articles, and unless the record of trial has been found legally sufficient to support it.

"d. Approval: No sentence of a court martial shall be carried into execution until the same shall have been approved by the convening authority: *Provided*, That no sentence of a special court martial including a bad-conduct discharge shall be carried into execution until the same shall have been approved by an officer authorized to appoint a general court martial.

"e. Who may exercise: Action by the convening authority may be taken by an officer commanding for the time being, by a successor in command, or by any officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction.

"f. Powers incident to power to approve: The power to approve the sentence of a court martial shall include—

"(1) the power to approve or disapprove a finding of guilty and to approve only so much of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense;

"(2) the power to approve or disapprove the whole or any part of the sentence; and

"(3) the power to remand a case for rehearing under the provisions of article 52."

SEC. 24. Article 48 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 48. Confirmation: In addition to the approval required by article 47, confirmation is required as follows before the sentence of a court martial may be carried into execution, namely:

"a. By the President with respect to any sentence—

"(1) of death, or

"(2) involving a general officer:

Provided, That when the President has already acted as approving authority, no additional confirmation by him is necessary;

"b. By the Secretary of War with respect to any sentence not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, when the Judge Advocate General does not concur in the action of the Judicial Council;

"c. By the Judicial Council, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, with respect to any sentence—

"(1) when the confirming action of the Judicial Council is not unanimous, or when by direction of the Judge Advocate General his participation in the confirming action is required, or

"(2) involving imprisonment for life, or

"(3) involving the dismissal of an officer other than a general officer, or

"(4) involving the dismissal or suspension of a cadet;

"d. By the Judicial Council with respect to any sentence in a case transmitted to the Judicial Council under the provisions of article 50 for confirming action."

SEC. 25. Article 49 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 49. Powers incident to power to confirm: The power to confirm the sentence of a court martial shall be held to include—

"a. The power to approve, confirm, or disapprove a finding of guilty, and to approve or confirm so much only of a finding of guilty of a particular offense as involves a finding of guilty of a lesser included offense;

"b. The power to confirm, disapprove, vacate, commute, or reduce to legal limits the whole or any part of the sentence;

"c. The power to restore all rights, privileges, and property affected by any finding or sentence disapproved or vacated;

"d. The power to order the sentence to be carried into execution;

"e. The power to remand the case for a rehearing under the provisions of article 52."

SEC. 26. Article 50 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 50. Appellate review:

"a. Board of review; Judicial Council: The Judge Advocate General shall constitute, in his office, a Board of Review composed of not less than three officers of the Judge

Advocate General's Department. He shall also constitute, in his office, a Judicial Council composed of three general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department: *Provided*, That the Judge Advocate General may, under exigent circumstances, detail as members of the Judicial Council, for periods not in excess of 60 days, officers of the Judge Advocate General's Department of grades below that of general officer.

"b. Additional boards of review and judicial councils: Whenever necessary, the Judge Advocate General may constitute two or more Boards of Review and Judicial Councils in his office, with equal powers and duties, composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article.

"c. Branch offices: Whenever the President deems such action necessary, he may direct the Judge Advocate General to establish a branch office, under an Assistant Judge Advocate General who shall be a general officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department, with any distant command, and to establish in such branch office one or more boards of rewiew and judicial councils composed as provided in the first paragraph of this article. Such Assistant Judge Advocate General and such board of review and judicial council shall be empowered to perform for that command under the general supervision of the Judge Advocate General, the duties which the Judge Advocate General and the board of review and judicial council in his office would otherwise be required to perform in respect of all cases involving sentences not requiring approval or confirmation by the President: *Provided*, That the power of mitigation and remission shall not be exercised by such Assistant Judge Advocate General or by agencies in his office, but any case in which such action is deemed desirable may be forwarded to the Judge Advocate General with appropriate recommendations.

"d. Action by board of review when approval by President or confirming action is required: Before any record of trial in which there has been adjudged a sentence requiring approval or confirmation by the President or confirmation by any other confirming authority is submitted to the President or such other confirming authority, as the case may be, it shall be examined by the board of review which shall take action as follows:

"(1) In any case requiring action by the President, the board of review shall submit its opinion in writing, through the judicial council which shall also submit its opinion in writing, to the Judge Advocate General, who shall, except as herein otherwise provided, transmit the record and the board's and council's opinions, with his recommendations, directly to the Secretary of War for the action of the President: *Provided*, That the judicial council, with the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General shall have powers in respect to holdings of legal insufficiency equal to the powers vested in the board of review by subparagraph (3) of this paragraph.

"(2) In any case requiring confirming action by the judicial council with or without the concurrence of the Judge Advocate General, when the board of review is of the opinion that the record of trial is legally sufficient to support the sentence it shall submit its opinion in writing to the judicial council for appropriate action.

"(3) When the Board of Review is of the opinion that the record of trial in any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the Judicial Council is legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, or that errors of law have been committed injuriously affecting the substantial rights of the accused, it shall submit its holding to the Judge Advocate General and when the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, such findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in accord with such holding and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the appropriate convening authority for a rehearing or such other action as may be proper.

"(4) In any case requiring confirming action by the President or confirming action by the Judicial Council in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, or the sentence, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the Board of Review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action or for other appropriate action in a case in which confirmation of the sentence by the President is required under article 48a.

"e. Action by Board of Review in cases involving dishonorable or bad-conduct discharges or confinement in penitentiary: No authority shall order the execution of any sentence of a court martial involving dishonorable discharge not suspended, bad-conduct discharge not suspended, or confinement in a penitentiary unless and until the appellate review required by this article shall have been completed and unless and until any confirming action required shall have been completed. Every record of trial by general or special court martial involving a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad-conduct discharge, whether such discharges be suspended or not suspended, and every record of trial by general court martial involving a sentence to confinement in a penitentiary, other than records of trial examination of which is required by paragraph d of this article, shall be examined by the Board of Review which shall take action as follows:

"(1) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, and confirming action is not by the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review deemed necessary, the Judge Advocate General shall transmit the holding to the convening authority, and such holding shall be deemed final and conclusive.

"(2) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally sufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, but modification of the findings of guilty or the sentence is by the Judge Advocate General or the Board of Review deemed necessary to the ends of justice, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action.

"(3) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General concurs in such holding, the findings and sentence shall thereby be vacated in whole or in part in accord with such holding, and the record shall be transmitted by the Judge Advocate General to the convening authority for rehearing or such other action as may be appropriate.

"(4) In any case in which the Board of Review holds the record of trial legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, and the Judge Advocate General shall not concur in the holding of the Board of Review, the holding and the record of trial shall be transmitted to the Judicial Council for confirming action.

"f. Appellate action in other cases: Every record of trial by general court martial the appellate review of which is not otherwise provided for by this article shall be examined in the Office of the Judge Advocate General and if found legally insufficient to support the findings of guilty and sentence, in whole or in part, shall be transmitted to the Board of Review for appropriate action in accord with paragraph e of this article.

"g. Weighing evidence: In the appellate review of records of trials by courts martial as provided in these articles the Judge Advocate General and all appellate agencies in his office shall have authority to weigh evidence, judge the credibility of witnesses, and determine controverted questions of fact.

"h. Finality of court-martial judgments: The appellate review of records of trial provided by this article, the confirming action taken pursuant to article 48 or 49, the proceedings, findings, and sentences of courts martial as heretofore or hereafter approved, reviewed, or confirmed as required by the Articles of War and all dismissals and discharges heretofore or hereafter carried into execution pursuant to sentences by courts martial following approval, review, or confirmation as required by the Articles of War, shall be final and conclusive, and orders publishing the proceedings of courts martial and all action taken pursuant to such proceedings shall be binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States, subject only to action upon application for a new trial as provided in article 53."

SEC. 27. Article 50½ is rescinded.

SEC. 28. Article 51 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 51. Mitigation, remission, and suspension of sentences:

"a. At the time ordered executed: The power of the President, the Secretary of War, and any reviewing authority to order the execution of a sentence of a court martial shall include the power to mitigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part thereof, except that a death sentence may not be suspended. The Judge Advocate General shall have the power to mitigate, remit, or suspend the whole or any part of a sentence in any case requiring appellate review under article 50 and not requiring approval or confirmation by the President, but the power to mitigate or remit shall be exercised by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of War. The authority which suspends the execution of a sentence may restore the person under sentence to duty during such suspension; and the death or honorable discharge of a person under suspended sentence shall operate as a complete remission of any unexecuted or unremitted part of such sentence.

"b. Subsequent to the time ordered executed:

"(1) Any unexecuted portion of a sentence other than a sentence of death, including all uncollected forfeitures, adjudged by court martial may be mitigated, remitted, or suspended and any order of suspension may be vacated, in whole or in part, by the military authority competent to appoint, for the command, exclusive of penitentiaries and the United States disciplinary barracks, in which the person under sentence may be, a court of the kind that imposed the sentence, and the same power may be exercised by superior military authority or by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no sentence approved or confirmed by the President shall be mitigated, remitted, or suspended by any authority inferior to the President: *And provided further*, That no order of suspension of a sentence to dishonorable discharge or bad conduct discharge shall be vacated unless and until confirming or appellate action on the sentence has been completed as required by articles 48 and 50.

"(2) The power to suspend a sentence shall include the power to restore the person affected to duty during such suspension.

"(3) The power to mitigate, remit, or suspend the sentence or any part thereof in the case of a person confined in the United States disciplinary barracks or in a penitentiary shall be exercised by the Secretary of War or by the Judge Advocate General under the direction of the Secretary of War."

SEC. 29. Article 52 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 52. Rehearings: When any reviewing or confirming authority disapproves a sentence or when any sentence is vacated by action of the Board of Review or Judicial Council and the Judge Advocate General, the reviewing or confirming authority or the Judge Advocate General may authorize or direct a rehearing. Such rehearing shall take place before a court martial composed of members not members of the court martial which first heard the case. Upon such rehearing the accused shall not be tried for any offense of which he was found not guilty by the first court martial, and no sentence in excess of or more severe than the original sentence shall be enforced unless the sentence be based upon a finding of guilty of an offense not considered upon the merits in the original proceeding."

SEC. 30. Article 53 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 53. Petition for new trial: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the Judge Advocate General is authorized, upon application of an accused person, and upon good cause shown, in his discretion to grant a new trial, or to vacate a sentence, restore rights, privileges, and property affected by such sentence, and substitute for a dismissal, dishonorable discharge, or bad conduct discharge previously executed a form of discharge authorized for administrative issuance, in any court-martial case in which application is made within 1 year after final disposition of the case upon initial appellate review: *Provided*, That with regard to cases involving offenses committed during World War II, the application for a new trial may be made within 1 year after termination of the war, or after its final disposition upon initial appellate review as herein provided, whichever is the later: *Provided*, That only one such application for a new trial may be entertained with regard to any one case: *And provided further*, That all action by the Judge Advocate General pursuant to this article, and all proceedings, findings, and sentences on new trials under this article, as approved, reviewed, or confirmed under articles 47, 48, 49, and 50, and all dismissals and discharges carried into execution pursuant to sentences adjudged on new trials and approved, reviewed, or confirmed, shall be final and conclusive and orders publishing the action of the Judge Advocate General or the proceedings on new trial and all action taken pursuant to such proceedings, shall be binding upon all departments, courts, agencies, and officers of the United States."

SEC. 31. Article 70 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 70. Charges; action upon, unnecessary delay: When any person subject to military law is placed in arrest or confinement immediate steps will be taken to try the person accused or to dismiss the charge and release him. Any officer who is responsible for unnecessary delay in investigating or carrying the case to a final conclusion shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

SEC. 32. Article 85 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 85. Drunk on duty: Any person subject to military law, who is found drunk on duty, shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

SEC. 33. Article 88 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 88. Unlawfully influencing action of court: Any person subject to military law who attempts to coerce or unlawfully influence the action of a court martial or any military court or commission, or any member thereof, in reaching the findings or sentence in any case, or the action of an appointing or reviewing or confirming authority with respect to his judicial acts, shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

SEC. 34. Article 89 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 89. Good order to be maintained and wrongs redressed: All persons subject to military law are to behave themselves orderly in quarters, garrison, camp, and on the march; and any person subject to military law who commits any waste or spoil, or wrongfully destroys any property whatsoever or commits any kind of depredation or riot, shall be punished as a court martial may direct. Any commanding officer who, upon complaint made to him refuses or omits to see reparation made to the party injured, insofar as the offender's pay shall go toward such reparation, as provided for in article 105, shall be dismissed from the service, or otherwise punished, as a court martial may direct."

SEC. 35. Article 92 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 92. Murder—rape: Any person subject to military law found guilty of murder shall suffer death or imprisonment for life, as a court martial may direct; but if found guilty of murder not premeditated, he shall be punished as a court martial may direct. Any person subject to military law if found guilty of rape shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court martial may direct: *Provided*, That no person shall be tried by court martial for murder or rape committed within the geographical limits of the States of the Union and the District of Columbia in time of peace."

SEC. 36. Article 93 is amended to read as follows:

"ART 93. Various crimes: Any person subject to military law who commits manslaughter, mayhem, arson, burglary, housebreaking, robbery, larceny, perjury, forgery, sodomy, assault with intent to commit any felony, assault with intent to do bodily harm with a dangerous weapon, instrument, or other thing, or assault with intent to do bodily harm, shall be punished as a court martial may direct: *Provided*, That any person subject to military law who commits larceny or embezzlement shall be guilty of larceny within the meaning of this article."

SEC. 37. Article 94 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 94. Frauds against the Government: Any person subject to military law who makes or causes to be made any claim against the United States or any officer thereof knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or who defrauds or attempts to defraud the Government of the United States or any of its agencies in any manner denounced by the Criminal Code of the United States or in any manner whatsoever, or who steals, knowingly and willfully misappropriates, wrongfully applies to his own use or benefit or wrongfully and knowingly sells or disposes of any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, money, or other property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof shall be punished as a court martial may direct: *Provided*, That any person subject to military law who commits larceny or embezzlement with respect to property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof or with respect to other property within the purview of this article, steals said property within the meaning of this article.

"If any person, being guilty of any of the offenses aforesaid or who steals or fails properly to account for any money or other property held in trust by him for enlisted persons or as its official custodian while in the military service of the United States, receives his discharge or is dismissed or otherwise separated from the service, he shall continue to be liable to be arrested and held for trial and sentence by a court martial in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had been so separated therefrom."

SEC. 38. Article 104 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 104. Disciplinary powers of commanding officers: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the commanding officer of any detachment, company, or higher command, may, for minor offenses, impose disciplinary punishments upon persons of his command without the intervention of a court martial, unless the accused demands trial by court martial.

"The disciplinary punishments authorized by this article may include admonition or reprimand, or the withholding of privileges, or extra fatigue, or restriction to certain specified limits, or hard labor without confinement or any combination of such punishments for not exceeding 1 week from the date imposed; but shall not include forfeiture of pay or confinement under guard; except that any officer exercising general court martial jurisdiction may, under the provisions of this article, also impose upon a warrant officer or flight officer or officer of his command below the rank of brigadier general a forfeiture of not more than one-half of his pay per month for 3 months.

"A person punished under authority of this article, who deems his punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense, may, through the proper channel, appeal to the next superior authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged. The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, and superior authority shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment. The imposition and enforcement of disciplinary punishment under authority of this article for any act or omission shall not be a bar to trial by court martial for a serious crime or offense growing out of the same act or omission, and not properly punishable under this article; but the fact that a disciplinary punishment has been enforced may be shown by the accused upon trial, and when so shown shall be considered in determining the measure of punishment to be adjudged in the event of a finding of guilty."

SEC. 39. Article 108 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 108. Soldiers—separation from the service: No enlisted person, lawfully inducted into the military service of the United States, shall be discharged from said service without a certificate of discharge, and no enlisted person shall be discharged from said service before his term of service has expired, except in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of War, or by sentence of a general or special court martial."

SEC. 40. Article 110 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 110. Certain Articles of War to be read or explained: Articles 1, 2, 24, 28, 29, 54 to 97, inclusive, 104 to 109, inclusive, and 121 shall be read or carefully explained to every soldier at the time of his enlistment or muster in, or within 6 days thereafter, and shall be read or explained once every 6 months to the soldiers of every garrison, regiment, or company in the service of the United States. And a complete text of the Articles of War and of the Manual for Courts Martial shall be made available to any soldier, upon his request, for his personal examination."

SEC. 41. Article 116 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 116. Powers of assistant trial judge advocate and of assistant defense council: An assistant trial judge advocate of a general or special court martial shall be competent to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon the trial judge advocate of the court. An assistant defense counsel shall be competent likewise to perform any duty devolved by law, regulation, or the custom of the service upon counsel for the accused."

SEC. 42. Article 117 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 117. Removal of civil suits: When any civil or criminal prosecution is commenced in any court of a State of the United

States against any officer, soldier, or other person in the military service of the United States on account of any act done under color of his office or status, or in respect to which he claims any right, title, or authority under any law of the United States respecting the military forces thereof, or under the law of war, such suit or prosecution may at any time before the trial or final hearing thereof be removed for trial into the district court of the United States in the district where the same is pending in the manner prescribed by law, and the cause shall thereupon be entered on the docket of such district court, which shall proceed as if the cause had been originally commenced therein and shall have full power to hear and determine said cause."

SEC. 43. Section 1 of article 121 is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 121. Complaints of wrongs: Any officer or soldier who believes himself wronged by his commanding officer, and, upon due application to such commander, is refused redress, may complain to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the officer against whom the complaint is made. That officer shall examine into said complaint and take proper measures for redressing the wrong complained of; and he shall, as soon as possible, transmit to the War Department a true statement of such complaint, with the proceedings had thereon."

SEC. 44. This act shall become effective on the first day of the fourth calendar month after approval of this act.

SEC. 45. All offenses committed and all penalties, forfeitures, fines, or liabilities incurred prior to the effective date of this act, under any law embraced in or modified, changed, or repealed by this act, may be prosecuted, punished, and enforced in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been passed.

Mr. ELSTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, since the bill is 47 pages long, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 13, strike out "members of the Army Nurse Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 14, strike out the words "flight officers."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 3, following the period after the word "trial", insert the following paragraph:

"All warrant officers in the active military service of the United States and warrant officers in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of warrant officers and enlisted persons, and persons in this category shall be detailed for such service when deemed proper by the appointing authority."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 3, strike out lines 11 to 17, inclusive, and insert the following:

"Enlisted persons in the active military service of the United States or in the active military service of the Marine Corps when detached for service with the Army by order of the President, shall be competent to serve on general and special courts martial for the trial of enlisted persons when requested in writing by the accused at any time prior to the convening of the court. When so requested, no enlisted person shall, without his consent, be tried by a court the membership of which does not include enlisted persons to the number of at least one third of the total membership of the court."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 16, strike out "2" and insert "5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 17, strike out the words "an officer admitted to practice law in a court of the judicial system of the United States" and insert the words "an officer who is a member of the bar of a Federal court."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 19, strike out "in" and insert "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 1, strike out "admitted to practice law in a court of the judicial system of the United States" and insert "who are members of the bar of a Federal court."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 3, strike out "in" and insert "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 7, strike out "admitted to practice law in a court of the United States" and insert "who is a member of the bar of a Federal court."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 9, strike out "in" and insert "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 12, strike out "admitted to practice law in a court of the judicial system of the United States" and insert "who is a member of the bar of a Federal court."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 14, strike out "in" and insert "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 19, strike out "officer" and insert "person."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 21, strike out the word "or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 21, insert after the word "counsel," "or investigating officer."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 22, after the word "act" insert "in any capacity as a member of the prosecution or defense or act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 14, strike out the proviso beginning in line 14.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 17, strike out the word "further."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 8, line 22, strike out the word "but" and all of lines 23 and 24.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 9, line 10, insert:

"*Provided further*, That a bad-conduct discharge shall not be adjudged by a special court martial unless a complete record of the proceedings of and testimony taken by the court is taken in the case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 9, line 17, strike out "a member of the Army Nurse Corps."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 9, line 17, strike out the words "flight officer."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 17, line 22, after the period insert "The accused shall be permitted, upon his request, to be represented at such investigation by counsel of his own selection, civil counsel if he so provides, or military if such counsel be reasonably available, otherwise by counsel appointed by the officer exercising general courts martial jurisdiction over the command."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 20, line 18, after the word "until", insert "in addition to the approval of the convening authority."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 24, line 22, strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 34, line 18, strike out the word "Any", and insert: "No authority appointing a general, special, or summary court martial nor any other commanding officer, shall censure, reprimand, or admonish such court, or any member thereof, with respect to the findings or sentence adjudged by the court, or with respect to any other exercise, by such court or any member thereof, of its or his judicial responsibility."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 34, line 24, after the word "responsibility", insert the word "No."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 34, line 24, strike out the words "who attempts" and insert the words "shall attempt."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 35, line 5, strike out the words "shall be punished as a court martial may direct."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 36, line 19, strike out all of line 19 and the balance of the page, and all of page 37, down to and including line 21, and insert:

"ART. 94. Frauds against the Government: Any person subject to military law who makes or causes to be made any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"Who presents or causes to be presented to any person in the civil or military service thereof, for approval or payment, any claim against the United States, or any officer thereof, knowing such claim to be false or fraudulent; or

"Who enters into any agreement or conspiracy to defraud the United States by obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the allowance or payment of any false or fraudulent claim; or

"Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or against any officer thereof, makes or uses, or procures, or advises the making or use of, any writing or other paper knowing the same to contain any false or fraudulent statements; or

"Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, makes or procures, or advises the making of, any oath to any fact or to any writing or other paper knowing such oath to be false; or

"Who, for the purpose of obtaining, or aiding others to obtain, the approval, allowance, or payment of any claim against the United States or any officer thereof, forges or counterfeits, or procures, or advises the forging or counterfeiting of any signature upon any writing or other paper, or uses, or procures, or advises the use of any such signature, knowing the same to be forged or counterfeited; or

"Who, having charge, possession, custody, or control of any money or other property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, knowingly delivers, or causes to be delivered, to any person having authority to receive the same, any amount thereof less than that for which he receives a certificate or receipt; or

"Who, being authorized to make or deliver any paper certifying the receipt of any property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof, makes or delivers to any person such writing, without having full knowledge of the truth of the statements therein contained and with intent to defraud the United States; or

"Who steals, embezzles, knowingly and willfully misappropriates, applies to his own use or benefit, or wrongfully or knowingly sells or disposes of any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, money, or other property of the United States furnished or intended for the military service thereof: *Provided*, That any person, subject to military law, who commits larceny or embezzlement with respect to property of the United States, furnished or intended for the military service thereof, or with respect to other property within the purview of this article, steals said property within the meaning of this article; or

"Who knowingly purchases or receives in pledge for any obligation or indebtedness from any soldier, officer, or other person who is a part of or employed in said forces or service, any ordnance, arms, equipment, ammunition, clothing, subsistence stores, or other property of the United States, such soldier, officer, or other person not having lawful right to sell or pledge the same; or

"Who enters into any agreement or conspires to commit any of the offenses aforesaid;

"Shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine or imprisonment, or by such other punishment as a court martial may adjudge, or by any or all of said penalties. If any person, being guilty of any of the offenses aforesaid or who steals or fails properly to account for any money or other property held in trust by him for enlisted persons or as its official custodian while in the military service of the United States, receives his discharge or is dismissed or otherwise separated from the service, he shall continue to be liable to be arrested and held for trial and sentence by a court martial in the same manner and to the same extent as if he had not been so separated therefrom."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 41, line 11, strike out "or flight officer."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 43, line 5, strike out the word "Council" and insert the word "Counsel."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 44, line 17, strike out the word "fourth" and insert the word "eighth."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 45, line 1, insert:

"SEC. 46. Section 8 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 61), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 8. Judge Advocate General's Corps: The Judge Advocate General's Corps shall consist of one Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, one assistant with the rank of major general, three officers with the rank of brigadier general, and an active list commissioned officer strength to be determined by the Secretary of War, but such strength shall not be less than 1½ percent of the authorized active list commissioned officer strength of the Regular Army, and in addition warrant officers and enlisted men in such numbers as the Secretary of War shall determine.'

"SEC. 47. Regular Army officers shall be permanently appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the commissioned officer grades of major general, brigadier general, colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and first lieutenant. The names of commissioned officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps below the grade of brigadier general shall be carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list. The Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be established by entering thereon the names of the officers concerned without change in their order of precedence on the existing promotion list. The authorized numbers in each of the several grades in the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War, but the numbers thus authorized shall not exceed the following percentages of the total strength authorized for that list: 8 percent in the grade of colonel; 14 percent in the grade of lieutenant colonel; 19 percent in the grade of major; 23 percent in the grade of captain; and 36 percent in the grade of first lieutenant: *Provided*, That numbers may be authorized for any grade in lieu of authorization in higher grades: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not operate to require a reduction in permanent grade of any officer now holding permanent appointment.

"Officers whose names are carried on the Judge Advocate's promotion list shall be promoted to the several grades as now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers generally and the authorized numbers in grades below colonel on such list shall be temporarily increased from time to time in order to give effect to the promotion system now or hereafter prescribed by law for promotion-list officers.

"Within the authorized strength of the Judge Advocate General's Corps additional officers may be appointed by transfer of qualified officers from other branches of the Army, by appointment of Reserve judge advocates or qualified civilian graduates of accredited law schools. Those originally appointed in the Regular Army in the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be credited with an amount of service for the purpose of determining grade, position on promotion list, permanent-grade seniority, and eligibility for promotion as now or hereafter prescribed by law.

"SEC. 48. The Judge Advocate General shall, in addition to such other duties as may be prescribed by law, be the legal adviser of the Secretary of War and of all officers and agencies of the War Department; and all members of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall perform their duties under the direction of the Judge Advocate General.

"SEC. 49. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Judge Advocate General, the Assistant Judge Advocate General and general officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps who are recommended for such positions by the Secretary of War. Upon the appointment of an officer to be the Judge Advocate General or Assistant Judge Advocate General with the rank of major general, he shall at the same time if not then holding permanent appointment in such grade be appointed a permanent major general of the Regular Army."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: In sections 46, 47, 48, and 49 substitute the words "the Department of the Army" for the word "War" wherever the latter shall appear, except in line 8, page 47.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 45, line 11, strike out the words "Regular Army" and substitute therefor the words "Armed services of the National Military Establishment who are subject to the Articles of War."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 16, line 5, substitute the words "Department of the Army" for the word "War."

Page 21, line 23, substitute the words "Department of the Army" for the word "War."

Page 30, line 12, substitute the words "Department of the Army" for the word "War."
Page 30, line 22, substitute the words "Department of the Army" for the word "War."
Page 31, line 15, substitute the words "Department of the Army" for the word "War."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 3, line 22, after the word "persons", insert a period and strike out the words "when requested in writing by the accused at any time prior to the convening of the court when so requested."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes on each of the amendments I have but will explain each briefly and then let them be voted on.

My amendment strikes out on page 3, line 22, the proviso that the enlisted man must request in writing that he shall have other enlisted men serving on the court martial. I think it is better that the enlisted person shall have enlisted men serving on the court martial unless he shall request otherwise. If this is not done you always have the enlisted man asking for enlisted men and the officers saying, "Well, he does not have confidence in us"; so the enlisted man under this particular provision will not ask for it. It will never be used.

If you do what I suggest, put a period after the word "persons" in the phrase "courts martial for the trial of enlisted persons." Then, the next sentence will read "When so requested, no enlisted person shall, without his consent be tried by a court the membership of which does not include enlisted persons to the number of at least one-third of the total membership of the court."

That means that unless the enlisted man objects he shall have enlisted men on the court martial without asking for it. It is simply a method of procedure.

I now yield to the committee.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it would not make it mandatory that the accused request in writing that enlisted men serve on general or special court-martial cases. We have provided that the man may have enlisted men if he requests it in writing. It seems to me the rights of the enlisted man are fully protected. We gave great thought and study and discussion to this whole subject in the committee, and came to the conclusion that the rights of an accused person was fully protected if he had the right to select enlisted men to serve if he wanted them. It seems to me that we have gone just as far as it is necessary in order to protect the rights of the accused by requiring him to make the request in writing. As a matter of fact, I do not think he is as fully protected under the gentleman's suggested amendment as he would be under the section of the bill as read.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe it will be found that the hearings reflect the fact that the American Bar Association Committee in its hearings and from questionnaires sent out received a large proportion of answers from former enlisted men objecting to the presence of enlisted men on courts martial in the trial of enlisted men. There was quite a feeling this should be mandatory when we began these hearings, but after the thing had been gone into and we had heard from people who went around the country, and from questionnaires sent out to those who had been in the service, we found there was a surprisingly large proportion of enlisted men who preferred to be tried by officers. This will give both those who want to be tried by officers and those who want enlisted men on the courts martial the same right to have them.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to clear up a misapprehension?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. My amendment does not make it mandatory. My amendment provides for the consent of the enlisted man, and the language would now read as follows, using the committee's own language:

No enlisted person shall without his consent be tried by a court the membership of which does not include enlisted persons to the number of at least one-third of the total membership of the court.

So my amendment, too, says it must be with the enlisted man's consent. The only difference between the committee language and mine is that I do not require the enlisted man to stand up to the officers and make the request. I let the enlisted man have them as long as he consents to it, but he does not have to initiate it and go against the officers over him.

Mr. KILDAY. At one time we had this provision written that way, but after further consideration we came to the conclusion that we were in error in so writing it because it would place it in the power of the accused to cause interminable delay in bringing his case to trial. If he does not have to make his choice until he is arraigned before a court martial, after the court is fully constituted, perhaps officers having been brought from long distances in order to constitute the court, at the very last minute he can say, "I decide I want enlisted men on the court." Then the case goes over.

I think it is perfectly fair and reasonable for him to be required to make his request. You understand that in this bill we give him the right to counsel, even in the preliminary investigation. He has the right to counsel from the very first moment they suspect him. That has not been true in the past. Now he has a lawyer from the very beginning.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. May I point out that the first sentence as written by the committee merely designates the enlisted personnel as competent to sit on the court. It does not say they shall or shall not. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania leaves the same competency of enlisted personnel as the committee has written it. Then he simply says that no enlisted person shall be tried without his consent by a court which does not include enlisted personnel. So I think the gentleman from Ohio is possibly not quite correct in saying that the committee amendment gives greater protection to the enlisted personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a similar amendment pending on the desk, but rise in support of this amendment. My reasoning is a little bit different from that of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

This bill provides that upon request of the enlisted man "prior to the meeting of the board" a court martial is appointed by an order of the commanding officer; notices are sent out and the officers come into the court-martial room. They are not convened until they raise their right hands and are sworn as a court. Under this bill the enlisted man has until that time to say, "I want enlisted personnel on my court." What does that mean? It means that the court will have to be adjourned, the commanding officer will have to cut a new order, and there will be at least a delay of 3 days in bringing the case to trial.

I think this amendment should be adopted. I think an enlisted man should be entitled to have enlisted men on the court. I think that has been determined by the sentiment of the enlisted personnel, and I do not think that it ought to be allowed to remain as it is so that the court can be delayed and cause the commanding officer to appoint a new court. If we change the law the way we have it now the commanding officer can appoint two courts, one court of officers to try officers and one court with enlisted personnel on it to try enlisted personnel. If the enlisted man says, "I want to be tried by officers," the commanding officer will call the other court, but as it is drawn at the present time it will cause a great deal of inconvenience to the appointing authorities.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. What would be the effect, in the gentleman's opinion if the amendment were adopted, if the enlisted man did nothing? Unless he expressed his consent, would he not then be tried solely by a court of officers?

Mr. CROW. Not necessarily. I believe it should be required to have enlisted personnel on the court.

Mr. KEATING. It does not strike me that way. It seems to me, as the gentleman from Ohio has said, that this amendment does a disservice to what we are trying to accomplish, and for this reason: Under the proposed amendment, if the enlisted man remained silent and did nothing, then it seems to me he would be tried by a court of officers; he would have to be. Now, under the bill as it reads, the thing is brought right up to

his attention, "Do you want enlisted men on your court? If you want them, you must ask for them in writing." As the gentleman from Texas has said, he is advised by counsel from the very start, and one of the first things his counsel would say to him would be, "Do you want enlisted men on your court? If you do, sign this paper asking for it. If you do not, then you do not sign the paper." It seems to me that that protects him thoroughly and much more effectively than would happen under the proposed amendment.

Mr. CROW. It might protect him if they approach it in that way, if the defense counsel asks him whether he wants them. But, do they always do that? Could he not change his mind the day he walked into court merely for the purpose of delaying the case?

Mr. KEATING. Under the bill as presented to us by the committee, as I understand it, if the man on trial wished to have enlisted men on the court to try him he could request that at any time prior to the convening of the court, and they would have to comply with his request. That is the way I think it should be.

Mr. CROW. But he certainly would have that right under this bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Could he not also change his mind under the amendment which the gentleman is referring to and not give his consent until the court had been convened?

Mr. CROW. No. I do not think he would have anything to say about it. It says here that the enlisted personnel must be on the court.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CROW. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. You will notice we went so far as to provide that the accused person shall, in all cases subject to general and special court martial, have the benefit of counsel, who shall have the same legal qualifications as the law officer of the court. Are we not to assume that counsel is going to give to the accused person the benefit of the best advice that he can and is going to advise him that he has the right to have enlisted men on the court? Are we going to assume that counsel is going to give him incorrect advice in all cases?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes to answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROW. I would like to answer the chairman of the committee. He states that they will all have legal counsel; all perfectly qualified. Now, if you read the bill it says, "if available." I think in most cases you will find that legal counsel is not available, and I do not think that is any protection to him at all.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I read exactly how the amendment will read:

> No enlisted person shall without his consent be tried by a court the membership of which does not include enlisted persons to the number of at least one-third of the total membership of the court.

Therefore, he does have enlisted persons unless he consents otherwise.

Mr. CROW. It would not be an officer court to try an enlisted man unless he consented to it. I think that is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did not General Doolittle suggest that four enlisted men sit on the court?

Mr. CROW. It has always been my understanding that his committee did suggest that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He testified that before our committee. I understood that would be his recommendation.

Mr. CROW. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I happen to know that in many courts martial no legal man acted as a representative of an enlisted man. I happened to work a good many years with the prisoners, both the disabled prisoners and the others, the detached men, and I felt that they did not have the proper representation. One man I know of, who gave a leg for us, was sentenced to life at hard labor.

Mr. CROW. I can agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I was very active during the war on courts martial, and I have had some experience in that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it not inconceivable that any enlisted man appearing before the court, this provision being in the Articles of War, is not going to know, either through counsel or otherwise, that he has the right to request enlisted personnel on that court? Why, it is inconceivable.

Mr. CROW. I do not think the Articles of War means anything in that connection. I have been in the Army and have heard them read every 6 months, and I have seen the enlisted men sleep through the whole thing. Most of the enlisted men do not know what is in the Articles of War.

I personally am in favor of this amendment and hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 36, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 4, line 7, strike out "age."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this section means that when appointing courts martial they are to pick those best qualified for duty by reason of age, training, experience, and judicial temperament, according to the committee version. My amendment simply strikes out the word "age." Will someone on the committee please tell me whether the older ones are supposed to be better than the younger ones, and what age is going to supply, simply in and of itself, as a qualification for serving on courts martial?

Mr. ELSTON. It gives some discretion in the selection of members who are to serve, so that they can take into consideration whether they are youthful or mature. That is all it means. The commanding officer thus would not have to take an enlisted man, regardless of his age. Bear in mind that in time of war we may be drafting boys who are 18 years of age and the commanding officer or convening officer may feel that they are not mature enough to serve on such a board. It is a protection to the accused that such a qualification can be taken into consideration.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Has not the gentleman been in Congress long enough to know that age in itself is a qualification?

Mr. FULTON. But not when you are younger.

May I say that if this word "age" is left in the bill, it will be assumed by people in the field that it means old age and that the older they are, that is the more reason why they should be on the courts martial. We who have been in the service do not want appointments on the basis of age. I have seen generals in the Army 37 or 38 years of age and with due deference to the committee, I think that Army generals of the age of 38 have probably cut their eye teeth enough to serve on a court martial.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I would agree with the gentleman that they should not put all old men on the courts martial and if that was the effect of the wording as it now stands, I would be opposed to it. I do not agree, however, with that. It seems to me it gives a wide latitude in the matter and that if a young man is being tried, this gives him protection in the matter of taking into consideration the age of the ones on the court. I do not agree that it would be interpreted to mean that only old men should be appointed to the court. I wonder if

it is not true, and might I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether it was not also intended that youth as well as old age might be a consideration in appointing them?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes, there was no desire to exclude youth. But there might be cases in which the convening authority might feel that the enlisted man was too young and not mature enough to act as a judge in the trial of a serious case. That is all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me that the gentleman's amendment is one that ought to receive very serious consideration. The question of training and experience and judicial temperament seems to me to be the important thing. We have an age limit of 21 years before anyone can take the bar examination, for example. I was an enlisted man in the First World War and had been a lawyer for several years before that. I do not know whether I was qualified from the angle of training and experience and judicial temperament, and so forth, but nevertheless it seems to me there is something in what the gentleman says with reference to this question of age. Furthermore, the other requirements, training and experience and judicial temperament, are the real thing.

Mr. FULTON. That is right. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The question of age would be involved in that. If it is specifically put in, then there are going to be rules and regulations passed, and being a mandate of Congress, it seems to me that would have to be considered and they would have to determine some particular age below which they could not consider the appointment of anyone to a courts martial, whether he was an officer or an enlisted man, even if such a person had the training and experience and judicial temperament. It seems to me those are the paramount qualifications that a man should possess to be a member of a courts-martial board.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I wish the gentleman would explain why if the word "age" is taken out in line with his amendment you should not also take out the words "training, experience, and judicial temperament," because in my opinion they all go together.

Mr. FULTON. Because age alone means nothing, and I do not want someone appointed on the basis of age alone.

Mr. KEARNEY. Training alone means nothing either.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I do not feel that this is a matter of particularly great consequence, but I want to say briefly that I concur very heartily in the argument that has been advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has analyzed the operation of this word as I have seen it work in the services. If you leave in the word "age" which is admittedly an immaterial factor, when the training and experience of the individual should be the true criterion, then you will have a perversion of the word "age" by people in the field that will be used to create discrimination between individuals that should not exist. Age is not necessarily synonymous with wisdom. I cannot see anything that is gained by including the word "age" in the legislation. For that reason I support the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROW:

Page 3, line 22, place a period after the word "persons" and strike out "when requested in writing by the accused at any time prior to the convening of the court. When so requested"

Line 24, change the small letter "n" in the word "no" to a capital letter "N." And on page 4, line 2, add the following:

"No enlisted person may sit as a member of a court martial for the trial of another enlisted person who is assigned to the same company or corresponding military unit."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because the first part of the amendment has already been passed upon. The second part of the amendment is in another section of the bill.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I agree that the first paragraph, as the amendment was read, was the original amendment made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] but I submit that the amendment which I am here to discuss now is the second paragraph on page 4, line 2, adding the following after that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CANFIELD). The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW] is not identically the same as the former amendment, and is in order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment for this reason: Article 4 of this bill reads: "Who may serve on courts martial." If you will turn to page 10 of the bill you will find article 16: "Persons in the military service—how triable."

The last sentence of that paragraph reads: "No enlisted person may sit as a member of a court martial for the trial of another enlisted person who is assigned to the same company or corresponding military unit."

My amendment merely moves that sentence from the paragraph I have just read to article 4 on page 4, line 14. It would follow the word "prosecution." It does not change the bill, although I think it specifies who may serve on courts martial, and does not specify how anyone will be tried by court martial.

I may add I have another amendment to place to article 16, which will show how an enlisted man shall be tried.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I want to be certain about what the gentleman's amendment seeks to cover.

As I understand the first part it is, with the exception of a few words, identical with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]; is it not?

Mr. CROW. I am not offering the first part as an amendment. The Clerk read that because I did not get a chance to tell him not to read it. I am offering the amendment to add to section 4.

Mr. ELSTON. The last part is that which the gentleman is now offering.

Mr. CROW. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. That is identical with the language employed in section 5 on page 10.

Mr. CROW. That is correct.

Mr. ELSTON. All the gentleman's amendment would do would be to move the language from page 10 and insert it on page 4.

Mr. CROW. That is correct.

Mr. ELSTON. In fact, it would not even be moved if the gentleman's amendment were adopted in its present form, but it would appear in both places.

Mr. CROW. I have another amendment to strike it out at one place and add it as another section.

Mr. ELSTON. Is there any reason why it should be on page 4 instead of page 10?

Mr. CROW. I have read a lot of law. I like to see substantive law written in a regular, well-ordered sequence, related things coupled together and not scattered in different sections of the bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Could you not go to one section as well as to another to find it?

Mr. CROW. That is correct; but when I look at that section of the bill which states who may sit on courts martial I believe that is where I should find enumerated the kinds and types and classes of personnel who may compose a court martial. I would not expect to find that in the section which provides the place where he is to be tried or the manner in which he is to be tried.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROW. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. When the gentleman looks at a particular section to find what shall be the constitution or a court martial he expects to find all elements in that section instead of having to go to other sections in order to find it.

Mr. CROW. The gentleman is correct.

All this amendment does is to clarify the bill. I think everybody will appreciate it once it is adopted and written into the bill. I ask support for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CROW) there were—ayes 32, noes 39.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: Page 4, line 8, after the semicolon strike out

the words "and officers and enlisted persons having less than 2 years' service shall not, if it can be avoided without manifest injury to the Service, be appointed as members of courts martial in excess of minority membership thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURLESON) there were—ayes 26, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON:

Page 11, line 13, after the word "issue", insert the word "or."

Beginning in line 17, delete the words "obtain any degrading statement not material to the issue or any self-incriminating."

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on page 10 which I want to offer, if the gentleman is going ahead with his amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will not be precluded from offering any amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the first part of this amendment inserts the word "or" in next to the last line of the paragraph that ends in line 14, so that it would read: "or to answer any question, the answer to which may tend to incriminate him or to answer any question not material to the issue or when such answer might tend to degrade him."

That is obviously what the committee meant. Would the committee accept that part of the amendment?

Mr. ELSTON. It does not seem to change anything. I see no objection to accepting it.

Mr. FULTON. You do not want the defendant limited to answering any question not material to the issue when such answer might tend to degrade him. It does change it somewhat.

The next part of the amendment is on page 11 where I am cutting out words in line 17.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I assume the gentleman refers only to the word "or."

Mr. FULTON. That is correct.

Mr. ELSTON. Now he is moving over to another amendment?

Mr. FULTON. No; it is one part of the amendment that I asked the gentleman to accept; that is, the word "or." Now I am going over to page 11, line 17, deleting the words "degrading statement not material to the issue or any self-incriminating."

I am striking out those words, and the reason for that is as follows: The way the committee has it written they would bar only the use of coercion and unlawful influence when it is to obtain any degrading statement not material to the issue or any self-incriminating statement. Actually, what the committee meant to do is this: They want to say the use of coercion or unlawful influence in any manner whatsoever by any person subject to military law to obtain any statement, admission, or confession from any accused person or witness shall be deemed to be conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline. In other words, you cannot have coercion or unlawful influence used to get any statement, admission, or confession.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, we have no objection to that, if it is agreeable to the other members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Page 10, line 10, strike out beginning with the word "and" to the end of the sentence, and insert "and preferably by persons of equal rank. In no case shall more than one-third of the membership of the general court trying any officer be of inferior rank."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I will speak of this briefly. If you will read how the committee says it on page 10, line 10, "in no case shall a person in the military service, when it can be avoided, be tried by persons inferior to him in rank." That committee statement does not mean anything. What do the words "when it can be avoided" mean? My amendment merely restates it saying that it is preferable, so that the person who convenes the court martial shall know that it is preferable to have persons of equal rank, but when he cannot do it there will be a specific limit on it so that they cannot have more than one-third of inferior rank as members of the court martial.

Now, the committee has no limit. They could, when it cannot be avoided, have the man tried by everybody of inferior rank. I would not do that. You should have the method of statement construed in the act, because, "when it can be avoided" would mean a thousand different things to a thousand different people.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman feels that heretofore in the trial of officers there has been no difficulty because the officers had generally been of superior rank; does he not?

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman repeat that?

Mr. KILDAY. In the past, in the trial of officers by court martial, the members of the court have been of equal or superior rank?

Mr. FULTON. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. And the system has worked satisfactorily?

Mr. FULTON. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, this is the same language which has always existed. It is a repetition of the present Article of War with the addition of the provision for the service by enlisted men.

Mr. FULTON. But I go further than the gentleman, because my amendment says to the commanding officer who convenes the court martial that it is preferable to have members of equal or higher rank, and then it clears up the language that you have from the former Article of War to show what it means. I do not put in a vacuous phrase such as "when it can be avoided."

In addition to that, if it cannot be avoided so that the commanding officer has to appoint inferior rank to try a man, he should not appoint more than one-third of the court-martial members of inferior rank. I want them tried by at least equal rank or above if possible, but if not, he should not be able to appoint a whole court of inferior rank but should be limited to one-third of the membership of lower rank.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Does the gentleman know whether there has been any case where there has been any difficulty in the application of the present law over a period of years? I believe it has worked very satisfactorily.

Mr. FULTON. If you are writing a law and amending it, such as we are here, you might as well have it mean something, and simply because there has only been one Noah's flood is no reason why there will not be one tomorrow.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was under the impression, though I may be wrong and somebody can correct me, that under the courts-martial system in the Army of our country it was mandatory that no officer would be tried except by only those of equal or higher rank.

Mr. FULTON. It was, unless it could not be avoided, when they could have people of inferior rank try an officer. The difference between my version and the committee is that it would only permit appointment of one-third of the people on the court-martial board of inferior rank rather than all.

Mr. KEARNEY. As I read this particular section, this does not change the wording that is now in effect.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman will turn to page 16 of the report, article 16, he will find set out, under the Ramseyer rule, the existing law as it is changed by this proposal. The gentleman will find that the law that now exists reads:

Officers; persons in the military service; how triable: Officers shall be triable only by general and special courts martial, and in no case shall an officer, when it can be avoided, be tried by officers inferior to him in rank.

That is the existing law. The only point I make is that when you are amending a law that has been in effect for many years you must bear in mind that the statutory provision is a very small portion of the law. The precedents which have been established under it are just as much a part of the law. I do not know what the holdings may have been under

this provision, but it should be disturbed as little as possible.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. What would happen in the case of a high-ranking officer where circumstances existed so that you could not get the one-third you are talking about? What would he do, languish in jail, or would no charges be preferred against him, or would he never be tried, or what?

Mr. FULTON. How does the gentleman mean that?

Mr. MATHEWS. Exactly as it is stated.

Mr. FULTON. If you have an admiral, unless there are other admirals that will sit in trial on this particular admiral, enough to constitute two-thirds of the court, I do not want the admiral tried. I do not want the admiral tried by a court composed entirely of ensigns, which can be done under article 16 as now stated. I want it limited to two-thirds men of equal or higher rank.

Mr. MATHEWS. What are you going to do with him in the meantime, until you can get him tried?

Mr. FULTON. Any admiral can be tried by other admirals, and any general by other generals.

Mr. MATHEWS. The circumstance I mention is that they are not available.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to suggest to the committee the desirability of clarification of nomenclature. In the first place, the bill involves the Department of the Army. At the bottom of page 4 we find mention of the Territorial Department. In line 5, on page 5, we have the Judge Advocate General's Department. Then to cap it all, over on page 45 we have the Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman will yield, perhaps the gentleman was not here when a number of committee amendments were offered changing the names of the departments. The reason is that this bill was reported out before the Unification Act was passed, and when the War Department was known as the War Department instead of the Department of the Army.

Mr. BUCK. Does that take care of the Territorial Department, too, and the Judge Advocate General's Department?

Mr. ELSTON. I think the amendments that were offered took care of everything.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill. But I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that this act applies only to the Army, and the Army will not be trying admirals.

From the study I have been able to make of H. R. 2575, the present bill to amend the Articles of War and to improve the administration of military justice, I believe that the Committee on the Armed Services has done an excellent piece of work. It is humanly impossible for any conscientious Member of this House, in view of the number, bulk, and technicality of the bills we have to consider, the vast amount of committee work and the innumerable other duties devolving upon him, to ever find himself in a position to give the thorough study he would like to any bill, except perhaps those from his own committee.

Section 8 of this bill particularly appeals to me. It amends article 11 of the Articles of War, to provide among other things that trial judge advocates and defense counsel of general courts martial shall, if available, be members of the Judge Advocate General's Department or officers who are members of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State of the United States, and that where a trial judge advocate is such an officer, defense counsel shall be likewise such officer.

The provisions of this section, coupled with section 46 of the act which amends section 8 of the National Defense Act, as amended, providing for a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps, mark an encouraging step in advance, provided that the Secretary of War and the Congress see to it that this Judge Advocate General's Corps is sufficiently numerous and efficient to provide qualified personnel for the reasonable carrying out of the provisions of section 8.

My own experience as a division judge advocate of a National Guard division, as well as a civilian defense counsel for an accused person before a military court, has demonstrated that both the accused and the United States suffered greatly by the fact that not only did line officers act as trial judge advocates and defense counsels, but that at times even officers of other departments were compelled to act as law members of general courts because of the shortage of Judge Advocate Department personnel.

Many times the rights of the accused were not adequately protected by reason of the fact that defense counsel, although earnest, honest, sincere, and diligent was inadequate to protect all those rights by reason of being untrained for that purpose. On the other hand, convictions which should have been obtained were lost because of the same situation applying to trial judge advocates.

Cases have been improperly prepared and deserved convictions lost because investigating officers were not qualified for that work and, particularly, not familiar with the laws of evidence.

Frequently time consumed both in investigations and in trials could have been shortened by technically trained personnel as investigators, trial judge advocates, and defense counsel.

It has been a manner of astonishment to me that this situation existed as long as it did, but during peacetime the appropriations for the Army were cut so much that it was only natural for it to reduce personnel in the Judge Advocate General's Department because of the mistaken view among so many military men of the uselessness of officers of that Department.

The legal profession is a profession of high standing, despite some popular view to the contrary. To qualify, one must spend years of arduous study and training. And yet, an army which so highly regards the utility, necessity, and efficiency of the members of the Surgeon General's Office seemed to have no such conception about the members of the Judge Advocate General's Department. But what would happen if a soldier who had a cold in the head, or bad appendix, were required to undergo treatment for that cold by a Signal Corps officer, or to have an ordnance officer perform an appendectomy upon him? Yet, when his reputation, property, liberty, and even life is at stake, he is given an infantry, cavalry, or artillery officer to defend them.

That has been the situation heretofore and is one which the present bill is designed to remedy to some extent. What further steps may need to be taken must await experience under the present act if it becomes law.

With regard to section 26, providing for a board of review and judicial council, these being innovations, again experience only will demonstrate their effectiveness.

The allowance under certain circumstances of enlisted men to sit on courts to try enlisted men may be of some help, but I do not share the optimism of some Members that this will create great reform. It seems to me that the benefit will be largely psychological.

I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that my belief that this act, and particularly section 8, will be beneficial to the administration of justice in the Army will be realized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 8, line 8, strike out "or the custom of the service."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I say by way of explanation of my several amendments that I did not know this bill was coming up this quickly. I had been in Europe and had examined quite a few camps for the purpose of making comments and suggestions to the committee. However, I find that the bill has come up, so it is necessary that these suggestions of mine be made as quickly as possible at this time because this is the only time they will get a hearing.

This amendment is to page 8, line 8, striking out the words "or the custom of the service." It would then read, "provided that general courts martial shall have power to impose any punishment authorized by law, including a bad conduct discharge." I am willing to have in the law every punishment that the general courts martial shall give, but they should not do it by what they might term "general customs of the service." I think we should be specific when we come to these serious offenses and we should have expressed in the law what the penalties and sentences may be.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not have the time or opportunity to read the hearings or he, perhaps, would not have offered his amendment. I refer to page 2038 of the hearings, where this question was asked of General Hoover:

Mr. ELSTON. I wonder if you could enlarge on the term "or the custom of the service"?

This was General Hoover's answer:

General HOOVER. That is meant to cover the types of punishment that are customarily used by court martial, but are not expressly authorized by the Articles of War. For example, a dishonorable discharge is not expressly authorized by the Articles of War, nor is detention of pay, reprimand, or admonition. The thought is that the term "custom of the service" will authorize those punishments which are now recognized by the Manual for Courts Martial. The only limitation that we have in the Articles of War is with respect to cruel and unusual punishments. Of course, that limitation would remain.

Mr. FULTON. With the understanding that it is specifically understood that the words "or the custom of the service" excludes unusual or degrading punishment, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Page 9, line 5, strike out beginning with the word *"Provided"* to the end of the section.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I have been advised by the committee since preparing this amendment that this is the same practice that has been used by the Navy in summary courts martial, is that correct? And that it has worked satisfactorily there. So that if this is specifically put in, to carry out the custom that has been practiced by the Navy without going beyond it, and the committee will so assure us of that, I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. ELSTON. I have been informed of that fact, but we cannot give you assurance.

Mr. FULTON. Well, with the understanding that it is the intention of the committee and in view of the debate here that that is the thought, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: Page 10, line 15, after the period insert the following new paragraph:

"No person subject to military law shall be confined with enemy prisoners or any other foreign national outside of the continental limits of the United States, nor shall any defendant awaiting trial be made subject to punishment or penalties other than confinement prior to sentence on charges against him."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment is to provide that no United States serviceman when he is sentenced to confinement shall be confined with enemy prisoners or any other foreign nationals outside of the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am quite interested in the statement the gentleman has just made and would like to ask the gentleman if he has any information that any soldier of the United States Army while awaiting trial and under charges has been in confinement with enemy troops in time of war?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; I have such information. I saw them myself this summer in the same cage as German prisoners. I saw our own troops in the Pisa disciplinary training center, not only in the same place with enemy troops, but in the same barbed-wired cage, which was about 50 by 200 feet long.

In addition to that, at the same disciplinary training center I have seen American boys in a barbed-wire cell, about 10 by 20 feet in size, confined immediately next to an Italian prisoner of war who had shot down in cold blood American fliers who had been captured in Italy during the war. So that I have seen both German and Italian prisoners of war right next to American prisoners of war.

In addition to that, at the same disciplinary training center, at Pisa, I have seen men held for months under physical punishment conditions who were not even tried yet. They were deprived of beds; they were deprived of sufficient clothing for their boards; they were forced to sleep on boards. They were put under this disciplinary training, gotten up for special inspections, forced to do work as if they had already been convicted. I said to those boys when I was at that training camp, "I will try to see first that you are not confined with these enemy prisoners and certainly that you are not punished before you have been sentenced."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Did the gentleman take this matter up with the commanding officer of the area? I refer to this question of confinement with alien prisoners.

Mr. FULTON. I may say I took it up with the lieutenant colonel in charge of the disciplinary training center, and I said I was shocked to find it. Then, on the relief of the other general in charge of Italy, I took it up with a very fine general, General Janes, and he said he was sorry that such had occurred and would see that it did not in the future; that those things occasionally occurred.

Now I want it in the Articles of War, to see that it never occurs again, because when you find American prisoners not even segregated from Nazi prisoners, using the same toilet facilities, in the same barbed-wire enclosure, with no separation, being forced to associate with people they were just fighting against shortly before, perhaps the committee had better adopt this amendment and see that it never occurs again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 34, noes 16.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment on the Clerk's desk. I wish to withdraw the amendment on page 10, because that has been covered by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], but I have an amendment on page 11, line 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: Page 11, line 22, at the end of the sentence, add "It shall be the duty of any person subject to military law, in obtaining any statement from an accused to advise him that he does not have to make any statement at all regarding the offense of which he is accused or being investigated and that any statement by the accused may be used as evidence against him in a trial by court martial."

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, in most of our State jurisdictions, when a man is placed under arrest he must be warned of the offense against him before he gives a written confession. As he gives a written statement, it devolves upon the officer taking that statement to advise him that any statement he may make can be used against him on the trial of the offense of which he is accused.

In the case of men charged with an offense against military law I have seen this thing happen, and you can visualize it: A boy has committed some offense. An officer goes down to investigate. I have been that officer—asking for his statement, asking what he has done, and so forth, and asking him all the leading questions he can think of. The boy does not know his legal rights. He will give a statement. Some of the questions are very leading. Oh, I know someone will say "You will be fair about those things." In reply I say you are playing a game, you are working for the prosecution; and I repeat that I have been on both sides of the table—and you would like for your side to win. Finally it becomes a game. You lawyers know how it works.

I feel that when anyone authorized to take statements from an accused interrogates him for that purpose that he should tell the accused that any statement he makes may be used against him on the trial of the offense with which he is charged.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the committee may accept this amendment. I believe it is entirely fair, and I feel that if the accused is apprised of his rights justice will not be harmed.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to say to the gentleman that I thoroughly agree with

this particular amendment. I happened at one time to defend a young man overseas charged with a very serious crime. By the time he got to me he had already given four different statements. All of them differed. There was no consistency between any two of the four. You can say that the fellow ought to have gotten life imprisonment—which he did—but it is our duty to protect the rights of an accused boy like that just as we do in our criminal proceedings in civilian life. I like the gentleman's amendment and feel that something along that line ought to be adopted.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. May I say that I was the investigating officer in the case to which my friend the gentleman from New York just referred. I think he will also say that the defendant in that case was in advance of the investigation warned of his rights and told that he was entitled to counsel.

Mr. KEATING. If my distinguished friend from Texas will yield further, I want to say that as long as my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania was in the case the boy was told of his rights; but before it ever got to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania the boy had already been interviewed by a sergeant, a lieutenant, and two or three others, and his story was never the same in any two instances.

Mr. BURLESON. I suggest that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania continue the trial of this case at some other time; but that is a good illustration of how it can happen and of the fact that it has happened time and time again.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. May I say in that connection that I, like the gentleman from New York, am in hearty support of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. As I understand the gentleman's amendment it is to assure the accused the same right a civilian has who is charged in the civil courts with a crime, of being told that any statement he may make may be used against him.

Mr. BURLESON. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. We have no objection to the amendment on this side.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. I thought at first that what the gentleman proposed was a different rule than what had been applied, but actually this is the rule that has always been applied by the Judge Advocate General and is the very rule that is being applied now.

Mr. BURLESON. May I say that I did not intend to suggest that it had never been used, certainly not; but in so many cases it is not used that it should be made mandatory.

Mr. GOFF. It is already provided for by the Articles of War.

Mr. BURLESON. With that I cannot agree. You, like some of the other gentlemen here, must be indulging in some presumptions. Perhaps there are vague references that may be interpreted, but why speculate and theorize on these matters which are so desperately fundamental.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is agreed to.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I object; it is already provided for.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 4, line 14, after the words "for the prosecution" insert "or defense."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be quite possible the members of the committee on both sides would be willing to accept this amendment after an explanation of it.

We have heard a lot here today about protecting the accused, which is certainly entirely in order and much to be desired; but, like all lawsuits, there are two sides to these cases. The prosecution, as well as the defense, should have ample protection. In the present wording it is provided that nobody shall sit as a member of a court martial when he is the accuser, which is obvious, or when he is a witness for the prosecution; but he could still sit there if he were a witness for the defense.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Of course, in drafting this bill we were seeking to give every protection to the accused. We never thought of any case where the accused would object to having one of his witnesses sit in judgment on him. We see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. He may not object, but the prosecution might object.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. Does the gentleman know whether the language now appearing in the bill is the same as in the present Articles of War?

Mr. KEATING. I am without knowledge on that point but if the Articles of War at present read that way, in my opinion, they are wrong. I do not think a defense witness ought to sit on a court martial.

Mr. MATHEWS. It is a fact, however, that the present Articles of War contain the same language as is in the bill?

Mr. KEATING. I cannot say.

Mr. MATHEWS. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, perhaps he is taking away something from the accused.

Mr. KEATING. That may be, but I do not believe any accused could seriously contend that one of his witnesses should sit as a member of a court martial.

Mr. ELSTON. Whether it is in the bill or not, it is perfectly obvious they would not permit any officer to sit in judgment if he were going to be a witness for either the prosecution or the defense. We see no objection to it being written in the law.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. For the gentleman's information, that is a new section added to the present Articles of War.

Mr. KEATING. I did not know about that and thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, is he not going to place it in the hands of the accused to practically name his court? I can foresee that the actual situation which will arise many times, if the amendment is adopted, is that the accused will be tried by members of his own battalion or company, and if he indicates he wants to call any particular member of the court as a witness, even though he would only give evidence as to the character of the accused, then that man could not be appointed to sit on that case.

Mr. KEATING. That is right.

Mr. MACKINNON. Does not the gentleman think that result would work a perversion of the present court-martial procedure or any fair court-martial procedure?

Mr. KEATING. In answering the gentleman, may I ask him a question? Does not the gentleman think it would be a perversion of justice for a defense witness in the case to sit as a member of the court martial?

Mr. MACKINNON. I think so if he were testifying as to matters involving the commission of the crime, but in these cases before military courts you get to the matter of character evidence to a greater extent than in the ordinary civil cases. They very frequently rely upon testimony from members of the court and members of their own command. For instance, they place a man's service record in evidence, usually through the officer having custody thereof. In fact, they consider many matters of character and the performance of duty that ordinarily would not be considered in a criminal trial in civilian courts and which do not go to the question of the commission of the offense. I can see a great deal of good that might come from the gentleman's amendment, but it strikes me that this might open up an avenue of abuse that could be used to delay a proper consideration of these matters. It would place a weapon in the hands of counsel for the accused where he could practically name his own court in many instances.

Mr. KEATING. My judgment is that no matter what the character of the witness' testimony might be, whether it goes to the merits of the proceeding or

in the nature of character evidence or specialized or expert evidence of any kind, the witness giving that evidence on behalf of one of the parties to the lawsuit should not also sit in judgment on the accused.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CROW. If one of the members of the court were going to act as a character witness for the accused, does the gentleman not think that he should disqualify himself from sitting on the court?

Mr. KEATING. I certainly do.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Not only should he not sit, but if he is a witness and does sit he, in effect, weighs the credibility of his own testimony.

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid we are losing sight of a very important matter in connection with criminal procedure. If this amendment should be adopted, any defendant up for court martial who does not want to go to trial can avoid trial for an indefinite period of time. We have had situations here in the District in which the defendants have disqualified one judge after the other, and very effectively avoided trial, so that if this amendment is adopted the defendant can subpena every member of the court, and when they are relieved because of disqualification under this amendment, he can subpena everybody appointed on the new court. In adopting rules of criminal procedure in all of the States it is necessary to see to it that the defendant is forced to go to trial. We lose sight of that here because of the fact that we have seen men who have been held in confinement for a long period of time, and I am afraid we are losing sight of the fact that one of the most difficult things in criminal cases is to get the defendant into court and get him ready for trial. In civil courts we have to overrule or grant all the motions to which he is entitled. His first motion for continuance is almost invariably granted, and then he can generally fix up the second one. As I said in my opening remarks, the constitutional right to a speedy trial is the one most frequently waived by the defendant. This would very effectively block trial of any defendant who did not want to go to trial.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I never intended to create a schism between the two sides of this committee by this simple amendment. Does the gentleman feel that simply by subpenaing a member of the court that would disqualify that member from sitting? My idea is that it would be necessary for him to show what he was going to prove in order to disqualify the man. He could not simply use the ruse of subpenaing everybody on the court and then prevent them from acting.

Mr. KILDAY. Do you not understand that under the provision we have that if a member of the court shows up who is a witness for the prosecution, all the defendant would have to do would be to say, "I challenge that member of the court," and he would have to stand aside. But, you are making it a statutory ground of disqualification.

Mr. KEATING. If he is a witness. In other words, if he is called as a witness to give testimony he is going to get some witness that aids the prosecution or the defense. He might just use this as a ruse to get out of it.

Mr. KILDAY. Does the gentleman take the position that a character witness for the prosecution, perhaps for the injured party to a transaction, would be competent to sit on the court martial under the provision we have here?

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not think he would be.

Mr. KEATING. No.

Mr. KILDAY. I think the converse would be true if the amendment is adopted, that the defendant would not have to go to trial unless he wanted.

Mr. KEATING. It certainly was not my intention to have that result, and I am inclined to disagree with the gentleman that that would be the effect of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania: On page 7, line 14, after the words "United States", insert the following: "Of a rank not less than that of the trial judge advocate."

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very obvious; namely, to see to it that the rank of the attorney representing the accused shall not be less than the rank of the prosecuting officer. I think it is quite obvious to all the men who have been in the service that very frequently a junior officer is imposed upon and somewhat awed by the superior rank of his opponent. This merely holds even the scales of justice in the actual trial of the case as between the accused and the prosecution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman's amendment make it mandatory that the defense counsel must be of equivalent rank with the prosecution counsel?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I can conceive of cases, and perhaps the gentleman would be familiar with such cases, where a defendant would be represented by a colonel who did not know half as much as the lieutenant who was on the other side. In other words, it does not matter what your rank is on this court-martial work; you have to know your business or you will get a licking in the lawsuit.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. That is correct. Therefore, this amendment would leave the respective parties to rest upon the ability of their counsel. With reference to the case to which my distinguished friend from New York refers, this amendment would not touch that situation at all, because this amendment is designed to protect the accused, and the case to which the gentleman refers, as I understand, was where counsel for the accused was of a rank superior to that of the counsel for the prosecution.

Mr. KEATING. Let us consider just the opposite of that case. It does not seem to me you are helping the accused in any way by forcing him to have as his attorney, over his objection, somebody of high rank. He might select a well-qualified lawyer who was a lieutenant.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. The counsel appointed must be of at least equal rank. The accused can choose other counsel if he so desires, and the bill so provides.

Mr. KEATING. I understood that the gentleman answered my inquiry by saying it was mandatory for the defense counsel to be of as high rank as the prosecuting attorney.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Where the defense counsel is appointed by the convening authority. This is an amendment to that part of the section on page 7 which states that in all cases in which the officer appointed as Trial Judge Advocate shall be a member of the Judge Advocate General's department, and so forth, the officer appointed as defense counsel shall be of the same professional qualifications and of equal rank.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I am in agreement with the gentleman and am going to support his amendment. However, I have seen some enlisted men that were quite able to appear before a court-martial board, and I would hope that a provision might be inserted in the bill to enable them to do so. However, I do not expect to offer such an amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. The amendment does not in any way prohibit or limit the accused in the right of selecting his own counsel. He can select an enlisted man if he so desires.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CROW. I call the gentleman's attention to the words on the bottom of page 6, line 25, "if available." Does not that control the whole thing? If they are not available, then they do not have to be of equal rank.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. That states that both the Trial Judge Advocate and defense counsel shall be members of the Judge Advocate General's department, if such officers are avail-

able. I would interpret that as referring to that particular phraseology.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Where I was located overseas, in a base of some 3,000 men, there were two attorneys. One was a lieutenant and the other was a captain. How would we ever get a case tried under those circumstances?

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. There would be no prohibition, as I have said, against the accused's selecting anybody he desired.

Mr. NORBLAD. He might have to select a captain who was not a lawyer rather than take a lieutenant who was a lawyer, in a case like that.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. I believe that is true.

Mr. NORBLAD. That would be very ineffectual.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 11, noes 24.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 14, after the sentence in line 2, add the following:

"It shall be the duty of the law member of a general or special court martial before a vote is taken to advise the court that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, and that in the case just considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in the accused's favor and he shall be acquitted; if there is a reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower degree as to which there is no such doubt; that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused is upon the Government.

"That each member is the sole judge of the creditability of the witnesses and the weight to be given their testimony, but the interpretation of law they shall receive from the law member, and shall be governed thereby. And provided further the law member shall instruct other members of the court martial that in case the accused has filed application for a suspended sentence, in the event he is convicted or he has pleaded guilty, they shall in their discretion grant or reject the suspended sentence application and so say by their verdict."

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment embodies three fundamental elements. The first is the theory of the presumption of innocence. This is so fundamental that it is recognized in all matters dealing with life and liberty of individuals everywhere. This spells it out. This defines it. This makes it definite and removes it from speculation. It definitely says that the court-martial board must be instructed to that effect. Some of the Members have recited personal experiences. Permit me to recite my own personal experience hurriedly. I know of one case. We were sitting in a tent out on a little island in the Pacific and I was talking to a fellow about his service on a court-martial case. We should not have been discussing it, of course, but we were, and he referred to "our side" several times. Finally I said, "What do you mean 'your side' "? He said, "The ship's side. The station's side." I asked him if he had ever served on a jury in civilian life, and he said he had not. I said, "You do not have a side." He said he never heard of such a proposition. He was an officer in the United States Navy, but he had never heard of being an impartial juror. Is it not possible that people might never have heard of such a thing? They should be definitely and clearly instructed on these matters. The layman cannot be expected to have studied these matters. Why presume and risk grave error.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman assume that an officer of the United States Army might be equally uninformed about that?

Mr. BURLESON. I would suspect that it is entirely possible.

Mr. Chairman, to come to my next point. The theory of reasonable doubt is recognized for just what it is, that if there is a reasonable doubt in the minds of those serving upon the court-martial board, as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt should be resolved in favor of the accused. The degree of punishment or the degree of guilt has nothing in the world to do with it. It makes no difference whether he is deprived of his liberty for 1 day or for 6 years. The principle is the same. If there is a reasonable doubt, it should be resolved in favor of the accused.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. We hear much said about Army justice or military justice being on a par with what we find in civilian life. Is it not true that if this instruction as contained in your amendment were not given by a judge in a civilian trial it would constitute a reversible error in most jurisdictions if an appeal was taken on that ground?

Mr. BURLESON. In all jurisdictions that I know anything about, and I just know about a few of them—I know enough to convince me that it is a principle of law that we find all through our judicial system, that always the doubt is resolved in favor of the defendant.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am certainly in accord with the gentleman's remarks and I shall certainly support his amendment. However, I do feel that the amendment does not go quite far enough. I feel that the question should be used in qualifying the persons who sit on that board, before they are qualified to sit on the board.

Mr. BURLESON. I agree with the gentleman and I think perhaps the accused and his counsel should have the right to challenge every individual member of the court-martial board. I had a provision in the amendment to that effect, but it was rather long and I withdrew it. I agree with the gentleman that each member of the court should be examined as an individual, as to whether he has such bias or prejudice that it would take evidence to remove it.

But, to hasten to another point I wish to make, court-martial board members should be the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses: I ask my good friend from Texas how one, reviewing a written page, could give any credence to testimony or be a judge of human nature, or the credibility of the testimony given by an individual while he was testifying under oath on the witness stand. You, from experience, know that you have a right, both as an attorney and as a juror, to appraise the character and demeanor of a witness giving testimony, as to whether he is telling the truth, and to judge the force that is to be given to his testimony. I think that should be incorporated in the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think it is perfectly obvious that we cannot undertake in the committee to write a complete code of procedure so far as court-martial cases are concerned, in the limited time we have at our disposal.

With respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] nobody wants to see any man, tried by a court martial deprived of the presumption of innocence, or to see him convicted unless there is evidence adduced against him beyond a reasonable doubt. I do not believe any case was called to our attention where that did happen. Moreover, this amendment is not confined to the presumption of innocence and reasonable doubt features.

Under the provisions of this bill the findings of the court are reviewed by the convening authority, who has complete authority to set aside any sentence, in its entirety, if it cares to do so. After that it goes before a board of review, and then to the Judicial Council, and the Judicial Council has the power to review the evidence. If the council finds that witnesses who testified against the accused were not credible witnesses it has the right to reject the testimony and to set aside the conviction or modify it. So it seems to me the rights of the accused are fully protected, in fact, more fully protected than in the civil courts, because there many courts of appeal do not have the right to pass upon the weight of the evidence. Such courts must take the position that the trial court, having seen and heard the witnesses, is in the best position to judge the credibility of the witnesses. In this case we go further than that and give the Judicial Council the right to pass upon this question. We have thrown unusual safeguards around the accused, and I believe we might do a disservice to accused persons if we undertake to write a complete code of procedure here on the floor of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am not unmindful of what you gentlemen on the committee have done in this bill. You have done a very commendable job. I am for your bill, whether this is agreed to or not, but to say that the time element enters into it is a poor argument, because we are now, after about 150 years, trying to write a bill under which a man's liberty can be taken from him. I do not care how much review is made possible under this bill, when a court is not advised of these two or three basic fundamentals of our system of justice, when it comes up to review they do not know what the court thought which sat in this case. I think certainly this instruction should be given the court, because under existing conditions it is not given, and you have men sitting on the court who never heard of these things before.

They rob a man of his life, of his liberty; and you could appeal it till kingdom come and they still would not reverse it because they do not know what the court had in mind when it assessed the sentence. You have got to reach men's minds, and if they are advised of that just before they pass sentence I certainly think that the defendant would come nearer getting justice than he would when you have a bunch of laymen like these in this last war sitting there taking men's lives who had never heard of these things.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Ohio says he did not recall having presented to the committee any instance where the substance, at least, of such instructions was not given. In my capacity as executive officer of an establishment here in the United States I detailed an officer of the command to serve as a member of a court in the camp in which we were located. Shortly afterward he came back to me and asked to be relieved of that detail by reason of the fact that when the court went into closed session and he endeavored to discuss the evidence he was told by the president of the court that he was not there to discuss the evidence, he was there to convict.

I think that all of us feel that these fundamental concepts of our law should be retained in the manual of court martial. They provide for a great deal of it, but this particular right is in the fundamental basic law.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it was the old Roman philosopher, Seneca, who said "Haste trips up its own heels, stops and fetters itself." I realize we have many important things to do and that our time is valuable here, but after all this is an extremely important matter and ought to challenge our most careful attention and a reasonable amount of our time. We ought not to be hasty, in my judgment.

I want to compliment this committee in taking what appears to be a very fine forward step in the administration of justice in the services of our country, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and so forth; but, Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the fact that nothing on this earth is perfect; and regardless of the time and brains that have gone into this bill, and a lot have gone into it, it is not a perfect bill and it will not be perfect even though you adopt a great many amendments. Mr. Chairman, I observed once before in this House and I observe again, honestly and truly, I do not believe there is anything sacrosanct about a committee's report even though it be the finest committee in the House with the most honest and sincere group of people involved; still, there is no perfection and there should not be any objection to a good amendment when it is offered, and I say this is a most excellent amendment, in my judgment.

When I was a district judge, and I served nearly 10 years on the bench, every time I tried a man accused of crime I instructed the jury that he was presumed to be innocent until that presumption was overcome and that every reasonable doubt of his guilt must be resolved in his favor. Had I not so instructed the jury the higher court would have reversed me, as it should have, because it must be impressed upon the minds of the jury that that is the fundamental law of the land, that a man is entitled to the presumption of innocence until his innocence is overcome by competent and legal evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. Just why there should be objection to incorporating this principle here in our military law is beyond my conception. You admit it is a part of the fundamental law. Then why not put it in here and require that those who sit in judgment upon a man be informed of that fact so there can be no question but what they will know it is the law? There just cannot be, as I see it, any sound argument against this amendment. As was stated by two or three gentlemen who have spoken previously here today, many of the men who sit upon these courts martial are not lawyers.

They may be very brainy, very smart men, but ordinarily they are not lawyers and they do not understand all these things unless they are told. You cannot operate a linotype machine and I cannot either. There are thousands of things I cannot do. If I come into a strange field where I am not acquainted, I appreciate an expert in that field telling me something about it.

Why anybody would object to a lawyer or some one instructing this body that is going to pass upon the liberty and maybe the life of a man as to what his fundamental rights are is beyond my conception. Why the objection to it? It cannot hurt, and certainly if it is the law, they ought to know what the law is and should not sit there in ignorance of the law when in a very simple way they can be advised what the law is. I do not see any reason why the amendment should not prevail.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has made a very persuasive argument on this subject. I cannot understand why we should not incorporate in this bill what is recognized everywhere as the fundamental law.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to say that I am thoroughly convinced by the argument the gentleman has made.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I told the chairman of the committee awhile ago I think this is a good bill. It is certainly better than the system we have operated under up to date. But that is still no reason why, when a good amendment is offered, one that is fundamental under either military or civilian justice, the committee should not accept it, as I see the matter.

I served as a TJA in the Army and I for one know, and they can talk until they are black in the face about military justice, that it stinks. I have been on both ends of it, as a prosecutor and defense counsel. You try to rectify that in this bill. Right here in connection with this one amendment I see no reason why we should not write this in so that the members of the court just before they vote, in some instances they may be taking a man's life or taking his liberty for many years, should not be reminded of these most simple and basic fundamentals in the American or any other system of justice. It is inconceivable to me that the committee will not accept it or that it will be voted down.

I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the discussion of this amendment has all centered around the first paragraph of it. Of course, I agree that the court and every member of it should know the law that the defendant is presumed to be innocent, and that presumption remains throughout the trial or until overcome by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. I have no particular objection to that being incorporated into the Articles of War, although I do not believe it to be necessary. The Articles of War do not spell out all of the procedure in detail. They deal mostly with the formation of the court, the definition of offenses, the punishment, and things of that kind. This is in the court-martial manual, and I see no objection to it going into the Articles of War.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has a great deal more than that in it. It goes on to say—

> That each member is the sole judge of the creditability of the witnesses and the weight to be given their testimony, but the interpretation of law they shall receive from the law member, and shall be governed thereby. And provided further, the law member shall instruct other members of the court martial that in case the accused has filed application for a suspended sentence in the event he is convicted or he has pleaded guilty, they shall in their discretion grant or reject the suspended sentence application and so say by their verdict.

The latter part of this amendment changes entirely the concept of courts martial. We are providing in this bill that on interlocutory matters the ruling of the law member shall be final and

binding on the court, but that does not apply to anything else. It does not apply as to the judgment, as to whether he is guilty under the law and the evidence. All of the members of the court must pass on that. Challenges, motions for directed verdict, and pleas of insanity, all those things pass out of the hands of the law member. But the law member is not the judge in the sense that in our civil courts we divide the functions of the judge as the trier of the law from the jury as the trier of the facts.

And again we import in here a lot of things which are unnecessary—the importation into the court martial of the right of the trial court to grant suspended sentences. There are provisions for suspension of sentence on review, and matters of that kind. I think it is a very dangerous practice for us now to pass on an amendment of this kind which changes the fundamental concept of courts martial by taking away from the members of the court, except the law member, decisions as to law and importing an entirely new type of restraint to be imposed.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Does the gentleman see any great danger in conferring the right on a court martial to grant suspended sentences?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman and I have both practiced in Texas exclusively, and that is the sort of thing we are used to down there, but I would hesitate a great deal to say that our court of criminal procedure was the best ever conceived. The question of suspension of sentence and probation are matters that generally lie entirely within the realm of those who deal with the law phases of the situation.

Mr. BURLESON. If it is left to the discretion of a board away up the line of command, all the way up——

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot yield further, because I want to answer the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON. All the way up to Washington, why cannot the board on the ground exercise its judgment?

Mr. KILDAY. When we provide board review on the credibility of the witnesses, my colleague is construing that as depriving the trial court of the right to pass on the credibility of the witnesses. Of course, all trial courts pass on the credibility of witnesses. But, we have gone further now and left the board of review to say that they are not going to believe the witness; they are going to pass on his credibility, and over a long period of years the courts of most of the States have had questions of probation and suspension handled differently, not by the trial courts, so I do not think at this late hour and in this manner we should import this new type of sentence into our military law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURLESON) there were—ayes 16, noes 25.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I have just introduced a bill to put into effect the tax recommendations made in the President's message on the state of the Union.

This bill would provide a cost-of-living tax credit of $40 for each individual income taxpayer and for each of his dependents, and would make up the revenue loss by reimposing an excess-profits tax. The excess-profits tax would be at a lower rate and after larger exemptions than those in effect during the war period. It would apply to only a relatively small number of corporations—probably less than 22,000 in all—which are making large excess profits during this period of inflationary pressures and rising living costs.

As the President said in his message, this is no time for a general tax reduction. The cost-of-living credit provided by this bill has been made necessary by the steady increase in the level of consumers' prices—32 percent since the $500 per capita tax exemption was first set in May 1944. The benefit of the credit would go almost entirely where it is most needed; 93 percent of it would go to persons with incomes under $5,000 a year. It would take 10,300,000 taxpayers with low net incomes off the tax rolls entirely. These persons have little, if any, means to pay taxes, except at the expense of their health and that of their dependents.

To reimburse the Treasury for the cost of this necessary relief to the small taxpayer, the bill provides for the reimposition of a reasonable excess-profits tax. The rate is 75 percent on profits in excess of 135 percent of prewar profits plus an exemption of $50,000. This liberal provision exempts the smaller corporations and places the burden where it should properly fall. The corporations which would be subject to this tax are the ones making large profits and can afford to pay it.

The bill, taken as a whole, provides relief which has been made necessary by the pressure of rising living costs, yet it does not add to the forces making for further increases in these costs. In both of these respects, it contrasts with the Republican tax-reduction bill. That bill would give less relief at the lowest income levels, where it is needed most, yet would drastically reduce Federal revenues and so force up living costs still further.

Of the 360,000 taxpaying corporations for this year, 22,000 would be affected by this bill.

Estimated number of taxable-income recipients and their total individual income tax under present law[1] and under the proposed cost-of-living tax-adjustment credit of $40 per capita, distributed by net income classes, in calendar year 1948

[Assuming personal income of $200,000,000,000]

[Number of income recipients in thousands; money amounts in millions]

Net income class (000)	Number of taxable-income recipients			Total tax[2]			
					Under the $40 per capita tax credit		
	Taxable under present law	Made nontaxable by the $40 per capita tax credit	Taxable under the $40 per capita tax credit	Under present law	Amount	Decrease from present law	
						Amount	Percentage distribution
Under $1	5,832.7	2,742.6	3,090.1	$252.1	$79.7	$172.5	5.4
$1 to $2	20,583.1	4,882.4	15,700.7	3,039.6	2,057.7	981.9	30.6
$2 to $3	15,096.3	2,294.8	12,801.6	4,182.0	3,109.8	1,072.2	33.4
$3 to $4	5,750.1	357.1	5,393.0	2,489.4	1,977.7	511.7	15.9
$4 to $5	2,512.9	65.9	2,447.0	1,561.6	1,311.6	250.0	7.8
Under $5	49,775.2	10,342.7	39,432.5	11,524.8	8,536.5	2,988.3	93.0
$5 to $10	1,463.2	----	1,463.2	1,626.5	1,478.8	147.7	4.6
$10 to $25	608.1	----	608.1	2,464.1	2,405.6	58.5	1.8
$25 to $50	149.5	----	149.5	2,144.2	2,130.9	13.3	.4
$50 to $100	51.4	----	51.4	1,878.9	1,874.4	4.5	.1
$100 to $250	10.3	----	10.3	980.0	979.2	.8	[4]
$250 to $500	1.3	----	1.3	321.8	321.7	.1	[4]
$500 to $1,000	.3	----	.3	177.7	177.7	[3]	[4]
$1,000 and over	.1	----	.1	124.9	124.9	[3]	[4]
$5 and over	2,284.1	----	2,284.1	9,718.1	9,493.1	225.0	7.0
Grand total	52,059.4	10,342.7	41,716.6	21,242.9	18,029.6	3,213.2	100.0

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] Includes normal tax, surtax, and alternative tax on net long-term capital gains.
[3] Less than $50,000.
[4] Less than 0.05 percent.

Treasury Department, Jan. 13, 1948.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 14, after the sentence in line 2, add the following: "It shall be the duty of the law member of a general or special court martial before a vote is taken to advise the court that the accused must be presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established by legal and competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, and that in the case just considered, if there is a reasonable doubt as to the guilt of the accused, the doubt shall be resolved in the accused's favor and he shall be acquitted; if there is a reasonable doubt as to the degree of guilt, the finding must be in a lower degree as to which there is no such doubt; that the burden of proof to establish the guilt of the accused is upon the Government."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to endeavor to bring together my two fine and distinguished colleagues from Texas. It is my hope that they will be able to see eye to eye on this problem now. This amendment strikes out the last paragraph of the amendment previously offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON]. It endeavors to write into military law only what is the fundamental law of our land now. I am sure it will also have the support of both gentlemen from Oklahoma, and I would hope that there would be no objection from anyone to this modified version of the amendment originally offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The presumption of innocence until guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt is one of the oldest and most cherished principles of our common law. In that respect from earliest times there has been a definite line of cleavage between our jurisprudence and that adopted in some other countries, where the initial presumption is one of guilt rather than innocence.

Certainly we should afford to the men of our armed services every protection which is enjoyed by the most hardened criminal in our land. To do less is to shirk our full duty to those who serve our country.

It may well be the fact, and probably is, that the basic rule of evidence embodied in this amendment is usually explained to the members of a court martial by the law member during the course of their deliberations. No harm can come, however, from ensuring that this will of necessity be done in each instance by making it a mandatory requirement as is here contemplated.

I earnestly urge that my colleagues, whom I know to be sincere in their desire to bring about a more nearly perfect performance of justice in court-martial proceedings, support this amendment designed to accomplish such a result.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, I had no objection to that portion of the amendment, as I indicated in my remarks a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania: On page 45, line 11, after the words "Regular Army" insert "all of whom shall be persons regularly admitted to practice, either in one of the district courts of the United States or a court of equivalent jurisdiction of a State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States."

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the bill presently under consideration sets up a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps. In questioning some of the members of the committee during the course of debate here this afternoon in which the statement was made that all officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps are lawyers, I find that that is not written into the statutory law, at least I am so informed, but that it is so provided by administrative order only. I think all of us recognize the fact that those who are dealing with legal questions, whether they be concerning the administration of justice or whether they be questions of claims against the Government, or on behalf of the Government, should be men who are trained in law. While it has never happened, it is nevertheless conceivable that it could happen that the administrative order might be repealed, and I can see no objection to writing into the law, at the time when we are actually establishing this separate Judge Advocate General's Corps, the provision which has always been observed heretofore. I ask the chairman of the committee whether there is any objection to accepting the amendment and putting into the act what we now have in the form of an administrative order.

Mr. ELSTON. I do not believe there is any necessity to adopt the amendment because obviously nobody is going to be selected as a judge advocate of the Army who is not in every sense of the word qualified. I think the amendment is surplusage and unnecessary. I do not know of a time when we ever had a judge advocate who was not qualified. It is inconceivable that one would be appointed who is unfit to hold the office and who does not possess the qualifications necessary to fulfill the office of Judge Advocate General.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is addressing himself to the Judge Advocate General. The amendment provides, I believe, that the officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps shall all be members of the legal profession.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JENKINS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK, having assumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from a committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

Very sincerely,

HUGH A. MEADE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. CELLER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

LET US STICK TO THE TRUTH

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it of course is to be expected in a Presidential election year that parties will be lined up against each other, and political oratory will ebb and flow. Criticism of the "ins" as well as the "outs" will be heard on all sides. There should be, however, a sincere desire on the part of national leaders to stick to the truth in making their appeal to the voters.

In the first issue of the Utah Democrat, Gael Sullivan, the executive director of the Democratic National Committee, has resorted to deliberate falsehood in maligning my record in the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

Among other statements, Mr. Sullivan reported as follows:

DAWSON is a member of the Committee on Public Lands, vital to western interests. His committee failed to pass a single major measure in the first session.

This is a deliberate falsehood. As one other who was greatly admired by Mr. Sullivan used to say, "Let's look at the record."

The House Public Lands Committee in the first session has considered and favorably reported to the House of Representatives 122 bills and resolutions, 107 of which were taken up by the House and passed. Among these measures was one granting statehood to Hawaii, and approving many reclamation projects throughout the country.

If Mr. Sullivan thinks that such bills as the one granting statehood to Hawaii, and approving reclamation projects in the West are not important to his party, or considered as major legislation, then I suggest that he reexamine his party platform.

Mr. Sullivan further points out that I followed the lead of the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, the economy champion of Congress, in reducing appropriations. I am proud to have had a part in reducing many Federal expenditures and also reducing the amount of the Federal debt. The President's budget presented the day before yesterday calls for nearly $40,000,000,000, which is nearly double the amount of any prewar peacetime budget. Surely we cannot go on spending and spending without some honest effort being made

to reduce expenditures. Of course we would all like to see benefits extended both at home and abroad, but if we expect to reduce the spiral of inflation we must make an honest attempt now to reduce Federal expenditures before our people are engulfed. I feel confident that the American people will insist that we honestly meet this problem without resorting to demagoguery. We are not so much interested in criticism, unless it is constructive, as we are in suggestion and program which will make this Nation a better democracy than it is now.

Just because a proposal is Republican policy or is Democratic policy is not really important. The important thing is whether such policy is good for all the people of this great country of ours.

It is indeed regrettable that one who stands so high in the Democratic Party should embark so early on a campaign of vilification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill for the repeal of all Federal taxes and license fees on margarine. These antimargarine laws, in one form or another, have been on the statute books for years. The butter lobby has managed to defeat every effort to put margarine on the same basis as any other nutritious and perfectly good food product. However, I have predicted on many occasions in the past, and I now renew that prediction, that the Federal antimargarine laws eventually will be repealed. They are unfair and unjust. In a democracy history shows such class legislation is repealed once the public has become thoroughly informed on the issue.

And right here let me say that the margarine issue is not a sectional issue. It should not be a partisan issue. The proposal to repeal the antimargarine laws is not an attack upon the dairy industry, or even upon the butter industry, as my colleagues to my left have in the past seemed to assume. In years past this reform has been blocked by the almost united opposition of Republican Members of Congress. They pleaded that they were protecting the butter industry. Before the war they could make the contention with some plausibility; that it might be possible to supply the American people with enough butter to meet their needs for a wholesome table spread, although this never has been done.

Today even the butter manufacturers themselves have to admit that it is impossible to supply adequate milk for America's children and at the same time supply enough butter for America's tables at any price. The issue now is: Will we deny our citizens a wholesome table spread which the butter industry cannot supply? I do not believe my Republican friends will continue to insist on keeping this legislation on the books. I would welcome their cooperation in a completely nonpartisan effort to aid all consumers, to help millions of farmers, and to strike a blow for free enterprise and equal treatment for all by repealing the discriminatory margarine laws.

The conditions which served as an excuse for the first antimargarine laws have changed, even though the laws still are in effect. The first oleomargarine was a poorly made product by comparison with modern margarine. It imitated butter, but it was not nearly as nutritious as butter, and it was made in some instances under unsanitary conditions.

When the original Federal antimargarine laws were enacted, there were no Federal and State pure-food laws. As all of you know, both the Federal Government and the States have enacted comprehensive and adequate pure-food laws since that time. Among them is the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. Under it, an official definition and standard of identity for margarine was adopted by the United States Food and Drug Administration in 1941. Margarine which is made according to this standard, and 100 percent of it is so made, has a minimum fat content of 80 percent and a minimum of 9,000 United States Pharmacopoeia units of vitamin A per pound. Ninety-nine percent of all margarine now is fortified with 15,000 units of vitamin A, the content always being indicated on the label.

I do not think that even the persons who contend that the antimargarine laws should be continued will deny that modern margarine is a nutritious and high-quality food. For anyone still doubtful, I refer them to a report on margarine by the New York Academy of Medicine, a Report on Margarine by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council and the verdict of many other nutrition groups and nutrition experts.

The Federal antimargarine legislation is the keystone in the almost Nationwide legislative structure built up against margarine. So long as the Federal Government gives its blessing to discrimination against margarine, we can expect State laws against margarine to continue.

Charges that margarine was sold under fraudulent conditions and that it was an unhealthy product were the arguments used to push through the first margarine laws in 1886. Some Congressmen argued logically that the Government should go directly to the heart of the matter through pure-food laws instead of using the taxing power against a domestic product. The interests pressing for legislation did not like this suggestion. The thought that a tax on margarine, coupled with regulations for the labeling of margarine as such, would kill the product. Their aim all along has been to kill margarine, or to cripple it until it no longer interfered with butter. That is the aim today of the group which insists on perpetuation of the antimargarine laws.

Recently I examined the debates and hearings which accompanied the passage of the three Federal antimargarine laws, the first in 1886, the second in 1901, and the third and last in 1931. They confirmed something which has been apparent all along—that the antimargarine laws are class legislation; that they were intended to kill one domestic product for the benefit of a competitive domestic product, and that they have failed in their purpose. Margarine has increased its production in spite of the strenuous efforts to legislate it out of existence. But the antimargarine laws have been costly. They have set a most vicious precedent. All through the years, they have forced the low-income groups to pay a higher price for their table spreads. Finally, the price of butter has risen to such fantastic heights that the majority of American families are low-income groups so far as butter is concerned. Almost everybody uses some margarine, but housewives, if they prefer to serve it yellow, as most do, are forced to waste time and effort in mixing in the color. It has been estimated that from sixteen to eighteen million pounds of margarine were wasted last year in the mixing process and that more than 88,000,000 hours were required to do the work.

As might have been expected, the enactment of the first Federal antimargarine law was preceded by a huge meeting of dairymen in New York City. As described by Representative Scott of Pennsylvania, the convention was composed of representatives from 26 States. They decided to seek legislation to remedy what Congressman Scott called the traffic in oleomargarine. As a result of this and similar meetings, Congress was flooded with memorials urging antimargarine laws.

Despite the pressure, the charges of fraud and unsanitary oleomargarine had to be repeated over and over again to get the measure through the House by a 177 to 101 vote.

For example, listen to Representative Scott in the House on May 24, 1886:

> Within a period of less than 10 years a gigantic traffic has grown up which has already displaced one-fifth of butter and substituted therefor an article, the ingredients of which are acknowledged to be not only offensive in their original character to human taste but positively injurious to the public health. * * * The genius which has succeeded by the application of chemical fluids and compounds in transferring a mass of loathsome and unwholesome ingredients into an article of food at a trifling cost does not hesitate to impose the produce upon the public and receive in the way of excessive profits the difference between the cost and the price of butter.

Although the oleomargarine bill was, on its face, a revenue measure, it was never seriously considered as a money-raising bill during congressional debate.

> I have no desire—

Senator Miller, of New York, said—

> to introduce such a bill for taxation. I want no money from this bill in the Treasury. I want protection to the dairy industry of New York. I want it to go as far as to exterminate the rival industry, if necessary.

This brings to mind that an editorial on June 18, 1941, in the Dairy Record, a magazine representing the dairy industry, said:

> The dairy industry must set as its goal the complete extermination of oleomargarine. It must never rest until the manufacture and

sale of oleomargarine have been outlawed in this country.

Senator Miller admitted frankly that—

This—

The 1886 statute—

doubtless is a new species of legislation, or largely so, in this country and under our system. But the exigencies of the occasion seem so great that this body cannot afford to ignore them.

I am indeed thankful that the precedent established by this first law has been confined to margarine. Otherwise, there would have been economic chaos in these United States long ago. Cotton would have placed a tax on rayon, lard a tax on vegetable shortening, and so on, through an endless list.

Time and time again in the 1886 debate the assertion was made that margarine would not sell if it were known as margarine. This apparently was taken for granted by even the defenders of margarine.

Representative Frederick, of Iowa, said:

The fact is, as shown by all the testimony, that it—

Margarine—

will not sell when known.

President Cleveland expressed a similar belief in signing the bill. The foes of margarine felt that they had put the quietus on margarine, butter's competitor, and were satisfied.

It looked for a time as if they had succeeded. In 1887 the production of margarine dropped to approximately 20,000,000 pounds. It had been estimated that at least 200,000,000 pounds of margarine annually were being manufactured before the law went into effect. Despite that first sharp decrease, the production of oleomargarine by 1889 had increased to 83,000,000 pounds.

The butter interests saw they had not killed margarine. In 1901, they again took their case to the Federal Government. This time they attacked margarine on the grounds that it should not be allowed to be colored yellow.

The fact that there was almost no reference to the color issue in 1886 did not deter them. When the first Federal margarine law went through Congress there was no claim that butter had any preemptive right to use yellow to the exclusion of oleomargarine. I could find but one reference to color in the 1886 debates. Representative Henderson, of Iowa, did propose that oleomargarine be colored pink. His argument, however, was that this was necessary to prevent fraud. He set up no claim that butter had an exclusive right to yellow.

The 1886 statute imposed a tax of 2 cents a pound on all oleomargarine, but it did not differentiate between the colored and uncolored product. In addition, it defined butter as the product of the cow and defined all other table spreads as oleomargarine. License fees were placed on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, and there were various labeling and packaging requirements and requirements also for the keeping of records.

The 1901 Federal statute reduced the tax on uncolored margarine to one-fourth cent and levied a tax of 10 cents a pound on colored margarine. There was a section which applied the laws of a State with regard to oleomargarine to oleomargarine shipped into the State. At the time, 32 States prohibited the sale of colored margarine, most of these statutes having been enacted after the butter industry saw that the 1886 Federal statute and other State laws would not kill their competition.

In 1901, the health argument figured very little. By that time, admittedly, most margarine had become a healthful and nutritious product.

By and large, the proponents of an amended law centered their case on alleged frauds. They claimed that most oleomargarine still was sold as butter. The majority report from the House Agriculture Committee said that four-fifths of the colored oleomargarine made was so sold despite the legal prohibition against such sales. This statement was challenged in a minority report, signed by six members and the gentleman from New York, Chairman Wadsworth. The gentleman from New York, Representative Wadsworth, stated that that fraud practice was largely done by retail dealers in butter. The gentleman from Mississippi, Representative John Sharp Williams, quoted the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, charged with enforcement of the 1886 act, as saying that no more than 5 percent of oleomargarine was sold as butter.

The minority report, read by the gentleman from New York, Representative Wadsworth, flatly charged that the real object of the legislation was to destroy the oleomargarine industry. He quoted a statement by a Mr. Adams, pure food commissioner of Wisconsin, before the House Agriculture Committee, which said:

There is no use beating about the bush in this matter. We want to pass this law and drive the oleomargarine manufacturers out of business.

He quoted also a statement by Charles Y. Knight, secretary of the National Dairymen's Union, in a letter to the Virginia dairymen, dated March 18, 1900:

Now is the time for you to clip the fangs of the mighty octopus of the oleomargarine manufacturers who are ruining the dairy interests of the country by manufacturing and selling, in defiance of law, a spurious article in imitation of pure butter.

The gentleman from New York, Representative Wadsworth, also called attention to an utterance by W. D. Hoard, ex-Governor of Wisconsin, and at that time president of the National Dairymen's Union, before the House committee. Mr. Hoard said:

It is provided that a tax of 10 cents a pound shall be imposed on all oleomargarine in the color or semblance of butter. In plain words, this is repressive taxation.

Representative Wadsworth's reaction to this confession was as follows:

Just here the minority of the Agriculture Committee parted company with the National Dairymen's Union, for we do not believe that the Congress ought to ruin one American industry to benefit another. And that is just the object sought by these men by their own confession.

The objective of the bill also was summed up boldly by Representative Grout, of Vermont, sponsor of the House measure. He said:

Most of the 38 oleomargarine factories now running will make room for 1,000,000 additional cows and the butter maker whose business now suffers from this competition will feel the relief as from a nightmare and will rejoice that he is at last permitted to reap the fruits of honest toil and the whole American people will be thankful that they are released at last from this oily monster which now lurks for entrance into every household, and for a place at every table.

It—

Oleomargarine—

may suit the stomach of the average workingman but it is true that it is not assimilated by the delicate.

From the fact that 700,000,000 pounds of margarine was consumed in this country in 1947, it is evident that Representative Grout did not have the gift of prophecy.

The minority report clearly summed up the heart of this issue in a statement which is as true today as it was almost 50 years ago. The report said:

Congress is being asked to ruin one industry to benefit another and this, in the opinion of the minority is the thing Congress ought not to do. The minority believes it to be class legislation of the most pronounced kind and it would establish a precedent which, if followed, would create monopolies, destroy competition and militate against the public good.

As I have stated previously, it is indeed fortunate that the precedent has not been followed. Nevertheless, the legislation, most unsavory in character, remains. It is time to get rid of it.

I told the House previously that the color issue, the chief talking point today of the butter lobby, was not raised in 1886. The butter spokesmen embraced this line of reasoning after they discovered that taxing and labeling oleomargarine left it still very much alive. The 1901 discussion has a strangely modern sound and I would like to quote some pertinent passages. It shows that butter's claim that it has an exclusive right to use yellow is as full of holes as the most perforated piece of cheese.

The case for butter was made by that champion of the dairy industry, Representative Grout. He said:

The trouble all comes from giving it—

Margarine—

a color not its own, but the color of butter—always yellow. The oleomargarine men complain because butter is sometimes colored but the coloring of butter only intensifies a little its natural color—the color that belongs to it, the color by which the world knows it, the color that this false product seeks in order that it may palm itself off for butter. * * *

We know that to meet a varying taste coloring matter is introduced into butter. I, myself, think it a foolish practice. I think that the taste of anyone which requires artificial coloring matter in butter is an abnormal and perverted taste.

Representative WADSWORTH replied to Representative Grout in words which I cannot hope to improve. Anyone who really believes that butter has some sort of sacred claim to yellow will read his

words closely. They are as true today as they were almost half a century ago. This is what Mr. WADSWORTH said:

It is claimed by the extreme butter men that yellow is the natural butter color and that practically no other food product has the right to use it. If that claim is true, what shade of yellow is it entitled to? * * * It is only in the months of May and June, and I speak as a practical butter maker myself when I make the assertion, that creamery butter, and that, of course, is the butter of commerce, has a decided yellow color or tint and that color disappears entirely or almost so when the fall and winter sets in. * * * Here are samples of butter purchased by me this morning and no two are alike. As a matter of fact, every sample is artificially colored. * * *

I deny that butter has the copyright, patent right, or any other right to any particular color, whether yellow or otherwise. * * * If coloring oleomargarine a shade of yellow helps to perpetrate a fraud, then the coloring of butter is actually a fraud because it makes the consumer believe, and necessarily, that fall or winter or white butter of any season of the year is June butter, which is generally considered the best.

Representative Williams, of Mississippi, who became nationally known for his wit and ability when in the Senate later, summed it up trenchantly:

Now what is butter color? Why, it runs all the way from a pure white in the hill country of Mississippi and the piney districts of the United States—almost as white as this piece of paper I hold in my hand—to as red a color as that which used to be the glory of the Goshen butter manufactured in Pennsylvania, the butter which had the widest reputation and the largest sale of any in the country and which everybody who was able to secure, desired for his table. * * *

If they are going to tax uncolored oleomargarine why do they not tax uncolored butter and if they are going to tax colored margarine out of existence, why do they not also tax colored butter out of existence and let everything stand on its own basis of color without artificial incentive to the buyer and without any sort of attempt at deceit?

Despite the convincing arguments of those who held that no food product holds an exclusive right to any particular color, the dairy lobby again prevailed. Butter, by action of Congress, was in effect, granted a preemptive right to yellow as against margarine.

Once again it seemed that butter had dealt margarine a fatal blow.

In 1901, per capita consumption of margarine had been 1.6 pounds, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. In 1902, it fell to nine-tenths. The following 3 years it was constant at six-tenths—or slightly more than half a pound a person.

But this decrease in margarine consumption was not accompanied by a corresponding rise in butter consumption. The low-income groups decreased their purchases of margarine but they did not increase butter purchases, probably because they could not afford to.

In 1902, butter consumption was 17.5 pounds per person as compared with 19.9 pounds per person in 1901, a decline of more than 2 pounds per capita. During the next 3 years, when margarine was being consumed at a little more than one-third of its 1901 rate, butter consumption still showed no compensating increase. As a matter of fact—and I hope those gentlemen who have been influenced by the contention that it is necessary to keep these laws against margarine in order to protect the dairy industry from ruin will follow me closely—not once, not in one single year, since the drastic antimargarine legislation of 1901 was passed has per capita butter consumption reached the peak it achieved in 1900—the year before the legislation was passed. In that year the American public consumed 20.1 pounds of butter per person. It has never been that high since.

Today, nearly a half a century after the passage of this most drastic of the antimargarine laws, butter consumption is estimated at less than 12 pounds per person per year.

As time went on, two processes were developed for manufacturing a naturally colored margarine which, inasmuch as it was free from artificial coloration, could be sold at the one-fourth-cent tax rate per pound. In 1929 the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, charged with enforcement of the antimargarine legislation, ruled that palm oil and soybean oil could be introduced into margarine without paying the almost prohibitive 10-cents-a-pound tax. These naturally colored oils gave the margarine a yellowish tint.

And then the butter interests moved in again.

They had, they thought, established an effective monopoly on yellow as the color of their table spread. They know that housewives prefer their table spread yellow, just as they prefer oranges yellow. Color tastes, so far as foods are concerned, are matters of conditioning and habits. We want certain foods colored certain ways and, knowing this, food manufacturers use artificial color, if that is necessary, to give the customer what he wants. But butter is the only food which seeks, by law, to prevent a competitor from using a color.

In 1931 butter again attempted to drive margarine from the competitive market, by seeing to it that margarine could not be colored, naturally or otherwise, without payment of a penalty.

A bill was passed amending the 1901 act, which had placed a tax of 10 cents a pound on artificially colored oleomargarine. It provided that, thereafter, all margarine should be held to be yellow in color when it was a tint or shade containing more than 1.6° of yellow, or yellow and red collectively, and subject to the 10-cent tax. By this amendment colored margarine produced from oils naturally yellow, as well as artificially colored margarine, was brought within the more drastic taxing and licensing provisions of the Federal margarine law.

Henceforth, domestic cottonseed and soybean oil—both of which contain some yellow color in their natural state—would have to be bleached before being used in the making of margarine.

Butter was now, it seemed, to own yellow as a table spread color—or at least 98.4 percent of it.

Now, in 1886, as we have seen, the butter interests established special privileges for butter as against margarine by claiming that they were thereby protecting the public from fraud and from an unhealthy food product. In 1901, their charges of impurity against margarine having been dissipated, they advanced once more behind a smokescreen, crying "fraud."

In 1931, their original purpose—to drastically curb or eliminate butter's competition—as strong as ever, they shifted ground once more. Margarine was being made with foreign oil, they said, to the detriment of American farmers. The fight was described as a battle between United States dairy farmers and "the coconut cow" referring to oil made from coconuts.

It was true that large quantities of palm oil and coconut oil were at that time being imported into the country and used in making margarine. But it is also true that considerable quantities of oleo and cottonseed oil were also going into the manufacture of margarine.

In 1931 the butter industry came out into the open. Their spokesmen said frankly that their first purpose was to protect the butter industry.

Senator Townsend, of Delaware, summarized the whole history of antimargarine legislation when he said:

The record of the proceedings of Congress during the debates of this act will convince any reader that the intent of the enactment was to protect the dairy interests.

Then he went on to mention Alexander Legge, Chairman of the Federal Farm Board, who, in testimony before the Agricultural Committee, said, "was especially insistent that palm oil be embargoed on the ground that it displaces American dairy products."

However—

Senator Townsend continued, with what, I am happy to say now, was considerable foresight—

it is my opinion that an embargo or a tariff will not relieve the situation permanently, for science will discover something that will take the place of palm oil unless the law is strengthened with respect to color in oleomargarine.

Science, as you know, did just that, even though "the law was strengthened." Margarine was further improved and fortified with vitamin A until today it is the nutritional equal in every way of butter.

It is hard to put a halter around ingenuity and enterprise as the butter interests have found out. In our economy it is hard to stifle competition. But the butter lobby tried again, and again, and again.

With a frankness matching that of the Senate sponsor, Representative Brigham, of Vermont, said:

The unrestrained sale of oleomargarine, costing as it does less than one-fourth the cost of dairy butter, will drive dairy farmers out of business.

There was, as has so often been the case, nothing in the record to support this oft-reiterated assertion. Restrictive legislation against margarine, as we have seen, had not helped the dairy industry. It had merely hurt the margarine industry and the people, mostly in the low-income groups, who use margarine.

Today antimargarine legislation is simply one more factor in adding to the high cost of living and in promoting inflation.

What happened after the passage of the 1931 act? Margarine consumption dropped again. Agriculture Department figures show that the per capita consumption of margarine declined from 2.6 in 1930 to 1.9 in 1931 and 1.6 the following year. Butter consumption fluctuated within narrow limits. It rose from 17.2 in 1930 to 18.0 in 1931 and 18.1 the following year. Then it dropped to 17.8, rallied briefly to 18.2, and the following year, 1935, it was 17.1—one-tenth of a pound lower than it had been in 1930, the year before the last Federal antimargarine law was passed.

After 1935 per capita butter consumption dropped to 16.4, where it remained until 1940, when it rallied briefly, but then it fell steadily again. In 1946 it was around 10½ pounds per person. Last year butter consumption is estimated to have been approximately 11½ pounds per capita. Compare this figure with the high of 20.1 pounds of butter consumed per person in 1900 and the all-time high of 22.2 pounds in 1896, and ask yourselves again if protection—however drastic—has really benefited the butter industry.

I see no indication that the production of butter will rise at any time in the near future. More and more, dairy farmers are realizing that the most profitable sale of their product is as fluid milk. A sale as butter is the least profitable, a point which I hope to develop at greater length later on.

Butter is not the only industry which has tried to use the law to kill off its competition. There are similar instances on record. The English wool industry secured legislation against calico years ago. I want to digress here a moment to tell you what happened in this instance, for the case has many aspects similar to the butter-margarine controversy.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries especially, wool was the great English industry—more important even in that country's economy than the dairy industry has ever been in the United States. Thousands of sheep, grazing on the green English countryside, produced the finest wool in the world and this was spun and woven into cloth of the highest quality by the cottage weavers. And then the Government, jealous of the superior quality of English wool, moved to protect it from any possible competition by forbidding the export of raw wool. It was feared apparently that foreign hands might prove as skillful in the weaving of the cloth as English hands, and that the finished product would then compete with English woolens. To increase wool's use, a law was passed that funeral shrouds must be wool.

Thus, for more than 120 years—

Leggett tells us in his Story of Wool—

it was illegal to bury a person in any other shroud or covering than pure English wool.

Not everybody liked this kind of legislation. As was said at the time: "This law forces our dead to consume what the living were inadequate to purchase."

Late in the seventeenth century calico prints began to appear in the English market. They were not hand-woven in a thousand scattered cottages as was English wool. They were machine-made—by primitive machines, it is true, but nevertheless the products of imagination and enterprise. The cloth was poor in comparison with wool. At first only the very, very poor bought calico.

But where the wool growers were complacent, the calico makers were enterprising. The quality of the cloth improved. More people bought the cheap cotton substitute for wool. And then calico began to be manufactured in England.

The Government moved to protect its greatest industry. It placed a tariff upon imported calico and a heavy tax on its domestic manufacture. It was a discriminatory tax—like the tax on margarine—favoring one domestic industry at the expense of another. This kind of internal tariff is a rare thing in Anglo-Saxon history, almost unprecedented. Its two most painful examples, and saddest failures, are the tax on calico to favor wool and the tax on margarine to favor butter.

What happened in the latter instance also happened in the first. Wool, like butter, won little or no advantage; the calico and printed-goods industry, like the margarine industry, was hurt, but it did not die. And then, in 1700, Parliament acted again in behalf of its "petted and pampered trade," as a contemporary critic referred to the wool industry. It prohibited the selling of cotton goods in England and 12 years later, it forbade the weaving of cotton goods and placed a fine of $25 on the weavers and $100 on the venders.

But enterprise is hard to kill, and, try as they would, the wool industry could not kill calico.

The woolen manufacturers went so far as to hire Daniel Defoe, the great novelist, as a public-relations man. Defoe's assignment, for which he was well paid, Leggett says, was "to prepare a pamphlet making sport of chintz and calico."

Defoe assumed the task with all the ardor of a dairy spokesman attacking margarine.

Chintzes—

He said—

were advanced from being upon the floor to the backs, from footcloths to petticoats. * * * We see persons of quality dressed in India carpets which, but a few years before, their chambermaids would have thought too ordinary for them.

Another law, passed by Parliament in 1720, was a measure of the failure of the earlier restrictive legislation in behalf of wool against calico. It was the most drastic of all and prohibited the purchase and use of "printed, painted calicoes, the wearing of which manifestly tends to the great detriment of the woolen manufacturers of the Kingdom."

It would appear that this should have been enough, once and for all, to kill the competition of cotton with wool, and hence, as its proponents thought, to save the wool industry.

But, as Leggett points out, the wool industry "while sheltered from the economic stress of foreign competition, was to a large extent stagnant at home. For many decades no new fabrics or designs were developed. As late as the eighteenth century woolen yarn was still being spun and woven by hand in the homes of weavers."

Wool, like the butter industry, was too complacent, too content to rest on the mythical protection of restrictive laws against its competitor. It was old fashioned. It had been slow to develop new processes and new techniques. It suffered accordingly.

But neither the wool industry nor the manufacture of cotton cloth perished in England. There was a place for both; a market for both. Eventually the costly wasteful, prowool, anticalico laws were repealed and that place and that market were found, both for wool and for cotton.

The woolen manufacturers, faced with vital competition, replaced the cottage industry with factories and developed new machines. And cotton, at long last, won the same right to be worn by the living—and even the dead in shrouds—as wool enjoyed.

I sincerely hope that this Congress will write the same ending to the discriminatory antimargarine laws as the English Parliament long ago wrote to the anticalico laws.

I have already stated that dairy farmers are more and more coming to realize that the most profitable sale of their product is fluid milk and that the least profitable is butter.

This realization upon the part of the farmer is shown by the decline in butter production and a corresponding increase in milk production during the past 10 years. Butter production dropped from a prewar—1937–41—annual average of 2,200,000,000 pounds to 1,500,000,000 pounds in 1946. During the same period, milk production increased from a prewar—1937–41—average of about 108,000,000,000 pounds to about 120,000,000,000 pounds in 1946.

Despite the increase in the production of whole milk, the United States Department of Agriculture reports that there is still not nearly enough milk to supply the people of this country at the high level of consumption of 1941, a level which nutritionists say is highly desirable. To achieve this health goal, 657 pounds of milk or its equivalent per capita is required, compared to the estimated 1947 supply of 430 pounds, of which 403 pounds is fluid milk or cream. To fill the gap of 227 pounds per capita approximately 5,800,000 additional dairy cows would be needed at the 1946 high rate of production per cow.

What caused the dairy farmer to divert more and more of his product from butter production to whole milk?

It was the simple fact that he got more money for one than for the other.

The average price paid for milk sold as fluid milk or cream during the 10-year period, 1936–46, was about 74 cents per pound; for butterfat, about 37 cents per pound. The prices paid for milk

for use in ice cream, cheese, and other products fell between these two levels.

In other words it was twice as profitable during this period for the dairy farmer to sell his milk for whole milk use as it was for him to divert it to butter manufacture.

As a result butter today is a minor factor in farm cash income and in the income of dairymen themselves. Farm cash income amounted to $24,519,000,000 in 1946. Butter and butterfat contributed about 2 percent of this amount.

Farm cash income from all dairy products in 1946 amounted to $3,716,000,000. Of this total, butterfat and farm churned butter accounted for $549,000,000, or 14.7 percent. It is interesting to compare this last figure with the percent of their milk which dairy farmers diverted to butterfat use, which I cited earlier. This comparison shows that, although dairy farmers in 1946 disposed of 23.35 percent of their milk for butterfat, their income from that amount was only 14.17 percent of their total income from milk.

An examination of the use of dairy products as milk or butterfat throughout the country reveals that in certain sections butter is such a minor factor in the dairy industry as to make the claim of the butter lobby that the industry's continued prosperity depends upon the suppression of margarine an absurdity.

In 1946, for example, the northeastern region, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and the New England States—produced over 18,000,000,000 pounds of milk. Of this amount, only 3.61 percent was disposed of as butterfat.

All indications are that butter will become increasingly less important in the over-all dairy picture. I have read recently a very significant speech by W. A. Wentworth, vice president of the Borden Co., at a meeting of the Minnesota Ice Cream Manufacturers Association in St. Paul. Mr. Wentworth dealt in figures, not emotion and prejudice, and these figures clearly indicate to me that butter is likely to become less and less important to dairymen.

Mr. Wentworth pointed out that in the prewar years, 1935 to 1939, an average of 58,515,000,000 pounds of milk was used in the production of fluid milk and cream, cheese, ice cream, evaporated milk, condensed milk, and whole milk powder. In 1947 approximately 84,640,000,000 pounds of milk were used in the production of fluid milk and cream, cheese, and the other whole-milk products mentioned. To state it another way, 56 percent went into the whole-milk products before the war; 70 percent of the milk produced is being used for the listed products now.

On the other hand, Nation-wide butter production in 1947 will approximate 1,700,000,000 pounds, which is 22 percent less than the average annual production of 1935–39. If the population increase is taken into account, the per capita consumption of butter is 31 percent less than that of 1935–39; or in other words, only about two-thirds as much butter per capita was available in 1947 as in the prewar period mentioned.

Mr. Wentworth points out that if sufficient butter were produced to make prewar per capita consumption possible, that 13,500,000,000 pounds more milk would have gone into butter in 1947. This is nearly one-fourth of the expected sales of fluid milk and cream. He points out that if the 13,500,000,000 pounds were diverted into butter that the total volume of milk for fluid milk and cream sales would have to be reduced to the volume consumed annually in 1935–39. On a per capita basis, consumption would be substantially lower now than in the prewar years.

From a nutritional standpoint and from the standpoint of the dairyman, this shift from fluid milk and cream sales into butter production is undesirable.

What the trend away from butter production and increase in the consumption of fluid milk and whole milk products means is strikingly emphasized in Minnesota. Ten years ago, approximately 77 percent of Minnesota's milk production went into the manufacture of creamery butter. But in 1946 only 42 percent of the milk produced in Minnesota was used in the manufacture of creamery butter.

The proportionately large production of butter in prewar years indicated in reality a waste of milk—a huge quantity of skim milk being fed to animals—to the loss both of the consumer and the dairyman.

There still is entirely too much thinking in the terms of scarcity economics in some dairy industry circles. Some people still regard buttter production as a possible refuge for the industry, if income declines and people are forced to curtail milk consumption. On the other hand, the increasing awareness of the value of milk from a nutritional and health standpoint would tend to keep milk consumption comparatively high even if there should be a business recession.

The real interest of the dairy industry lies in expanding its market for fluid milk and in selling its extremely valuable products in ever increasing quantities at reasonable prices. This is in the best interests of the industry and of the Nation as a whole. It is evident, therefore, that dairymen no longer are dependent upon butter and that butter will be less and less important to the industry.

There will continue to be, of course, a market for butter. It is preferred by many people and always will continue to be regardless of the fact that margarine is as good nutritionally and will sell for a cheaper price. But the dairy industry as a whole will not be hurt if margarine greatly expands its present market. In fact, it will be helped if it pursues a statesmanlike course and also expands its markets in its most profitable field, that of whole fluid milk and whole milk products.

It is interesting to observe that, for the most part, the greatest butter production is in those areas where the soybean industry represents an increasingly important part of the farmer's income: Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Kansas—to mention a few.

Are the gentlemen who represent the people of these States going to say to the soybean farmers, who produce almost 45 percent of the oil used in margarine, "This food, into which so much of your product goes and upon which your livelihood so largely depends, is not worthy to compete in a free American market with butter. We are going to continue to restrict it and curb it and hamper it."

For more than a half a century that is what has been said by this Congress to the cotton farmers of the South whose cottonseed oil was used in margarine.

The cotton farmers protested in vain. Their protests were drowned out by the clamor of the butter interests demanding protection and special privilege for their product. The butter interests were well organized and they threatened vengeance on any Congressman who wanted to do the fair and right thing.

And so butter, like wool in England, remained a "petted and pampered" industry. But the butter industry was not the gainer. There was no gainer. There were only losers—the low-income consumers, the workingmen, the cotton, soybean and livestock farmers and the country as a whole.

What this vicious discrimination against margarine means to the poor farmer of the South has been well stated by Oscar Johnston, president of the National Cotton Council, in testimony before a Senate Agriculture Subcommittee in June 1944. He pointed out that it was the poorest farmers, the sharecroppers and the tenants, upon whom these antimargarine laws laid the heaviest burden. The mortage against the tenant's crop, drawn to assure payment of funds advanced him to make the crop, ordinarily did not cover cottonseed.

The seed, he testified, frequently provided the source of income on which the farmer lives.

The discrimination against margarine has curtailed the use of cottonseed, has decreased their value and thereby has taken millions of dollars out of the pockets of the neediest farmers in America.

The butter industry would have you believe that the fight over margarine is still largely a fight between the cotton producing South and the dairy industry, The consumer of course has been ignored because he was unorganized.

But, as I have indicated, this is no longer a struggle between the cotton South and the butter interests, even if we do not take the consumer into account.

The soybean farmers, many of them living in the Middle West, are in this fight, too, standing side by side with the cotton farmers, demanding that these unfair antimargarine laws be wiped out.

Ersel Walley, president of the American Soybean Association, recently made this statement:

> Modern margarine is a clean, nutritious, widely accepted product of American farms. It is the only food product on the American market upon which specific discriminatory taxation has been levied. This discrimination should be removed as quickly as possible.

In the 10-year period between 1936 and 1946, soybean production in the United States rose from 33,000,000 bushels to 196,000,000 bushels. In 1936, the value of soybeans harvested for beans was estimated at $520,000,000. In 1946 the value was even higher.

In Iowa, a leading dairy State, cash receipts for soybeans produced in 1946 were two-thirds of all dairy products. The

Iowa crop of harvested soybeans sold for $82,182,000; all Iowa dairy products, for $123,752,000.

The value of soybeans produced in Illinois in 1946 amounted to $183,243,000; dairy products to $146,022,000. In Illinois the value of the soybean crop is $37,000,000 greater than the value of dairy products.

The Indiana soybean crop was worth $56,897,000; the Missouri crop—$34,290,000; and the Minnesota crop—$22,172,000.

I do not think all the Members of this House are fully aware of the tremendous importance of the soybean industry to this country, of its amazing development and growth, and of its value to the farmers of their own and other districts. I have assembled some of this information and will be glad to give it to any Member who is interested in it.

There are districts I could cite in the so-called heart of the butter country where soybeans are a more important source of income to the farmer than butter. And without a profitable market for the oil which comes from the soybean, the farmer cannot economically produce that crop. I shall only add that in 1946, soybeans contributed $600,000,000 to the farm income of the Middle West alone.

Soybeans are very important in the whole food picture. For example, soybeans are an important source of protein feed—essential for the production of meat, dairy products, and eggs.

Soybean oil meal, as Mr. Walley points out, today leaves the processing plants at approximately the same price per pound as is paid for wheat or corn by live stock feeders.

Yet—and it is important that the Members of this House understand this fact—one pound of soybean oil meal will replace from 3 to 4 pounds of corn in the livestock ration, and will, therefore, help alleviate the critical grain shortage.

The expanded use of soybean oil meal by livestock feeders thus offers a way to meet the needs of the hungry peoples of Europe and of our own people, and, at the same time, benefit the American farmer.

But—and I want to stress this point—in order to get the soybean meal to the chickens and the cattle economically there must be a profitable market for the oil which is crushed out of the bean before it becomes meal.

The ability of the soybean industry to produce protein meal on an efficient basis—

Mr. Walley says—

is contingent upon profitable usage of soybean oil. This means that soybean oil, unhampered by outmoded restrictions, must go into food products in increasing quantities over a period of years.

I said earlier that the interests of the consumers had been largely ignored on this question in the past because consumers were unorganized. But I am sure no Member of Congress believes today that, with butter selling around a dollar a pound, that consumers are indifferent to the situation created by these discriminatory laws. If anyone doubts what I say, make your own poll of housewives. You will find that they are overwhelmingly in favor of legislation which will enable them to buy margarine already colored.

These taxes and license fees on margarine are direct levies upon the consumer's pocketbook. They add to the high cost of living at a time when one of the country's chief concerns is inflationary prices.

Since 1939 the over-all cost of living has increased 60 percent. In 1939, according to the Department of Agriculture, the weekly food bill for an average household amounted to slightly more than $6. In October 1947 it was more than $12. Today it is even higher.

It is little wonder that housewives, anxiously trying to stretch their food budgets are demanding margarine at the grocery stores of the country. And yet, due to these Federal—and State—antimargarine laws, more than half the grocery stores in the United Statse do not sell margarine, either colored or uncolored.

These are mostly the small independent stores, operating on little capital, afraid or unable to pay the fees and meet the other restrictive requirements of the law. And these are, generally the stores patronized by the lower-income groups whose need for an economical supply of vitamin-giving fat foods is greatest.

Margarine or butter is essential in the individual diet. The same Federal Government that tries to strangle margarine with taxes and fees lists it as one of the seven basic foods. And yet combined margarine and butter consumption for 1947 is estimated at only 16 pounds per person, considerably below previous nutritional levels.

Only one retail grocer in a hundred sells colored margarine; this is due, it is true, to State as well as Federal laws. But even in those States where only Federal fees and taxes operate to restrict the sale of colored margarine less than 1 store in 20 sells it.

The housewife wants to serve margarine yellow. This is a matter of food tastes and food habits. Butter meets the consumer preference by using artificial coloring without penalty. The housewife has to mix the coloring and margarine herself.

This is a time-consuming and wasteful process. From 2 to 2½ percent of the margarine is lost in the process of mixing, thus about sixteen to eighteen million pounds were wasted in 1947. It is also a totally unnecessary process. There is no reason, except these discriminatory laws, why all margarine should not be colored in the factory and sold to the consumers as they want it.

Yes, the antimargarine laws have their place in the total inflationary picture.

And right here, I want to repeat my hope that the leaders of the Republican Party will not, as they have generally done in the past, make a party issue out of this struggle to repeal the antimargarine laws. In the past, efforts to get legislation to repeal the antimargarine laws have met the united opposition of the Republicans. This state of affairs could not happen if the Republican leaders had been sympathetic to repeal. This effort to give long overdue justice to the farmers who produce domestic oils, and to the makers of margarine, and to the consumers, should be bipartisan. I do not see how either the Republican or Democratic leadership can afford to identify themselves as standing against the repeal of vicious, inflationary, un-American class legislation.

Unfortunately, some of the measures taken by the Republican leadership of this Congress have, in my opinion, contributed materially to the rising cost of living. This is not the place or time for a bill of particulars on this subject. I repeat that in this instance where the issues are startlingly clear once they are examined squarely, I hope that right-thinking men in both parties will join together. The Eighteth Congress will bring credit upon itself and do the entire country a service if it tears out these antimargarine laws by the roots and flings them where they belong—upon the scrap heap of oblivion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ARMS FOR PALESTINE JEWS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the United Nations decided on partition it was patent to all that the Moslem Arabs would not acquiesce. In fact the Moslem delegates from Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Iran, Afghanistan, stormed out of the Assembly Chamber at Flushing Meadows in high dudgeon when the President, Aranha, announced the vote for partition, 33 to 13.

These delegates had vowed vengeance. They threatened dire violence. They have now exhorted their nationals and lashed them into a fury of malice, plunder, rapine, and assassination against the Jews. They are sending arms and armed men into Palestine to sabotage the decision of the United Nations and make partition impossible. They are even holding innocent Jews in Egypt, Iraq, Yemen, and Syria as hostages and visiting upon them and their loved ones cruelties to their persons and confiscation of their properties.

Certainly the Jews in Palestine have the right to protection from the United Nations. Great Britain refuses adequate policing. The communal strife grows bloodier and more murderous each day. Great Britain deliberately refuses to curb the cutthroat bandits of the Grand Mufti and denies the Jews the right of self-protection. Britain plays the dog in the manger. She refuses to recognize Haganah as lawfully constituted.

Witness the shameful conduct of Britain concerning besieged Jerusalem. A horrible situation has been created in the very center of the Holy Land. The old city of Jerusalem, containing the shrines of the three great religions is under an Arab blockade. Arab bombs, grenades, knives, guns desecrate the Holy City. Under the eyes of the British and apparently with her consent several hundred Arabs under the Grand Mufti have blockaded the gates of Jerusalem and have isolated 1,800 Jewish inhabitants living near the wailing wall. The

purpose is to starve and finally massacre them.

The British are taking no steps to avert a catastrophe. Even the Palestine police are not permitted to pass Arab road blocks, although the British military could dissipate these Arab desperadoes in short order.

That is a typical example of how the British are maintaining law and order.

What must the Jews do outside this beleaguered area? Their patience is exhausted. They must try to break through the blockade to feed their brethren and finally rescue them. That means more violence.

How will Mr. Bevin excuse this British perfidy?

Britain even refuses to allow the members of the UN Palestine Commission to enter Palestine, although the Holy City is set aside in the partition plan as a separate unit.

How will Mr. Bevin explain away his flouting of the UN decision by allowing such reign of terror in the City of Peace?

The Jews are willing to bear the brunt of the fighting, but Great Britain disarms them and renders them impotent to defend themselves. Jews ask for Haganah the right of elemental self-defense. But Britain cruelly refuses that right—thwarts this right—so that Haganah men fighting to save their lives and that of the Jewish inhabitants, fighting to save the decision of the United Nations, must hide their arms, must disappear or be shot down by British troops as malefactors. Think of it. Shot down in cold blood in performing the duty that should be Britain's. Can the United States which voted partition, voted for the Jewish state, remain complaisant and unmoved by such turn of events? I hope not.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. Does the gentleman mean then that he wants American boys to be sent over there?

Mr. CELLER. I did not say that. If the gentleman will be patient, I shall be very glad to give him my views on that matter.

A mass of documented proofs attest to the unwarranted killing, disarming, and arrest of Haganah members by British forces. A few apologies may be forthcoming, but the tragicomedy goes on.

The main highways, which must be traversed by the Jews for sustenance and life for cities like Tel Aviv, are infested with Arab bandits. The Jewish Agency demanded and demands that the British patrol these roads, or allow the Haganah to do it. The British refuse to risk their men to patrol and refuse the requests of the Haganah. The roads, particularly those leaving the winding, hilly country near Jerusalem, which are constantly used by the Jews, are traps for murderers and snipers. The British police search all passengers and compel them to traverse unpatrolled highways unarmed. This is legalized murder. And the British are guilty of complicity in the murder.

Withal the Haganah has been ordered to show uttermost restraint. This they do save under the sternest provocation. They know that the Mufti's agents want the rioting to proceed. Widespread outbursts are grist to the Mufti's mill.

The Jews can take care of their own, if left unmolested and if the Grand Mufti is denied outside arms and men. They have the leadership, courage, will, and know-how, but arms and equipment are desperately needed.

This anomalous situation must cease. The British version is that on May 15, when they quit Palestine, the Jewish militia can be recognized but not until then. Until then Jews must be disarmed. Arms must be confiscated and those armed must be imprisoned. By May 15, under such intolerable conditions the Grand Mufti and the Arab League will have completed their dirty work. Jews by the thousands will have been destroyed. Palestine might be Juden run. I suppose Mr. Bevin presumes that on May 16, the day after British evacuation, arms in plenty will by some miracle descend upon the Jews, if there are any remaining, like manna from Heaven.

Well the game will not be played according to Mr. Bevin's plans. Jews will get arms by hook or crook. They must have arms to defend their hearth and home and their land. Otherwise the world would look upon them as spineless jellyfish. They will fight and die with Maccabean courage.

Meanwhile Bevin allows former British Indian Army officers to leave London for Palestine to fight the Jews. The New York Times of January 12 reports that some 4,000 British Army veterans have embarked as volunteers to fight under the aegis of the Arab League. Apparently Herr Bevin is now finicky about neutrality. He would undermine the decision of the United Nations. He would break the back of Jewish resistance by strengthening the Arabs led by the Grand Mufti, who stabbed Britain in the back in Iraq when she was in most desperate straits.

How Machiavellian a role Herr Bevin can play is seen in the reports (New York Times, January 12) that Britain was and is supplying arms to Egypt, Iraq, and Trans-Jordan. The Jewish Agency claims that the value of equipment shipped by Britain amounts to over $25,000,000. In fact only last week Britain concluded a military pact with Iraq. It will be formally signed tomorrow at Portsmouth. It provides for a plentiful supply of arms, heavy and light equipment, and planes. Only a child would deny that arms sent to Egypt, Iraq, and Trans-Jordan find their way into Palestine.

I have information from an accredited source that in the past few days Britain sent to Iraq 150 armed vehicles, 75 planes, 2,000 nonmilitary vehicles—easily convertible to military uses. These planes and cars are destined for use in Palestine to subvert the UN decision of a separate Jewish state.

Also the United States is reported to have sold to Iraq 150 Willys-Knight jeeps from surplus stocks, presumably for civilian purposes. But United States jeeps are admirable for war against the Jews.

I read from the New York Times of January 12 "Since the United Nations recommendations that Palestine be partitioned into Jewish and Arab states reports have come from Arab League countries of the recruiting, arming, and training of volunteer armies to resist the proposal. An incursion into the Holy Land by a force from Syria took place last Friday."

These armies are equipped with British guns, grenades, planes, and tanks.

Your hands are dripping with Jewish blood, Herr Bevin. There is too much fat around your belly and as well around your heart for you to be either just or compassionate.

Our State Department has placed an embargo on arms against Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, and Palestine. You will note Yemen is not included, nor is Pakistan included, nor is India included. These Moslem countries can buy unlimited arms made in the United States, shipped from the United States and sent to Yemen and Pakistan and India. And then they can be routed to Palestine Arabs.

The embargo does not include lend-lease jeeps and trucks, which are already in many of those countries of the Middle East, and which can be readily turned over to military uses. It does not include clothing and shoes which can be used for uniforms. Millions of dollars of articles went into Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen under lend-lease. They have very likely by this time found their way into Palestine to be used against the Jews.

Secretary General Trygve Lie in his address at the first session of the UN Palestine Commission recalled that the General Assembly had called on member nations not to interfere with or in any way impede the partition decision. By sending 4,000 British veterans, plus officers, to the Arabs in Palestine Herr Bevin thumbs his nose at the Secretary General. He says, in effect, to hell with the decision of the General Assembly.

Let us examine our own efforts at neutrality. Let us see how lopsided it really is, and how it aids the Arabs and hurts the Jews. The Arab states, being sovereign, can procure, and do get, arms and matériel from many countries. The Jewish Agency, not yet a sovereign state, has no such right. It is limited to the arms it manufactures and arms it smuggles into Palestine. But our embargo applies not to Turkey or Iran or Yemen. It does not apply to another Moslem country, Pakistan. Pakistan, Yemen, Iran, and Turkey all voted against partition. There is nothing to stop all four of these Moslem countries from shipping to Arabs in Palestine American arms and planes and jeeps and tanks.

There is no embargo whatsoever imposed by Great Britain. For our State Department to impose any embargo without similar action from London leaves open plenty of arms to the Arabs, but closes the door to the Jews.

Thus, the American neutrality embargo is working like the neutrality did in Spain. The embargo imposed by the western powers left the republican

forces impotent while Franco got all the arms he wanted from Hitler and Mussolini.

Now our State Department by the embargo shuts off much needed supplies to the Jews, while the Arabs, with the aid of Britain and American arms indirectly supplied through Turkey, Iran, Yemen, or Pakistan, can mow down the Jews, render the UN decision a nullity, and make of the Holy Land a Sodom and Gomorrah.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Our neutrality is actually inconsistent with our action in the United Nations. Neutrality in this instance is no neutrality at all. It is favoritism to one side—the Arab side.

By our so-called neutrality we play Bevin's game. He wants partition to fail and thereafter have United Nations ask Britain to remain in Palestine.

By our neutrality we play the Grand Mufti's game—the game, extermination and massacre of the Jews.

I read a very significant report that comes out of Egypt. It is in the form of a cablegram sent from Egypt:

Roz El Yusef—

An important Egyptian newspaper—

reports that Arab League secretariat has just now received a large quantity of arms and ammunition sent by the Indian and Afghanistan Governments. The secretariat is now arranging for the safe transfer of this consignment to Palestine. The same paper reports that the Mufti asked the Egyptian Premier for permission to transfer to Palestine all arms and ammunition acquired by his agents and envoys in Egypt in the western desert and in Libya.

Here is another part of the cablegram:

Al Ahram—

Another Egyptian paper—

states that the Egyptian Government allotted a half million Egyptian pounds as the first installment in support of Palestine Arabs fighting against partition. This sum was allotted from a secret budget of the Premier and of the Foreign Ministry and is not part of the official budget. This was done in order to avoid the danger of a conflict with the Security Council or the General Assembly in the event that Egypt is accused of violation of the General Assembly resolution or of the United Nations CB Charter.

Al Mussawar—

A third Egyptian paper—

states that all Egyptian officers have been granted 6 months leave with full pay to go to Syria and to join Arab voluntary forces.

In pursuance of the fact that India supplied arms in the fashion indicated, I sent the following cable to the Premier of India yesterday:

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,
Premier, Government of India,
New Delhi, India:

It is reported in the Roz el Usef, a newspaper published in Cairo, Egypt, that the Arab League Secretariat has acquired a large quantity of arms and ammunition sent by the Indian and Afghanistan Governments and that the Secretariat is arranging for the safe transfer of this consignment to Palestine. If true, this action on the part of your Government is a violation of the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations on Palestine. Trygve Lie, secretary of the United Nations, has urged all nations to uphold the decision. I am sure that Trygve Lie and many friends of India in the United States will be shocked if you do not repudiate this reported violation of international comity. India has much to gain from a strong United Nations. Actions of this character wound the prestige of the United Nations to which India has, and is now in the act of so applying, applied for redress of wrongs.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Member of Congress,
United States of America.

Assuredly we have the right to expect the United Nations to have some definite obligations in this ordeal by fire in Palestine. These obligations must be respected and fulfilled. The UN must send a force into Palestine to defend its decisions; otherwise the house called UN becomes a mere shambles. UN prestige is at stake. Contingents of regular troops or volunteers contributed by several of the smaller nations, like Sweden, Belgium, Norway, Brazil, Colombia, South Africa, and Mexico, might be sent to the scene without delay. Small nations would consent. These forces could work with Haganah.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. Would not the Soviet Union have a right to send in troops if these other nations sent in troops?

Mr. CELLER. I purposely left out the Soviet Union in my remarks because I did not want to touch on that problem. It is a very difficult one. It is hoped that the United States and the Soviet Union, China, France, Great Britain, and the other members of the Security Council might work out some arrangement. I do know they are deliberating on this matter. I do not know the outcome of their negotiations. Meanwhile the situation is deteriorating, and it cannot wait until the Security Council members can get together on some sort of an agreement. The smaller nations have expressed a willingness to send volunteers into Palestine for the purposes I have outlined. So that I think the United Nations should avail itself of any offers made by the smaller nations and their willingness to send contingents into the Holy Land. If no offers have actually been made, then overtures to that end should be made to them.

Mr. GOFF. Is not the Soviet Union also offering to send troops in there?

Mr. CELLER. That I do not know, sir.

Mr. GOFF. Does the gentleman think there is any way we could prevent them from sending their troops in?

Mr. CELLER. I think this suggestion of mine is the best way. It would prevent troops from any of the big nations, from any of the members of the Security Council going into Palestine. I spoke of smaller nations.

These forces could work with Haganah. The Arab rebellion must be crushed. The task of doing it is that of the UN. Only a force representing the authority of the UN may convince the Arabs that violence and murder will not defeat partition.

The United Nations must first put the Jewish Agency through Haganah in a position adequately and successfully to meet Arab onslaughts. The United Nations must make it possible for Haganah to have heavy and light arms and planes and tanks and mortars. These can be supplied by the United States through the United Nations.

Second, United Nations, through the Security Council, must set up an international police force, totaling around 50,000 men, with 2,000 planes, supplemented by an international fleet, including carriers, cruisers, and battleships.

Then and then only will it be possible for the Jewish state to come into being without undue bloodshed. Then and only then will the United Nations justify its existence. Then and then only will the Arabs learn their lesson, namely, that they cannot with impunity trifle with a solemn decision of the United Nations, of which they are members and whose edicts they have sworn to obey—not offend.

Finally, the crucial period comes between May 15 and September 12, when the British get cut and the Arab and Jewish states come into being and are given full independence.

It is incumbent upon the Military Staff Committee of the Security Council to present their recommendations forthwith and for the Council to lose no time in coming to a decision.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert, with the consent of the Members of the House, the text of a statement issued by the Jewish Agency in connection with this momentous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. The text of the statement issued by the agency follows:

The Jewish people of Palestine are in desperate need of arms for their defense. The ex-Mufti of Jerusalem, who collaborated with Hitler in the destruction of 6,000,000 Jews in Europe, has now called the Arab world to arms to carry on his work of massacre and extermination. Through his connections with the Arab League and the Arab states, the Mufti has the facilities to acquire arms and munitions for aggression and invasion.

The Jewish Agency for Palestine has the responsibilities of a state about to be born. It must protect the lives and homes of the 700,000 men, women, and children of Palestine. The United Nation's decision made no provision for an international force, but did provide for a Jewish militia to defend the Jewish state and to maintain public security.

It therefore devolves upon the responsible defense forces of the Jewish community of Palestine to rush preparations in a race against time in view of the threatened Arab aggression in defiance of the United Nations decision and the announced early withdrawal of British troops.

Accordingly steps were taken to arrange for the legitimate purchase of war surplus matériel and equipment. To facilitate these purchases the Jewish agency made dollar credits available. The materials found near Asbury Park on Thursday were to the best of

our knowledge, legally procured to await legitimate shipment.

It has, throughout, been our understanding that all such transportation was in full conformity with American law. We are proud to give our aid to the embattled Jews of Palestine. We trust that material urgent for their defense may soon be shipped to them legally, and with God's help reach them in time to meet their grave emergency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which would make dutiable platinum foxes and furs and all mutations or types developed from black, silver, or platinum foxes.

During recent years the demand for lighter and lighter colored furs has made the so-called platinum fox furs extremely valuable. The first platinum fox was a "mutation" developed accidentally from the mating of two silver or black foxes. Importers have been bringing into the United States increasing amounts of platinum fox furs claiming that they were free of duty as furs and fur skins not specially provided for, rather than as silver or black fox furs which are dutiable at 37½ percent. The court upheld the claim of the importers but the Government appealed the case, saying that if the ancestors of platinum foxes were silver or black foxes, then they too should be so classified for duty purposes.

It is not my intention to try to interpret the desires of any earlier Congress and I am perfectly willing to let the appellate court which now has the case decide it on its merits. My primary concern is the present and future rights of our fur producers, and I consider their protection a matter of right developed from 150 years of the American way of living. Everyone knows that no American fur grower can produce furs as cheaply as the producers in Russia or any other country now shipping them to us in huge quantities, even if he were willing to lower his standard of living so that it was comparable.

Russia has shipped furs to this country without regard for costs of production and without regard for the effects on the domestic market. More than two-thirds of all the imports from Russia in 1946 consisted of furs. As a result of this and of imports from other countries our home industry is in dire straits and this bill may have the effect of an opening announcement that Members of this Congress will not let our so-called need for imports completely upset their judgment. If our tariffs are too high—then they may be lowered, but if they are too low, then by the same token let them be raised. We cannot save the world by destroying our own industries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MEADE (at the request of Mr. MORTON), until January 19, 1948, on account of urgent business in his district.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative business of the day and following any other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Ben W. Colburn;

H. R. 769. An act for the relief of the estate of Ruth Horton Hunter;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased;

H. R. 1175. An act for the relief of the estate of Daphne Ward Pope, deceased;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Calvin J. Frederick;

H. R 1426. An act to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen;

H. R. 1531. An act for the relief of William P. Gillingham;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth F. McCombie;

H. R. 2056. An act for the relief of J. C. Bateman;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Charles J. Smith;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Mattie A. Horner;

H. R. 3068. An act for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas;

H. R. 3146. An act to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3754. An act for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 15, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1209. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing refunds of internal revenue in excess of $500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, on account of taxes illegally or erroneously collected, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4856. A bill to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4948. A bill to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave in cases involving transfers to other Government agencies under different leave systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNEY (by request):

H. R. 4949. A bill to provide hospitalization and pensions to veterans of certain campaigns on a parity with war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADE of Maryland:

H. R. 4950. A bill to authorize the construction of a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital in Baltimore, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4951. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public education, accommodations, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4952. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4953. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 4954. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4955. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 4956. A bill to establish a District of Columbia Armory Commission for the control of armories in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 4957. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of World War I under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 4958. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4959. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code 396, relating to the importing and transporting of obscene books and other material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 4930. A bill to create a Committee on Capital Clearance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MITCHELL:
H. R. 4961. A bill to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 53 Stat. 1266) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:
H. R. 4962. A bill to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4963. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide readjustment insurance for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES:
H. R. 4964. A bill to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSS:
H. R. 4965. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide readjustment insurance for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:
H. R. 4966. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ANGELL:
H. R. 4967. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building and for remodeling of the existing main post office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:
H. R. 4968. A bill to provide a cost-of-living credit under the individual income tax and to reenact the excess-profits tax on corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOBLICK:
H. R. 4969. A bill to reduce the age requirements for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 60, and, in the case of veterans of World War I or II, to further reduce such age requirements according either to their length of service or to whether they served outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:
H. J. Res. 295. Joint resolution to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BEALL:
H. Res. 425. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all phases of the sugar industry; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 426. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 425; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:
H. Res. 427. Resolution to increase personal income tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. Res. 428. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4242; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:
H. R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Fritz Busche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:
H. R. 4971. A bill for the relief of Peter Velykis, also known as Domas Rupeika; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:
H. R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Samuel Ensler and Louis Puccinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:
H. R. 4973. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:
H. R. 4974. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Capodanno and the legal guardian of Vincent Capodanno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:
H. R. 4975. A bill for the relief of Joseph Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:
H. R. 4976. A bill for the relief of Father Louis Naclerio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:
H. R. 4977. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1126. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition of citizens of Iowa, Lake Charles, Maplewood, Roanoke, and Sulphur, La., in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1127. Also, petition of veterans and other citizens of Morrow, Palmetto, and Rosa, La., in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1128. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of members of the Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Frederic P. Gehring, of the Congregation of the Missions, St. Vincent's Seminary, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Humbly we beg Thee, O Father of Lights, to illuminate our minds with understanding and inflame our hearts with courage, so that we may carry out dutifully and unselfishly the obligations of Thy sacred trust. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1031. An act for the relief of Antonio Zamora; Mrs. Antonio Zamora; Antonio Zamora, Jr.; Mrs. Juan Chavez; John Chavez, Jr.; Roland Chavez; Selso Trujillo; Dr. M. G. Wright; and the heirs of Keith Lane.

REV. FREDERIC P. GEHRING, C. M.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, we are very much honored today by the presence of the Reverend Father Frederic P. Gehring, director of the Vincentian missions in China, who has just delivered the invocation. Like so many celebrated men, he was born in Brooklyn. He was ordained at St. Vincent's Seminary, in Germantown, which, I am happy to say, is in my district. He served 7 years in China at the missions. He was in charge of relief work during the Sino-Japanese War. He joined the Navy in February 1942 as chaplain, and landed on Guadalcanal with the Navy and the Marines.

He was the first American chaplain to receive the Legion of Merit award and Presidential citation for rescuing 27 missionaries of all faiths from behind the Japanese lines on Guadalcanal. He served with Admiral Halsey on New Caledonia and New Guinea with the first naval detachment. After 2 years of active service, he returned to the United States and then went back to the Pacific and landed, I may say parenthetically, at the same time I did, with the first troops in Tokyo.

He was detached from active service in 1946 and is now serving as director of the Vincentian missions in China.

I am sure we are all very happy indeed, in paying honor to Father Gehring, to know that through him we pay honor also to those brave marines and naval forces with whom he served with such notable distinction.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have three requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the strange case of Heinz Norden.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is that about?

Mr. DONDERO. It has to do with a man who had been on one of the relief boards and sent to the American zone of occupation in Germany after he had had a record here which was certainly questionable. I am putting those facts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that matter have reference to the case of a man where there was some criticism?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; there was criticism offered against me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. By whom?

Mr. DONDERO. By the Washington Post because I attacked this man.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right; I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from the State Department in reference to the same person.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY DISREGARDED BY UNITED NATIONS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the matter I wish to call to the attention of the Congress deals with the sovereignty of the United States and its Territories. According to the New York Times of January 9, 1948, page 12, A. H. Feller, United Nations General Counsel, stated that the ultimate decision on the admission of alien correspondents accredited to the United Nations must be made by the international organization and not by the United States. He added that even if the United States denied admission to an accredited United Nations representative, the United Nations had the power to insist on his entry.

This question has been recently touched off by the arrest of Nicholas Kyriazides, UN correspondent for a Greek Communist paper, and S. Syed Nasan, UN correspondent for a Communist Bombay weekly, both detained by United States immigration authorities.

It is well known that Communists, regardless of their alleged mission or vocation, use every occasion for espionage purposes. The ban on the admission of foreign Communists is also on our statute books; nevertheless, our laws were overruled.

It is interesting to look into the character of the gentleman who has thus assumed the authority to override the laws of this country. Who is Abraham Feller? He is an American who, according to Plain Talk magazine of October 1947, "has been a member of the Committee on International Law of the National Lawyers Guild, which was repudiated as Communist controlled by such liberal attorneys as Frank P. Walch, Morris Ernst, Ferdinand Pecora, and Robert Jackson." According to this magazine, Feller's pro-Russian sympathies are well known to his former associates in Federal agencies.

This is the man who apparently has been given a superauthority above the Congress of the United States on matters vital to our national security.

Where are we heading, gentlemen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the late Honorable Clarence E. Hancock.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials on the late Honorable Clarence E. Hancock.

THE AIR SUPREMACY ACT

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, in view of the report of the President's Air Policy Commission and the prediction that the United States will be in serious danger of atomic attack after December 31, 1952, I again invite your attention to the Air Supremacy Act, H. R. 4527, which was introduced by me on November 20.

The bill would insure a continuing program of national defense which would enable the United States to launch a maximum air offensive immediately the security of the United States is endangered through the overt act or acts of any aggressor nation. It provides for the construction and maintenance of 6,000 additional modern military planes during the fiscal year 1949, and intensified research in the development of aircraft, rockets, guided missiles, atomic weapons, and electronic equipment.

The report of the Commission emphasizes the importance of my bill. Another convincing reason for its immediate enactment is the necessity for protection of any substantial investment in human liberty we may make in restoring the economy of Europe. It would be foolish for us to fatten those countries merely for a Soviet killing. Military experts agree that Russian forces could sweep over Europe in a matter of days. If our aid results in the peaceful curbing of communism in Europe, the only consideration which will deter Russian military aggression then is the knowledge that we have a plentiful supply of atomic bombs on hand with swift means for delivery to Russian soil.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include newspaper editorials.

AN ADDITIONAL BALCONY ON THE SOUTH PORTICO OF THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial and a letter published in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, as the only active architect in the present Congress it seems to me that it is entirely proper that I say a word or two about the proposal to erect an additional balcony on the south portico of the White House. I am against the idea; and I do believe that bulling it through over the unanimous protest of the Commission of Fine Arts is not proper. It is to be remembered that these public buildings are not the personal property of any tenant; that they are tenants at will of the public only; and that it is not their prerogative to make physical changes to suit personal desires. The President has indicated that he will use maintenance and repair funds for a capital improvement. It is just as illegal for him to do this as it would be for anyone else to switch funds from the specific purpose for which they were authorized to another purpose. But beyond the point of legality comes the question of propriety. The building belongs to the American people. The Commission of Fine Arts is doing its proper duty in objecting, as they have, to changes in the structure that would materially affect the physical appearance, for it is a heritage of the American people, not lightly or casually to be altered at the whim of any tenant. We want our President to be housed in dignity and comfort, but we will view with regret any move that proposes to change the appearance of this building our people have owned and loved for well over a hundred years.

I include in my remarks a letter by Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, Washington architect, active for many years in civic affairs and member of the architects committee on the National Capitol, also an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Monday, January 12:

SEES FINE ARTS COMMISSION FLOUTED

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

May I be permitted the use of your columns to relate the White House balcony controversy to the general question of the part played by the National Commission of Fine Arts in the building of the National Capital?

The Commission had its beginnings in an Executive order by President Theodore Roosevelt issued in 1909, an order revoked by his successor, President Taft, who felt that such an undertaking should have its foundations in legislative authority. This authority was established by act of Congress approved May 17, 1910. It was broadened by successive Executive orders and directives issued by Presidents Taft, Wilson, and Harding, and by supplementary legislation, the Shipstead Act, extending the jurisdiction of the Commission to private holdings fronting various public buildings and parks. Its duties were summarized by the late Charles Moore, Chairman-militant of the Commission, as advising upon "all questions involving matters of art with which the Federal Government is concerned" in the District of Columbia * * * from medals, insignia, and coins, statues, fountains, and monuments; to public buildings and public grounds under Executive administration; and finally to related private undertakings.

The recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts are not mandatory, but they

carry a great weight of qualified opinion in the field of the arts. Service on the Commission carries no remuneration other than the great honor and distinction of being selected to serve as a guardian of the public interest in the development of the Federal City. The great architects, sculptors, and painters of the past four decades have been glad to give their services to the cause. This service has not been in the form of arbitrary approvals or disapprovals but constructive and helpful criticisms and suggestions to make the most of each opportunity. There have been controversies and disagreements, it is true; but one cannot overlook such major achievements as getting the railroads out of the heart of the city, redeeming the Mall, saving the foreground of Arlington from the scheduled Pentagon development, and establishing high standards in every field of the arts. Nor can one overlook the vision and wisdom of those Executives who have shown their appreciation of the Commission's service by broadening its scope and establishing a tradition of conformance with its recommendations.

With this background, one may consider the question of the balcony. It may be granted that the distinguished architect who was called in for consultation after the project was under way has never done anything in his life which was not good architecture; it may be acknowledged that the present awnings of the portico are inexcusably ugly; it may well be that a balcony is a pleasant place on which to sit; there may be ample precedent for such a treatment in the buildings of Charlottesville or Charleston; the whole thing may be much ado about nothing.

On the other hand, we must take cognizance of the fact that the outstanding representatives of the allied arts, who have been picked to advise us in such matters, are unanimous in their disapproval; that the obnoxious existing awnings can be redesigned at a fraction of the balcony cost; that the precedent for this historic structure is nearer Dublin than Charleston; that the White House is a much sought after place as it stands, even lacking a balcony; that the affair is of great consequence because a matter of principle is at stake * * * the propriety of an executive agency proceeding with such a project, particularly a nonessential project involving one of our most highly regarded historic monuments and the current Chief Executive, in complete disregard for the unanimous adverse opinion of the agency established by preceding Executives to protect such monuments, regardless of pro forma compliance with the letter of the law regarding "submission" of plans.

It may be said that this is something for the Executive to decide, that it is not the business of private individuals or associations. That theory has been thoroughly tested in the past and found wanting. It was not until the turn of the last century that an aroused public opinion checked mediocrity in Capital building and saved the White House from threatened defacement. Once before, in the present administration, it has had to do the same job over again. It is unusual, to say the least, to start such needless controversies in election years. The professions have a right to raise voices of protest by virtue of the service they have given in the past and the need of obtaining recognition for the recommendations of their Supreme Court if that body is to have future value to the Nation.

HORACE W. PEASLEE.

IN TERMS OF AN OLD LEGACY

There is sentimental as well as a very practical appropriateness in the resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Washington chapter of the American Institute of Architects on the White House balcony controversy.

The committee disapproves as a matter of principle any action by the President or any Government agency tending to ignore recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission has unanimously disapproved the balcony, to be added to the south portico, because it permanently changes the south facade of an historic structure.

Before he left office the late Theodore Roosevelt wrote to the then president of the American Institute of Architects a letter in which he said that—

"If I had it in my power as I leave office, I would like to leave as a legacy to * * * the American Institute of Architects the duty of preserving a perpetual eye of guardianship over the White House to see that it is kept unmarred and unchanged from this time on."

The Washington chapter has lived up to the spirit of that trust and more than once has added its influential voice in protest over unwise changes in the White House. Since the first Roosevelt's day, subsequent Presidents strengthened the hand of the Fine Arts Commission, as discussed in Horace Peaslee's letter today, in guarding against the sometimes whimsical desires of White House tenants.

It is difficult to believe that the President, on careful consideration of the implications of such a decision on his part, will ignore the recommendations of the Fine Arts Commission and proceed to make a change in White House architecture in the very year which is to determine his own continued occupancy of the mansion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Elmo Roper.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by William Schulman.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extracts from a letter by the Chief of Transportation of the Army.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include arguments for and against Federal aid to education by M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $165.67, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, on several instances during the last session, I had occasion to mention, on the floor of this House, the status of oceangoing ships owned by the Maritime Commission, but operated by the Army, insofar as safety-at-sea requirements were concerned.

I criticized certain conditions then existing and called for compliance with the laws of the United States. The Army responded in a most agreeable manner stating that the unsatisfactory conditions noted were a part of the aftermath of war and that they would be corrected as soon as possible.

I am now pleased to state that the Army has done, and is doing, an outstanding job at bringing these ships, as well as all of its own public vessels, into conformity with the safety-at-sea laws and requirements. I note with special satisfaction that the three great hospital ships of the ZC–2 class, which are all named in honor of enlisted men rather than for officers, have been completely converted for Army use and for safety at sea. I note also that six of the big P–2 class transports—ships which are the military counterparts of the magnificent new American President liner *President Cleveland*, now on its maiden voyage in the Pacific—are in yards undergoing conversion for peacetime passenger-transport service.

In regard to cargo craft, the Army is progressing so rapidly that it is expected that all such vessels will be certificated by the Coast Guard not later than March 31, 1948, in the same manner as our commercially operated and privately owned vessels of similar types.

Complete information regarding the status of each Army ship is being entered in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of those who seek more details.

I believe the Army Transport Service and the Chief of Transportation, Maj. Gen. Edmond H. Leavey, are deserving of commendation and of this recognition of work well done—of accomplishments which will make travel safer for every American who takes passage in an Army ship.

TAKE IT OR LEAVE IT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute on the subject of Take It or Leave It, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, appearing before a Senate committee, Secretary of State, General Marshall, referring to the plan which bears his name, told the committee that we should, and I quote, "either undertake to meet the requirements of the problem or don't undertake it at all."

He spoke in the typically militaristic manner, as though he were giving an

order, forgetting that he was Secretary of State and not a general giving orders to a buck private. In effect, he told the American people to take it or leave it.

He described the world situation as critical and extreme. He told us that our national safety and way of life were in the balance—that, if we did not take the Marshall plan as written, the alternative was to get ready for World War III. Acceptance of the Marshall plan "as is" is not the only alternative to war.

General Marshall may be a great general, but the record carries no evidence that his opinions are infallible when the issue is our ability to produce or the volume of our national resources which can be sent abroad without weakening our national defense, impairing our economic welfare.

Assuming that he is a great general, all are not disposed to accept his statements as to the absolute necessity of giving to foreign nations within the 15 months beginning April 1, $6,800,000,000; within the next 4 years, $17,000,000,000.

Some just cannot forget his inability to remember where he was the evening of December 7, 1941, when the Japs attacked Pearl Harbor.

If, with all the information of the Army, the Navy, the State Department, and the Secret Service at his command, he did not know the Japs were about to attack, did not know where he was when they hit us, why should we unquestioningly accept his opinion as to what we must now do to be saved?

For the last 13 years we have been hearing from the "one-worlders" that this country of ours was so weak, so lacking in all of the elements that make for national strength, that, if we did not do this, that, or the other—always spending, discarding the old, established, efficient ways, trying new experiments, we were, as a nation, on the road to oblivion.

Then President Roosevelt frightened us into believing that, if we did not get into World War II without delay, Hitler's bombers would be blasting St. Louis, Kansas City, Detroit, Chicago, and all the industrial cities of the Midwest—that to exist we must fight another war, make the world safe for democracy.

The internationalists, the one-world advocates, have been shaping our foreign policy for the past 15 years. What is the result? Their foreign policy has gotten us into two wars. You figure out our benefit from those two wars.

We have a national debt on which the interest alone is $5,500,000,000 per year. We have shipped so much of our natural resources, given so many of our dollars abroad, that today prices are "out of sight." We have inflation. The average American finds it extremely difficult to buy items which he has always considered necessities.

If we must take the Marshall plan "as is"—that is, "take it or leave it"—we will be wise to reject it. It means less fuel oil, gasoline, food, fewer homes, less of everything we need. It means the destruction of our way of life, a dangerous weakening of our ability to defend ourselves. It means that we will be compelled to cut benefit payments to veterans; to cut out much of our domestic program which is necessary for our own well-being.

The expenditure of a fraction of the amount the Marshall plan proponents insist we must give to Europe could and should be used to strengthen our national defense.

Sure, help feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and, as ability permits, help other countries. But first, by all means, look after our own people, take the measures, spend the money necessary, for our own national security. One hundred forty-four million people cannot, and they should not be asked to, assume responsibility for the rest of the world. There just isn't enough to do all of the things the administration proposes to do. We must make a choice. I think we should first choose to follow the policies which will serve our own national welfare best.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, the President in his budget message said:

> Since last fall the number of dwelling units built has been greater than in any comparable period in our history. But, many families most in need of housing, particularly veterans, cannot afford to pay present high prices.

But the President wants present high prices to stay with us. He said in the same message that his estimate of national income assumed stable prices close to the present level. It follows that the President cannot want present high prices to come down and that therefore he merely pays lip service to the concern of veterans for housing at reasonable prices.

WHERE ARE YOU GOING TO GET THE MONEY?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, since we are not going to meet again until Monday, I call your attention to something that is vital to the welfare of this country. It worries me greatly. I want every Member of Congress to think it over, unless you have the answer now and can give it to me. It is this: With a $258,000,000,000 debt, with the President asking for $39,700,000,000 to run this country, with several proposals such as socialized medicine, that would require $500,000,000, the first year, Federal aid to schools $500,000,000, and universal military training that will require $3,000,000,000. The President said nothing of economy in government. The President and many Members of Congress are asking additional sums of money, for this and that, and with the people of this country clamoring for tax reduction, I want some Member of this House to tell me now where are you going to get the money to run this Government? If you do not have the answer now, I will try to call it to your attention again, if nothing happens to me. I think it is something that ought to be considered by every Member of Congress, and have it driven home. It is all important to our welfare, to our stability. A drop of water falling on a rock will soon wear it away, and I expect to ask you the question as long as I am here and as long as it is so important to our existence: Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman got the answer?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I have been trying to tell you Republicans for the last few weeks that if we do not take back the right of the Congress to "coin money and regulate the value thereof," and stop the Federal Reserve System from inflating the currency, you will never be able to control the situation.

Mr. RICH. You have been coining and printing money. The Democratic administration started to print money when it came in here 15 years ago, and you have been printing it until it is just like paper. It will soon be worth nothing. We must annul many of the laws the Democrats passed the past 15 years, and the quicker we do it the better. It has been going on too long. Let the people elect a Republican President, and I guarantee you we will do just that—repeal a lot of laws to undo the wrong to America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Philip H. Parrish.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Rear Adm. J. L. Holloway, Superintendent of the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. JUDD submittted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended.

DISCHARGE PETITION NO. 12

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to see the Republicans getting ready to join me on my oleomargarine

bill. I call the attention of my friend from Kansas, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to the fact that I understand there is in Washington at this time a large group of gentlemen representing the soybean group of the Middle West. They have seer some very important Republicans and that they are about to issue a statement on the bill, not the one introduced by me but a bill introduced by somebody who copied my bill 6 years after I introduced my first one. However, I am glad to have you join up with me even though you introduced your bill long after I introduced mine. We are all walking along the same street, and I am glad to have you with me. I understand the announcement will be made next week. Join up with us and let us take off this unconstitutional, unreasonable, and unpalatable tax of 15 cents on oleomargarine. You do not get Bang's disease from oleomargarine, you do not get tuberculosis from oleomargarine, all you get is a 15-cent tax. Oleomargarine has more vitamins and it has more calories than butter, and it is much more available. So join up early.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article on some problems of the United States Merchant Marine by Mr. Frazer Bailey, president of the National Federation of American Shipping.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he intends to make in Committee of the Whole today and include some letters.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., edited by Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during the First World War, the subject being world government.

Mr. SOMERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extent his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an address by Hon. John Hilldring, of the National United Jewish Appeal Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., December 13, 1947, and an address by Gen. Joseph T. McNarney at the same conference.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include some newspaper material.

Mr. McGARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by John Frey, president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copies of a resolution adopted at the recent annual meeting of the National Association of Farmers.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Richard Grey, president of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor, before the Joint Committee on Housing of the Congress of the United States yesterday morning.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FOGARTY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement of the union's position on the GSI strike.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION—THREAT OF ANOTHER WORLD WAR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] in what he said about this international Sanhedrin up here in New York, shown as the United Nations, attempting to subordinate the United States to its domination.

I also want to remind you that the mothers and fathers and the servicemen of this Nation who just fought two wars in the last 30 years do not want that outfit dragging us into a race war in Palestine.

I am speaking now for the real Americans.

They have no right to drag us into a race war in Palestine. They have no more right to go in there and set up a racial state in Palestine than they have to set up an Indian state in Ohio or Pennsylvania or to set up a Negro state in Virginia, Texas, or Mississippi.

It is about time that the American people were given to understand that we are not going to let this Zionist group, this branch of the Communist movement, drag us into another world war to sacrifice 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 or probably 5,000,000 American boys.

Since the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] continues to insist on our following a policy which would probably lead us into a race war in Palestine and line up the whole Moslem world against us, I want to quote the words of a great American Jew, Mr. Benjamin H. Freedman, of New York, who bitterly opposes this entire movement for the partition of Palestine.

In a recent letter published by the National Economic Council, Inc., of New York, Mr. Freedman said, in part:

GENTLEMEN: I write you with respect to the so-called Palestine question.

The threat of political Zionism to the welfare and security of America is little realized. It is a dangerous mistake to think of it as a localized, Arab-Jewish struggle. There may soon take place in Palestine an explosion that will set off another world war. Every American citizen, every head of a family, all members of Christian churches, every non-Zionist Jew, should be brought to understand that the consequences can be fatally disastrous.

* * * * *

It has always been a cardinal principle of American policy that all civilized peoples have a right to enjoy their own freedom. Limitation of immigration into any country by those who already live there is one of the basic rights belonging to any people. No self-respecting people will hesitate to resist forced immigration of aliens into their borders. The United States would never permit Soviet Russia to compel us to admit Japanese immigrants and to give them the choicest parts of the Pacific coast.

* * * * *

The slavery question resulted in the American Civil War. But such a question will be dwarfed by comparison with the issue whether Americans of the Christian faith should be sent to Moslem lands for the purpose of forcing upon the unwilling inhabitants the establishment of a national Jewish state. What if in such a war the newspapers of the United States begin printing casualty lists of American soldiers, Christians killed in Palestine to satisfy Zionist aspirations? Has anybody had sufficient foresight to understand what this may mean to the Jews of America, Zionist and non-Zionist alike? Doubtless the Jews in Palestine would be massacred to the last man, woman, and child.

But what of the Jews in America? Americans do not want another world war; if another should come in which the cause could be laid at the door of the Jew, who knows how popular resentment might break out against a whole people? Have the political Zionists stopped to consider that? Anti-Semitism is bad enough already in America. But if Zionist should push us into war for a Jewish Palestine, what will come will be to the present anti-Jewish sentiment as a hurricane is to a zephyr. If the majority non-Zionist Jews could only be brought to realize the disaster political Zionism is preparing for all Jews, and if they had the courage to act, they could break its power in a week. But they will not do this because they are afraid of being branded as "anti-Semitic Jews."

Popular ignorance of the real basis of political Zionism is beyond calculation. Vaguely most Christian Americans have the idea that the Jews claim Palestine because it was the Promised Land in which they lived for a period of a few centuries that ended 2,000 years ago. And the thought of a people returning to its homeland seems emotionally satisfying and good.

But here are facts most Americans do not know:

Political Zionism is almost exclusively a movement by the Jews of Europe. But these eastern Eurcpean Jews have neither a racial nor a historic connection with Palestine. Their ancestors were not inhabitants of the Promised Land. They are the direct descendants of the people of the Khazar Kingdom, which existed until the twelfth century.

The Khazars were a non-Semitic, Turko-Finn, Mongolian tribal people who, about the first century A. D., emigrated from middle Asia to eastern Europe. There they created one of the largest kingdoms of their time. At its greatest extent it covered an area of about 800,000 square miles. About the seventh century A. D., the King of the Khazars adopted Judaism as the state religion, and the majority of inhabitants joined him in the new allegiance. Before that date there was no such thing as a Khazar who was a Jew. Neither then nor since was there such a thing as a Khazar whose ancestors had come from the Holy Land. The Semitic peo-

ple, who established Judaism in Palestine many centuries before the Khazars became converts to the Hebrew faith, did mostly emigrate from Palestine. But none of them emigrated to the Khazar Kingdom far to the north.

* * * These eastern European, Yiddish-speaking Jews have no historic or racial connection with Palestine, or, for that matter, with the other Jews who existed in other countries for thousands of years prior to the Khazar conversion.

At best, the cry of truly Palestinian-descended Jews for a return of the homeland would be highly dubious. What right have peoples whose ancestors departed nearly 2,000 years ago to claim territory in which the present inhabitants have lived for 1,300 years? If the Indians should demand America back, would we all pack up and return to the lands of our ancestral origins? Yet the Arabs have been in Palestine a 1,000 years longer than we have been here. And if the claim of Palestinian-descended Jews is so dubious, what of the claim of Khazar-descended Jews? Would a single Christian support their trek back to the homeland or want to oblige them by expelling the Arabs, if it were known that these eastern European, Yiddish-speaking Jews, who form the Zionist group practically in toto, have neither a geographic, historic, nor ethnic connection with either the Jews of the Old Testament or the land known today as Palestine?

If the Jewish claim to Palestine is stated on the only other remaining ground, the religious, it may be summarily and finally replied that religiously both Christians and Moslems also have religious roots there. The reason it is called the Holy Land today is because Jesus of Nazareth lived and died there. To Christians he is the Son of God and Saviour. To Mohammedans he is a great prophet. To official Jewry, he is an executed blasphemer.

The ability of Zionists to have things their way stems from the organized pressure they can bring upon people who do not agree with them. By holding the threat of being called anti-Semitic over men engaged in public or business life, they have been able to stifle opposition—even among American Jews such as the writer, who have no interest in forming a Jewish state and wish only to live and die as good Americans.

It will take courage for Americans of whatever origin to think these facts through and take public positions upon them. They will be smeared. They will be slandered. Already Zionists have been able to bring about the economic ruin of many Christians and Jews who have dared challenge their right to claim Palestine for a national Jewish state.

But America and American Christianity stand at a crossroad. The majority must decide whether it will longer submit to being the tool of a small but ruthless and unscrupulous minority of a minority people. The great majority of American Jews also must choose. Will we all acquiesce in the program of political Zionism? Will we follow it out to its inescapable consequences?

If we do, we shall be walking the road to ruin.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN H. FREEDMAN.

PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi as usual speaks from a wealth of lack of information on the subject. There is no intention to set up in Palestine or in the Middle East a theocratic government. The Jewish state in Palestine is not to be a religious state, and if he would read—and he who runs may read—he will readily perceive that there is not any idea of setting up a theocracy by the Jews in Palestine.

Beyond that he makes an aspersion upon those who, with great intrepidity and great wisdom, pioneered to set up that state, that they are inclined to be Communists or are Communists. That is a damnable statement to make.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from New York will take his seat.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. CELLER. That is a damnable statement to make.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects to the word "damnable"; is that it?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; as used, it is a violation of the rules of the House and of all rules of common decency.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. This is not debatable. The Chair will pass on the question.

The Chair is not too conversant with the word "damnable" but does not find that it is banned in the rules of parliamentary procedure. The Chair thinks it is a rather harsh word.

The Chair hopes that the Members will not take this as a precedent for using the word on too many occasions.

Mr. CELLER. May I continue, Mr. Speaker? My 1 minute had not expired.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's 1 minute had already expired.

Mr. CELLER. Under leave to extend, I emphatically deny that the Palestine Jews are Communists. They abominate communism. Many of those who made the trek to Palestine did so to avoid and to escape communism. There is and will be in the proposed Jewish state uttermost freedom of religion. Examine the reports of its suggested constitution. In the main it is patterned after our own Constitution. It would enshroud the nationals of Palestine, Jews and Arabs alike, with the precious gift of our Bill of Rights—with freedom of speech, press, religion, peaceful assembly, with trial by jury, confrontation of witness for anyone accused, the right of petition, and the writ of habeas corpus. All these rights are foreign to communism and would hardly be found in Russia. The Jews in Palestine will set up a republic where, like our own, private capital and private initiative and enterprise will prevail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLES OF WAR

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2575, amending the Articles of War, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 19, line 2, after the period insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(d) There shall be strict equality of treatment in the confinement of officers and enlisted personnel awaiting trial and in the sentence, confinement, and punishment after sentence. No privileges or exemption from punishment or routine shall be granted to officers under confinement that are not granted equally to enlisted men under confinement."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to be placed in the bill on page 19 at line 2. The purpose of the amendment is to make sure that under the military law of the United States governing the Army there shall be no possible variation from equal treatment as between officers and men. This amendment is so drawn that when they are confined prior to trial they shall be treated equally, that in the sentencing they shall be treated equally, and that in the confinement after trial they shall be treated equally.

You ask me whether I feel this is necessary under the law; and my answer is that I have seen it otherwise. I have visited Army camps in Europe where men were awaiting trial. In one of the camps I found three officers who were quartered in a very nice tent, a large tent, with a bed for each officer and as many blankets as he wanted, and a separate desk for each officer. They also had a fine floor under them. Then I went over and looked at the enlisted men who were confined there awaiting trial. I found that they had no shelter during the day and that at night they had but a pup tent for two men. I found further that they had no beds. They were required to sleep on a hard wooden floor. I found further that the hard wooden floor was of boards that the boards had curled so that I could put my hand between the boards, my whole four fingers. I talked with these enlisted men and asked them whether they had enough covers. This was in Italy in the fall. They said that they had only two blankets each and that they were cold. That was not the case with the officers.

If special privilege is to be given to officers I think the public wants the law so changed that the practice shall be stopped. It was not the case of just one officer but it has been the case with many, many officers.

I am not a former enlisted man talking, but an officer from World War II. In military justice I want Benny Meyers treated just as young Jimmy Jones from my district was treated when he went a. w. o. l. for 8 days beginning Christmas night in 1945. He was accused of some things and yet after 3 years in combat in Italy, although only 21 years old, he was sentenced to 30 years at hard labor after being held 7 months by the Army admittedly without a trial. Perhaps Benny Meyers will not get that, but, believe you me, as a former serviceman of World War II, I am going to see that whatever treatment is given is meted out equally as to officers and enlisted men.

We have never had this provision in the law but it is about time we did have it.

I yield for a question to the committee if they desire to ask any. If not I have a question or two I should like to ask about the bill generally.

Mr. ELSTON. I shall be glad to try to answer any question the gentleman would care to propound. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that I expect to oppose his amendment when the gentleman has completed his remarks.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up another question before the committee. When I was in Europe I went to Nuremberg and saw there Army and Navy officers trying enemy prisoners under what might be called the law of nations. Those trials involve, peculiarly, only enemy nationals and enemy prisoners of war. There are none being tried who are United States citizens. But how does that law of nations that we are trying people under in Germany today fit in with your law of military justice before us here today? Suppose that someone should ask for one of our men to be delivered up to this same tribunal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes on this general subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, suppose that Russia should ask that one of the officers in our Army or Navy be delivered up to this international tribunal for trial under the law of nations for a crime with which we disagree. May I ask the committee, how does this bill cover that? Does it cover it at all and if it does not should we not have some legislation that tells our men just what their liabilities are and who shall try them if they are guilty under this new law covering what might be called a crime against nations?

Mr. ELSTON. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we are not seeking in this bill to deal with international law. This bill deals solely with military justice; that is, with the administration of justice within our own Army. In response to the gentleman's question as to whether or not we would turn one of our soldiers over to Russia if Russia made a demand of that kind, I know of no law that would authorize it and if such a request were made I am sure it would be turned down in no uncertain terms. The reason we are trying some of the war criminals of Germany is because we defeated that nation. Her war criminals were not turned over to us. They were arrested by American soldiers and were placed on trial under international law.

Mr. FULTON. Could I sum it up, then, by saying that at the present time it is the intent of the Congress, as evidenced by the gentleman's committee and by those present, that there shall be no United States serviceman turned over to any tribunal for charge under what might be called a war-crime law?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I do not believe the question the gentleman propounds has any connection with the administration of military justice but comes within the general power of the Army to administer its own affairs. The only thing comparable to that I can imagine is the thing that occurs so frequently here in the United States, where local civilian authorities contend that a member of the armed forces is guilty of a violation of the civil law. Then the military commander may in his discretion deliver the man to the civil authorities for trial, or refuse to do so, as he may see fit. Sometimes they will do one, sometimes the other. That is not a matter in any wise connected with military justice but one having to do with the authority of the military command.

Mr. FULTON. In the gentleman's view it is in the discretion of the military commander under the supervision of the Commander in Chief, the President?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. Very frequently the Army authorities refuse to deliver the men to the civil authorities in the United States.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the committee what measures are being taken by the Army or by the committee to see that the practice does not continue of inflicting these very high penalties, for example, 20, 30, 40, 50, or 60 years or life at hard labor, then they come along later and cut the sentences down to what they should have been in the first place.

For example, you will all recall about the poor unfortunate serviceman who was in a draft camp down here in the South who, because he would not obey an officer at one time on a small matter, was sentenced to death, and then within a period of about 6 months the sentence was reduced to 5 years. When is that practice going to cease and what is being done to eliminate it so, in the first instance, Army courts martial will give a sentence that is roughly equivalent to the crime involved?

Mr. ELSTON. I am sure the gentleman appreciates that it would be unwise to have a fixed penalty for every offense, since the circumstances are not the same in every case.

Mr. FULTON. I agree to that.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman, I am sure, can appreciate that there are times when more severe penalties are warranted than at other times; for example, when an organization is engaged in battle it may be necessary that more severe penalties may be inflicted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I comment and say because I have been restricted on the debate, I had asked the committee for extra time to discuss some of these general things to save amendments.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. We have endeavored in the drafting of this measure to equalize justice so far as it can be done. With this in mind, we have set up the board of review and the judicial council. Such council has complete authority to equalize sentences. I believe that that will take care of the matter. We, in our committee, gave a great deal of study to the question and came to the conclusion that that was the best way in which to solve the problem. It would be utterly impossible to fix definite penalties, because circumstances in one case might warrant a sentence of 6 months, whereas in another it might warrant a sentence of 5 years, although both offenders were charged with the same crime.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the gentleman this? As far as your experience is concerned then, at the present time the Army is not now engaging in the practice, is it, of giving very severe sentences, and then later cutting them down?

Mr. ELSTON. No; I do not think they are doing it now; at least not to the same extent. I think most inequalities of sentence came about because we were at war. Of course, if sentences are still out of line, the Army can correct them.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask another question on a particular case that occurred during the war? I want to know just how far enemy aliens, enemy nationals, and also prisoners of war or enemies of the armed forces can testify in American courts martial against American servicemen. May I point out to you one case? There was an instance of a Navy court martial where the captain of an American ship had testify against him the commander of a Japanese submarine when the charge against the American Navy captain was simply one of negligence. It involved no moral turpitude and it involved no intent. Is there any limit on the power of these witnesses who are enemy nationals, enemy aliens, enemy prisoners of war, or enemy servicemen in testifying against American servicemen?

Mr. ELSTON. I will say to the gentleman there is nothing in the law that precludes the calling of any witnesses. The court is the judge of the credibility of the witnesses. If the witness is not a credible witness and the court does not see fit to give his testimony any faith

or credit, the court may reject it in its entirety. But I am sure the gentleman can appreciate that there might be some instances in which an injustice might be done if enemy aliens or prisoners of war could not be called as witnesses. Such persons may have witnessed the commission of a crime. The accused himself might want to call them as witnesses on his behalf. So, I am sure the gentleman can appreciate that we have to handle the matter just as it is handled in civil cases, namely, allow anybody to be called as a witness, but let the court determine how much faith and how much credit shall be given to his testimony.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman that I think the conduct of the Trial Judge Advocate in calling the Japanese commander who had sunk the ship of the American commander was most reprehensible. I think the Navy Department agreed by the action it took in disapproving the sentence meted out to the American commander and immediately restoring him to duty.

However, I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that in the very nature of things you cannot disqualify people as witnesses. Cases have been brought to my attention where American soldiers have been convicted of murdering German civilians, and of course the witnesses were German civilians. The men should have been tried, and were properly tried, and the evidence against them by the aliens was entirely proper. In my State at one time no person who had ever been convicted of a felony or who had been pardoned could testify. It reached the point where we had to pass remedial legislation, because so many persons were called as witnesses who were thereby disqualified. I do not think we would be justified in disqualifying any witness.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman that in cases of negligence in the performance of duty it is not a proper method of trial to call the commander of the submarine that sank an American officer's ship, in order to prove that he did not take proper evasive tactics.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. I am interested in the gentleman's amendment. As I understand it, it would provide that all officers and all enlisted men be treated exactly alike pending trial. Is that true?

Mr. FULTON. It provides that whatever privileges are given to officers shall likewise be given to enlisted men that are in confinement awaiting trial. If the officer is just confined to his room but not in confinement, that is different. If the enlisted man is in his quarters, restricted but not subject to confinement, that is different. But when I saw in a camp this summer that enlisted men were deprived of beds and forced to sleep on the floor while officers were not only given beds but tables, and when I saw the privileges officers had as compared to the enlisted men, it certainly made me want to see that the same treatment was given to each. That is all this amendment does.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all appreciate that we do not want officers to be treated in any different manner than enlisted men if their offense is the same. We have given a lot of consideration to this question in our committee. We have placed three provisions in this bill in which we attempt to equalize sentences, punishment, confinement, and the like. For example, we have now provided that officers may be tried by a special court martial. Heretofore they could be tried only by a general court martial. In the past there has been a reluctance on the part of commanding officers in many cases to file charges against officers because it would result in a general court-martial trial. Now officers may be tried by a special court martial the same as enlisted men.

We have also made it possible for an officer to forfeit two-thirds of his pay for 3 months. Heretofore it could be done for only 1 month.

We have also made it possible for an officer to be reduced to the grade of private regardless of what his rank might be.

The matter of confinement, the place they will be confined, and the manner in which they will be confined, I submit is an administrative function. It would be very difficult to legislate as to the kind of a place in which accused persons should be confined and as to the exact treatment they should receive. Such things must largely be left to the discretion of commanding officers. In view of the criticism that has already taken place, I believe that conditions have greatly improved.

If this measure passes with the provisions in it to which I have referred, there should no longer be any criticism about any discrimination between officers and enlisted men as far as trials and punishment are concerned.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 16, line 16, place a period after the words "court martial" and strike out the remainder of the paragraph and substitute the following: "In all other cases tried before a general court martial, the verdict shall be by the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members of the court."

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, after the proceedings yesterday, I would like to make this statement for the record—that it has not and is not my intention in offering numerous amendments, to place cumbersome technicalities around this bill or the administration of military justice, but simply to clarify the situation and to make error less likely and to spell out word for word that there shall not be speculation in arriving at a just verdict in court-martial proceedings. The amendment I now offer proposes to strike out language from the bill as it now reads which deals with verdicts in cases which may result in a sentence of death. Can you imagine that the concurrence of an entire court-martial board shall not be had when the death sentence is involved?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Suppose one of the members of the court was taken seriously ill. Would not the gentleman's amendment prevent any decision at all in such a case?

Mr. BURLESON. It would in cases where the death penalty is involved.

Mr. KEATING. And the gentleman feels that in such cases there should be what we call a mistrial and a new trial would have to be held?

Mr. BURLESON. That is right. This is a serious matter.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Is it not a fact that in the civil courts in the event one juror is taken seriously ill a mistrial is declared and the court is compelled to reconvene, and is it not also proper that justice should be so carried out in a military court?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly. I think in some places an extra juror is provided. In most jurisdictions the unanimous concurrence of the jurors is required to return a verdict.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Is it not true that in criminal cases in nearly all the States a unanimous verdict is required?

Mr. BURLESON. I will say to the gentleman that it is true in all those jurisdictions with which I am familiar.

Mr. ROBSION. Now when the gentleman proposes that this provision shall apply to certain cases, does he mean cases where the death penalty may be imposed or is actually imposed?

Mr. BURLESON. I mean where the death penalty may be imposed as provided by law.

Mr. ROBSION. That is, where the judgment might result in the death of the accused?

Mr. BURLESON. That is right.

My amendment goes further and strikes out the entire paragraph after line 16 on page 16 and provides that in all other cases three-fourths of the members shall concur in returning any type of verdict. That certainly seems liberal and reasonable to me. At the present time it must be unanimous in cases of the death penalty and then provides for a three-fourths member vote for sentences of 10 years or more and less than a 10-year sentence only two-thirds of those present at the time the vote is taken is required. It seems to me it is very reasonable that we should have three-fourths of the members of a court-martial board concurring in returning any type of verdict because this deals with the very life and liberty and future of boys who are charged with crime.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I had an amendment along this same line which would require

the unanimous vote of those participating in the court martial in a case where a death sentence was possible. I too feel that it is necessary to have the unanimous vote of those participating because when somebody decides that he is not in favor of the death penalty he will just stay away if he is a member of the court martial.

Mr. BURLESON. I can very well conceive of that thing happening.

Mr. FULTON. So I had inserted in my amendment the words "participating at the trial" in line 16, which removes the objection raised by the gentleman from New York. So if you have the concurrence of all members of the court martial participating at the trial, I would ask the gentleman if he would not accept that as an addition to his amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. I would want to better understand the gentleman's idea. It is provided that as few as five may constitute a court martial. In that case I can conceive of two or three of those individuals being incapacitated, or, because of some circumstance, not being present. If the wording I suggest is adopted all doubt will be removed. Otherwise there will be no verdict returned at all. If they are members of that board they will be participating. I think we have the same idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the question raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] is more apparent than real. The court cannot sit unless five members are present. Unless there is a quorum present the court cannot sit. Five is the minimum for a general court martial.

I say it is more apparent than real, because the convening authority has the right to constitute a court of any number he may see fit, provided it is not less than five. So that under the entire system of the courts martial the most members of a court that a man could expect would be five, because the convening authority could limit it to five, and the court could not sit unless five were present.

I might say also with reference to the three-fourths concurrence in other sentences, that the provision contained in the present bill is an exact copy of the Articles of War as it has existed for many, many years. I know of no instance in which there has been complaint as to the concurrence of all for the death penalty. I cannot imagine an officer in the Army who would stay away from a court because he was opposed to the death penalty. If a man is of that caliber he is certainly in the wrong place. I cannot imagine a man of intelligence and principle, who felt that death should not be given in certain circumstances, who would sidestep his duty by not attending the court. I can see where a man who did not want to impose the death penalty might stay away.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. NORBLAD. If an officer stayed away he would be violating his orders and would be subject to court martial himself, would he not?

Mr. KILDAY. Of course. We are dealing with extraordinary times. This is not only for peacetime or for wartime but it is for all time. When we get into a court martial during a war, it might very well be that a member of the court would have to go forward with his men. But as I say, the concurrence of all in death penalty cases and the concurrence of two-thirds or three-quarters has been the law for many, many years. That is not one of the things I have heard complaints made about against the court-martial system. Of course, you can sit around and conjure up objections of all kinds to this thing.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Under article of war 43, I believe the Supreme Court finally held that a conviction could be had with less than a unanimous vote, a three-quarters vote. Is that right? Has this been changed?

Mr. KILDAY. I am not familiar with the decision to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. ALBERT. As I understand, under this bill, both sentence and conviction must be by a unanimous vote of the court.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman means in the case of the imposition of the death penalty.

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. I am not familiar with the decision to which the gentleman refers. It seems to me what it means is that both conviction and sentence must be unanimous; in other words, you would not reach the penalty until after you had reached an agreement as to the guilt or innocence.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that unanimous consent is required only in the case of imposition of the death penalty and then it is the unanimous consent of those present at the time the vote is taken.

Mr. KILDAY. Not less than five.

Mr. FULTON. And not less than five. So it really might not be unanimous consent of the whole court-martial board. So there is that possibility and this amendment was designed to correct it.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. I may say that was the point I was trying to make. Possibly I did not make my position clear. The language "those present" brings up the policy of the Army and Navy in conducting courts martial. It provides with reference to other duties that they may be collateral to his general duties and that he is not serving upon courts or boards or any of those things that is made of priority in the service.

Mr. KILDAY. That would hardly take place in a death-penalty case.

Mr. BURLESON. In all cases. Why should they not be present? There is no good reason why they should not.

Mr. KILDAY. Let us be practical about the proposition. Five is the minimum number regarded as essential under the law. When you start adding additional members you are simply taking care of the contingency that some member of the court might not be present, yet you are sure of the presence at all times of five. It is just like the case of alternate jurors which are provided for in some jurisdictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to enter into this debate because I am not an expert on the practice of courts martial, but I want to call the attention of the Committee on Armed Services and the House to a case where I think there was a flagrant violation of equal justice. I am referring to the case of two boys, William D. Kimbrell, Army serial No. 34-393-207, and Joe R. Herald, Army serial No. 35-445-400. In October of 1943 these two boys were charged with raping an Arab woman. I was permitted to read the transcript of testimony taken before the court. I doubt very seriously if even a country justice of the peace in the remotest part of this country would have convicted either of the boys on the testimony. They were, however, both convicted. As I recall, they were sentenced to death. Their sentence was commuted to life imprisonment, and later the sentence of Kimbrell was cut to 20 years. The Herald boy was permitted to go back to active duty and earn an honorable discharge. The Kimbrell boy was not given such permission, but they did finally in their benevolence cut his sentence down to 12 years. After he served 4 years in the Federal penitentiary he was paroled.

I am not complaining about the sentences. What I am complaining about is the matter of equal justice. If Herald was entitled to a fair and honorable discharge and enjoy all the benefits of the GI's under the GI bill, I do not see any reason any responsible person could advance for not giving the other boy the same treatment. They were both convicted on the same testimony for the same offense. Incidentally, the charges were preferred against these boys and they were tried in about 2 hours' time. Their attorney was not given any opportunity to prepare their defense. They had to move on. I was advised—and I am pretty sure it is true—that some example had been called for by some of the officers, that they had demanded that an example be made of some of these boys, and this boy was a victim. I do not say the boys were justified in their conduct. I do not say Kimbrell was justified in his act, but I do say that equal justice should have prevailed.

Here is another thing that burned me up when I took the matter up with the War Department trying to see that equal justice was carried out. I found out that one of the fellows who sat on the original trial court was sitting down there in the Judge Advocate's office in the position of an appellate judge ruling on the appeal. It is absurd to think that he was going to reverse his decision. He did not happen to sit on the case of one of the boys, but he did sit on the case of the boy from my district. I would like to ask, Is there a man in the House who would be willing to be prosecuted and tried by the same man and then have the same individual rule on his appeal?

I hope this bill will correct some of these evils. We are being called upon now to vote for universal military training. I am wondering if we can, with good conscience in voting for universal military training, stand by and see these things practiced against any kid in this country, if we are not going to have equal justice? I hope to vote for universal military training. However, if we do not have equal justice in cases of this kind I do not think we should have universal military training but we should have a cleaning out of those who come before our committees and ask us to vote for all these things.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I may suggest to the gentleman it is possible that the boy who received the more severe sentence had some bad record.

Mr. MANASCO. They both received the same sentence. Here is what a member of the Secretary of War's office said to me, and I am putting these letters in the RECORD. He states that a survey revealed that young Kimbrell, now 36 years of age, is a confirmed alcoholic. Now, he had been in the penitentiary 4 years. How any person, I do not care how stupid he is, could say that a person is a confirmed alcoholic after he has been in the Federal penitentiary for 4 years is beyond me. If he is a confirmed alcoholic there he must have been getting some liquor in the Federal penitentiary, and if that is true perhaps we had better investigate the Federal penitentiaries.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman know whether the boy had a bad record in the past or not?

Mr. MANASCO. He did plead guilty on two or three occasions to being drunk before he got into the Army, but he was good enough to be taken into the Army. The Army made it possible for him to get drunk when he was over there in north Africa.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman tell us whether the boy who received the tougher treatment had been in trouble previously in the Army?

Mr. MANASCO. I do not think that was of any concern at all. I did not investigate that, however. He came from another State that probably had a little more political influence with the Army than I did.

Mr. KEATING. I doubt if anyone would have any more political influence with the Army than the gentleman.

Mr. MANASCO. I never found I had any and I do not want any. I do not think it is right for anybody to have political influence in cases of this kind. I think we should see that justice is done, whether the boy comes from my district, from the district represented by the Speaker, or by the Vice President of the United States, or anybody else.

Mr. KEATING. I agree entirely with the gentleman's statement, but I do recognize the fact that in the sentencing of a convicted man in military justice, just as in civil justice, his previous record for past convictions or past difficulties with the law is one of the factors considered. I just wondered whether possibly that might have been the determining factor in this case.

Mr. MANASCO. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that if two men were to go out and bare their chests to enemy bullets after they had been drafted and one had been involved in a traffic accident some 8 or 10 years before and the other one had not, justice would require that one boy be given life imprisonment while the other one is restored to active duty?

Mr. KEATING. No; and if my remarks led to that conclusion on the part of the gentleman, I regret it.

Mr. MANASCO. I might be stretching that a little bit.

Mr. KEATING. I do not know whether either of these boys bared their breasts to enemy bullets.

Mr. MANASCO. Here is what I am complaining about. If the Army were so solicitous about the past reputation of these boys, why was it possible for them to get liquor on this night they were alleged to have gotten drunk and raped this Arab woman? If the Army had been as solicitous of their conduct while they were under the control of the Army as before, they could not have gotten drunk.

Mr. KEATING. Naturally, I knew nothing about their being drunk, because the gentleman had not stated it.

Mr. MANASCO. I did not go into all of the details because the trial was so arbitrary. The defense counsel was not given an opportunity to prepare his defense. I would like for you gentlemen to read that transcript. That is the reason I am calling this case to the attention of the House.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to clarify one point in the gentleman's argument. We had a case of this nature brought to the attention of our committee. Under this bill any general court martial has to be reviewed by the reviewing authority, automatically.

Mr. MANASCO. It was done in this case, but the reviewing authority was a member of the original court.

Mr. RIVERS. We have a new reviewing authority, and from a year after the imposition of sentence, or 6 months after the expiration of the sentence, whichever is the longer, any after discovered evidence presented, there is a review on.

Mr. MANASCO. The so-called Roberts committee reviewed it. But, of course, they took the findings of these fellows down here in the War Department. They did not have time to go out and investigate, and the only question I am raising heck about is that one was restored to duty and the other was sent to the penitentiary and paroled by the Civilian Parole Board and not given the right to earn an honorable discharge. But, he has that stigma upon him which the other fellow does not have.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. I would like to cite an illustration of a situation which I found in a similar case where a man was convicted for the rape of a French woman without any corroboration whatsoever; not a single solitary witness to corroborate it except the woman herself. And, as the gentleman knows, that is in complete opposition to every single principle of our law, that there must be some corroboration of the crime if it is a capital offense.

Mr. MANASCO. The testimony presented in this particular case showed, as I recall, that the Arab woman was nursing a baby during the operation, and probably that was sufficient corroboration.

Mr. RAINS. I hope there will be provision made in capital cases where it takes corroboration in crimes of this nature, because that is provided in all criminal jurisdictions that I know anything about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Do I understand that this trial judge advocate who participated in the original trial is now sitting in the appeal division that passed on this man's appeal over here?

Mr. MANASCO. He was sitting in the office that I went to to review the transcript. I made the fatal mistake of saying down there that an ignorant justice of the peace would not have convicted the boy on the testimony presented, and he rose up in holy wrath.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. He did not sit on the other fellow's case?

Mr. MANASCO. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. The letters, which I have received permission to insert, are as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1947.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR,
Washington, D. C.

In re: Kimbrell, William Dolphus, ASN 34–393–207, case No. CM–249414, register No. 63864–8.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The above-named general prisoner was convicted by a military court in north Africa in October 1943 for the crime of rape. Kimbrell and another soldier,

Joe R. Herald, ASN 35-445-400, BCM0143, were codefendants. They were given separate trials; however, the evidence submitted to the court was the same, and they were both found guilty and given identical sentences.

I have read the transcript of the proceedings before the court and am not taking exception to the findings of the military court but am basing my request on the grounds of discrimination. Herald has been restored to active duty and is being given an opportunity to earn an honorable discharge. Kimbrell is serving a sentence of 20 years for the same crime, convicted by the same court on the same evidence.

I, of course, am not protesting the Department's action in restoring Herald to duty, but I do think that in all fairness my constituent is being called upon to pay a greater price for a crime than the boy who came from Kentucky. I would greatly appreciate it if you would take a personal interest in this matter and see that equal justice under the law is meted out in this case.

Yours sincerely,

CARTER MANASCO,
Member of Congress, Alabama.

FEBRUARY 17, 1947.

Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANASCO: The Secretary of War has asked me to reply to your letter of January 17, 1947, in behalf of general prisoner William D. Kimbrell, Army serial No. 34393207, and in which you refer to Joe R. Herald (former general prisoner).

Please be assured that the War Department has the best interests of each general prisoner at heart and is giving each individual's case every reasonable consideration for restoration to duty. All the circumstances surrounding Kimbrell's offense, his past military history, his civilian history, and all other pertinent factors have been carefully evaluated. The results of this survey were then presented to the clemency board, who in turn considered the advisability of returning this man to honorable duty.

This survey revealed that Kimbrell, now 36 years of age, is probably a confirmed alcoholic and that he had admittedly been arrested and fined by civil authorities on three occasions for being drunk and disorderly before he entered the armed forces. He admitted at the trial that he had been drinking prior to the commission of his present offense, and also that he took the lead in having intercourse with the woman who was attacked. All the circumstances in his case indicate that there is every probability he would again become involved in further misbehavior, as a result of his addiction to alcohol, should he be released from confinement and returned to duty. Consequently, his restoration is not favorably considered.

It should be noted that Herald was recommended for restoration to duty prior to the termination of hostilities and was actually transferred from the penitentiary to the disciplinary barracks for that purpose August 9, 1945. He was considered qualified for restoration to duty under policies existing at that time and because the record indicated that Kimbrell was a coaccused, a further special report on the latter's restorability was obtained from the penitentiary.

In accordance with Army regulations, Kimbrell will continue to receive regular annual clemency consideration; his next review being scheduled for July of this year. At that time his case will be again reviewed for the possibilities of further leniency. Your letter and a copy of this reply have been attached to his file for consideration at that time. In view of the large number of unrestorable prisoners serving comparable sentences for similar offenses, the War Department cannot adopt the policy of releasing all coaccused in the event that one of them is restored to duty. However, you may be assured that the board will carefully consider all aspects of the situation in this case.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

FEBRUARY 21, 1947.

Hon. JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I have your letter of February 17 replying to my letter of January 17 in behalf of General Prisoner William D. Kimbrell, ASN 34393207.

I, of course, cannot agree with your position in this matter. You apparently base your position on the ground that Kimbrell, now 36 years of age, is probably a confirmed alcoholic. If this be true, the man should be placed in a hospital for treatment instead of being confined to a penal institution. I did not know that our Federal penitentiaries permitted men to drink intoxicating liquors. This man has been a prisoner almost 4 years and how anyone could say that he is a confirmed alcoholic after being a prisoner for almost 4 years without having some information that he had been drinking during this period of confinement sounds utterly ridiculous to me.

If the War Department had exercised the same interest in Kimbrell that it is now exercising, it would have been impossible for him to have been drinking on the occasion which led to his trial. In view of this fact, I think it is nothing but right that the Department exert every effort to rehabilitate this young man, and I respectfully urge you to use your high office in seeing that this is done.

This young man was good enough to offer his life for his country, yet his punishment for an identical offense was a long prison sentence while his associate was restored to active duty.

Next week I am taking the liberty of calling to the attention of the House of Representatives the discrimination against young Kimbrell in the hope that the Congress will conduct a thorough investigation into this case and similar cases.

Yours sincerely,

CARTER MANASCO,
Member of Congress, Alabama.

MARCH 10, 1947.

Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANASCO: This is with further reference to your interest in the case of general prisoner William D. Kimbrell and to your letter of February 21, 1947, addressed to Hon. John W. Martyn, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of War.

As Mr. Martyn informed you in his letter of February 17, 1947, Kimbrell has been considered unfavorably for restoration to duty largely because he took the lead in the offenses and because of his past history of alcoholism. Recommendations against restoration in this case have been unanimous from the authorities at the institution and from the various War Department agencies concerned with the case.

Kimbrell's case was scheduled for special consideration by the Advisory Board on Clemency, of which former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts is chairman, on February 27, 1947. As the case was not heard at that meeting, it is presently scheduled for consideration at the next meeting, March 19, 1947.

Your letter of February 21, 1947, and all of your previous correspondence in Kimbrell's behalf has been attached to his personal records and will be available for the Board's consideration.

Please be assured that the War Department will accord Kimbrell every possible consideration, and I have asked that you be advised of the ultimate decision.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. ROYALL,
Under Secretary of War.

APRIL 15, 1947.

Hon. CARTER MANASCO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANASCO: The Under Secretary of War has asked that I inform you further in the case of William D. Kimbrell.

As a result of a recent consideration of Kimbrell's case by the Clemency Board, his 20-year sentence has been reduced to 12 years. This reduction will make him eligible for initial parole consideration in October of this year. Should Kimbrell desire parole he should make application at that time to the authorities at the United States Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga., where he is presently confined.

I am pleased to transmit this information.

Sincerely yours,

G. K. HEISS,
Colonel, GSC, Special Assistant.

APRIL 19, 1947.

Col. G. K. HEISS, GSC,
Special Assistant to the
Under Secretary of War,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

Re Kimbrell, William Dolphus, ASN 34393207, general prisoner.

DEAR COLONEL HEISS: I have your letter of April 15 advising that the Clemency Board has reduced the sentence of the above-named prisoner from 20 to 12 years, making this young man eligible for parole consideration in October of this year.

I, of course, appreciate this consideration but am still convinced that military justice is not uniform. I just read in one of the daily papers yesterday where a boy in Japan had killed a Japanese citizen and also raped a Japanese woman. His original sentence was death, and it was commuted to 3 years in prison. Of course, I realize that the War Department probably considers the life of a Japanese and the chastity of a Japanese woman much less than that of an Arab, but I thought that our laws were based on the established principle of equal consideration for all.

There is nothing further that can be done in this case, but I do hope that when we finally write a unification bill, which my committee is now considering, we can assure equal justice to all boys whether or not they come from Alabama, Kentucky, or any other State. General Royall is to testify before our committee, and I sincerely trust that he will be able to advise our committee that the War Department intends to reform its court martial.

I think that the decision in this case has been influenced by someone who happened to sit on the board during the court-martial proceedings. I, of course, am not going to let this flagrant discrimination against my constituent influence my decision upon consideration of the unification bill, because I think that matter should be considered like court-martial cases—without any prejudices.

Yours sincerely,

CARTER MANASCO,
Member of Congress, Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, I leave it to you fair-minded men to say whether or not equal treatment was given these boys. If the Department of the Army is not fair enough to correct this unconscionable

miscarriage of so-called justice in this and similar cases, the Congress should do so at once.

These boys are carrying a lifetime stigma because of the lack of conscience of some officers who someday hope to be generals. Let us correct the law that gives officers so much arbitrary power.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is much I can add to the statement already made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], in opposition to the pending amendment. I would like to say this, however, that in all of the hearings had before our committee, nobody voiced any objection to the section now under consideration. The Vanderbilt Committee made an exhaustive study of the whole subject, as did the American Bar Association and many service organizations. There was at no time any objection raised to this section. Our committee considered a volume of complaints but we have no recollection of any objection to the subject which the proposed amendment would cover. I therefore believe the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again read.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURLESON) there were—ayes 11, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 32, line 8, after the period insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) The time a defendant is held in confinement prior to sentence shall be specifically allowed as a credit on the sentence imposed, and be available for credit in the computation of the serving of minimum time of confinement in deciding when the defendant is eligible for parole."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the Committee accept this amendment without argument, as it is obviously what should be done in computing what the confinement is?

Mr. ELSTON. I do not think it should be written into the law. We have been informed that as a matter of fact consideration is given in all cases to the time the man has been confined.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is that all time that a serviceman spends in confinement shall be credited on the sentence that he must serve when he is sentenced. The reason this is necessary is that when the man is sentenced, as I observed in one case where a man served 7 months prior to his sentence and prior to his trial, he then has to serve a certain minimum length of time, but when the minimum length of time he has to be confined after his sentence is calculated, they do not take into consideration the fact that he spent 7 months in the brig before he came up for sentence. The young man, then, is confined for 7 months longer than he otherwise should have been confined and was found guilty for. It is the fact that they do not credit such confinement on the minimum sentence after he is sentenced. That is the trouble. It is the general rule that they take it into consideration before the sentence, but when the man is put into a Federal court he then loses that time in confinement which he otherwise should get.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my colleague, who is with me on this amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the amendment the gentleman proposes follows the ordinary practice in most civil criminal courts?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct. This amendment simply follows the practice of the ordinary civil courts of every State of the Union, as well as the Federal courts.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. I believe as to the question of time it is discretionary. In some cases the men get it and in some cases they do not. This amendment would make it mandatory in every instance, and everyone would be treated alike.

Mr. FULTON. Yes; this amendment would make everyone be treated alike, and take it out of the discretionary class.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman stated that it is the practice in the civil courts to give consideration to the time already served before conviction.

Mr. FULTON. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. I grant that it is the practice, but is it written in the substantive law of the State? In the gentleman's own State of Pennsylvania, is there a statutory provision that time served before sentence shall be taken into consideration?

Mr. FULTON. I cannot give you the particular citation, but I know that that is the law. And if as the gentleman who has just spoken here says, the Army has a discretionary system and that this consideration is given to some people and not to others, then perhaps we had better put it into the substantive law. I understand that some members of the committee feel that this is not a very bad amendment and I thought perhaps you might accept it.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. It is my recollection that it is a part of the criminal code of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I point out to the Committee that the gentleman is an attorney in the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Suppose the defendent himself through his attorney asks for one or more continuances extending over a period of months and thus through his own action deprives himself of an early trial?

Mr. FULTON. Unless there is a valid reason for continuance, such as illness or inability to get witnesses, the commanding officer will not grant the continuance. The purpose of military justice or civil justice is to have a speedy and prompt and fair trial. That is within the jurisdiction of the commanding officer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has conceded, as I understand it, that the time served is usually taken into consideration by the court.

Mr. FULTON. Not usually, but sometimes—according to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. KEATING. I understood it usually was. But does not the gentleman also concede that the reviewing authority in cutting down the sentence or in considering the length of time of the sentence also takes that matter into consideration?

Mr. FULTON. The trouble with that is that these men are in the United States Federal prisons and are subject to United States law. So the law computes the minimum time that they must serve in confinement. This man whose case that I know of could not even get credit for his 7 months.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered is a very good one. I certainly shall support it and simply want to call to your attention the fact that in most all cases except in certain instances after conviction, appeal bonds are allowed. In my own State, only if the conviction is in excess of 15 years, is an appeal bond not permitted. But in all other instances appeal bonds are acceptable. In the State of Texas and in most other States, it is within the discretion of the presiding judge as to whether the defendant is allowed time spent in jail to apply to a sentence which is subsequently imposed.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand one of the main purposes of this bill to amend the Articles of War is to eliminate injustice and inequalities. I believe that that can best be done by making these provisions mandatory rather than by leaving these questions to the discretion of courts martial. Like other Members who served in the armed forces during the war, I have observed the results of many courts martial. There were unquestionably many inequalities with reference to sentences and to credit for time served before trial. I believe that if we spell these things out in the law as best we can without upsetting the disciplinary functions of the Army, we should do so. I will therefore support the amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is eminently correct. I believe this must be spelled out. If we leave these matters to speculation, then inequities are more likely to occur as they have in the past. That is the big trouble now. You cannot depend on the administration of military justice being properly executed, as compared with civil courts in the States, because in too many instances the handling is not done by those legally trained. What else could be reasonably expected? It is the simple truth and the experiences that many of the Members have related bear that out.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I hope the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will not conclude that by asking questions I am against the gentleman's opinion. I am trying to get information. I am a little worried about whether we should make this mandatory or discretionary. What is the rule in the State of Texas? I have been told that in Pennsylvania it is mandatory that it be counted on the total sentence. I wonder what the rule is in other States.

Mr. BURLESON. I think perhaps the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is better qualified to answer that than I am, but I believe it is left to the discretion of the court.

Mr. KILDAY. It is discretionary with the trial court in Texas, just as it is in the Federal court.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield that I may ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] a question?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman or does the gentleman's committee know whether generally throughout the country it is a matter of discretion, or is it written into the State law?

Mr. KILDAY. I was surprised to learn that it was mandatory in the State of Pennsylvania. I had never known of a State in which it was mandatory. As far as I know, the rule that applies in the Federal courts is the general rule prevailing throughout the United States—that is, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. BURLESON. A good reason for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the fact that no bond is provided in military matters. The boy must remain in incarceration while awaiting trial.

I have not told any sad stories yesterday or today, but when I came back to Okinawa from the China Sea right after hostilities had ended in the Pacific, I found that 28 boys had spent about 30 days in a stockade without anything having been done. Some of them had not even been advised as to what charges were placed against them—a disgraceful situation. They were just about 400 feet behind the fox holes which were behind the Jap lines on Okinawa. About twice a week the Japs threw hand grenades in the stockade. You would not keep a pig in such a place. It was atrocious and the most revolting thing you can imagine. Of course, that is an isolated case, I am sure. I do not know that it really serves any purpose to mention it here, but at least bear in mind that no bond is allowed, and certainly it should be mandatory that credit be given from the time of incarceration when sentence is imposed.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. Do I understand that those were marines who were being held under a law that governs the Articles for the Navy?

Mr. BURLESON. Most of them were Seabees.

Mr. GOFF. That is under the Navy?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes.

Mr. GOFF. I am surprised to learn of such horrible conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has done a good job in bringing out a revised court-martial military-justice bill. I am in favor of this amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. At the present time, in the trial of court-martial proceedings, as in criminal law which governs in most States, whether or not a man receives credit for the time he has been confined pending his trial is discretionary with the military court itself. Whether he gets that credit rests upon the generosity or caprice of the prosecutor in recommending it and the court in recognizing it.

We have a peculiar feature about trials in court-martial cases. A man is arrested and confined and the records in his case must be collected. It may be that the records are distributed in various places throughout the United States or even in foreign countries, and it takes time to collect those records. In the meantime, without any fault on his part, he is prevented from having a speedy and immediate trial. In the last analysis, if he gets credit for the time he has waited for trial, probably without fault on his part, he has to depend on the generosity of the trial court. I believe that if we err here in writing this law we can afford to err in giving the man who has remained in confinement 60 days, 7 months, or any other length of time, the benefit of the doubt and give him credit on his sentence for that time spent in confinement and awaiting trial. I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER] has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to make any observations at all with regard to this bill when the debate started. I do not pretend to be, in fact I know that I am not, an expert in this particular field. I have a high regard for this committee and the members of it. As I observed yesterday, I think they have taken a forward step toward bringing about a great reform in the administration of military justice.

Relative to this matter my experience in life and my study and reading in life have brought me to a conclusion. Whether or not I am correct in it may of course be a matter subject to debate and you may disagree with me, but I have made a careful study along this particular line and have come to this conclusion, that ordinarily it is the certainty of punishment and not the amount of punishment that is the big deterrent to crime. As an illustration, if a statute provides that if a man robs a bank he shall be hung by the neck until he is dead, dead, dead, a criminally minded person will take a chance and rob a bank if he thinks he has a good chance of never being caught or if caught of going free; whereas, if the statute provides that the maximum punishment is only 30 years in prison, but if he knows that in 999 cases out of 1,000 he will be apprehended and convicted he will not rob the bank. That has been true down through the ages.

Back in the olden days they used to use all kinds and methods of punishment. The Romans used to put a criminal in a barrel, drive nails through the barrel, and roll him down a hill. They used to burn people. They used all kinds of instruments of torture, and so on, and yet people continued to commit crime. So it is not always the amount of punishment but usually it is the certainty of punishment that deters people from committing crime. Not only that, but if it is known that actual justice, equal and exact justice will be meted out to everybody, then it brings about a wholesome feeling in all of society.

Why should not these boys who are charged with crime and who are kept confined especially for an unreasonable length of time as some have been and inevitably will be, why should they not be given this credit? When they are kept in durance vile, they have suffered the confinement there; then why take any chances of permitting discretion on the part of anybody? There is not any reason for it, and every person should be given credit, in my judgment, for the time he has spent in durance vile in the guardhouse or in prison. The time so spent should be applied on the sentence he finally gets if he is finally convicted. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we will be making a serious mistake by not writing this into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I think in this debate we are losing sight of the fact that in many many cases it is necessary to force the defendant to trial. As I stated on yesterday, one of the greatest difficulties—and I am sure my friend from Oklahoma sitting on a court has

seen district attorneys struggle many many times and maybe many different terms of court to force a defendant to trial—one of the greatest difficulties is getting a defendant to trial.

If this amendment is adopted you will be placing a premium on every effort that the accused can make to delay his trial because as a matter of law the time that he is held in confinement awaiting trial must be credited on his sentence if he is convicted. The sentence would be confinement at hard labor. His confinement in the guardhouse has not been at labor any harder than perhaps cleaning up the jail and things of that kind, but certainly it is not confinement at hard labor. He could subpena witnesses from all over the country, take depositions around the world, and delay his trial for the major portion of the sentence he is going to get. So you are placing a premium on the effort to delay trial. Of course, the man who is held in jail pending trial through no fault of his own while the prosecution is getting its witnesses together, taking depositions and things of that kind, should be given credit for the time he is held in confinement.

The only way you can accomplish that is by leaving it within the discretion of the court. If he does not profit by reason of his delaying the trial, what have you accomplished with this amendment? Let us be practical. If the court feels he has delayed his trial, what is the court going to do? The members of that court are going to add it on the sentence they will give him. Here you are binding the hands of the court on a matter that, in our own Federal court, is within the discretion of the court, and I am sure in the majority of the States, as in my own State, it is discretionary with the court.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman talks about the defendant delaying the case.

Mr. KILDAY. Did the gentleman ever file a motion for a continuance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Many times. We all know in civilian courts you file a motion to delay a trial so the thing will cool down in the community.

Mr. KILDAY. And witnesses will die.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That would not do you any good in an army overseas or some place like that. In civilian trials your defendant is probably running loose on bond.

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot imagine any place in the world that there would be more chance of witnesses disappearing than in an army during time of war when they are continually on the move.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Is this question unreasonable? Suppose they would keep a man in confinement for 18 months through delaying tactics, then the court should find he should be sentenced for 1 year. Would he have cause for damages?

Mr. KILDAY. No. He would have been done a dirty trick maybe, but he would not have any action for damages.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. This case I cited of the man held 7 months in Italy for trial is not an isolated case, because I asked General Eisenhower to make a survey of the Mediterranean area on courts martial and he came back with the astounding fact that this was the usual thing, that they were held for trial from several months up to 7 months. The reason given was there were so many people to be tried that the courts could not get to them. Now would you say that was because the young man could not voluntarily get a trial or was it because the Army court-martial system had bogged down?

Mr. KILDAY. In that instance he should get credit for time held in confinement. But you have the other type of case also. It is one of those situations in which you have got to leave it within the discertion of the court. Why do you not bring in a bill to change that in the Federal court? That is the rule that applies to you and to me.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and perhaps some of the others who are urging the adoption of this amendment are unaware of the fact that our committee endeavored to prevent delay. For example, on page 34 of this bill, amended section 31, article 70, reads as follows:

> When any person subject to military law is placed in arrest or confinement immediate steps will be taken to try the person accused or to dismiss the charge and release him. Any officer who is responsible for unnecessary delay in investigating or carrying the case to a final conclusion shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Does the gentleman believe there would be very much of an incentive on the part of the party who is charged in the Army, Navy, or Air Corps, since he cannot make bond, to want to stay in jail? Certainly he would not want to hold himself in jail.

Mr. KILDAY. That would depend on where he is confined. If confined at Randolph Field, Tex., in my district, he would be living pretty well; he would be in a pretty good set-up, good surroundings, and very little work to be done. On the other hand if he should be in a stockade such as we are told exists overseas, then I think he would be quite anxious to go to trial. I insist this is a matter of procedure, a thing which must be left within the discretion of the trial court or reviewing authority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would say this to the chairman of the committee that just read the section over there, it sounds pretty good that any officer that unnecessarily delays a trial may be punished as the court martial may direct. But, it does not mean a thing in actual practice, because I have seen in Europe where the cases were stacked up three to four hundred, with a small staff to try the cases, and with orders emanating from SHEAF every week, "Why do you not call up those cases?" They come back and say, "We do not have the officer personnel to try them." So, you could not court martial any officer if there were not enough officer personnel to try those cases. They would never be tried and you would still have several hundred men languishing in confinement for 7 or 8 months before they were tried.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is exactly what we are trying to do in this bill, to increase personnel, so that there will be sufficient personnel to bring the offenders to trial, and the section that I just read was not in force and effect at the time the gentleman is speaking about.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say this to the gentleman that during the war, about the first minute you entered the Army, latrine rumors told you that if you were picked up for something, they would throw you in the brig and throw the key away. Then an officer would read the section of the court-martial manual to you where, within 7 or 8 days, I have forgotten which, that you had to be charged. Gentlemen, it sounds pretty good that the high command made it mandatory that you be charged within 7 or 8 days, but after you were once charged you might languish 7 or 8 months in prison and never be tried, and I think that should be counted off a man's sentence.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I agree that the bill as now drawn may tighten it some within their discretion, but the damage has been done to the ones that you spoke of. They languished for 7 or 8 months, and some of them are in prison this minute, with no credit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. Because they could not court martial any officer for it. In the Mediterranean theater the cases were piled up by the thousands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, they were piled up in the ETO by the thousands also as well as where the gentleman from Texas was, in the Pacific theater, and everywhere. And, I will say to the gentleman of the committee that any time he talks to the "high brass" over here at The Pentagon you are still going to get the same kind of stuff

that is in this bill, even though it is a little better than what we have had in the past. I am very grateful for what you have done. You have done a great work, but I still cannot understand this reluctance on the part of the committee, when you have done a good job in bringing out this bill, why you so persistently fight these things that will even make it better. That has been the attitude you have. You have not adopted one single amendment, or at least only one or two, and if this thing goes out it will be a committee bill, and not an enlisted man's bill, and the rest of us that fought in this war. I think the committee should take cognizance of that question. There are many of us who were in World War II that had been trying to strengthen this bill and do something for the bill. There are many who, like me, have been trial judge advocates and defense counsels, too, and they know how rotten and corrupt the whole system was. They can debate as long as they want to and they will not do anything for the boys that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] is talking about, who are serving 20 years, because some officer was so stupid, and the officers of the court were so stupid and so blind in sentencing a man for that length of time, 20 years of the best years of his life, and allowing the accused to be restored to duty and given an honorable discharge.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. For the gentleman's information, I would like to inform him that I am in the process of presenting a resolution asking for a special board to review every court martial handed out in World War II, not involving moral turpitude, regardless of the provisions of this bill or of any policy of the Army or the Navy, with the view of correcting these inequalities, where moral turpitude has not been involved. I thought the gentleman would like to have that information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate that. I think it should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 28, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Chairman, Earl K. Long is a candidate for Governor of the State of Louisiana in the Democratic primary to be held on January 20. Earl K. Long was elected Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana in 1936, at which time was also elected Richard W. Leche as Governor of Louisiana. Earl K. Long became Governor of Louisiana in April 1939 when Governor Leche resigned, and he served until May 1940. Governor Leche and many other high officials in the State of Louisiana, and other persons, doing business with the State of Louisiana, were indicted and convicted in the Federal Courts on various charges in defrauding taxpayers in the State of Louisiana.

The Earl K. Long-Richard W. Leche administration was one of reckless and fraudulent exploitation of the people's money and of the people's rights. Many connected with this regime were guilty of every conceivable misfeasance and malfeasance in office.

Earl K. Long, in his present compaign for Governor, boasts that even though some of his former associates were guilty of crimes against the State, that he, himself, is innocent. He repeatedly tells the people that he was investigated and reinvestigated by various agencies of the Federal Government and nothing improper or wrong was found against him.

I now charge that Earl K. Long received an income in excess of a quarter million dollars during the years 1938 and 1939, while he was Lieutenant Governor and Governor of the State of Louisiana.

I charge that this income is largely of the same nature which his former associates profited in; an income of illgotten gain and graft, obtained in an illegitimate and illegal manner at the expense of the taxpayers of the State.

I charge that Earl K. Long did not report this income to the Federal Government and instead reported an income of a nominal sum. I charge that his failure to report the proper income was a willful intent to evade his income tax.

I charge that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has assessed at the present time against Earl K. Long a tax liability including fraud penalty in excess of $100,000.

I charge that Earl K. Long has agreed to pay this tax liability including fraud penalties, but has requested that final consummation be deferred until after the present gubernatorial election.

I charge this tax claim, including fraud penalties, is now in the hands of the regional office in Dallas, Tex., and the technical staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in New Orleans for settlement. The apparent indifference on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in allowing this matter to remain in abeyance is an aid in protecting an individual guilty of acknowledged tax evasion and violation of his trust in office against his people.

I call upon the Bureau of Internal Revenue to issue a deficiency notice or demand payment against Earl K. Long; and to effect the collection of this fraud income tax claim now, and to take whatever other steps proper under the circumstances. Should this not be done I intend to call this matter officially before the Congress of the United States by resolution asking for an investigation of such conduct by this Government agency.

We have had for almost 8 years constructive and honest State government in Louisiana. Our State is blessed, as no other, with natural resources. We have it within our means to provide a way of life for our people as good as any to be found in this country. We can do that with continued honest, constructive, and liberal government. Louisiana must not again put its affairs in the hands of a man like Earl K. Long, who swindled its taxpayers of hundreds of thousands of dollars, as well as many thousands of dollars from the United States Government.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 34, line 6, after the word "delay", strike out the balance of article 70 and substitute therefor the following: "Each person subject to trial by either general, special, or summary court martial, shall receive a speedy and fair trial. All trials of general court martial shall be commenced within a period of 60 days after the service of charges upon the defendant. Trial of special court martial shall commence within 30 days and summary court martial within 15 days respectively of the service of charges upon the defendant, except upon specific authority by the Judge Advocate General for the continuance in his discretion because of special circumstances."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to make a rule for speeding up courts martial once the charges have been served upon the defendant. It does not relate to when the charges must be prepared. The Army command can have all the time they want to prepare the charges, but once you arrest the man and throw him in jail, then, on a general court martial, they must bring him up for trial within 60 days. On a special court martial, he must be brought up for trial within 30 days, and in a small summary court martial, 15 days. That would prevent what happened in the Mediterranean theater during the war and will prevent these fellows languishing in jail for long periods of time without trial. There is an exception made in that the Judge Advocate General can say that there shall be a further continuance in special cases, but it is necessary for them to get administrative authority to do it. They cannot do it in the field and let the fellow just stay there as they did previously. Now you say to me, "FULTON, why are you so strong on this?" Well, on the summary that I have prepared of the Army, showing what happened in the Mediterranean theater, it showed conclusively that thousands of men were not brought up for trial for a period of weeks because they were so tied up that they could not get to the cases. That is what some of us servicemen who have served in this war are trying to correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. As I understand it, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out the suggestion made by our distinguished friend, the gentle-

man from Texas, yesterday to speed up the trial of court-martial cases?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct. The distinguished gentleman from Texas yesterday said that the purpose of Army justice was to speed up trials and not to delay them. Upon this particular thing we are helping Army justice and we are also protecting the serviceman who is thrown into the brig and has no rights for a trial. He is under his commander, and the commanding officer may think there are other things necessary. In the Army and the Navy, we servicemen know it is always those things that can be done as they go along that delay the most. There are never enough officers in wartime for court-martial proceedings. There are never enough officers who have time to sit in these summary courts and captain's mast. Those are things that are put off.

I would like to ask the committee several things that I think are defects, and ask how you are going to correct them.

During this last summer in Italy, I noticed people in solitary confinement. They were kept there without being given a full meal every third day. They were on bread and water. How will the committee see in the future that those fellows are not kept in there? The one I speak about was 2 weeks on bread and water, without exercise and without his full meal every third day. What kind of a system can you devise to protect service men against that?

Mr. ELSTON. I think if the gentleman is familiar with the administrative orders, he would know it is a violation of an administrative order to do that. I am sure the gentleman could appreciate that it would not be possible for this committee to legislate on a matter of that kind. There are certain things that have to be left to the discretion of the commanding officers, and those who have persons in confinement. If there is an unruly prisoner and certain restraints have to be placed upon him, obviously he has to be dealt with in a different manner than one who at all times is on his good behavior. So I do not see how it would be possible to legislate in order to settle the problem which the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. FULTON. What kind of a check does the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives make upon the carrying out of the policies you have laid down? Do you check to see if there are administrative rules set up? Do you check to see whether they are being carried out?

Mr. ELSTON. I will say to the gentleman that in the case of flagrant violation of administrative orders of the kind he has brought to the attention of the committee, of course the committee would act upon it.

Mr. FULTON. I went up to the Federal penitentiary at Lewisburg to visit a 21-year-old serviceman from my district who had been convicted, and I found that this kid, who had just turned 21, was confined with bank robbers and rapists and murderers. There was no segregation whatever. Is there anything dealing with segregation of these young servicemen in Federal prisons?

Mr. ELSTON. I would say that the gentleman ought to bring those specific cases to the attention of those who have it within their power to correct them. But I do not see how we are going to put anything in this bill that will correct the individual cases to which the gentleman has made reference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I might point out too, and call to the attention of the House, that when we had this man Kilian over at Litchfield, England, where he just took them out and said, "Don't break too many bones," and then when he was finally brought to trial he asked to have the man who is at present Secretary, General Royall, for his defense counsel. What chance does an enlisted man have under that kind of a system unless Congress does something to protect him?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman, a member of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What you are talking about is not the type of thing to put in an act. In California we have all that taken care of under our penal system, and that is what we should have in this case.

Mr. FULTON. Will your committee go ahead and check on the administration and penal system so that these men will be protected, and these abuses will be stopped?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Speaking as an individual, I am willing to look into the matter, and perhaps some kind of an act can be passed that will give better assurance of fair and honest treatment of these men.

I think the gentleman is to be commended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes, to answer questions, and to get things off my chest that I have been complaining about.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I believe there are bills pending before the Committee on the Judiciary with the general substance of which I am in agreement, to devise some method in Federal penitentiaries of segregating so-called hardened criminals from a lot of these boys who should not be classed in that category. I believe the gentleman's colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has been working in that field also.

Mr. FULTON. May I compliment the members of the Committee on the Judiciary for going into that, because I found a young man convicted and sentenced to 5 years under an Army court martial for selling a carton of cigarettes in Italy; and I found another young man sentenced to 5 years for misuse of an Army ambulance for 1 day. I found them mixed in with hardened criminals yet these boys were only in their early twenties.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. It is a fact, is it not, that referring to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that some of the things the gentleman is objecting to arise by virtue of administrative orders and because these certain requirements are not written into the statutory law?

Mr. FULTON. If it is the proposal of this Congress through its committees to go ahead and see that some of these difficulties with our Army penal system are worked out and proper administrative changes made then I have made, I hope, a great point here of the protection of these servicemen.

Let us turn to something else. I wish to complain here publicly of the treatment of servicemen in confinement when they are not given adequate toilet facilities. I found that in the Army disciplinary center at Leghorn, Italy, servicemen were kept without latrine facilities and were forced to use a 2-gallon can without a lid. The can was removed only once every 24 hours. Some of the cells smelled so bad that Dr. Pfeiffer, a New York surgeon, was unable to approach the cells where these men were confined.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman talking about conditions here in America or in Europe where we are going to reform everything?

Mr. FULTON. These were conditions that existed in the disciplinary training center at Leghorn, Italy, that I found on my trip there. They were American servicemen in an American disciplinary training center.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under American officers?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure every member of our committee is in full sympathy with the views of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that persons accused of offenses should be given a speedy trial. Our committee fully considered the subject and we felt that when we enacted section 31 and made it an offense for an officer to delay either the investigation or the carrying out of a case to final conclusion, we had taken care of the matter about as well as it would be possible to do so.

I can conceive of a situation where if the gentleman's amendment were adopted it would in many cases work a disservice to an accused person. For example, there may be cases where men are arrested and placed in confinement, charged with serious offenses, yet the circumstances may not, in the opinion of the commanding officer, warrant a general court-martial trial. Such officer might allow the accused to remain in jail for a few months and then dismiss

the case rather than proceed with a general court-martial trial. If we are going to adopt a hard and fast rule that an accused person has to be brought to trial within a certain number of days, I repeat, we may do a disservice rather than a service to the persons we are seeking to help.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to compliment the committee on its sincerity of purpose and on the result it has obtained in this bill. I think they are going in the right direction, but I also believe that the amendments I have offered are further steps in the same direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 11, noes 31.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 45, line 14, after "SEC. 47", strike out the word "Regular."

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, there is no question as to what the intent of this amendment is. It is simply to allow the appointment of a civilian to the Judge Advocate General's Corps. When I say civilian I simply mean an officer or officers who are not in the Regular Army. By striking out the word "Regular" it will permit the President to appoint anyone in the Army to the Judge Advocate General's Corps or the Judge Advocate General.

It does not seem to me that it should be necessary for the President to go into the Regular Army to find a lawyer or to find someone competent to serve in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. Suppose he wanted to go out and find a civilian and bring him into the Army to serve in this capacity. This would not require him to get a West Point graduate to fill that place.

Yesterday I made a remark in a more or less facetious way that the Army wanted to be certain that it held the authority unto itself. I am not so facetious about that today because I think it was put in here for that very reason and that it was suggested by the Army. I hope the committee may be liberal enough to share my views in this matter. I cannot see how it could possibly be injurious to the purpose and intent of this bill. Why should we preclude the President from reaching to other sources for competent legal counsel to represent the Judge Advocate General's Corps?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the amendment which the gentleman has offered will do what I think it will do, I am certainly for it. I would like to ask another question. Does the bill as it is written now preclude the appointment of Reserve officers or Reserve personnel on this board?

Mr. BURLESON. It does, except that, of course, they may be brought in and given a Regular Army commission. It is entirely possible they may be commissioned in the Regular Army. But so far as a Reserve officer is concerned on active duty the answer would be "no." That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand the purpose is to permit the President to appoint a Reserve officer to the Judge Advocate General's Corps, which the gentleman feels cannot be done now?

Mr. BURLESON. I feel it cannot be done under the language of the bill as written. The individual has got to go into the Regular Army. I can visualize that a man may be brought in to serve in this capacity and may not want to be in the Regular Army. He may not want a general's commission in the Regular Army. But he might be willing to serve as a civilian soldier and to give of his time for a certain period to serve during a war. I see no harm in an amendment like this being adopted and I hope the committee may see it that way.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it not a fact that 90 percent of the Regular Army officers are not qualified attorneys? Most of them have not studied law. The lawyers come from the Reserves.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is correct and that has been one of the things that has carried military justice so far astray. Of course, they should not be criticized because they were not professional men. They were completely out of their field. Someone mentioned the other day that he could not run a radar, or whatever he said, some technical piece of machinery. Why, of course not. Everyone must have his limitations. There are probably self-styled experts in numerous fields of endeavor but I am inclined to doubt abilities if there is obvious attempt to cover too much territory. The same thing is true in the Army and in the Navy. Why not recognize it. The only reason I can see is the desire of the military to keep its closed fraternity.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. In other words, if a man can serve his country in time of war directly from civilian life, he can do likewise in time of peace.

Mr. BURLESON. I believe so.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not believe the author of the amendment is entirely familiar with Public Law 381, the promotion bill, or of all of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I am afraid my colleague from Texas did not read the entire section 47. I do not care whether the word "regular" stays in there or not, but I do want to correct the impression that has been made in debate. Turning to page 46 of the bill, the last paragraph on the page, you will see that it reads:

Additional officers may be appointed by transfer of qualified officers from other branches of the Army by appointment of Reserve judge advocates or qualified civilian graduates of accredited law schools.

In other words, instead of the bill providing that these shall be regular officers transferred to the Judge Advocate General's department, it provides exactly the contrary.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. In the first place, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that there may be a few people outside of the Armed Services Committee that understand this promotion bill, I will say that there are not very many of us on this floor that ever understood the bill. I am presuming that it is a good bill, and I have heretofore commended my good friend and colleague from Texas in knowing so much about it and so ably explaining it here. I voted for it, though frankly I do not know why, except that he said it was all right. It is a complicated thing, but then if you have no objection to this word "regular" being in here, will the committee agree that it be stricken?

Mr. KILDAY. I personally would have no objection to it, no matter how complicated it may be.

Mr. ELSTON. Personally I have no objection to it, except that this is a technical section, and if we start to take words out of a section which was drafted with a great deal of care, we may unintentionally affect other parts of the section. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] pointed out, no harm would be done if the word "regular" remains in the section, since the officers the gentleman is referring to can be given consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURLESON) there were—ayes 14, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the passage of this bill. For too long our armed services have discriminated against the enlisted man, and this legislation is one means whereby we can attempt to restore the dignity of the American citizen who is chosen to serve in the lower ranks of the services.

There are so many things about this bill that I like that it will be impossible to discuss them all. I do want to point out the fairness of the provision allowing enlisted men to sit on their own courts. For many years I have believed that the fundamental right of an accused to be tried by a jury of his peers is being violated in courts martial, because the Articles of War and all military and naval

law specifically and purposely set out the inequality of officers and enlisted men. It is a common expression in the Army that an officer is a gentleman by act of Congress, and the question naturally follows as what that makes out of an enlisted man. Here we are requiring that a soldier may demand that at least one-third of the court be enlisted men. Of course, we cannot know how this will work out in actual practice, but I believe that this will be a step toward equality as individuals in the courtroom. I should like to see every soldier tried by a court comprised wholly of his equals, which is apparently working out so very well at the Umtie camp in Kentucky, but I believe that this procedure should be tried out thoroughly before taking so radical a step. But it is not beyond the realm of possibility that enlisted men's courts will be the method which we must adopt in order to secure a purer, a more equitable and effective justice in our military courts.

I strongly favor the removal of the judge advocate from the chain of command. The old Prussian theory of the use of courts martial for the enforcement of military discipline is violative of our basic philosophy of Anglo-Saxon judicial procedure. No commanding officer should have both the power of appointment of a court and the power of review of the sentence imposed. The change of this archaic and reprehensible system is to my mind one of the best features of the bill. I think, however, that some penalty should be attached to the provision forbidding an attempt to coerce or unlawfully influence the action of a court martial.

We are by this bill rectifying some of the obvious evils in our military systems which were disclosed during the last war. It is a long and laborious process. I desire to call your attention to another evil which should receive our attention soon. We should divorce the Inspector General's Department from command, too, as we are here separating the Judge Advocate's Corps. I intend to introduce or support such a bill from the committee introduced for this purpose, and I urge your serious consideration of such a proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 424, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHT TO WORK

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, had some so-called labor spokesmen been functioning when Adam and Eve were driven out of the Garden of Eden, no doubt God would have been charged with being antilabor and with promulgating a slave-labor edict, for by that command, both Adam and Eve were forced to work, though some present-day labor leaders loudly assert that no one can be forced to work.

However, from that day to this, every thinking individual has known that, if man would live, he must eat. Over the greater part of the earth, in addition to food, man must have clothing and shelter to protect himself from heat; from cold.

Assuming then if he would live, he must have food, clothing, and shelter, it follows that unless he is the recipient of charity, inherited wealth or steals or robs, he must work.

Some say and apparently with every evidence of sincerity, that every man is entitled to a job; that the man who works has a property right in a job and, for good measure, they add that no man can be forced to work.

All three of these assertions are reiterated time and again before congressional committees to individual Members of Congress, accompanied by the demand that Congress enact legislation insuring to everyone a job at a wage which will enable him to live according to the American way of life, while at the same time, guaranteeing that no one will be required to work at any time, place, or kind of employment when he does not wish to do so.

If we accept the premise that every man has a right to a job, we must also remember that jobs do not, like rain, without man's effort, come down out of the clouds.

Science tells us that it requires the power of the sun to first draw the water from the sea into the clouds before it can fall as rain.

Common sense should teach us that, before there can be a job, someone must work to create it. Even the farmer who works for himself, before he can plow his field, sow the seed, harvest and sell his crop, is forced either to clear the land or work to obtain the money to hire it done. Before the farm hand had his job, the farmer worked to create that job.

The factory, mine, or mill owner who employs 10, a hundred, or thousands of men, was compelled to work, he and his associates, before the mine was opened, the mill or the factory erected; before jobs were available.

So it is not only absurd but silly to say, as do Lewis, Green, Murray, and hundreds of their associates, that no man can be forced to work. Before any man can be given or successfully demand a job from another, that other or someone in the direct line preceding him was forced by circumstances to work to create the job or earn the money which created it.

If I am entitled to a job, then you or someone else must work to create the job. And you must continue to work in one capacity or another to obtain the money to pay my wages.

This simple truism organized labor has long overlooked.

Having accepted the assumption that every man who desires it is entitled to a job, unfortunately labor has gone one step farther and now holds that, after the opportunity to work—to live—has been created, then organized labor, through the closed shop, the union shop, union security, the check-off, which is a first mortgage upon the worker's pay, which gives the unions a priority over earnings at the expense of the grocer, the clothier, the landlord—yes, even the undertaker—has the right to say who shall work, when and where he shall work, the kind of work he shall do, and the wage which the creator of the job shall pay.

Having established the fact that employees have the right to work, labor unions inconsistently then levy a tax by way of initiation fees, dues, and special assessments upon all who exercise that right, thus placing a limitation upon what it contends is an unqualified, unlimited right.

They then go one step farther and lay down the decree that only those who comply with their rules and regulations shall exercise this God-given, this constitutional right to earn a livelihood—a second limitation of the right to a job.

Nor is that the end. They take another—a third restrictive step—and deny to some who seek to join the union, who announce their willingness to obey its rules and regulations, the right to become members of the union which has control of the jobs.

The closed shop is on occasion followed by the closed union.

Years ago, some employers required all applicants for jobs to sign an agreement that, if they belonged to a union, they would withdraw; that, if they did not belong, they would not join. That was the yellow-dog contract. It was outlawed in 1935.

Today some unions have adopted that policy in reverse. They insist upon a contract that no man shall work unless he joins the union and complies with their demands.

The man who joins, in addition to his city, school, county, State, and Federal taxes, which already take approximately a third of every dollar he earns, must in addition pay the tax imposed by the union.

Again, though a man may be willing and anxious to join and pay, because the higher-paying, more desirable jobs are limited in number, opportunity to

obtain them is limited by arbitrary rules, by favoritism, by all sorts of unfair practices—hence only the favored few can get the better jobs.

Over the years, because of the development of mass production in many industries, the individual who is forced to work—if he would eat—became a human cog in a gigantic mechanical machine. Herded together by the thousands under one industrial management, employees lost all personal contact with those who determined the wage and the conditions under which they should work.

With the desire for increasing profits ever present, and profits obtainable only through greater, more efficient production, employees were in altogether too many instances exploited by employers. In some few industries, sweatshops were the rule. In others—where there was an apparently high wage—living conditions were deplorable and the cost of living ever mounting.

So it was that the Congress in 1935 passed the National Labor Relations Act, the avowed purpose of which was to lessen the causes of labor disputes. Unfortunately, "Equal justice under law" was not the underlying principle. Though under it coercion and abuses practiced by employers were outlawed, the act threw wide open the door for oppressive practices by ill-disposed labor leaders and officials of unions.

Arbitrary curtailment of the individual employee's right to work—as, for example, in the sit-down strike of 1937, where hundreds of thousands of employees were, by the action of the unions and their goon squads, denied all opportunity to earn a livelihood—and a brazen disregard of the public's right to production and service, created the overwhelming public demand for a law which would protect the employee from his labor boss, the public from work stoppages, slowdowns, and strikes which threatened the public health, safety, and welfare.

The result was the Taft-Hartley Act which only experience and the passage of time will reveal as an adequate or inadequate relief measure.

So much for generalities. That there is need for adequate enforcement of the law by local, State, and Federal officials, or new legislation, or both, in order to protect the individual's right to work, can be determined by a brief statement of what happened in a few recent strikes—some before, some after, the effective date of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Permit me now to give you facts as shown by sworn testimony from citizens with good reputations for truth and veracity.

CLINTON, MICH., STRIKE

The Clinton Machine Co. at Clinton, Mich., is headed by Don Thomas, a young, husky, aggressive, former football player, mentally and physically able to do the work of two men. Starting on a shoestring, he has developed, in restricted quarters, an organization which produces an average of a thousand small motors a day.

When a labor dispute arose, a strike and a massed picket line resulted. Thomas led a group of back-to-work employees—who were satisfied with the proposed settlement of the strike issues—into the plant after a push-and-pull contest with the massed picket line.

Local pickets being unable to block the returning workers, sympathizers from adjoining plants in Michigan and from other States—including some from as far east as Buffalo, N. Y.—descended upon the city to the number of between 2,500 and 3,000. The entire population of Clinton is but 1,600.

Reliable information is to the effect that after the first back-to-work group went through the picket line, Conciliator Raymond Humphrey stated that he was informed by certain sources "that the present situation will not remain as such, and that if no settlement is reached today there might be trouble tomorrow morning or at some future date."

On the same day men on the picket line warned returning workers: "If we don't get what we want this afternoon, watch out tomorrow," while from 1,000 to 2,000 pickets demonstrated.

Emil Mazey, speaking from a sound truck parked in a street near the plant, was the first of the UAW officials to broadcast:

> We're going to demonstrate to employers in small towns that they are not going to push our workers around. This demonstration by Detroit and Toledo officials is just a sample of what's going to happen if this strike continues.

While the besieged workers sat at tables in the plant's yard waiting for breakfast, they were greeted with a shout of "scabs" over a UAW loudspeaker. Names of individuals who had returned to work were read, and Chester "Moon" Mullins, of Detroit, a union official, shouted over the loudspeaker:

> We could come right in there and knock hell out of you. We could put enough pickets around the plant to take the building apart, brick by brick.

Thomas had announced:

> I'll stand back of these rights—

The right to work—

> even if the situation results in my being found dead in the street. I believe I've got 2,000 people in the countryside backing me up.
>
> Violence is a hell of a way to find an answer to this thing. And it's a hell of a union that has to rely on violence to impose its will on its own workers, its union local, and an employer.

Thus was the stage set for civil strife.

When Thomas, having passed through the picket line with returning employees, was challenged to fight and turned on his tormentors, Captain Scavarda, who was on the scene in command of some fifty-odd State troopers, ordered him back into the plant, accused him of labor baiting, and threatened to arrest him.

When Virginia Service, an employee, who weighs 120 pounds, sought to pass the picket line on her way to work, she had her hat and blouse torn, her hair pulled, by Helen Houghton—weighing 168 pounds, assisted by several other pickets. Captain Scavarda, who was standing near, picked Virginia up, carried her out of the picket line, but no arrests of pickets were made.

A State trooper caught a picket throwing rocks, took him to Captain Scavarda's State police car, where he was released by Captain Scavarda, the captain said, for lack of evidence.

O. E. Priest, a man some 50 years of age, president of the local chamber of commerce, who had been interested in the back-to-work movement was accosted on a public sidewalk by one of the pickets who called him unprintable names, accused him of interference with the strikers' activities, and shoved him off the sidewalk. Captain Scavarda, aware of the episode, put his arm around or took hold of Priest, ordered him off the street and back to his office.

Employees seeking to leave the plant in trucks to obtain material were requested, or ordered, by State troopers not to do so.

A Ford auto, coming down the highway to deliver coffee to plant workers, was met by a group of pickets who threatened to overturn it. A citizen living nearby—not interested in any way in the controversy other than as a citizen—called to the driver to come in on his lawn. When the pickets followed, the property owner ordered them off and threatened them with a shotgun. At this display of the individual's lawful right to protect himself and his property, the pickets promptly retreated—as they did on a subsequent occasion when they appeared with a sound truck from which was directed at this individual's home obscene and profane language.

Employees remained in the plant, through fear of violence or from choice, and ate their meals on company property.

Soon it became evident that violence would result if the imported pickets remained on the scene. It also became evident that the sheriff and his force of three or four intended to take no action; that the State police would not prevent the hurling of threats and stones and the use of vile language over a loudspeaker at those who had returned to work. At the same time it became evident that the State police would not keep open the plant entrance and the adjacent streets and highways, nor disperse the crowd under the Riot Act which makes it their duty to disperse all unlawful, riotous, or tumultuous assemblies of more than 30 persons.

At this juncture, State and Federal mediators and conciliators came upon the scene. As a result, and because of the violence and the efforts of the conciliators and mediators, management yielded to certain demands, and an agreement was reached.

Whatever the cause, in every strike investigated the sequence of events was the same—a labor dispute, a strike, a picket line of local employees unable to prevent the return of employees who desired to work, then imported pickets, followed by violence, unlawful assembly, the appearance of State police, of State and Federal conciliators, a closing of the plant, except in Dowagiac, and a subsequent settlement.

Whether the settlement was forced by the violence, the threat of civil war, the inaction of the State police, or the urgency of the "requests" of the conciliators, the reader may judge.

BENTON HARBOR, MICH., STRIKE

In Benton township near Benton Harbor, Mich., Remington Rand employees went out on strike. There was a massed picket line completely blocking the entrances to the plant. The sheriff summoned his deputies, the police of St. Joe, Benton Harbor, and Niles. Through the prompt performance of their duties and without violence, the plant entrances were kept open to returning employees until the arrival of several hundred pickets who were incited by CIO regional officers to charge the sheriff's deputies and the police. Borne back by overwhelming numbers, the police used a fire hose and the pickets were beaten back, some of their leaders taken to the county jail. One was given a 90-day jail sentence; others presumably are awaiting trial.

State police appeared under the command of Captains Babcock and Scavarda, as did conciliators. Until their arrival, the plant entrances had been kept open. The law of the State of Michigan, which makes it an offense to interfere with an employee going to or from his work, was being enforced. Upon arrival of the State police in force, Captains Babcock and Scavarda called a conference with management, and upon, as they say, their request—which management said it considered an order—a truce was reached with the union representatives and the plant gates were temporarily closed. One of the objectives of the picket line, the closing of the plant to returning employees, was attained.

DOWAGIAC, MICH., STRIKE

At Dowagiac, Mich., Heddon Co. employees went on strike.

There was a successful back-to-work movement, some 70 percent of the employees returning to work. Then a picket line, made up of cars—an overwhelming majority of them driven by sympathizers from outside—appeared on the scene. They were driven so closely together that it was dangerous for employees to enter the plant, and in violation of State law successfully closed the plant entrances.

Until the arrival of the outside sympathizers—who operated under the direction of the sound truck driven by one Sirko, who has a record of a sentence of from 1 to 10 years for armed robbery—the local police force of nine had successfully maintained order and enforced the law, although there were a few incidents of violence.

Again the State troopers were called. Captain Scavarda, who had been sent out on all three occasions from State police headquarters at the capital, requested management to close the plant. Management refused. Mayor Black called upon the Governor for aid. The Governor issued orders to the State police to enforce the law.

Upon receipt at Dowagiac of news that the State troopers were on the way, the picket line of motor vehicles began to dissolve and, by the time the State police arrived, there were very few pickets left—practically all of the motor car pickets had left the vicinity of the plant and the outsiders had left town.

On the picket line at Dowagiac Helen Houghton reappeared. She had traveled some 67 miles from her home at Bronson to go on picket duty, as she had at Clinton. Here, too, when a school teacher—weighing 103 pounds—with a companion went through a picket line, Mrs. Houghton—still retaining her weight of 168, but accompanied by an assistant who had driven with her from Bronson—ran down the street and assaulted the school teacher, who was attempting to earn a little extra money to supplement her salary.

At Dowagiac, several people were arrested, some of them for as many as 4 or 5 alleged violations of the law. Here—as is so often the case—the strike over, requests for leniency were made and the justice of the peace imposed fines of $100 and costs of approximately $6 on Thomas Flynn and Harold Marsh, international representatives, and Helen Houghton. Smaller fines were imposed upon three local pickets.

Robert Waterson, the prosecuting attorney, announced that in view of pleas of guilty, five other cases against Flynn and some against local people would be dismissed.

The press announced that it was understood that the defendants will be reimbursed by their union, the total amount of fines and costs being $544.90.

As the principal source of income of the union is from moneys collected from the employees, it is evident that those who were assaulted and other back-to-work employees will be paying their share of the fines and costs imposed upon those who assaulted, those who prevented them from working.

MICHIGAN CITY (IND.) STRIKE

A strike developed at the Joy Manufacturing Co., Michigan City, Ind.

There was no violence on the picket line, but some name-calling and threats. There was a back-to-work movement which apparently was becoming stronger as the days went on. Employees were followed on their way home and threats were made to individual employees.

One employee living in New Buffalo, some 12 miles from the plant, had the motor of the truck, in which he went back and forth, damaged.

Paint was thrown against the sides of a home which another employee was building.

Another employee was beaten by three men as he approached his home.

A shotgun blast shattered the windows and drawn shade in the home of another employee, where the lives of the occupants would have been snuffed out had they not gone to another room just a short time before.

But the strike was unsuccessful. Employees were returning to work.

Mr. Cunningham, of the conciliation service with headquarters at Cleveland, wired the management to meet with Federal conciliators and the union representatives. The conciliators appeared, as did management, but union officials refused to negotiate while the chairman of a congressional committee was present.

Again, there was an intimation that the management should settle with the union.

Again, as in the three preceding cases, employees were at times prevented from working, and on all occasions during the strike some employees were forced, through fear, to forego their right to work.

GALION, OHIO, STRIKE

At Galion, Mount Gilead, and Kenton, Ohio, a distinguished inventor, who ranks with Edison and Bell, by his genius had made possible improvements in telephone equipment and kindred electrical devices.

The plants were manufacturing, among other things, a 4,000 line switchboard, completed instruments and parts for the Army, Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission.

At Galion there were—as always is the case—some who were dissatisfied; one, a chronic promoter of trouble. He brought the situation to the attention of Edward J. Duck, a CIO organizer, from Toledo, who moved into Galion determined to organize the Galion plant which, to a certain extent, supplied the plants at Mount Gilead and Kenton. His efforts were unsuccessful, many of the employees desiring to and returning to work. Then some 350 were penned in the plant by pickets brought in from other cities, again some from as far east as Buffalo, N. Y.

The local police, the sheriff's force, either failed or were unable to handle the situation and keep the plant open. The sheriff disarmed the Galion police.

Two men were kidnapped, are now awaiting trial. Some 500 or 600 windows of the plant were broken. Several pickets were arrested.

A representative of the Governor appeared, and through his efforts a truce was obtained. The union agreed that if the two pickets, who had been arrested and who were then in jail, would be released, the union in return would permit the release of 350 employees who for 9 hours had been imprisoned in the plant. With the approval of the Governor's representative, and without objection from the sheriff, the agreement was carried out. The imprisoned workers were permitted to go home; the pickets who had been arrested were released. Again the law-enforcing agencies bargained—and, to obtain the release of imprisoned workers, surrendered to the union demand.

The management—following the usual pattern—was then permitted to reopen the plant, provided it signed up with the union, agreed to accept the membership cards—many of which had been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation—after the cards had been checked, as evidence of the union's right to bargain for the employees in the Galion plant.

The employees were told that subsequently an election to determine a bargaining representative would be held. Just when such election would be held, or whether in the meantime the employees would be free from coercion and fear, no one seemed to know.

At the Mount Gilead, Ohio, plant a massed picket line attempted to keep the workers from their jobs. Two women, one 54 years of age, the other somewhat younger, defied them, attempted to force their way in. They were unsuccessful.

But here the sheriff appeared upon the scene and laid down the law to the leaders of the strike. He told them that a court injunction would be enforced. When it appeared that the countryside

was aroused, was about to arm, and, like the patriots of Lexington and Concord, would meet the unlawful activities of the pickets in an effort to defend themselves and their opportunity to work, Mr. Duck, "Toots" Martin, and the other CIO leaders, realizing that they were helpless before officials determined to enforce the law, got out of town.

Earlier, at the Kenton, Ohio, plant, 25 masked wreckers descended upon the night watchman, overpowering him. They injured and destroyed not only instruments which were in the process of being completed, and finished instruments, but the highly complicated tools necessary to production. Thus, not only were the efforts of the Army and the Navy to build up our national defense hindered and delayed, but instruments needed by those attempting to develop and perfect the atomic bomb for national defense were destroyed.

There is available no evidence whatever which even tends to show that any interest was served by such destruction other than the interests of the enemies of our country or of those who were seeking to organize the plant. Whether Communists who had infiltrated into the CIO, or union organizers, were responsible for the destruction is a matter of speculation, not of proof.

Over the loudspeaker at Clinton, after thousands of pickets had taken over the town and blocked entrance to the plant, Emil Mazey—and his statement is repeated—announced that the CIO was "going to demonstrate to employers in small towns that they are not going to push" the members of his union around. There was added the statement that "this demonstration by Detroit and Toledo officials is just a sample of what's going to happen if this strike continues."

There was a further threat by a union official that "we could come right in there and knock hell out of you. We could put enough pickets around the plant to take the building apart, brick by brick."

These threats were met by the assertion of Don Thomas that "I'll stand back of these rights"—the right to work—"even if the situation results in my being found dead in the street. I believe I've got 2,000 people in the countryside backing me up."

At Galion, a machine gun, shotguns, a rifle and a German Luger were carried by the imported pickets. An otherwise peaceable citizen threatened to get his rifle and protect his home by shooting. At Michigan City a returned war veteran announced publicly that he learned to kill in Germany, and intimated he would do some of it if he was assaulted in his home.

All these incidents are evidence that the lawlessness of goon squads may, if the law is not enforced, tend to bring on civil strife, a strife which we shall all deplore and regret.

Nothing is to be gained by ignoring such situations. Nor can those in public office, charged with enforcing law and order, any longer hide behind the subterfuge that there is no law, at least in Michigan, to prevent violence and rioting.

Since 1867 and until October 12, 1947, section 28.584 of the Statutes of Michigan provided:

SEC. 352. Any person or persons who shall, by threats, intimidations, or otherwise, and without authority of law, interfere with, or in any way molest, or attempt to interfere with, or in any way molest or disturb, without such authority, any mechanic or other laborer, in the quiet and peaceful pursuit of his lawful avocation, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

That law was amended by Act 297 of the Public Acts of 1947, which became effective October 12, 1947. That act reads as follows:

(28.584) SEC. 352. Any person or persons who shall, by threats, intimidations, or otherwise, and without authority of law, interfere with, or in any way molest or attempt to interfere with, or in any way molest or disturb, without such authority, any person, in the quiet and peaceful pursuit of his lawful occupation, vocation, or avocation, or on the way to and from such occupation, vocation, or avocation, or who shall aid or abet in any such unlawful acts, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Act 176 of the Public Acts of 1939, section 17, until October 12, 1947, was the law in Michigan. It reads:

SEC. 17. It shall be unlawful for any employee or other person by force, coercion, intimidation, or threats to force, or attempt to force any person to become or remain a member of a labor organization, or for any employee or person by force, coercion, intimidation, or threats, to force or attempt to force any person to refrain from engaging in employment. Violation of this section shall be a misdemeanor and punishable as such.

That law was amended by Act 318 of the Public Acts of 1947 which became effective October 12 last. The amendment reads:

SEC. 9f. It shall be unlawful to hinder or prevent by mass picketing, threats, intimidation, force, or coercion of any kind the pursuit of any lawful work or employment, or to obstruct or interfere with entrance to or egress from any place of employment, or to obstruct or interfere with free and uninterrupted use of public roads, streets, highways, railways, airports, or other ways of travel or conveyance. It shall be unlawful for any person acting either individually or as one of a group to engage in picketing a private residence by any means or method whatsoever: *Provided*, That picketing, to the full extent that the same is authorized under constitutional provisions, shall in no manner be prohibited.

That today is the law in Michigan.

Nor is that all. Riots and unlawful assemblies are in Michigan outlawed by statute.

Section 28.789, Michigan Statutes, Annotated, as amended by section 521 of act 106 of the Public Acts of 1941, approved on May 20, reads as follows:

Suppression of unlawful assemblies—if any persons, to the number of 12 or more, being armed with clubs, or other dangerous weapons, or if any persons, to the number of 30 or more, whether armed or not, shall be unlawfully, riotously, or tumultously assembled in any township, city, or village, it shall be the duty of the mayor and each of the aldermen of such city, the supervisor of such township, the president and each of the trustees or members of the common council of such village, and of every justice of the peace living in such township, city, or village, and also for the sheriff of the county and his deputies and any member of a city police force and any member of the Michigan State Police, to go among the persons so assembled, or as near to them as may be with safety, and in the name of the people of this State, to command all the persons so assembled immediately and peaceably to disperse: *Provided, however*, That the above provision with reference to any member of a city police force shall not apply to any such police officer while he is privately employed. (Effective January 10, 1942.)

Section 28.790, Michigan Statutes, Annotated, riots and unlawful assemblies, failure to disperse when commanded; calling aid; arrests, section 522:

If the persons so assembled shall not, upon being so commanded, thereupon immediately and peaceably disperse, it shall be the duty of each of said magistrates and officers to command the assistance of all persons there present, in seizing, arresting, and securing in custody the persons so unlawfully assembled, so that they may be proceeded against for their offenses according to law.

A subsequent section reads as follows—riots and unlawful assemblies—neglect of officers to suppress, section 524, section 28.792, Michigan Statutes, Annotated:

Any mayor, alderman, supervisor, president, trustee or member of a common council, justice of the peace, sheriff or deputy sheriff, having notice of any such riotous or tumultuous and unlawful assembly as is mentioned in this chapter, in the township, city, or village in which he lives, who shall neglect or refuse immediately to proceed to the place of such assembly, or as near thereto as he can with safety, or shall omit or neglect to exercise the authority with which he is invested by this chapter, for suppressing such riotous or unlawful assembly, and for arresting and securing the offenders, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment in the county jail not more than 6 months or a fine of not more than $250.

That is the law in Michigan today.

Section 28.794, Michigan Statutes, Annotated, as amended by section 521 of Act 106 of the Public Acts of 1941, approved on May 20, reads as follows:

Control of armed force: Whenever an armed force shall be called out in the manner provided by law for the purpose of suppressing any tumult or riot, or to disperse any body of men acting together by force, and with intent to commit any felony, or to offer violence to persons or property, or with intent, by force or violence, to resist or oppose the execution of the laws of this State, such armed force, when they shall arrive at the place of such unlawful, riotous or tumultuous assembly, shall obey such orders for suppressing the riot or tumult, and for dispersing and arresting all persons who are committing any of the said offenses, as they may have received from the Governor, or from any judge of a court of record, or the sheriff of the county, any chief of police or his duly authorized representative, or any member of the Michigan State Police, and also such further orders as they shall there receive from any two of the magistrates or officers mentioned in the first section of this chapter.

Nor are the above citations the end of statutory provisions which can be used to protect law-abiding citizens.

There is a statute which makes it a felony to maliciously destroy or injure personal property. It reads as follows:

Maliciously destroying or injuring animals and personal property: Any person who shall

willfully and maliciously * * * destroy or injure the personal property of another, by any means not particularly mentioned or described in this section, shall be guilty of a felony. (Sec. 377, Act No. 328, Public Acts of 1931, sec. 28.609, Michigan Statutes, Annotated.)

There is another statute which makes it a felony to maliciously injure or destroy the home or a building of another. That statute reads like this:

Maliciously injuring or destroying house, barn, or building of another: Any person who shall willfully and maliciously destroy or injure any house, barn, or other building of another, or the appurtenances thereof, if the damage resulting from such injury shall exceed $50, shall be guilty of a felony. If the damage done shall be $50 or less, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. (Sec. 380, Act 328, Public Acts 1931, sec. 28-612, Michigan Statutes, Annotated.)

Then, there is still another statute which, if enforced, would do away with massing at the gates of an entrance to a place of employment. That statute reads:

Disturbance of meetings: Any person who makes or excites any disturbance or contention in any tavern, store or grocery, manufacturing establishment, or any other place of business or in any street, lane, alley, highway, public building, grounds, or park, or at any election where citizens are peaceably and lawfully assembled, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Sec. 17115-170, 1940 Supplement Mason's Code, reenactment of secs. 16825; Act No. 328, Public Acts of 1931, sec. 170, Michigan Statutes, Annotated, 28.367 amending sec. 16.839, CL 1929.)

As everyone knows, assault and battery is still an offense against the law. So it will be seen that there is ample law—upon the books in Michigan, at least, and it may be assumed that other States have similar statutes—to protect citizens in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights; to punish those who, using organized labor as a shield and strikes as a defense, engage in unlawful activities.

The local law-enforcing officers at Benton Harbor, at Dowagiac, at Michigan City, Ind., made a successful effort to enforce the laws which prohibit interferences with employees attempting to go to their jobs until imported goon squads or pickets appeared on the scene.

At Clinton, at Benton Harbor, the State police made no worth-while effort to keep the entrances to the places of employment open. On the contrary, at Clinton and at Benton Harbor, on the advice of State authorities, the plants were closed and workers denied the rights guaranteed them by the State statutes.

At Galion, Ohio, the local officers were unsuccessful in their efforts to protect the workers. Upon the arrival of State authorities, a deal was made. The plant was closed, imprisoned workers were released, when the mayor of the city agreed to release two pickets who had been arrested.

It is not within my province, nor have I any disposition to criticize the State police of Michigan. Individually, the troopers stand for law enforcement. They are alert, constantly on the job, and effective, except when hampered by a policy which Commissioner Leonard says he inherited with the office.

Not only in Michigan but in many other places it has, in recent years, been the policy of law-enforcing officers to excuse during labor disputes and strikes all sorts of violations of the law. In many places, on many occasions, that policy has been approved by the public, but law violations have become so numerous, so serious, that the people now—at least in the smaller cities and in the rural communities—are demanding that all officers enforce the law, prevent violence, rioting, the destruction of property, and all activities which prevent the man who wants to work, who must earn the money to provide himself and his family with a livelihood, from going to and from his job.

Law enforcement at the beginning of strikes, insistence that pickets and those on strike obey the same laws which apply to other citizens, will solve the major part of our labor troubles.

Mediation and conciliation under the Taft-Hartley Act carried on in a spirit of fairness, with the determination to, in good faith, solve the issues, will take care of all others, except where a settlement is prevented by those who choose to defy the law.

EMPLOYEES DENIED THE RIGHT TO WORK

The procedure followed in these four strikes, and the results obtained, are familiar and follow quite faithfully the methods employed by certain labor organizers to impose their will upon employers, deprive individual employees of the opportunity to exercise their right to work, and force them into a union.

Unfortunately, the success of these methods strengthens the organizer's power, not only over the unorganized employee but over union membership, and tends to establish autocratic rule in the unions. These methods violate the Taft-Hartley Act, but since the penality is limited to loss of the benefits of the act and punishment for violation of any injunction which has been issued, the Federal remedy is not always effective.

A study of these cases shows the following steps:

First. A labor dispute, either real, growing out of grievances of the employees themselves, or one instigated and stressed by those who have an objective of their own in mind.

Second. A strike, carried on first by employees of the struck plant or by pickets of the same organization from adjoining plants.

Third. Then, if the strike is unsuccessful, the employer refuses to negotiate, or if a back-to-work movement seems to be succeeding, a calling in of hundreds or, if necessary, thousands of pickets from other cities; if necessary, from other States.

Fourth. The intimidation not only of those who desire to work, but, in the smaller cities, of the whole population, by a show of force, by the general use of vile, indecent, profane, and threatening utterances. The destruction of or injury to company property, the property of individuals, assaults upon those who insist upon working.

Fifth. When the violence caused by the invading goon squads, pickets, and sympathizers gets out of hand, as is almost always the case when the strike is not successful in the first instance, the State officials are called upon.

Sixth. If they have not already appeared, then come State and Federal mediators and conciliators, who, joining with law-enforcement officers, either request or order that the plant be closed until an agreement is reached.

Inasmuch as the purpose of the strike and the picket line is to force management to come to terms and to prevent employees who desire to work from going to and from their jobs, the company's surrender to the request of the conciliators and the police means a victory for the union.

Often it means that those who did not desire to strike; that those who, after the strike, desired, because of company concessions or otherwise, to go back to work, are, during the progress of the strike, deprived of the opportunity to earn a livelihood.

A further result is that often, by the settlement between the employer and the union, the employees who did not desire to strike, who have no grievance, are forced to submit to the control of union officials.

In Michigan, and presumably in many other States, there are statutes, not enforced, but which, if enforced, provide a remedy.

In all the States and at common law, it is an offense to commit an assault and battery. Seldom is that law enforced when the battery occurs during a strike.

In Berrien County, Sheriff Kubath, acting under the direction of Prosecutor Joseph Killian, enforced the law, prevented violence, made it possible for individuals to exercise their right to work, at least until the coming of the State police, upon whose arrival the plant was closed.

When hundreds or thousands of pickets and their sympathizers invade a city like Clinton, which numbers but some 1,600 people, the local authorities cannot cope with the situation, although it was demonstrated at Dowagiac, a slightly larger city, that a determined police force, acting upon direct orders from the Governor, can, and in that case, did force obedience to the law without a semblance of bloodshed.

The knowledge of their coming and of the orders which they had received caused the unlawful picket line to vanish. Similar activities under like orders in larger cities, even though the pickets numbered thousands, would undoubtedly provoke but little violence or bloodshed and, in the end, would establish the law's supremacy, for this country has not yet accepted the doctrine that the law must yield to goon squads, even though in 1937, during Governor Murphy's administration, the police, the State troopers, the Michigan National Guard, and the orders of the court were openly defied.

From that era of lawlessness, sanctioned by Governor Murphy without disapproval from the President of the United States, with whom the Governor

stated he was in daily contact, the country is now slowly recovering.

The action of the local law-enforcing officers of Berrien County, proceeding under the orders of Prosecutor Killian, may be the opening gun of a new Lexington and Concord, which will free the worker from coercion either by employer or union; which will enable him to exercise his right to earn a livelihood; to, in the words of the Taft-Hartley Act, which I quote:

> Have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities except to the extent that such right may be affected by an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment as authorized in section 8 (a) (3).

It may be that a policy of law enforcement, fostered and given effect by the governors of the various States, may sound the death knell of the goon squad, of the violence, coercion, and intimidation which all too long have prevented the individual worker from exercising his right to work.

If it does not, then an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, defining mass picketing, preventing picketing of local plants by invading sympathizers numbering hundreds or thousands, may be necessary.

If an effective legal remedy is not found, the hearings indicate clearly that then will come armed resistance to goon-squad methods, especially in the smaller communities, where farmers and others have children and wives employed temporarily in the factories.

In the rural communities, not only are the folks law abiding but they are insistent that others obey the law.

If the law fails to function, they will, as always has happened in the history of our people, take measures to protect themselves. And, when they do, the ultimate result will be a disastrous defeat for the goons, and irreparable injury to the cause of organized labor.

Wise labor leaders will carry on their battle for better working conditions in a legal, peaceful way. When their battle is so waged, victory will be won, for the overwhelming majority of our people are in sympathy with the men and women who work in industry.

Following the suggested path, and accompanying it with the policy of doing a day's productive work for an adequate day's wage, labor's victory will be certain.

But lawlessness will bring only defeat.

The right to work is more sacred than the right to strike.

CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint two additional conferees on the bill (S. 1317) to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following additional conferees: Mr. D'EWART and Mr. MURDOCK.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a Detroit newspaper.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the president of the National Biscuit Co.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. JENKINS of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Boston Post.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. NICHOLSON (at the request of Mr. GOODWIN), for 1 week, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHAT ABOUT THE RESERVES?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 2 years since the shooting stopped in World War II. It soon will have been 3 years since VE-day. But throughout the world there continues uncertainty, tension, strife. World peace is still only a distant hope, a rainbow, beautiful in the slowly clearing skies.

In a world so continuously beset with economic and social problems it ill behooves us to become lethargic in our thinking on our own Nation's security. We, in Congress, should seriously take stock of our defense plans in order to determine if our program is adequate and if the proper emphasis is being placed on the component parts of our security forces.

Already two world wars have occurred within our lifetime. In both we have been most fortunate in having a dual ocean barrier as well as allies actively holding off our enemies. Both the ocean barriers and the Allies provided us with vital time needed to mobilize our citizen forces, call into Federal service the National Guard, call to active duty our Reserve Officers, institute a selective service system; in brief, to organize, equip, and train our citizens and make of them a fighting force. It took many, many months to accomplish this.

Long-range bombers, air-borne and parachute troops, rockets and guided missiles have effectively diminished the value of our ocean barriers. Our allies now look to us for aid and succor to even maintain a mere existence. To count on substantial aid from them in the event of an attack on this country would be wishful thinking.

All of this can mean only one thing—we should seriously review the present concept of our defense forces.

There are three recognized methods by which a nation may provide for its security. A standing professional force, complete reliance upon citizen soldiers, or a combination of the two.

Traditionally, we have placed our reliance in the combination, although our history, brief though it is, shows the use of all three during various periods. General Washington, of necessity, built a force largely from untrained civilians. The Indian wars, because of their limited scope, were fought entirely with professional soldiers. All our great military leaders from General Washington through General Marshall have advocated a trained citizenry in addition to a standing army.

Modern wars have become global in scope, involving tremendous armies and navies and stupendous costs. To maintain, in time of peace, professional forces of a size to wage a modern war would be economic suicide in a democracy.

With the advance in technical procedures and scientific use of methods and machines which typify modern warfare, it would be unwise to rely entirely on part-time citizen soldiers.

Of all the major wars in which this country has engaged, only two, the Revolution and the Civil War, were fought within our boundaries. However, there is every reason to believe that any future conflict will, initially at least, create a theater of war here, in the United States. A future aggressor will seek to rely on many Pearl Harbors, within our borders. to paralize this Nation industrially and militarily at the outset of war. Therefore, from every viewpoint, economically, technically, and defensively, it would appear wise to follow our traditional plan of a relatively small, well-trained professional force augmented by a large, trained and organized citizen reserve.

From a logical security viewpoint it becomes essential that we consider the relative sizes of the professional and reserve forces, and in particular the degree of organization and size of the reserve components.

Many of the concepts of the past based on wars fought outside this country must be discarded and our plans realistically prepared for a major conflict with the fighting war beginning within our homeland.

With the always-present possibility of many Pearl Harbors suddenly shocking this peaceful Nation into the awful realization of another war, it becomes essential that our defense forces not be paper organizations and that those that do exist in fact be capable of immediate action to the greatest degree possible.

Because of cost, our professional forces will of necessity be held to a minimum. They are dangerously low now. There is little likelihood that they will be increased during peacetime. This leads us to the inescapable conclusion that the Reserves must be large, well organized, well trained and equipped.

Historically, this Nation's security dollars are limited. They have to be stretched as far as possible. Under this condition, some components of our security system may be bypassed or ignored. I fear that such is the case with

our Reserve forces today. They are largely paper forces. They are not on a footing for immediate service, nor are they organized on a basis commensurate with the emphasis placed on them in the national security picture. We must bring about a national realization of the necessity of doing something now, to properly organize, equip, and train our citizen defense forces.

Too much of the planning by the armed services for national security has been based on the assumption that Congress would pass universal military training legislation. Yet the experience gained in the long-drawn-out fight made on this legislation in the House Committees on Military Affairs and Armed Services indicates clearly that years of delays may be encountered before passage is obtained. If it were passed tomorrow, 2 or 3 years could elapse before it were fully effective. This is not an argument against UMT. It is a statement of facts which concern our national defense.

There appears to be one alternative. It is the immediate development to full strength of the National Guard and the Organized Reserve. Thus far, efforts for the development of both are altogether too half-hearted for the good of the Nation. Inaction, lack of training, and low morale are taking dangerous toll in these organizations. The people in the field appear to be doing all they can, but they need more backing from Washington.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the gentleman have any idea how many men we now have in the Officers Reserve Corps?

Mr. SIKES. I do and I am going to touch on that.

Mr. CARROLL. And also as to the enlisted personnel? Is the gentleman going to discuss that also?

Mr. SIKES. I am. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if he cares to make a contribution along those lines.

Mr. CARROLL. I have asked concerning that because it occurs to me that there is not very much information as to how much of the military budget is being used for the Reserves.

Mr. SIKES. A very small percentage. The amount requested, particularly by the War Department, was small in comparison with the over-all military budget. I believe the departments received all they requested from Congress for Reserve and National Guard activities. I am going to comment further on this matter and after I do so if the gentleman cares to inquire further, I shall be glad to discuss it with him. I am glad to note my distinguished friend's interest in the matter.

The strength allotted to the National Guard by the Departments of Army and Air is close to 700,000 officers and men. Today in fact the National Guard is made up of skeleton units, partially equipped, which total about 200,000 men. Can we afford to allow the National Guard to remain as skeleton units awaiting possible passage of UMT legislation? Is it not more practical to inaugurate a drive of sufficient amount to bring these units up to usable strength, to equip and train them for modern warfare, as War Department blueprints long ago envisioned?

The Organized Reserve, in which over a million wartime officers and men signified their interest by joining, is today anything but an effective security force. Only a small percentage of its officers have received assignment to actual functioning units. The enlisted reserves, about 600,000 of them, are altogether too small in number. Enlisted for 3 years, they are only in the larger centers being incorporated into active units. Very little equipment has been released to Reserve units.

Are we willing to allow 600,000 men of the Enlisted Reserve Corps to live out their enlistments without being placed in units of the Organized Reserve Corps? Are we to lose the services of these most valuable veterans of World War II because they have not been integrated into an adequate Reserve program?

Is it not practical to build realistically on what we have at hand? We have today in the civilian components of the Army, Air, and Navy Reserves a substantial force of officers and men as fine as this world has ever seen. If properly organized, equipped, and trained we could have a security force right now which might well prove invaluable in the event of emergency.

Certainly 2½ years is sufficient time for the leaders of our armed forces to realize that something should have been done with our citizen components to effectively weld them into the proper kind of security forces.

All of the blame for the present weakness of the Reserve components cannot be attached to the armed services. Congress must accept its share. Legislation which is vitally needed to help insure strong functioning organizations now lies dormant in this House. I refer particularly to measures for inactive-duty training pay and for a retirement program for the Reserves.

Our professional forces are scattered all over the world. Their job is a difficult and a far-flung one. They are doing that job in a splendid manner. I have no quarrel with the work of our military establishments, as far as that work goes. But we are not effectively using the backlog of trained men now available and eager to serve. They are all that we have to fall back on in the event our small standing forces should suddenly be engaged. It appears exceedingly unwise to fail to take full advantage of the strength and security they represent. A little additional emphasis on National Guard and Reserve organization will make a great deal of difference in the immediate effectiveness of our fighting forces.

All of our security measures have one purpose only—that we will be able to avoid another war while exercising sound leadership toward world peace and plenty. This Nation has never wanted war and never will seek war. We are a peaceful people, coveting no territory, desiring no interference in the rights of other people to their own thinking, political or otherwise. But we do insist on our own right to adhere to the principles of the "four freedoms."

We know clearly, from the harsh reality of experience, that strength is for the moment our best insurance against involvement in war, our best guaranty of the right to build toward lasting world peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address which he recently made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of California). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, in order to bring about peace in the industrial world we must encourage cooperation and fair play in the public interest and prevent either management or labor from using monopolistic practices to restrict production and competition.

As the ranking member of the House Labor Committee, I will endeavor to prove that the Taft-Hartley law is working and show how it protects the interests of the individual worker, the union, management, and the paramount interest of the public.

The data collected by labor relations' field men shows that the Taft-Hartley law is getting results.

Since the passage of the act there has been a much better understanding, on the part of unions and companies alike, as to what is involved in collective-bargaining process, than there has been at any other time in our history.

Many of the rank and file of labor are doubting their leadership charges that the Taft-Hartley Act is a slave-labor law, because the workers have not become slaves and their unions have not been destroyed. They are now experiencing greater freedom from the excessive power of union-hall officials.

The Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 has not retarded the growth of the labor movement. On the contrary, union membership has increased under the law. The teamsters' union, alone, has acquired approximately 100,000 new members since the passage of the act, according to Daniel J. Tobin, international president.

The new law has not affected the ability to bargain for higher wages and better working conditions. Actually, the best contracts ever negotiated have been signed.

The section dealing with the separation of the prosecution and judicial powers of the NLRB is being accepted by union leaders with considerable enthusiasm.

The rank and file of labor is just as anxious as the rest of us to reduce strikes. The average workers earned $72 more in 1947 than in 1946 due to industrial peace. In 1947 there was a loss of only 16 days' employment to the average worker because of strikes, as compared with 25 days in 1946. There were 81,000,000 less man-days idle in 1947 than in 1946, although the act did not take effect until August 1947.

Four million six hundred thousand workers lost an average of 25 days because of strikes in 1946. At $8 per day, their total loss in wages was $920,000,000. Two million two hundred thousand workers lost an average of 16 days in 1947. At $8 per day, their total loss in wages was $281,600,000. In comparison, fewer strikes in 1947 saved the American workers $633,400,000.

We had 1,385 less work stoppages in 1947 than in 1946. The monthly trend in work stoppages has decreased since the passage of the act as follows: In August there were 335 work stoppages; in September, 200; October, 175; November, 150; and, December, 120.

The Labor Board has on file 29,418 anti-Communist affidavits. They have been signed by 20,934 AFL, 6,715 Independent, and 1,769 CIO, union officers. Many Communists were dismissed from union leadership because they refused to sign these affidavits.

The Taft-Hartley Act is the law of the land. But the smooth administration of the act will be greatly hampered if labor, management, or Government seeks to enforce its rights without full consideration of the public. Success of the act will also depend upon the cooperation and good judgment used by the National Labor Relations Board, the general counsel, and the Federal Mediator.

The Taft-Hartley Act does not apply to the railroad brotherhoods. Congress exempted them because they are subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act which has been very successful in promoting good labor-management relations in the past several years.

In writing the Taft-Hartley Act, the objective of Congress was not to outlaw strikes, but to discourage and minimize their effect. Congress expects to protect national interests against the consequences of major disagreements. There will always be strikes as long as we live in a society that permits men to lay down their tools to enforce a demand or voice a grievance. We cannot stop men from disagreeing, nor should we allow the Government to attempt solution of all disagreements.

Our top labor leaders have admitted that wildcat strikes and jurisdictional strikes are wrong. They also contend that unions as well as management must abide by their contracts. Many labor leaders see nothing wrong in making financial reports available to their membership and the Department of Labor. Most of them are in favor of the Communist section which requires labor leaders to sign anti-Communist affidavits.

The principal and outstanding causes for amendments to the Wagner Act were:

Abuses and racketeering by labor leaders; secondary boycotts which deprived our citizens of deliveries of milk, bread, meat, fruits, and vegetables; Petrillo's methods used to deny children in 200,000 rural schools the opportunity to learn to play musical instruments; jurisdictional strikes in the building trades which delayed our housing program; poor administration of the act by the NLRB and open congressional hearings held by the labor committees which gave the facts to the public.

LABOR ABUSES RESPONSIBLE FOR TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

A few outstanding examples are as follows:

First. According to an indictment—February 1, 1940—a Chicago union, along with contractors, prohibited the installation of any fabricated stone finished in the Bedford-Bloomington district of Indiana and members of the Chicago unions refused to work in or on buildings upon which limestone finished in that district was used. Just think, limestone finished in the Bedford-Bloomington area is 100-percent union fabricated and its sister unions refused to use it.

Second. Owners of a cafe were asked to sign a union contract. They expressed a willingness to sign provided their employees voted to join a restaurant-workers' union. However, not one expressed a desire to join. The business agent, upon being informed of the workers' decision, stated it was mandatory that the owners sign a contract, regardless of the desire of the employees. The union agent later informed the owners that "if they didn't sign, they would have to suffer the consequences." The consequences were: (1) A picket line, (2) stench bombing, (3) acid throwing in patrons' cars, (4) seat cushions and tires slashed on employees' cars, (5) roofing nails put in the street in front of the cafe, (6) five plate-glass windows were broken.

While all this was going on, no dispute existed between the employees and employer.

Third. Two New York veterans, returned from the war, purchased a gasoline truck and entered the fuel-oil business. In a short time they had 12 employees. One morning a union agent phoned that their trucks would not be loaded at the docks unless they signed with the union. The veterans told him they had no objection to their employees joining the union if they wanted to and invited him to talk to the employees and hold an election. They held the election and the vote was 12 to 0 for no union. Another election was later held and the results were the same. After that a union agent called and told the veterans to quit fooling around and informed them they would either sign or they would not get any oil the next morning. They did not get the oil. The union agent told them the regular initiation fee was $37.50, but if they did not pay that day, the fee would be $75. They had to sign to remain in business.

Fourth. There was outright open warfare in Pittsburgh, Pa., between CIO and AFL unions. Let us note just a few things that happened.

(a) An employer had his place of business wrecked by an explosion so violent it shattered 150 neighborhood windows.

(b) Another employer had his two one-story buildings damaged. The blast broke 50 nearby windows.

(c) The violence consisted of 5 explosive bombings; 9 fire bombings; 2 beatings; 3 trucks burned; 2 arson cases; 1 truck driver stoned; and 23 smashed windows, not counting those broken by bomb explosions. The people that were injured and had their property destroyed were innocent victims and had no say as to which union should be in control.

Fifth. In some areas, unions have threatened to cut off supplies of gasoline to service-station owners unless such owners join the union. Also similar tactics have been used to force grocery-store owners to join. Remember, they owned their own places of business, hired no help, but still were forced to join a union in order to operate their own business.

There have been more violent irresponsible statements against the Taft-Hartley Act than have appeared against any other piece of legislation in many years. Labor leaders denounced it, both before and after its passage. Workers were told it was a slave-labor law.

The Taft-Hartley Act is not a slave-labor law according to section 502, title 5, of the act:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to require an individual employee to render service or labor without his consent, nor shall anything in this act be construed to make the quitting of his labor by an individual employee an illegal act; nor shall any court issue any process to compel the performance by an individual employee of such labor or service, without his consent.

This act is not a vicious antilabor act, as many labor leaders have tried to make the rank and file of labor believe.

First. The act does not stop industry-wide bargaining.

Second. It does not abolish the right to strike.

Third. It does not outlaw the union shop.

Fourth. It does not take away union welfare funds.

Fifth. It does not stop the union check-off.

The Taft-Hartley Act does stop labor abuses and racketeering:

First. The act does stop jurisdictional strikes.

Second. It does stop wildcat strikes.

Third. It does stop secondary boycotts.

Fourth. It does allow employers the right of free speech as long as they do not threaten the employees or promise rewards for not joining a union.

Fifth. It does prevent Communists from holding offices in unions.

LABOR'S BILL OF RIGHTS

The Taft-Hartley Act will specifically protect the American worker:

First. They still have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

Second. Individual workers are protected against Communist labor officials.

Third. Workers are protected against excessive initiation fees.

Fourth. They are protected against political assessments.

Fifth. They will know how their union dues are spent.

Sixth. A worker cannot be fired on union orders unless he fails to pay his union dues.

Seventh. Members can express themselves on union matters without fear of losing their jobs.

Eighth. Workers are protected against loss of work through secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes.

Ninth. The act protects the individual member against the diversion of his welfare funds.

Tenth. The act gives the worker a right to vote. Every worker is to enjoy the right to vote in an election to determine whether union membership is to be required of all workers. Members will have opportunities to vote to accept or reject the employer's last offer.

Eleventh. They can take their grievances direct to their employers.

Twelfth. Skilled workers can form their own craft union rather than remain a member of a plant-wide union.

Thirteenth. A worker cannot be forced to strike against his will.

Fourteenth. An employee can sue the union in case of an illegal strike.

Fifteenth. The act gives the worker the right to work.

Sixteenth. It protects him against involuntary servitude because he still has the right to strike.

BENEFITS TO UNIONS

The Taft-Hartley law continues the many protections of the Wagner Act to unions and in addition grants new rights:

First. Collective bargaining rights are continued.

Second. Protection against membership raiding by other unions.

Third. Protection of craft units to form their own unions if the majority of the craft desire it.

Fourth. The right to sue employers for breach of contracts arrived at by collective bargaining.

Fifth. Provision for professional workers to form separate bargaining units.

Sixth. Protection of the right to strike.

Seventh. All bona fide unions are to be treated alike.

BENEFITS TO MANAGEMENT

Management who had few rights under the Wagner Act, now receives recognition:

First. Management will have greater freedom in hiring workers.

Second. Supervisors are agents of management and consequently have no protection of the Wagner Act.

Third. The right to sue unions for damages in the case of contract violations, secondary boycotts, and jurisdictional strikes.

Fourth. Freedom of speech in presenting news and arguments, provided they contain no threats or promise of benefits.

Fifth. The right to require unions to bargain in good faith.

Sixth. The right to enforce the required cooling-off period of 60 days before strikes by discipline or discharge of employees illegally striking during that time.

Seventh. The right to petition for an election to determine the bargaining agent.

Eighth. Greater protection to plant property through the requirement that guards may not be members of the same bargaining unit with production employees.

Ninth. Freedom from union featherbedding demands.

Tenth. The right to discharge workers who participate in wildcat strikes.

BENEFITS TO THE PUBLIC

For the first time, the paramount interest of the public and State is recognized:

First. A decrease in unnecessary strikes, work stoppages, and interruptions to production and distribution of goods where the public has been the innocent victim of union racketeering, wildcat strikes, and jurisdictional strikes.

Second. Potential lessening of industry-wide strikes threatening the national health and safety.

Third. Protection for the 75 percent of labor who are unorganized and who might wish to remain so, (a) against force and physical violence by labor unions to force membership, and (b) against the threat of insecurity from inability to obtain jobs.

Fourth. Possibility of redress for damages suffered by individuals and businesses as a result of illegal union activity and racketeering.

Fifth. Reinforcement of the principle of protection of the public interest over and above the private interests of any particular individual group.

The most important item to the public interest is the desire to be protected from ill-advised strikes.

LABOR'S RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

After making a thorough study of the Taft-Hartley Act, you realize that nothing is designed therein to undermine collective bargaining, permit employers to interfere unlawfully with organizing activities of employees or destroy unions that represent their employees. The law preserves the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively when they wish to do so. The new law makes it unlawful for employers or unions to threaten or force workers to join or not to join unions.

FREE SPEECH

This act guarantees free speech to both employers and employees. Employers may say what they please as long as they do not threaten employees or try to bribe them with promises of benefits. Employees can express themselves on union matters without fear of either losing their job or being expelled from their union.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

Union workers will receive more information about their unions than they have in the past. A union must disclose the names of its principal officers and all other officials to whom it pays more than $5,000 a year. It must show how they are selected, and how much members pay in initiation fees and dues. It must make available to members financial statements showing how much money it received, the source, how it was spent, and how much it has on hand.

JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES

The new law makes jurisdictional strikes unfair labor practices. These strikes usually arise out of quarrels between unions. The innocent employer suffers through no fault of his own. In case a jurisdictional dispute is not settled within 10 days by the unions involved the Labor Board will settle it for them.

COMMUNIST SECTION

By forcing labor leaders to sign anti-Communist affidavits we expect to take virtually all of the power away from Communists in labor circles. For years these Communists have planned political strikes to stall our production. The time has come to call a halt to these serious walk-outs led by Communists. Many union leaders have been dismissed by their unions because they refused to sign these anti-Communist affidavits.

INDUSTRY-WIDE STRIKES WHICH THREATEN NATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

If no agreement is reached in a major dispute, such as steel or coal, which might imperil the national health and safety, the President may appoint a board of inquiry to investigate the issues involved in a dispute and make a written report to him within such time as he shall prescribe. Such report shall include a statement of the facts with respect to the dispute, including each party's statement of its position. The President shall file a copy of such report with the Mediation Service and shall make its contents available to the public.

If a threatened or actual strike imperils the national health or safety the President of the United States may direct the Attorney General to petition any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties to enjoin such strike or lock-out. The parties, aided by the Mediation Service, must make every effort to adjust and settle their differences. Neither party shall be under any duty to accept, in whole or in part, any proposal of settlement made by the Service.

At the end of a 60-day period, unless the dispute has been settled, the board of inquiry shall report to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts which have been made for settlement and a statement of the employers' last offer of settlement. The Labor Board, within the succeeding 15 days, shall take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer involved in the dispute on the question of whether they wish to accept the final offer of settlement, and shall certify the results within 5 days.

The President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action. After going through this 80-day procedure, a legal strike may be called if no agreement has been reached. This line of procedure follows closely that prescribed in the existing Railway Labor Act.

UNION SHOP MEANS UNION SECURITY

Workers can bargain for a union shop if more than 50 percent of them vote for it. In a union shop an employer can hire union men or nonunion men. If the employer hires a nonunion man, he must join the union within 30 days or he loses his job.

Workers in a union shop may sign a permit to have their dues checked off or they can pay their dues direct to the

union. However, if they do not pay their dues they can be discharged from the union.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Labor organizations are placed on the same basis with national banks and corporations in regard to political contributions. It is unlawful for any national bank, any corporation, or labor organization, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any national election to any political office, political primary or political convention. It is also unlawful for any candidate, political committee or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

This does not prevent a labor organization from endorsing candidates of their choice. It does not prevent workers from making voluntary contributions to assist or defeat candidates.

SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

Unions cannot strike against an employer with whom they do not have a dispute. The secondary boycott was outlawed because it injured innocent employers who could not do anything about the situation. Also many employees lost their wages and were forced to strike against their employer because his supplier was having labor difficulties. As a result, the public suffers through delay, inconvenience, and excessive cost.

CONCLUSION

I am convinced that if labor, management, and government will make a sincere effort to comply with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, it will provide the system for industrial peace and prosperity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made earlier today and include a statement by Merwin Hart and also one by Mr. Ben Friedman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include reprint of a short story appearing in the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of California). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

FEDERAL TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in 1886 a vicious, monopolistic piece of legislation was pasesd in the Congress imposing a tax upon the people of our country who would have the audacity to go to the grocery store and purchase a pound of table spread called margarine—in other words, exercise their freedom to spend their money as they wished.

Under the guise of protecting the poor ignorant citizens of the United States from fraud, certain selfish interests resorted to sectionalism and, with the aid of a powerful lobby, maneuvered the tyrannical law through the necessary procedure and onto our statute books.

This law still exists, and Mrs. Consumer is forced to pay as much as 20 percent in excess of the rightful cost for the privilege of purchasing a pound of margarine with which to supply her children with a nutritious, palatable, and economical spread for their bread.

In spite of their clamors against inflation, certain of my colleagues, for obviously selfish reasons, persist in throwing every stumbling block possible in the way of legislation to remove this additional cost-of-living item from the statute books.

Even though this imposition on the right of free people has been in existence for many years, the production of margarine between 1915 and 1947 increased from 142,000,000 pounds to 700,000,000 pounds, or a present per capita consumption of 4½ pounds per annum. And with butter at $1 per pound, the consumption of margarine is going ahead by leaps and bounds.

The citizens of this country who purchased this 700,000,000 pounds of margarine are aroused, and the farmers who raise the soybeans, corn, and cottonseed from which margarine is processed are aroused. Why in 1773 we had a tea party up in Boston because of unjust taxes such as this. The American people still retain the fighting spirit that prompted that historical event and it would not surprise me to see them have another "dumping party"—only this time it will have more dignity—the "dumping" will take place at the ballot boxes.

During the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture when the Seventy-eighth Congress was in session, one of the members of that committee made the suggestion that the low-income groups could be taken care of by purchasing lard, fortified with vitamins, in place of butter or margarine. Has any Member of the House ever tasted lard on a hot biscuit? It is interesting to note that this Member's State is prominent in the raising of hogs.

Recently I made an investigation into the purchase of butter by our armed services for the 12 months ending November 30, 1947, the result of which was the motivating factor in my addressing the following communication to the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force:

In the interest of combating inflation and reducing the cost of Government to the taxpayers during these critical times, I have obtained figures from appropriate sources which prove conclusively that the armed services can make one change in their purchasing procedure which will save the Government in excess of $10,000,000 per year without impairing the health, efficiency, or well-being of the members of these services.

Your attention is invited to the purchases of butter from December 1, 1946, through November of 1947. The records of the Quartermaster Corps and the United States Coast Guard show that a total of 26,690,922 pounds of butter was purchased during this 12-month period at an average cost to the Government of 66.84 cents per pound. Had our armed services purchased the same amount of margarine—colored in the same manner as butter, fortified with 15,000 United States Pharmacopoeia units of vitamin A and possessing the same palatability, digestibility, and nutritive qualities as butter—our taxpayers would have been saved $10,077,506.36. The price of the above-described margarine, during the same period of purchase, averaged 30.25 cents or less per pound.

Added to the direct savings effected by this change would have been the release of the 26,690,922 pounds of butter to the open market over the 12-month period, which, of course, would have had a tendency to bring down the retail price of butter to the consumer.

It is respectfully recommended that the necessary directive be issued to correct this situation as expeditiously as possible in order that the taxpayers and housewives of our country will be afforded the relief that such a measure will certainly bring about.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1031. An act for the relief of Antonio Zamora; Mrs. Antonio Zamora; Antonio Zamora, Jr.; Mrs. Juan Chavez; John Chavez, Jr.; Roland Chavez; Selso Trujillo; Dr. M. G. Wright; and the heirs of Keith Lane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4055. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on January 14, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Ben. W. Colburn;

H. R. 769. An act for the relief of the estate of Ruth Horton Hunter;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased;

H. R. 1175. An act for the relief of the estate of Daphne Ward Pope, deceased;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Calvin J. Frederick;

H. R. 1426. An act to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen;

H. R. 1531. An act for the relief of William P. Gillingham;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth F. McCombie;

H. R. 2056. An act for the relief of J. C. Bateman;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Charles J. Smith;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Mattie A. Horner;

H. R. 3068. An act for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas;

H. R. 3146. An act to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3754. An act for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, January 19, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1210. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed list of the lands exchanged under the provisions of the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Preliminary report pursuant to House Resolution 176, Eightieth Congress, relating to the survey and study of the postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAWFORD (by request):

H. R. 4978. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1524), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 4979. A bill to provide for the disposition of internal-revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4980. A bill relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4981. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. R. 4982. A bill to expedite the immigration of the alien parents of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4983. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 4984. A bill to provide for the maintaining of the corps of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the regiment of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy at full strength, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4985. A bill granting the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code to members of the armed forces taken as prisoners of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4986. A bill to amend section 2000 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 4987. A bill relating to the authority to allocate the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 4988. A bill to establish control and jurisdiction of the armory of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 4989. A bill to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4990. A bill to provide percentage depletion in the case of tripoli for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 4991. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 429. Resolution to investigate the conduct of the Navy Department anent the proposed lease of Floyd Bennett Field to the Port of New York Authority; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4992. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Forrest J. McDermott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4993. A bill for the relief of Silvana Serra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4994. A bill for the relief of William C. Pollett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 4995. A bill for the relief of the Belle Isle Cab Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1129. By Mr. COLE of New York: Petition of the New York State Council of Churches, 75 State Street, Albany, N. Y., to the Congress of the United States, in opposition to universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1130. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of La Fayette, Ind., in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1131. By Mr. HART: Petition of Unit 46, American Legion Auxiliary, of Union City, N. J., urging the establishment of a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1132. Also, petition of Unit No. 172, urging a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1133. Also, petition of New Jersey Licensed Beverage Association, Newark, N. J., opposing any further taxes on alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1134. Also, petition of the New Jersey Licensed Beverage Association, of Newark, N. J., recommending that adequate and appropriate provision be made in the Revenue Act of 1947 for an adjustment of floor-stock taxes on distilled spirits of all retailers and distillers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1135. Also, petition of 87 residents of New Jersey urging the adoption of a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1136. Also, petition of New Jersey Licensed Beverage Association, of Newark, N. J., favoring the reduction of the present 20-percent cabaret tax to the prewar tax of 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1137. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of W. H. Halling and 10 other residents of Jetmore, Kans., against H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1138. By Mr. KILDAY: Petition of American Legion Auxiliary Unit No. 336 (Stonewall Jackson Post), San Antonio, Tex., with 35 signatures; Alamo Post, No. 2, American Legion, San Antonio, Tex., with 19 signatures; and Two Hundredth and Eleventh Medical Battalion, San Antonio, Tex., with 30 signatures, urging legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1139. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition of citizens of Jennings, La., in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1140. Also, petition of Commander C. Shea Mooney and members of John C. Bowdon Post, No. 208, of the American Legion, Vinton, La., in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1141. Also, petition of Commander Edwin J. Jeanmard, American Legion Post, No. 236, and members of that post, Ville Platte, La., in favor of military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1142. Also, petition of the American Legion Auxiliary, Arceneaux Unit, No. 77, Rayne, La., and other citizens of Rayne, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1143. Also, petition of Legionnaires and auxiliary members, De Ridder, La., and members of the Rotary Club, De Ridder, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1144. Also, petition of the American Legion Auxiliary, Hackberry, La., and other citizens of Hackberry and Sulphur, La., in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1145. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of A. T. Nelson, of Texarkana, Tex., and a number of other people, urging the Eightieth Congress to support and vote for legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military

Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1146. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Mrs. Frances Peterson and 90 other members of Barringer-Walker Post, No. 139, American Legion Auxiliary, Lyndhurst, N. J.; also petition of Roland E. Waller, of Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., and 36 others, urging enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1147. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Legion, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to establish a commission to hear claims of American nationals who were prisoners of the Japanese; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1148. Also, petition of the Los Angeles branch of the National Customs Service Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of certain amendments to the retirement plan for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 16, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 14, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we turn to Thee because we are sore vexed with our own thoughts. Our minds plague us with questionings we cannot answer, and history confronts us with responsibilities we cannot evade. Who among us is sufficient for these things?

We are humbled by our experience of failure and driven by pressure to act before we are sure what Thou wouldst have us do. Thou knowest our deadlines as Thou knowest our need. We cannot push Thee, for Thou wilt not be hurried. But only Thou canst keep us from being pushed.

Give us, therefore, the unhurried mind and the untroubled heart, by the mercies of Christ our Lord. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Wednesday, January 14, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. D'EWART and Mr. MURDOCK had been appointed additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1317) to give members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4055) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4055) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Senate listens to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address annually on Washington's Birthday. It is read by a Senator designated by the Chair. The designation has faithfully alternated from one side of the aisle to the other each year. The Chair enters an order that this year Washington's Farewell Address will be read on Monday, February 23, inasmuch as February 22 falls on Sunday, and the Chair designates the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] to read the address.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday next.

Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today after 12:45 p. m.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dealing with the pay increase may be authorized to sit during the remainder of the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may sit this afternoon for the purpose of hearing testimony on Senate bill 984, the antidiscrimination in employment bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE COST OF FOREIGN AID

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, tables prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at my request show that the loans, property credits, advances, relief, and rehabilitation grants and other authorizations to foreign countries by the United States Government from July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1947, total $73,092,058,013, and that the same items—partly estimated—for the period of July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1947, amount to $24,099,211,087.

Funds used prior to July 1, 1945, are considered, by and large, to be war expenditures; and authorizations since that time are considered to be peacetime expenditures for foreign aid. I should like to make some observations regarding the sum of $24,000,000,000 foreign aid provided during the period of July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, and the sum of $19,000,000,000 as requested by 16 nations at the Paris conference in September 1947.

HOW MUCH IS $24,000,000,000?

This sum of $24,099,211,087 is $183 for every man, woman, and child in America on the basis of the last official census. It is $616 for every American family. Think of it. Foreign aid has cost each American family more than $25 a month for each of the past 24 months. This tidy sum would pay all the income tax a married man with two children pays on a $4,000-a-year income.

In order to take a look at the cost of foreign aid to the average man, we have prepared a table showing with reference to each county and principal city in Missouri: (1) The cost of foreign aid since VJ-day to the residents of each county and city; (2) the cost of the proposed Marshall plan; and (3) the county revenue received from all sources in a 1-year period. I ask unanimous consent to have this table incorporated as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts [1]
Adair	$3,705,018	$2,955,916	$6,660,934	$317,155
Kirksville	1,844,640	1,471,680	3,316,320	
Novinger	145,119	115,778	260,897	
Andrew	2,381,745	1,900,190	4,281,935	256,575
Savannah	385,764	307,768	693,532	
Atchison	2,360,151	1,882,962	4,243,113	286,879
Fairfax	148,779	118,698	267,477	
Rockport	257,298	205,276	462,574	
Tarkio	386,862	308,644	695,506	
Watson	49,227	39,274	88,501	
Audrain	4,149,159	3,310,258	7,459,417	378,581
Laddonia	107,604	85,848	193,452	
Martinsburg	77,226	61,612	138,838	
Mexico	1,656,699	1,321,738	2,978,437	
Vandalia	488,976	390,112	879,088	
Barry	4,308,918	3,437,716	7,746,634	198,897
Cassville	222,162	177,244	399,406	
Monett	804,285	641,670	1,445,955	
Wheaton	71,919	57,378	129,297	
Barton	2,589,084	2,065,608	4,654,692	164,274
Golden City	158,661	126,582	285,243	
Lamar	547,536	436,832	984,368	
Liberal	141,093	112,566	253,659	

[1] Net amount of taxes received by each county for county, county road and bridge, special road and bridge, and school purposes. The county tax total was derived from real estate, personal property, merchants and manufacturers, railroads and utilities, and covers a period from Mar. 1, 1945, to Feb. 28, 1946, inclusive. Tax receipts for the city of St. Louis and Kansas City include all property taxes, licenses, franchise and other taxes and fees for the fiscal year 1947.

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts
Bates	$3,574,173	$2,751,526	$6,325,699	$249,503
Adrian	158,844	126,728	285,572	
Amsterdam	31,476	25,112	56,588	
Butler	541,314	431,868	973,182	
Hume	89,121	71,102	160,223	
Rich Hill	364,902	291,124	656,026	
Rockville	61,488	49,056	110,544	
Benton	2,038,986	1,626,732	3,665,718	146,642
Warsaw	175,131	139,722	314,853	
Bollinger	2,360,334	1,883,108	4,243,442	73,742
Marble Hill	77,043	61,466	138,509	
Boone	6,403,353	5,108,686	11,512,039	472,488
Centralia	365,268	291,416	656,684	
Columbia	3,367,017	2,686,254	6,053,271	
Hartsburg	28,182	22,484	50,666	
Sturgeon	104,493	83,366	187,859	
Buchanan	17,214,261	13,733,782	30,948,043	1,631,689
Rushville	56,547	45,114	101,661	
St. Joseph	13,855,113	11,053,806	4,908,919	
Butler	6,272,508	5,004,296	11,276,804	257,615
Poplar Bluff	2,042,829	1,629,798	23,672,627	
Caldwell	2,128,107	1,697,834	3,825,941	216,503
Breckenridge	133,224	106,288	239,512	
Braymer	178,425	142,350	320,775	
Hamilton	302,865	241,630	544,495	
Kidder	49,410	39,420	88,830	
Kingston	72,102	57,524	129,626	
Polo	107,970	86,140	194,110	
Callaway	4,226,202	3,371,724	7,597,926	250,978
Auxvasse	89,670	71,540	161,210	
Fulton	1,518,351	1,211,362	2,729,713	
Mokane	99,552	79,424	178,976	
New Bloomfield	91,500	73,000	164,500	
Camden	1,641,693	1,309,766	2,951,459	124,465
Camdenton	163,419	130,378	293,797	
Cape Girardeau	6,912,825	5,515,150	12,427,975	435,537
Cape Girardeau	3,554,958	2,836,196	6,391,154	
Jackson	569,679	454,498	1,024,177	
Carroll	3,259,962	2,600,844	5,860,806	404,120
Bosworth	92,415	73,730	166,145	
Carrollton	744,810	594,220	1,339,030	
Hale	102,846	82,052	184,898	
Norborne	226,737	180,894	407,631	
Dewitt	57,462	45,844	103,306	
Carter	1,131,358	908,996	2,040,354	48,063
Van Buren	83,814	66,868	150,682	
Cass	3,574,722	2,851,964	6,426,686	366,637
Belton	177,693	141,766	319,459	
Creighton	49,776	39,712	89,488	
Drexel	82,350	65,700	148,050	
Garden City	109,617	87,454	197,071	
Harrisonville	424,926	339,012	763,938	
Pleasant Hill	387,594	309,228	696,822	
Cedar	2,140,551	1,707,762	3,848,313	92,443
El Dorado Springs	428,586	341,932	770,518	
Stockton	146,583	116,946	263,529	
Chariton	3,309,372	2,640,264	5,949,636	307,564
Brunswick	320,067	255,354	575,421	
Keytesville	156,282	124,684	280,966	
Mendon	64,050	51,100	115,150	
Salisbury	321,897	256,814	578,711	
Christian	2,477,454	1,976,548	4,454,002	129,193
Billings	82,716	65,992	148,708	
Ozark	175,863	140,306	316,169	
Clark	1,860,378	1,484,236	3,344,614	185,318
Kahoka	325,923	260,026	585,949	
Clay	5,566,311	4,440,882	10,007,193	678,660
Excelsior Springs	890,112	710,144	1,600,256	
Kearney	99,369	79,278	178,647	
Liberty	658,434	525,308	1,183,742	
North Kansas City	491,904	392,448	884,352	
Smithville	141,276	112,712	253,988	
Clinton	2,426,763	1,936,106	4,362,869	282,947
Cameron	661,545	527,790	1,189,335	
Lathrop	191,967	153,154	345,121	
Plattsburg	350,445	279,590	630,035	
Cole	6,388,896	5,097,152	11,486,048	446,003
Jefferson City	4,441,044	3,543,128	7,984,172	
Cooper	3,307,725	2,638,950	5,946,675	273,020
Boonville	1,114,287	888,994	2,003,281	
Pilot Grove	136,884	109,208	246,092	
Crawford	2,322,819	1,853,178	4,175,997	125,973
Bourbon	65,880	52,560	118,440	
Cuba	189,039	150,818	339,857	
Steelville	185,379	147,898	333,277	
Dade	2,058,384	1,642,208	3,700,592	115,381
Everton	67,344	53,728	121,072	
Greenfield	247,599	197,538	445,137	
Lockwood	153,903	122,786	276,689	
Dallas	2,108,709	1,682,358	3,791,067	78,981
Buffalo	168,360	134,320	302,680	
Daviess	2,451,834	1,956,108	4,407,942	216,032
Altamont	50,142	40,004	90,146	
Gallatin	300,486	239,732	540,218	
Jamesport	139,263	111,106	250,369	
Pattonsburg	186,111	148,482	334,593	
De Kalb	$1,784,433	$1,423,646	$3,208,879	$170,266
Maysville	187,758	149,796	337,554	
Osborn	65,514	52,268	117,782	
Stewartsville	87,474	69,788	157,262	
Union Star	75,213	60,006	135,219	
Dent	2,152,629	1,717,398	3,870,027	88,357
Salem	576,633	460,046	1,036,679	
Douglas	2,854,800	2,277,600	5,132,400	81,674
Ava	254,919	203,378	458,297	
Dunklin	8,227,131	6,563,722	14,790,853	363,789
Campbell	326,838	260,756	587,594	
Kennett	1,159,305	924,910	2,084,215	
Malden	489,159	390,258	879,417	
Franklin	6,197,844	4,944,728	11,142,572	368,486
Gerald	67,893	54,166	122,059	
New Haven	183,366	146,292	329,658	
Pacific	308,721	246,302	555,023	
St. Clair	258,030	205,860	463,890	
Sullivan	460,611	367,482	828,093	
Union	388,875	310,250	699,125	
Washington	1,236,348	986,376	2,222,724	
Gasconade	2,271,762	1,812,444	4,084,206	144,104
Bland	103,395	82,490	185,885	
Hermann	422,364	336,968	759,332	
Owensville	263,337	210,094	473,431	
Gentry	2,444,697	1,950,414	4,395,111	197,472
Albany	367,830	293,460	661,290	
King City	201,849	161,038	362,887	
Stanberry	346,419	276,378	622,797	
Greene	16,569,003	13,218,986	29,787,989	1,148,942
Ash Grove	201,483	160,746	362,229	
Republic	144,570	115,340	259,910	
Springfield	11,206,554	8,940,748	20,147,302	
Grundy	2,876,028	2,294,536	5,170,564	186,958
Trenton	1,289,418	1,028,716	2,318,134	
Harrison	3,024,075	2,412,650	5,436,725	300,598
Bethany	490,806	391,572	882,378	
Cainsville	139,995	111,690	251,685	
Gilman City	101,565	81,030	182,595	
Henry	4,083,279	3,257,698	7,340,977	301,548
Clinton	1,105,503	881,986	1,987,489	
Urich	85,095	67,890	152,985	
Windsor	434,259	346,458	780,717	
Hickory	1,190,598	949,876	2,140,474	68,369
Hermitage	36,600	29,200	65,800	
Holt	2,283,108	1,821,496	4,104,604	239,351
Forest City	100,284	80,008	180,292	
Maitland	98,637	78,694	177,331	
Mound City	293,898	234,476	528,374	
Oregon	178,974	142,788	321,762	
Howard	2,383,758	1,901,796	4,285,554	191,501
Armstrong	85,644	68,328	153,972	
Fayette	477,264	380,768	858,032	
Glasgow	272,670	217,540	490,210	
New Franklin	209,352	167,024	376,376	
Howell	4,075,410	3,251,420	7,326,830	171,462
Mountain View	132,675	105,850	238,525	
West Plains	736,758	587,796	1,324,554	
Willow Springs	279,990	223,380	503,370	
Iron	1,910,520	1,524,240	3,434,760	80,436
Ironton	198,189	158,118	356,307	
Jackson	87,442,524	69,762,888	157,205,412	11,845,409
Blue Springs	144,204	115,048	259,252	
Buckner	104,493	83,366	187,859	
Fairmount	458,415	365,730	824,145	
Grandview	109,068	87,016	196,084	
Independence	2,940,078	2,345,636	5,285,714	
Lee's Summit	414,129	330,398	744,527	
Oak Grove	124,440	99,280	223,720	
Raytown	91,500	73,000	164,500	
Sugar Creek	299,754	239,148	538,902	
Kansas City	73,049,574	58,279,988	131,329,562	16,748,682
Jasper	14,403,015	11,490,930	25,893,945	980,344
Carl Junction	190,137	151,694	341,831	
Carthage	1,937,055	1,545,410	3,482,465	
Jasper	147,132	117,384	264,516	
Joplin	6,797,352	5,423,024	12,220,376	
Sarcoxie	193,431	154,322	347,753	
Webb City	1,287,039	1,026,818	2,313,857	
Jefferson	5,860,209	4,675,358	10,535,567	494,974
Crystal City	625,311	498,882	1,124,193	
De Soto	937,143	747,666	1,684,809	
Festus	845,460	674,520	1,519,980	
Herculaneum	329,400	262,800	592,200	
Hillsboro	46,848	37,376	84,224	
Johnson	3,955,911	3,156,082	7,111,993	378,115
Holden	332,694	265,428	598,122	
Knob Noster	117,120	93,440	210,560	
Warrensburg	1,073,844	856,728	1,930,572	
Knox	1,624,674	1,296,188	2,920,862	174,844
Edina	299,571	239,002	538,573	
Hurdland	56,913	45,406	102,319	
Knox City	76,677	61,174	137,851	
Laclede	3,425,394	2,732,828	6,158,222	162,636
Conway	94,428	75,336	169,764	
Lebanon	919,575	733,650	1,653,225	
Lafayette	$5,097,648	$4,066,976	$9,164,624	$498,657
Concordia	197,091	157,242	354,333	
Corder	115,290	91,980	207,270	
Higginsville	646,539	515,818	1,162,357	
Lexington	977,403	779,786	1,757,189	
Odessa	344,223	274,626	618,849	
Waverly	160,308	127,896	288,204	
Lawrence	4,508,571	3,597,002	8,105,573	270,534
Aurora	742,248	592,176	1,334,424	
Marionville	206,241	164,542	370,783	
Miller	94,977	75,774	170,751	
Mount Vernon	362,706	289,372	652,078	
Pierce City	221,064	176,368	397,432	
Lewis	2,102,670	1,677,540	3,780,210	189,348
Canton	388,875	310,250	699,125	
La Belle	152,439	121,618	274,057	
La Grange	223,626	178,412	402,038	
Lewistown	75,945	60,590	136,535	
Lincoln	2,634,285	2,101,670	4,735,955	228,928
Elsberry	283,284	226,008	509,292	
Troy	273,219	217,978	491,197	
Linn	3,919,128	3,126,736	7,045,864	308,757
Brookfield	1,129,842	901,404	2,031,246	
Browning	97,173	77,526	174,699	
Bucklin	154,086	122,932	277,018	
Linneus	128,832	102,784	231,616	
Marceline	586,698	468,076	1,054,774	
Meadville	93,147	74,314	167,461	
Livingston	3,294,000	2,628,000	5,922,000	194,088
Chillicothe	1,466,196	1,169,752	2,635,948	
McDonald	2,882,067	2,299,354	5,181,421	110,639
Anderson	171,654	136,948	308,602	
Noel	94,245	75,190	169,435	
Pineville	95,892	76,504	172,396	
South West City	96,075	76,650	172,725	
Macon	3,915,468	3,123,816	7,039,284	332,332
Atlanta	92,781	74,022	166,803	
La Plata	260,043	207,466	467,509	
Macon	769,698	614,076	1,383,774	
New Cambria	58,194	46,428	104,622	
Madison	1,767,948	1,409,776	3,176,824	87,467
Fredericktown	624,762	498,444	1,123,206	
Maries	1,580,754	1,261,148	2,841,902	72,925
Belle	113,643	90,666	204,309	
Vienna	79,239	63,218	142,457	
Marion	5,778,408	4,610,096	10,388,504	395,461
Hannibal	3,818,295	3,046,290	6,864,585	
Palmyra	418,155	333,610	751,765	
Mercer	1,604,178	1,279,836	2,884,014	130,328
Princeton	289,872	231,264	521,136	
Miller	2,708,034	2,160,508	4,868,542	198,515
Eldon	473,970	378,140	852,110	
Iberia	88,938	70,956	159,894	
Tuscumbia	49,227	39,274	88,501	
Mississippi	4,236,267	3,379,754	7,616,021	188,926
Charleston	948,306	756,572	1,704,878	
East Prairie	451,827	360,474	812,301	
Moniteau	2,154,825	1,719,150	3,873,975	150,447
California	462,075	368,650	830,725	
Tipton	223,077	177,974	401,051	
Monroe	2,414,685	1,926,470	4,341,155	210,803
Madison	114,375	91,250	205,625	
Monroe City	361,974	288,788	650,762	
Paris	269,559	215,058	484,617	
Montgomery	2,276,886	1,816,532	4,093,418	183,645
Middletown	44,469	35,478	79,947	
Montgomery City	305,793	243,966	549,759	
New Florence	103,395	82,490	185,885	
Rhineland	37,332	29,784	67,116	
Wellsville	240,462	191,844	432,306	
Morgan	2,038,620	1,626,440	3,665,060	140,184
Stover	106,872	85,264	192,136	
Versailles	325,923	260,026	585,949	
New Madrid	7,281,021	5,808,902	13,089,923	361,455
Gideon	293,898	234,476	528,374	
Lilbourn	252,174	201,188	453,362	
New Madrid	448,350	357,700	806,050	
Parma	217,221	173,302	390,523	
Portageville	385,581	307,622	693,203	
Risco	78,507	62,634	141,141	
Newton	5,314,137	4,239,694	9,553,831	307,855
Diamond	88,938	70,956	159,894	
Granby	266,265	212,430	478,695	
Neosho	973,194	776,428	1,749,622	
Seneca	199,653	159,286	358,939	
Nodaway	4,676,748	3,731,176	8,407,924	540,044
Clearmont	44,469	35,478	79,947	
Elmo	58,194	46,428	104,622	
Hopkins	152,622	121,764	274,386	
Maryville	1,043,100	832,200	1,875,300	
Ravenwood	61,488	49,056	110,544	
Skidmore	91,134	72,708	163,842	
Oregon	2,450,370	1,954,940	4,405,310	101,783
Alton	105,408	84,096	189,504	
Koshkonong	51,606	41,172	92,778	
Thayer	309,636	247,032	556,668	
Osage	2,264,625	1,806,750	4,071,375	118,222
Chamois	141,093	112,566	253,659	
Linn	123,708	98,696	222,404	
Meta	69,723	55,626	125,349	

County and cities	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Foreign aid proposed by Marshall plan	Total foreign aid provided and proposed	Annual tax receipts
Ozark	$1,970,178	$1,571,836	$3,542,014	$55,459
Bakersfield	32,391	25,842	58,233	
Gainesville	46,665	37,230	83,895	
Pemiscot	8,574,831	6,841,122	15,415,953	385,072
Caruthersville	1,209,996	965,352	2,175,348	
Hayti	480,924	383,688	864,612	
Steele	290,055	231,410	521,465	
Perry	2,810,514	2,242,268	5,052,782	118,760
Perryville	714,981	570,422	1,285,403	
Pettis	6,100,488	4,867,056	10,967,544	562,254
Green Ridge	64,050	51,100	115,150	
La Monte	89,853	71,686	161,539	
Sedalia	3,738,324	2,982,488	6,720,812	
Smithton	73,932	58,984	132,916	
Phelps	3,190,971	2,545,802	5,736,773	178,826
Newburg	193,248	154,176	347,424	
Rolla	940,803	750,586	1,691,389	
St. James	331,596	264,552	596,148	
Pike	3,353,841	2,675,742	6,029,583	231,052
Bowling Green	361,425	288,350	649,775	
Clarksville	160,857	128,334	289,191	
Louisiana	854,427	681,674	1,536,101	
Platte	2,536,746	2,023,852	4,560,598	285,214
Dearborn	83,448	66,576	150,024	
Parkville	122,793	97,966	220,759	
Platte City	123,525	98,550	222,075	
Weston	205,143	163,666	368,809	
Polk	3,184,200	2,540,400	5,724,600	183,549
Bolivar	482,388	384,856	867,244	
Humansville	143,838	114,756	258,594	
Pulaski	1,971,825	1,573,150	3,544,975	101,636
Crocker	82,899	66,138	149,037	
Dixon	135,603	108,186	243,789	
Richland	180,255	143,810	324,065	
Waynesville	85,644	68,328	153,972	
Putnam	2,072,841	1,653,742	3,726,583	116,909
Unionville	375,516	299,592	675,108	
Ralls	1,837,320	1,465,840	3,303,160	170,192
Center	89,304	71,248	160,552	
Perry	151,890	121,180	273,070	
Randolph	4,475,814	3,570,868	8,046,682	359,700
Clifton Hill	50,874	40,588	91,462	
Higbee	160,491	128,042	288,533	
Huntsville	318,237	253,894	572,131	
Moberly	2,364,360	1,886,320	4,250,680	
Ray	3,400,872	2,713,264	6,114,136	343,894
Hardin	147,315	117,530	264,845	
Lawson	93,513	74,606	168,119	
Orrick	121,878	97,236	219,114	
Richmond	775,920	619,040	1,394,960	
Reynolds	1,714,710	1,368,020	3,082,730	53,475
Centerville	54,900	43,800	98,700	
Ellington	155,367	123,954	279,321	
Ripley	2,306,898	1,840,476	4,147,374	82,554
Doniphan	293,532	234,184	527,716	
St. Charles	4,677,846	3,732,052	8,409,898	366,109
St. Charles	1,976,949	1,577,238	3,554,187	
Wentzville	137,616	109,792	247,408	
St. Clair	2,405,718	1,919,316	4,325,034	126,172
Appleton City	217,404	173,448	390,852	
Osceola	217,770	173,740	391,510	
St. Francois	6,578,850	5,248,700	11,827,550	605,784
Bismarck	238,266	190,092	428,358	
Bonne Terre	682,590	544,580	1,227,170	
Farmington	684,054	545,748	1,229,802	
Flat River	988,383	788,546	1,776,929	
Ste. Genevieve	1,995,615	1,592,130	3,587,745	111,215
Ste. Genevieve	510,021	406,902	916,923	
St. Louis	50,184,090	40,037,580	90,221,670	7,483,711
Ballwin	68,625	54,750	123,375	
Clayton	2,391,627	1,908,074	4,299,701	
Ferguson	1,047,492	835,704	1,883,196	
Kirkwood	2,220,156	1,771,272	3,991,428	
Maplewood	2,356,125	1,879,750	4,235,875	
Lemay	2,298,846	1,834,052	4,132,898	
Overland	536,922	428,364	965,286	
Normandy	1,270,569	1,013,678	2,284,247	
Pinelawn	3,686,718	2,941,316	6,628,034	
University City	6,043,209	4,821,358	10,864,567	
Webster Groves	3,366,102	2,685,524	6,051,626	
Wellston	2,079,429	1,658,998	3,738,427	
St. Louis City	149,336,784	119,143,008	268,479,792	27,195,548
Saline	5,383,128	4,294,736	9,677,864	545,336
Marshall	1,561,539	1,245,818	2,807,357	
Slater	561,810	448,220	1,010,030	
Sweet Springs	258,579	206,298	464,877	
Schuyler	1,212,741	967,542	2,180,283	95,908
Downing	92,781	74,022	166,803	
Greentop	46,482	37,084	83,566	
Lancaster	162,138	129,356	291,494	
Queen City	118,218	94,316	212,534	
Scotland	1,565,931	1,249,322	2,815,253	57,046
Gorin	91,500	73,000	164,500	
Memphis	354,105	282,510	636,615	
Scott	5,558,991	4,435,042	9,994,033	297,065
Benton	74,664	59,568	134,232	
Chaffee	557,967	445,154	1,003,121	
Illmo	223,992	178,704	402,696	
Sikeston	1,453,752	1,159,824	2,613,576	
Shannon	$2,165,073	$1,727,326	$3,892,399	$141,949
Birch Tree	90,585	72,270	162,855	
Eminence	76,311	60,882	137,193	
Winona	87,840	70,080	157,920	
Shelby	2,053,992	1,638,704	3,692,696	201,103
Clarence	211,731	168,922	380,653	
Hunnewell	57,096	45,552	102,648	
Shelbina	385,581	307,622	693,203	
Shelbyville	138,348	110,376	248,724	
Stoddard	6,040,647	4,819,314	10,859,961	316,474
Bloomfield	221,064	176,368	397,432	
Bernie	212,280	169,360	381,640	
Dexter	568,764	453,768	1,022,532	
Puxico	144,936	115,632	260,568	
Stone	2,067,534	1,649,508	3,717,042	90,531
Crane	185,379	147,898	333,277	
Galena	92,781	74,022	166,803	
Sullivan	2,567,283	2,000,346	4,507,629	174,975
Green City	127,551	101,762	229,313	
Milan	368,928	294,336	663,264	
Taney	1,889,109	1,507,158	3,396,267	89,599
Branson	185,013	147,606	332,619	
Forsyth	53,070	42,340	95,410	
Texas	3,625,779	2,892,698	6,518,477	160,161
Cabool	195,627	156,074	351,701	
Houston	150,060	119,720	269,780	
Licking	109,434	87,308	196,742	
Vernon	4,682,238	3,735,556	8,417,794	282,149
Bronaugh	48,495	38,690	87,185	
Nevada	1,497,123	1,194,426	2,691,549	
Sheldon	84,729	67,598	152,327	
Warren	1,415,322	1,129,164	2,544,486	108,461
Marthasville	58,743	46,866	105,609	
Warrenton	229,482	183,084	412,566	
Washington	3,201,036	2,553,832	5,754,868	121,104
Potosi	369,111	294,482	663,593	
Wayne	2,341,302	1,867,924	4,209,226	78,774
Greenville	104,676	83,512	188,188	
Piedmont	215,391	171,842	387,231	
Webster	3,152,358	2,514,996	5,667,354	140,941
Marshfield	322,812	257,544	580,356	
Seymour	137,433	109,646	247,079	
Worth	1,161,135	926,370	2,087,505	132,451
Grant City	221,247	176,514	397,761	
Wright	3,287,961	2,623,182	5,911,143	100,912
Hartville	71,919	57,378	129,297	
Mansfield	168,726	134,612	303,338	
Mountain Grove	444,873	354,926	799,799	
Norwood	72,834	58,108	130,942	

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it will be observed from this table that the residents of my native county of Macon, a typical northeast Missouri county, have since VJ-day paid, on a per capita basis, a total of $3,915,468 for foreign aid; the Marshall plan, as proposed at the Paris conference, will cost them $3,123,816 more in the next 4 years, making a total foreign-aid bill of $7,039,284 for this county in northeastern Missouri. That is more money than Macon County, Mo., has collected in taxes during the past 20 years.

For 2 years the Federal Government has collected, on a per capita basis, a foreign-aid tax bill from the people of Macon County that is 11 times their county annual tax bill of $332,332.76. The Marshall plan, if adopted, will cost them as much in the next 4 years as all their county, county road, and school taxes will cost in the next 9 years.

Taney County, Mo., lies in what is known as the Shepherd of the Hills country. The residents of this Ozark county have a $90,000 annual county, road, and school tax bill, but their foreign-aid bill from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, is 20 times their annual tax bill. Those people can multiply the tax bill they get from the county collector, for county, county road, and school purposes by 10 if they want to know what their annual share of the $24,000,000,000 foreign aid provided since VJ-day amounts to. Similar comparisons can be made for the residents of every county in Missouri. I dare say it is substantially the same for every county in the United States.

The civic-minded, progressive citizens of Kansas City, Mo., my own home city, recently concluded a successful campaign for approval at the polls of a $41,500,000 bond issue to pay for public improvements to be completed within the next 15 years. These bonds will run for 20 years, so we will probably be paying on them for the next 35 years. Since VJ-day, on the other hand, the people of Kansas City have provided $73,049,524 in foreign aid. If the Federal Government had distributed foreign aid to our own people, on a per capita basis, the people of Kansas City could have their bonds already paid and have enough left over to pay all the city taxes and license fees for the next 22 months.

The proposed Marshall plan will cost the people of Kansas City another $58,000,000 in the next 4 years. We may well contemplate the slums this would clear, the hospitals, homes, schools, and streets this would build; the playgrounds, parks, airports, and other improvements it would provide.

It takes a two-thirds vote by the people of Kansas City to pass a bond issue for their own public works and improvements; but foreign aid, costing nearly twice the recent bond issue, has already been appropriated by the Congress without the people of this country having had an opportunity to pass on the matter at the polls. It is interesting to speculate how the people of Kansas City would vote on a $58,000,000 bond issue to pay their share of the Marshall plan. It would be even more interesting to see what would happen to city officials who would raise every city tax and license fee in Kansas City the necessary 85 percent for the next 4 years just to pay Kansas Citians' per capita share of the Marshall plan.

Every major city in Missouri and most of the large cities in the United States can barely make ends meet. They have increased taxes time after time until they have about reached the limits set by the Constitution or by the taxpayers. The city of St. Louis has had a very economical administration. A city income tax was recently declared invalid by the Missouri Supreme Court with the result that there has been no alternative but to economize. The city administration has been compelled to reduce the number of city employees. The mayor has even asked the police and fire departments to reduce their personnel. Employees in some departments voluntarily have taken pay cuts in order that sufficient people may be kept on the city pay roll to render necessary service to the public. The maintenance of public buildings and streets has been allowed to lag. The building of public improvements has been postponed.

It is interesting to compare the financial predicament of the cities with the price their residents have paid and are being asked to pay for foreign aid. Since VJ-day the residents of St. Louis have provided for foreign aid $149,336,784, figured on a per capita basis. Under the 4-year Marshall plan they will provide an additional $119,143,008, making

the 6-year total $268,479,792. This is enough to pay all the city taxes in St. Louis for 10 years.

Unfortunately this is only the first cost of foreign aid. An additional cost is found on the price tag of every essential product. The high cost of giving is a major cause of the high cost of living in this country today. Every dollar sent to Europe weakens by that much our own national economy. We are distributing our wealth and resources around the world without the benefit that comes from ordinary foreign trade. Every such expenditure not only increases our national debt and the burden of taxation but causes shortages of scarce goods in our own country. This process raises prices, promotes inflation, and intensifies our own difficulties. The ultimate result will inevitably be to reduce our own national economy to the level of the countries we want to help and to make us as vulnerable as they are to communism. Instead of setting an example to lead Europe out of her economic and political chaos we may be forced to adopt the same economic planning and controls that we find plaguing Europe today, with such tragic results.

DEATH OF JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I am deeply grieved to announce to the Senate the death of Hon. Josephus Daniels, which occurred at his home in Raleigh, N. C., on Thursday afternoon, January 15, 1948, after an illness of 10 days.

Mr. Daniels was North Carolina's most distinguished citizen. For the past 50 years he has held many positions of prominence and power in the Nation and has always discharged the high duties imposed upon him with great distinction to himself and credit to his State.

Mr. Daniels was 85 years of age but still in full vigor of physical and mental strength, and he was actively engaged in the editorship of the Raleigh News and Observer, one of the influential papers of the Nation. He was editor of this paper for 50 years.

Mr. Daniels first became known to the Nation when he was appointed Secretary of the Navy by President Woodrow Wilson in 1913, and he served 8 years in that important position. His record received the stamp of approval of the whole Nation. He inaugurated many reforms in the Navy which were at first unpopular but which added tremendously to the morale of the Navy, and later received the approval of the Navy and the public. Mr. Daniels was proud of the achievement of the Navy in convoying more than 2,000,000 American troops to Europe during World War I without the loss of a single life, notwithstanding the fact that the ocean was infested with submarines, and the voyages were made in the face of constant danger and hazard. He was the last survivor of the Wilson Cabinet.

After his retirement, on March 4, 1921, Mr. Daniels returned to the editorship of his paper and remained at this post until he was appointed Ambassador to Mexico by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933. It so happened that President Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy under Mr. Daniels, and was acquainted with his great ability, high integrity, and fine diplomacy. The service of Mr. Daniels justified this appraisal of him by the President, because he was able to establish and maintain good relationships with our neighbor to the South, and during his 8 years of service as Ambassador to Mexico the good-neighbor policy reached full fruition. The good results of his tenure of office continue to this day.

In 1941 Mr. Daniels returned to Raleigh, having resigned the Ambassadorship, and resumed again the editorship of his paper and the writing of many valuable books, which proved a great contribution to the history of the era in which he was such a vital factor. These books have gained large circulation.

In a brief word, Mr. Daniels, as editor, statesman, diplomat, and author, achieved distinction and renown, and in each field was able to make an outstanding contribution to his day and generation.

He was a crusader for any cause which enlisted his sympathy and stirred his enthusiasm. He believed definitely in popular government and democratic processes of life. He had an unfailing faith in the God whom he worshipped with sincerity and devotion, and reposed unshaken confidence in his fellow man.

All North Carolina mourns his passing, and friends and acquaintances throughout the Nation will shed a tear in honor of his memory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday, at his home in Raleigh, N. C., surrounded by family and friends and those he loved best, Josephus Daniels, suffering from pneumonia, quietly slipped out of the company of living men.

The Nation mourns his passing. He was a great American, who loved his country, and served it nobly and well. Three great Presidents called him into the public service. He first served under Grover Cleveland, was Secretary of the Navy under Woodrow Wilson, and Ambassador to Mexico under Franklin Roosevelt.

As Secretary of the Navy he did much to fashion and direct the mighty Navy that swept the seas free of German U-boats and German ships of war, and that contributed in such large measure to the winning of World War I. With fine courage and over powerful opposition, he accorded new rights to the enlisted personnel, giving them new worth and new dignity, and building a sturdier, finer morale.

As Ambassador to Mexico, he broke precedents, set aside conventions, became an apostle of America's humanity, dispelled old animosities, won the hearts of the Mexican people, and bound them to us with ties of friendship and affection. He was the Ambassador of the good neighbor.

Josephus Daniels enjoyed the unique distinction of being the confidant, the counselor, the intimate friend of both Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt.

As newspaper editor and publisher he was ever in the fight for truth and justice and democracy, battling for the people and the advancement of their welfare, battling for all that touches and concerns human need. He was a valiant warrior who never lowered his arm in battle, never turned back, but marched on and fought on. Defeat held no terror for him, and he lived to see most of his causes triumph.

Josephus Daniels never grew old. The last time I saw him was exactly 4 weeks ago, when he lunched with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], my colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself. In spite of his 85 years he was as vital, as vibrant, as joyous as ever, interested in all about him, concerned with all the momentous events and problems of the world today.

He did not grow old because he was too busy—too busy with fine achievements, too busy looking to the future with its challenges and its opportunities. His face was always to the rising sun, leaving the shadows to fall behind. He was ever presssing forward to new goals.

Josephus Daniels—editor, publisher, politician, statesman, churchman, Cabinet member, diplomat, author, and lecturer—was a remarkable man, but in nothing more remarkable than in his rare gift for friendship. Many in this Chamber were privileged to know the warmth, the sweetness, and the light of that friendship. It helped us on.

Josephus Daniels was one of God's great, good men. He has gone to a better place, to join the choice and master spirits of the ages.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to add a word to the fine remarks of the Senator from Alabama. Speaking from only a very slight acquaintance with the late Josephus Daniels, I pay my tribute of deep respect at this time on his passing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from New Jersey in tribute to Josephus Daniels.

I had known of Mr. Daniels by reputation a good many years before I ever knew him personally. I think my first acquaintance with him was when he came to Washington as Secretary of the Navy. I became intimately acquainted not only with him, but with his very charming wife, who came from a distinguished family, and who preceded him to the grave by several years.

I may be mistaken regarding this, but I think I am correct when I say that he never became a candidate for any office in North Carolina. Under Woodrow Wilson he served as Secretary of the Navy, and subsequently he became Ambassador to Mexico, as we all know.

Josephus Daniels was a man who was fundamentally devoted to the American Government and to the principles of American democracy. He was a simple man in his tastes, but profound as a thinker and writer. He inaugurated some practices in the Navy when he became Secretary, and discontinued other practices in the Navy, which subjected him at the time to a considerable amount of ridicule throughout the country. But I dare say that no man as Secretary of the Navy ever did more to build up and strengthen the morale of the American Navy than did Josephus Daniels.

As a counselor and adviser he was wise and friendly. One always felt, after consulting him and asking his advice regarding any subject, that he

had disassociated himself from any selfish consideration, and tried to put himself in the other man's place, and tell him what he would do under the circumstances.

Though he was a man of the strictest morality and of the strictest and almost abstemious habits, to such a point that he was sometimes called a Puritan, he was tolerant and liberal in his views in regard to other men and their opinions. He enjoyed the affectionate respect of all those who knew him.

He wrote two or three very interesting books. One of his sons, Jonathan Daniels, has written a very interesting and valuable book which is a contribution to American literature and to American history.

I mourn the loss of Josephus Daniels at 85 years of age as being a loss to the American people. His quiet influence, the fact that he was still around, afforded a good deal of consolation to many people who knew him. In addition, I mourn his loss as a personal friend. I grieve with all his millions of friends in this country. He lived to a ripe age, to a mellow age, a decade and a half beyond the allotted time of three score years and ten. He has left an influence in the minds and hearts of the American people which will not soon be forgotten.

I wish to express to his sons in North Carolina and in Washington—one of whom is a distinguished physician in the city of Washington, one of the outstanding physicians in the Nation's Capital—my profound sympathy, and my affectionate hope that their father's long and distinguished life and his contribution to America will be in some degree a consolation for his loss to them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the press of yesterday and today has carried the sad news of the demise of a distinguished American, the Honorable Josephus Daniels, former Secretary of the Navy of the United States, and Ambassador from the United States to the Republic of Mexico. I knew Mr. Daniels and his family well. I could call him my friend, and he could call me his friend. In my observation of American men of letters and American statesmen, I would say that the Honorable Josephus Daniels represented the best of American ideals and traditions, and that the United States of America is a better country because Josephus Daniels lived and served it. I shall miss him. The United States will miss him.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committe on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1948.*

(NOTE.—The original report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no exchanges were consummated under the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C. sec. 869) providing, among other things, for the patenting to States, counties, and municipalities of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity; to the Committee on Public Lands.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL PICKET BOAT TO STATE OF TEXAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the State of Texas had requested the Navy Department to transfer a picket boat for use by the Texas Game, Fish and Oyster Commission in law enforcement work; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the eighth annual report of that Agency for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

QUARTERLY REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of that Commission for the period October 1, through December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING—PETITION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by about 25 very fine citizens of Orange City, Fla., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio, being a bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

DECEMBER 12, 1947.

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, as introduced, without amendments, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent $8,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with $3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 189) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make certain expenditures and to employ temporary assistants, reported it without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report of the month of December 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319, Seventy-eighth Congress, relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 7, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of December, 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

James H. Cunningham, care P. M. S. and T. University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn., United States Army; annual rate of salary, $3,912.

W. E. JENNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith	Chief Clerk	$10,000.00	$4,999.98
Cecil H. Tolbert	Assistant Chief Clerk.	9,524.13	4,762.02
Adelbert F. Teague	Assistant clerk.	7,075.06	3,537.48
Herman E. Downey	do	5,447.37	2,723.64
Edmund T. King:			
July 1 to Oct. 3	do	7,075.06	1,827.69
Oct. 4 to Dec. 31	do	7,549.08	1,824.35
H. Maurice Joyce	do	6,522.05	3,261.00
Lawrence H. Wendrich, Oct. 13 to Dec. 31.	do	6,522.05	1,413.10
Mary K. Yanick	Clerical assistant.	3,212.74	1,606.32
Marie Jeneau:			
July 1 to Sept. 1	do	3,461.04	586.45
Sept. 10 to Dec. 31	do	3,461.04	1,067.15
Bernadine Wassam	do	3,047.22	1,523 58
Yvonne A. Beaudry, Oct. 22 to Dec. 31.	do	3,047.22	584.04
Thomas J. Graves	Professional staff member.	8,576.10	4,288.02
Robert H. Montgomery.	do	8,023.09	4,011.54
Earl W. Cooper	do	8,023.09	4,011.54
Hale G. Knight	do	8,023.09	4,011.54
Francis S. Hewitt	do	8,023.09	4,011.54
Harold E. Merrick	do	8,023.09	4,011.54
Thomas J. Scott	do	8,023.09	4,011.54
John Pillsbury:			
Sept. 15 to Dec. 15	Clerical assistant.	5,033.55	1,272.36
Dec. 16 to Dec. 31	Professional staff member.	7,075.06	294.79
Kimball Sanborn, Oct. 9 to Dec. 31.	do	7,075.06	1,611.52
EMPLOYED TEMPORARILY			
Philip M. Darling, July 1 to July 22.	Assistant clerk	7,075.06	432.36
Rita J. Mackey, July 1 to Nov. 4.	Clerical assistant.	3,047.22	1,049.57
Charles M. Mills, Sept. 2 to Nov. 30.	Professional staff member.	7,075.06	1,749.09

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 15, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

EMPLOYED TEMPORARILY

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Leslie M. Gravlin, July 1-2.	Consultant	[1] $35.00	$70.00
H. C. M. Case, July 1-15.	do	10,000.00	416.66
Marianne S. Futterer, July 1-27.	Typist	2,716.16	203.70

[1] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended	690.36
Balance unexpended	49,309.64

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, submits the following report in addition to the statement showing the name, profession, and total salary of persons employed, for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1947:

Miscellaneous expenses

Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 130, as of July 1, 1947	$14,232.47
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947	8,357.10
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1947	5,875.37
Amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947	50,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947	6,841.11
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1947	43,158.89

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 31, 1947.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John G. Adams	Chief clerk	$10,000.00	$4,604.23
Herbert S. Atkinson.	Assistant clerk.	5,281.24	2,640.62
Justice M. Chambers.	Staff adviser	9,050.11	4,525.05
Georgia P. Earle	Clerical assistant.	3,626.56	1,813.28
Mark H. Galusha	Staff adviser	9,050.11	4,525.05
Verne D. Mudge	do	9,050.11	4,525.05
Irene Posey	Clerical assistant.	3,626.56	1,813.28
Walter I. Smalley	Assistant clerk.	5,281.24	2,640.62
Roberta Van Beek	Clerical assistant.	3,626.56	1,813.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,903.60
Balance unexpended	5,096.40

CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 9, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Philip Levy	Professional staff member.	$10,000.00	$1,634.35
Robert D. L'Heureux.	do	7,075.06	3,537.48
Robert C. Hill	Chief clerk	$7,944.09	$2,648.00
Eunice V. Avery	Clerical assistant.	4,950.79	2,475.36
Caro McNeill Pugh	do	3,543.80	1,771.86
Edna A. Stewart	do	3,543.80	1,739.67
Pauline C. Beam	do	3,543.80	1,739.67
William F. McKenna.	Professional staff member.	9,761.13	1,626.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure; balance remaining July 1, 1947	$5,498.32
Amount expended July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1947	2,873.25
Balance unexpended	2,625.07

CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. H. Macomber, Jr.	Chief clerk	$9,524.13	$4,762.02
Glenn K. Shriver	Assistant chief clerk.	7,391.07	3,695.52
E. B. Van Horn	Staff director	10,000.00	4,960.32
Walter L. Reynolds	Staff member	8,734.11	4,367.04
Thomas A. Sappington.	do	7,075.06	3,537.48
Ann M. Grickis	Clerk-secretary.	5,116.32	2,551.26
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.).	Clerk	3,295.51	1,640.82
Marie C. Tylor	do	3,295.51	1,640.82
Velda Blanche Holder.	do	3,047.22	1,516.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong.	$10,000.00
Amount expended to June 30, 1947, $1,150.70; amount expended July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1947, $1,473.83; total	2,624.53
Balance unexpended	7,375.47

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Dr. Clarence Heer	Staff director	$10,000.00	$1,777.76
Carl H. Chatters	Special consultant	10,000.00	1,333.32

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Joe S. Floyd, Jr.	Staff member	$5,033.55	$531.31
Everett M. Schadt	do	5,033.55	447.42
Mary Helen Woods	do	2,467.87	219.35

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Congress $30,000.00
Amount expended 5,782.62

Balance unexpended 24,217.38

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WAR SURPLUS DISPOSAL

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 14, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Boos	Chief investigator.	$7,707.08	$3,853.50
Pauline Chaternuck.	Stenographer	2,633.40	1,316.70
Kathleen M. Colson.	do	2,633.40	1,316.70
Edward A. Connors.	Investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Caira May Cook, from July 14.	Secretary to counsel.	3,626.56	1,682.30
Miles N. Culehan	Counsel	10,000.00	4,999.98
Sylvia Deane, July 1 to 19.	Secretary to counsel.	3,626.56	191.40
Philip F. King, from September 13.	Technical consultant.	7,470.07	2,241.00
John D. Leadbetter, July 1 to August 31.	Messenger	2,467.87	411.30
Myles C. McCahill	Investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
John B. McDonald, July 1 to November 23.	do	5,695.66	2,262.40
Hubert R. Moody	do	5,695.66	2,847.78
O. J. Peterson, July 1 to 22.	do	5,695.66	348.06
Ray H. Pincomb, July 1 to 26.	do	5,695.66	411.35
Robert L. Piper	Chief clerk and investigator.	5,695.66	2,847.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $100,000.00
Amount expended 54,972.65

Balance unexpended 45,027.35

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 15, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Hugh R. Brown	Chief clerk	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Albert A. Grorud	Professional staff.	7,022.40	3,511.20
Elmer K. Nelson	do	7,075.00	1,768.75
Orville Watkins	Clerical assistant.	5,116.32	2,558.16
Nellie D. McSherry	Assistant Chief Clerk.	7,075.00	3,493.80
Estelle Bedsworth	Clerical assistant.	3,295.51	1,647.75
Charlotte Mickle	do	2,964.45	1,482.22

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $32,551.50
Amount expended 14,704.36

Balance unexpended 17,847.14

NOTE.—With further reference to the "Note" on the report of this committee for the first period of this year, it should be noted that the stenographic reporter's account for the first session remaining unpaid totaled $6,244.45.

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 15, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from June 30, 1947, to January 1, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Meredith	Executive director.	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Raymond R. Dickey.	Chief counsel	9,050.11	4,525.06
Bertram H. Wimer	Chief investigator.	8,418.10	4,057.63
Albert J. Wolken	Investigator	8,418.10	4,057.63
Guyon, Catherine L.	Consultant	6,522.05	3,261.03
Ailene J. Loveland	Secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Pearl Mae Nichols	do	3,792.09	1,896.05
Dorothy J. Holshouser.	Editorial secretary.	3,792.09	1,896.05
Charlotte M. Southmayd.	Clerk	2,964.45	1,482.23
Alma M. Youse	Secretary	2,964.45	1,482.23
Catherine G. McNamara.	do	2,964.45	1,482.23
Virginia Lee Bauer	File clerk	2,633.40	1,316.70
Gene Wynes	Messenger	2,004.20	1,002.10
Albert E. Johnson	Special consultant.	7,233.07	3,616.54
John M. Frier	do	7,233.07	2,388.00
William C. Broadgate.	do	7,233.07	1,467.66
Walton C. Groce	do	7,233.07	700.22
Paul E. Hadlick	do	7,233.07	1,287.74
Alice M. Dodd	Secretary-stenographer.	2,964.45	213.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $100,000.00
Amount expended 86,450.94

Balance unexpended 13,549.06

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 15, 1948.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name	Profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman.	Assistant counsel.	$6,495.72	$3,247.86
Robert B. Barker	Investigator	8,075.76	471.08
Bernard S. Bercovici.	do	8,075.76	4,037.88
Lucille Bruskin	Assistant clerk.	3,378.27	1,568.40
William S. Cole	Assistant counsel.	9,366.12	4,162.95
Frederick N. Coughlin.	do	6,026.72	3,013.32
Philip R. Davis	do	10,000.00	3,111.09
Agnes P. Dodge	Assistant clerk.	2,886.69	1,409.34
Francis D. Flanagan.	Chief assistant counsel.	9,998.14	4,856.42
Thomas F. Flynn, Jr.	Investigator	5,392.22	898.70
Phelps Hunt	Editorial clerk	1,931.60	965.76
Linton W. Jeffery	Investigator	8,075.76	2,332.99
Jean F. Kerr	Assistant clerk.	2,798.92	559.77
Kathryn L. Kohler	do	2,964.45	741.09
Felix E. Larkin	Assistant counsel.	9,050.11	1,835.14
Lydia Lee	Editor	5,033.55	2,516.76
Joseph M. Mannix	Investigator	6,026.72	2,875.37
George Meader	Consulting counsel.	10,000.00	2,361.09
Gladys E. Montier	Assistant clerk.	3,543.80	1,716.70
Constance L. Morris.	do	2,881.69	1,358.08
Eric Nordholm	Messenger	1,188.00	956.39
Franklin N. Parks	Assistant counsel.	6,680.05	3,340.02
Jeanie M. Prichard	Assistant clerk.	3,212.74	1,716.70
William P. Rogers	Chief counsel	10,000.00	4,999.98
Haven Sawyer	Investigator	5,392.22	2,696.10
James F. Sheridan	do	5,392.22	2,696.10
Dorothy Smithson	Assistant clerk.	3,212.74	1,523.56
M. Louise Spilman	do	3,957.62	1,220.25
Eleanor L. Taylor	do	3,212.74	1,523.56
Franklyn Yearsley	Investigator	4,205.91	700.98
Ruth M. Young	Clerk	3,792.09	1,840.84

Funds on hand July 1, 1947, plus funds authorized by S. Res. 145 agreed to July 23, 1947:
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $132,162.36
Amount expended 94,216.28

Balance unexpended 62,946.08

OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman.

INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS RELATING TO STEEL SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION (REPT. NO. 825)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have been designated by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], chairman of the Senate Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, to submit to the Senate a report on steel supply and distribution, which is the result of investigations over the past 6 months by the Steel Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. It seems particularly timely to call to the attention of the Senate the situation with respect to the Nation's most vital resource—steel.

Steel is the basic commodity of our economy—and of the world's economy.

No other material is of such value in the construction and reconstruction of the world's commerce and trade.

The job opportunity of every worker, the market for every farmer, the success

of every businessman depends, in some degree, upon the production and distribution of steel.

We cannot have prosperity today unless we have enough steel to make that prosperity possible.

Balance in the domestic economy and success of a European recovery program will depend, in the final analysis, upon steel.

The steel subcommittee in its investigations and hearings has given attention to disruptions to normal channels of trade and to increased integration in the steel industry which are cutting off sources of supply for the smaller businessman.

It has studied remedies for the shortages of basic raw materials which go into the manufacture of steel.

The subcommittee has heard from both sides of the question as to whether steel capacity should be increased. Testimony ranged from demands for no expansion to statistical projections calling for a 20,000,000-ton increase. The fact that no executive agency of Government has made any survey of actual, over-all demands for steel since the early days of the war has made it impractical for the subcommittee to make a recommendation as to the necessity for steel expansion. The subcommittee has recommended that an overall survey of steel requirements be undertaken by the executive agencies as the only intelligent basis for demands upon the industry or commitments abroad.

It takes steel to make steel, to build new facilities, to transport basic materials. Increased production and capacity are limited by these factors.

In the world picture, large exports of critically short steel products have thrown the domestic economy out of gear. It is the fear of the steel subcommittee that present export levels will be maintained and further inroads made upon domestic supplies. In such case, the smaller independent businessman in the steel industry, suffering from extreme shortage now, will be forced to the wall.

Although the subcommittee has dealt with emergency supply situations, has obtained relief for many distress cases, and has been successful in revealing and discouraging the steel gray market, the basic problems which are threatening small business in the steel industry are as urgent today as when the subcommittee began its investigations in May 1947.

The maintenance of free competitive enterprise—large or small—is the keystone of our democracy and of our form of government.

It will profit us little either in the immediate problems or in longer-range considerations to foster the flame of free enterprise in western Europe, if we must submit our own economy to regimentation.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit the interim report and request that it be printed, with an illustration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. BROOKS):

S. 1988. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1989. A bill to provide for the payment of certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave in cases involving transfers to other Government agencies under different leave systems; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1990. A bill to provide a means for the orderly continuation and completion of the Deer Creek and Aqueduct divisions of the Provo River project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1991. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Waline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1992. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.; and

S. 1993. A bill to authorize the alteration of certain highway bridges at Federal expense in connection with flood-control projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1994. A bill for the relief of Barbara O'Brien Farquer;

S. 1995. A bill for the relief of George Bailey; and

S. 1996. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Chang Ha Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1997. A bill for the relief of Sister Anna M. Alzbeta Sijarto-Hajdukova (also known as Sister M. Elizabeth); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1998. A bill to authorize the Administrator, War Assets Administration, to convey the Tobyhanna Military Reservation to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1999. A bill for the relief of Lloyd F. Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia introduced Senate bill 2000, to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SPARKMAN introduced Senate bill 2001, to continue rent control until April 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2002. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company; and

S. 2003. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2004. A bill for the relief of the Housing Authority of the City of Bridgeport, Conn.;

S. 2005. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; and

S. 2006. A bill authorizing contributions to local public housing agencies with respect to certain payments in lieu of taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2007. A bill to reserve to the United States all oil, gas, coal, and other minerals contained in lands included within the Fort Reno Military Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2008. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes of premiums paid on national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2009. A bill to provide for the security of the United States through the development and construction of air weapons of advanced design, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli;

S. 2011. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Spano and his family; and

S. 2012. A bill for the relief of Frank Arnim, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2013. A bill for the relief of Sister Stefania Cuprys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 2014. A bill to establish effective rent control until June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO ASSESS CERTAIN OWNERS OF NONMILITARY BUILDINGS AT FORT MONROE, VA.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes.

Some years ago the Senate passed a similar bill, but it included other matters, and did not pass the House. Fort Monroe is the only military reservation as to which the law requires specific charges to be made against civilians who use the reservation. The Secretary of the Army favors the repeal of the act of 1894, which requires him to impose such charges on civilians at Fort Monroe, in order that he may be free to treat all civilian users of military reservations alike.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2000) to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue rent control. This bill seeks to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and would be known as the Housing and Rent Extension Act of 1948. Essentially, it would continue the programs of rent control,

limitations on construction for amusement or recreational purposes, and veterans' preference until April 30, 1949, and would continue the Office of the Housing Expediter to that date for the purpose of administering them. In addition, it clarifies the purposes of the Housing and Rent Act by adding a declaration of purposes, sets the rent agreed upon under the present 15-percent lease provision as the maximum rent for the effective period of the lease, but deletes the provisions removing housing acommodations so leased from rent control, gives the Housing Expediter the right to sue for overcharges if the tenant does not, strengthens the enforcement and eviction provisions by providing for criminal sanctions for willful violations of the act and by authorizing the Housing Expediter to conduct investigations and hearings, and provides for the allocation of materials or facilities in short supply to increase the supply of housing accommodations.

Under the present Rent Act, units on which landlord and tenant sign a voluntary lease for not more than 15 percent above the maximum rent, and which carry over until at least January 1, 1949, are decontrolled as of December 31, 1947. This means that should any tenant violate an obligation of his tenancy or otherwise terminate his lease, the unit is thereafter free from control. It is fairly evident that there would be tremendous pressure to void these leases so as to remove these units from all controls. This bill would amend the present act so as to continue to hold these units under rent control but to honor the 15-percent rent increase for as long as the lease exists.

This bill continues the local advisory boards with all the powers they now have to recommend to the Housing Expediter actions on decontrol, the adequacy of the general rent level, operations of the local rent office and individual hardship cases. It would continue to allow the Housing Expediter to exercise his judgment as to whether a local board recommendation has been properly substantiated and is in accordance with the provisions of the act.

This bill strengthens the enforcement provisions so as to give the Housing Expediter the right of treble-damage action against willful and flagrant violators and also to permit the Housing Expediter to refer to the Attorney General willful and flagrant violators for criminal action. This is a necessary amendment because the present provision of the act giving the tenant the right of treble damage has failed to cure violations. It is not working because tenants are more afraid of losing the roof over their heads than they are desirous of obtaining monetary damages. Experience shows that generally law-abiding landlords who always obey the law are still obeying but that the old violators are boldly overcharging and accepting bonuses and side payments. When they are caught, they simply make restitution and unless an injunction is obtained proceed to commit the same violations all over again.

This bill contains a restatement of the general allocation powers which were in the Second War Powers Act and the limited ones in the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. The power in this bill, however, is to be used solely for the purpose of increasing the supply of housing accommodations. The bill thus provides that if a shortage of materials needed for an increased supply of housing accommodations exists or is likely to exist, the Housing Expediter may allocate such materials for housing construction.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2001) to continue rent control until April 30, 1949, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRINTING OF FIFTIETH ANNUAL REPORT OF SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 190), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Fiftieth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1947, be printed as a Senate document.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 1020, to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "$12,000,000"; and the House agree to the same.

HUGH BUTLER,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
GEO. W. MALONE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN M. VORYS,
WALTER H. JUDD,
JAMES G. FULTON,
JAS. P. RICHARDS,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the conference report has to do with the Philippine rehabilitation bill which was passed by the Senate on July 25 last, before the close of the first session. The Senate made available for administrative purposes $16,000,000 of the funds appropriated. The House action reduced that amount to $8,400,000. Conferees were appointed, and the report is now in agreement on the sum of $12,000,000. I should like to have the report adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The conference report was agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C., January 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK BEFORE THE NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, before the National Small Businessmen's Association, at the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., on January 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMIRAL NIMITZ' VALEDICTORY

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the final statement made by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 7, 1948, summarizing the context of Admiral Nimitz' statement, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR AND THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—ADDRESS BY MATTHEW WOLL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Labor and the St. Lawrence Waterway, by Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, before the New England Project Conference at Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE—ADDRESS BY CLARENCE FRANCIS

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Causes of Industrial Peace," delivered by Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp., before the fifty-second annual congress of American industry, National Association of Manufacturers, at New York City, on December 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR CONGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK DAILY MIRROR

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Congress," published in the New York Daily Mirror for January 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WE MUST SAVE EUROPE WITHOUT LOSING AMERICA—ARTICLE IN THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION JOURNAL

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Must Save Europe Without Losing

America," published in the National Education Association Journal of January 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BATTLE OF THE FAMILY BUDGET—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Battle of the Family Budget," by Richard L. Neuberger, from the New York Times Magazine of January 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CENSORSHIP THROUGH FEAR—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM WYLER

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Censorship Through Fear," by William Wyler, published in the December 1947 issue of the Screen Writer, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT NEWS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the St. Lawrence seaway, from the Detroit News of January 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, in the peaceful burying ground of historic Old Christ Church in the city of Philadelphia a simple flat stone marks the last resting place of an illustrious American patriot and statesman who was born 242 years ago tomorrow. The fading inscription on that stone recounts that here is buried all that was mortal of Benjamin Franklin, printer.

So deep was the humility, so sincere the simplicity, of this great man that his vast achievements in public service and his tremendous contributions to the welfare of human society were ignored in the epitaph he wrote for his grave, describing himself simply as "Benjamin Franklin, printer." But the light of his genius continues to illuminate the world. It shines more brightly with the passing years, and, therefore, on the anniversary of his birth, it is a sacred duty to recall, with proper tribute of homage and honor, the greatness of Benjamin Franklin, first citizen of Pennsylvania.

As much as any other man of his time he shaped and guided the destiny of our Republic in the struggle for American independence and in the troubled formative years of our country.

Of him it may be truly said, "He walked with kings, nor lost the common touch."

His giant intellect concerned itself with the simple as well as the more complex needs of his fellow man. He helped establish a nation of liberty and freedom on this continent—and he invented a household stove that added to the comfort and convenience of his fellow citizens.

He negotiated with Europe's greatest masters of statecraft and diplomacy on equal terms, yet he preached the virtues of thrift and industry.

His investigations into the laws of nature gave him first rank and fame among the scientists of his day—and he wrote a treatise on the Causes and Cure of Smoky Chimneys.

Every schoolboy is familiar with the kite-flying experiments by which he determined the nature of electricity, an achievement that opened a whole new realm of discovery and invention for human progress and betterment.

Into his philosophy he poured wisdom that stands unchallenged today to guide the affairs of men into the channels of right living.

Franklin's career as a benefactor of humanity was so diversified and his achievements so numerous that it is impossible to enumerate them all.

Throughout his life he held fast to the creed that he drafted at the age of 22, and which he entitled "Articles of Belief and Acts of Religion." In that creed he wrote:

I believe in one God, creator of the universe. That He governs it by His providence. That He ought to be worshiped. That the most acceptable service we render to Him is doing good to His other children. That the soul of man is immortal, and will be treated with justice in another life respecting its conduct in this.

By reason of its great importance, I should like to refer to an incident concerning the drafting of our Constitution. The adoption of our Constitution was one of the greatest accomplishments in all history. It brought a new birth of freedom, and meant that 8 years of suffering and hardship would not go without reward. The great men of the Constitutional Convention met day after day for 4 weeks and had not made any progress.

On the last morning of the fifth week there was heated discussion. They were about to adjourn without completing the great purpose for which they had met. It looked like failure, when Benjamin Franklin, the most mature and tactful man in the convention, arose. Addressing Gen. George Washington, President of the Assembly, he said:

Mr. President, the small progress we have made after 4 or 5 weeks' close attention and continual reasonings with each other, our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes, is, methinks, a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding.

In this situation of this Assembly, groping, as it were, in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Light to illuminate our understanding?

I have lived, sir, a long time; and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?

We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests, our project will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages. And, what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, conquest.

I, therefore, beg leave to move:

That hereafter, prayers imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessing on our deliberations, be held in this Assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service.

From then on, history tells us, real progress began to be made in the framing and adoption of our Constitution. Gladstone asserted that this document was "the greatest piece of work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Thus, in the adoption of our Constitution we can almost trace the finger of Divine Providence. Its adoption laid the foundation for peace and prosperity, when it looked as if failure to agree upon a plan of government would result in misery and confusion.

Mr. President, I should like to mention another incident in the career of Benjamin Franklin which is worthy of thoughtful consideration in these critical times.

When the work of the Constitutional Convention had been completed and Franklin stepped into the courtyard of Independence Hall, he was greeted by a great multitude of citizens.

"What kind of government have you given us?" he was asked.

"A Republic, if we can keep it," Franklin replied.

There is patriotic inspiration and guidance in those words. On this notable anniversary they should remind all Americans to rededicate their lives to the perpetuation of the ideals and principles handed down to us by Franklin and the other revered founding fathers of our Nation.

Their deeds of patriotism, their lives of vision, courage, and sacrifice, point the way in which each of us can contribute, in large or small degree, toward carrying out the injunction of Franklin—to keep our Republic, not only for the greater glory of America, but as a beacon light of human liberty and justice throughout the world.

MEAT PRODUCTION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the last few weeks I have been amazed at the way in which a bureaucratic, semicollectivist philosophy seems to be coming back in fashion. I refer to all the proposals we hear about restoring rationing and price controls and various other regulations covering meat. That is a controversy which I thought was settled by the election of 1946. I thought the American people at that time expressed a pretty clear preference for meat rather than for controls.

Now, apparently, we have the same question back with us. It is being said on all sides that the price of meat is too high. I do not know the basis for that statement. The price of meat is certainly higher than it used to be. So is the price of everything else. If the price of meat is too high, so are wage rates too high; so is the price of coal, the price of lumber, the price of steel, and the price of everything else. The farmer who produces meat must buy all these things in one form or another. He must have a price for his cattle and hogs sufficient to pay his costs of operation.

I speak to the Senate frankly in behalf of the livestock men—the producers of

the meat supply of the country. Their costs have gone up along with the prices they receive. Our State statistician at Lincoln, Nebr., for the Department of Agriculture has just supplied me with the average cost of producing beef in Nebraska within the last few months. That cost is at an all-time high. In October it cost $20.20 per hundred pounds of beef; in November, $19; in December, $20.70. That is the inflationary effect of present conditions on our level of costs. If we can get those costs down, we will get cheaper meat, but not otherwise.

Unfortunately, the people of this country have been told by the dominant political philosophy of the last 15 years to ignore realities and to expect something for nothing. They would like to have cheaper meat, and they would like to have more of it. These twin desires are natural, but they are incompatible with each other. Last year the people of the United States bought and ate far more meat per capita than they could ever afford to buy during the prewar period—but it was not cheap. If the price had not been well above prewar standards, so much meat would not have been produced. That is the hard economic reality which consumers must face.

Now our producers are threatened again with renewed talk of rationing and price controls. The mere fact that these suggestions are made has already done serious damage by discouraging the production we need. The meat supply for next fall and next year is being determined right now or will be within the next few months. Official talk about rationing and price controls will only discourage meat production, and make the shortage later on much worse.

But suppose controls should be adopted again, what will be the result? Will it increase the supply of meat? Of course not; it will decrease it. The only result will be to push the bulk of the meat business out of its normal processing and marketing channels and into the black market.

Consider the impossibility of enforcing such controls at the present time. The OPA and all the other enforcement machinery has been disbanded. Meat controls could not be enforced in 1946 by an organized army of Federal agents. What possible chance would there be to enforce them now with a makeshift group of temporary employees? We will have trouble setting up OPA machinery again, but the black marketeers will have no trouble setting up in business. Their machinery is already set up. If the OPA was the school for black marketeers in this country, new controls would be a postgraduate course.

Some may think controls can easily be enforced against the large packers. Perhaps they can, but the meat would not go to the large packing firms. In livestock marketing, the animals go to the highest bidder, with no questions asked. The highest bidder will be the black market. Nor is rationing the answer. Black market slaughter is just too easy. Any unused barn or shed will serve. From there the meat can be moved directly into channels for the consumer, short cutting the rationing machinery entirely.

Mr. President, I suggest that we stop trying to have our cake and eat it too. The price level has been raised far above prewar prices by the financial and monetary policies that have been followed by the administration during the past 15 years. Costs in every industry have increased by leaps and bounds. Reducing prices means reducing costs first, and that means reducing wages. That is something I have not heard anyone suggest.

If the advocates of this type of control legislation really mean what they say, I suggest that they have their measures brought to the floor for debate as promptly as possible so that we can get this question settled once and for all. In the meantime, I suggest that we have a moratorium on public statements urging meat rationing and price control. Talk of that sort is doing no good for the production of meat, and high-level meat production is the only really satisfactory solution to this problem.

EUROPEAN RELIEF NEEDS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, many public officials, Members of Congress, newspaper editors, columnists, radio commentators, and many other prominent people of America, have made impressive arguments for European relief needs. Most of the arguments have dealt with the humanitarian side—the need of helping the starving and suffering peoples in Europe—and the need of saving western Europe from Communist domination for our own future security.

I wish at this time to commend former Governor Stassen and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson for the emphasis they have placed on another aspect of foreign aid. Governor Stassen is especially to be commended for being one of the first concerned about the need of maintaining future markets for farm products in Europe after assistance programs come to an end and Europe again has dollars with which to purchase our food.

Governor Stassen and Secretary Anderson correctly take the position that there can be no permanent prosperity in the United States, and particularly among farmers, unless such a market is retained.

Even now, because of a loss of European markets for some farm products, our Government, in order to maintain parity prices, purchased practically all the 1947 tobacco and peanut crops, together with large quantities of eggs, potatoes, and fruits which were in surplus.

While there has been Government price support of a few farm products, this Congress during the past year enacted unusual legislation to hold down the price of wheat, the most important of all food items. As a result of Government controls, the export price of wheat is lower in the United States than in any other nation of the world.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a press release by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., under date of January 1, 1948.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAYS WHEAT "RIDER" AVERTED PRICE OF $5

WASHINGTON.—Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, said Wednesday a wheat carryover rider inserted in the interim foreign-aid law recently enacted by Congress may have prevented wheat prices from climbing as high as $5 a bushel.

He referred to an amendment placed in the $540,000,000 foreign-aid statute by the appropriations committees of the Senate and House requiring that "exports not reduce our domestic carry-over below 150,000,000 bushels."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, surely as a result of our large appropriations, and the effort American farmers are putting forth to meet the present food needs of Europe, the United States ought to have a high priority in the future markets of these countries, and, in my opinion, it is most important that both the executive department of our Government and the Congress of the United States at the present time negotiate with European countries to the end that we might retain as much as possible of these markets beyond the period the Marshall plan is intended to cover.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks a portion of the testimony by Secretary of Agriculture Anderson before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on January 13, 1948, as reported by Robert J. Donovan of the New York Herald Tribune; and also a letter addressed by me to Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the testimony and letter referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary Anderson told the committee at a hearing on the aid program: "From the standpoint of our consumers, the effect of our proposed exports should be less noticeable than the effects of the exports in recent years. Our total food exports will actually be smaller than in other recent years, and as the program continues, there will be decreasing emphasis on scarce foods and increasing emphasis on more abundant foods."

Secretary Anderson emphasized that the ERP would have an important bearing on farm prosperity, and he warned the committee that "it is essential that farmers have a good market in Europe."

While he did not use the word "depression," Mr. Anderson stated the case in terms which left no doubt that loss of European markets would have serious consequences for American farmers.

INCREASED YIELD CITED

"As we have studied the question of what this program will mean to our farmers," he said, "we have had to ask ourselves what would happen if the economy of Europe were allowed to disintegrate and if it provided little or no outlet for United States farm products. That prospect would not be pleasant to contemplate."

Secretary Anderson reminded the committee that before the war a high percentage of American farm products was sold to Europe, and he summed up the problem for the future in these words:

"Our farmers are now producing a third more food and fiber than they were before the war. They have revolutionized farm production and the revolution is here to stay. Our farmers are not going to give up their new machines or their high-yielding varieties, their improved insecticides or their improved

methods of cultivation. We are going to have abundance of agricultural production, and we shall continue to need export outlets for some of our most important farm commodities."

Secretary Anderson conceded that ERP exports coming on top of domestic and other foreign requirements, "will continue temporarily the strain on our grain-producing areas." He said, however, that the program was "feasible from the standpoint of our own agriculture" and that the nation had "no practical alternative but to carry through a program of this magnitude."

JANUARY 10, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Today when there are so many problems of such immediate and vital concern facing our Government, I am afraid that the importance of one long-range problem very closely related to future security and welfare is being overlooked.

For a long time I have been concerned over the future of our agricultural industry. The past great war created demands on our farms, and on our farmers, for agricultural production greater than ever before in history. The record reveals how well our farmers met that need and the even greater need that arose after the war, and that is now playing such a vital role in our crucial struggle to secure the peace.

Following World War I, and until the time that Hitler came to power in Germany, this country enjoyed a fairly good foreign market for agricultural products, particularly wheat and cotton. Then because of the self-sufficiency program adopted by the Axis Powers in preparation for war, we lost most of this market. As a result, we faced tremendous surpluses. This was at a time when our production of wheat was not much more than one-half the present level of production. This in combination with continued imports of large supplies of wheat at a time when we had these great domestic surpluses, led to extremely low prices. In fact, at one time wheat sold for less than 30 cents a bushel.

The effect of this was felt throughout our economy. In looking back, it has always been very evident that our Nation cannot prosper when agriculture is in a depression. The period of the 1930's is known to all. The tempo of our entire economy reached a dangerously low point. Industry closed down, unemployment was rampant, and measures for our national defense lagged at the very time that we were being forced into a world crisis because of the ambitions of the Axis dictators. Luckily, through the efforts and sacrifices of our allies, the United States was given time to recover and through a tremendous expansion of industrial and agricultural production, our defenses were built. If we had faced the Axis without this period in which to recover the results would have been disastrous.

To meet the needs of this emergency, farmers were asked to expand production until it reached the present high level. Now I see signs of a trend that is causing me grave concern. This year the Government, under the farm price support program, had to purchase practically all of the 1947 crop of tobacco and peanuts. The foreign countries were unable to purchase these commodities under our relief aid. With wheat production at a level 500,000,000 bushels greater than can be consumed in the United States, this same situation would exist in wheat and all major agricultural commodities if it were not for the foreign relief program financed by huge American appropriations that is providing a European market for our surpluses.

Europe has, historically, been deficient in food supplies, and many times in the past has been our greatest outlet for agricultural surpluses. I am now somewhat alarmed by the thinking of many Members of Congress and others high in Government positions. As evidenced by previous European programs, they are apparently striving to make Europe self-sufficient in food supplies even to the extent of endeavoring to establish new food sources in other parts of the world for farm commodities of which we normally have burdensome surpluses.

In my opinion, it is of the greatest concern to our future prosperity to maintain a prosperous agriculture. This, I believe, can only be accomplished by retaining large outlets in Europe. Because of the sacrifices of our people through tremendous relief appropriations, and because of the extreme efforts the American farmers have made to supply vital food necessities for Europe, I believe the United States is rightfully entitled to a high priority in future European markets. I believe it would be in the best interests of not only our farmers but the country as a whole if there was coordination of efforts toward this end by the State Department and the Agriculture Department. Therefore, I think it is highly desirable that the Department of State establish a division under one of the branches of the Department with the responsibility of looking toward future markets in Europe. This, I believe, could be established at little extra expenditure, since the Department already has agriculture attachés in the various embassies who could effectively work out a program in coordination with the Department of Agriculture.

On my two recent trips to Europe this summer I spent a large part of my time seeking information on this subject. I found that some agriculture attachés in some of the embassies were giving intelligent thought to the problem of future markets, but I regret to add others were completely indifferent to the problem.

Many Members of Congress apparently are totally unaware of the fact that if it were not for relief appropriations to Europe most farm products, and particularly wheat, would be in great surplus at the present time. Farm prices would be far below present levels and it is entirely possible that wheat would be selling for $1 a bushel. Once the relief appropriations are discontinued and unless we begin now to look for these markets, much of our agriculture will have to be supported by price-support program. This would entail great expenditures with the resulting difficulty of disposing of surpluses, or else we would face the problem of liquidating or greatly reducing our farm production.

I need not point out the dangers of this alternative. Our past experiences make them clearly evident. Suffice to say, industry and our whole economy would go into a tailspin and we would undoubtedly have a disastrous depression. In the interests of survival and national security, this must not happen. Never again in a future emergency will we be given an opportunity to prepare to defend ourselves.

I respectfully urge, Mr. Secretary, that the consideration of this problem be given early attention.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

CANCER—NEW JERSEY EDITORIAL CONTEST

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time, when the thoughts of men and women are so filled and so concerned with the complex problems arising out of government and general human welfare, I ask Senators to pause and think specifically of the gallant fight being waged by some of our people against a disease that takes a great toll of lives from among our people. I speak of the disease of cancer, a malady which to this time has baffled men in their quest for a cure in all cases.

However, there can be no doubt that some headway toward success is being made. Cancer presents a high challenge to science and to medicine. It is a threat which can be successfully met only through general realization of its existence, and the wilingness of the people everywhere to be helpful in this great effort to eradicate a destructive disease.

This Government has recognized the existence of this growing menace to life, and in the last few years has made large appropriations to aid in the fight against it.

It is time that the people everywhere, the general public, shall, without fear, and with calmness and earnestness, realize and meet the situation.

While statistics show that 180,000 people die annually in this country from cancer, it is believed by many doctors that more than that number have their lives and their usefulness terminated by this disease. We are told that perhaps one-half of these need not die, because if the existence of the affliction is found in time, it is known that it can be cured.

In addition to the research being made with funds appropriated out of the Public Treasury, the American Cancer Society is spending from five to six millions of dollars yearly in research work to find the cause of this disease. When the cause of it is found, it is believed that its destructive result will be eradicated.

The New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society is recognized as a leader in the fight on cancer. The division is well organized, with active chapters in each county of the State. The success of the cancer-control program in New Jersey, now in its second full year of operation, is due to the cooperation of the medical profession and laymen, and to the complete support given by the press, radio, and citizenry of the State.

Realizing that thousands of lives could be saved from cancer if the public were educated to be alert to the cancer danger signals and to receive early diagnosis, the New Jersey division asked the press of the State to enter an editorial contest, thus insuring wide dissemination of news about cancer.

With the cooperation of the New Jersey Press Association, the contest resulted in awards to three daily newspapers and three weeklies. Award plaques were personally contributed by George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and president of the Cancer Society, New Jersey division. Mr. President, I do not know of any citizen in this land who has so unselfishly contributed more of his time and his means in the leadership to find a cure for this affliction than has George E. Stringfellow. I am glad at this time to pay this tribute to this outstanding citizen, and also to the State of New Jersey.

With the aid of the great press and radio of this country, I believe that within a short time a general and active interest can be aroused to even strengthen this fight against a bodily disease and to speed the day when a general cure for it will be found.

The six winning editorials appeared in six newspapers. The three daily newspapers which were chosen were the Union City Hudson Dispatch, the Paterson Evening News, and the Passaic Herald News; the three weeklies which were chosen were the Merchantville Community News, the Cranford Citizen and Chronicle, and the Maplewood News.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials upon this important subject be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Union City (N. J.) Hudson Dispatch of April 19, 1947]

CANCER DEATHS UP NEARLY 100 PERCENT; WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

Every 3 minutes on the average, somebody in this country dies of cancer.

The death rate from cancer in New Jersey has increased nearly 100 percent in the past quarter century. It killed 168.5 per 100,000 in 1945 compared with 87.5 in 1920.

It is estimated that 17,000,000 Americans now living are doomed to die from cancer. This scourge is the greatest and cruelest killer of those from 35 to 55 years.

Cancer is No. 1 "malady murderer" in the country, only second to heart disease. In New Jersey in 1945 there were 7,077 who died of cancer, compared with an average of 3,107 from 1920 to 1924.

Cancer is killing 184,000 a year throughout the country—that's more than 200 times the number killed in the catastrophe at Texas City.

What are you going to do about it?

"What can I do about it?" you may ask.

You can help to raise the $12,000,000 to fight cancer during this month's campaign. The quota for New Jersey is $750,000, for Hudson County, $95,000, and for Bergen County, $77,000. Here's what your contribution would be used to accomplish:

1. Inform men, women, and children everywhere of the danger signals and urge people to consult a doctor immediately at any sign of cancer. Remember, one in three may be saved through early diagnosis and prompt treatment. Money spent to spread knowledge will help your doctor help you.

2. Provide better facilities for prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer. Cancer treatment requires radium—X-ray equipment—skilled personnel. Money spent for these facilities will help your doctor help you.

3. Expand widely the scientific research attack now being conducted by the National Research Council in 90 scientific centers in the United States alone. Cancer research must expand its work in radioactive substances which, according to authorities, may open up a new world of possibilities. Research, it is hoped, may lead to more effective treatment and possibly even the elimination of cancer. Money spent on cancer research will help your doctor help you.

Remember, that 25 cents of every dollar you give will be used for research to discover the cause and cure of cancer; 15 cents will be used for a Nation-wide educational campaign, and 60 cents will be spent in New Jersey to aid in improving equipment and services in existing cancer clinics; to establish new clinics, to aid in establishing and maintaining State-wide tissue diagnostic services, for nursing service in homes, and many other activities.

It's up to you to decide what to do about stopping the scourge of cancer in New Jersey and throughout the country.

Make your contribution today.

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News of April 18, 1947]

STOP A MINUTE AND GIVE THOUGHT TO THIS—ARE YOU DOOMED TO A HORRIBLE DEATH?

"Give To Conquer Cancer" is the slogan of the appeal for funds to battle this scourge through research, education, and service. The need is great. An estimated 184,000 persons will die of cancer in the United States this year, an average of one fatality every 3 minutes. No respecter of social position or age, cancer kills four times as many children as does infantile paralysis.

While cancer statistics are horrifying, there is a bright side—a side which has grown brighter since the first extensive effort was organized in 1945, and which will grow even brighter if the present appeal has the wide public support it merits.

With funds raised the last 2 years, 94 research projects have been financed and are being conducted by outstanding scientists. Three times as many projects await funds to be started. Facilities and expert personnel have been provided in numerous hospital clinics, which report many cures. The field army volunteers have been aided in their year-around education and service program. Knowledge is being spread that cancer is curable if the public can be made sufficiently alert to have regular physical examinations. At last progress is being made by the weapons of research, education, and service, weapons which can be put to full use only if everybody will give to conquer cancer.

As a duty, and as a measure of the personal happiness that come from assured health, we must give freely and gladly to save human lives, perhaps your life.

Seventeen million Americans now living are doomed to fall victims to the greatest killer of all time—cancer.

Chances are, based on present conditions, that one out of every two families in America will be bereaved from this cause.

There is one chance in eight that you will be a victim.

Every 3 minutes some American dies of cancer—504 every day, 184,000 every year.

And the rate is going up.

Yet cancer is not necessarily fatal.

Even on the basis of our present slight knowledge of this dread disease, one out of every three victims can be saved through early diagnosis and prompt treatment.

And some day the cause and the remedy will be found.

But the trouble is that we have done so little and spent such a slight sum against this most vicious of all enemies—the greatest and cruelest killer of all women between the ages of 35 and 55, and the second greatest killer of men.

We spent $317,000,000,000 from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day to win World War II. Our total dead were 280,000.

During the same period our country spent only $2,000,000 in the research fight against cancer—and the cost in lives for that period was 607,000.

Cancer has claimed more lives than all the wars the world ever has known.

These are the facts and figures which caused Congress and the President to designate April as Cancer Control Month.

Cancer can be combated—and someday can be conquered, medical men believe—by research, education, and service. The American Cancer Society's campaign is directed to those ends.

Whether the appeal is based upon cancer's economic waste, the personal misery it causes, or the family tragedies that result from it, no one can be deaf to a plea for funds to war upon it.

Won't you—as one of the eight who may fall victim or as a member of one of the two families which cancer will strike—do your part?

Police Commissioner Jack Stern is chairman of the Paterson Cancer Fund drive and responsible for the raising of the city's $40,000 quota. On the shoulders of Harold W. Hutchinson rests the responsibility of raising the county quota of $60,000 including Paterson's $40,000.

The Cancer Society has no paid organization and is aided only by the efforts of volunteer workers. There is great need for such workers and the News appeals to them to come forward.

Phone Mrs. Edwin Lee, Lambert 3-6686 and offer your services. Do it now.

Contributions may be sent to headquarters of the Passaic County Cancer Society in room 104 of the County Administration Building.

Have you contributed? Have you done your share or are you just one of those who don't care?

What are you willing to do?

[From the Passaic (N. J.) Herald News of April 30, 1947]

YOU CAN HELP IN THIS GREAT FIGHT

Bob Bremner was editor of the Passaic Daily Herald and a member of the Sixty-third Congress when Dr. Howard A. Kelly came to his bedside in a Baltimore sanitarium in 1914. A million dollars worth of tubed radium was packed into his shoulder.

"There is nothing more that medical science can do for you, Bob," said the great physician from Johns Hopkins.

"Let's talk about something more important—about my industrial safety bill," said the indomitable Scot who smiled at death. "My life hasn't been worth one-tenth of the effort put forth to save it. I am ready for the scrap heap but I feel the cutting and the doctoring has added to our knowledge of how best to fight cancer. The day is coming when science will conquer it. I would rather be with those who were in the fight than be one of those who reap the benefit."

Then Robert Gunn Bremner died, aged 39.

Hugh Lendrim was treasurer of the newspaper in those days. He loved Bob Bremner as though he were a younger brother. Bremner's long illness and cheerful fight impressed him deeply. When Mrs. Lendrim died of the same cruel malady, he provided in his will for the establishment of the Josephine Lendrim Clinic at Paterson General Hospital, where radium, X-ray, and surgery since then have saved many lives.

One of Paterson General's former patients, an elderly man from East Sixth Street, Clifton, was waiting in the Passaic YWCA lobby to greet Dr. George T. Pack, after the famous cancer surgeon concluded an address last year.

"Don't you remember me, Doctor?" he asked. "Perhaps you can't; there are so many. You saved my life 6 years ago when you cut away part of my tongue."

But a Passaic city employee who is now Dr. Pack's patient at Paterson General can't hope for that everyday miracle. Too much time went by. Medical science has not found the answer that Congressman Bremner hoped for 33 years ago.

When it is found, it will be due very likely to the research work which the American Cancer Society is supporting through grants of $3,500,000 to research laboratories and medical colleges. Many of our ablest scientists are engaged in that humanitarian study of cause and cure.

Passaic County Chapter of the society is appealing to the public this month for $60,000, of which Passaic is asked to contribute $18,000 and Clifton $6,000. The campaign will continue through May.

Passaic General Hospital, whose well-equipped cancer clinic received $4,678 for radium and equipment from the society, will be helped by this campaign. So will the

clinics at Barnert Memorial, Paterson General and St. Joseph's Hospitals. Special medications will be paid for; nursing service will be supported.

Cancer ranks second to heart disease among all causes of death. It is responsible for one death among every eight. All who reach middle age live within its shadow.

Harold W. Hutchinson, 150 Ellison Street, Paterson, is Passaic County chairman of the cancer campaign. Herman P. J. Hoffman, Administration Building, Hackensack, is Bergen County chairman. Henry C. Whitehead heads the campaign in Passaic, John C. Barbour in Clifton.

Your check, mailed today to any of these campaign directors, will help to speed the day when the malady that kills one out of eight will come under control.

[From the Merchantville (N. J.) Community News of April 17, 1947]

WE CAN THINK OF NO EXCUSE FOR DODGING THE CANCER DRIVE

As president of New Jersey Division, Inc., of the American Cancer Society, George E. Stringfellow has said:

It is the responsibility of the doctors to advise how, where and for what medical facilities, programs and services money shall be spent.

It is the responsibility of the laymen to raise the money and to administer the funds in accordance with sound business practices.

This arrangement would, it can be supposed, be generally accepted by laymen without argument. Still, leading laymen giving their time, effort, and money to the fight against cancer would be concerned in the expenditure of the fund, and there could be some who felt their wardenship included watching the medical end. But Mr. Stringfellow's plan is best.

This agreement seems necessary as well as wise. The public asked to contribute this month to the drive for funds to fight cancer should be assured that its money will be properly spent and not wasted by questionable experiments, medically or administrative.

With the question settled, there will be no excuse for the tightwad and the responsibility-dodger to evade an obligation through asking: "Who spends it, and how?"

Too many people find excuses for their selfishness when drives come along, by knowing something like one of the stories of Red Cross charging for doughnuts, or a snooty girl being rude to a soldier at a Red Cross post. Too many people expect the other fellow to give the share they owe to movements that contribute to national or local relief and welfare.

Most men or women would be offended if asked if they were inferior, or normal good citizens. Yet one falls short of being a normal good citizen if he doesn't contribute what his means permit toward every drive that is necessary to maintain the organized services for reducing suffering and saving lives.

It isn't necessary to repeat the object of this drive for a fund to combat cancer. It is a rare case, indeed, where one of us can't name a relative or friend or an acquaintance who has died of cancer. We don't like the pressure practiced in frightening people to contribute to a war chest with the reminder that they might be victims. Yet that is true.

But the fight is to save future generations. This will be done through having all the money necessary to keep the best scientists on full time in their researches, their experiments; in having plenty of money to buy what science requires for its work.

For the present, the gains in the battle against cancer are many. The constant crusade has made the average physician more cancer-conscious. Like the fight against tuberculosis, now so effective in widespread X-ray examinations, the family doctor is alert in watching for signs of cancer, the public is being educated to seek immediate medical advice where any ailment indicates a character that could point to cancer.

Cancer is being stopped now, and some day its elusive mysteries will be revealed. But today we should make it possible that the mother of the poorest child, the worker in a factory, the person of moderate circumstances, reluctant to turn to modest savings, should know there is a clinic nearby prepared to give them free examinations and treatment if necessary.

Our hospitals are helped in fighting cancer through the State drive. We can't raise too much money. Camden County should have a hospital department with no other interest than cancer.

As to contributing to the drive, we can add that the failure of a canvasser to call for a donation doesn't excuse nongiving. A contribution left at a bank or at any reliable store will reach the fund.

[From the Cranford (N. J.) Citizen and Chronicle of March 20, 1947]

A TERRIBLE TOLL

Did you know that one in every two families in Cranford will be struck by cancer?

This horrible disease will kill one in every eight persons now living here.

This is a fact not only locally but in every community in this wonderfully rich and beautiful land of ours—this land of wealth and luxury.

The American Cancer Society tells us this terrible toll of death will occur unless we do something about it. And the local chapter, which will conduct a drive for funds in April, tells us what we can do to help avert this appalling tragedy.

First, we can give—give every penny possible to the society's drive for funds so that the goal may be reached. Then we can pay heed to what they tell us about the danger of cancer.

One thing imperative is the need for early detection of the disease, because in this way, lives can be saved. At least one-third of the 17,000,000 Americans now living who are doomed to die of cancer, could be saved if the disease were detected in time and proper treatment given. So another thing that we can do is to become cancer conscious and see our doctors for a complete medical examination at least once a year.

The American Cancer Society points out that there are three acceptable methods of treating cancer—with surgery, radium, and the X-ray. Recognizing this fact, and with the knowledge that in many cases early cancer can be cured, we can face the threat of this scourge with courage and realism.

All the wealth in the world cannot save us from death but there is one way in which we can use our money to keep the grim specter of cancer from us—by putting it to work in research projects where scientists are trying to learn the cause of cancer and perfect a cure for it.

Remember: When you make a contribution to this cause, you are really helping to save the lives of many people right here in Cranford.

[From the Maplewood (N. J.) News of April 3, 1947]

ONE IN EIGHT WILL DIE

No matter how objective one may wish to be, there are times when a person's thoughts, feelings, and actions are influenced directly by his own experiences or by the experiences of those close to him. It is perhaps for that reason that we feel so strongly about the effort now under way, locally and throughout the Nation, to obtain funds with which to fight cancer. We have hated cancer for 18 long years, hated it since the Easter of 1929 when our own mother died of this cruel disease.

There has been progress in the battle against cancer in the intervening years, but not nearly so much progress as in other disease areas. A vast amount of scientific exploration still is necessary before it will be possible to have all the answers about causes, preventives, and cures. And a great amount of general education of the public at large is necessary in order to create an awareness of the disease and its death-dealing blows.

The American Cancer Society, which is leading the attack against cancer, presents these startling statistics:

Cancer strikes on the average one out of every two families.

Cancer is the greatest and cruelest killer of American women between the ages of 35 and 55.

Cancer is the second greatest killer of men.

One in every eight living Americans is destined to die of cancer.

And here are some Maplewood statistics:

Of a total of 209 deaths here in 1946 from all causes, 27 were from cancer. Only the various kinds of heart ailments exceeded this total, the heart figure being 74. Of the cancer deaths, 15 were of men and 12 of women; by age groups, there was one in the 35–44 class, three in 45–54; nine, 55–64; eight 65–74, and six 75–84.

Money in itself will not stop cancer, but the society, in its bid for at least $12,000,000 nationally, has a three-pronged program: Inform men, women, and children everywhere of the cancer danger signals in order to promote early diagnosis and treatment; provide better facilities for prevention, diagnosis, and treatment (effective treatment requires radium, X-ray equipment, and more skilled personnel); expand widely the scientific research attack now being conducted by the National Research Council.

The Maplewood committee's objective is to exceed the $8,900 subscribed by Maplewoodians last year. Since that is an average of considerably less than 50 cents per resident it should be an easy goal to reach. It should be easy to double that amount.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am very glad, indeed, that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has made these remarks about a distinguished citizen of my State, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, and I am glad to join with the Senator in paying tribute to Mr. Stringfellow for his work in connection with cancer research.

BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, as a preliminary to taking up consideration of the unfinished business, I should like to ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement relative to reclamation and irrigation and power, as provided by the program of the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, never before in the history of our country has there been more general interest than exists today in the continuing program for the development of our natural resources by the Interior Department's Reclamation Bureau, through reclamation, power, and related projects, and the effort of the Corps of Engineers on river-and-harbor and flood-control projects.

Interest in the efficient and effective progress of these activities extends to almost every resident, both rural and urban, throughout the 17 so-called western reclamation States, but it is of almost

equal interest to the other States because of the great asset value to the Nation at large of a comprehensive and permanent conservation effort.

So that Congress and the general public may have for convenient reference a list of the construction appropriations proposed in the budget just submitted to Congress for the fiscal year beginning next July, I am requesting permission to insert in the RECORD herewith a list of the amounts approved by the Budget Bureau for the use of the Reclamation Bureau in the construction of irrigation works and multiple-purpose projects to develop our land and water power.

It is to be remembered, of course, that these are subject to review and alteration by the Appropriations Committees of Congress, and by the House and Senate, and that the estimates by the Budget Bureau are not necessarily binding.

Also, for the information of those who are interested in having a similar convenient list of construction estimates for flood-control and river-and-harbor work proposed to be carried on in the next fiscal year by the Corps of Engineers, I will say that such a list was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 12, 1948, on page 94, at the request of Representative ENGEL of Michigan.

It will be noted that the total amount of funds approved by the Budget Bureau for submission to Congress for construction activities of the Reclamation Bureau during the next fiscal year is $257,025,461. This figure is compared with an amount actually approved for the current fiscal year of $211,102,771.

The total proposed for the various reclamation projects in the Missouri Basin development program amounts to $58,325,000 for the Reclamation Bureau and $5,575,000 for other cooperating Department of the Interior units, making a grand total of $63,900,000. This is indicative of the advancement of many projects into the general-construction phase and is compared with a total during the current fiscal year of $33,407,110.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation—Estimates of new appropriations for construction included in the budget for the fiscal year 1949—Project and amount

RECLAMATION FUND, CONSTRUCTION

1. Paonia project, Colorado	$471,000
2. Pine River project, Colorado	60,000
3. Boise project, Idaho, Payette division	750,000
4. Boise project, Anderson Ranch Dam	5,800,000
5. Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho	1,136,000
6. Minidoka project, Idaho	(1)

[1] On the Minidoka project, Idaho, the budget estimate proposes that the limitation on the amount available for surveys and preconstruction work in connection with the north side pumping division stated in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947, be increased from $100,000 to $770,000.

RECLAMATION FUND, CONSTRUCTION—continued

7. Sun River project, Montana	$45,000
8. Tucumcari project, New Mexico	1,540,000
9. Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas	100,000
10. W. C. Austin project, Oklahoma	320,000
11. Deschutes project, Oregon	230,000
12. Owyhee project, Oregon	150,000
13. Ogden River project, Utah	34,000
14. Provo River project, Utah	1,200,000
15. Yakima project, Washington, Roza division	1,497,000
16. Riverton project, Wyoming	750,000
17. Shoshone project, Wyoming, power division	430,000
Total, reclamation fund, construction	14,513,000

RECLAMATION FUND, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT

The 1949 budget includes estimates for commencement of rehabilitation and betterment on the following completed projects in not to exceed the following amounts, payable from the reclamation fund:

1. Salt River project, Arizona	556,500
2. Yuma project, Arizona	500,000
3. Orland project, California	50,000
4. Bitterroot project, Montana	40,000
5. Milk River project, Montana	103,500
6. North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming	750,000
7. Humboldt project, Nevada	225,000
8. Carlsbad project, New Mexico	400,000
9. Hyrum project, Utah	48,000
10. Yakima project, Washington	151,000
Total, reclamation fund, rehabilitation and betterment	2,824,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation and betterment projects, reclamation fund	17,337,000

GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

1. Gila project, Arizona	3,000,000
2. Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada	24,000,000
3. Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California	260,000
4. Central Valley project, California	41,500,000
5. Kern River project, California	50,000
6. Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	23,000,000
7. Hungry Horse project, Montana	9,850,000
8. Columbia Basin project, Washington	48,000,000
Total, general fund, construction	149,660,000

OTHER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

1. Fort Peck project, Montana	2,200,000
2. Missouri River Basin	[2] 63,900,000
3. Boulder Canyon project (Hoover Dam)	1,920,000
4. Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal)	4,484,000

[2] This figure represents the lump sum estimated for the Missouri River Basin, fiscal year 1949. The break-down of this amount is set forth in the table which appears below.

OTHER CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—continued

5. Colorado River front work and levee system	$1,160,000
Total, other construction projects	73,664,000
Grand total, 1949 estimates of new appropriations for construction	240,661,000
Estimated unobligated balance July 1, 1948, for use on construction projects in fiscal year 1949	[3] 16,364,461
Grand total of construction funds, fiscal year 1949	257,025,461

[3] The total estimated unobligated balance July 1, 1948, for construction is $20,321,056, of which $3,956,595 is for use on construction projects subsequent to fiscal year 1948, leaving $16,364,461 available for use on construction projects during fiscal year 1949.

Break-down of Missouri River Basin project program, fiscal years 1948–49

PHASE A—UNITS SELECTED FOR CONSTRUCTION

Angostura, S. Dak	$3,600,000
Bostwick, Nebr.-Kans	3,000,000
Boysen, Wyo	6,108,000
Belle Fourche, Wyo	550,000
Cannonball, N. Dak	950,000
Canyon Ferry, Mont	3,500,000
Cedar Bluff, Kans	3,600,000
Frenchman-Cambridge, Nebr	8,900,000
Glendo, Wyo	1,000,000
Grand River, S. Dak	1,800,000
Heart River, N. Dak	2,347,000
Kortes, Wyo	4,800,000
Moreau River, S. Dak	995,000
Narrows, Colo	2,000,000
Powder River, Wyo.-Mont	1,000,000
Region 6 headquarters, Montana	5,000
St. Francis, Colo.-Kans	2,000,000
Transmission lines	5,053,000
Yellowstone pumping, Montana-North Dakota	700,000
O. & M. during construction	50,000
Subtotal, phase A	51,958,000

PHASE B—UNITS BEING PREPARED FOR CONSTRUCTION

Bad River, S. Dak	15,000
Big Horn pumping, Wyoming	20,000
Columbus, Nebr	200,000
Grand Island, Nebr	500,000
Hardin, Mont	500,000
Jefferson River, Mont	100,000
Lower Marias, Mont	300,000
Middle Loup, Nebr	300,000
Missouri-Souris, Mont.-N. Dak	700,000
Montana pumping, Montana	50,000
North Dakota pumping, North Dakota	50,000
Oahe-James River, S. Dak	400,000
Rapid Valley, S. Dak	55,000
Shoshone extensions, Wyoming	100,000
South Dakota pumping, South Dakota	30,000
Sun River, Mont	50,000
Tongue River, Wyo	78,000
White River, S. Dak	30,000
Wind River, Wyo	20,000
Subtotal, phase B	3,498,000

PHASE C—CONTINUING WORK ON THE GENERAL PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

Big Horn Basin, Wyo.-Mont	80,000
Cheyenne River, S. Dak	35,000

PHASE C—CONTINUING WORK ON THE GENERAL PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT—continued	
Clarks Fork, Wyo.-Mont.	$6,000
Garrison diversion, North Dakota	78,000
Helena Valley, Mont.	30,000
Judith River, Mont.	15,000
Kansas Basin, Colo.-Nebr.-Kans.	400,000
Little Missouri, N. Dak.	15,000
Lower Platte Basin, Nebr.	700,000
Nilan, Mont.	8,000
Niobrara Basin, Wyo.-Nebr.	200,000
North Platte Basin, Colo.-Wyo.-Nebr.	180,000
North Republican, Colo.-Nebr.	14,000
South Platte Basin, Colo.-Wyo.-Nebr.	300,000
Three Forks, Mont.	428,000
Upper Marias, Mont.	50,000
Wilson, Kans.	100,000
General:	
Power studies, region 6	$30,000
Reports staff, region 6	100,000
Subtotal, phase C	2,769,000
PHASE D	
For work in cooperation or in connection with the activities of the Corps of Engineers	100,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	58,325,000
Other Department of the Interior agencies:	
Bureau of Land Management	450,000
Bureau of Mines	150,000
Fish and Wildlife Service	425,000
Geological Survey	4,150,000
National Park Service	200,000
Office of Indian Affairs	200,000
Total, other departmental units	5,575,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	63,900,000
Total program, Bureau of Reclamation	58,325,000
Less transfer to Denver office (included above)	4,560,000
Total obligations, Bureau of Reclamation	53,765,000

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation for construction, fiscal year 1948

Fund or project:	*Amount*
Reclamation fund:	
Regular	$11,876,750
Supplemental	72,000
General fund:	
Regular	49,841,288
Supplemental	31,939,000
Fort Peck project, Montana	1,500,000
Missouri River Basin:	
Regular	17,000,000
Supplemental	6,400,000
Boulder Canyon project (Hoover Dam)	435,000
Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal)	3,245,000
Colorado River front work and levee system	1,000,000
Total new appropriations	123,309,038
Unobligated balance for construction, fiscal year 1948	87,793,733
Total	[1] 211,102,771

[1] Of this amount, it is today estimated by the Interior Department that $20,321,056 will be carried into the fiscal year 1949 as an unobligated balance.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senate has now approached the point at which we are ready to take up the unfinished business, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Baldwin	Hatch	Myers
Ball	Hawkes	O'Conor
Barkley	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hill	Overton
Bridges	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Holland	Revercomb
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Maybank	Williams
Fulbright	Millikin	Wilson
George	Moore	Young
Green	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent on official business of the Committee on Public Lands.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on account of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotions of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skill between people of the United States and other countries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The immediate question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the words "Educational Exchange Act of", it is proposed to strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, House bill 3342, the pending measure, which, according to its amended title, is "An act to promote a better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations," is the Voice of America program. This bill, which has been the subject of intensive study and considerable debate in the Congress and in its committees for a period of over 2 years, is an attempt to give legislative authority to certain activities that have been carried on by the State Department since the close of the war. Let me repeat that the bill represents an attempt to give legislative authority to certain activities which have already been carried on. It is really the consolidation of the activities of the State Department's Division of Cultural Relations, the Office of Inter-American Affairs and the so-called Office of War Information, which carried on during the war, and which aimed to provide an intelligent understanding of the status and progress of the war effort and of the war policies and activities of the Government. After the close of the war, it was felt advisable to continue these activities which aimed to explain the spirit and purpose of America to other nations of the world.

The so-called Mundt bill, which is the foundation of the present proposed legislation, passed the House of Representatives last June by a vote of 272 to 97. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate immediately took up the bill and reported it favorably shortly thereafter with certain amendments, but it did not come to a vote before the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. A Senate resolution was adopted, however, providing for the setting up of a special committee to investigate the whole matter and to cooperate with a corresponding committee of the House of Representatives in visiting Europe this past summer and reporting back to the Congress not later than February 1, 1948.

THE TRIP ABROAD

Following up the directive contained in the Senate resolution, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] appointed as a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to make this study, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]—myself—as chairman. Acting with a corresponding committee appointed by the House of Representatives, composed of Representative MUNDT, chairman, and Representatives GORDON, JARMAN, JUDD, LODGE, MANSFIELD, and LAWRENCE SMITH, we visited the capitals of Europe together during the months of September and October. We made a careful study of the operation of the so-called information and educational program of the State Department in these various parts of Europe. The committee is now engaged in preparing a report, country by country, of the places visited and indicating more specifically than it is necessary to do at this moment, the situation as we found it in those countries. It is our hope and belief that the report, which will shortly be presented to the Congress, may be of aid

in bringing about a better understanding of the so-called information and educational exchange program, and may also be a helpful guide to the new administration being set up in the State Department to direct these activities.

Let me emphasize at that point, Mr. President, that a new administration is being set up in the State Department, with a new Assistant Secretary of State at its head, whose name has just been announced, and whose nomination will shortly come before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for action.

Mr. President, I think it is fitting at this point in my remarks to acknowledge our appreciation to the War Department for its courtesy in extending to us the use of an Army plane—a C–54—with a most excellent and attentive crew, composed of the following members: Capt. R. W. Carroll, Capt. William E. Gregg, Master Sgt. Frank Sayho, Tech. Sgt. Theodore M. Lucas, Capt. Edward M. Rubich, Capt. Paul H. Pflug, Staff Sgt. William P. Truesdell, Staff Sgt. L. M. Harris, and Master Sgt. Steve Fedinick.

The party was in the immediate charge of Col. Paul Tombaugh, to whom we owe our thanks for the effective way in which the strenuous schedule was carried out.

The joint committee staff was made up on the House side of Mr. John Easton, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; Messrs. Rewinkle and Ravendahl, of the State Department, and Mr. Morrell; on the Senate side, Mr. A. B. Hermann, administrative assistant of the chairman, and Henry Holthusen, of New York.

As chairman of the Senate group, I desire to express my acknowledgment to Chairman MUNDT and his colleagues of the House group and the appreciation of all of us on the Senate side for the effective way the Members of the House worked with us in our common endeavor to understand and make some contribution to our American foreign policy in dealing with this difficult subject.

I desire to add a word of personal appreciation of the fine assistance and counsel I have received from my colleagues in the Senate, and the opportunity that it gave us all to know each other better in taking a trip of this kind, joined as we were in our common interest to serve our country more effectively. While the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] did not actually accompany the party on the trip, he went to Europe independently last summer, and he has filed with the committee a separate and most important report containing his observations made from a somewhat different viewpoint.

The trip as a whole consumed nearly 2 months, and the committee or some of its members at least covered every capital in Europe except Yugoslavia, Albania, Russia, and the Irish Free State. We covered the important countries of western Europe, the Scandinavian countries, Germany, the so-called satellite countries behind the iron curtain, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Spain, and Portugal. We had the unique experience of feeling the comparative "atmospheres" of the free countries of western Europe, now included within the European recovery plan, and the "unfree" police states suffering in fear behind the iron curtain. We saw with our own eyes and experienced the pattern of the Communist infiltration. We felt the influence of misrepresentation, falsification, division, chaos, compromise, despair, and ultimate absorption.

We moved in the States where we could watch the liquidation of the opposition. We could feel the fear that was engendered in the peoples of these countries when the opposition leaders were seized and charged with treason. We arrived in Bulgaria just after Petkov had been murdered. We were in Rumania after Maniu had been imprisoned, but before he was tried and condemned to a life of solitary confinement. We were in Hungary after Nagy had been thrown out, and before Pfeiffer, with whom we conversed, had been compelled to flee for his life. We were in Poland and talked with Mikolajczyk before he was compelled to flee. And, of course, we knew before any of these incidents of the case of Mihailovich in Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, while we were experiencing these successive nightmares which we could hardly believe there was constantly brought to our attention the incessant falsification of our country and the charges that we in the United States had imperialistic designs on Europe; that the proposals of Secretary Marshall, now known as the Marshall plan, were a frantic effort to divert an inevitable American economic depression by unloading our surplus on Europe—were an attempt to give priority in the recovery of Europe to the German aggressors; that it was a plot to restore the military might of Germany as a United States instrument to dominate Europe; that the recovery program was clearly an act of imperialism to make all of Europe a dependency of the United States.

Perhaps because of these vivid experiences and these outrageous misrepresentations of the spirit and purpose of our country we were peculiarly sensitive to the fact that we were woefully inadequate as a nation, through our embassies and legations, to present our story. We did not have the means adequately to staff our representatives in the various countries of Europe with people equipped to contact the local press, to use the radio, properly to distribute such information agencies as our motion pictures; to aid our pitifully small libraries to meet the daily demands everywhere of people to know more about America and what America really did stand for. Coupled with all this, we found a real eagerness among natives with whom we talked to come to America and to exchange ideas with us, and to have our people come to Europe to tell those in Europe why and how America has become the great nation that she is.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THIS TRIP

Mr. President, I think I am justified in drawing certain conclusions from our trip, for my colleagues as well as myself. I have talked these matters over with them quite fully, and I should like to present our conclusions briefly:

First. The United States today is not understood in these countries, and our present service, acting through our embassies and legations, is wholly inadequate to make us properly understood. This does not mean boastful propaganda, but simply means telling the truth;

Second. The present hostile campaign by Russia, which has been intensified since the European recovery program has begun, makes it imperative that we make it clear to the people of these countries, as distinguished from their rulers, what we are trying to do for Europe and why we are trying to do it. The constant reiteration of lies and misrepresentations does have its effect and does leave questions in the minds of people who otherwise would be friendly to the United States. For example, in Czechoslovakia, which is slowly being absorbed by the Communist movement, the question was seriously asked of us whether we did intend to build up Germany industrially, so that she might become our instrument to control Europe.

The extent to which the official Soviet Government goes in its attacks against the United States and its motives is almost unbelievable to any American who respects honesty and truth.

To illustrate the viciousness of these attacks, I should like to cite several examples.

The first concerns a bitter attack made by Radio Moscow only a few days ago against the efforts of charitably minded Americans to alleviate starvation in the war-torn countries of the world.

I quote this Russian broadcast, which was sent out a few days ago over Radio Moscow in the German language to the German people:

> Only simple-minded people could have believed that American alms in the form of CARE parcels would fill the stomachs of the miners. These CARE parcels were advertised to an almost unbelievable extent by Anglo-United States propaganda which stated that the parcels contained 40,000 calories. Examination proved, however, that the parcels contained a multitude of various goods including toilet paper. Moreover, these parcels are being debited against Germany's account and in the future will have to be paid for in hard cash.
>
> Only American manufacturers are benefiting through the CARE parcels. According to reports in the German democratic press (Communist), American racketeers have made a profit of $15,000,000 already during the first months of the CARE parcel scheme. The CARE parcel system introduced into the Ruhr mines by the Americans is nothing else but the notorious sweated labor system designed to exploit the miners, and its perilous results are already becoming noticeable.

Here are further examples of this vicious propaganda:

To Germany, Radio Moscow said:

> No other name than "Hitlerite Anschluss" describes this Austrian federation hatched in Germany, this anti-Communist Catholic state designed to unite Bavaria and Austria and the western territories under the wings of the United States dollar and the Vatican cross. This federation displays only too blatantly the stamp "Made in the U. S. A.," which is born out by the fact that both Cardinal Spellman and the bank of Pierpont Morgan are showing unhealthy interest in it.

In Italian to Italy, Radio Moscow said:

> United States warmongers agree in supporting a military aggression against the Soviet Union. Some of them even want the United States to drop atom bombs on Soviet cities even now.

To the Czechs, Radio Moscow said:

The Marshall plan is not merely a plan for the economic and political enslavement of European countries by the United States. It is at the same time a plan to organize military strategic bases in Europe for United States imperialism, a plan to accumulate supplies of strategic raw materials for the United States with the help of European suppliers. United States expansionists circles demand that United States loans and deliveries to certain European countries be made only in exchange for certain territorial concessions.

In English to North America, Radio Moscow said:

The American bankers and monopolists have no desire to combat inflation for they need it as a weapon of attack on the wide masses. Indeed, New York business circles are already discussing what they call the need for a reserve army of four or five million unemployed which will help them to keep wages down and crush the efforts of the trade-unions defending the rights of the working peoples. All of these methods of plundering the United States masses are directly connected with the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I should like to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my address excerpts from other broadcasts from Moscow, which further illustrate what Russia is saying about us. The ones which I have read are illustrative, but I feel that the others are important for the RECORD, to show the extent to which this program of vilification has been carried.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of December 10, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Persian to the Near and Middle East, said:

"The generous American help in dollars and armaments to international reaction has not had the desired results for United States imperialists. In the struggle between the forces of reaction and those of democracy, the latter have gained the upper hand, and are more and more strengthened. Hence the ruling United States circles are striving with greater obstinacy to weaken the people's resistance from within, and to sow the seeds of discord in the democratic camp.

"These objects must be realized by those statesmen, circles, and parties who are linked with imperialistic policy and foreign capital. Such parties and statesmen are ready to carry out without argument the orders of their overseas masters. Even if these orders run contrary to the interests of their countries they do not fail to obey like slaves."

[From the Washington Star of December 11, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to the United Kingdom, said:

"The Foreign Ministers Conference in London has been marked by a consistent effort of the Soviet delegation to reach a speedy European peace settlement. In fact it was the sincere desire of the Soviet delegation to reach an agreement which from the outset secured concerted decisions on certain questions of procedure in framing the German treaty. On the other hand, during the discussion of such crucial issues as the creation of a democratic government for the whole of Germany, the future peace conference, in German assets in Austria, the United States delegation, as a rule followed by Bevin and Bidault, took a stand that betrayed not the slightest desire to reach coordinated decisions. It is a stand aimed at causing a break-down in international cooperation."

[From the Washington Star of December 12, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Persian to the Near and Middle East, said:

"The small Syrian Republic is passing through a severe economic crisis. Local industries are limiting their production and the workers are being deprived of employment and means of earning their bread. Public opinion in Syria places the responsibility for the situation on the shoulders of the United States monopolists.

"The Americans have filled the markets of that country with their goods. They are resorting to numerous intrigues and machinations to undermine the basis of the states. American diplomats arrogantly interfere in the internal affairs of the country, imposing their will on a Majlis of their own making, and support the reactionary circles which are resented by the nation."

[From the Washington Star of December 16, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Polish to Poland, said:

"At the very beginning of the conference the Soviet delegation proposed a number of concrete and definite motions aimed at bringing about agreement on the most pressing matters pertaining to the postwar regime of Germany. It demonstrated to the whole world who really desires peace and who obstructs the agreement.

"The shouts and the conference is over, and the declaration of the United States papers that they have had enough of it equally betray the anger of the reactionary circles on both sides of the ocean with the fact that the Soviet proposals expose those who are trying to put the blame on others."

[From the Washington Star of December 17, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to the United Kingdom, said:

"The House of Representatives has just passed the bill on interim aid for Europe, after putting some anti-Communist and anti-Soviet amendments into it. These amendments leave no doubt that not only on that pretext of aid the United States means to interfere in the domestic affairs of European countries, but also that this United States interference is aimed at crushing the democratic movement of the peoples of Europe."

[From the Washington Star of December 18, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to North America, said:

"The Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives has demanded the death sentence for America's most popular stars, simply because they have espoused the lofty human ideals of peace, freedom, and democracy. If an actor does not further the idea of atomic war, he cannot find work in America today. If he opposes racial discrimination, he is prosecuted. If he refuses to devote his talents to anti-Soviet activity, he is threatened with imprisonment. All that is progressive and truly democratic in America has become seditious."

[From the Washington Star of December 20, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting to the Soviet Union, said:

"The wave of American tourists has transferred from Greece to Turkey to Iran. trans-Atlantic businessmen, sleuths, and corrupt journalists, singly and in parties, make interesting journeys through this country.

"It is not historical remains but oil which lures American imperialism to the Middle East. It is oil that is needed by contemporary American militarism. * * *

"Everywhere in the Middle East the traveler is struck by the potentialities of the future. Naturally this 'future' is described in the Stars and Stripes form of United States colonial domination over the countries of the East."

[From the Washington Star of December 21, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in German to Europe, said:

"The Soviet decision to abolish rationing and carry out a currency reform has found a wide echo in the world press. The great Soviet country which had borne the main burden of the war proved once more to the world that the Socialist economic system is immeasurably superior to the chaotic and predatory system of capitalism.

"The venal journalists, on the other hand, who are being kept by the reactionary monopolists in the United States, Britain, and other capitalist countries, have shown once more that they do not draw their money for nothing. They employed every means to distort the historic Soviet measure."

[From the Washington Star of December 22, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Japanese to Japan, said:

"With the help of the Japanese Zaibatsu and militarists, the Americans have transformed Japan into a colony and a military base of the United States. Because of this, the United States adheres to its unilateral policy regarding the Japanese peace treaty. The American imperialists and the Japanese reactionaries, therefore, have started to slander the Soviet Union.

"In order to regain their power, the Japanese reactionaries, with the support of the American imperialists, are turning Japan into a colony of the United States and are wholeheartedly supporting American unilateral policy."

[From the Washington Star of December 23, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Danish to Denmark, said:

"The various plans for setting up regional customs stations, the realization of which threatens the economic independence of European countries, are an important link in the schemes of the United States monopolists who wish to take posession of the European countries' economies.

"The (decision) to establish a Nordic customs union is also dictated by the interests of the United States monopolies and by the attempts of the monopolies to transform the Scandinavian countries into a customs-free dumping market for United States goods."

[From the Washington Star of December 24, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Russian to the Soviet Far East, said:

"In his message to Congress, President Truman tried to conceal the imperialistic essence of the Marshall plan behind a variety of worthy formulas, and to represent that program as aid to the democracies of Europe.

"The struggle of the progressive elements of European countries which suffered from the war and the struggle for the preservation of the sovereignty and independence of these countries are declared by Truman to be opposition to the rehabilitation of Europe. We must not close our eyes to the fact, says the message, that the Communists are decisively opposed to any attempt to help Europe get back on her feet."

[From the Washington Star of December 30, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in French to Europe, said:

"The Voice of America (The United States short-wave broadcast) carries out the orders it gets from Wall Street and does not shirk at any method to carry them out. When King Dollar is in, the moral standards are out.

"The truth is a foreign notion to the Voice of America, in particular, and United States broadcasts in general. The United States wavelengths are almost entirely under the control of monopolist corporations. The class in power allows only reactionary journalists and commentators ready to write and read anything that pleases the 'boss,' to the mike. Progressive journalists hardly ever manage to broadcast."

[From the Washington Star of December 31, 1947]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting to the Soviet Union, said:

"Recently, on board the steamship *Russiya*, a group of Armenians arrived from the United States. They had emigrated from Russia 20 to 30 years ago. The stories of these living witnesses on life in the United States are full of tragedy. They speak about awful years during which they lived in Truman's golden America.

" 'Some of us made a fairly good living at times, but despite that, could never feel like human beings in the United States,' said an Armenian doctor, who has just returned from the United States.

" 'It is only here among the Soviet people that we begin to feel and experience real freedom and human life,' said an electrician who lived 46 years overseas."

[From the Washington Star of January 1, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in French to Europe, said:

"More than 2 years have elapsed since the end of the war against fascism. Where is peace today? The angels must be particularly saddened when they fly over the very Christian America and when they hear on the waves—so-called free—the choir of the warmongers which rival each other to find the most efficient means to exterminate men.

"But what does it matter? The American leaders have prepared impressive gifts for the European people: Antiworker laws in France, increases in the price of coal and railway fares, projects for a western German state, amnesty for the Fascists, and many things which I do not mention. It is not toward the star of Bethlehem but toward the dollar that certain 'kings' of western Europe turn their glances today, forgetful of national dignity and surrounded by the indignation of their people. It is not before the humble manger that they kneel but before the American association of industrialists."

[From the Washington Star of January 4, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to the United Kingdom, said:

"The formation of a provisional democratic government of Greece upset the whole reactionary camp from Athens to Washington. The growth and consolidation of the democratic forces of Greece, which is indicated by the failure of all the efforts of the Athens puppets to crush the democratic army in the guerrilla forces, reflects the deep and abiding love of the Greek people for liberty and independence.

"The Anglo-United States patrons of the Greek Fascists are in difficult straits. The actions of the Greek democrats expose the whole imperialist policy pursued by Britain and the United States in Greece."

[From the Washington Star of January 5, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in English to North America, said:

"It is known that the American reactionaries label as Communists all who refuse to bow to the almighty dollar, all who refuse to sell their Nation for a mess of pottage. All this further exposes the real aims of the American imperialists, who dream of clearing the road to world domination with the dollar and the atomic bomb.

"But the bosses of the Marshall plan overlook the will of the nations of Europe, who do not want to serve as pawns in the hands of others or sacrifice themselves for plans hatched on the other side of the ocean."

[From the Washington Star of January 6, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting to the Soviet Union, said:

"Wallace's election campaign undoubtedly leads to the salvation of the democratic forces in the United States, and it is greeted by all who favor democratic development in the United States and are sincere friends of peace * * *."

Moscow radio, broadcasting to the United Kingdom, said:

"Even before the announcement that Wallace was to stand for the Presidency, Government employees were discharged under Truman's loyalty order for sympathizing with Wallace and listening to his speeches, and as the election campaign gets going and the people's movement against the bipartisan policy continues to mount, fresh emergency measures against progressive-minded Americans may be expected."

[From the Washington Star of January 7, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in French to Europe, said:

"It is by now ancient history that corruption is rife in the United States administration, as well as in the political parties. Indeed, corruption in the United States has assumed truly American proportions, and this applies to Federal Government organs and private concerns.

"Volumes would have to be written to write even a brief outline of the dishonesty of American officials, many of whom have felt the heavy hand of the law and public opinion. But there are not a few United States statesmen whose nefarious activities are carried on behind the scenes, and of whose exploits little or nothing is known."

[From the Washington Star of January 8, 1948]

WHAT THE RUSSIANS ARE SAYING OF US

The Moscow radio, broadcasting in Russian to the Soviet Union, said:

"The countries treading along the American path are up to their eyes in postwar difficulties. Britain and France are going through a crisis, and even in the United States the approach of a crisis is becoming clearer. The Marshall plan is designed to delay the approach of a crisis and to convert the European countries into suppliers of raw materials for United States markets. It is designed to strangle the industries of Europe and to cast European countries into the abyss of poverty and unemployment."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I proceed now to my third point:

I think it was the feeling of our entire group that, while there were shortcomings in the services that our missions had rendered during the last few years in the information field, nevertheless generally speaking, and realizing the limited resources at their command, they had done a distinctly creditable job and the limited personnel engaged in these operations was entitled to real gratitude and praise from us.

Fourth. I think we are agreed also that whatever expenditures have been made up to date for this service were fully justified, and that the necessary work to be done in these informational and educational fields must have far more extensive support than it has had in the past. We compared the amount spent by Great Britain for her information program, including the BBC broadcasts, and we discovered that, as against the meager $12,000,000 which we are spending this fiscal year, Britain is spending the equivalent in sterling of something like $40,000,000—between three and four times as much as we are. This is because Britain has discovered during the more than 10 years she has been carrying on this service, the vital importance of it in connection with the development of her foreign policy. We could not get the figures on Russian expenditures, but the evidence was clear on all sides that this kind of ideological warfare was the great big effort that Russia is making today. Estimating from the number of persons apparently employed, from the space occupied, and from the intensity of the radio programs, it probably would not be out of the way to guess that Russia is spending at least two or three times as much as Great Britain, which would mean that she is spending ten to fifteen times as much as the United States.

Fifth. I think we would all agree also that the critical times call for the highest possible type of personnel at all levels, and especially the key men who have to determine these fundamental policies.

Sixth. This brings us to a consideration of the organizational set-up. It was agreed, I think, by all of us that the over-all supervision of this important work must be in the Department of State, with our chiefs of missions in the various countries primarily responsible. But we were also agreed—and this agreement on our part is reflected in the Senate amendments to the bill which I will discuss presently—that there must be a distinct set-up, on the one hand, of the so-called informational service, which may conceivably have certain propaganda implications and may even become involved politically; and, on the other hand, we must set apart by itself the so-called educational exchange service which, if it is to be truly effective, must be objective, nonpolitical, and, above all, have no possible propaganda implications.

Seventh. We were agreed that there were geographical and cultural differences in the countries we visited, which would require variation in dealing with the informational and educational exchange programs in the various countries. This implies that there could not be one pattern set up in New York City, for example, which would be made universal for all of Europe. This would apply, of course, even more when we are dealing with other parts of the world, such as the South American areas and the Middle East and the Far East.

Eighth. We were agreed that the State Department had been wise in using the assistance of other Government agencies in handling certain phases of its work, and especially those phases which had to do with the giving of technical assistance to other countries, as, for example, the setting up of geological surveys, weather bureaus, and so forth.

Ninth. We were particularly agreed with the importance of using private American agencies to the maximum extent possible in everything having to do with the understanding of America abroad. I wish to emphasize especially the importance of using private American agencies to the maximum extent possible in everything having to do with the understanding of America abroad.

By these private American agencies, I mean our press service, our American periodicals, our motion pictures, and our private commercial radio service. We believe that every effort should be made to facilitate these services and to this end we even explored the possibility of ways and means by which it might be possible to enable these activities to expand through relieving them in some way of the embarrassment of foreign currencies which they received for their services, and which were not convertible. We did not find it possible to incorporate in the pending legislation any immediate provision that would take care of this matter, but we earnestly recommend that hearings be held on the subject, and that subsequent legislation be passed to make it possible for this type of private American service to be rendered more extensively.

Whether that should be in the form of introducing a bill, having hearings on it, and determining how this is to be brought about, is a matter for later consideration. I think our committee is agreed that some formula should be developed whereby the foreign currencies might be translated into dollars, so that the publications rendering this very important service can be given relief from their present dollar embarrassment.

Tenth. The committee feels that, while none of us wants to impose any type of censorship on the products of private American industry operating abroad, nevertheless there should be some way by agreement with the producers themselves to maintain the highest possible quality of production. What I mean by this is, for example, if we are sending motion pictures abroad reflecting American life, there should be a pride among the producers in reflecting the highest possible type of American life, and not send over some of the unfortunately cheap type of films which represent the regrettable, seamy side of the American character. It seems completely fitting that in this field of "who we are and why we are," we should reach a "standard to which the wise and honest can repair."

Eleventh. Every member of our committee is a strong supporter of the United Nations and what the Charter stands for. Consequently, we were particularly careful to consider whether any of the activities we were carrying on, or might carry on, would in any way conflict with the over-all international picture of the United Nations, which we want to keep in the forefront. I think we were agreed that our activities up to date fitted in with the United Nations plans, and, as we expand the work can be made to fit in even more, and that our activities are in entire consonance with UNESCO.

Our over-all conclusion is that this service has the great opportunity to reflect American life to the other peoples of the world, and, above all, American policies, and to these ends we firmly believe that the expansion of the service at this time is imperative.

The problem now before us is whether the pending legislation known in the House as the Mundt bill, with such amendments as the Senate committee has recommended, should be passed. As I stated in my opening remarks, this bill aims to give legislative authority for what have been the unofficial activities of the State Department since the end of the war. Year by year, the State Department has been compelled to ask for appropriations for activities which it felt were imperative, and yet which really had no legislative authorization. We have tried in the pending bill to bring all these activities into the "tent" of the State Department, and, in the interest of conformity, certain existing legislation is repealed, when and if this act takes effect.

Let me run through the bill, hurriedly, indicating its scope:

Title I gives the "short title, objectives, and definitions."

Section 1 gives the short title.

Section 2 declares the objectives and distinguishes clearly between, first, an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States and its people—that is in one category; second, an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in (a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills; (b) the rendering of technical and other services; (c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts and sciences.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I should like to congratulate the Senator on the very clear statement he is making on the pending bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is one feature of the bill upon which he has touched which is of interest to me and to many people in the educational field. While I was home during the late summer, and since then by correspondence, I have had the benefit of the views of Dr. Cherrington, of the University of Denver. From information which he has given me it seems there is a good deal of opinion among leaders in the educational world that there should be a complete divorcement in organization, that the activity should not be taken out of the State Department, but within the State Department there should be a complete divorcement, from top to bottom, of the information service as distinguished from the educational exchange service. The Senator has emphasized that his bill takes some account of that point. As I understand, the whole activity will be headed by one person, and thus in both these fields we will present a single face to the world.

I should like to have the benefit of the Senator's observations on the reasons for that particular theory of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator for particularly calling this matter to our attention, because that is one of the most important changes made by the Senate committee in the bill, as I shall point out later. Not only have we made this distinction between the information service and the educational exchange service in the statement of purposes, but we have also emphasized the point in title VI, establishing two advisory commissions instead of one; one commission to advise in the field of information which might be called propaganda, and the other in the field of educational exchange which might be called the purely cultural side. We have very fully discussed the matter which the distinguished Senator calls to our attention, and we felt that, as the State Department is set up at the present time, the logical composition of the work would be to have an Assistant Secretary of State in charge of public affairs. Under him would be two subassistants, one of whom would be directly charged with the informational side of the work, and the other directly charged with the educational exchange side. In the field of which the distinguished Senator is speaking we had in mind that it should be headed by educational men of outstanding ability who understand the whole educational exchange problem, and particularly the interchange of students, which is, we feel, one of the most important parts of the bill. It was felt that that was the logical set-up from the standpoint of the present State Department organization; and without making any radical change in the set-up, we felt this would be the best way to deal with it. I have had correspondence with Dr. Cherrington. I have discussed the matter with Dr. Conant and Dr. Dodds, of Princeton, who are very much interested in it; and I think I am correct in saying that they feel that the way we have set this up comes as near as anything can at the present moment to meeting their desires for the separation of the two services.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the provisions of the bill for the separation of the two agencies beneath the top man are

thoroughly admirable. Dr. Cherrington told me just yesterday that there has been a recent meeting of the presidents—I think of our educational institutions—I think he said 600 of them were present—and that they still hope that the two agencies may be completely separated, each having its own head.

I would not offer any amendment to that effect, because I have confidence that the committee has made the best solution of the problem it could make. But it continues to emphasize the point that by heading both agencies with one man, there will be presented to the world one face, which could readily lend itself to the impression that the educational part and the informational part are really being intermingled and are intended to serve propaganda purposes. What would the Senator say is the answer to that particular criticism?

Mr. SMITH. I would hope that the man who has been suggested to set up the whole organization and to take both of these services under the same general tent in the State Department would be so proficient in his job that when he was dealing in the field of what we have heretofore called cultural relations—educational exchanges—he would be able to promote that part by itself, and would not try to steal the thunder of the other part for his own purposes. I think the man who is recommended and who probably will be appointed is of such caliber that he is capable of making that vital distinction.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then I take it that the Senator from New Jersey believes that in the operations under the provisions of this bill, the top man will be able to make it clearly evident to the world which is information and which is on the educational side.

Mr. SMITH. I think I am safe in saying that we shall feel that we have failed in our purpose if that is not perfectly clear when the plan becomes operative.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Might there also be a reasonable assurance that if that objective is not met in practice, there would be general support for an amendment which would separate the two services from top to bottom within the State Department?

Mr. SMITH. Speaking for myself, Mr. President, I certainly would take that position if I felt that the situation was abused in the way the Senator from Colorado suggests it might be abused.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Colorado for bringing this matter to our attention, because it is one of the most important features of the bill.

Mr. President, in this connection I may say that in Great Britain these two services have actually been divided by not having the so-called cultural service under the foreign service at all. They think they may have to go back to giving it a foreign service coverage; but the British consul, so-called, is entirely independent of the whole BBC operation and all the informational program. I understand that they have been somewhat embarrassed because they have had to have parallel organizations in the field, and in certain areas the same person has had to serve both purposes, and so forth.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will further yield, I should like to say something which seems to me to be obvious, and perhaps it should not be said, namely, that the information service must necessarily proceed on a current, day-to-day basis, according to the necessities of the international situation, whereas the other agency is dealing with what might be termed the verities, which have more permanence; and it would be a very bad thing if the world received the impression that we were mixing the two and were using the verities of our cultural life and were twisting them so as to serve temporary, day-by-day, information-service purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is entirely correct, and I agree completely with the statement he has just made.

Continuing with the brief analysis of the bill, let me say that section 3 of title I relates the activities under this bill to the United Nations. Section 4 contains certain definitions.

Then we come to title II, entitled "Interchange of Persons, Knowledge, and Skills."

Section 201 of this title has to do with the exchange of students, teachers, and so forth. It contains an amendment aimed at protecting the United States from subversive activities. We inserted a provision of our own there, and it will be brought up presently among the amendments. It would change the language in such a way as to protect us against subversive activities by students entering this country.

Section 202 provides for the interchange between the United States and other countries of books, periodicals, and so forth.

Section 203 gives authority to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, and so forth.

Then we come to title III, which is headed "Assignment of specialists."

Sections 301, 302, and 303 provide the machinery for assigning specialists to other countries that are desirous of obtaining the services of persons having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications. Mr. President, I may say that in connection with this part of the bill, Secretary Marshall tells me that today he has applications from all over the world, particularly from South American countries, for the assignment of specialists to help them with some of their jobs, and especially to give them the benefit of American techniques. Secretary Marshall feels unable to comply with such requests unless he has authority of this kind. Therefore I feel that this is a very important part of the bill.

Title IV relates to participation by Government agencies. Sections 401, 402, and 403 authorize the Secretary of State in carrying on the activities under this act to utilize the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies. That means that if there are in the Interior Department, for example, personnel in some specialized fields who are carrying on specialized work, the State Department could call on that Department—or, for that matter, the Department of Agriculture or any other department—for help in carrying out this part of the purposes of the bill.

Title V has to do with disseminating information about the United States abroad. Sections 501 and 502 of this title cover the information through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers and instructors abroad. It should be noted especially under this heading that it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State shall reduce Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate. This was a matter of a great deal of debate last summer, when the matter was up for consideration, and I think the Appropriations Committee considered it. We took great care to provide that the Secretary of State should reduce Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination was found to be adequate. This is the spirit of the whole bill, namely, to incorporate private activities whenever they can be found to fill the need.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the committee amendments, I notice it is provided that the information which the Secretary of State will be authorized to provide to other countries may be made available to Members of Congress 15 days after it is released. I should like to ask why it is necessary to withhold such information from Members of Congress for 15 days after it is released to other countries.

Mr. SMITH. Let me say that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has an amendment which would slightly change this language, and I shall accept that amendment when it is presented. But the purpose was not to make Members of Congress wait 15 days. We said, "within 15 days." In other words, by this provision we would make sure that those who are handling the information cannot dally along with it, but must get it out promptly. This provision was inserted merely as a matter of convenience.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am wondering whether there is any objection to making it possible for Members of Congress to receive the information, if they so desire, at the same time it is broadcast in foreign countries.

Mr. SMITH. I may say that we have discussed that matter at great length. If the Senator from Arkansas is suggesting that every Member of Congress should receive every one of these releases, I point out that he would simply be showered with a mass of material with which he could not possibly deal. But we drew up our ultimate amendment in such a way as to provide that, upon request, this information should be furnished as soon as practicable. Some of the material which goes abroad is disseminated from the embassies abroad, although it originates in the United States; and it would take some time to

get it back. But the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who has made quite a study of this matter, brought an amendment to me last night. I think it will probably cover the points the Senator from Arkansas is raising. When our committee amendment is presented, if the Senator presents that amendment to our amendment, I think the point will be covered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Such a provision may serve some useful purpose; but I cannot see why the Congress or Members of Congress, or any American citizen, so far as that is concerned, should not have the information, if it is available, at the same time it is released abroad. I cannot see any reason for withholding it for 15 days.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If I am correct in my understanding, the 15-day period is really a period of limitation. We recognized that there were certain difficulties in making the information available immediately, such as those involved in transportation from abroad, translation sometimes, and things of that kind, but in no event should it be longer than 15 days.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the statement. I wanted to emphasize the point, though. It occurs to me, with respect to information to be disseminated abroad, information which emanates from the State Department here, that there would be no excuse for withholding it from any Member of Congress or from the public for 15 days.

Mr. SMITH. I think that the kind of information of which the Senator speaks would be available here, but as a practical matter we send material abroad constantly, and we send a wireless bulletin which is made the basis of releases over there; sometimes the entire bulletin, sometimes part of it, being released. Sometimes a special article in the bulletin is adapted to local conditions, and I think that it would be difficult if we said literally that every document that goes out abroad, or every broadcast, must be given simultaneously to everybody here. It would be just a practical question of how best to do it. There was no disposition on the part of anyone to conceal the information. The whole spirit of the thing was to do it in the most practical way and without too many complications.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have just been handed a copy of the amendment which will be proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator that the printed copy was slightly changed, after I conferred with the Senator from Minnesota last night, but it is substantially the same, I think.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is the desire of the committee to make information available as quickly as it is practical to do so, is it not?

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely, and to everybody, especially to Members of Congress; absolutely.

To continue, under title VI—and this is a very important title—there is provision for advisory commissions to formulate policies, sections 601, 602, and 603. This is a completely new title in the bill and takes the place of the former title VI. This title, as I said to the distinguished Senator from Colorado a few minutes ago, recognizes the sharp distinction now drawn in the bill between the Information Service, on the one hand, and the Educational Exchange Service on the other. It provides definitely for two commissions to advise with the Secretary of State as to the policies and programs to be adopted for the carrying out of the act. Now, if the Senators will visualize what I said to the Senator from Colorado a minute ago, they will see a new Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs; under him, as subassistants, one in charge of information, another in charge of educational exchange, and those subassistants have the advisory commissions in their special fields. Those commissions are composed of five persons each, appointed as provided in the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico. He was the author of the amendment, so I am glad to yield to him, that he may explain it.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to emphasize the fact that in the amendment we have completely separated the two, having one commission for the Educational Exchange Service, which is entirely independent of the Information Service.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. That is in reality quite a step toward what the Senator from Colorado has in mind, and it is vastly superior to the House provision, which combined the functions in one commission.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is quite right, and I am glad he emphasizes the point. One of the commissions is to be known as the United States Advisory Commission on Information; the other is to be known as the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

I pass to title VII, appropriations, sections 701 and 702. This title covers the general authorization of appropriations to carry out the purposes of the act, and provision for the transfer of funds. I may say that there are no appropriation figures in the bill. There are no ceilings or anything of that kind. Authority is simply given for appropriations to meet the purposes of the act. The Department is required, of course, to bring in its broken-down budget and requests for appropriations each year.

Title VIII covers administrative procedures, sections 801, 802, and 803. This title gives certain specific authorities to the Secretary in carrying out the various titles of the act. I may say that in those sections provision is made for the employment of special committees to study special problems, as for example the moving-picture industry, which would be one; the way the radio can be best handled, and things of that kind. We thought we should provide for the appointment of special committees, with the advice, of course, of the two commissions set up in title VI.

Title IX, funds provided by other sources. This title has two sections, section 901 and section 902. I shall try to point out the difference between them. Section 901 provides for reimbursement to the Government of the United States, by others who have been benefited by the activities of the Department, of the cost of the service rendered. There are cases in which the Government makes its investment in helping other countries, or helping special projects somewhere, and this provides for reimbursement where that is done.

Section 902 provides for payment in advance by other governments for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to the act. In these two provisions we take care of reimbursement for expenses paid by the governments, and payment in advance, when we require that before we undertake a project. There seems to be ample reasons for those distinctions.

Title X is entitled "Miscellaneous." Section 1001 provides for a loyalty check on personnel by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That was incorporated by the Senate, modifying in certain respects the House provision on the same subject.

Section 1002 provides for the delegation of authority by the Secretary of State. Obviously he cannot perform all the functions himself.

Section 1003 provides for restricting information in the interest of the security of the United States. That is a provision written into the bill by the House, and the reasons for it are obvious.

Section 1004 provides for the repealing or superseding of certain existing acts, which I mentioned earlier. We are trying to bring in under the tent of the State Department, in one bill like this, all the activities of this nature being carried on under different pieces of legislation.

Section 1005 is a very important section. It provides for the utilization of private agencies. This is one of the most important sections of the whole bill, and provides, among other things, as follows:

> It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country.

That is a clear-cut statement of policy of the Congress to use private agencies to the maximum extent possible.

Section 1006 is a provision for terminating authority under the act by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress. If at any time Congress feels the act is not being properly administered, a concurrent resolution can bring it to an end.

Section 1007 protects veterans' preferences.

Section 1008 provides for reports to the Congress.

Section 1009 makes the act applicable to all international information activities and educational exchanges of the State Department. There again we have to cover two sections in order to bring these activities together, so there cannot be overlaps or conflicts.

Section 1010 covers the separability of provisions.

Finally, the title is amended, from the very cumbersome title which the bill had originally and which appears on the calendar, to the simple title, which will read as follows:

An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations.

Summing up the bill as a whole, it should be noted that the amendments which both the House and Senate incorporated in the original bill added certain safeguards in order to prevent the possibility of any abuse of powers granted by the bill and, as far as possible, to make clear the standards of service expected and the scope of authority of those charged with the responsibility. These safeguards are enumerated in the report of the committee accompanying the bill, but I am going to repeat them here, because this is a very important feature of the bill as drawn. There was criticism of some of the activities of the State Department in carrying on these different functions, and both the House and Senate felt that certain safeguards should be incorporated in the bill.

First. In addition to the usual investigation conducted by the Department of State, the FBI is required to investigate all personnel employed under the information program within 6 months. All new employees are also subject to FBI investigation. In other words, a person already employed must be investigated within 6 months, and new employees, before they can be taken on, are subject to report by the FBI.

Second. The Secretary of State will be required to use the services of private agencies for carrying on this program wherever practicable. I have already emphasized that point.

Third. The Secretary of State must also use the existing facilities of the Government to the fullest extent possible before setting up any new facilities.

Fourth. Reports must be sent to Congress twice a year on both activities and expenditures of this program, including appraisals of results of the program in foreign countries.

Fifth. The exchange of persons authorized by the bill must be on a reciprocal basis. This does not mean a literal 50-50 exchange of students, but the program must be a two-way street. The bill also provides for the speedy deportation of any alien who enters this country under this program and then engages in political activities.

Sixth. The legislation may be terminated by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Seventh. The two advisory commissions established by title VI are designed to assist this country in the formulation and recommendation to the Secretary, of policies and programs for the carrying out of this act. In addition, the commissions are to report semi-annually to the Congress on the recommendations made to the Secretary, but the committee wishes to stress also that the two commissions are not to be viewed primarily as policemen—as constituted they can be of great constructive value to the Secretary of State and the Congress in the best development of public-relations programs in the foreign relations of the United States.

Taking the special amendments made by the Senate, there were three special principal emphases; first, the simplification of the bill by simplifying the title and statement of purpose; and, second, as I have emphasized before two or three times, the definite separation of the Information Service from the Educational Exchange Service. This separation is clearly stated in section 2 of the bill and is clearly emphasized in title VI, which, as I stated before, provides for two separate advisory commissions covering both activities.

In this connection—and this is in answer to the question asked of me by the Senator from Colorado a moment ago—it is contemplated that the organization in the State Department, while it will have an Assistant Secretary of State covering the general field of public affairs, will also have two subassistants, one primarily charged with the Information Service as defined in the bill, and the other primarily charged with the Educational Exchange Service as defined in the bill.

Each of the subassistants, acting with the Assistant Secretary of State and with the Secretary of State himself, will be aided in determining policy and programs by the respective advisory commissions, and by any other special committees that may be set up under the authority of section 801 (6) of the bill. In other words, we have here given the widest range to obtain the advice of the highest caliber from the best people of this country in developing a policy which will represent the Voice of America abroad.

The third point emphasized by the Senate committee's amendments is the emphasis on the use of private agencies. All the way through the bill, as it reads today, the Secretary is charged with the responsibility of utilizing the services and facilities of private agencies through contractual arrangements or otherwise.

Furthermore, section 502 has been amended to read as follows:

In authorizing international information activities under this act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information.

We want to emphasize particularly those two points, because the suggestion was made that the Department might lose its head and get into too wide a field and try to cover everything. We want to make it clear that it is the policy of Congress to use private agencies wherever they can be used to serve the purpose.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me high-light a few points which I feel are important in connection with this legislation:

First. What do we mean by the Voice of America? From a technical standpoint the Voice of America is the international information program now being conducted on a limited scale by our State Department. It takes in our international short-wave radio programs directed to the countries of the world in some 24 languages. It includes some 59 American libraries, operated in half a hundred foreign countries. It encompasses our exchange-of-persons program with other countries under which American teachers and specialists in the sciences and arts go to these countries at their invitation to assist them, and under which we encourage students, teachers, and others to come to the United States to study and give us the benefit of their cultures. It includes also the daily informational service to our embassies throughout the world to keep them informed of the news from America, and to enable them to pass it on to any persons in foreign countries who wish to publish it or otherwise disseminate it. In short, the Voice of America is our own instrument for projecting a full and fair picture of the United States to the other nations of the world.

Second. This service, in the judgment of your committee, is of special importance now, because of the increasingly serious situation in Europe. Its importance is further enhanced in light of the efforts we have been making to relieve hunger in the war-ridden countries of Europe and the Far East as well. And it becomes of transcendent importance now that we are about to provide additional billions through the European recovery program—the so-called Marshall plan—in aid to these countries in our efforts to forestall chaos and prevent starvation abroad.

Third. It was our sincere hope that Russia and all the satellite countries would participate in this humanitarian effort. Russia has not only refused to do so, but Moscow has applied pressure on the satellite countries to prevent their participation. Russia has not only declined to join in this effort, but she has organized a consolidated propaganda service, with headquarters in Belgrade, in a concerted movement to destroy our European recovery program. This is all part of her plan to impose communism on Europe, for Russia well knows that communism can only thrive on chaos and human misery; that a happy, well-fed population does not turn to her type of dictatorship. The Moscow plan is to divide and then absorb.

Fourth. Our present Voice of America with its limited budget in the light of these new developments, is wholly inadequate to meet the needs of our country. It must be strengthened far beyond our previous conception of its size and scope. At the moment we are losing this war of words, and in order to make up for the ground that we have lost, we definitely need to take two steps:

(a) Pass the pending bill, which will give this program the needed legislative authority;

(b) Present to the respective appropriation committees of the House and Senate a revised emergency budget for the balance of this fiscal year, and a new

over-all budget for enlarged activities for the fiscal year 1948–49.

This legislation and these appropriations must obviously go hand in hand with the European recovery program, in order that the spirit and purpose of America in developing that program may be made clear to the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, before I close, and open the subject to questions, I should like to reflect some personal thoughts which have come to me in trying to reply to the question, "What do we all mean by the Voice of America?" Perhaps if I have criticized the service up to date I would say it was because the Voice had seemed to be too much a current voice. The Voice of America, to me, Mr. President, goes back into history. That is why our cultural-exchange program is so important. I like to think of the Voice of America in terms of the past, of our ancestors—and I am proud to say their blood is in my veins—who came to the tidewater land of Virginia, who came to the shores of New England, who later pioneered to the West and moved across this great country with the spirit of freedom, the spirit of truth, seeking truth, seeking release, people who came from every stock in Europe, in these countries which today are in difficulties. There is not a country in the so-called Marshall plan, I think I am correct in saying, that does not have stock in America. There is not a country to which the Voice of America may not appropriately be directed. America should interpret to these countries the part they played through their own people in making a consolidated whole here in this country where the divisions have been broken down, and where, through devoted effort, we have moved forward to a new and better vision of life as a whole.

Mr. President, I am thinking in terms of voices—not only the voices of today, but the voices of the past. I cannot help thinking of the voices in our colonial days. I cannot help thinking of the voices during the Revolution, those of George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] today paid a glowing and splendid tribute to Benjamin Franklin. The voices of those named, and those of others of our distinguished forebears are the voices of America. I want to have those voices heard abroad, because they come from the very stocks we are now trying to help, as some of their forebears came to us in the early days of our history.

Coming to the later stages of our history, we find the name of Abraham Lincoln. We can go further, to the voices of those who are today making America. We can think in terms of the voices of the boys who served in World War I and those who served in World War II, and who gave their lives in those wars. Those were voices of America.

Let me say to my colleagues, whether in the House or the Senate, that all the voices raised on the floor of these two Houses of Congress are voices of America today, and we are challenged to make those voices worthy to represent the America in which we believe.

So it is not a mere mechanical dollars and cents matter, merely the making of an appropriation, in order to have some machinery set up, it might be said, to advertise America. It is something much more profound than that. It is the giving of the spirit of America to the world, which needs it so profoundly today to raise it up from the despair in which it is now; to have the peoples of the world understand why we are interested in relief, why we are interested in a recovery program, and why we are willing to do what we now propose to do. It is because we feel in our hearts that we are the descendants of the ancestors of the very people who are suffering because they have not had the privileges we have had in America, in this great free country.

So I feel, Mr. President, that we should pass the bill before us, to give legislative authority which will make it possible for us to give this true picture to the world—to give the peoples of the world the truth. We should pass the bill so that whatever money is needed will be generously given in order to carry on the program. But we cannot stop there. The spirit of America is the voice of America, and every one of us has his responsibility to contribute to that voice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a number of editorials on this subject which have come to me from various parts of the country.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Star-Eagle of November 14, 1947]

UNITED STATES VOICE NEEDED IN EUROPE TO COMBAT COMMUNIST LIES

The United States is losing a vital battle in Europe, one which is related intimately to the success or failure of the effort to save the Continent from economic collapse and from communism. This country is losing the fight to gain the confidence of the people of Europe, the people whose mood is desperate and whose sentiment is being captured by the adroit propaganda of Moscow.

All who are familiar with conditions in western Europe concede this to be the case. Russia has little to offer the nations in distress except words. Insofar as her own interests are concerned, Russia is making the best possible use of this weapon. They are not necessarily words of promise because Russia can promise virtually nothing that is tangible. Over the air and through the media of newspapers and other publications, Moscow sends a torrent of abuse and ridicule, all designed to impair the prestige of the United States and sow suspicion and distrust.

This technique, like so much that is characteristic of Moscow's methods, is a heritage from Hitler and follows a familiar and fairly sound line of reasoning. If sufficient mud is thrown, some of it is reasonably certain to stick. If a big lie is repeated with tireless insistence, it comes to be accepted eventually by the more credulous as truth.

Returning from two months in Europe, as chairman of a committee which studied the overseas information program, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey declared that "if we are going to make the Marshall plan work we must see to it that the people of Europe know what we are trying to do." He adds that the invective that has been turned against the United States in these countries in the effort to force communism on western Europe "is so vicious as to be almost unbelievable to anyone who hasn't actually heard it."

Senator SMITH charges that Russia has organized a consolidated Communist propaganda service with headquarters in Belgrade in an effort to destroy the United States recovery program. There can be no doubt that this is true and that there is an imperative urgency that this conspiracy be defeated.

Former Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles has repeatedly emphasized the need of a truth campaign if the people of Europe are to have an honest concept of the American effort and the motives by which it is animated. Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, of Brooklyn, who speaks with the authority of first-hand knowledge, has also raised his voice for the need of a more adequate and eloquent Voice of America.

Senator SMITH has indicated that he will sponsor legislation providing for an expansion of this country's information service abroad. His hand will be strengthened materially by the American Federation of Labor's stand for the creation of a Deminform, or democratic information bureau, to combat the influence of the Cominform. Through one means or another the challenge of destructive Soviet propaganda must be met. Defeat in the war of words involves the danger of defeat in the whole war.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of November 14, 1947]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

One of the most foolish economies put through in the first session of the Eightieth Congress was the 50-percent cut in an appropriation for the Voice of America broadcasts. These are the American radio broadcasts to Europe and the rest of the world carried out under the auspices of the Office of Information of the Department of State. The program is now operating on an annual budget of $10,000,000, an amount considered altogether inadequate in the light of the world responsibilities of the United States.

Official radio broadcasting is a new venture for us. Without doubt the programs beamed abroad could be much improved. But in 1946 the Department of State received 150,000 letters from foreigners who heard its broadcasts, and other evidence suggests that the audience is large, continuous, and substantial. The British Broadcasting Corp., which is official, has had much more experience in this field. It is convinced, through various checking devices, such as offering to communicate with relatives of those in eastern Europe, that broadcasting is an important adjunct to the effective conduct of foreign relationships.

That, too, is now the conviction of most Members of the Congress who went abroad during the recess. Senator SMITH of New Jersey, is cochairman of a congressional committee which investigated American broadcasts, as well as Russian propaganda, in Europe. He will ask the regular session of the Congress, meeting in January, to provide $5,000,000 supplemental appropriation for the Voice of America until June, when the present fiscal year ends, and will urge an appropriation of from $40,000,000 to $45,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

But Senator SMITH believed in the Voice of America broadcasts from the first. Other Republicans now are joining him in his effort to get increased support for a program designed to deliver the American message to Europe on the air, both west and east of the iron curtain. The Secretary of State, Mr. Marshall, has stressed the importance of the Voice of America to his long-range project for European relief. The Congress is going to insist that western Europe knows where help is coming from and the reasons for it.

So it looks now as if the Voice of America will be restored to its former strength and even fortified. The task of broadcasting the facts about American aid will, however, be

delicate. Mr. Marshall warns that we must not create resentment among the receiving nations. We should not "poison the gift." Russia will attend to that without assistance from us.

[From the New Brunswick (N. J.) Daily Home News of November 17, 1947]

LET VOICE OF AMERICA BE HEARD EVERYWHERE

Recently returned from Europe where he headed the Senate group of the congressional committee investigating the Nation's overseas information program, New Jersey's Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH is vigorously supporting complete revision to expand the State Department's Voice of America program.

Senator SMITH describes the Voice of America program carefully, dispelling the popular illusion that it is nothing but a radio broadcast to a few countries. The Voice of America includes international short-wave radio programs sent to the whole world in 24 different languages. It includes 59 American libraries operated in some 50 countries. It includes the exchange of persons program, in which American teachers and scientists go to foreign lands to study, while exchange visitors come here to get to know the United States. It includes news service daily to all American embassies to be passed on to people in the lands where the embassies are located. As described by Senator SMITH, the Voice of America is "our own instrument for projecting a full and fair picture of the United States to the other nations of the world."

In his 2 months in Europe this summer, Senator SMITH found the Soviet Union defeating us decisively in a war of words. Too little and too late for us again. Senator SMITH says the United States must expand the Voice of America to disprove Russian propaganda and to let the people of the world know the truth about our own democracy and about our hopes and aspirations for world peace.

We concur with Senator SMITH in this. The success of our aid to Europe will be seriously jeopardized if we do not export the truth with the food, if we permit Russia to misrepresent us and our democracy to European peoples without being answered. Let the Voice of America ring out strong and brave and true to give new hope to freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Evening Courier of November 18, 1947]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA TO BE TUNED UP AGAIN

Opinions and attitudes change frequently in this changing world.

A few months back there was vigorous opposition in Congress to the Voice of America—our short-wave radio information service to Europe. Its appropriation was cut in half and only by the skin of its teeth did it escape being abolished altogether.

Since that time a Senate-House committee, with Senator SMITH, of New Jersey, as co-chairman, visited 22 European countries in a study of economic and political conditions. Much of its attention was devoted to the propaganda and information services of America, England, France, and Russia.

The committee found that not only our radio voice but all our other information services were markedly inferior to Russia's and Britain's, and even below the French in some places. Fortunately, only Russia at present is spreading propaganda hostile to the United States.

At a time when we are about to spend many billions in aid to Europe, it is essential that Europe know from where and why the aid is coming. The committee has drawn up a report to that end, recommending that the activities of the Voice be greatly expanded and other information services extended.

Senator SMITH says he will ask an appropriation of forty to fifty million dollars for the Voice when the regular session of Congress convenes in January. Representative KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, his co-chairman, will press for a $50,000,000 bill in the House.

"If we are going to make the Marshall plan work," SMITH says, "we must see to it that the people of Europe know what we are trying to do.

"The invective that has been turned loose against us—by Russia and her satellites—in their effort to force communism on western Europe is so vicious as to be almost unbelievable to anyone who has not actually heard it."

Secretary of State Marshall will be asked to present a detailed program to Congress for use of the Voice, of which he has been a consistent backer. This may include a personnel shake-up and a restriction of broadcasts to factual news and editorial comment from individual newspapers, to silence critics who claimed the Voice sometimes expressed unattributed opinions which were those of its own staff.

Indications are that America's voice soon will be heard again at full force.

Most Members of Congress have come to recognize they were wrong in turning down the volume control at the last session.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of November 19, 1947]

STRONGER VOICE

Almost without exception, Members of Congress who toured Europe this summer have come back convinced of the necessity for expanding our international information program. As Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, chairman of the Senate group investigating the program in operation, said in a radio broadcast last week: "We found in every country we visited that we are losing this war of words. Our own Voice of America is pitifully weak compared not only with the efforts of Russia and her Communist satellites but also with the efforts in the same field that are being made by friendly countries such as Great Britain and France."

In other words, if we are to overcome the deadly effects which endless repetition of slander and lies by the Moscow propagandists is bound to have, we must strengthen our facilities for making the truth known and strengthen them immediately with all the tools at our command. We hope that in light of these reports, Senator TAFT and others who have opposed a broadened information program will be persuaded to change their minds. Three steps are essential, in our view, to make American efforts more effective. The first is a deficiency appropriation to restore the cuts which limited the program for this fiscal year to $12,000,000. The second is to pass the Mundt bill, which will place our information activities on a permanent, businesslike basis. In this context we need to expand not only our radio broadcasts but also our libraries abroad, our daily overseas press bulletins, and our student exchange program. The third step is for the administration to appoint a man to direct our information program who is both an evangelist and an administrator who can command the confidence of Congress.

There is one danger which we hope Congress will avoid in augmenting the Voice of America. In their zeal to meet the attacks the Communists are making on us, some Members may be tempted to insist that we fight fire with fire. Nothing could do our cause more harm than to have our information program perverted into a mere anti-Communist crusade or a vehicle devoted solely to extolling our virtues as benefactors. Either of these courses would convince the people for whose minds we are contending that we too were merely engaged in propaganda. What our information program needs is facts, not invective or self-adulation. The objective truth can be just as devastating as Moscow's name calling, and far more effective.

[From Foreign Policy Bulletin of November 28, 1947]

HOW SHOULD UNITED STATES ANSWER SOVIET PROPAGANDA ABROAD?

In his Chicago speech of November 18, on the eve of his departure for the sixth session of the Council of Foreign Ministers which opened in London on November 25, Secretary of State Marshall raised an important question concerning American-Russian relations. This question is whether the United States should attempt to answer the "calculated campaign of vilification and distortion of American motives in foreign affairs" waged with increasing venom by Soviet officials and Communist groups elsewhere; and if so, in what form American answers should be couched. Should American spokesmen seek to match the vituperation of Mr. Vishinsky—or should they disregard words of abuse and limit themselves to pointing out the positive aspects of our way of life? Is it wise or not for this country to embark on a national Operation Backtalk like that launched against the Russians on October 28 by General Clay in the American zone of Germany—a program which, according to first-hand reports, shows signs of petering out?

WHAT IS GOOD UNITED STATES PROPAGANDA?

These questions reveal the need for determining the scope and content of American propaganda abroad. Many of the Congressmen who visited Europe during the past few months have returned convinced that this country must be more generous in its appropriations for the Office of Information in the State Department, now operating on the shoestring budget of $12,800,000 a year. But even should Congress heed the proposal of Representative KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, that this sum be raised to $300,000,000 for 6 years (or $50,000,000 a year), administrators of the information program will still face many questions as to what constitutes an effective reply to the propaganda conducted by the Soviet Government and by Communist parties outside Russia. In seeking answers to these questions the following points might be considered:

1. Need to convince non-Russians

The object of American information services is not so much to convince the Soviet leaders, or even the Russian people (although any such byproduct of American propaganda would obviously be welcome), but to convince peoples outside Russia who for one reason or another find some appeal in Soviet arguments. Little is gained, in this respect, by mere denunciation of Soviet ideas and practices—especially since it is doubtful that American spokesmen can match the virulence of Mr. Vishinsky. What can be done is to demonstrate by our actions that the United States, within the limits of its capacity, is determined to help other peoples improve their lot.

2. One world—but many peoples

In addressing itself to peoples outside its borders the United States should bear in mind that, while technological progress in transportation and communications has truly led to the emergence of one world, vast differences persist in the traditions, historical backgrounds, and political, social, and economic development of the various peoples inhabiting this one world. American information services should be sufficiently flexible and differentiated to meet the special needs and interests of the particular nations to which they are addressed—and should not be limited to a few blanket formulas about the advantages of the free-enterprise system. To countries which, to begin with, do not possess the resources of the United States, and have been shattered by two world wars and a great depression, constant American emphasis on this concept sounds unrealistic, or patronizing, or both.

3. United States must not be identified with reaction

The success of Soviet propaganda is due primarily to the existence throughout the world of genuine political, social, and economic maladjustments which Communist propagandists skillfully exploit to denigrate democracy. It is therefore essential that American information services stress the need to correct these maladjustments by whatever methods seem most appropriate in a given country, provided political liberty, basic attribute of democracy, is preserved. An attitude of deprecation toward other systems simply because they are not like ours gives ammunition to Communist propagandists who claim that the United States intends to use its resources to stifle internal reforms in nations receiving American aid. It is of paramount importance that other peoples should have no cause to identify Washington's resistance to Russia and communism with support of reaction and resistance to all change abroad.

4. Facts are our greatest strength

All peoples, especially in Europe, have grown unutterably weary of propaganda and counterpropaganda. Our greatest strength lies in presenting factual information, as both the BBC and the OWI did during the war, when they won the confidence of listeners who defied Nazi terrorism to hear British and American broadcasts. In presenting information, it is wise to mention not only facts favorable to the United States, but also facts that are not so favorable. Other peoples have learned by hard experience that life is a mixture of good and evil, and that one cannot always expect a happy ending. When our propaganda attempts to give the impression that we are mercifully free of all the flaws we find in others, our admonitions are regarded as either naive or hypocritical. It would be much more effective to admit such faults and shortcomings as we may have, while pointing out our unremitting efforts to remedy them—as the President's Committee on Civil Rights has successfully done in its report. Wide circulation abroad of the findings and recommendations of this committee, which epitomizes some of the qualities the rest of the world particularly admires about Americans, would do far more to enhance the prestige of the United States than any amount of back talk at Russia.

Nor should the United States pretend that it alone among nations is above power politics. In one form or another power is always used in politics, whether national or international. Power is not of itself evil; what can be evil is the use one makes of power. What the world criticizes most about the United States is not that it uses its power too much, but that it has not yet developed a constructive foreign policy commensurate with the power at its command.

5. Faith—not fear—must be motive

American propaganda should be motivated not by fear of Russia, which is purely negative, but by positive faith in American ideas, and by concrete measures to carry them out in practice abroad such as the program of farsighted aid urged by Secretary of State Marshall. Every time we reveal fear of Russia we thereby weaken our own position in the eyes of the rest of the world. Nor should we, through fear, force on other peoples a choice between Russia and the United States, which for many of them would be suicidal.

6. Europe must have means for its own propaganda

The most effective propaganda, as the Russians have discovered, is directed not from outside, but from inside. For example, commendation of our aid to Europe sounds more gracious if offered by writers and radio commentators in countries receiving aid than if presented by ourselves. Europe, however, is greatly handicapped by the shortage of newsprint, which has reduced most European newspapers to four, and often only two pages. One of the most useful contributions the United States could make to the dissemination of information would be to make newsprint available to the countries of western Europe. Here, too, we might learn from the Russians, who have helped their neighbors in eastern Europe and the Balkans to obtain newsprint. More good words would be heard about the United States if Europeans who support the Marshall plan had a better opportunity to express their views directly to their own countrymen.

But, no matter how technically efficacious our propaganda may prove to be, we must always remember that words, written or spoken, have become devalued through overuse and overemphasis. Only actions can serve to revalue them. No matter how much money we spend on propaganda, the money will be wasted unless our actions abroad match our words. This means that we must do some hard thinking here about the basic concepts of our foreign policy, and develop greater understanding both of the world outside our borders and of our new role in world affairs.

VERA MICHELES DEAN.

[From the Des Moines Register-Tribune of December 3, 1947]

HOW ABOUT TELLING EUROPE THE PLAIN, UNVARNISHED FACTS?

One of the happy results of European visits by so many of our Representatives and Senators this fall was the almost universal discovery that the story of our kind of democracy and of our foreign policy was not being told adequately, probably not even well.

The first reaction to this has been a fairly common conviction that the Voice of America type of program under the auspices of the State Department needs great expanding. And this in turn raises the natural question what kind of job the international broadcasts have been doing with limited resources, and what kind of job they ought to do with substantially augmented resources.

Whenever some people talk about this part of our role as the world's greatest power, they use such phrases as "countering Communist propaganda" or "replying to Russia" or "defending ourselves against Soviet accusations." There is even an assumption in some quarters that, in order to get a fair hearing before the European world, we must conjure up some marvelously shrewd propaganda scheme. The inference of this is that we must somehow twist our story into an even more Machiavellian design than the Russians and other Communists have succeeded in doing, in putting the case for their philosophy.

The Register, frankly, is pretty doubtful about this approach. It is simply making the job hard. It is taking risks of outsmarting ourselves in the process. It implies the use of politically calculated and perhaps even faintly dishonest techniques.

We think there is a better way.

That way is simply to tell the world the truth—the whole truth, the unadulterated truth.

We have not seen in any detail the content of the Operation Backtalk which General Clay inaugurated in our zone of Germany a month or two ago. But our impression is that it was conceived partly in anger against Russian propaganda, and the latest reports are that it has already begun to fizzle. If it was largely propaganda, that is no wonder. Germans and Europeans generally are pretty well fed up on mere propaganda. They have been fed so much of it that they can smell it a half mile away.

During the war the British Information Service around the world took a different tack. It provided all the facts it could accumulate about everything imaginable affecting the British war effort—historical facts, political facts, economic facts. Some of these accumulations were not very complimentary to British history; some of them were not even very complimentary to the existing British Governments. But the result was that the British people and the British Governments sounded to observers as if they were human beings rather than incredible brass gods.

If we want the people of Europe to believe in us, to judge us fairly and dispassionately, we first have got to seem human to them. We have got to have our story told in such a way that we appear to be what we are, with many faults and many virtues. And the way to seem what we are is to tell our story straight, to tell it truthfully, but to tell it as completely as possible.

Certainly this takes money. The job needs to be adequately financed. It will be only a drop in the bucket relatively, anyway. We presume that Congress will shortly take care of that part of it.

Once the resources exist, we need to see that the whole project is affirmative and constructive—not defensive and incriminating. We would lose in a war of incrimination against communism; the Communists have far fewer scruples about undignified accusation and distortion than we. Why should we even stoop to this level, when it is not an effective technique anyway?

Why should we not, instead, tell Europe and the world precisely the reasons why our sudden acquisition of enormous economic power worries us? Why should we not confess frankly that we are feeling our way, that we don't have all the answers, and that we are doing our human best to live up to our responsibilities?

Why should we not say candidly that we haven't yet found the perfect economic system for every imaginable society, that unquestionably our system still has some weaknesses, that we are all too aware of them, that we are trying conscientiously to correct them?

Why should we not take the wind out of the Communists' sails by pointing out frankly the ways in which our democracy has not yet achieved the ideal, the ways in which we have improved its functioning so strikingly in the last generation or two, and the ways in which we hope to carry it ahead still further in the years ahead? Need we be ashamed of that?

This, and more, is a story that Europe could believe. It is a story that any reasonable human could have faith in. It is a story that would inspire confidence and hope.

Then, if our actions meanwhile give credence to our words, we will have measured up. If our actions do not, of course, then telling our story at all would be a waste of time.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of December 13, 1947]

VOICE OF AMERICA'S AUDIENCE

There is an excellent chance that the United States, despite the Marshall plan, will lose its strategic fight in Europe unless it steps into the propaganda duel with enough intelligence and vigor to outwit the Russians at a game they play surpassingly well.

That we are running a poor second has been widely conceded—just how poor is startlingly illustrated in a pair of reports from the Continent.

The New York Herald Tribune, describing a typical American information organization in a European country, cites "a couple of mimeograph machines, a 2,000-volume library, and a few reels of documentary films," plus the beamed broadcasts of the Voice of America. The budget is $40,000 a year. The typical Soviet set-up consists of an elaborate network of personnel operating hundreds of libraries (to our one), and costing millions of rubles. Even the British, impoverished as they are, lay out $240,000 in

Czechoslovakia—just over 10 times what the American information budget cost.

The New York Times, in an interview with Senator LODGE, shows the comparative fruits of these ventures.

A wealthy, conservative French physician told LODGE: "Of course, we realize that medical science is way ahead in America of what it is in France, but then we also know that you have all those underprivileged people over there on whom your doctors constantly experiment."

A conservative French deputy told LODGE: "We know that you Americans are trying to build up Germany industrially faster than you want to build up France. The reason you do this is because you intend to have a war with Russia, and you want to get Germany into shape as your ally." Why would we fight the Russians? "Because Russia has taken away so much of your export trade."

So much for the Communist success in swaying some of the most stalwart people of France. So much for our dismal failure.

There is every indication that Congress will multiply by several times last year's pitifully inadequate information budget. But the words of the two conservative Frenchmen make admirably manifest the fact that dollars alone won't get us where we need to go. We can prate "Look how rich we are," a million times and it won't undo what's been done to the French mind, or the Polish mind, or the Italian mind, during these past 10 years. The task calls for a consummate amount of thought, skill, and understanding.

Consider your typical French physician, and what was happening to him between 1940 and 1945. Battered by ponderous forces that drove him to the brink of financial and physical ruin, his intellectual and psychological make-up could hardly survive unscarred. The mass cynicism that resulted from the war finds no parallel in the American experience, except possibly for the psychological ruin that lay strewn through the South at the close of the Civil War.

This is the culture most receptive to communism, and the Russians know it and have capitalized upon it. A measure of their success is the fact that the physician and the deputy, while no friends of Russia and certainly not in Soviet employ, are unconsciously playing the Russian game.

How do we win these people?

Not alone by the Marshall plan, as long as the gifts are accepted with grave suspicions of our motives.

Not by the broadcast of canned descriptions of Thanksgiving dinners in the United States, nor by mail-order catalogs reflecting the extent and variety of our luxuries, nor by querulous demands that the Europeans be more like us.

We have to talk their language, and the language they best understand is the assurance of security—freedom, to a drowning man, is less important than a rope.

The details of the task may well occupy the constant attention of a battery of earnest, intelligent information specalists for years to come, but the important thing now is for Congress to grasp the dimensions and the broad nature of the problem. That understanding must be applied to the terms of the Marshall plan, but further than that, to the creation of an information service that will, by slow degrees, transform a sea of cynicism into a reservoir of friendly understanding. That is the size of the job.

[From the Princeton (N. J.) Herald of December 17, 1947]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Americans who are worrying about what Russians are thinking of us for retaining our bases in the North Pacific must have experienced quite a shock if they listened to the recent radio broadcast which Senator SMITH made from Washington. The New Jersey Senator did not mince words in his forceful plea for recognition of the vital importance of the Voice of America in the new war that is going on in Europe.

"Russia has turned loose against us a propaganda machine of incalculable size and effectiveness," he declared. "No one can even estimate the resources that are being poured into it. It employs every kind of device of mass communication to din into the ears of the populations of every country of the world, the lies and distortions by which she hopes to keep the world in chaos and ultimately to control it. The grist for this gigantic propaganda machine comes direct from Moscow with almost every act of her government, and every speech by her representatives at the United Nations designed for propaganda value in the war of the ideologies."

Senator SMITH was cochairman of the Smith-Mundt committee which spent 2 months this past summer in Europe visiting all its countries except Russia, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Ireland, in an exhaustive investigation of the need for the expansion of our international information service. Reporting to the country on the results of that trip the Senator said that the invective "that has been turned loose against us by Russia and her satellite countries in their effort to force communism on western Europe is so vicious as to be almost unbelievable to anyone who hasn't actually heard it. We are accused of virtually every political and moral crime under the sun."

The Voice of America is the international program conducted by the State Department for which $12,000,000 has been appropriated for the current fiscal year. Even Great Britain, as the Senator points out, with governmental expenditures reduced to the barest minimum, spends $40,000,000 on a similar, but expanded program. Our information program consists of short-wave radio programs in approximately 24 languages, about 50 American libraries operated in as many foreign countries and its exchange of persons with other countries under which American teachers and specialists in the sciences and arts go to those countries at their invitation to assist them, while their students and teachers come to the United States. The program at present is wholly inadequate to meet the needs of our country in the face of existing conditions.

"My experiences and my observations on this investigating trip," said the Senator, "impel me to use every means at my disposal to try to let the American people know what is happening to us in Europe."

The Marshall plan which provides for an appropriation by the Congress of billions of dollars for the rehabilitation of European countries will fall tragically short of its objectives unless we organize an information program capable of combating the consolidated Communist propaganda service which aims to destroy our European recovery program.

Senator SMITH gained his information at first hand. Given ample opportunity to learn what is going on in Europe, he took full advantage of it and has reported his observations in language which leaves no room for doubt. It is inconceivable that Congress should fail to appropriate the necessary funds for America with its seeming wealth of resources, to tell her story to the world, that all nations may know what we are striving to do for the stricken peoples of Europe. It will be impossible to attain our objectives unless we can offset the Communist program of misrepresentation of which Senator SMITH has testified.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of December 19, 1947]

WORD AND DEED

Nothing is to be gained by exchanging cold war for hot words. But that is not the announced purpose of the new State Department policy to meet Russian propaganda with direct replies. If the policy is wisely carried out, it will aim at light, not heat. It will counter lies with facts, not Russian rhetoric with American declamation.

The Voice of America will be only one of the avenues of appeal to the peoples of the world—and especially, we must admit reluctantly, of Germany. But the congressionally snubbed Voice will be of key importance in the new program. Greatly increased appropriations will be necessary to make it a match for the strident blare from Moscow.

Most important of all are the actions with which the United States backs its words. Inflated speech, like an inflated economy, promises more than it delivers. But a people that means business in its support of world democracy can afford to advertise its motives as well as its acts.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of December 5, 1947]

WHERE OUR VOICE IS HEARD

Fighters for democracy lead a lonely life behind the iron curtain of communism. Yet they are not discouraged, for they know that powerful forces in the west are working with them. They know because of the Voice of America radio broadcasts. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, the Polish peasant leader who recently fled from his country, has testified to this.

Mikolajczyk reports: "Poles hear that the Americans have not forgotten the people behind the iron curtain and still believe in the principle that freedom and democracy cannot be divided into spheres of influence. Freedom and democracy must be shared by all if peace is to reign over the world and mankind is not to be drowned by chaos."

Unfortunately these words, that mean so much to believers in democracy abroad, carry little weight with Congressmen here at home. The cost of the Voice of America broadcasts is a small price to pay for the lives men are risking to fight Communist oppression. Such services toward freedom cannot be bought on the open market. Congress should forget politics and throw full aid behind this Voice, bringing hope to freemen from a friendly people.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Times of December 22, 1947]

GETTING THE TRUTH TO EUROPE

Every American who has visited Europe of late has returned convinced that there must be a vast increase in America's information service. The most recent is John G. Cowles, the Minneapolis publisher. "We need a competent, hard-boiled organization in Europe to get the people the facts about the United States and about Russia," he says.

The inflation in Russia and the devaluation of the Russian ruble presented a rare opportunity to show the people of Europe what they could expect under Communist domination. Yet we fell down flat owing to the inadequacy of both our information service and broadcasting facilities.

We did the same thing when the Big Four Conference broke up in London. The Russians broadcast all over Europe that the western democracies opposed the union of Germany into a single nation. Newspapers in the Soviet zone in Russia were filled with extracts from Molotov's speeches. Apparently there was no real effort on the part of our authorities to have the truth presented in newspapers in western Germany.

We are about to embark on the Marshall plan. The Russians have twisted and distorted the purpose of that plan and may now be depended upon to take up the task with renewed zeal. We must counteract this but we cannot do it unless our information service is greatly expanded.

It is one of the most important matters facing the regular session of Congress.

[From Collier's magazine of December 27, 1947]

GIVE AMERICA A REAL VOICE

The United States State Department's propaganda service, first called the Voice of America, then formally christened the Office of Information and Educational Exchange, had tough sledding during the year or so in which it was under the supervision of William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who recently resigned that post.

For all the tough sledding, the Voice of America idea is a good one. The idea is that, since Russia is flooding much of the world with the falsest kind of anti-United States propaganda, we should crack back with fair, factual, and vigorous propaganda of our own. The Voice attempts to do that, but is pretty seriously handicapped at present because Congress last summer granted it only $12,400,000 for a year's work instead of the $31,000,000 the State Department requested.

All of which impels us to urge that the Senate pass H. R. 3342 at its earliest convenience.

H. R. 3342 is a bill, passed by the House last July, to make the Office of Information and Educational Exchange permanent, and to put it in charge of a wide variety of United State propaganda services—radio programs beamed in strategic directions, library and information offices in many countries outside the iron curtain, documentary films on various aspects of American life, and so on.

Representative KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, who led the initial congressional attack on some of the Voice's misplays, is a strong backer of this plan to tune up, tone up, and generally strengthen the Voice. MUNDT urges that we spend some $50,000,000 a year on these efforts to funnel into other people's minds our side of the argument between democracy and communism.

Such an expenditure seems to be a reasonable one, only provided the agency is run by realists and businesslike executives, with dreamers, phonies, and tinhorn tub thumpers ruled out.

We have a mighty story to tell about this country, to a world which knows only fragments of that story. Let's get busy and tell it.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 4, 1948]

ONLY WAY TO OFFSET RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA IS TO ANSWER IT—INDICATIONS ARE NOW THAT PLANS ARE AFOOT TO DEVELOP MACHINERY TO DRILL THE TRUTH INTO EUROPE

(By Leland Stowe)

The answer to Soviet propaganda is simple. The answer is really to answer it. But we can't possibly hope to counteract the most highly developed propaganda organization in today's world merely with occasional statements by Secretary Marshall, the President, and a few others.

Even when Molotov and Vishinsky have spells of silence, the Soviet-Communist propaganda mills grind steadily onward with great effectiveness, day in and day out. Yet the same nation which perfected advertising into a near science and invented the almighty public-relations man has left the world field, politically speaking, almost completely free for the last 2½ years to Moscow's experts.

One cheering item for the new year is that Uncle Sam gives promise of finding his voice at last—and of using it consistently, with some boldness and imagination. Under Secretary of State Robert A. Lovett revealed this when he announced a decision "to meet Russian misstatements and distortions with direct replies." This decision appears to be a constructive byproduct of the otherwise dismal Big Four failure in London. Top American policy makers evidently got tired of watching Molotov and his colleagues run away with the propaganda ball.

BUSINESSES DO IT

So the year 1948 should see the United States begin to act something like a $200,000,000,000 concern.

Can any organization with an annual income of approximately $200,000,000,000 afford to spend less than $50,000,000 to present its case and its goods to hundreds of millions of potential customers? You wouldn't think there could be the slightest question about this. After all, scores of America's biggest corporations spend proportionately far more than this each year—just to get the facts about their products and what they are doing before the public, here and abroad.

To the richest and most powerful nation in the world, $50,000,000 a year, both to make available all pertinent facts about its activities and to prevent the spread of false conceptions about its policies, ought to be an indispensable investment.

CONGRESSMEN "EXPOSED"

But until very recently, a majority in our Congress insisted that the United States of America had no need of a respectable and strong public-relations instrument. Last June Congress refused to appropriate some $33,000,000 a year (out of a budget of as many billions of dollars) for the United States Information Service and the Voice of America overseas broadcasts. Congress cut the requested funds down to a niggardly $12,800,000 for this fiscal year. On the world's fiercely competing ideological markets, Congress rated the facts and truth about America as being worth no more than a ragged shoestring.

Since then, nearly 200 Congressmen have visited Europe and been personally exposed to the high-pressured anti-American propaganda war being waged by the Soviets and Communist Party machines throughout the Continent. They discovered that the outside world is a lot different from Washington and Kalamazoo. They learned that a lot of things which Congressmen and most Americans take for granted can be made to look alarmingly different when served to foreign publics with a neat Communist twist or with calculated omissions.

Suddenly a good many of these traveling Congressmen became angry and alarmed at the distortions and libels of Uncle Sam which they encountered. Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, had fought all along for an Uncle Sam-sized information service in and to foreign lands. Today, prospects for his bill are greatly strengthened. In the coming session, he will seek an appropriation of $50,000,000 a year for the next 6 years. Thanks to the tremendous activities and the tactics of Soviet-Communist propaganda, there seems a fair chance that America's voice, both by radio and printed material, will be raised to something more than an adolescent's shrill squeak.

This explains Lovett's announcement about direct replies to Soviet propaganda. It could be made only because a fair number of American politicians are beginning to catch up with some of the harsh facts of our postwar era. But there can be no adequate, persistent answer to Moscow's vast propaganda offensive unless the bulk of American voters became equally aware of the extremely vigorous competition which confronts us and western democratic principles in Europe and Asia. In the realm of governmental information and international public relations, the American people must grow up fast. In these respects, and as of today, Uncle Sam's team is far behind Uncle Joe's.

A WASTE OF BREATH

If it isn't worth $50,000,000 a year for America's case to be heard accurately and read accurately by hundreds of millions of people overseas, then the United States might as well crawl into its shell like a turtle—and leave the world field to uncontested Soviet propaganda. For Americans to denounce communism, yet refuse to provide the means to repudiate a constant barrage of Communist assertions and misstatements, has been both a waste of breath and lack of elemental common sense. When you are assaulted by mud-splashers the first thing to do is turn on a good garden hose. In these times, the Office of Information in the State Department can and should function as a powerful garden hose; not a trickle, but a pounding, unceasing stream of clear water.

What could a $50,000,000 information hose do? Molotov's London speech, which broke up the Conference, offers an enlightening example. When Lovett spoke of misstatements, distortions, and falsehoods, he undoubtedly had this speech in mind. But although Marshall and Bevin replied to it and spiked many an assertion, they did not begin to answer Molotov as he could be answered. Restudying this speech, you can see what opportunities Washington has missed until now for lack of detailed direct replies. Here are samples:

1. Molotov accused the western Allies of "hidden reparations and economic privileges" in western Germany. To brand the accusation as false is only a half measure. What about the enormous hidden reparations and economic privileges amassed by the Soviets in the eastern European countries? Washington possesses thousands of columns of hard facts on this. An adequate United States Information Service could deluge Europe with such facts.

2. Molotov charged Anglo-Americans with buying up whole concerns in Germany. Marshall and Bevin declared this absolutely false. But why stop there? Every informed person knows that the Soviets have been steadily buying controls of quantities of enterprises in Hungary, Rumania, and other satellite countries for more than 2 years. An alert information service, sufficiently expanded, would present Europeans with a long and confirmed list of such actions.

3. Molotov claimed that western Germany's whole economy was in a state of dependency on other countries, especially the United States of America. What about the economic dependency of every Soviet satellite nation? The facts are all available—but millions of Europeans will never know them unless Washington leads in presenting them, alongside Molotov's charges.

MOLOTOV WIDE OPEN

In his denunciation of the western Allies Molotov left himself wide open to direct replies, well documented, on most of the sweeping accusations he made. The General Marshall-Bevin retort was "We're not doing that." It would have been far more effective, in public-relations terms, if they had added, "But this is precisely what you are doing."

Foreign ministers can't talk forever. They cannot answer the Niagara of Soviet propaganda with a host of unanswerable facts in a half-hour speech.

The only way to reply crushingly and tellingly to a vast propaganda machine is through a large and well-organized mechanism for information. The Soviets will continue to win the propaganda war until America refuses to let its voice be smothered by the opposition's sheer weight, plus its own indifference and lack of political awareness.

[From World Report of January 6, 1948]

REPORT ON THE VOICE OF MOSCOW—RUSSIA'S WAR OF WORDS AGAINST AMERICA

The "cold war" is entering a new phase.

Soviet propagandists are trying—in some cases successfully—to convince the world that America is expansionist, aggressive, a warmonger out to dominate the world.

United States officials think the time has come to tell the world that Russia is the

guilty party. The Voice of America, if Congress approved, is to reply vigorously to the Voice of Moscow.

In the following survey, World Report analyzes the problem the American Government is up against in combating Russian propaganda.

In the "cold war" between Russia and the United States, Radio Moscow is a major weapon. It assumed the offensive early and has hammered away at America's conduct and intentions early and late.

Until recently, Radio Moscow has had things pretty much its own way. Soviet diplomats, like V. M. Molotov and Andrei Vishinsky, have provided it with scorching ammunition against America. Russian newspapers, under direct control of Soviet officials, daily provide additional ammunition.

Lately, however, Radio Moscow has begun to notice international competition. A smaller, less experienced instrument, the Voice of America, has demanded attention in Moscow. Apparently the Voice of America finally has got under the skin of Soviet propagandists.

The episode began with the Voice of America broadcast reports that Russian consumers were doing some panic buying in Moscow. Stores were closing to avoid having their shelves stripped of goods. There were rumors of changes in prices and in the value of the ruble.

A few days later the Soviet Government announced its drastic devaluation of the currency. Ruble devaluation of 90 percent was an official admission that inflation in Russia had reached critical heights.

What annoyed Moscow was that the press in America and in western Europe generally interpreted the currency devaluation as evidence of economic crisis inside Russia. The Voice of Moscow says it is nothin of the kind. The capitalist press, according to Moscow, is reacting with "fury and lies" to conceal the economic crisis that grips the United States.

Finally, said Radio Moscow, "This anti-Soviet chorus was joined by the New York radio station of the State Department's Voice of America, whose lying broadcasts have on more than one occasion incensed the working people of our country."

To American officials, the significant point in this statement is the admission that the Voice of America reaches Russian workers.

In the past, the Voice of America has had difficulty reaching Russian listeners. First broadcasts, a few months ago, were feeble. They were criticized by the American Embassy in Moscow as inadequate. Attempts by the State Department to improve the programs were handicapped by congressional opposition and a cut in appropriations.

Other efforts to inform Europeans of American aid and of America's side of the argument with Russia did not seem to be getting very far. Congressmen who visited Europe last summer complained that Europeans heard much of an occasional shipment of Russian grain, but heard little or nothing of continuous shipments of American wheat and coal. Some Europeans, usually friendly to America, seemed to be impressed by Moscow's repeated statements that the United States was imperialistic.

There is no evidence that Soviet propaganda has won many in western Europe to Russia's cause. There is evidence, however, that the Voice of Moscow has helped to make Europeans suspicious of America.

Success of the Voice of America in annoying Soviet propagandists is thus significant. Internal difficulties in Russia, combined with Communist set-backs in France, may now handicap Radio Moscow in influencing western Europe.

TO REPLY TO RUSSIA

Exactly how the Voice of America will seize this opportunity remains to be determined. Thus far, the Voice of America has ignored repeated attacks by Moscow on American intentions. Now, however, high officials in the State Department say the time has come to correct misinformation, distortions, and outright lies broadcast by the Voice of Moscow.

Answering Soviet attacks on the United States can be a full-time job. A limited sample of Moscow broadcasts for one recent week gives an idea of what is involved.

To British listeners, the Voice of Moscow attacks the Marshall plan, blames the failure of the London Conference of Foreign Ministers on the western powers, says American prosperity is at an end, explains what is back of anticommunism in the United States and warns the British that the dollar is growing strong at the expense of the pound sterling.

The Marshall plan, according to Moscow, is "an instrument for swelling the profits of United States and European monopolies by still further tightening the screws on the laboring population of western Europe." In other words, if the Labor government in Britain supports the Marshall plan, it does so at the expense of its principal supporters, the British workers.

Western diplomats at London wanted the recent Conference to fail, Radio Moscow explains, because they "wanted to pursue a policy for dismembering Germany to the bitter end, and transform the western zones into colonies for German imperialists." Thus, Moscow ignores Anglo-American statements urging a united Germany, warns British labor to beware of imperialism.

"The color has gone out of United States prosperity," Moscow broadcasts to England. "Indeed, the sinister signs of an approaching crisis have become so evident that they can no longer be concealed." To left-wing members of the Labor Party in Britain, this view may reinforce their earlier fears that the Labor government ought to get closer to Russia, divorce itself from America.

Lovers of liberty in England are advised by Moscow that the United States is engaged in "a police onslaught on the elementary democratic rights of the United States people." Anticommunism in America, it is explained, is a "campaign undertaken to justify a policy of external expansion."

To Britons worried about the stability of the pound sterling, Moscow says that the British-American deal on western Germany puts financial policy in American hands, and "the pound follows the wake of the dollar."

Germans come in for special attention by the Voice of Moscow. They are told that America wishes to dismember Germany permanently. They are also advised that American charges about Russia taking reparations out of Germany are designed to conceal huge American takings. Thus, according to Moscow, "almost the entire German production" of textiles is seized by the United States. Exports of German coal are made "at such low profit for the Germans that they depend on loans which only the United States can make. Thus, western Germany is coming under United States capitalism."

Soviet propagandists, however, do not say one thing to Russian audiences and the opposite to listeners abroad. The propaganda line is substantially the same both at home and abroad.

RADIO MOSCOW'S LINE

Russians, day after day, learn from the Voice of Moscow that the United States "has embarked on a new, openly expansionist policy directed at establishing world domination," that "United States monopolistic capital * * * is endeavoring under the guise of aid to enslave European countries," that Wall Street looks upon Greece as an appetizer and now wants "to gobble up France," that oil is the only reason for American concern with the Middle East and that America's own economic crisis has now reached the point where "millions of men, including war veterans, are unable to find any occupation."

Many members of the United States Congress now think that Russian statements of this sort ought to be answered. The likelihood is that the current Congress will encourage the Voice of America to speak up.

A major problem, however, is how the United States can offset Russian propaganda without getting the United States Government deep into the propaganda business.

In America, if not in Russia, Government statements are not always accepted by the public at face value. Only the other day, a Voice of America broadcast to China drew criticism because it played down the view of Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer that Washington ought to go to the aid of Nationalist China.

Some Europeans, furthermore, are weary of propaganda. Austrians, for example, say they want neither Russian nor American propaganda.

Methods that a reinforced Voice of America will use in answering Moscow are still to be determined. They probably will be the subject of controversy in and out of Congress.

So long as the cold war between Russia and America continues, however, it is generally agreed that there is a job for the Voice of America to do. Its busiest time may come during the next few months, while the United States Congress debates—and the Voice of Moscow attacks—the $17,000,000,000 program for helping western Europe.

[From the Washington Star of January 9, 1948]

INFORMATION PROGRAM BOOST

The varying fortunes of the State Department's Voice of America radio program have taken a decided turn for the better as a result of two new developments. The first was the unanimous approval by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of a bill to provide basic legal authority for the broadcasts. The second was the appointment of George V. Allen, now Ambassador to Iran, as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

The bill reported by the Senate committee is a substitute for the Mundt bill which passed the House last year. The proposed legislation reflects the views of the joint committee which toured Europe the past summer and found urgent need of a well-considered and well-rounded foreign-information program. It will provide the statutory authority which the existing program lacks and which Representative TABER, of New York, insists on as a prerequisite to further appropriations. The measure would set up two advisory commissions, appointed by the President, to recommend general policies governing broadcasting and exchange of students between this country and other nations. Passage of this authorization would pave the way for consideration of appropriations to effect the program. Opposition to the information plan has dwindled noticeably as a result of first-hand observations by the congressional travelers.

Mr. Allen is a good choice as successor to William Benton, who had a number of congressional critics. The youthful diplomat (he is only 44) is a career man in the State Department with a background of newspaper experience after graduation from Harvard. He proved to be an intelligent and resourceful Foreign Service officer in difficult wartime assignments. There is good reason to believe that his appointment will meet with approval at the Capitol and elsewhere and that the lagging foreign-information program will derive a real lift from his leadership.

[From the New York Times of January 9, 1948]

TO TELL THE AMERICAN STORY

The quick and unanimous action of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in reporting out a bill to authorize an information program overseas, and predictions that

money will be appropriated for an expanded service, are welcome indications that Congress at last is aware of the necessity of telling abroad the American story.

Words are an important weapon in the cold war into which the United States has been forced. No more short-sighted action was taken in the first session of the Eightieth Congress than that which halved the requested $20,000,000 for an already curtailed program. There are predictions now that $5,000,000 is to be voted immediately to expand the radio service—the Voice of America programs—and that the full program of information and student exchange may be granted as much as $50,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

The change of attitude in Congress can be traced directly to the gathering by many of its Members during the summer recess of some first-hand information for themselves. All, or nearly all, of those who went to Europe and saw for themselves how this country's acts and motives were being distorted came back convinced that action must be taken to give people of other lands facts and explanations. It is not enough to hold good intentions. Others must be convinced that the intent is good.

The revitalized program, as envisioned in the Senate bill drawn by the subcommittee headed by Senator SMITH of New Jersey, seems to us to be an improvement not only over the old program but also over the Mundt bill that was passed by the House at the first session. It divorces the information program and the student-exchange program—to free the latter from any propaganda taint—and sets up separate five-member committees to advise the new Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the program. The nomination of George V. Allen, a career diplomat with a newspaper background, for that post gives promise of an able administration. The sooner the expanded program can be put into effect the better. Too much time already has been lost through delay and misunderstanding of the need.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1948]

THE INFORMATION PROGRAM

With the White House announcement that George V. Allen will be appointed Assistant Secretary of State in charge of our information and cultural program, this troubled area of our policy bids fair to take on new force and direction. Mr. Allen, who is not to be confused with George Allen, of Missouri, former jester at the White House court, is a career diplomat, looking back at 44 upon a record which includes early newspaper work, service in the State Department at Washington, and participation in some of the major wartime conferences. His latest position, as Ambassador to Iran, has given him first-hand experience in a region where the conflict of propagandas and the war of ideas is crucial.

Mr. Allen's appointment coincides with a disposition on the part of Congress to face realistically the need for a foreign-information program. The Congressmen who visited Europe last summer returned with a heightened appreciation of how necessary it is to counter the anti-American propaganda of the Soviets, as well as to spread understanding of our own life and ideals. Even JOHN TABER, who in other respects seems to have learned little, may possibly have regretted his earlier lead in reducing appropriations for this purpose to a bare minimum.

At the close of the last regular session, the House approved a bill authorizing the Office of International Information and Educational Exchange, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee gave its sanction Wednesday to a similar bill. Though neither of these carries appropriations, the prospects for a supplemental grant, and an adequate budget for the next fiscal year, have been considered favorable. Mr. Allen's nomination should greatly help the cause.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post of January 12, 1948]

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE

Expansion of America's information service abroad is indicated by two actions of the past week—unanimous approval by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of Senator SMITH's bill for a revitalized program, and appointment of George V. Allen as Assistant Secretary of State to supervise the service.

Allen, who has been Ambassador to Iran and is thoroughly familiar with a part of the world where our information service is vitally important, is a brilliant young career diplomat and a former newspaperman. His nomination gives promise of an abler administration than the service has had in the past.

Senator SMITH's measure corrects several flaws in the Mundt bill, which passed the House at the last session, and is supported by numerous former critics of the information service whose views were changed during their summer visits to Europe. The radio Voice of America now appears likely to get an added $5,000,000 appropriation almost immediately, with perhaps as much as $50,000,000 to be granted for the whole information and student-exchange program for the next fiscal year.

Congress is right in realizing how essential our information service is to combat foreign propaganda, and Senator SMITH is to be commended for having been a leader in bringing many of his colleagues around to that realization.

[From the Washington Post of January 12, 1948]

TELLING THE WORLD

One of the most hopeful auguries of the new session of Congress is the manner in which action has been expedited to put the foreign information program on a sound basis for the future. Last week the Senate Republican Policy Committee gave the green light to the Senate version of the Mundt bill as one of three pieces of "must" legislation for January. Later, at the instigation of Senator SMITH, the Foreign Relations Committee reported the bill out with only a minor change over what already had been passed by the House last session. There is every indication that with the support of newly won converts in the Senate the bill shortly will become law.

In addition to providing the basis for expansion of Voice of America broadcasts, libraries and other facets of the information program, the Mundt bill also goes into another significant aspect of our cultural relations—the interchange of students, teachers, and technical materials and the assignment of specialists to other countries on request. These activities must be considered a complement to the program of advertising America. In a concession to educators, the Senate committee included an amendment establishing two separate advisory committees of private citizens, one for informational and the other for educational activities. Providing that the separation is not carried to the point of handicapping operations at field levels, the establishment of these committees should make for more public understanding and support.

The crucial importance of an immediate effort to broaden the various parts of the information program is illustrated by the noticeable increase in Russian propaganda since the advent of interim aid and the Marshall plan. This propaganda has become more and more vicious. If the world is to have a fair and accurate picture of what we are doing, if our motives are not to be misconstrued and turned against us in the minds of the very people we are trying to help, then we shall have to use every means at our command for propagating the truth. Passage of the Mundt bill itself, of course, does not assure the funds necessary to do the job. But it is the first step in what many Members of Congress have rightly come to regard as an inescapable choice. The second equally essential step will be to vote the money for an adequate program, both in a deficiency appropriation and in next year's budget.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like very much to congratulate and commend the Senator from New Jersey upon his very excellent address, and particularly his last remarks, with regard to the real purpose and significance of the legislation.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he would be willing to consider an amendment which I believe would carry out specifically what I believe is stated to be the intention of the committee in its comment on page 10 of the report, in which it says:

> It is not intended that these two Commissions have authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

The reason why it seems to me the amendment may be appropriate is because of the very broad provision in section 1009. Therefore the amendment, I believe, would be appropriate on page 17, line 21, to add, after the word "Act," the words "*Provided, however*, That the Commission created by this section shall have no authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the program created by Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted August 1, 1946, or the United States National Commission for UNESCO."

In other words, I believe that amendment simply carries out what the committee states is its intention, and makes it clear. The reason, I believe, arises not from the section on page 17, that is, section 601, but from the very broad terms of section 1009, which states that—

> All provisions in this act regulating the administration of international information activities and educational exchanges provided herein, shall apply to all such international activities under jurisdiction of the Department of State.

I think that certainly would leave room for doubt. I may say that in the long run I think it is very likely that all these programs may be merged. But in the short term I think it may be very confusing, because, as the Senator well knows, even when we pass this act, there will still be a major obstacle in procuring the money. I should not like to see the program now started under Public Law 584 held up or interfered with for any reason, because that board has been appointed and has started to function. I am worried about the possible interpretation of section 1009, and I suggest the amendment for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator has reference, I believe, to the so-called surplus property realizations abroad, to be used for educational purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Under the law known as the Fulbright Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. In answer to the Senator, I will say that it is clearly the intention, as stated in our report, not to give any authority over these boards. Unless some of my colleagues see some objection to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas, I should be glad to accept his amendment interpreting what we mean by this section.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I offer the amendment with that understanding.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know whether it is now in order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will offer it at the appropriate time.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Arkansas has submitted his amendment, which I take it will lie on the table until the appropriate time arrives for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as one member of the subcommittee, I should like to pay my tribute to the work which was done by the chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who worked so hard and so faithfully on this bill. The other members of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] all made valuable contributions.

Certainly the bill as it is now is in much better form than it was when it came over from the other branch. It meets the needs of the situation in a more practical and complete way.

However, I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me when I say that the bill is only a beginning, insofar as United States public relations abroad are concerned. There has been a good deal of talk to the effect that if Congress would only pass this bill all our troubles would be over. To my mind, Mr. President, there could be no more false doctrine than that. We can pass all the bills we want to, and we can vote hundreds of thousands of dollars in appropriations; but unless there is energetic, intelligent, and imaginative administration we shall not really hold up our end in the great debate which is going on over the world and in which we, whether we like it or not, are one of the two principal participants.

That means, of course, that there must be an intelligent administration of the Office of Public Information. I understand that Mr. Allen, the new appointee, is a very able man, from whom we can expect great things. But as the Senator from New Jersey has said, the Voice of America is not limited to one little bureau in the State Department. The Voice of America is the President of the United States. The Voice of America is the Secretary of State. The Voice of America is the United States ambassador in every country. They are the ones who are going to be listened to and noted by people the world over. It is up to those who administer this act and who carry out the expenditure of funds always to bear in mind that the conduct of public relations is not a little incidental clerical activity. In the days in which we are now living, it is the armor in which strategy and economics are clothed. If the European recovery program known as the Marshall program is not conducted with due and intelligent regard to the matter of public relations, it will not do a great deal of good.

Let me repeat what I said at the outset. I congratulate the Senator from New Jersey for the fine and useful work which he has done in connection with this bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with this bill. For a long time I have been in favor of what it provides for. In fact, I had something to do with bringing out previous bills on this subject.

Psychological warfare is very, very old. It is almost as old as war itself. Even in an organized sense, it is almost as old. We know something about the use of the Voice of America in warfare, because it is spectacular, and because it has brought great results. Propaganda has always been an arm of the State, especially in despotic countries, where the one who has the power must always maintain it by keeping himself before the populace, whether it be a mob or whether it be a thoughtful group.

Mr. President, there are many things in this bill. The reaffirmation of the exchange of students is one. The fact that America is not ashamed to talk about herself is another. The fact that we may be made conscious, as we should always be in a democracy, that the voice of that democracy is in reality the voice of all the people, is another factor. I am sure that those who become spokesmen for our people will reflect that voice as time goes on.

Today I wish to do what I think ought to be done in relation to the Voice of America. We have been talking a great deal about the Marshall plan and about relief and aid for Europe. In spite of what anyone says, I am still a believer in the fact of one world. I have been such a believer for a long time. It makes no difference whether the world is divided in two politically. The economic entity, the geographical entity, and the fact of unity is always there, and we come back to it. I therefore wish today, if I can, to attempt to bring a spirit of universality into what we are talking about, and especially in regard to these plans.

I believe that in presenting the voice of America we shall have to present it to the whole world, because there has been a realinement of the world. World conditions and the relationships between nations make it impossible to spend all our time in our discussions on any one country or any one group of countries, or any one part of the world when we discuss world policies.

First of all, few have noticed that the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan, in reality, have their origin in what we have done in the Far East. China was told to put her own house in order before she could depend upon future aid, and Japan is now looked upon as the very center of American activity and policy of that phase of the Truman doctrine, which stands for the support of peoples attempting to remain free of economic controls and political dominations.

With Congress having before it resolutions which call for the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States, Japan becomes more of a neighbor than ever. Our administration, as trustee of the former Japanese islands of the Pacific, makes us an actual administrator of territory which was formerly controlled by Japan and a close neighbor to nations and peoples who, until the immediate present, have been considered far off.

Our first treaty with Korea, which was completely forgotten when the Japanese annexed that land, seems now, as far as our responsibility there is concerned, to have again come to life, and Korea looms large and we stand today as we always have, in theory, for the independence and territorial integrity of China.

Our tasks will not be easy. They will be many times harder than they have ever been unless we properly orient ourselves to the basic values of our various friendships and responsibilities in Asia, and without prejudice and without hate, evaluate honestly who are and who must be our friends if even a semblance of peace is maintained in the Eastern Hemisphere.

Our new relations with the Philippines, the recasting of controls in Indonesia, in Indochina, and Siam; the continued development, in their individual national responsibility, of the commonwealth states in the Pacific, are all contributing factors in our policy and our plans. In a way, Australia and New Zealand are now as close to us as is Canada.

I call to the attention of the Senate today the fact that we talk about the "iron curtain," and the fact that the eastern part of Europe is far from us, and we speak of the need of uniting western Europe against what might be trouble from the east. Those who point out and emphasize the two-worlds idea have completely forgotten that if Alaska should be made a State, or even with Alaska a Territory, we are separated from Russia on the west by merely a few miles. The way to the heart of the United States, from a strategic standpoint, by many enemies situated in the middle of Europe or in Asia, is, of course, by way of the Pacific. Geography has made it that way, and by reason of travel by air we are so close to Russia that she is one of our very nearest neighbors.

The new India, whether united or divided into parts, has given us an entirely new relationship, one which will test the ability of our diplomatists to evaluate new conditions and work in accordance with them, and test executive understanding and leadership in carrying on our new responsibilities in that part of the world. To the thoughtless, they seem to be few, but they seem great in number to those who know the strivings of the people of all Asia to meet the challenge given them by a mere reading of the political concepts of the west and the free intercourse with our missionaries.

A reminder of a single event will make my point. When William J. Bryan was

in India he left this thought, and it never died. No matter, he said in effect, how much you may dislike Britain, never forget that you should be forever grateful to her, for she gave you the English language, in which the concepts of liberty have been expressed.

Mr. President, I wonder if those few words Bryan said back in 1907 or 1908, are not in complete harmony with the words of the Senator from New Jersey in closing his statement on the pending bill. If the words of liberty were essential to the Indian people, and if what has taken place in India since that time does not prove that the words of liberty are essential to a people, then, of course, we may lose sight entirely of all that the Senator from New Jersey has said, and that which we have stood for as a nation may become merely a doctrine having no effect around the world. We know it has an effect, and we have such implicit faith in the democratic processes, coupled with the educational processes, that once these ideas gain root in the hearts and minds of men they never come out, because they are related to the eternal strivings of man himself and of man's soul for lasting and eternal liberty.

Great as these factors are, however, the responsibility for seventy-odd-million Japanese, functioning under a new constitution sponsored by us, and, when the time for peace actually comes, introduced to the world as an American-directed product, our biggest and greatest task is, of course, Japan herself.

Almost a century has passed since Commodore Matthew Perry anchored his tiny squadron of small vessels in Tokyo Bay. Faced with this impressive display of power the Japanese were forced to accept their first modern treaty. This treaty served to "open" Japan to the west and exposed her to western idealism, western realism, European and American ways. In almost a decade from the time of the first treaty students from Japan had arrived in America and the teacher-student relationship was begun. In the late summer of 1945, again an American, this time a soldier, led the spearhead of the greatest concentration of armed strength the world has ever know into Tokyo Bay. From a turret of the flagship *Missouri* flew an American flag of 31 stars—Commodore Perry's flag of an earlier day. On the deck below, Gen. Douglas MacArthur received the imperial surrender. Japan had been "opened" for a second time and exposed again to western idealism, realism, and practices. It is hoped that this second opening will renew an even firmer student-teacher relationship.

We now know only too well what dire consequences sprang from the earlier contact between our country and Japan. Japan followed with zeal all she thought represented best the strength of the West, our military and naval habits. Two or three centuries of Shogunate and military single-willism, plus the fact that her constitution was set up by a revolutionary government, proved to be factors so strong that even the new constitution and the new leadership could not overcome the habits and the thought of the past. Perry's visit was conceived in a mixture of American self-interest and American good will, but it was the first link in a chain of events that led to the acme of the world's use of force to combat force at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

I emphasize that point of self-interest, because it has come back into the vocabulary of those who are constantly talking and asking questions about the Marshall plan.

Having emerged from the long slumber of centuries of hermit-like seclusion, the Japanese grasped eagerly at the new material techniques of the west. It is inevitable that the learner should attempt to imitate his teacher and, like so many students, the imitation was accepted and indulged in without, of course, attempting to interpret completely that which was imitated. The Japanese learned the west's techniques, learned them well and applied them ruthlessly, testing their new-found strength in a series of wars spaced almost regularly at 10-year intervals—the Chinese-Japanese War of 1895, the Russian-Japanese War of 1905, the World War of 1915, the Manchurian incident of 1931, and finally in 1941 the Second World War. The peoples of the west followed this strange spectacle of growing power in the Orient, first with amusement, then with surprise, then awe, and finally, after the rape of Nanking, with either indignation or terror and horror. It was a hideously fascinating spectacle. From an island base, rich in natural beauty, but wretchedly poor in the substance of power and scarcely larger than New Mexico, the Japanese reddened the map of Asia in ever-widening arcs until at the pinnacle of their military success their empire encompassed an area equal to that of continental United States.

This, then, was the end result of a seemingly insignificant naval visit more than 90 years ago. What can we expect from the "second" opening of Japan, carried out under such strikingly different circumstances? As you know, it required almost 4 years of devastating war, appalling sacrifices of American lives, and an immense united effort to pry loose the Japanese from their conquests, and to force them once again back into the confines of their homeland. But now the arrogant alien boot no longer echoes in war-torn China. The Japanese Fleet is at the bottom of the sea. Flattened beyond recognition are many of the great cities of Japan where the abundance of Asia and what she could secure from the west had been fashioned into deadly instruments of aggression.

We have won at tremendous cost this second opportunity to "open" Japan. We had to pool our courage, our skill, our intelligence, and our imagination in a common undertaking of unbelievable magnitude. Our responsibility is not merely to make the victory that finally came a vindication of our technology, but even more a triumph of a way of life based upon decent ideals, a fulfillment of American democracy, and its dream of human freedom.

But are we equal to this new task? Can we meet the challenge of the second opening of Japan, and in a larger sense the challenge of the peace, with a trust in the strength of the atomic bomb? No; we need something more. Will we retain the war-forged spiritual unity and the determined will to achieve, now that the objective is to construct, rather than to destroy? Can we supply the needed leadership to the world, when the basic requirement is no longer guns but mechanisms of peace and ideals?

Mr. President, I cannot help but pause for a moment to point out that the problems of peace are so much more difficult than the problems of war, and to point out that, throughout the ages, man had been perfectly happy to unite at all times for war, but has refused to unite for peace. Way back in the days of the Greek dramatists and poets, Sophocles, I believe it was, had one of his heroines wail the lines:

> When, oh when, will men cease to unite for destruction and unite for the building and the bringing of peace?

That question is still unanswered, Mr. President. That question may be answered by the Voice of America moving out into the whole world, because we will not, we dare not, we cannot move into the world's sphere and talk about America and not also talk about peace, good will, educational relationships with one another and, above all things, governments built upon understanding.

Our capacities to wage the war were admittedly unsurpassed. Our capacities to lead the peace are presently undergoing careful scrutiny in many parts of the world. Japan must have no cause for losing faith in her teacher.

Although we share the control of Japan with our Allies, the circumstances of the war have projected America into a position of primary responsibility. Our task bids fair to challenge all of our capabilities, which can become successful only on a cooperative basis, and cooperation never succeeds unless there is a fusion of common ideals and common characteristics. Have I thereby set the stage for an impossible contingency? Is there anything in the way of ideals common between us and our former enemy? If our answer is to be generated by hate, it will be definitely "No." However, through a study of history and what has actually taken place, without our being against Japan just because we are for some other country, we can discover many common ideals and aspirations. If it had not been for these common ideals and aspirations, the peace, as it did come in Japan, would never have occurred. The atomic bomb, despite the Emperor's reference to it, and again admitting that it was a contributing factor, was not the basic factor which brought about the surrender and, with it, the complete trust on the part of our former enemy that America would honor every promise she made.

How did it happen that a country and a people who have been credited with being individually and collectively self-sacrificing, and still having an army of 4,000,000 men trained and equipped, who had never shot a bullet at an enemy, surrendered unconditionally, and still realized that what they were doing could be done with honor? It could not have been from a fear of a call for more sacrifice. It must have been from trust. And how was it, despite the fact that many leaders

of our Government justified the use of the bomb on the score of military necessity, and knew little about what had gone on since the very days of Pearl Harbor in attempting to bring about a complete surrender where guerrilla warfare could be avoided, that armies scattered over almost half a globe could be returned without piecemeal fighting and disorder? Something must have been going on, because a people of over 70,000,000 could not be converted overnight by the destruction of a comparatively small city, after larger cities had been destroyed without affecting their spirit.

It is because I believe that a future successful building of Japan depends upon an appreciation of the ideals which will go into that building that I am going to attempt to point out what can be accomplished by reference to what has already been accomplished. If the same spirit can control the future in the same way that it got control of the hearts and minds of the Japanese people in the past, we can build hopefully, and under our tutelage Japan can become a leader of Asia in developing national solidarities and peaceful international activities to such an extent that the rebirth of the new Japan will affect the lives of the millions and millions of other peoples in Asia.

When I say that, I do not in any sense condone a single act of the Japanese Government in bringing about war with America. Time and time again in talking to the Japanese I have repeated one theme, namely, that the government led by Matsuoka and Tojo had actually become apostate, that these leaders turned their backs upon the fundamentals of their greatest leaders, and that the acceptance of their theories would lead to Japan's utter destruction.

We remember that after Pearl Harbor the Japanese Government instituted a monthly celebration in honor of the Pearl Harbor victory. The idea of apostate leadership struck me so forcibly that I wrote one or two magazine articles and developed the first of what became my messages to the Japanese people. I pointed out in December 1941 that never in the world's history had a nation of 70,000,000 people deliberately moved to its own destruction to the extent that I called it national suicide. I was, of course, an American; and Pearl Harbor outraged me even more, I think, than anyone else, because it seemed proof positive that wicked forces in Japan had completely gotten control of the finer thinking of the great men I used to know. I was so convinced that the destruction of Japan was certain that I started my appeals directly to the Japanese people. The OWI institutionalized my messages, and they were sent regularly up until January 1, 1946. All the time I stressed one theme, namely, an appeal to the Japanese people to overthrow their false leaders and to return to the teachings of Meiji Tenno and his associates.

I make that point at this time, Mr. President, because I do not know of any other case in history when people have given up in the way that the Japanese people gave up; and I make this point particularly in view of their constitution and the controls which existed among them and the fact that a Japanese general in the field was completely autonomous and completely independent from the government at home, and could do whatever he wished to do. Mr. President, do you think that a Japanese general in charge of troops, who had learned year after year to live on the land in China, could have been made to surrender unless he had been convinced that surrender was the proper thing for his people? Of course, he could not.

People do not understand, they do not realize, how the Japanese mind worked and how the Japanese institutions worked. Let me give one incident. I was appointed chairman of a Senate committee to try to do something for our own men who had been captured in foreign countries. We had an extremely interesting little request that came to us. The Japanese had allowed their prisoners to send home to their parents postal cards saying, for the most part, that the prisoners were well. But those postal cards were undated. Some of the parents said they had received word of the death of one of their boys, and then later on had received one of the postal cards from the boy himself saying that he was well and happy. The parents wanted to know if we could not bring it about so that the boys could date the postal cards they sent. I made that request on the part of our people through generals.

It is realized that the request had to go through Spain and through Russia at that time, in order to reach Japan. The Japanese people replied immediately saying they had no objection to the boys dating their postal cards, but that we should know they could not control the generals in the field, and if the generals who were responsible for the prisoners said that no dates should be allowed on the postal cards, the Japanese Government could do nothing about it. I mention that to emphasize the fact that the universal surrender came even among armed forces that knew they were completely autonomous and could act for themselves. I mention it also to show the type of thinking that goes on in another great country. Japan replied to our request immediately, but it took months for us to get the answer. Why? The answer was held up in one of the countries through which we had to communicate. Why was it held up? It was held up because it was deemed unimportant. "Why should any parent be interested in his son after he has once entered the Army?" There are nations in the world who still do not have what we call a dog tag, that is, an identification tag, for their soldiers. They do not keep track of the soldiers. They bid the boys good-by when they leave, and if they come back they welcome them, but there is no communication, for the most part, especially in time of war. The boys are expendable, to use an expression which we developed, and they remain expendable all the time. Therefore, it should be emphasized over and over and over again that the surrender came as a result of a reasoned appeal; it came as the result of a conviction.

In war, therefore, we have an illustration of the strength of the very thing we are trying to do now in peace. As time moved on we were thus in a strong position to be able to explain what was meant by unconditional surrender, and ultimately we were able to unite the Japanese people in the thought that it was not necessarily the aim of America to destroy their basic institutions. We repeated that surrender with honor was obtainable, if it were lived up to in honor, and thus came the unheard of surrender, with almost universal respect for what the Emperor had done.

The convincing of our own people of the necessity of avoiding anarchy in Japan was not an easy task. I call to mind now one radio program I was on, in which the great man with whom I carried on a discussion maintained that anarchy in Japan would be welcomed. Think of it, Mr. President. But in the midst of the war we were so full of hate that we were going to exterminate peoples. That is what was said. In war, if you want to take enemies, you had better tell the enemies you are going to treat them right when you take them, or you will not take them; because if any soldier boy knows he is going to be exterminated when he surrenders, of course he will fight to the last ditch, regardless of anything.

It seems to me that when we realize what we did by psychological warfare in World War I, in bringing about a continued reasoned appeal to the people of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire, and broke it up, not by guns or bullets or bombs but by reasoned appeal, we should never have lost sight of our chance. Incidentally, we did not lose sight of it, for never once did the psychological warfare of our Army and Navy cease throughout the war, and it brought tremendously great results.

Calculate if you can the loss of life to our boys, and the millions of dollars of destruction that we would have had to fight through, if we had not secured the type of surrender we did. Get out the map of China. It is unnecessary to go to the South Sea islands, but just get out the map of China and figure out how far the Japanese troops were scattered over that country. Consider that they were turned into guerrillas, and think how many American boys would have lost their lives chasing down those guerrillas, if we had not brought about the type of surrender we did. My point is that the surrender had to be organized, and was not an impulsive thing resulting from the destruction of Hiroshima and part of Nagasaki.

I go back to Germany, and I go back now to our discussions in the State Department. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and I, with five or six others, took part every Saturday morning in those discussions. Time after time it was pointed out, and I could not help pointing it out, because I knew, that when Hitler fell there would then be nothing to pin to. As early as 1934 Hitler destroyed both the German Constitution and the German Government by breaking the first rule of politics and government, by taking unto himself not only the Constitution but also the Government; so that when Hitler came to an end there was nothing at all with which one could negotiate. We had a little

chance, because an admiral claimed to be a successor of Hitler, but we did not embrace that opportunity of giving unity to the German people. We let the opportunity go; probably we had to. But the answer of the experts was always the same, "We will have the German people, and we can deal with them."

Mr. President, it is impossible to deal with a people, utterly impossible. We may be able through the Voice of America to appeal to the people, to appeal to individuals, teaching them better habits, a better outlook, a better history, but there is no technique that has ever been devised in the history of government or in the history of politics which makes it possible for forty or fifty or sixty million people to carry on negotiations with anybody. It just cannot be done. We knew that. We knew that was going to happen in Germany, and now we know the result of letting it happen the way it did because we are spending, as every one who thought about it knew that we would spend. The minute an enemy is defeated, then his conqueror must feed him. That is not a rule of life, that is not a rule of war, that is not a rule of law; it is a fact that has followed. The victor must either kill or starve his vanquished foes, or feed them; and to kill or starve them is not the American way.

We are paying now for the fact that Hitler did not know his political science in 1934, or he would never have done what he did. At that time, when Hitler assumed complete control and autonomy, I was at the University of Berlin. I was talking with the various professors there about what he might do. No one who was trained in government could conceive that Hitler would possibly do what he did; but he did it, and much of our trouble comes from the fact that there was no continuity in authority, no way for those people to speak for themselves. Had there been, we probably could have brought about the type of surrender that was brought about in Japan.

The American people should be grateful beyond words not only because of the number of boys whose lives were saved, not only because of the property that was saved, but because we have a chance to make a real beginning in building constructively upon a foundation that is already established. The Japanese Nation has been a unit for generations, so much of a unit that probably that made our task tough. Literacy in Japan is very high. When the war started, there were more electric-light bulbs per capita in Japan than there were in the United States. She has not been a backward country. I am frequently asked whether my messages got to the Japanese people. "How could they?" I have been asked. Radio sets are very cheap; the Japanese people had as many as we had, and they knew how to work them.

One thing about a newly awakened people getting new devices, and one thing which is extremely interesting, is that they work such devices to death once they begin to understand them. I have gone into Japanese hut after Japanese hut and have seen two, three, and four clocks, not one of them going. Those who live in the huts found what the time was in other ways. But it was the style for everyone to have one or more clocks, so the people obtained as many as they could.

With respect to radio messages which we sent to the Japanese, those messages were heard. We received replies sometimes so quickly as to startle us. We received one reply from the Japanese Government to the messages we sent near the end of hostilities, in the form of an action which took place within a week after the first message from us went out. The replies were picked up as far west as Portugal in Europe. We can get to the people of the world by radio, and I am glad we are headed toward an attempt to do so now.

If the Japanese leaders had succeeded in convincing their people that Japan should fight as the last machine gunner fought at Iwo Jima or Okinawa to utter destruction, who can figure how long it would have taken our soldier boys to have burned and blasted out of China and other places of Asia all of the Japanese who were there.

All during the war, both in our own country and in Japan, not much was publicly said and not much was quoted that went out in our psychological warfare. But if what was said had not been very effective, why was so much attention paid in replying? If the Japanese people did not hear what the OWI sent out under the name of Senator THOMAS, why did the Japanese radio go to the trouble to try to belittle and abuse all that Senator THOMAS stood for? At any rate, the results did come out as I maintained from the very beginning were possible. My and the OWI's 5 years' work may be completely marked off as having been useless, but the results remain. I have stressed this point because I believe that the future success of American and Japanese cooperation in bringing stability to Asia depends entirely upon our being able to appreciate common viewpoints from which we can operate and through which there will be joint agreement. The surrender is proof that it can be done.

In the messages to Japan I took the stand that modern Japan was at her very best in thought and in action during the days of the Meiji era, when such men as Admiral Togo and General Nogi were the instructors of the present Emperor. I knew both Togo and Nogi. I knew their lives and I knew their ideals, and I knew what the present Emperor had been taught as a boy. I knew also Admiral Nomura. He, too, had become an instructor of the princes in the peers school. I knew his philosophy about the world and what the result would be if Japan and America should fight. I knew that the present Emperor and his little brother, Prince Chichibu, had both been taught that friendship with America was of prime importance for the success of Japan, and that if Japan went to war it would end with the destruction of the Japanese prestige in the world. It was because of this knowledge that I had such faith in the effectiveness of the two messages which some of us urged President Roosevelt to send directly to the Emperor before Pearl Harbor. I knew these boys could never forget these teachings. To an extent, therefore, I knew that my appeal to the Japanese people would also bear fruit if any of my words got to the Emperor. I know now that they did. Have we not in the basic teachings of the necessity of friendship with America, which was drilled into the mind of the present Emperor as a child, a key to the position of the future Japan in the world? Is there throughout all of Asia another nation with the educational system which, when properly cleansed of propaganda, can unite a people as Japan was united for evil? Can this not be turned to good purposes with lasting effect if the good purposes are based upon truth?

That Japan can achieve national solidarity we all know and admit. That she has been a good and constructive member of the community of nations in the past we also know. To anyone who wishes to understand the schemes of national planning which Russia, Germany and Italy later followed, he should study the antecedents of those schemes tried in the development of Japanese nationalism from 1868 down to 1900. Thus we have a people who have been schooled and who can be united to deal with; a people, too, who have been united at times for good quite as much as they have been for ill. When one realizes the whole history of the development of nationalism all over the world, one is not surprised that a people such as the Japanese, who consciously were imitating others, did at times take more seriously the written word and what was being done in the world than a people who were not conscious of imitating. Give the Japanese people and Japanese nationalism an honest psychoanalysis and that which has occurred in their land can be explained on the basis of what had occurred in other lands. Japan's acceptance of the Axis theory of Mussolini and Hitler makes the strutting of Matsuoka today seem the comic-opera stuff it was. But Japan's leaders, like Matsuoka, were not the only people in the world, although they acted the part more ridiculously, who fell for the strutting.

Look at the Japanese soldiers' record in the Boxer War. Note the respect which Nogi and Togo both had for noncombatants in the Russo-Japanese war, where General Nogi, during the battle of Port Arthur, sacrificed brigade after brigade rather than let his fire reach defenseless persons, women and children and noncombatants. Then read an Italian writer's thesis written after the First World War in defense of horrible warfare and translate that into Japanese and have it accepted literally by a people who were admittedly following, what we know today, were false leaders and you have an explanation of the Japanese change of character and what took place at Nanking and other atrocity centers. The philosophy of warfare took a terrific change after the last war. Writers began putting forth the ideas of horrible warfare and the more horrible the more quickly it was to be over. The sad part about that attitude is that when people get an idea from someone else and not from their own experience and translate that idea into their own langage and into their own way of behaving, horrible warfare becomes beastly warfare, and there

is much of the last war that has to be characterized as low-down, beastly warfare. Thus we see that the seeds which matured in the destruction of Pearl Harbor had their beginnings in the Western Hemisphere.

Japan is a nation that definitely wants to be led in world affairs. She needs the association of an honest mind and teacher. The Japanese people have never once lost the student attitude. I do not mean by that that the nation and culture of Japan is devoid of much that is their own, because they are not. But I do want to leave with the Senate the thought that every act of Japan since the arrival of Admiral Perry and the decision of the Japanese leaders to take upon themselves western ways has been an act of following and not of leadership. As long as Japan had the leadership of Great Britain under the Anglo-Japanese alliance, she had a constructive leadership. I am not advocating an American-Japanese alliance, but the war has put us in a position of either being good neighbors, of assuming the teacher-student attitude, or of completely withdrawing and allowing friendships to be sought in less helpful centers, as they were when Japan looked to Italy and Germany as friends and broke with their former allies, the British, and her association with us.

Now if there is to be the student-teacher position plus good neighborliness, because the good-neighbor policy must work east and west as well as north and south, we have an obligation to perform. If we will do our part there is no doubt in my mind but that Japan will do hers.

It is important that we have clearly in mind what it is that the United States proposes to accomplish in Japan. Our objectives are not secret. They have been stated clearly and firmly many times. They are objectives that are entirely in harmony with the purposes of the United Nations. They were endorsed by all the major allies at Potsdam. What we desire is the full demilitarization of Japan and the removal of obstacles which thwart democratic activities in Japanese society. At the same time we will allow the Japanese people every opportunity to resume a peaceful and respectable place in the world.

I said before that the primary responsibility for the success or failure of the Allied objectives rested with the United States—that the future of Japan would be determined largely by our actions. There is, however, also a clear limitation on our responsibility. We cannot create democracy in Japan, for democracy, as General MacArthur has said, and as we all know, "is a thing largely of the spirit." General Marshall, echoing the ideals of Lee, which he undoubtedly planted in his heart as a youth at the Virginia Military Academy, has defined it in a way that Jefferson would applaud, and at the same time realize that his teachings were as much a part of American leadership today as he hoped they would be when he wrote that he and Adams would yet look down from heaven with joy at the fulfillment of this great dream. Marshall's words should be taught to every school boy and girl in America, should be translated and made part of the education of each youth in Japan. These are his words:

> I realize that the word "democracy" is given many interpretations. To the American Government and citizens it has a basic meaning. We believe that human beings have certain inalienable rights—that is, rights which may not be given or taken away. They include the right of every individual to develop his mind and his soul in the ways of his own choice, free of fear and coercion—provided only that he does not interfere with the rights of others. To us a society is not democratic if men who respect the rights of their fellow men are not free to express their own beliefs and convictions without fear that they may be snatched away from their home and family. To us a society is not free if law-abiding citizens live in fear of being denied the right to work or deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Surely I will be excused for a moment's diversion to say what I have said so many times, that the outstanding characteristic in our world leadership in the world war is that our great generals and admirals are statesmen first and military geniuses second. If this is not a complete proof of the American ideal of citizen soldiery, I do not know what else it may be. An almost day-to-day association with our Secretaries of War and the Navy during the war period gave me a renewed appreciation of the basic idealism which underlay their acts.

Democracy is a way of life a long time in the building. Our legitimate objective, and the most we can hope to accomplish, is to establish and permit to grow in Japan those conditions under which democracy can flourish. At the same time, we must remain on guard against a revival of forces which, just a short time ago, were calling for a hundred years war against us and crashing planes in mad suicidal dives on our naval vessels. Let us make no mistake; militarism in Japan is not a mere surface phenomenon involving a few generals and admirals. It is more a manifestation of imitation of evils found in the West and the tragedy which befalls a people who cast off decent ideals to follow apostate leadership.

The work of the occupation has fallen into three main categories: Demilitarization, political and social reorientation, and economic reconstruction. In considering each of these it is important to remember that the actual task of administering the policies has rested largely with the Japanese Government, operating under the authority and supervision of the supreme commander for the Allied Powers.

The most tangible result is seen in the demobilization of Japanese military power. Within a very short time after the surrender, forces in the homeland were completely disbanded and armaments production was brought to a halt. When the Japanese had completed these assignments, they were ordered to dissolve their war and naval ministries. Then came the return of the pioneers of Japanese expansion—the 6,000,000 civilians and soldiers scattered in outposts throughout the Pacific and in Asia. This tremendous job of repatriation was completed by the end of 1946 except for large numbers of Japanese prisoners still held by the Russians. Still another phase of demilitarization has been the war-crimes trials. These have been conducted with justice. In addition to the major criminals still undergoing trial in Tokyo, scores of other Japanese have been made to answer for the flagrant atrocities they committed against the helpless during the war. These trials received full publicity in Japan so that the ordinary people may know to what depths of wickedness their military descended.

Of course, the complete destruction of Japan's current ability to wage war is not in itself perpetual insurance against a revival of military power. In the long run the prevention of militarism must depend upon the further growth of the democratic idea among the Japanese people. It is at this point in allied policy that the problem of demilitarization merges with the larger questions of political and social reorientation and economic reconstruction.

What we should attempt in these fields is the establishment of an environment in Japan which will predispose the people of that country to a peaceful revolution of tremendous consequence. We should introduce in a few years the nonmaterial aspects of hundreds of years of western culture—the fruits of the renaissance, political liberalism, Christian humanism—in short, all those ideals and spiritual values which have tempered the material advance of the west. But in addition to that, the oldest of all Chinese learned culture, based as it was upon a deep and appreciative study of the Chinese classics, should be revitalized and brought to life under the auspices of teachers who have accepted the theory of the dignity of the individual and the notion of the processes of government which spring from an acceptance of the principle of inherent right in the individual and above all the great principle that governments are instituted not for their own perpetuation nor their own good, but for the people they represent.

Mr. President, time after time in the hearings on the European relief bill questions were asked by various Senators, as to why we cannot bring this about, or bring that about. The answer is easy. No other government on earth fully accepts the notion that a government is merely the agent of the people. Political parties in every government I know of where the democratic processes have been working incidentally, are professional affairs, and those political parties succeed, and the men in them derive their livelihood, only when they control government. One could not convince an Italian, a Frenchman, or a citizen of any other country that when government speaks it speaks for the benefit of the people. They know that it speaks for the benefit of the party in power, and the self-perpetuating will of those people. In America, where political parties are sentimental, and where we continually have accidents in politics in every State in the Union, it is difficult for us to see that there is a difference. It was extremely interesting to attend the Oxford debate the other night and find one of the young debaters, a boy who was probably only a sophomore in college, being introduced as a man who will be put forth by his party as a candidate for a seat in Parliament. Already

he had adhered to a given party in Great Britain, and that is where he will stay as long as he lives. His success in his political life will not depend upon that which he does for the Government of Great Britain, but it will depend upon that which he can do for the party which he joins. If he becomes a great leader he will be moved from one constituency to another in order to preserve himself in his party position. If that practice were followed in America, being alined with the Democratic Party, if the Democratic Party could persist I could have a life job. But it does not work that way in America. All the alinement in the world will not keep the independent voter from jumping fences and sidewalks and voting as he pleases.

That is the fundamental difference. Even when we make comparisons with the mother of parliaments, the country which gave us most of our institutions, we find that the difference is so great that it is exceedingly difficult even for United States Senators to understand. They ask an ambassador on the stand the question, "Why can you not bring it about so that in France, Italy, Holland, or Denmark, the people will react in a certain way?"

It will take a long time, Mr. President. The Voice of America may bring about such changes. That is one of the tasks which we have to do if our type of life is to persist in the world.

To bring about the desired reorientation of Japanese society, every phase of Japanese life must be affected. The initial targets already aimed at are the feudal components of the social structure and elements in public life which had championed totalitarianism. These impediments to freedom had to be uprooted and swept into obscurity before any constructive measures could be undertaken. Therefore, thousands of persons in government, business, education, and public information were screened. Scores of Japanese with militaristic leaning have already been excluded from public life. Furthermore, the thought-control police—the dreaded Kempei-tai—have been abolished and the fanatic patriotic societies, such as the Black Dragon, have been dissolved.

State Shintoism, chief perpetrator of the imperial divinity concept, has been abolished. This is not the great revolution which many writers have stressed. The Shinto religion, even in my day, was a religion without a theology, without a hierarchy, and even without a system of morals, excepting for the influence which those priests who did read and who understood the Chinese classics might have accepted. Ancestor worship alone had little state significance until it was pointed out to the Japanese by westerners that it was not necessary for the whole nation to become Christian, as was the plan, in order that nationalism might properly be accepted, since thoughtlessly, it had been pointed out that nationalism, as a state ideal, had developed only in Christian countries. The scheme was for the crown-prince to become a Christian and that when he succeeded to the emperorship the transition would be easy. At this time it was pointed out that, if Shinto were made to stand for the concept of the divine right of kings, as evolved in the west, Shintoism could become a state religion and be made into a political concept to develop the theory of national patriotism. The Mikado cult has ceased to operate in the realm of mysticism. The emperor, Hirohito, has been humanized and placed both constitutionally and in practice on a level comparable with that of King George of England. In my day the Mikado cult, as a political necessity, had not become so universally accepted that those few teachers, who talked about the development of the Japanese Constitution and compared the Emperor's political position with that of the King of England, were interfered with. I remember one debate in Parliament where this was openly done and, while the member of Parliament was chided because he was reminded of the fact that the constitution carried the provision of the inviolability of the Emperor, it did not seem then archtreason to discuss the point.

While the effect of these preliminaries were spreading through Japan the Japanese Government was pushed into a series of actions designed to establish a basis for genuine democracy. Restrictions on political, civil, and religious liberty came to an end and thousands of political prisoners—potential leaders of a new Japan—were released. The notoriously brutal Japanese police received a reschooling in practices of common decency and courtesy. New textbooks in geography, history, and morals cast Japan in an entirely different light for the pupils of the elementary and secondary schools.

The press, the radio, and the screen all experienced a new freedom. They ceased to be the mouthpiece of officialdom and their liberty was limited only for the interest of Allied objectives.

One of the most far-reaching changes concerned the women of Japan whose position in society had long been backward. They were granted legal equality. This change cannot be marked off as a purely theoretical one as some critics have sought to do. That the women will exercise their new rights is indicated by the first election after the establishment of the occupation. They constituted 67 percent of all voters. They elected 38 of their sex to the House of Representatives. One of my own students, who wrote his master's thesis in the middle twenties on the subject, The Introduction of Women's Suffrage in Japan, became one of the leaders in this movement. My point in mentioning this is to show that there are thousands in great movements in Japan who are prepared to assume leadership in many fields in bringing about Japan's great social and political changes. The universities of our country are all represented in these fields.

The trends toward political, economic, and social democracy set in motion by General MacArthur's directives culminated in the new constitution promulgated on November 3, 1946. Much ill-informed criticism has been directed at this constitution. There are those who say that the document is alien to the Japanese character, that in allowing it to be promulgated General MacArthur has provided the shell of democracy without the substance. The fact remains, however, that the document is one of the most democratic fundamental laws ever devised. It conforms in every respect to the most advanced concepts of the political, economic, and social responsibilities of government. That it is un-Japanese does not destroy its basic purpose. Almost everything that we attempt in Japan at this time might be labeled un-Japanese, since we are attempting to reform and redirect Japanism, not to preserve it intact. MacArthur himself has clearly stated that the constitution, however liberal, does not of itself create democracy. However, what it does do is to provide the legal structure within which democracy can develop. That is all that any constitution could do. That is all that we intend to do. The process of giving substance to a fundamental social concept is something which can be undertaken only by the people who live under it. The task is a timeless one, and we shall not know soon with what degree of success the Japanese will discharge it. Knowing the Japanese and knowing that the seeds of democratic thought are already there, I am convinced that democracy has taken genuine root in Japan and that it will endure. All are impressed by the recent Japanese elections. A preponderance of moderate candidates was elected, and the national Government is now headed by a Socialist, who is a Christian, Tetsu Katayama, whose views follow those of the British Labor Party. His cabinet is of a coalition type and it contains a considerable conservative element.

The political and social progress of Japan during the 2 years of the occupation has been very impressive. In the long run, however, it is likely that the final test of our policies will take place in the economic field. If we fail there, democracy will not stand in Japan. Let us not forget that the advance of totalitarianism in Europe was built largely on the promise to end the economic chaos into which the various nations had fallen.

The great family trusts—the so-called Zaibatsu—have been dissolved and large land holdings have been divided. Responsible trade-unions have been encouraged. The motive behind these measures is to break up excessive concentration of wealth in impoverished Japan and to diversify economic power and responsibility.

There are some problems of the Japanese economy that are beyond the control of the Japanese themselves. Consider for a moment that the arable land in Japan now available to feed a population of between seventy and eighty million people is equal to slightly more than one-half the farm acreage of the State of Illinois. We must face the fact that Japan does not and cannot produce sufficient food. The prospects for any significant increase in agricultural production in the foreseeable future are exceedingly remote. As a matter of fact, in the absence of large imports of fertilizers there is more likely to be a drop in output. Then remember that Japan's major cities

were destroyed. Familiar as the Japanese are with overnight destruction, such as the Tokyo earthquake and the fire of '23, the Osaka and Aomori fires, and the volcanic eruptions, yet the destruction of her cities on a scale greater and more extensive than the destruction in any country in Europe makes it too much for us to expect them not to have greater economic consequences.

It is clear that Japan's sole hope of maintaining even a tolerable standard of living depends upon the redevelopment of peaceful foreign trade. Until this can be done, the United States must advance essential food supplies. It is hardly necessary to stress that if widespread starvation takes place in Japan, not only would our democratic objectives be defeated, but the security of the occupation itself would be placed in costly jeopardy. The Japanese authorities have been prodded into developing the most equitable distribution of food supplies. Beyond this the responsibility rests with the people of the United States and with their Congress to make available basic assistance until economic recovery reaches the point where Japan is once again self-sustaining.

At present three factors hamper Japan's recovery: The economic breakdown and exhaustion within Japan; the failure of the Allies to settle finally the reparations problem; and the barriers to free Japanese trade in the world markets. In each of these instances only initial corrective measures have been taken.

Regardless of what the Japanese themselves do, however, we must recognize that ultimately the tempo of Japanese recovery is intricately related to allied policy on the questions of reparations and foreign trade. The principle of compensating the victims of Japanese aggression with a part of Japan's productive capacity is recognized by all the Allied Powers. But it is imperative that the Japanese be advised as quickly as possible on the precise terms of the reparations settlement. Until this is done they cannot go forward with their recovery plans. In the case of foreign trade, the Japanese have been permitted some private trading. But this is only a partial solution. Japan must be able to purchase essential nonstrategic raw materials freely abroad and to sell finished products in the world markets. This may run counter to the views of some selfish interest in the Allied Nations, but the alternatives are a continuous drain upon the taxpayers of the United States or mass starvation in Japan. These are the inescapable realities of the situation.

But, regardless of the distress caused by bad economic conditions, Japan must be guided from that most fatal of all premises, that feeding the people must come first, social, and political reforms after. That is the fallacy to which Italy has sunk with such fatal results to the good and well-being of that great people. My plea is that political, social, and economic upbuilding go hand in hand, for they are related.

The destruction of Japan was so complete, her defeat so colossal, and her governmental changes so revolutionary, that there is no other way out for Japan, except to attempt to be a good student and a good neighbor. Common sense, therefore, is the only guide Japan need follow. But pure common sense will not see us through in our end of what must be a bargain. We must appreciate our student. No teacher is successful if he has no sympathy for or appreciation and comprehension of his student. To know Japan, therefore, to understand her basic ideals, to appreciate both the good and the bad of her characteristics, becomes our prime essential. We must cease to be satisfied with following the policy of rather ill-trained unsympathetic experts either in Asia or Europe.

Economically, Japan has always been dependent upon our trade. In the future that will be the case more than ever. The invention of nylon and its universal acceptance by the ladies of the world may bring upon the Japanese silk industry an economic repercussion from which it cannot recover. Both nylon and war must be overcome. But Japan's success economically is more certain than it has ever been if she can remain free from the destructive burdens of a terrible taxation which was necessary to maintain her unnatural armaments. Thus Japan economically faces the new world with skill, abundance of labor, organizational ability, a knowledge of knowing how to work together, and a craftsmanship unexcelled. Given these factors, plus a halfway decent market, she will succeed. Whether she will have that market depends upon us. We shall have to do some adjusting there. Japan's skill in meeting the demands of consumers in almost any line was, we remember, so much a factor before the war that those who judged war entirely on the basis of economic competition felt that she and her selling abilities must be destroyed. Thus, if we become her sponsor and her economic ally in raising her own standard of living and helping her to get her goods into the markets of the world, she will become a profitable ally, not only to us but to the whole world.

Socially, Japan must of necessity work for the raising of standards in the rest of Asia, or else she will be overcome by lower standards, if the thesis that poverty anywhere affects the living standards everywhere is true. If we have really learned that war anywhere is the concern of all everywhere, then Japan can join enthusiastically with us in attempting to arrange her economy so that her standards will contribute to the betterment of the standards throughout the world.

The Japanese money system is, of course, completely destroyed. But the Japanese people have been used to a stable currency, and that can be assured them again by association with us. Her yen should be pinned to our dollar.

Politically, we need not fear a return to any philosophy at all which is distasteful to our American democratic ideals, if we will but give the Japanese people a chance again to read and study about Washington and Lincoln and the other American leaders that every Japanese schoolboy studied during the development of the Japanese school system. The war was carried on by Japanese leaders who were utterly false to world thought and to the Japanese traditions that were accepted by the majority of the Japanese people a generation and a half ago.

So Japan can again be brought into the sisterhood of nations, with the Rising Sun as a token of a restoration of an old aspiring, an old striving, which was crushed by the rise in the world of a false doctrine based on the notion of a single will in a state under the leadership of dishonest, ill-trained, overambitious Hitlers, Mussolinis, Matsuokas, and Tojos.

Under the old theory, the Emperor of Japan owned all the land and all the people, and was father of all. Those concepts were taken from the theories put into the Chinese characters. The people in a paternal sense were never forgotten. They had no rights, but they needed no rights because the Emperor was all-benevolent. That was theory. Today Japan has a constitution based upon our own American notion that governments exist for the benefit of the people; that governments themselves have no rights, but that the rights belong to the people; that the property is the property of the people; and that the governments use the property only for the people's benefit and for public use. In this picture the Emperor is a guardian, therefore, of the people's property and the people's well-being. That, too, is theory. It is the key to American-Japanese cooperation. Leadership in Japan will, no doubt, come from the people inspired by these ideals, and the Emperor will be an interpreter of the people's aspirations. We should think that through as we consider the whole of Asia, and we should consider whether it is an exaggeration to say that the making of the new Asia will undoubtedly occur under Japanese leadership. The culmination of the American revolution is not yet complete, but it is surely on the way.

This is what I said in 1943:

> The after-war world will be a world with the center of interest shifted away from the Western Hemisphere to the East. Asia, like Europe, is allied with distant powers and is divided within. Yet the preponderance of Asiatic populations will throw the center of gravity to the Eastern Hemisphere. Since the beginning of time, Asia has been a world problem. Now it is the world problem. The conflicts in which the four major allies—Russia, China, the United States, and Great Britain—are fighting are Asiatic conflicts. But long after Asia will have ceased to be a theater of military operations it will be predominant; for the three greatest social, political, and economic revolutions—the Chinese, the Indian, and the Russian—are essentially Asiatic.

Our fundamental concept of democracy and our religious and political recognition of the dignity of the individual and his inherent rights are necessary to the solving not only of Europe's problems but also of Asia's. Our belief in the rights of revolution gives us confidence in the face of change. With faith, then, in our idealism, the world will go forward as it follows American leadership.

If my prediction is true, the place for Japan in the fulfillment of that prophecy is plainly seen when we catch the spirit

of her new constitution. Our whole success depends upon our being able to keep the thought of the leadership in Japan in harmony with what we said in our psychological warfare, and to build the future Japan upon what we told the Japanese were their own ideals, as taught to them during the best part of the Meiji era, their greatest period.

Mr. President, I have felt justified in doing the two things I have done in my rather long consideration of this bill. First of all, the theories behind the bill are as essential to our success and as much in keeping with our own self-interest in the expansion of American ideals in the rest of the world as is any other thing we may suggest. In the second place, no matter what we think, no matter what we do, no matter how we act, we have with us all the time the problems of Asia, which to a certain extent we have forgotten because Asia has not been in the headlines lately. That is a very good sign, Mr. President, because things are moving fairly well so far as concerns Japan and the part of Korea for which we are presently responsible. Comparatively speaking, things in those parts of the world are moving along fairly well. But never can any American fail to realize, Mr. President, that a peaceful Europe will bring to us no peace at all unless we have a peaceful Pacific and a peaceful Asia. Our real neighbors, our real responsibilities, are to be found in the lands to the west of us, across the Pacific rather than in the lands across the Atlantic. The answer to the question of to what extent our Army and Navy must be expanded is to be found in the lands lying to the west of us, across the Pacfic. However, the average person in the United States does not realize that that is the case.

Therefore, Mr. President, I add this final thought to the fine sentiment presented by the Senator from New Jersey at the close of his speech, when he stated that American stock had its roots in and stemmed from practically every one of the 16 countries for which we are trying to do something under the Marshall plan. Of course, more of our American stock has come from Europe than from Asia; nevertheless, a considerable part of it has come from Asia. It is obvious that we are responsible for the new birth, the new life, and many of the revolutions which have occurred in that part of the world, because those developments have occurred under the leadership of our thought. So it is that we must see to it that those great revolutions succeed properly, if we are to have peace and contentment for ourselves and for the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which is, in section 1, on page 2, line 5, to strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for the great leadership he has given to the course of the measure pending before the Senate of the United States, and, because I understand a record vote will not be taken on the bill, I desire to make myself of record in support of it.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the Seventy-ninth Congress we had a similar controversy before the Senate over similar legislation, except the way was much more difficult then than the Senator from New Jersey has found it to be in this instance. But it is rather interesting, Mr. President, to go back to that debate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, when it was my task to lead on this side of the aisle the fight for the retention of what was then the foreign branch of our OWI, then being conducted under the very able leadership of Elmer Davis, and note the course of the argument, and the pleas which were made at that time in support of the proposition that if we were really going to accomplish the great objectives which we have in Europe as far as winning the peace is concerned, the then Voice of America, known as the Foreign Branch of OWI, should not be hamstrung by the Congress of the United States. By a very close vote, it will be recalled, we won that battle in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

It is interesting to note, however, the great change that has come over the thinking of the Congress since that year, with the result that now we have this very sound piece of legislation, so well handled by the Senator from New Jersey, bearing out, I think, some of the very points that were made in the debate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, when we pleaded with the Congress not to make the mistake of closing off or shutting down the appropriations for a public relations program in Europe, because, as we predicted, if we do not maintain that program, then movements in Europe contrary to the best interest of America are bound to take root.

In closing these remarks, I again wish to thank the Senator from New Jersey, and point out in the RECORD that what we are doing today seems to me to be taking a step that ought to have been taken with much greater vigor and greater spirit back in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the kind words of the Senator from Oregon are very much appreciated by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I rise to say a few words in connection with the remarks made by the Senator from Massachusetts, who paid a high and well-deserved tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. It happens that originally there were just two members of that subcommittee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself. Later there were added to the subcommittee the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Our work was not all performed at home, but it took us into nearly all the European countries and then back home again. I want to say, Mr. President, that, under the leadership of the Senator from New Jersey, I never saw any group of men work with greater singleness of purpose or with a stronger desire to bring out the best bill possible in the light of everything we had to consider. I am glad to pay this tribute to the Senator from New Jersey.

I may say, Mr. President, I was tremendously impressed by the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey as he concluded his eloquent address by referring to the voice of America as a voice of all the great Americans of the past and of all the great Americans of the future, and saying that the voice of America must include all that has been said of our ideals and purposes and way of life, by those who are dead and gone, and by those who live today. Mr. President, I know that he agrees with me that to that voice of America should also be added not only the voices of the present and the voices of the past, but also the voice of the future; for the voice of America as she looks down the years in the future is the hope of all the downtrodden and oppressed peoples of the world. The voice of the future in America must remain the voice of the past and the voice of the present, a strong voice declaring the rights of freeemen, the freedom of the individual, the rule of law and order, things for which the countries of the Old World are so desperately praying and yearning. So we must project to that part of the world our best hopes for the future, that the other countries of the world may remain strong, free, and independent nations. All the rights, freedoms, and high principles combined, of the past, the present, and the future, constitute the strong and mighty voice of America.

In working on the pending bill we have tried to lay the foundation upon which adequate appropriations may be made, so that the voice of America hereafter, as it speaks to the world, shall be as strong and as mighty as is America herself.

I shall not take further time except to say that in the light of all the things we had to consider, including the probable attitude of the House of Representatives, we have brought forth the best bill we were able to present, and with the amendments which will be agreed upon today, I think for the present at least the bill will answer its purposes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I was very much interested in noting yesterday an editorial in the Washington Post on the subject of a suggestion made by our colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. The suggestion had to do with the air-mailing of copies of American newspapers overseas as a vital part of our foreign-information program. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READING MATTER

Senator WILEY expressed a commendable thought in calling for greater numbers of

American newspapers and magazines to be flown abroad, and we hope that the Nation's publishers, not the State Department, will act upon it. Our foreign-information program, and, indeed, the Marshall plan itself, can have no more important adjunct than the spread of American reading matter. The situation now is that, aside from the limited American publishing operations in foreign cities and the relatively few copies sent by air from this country, American periodicals are a month or 6 weeks old when they reach libraries and reading rooms abroad. Our disadvantage in the ideological struggle is thus obvious; Moscow papers can be had in almost any European capital the next morning.

The ideal solution for this problem would be for American newspapers and magazines either to set up editions published in Europe and Asia or to band together and promote a commentary service for distribution abroad. Perhaps, also, the idea might be considered of encouraging the kind of overseas editions which were put out during the war by several of our newspapers and magazines. Under this arrangement all copy would be written, edited, and set in type in this country, but the actual printing would be carried on abroad by means of lightweight printing plates flown from the United States.

But one or the other of these ideas would take time, and Senator WILEY'S suggestion could be carried out immediately. There is a place in his picture, moreover, for book publishers, for American books are desired almost universally. Universities in Germany and Japan, for example, have received practically no American textbooks and technical material since before the war. To place such material in their hands now could be to acquire an inestimable asset in cementing friendship and spreading American ideas.

Every man in these perilous days must be his own Marshall plan according to his ability, as Mr. Drew Pearson has demonstrated so well and so admirably with his Friendship Train project. In the battle we are waging, food for men's minds is no less imperative than food for their stomachs. What must be guarded against, however, is the suggestion of Government subsidization; this would be a double-edged weapon, for it would give the Kremlin a weapon in their ideological war on America by demonstrating the same tie-in between press and state that Russia has.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to express my deep appreciation of the kind words of the Senator from New Mexico, and to thank him for having added the voice of the future to the voices of the past and of the present. I should like further to pay tribute to him for the wonderful assistance he has given us all in the consideration of the bill, and the special point that he emphasized, not only every time we met together, but which he also emphasized the other day when, to my regret, I was not present on the floor of the Senate, that in dealing with foreign relations, politics is forgotten. The reason why our committee was successful this summer, in my judgment, was because we never even thought of politics. We were Americans working together, trying to find an American policy to accomplish an American purpose, and I thank God I have been able to be associated with men who had that view in approaching this subject.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to continue with the consideration of the committee amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and of other countries, which is one of the essential foundations of peace, and to correct misunderstandings about the United States in other countries. The means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(2) the rendering of technical and other services to other countries on the basis of mutual cooperation;

(3) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United States, its people, and the principles and objectives of its Government; and

(4) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United Nations, its organization and functions, and the participation of the United States as a member thereof.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. Among the means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people, and policies promulgated by the Congress, the President, the Secretary of State and other responsible officials of Government having to do with matters affecting foreign affairs;

(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

(a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(b) the rendering of technical and other services;

(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 3. In carrying out the objectives of this act, information concerning the participation of the United States in the United Nations, its organizations and functions, shall be emphasized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 2, to change the section number from 3 to 4, and in line 6, after the word "agency", to strike out "in the executive branch."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, in section 201, line 18, after the word "skill" to insert "and shall wherever possible provide these interchanges by using the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity", and on page 5, line 4, after the name "United States" to strike out "If the Secretary finds that any person from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General, and such person shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody, and promptly deported." and insert "The persons specified in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrant visitors for business under clause 2 of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 8 U. S. C. 203), for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to section 14 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162, 8 U. S. C. 214). Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under clause 2 of subdivision (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (54 Stat. 671, 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, in section 301, line 8, after the word "any", to strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, in section 302, line 18, after the word "Any", to strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, in section 303, line 9, after the word "Any", to strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, in section 401, line 6, after the word "with", to strike out "their" and insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "approval", to insert "of the President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 7, after the word "agencies", to strike out "whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. In utilizing the Government agencies, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the best available and qualified Government services, facilities, and personnel shall be sought, in order to insure professional

competence and avoid duplication; and (2) that the Secretary shall consult the appropriate technical agencies of the Government concerning any activity authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act which comes within the competence of such agencies."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. My amendment is in lieu of the committee amendment on page 9, line 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the committee amendment in lines 7 to 20, inclusive, it is proposed to insert the following:

Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. The Secretary shall include in each report submitted to the Congress under section 1008 a statement of the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies utilized in carrying on activities under the authority of this act, showing the names and salaries of the personnel utilized, or performing services utilized, during the period covered by such report, and the amounts paid to such other agencies under this section as payment for such performance.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment is self-explanatory. I ask that my amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment on page 9, line 7.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I ask whether the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it has not been agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the amendment has not yet been reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 10, in section 403, line 14, after the word "through", to strike out "the" and insert "any appropriate"; in the same line, after the word "agency", to strike out "with appropriate legislative authority"; in line 17, after the word "agencies", to insert a comma and "and shall not enter into the performance of such services to any foreign government where such services may be performed adequately by qualified private American individuals and agencies and such qualified individuals and agencies are available for the performance of such services"; and on page 11, line 12, after the word "assignments", to strike out the semicolon and "(4) that such services shall not be undertaken for a foreign government if, in the opinion of the head of the Government agency, such services will impair the fulfillment of domestic responsibilities of that agency; and (5) that the Department shall invite outstanding leaders in the United States, both within and outside the Federal Government, in the various fields of activity covered by this title, to review and extend advice on the Secretary's policies in rendering technical and other services to another government pursuant to this title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 21, to strike out:

TRAINING

SEC. 404. Any Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to provide to citizens of other countries, and to citizens of the United States going to other countries in connection with the carrying out of this act, technical and other training within the fields in which such agency has competence, or to provide for such training through State and local governmental agencies or private institutions and organizations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 5, to strike out:

INTERCHANGE OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

SEC. 405. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to promote the interchange with other countries of scientific and specialized knowledge and skills, within the fields in which such agency has competence, through publications and other scientific and educational materials.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 12, to strike out:

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

SEC. 406. In order that the activities of Government agencies authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act may be effectively coordinated and interdepartmental relationships as authorized by this act may be clearly defined, the Secretary may establish upon direction of the President an interdepartmental committee to advise the Secretary on the development and administration of these activities.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, in section 501, line 4, after the word "abroad", to strike out "all such press releases and radio scripts shall, in the English language, be made available to press associations, newspapermen, radio systems and stations in the United States, and to Members of the Congress of the United States, upon request, within 15 days after release as information abroad." and insert "On request, representative samples or specific individual press releases and radio scripts shall be made available in the English language for examination at the Department of State by representatives of press associations, newspapers, magazines, radio systems and stations, and be made available to Members of Congress, within 15 days after release as information abroad."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, in the committee amendment, beginning with the word "on" in line 9, it is proposed to strike out through and including line 16, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Any such press release or radio script, on request, shall be available in the English language, at the Department of State, at all reasonable times following its release as information abroad, for examination by representatives of United States press associations, newspapers, magazines, radio systems and stations, and, on request, shall be made available to Members of Congress.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator in charge of the bill, and I think it is agreeable to him.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what is the limitation proposed in the Senator's amendment?

Mr. BALL. We simply say, "at all reasonable times." I could not figure out what the 15-day limitation meant.

Mr. HATCH. I did not understand the Senator's amendment. As I now understand, the amendment provides that such releases shall be made available at all reasonable times.

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the committee amendment on page 13, beginning in line 9.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, in section 502, line 20, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private American individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and," and on page 14, line 5, after the word "information", to strike out the semicolon and "(3) that the Department shall invite outstanding private leaders of the United States in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities; and (4) that all printed matter, films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall, when disseminated by the Government, be identified as to Government or private source."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 12, to strike out:

TITLE VI. ADVISORY COMMISSION TO FORMULATE POLICIES

FORMULATION OF POLICIES

SEC. 601. There is hereby created a United States Information and Educational Exchange Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission") to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commission shall formulate and present to the Secretary of State the policies to be

followed and adhered to in connection with the interchange of persons, knowledge and skills, the assignment of specialists, the preparation and dissemination of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and the carrying out of the other provisions of this act.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION, GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) The Commission shall consist of 11 members, not more than 6 of whom shall be from any one political party, as follows: (1) Nine members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) the Secretary of State or such officer in the State Department as may be designated by such Secretary.

(b) The members of the Commission shall represent the public interest, but of the persons appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, one shall be selected from among educators, one from among individuals formerly in active service in the armed forces of the United States, one from representatives of labor, one farmer, one from the newspaper business, one from the motion-picture industry, one from the radio industry, and three from persons having general business experience. All persons so appointed shall be persons of national reputations in their respective fields. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The term of each member appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on the Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(d) The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman from among members of the Commission.

(e) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commission away from their places of residences.

(f) The Commission is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this title.

(g) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerical assistants as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commission shall meet not less frequently than once each month and shall from time to time prepare and transmit to the Secretary and to the Congress its recommendations for carrying out the various activities authorized by this act, and shall submit to the Congress a quarterly report of all programs and activities recommended by it under this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

And to insert:

TITLE VI—ADVISORY COMMISSIONS TO FORMULATE POLICIES

SEC. 601. There are hereby created two advisory commissions, (1) United States Advisory Commission on Information (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Information) and (2) United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Educational Exchange) to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commissions shall formulate and recommend to the Secretary policies and programs for the carrying out of this act.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSIONS; GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) Each Commission shall consist of five members, not more than three of whom shall be from any one political party. Members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment.

(b) The members of the Commission on Information shall represent the public interest, and shall be selected from a cross section of professional, business, and public service backgrounds.

(c) The members of the Commission on Educational Exchange shall represent the public interest and shall be selected from a cross section of educational, cultural, scientific, technical, and public-service backgrounds.

(d) The term of each member appointed under subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years, except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on each Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of 1 year, two at the end of 2 years, and one at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(e) The President shall designate a chairman for each Commission from among members of the Commission.

(f) The members of the Commissions shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commissions away from their places of residence, as provided in subsection (6) of section 801 of this act.

(g) The Commissions are authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon them by this title.

(h) The Department is authorized to provide the necessary secretarial and clerical assistance for the Commissions.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commissions shall meet not less frequently than once each month during the first 6 months after their establishment, and thereafter at such intervals as the Commissions find advisable, and shall transmit to the Secretary a quarterly report, and to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under the authority of this act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs, and such recommendations as shall have been made by the Commissions to the Secretary for effectuating the purposes and objectives of this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment in section 601.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, at the end of line 21, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, however, That the commissions created by this section shall have no authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the program created by Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, enacted August 1, 1946, or the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Arkansas. We feel that it is appropriate, because it is distinctly the purpose of the bill to exclude the other activities to which the Senator has referred. There is no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment on page 17, line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to section 702, on page 20, beginning in line 8. After the word "Secretary", I move to strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall", to comply with the amendment adopted earlier on page 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 19, to insert the following subhead:

THE SECRETARY

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 5, after the word "create", to insert "with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, in section 901, after line 6, to insert:

ADVANCE OF FUNDS

SEC. 902. If any other government shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services. Funds so received may be established as a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for the specified purpose, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure, subject to the provisions of this act. Any unexpended balance of the special deposit account and other property received under this section and no longer required for the purposes for which provided shall be returned to the government providing the funds or property.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 3, after "Sec. 1001", to strike out "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duties is consistent with the security of the United States: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, unless an unfavorable report as to such employee is rendered sooner by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may, without such certification, be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." and in lieu thereof to insert "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties by the Government under this act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 7, to strike out:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1002. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 15, to change the section number from 1003 to 1002.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 23, to change the section number from 1004 to 1003.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 4, to change the section number from 1005 to 1004.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 20, to change the section number from 1006 to 1005, and in line 23, after the word "agencies", to insert "including existing American private publications."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, line 21, after the word "utilize", it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "publications" in line 23, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make it very clear that in conducting these activities, particularly the informational activities, the State Department is to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, by contract or otherwise, the facilities and services of private agencies in the field. One reason why I am offering the amendment is that since this bill was scheduled for consideration in the Senate I have received word that the State Department is considering going back to its old practice of itself programing all its short-wave broadcasts. During our hearings on the State Department appropriation bill last year it was brought out very clearly that such a plan costs several times what it would cost if the services were contracted for. Somehow when the Government attempts to do that kind of news writing and broadcasting, it means three or four employees for every one employed by private agencies in the field. I know that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles the State Department appropriation would not want to go back to the old system, under which the State Department had a huge staff of people in New York doing all the programing, or nearly all the programing, for short-wave broadcasts. I wish to make very clear in this bill the intention of Congress, namely, that the Department shall utilize to the maximum extent practicable the facilities of private agencies. I realize that there are some broadcasts to critical areas which the State Department itself may have to program. However, to the maximum extent practicable, it should utilize the facilities of private agencies in this field.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have a memorandum given to me by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] who, I am satisfied, has seen the amendment of the Senator. He wished to have me ask the Senator whether, in carrying out the provisions of the act under the terms of the Senator's amendment, the Secretary will give consideration to using the facilities and services of all regularly licensed international short-wave stations on an equal basis.

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator that I believe that in that field we must leave discretion with the State Department to contract with whatever private agencies in the field it feels can do the best job for the program. I would not attempt to say, either in the legislation or here on the floor, that the Department should contract in one way or another, or should or should not contract with a certain agency.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's amendment provides that such use of private facilities shall be made to the greatest extent practicable. In reality that probably covers what the Senator from Wyoming had in mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I find myself in complete agreement with the Senator's amendment. However, for purposes of clarification, am I correct in my understanding that in making use of private facilities—and I think they should be used—the State Department will retain necessary discretion to protect public funds in case any private agency should seek to make a charge for its facilities which the State Department might find to be unreasonable in comparison with what the State Department itself could do in sending the program across the air waves?

Mr. BALL. Of course the State Department always has such authority. However, I may say that all the testimony we took last year indicated that if the Department can find a private agency to do the job, it is always much cheaper than to have the Department itself do the job.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is true. I simply did not want to leave in the RECORD the impression that the congressional intent was that no matter how much the private agency sought to charge the Government, the Government would have to use such agency rather than the State Department.

Mr. BALL. I am very glad that the Senator has made that point, because there is certainly no such intention. The price will be subject to negotiation. The State Department does not have to sign a contract with anyone.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As I understand the Senator's amendment, I believe that what it does is to make it perfectly clear that the Secretary shall use private agencies to the maximum extent practicable. Is that the language?

Mr. BALL. That is the language.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator from New Jersey will agree that that is the purpose of the bill itself, and that there is no particular objection to that language.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct. I talked it over last night with the Senator from Minnesota, and he has just spelled out in the amendment what we had in mind in the amendment to this section we had previously recommended. I have no objection to the amendment. I hope it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the committee amendment on page 27, line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the amendment which I offered as a substitute for the committee amendment was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 4, to strike out:

OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

SEC. 1007. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new Government agency; except that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 14, to change the section number from 1008 to 1006, and in the same line, after the word "Act," to strike out the comma and "or under any provision thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 17, to insert a new subhead as follows:

VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 19, to change the section number from 1009 to 1007.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 23, to change the section number from 1010 to 1008.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 6, to change the section number from 1011 to 1009.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1010. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, that completes the committee amendments, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 18, to strike out the word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 7, line 12, after the word "serving" and the period, to insert "No person shall be assigned for service to or in cooperation with the government of any country, unless (1) the Secretary finds that such assignment is necessary in the national interest of the United States, or (2) such government agrees to reimburse the United States in an amount equal to the compensation, travel expenses, and allowances payable to such person during the period of such assignment in accordance with the provisions of section 302, or (3) such government shall have made an advance of funds, property, or service as provided in section 902."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if we might have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. BALL. I should like to explain both this amendment and the one just agreed to substituting the word "and" for the word "or" in line 18 on page 6. That is an amendment to section 203, which authorizes the Secretary "to assist schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States." Then it goes on to say "or serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States."

There is no restriction whatever on who founds them or sponsors them. I think the word "and" should have been used instead of the word "or" in the original draft of the bill. I think the Senator from New Jersey agrees with me.

The whole title, as it now stands, would permit the Secretary to assign technical experts from our Government to foreign governments to an almost unlimited extent, with our Government bearing the whole cost. It seemed to me that in the great majority of cases—and I think the Senator from New Jersey, after consulting the State Department, found that was true—the foreign government does reimburse our Government. I wanted some restriction on the Secretary's right to assign personnel to other governments and to have us bear the total cost only when he finds it is in the national interest to do so. It will give the Appropriations Subcommittee some check on this particular section of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to accept that amendment, and the other amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota, and I wish to thank him for what I think is a great contribution to the improvement of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, before the bill is passed, I should like to make one or two remarks.

We went through quite a controversy on the floor last year and in our committee when we authorized continuance of this activity in the State Department, even though it was not authorized by law. In reading Time magazine for January 12, 1948, I was struck by an article on page 13, which reads as follows:

Though no one said so openly, the sponsors of "journals-for-export"—

They were referring to proposals that American publications be exported directly to some of these countries as part of the national program—

were moved by the American's abiding distrust of Government-controlled news. If they needed grounds for their distrust, they now had a good example.

Three weeks ago the United States press headlined the testimony of Lt. Gen. Albert Wedemeyer before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Wedemeyer, whose report on China had been suppressed by Secretary George Marshall, roundly endorsed immediate economic and military aid to the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek.

But the United States Information Service's bulletins to China (framed by the State Department) sounded quite different. In its account of the China hearings, USIS gave a niggling 17 lines to Wedemeyer, a fat 68 to Willard Thorp and William Walton Butterworth, Jr., State Department apologists for the United States indecisive China policy. USIS painstakingly reported that Wedemeyer had called Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek "a benevolent despot"; it did not add that Wedemeyer also declared that Chiang was "a fine character" and "the logical leader of China today," who needed United States help and should get it. Nothing was said to China, either, about Wedemeyer's recommendation of military aid.

Few United States correspondents in China were surprised at USIS's slanting of the news. USIS headquarters in Shanghai, run by big, beefy Bradley Connors, had consistently trimmed its sails to the State Department's anti-Chiang clique. From Nanking, Time correspondent Fred Gruin reported:

"Since July there have appeared in the United States press many powerful opinions favoring aid, including speeches by Thomas E. Dewey, statements by Representative WALTER JUDD, former Secretary of State James Byrnes, and former Ambassador to France William C. Bullitt.

"So far as USIS is concerned, these do not make news fit to print. Of 66 United States editorials on China which were distributed by USIS, 59 were anti-Chiang and anti-United States aid. The hostile New York Herald Tribune was quoted 11 times, the New York Times, guardedly sympathetic, only 3 times."

Mr. President, I will admit that I have not had time to check with the State Department as to the authenticity of that story, but since there has been no denial from the State Department I assume it is reasonably accurate. I think that kind of deliberate slanting of the news to reflect, not the voice and policy of America, or even the Government of the United States, but the voice of a little clique in the Information Service in the State Department, is a danger which has disturbed a great many members of this service in connection with the whole information program. It was taken over, as we all know, from the OWI. There were far too many Communists and fellow-travelers in that agency from the beginning. I am afraid that some are still there, and that probably the gentlemen responsible for this kind of vicious slanting of news of the developments in the United States regarding China are some holdovers from that fellow-traveler group in OWI, or else some other fellow-travelers who have been brought in by that group.

I say to the Senator from New Jersey that when the Committee on Foreign Relations considers the nomination of the Assistant Secretary to head up this program he will be asked about it and what

his policy will be. In my opinion, the supervisors who are responsible for this kind of distortion and complete slanting of news in contradiction to the policy adopted by the Congress and by the Government of this country should be dismissed from this activity. They have no place in it.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that a democratic country can possibly compete in lies with a dictatorship. We have freedom of speech, and the lies always catch up with us. We cannot control what our people or any other people in the world believe in the way of information. The only kind of propaganda with which a democratic country can possibly get anywhere is the truth. The policy of the State Department, in my opinion, should be constantly to put the emphasis on telling peoples all over the world the truth, even when it may hurt the feelings of some persons in the State Department who do not seem to agree with what the people of America think.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in connection with what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has just said, as far as I am concerned, as chairman of the subcommittee, it will be my purpose to request the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask the appointee who is to have charge of this work to confer with us regarding the policies to be carried on in conducting this important office.

So many things have been brought to our attention that it would not be fair to a new incumbent not to confer with him regarding the information service, the educational exchange service, and many other matters which have been brought to the attention of the committee and which should be considered in connection with the policy in conducting those offices in the future. So far as I am concerned, it will be my recommendation that we confer personally with the appointee before his appointment is confirmed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, since the Senator has raised the question with reference to consulting with the new head of the agency, I should also like to recommend to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations that they consider and perhaps advise with him on the question of how to make more efficient the organization he will head, because a bill designed to achieve a purpose similar to that of the part of this bill relating to the exchange of persons, was passed in the Congress over a year and a half ago, but the Department has been exceedingly slow in implementing it. I have particular reference to the Office of Financial Policy and Development, which seems to be bogged down and quite unable to take action.

So, with the passage of this bill, with which, as the Senator knows, I am thoroughly in accord, I hope the committee will try to do something to improve the administration of these matters within the State Department. Of course, I do not need tell the Senator that the State Department has been one of the most difficult departments of the Government to reorganize. The present Secretary of State is the third Secretary of State who has promised to reorganize it and streamline it, but nothing of that sort has been done thus far.

In view of the magnificent effort which I consider this bill to represent, I hope the Senator from New Jersey will now give some attention to seeing to it that after the bill is passed, something will happen in the State Department.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his comments. Personally, I feel that they are very much in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the bill, and I shall not do so; but I do not care to have the vote come without my saying just a word or two in its support.

I happen to be one of the Members of the Senate who were appointed as a subcommittee and who traveled all over Europe in an effort to learn what our information service was doing there, what it had been doing, what it needed, and what was the result of the reduction made necessary by the reduction of the appropriation. I concur in the statement which has been made by the Senator from New Jersey, namely, that not only in the consideration of the proposed legislation but in all the investigations which occurred abroad, never a shadow of politics entered the picture in any form. I was, as were all of us, impressed by the pitiful inadequacy of our present service in some of the countries. It is an anomally that any country has to engage in propaganda or in the dissemination of information in order to counteract misinformation constantly fed to people by any other country supposed to be friendly. That is a new development in international relationships, and it is a very disturbing development.

Nevertheless it is a fact—and we have to deal with facts—that in various parts of Europe and other parts of the world an organized, concentrated effort is indulged in on the part of government, at great expense and great display, to misrepresent the motives of the United States Government as a government, to distort everything that is said in and by the United States Government, to utilize every episode which occurs in this country, as an evidence of our alleged depravity, of our alleged selfishness, of our alleged imperialistic desires, and also to misrepresent the kind of life the American people lead.

In those countries we found a yearning for the truth. Their people hunger for information about the way the people of the United States live—about our school system, about our agricultural system, about our social system, about our cities, about our country generally, and all the things that make up what we have come to call the American way of life. They are anxious for it; and notwithstanding the inadequacy of our service in many of those countries especially, which I need not mention by name, it has been difficult to persuade the people there that the things said about us are true; and whenever there has been an opportunity for the people themselves to learn at first-hand and on the ground, by any sort of demonstration, that they are not true, they have leaped at the opportunity to obtain that information.

So it would be most unfortunate if we did not accept the responsibility of educating them and informing them about our Nation, about our people, about the way we do things, and about our democracy and our political and social institutions. This bill authorizes the appropriations necessary to do that. I hope that when the appropriations come along, after the bill is passed, after the authority has been granted, they will be adequate to do the job which is so essential at this period of our great world leadership, which we have not sought so much as it has been thrust upon us.

So, Mr. President, I am happy to join in the passage of the bill, and to have added my feeble efforts in its construction and in the obtaining of the information upon which it is based.

I wish to compliment the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for his untiring and diligent and intelligent efforts directed toward bringing about the enactment of a bill which would be workable and at the same time would not trespass too much upon any theories we have heretofore entertained in regard to the functioning of a government in the matter of giving the world information about ourselves and our people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 3342) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations."

The bill as passed is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, OBJECTIVES, AND DEFINITIONS

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948".

OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this Act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. Among the means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people, and policies promulgated by the Congress, the President, the Secretary of State and other responsible officials of Government having to do with matters affecting foreign affairs;

(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

(a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(b) the rendering of technical and other services;

(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences.

UNITED NATIONS

SEC. 3. In carrying out the objectives of this Act, information concerning the participation of the United States in the United Nations, its organizations and functions, shall be emphasized.

SEC. 4. When used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of State.

(2) "Department" means the Department of State.

(3) "Government agency" means any executive department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency of the Federal Government, or independent establishment, or any corporation wholly owned (either directly or through one or more corporations) by the United States.

TITLE II—INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

PERSONS

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges on a reciprocal basis between the United States and other countries of students, trainees, teachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill and shall wherever possible provide these interchanges by using the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity. The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services for such persons from other countries upon their arrival in the United States, and for such persons going to other countries from the United States. When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in such program on a basis of reciprocity the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States. The persons specified in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrant visitors for business under clause 2 of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 8 U. S. C. 203), for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to section 14 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162, 8 U. S. C. 214). Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under clause 2 of subdivision (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (54 Stat. 671, 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155).

BOOKS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including government publications, for the translation of such writings, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 203. The Secretary is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, and serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States. In assisting any such schools, however, the Secretary shall exercise no control over their educational policies and shall in no case furnish assistance of any character which is not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States.

TITLE III—ASSIGNMENT OF SPECIALISTS

PERSONS TO BE ASSIGNED

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, when the government of another country is desirous of obtaining the services of a person having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications, from time to time to assign or authorize the assignment for service, to or in cooperation with such government, any citizen of the United States in the employ or service of the Government of the United States who has such qualifications, with the approval of the Government agency in which such person is employed or serving. No person shall be assigned for service to or in cooperation with the government of any country unless (1) the Secretary finds that such assignment is necessary in the national interest of the United States, or (2) such government agrees to reimburse the United States in an amount equal to the compensation, travel expenses, and allowances payable to such person during the period of such assignment in accordance with the provisions of section 302, or (3) such government shall have made an advance of funds, property, or services as provided in section 902. Nothing in this Act, however, shall authorize the assignment of such personnel for service relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

STATUS AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 302. Any citizen of the United States, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this Act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes.

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE UNDER ANOTHER GOVERNMENT

SEC. 303. Any citizen of the United States while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under authority of this Act may, at the discretion of his Government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, and without additional compensation therefor, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned, if the acceptance of such an office in the opinion of such agency is necessary to permit the effective performance of duties for which he is assigned, including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government, in carrying out programs undertaken pursuant to this Act: *Provided, however,* That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government.

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, in carrying on any activity under the authority of this Act, to utilize, with the approval of the President, the services, facilities, and personnel of the other Government agencies. Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this Act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this Act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. The Secretary shall include in each report submitted to the Congress under section 1008 a statement of the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies utilized in carrying on activities under the authority of this Act, showing the names and salaries of the personnel utilized, or performing services utilized, during the period covered by such report, and the amounts paid to such other agencies under this section as payment for such performance.

TECHNICAL AND OTHER SERVICES

SEC. 402. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, may perform such technical or other services as such agency may be competent to render for the government of another country desirous of obtaining such services, upon terms and conditions which are satisfactory to the Secretary and to the head of the Government agency, when it is determined by the Secretary that such services will contribute to the purposes of this Act. However, nothing in this Act shall authorize the performance of services relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

POLICY GOVERNING SERVICES

SEC. 403. In authorizing the performance of technical and other services under this title, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage through any appropriate Government agency the performance of such services to foreign governments by qualified private American individuals and agencies, and shall not enter into the performance of such services to any foreign government where such services may be performed adequately by qualified private American individuals and agencies and such qualified individuals and agencies are available for the performance of such services; (2) that if such services are rendered by a Government agency, they shall demonstrate the technical accomplishments of the United States, such services being of an advisory, investigative, or instructional nature, or a demonstration of a technical process; (3) that such services shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of the construction of public works, and that, under authority of this Act, a Government agency shall render engineering services related to public works only when the Secretary shall determine that the national interest demands the rendering of such services by a Government agency, but this policy shall not be interpreted to preclude the assignment of individual specialists as advisers to other governments as provided under title III of this Act, together with such incidental assistance as may be necessary for the accomplishment of their individual assignments.

TITLE V—DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

GENERAL ANTHORIZATION

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it appropriate, to provide for the preparation, and dissemination abroad, of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers and instructors abroad. Any such press release or radio script, on request, shall be available in the English language at the Department of State, at all reasonable times following its release as information abroad, for examination by representatives of United States press associations, newspapers, magazines, radio systems, and stations, and, on

request, shall be made available to Members of Congress.

POLICIES GOVERNING INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 502. In authorizing international information activities under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this Act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information.

TITLE VI—ADVISORY COMMISSIONS TO FORMULATE POLICIES

SEC. 601. There are hereby created two advisory commissions (1) United States Advisory Commission on Information (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Information) and (2) United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Educational Exchange) to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commissions shall formulate and recommend to the Secretary policies and programs for the carrying out of this Act: *Provided, however,* That the commissions created by this section shall have no authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the program created by Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, enacted August 1, 1946, or the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSIONS; GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602 (a) Each Commission shall consist of five members, not more than three of whom shall be from any one political party. Members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment.

(b) The members of the Commission on Information shall represent the public interest, and shall be selected from a cross section of professional, business, and public service backgrounds.

(c) The members of the Commission on Educational Exchange shall represent the public interest and shall be selected from a cross section of educational, cultural, scientific, technical, and public service backgrounds.

(d) The term of each member appointed under subsection (a) of this section shall be three years, except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on each Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of one year, two at the end of two years, and one at the end of three years from the date of the enactment of this Act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(e) The President shall designate a chairman for each Commission from among members of the Commission.

(f) The members of the Commissions shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commissions away from their places of residences, as provided in subsection (6) of section 801 of this Act.

(g) The Commissions are authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon them by this title.

(h) The Department is authorized to provide the necessary secretarial and clerical assistance for the Commissions.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commissions shall meet not less frequently than once each month during the first six months after their establishment, and thereafter at such intervals as the Commissions find advisable, and shall transmit to the Secretary a quarterly report, and to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under the authority of this Act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs, and such recommendations as shall have been made by the Commissions to the Secretary for effectuating the purposes and objectives of this Act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

TITLE VII—APPROPRIATIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 701. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this Act are hereby authorized.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 702. The Secretary shall authorize the transfer to other Government agencies for expenditure in the United States and in other countries, in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, any part of any appropriations available to the Department for carrying out the purposes of this Act, for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained in this Act or under the authority governing the activities of the Government agency to which a part of any such appropriation is transferred, provided the activities come within the scope of this Act.

TITLE VIII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

THE SECRETARY

SEC. 801. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this Act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) whenever necessary in carrying out title V of this Act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed ten years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation Act;

(4) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(5) to employ, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation Act (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(6) to create, with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange, such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this Act. No committee member shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 802. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this Act, subject to approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended; and

(4) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study.

MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND FACILITIES

SEC. 803. In carrying on activities under this Act which require the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities.

TITLE IX—FUNDS PROVIDED BY OTHER SOURCES

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 901. The Secretry shall, when he finds it in the public interest, request and accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States, for all or part of the expenses of any portion of the program undertaken hereunder. The amounts so received shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

ADVANCE OF FUNDS

SEC. 902. If any other government shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to this Act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services. Funds so received may be established as a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for the specified purpose, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure, subject to the provisions of this Act. Any unexpended balance of the special deposit account and other property received under this section and no longer required for the purposes for which provided shall be returned to the government providing the funds or property.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 1001. No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties by the Government under this Act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such

employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be employed or assigned to duties under this Act for the period of six months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 1002. The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred upon him by this Act to the extent that he finds such delegation to be in the interest of the purposes expressed in this Act and the efficient administration of the programs undertaken pursuant to this Act.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

SEC. 1003. Nothing in this Act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 25, 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 1004. (a) The Act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An Act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," as amended (52 Stat. 442; 53 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

(b) Existing Executive orders and regulations pertaining to the administration of such Act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall remain in effect until superseded by regulations prescribed under the provisions of this Act.

(c) Any reference in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or in any other law, to provisions of such Act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to be applicable to the appropriate provisions of titles III and IX of this Act.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

SEC. 1005. In carrying out the provisions of this Act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise. It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this Act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country.

TERMINATION PURSUANT TO CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS

SEC. 1006. The authority granted under this Act shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

SEC. 1007. No provision of this Act shall be construed to modify or to repeal the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 1008. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this Act, inclusive of appraisals and measurements, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs in each country where conducted.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS TO APPLY TO ALL INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES OF STATE DEPARTMENT

SEC. 1009. All provisions in this Act regulating the administration of international information activities and educational exchanges provided herein, shall apply to all such international activities under jurisdiction of the Department of State.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1010. If any provision of this Act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

JUSTICE DOUGLAS AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate and the country to an article in the column headed "Matter of Fact," which appeared today in the Washington Post, the article being written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and entitled "From Cloister to Convention." I am going to read excerpts from the article, and make some comments about the conditions existing in this country, and in particular in the Southern States. The article states:

The peculiar, intermittent courtship between American politics and Justice William O. Douglas has entered a new and more decisive phase. The leaders of the northern Democratic organizations have sent word to Justice Douglas that the party's 1948 vice presidential nomination is his for the taking.

The message was carried, sometime ago, straight from a leaders' meeting in New York to Douglas' chambers in the gloomy cloisters of the Supreme Court. The executive director of the Democratic National Committee, Gael Sullivan, was the messenger. Douglas did not welcome this political annunciation, and has given no subsequent sign of his intentions. But the Democratic leaders feel that if President Truman eventually asks Douglas point blank to be his running mate, the Justice will be forced to accept.

There is, of course, no sort of guaranty that the leaders' message to Douglas will thus be followed up by any request from the White House. As far as President Truman personally is concerned, the choice of his companion on the ticket is still officially open. This will no doubt be asserted by the President himself. Yet, whatever the President may say will not detract from the singular interest of the episode described above.

There are, first of all, the circumstances of the leaders' decision. The New York get-together was held under the informal chairmanship of Edward J. Flynn. It is reported to have been attended by delegates from the satrapies of Ed Kelly and Jake Arvey in Illinois, David Lawrence in Pennsylvania, Frank Hague in New Jersey, and one or two more. In short, the same principalities and powers were assembled that took the lead in 1944 in rejecting both James F. Byrnes and Henry A. Wallace and in conferring the Vice Presidency on Harry S. Truman.

The debates of the satraps were, rather naturally, not formally recorded. Yet it is known that two major points were generally agreed upon.

Point 1 was that Truman would need a running mate linked to the New Deal, rather than a conservative, in order to win this year.

Point 2 is the important one.

Point 2 was that the nomination of such a running mate would arouse bitter opposition in the southern wing of the Democratic Party, but that the North possessed the votes to impose a northern choice on the convention. In both these points the practiced political eye will read much that is significant.

Mr. President, it is true that the North will have the votes at the national convention to impose upon that convention the candidate for Vice President they desire, but it is not true that, because Mr. Kelly and Mr. Arvey and Mr. Hague get together they can elect their Vice Presidential candidate. In fact, the Democratic electors of the southern wing of the party will not follow Mr. Hague's direction, and will not vote for any candidate for Vice President who we think is inimical to the welfare of our people and whose philosophy of government would be to destroy our social institutions.

Mr. President, I serve notice now, and I think I can speak for the people of one sovereign Southern State when I say it, that we are not going to support any candidate for Vice President who is forced upon us by the convention, if we do not choose to support him, that that is a question which will be determined by our Presidential electors according to the Constitution of the United States. Because a candidate is strong on the East Side and pleases Boss Flynn is not persuasive with us. The Democratic electors of the South will not sacrifice our people upon the cross of political expediency. And this goes for Mr. Justice Douglas, as well as any other candidate who is nominated by the northern Democrats against our will and over our protests.

Mr. President, I think it is a shameful thing that politicians like those named would attempt to put the Supreme Court of the United States in politics. The episode referred to, if it happened—and my information is that it did—will cause the people to think that every decision of Mr. Justice Douglas is swayed by political considerations. It destroys the judicial atmosphere so necessary for confidence in a court. Our people are tired of politicians who plan and plot and politicalize the highest court of this country, and I think the people, not only of the South but of the Nation as a whole, will resent it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the whole article may be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

FROM CLOISTER TO CONVENTION

The peculiar, intermittent courtship between American politics and Justice William O. Douglas has entered a new and more decisive phase. The leaders of the northern Democratic organizations have sent word to Justice Douglas that the party's 1948 Vice-Presidential nomination is his for the taking.

The message was carried, some time ago, straight from a leaders' meeting in New York to Douglas' chambers in the gloomy cloisters of the Supreme Court. The executive director of the Democratic National Committee, Gael Sullivan, was the messenger. Douglas did not welcome this political annunciation, and has given no subsequent sign of his intentions. But the Democratic leaders feel that if President Truman eventually asks Douglas point blank to be his running mate, the Justice will be forced to accept.

There is, of course, no sort of guaranty that the leaders' message to Douglas will thus be followed up by any request from the White House. As far as President Truman personally is concerned the choice of his

companion on the ticket is still officially open. This will no doubt be asserted by the President himself. Yet, whatever the President may say will not detract from the singular interest of the episode described above.

There are, first of all, the circumstances of the leaders' decision. The New York get-together was held under the informal chairmanship of Edward J. Flynn. It is reported to have been attended by delegates from the satrapies of Ed Kelly and Jake Arvey in Illinois, David Lawrence in Pennsylvania, Frank Hague in New Jersey, and one or two more. In short, the same principalities and powers were assembled that took the lead in 1944 in rejecting both James F. Byrnes and Henry A. Wallace and in conferring the Vice Presidency on Harry S. Truman.

The debates of the satraps were, rather naturally, not formally recorded. Yet it is known that two major points were generally agreed upon.

Point 1 was that Truman would need a running mate linked to the New Deal, rather than a conservative, in order to win this year. Point 2 was that the nomination of such a running mate would arouse bitter opposition in the southern wing of the Democratic Party, but that the North possessed the votes to impose a northern choice on the convention. In both these points the practiced political eye will read much that is significant.

The northern leaders' insistence upon a New Dealer again underlines the fundamental change that has come over these great political organizations in the last 16 years. In the days before Roosevelt, these organizations were the conservative element in the Democratic Party. They relied on petty favors to hold the mass of their voters in the precincts, and in Washington were glad enough to take a right-wing line.

Now, however, the mass vote of the big cities can only be attracted by progressive personalities and programs. The leaders of the Democratic organizations privately cherish the wholly conservative opinions which they have always held. But they must give the voters the programs and personalities they want because their power depends upon it.

Their attitude was admirably summed up by one of the hard-boiled henchmen of the Kelly-Arvey organization, at the conclave which chose the able Paul Douglas as the Democratic senatorial nominee in Illinois. Douglas was rejected for the governorship nomination, which went to Adlai Stevenson, because he had fought the organization too hard in the past. The organization men could not bear the thought of Douglas passing out the jobs in Springfield, but could just bring themselves to support him for the Senate. The hard-boiled henchman in question put the general view very simply:

"I hate the — — guts of the — — —, but I'm for him because maybe he can win."

As the foregoing remark suggests, the progressivism of the northern satraps is in fact strictly confined to major candidates and party platforms. It is strikingly absent from their approach to the real business of government.

Hence result such oddities as Edwin J. Flynn's support of Commissioner Edmond Hanrahan for the chairmanship of the Securities and Exchange Commission. There is here a certain amusing irony. Justice Douglas, whom Flynn wants for the Vice Presidency, was once the fighting leader of the SEC, while Hanrahan is favored for the SEC chairmanship by precisely the business interests whom Douglas once fought. This kind of thing is the source of the curious split personality of the Truman administration.

Yet even progressivism in word and conservatism in deed is enough to inflame the feelings of the southern Democrats. The southerners will shortly be aroused into a fury of indignation by a strong Truman message on antidiscrimination legislation. They are sore as bears already. Although Justice Douglas is personally popular with many of them, the southerners will like no choice imposed by the North.

In this matter, as in so many others, President Truman's position recalls the plight of the Light Brigade. Wallace to the left of him, O'Daniel to the right of him, volley and thunder.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD at this point a great speech delivered by a great American in Chicago recently at the dinner given in honor of a great liberal in American political history, John Peter Altgeld, of Illinois. The speech was delivered by a great Justice of the United States—Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

John Peter Altgeld is probably unknown to most Americans. He seldom figures in our history textbooks. Few adults or school children identify him with the great human causes which have shaped the American character. His name has not yet become, as it should, a symbol of the clean, powerful force which we call American idealism.

He has, indeed, been an "eagle forgotten." But as Vachel Lindsay nobly said of him, "To live in mankind is far more than to live in a name." Altgeld does, I believe, "live in mankind." It was the cause of mankind which he pleaded. Though his name may no longer be identified with the issues which he espoused, their vitality in the years which followed him reflect the courage and faith with which he embraced them. Moreover, those who would not have seen eye to eye with him on many of the contentious issues of his era nevertheless gain inspiration from the character of his advocacy.

He feared no man. As a lawyer, his clients did not cause him to stand mute when his conscience urged him to speak out. As a politician, he did not follow the safe course of indecision or of ambiguous pronouncement when his instinct for justice told him to meet an evil head-on. As a private individual, he did not turn his back and withdraw to the ease and comfort of his wealth when the victims of an industrial system cried out against its inhumanities.

The powerful social forces of his age moved him to action. He was blunt, outspoken, and at times indiscreet. Edgar Lee Masters once said that perhaps "his weakness was that he hated the bad so much that it obscured his love of the good." He certainly made up in daring what he may have lacked in discretion. His was the frontal attack—he stormed the walls of the enemy at high noon; he did not delay in order to infiltrate their fortress at midnight. He was, indeed, an expendable. The heat of his zeal, the tremendous demands of his nervous energy consumed him in a brief and hectic 55 years.

He lost almost every major cause he pleaded. But those were the skirmishes and the battles which were mere episodes in a larger and more far-flung campaign. His failures caused new recruitments. A full generation later men who never knew his name were summoned by the ideas which he had generated or espoused. They marched to great victories of which he perhaps had never even dreamed.

His activities were, in the main, restricted to Illinois. But the ideas which he represented spread throughout the land as seed travels on the great airways of the world. His platform power was potent, though his spoken word was carried by the tongues of men, not by the magic of radio. The issues of which he spoke later became national issues. Millions became advocates of his lost causes. A generation unborn at his death witnessed victory in the war of which his lost battles were a part.

One who follows a trail through the wilderness may not know who first laid it out, who blazed the trees that mark its course. The pioneer who went ahead and marked the trail may, like Altgeld, be unsung. Those who later come to know its rigors—the crags which it mounts and the treacherous lowlands which it skirts—will want to pay tribute to him who first dared walk it. As Irving Dilliard said, the State of Illinois paid such a tribute in a literally inspired way in 1941 when it chose Altgeld Hall as the name of the building to house its distinguished college of law. Such monuments to his name do more than honor him. They help insure that his ideas continue as potent forces in our national life.

Altgeld came to maturity during the days of our robber barons. The great industrial and financial strength of the East had won a war and had grown stronger in the process. A large productive capacity, a huge reservoir of capital awaited new ventures. Men of vision saw untold opportunities in the exploitation of the western two-thirds of the continent. Parrington has described the beginning of this gilded age in pungent terms:

"A passionate will to power was issuing from unexpected sources, undisciplined, confused in ethical values, but endowed with immense vitality. Individualism was being simplified to the acquisitive instinct. These new Americans were primitive souls, ruthless, predatory, capable; single-minded men; rogues and rascals often, but never feeble, never hindered by petty scruple, never given to puling or whining—the raw materials of a race of capitalistic buccaneers. * * * The romantic age of Captain Kidd was come again, and the black flag and the gospel banner were both in lockers to be flown as the needs of the cruise determined. With all coercive restrictions put away the democratic genius of America was setting out on the road of manifest destiny. * * * It was an anarchistic world of strong, capable men, selfish, unenlightened, amoral—an excellent example of what human nature will do with undisciplined freedom. In the gilded age freedom was the freedom of buccaneers preying on the argosies of Spain."

Banker, industrialist, builder, and speculator were the driving forces in that tremendous undertaking. Some maintain that, at least in days of peace, the job never could have been done so fast any other way. However that may be, it is clear that it was extravagant in its cost, inhuman in its methods, corrupt in its influence.

The agrarian groups were exploited by the mercantile and industrial interests. A scourge of poverty and want—10 percent interest and 10-cent corn—swept the farms. Out of such stuff grew the Granger movement and later the Populists and other groups bent on reform.

Jungle warfare was the technique that fashioned the trusts. Big business rose out of the ruins which it had made of little business.

The newly acquired wealth became, in part, a slush fund to corrupt legislatures, to purchase favors from public officers. The Credit Mobilier scandal and the whisky tax frauds were typical.

The Nation had just rid itself of chattel slavery, renouncing for all time the idea that men could be bought and sold and exploited like cattle. But it seemed to many that the Nation was on the verge of embracing a form of industrial slavery, which in its consequences was almost as vicious as the slavery which had just been abolished.

The great industrial projects of that age required men as well as capital for their execution. But, in the eyes of the promoters, men were as fungible as the ties of the railroad tracks which spanned the continent.

There was at least some effort to protect the capital placed in the ventures and to give it rights against the day of loss and failure. But there was little or no effort made to compensate for the arms and legs and eyes and lives of human beings that went into these great industrial undertakings. Workmen's compensation laws, employers' liability laws were still in the future. There were only a few who talked of social justice.

Many workers, living in company towns, were beholden as in feudal days to a master; and this time their master was a corporation.

Child labor was widespread. Long hours of work obtained for men and women alike. Unhealthy and unsanitary conditions of work were found on every hand. The 8-hour day was a radical idea. Trade unions were sabotaged. Collective bargaining was still largely a dream.

The claims of stockholders and bondholders against enterprises had long been recognized. But there was no similar recognition of the claims of labor. Workers had no right to work; they had no claim to a fair wage.

Men struck for more wages—so that they might live decent lives, so that they might raise sturdy sons. Strikebreakers were brought in; and the poorly organized strikers were usually defeated. A great industrialist handled his strike with these words: "There is nothing to arbitrate. The workers have nothing to do with the amount of wages they shall receive."

The reaction was severe. There were probably some men of violence on the scene who would destroy the system that gave birth to the new industrial oligarchy. But men of good will—zealots and reformers—were also pilloried as anarchists. So were those who only protested against the chains of their new slavery.

There were riots and bombs. Violence begat violence. Troops—Federal troops—were called out to enforce injunctions issued by Federal courts. These were injunctions not only to protect property but to keep plants open and to outlaw strikes. He who defied the injunction went to jail. He was in contempt of court.

A great restlessness swept the country. There was a depression in the early nineties and millions were unemployed. They swept over the Cascades and the Rockies on the move to Washington for currency reforms, for a public works program. Some stole trains and were jailed. So were the hitchhikers who rode the boxcars. Strikers, too, were jailed. Contempt of court became a weapon in industrial warfare. It was a powerful weapon. It alined the forces of government—the courts, the marshals, the troops—on the side of industry and against the workers. Government was there not to adjudicate the justness of the claims, not to mediate nor to arbitrate the disputes, but to crush and suppress those who protested against the injustices of the new industrial era.

These issues were injected into local and national politics. A distinguished line of muckraking journalists, starting with Henry Demarest Lloyd, emerged and wrote in words that all could understand an indictment against the age of plunder and exploitation.

Antimonopolists pressed their reforms. Those who protested against the great and uncontrolled power of industry often advanced as their cure-all the socialization of business. Many good people were alarmed. Mr. Justice Brewer, who severely criticized Altgeld, was of the view that "the cry for socialism comes largely from the dissipated, the lazy, the dishonest." Men stood condemned as un-American whose programs of reform were not more radical than the vision of our own Tennessee Valley Authority and Grand Coulee. The specter of socialism did indeed stalk the land. Mr. Justice Holmes, writing in 1897, observed that "when socialism first began to be talked about, the comfortable classes of the community were a good deal frightened"; in fact, the fear of socialism "influenced judicial action both here and in England." Many in high places believed that this society of ours was headed for a pitched battle along class lines.

It is easy in retrospect to draw a false picture of an age merely by emphasizing the extremes which history has recorded. The sketch of the gilded age which I present may suffer that defect. But whether it does or not, I think it fair to say that this is the view Altgeld had of the era. The enormous injustices which he saw violated his sense of social justice. He first wrote and spoke his protests; then he moved to action, giving and expecting no quarter.

As Governor of Illinois he put through a law aimed at sweatshops, at the employment of children who were under 14, and at the employment of women over 8 hours daily or more than 48 hours a week. The latter provision was held unconstitutional on grounds which reflected the dominant political philosophy of the age—that it violated both the employer's and the worker's freedom of contract. He put through a law in aid of collective bargaining, which made it a crime to dismiss an employee because of membership in a labor union, and thus sowed one of the first seeds out of which the National Labor Relations Act grew a generation or more later. He inaugurated a system of mediation and arbitration of labor disputes. He put through a law that outlawed limitation of production, price fixing, pooling agreements, and other restraints of trade. He got an inheritance tax law passed. He was offered $500,000 if he would sign a bill which would tighten the hold of the traction and other utility interests on the State. He vetoed the bill, stating it was a "flagrant attempt to increase the riches of some men at the expense of others by legislation." Thereafter he campaigned for public ownership of utilities.

He protested vigorously against the use of Federal troops to break strikes. He resisted the use of the injunction in industrial disputes. As Harry Barnard graphically shows, it was Altgeld who coined the phrase "government by injunction" and drove home at every opportunity the oppression which that practice fostered. The Norris-LaGuardia Act, passed in 1932, thus can trace its ancestry to him.

As governor he put his influence behind the development of a strong, progressive university. He feared that monopoly capital might spawn its own seats of learning and dominate the minds of men as well as their bodies. He also knew that the character of a university is a "force that creeps silently over the land, and by day and by night molds the sentiment of men." He therefore wanted a university which would represent the great common people of this country, which would be the friend and the helper of the toiling masses, of those people who do the work of the world.

He well knew the workings of the judiciary because he had been a judge. So when he saw rulings of courts which seemed to him prejudiced and partisan, which tipped the scales against the common man and in favor of the vested interests of that day, he cried out in protest. In 1893 he said, "The men who administer the laws are human, with all the failings of humanity. They take their biases, their prejudices, with them onto the bench. Upon the whole, they try to do the best they can; but the wrongs done in the courts of justice themselves are so great that they cry to heaven." He saw the corrupt use of wealth extending its influence so far as to create judges who do its bidding.

Altgeld knew what we are apt to overlook or forget, that the procedural safeguards of the Bill of Rights were designed to protect the citizen against the tyranny not only of legislatures and of executives, but of judges too. He knew that power could be abused, whether it was industrial power or judicial power. He knew his history and had read those chapters which reveal that even courts sometimes show a callous disregard for human rights. Their robes do not always conceal their tyranny. The framers of the Constitution, knowing that, designed the constitutional requirement of a fair trial to protect the accused, not only against the police and the prosecutors, but against the judges as well. All these things Altgeld knew; and that is perhaps why, as Charles A. Madison says, "He was harshest on judges who abused the spirit of our laws to the hurt of the people."

When Altgeld became governor four of the men found guilty in the Haymarket riots had been hanged. Three were still in prison. Altgeld reviewed their cases and granted them pardons. The pardon was for him a simple, uncomplicated act. For as he told Brand Whitlock, he knew he was "merely doing right." He felt that way because in his judgment "those fellows did not have a fair trial." Unfair attitudes of both judge and jury had, in his view, infected the trial.

The reaction was violent as Altgeld knew it would be. He at once experienced what many before and after him experienced—that he who calls for the application of the Bill of Rights to unpopular minorties, as well as to the other groups of the community, often becomes himself suspect. Thus when Altgeld insisted that even anarchists were entitled to due process of law, he was dubbed an anarchist. But a man whose devotion to our system of government was so great that he did not want it to become the tool of a capitalist oligarchy was not even remotely related to the anarchists. He was merely seeking to apply the philosophy of Jefferson to the work-a-day world of the nineties—due process of law for every man, whatever his race or creed or political faith; social justice for those at the bottom, as well as those at the top, of the economic pyramid.

But the label stuck. Then came the bitter years. He lost both his wealth and his health under the pressures of his enemies. The man who had the courage to adhere to the spirit of our Bill of Rights and extend its benefits to a despised and hated minority was hounded to his death by powerful influences bent on his destruction. Yet I am confident it will be recognized as true 100 years from now, as it is increasingly recognized today, that of those on the public stage in that era it was Altgeld who brought the brightest honor to the democratic ideal.

Some issues survive all ages. But most of them have a habit of being redefined in the special context of the next generation. Hence this review of the issues which drew Altgeld's fire has relevancy here only as a reflection of his philosophy. It is that philosophy which remains a vital factor in American life, though the issues which gave it content have been resolved or forgotten. Altgeld's philosophy has relevance to current American problems in at least two respects.

First. Altgeld placed human beings higher than the dollar in the national scale of values. A nation's industrial plant represents not only the daring of capital and the imagination of executives, but the blood and sweat of men. The men and women who compose a nation are its greatest natural resource—greater than its mines or forest or rivers. The nation is healthy only if its people are strong. The state must concern itself with their economic disasters. For the greater share of their troubles is due not to laziness but to economic forces beyond their control. There is in most men a lively sense of decency, of good will, of fraternity. The poor have those instincts, as well as those blessed with more worldly goods. The powers of government should be directed to protect them in their struggle to survive and in their efforts to live in dignity and to share the fruits of freedom.

Altgeld felt with Cardinal Manning that even a starving man had the right to eat. And he thought it was an insult for those who "started in life with good brains, good training and excellent advantages and who are now well-housed, well-clothed, and well-fed, who know nothing about the actual conditions or wants of the poor" to lecture them on "laziness or shiftlessness."

We will be wise if we carry that philosophy into the world problems which confront us today. There are active bidders for the good will and support of the common people of the world. There are emissaries of totalitarian regimes in the capitals of the world, bargaining with bags of wheat for the souls of men. They are our competitors; but we need not emulate their example.

The victims of war in Europe and Asia need and ask our aid. But these people must not be treated as if they can be purchased with the dollar. We must not manage this great crisis of democracy as if it were an auction; as if the peoples of the world were on the block and going to the highest bidder. The sensitiveness of people increases with their suffering. The peoples of the world have suffered beyond our comprehension. If we so manage this crisis as to leave the impression that our standards are mercenary, we will have generated a revulsion to our system which may well be irreparable.

As a result of their struggles all peoples of the world are closer together. Their common interests have made them parts of something which is bigger than their own country. That is true of us, too. We have wider horizons, greater obligations. So when we come to the aid of the distressed people of the world, we act not out of charity alone but in answer to a responsibility to support in peace the ideal for which we were willing to wage a war.

Someway, somehow, we must let the peoples of the world know that. We must reach behind the facade of ministers and cabinets and commissions and let the common people feel our warm handclasp. We must let them know that we understand their suffering. We must make sure they know that our desire is not to make them our satellites but to meet them as equals in a world where standards of decency and justice prevail.

My remarks are not directed to agencies of government. I refer more particularly to the role which all groups—civic, cultural, and religious—can play in keeping close ties with the peoples of the world. Behind even the iron curtain of eastern Europe are human beings whose thirst for freedom is as great as our own. We must manage to let them feel the warmth of our understanding and friendship. We must not let them become the forgotten people of the world. They must know that their problems are our concern too, that we respect their worth as human beings, that they also are part of the brotherhood which we have come to symbolize in the world. Governments may be imposed on these people. But the people themselves are the ultimate source of political power in every state. The pattern of an enduring peace will be found only in their hopes and aspirations.

Altgeld once said that "All great reforms, great movements, come from the bottom and not the top." That is true in the international as well as the national field. Thus it is doubly important that we do not lose the link which we have with all peoples whose dream is political, intellectual, and religious freedom.

Second. There is another current problem to which Altgeld's philosophy is relevant. On the domestic scene his courage and steadfastness of purpose are needed for protection of the civil liberties of our people.

We are apt to leave that task to the faraway court in the State or National Capital. Those courts, by their examples, exert a great influence. But the great percentage of the grist is found in the lower courts. A more accurate measure of the vitality of our Bill of Rights is not in the sporadic rulings of our highest tribunals but in the day to day attitudes of the lower courts. Moreover, it is not in the courts alone that the strength of our civil liberties is to be ascertained. The executive and legislative branches of government also have responsibilities for enforcement of the Bill of Rights. The administration of the voting booths, the habits of the police in law enforcement, the nature of the city's ordinances—these all are indices of the vitality of the Bill of Rights in the life of the community. So is the attitude of the community. For an indifferent community, like a misguided one, will surely breed disrespect for the standards embodied in the Bill of Rights.

We may never reach perfection in our practice of the ideals of the Bill of Rights. But there is no earthly reason why with education and organization it cannot become an increasingly potent force in the every-day lives of our people. The extent of a community's respect of the human rights of all of its citizens is in fact the measure of its progress in civilization. Altgeld broke the trail—making it easier for every man of conscience who followed.

The creation of a healthy community attitude is not the exclusive task of any one group. The task starts in the homes, in the schools, and in the churches. But city and State officials, editors, lawyers, and other groups of citizens have an important share of the responsibility. I remember recent instances where tyrannical judges sitting in local courts rode roughshod over the civil liberties of defendants charged with crime. In one case it was a doctor, in another an editor who thundered personal disapproval and started campaigns to rid their cities of those oppressive practices. They were indeed the ones that alerted the local bar associations and caused civil-liberties committees to be formed to patrol the local scene.

These are not always easy steps to take. When Altgeld insisted that even anarchists were entitled to due process of law, he himself was labeled a subversive influence. That will often be said today when one insists that the safeguards of the Bill of Rights be extended to all groups, including any minority group in our midst that may be at the whipping post or the subject of temporary hysteria.

Yes; it takes courage to stand between an unpopular minority and the community, insisting that our Bill of Rights was designed for the protection of all people whatever their race, creed, or political faith. The lawyer may feel uneasy when it seems that important clients may slip away because of his attitude. The editor may be tempted to stand mute by reason of the views of important advertisers. Even the clergyman may be under pressure to hold his tongue because of the influence of some of his parishioners.

But those who are devoted to the democratic ideal expressed in our Bill of Rights will take the direct and daring course. Once they are sure of their facts and know they are doing right they will, like Altgeld, espouse the cause of the victims of ignorance, prejudice, or passion. They, too, may be pilloried or cursed. But institutions become great by the greatness of the men who champion them, by the greatness of the advocacy that defends them. A people indifferent to their civil liberties do not deserve to keep them, and in this revolutionary age may not be expected to keep them long. A people who proclaim their civil liberties but extend them only to preferred groups start down the path to totalitarianism. They emulate either the dictatorship of the right or the dictatorship of the left. In doing this they erase a basic distinction between our system of government and totalitarianism.

To allow that to happen is to lose by default. Far better to lose pleading the cause of decency and of justice. Then we win greatness even in defeat, and leave behind a rich heritage for those who later rebuild on the ashes of our lost hopes. But there will be no failure if we adhere steadfastly to our faith. For the goal of people of all races is toward a system which respects their dignity, frees their minds, and allows them to worship their God in their own way. None has yet designed an article of political faith more suited to those ends than our own Bill of Rights.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY—NOMINATION CONFIRMED

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mark Edwin Andrews, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

LICENSING OF COMMODITY SHIPMENTS TO EUROPE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I learn from a release which came to me today that on January 15 the Department of Commerce issued an order that beginning March 1, 1948, all commercial shipments of commodities to Europe will require individual validated licenses. The Department of Commerce made that announcement yesterday through its Office of International Trade. I do not wish to comment at this time on the order, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning March 1, 1948, commercial shipments of all commodities to Europe will require individual validated licenses, the Department of Commerce announced today through its Office of International Trade.

All European countries are included in a new country group which will include all of the countries of continental Europe, the British Isles, Iceland, Turkey, the U. S. S. R., all Asiatic possessions of the U. S. S. R. and Turkey, Portugal, including the Azores and Madeira, Tangier, Spain, and all Spain's colonial possessions, and the Mediterranean islands.

The new procedure will require individual validated licenses for all shipments to these countries, but it does not affect those licensing regulations applicable to specified destinations within countries, such as the arrangements for shipments of gift packages.

There will be no change in the forms and procedures required for obtaining licenses for shipments of goods on the positive list. The positive list is a list of commodities in short supply for which export licenses are required to all destinations.

Department of Commerce officials emphasized that the new regulation does not mean that an embargo will be placed on any particular goods going to particular countries. They explained further that it is the policy of the United States Government to foster a healthy and stable trade relationship which can contribute to a balanced and expanding world economy. The new licensing policy has been established, it was stated, to insure a careful programing of the supply of essential goods to areas of greatest need, and to limit the shipment of commodities which can make no contribution to world recovery.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to state that the step now being taken by the Department of Commerce, as set forth in the release to which I have just referred, was recommended last August by the Senate Small Business Committee. If that policy had been adopted at that time, I am quite satisfied that the acute situation now confronting us in regard to various commodities and articles in short supply, such as petroleum and steel, would not exist.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would not the adoption of that policy at the time when it was advocated by the Senate committee also have materially lessened the black markets, or the gray markets, in regard to the handling of these products for which export licenses were issued?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the second point I was about to make, and I thank the Senator from Ohio for making part of my speech for me. It certainly would have done that, and I agree in toto with what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

THE OIL SHORTAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, today there has come over the wires a report that the Secretary of Commerce has announced that the total exports of petroleum products for the first quarter of 1948 will be 12,000,000 barrels, or 480,000,000 gallons, and that these exports go to approximately 76 countries.

Although we welcome the news that the exports in the first quarter of 1948 are not being increased, and that news will be of great interest domestically, nevertheless, it does not bar the way to further exports to foreign countries. At the same time, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there is a shortage of these products, and it is plaguing many sections of the United States at this time. I am quite satisfied that if it is not alleviated it will continue to cause discomfort and in some places suffering before the winter is over. I also point out that we were told recently, at another of our subcommittee hearings, that we must expect shortages of gasoline beginning next May. As one whose only interest arises through his connection with the investigations conducted by the Small Business Committee, which is a nonpartisan committee, I should like to call attention to some of the investigations we have made, what we have found, and what we feel should be done by way of improvement, unless conditions are to become worse instead of better. If the hour were not so late I should like to make a complete statement at this point for the RECORD, because I think it is a matter which deserves deep attention and consideration. However, by reason of the lateness of the hour I shall ask that my remarks be printed in the RECORD instead.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a Senator from New England, a section of the United States which is vitally interested in the subject under discussion, I should be very much interested to hear what the Senator had in mind to say—if not the complete statement, then a summary of what the committee intends to do respecting the situation in the very near future, particularly in relation to fuel oil for New England, or what can be done by the Department.

Mr. WHERRY. The conclusions I have reached are to be found on page 10 of the statement I hold in my hand. I will act upon the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and state that on page 10 of the recommendations which I have to make, I call attention to the severe shortage now existing. The testimony is that we have ample sources of crude oil in the country to supply all our needs if we can get the crude to the places where it is needed.

For that reason it is going to be very necessary that there be a reconsideration of the policy which has been followed of sending steel from the United States, such as I described in the beginning of my remarks, to the Saudi Arabia oil field. If we can get the tubular pipe-line material into the sections of this country where it is needed we can provide not only transportation for fuel oils, but for natural gas as a heating fuel, and thereby get to the people of America, within the next year, fuel oil and natural gas, and alleviate fuel shortages in the future. It is my belief that commitments respecting steel exports should be reviewed with that idea in mind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that there is no actual shortage of oil, but that the question is one of transportation, and a question of obtaining the proper facilities to produce oil?

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that that was the testimony up until last week. There is now apparently developing a shortage of gasoline, for the reason that the oil companies have used oil for the making of lower grades of petroleum products. That will cause a shortage of gasoline early in the spring. Up to now, however, the testimony of the oil industry itself and of the various departments has been that the question is one of transportation, and not a question of production of crude oil.

I believe the Senator from Illinois will recall that the committee invited him to be present at some of the hearings held in Chicago. The Senator at that time may have been obliged to attend some other committee meetings and could not attend the hearings held in Chicago. In June of this year in Chicago we held a series of meetings at which 258 independent oil men stated they had been cut off from all their supply of fuel oil. The testimony given by the independent oil men was that those who furnished oil to them said they had no fuel oil. When the suppliers of the independents went to their sources of supply for fuel oil and asked about fuel oil, the answer was always given, "We do not have the transportation." So I am quite satisfied that up until now, at least, the difficulty has been a question of transportation, not only of tank cars and tankers, but carrying lines between oil fields and points of distribution.

About the time of the hearings to which I have just referred, as I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois will recall, announcement was made of a commitment made by the Department of Commerce in the amount of 480,000 tons of steel, for the most part various sizes of steel pipe line, which was to be sent to Saudi Arabia upon the theory that Saudi Arabia was a part of world producing fields, and that if petroleum could be produced there and furnished to the Continent it would save the situation.

From the hearings we have had, however, it has been pointed out very definitely that it is not a question of production abroad; 330,000 tons of steel will build a pipe line, which will provide only transportation, and during the 3 years it will take to build it tanker transportation will have to be depended on. Oil will have to be carried until 1951 by tankers.

The Department of Commerce, after the protest referred to, did consider that question, and at that time did reduce exports for the fourth quarter for that particular project to 20,000 tons. But the commitment, I am satisfied, on the long-range period, still exists.

I hope that in light of what has been found, not only by the Small Business Committee, but from other sources of information, even from the Departments further consideration will be given by the Department of Commerce to this huge export of tubular goods out of the United States. The country is behind, in the matter of sinking wells, by 67,000 wells. That includes wildcat wells, as well as wells which should be sunk in proven fields. Had those wells been sunk, we could have kept up production, and the situation would undoubtedly have been much better than it is now.

Mr. President, once again I repeat that the shortage has resulted from lack of transportation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the latest evidence before the Senator's committee on the subject of the surplus Navy tankers, and the tankers which were under the control of the Maritime Commission?

Mr. WHERRY. I think I can state to the Senator that the only thing we investigated was the T–2 type tankers. I think the testimony is undisputed that so far as the tanker situation is concerned worldwise, the situation is serious. Mr. Ball, Director of the Oil and

Gas Division, first told the committee that there was not sufficient tanker service, but later said there was. He has now said that he feels that if all the tankers are finally put into service which it has been claimed will be, they will possibly be ample. The difficulty is that T–2 tankers have been taken out of coastwise trade domestically. They have gone into world-wide transportation, and that has resulted in lack of domestic transportation.

For example, the committee protested to the President relative to the sale of the 100 United States T–2 tankers by the Maritime Commission to foreign nations and nationals, which I suppose the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts had in mind when he asked his question. Thirty-one of the tankers were firm commitments, which I imagine could not have been changed without a great deal of embarrassment to the administration, because the contracts had been made. Yet 83 of those tankers are being transferred to foreign governments, and will soon be flying foreign flags. They have been taken outside American jurisdiction and cannot operate in coastwise traffic. After they are once sold to a foreign government and sail under a foreign flag, of course, we do not have anything to say with respect to where they shall go.

Twenty-nine of the first 31 of those tankers on the trips made by them prior to their last trips, brought oil from the Gulf Coast to seaport points along the New England coast, in which the Senator from Massachusetts is vitally interested. Since then other tankers have been conditioned. It is our contention that we do not have enough tankers, that we are short of tankers, and that the further sale of tankers to foreign nations should be stopped.

It is the contention of the Interior Department that whether the tankers are carrying petroleum here or carrying petroleum in other parts of the world they are carrying petroleum, and that if petroleum is carried by tanker from Saudi-Arabia it will result in relieving the demand for oil at some other place. I suppose on a world-wide basis, which of course is very general, it would be very difficult to attack that conclusion. But I do say that the impact which the sale of these tankers has had upon the domestic economy is now being felt by way of acute shortages along the Atlantic coast.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator knows that on June 3 of this year there were over 100 tankers that could have been bought by the major oil companies for $2,000,000 apiece, and the Senator knows that there were bids in for 8 of them, I believe. Is not that true?

Mr. WHERRY. In June of this year, according to the testimony, as I recall—I would have to refresh my memory—there were not on file a sufficient number of applications of United States citizens to indicate that they would take up the tankers that were offered for sale. I agree with that.

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct. If the major oil companies had bought those tankers and put them into operation——

Mr. WHERRY. At that time.

Mr. McMAHON. At that time, when they were offered for sale by the Government, there would not be any shortage of transportation.

Mr. WHERRY. But at that time the oil was being hauled by chartered tankers of the Maritime Commission, instead of tankers purchased for that purpose. The oil companies testified they were not in the transportation business, and that the tankers, which have now been sold, although they were not owned and were not purchased by those companies, were hauling oil for those companies to the people in Connecticut, as chartered boats; and I want to continue that charter; I think it is a good thing. I say now that when the charter expires—and I think it will expire in January—the Maritime Commission should have the right to continue chartering boats. There are many reasons for that. There is the question of labor. There is the question of knowing how to conduct the business. I am not sure about this, but I understand that one of the big reasons why they tried to stop the tankers being sold to foreigners was the fact that some of the companies carrying oil to foreign ports could get cheaper personnel than they could get in the United States. That was brought out in the evidence. But if the distinguished Senator from Connecticut would care to go through the hearings, I am quite satisfied he would find the question he asked was answered as I have answered it; I say to the distinguished Senator that in the Gulf-coast region oil has backed up, I think nearly 10,000,000 barrels over what it was a year ago, because there are not the transportation facilities with which to carry the oil.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will also say that the reserves on the east coast, including Maryland and New Jersey, and right on up into the Senator's territory, have been depleted in nearly the same degree.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. It is my information that all the tankers laid up in the fleet will be out by the middle of February, with the exception of two. As the Senator knows, they would have been out before this, except that, first, the major oil companies did not buy them when they should have bought them. They saw oil burners being sold by the hundreds of thousands, and, unfortunately, the industry did not take steps to buy the tankers and put them into service. That is observation No. 1. Observation No. 2——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I have the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. I thought the Senator yielded to me.

Mr. WHERRY. I yielded to the Senator, but he has made an observation. Now, I should like to say, in reply to his observation, that the burden the Senator suggests be imposed upon an independent oil company which is dependent upon tankers, whether chartered or owned, to go out and buy tankers for transportation, is one thing. As the Senator has suggested, if the United States citizens' applications had been on file last June and if the companies had not depended upon the chartering provided for in the proposed legislation, to permit them to haul under a charter, what he has said would be correct; but I say also to the Senator that no commitments were made to any foreign country in June of this year; not one. The only time when a foreign commitment was made was in September, when it was brought out by the Maritime Commission that they had prorated the tankers around, after American dollars became short, and they could not pay for the transportation in Europe. Then they started to make these firm commitments, which, indeed, were not firm, and as late as September of this year there were 161 United States citizens' applications on file. They had no consideration, and I think every one of those foreign sales attempted to be made under the War Shipping Act was made illegally. That is what I think about it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. As I said, all but two of the tankers will be in service by February 15. The delay in putting them in service has been caused by the fact, as the Senator knows, that they have had to be strapped. Due to a breaking in the middle of a couple of them on the east coast, it has been necessary to make this repair on all of them for safety's sake. I have it on very good authority, I will tell the Senator, even though we get everyone of those tankers but two into operation, that, because of a shortage of oil, we shall still have a shortage on the east coast that will not be solved this winter or next winter, or probably the winter thereafter, and we are probably going to have a shortage of gasoline for the next 3 years.

Mr. WHERRY. In respect to that observation, I should like to have the Senator read the report of the Small Business Committee which made its investigation since June. If he will just read it, he will find it is the testimony of all the companies, it is the testimony of the agencies, including Mr. Ball, Director of the Oil and Gas Division of the Interior Department, upon whom the Secretary of Commerce depends for his statistics, that there has been no shortage of oil, that it is a question of transportation. The only time any testimony has been offered that we are now approaching a shortage of oil came within the past 10 days, when Mr. Ball, at a later meeting, stated that the situation has changed, that it is not only a question of transportation, but now a shortage of oil is beginning to develop.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that the truth or the untruth of that assertion of Mr. Ball's will be fairly proved at the end of February or early March, when all the tanker fleet and all the capacity will be in operation, and I say to the Senator—and I have made

something of a study of the matter—that I am convinced we shall still, unfortunately, have a shortage due to a lack of supplies of oil.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not arguing that point at all. The Senator is confirming my statement. Certainly we are going to have a shortage of oil. We are going to have a shortage of oil because we have not had the transportation, for one thing. We are going to have a shortage of oil because we have not the wells. We are 67,000 wells behind in production.

Mr. McMAHON. Well, that is it; we are going to have a shortage even though we solve the transportation problem.

Mr. WHERRY. But it is only now, after the horse is out of the barn, after there has been a failure in transportation, and after the authorities have failed to give the allocations of steel to produce the wells, that they come up against this shortage of oil. I think it is with the absolute purpose of inviting rationing of petroleum products in this country, if the Senator wants to know what I think about it. I did not rise to discuss the former report I made, but the distinguished Senator says he knows something of the situation. I am glad he does, but he has not read the oil report, or he would not have said what he did state. Not only are the recommendations available, but the complete testimony is available

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Certainly I yield. I always yield to the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. With all due deference to the magnificence and eloquence and great accuracy of the report that comes from the Senator's committee—and I have not read it——

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I thought.

Mr. McMAHON. I sat for about 10 hours one day listening to this story, over in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. As a result of that meeting of that committee, we did something about it.

Mr. WHERRY. What date was that?

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, I think that was probably about a month ago.

Mr. WHERRY. It was after the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business made their report to the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. In any event, without in any way wishing to detract from the magnificent work the Senator's committee did, or its report, all I can say to the Senator is that it is my opinion, based upon the evidence I have heard, that there is going to be a shortage of the product. I certainly hope that that is not going to be the case, but I think we make a mistake when we say that transportation, and transportation alone, is the cause, because the transportation problem is going to be solved, I am told, in the middle of February.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator state who told him that?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; Mr. Ball and the Maritime Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; Mr. Ball. Now, Mr. Ball is only with the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior. The testimony of Colonel Johnson, who probably knows more about transportation than anyone else in Washington, or in the United States, will inform the Senator just the contrary.

Mr. McMAHON. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WHERRY. That is his evidence. That is the evidence.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not think so. I think the Senator is talking about the situation when he took this evidence some weeks ago.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator can, if he cares to, review the testimony. If the Senator will just read the record he will find that there is a shortage of oil, caused by a lack of transportation; and now, after the horse is out of the barn, of course, there is a shortage; and now the shortage is blamed on something else. I agree with the Senator there is a shortage, and there is going to be a shortage, and in the spring of this year the supply of gasoline will be the shortest it has been in a long time.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield, if the Senator wants to add something constructive to this debate. If he does not, I shall refuse to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has not read the record.

Mr. McMAHON. I have not read the record, because it has not yet been printed.

Mr. WHERRY. After attending one hearing for 10 hours, the Senator is now an expert.

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, no.

Mr. WHERRY. He is an authority on transportation and on oil.

Mr. McMAHON. No.

Mr. WHERRY. And the basis for the meeting the Senator attended, the evidence relied on, was the evidence which we have gathered over the United States since last June, in innumerable hearings, evidence brought out from all the agencies and industry itself.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. McMAHON. There is no point in our disputing the question as to who has the greatest basis in fact for the opinions which he is voicing. I think the Senator ought to know that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has held many hearings on this subject. Let me point out to the Senator also while we are on the subject, that this shortage basically is caused by the fact that in the year 1947 this astounding thing occurred: We consumed, and are now consuming, at the rate of 586 gallons per capita a year. During 1940 we consumed at the rate of 325 gallons per capita. I think the Senator will agree that there has never been, in the entire history of the oil business, the stupendous increase in consumption which has occurred during the past 12 months. I think we can agree on that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, I agree to that. Anyone knows that there has been an increase in petroleum consumption. He can find that out without looking at the record. Such increase has been brought about by the increased sale of oil burners, and by the 101 uses to which petroleum has been put. The amount of money in circulation is also a factor. The same is true of power, and many other things. I agree with the Senator that there is an increase in the domestic use of petroleum products; but the fact that we are producing as much this year as we produced in 1940 does not solve the problem. What we want to do is to produce enough in this country to have a supply which is equal to the demand. If we are to do that, we must have steel to build pipe lines. We must have steel to build tank cars. We must have steel in the proved producing fields to bring in new oil wells. Also we must provide pipe for wildcatters to enable them to bring in 60,000 wells which we do not have today.

Mr. McMAHON. I agree.

Mr. WHERRY. Then we are agreed on that point. I shall be glad now to insert the remainder of my remarks as a statement. I think I have pretty well covered the subject.

I have attempted to do this in the service of a committee which has worked hard. I have no quarrel with the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We have gone to any town where the independent oil dealers have asked us to go. We have done a great deal of work in processing claims. The theory which the Senator is advancing, of a pool to allow the big companies to supply hardship cases, would bypass every independent oil operator in the United States. If that is what the Senator wants, very well; but I am not for it. So long as I am chairman of the Small Business Committee, we will continue to work for the interests of small business and the interests of consumers.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I appreciate what the Senator has said about the bypassing of independent dealers.

Mr. WHERRY. That is taking place in the Senator's own State. Today we processed a claim involving an attempt to take oil out of a pool and furnish it to another dealer in the Senator's own State, and thereby bypass the independent dealer who has been the normal distributor. Not only is the independent dealer bypassed, but the customers whom that dealer has built up over the years are bypassed. They have no opportunity to get oil unless they beg the major company to furnish it to them.

That is the kind of service which our committee is giving to independent operators throughout the country. It is the kind of service which they must have. It is the kind of service which will keep them in business. I have worked for 5 years on the Small Business Committee, and I shall continue to work to preserve the small businessman.

Mr. McMAHON. I am delighted to hear of the Senator's devotion.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator can come over to our committee and render a much greater service than by helping the big companies bypass the independent dealers.

Mr. McMAHON. Only today I issued a statement in which I said that unless there were some relief for the independent dealers, if a plan to squeeze them out of business was to be used, then there was nothing for Congress to do except to go to allocation and control.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of my statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WHERRY IN CONNECTION WITH OIL SHORTAGE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE OIL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. President, may I call to the attention of the Senate today a situation, the seriousness of which we are all aware, but about which the administration and the responsible executive agencies are closing the door after the horse is out of the barn.

I refer, gentlemen, to the shortage of fuel oil and other petroleum products which is plaguing many sections of the country at this time, and which will continue to cause suffering and discomfort throughout the balance of the winter.

And beyond that, gasoline will be short in the spring.

The Oil Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has been investigating problems of oil supply and distribution since June 1947. Since that time, this committee has repeatedly called the attention of Government officials and of the public and the press to situations which were brewing in the oil industry and to related problems which would affect the supply of oil in the immediate months to come.

In August and September of 1947, the Oil Subcommittee conducted hearings throughout the Middle West, investigating complaints of small businessmen in the oil industry; independent producers, distributors, and dealers who are faced with a variety of problems in securing oil for distribution.

Again and again in its investigations the subcommittee was faced with the complaint that development of new oil resources and the building of pipe lines was greatly hampered by the lack of steel.

Better utilization of tank cars for the transportation of oil also became a major project for the Oil Subcommittee, based upon its findings that cars were in desperate short supply and that steel was not available to build sufficient new ones.

The Oil Subcommittee has sought the cooperation of the Office of Defense Transportation and of major oil companies and tank-car companies to require that tank cars be used to their full capacity; that hoarding and banking of tank cars be discontinued; that unloading and turn-around time be speeded up; and that truck transports be substituted for tank cars on short hauls.

While in the midst of Midwest hearings in September 1947, the Oil Subcommittee learned that the Department of Commerce was about to issue an export license to the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. to build a pipe line across Saudi-Arabia, which would eventually require 480,000 tons of steel, principally welded pipe—pipe for which the oil industry in the United States had been begging for years—not to mention the needs of other industries.

On September 23, I protested the licensing of steel pipe for the Saudi-Arabian pipe line and called the attention of the Secretary of Commerce to the fact. I quote from my letter to him of that date:

"Shortages of critical steel in this country have made it impossible for many American businessmen to plan production on a sound basis. The lack of water-well casing and water pipe in the farm and grazing areas of the Nation is acute and may well affect food production. There is a very serious possibility that homes will be cold and businesses forced to operate at reduced levels of operation this winter because of the shortage of steel pipe with which to transport heating oil and gas. Development of new oil resources and the construction of pipe lines in this country have been hampered by the shortage of pipe and tubular goods."

On October 9 the Oil Subcommittee called a hearing with high officials of the Government, including Mr. Forrestal, Secretary of National Defense; Mr. Lovett, then Acting Secretary of State; Mr. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce; Mr. W. John Kenney, Under Secretary of the Navy; and representatives of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, all of whom participated in the decision to approve 480,000 tons of steel for the Saudi Arabian pipe line.

At the request of the participants, this meeting was a closed session, due to the implication that national defense considerations had played a part in the decision to approve the shipments. Out of this meeting came the answer that the development of the Saudi Arabian pipe line was in the national interest, and in the opinion of our Secretary for National Defense, "was more important than the development of any oil resource in the United States or the Western Hemisphere."

The subcommittee has proved to its satisfaction in subsequent open hearings that either these high officials of our Government were misled in information presented to them, or there is something afoot in our policy-making branch of Government that is neither healthy nor in the best interests of our national welfare.

Not satisfied with the equivocal outcome of its initial inquiry on the Saudi Arabian pipe deal, the Oil Subcommittee pursued the question with other Government officials involved in the decision to develop the project, and also with representatives of the independent oil producers, who have a large stake in and much to lose by the shipment of critically needed steel pipe away from this country.

Mr. Max Ball, Director of the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior, which Division and agency has the especial responsibility for protecting the interests of the oil and gas industry in this country, reported to the Oil Subcommittee on October 15 that he had voted against the licensing of pipe for Saudi Arabia pipe line on July 14, 1947.

But in the intervening weeks between then and September 22, when the license had been approved, Mr. Ball reversed his opinion on the grounds that the pipe line would make the Saudi Arabian oil more accessible, and would relieve a serious shortage of tanker transportation for carrying that oil from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean.

It is interesting to note here that the Secretary of Commerce, who has the last word in deciding upon an export license, made his decision at the Cabinet level and not upon the advice of his own Office of International Trade. That office had the courage to tell him that the shipment of 480,000 tons of steel, or any sizable portion of that export per quarter, could not be justified with regard to the domestic economy. Other Government agencies—the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Office of Defense Transportation also refused to go along with the Department of Commerce's action.

Their objections were of little avail.

The Maritime Commission, which agency should know more about the tanker situation than any other Government agency, was not asked for advice on the Saudi Arabian pipe deal.

When the Oil Subcommittee continued its investigation to find out the true situation with respect to tankers, it found the Maritime Commission busily engaged in selling 100 United States fleet tankers to foreign nations and nationals, in what I believe to be a violation of the law.

Counter to the claim that we must build a pipe line for Middle East oil because of a tanker shortage, valuable tankers have been sold to foreign nations who may or may not transport oil to American ports, and who cannot operate in coastwise traffic in the United States, according to the law.

It was clearly indicated in testimony given by Maritime Commission officials that instructions to sell these tankers had come from the White House upon advice of the State Department.

The sales were still further supported by an opinion of the Attorney General on December 9, which validated 83 of the tanker sales. Seventeen of the allotment were saved for sale to United States citizens.

To the average person, the story of oil supply and distribution would ordinarily seem very remote from a Saudi Arabian pipe line and the sale of tankers to foreign nations. Unfortunately it is as involved as most of our international policies are these days.

The ridiculousness of the situation is that the Oil Subcommittee has found that the building of a Middle East pipe line does not mean increased supplies of oil, simply improved transportation. Furthermore, the pipe line cannot be built for 3 years and in that time the oil must still be shipped by the same number of tankers that have been required right along. A pipe line built with that steel in this country would be put into active use carrying oil to homes and to industry.

World-minded Government officials, it seems, have given too little consideration to the critical and immediate shortages in our own country.

The general impression has also been created by Government officials that oil resources in the United States have been stripped, and for that reason it was most advisable for us to develop Middle East fields.

The oil industry as well as representatives of the Bureau of Mines have told the Oil Subcommittee otherwise.

Sixty-seven thousand more oil wells could have been drilled by the oil industry since the war, had the oil-drilling equipment been available.

One hundred and seventy to one hundred and eighty trillion cubic feet of natural gas are available in this country.

Recovery of oil from shale is only in its infancy. One pilot plant, experimenting with processes, is in operation at this time by the Bureau of Mines; 92,000,000,000 barrels of oil is presently estimated as recoverable from shale in this country.

When we think that Germany fought the recent war on oil in a large measure recovered from shale, from coal, and from natural gas we can realize how far behind the times we are in the development and utilization of our natural resources.

Government officials have repeatedly told this committee that the "cream" has been taken from the oil fields in the United States. A perfect refutation of that is the new oil field which has just been opened in west Texas, covering an area of 800 miles. At this moment 886 barrels per day are being taken out through a ⅜-inch pipe. When brought into full production, this field will be one of the largest developments in recent years.

This shows what American ingenuity can accomplish—even hampered by lack of materials.

Steel pipe and tubular goods are needed to bring this oil, and oil from other fields in the United States, to points of distribution. Instead, it is the apparent attitude of Government officials that our steel should be hurried off to Saudi Arabia, rather than devoted to our own hemisphere.

As to the advisability of the development of a Saudi Arabian pipe line, we have only to study the Arabian-Palestine situation and the Greek and Iran difficulties.

Information has reached me that work on the western end of the Saudi Arabian pipe line has been stopped and work can only be done on the eastern end—a possibility which was discussed with our Defense and State Department officials in the committee's October 9 closed session.

As to the need for tankers in domestic transportation, we have only to read the newspaper accounts of the fuel-oil shortage along the east coast, particularly in the Northeastern States.

From all over the country the Senate Small Business Committee has received complaints and appeals for assistance in serious oil shortages. As the heating season has progressed, the committee has held emergency hearings and consultations with the oil industry and with independent dealers to negotiate emergency shipments of fuel oil and gasoline, where it is necessary to keep families warm, and municipal services running.

In these negotiations, the Oil Subcommittee has attempted to work out solutions to shortage problems, which would result in distribution of oil through smaller independent dealers in proportion to that distributed through company-owned outlets of the major oil-producing companies. Thus, in its emergency assistance, the Oil Subcommittee has sought to restrain monopolistic practices in the oil industry.

Since early summer, then, the Oil Subcommittee has been warning the public; has been proclaiming the oncoming oil shortage; has been trying to prevent the "giving away" of critical materials needed for the production and transportation of oil.

The subcommittee has been trying to effect improved use of tank-car facilities and to promote the more equitable distribution of petroleum and petroleum products by major oil companies to independent distributors and dealers—these small businessmen who through the years have served normal channels of trade.

A report issued by the Senate Small Business Committee on December 18 emphasized these efforts, and called attention to other recommendations by the Oil Subcommittee.

Through all of the warnings and evidence produced by the almost continuous hearings of the Oil Subcommittee over the past 6 months, the responsible Government agencies seemed to have their eyes averted.

On January 15 the Secretary of Interior, Mr. Krug, called a meeting with representatives of industry to discuss voluntary distribution agreements, in accordance with the new Economic Stabilization Act.

Now that the oil emergency is well advanced, I am glad to see that the Interior Department is moving to step into the breach.

In a letter to the National Petroleum Council on setting up this meeting with industry, Secretary Krug has now indicated a need for action in the field of distribution of petroleum and its products. Reference is made to Senate Small Business Committee findings, and to a similar need for action with respect to the allocation of transportation and equipment.

In subsequent releases, Secretary Krug has stated that a return to wartime controls over petroleum are necessary. This is what I mean by closing the door after the horse is out of the barn.

A solution to the immediate oil emergency, which has been suggested by representatives of industry and representatives of State coordinating committees who have met with the Department of Interior, has been what is called a hardship pool of oil, whereby major oil companies would supply needy cases which have been screened by the State committees.

This is what I call a consumers' hardship pool, and although it may serve consumer needs which we all desire, it will also distribute the oil exclusively through major oil company outlets.

This is a phase of the oil shortage which the Senate Small Business Committee has been fighting and will continue to fight. The smaller, independent businessman in the oil industry has the right of survival, the right to the customers which he has developed over the years, and the right to his share of the Nation's natural resources.

My purpose in this description of the activities of the oil subcommittee is to show the disinclination on the part of executive agencies to profit by the hearings and investigations conducted by a Senate committee, or to be forewarned of national emergencies in time to take preventive action.

We are in the midst of a heating oil crisis today, because Government agencies have not taken precautions to safeguard our domestic supplies, our transportation facilities, or provide the means for the development of new oil resources.

And let me warn you today that when the weather lightens and the use of cars and motor transportation increases, you will hear loud complaints on the lack of gasoline—for business purposes, for family use, and recreation.

We have ample sources of crude oil in this country to supply all of our needs.

The stumbling blocks and limitations in production and distribution of petroleum products are the problems which must be overcome.

We must make sure that the inordinately large exports of oil to Canada or any other foreign country are reduced to normal.

We must watch that foreign-aid oil needs are kept at a minimum and that they are satisfied from sources of oil outside this hemisphere so long as domestic demand exceeds supply.

We must be alert that foreign-aid needs are not disguised under the heading of military requirements.

We must insist that shipments of steel pipe and tubular goods in export be granted only with full consideration being given to domestic needs for these products;

We must see that United States tankers are retained for domestic transportation insofar as the need exists;

We must assure that tank car facilities are used efficiently and that exports of steel are so handled to permit sufficient new tank and freight cars to be constructed;

We must reveal and correct practices in the oil industry which are smothering independent business and affecting the flow of petroleum products from originating fields, and through the various stages of distribution until its delivery to the customer.

During the war we were spurred on by the warning phrase, "too little, too late." It seems to me this is equally appropriate today. If the proper effort were applied to solve such problems as the oil shortage before they reach emergency proportions, there would be no need even to propose the distasteful step of government control and regulation.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 19, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 16 (legislative day of January 14), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

William H. Beach, of Virginia.

Frederik van den Arend, of North Carolina.

Walter J. Stoessel, Jr., of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John R. Alison, of Florida, now holding recess appointment, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Vincent C. Burke, of Kentucky, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Jesse M. Donaldson, appointed Postmaster General.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Bernice Pyke, of Cleveland, Ohio, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 41, with headquarters at Cleveland, Ohio. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Frank E. Flynn, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona. (Mr. Flynn is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 2, 1947.)

William W. Hart, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois. (Mr. Hart is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

Leslie E. Given, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia. (Mr. Given is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 2, 1947.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John J. Barc, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired November 4, 1947.)

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon. (Mr. Caufield is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 28, 1947.)

Leland Stanford Finney, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia, vice John White Stuart, deceased.

Edney Ridge, of North Carolina, to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina. (Mr. Ridge is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be circuit judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Wirtz is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Mary E. Ingle
Mary Matula
Elizabeth J. Haglund
Genevieve T. Piette
Frances C. Wickham

To be junior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Mary Ellen Deady

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant and arm or service specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Samuel T. Rhodes, Infantry.
Andrew J. Roach, Quartermaster Corps.
Robert K. Weaver, Infantry.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be rear admirals:

Gordon T. Finlay, to rank from December 30, 1947.

Wilfrid N. Derby, to rank from December 31, 1947.

Edward H. Smith, to rank from January 1, 1948.

William K. Scammell, to rank from January 2, 1948.

Earl G. Rose, to rank from January 3, 1948.

Eugene A. Coffin, to rank from January 4, 1948.

Joseph E. Stika, to rank from January 5, 1948.

Halert C. Shepheard, to rank from January 6, 1948.

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be captains:

Floyd J. Sexton
Gordon W. MacLane
John E. Whitbeck
Charles T. Henley, Jr.
John N. Heiner
John Trebes, Jr.
Joseph Greenspun
Louis W. Perkins
Raymond T. McElligott
Louis B. Olson
Charles W. Dean
Roderick S. Patch
Harold G. Bradbury
Arthur G. Hall
Norman C. Manyon
Frederick C. Hingsburg
Paul K. Perry
Norman H. Leslie
Albert M. Martinson
Raymond J. Mauerman
George E. McCabe
Lee H. Baker
Charles W. Harwood
Severt A. Olsen
Joseph S. Rosenthal
Frank M. Meals
Thomas Y. Awalt
Alfred C. Richmond
Walter R. Richards
Roy L. Raney
Russell E. Wood
Clarence H. Peterson
James A. Hirshfield
Joseph D. Conway
Frank T. Kenner
George C. Carlstedt
John Rountree
William W. Kenner
Stephen P. Swicegood
Henry C. Perkins
Charles W. Thomas
Frank A. Leamy
John H. Byrd
Beckwith Jordan
Niels S. Haugen
Harold S. Berdine
Clarence C. Paden
Donald G. Jacobs
Carl E. Guisness
George W. McKean
William J. Austermann
Gaines A. Tyler
Ira E. Eskridge
Christopher J. Sullivan
Harry W. Stinchcomb
Paul B. Cronk
Harold C. Moore
Richard M. Hoyle
Stanley J. Woyciehowsky
Kenneth K. Cowart
Rutherford B. Lank, Jr.
Dale R. Simonson
Morris C. Jones
Miles H. Imlay
Edward M. Kent
Frank E. Allison
Henry T. Jewell
Gordon A. Littlefield
George C. Whittlesey
Donald E. McKay
Vernon E. Day
John L. Steinmetz
Stanley C. Linholm
Fred P. Vetterick
Carl F. Ganong
Lawrence M. Harding
Morris G. Jory
Dwight A. Chase
Frank R. Bellomy
George M. Phannemiller

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be commanders:

George F. Hicks
Alexander L. Ford
Stephen H. Evans
John A. Glynn
John E. Fairbank
Joseph A. Kerrins
Edward H. Thiele
Reginald H. French
John W. Ryssy
Richard L. Burke
Nathaniel S. Fulford, Jr.
Albert A. Lawrence
Chester M. Anderson
Jerry B. Hoag
Julias F. Jacot
Glenn E. Trester
Chester A. Anderson
Edward E. Hahn, Jr.
Wilbur C. Hogan
Kenneth P. Maley
Samuel F. Gray
Earl K. Rhodes
Carl B. Olsen
Leon H. Morine
Walter C. Capron
Watson A. Burton
Frank K. Johnson
Leslie D. Edwards
Frederick G. Eastman
Arthur G. Morrill
George N. Bernier
Dwight H. Dexter
Edward W. Holtz
Herbert F. Walsh
Edwin J. Roland
Peter V. Colmar
George H. Bowerman
Allen Winbeck
William B. Chiswell
Oliver A. Peterson
Marius DeMartino
Carl G. Bowman
James C. Wendland
Richard M. Ross
John A. Dirks
Harry A. Loughlin
Henry J. Wuensch
George W. Nelson
William P. Hawley
Hans F. Slade
John N. Zeller
Romeo J. Borromey
Donald B. MacDiarmid
Garrett V. A. Graves
William B. Scheibel
Bret H. Brallier
George H. Miller
John W. Malen
Gordon P. McGowan
Kenneth S. Davis
William E. Sinton
Henry S. Sharp
George A. Knudsen
John R. Stewart
Arthur J. Hesford
William L. Maloney
Ralph R. Curry
Harold J. Doebler
Edmund E. Fahey
Spencer F. Hewins
Clifford R. MacLean
Henry F. Stolfi
John F. Harding
Herman T. Diehl
Leonard T. Jones
Montegue F. Garfield
Searcy J. Lowrey
Samuel L. Denty
George W. Dick
Charles E. Brush
Charles B. Arrington
Robert T. Alexander
Edward A. Eve, Jr.
Howard A. Morrison
Eric A. Anderson
Marion Amos
Halmar J. Webb
Frank A. Erickson
William D. Shields
Chester L. Harding
Richard E. Morell
Aden C. Unger
Victor F. Tydlacka
George I. Holt
Simon R. Sands, Jr.
Donald M. Morrison
Christopher C. Knapp
Joseph E. Madacey
Elmer E. Comstock
Henry U. Scholl
Elmer J. J. Suydam
Rufus E. Mroczkowski
James R. Hinnant
Oscar C. B. Wev
Harold B. Roberts
Ned W. Sprow
William I. Swanston
William E. Creedon
Henry A. Meyer
Preston B. Mavor
Quentin M. Greeley
Richard C. Foutter
Richard D. Schmidtman
John T. Stanley
James D. Craik
Theodore J. Harris
Anthony J. DeJoy
Loren H. Seeger
George D. Synon
Irwin J. Stephens
Donald T. Adams
Theodore J. Fabik
Reinhold R. Johnson
John R. Henthorn
Hollis M. Warner
Walter B. Millington
John P. German
Oscar C. Rohnke
Karl O. A. Zittel
Gilbert I. Lynch
George R. Leslie
Joseph A. Bresnan
Carl H. Stober
John R. Kurcheski
Frederick G. Wild
Alvin H. Giffin
Joe G. Lawrence
James A. Alger, Jr.
Albert J. Carpenter
Willard J. Smith
Robert S. Lecky
Emmet T. Calahan
Joseph F. McCue
John H. Forney
Eugene A. Coffin, Jr.
David O. Reed
Forrest I. Phippeny
Edward W. Laird
William G. Wallace
Harry S. Salzer
Verne C. Gibson
Russell E. Yates
George C. Balzer
Charles R. Monteiro
Hugh D. Wear
Daniel J. Lucinski
Hubert R. Chaffee

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenant commanders:

Harry E. Davis, Jr.
Joseph Howe
William W. Childress
John H. Wagline
John J. Hutson, Jr.
Robert E. McCaffery
Albert E. Harned
David H. Bartlett
Vaino O. Johnson
Richard F. Rea
Louis M. Thayer, Jr.
Evor S. Kerr, Jr.
Walter S. Bakutis
Edgar V. Carlson
Clayton M. Opp
Loren E. Brunner
Charles E. Columbus
William L. Sutter
Gilbert R. Evans
Wallace L. Hancock, Jr.
Adrian F. Werner
Woodrow W. Vennel
Gilbert F. Schumacher
Charles Tighe
Richard Baxter
Oscar D. Weed, Jr.
Harold Land
Ralph D. Dean
Joseph R. Scullion
William J. Conley, Jr.
Richard L. Mellen
Glenn L. Rollins
Ernest A. Cascini
Frank V. Helmer
Robert F. Shunk
Justis P. White
William J. Lawrence
Bernard E. Scalan
Guy L. Ottinger
Clifford S. Gerde
Edward C. Thompson, Jr.
George R. Boyce, Jr.
Gerald T. Applegate
George R. Reynolds
Fred J. Scheiber
William B. Ellis
Christian R. Couser
Thomas R. Midtlyng
Randolph Ridgely III
Harold L. Wood
Arthur W. Johnson
Douglas R. Henderson
Robert Wilcox
Chester R. Bender
Richard R. Smith
Samuel G. Guill
Paul E. Trimble
Russell R. Waesche, Jr
Joseph P. Martin
George W. Playdon
Thomas F. Epley
Julius E. Richey
Frederick J. Statts
James S. Muzzy
Raymond W. Blouin
Fred F. Nichols
Theodore F. Knoll
Frank M. McCabe
Harold L. Durgin
Joseph R. Davis
Thomas B. McKinstry
Ellis S. Gordon
Myron W. Caskey
Forrest A. Tinsler
Wayne L. Goff
Ronald M. Freeman
Joseph A. Ciccolella
Ralph S. Feola
Howard W. Schleiter
Richard H. Fairman
Clarence N. Daniel
Harold D. Seielstad
Joseph W. Naab, Jr.
Corliss B. Lambert
James McIntosh
Maynard F. Young
Mark A. Whalen
William F. Cass
Roger M. Dudley
Albert F. Wayne, Jr.
Clement Vaughn, Jr.
Chester I. Steele
Clarence H. Waring, Jr.
Peter J. Smenton
John B. Oren
Paul E. G. Prins
Edward P. Chester, Jr.
Larry L. Davis
Alexander W. Wuerker
John E. D. Hudgens
Arthur Pfeiffer
George E. Howarth
Benjamin F. Engel
Robert Waldron
George T. Murati
James W. Williams
Henry P. Kniskern
Cornelius G. Houtsma
Edward C. Allen, Jr.
Arthur B. Engel
James A. Hyslop
Benjamin D. Shoemaker, Jr.
Raymond A. Tuttle
Donald M. Morell
Charles E. Leising, Jr.
George W. Holtzman
Benjamin P. Clark
Thomas R Sargent III
Edwin B. Ing
Winslow H. Buxton
Robert D. Brodie IV
Robert W. Goehring
Harry L. Morgan
John D. McCubbin
Ross P. Bullard
Orvan R. Smeder
Victor Pfeiffer
William L. Morrison
David W. Sinclair
Robert R. Russell
Charles E. Masters, Jr.
James N. Schrader
Harry F. Frazer
Julian J. Shingler
Warner K. Thompson, Jr.
William R. Riedel
Louis B. Kendall
Ralph M. West
Charles E. Sharp
Charles W. Schuh
Lynn Parker
Claude G. Winstead
Thomas G. Byrne
Leslie G. Haverland

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenants:

Robert E. Reed-Hill
Joseph J. McClelland
Raymond G. Miller
John P. Latimer
James A. Martin
Robert E. Hammond
Clyde R. Burton
Ottis T. Estes, Jr.
James F. Bills
Paul E. Burhorst
Edwin C. Crosby
Ira H. McMullan
William C. Foster
Holmes F. Crouch
Kenneth H. Potts
James W. Paine
James A. Cornish
William K. Earle
Robert F. Barber
Joe L. Horne
Helmer S. Pearson
Chester A. Richmond
James M. McLaughlin
Whitney M. Prall, Jr.
Henry F. Rohrkemper
Charles F. Scharfenstein, Jr.
Walter R. Lewis
Robert P. Cromwell
Kenneth R. Goodwin

James W. Kincaid
Kingdrel N. Ayers
Victor A. G. Schmidt
Elmer A. Crock
James A. Palmer
George W. Girdler
Bernhard R. Henry
Robert C. Gould
Henry C. Keene, Jr.
Ellis L. Perry
Loy W. A. Renshaw
Cecil E. Meree, Jr.
Lawrence D. Bradley, Jr.
Clyde L. Olson
Joseph G. Bastow, Jr.
Bob Kirsten
John B. Speaker, Jr.
Louis F. Sudnik
John F. Thompson, Jr.
William E. Chapline, Jr.
Albert Frost
William F. Adams
William F. Rea III
James L. Lathrop
Austin C. Wagner
Stephen G. Carkeek
Norman L. Horton
Henry A. Pearce, Jr.
William A. Jenkins
Charles E. Vautrain, Jr.
John Natwig
Kenneth L. Peterson
Roy M. Hutchins, Jr.
Stanley H. Rice
Roderick L. Harris
Opie L. Dawson
Harold T. Hendrickson
Robert J. Clark
Clinton E. McAuliffe
David W. Woods
Hugh F. Lusk
James D. Luse
George C. Fleming
William C. Morill
Kenneth E. Wilson
Ward J. Davies, Jr.
John M. Waters, Jr.
Walter A. Wright
Frederick C. Munchmeyer
Harry E. Haff
Richard W. Young
Charles Dorian
Roger H. Banner
James W. Moreau
Robert P. Cunningham
Charles A. Greene
James W. Christman
Gerhard K. Kelz
Douglas D. Vosler
Edward D. Scheiderer
Leroy A. Cheney
Frederick A. Goettel
Albert A. Heckman
George F. Breitweiser
Lewis W. Tibbits, Jr.
Theodore S. Pattison
Donald H. Luzius
Arthur A. Atkinson, Jr.
John W. Sutherland
Urial H. Leach, Jr.
Richard H. Welton
Frank C. Schmitz
Ernest H. Burt, Jr.
Francis X. Riley
Bainbridge B. Leland
Jerry K. Rea
John L. Haney
Richard L. Fuller
Billy R. Ryan
Charles E. Norton
George H. Lawrence
Robert E. Emerson
Hersey C. Forehand, Jr.
Sherman K. Frick
Marcus H. McGarity
John E. Day
Fletcher W. Brown, Jr.
Charles W. Scharff
Charles M. Shepard III
James W. McGary

The following-named officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenants (junior grade):

James P. VanEtten
Joseph R. Steele
LeWayne N. Felts
Edward M. F. Kirchner
Mitchell A. Perry
Garth H. Read
David R. Domke, Jr.
John D. Richardson, Jr.
William E. Dennis
Robert J. LoForte
Owen W. Siler
Arthur Hancock
Richard A. Pasciuti
William S. Allan, Jr.
Leslie B. George
Robert B. Moore
Charles Wayne
Wallace C. Dahlgren
Harry H. Carter
Bernard E. Kolkhorst
Donald M. Reed
George W. Sohm
Carl L. Parrott
Frederick J. Hancox
Robert A. Adams
William M. Benkert
Robert A. Schulz
Warren E. Rast
Curtis J. Kelly
Austin F. Hubbard
Ward R. Emigh
William J. Zinck
Richard E. Hoover
William N. Banks
Keith Low
Daniel J. Scalabrini
Robert E. MacDonald
Edward R. Tharp
Wilfrid N. Derby, Jr.
Alexander Cameron
Alden E. Lewis
Robert T. Norris
James N. Ashbrook
Frank B. Carter
Paul Morosky
Frank M. Fisher, Jr.
Rufus S. Drury
John J. Doherty
David L. Davies, Jr.
Donald A. Caswell
Robert J. Carson
Kenneth H. Langenbeck
Robert D. Johnson
Robert F. Henderson
Paul R. Peak, Jr.
Virgil N. Woolfolk, Jr.
Elmer M. Lipsey
James A. Hodgman
Robert C. Phillips
Albert J. McCullough
Wesley M. Thorsson
Peter S. Branson
Harrison B. Smith
John M. Dorsey
Paul T. Ryan
Paul A. Lutz
Robert C. Boardman
William E. Fuller, Jr.
Parker O. Chapman
Albert B. Ellerman
William H. Brinkmeyer
George H. Weller
David A. Webb
Carl Blanchett
Richard W. Goode
James E. Murphy
James W. Carroll
James L. Harrison
Bernard S. Brown
William E. Murphy
John A. Devlin, Jr.
Milton L. McGregor
John D. McCann
Sumner R. Dolber
Garth D. Clizbe
Julian E. Johansen
Lilbourn A. Pharris, Jr.
Harold L. Davison
Richard L. Bailey, Jr.
John M. Austin
Theodore C. Rapalus
Clarence R. Easter
Harley E. Dilcher
Frank Barnett, Jr.
Edward D. Middleton, Jr.
Paul P. Perez
Marion G. Shrode, Jr.
George F. Thometz, Jr.
Arthur A. Fontaine
Frederick W. Hermes, Jr.
James T. Maher
Gordon F. Hempton
George A. Warren
William H. Boswell
Vance K. Randle, Jr.
Ricardo A. Ratti
George W. Wagner
John J. Fehrenbacher
Raymond G. Parks, Jr.
James H. Durfee
Harold K. Goodbread
Richard P. Arlander

(All the above nominations are for permanent commissions in the U. S. Coast Guard. Dates of rank to be set forth in the commissions to be issued to the foregoing officers in the rank of captain and below will conform to the dates assigned in the approved precedence list as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury.)

The following-named person to be a commander in the United States Coast Guard:

Edward A. Richmond

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Claude H. Broach
Kenneth W. Donnell
Douglas R. Shambeau
James L. Thompson
Daniel C. Dickert
John F. Gornell
Donald G. Elliott
Anthony D. Dean
Lloyd R. Morrison
Cyril L. Heyliger
Frank F. Elliott
Paul Olson
Leo M. Mallett
Charles H. Freericks
Paul J. Allman
William D. Brimner
Newton W. Winberg
Edward J. Worrel, Jr.
William T. Corfield
William B. Wilson
Herbert J. Kelly
James E. Wilkinson
William S. Vaughn
Charles F. Kaminski
Richard H. Puckett
George W. Stedman, Jr.
Rodman W. Vaughan
Theodore A. Dahlburg
Edmund B. Redington

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Charles F. W. Cullison
Ashton H. Barnes
Martin D. Berg
William D. Strauch
William B. Durham
Herschel E. Sanders
Russell A. Serenberg
Frederick B. Thatcher
Arthur M. Davison
Edward H. Houghtaling
Wilbur S. Doe
Roland H. Estey
George M. Bishop
John L. Barron
Gordon H. MacLane
William J. L. Parker
William H. Fuller
Bernard T. Clark
Louis L. Lague
Walter Curwen, Jr.
David M. Alger
David Oliver
Arnold E. Carlson
Gene R. Gislason
Henry A. Lagasse
William D. Hemeon
Thomas M. MacWhinney
Lemuel C. Sansbury
Francis D. Heyward
Thomas N. Kelley
Benjamin M. Chiswell, Jr.
John C. Saussy
Raphael T. A. McKenzie
Arthur C. Hoene
Edward F. Cotter
James V. DeBergh
Thomas F' Dunham Jr.
Ernest R. Challender
James W. Conway
Claude W. Bailey
Andrew P. Hopewell
George W. McClure
Walter N. Butcher
Charles L. Turner
James F. Phair
Robert A. Copeland Jr.
Clinton J. Maguire
Roger B. Clark
George W. Walker
Bruce W. Clark
Herman W. Klotz

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

John W. Hume
Lewis R. Davison
John H. Hawley
Carol L. Mason
Elmer Mathison
Warren C. Mitchell
Henry A. Campbell, Jr.
Charles E. MacDowell
Harold J. McCormack
William H. Monger
William W. Richards
Joseph E. Gould
Robert Adamson
David Gershowitz
William H. Dahn
James W. Swanson
Earl S. Childers
Armand J. Bush
Lester A. Levine
John J. O'Meara
George J. Bodie
Donald J. P. Evans
Lewis F. Lovell
Hudson E. Deming
Albert Frevola
Edwin J. Brummeler
Melvin S. Leach
William H. Campbell
James D. Doyle
Caleb M. Sickles
David Block
William H. Schmidt
William J. Donnay
Thomas J. Fallon
William N. Killebrew
Robert A. Lemmon
Thomas J. Hynes
William G. Fenlon
Louis Hopper, Jr.
John M. Tooley
Wilmer Clark
Albert J. Guillemette
Paul McGill, Jr.
Harry U. Potter
George L. Oakley
Elvin F. Yates
Milton B. Williams
Thomas J. O'Brien
James E. Edwards
James S. Cooper
Gwyn A. E. Williams
Louis N. Donohue
Richard C. Ragan
Herman S. McNatt
George H. Wittler, Jr.
Glenn O. Thompson

The following named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Samuel H. Yearta
Russell W. Lentner

(All the above nominations are for permanent commission in the U. S. Coast Guard. Dates of rank to be set forth in the commissions to be issued to the foregoing officers will conform to the dates assigned in the precedence list as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury.)

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Willard L. Jones
Irwin D. Weston
Robert N. Williams
Jens B. Krestensen
Chester L. Jordan
Russell W. Thresher
William E. Schweizer
Owen P. Thomas
Walter W. Reynolds
William B. Dawson
Harry E. Rowand
Luther W. Cartwright
Lance J. Kirstine
Charles E. Swanson
Stacy Y. Hammond
Attilio E. Del Pra
William H. Moulton
Thomas E. McCready
Lewis L. Whittemore
Joseph J. DeCarlo
Hugh V. Hopkins
Thomas B. Christiansen
Harry C. Gifford
William W. McKellar
Charles N. Hubbard
Augustus F. Pittman
Leo T. Robbins
James Morrison
Oliver F. McClow
David B. Sollenberger
Gustaf A. Nordling
Meyer Robbins
Norman H. Church
Almond L. Cunningham
Alexander Smith
Arendt Michaelson
Francis P. Bergmeister
Walter A. Reynolds
Clyde D. Goodwin
Harry A. Oest
Allen E. Holst
John N. Buckley
Joseph Mazzotta
Samuel D. LaRoue
Victor A. Johnson
Jonas T. Hagglove
Louis I. Reilly
Jens H. Jensen
Harold W. Parker
George V. Stepanoff
Lawrence Ditlefsen
John A. Turmala
Ralph A. Taylor

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard.

William Lieberson
Paul A. Ortman
Carlton V. Legg
George E. Alston
Cecil C. Humphreys
Virgil L. McLean
George M. Gallagher
Henry M. Anthony
Cloyd C. Lantz
Henry E. Solomon
Herbert L. Scales
William A. Ronning
Robert L. Blanchett
Carl E. Roberts
Harry F. Bradley
James E. Rivard
William E. Lowe
George D. Batley
Garland Sponburgh
John M. Joseph
Norman D. MacLellan
Joseph E. O'Hagan
James W. Stonecypher
Ralph D. Fritz
Alvin N. Fisher
Elmer M. Chandler
Howard M. Sias
Brownlow J. Fadden
Gordon P. Hammond
Ray Thorp
John O'Brien
Linwood Hudgins
Ralph Burns
Donald R. Greenawalt
Clyde R. Brink
Jesse A. Stewart
Charles F. Blake
Valentine Thornton
John L. Morgan
Anthony P. Winkler
David G. Cowie
Norman A. Dreher

Ernest D. Murray
James W. Coste
Burritt K. Cook
John Lenci
Peter Madison
James F. Mace
Stephen B. Heck
Glen S. Jennings
Michael J. Bruce
Charles V. Rudolph
Andrew F. Mackay
Charles P. Moffett
Alfred M. Haynes
George F. Erwin
Wilfred Pantzer
Walter G. Davis
Gillis G. Cook
Martin Lentz, Jr.
Hamlet I. Allen
Michael J. Hoosick
Arthur J. Schletker
Clarence J. Gilleran
William E. Ehrman
William B. Daughtry
Ralph J. Davidson
Charles Ehmann
Leonard M. Cannon
Hans A. Jensen
Arthur I. Roberts
James A. Anderson
Roy F. Sumrall
John T. Cherry
William K. Kehoe
Leonard T. Toner
John B. Klapperich
Raymond J. Buchar
Oswald R. Olsen
Hubert F. Wren
William S. Cochrane
Clifton E. Mosher
Aubrey L. Diggs
Percival A. Williamson
Oskar F. Aune
Freeman H. Harmon
William M. Powers
Sidney W. Douglas
Henry J. Cookson
Antonie Simon
Theodore M. White
Wesley J. Cumberland
James E. Hannewyk
Joseph Gnas
Carl A. Heintz
Harold A. Hutcheson
Charles H. Langlois
Gregory E. Smith
William L. DeJong
Arthur P. Minor
James C. Waters
Emmett P. O'Hara
Roderick C. Davis
Albert J. Summerfield
Frank H. Stewart
August Kleisch
Theodore McWilliams
Gerald E. McGovern
Charles C. Bennett
Ben B. Dameron
Wilfred C. Gray
Allen H. Graham
John R. MacLeod
Hubert McGee
Walter C. Bolton
William M. Prentiss
Charles Overstreet
Ray M. Marshall
James F. Carr
Robert E. Rountree
Ralph D. Fisher
Francis J. Malloy
James W. Booze
John L. Gillikin
Stewart R. Graham
Kenneth M. Bilderback
Daniel D. Murphy

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Lynn L. Baker
Thomas F. McKenna
Glenn J. Shannon
Ernest A. Bigelow
Sidney K. Broussard
Louis J. Glatz
John Dalin
Ludlow S. Baker
Frank D. Hilditch
Arthur M. Watson
Arthur H. Sheppard
Frank W. Dunford
Robert Hoyle
Donald A. Brown
Charles H. Freymueller
Raymond W. Siegel
Frederick A. Maier
Harry A. Solberg
John S. MacCormack
Herbert Krause
Donald A. MacLean
Earl L. Ottinger
Theodore J. Kozanecki
Errol H. Seegers
Forrest H. Willoughby
Robert D. Burkheimer
Jack E. Forrester
George H. Waddell, Jr.
Robert M. Becker
Franklin A. Colburn
Robert S. Wilson
Eugene F. Walsh
Andrew J. Cupples
John A. Weber
Lloyd E. Franke
Samuel E. Taylor
Richard A. Wilkie
Earl E. Broussard
Cletis L. Caribo
John F. Fitzgerald
Peter E. Gibney
Robert S. Bruce
Lewis R. LaValley
Leonard H. Dalton
Joseph D. Meagher
David C. Kierbow
Antone E. Clark
Burton V. Weston
Manson E. Meekins
Earl B. Cooper
Robert W. Smith
James P. Flessas
Robert S. Capp
Leslie F. Cool
John D. Roberts
Scott P. Berryman
William G. Blandford
Stanley G. Perret
John R. Allums
Norman E. Dion
Daniel J. Garrett
John R. Mackey
John W. Landefeld
Rayner C. Burke
Earl W. Rinehart
Joseph F. Furlough, Jr.
Ottis H. Abney
Curtis H. Jurgens
Benjamin J. Kowalski
John J. Jordan
Charles D. Budd
Howard A. Linse
Harry H. Chapin
Bertrand S. Dean
William L. Monks
David W. DeFreest
Robert L. Lawlis
Joseph J. Lamping
James W. Dodson
George D. Winstein
Joseph W. Finnegan
Frederick T. Mosher
Robert J. Mackle
Clarence S. Hall, Jr.
Joseph M. Weber
Fred T. Merritt
James E. Nesmith
Robert R. Pope
Albert E. Flanagan
Stanley G. Putzke
Charles W. Lockwood
Lloyd L. Kent
Arthur F. Heffelfinger

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

George A. Choquette
George A. Gyland
John Kruszewski
Floyd L. Hartson
Jacob C. Sorensen
Earl G. Hamilton
Lloyd S. Sadler
Loren V. Perry
Franklin H. Schonewolf
Clemons C. Pearson
Elmer Winbeck
Charles W. Smith
Nathan Vanger
Alton F. Pinkham
Ernest W. Payne
Axel R. Mattson
Marvin H. Twiford
Edward W. Jackson
Charles B. Martinson
Leland O. Wilkie
William H. Yates
Byron M. Wineke
Adam Stanzak
Paul A. Berg
Olaf T. Sturdy
Thomas B. Prather
James G. Cowart
Carl D. Eubanks
Ronald S. Krueger
Mart L. Jackson
Sterling M. Anderson
Harry S. Raleigh
Leo J. A. King
William S. Bishop
Henry J. Pfeiffer
Thomas C. Pennock
Hugh E. McCullough
Alvin J. Boxwell
Willard E. Carlson
Hugh J. LeBlanc
David T. Haislip
Stanley L. Waitzfelder
Harold D. Muth
James C. Boteler
Richard L. Huxtable
John Vukic
Orville C. Hinnen
Harold G. DeLong
Fred E. Wilson
Clarence G. Porter
Leroy Flatt
Charles R. Howell
Robert E. Bracken
Leroy B. Smith

(All of the above nominations are for permanent commission in the U. S. Coast Guard. Dates of rank to be set forth in the commissions to be issued to the foregoing officers will conform to the dates assigned in the precedence list as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury.)

The following-named persons to be captains in the Coast Guard:

Robert E. Coombs
Robert A. Smyth
Edward C. Cleave
William H. McGuire
Eugene Carlson
George W. Callbeck

The following-named persons to be commanders in the Coast Guard:

Howard C. Bridges
Ralph T. Eiland
Lewis H. Shackelford
William W. Storey
Karl C. Nielsen
Hugha F. Cobb
Frederick S. Walker
Frederick A. MacGurn
Alfred W. Kabernagel
Francis W. Leahy
John R. Coiteux
Arthur L. Dickert
Raymond C. Vose
George P. Kenney
Edward P. White, Jr.
William S. Donaldson
David T. Smith
Francis W. Richardson
William T. Butler
Philip A. Ovenden
James B. Rucker
James W. Fleming
Leo A. Welsh
Petter G. Pettersen
Joseph B. Feder
Charles P. Murphy
John B. Lyman
William E. Coates

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the Coast Guard:

John A. Brooks
Herbert E. Peters
Thomas K. Whitelaw
Arthur H. Nesbit
Frank H. Nelson
Charles F. Perry
George J. Brill
Robert H. Farinholt
Alexander G. Moberg
Alf S. Lie
William F. Driscoll
Merton Hatfield
John M. Clark
Frank J. Hicken
Robert J. Brown
George E. Dobbins
Harrison M. Suiter
Edward O. Clark
Lester E. Carlson
John T. Leonard
Charles F. Fornason
Alan Mason
Stanley J. Rovinsky
Roderick Y. Edwards
Everett M. Ward
William B. Hogg
Kolbjorn Hansen
James E. Davidson
Richard K. Griswold
James F. Brady
Thomas J. Haley
John F. Kettler
Horatio G. Thompson
Charles C. Plummer
Edmund J. Martin
Gurdon K. Baker
John W. Schmoker
Thomas F. Kane
Mayer Stockman
Harry A. Voight
Harry A. Walker
Lloyd B. Kennedy
James W. Leek
James C. Hunley
Charles W. Beach
Joseph Change
Frederick A. Reicker
Willis A. Bruso
Donald C. Gunn
Addison S. Elliot
Albert Hanna
Sverre S. Arnet
Stuart H. Waring
Jesse O. Thompson
Cortlandt W. Quinby
Lloyd L. Stoltz
Homer D. Babbidge
George E. McCarthy
Raymond J. Fugina
Burton A. Gunderson
Leroy E. Kuhns
Elmer M. Fripp
James E. Skelly
Oscar Olsen
Roland E. Messner
Allen L. Woodruff
Donald V. Reardon
William T. Smith
Toralv A. Berg
Harold C. Jones
Roy E. Van Benthuysen
Earl Tillotson
Allan P. Moffat
Thomas H. Gemmell
Robert S. Smith
Charles W. Miller
James P. Chaplin
James L. Jones
John A. Rylander
George P. Creighton
Frederick K. Arzt
Clay Clifton
John B. Hunziker
Charles M. Vasterling
John M. Goddin
Arthur S. Phelan
Paul Pollatt
Gordon E. Howell
Emmett J. Corrigan
John M. Handley
Charles W. Hendrickson
George D. Skene
William A. McFaull
William E. Pratt
Joseph Gomes
Thomas J. Dromgool
William G. Gillis
George S. Beck
Norman E. Merrill
Lee O. Moyer
Vitus G. Niebergall
Arthur S. Whitehead
John H. Cleary
Henry A. Hansen
Leif H. Konrad
Arthur R. Hoglund
Louis H. Hirschy
Henry A. Mildrum
John Littlefield
Wesley W. Wood
Norman H. T. Studley
Alton E. Borden
Otto V. Knierim
Felix S. DeSoboll
William F. Roe
James L. Rafter
Barney Frankel
John H. Phinney
Frank N. Sampson
William I. Connelly
Stanley W. Burns
Elmont L. Boisen
George C. Ferenz
Bertram J. Tuckey
John A. Rourke
Leonard C. Walen
John F. Powers
George J. Monteverdi
James M. Caulk
Joseph A. Bruno
George M. Russell
Edward B. Wiswell, Jr.
William T. Coyle
Roland P. Fox
Alfred W. Medcalf
Francis R. Dillenkofer
Patrick J. Clinton
Earl G. Young
Bernard Trachtenberg
Elmer J. Bodenlos
John H. Holm
Charles E. Klinck
Joseph E. Mallett
Joseph Yamin
Lawrence D. Connor
Lewis H. Brickhouse
Isaac R. Boothby
Clinton Critchfield
Archibald H. McComb, Jr.
John M. Cross
James B. McCarty, Jr.
Leonard E. Penso
John M. Penberthy
John B. Blain
Samuel J. Miller
Thomas P. McMaster
Theodore K. Tischler
Paul E. Savonis
George C. Steinman
John C. Hooker
James Farrelly
John W. Anderson
Charles V. Carson
Ernest S. Rasmussen
Melvin S. Richardson
Edwin W. Wickham
John F. Kinnaly
Adam A. Klein
Alexander W. Calcott
Clarence C. Jones
Horace M. Stewart
Mark B. Wallace, Jr.
Edward A. Wegge
Edward E. Dickey
Lucius E. Wadman
Arthur F. Mason
John P. Fox
Edward W. Kirkpatrick
Herbert J. Stevens
Edward L. Johnson
Earl N. Story
Ellery H. Capen
Vincent H. Casey
Leo J. Catte
Emilio G. Oliotti
Karl A. Bergman
Charles G. Cotton
James C. Campbell
William J. Willman
Charles Martin
Lewis G. Aufdemorte
Elwyn W. Hersey
Cahir M. Dempsey
Archibald F. Jones
Peter Olsen
Albert M. Curley
Jeremiah J. Cadogan
Arthur M. Vrooman
Henry Dean
Paul N. Planchet
John S. Christensen
William A. Dougan
Benjamin Malloch
William J. Tracy
Thomas E. Julin
Viggo A. Madsen
William A. Williamson
Mark J. Dierlam
Frank W. Larkworthy
Carl A. Sjolund
Raymond A. Hodge
Lester W. Raynes
Frank H. Gordy
Glenn W. Ellis
Charles C. Phillips
George O. Berntsen
Francis J. Swan
George E. Ross
Martin Spain
George E. Holland
Otto H. Hinz
Thomas McCusker
Maurice D. Melanphy

Thomas Dumont	Julius Engell
John Ulery, Jr.	Ernest Potvin
David S. Garvis	Richard K. O'Connell
John H. Kieszling	Mark L. Hocking
Andrew H. Mack	Clement B. Cozad
Samuel O. West	Carl H. Carlsen
Richard J. Shields	James H. McDowell
Jesse E. Eastman	Fred H. Cronan
Gorwan W. Larsen	John R. Silliman
Sylvius Pellegrini	John A. Fagan
Russell H. Coleman	Harold O. Rasmussen
Robert B. Scott	Reginald G. Dobbin
Charles P. McFaull	George H. Grosvenor
Thomas A. Powers	Louis P. Laussade
Clifford A. Anderson	Frederick W. Kilcline
Fred E. Morton	Martin Grade
Albert J. Happel	George W. Nantau
Robert Murdoch	Ellis D. Baker
John M. Marks	Carl H. Moen
James J. Graham	Robert F. Supper
Arthur E. Wilcox	Byron I. Reynolds
Curtis A. Alexander	Thomas S. Coffee
James R. Hooper	Francis B. Ford
Harold C. Cooper	Seymour S. VanKirk
Percy M. Endom	Robert J. Ernst
Curtis B. Cotton	Robert Flockhart
Gilbert Hinchcliffe	Joseph P. Mannix
George A. Butler	Edwin J. Lautermilch
William C. Mahoney	Bertrand J. Henesey
John D. Hill	William J. Noonan
Arthur F. Nassie	James J. L. Corkle
Thomas J. Ellison	Robert H. Burtt
Julius Schuler	Peter Snyder
Louis A. Grundler	Gustav E. Johansen
Andrew M. Thomsen	Harry J. Rhodes
Martin J. Dean	Edward R. Doty
James E. Miller	Robert G. Frye
James H. Coe	

(All the above nominations are for permanent commission in the U. S. Coast Guard. Dates of rank to be set forth in the commissions to be issued to the foregoing officers will conform to the dates assigned in the precedence list as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury.)

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 16, 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mark Edwin Andrews to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, we turn to Thee in the faith that Thou dost understand and art very merciful.

Some of us are not sure concerning Thee; not sure how Thou dost reveal Thy will to us; not sure that it is possible for us to know, in every decision, just what Thou desirest Thy servants to do. But if we could say, "This is what God wants us to do," none would vote against it, and how much time and temper and money would be saved.

Make each one of us willing to yield himself to Thee in prayer and obedience.

Come and deliver us, O Holy Spirit, for we have no hope in ourselves. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 19, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. IVES thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

HARLEY M. KILGORE, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 16, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CABLE A. WIRTZ TO BE CIRCUIT JUDGE OF SECOND CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be circuit judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Wirtz is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT M. CRISTY TO BE SECOND JUDGE OF FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 10:15 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLSON C. MOORE TO BE FOURTH JUDGE OF FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF VINCENT C. BURKE TO BE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice of a hearing on the nomination of Vincent C. Burke to be First Assistant Postmaster General, to be held in the committee room of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a week from tomorrow at 10 o'clock in the morning.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rent Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit in a hearing this afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF TREASURY ON STATE OF THE FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the state of the finances of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

SPECIAL ASSISTANTS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, under the appropriation "Compensation of Special Attorneys, etc., Department of Justice" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirty-third annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A paper in the nature of a petition, from the State Committee of the Liberal Party of New York State, relating to the control of in-

flation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions of sundry members of the Adult Council, Henry Street Settlement Anti-Inflation Council, and the Madison House Vladeck Tenants' League, all of the lower east side, New York City, N. Y., praying for the reestablishment of price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Mothers' Club of Public Schools 84 and 8, Long Island City, N. Y., favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Council of American Master Mariners, of New York, N. Y., signed by Thomas W. Sheridan, secretary, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; ordered to lie on the table.

LETTERS FROM UNITED STATES CITIZENS TO RELATIVES ABROAD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in the past made a number of suggestions of methods by which American citizens can help in an adequate information program overseas. I am grateful for the many kind comments which I have received on my suggestions, as well as for the constructive criticisms from newspapers and others. At this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD some further suggestions which I have along this general information line.

As will be noted from my present and previous comments, my purpose in making these suggestions is to prevent our information program from becoming just one more bureaucratic operation involving vast expenses to the Government, and not accomplishing the results intended by Congress. I was glad to vote for the Voice of America bill, but I believe that the big question in connection with this legislation, as with so many other bills, is as to how it will be administered. Will it be done efficiently, economically, in cooperation with private news gathering and distributing agencies, or will it fail, as so many other high-minded projects have failed, because of bureaucratic maladministration?

I want American newspapers and American citizens to make their fullest contributions to our overseas publicity program, rather than have some Government propaganda mill here in Washington try to do the job alone.

Mr. President, at the last meeting of the Senate the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] presented for the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post, which brought out an idea about which I have thought a great deal, namely, that we must see to it that in the utilization of the press, the radio, and other instrumentalities, we do not find ourselves in the position of subsidizing them, because that would give Russia an opportunity to say, "You see, this is just a propaganda machine operated and paid for by the United States Government."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me entitled "United States Citizens Should Write 'Liberty Letters' to Relatives Abroad as Part of Information Program" be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CITIZENS SHOULD WRITE LIBERTY LETTERS TO RELATIVES ABROAD AS PART OF INFORMATION PROGRAM

Supplementing my suggestions of December 4 and 10, I believe that every United States citizen who has relatives or friends in foreign countries has a responsibility to constitute himself, or herself, a one-man or one-woman agency for the purpose of spreading abroad the truth about America.

There is no single better medium of publicity than in the letters that come straight from the hearts of millions of American citizens of foreign birth or of foreign ancestry to the folks in the land of birth of their fathers or the foreign land of their own birth. These letters can become a flood of liberty correspondence which will really ring the bell, the liberty bell, behind the iron curtain.

The following points might be stressed in such a program:

REPORTING OUR AID

1. American citizens writing abroad should write about true conditions in America, stressing the many blessings that we enjoy in this land of freedom, the comforts, the conveniences, as well as stressing the aid that we have already extended abroad for the noblest of humanitarian purposes—both as individuals and as a Nation.

2. They should ask questions from their relatives in order to determine just what misinformation must be counteracted, what false stories are being told about America. Then these untruths should be squarely antidoted in the Americans' letters.

3. Supplementing the correspondence, Americans writing abroad might include newspaper clippings or magazine articles whenever possible. If necessary, these clippings and articles may be from foreign-language papers and magazines. Of course, such papers and magazines should be themselves of unimpeachable loyalty and integrity to our country.

MAGAZINE SUBSCRIPTIONS

4. Americans should take out newspaper and magazine subscriptions wherever possible, if necessary, to foreign-language publications here and send these subscriptions abroad. From time to time inquiry might be made as to whether or not the papers are being actually received or read, in order that they might not simply go unread or confiscated by some government. Wherever possible, encouragement should be given so that foreign folks will reciprocate the Americans' courtesy by perhaps sending clippings or whole issues or subscriptions to their papers to us. In this way we can get an idea of what is written in their press, and they can get an idea of what is written in our press. At the same time, we will avoid making the mistake of constantly giving and never seeking anything in return. This constant giving serves to cheapen our own gift, which is not fully respected and appreciated, simply because it is a one-way and free gift. On the other hand, if foreign folks got in the habit of reciprocating our courtesies they, in turn, would more highly prize the things that we send to them.

BEING WELL INFORMED OURSELVES

5. Americans should make sure when they write abroad that they themselves are adequately informed about our country and about all that it means to the world. This means that it is up to us to know the basic documents of our own land, the basic meaning of our freedoms, and the meaning of our way of life as contrasted with the totalitarian way of life.

Every American letter going overseas can become a message of liberty and an inspiring challenge to foreign people. It can be a means of closer and warmer understanding of the United States and of what we are trying to do in the fields of foreign and domestic policy. Years ago liberty letters to relatives abroad swelled the floodtide of immigration here. Today such letters can swell the wave of democracy—the wave of the future—throughout the world.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. FLANDERS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1842. A bill to amend the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; with amendments (Rept. No. 826).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the months of September, October, and November 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of September 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va., Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual rate of salary, $7,102.20.

O. BREWSTER,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of October 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va., Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual rate of salary, $7,102.20.

O. BREWSTER,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM
UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of November 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va., Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual rate of salary, $7,102.20.

O. BREWSTER,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 2015. A bill to amend and extend the maximum rent provisions of Public Law 129, Eightieth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 2016, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accept enlistments of aliens in the Regular Army, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2017. A bill granting a permanent civil-service status to certain persons whose names were passed over in making appointments from civil-service registers prior to World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2018. A bill for the relief of Satish Chandra Mondol; and

S. 2019. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Armand Gregoire against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2020. A bill for the relief of Jong Ah Ying; and

S. 2021. A bill for the relief of Jesus T. Esteva and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2022. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Cryor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. TOBEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 2023, to provide for the national defense, to protect the national security, and to promote the general welfare of the United States by providing for the effective distribution of materials and facilities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. FLANDERS introduced Senate bill 2024, to provide for the allocation of meat, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2025. A bill for the relief of the families of certain merchant seamen who lost their lives in an airplane crash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 2026, to provide for a temporary increase in compensation for employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 2027. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended;

S. 2028. A bill to amend the law relating to the possession, carrying, and acquisition of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 2029. A bill to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

S. 2030. A bill to provide that compensation of members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

S. 2031. A bill defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2032. A bill to provide priorities for veterans in the occupancy of Government residential property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2033. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306); and

S. 2034. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2035. A bill to provide for government, relief, economic rehabilitation, reorientation, and reeducation in occupied areas in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the maritime commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to create a Committee on Capital Clearance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accept enlistments of aliens in the Regular Army, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me together with the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

I am introducing a bill "to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accept enlistments of aliens in the Regular Army" and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. Reasons for introducing such a bill are as follows:

1. Due to the failure of the voluntary recruiting system to attract a sufficient number of men, we are at present between 60 percent and 70 percent short of the minimum strength of five divisions which the Army requires in combat ground troops, not counting occupation forces.

2. There is no published plan to make up this difference. The only manpower plan which is proposed, in addition to the continuation of voluntary recruiting, is universal military training and this will, at least initially, have an adverse effect on the question of getting sufficient personnel for a standing army, because about 80,000 officers and enlisted men would be needed to put it into operation. There is also reason for believing that universal military training may discourage voluntary enlistments, although the expectation of its enthusiastic proponents is that many young men, after having been in the Army for a while, will like it so well that they will want to stay for 3 years more.

3. Unless we are prepared to return to selective service, which is indeed a last resort, this leaves two methods for bringing the combat Army up to strength.

4. One method is to increase the number of civilian employees in the Army so as to relieve the soldiers of as many noncombat duties as possible, thereby enabling them all to serve in combat units.

5. The other method is to recruit aliens for occupation duty. In connection with this proposal it should be said:

A. That it will fill up the gaps which the present system of voluntary recruiting is unable to fill;

B. That it will relieve the very bad condition which is caused by the policy now being forced on us by circumstances of sending 18-year-old boys to Germany. I am told reliably, Mr. President, that to many of these boys this is such a demoralizing experience that they will never get over it. Moreover, it is not possible to send the older men to replace the 18-year-olds because they have all served their time abroad and it would not be fair to them to send them back.

C. There are many young men of Polish, Czech, anti-Nazi German, Russian, Byelorussian, and other stocks who would gladly serve. There is no doubt that such men could be obtained and that they would be loyal and efficient soldiers. Such troops could certainly be used to garrison occupied areas such as Germany, Austria, Trieste (Korea, Japan, and the Pacific islands).

D. Their number should be limited—say 50,000 at the start, and in any case never more than 15 percent of our total Army.

E. After 5 years of service—a most thorough screening period—the alien would be eligible for American citizenship. We should get some fine and useful citizens as a result of this process.

F. This also offers a partial solution to the problem which is presented by the displaced persons in that it would enable the entrance of certain selected persons into the United States after satisfactory military service.

G. Although the Secretary of the Army has a technical power to take this step today, I believe that such an important step should not be taken on a technical basis but with the deliberate approval of Congress.

6. It has been said that perhaps the Russian Government might not like it. Insofar as that argument is concerned, it seems superfluous to say that our efforts to please the Russians have not been crowned with success and that the Soviets are sure to vilify us no matter what we do. Having already compared our President with Hitler, it is hard to see what there is left for them to say. Moreover, they have not criticized the French Foreign Legion and could not consistently criticize us for recruiting aliens. There are, in fact, plenty of reports that they have done the same thing.

7. Although it is not an exact parallel, it is interesting to note that Britain in her zone in Germany has eased her manpower problem by using Danish, Norwegian, and Belgian units.

8. It should be noted that we ourselves are at present employing non-American citizens to guard our supplies, etc., in Germany so that no new principle would be established.

9. Transcending all these arguments, however, is the fact that there are millions of people the world over who look to the United States as the guardian of democracy. It is only right that the young and able-bodied men among these people should have the privilege of helping us carry the torch. For many reasons, they cannot put their own armies into the field. But their young men can help, and should be enabled to do so. We may well recall the help which Lafayette, Kosciusko, Steuben, and Pulaski rendered in the War of the Revolution and which their descendants gave in the Civil War. It may also be remembered that the United States Army has had successful experience in organizing units of foreign troops. Both the

Indian scouts and the Philippine scouts were in this category.

10. It can in any case not be denied that the failure of the voluntary recruiting system leaves us with the alternative of either adopting conscription, hiring more civilians, or enlisting aliens for occupation duty. Conscription is a desperate last resort. The hiring of civilians will probably not greatly affect the total, and, in any event, would not cure the present evil of exposing our 18-year-old soldiers to demoralizing influences in occupation areas. This leaves the alien soldier as the best solution.

11. If we do nothing, we shall have an Army which is not prepared for war. Without a combat army to seize and hold bases neither our Navy nor our Air Force can give us a balanced armed force which is immediately ready to fight. Earlier this year I offered an amendment to a bill providing for 70 air groups. No one is a stronger believer in that branch of the service than I am. But modern war is a balanced affair between the three branches of land, sea, and air. We must be ready now because we are told that in the war of the future there will be no time to prepare. As General Eisenhower has said, the issue may well be decided in the first 60 days.

The bill (S. 2016) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to accept enlistments of aliens in the Regular Army, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized until June 30, 1950, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified aliens not less than 18 years of age nor more than 35 years of age for an enlistment period of not less than 5 years for service outside the continental United States, its territories and possessions.

SEC. 2. Provisions of law prohibiting the payment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall neither apply to aliens who enlist in the Regular Army under the provisions of section 1 of this act nor to their dependents and beneficiaries.

SEC. 3. So much of section 2 of the act approved August 1, 1894 (28 Stat., ch. 179, 216; 10 U. S. C. 625), as amended, as reads "; and in time of peace no person (except an Indian) who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not made legal declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, shall be enlisted for the first enlistment in the Army" is hereby suspended until June 30, 1950.

ALLOCATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN MATERIALS AND FACILITIES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the national defense, to protect the national security, and to promote the general welfare of the United States by providing for the effective distribution of materials and facilities, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated January 16, 1948, addressed to me by William Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, may be printed in the RECORD, together with the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter presented by the Senator from New Hampshire, together with the bill, will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter presented by Mr. TOBEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1948.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: At the hearing on January 14, 1948, before your committee, you requested that I send to you a draft of a proposed bill which was intended to carry out the recommendations made by the President with respect to allocations. A draft of such a bill is attached.

In substance this draft is similar to the proposed bill which was transmitted on December 8, 1947, to the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Some deletions have been made by reason of the enactment of the joint resolution of December 30, 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.), which makes unnecessary certain provisions contained in the earlier draft. Thus the provisions for continuing of allocation powers over railroad facilities and equipment and for continuing export controls, and the provisions limiting immunity under the antitrust laws, all contained within Public Law 395, are no longer in this draft. In addition, the new draft includes fuels and nitrogenous compounds suitable for the production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials within the listed items over which complete allocation powers, including rationing, would be granted.

Fuels were included at the request of the Department of the Interior, and the nitrogenous compounds were included as result of the studies of our Office of Materials Distribution, which feels that the granting of this power would assist materially in the production of needed supplies of fertilizers.

I appreciate very much your interest in this matter as well as the productive discussion of these questions which took place when I appeared before your committee.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. HARRIMAN,
Secretary of Commerce.

The bill (S. 2023) to provide for the national defense, to protect the national security, and to promote the general welfare of the United States by providing for the effective distribution of materials and facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (by request), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Priorities and Allocations Act of 1948."

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) Certain materials and facilities continue in short supply at home and abroad as a result of the war. There is a danger that these scarce materials and facilities will not be available for essential purposes at home and abroad, and that the demand for these scarce materials and facilities will result in further inflationary rises in prices. These inflationary price increases and maldistributions of scarce materials caused by war and its aftermath are impeding, and unless corrected will continue to impede the free flow of commerce among the several States and with foreign nations. Voluntary cooperative efforts, which must be assisted and encouraged by the Government, will help to eliminate or reduce the effects of these scarcities, but these voluntary efforts alone will not be sufficient to protect the United States from the effects of the scarcities. The continued exercise of certain limited emergency powers is required to complete the orderly reconversion of the domestic economy from a wartime to a peacetime basis, to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the American people, to promote the national defense, to aid in preventing inflationary price increases, and to support the foreign policy of the United States.

(b) The Congress hereby declares that it is the general policy of the United States to continue emergency wartime controls of materials and facilities to the extent necessary for the following purposes:

(1) to protect the domestic economy from the injury which would result from adverse distribution of scarce materials and facilities which basically affect industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living or where adverse distribution would result in failure to fulfill requirements essential to the domestic economy, or would contribute to inflationary price rises;

(2) to promote production at home and abroad of materials critically needed in the United States which basically affect industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living or where inadequate supplies of such materials are resulting in failure to fulfill requirements essential to the domestic economy, or are contributing to inflationary price rises;

(3) to make available materials and facilities to countries in need consistent with the foreign policy of the United States; and

(4) to aid in carrying out the foreign policy of the United States.

PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

SEC. 3. In order to effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 of this act, subsections 2 (a) (1) and 2 (a) (2) of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676) as amended by the act of May 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 236) and as further amended by the Second War Powers Act 1942 (56 Stat. 177), are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2 (a) (1) (A) In order to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Priorities and Allocations Act of 1948, the President may, in his discretion, assign priority to deliveries under any contract or order over deliveries under any other contract or order, and he may require acceptance of and performance under such contracts or orders in preference to other contracts or orders for the purpose of assuring such priority, whenever the President finds that either of the following circumstances exists:

"(i) The prompt filling of the contract or order is needed to bring about an early increase, or prevent a substantial reduction or break-down, in the production of a material or facility, at home or abroad, which is critically needed in the domestic economy and which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living, or

"(ii) The head of the agency designated by the President for this purpose certifies that the prompt filling of the order is of high public importance and essential to carrying out the foreign policy of the United States, especially foreign-aid programs; and the head of the appropriate agency designated by the President to act under paragraph (B) or (C) certifies that proposed action will not have an unduly adverse effect upon the domestic economy of the United States.

"(B) Whenever the President in his discretion determines that a shortage in the supply of any of the materials or facilities listed below is interfering or may interfere with the fulfillment of the over-all requirements for the defense of the United States and for carrying out the foreign policy of the United States or is resulting in an adverse distribution of the material or facility which is causing or threatens to cause a failure to fulfill requirements essential to the domestic economy or which will contribute to inflationary price increases, the President may allocate such material or facility (and the facilities needed for its production) in

such manner, upon such conditions and to such extent as he may deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Priorities and Allocations Act of 1948, and he may assign priority to deliveries of such material or facility under any contract or order over deliveries under any other contract or order, and may require acceptance of and performance under such contract or order for the purpose of assuring such priority, in order to carry out such policies:

"(i) Tin and tin products, except for the purpose of exercising import control of tin ores and tin concentrates; antimony; cinchona bark and quinidine, when held by any Government agency or after acquisition (at any time) from any Government agency, either directly or through intermediate distributors, processors, or other channels of distribution, or when made from any materials so acquired; and nitrogenous fertilizer materials and nitrogenous compounds suitable for use in the production of nitrogenous fertilizer materials; and fuels;

"(ii) Iron and steel, including rolled, forged, cast, and drawn products, for the purpose of limiting the less essential uses and of assuring, by the use of priorities and set-asides, availability for the most essential of the other uses;

"(iii) Grain and grain products; rice and rice products; dried beans and peas; fats and oils of vegetable, animal, or marine origin (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, margarin, soap, and soap powder); livestock and poultry and their products; milk, and its products.

"(C) Whenever the President in his discretion determines, after a public hearing held upon reasonable notice, including publishing a notice in the Federal Register, copies of which shall be sent to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and after such investigation as he may deem appropriate, that a shortage in the supply of any other material or facility which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living is interfering or may interfere with the fulfillment of the over-all requirements for the defense of the United States and for carrying out the foreign policy of the United States, or is resulting in an adverse distribution of such material or facility which is causing or threatens to cause a failure to fulfill requirements essential to the domestic economy or which will contribute to inflationary price increases, the President may allocate such material or facility, in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he may deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Allocations and Priorities Act of 1948, this authority being limited, however, to restricting the less essential uses and assuring, by the use of priorities and set-asides, availability for the most essential uses; and he may assign priority to deliveries of such materials and facilities under any contract or order over delivery under any other contract or order and may require acceptance of and performance under such contract or order for the purpose of assuring such priority, in order to carry out such policies.

"(D) Whenever the President deems it necessary, in order to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Priorities and Allocations Act of 1948, he may restrict and control inventories of any scarce material which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living, so as to carry out such policies, without regard to the requirements of paragraphs (B) and (C) above, and in so doing he may establish specific inventory limits for different classes of persons and different materials.

"(E) Discrimination against orders or contracts to which priority is assigned or for which materials or facilities are allocated under this act or under any regulation or order issued under this act, either by charging higher prices for such orders than for other generally comparable orders, or by imposing different terms and conditions for such orders than for other generally comparable orders, is prohibited.

"(F) The President may issue such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary to carry out this subsection 2 (a) (1), and any such rules, regulations, and orders may contain such classifications and differentiations and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the President's discretion are necessary or proper to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Priorities and Allocations Act of 1948.

"(2) This section 2 (a) as amended (including the amendments made by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and section 3 of the Priorities and Allocations Act of 1948) shall be in force until March 31, 1950, except that the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power, authority, or discretion under such section 2 (a) as amended. The amendments to such section 2 (a) (1) made by section 3 of the Priorities and Allocations Act of 1948 shall not be construed to limit or restrict the authority conferred by Public Law 24, Eightieth Congress, approved March 29, 1947, or Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, approved December 30, 1947."

EXEMPTION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 4. Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after "Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947" the following:

"Section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676) as amended; Public Law 24, Eightieth Congress;"

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) The President may exercise any part or all of the power, authority, and discretion conferred on him by this act through such existing department agency, Government corporation, or official of the Government, as he may direct.

(b) Each officer or agency to which the President delegates any of the powers, discretion, and authority conferred by this act shall make a quarterly report, within 30 days after each quarter, to the President and to Congress of its operations under this act. Each such report shall contain a statement of the controls which it exercised under this act during the quarter, and detailed information as to the manner in which the controls were exercised and the effects of the controls. Each such report shall contain a statement of the facts and reasons for the continuance of each of the controls exercised during the quarter.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, including the employment of personnel for the purpose of rendering of assistance and encouragement to voluntary cooperative action on the part of various segments of the public. Any funds appropriated pursuant to the authority of this section, section 9 of the act of December 30, 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.), may be expended without regard to the Civil Service Act and rules.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 7. Title XV, section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1501. Titles I, II, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this act and the amendments to existing laws made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted."

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 8. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SALARY INCREASE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to give a temporary cost-of-living salary increase to the school teachers of the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement of the bill by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with an explanatory statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2026) to provide for a temporary increase in compensation for employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all employees whose compensation is prescribed by the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $1,000 per annum, during the period covered by this act as provided in section 2; except that any such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed the rate of $8,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of January 1, 1948, and shall terminate at the end of the first month thereafter in which the index of the cost of living for the District of Columbia as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics shall be equal to or lower than it was on January 1, 1943.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CARRAN ON TEACHERS' PAY BILL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I have just introduced a bill designed to give a temporary cost-of-living salary increase to the school teachers of the District of Columbia.

The aim and intent of this bill is justice. I am aware that the salaries of teachers in the District of Columbia have been increased in recent years. I am proud that I took a substantial part in securing that increase. But the real wages of these deserving men and women is less today than it was 5 years ago, in spite of the dollar increase which they have received; and 5 years ago, the woeful inadequacy of teachers' salaries here in the Nation's Capital led the Congress to take action for the correction of a situation which nearly everyone agreed demanded correction.

It was in 1943 that I introduced the bill to give Washington's teachers a temporary salary increase to help meet the rising cost of living until we could pass legislation to bring their salaries more nearly in line with what they ought to get. I was happy to sponsor that bill, and to lead the fight for its enactment. It was enacted; and subsequently,

after several years of effort, we were able to secure enactment of permanent legislation revising the salary scale for employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

That permanent legislation, however, went little if any beyond the increases granted earlier, on a temporary basis. But the cost of living continued to go up in the meantime, and has not halted.

The bill which I have introduced would grant additional compensation to Washington teachers at the rate of $1,000 per year, except that such additional compensation, or any portion of it, would not be paid if the result would be to raise the aggregate rate of compensation above $8,000 per year.

This increased compensation would be effective as of January 1, 1948, and would continue until the cost-of-living index for the District of Columbia, as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, gets back down to the level it occupied on January 1, 1943.

THE WORLD PROBLEM WE FACE—ADDRESS BY JOHN COWLES

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The World Problem We Face," delivered by John Cowles, of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOOD SITUATION IN THE AGRICULTURAL WEST—LETTER FROM GERALD GORDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Mr. Gerald Gordon, secretary-manager of Associated Industries, Topeka, Kans., in which he gives information as to the food situation in the agricultural West, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENTS OF HEAVY INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT TO RUSSIA—LETTER FROM CHARLES K. MORRILL

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Charles K. Morrill, county commander of the AMVETS of Essex County, Mass., relating to shipments of heavy industrial equipment to Russia, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM SOUTHWORTH LANCASTER

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway, by Mr. Southworth Lancaster, traffic manager of the Boston port authority, published in the Boston Sunday Herald, January 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO EUROPE—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SCHEDULES OF INVENTORIES AND DELIVERIES

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Ralph S. Trigg, Deputy Administrator, dated December 31, 1947, enclosing schedules of inventories held by the Commodity Credit Corporation as of October 31, 1947, and schedules showing deliveries to cash-paying foreign governments, for the fiscal year 1947 and the quarter ending September 30, 1947; which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FREEDOM TRAIN

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter by Miss Patti Bees, entitled "Why I Want to See the Freedom Train," from the Montgomery Advertiser and Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE DETROIT NEWS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Read it Carefully, Senators!" from the Detroit News of January 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, one from the Brattleboro Daily Reformer of January 14, 1948, another from the Rutland Herald of January 13, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

HIGH TAX ON BIG INCOMES HELD HURTING PRODUCTION—ARTICLE BY FRANCIS P. DOUGLAS

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "High Tax on Big Incomes Held Hurting Production," by Francis P. Douglas, published in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., on January 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a résumé of the history and objectives of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOUBLE HARNESS FOR THE ST. LAWRENCE—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Double Harness for the St. Lawrence," from the New York Times magazine of January 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COOPERATIVE HOUSING VENTURE PAYS OFF—ARTICLE BY EARL ARONSON

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cooperative Housing Venture Pays Off," by Earl Aronson, from the Washington Post of January 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COST OF FOREIGN AID—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. WHERRY (on behalf of Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article with respect to the cost of foreign aid, by Frank C. Waldrop, published in the Washington Times-Herald, January 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the calendar was called last week, I shall ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with today. The intention is to call the calendar a week from today, and I will ask Members of the Senate to take notice of this announcement.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, during the morning hour it was announced that it was our intention to proceed with the call of the calendar a week from Monday, after morning business shall be concluded. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with it today.

I also ask unanimous consent that when the calendar is called a week from today, which is the regular procedure, the Senate begin with Calendar No. 863, where the call of the calendar was ended on January 12.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The order was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, January 26, 1948, at the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 863.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is about to address the Senate, has a message that is of very great interest to all of us. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Massachusetts withhold his suggestion until the conclusion of the morning business? It is about concluded.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. It is our hope that on Wednesday we shall take up for consideration the civil-service retirement bill. I am not so sure that that can be done, but I think Senators can rely on this statement, at least, that on Wednesday it is our hope to make that bill the unfinished business, recess until Friday, and have the bill taken up for consideration on that day.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To what bill is the Senator referring?

Mr. WHERRY. The civil-service retirement bill. Also, I should like to repeat the announcement made earlier, that it is not our intention to dispense with the calling of the legislative calendar a week from today, but it is the intention to call it for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, and then to proceed with consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, if it meets with the approval of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are no resolutions coming over from a previous day. The morning business is concluded.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Buck	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kilgore	Russell
Butler	Knowland	Saltonstall
Byrd	Langer	Smith
Cain	Lodge	Sparkman
Capper	Lucas	Stennis
Chavez	McCarran	Stewart
Connally	McCarthy	Taft
Cooper	McClellan	Taylor
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McKellar	Thye
Ecton	McMahon	Tobey
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Ferguson	Malone	Umstead
Flanders	Martin	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Maybank	Watkins
George	Millikin	Wherry
Gurney	Moore	Wiley
Hatch	Morse	Williams
Hawkes	Murray	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent on official

business of the Committee on Public Lands.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. FLANDERS. For how long?

Mr. HOLLAND. About 5 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, because of the serious times through which we are passing, I think it may be worth while to ask the Senate to remember for just a few minutes that today is the birthday anniversary of Gen. Robert E. Lee, a great Virginian, a great southerner, and a great American. I hope the Senate will permit me to speak for a few minutes in commemoration of the one hundred and forty-first birthday anniversary of General Lee. I do not wish to speak of his military prowess, or of any quality which would mark him as peculiarly a product of any one State or section; but because of the nature of the trials with which our Nation is now beset, I feel that it is appropriate to speak of him as an outstanding American, and as one from whose life we may all gain inspiration and learn lessons which will help us better to face the problems with which we are now confronted.

I feel that there have been too many memorial addresses seeking simply to express the viewpoint of the speaker. Therefore, I have three brief quotations from others.

The first quotation is from a letter written by General Lee himself after the War Between the States to Governor Letcher, the war Governor of Virginia. I quote briefly:

> The duty of its citizens, then, appears to me too plain to admit of doubt. All should unite in honest efforts to obliterate the effects of the war and to restore the blessings of peace. They should remain, if possible, in the country; promote harmony and good feeling, qualify themselves to vote and elect to the State and general legislatures wise and patriotic men, who will devote their abilities to the interests of the country and the healing of all dissensions. I have invariably recommended this course since the cessation of hostilities and have endeavored to practice it myself.

Mr. President, it seems to me that at this particular time, when the differences of opinion which exist in this Nation are nothing like so violent as those which had existed just prior to the time of this noble utterance by General Lee, it might be well for us again to bring to mind his admonition that a citizen has no more important duty to all the people than to promote harmony and good feeling and to qualify himself to participate in the selection of the finest men whom he can find to assume the responsibilities of government.

The second quotation is from a great southern biographer and historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, of Richmond, Va. At the close of his four-volume biography of General Lee, Mr. Freeman speaks of him as follows:

> Of humility and submission was born a spirit of self-denial that prepared him for the hardships of the war and, still more, for the dark destitution that followed it. This self-denial was, in some sense, the spiritual counterpart of the social self-control his mother had inculcated in his boyhood days, and it grew in power throughout his life. He loved the luxury that wealth commanded. Had he been as rich as his Grandfather Carter, he would have lived in a style as hospitable. Fine horses and handsome clothes and lavish entertainments would have been his; Arlington would have been adorned, and his daughters would have enjoyed travel and the richest comfort. But Arlington was confiscated, its treasures were scattered; each stage of his sacrifice for the South brought him lower and lower in fortune until he was living in a borrowed tenant house and his wife was husbanding the scraps from a pair of trousers a farmer's wife had made for him. His own misfortunes typified the fate of the Confederacy and of its adherents. Through it all, his spirit of self-denial met every demand upon it, and even after he went to Washington College and had an income on which he could live easily, he continued to deny himself as an example to his people. Had his life been epitomized in one sentence of the Book he read so often, it would have been in the words, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." And if one, only one, of all the myriad incidents of his stirring life had to be selected to typify his message, as a man, to the young Americans who stood in hushed awe that rainy October morning as their parents wept at the passing of the Southern Arthur, who would hesitate in selecting that incident? It occurred in northern Virginia, probably on his last visit there. A young mother brought her baby to him to be blessed. He took the infant in his arms and looked at it and then at her and slowly said, "Teach him he must deny himself."
>
> That is all. There is no mystery in the coffin there in front of the windows that look to the sunrise.

In the virtue of self-denial I think will be found much strength to help carry American citizens through the actual privations which I am sure will confront us in the years which lie immediately ahead.

I close with a quotation from an epic poem written by Stephen Vincent Benét, a great Pennsylvanian, who was, by the way, the son of a colonel in the United States Army, and whose grandfather, Stephen Vincent Benét, was an officer in the United States Army during the War Between the States. In his poem, John Brown's Body, he pays one of the finest tributes to General Lee which I think has been uttered by anyone:

> And so we get the marble man again,
> The head on the Greek coin, the idol-image,
> The shape who stands at Washington's left hand,
> Worshipped, uncomprehended, and aloof,
> A figure lost to flesh and blood and bones,
> Frozen into a legend out of life,
> A blank-verse statue.
> How to humanize
> That solitary gentleness and strength
> Hidden behind the deadly oratory
> Of 20,000 Lee memorial days,
> How show, in spite of all the rhetoric,
> All the sick honey of the speechifiers,
> Proportion, not as something calm congealed
> From lack of fire, but ruling such a fire
> As only such proportion could contain?
>
> The man was loved, the man was idolized,
> The man had every just and noble gift.
> He took great burdens and he bore them well,
> Believed in God but did not preach too much,
> Believed and followed duty first and last
> With marvelous consistency and force,
> Was a great victor, in defeat as great,
> No more, no less, always himself in both,
> Could make men die for him but saved his men
> Whenever he could save them—was most kind
> But was not disobeyed—was a good father,
> A loving husband, a considerate friend,
> Had little humor, but enough to play
> Mild jokes that never wounded, but had charm.
>
> Did not seek intimates, yet drew men to him,
> Did not seek fame, did not protest against it,
> Knew his own value without pomp or jealousy
> And died as he preferred to live—sans phrase,
> With common sense, tenacity, and courage,
> A Greek proportion—and a riddle unread.
> And everything that we have said is true
> And nothing helps us yet to read the man,
> Nor will he help us while he has the strength
> To keep his heart his own.
>
> For he will smile
> And give you, with unflinching courtesy
> Prayers, trappings, letters, uniforms, and orders,
> Photographs, kindness, valor, and advice,
> And do it with such grace and gentleness
> That you will know you have the whole of him
> Pinned down, mapped out, easy to understand—
> And so you have.
> All things except the heart.
> The heart he kept himself, that answers all.

Mr. President, I hope that the mention of General Lee's qualities of devotion to duty, of self denial, of gentleness, of kindness, and of the promotion of harmony and unity among his people after a time of great violence and great difference of opinion, will not be found by the Senate to be inappropriate at this particular time.

ALLOCATION OF MEAT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the allocation of meat.

The bill (S. 2024) to provide for the allocation of meat, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to say a few words at this time to explain the nature of this bill and my reasons for introducing it.

The bill relates to the allocation of fresh and processed meat and meat products, including rationing thereof at the consumer level. It authorizes the President to do everything necessary to formulate such an allocation or rationing program, including the complete preparation and distribution of the necessary papers, forms, and other documents, and the planning of an organization to administer it.

The bill forbids the direct setting of maximum prices. But by controlling effective demand, the free play of the mar-

ket will itself control prices. Intelligently administered, rationing will assure prices high enough to bring out heavy supply, yet lower than result from limitless demand on temporary short supply. In addition, the available supply will be more broadly distributed.

The bill does not provide for the actual initiation of allocation or rationing. Before that can take place the President must submit his program to Congress, together with a report in the form prescribed in section 6A of Public Law 395, of the Eightieth Congress, commonly known as the anti-inflation bill. It will be remembered that this section provides that the President shall state the circumstances requiring the proposed measures, give a detailed procedure for their administration, including a specification of the additional budget and personnel requirements, indicate the proposed degree of curtailment and the formula to be employed, and give a complete record of the factual evidence on which his recommendations are based.

After such recommendations have been made there is provided a period of 30 calendar days of continuous session on the same terms as that prescribed in the Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, during which time Congress can take action to prevent the putting of the program into action.

The administration of the proposed act is placed with the Department of Agriculture, and only the Secretary may exercise the powers, authority, and discretion so delegated as a part of the administration of that Department. No separate or new authority may be set up.

Unless and until the actual procedure of allocation or rationing is requested by the President, together with an appropriation therefor, provision is made for the preparation authorized by the act, by transfer or otherwise, of such amounts as may be necessary, not exceeding $1,000,000, from any appropriation or fund available to any bureau, corporation, or agency within the Department of Agriculture.

The authority granted by the act will expire on January 31, 1949, or on such earlier date as the two Houses of Congress may adopt in a concurrent resolution declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by the act is not necessary.

Mr. President, no one realizes better than I the seriousness of this proposal. It can be justified only by the seriousness of the conditions which threaten the country at this time, and it warrants consideration now only because of the fact that it will take some months of preparation to organize action of the kind for which the necessity is feared. When the crisis comes upon us, if it does come, it will be too late to make preparations for meeting it.

What is the situation which we fear will make allocation and rationing advisable? What we have reason to fear is the further and even accelerated continuance of an inflationary spiral, already under way, which particularly affects meat and meat products.

As a result of the testimony presented at the hearings of the Eastern Price Investigating Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which hearings lasted more than 2 months and covered the country east of the Alleghenies, it became clear that the cost of food is the serious element in the cost of living for the low-income groups. Whereas it has been considered that normally one-third or less of the family budget goes for sustenance, testimony was repeatedly presented to the effect that among this group the percentage which had to be devoted to food is rising to 40, 50, and, in some extreme hardship cases, even 60 percent of the total family budget.

We remember, of course, that there are differences of expertness in food purchasing and food preparation on the part of the housewives. In many cases in which these extreme percentages appear more skillful buying and preparation of food might have reduced the percentage of the income which had to be devoted to this part of the cost of living. It did not appear, however, that any combination of skill and experience could have done more than mitigate the burden which the high cost of food is putting on the overloaded shoulders of this unfortunate group of our fellow citizens.

It is clear from the testimony that the wage increases made since the end of the war have tended to widen the gap between the lower-income groups and those who have been most successful in gaining advances. There has been a wide disparity between the highly organized and highly paid wage earners, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, white-collar workers, workers in many service occupations, employees of intrastate businesses, and others who have had no adequate adjustment of their pay to meet the increased cost of living. Meanwhile, the new advances, contemplated and asked for, widen this gap still further.

Besides the low-paid wage earners there are elderly people living on pensions and retirement allowances, publicly or privately provided for; all those living on the painfully accumulated savings of a lifetime; many groups of governmental employees, for instance, the postal clerks; Federal and State employees, notably school teachers, as well as firemen, policemen, and other workers, accounting in the aggregate for many millions who are in severe and increasing distress. There must be added to this practically all those connected with religious and charitable institutions such as preachers, hospital employees, and others. The employees of charitable institutions are particularly hard hit since the financial conditions in which these institutions find themselves make any increase in the pay to their employees difficult, if not impossible.

It is this growing body which has been left behind, which should give us most serious concern from the human standpoint. Were it not for this increasing gap between the two groups, and the continuing increase in the numbers of the group left behind, we would be unconcerned as to a rise in the price of living which was matched by an increase in income. We would be unconcerned, that is, from the human standpoint, though we would still be seriously concerned as to the effect of such a situation on our economy as a whole, and on the prospects for continued high employment, production, and consumption.

The plight of this low-income group carries with it economic dangers, as well as human suffering, to the extent that a larger and larger percentage of the family budget has to go to food. To that extent the ability to purchase other consumer goods is diminished. To that extent the market for clothing, entertainment, household equipment, furniture, and other necessities will be severely curtailed. This factor alone may well be the one which sets a limit on our present prosperity, so-called, by starting a recession in those businesses which deal not merely with consumer luxuries, but with consumer goods which, though necessities, are still less so than is the food which keeps the human being in health and even continued existence from day to day.

There is no single contribution to slowing up the continued rise in the cost of living which can be as effective as focusing our attention on meat. While food is the largest single element in the family budget, meat is the most expensive and most uncontrolled factor in the cost of food. Under present conditions it accounts for at least 12 percent of the normal family budget. If we can arrest the increase in this one factor and if we can, hopefully, start it moving in the reverse direction, we shall do more to relieve the acute problems of the family budget than by doing anything else about anything else.

No one familiar with the situation holds out any hope for anything except a further rise in meat prices on a scale more serious than anything we have yet experienced.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question and a very brief comment in connection with the food cost to which he has reference?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. This morning we had a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and Mr. Dodd, Under Secretary of Agriculture, was testifying before the committee. Mr. Dodd said that under their price-support purchasing of eggs, alone, they have purchased more than 60,000,000 pounds of excellent powdered eggs and frozen eggs, and are holding them in cold storage at the present time. He said they have put them in storage at a cost of slightly over 30 cents a pound, and that under the law by which the Commodity Credit Corporation is governed they cannot sell these eggs at a loss, but must sell all the commodities they have in storage at what they cost them.

I wonder whether the Senator knows that the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot find a market for that excellent food product—eggs—for which they would have to receive approximately 35 cents a pound if they resold them, which would be at the equivalent of about 35 cents per dozen. In the event that they continue to be unable to find a market for these eggs—which, if sold by them, must be sold for slightly more than 30 cents a pound, then is it not better that we commence to examine ourselves as a

nation by going into such situations and determining what we must do legislatively and what we must do in policing those who have put all kinds of food commodities into cold storage and are holding them in cold storage, hoping and hoping that by their very action they can force up the market price, so that they can make a profit on those commodities?

This morning there came across my desk a letter from an operator of a large cold storage plant, who says, "My plant is full to the roof with commodities," and he also referred to the large quantities of commodities stored by the Commodity Credit Corporation and other agencies.

I mention these points now because I believe we should examine ourselves as a nation, rather than take steps to put the Nation under police control. I believe that such control is not now necessary, because the cold-storage warehouses are full of commodities, whereas the legislation enacted by Congress ties the hands of the Government agencies in such a way that they are prevented from disposing of, for instance, 60,000,000 pounds of dried eggs.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I think the Congress might well consider the matter of the prices which the Commodity Credit Corporation is allowed to charge, and a little later in my remarks I shall have some things to say about the problems of policing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say for the record, and because I think it should be stated at this time, in connection with the able remarks which have been made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that having in mind exactly the situation of which the Senator from Minnesota has complained, at the time when the authorization bill, and later the appropriation bill, relating to the giving of intermediate foreign aid to western Europe was before the Senate, some of us offered a provision, which was written into the authorization bill, and, in somewhat different form, and even enlarged, was written into the subsequent appropriation bill, by which questions such as that relating to dried eggs, to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred, are solved by the diversion of such surpluses for consumption in Europe. In that bill we did exactly what has been suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, in that we permitted the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell such commodities at a loss, for use in the foreign relief program, and permitted it to write off that loss, in an amount not to exceed $57,500,000, limited, however, to food commodities in surplus supply purchased under the price-support program and thereafter diverted for European relief.

So, if I correctly understand the situation, the problem complained of by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has been solved to a very considerable degree by the method just suggested.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. At the present time, farmers in my State are selling poultry at prices ranging from 12 cents to 17 cents a pound. I understand that in Washington the price to the consumer is around 40 cents a pound. Therefore, the middlemen—those who handle poultry between the farmer and the consumer—are receiving more than the farmer himself receives.

If the Senator's bill were effective, and if it reduced the price received by the farmer for his poultry to a level below the present low levels, which compare very well with the prices of 4 or 5 years ago, it seems to me that the net result would be a lowered production and only more trouble in the future.

I cannot see any reason for imposing police controls again at this time, unless we go all the way and get at the high profits which are being piled up between the producer and the consumer.

In fact, just the other day a statement was issued to the effect that the chain stores made greater profits last year than in any previous year. It seems to me that is more the problem, rather than the problem with the producer himself. By this I mean dealers in food ought to operate on a more reasonable profit margin.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, whom I thank for his observations, that in this bill it is not proposed to control poultry in any way.

Mr. YOUNG. How about meat, then? In the case of meat, is not the difference between the price the farmer receives and the price the consumer pays almost as great as in the case of poultry?

Let me say that I have every sympathy for the cause the Senator is representing, and I certainly have great respect for the Senator personally; but I think that in connection with these items we should not place the shackles of controls on the farmers exclusively. I think the largest profits at the present time are being made by the middlemen.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I think what the Senator has said is perhaps particularly true in the case of many commodities. The investigations made by our price committee indicated that there are very severe mark-ups, particularly in the case of vegetables and other fresh produce, and indicated severe mark-ups in other lines. However, speaking for myself, let me say I was astonished to find that the public records of packers and distributors, such as chain stores, although indicating unprecedented aggregate profits, nevertheless indicate that the profits on the basis of the dollars of sale were small enough so that if they had given up all their profits and if the profits thus given up were expressed in terms of lower prices to the consumers, the consumers would scarcely have noticed the difference. That was one of the most astonishing things that came out of our study. In other words, those profits are for the most part made by taking a thin shaving off a very fast-moving stream of production.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I do not think the profit is so thin, at times. For instance, the testimony in our Committee on Agriculture this morning, by the Department of Agriculture, included a statement that now, when a loaf of bread is selling for 15 cents, the cost of wheat entering into that loaf of bread is only 4 cents. The other 11 cents goes entirely to middlemen and processors. If the price of wheat were reduced $1.50 a bushel, bread would still be selling at 13½ cents a loaf.

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, that I am not trying to make out the same case for bread as for meat. I am referring strictly to meat. I think the conditions turn out to be very much different when we look at the figures involved.

Mr. YOUNG. I appreciate that, but I am concerned about all the controls sought to be imposed upon the things the farmer produces, with nothing of a similar nature to be imposed upon the manufacturer or upon labor. I fear that we shall wind up just as we did after the First World War, with the farmer footing the bill, receiving nothing for the things he produces.

Mr. FLANDERS. I hope, sir, to express not merely my sympathy with, but my confident hopes for, the future of the stock raiser and stock feeder, before concluding my remarks.

Mr. YOUNG. If I may add, just for the RECORD, the price that the farmer in my State is receiving for his poultry, as of January 15, is, on heavy hens, 18 cents; roosters, heavy, 17 cents; roosters, light, 12 cents. That affords a considerable contrast to what the good people of Washington are paying for poultry.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is a contrast, sir. No one familiar with the situation holds out any hope for anything except a further rise in meat prices on a scale more serious than anything we have yet experienced.

The short corn crop of 1947 and the limits placed on the use of other grains, particularly wheat, aggravate the prospect. The requirements for European relief have seriously cramped the supply of feed grains and the substitutes for feed grains among the food grains. Even more serious than this is the fact that the increased incomes of the higher income groups tend to express themselves particularly in meat. The purchase of more and higher grade meat is the way in which the American is accustomed to express an improvement in his income. It is most unfortunate that this tremendously increased demand on the part of the better-paid group results in depriving those less fortunate of the share to which they have been accustomed.

With this short supply of feed and an effective consumer demand without visible limits, the price of this food element continues upward day by day. The shortage in feed and the stimulus of present high prices has resulted in heavy movement of meat animals to the market. This heavy movement is at the expense of future supply. The demand will continue and expand. The supply will diminish. We have ahead of us in weeks or months from now, a situation which we may safely predict as being one in which meat prices will go far beyond anything we have ever previously experienced or

imagined. It is to meet this contingency that the bill is introduced.

I have spoken primarily of the human aspects involved. Serious though these are, we might feel hesitant to return to any measure of control were it not for the fact that broad-scale and important economic considerations are involved as well. The bill is proposed as a major contribution to the control of our existing inflation. Its place in our whole economy may be expressed as follows:

While monetary and fiscal factors and policies set the ceiling to which inflation may rise, there works beneath that ceiling a machinery of inflation which we see in active and effective operation. That machinery is the wage-cost-price-cost of living spiral which makes its continued upward progress month by month, with no evidence as yet of meeting any brakes or deterrents to its progress. Every price advance furnishes the motive power for this mechanism. Every wage advance makes more certain its continued operation. As this vicious spiral rises over the months and years, we can view with melancholy confidence an impending disaster of resulting calamitous deflation, which will express itself in unemployment, decreased incomes, restricted consumption, and general distress. We are justified in believing that the higher this spiral goes the more severe and the more extended will be that subsequent deflation and unemployment. It is therefore of the utmost importance that we find the means to put the brakes on this inflationary machinery.

Mr. President, I conceive the bill which I am introducing today to be a major instrument in the control of this inflationary mechanism. If we can bring the price of meat under control, we can make an important contribution to arresting the increasing cost of living. That is a contribution which Government can make to solving our problem.

There is a contribution which industry can make. If those businesses whose profit margins are good—and there are many such businesses—will at least hold off on price rises and preferably lower them by a moderate amount, the other elements of the cost of living will also have been brought under control. The recent action of the General Electric Co. in reducing its prices for household equipment and the action of the Weyerhaeuser Lumber Co. in reducing the cost of lumber, are both significant contributions to this effort. A third one recently noted in the papers was the endeavor on the part of the boys' clothing manufacturers to bring their price onto a more reasonable basis.

There can be and must be more effort of this kind. As an example, the prosperous oil refiners should reverse the mounting price of fuel oil for household heating. This will be the contribution of business to a restraint of the vicious upward spiral.

Mr. President, if the Government can make its contribution with regard to the price of meat and if business will expand its contribution to controlling the prices of other materials and products so that, in combination, it becomes evident that we are really contributing to the balancing of the family budget, then business and Government and public opinion in general may with confidence ask organized labor to restrain its requests for this new revolution of the fearful machinery of inflation. I have the necessary confidence in the public spirit of organized labor and in its intelligent analysis of its long-range interests to believe that such action on the part of Government and of business will meet with a ready response from the better-paid wage earners.

It may be objected, and it has been objected, that black markets would quickly destroy the effectiveness of rationing. As against this fear let us remember that the Congress will authorize rationing only on insistent public demand. Under such conditions most of the policing will be done by the people. Let it also be remembered that we have but one commodity to control, and that, as to rationing only and not as to price. A little policing will go further. Let us not forget that we shall be rationing a volume of meat which we would have considered abundant in past years. We are not rationing as the result of real scarcity. Let us finally remember that black markets grow with time. The critical period would not be expected to outlast one corn-crop failure and one season of drought-ruined grain crop in western Europe.

It may be objected, and it has been objected, that the proposals of the bill place the burden of restraining inflation in too heavy a measure on stock raisers and stock feeders. I am sure that consideration of the problem as a whole and with respect to its effect in maintaining our general prosperity and averting a serious decline will override the apparent short-range interests of those engaged in animal husbandry. Even as the demand for meat expands with prosperity, so it contracts with depression. Anything which maintains that prosperity is in the long-range interest of this branch of agriculture.

Furthermore, in placing the administration of rationing in the hands of the Department of Agriculture we give assurance that it will be administered in the long-range interests of the American farmer. It will be easier to do this since, if rationing is so administered as to lower the price to the farmer unduly, it will diminish the needed supplies. It is the essence of wise administration that the price at the stockyards should be high enough to warrant high production on the farms and on the ranches. If this is not done, the controls fail of their purpose.

It is an admittedly uncontrollable factor at the present time in the shortage of feed grains. I can see no reason why this should affect the shortage of animal production so far as beef is concerned. It is no real hardship to have to go to grass-fat cattle. The meat is not of as high quality, but the pressure cooker and other ways of preparing render such meat tender, palatable, and nutritious. We are concerned here with quality not quantity. As to the quantity, every assurance can be given, as stated before, that prices resulting from administration by the Department of Agriculture will assure profit from high production. To assume any other result is to assume an ineptitude for the existence of which there is no evidence.

Mr. President, in my humble opinion there is no other industry in the Nation which has an assured future which can be compared with that of stock raising and feeding. As has already been stated, prosperity for the American family expresses itself in meat. If we can assure prosperity, we can assure a large and profitable market for the meat raiser. This bill is primarily a contribution to the maintenance of that prosperity on which the animal husbandry of the Nation depends for its future profits.

In closing let me again emphasize that the bill merely makes provision for establishing the machinery of allocation and rationing. The actual putting of that machinery into operation cannot take place unless it is the will of Congress that it should take place. It will not be the will of Congress to allow allocation and rationing actually to be undertaken unless and until the popular demand for it becomes so strong that the process can be administered successfully on the basis of a widespread support in public opinion. The danger is that that strong necessity and strong demand may come when we are months away from our ability to meet it. The purpose of the bill is to provide for that contingency when, as, and if it appears in insistent form.

Mr. President, we are engaged in a new and serious undertaking. We are undertaking to do what our Nation has never done before or, so far as I know, what has never been done by any nation at any time. We are attempting to maintain high employment, high production, and high consumption on a basis of broad distribution, and at the same time avoid a destructive end to this condition by inflation. I commend the bill to the earnest consideration of the Members of this body as a contribution to the solution of the problem of the continued maintenance of a high and well-distributed national prosperity.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for a question?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The bill the Senator has introduced, as I understand, provides for allocation and rationing of meat——

Mr. FLANDERS. And meat products.

Mr. LUCAS. And meat products. Yet it gives the administration or the executive branch of the Government no authority at this time to enforce any of its provisions. That, as I understand, would be a factor to be determined eventually by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The question I wish to propound is this. What does the bill do, if anything, with respect to delegating power to the executive branch of the Government to prepare for the eventual passage of a rationing bill by Congress?

Mr. FLANDERS. I read that——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator probably read it, and I apologize for not having been present and heard it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I read that provision from the bill itself. It is as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, is hereby revived and reenacted for the exercise, but only in accordance with the provisions of this act, of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by such title III with respect to the allocation of fresh and processed meat and meat products, including the rationing thereof at the consumer level.

The President is authorized to do all things necessary to formulate a program under this act, including, but not limited to, the preparation, printing and binding, and distribution of necessary papers, forms, records, and other documents and, subject to the provisions of section 4 hereof, the planning of an organization to administer such program.

Does the Senator wish me to go on with respect to the provision authorizing the machinery?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I thank the Senator, but he will not have to do that for me.

Has the Senator conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture or any other agencies of government which would be compelled to follow through with the preparing of the necessary machinery, as is suggested in the bill, with respect to whether they have the personnel or whether they have the funds to do the things the Senator is requesting be done in his bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say that I have so conferred. The suggestion of the Secretary, so far as the funds are concerned, is to be found in section 8 of title I:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out this act. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to this section, there may be utilized, by transfer or otherwise, such amounts as may be necessary, not exceeding $1,000,000, from any appropriation or fund available to any bureau, corporation, or agency within the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. It seems to me from what I know of the problem that the Senator is certainly on the right track. I cannot foresee any harm whatsoever arising from the adoption of such a measure.

Mr. FLANDERS. As a result we may have spent $1,000,000 uselessly. There is precedent for doing that.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FLANDERS. Would the Senator from Minnesota mind if I cleared up the matter I now have under discussion with the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. THYE. No, indeed. I am sorry to have interrupted.

Mr. FLANDERS. I was speaking, of course, with misguided humor when I said there was precedent for wasting a million dollars. What I should say is that it is a small insurance premium to pay if we can, by the expenditure of that sum, avert a major calamity.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. FLANDERS. If the Senator from Minnesota will excuse me, I will yield to him next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont declines to yield to the Senator from Minnesota until he has concluded his colloquy with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. What I have to say will not take long, I assure the Senator. What the Senator is attempting to do through his measure is simply to have the machinery prepared and ready for the emergency which he anticipates is coming as a result of the shortage in the corn crop and as a result of the situation which exists in the meat commodities of the country at the present time. There is nothing in the bill which would delegate to the President of the United States authority to ration or control or allocate anything. In the event the time comes—and I believe it will come—when the people of this country will be so economically disturbed, as the result of the constant increase in food prices, that they will eventually demand that such legislation as now discussed has become a reality. When that time arrives, then Congress would pass a second bill, which would provide for the taking of certain action, but in the meantime all that the Department of Agriculture would be doing is getting the machinery ready so that they would not have to wait perhaps a couple of months to put the second bill into effect. The Department then will have the machinery all set up and the facilities ready to proceed in the event Congress decides to make the move which the Senator suggests.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the effect of the present bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the only reason I wanted to make a comment at this time was that the able Senator from Illinois asked whether there would be any harm in inaugurating at this particular time the mechanics for administering rationing. The only harm which I recognize today in connection with any discussion of rationing or any discussion of control is that many persons have sought to obtain meat-storage facilities and that every person who has been able to obtain storage facilities has been busily engaged in filling them. I read an article in a newspaper not so many weeks ago in which the Senator from Vermont himself was quoted as having said he had the storage plant in his home filled. If the people of the Nation have a fear that we are going to reestablish some type of control it will result in lessening the normal market flow by reason of the fact that people will fill their lockers and private storage plants as rapidly as they are able to fill them. That in itself will create another run on the meat supply, which is already short, and, on top of that, it will create the danger of a black market in meat.

It may be said, Mr. President, that we are all rational human beings and will never resort to such an unpatriotic action; that we will not black market our livestock, and so forth. But it has been proven in every nation which today has controls in operation, as they are in European countries, that the black markets are in full operation there, and if black-market operators are threatened with respect to one particular commodity they will shift over to another commodity, and in that way create a scarcity in that other commodity.

What we should attempt to do here is to control the black market. If illegal slaughtering is indulged in it will mean the loss of byproducts which are so necessary to the health of all of us, and particularly to those who are affected with certain types of ailments, for they will be deprived of certain products which are necessary to keep them in good health or alive. When the byproducts of animals slaughtered in the normal manner are lost by reason of the slaughtering of animals in the black market there will be scarcities created in medical supplies. Under black-market operation, hides will not be properly cared for. That will create a further scarcity of leather. Leather production is now in a distressed condition, and black-market operations will aggravate that distress. I could go on and enumerate many other evils which would result as a reaction to the suggestion which the Senator from Vermont has put before us here today respecting proposals to reration or recontrol meats.

That is the reason why I wished to comment at this particular point.

Mr. COOPER and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FLANDERS. If the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Illinois do not object, I should like to say a word or two about the lockers full of meat. I think that privilege is one which should be granted to me.

My recollection is that in talking with a gentleman engaged in stock feeding I spoke somewhat expansively about having meat in a locker. A member of the staff of a certain radio commentator telephoned and asked if it was true. I gave him the details as to the meat in my locker, which the commentator very calmly and completely disregarded in making the broadcast.

I have three children. Each child has a husband or wife, as the case may be. The total progeny amounts to eight grandchildren, who afford one of the greatest satisfactions a person can have when he reaches my age. I assure Senators that children have nothing on grandchildren.

From the total number of children and grandchildren let us subtract two who are infants in arms. That leaves 12 meat eaters, aside from Mrs. Flanders and myself. Last fall, before I thought anything about meat rationing, we had one grass-fed steer put into the meat lockers. It was not a new undertaking. I even did it under OPA. I did it strictly in accordance with OPA rules. At that time the animal was brought up and fattened on a farm in which I had a large interest—not complete ownership,

but enough thousands of dollars so that it worried me then. I have since written it off.

We have in the meat lockers, then, what is left of that one steer. The lockers are nearly full, but their contents consist largely of fruits and vegetables and the remains of one steer. To that extent I am guilty.

Let me say, however, that I am not sure that meat lockers are a bad thing in the long run. I am not sure but they will tide the country over during a period of scarcity and somewhat relieve the tremendous demand, to the extent that they come into operation at a later time of heavy pressure of demand on prices, and thereby make the task of the Government that much easier.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. A thought occurred to me when the Senator stated that meat in lockers might tide us over a short period. That would be true in the case of the person fortunately situated with meat in his locker. However, I am concerned about the poor lady whom I used to see when meat rationing was in effect, standing in the street waiting for the butcher shop to open. Then she would rush in with all the others, in the hope that there would be a piece of meat for her when she got to the counter. I am concerned about that person, and not the man with a locker full of meat to provide for his children and their children. When she cannot find meat in the meat market or at the storage plant, she is not as well situated as is the person whose grandfather or someone else has meat in the locker.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest two things to the Senator from Minnesota. The first is that there is an effect favorable to this imaginary lady in an imaginary queue. A certain amount of the effective demand for meat has been removed by the man with a high income who has stored it away. By the way, so far as I know meat lockers in my region, they are largely filled by ordinary people. The people with large incomes have not been the moving spirits in starting the cooperative lockers or in filling them.

The second point is this: Remember that we shall be rationing what we have always considered to be an abundance instead of a scarcity. My guess is that the queues will be very short, and will not extend out into the rain, the snow, and the hail.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in the very able speech which the Senator has made, he stated that the price of meat was the central factor in the high cost of food. I ask the Senator if his statement is based upon a belief that if the price of meat continues to rise there will be an incentive to farmers to feed more and more grain to livestock, and that the supply of grain will be diminished, which will be reflected in the cost of other foods.

Mr. FLANDERS. There are two factors involved: One is saving grain and the other is controlling the cost and distribution of meat. In a way they are tied together. Extremely high costs have led to the feeding of high-cost grain. However, my principal approach to the question in this bill has been from the standpoint of control of a major element in inflation on the economic side, and an endeavor to bring about better distribution at a somewhat lower cost to a growing group of American citizens who are being left behind. There are those two elements—one of a human sort and the other of an economic sort.

Mr. COOPER. Let me ask the Senator if it is true that the domestic consumption of meat today is approximately 150 pounds per person, as compared with 125 2 or 3 years ago?

Mr. FLANDERS. It was a little more than that in the year 1947. It is not expected to be quite so high this year. In fact, the supply is variously estimated at between 125 and 135 pounds, which for many years past has been considered an ample supply of meat.

Mr. COOPER. Would it be true, if rationing were imposed, that there would be as much meat per person available as was available 3 or 4 years ago?

Mr. FLANDERS. That would be the expectation because the temporary flow of beef creatures to the market and the temporary shortage in hogs because of the lack of feed are both reckoned in the estimates which I made of 125 to 135 pounds per capita.

Mr. COOPER. I gather from what the Senator has said that he has no doubt that in the next few months there will be an increased demand for a diminishing supply of meat.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. If his assumption is correct, why is the Senator proposing to postpone the matter of rationing rather than advocating that it be imposed now?

Mr. FLANDERS. The answer is very simple. We cannot ration successfully until the general population is aroused to the necessity for rationing.

Mr. COOPER. However, if the Senator's assumptions were true, is it not true that the situation in the future will be much worse respecting supply and demand than it is today, and that prices will have advanced?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. Sometimes one must have a pretty hard toothache before he is willing to go to the dentist.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to return to the lockers for just a moment and ask my colleague if he does not think it is about time for the professional critics of the farmer who kills a hog or a steer and freezes the carcass in his locker to come forward with some workable plan showing the farmer how he can kill from 20 to 30 pounds of a steer at a time, and not criticize him for having the whole animal frozen.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say to the senior Senator from my native State that there is a research problem in agriculture which has not yet been adequately solved by the research staff of the Department of Agriculture, and that is some means of cutting T-bone steaks from a steer without killing it. When that can be done such criticism will be justified.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make an additional observation with respect to the locker situation?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand from what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has said, the lockers are practically all filled at the present time.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the best information we can get.

Mr. LUCAS. So whatever we do will not have very much effect upon the locker situation, because we cannot get more meat into them than is there at this particular moment.

Furthermore it seems that when we get into one of these arguments we get into the discussion of black markets. Some would want it to appear that the Senator is introducing a measure which would immediately establish a black market in meat throughout the country. I challenge that contention on the basis of what the Senator has said. It should not be forgotten that this measure does not do anything other than give the Secretary of Agriculture a certain amount of authority to prepare for the eventful day which we all hope will not come.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the bill, all we are doing is taking time by the forelock. I do not see why there should be very much complaint about that kind of an operation. To say that people are immediately going to do something illegal, which is in line with what some have done before, is not in harmony with the provisions of the bill. When the Senator from Minnesota spoke about the lady who waited in line under OPA——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will permit me to make a remark at this point.

Mr. FLANDERS. I will yield if the Senator from Illinois is willing to have me yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I had hoped I might be able to finish my statement. We may be here a long time this afternoon.

Mr. THYE. It will take only a moment of time.

Mr. FLANDERS. Out of courtesy to the Senator from Illinois, I shall let him finish his sentence.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. It is customary and usually parliamentary to permit a Senator to finish his statement before he is interrupted by another Senator. I am making only a short statement in the Senator's time. That is, strictly speaking, against the rule. But it is seldom that a Senator is interrupted in such fashion in the middle of a statement.

Mr. FLANDERS. I take it that the Senator from Illinois does not have a speech in mind, but simply a brief statement.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. What I was about to say I think is applicable to what the Senator from Minnesota stated regarding the lady who waited in line, in the rain, to get a piece of round steak. If she did get a piece of round steak at 48 cents a pound in the butcher

shop, under OPA, that is more than the same lady, who may come from a family on an income of $2,500 or $3,000 a year, is getting today. That lady does not get any round steak at the present time, because she cannot afford to buy it, due to the high price.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Vermont. The only reason why I was so brash as to interrupt at that particular moment was that it seemed so pertinent to the thought which the Senator was expressing at the time. That was the reason for the interruption. Cattle must be placed in feed lots, and if there is a question raised as to whether we shall reestablish rationing, it immediately breaks off the normal chain of events. The man who normally builds his feed lots to fatten and grow a certain tonnage of beef immediately stops then and there. There is a break in the chain of production that cannot be overcome. The same is true of the man who is planning to farrow pigs next August or next July for fall production. If he thinks he can make more by selling grain today, he will sell it at today's prices, and he will not be prepared for production in the fall. That chain of events will be broken. It will have two reactions. That is what has happened in European countries, and it is reasonable to believe that in the United States people will act as they have in European countries, such as France and Italy and the other countries which are involved with rationing at the present time.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say to the junior Senator from Minnesota that it is entirely possible that stock raisers and feeders will act on the impulse of the moment, on very short-range interest, and against their long-range interest. I had supposed that that fleeting nervousness was characteristic rather of the money market in New York than of the solid, substantial, down-to-earth raisers and feeders of stock. I tried to say in my talk before this body that there is no imaginable consideration that can be brought to bear on this subject by anyone which does not indicate to my mind that the future of the stock raiser and feeder is the rosiest, that stock raising is the most hopeful branch of agriculture whatsoever in this country, and that it is menaced only by one thing, namely, by a drop in the standard of living of the American people. Anything which tends to maintain that standard of living is something in which stock raisers and stock feeders are tremendously interested. So long as our people are well paid and prosperous, so long will they make their principal method of expressing their prosperity the purchase of more and better meat.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The real purpose of the bill is to reduce the price of meat; is not that correct, Senator?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; and to better distribute it; but not to reduce it below a price at which it will make it unprofitable to raise cattle.

Mr. YOUNG. During the course of the able Senator's remarks he referred to beef and stated that rationing would not reduce the number of cattle. To a certain extent I would agree with him, but that would be untrue as to hogs. For instance, the reduction in the number of hogs now is due directly to the higher price of corn. The hog lives entirely on grains.

Mr. FLANDERS. A grass-fed hog is a rare animal.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. If we should reduce the price of hogs, there would immediately be another sharp reduction in the number of hogs, which would further aggravate the problem and extend it that much further into the future. I think if the people would wait until next year, when we should again get a corn crop and get hog production up, the problem will be solved. The more we go into rationing the bigger our problem will be in the future.

Mr. FLANDERS. The observations of the Senator from North Dakota are cogent and almost convincing, except from this standpoint: I think that with a good corn crop we may confidently look to the early return of pork on the market as a means of tiding us over the long period of scarcity of beef. Pork has always been the mainstay of the lower-income groups. They are the ones who are in most serious difficulty at the present time. We should not do anything about reducing the price of hogs as long as corn is as scarce and as high as it is at the present time.

Mr. YOUNG. I would agree with the able Senator that there are certain laboring groups, particularly white-collar workers, who are severely hurt. But it is difficult for me to understand why, with the tremendous purchasing power of the American people, the price of beef is being forced up when we have a better supply than we have had for a long time. Someone must have money to spend.

Mr. FLANDERS. Someone must have money to spend, and those who have it are forcing the demand. As I tried to explain in my introductory remarks, there is a situation in which one group of our citizens is continuously expanding its income and leaving another group behind. That group is very definitely being left behind, and there are millions of persons in the group—not just a few tens of thousands, or a few hundreds of thousands, but literally millions of them.

I yield the floor.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused for my absence during that portion of the session at which I was not present today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—FAR EASTERN COMMISSION DOCUMENT NO. 230

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on Friday, December 19, 1947, I brought to the attention of the Senate the document known as FEC 230. Since that time I have raised certain questions concerning this document and related policies with the State Department and the Department of the Army.

For the information of the Senate I wish briefly to review the situation. On December 15, 1947, a copy of FEC 230 came into my possession from a non-Government source.

On December 17, 1947, while the Senate Appropriations Committee was holding hearings on the emergency-aid program, I requested Mr. William Butterworth of the Far Eastern Section of the State Department, then a witness before the committee, to supply us with a copy of FEC 230. The Department complied that afternoon and sent a copy to the committee, but pointed out that it was classified as confidential.

During the 40 days that have passed, I have requested by letter, personal conference, and telephone that this document be made public. To date, this has not been done.

During my remarks on December 19, 1947, I said:

> Although I am in complete accord with the policy of breaking up cartels and trusts in both Germany and Japan, I believe that FEC 230 and other policies being followed in Japan go far beyond this.

Today I wish to point out why I believe this to be so.

On April 12, 1947, the "law relating to prohibition of private monopoly and methods of preserving fair trade" was promulgated and has been in effect in Japan since then. This law, which is broader and perhaps better than our own antitrust laws, prevents monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade.

If the Government of Japan in following S. C. A. P.—Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers—directives was dissolving corporations for the violation of the provisions of this law, there would be a basis for commending S. C. A. P. for some big-scale trust busting. But FEC 230 and certain other policies go far, very far, beyond trust busting.

The claim is made by the State Department that FEC 230 is not final policy, but was only submitted to the Far Eastern Commission for their consideration and action. It was also indicated that our Government had withdrawn the document for further study.

Let us look at the record.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of a booklet entitled, "Activities of the Far Eastern Commission." It is a report by the Secretary General to the Secretary of State. On page 7 of that booklet, where Committee No. 2, on "Economic and Financial Affairs" is discussed, the following appears:

> Chairman: Mr. F. C. Everson (United Kingdom).
>
> Deputy Chairman: Mr. Roswell H. Whitman (United States).
>
> Subjects for consideration: Extent and character of Japanese industry, commerce, and agriculture necessary for a viable economy in Japan; measures necessary to establish such an economy, such as regulation of Japanese foreign commerce, control of agriculture, control of fishing and aquatic industries, control of transportation and communication, and control of industries.

Just why so much emphasis is placed on "control" rather than rehabilitation is difficult to understand.

Mr. President, FEC 230 is an 18-page document outlining a "policy of excessive concentrations of economic power in Japan." It was submitted by the United States representative and was circulated among the other members on or about May 12, 1947. Section 5 of that document provides:

All individuals who have exercised controlling power in or over any excessive concentration of economic power, whether as creditors, stockholders, managers, or in any other capacity should be:

a. Divested of all corporate security holdings, liquid assets, and business properties;

b. Ejected from all positions of business or governmental responsibility;

c. Forbidden from purchasing corporate security holdings or from acquiring positions of business or governmental responsibility at any time during the next 10 years.

In addition to the above, certain lesser restrictions apply to others, as is indicated by the following language also found in section 5:

All other persons likely to act on behalf of the individuals described above should be subjected to the measures specified below. Determining who such persons may be, such factors as ties by blood, marriage, adoption, or past personal relationship should be taken into account.

Mr. President, all this is to be done without any accusation, trial, or conviction as a war criminal or as any other type of law violator by either American or Japanese standards.

Now let us see how the property of the "purgee" is to be disposed of. Section 6 states:

a. Policies which facilitate the conveyance of divested holdings to new owners should not be modified by an effort to obtain any specified degree of compensation for the former owners of these holdings. The overriding objective should be to dispose of all the holdings in question as rapidly as possible to desirable purchasers; the objective should be achieved even if it requires that holdings be disposed of at a fraction of their real value. In negotiated sales of divested holdings to desirable types of purchasers, the purchasers' ability to pay, rather than the real value of the holdings, should affect the fixing of prices and terms of payment.

Section 7 states:

If necessary to complete the liquidation within about 2 years, invitation of bids upon securities from eligible purchasers, and acceptance of the highest bids, however low such bids may be.

Mr. President, I call to your attention and to the attention of the Senate that this is not a proposal of the Kremlin as you might suspect, but is the official American proposal to the Far Eastern Commission.

Now let us see who these "desirable purchasers" are. In section 8b it is stated:

A decided purchase preference, and the technical and financial aid necessary to take advantage of their preference, should be furnished to such persons as small or medium, entrepreneurs and investors, and to such groups as agricultural or consumer cooperatives and trade-unions whose ownership would contribute to the democratization of the Japanese economy. * * * in the case of negotiated sales, prices should be fixed with special reference to such purchasers' ability to pay, as should the time period allowed for payment of these prices.

So much for our Government's proposal for purging the former owners without trial of any kind; sale of their properties without regard to their value; further cuts in the sale price to fit the purchasers ability, if any, to pay; or financing of the sale to cooperatives and labor organizations, a considerable number of which in Japan are Communist-dominated.

Apparently, however, those in the economics section of SCAP believed that the already adopted "Anti-Trust" legislation did not go far enough. Like some of our Washington bureaucrats they wanted unlimited power over all Japanese companies, regardless of whether they were monopolies. I have been informed, but have not yet been able to verify the story, that at about 6 p. m. on the evening of December 9, which was the last day the Japanese Diet was in session, several men representing themselves as being from occupational headquarters arrived and strongly urged, if in fact they did not demand, that the new economic deconcentration bill be enacted. As a result, it passed the lower House, and then went to the House of Councillors at about 11:40. Since adjournment was scheduled for midnight, this left about half an hour for discussion. Even so, the clocks had to be stopped.

Article 1 of the "Elimination of Excessive Concentration of Economic Power Law" states:

By eliminating the Excessive Concentration of Economic Power at the earliest possible date and rationally reorganizing the economy, as a part of the series of measures taken for the reconstruction of the peacetime and democratic nation, aims to lay the ground work for building a democratic and healthy national economy.

Article 2 states:

"Enterprise," as used in this law, shall include every kind of economic business or financial instrumentality or person, whether in the form of cartel, syndicate, combine, trust, stock company, partnership, association, concern, aggregate of firms or bodies, individuals, or otherwise.

Now, let us take a look and see what restraints, if any, are placed upon the HCLC, the Holding Company Liquidation Commission. It is to be noted that they also have their alphabetical agencies. Article 3, as I read it, should be a bureaucrat's delight and a pattern to be followed wherever and whenever the state sets out to become the supreme authority over a nation's economic life. This article states:

The HCLC shall designate excessive concentrations of economic power which exist on the effective date of this law or which shall have been in existence at any time between August 1, 1945, and the effective date of this law, and shall eliminate such excessive concentrations of economic power in interest of public welfare. For this purpose, an excessive concentration of economic power shall be defined as any private enterprise conducted for profit, or combination of such enterprises, which, by reason of its position in many lines, restricts competition or impairs the opportunity for others to engage in business independently, in any important segment of business.

Mr. President, I submit that this language is broad enough to give the power of life or death over the entire Japanese economy, limited only by the conscience of the members of the HCLC.

Now let us turn to some of the laws socializing certain parts of the Japanese economy. Like controls, these are claimed to be temporary expedients to meet emergency situations. However, experience in our own country has shown that it is easier to pass such laws than to get rid of them.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have copies of the legislation and photostatic copies of the Official Gazette, promulgating these various laws, which may be described as follows:

First. The grocery-distribution law. There is established a tax-exempt government corporation which has the sole purchase and sale of all indigenous and imported grocery at prices established by the price board; the storage, transportation, recovery, necessary mixing, and examination of grocery, and the appointment of authorized dealers in grocery business incidental to the business provided for it in items 1 and 2.

Next is a feed-distribution law, which is also a tax-exempt government corporation having the sole purchase and sole sale of all feed at prices established by the price board, together with the storage and transportation of all feed.

Next is a liquor-distribution law. Here again a tax-exempt government corporation is set up, having the sole purchase and sole sale of all liquors, at prices established by the price board, together with the storage and transportation of all liquors.

Fourth. The petroleum-distribution law. This, too, sets up a tax-exempt government corporation having the sole purchase and sole sale of petroleum products at prices established by the price board, and the storage and blending, distribution, transportation, and appointment of authorized dealers in fuel.

Fifth. The solid-fuel distribution law. The pattern of a tax-exempt government corporation is followed having the sole purchase and sole sale of coal, coke, and lignite, at prices established by the price-control board, together with storage, transportation, and matters incidental to solid fuels.

Next, the industrial reconstruction public corporation law, which creates a tax-exempt government corporation for the construction, lease or sale of industrial equipment, or the purchase, lease or sale of industrial equipment or materials.

Seventh. The oil stuffs distribution law creates a tax-exempt government corporation having sole purchase and sole sale of indigenous and imported oil-stuffs, at prices determined by the price board, together with their storage and transportation, and the appointment of dealers.

When FEC 230 is examined, not alone but in conjunction with other policies, a pattern develops which is disturbing to me, and I think it will be disturbing to the Congress.

I have a very high regard for Gen. Douglas MacArthur. His contribution to the winning of the war is known to every American. The restoration of law and order in Japan, the demilitarization

and repatriation of troops were all carried out under the most skillful and intelligent leadership of the supreme commander. But the military phase of the occupation was completed months ago and was succeeded by the necessity of restoring the Japanese economy to the point where it can be self-supporting and not a continual drain upon the United States Treasury.

In the lower echelons of SCAP are former OPA officials and employees, together with numerous individuals who have had little, if any, practical managerial experience in American business or industry.

Either originating among doctrinaire New Dealers who found their activities limited in Washington and signed up for overseas occupation service, or finding its fountainhead in the Far Eastern Commission, which initiates some policies for transmission to General MacArthur, certain activities are open to serious question by both the Congress and the people.

It seems to me that in both Germany and Japan our policy should be to eliminate trusts and cartels, but not to promote socialism or a controlled economy. Rather, we should strive to build a beachhead of free enterprise to the end that their people may raise their standard of living as we have done down through the years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I understand from the remarks of the Senator from California that under the order to which he refers, if anyone in Japan has a historical background of having accumulated any property by way of success and interest in a business, it is now to be taken away from him. Is that substantially correct, or have I overstated it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I think the general policy as enunciated in FEC 230 goes that far.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Therefore, the criterion to be used is to examine whether or not an individual there has been a successful operator in the economy of Japan heretofore. I would assume that that is one of the criteria. If he has accumulated anything, if he has an important position in industry or business, that is now to be destroyed or taken away from him. I am not supporting certain of the policies heretofore followed by some of the Japanese industrial leaders; I think that a certain amount of punishment and reorganization and rearrangement may be necessary; but I also understand that under the policy of the document to which the Senator refers, somebody in the State Department or somebody in the administrative government then undertakes to take that property and parcel it out to such persons as they want to give it to without any sound program for the repayment, based upon the value of the property, or even upon the ability, if you please, of the person receiving it to operate the business successfully within a free economy. Is there any safeguard in that direction?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not see in FEC 230 any safeguard such as we would consider necessary in any Anglo-Saxon idea of equity or law. I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa, I heartily agree with him that if there are any of these Japanese industrialists, large or small, who are war criminals, or who have been convicted of crimes against occupation regulations or Japanese law they should of course be eliminated from the industrial and economic picture of Japan. This is the process that we have followed in Germany. I would say the general policy of breaking up the cartels, the trusts, the so-called zaibatsu interests is a sound policy for us to follow in Japan, as it is in Germany. But the point I wanted to make is that they apparently have a very sound antitrust law which is now on the statute books of Japan. This goes far beyond the breaking up of monopolies, the breaking up of businesses in restraint of trade. It gives into the hands of a new agency the power to eliminate economic organizations which are not in that category. As I pointed out, FEC 230 itself, if that policy is to be carried out, provides the owner will be divested of his holdings without regard to the value of the property or the fair market price of the property.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have one further question, if the Senator will yield. I understand from the statement of the Senator that the business involved in the stock ownerships or investment ownerships is to be destroyed, necessarily.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the business is not necessarily to be destroyed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then may I ask one further question? The Senator has been through this a great deal. It is difficult for me to see how monopoly is destroyed or how competition can be enlarged if they take it away from one group of ownership and transfer it, without pay, necessarily, to another group of owners. I am not saying the Senator said this at all, but I am wondering how that relieves the competitive situation or the monopolistic situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator misunderstood me in that regard. I said that the business, as a business, was not being destroyed, unless it was a war industry. I think the pattern is clearly established that they are breaking up the large combinations; which I think is entirely sound. Then, of course, a business would continue, unless it was a war industry, which would very correctly also be taken out of the Japanese economy entirely. But the point is that a considerable number of people who have worked for some of the large industries in Japan, in my opinion, under a strict reading of FEC 230, would be deprived of the privilege of being associated with industrial or business activity in Japan for a period of 10 years, even though they may not have been either accused, tried, or convicted of a crime of any nature whatever.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I may say from his remarks that he has certainly given a picture of a most shocking and startling philosophy that apparently is being put into effect in Japan, if free enterprise is to be fostered in Japan and if Japan is to go forward under a free competitive system. I congratulate him for digging into this thing and giving us the picture of it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Without in any way commenting upon FEC 230, I should like to ask the Senator a question. General MacArthur is still in supreme command of the whole situation in Japan, is he not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. He is.

Mr. McMAHON. Has the Senator had any occasion to talk with him personally or to exchange written views with him, or to inquire as to what he thinks about it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I have not, on this particular document. Two years ago, when I was a member of the committee, with the former Senator from Delaware, Mr. Tunnell, relative to an investigation of the disposal of Army and Navy surplus properties overseas, I had the opportunity to meet with General MacArthur and certain members of his staff. At that time this document, of course, was not even in being. I will say that I was very favorably impressed with the occupation job which General MacArthur had done. It was a most unusual situation, having come into and occupied Japan, where they had had a home army that had not been defeated in the field. At the time we were there, which was approximately 7 months after VJ-day, there had not been a single attack upon any American soldier or any other soldier of the occupation forces. It showed that General MacArthur had been able to take control of the situation and was carrying out his occupational duties diligently. I think he has done an outstanding job in the defeat of Japan, in demilitarizing Japan, repatriating the Japanese soldiers there, and in getting the country back on a nonwarlike basis.

Mr. McMAHON. That may be all well and good. I do not say I disagree with any of the encomiums the Senator has indulged in respecting the General. But the fact remains that he is still in supreme command of our occupation of Japan.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Only to this extent, if I may interrupt the Senator at that point. The General is in supreme command as the executive officer who is responsible for carrying out the policies of the Government of the United States and the Far Eastern Commission. But, as the able Senator from Connecticut may know, at the Moscow meeting of Foreign Secretaries in December 1945, further negotiations between the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom were conducted on the subject of greater Allied participation in the control of Japan during the occupation, and with the concurrence of China the three Foreign Ministers on December 27, 1945, issued a communiqué establishing terms of reference for a Far Eastern Commis-

sion to replace the Far Eastern Advisory Commission, and that this Far Eastern Commission has as its principal functions to formulate the policies, principles, and standards in conformity with which the fulfillment by Japan of its obligations under the terms of surrender may be accomplished.

The Commission may take action by a majority vote, provided the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China all concur in the action taken. The Far Eastern Commission formulates policies, which are then transmitted to the State Department and to the joint chiefs of staff, which are then forwarded on to General MacArthur as directives for him to execute.

Mr. McMAHON. Granted that that may be so; General MacArthur's conduct of the occupation has been such as to lead me to believe that if he did not think that a policy which was handed to him was for the best interests of this Government we would have heard from him from Tokyo in no unmistakable terms. Which leads me to the observation that in view of the seriousness of the situation, as the Senator from California portrays it, and I do not doubt it or deny it, it occurs to me that it might be a good thing for me, as one individual interested in the question, to send the Senator's speech to General MacArthur and say to him "Now, look here, General, here is the story. What have you to say about it?" Then when I receive the General's reply I shall be glad to show it to the Senator and place it in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to have it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1948 (H. DOC. NO. 499)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying plan, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 303.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as it appears that the work of the Senate has been concluded for the day, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 21, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 19, 1948:

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commander, Naval Forces, Western Pacific.

Andrew Roman (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948, in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Warren W. Barker	Wedo Nutaitis
Raymond A. Marston	Theodore W. Pstrak

John D. Shaw (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

Richard M. Hennigan to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948, in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Dwight H. Smith (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of names:

Dennis P. McCarty
Francies Marshall

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

James C. Billings, Jr.	Henry A. L. Church
Norman D. Chetlin	Lawrence R. Eades

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Robert E. Dickman
Edward L. MacCordy

Myers Thornton (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of name.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Anne M. Bailey	Josephine L. Hart
Ann M. Bono	Virginia M. Huff
Margaret Bozdos	Valeria Kalemba
Margaret M. Cook	Emma R. Partridge
Hazel C. Crouse	Edna J. Rundell
Wanda M. Crouse	Mary E. Staud
Alyeene L. Emfinger	Flora B. Sturm
Lois J. Gallagher	Hollyce J. Trantham

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of names:

Ethel C. A. Eusebio	Dorothea M. Johnston
Eleanor G. Hall	Maria Poljanac

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William H. Martin, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Frank F. Wildebush

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

John D. Boland

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

John P. Ahearn	Albert E. Thielen
Arthur A. Helgerson	Harry A. Underwood
Francis E. Hornbrook	William J. Weller

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of names:

Halim G. Habib
James M. Keirnan
Joseph E. F. Rankin

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

John E. McGraw

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Charles E. Payne
Lloyd W. Wolford

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Philip H. Dunham	Roy C. Lininger
Joseph O. Kuebel, Jr.	Edward A. Smith
Joseph T. Kuschell	Wayne C. Whitehead

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Jasper E. Morgan

LIEUTENANT

Arthur L. Hall

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Lillian T. Buytaert	Marjorie H. Johnson
Anne T. Cooley	Marie E. Poulin
Patricia E. George	Vera M. Joyce
Bertha M. Davis	Bertha E. Rollings
Cecilia C. Flannery	Ellen Williams
Ruth E. Hartley	

Gladys LaV. P. Kennedy, to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurses Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of name.

ENSIGNS

Corinne A. Fischer
Melanie Ince
Eleanora W. Rennock

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, by whose mercy we are permitted to assemble, do Thou refresh us with Thy presence. Breathe into our souls Thy quickening spirit, that we may stand fully assured of Thy will. We pray that this erring world, with its oppression and misery, may cease to follow the winding paths of greed and selfish ambition. From Thy abundant gifts may we learn that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

Dear Lord, we ask Thee to relate our lives to the welfare of all the people

whom we serve; keep us within Thy hands, that, by industry, by discipline, and intelligent devotion to high purpose, we may act as men and women who believe in God and in the ultimate triumph of the right. We pray in the name of Him who is our Redeemer forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 15, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3342. An act to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1020) entitled "An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD as to charges made by some persons that Members of Congress are at fault for the current fuel-oil shortage.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of you who represent areas afflicted with a fuel shortage and unprecedented cold waves received but little encouragement from the reports in the local press headlined, "Truman cuts oil, gas for Federal buildings," and "Truman cuts oil for United States offices." I am confident that you read those articles and noted that the President directed that the working-hour temperatures in Government buildings using fuel oil were to be reduced to 68°, and that Government automobiles move no faster than 40 miles an hour.

I am sure you noted further that the local newspapers reported that the customary temperatures range from 72° to 74° in Government buildings are to be reduced to 68° during the daytime and to 60° at night.

The fact that Washington suffered the extreme hardship of a temperature of 36° Saturday afternoon may have led the President to issue this order. This will not greatly impress the people of New England, where the temperatures have ranged from zero to 22° below zero in the same period, nor will it impress the people of the Central and Middle West, where even lower temperatures were reached during the cold wave of last week.

The delay in instituting this obvious means of conservation of heating oil at a time when the Federal Government has been urging civilians to adopt every measure of conservation, in view of the admitted shortage in fuel oil, is regrettable. There is no way of knowing how much of that precious fluid has been wasted in heating Federal buildings up to 70° or 74° this last month and a half while New England, the Northeast, North Carolina, and the central part of the country have been struggling with a fuel-oil shortage during repeated cold waves.

I shall request soon the opportunity to lay before the House the full details of knowledge, on the part of Federal officials, of the impending fuel shortage, which goes back as far as July and, in some instances, as far back as April or May.

At this time, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a telegram to the President, dated December 13, 1947, which read as follows:

Yesterday afternoon in the testimony of William E. Gannon, purchasing agent, Bureau of Federal Supply, before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it appeared that many suppliers of fuel oil, Diesel oil, and kerosene have determined not to bid for the period of 6 months beginning February 1. It also appeared that a number of Government buildings had reconverted to oil-heating units within the last year. The witness stated that he did not know why they could not reconvert to coal. The total requirements for the 6-month period in region No. 1 was 28,500,000 gallons, and for region No. 2, 27,500,000 gallons. We do not now have the figure for region No. 3. We understand the supplies of coal for all those regions are much more adequate than the supplies of fuel oil. As you know, the shortages of fuel oil in portions of both regions 1 and 3 have created emergency conditions which may become much worse soon, and appeals have been made and are being made to the public of those areas to carry out conservation measures. We believe it is of the utmost importance that immediate steps be taken to investigate the possibility of conversions in Government buildings not only in the affected areas but throughout the country to determine the wisdom of such a means of relieving the fuel-oil situation and that vigorous action should be taken to that end. If it is possible to do this, it should also have the further effect of encouraging the conservation suggestions now being urged on the general public. We respectfully and urgently request that you order that such investigation be conducted immediately. Mr. O'HARA signs this telegram as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and as a Representative from Minnesota in region No. 3, an area deeply concerned with the existing fuel-oil situation. The others sign as members of a special committee appointed by Speaker MARTIN to inquire into possibilities as to the fuel situation in New England and as to developments before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This telegram was signed by the following members of the New England delegation: ANGIER L. GOODWIN, ROBERT HALE, THOMAS J. LANE, WILLIAM J. MILLER, ANTONI N. SADLAK, and myself. The gentleman from Minnesota, JOSEPH P. O'HARA, joined us in this telegram.

Not having received any reply from the President, on December 19, 1947, a further telegram was sent to the President, which is as follows:

We are advised New England weather continuing cold and averaging 6° colder than last year. Although governors and State agencies doing everything possible to meet the crisis, suppliers throughout New England are daily reporting their supplies of heating oil rapidly approaching exhaustion. In view of fourth recommendation of industry committee filed yesterday, we respectfully request your advice as to whether our suggestion in our telegram to you of December 13 met with your approval. We sincerely believe the emergency conditions confronting the industries and the people of New England require the interest of and most vigorous possible action by their Federal Government.

It was signed by the following members of the New England delegation: ANGIER L. GOODWIN, ROBERT HALE, THOMAS J. LANE, WILLIAM J. MILLER, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ANTONI N. SADLAK, and myself, who are members of the subcommittee designated by the Speaker on December 8, 1947, to observe with the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

On December 19 Hon. John R. Steelman wrote the following letter:

Reference is made to your telegram of December 13, addressed to the President, signed by yourself and Congressman ANGIER L. GOODWIN, ROBERT HALE, THOMAS J. LANE, WILLIAM J. MILLER, JOSEPH P. O'HARA, and ANTONI N. SADLAK, regarding the fuel-oil shortage.

In accordance with the suggestion in your telegram, I have asked Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming to investigate the practicability of converting heating facilities in Government buildings from oil to coal.

I will communicate with you again as soon as results of this investigation are available.

As of this moment I have not received any further communication reporting the result of General Fleming's investigation. However, on January 13 my attention was called to the assertion made recently in the column written by Mr. Drew Pearson in which he discussed the military requirements for oil. As a result I wrote Mr. Steelman on that date the following letter:

I noticed this morning in the column written by Mr. Drew Pearson for the Washington Post, he stated, "Within the past few weeks Stewart Field, N. Y., has converted its heating units from coal to oil, and Fort Myer, Va., has switched from coal to oil for heating the barracks." In view of the suggestion with reference to such conversions made by a subcommittee of the New England delegation to the President and your letter of December 19, I would appreciate your advice as soon as possible as to whether this is an accurate statement, and if so, the amount of daily consumption of heating oil at those two points.

Again I have had no reply to my request for information.

Consequently, I have sent Mr. Steelman this morning the following telegram:

Referring to the telegram December 13 from several members New England delegation and Congressman O'HARA, to second telegram December 19 from several members

New England delegation, to your letter December 19 and to my letter to you of January 13, in view of conservation order issued Saturday and extreme cold wave prevailing New England, shall appreciate your immediate advice of results of General Fleming's investigation and as to information requested in my letter January 13.

You all know that many Federal agencies have been engaged in vigorous attempts to convince the private citizen that he or she must overcome this shortage by the most drastic kind of voluntary cooperation in reducing the heat in their homes. In the meantime, State and local officials are doing their utmost to meet the requirements for their hospitals, schools, churches, transportation systems, and other institutions, while industries using fuel oil have been engaged in a constant effort to keep in full operation so that their employees may work full time and production of vital goods may continue.

While it will be a source of some comfort to them that the President has taken a cautious step toward the conservation of heating oil more than a month after we made the request for an investigation as to the possibility of converting in Government buildings, there remain a great many questions as to the soundness of the Government's over-all program. It is my purpose to discuss this further in the near future.

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 500)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 16, 1948.*

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 499)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, under the Reorganization Act of 1945, which transfers the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security to the Department of Labor. The United States Employment Service is now in the Department of Labor by temporary transfer under authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, while the Bureau of Employment Security is at present a constituent unit of the Federal Security Agency. This plan will place the administration of the Employment Service and unemployment-compensation functions of the Federal Government in the most appropriate location within the executive establishment and will provide for their proper coordination.

I find that this proposed reorganization is necessary to accomplish the following purposes of the Reorganization Act of 1945: (1) To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government according to major purposes, (2) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government, and (3) to promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government.

The United States Employment Service was established in the Department of Labor by the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933. It was later transferred under Reorganization Plan No. 1, effective July 1, 1939, to the Social Security Board in the Federal Security Agency. After the creation of the War Manpower Commission, the United States Employment Service was placed under that Commission by Executive Order No. 9247 of September 17, 1942. Shortly after the Japanese surrender the Service was transferred to the Department of Labor by Executive Order No. 9617. Both of these transfers were made under the temporary authority of title I of the First War Powers Act.

The provision of a Nation-wide system of public employment offices, which assists workers to get jobs and employers to obtain labor, belongs under the leadership of the Secretary of Labor. Within our Federal Government the Department of Labor is the agency primarily concerned with the labor market and problems of employment.

The Department of Labor already has within its organization many, but not all, of the resources needed for the full performance of this role. It has a broad understanding of working conditions and the factors in labor turn-over. Through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it develops extensive information on the long-term trends in employment and on the occupational characteristics of the labor force. Through the Apprentice Training Service, it promotes the development of needed skills. I consider it necessary and desirable that these facilities of the Department of Labor should now be augmented by the other major operating agencies in the field of employment—the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security. These agencies are concerned, as is the Department of Labor, with the full and proper employment of American workers.

The results achieved by the Employment Service after more than 2 years of operation within the Department of Labor strongly justify the decision to place these functions permanently within that Department. More employers are now using the facilities of the public employment offices than ever before in the history of the peacetime Employment Service. More services are being furnished employers by the public employment offices than ever before. Today the public employment office has become the central labor exchange in the community and the primary source of information on employment opportunities and immediate labor market trends.

The Bureau of Employment Security in the Federal Security Agency administers the Federal activities relating to the Nation-wide unemployment compensation system. As a practical matter these functions have proved to be intimately related to those of the United States Employment Service. Under existing State laws, claimants for unemployment compensation must register with the Employment Service before they may become eligible for benefits. In consequence nearly all States have assigned the administration of these two programs to the same agency.

Both the Employment Service and the unemployment compensation system are concerned with the worker as a member of the labor force. Both are concerned with shortening the periods of unemployment and with promoting continuity of employment. When the worker becomes unemployed the alternatives are either to assist him in obtaining new employment or to pay him benefits. The proper emphasis is on employment rather than on benefit payments. This emphasis can best be achieved by having the two programs administered in the agency most concerned with the employment process—the Labor Department.

By reason of the reorganizations made by this plan, I find that the responsibilities and duties of the Secretary of Labor will be of such nature as to require the inclusion in the plan of provisions for the appointment and compensation of a Commissioner of Employment to coordinate the Employment Service and unemployment insurance activities within the Department. The plan also provides that the Federal Advisory Council, a group representative of labor, management, and the public, authorized by the Wagner-Peyser Act, shall advise the Secretary and the Commissioner on the operation of both the unemployment compensation system and the United States Employment Service.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 19, 1948.*

AMENDING RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 430), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2873), to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Lands now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the

Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 431), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 3239, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], was inadvertently referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], and others interested, and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill H. R. 3239 and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a radio speech by himself, and in the other, a newspaper editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, last week temperatures in the Second District of Massachusetts ranged down to 22° below zero, while our people are victims of a fuel-oil shortage. Prices are mounting rapidly. No one knows why. Emergency officials have been appointed by Gov. Robert F. Bradford to aid any individuals who find themselves unable to secure fuel oil or kerosene. They are doing their best to bring relief wherever necessary. They are serving without pay. They are not connected with any oil companies. I have been told by the State coordinator, Mr. George Rockwell, that his organization has been successful in furnishing oil wherever needed. Because of the scarcity of fuel oil, deliveries are limited in amount. People are told to follow various rules in order to conserve their allotments.

During the war we had a scarcity of fuel oil in New England. We knew our Army and Navy were using tremendous quantities and that tankers were scarce and tank cars also. What is the reason or the excuse for the present fuel-oil shortage? Is it lack of crude oil, fuel oil, or kerosene in the United States? Not at all, if the information given to Senate and House committees and individual Senators and Congressmen is accurate. Oil company and Government officials tell us that an export quota of 12,000,000 barrels of oil for the first 3 months of 1948 has been established. Great quantities were shipped abroad in 1947. Perhaps the Secretary of Commerce, who handles oil export licenses, has not heard the story emanating from Max W. Ball, Director of the Interior Department's Oil and Gasoline Division, that the United States will suffer from an oil scarcity for the next 4 years. Perhaps he has heard the story, and his decision to issue these licenses is the proper one. Then, we are told that four times as much oil was piped in 1947 as in 1946 from Portland, Maine, to Montreal—not for Canadian use but to be exported overseas.

I favor helping our European friends. I do not want them to suffer from the cold. I plan to vote more aid for them. But I would like to know the facts. Is the scarcity due to our Government, directly or indirectly, purchasing oil in competition with the people of the United States for foreign use? Does the Government pay more for its oil than the market price and so get preference? That is the way it gets grains, and up goes the price here at home. And the price of fuel oil surely is going up. Why? Transportation costs were offered as an explanation by one witness. Yet a Boston independent oil dealer bought a tanker when he was advised that no tankers were available for his use. Then he sent letters to the New England congressional delegation showing that he tried to buy some oil to bring in his tanker to Boston at the time our committees were being told that there was more oil in storage in the Gulf area than at this time last year. The Bostonian received two bids to furnish him with oil at a time when the regular market for fuel oil was approximately 6¾ cents per gallon. One bid was for 13 cents a gallon, the other 11½ cents a gallon. Today I am told that independent distributors are paying retail prices for wholesale deliveries of fuel oil in order to supply their customers.

A lot of questions are being asked in Massachusetts by angry and resentful people. Did manufacturers of oil products receive greater profits from oil shipped overseas in 1947 than they were receiving per gallon from oil sold by them in the United States? Are they making greater profits in 1948 from their overseas shipments than from oil sold at home? How much oil did they sell to the United States Government or any of its agencies or for its account in 1947? At what prices?

Why did the Cabinet of the President of the United States order the sale of more than 80 Government tankers to foreigners in 1947, even if a law permitted it, when the Secretary of the Interior and Mr. Ball must have known that there would be a serious scarcity of fuel oil in the United States this winter, caused in part by lack of tankers? If the Secretary of the Interior by Mr. Ball, who serves under him, can prophesy that the people of the United States will suffer from a scarcity of fuel oil for the next 4 or 5 years, why were not adequate steps to prevent the present existing shortage along the entire eastern seaboard taken by him last summer and fall instead of now in the dead of winter? If the major oil companies do not intend to increase the capacity of their refineries in 1948 what action does Secretary Krug recommend?

Why are the prices for fuel oil advanced at about the same time and the same amount by many, if not all, of the major companies? Who fixes them? What is the true break-down for the existing prices of fuel oil and gasoline? The dealers claim that they are getting the same spread which they have had for years.

Since scarcity of fuel oil for heating purposes is causing human suffering and anxiety, why do the refiners not increase the percentage of distillation of fuel oil and decrease the percentage of gasoline? Most owners of oil heating systems own automobiles. My guess is that they would unanimously prefer a scarcity of gas and sufficient fuel oil to the system as now manipulated.

And if Mr. Ball, of the Department of Interior, has reasonable grounds for testifying that there will be a scarcity of fuel oil for the next 4 or 5 years, what is he or Secretary of the Interior Krug planning to do about it?

And if they have nothing better to offer the American people than the miserable conditions prevailing in many States today, I urge the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make every effort to ascertain the answers to the above questions and many others which will occur to committee members. Government officials have proved so ineffective to date in this important matter that I urge the committee to report such legislation as will protect our own people against scarcity of fuel oil and, also, gasoline; against exorbitant prices for them; and against the bungling in oil products which has caused so much trouble this winter in the United States of America. It might be well to find out why a driver of an automobile has no trouble in keeping his tank full while a home owner cannot be sure of obtaining fuel oil—a much more serious matter.

Did the refiners make such a bad guess on fuel oil needs this year that we are just plain out of luck for once, and next year they will refine all the fuel oil we need? I hope this is the correct answer. I heard President Rathbone, of Standard Oil of New Jersey, testify. I believe he has the ability and the knowledge to set up a program which will work for the rest of this winter and during coming winters. Under a recent law, the major oil companies can make such voluntary agreements with the President's approval as may be necessary. But, I would add that if Mr. Ball's prophecy of a 4 years' scarcity of fuel oil comes true while this Nation is at peace, then the oil industry will have failed to keep faith with its best customers—the people and Government of the United States. And something which will protect the people may be necessary—perhaps something drastic. This is not a partisan political matter at all. This is an all-American matter which requires the active cooperation of our people, our corporations, and our Government. This problem can and will be licked.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 21, after all legislative business and any other special orders that may have been entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject, There Are No Such Words as Political Expediency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include tables and excerpts.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Daily News of Los Angeles.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of Michigan's veteran laws and include therein a digest thereof.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda under the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held a hearing on January 14, 1948, relative to complaints that the committee had received, charging improper activities in propagandizing and lobbying for pending legislation providing for universal military training. It is interesting to read the testimony of the Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, and others who appeared before the committee.

It would seem that the military has established a so-called Army Advisory Committee which has for its goal the establishing of these committees in at least 600 representative communities, with an approximate membership of 9,000 civilians. The purpose of the advisory committees, according to a memo signed by Col. James Pierce, issued August 26, 1946, is for "preparing a favorable reception for Army policy and discovering the things that hamper Army policy; to advise the Army on all community attitudes which are based on adverse reactions to acts, facts, and policies of the Army; to provide channels for the dissemination of facts and policies of the Army in a manner so that the public will understand and be completely informed."

Under date of November 14, 1947, an invitation to a meeting to be held at the Pentagon on Tuesday, December 9, 1947, was forwarded to members of the Advisory Council over the signature of Maj. Gen. F. B. Parks. This meeting was attended by delegates of various women's organizations throughout the Nation. The main purpose of the meeting was to get support for the universal military training plan.

The thing that disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that not only the Army, but other branches of the Government, are spending huge sums of the taxpayers' money to indoctrinate and propagandize the public for their pet ideas.

Up to January 1 of this year, the Army had been using military aircraft to fly groups to Fort Knox for inspection of the experimental units. The record also shows that they have flown groups of ministers and newspapermen and others to Europe for inspection trips of various kinds.

Government agencies distort and screen the news. Propaganda of all sorts flood the press and radio. It reminds one of Hitler's teaching of telling, over and over again, a lie, for people will soon believe the falsehoods.

When the Secretary of the Army, General Royall, was asked by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], the chairman of the committee, as follows:

> Now do you feel, Mr. Secretary, that it is proper and legitimate for the Department of the Army to use appropriated funds to that Department for paying lunches of women's organizations, such as the one that was entertained at the Pentagon, the other day.

General Royall replied:

> I think it is perfectly proper. They are advisory to us. Whenever we have sent a group of ministers, a group of newspapermen, or a group of businessmen, either over to Europe or anywhere else, to look at the situation and give us the benefit of their advice, whenever we have invited people in this country to come to Washington, or come from Washington in a group to advise us on a particular matter, we buy them meals out of Army funds. I don't mean individually, but when we have a group.

It seems to me that the military should carry out our policies and not form them. The overload of military personnel in Government seems responsible for this unhealthy condition.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very fine line of demarcation between what is propaganda and what is information. If the Secretary of War feels it is proper to set up advisory committees to indoctrinate them in favor of universal military training, then what is to prevent other departments of the Government from the following similar procedures?

The advisory committees, if they are the same as we had under the old OPA and the WPB, it is quite evident that they were selected because they think as the agency wants them to think. They are told what the policy will be. Their advisory capacity has, indeed, been limited. It is only natural that when these committees receive a trip to Washington, Fort Knox, or across the water, and are wined and dined, that they are expected to go out and spread the propaganda of the Department which gives them the honorary title of advisory committees. They are expected to try and influence legislation before Congress. In this last respect, it seems a clear violation of the law. It is a subterfuge for the military or any department of Government to say they are doing it to inform the public. The real reason for the entertainment and the spending of the taxpayers' money is to influence legislation.

I trust that the committee investigating lobbying activity will bring those who are violating the law to the court of justice. If the law is not explicit, then it ought to be clarified to prevent agencies of the Government spending the taxpayers' money to promote the propaganda and influence legislation favorable to them.

TITLE TO TIDELANDS

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to correct through congressional action the unfortunate conditions brought about by the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the so-called Tidelands case against the State of California. This is the bill which has been prepared by the Association of Attorneys General of the various States after several months of study and deliberations and it applies impartially to every part of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reasserts the principle of States' rights, as opposed to centralization of power in one top-heavy bureaucratic despotism. It restores title to their homes to thousands of families in widespread areas of the United States,

and it returns the ownership of docks, and piers, and bridges, and harbor works of all kinds to their rightful owners rather than keeping them clouded by either present claims or possible future litigation on the part of the Federal Government. This bill will clarify the present muddled situation by the one means the Supreme Court indicated might properly be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. And also keep a bureaucracy from getting between those States on the border line such as Mississippi and California, and the ocean or gulf.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that many other Members of the House will introduce this identical bill in support of the sentiments now existing in their States and congressional districts, as indicated by the very widespread approval given to it by the Association of Attorneys General.

UPWA-CIO SPONSORS PAUL ROBESON FOR PANAMA CANAL ZONE TEACHERS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, January 12, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report which, in my opinion, shows conclusively that the United Public Workers of America, CIO is Communist dominated and controlled. As further proof of my contention, I call your attention to a copy of the Daily Worker of last Wednesday, January 14, 1948, which I hold in my hand. Everyone knows the Daily Worker is the official publication of the Communist Party of America. On page 12 there is advertised a benefit performance of the well-known Communist, Paul Robeson, to be held tonight at 8:30 p. m., Manhattan Center, Thirty-fourth Street at Eighth Avenue, New York City. At the bottom of this advertisement is printed "Auspices United Public Workers of America, CIO."

I also hold in my hand a dodger that has been distributed and put in public buildings which, in addition to advertising the benefit concert, states at the bottom that it is for the "benefit scholarship fund for public-school teachers in the Panama Zone," and, also, that it is "sponsored by the United Public Workers of America, CIO."

Everyone in the United States should know by now Paul Robeson's many Communist affiliations, but just for the record I am going to ask permission from the Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, to include a report on Paul Robeson, prepared by the staff of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and also a letter sent by me to the Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, last Saturday, urging that the United Public Workers of America, CIO, be named as a subversive organization:

PAUL ROBESON

The Daily Worker of April 6, 1938, page 2, reveals that Paul Robeson visited the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain, and the Daily Worker of January 24, 1938, page 4, reveals that he entertained this group in Spain. The Abraham Lincoln Brigade was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944.

Paul Robeson, according to a sheet attached to a letterhead of January 17, 1920, was a signer of a petition to discontinue the Dies Committee, which was sponsored by the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist front in Report 1311, dated March 29, 1944, of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

A letterhead of January 18, 1939, lists Paul Robeson as a member of the executive committee of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy. The Attorney General has said of this organization: "The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist control in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7684), and that it was "established in the United States, in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7683.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as a Communist front in three committee reports which are dated January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.[1]

A pamphlet entitled "What is APM," page 12, discloses that Paul Robeson was a member of the national council of the American Peace Mobilization, and, according to the Daily Worker of September 3, 1940, page 4, he was a vice chairman of this organization. In addition, Paul Robeson was a speaker at an American Peace Mobilization mass meeting held in Washington, D. C. (See Daily Worker, September 13, 1940, p. 4, and September 15, 1940, p. 2.) The American Peace Mobilization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944, and Attorney General Francis Biddle said, "The most conspicuous activity of American Peace Mobilization was the picketing of the White House, which began in April 1941, in protest against lend-lease and the entire national-defense program. * * * On the afternoon of June 21, 1941, he (Frederick V. Field, national secretary) suddenly called off the picket line around the White House." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, p. 7684).[2]

The program, Artists' Front to Win the War, reveals that Paul Robeson was a sponsor of this organization which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in committee report of March 29, 1944.

A letterhead, dated September 11, 1941, lists Paul Robeson as a sponsor of the Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges, an organization cited as a Communist front on March 29, 1944, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

According to the Daily Worker, March 5, 1941, page 2, Paul Robeson was a signer of the statement sent to the President defending the Communist Party.

An official booklet of the committee lists Paul Robeson as a member of the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo. This booklet, These Americans Say, page 8, lists him as a representative individual. The Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front on March 29, 1944.

Paul Robeson was vice chairman of the Emergency Peace Mobilization. (See Daily Worker, Sept. 3, 1940, p. 1.) He was also affiliated with this organization as a singer according to the Daily Worker of August 13, 1940, page 5; August 31, 1940, page 1; and September 2, 1940, page 4. This organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.[1]

A letterhead of February 26, 1946, reveals that Paul Robeson was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist front on March 29, 1944.[2]

Paul Robeson was a national sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as shown by a letterhead of July 6, 1938. Another letterhead, that of February 2, 1939, of the Michigan chapter, reveals he sponsored the same organization. On March 29, 1944, this organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

Paul Robeson has been affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as a sponsor according to a memorandum issued by the council on March 18, 1946. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.[2]

The affiliation of Paul Robeson with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties is shown by the Daily Worker of March 18, 1945, page 3, which names him as one of the signers of a statement hailing War Department order on commissions for the Communists which that organization sponsored. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the committee reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle called it "part of what Lenin called the solar system or organization, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters

[1] The American League for Peace and Democracy was a successor of the American League Against War and Fascism, which, together with the American Peace Mobilization, were named as subversive by the Department of Justice acting under authority of Executive Order 9300, dated February 5, 1943.

[2] The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee; the National Council of American Soviet Friendship; the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and the American Youth for Democracy were designated as subversive by the Department of Justice acting under authority of Executive Order 9835, dated March 21, 1947.

[1] The American League for Peace and Democracy was a successor of the American League Against War and Fascism, which, together with the American Peace Mobilization, were named as subversive by the Department of Justice acting under authority of Executive Order 9300, dated February 5, 1943.

[2] The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee; the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and the American Youth for Democracy were designated as subversive by the Department of Justice acting under authority of Executive Order 9835, dated March 21, 1947.

of their program. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687.)[3]

A pamphlet, For a New Africa (proceedings of Conference on Africa, New York, April 14, 1944), shows that Paul Robeson was chairman of the National Negro Congress which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in committee reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. This organization was also cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle in support of the following characterization: "From the record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served as what James W. Ford, elected to executive committee in 1937, predicted 'An important sector of the democratic front' sponsored and supported by the Communist Party." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7689.)

The issues of January 5, 1943, March 14, 1944, page 2, and April 30, 1946, page 2, of New Masses, reveal that Paul Robeson has been a contributing editor of that publication. Paul Robeson was a signer of the New Masses' letter to the President which defended Communists. (See New Masses, April 2, 1940, p. 21.) New Masses, November 9, 1943, page 31, discloses that Paul Robeson was a member of the reception committee of New Masses' thirty-third artists' and writers' annual ball. New Masses was described by Attorney General Francis Biddle as a Communist periodical (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688) and was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944.

Paul Robeson's affiliation with the New Theater League and the New Dance League is shown by his contribution to the New Theater of July 1935, page 5. Both the New Theater League and the New Theater have been cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944.

The Schappes defense committee, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, sponsored the open letter to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York State, which requested a pardon for Morris U. Schappes, a Communist. According to the New York Times, October 9, 1944, page 12, Paul Robeson was a signer of this letter.

According to the program of the third meeting of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Nashville, Tenn., April 19–21, 1942, Paul Robeson gave an evening concert on April 20, 1942. The Southern Conference for Human Welfare has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

The dinner invitation reveals that Paul Robeson sponsored the Soviet Russia Today dinner which celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army at the Hotel Commodore in New York City. Soviet Russia Today was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

Paul Robeson has been affiliated with the Spanish Relief Campaign as the international chairman of the Negro Peoples' Committee, a participating organization. This information was obtained from the back cover of Children in Concentration Camps. The Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940.

Paul Robeson's affiliations with the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade is shown by the Daily Worker of February 21, 1940, which discloses that he was a signer of the letter sponsored by that organization to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson protesting the attacks upon the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. In addition, the Daily Worker of September 17, 1940, page 7, and September 20, 1940, page 7, shows that he has sung for this organization which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.[2]

According to a handbill, "Paul Robeson will welcome America's real fighters for peace and freedom"; Paul Robeson was a speaker at a Washington Peace Mobilization meeting held in Washington, D. C., on September 13, 1940. The Washington Peace Mobilization was cited as a Communist front on March 29, 1944, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.[3]

Paul Robeson was a speaker at a youth rally to defend labor's right to strike on June 14, 1946, at Manhattan Center, New York City, according to a handbill. This rally was sponsored by the American Youth for Democracy, an organization cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944, and also in report 271 of April 17, 1947. The following is quoted from report 271: "The committee calls upon the governors or legislatures of the various States as well as the administrative heads of the various colleges and universities to thoroughly expose the Communist connections of the American Youth for Democracy as well as the inimical objectives of the Communist Party in America."[2]

The Daily Worker of April 6, 1942, page 5, contains a report by Sasha Small of the International Labor Defense National Conference on Civil Liberties in Support of War. The following is quoted from that: "Paul Robeson * * * spoke * * * of * * * how the ILD today under the leadership of such a person as Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO was performing an essential service to the winning of the war." The International Labor Defense was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, and was called the legal arm of the Communist Party by Attorney General Francis Biddle. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7686.)

The Daily Worker of July 23, 1940, page 1, reveals that Paul Robeson was a signer of an open letter to President Roosevelt which protested against the attack on the right of the Communist Party to use the ballot.

The following statement is attributed to Paul Robeson by the Daily Worker: "There are only two groups in the world today—Fascists and anti-Fascists. The Communists belong to the anti-Fascist group and I label myself as anti-Fascist.

"The Communist Party is a legal one like the Republican or Democratic Party and I could belong to either. I could just as well think of joining the Communist Party as any other." (See Daily Worker, April 21, 1947, p. 1.)

The March 16, 1947 issue of the New York Times contains an article by Jack Goodman which tells of Paul Robeson's retirement from the formal concert field. In this article, he is attributed with saying, "Then * * * I want my audiences that I am about to wind up with some pretty strong stuff—actually inviting them to leave if they can't take it. * * * They've paid their money, heard some truly great music, actually as many numbers as most artists sing. From that point on it's up to the listeners' hearts, and they can either enjoy or hate my songs of Soviet Russia, union songs like Joe Hill, songs of the Spanish Republican front fighters, and songs of the Chinese people. I know I've made many enemies that way, usually based on the listener's pocketbook, but those are the songs I do most wish to sing."

The Daily Worker of April 29, 1947, page 12, contains an article by Ruby Cooper which reports on a rally in tribute to Paul Robeson and to post the recent ban on his concert at Peoria, Ill., held at the Civil Opera House in Chicago under the sponsorship of the Abraham Lincoln School. The Abraham Lincoln School was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311 of March 29, 1944.[4]

On August 7, 1941, Zola Ardene Clear appeared before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and gave testimony in executive hearings. At this time Miss Clear submitted letterheads of the Washington Committee for Aid to China and the National Negro Congress, which were placed on file as exhibits. Both of these letterheads announced that Paul Robeson would sing on April 25, 1941, at Uline Arena, at a benefit performance for the two organizations. The Washington Committee for Aid to China was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311, dated March 29, 1944. The citation of the National Negro Congress has been given in a previous paragraph of this report.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 17, 1948.*

HON. TOM C. CLARK,
United States Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I am enclosing pages A102, A103, A104, A105, and A106 from the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing a report on the United Public Workers of America-CIO, with my personal remarks. I have every reason to believe the contents of this report are accurate.

You recently released a list of organizations which, in your opinion, are subversive and should be considered as such in connection with determining the loyalty of Federal employees. While you stated at the time that the list was not complete and you expected to add names from time to time, I fail to find the name of the United Public Workers of America-CIO on your original or subsequent lists. In view of this, I respectfully ask and would appreciate your answers to the following questions:

1. Has the Federal Bureau of Investigation made an investigation of and submitted to the Attorney General's office a report on the UPWA-CIO?

---

[2] The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee; the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and the American Youth for Democracy were designated as subversive by the Department of Justice acting under authority of Executive Order 9835, dated March 21, 1947.

[3] The National Federation of Constitutional Liberties and the International Labor Defense were absorbed by the Civil Rights Congress; the Washington Peace Mobilization was the local affiliate of the American Peace Mobilization and both of these organizations were designated as subversive by the Department of Justice acting under authority of Executive Order 9835, dated March 21, 1947.

[4] The Abraham Lincoln School was designated as an organization that appears to be an adjunct of the Communist Party by the Department of Justice acting under authority of Executive Order 9835, dated March 21, 1947.

NOTE.—Footnotes by Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY, of Illinois.

2. If you have received such a report, did it contain information indicating that the organization is subversive within the contemplation of Executive Order 9835?

3. If you have received such a report and it contained information indicating that the organization is subversive within the contemplation of Executive Order 9835, why has the organization not been designated by you as subversive?

4. If the Federal Bureau of Investigation has not made a report on the UPWA-CIO, will you request Mr. J. Edgar Hoover to make such an investigation and inform me of the results?

From the enclosed report on the UPWA-CIO, one can readily see that the organization has consistently followed the Communist Party line as much as any Communist-front organization you included in your original list of subversive organizations. If this is true, the UPWA-CIO should be listed immediately as a subversive organization.

The leaders and officers of the UPWA-CIO have been completely dominated by the policies of the Communist Party. They have repeatedly shown that they are slaves to the Communist Party line even if it meant opposing the Government of the United States.

In the Panama Canal Zone the UPWA-CIO has taken the lead in pro-Communist activities and has played an important role in undermining our defenses and in bringing pressure against the granting of vital bases to the United States.

As further proof of my belief that the UPWA-CIO should be listed as a subversive organization, I invite your attention to an advertisement on page 12 of the January 14, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker, wherein it was announced that the UPWA-CIO was sponsoring a benefit performance by Paul Robeson and Ray Lev. While the advertisement does not say for whose benefit the performance is given, a printed dodger recently circulated by the United Public Workers of America, which you probably have in your files, specifically states that the Robeson-Lev concert is for the "benefit scholarship fund for public-school teachers in the Panama Zone."

In view of the fact that the UPWA-CIO is the sponsor of this performance featuring Paul Robeson, I believe it would be not only appropriate but necessary to call your attention to the attached record of this well-known Communist. This report was prepared by the staff of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, but the footnote is mine.

I respectfuly urge you to give this matter your immediate attention and request that you furnish me with a repy at an early date.

Very truly yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter addressed to the Honorable Tom Clark, Attorney General, last Saturday on this question and a report on Mr. Paul Robeson made by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in today's Washington Post.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by W. Howard Chase.

INCREASE IN DOMESTIC AIR-MAIL RATE

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for a return to a 6-cent rate for domestic air mail. It was promised that the 5-cent rate would produce such an increase in volume in air mail that a profit would result. Contrary to predictions, the volume has not increased sufficiently but the deficit is much greater. The estimated deficit for domestic air mail for the fiscal year of 1947 is nearly $19,000,000. By increasing the air-mail rate to 6 cents we will reduce the deficit by nearly $15,000,000 a year. I do not believe that the volume will suffer by reason of this increase. The American people will be satisfied to pay a fair price for air-mail service.

MEAT RATIONING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have today offered in the House Senator FLANDERS' meat-rationing bill which he has today offered in the Senate. The bill proposes that full organization for meat rationing be established by the President but that meat rationing be put into effect only after 30 days' notice to Congress and provided that Congress shall not stop it by concurrent resolution. The need is clear. Spiraling costs of meat have been perhaps the most potent element in the spiraling costs of food. In addition, feeding of grain to cattle has aided inflationary pressures on grain.

The real pinch will come in the spring.

Democracy is freedom, not license, as we show by our capability to control ourselves, whether in meat or in rents, when we need to, without fear. Democracy will be preserved by its flexibility. It can be destroyed by rigidity. This bill will give us the machine for meat rationing and we shall decide whether to step on the starter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, of all the ridiculous proposals that have been brought before the Congress for a long time it is this idea of starting out on a rejuvenated OPA in connection with meat rationing. Meat happens to be an end product. How you are going to set up a meat-rationing program without including everything in connection with the production of meat is more than I can understand. Ordinarily wheat is the barometer of the agricultural price world. Wheat prices influence all other grain prices. Of late the shortage and demand for corn for industrial and feed purposes seems to make corn a more potent yardstick than ever before. Huge domestic consumption of meat, plus the increase in meat exports, plus the grain exports, keep strengthening the prices for meat.

The reason we do not have meat in this country is because we have not been following the proper process for obtaining meat and meat products. What has happened in the last 4 years? Cattle numbers have been reduced from 85,000,000 on January 1, 1945, to 76,000,000 on January 1, 1948, or by 9,000,000 head. Slaughter is on the increase. Why? This administration has killed off 35 percent of the sheep since 1942 and the Department of Agriculture wants to kill off 3 percent more this year. Since January 1, 1942, sheep numbers have been reduced from 56,000,000 to 36,000,000. There were 83,000,000 hogs on United States farms on January 1, 1943, and 59,000,000 January 1, 1947. In fact, on January 1, 1943, there were 40 percent more hogs on farms than now. Then a few months ago under the same sponsorship in connection with this proposed meat-control legislation we had Mr. Luckman brought into the picture to start killing off the chickens. The chicken numbers will not stand too much reduction in numbers either.

The foreign shipments of meat which have been in the billions of pounds have been made by reducing cattle, hog, and sheep numbers in the United States. We have been killing off the seed stock or the stock pile, in other words. How much further should livestock numbers in the United States be reduced? Even milk cow numbers are down—yes, below what they were 10 or 12 years ago—and now even they are not supposed to be fed grain.

Did you realize that less milk was produced in the United States in December 1947 than any December since 1940? Do you realize the ten to twelve millions increase in population since 1940? Do you realize we have been on a dairy products export basis up to the war period and now on a dairy export basis? Do you want less meat for the American people? Do you want less milk for the babies of America? If some change of attitude in high places does take place you can be sure to see it.

The more clamor there is for meat control the higher the price. All this talk

about rejuvenating the OPA is idle. You cannot have meat and send it away at the same time. The President has the power, authority, and money to control prices—either high or low prices—and any time he wishes to assume the responsibility of doing something about them he can do so.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Louis Bromfield.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from former Democratic Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from a constituent.

CALIFORNIA MILK SHIP

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the great heart of America is indisputedly illustrated in an event now taking place in the State of California. There Gov. Earl Warren, one of the West's outstanding leaders, conceived the plan to send an entire shipload of condensed milk to the undernourished children of Greece, France, and Italy as a gift from the people of California.

Governor Warren called upon his friend, Charles P. Skouras, president of Fox West Coast Theaters and National Theaters, to give aid and support to this worthy cause. One of the West's greatest civic leaders, Mr. Skouras immediately assigned his organization to make the California milk ship an unqualified success by spearheading the publicity activities for this humanitarian endeavor throughout the State.

That is being done, gentlemen, and at the end of this week the steamship *Golden Bear* will sail from California with 1,400 tons of milk for the hungry children of the three countries.

From every city and community in California cash contributions poured into the coffers of the milk-ship fund. This was the result of untiring efforts on the part of Mr. Skouras' representatives, who, working with civic bodies such as junior chambers of commerce, told the people of California of this fine gesture of democracy.

It is thus worthy of note that when an admirable cause is to be supported, it is the great motion-picture-theater industry that leaps into the breech and leads the way. Gentlemen, hardly a campaign in history of the motion-picture industry has been launched but what its leaders were ready to take the reins.

One of the most noted of these leaders, Mr. Skouras, demonstrated again the eagerness with which the industry is willing to contribute time and great sums of money to promote peace and good will throughout the world, and to let the peoples of the world witness an example of democracy at work.

The California milk ship is the training ship of the California Maritime Academy. Usually at this time of year it sails on a 4-months' training cruise to South America. But this year the academy and the United States State Department agreed to permit the ship to travel to Marseilles, Pireaus, Naples, and Genoa to deliver the milk purchased by the people of California. More than a hundred cadets of this fine academy will combine their training period with the roles of ambassadors of good will delivering the sorely needed milk to authorized relief agencies in the three countries.

Here is an example of American generosity and humanitarian qualities that might well be considered by the people of other States. With this gesture, California is demonstrating its determination to inspire the unfortunate people of our allied lands with its conviction in the principles of democracy. California will do its share to build good will throughout the world.

Governor Warren, Mr. Skouras, and all the people who have helped to send the California good-will ship on its way are to be congratulated for their high ideals and their efforts to defeat the destructive forces of communism, which are seeking to prevent the humanitarian forces of democracy from being welcomed and treasured by freedom-loving people of the world.

APPOINT COORDINATOR OF FUEL OIL

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, it seems confusion is the keynote in the Federal agencies here in Washington. You have heard my colleagues, speaking this morning, call to your attention the fact that the Federal Government is converting to fuel oil in many of our Federal buildings and that enormous quantities of fuel oil are being exported, notwithstanding the fact that thousands of homes and apartment buildings throughout the Nation are unable to obtain needed fuel oil.

For many weeks the country was led to believe that the reason for the fuel-oil shortage was a lack of transportation facilities. Within the past few days we have been told there is not an adequate supply of fuel oil.

On January 9 I wired Col. J. M. Johnson, Administrator of the Office of Defense Transportation, urging that emergency steps be taken to channel adequate facilities for transportation of direly needed fuel oil to the metropolitan New York area. In reply I received a communication signed by A. H. Gass, Director of Railway Transport Department, wherein he stated:

> I believe that your principal difficulty is a lack of tanker space rather than tank-car space. If this is so, then the allocation of tankers is under the Maritime Commission and not the Office of Defense Transportation. If, however, your feeling is that it is a tank-car proposition, I would appreciate advice as to where the oil is available for movement into the New York area.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a House resolution expressing the sense of this House that there exists an emergency in the distribution and supply of fuel oil and urging that the President of the United States appoint a Coordinator of Fuel Oil to conduct a complete survey and study of the operations of Federal agencies with any supervisory power over the production, distribution, or procurement of fuel oil, with a particular view of recommending ways and means to alleviate the fuel-oil shortage in the affected areas. I hope the House will take action on this resolution. Possibly a coordinator can bring order out of the existing confusion.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that the country is disgusted with the double-talk that is now going on in the executive department of this Government. For instance, a few weeks ago the President came up here and cried out loudly against the rising cost of living. This morning I find that the Commodity Credit Corporation is back in the market buying potatoes to boost the price at the very moment that potatoes are selling for a price higher than I can remember. They have 61,000,000 pounds of dried eggs on hand, and since October 27 they have only sold 1,120,000 pounds, and they are now back in the market buying eggs to maintain and boost the price. It is no wonder that such prominent Democratic leaders as George H. Earle, former Governor of Pennsylvania, now Democratic national committeeman, sent out a letter saying—and I quote:

> From the bottom of my heart, I say if Truman is nominated and defeated, our Democratic Party is sunk. If Truman is nominated and elected, our country is sunk.

I think Governor Earle knows what he is talking about.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem by Lou Williams, the Buckeye poet.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two articles from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, one entitled "Hoosier Watchdog," and the other on military training.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial from the New York World Telegram and in the other an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from the Milwaukee Sentinel on the situation in Poland.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. PASSMAN (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement issued by the United Electrical and Machine Workers of America, CIO.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting statement made by George Reedy, an able newspaperman, over the radio this morning on the subject of Henry Wallace and his third party.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

HIGH PRICES

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I received in the mail from a gentleman down in my district a Confederate $5 bill. This party asked me to redeem it if it was any good, and send him $5 for it. Not wanting this friend to lose faith in the stability of the Confederacy, I promptly mailed him the $5. However, the thought occurred to me at the same time that the $5 bill I sent him of United States currency is worth little more than this Confederate bill printed in 1864 and will buy little more today. I further reflected on the thought that during the special session of Congress we failed to do anything about it. I also reflected that from the way this session is beginning it is unlikely that this session, controlled and dominated by the Republican Party, is apt to do anything about the high prices. I say to you that the least we can do is to freeze prices and wages at the present level and not permit prices to go any higher.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this morning there has been quite a discussion as to the oil problem, may I say that the special committee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has begun an investigation of this problem as it affects our national defense, and Mr. Forrestal, Secretary of National Defense, appeared before us this morning and made what I believe to be a factual statement, which I think will be of information to the membership of the House. In view of the fact that there has been some discussion of the use by the armed services of too much oil, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I urge all Members to read this factual statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the one hundred and forty-first birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee. I claim the honor at this time to call attention of the anniversary date of so great a man to the Congress.

Let us examine General Lee and inquire what makes his life so immeasurably grand. It must be the fact that he went beyond the heights of greatness and on to peaks of nobility.

His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world: This was a man.

We have only to witness the degree of fortitude and courage with which Lee accepted adversity as well as the gracious manner in which he bore pain, suffering, and even defeat to appreciate the true stature of his greatness. Everything about Lee, the loftiness of his ideals, manliness of his actions, and the unselfishness of his deeds, seemed firmly anchored in the bedrock of Christian faith, hope, and charity.

Both by nature and necessity General Lee was a lover of hard work; he cared little for the social or lighter pursuits of life. He liked the soldier's hardships, the soldier's toil, even the soldier's fare, as well as the soldier's glory.

General Lee was born in Virginia January 19, 1807. In 1825 through the generosity of that great South Carolinian, then Secretary of War John C. Calhoun, young Lee was admitted to West Point, graduating therefrom 4 years later without a demerit, second in his class.

Probably the most unusual experience ever coming to an individual came to Lee in March 1861, when at the Blair House in Washington, he was confronted with the decision as to whether he should command the Federal forces or the poorly organized, scantily clad troops of Virginia. He assumed command of the Confederate forces in 1861 with the rank of general which he held until his surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865.

Someone has said that the presence of Napoleon in battle line was equal to the presence of 100,000 troops. If that be true how could we estimate the value of the presence of the matchless Lee as he recklessly rode among his troops in his modest uniform of grey, bearing only the stars to indicate his rank?

The late Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, has described the character of Lee in these beautiful and striking words:

He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vice, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile. He was a Caesar without his ambition, Frederick without his tyranny, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life, and modest and pure as a virgin in thought, watchful as a Roman vestal in duty, submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles.

So, like the varicolored threads of a rich tapestry which combine to produce one perfect, balanced design of beauty, the attributes of Lee's greatness, that is, his outstanding ability and talent, his sterling character, his high moral caliber, his Christian faith and devotion, together without the nameless other qualitative attainments and representations of his life were joined, it seemed, to create the world's grandest and most enduring design for noble living.

Theodore Roosevelt once said:

The world has never seen better soldiers than those who followed Lee; and their leader will undoubtedly rank, without any exception, as the very greatest of all the great captains that the English-speaking people have brought forth.

British Field Marshal Wolseley said of Lee:

He was the ablest general, and to me seemed the greatest man I have ever conversed with. * * * General Lee was one of the few men who ever seriously impressed and awed me with their natural and inherent greatness.

To be sure there is no longer any feeling of sectionalism, no South, no North, no East, no West; all of us are now sons and brothers of our great common country. It is with a feeling of pride, however, that those of us from the South extol the virtues of our heroes and count their contributions to history. At the top of the great roster of our southern heroes will forever be found the name of Robert E. Lee.

THE LIQUOR INDUSTRY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, recently there was sent to the desks of all Members a news letter of the beer, wine, and liquor industries. In this letter the Secretary of Agriculture was charged with playing politics with whisky. I am not saying anything in defense of the Secre-

tary of Agriculture. He does not need anybody to do that. But the same news letter contained the strongest proof possible of the need for immediate restriction of the use of grain for alcoholic-beverage purposes. This news letter showed that the stocks of liquor on hand on November 1947 as compared with November 1946 was 100,000,000 gallons more. In view of the fact that we have today a supply of liquor over 4 years old, which is more than adequate to meet the present high demand for the next 6 years, it seems to me that while there is so much hunger in the world we could well afford to restrict the use of grain for alcoholic-beverage purposes.

Time is urgent in this matter because the grain-conservation program comes effectively to an end January 21, 1948, and if statutory power does not exist by that date, serious and irreplacable wastage of grain will occur.

Since most grain never leaves the farm on which it was raised, the problem of practically conserving grain has to be solved among those industries which consume cash grain. The amount of grain used by any one of these may seem small against the whole crop, yet be a very serious percentage of the grain available to the market; and it is only grain reaching the market that is available for bread, industrial requirements, an important part of animal and poultry feeds and exports.

During the war conservation methods were found practical in the brewing industry, the wet-milling industry, and other cash-grain users. The President should have the power to restore such of these controls as are deemed wise.

Both the domestic economy and foreign policy of the United States will benefit by a removal of the distilling industry from the grain market. The consumption of grain by the distillers during the past 2 years has averaged between 50,000,000 and 55,000,000 bushels a year, or nearly 5,000,000 bushels a month. In the period of operation, from October 1 to 25, 1947, the industry consumed more than 8,000,000 bushels, or at a rate of nearly 100,000,000 bushels a year.

While this is a small part of the total grain consumption, it is a significant part of the grain which comes to market and a very large part of the estimated carry-over for the present year. The carry-over as of July 1, 1948, has been estimated as between 60,000,000 to 150,000,000 bushels—a figure described to the Senate Committee on Appropriations as dangerously low by a representative of the Kansas City Board of Trade, who considered anything less than 235,000,000 bushels reckless. The Secretary of Agriculture has given his opinion that the indicated carry-over may be so small as to be disastrous.

The savings from the distilleries would make up half of the indicated deficit in this year's carry-over, and may be the decisive margin between success or failure in meeting our foreign grain commitments and maintaining adequate stocks for bread and other normal uses in this country toward the end of the present crop year.

Moreover, the withdrawal of the distillers from the grain market should remove a powerful upward pressure on grain prices. Because the cost of grain is so small a part of the cost of whisky, the distillers are free to buy regardless of costs, and in the present grain market are a very strong bullish force. A vice president of General Mills testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee that an increase in the export program from 500,000,000 to 570,000,000 bushels might entail a rise of 1 cent a bushel for each additional million bushels bought. This would result in an increase of 70 cents a bushel in the price of grain. Conversely, the withdrawal of the distillers' demand for 50,000,000 bushels of grain over the next year would substantially reduce the price of grains. The suspension of distilling purchases might well then save the Government and all other grain buyers substantial sums, simply by relieving the pressure of the distillers on present grain supplies.

If the use of grain for whisky and beverage spirits were suspended even through the entire 1948 crop year, no harm would be done to the industry or the public.

The distilling companies, unlike all other industrial users, such as wet millers or brewers, have great stocks of their products on hand because of the very nature of their business. The distilling companies now have in their barrels and tanks 475,000,000 gallons of whisky and an 8 months' supply of neutral spirits for blending purposes. This amount represents about 110,000,000 bushels of grain, the last great remaining grain stock from the years of abundance, and will supply the country at the highest known rates of liquor consumption for approximately 2½ years.

Even a year's suspension of distilling will not affect the tax receipts from whisky and beverage spirits. Those taxes are paid on the release of stocks from warehouses and this amendment will in no way prevent the continued sale from stocks.

No unemployment problem will result from extending the present distilling holiday. The actual distilling of grain for whisky and beverage spirits gives employment to little more than 2,000 people.

If the distillers are allowed to resume unrestricted operations, the industry, to judge from its performance in October, will consume grain at the ruinous rate of 10,000,000 bushels a month in anticipation of a later shut-down. In the circumstances it is imperative that restrictions should continue so that the greatest possible savings of grain from the industry may be insured. Control over the use of grain for alcoholic-beverage purposes is in no way intended to single out and harm the distilling companies and their interests. In fact the companies do not stand to suffer any material loss. They will be free to sell from their present large stocks. However, the distilling companies should not in this year of world famine be converting grain into whisky. When the present grain crisis is passed, they can rapidly replace their stocks with no loss of continuity.

Public interest requires control legislation; and it will injure no private interest.

LEASING OF SALMON TRAP SITES IN TERRITORIAL WATERS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, two identical bills are now pending before Congress which are, I am convinced, opposed by 99 percent of the people of Alaska. I refer to those bills before both Houses which would set up a system of leasing salmon-trap sites in the Territorial waters. It is safe to say that a substantial majority of Alaskans are opposed to the use of the salmon trap. This will be definitely determined at a referendum to be held next October. Then the people of Alaska will be asked to vote on whether traps ought to be abolished over a 10-year period. All observers with whom I have talked expressed belief that those opposed to traps will far outnumber the trap supporters. Of course, under the strict limitations of our organic act, the referendum will be only advisory in nature. That is because in passing the organic act in 1912 Congress reserved to itself the power to legislate with reference to fish and wildlife in Alaska. My understanding is that no other Territory was discriminated against in this fashion. Every effort during the last 36 years to give administrative control of these resources to the people of Alaska has failed. This despite the fact that insufficient Federal appropriations, and other factors, have resulted in a notable diminution of fish and wildlife resources under Federal management.

Now it is proposed not to right the wrong which has been done but to confirm it absolutely. The pending bills would do that which to my knowledge has never before been done in the history of the United States—give title to private individuals and private companies for a 15-year period to these trap sites. It is true the bills make no provision for renewal of these leases. But it is likewise true that there is no prohibition against another bill being introduced somewhere near the end of the 15-year period to amend the law so as to renew those leases.

There is supposed to be some sugar coating in all this. The bills provide that the biggest operators must surrender a certain percentage of the traps they now hold. I contend that a close examination of the bills will reveal there is no positive necessity for surrender of any traps. Even if there were such surrender, I maintain the proposed legislation should command no support. It would in effect give a vested private right in what is and always has been considered a public resource. So today I have introduced a bill anticipating the result of the referendum in Alaska next fall, calling for the abolition of salmon traps in Alaska waters over a 10-year

period. That bill should be passed or my bill to transfer control of the fish and wildlife resources in Alaska to the Territorial government should be passed. The public good would be served if either of them were to become a law. Quite the contrary would result if the trapsite leasing bill were to pass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of January 9, 1948, entitled "No Room for Compromise."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Boston Traveler.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech delivered by him.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a newspaper article.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the citizenship of North Carolina laid to rest a distinguished world citizen, Hon. Josephus Daniels. Time will not permit my giving a worthy tribute to this outstanding citizen, but I would like to include as a part of my remarks, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Charlotte News of January 16, and to quote from the editorial this statement:

His last public utterance came from the White House less than a month ago at the conclusion of a visit with President Truman. It was a bit of advice to the American people, or more particularly to newspaper editors and writers. He urged them to talk and write less of war, and to talk and write more of peace. Words are thoughts and thoughts become deeds. It was a profound truth, stated simply in a few words.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

(The editorial referred to follows:)

JOSEPHUS DANIELS, OF RALEIGH

Josephus Daniels believed in man's fundamental goodness and in his infinite capacity for growth, and we believe in this because of men like Josephus Daniels.

He attained success and distinction as publisher, editor, statesman, diplomat, and writer, but his greatness rests in his simple humanity. It is Josephus Daniels, the individual, who looked upon all men as unique and who was himself unique, that we remember first when we think of him and recall the many things he accomplished in his long, rich life among us.

His last public utterance came from the White House less than a month ago at the conclusion of a visit with President Truman. It was a bit of advice to the American people, or more particularly to newspaper editors and writers. He urged them to talk and write less of war and to talk and write more of peace. Words are thoughts, and thoughts become deeds. It was a profound truth, stated simply in a few words.

He had been talking to Presidents for a large part of his life and preaching truth in plain words since early manhood. He spoke out boldly on many subjects, but all his advice over the years summed up to the theme of his last message—work for peace and human happiness.

He was called a crusader—and he was a forceful, versatile, and wide-gaged reformer who was at his best when turning out a blistering editorial—but he was more of an evangelist than a political crusader. He sought to convert rather than confound. He wanted a Christian revival, not a revolution. He was a Puritan bred in the democratic spirit, so that his causes ranged from prohibition to the New Deal, which carried forward on the national level a movement he long before had advanced in his native North Carolina. But whether he was contending against John Barleycorn, American monopolists, or British imperialism—three of his favorite targets—it was clear that he wanted something more than sobriety, economic security, and political freedom for men. He believed, and he proved, that life on earth could be good.

Josephus Daniels started out with a paper of his own in a North Carolina town when he was 18 years old and lifted himself to a place among the famous American editors in the line extending from Benjamin Franklin. His nearest counterpart in this notable company is William Allen White, of Emporia, Kans., who died in 1945.

White was the spokesman of the progressive Middle West, Daniels of the liberal South. White was the adviser of Presidents and other national leaders and the conscience of the Republican Party. Daniels worked in the Administrations of three Democratic Presidents and was the intimate of two—Wilson and Roosevelt. His work to keep the Democratic Party true to the Jeffersonian ideals made his home in Raleigh a mecca for politicians. Both White and Daniels attained the status of national figures and the stature of world citizens while working at their editor's desks in relatively small cities of the American hinterland.

Josephus Daniels belongs to Raleigh, to North Carolina, to Washington, to America, and to the world, and his effect upon all for good cannot be measured except by the word, "great." His contributions as Secretary of the Navy, as adviser on national policy, as Ambassador to Mexico, and as a journalist and writer over more than 60 years are all distinguished by the generous, honest, noble spirit that was the shining mark of the man. Presidents and world leaders turned to him for counsel because they found deep insights in his simple words, a wisdom that came from broad knowledge of and complete devotion to the Christian and democratic faiths of America. The people listened to him because he spoke with an intelligence that consistently was informed by the heart. Now that he is gone, they think of him with pride and affection, and remember how well he taught them that America's greatest glory comes from its citizens who love their fellow men and live courageously in that faith.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial recently appearing in the Boston Post.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD, and include the program of the DAV and the program of the VFW.

PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very interesting speeches this morning covering all deals, going in all directions, condemning—I want to refrain from using a little stronger word—condemning everything under the sun, except one constructive speech about increasing our air-mail postage from 5 cents to 6 cents.

Meat? Why, I can remember, in 1946, when people were promised within 60 days they would have all the meat they wanted at lower prices than OPA. We now have approximately a 30-percent average increase in the cost of living since that time, as a result of the great majority of the Members of the Republican Party voting as they did, and bringing about a cost to the American consuming public of at least $20,000,000,000 more than they would have paid if OPA-controlled prices were in existence since June 30, 1946.

On the question of fuel oil, the trouble is production. There is lack of production. The distribution can be improved upon, but production is by private interests. Only last year we directed the Maritime Commission to dispose of tankers. This Congress did that. The Maritime Commission had to do it. This Congress has failed to give them the power to see that those who bought the tankers should transport fuel oil to American cities and to sections of the country adversely affected under the present emergency. The fault lies in this respect with the Congress of the United States rather than with any agency of the executive branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

FUEL OIL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps the fault does lie with Congress in not placing some limitation upon the amount of petroleum supplies that are being sent abroad. I read in the paper just the other day that Ambassador Caffery announced that since the interim-aid program had been voted, 200,000 tons of petroleum had been received by France.

I also received a letter from a party who has a picture taken of a Russian oil tanker loading up from Hamilton Point, Calif., taking a cargo of petroleum to Russia.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered for today, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

FUEL-OIL SHORTAGE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on this oil problem there is only one solution. The oil dealers apparently cannot or will not work the matter out themselves. The President's letter to me said if the owners of the tankers would use the tankers for home consumption instead of for foreign export, there would be enough tankers to care for the United States transportation. Increased shipments of oil are going to Russia and Canada. There is only one thing to do in order to keep the people warm, and that is to issue an embargo, as the President did in the case of coal, until the emergency is over. It is not entirely a question affecting New England, but it is a problem that affects the entire country. I assure everybody who is interested in relief that you are not going to get that bill through very quickly if we continue sending oil to Russia—the country which is constantly obstructing us—if we continue sending unneeded oil, I believe, to Canada, and let our own people suffer from cold. One man and one boy were found dead in a cold house this week end.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. REES. With respect to this question of the production of oil, it ought to be observed also that in my section of the country we are having difficulty getting machinery to produce the oil, yet at the same time we are sending large quantities of oil abroad.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is not a local situation, it is a general one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

SPECTER OF INFLATION IS PROPAGANDA

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the comment of the gentleman from Georgia about prices. He unconsciously, or perhaps consciously, is merely reiterating the propaganda of the ADA. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in his message on the state of the Union the President stated that since 1938 the income of the industrial workers of this Nation enabled them, dollar for dollar, to buy everything they did in 1938, to pay their taxes, and have 50 percent left over. He forgot, however, that there are some people in the country who are not in that position; for instance, certain people on the civil-service pay rolls, teachers, and others in State employment, white-collar workers, and those who depend upon fixed incomes.

The President in his message on the budget, just a few days ago, said he was not going to raise the wages of Federal employees. However, those are the very persons who need help, if they are not receiving at least 75 percent more than they received as wages in the year 1938. I say we should give an example to the rest of the country by raising the wages of necessary Federal employees to the point where they can once again meet the cost of living. Then the various States of the Union will do justice to their employees, as will the businesses of the country with their faithful white-collar workers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

ONE-YEAR HOLIDAY ON USE OF GRAIN FOR LIQUOR MAKING

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] for calling attention to the fact that the Government is continuing to use a great quantity of grain in the manufacture of distilled liquors even though they have a full year's supply on hand. It seems incredible at this time when there is such a shortage of food that millions of bushels of corn and other grains are being used presently for the making of distilled liquors.

It may interest you to know that a great portion of the two and a half million bushels of grain allocated to the distillers is corn. At the same time, on the floor of the House we talk about the shortage of meat for human food. In place of using that corn to produce meat they are using it to produce distilled liquors. There is not much sense in that sort of thing as I see it.

I have a bill pending in the Committee on Agriculture. I am going to ask for its consideration in the immediate future. This bill would withhold new grain from the making of distilled liquors for a period of 1 year. I think the bill is fair and I trust the Members on both sides of the aisle will support this proposed legislation.

EXPORTATION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, something has been said about the export of oil. I call the attention of the House to the fact that we are exporting 450,000 barrels of crude oil daily; we are importing 460,000 barrels daily of crude and heating oils and petroleum products. Of the export, part is lubricating oil. Two refineries in the United States make lubricating oil out of a different grade of oil than is used for general purposes. Very little, if any at all, is being exported to Russia.

When you speak of sending oil to Canada you must remember that we are getting imports from Canada of wood pulp and other critical materials. We are not sending them too much. Anybody on the Committee on Armed Services could tell you that there are certain critical materials we are getting from Canada. Now, if you want to go ahead and slap somebody in the face and say, "No, you cannot have it," you are going to have the same retaliation come back at you sooner or later. And also the shipments to Canada have been reduced.

THE LATE JOSEPHUS DANIELS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, "Know ye not that a prince and a great man has fallen—in Israel." On last Thursday, January 15, at his home, Wakestone, in the city of Raleigh, N. C., the spirit of Josephus Daniels passed from the shores of sound to the great realm of silence. He was North Carolina's most distinguished and beloved citizen, and he was my close, personal friend. From the days of my childhood I have enjoyed the friendship of this great and good

man, and I shall always cherish the memory of all the moments I have spent with him. Sincere human affection inspires me to pay tribute to this great statesman whose life was such a blessing to the State, to the Nation, and to the world in which he lived.

No words that I might employ could add dignity to the life, nor splendor to the spirit of Josephus Daniels who, by his own life, enriched the lives of all who felt the tolerance and kindness of his great heart.

Only in the dusk of evening, when the sinking sun goes down, do the lovely heavens glow with the rich coloring of the dying day and tell the true story of the great light which never wanes. The soul of Josephus Daniels has entered upon a new career in the regions of immortality, but this great spirit of departed eminence will enter that new career unafraid and with humility, tolerance and love, the human attributes which marked the pathway of his life. The tender sweetness of his genial manner was a living inspiration to all mankind. He possessed all of the splendid virtues and fine sensibilities prerequisite to true greatness. On the broad stage of human affairs, he rose to lofty peaks, but his soul selected its own society. The magnificence of his life is a benediction which shall be cherished by troops of friends around the world. He rose to the full stature of manhood, and he died in the faith of a Christian. He left a name without a blemish, a heritage of honor to his children. His proud spirit may travel the pathway of the stars, but no tomb can ever enclose the grand influences of his life.

They say that life is a highway; the milestones are its years,
And here and there is a tollgate where we pay our way with tears.
It's a high road and a rough road and it leads near and far,
But it leads at last to the golden town where the golden houses are.

In the shadow of his life, travelers upon the rough and rugged road of life have found rest and inspiration. His spirit is on the road that leads to the "golden houses."

In a life beyond fourscore years, he was honored with a commission from every Chief Executive of his political faith who has occupied the White House since the day he was born. His long public record is written in the history of our Nation, and his private life upon the tablets of the hearts of thousands of friends. He was a gifted statesman and a righteous man. He loved his children and adored his wife. His great and true devotion for his wife will always be remembered by the people of his State. His charming wife and companion preceded him to the grave a few short years ago. When I think of his great devotion for the woman he always affectionately called Miss Addie, and when I think of the long number of years he has lived, there is something quite appropriate in these lines of an English poet:

To my ninth decade I have tottered on,
And no soft arm bends now, my step to steady.
She, who once led me where she would, is gone.
So when He calls me, Death shall find me ready.

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I desire to say a word to those Members of Congress whose people are shivering in the cold for want of oil. The last Congress authorized the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway that, when completed, will be equal to a slack-water route from the Gulf to Chicago.

It will open up the vast oil fields in the South to everybody between the Great Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico and everybody who has access to the Great Lakes.

There is more oil produced in Mississippi than is produced in the States of Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio all put together. Those four States produce 106,300 barrels a day, while Mississippi produces 107,300 barrels a day. That oil cannot be transported profitably up the swift current of the Mississippi River, but by the development of this inland waterway it gives us a slack-water route all the way up to the Tennessee River and a downstream route, 262 miles from there to Cairo, Ill., which will offset the 180 miles upstream from Cairo to St. Louis and the 38 miles distance from St. Louis to where we enter the Illinois River, which provides a slack-water route into Chicago.

I am appealing to you now to help get construction started on this great project at once.

I will show where it will benefit the people in every State between the Alleghenies and the Rocky Mountains, and even beyond the Allegheny Mountains, because it will provide a slack-water route into the Great Lakes which will enable your people to transport, not only oil but all other materials, on barges that cannot now navigate economically against the swift current of the Mississippi River because of the enormous expense.

At the same time, as General Robbins pointed out, it saves the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

He said it would mean more than would extending an arm of the Gulf of Mexico all the way up to St. Louis; for the reason that it would furnish a slack-water route for upstream traffic and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address.

DISSEMINATION ABROAD OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

Page 2, strike out lines 2 to 19, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries. Among the means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

"(1) an information service to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people, and policies promulgated by the Congress, the President, the Secretary of State, and other responsible officials of Government having to do with matters affecting foreign affairs;

"(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

"(a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

"(b) the rendering of technical and other services;

"(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences."

Page 2, after line 19, insert:

"UNITED NATIONS

"SEC. 3. In carrying out the objectives of this act information concerning the participation of the United States in the United Nations, its organizations and functions, shall be emphasized."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "3" and insert "4."

Page 2, line 25, strike out all after "agency" over to and including "branch" in line 1 on page 3.

Page 3, line 12, after "skill" insert "and shall wherever possible provide these interchanges by using the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity."

Page 3, line 20, strike out all after "States." over to and including "deported." in line 2, page 4, and insert "The persons specified in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrant visitors for business under clause 2 of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 154; 8 U. S. C. 203), for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. A person admitted under this section who fails to maintain the status under which he was admitted or who fails to depart from the United States at the expiration of the time for which he was admitted, or who engages in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to section 14 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162, 8 U. S. C. 214). Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Such persons shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under clause 2 of subdivision (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (54 Stat. 671, 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155)."

Page 4, line 13, strike out "or" and insert "and."

Page 5, line 2, strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

Page 5, line 5, after "serving." insert "No person shall be assigned for service to or in cooperation with the government of any country unless (1) the Secretary finds that such assignment is necessary in the national interest of the United States, or (2) such government agrees to reimburse the United States in an amount equal to the compensation, travel expenses, and allowances payable to such person during the period of such assignment in accordance with the provisions of section 302, or (3) such government shall have made an advance of funds, property, or services as provided in section 902."

Page 5, line 11, strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

Page 6, line 2, strike out "person" and insert "citizen of the United States."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "their" and insert "the."

Page 6, line 23, after "approval", insert "of the President."

Page 6, line 24, strike out all after "agencies." over to and including "agencies." in line 12, page 7, and insert "Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. The Secretary shall include in each report submitted to the Congress under section 1008 a statement of the services, facilities, and personnel of other Government agencies utilized in carrying on activities under the authority of this act, showing the names and salaries of the personnel utilized, performing services utilized, during the period covered by such report, and the amounts paid to such other agencies under this section as payment for such performance."

Page 8, line 5, strike out "the" and insert "any appropriate."

Page 8, lines 5 and 6, strike out "with appropriate legislative authority."

Page 8, line 8, after "agencies", insert ", and shall not enter into the performance of such services to any foreign government where such services may be performed adequately by qualified private American individuals and agencies and such qualified individuals and agencies are available for the performance of such services."

Page 8, line 23, strike out all after "assignments" over to and including "title" in line 8, page 9.

Page 9, strike out lines 9 to 17, inclusive.

Page 9, strike out lines 18 to 24, inclusive.

Page 10, strike out lines 1 to 8, inclusive.

Page 10, line 17, strike out all after "abroad." down to and including "abroad." in line 22 and insert "Any such press release or radio script, on request, shall be available in the English language at the Department of State, at all reasonable times following its release as information abroad, for examination by representatives of United States press associations, newspapers, magazines, radio systems and stations, and, on request, shall be made available to Members of Congress."

Page 11, line 1, strike out all after "Secretary" down to and including "and" in line 5.

Page 11, line 11, strike out all after "information" down to and including "source" in line 18.

Page 11, strike out all after line 18 over to and including line 14 on page 14 and insert:

"TITLE VI—ADVISORY COMMISSIONS TO FORMULATE POLICIES

"SEC. 601. There are hereby created two advisory commissions, (1) United States Advisory Commission on Information (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Information) and (2) United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission on Educational Exchange) to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commissions shall formulate and recommend to the Secretary policies and programs for the carrying out of this act: *Provided, however,* That the commissions created by this section shall have no authority over the Board of Foreign Scholarships or the program created by Public Law 584 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, enacted August 1, 1946, or the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

"MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSIONS; GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 602. (a) Each Commission shall consist of five members, not more than three of whom shall be from any one political party. Members shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment.

"(b) The members of the Commission on Information shall represent the public interest, and shall be selected from a cross section of professional, business, and public service backgrounds.

"(c) The members of the Commission on Educational Exchange shall represent the public interest and shall be selected from a cross section of educational, cultural, scientific, technical, and public service backgrounds.

"(d) The term of each member appointed under subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years, except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on each Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of 1 year, two at the end of 2 years, and one at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

"(e) The President shall designate a chairman for each Commission from among members of the Commission.

"(f) The members of the Commissions shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commissions away from their places of residences, as provided in subsection (6) of section 801 of this act.

"(g) The Commissions are authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon them by this title.

"(h) The Department is authorized to provide the necessary secretarial and clerical assistance for the Commissions.

"RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

"SEC. 603. The Commissions shall meet not less frequently than once each month during the first 6 months after their establishment, and thereafter at such intervals as the Commissions find advisable, and shall transmit to the Secretary a quarterly report, and to the Congress a semiannual report of all programs and activities carried on under the authority of this act, including appraisals, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs, and such recommendations as shall have been made by the Commissions to the Secretary for effectuating the purposes and objectives of this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations."

Page 14, line 20, strike out "may" and insert "shall."

Page 16, line 17, after "create", insert "with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange."

Page 18, after line 17, insert:

"ADVANCE OF FUNDS

"SEC. 902. If any other government shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services. Funds so received may be established as a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for the specified purpose, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure, subject to the provisions of this act. Any unexpended balance of the special deposit account and other property received under this section and no longer required for the purposes for which provided shall be returned to the government providing the funds or property."

Page 18, line 20, strike out all after "1001." over to and including line 10 on page 19, and insert "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties by the Government under this act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Page 19, strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive.

Page 19, line 18, strike out "1003" and insert "1002."

Page 20, line 2, strike out "1004" and insert "1003."

Page 20, line 8, strike out "1005" and insert "1004."

Page 20, line 24, strike out "1006" and insert "1005."

Page 21, line 1, strike out all after "utilize". down to and including "agencies," in line 2 and insert "to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies."

Page 21, strike out lines 9 to 15, inclusive.

Page 21, line 18, strike out "1008" and insert "1006."

Page 21, lines 18 and 19, strike out ", or under any provision thereof."

Page 21, after line 21, insert:

"VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT"

Page 21, line 22, strike out "1009" and insert "1007."

Page 22, line 2, strike out "1010" and insert "1008."

Page 22, line 10, strike out "1011" and insert "1009."

Page 22, after line 14, insert:

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1010. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I certainly am not going to object, but I think it would be proper for the gentleman to explain what this is that he is proposing to do.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be very happy to do that, Mr. Speaker. This is the bill to create an American Information Service abroad that was debated so long in the House last summer and which passed the other body unanimously on Friday of last week. The Members of the House will be interested to know that there are no basic changes whatsoever in the legislation as it passed the House with the exception that the other body added some minor amendments which have further encouraged the use of private agencies, wherever they could, in the implementation of this program. The only other material change in our House bill made in the other body was the change in the so-called Dirksen amendment, which was made in consultation with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and in consultation with me as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill. It was made also on the basis of investigation and study which both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and our subcommittee made in Europe this summer. Otherwise there are no major changes in the bill from the form in which it passed the House last June 24, and so I recommend we concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, who selects these voices? Some voices, I had assumed, did not go to Europe.

Mr. MUNDT. These voices, as you call them, will be selected by the Department of State under the Secretary of State, Mr. Marshall, and the program will be administered by personnel cleared and checked by the FBI before it is utilized. The so-called Mundt loyalty amendment which we have put in all of our foreign-aid and assistance bills, since our unfortunate experiences with UNRRA, is made an inherent part of H. R. 3342. I made sure of that before I ever introduced the legislation.

Mr. MACKINNON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has any division been made in the bill between the propaganda activities and the educational activities?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. That was made in the revised Advisory Commission by the amendment to the Dirksen amendment, to which I earlier referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, by our final passage of H. R. 3342 just now with the amendments added by the Senate, the Eightieth Congress has in my opinion written an important new chapter in American history. For the first time in our peacetime history, this Republic will now have a permanent, comprehensive, and coherent program for disseminating information abroad about the American concept, the American program, and the American people. For the first time, we will be equipped and prepared to tell people in foreign lands the truth about America and the free institutions which have made us strong. And for the first time, too, when and where we need to use it we shall have an arm of our Government able and adequate to answer and refute slanderous falsehoods about us and to expose the fallacies and motives of vicious propaganda directed against us and our way of life. We will now be prepared to wage a peace just as we must be prepared to wage a war should necessity arise.

Mr. Speaker, today's action concludes a long and arduous campaign to establish such an information service as H. R. 3342 provides. Like all new ventures, it has had persistent opposition but it has also had the loyal and consistent support of many advocates. I wish to extend my personal appreciation to the many individuals and organizations who have cooperated so energetically and tirelessly in the promotion of this legislation. The educational campaign which they have conducted has aided mightily in bringing about the final passage of this legislation, which, in my opinion, in the final analysis may well do as much or more than the Marshall plan itself to promote permanent peace and to prepare the minds and hearts of people in foreign countries to follow the pursuits and practices which make war both unnecessary and impossible.

Now that H. R. 3342 has become permanent legislation, Mr. Speaker, we who believe in letting the voice of America be heard abroad in strong and strident terms must not cease our efforts. I hope that within the next few weeks we can pass a supplemental appropriations bill making available without further delay five or six million dollars to do the immediate make-ready work necessary to the full development of an adequate and effective foreign information program. I also trust our State Department will request not less than $50,000,000 for the next fiscal year to conduct an information program abroad which will be a real credit to the United States and an effective element in waging the peace which we must win if we are to avert the necessity of again having to wage war. I predict that this Congress will wholeheartedly support an adequate appropriation for this work if the State Department, the Budget Bureau, and the Appropriations Committee will cooperate to bring before us an appropriations item which is large enough to do this man-sized job in a businesslike, effective, and determined manner.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material in each.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

FILLING VACANCY IN OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1436) to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ESTABLISHING A FISH HATCHERY AT ROGERS CITY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 210) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ESTABLISHING A FISH HATCHERY AT ST. IGNACE, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 214) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ESTABLISHING A FISH HATCHERY AT CHARLEVOIX, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 215) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ESTABLISHING A FISH HATCHERY ON THE ANNA RIVER, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 216) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. DEANE objected.

AMENDING ORGANIC ACT OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3106) to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1821) to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. DEANE, and Mr. PLUMLEY objected.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and

other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that this bill is one that proposes to do something about the fuel-oil situation. It is proposed to extend the time in which the demonstration plant which is being operated by the Department of the Interior can function. I understand it does violate the policy announced by the objectors on the Consent Calendar in that the amount involved is more than $1,000,000, consequently I am asking the Committee on Rules for consideration. However, I think the Members should know that the Department of the Interior, Oil and Gas Division, now regards the synthetic liquid fuel program as offering the answer to our dwindling petroleum reserves in this country. The reserves in coal shales are estimated to be five times that of our petroleum. The reserves in sub-bituminous coal are estimated to be 25 times that of petroleum. The research already carried on demonstrates that gasoline can be produced with presently known processes at less than 9 cents a gallon. It demonstrates that fuel oil can be produced at about $1.92 a barrel, making a synthetic fuel oil competitive with fuel oil produced from petroleum. The demonstrations that are now going on should be carried to completion. These pilot plants should be permitted to operate so that we can get experience and encourage private industry to put some money into plants and produce fuel oil that the country needs. Therefore if the Committee on Rules grants us a favorable rule, I hope that we can get favorable consideration of the bill at an early date.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that there is a great program under way at this time under present legislation?

Mr CASE of South Dakota. That is true. There is a program under way, but the Secretary of the Interior says he needs additional time and additional funds to carry it on. This bill was urgently recommended by him and reported by the Committee on Public Lands unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BRAINERD WAR DEAD NATIONAL MEMORIAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3614) to provide for the establishment of the Brainerd War Dead National Memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1005) to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled an act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

FISH RESTORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1693) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2273) to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has considerable merit from the standpoint of equity and justice, but in view of the fact that it involves some $3,000,000, it seems to me that it is not a proper bill for consideration on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST PARTY AND VETERANS' BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3623) to provide that members of the Communist Party shall be ineligible for veterans' benefits, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. HUBER, and Mr. KEAN objected.

NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1809) to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3218) to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to assure continuous operation of irrigation or power systems operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the reclamation fund an emergency fund which shall be available for defraying expenses which the Commissioner of Reclamation determines are required to be incurred because of unusual or emergency conditions.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1710) to authorize a survey of a proposed Mississippi River parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of this bill explain what part of the Reclamation Act is proposed to be amended?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the Rules Committee has granted a rule on this bill and, as I understand, the bill is scheduled to come up for consideration tomorrow or the next day in the House. Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

PARKER RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4108) to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. McDOWELL, and Mr. PLUMLEY objected.

NATIONAL CEMETERY IN EVERY STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1109) to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States and Territories as may be needed for the burial of war veterans and certain other persons as provided for in section 281, title 24, United States Code, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. PLUMLEY objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

KLAMATH INDIANS OF OREGON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2502) to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known as the "Klamath Welfare Act."

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, from the capital reserve fund deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians (hereinafter referred to as the "Klamath Tribes"), said fund being established pursuant to the act of August 28, 1937 (ch. 874, 50 Stat. 872), as augmented by the proceeds of the judgment fund of the Klamath Indians as provided in the act of August 7, 1939 (ch. 552, 53 Stat. 1252), to credit the sum of $1,000 upon the books of the Office of Indian Affairs, to each person determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be entitled to enrollment upon the annuity roll of said tribes of the Klamath Reservation, Oreg., living upon the date of the enactment of this act. Notwithstanding the provisions of any prior act or acts relating to the enrollment of members of the Klamath Tribes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, by and with the consent and recommendation of the general council of the Klamath Tribes, or its duly authorized representative, to eliminate from the roll any member or class of members for such cause as, to the Secretary and the said general council or its representative, shall be found just and reasonable upon such investigation or hearing as the Secretary may determine. The share of each adult member of the credit so established shall be available for expenditure, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, for the following purposes;

Purchase of land or interests in land; improvement of lands acquired or already held by the Indian; erection and improvement of suitable homes, including household equipment and furnishings; repayment of any loans received from the United States or from the Klamath tribal funds; purchase of building material, feed, seed, and grain; purchase or rehabilitation and repair of farming equipment, tools, trucks, tractors, machinery, and implements; and purchase of any other equipment or supplies necessary to enable the Indians to fit themselves for or to engage in farming, livestock, industry, or such other pursuits or vocations, including education and adult education, as will enable them to become self-supporting; and health, including dental work: *Provided, however,* That the funds of the aged, infirm, decrepit, and incapacitated members may be used for their proper maintenance and support: *Provided further,* That during minority, the share of each minor Indian shall be available for expenditure only for his education and for health purposes, including dental work, except that in an emergency expenditure of a minor Indian's share may be made for any of the purposes specified in this act. As herein used, the term "minor" shall include all members of the tribe who have not attained the age of 21 years, except that minors 18 years of age or over and who are married or have families of their own to support, shall be regarded as adults. On the death of any enrolled member, adult or minor, the sum on deposit to his credit shall be distributed as personal property, and shall be available for expenditure by the distributees only for the purposes herein authorized: *And provided further,* That each member of the Klamath Tribes honorably discharged from service to the United States in its armed forces shall, upon application to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, be paid $200 in cash, free from the aforesaid restrictions and in addition to the $1,000 to be credited to such member as provided in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 3. That in no event shall any portion of the funds hereby directed to be credited and paid become liable, payable, or subject to any debt or debts contracted prior to the passage of this act by any Indian of the Klamath Tribe, except debts to the United States or to the tribe.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 3, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500."

On page 4, line 5, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1330) to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the lands belonging to the United States within the exterior boundaries of said monument to the same status held immediately prior to the issuance of said proclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. HUBER, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. DEANE objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

ELIMINATION OF REGULAR ARMY OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this is a good bill but it is too long for the Consent Calendar, and therefore I object.

RECLAIMING LANDS BY DRAINAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3538) to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, is authorized to investigate, plan, design, and report to the President and the Congress on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage.

SEC. 2. Reports on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage may be made from time to time to the Congress through the President and shall contain such information as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem pertinent, including in any event (1) a description of the area or areas to be drained; (2) a description of the principal works proposed to be constructed for the purposes of the project; (3) a statement of the estimated cost of the project; (4) the Secretary's recommendations regarding the part of the estimated cost of the project which can properly be allocated to Federal responsibilities in connection with the public health or other matters of general public benefit; (5) advice as to the extent to which contributions toward the project are assured through promises of financial aid, the contribution of lands, easements, or right-of-way, or other assistance by States or agencies or creatures thereof, or public or private bodies, or individuals; (6) advice as to what assurances have been obtained that beneficiaries of the proposed project will pay, either in advance of the beginning of construction thereof or over a period of years after completion of the construction of the project, and appropriate share of its construction costs; and (7) advice as to what assurances have been obtained that funds required from year to year for the operation and maintenance of the project will be forthcoming from sources other than the United States.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall be deemed supplemental to the Federal reclamation laws.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation," and insert the word "Agriculture."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "the Interior" and insert "Agriculture."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "Federal", insert ", State, and local."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "benefit" and before the semicolon, insert "including a statement of the total value of private, local, State, and National benefits to be derived from the project."

Page 2, line 21, after the period, insert the following: "Recommendations for Federal participation in construction of any such projects shall not be made unless it is shown that the total private, local, State, and National benefits of the proposed improvements to whomsoever accruing exceed the total costs of the project: *Provided,* That where works or activities contemplated include channel and major drainage improvements within the purview of section 2 of the Flood Control Act, approved December 22, 1944, or otherwise, such works shall be the responsibility of and shall be reported on (and prosecuted) by the War Department under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers; and the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of War shall take cognizance of the findings and recommendations of each other and shall state the respects in which the prosecution of the plans and proposals of each will be correlated: *Provided further,* That this act shall not include the authority to investigate, plan, and prepare reports relating to drainage projects adjacent and incidental to Federal irrigation projects under construction by or administration of the Department of the Interior except by agreement with such Department."

Page 3, line 3, strike out all of section 4.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage."

VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR NEGRO VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3814) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the

birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the Speaker has announced that he would recognize somebody to move to suspend the rules on this bill.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. KEAN. Then, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims, and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by members of the committee that a rule has been asked for on this bill, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC AIRPORT IN THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand the same situation applies to this bill as the preceding one. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AIRPORT FOR THE CITY OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3509) to authorize the construction of a class IV airport for the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and a public highway or bridge from the city of Fairbanks to the location of the airport.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been requested on this bill, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the next business, House Concurrent Resolution 57.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3924) to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been requested on this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING TIME FOR CERTAIN APPLICATIONS UNDER NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4141) to amend subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to extend for 2 years the time within which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous insurance benefits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (38 U. S. C. 802 (d) (5), is amended by substituting "seven" for "five" in the first proviso, so that the subsection will read as follows:

"(5) If any person deemed to have been issued insurance under subsection (3) (A) or (b) hereof die without filing application and within the time limited therefor, death insurance benefits shall be payable in the manner and to the persons as stated in subsection (2): *Provided*, That no application for insurance payments under subsections (2) or (3), as hereby amended, shall be valid unless filed in the Veterans' Administration within 7 years after the date of death of the insured and the relationship and dependency of the applicant, where required as a basis for such claim, shall be proved as of date of death of insured by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator: *And provided further*, That persons shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to have been mentally or legally incompetent at the time the right to apply for continuation of insurance or for death benefits expires, may make such application at any time within 1 year after the removal of such disability."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill would amend subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, in order to extend for 2 years the time in which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous—automatic—insurance benefits after the death of a veteran who was deemed to have been issued such insurance under existing law—subsection 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

Under existing law—subsection 602 (d) (5)—application must be made within 5 years after death of the insured and this bill would extend the time to 7 years after the death of the insured. Under present provisions, the time for filing applications has expired with respect to those persons eligible to apply for such death benefits, who were residing in enemy-occupied territories and were unable to learn of their rights, or if aware of such rights, were precluded from making application until the reoccupation of such territories. As an example the time for filing applications has expired with respect to those veterans who died between the time of the Japanese attack on the Philippines in December 1941 and the formal surrender in May 1942 of the troops in the Philippines and due to the Japanese control of the Philippines after the surrender, the dependents eligible to apply for such insurance death benefits, who were residing in the Philippines, were precluded from making application until our reoccupation of the Philippines.

This bill is intended to correct, by the necessary extension of time for making such application, the above-described situations.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING MINIMUM RATING FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED ARRESTED TUBERCULOSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4243) to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the report to show the attitude of the Veterans' Administration on this bill, and there is nothing in the report about the cost. Therefore, I object.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1947, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, favorably reported H. R. 4243, Eightieth Congress, a bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis.

The purpose of the bill is to insure that veterans who have incurred active tuberculosis in the service of their country, either in time of war or peace, will receive compensation proportionate to the degree of disability resulting from arrested tuberculosis so long as they live.

Under existing regulations of the Veterans' Administration, provision is made for payment of compensation for service-connected arrested tuberculosis for specified periods following an arrest of active tuberculosis. In some instances where pronounced symptoms of the disease are manifest after arrest, ratings of 20 or 30 percent are authorized for life. However, in certain other cases where pronounced symptoms of tubercular disability are not manifest, veterans having arrested tuberculosis are ultimately rated as no percent disabled.

The committee, after extensive hearings and thorough consideration of the matter, is convinced that an active tubercular process has residuals which continue throughout life and that a veteran having arrested tuberculosis should be relieved of the fear that his compensation may be terminated, notwithstanding the fact that his disability continues.

The following table shows the difference between ratings made under existing regulations of the Veterans' Administration and those proposed by the bill:

Rating for arrested tuberculosis under Veterans' Administration regulations	Percent disability	Ratings for arrested tuberculosis proposed by H. R. 4243	Percent disability
Period:		Period:	
6 months after arrest (may be continued for successive periods of 6 months, up to a maximum of 2 years under certain conditions).	100	2 years after arrest (may be reduced to 50 percent for failure to follow prescribed treatment or to submit to examination when requested).	100
Balance of 5 years	50		
Next 5 years	30	Next 5 years	50
After 10 years:		After 7 years (for life):	
(A) If veteran had far-advanced active lesions, for life.	30	(A) If tubercular condition is diagnosed as far-advanced.	40
(B) If veteran had moderately advanced lesions and residuals continue to show certain evidence of disability, for life.	20	(B) If tubercular condition is diagnosed as moderately advanced or less.	30
or—			
(C) Otherwise	0		

Mr. Speaker, under the terms of the bill, at the rates of compensation now provided under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the veterans' regulations issued thereunder, a veteran having arrested tuberculosis incurred in wartime service will be entitled to at least $41.40 per month so long as he lives. A peacetime veteran having the same disability will receive at least $31.05 so long as he lives.

As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am convinced that the bill is meritorious and should be promptly enacted to insure the welfare of veterans having arrested tuberculosis.

SENIORITY OF RURAL CARRIERS, POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1189) to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees—rural carriers—in the field service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill explain what it provides?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for seniority out of a local post office on rural routes. For example, if there are three rural routes out of a town and one route becomes vacated then under my bill the oldest carrier out of that town has the right to fill that vacancy, and so on down the line.

Under present practices the postmaster can put a new man who qualifies as rural carrier on a select route. This bill gives seniority to those who have been carrying the routes and who in many cases have been carrying a route that was not the most desirable.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the attitude of the Post Office Department on this bill?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The Post Office Department is not opposing the legislation. They contend that they are following this practice already.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. I have had some experience along that line. In every instance the Post Office Department has made it mandatory that the senior carrier have the right to transfer to the vacated route over any carrier with less seniority. I do not know whether that is the law, but they have been doing that.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman from Alabama that I have had several instances called to my attention where that procedure was not followed; and the purpose of this legislation is to make it mandatory that the oldest carrier out of the post office shall be entitled to the best route when it is vacated.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I have had several such cases in my own district. I found that they have even started to bring in rural carriers from other States to take these positions. To this I strenuously object, but what is in the bill that would prevent that sort of carpetbagging, so to speak?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. It would not prevent the transfer or exchange between other States. It would, however, make the man who transferred to that locality take the route that no one else carrying out of that post office desired.

Mr. RANKIN. Would this shut the door in the face of people living along the vacated route, many of whom are ex-service men, from competing for this route, and put on the route a man who probably would not be satisfactory to the patrons of the route, and who might not be a veteran?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. No; no; the veterans would qualify through examination and appointment.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that this bill would not affect the prerogatives of Members of Congress of designating which one of the three top men on the eligible list shall be chosen.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. And it would not prevent a veteran from taking a route out of that post office. He would have to take the route that was least desirable to the others who have served out of that post office a longer length of time.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. This has no relation whatever to any subsequent appointees. It just covers those who are serving at the time?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION. The one oldest in service has the preference?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right and he does not have that preference until there is a vacancy on a route out of his post office. Then the oldest man has a right to request that he be transferred to that vacancy, if he desires it.

Mr. RANKIN. You can take a man and put him on a loop route 15 or 20 miles from the office he serves. Under this bill could not he be put on a route he has never served?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The route must emanate out of the same post office.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but you have loop routes that come from the same post office, and some of them originate 10, 15, or 20 miles from the area to which you propose to transfer him.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman made the statement that this bill would not interfere with the prerogatives of Members of Congress in the appointment of one of the top three eligible candidates for a vacancy. It may be that I have overlooked some opportunities.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman that that prerogative goes only to the member of the party of the administration in power.

Mr. COLE of New York. The administration at the White House?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Yes; that is right. In the absence of a member in their party, either Senator or Representative, in the district wherein the vacancy occurs, why, then, the political adviser is the Democratic county committee of that particular county.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then do I understand it is correct that is the procedure that is followed under the guise of the civil service and the merit system?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. You do not make any provision for promoting the substitutes who probably carry the mail during the bad weather, on the hot days and the rainy days and in the snow and sleet.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There is a bill having that purpose in view before our committee at this time. That has long been requested.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. All in the world this bill does is to provide that in the event of a vacancy in a certain post office, if there is more than one rural route out of that post office, if the senior carrier wants to do so he may be appointed or be transferred to the route that is vacated?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. REES. That is all there is to it. It is wholly within the post office. The gentleman remembers, I believe, that the mail carriers' organization asked to have this privilege extended to include an entire State.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. REES. But the committee decided this should apply only in a single post office?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. REES. It has nothing to do with the rights of veterans, because if there is a vacancy there the veterans may apply themselves. They always have that privilege.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is right. The veteran must take his examination. He is entitled to his veteran's preference and under the civil-service rules if he is one of the top three men, and if the political advisor does not designate him, then they must state in writing the reason why they have bypassed the veteran.

Mr. RANKIN. If he is one of the top men and has a 10-point disability allowance, then he may be transferred over yonder to a route entirely away from his home and his own people.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Let me follow through on that. If he is the oldest carrier out of that post office and a route out of that post office is vacated, it is optional with him to transfer. If he is on another route he is not disturbed at all, because no one can bump him.

Mr. RANKIN. You do not consult the people on the route, and I fear you shut out the servicemen and others on that route from the right to serve on the route the other fellow never lived on, or served on.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There is no way that you shut out the servicemen. If the gentleman will just withhold his objection for a minute, let me cover it again. If you have a veteran who is a rural carrier on a route—let us say that there are four routes out of that post office—and one route becomes vacant, now, there are three men left carrying out of that post office; is that not correct? Any one of those men, the oldest in service first, can say, "I want the route that has been vacated." That does not disturb either of the others unless they want the route that is being vacated by the oldest man who is transferring, so it does not affect the veteran at all.

Mr. RANKIN. Of yes. The man who lived on this route, if they are going to give him an opportunity at all, must go and take an examination for another route that does not even touch his community and have transferred to their route a man who never lived in that area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMEND THE INCOME LIMITATION OF PENSION TO VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4242) to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death pension to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think that this bill is a very meritorious one. It is aimed to meet a very unfortunate situation. I received a letter recently from a valued friend of mine who is the attorney general of Massachusetts, a man whom I respect very much, calling to my attention the inequitable results that follow from the present law where we put a limitation of $1,000 income each year in order for a widow to receive a nonservice-connected pension; that is, where the husband died without service connection.

As an illustration of the urgency of this bill, he called to my attention the case of a widow who, upon the death of her husband, received $1,000 life insurance. Then there was seventy-odd dollars extra in addition to the $1,000, a dividend of some kind, making a total of $1,070. She paid out $600 or $800 for burial expenses, but that was not deductible. That dividend brought it over $1,000, and, so far as the construction of the law by the Veterans' Administration is concerned, it has been that way for years. She received an income in excess of $1,000 that particular year, and she was denied the pension provided for by law.

Another case called to my attention is where a veteran died and his widow applied for a non-service-connected pension. It was denied. The facts are that there was a $1,000 insurance policy, but the insurance company paid it in 11 months instead of 12 months, and the Veterans' Administration said that if she had received the payments over a 12 months' period that she received for the 11 months' period it would be in excess of $1,000 income during the year. I understand that she was denied a pension because under those circumstances she received an income of over $1,000 in 1 year.

Now, the funeral expenses are not considered a deduction in determining income. You and I know that in the case of death there are funeral expenses, and yet the construction of the present law is such that the funeral expenses are not deducted, and then, in addition, any other income, such as a dividend, is considered as being in excess of $1,000.

This bill, introduced by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and reported out of the committee, meets that situation. It is based upon justice, and I hope that no one will object.

Mr. KEAN. Of course everything the gentleman says is true, but there is nothing in the report on this bill to give the cost of the bill. There is nothing in the report to show the attitude of the Veterans' Administration. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts would not want us to pass a bill by unanimous consent unless we could get that information.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I would; where there is justice involved I would. I am not adopting a position that I did not adopt when I was leader for 6 years. Everybody recognizes the justice of this bill. The very facts speak for themselves. Take the case of a veteran dying and leaving his wife a thousand dollars of life insurance. If there is a dividend of $70, she is getting earnings of over $1,000 a year. They do not even allow a deduction of the funeral expenses to be made from the gross earnings or income.

Then there is another case where the $1,000 life insurance policy was paid over an 11-month period instead of 12 months. Then they say that if it was paid over a 12-month period with the same payments the widow was getting over the 11-month period it would exceed $1,000.

It seems to me this legislation is so thoroughly based upon justice that despite what my friend from New Jersey says we ought to pass the bill today by unanimous consent.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I understand this bill is predicated upon the justification of the increased cost of living.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is one of the elements, yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. According to the report of the committee, that is the basis for justifying the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not argue that, but these other factors are involved.

Mr. COLE of New York. If that is so, then will not the gentleman agree that this bill, which seeks to correct what we all hope is a temporary situation, should be temporary and limited to a period of perhaps 2 or 3 years, rather than be a permanent adjustment of the allowances?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not want to agree to that because, again, that does not meet the cases to which I have just referred.

Mr. COLE of New York. Neither does this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, this bill meets those cases by increasing to $1,800 the income a widow can receive or earn during a year and still be eligible where she has no children, and a larger amount where there are children.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The bill has the very strong endorsement of all the veterans' organizations. Our committee is deluged with mail upon this subject. It feels a great injustice was done. It was felt in the beginning that we did an injustice in not putting a higher ceiling upon it. I earnestly hope this bill will be allowed to pass. There is great suffering today because of it. I think the situation is very unusual. Certainly the widows and the dependents are among the most deserving and worthy people there are in the country today.

This bill (H. R. 4242) would increase the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death pension benefits to their dependents, and provide a fixed annual income limitation in passing on the dependency of parents for death compensation benefits.

Specifically, it raises the annual-income limitation relating to pension for non-service-connected disability for a single veteran from $1,000 to $1,800; and in the case of a veteran with dependents,

from $2,500 to $3,000. Payments of retirement annuities and social-security benefits would be excluded in determining income.

The annual-income limitation for a widow without child, or in case of a child, is raised from $1,000 to $1,800, and for a widow with child or children, from $2,500 to $3,000. Also, in this connection, the expenses of the veteran's last illness and burial borne by the dependents would be excluded in determining the annual income as would commercial life insurance or income therefrom not in excess of $3,000 received in any one year. An annual income limitation of $1,800 for one parent and $3,000 for two also is fixed in deciding their dependency for death compensation payments.

Hearings were conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on a number of bills on this subject. The bill carries the endorsement and approval of all the major veterans' organizations. The record was thoroughly examined, and the committee was impressed with the conviction that existing limitations are outdated and too restrictive, particularly in view of the prevailing high prices. Income limitations now in the law were fixed when living costs were at a much lower level than they are today.

The committee believes that the limitations fixed in the bill are conservative, but by the adoption of this bill a number of worthy and necessitous cases heretofore barred would be given favorable consideration.

It is not possible to give a reliable estimate of cost, but it does not seem that the proposed slight liberalization would greatly increase the number of persons now on the rolls.

Mr. KEAN. If the gentleman will yield, if there is going to be any further suffering, it is because the committee did not make a proper report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the committee did make a proper report.

Mr. KEAN. The committee made no estimate of the expense. The committee did not make a statement as to whether or not the Veterans' Administration is in favor of this bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will have to object to that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. McCORMACK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, January 26, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered on September 18 by the Honorable Josephus Daniels.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the next bill on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4309) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—GI bill of rights—pertaining to "Loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property," so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is too big to be considered on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering at this time would authorize the Farm Credit Administration to make direct loans to World War II veterans at 3 percent for the purpose of acquiring farms and farm equipment.

Loans on farm real estate would be limited to $12,000, and on farm equipment, to $4,500. An appropriation for $200,000,000 is authorized for real-estate loans and $100,000,000 for equipment and personal property loans, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary to carry on the purposes of the bill.

Appraisal and approval of the loans would be made by county appraisal committees appointed by the Farm Credit Administration and a loan would be limited to 100 percent of the appraised value. It is believed that these local committees, being thoroughly familiar with the value of farm real estate and property, would be able to give the veteran adequate protection in purchasing farms or farm equipment.

Originally, the bill provided for administration of the bill by the Veterans' Administration, but this was changed to another agency—the Farm Credit Administration. It was felt that this organization, which has had much experience with direct farm loans, is equipped with existing machinery to carry out such a program.

The committee believes that there is an urgent need for more adequate opportunity for farm veterans, which the existing law does not provide, and that passage of this bill will give the needed relief to which they are entitled.

AMENDING SECTION 30 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3778) to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), be, and it is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 30. (a) At the first session of the House of Representatives in the Eighty-first and in each succeeding Congress, before any other business shall be transacted, the oath of office shall be administered to such of the Members-elect and Delegates-elect present whose qualifications shall not have been challenged by a Member-elect. Such oath of office shall be administered by the officer of the last preceding House of Representatives who has the duty of calling the roll of Members-elect and Delegates-elect. Upon taking the oath of office such affiants shall become Members or Delegates, as the case may be, of the Congress to which they have been elected.

"Thereupon the Speaker shall be elected by the then Members of the House, who are present, and the oath of office shall be administered to him by a Member of the House.

"Thereupon the Clerk shall be elected by the then Members of the House, who are present, and the oath of office shall be administered to him by the Speaker.

"The Speaker shall then hear and pass upon any challenge of the right of any Member-elect to take the oath of office and become a Member of the House and shall then administer the oath of office to its Members-elect whose right to take the oath and become Members of the House had been challenged and overruled.

"Whereupon, any such Member shall have the right for five legislative days to make a motion that the election of the Speaker and Clerk of the new House be reconsidered and vacated. If any such motion be carried such vacancies shall forthwith be filled, respectively and successively, by electing a Speaker, and then a Clerk, who shall immediately take office, and be sworn in as hereinabove provided.

"The Speaker shall administer the oath of office to those Members-elect and Delegates-elect who appear after others have been so sworn, before they take their seats, if no challenge of their qualifications shall have been interposed by a Member, and upon so taking the oath of office they shall become Members or Delegates, as the case may be, of the Congress to which they have been elected. In the event the qualifications of any Member-elect or Delegate-elect who appears after others have been so sworn, shall be challenged by a Member of the House, the Speaker shall hear and pass upon each such challenge, and in those cases in which the challenge is overruled he shall administer the oath of office to such Member-elect or Delegate-elect, and upon so taking the oath of office he shall become a Member or Delegate, as the case may be, of the Congress to which he has been elected. No Member-elect or Delegate-elect whose qualification shall have been challenged by a Member of the House and as to whom such challenge has been sustained by the Speaker shall be permitted to take the oath of office.

"(b) The Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth and each succeeding Congress shall cause the oath of office to be printed, furnishing two copies to each Member and Delegate who has taken the oath of office in accordance with law, which shall be subscribed in person by the Member or Delegate, who shall thereupon deliver them to the Clerk, one to be filed in the records of the House of Representatives, and the other to be recorded in the Journal of the House and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and such signed copies, or certified copies thereof, or of either of such records thereof, shall be admissible in evidence in any court of the United States, and shall be held conclusive proof of the fact that the signer duly took the oath of office in accordance with law."

"Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress may subscribe and deliver the two signed copies of the printed oath of office at their

convenience, at any time before the expiration of the Eightieth Congress."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the balance of the page down to and including line 24, page 3.

On page 3, line 25, strike out "(b)" and insert "SEC. 30."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," as amended (22 Stat. 403), is amended by adding at the end of paragraph "Second" the following new subparagraph:

"Ninth, that no person shall be discriminated against in any case because of any physical handicap, in examination, appointment, reappointment, reinstatement, reemployment, promotion, transfer, retransfer, demotion, or removal, with respect to any position the duties of which, in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission, may be efficiently performed by a person with such a physical handicap: *And provided further,* That such employment will not be hazardous to the appointee or endanger the health or safety of his fellow employees or others."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE BANKRUPTCY ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3930) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article XII of chapter XIII (relating to wage earners' plans) of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 681. Extensions made pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this chapter shall extend the obligation of any person who is secondarily liable for or who may have insured or guaranteed such debt or debts, or any part thereof, or bonds issued upon the security of same, and a copy of the order confirming such extension, certified as required by the provisions of law with reference to judgments and proceedings in courts of the United States, shall be sufficient evidence that such extension has been confirmed in any suit or proceeding brought against any such person so liable."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable with respect to extensions which are confirmed on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after "SEC. 681," strike out the remainder of line 8, all of line 9, and on page 2 strike out lines 1 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Extensions made pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this chapter shall to the same extent, extend the obligation of any person who is secondarily liable for such debt or debts, or any part thereof, as gratuitous surety, and a copy of the order confirming any such extension to the primary obligor, certified as required by the provisions of law with reference to judgments and proceedings in courts of the United States, shall be sufficient evidence of such extension both as to primary and secondary obligors."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1324) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended (U. S. C. title 5, section 693 (a)), is amended by inserting before the colon preceding the first proviso thereof a comma and the following: "and to all officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind at the election of such officers and employees as herein provided."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 3 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof two new sentences as follows: "In the case of any officer or employee in the service of the National Library for the Blind on the effective date of this amendment, notice of desire to come within the purview of the act must be given to the disbursing officer by whom his salary is paid within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act. In the case of any officer or employee of the National Library for the Blind who enters the service of such Institution after the date of enactment of this amendment, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after the date of entrance into such service."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 5 of such act is amended by inserting after "or the legislative branch of the Government" a comma and "and periods of service as an officer or employee of the National Library for the Blind."

SEC. 4. Any service rendered prior to the effective date of this act as an officer or employee of the National Library for the Blind shall be considered creditable service for the purposes of section 9 of such act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY RESERVATION AT FORT SCHUYLER, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 108) to authorize the conveyance of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for the use as a maritime school, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to convey to the State of New York the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., together with the improvements thereon, subject, however, to certain limitations and conditions as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the express provision that if the State of New York shall fail to maintain so much of the military structures and appurtenances presently erected, which formerly constituted the old fort, as an historical monument reasonably available to the public, or if the State of New York shall at any time cease to use the property so conveyed as a maritime school, devoted exclusively to purposes of nautical education or, in the alternative, if the State of New York shall fail to use and maintain the property so conveyed as a public park, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the balance of the line down to and including line 7, and insert "That the Secretary of War is authorized to convey to the State of New York all that portion of the United States Military Reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., together with all improvements thereon, lying easterly of a line commencing at a point (latitude 40 degrees, 48 minutes, 23 seconds; longitude 73 degrees, 47 minutes, 52 seconds) fixed on the south sea wall which is approximately 25.5 feet westerly from an angle in said sea wall and thence running in a northeasterly direction 592.5 feet, more or less, to a point on the north sea wall which is approximately 196.5 feet westerly from an angle in the north sea wall, said line being the easterly edge of a concrete curb for an 18-foot concrete road running in a northeasterly and southwesterly direction.

"Page 2, following section 3, add an additional section, section 4:

"SEC. 4. The conveyance herein authorized shall not be executed by the Secretary of War until the State of New York shall have relinquished to the United States of America, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy, all right, title, or interest that it may have pursuant to any lease or otherwise in that portion of Fort Schuyler Military Reservation which is not herein expressly authorized to be conveyed to said State."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 2, line 8, strike out the word "War" and insert "Defense."

On page 3, line 12, strike out the word "War" and insert "Defense."

On page 3, line 14, strike out the word "Navy" and insert the word "Defense" in lieu thereof.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 3, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "War or the Secretary of the Navy" and insert the word "Defense."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MILITARY AND NAVAL MISSIONS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2313) to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218) and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763) providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee for an explanation of certain sections of this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. This bill was reported by the Committee on Armed Services unanimously in July. The same bill passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress but failed of passage in the Senate.

The necessity for the bill at the present time is that it has to do with a small detail of officers and enlisted men in countries other than the Western Hemisphere. I should like to call attention to the fact that two subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee explored the Pacific and European theaters this fall, and it was the unanimous opinion of those subcommittees, one under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] and the other the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], that the need for this bill is pressing. I would be glad to yield to either the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] if they care to say anything about the measure.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand that the purport of this bill is to give the President the power to send naval and military missions outside of this hemisphere?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct. He has that power under statute now with reference to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SHORT. And also the Philippines.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Also the Philippines.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman explain what is meant by "military and naval mission"? How large is a mission?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I think the figures are somewhat restricted, for obvious reasons, but I am certain that the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from New York will agree that the average mission in Europe is not over 25 men. That includes enlisted men and officers. If the gentleman knows anything about the situation in the Far East, in Arabia, he may have some understanding of the very important mission that these men will carry out.

Mr. CARROLL. Is there any limitation by Federal statute or regulation defining or outlining what constitutes a mission?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Not that I know of, but if the gentleman will name the exact mission we will be glad to tell him what the exact number in each mission in each country is and where it is detailed at the present time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]?

There was no objection.

OPERATION AND EXPANSION OF RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4143) to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE]?

There was no objection.

REGULATIONS FOR SOLDIERS' HOME, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 929) be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill (S. 929), as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Inspector General of the Army shall designate officers of the Inspector General's Department under his jurisdiction to inspect thoroughly, once each year, the United States Soldiers' Home, Washington, District of Columbia, its records, accounts, management, discipline, and sanitary condition, and shall report thereon in writing to the Secretary of War, including in his report such suggestions as he desires to make."

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: Page 1, line 11, strike out the word "war" and insert the words "the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2636) was laid on the table.

REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 275 to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is too large for the Consent Calendar, and therefore I object.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. KEAN. Yes; I will reserve the objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think, in all fairness, we should have a little consideration of this absolutely nonpartisan piece of legislation.

All we are trying to do is to correct something that happened last year in the Appropriations Committee. Except for that, it would not be necessary to come in here with this bill. They put in a provision under which the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation has some severe restrictions on operations. I regret that the understanding is that bills that may involve loans even of over one million do not obtain approval of these official objectors. The sponsors of the bill should have been so advised so that an application for a rule could have already been made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

POSTAGE STAMPS COMMEMORATIVE OF ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMING OF THE SWEDISH PIONEERS TO THE MIDDLE WEST

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 251, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1948, a special series of 3-cent and 5-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, which directs the Postmaster General to issue a 5-cent stamp commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West, is one which

I thoroughly approve and should, in my opinion, pass the House unanimously.

Our Swedish settlers played a very important part in the settlement, development, and growth of this country and this recognition is one which they justly deserve. Although this resolution pays tribute to their work in the Midwest, it is also a fact that the Pacific Northwest and other parts of the country were initially settled and developed by these pioneers.

Their task was certainly not an easy one, but by perseverance and hard work they developed many portions of this country from an uninhabitable state to a part and parcel of the strongest Nation on earth. We, in the State of Oregon, have seen many evidences of a job well performed and I, for one, wish to add my word of commendation and praise to these hardy pioneers.

The Clerk read the committee amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "3-cent and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the calling of eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

SENIORITY OF RURAL CARRIERS, POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill (H. R. 1189) to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees—rural carriers—in the field service. I have conferred with the gentleman who objected and he has withdrawn his objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the seniority status of a rural mail carrier shall be based upon the regulations of the Post Office Department which provide that seniority shall commence on the day of appointment as a regular rural carrier. In case of voluntary transfer from one post office to another, or from any branch of the service into the rural service, the relative seniority of the transferee shall be determined by the date of entrance into the rural service of the office to which transfer is made.

SEC. 2. All rural carriers, upon entering the service, shall be assigned to the least desirable route and shall rise to the more desirable routes by seniority only.

SEC. 3. The awarding of promotions and preferential assignments shall be based upon seniority and ability; if ability be sufficient, seniority shall govern.

SEC. 4. Each new route or vacancy shall be bulletined and all rural carriers attached to the office shall be given a chance to apply. The senior rural carrier who applies shall be assigned thereto as provided in section 3.

SEC. 5. Rural carriers awarded these assignments shall have 90 days in which to demonstrate their fitness for the route and shall not be removed therefrom until their inability to fill the assignment has been proven. In case of their inability to fill the new assignment they shall be returned to their former position. Such rural carrier shall be allowed the right of appeal as stated in section 6.

SEC. 6. (a) A senior rural carrier who makes application for a new or vacant route, whose application has been denied, or who has been declared incompetent for same, shall have the right, upon written request, to a hearing before a post-office inspector, on his case, and shall be furnished a statement in writing of the reasons for his rejection by official responsible for same.

(b) This hearing shall occur, except under unusual conditions preventing same, within 10 days from the date of his request. In case of a postponement, the rural carrier affected shall be given a written statement of the reason for the postponement.

(c) The rural carrier shall have the right to be represented at the hearing by not more than three representatives of his own choosing.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this act shall not be construed as supplanting any civil-service regulations in effect on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 8. This act shall be known as the "Seniority Act for Rural Mail Carriers."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING FOREST USE IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 412, H. R. 1809, a bill to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, in conformity with regulations prescribed by him, may permit the use and occupancy of national-forest lands for purposes of residence, recreation, public convenience, education, industry, agriculture, and commerce, not incompatible with the best use and management of the national forests for such periods as may be warranted but not exceeding 30 years and of such areas as may be necessary but not exceeding 80 acres, and after such permits have been issued and so long as they continue in full force and effect the lands therein described shall not be subject to location, entry, or appropriation, under the public land laws or mining laws, or to disposition under the mineral leasing laws: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the said Secretary from canceling, revoking, or otherwise terminating a permit so issued upon proof of a breach of its terms and conditions or for other just cause.

SEC. 2. That the last paragraph in the appropriation for the Forest Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (act of Mar. 4, 1915; 38 Stat. 1101; 16 U. S. C. 497), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "lands", insert the words "in Alaska."

Page 2, strike out all of lines 10 to 13, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 232, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, lines 2 and 3, strike out ", not more than $20,000 annually."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "For" and insert "Not more than $20,000 annually for."

Page 3, line 9, strike out "For" and insert "Such additional sums as may be needed for."

The amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR NEGRO VETERANS AT BIRTHPLACE OF BOOKER T. WASHINGTON IN FRANKLIN COUNTY, VA.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3814) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., with an amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $5,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to acquire, at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., a suitable site and to contract for the erection thereon of a hospital for Negro veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill was cleared by the leaders of the House. It was reported out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee unanimously for two reasons: One, that it would honor a great American, a Negro, who went extremely far in patriotism, citizenship, and in accomplishments.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $5,000,000 to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to acquire at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., a suitable site and to contract for the erection thereon of a hospital for Negro veterans.

Your committee has taken cognizance of the fact that a Negro hospital, completely staffed and managed by Negroes,

has been very successfully operated by the Veterans' Administration at Tuskegee, Ala. This hospital now cares for a total of 2,113 Negro veterans. A 200-bed hospital for Negro veterans has been authorized for Mound Bayou, Miss.

May I say that I visited the hospital at Tuskegee, Ala., and I found it admirably conducted. May I say further that many of the finest papers on medicine and surgery have been written and sent to the Veterans' Administration by Negro doctors.

In considering the location of the proposed hospital, the committee took into consideration the Negro population of the area and the number of Negro veterans now in the Veterans' Administration hospitals in that area. The War Department records show that the State of Virginia alone has over 50,000 Negro veterans.

In addition to the advisability and need for such a hospital to serve the Negroes in that area, the committee felt that it would be a timely recognition of the services rendered by Booker T. Washington, one of the most outstanding leaders of the Negro race. The bill has the earnest support of several Negro groups.

Mr. Speaker, in hospitalizing these men it results in very much minimizing the spread of tuberculosis. In other words, tuberculosis will be somewhat stopped. It is a very infectious disease, so besides resulting in the saving of human lives it will mean a stopping of the spread of the disease.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the passage of this measure. I supported it in the committee and offered the amendment at the suggestion of the Veterans' Administration to raise the amount to $5,000,000.

For 16 years I was chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. For more than 20 years I have been a member of that committee. During all that time I have done everything I could to aid the Negro veterans hospital at Tuskegee, Ala. I saw to it that that institution was provided with whatever it needed.

Recently there was provided an all-Negro veterans' hospital for Mississippi at Mound Bayou, a Negro town, the land for which was contributed by Hon. Joseph Davis, a brother of Jefferson Davis, shortly after the War Between the States.

I understand that there have been some Communist influences attacking these all-Negro veterans' hospitals. However, I consider that the Negroes representing the Booker Washington Foundation have the interests of the Negroes at heart, and they are in favor of the passage of this bill. Booker T. Washington's daughter came to see me and asked me to support this measure, and this morning I received this telegram from her from Kansas City, Mo. It says:

> Am grateful to you for your efforts in legislature of proposed veterans' hospital at my father's birthplace in Virginia. We are hoping you will continue efforts for same.

The passage of this measure will be of great benefit to the Negro veterans of Virginia, West Virginia, east Tennessee, and the surrounding area. It will also greatly benefit the white veterans of Virginia and help to keep down that friction the Communists are trying to stir up between the two races in the Southern States.

I trust it will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, before recognizing the gentleman from Arizona, I would like to state that the erection of this hospital will relieve the situation insofar as the shortage of beds in other hospitals is concerned. It will relieve the bed situation over the entire country today.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this bill come before the House at this time. I think it might have passed under unanimous consent earlier in the day. It is well, however, to bring it up for this brief period of discussion. There is too much talk about racial discrimination in America on the part of those who want to present a false picture of America. This establishment of a hospital distinctly for colored veterans will go far toward refuting that false charge on the part of those in other lands who make such charges. I am not thinking particularly nor solely of that benefit as the main thing, but also of the good that will be accomplished by the hospital as it will be established.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. We have one of these Negro veterans' hospitals at Tuskegee, Ala., and they have not had the slightest trouble. They have gotten along well and they are satisfied, and I think the same condition will prevail here.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am sure it will. This hospital honors a great man. It is a recognition not only of the need of our colored veterans, but also of the ability which doctors and leading men of that part of our citizenry have contributed in the field of medicine and will contribute in the future. Booker T. Washington has done a great piece of educational work, as have others of that race through the advancement of science, and through the instrumentality of the staff at this hospital we could and shall expect to see even greater things accomplished.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my understanding is the only reason it was objected to on the Consent Calendar was because it would take a suspension in order to pass it.

Mr. RANKIN. And because of the amount.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And because of the amount that might be involved if the suspension had not been promised, because the need is very great.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand that under the Consent Calendar there is a limited amount of expenditure that can be included in a bill.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to make this observation, that aside from the Negro veterans who need hospital facilities, the Negro race, as a whole, is desperately in need of adequate health facilities in the way of hospitals. The Negro race comprises one-tenth of our population, and yet they only have access to one-tenth of 1 percent of all the hospital facilities in the country. So, while I am 100 percent in favor of this bill, I trust the health facilities may be extended so that the colored people as a whole will have more adequate service available to them.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have that feeling also.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, of course that condition does not prevail in the South because no Negro is denied the use of a hospital.

Mr. BREHM. I did not mean that they were denied admission. I meant there are not enough adequate facilities to take care of them.

Mr. RANKIN. This will also do another thing. As was pointed out a moment ago, it will relieve the pressure on the hospitals that now exist throughout Virginia and West Virginia and Tennessee. This will fill a long-needed want. And it will have, in my opinion, one of the finest influences of anything that we can do at this time, and I want to say again that they asked us not to take it up under unanimous consent because of the amount and because of the fact that the Speaker had agreed to recognize the lady from Massachusetts under suspension of the rules. But I do not believe there would be a vote against it, certainly not more than a half dozen or a dozen if the roll were called and the entire membership of the House called on to register their views.

Mr. MURDOCK. I congratulate the committee for bringing this bill in, and thank the leading members of the committee who are sponsoring it here today. I feel that this hospital will serve the same useful purpose as the one to which the gentleman from Mississippi has already referred.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say also that the total of veterans waiting for admittance to veterans' hospitals is 18,192, so the gentleman can see the great need for every single bed that can be secured for hospitalization purposes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on this bill at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 7 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SARBACHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD House Resolution 147, passed by the House of Representatives of the Missouri State Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 147

Whereas the United States Army engineers, by act of Congress, are constructing a large dam on the White River near Bull Shoals in the State of Arkansas for the purpose of flood control; and

Whereas the construction of said dam will inundate all of the White River Valley in Taney County, Mo., from a point above Forsyth to the Missouri-Arkansas border, destroying practically all of the valley land in Taney County; and

Whereas the construction of said dam and the impounding of said waters of White River will flood the courthouse and the business section of the town of Forsyth, the seat of government of Taney County, Mo.; and

Whereas the people of the entire State of Missouri are interested in said seat of government of Taney County, Mo., for the reason that it is the place established by law for the holding of circuit court of the State of Missouri and for the further reason that the State of Missouri appropriated $5,000 in the year 1889 to aid Taney County in the construction of said courthouse; and

Whereas the said circuit court of Taney County, Mo., is a part of the judicial branch of the government of the State of Missouri; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri that the United States Army engineers are considering building a dirt levee around the courthouse and business section of the town of Forsyth rather than proceeding under eminent domain as provided by statute and established in the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Missouri; and

Whereas said levee would not be compensation under the Constitution of the United States or the State of Missouri, would prevent the future growth of the town, would create a serious problem in sanitation; would ruin the business of the community, would be injurious to the health and happiness of the residents, would lessen to a great degree the value of the property therein, would place the official records of the county and the circuit court in constant danger of loss by flood in the event of the overflow or breaking of the levee, and would create a continuous hazard to life and property in Forsyth: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fourth General Assembly of Missouri, That the United States Army engineers be requested to abandon the levee plan for Forsyth and to proceed with utmost dispatch to provide just compensation in accord with the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Missouri as judicially determined; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the United States, each Member of Congress from Missouri, to the Governor of Missouri, to the Chief of the Army Engineers in Washington, D. C., and to the office of the Army engineers at Little Rock, Ark.

MURRAY E. THOMPSON,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that House Resolution No. 147 was adopted by the house of representatives on January 8, 1948.

CURTIS J. TINDEL,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THOUGHTS ON CURRENT AFFAIRS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there have been some questions asked as to whether I will enter the senatorial primary in South Dakota, or run for reelection to the House. The question in my own mind, however, has not been primarily on that point but whether I should be a candidate at all, so much out of tune do I find myself with much current opinion in Washington on world affairs.

Friday night, the press reported that the highlight of testimony by Secretary of Defense Forrestal before the Foreign Affairs Committee came when the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] asked Mr. Forrestal what the effect would be on this country if a beachhead were established on the Mediterranean by any power hostile to the United States. Secretary Forrestal was quoted as replying:

I think any act of war in the Mediterranean or Middle East would have definite significance for us. In other words, the free transit of commerce and trade through the Mediterranean is a vital part of our national security.

That came only a day after it had been announced that the United States was reopening a big wartime air base in Libya, eastern Africa. It came within a week after the disclosure that 1,000 armed marines had been dispatched to our warships in the Mediterranean.

What Mr. Forrestal would say if some other world power should establish such beachheads in the Caribbean, I do not know, but reflection on these events forces me to think of the reckless way in which our policies run in opposite directions, at one and the same time.

On the one hand, we fall for the argument that our oil reserves lie in the rich fields of the so-called Near East, thousands of miles away, instead of in the almost limitless lignite coal fields of our own Northwest which could be converted into synthetic liquid fuels for a fraction of the subsidy we spend in airfields and Navy to support and safeguard the thin long lines to Saudi Arabia.

On the other hand, we let ourselves be pressured into supporting the partition of Palestine and antagonize the Arabs through whose world the oil lines run and in the heart of whose empire the fields are found. Now we are asked to send troops.

If there was ever a policy more calculated to get us out on a limb and saw it off, I cannot find it in history.

On the one hand, we pour out purple oratory about the dangers of communism; on the other we pursue a policy in Germany which starves the one people who have great capacity to produce and stifle their natural will to work.

We need, sir, to get a single objective in Germany. The German people do not desire to be rebuilt into a menace to France or Czechoslovakia or Poland or Russia or any other nation. They are sick and tired of conquest. They want to live; and they are the people who have both the capacity and the spirit to be an effective ally for western civilization if a time of test comes.

We fall for the silly Molotov line that the Germans want a unified reich above everything else and so we propose an ersatz empire for them which frightens France instead of permitting the natural revival of the original states with a simple plan of working together which could grow into a federation of the free states of Europe which France and Belgium and the other free states could join.

The Russians talk of unity but raid the factories of the Germans and keep their war prisoners for slave labor. Vishinsky may shout and Molotov may bluster but as long as Stalin persists in such tactics, the Germans will neither love nor trust them. We do not need to tell these things to the German people—we only need to give them a chance to work and eat and live. They know what is happening.

It may be heresy, Mr. Speaker, but while I am confessing my thoughts, I may as well say that great a man as he is, much as I admired his war leadership, I have my doubts that Gen. George Marshall is the most diplomatic man in the country to head our diplomatic department as Secretary of State. The other day he told a committee of the Congress that only his Department should be permitted to administer the foreign-aid program, that there "could not be two Secretaries of State," and, in effect, that it should be his program or nothing.

Another George in our history, George Washington, advised that in our commercial relations with other nations we should have "as little political connection as possible." It seems evident that George Marshall wants as much political connection as possible. He wants our commerce and our loans and our gifts to be on a political basis.

He is sincere, of course, but I fear his thinking is typical of the career military mind turned to diplomacy. There is so much of that these days, Mr. Speaker. Why, the portion of the new Congressional Directory devoted to the executive branches of the Government reads like a combination of the Army-Navy Register and a telephone directory from Wall Street. I was thankful the other day when one committee of Congress said "No" to the President when he proposed a brilliant but straight-out military man to be head of an agency intended to be

so civilian that the word "civil" or "civilian" appears in its very name.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to make a speech of this sort, but I cannot regard these things with complacency. When President Truman sent us his message carrying the so-called Truman doctrine and followed that with his request for aid to Greece and Turkey, although I voted for the Greek aid bill because I thought our hands had been tied, I wrote the President and voiced my concern over the trend he was taking. The letter will be found in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, page A2314.

The policy of opposing communism is proper because communism is a destroyer, but we should count our resources and command the times and places where we meet it. The policy of containment is fallacious. It forces us to ride off in all directions wherever the gremlins of the Kremlin want to extend us. We do worse than "the clumsy boxer who telegraphs his punch," to borrow the words of my eloquent colleague; we give to the Reds the power to say where we spend our energies and when.

Mr. Speaker, I do not despair of our country, but I do despair of the contradictory policies we are following today. This Nation can be strong. This Nation can help rebuild the world in ways which will preserve the self-respect of those who receive our aid and which will maintain our own way of life.

While I retain membership in Congress, I shall continue to try to point out those ways to the extent of my limited ability; if or when the time comes that the views I express are unacceptable to the people I have the honor to represent, I shall retire without regrets to a spot in western South Dakota, where the deer and—yes, Mr. Speaker, where the buffalo roam.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think I must join the gentleman in his thoughts that we want neither one-man rule nor military rule. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me, after his studies, if he believes we have a sufficient supply of fuel oil in this country in our shale and coal.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that the Division of Oil and Gas in the Department of the Interior has supplied me with the figures to show that the reserves we have in oil shales in this country are 5 times those in petroleum, and that the reserves in the subbituminous coals are 25 times those of petroleum, and when you add that all together you have reserves that will run probably a thousand years or more.

Mr. BRADLEY. Is the gentleman convinced that we have adequate and economical methods for the extraction of those fuels?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not satisfied that we have plants in existence at the present time sufficient to produce the supplies that are needed. In my reference on the Consent Calendar, to the bill which I introduced for the continuation of the experimentation program, I pointed out that the results thus far obtained indicate that fuel oil can be produced in the laboratory plants at about $1.92 a barrel today. The Division of Oil and Gas tells me that, put on a commercial scale, this should be competitive with petroleum produced from natural sources.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Has the gentleman any idea of what the capital cost would be to develop plants necessary to produce this fuel?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The capital cost will be very large. The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, in connection with a company in Pennsylvania, are investing $250,000,000 in a plant in western Pennsylvania, designed to make recoveries from waste coals there. The plant cost will be high. It will take some time to build them. That is why I think we should get on the job.

Mr. BRADLEY. Does the gentleman have any idea of the number of years that may be required to develop adequate plants?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That will depend on the size of plant which it is determined is most practical to use. It will take some time to complete the experimentation that will give an adequate guide. That is why we ought to be on the job.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. How does the price you quoted for synthetic oil compare with the price of crude oil from petroleum?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have heard a figure of $2.50 suggested as comparative at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is a barrel of this synthetic oil equal in value to a barrel of the petroleum oil?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My understanding is that it is, definitely.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has again expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any other special orders today, I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 7 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from people in the State of Pennsylvania that concerned me greatly, but none that concerns me as much as a letter I received today from a former Governor of Pennsylvania. I am going to read this letter to you and I think all of you should listen to it carefully:

WEST GROVE, PA., *January 13, 1948.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This session of Congress will decide, not the welfare of us Americans, but our very existence.

You have before you a recommendation of General Marshall basing European recovery upon economic measures, namely, the expenditure of billions of American dollars. If carried out, this great sacrifice by the American people, raising our own cost of living to unbelievable heights, will be just as successful as the British of old, trying to buy off the Danish ravagers.

If Russia occupied Canada and we had no Army, Air Force, or Navy, would any of us be interested in building up our own business? That today is the position of every European country outside the iron curtain.

Why is our country threatened as never before?

Simply because first Roosevelt, Hopkins, and Marshall, and then Truman and Marshall, failed completely, in spite of repeated warnings, to analyze correctly the Russian menace. Yet you gentlemen, selected by our people because of your patriotism, foresight, and integrity, consider seriously again following the disastrous policy of President Truman and General Marshall.

In the autumn of 1945, Russia, by breaking again and again her agreements for Europe and Asia, was exposed in her true colors. Then we had the mightiest military power in world's history, on land, sea, and in the air, and a monopoly of the atomic bomb. That was the time for the show-down with Russia. And now today due to the policy of Truman and Marshall we are about to face this show-down with one-tenth of our military power and with God and the Kremlin alone knowing if we still monopolize the atomic bomb.

Listen to this next paragraph carefully.

From the bottom of my heart, I say if Truman is nominated and defeated our Democratic Party is sunk. If Truman is nominated and elected our country is sunk.

Very sincerely,

GEORGE H. EARLE,
Formerly Governor of Pennsylvania, Democratic National Committeeman, American Minister to Austria and Bulgaria.

It is time for all of us to wake up when men like former Governor Earle have such a change of heart, a man who was an ardent New Dealer for a number of years, a man who was appointed by a former President to serve as Minister to Austria and Bulgaria. When he says that if such and such is the case it is time for the American people to wake up. He speaks from the background of the extensive European experience he had a few years ago. He has had a change of heart and wants to save America. I say it is well to heed his advice.

If there ever was a time when America should wake up today is that time. We should weigh carefully what we are doing. We should make America strong. We ought not to wreck America for any other country in the world. We should think of, work for, and try to save this country, the most precious thing we have; and I hope every Member of Congress will take to heart what former Governor Earle has said. Just let me read that last sentence again. Bear in mind this is from a former Democratic

Governor of Pennsylvania and presently a Democratic national committeeman:

From the bottom of my heart, I say if Truman is nominated and defeated our Democratic Party is sunk.

That is pretty bad, to sink the Democratic Party. For I believe in the two-party system. But—

If Truman is nominated and elected our country is sunk.

That is altogether too bad. To wreck America and our form of government would be a catastrophe.

Mr. Earle now is putting country above politics. I congratulate him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a piece of legislation he introduced today, together with an explanation of same.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE FUEL-OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I took occasion to express briefly certain criticisms of a recent order with reference to the heating of Government buildings. I regret to learn that apparently a few of my colleagues thought I was approaching that problem in a partisan sense. I want to assure the Members of the House that when I am trying to deal with a situation such as this I am doing so as a representative of all the people in my district, as I know you do in connection with such problems affecting your people. The people who support the Democratic Party can become just as cold in the First District of Massachusetts and everywhere in this country as the Republicans. It is an important thing, in my opinion, for each and every one of us to join hands in attempting to meet this crisis.

I want to discuss another aspect of this problem and I assure you that in discussing it I am simply voicing a criticism I believe is sound and legitimate. Certainly, as human beings, whether as Members of Congress or officers of the executive department, we are all subject to the human frailty of making errors of judgment.

This has to do with what I believe to be a mistake made by responsible officers of the Department of Commerce. On January 2 the Department issued a bulletin referring to the fuel-oil difficulties in this country and advising that our friends in Canada had agreed to reduce exports from us of certain types of heating oil by 50 percent in the month of January. That is a very constructive step. Most of those exports were going right through the areas which are desperately in need of oil now. I commend the Department for the efforts they made.

For possible use by Members of the House, I am including the bulletin. It reads:

The Department of Commerce has just been informed by the Canadian Government, through its Embassy in Washington, of a voluntary reduction in imports of certain petroleum products from the United States, Under Secretary of Commerce William C. Foster announced today.

The petroleum industry of Canada has agreed to reduce its imports of finished kerosene, stove oil, furnace oil, and Diesel oil from the United States to 50 percent or less of the monthly average of imports in the first quarter of 1947. These reductions, effective January 1, will continue throughout the month of January when the Canadian Department of Reconstruction and Supply, in cooperation with the Canadian petroleum industry, will review Canada's petroleum position with a view to making even greater reductions during the remaining months of the first quarter of 1948.

Under the newly announced Canadian limitations, the import of these petroleum products from the United States during January will be reduced to a rate not to exceed 6,000 barrels a day. The Canadian reduction of petroleum imports comes as a result of a cooperative effort between the Canadian and American Governments to solve the liquid fuel problems of the two countries.

However, last Friday, the Department, through its Office of International Trade, issued another bulletin in which it gave a tabulation of the exports of petroleum products which would be allocated for shipment to all countries but Canada in the first 3 months of this year, which I am inserting at this point:

Country allocations of petroleum products for the first quarter of 1948 were announced today by the Department of Commerce through its Office of International Trade.

The country allocations and types of petroleum products follow:

[In barrels]

	Aviation motor fuel (5,016)	Other motor fuel (5,017)	Kerosene (5,027)	Gas oil and distillate fuel oil (5,030)	Residual fuel oil (5,031)	Blending A agents (5,013)
Argentina		220,000				
Australia	20,000	300,000	70,000	100,000	50,000	
Belgium		175,000	8,000	175,000	100,000	
Brazil		80,000				
British Honduras	2,000	5,000	2,000	3,000		
China	60,000	350,000	110,000	100,000		
Costa Rica	2,400	30,000	3,500	10,000	20,000	
Cuba	25,000	200,000			200,000	
Denmark		70,000	5,000	120,000	70,000	
El Salvador		25,000	1,500	3,500	40,000	
Eire	15,000		5,000			
France	120,000			300,000		
Guatemala	5,000	8,000	2,000		55,000	
Honduras		3,000	2,000			
Italy	30,000					
Mexico	80,000	450,000		100,000	400,000	
New Zealand	10,000	140,000	20,000	35,000	70,000	
Norway		10,000	7,000			
Panama, Republic	100	40,000	7,000	10,000	25,000	
Paraguay	1,500					
Philippines	20,000	330,000	70,000	160,000		
Portugal	20,000	250,000	40,000	10,000	19,000	
Sweden		225,000	50,000	250,000	100,000	
United Kingdom	120,000	1,500,000	130,000	1,200,000	300,000	
Netherlands				60,000		
Iceland	35,000	30,000		40,000		
British West Africa	5,000	70,000	25,000	20,000	10,000	
Switzerland		30,000	10,000	50,000		
French West Africa	10,000	60,000	10,000		15,000	
Subtotal	581,000	4,401,000	578,000	2,746,500	1,474,000	
Reserve	119,000	849,000	322,000	453,500	326,000	150,000
Greece	45,000					
Japan and Ryukus		400,000	50,000	1,600,000	375,000	
Total	745,000	5,650,000	950,000	4,800,000	2,175,000	150,000

Mr. Speaker, I made something of a study of that because the Department had indicated it wished to help us here at home and that it felt our good friends to whom we were shipping this oil would join with us as Canada did. But to my astonishment the tabulation as to gas oil and distillate fuel oil showed that we would export in excess of 583,617 more barrels in the first quarter of this year to all countries, including Canada, than we did in the first quarter of 1947, and upon examination of the residual oil figure, which is another important item, if we are going to meet this crisis, I found there will be in excess of 342,103 barrels shipped, if the program is carried out, over the comparable period of 1947. In short, we will be shipping from a vitally needed fuel-oil source in this country 925,720 more barrels than we did last year, and this at a time when our people are cold, when in New England we have had temperatures in the last week ranging from 2° to 24° below zero, 9.7° below the same period last year, at a time when the people of the West and Northwest are suffering, when the people of North Carolina are having their troubles, too, and when the people of the District of Columbia are having difficulties. I repeat, if my computations are correct, this program will mean that we will ship 975,720 more barrels of these types of oil than we did last year.

I want to make it clear that the figures were furnished to me by the Office of International Trade, the allocations being those in the table I have inserted, and the figures on exports to Canada and to all countries in the first quarter of 1947 having been prepared by that office for me Friday afternoon.

I now wish to insert another bulletin issued by that office on January 2, which reads as follows:

An export quota of 12,000,000 barrels of petroleum products has been established for the first quarter of 1948, the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, announced today. This quota continues the policy of restricting exports of major petroleum products to the maximum extent possible until the current domestic shortages are alleviated.

The 12,000,000-barrel quota figure compares with shipments of more than 17,000,000 barrels in the first quarter of 1947. Since the current established quota is substantially below estimated export demand, export licenses will be approved only on the basis of the most urgent need, OIT stated.

The first quarter of 1948 product breakdown of the quota is as follows:

	Barrels
Blending agents	150,000
Aviation gasoline	700,000
Motor gasoline	5,250,000
Kerosene	900,000
Gas oil and distillate fuel oil	3,200,000
Residual fuel oil	1,800,000
Total	12,000,000

In addition, 2,470,000 barrels of petroleum products have been authorized for shipment by the United States military authorities to Greece and the occupied areas of Japan and the Ryukyus Islands to meet the requirements of special programs.

Let me repeat for emphasis that very commendable statement of policy:

This quota continues the policy of restricting exports of major petroleum products to the maximum extent possible until the current domestic shortages are alleviated.

Can you or I explain how such a policy can be squared with allocations of 925,720 more barrels of these critically needed oils in this quarter over the amount exported in the first quarter of last year? Can anyone explain how we could secure such magnificent cooperation from our friends in Canada, where it is certainly cold, too, and be so completely unable to explain our situation satisfactorily to our friends in these other countries? Possibly there are urgent needs for gas oil and distillate oil in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Mexico, Australia, New Zealand, and British West Africa, but I doubt if it is for the purpose of heating homes in a zero temperature. Again, there may be urgent needs for residual fuel oil in Australia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Guatemala, Mexico, and British and French West Africa. If so, I insist that the people of this country also have need for this oil which can and should be explained to the governments and peoples of those countries. I have every confidence that if this is done, we would find the same friendly response as the one we received from Canada. If there is some other reason, which the Government does not wish to give publicly, at least an adequate explanation should be given to the representatives of those in this country who are facing difficulties and who are being asked to take every kind of a conservation measure.

There is another feature of this program. Competent witnesses before committees of this House, and particularly before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, testified that one of the main reasons for this shortage is because we do not have enough tankers to bring oil from the Gulf coast up to New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New England. I do not know what the capacity of a T–2 tanker is, but those are the tankers involved recently in the foreign sales by the Maritime Commission, and I hope to be able to give you some more details about that particular transaction which I think was unwise in the extreme, and which met the protest of one member of that Commission. I do want to express the hope that something is being done by the Commission to make those tankers available for the east coast run until we get by the worst of this situation. Many of you will recall the committee resolution adopted by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce making several constructive suggestions as to meeting our difficulties. But may I repeat two of the recommendations, which are as follows:

(3) The Maritime Commission should desist, for such time as such shortages continue to exist, from completing the transfer to foreign purchasers of tankers owned by the Government.

(4) Negotiations should be undertaken by the Maritime Commission with the purchasers and owners of tankers formerly owned by the United States, with a view to securing the use of such tankers for the transportation of fuel oil to alleviate such shortages.

If you wish to refer to the complete resolution, it is printed at page 11760 of the RECORD of December 19, 1947.

If that transaction is water over the dam, we now confront the fact that if the capacity of a T–2 tanker is approximately 100,000 barrels of oil, the requirements of this program to ship to our good friends abroad 14,470,000 barrels of petroleum products during these 3 months will mean that we shall have taken out of our coastal service the equivalent of 144 trips. And most of them will be much longer than the time for the average east-coast run. Mr. Rathbone, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, testified before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in December that if his company could have five additional tankers, it could serve all of that particular company's consumers in New England during the months of January, February, and March; in other words, the people who use that company's oil would not have a crisis.

I am trying to give these facts to the Members of this House whose constituents are cold and who have hospitals and schools and industries facing the possibility of closing.

In my own district one community is considering the advisability of closing its schools to conserve fuel oil. The governors of our New England States have begged us to try to help. We are all receiving daily pleas for assistance from county and local officials and from individuals. In my judgment, every Member of Congress has done his level best. I think it is fair, I think it is proper—in fact, I think it is our duty—when we think a mistake of judgment has been made by any administrative officer, to call attention to that mistake of judgment. I am very glad to report that my friend the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has promptly called a meeting of that committee tomorrow so that we may go into these figures and find out what the facts are and try to carry out the express will of that committee, which, on December 19, passed the resolution to which I have referred, asking and urging that the administration use the export powers it has to protect our people at home, and try to get us through this crisis, and urging the President and every agency of Government to take all possible action to utilize such powers as they possess to aid in alleviating the shortages. We are not dealing with any theory. We are dealing with cold—and I mean cold—stark facts.

Your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by initiating hearings last July, did not act as partisans; rather they were acting as a group attempting to discharge their responsibilities to this House and to the American people as a whole. You will find in the report of those hearings a clear indication, even then, that we were not only in trouble as to gas in the Northwest but that we were headed for trouble as to heating and fuel oil in other parts of the country this fall and winter unless everything worked out perfectly. You will find that the chairman and the members of the committee constantly impressed upon the witnesses from Government and industry the necessity of using every means of avoiding the situation now confronting us.

That committee did not continue its hearings during the last special session as partisans, and it certainly acted as representatives of all the American people, regardless of politics, when it promptly passed the committee resolution before adjournment.

I hope that every Member of this House, whether he be a Democrat or Republican, who has people at home suffering or in danger of suffering, will join with us all in trying to point out constructive solutions to remedy this unfortunate situation, which will keep our hospitals open, which will keep our schools and our transportation systems going, which will keep our people at least safely warm, and which will make it possible for these great industrial centers to keep their industries at 100-percent production to furnish the goods we need if we are going to undertake the programs ahead of us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on January 17, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4055. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 20, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1211. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 447); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1212. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Works Agency, for fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

1213. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for government, relief, economic rehabilitation, reorientation, and reeducation in occupied areas in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1214. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfer to the State of Texas of a picket boat or craft of similar type; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1215. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1 through December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1216. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1947, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1217. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfers to various eligible institutions and organizations which have requested donations or loans from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1218. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1219. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1220. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Thirty-third Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1221. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a report of the activities of the Board occurring since its last annual report and up to November 1, 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 430. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2873, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; without amendment (Rept. 1243). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 431. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4044, a bill to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1244). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3239) to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, and the same was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4996. A bill directing the Fish and Wildlife Service to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell clam in Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 4997. A bill making an initial appropriation to enable the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry on certain studies of the soft-shell clam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 4998. A bill to prohibit the use of traps, weirs, and pound nets for fishing in the waters of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 4999. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5000. A bill to increase all benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5001. A bill to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 5002. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by certain employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5003. A bill to provide for the allocation of meat; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 5004. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asiatic and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 5005. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, with respect to farmer-debtor relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 5006. A bill to allow certain periods of service to be credited to certain employees of the postal service for the purposes of promotion under the act of July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 5007. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate American-made rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TWYMAN:

H. R. 5008. A bill to provide a rate of postage of 6 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof, on domestic air mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 5009. A bill to grant retirement with pay to certain disabled emergency officers of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 5010. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5011. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on admissions, cabarets, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5012. A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons temporarily residing in the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5013. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of World War I under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 5014. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyrights," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5015. A bill to require the exclusion of payments by the Veterans' Administration and of aid to dependent children allowances from the computation of net income when making certain determinations with respect to low-rent or defense housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 5016. A bill to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 5017. A bill to extend the time for filing valid application for disabled emergency officers' retirement benefits, to grant retirement pay to World War emergency officers who now have or who may later establish a 30-percent or more service-connected permanent disability for this and/or other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 5018. A bill to amend and extend the maximum-rent provisions of Public Law 129, Eightieth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5019. A bill to authorize the Administrator, War Assets Administration, to convey the Tobyhanna Military Reservation to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5020. A bill for the relief of certain persons occupying lands of the United States

within the drainage of the Arroyo Seco, Angeles National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 5021. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1947, so as to permit State and local taxation of property leased thereunder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5022. A bill to provide that temporary housing projects located in municipalities may, on the request of the municipalities, be disposed of without regard to the removal provisions of existing law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 5023. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to make an allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the Air Force of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. Res. 432. Resolution for the relief of Georgia Reed; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 433. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a Fuel Oil Coordinator; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 5024. A bill for the relief of Crawford F. Carpenter, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON (by request):

H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Josefina Feliu Mielnikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of the estate of James F. Delahanty, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5027. A bill for the relief of Mor Klein and Mrs. Teri Muller Klein, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5028. A bill for the relief of Five Boro Personal Loan Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1149. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 53 residents of California, urging that legislation establishing a system of universal military training be enacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1150. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of H. E. Michaels and 81 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1151. Also, petition of William C. Fische, Jr., and 60 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1152. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Miss Amanda E. Lind and 11 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1153. Also, petition of Mrs. Haworth and 14 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1154. Also, petition of Mrs. Louis Clark and 105 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1155. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 86 residents of Butler County, urging the passage of H. J. Res. 239 and S. J. Res. 150, the Christian amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1156. Also, petition of 91 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1157. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of Charles H. Carey Post, No. 56, American Legion, Salem, Ohio, signed by 34 members, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1158. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of New Athens, Ohio, signed by 11 members, in support of the Capper bill and the Bryson bill prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation and importation of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1159. Also, petition of 15 residents of Steubenville, Ohio, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1160. By Mr. McGARVEY: Petition submitted by members of the Pennsylvania Railroad Post, No. 204, the American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1161. Also, petition submitted by Miss Betty Crothers, Philadelphia, Pa., and others, in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1162. Also, petition submitted by Mrs. A. H. Wittman, Philadelphia, Pa., and others, in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1163. Also, petition submitted by members of the William P. Roche Unit, No. 21, American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1164. Also, petition submitted by members of the Breen-McCracken Unit, No. 27, American Legion Auxiliary, Philadelphia, Pa., in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1165. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mrs. William W. Wakeman and sundry citizens of Massachusetts advocating enactment of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1166. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition containing 87 signatures of residents of Racine County, Wis., and presented by the Racine County commander of the American Legion, in support of legislation for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1167. By the SPEAKER: Petition of student veterans of West Virginia State College petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to increase subsistence to veterans going to college; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1168. Also, petition of Local No. 22, ILGWU, of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to exporting arms and munitions of war to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1169. Also, petition of the chairman of the executive committee of the Protestant War Veterans of the United States, Inc., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to opposing the Marshall plan and aid to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost reveal Thyself to the pure in heart, we pray Thee to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. Allow not fears and doubt to abound. Free our hearts, and grant us wisdom and courage for these expectant days of hard work and loads to carry.

We pray for our own America, that she may always be a land of churches, homes, and schools, with a national theme of tolerance and good will to all within her borders. May her reverence, integrity, and simplicity be a royal fortress and her hearthstones be a rampart against this garish world.

Our Father, this day may we render acceptable service unto Thee. In the holy name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 19, 1948, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 389. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 769. An act for the relief of the estate of Ruth Horton Hunter;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased;

H. R. 1175. An act for the relief of the estate of Daphne Ward Pope, deceased;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Calvin J. Frederick;

H. R. 1426. An act to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen;

H. R. 1531. An act for the relief of William P. Gillingham;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth F. McCombie;

H. R. 2056. An act for the relief of J. C. Bateman;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Charles J. Smith;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Mattie A. Horner;

H. R. 3068. An act for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas;

H. R. 3146. An act to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4055. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations from committees:

JANUARY 20, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

MELVIN PRICE.

JANUARY 20, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

With kind regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

EUGENE J. KEOGH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 434).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Armed Services.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 435).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

REESTABLISHMENT OF THE GOLD STANDARD

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on November 28 last I discussed the deterioration of our money since 1933 and pointed out that the only cure for spiraling prices appeared to be a restoration of free circulation of gold.

Today I have introduced a bill providing for the reestablishment of the gold standard on January 20, 1949—1 year from today—the date the next administration takes office.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of restoring the circulation of gold and ending the deterioration of our money is of direct and immediate importance to every bondholder, insurance-policy owner, and every pensioner in America.

However, restoring the right of the American citizen to own gold may be of much greater significance. There is impressive evidence indicating that the right to own gold is the human freedom on which all other freedoms ultimately depend.

It appears that only by the right to own gold can the people control the public purse and thus effectively restrain their political rulers. Because of that fact, the modern tyrants of Europe, Lenin, Hitler, and Mussolini, all quickly prohibited individual ownership of gold. Then there remained in the hands of the people no effective barrier against inflation and war.

If Congress will move constructively to restore to Americans the freedom to own gold, the drive here toward the chaos of national bankruptcy and perpetual war can most surely be ended.

In the weeks ahead I expect to discuss this important subject from time to time. Meanwhile, I hope all interested in peace and economic stability will carefully consider this proposal as possibly the only real and complete way out of our present difficulties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Hon. KARL STEFAN entitled "Glass-House Tenant."

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three statements presented as a program on synthetic rubber before the Chemical Engineers' Club.

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read to the House a letter which I received from a farmer in Kansas. It reads as follows:

MORRILL, KANS., *January 12, 1947.*

Mr. ALBERT COLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: You, as a Representative of the people of this district, will have the opportunity during this session of Congress to speed the return of normal government or to further shackle certain industries through Government control.

I am a small farmer in Brown County engaged in diversified farming. Hog raising has always been best suited to my farm so in the past and now most of my crops and efforts end up in about 80 head of hogs produced annually. Whether or not I make a living depends to a great extent upon how much profit I make on my hogs, not, understand, how much I get for my hogs. I have sold hogs for $15 per hundredweight at a much larger profit than I receive today. Since we are continually bombarded with the discussion of high meat prices I think it is time the public should be informed of the real facts of the issue rather than sold on the idea of rationing and price control as Secretary Anderson is doing.

Meat is high but to my knowledge I have never produced pork at less profit than I do today. Understand I am not complaining about the situation as it is today, I am merely stating my case against rationing and price control in an industry which is already in a seriously low state of production because of the unattractive profit outlook. With record high grain prices we must have high meat prices or no meat. Ration meat now and there'll be none to ration later.

Today on my farm I can get $27 per hundredweight for my choice hogs; I can sell my corn for $2.70 per bushel. It has always been an accepted fact that it requires about 10 bushels of corn to produce 100 pounds of pork. Therefore at present prices I about break even on my feed costs. I sell my corn through the hogs for just about what I could sell the corn. Here's where the rub comes in—there's a hell of a lot of work and risk in raising hogs. It's no fun caring for them when the snow is hip deep or the mud in the lots is a foot deep. Then, too, an epidemic can strike your herd and wipe out your hogs and the corn crop that is already in them. The fellow, I'd say, that's sitting by the fire and has already sold his corn is the one in the golden chair when the feeding ratio is as it is today. I'm not in the hog business for conditions as they are today but I stay because there is always the possibility of a change before the next crop of hogs go to market. I may not make any money on the hogs I am now feeding but if the Government lets things alone I am still willing to gamble with the hogs.

Price control and rationing is nothing more or less than a political move to reduce the price of meat. The administration is smart enough to know that they cannot reduce the price of grain because the grain producer can sit on his grain until hell freezes over. With livestock the situation is different, when it reaches a certain age and weight it must be marketed regardless of price. I will admit that rationing and price control of meat would be a boon to President Truman this fall because millions would think they had benefited by the lower living costs. Have they forgotten their grumblings of a year or two ago when meat was not available at any price? After all are high living costs so poisonous a situation? We had low living costs in the early thirties; we also had bread lines, relief, and unemployment.

The impending shortage of meat is due largely to one thing—the lack of visible profit in its present production. The livestock producer doesn't ask $25, $30, or $35 per hundred for his product; he asks for a profit for his labor. The present price of grain makes $30 hogs a just and fair price. If the price of meat is reduced by act of Congress then I am shooting craps with a pair of dice that are loaded to roll deuces and I am forced to quit the game or go broke.

Sincerely,

VERN R. MOEHLMAN.

PRICE CONTROL AND RATIONING

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal of late about the return to controls and rationing. I have always been opposed to controls and rationing because I consider them absolutely contrary to the American philosophy of government. However, to implement my own thought on the subject, I would like to quote the words of Joe Stalin on the subject of rationing. He said, and I quote:

Ration books in the hands of the proletarian states are the most powerful means of

control. A power unprecedented in history, a means of compulsion stronger than the laws of the convent or of the guillotine.

We had better beware before it is too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a speech made by me before the Women's Patriotic Conference in Washington, D. C., on January 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION IN THE COST OF LUMBER

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper release of the Joint Committee on Housing dated January 9, 1948, announcing the 10-percent reduction in the cost of lumber for 60 days by the Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., of St. Paul, Minn. This is the first volntary move by a leading lumber producer to announce a cut in prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the release from the Joint Committee on Housing is as follows:

Encouraged by the first voluntary move by a leading lumber producer to announce a cut in prices, Congressman RALPH A. GAMBLE, Republican, New York, chairman of the Joint Committee on Housing, called upon another important building-material industry to aid in attaining the objective sought by the anti-inflation law recently enacted by Congress.

In a telegram to the Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., of St. Paul, Minn., and to Laird Bell, of Chicago, chairman of the board, Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., of Tacoma, Wash., which announced on Friday a 10-percent cut in lumber prices at the mill, Chairman GAMBLE complimented these companies on their moves and made it known that he had called upon the gypsum industry to pursue a similar course.

Chairman GAMBLE's telegram to the lumber firms read:

"The 10-percent cut in lumber prices at the mill which you have just announced is the first victory in our concentrated attack on inflation.

"I commend you for the courage you have shown in taking the leadership in support of the public interest.

"If other responsible interests in your great industry follow your example, we can quickly realize substantial savings in housing construction costs.

"Our committee has called the gypsum industry to a conference in Washington on January 28, similar to the one we held last Friday (January 9) for leaders in the lumber industry. I am hopeful the gypsum industry will join the lumber industry in reducing costs, speeding up production and channeling shipments to areas where materials are short, thereby promoting the objective sought by the anti-inflation law recently enacted by Congress."

The foregoing message to the Weyerhaeuser firms was prompted by a statement made by F. K. Weyerhaeuser, president, Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., in which he said:

"We wish to do our part in reducing the cost of building and in checking the inflationary trends now threatening our national welfare. Due to the great demand for lumber arising from the wartime depletion of stocks and the postwar boom in home construction, lumber prices have risen sharply but in about the same proportion as the prices of farm products.

"While the cost of lumber used in the average small house totals only about 20 percent of the cost of all materials and lumber used, nevertheless the price of lumber affects total building costs. Since OPA controls were removed we have followed a very conservative policy in the pricing of our products right down to the present moment.

"In spite of our present price position we have determined to make price reductions on house building items of Douglas fir, western hemlock, and coast red cedar lumber shipped from our affiliated sawmills and going to the retail lumber trade. We will maintain these prices on such shipments for the next 60 days and longer if we believe conditions warrant.

"These reductions will average 10 percent of the f. o. b. mill value. They will appear in our price quotations to retail customers and will also apply to orders now on file for these customers and shipped after this date."

HAS THE ROOSEVELT POLICY ON GOVERNMENT SPECULATORS BEEN REVERSED BY TRUMAN?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include two letters and two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, recent disclosures have proved that high officials in the present administration have been engaging in commodity speculations.

It is interesting to note that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prohibited officers or employees from engaging in such practices when he was President. This order was issued April 22, 1937. It reads:

I believe it to be a sound policy of the Government that no officer or employee shall participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or of commodities for speculative purposes, as distinguished from bona fide investment purposes. Engagement in such speculative activities by any officer or employee, whether under the competitive civil service or not, should be among the matters considered by the heads of departments and establishments and by the Commission in passing upon questions concerning his qualifications for retention or advancement.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Following this announcement of Presidential policy the following notice was sent on April 30, 1937, to the heads of all departments and independent establishments:

In a letter dated April 22, 1937, the President requested the Commission to take steps to inform all officials and employees of the Government that speculation on their part or in their behalf in corporate stocks or bonds or in commodities is contrary to Government policy. The President said:

"I believe it to be a sound policy of the Government that no officer or employee shall participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or of commodities for speculative purposes, as distinguished from bona fide investment purposes. Engagement in such speculative activities by any officer or employee, whether under the competitive civil service or not, should be among the matters considered by the heads of departments and establishments and by the Commission in passing upon questions concerning his qualifications for retention or advancement."

Accordingly, an official notice to this effect should be distributed to each officer under your jurisdiction, whether under the competitive civil service or not, for the information and guidance of the officials and employees therein.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

The appointments of Edwin W. Pauley to the several offices he has recently held in the administration were in violation of this policy. These appointments indicate that the Truman administration is not following the same policy in such matters as was followed during the Roosevelt administration, even though President Truman, Attorney General Clark, and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson have made a number of recent speeches denouncing commodity speculators.

Now that these individuals have been charged with violating this policy, and the initial evidence has supported the charges, what standard is to be applied in proving them? Raymond Moley, who was an early supporter of President Roosevelt, has unearthed a Roosevelt precedent to cover the case. He states that where the initial evidence supports a violation of public trust by a public official the traditional rule as to the burden of proof is reversed and the burden rests with the officer charged. Moley states:

Members of this administration cannot sit tight and demand that Stassen and others prove them guilty. It is up to them to prove their innocence.

The entire article is here inserted under leave to extend my remarks:

MOLEY SAYS ADMINISTRATION MUST STICK TO F. R. STANDARD

In February 1932, as governor, Franklin D. Roosevelt removed Thomas M. Farley, sheriff of New York County. In doing so, he brushed aside several charges filed with him and rested his action on a broad principle of public morality.

Farley's bank account bulged with funds for which no explanation had been made. Nor had it been proved that these funds were illegally accumulated.

But since Farley held an office of public trust, Roosevelt maintained that the traditional rule that the burden of proof rested with the accuser was reversed and that the burden in such a case rested with the official charged. This reporter was in a position to know that Roosevelt, in making this point, was trying to set a standard for all future office holding.

In announcing his decision, he said: "The stewardship of public officers is a serious and sacred trust. They are so close to the means for private gain that in a sense not at all true of private citizens, their personal possessions are invested with a public importance in the event that their stewardship is questioned.

"One of their deep obligations is to recognize this, not reluctantly or with resistance, but freely. It is in the true spirit of a public trust to give, when personally called upon, public proof of the nature, source, and extent of their financial affairs.

"It is true that this is not always pleasant. But standards of public service must be measured in this way * * * because if popular government is to continue to exist it must in such matters hold its stewards to a stern and uncompromising rectitude."

The present members of the Truman administration hold office because the people elected the man who announced this principle. Their responsibilities as well as their power are derived from his mandate.

Members of this administration cannot under this principle sit tight and demand that Stassen and others prove them guilty. It is up to them to prove their innocence.

RAYMOND MOLEY.

Also here included under leave to extend my remarks is editorial appearing in the Minneapolis Star of January 14, 1948:

SMELLS BAD, MR. TRUMAN

Ed Pauley, special assistant to the Secretary of the Army, didn't make a million dollars speculating in the commodities market, Mr. Stassen. How could you accuse him of such a thing? He profited by only $932,-703.10, he says.

And Brig. Gen. Wallace Graham, White House physician, didn't deal in commodities after President Truman denounced speculators last October. At least, he didn't mean to. He still played the market in cotton and cottonseed oil, but he didn't think they were commodities. And he didn't incur a loss, as he said earlier. Now he admits he made $6,165.25.

After trying to create the impression for months that he didn't know a broker from a billygoat, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma now confesses that he did do a little speculating, in his wife's name, to eke out his meager salary.

Trading on the commodity markets isn't illegal. It's a legitimate part of the milling and grain and similar businesses. But gambling on a rise or fall in prices in these days of world-wide want has a bad smell. Particularly when the gamblers are Government insiders who are in a position to know in advance about decisions which affect the market.

Mr. Truman has done a lot of talking about the evils of speculation. Much of it hasn't made complete sense. But now offenders are found right in his own circle.

What are you going to do about it, Mr. President?

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to urge the passage of my bill presently pending before the Judiciary Committee, prohibiting speculation in commodities by certain officers and employees of the Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, one from this week's issue of Newsweek and one from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Litchfield County Farm Bureau, of Connecticut, at their annual meeting on January 9, 1948.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and that the same appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MCDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SHIPMENTS OF FUEL OIL ABROAD

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under a Paris date line, January 17, the Associated Press dispatch discloses that Ambassador Caffery stated that in the first 24 days of the interim-aid shipments of coal to France amounted to 1,250,000 tons, plus 200,000 tons of petroleum. I would suggest to some of those on the east coast bothered with fuel shortages that, while it may not get them needed fuel, they can at least generate some warmth, get hot under the collar, by figuring how many homes this amount of fuel would heat.

They might also try to figure out where the transportation came from, how much was used, and what relief they might have had if that transportation had been used to carry fuel for our own citizens.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING AND ROTC LEGISLATION

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest is developing in two bills now pending before the House. They were reported by the Education and Training Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee late in the first session. I am chairman of the subcommittee involved.

Of the two bills, the most important is the so-called inactive duty training pay bill which would authorize inactive duty training pay for Army and Air Force Reserve officers, thereby putting them on par with Navy and Marine Corps Reservists and members of the National Guard.

The other bill is the ROTC bill which proposes to expand and make certain refinements in the ROTC system. This bill also makes provision for an Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps for the first time in our history.

I would like to have it clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, that I am very much aware of the importance of these two bills to the civilian components of the Army and the national defense. Nevertheless, I have not yet moved to seek a rule from the Rules Committee to activate either of these bills. It is not surprising that this gives some of my good friends on both sides of the aisle considerable concern.

After second thought, however, I think that my friends in the House will realize that public questions involving vast sums of money should be delayed when there is reasonable possibility that the legislative solution proposed may have to be changed considerably before the legislation can be enacted. At this time, there is meeting in the Department of Defense a special committee appointed by Secretary Forrestal and headed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Gordon Gray, whose function is to completely resurvey the reserve problems of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. One of the problems to be considered by this special committee is the determination of the proper emoluments for the various reserve components as well as their interrelationship, such as the relationship of the National Guard to the Army Reserves and the relationship of the Naval Militia to the Naval Reserves. This study also is to encompass the possibility of joint usage of reserve training facilities in an effort to save vast investments of money, manpower and materials. It will also consider the officer training programs of the various services and seek to eliminate any unnecessary differences between them.

I have taken the position, and have so advised the military, that it would be improper for me to attempt to secure the approval of the House of Representatives on this legislation at a time when the Department of Defense is actively considering the possible revision of certain problems affecting the Reserve components. This seems to me to be eminently logical and fair and, for that matter, I would say that it is the only sensible way to proceed. May I also say, Mr. Speaker, that it would be inappropriate also in my view to proceed with this legislation at a time when the Department of the Army is unable to furnish fully the instruction material and training facilities for its own reserves. Additional armories are necessary as all of us know before these components can be adequately trained. Further, additional Army planning will be necessary before its reserves can be profitably trained. I have been pursuing this phase of the matter with the Department for some time.

So I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that a brief delay in enactment of the inactive duty training pay bill will have very harmful results. In fact, a brief delay may well be very helpful, in that it may assist Mr. Gordon Gray in reaching an early decision with respect to the major questions involved in this exceedingly important subject.

I wish also to make it clear at this time, Mr. Speaker, to my friends on the floor of the House of Representatives and also to my good friends in the Reserve chapters throughout the country, that I am not personally opposed in any way to this legislation. Neither is it my intention to withhold action on it indefinitely. On the contrary, I do propose to seek action on this legislation this session and, I hope, favorable action. But again I say that in my opinion the House of Representatives should not act until it has available the

advice and conclusions of the expert, special committee now surveying this entire field by direction of the Secretary of Defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. William Rhinehart.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including an editorial and also a newspaper article.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders entered for that day, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MISLEADING DISCUSSIONS OF MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 5003) to provide for the allocation of meat, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and a similar Senate bill, are mischievous proposals. Their net effect will be to make meat scarcer and harder to get during the coming year. I know that the gentlemen who are sponsoring this legislation are not deliberately trying to reduce the supply of meat available to the average consumer in this country, but that is going to be the effect of their proposals and of all the discussion going on in this country today, in high places and low, on the question of meat shortages.

This discussion is mischievous because the best available estimates from both Government and private sources indicate that the per capita supply of meat this year will be above the average consumption in recent years.

There need be no shortage and there will be none unless it is an artificial shortage, created by the fear generated by misleading discussions of possible shortages and threats of rationing and price controls. Reports from all over the country indicate that this fear is resulting in the hoarding of meat on the part of consumers everywhere, something that is easily possible because of the great number of frozen food lockers. They indicate also, because of the uncertainty as to controls, that producers and feeders of livestock are sending immature and unfinished animals to market and are reducing the scope of their operations.

This is thoroughly understandable because, with controls on meat and no controls on the prices of feed, wages, and other production costs, no farmer can safely make his plans for months ahead, which he must do if he stays in the livestock business. Producers are willing to take their chances with the law of supply and demand, with the risks of weather, and pests, and diseases, but they understandably are reluctant to add to these the additional risk of what may come out of Washington if we are going to start in with controls.

The estimated per capita consumption of meat for 1947 was 156 pounds. The estimate for 1948 is 146 pounds, or 6.5 percent less. Figured out in terms of daily consumption, it means that consumers will have to reduce their daily consumption for 1948 by less than half an ounce, as compared with 1947. But that is not all. With the exception of 1946 when the per capita consumption was about 153 pounds, and 1947, consumers will this year have more meat than they have had in any year, going back as far as 1910. They will have more than 20 pounds per capita above what was consumed on an average between the years 1935 and 1939.

Is this any cause for a panic? Is there going to be any suffering in this country because our available supply of meat is going to be half an ounce less per day than it was during the year of our greatest consumption? Is this any excuse for going back to controls, which even those with the shortest memories know mean black markets, outrageous prices, and empty meat counters? Let us use our heads.

TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently tried to reduce the high cost of living of the city dweller by every means at my disposal, including voting for tax reduction and other alleviating measures. To that end I have today joined other Members of the House, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], in introducing a bill to eliminate the tax on oleomargarine. I hope the House will pass this measure.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the gentleman's unanimous-consent request would obviate Calendar Wednesday tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I take this opportunity and still reserve the right to object to ask the distinguished majority leader in the absence of the chairman of the Rules Committee—I having addressed the chairman of the Rules Committee 2 weeks ago in regard to four bills, three of which were unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee, and the well-known bill on universal military training, which passed the House Committee on Armed Services by a two-thirds vote—can the majority leader on behalf of the Rules Committee or the leadership of the House give me any idea when I may expect an answer from the chairman of the Rules Committee?

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman of course knows, that is a question to be addressed to the committee. I might say to the gentleman from New York that one of those bills on which he asked a rule was reported from the Rules Committee and the gentleman called it to the floor and brought it to passage.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We very much appreciate that. The bill passed the House by unanimous vote, but we have other bills in the same category.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORBLAD (at the request of Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include transcript of a broadcast by Jack Beall on January 10, 1948.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Secretary of State Marshall.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Journal American.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 weeks have seen an

unrivaled cold spell attack the regions of up-State New York and the Northeast. Ice is 3 feet thick in some spots. Snow is deep and the weather is generally overpowering.

Reports come from my section that there is some suffering and considerable discomfort from the winter. The 20-percent shortage of fuel oil from normal supplies is bound to cause such misfortune. While State authorities are doing what they can, I believe it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to act likewise.

With careful distribution, much of the suffering can be eliminated. The first duty of the petroleum industry, it seems to me, is to take care of fuel-oil users who have homes and families to keep warm. Their need is paramount.

Behind the iron curtain, the proletariat is considered only after all favored groups and government commissars are taken care of. This is true with fuel as it is true with other necessities. The people get what is left and have to like it.

But we live in America, where cold and hunger are supposed to be unknown. We are said to enjoy the highest standard of living in the world.

Therefore, to preserve this great country, people must be kept safe from the ravages of the elements. I call upon business and the proper agencies of Government as well to cooperate in the equitable distribution of fuel oil.

To stimulate such cooperation, I am introducing the following bill, which the House should pass before this critical emergency threatens the whole Nation.

My bill reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That Congress hereby directs the President to call representatives of the Department of Interior and of the petroleum industry together for the purposes of:

1. Taking immediate care of all persons who heat their homes with fuel oil and who now find themselves in desperate straits because of lack of it.

2. Assuring home users of fuel oil that they will be given priority over other users, at least up to 1,000 gallons.

3. Securing adequate additional supplies of fuel oil at the earliest possible moment from sections of the United States not suffering from extreme cold and arranging for the shipment of these supplies to areas where shortages of fuel oil exist.

ALLOCATION OF GRAIN TO THE DISTILLING INDUSTRY

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the special session the Congress gave the President power of life and death over the beverage-distilling industry, to allocate that industry's grain until January 31 next, on the theory that by the end of this month the President and the Secretary of Agriculture should be able to prove whether or not there was a sufficiently serious food shortage to warrant the restriction of all grain processors in their use of grain. Now I understand that the administration is saying, in effect, that they have not had enough time to prove a shortage and provide an orderly method of allocating grain to all users, but that they must keep the use of grain rationed. A bill has been introduced in the Senate giving them until February 29, 30 days more. I think we ought to give them 60 days; let us get this whole question of the alleged need of controls straightened out once and for all. Accordingly, I am introducing today a resolution extending the effective date of that provision of Public Law 395 allocating grain to distillers to March 31, 1948.

In a word, what I am saying is this: If the President or the Secretary of Agriculture have not had time to demonstrate a bona fide grain shortage and to set up an allocation system for all users of grain, we should now give them until March 31, approximately 2½ months, and during this period the beverage-distilling industry should be allowed a fair and adequate amount of grain with which to continue their operations and to provide full employment for their workers.

BARUCH PROPOSALS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute to call to the attention of the House the testimony of Mr. Bernard Baruch yesterday before a committee in another body. In my opinion this testimony of Mr. Baruch is one of the best-balanced proposals that we have had in regard to our foreign-aid program, and I commend to the Members of the House a careful consideration of the 11 points brought out in the Baruch proposal as presented to the committee in the other body yesterday. Most of us are convinced that aid to the western European nations is absolutely necessary for their rehabilitation and for a peaceful and stable world. We also realize that aid from the United States will be a subtraction from our total supply of goods, foods, machinery, medicine, and moneys. Such a subtraction must be made in an orderly manner or its effect on our domestic economy will be subject to justifiable criticism. The Marshall plan must be spelled out in the coming weeks in a practical and common-sense manner. In my opinion Mr. Baruch's 11 points lay the practical basis and common-sense principles which must be carefully considered in the spelling out of our aid program to the 16 nations of western Europe. It provides a framework for the proper coordination of our domestic-production economy with the foreign-aid program. I include at this point the 11 points as outlined in this morning's Washington Post:

TEXT OF 11-POINT BARUCH PLAN

Here is the text of the 11-point program recommended by Bernard M. Baruch to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"1. The United States stand ready to buy all nonperishable raw materials produced anywhere and by anyone in the world for the next 5 years, and which cannot find normal commercial markets: Minerals, metals, and ores, both crude and refined jute, sisal, etc., yes, even wool and cotton. Also up to 750,000 tons of crude rubber. This should be made a part of the European recovery legislation.

"2. Extend the President's present tariff authority for the next 3 years.

"3. That the countries of Europe—as many as are willing—band themselves into a political, economic, and defense union under the United Nations. This would include the lowering of trade barriers among them.

"4. That the United States, and such others as will join us, mutually guarantee the nations entering this union against aggression. By guaranteeing I mean a firm promise to go to war in joint defense if any of them are attacked.

"5. That the European nations organize to liberate and use every productive resource of the Continent, with those of the Ruhr regulated under priorities and international control so as to protect the peaceful interests of Germany's neighbors.

"6. Stabilize all European currencies and establish realistic rates of exchange.

"7. A 2-year production drive in this country—to work for peace as we worked for war—where feasible, with longer hours and overtime; where not, to smash production bottlenecks.

"8. As part of this work-for-peace drive, an across-the-Nation anti-inflation program to stabilize for peace, including:

"(a) Reduction of major food and agricultural prices in exchange for guaranteeing farmers an assured price for their crops for the next 3 years, with ample soil conservation.

"(b) In return for this roll-back, stabilization of wages.

"(c) Restoration of the excess-profits tax by 50 percent of the cut from war levels, with wartime amortization for new plants.

"(d) Continued rent controls, with provision only for clearly justifiable increases.

"(e) Postpone tax reduction for 2 years, after which a 5-year orderly reduction of personal and corporate taxes combined with the systematic, substantial lowering of the national debt which is a terrible threat to our security.

"(f) Put off all less essential works, including Federal, State, and municipal projects, giving priority to increasing production, housing, schools, hospitals, and other more essential needs.

"(g) Set up a capital issue committee, with advisory powers, under the Secretary of the Treasury, to review all capital issues, public and private, with a view to deferring less essential projects. The Governors of each State should appoint committees to pass on all proposed projects at the local level before going to the Federal committee.

"(h) Congress to set up a digging committee to scrutinize all Federal works and expenditures to determine which are postponable; also where Government spending can be cut and whether it is being done most economically. 'Cut costs for great efficiency' is a sound business maxim. It applies to governments as well.

"(i) More production—so important that I repeat it.

"9. Settle realistically all prewar and wartime intergovernment debts. For example, Britain and her creditors must decide what is to be done with the $14,000,000,000 of frozen pound sterling accumulated during the war.

"10. The British and others to retain their empire preferences for 3 years.

"11. A general staff for peace to develop an over-all, global strategy for America's peacemaking."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in

one an editorial appearing in the Daily Northwestern, of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and in the other a radio broadcast by George E. Reedy.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a radio address delivered by him, and in the other a letter with an editorial enclosed.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Reader's Digest entitled "Hidden Red Ink in TVA Books."

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the Alien Property Custodian.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RED INK IN THE DAILY TREASURY STATEMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the daily Treasury statement should be printed in red ink, and I would introduce a bill to that effect, but I am afraid I would not be successful in having it passed. Now, according to the statement of the Treasury of January 15 it shows that we have spent $231,832,000 more than it has taken in. That puts us in the red for the year to date; with a debt of $256,558,000,000 we must not go in the red. The thing that worries me and the thing that is going to keep us in red ink is the fact that the President did not say a word in any of his messages about economy in Government. That is the thing that disturbs me. He has charge of all departments of Government. He is only interested in asking the Congress to appropriate $17,000,000,000 for the people in foreign countries. He is asking us to appropriate for universal military training the sum of $3,000,000,000, and for socialized medicine it will cost about $800,000,000.

The President wants aid to education for $500,000,000. He wants five hundred million for interest on the public debt. He is always asking for more money for more things for the Government to do. Where will you get all this money? The people want less taxes. How can you cut taxes, cut the public debt, and keep on spending? I say it cannot be done. So, Mr. President, I say to you and the Congress, Cut out your foolish and unnecessary spending. Where is the end going to be? Everything will be red pretty soon.

VETERANS' INSURANCE LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a bill which I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing into the House a bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, to protect the insured against lapse by crediting to the insured dividends from excess of premiums over death costs chargeable thereto and by automatic payment of premiums from accumulated credits. It will save insurance for thousands of veterans, Mr. Speaker. The bill may not go through; the committee may not decide to favor the bill, but I think something of this sort should pass in order to protect the veterans who have allowed their insurance to lapse and to give the veterans the benefit of surpluses due them. It is a very precious possession to them, and I believe that something should be done. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs had a hearing relating to the purposes of the bill.

The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 as enacted and now in force provides that the United States shall bear the cost of administration and shall bear the excess mortality cost and of cost of waiver of premiums for total disability traceable to the extra hazards of the military or naval service as such hazards may be determined by the Administrator.

This is a promise on the part of the Government to the insured that the Government shall bear all expenses and all payments to be made on account of death and disability traceable to the extra hazard of the military or naval service. This leaves to be paid out of the accumulated premium payments by the insured only the civilian death claims remaining after excluding payments of war connected deaths and disabilities required to be made wholly by the Government.

The bill provides for a prompt credit of dividends to each insured veteran to cover the excess of the premiums paid over the civilian death claims. The credit begins with the end of the insured's first policy year and continues at the end of each policy year. Any premium not paid when due is paid as of the due date by being charged against his credit. Three percent compound interest is added to the credit at the end of each policy year.

The present NSLI of October 8, 1940, is verbatim the same as the Government Insurance Act of 1917 in requiring the premiums charged to be based on the American experience table of mortality. This was then uniformly recognized by the United States and the States and used by the life-insurance companies for insurance on standard civilian risks. No change was made in this until after a study of the 10-year experience of the life companies between 1930 and 1940, the insurance commissioners of the United States and the District of Columbia in cooperation with the life insurance companies agreed on the new 1941 commissioners standard ordinary mortality table which shows a lower death rate, particularly in the younger ages. The death rate is, however, about the same for ages approaching 60 and many years thereafter. This new mortality table has been adopted by the legislatures of more than two-thirds of the States as the compulsory basis for standard life risks insured by the companies beginning in 1948.

The savings in the lower number of deaths shown by the new table as compared with the rates of premiums paid on the basis of the old table entitle the insured to dividends which are illustrated in the following table per $1,000 of insurance:

Age at entry	American experience table of mortality, 5 year term	Commissioners standard ordinary mortality table, 1941	Excess for dividends
18	$7.58	$2.30	$5.28
20	7.70	2.43	5.27
22	7.81	2.59	5.22
24	7.93	2.77	5.16
27	8.17	3.11	5.06
30	8.41	3.56	4.85
34	8.88	4.35	4.53
38	9.59	5.46	4.13

This means that a young man entering service at age 18 and having the premiums of $7.58 deducted from his pay or paid during 3 years would have accumulated dividends of $5.28 during each year. This would keep his insurance in force for more than the entire 8 years of possible present term insurance. The same would be true for a young man entering at age 20 and paying for 3 years. For a young man entering at age 30 who pays premiums for 4 years, the dividends

would keep his insurance in force for the whole 8-year period of term insurance. In every such case there would be a remaining credit to be applied to his converted insurance premium or to a continued term premium if the term rate should be extended.

Even for those serving or paying for less than the 3 or 4 years stated there would be a substantial accumulation of dividends to carry the insurance in force for a proportionate number of years.

The bill I referred to is as follows:

A bill by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act to protect the insurance against lapse by crediting to the insured dividends from the excess of premiums over death costs chargeable thereto and by automatic payment of premiums from the accumulated credits.

Be it enacted, etc., That the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by inserting in section 602, at the beginning of subsection (f), a paragraph number (1) and adding at the end of subsection (f) a new paragraph (2) to read:

"(2) Every insured veteran shall be credited with an annual dividend on each policy, as of the end of the first and of each succeeding policy year, equal to the difference between the current mortality contribution of the policy on the mortality and interest basis prescribed in subsection (e) of this section as paid by the insured by deduction from pay, or from a dividend accumulation, or otherwise, and the net mortality losses chargeable to the policy on the basis of actual experience excluding any losses traceable to the extra hazard of the military or naval service; provided, that prior to any other determination effective after the taking effect of this act, it shall be assumed that such net mortality losses are based upon the expected mortality computed on the basis of the 1941 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality.

"From the date of the original policy all premiums deducted from the pay of the insured, or otherwise paid, together with all dividends and optional additional payments made, if any, accumulated as of the end of each policy year with interest at the reserve rate, shall from time to time be applied; first, to pay any premium as of the due date; second, to reduce any premium loan against the policy; and third, on termination of the policy by surrender or death any remaining credit be paid in the same proportion and manner as other payments to the insured or to the beneficiary or beneficiaries.

"Unless the insured in a converted policy shall elect otherwise in writing, any premium not otherwise paid shall be paid as of the due date from the accumulated dividend credit, and any remaining unpaid premium shall be paid by a premium loan against the policy to the extent that, as of the end of the current policy year, the total accumulated indebtedness shall not exceed the reserve.

"Interest under this subsection shall be accumulated at the reserve rate.

"No dividend or remaining credit shall be paid in cash in any case other than on surrender of the policy or as a part of payments to a beneficiary or beneficiaries.

"No policy shall be held to have been lapsed or shall be lapsed for nonpayment of any premiums which have been or are being paid by a charge against the dividend accumulated credit or by a premium loan as herein provided.

"The Veterans' Administration shall give prompt notice to the insured of dividends and unpaid premiums, if any, and of the remaining accumulated credit or charge, and within 6 months after the taking effect of this act give notice to each insured whose policy shall have been lapsed of the requirements for reinstatement."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an address I made some time ago. I also ask that my address may follow the address of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill he introduced today.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly as to the current situation in New England with reference to the continuing shortage of fuel oil.

First, at the request of the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], I am glad to report that the committee arranged a special meeting to consider the analysis I had made of the proposed export program of petroleum products for the first 3 months of this year. I referred to that in detail in my remarks yesterday, which may be found at page 329 of the RECORD. Yesterday I requested the committee staff to check on the accuracy of my analysis, and the staff reported to the committee that it was in agreement with it. The committee instructed its staff to immediately secure an explanation of the program from the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Next, I wish to report that the weather situation in New England remains very severe. News accounts reaching here this morning indicate that in eastern Massachusetts a record cold was registered. In central Massachusetts the mercury dropped to 45° below, an official low record. In western Massachusetts temperatures between 8° and 25° below were registered. As Members from Pennsylvania, New York, and the Central and Midwestern States know, this is a terrific burden on the depleted fuel-oil supplies. On top of that, the sixth snowstorm in 25 days in parts of Massachusetts aggravated conditions. The news account states that 47.2 inches of snow has fallen on storm-weary Boston up to now.

I have been trying to keep closely in touch with the current situation in western Massachusetts, and upon inquiry yesterday afternoon I received the following telegram from Hon. Robert F. Bradford, Governor of Massachusetts:

Continued cold weather; rapidly increasing seriousness of fuel-oil situation in Massachusetts. Temperatures last week averaged 9.7° below same period last year. Urgent that all possible steps be taken to obtain additional supplies for Massachusetts.

Yesterday, at pages 302–303 of the RECORD, I reported in detail upon a constructive suggestion which had been made by a subcommittee of the New England delegation as early as December 13, 1947, and upon subsequent correspondence with Hon. John R. Steelman. I stated that I had sent another wire to Mr. Steelman yesterday morning, indicating I would appreciate his advice as soon as possible as to the results of General Fleming's investigation and the practicability of converting heating facilities in Government buildings from oil to coal and as to the accuracy of a report which I brought to his attention on January 13, that within the past few weeks Stewart Field, N. Y., and Fort Myer, Va., had converted from coal to oil. I stated I had had no reply to my letter of January 13. I regret to advise the Members that, as of a few minutes ago when I left my office to come to the floor, I had not received an acknowledgment of my letter or any reply to the telegram which I sent yesterday. Consequently, I have sent another wire to Mr. Steelman, reporting on Governor Bradford's wire, and again asking for the courtesy of an immediate report on General Fleming's investigation and as to the accuracy of the report of recent conversions at these two Army installations. The wire is as follows:

Referring to telegram December 13, second telegram December 19, your letter December 19, my letter January 13, and my telegram yesterday, may I quote from a telegram I have received from the Governor of Massachusetts: "Continued cold weather; rapidly increasing seriousness of fuel-oil situation in Massachusetts. Temperatures last week averaged 9.7° below same period last year. Urgent that all possible steps be taken to obtain additional supplies for Massachusetts." I shall appreciate report on results of General Fleming's investigation and as to accuracy of information reported in my letter January 13, so that I may inform the New England delegation immediately and include it in report to Governor Bradford as to all efforts which have been made by all members of New England delegation to obtain additional supplies for Massachusetts.

I do not know how much fuel oil is being consumed daily in the gigantic and scattered institutions owned or operated by the Federal Government. If any is being consumed where reconversions could have been made promptly after the suggestion of December 13, then more than a month's supply of an unknown amount of this now precious fuel has been consumed unnecessarily.

I insist that the Federal Government has had ample opportunity to examine the possibility of reconversion all over the country and to have taken constructive action. Surely, any fuel oil which could be saved in this manner in areas where the weather conditions are not severe could have been diverted to those

who so desperately need it. Too, it is obvious that any such release of shipping space would help to break the bottleneck of transportation to these areas. Many witnesses have testified that there is ample oil if we can only get shipping space. I am supremely confident that our colleagues from those areas would definitely approve of such a governmental policy in behalf of the people of our districts and I cannot understand this apparent delay in action by the executive department. If it is not feasible, it is simple enough to state so and explain the reasons. If it is feasible, every 24 hours lost in taking the action is the loss of some amount of fuel oil which might mean the difference between keeping a school, a hospital, or an industry in one of our districts operating 24 hours longer. It is reasonable to believe that it would keep scores of houses warm and this is a matter of prime importance where every householder is concerned and obviously of the greatest importance where there may be sickness or elderly people or children living in such a house.

Finally, I again state that I believe it is the clear responsibility of the executive department to take vigorous and effective action in every field in which they can be of assistance. That was not only the request, but the formal recommendation of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its resolution adopted December 19, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11760, as follows:

(8) The President and the departments and agencies of Government should take all other possible and appropriate action to utilize such powers as they now possess to aid in alleviating such shortages.

Already, too much time has elapsed. All too much irreplaceable fuel oil has gone. There is no excuse for any further delay. In my opinion, it has been a case of too little and too late. I not only ask in behalf of my constituents, whether they be Democrats or Republicans or independents, I demand immediate action. I hope each of you, if your constituents are affected, will do everything in your power to support the efforts of your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of those of us, irrespective of party, who have been working together toward the simple end of preventing this situation from becoming worse and of curing it, if it lies within our power to do so. I know that, even if your constituents are not affected, you are interested in the well-being of your fellow Americans and I ask you, too, to support us.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 501)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1947, to September 30, 1947, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, and June 26, 1947, respectively. Previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, and June 26, 1947, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 19, 1948.*

LOUIS H. DEAVER

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3111) for the relief of Louis H. Deaver, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "United States Employees' Compensation Commission" and insert "Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA L. DUDLEY

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENNINGS, CASE of New Jersey, and CRAVENS.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

BELMONT PROPERTIES CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 851) for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Belmont Properties Corp., Arlington, Va., the sum of $667.50. Such sum represents the amount of a fee paid by the said corporation to the Federal Housing Administration in connection with an application, made on October 20, 1941, to such Administration for mortgage insurance on an apartment-house project in Arlington, Va. While such application was pending the land on which such project was to be constructed was condemned by the United States: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERTHA M. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4331) for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bertha M. Rogers, of Frederica, Del., widow of John R. Rogers, Sr., the sum of $8,285.47; such sum having been awarded to the said John R. Rogers, Sr., by an act entitled "An act for the relief of William J. Simpson and John R. Rogers, Sr.", approved July 11, 1946 (Private Law 716, 79th Cong.), and the said John R. Rogers having died prior to receiving such award or any part thereof: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAYATO HARRIS OZAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 387) for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13C of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit Hayato Harris Ozawa, the husband of Shigeko Elizabeth Tamura Ozawa, a citizen of the United States, and the father of two children born in the United States, to remain permanently in the United States, provided he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILHEMINA PIPER ENZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 560) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for per-

manent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz, who entered the United States at New York, N. Y., on December 1, 1943, and that she shall, for all purposes under the imimgration laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. KEUM NYU PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 899) for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Keum Nyu Park, Honolulu, T. H., shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted on March 9. 1938, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record Mrs. Keum Nyu Park as having entered the United States for permanent residence on March 9, 1938."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GISELA PERL (KRAUSZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1139) for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as, follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz) as of March 2, 1946, the date she was admitted temporarily to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the period insert "Upon the enactment of the act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Rumania of the first year that the said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: On page 1, line 7, strike out "March 2, 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "March 25, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANASTASIOS PANAGE IOANNATOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1298) for the relief of Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ionnetos or Tom Panage Yanatos).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ionnetos or Tom Panage Yanatos), of Santa Fe, N. Mex., who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States in time of war and has resided in the United States of America since January 18, 1926, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on January 18, 1926, the date that he entered the United States at New York, N. Y.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued with respect to the said Anastasios Panage Ionnatos.

SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the non-preference category of the first available Greek immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MITSU M. KOBAYASHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2303) for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, that provision of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 889-890; 54 Stat. 671-673; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155), which denies the benefits of its provisions to persons racially inadmissable or ineligible to naturalization in the United States, shall not be held to apply to Mitsu M. Kobayashi who last entered the United States in the year 1926

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE EDGAR EDWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, Lawrence Edgar Edwards shall not be subject to sections 3 and 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 878, 889; 8 U. S. C. 136, 155).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Lawrence Edgar Edwards as of April 7, 1946, the date upon which he was admitted temporarily to the United States at Detroit, Mich."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DAISY A. T. JAEGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2250) for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers, New York, N. Y., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted at New York, N. Y., on March 11, 1942, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 3, after the period insert "Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Portugal of the first year that the said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUGUST DANE TETUAEARO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of August Dane Tetuaearo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien August Dane Tetuaearo, of Ryde, Sacramento County, Calif., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration laws, the said August Dane Tetuaearo, whose wife is a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his entry therein in the year 1925.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR C. KAMINSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3061) for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski, also known as Victor Kaminski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski), of Wilmington, Del., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on the date and at the place of his last entry therein.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after the period, insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Poland of the first year that said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TECH. SGT. TSUYOSHI MATSUMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3263) for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703, 57 Stat. 600), Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto, who served honorably in the United States Army and who entered the United States temporarily as a student in 1937, may be permitted to remain permanently in the United States if he is found to be admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to persons of races ineligible to naturalization.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTHER RINGEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 420) for the relief of Esther Ringel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation issued pursuant to sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1947 (39 Stat. 889–890; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156) and section 14 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 214) in the case of Esther Ringel, any previous or existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Esther Ringel should be deemed to be lawfully a resident of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN T. HOLLANDSWORTH, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 99) for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr., postmaster at Beckley, W. Va., with the sum of $2,000, on account of a shortage of that amount in his War Savings stamp account.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TROY CHARLES DAVIS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 258) for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Troy Charles Davis, Jr., of Denver, Colo., a merchant seaman entitled to medical treatment and hospitalization at Government expense, the sum of $211.32, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him in connection with an emergency operation which it became necessary for him to have performed in a private hospital in Denver, Colo., because of the lack of a marine hospital in that city: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCY JEFFERSON WEIL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 339) for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of the civil-service retirement and disability fund, to Lucy Jefferson Weil, the widow of Isaac Weil, a former employee of the United States, an amount equal to the amount which would have been refunded to her under the provisions of section 12 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to the employment of the said Isaac Weil during the period from August 1, 1941, to November 7, 1944, had not such employment been in contravention of the automatic separation provisions of such act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. WILLIAM J. KENNARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 957) for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Col. William J. Kennard, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $950, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the difference between (1) the amount he was actually allowed as compensation for the value of the personal property which he lost as a result of the invasion of the Philippine Islands by the Japanese in December 1941, and (2) the amount which should have been paid to the said Col. William J. Kennard as compensation for the value of such property: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADA B. FOSS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1039) for the relief of Ada B. Foss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ada B. Foss, of Cape Porpoise, Maine, the sum of $275.99 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for accrued annual leave earned by her husband, the late Justin A. Foss, as a lighthouse keeper at the Goat Island Light Station, Cape Porpoise, Maine, the said Justin A. Foss having been prevented by his death on December 26, 1942, while serving in the United States Coast Guard, from making application under the act of August 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 616), as amended, for payment for such accrued leave: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK J. SHAUGHNESSY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1043) for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the internal-revenue account of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y., with the amount of $468, representing certain moneys received by and in the custody of John V. Franey, deputy collector of internal revenue, Binghamton, N. Y., as internal-revenue collections, and which were stolen by an unknown person in a hold-up of the branch office of the collector located at Binghamton, and which were not turned over to the said Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, for deposit.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKIE STALNAKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1100) for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frankie Stalnaker, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by her, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by

her on December 7, 1944, in Baltimore, Md., as a result of being struck by a United States Government mail truck.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,500."

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARMATZ to the committee amendment: In lieu of the sum "$1,500" insert "$4,000."

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAFFEY ROBERTSON-SMITH, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 350) for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF MARY D. BRIGGS, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased, former postmaster at Los Angeles, Calif., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $2,796.60, which sum remains due as the result of a defalcation of one Clyde T. Suttle, then a clerk in the Los Angeles post office, in the amount of about $9,000, less amounts regained from the surety on the bond and by judgment against the said Clyde T. Suttle. All charges against the postmaster's account of the said Mary D. Briggs arising from the embezzlement of the said Clyde T. Suttle shall be remitted, and the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to release to the personal representative of the said Mary D. Briggs the amount to her credit in the civil-service retirement and disability fund which has been retained because of such shortage in her account.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "charges", insert the word "remaining."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL W. POORVU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1169) for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $8,288.45, to Samuel W. Poorvu, of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred in connection with the leasing of quarters for Wellesley branch of the post office at Boston, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE REVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1286) for the relief of Lawrence Reves.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $129.48 to Lawrence Reves, of Duck Hill, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Lawrence Reves on the 20th day of May 1946 as the result of the negligent and wrongful operation of a United States Army vehicle at Camp McCain, Miss., by a member of the armed forces of the United States who was not then and there acting within the scope of his office and employment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE RELIEF OF A. S. OSTEN AND GUY F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That A. S. Osten, certifying officer of the Federal Public Housing Authority, be, and is hereby, relieved of financial liability by reason of erroneous payment in February 1943, in the sum of $2,386.54 under disbursing office symbol 86–774, and the Comptroller General is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, by reason of such erroneous payment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD W. BIGGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1653) for the relief of Edward W. Bigger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Edward W. Bigger, who is alleged to have sustained injury in the line of duty on or about August 15, 1940, while employed as county administrative officer for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in Marion, Crittenden County, Ark., and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The monthly compensation which the said Edward W. Bigger may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "United States" and insert "Bureau of."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "Commission" and insert "of the Federal Security Agency."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HARRY L. NOVICK ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of Mrs. Harry L. Novick and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Harry L. Novick, the sum of $850, to pay to the estate of Randolph Bolles, the sum of $813.60; to pay Mr. and Mrs. John C. Clark, the sum of $320; all above claimants of Jacksonville, Fla.; to pay Marie F. Merwin, of Palatka, Fla., the sum of $926.05, in full settlement of all claims listed herein against the United States for property damage, as the result of a United States Army plane crashing in Jacksonville, Fla., on July 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "Mrs.", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 2, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "Margaret Lee Novick, of Miami, Fla., the sum of $275; to pay the estate of Randolph Bolles, deceased, of Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of $639; to pay to Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Clark, of Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of $203; to pay to Marie F. Merwin,

of Palatka, Fla., the sum of $466, in full settlement of all claims of said parties against the United States for property damages sustained by them as the result of the crash of two United States Army airplanes in Jacksonville, Fla., on July 20, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others."

MICHAEL ABARNO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of Michael Abarno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Michael Abarno, Staten Island, N. Y., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Michael Abarno against the United States on account of the death of his minor son, Vito Abarno, who was fatally injured on July 15, 1943, when the automobile in which he was a passenger was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Tompkins Avenue and Wadsworth Avenue, Staten Island, N. Y.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Michael" and insert in lieu thereof "the estate of Vito."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Michael" and insert in lieu thereof "estate."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "his minor son."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK A. CONSTABLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2269) for the relief of Frank A. Constable.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank A. Constable, Detroit, Mich., the sum of $1,211.61. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Frank A. Constable against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on May 12, 1942, when an automobile owned and driven by him was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Woodward Avenue and Eleven Mile Road, Detroit, Mich.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,211.61" and insert "$711.61."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORAN CURRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2386) for the relief of Oran Curry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 944, which is an identical bill, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Oran Curry, of Neola, Utah, the sum of $587.33, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States as compensation for quarters in connection with services rendered the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, at the Uintah-Ouray Indian Agency and Reservation in Utah, from May 1926 through March 1933, inclusive, this being the amount due him and remaining unpaid under his contract of employment, as certified by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. No charge shall be made against the disbursing officer or the certifying officer nor shall any claim be made against Oran Curry, for the amount of the overpayment of $35 made on certificate of settlement No. 0858898, dated August 21, 1944.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2386) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARDY H. BRYANT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2479) for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Hardy H. Bryant, the sum of $2,032.34, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for performance of certain service not covered by his contract with the Post Office Department to carry mail on screen wagon route 450002 at Beaumont, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES W. ADKINS AND MARY CLARK ADKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2489) for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins, of Moncks Corner, South Carolina, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, James Jervey Adkins, sustained as the result of a bullet fired from a .22-caliber automatic pistol in the hands of a United States Navy officer from the deck of a vessel in the waters of the Cooper River, in Berkeley County, South Carolina, on March 8, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. W. EATON COAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2697) for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ROSE MARY AMMIRATO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay the sum of $5,000 to the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for personal injury on August 30, 1944, by reason of the negligent driving of a post-office truck which resulted in certain injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 6, 7, and 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States mail truck at the intersection of Fourteenth Avenue and Sixty-first Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., on August 20, 1944: *Provided*,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. J. BRENNAN AND JANET HOWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3067) for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of E. J. Brennan, Chief Disbursing Officer, in the amount of $220.70, for moneys advanced to Janet Howell, agent-cashier at the National Training School for Boys, which was stolen from the safe at the institution on April 12, 1946, and that Janet Howell, agent-cashier, also be relieved of accountability in that amount; and that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to pay out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated the sum of $35.17 to Janet Howell to be credited to the personal accounts of inmates whose funds were stolen at the same time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAE H. FITZGERALD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3159) for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald, of Mineral Wells, Tex., the sum of $10,742.15, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damages, sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck and trailer on Highway No. 77 near Davis, Okla., on November 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,742.15" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN A. KING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3300) for the relief of Martin A. King.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Martin A. King, postmaster at Clarks Summit, Pa., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $410.53. Such sum represents a shortage in the amount of the said postmaster caused, without fault on his part, by the robbery of post-office funds on the night of July 27–28, 1934, from the post-office vault. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of said postmaster in the sum of $410.53. The sureties of the said postmaster are released from any liability to refund to the United States the whole or any part of such sum of $410.53.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE L. PURDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3550) for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jesse L. Purdy, a classified city carrier in the United States post office, Akron, Ohio, the sum of $55.47. Such sum represents the salary (a) which was paid to the said Jesse L. Purdy for 7 days annual leave and 1 day sick leave taken by him during the period beginning July 16, 1945, and ending January 15, 1946, while he was on duty as a temporary rural carrier, and (b) which he was required to refund to the United States because he was not entitled to payment for such leave. The said Jesse L. Purdy took such annual and sick leave after having been erroneously advised by post-office officials that he would be paid for such leave.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM C. REESE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3937) for the relief of William C. Reese.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay William C. Reese, of Birmingham, Ala., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained from the kick of a mule on October 15 or 25, 1917, while the said William C. Reese was in the performance of his duty as an employee of the Goodrich Construction Co. engaged in the construction of an Army camp as a subcontractor under authority of the United States, said injury having been sustained through the negligent or reckless act of a soldier of the United States Army in charge of such mule whilst in the performance of his duties as such soldier: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLINTON R. SHARP

The Clerk called the bill (S. 84) for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States (8 U. S. C. 213 (c), 703), Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp, Japanese wife of Clinton R. Sharp, a United States citizen and veteran of World War I, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed without presenting immigration visas or other travel documents. Upon such admission, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Japanese of the first year that the said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IOANNIS STEPHANES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 136) for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Ioannis Stephanes (alias John Stephens), of Mountain City, Nev., who entered the United States in August 1925 and has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulation, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on payment of the visa fee of $10 and head tax of $8.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA M. KINAT (MRS. JOHN P. TAYLOR)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation in the case of the alien, Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor), and she shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which said warrant and order have issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. YONEKO NAKAZAWA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws, Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa, who was admitted to the United States on May 16, 1930, as the minor child of a treaty trader, is hereby declared to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed to cancel all outstanding deportation proceedings in respect to the said Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa. Upon the enactment of this Act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Japanese of the first year that the said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS ABADIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 185) for the relief of Thomas Abadia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Thomas Abadia, of Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence in 1940, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Thomas Abadia upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTIAGO NAVERAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 186) for the relief of Santiago Naveran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Santiago Naveran, and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Santiago Naveran, who arrived at Tampa, Fla., on or about July 7, 1924, as a seaman on the steamship *Sec. II*, which he deserted on or about July 10, 1924, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at such place and on such date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that such quota becomes available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO ARGUINZONIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 187) for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Antonio Arguinzonis, of Shoshone, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of the said Antonio Arguinzonis upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIMON FERMIN IBARRA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 189) for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Simon Fermin Ibarra, of Twin Falls, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on March 14, 1940, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Simon Fermin Ibarra upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEDRO UGALDE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 190) for the relief of Pedro Ugalde.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Pedro Ugalde, of Twin Falls, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on May 18, 1940, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Pedro Ugalde upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIAN URIARTE

The Clerk read the bill (S. 191) for the relief of Julian Uriarte.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Julian Uriarte, of Boise, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on July 19, 1931, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of the said Julian Uriarte upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUAN LLONA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 192) for the relief of Juan Llona.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Juan Llona, of Boise, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on July 11, 1926, the year of his actual entry into the United States, upon payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Juan Llona upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 298) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of Pedro Bastida and Fidel Acordarrementeria, both of Battle Mountain, Nev., legally admitted as seamen, but who have remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that these aliens shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of their actual entry on the payment of the visa fees of $10 and the head taxes of $8 per person.

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAMIAN GANDIAGA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1579) for the relief of Damian Gandiaga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Damian Gandiaga, of Tuscaror, Nev., shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on June 3, 1944, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Damian Gandiaga upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that the Spanish quota is hereafter available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HILARIO A. GOITIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 353) for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Hilario A. Goitia, 609 H Street, Los Banos, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted at Galveston, Tex., on February 10, 1927, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert "upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first available quota for Spain."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: Page 1, line 7, after "residence", insert "upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BETTY ISABEL SCHUNKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 421) for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the fifth category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875–878, 8 U. S. C. 136 (c)), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit the entry into the United States for permanent residence of Betty Isabel Schunke, Potts Point, Sydney, Australia; wife of Sgt. Edwin A. Schunke, United States Army.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Betty Isabel Schunke, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHEL FERAPONTOW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 892) for the relief of Michel Ferapontow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Michel Ferapontow, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at the port of New York on or about November 29, 1945. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Russian quota of the first year that the same Russian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIKTOR A. KRAVCHENKO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 896) for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Viktor A. Kravchenko, of New York, N. Y., shall not be subject to the provisions of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 137), of section 19 of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 155), and of sections 305 and 328 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, secs. 705 and 728); and for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Viktor A. Kravchenko shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted as of September 1, 1944, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Attorney General is directed to record the admission to the United States on August 18, 1943, at Niagara Falls, N. Y., of the alien Viktor A. Kravchenko, as a lawful admission for permanent residence. In the administration of the immigration laws, the said Viktor A. Kravchenko shall not be regarded as having been at any time prior to the enactment of this act a person within the provisions of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 137), or those parts of sections 3 and 19 (a) of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, secs. 136 and 155 (a)), which relate to aliens who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property, or anarchy, or the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law or the assassination of public officials, or similar classes, and he may be naturalized, if otherwise eligible, regardless of the provisions of section 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 705).

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall reduce by one number the quota of the alien's nationality for the fiscal year then current or next following."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1572) for the relief of Basque aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of Bartolome Errea, Marcelino Yturbe, Francisco Lorono, Pete Elguezabal, Zenon Zubieta, Francisco Alluntiz, Damin Gandiaga, Manuel Zulueta, Jose Antonio Odriozola, Fidel Acordarrementeria, and Pedro Bastida, all of eastern Nevada, legally admitted as seamen but who have remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that these aliens shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of their actual entry on the payment of the visa fees of $10 and head taxes of $8 per person.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct 11 numbers from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Damin Gandiaga," and after "Zulueta" insert "and."

Line 8, strike out "Fidel Acordarrementeria, and Pedro Bastida."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "eleven" and insert "eight."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHILIP LEE SJOERDT HUIZENGA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1859) for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 5, 1945, at San Francisco, Calif., if he is admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for China during the first year that the said China quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET KATHERINE HUME

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1927) for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Margaret Katherine Hume, of Fortine, Mont., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration laws, the said Margaret Katherine Hume shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on the date and at the place of her last entry therein.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIAN D. McC. PLEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3039) for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (c)), Marian D. McC. Plein, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

Line 5, after the first comma, insert "as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FLORENCE BYVANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1009) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the amount of the insurance under the Government life-insurance policy (No. K 720604) of Clarence A. Byvank to Florence Byvank, his widow and designated beneficiary, in accordance with the terms of such policy, beginning with the first calendar month following the month during which this act is enacted, notwithstanding the lapse of such policy in December 1931. The insured, Clarence A. Byvank, applied for reinstatement of such policy in February 1932 and transmitted payment for back premiums thereon at the time of application but died suddenly from monoxide gas poisoning on March 30, 1932, before a report of his medical examination had been filed with the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK DURANTE AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3224) to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Frank Durante and wife, Maria Durante, and two children, namely, Paul Durante and Patsy Durante.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation issued pursuant to sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156), in the case of Frank Durante, Maria Durante, Paul Durante, and Patsy Durante, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Frank Durante, Maria Durante, Paul Durante, and Patsy Durante shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same fact upon which the outstanding proceedings rest.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 7, after the name "Durante", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

On line 8, after the name "Durante" and the comma strike out the names "Paul Durante and Patsy Durante."

On line 10, after the name "Durante", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

On line 11, after the name "Maria Durante", strike out the comma and the names "Paul Durante, and Patsy Durante."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT WILHEM GERLING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3742) for the relief of Robert Wilhem Gerling.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission of Robert Wilhem Gerling, of New York City, N. Y., as of August 4, 1939, the date on which he was lawfully temporarily admitted to the United States. The said alien shall be admitted to become naturalized without complying with the provisions of section 331 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1153; 8 U. S. C. 731): *Provided*, That he is found otherwise eligible for naturalization under all the provisions of existing laws.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "admission", insert the words "for permanent residence."

On page 1, line 5, substitute the name "Wilhelm" for "Wilhem."

On page 1, lines 8 to 13, inclusive, strike out all following the period after the word "States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOMINGO GANDARIAS

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 3849) for the relief of Domingo Gandarias.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Domingo Gandarias, of eastern Nevada, legally admitted as a seaman but who has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of $10 and a head tax of $8.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LADISLAO VAIDA AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4403) for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida, who entered the United States at New York on December 28, 1945, and that they shall, for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as immigrants for permanent residence as of that date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall thereupon reduce by one number the immigration quota of Czechoslovakia, and by two numbers the immigration quota of Hungary, for the current fiscal year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN A. DILBOY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of John A. Dilboy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of John A. Dilboy as of July 2, 1925, the date he was admitted temporarily to the United States. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Turkish quota of the first year that the said Turkish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MABLE GLADYS VIDUCICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2557) for the relief of Mable Gladys Viducich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (3)), Mable Gladys Viducich, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

CHARLES E. CROOK

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2268) for the relief of Charles E. Crook be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EDWARD H. ISENHART

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 664) for the relief of Edward H. Isenhart be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Lands now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 430 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 2873, which is a bill to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This bill is known as the Rockwell bill, as it was introduced by my distinguished colleague from Colorado, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands that reported this legislation.

This is an open rule, providing for 3 hours' general debate. I understand that the bill was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Public Lands. However, in order to be entirely frank and honest with the House, I must state that the bill does not come to the floor with the unanimous approval of the Rules Committee. There was a division in our committee and some members are opposed to certain provisions of the bill. They voted to report this measure to the House with the understanding that their opposition be noted.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation. It is a complicated and intricate bill. It is exceedingly technical in its terms. I am not going to undertake to explain the bill, because I am sure the committee will be able to do that to the entire satisfaction of the House. As I have indicated, there is controversy over certain provisions of this bill and a sharp difference of opinion concerning some of its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments under our reclamation program are recognized by all. We have seen the benefits which have accrued from the great reclamation projects in the Western States. I am confident Congress will continue to develop and expand this program.

This is one of several bills, as I understand, which the Committee on Public Lands will bring to the House to perfect the procedure involved in approving new projects, and to clarify existing rules and regulations. This bill has the approval of Mr. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

This is a bill over which there has been a great deal of controversy and wide differences of opinion in the committee. The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has been working on this legislation for more than 3 years. I understand it is a compromise measure; that it is not exactly what any member of the committee desired, but in order to bring a bill to the House it was necessary for members to give and take. The different members have made concessions in order that the bill might be reported out.

I am going to mention one or two provisions over which there will be controversy. There will be considerable debate over the period of time specified in this bill for the repayment of power projects. At the present time 50 years is the time fixed for the repayment of money used for the development of public power. This period is now being extended to 78 years. I know some of the Members feel that is a little too long. However, the bill is open to amendment, and every Member will have an opportunity to express his attitude.

Another controversial feature is the interest rate to be charged on power projects. At the present time interest is being charged on the amount allocated to power on these projects at the rate of 3 percent. The Reclamation Act of 1939 is not altogether clear on just what disposition is to be made of the funds obtained from this interest charge. Under what is known as the Solicitor's opinion, rendered several years ago, all of this money has been retained by the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditure on the project. This practice has not met with the approval of the irrigation and water people of the West who have contended that these funds should have been returned to the reclamation fund in the Treasury Department and reappropriated for the development of additional reclamation projects. A compromise was finally worked out, as you will note from the bill. This interest rate has been reduced to 2½ percent, of which 2 percent is turned back to the reclamation fund in the Treasury Department, to be reappropriated by Congress for the development of other projects. One-half of 1 percent is to be retained by the Bureau for use on the particular project on which the interest is collected.

The bill also provides that recreation, silt control, as well as fish and wildlife preservation, may be taken into consideration by the Secretary of the Interior in determining whether or not any particular project is feasible. I know some members of the Rules Committee expressed concern over this provision. I believe, however, that there is nothing to be disturbed about, and in my opinion the amount which would be charged to these particular features would be very small as compared with the cost of the entire project.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman mentioned the fish and wildlife provision. What limitation is there in the bill as to how much may be charged that leads the gentleman to the conclusion that it will not be very much?

Mr. CHENOWETH. There is no limitation, I may state to the gentleman from Virginia, but the bill makes no change in the present procedure for the approval of reclamation projects. In other words, the Secretary must determine that the project is feasible before he can proceed with the construction of the same. If the allocations do not equal the total estimated cost then he must submit the project to Congress and we will have the opportunity of passing upon the amounts charged to recreation, fish and wildlife, and all other estimates in his report.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take further time to mention other provisions of the bill. I wish to state that I am going to stay with the committee on this bill. I do not think anyone is fully satisfied with this measure, but it is the best the committee can write after 3 years of work.

I feel that it is a question of taking this bill or have no legislation at all. I believe that some legislation is very desirable and essential at this time in order to promote and develop reclamation in our Western States.

We must develop the natural resources of our country. It has been proven that reclamation is of benefit not only to the arid States of the West where these projects are located, but to the entire Nation. Water is the life blood of the West and turns deserts into garden spots. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation has determined this bill to be necessary. I urge that the rule be adopted and the bill pass as submitted by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of a bill that is highly important to the West. I must say that this legislation is long overdue, for some such legislation as that contained in the bill that will be brought before the House under the adoption of this rule has been called for during the past 3 or 4 years.

As early as 1945 there was a call made by several Members of this House for clarifying legislation. The law that is sought to be clarified is the Reclamation Act of 1939. One part of that act seemed ambiguous and there was a difference of opinion, and a controversy arose over the interpretation of that act. It was therefore sought to be clarified, and after many, many weeks of hearings beginning back in 1946 the bill that is before us was reported out by the Public Lands Committee. It was a unanimous report on the part of the Public Lands Committee, and I hope that the House will not hesitate to vote this rule so that the merits of the measure can be fully discussed. The Appropriations Committee, one of the great committees of this House, has asked for some such legislation as is before us if the rule is voted. If no action is taken today and this measure is not made in order, no chance to clear up the confusion may occur and the cause of reclamation would be hampered.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is of far more importance to reclamation and to the country generally than the sparse attendance of the Members this morning would seem to indicate.

This bill makes some very radical changes in the Reclamation Act. I believe every Member of Congress is deeply sensible to the advantages of reclamation and the necessity for these reclamation projects, and, therefore, it is all the more important that legislation on this subject should be sound and should be businesslike. We should not let down the bars to logrolling and pressure groups, but we should continue the program upon a sound businesslike basis.

Now, there are some things in this bill to which I wish to call attention this morning because I think it ought to go back to the committee from which it came and be corrected. I am not the only one who thinks so. I know reclamation is a popular vote-getting subject in some areas of the country, but I think you have got to put it on a broader principle than that if you are going to sustain the program over the years and the generations that are to follow. There is such a wide field in the matter of reclamation in the West that this Congress should not take the responsibility of weakening that program by inappropriate concessions in order that unsound projects may be approved.

Let us discuss the method by which these reclamation projects are approved. There are certain principles laid down under which the Secretary of the Interior shall examine each individual project, and if he is convinced that it will be self-liquidating over a certain period of years, then he shall so certify and it then becomes automatically authorized. If the Members of this House think that after a project is proposed in the future it will come back here and you may have the opportunity to correct it by authorization, I want you to be disabused of that impression because under this bill—and under present law for that matter—you have delegated absolutely to the Secretary of the Interior the power to authorize any project that he sees fit under the terms laid down by this bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Of course, the gentleman knows that the Secretary of the Interior would have to come back to this Congress to get an appropriation, even though he found the project to be feasible.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. And the House would have to vote on it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, you have to get an appropriation for anything that is authorized, but it is the function of the Congress to authorize appropriations and you have delegated to the Secretary of the Interior the function which the Congress is supposed to perform.

Mr. BARRETT. That delegation was made quite some time back and it is existent at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; it is existing law.

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is one thing which surprises me about my friends who are now in control of the House. You have inveighed for years against bureaucracy and against delegation of authority to the bureaucrats to do this and that. I am wondering what has come over the spirit of your dreams when now you propose to reaffirm and lend your stamp of approval to this delegation of authority which is your constitutional duty to perform.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I merely want to call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to what the gentleman from Wyoming mentioned. There is no change being made in the present procedure by this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is what I am quarrelling about and I am surprised at gentlemen on that side of the aisle not desiring to make some change.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is my understanding this committee is making a further study of the reclamation law and it is very possible the committee will come in later with some such provision as the gentleman is now suggesting. The present controversy deals principally with the interest charges and the period in which the project may pay back. I do not know whether the committee gave any attention to the other or not. I am not informed on that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad that the gentleman has finally paid such a fine compliment to the Democratic bureaucrats that they are willing to continue and reaffirm by legislation this delegation of authority.

Now, let us see what is in this bill that is new. Well, the law as presently laid down is that in order for the Secretary of the Interior to authorize one of these programs he must find that certain things exist, certain advantages, and they are enumerated in the present law. But, this bill adds to those things. This bill arranges it so under provision No. 7, which you will find on page 5 of the bill, that in determining the feasibility of a program, of a proposed project, that the Secretary of the Interior shall take into consideration not only the commercial benefits, not only the flood-control benefits, not only the irrigation benefits, but shall take into consideration recreational advantages and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and when they do take that into consideration there is no limitation of how much of this allocation may be charged up to propagation of wild tadpoles and other

wildlife, and after you have done that it is further provided that this provision to take care of the fish and rabbits and other wildlife shall not be charged back and shall never come back into the Treasury of the United States.

Now, is that sound, gentlemen? Does that sound businesslike, or is that what you Republicans, in the days of Harry Hopkins, used to call boondoggling? I am sort of ashamed of you fellows when you bring in a provision like that, and I say it in all seriousness, and I mean what I say that this bill ought to go back to committee. I remember when you gentlemen came into power in this House, a lot of people in this country were encouraged; they were encouraged to believe that you were going to have sound policies; that you were not going to propose any boondoggling; that you meant what you said about Harry Hopkins and the other New Deal boondoggling projects that too much money had been spent on, and we were encouraged to believe that you were going to help economize and balance the budget and bring down the cost of Government. And I voted with you a lot of times last year in the hopes you were going to do it and meant business. I remember that you started out pretty good and you voted down a lot of the reclamation appropriations that you did not think were sound. But something happened. Somebody got scared. An election year was coming on. And, after you had cut out all those projects and had reduced the budget some—you know you promised to reduce it $6,000,000,000—and when you got done, when you finished up and put in all of these reclamation projects and all the other little things that the logrolling was about, what happened to that budget that you were going to cut $6,000,000,000? Get your pencil and look, and you will find that when you get through with this year's appropriations you will have appropriated more money than the President of the United States recommended in his budget.

Now, gentlemen, I am interested in reclamation. Everybody is interested in reclamation, but if this reclamation business is going to work it has got to be sound. You cannot mix up sound reclamation with the preservation of fish, and recreation, and tadpoles, and rabbits and all the other little old things that you have got mixed up in this bill. Now, all of you know it. Why do you not take this bill back to your committee and cut out the boondoggling and bring in a bill here that we can all be happy about and proud to support? What is the reason for this boondoggling provision about the fish and the wildlife? Now, you understand that whenever you build a dam you are going to make a nice swimming hole and you will probably make a few little swimming holes back in the tributary streams, and you will revive the old swimming hole that the boys used to go to after school and sometimes before school was out, and I reckon that the Secretary of the Interior is going to have to take a census of all the little fish in those creeks so as to see how much of this can be charged up to boondoggling and then, of course, you have to take a census of the rabbits, and you have to take a census of the tadpoles, and then you have to figure out the infant mortality of the tadpoles so as to figure how many are going to turn into good edible frog legs in the course of time. Is that what you gentlemen are offering the people of the United States as an economy program? Do you mean what you have got in this bill, or do you mean what you are telling the people of the United States and what I hope you meant when you told the people of the United States? Are you going to pass this bill this morning and put your stamp of approval on a boondoggling project that Harry Hopkins in his brightest dreams never conceived of? Is that what you are offering the people of the United States as a program? All right.

I know what I say is not going to amount to a hill of beans. You are going on here today. You are going to talk about reclamation for 3 hours, so you can send some speeches back home and maybe mend up a few of the holes that you made last year when you cut out some of this stuff. That is what you are going to do. When it is all over, you are going to vote for this bill, Democrats and Republicans, and you are going to put this hoax on the people of the United States. When you do it, you are doing the greatest kind of an injury to the reclamation doctrine itself, because all reclamation is based upon the idea that this money is going to be paid back in a period of time, and that that same money, as Congresses come and go and generations come and go, can be reappropriated so that we may have other reclamation projects in the great West. Yet you are going to stop up the flow of that money back into the Treasury, you are going to stop it up by boondoggling with fish and rabbits and what have you.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, of course I do not believe the very ingenious argument made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, in which he now says the Republicans have started on a boondoggling spree, is going to be taken very seriously by anyone. He has been in Congress a long time. I admire him a lot. We are on the Rules Committee together. He talks about voting with the Republicans. We respect his ability. We are glad when he votes with us, he should do so more frequently. But do you know what he is trying to do right now? The gentleman is a consistent party man. He wants to defeat this proposed legislation. Do you know what his party will be saying in a short time if it is defeated? "Look what these Republicans are doing to reclamation." He talks about tadpoles and frog ponds, and all that kind of business.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. No; I cannot yield right now. I have only 5 minutes. I would love to yield otherwise.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wish the gentleman would yield, when he talks about me.

Mr. RIZLEY. There are some people here that happen to live out on the plains of Texas. I happen to live out on the plains of Oklahoma. Of course we do not have the Potomac flowing by as does the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. I do not think it is going to wreck the economy of this country and I do not think anybody ought to accuse anybody of boondoggling if some of these reclamation and flood-control projects have just a little bit of money in them for recreation. That is a very insignificant part of this bill, a very insignificant part.

The facts are that this legislation is needed, and needed badly. If you believe in reclamation, if you believe it is necessary to harness some of these streams and use some of the water for irrigation, then certainly we need this legislation. Let us see the position that the gentleman from Virginia would put us in. What is his remedy? His remedy is to leave the law just like it is, exactly as it is today. That is the only remedy that he suggests, except that he says he would send it back to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I cannot yield right now.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman should not put words in my mouth unless he is willing to yield to me. That is not a fact.

Mr. RIZLEY. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that the Committee on Public Lands have been working on this bill for more than 3 years and have unanimously agreed on this bill. Talk about sending it back to the committee for further action—they have had this legislation for about 3 years and have been working on it intensely. I am not one of those who is going to come in here—and I do not know when the gentleman from Virginia first saw this bill, but I did not see it until last Friday, and I doubt if he did—but I am not going to say to the Committee on Public Lands who have been working on this bill as well as to other committees who were working on it until the reorganization bill came along, "You fellows do not know anything about what you are doing. You are just a boondoggling crowd. You are just a bunch of boondogglers and we want to send it back."

I think this rule ought to be adopted. The rule is wide open and we will have some amendments offered on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman said that I wanted to send it back. I do not care about sending it back if you will cut out the frills and foolishness contained in it. Does the gentleman favor this provision about wildlife and game?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am going to do just as the gentleman from Virginia is going to do. I am going to be here and vote for such amendments as I favor, and I will vote against those amendments which I do not believe should be in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is a fair enough answer to my question.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me that the gentleman from Virginia is taking a rather inconsistent position, if I understand correctly. He contends that these big flood-control dams should be constructed in these Eastern States on a wholly nonreimbursable basis, so that the people of those States do not pay a nickel toward the cost of construction of the dam. But when it comes to a matter of building them out West, he takes an entirely different position and says that the multiple-purpose dams built in the West, part for flood control, part for navigation, part for irrigation, should be paid for in their entirely by the farmers, and that none of the cost should be nonreimbursable, and that all of these other items which are for the benefit of the general public should not be charged to the public, but should be charged to the poor farmers who are trying to make an honest dollar.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think the gentleman's observation is very well taken.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. This item on wildlife conservation is not really insignificant and certainly I do not believe such expenditure can be classed as boondoggling. Remember when we build a dam on the great rivers of the Northwest, if we do not put in fish ladders, we are going to destroy or injure the salmon industry. Putting in such fish ladders has been done along the Columbia River, and should be done elsewhere. A great industry depends upon it. Should that be charged up to the farmers who use the water? I contend it should not be. It should be a nonreimbursable item. There are other nonreimbursable provisions in this bill that ought to be considered favorably.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in reclamation, but I am interested in seeing that reclamation is carried on in this country so that it is going to be beneficial to the people in the Western States where they need reclamation, to such a degree that the people in the Western States feel that it is a wise and good thing for the United States to adopt such a bill as this one now before us.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] spoke about the Columbia River fish ladders. You know what has happened to the fish industry on the Columbia River. You have almost wrecked it. It is not now what it used to be. You westerners are to blame for that.

Now, you also have in this bill a 78-year period for repayment, where the former legislation required repayment in 50 years. If you put in this bill 78 years before these debts are repaid, you break faith for good legislation; your own farmers out there do not want it. Your own people are not anxious to have it in the legislation, but some smart politicians are trying to adopt that with the idea that it is going to help reclamation, in the guise that the politician will benefit. Shame on the politicians.

I suggest you make the time 50 years to pay; that is too long. Ever hear of a bank making a loan for 78 years? Ever hear of one for 50 years? Then let us cut down the time and be sensible. We need all the sense we have if we want cents in the Treasury, and more water on the land.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have predicted that certain sections of this bill would bring about just such a show on the floor of this House as we just witnessed a moment ago.

I shall not oppose the rule. I believe that every bill as important as this should have its day in court, and should stand or fall on its own merits or demerits.

There are certain sections of this bill to which I am vigorously opposed. The Secretary of the Interior at this time, under section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939, has more power than any man in these United States should have to authorize projects. While some may say this bill does not extend that authority, the facts are that this bill puts the stamp of approval on that authority which is granted to the Secretary of the Interior in section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939 and then some by inference, at least, if not specific.

I am also opposed to the 78-year payout period provided in the bill. In my candid opinion, I do not think any project is economically feasible that cannot pay out in 50 years or thereabouts.

As many of you know, with two other members of the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations, I took a 9,500-mile trip by automobile through the Western States last fall.

We talked to hundreds and possibly thousands of people, to people who are electric power and water users; and I can frankly say that no one expressed any great concern about the costs of electric power or water for irrigation. What they want are sufficient appropriations by Congress to insure the building of good projects. They need water, which is liquid gold to the West; and they have need for more power in some sections of the West. The thing they want is for the Congress to appropriate sufficient money to carry on those projects.

I know most of the Members of Congress, and I believe I can say all of the Members of Congress are in favor of developing the West and of appropriating sufficient money for the completion of reclamation projects, hydroelectric projects, and everything else that is proper and feasible for the Western States; but to disturb that good feeling which now exists with the bill extending the pay-off time to 78 years is disturbing to a lot of us. This Treasury of ours needs money brought into it faster rather than to have it come in slower. I did not find anybody in the Western States who was not willing to pay his bill. True, we have flood control in every section of our Nation which is nonreimbursable; which is a national responsibility. I found no one in the West who did not want to pay his own freight. I have five counties along the Missouri River. I want the Missouri Valley program to go forward under the Pick-Sloan plan, which is now doing and will continue to do a good job developing that great area which covers one-sixth of the United States. I am also deeply interested in the development of the West. If anyone feels I am not he simply does not know my heartbeats. The best indication is the fact that I spent seven long weeks together with two other members of my committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FULTON, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman SCHWABE, traveling night and day and Sundays, too, to see those projects out there so as to appropriate the right amount as near as is humanly possible for each project. I know the Congress is in harmony with that purpose today. To disturb it with such a provision as is contained in this bill, giving the Secretary more power, delegating power to the Secretary of the Interior which the Congress should reserve to itself, will hurt the West. Also let me remind you, my colleagues, that 78 years is equal to the time from Grant to Truman. I shall offer amendments at the proper time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This bill further sanctions public electric power development. That is the socialization of electric power development. Is not that true?

Mr. JENSEN. To some degree it might because of the fact that under the 78-year pay-off program it may not be necessary to raise Federal power rates on many hydroelectric power-producing dams to the end that private industry will not be able to compete with the Government power rates. We of this Congress must defend the private power companies who are doing a good job in most instances furnishing power at reasonable rates and giving good service. We must defend them against unfair Government competition just as vigorously as we do the farmer or the peanut vendor or the corner grocery man.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman spoke of the Missouri Valley project. Does that provide for a 9-foot channel on the Missouri?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. How far up?

Mr. JENSEN. To Sioux City, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain recent statements in the press regarding the relationship between the recommendations of the President's Air Policy Commission and universal military training, I find it necessary to make the following observation:

There are no grounds for reaching the conclusion, either from the recommendations of the Air Policy Commission or after an examination of present security requirements, that a 70-group air force program could be an effective substitute for universal military training. Mr. Finletter and his associates confined the scope of their excellent study to the role of air power in a future war. They did not examine the role of the ground forces or of the surface Navy, nor the means required to maintain these and their respective Reserve components at the level of strength and degree of readiness commensurate with the national safety. This training bill would provide the nucleus for Army, Navy, and Air Reserves and directly benefit the National Guard.

It is noted that the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, which reported its findings on May 29, 1947, set down six essentials of an integrated program, all of which it deemed absolutely necessary to the national security. These included a mobile striking air force and universal military training. The Commission did not consider one the substitute for the other. The Commission reported, "We cannot sacrifice any one of these elements for any other. They must all be taken care of at the same time."

A powerful air force will be unquestionably the first line of American defense in a future conflict. Moreover, there is justification for the hope that such a force will serve in large measure as a deterrent to aggression against the United States, though it should be emphasized that a 70-group air force, built around 700 heavy bombers, is not an overwhelming force even by standards of World War II, as the Air Policy Commission carefully points out.

It cannot, however, be considered a conclusive deterrent to an attack upon the United States. If war comes, it will come without warning, exposing the whole of the American countryside to widespread casualty, panic, and demoralization. Without trained men in every community instantly available to reorganize essential services, replace broken communications, care for the wounded, and perhaps repel airborne invaders, it is quite possible the country would never recover from the initial blow. There will be no time to train men after an emergency has arrived, yet trained men will be needed by the millions to augment the Regular forces in their counteroffensive effort, and to keep the home front intact and operative. Almost certainly it will not be possible to distinguish combatant from noncombatant. Every American will be involved.

In the circumstances, it would be exceedingly dangerous if the American people allowed themselves to be soothed by the illusion that a striking air force and universal military training are interchangeable elements of a security program. Their missions are wholly distinct. Both are required to achieve the strongest possible deterrent to attack upon the United States, or to provide the indispensable success in the event of war.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I did not object to the majority leader's request to do away with Calendar Wednesday business. At that time I explained to him that I had asked the Rules Committee and the Republican leadership of the House in an inquiry by letter as to when the members of the Armed Services Committee might be heard before the Rules Committee on the question of universal military training, and three other bills unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee. There are 33 members of the Armed Services Committee. Two-thirds of the membership of that committee fully support the principle of universal military training.

The bill was reported by the Armed Services Committee by a vote of 20 to 0. I have in my office petitions from a million and a half Americans on this subject favoring it. Five out of six potential Republican candidates have declared in favor of it. Not one word was said at the Republican National Committee yesterday by the gentleman reporting our congressional program. He not even mentioned the name "universal military training." I say it is high time for the leadership of this House or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to either state openly that they are not going to give us a rule, or the reasons therefor. Otherwise I shall continue to object to obviating Calendar Wednesday, and when the proper time comes in the House the Armed Services Committee will call up this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times on Wednesday, January 7, entitled "The GOP and UMT."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The editorial referred to is as follows:

THE GOP AND UMT

No more important legislative business faces the present session of the Eightieth Congress than that of universal military training. This newspaper believes universal military training should be adopted. We believe it must be adopted if Congress is not to fail in its duty to the citizens of this country in providing for their security and is not to fail the peace-loving people of all the world in serving notice that the United States intends to remain strong in a military way until such time as threats of national aggression no longer exist. President Truman has repeatedly urged the establishment of such a system of training, and may confidently be expected to renew this recommendation when he addresses Congress today.

The decision whether UMT will be adopted at this session rests on the Republican leadership in Congress. Every opinion poll of the people for the last 3 years has shown an overwhelming majority in favor of some program of compulsory military training. Newspaper analysts of congressional attitudes believe that if Congress is given the opportunity it will pass such a bill. Five of the six leading potential candidates for the Republican nomination for the Presidency—Dewey, Warren, Stassen, Eisenhower, and MacArthur—have unequivocally supported UMT.

As matters now stand in Congress, the House Armed Services Committee has approved a bill establishing a compromise training program which is not so good as was hoped for, but which has been approved as adequate for the time being by the Army leaders who would have to direct it. This bill, however, is now blocked in the Rules Committee, which is controlled by the Republicans. Without the committee's approval it is unlikely even to reach the floor of the House. There is no bill before the Senate and none in immediate prospect. That, too, is a Republican responsibility. Senator GURNEY, a Republican, heads the Armed Services Committee and Senator TAFT decides the order of consideration of bills in the Senate.

Senator TAFT in the Senate and Speaker MARTIN in the House, and their fellow Republican policymakers, will be gambling with the national security of the United States and with their own political fortunes, we believe, if they attempt to block debate of UMT. Yet it is being freely predicted that attempts will be made to do this. Mr. TAFT has put himself on record as against UMT—for reasons which do not stand careful analysis—while Mr. MARTIN is said to be lukewarm toward the proposed program.

This is no time for partisan division on questions of national security. It is no time for any small group of men, no matter how honest their motives, to decide in a caucus room that they will not permit debate on a question which the majority of their colleagues and a majority of their countrymen apparently favor. Two and a half years ago, in his final report as Chief of Staff, the now Secretary of State warned that "the timing of our decision on universal military training is urgent." "The officials of the State Department," Mr. Marshall said then, "have been strongly of the opinion that a decision in this matter prior to the final peace negotiations would greatly strengthen the hand of the United States in securing acceptance of a genuine organization to handle international differences."

The question is no less urgent today than it was on June 30, 1945. Two and a half years of a strained peace have not lessened the necessity that this country retain its military leadership. Any sign of weakness on the part of the United States, any indication that we are not ready to assume our proper responsibilities in maintaining the peace of the world, can only be an invitation to aggression, as it was in 1914, as it was again in 1939. Quick consideration and passage of a strong training bill would do much to assure world peace. A militarily strong United States would not be an invitation to war. It would be a guaranty against it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might direct an inquiry to the members of the committee handling the bill, if I may have the attention of either the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] or the chairman of the committee.

For the purpose of the RECORD, I would like to ask if the phrase used in subsection 2 of section 9, "the estimated cost of the proposed construction," is intended to cover the costs that will be incurred in repairing damages that might be involved in construction. Now, I raise that question because subparagraph 7 refers to the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and so forth, apparently listing that as a benefit from the project. This morning the Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions for the War Department had before it representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service asking for funds to build some hatcheries and to do some other things to overcome the

damages to the salmon run created by the construction of the McNary Dam and other dams on the Columbia River. Now, then, what I am wondering about is if it will be understood that the phrase "the estimated cost of the proposed construction" will include such costs as this for the building of hatcheries or the doing of whatever may be necessary to offset damages to fish and wildlife.

Mr. ROCKWELL. May I ask the gentleman from Montana to answer that question?

Mr. D'EWART. I think the gentleman should recognize that paragraph A of section 9 has to do with the report that will be made by the Bureau of Reclamation to the Congress in regard to the feasibility of projects. It specifies eight different items under which this report shall be divided.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall pursue the question further when we reach that point in the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2873, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2873 amends section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This bill, as amended, was favorably and unanimously reported by the Public Lands Committee on July 11, 1947.

HISTORY OF THE BILL

The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 was passed for the purpose of making more flexible the annual repayments required of irrigation water users under a reclamation project. Its passage followed the report of a commission appointed to investigate the repayment situation on all projects in the West. While this legislation was being considered by Congress in 1939, there was incorporated in it provisions for the authorization by the Secretary of the Interior of projects which conformed to a formula set up in the act. It is this formula which is amended by H. R. 2873.

The hearings on the Reclamation Act of 1939 discloses that the feasibility formula was not too carefully scrutinized by Congress. The language of section 9, which H. R. 2873 amends, is ambiguous in some respects and has been subject to different interpretations.

The interpretation put on section 9 (a) by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior led to a controversy, and the introduction of legislation 3 years ago was intended to clarify this provision. Former Congressman Robinson, of Utah, introduced the first bill for this purpose. Extensive hearings were held but the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned before the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, which considered it, made any report.

Before the introduction of the Robinson bill and since then, the House Appropriations Committee has raised questions with respect to the way by which the Bureau of Reclamation set up repayment schedules for reclamation projects under section 9 of the act. The National Reclamation Association, representing irrigation interests in 17 Western States, took exception to the interpretation of section 9 by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior and passed resolutions urging clarifying legislation. Generally, it was contended by those who supported H. R. 2873 that the opinion of the Solicitor did not conform with the intent of Congress in passing the 1939 act. Further, it appeared that for 5 years after the act was passed, the Bureau of Reclamation had followed a practice which seemed to be in full accord with the intent of Congress in passing the act. However, after the Solicitor's opinion, which was rendered in 1944, the policy and practice of the Bureau changed. The Bureau contended, and probably correctly so, that it was bound by the Solicitor's opinion.

After H. R. 2873 was introduced and considered by the Public Lands Committee of the House, during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the Senate Committee on Interior Department Appropriations included a statement in its report to the effect that clarifying legislation on this subject should be passed by Congress at the earliest possible moment.

Extensive hearings were held on H. R. 2873 in the form in which it was introduced. The issue involved was strongly contested by those appearing for and against the bill. There was a difference of opinion among members of the Public Lands Committee after hearings on the bill were concluded. Under this situation the committee made an effort to find a solution to the problem which would meet the views of all members of the committee. Finally, a proposal for amendments was suggested which was submitted to both the Bureau of Reclamation and representatives of reclamation interests in the West. This formula was accepted by both groups, written into the bill which, as thus amended, was unanimously approved by the committee.

I believe that the Members of this House will fully appreciate that the subject of this bill is very complicated and involved. It is not easily understood. Legislative language which has been carefully written and considered is required to cover the subject. Amendments which are not carefully weighed may result in further confusion and lead to interpretations by the executive branches of the Government contrary to the intent of a committee which spent weeks in considering the bill. The committee is satisfied, after most exhaustive weighing of every provision of the bill, that all ambiguity has been removed.

THE ISSUE

The principal issue under this bill concerns the application of the returns from the interest component of power rates fixed on commercial hydroelectric energy produced by a reclamation project. This may sound complicated. Perhaps I can explain it in this way.

Under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, it was provided that the Federal Government's investment in the commercial power features of a reclamation project should bear interest at not less than 3 percent per annum. It would appear, from the language of the act, that this meant the payment into the Treasury of the United States of all returns from interest for the use of money. The Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, however, held that interest, as there used, did not connote its ordinary meaning. He said that the Secretary of the Interior was empowered by this act, when construed with other provisions of the reclamation law, to apply the interest returns from the power investment to aid in repaying irrigation costs which were beyond the ability of the water users to repay. This meant, of course, that the Government received no interest on its investment in the commercial power features of a reclamation project; and it was contended by those who supported H. R. 2873 that the result was a subsidy from the Nation's taxpayers to Federal power developments.

It was clear that Congress should determine whether the apparent intention of Congress in passing the 1939 act should be sustained or whether certain holdings of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior should be recognized and written into law.

Some who appeared before the Public Lands Committee, as well as members of the committee, felt that the Government was justified for reclamation development to enact legislation which permitted the application of the interest component of power rates to aid in repaying irrigation costs. As chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee, I opposed such a position and believe that the Federal investment in the incidental power developments of a reclamation project should not only bear interest on unpaid balances during the amortization period but should be used to reimburse the Government for use of money borrowed to finance such developments. This interest return to the Government would be in addition to the return of the original investment.

With this explanation in mind, may I now point out the principal provisions of H. R. 2873. They are:

First. Interest component: This bill, as now amended, provides that the interest rate on the commercial power in-

vestment in reclamation projects shall be not less than 2½ percent per annum.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Is the purpose of that just to reimburse the Federal Government for the interest they paid to help build these projects so that the general taxpayer will not pay in taxes to take care of the project?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is the purpose; yes.

At least four-fifths of the returns from this interest rate shall be paid into the Treasury for the use of money. One-fifth of such interest rate may be assigned by the Secretary of the Interior to aid in repaying such irrigation cost of a reclamation project as are beyond the ability of the water users to repay. It is believed that under present cost of money to the Government the 2 percent will reimburse the Government for what it has to pay for borrowed money invested in power features of a reclamation project. The rates were fixed as a floor and accordingly may be increased as costs of money borrowed by the Government increases. Under this arrangement, specified in the bill on page 9, lines 10 to 23, inclusive, there will be paid into the reclamation fund, as provided by the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318), interest at not less than 2 percent per annum for the use of money invested in commercial-power features of a reclamation project. The returns from not less than one-half of 1 percent per annum may be assigned to aid in repaying irrigation costs.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the 1939 act did not specify any particular period for the amortization of the capital investment of the Government?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is correct.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How about the 1932 law? Is there not something in there that fixed it at a total of 50 years, the first 10 years during construction requiring no amortization payments, but the balance to be paid in the next 40 years?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I only know what the Department told our committee. Their contention is that under the present law there is no limit; that they could say that the project could run for 200 years, and that they are only bound by the Solicitor's opinion. That is the law as it exists today, barring any legislation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. At any rate, it has been the policy of the Department of the Interior and other agencies that have to do with this service to amortize the Government's investment over a period of 50 years?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I think that has been the custom, yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This proposal is to increase that to 78 years?

Mr. ROCKWELL. This proposal is to make it possible to increase it to 78 years; to make it more flexible.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Now, with reference to the interest charge, in the gentleman's investigation of this matter and in the hearings before the committee, was there any evidence that established the fact that the Congress had any intent in the 1932 or the 1939 acts to waive interest charges, or not to require the payment of interest on the money that the Government advanced to these parties, back into the Treasury?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That was the contention within the committee. The opinion of the Solicitor of the Interior Department stated that they must charge 3 percent interest, but after they had collected the interest they might use the money back on the project or for any purpose they desired connected with it. Therefore, they were not using it to go into the Treasury, but were placing it back as capital investment on the project.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And they did that?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That has been the custom.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In order to stop that it was necessary for them to write a legislative provision in the appropriation bill, which was done last year, I believe?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is what the Appropriations Committee did last year.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This provision in this bill that requires not less than 2½ percent is a compromise with the Interior Department, which insisted on a 3 percent, which was not to go back into the Treasury?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Yes; it is a compromise between the Department and also members of the committee, many of whom contended there should be no interest rate charged on power development, that they should only pay the original investment back to the Treasury. There were two schools of thought, one of which believed no interest should be charged at all as is the case with irrigation projects where the money is paid back without interest. The other school of thought of which I was one felt that the Federal Treasury should be reimbursed to the amount that it cost the Treasury for the money. This we estimated at 2 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Colorado five additional minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Just one more question if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am sorry to take so much of the gentleman's time but I hope he will touch on that provision of the bill appearing on page 6 which reenacts what I understand to be existing law giving the Secretary of the Interior in effect the authority to enlarge authorized projects without specific authorization of the Congress. I hope the gentleman will discuss that because I am very much interested in that particular provision.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman stated that there were some members of the committee who were in favor of power projects not paying interest. If the gentleman will recall, I think the true facts are that all members of the committee wanted power projects to pay interest, but some of us on the committee felt that the interest should be used to pay the irrigation part of the project which the irrigators could not pay, whereas the gentleman from Colorado and some other Members felt that the interest should be returned to the reclamation fund. In other words, we all wanted interest paid, but it was a question of how the interest should be applied. It divided the committee and finally there was an agreement whereby 2½ percent would be charged. One-fifth of that would go to the aid of the irrigators and four-fifths of it to the reclamation fund or the Treasury.

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is entirely correct, I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico. I thank the gentleman for correcting the statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I should like to complete my statement, but I will yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In the comparison on page 4 of the committee's report, in section 5 of 9 (a), I notice there is a change in the wording from "power" to "commercial power." Will the gentleman explain if that has any significance in establishing a priority against municipal purchases in preference to private company purchases? As I understand it, now the municipalities have a priority right of purchase. By using the words "commercial power," changing the language from the one word "power" to the qualified phrase "commercial power," is there any significance?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I am not a lawyer, but I am sure it does not change the intent because the intent of the committee is that the REA and the local communities shall have the first right to this power.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, it does not change the priority right of purchase.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I know that is the intent of the committee.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would call the attention of the gentleman from California to page 9, line 3, and to lines 24 and 25. That answers the gentleman's question, I am sure.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, proceeding with my statement:

Second. Amortization period for repayment of power investment: The repayment period for the investment in commercial power features of a reclamation project may extend to 78 years or the useful life of the project, whichever is shorter. The 1939 act does not contain any express provision on the repayment period for the commercial power investment, but the practice of the Bureau of Reclamation had been to fix this period at 50 years. It should be noted that the 78 years is not a fixed amortization period. The period may be for any period, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, up to 78 years. Further, during this entire period the investment bears interest on unpaid balances.

Third. Silt and salinity control and recreational benefits: The project cost for silt and salinity control and for recreational benefits are made nonreimbursable. This is justified because many a multiple-use project incurs additional cost to control salinity and provide for the retention of silt. These projects may also involve additional cost for incidental recreation values. Such costs are all in the public interest and should not be charged against the water users. Expenditures by the Government for flood control and for fish and wildlife are also in the public interest and under the present law are nonreimbursable. There is no reason why the cost of silt and salinity control and recreational benefits should not be put in the same position as flood control and as fish and wildlife expenditures. It should be pointed out, too, that under the present law if the Army engineers construct a project with incidental silt and salinity control and recreational benefits the costs for them are nonreimbursable. The same rule should be applied to multiple-purpose reclamation projects.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as I said a few moments ago while we were discussing the rule, this legislation or something like it has long been overdue. Correcting and clarifying legislation on the Reclamation Act of 1939 was called for in 1945. You will recall that the act of 1939 had provisions in it concerning the repayment with interest at 3 percent of the cost of commercial power facilities in these Government dams built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

A solicitor in the Department of the Interior in 1944 made a certain ruling or interpretation of subsection 9 (c) of the act of 1939. His interpretation was not acceptable to many Members of this House and to many water authorities throughout the country. In fact, the very powerful and influential National Reclamation Association at its next annual meeting went on record in its first resolution as condemning the view of the law as announced in the solicitor's opinion.

It was felt by Members of this House there should be clarifying legislation at that time. I was then chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and when called on to clarify the situation in a legislative way I said on the floor of the House in November 1945, that if the law is not clear we should clarify it and that I wanted to help in that matter. I made my view quite clear that the Congress makes the law and determines the policy and that we are not bound for very long at least by a solicitor's opinion if it is contrary to the intent of the Congress in the interpretation of the law.

Accordingly, a few weeks after that, the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation started hearings early in 1946 on a bill which was to remedy this matter. It has been said here by several that long and extensive hearings have been held on, if not this particular bill, similar bills. I have in my hand here the hearings held on the subject matter of this measure in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is a very highly technical matter. I now hold in my hands the hearings held by the present Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands of the Eightieth Congress. So, you see, gentlemen, your Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has heard reams of hearings and weeks of testimony by experts on this matter. It is a difficult and highly technical subject.

Let me go into it just a bit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On page 9 of the bill, lines 13 to 17, there is reference made that power revenues may include no more than one-fifth of the revenues derived. Will the gentleman explain what that means?

Mr. MURDOCK. That refers to one-fifth of the revenue derived as interest being used to retire the capital investment for irrigation. The crux of this question and one of the chief points in this matter is this: Shall interest be paid on Government investments in commercial power facilities in these Government plants? What disposition shall be made of such interest moneys? My colleague from New Mexico said a moment ago that everyone on the committee now, and formerly, too, felt and do feel that wherever the Government invests money in a commercial power plant in connection with reclamation, and that power is sold for commercial use to municipalities or anyone else, that interest should be paid on that money. This bill so provides for interest. In this bill we are changing the rate from 3 percent, which is written in the present law, to 2½ percent. But this measure provides that that money, the 2½ percent, shall go into the Treasury as rent or payment for the use of money. However, in certain cases the Secretary may determine that in order to make a project feasible it is going to have to have a little extra help, and he may take as much as one-half of 1 percent, or one-fifth of this interest money, and not pay it into the Treasury as interest, but apply it on the reduction of capital investment on the irrigation costs which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Gentlemen, let me point out that the National Reclamation Association, by resolution for two different years, has called upon us to clarify this legislation, because they said the Solicitor's opinion, which had now become law, was contrary to the intent of Congress. Let me also point out that at the meeting of the same National Reclamation Association in Phoenix, Ariz., last October—and I am proud to say that several Members of the House were in attendance there—this matter came up, and by unanimous consent of that large organization, representing 17 Western States, the association went on record as endorsing this Rockwell bill in its present form. Now, in view of the fact that twice before they had called for something like this, and last October the same organization unanimously approved this form of a bill, it seems to me, gentlemen, that that ought to go far to convince us that we should adopt a measure like this, which is rather intricate for most of us to understand and very, very difficult to explain briefly, but is regarded as solving our problem, I want to give their request and later endorsement all the emphasis I possibly can.

Let me read the resolution that was adopted last year by the National Reclamation Association. Mind you, do not get confused by the name. The National Reclamation Association is a private organization of water users and is not the same as the United States Reclamation Bureau. This is their latest resolution:

Whereas the National Reclamation Association at its fourteenth annual meeting held in 1945 adopted in its resolution No. 1 an expression of its position adverse to the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior respecting the application of power revenues in fixing the power rates on reclamation projects and affirmed its position as to the intent and application of the 1939 Reclamation Act; and

Whereas the National Reclamation Association at its fifteenth annual meeting held in 1946 reiterated by resolution No. 13 the position theretofore taken with respect to these matters and authorized the president of the association to appoint a committee to confer with the Secretary of the Interior the Bureau of Reclamation, the Members of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives, and interested citizens; and

Whereas following extensive conferences and hearings before the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives there has been reported out, with amendments, a bill (H. R. 2873) which, in the judgment of the committee and of others who have closely analyzed it, fulfills the purposes sought to be accomplished by said resolutions hereinbefore described, and which contains additional beneficial provisions tending to promote the feasibility of Federal reclamation projects and to relieve water users on existing projects from costs attributable to purposes other than irrigation or municipal water supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association hereby expresses its satisfaction with H. R. 2873 as reported with amendments by the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives and urges its prompt passage by that body and by the Senate and its approval by the President of the United States.

The National Reclamation Association is made up of farmers, water users, and has some of the best technical experts in the country, who know more about irrigation, its purposes, and its value, I think, than any other group inside the Congress or out. After all these hearings before the House committee in which they took part they have placed their stamp of approval on this bill in its present form. For that reason, I hope we can pass the bill without amendment.

In 1945 I promised certain gentlemen now right in front of me that I would do my best as chairman of the committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress to get action taken by that proper legislative committee of the House to clarify this matter. While this bill does not satisfy me entirely, it is a compromise, it is the best we can get, and I believe we ought to adopt it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I want to compliment the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] on the fine work he did as chairman of this committee last year. It was certainly through no lack of desire on his part that we did not have his bill presented last year. I am with him in the hope that we can carry it at this time.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I notice that section 9 provides that the Secretary may make findings as to the nonreimbursable items. The one I am interested in is the one with reference to salinity control. In my area there are 450,000 acres of land in the Sacramento-San Joaquin delta which are subject to the encroachment of salt water. Can the gentleman inform us what are the bases of his findings regarding how much should be nonreimbursable for that particular purpose?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot be as specific as that, as that is a special problem and varies with conditions on each project that has it.

I am heartily in favor of the provisions here written which were condemned a little while ago by a member of the Committee on Rules. When we build a great multiple-purpose dam on our western rivers and when we attempt to have a great reclamation project, there are other things that must be considered besides irrigation and power, for instance, salinity control as in the great Central Valley of California. If we cannot stop the encroachment of salt water in that area, which is in your district, sir, around the Great Bay, hundreds of thousands of acres of land which used to be productive will be ruined. It is just about as important that we build a dam like Shasta Dam to furnish fresh water to keep back salt water and provide for salinity control as to supply it to be used for irrigation.

In addition to that, there are other benefits to accompany reclamation. I mean recreation on lakes and rivers in our western part of the country where we have so little water that the sight of a cupful of it is delightful to the eye. We would like to have fish. The Fish and Game Protective Association of Arizona is in constant touch with me, calling my attention to the fact that thousands and thousands of citizens in Arizona want some place to go boating, some place to go fishing. These things are important and of such value that you cannot figure the money worth exactly, but they have great value, and the farmers in that irrigation district should not be called upon to pay for these benefits to get reclamation.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. May I first commend my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, for his splendid statement. But it occurs to me that he might have said to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that the extent of the allocation that the Secretary of the Interior might make for salinity control is wholly an engineering problem and, of course, the Secretary will refer that matter to a board of engineers. I might say to the gentleman from California that there are several checks upon size of the allocation that might be made by the Secretary of the Interior; in the first place the question of feasibility must be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. Of course the budget then will call upon other interested departments of Government for advice as to the computation of the Secretary. In addition to that, of course, when the Bureau of the Budget requests an appropriation for that particular project, the Committee on Appropriations will then look into the various elements of feasibility and the amounts allocated. So it seems to me there are many checks on the discretion of the Secretary and no one can say just how much is going to be allocated for salinity control because the engineers themselves will have to make a detailed study and only after they make their report will the Secretary arrive at the amount to be charged against salinity control.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Wyoming has put it just exactly right. All of these things are taken into consideration exactly as the formula for flood control has been studied by the engineers. Heretofore, for instance, when we built Hoover Dam, the cost of the whole thing was considered and the flood-control part was estimated at $25,000,000 and that amount was thought to be about right for flood control. Therefore that part of the cost was put in a special category by itself. The same thing will apply to silt control, salinity control, fish and wildlife protection, and recreational facilities. Certain things will be made nonreimbursable so that our farmers will not have to pay for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I compliment the gentleman for his explanation of these provisions of law. May I also point out to you that in addition to the 450,000 acres of very rich peat land along the upper reaches of the San Francisco Bay, there are many industrial plants and twice in the last 25 years they have had serious encroachments there which almost compelled them to shut up their plants, the steel mills, chemical plants, and canneries and so forth. This will have a salutary effect in keeping these plants open throughout the entire year.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I rise to inquire about that clause on page 7: "The Secretary may make findings with respect to projects heretofore authorized." It seems to me that is going very far afield and opens the door to unknown possibilities. Not only to projects that will be authorized as to engineering data that may be available, but as to all of the projects that have heretofore been authorized, means that you are on a fishing expedition to justify an unjustifiable project. I would like to have the gentleman's explanation of that provision.

Mr. MURDOCK. As the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] indicated a moment ago, such findings will be subject to engineering checks on those projects the same as on any projects which may hereafter be authorized. Some of these benefits which the bill makes nonreimbursable are so needed I would not deny existing projects of them after all have been carefully checked.

Mr. Chairman, may I, in closing, say this: The great cause of reclamation has been harmed or has been slowed down because of the controversy over the Solicitor's ruling in 1944 on the act of 1939. I believe that this measure will clarify it and put it on a sound business basis so that we can go forward at once with the work of reclamation which the country now needs. Failure to pass a proper bill will continue the existing confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] has again expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2873, now under consideration, is a bill to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This bill is the result of extended hearings held over a long period of time. It was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] is chairman, to the full Committee on Public Lands, and in turn was unanimously reported by the full committee to this House after mature consideration. Differences of opinion in the committee which had been evident for some time have been composed in a satisfactory manner. Your committee believes that the bill here presented is one which will benefit the whole Nation and particularly those States depending upon irrigation, conservation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power.

The National Reclamation Association at its sixteenth annual convention held in Phoenix, Ariz., in October 1947, gave unanimous approval to the bill in its present form.

As reported, the bill will permit the inclusion of recreation, salinity control and silt control, and the allocation of costs of proposed Federal reclamation projects. It will reduce the rate of interest required to be returned on the power investment from 3 to 2½ percent per annum.

The bill settles the long-standing controversy over application of interest rate on the power investment by providing that not more than one-fifth of the revenue derived from the interest component of power rates may be applied on irrigation costs chargeable to power.

The enactment of this legislation will not cost the Federal Treasury one penny of the taxpayer's money. On the contrary, at the interest rate established by the bill, the Federal Government will receive a greater amount of interest than it

costs the Government to otherwise borrow money.

This bill would insure the completion of the great Central Valley project, which is as large as the entire State of Michigan. In other words, the Central Valley is as large as the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and one-half of the State of Rhode Island combined. It would also make feasible smaller projects which would otherwise be nonfeasible. The enactment of this bill will add billions of dollars of wealth from which the Federal Treasury will benefit.

The tremendous demand for power during the past year has necessitated the use of more than 40,000,000 barrels of oil for the production of electric energy, a large part of which could and should have been provided by hydroelectric power plants. This demand is increasing. Our national petroleum resources are limited, and every barrel of oil taken from the ground is gone forever. It is a woeful waste of irreplaceable oil to use it for manufacturing electricity in areas where hydroelectric power can be developed. Hydroelectric power is inexhaustible. Every reclamation, conservation, and irrigation project developing hydroelectric power, whether privately or publicly owned, builds our national peacetime economy just that much stronger and strengthens our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, money advanced for irrigation and conservation projects from which hydroelectric power can be developed is not a Government subsidy. It is an investment in the security of America. Every dollar must be repaid.

Mr. Chairman, there is no honest objection to the development of hydroelectric power by private enterprise. On the other hand, private power interests have no right to interfere with great hydroelectric power projects beyond their financial scope, such projects as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Hoover Dam on the Colorado River, Grand Coulee and Bonneville on the Columbia River, the Shasta Dam in the great Central Valley project, or with infant multiple projects which are made economically feasible by Government participation which will continue as they have in the past to be self-liquidating. Without these large publicly owned hydroelectric projects to which I have referred we would have been totally unable to produce the aluminum for the air fleets of World War II, one-third of which aluminum was produced from the power furnished by the Columbia River projects alone.

This is forward-looking, constructive legislation and should be passed by this House without changing its text, intent, or purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields back 6 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The question I want to ask is along the line of that asked by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and relates to the proviso on page 7, beginning in line 5, which authorizes the Secretary to make a new analysis of the projects heretofore authorized. The question I wish to propound is whether new projects which are yet to be authorized will have the privilege of the 78-year repayment base period? Will these projects, which are going to be retroactively analyzed, also have that same benefit of extending their period of repayment from the present allowable of 40 years to 78 years?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I may say to the gentleman there is no limit of 40 years at the present time. The life of the project is the limit at the present time.

Mr. HOLIFIFLD. It is not to exceed 40 years, is it not?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No. That particular section refers to the power project, and as to power projects under the present law there is no limit. The practice of the Department has been to limit them to 40 or 50 years, but it may extend them beyond 50 years, subject, of course, to the approval of Congress, which appropriates the money. As to these projects, we may go back, even under present law, and revalue the projects and come to the Congress and ask for an additional period of time. So it makes no difference either way by this bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let me be clear in my understanding. At the present time the Central Valley water project in California is amortized on a 40-year basis.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is the irrigation project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Irrigation and power, both.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As to the power project, there is no limitation, so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Can they obtain the same benefits, that is, change from a 40-year basis to a 78-year basis, that the new projects may enjoy?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, by going back and asking Congress again to authorize. All of these projects have to be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the gentleman is confused. The gentleman from New Mexico is absolutely correct. Under the present law there is no limit. It is merely limited to the useful life of the project. I have been informed a matter of only a few weeks ago a power project was authorized by the Secretary of the Interior on a pay-out of 69 years. So this matter of 40 years does not enter into it. The 40 years applies to the irrigation farmer, not to the power end of it. There is no limitation to the power pay-out at the present time, except insofar as the contracts made with the department set a limit.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why a matter so simple can be made so difficult to understand. The matter before us is very, very simple indeed if we only bear in mind two things.

In every multiple-power project the money invested by the Government is divided into two large sections. One is flood control, which is nonreimbursable. The other section is the portion of the investment which is reimbursable. That portion of the investment which is reimbursable is divided into three blocks. The first block is the power investment which power has to reimburse. It has to charge enough to pay back the investment to the reclamation fund or the Government. The second block is that portion of the irrigation costs which are assigned to the irrigators to pay and they have to pay those through their operations in a period of not to exceed 40 or 50 years. The third block is a small block, which is that portion of the irrigator's costs which the irrigators cannot reimburse and which are assigned to the power project to reimburse.

Under the present law it is required by the present practice of the Bureau of Reclamation that the power investment shall be reimbursed to the Government as principal plus 3 percent interest, but the 3 percent interest is used in some cases to aid in the third block of costs which are assigned to power but which go to irrigation and which the irrigators cannot pay.

The thing that brought all this controversy about is that the Solicitor back in 1944 ruled, as to power, that there was no limit within which the power investment need be paid, but that so long as power returned the principal within the useful life of the project, that was all that was necessary, and that in returning that principal, 3 percent interest should be credited to the principal, not as interest, and naturally, the National Reclamation Association and other people began to object.

In my opinion, they have made a mountain out of a molehill and they have made a mountain out of a molehill because they had a certain purpose in doing that. The National Reclamation Association is the one that through all their conventions and through all the sessions of Congress has been raising this question and making, as I say, a mountain out of a molehill. Why? Because the National Reclamation Association is composed of two classes of people: One, the people who already have projects built or have projects under construction and who, being organized, are members of the National Reclamation Association; second, people who are interested in reclamation because they are in sympathy with the power people who are interested in power. They are the people who put up the money for the association and they are the people who have the greatest voice in the National Reclamation Association. Sure, there are others of us who belong to it, but our voice is weak, because we are not organized. Our projects have not been authorized.

It is perfectly natural that those who already have their projects built or under construction should object to other projects being built on their same streams, if they can possibly prevent it; and just as naturally the power lobby is interested in seeing to it that as little public power as possible is provided at low rates of interest. So, their interests coincide and naturally the National Reclamation As-

sociation has been, in session after session, in and out of season, talking about this interest component, and they have convinced the fine gentlemen who head the Appropriations Committee and they have convinced many other Members of Congress that the Solicitor's opinion is a real danger to us. Well, maybe so; I do not know. But I do know that up until now that provision of the Solicitor's opinion which says that the interest component, the 3 percent interest, may be credited to the principal and to the reimbursing of the principal, has not been followed, and the Bureau of Reclamation has at all times said that they are not going to follow it. That is why I say that this thing is a mountain made out of a molehill.

Mr. Sawyer, of the National Reclamation Association, testified before the committee and virtually admitted that that was the fact; that the Bureau of Reclamation was not following the Solicitor's opinion, but he said:

That opinion of the Solicitor creates a climate in which appropriations are made and very strong representations have been made by influential members of the Appropriations Committee that they do not like that climate——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ—

They would like to see it changed. They come from the portion of the country that has the voting strength. It is on the tolerance of these men—

That is, the Appropriations Committee men—

as I have said several times, that reclamation exists at all.

It is a climate created by the Solicitor's opinion that we are trying to correct by this bill. As far as I am concerned, and that is why I can talk about this bill without any animosity whatever, I do not care whether this bill is passed or whether it is not passed, because I think the present law under the administration of the Bureau of Reclamation and its present policies is good. This bill only makes it certain that the present policies will be followed, so far as power investment is concerned.

One of those gentlemen from the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Jones, appeared before our committee. I congratulate Mr. Jones, a former Congressman from Ohio, because he was very frank with our committee. He said he wanted this 3 percent paid and not used to aid irrigation costs. He said he did not care whether it was paid to the reclamation fund or the Treasury, but he wanted it paid. He was frank in telling the committee what he thought, which reflected the thinking of the National Reclamation Association. I quote:

Mr. JONES. Therefore, by the policy of the present law, the reclamation program is being broken because they are breaking the market for the sale of power at higher generation cost projects.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Pardon me, Mr. Jones. I did not quite understand what you mean by the expression "breaking the market for power." Would you mind explaining that?

Mr. JONES. Well, as a matter of fact, sir, to emphasize the point, you will find in last year's hearings of the Interior Department appropriation bill, where a private utility purchased all of the power at Shasta Dam, and it can produce it at 5 mills plus a kilowatt-hour, yet it is buying power at an average rate of about 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, the top rating being 3.4, which is 3.3 mills less than the private utility can generate that power with the tax component in its facilities.

Therefore, I say that the Reclamation Bureau is breaking the market. It should be able to get the full amount that the private power company would pay, if it were using it own facilities, five point plus a kilowatt-hour.

Do you understand what I mean?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In other words, in simple language, it just means we are not selling power for enough money.

Mr. JONES. For what it would take private utilities to generate it, at their own plant, and pay the taxes according to the laws of the States.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. You want to charge more?

Mr. JONES. My point is you cannot have your cake and eat it, too. If power is to help pay out these projects, power should be used for this purpose. Instead of making a promise on the one hand to get the great transmission and generating projects to pay out the construction costs and then break the market of the power by underselling the market.

That is plain speaking, and that is what is before us.

As I said, we have three blocks of investments here. If the 3 percent is used to assist in paying that little block of irrigation costs that the irrigator cannot pay, then they can sell power a little bit cheaper. If, as the Solicitor's opinion says, the investment for power can be paid by the 3 percent being credited to principal, then they can sell power still cheaper. Under this bill they cannot do that. They cannot sell power and use the 3 percent to pay for the principal of the power investment. They cannot use the 3 percent to pay for the help that the irrigators get, except for the small one-fifth portion of the interest.

Because of that, I say that this bill simply carries forward what the Bureau of Reclamation has been doing, with the one single, solitary exception of that 3 percent which the irrigators used to get and which they will not get in the future if this bill is passed. To the extent of the other four-fifths, additional power rates will be necessary to assist the irrigators on the proportion of their cost assigned to power.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am referring to the provisions on page 9 of the bill where the matter which the gentleman is talking about is covered. As I understand it, one-fifth of the interest component can be turned into the irrigation project.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. One-fifth of the interest component can be credited toward paying the debt of the irrigators, which they are not able to pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then it reads as follows:

In addition to any and all sums otherwise assigned for such purpose from power revenues.

Will the gentleman please explain to the Members just on what basis the revenues from the power features of the project are turned over to the irrigators? What is the limit? What principles are involved?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This is the principle involved: Under the reclamation law, the Congress realized that there were projects on which the irrigators could not pay in full for the advantages that they get. So, under the irrigation law, they provided that the Secretary may allocate some of those costs that otherwise would have to be paid by the irrigators to the power project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; but the point is that here we have apparently granted an unlimited discretion to just turn over power revenues to the irrigators. What I want to know is what is the principle involved? We are building a big dam on the American River—the Folsom Dam—that will be authorized here very soon and part of that money from the power revenues is going to the irrigators.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is to assist the irrigators.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Are there not some principles that the Secretary applies to determine what portion of the power revenues should be turned over to the irrigation people?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What are they?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This is the principle: He requires the irrigators to pay to the limit of their ability. Then what they cannot pay he assigns to power, provided power can pay and still charge reasonable rates, and provided the Congress approves it. He must report to the Congress how much he does so allocate to power. If the gentleman does not agree with that principle, of course, that is another matter. There are some of us who are not in agreement with it and some of us who are.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am thoroughly in agreement with it. What I want to know from the gentleman is just how he does arrive at the amount of power revenues that should be turned over. Does it depend on the rate structure? Does it depend on how much the irrigators need, or any other factors? What is the principle that the Secretary invokes to make the allocation?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It depends on what the Congress says can be turned over to them. He figures out the costs and amounts which can be recovered from power and brings it to Congress. It depends on the Congress and it depends on the cost.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will it vary from project to project?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Oh, necessarily it has to vary from project to project. Each project must stand on its own feet.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the Secretary have the absolute power to determine at what rate the water prices should be fixed? In other words, what is too much to pay for water?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I can yield any further. I

think I have answered the question so far as I as a Member of Congress can answer it. If you want some detailed explanation of just how he goes about that, I presume that you would have to ask him about it. I am not an engineer; I am not an accountant; and I do not have much experience so far as that aspect of these projects is concerned. I wish I had more. I am sorry I cannot help the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If I may ask the gentleman one more question. For instance, in the area that I referred to, would the rates that the Reclamation Bureau gives to the water users compare with the rates by local irrigation districts?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. You mean in setting the rates or the price that should be paid for power?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, in setting the rates that they should charge for water. What would determine how much irrigators have to pay for water?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Oh, we are getting into deep water here. I cannot tell you that. I am not an engineer or an accountant.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is a matter of business and is not an engineering matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If so, I am sure the gentleman can figure it out for himself. I cannot even undertake to tell you how my own home projects in New Mexico are being figured. That is up to these experts and up to the Congress when they bring the figures before the Congress.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am so happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I would like to know the feeling of the committee on the principle involved in sections 8 and 9 on page 6 that if the proposed construction is found to be feasible then the new project shall be deemed to be authorized and may be undertaken by the Secretary. Is it the idea of the committee to turn this over to the Secretary without reference to Congress?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No, that just follows the present law, with reference to small projects. They do that if they find they are feasible, provided Congress approves by appropriating the money. But there are no more small projects and nearly every project now comes to the Congress for authorization as well as appropriations.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. What in this act forces it to come before the Congress?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Only Congress can vote the necessary appropriations. That language is exactly the same as the old law. There is no difference in that language.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the Solicitor's opinion, I think it would be proper to read from that opinion because I have heard some people say that the Solicitor's opinion is misinterpreted by some of us in Congress. When we have said that the Solicitor's opinion held that the power investment could be paid by applying the 3 percent interest to the principal rather than collecting the interest in addition, some people have said that we misinterpreted him. I want to read into the RECORD exactly what he said. In taking up the question, he first said:

> One view of the law is that the allocations report must be predicated on estimates of revenues sufficient to return to the United States that portion of the reimbursable costs properly chargeable to power and the other portions of the reimbursable costs that are to be met by power revenues, and, in addition, interest at 3 percent per annum on what is described in section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 as "an appropriate share of the construction investment."
>
> The other principal view is that, even though power rates are to be fixed on a basis that includes as a part of the rate base interest on that portion of the costs properly chargeable to power, it is only necessary, insofar as showing full reimbursability of the project is concerned, to show a return within an agreed period of amortization of the full amount of the project costs which are allocated to be returned from power revenues.

In answering these questions, he said:

> I believe that a proper interpretation of section 9 of the Reclamation Act of 1939 and the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment to the Department's Appropriation Act of 1939 require that the minimum rate schedule be such as to produce revenues sufficient only to meet, in addition to the return for operation and maintenance cost, an amount equal to 3 percent of the power construction costs with the proviso that, if total revenues thus produced are insufficient to repay all costs allocated to power to be repaid by power revenues, "other fixed charges" must be included in the rate schedule to produce revenues sufficient to repay such costs.

That certainly holds that the 3 percent interest may be used to repay the total investment in the power plant. With that interpretation of the law none of us agreed; and, though the Bureau of Reclamation never has followed it insofar as the power investment is concerned, it does create a cloud. This bill, if it does nothing else, corrects that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] has again expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this is not a sectional issue. It is a national issue. It affects not only the 17 Western States that are directly affected in the creation of new wealth, but it affects the Nation as a whole. We are 48 States but one Nation. The time has come that we should all realize that wealth-creating projects and wealth-saving projects should be given preference to every other, and it is not boondoggling, even though there may be same boondoggling in States very close to us.

The Federal Government realized the value of its vast resources. It realized that there were in the Western States large bodies of land that could be reclaimed by irrigation. Then, a little later on there developed another industry that came along which we did not see at the time we started in with reclamation. That was hydroelectric power. Hydroelectric power especially affects the Nation just as much as irrigation.

In my own State we are more interested in hydroelectric power than we are in irrigation, although we are interested in both. The REA is working in my State and it needs more and cheaper electricity if it can get it. Unfortunately there are some who would like to have us continue in darkness but we refuse to stay there. We are going to have plenty of light but up to date only 10 percent of the farmers of my State have been able to get electricity in their homes.

Now that the war is over, however, we are in hopes that this bill will pass and within a short time we will have electrical energy not only for light but for power for all the farmers of North Dakota. And I can assure you that that is also the longing and the desire of all farmers in all of the Missouri River Valley States.

Then comes another question with which this program and this bill are directly connected—the national welfare and the national security. I have before me a statement by Mr. Forrestal about synthetic oil and I shall just read a few sentences from it. Secretary of Defense Forrestal stated that the United States is so short of oil that if war came tomorrow we would need 2,000,000 barrels a day more than the Nation can produce. Get that! Then, testifying on the impact of the oil shortage on national defense before a House Armed Services Subcommittee, Mr. Forrestal urged the United States to set up immediately a synthetic-oil industry at the cost of $8,000,000,000.

I am sure my friend from Virginia would not say that that was boondoggling. Oil can be made synthetically from coal, natural gas, and oil shale. In addition I want to save at least part of the oil used in producing electrical energy and thereby save part of that $8,000,000,000 that Mr. Forrestal suggests. Let us develop hydroelectric power to do part of the work that this oil would do.

The chairman of our Public Lands Committee has told you on several occasions that we are now using in the neighborhood of 40,000,000 barrels of oil a year to create electrical energy and to do what this wasted water would do if put to useful work; water which runs unchallenged to the ocean when it ought to be harnessed and made to produce electricity and which could be used over and over again as long as the rains came from the heavens. We should use the water in place of burning up the oil we need so badly at a time when we are creating the largest air force in the world. We will need many times the oil we can produce today to keep those planes up in the air in case of war.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is a national issue, an issue confined not to the 17 Western States but which affects the entire Nation. Let us go a little further and see some of the results that have come from reclamation. Reclamation has already added billions and billions of dollars of new wealth. The Government collects income taxes on that new wealth. In the higher brackets it takes as much as 85½ percent of that

new wealth. That means a reduction in the taxes of this Nation, a load taken off of all the people. If this bill passes, it will materially facilitate and increase the production of this new wealth.

Why let the water go unchallenged to the ocean, bringing death and destruction not only to human beings, but destruction to property and to livestock as well? Let us harness the water and use it instead of letting it go unchallenged to destroy people down on the lower reaches of our large rivers such as the Mississippi, the Columbia, and so on.

In the last war, and the evidence is ample before our committee—it is in the hearings and if you have any doubt about what I say read the hearings—millions upon millions of dollars were saved to the Federal Government because of the new hydroelectric power plants that had been created, for they made possible the vast production of aluminum and other instrumentalities used in the war.

I am proud of the performance of these 17 Western States that had the vision—and of the eastern people too who had the vision—to see that reclamation was needed and to develop these new sources of electrical power and who had the good sense to finance it as well as use it for the needs of our Nation.

Now, something has been said as to the purpose of this bill. I just want to call your attention very briefly to a request that the Appropriations Committee made at the time one of these appropriation bills for the Reclamation Bureau was up for consideration.

Here is the statement:

> In making certain appropriations in this bill from the general fund for reclamation projects the conferees do so with the recommendation that new legislation shall be passed at the earliest opportunity providing for the disposal of the interest collected—

That is, the interest component—

> on sums invested in power and municipal water features on reclamation projects and with the understanding that interest heretofore or hereafter collected on such investments in power or municipal water features of any such reclamation project constructed or operated under the authority of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1948.

Our committee had that mandate. After many weeks of meetings and after much diversity of opinion as my able chairman the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] has pointed out to you, there were differences of opinion. Those differences of opinion were not only in the Bureau of Reclamation and in our committee. There was a difference of opinion in the 17 Western States. There was a difference of opinion among many people outside of those 17 States as to just what should be done and what was for the best interest of the Nation as a whole as well as for the 17 States.

We finally compromised after many weeks. We had to give and we had to take. When the bill was finally reported it was reported unanimously. All of the members of the committee were present when it was reported out. There was no question left. We were all agreed we did not get all we wanted. I did not get all I wanted and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] did not get everything he wanted for his bill. But we reached a compromise.

What was the compromise? Under the Solicitor's opinion—and I think the Bureau was correct, we would not want them to go against the Solicitor's opinion—the law was construed that this 3 percent could go into the irrigation project to help irrigation and it was further held that the time was unlimited except as to the life of the project. There is some doubt even whether it was limited to the life of the project. There was nothing said in the Solicitor's opinion as to how the principal should be paid back. His conclusion was that if you kept paying the 3 percent each year on a project you were doing your full duty and that was all that was required.

We compromised. The first compromise was that the interest rate was lowered from 3 to 2½ percent. Two percent was to go into the Treasury earmarked for reclamation. There was no dispute about that. I wanted all to go for the project, but my friends on the committee outnumbered me, although I did have some considerable support there for my position. Two percent goes now into the project and only one-half percent goes to the particular irrigation project for irrigation use to help the farmers. That is only one-half percent out of 2½ percent, whereas before we got the whole 3. That was a considerable concession.

However, in order to make these smaller financially sound projects feasible, I wish my friend from Virginia would hear those words "sound projects" because any one project is sound that pays out in the end with 2½ percent interest—we had to extend the life within which these payments were made from what was proposed both in my bill and in the Rockwell bill from 67 years to 78 years. This was necessary to bring about the results that we in our States need. But we do not live for our own States alone. If we are here legislating for the Nation we ought to be big enough to realize this Nation is one Nation. We cannot bear that in mind too many times. Sectionalism has no business in national legislation.

Now then, on this question—it was a debatable question and I am not saying which side was right or wrong—it was necessary to meet on some happy hunting ground, in the middle somewhere. So, we agreed that if the time was extended to 78 years we would consent that the 2 percent should go into the Treasury, earmarked for general reclamation, and that Congress should reappropriate and allow projects from time to time out of that particular money, that particular fund.

Now, I have no quarrel with anybody. That is the suggestion I have to make, and I wish to say, however, that the Committee on Rules should not be asked to write the laws. Their business is to bring out rules. The different committees that have all the information before them write the laws, and there is good reason why the Committee on Rules should not attempt to write laws, for the reason that they have not heard the evidence. They do not know what it is about.

It has been wisely said by myself and others that the person who does not know and remembers that he does not know is not dangerous to society or to national defense, but the person who does not know that he does not know and thinks he knows becomes dangerous to society and to national defense alike. So, let us remember that no person is all-wise in our body here; that we all are limited in time and energy and that we must not try to run the whole show; that we must limit ourselves to the subjects that we have heard fully discussed and have full knowledge of. That is one reason I believe that if you go amending this bill you will change the very purpose, the very object of our compromise, and I, for one, shall vote to recommit it if any such attempt is made here in this House.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman that I do not know how the principal is to be repaid on the reimbursable projects? Would the gentleman kindly explain?

Mr. LEMKE. They are to be repaid now within the life of the project; that is, they are divided in two. As to irrigation the principal must be repaid within 40 years or such further extension as Congress may allow without interest. On the power side, under this bill, it will have to be repaid within 78 years with interest at 2½ percent on unpaid balances, or sooner, if the life of the project does not run and does not stand up for 78 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I ask the gentleman an additional question? Is this principal repaid at a uniform rate or just as the Secretary of the Interior wishes it should be repaid?

Mr. LEMKE. It is paid back at a uniform rate, and it is paid back under contract made by the various projects with the Department of the Interior, and under that contract it is flexible. There may be certain different conditions. For instance, the present law says from the time that the project gets into operation, which may take 10 years from the time the contract is made. Then when the payments begin to run they are fixed and uniform. I know that from my own experience with irrigation in my own State. When we had the drought, and they were not able to pay, they got an extension from Congress.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman, and the gentleman from Florida for his extension of time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to ask a question regarding that part of the bill on page 10 beginning with line 4:

> Nothing in this subsection shall be applicable to provisions in existing contracts, made pursuant to law.

On page 7 you give the Secretary the right to make a reanalysis of projects which have been heretofore authorized, but according to my understanding you, in this section, take away the right for any readjustment of rates to give existing projects the same beneficial right of repayment that you are now giving future projects.

Mr. LEMKE. Let me say to the gentleman that there are certain inequities, and so forth, that can be readjusted without further action by Congress. However, there are some of these projects that have been created by special act of Congress, like the Hoover Dam and others. If they wish to come under the similar provisions, I, for one, shall support them, unless they continue to obstruct this legislation and pull everybody down to their own situation. I do not believe that is necessary to gain their object. But, I know that the Hoover Dam and some other projects need help.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I think what the gentleman from California has in mind is, say, for the Central Valley Authority, that their present pay-out period is approximately 50 years. I think his query is directed to this point. If this bill is passed, can they renegotiate to extend the pay-out period to 78 years?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Providing it is necessary.

Mr. LEMKE. I am satisfied they can.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Without additional legislation, or with it?

Mr. LEMKE. With additional legislation. They can extend it from the time it was started up to 78 years. I am satisfied that can be done by Congress if they desire it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the contract between the Central Valley Authority and the farmers of the area is now on a 39-year basis?

Mr. LEMKE. It may be necessary that you come and ask Congress to give the same privileges to you and the Hoover Dam and other similar projects that this bill has. I, for one, shall be glad to join hands with you when that time comes. You cannot cover everything in one bill. I think the gentleman realizes that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In regard to the renegotiation of the Hoover Dam and the Central Valley projects, is that the attitude of the committee that is opposing this bill?

Mr. LEMKE. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman is expressing his own opinion. Does he know what the opinion of the committee is?

Mr. LEMKE. I am expressing the opinion of a considerable number, if not the majority of the committee, when I say that I am satisfied that, if this bill passes, similar legislation for their projects and similar terms will be very seriously and gratefully received.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. I can say for the benefit of my California colleague, or colleagues [Mr. McDONOUGH], and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], also the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON], that I concur with the gentleman from North Dakota and, as chairman of the committee, I will support legislation to extend the amortization period of the Colorado River to the full length of time provided for in the bill now pending before this House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I ask the chairman of the committee if he would extend that same project to the Central Valley water project in case it was necessary?

Mr. WELCH. In case of necessity, absolutely.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for giving me this 5 minutes. I was reluctant to ask the members of the majority to give me 5 minutes because I know many members of the committee desire to discuss this very important bill.

Those who do not live out in the western part of the country do not really understand how vital water, backed up behind dams, is to our part of the country. We have no rain from roughly the 1st of April until the middle of November. By building these dams, we store the water necessary to give our lands water during the growing season.

To show you the importance of water and irrigation, I can cite you a very simple illustration. This is in figures as of before the war.

In my county bare land, without irrigation, was worth roughly $50 an acre. In the sixties, seventies, and eighties, that land raised very excellent grain, especially barley and wheat. With water on that land so that it would raise fruit, nuts, and vegetables which it does raise now, including thousands and thousands of tons of grapes, it went from $250 an acre to $1,000 an acre. In other words, the price rose from 5 to over 10 times in value due to the fact that we have irrigation.

I want to direct my attention to the matter contained in the provisions of the bill on page 9 which provides that there may be returned from the net power revenues one-fifth of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates in addition to any and all other sums otherwise assigned for such purpose from power revenues. To me that is a very broad provision. What I am thinking about is this: It seems to give unlimited discretion to the Secretary of the Interior to turn over from the power revenues all of the money that he cares to to the irrigationists. I have thousands of irrigationists in my district, and I want them to get help from power revenues. But I likewise have a great many people who are going to buy this public electric power. The Sacramento Municipal Utility District which was just organized 2 years ago serves over 200,000 people. There are 60,000 meters in the district. We will be the first big customer for the hydroelectric power generated in the Central Valley project at the Shasta Dam. The power users whose power bills are going to pay for the power features of this dam plus some extra money to the irrigationists should not lose the benefit of the public ownership in that project and they will lose these benefits if there is too much of a diversion to the irrigationists.

You must remember that in the Central Valley of California there are dozens and dozens of independent local irrigation districts. In the very area that I represent there are probably 10 different districts. The ranchers using the water developed by these districts raised all the money that they required to develop their water and, in some instances, also electric power. They did not get one dollar from the Government. They got no help from anybody. They paid the interest on their bonds at rates ranging from 4 percent to 6 percent. They bonded themselves for 40 years and are gradually paying back the bonds dollar for dollar.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. May I say to my colleague from California that of course he recognizes the fact these power projects are wholly incidental to reclamation and that that is the basic authority upon which they were constructed originally. The law properly provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall take such proportion of the revenues from power as will make it possible to construct the reclamation end of the project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that thoroughly, but I do not want the Secretary to go too far and rob the power consumers, who are going to pay for all this, of all of their benefits. There is danger of doing that very thing.

Mr. BARRETT. No, no; there is no danger of doing that because the Secretary of the Interior is limited by economic reasons. He has to sell this power at a very low rate in big blocks and consequently he has to keep that rate low. Therefore a project can only be determined to be feasible, first, if the power can pay for its way and also if it can pay enough so that the farmers can construct their reclamation projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My time is all being taken up by members of the committee, but I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This bill does not extend in any way the amount which power has to pay in aid of irrigation, but it does limit the amount of interest which may have to be paid.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that thoroughly. That is just what I am afraid of. It does not limit it and the very cheap electricity that our people are looking for may be dissipated by diverting too much to irrigationists and thereby making the electric rate too high. If you get a Secretary of the Interior who wants to ride roughshod over the power consumers, that is what might happen. There ought to be a balance in there somewhere where they could not give too much money away and thus charge the electric consumers who are going to pay for these projects.

Mr. BARRETT. There is no change from the present law. That is the law at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I know, but it has not been applied to my section yet and I am afraid that it could be applied to the detriment of some of my people.

I want to mention one other thing, just to raise the question. We have been talking about this reclamation law and have heretofore thought of its projects as being liquidated over a 40-year span. Often the question comes to my mind, What is going to happen to any particular project when all of the landowners have paid it all out? I understand the original idea of those who drafted the 1902 act was that the landowners would then take it over and operate it; but as far as I know, that has not yet occurred. The reason I mention that is this: I think we ought to lay down this principle, and I have gone so far as to introduce two bills, heretofore, covering the principle, that on intrastate rivers, like we have in California and other States, after the Government acts as banker and furnishes the money to build the projects and upon their completion then the United States should make a contract with the State, providing that the State may be substituted in place of the National Government to administer the project. In the contract providing for this arrangement, they would then provide that the State of California, for instance, would stand in lieu of the landowners who are paying the water bills, and the power consumers, and guarantee to the Federal Government every dollar provided to be repaid to it by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And the administration would be in the hands of the local people. Without any derogatory reference against any member of the Department of the Interior, it is my firm conviction that we would have better administration by local people on the ground making the ultimate decisions than we can have from this far-off administration, 3,000 miles from the scene where the law is to be administered. Also, the Secretary of the Interior has so many important questions before him that he simply does not have enough hours in the day or enough days in the year to make decisions that he has to make and should make expeditiously. It is not in criticism of their administration, but it is trying to keep in the Department of the Interior the questions involving interstate rivers, and let the United States be the banker to start these intrastate river projects, and then leaving it up to the States who are willing to assume the responsibility of reimbursing the National Government for every dollar they have in the project. This would be more to the benefit of the landowners, would get more rapid decisions, and perhaps would even bring more economical administration. I hope to elaborate more on this proposition in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, what we are discussing this afternoon in the Committee is a specific bill and the wording of that bill. I say that in all seriousness. From noon today up to the present time, I have heard arguments on this floor in favor of the value of reclamation. I have heard discussions of the urgent need of water in the western part of the United States, but I have not heard all of the discussion that I wanted to hear on the specific detail of the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I served for 4 years as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I served very happily on that committee, and was sorry to leave it, but I was one of the Members of the House who was compelled to give up certain committees, under the terms of the Reorganization Act. I served under the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], and under his predecessor, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]. I regret that I cannot now serve as I would like to, under the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], nor on the subcommittee of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

This bill is not new to that committee. This bill has been discussed at length, and the arguments that are embodied on this bill are perhaps still not completely finished.

Laws are made by bringing bills before committees, and eventually and hopefully bringing them out of committees, and then discussing them on the floor, and then, in the wisdom of the Members of the House, sending the bill, if the House so decides, to the other body, in the form in which a majority of the Members want it.

For our discussion today we can divide this bill easily into three parts. There is the question of whether this House wishes to give more power to the Reclamation Bureau, an agency of the Department of the Interior. A great many Members of this House on both sides of the aisle have gone out in their campaigns in the last 5 years and have spoken very firmly on the subject of wanting to go down to Washington to do what they could to limit the powers of governmental agencies and of departments.

I think as I read the bill that that section beginning on page 4 and extending beyond that to about page 5 or 6 does in some ways extend the powers of the Department of the Interior and those of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Commissioner beyond the powers which these agencies or individuals previously had in their hands. Thus we have a question to decide here: Shall we extend the power of the Bureau of Reclamation in view of the fact that Congress has repeatedly committed itself to limiting the powers of governmental departments? I shall offer no amendment on that point, but I understand a member of the committee intends to offer an amendment to leave the powers of the Commissioner where they exist now and not to extend them; and I, as one Member of the House, will vote for that amendment.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. D'EWART. I merely wish to state that the part to which the gentleman referred only extends the power as to the Secretary in determining the feasibility, not in determining the cost of construction or the construction of the dam.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman, and I am glad that is now a part of the RECORD.

The second part of the bill—and this has been a subject of continuous discussion before the committee—has to do with what we refer to as the interest component. How much of the interest, as you heard this afternoon, shall be applied to reclamation, reduction of reclamation costs, and how much shall be applied to the reduction of power costs? As it appears in this bill, it is, in my opinion, a compromise, and I think the committee has done a commendable job to bring out on the floor a compromise on so highly controversial a subject as the interest component which has been discussed, to my personal knowledge, for 5 years before the present subcommittee and its predecessor committee.

I am not saying that I like this settlement; I am not saying that if I had written it, any more than I think if some members of the committee had written it as they wanted it, it would have been exactly this way; but it is what I call a compromise and it is my intention to support the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], in that compromise which we now find in the bill.

But when you come to the third feature in the bill, which is the extension of time in which a project may be declared feasible, by no stretch of the imagination—to me at least—can that be called a compromise. It has been called a compromise on this floor today. The Bureau of Reclamation either by law or by

custom is accustomed to declaring a project feasible if it can pay itself out in 40 years. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] asked where that originated. I do not know, but I strongly suspect as a man who was formerly on city councils and local governmental agencies that it was adopted from the rule that Government securities, Government bonds, are usually required to run no more than 40 years.

Mr. D'EWART. If the gentleman from California will reread that particular section he will find that the 78 years does not apply to feasibility but applies only to the repayment of the money.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am corrected. The bill applies to the ability of the district to repay for power only in this bill, in that length of time; but the All-American Canal, which has been referred to, is compelled by law to repay within 39 years.

The gentleman from Wyoming said this afternoon that a project had been permitted at 69 years. So this is not a compromise. Here is 78 years—beyond anything that we have discussed so far or accepted. I feel very strongly on the fact that 78 years is opening the door wider for projects than this Congress has ever before, or should now, open that door. It does not mean that a project cannot be built if it cannot be paid for in 40 years. It means that Congress must say it is willing it should be built, and not place authorizing power more strongly than it rests now in the hands of an agency of Government.

I understand an amendment will be offered to bring it back to 50 years, and that this amendment will be offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations having to do with the Department of the Interior, who is so familiar with this cost problem. I shall certainly support that amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman agree with me that under existing law there is no limitation whatsoever except the useful life of the project and it might well be over 100 years under the law at the present time?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I will agree with the gentleman that under existing law such a thing might be possible, but custom is one deterrent and the unwillingness of a Secretary of the Interior to take upon himself the responsibility of deciding that is another. But if you write into the law that he may have the right on some basis of the life of a project, or the ability of the people to pay, or specify 78 years, then you know full well that the Secretary of any department would think himself authorized to extend the time to the full limit specified and discussed by the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT. May I say to the gentleman that, as I understand it—and I think I am correct—it is true that the average life of the project as estimated is 50 years, but the average pay-out is more than 60 years at the present time.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I do not think that is an argument—to suggest that we weaken the financial integrity of the project or the financial integrity of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is making it much worse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the gentleman and I formerly sat on the same committee. But he misses the entire point of the compromise which he would not have done if he had been on the committee, because I was at one end of that compromise. This bill takes away the 3 percent we get to help irrigation and I get only one-half percent, the other two going to help out projects as authorized by the bill. For giving up that 3 percent or 2½ percent, in return I get the 78 years, which works out not quite as good as the 2 percent or if it were 2½ percent to help irrigation. If the gentleman's amendment prevails it will defeat the very purpose of our compromise and it will do the very thing I am sure he would not want done if he were still a member of the committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman may call that a compromise, but I do not think giving more than anybody has had before is a compromise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in hearing the discussion of the two gentlemen from California, both of whom have raised some very important points. The last speaker, it seems to me, has touched on a point that if a certain amendment is adopted will destroy the effect of the whole bill. As the gentleman from North Dakota has pointed out, the whole purpose of this compromise legislation is to preserve the economic feasibility of these great projects. I think it is very important, and I would like to speak to the gentleman from California on the point that he made. If this bill is now amended, reducing the pay-cut period to 50 years, the ultimate effect will be an increase in the power rates. The reason that this compromise has been made by the committee was to see that, first, we would not destroy the economic feasibility of projects and, second, that there would not be any increase in power rates. It is clear what we are talking about in this bill. Some of us feel very strongly about Mr. LEMKE's bill. Some of us felt that the National Reclamation Association had no business to come before this Congress and stir up this issue. We felt we were getting along all right under existing legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, how does the gentleman know that I am going to support the amendment?

Mr. CARROLL. I did not say that the gentleman would. I am talking about the increase in power rates.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman's feeling that the power rates would necessarily be raised is not based on the evidence. That is the gentleman's point, is it not?

Mr. CARROLL. That is exactly my point.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. For example, if I may illustrate very briefly the one project with which I am personally very thoroughly familiar, the Reclamation Bureau is charging up against that project 60 percent of the income as the cost of operation when other projects in the same area are not running any more than 21 percent or 27 percent, and that is what is being charged into the cost, and not 50 years or 39 years. My point is that I believe that that is not the only factor in the power rates that you should consider.

Mr. CARROLL. I can assure the gentleman from California that that is the chief factor. As a matter of fact, all of the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior and all his experts said, that if you destroy the rate structure that now exists you will stop irrigation in the West and you will stop some of the great hydroelectric projects in the West. Now, what did he mean by that? That there are certain costs allocated to irrigation. Those have already been set. The pay-out period is 50 years. Many witnesses came before us. They said that they objected to the interest component going to pay off the cost allocated to irrigation. They wanted that money to go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury Department. We resisted, many of us, because we felt that when you do that, when you take away that money that was applied to the cost of irrigation, necessarily you place a greater burden on power revenue, and in order to get additional revenue you would have to increase the power rate. There is no doubt in my mind that that was the evidence, and that is a point on which every member of the committee will agree.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman understands that I am not opposing that part of the bill. The gentleman understands that I am talking primarily about the length of time—the 78 years.

Mr. CARROLL. But the point that the gentleman does not really understand—if I may be so bold—is the real purpose of this compromise. We extended the pay-out period so that we could give 2½ percent into the Treasury to pay the interest component into the Treasury. If we do not do that, then you will have to increase the power rate. The way that you do not increase the power rate is to extend the pay-out period 78 years, and I stand for correction if I am wrong on this to any member of the committee. Do I make myself clear on that?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I understand the gentleman but I do not neces-

sarily agree with him. But I will not take his time. A member of the committee, I think, will discuss it.

Mr. CARROLL. I am perfectly willing to answer questions.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think this has been worked out previously under the Department, and I think also the gentleman should understand, as I understand it, that the adoption of the amendment, which I hope will be offered, for 50 years, does not necessarily mean that no project will ever be built. It would pay itself out in longer time. I believe that projects of that kind must come to the Congress if we are to preserve the integrity of the Congress, and the financial integrity of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from Montana has very ably pointed out that we are talking about a pay-out, an extension of pay-out period for revenue purposes. Now, if you limit that to 50 years necessarily you must find the revenue to take care of the project. In order to do that, your revenue must come from some source. It cannot come from irrigation, it can come only from the sale of power, which means increasing the power rate. That is what the gentleman from New Mexico has been trying to tell this body, that there are influences working underneath trying to increase the power rates. I should think everybody in California will understand, with your great Central Valley Authority, what the basic issues here are.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. At the present time and under the ruling of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, 3 percent is allocated to irrigation. The bill reduces that to one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. CARROLL. That is exactly right.

Mr. WELCH. May I call the attention of my colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] to the fact that if under the amendment proposed the time is set back from 78 years to 50 years, it destroys the effectiveness of the bill, it emasculates it.

Mr. CARROLL. Not only does it do that but the experts have testified that it will destroy the economic feasibility of future projects.

Mr. WELCH. Projects cannot be amortized in 50 years.

Mr. CARROLL. I did not like this bill but I accepted the compromise because I thought that the Committee on Appropriations was holding a club over the West, and if we did not take this it might interfere with future projects.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I think the distinguished chairman of our committee made the point I have in mind, but is it not a fact that if the time specified in this bill is limited the whole effect of the bill is lost and we might as well send it back to committee, because it destroys the compromise and the whole integrated program upon which this bill is based?

Mr. CARROLL. There is no question about that. If they cut the limitation in this bill I will fight it as hard as I fought it originally in committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. I want to serve notice right now that if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California to set back the amortization period from 78 to 50 years is adopted, as chairman of the committee I shall, with the approval of the committee, move to recommit the bill, because that destroys the effectiveness of the bill, and small irrigation multiple projects cannot be amortized.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I do not believe the testimony before the committee shows that changing this time raises or lowers the interest rate. I do not think that was the purpose of extending the time. The purpose of extending the time, as I recall the testimony, was to make other projects feasible, not to affect the rate that will be charged. In other words, under the reclamation law the irrigator is going to have to pay according to his ability. Whether we have this law or the old one, the man using the electricity is going to pay the same rate under this law as under the old one, but by adding the two together and extending the time we make projects feasible that were not otherwise feasible.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; I think the gentleman will agree with me that if we set a limitation of 50 years and change the interest component it necessarily means an increase in the power rate, because you have to have more revenue.

Mr. D'EWART. No; I do not think the evidence shows that.

Mr. CARROLL. I am sorry; I disagree with the gentleman. We discussed that for months. I take a different view.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2873 is a measure that will be of assistance to the West. I am for the development of our natural resources and, while this bill may not suit every individual, it is a good bill and I shall support it. As stated in the committee report, the bill is one which the Western States, the Federal Government, and the Nation as a whole can support wholeheartedly.

The extension of irrigation is a vital matter to many localities. From our national viewpoint it is a necessity. Our power development is needed also. There is a shortage of power in the country. The principle of public power has been well established. Believing that this bill will assist in these developments, I shall support it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by our esteemed chairman the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the very able chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], and our very able colleague the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] that the committee voted unanimously to send this bill out is true. However, I should like to give a little background of the history of this legislation, and also to point out the fact that this so-called compromise was effected during the last 12 or 24 hours the bill was before the committee. There was need for legislation. There is no argument about that. There is no argument over the fact that we need lower interests. I agree with them on that. I am for the power projects. I believe in helping irrigation in every way possible. This bill was before the Seventy-ninth Congress. It has been before this Congress and was one of the first bills that came up. We discussed it for weeks and weeks. Then, finally, we had a bill on which we voted in the subcommittee and on which there was disagreement. Then overnight the very capable attorneys from the Reclamation Division of the Department of the Interior came down and talked to some of the leaders in our committee and we have this compromise.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. You are absolutely mistaken. That compromise was made here on the floor between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], myself, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and was then submitted after we had agreed with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] and he was satisfied with it. That is how the compromise was made.

Mr. POULSON. All right; I will stand corrected. But was not the compromise presented within the last few days after this bill had been before the committee an entire session?

Mr. LEMKE. There had been attempts at compromise made all along and one time I thought we had a compromise.

Mr. POULSON. But was not the bill passed out immediately after that? After this compromise was it not immediately passed out?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes. The committee was waiting for the subcommittee to agree and when the subcommittee was agreed it went through the committee, and you were present at that hearing and at other hearings.

Mr. POULSON. Did not some of the attorneys offer some of the wording of this legislation?

Mr. LEMKE. I will say that I called up the Department and asked them to figure out for me what would be a reasonable recompense in the extension of time so as to repay for agreeing to let the interest go into the Federal Treasury, that is, the 2 percent. That was the reason for the compromise and that is the reason for the extension of time.

Mr. POULSON. I cannot yield further, but I do want to say that after this bill was brought out, then the attorneys who represent the various groups in southern California, the largest municipally owned department of water and power, the Colorado River Board and the

Metropolitan Water District and all of these public agencies, saw in this legislation wording which they felt was definitely detrimental to the interests of southern California. For that reason and that reason alone, I found it necessary to oppose certain phases of this legislation. Why do I oppose it in certain particulars? As you all realize, this legislation definitely lowers the standards of feasibility for any project which would give the Director of Reclamation the power to authorize a project. We in southern California have one very serious problem confronting us. There is legislation in the Senate as well as in the House for a project for Arizona involving $800,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 which absolutely has no semblance of feasibility. The minute we start lowering these standards of feasibility to such a low level that the Director or Commissioner of Reclamation can then determine that this is feasible, then we will have brought upon ourselves one of the most serious problems that could possibly confront southern California.

Whether or not they planned this bill according to the best legal advice we were able to get, if you will turn to page 9 of the bill, you will find it reads as follows:

Page 9, line 2: "; (3) the return, without interest, within a reasonable period of years not exceeding the useful life of the irrigation features, and with respect to each irrigation block, in a period conforming so far as practicable to the period within which water users are required to repay their share of the irrigation costs, of that share of the investment found by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 9 (a) hereof to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power revenues."

Now, just last week the attorneys for the Reclamation Division of the Department of the Interior presented to the committee their versions of a bill which complements this bill, and which will absolutely lower the standards to such an extent that it will not be necessary for them to come before Congress to authorize any project. Let me read from this draft of a bill which their attorney presented when we had another piece of legislation up here, which definitely shows the fine hand of the Department, whereby they are going to attempt to take within themselves powers which we in Congress think we have today.

Quoting from this draft which was presented from Mr. Will, of the Reclamation Division, to Mr. Harris, page 2:

Each contract entered into under the provisions of this subsection shall provide for such rates as, in the Secretary's judgment, will produce revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost and an appropriate share of such fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper, due consideration being given to that part of the cost of construction of works connected with water supply and allocated to irrigation and to the recovery of the actual cost of such works in a reasonable period of years, consistent with the Secretary's findings regarding the financial capacity of the organization and within the useful life of the project.

We know that over in Egypt that project ran for about 2,000 years. They run for at least 200 years over in this country. Now, what are they attempting to do? They are definitely attempting to take full control out of the hands of Congress, and then be able—I will not say they would do this, but this is what they could do: They could go out on about October 15, and they could say, "I, representing the President of the United States, am going to authorize a project in your district." That is exactly the type of power that we are giving them when we pass this bill, unless we make some amendments which I am going to offer tomorrow.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. My colleague from California is a member of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. POULSON. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. Why did not the gentleman offer the amendment before the Committee on Public Lands?

Mr. POULSON. Because the bill went out so fast that I never had a chance to talk to the attorneys representing the publicly owned department of water power in Los Angeles; the Colorado River Board, the metropolitan water districts, and others. I am not an attorney. I do not understand these clever manipulations of words which can mean two or three different things, to be interpreted by attorneys again. My esteemed colleague can give me credit for not being able to understand that particular thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] has expired.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Did not the gentleman join with his colleagues on the committee in unanimously reporting this bill after the so-called opposition from the attorneys in southern California had made their opposition known?

Mr. POULSON. Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, I represent the people of southern California, and if we find there is legislation which is definitely detrimental, and which has been placed there by attorneys on the last minute of the committee hearings, we certainly have the prerogative and the right to come out and oppose it. Does the gentleman say that a member of a committee, once voting for it, then finding there is something detrimental to his district, does not have the right to get up and oppose the bill? Does the gentleman say that?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WELCH. The purpose of this bill transcends the interest of southern California, northern California, Maine, Florida, or Louisiana. It is a national bill and not a sectional bill.

Mr. POULSON. All right. I ask the chairman if he is in favor of giving the power to any man regardless of political party to determine whether there shall be a project or not? Is he in favor of having Congress absolutely give up its power, abdicate? The Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Public Lands absolutely abdicate their authority over these projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] was very frank in stating his opposition to the present bill and also in indicating his intention to support certain amendments. His frankness leads him to say that he fears that the enactment of this bill would give encouragement or hope for a certain project in Arizona which he thinks might be harmful to southern California. I am very sorry the gentleman from California feels that way about it. I feel that it would be better for the gentleman from California to base his objections to any Arizona project on the merits or demerits of that project alone rather than to oppose a general reclamation bill which is intended to improve reclamation prospects in all of the 17 Western States.

This measure is indeed a general reclamation bill and applies under the given conditions to every one of the 17 reclamation States. It seems to me a part of wisdom to consider it on its own merit, as it affects all parts of the West—and I think beneficially—rather than raising objection to it because of the possible advantage which the gentleman from California thinks might accrue to the Central Arizona project on the passage of this bill.

Furthermore, perhaps the gentleman's fear that this bill, if it should become law, would help the central Arizona project to materialize is not well founded. No, if we pass this bill as it is it will have no effect whatsoever on the central Arizona project which the gentleman so positively opposes. No one thinks of the Secretary's finding of feasibility for a project like the central Arizona project. As the gentleman should know, the central Arizona project bill is now before the Public Lands Committee of the Senate in the form of an authorization. The proposal has been submitted to the States interested and it is my understanding that it would be impossible over the objection of any one State for the Secretary to make a finding of feasibility even if this bill were law.

I trust the gentleman from California will modify his objection to the Central Arizona project, but in any case his objection on that ground has no validity. Therefore, this objection might jeopardize the passage of this worthy measure for reasons that have no connection with the measure. If this bill is good for projects yet unborn in all the Western States—as I believe it is—it would indeed be a sad mistake to vote against it on the erroneous ground that to do so would

defeat a project one wanted to thwart. Such would be not only harmful but ineffectual.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time the committee substitute bill will be read as an original bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) No expenditures for the construction of any new project, new division of a project or new supplemental works on a project shall be made nor shall estimates be submitted therefor by the Secretary until after he has made an investigation thereof and has submitted to the President and to the Congress his report and findings on—

"(1) the engineering feasibility of the proposed construction;

"(2) the estimated cost of the proposed construction;

"(3) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be repaid by the water users;

"(4) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues and from sources other than the users of water for irrigation purposes to the end of providing the necessary measure of assistance in repayment of irrigation construction costs;

"(5) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to commercial power and which together with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate of not less than 2½ percent per annum can probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues;

"(6) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes and probably be returned to the United States;

"(7) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to (i) preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife pursuant to the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), or (ii) recreation, including recreation by reason of the provision of enlarged or improved facilities or conditions specifically and reasonably required for such purposes, or (iii) general salinity control, or (iv) silt control. Costs allocated pursuant to such findings, together with the annual operation and maintenance costs attributable to the same purposes, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable;

"(8) the economic benefit-cost ratio of the proposed construction.

"If the proposed construction is found by the Secretary to have engineering feasibility and if the repayable and returnable allocations to irrigation, power, and municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes found by the Secretary to be proper pursuant to subdivisions (3), (4), (5), and (6) hereof, together with any allocation to flood control or navigation made under subsection (b) of this section, and together with any allocation made pursuant to subdivision (7) hereof, which shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable, equal the total estimated cost of construction as determined by the Secretary, then the new project, new division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, covered by his findings, shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken by the Secretary. If all such allocations do not equal said total estimated cost, then said new project, new division, or new supplemental works may be undertaken by the Secretary only after provision therefor has been made by act of Congress enacted after the Secretary has submitted to the President and the Congress the report and findings involved. The Secretary may make findings with respect to projects heretofore authorized as to that part of the cost thereof which should be allocated in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (7) hereof and in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, and such part of said costs shall, after transmittal to the President and the Congress of a report containing such findings, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. Operation and maintenance costs attributable to the purposes enumerated in subdivision (7) hereof shall, after the transmittal of any such report, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter to him from Mr. James Pearson, of Shenandoah, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICAN MARITIME LABOR AND THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent war, many a torpedo was fired at an American merchant ship, and when it struck its mark quite a few jobs for American seamen went up in smoke and flame. However, never before has a torpedo been fired with such possible dire consequences as the one launched by the State Department's European recovery program. A German or a Japanese torpedo might sink one ship and deprive a few men of their jobs—the State Department's model ERP, 1948, will do just 500 times better than the best German or Japanese weapon and, most amazing to relate, the model ERP, 1948, torpedo was not designed or fabricated by technicians who know naval ordnance, seamanship, or shipping, but, rather, at the technical level by two Rhodes scholars, three professors, an investment banker, and a career bureaucrat. Nevertheless, I must confess, that it is an amazingly efficient weapon of destruction for the American merchant marine.

On January 13, I invited the attention of the House to the fact that acceptance of the European recovery program, as submitted to the Congress by the State Department, would sound the death knell of an adequate American merchant marine. The transfer of 500 vessels to foreign flags, as proposed in the ERP, would nullify the policy declaration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and would deplete seriously our national defense reserve of merchant vessels.

Today, I intend to discuss the personnel angle of this ERP proposal, for it takes men as well as ships to make a merchant marine. A knowledge of the effect of the State Department's proposals on our American seamen and our American shipyard workers is essential to an intelligent understanding of this shipping problem.

The appropriation bill passed by the Congress last month contained $1,300,000 for the reconversion unemployment program for seamen. This money was needed due to the exhaustion of a $900,000 appropriation made last spring. The initial appropriation was used up, after only 5 months of the fiscal year had passed, due to the unexpected return of 372 chartered American vessels to the laid-up fleet between July and November 1947. The causes of this marked decline in the United States flag merchant fleet were the numerous transfers of American war-built vessels to foreign flags and the considerable number of new vessels from foreign shipyards—notably from those of Great Britain. The world's supply today of dry cargo vessels, in the 7,000 to 10,000 deadweight ton category, is far in excess of the world's demands. Nevertheless, such ships are being built in quantity in European yards, in large measure with steel obtained from the United States. We are following the seemingly absurd policy of delaying essential construction of passenger and other types of vessels in American yards because of the steel shortage here while, at the same time, we are shipping large quantities of steel to Europe for the construction of similar-type vessels in foreign yards.

Our merchant fleet is the marginal fleet of the world. Every ship transferred by us to a foreign flag, every vessel constructed in a foreign yard, results in one more idle American ship and in added unemployment for at least 42 American seamen. The long-run effect of the shipbuilding race being carried on by the western European nations is sure to be a serious overbuilding of the world's merchant fleet. Under such a condition the world's resources are wasted and it is America that suffers most of all, for the merchant shipping so vital to our national defense withers and dies on the vine.

I am not one inclined to be an alarmist, but there is no use in minimizing the dangerous and explosive situation now existing between the United States and the Soviet Union. I sincerely hope we may find peaceful solutions to all of our disagreements and differences, but we failed to do so in the past when Germany, Italy, and Japan were concerned, and we may fail to do so with startling rapidity in the future where Russia is concerned.

One of the absolute essentials for the waging of successful war overseas is a big merchant marine. We may talk about air power as we will. We may believe that air power will deliver the first blows; we may believe that it will deliver tremendously effective blows; we may believe that it is the paramount arm of the fighting services. I care not how many such assumptions we concede, the fact still remains that now, and within the next few years, at least, a big merchant

marine is necessary for the successful conduct of overseas warfare on a large scale.

We have that merchant marine. Russia does not have it and cannot build it in the near future. The one way she can get a big merchant marine quickly is to capture it through the sudden conquest of western European nations and the taking over of their ships. You may say, perhaps, that this is utterly fantastic. The overrunning of Poland, and France, and Holland, and Belgium, and Norway, and Denmark were fantastic; yet they were also real. You may say that if this should occur these ships would be brought to the United States by their foreign crews. Well, perhaps; and again, perhaps not. Dictators have ways of treating the families of those who go over to their enemies—ways which might well be quite effective in bringing about the delivery of most of these 500 ships to European ports.

In such event, a major part of these ships might well spell the added number needed for extensive overseas operations on the part of the Soviet Union—might well spell disaster for the American people. Who knows? And, not knowing, why take this unnecessary risk in a world such as we have today? We do not have any sugar daddy to look out for us if we get into trouble. The world considers us to be grown up and able to look out for ourselves. I hope the world is right.

The loss of 372 vessels from the active fleet, during the last 6 months of 1947, threw about 16,000 American seamen out of work. Neither the initial $900,000 nor the supplemental $1,300,000 appropriated for the unemployment program for seamen is a measure of the direct cost of seamen's unemployment. These Federal appropriations cover only unemployment for seamen who served on Government-owned vessels. Great numbers of seamen are entitled to unemployment benefits from State funds on the same basis as shoreside workers. As the States do not segregate their unemployment figures by occupations the full cost of unemployment among our merchant seamen is not easily ascertainable.

But, Mr. Speaker, the cost in the terms of human suffering is ascertainable. Just consider the problems faced by the families of American seamen. Supported by an occupation which allows at best only 9 or 10 months of earnings during the year, the families of seamen even now are faced with long periods of existence on $18 to $21 per week, from unemployment insurance. In the light of present-day living costs, such benefits do no more than meet food bills—and perhaps they cannot even buy sufficient food for a wife and children in a seaport city. In the event of the adoption of the ERP plan, the lot of the seaman's family will be even more difficult and discouraging.

The transfer of 500 American vessels means immediate loss of 30,330 jobs in the seagoing branch of the maritime industry—22,750 officers and seamen will be deprived of billets on board ship; 7,580 men ashore awaiting employment will be deprived of decent opportunities to serve at sea—all of this supposedly in the best interests of the American people. Because it has been traditional to rotate employment in the maritime industry on a "first-in first-out basis," the effects of this surge of unemployment will be felt by every seaman. Time on the beach awaiting a ship, which now ranges from a week up to 5 or 6 weeks, varying according to rating and port, will be stretched to 8, 9, or 10 weeks in virtually every rating and every port.

And then the effects of this proposed ship transfer will be felt in ship-repair yards and in countless other industries which supply maritime needs.

Workers in private shipyards employed on new construction have fallen already from a wartime peak—from 1,700,000 to 33,000. The only employment now keeping minimum shipyard labor forces together, and preserving the core of the shipbuilding industry in this Nation, is the ship-repair work, which currently employs a little more than 70,000 men. With the transfer of 500 additional vessels to foreign flags—with repair work on these vessels being done in foreign yards—the bottom will drop out of American shipyard employment in some instances.

Employees of ship-chandlering firms, of steamship offices, of maritime insurance companies, and other such shoreside industries will be hard hit.

Let us make no mistake about current conditions. Our maritime labor is no longer made up of an expanded wartime force. During the war we had over 240,000 merchant seamen afloat simultaneously out of a total maritime labor force of about 275,000 officers and men. Today we are down to far less than half that number. Experienced former seamen, recalled for the war, and many thousands of seamen trained for the war, have returned to shore-side pursuits. The present-day force is composed of skilled men who desire to go to sea as a permanent occupation.

We entered the war with approximately 55,000 active seamen. The lives and health of these men were endangered gravely by their lack in number for they were spread so thinly over our rapidly expanding merchant fleet that their physical endurance was taxed to the limit. After doing their own jobs, they willingly went on and did much of the work of green men recruited to get the ships to sea. Eighty thousand seven hundred and fifty-nine men are required to operate the very minimum merchant fleet which the President's Advisory Committee on Merchant Marine deems essential for the national defense. We have these men now—a distinct element in the security of America—but we shall not have them long if the proposed shipping provisions of ERP are approved by Congress.

The Paris report of the 16 western European nations contemplates a 1951 maritime labor force for the United States which, at best, equals only our prewar number. I do not believe that this Congress should accept the responsibility for such a dissipation of our skilled maritime manpower.

We have heard much of an alleged $200,000,000 saving if we transfer 500 American vessels to foreign flags. Let me remind you of the appropriations for recruitment and training for maritime labor during the recent war. For the fiscal year 1943, $53,500,000; for the fiscal year 1944, $63,225,360; for the fiscal year 1945, $67,980,795; and for the fiscal year 1946, $39,598,710. Thus a total of $224,304,865 was expended on recruitment and training of maritime labor alone during those four war years, a figure in excess of the total alleged savings from the transfer of 500 vessels to foreign flags. This dollar total does not include the loss of vessels, the loss of life, the loss of cargoes, and the heavy accident and sickness tolls resulting from failure to maintain an adequate and skilled maritime labor force.

Then again, this figure does not include any part of the tremendous sums spent on the recruitment and training of shipyard labor.

Let us never forget that our seamen are Americans. They and their families spend most of their earnings for American products. Their taxes help finance this Government. If we add the cost of recruitment and training programs, the cost of unemployment benefits which will accrue, the losses in purchasing power and in tax payments from unemployment, and compare this sum with the alleged savings involved in the proposed transfer of vessels, I am sure that the alleged savings will look very seasick indeed.

American seamen, as do American ships, provide other nations with dollars for exchange. American seamen spend dollars in foreign ports. American ships spend dollars for dock charges, harbor duties, food, and many other items in overseas ports. We should keep this definitely in mind.

Let us, as Americans, now consider the wage standards and working conditions which will prevail in these ships if they are transferred to foreign flags.

In June 1946, the twenty-eighth session of the International Labor Organization, the International Maritime Convention, convened in Seattle, Wash. The convention had before it a series of international agreements establishing a minimum world-wide labor code for the maritime industry.

The convention on wages, hours, and manning was by far the most important of these proposed agreements.

The United States had a then-established monthly wage for an AB—able-bodied seaman—of $145 and, during the course of the convention, a new contract negotiated in the maritime industry, raised this minimum wage to $172.50 and reduced the working hours at sea to 48 per week. Today, the American AB receives $192 to $197 per month, and there is an arbitration proceeding in progress which may raise this figure. Minimum standards proposed for adoption at the Seattle convention were modest indeed. A basic monthly wage of £18 or $72 was suggested for able seamen with a maximum working week of 56 hours. The United States delegation sought a higher world-wide minimum wage and a shorter workweek. The European delegations, following the lead of the British, insisted upon a minimum of £16 or $64 per month and the convention adopted this figure for a 56-hour working week.

Our delegation was disappointed in the results, but was pleased by the fact that the principle of an international wage-and-hour minimum had been established, and that some progress had been made toward raising the level of seamen in the most substandard foreign fleets.

Within recent weeks the British Government has announced that it will not ratify the Convention of Wages, Hours, and Manning. It was recognized at Seattle that the ratifications of the United States and Great Britain are essential for the convention to have any real meaning. As the British are now paying a wage in excess of $64, their decision not to ratify is due apparently to their desire to avoid the maximum 56-hour week provisions of the convention. We are thus witnessing the very sorry spectacle of a labor government refusing to support a very minimum of labor standards. These are the wage standards and the working conditions to which we are being asked to transfer 500 American ships.

Mr. Speaker, does any Member of this House want to go on record as favoring a labor standard below a $64 minimum monthly wage and a working week in excess of 56 hours?

American labor is unalterably opposed to the proposals of the State Department in regard to the transfer of vessels as proposed in ERP. I believe American labor deserves the support of every Member of Congress in its battle to maintain our merchant fleet.

The Master, Mates, and Pilots, the Seafarers International Union, and the Sailors Union of the Pacific have consistently opposed the gift of American ships and of seamen's jobs to foreign nations. In testimony before congressional committees, in their own publications, and in countless letters to the Congress, the representatives and members of these organizations have stressed the sad effects of such a policy on the American merchant marine.

The CIO is equally firm in opposition to the proposed transfers. Many of the Members of this House are familiar with the informative and constructive suggestions advanced by the CIO maritime committee for the shipbuilding industry of this Nation. The day before President Truman called upon the Congress to deliver this ERP left-hook to the jaw of the American merchant marine, CIO's president, Philip Murray, presented to President Truman a program for the maintenance of a strong United States merchant marine. Although the program was completely ignored in the President's message, I believe it is well worth the attention of every Member of Congress, whether or not he finds himself in complete agreement with Mr. Murray.

The opposition registered by all labor organizations to further transfer of vessels is not a policy originating among labor leaders. Rather, it is a policy dictated by the rank and file of labor—a policy expressed in resolutions and letters from the crews of hundreds of American-flag vessels operating on the high seas of the world. It is a policy formulated by the leaders of labor in response to the demands of the common man.

Seamen are prolific letter writers. The journals of the seamen's organizations, the Pilot of the National Maritime Union; the Voice, of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards; the Seafarers Log, of the Sailors Union of the Pacific; and many other such papers publish pages of letters from the membership of their respective organizations. A review of the letter columns of these publications shows that the most burning question today among American seamen is the proposed foreign-flag transfer of American vessels, and the threat of unemployment and want that such transfer holds for them and their families, for we should ever keep in mind that merchant officers and merchant seamen are married, just as you and I are married, and that they have homes and children, even as you and I have homes and children.

In recognition of the soundness of the position of the personnel of the American Merchant Fleet, in appreciation of their wartime services, in understanding of the contribution they have made and are continuing to make to the security and well-being of the Nation, the Congress should give heed to these voices coming to us from the sea and from the shipyards of America. There should be no further transfer of our vessels to foreign flags. Relief cargoes should be carried chiefly in American ships, for the well-being of all America.

REREFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that certain bills which I shall enumerate, which have been inadvertently referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, be rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bills.

I may state that I have consulted with the Parliamentarian and am advised that these bills have been wrongly referred because the jurisdiction of the committees has been changed under the Reorganization Act. I have conferred with the author of each of the bills and also with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and there is no objection.

The bills are as follows:

H. R. 790, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, by providing for a hearing of claims of employees of the United States before the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

H. R. 970, a bill to increase the compensation for total disability granted employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916,

H. R. 1872, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended.

H. R. 2047, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States.

H. R. 2048, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended.

H. R. 3480, a bill to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to increase the maximum and minimum monthly compensation.

H. R. 3596, a bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," to clarify the eligibility for benefits of certain employees detained by the enemy in the Philippine Islands.

H. R. 3673, a bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3927, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing a speech of the Honorable Josephus Daniels, which on yesterday I sought permission to print, will be approximately $177.50. I ask unanimous consent that this speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech recorded by him and broadcast over Station WWJ on Monday, January 19.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

EIGHT HUNDRED DOLLARS SALARY INCREASE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in 1945, postal employees received their first increase in pay in 20 years. This $400 per annum upward revision represented a 20-percent increase, which was long overdue. It was entirely inadequate to keep pace with rising living costs and it did not anticipate the feverish jump in prices which has taken place in the past year and a half.

The gap between the fixed salaries of postal workers and the income needed to maintain a decent standard of living is widening. The strain is beginning to tell. Many postal workers are being forced to take outside jobs, on time that should be spent in rest or recreation, in an attempt to bridge the deficit. This is making serious inroads on their health, their peace of mind, and their efficiency. They cannot carry this double burden for long without cracking. It is our responsibility to prevent this by providing for an immediate pay increase for our loyal and hardworking postal employees,

In 1945 they received a 20-percent raise, but since 1941 the cost of living has zoomed over three times this figure. What about the difference? How is it compensated for? By dipping into savings which are disappearing. By going into debt.

We are preparing to appropriate billions for European recovery and billions for national defense, with small regard for the inevitable element of waste involved and yet we raise the cry of penny-pinching economy when the security of our own essential and constructive Government services is at stake. Small wonder that there is restlessness among our people to the indifference of Government to their needs.

To the specious argument that if our postal workers will only hang on and endure, everything will return to normal at some unspecified time in the distant future, I say: this is cruel and dangerous.

Prices will never go all the way back to prewar levels. If and as our economy goes forward, most of the pay increases won by our industrial workers will become permanent. The forgotten segments of our workers must try to catch up or find themselves losing ground before the higher minimum standard for living.

Could it be that Government workers are being ground into poverty because they cannot strike?

Workers in industry have been forced to strike on two occasions since the end of the war in order to win necessary wage increases. And a third round of strikes is coming up. But postal workers and all other Government workers are caught in an economic squeeze that will impoverish them unless financial help is soon forthcoming.

Here are the facts.

Wages in retail trade have gone up nearly 70 percent since 1939.

In manufacturing, they have increased over 100 percent in a like period.

In coal mining, they have increased 175 percent.

In the postal service, 20 percent.

Profits interestingly enough have more than doubled since 1939.

As against these incomes, the prices of all items have climbed 65 percent above the 1935–39 average.

Apparel prices have been boosted 90 percent.

Food has skyrocketed in price over 100 percent.

Where does this leave the postal worker and his skimpy 20 percent increase? In a truly desperate situation, for which we, the Congress, must assume the responsibility. It is in our power to correct this intolerable situation at once, by enacting into law the Butler bill—H. R. 4640—which provides for a $800 yearly increase for postal workers. This, added to the $400 increase granted in 1945, will total up to an increase of 60 percent since 1925.

Indifference may be excused on the grounds of ignorance but ingratitude has no case. I prefer to assume that we have taken our loyal and hard-working postal workers for granted, and that it is time for us to wake up and see that justice is done in the matter of the pressing need for increased compensation.

Put yourselves in their position. How would you like to carry a heavy bag of mail all day long, or sort thousands of pieces of mail until one arm goes numb and you have to shift to the other for relief? Where is the incentive for working hard when a man finds that his pay is shrinking in its purchasing power? Is this the American method of rewarding conscientious service?

We, as Members of Congress, are doubly indebted to the men and women of the postal service. They do the work of delivering thousands of letters and pamphlets to our constituents at no cost to ourselves.

The postal service enables all the millions of people in this country to communicate with each other, and with friends and relatives all over the world. With each passing day, business and industry rely more heavily upon this dependable service.

What would happen if it broke down?

That is the measure of its importance and the reward which it should receive for serving us so well. Let business leaders and labor leaders speak up for their friends the carriers and clerks of the United States Post Office Department. Above all, let Congress appropriate sufficient funds to help them make both ends meet.

The President has called our attention to this problem of underpaid Government workers.

The next move is ours, and there is only one move. Give to the men and women who make Government function the increased pay which they deserve and need.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3342. An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 21, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1222. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued FPC Reports, volume 5, which contains all opinions issued by the Commission during the period of January 1 to December 31, 1946, and in addition contains selected orders in the nature of decisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1223. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1947, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1224. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, covering operations for the fiscal year of 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1225. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to give the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1226. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1227. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1228. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the certified flying pay report, showing the average number of officers above the rank of major receiving flight pay during the period April 1 to October 1, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1229. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the furnishing of services and the temporary detail of United States employees to public international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1230. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Sixty-first Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4505. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4836. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3506. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for a new Federal building in Huntington, W. Va., adjoining existing Federal buildings there, as an economy measure, before land values have increased as a result of improvements; with amendment (Rept. No. 1248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4967. A bill to provide for

the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building and for remodeling of the existing main post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5055. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3596) to amend the act of December 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," to clarify the eligibility for benefits of certain employees detained by the enemy in the Philippine Islands; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 3480) to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to increase the maximum and minimum monthly compensation; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 2048) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 2047) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 1872) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 970) to increase the compensation for total disability granted employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 790) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, by providing for a hearing of claims of employees of the United States before the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 3673) to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol, and for other purposes; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 3927) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5029. A bill to provide for certain payments to States, Territories, and possessions, and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5030. A bill to provide for a Federal building at Kodiak, Alaska, for use as a jail and other Federal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 5031. A bill to restore the right of American citizens to freely own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to establish and maintain a domestic gold-coin standard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5032. A bill authorizing the modification and expansion of the flood-control project for the Clinton River, Mich., to include improvements for flood control and other purposes on Red Run, a tributary of the Clinton River, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 5033. A bill to amend section 7 (b) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to advance the effective date of within-grade salary advancements; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5034. A bill to amend sections 3 and 15 of the Immigration Act approved May 26, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 5035. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the eighty-second national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5036. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5037. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers' excise taxes articles sold to hospitals not organized for profit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5038. A bill to terminate the war excise tax rate on theater tickets and other types of amusement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 5039. A bill to increase the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts and before United States Commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5040. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 5041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5042. A bill to amend and extend the maximum-rent provisions of Public Law 129, Eightieth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5043. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the eldest children of veterans of World War II where the veterans have received no educational benefits under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 5044. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5045. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act to protect the insurance against lapse by crediting to the insured dividends from the excess of premiums over death costs chargeable thereto and by automatic payment of premiums from the accumulated credits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5046. A bill to grant an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5047. A bill to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 5048. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral rights; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 5049. A bill to reopen the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 5050. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate and to increase and intensify research in the perfection of a vaccine for hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5051. A bill to add section 3a to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 5052. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 5053. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5054. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution relating to the authority to allocate the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral

spirits for beverage purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution to effectuate the principles of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to effectuate the principles of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of January 19, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 436. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to make investigation on matters coming within jurisdiction of the committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 437. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4244; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 438. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3565; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 439. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4243; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 440. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3748; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 441. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3016; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 442. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1335; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 443. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4309; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 444. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4212; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 5055. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5056. A bill for the relief of Lewyt Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 5057. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth DeCourcy and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5058. A bill for the relief of Walter Wetteschreck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5059. A bill to authorize Martin Travieso, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, to accept a decoration from the French Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of John S. Steber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 5061. A bill for the relief of James B. DeHart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 5062. A bill for the relief of Peter Kristian Kristensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1170. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Robert C. Reigert and 214 other veterans, students at the University of Cincinnati, in support of an increase in subsistence rates under Public Laws 346 and 16; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1171. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 75 residents of Butler County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1172. Also, petition of 16 residents of New Castle, Pa., in favor of S. 265, a bill to abolish liquor advertisements in magazines, radio programs, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1173. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 36 residents of Somerton, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committe on Armed Services.

1174. Also, petition of 225 residents of Steubenville, Ohio, and vicinity, circulated by the American Legion Auxiliary of Argonne Post, No. 33, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1175. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of 54 residents of Snow Hill, Md., and 2 residents of Pocomoke City, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1176. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Crisfield, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1177. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Petition of citizens of Indiana County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1178. Also, petition of citizens of Armstrong County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1179. Also, petition of citizens of Cambria County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1180. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Roy C. Morgan, commander, New Milford Post, No. 217, American Legion, and 80 members of that post, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1181. Also, petition of F. C. Hazard, adjutant, Teaneck Post, No. 128, American Legion, Teaneck, N. J., and 61 members of that post, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1182. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mary Strobel and others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to lower foreign postage rate; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1183. Also, petition of Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 2848; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord most high and very near, to whose mind the past and the future meet in this very day, hear us as we pray.

The great questions that stand unanswered before us defy our best wisdom.

Though our ignorance is great, at least we know we do not know.

When we do not know what to say, keep us quiet.

When we do not know what to do, let us ask of Thee, that we may find out.

We dare to ask for light upon only one step at a time.

We would rather walk with Thee than jump by ourselves.

We ask this in the name of Jesus Christ, who promised to send us a guide into all truth. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KNOWLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous request, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 19, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R Sharp;

S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.;

S. 136 An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;

S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.;

S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil;

S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;

S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard;

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss;

S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.;

S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; and

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gandiaga.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564); and

S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3111) for the relief of Louis H. Deaver.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 232) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JENNINGS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. CRAVENS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 108. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes;

H. R. 358. An act for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 420. An act for the relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Michel Ferapontow;

H. R. 896. An act for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 927. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu;

H. R. 1189. An act to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lawrence Reves;

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ionnetos or Tom Panage Yanatos);

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer;

H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;

H. R. 1653. An act for the relief of Edward W. Bigger;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;

H. R. 1809. An act to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1859. An act for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizenga;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2218. An act for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards;

H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States;

H. R. 2425. An act for the relief of August Dane Tetuaero;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2502. An act to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon;

H. R. 2557. An act for the relief of Mable Gladys Viducich;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;

H. R. 3061. An act for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski);

H. R. 3067. An act for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mae H. Fitzgerald;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante;

H. R. 3263. An act for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Martin A. King;

H. R. 3538. An act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage;

H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy;

H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25);

H. R. 3814. An act to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.;

H. R. 3849. An act for the relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3930. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 4141. An act to amend subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to extend for 2 years the time within which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous insurance benefits;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers;

H. R. 4403. An act for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida; and

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 3111. An act for the relief of Louis H. Deaver;

H. R. 3342. An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FURNISHING OF SERVICES AND DETAIL OF UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES TO PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the furnishing of services and the temporary detail of United States employees to public international organizations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSOLIDATION AND REVISION OF LAW RELATING TO THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO TRANSMISSION AND SALE OF ELECTRIC ENERGY

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Bonneville Administrator covering the transmission and sale of electric energy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL PLANT, MUSCATINE, IOWA

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENTS OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers, and to give the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, reporting pursuant to law, the average number of officers above the rank of major receiving flight pay during the period April 1 to October 1, 1947, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixty-first annual report of that Commission for the period November 1, 1946, to October 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the period ended November 1, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1947, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

OPINIONS AND DECISIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting volume 5 of its reports, pertaining to the opinions and decisions of that Commission for the calendar year 1946 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN RELATIONS BY INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE, ETC.

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, recommending an amendment to the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A letter from Representative RICHARD B. VAIL transmitting a letter from Ohio Bell, of Chicago, Ill., relating to certain changes in a petition heretofore presented to the Senate by him (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

The petition of Vergil D. McMillan, of Washington, D. C., praying for an investigation of the administration of the National Capital Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF LAWS AND REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO CERTAIN WIDOWS OF VETERANS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from the Doucette-Lingard Post, No. 1624, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Gloucester, Mass., requesting Congress to amend all present laws and regulations pertaining to widows and other dependents of the veterans of any wars to authorize these widows and other dependents existing pensions without regard to any other income which they may be receiving from other sources. This resolution further requests that all income received by any widow or other surviving dependent be made free from Federal taxation.

I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has charge of this matter.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved in regular meeting assembled of the Doucette-Lingard Post, No. 1624, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Gloucester, Mass., That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to amend all existing laws and regulations pertaining to widows and other dependents of veterans of any wars participated in by the armed forces of the United States to allow (authorize) the previously mentioned widows and other dependents to draw the existing pensions regardless of any other income which they may be receiving from any source whatsoever; also be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to make all income received by any widow or other dependent of any veterans exempt from all taxation by Federal Government.

Unanimously passed, December 10, 1947.

DOUCETTE-LINGARD POST,
No. 1624, VFW.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA STATE GRANGE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a resolution from Joab K. Mahood, secretary of the Pennsylvania State Grange, Harrisburg, Pa., setting forth the stand taken by his group in opposition to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

I do not agree with the stand taken in this matter by this group, but send their resolution to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the recurrent floods which sweep down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers and their tributaries have for many years taken a heavy toll of life and property; and

Whereas the floods along these rivers during the present year were among the worst on record, destroying crops, inundating millions of acres of farm lands, washing away the fertile topsoil, and inflicting heavy damages on other forms of property; and

Whereas Congress has approved a comprehensive plan for harnessing these rivers and putting an end to this wanton waste of our natural resources, which is sapping the life of the Nation and endangering the food supply of this and succeeding generations of Americans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania State Grange urge the appropriation of adequate Federal funds to translate the plan in this connection into reality as speedily as the work can properly be done; and be it further

Resolved, That we believe it would be in accord with sound public policy to hold in abeyance an international project like the development of the St. Lawrence seaway while we devote our money, materials, and energies to the completion of this urgently needed and vitally important domestic undertaking.

Adopted by the Pennsylvania State Grange at New Castle, Pa., October 30, 1947.

APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made by me as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee in connection with the appointment of Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, MEMBER OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. LAURENCE S. KUTER TO THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The significance of the unusual legislation requested by the President with respect to the appointment of Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, a general officer of the Army of the United States, to membership on the Civil Aeronautics Board is emphasized by the invitation of the President to the membership of the Armed Services Committee to discuss this matter with him.

I think it is important that the real issue should be clearly defined, and I want my own position known.

The President requested Chairman GURNEY, of the Armed Services Committee, to introduce a special bill which would allow General Kuter to be appointed as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board (a civilian agency) and retain military emoluments of his active status as a major general in the Army, including pay, retirement, etc. These financial emoluments are: Base pay, $8,800; flight pay, $4,400; rental and subsistence allowance, $1,944; making a total of $15,144, while the civilian members of the Board would receive only $10,000.

I am informed that by informal agreement with the Air Corps, General Kuter could continue to draw flight pay without military flying. This would be a special exception, which I especially disapprove. General Kuter would receive his pay from the Army and, in turn, the Army would be reimbursed

from the appropriation made for the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I fully concur in what has been said as to the ability of General Kuter, but I think it is a most unwise procedure to transfer officers from active service in the military branches of the Government, where they owe primary allegiance to civilian duties, and then pay them, as in this case, $5,000 annually more than is received by those appointed from civilian life.

Not only is the principle of unequal compensation involved, but, likewise, if such appointments are continued, they would develop a dangerous dominance by military services over civilian departments. The Armed Services Committee unanimously disapproved the bill when it was first proposed.

With regret, therefore, I am unable to agree to the President's additional request today that I withdraw my opposition to this special legislation for General Kuter.

We must be careful not to militarize the civilian functions and agencies of the Government.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1545. A bill to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; with amendments (Rept. No. 827); and

S. 1611. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 828).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I present an additional report of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to Federal personnel during November 1947. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with a statement by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report, together with the statement by Mr. BYRD, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, NOVEMBER 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH OCTOBER 1947

(The following report is compiled from signed, official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives, by agency, the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the total Federal personnel for November decreased 14,145 from the October total of 2,014,008 to the November total of 1,999,853. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment, there was a decrease of 3,929 from the October total of 1,172,705 to the November total of 1,168,776.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed a decrease of 10,216 from the October total of 841,303 to the total of 831,087 in November.

The Department of the Army reported a net decrease of 10,222 from its October total of 390,406 to the November total of 380,184. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 2,264, while outside the United States the decrease amounted to 12,486. The bulk of the overseas decrease was reported by the Mediterranean theater, which is now in the process of closing down operations.

The Navy Department decreased its total employment 940 from the October figure of 340,159 to the November figure of 339,219.

The Air Forces increased employment 924 from the October figure of 110,305 to the November figure of 111,229. These figures do not include Air Force personnel overseas who are reported by the Department of the Army.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal personnel within the United States decreased 1,054 from the October total of 1,778,972 to the November total of 1,777,918. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside the United States decreased 3,878 from the October figure of 1,119,278 to the November figure of 1,115,400.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment is 662,518 for November, an increase of 2,824 over the October figure of 659,694.

Department of the Army personnel within the United States increased 2,264 from the October figure of 252,878 to the November figure of 255,142.

Navy Department personnel within the United States decreased 386 from the October figure of 296,078 to the November figure of 295,692.

The Air Force Department increased 924 from the October total of 110,305 to the November total of 111,229.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 13,091 from the October total of 235,036 to the November total of 221,945. (See table III.)

A reduction of 51 was reported in overseas personnel by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment.

Total overseas employment for the National Military Establishment is 168,569, a decrease of 13,040 from the October figure of 181,609.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 12,486 from the October total of 137,528 to the November total of 125,042, most of which occurred in the Mediterranean theater.

The Department of the Navy reported a reduction of 554 overseas employees.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

Total industrial employment during the month of November decreased 11,942 from the October total of 561,671 to the November total of 549,929. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies, exclusive of the National Military Establishment, decreased 524.

The National Military Establishment increased a net amount of 11,418 from its October total of 540,129 to the November figure of 523,711.

The Department of the Army decreased its industrial employment a total of 10,635. Inside United States there was an increase in industrial employment of 2,008. Outside United States industrial employment decreased 12,643.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 783.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October*

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	73,144	70,683	−2,461
Commerce	34,150	34,125	−25
Interior	42,298	42,390	+92
Justice	24,687	24,844	+157
Labor	4,404	4,409	+5
Post Office	460,422	462,042	+1,620
State	7,181	7,256	+75
Treasury	85,537	84,706	−831
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	40	41	+1
Office of Scientific Research and Development	58	48	−10
Office of Selective Service Records	641	640	−1
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	59	59	----------
National Security Council [1]	----------	4	+4
National Security Resources Board	44	51	+7
Office of Government Reports	20	19	−1
Office of Housing Expediter	5,319	4,774	−545
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	3	+1
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,375	4,660	+285
War Assets Administration	33,213	31,947	−1,266
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	----------
Bureau of the Budget	606	599	−7
Civil Aeronautics Board	556	558	+2
Civil Service Commission	3,608	3,663	+55
Export-Import Bank of Washington	111	114	+3
Federal Communications Commission	1,265	1,267	+2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,161	1,170	+9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	360	360	----------
Federal Power Commission	774	780	+6
Federal Security Agency	31,067	31,055	−12
Federal Trade Commission	558	559	+1
Federal Works Agency [2]	22,806	22,743	−63
General Accounting Office	9,969	9,520	−449
Government Printing Office	7,539	7,578	+39
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,471	12,294	−177
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,264	2,265	+1
Maritime Commission	6,690	6,767	+77
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,023	6,048	+25
National Archives	328	326	−2
National Capital Housing Authority	278	287	+9
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	19	21	+2
National Gallery of Art	317	318	+1
National Labor Relations Board	847	786	−61
National Mediation Board	103	102	−1
Panama Canal	646	549	−97
Railroad Retirement Board	2,841	2,811	−30
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6,707	6,520	−187
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,179	1,180	+1
Smithsonian Institution	516	516	----------
Tariff Commission	225	224	−1
Tax Court of the United States	125	124	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,649	14,514	−135

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October*—Continued

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Veterans' Administration	207,073	207,078	+5
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,119,278	1,115,400	+2,485 −6,363
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−3,878
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of Secretary of Defense	433	455	+22
Department of the Army	252,878	255,142	+2,264
Department of the Navy	296,078	295,692	−386
Department of the Air Forces	110,305	111,229	+924
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,778,972	1,777,918	+5,695 −6,749
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−1,054

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Adjusted from the previously repo ted figure of 22,205.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October 1947*

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,741	1,816	+75
Commerce	2,649	2,649	
Interior	4,853	4,800	−53
Justice	407	406	−1
Labor	77	78	+1
Post Office	1,537	1,540	+3
State	13,584	13,511	−73
Treasury	589	594	+5
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Selective Service Records	20	19	−1
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Office of the Housing Expediter	28	28	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	162	167	+5
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
War Assets Administration	516	509	−7
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	96	96	
Civil Aeronautics Board	14	15	+1
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	36	36	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	1,301	1,336	+35
Federal Works Agency	312	300	−12
Housing and Home Finance Agency	43	42	−1
Maritime Commission	148	146	−2
National Labor Relations Board	2	2	
Panama Canal	23,606	23,577	−29
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	113	99	−14
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October 1947*—Continued

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Veterans' Administration	1,574	1,591	+17
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	53,427	53,376	−193 +142
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−51
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	137,528	125,042	−12,486
Department of the Navy	44,081	43,527	−554
Total, including National Military Establishment	235,036	221,945	−13,233 +142
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−13,091

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October*

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	74,885	72,499	−2,386
Commerce	36,799	36,774	−25
Interior	47,151	47,190	+39
Justice	25,094	25,250	+156
Labor	4,481	4,487	+6
Post Office	461,959	463,582	+1,623
State	20,765	20,767	+2
Treasury	86,126	85,300	−826
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	40	41	+1
Office of Scientific Research and Development	58	48	−10
Office of Selective Service Records	661	659	−2
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	59	59	
National Security Council [1]		4	+4
National Security Resources Board	44	51	+7
Office of Government Reports	20	19	−1
Office of the Housing Expediter	5,347	4,802	−545
Philippine Alien Property Administration	164	170	+6
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,378	4,663	+285
War Assets Administration	33,729	32,456	−1,273
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	99	99	
Bureau of the Budget	606	599	−7
Civil Aeronautics Board	570	573	+3
Civil Service Commission	3,613	3,668	+55
Export-Import Bank of Washington	113	116	+3
Federal Communications Commission	1,301	1,303	+2
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,164	1,173	+9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	360	360	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October*—Continued

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Federal Power Commission	774	780	+6
Federal Security Agency	32,368	32,391	+23
Federal Trade Commission	558	559	+1
Federal Works Agency [2]	23,118	23,043	−75
General Accounting Office	9,969	9,520	−449
Government Printing Office	7,539	7,578	+39
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,514	12,336	−178
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,264	2,265	+1
Maritime Commission	6,838	6,913	+75
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,023	6,048	+25
National Archives	328	326	−2
National Capital Housing Authority	278	287	+9
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	19	21	+2
National Gallery of Art	317	318	+1
National Labor Relations Board	849	788	−61
National Mediation Board	103	102	−1
Panama Canal	24,252	24,126	−126
Railroad Retirement Board	2,841	2,811	−30
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6,820	6,619	−201
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,179	1,180	+1
Smithsonian Institution	522	522	
Tariff Commission	225	224	−1
Tax Court of the United States	125	124	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,649	14,514	−135
Veterans' Administration	208,647	208,669	+22
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,172,705	1,168,776	−6,335 +2,406
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−3,929
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of Secretary of Defense	433	455	+22
Department of the Army:			
Inside continental United States	252,878	255,142	+2,264
Outside continental United States	137,528	125,042	−12,486
Department of the Navy	340,150	339,219	−940
Department of the Air Forces	110,305	111,229	+924
Total, including National Military Establishment	2,014,008	1,999,853	−19,761 +5,616
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−14,145

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Adjusted from the previously reported figure of 22,517.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during November 1947, and comparison with October 1947*

Department or agency	October	November	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,139	1,087	−52
Interior	6,238	6,033	−205
State	318	343	+25
Treasury	3,835	3,628	−207

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Fe eral Government inside and outside co tinental United States employed by exec tive agencies during November 1947, a comparison with October 1947*—Continu

Department or agency	October	Novem- ber	Incre (+) decre (—
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	301	286	
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5	3	
Panama Canal	2,127	2,114	
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,779	7,724	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	21,742	21,218	{ —
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			—
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States [1]	195,213	197,221	+2,
Outside continental United States	107,652	95,009	—12,
Department of the Navy	237,264	236,481	—
Total, including National Military Establishment	561,871	549,929	{ —13, { +2,
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			—11,

[1] Including Air Force industrial employees. For month of November, the Air Force employed 95 industrial workers.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF V GINIA, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMIT ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDE EXPENDITURES

Although civilian employment in the ecutive agencies of the Federal Governm dropped during November to below 2,000, for the first time since 1941, more than h of the agencies reporting to the Joint Co mittee on Reduction of Nonessential Fede Expenditures showed employment increa inside continental United States.

Fifty-six reporting agencies certified a to civilian employment in November of 1,999,8 a net reduction of 14,145 under the total the preceding month of October, but creases in nonmilitary employment ins the country were reported by 29 agencies.

The major portion of the net reducti was accounted for by a decrease of 12,643 civilian industrial personnel employed by Army overseas. This reduction was said have been occasioned largely by the disco tinuance of the Mediterranean theater operations, but it was partially offset by increase of 2,264 civilian employees taken by the Army inside the United States.

Continuing the unbroken trend of both Army and the Air Force since the milit unification law became effective last summ the civilian employment of the Air Fo also increased in November by 924.

Other agencies reporting major increa inside the country included the Inter Justice, and Post Office Departments, Ato Energy Commission, Civil Service Comm sion, and the Maritime Commission. Oth reported smaller increases.

Those reporting substantial decreases cluded Agriculture, Treasury, and Navy partments, Office of Housing Expediter, V Assets Administration, General Account Office, Housing and Home Finance Age Panama Canal, Reconstruction Finance C poration, and Tennessee Valley Authority.

operation of the hospitals and in the conservation of the health of the Indians of Alaska than under the present system.

The repeal of the Wheeler-Howard Act as it applies to Alaska is imperative in order that Alaska may be developed. The said Wheeler-Howard Act provides for creation of Indian reservations by the Secretary of the Interior with approval by the Indians, and that such reservations shall not be allotted in severalty to any Indian.

Under authority of the Wheeler-Howard Act, large areas in Alaska comprising more than a million and a half acres have been set aside and created as Indian reservations. Proposals for creation of additional Indian reservations in Alaska, totaling millions of additional acres, are now under consideration by the Interior Department.

The Indian people of Alaska through their organization, the Alaska Native Brotherhood, have gone on record against reservations.

The Indians or natives of Alaska get along very well with the other citizens. Some of these Indians are leading businessmen of their communities; others earn above the average annual income for Alaska residents and are fully capable of managing their own affairs. Many have been and are members of the Territorial legislature.

The excellent relationship between the Indians or natives of Alaska is evidenced by the fact that the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, on February 16, 1945, enacted the so-called equal rights law, which provides:

SECTION 1. All citizens within the jurisdiction of the Territory of Alaska shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of public inns, restaurants, eating houses, hotels, soda fountains, soft drink parlors, taverns, roadhouses, barber shops, beauty parlors, bathrooms, resthouses, theaters, skating rinks, cafes, ice cream parlors, transportation companies, and all other conveyances and amusements, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and applicable alike to all citizens.

SEC. 2. Any person who shall violate or aid or incite a violation of said full and equal enjoyment; or any person who shall display any printed or written sign indicating a discrimination on racial grounds of said full and equal enjoyment, for each day for which said sign is displayed shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished or imprisoned in jail for not more than 30 days or fined not more than $250, or both.

This would indicate that there is no discrimination or segregation of the Indians of Alaska.

The solution of the Indian problem in Alaska is not to set them apart from the other people or from modern life, but to give them the tools with which to compete on an equal footing with other people.

Education and equal opportunity with other people of Alaska is the solution of the Alaskan Indian problem.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Nebraska proposes that the Indians in Alaska be treated differently from the Indians in the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. I would say that the Indians of Alaska come in a different category from the Indians in the States. Our relationship with the Indians in the States is controlled by treaties which are provided for in the Constitution of the United States. There is no such provision with relation to the Indians of Alaska, and therefore we are attempting to act on the Alaska Indian situation separately from the situation of the Indians in the States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me call attention to the fact that there are approximately 12,000 employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at the present time, and we are trying to get rid of thousands of them. I particularly call attention to the Indians of Oregon, especially those at Klamath Falls. There is a school there—I think it is called the Sherman School—where in my opinion the situation is deplorable.

I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. President, for the fine job he is doing in connection with the Indians in Alaska, but I hope it will include all the Indians in the United States of America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from North Dakota in regard to commending the Senator from Nebraska for the points he has just made on the floor of the Senate with regard to the Alaskan Indian problem. I also wish the record to show that I share the views of the Senator from North Dakota in regard to the need for immediate action in connection with the problems of the Klamath Indians.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I may say that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, in charge of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], has under consideration—and we hope for action on at least one of the proposals—the liberation or the emancipation, if you will, of certain Indian tribes, in cases in which it has been publicly admitted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that they are ready for emancipation; and let me point out that the tribe to which both Senators have referred, namely, the Klamath Indians, is one of that group.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which I have introduced be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2037) to transfer to the Territorial government of Alaska the administration within such Territory of laws relating to Indians, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, except as provided in section 2, (a) all powers, duties, and functions of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs with respect to the administration, within the Territory of Alaska, of laws relating to Indians are hereby transferred to and shall be exercised by or under the direction of the Territorial government of Alaska.

(b) All records and property of the Department of the Interior or the Office of Indian Affairs used primarily in the exercise of powers, duties, and functions transferred under subsection (a) are hereby transferred to the Territorial government of Alaska.

(c) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use in the exercise of functions transferred under subsection (a) are hereby made available to the Territorial government of Alaska for carrying out such functions.

(d) This section shall become effective on the first day of April 1949.

SEC. 2. (a) All functions, responsibilities, and duties of the Secretary of the Interior, the Office of Indian Affairs, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relating to the maintenance and operation of hospitals in the Territory of Alaska and the conservation of the health of Indians in such Territory are hereby transferred to and shall be administered by the Public Health Service and the Surgeon General, respectively.

(b) All personnel, records, and property (including office equipment) of the Office of Indian Affairs or the Department of the Interior used primarily in the performance of functions transferred under subsection (a) are hereby transferred to the Public Health Service.

(c) All unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use by the Department of the Interior or the Office of Indian Affairs in the exercise of functions transferred under subsection (a) are hereby made available to the Public Health Service for use in carrying out such functions.

(d) This section shall become effective on the first day of April 1949.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Territorial government of Alaska such sums as may be necessary to enable such government to provide education for children of Indians, Eskimos, and other natives of Alaska.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 13 of the act entitled "An act to conserve and develop Indian lands and resources; to extend to Indians the right to form business and other organizations; to establish a credit system for Indians; to grant certain rights of home rule to Indians; to provide for vocational education for Indians; and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), is amended by striking out the following: "except that sections 9, 10, 11, 12, and 16 shall apply to the Territory of Alaska."

(b) Section 19 of such act of June 18, 1934, is amended by striking out the following: "For the purpose of this act Eskimos and other aboriginal peoples of Alaska shall be considered Indians."

(c) The act entitled "An act to extend certain provisions of the act approved June 18, 1934, commonly known as the Wheeler-Howard Act (Public Law No. 383, 73d Cong., 48 Stat. 984), to the Territory of Alaska, to provide for the designation of Indian reservations in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), is hereby repealed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Bureau of Indian Affairs originally opposed the emancipation or liberation of any tribe of Indians; and it was only after long hearings that the Indian Bureau finally agreed to the emancipation or liberation of 10 tribes. However, I call attention to the fact that instead of only 10 tribes, in my opinion there are

at least 20 tribes, including at least 2 tribes in North Dakota, that at the present time are ready for emancipation, just as the Klamath Indians in Oregon are. I hope that when the Indian Bureau states that only 10 tribes—some in California and some in other places—are ready for emancipation at the present time, the distinguished Senator will carefully look into the situation of other tribes, because I think if he does so, he will find that a number of other tribes are likewise ready for emancipation today.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from North Dakota for the interest he has shown and the effective work he did as a member of this committee and also under the committees existing under the former committee organization of the Senate, and I also commend him for the continued interest he maintains in all affairs relating to the emancipation of the Indians in the United States. The solution of this question should be arrived at as quickly as is possible, without further delay.

STANDARD TIME

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require that the standard time now prevailing throughout the United States shall be used in connection with all business affecting commerce and also affecting all offices and departments of the United States Government, legislative, judicial, and executive. This bill is intended by me as a counterattack against the daylight savings bill for the District of Columbia which was enacted last March. It was not observed by the railroads or other common carriers. It is opposed by the National Association of Broadcasters, and most of the district committees of that association have gone on record in opposition. It has produced much confusion and much trouble.

We should have a regular standard time prevailing throughout the United States, and that is the purpose I have in offering this bill. I wish to have it appropriately referred, and I should like to have it acted upon as soon as possible.

The bill (S. 2041) to amend the act of March 19, 1918, so as to require that the standard times fixed therein shall be used in connection with all businesses affecting commerce, introduced by Mr. OVERTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which provides for the creation of a commission of 24 members to arrange for and to carry out the observance of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Interior.

The Commission would be composed of the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the respective chairmen of the Public Lands Committees of the two Houses, six other members of each of these committees appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, respectively, and six distinguished citizens appointed by the President.

The Commission is directed to make a report to the Nation of 100 years' stewardship of its natural resources, their exploration and conservation, their present condition and extent, and their future availability and development.

The Commission is also directed to prepare plans for the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the Department, and to make a report to the Congress not later than May 15, 1948, in order that any legislation necessary to enable it to carry out its plans may be enacted.

An appropriation is authorized to defray the expenses of the Commission.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 175) providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Department of the Interior as an executive department of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. HATCH), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator WHERRY relating to the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress, before a meeting of the Republican National Committee, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE DINNER ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator KNOWLAND on January 19, 1948, at the dinner of the Republican National Committee, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY BEFORE LYNCHBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley before the annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Lynchburg, Va., on January 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM LELAND OLDS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX ON VEGETABLE OILS—LETTER FROM H. K. THATCHER

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter relative to tax on vegetable oils, addressed to him under date of January 16, 1948, by Mr. H. K. Thatcher, director of the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CASE AGAINST COMPULSORY ARBITRATION — ARTICLE BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Case Against Compulsory Arbitration," written by himself, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY THE POWER AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relating to development of the St. Lawrence seaway, issued by the Power Authority of the State of New York January 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISM DEFINED—EDITORIAL FROM THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN NEWS OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Defines Communism," published in the Young Republican News of Washington, D. C., of January 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTITUTION IS IGNORED IN CIVIL RIGHTS HYSTERIA—ARTICLE BY DONALD R. RICHBERG

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Constitution Is Ignored in Civil Rights Hysteria," by Donald R. Richberg, published in the Washington Star of January 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following House bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 108. An act to authorize the conveyance of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 358. An act for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia;

H. R. 387. An act for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 420. An act for the relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Michel Ferapontow;

H. R. 896. An act for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko;

H. R. 899. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 927. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank;

H. R. 1139. An act for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz);

H. R. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lawrence Reves;

H. R. 1298. An act for the relief of Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ionnetos or Tom Panage Yanatos);

H. R. 1516. An act for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer;

H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;

H. R. 1653. An act for the relief of Edward W. Bigger;

H. R. 1747. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others;

H. R. 1859. An act for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerdt Huizonga;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2218. An act for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards;

H. R. 2250. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States;

H. R. 2425. An act for the relief of August Dane Tetuaearo;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2557. An act for the relief of Mable Gladys Viducich;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;

H. R. 3061. An act for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski);

H. R. 3087. An act for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mae H. Fitzgerald;

H. R. 3224. An act for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante;

H. R. 3263. An act for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;

H. R. 3300. An act for the relief of Martin A. King;

H. R. 3550. An act for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy;

H. R. 3742. An act for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25);

H. R. 3849. An act for the relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3930. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers; and

H. R. 4403. An act for the relief of Ladislao Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1189. An act to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees (rural carriers) in the field service;

H. R. 4236. An act to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; and

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the Swedish pioneers to the Middle West; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1809. An act to facilitate the use and occupancy of national forest lands, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3538. An act to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2502. An act to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon; and

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3814. An act to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 4141. An act to amend subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to extend for 2 years the time within which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from April 1, 1947, to September 30, 1947, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, and June 26, 1947, respectively. Previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, and June 26, 1947, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 19, 1948.*

AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS FOR SOLDIERS' HOME, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 929) to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564), which was, in line 11, to strike out "War" and insert "the Army."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, when the Senate passed Senate bill 929, the bill inadvertently named the Secretary of War, instead of giving the correct name, "Secretary of the Army." Therefore this amendment is necessary.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

EVA L. DUDLEY ET AL.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MCCARRAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with, inasmuch as we have a unanimous-consent agreement that it shall be called next Monday for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, starting with No. 863, where the consideration of calendar measures was concluded on January 12.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTROL OF USE OF GRAIN FOR PRODUCTION OF SPIRITS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am taking the floor at this time to ask for the immediate passage by the Senate of Senate bill 1842, a bill to amend the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency last December.

As originally introduced, the bill would have amended the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, approved July 15, 1947, by adding to section 3 of that act a new subsection 1501 (b) (1) (g). This new subsection would have added grain to the enumerated articles that are not decontrolled under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947. Therefore it would have recontrolled grain by adding to the controlled items the following language:

(G) Grain, except grain on the farm where raised and except that no grain may be allocated or released, and no grain or grain products may be used, for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes, including whisky, unless the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution shall find that the amount of grain available for more essential domestic uses and for exports to carry out the foreign policy of the United States is such that grain can safely be made available for distilled spirits, in which event the President may authorize the use of grain from time to time for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes for limited, specified periods of time. In considering the relative essentiality of uses of grain, consideration shall be given to the availability of adequate supplies of distilled spirits.

Mr. President, this bill went to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr.

FLANDERS] was appointed chairman of a subcommittee to consider the matter. There is wide interest in the proposed legislation. Under the present law, the President will have the powers specified until January 30. That fact indicated the need of haste in holding hearings on this very complex subject. It is the opinion of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as expressed through its chairman, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], that adequate hearings should be allowed, in order to be fair to all interested parties. Therefore, in this situation, the Committee on Banking and Currency met and unanimously approved a bill extending for 30 days the time the President now has, and the 30 days will be used in order to afford full and fair hearing to all interested parties.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am making a motion that the bill be taken up at this time for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator will not withhold his motion, in view of the fact that the bill will be placed on the calendar, and will be up for consideration Monday. That will give ample time for those who have not had an opportunity to consider the matter to look into it. As I understand, the bill provides only for the extension of the President's authority for 30 days.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is correct. All interested parties have expressed agreement in the proposal. It relieves their minds, because they will have this time for hearings on this complex subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair points out that the bill was reported Monday, and is on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it is on the calendar.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask that it be taken up at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator say it meets the approval of all the distilling interests, as well as others?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Vermont advised me that the day the hearing was held the distillery interests had asked for more time, and in view of that he asked for 30 days more.

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be very unfair to take this bill up without further consideration. I do not know whether I would be against it or for it, but this is the situation: Without hearings, in December we imposed a restriction on the particular industry here involved, without giving the members of that industry a chance for a single hearing. I advocated the action myself, because we were right up against the deadline and the necessity for action within 1 or 2 days. But it does seem to me that there is enough time between now and February 1 to have full hearings, and that we should hold hearings and take action before the 1st of February after the hearings have been held.

I do not care to say absolutely that I would not vote for the bill, but I think it merits more consideration than merely taking it up and passing it without consideration of any kind by the Senate. The distillers seem to be completely divided. None of them can agree with others, so far as I can discover. I do not know whether they should have a particular form of allocation, whether Mr. Anderson's form of allocation is fair or not fair. I think the committee should try to afford hearings before February 1, so that we may act intelligently. The House must act, and, I think certainly the House is not going to act before Monday, if the Senator will let it go over until Monday. That is my own impression at the present time from the way the Banking and Currency Committee of the House is proceeding.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator from North Dakota to ask a question?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I received a telephone call from the distillers, who are having a meeting in Minneapolis, informing me that they want to be heard. I do not know which side I am going to be on.

Mr. TOBEY. I may say to the Senator that it is just such considerations that motivate the committee. In response to the comments of the distinguished leader from Ohio, the time between now and February 1 is 10 days. The Committee on Banking and Currency is overwhelmed with the magnitude and the amount of legislative matters under consideration. We are working. We are to hold a night session tomorrow night. To ask that this bill go over now is unfair and unjust to the committee. If there are any interests to be affected, there is to be a 30-day period for extended hearings, for the very purpose the Senator from Ohio mentions, namely, so that all parties can be heard. That is the primary purpose of the bill. It is the unanimous consensus of the Committee on Banking and Currency that that is the wise procedure, in view of all they have to do, to conserve the rights of the people who are interested. I yield further to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator think the members of the industry ought to be heard? They are meeting at Minneapolis.

Mr. TOBEY. That is just exactly why we are postponing the matter, so they can be heard. That is the purpose.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator is not so very busy, I wonder if he would take up that $10,000 bill of mine for hearing.

Mr. TOBEY. We cannot take up anything so small as $10,000. We deal only in millions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to supplement the statement made by the Senator from Ohio. As a matter of fact, hearings were set down in the subcommittee for yesterday. I represent a State whose people are vitally interested in this legislation. A request was made for a postponement of the hearing from yesterday, because of the short notice. The hearing was called anyway, and a good many of those who wanted to be heard came on to Washington. On yesterday, or the day before yesterday, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], chairman of the subcommittee, decided to postpone the hearing, because there was not sufficient time to have a full hearing between now and the 1st day of February, and he proposed the extension now sought.

I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire would not intentionally make a misstatement, but it is not accurate to say that all interests have agreed on this 30-day extension, even. Whether it would be possible to hold a comprehensive hearing between now and the 1st day of February is problematical. That is only 10 days off. The suggestion has been made by the particular industry involved even in this extension, that the power to allocate be extended to other beverage industries besides merely the distilled-beverage industry, to include industrial alcohol or beer or other forms of distilled or fermented liquors that are made from grain. I think they would like to present that viewpoint to the committee. Whether the committee would adopt it is a matter about which I express no opinion. But if the Senator undertakes to get this bill up today, it will undoubtedly arouse controversy, and also uncertainty as to whether it ought to be amended, to what extent it ought to be amended, whether for the 30-day period, even, because when we passed it in December, it was only for a 30-day period, practically speaking. It is to expire on the 31st day of this month, which is now 10 days hence. But the extension the Senator proposes is no more than the provision in the bill that was adopted here in the latter part of December, which provided that the law should expire on the 31st day of January. So what the Senator is really doing is practically asking now, without a hearing and without much debate or consideration or opportunity to be heard, for an extension practically equal to the provision of the law as it was adopted in December. I think that to try to get the bill up today might be a little unfair to some of us who perhaps do not know exactly the extent to which the time ought to be extended, or how much should be covered in the extension.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. TOBEY. Has the Senator from Kentucky finished?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have concluded for the moment. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I am on the subcommittee to which this matter was referred. It was first proposed that we have hearings on Thursday or Friday of this week. We felt that if we did, we could not complete them in 1 day, that time was of the essence, and that we would not get any legislation through in time to meet the dead line of January 31. We had already gone into the matter very fully. We knew that 85 percent of the consumption now is bourbon whisky, which is made primarily from corn, with some wheat and rye mixed; that corn was critically short; there could not be any argument

about corn being short. We then said we would have hearings for 1 day, on Tuesday, which was yesterday. Numerous representatives of the industry complained that they could not adequately present their viewpoint in 1 day. Unfortunately, one member of our subcommittee had to be out of the city this week. The chairman and I wanted to accommodate him in the fullest way. In deference to his wishes, and to afford an adequate hearing to a large industry, some elements of which did not want any control at all, others of which wanted proper standards written into the act, to bring it more in line with decisions of the Supreme Court in NRA and similar cases, wherein they said the Congress had not set up proper standards, we decided there was but one practical thing to do, and that was to continue an emergency control for 1 month. That is a short month, even though it falls in a leap year. That would give us time to hear adequately the viewpoint of the distillers.

Mr. President, I think I am sufficiently familiar with the viewpoint of the American people, and I can say, I think, without successful contradiction, that the overwhelming majority of them want us to put food first in the present emergency. There are in bonded warehouses now 480,000,000 gallons of whisky. There are 60,000,000 gallons of neutral spirits. The distillers last year made twice as much whisky as they sold. They have a supply, on the basis of the present consumption of about 60,000,000 gallons a year, that will last 5 or 6 years. The distilling interests were shut down completely for 22 months during the war, and yet during that period and the succeeding period they made unprecedented profits. I think it would be the most selfish and most unpatriotic attitude for any distilling interests—and I can only say it does not represent all of them—not to be willing to make any concession to this emergency for food and especially for corn, the scarcity of which no one can deny. I understand that the allocation now being made by the Secretary of Agriculture is adequate to produce all the whisky the country will consume, and that the restrictions will not unduly depress the profits of the operations of the industry. So I hope very much my distinguished leader, the Senator from Kentucky, will not attempt to block consideration of this 30-day extension. When the bill was passed last month, I do not believe there was a dissenting voice in this entire body. I have never heard anybody say, "I want the distillers to use all the corn they want, it does not make any difference whether you can feed your cattle, or whether you have corn bread, or how much wheat would have to be diverted; I want the distilleries to run; I want them to make twice as much whisky as they can sell; I want them to pile it up; in their warehouses, where they have 480,000,000 gallons, let them put 580,000,000 gallons; we must fill these warehouses."

The point I wish to mention now is that during the war emergency it was not possible to get new oak-stave barrels, which are necessary for the aging of that superior product which is manufactured in the State of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. So about 100,000,000 gallons of whisky were put in old whisky barrels, the char of which had already become so soaked with fusel oil that it would not properly age the whisky in those barrels. The producers cannot sell that whisky now under the established brands, because it is not the same kind of whisky. The pure-food laws will not permit the producers to sell that whisky under the established brand names. The only practical way to utilize that 100,000,000 gallons of whisky, which is more than a year's supply, is to redistill it, and when that whisky is redistilled and the pure alcohol gotten out again, if they want to, they can use it in blended whisky, which some say the majority of the people now prefer, because it is a light-bodied whisky and has a flavor to which people became educated when bonded whisky was sold at such a high price, and the producers learned to put a quart of whisky in a fifth bottle. That 100,000,000 gallons would take care of all visible needs.

I hope very much, Mr. President, that our distinguished majority leader will recognize the position in which the subcommittee is placed. We are trying to do what is best for the Senate and for the Congress and for the people of this Nation. We do not want to work any injustice on any industrial group, but we do want to put first things first. That would be to put our need for food above our need for liquor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I yield gladly to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not intend that the Senator from Virginia shall put me in the attitude of standing here and advocating the manufacture of liquor as opposed to bread. I do not think anything I ever did or said justifies the imputation to me of any such preference.

Mr. President, discussion of this subject came up in December. The manufacture of whisky is a very technical procedure. The difference between bonded whisky and blended whisky, and whisky made with neutral spirits, in which a comparatively small proportion of whisky may go into the blend, and all of that, is a very technical matter. When the subject came up in December I offered an amendment, which I thought would cure a situation that might operate as a loophole, by including neutral spirits also in the power to allocate grain for manufacture. The amendment was placed in the bill on the floor without very much consideration. Whether it was adequate or whether it met the situation I am still a little undecided. But since authority to allocate has been in effect, there has been a suggestion that other forms of alcoholic beverage ought to be included. I do not know whether they ought to be or not. I am not in possession of sufficient information to enable me to present an amendment which has been suggested at least by some of those who are affected by the allocation.

I am not seeking in any way to block the legislation. I do not think any harm would come if it went over a day or two so that we might look into the wisdom of offering some amendment here, rather than be compelled to take the bill as it is.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me so that I may make an explanation to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, please.

Long before any agreement was entered into about the shutting down of the distilling industry, many of the distilling interests in the State which I happen to represent entered into a voluntary shut-down agreement themselves. They did so months in advance of the agreement that was entered into generally throughout the country. They have undertaken honestly and patriotically to observe and live up to every requirement. Whether they made money during the 2-year period when they were operating about 6 days a month I do not know. I have not looked into that, and I am not in any position to say whether they did or did not. But if we are going to conserve food, and grain that goes into food, there certainly is nothing insidious about a suggestion that all forms of liquor which consume the grain that goes into food, might well be considered.

The only thing I had in mind by following the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was the first to speak on the subject, was that there might be a legitimate reason for giving a day or 2 days to look into the question to see whether the authority should be extended as it is, or whether the law should be amended so as to include other forms of grain consumed in the making of liquor.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia addressed the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield further, I might say in that connection that since the allocation was made under the law as it now exists, one very large distilling interest in this country has brought a lawsuit in the Federal court to attack the constitutionality of even the 30 days' provision which was in the legislation passed in December. I do not know what will be the result of that litigation. I do not think that one particular interest represents the general body of those engaged in the industry. That particular interest has a right to bring a lawsuit, which I suppose it will be decided some time in the future, perhaps too late to be of any value in the present situation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire permit me to clarify one statement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I want to say to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky that he knows that I not only

admire him, but I love him, and I would be the last individual in the world to say anything from which any inference might be drawn that I was placing him in the position of putting liquor above food. That was not my intention at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator from Virginia meant no such implication.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Oh, absolutely not.

Mr. BARKLEY. And I appreciate his statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There was only one thing I wanted to develop. Unfortunately, I did not hear the opening statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or the first statement of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], but, as a member of the subcommittee, I wanted to impress upon the Senate the fact that if it were proposed that the subcommittee should hear the witnesses who desired to be heard, and to consider all the phases which we think properly should be considered of legislation which would extend this measure until the new corn crop comes in in the fall of 1948, we could not do that in time to complete action on the legislation in January.

Mr. TOBEY. I may say, Mr. President, before the Senator from Kentucky proceeds further, that I appreciate that all the Senator has said was said absolutely in good faith and in all sincerity. But he is arguing the matter of control of grain for distilling purposes. That is not the purpose of the measure which is before us today. Naturally the committee of the Senate responsible for the subject matter, burdened with other work as it was, found the congestion such that in an important matter such as this there was not adequate time between now and February 1, 10 days, to give all the people interested in this salient matter the opportunity to present their cases. So, under the jurisdiction of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is now in the Chamber, a hurried meeting was called, the Senator placed the situation before the subcommittee, and the subcommittee voted unanimously to ask that the matter go over for 30 days more, which will give sufficient time for all interested parties to come and be heard fully, with justice to all. That, Mr. President, is all there is to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that situation. I have not for a long time been a member of the distinguished committee now presided over by the Senator from New Hampshire. I know with what sincerity it approaches every subject with which it deals. It was contemplated last week, however, when the hearing was set down for yesterday, that there would be such a hearing conducted as would enable the committee to act permanently on the subject, and not simply for 30 days. It developed that that was not sufficient time.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And as between the program of continuing the legislation indefinitely without an adequate hearing, and the proposal now submitted to the Senate, I think the latter is preferable, although it was not expected that the subject would be brought up today, and it might make it difficult, without adequate information, for Members of the Senate who in good faith may want to suggest an amendment or two, to do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, all Senators will have an opportunity to offer amendments when the bill is reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is, the permanent legislation. I am speaking now of the 30-day proposal.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the House is concerned, I have no information as to whether it will or will not act. Last week I received 150 to 250 telegrams with reference to a Morton bill which had been introduced in the House of Representatives by a Member of the House from the State of Kentucky, requesting information as to when hearings would be had on the Morton bill. I have no information about when hearings will be had on that bill. I tried to find out from the author and from the committee of the House, and so far as they know, no hearings are scheduled on the Morton bill or any other bill on the subject, and whether there are to be any hearings or whether any action will be taken on the bill I do not think anyone knows.

Mr. TOBEY. That is not our responsibility, of course.

Mr. President, I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks there be inserted a statement which I had prepared, and also two paragraphs from a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. N. E. Dodd, bearing on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement and the extracts from the letter referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On December 15, 1947, S. 1842 was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. As originally introduced, S. 1842 would have amended the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, approved July 15, 1947, by adding to section 3 of that act a new subsection 1501 (b) (1) (g). This new subsection would have added grain to the enumerated articles that are not decontrolled under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947. Therefore, it would have recontrolled grain by adding to the controlled items the following language:

"(G) Grain, except grain on the farm where raised, and except that no grain may be allocated or released, and no grain or grain products may be used, for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes, including whisky, unless the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution shall find that the amount of grain available for more essential domestic uses and for exports to carry out the foreign policy of the United States is such that grain can safely be made available for distilled spirits, in which event the President may authorize the use of grain from time to time for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes for limited, specified periods of time. In considering the relative essentiality of uses of grain, consideration shall be given to the availability of adequate supplies of distilled spirits."

As S. 1842 was referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on December 15, 1947, there remained very little time to act upon it before the end of the special session. On December 16, 1947, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee favorably reported Senate Joint Resolution 167 and added an amendment to section 4 of the joint resolution by adding a new subsection (b), which revived and reenacted the original authority vested in the President by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942. However, it limited such authority to the allocation of grain for the production of distilled spirits for beverage purposes. The authority invested in the President was made to expire on January 31, 1948. When Senate Joint Resolution 167 was taken up on the floor of the Senate, the Senate added the words "neutral spirits" so that the authority conferred on the President was enlarged to control over the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes. Senate Joint Resolution 167 as enacted by the Senate and by the House contained that language.

The Banking and Currency Committee gave early consideration to S. 1842 at the opening of this present session. It was apparent that the period, during which the use of grain for the production of distilled or neutral spirits for beverage purposes might be controlled, would have to be extended. On January 12, 1948, during a hearing upon stabilization measures, I asked Secretary Clinton P. Anderson the following question:

"As a result of your experience in imposing restraints on the use of grain for distilling of neutral spirits, and for beverage purposes, what is your opinion of the need for extension of the allocation and rationing power for that purpose?"

Secretary Anderson's reply was as follows:

"I think it is necessary to continue the allocation and rationing power on the distilled spirits. I only point out the fact that I limited them to about 2,500,000 bushels, and I think unrestrained they would have used at least 7,500,000 bushels; and possibly more, of grain during the same period. I think the saving of that 5,000,000 bushels is important."

It became evident that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee would need more time to consider the matter of grain allocations. S. 1842 would authorize the allocation of grain for all purposes, except that it would not allow allocation of grain where raised. It would set up new rules with respect to the allocation of grain for the use of distilled spirits for beverage purposes. As S. 1842 would take the form of an amendment to the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, it would expire on February 29, 1948, along with that act.

S. 1842 would provide for the controlling of grain for a 1-month period only. It would require complex regulations that could not be set up in time to take effect during that 1-month period. The question whether grain should be allocated for all purposes would require longer hearings than could possibly be held before the termination of the present law on this subject (January 31, 1948). The committee has received a flood of requests from witnesses who wish to testify on this matter.

Accordingly, the committee has without objection agreed to continue section 4 of the present law (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.) for an additional month by making the termination date of the present law February 29, 1948. This was done in order to afford this committee the opportunity to consider the subject matter of S. 1842 in connection with general allocations before the expiration date of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (February 29, 1948). To accomplish this, the committee has amended S. 1842 in the following respects:

"First committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 4 (b) of the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to aid in the stabilization of commodity prices, to aid in further stabilizing the economy of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved December 30, 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out 'January 31, 1948' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 29, 1948'."

Second committee amendment: Amend the title so as to read:

"A bill to extend to February 29, 1948, the period during which the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes may be controlled under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942."

To summarize in a few words, the effect of S. 1842, as reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, is to continue the present law which vests authority in the President to allocate grain for the production of distilled or neutral spirits for beverage purposes, for 1 month by making the termination date of the present law February 29, 1948, instead of January 31, 1948, so that the Banking and Currency Committee may hear more witnesses upon this matter.

[Extract from letter of N. E. Dodd, Acting Secretary of Agriculture]

JANUARY 21, 1948.

This is in reply to your telephone request of January 20 for a statement with respect to S. 1842, reported out by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, with amendments. As amended, the bill extends until February 29, 1948, the provisions of section 4 (b) of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, first session. This section authorizes the exercise of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon the President by title III of the Second War Powers Act, with respect to the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes.

As you know, grain continues to be in critically short supply, and its conservation is a matter of urgent necessity in order that the most essential domestic requirements be met first and in order that the United States be in a position to fulfill commitments made pursuant to our foreign policy. During the fiscal year 1947 the distilling industry used approximately 59,000,000 bushels of grain. From information now available to us it is estimated that in the absence of controls distillers would use at least 7,500,000 bushels of grain per month. By virtue of the allocation order now in effect, issued under section 4 (b) of Public Law 395, approximately 2,500,000 bushels of grain are allocated to the distilling industry for the month of January. It is imperative that distillers limit their use of grain during the next few months. Since the distilling industry is unable to agree upon any plan of voluntary allocation, it is our opinion that statutory authority for that purpose, is provided in S. 1842, as amended.

Mr. FLANDERS rose.

Mr. TOBEY. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from New Hampshire yielding for an inquiry or surrendering the floor?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me put it this way: The Senator from Vermont was called away from the Chamber in an emergency. He came to me and asked me, as a brother Senator and as a member of his committee, if I would be good enough to present this matter. I have done so in my humble way. Under the whip and spur of the agitation which has arisen in the Senate today on this question, he has patriotically and unselfishly returned to the Chamber and is now present. I ask him to speak for himself as chairman of the subcommittee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the parliamentary situation is concerned, the Chair does not care to surrender the power of the Chair to recognize Senators. A Senator has a perfect right to yield for a question, if a question is addressed to him.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield for a question; and I suggest that the question be, "How are you doing?"

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that we should adhere to the rules relative to yielding the floor. I do not wish to take the Senator from New Hampshire from the floor. He can present his case if he cares to do so. I asked him in the beginning if he would withdraw his motion, feeling that there would be no debate on the issue, and that the bill would undoubtedly be passed on Monday. That is the easiest way to expedite the procedure. If we are to have a full-dress debate, I think in fairness to the Senator from New Hampshire and to the chairman of the subcommittee, we should have a quorum call and debate the question, because we would require a quorum before taking a vote on the question. In view of what has been said by the distinguished Senator who is working so hard on this committee, that the report is unanimous, that there will be no debate upon it, and that the bill will pass, I ask the Senator if he will not permit the bill to come up on the call of the calendar on Monday. If he feels that he cannot do so, I think the only thing to do is to have a quorum call and a debate on the question whether or not we are to take up this proposed legislation ahead of other legislation with respect to which certain plans have been announced to the Senate, and upon which Members of the Senate have informed themselves.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if I were commenting on the proceedings here today, I would say, in the language of Holy Writ, "How great a matter a little fire kindleth."

I submit to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from New Hampshire is doing a perfectly natural thing. When the Senator who asked him to present the case now returns to the Chamber, he should have the courtesy of making a few remarks on this question. So I yield to my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. He may ask a formal question, and he may ask additional questions; but I think the courteous thing to do is to allow him to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the calling of the roll,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with, because I feel that an arrangement has been made which will be satisfactory relative to calling up the bill which has been discussed. It is the intention to ask unanimous consent, before the close of business today, that the civil service bill, Senate bill 637, be made the unfinished business. I have been in touch with the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] who has agreed that on Friday, when that bill comes up for consideration, he will not object to a motion to set it aside temporarily until the question just discussed has been settled. If that is in agreement with the understanding of the Senator from North Dakota and of the Senator from New Hampshire, I suggest that we proceed on that basis.

Mr. TOBEY. That is agreeable to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the suspension of further proceedings under the quorum call? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business today Calendar No. 144, Senate bill 637, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, be made the unfinished business, and that it be understood that when the Senate convenes on Friday following the recess, the unfinished business, which will then be Senate bill 637, will be temporarily set aside for the consideration of Senate bill 1842.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is perfectly satisfactory to me, as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the Kilgore-Aiken bill, that the Senate defer considering it until Friday.

EUROPEAN FEDERATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 20, Mr. Foster Dulles, appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, made a powerful and, I believe, unanswerable argument that this country should encourage the unity of Europe. I hope all the Members of the Senate will take the time to read Mr. Dulles' statement before the committee. His emphasis is noteworthy, and the several points which he brought out in his speech, particularly that as to the attitude this Government ought to take toward the creation of a federated Europe, I think are worthy of study by every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, on Monday last Mr. Bernard Baruch, one of our country's wisest elder statesmen, also recognized the importance of promoting the unification of Europe. Also on Monday, Mr. Drew Pearson, in an article entitled "U. S. of Europe Held Only Solution," presented powerful arguments in favor of a federation of Europe. The Times-Herald, of Washington, which is not generally regarded as being idealistic in its approach to international matters, expressed similar views on Saturday, January 17, in an editorial entitled, "Europe Needs a United States." This morning the Washington Post commented favorably again, as it has many times in the past, on the subject of European unity.

These expressions are the most recent, but by no means the only, support that has been given the idea of European federation during the past year. It is significant that the only strong and bitter opposition to European federation comes from the Communists. That in itself should be persuasive to those among us who are too busy to take the time to study the affirmative reasons for federation.

Mr. President, in order to refresh the memory of the Members of the Senate and of the people, I wish to point out that on March 21, 1947, the senior Senator from Utah and I introduced a resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10, providing:

That the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it rests today.

Following the introduction of the resolution, the press of this country commented on the proposal favorably. Practically all of the papers expressed their strong approval of the idea, but many felt that it could not be achieved because of the ancient prejudices and rivalries that have in the past kept the nations of Europe apart. Since that time, however, I think the actions of the Europeans themselves have gone far to dissipate this defeatism. The unprecedented response to Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard last June, by the 16 European nations, has brought the unification of Europe within the realm of possibility. Mr. Dulles, on Tuesday, had a great deal to say in answer to direct questions. He said positively he thought it possible to achieve the purpose within the near future, and that really all that was required was a "push," which I interpret to mean some encouragement from this country.

Secretary Marshall, in his statement at Harvard and in his letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, commenting on the resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) prior to his speech, seemed to recognize the importance of unification to the future of Europe. He stated in his letter of June 4, 1947, that he was "deeply sympathetic toward the general objective of the resolution." Since June, however, I have not seen any statement of the Secretary's or of any other important member of the administration, following up or developing this point. On the contrary, the usual discussions of the Marshall plan, in the press and by the people, have centered around the amounts involved the effect upon our economy, and, generally speaking, the view that it is a relief or reconstruction plan for the individual nations involved. In other words, the objective of a unified, federated Europe has been forgotten or overlooked.

Mr. President, for my own part, while I have made many speeches in support of the Marshall plan, I have done so because I believed that an indispensable consideration or objective of the plan was a federated Europe. If the same old prewar Europe of many impotent, independent states is rehabilitated, I do not think we shall have achieved anything of lasting value, or anything commensurate with the sacrifice that we shall have made. To put it another way, unless our Government and the Europeans accept the idea that some form of political federation, as well as economic cooperation, is a proper objective of the Marshall plan, I shall have great difficulty in bringing myself to support the plan. If our Government is unwilling to recognize, and to accept, federation as a necessary and legitimate goal, I think the entire concept of European reconstruction is a futile gesture bound to result in disaster for Europe, as well as for ourselves.

My reasons for this conclusion are too involved to discuss in detail at this time, but I shall sum them up with this thought: If we reconstruct Europe within the framework of her medieval political and economic structure, and she does not achieve unity, she can protect herself from neither alien domination nor internal quarrels. Standing alone, none of the 16 nations can withstand the determined pressures of the Russians. While they think they can take refuge in neutrality, the last war has proved how futile that is. We cannot afford permanently to protect them from foreign domination. They must find a way to protect themselves and to stand on their own feet, economically.

If we reequip their industrial plants and they do not at the same time achieve federation, we are likely to find that very industrial power turned against us. How often have we regretted selling scrap iron to Japan before the last war. But that was nothing compared to the industrial power that we shall have furnished our opponents if Europe should succumb to Russia after we have rebuilt her under the Marshall plan.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Foreign Relations will incorporate in the bill that is reported to the Senate the sense of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10. If it is overlooked by the committee, I intend to offer it as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. President, on December 9 and 10, I gave the Marfleet lectures at the University of Toronto. The subject of those lectures was the federation of Europe. In them I have attempted to give more fully the reasons why this country and our neighbors in the New World have a vital interest in seeing a strong, self-sufficient Europe created out of the chaos of the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the lectures be incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the lectures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW WORLD LOOKS AT THE OLD WORLD

I

When the United Nations was created in 1945, we believed that, at long last, a rational world order was in the making. We remembered, of course, in our more thoughtful moments, that once before, in 1920, a former effort to bring peace to the world was fatally crippled by the absence of one of the great powers. But this time all the great powers are participants and we thought that people had surely learned something from the Second World War. Such does not seem to be the case. This time, instead of a refusal by a great power to participate, we are confronted with a participant, relentless and aggressive in its efforts to obstruct and to destroy the effectiveness of the undertaking.

In view of the rather obvious fact that the United Nations cannot operate effectively under existing conditions, it seems to me the better part of wisdom for the people of the New World, particularly of your country and my country, to take a good look at the Old World and see if we cannot find a gleam of hope in that dismal scene. I do not suggest that we abandon the machinery or the concept of the United Nations. But I do suggest that, while that organization is temporarily stalemated, we should look elsewhere for the means to stop the persistent aggression of Russia and for a way to reestablish a semblance of order and freedom in the world.

In my own country we have, I think, finally recognized that appeasement and half measures lead only to futility and failure. As a result of Secretary Marshall's suggestion last June, we are developing slowly and painfully a positive and affirmative program to give the free peoples of western Europe an opportunity to rebuild their stricken countries, and thereby to avoid the tyranny of Russian domination. The so-called Marshall plan, as it is presently conceived, is the correct approach; but it alone is not enough to create a strong and stable community in Europe. Something new is needed. That something, I believe, is the federation of the nations of Europe.

It is my conviction that the New World can help Europe along the road to federation. Europe is ripe for a change. She has just passed through the most devastating war in history, which left chaos and discontent in its wake. Europe, at this moment, is wallowing in the backwash of the Second World War and needs help desperately; but, so long as Europe remains a senseless conglomeration of separate economic and political entities there is little hope for the peace and prosperity of Europe or of the world.

Very seldom, if ever, have people achieved any notable progress in their social or political structures just because it was the reasonable or wise thing to do. The progress they have made in these fields has usually resulted from a serious threat to their very survival. Social and political traditions are not easily changed by rational methods alone.

The most propitious time to move forward is just after society has been disturbed by some great upheaval, which leaves it in an unstable and fluid state. At such a time vested interests disappear; the established order is disestablished; old prejudices soften as new ones begin to evolve; the old rulers lose their power to others; and new patterns of society begin to take shape. Thus, after the Thirty Years War, modern Europe began to emerge from medieval feudalism. After the Napoleonic conflicts, the concert of Europe and a multitude of peace organizations flourished. Out of the First World War came the League of Nations and out of the second, the United Nations.

As a result of the upheaval, from which she has not yet emerged, Europe as I have said, is ripe for a change. It is our job to see that the change is forward to a system of freedom and self-government, rather than backward to slavery and tyranny; forward to unity and peace, rather than to nationalistic particularism and impotent fragmentation which leads to war and probably to domination by an alien power.

The idea of a federation of Europe is not new. For centuries it has been advocated by some of the wisest men of the Western World. The point is that the circumstances of the present are more compelling, the necessity is greater, than at any time in history. No one has expressed this more eloquently than Winston Churchill when, at a meeting in London in May of this year, he said:

"This is the hour of choice, and surely the choice is plain. If the peoples of Europe

resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of freedom, happiness, and abundance to begin again their healing flow.

"This is the supreme opportunity, and, if it be cast away, no one can predict that it will ever return or what the resulting catastrophe will be * * *.

"We hope to reach again a Europe purged of the slavery of ancient days in which men will be as proud to say, 'I am a European,' as they were to say, 'Civis romanus sum.' We hope to see a Europe where men of every country think as much of being a European as of belonging to their native land, and wherever they go in this wide domain will truly feel 'Here I am at home'."

Why it is important to us that Europe be united

There are many reasons why it is to the interest of the Western Hemisphere that Europe should recreate the unity which, in ancient and medieval times, permitted her people to live in relative peace and happiness. Overshadowing all other considerations is the supreme interest that we have in creating a peaceful world. But there is also the hard, materialistic fact that we have made, and are committed to make additional, enormous loans and grants to the nations of Europe; and as a consequence we are faced with such a terrific drain upon our national resources through these services, that we are forced to take stock of our wealth lest we impoverish ourselves in helping the world. It would be strange if we did not take a selfish interest in the possibilities of a United States of Europe. But whatever malicious propaganda the Kremlin may spread to the contrary, the fact remains that the primary reason for our loans and grants is our wish to create a stable and orderly world in which we, and all peoples of the world, may live in peace. I am convinced that the uniting of Europe is a fundamental pillar of a stable world order.

Our concern is not simply an idealistic dream of bringing relief to suffering Europe; nor is it the hard-shelled manipulations of economic imperialism. We have a deep and inescapable interest in the welfare of Europe. Twice, in 25 years, we have shed our blood and spent our treasure in world wars which grew out of European feuds and power politics. We know that the policy of isolation, which allowed us to flourish and grow great, is no longer possible. We know that our present well-being will be short lived unless Europe recover and can carry on normal commercial, social, and political relations with us. Rich as our two countries are, indeed, rich as are all the Americas, we in the New World cannot indefinitely subsidize an impoverished, non-self-supporting Europe. That continent must learn again how to take care of itself.

Three choices lie before us:

1. We might withdraw from western Europe, in which case we would in all likelihood abandon Europe to communism. There can no longer be any doubt as to Russia's international program; her army, secret police, and fifth columns have established domination over one small country after the other along her borders and beyond. She is interfering in the domestic affairs of many other countries. While she professes faith in the United Nations, her actions, in and out of that organization, belie that profession. She is abusive, belligerent, uncompromising, and aggressive. While she shouts imperialism at the Anglo-Saxon countries, especially the United States, she is busily engaged in grabbing Sinkiang and northern Korea and threatening Greece and Iran and I may say France and Italy. Her expansion is so great that she threatens to control all independent nations except our own. If the United Nations is to succeed as a voluntary union of peoples, it is imperative that, pending the realization of its objectives, the existing power relationships among the great nations be preserved. The United States cannot tolerate the expansion of Russia to the point where she can control, directly or indirectly, all the resources and manpower of Europe, Asia, and Africa; for such control would spell the end of a voluntary association of nations and the issue would certainly be decided by war.

A United States of Europe cannot conceivably threaten Russia's security; but, on the contrary, it would mean a substantial contribution to Russian development and well-being. There is nothing aggressive in the uniting of Europe for economic, social, and political purposes. The objectives are the rehabilitation of that unhappy region in the interests of peace and the prevention of war. There is ample reason to believe that the Russian objections to a united Europe are based upon the imperialistic intentions of Russia herself. One of her political techniques is to create disturbances in the world so that she may fish in troubled waters. In short, Russia does not object to a United States of Europe because it would menace her security; she objects to it because it would mark the end of what she thinks is a profitable fishing season.

If Russia were not so bent on establishing a communistic world at any cost, she would readily see that a revived western Europe would mean an increase in trade for eastern Europe. It would mean political and economic stability and therefore greater buying power. It would give Russia a chance to develop her resources and would furnish her with new markets for her goods and raw materials.

However, this course of action does not appeal to Russia and, as long as that is the case, we dare not abandon Europe to her mercies, which we have come to know so well.

Obviously, the easy course of isolationism is not the proper one for the United States, nor for the New World states, to follow with regard to Europe. It would permit Russia to consolidate her power in Europe to such an extent that she would achieve domination over an additional 270,000,000 people. In view of the Kremlin's policies, no one can doubt that such a consolidation of power by Russia in Europe would ultimately spell war for the world, and that the two primary belligerents would be Russia and the United States. Such enormous power and unlimited resources under the control of one autocratic government, when geared to an emotional drive to world revolution, would be accompanied by an irresistible urge to conquer and dominate the world. If it should succeed, it would mean the conquest of mankind by the greatest slave state in all history, a catastrophe beyond the power of description. The nature of the regime in Russia is such that I do not believe it has within it the power to stop of itself. Each success only adds fuel to the fire of its fanaticism. Until it is halted, the urge to greater expansion only becomes stronger each time she scores a triumph.

2. The second course of conduct open to us is the piecemeal approach, which we have been following. This aid, offered on a restricted scale, presents basic difficulties in the formulation and administration of policy; for it seems to have no further aim than the reconstruction of the same old crazy-quilt pattern of European sovereignties, the same redevelopment of highly industrialized communities burning with economic nationalism, and seething with historical wrongs and ambitions. Such a reconstructed Europe would be built upon the same foundation that has produced conflict after conflict and an ever-increasing suspicion, hatred, and distrust among her peoples.

Many scientists and statesmen believe that the traditional national states will have to make way for a broader cooperation among the people of the world. Contemporary international affairs are marked by our going through a great historical transition, which is modifying the old state system into another form of political control. Sound foreign policy dictates the reexamination of the characteristics of the nation state, particularly calling for the elucidation of how states have come into existence and passed into oblivion; what conditions affect the growth of nation states; colonial systems; national economies; the factors which create world crises; the decline of the nation state in terms of international economic dependence; the logistics of heavy industrial concentration; the logic of the drive toward autarchy, and the modern state as a commonwealth or a political economy. Without attempting to evaluate any of these, we cannot fail to recognize that we have entered upon an era when we must explore the possibility of an organized cultural community without terminal associations, an example of which was medieval Europe.

Again without suggesting what the outcome will be in the broader field we cannot escape the conclusion that the piecemeal approach to the settlement of Europe's problems is short-sighted, unstatesmanlike, and blind to the trend of the times.

3. That leaves us with the third and last choice of policy, namely, the promotion, with all our power of persuasion and with all our economic and industrial strength, of an economic and political union of the western European nations. Such a policy would preserve intact and free that Europe which has been the mother of political and religious freedom, the creator of modern industry, the builder of the world's great empires, and the author of some of the greatest literature, science, art, and drama of contemporary life. It need not destroy the cultural autonomy of the individual states which have made these contributions to our civilization.

Our encouragement of a United States of Europe cannot reasonably be construed as the unsolicited meddling of one country in the internal affairs of another. Our interests are personal; they are immediate; they are real. But there is another very urgent reason for our interest. If western Europe were to succumb to the Russians, then the systems, institutions, and forces which have made all North and South America—but especially our two countries—great, will be imperiled. A healthy, prosperous, rehabilitated, and united Europe is one of the best guarantees that our own two countries, and all they stand for, will continue to prosper and flourish.

But we should be remiss in our discussion were we to fail to note that our interests in Europe are also filial. We are simultaneously the trustees and the exponents of European civilization. It is natural law that children shall grow into adults, and, upon reaching maturity, assume their share of responsibilities. So it is with states. We, in the New World, are the children of Europe; and we must assume our share of the burdens which Europe hitherto has carried. As the physical, cultural, and spiritual children of Europe, we inherited at national birth both the blood and the spirit of Europe. While our New World climate has been more invigorating, our resources far richer, and our lands vastly larger than those of Europe—nevertheless our environment is inescapably conditioned by Europe. With limited exceptions, our languages, religions, schools, music, literature, philosophical concepts, social institutions, political phenomena, architectural styles, dress, habits of thought, and ways of living, are fundamentally and inescapably European. Europe has played a leading role in the creation of our commerce, in the opening of our mines, in the building of our railroads, and in the

fashioning of thousands of our enterprises. Europe has performed these services for every country in North and South America. It is no wonder then that we should simultaneously reflect our Old World heredity and our New World environment.

It is not surprising that, as the grown children of Europe, we, in the New World, are now the trustees of a heritage of European civilization and that our future is bound up with that of Europe. Once a European monarch transferred to our shores the seat of his empire; and other European rulers from time to time have fled here for safety. It was here that crucial revolutions occurred through which European doctrines of freedom were tested. New World dynamism has constantly given life to Old World ideas. There is no escaping the link which binds our worlds together. The League of Nations and the United Nations Organization were European in concept; but they came into being chiefly as a result of New World effort and vision. We need not go further to show how completely we, as children of Europe, are interested in what happens to that, at present, unhappy continent, and how inextricably our fate is bound up with hers.

We are more than the mere recipients of a European heritage. Here, and through us, many things which began in Europe have been brought to fruition. With due humility we may observe that in much we are the exponents and maximizers of European civilization. Take, for example, industry and finance. In these fields we are much more than a branch of Europe. Not only have we achieved world leadership; but our strength in these areas, in a very substantial measure, contributed to the United Nations' victory in the Second World War. It was also because of this strength that we in the New World were able to help England survive the ravages of the total war just ended. If we turn to the field of social welfare we note that we have attained the highest standard of living in the world. But we must simultaneously note that the pattern of our social life and institutions is essentially European.

Need we go further in the exploration of the necessity and compulsion of our interest in Europe and in her well-being? That interest may be confused but it is nevertheless there. It is the interest of the adult individual in the security and well-being of his parents, of the pupil in the welfare of the teacher, of the businessman in the prosperity of those with whom he must do business, of the benefactor in the recovery of the person he is assisting, and of one man in the well-being of other men.

We are bound to Europe by the same civilization, and we are set apart from the rest of the world thereby. There are three main bonds which hold us together: (1) The scientific method; (2) the rule of law; and above all (3) the integrity of the individual human being.

The example of the New World

We, here in the New World, have a real contribution to make and a constructive example to set for Europe to unite and to federate for her own best interest. In no small measure are the successes of Canada and the United States to be attributed to their form of government. Indeed, it is my conviction that the most important single reason why our two countries have succeeded in overshadowing other similar areas of the world in growth and development in many fields is that we have a Federal form of government and thus avoid the countless frictions and internal frustrations of national fragmentation. Had Canada, Quebec, British Columbia, and the Maritime Provinces, and had each of the Thirteen Original Colonies, which rebelled against the British and which later jointly became the United States, insisted upon retaining its independent sovereignty, political and economic dismemberment of this great continent would have taken place, and it would have been beset by jealousies, suspicions, and distrust so that now North America, like Europe, would have been the scene of political strife and of economic and social frustration.

We often hear it said that the problems of European unification cannot be compared with the problems involved in the federation of our two countries; and I would be among the last to deny that it was considerably easier for us to unite than it will ever be for Europe to do so. But, in spite of this, it should not be overlooked that all of the difficulties, under which Europe now labors, were in some measure to be found here prior to federation. There were boundary problems, currency difficulties, and tariff squabbles and a vast number of other issues which had to be adjusted before unions could be achieved. There were differences of language, religion, and social institutions.

In my own country the issue of slavery could not be solved in the beginning and finally had to be purged by a bloody civil war. Slavery was no small obstacle to unity. Then, too, in the self-sufficient provincial economy of 1776, with its slow means of communication and its limited power of mass destruction, I doubt that the compelling necessity for federation was anything like as obvious to the citizens of that time as it should be to anyone who knows there are supersonic planes and atomic bombs in the arsenals of today.

We solved the problems of that era. With our help, Europe can solve hers, too.

Many years ago we blazed the trail for Europe to follow. If the English of Canada and the French of Quebec, if the Dutchman of New York and the Englishman of Connecticut, if the Frenchman of Louisiana and the Spaniard of California, if the Swede of Delaware and the German of Pennsylvania, could be molded into a single body politic, living amicably with each other, striving for common national purposes, then there is every reason to believe that the Frenchman of France and the Englishman across the Channel, that the Dutchman of Holland and the German of Germany, and even the Spaniard of Spain, with all their neighbors, if given the right conditions, can unite for a reconstructed and rehabilitated Europe.

In other ways, too, we in the New World may be able to furnish Europe with useful examples. Our southern neighbors of Latin America have, over the years, reached among themselves and with us an understanding which is operating in the interest of peace and the settlement of disputes on these two continents. The Pan American Union, looking back to Bolivar for conception and to Blaine for realization, is now much more than an institution for the clarification of information about the countries of the Western Hemisphere. It is a truly international institution on the broadest basis, which, since the beginning of the Second World War, when taken in conjunction with the arrangements entered into between our two countries, has developed into a system of continental security. The Pan American states have accepted responsibility for the administration of the Monroe Doctrine and hemispheric defense. The Act of Chapultepec, supplemented by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, has created an American system of hemispheric defense.

In trade, in transportation, and in many other ways the countries of the New World have blazed the trail for Europe, showing her how to reach effective and creative federation. In addition to these examples and the several more general inducements mentioned above, there are two particular reasons why states are driven into federation. One is the danger from foreign powers; the other is the inconvenience and inefficiency of economic separation. These reasons impelled both of our governments to adopt a unified federal form of political organization. Both reasons are impelling forces of utmost urgency in Europe today.

Why Europe must and can unite

We have now seen why it is of the utmost importance to us that Europe unite. Let us next see why it is of the greatest importance to Europe herself that she unite.

It was C. B. Fawcett, one of the world's leading geographers, who said in 1941, when discussing the bases of a world commonwealth:

"There are but two unchangeable natural units of human organization—the individual and the whole of mankind. All intermediate units, such as the family, clan, tribe, or nation, church or state, or other association, are changeable or changing."

I agree with this observation, but, at the same time, it would be unrealistic for us to disregard the power of racial, historical, cultural, and other prejudices which have divided Europe into seemingly permanent units called states. In spite of the forces making for separation, there are many compelling factors which are working for the eventual termination of European differences, and for the wiping out of racial trade, and other barriers that for centuries have afflicted European politics.

It is not necessary to canvass them all here, but a few might be mentioned. The political frontiers of Europe are largely historical and seldom follow geographical lines. Racial groups, as a rule, cannot be separated from each other by any clear-cut line, but, rather, one group merges into the other through a zone of intermarriage and mixed population. No boundary line can do justice to all. The railroads of Europe, in response to economic requirements, cut across the Continent with complete disregard for geographical and political boundaries. The inland waterways, both natural and artificial, make Europe a single economic whole; and it is not by chance that effort after effort has been made to internationalize the major rivers such as the Danube, the Rhine, and the Elbe. Europe's industry and her skilled populations are located where iron, coal, and other mineral deposits have made it possible for the industrial life to develop. Europe's food supply is derived from a number of countries, regardless of political frontiers. The bread basket of Europe lies in the east. That basket comprises in whole, or in part, at least nine states distinguished for the liveliness of their politics. Together they are deeply affected by a constant common need—the need for food and the need for economic unification. It is the need for the agricultural areas to support the industrial. It is the need for the latter to supply the former with tools and necessaries. It is the need for bringing to the industrial areas the benefit of tremendous water-power resources in other countries.

There are signs that Europe realizes the need for union. At the moment plans are being drawn for a customs union of western Europe. In making these plans European statesmen must be mindful that the foundation of the modern German Reich, which a short while ago was the most powerful continental state, was the merging of common economic interests into customs unions. Out of these unions came the political integration which unified the German states into a single empire. Europe should be able to reach unification by the same road.

One of the chief reasons why Europe needs to unite is that the Continent, in its present fragmentary form, is a large power vacuum which Russia is striving to fill. The people of Europe could easily lose faith in our ability to protect them from Communist infiltration and subjugation. Some have come to believe that Russian domination is inevitable. The success of the recent coups in Hungary and Bulgaria will speed the process.

All the millions of dollars sent in aid to Greece and Turkey, and to be sent to Italy and France, will be unsuccessful unless some positive program of action on Europe's part gives evidence that she means to help herself and does not intend to succumb to the spirit of defeatism which has been too evident in her life.

A United States of Europe is the answer to the dilemma. We must encourage its formulation. Russia, of course, will oppose it bitterly. Even though such a federation would not threaten Russia, it would interfere with the spread of communism and it is to be expected Russian opposition will be exerted in many ways, especially through Moscow's influence over the Communist party in France. This opposition is certainly one of the important obstacles to the achievement of a European federation. But that does not mean that we should give up hope, for, even in France, the Communists control less than one-third of the votes and, therefore, with strong leadership in the democratic parties, France could take the lead in promoting a European union. Although France is torn by internal dissension, she is not through as a great nation and she will again develop statesmen of the caliber of Briand and Jaures, who worked so hard for European federation. It is this France, united with England, which must take the lead in uniting Europe in spite of Russia's opposition.

Let us be under no illusions. If Russia obtains control of western Europe, the control of Africa, the Near East, and the Middle East will fall into her lap like a ripe plum. She will thus be able to carry into full effect the geopolitical objectives of Haushofer and Rudolf Hess. The only difference will be that Russia—not Germany—will become the master of Europe. Russia will then control not only the heartland but the whole world island, and Europe, Asia, and Africa will become the arsenal of the Slavs. That, in rather naked terms, is the fundamental power issue which lies behind the federation of Europe. It is no longer a question of Europe's ruling, or not ruling, dependencies and tropical and backward countries. The question now is, Will Europe in her turn be ruled? The answer lies with Europe. But Europe cannot give it alone; she needs our moral and tangible help if she is to answer it with imagination, courage, and determination.

THE NEW WORLD LOOKS AT THE OLD WORLD

II

In the first lecture last evening, I discussed in some detail some of the reasons why Europe must unite for her own salvation as well as for ours. I alluded to certain other aspects of the question which I should like to develop further tonight. It may be that some of these arguments will seem repetitious to you, but I think the subject is of such vital importance to the future of our countries that some repetition will not be amiss.

Last spring, on March 21, when I introduced a resolution in the Senate of the United States endorsing the idea of a United States of Europe, there was a great deal of editorial comment throughout the country. Most of the comment was favorable and a few editors were enthusiastic but, generally, they seemed to think the idea was too good to be practicable. In other words, while they recognized the need and the good sense of the proposal, they were defeatists regarding its achievement. It was obvious from many of the articles that the writers had never seriously considered the proposal before and were unaware of its ancient and respectable lineage. I think, therefore, that some further reference to its ancestry and to the considerations favorable and unfavorable to its adoption may be appropriate.

History of European federation

Since the beginning of the Middle Ages, two contradictory forces have been pulling Europe in opposite directions. One has been a strong tendency toward local particularism, which has produced small feudal entities and new national states. The other has been the slow-growing desire for the unification of European peoples on a continental basis.

The pages of western history are filled with philosophical discussions of how Europe should be organized in order to achieve unity and to eliminate recurrent warfare. These need no repetition here, but I am sure that in this connection a number of illustrious names will come to your minds: The medieval Pierre Dubois, the fourteenth century Dante, King Podebrad of Bohemia, Erasmus, Dean John Colet, Sebastian Franck, Sir Thomas More, William Pestel, Comines, Emeric Cruce, Hugo Grotius, William Penn, Abbé Saint-Pierre, and Immanuel Kant, to mention only a few of the more outstanding. I would like to impress upon you that these men were not idealistic dreamers. They were thoughtful and practical men.

Statesmen, too, have tried their hand at unification. One immediately recalls the grand design of Henry IV, Elizabeth, and the Duke of Sully in this connection. Occasionally statesmen resorted to force to compel Europe to combine as did Charlemagne, Louis XIV, and Napoleon.

However, it was not until after the First World War that the movement for a European federation became widespread. Since then not only has the subject been discussed extensively but many books dealing with it and a new journal called Pan-Europa have appeared. France took the lead in exploring the practical aspects of the idea, and in 1925 Premier Herriot seriously considered having his country assume responsibility for the establishment of a European federation. In 1926 a federation conference was called in Vienna, in 1930 a second was convoked in Berlin, and in 1932 a third met in Basle. During 1929 and 1930 Foreign Minister Briand, of France, became the leader of the unified continental forces working for federation and unification. In calling together the 1926 Congress the following statement was issued:

"Anarchy is indeed the only appropriate description for a society of 34 states without law, without organization, without common organs or authorities, without a court of justice, without a police force, and without a solidarity; a society the members of which are in perpetual strife with one another and pile up murderous weapons against one another; a society in which might takes precedence over right, and in which the normal methods of negotiations are threats and blackmail; a society in which the members are ruled by club law, as were states and castles in the darkest days of the Middle Ages."

Although the efforts of the twenties did not result in the creation of a unified and federated Continent, the acceptability of the idea to many Europeans was made clear in the numerous efforts at economic unification. Even Hitler made it the heart of his economic propaganda program; and it is fair to say that many Europeans, who later laid down their lives in war against Hitler, were in full agreement with him on the idea of a European federation.

Actually, as I have said before, Europe has had many experiences with federation in the past—the Holy Roman Empire, the Confederation of the Rhine, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, and Germany. Federation is therefore a tried and tested arrangement, not only on this continent but Europe also has used it on a limited basis and with success.

Requirements for federation

Federation has been given so much thought, in the past, that patterns of organization have been thought out and are ready for adoption. Obviously, Europe does not need a universal empire nor a constitution like that of the United States. Nor does she require a Canadian system. She must have her own brand of union which gives effect to national peculiarities and aspirations. It must be something more than the utopian concepts of the nineteenth-century Lorimer and his predecessors, who reechoed Saint Pierre and lacked the realism of Sully and Henry IV.

One of the organizations advocated for Europe recommends the establishment of an upper house, a house of representatives, and the assignment to the federated government of matters concerned with foreign policy, justice, and security of the federation.

Duncan and Elizabeth Wilson, in their thought-provoking Federation and World Order, published in 1940, suggested an international federal government, with a house of representatives, an upper house or senate, an international civil service, an international army, an international judiciary, all based upon a fundamental constitution or charter.

William Ivor Jennings, in 1940, devoted several pages of his excellent work, A Federation for Western Europe, to a draft constitution for such a federation. In that constitution he covered membership in the federation, the constitution as supreme law, the guaranty of territorial integrity to the federated states, citizenship in the states and in the federation, the president, the council of ministers, the federal legislature consisting of a peoples' house and a states' house, and the control of the federation over external relations, defense, dependencies, and a number of other items.

Thus the patterns of federalism have been extensively explored. Even the United Nations Organization provides in its Charter the basis for a European federation under the heading of "regional organizations."

I do not wish to leave the impression at any point in this discussion that I am unaware of, or minimize, the seriousness of the obstacles to federation. There are powerful influences obstructing the path to unity, but I do not think they are insuperable. Let us summarize the obstacles which appear to be the most potent.

The obstacles in the way

1. The basic difficulty which must be overcome is the intensity of national feeling, attended by prejudices, fears, and animosities deeply ingrained in Europe's people by patriotism and past history. National feelings are so powerful that they keep Europe divided, even though geographically it is less broken by barriers than China. We can ascribe lack of political and economic unity to human obstacles alone. In spite of the fact that Europe is a single permanent regional division of the habitable world, and in spite of the fact that not one of her political divisions can make a claim to a similar status, nevertheless every national group in Europe regards itself as a permanent entity. Nationalistic hatreds have kept European peoples apart for centuries, and as long as the present nation-states remain unmodified they will continue to do so.

2. A second obstacle in the way of union is the seeming danger that a union of Europe will be an occasion for the domination of the whole Continent by the German people. Other nationalities cannot help noting that, since the middle of the nineteenth century, the Germans have become the most numerous people on the Continent. They substantially outnumber the French or the Italians or the English. It should be pointed out, however, that in spite of their being the most numerous people they still constitute less than one-third of the population of the contemplated federation of western Europe. Working together, there is no reason why the

other peoples in the federation could not avoid domination by the Germans.

3. A third obstacle consists of Soviet Russia's efforts to unite the Continent in her own interests by power methods similar to those used by Louis XIV, Napoleon, the Kaiser, and Hitler. Russia is bending every effort short of war to achieve unification of the states under her domination. She is turning the full force of her economy and propaganda toward preventing the federation or unification of Europe by any other means than her own.

4. A fourth and important obstacle is the language problem. It makes difficult the ordinary intercourse of the citizens and hampers the free movement of persons and the flow of ideas and information so important to the achievement of understanding and unity. But you in Canada have overcome that difficulty, and so have the Swiss.

5. A fifth obstacle is incompatible political ideologies, which are still active and which cannot be considered as conducive to cooperative or unified actions between or among states. Authoritarian states still exist in western Europe. Both communism and fascism have holds upon large sections of the populations.

6. A sixth obstacle is cultural differences, which oftentimes are much stronger than blood differences.

7. A seventh obstacle is religious differences, which are especially pronounced in eastern Europe.

8. But overshadowing all other obstacles in European history, from the nationalistic standpoint, is a ledger of unrequited injuries from the past, which each state keeps to be settled at some future date.

These by no means exhaust the list of obstacles, but they will serve to show how great is the task of federating Europe. C. B. Fawcett said six years ago:

"It is to this anarchic Europe, of conflicting sovereign independent states and incompatible political ideologies, of uneasy majorities and rebellious minorities, of peace-loving peoples and aggressive tyrants, that any proposals for a United States of Europe are to be applied."

It is entirely possible that the obstacles may be overemphasized.

In 1878, looking upon a scene no less difficult, the great Swiss scholar, J. K. Bluntschli, as he advocated the union of Europe, said:

"The need for a solution of the problem (of a European confederation) is today present and imperative and will grow more so from year to year. I do not know when another serious effort at solving the problem will be undertaken but I am firmly convinced that one or more European statesmen, in the not too distant future, will undertake the task and bring it to completion. The work is much easier than has been the establishment of the German Reich. The great danger which always prevented union, namely, the hegemony of one state over another, has now finally been overcome."

When those optimistic thoughts were expressed, Europe was a prosperous paradise compared to what she is today. The necessity for drastic reform was far less obvious or compelling then than it is today. The present and the future of Europe, in the absence of some really significant reform, is scarcely bright. Winston Churchill with his usual talent for forceful descriptions put it very well when he said:

"But what is Europe now? It is a rubbleheap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations."

The new situation in Europe—Russian opposition

All through the Second World War the federation idea persisted in some form, and as the conflict drew to an end and the United Nations Charter was being formulated it was deemed expedient to incorporate into the Charter article 52, the provision which encouraged "regional arrangements for peace and security consistent with the purpose and principles of the United Nations." While this presumably was meant to cover the Monroe Doctrine, it had special significance for Europe.

It is not clear now if any European participant in the Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco Conferences had a united states of Europe in mind as the subject of article 52. Certainly Soviet Russia did not, for she was opposed to all efforts at European unification. Ever since 1917 Soviet Russia has distrusted and opposed all plans for the unification of Europe. Lenin condemned federation as a threat to Russian security and his successors have followed his line meticulously.

And so it is today. Russia still opposes all plans for European recovery including customs unions. She has warned the Scandinavian states against cooperation and confederation, presumably because cooperative action among European states will make more difficult Russian plans for the domination of the Continent.

The Russian fear must be understood in terms of what appear to be Soviet interests and purposes. Political fragmentation and war have reduced European states to near impotence in the face of the power of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This suits Russia perfectly, for it gives her great freedom of action on the Continent. She fears, however, that Europe will discover that it has at hand the means for achieving power comparable with that of Russia if Europe will only take advantage of the opportunity to unite. Soviet statesmen naturally fear the revival of German military strength. They know that now the German people are slowly starving, the country is stripped of industrial resources, the agricultural land is depleted, and the military system is dead. But they fear the unified revival of the Continent because they believe that it will provide German industry and agriculture with an opportunity once again to create another powerful military force with which to challenge Soviet preponderance in the future. Naturally, therefore, there is continued Russian skepticism about and opposition to a United States of Europe.

But it is my conviction that it is precisely in a United States of Europe that the security of Russia and the world must be sought. Federation is a most powerful guaranty against a resurgent German military power. Indeed, I can see no other way in which to solve the German problem. Today, because of the fear of Germany, we have been forced to impose levels of production on her economy which are disastrous not only to that country but to all of western Europe. We know that the holding of German production down to a fraction of its prewar level has caused starvation in Germany and costs to England and ourselves of enormous sums of badly needed resources. The curtailment in the production of coal and steel essential to construction and the resulting idleness and destitution have set the stage for communism. We are not blind to the fact that the unleashing of German energy and industrial skill and productive power will produce better conditions on the continent of Europe, but we must be assured that it will not simultaneously renew war and militarism. Again I say that this assurance can be found in a United States of Europe.

Federation is the solution of both the European problem and of the German problem. "If," as Churchill says, "without prejudice to any future question of German federation * * * individual (German) states * * * (are) * * * invited to take their place in the council of Europe," that is, if they operate as individual states in a European federation, then France and England participating in such a confederation can guarantee peace and security to the Continent, for they will more than offset the German states acting singly or in combination. Moreover, the economic pattern will be such that no single element or state or combination of states in the federation can conceivably break away and carry on a successful war against the others.

The conclusion is that the best solution for the dilemma of lagging European production is the merging of European states into a larger union, a union so large that there will be no danger of German domination or aggression. If this is done, the productive power of Germany will be the spark to light the furnaces of industry and to speed the movement of trade throughout western Europe. Europe can once again become self-supporting and resume her proper role in the society of nations. No country with peaceful intentions can, with reason and logic, object to such a development. Opposition can only come from aggressive power-political interests whose purpose is the domination of European states individually and collectively.

Europe as an idea implies confederation

Having viewed some of the obstacles in the way of a successful federation of Europe, let us look again at some of the reasons why a federation will ultimately come about and why it is neither chimerical nor an idle dream.

In order to succeed, federations require something more than lands and people living in close proximity. There must be a force holding the member states together which impels them to union.

Perhaps the most important single force both in the United States and in Canada which operated in favor of federation was the feeling in all of the colonies that they belonged together and that they individually constituted segments of a single whole. Even today that feeling is hard to define, but we know it was there at the time of union. For about 150 years, the Thirteen Colonies, which later became the United States, were associated in common perils, objectives, and struggles. Later they were united in a revolutionary war, whose purpose was political freedom. Economic, social, and political forces finally compelled them to unite. So it was with your people. Even British Columbia, which for a time seemed lost, eventually had to decide that its proper course lay in union with Canada, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces rather than in annexation to the United States. Thus, in both our countries an undefinable bond, which can only be described as a common consciousness of belonging to the same group, knitted our people into a single whole.

I believe that I can discern a similar force operating in Europe today. It has operated unnoticed for a long time. Again I quote from Bluntschli:

"In spite of all the language and national differences, which separate European people, and in spite of the many struggles in which they are engaged against each other, they are permeated by a feeling of being the same sort and possessing common interests as a European people; and they are bound together in spite of all these things into an ancient European brotherhood of states."

More recently, Winston Churchill said of Europe:

"It has been finely said by a young English writer, Mr. Sewell, that the real demarcation between Europe and Asia is no chain of mountains, no natural frontiers, but a system of beliefs and ideas which we call western civilization."

"In the rich pattern of culture," says Mr. Sewell, "there are many strands; the Hebrew belief in God, the Christian message of compassion and redemption, the Greek love of truth, beauty, and goodness, the

Roman genius for law. Europe is a spiritual conception. But if men cease to hold that conception in their minds, cease to feel its worth in their hearts, it will die.

"These are not my words, but they are my faith."

Thus Europe is an idea, a concept, a belief, a feeling which has been held by the people of that Continent for generations, which has enabled them to shape and dominate history for the last few hundred years, and which has permitted their sons and daughters to carry Europe's message and institutions, its religion, art, law, science, and industry to all parts of the world.

In the light of this common feeling, it is not strange that the idea of a continental federation should have attracted Europeans for hundreds of years. Occasionally some form of unification has been achieved. The Roman Empire united western Europe by force, and in the ninth century, Charlemagne welded the Continent into a great empire stretching from Spain to the Elbe River. Later, the Holy Roman Empire and the Catholic Church knit European society into a loose yet effectual whole, held together by social and spiritual bonds.

Even the national particularism, which appeared with the dawn of modern states in the fifteenth century, was unable to destroy the European concept here described. It is true that the rise of the national state and its armies, as well as the appearance of the nation in arms, which reached its extreme form in modern totalitarianism, produced the political fragmentation of Europe for over 500 years. But in spite of this, the European people have retained their common consciousness. They know that from prehistoric times they have belonged to the same white race whose branches are to be found in north Africa and south Asia. They still believe that they once possessed a common primitive civilization going back to neolithic times, and they are aware of the significance of the statement of philologists that with one exception all their languages have been derived from a common mother tongue. Their political organizations and customs have developed along similar lines and their histories have been distinguishable from the unchanging lethargy which has characterized oriental despotism. All this is reflected in European thoughts and attitudes.

Within the last 6 months two incidents have occurred which indicate that both my country and Europe have sensed the necessity for joint and cooperative action in Europe if the rehabilitation of that region is to be achieved. The first of these incidents was Secretary of State Marshall's speech at Harvard in June.

Implicit in his statement that "any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative," is the idea that more than mere relief of the present distress, and revival of the same old order, must be accomplished. His emphasis upon cooperative or joint planning and action by the European nations, indicates to me that he recognized that, in order to achieve a cure, their problems must be viewed as a whole and solved as a whole. It seems only common sense that to try to rehabilitate each nation individually, without regard to the whole, would be excessively wasteful, extravagant and ineffective in the long run. If it requires joint action to rehabilitate Europe, it is equally important that they continue to act together if they are to remain strong enough to preserve their freedom and independence from foreign domination.

In response to Secretary Marshall's suggestion, representatives of 16 of the western European nations gathered in Paris last summer and, with an extraordinary spirit of good will and cooperation, unanimously issued a report in September. That report gives us the most recent indication of the trend of thinking of European statesmen, and gives us good reason to believe that they do not regard economic and political federation as impracticable or unrealistic as some of our people have supposed. In that report the cooperating states pledged themselves in part as follows:

"(v) To cooperate with one another and with like-minded countries in all possible steps to reduce the tariffs and other barriers to the expansion of trade both between themselves and with the rest of the world, in accordance with the principles of the draft charter for an international trade organization.

"(vi) To remove progressively the obstacles to the free movement of persons within Europe;

"(vii) To organize together the means by which common resources can be developed in partnership."

Elsewhere the signatory powers (p. 39) pledged that—

"When production sufficiently increases, countries at present maintaining export restrictions will abolish them. As regards import restrictions, an essential condition for the freer development of European trade, on a multilateral basis, is that balance of payments difficulties should be progressively reduced. These difficulties will diminish as production increases, internal stability is reestablished, and export trade expands. As they diminish, the participating countries will reduce progressively restrictions on their mutual trade. This would be facilitated by the adoption of a system of transferability, designed to make European currencies interchangeable, as proposed by the committee of financial experts in chapter II of their report, on which a meeting of experts is to be held in London on September 22."

This bible of European recovery recognizes that the problem does not end with recovery; but that much more is implied in the so-called Marshall plan. While it does not develop the theme in so many words, the report does give time and space to two recent and notable instances of European cooperation: (1) The customs convention signed in London on September 5, 1944, to which Belgium, Luxemburg, and the Netherlands were parties, and (2) Scandinavian cooperation discussed at Copenhagen on August 27 and 28, 1947.

The report further develops the idea of the need for closer economic cooperation than in the past, observing—

"That the present division of Europe into small economic units does not correspond to the needs of modern competition and that it will be possible with the help of customs unions to construct larger units on the strictly economic plane."

Of exceptional significance is that part which deals with the development of hydroelectric resources. It reads in part as follows:

"This work involves the cooperative development of resources cutting across frontiers and the decisions are being taken without regard to national frontiers. Preparation of periodic revisions of a survey of European large-scale power resources and the study of the desirability of establishing an international high-tension network represent similar fields for continuing common planning."

Much the same philosophy and attitude may be discerned in the passages dealing with steel production. Here is an example (p. 39):

"In view of the high cost of installation of steel-producing capacity, arrangements are being made for the interchange of information by the steel-producing countries about their programmes of modernization and extension so that each country, in developing its programme, may take account of the plans made by the others."

These pledges, I submit, are unique in European history and if properly nurtured and directed in the administration of the Marshall plan could result in the unification of the signatory powers.

Another cause for hope occurred on September 12, 1947, when it was announced that 14 states, namely, Austria, Belgium, Britain, Denmark, Ireland, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxemburg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, and Rumania (10 additional eastern European countries, including Russia, were probably to be invited), were arranging meetings for a discussion of closer cooperation and the possibilities of a customs union embracing them all.

The cynics may scoff at these pledges and these conferences. They can point to broken pledges and many failures in the past, but failures are an important part of the whole of human experience. In a negative way they are the guideposts to success rather than proof that success is unattainable.

Human institutions develop slowly and painfully. Rarely are they completed at one time and set into successful motion immediately upon their conception. It took 150 years of colonial experiences, and centuries of English background, to create the Constitution of the United States of America. That instrument was anticipated by many conferences and efforts at union before it was ever consummated. Therefore we recognize that Europe, complicated in structure, diverse in population, and confused in economic activity, cannot create at one stroke an international order of peace and security. The important thing is that many thoughtful men of both the Old and the New World have recognized the objective toward which we should move if western civilization is to avoid self-destruction or domination by the East.

It was not pure accident that the World Wars of 1914 and 1939 originated in Europe. Such conflicts are the logical result of the inconsistencies, the clashing of national interests which inhere in the confinement of modern industrialism within the restrictions of a medieval political system. An effective universal system such as the United Nations could adjust these conflicts, but, until that organization develops, the adjustment must be made on a more limited scale if self-destruction is to be avoided.

Federation is also the answer to the threat of Russian domination. William Henry Chamberlin, in his book, The Cockpit of Europe, shows with convincing clarity how communism has spread over eastern Europe. Ruthless minorities in different countries, by a combination of sabotage, terror, and force, have seized power in one country after another and established police states. It would be unlikely that such tactics could be used successfully against a United States of Europe.

There are many other reasons why we have cause for hope that federation will come about. The last one to which I shall call your attention is the compelling character of economic forces working for union. Prior to the Second World War, Europe, over the centuries, had developed a highly integrated economy which possessed a unique balance of agriculture, industry, and trade. That balance was shattered by 6 years of campaigns. The present difficulties of Europe are merely manifestations of the impossibility of maintaining national particularism in the face of continental economic forces which, in order to operate, must disregard national frontiers. The industrial Ruhr, the coal-mining Saar, and the industrial Silesia, are not German, French, and Polish alone. They belong to all of Europe and are the heritage upon which the whole Continent should build.

The Europe of the future, if it is to rise from its ashes, must find some way by which the steel and coal of Germany, the shipping of England, the surplus labor supply of Italy, and the many other contributions of the individual countries can be pooled for

the common continental good. A United States of Europe, I am convinced, is the answer, and I believe that is borne out by the report of the Committee on European Economic Cooperation. Here are three additional significant passages.

On page 2:

"(viii) The participating countries * * * further stated their belief that the establishment of a joint organization to review the progress made in carrying out the recovery program will be necessary. On page 12 the signatory states announce that the production program provides for mutual help between the participating countries over a wide field, and for a number of practical steps for specific action, such as the international power project. In addition broader proposals are made for the reduction of trade barriers and the removal of financial obstacles to intro-European trade."

But the most significant passage of all is the one which deals with the obliteration of national boundaries as they may stand in the way of satisfactory arrangements for the hydroelectric plants of Italy and France. The report says that the committee "examined many projects and chose a plan which comprises six hydroelectric plants in Italy, France, and on the Austro-Italo-Swiss frontier together with two lignite thermal plants in Germany and one geothermal plant in Italy. These projects have been selected without regard to national frontiers and involved in some cases the cooperative development of resources cutting across frontiers."

But, why labor the point further? These and a whole series of measures providing for closer cooperation and the ultimate elimination of difficulties affecting trade, industry, and the free flow of goods and people across national frontiers are but the beginning of closer European cooperation, which should end in only one way—a United States of Europe.

Where do Britain and Canada stand?

By now several of you must be asking yourselves, where does Britain fit into the picture? If Britain were to join a federated Europe, what would happen to her relations with members of the British Commonwealth of Nations? What would Ireland's role be in such a new arrangement? Would she remain aloof while Britain entered, or would she join side by side with Britain? Specifically, what would be the effect upon Canadian-British relations? Would there be any change in Canada's relations with Europe and with the other dominions?

The answers to these questions would tax the powers of a seer, and I make no claims in that direction. I have assumed throughout that a European union without Britain would lack realism, and for that reason British membership would be a sine qua non of federation. It seems to me that there are no insurmountable obstacles in the way of Britain fulfilling her obligations in both federations with injury neither to herself nor to any other state. Indeed, there is reason to believe that by her possession of membership in both, Britain would play a larger role in the quest for world peace.

Ireland would have to decide for herself whether she would join or not, but the advantages of union would be so pronounced that she would probably join at the outset. If, for any reason, she deemed it best not to join a European union immediately, it could only be a question of time before she ultimately would join. The Irish economy is bound to that of the rest of the British Isles and to that of the Continent. The isolation resulting from aloofness would cause disadvantages in trade and discriminations, which Ireland would find too onerous to bear.

As for Britain's relations with the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the bonds which tie the group together are so flexible that there should be no difficulty in finding an adjustment which would allow Britain to be a member of both. It will be recalled that the reciprocity arrangements of 1911 between our two countries presented no serious constitutional obstacles for Canada. Empire preference could be made consistent with obligations in a new European union. In short, to an outsider there seems to be no insurmountable reason why Britain could not accept membership in a European union consistent with her position in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

If this view is correct, a Europe, into which Britain was federated, could offer only advantages to Canada, the other dominions, and to the world at large. Britain would be a tie between two of the most economically significant groups in the world. Her dual membership would give her the opportunity to bring the two closer together. Politically and militarily the dual membership could eventually become a great force for peace and stability.

In closing, permit me to emphasize a few points. In recent weeks the Russians have directed a vicious and clever attack upon the motives of the United States in granting assistance to Europe. I am fully aware of the delicacy of the situation. Gestures of good will on the part of the strong, or measures of enlightened self-interest are easily misrepresented and misconstrued. The fact is that our fundamental interest in the creation of a strong, prosperous, and free European community is that such a Europe can make a powerful contribution to the keeping of the peace. Britain and the Commonwealth were the great stabilizing influence in the last century. The New World must now assume much of that burden, but we need the help of a strong Europe. The small and, relatively speaking, impotent nations of Europe, unless they are welded into a federation, can contribute little to the keeping of the peace. If they do not, separately, become mere pawns in the game of power politics, at best they will become ineffective neutrals which, to that extent, will weaken western civilization in its resistance to the unlimited expansions of Russia. A strong, independent Europe would not encourage us to seek the domination of the world, and at the same time it would discourage such an undertaking by any other great power.

The criticism has been made that advocating a federation of Europe is officious intermeddling by Americans. At the same time, however, we are told that we have a responsibility to use our power and our wealth to rehabilitate the stricken areas of the world. These views are inconsistent. If we grant that we have this obligation, then we must also be obliged to see that the rehabilitation is sensible and effective. There can be no obligation to recreate the same old divided Europe, from which two world wars have emerged to afflict us. Surely we have a legitimate interest in the purposes for which the products of our land and the work of our people are to be expended.

We have sympathy for the Europeans in their distress. We have, I believe, consideration for their pride and self-respect, but as partners in undertaking to preserve in the world an opportunity for men to be free, we are entitled, if not obliged, to use our best judgment and all our powers of persuasion.

It is not proposed that we force our ideas upon any country, but I do propose that, insofar as we are able, we persuade the Europeans to follow the path to political unity. Many of the wisest Europeans of the past and of the present have advocated it, so it is not an alien idea. There are many obstacles, but with the example and the generous assistance of the New World, I am sure that Europe can surmount all of them.

Finally, may I say that in this confused and troubled world, stricken by two utterly senseless and stupid fratricidal wars within a quarter century, there is one hard fact that stands out clear and reassuring and that is the friendship and good will that exists between your country and my country and, in truth, among all the peoples of the New World. This example of self-restraint and good sense has been, and will continue to be, not only our own salvation, but gives us the right, I believe, to look to the Old World and offer it our advice and our help to go and do likewise.

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks a very able and penetrating article which appeared yesterday, written by Walter Lippmann, entitled "Evil for Good Ends," dealing with the whole question of the argument of fear as a premise upon which to base support for the Marshall plan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MORSE. In connection with this article, I wish to say, Mr. President, that I think Mr. Lippmann performs a great service for the thinking of the American people by pointing out that all history records that no nation can live by the sword, and that no nation can hope, of course, to survive on the doctrine of fear. It is well to point out that, as we come to analyze and debate the Marshall plan, we ought to consider it solely and entirely from the standpoint of the economic merits of the plan, the contribution of the plan to winning the peace, and the soundness of the plan in carrying out the idealism of our belief in the brotherhood of man which has always characterized the American democracy.

I would particularly emphasize the next to the last paragraph in Mr. Lippmann's article. It seems to me it ought to sink through the cortexes and deep into the brains of the thinking people of America, because I think he is unanswerably sound in the premises he lays down in that paragraph when he says:

> Fear is a bad motive in diplomacy and fright is a poor substitute for argument in dealing with a democratic people like our own. The genuine motive of the Marshall plan is an interest in the revival of great nations and in the unity of Europe and in the peace of the world. In arguing the case for the Marshall plan, it is a mistake to rely upon fright. This plan calls for a sustained effort over a period of more than four years, and if it has no better foundation in American life than fear, the effort will not be sustained. It is not possible to maintain a state of hysteria and fear over a period of 4 years.

Mr. President, as one in the Senate who sincerely believes that without the Marshall plan the hope of winning the peace becomes most remote, I am going to argue consistently and constantly in the Senate and throughout the Nation for the adoption of the plan on the basis of its economic soundness, and on the basis of its carrying out the idealism of America, for if we ever lose the idealism, then we become a lost Nation. Also I shall support the plan on the ground that from the standpoint of national self-interest it is essential to winning the peace.

EXHIBIT A

EVIL FOR GOOD ENDS

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is a notion, held by some in Washington, that the only way to win the support of Congress for the Marshall plan is to frighten it. I believe that nothing but mischief can come of that, and that to organize a propaganda of fear would be wrong in itself, would not deserve to work, and would not in fact work.

A campaign of fear designed to ride roughshod over all doubts and hesitations would be at bottom an attempt to rob the Congress of its right to be convinced and its duty to deliberate. The notion, though it is put forward by fervent, even frantic, opponents of the totalitarian system, is profoundly undemocratic. It lacks a decent respect for the dignity of representative government, and it rests on the self-righteous assumption that the true believers in whatever it is that is to be stampeded through Congress are entitled to do evil that good may prevail.

The practitioners of this notion have been operating for nearly a year, ever since the crisis of last March during which the Truman doctrine was improvised. That crisis, which arose out of a diplomatic failure to anticipate and to prepare for the recession of the British power in the Eastern Hemisphere, caused a panic within the administration. The panic caused it to stampede Congress into voting aid to Greece. The campaign of fear employed to stampede Congress, though it may have been successful in lining up the votes, committed the United States so publicly and so irretrievably that it was then impossible to make a success of the Greek policy.

In order to frighten Congress, the administration put itself in a position where in fact it was married indissolubly to any Greek government in Athens which, no matter what else it did or did not do, proclaimed its anticommunism. The propaganda employed to sell the Truman doctrine for Greece deprived the United States of its leverage and influence in Greece.

An intervention may have been necessary. It might, if we had remained free agents, have been successful. But because of the way it was sold to Congress, it has become an entanglement in which American prestige is at stake on the outcome of a civil war in which the Government we are supporting can and does compel us to support it on its terms, not on ours.

Something of the same sort is happening in Germany. The net practical effect of telling the world that we are going to stop communism by subsidizing anti-Communists is that we are losing control over western Germany. Whereas we can still spend 6 months debating whether we shall give aid to our great allies, the British and the French, in western Germany we no longer have any such freedom of decision.

For we have committed ourselves to, and have staked our prestige so completely on making Bizonia a going concern, that we must now subsidize the Germans no matter what they do or fail to do. We cannot bargain with the Germans as we propose to bargain with the British and the French, saying that we shall furnish assistance provided they in their turn carry out the engagements they have made.

In Germany we have to furnish the assistance, and we cannot withhold it if the Germans do not fulfill their part of the bargain. There is no bargain in Germany because we have made ourselves so wholly responsible for the condition of life among our Germans. We have therefore deprived ourselves of the power to say to the Germans that we shall stop the subsidy if Bavaria and Lower Saxony choose to put their food into the black market rather than into the Ruhr.

Fear is a bad motive in diplomacy and fright is a poor substitute for argument in dealing with a democratic people like our own. The genuine motive of the Marshall plan is an interest in the revival of great nations and in the unity of Europe and in the peace of the world. In arguing the case for the Marshall plan, it is a mistake to rely upon fright. This plan calls for a sustained effort over a period of more than 4 years, and if it has no better foundation in American life than fear, the effort will not be sustained. It is not possible to maintain a state of hysteria and fear over a period of 4 years.

Either our people will decide that they are being bamboozled by the cry of wolf—wolf, or they will decide that they prefer the horrors of war itself to living a life of unending anxiety. In either event they will not give the Marshall plan the kind of support which it must have if it is to be successful.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD—PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF GENERAL KUTER TO BE CHAIRMAN.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to speak on another matter, Mr. President, quite unrelated to the remarks just made. I have been—and I think the word properly to be used in this instance is the word "deluged"—I have been deluged in recent hours with communications from various parts of the country, including my home State, in protest form, in criticism form, and in inquiry form as to whether or not the position I took in opposition to the appointment of General Kuter as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board meant that I was serving notice by implication that I am opposed to the boom for General Eisenhower for the Republican nomination for the Presidency. I am at a complete loss, Mr. President, to figure out why anyone could make the interpretation that I am necessarily opposed to the Eisenhower boom because of the position I took on the Kuter matter. But being a neophyte in American politics, Mr. President, I daily marvel at the mysteries and the wonders of political strategy.

If anyone thinks he or she is putting me on the spot by the inquiries I am receiving about my position on Eisenhower, he has another thought coming, because one is never on the spot, Mr. President, when his position is as crystal clear as my position is on either the Eisenhower or Kuter issues. My opposition to the Kuter appointment does not subject itself in the slightest degree whatsoever to any interpretation that the junior Senator from Oregon will necessarily oppose for the Republican nomination any military official who has become a civilian at the time the matter of his possible nomination is under advisement by the convention.

I suppose I ought to be flattered or highly complimented over the fact that any interest is shown by any substantial number of people as to my position in regard to who should be the Republican nominee. I suppose it is because many progressives and independent voters seem to share my views on political issues. I want to say to these inquirers who are after me to clarify my position on Eisenhower that I have taken no position on General Eisenhower, and I do not intend, Mr. President, to take any position on General Eisenhower until I know where he stands on the great issues that face this country, domestic and international. I want to know what his labor program is. I want to know where he stands on matters of social security. I want to know what his policy is in regard to inflation. What is his agricultural program? Where does he stand on reclamation, soil conservation, power development, and taxes? I want to know his position on the legion of vital questions which Members of the United States Senate are going to have to stand up and be counted on in the weeks immediately ahead. When those interested in his boom give me answers to those questions covering the fundamental question as to the general's position on the great legislative problems which face this country—or, in other words, as to what his platform is—then I shall answer the inquiries received today as to just where I stand on the Eisenhower boom.

I may say, as I said to the press the other day, that I think a great many progressives in America will show considerable interest in General Eisenhower if they can receive any assurance that he shares the views on social and economic questions held by my very good friend and a distinguished Member of this body, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is recognized as one of the official spokesmen of the Eisenhower boom.

Now, what about my position in the Kuter case? So that there may be no misunderstanding as to my position in regard to the transfer of military officers to civilian positions, and their being permitted to retain at the same time their active status in the Army and their salaries in the Army, which in the case of General Kuter would have been some $5,000 more than the salary he would receive as a civilian, as chairman of a civilian commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, I want to read into the RECORD at this time a statement I have prepared on the issue. I hope this statement will be a complete answer to the inquiries I am receiving on the matter of why I opposed the Kuter appointment.

The statement is as follows:

I offered the motion in the Armed Services Committee meeting to reject the President's proposal that General Kuter be appointed Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board but be allowed to keep his active Army status and higher Army pay. I offered this motion because I think the basic principle of the President's proposal is unsound.

I raised objection to the proposal last week when it first reached the Armed Services Committee, and no new factors have been presented in the meantime which in my opinion justified a reversal of the position taken by the committee at that time.

My position on the matter is summed up by the following points:

1. One of the basic principles of representative government which our founding fathers safeguarded when they wrote the Constitution was to make certain that our form of government would be a civilian government free of military domination. It doesn't seem to me we can justify making exceptions to that principle simply because the President is finding it difficult—because of low salaries—to secure civilians to fill civilian posts.

If the salaries for our top administrative positions are too low, then the remedy is to increase the salaries; but not to transfer

to those civilian posts military personnel, unless and until those military men resign from the Army and return to full civilian status.

In other words, I have insisted in this controversy that the principle of filling civilian jobs with civilians stems from the constitutional origin of our Government.

2. The proposal to transfer General Kuter to the chairmanship of the CAB, and still permit him to retain his active Army status and his much higher Army pay, would result in an unfair discriminatory wage policy on the Civil Aviation Board.

It certainly is not fair to the other Commissioners on that Board to pay the Chairman of the Board better than $5,000 more than they receive. Such a policy does not encourage either good feeling or the greatest of efficiency in Government service.

3. I opposed the transfer of General Kuter because I assume that when the Congress passed the appropriation budgets for the various branches of the military, those budgets were not watered with surplus personnel; but rather the services of all the officers are needed in connection with carrying out the work and duties of the Military Establishment.

However, the frequency with which it is suggested that civilian posts be filled with military personnel raises a question with me—and I know with a good many other Senators—as to whether we should not look into the question of decreasing the number of generals and admirals in the Army and the Navy if so many of them are so readily available for the filling of civilian posts. Perhaps the time has come to get a large number of them back to civilian status by legislation.

4. The committee was presented with a few precedents involving the transfer of military men to civilian posts and, as is usual under such circumstances, the argument was made that Kuter's appointment should be approved because of previous precedents.

My answer to that was and is that two wrongs never have made a right; and, further, I believe the time has come to put an end to such precedents.

I believe, if I hear the voice of the American people correctly—and as a Member of the Senate it is part of my job to keep my ear to the ground and listen to the will of the people—there is an overwhelming sentiment in support of putting an end to the practice of placing military personnel in civilian posts.

I am perfectly willing to vote to confirm any competent ex-military official to a civilian post, but I shall insist that he be in civilian status and not in active military status before I shall vote to confirm him.

5. It also is my position that it would have been no true service to the President if we had reversed ourselves on the Kuter case because, as I told the committee—and there was general agreement with me on the point—had we voted to approve of the transfer of General Kuter, it only would have resulted in a very controversial debate on the floor of the Senate; and, in my judgment, a majority of the Senate would have refused to sustain the committee.

I say that because a good many Members of the Senate not on the Armed Services Committee have informed me, personally, since the issue first arose that they would oppose this confirmation on the floor of the Senate. I think general opposition has developed in the Senate to the idea of appointing military men, still active in the Military Establishment, to civilian posts and permitting them to retain their active status in the Army or the Navy.

I wish to emphasize that the position I have taken in this case is completely nonpartisan. I am satisfied that the same attitude of nonpartisanship characterized each and every member of the Armed Services Committee. I think my record shows that I never hesitate to support the President of the United States, irrespective of partisanship, when I think he is right on any issue—even subjecting myself to great criticism within my party for doing so at times. My record also shows that I never hesitate to vote against him when I think he is wrong. To my way of thinking, that is only carrying out the basic obligation which rests upon a Member of the Senate if he is to live up to the principles of representative government.

Because of the inquiries, communications, and protests which I have received since the action of the Armed Services Committee, I make this statement in order to make unequivocally clear the reasons for my action on the Kuter case, and the basis for my statement that not even by a stretch of the imagination can anyone justify inferring from my position that it means that I am for or against General Eisenhower as a possible nominee of the Republican Party for the Presidency.

REPORT OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE—VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to what I am about to say, if he is present. If not, he can read it in the RECORD.

In the New York Times of last Sunday, I read the following news items:

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE TO DELAY ITS REPORT

WASHINGTON, January 17.—The Joint Economic Committee agreed today that it would not have time to make an adequate report on President Truman's economic message by February 1, as required by law. The group consequently authorized its chairman, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, to prepare a measure for congressional enactment postponing the dead line until March 1.

Senator TAFT indicated that similar steps might have to be taken with respect to the legislative budget. The joint Budget Committee is required to report to Congress February 15 its recommendation of a ceiling on Federal expenditures in the 1949 fiscal year beginning July 1.

Republicans were criticized in some quarters for the economic committee's failure to make a report last year and for the failure of the Senate and House to agree on terms of the legislative budget.

The Economic Committee's report is required by the Employment Act of 1946, under which it and the President's Council of Economic Advisers were established. The committee was not able to organize its staff in time to make a report last year.

The legislative budget procedure was set up under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The Budget Committee, consisting of members of the Senate and House taxing and appropriating committees, met the February 15 dead line last year and recommended an expenditure ceiling representing a $6,000,000,000 cut in the President's budget. But while the House approved it, the Senate scaled down the cut to $4,500,000,000, and the two Chambers never did agree on a compromise.

I think all of us can recall the interesting situation of last year, which developed over our failure to ever reach an agreement within the Republican majority as to what the budget cut should be in total amount. We ended up the session by failing to come forward with a legislative budget, as required under the law. What I wish to address myself to for a moment is the newspaper report of the intention of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to prepare some legislation extending the time both for the legislative budget and for the committee's economic report.

I suppose there is some truth in the old saying, "Better late than never." I think it is applicable to a great deal of the work of the Economic Report Committee to date. I say that most respectfully. I want the RECORD to show that on May 19, 1947, the junior Senator from Oregon commented on this very problem, and on the importance of our then and there taking action to postpone the date for filing the committee's economic report and for submitting a legislative budget. I introduced a joint resolution, which I judge it is quite proper for me to bring to the attention of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report at this time. I do so because apparently from the newspaper story I have read the committee is not aware that my May 19, 1947, joint resolution is a pending joint resolution, and was introduced in order to cover the very problem which the committee apparently discussed when it instructed my good friend from Ohio to prepare some legislation on this point. The joint resolution is brief. It reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the last sentence of section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "February 15" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 15."

(b) Section 5 (b) (3) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "February 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1."

Although my resolution has been pending on the calendar for a great many months, I invite the attention of the committee to it now, and urge the committee to assist me in obtaining early action on the joint resolution. I judge from the New York Times story that the resolution would accomplish what the committee wishes to accomplish. I wish to add that I think the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has a great job to do. I think the country is watching it in connection with the whole question of inflation. We have a right to look to the committee to come forward with a constructive program which deals with inflation. The weeks which have passed since the special session of Congress have not resulted in any significant downward movement in prices. They have not resulted in any check on inflation. In many, many instances prices are climbing and climbing.

Although it is not very comfortable or personally pleasing for me to constantly be saying, "I told you so," nevertheless, attention must be called to what the RECORD shows as to the position which some of us took in the special session of Congress. Three of us on this side voted against the bill which was put through in the special session. As the RECORD shows, we stated in that debate that it would not accomplish any effective check on inflation; and it has not. I repeat: it never will. So, as I say, I am looking to the joint committee coming forward

with a program which has some really effective chance of doing something about inflation, which remains, as of this hour, the No. 1 domestic problem facing the country. It is the No. 1 political obligation of the Republican Party, which has a majority in the Congress in this session, to do something about checking inflation and the rising cost of living.

We must answer to those veterans, for example, who are writing to us a large number of letters containing such sentiments as are expressed in a paragraph from a letter which I received this morning from a veteran in college. He says:

I trust the Republican Party will do something effective about the spiraling cost of living. It is getting critical. We have hamburger once a week for our meat dish, and the prediction is higher prices yet. I got a job this week after living off savings all fall term.

He is a veteran in school. I digress a moment to say that our party has the responsibility on the House side of doing something about the veterans' legislation which remains bottled up in the House of Representatives. As the author of that legislation on this side, I say again what I have said before, that until my party does something about it in the House and gets that legislation on the way to the White House, it must assume responsibility for its nonpassage. I will take my chances on a Presidential veto once the bills are passed by the House of Representatives and sent to the President.

This veteran is one of the students who would benefit from that legislation. I think he should have had the benefits of it at the beginning of the fall term. I feel that we should have done something about the problem in the special session of Congress, so that he could have had the benefits of it at the beginning of the winter term. We certainly should do something now so that he may get the benefits of this legislation which has passed the Senate, in the spring term.

I read further from the veteran's letter:

We thought we might give school work full time for 9 months and then try to recoup our savings in the summer, but it became all too apparent that our savings were dwindling too fast.

Mr. President, I do not like a "hatchet" job any better than does anyone else, but so long as I feel that we Republicans have bogged down with regard to coming forward with a constructive program on the critical domestic issues facing the country, I shall continue to needle and needle, if that is what is necessary in order to get some action in support of a sound, constructive, progressive Republican program. The alternative is running the risk of another Democratic administration, which to date has certainly failed miserably in meeting the needs of our postwar economy insofar as effective stabilization is concerned. However, I think a majority of our people believe and I agree that at least the President is trying to secure the adoption by Congress of either his program or a better one, if we on this side of the aisle will devise it.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Joseph Lawton Collins, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Deputy Chief of Staff, United States Army, with the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. Willard Stewart Paul, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Director, Personnel and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Director of Intelligence, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be Director of Army Education System and Commandant, Command and General Staff College, with the rank of lieutenant general;

Col. Wendell Westover, Army of the United States (colonel, Cavalry Reserve), for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947; such appointment to continue in force only for the duration of his assignment as executive for Reserve and ROTC affairs, Special Staff, United States Army;

Samuel T. Rhodes, Infantry, Andrew J. Roach, Quartermaster Corps, and Robert K. Weaver, Infantry, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant and arm or service specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

First Lt. Charles S. Gersoni, Medical Service Corps, for promotion in the Regular Army;

Maj. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Director, Service, Supply, and Procurement, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Gordon M. Johnson and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves, Army of the United States (brigadier general, assistant to the Chief of Engineers and lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Army member of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission and Chief of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project with the rank of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Lt. Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg (major general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Lauris Norstad (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be commanding general, United States Air Force in Europe, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and Administration, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Howard Arnold Craig (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Matériel, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Commander, Air Matériel Command, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be commanding general, Tactical Air Command, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Maj. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Air Comptroller, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947;

Brig. Gen. Franklin Otis Carroll, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Doyle Overlton Hickey, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Raymond Hartwell Fleming, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. William Henry Draper, Jr., and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States;

Earl E. Stone, and sundry other officers, to be rear admirals in the Navy;

Vice Adm. John L. McCrea, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as deputy commander in chief, Pacific Fleet;

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of the Material Division, Office of the Under Secretary of the Navy;

Maurice E. Curts and Dixwell Ketcham, for appointment to the permanent grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Capt. Homer N. Wallin, United States Navy, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Pacific and United States Pacific Fleet;

Vice Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, United States Naval Forces in the Mediterranean;

Vice Adm. John D. Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air);

Vice Adm. Harold B. Sallada, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, United States Pacific Fleet;

Capt. Howard M. Shaffer, and sundry other staff officers, for appointment to the permanent grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Midshipman John C. Shannon (Naval Academy), to be ensign in the Navy;

Charles R. Mischke and Charles B. Teal (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps);

Jerry W. Bates to be an ensign in the Navy from the 6th day of June 1947 in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed;

Edward F. Krueger to be an ensign in the Civil Engineers Corps of the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948 in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Navy as previously nominated;

Lowell K. Cunningham and several other civilian college graduates to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy;

Marshall V. Perry (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy;

Thomas H. Boothman, and sundry other civilian college graduates to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

Robert C. Doerpinghaus and William E. Nims, civilian college graduates, to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy;

Patricia L. Ratcliffe to be ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, to correct spelling of name; and

William L. Eagleton and sundry other officers to be commander, lieutenant commanders, and lieutenants in the Navy.

Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Watson to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific;

Maj. Gen. Clifton B. Cates to be the Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1948; and

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1948.

INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM PROTOCOL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive A, Eighteth Congress, second session, a protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed in Washington on November 28, 1940.

The Chair wishes to call the attention of the Senate to the requirement that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaty. Is it satisfactory to the Senator from Michigan that the injunction of secrecy on the treaty be removed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is entirely satisfactory.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD, together with accompanying papers.

The matters referred to are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

To the end that I may receive the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The protocol was open for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington from September 11, until November 1, 1947. It was signed during that period for the United States of America, subject to ratification, and for the 14 other American Republics which became parties to the Inter-American Coffee Agreement.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate a report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

Inasmuch as the previous extension of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement expired on October 1, 1947, and in view of the fact that the present protocol will extend the agreement for only 1 year from that date, I recommend that early consideration be given to the protocol by the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 21, 1948.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) Protocol for the extension of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement—certified copies in the English, Spanish, Portuguese, and French languages.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 20, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of a protocol for the extension for 1 year from October 1, 1947, subject to certain conditions, of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement signed in Washington on November 28, 1940. The protocol, in accordance with the provisions of article 4 thereof, was open for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington from September 11, 1947, until November 1, 1947, and during that period was signed for the United States of America, subject to ratification, and for the 14 other American republics which became parties to the Inter-American Coffee Agreement.

The protocol retains the framework of the Inter-American Coffee agreement for a 1-year period, but suspends the provisions of articles I to VIII, inclusive, of that agreement, which relate to coffee quotas.

Article 3 of the protocol provides that the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to complete by April 1, 1948, its recommendations regarding the type of cooperation which appears most likely to contribute to the development of sound and prosperous conditions in international trade in coffee equitable for both consumers and producers. Article 3 of the protocol provides further that the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to make arrangements prior to October 1, 1948, for the transfer of its functions, assets, and records to an appropriate inter-American or other international organization.

The 1-year extension provided for by the protocol has been recommended by an interdepartmental committee consisting of representatives of the interested agencies of the United States Government. The domestic coffee trade has indicated that it considers that the extension of the agreement for 1 year under the terms set forth in the protocol would be a desirable measure.

Information on the background and purposes of the coffee agreement is set forth in the report of January 8, 1941, by the Secretary of State to the President (Senate Executive A, 77th Cong., 1st sess.).

Advice and consent to ratification of the coffee agreement was given by the Senate on February 3, 1941. The agreement was ratified by the President on February 12, 1941, and the instrument of ratification by the United States deposited with the Pan American Union on April 14, 1941. On April 15, 1941, a protocol was signed at Washington, bringing the agreement into force on April 16, 1941, among the governments which had up to that time deposited ratifications or approvals of the agreement. The Congress of the United States, by joint resolution approved April 11, 1941, provided for the carrying out of the obligations of the United States under the agreement on and after the entry into force of the agreement and during the continuation in force of the obligations of the United States thereunder (55 Stat. 133).

The agreement, which was to expire on October 1, 1943, was twice extended without modification for 1-year periods by unanimous approval of the signatory countries. That action was taken pursuant to the provisions of article XXIV of the agreement, which authorize the continuation of the agreement upon acceptance by all participating governments of a recommendation by the Inter-American Coffee Board that the duration of the agreement be extended. By a protocol open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 1, 1945, until November 1, 1945, the agreement was extended, with certain modifications, for an additional 1-year period from October 1, 1945. By a protocol open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 3, 1946, until November 1, 1946, the agreement was extended, subject to certain conditions, for a further 1-year period from October 1, 1946. Those extensions also were approved by the domestic coffee trade.

Inasmuch as the previous extension of the agreement expired on October 1, 1947, and in view of the fact that the present protocol will extend the agreement for only 1 year from that date, the Department of State recommends its early approval on behalf of the Government of the United States of America.

Respectfully submitted.

G. C. MARSHALL.

PROTOCOL FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COFFEE AGREEMENT FOR 1 YEAR FROM OCTOBER 1, 1947

Whereas an Inter-American Coffee Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in Washington on November 28, 1940; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed in Washington April 15, 1941, the Agreement was brought into force on April 16, 1941, in respect of the Governments on behalf of which the Protocol was signed on April 15, 1941; and

Whereas article XXIV of the said Agreement provides that it should continue in force until October 1, 1943; and

Whereas by unanimous consent the Governments signatory to the Agreement twice extended the said Agreement unchanged for 1-year periods, these extensions being duly attested by two certified and signed Declarations passed by the Inter-American Coffee Board on May 12, 1943 and July 25, 1944, respectively, which were duly deposited in the Pan American Union on June 11, 1943, and September 11, 1944, respectively, in accordance with the provisions of article XXIV of the Agreement; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed and deposited with the Pan American Union under date of October 1, 1945, the said Agreement was extended for one year from October 1, 1945, with certain changes recommended by the Inter-American Coffee Board; and

Whereas by a Protocol signed and deposited with the Pan American Union under date of October 1, 1946, the said Agreement was extended for one year from October 1, 1946, subject to certain conditions recommended by the Inter-American Coffee Board.

Now, therefore, in support of a recommendation made by the Inter-American Coffee Board on September 11, 1947, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol, considering that it is feasible, pending further efforts toward completion of international and inter-American arrangements for dealing with commodity problems, that the Agreement should be prolonged for one additional year, subject to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory to the present Protocol for a period of one year from October 1, 1947.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Governments signatory to the present Protocol agree that the provisions of Article I through and including VIII of the Agreement shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

(a) During the period specified in Article 1 above, the Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to complete by April 1, 1948, its recommendations for the consideration of the governments now participating in the Agreement and of other governments that might be interested in participating in an understanding regarding the type of cooperation, whether inter-American or other international, that appears most likely to contribute to the development of sound and prosperous conditions in international trade in coffee equitable for both consumers and producers.

(b) Such recommendations shall be in accordance with general principles of commodity policy which are embodied in the Chapter on Inter-governmental Commodity Arrangements drafted in the First Session of the Preparatory Committee on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment or which may be embodied in the Charter for an International Trade Organization if such Charter is concluded prior to the submission of such recommendations by the Board.

(c) The Inter-American Coffee Board shall undertake to make arrangements prior to October 1, 1948, for the transfer of its functions, assets and records to an appropriate inter-American or other international organization.

ARTICLE 4

The present Protocol shall be open for signature at the Pan American Union from September 11, 1947, until November 1, 1947, provided, however, that all signatures shall be deemed to have been affixed under date of October 1, 1947, and the Protocol shall be considered as having entered into force on that date with respect to the governments on behalf of which it is signed.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done at the City of Washington in the English, Spanish, Portuguese and French languages. The original instrument in each language shall be deposited in the Pan American Union which shall furnish certified copies to the Governments signatory to this Protocol.

CARLOS MARTINS PEREIRA E SOUZA
Brazil

ANDRÉS URIBE C.
Colombia

J. RAFAEL OREAMUNO
Costa Rica

GMO. BELT
Cuba

JULIO ORTEGA
Dominican Republic

C. J. AROSEMENA
Ecuador

CARLOS A. SIRI
El Salvador

ENRIQUE LÓPEZ HERRARTE
Guatemala

JOSEPH D. CHARLES
Haiti

JULIÁN R. CÁCERES
Honduras

V. SÁNCHEZ GAVITO JR.
Mexico

GUILLERMO SEVILLA SACASA
Nicaragua

C. ALZAMORA
Peru

WILLARD L. THORP,
(Subject to Ratification)
United States of America

M. A. FALCÓN-BRICEÑO
Venezuela

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the original, in English, of the Protocol for the Extension of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement for one year from October 1, 1947, deposited in the Pan American Union.

Washington, D. C., December 4, 1947

[SEAL] WILLIAM MANGER,
Secretary of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate take a recess until Friday, January 23, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 23, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 21, 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

A. Ogden Pierrot, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Francis A. Flood, of Oklahoma.
Owen T. Jones, of Ohio.

John W. Henderson, of Iowa, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Elleard B. Heffern, of Missouri.
Charles E. Higdon, of Tennessee.
Samuel Owen Lane, of California.
Richard F. Lankenau, of Indiana.
William L. Magistretti, of California.
Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois.
Clinton L. Olson, of California.
David Post, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas J. Corcoran, of New York.
William D. Craig, of California.
Wayne W. Fisher, of Iowa.
Francis C. Grant, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Matthew J. Looram, Jr., of New York.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.
James D. Moffett, of Minnesota.
John F. O'Donnell, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Howard W. Potter, Jr., of New York.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for terms of 2 years from January 22, 1948:

Harvey Jones Gunderson, of South Dakota.
Henry T. Bodman, of Michigan.
Henry A. Mulligan, of New York.
John D. Goodloe, of Kentucky.
Harley Hise, of California.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Rupert Hugo Newcomb, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Mississippi, vice Wyatt T. Reese, term expired.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Frank S. French
Emanuel E. Mandel

To be pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

George B. Hutchison

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

To be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Ward A. Kemp, October 10, 1947.

To the rank of captain in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Jack Senior, January 1, 1948.
Ronald D. Horne, March 1, 1948.
Charles K. Green, March 1, 1948.

To the rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Henry C. Warwick, January 1, 1948.
Benjamin H. Rigg, March 1, 1948.
Albert J. Hoskinson, March 1, 1948.

To the rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Ernest B. Lewey, January 1, 1948.
John C. Mathisson, March 1, 1948.
George E. Morris, March 1, 1948.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

Rear Adm. Henry R. Oster, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated:

LIEUTENANT

James A. Warren

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Charles F. Grad
Harvey E. Lewis
John E. Aicken
Leon J. Dura
Elbert S. Rawls, Jr.

ENSIGNS

Stewart W. Damon
Robert A. Evans, Jr.
Fritz H. Hediger
Robert S. Haley
Richard J. O'Brien

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Alfred H. Noble
Graves B. Erskine

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Edward A. Craig
Thomas J. Cushman

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, in meditation and prayer we would ponder these great injunctions: Know thyself, control thyself, give thyself. Through the dawning of each day may their growth be determined in our lives, thus fulfilling our God-given best.

O Lord, the greatness of a nation depends not upon its resources but how it uses them; forbid that we should waste or foolishly dissipate them. Let our thoughts be centered in a passion for higher things; make us strong in Thy strength, wise in Thy wisdom, and loving in Thy love. Give us the spirit of courage to overcome our faults, casting out the beam from our own eye, and extending our horizons of brotherhood and understanding. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech made to the people of his district.

Mr. CROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by James F. O'Neal, national commander of the American Legion, made before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Martinsburg Journal on the subject They Are Not Broke.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article. I am advised by the Public Printer that the length of the article is in excess of the amount allowed under the rules to the extent of $177. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that the remarks exceed the usual amount allowed to the extent of $230.75. Notwithstanding the excess amount, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of grain allocation for the beverage distilling industry.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by Mr. Straus, of the Reclamation Bureau, and in the other to include resolutions passed by the Nebraska Reclamation Association.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Peoria Journal of January 4.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Naval Air Service Has Record of No Passenger Fatalities During 1947."

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier entitled "The Tariff Issue."

THE CRIPPLED CAB AND CAA

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the morning paper that there has been another air accident near Boston. Fortunately, no lives were lost, but this seems to be due to the courage and the pluck of the passengers and crew. While we have continuous air crashes in the United States of America, the Civil Aeronautics Board is without a chairman. The Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority has offered his resignation.

At a press conference within the last 2 weeks, it was indicated that the appointing authority did not even realize that another vacancy existed on the CAB. And this morning's papers announce the resignation of still another member. Another member of the CAA has asked for a 4-year leave of absence. The CAB is 2 years behind in its docket. Employee morale is at a very low ebb. Here we have two of the most responsible boards that are subject to the appointing power of the President in a state of inefficiency and disintegration. The President recently suggested the name of an Air Forces man to be head of the CAB, but that was not satisfactory because it was proposed that he be chairman of a civilian board but at the same time draw his Air Force pay as a general of the Air Forces. The CAB could have come under the control of the Army Air Force. How can one man serve two masters?

The situation is one which should receive prompt attention by the Congress, for the appointing authority is either unable or unwilling to designate competent personnel to insure the carrying out of the air safety program. The lives and safety of the air-traveling public should no longer be endangered by politics, indecision, or callous indifference.

RETIRED RAILROAD EMPLOYEES AND THEIR SURVIVORS ARE IN THE FORGOTTEN CLASS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the Eightieth Congress convened in January 1947, hours have been consumed with oratory designed to indoctrinate the American people with the plight of those in various parts of the world who have been victims of the war and, as a result, deprived of the necessities of life. In response, this Congress has already appropriated millions of dollars to aid unfortunate people in various countries, to say nothing of billions of dollars appropriated by previous Congresses.

While these acts of world-wide charity were being practiced at the direct expense of the American taxpayers, millions of our own citizens are in dire and desperate straits because of their inability to purchase the bare necessities of life on account of the present high cost of living. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the increase in the cost of living reached an all-time high of 67.2 percent above the August 1939 level.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there are thousands of retired employees under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts. These groups are suffering greatly because of the meager benefits they are receiving. It should be remembered that these groups represent the stalwart citizens of yesterday, who, by their labor and the payment of taxes, played such an important role in building this great Nation.

In the President's recent message on the state of the Union, he endorsed the sentiment of many of us in Congress that the provisions of the Social Security Act should be liberalized.

It is common knowledge that veterans' benefits have been increased at two different intervals the past several years.

There is also legislation pending in Congress to liberalize the benefits to retired civil-service employees.

A group of retired employees and their survivors, who are under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act, have not received adequate increases in benefits. It is true that the Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act provided some improvement, but they do not give an adequate increase in the face of the present high cost of living. The cost of the Crosser amendments is borne by the employer and employee, whose dual contributions to the railroad-retirement fund were increased to meet the liberalization of the existing law.

According to the Railroad Retirement Board, for the fiscal year 1947 there were 240,026 persons on the retirement rolls, whose average monthly benefit was $61.10. Widows 65 years and over on the retirement rolls received a monthly payment of $28.34; widowed mothers $25.27 monthly; children an average monthly payment of $15.70 and dependent parents $16.84 monthly.

Recipients of railroad-retirement benefits are in the same plight with retired employees under the Social Security Act, since it is evident that the average monthly benefit of $61.10 to retired railroad employees is insufficient to meet the present cost of living.

With the largest railroad shops in the world located at Altoona, Pa., in my congressional district, naturally, I am deeply interested in the living conditions of the retired employees and their survivors. There is hardly a day in the week that I do not receive pathetic letters from retired employees or their survivors informing me of their dire circumstances.

In the hope of providing at least temporary relief, and without increasing the pay-roll tax on management and employees now working, I have introduced H. R. 5000 in Congress to increase present benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by a flat 30 percent. This increase is to remain in effect as long as the cost of living exceeds the 1935–39 cost-of-living level of 100. As previously mentioned, the cost-of-living level is now 167.2 percent, which is 67.2 percent above the August 1939 level of 100.

It is estimated by the Railroad Retirement Board that the minimum cost per year will be approximately $72,000,000. It is the intent of my bill that the necessary money to pay the cost of the proposed increase will be appropriated annually to the railroad-retirement account from the general funds of the Treasury of the United States.

The provisions of H. R. 5000 are as follows:

H. R. 5000

A bill to increase all benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective July 1, 1948, each benefit payable with respect to any calendar month, or part thereof, under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, shall be increased by 30 percent if the consumers' price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics with respect to the preceding calendar month exceeded the 1935–39 base of 100.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Railroad Retirement Board on or before the 10th day of July 1948, and on or before the 10th day of each calendar month thereafter, whether or not the consumers' price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the preceding calendar month exceeded the 1935–39 base of 100. Such certifications shall be conclusive on the Railroad Retirement Board and for the purposes of judicial review under section 11 of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended.

SEC. 3. If, pursuant to the provisions of sections 1 and 2 above, an increase in benefits with respect to any month is required, the Railroad Retirement Board, after computing the benefits with respect to that month in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, shall add to each benefit amount so computed the required increase, and shall certify each benefit amount as so increased as the benefit with respect to that month under the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended.

SEC. 4. If the award made in any calendar month by the Railroad Retirement Board is a lump sum payable under section 5 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, and the certification from the Secretary of Labor, required under section 2 hereof, shows that the consumers' price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics with respect to the preceding calendar month exceeded the 1935–39 base of 100, the Board shall add to the lump sum an amount equal to 30 percent thereof prior to certification.

SEC. 5. In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account under the provisions of sections 15 (a) and 4 (n) of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account from the general funds in the Treasury of the United States, not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1949, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount sufficient to cover the cost of the increases provided by this act.

YOUR BUSINESS AND MY BUSINESS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it is my business when we pay the President of the United States $75,000 a year. For the amount of work he does I question sometimes whether he is getting paid enough for what he is doing, and for the responsibility he has to assume. But it is not my business when the House of Commons of England grants Princess Elizabeth and Prince Philip a $200,000 a year allowance just for being Princess and Prince; and it is not any of my business when they pay the King $2,000,000 a year. But it is my business when this country furnishes the money to pay those salaries. It is my business when we furnish free the coal for the people of England when the people of England will not mine their own coal. It is my business when we furnish free the oil to keep those people warm when they do not try to get their own oil and our people run short of oil here at home. It is my business when we are now proposing to spend something like $17,000,000,000 to take care of a lot of royalty over there who are getting many times what they are worth and we have to pay the bill. It is your business too. Let us look after our own business here at home. It was our business when you gave Britain $4,400,000,000 2 years ago, and they have spent it to buy up their coal mines, their railroads, their public utilities, creating a socialistic government. It was to put them in position to get on their feet. Now they want billions more and it is my business to see that they do not get it from my constituents or any part of it, especially for nothing. You cannot pay people not to be Communists. If they intend to be communistic, money will not stop them. The food we send there for nothing creates high prices for food here; the fuel, coal and oil create high prices for those things here at home and create a scarcity. I am not trying to run Britain's government. I want them to do that. It is my business to look after America and the American people and as long as I am in Congress I will do that. That is my business, that is your business. Let us attend to our business and take care of America. Take care of them now. Stop giving our resources away. Be wise. You must economize.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement of the Congress of Industrial Organizations on the 40-hour week.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include a letter and a newspaper editorial.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is the conviction of the Congress of Industrial Organizations that any move toward nullifying or diluting essential sections of the Fair Labor Standards Act would not merely hamper our national effort to increase production but would serve to discredit our altruistic professions in respect to legislation implementing the Marshall plan. People abroad would interpret attacks on the wages-and-hours law as proof that our Government was more responsive to pressure for increased profits than to pleas for human needs.

None of the current production difficulties or underutilization of facilities has anything to do with the necessity for paying time-and-a-half rates after 40 hours. The basic shortages to be overcome in carrying through a foreign-aid program are in such products as steel, food, fertilizer, freight cars, and power. Basically, these bottlenecks are due to the failure of industry to foresee needs and to expand to meet them.

Mr. Speaker, the letter from the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations follows:

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN: I am writing you this letter to express the concern of the CIO in regard to the current attacks on the Fair Labor Standards Act. Testimony offered by employer groups makes it very evident that an effort is being made to eliminate the overtime provisions of the FLSA. We have prepared a brief memorandum, herewith enclosed, summarizing labor's conviction that this particular section of the act, and indeed the law as a whole, should be strengthened and not weakened.

In regard to the basic provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, please let me rest te our general position:

1. The minimum wage should be raised to at least 75 cents an hour.

2. There should be no weakening of present provisions for the payment of overtime after 40 hours a week at the rate of one and a half times the regular rate of pay.

3. Present child labor provisions should be improved.

4. Coverage should be extended to certain additional groups.

American labor performed miracles of production during the war while the overtime and other provisions of this act were in effect. Through cooperation between management and labor the United States can similarly produce abundantly to meet home needs and to aid other less fortunate nations. The law is sufficiently flexible to meet any contingency. Current record-breaking profits provide ample margin for the wage provisions.

The basic shortages to be overcome in carrying through a foreign-aid program are in such products as steel, food, fertilizer, freight cars, and power. None of the current production difficulties or underutilization of facilities has anything to do with the necessity for paying time-and-a-half rates after 40 hours. Basically, these bottlenecks are due to the failure of industry to foresee needs and to expand to meet them. In December 1947, there were 1,643,000 unemployed in this country and a manpower reserve of at least 4,000,000.

It is our conviction that any move toward nullifying or diluting essential sections of the Fair Labor Standards Act would not merely hamper our national effort to increase production, but would serve to discredit our altruistic professions in respect to legislation implementing the Marshall plan. People abroad would interpret attacks on the wage and hour law as proof that our Government was more responsive to pressure for increased profits than to the pleas for human needs.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President.

DETROIT'S NATURAL GAS SHORTAGE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include therein an excerpt from the record of the proceedings of the Common Council of the City of Detroit on Thursday, January 14, 1948, an editorial appearing in the Detroit News on January 16, 1948, and an article that appeared in the Detroit Times on January 16, 1948, written by James Inglis, city hall reporter—all of which pertain to the natural-gas shortage in the Detroit area—and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor and privilege to represent the Sixteenth Congressional District of Michigan since it was originated. The Sixteenth Congressional District of Michigan is comprised of two wards on the west side of the city of Detroit, the city of Dearborn, and a number of important communities known as the Detroit down-river area, which includes the heavily industrialized city of Wyandotte. This is the largest industrialized district in the entire world. It includes the gigantic Ford Motor Co.'s River Rouge plant and hundreds of other nationally known corporations.

During the wartime, the Detroit area was referred to as the Arsenal of Democracy. The very heart of the "arsenal" is in the Sixteenth Congressional District, and its importance in production in peacetime is equally as vital to the welfare and security of this Nation as it was in wartime. We hear from every side that if inflation is to be licked and our country is to continue to prosper, it must be done by production at the lowest possible cost and in the greatest volume.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that management and labor cannot produce materials necessary to satisfy the country's needs and prevent inflation and do their full share in maintaining the prosperity of the country if certain selfish interests are permitted to strangle the very fuel supply so essential to accomplish these ends. The entire Detroit area is confronted with a fictitious natural gas shortage brought about by the powerful and ruthless Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. This company has recently secured the approval of the Federal Power Commission to construct a new gas line from the Texas fields to Detroit. This new pipe line, if it is ever constructed, will cost approximately $136,000,000, which will be principally paid for by the gas consumers of the Detroit area. These gas consumers are not, however, all nationally known corporations—83,000 families in the Detroit area heat their homes with gas—more thousands of families are asking for natural gas for heating purposes, and nearly a half million families in the Detroit area are using natural gas for domestic purposes.

It is the contention of the city of Detroit that the natural gas shortage is fictitious in its origin and has been deliberately created by the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., the local gas distributor, as a means of deceiving the public into support of its scheme to bring in, through its holding company, the American Light & Traction Co., a separate and wholly owned natural gas pipe line which would serve to link together various gas subsidiary companies in Michigan and Wisconsin which, except for such pipe-line device, would be severed from the holding-company structure through enforcement of the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

It is also the contention of the city of Detroit that Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., as a part of this scheme, is attempting to deprive the industries of the Detroit area and the public generally of the continued use of the existing natural gas supply brought to Detroit by the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., whose rates have been greatly reduced and are under effective Federal regulation, and which reduced rates also reflect a virtual equity held by the rate payers in the Panhandle Eastern system—an equity amounting to approximately $30,000,000. In its place Michigan Consolidated would impose upon the public an absolute monopoly from the gas well to the burner tip and thereby deny competitive pipe-line rates, depriving the public of this benefit. Michigan Consolidated's proposed new pipe-line system will cost in the neighborhood of $136,000,000. Its proposed rates are still unknown, but will undoubtedly be much higher than the present rate, perhaps as high as 35 cents as compared to present 18½ cents per thousand cubic feet. The Common Council of the City of Detroit is determined to prevent this monopolistic imposition of increased gas costs, and it is my own opinion that the intervention of Congress in support of the city of Detroit may become necessary. In the Sixteenth Congressional District, where the existing Panhandle Eastern system terminates, my constituents look with urgency to me for protection.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the Congress be apprised of the attitude of the common council, as well as the arbitrary position taken by Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. against the public interest, I submit at this point the information you have permitted me to place in the RECORD.

[Excerpt from the record of the proceedings of the Common Council of the City of Detroit on Thursday, January 15, 1948]

Chairman OAKMAN. How much gas did you take from Panhandle for the Detroit area in 1947?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Fink will answer that; 1946 is probably the best year.

Mr. FINK. 1946? About 43,000,000,000.

President EDWARDS. My personal opinion of this matter is that neither of your companies is going to be, in the immediate future, in a position to supply the estimated needs which you have represented as the sales capacity of this area alone; that only by continuing to keep the source of supply that we have, getting an expansion on gas in this area, are you going to be able to meet it. And it beats me——

Mr. MONTGOMERY (interposing). That is all we want.

President EDWARDS. Yes; but you don't want that. You don't want to keep the source of supply you now have. You want to keep a portion of it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. We want to keep the amount we took in 1945. Now, we built the new line——

Councilman SMITH (interposing). Is that the maximum you have ever taken from them?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Up until the time of our hearing before the Federal Power Commission, when the case started.

Councilman SMITH. Forty-five.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes; we planned our new line on that basis, that we could continue to take—or, I should put it the other way, that when it came to a question of whether Panhandle should be allowed to continue to

serve in this district, the Federal Power Commission asked us if we could continue to take all that Panhandle was giving us. Well, the last year up to that time was 32,000,000,000, so we said, "Yes, we will take all that we have been getting." We have laid all our plans on that.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Who asked you to do that?

Chairman OAKMAN. Now, it seems you are afraid of an oversupply or overabundance. Your company is on friendly terms with the Edison Co., are you not? I mean, you know the people, you know who they are. You are the biggest consumer of fuel in the city of Detroit. Isn't it possible if you were stuck with too much gas you might sell it to the Edison Co., you might sell the Edison Co. some fuel or power?

The city of Detroit buys enormous quantities of fuel. If you had this surplus of natural gas, the public lighting commission and the water board are all potential customers.

We know that the Ford Motor Car Co.—they told us they are wanting 27 billions alone. And in your own statement, you said there are 100,000 additional homes and 30 factories, and if you had the gas you would have 200 more factories screaming for it, and yet you are afraid here of a little 13,000,000,000 of gas.

Mr. FINK. Mr. Oakman, all of our financing, all of our SEC records, all of the evidence we presented there is based on this 32,000,000,000. As I mentioned earlier in my discussion here, to change that figure, as you are asking us to do, would put serious obstacles in the way of carrying out the financing as we are having it approved.

Councilman NOWICKI. Mr. Fink, it would improve your situation, wouldn't it?

Mr. FINK. No.

Councilman NOWICKI. Wouldn't it improve your situation?

Mr. FINK. No.

Chairman OAKMAN. He means he would probably have to go back and file for a new application with the SEC.

Councilman NOWICKI. It seems to me if your financing, your construction, your improvements, and your extensions were predicated on a minimum supply—or maximum supply from Panhandle of 32,000,000,000, and now because of an adjustment in the source of supply, in the market and other causes, you can build up your picture with an assured stand-by of 45,000,000,000, then it seems to me your condition is not being aggravated but being improved, that any additional facilities Michigan Consolidated might expand on its own would increase or improve the picture.

I have difficulty following your reasoning, where you seem to imply the position of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. would be jeopardized if you moved over from your position to accept 32,000,000,000 and agreed to accept 45,000,000,000 from Panhandle, as offered this morning.

Councilman GARLICK. You are right from the standpoint of the distributing company, Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., but you are talking strictly about financing the Michigan pipe line.

Councilman NOWICKI. I am also thinking of Mr. Montgomery's very generous estimates of what this area can absorb. Certainly, if I understood him correctly, he is thinking in very optimistic terms, to say the least, as to what gas consumption in the future will be.

Councilman SMITH. As I see it, the limit of Panhandle Eastern's capacity is what they furnished in 1946 or 1945; that they can't furnish any more than that unless they construct new facilities. It seems to me it is useless to attempt to take into consideration what they are undertaking as far as future facilities, when the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. is already prepared to do it.

Mr. MAGUIRE. No; that is not correct. We have the capacity to furnish that 125,000,000, and we are doing it, and we have furnished more new facilities, and we have 45,000,000 more capacity than we had in 1945 or 1946.

President EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, personally I have got to leave for a radio broadcast that has been set up for a long time. I would like to sum up where we are at the present stage of the game and see if there is any chance of getting any place else.

I would like to ask Mr. Fink once again whether his company will consider entering into a contract with the Panhandle Eastern Co., calling for the delivery of 45,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas per year, or more than that, in meeting the offer which Panhandle has made to furnish 45,000,000,000 and more than that as stated in the first portion of the meeting.

Chairman OAKMAN. I think if he agreed to do that, we would step out as an intervener.

Mr. FINK. Not at this time, Mr. Edwards.

President EDWARDS. You are not willing even to consider that?

Mr. FINK. Not at this time. We are willing to sign—well, as a matter of fact, we signed this contract to take 32,000,000,000.

President EDWARDS. Let me ask one other thing, then—well, Mr. Chairman, the best we had from the other side of this table is that the Panhandle Co. would be willing to consider, they might offer a contract for as little as 45,000,000,000. Could we ask for a statement of their position at this time in relation to that? They offered 45,000,000,000.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Forty-six, I think it was; with a 90-percent load factor.

Mr. LEE. On the present rate schedule.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Whatever the rate schedule is at that time; yes.

President EDWARDS. You are willing to sign a 15-year contract therefor?

Mr. MAGUIRE. Yes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Not under the present rate schedule.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Wait a minute. Whatever the rate schedule is.

President EDWARDS. We understand.

Mr. MAGUIRE. You are getting 30 cents for your gas. Why don't you talk about what your rate schedule will be?

President EDWARDS. I think everybody understands the rate schedule is controlled by the Commission.

Mr. MAGUIRE. We will be glad to do that. We will be glad to sell that gas at what Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co. is going to charge for that gas, less the depreciated amount we have in our present system. We will be glad to do that.

Councilman NOWICKI. Less the depreciated amount?

Mr. MAGUIRE. Why, certainly; we would be tickled pink. We would be then getting something like 32 cents for the gas. Tickled pink. Because that is what you are going to pay for this.

President EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, it is my personal opinion, and I want to state it before I leave this hearing, that unless Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co. and Michigan Consolidated were prepared to tell this council that they were willing to contract for the supply which is now available to them through the existing pipe line now serving Detroit, that they have little equity in asking this council to withdraw the city's intervention in the pending appeal, and I certainly wouldn't vote for doing so under these circumstances.

Chairman OAKMAN. Gentlemen, if there is any opportunity of your getting together between now and Saturday, I, for one, would be glad to come down here and meet Saturday morning, or—tomorrow the president and two of our other members will be in Washington.

President EDWARDS. I would like to have this statement of policy printed in the record, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman OAKMAN. Mr. Maguire, will we have a copy of the statement you read this morning?

Mr. MAGUIRE. Yes; you may have it.

Chairman OAKMAN. We would like that for our record.

Mr. MAGUIRE. Certainly.

President EDWARDS. I am sorry, I have to leave.

(President Edwards then left the council chambers.)

For clarification of the foregoing it should be stated that Messrs. Henry Montgomery and Henry Fink are, respectively, public-relations adviser and president of Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. Mr. W. G. Maguire is chairman of the board of the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. I have been informed that Mr. William G. Woolfolk, chairman of American Light & Traction Co., which controls Michigan Consolidated, was also invited to attend the Detroit Common Council proceedings, but, for obvious reasons, did not make his appearance.

[Editorial appearing in the Detroit News on January 16, 1948]

WHAT IS NEEDED IS MORE GAS

The common council made a good try at solving the gas-shortage problem, and it is not its fault that the companies vying for the privilege of bringing natural gas to Detroit from the Texas fields refused to agree.

Maybe it is nobody's fault. There is no question, however, that the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., which has the franchise to distribute gas at retail in Detroit, has put itself in a regrettable position.

Consolidated refused at the council hearing a firm offer by Panhandle Eastern, its present supplier of natural gas, to furnish 27,500,000 additional cubic feet daily, beginning a year from now.

Consolidated had its own sound reasons for refusing. It plans to build its own pipe line from the Texas fields, claimed to be capable of completion by 1950.

It has obtained its go-ahead for the project from the Federal Power and Securities Commissions on the basis of buying no more of its requirements from Panhandle than it now is able to buy from that source.

Panhandle has its own additional pipe-line facilities under construction or at the planning stage. Its offer to supply Consolidated additional gas was made contingent on the signing of a 15-year contract.

If Consolidated signed, it would be pretty sure of having to delay indefinitely and possibly abandon its own pipe-line plans. In that case, Detroit, too, would lose an additional future source of natural-gas supply.

However, as stated, Consolidated is put in the position of refusing additional gas when gas is needed, and that is not, for a public utility, an enviable position.

The council tried to bring the two companies together on a basis that would give Detroit both sources of supply.

Detroit rate payers in effect have a $30,000,000 equity in Panhandle's pipe line, which was planned to supply Detroit with an eventual 180,000,000 cubic feet of gas daily. If Consolidated does not take that amount, Detroit gas consumers will go on paying for a part of the expanded Panhandle facilities, while getting no use of them.

There is little doubt that Detroit will need both the Panhandle facilities and those planned by Consolidated. Apart from the home-heating demand, a generous supply of natural gas is vital to the city's industrial growth. By 1950, a market almost certainly will exist for all the gas both companies would be in a position to supply.

Having tried for a solution and failed, the council should not give up. The obstacles in

the way, however valid they may appear to the rival companies, are at odds with the common sense of the situation.

The council should continue its effort to assure Detroit, now and in the future, a capacity gas supply from both sources.

[Article that appeared in the Detroit Times on January 16, 1948, written by James Inglis, city hall reporter]

SEEK COURT BAN ON CONSTRUCTION—CITY PUSHES FIGHT ON SECOND PIPE LINE

Common council will continue to fight the construction of a second natural-gas pipe line to Detroit until there is an ironclad guaranty that the flow of gas through the present pipe line continues for at least 18 years.

Assistant Corporation Counsel James H. Lee will appear in Federal court in Washington Monday to support a lawsuit seeking to stop work on the Michigan-Wisconsin pipe line, now under construction from Kansas to Michigan.

FIVE-YEAR STALEMATE

Common council failed yesterday in an attempt to break the stalemated negotiations between the two big utility firms that have been fighting for more than 5 years over the Detroit gas market.

W. G. Maguire, chairman of the board of the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co., Detroit's present supplier, was summoned from New York City for a face-to-face showdown with Henry Fink, president of the Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.

After an angry exchange of conflicting views the session broke up in complete disagreement.

Council President George Edwards informed the two utility chieftains that they owed it to the people of Detroit to sign a new 15-year contract starting in 1951 which would guarantee that gas would continue to flow through the old pipe line to Detroit in at least its present volume.

In behalf of the local gas company, Fink offered to sign up for 32,000,000,000 cubic feet a year, the amount that Panhandle furnished Detroit in 1945.

CITY'S DEMAND

Edwards with the tacit support of the other members, insisted that the city would settle for nothing less than 45,000,000,000 cubic feet a year, approximately the amount of gas supplied by Panhandle in 1947.

Panhandle officials, including Edward Budrus, president, and Fred H. Robinson, attorney, offered to supply Detroit with any amount from 45,000,000,000 up to 60,000,000,000 cubic feet a year for the 15-year period after the present contract expires in 1951.

They contended that with the underground storage facilities in central Michigan this would be sufficient to take care of all of Detroit's future needs.

The Panhandle pipe line is being enlarged at present from a daily capacity of 125,000,000 cubic feet to 180,000,000 cubic feet, Panhandle officials said.

Maguire told the council his company wanted to use most of this new pipe line capacity to serve Detroit.

"We don't propose to be used merely as a stand-by facility for the new Michigan-Wisconsin pipe line," he added.

Lee, the city's authority on natural gas matters, provided the clinching argument which put the council in Panhandle's corner.

"We have Panhandle under regulation now," Lee declared.

"We fought a long, tough rate case from the Federal Power Commission clear through the Supreme Court to get the rate for gas at Detroit reduced to 18½ cents.

"It has meant millions of dollars in savings to Detroit gas users and will mean millions more in the years to come.

"Why should we throw all this away? We have no guaranty whatsoever what the price of gas would be from the new pipe line."

Maguire charged that the wholesale price of gas from the new pipe line would be 32 cents instead of the 18½-cent rate now in effect.

The new Michigan-Wisconsin pipe line which will be owned by Michigan Consolidated Gas Co., is actually being constructed at present. The 1,200-mile line from Kansas to Michigan by way of Wisconsin will cost $105,000,000 and is scheduled for completion by the end of 1949.

The Federal Power Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission have given their approval. The lawsuit in Washington is an appeal by Panhandle from the Federal Power Commission order authorizing the new line.

Up to this point the city government of Detroit, largely at the insistence of Lee and former Corporation Counsel William E. Dowling, has opposed the new line.

Yesterday's common council debate was the result of an effort by Michigan Consolidated to get the city government to change its position.

THE OIL SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to make a different kind of a report this morning not only to the New England delegation but to the membership of the House as a whole than those I have had to make in the last few days. Just before I left my office I received a letter from Mr. John R. Steelman with reference to the recommendation as to reconversions from oil to coal which had been made December 13, 1947, by a subcommittee of the New England delegation. I understand a similar letter has been sent to each member of the subcommittee.

The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 19, 1948.

The Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HESELTON: This is further in reference to my letter of December 19 regarding the investigations being undertaken in connection with possible conversion from oil to coal in Government buildings.

The Federal Works Agency, which is conducting this investigation, has sent me an interim report, and I attach copy hereto for your information. Their final report should be available to us shortly after January 22.

I have inquired of the Department of the Army regarding the two conversions from coal to oil reported by Mr. Drew Pearson, concerning which you inquired in your letter of January 13. I am advised that the conversion at Fort Myer, Va., was planned and contracted for, but has been stopped by the Department of the Army since the fuel-oil shortage became evident. Stewart Field, N. Y., is under the United States Military Academy, West Point, and information regarding activities at this field is not immediately available. However, on December 6 the Department of the Army issued a similar stop order on all such conversions, except on specific approval. They are inquiring as to the current status of this reported conversion, and I will write to you again as soon as I have full information.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. STEELMAN.

I also insert the letters of J. W. Follin, Assistant Administrator, Federal Works Agency, to Mr. Steelman, January 13, 1948 and January 16, 1948, and of Acting Secretary of the Navy to General Fleming, January 9, 1948:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, January 13, 1948.

Hon. JOHN R. STEELMAN,
Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DR. STEELMAN: Reference is made to my letter of December 31 which reported to you the holding of a meeting in this office on the subject of possible conversion of oil-burning plants in the Government buildings to the use of coal, pursuant to your request of December 19.

In my letter I advised that we had requested an interim report by January 8 from the various Government agencies represented at the meeting advising of their accomplishments in surveying the various buildings under their supervision to determine the possibilities of making such conversions.

We have received responses from a number of the departments and agencies which convey the results of their studies to date and report their actions in circularizing their field offices to secure the desired information. These preliminary reports indicate that in locations where it is practicable to convert from oil to coal this work would require from 2 months upward. This would indicate that in hardly any case would it be possible to convert a plant in sufficient time to affect any appreciable saving this year. However, if, as forecast by Mr. Max Ball at our meeting, the present shortage should continue for a period of 5 years, it would appear that those conversions deemed advisable could be completed before the next heating season.

Our preliminary reports bear out also the points made in my letter that a great majority of Government buildings are already heated by coal; also that the cost of making conversions from oil to the use of coal would be very considerable, and that in the case of such changes it would be necessary to consider the employment of firemen to operate the plants, which would entail still more expense.

Being provided at this time with incomplete returns, we will defer the making of any recommendations as to the general policy to be followed and will summarize all of the information and make such recommendations as appear reasonable after receipt of the remainder of the reports on January 22.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FOLLIN,
Assistant Administrator.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, January 16, 1948.

Hon. JOHN R. STEELMAN,
Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEELMAN: Reference is made to my letter of January 13 which advised you of the contents of interim reports received from the various Government agencies in connection with their survey of their building operations throughout the country to determine the practicability of converting buildings now heated with oil to the use of coal.

Since that date I have received a letter from the Office of the Secretary of the Navy which reports their ability to save substantial amounts of fuel oil without delay or cost since the plants involved are at present equipped to burn oil or coal without modification. I am sending you a copy of this letter since I believe it will be of interest to you and without waiting for a final report as of January 22.

After receiving all of the reports from the departments, we will submit the summary

of the data contained for your information along with any recommendations which may appear appropriate.

Sincerely,

J. W. FOLLIN,
Assistant Administrator.

JANUARY 9, 1948.

Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator, Federal Works Agency.

MY DEAR GENERAL FLEMING: The Navy Department was represented at the conference held December 30, 1947, in the Federal Works Agency on the subject of converting from fuel oil to coal in Government buildings, both in Washington and in the field. All agencies represented at the conference were requested to conduct surveys and to submit reports to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency of reductions in fuel-oil consumption possible within available appropriations.

The information required for the report desired is available in the Navy Department obviating the necessity of conducting a survey of field activities. The Navy Department has taken positive steps as a routine procedure to conserve all utilities including fuel oil, directly and indirectly. Reports received from the field indicate the fuel-conservation program is being administered effectively through special attention to temperature control and avoiding wasteful practices. It is believed this program has no effect on the present fuel-oil situation, since the conservation of all utilities is the continuing objective of the Department as a matter of economy without regard to availability of fuel.

A substantial reduction in the present rate of fuel-oil consumption can be made by the Navy Department at certain shore establishments presently equipped to burn either fuel oil or pulverized coal. The activities and the estimated quantities of coal and fuel oil involved in this category are listed below:

Field activity	Annual consumption, bunker C fuel oil	Equivalent consumption, bituminous coal
	Barrels	*Tons*
Norfolk naval shipyard, Portsmouth, Va.	590,000	135,000
Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.	610,000	140,000
Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.	210,000	48,000
Boston Naval Shipyard Annex, South Boston, Mass.	10,000	2,300
	1,420,000	325,300

The change can be accomplished as soon as adequate coal supplies are provided, and should result in a substantial reduction in fuel-oil consumption during the current heating season.

Further reduction in the consumption of fuel oil in succeeding years would result if certain facilities presently equipped to burn only fuel oil were equipped to burn also pulverized coal or gas. Funds are not presently available for projects in this category.

Sincerely yours,

W. JOHN KENNEY,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Obviously, the most constructive and most encouraging development is the action of the Navy Department. You will note the estimated annual saving of bunker C fuel oil of 1,420,000 barrels. The conservation of more than 118,000 barrels of this type of oil monthly at these four installations will help. Too, the release of tanker space should be helpful.

I call your attention particularly to the sentence:

The change can be accomplished as soon as adequate coal supplies are provided and should result in a substantial reduction in fuel-oil consumption during the current heating season.

This, following the Navy's attempt to help by saving from its stocks at Melville, R. I., is a shining example for other Government departments and agencies.

Next, in terms of encouragement, is the news in Mr. Steelman's letter that the plans and contracts for conversion to fuel oil at Fort Myer, Va., has been stopped by the Department of the Army, "since the fuel shortage became evident." While the date of the order is not clear, it is only indirectly a matter of concern. The important thing is that an unknown amount of fuel oil has been saved by this action. The further report on the current status of the conversion to oil planned for Stewart Field, N. Y., will be welcome. And it is good news that the Department of the Army issued a similar stop order on all such conversions, "except on specific approval." Of course, the question arises why the Army has taken only the limited step of stopping conversions to oil, with possible exceptions, when the Navy has been able to go so much further and convert existing oil heating installations to coal.

However, the action of both these Departments stand out in marked contrast to the many doubtful reasons given by other departments and agencies for their inability to help. Obviously, no buildings now being heated by coal are of importance. But it is certainly debatable as to whether the cost of converting from oil to coal or of employing a few firemen can be weighed against the shortage of fuel oil in parts of this country and be held by any reasonable person to be of any validity. The existing cost of trying to meet this emergency upon individual citizens and upon States, counties, and municipalities would far outrun the cost to the Federal Government for its efforts. The Navy is not bringing up that sort of specious objection. The Army is not. It will certainly be entrusted to the people who have been cold, are cold now, and may be cold throughout this winter to know all the facts. Is it beyond reason to ask the heads of those agencies and departments to reexamine the facts on both sides of this problem and try to take a little more interest in the individual citizen? Maybe they could even find a way to save a few dollars in their terrific budgets to absorb the costs they parade as excuses for not wanting to act.

Mr. Follin's doubt as to the feasibility of action because of the time element is answered by his own reference to Mr. Ball's forecast of a shortage for 5 years. May I point out that our telegram to the President was sent on December 13. This is January 21. Apparently, if prompt action had been taken some conversions could have been completed by the middle of next month. We have cold winters in parts of this country which do not end until April. If we have continued subnormal temperatures in New England until then we are not going to be very grateful to those agencies who could have helped us by converting by mid-February and thereby lent us a hand to get by until spring up our way.

But most important is the possibility of a 5-year shortage. You all recall Secretary Forrestal's testimony Monday on this problem. I hope the reluctant dragons who head these agencies will read his testimony and that they will follow the example of the Navy and Army in filing their final reports tomorrow. It is not too late yet.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REDUCING THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, every honest citizen of this country recognizes the necessity of paying his debts, even when it hurts. Every citizen knows it is much easier to pay his debts while his income is high. Some people find it hard to understand that it is just as necessary for a government to pay its debts as it is for an individual to do so, and that it is equally desirable that payments be made while income is high. Actually in the case of a government there is not only the pressure of honesty and of maintenance of credit but there is the not too widely understood fact that the existence of a large public debt tends to destroy the value of money and to increase the cost of living. The use of tax money to pay the public debt during periods of high income is one of the most effective deflationary devices.

Most Members of this House will agree that we should make substantial reductions in our public debt while incomes are high. Many Members recognize the inflationary effect of drastic tax cuts, but say that it is impossible to give any assurance that the debt will be reduced even if taxes are kept high. They feel that as a body we would succumb to the same temptation to spend that assails many individuals who have cash on hand. I fear that there is much justification for this attitude.

The President has estimated that we will have something in excess of $7,000,000,000 surplus at the end of the next fiscal year should we retain our present tax income and appropriate in keeping with his suggested budget. I have, therefore, introduced a bill to appropriate the $7,000,000,000 to the payment of the public debt.

If we will do this now at the beginning of the session, we can assure ourselves and the people that the debt will be reduced. Should we refuse, I fear we may succumb to the temptation to court po-

litical support through the promise of excessive tax reduction at the expense of debt retirement. If we are sincere about wanting to pay the debt, let us begin paying it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Huntsville Times entitled "Tax Reduction Not Everything."

AMENDING PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1020) to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1020) entitled "An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"$12,000,000"; and the House agree to the same.

JOHN M. VORYS,
WALTER H. JUDD,
JAMES G. FULTON,
JAS. P. RICHARDS,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HUGH BUTLER,
SHERIDAN DOWNEY,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
GEO. W. MALONE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1020) entitled "An Act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment reduced the sum available to pay the expenses of the Philippine War Damage Commission from $16,000,000 to $8,400,000. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment increasing the amount to $12,000,000, and that the House agree to the same. This increase is one of allocation only, and does not increase the total authorization of $400,000,000 already provided by law for settling Philippine war damage claims.

JOHN M. VORYS,
WALTER H. JUDD,
JAMES G. FULTON,
JAS. P. RICHARDS,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 2]

Barden	Gary	Morgan
Bland	Gavin	Morrison
Bloom	Granger	Nicholson
Boggs, La.	Harrison	Nixon
Buckley	Hart	Norton
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Passman
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Pfeifer
Byrnes, Wis.	Heffernan	Philbin
Cannon	Hendricks	Potter
Chapman	Hinshaw	Powell
Chiperfield	Horan	Reed, Ill.
Clark	Jenkins, Pa.	Rivers
Clippinger	Jones, N. C.	Rooney
Coudert	Judd	Sasscer
Cox	Kee	Scoblick
Cravens	Kefauver	Scott, Hardie
Davis, Wis.	Kennedy	Shafer
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Short
Dirksen	Lemke	Stratton
Domengeaux	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Dorn	McMillen, Ill.	Vail
Douglas	Marcantonio	West
Fellows	Mathews	Wigglesworth
Foote	Merrow	
Fulton	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution and an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2873, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, January 20, the Clerk had read the first section of the committee amendment.

Are there any amendments to the first section of the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 6, strike out line 11 to the word "new" in line 25 and insert the word "A" before the word "new" in line 25.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment I am sure is very clear to those who have read this section of the bill. Section 9 of the Reclamation Act of 1939, in the opinion of many who are closely associated with and have dealings with the Interior Department, gives the Secretary of the Interior more power than any man in Government should have. This section which I propose to strike out by my amendment gives the Secretary additional power, if not in specific wording in that section at least by inference.

Starting in line 23, here are some words I should like to read: "shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken by the Secretary."

This means that any project would be authorized if the Secretary felt that it should be authorized and, by the simple fact that he says it is authorized, it has the effect of law, and circumvents the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States.

I call your attention to the fact that right now in the files of the Interior Department you can find several hundred projects which they hope to have authorized, amounting to some $6,000,000,000.

If this section remains in the bill, I am thoroughly convinced that all the Secretary of the Interior would have to do would be to say, "I am in favor of those projects, and I recommend that they be authorized." Then the folks who are interested in these projects would feel that they were authorized because the word would go out that the Secretary's word was equal to an authorization, and then they would pour it on Congress to appropriate money to build those projects. I think that is too much power to give any man.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The provision to which the gentleman has referred, as is shown by the report on page 5, is word

for word the language now contained in existing law. Therefore, this bill does not give the Secretary any more power than he now has under existing law. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to restrict considerably the powers now given to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. JENSEN. If that were the case, then I certainly believe that this amendment is justified. If it would restrict the Secretary in the authority that he has under section 9 of the Reclamation Act of 1939, then I certainly believe that this amendment is justified.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is one of several that will be presented to the committee for their consideration. I would like to point out that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands has been considering this legislation for at least 3 years. I have been a member of the committee now going on 6 years. The committee has for at least 3 years carefully considered legislation which might clarify and set up a yardstick not only for reclamation projects, but for the development of electrical energy. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa does in his opinion restrict the Department of the Interior. I think if you read the report on page 5, which is available to you, you will find that there are very few changes from the existing law. There are a few minor changes. But the thing that I would like to point out to the committee is that the bill as presented to you today represents the composite judgment, of all groups interested in reclamation development. It has had careful, complete study—the judgment of the committee presenting this bill to you ought to have careful consideration. This is a technical bill. It is difficult to understand. We have had to compromise in the committee and have had to compromise with the people out in the field. It does clarify, for instance, the Solicitor's opinion which was handed down in June 1944. The opinion was not pleasant to any of us. We did not like it. Yet the Department of the Interior had to follow the Solicitor's opinion until changed by Congress. It clarifies the Solicitor's opinion. The bill sets up new yardsticks for reclamation projects. Many of the present projects would not be feasible unless a new, more flexible yardstick be established.

In my opinion that should have considerable weight with the committee. The yardstick that is set up ought to be a little more flexible today than it was 20 years ago.

Money appropriated for irrigation is paid back, without interest, and money for electrical-power projects is paid back with interest. This brings new wealth to the United States. This bill affects the 17 Western States. There is a shortage of electricity in those States. Remember this money is paid back to the Treasury of the United States with interest.

The bill does spell out and settle some long-standing conflicts over the application of the interest rates on power investment. This has been needed, and I think the gentleman from Iowa, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, has been disturbed from time to time as to how the interest rates are being applied to these power projects.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I prefer not to yield at this point.

Mr. JENSEN. I just wanted to say that I am in perfect harmony with that section of the bill that recaptures the interest component.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am glad the gentleman is in harmony with that part of the bill.

There is another section of the bill that sets up a longer period—78 years, or the life of the project. That sounds like a long time, but it is not a serious thing. I would also point out to you who are objecting to this type of legislation that the last section of the bill sets up a provision that does not alter or amend or modify in any way the provisions of the act of December 22, 1944, which was the O'Mahoney-Millikin Act, which this Congress adopted. The committee should be supported and this bill adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I want to read the section of the bill that this amendment will strike out, so that those who have any doubts about the authority that the Secretary of the Interior now has under the present Reclamation Act may understand what this amendment would do to correct that. The section that this amendment strikes out begins on line 11, page 6, and reads as follows:

> If the proposed construction is found by the Secretary to have engineering feasibility and if the repayable and returnable allocations to irrigation, power, and municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes found by the Secretary to be proper pursuant to subdivisions (3), (4), (5), and (6) hereof, together with any allocation to flood control or navigation made under subsection (b) of this section, and together with any allocation made pursuant to subdivision (7) hereof, which shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable, equal the total estimated cost of construction as determined by the Secretary, then the new project, new division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, covered by his findings, shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken by the Secretary.

Evidently that is a repetition of what is now in the 1939 Reclamation Act as far as authority is concerned. This amendment amends that out and gives to the Congress the power to determine whether these projects shall be feasible and shall be initiated.

In my opinion, the original act should be amended. The authority was too extensive and if we are attempting to reduce bureaucratic authority in the Government of the United States, here is an opportunity to do it. I do not want to appear in any way to be opposed to the extension of reclamation or to the extension of hydroelectric power, or to the development of the national resources of the Nation. I certainly do not want to usurp the authority that Congress is supposed to have and turn it over to the head of a Department who may very justifiably and very conscientiously, and in many instances do a good job, but nevertheless the people of the United States would like for us to do that job and not give it to the head of any department.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This would enlarge the scope of the bill. Does not the gentleman believe that if that were to be done it should be submitted to the committee and the committee consider it, and the gentleman should appear before the committee asking to broaden the scope of this bill? I do not think that should be done on the floor on such brief consideration as we can give it on the floor.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not agree with the gentleman from New Mexico on that theory for the reason that certainly the Members of Congress can understand if the language is as plain as it is in this section and the amendment proposes to remove that section of the bill, the Members can understand that our authority is being taken out of our hands and has been out of our hands for a long time, since the 1939 Reclamation Act, and given to the Secretary of the Interior.

The people send us here. They want and expect us to decide whether or not projects are feasible or not feasible and whether they should be undertaken.

I do not quarrel with that section of the bill which leaves authority with the Secretary as to the 3-percent interest allocation for new projects under the Solicitor General's opinion; I agree with that. It has been reduced to one-half of 1 percent and to a 2½-percent interest rate. That is fine; but I certainly do not think we should leave the authority that the Secretary of the Interior has under the Reclamation Act in this bill. Here is an opportunity in the House to reduce that authority and bring it back to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am not an expert on reclamation and irrigation projects, but it seems to me there is quite a similarity between reclamation works and the river and harbors works and flood-control projects. They have to come to Congress for authorization for flood-control projects and river and harbor projects. Why should not reclamation projects be handled in the same way?

Mr. McDONOUGH. By all means they should be. We should follow normal procedure that is followed in these other categories and let committees of Congress and the Congress itself decide the feasibility of projects.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. We have the Board of Army Engineers in whom we have great confidence and certain funds are turned over to them each year for river and harbor projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. The gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] made the statement that this provision of law has been in effect since 1939. I believe he is mistaken, as I am informed this provision has been an existing law for 22 years. I see no reason why it should be repealed at this time. The Congress has several checks on the discretionary power that is lodged with the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary has exercised that discretion very well for the last 22 years. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] can finally determine if the power has been exercised correctly. He is the one man in this Congress who has more power and authority than the Secretary of the Interior himself, because after the Secretary of the Interior makes an exhaustive study and determines that the project comes within the formula as set forth by the Congress then he must come to the Appropriations Committee and report that the project is sound and feasible and that it will pay out under the provisions of law as outlined by the Congress itself, and therefore request the money to build the project. Then is when the Appropriations Committee of this House may interrogate the Secretary of the Interior and it can turn down the project if it so determines.

What is the effect of the amendment? The amendment changes the whole procedure that Congress has adopted and approved since 1926, and says that the Secretary of the Interior and the Representatives from the West must get authorization from the Congress for every project that is proposed. That will be such a cumbersome undertaking that it will make it difficult if not impossible to authorize these projects.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. This amendment takes nothing away from the weight and effect of the present law, specifically referring to section 9 of the Reclamation Act. It leaves that intact but simply provides and assures us that no additional authorization and power will be given to the Secretary of the Interior to authorize more projects.

Mr. BARRETT. I am very much afraid that the gentleman is entirely mistaken because existing law provides for all of the elements that are outlined on page 6, from line 11 to the bottom of the page. That is in existing law at the present time and you are repealing it.

Mr. JENSEN. Even if it does take some power away from the Secretary of the Interior it is right and proper that that be done and the gentleman should not worry about that for a minute.

Mr. BARRETT. That is where we differ. The gentleman says in the first instance it takes away no power. I say it takes the entire power away from him. I say that the Congress of the United States for the last 22 years has adopted a different policy and it has followed it with approval. The Appropriations Committee has appropriated for these projects year after year; it has worked successfully, and I can see no good reason why we should change it at this time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. If we had this same kind of amendment in effect to take power away from the Secretary of the Interior, we could have taken care of the gentleman's Jackson Hole Monument. Does he remember that?

Mr. BARRETT. The Jackson Hole Monument was an outrageous abuse of the discretion delegated to the Executive, and the Congress so determined when it repealed the order creating the monument.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would the gentleman agree that if this power is granted to the Secretary of the Interior the same power should be granted, we will say, to the Secretary of National Defense in the Cabinet, if he thinks it proper, to determine the feasibility of putting any particular project he wanted in the United States into effect without coming to the Congress? Does the gentleman think that would be proper?

Mr. BARRETT. The Congress of the United States since the early days has taken the position it cannot carry on all the clerical work of the Government. The Constitution of the United States says that the Congress alone shall coin money, for instance, but of course the Congress doesn't actually print the bills. It leaves that work to others.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana to the amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 4, line 15, to page 7, line 15, delete all and substitute "Section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939 is hereby repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that is not a substitute for the Jensen amendment. The Jensen amendment applied only to the section at the bottom of page 6 of the bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It is the same section that I am striking out by my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer his amendment after the Jensen amendment is disposed of.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the Jensen amendment proposes to strike out, beginning on page 6, line 11, all of that section down to line 25 and add the word "a." My amendment strikes out that same section and also provides for the repeal of the same section which is in the 1939 act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must hold that the amendment is not germane to the Jensen amendment. The gentleman's amendment can be offered after the Jensen amendment is disposed of.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. May I offer this as an amendment to the Jensen amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the same thing in other language.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I proposed it as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. I wil say to the gentleman that he will have an opportunity to offer his amendment after the Jensen amendment is disposed of.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Indiana has placed his finger on what is really happening before this body. He wants to repeal all of section 9–A. Now, the point that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] makes is that this law has been in effect 22 years. The repeal of that law is not the real issue before this Committee. We are talking about other things, but in order to draft this legislation we have incorporated in this bill a part of an act that has been in existence for 22 years. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] now comes before this body and moves to strike out a section of the law that has been in existence for 22 years, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] says, "Give the committee a chance to pass upon that."

I say to the Members here that that is not the real issue; that is not the real reason that this bill comes from the Public Lands Committee, and if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], or any other Member of this body, wants to bring this issue up in a separate piece of legislation, then it ought to come before our committee, and we ought to have an opportunity to examine and to call witnesses in, and then we can debate that issue as to whether or not we are going to modify the existing reclamation law.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This section that the gentleman from Iowa proposes to strike is substantially the same wording as section 9–A of the 1939 act, is it not?

Mr. CARROLL. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, the 1939 act is the one that gives the Secretary the power and the authority to enlarge existing authorized programs or modify them, and it gives him the right to instigate new ones. It is a complete departure from every other procedure we

have in our system of government, such as the War Department on flood control, where we authorize the engineers to make a report as to its feasibility, and then authorize the project.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the gentleman from Indiana will find, as expressed by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] that this has been the existing practice for approximately 22 years. This is a delegation in a sense, to the Secretary of the Interior, to examine the economic feasibility of various projects and then to make a determination and authorization which, as the gentleman from Wyoming said, has been the practice for 22 years, without any great burden on the Congress, without any great burden on the Committee on Appropriations. Now, actually Congress retains the purse strings. Congress retains the controls, because Congress must appropriate the money.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentleman agree with the policy where an agent of the executive department may agree upon a certain project, deem it to be feasible and, in a measure, start upon that project before the Congress has ever authorized it?

Mr. CARROLL. It is entirely dependent, in my judgment, when you talk about economic feasibility, upon whether or not that project can pay its way out. If it can pay its way out—and the Secretary must be considering all the time what the Committee on Appropriations will do, too—then he makes that authorization. If it does not pay its way out he cannot make the authorization, and you have a double check when it comes before the Congress.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to say this, that I am one of the friends of reclamation and irrigation. I am heartily in accord with the program, but I am unalterably opposed to delegating the power of Congress to a bureau chief or to the Secretary of the Interior, who may obligate the Congress before he has been authorized to do so.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman agree with me that if we are going to debate the issue, we ought to do it when it is germane? We ought to have a piece of legislation before a committee. Then we can call in witnesses and explore that particular issue. You may have an important point, but it is not the chief issue under consideration in this bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it should be perfectly well understood by the House that even if the Secretary made a finding of feasibility he could not obligate any funds. All he could do would be to present estimates to Congress. There would be no funds available until appropriations had been made.

Mr. CARROLL. Exactly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, when members of the Committee on Public Lands take the floor in behalf of this bill, which was reported unanimously by the committee, they should not be interrupted to the degree that nearly their whole 5 minutes is occupied by the opponents of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that that is entirely in the control of the gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, yesterday I asked a question but unfortunately there was not time to get the answer. The question I asked yesterday I should like to ask again now for the purpose of the record. I address it to the chairman of the committee reporting the bill. Does the phrase "estimated cost of construction," which is in subparagraph 2 at the top of page 5, contemplate and mean that the estimated costs of the proposed construction will include the liquidation of damages resulting from the construction and the relocations, alterations, and replacements incident to or required by the proposed construction?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Lands met this morning. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] appeared before the committee. The committee is of the unanimous opinion that it is the intent of the language used that the Secretary shall include all of the costs in making his report on the proposed construction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the chairman for that statement.

With respect to the issue which has been under debate under this pending amendment, the point I raise is of course important to that because it bears upon what the estimated cost would be.

Now, then, with respect to the issue here. The record should be clear that if the Secretary makes a finding of feasibility, he cannot then go out and obligate funds on the basis of that. All he gets authority to do is to submit estimates to the Congress. Not until appropriations have been made can he obligate funds. So the decision rests in the hands of Congress as to whether or not you want to take up any project even though a finding of feasibility has been made.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman know that under that authority the Secretary may go so far with the project that the Congress then is obligated to make the authorization and the appropriation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I do not know that at all, because he does not have a dollar to spend on it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In other words, it is taken out of the hands of the Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; it is not taken out of the hands of the Congress. The Congress is going to sit there and determine whether it wants to appropriate any money.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman would explain why there is so much noise about my amendment and why this section was placed in the bill, since the very first wording of the bill is that section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 is amended to read as follows, and that language is almost identical with section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939. My amendment does not disturb it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There are two reasons, as far as I know. I am not a member of the Committee on Public Lands, which really should answer the gentleman's question, but as I understand it, and as I have heard this debate, the first reason is that the Committee on Public Lands finds it has a lot to do, and it wants to have advice based on the engineering investigations. So it says, we ask the Secretary of the Interior through the appropriate engineers and technicians he has, to make an investigation and find out whether or not this is a feasible project. The committee is not composed entirely of engineers, so it proposes that the Secretary determine whether or not a project has engineering and economic feasibility and what the proposed costs are, and if he finds that it is feasible, then he is our agent to the extent of making a finding. He can submit estimates to the Congress and if Congress wants to make appropriations, they may do so.

The second reason, I understand, is that the present law is not explicit enough in items covered in subparagraph 7 which refers to fish and wildlife costs and other things of that sort. The committee merely felt that the present law should be extended and clarified in a particular or two to be sure that those things would be included in the report.

I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] a member of the committee.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman from South Dakota is eminently correct. Will he not agree with me, in addition, that in this and other programs the Secretary of the Interior after he determines that the project is feasible, it must be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and it must concur in the findings. In addition to that, it must be submitted to the governors of the States in which the projects are located and they must, in a measure, concur, and, after all, the Committee on Appropriations of the Congress and the Congress itself must concur.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate yesterday the gentleman from southern California [Mr. POULSON] expressed some opposition to the bill and indicated that one of his lines of opposition was fear that the passage of the bill as is would permit the Secretary of the Interior to make a finding of feasibility for the central Arizona project, which is a large

project, and about which there is some controversy. I had no time at the moment on the floor to answer, but I extended my remarks in the RECORD in partial answer, and they will be found on page 366 of yesterday's RECORD.

However, I would like to settle this matter by showing that such fear is unfounded. I talked privately with the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] and see that he is present and listening. Wanting to clarify this matter, I phoned the Commissioner of Reclamation and asked that very question: If this bill now before the House should become law, would it make possible a finding of feasibility on the central Arizona project, which was the one that the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] particularly mentioned? That phone call was yesterday, that is, last night. I received my reply just a few moments ago and want to read a part of it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will give strict attention to the communication which the gentleman from Arizona is now about to read.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank my chairman. I do think this answer is very pertinent because two Members admitted or indicated that they feared the passage of this bill would have certain effects which I feel sure it would not have.

Commissioner Straus said:

In our telephone conversation of yesterday afternoon, you asked me whether the central Arizona project could or would be authorized by the Secretary's finding of feasibility under H. R. 2873, assuming that this bill is enacted or under any other legislation. Your question is prompted by the fear—

He used the wrong word there so far as I am concerned, because I have no fear of such. Continuing quotation:

Your question is prompted by the fear which seems to be entertained by some Members of Congress that the enactment of H. R. 2873 would be used to accomplish authorization of the central Arizona project without an opportunity for the Congress to pass on it. My answer to your question is "No."

Then he gives an elaborate explanation why the answer is "No." I will not take time to read all of it now. The full letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1948.

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MURDOCK: In our telephone conversation yesterday afternoon, you asked me whether the central Arizona project could or would be authorized by a secretarial finding of feasibility under H. R. 2873, assuming that that bill is enacted, or under any other legislation. Your question was prompted by the fear which seems to be entertained by some Members of Congress that enactment of H. R. 2873 would be used to accomplish authorization of the central Arizona project without an opportunity for the Congress to pass on it.

My answer to your question is "No."

Without prejudice to consideration of the central Arizona project on its merits, my answer to your question is predicated upon the following:

1. Any finding of feasibility by the Secretary, whether under H. R. 2873 or existing law, would require a finding that there is an adequate water supply for the project. All of us in the Bureau of Reclamation are keenly aware of the controversy between California and Arizona over the availability to Arizona of this supply of water and of the difficult and delicate questions involved in the controversy. The Bureau of Reclamation is not in a position to make the final and authoritative determination of these questions that must be made before the central Arizona diversion can be considered to be on safe grounds. If for no other reason than this, therefore, there will be no attempt to secure authorization by secretarial finding of feasibility.

2. The proposal to authorize construction of the central Arizona project is already before the Congress, and the Bureau's report on it is being prepared pursuant to a request from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation of the Senate Public Lands Committee. The Bureau's forthcoming report is not intended as a vehicle for secretarial authorization and would not serve that purpose if it were so intended.

3. Even if some future Commissioner of Reclamation had a different notion from that which I have and could convince the then Secretary of the Interior that he ought to find the project feasible, a report containing that finding would have, under the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, to be sent to all of the States of the Colorado River Basin—that is, to Wyoming Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, California, and Arizona—for review and comment and an objection by any of the States to any of the plans or proposals contained in the report would automatically require the Secretary to secure congressional authorization before undertaking construction of the project or before asking for appropriations for such construction. In other words, California, like every other State of the Colorado River Basin, has the power to veto any proposal for secretarial authorization of a reclamation project on the Colorado River, no matter how good or poor it may be, and to require that its authorization be by act of Congress. H. R. 2873 does not change this provision of the Flood Control Act of 1944 one whit.

To all this, I may add for the sake of the record that neither you nor any other member of the Arizona delegation has ever requested that authorization of the central Arizona project be accomplished by a secretarial finding of feasibility. None of you has ever so much as hinted that this might be done if H. R. 2873 were enacted. I assure you that authorization of the central Arizona project will not be accomplished in this fashion and that I do not and have never had any intention of recommending to the Secretary that it be so accomplished.

I hope that this explanation will prove helpful in any discussion that may arise concerning the effect of enactment of H. R. 2873 on the central Arizona project. Please feel free to use it as you see fit and call on me for any further information that I can give you.

Sincerely yours,
MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Commissioner.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to have you explain what the letter means. I have not yet been able to figure out what that letter means. It means nothing to me.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is it. The charge was made yesterday that very likely, if this bill passed as is, the Secretary of the Interior could make a finding of feasibility for the central Arizona project, thus authorizing its construction without the Congress taking any action. Now, this answer is that, under the bill as is, should it become law, the Secretary of the Interior could make no such finding or authorize the project without the action of Congress. That seems to some Members the very crux of this matter and I want to show it to be erroneous. Why does the Secretary of the Interior not have the power? Commissioner Straus says it is because we passed legislation in 1944 that makes it necessary to submit all such proposals to the States involved and interested. In this case all the States in the Colorado Basin are involved. So that the Secretary of the Interior must submit any projects in the Colorado River Basin to the governors of the 7 States, and any governor would have a chance to veto it. The President or the Secretary of the Interior, under existing law, could not possibly submit a finding of feasibility and authorize such project without submitting it to the Congress.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. If I obtain additional time for you, will you read this letter, which will explain some of the problems?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman know that the Colorado River Board is opposed to most every section of this bill except the interest component pay-back? Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. MURDOCK. Do you mean the Colorado River Board of California is opposed to the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. The Colorado River Board that speaks for all the Colorado River area, for most of the people.

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I fear the gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly am not. I can produce a telegram to that effect, if the gentleman would like to read it.

Mr. MURDOCK. You are probably referring to the Colorado River Board of the State of California. I know their stand on it, but that Colorado River Board of California does not speak for all the seven basin States of the Colorado River Basin.

Mr. JENSEN. It speaks for the State of Colorado very plainly.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot yield until I have read a little more from this letter.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I wanted to correct the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. It is not the State of Colorado but the State of California to which he referred. The State of Colorado is very definitely in favor of this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON. I want to point out that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished gentleman from Colorado on this side are both supporting this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will ask that the entire letter be placed in the RECORD, but I will just read a portion of it now.

On page 1:

The proposal to authorize construction of the central Arizona project is already before the Congress, and the Bureau's report on it is being prepared, pursuant to a request from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation of the Senate Public Lands Committee. The Bureau's forthcoming report is not intended as a vehicle for secretarial authorization, and would not serve that purpose if it were so intended.

3. Even if some future Commissioner of Reclamation had a different notion from that which I have and could convince the then Secretary of the Interior that he ought to find the project feasible, a report containing that finding would have, under the provisions of section 1 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, to be sent to all of the States of the Colorado River basin—that is, to Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Nevada, California, and Arizona—for review and comment, and an objection by any of the States to any of the plans or proposals contained in the report would automatically require the Secretary to secure congressional authorization before undertaking construction of the project or before asking for appropriations for such construction.

In other words, California, like every other State of the Colorado River Basin, has the power to veto any proposal for secretarial authorization of a reclamation project on the Colorado River, no matter how good or poor it may be, and to require that its authorization be by act of Congress. H. R. 2873 does not change this provision of the Flood Control Act of 1944 one whit.

Now, I want in fairness to myself and the Arizona delegation to read one further paragraph:

To all this I may add for the sake of the record that neither you nor any other member of the Arizona delegation has ever requested that authorization of the central Arizona project be accomplished by a secretarial finding of feasibility. None of you has ever so much as hinted that this might be done if H. R. 2873 were enacted. I assure you that authorization of the central Arizona project will not be accomplished in this fashion and I do not and have never had any intention of recommending to the Secretary that it be so accomplished.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Is it not true that under the law as it now exists the Department of Irrigation and Reclamation uses the power vested in it to carry out repairs and minor projects? And would it not be true that if we repealed this section of the law it would not be possible to go ahead and make any repairs without getting authorization? The Department could not put in a bolt or drive a nail without getting authorization from Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to elaborate on that for it certainly would hamper the Bureau's work, but I want in the short time I have remaining to plead with my friends from California, including the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] and the others who have indicated their fear of this Arizona project coming under this bill—which it will not—I want to plead with them to remove their objection to the bill on that basis because that basis is not valid. I hope my friends will do that and support the bill without amendment. Of course, I am interested in the central Arizona project and also in this general reclamation bill, but I do not regard this measure as necessary to make the other possible. They are different matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to get back to the meat of this argument that we have here on this amendment. There seems to be a misapprehension as to the power that the Secretary of the Interior has over reclamation projects. In the first place, for those of you who do not come from the West, may I say that we are talking about projects that are to be entirely repaid, either power or irrigation, and in the case of irrigation the money is paid back without interest. In the case of power the money is repaid with interest. Congress adopted the formula for this repayment in the Reclamation Act of 1939 and it was in the act before that to some extent. In addition to that, if a project cannot be paid out in full under that program it must take the same procedure as flood control and come to Congress for authorization.

It is very difficult to get authorization under the formula that this amendment would take out of the bill. First, it must satisfy and be approved by the State where the project is to be built, and if the water affects several States it must also have the approval of the other States using the water. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] mentioned that in a letter which he read. A matter that affects the water of Arizona must be approved by all of the upper division and the lower division States because they use that water. In the course of investigation and study the Bureau must keep in constant touch with local groups, the Board of Army Engineers, and any others who might be affected in any way.

After a report is completed the Bureau must submit it to the governors of all the affected States on that stream. Ninety days is allowed to review that report.

If the Bureau does not approve the report or if the States do not approve it, it must be so reported to Congress with objections. In Colorado the State conservation board receives these investigation reports and handles these matters for the Governor. They in turn take it up with the local water users and local committees before making a reply.

New projects generally cannot be built unless they have the help of power or a longer time to repay.

In my opinion, this is a great protection and saves the Congress a lot of work. I might say you might just as well ask Congress to approve every loan made by every agency of the Government.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman explain what the duties or privileges of the Secretary of the Interior are under the 3-percent component, according to the Solicitor General's opinion, insofar as initiating new projects without authorization of the Congress? Is he not privileged to use some of that money to initiate a new project without the authorization of the Congress and would he not be given additional authority under this amendment to do likewise with the one-half percent given him?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I do not think it is additional authority. In my opinion, it is a little less authority than under the present situation, according to the Solicitor's opinion. The 3 percent to which the gentleman refers, which is charged, may be used to help amortize and pay out the project. Under this bill 2 percent of that is paid in interest and one-half percent may be used for that purpose. That may be figured in as help to irrigators to pay off a project.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Right, but this section of the bill we are debating says he has authority to proceed then on a new project, a new division of a project or the supplemental works on a project covered by his findings. It does not refer to repairs and alterations and correction of a job. It says it has authority to proceed on a new project.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I think that is the same law that has been in existence since 1939 under which we have been working out West all these years.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It does not limit the amount of the cost of the new project, so that he could authorize, we will say, a project costing $50,000,000 without the authorization of the Congress, then go to the Appropriations Committee and say, "Well, the people out there need this, we have found it feasible, and we have to have the money."

Mr. ROCKWELL. It will have to show it can be paid out.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes. The gentleman is chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, also author of the bill. A large number of Members wish to ask him questions and the gentleman is doing a good job.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I have two questions. Will the gentleman tell us exactly how much additional power, in the gentleman's opinion, is given to the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of Reclamation in this bill as compared to what he would have under the Jensen amendment? Does the gentleman see what I have in mind? The second question: Is it not a fact that in

the letter read by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] the Commissioner referred only to his authorization of construction. He has never authorized construction without money, but he has authorized a project to be brought down for future construction.

There is a very different point involved which I do not think is covered in the Commissioner's letter. Will the gentleman from Colorado please discuss those two points?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Here is my understanding in reference to the additional power, if the gentleman wants to call it that. I do not call it power. I would call it discretion. The Secretary in his discretion would have the authority in figuring out the ultimate cost of a project, if it is feasible and will pay out in full, to add certain other nonreimbursable costs, such as silt control, general salinity, and recreation features. Under the present law, those are not considered as part of the feasibility of a project. As I understand, the only difference in this present rewriting and the other bill is that those reimbursable parts will be added. I think I am correct in that, am I not?

Mr. JENSEN. I am not so sure.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I ask the gentleman this? We have under consideration the amendment of our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], a friend of reclamation. Is it not a fact that what he is trying to do with his amendment—and I think it will do it—is trying to restore to Congress the power to make authorizations rather than for that power to be vested in the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I think that is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Should it not be vested in Congress rather than in the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. ROCKWELL. The point I make is that that has been the law for many years.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Well, that does not justify it alone.

Mr. ROCKWELL. It has worked out successfully. I believe you might compare it to a loan. Congress does not approve every loan that the RFC makes. We authorize them to make these loans under certain reservations. Now, the loans that are made under this act are to be repaid in full. They are not a gift, like flood control, but they are to be repaid.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But the Secretary of the Interior can inaugurate the authorization.

Mr. ROCKWELL. In other words, if you follow me, before he can even authorize a project, he must first have the approval of all the other agencies, and of the States, and of the little communities where the project is to be built; and if anybody objects, that has to be put in the record.

Mr. LECOMPTE. He can come to the Committee on Appropriations and ask for money that has never been authorized by the Congress for these projects; is that not right?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Well, no more so than he can under the present bill. He can do it now under that formula.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is what the gentleman from Iowa is trying to take out.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I agree with the gentleman that that is what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is trying to do; and the reason we do not favor it out there, or one of the reasons, is that we would have every little project come before our committee, with engineers, and so forth, to decide whether or not they are correct. Even now that has all got to be approved by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point that I think should be made clear is this: This does not go so far as you do with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There you give them money and let them make loans. They can go ahead and put this money out. Here you are not giving anybody authority to put out any money. You are merely giving authority to make a finding of economic feasibility. Congress still controls every dollar. There is not a dollar that the Secretary of the Interior can put out or spend until it has been appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman who is now addressing the House knows that the Bureau of Reclamation employs thousands of engineers and assistant engineers and great staffs to look into all of these projects. Just how much they do that is worth the chips that the taxpayers are handing out to them, I am not sure; I am satisfied we have got too many of them on the pay roll. Now, the gentleman also knows that the salaries of a number of those come out of the taxpayers of the United States which is never reimbursable on your reconstruction work and your planning, and so on. You also know that a lot of their salaries are chargeable to these projects that are going to be constructed or that are under construction. Of course, if my amendment is not adopted, the Interior Department will say, "Why, you gave us orders to go into all these projects and determine their feasibility. It is going to take another 1,000 or 2,000 or 3,000 or 5,000 engineers, assistant engineers, metallurgists, geologists, and what have you." How can the gentleman or anyone else think we are ever going to reduce the administrative costs of this Government if we do not start now and cut out such practices?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to make this observation: The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] and all of his colleagues from Iowa stood on the floor of this House and urged rather persuasively that this House authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and borrow approximately $225,000,000 to build thousands of different projects all over the country, and, of course, I was wholly in favor of the legislation; but this House and the Committee on Appropriations do not pass on those particular projects one after the other. Why should you apply a different rule to the Bureau of Reclamation? That is what I want to know.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. This bill has been before the Committee on Public Lands and its subcommittee, presided over by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], roughly 2 years. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] knew that this language was written into the bill months before the bill was reported to the House. They did not ask at any time to appear before the committee, which they could have done and been welcome, and they could have made known their objections to the language written in the bill. However, they waited until this late date to come here to confuse the minds of the Members of the House who are not familiar with some of the technical aspects of the matter.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, since my name has been mentioned?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want the gentleman to know that I did appear before his committee over a year ago and gave my idea as to what should be in this bill and what should not be in the bill, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman interposed no objection to what was known as the Rockwell bill, reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands to this House.

Mr. JENSEN. How did I know you were going to report the bill, at that time?

Mr. WELCH. Congress was in session.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the author of the bill, a question in connection with the next section, as long as he is explaining this particular section.

As I read section 2 of H. R. 2873, and in particular lines 12 to 25 of page 8,

I see possibilities that the administration of this act can be such as to raise Federal power rates in the Pacific Northwest. Let me briefly explain. This section provides for 50-year power contracts and 78-year repayment period, with no reference how the power component cost is to be calculated. Now if the power pay-out is deferred to, say, the difference between 50 and 78 years, and staggered or placed at the end of the period, compound interest on the unpaid power cost component can amount to such a value as to require rate elevation. Since, as I read it, multiple legal construction is possible, I want to inquire if the legislative intent is to elevate rates in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Absolutely not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is not the legislative intent?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is not the intent. I am not a lawyer and I am not an engineer, but the testimony before our committee would indicate that this does not in any way affect the present rates or anything that is already under construction, and it is felt that it would be probably as cheap or certainly no higher than the present rates.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. They would not be increased?

Mr. ROCKWELL. No.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am concerned about that particular section. I am certain the committee had no such intention. With the chairman's explanation, I am sure the legislative intent, then, is not to elevate or in any wise authorize the elevation of rates as it affects the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is my understanding.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. According to the letter of Mr. Straus and according to the discussion we had in our committee today, was it not brought out that if any State or any section protests, then the matter has to come before the Congress for an authorization? So that in turn would give any section a chance to protest and automatically bring it before the Congress?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is my understanding. I am not too familiar with the legalistics of this bill because I am not a lawyer. But my understanding is that any objection made by any State or any municipality would be handled in that way. In a case like this, I understand that every State on the Colorado River is affected, and therefore the report would come in from the Governor of every State, and if any of them opposed it that report would have to come to the Congress with the objection. Then Congress acts upon it and does as it sees fit.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we seem to be arriving at a delightful state of confusion in regard to the bill. I would like to see if I can add still further to that confusion. I trust the gentleman from Indiana will not press his proposed amendment, as high regard as I have for him, because I think that it confuses the present issue, which is consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

I asked the chairman of the subcommittee a question regarding the letter written to the gentleman from Arizona. The letter written to the gentleman from Arizona does say that the Commissioner will not authorize construction. I think one of the issues is as to the authority of the Commission to investigate and to spend money for investigation. When the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands said to the gentleman from Iowa that he should have come before the committee and presented what is now being talked about on the floor, the gentleman from Iowa actually had, had he cared to use it, the perfect answer, and that is that this provision was not in the Rockwell bill when it was under consideration by the committee in the form in which it now appears. The bill as we have it is what the committee calls the compromise bill which was accepted, as a member of the committee has said, within the final 24 or 48 hours before the committee voted. A great many people did not have a chance to consider it in detail.

The intent of some Members, as expressed on this floor, seems to be to allow all these authorizations to go through, many of them good and reasonable, with no objection to the authority in the hands of the Commissioner, until they reach the Committee on Appropriations and then to say to the Committee on Appropriations, "You are our only line of defense. No matter what approval has been given it and no matter what authority has been given, you must be the one to find out if this is really sound." It seems to me as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and as one who is tremendously interested in reclamation, since my district is dependent on irrigated water, it seems that that is putting a severe burden upon the Committee on Appropriations. My position as a member who is interested in reclamation, and a former member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, is that I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], but that I would not vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, if he were to offer it.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], who has been so patient.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is the question I had in mind: Are you satisfied with the Commissioner's answer in the letter which I read in part, that the passage of this bill would not permit the authorization of such a project as the central Arizona water project?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am satisfied with it. I think it is good that it should be included as a matter of record as the Reclamation Commissioner's opinion. I am not satisfied that the Commissioner is saying that he would not spend money on proposed projects before he came to the Congress for authorization for construction. I think that should be covered in the letter.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the gentleman's fears are somewhat unfounded as applied to the lower Colorado Basin. No project needs money appropriated in the Colorado River Basin, because annually by existing law we take $500,000 out of the power revenues from Hoover Dam, the Boulder Canyon project, to make such investigations, and the Secretary has that fund on which to draw.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. This is entirely a matter of principle with me. I am not opposed to the Commissioner nor the Department. I think we should curb the powers of agencies of government and bring the powers back to Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As a matter of principle, will the gentleman advocate that each rural electrification project be required to come before a committee of Congress for investigation and study before you authorize it?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I would have to study the question before answering it. I am inclined to think the answer would be "Yes," if large and involved projects are to be allowed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may propose a unanimous-consent request that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I decline to yield for that purpose at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before the House after a compromise was reached. I doubt if it is satisfactory to any member of the committee that reported it. As a matter of fact, it came here from the Rules Committee by the skin of its teeth.

There are three things that are bad about this bill. One is the very thing the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is trying to correct, and I shall support his amendment. I am afraid, however, that it does not do what he wants to accomplish. If you will examine the report, you will find that the language which this amendment would strike out, is substantially that part of section 9 (a) of the 1939 act. It is that act from which the power and authority of the Secretary stems, and I feel that the entire section in the 1939 act should be repealed. It has been stated here today that this

practice is similar to that exercised by RFC, and my good friend from South Dakota says the Rural Electrification is authorized to do the same thing. But that is not the fact. Congress authorized the RFC to make sound business loans. The projects in Rural Electrification are not in fact projects of the Federal Government. The Rural Electrification Administration is a separate entity and that may and does borrow money from RFC on a sound business basis. Here you have a situation that is a complete departure from every other principle of government, in which the Congress is not asked to authorize a project until after the project has been established. In other words, we are delegating to the Secretary of the Interior the power to place the Congress under obligation to authorize and appropriate after he has decided on a specific project.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; I decline to yield for the moment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman referred to my statement. Certainly he wants to be corrected there.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I will give you an opportunity to correct it, if you will allow me to continue for a moment.

I do not think it is sound for Congress to place this extraordinary power in the hands of an appointive official of the executive department. This extraordinary power authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to modify, to extend, to enlarge, or to establish new projects that have never been authorized by Congress.

What do we do in flood control? Before the Army engineers may investigate the feasibility of a project there must be an authorization directing them to make the survey. They report back to the committee. If the committee then determines that it is good for the country, that it is feasible, then the Congress authorizes it and the money is made available. But here we designate an individual in the executive department to act for the Congress and obligate us so that we must eventually appropriate the money to carry out the project, and that is neither good government nor good law.

I urge you to support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, but I would prefer another amendment that would definitely correct the situation. I would strike out that part of this section proposed by the pending amendment and also section 9 (a) of the 1939 act which is the origin of this authority. I am a friend of irrigation and reclamation. I spent a number of years in the West. I know how desperately they need these projects. I know that water to them is vital to their economic existence. This method of establishing projects, however, is a disservice to the friends of reclamation and irrigation and the people of the West may find appropriation committees denying funds that otherwise might be granted if authorized by law. I think we should recapture that power and keep it in Congress where it belongs.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the gentleman is somewhat in error in comparing the REA with this situation. This is the situation, as I understand it, that Congress appropriates money to the Rural Electrification Administration or in some instances says it can borrow money from the RFC; in any event, the REA gets money and makes individual allocations without any review by Congress.

This authorization is not an authorization——

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. All right, now——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me finish the comparison—is not an authorization for the Secretary to spend one dollar. It really creates an authorization so that a project would not be subject to a point of order when and if Congress ever comes to appropriate.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have not the time to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman from South Dakota knows very well that the set-up in REA is entirely different from this; that is a separate entity. The REA goes to a bank, the RFC, that we set up, and borrows money and obligates itself for repayment, and that situation is entirely different from the one we are talking about here.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I cannot resist yielding to my dear friend from California after I have made just one other statement.

My Committee on Publicity and Propaganda has been investigating the Bureau of Reclamation for some time; and reports of our investigators show that today in the city of Denver there are 1,000 engineers on the pay roll of the Bureau of Reclamation—who may go out at the instance of the Secretary and make surveys without any authority of the Congress other than the authority of section 9a of the Reclamation Act of 1939. We know, too, that Mr. Straus and Mr. Krug have called the field men into Washington and directed that they must see to it that all funds must be expended before the end of the fiscal year, in order that more money may be justified.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to truly represent the people who have entrusted us with our seats in Congress, we must recapture this delegated power and assume our obligation of exercising it solely in the people's interest.

I now yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana stated in his opening remarks that this bill was reported to the House with indifference by the Committee on Public Lands. He also stated it got by the Committee on Rules by the skin of its teeth. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Rules and he has the right to speak for his committee, but the gentleman has no right to speak for the Committee on Public Lands.

This bill originally was reported to the House unanimously. The committee met again this morning, Mr. Chairman, and the members reaffirmed their faith in this bill and ask to have it passed by the House without crippling amendments such as the amendment under consideration.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman is one of my very dear friends. What I said about this bill coming from the Committee on Public Lands I reiterate now. In discussing the matter with members of the committee and in listening to testimony before the Rules Committee several of the members said there were features of this bill they did not like, but they had to compromise in order to get anything.

What were the compromises? You have a provision in here to increase the amortization period from 50 to 78 years, giving this agency the right to use the money that ought to be paid back to the Government under the loans for an additional 28 years. There is another provision in the bill that reduces the interest rate from 3 percent to 2½ percent but only 2 percent of the interest is covered back into the Treasury. They leave in the hands of the Secretary one-half of 1 percent to play with, to employ engineers, if you please, or to promote wildlife, for instance.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman has referred to authorizations for flood control. Are those reimbursable or not?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; they are not.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that every authorization for the West is reimbursable and has to be paid back?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes; and that is as it should be.

Mr. CARROLL. That is right. Now, the gentleman has made reference to the city of Denver. I may say to him that his information is not correct about the Denver engineering office. As a matter of fact, in the last session of this Congress a limitation was placed upon the appropriation for the Denver engineering office and they have destroyed and dispersed that office.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Effective the next fiscal year. Our investigators have reported that last summer the Denver office of the Bureau had 1,000 engineers on the pay roll.

Mr. CARROLL. They were on the pay roll, but they were not in Denver.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, but I think he is wholly mistaken when he says that the effect of this bill is to raise the limitation of the life of the project and the pay-out on the project from 50 to 78 years.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That will come later.

Mr. BARRETT. May I say to the gentleman that he is wholly mistaken. Under existing law there is no limitation whatsoever. The law does not provide 50 years. It provides that it shall be repaid, and that means within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The policy of the agency has been 50 years.

Mr. BARRETT. No; the law does not say so.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I did not say the law so provided. I said the policy of the agency has fixed it on the basis of 50 years.

Mr. BARRETT. The average pay-out is 60 years.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Let us debate that when we get to it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, the gentleman was interrogated a moment ago with reference to repayment of flood-control moneys.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I may say to the gentleman that there is just as much flood-control money spent out in the western part of the country as there is anywhere else in the country without reimbursement.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, it is unwholesome and fundamentally wrong for Congress to leave in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior the right to obligate us and the people's money without first coming to Congress for it. The Jensen amendment will accomplish in part what we should do here, but I still think we ought to go to the roots of the thing and repeal section 9 (a) of the 1939 act.

Mr. Chairman, the Jensen amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. On the pending section and all amendments thereto?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Yes.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman is requesting that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that there are five more amendments on the Clerk's desk to this section.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the full 5 minutes. I just want to point out that if the Jensen amendment is adopted it may have one result, and that is that it will open the door to logrolling, which evidently the Congress, which passed the original 1939 law, wanted to avoid. This is particularly true with respect to the amendment which the gentleman from Indiana proposes to offer, because the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana strikes out the entire section which requires the Secretary to make certain calculations, certain investigations as to costs and as to feasibility, before any bill can be presented to Congress or to the Committee on Appropriations. The result will be that a group of people on the river somewhere, having a little project, would have to come to Congress without the aid of the Secretary of the Interior and ask that their project be approved. Why, you would have hundreds of these projects up here without a proper investigation and the result would be, of course, logrolling. I would say to Colorado, "You help me with mine and I will help you with yours." The Committee on Public Lands would be under terrific pressure. Perhaps it is a good thing; I do not know; but if it is, I think the Committee on Public Lands ought to take this particular section and take this particular amendment into consideration, call witnesses, debate it fully, present it to the House for its consideration, and it ought not to be done here on the spur of the moment on the floor of the House.

Furthermore, it will endanger the bill which has been presented here for the purpose of correcting one of the greatest objections to the reclamation law raised by the gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations, which I discussed yesterday. Let us stay with that and cure that objection, and if this other thing needs to be amended, and if we want to have a little logrolling, well, let us take that to the committee later on and I am sure the committee will give it very careful consideration.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. In looking at the report on page 4 and comparing clause 9 of the existing law with section 9 in this bill, I do not see how striking out the language which is stricken by the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa would change the existing law anywhere. Section 9 of the existing law will be just as it is. All this is a reiteration, is it not?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Oh, no. The striking out by this amendment would in effect amend the existing law by striking it out of the existing law also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, my approach to this problem is going to be institutional rather than technical. Sometime in the past the Congress of the United States adopted a policy of going west and harnessing those rivers for the benefit of the general welfare of the United States, and while I used to live out there in the West and operated industries, where we sent our own men into the hills and picked out our own spots, and where we, with our own private funds, built dams and impounded water, and later carried it out on our fields and irrigated our crops on a big scale, I went out this summer and looked over the field and found this new form of operation going on wherein the people of the United States, through the Irrigation and Reclamation Act, puts up hundreds of millions and proposes to put up billions of dollars.

You have harnessed the Columbia River, you are harnessing the Sacramento River, and you are harnessing the Colorado River in the interest of the general welfare of the United States. If you go to Grand Coulee and Bonneville you will find that about 65 percent of the kilowatt-hours you use in the Pacific Northwest is being produced from the waters harnessed by Federal funds, where the people are being charged rates on the consumption of kilowatts to reimburse those funds.

We are shifting our population and our industry to the western section of the United States at a very rapid rate, and by shifting I mean you have built and you are building new industries which are to take care of new populations. There are 20,000 people going into California per month. If we want to get our necks out—and there is some other language I could use that you would understand—just let us rewrite the Irrigation and Reclamation Act here this afternoon by two or three amendments such as are being proposed. I am not going to scuttle that operation out there and I am not going to be a party to scuttling that operation in such a manner. As a member of this committee, I feel that if you do not want to pass this bill, instead of cutting its throat, send the bill back to the committee and let this operation die.

If you want to go ahead with those projects and maintain the national defense of this country as wrapped up in the Colorado and Columbia Rivers, you had better be careful how you deal with this organic law, and not start out to rewrite it here on the floor.

Who is going to go out and make this initial work unless it is some department of the Government? The committee of

which I am a member is not going to do it, and I will bet you the Appropriations Committee is not going to do it, and I will bet you there is no special investigating committee of the House or the Senate that will do the job. You have the highest policy of government involved in the irrigation and reclamation operation of this country. You have your whole power project of the West, the entire water supply of the West, you have the Central Valley of California involved in this, which is an empire upon which this country is going to depend substantially for its food supply in the coming years; where you are going to build literally billions of dollars worth of irrigation canals, dams, and things of that kind, or you are going to surrender the western half of the United States and let it go back to the grasshoppers. You are going to put water out there; there is no question about that. If you are going to do away with the irrigation and reclamation project and jerk it back to a one-horse affair, you are starting out on it in a good way here this afternoon.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Is it not perfectly clear to the gentleman that this proposed amendment does not take out of the bill an additional power which is given by the bill to the Secretary of the Interior, but what it is doing is going back and taking away from the Secretary of the Interior the power he has had for a long, long time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is a power which is now in section 9 of the existing law. You are proposing to rewrite the organic Irrigation and Reclamation Act here by these proposed amendments. That is no way to do it.

Mr. ENGLE of California. In other words, to make it perfectly clear, this amendment is not stopping an additional power which this committee undertakes now to give to the Secretary of the Interior, the amendment seeks to go back to the law as it existed and now exists prior to the passage of this bill and take out a power which the Secretary of the Interior has always had.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exactly what is being proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 51, noes 52.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROCKWELL and Mr. JENSEN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 66, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COTTON: On page 6, line 23, after the word "authorized", insert "when adopted by Congress."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment involves the question just previously voted upon and decided.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DONDERO). This is an entirely different matter. The Chair believes the amendment is germane, and the Chair overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from New Hampshire will proceed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I recognize the fact that I come from a section of the country which is not directly interested or involved in reclamation, but I am none the less anxious to be able to vote for this bill.

I realize further that it would be presumptuous for a new Member to attempt by amendment to tamper or tinker with a bill which, as has been said by members of the committee, is the result of long months and years of study. I would therefore call the attention of the committee to the fact that this amendment, unlike the previous amendment, does not in any way change the machinery of the bill. It simply preserves the authority of Congress, as the ultimate arbiter of the expenditures of government.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this principle far transcends anything involved in this particular measure or any other measure that comes before us on this floor. We have seen the vain endeavors of Congress to stem the tide of governmental expenditures; to dispense with needless employees; to reduce bureaucracy; again and again it has been impressed upon us that until we have the cooperation of departments and bureaus in the executive branch of the Government we are, to a certain extent, powerless to accomplish the result which we desire to accomplish and which the people desire we should accomplish. We cannot force that cooperation, of course, without invading the realm of the executive branch of the Government. But I insist that this is indeed a poor time for the Congress to formally abrogate and surrender any of its prerogatives in controlling the expenditures of the Federal Government.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. ROCKWELL. The gentleman understands, of course, that this would accomplish the same thing as the amendment that was just defeated? You are trying to amend a law that has been in existence since 1939. In other words, this is nothing new. It is a custom that has been the practice for many, many years.

Mr. COTTON. I will say to the gentleman in answer to his first question that I do not concede that this simple amendment calling for the approval of Congress without disturbing the machinery set up in the bill is identical with the amendment that has just been voted upon.

In answer to his observation about the length of time this situation has existed I would suggest that if a principle is wrong it is not made right by the length of time it lasts. Adam committed the first sin long ago in the Garden of Eden but antiquity does not justify it.

If it has been in the law of the land that the Secretary of the Interior may spend without approval of Congress we should take it out when we are reviewing it. Certainly we should not now place the stamp of approval on such a policy. Let us write into this bill that Congress must ultimately approve of all expenditures. Let us not be satisfied by passing that responsibility on to the Committee on Appropriations. This is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental principle involved in this amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire I think is clearly understood by every member of the committee. I say to you that there is scarcely a Member of this House, I doubt if there is a single Member of this House, who at some time on the political hustings has not inveighed against and decried bureaucracy. When you were out seeking the votes of your constituents you told them that when they elected you to Congress you would come down here and take away the powers of the bureaus, the agencies, and the commissions that had been surrendered by the previous Congresses; and perhaps if your opposition in that election was a sitting Member, you pointed your finger directly at him when you made that statement.

This is not a new thing. It has been before us time and again in various respects. There is neither rhyme nor reason why the Secretary of the Interior or some inferior official in that Department should exercise that power, duty, and responsibility this Congress ought to shoulder itself and has shouldered in every parallel situation that we deal with down here.

You have heard expressed time and again today a similar criticism and the parallel drawn that when you are dealing with flood-control projects, when you are dealing with rivers and harbors authorizations, in order to get a survey made you have got to come to Congress and get it approved.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does not the gentleman think that the real check on unbridled discretion of the Secretary is the Committee on Appropriations which reviews the request for moneys for projects they approve?

Mr. PICKETT. That is one check and certainly we ought to have that check. We ought to have other checks on these fellows who want to do something without the authorization of Congress. That is what is proposed by this amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. There has been so much said about the appropriate committee having the final say. That is all well and good, but when some committee of the Congress and the Congress of the United States passes a bill which authorizes some agency to go out and authorize these projects, then the people say, "Why, for goodness' sake, the Congress authorized this. Do you mean to say that you are not going to give us this money?" And they bring down the house on us. That is why during so many late years we have had these great appropriations which never should have been made.

Mr. PICKETT. All right; now let us get back to the fundamental proposition here. Are the Members of this House going to endorse a proposition that is fundamentally wrong simply because it has been the custom for 20 years to do it? That is one reason advanced by those who are in opposition to this amendment. That is no reason at all, and you know it. Are you going to endorse the continuation of a bad practice simply because, as some say, that to require you to go through a legislative process and require the Department of the Interior to justify these authorizations would also demand a great deal of work by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation or the Committee on Public Lands? And certainly the charge and assertion which was made by my friend from New Mexico a few moments ago, that if you changed the policy of authorization from existing law to what is proposed here, there would result a considerable amount of logrolling, is one of the most astounding things I have ever heard. I do not know of any better opportunity to do logrolling than you would have if you wanted a group of projects in several States and you run down to the Secretary of the Interior or his delegated official and everyone pitched in and helped everybody else out. The custom for years—the practice for years and the law for years—has been that those who want flood-control projects authorized in their districts or their States or sections, those who want rivers and harbors authorizations, must come to the Congress and get them. I know of no instance, and there has been none referred to here, where there has been any logrolling. If there has been, somebody ought to mention it, and we ought to help eliminate it. Certainly the adoption of this amendment would return us to one of the fundamental conceptions of the duties and responsibilities of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose and intent of this amendment is the same as the last amendment. Every other amendment will have the same purpose. That is, to knock a hole in the irrigation and reclamation law.

It is a fact, and you know it to be, that we make large appropriations here for the REA and we delegate authority to that agency to approve projects. Is it not just as reasonable for the Bureau of Irrigation and Reclamation to use the same judgment? There has not been one instance cited here where the Bureau has misused its judgment. There have been made general statements, but a specific instance has not been mentioned.

There are many cases where the Bureau of Irrigation and Reclamation has to move forward on small projects and make surveys. It cannot go forward in the authorization of projects and the expenditure of money on a project until it has been approved by the Appropriations Committee. It is desired that we go further in checking on the Bureau of Irrigation and Reclamation than we do with the REA or any other Government agency. In these other cases we give the agencies the money, let them go out, spend it and allocate it as they see fit. In this instance we hold in check all authority until it has been found to be thoroughly feasible, then it is presented to the Congress through the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is agreed to it will cripple the Bureau to the extent that we cannot have continued expansion in the West. I know there are some people who would move their lips in friendship for irrigation and reclamation in the West but deep down in their hearts they do not want to see the West developed because they are afraid there might be some competition. But let me point out that we do not grow the same products out West that are grown in the Middle West. We buy the manufactured goods from eastern plants. When we develop one of these irrigation and reclamation projects it results in our buying large amounts of electrical equipment and farm equipment, which are produced in the East; therefore, it is to your advantage to see that this portion of the United States continues to develop. To shoot a hole in this particular law is to destroy the progress already made in the western part of the United States. Leave the law intact. For 22 years it has been working well.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I am very much interested in what the gentleman said about limiting surveys and investigations. In the last flood-control bill, for which the Bureau of the Budget set up some $5,000,000, we were limited to $125,000 by action of the House. This was modified by the Senate and raised to $2,000,000. The compromise passed this body. That is as much as could be spent for surveys and investigations. That is just another check in addition to the check that comes from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Colorado. In plain English, this law has been working well and for anyone to come in here with these amendments is to destroy its whole effectiveness. Please do not meddle with the law at this time. There are no instances mentioned here where there has been an abuse of authority. There has been a group of generalities. Leave the law as it is and let the Bureau of Reclamation and Irrigation continue to function. They function as efficiently as any department. These projects pay back to the United States all money invested. In addition thereto, I have in mind a project near my home town of Phoenix. We pay more money each year in income taxes from the resources that we get out of this project than was paid to construct the project. It is to the benefit of all of us. Let us not poke holes in this law. So, I plead with you, do not adopt any of these amendments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was going to observe that the Congress does not approve large road-building projects, nor do we approve sites for air landing strips, and so forth. There would be just as much sense having Congress approve that type of construction as it would be for these small irrigation projects.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. It is not our business to go out and approve particular, minute details. That is the reason we have experts. That is the reason we do not approve every irrigation project, because we would find it will not function, and that is the reason we should leave this particular law as it is.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. My colleague is right in pointing out the great economic benefit of irrigated areas. I would like to ask the gentlemen on either side of the aisle who have apparently been opposing reclamation here whether they can find anything in general in the history of reclamation from 1902 down to the present hour to complain of? Throughout those 45 years the Bureau of Reclamation has spent nearly a billion dollars and created wealth, tax-producible wealth, as the gentleman has said. My colleague refers to the great reclamation project in which we live in the Valley of the Sun. Yes indeed. That project has received from the Government a total of less than $25,000,000, three-fifths of which has already been repaid. In addition to the income tax mentioned, this project has created more than $200,000,000 in permanent wealth. That project has lately produced $40,000,000 in cash crops over 12 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I realize that this is a national issue, and I am sure every Member of the House does. I also realize that many Members do not realize that this is for reimbursable projects, and that every cent so far has been and will be repaid.

Yet, my friends say they are for reclamation, and then immediately try to give it the stiletto and murder it. Let us be fair with these western people that have done so much for the defense of this Nation, and for the welfare of this Nation, and let them point out wherein there have been any projects wherein the Bureau has abused its power.

It would be just as sensible to come in here and say that before the RFC makes a loan or even an estimate, whether the security is sufficient or not, they should refer it to Congress for congressional action. I wonder if some of them would not come in here and want Congress to pass upon whether or not they should button up their vests before they act.

You cannot put hobble skirts on an agency and expect it to function. We must give it an opportunity to step out and do the preliminary work, and then Congress does pass upon it, if they need money to continue or more money than will be paid back by the reimbursable provisions of the present law. The whole thing is confusion and misrepresentation and misunderstanding by men who have no knowledge of irrigation and reclamation, and yet they want to talk wisely about it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As the gentleman has stated, here is a proposition where somebody in the United States advances some money to certain sections of our population to build irrigation and reclamation projects, which money is to be reimbursed. Why not do more of that, at least in line with the billions of dollars we are sending to other countries where we know good and well there will be no reimbursement? Is it not as much for national defense to provide for a large percentage of our population in the Western States as it is to do jobs abroad in Palestine, China, India, or somewhere else?

Mr. LEMKE. I would say a hundred times more so, and I will go further and say that it is just as important, and more important than the large appropriations we make each year without reimbursement for river and harbor improvement. My eastern colleagues ought to sit up and take notice. They may hear from us sometime if they continue their present obstructive practice connected with western irrigation projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendments that have been offered today have been opposed on the ground that other agencies of Government do not have to come to Congress to get authorization. Now I ask you if that is not the primary reason why this Nation is in such a mess today? Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time that every agency of Government be required to come to Congress to get its authorization to spend the people's money. Until we do that, we will be going down the road to financial destruction and complete destruction of everything we hold dear in America.

I am fed up, sick, and tired of listening to some Members of Congress, men that you expect more than just lip service from, when they have something that is of particular interest to them, getting up and saying, "Let the bureaucrats run America and let Congress do the wishes of the New Deal socialists." We were elected to represent all the people of America as well as the people in our own district. I sincerely trust you will not vote against this simple amendment which provides that the Interior Department shall come to the Congress to get authorization for these great expenditures which will in the next few years amount to billions.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does this amendment place any limitation on the size of the projects that will have to be approved by Congress?

Mr. JENSEN. No; it does not.

Here is what you are doing if this bill in its present form is made law. It will stir up a fight in Congress on reclamation projects, so sufficient appropriations for many worthy projects might be in jeopardy. You are doing a terrible disservice to reclamation and the development of the West by this kind of business; remember what I am telling you, my colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. The fact of the matter is that we have voted down an amendment that has the identical objective. There are just two ways to find a project feasible. In the first place, Congress has the power to consider individual projects and to declare them feasible, and that was done in the last session of this Congress. In the second place, this Congress since 1926 has delegated to the Secretary of the Interior the power to declare projects feasible under certain accepted rules and regulations as laid down by the Congress.

What is the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire? He says, "All right, the Secretary of the Interior can make these studies, he can make these findings, but the project will not become feasible and be authorized until adopted by the Congress." To my way of thinking that is absolutely absurd, because after all, what does that mean? It means that the Congress itself has to authorize the project. We have already voted on that particular issue. We have had it up. The gentleman from Iowa offered an amendment the effect of which was to say that a project could not be authorized except by a vote of the Congress. I think this is just a lot of horseplay, if you ask me. We have already voted down that proposal.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not my good friend from Wyoming feel that it is the duty and the responsibility of Congress to recapture these delegations of power which were made at a time when they should not have been made and has not the gentleman himself criticized the Congress for having delegated power that the Congress itself ought to exercise?

Mr. BARRETT. What I criticize very severely is the abuse of the power the Congress delegates. That was the case in the matter of the Jackson Hole National Monument. I am sure that Congress recognized that fact when they repealed the action of the executive in establishing that monument.

I want to say furthermore that I think the gentleman is incorrect because we must delegate authority. We have delegated authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish rates. We have delegated authority in hundreds of cases. As long as we safeguard these delegations of power with sufficient restrictions I am sure we are on safe ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROCKWELL) there were—ayes 51, noes 48.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROCKWELL and Mr. COTTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 58, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 7, line 5, after the period, strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, please let me make clear at the very outset that this is not one of the amendments which is seeking to take anything away from the Bureau of Reclamation or the Secretary of the Interior that they have ever had before.

I believe this is an amendment which will help the bill, yea, which will save it from disastrous defeat; because it will never become the law with this joker in it that this amendment would eliminate.

I do not believe the committee realizes the extent to which these words go. I know there are Members of this House who are voting for the bill because it has always been said, and truly, that projects would be self-liquidating. Now, here is a proposition that authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to go back for 40 years, should he so desire, to the very beginning of the Bureau of Reclamation, and "make findings with respect to projects heretofore authorized as to that part of the cost thereof which should be allocated in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (7) hereof and in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, and such part of said costs shall, after transmittal to the President and the Congress of a report containing such findings, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. Operation and maintenance costs attributable to the purposes enumerated in subdivision (7) hereof shall, after the transmittal of any such report, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

The only string tied to this unlimited grant of new power is, you will notice, that the allocation should be "in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (7) hereof and in accordance with subsection (b) of this section." This string refers only to the allocation and its purposes, and these purposes are stated to be, "(i) preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife pursuant to the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), or (ii) recreation, including recreation by reason of the provision of enlarged or improved facilities or conditions specifically and reasonably required for such purposes, or (iii) general salinity control, or (iv) silt control. Costs allocated pursuant to such findings, together with the annual operation and maintenance costs attributable to the same purposes, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

But if you will read carefully what this amendment seeks to eliminate, you will see that it ties itself only to the allocation and its purposes and eliminates from section 7 this vital condition precedent: "the part of the estimated cost," which effectually leaves out of all consideration the vital requirement that there should be an estimate of the cost of effectuating these purposes in the project.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman point out in the portion he proposes to strike from the bill where that provision is found?

Mr. HOBBS. On page 7, line 5:

> The Secretary may make findings with respect to projects heretofore authorized.

I asked the Commissioner of Reclamation himself if I were correct in my interpretation that that would authorize him to go back to the foundation of his Bureau and in any project that subserved: (i) Preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife pursuant to the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), or (ii) recreation, including recreation by reason of the provision of enlarged or improved facilities or conditions specifically and reasonably required for such purposes, or (iii) general salinity control, or (iv) silt control, the Secretary could make findings as to that part of the cost thereof which should be allocated, and that such part of said costs might become nonreimbursable and nonreturnable, he said, "Yes."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He must of course report to the President and the Congress, and it must be accepted by the President and the Congress as to those provisions.

Mr. HOBBS. I am not entering into that debate; that is partisan, that has nothing to do with the merit of my amendment; but I submit that when the people from the arid lands of the West come to Congress and ask for irrigation and reclamation projects on the strength of their assurance written into the law that the users of the water, the users of the electrical energy would pay for the project eventually, they ought to live up to their contracts. I have supported every one of such bills since I have been here and would like to support this one. But I can never go back for 40 years and catch up the loose ends that never before have been mentioned in reference to projects some of which have been paid for, and take from the Federal Treasury money long since paid in good faith, by the provision that such funds shall become nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. So, it means that you may have a $40,000,000 joker in the bill. There is no excuse for it and no need for it. It does not help the bill. I submit that the amendment ought to be accepted by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] some questions. Does not the gentleman's amendment apply only to that portion of the projects mentioned in subparagraph 7, page 5, of the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not think it even covers that much. It covers only the retroactive effect of that provision. We are leaving the provision in there as to all pending and future projects.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me submit my question this way: The amendment the gentleman offers would strike the language which appears in the bill now before us which has reference to that portion of projects heretofore built which deals only with the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife. Is that correct?

Mr. HOBBS. And similar things in the past; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the past, all right. Now let us analyze the amendment for a moment. Suppose that 20 years ago a project was entered into which involved a cost, we will say, of $10,000,000, $50,000 of which at that time involved the preservation and the propagation of fish and wildlife, fish and wildlife being preserved in the interest of the general welfare of this country. Upon what grounds have we any right to burden a group of farmers who purchase water from a project so financed and built? It is making those farmers who buy that water pay for the portion of that project which was built for the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife when the fish and wildlife are to be enjoyed by the people of this country generally. I think that is a fundamental issue which is raised by this amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to reply to the gentleman. Assuming the hypothetical case which the gentleman mentions 25 years ago, they came, they offered to pay; nothing was said about the preservation of fish or the propagation of fish or wildlife; they have been paying on the basis of the original contract for all these 25 years. Some of these pay out completely in 40 years. This was never thought of then, nor were our fish hatcheries in existence then.

Now, all that I am saying is that as to those projects in which it is contemplated recreation, fish, game, or whatnot, anything you want to put in there, can be done now as to pending projects or future projects, but do not make a gift to these people who have been paying for 40 years out of the Treasury of the United States money for these purposes that was never contemplated, which projects in some instances have been paid out and liquidated in full.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like for the gentleman to say specifically whether the language of his amendment deals strictly and categorically only with the language preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife? It is limited to that, is it not?

Mr. HOBBS. No; it is not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us see if it is not. Subparagraph 7, which the gentleman's amendment affects, says:

> The part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to (1) preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife pursuant to the act of August 14, 1946, or (2) recreation, including recreation by reason of the provisions of enlarged or improved facilities or conditions specifically and reasonably required for such purposes, or (3) general salinity control, or (4) silt control.

Mr. HOBBS. It applies to all those categories.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It applies to all those categories, I agree with the gentleman. That is a further reason why you have no moral right to impose such costs on a group of farmers who are buying water to irrigate their land. Let the general public pay for what they use and enjoy; don't impose it on the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention particularly to the wording of this paragraph. It goes further than has been indicated up to the present time:

> The Secretary may make findings with respect to projects heretofore authorized.

We have discussed up to now only projects that have been constructed. In the Missouri River Basin of Montana we have a lot of projects that have been authorized but not constructed, projects that extend along a river 2,500 miles long. Those projects were authorized in what is known as House Document 191. They have not as a whole been constructed; in fact, very few of them have even been started.

If the pending amendment is adopted those projects could not be reexamined to determine the amount of cost that should be charged to salinity, to silt control, to wildlife and other items that the Congress has indicated approval of in today's debate and which would be credited as nonreimbursable items. In other words, the farmers in those areas would

have to pay for such items if the projects are constructed.

We have in other parts of the country projects that have been authorized but not constructed. It seems to me if the Congress is going to adopt this principle in regard to future projects, projects that have been authorized but not constructed are entitled to the same treatment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand the gentleman's position, he draws a real distinction between authorized projects of the past and projects actually constructed, and as I further understand, the gentleman's contention is that the language in the bill now does not apply to projects that have been completed.

Mr. D'EWART. The language of the amendment applies both to authorized projects that have not been constructed and authorized projects that have been constructed.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I think the gentleman is very mistaken. It does not touch it. My amendment touches only those that were heretofore authorized and does not touch those that are now pending or in the future. If there is any question about it, I will be glad to call attention to section 7 and subsection (b) of section 9. There is not a word in my amendment that applies to anything but those heretofore authorized.

Mr. D'EWART. I would like to say in answer that no project that has been constructed in the past was constructed without first being authorized; therefore the amendment applies to not only projects authorized but also those that have been authorized and constructed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The adoption of the amendment would certainly make the rule lack uniformity in the various sections of the West.

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. It seems to me that this committee has done a good job in working out this bill. I have voted against the previous amendments and I shall vote against this one and support the bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. For instance, in my own congressional district there are two projects, one known as the Optima Dam project, authorized by this Congress more than 10 years ago, but construction of the project has never even yet been commenced. Of course, the adoption of this amendment offered by my good friend from Alabama would impose a situation on my folks out there entirely different than these projects that are to be built in the future, because they have been authorized heretofore. This amendment clearly, I think, takes in those projects, all of the projects, that were heretofore authorized, even though no construction work has been done on them.

Mr. D'EWART. The gentleman is entirely correct. The amendment includes the authorized projects, whether constructed or not constructed.

I therefore oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, on first appearance this would not be a bad amendment, but this is just another illustration of what happens when you try to write legislation on the floor. In my personal opinion this is going to sabotage the very thing we are trying to accomplish in this bill. Let me call your attention to a few of the things that might happen and do happen on these great western projects.

Let me read from section 9, paragraph (7) at the top of page 6 of the bill, "recreation, including recreation by reason of the provision of enlarged or improved facilities or conditions specifically and reasonably required for such purposes."

Now, a project could very easily be started, finished, and completed in every detail, and then this part that I have just read have no bearing or interest on the project for years after the project had been completed and in use.

Let me read clause (iii): "General salinity control."

Now, the control of the water itself is a very important project. I am referring to the changes in the water after you find out you have had it in this reservoir for months or years past. The very standing of the water in the reservoir and the condition of the soil may so affect the change of that water that the farmers cannot use it. I suppose on the floor of this House you want to rewrite this legislation and prepare it in such a way that no recourse could be had by the farmers who had irrigated their lands and established their ditches and prepared their land for water, and then to find themselves up against the proposition where none of the water was usable after a certain number of years. Still a worse condition exists, and that is this. I am talking about silt control. Silt can put an irrigated section out of business.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With reference to salinity, a man would need to go into the Central Valley of California and spend 3 or 4 weeks on the study of that one question alone before he would be prepared to discuss this thing intelligently.

Mr. HILL. Of course.

Mr. CRAWFORD. After the deal has been completed and been in operation for years, you may find the accumulation of silt that destroys the use of the water. Farmers have some rights in this the same as other people.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that in the Committee on Public Lands we had a discussion on almost every phase of this bill, and on this particular phase of the nonreimbursability of the items named, such as salinity control, there was no controversy. We were unanimous all the way through in making those items nonreimbursable. While that does not quite apply to the matter of making them retroactive, yet I think we ought to apply the rule now generally accepted uniformly.

Mr. HILL. In discussing this question of silt, let me say that only today in a discussion of this bill with some friends of mine I learned that the lake behind the great Boulder Dam, now called the Hoover Dam, in the course of a number of years will fill itself completely up with silt. If you apply that to many irrigation lakes in my own county and my own district, we have lake after lake that is beginning to be filled with silt.

If you accept the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], for whom I have the highest respect as one of the real lawyers of this House, you will find yourself in difficulty on these projects, because when these reservoirs fill up with slit certainly the Interior Department has a responsibility in keeping their contract with those farmers using this water. The land under the Colorado-Big Thompson project has been bonded; it is a mortgage against every farm in that district. Would you come along and write words in here which you cannot justify and tell those farmers that after they have mortgaged their farms and paid the mortgages off, and the reservoirs fill up with silt, that they have no recourse on the Department of the Interior who provided the water?

In Colorado we have one of the first projects that was ever built by the Interior Department. Today there is a committee working to bring before this House legislation to provide some protection to the farmers in that particular district who find themselves in severe difficulty. At the time of building this project, or when completed and used for several years many of these problems or difficulties arose. Now if you adopt this amendment, the farmers on this project can have no possibility of ever receiving any assistance from the Interior Department in correcting their troubles. This amendment should be unanimously defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk. Since they apply to the same section of the bill and deal with the same subject, I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PICKETT:

On page 7, line 12, after the word "nonreturnable", insert the following: "only after provision has been made by act of Congress after the Secretary has transmitted to the

President and the Congress the report and findings involved."

On page 7, line 15, after the word "nonreturnable", insert the following: "only after provision therefor has been made by act of Congress enacted after the Secretary has submitted to the President and the Congress the report and findings involved."

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, has not this amendment already been covered in other amendments that have been voted on today?

Mr. PICKETT. I insist on the amendment, Mr. Chairman. I cannot yield further. The situation is simply this, notwithstanding that you voted down the principle which I espoused a few moments ago, when I asked to make it mandatory that projects approved by the Bureau of Reclamation be submitted to the Congress for authorization, I think certainly that the problems presented by the gentleman from Alabama and the argument he offered in support of it is a further reason for the necessity for requiring that the approvals be given by an act of Congress rather than the Bureau of Reclamation or the Secretary of the Interior.

Now let us look at what you have here. Based on certain criteria upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, he may approve projects. Then as you go along and read your bill you find this language commencing on line 24, page 6:

If all such allocations do not equal said total estimated costs, then such new project, new division, or new supplemental works may be undertaken by the Secretary only after provision therefor has been made by act of Congress—

And so forth. That is what is in this bill. You are assuming apparently that the Congress will be more generous with your projects than the Secretary of the Interior would be because you have written in the bill language which purports to say that if under the criteria that he must consider he does not find it economically feasible and sound, then you ought to come to the Congress and you must come to Congress and get authorization for it; but where it happens to suit you or where it is deemed to be feasible and economic under the terms of this bill, you do not want to do anything except let him have carté blanche to authorize it. Why should you not be fish or fowl instead of fish and fowl as the case may be. It simply amounts to this, that basically and certainly under good and sound principles of government and good and sound practice by the Congress, we ought to require that all projects of the size and importance of reclamation projects be approved by act of Congress, just as we do with flood-control projects and rivers and harbors projects and other projects of that kind.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are not the amendments offered by the gentleman similar in principle to the amendment which the Committee defeated this afternoon?

Mr. PICKETT. I certainly agree that they are, and I would want to insist that the action of the House a few moments ago was erroneous if you are going to act under sound legislative principles and not delegate your authority to somebody in a Federal department, bureau, or agency.

I want to call your attention again to the language found in this bill where you say if it is not feasible under the criteria then come down to Congress and maybe Congress will be a little more generous with you. That is the effect of it. But if it is feasible, you say we still do not want to come down here and justify it before a committee of this House.

(Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and also to revise and extend the remarks he made previously.)

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment in substance was already voted down by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes 19, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

Are there any further amendments to this section? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 43, 485h (c)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts to furnish water for municipal water supply or miscellaneous purposes. Any such contract either (1) shall require repayment to the United States over a period of not to exceed 40 years from the year in which water is first delivered for the use of the contracting party, with interest not exceeding the rate of 2½ percent per annum on the unpaid balance if the Secretary determines an interest charge to be proper, of an appropriate share as determined by the Secretary of that part of the construction costs allocated by him to municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes; or (2) shall be for such periods, not to exceed 40 years, and at such rates as in the Secretary's judgment will produce revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost and an appropriate share of such fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper, and shall require the payment of said rates each year in advance of delivery of water for said year. Any sale of electric power or lease of power privileges made by the Secretary in connection with the operation of any project or division of a project shall be for such period, not to exceed 50 years, and at rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues which, together with power revenues from all other sales or leases or power privileges, will be at least sufficient to cover (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, including reasonable provision for replacements; (2) the return, within 78 years from the date upon which each feature becomes revenue producing or the useful life of such feature, whichever may be the shorter, of an appropriate share of the construction investment properly allocable by the Secretary to commercial power, together with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate of not less than 2½ percent per annum; (3) the return, without interest, within a reasonable period of years not exceeding the useful life of the irrigation features, and with respect to each irrigation block, in a period conforming so far as practicable to the period within which water users are required to repay their share of the irrigation costs, of that share of the investment found by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 9 (a) hereof to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power revenues: *Provided*, That the power revenues to be applied toward the fulfillment of the obligation to return that share of the investment found by the Secretary pursuant to section 9 (a) hereof to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power revenues may include no more than one-fifth of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates in addition to any and all sums otherwise assigned for such purpose from power revenues: *Provided further*, That all revenues derived from the interest component of power rates not so assigned shall be accounted for as interest and shall, together with all other moneys so required to be returned to the United States, be returned to the United States as provided by the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318); and (4) such other costs and fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper. In said sales or leases preference shall be given to municipalities and other public corporations or agencies; and also to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations financed in whole or in part by loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and any amendments thereof. Nothing in this subsection shall be applicable to provisions in existing contracts, made pursuant to law, for the use of power and miscellaneous revenue of a project for the benefit of users of water from such project, and the provisions of this subsection respecting the terms of sales of electric power and leases of power privileges shall be in addition to and alternative to any authority in existing laws relating to particular projects. No contract relating to municipal water supply or miscellaneous purposes or to electric or power privileges shall be made unless in the judgment of the Secretary it will not impair the efficiency of the project for irrigation purposes."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 8, line 21, strike out "seventy-eight" and insert "fifty."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is intended to continue the policy in connection with the retirement of the contribution of the Government loan on these projects at 50 years, the same as it is now. I understand the law does not specify any particular period over which the Government loan shall be amortized, but it has been the policy since the reclamation projects started to amortize the Government loan over a period of 40 years, allowing the first 10 years for the project to become self-sustaining.

The proposal in this bill is to increase the total period to 78 years. No project

has ever been carried over such a long period of time. Commercial loans are never based on such extended terms. This is simply subsidizing cheaper power rates, which power is simply an incident of the reclamation and irrigation project. I think it is entirely too long for the Government to wait for its money. It is true this bill provides for interest charges. The law as it is today provides for a rate of 3 percent, but the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior has ruled that interest should not go back into the Treasury. In other words, returns on Government loans could be used for other projects in connection with the Interior Department program.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In just a minute.

This bill proposes to reduce the interest rate to 2½ percent and cover back into the Treasury 2 percent of the 2½; but one-half percent is still left in the hands of the Secretary to play with just as he has been playing with the 3 percent.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In just a minute I will yield to the gentleman.

I think the ruling of the Solicitor was wrong and was not based upon any sound principle of law. It was never the intent of this Congress to waive interest on the loans that we made for these projects, even though they were covered back into the Treasury—2 percent interest.

It is proposed to increase the repayment period from 50 to 78 years. That is not good business, and I hope this Committee will adopt this amendment reducing the period of time to the number of years established by the Interior Department heretofore.

I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman has twice said that the Secretary had 2 percent to use in any way he saw fit, to play with on other projects. I remind the gentleman that it can be used only on a particular project to remit irrigation charges and costs in that particular project.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman perhaps is not familiar with the activities of the Interior Department in handling the money that has been placed at their disposal.

Is there anything wrong with maintaining the situation as it is today? Are we going to subsidize cheaper power rates in competition with private power up there by delaying the period of time in which the taxpayers are going to get back the money they lent? I think it is all right for the Government to lend this money on these projects, but I do not think it is fair for them to use the money over such a long period of time in order to cut down the rate on power which is only an incident of the original project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is really the nub of the whole bill, this is the real issue that is before this body right now. These other amendments that we discussed, as I have said before, were not germane to this legislation, so this is the real issue that is before this body and I hope now we have unveiled the forces that are working against this piece of legislation. The gentleman has expressed it: Are we going to give the people cheap power? That is the issue in this whole piece of legislation.

Let me summarize for just a moment what has happened in the weeks, the months, and the years in the discussions that came before the committee. The real issue has been this, let us take for example the Colorado-Big Thompson project. It is a multiple-purpose project. In the Colorado-Big Thompson project, for example, the estimated cost of creating that project was $50,000,000, $25,000,000 allocated to irrigation and $25,000,000 for the sale of electric energy. There is a distinction between estimated costs and actual cost of construction. The estimated cost is based on a pay-out period of 50 years. As stated by the gentleman from Indiana, there is no law governing this except an opinion of the Solicitor General. That opinion, as the gentleman from Wyoming has pointed out on numerous occasions today, sets no limitation upon the pay-out period. It can be for the natural life of the project. This legislation for the first time imposes a limitation upon the power of the Secretary of the Interior. That limitation is 78 years or the useful life of the project, whichever is the shorter; in other words, a limitation of 78 years.

Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to determine the economic feasibility of a project. What do I mean by that? When he goes out to estimate whether or not these projects are feasible he has to find out where you can sell the power and how much you can sell it for.

Let me tell you what has happened in the case of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. I mentioned the estimated cost of construction as $50,000,000. It has been said that the Bureau of Reclamation has not done a good job. As a result of the increase in the cost of material, labor, and some other factors, that original estimate of $50,000,000 has now gone to $131,000,000. The farmers of northern Colorado cannot and should not bear that increase. It has to come from some place. Where will it come from? It will come from the eventual sale of electrical energy.

What is the price now? Seven mills per kilowatt-hour—too high for sale in that area. They will be pricing themselves out of the market unless we enact this legislation. If there were no legislation at all and we used that 3-percent interest to pay for the cost of irrigation and the increased costs, then the power would sell for about 5.1 mills. They can sell it in that area for five and one-tenth. Under this law which extends the period from 50 to 78 years, we will have a comparable power rate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the gentleman how the figure "78" was arrived at?

Mr. CARROLL. The figure "78" was reached, according to my best recollection, and I stand to be corrected, in this way: We had a certain problem to meet. There was the feeling that we should pay the interest component of 3 percent back into the Treasury. Obviously if we took the interest away from the cost of irrigation we would have to increase the power rate. Power is already carrying too large a load. But the Appropriations Committee insisted that we have got to pay the 3-percent interest money back into the Treasury. This legislation is the compromise coming out of the committee. There was a feeling that if we extended the pay-out period to 78 years we could meet all of the objections. We pay our way and we will pay the interest back into the Treasury of the United States. There will be no loss of money. At the same time we will not increase the power rate to take us out of the power market. It is just a sound business transaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will bear with me for about a half a minute. I neglected to say when I offered this amendment that I was doing it on behalf of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who was momentarily called from the floor, he, of course, being chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations and vitally interested in this matter. He asked me to say to the House in his behalf that this is one of the most important things that he had to contend with in this bill and he hoped the amendment would be adopted.

Mr. CARROLL. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that is one of the reasons that we have recommended this legislation. It was to meet the urgent and repeated demands of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I personally felt there was no need for this legislation but there was a feeling, because they were holding a club over the head of the West, that we had to return the percentage into the Treasury; therefore, in order to do that and meet the demand of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and a former Member of Congress from Ohio, Mr. Jones, we recommended this very legislation.

Using the Colorado-Big Thompson as an example, I say to you if your amendment prevails it will mean an uppage in the power rate that may destroy the economic feasibility of the Colorado-Big Thompson, and further I say to you as regards the Central Valley Authority in California, if the Members of California

support this amendment, you may destroy the operation of the Central Valley Authority; this same principle pertains to every great project in the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I merely wanted to point out to the gentleman that last year this Congress agreed to a 40-year amortization for TVA. That does not mean that TVA is actually on a 40-year amortization basis because probably the average age of TVA and its various projects is already 7 or 8 years. But, it was to stay within a projected 50-year period, and TVA cooperated with that sort of a program. TVA includes not only power; it includes navigation and flood control. We worked out, at least tentatively, and enacted into law, a 40-year amortization program which seems to be most reasonable. I want to see reclamation go forward. I want to see cheap power. I think it is part of the life stream of the economy of the Nation, and where there are excessive charges by private operators in the power field, I think the yardstick is a healthy one. But, let us not be uneconomic in whatever our plans may be. The authorities seem to feel that somewhere between 40 and 50 years is reasonable amortization. Now we say that some projects in some sections of the country will be 78 years and others will be 40 and 50. I do not think we are entirely logical in that.

Mr. CARROLL. May I interrupt the gentleman to say that we are not confronted with a theory; we are confronted with an economic fact, and the economic fact is this. The West is imposed upon, may I say. They insist that we shall pay the interest component into the Treasury instead of into the cost of irrigation.

Mr. PLOESER. Of course, TVA is paying back into the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to ask for additional time if the Committee does not object. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes. I think his discussion is most intelligent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the TVA, with which I am not familiar, may have different economic circumstances surrounding it, but from listening to hours and days of testimony, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana prevails, I know what it will do to the power rate all over the West, and I know that it will increase that power rate to such an extent that you may destroy the economic feasibility of the existing projects. May I finish by saying this, from a sound business standpoint the Government has invested millions of dollars from which it must receive a return on, from revenue which can only come from the sale of electric energy. That electric energy must be sold at a rate which is reasonable.

Mr. PLOESER. Well, but you have two factors to consider when you are trying to allocate your funds and make a division as between irrigation or flood control or whatever else you have and power. You are not going to build a project that has to price itself out of the market. If you are going to build one it must price itself within the competitive market for the users of power, and then it is only natural that you will get your project in such shape that you can be economic enough to do it within a reasonable amortization period, or else it is not beneficial to the Nation in the long run. It is still not too late to make proper allocation of the costs.

Mr. CARROLL. The allocation of the costs has already been made. Irrigation in the West can bear only a certain amount of the load of these great projects. The great brother that bears the load is power. If you put too much of a burden on power, you will destroy the great projects.

Mr. PLOESER. Beyond the point of what costs can be revised, if they can be revised in the light of facts from $50,000,000 to $120,000,000, which the gentleman is talking about, they can be revised in the light of the facts as to the proper allocation of the investment.

Mr. CARROLL. I am sorry I cannot agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. One is just as good as the other.

Mr. CARROLL. It may be true as to future projects but clearly not as to existing projects.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Missouri brings up the agreement that was reached with TVA on this repayment plan. This is an entirely different situation. It involves more than one project. TVA cost allocations were defined and fixed based on the amount of revenues being paid into the Treasury, but here you have numerous projects. You cannot treat them as individuals, the whole group must be taken into consideration.

Mr. CARROLL. The real point here is that the Government does not lose a dollar, not a dollar.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course not.

Mr. CARROLL. We are investing not only in the future of the West but in the future of this Nation. There is a bill before this Congress that may ask for $2,000,000,000 for a great Air Force, continued expansion and production of electric energy is needed for this program.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If we had just one project under this bill, we might agree to that.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The project the gentleman mentions was one of those projects the Secretary of the Interior approved based upon an investigation by the engineers as to its feasibility under the policies then existing in the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CARROLL. I am not sure of that, but I think it is reasonably accurate.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is true. That policy was that amortization of the Government loan would be made upon a basis of 50 years.

Mr. CARROLL. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Now, after the project is all established and after the Secretary has made his survey and recommended that it could be done feasibly and the rates would be low, the bill recommends that we extend the period from 50 to 78 years, so you can reduce the power rates even lower than that.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the gentleman misses the point. Year after year for over 10 years the Congress has appropriated money to take care of the expansion of this program, so by implication it has endorsed the change in the plans.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. By that very thing, by the expansion of the program, you are increasing the revenue. If it was right in the first place, it ought to stay that way now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot pose as having an intimate knowledge of this rather complicated problem involved in the reclamation undertakings. When we heard the description of the provisions of this bill before the Rules Committee, the thing that attracted my attention first was this particular provision for the extension of the amortization period to 78 years. In connection with that extension, I noted, as you all have, that compared with the current rate of interest charges, which is 3 percent, the rate has been reduced to 2½ percent, 2 percent to go into the Treasury, whereas none of the 3 percent went into the Treasury before, and one-half of 1 percent to be used by the Reclamation Service for assisting the project, I suppose, to meet unexpected emergencies. That feature of the bill I thought was excellent. I thought that was a distinct step in advance toward sound financing. It decreases the cost to the beneficiaries of the project by reducing the rate of interest from 3 to 2½ percent, and still leaves something in the hands of the Interior Department to the extent of one-half of 1 percent to be used for what might be termed emergencies.

I was somewhat dismayed, however, to find that when we decreased the burden to be placed upon the beneficiaries, we at the same time increased, from the standpoint of sound economics, the burden on the Federal Treasury by increasing the amortization period from 50 years, which has been the customary period, to 78 years. I do not pretend to be a highly educated economist. I have been in business for myself for some

years. I have yet to hear of a 78-year mortgage. It would be new to my experience or observation. I have never yet heard, or perhaps I am mistaken, of a bond running for 78 years. But there is another side to this which may not seem important to you. What I am interested in is that new projects shall be given fair consideration not only by the Committee on Public Lands of the House but by the Committee on Appropriations. The projects which are proposed in the future will be the more persuasive to the Congresses of the future if the amortization period is not beyond the normal period for amortization in business life. I fear, and I say this quite seriously, that this increase from 50 years, let us say, to 78 years in the amortization period will be a deterrent in the Committees on Appropriations of the future. I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations nor of the Committee on Public Lands, but I have some ideas of the psychology of Congresses. It is going to be a pretty difficult thing for the proponents of a project to come before the Committee on Public Lands in the future, and especially the Committee on Appropriations in the future, and defend a project when the members of the committee will understand that it is going to be financed in a way that no other economic undertaking that I know of is ever financed in the United States. I honestly believe that the 78-year period will be a deterrent to new projects, and I ask the Members from the West who take such an interest in such things to bear that in mind.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before I get to the matter of the amendment, I want to mention two things. A moment ago when the gentleman from Colorado had the floor, the gentleman from Indiana asked regarding the project mentioned in Colorado, the Big Thompson project. I gathered from what the gentleman from Indiana said that he thought the Big Thompson project was one of those established on a finding of feasibility by the Secretary of the Interior. I was in Congress at the time and I know that the Big Thompson project was duly authorized by Congress. It was handled by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation while I was a Member, and passed the House and Senate, as other authorization acts were passed. I want to make that correction and make it clear that this is not a project which was brought in by the Secretary of the Interior on a finding of feasibility.

May I refer to one other matter? I listen always with great interest to my friend the gentleman from New York. He is a sage and a philosopher. He said he had never heard of a mortgage running for 78 years. I do not know whether I have heard of a mortgage running for 78 years, but I have heard of 99-year leases. I think it is possible to have a sound business contract extending over a long period of time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the gentleman put mortgages and leases in the same category?

Mr. MURDOCK. May I point out to the gentleman that they are both business contracts or transactions, and really are not entirely dissimilar. The gentleman from New York says that the 78-year period is likely to deter future projects. Let me call attention to the fact that irrigation is growing, therefore the law must be undergoing evolution. At the present time we have irrigated about 10,000,000 acres of land in the United States. There are 20,000,000 acres, or a little more, that could be irrigated by the total development of our water resources. But, mind you, the easy projects have already been developed. From now on we shall have more difficult ones. The very first project was the Salt River Valley in the State of Arizona. Roosevelt Dam, begun in 1906 and finished in 1911, named after Theodore Roosevelt and dedicated by him, was really the Father Abraham big dam in the reclamation cause, and that was a comparatively easy program of development as compared with those in the future.

We are going to have to have more time for repayment. I want to call attention to the fact that in the evolution of the law we have progressively increased and lengthened the period of repayment. Ten years was first set, then 20 years, 30 years, 40 years, and 50 years. Those are the repayment periods specified in earlier reclamation acts. Now we come here with an act that proposes a 78-year period for repayment and I feel the nature of the investment amply justifies the longer period.

A year and a half ago I was at Hoover Dam and went through the great power plant for the third or fourth time, taking part in a celebration. They were celebrating the tenth anniversary of the beginning of the production of power at Hoover Dam. Well we might celebrate it. Think of the Hoover Dam and the Grand Coulee Dam and what they did during the war in connection with the production of power which was so necessary. But it was pointed out that in 10 years of production the power plants at Hoover Dam had paid 25 percent of the cost. Probably it ought to pay out in 40 years, or thereabouts. Will that dam last any longer than 40 years? It will last a thousand years if properly taken care of. Is it good security?

When the great Coolidge Dam was built in Arizona, on the Gila River, named after the late President Calvin Coolidge, they put two giant eagles as ornaments on the south face of that dam. There they are, with outspread wings, 50 feet from tip to tip. A cartoonist pictured those two giant eagles and had one eagle saying to the other, "Steady Brother; the first thousand years are the hardest." I appreciate that picture and that fact. I think those eagles will be standing there on Coolidge Dam for a thousand years. Now, is it too much to ask that we have 78 years to pay for such a permanent structure?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] who was unfortunately called away from the floor, and is now offered for him by the gentleman from Indiana.

I agree with the gentleman from Colorado who said it is the nub of the bill. I completely disagree with the reasons given by the gentleman from Colorado for saying it was the nub of the bill. I am in complete disagreement with him today, as I was yesterday, that this necessarily would raise power rates, or has any direct relation to an increase or decrease of the power rates.

Those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning read the colloquy between the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] in which the gentleman from Montana, a member of the committee, also said that the evidence did not support the statement that a reduction to 50 years would change or increase the power rates.

I again call attention to the fact that I was for 4 years a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and I say that that evidence does not support the statement that this would increase power rates; that that is just an unsupported statement.

Now, to the gentleman from New York who asked about the length of time, the present custom and regulation in the Department is that a 40-year period, plus a 10-year construction period, without the payment of interest, makes the 50-year total. There is one project authorized as high as 67 years. There is no project, to my knowledge, authorized beyond that, and the figure 78 has no connection with any existing practice in the Department. I therefore do not call it a compromise in any sense of the word. I think a compromise would have been something between 50 and 67 years.

With reference to existing projects like, let us say, Central Valley, so ably represented by the gentlemen from California [Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. GEARHART], who are here, the evidence has shown that project can pay itself out in less time than any time that has been discussed here, and therefore does not enter into the picture. The question of cost of operation being charged against the project is more pertinent than the number of years.

I think Congress could properly investigate the costs of operation of some of these projects. We would find they could pay themselves out in less time than now contemplated. The fact remains that aside from everything else there is no justification for 78 years, and that this House should certainly support the soundness of the proposal to set a limit at 50 years.

I think it is unfortunate that when any Member stands on the floor of this House to defend the soundness of the finances of the United States, the integrity of the financial condition of the United States and its projects, there

should immediately be raised a charge of for or against reclamation, of for or against some hypothetical Power Trust. Those of us who speak for this amendment are just as much interested in reclamation as those who speak against it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. WELCH. I hope my California colleague is not trying to convey the impression to the members of this Committee who are not as familiar with the mechanics of the laws or of the bill before us as some of us are, that the life of the project, whether it be 40, 60, or 78 years will cost the Government of the United States one additional penny.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. They are reimbursable.

Mr. WELCH. They are reimbursable, but not out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I can argue that point with the gentleman if he will get me additional time.

Mr. WELCH. This additional time of repayment does not cost the Federal Government one dollar.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think it does; yes.

Mr. WELCH. It matters not whether those projects run, as I said, 40, 60, or 78 years, or to the life of the project.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It adds to it indirectly.

Mr. WELCH. It does not add to it indirectly, if I may say so.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. All I am trying to impress upon the Committee today is that I think a limit of 50 years as suggested in the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa is a good limit.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it must be recognized by every one of us, whether it will cost the Government additional money or not, that no one can write a law today that will make any particular project live and be serviceable and useful 78 years from now. The law we write will not make it serviceable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, there are no Members in this House who are more interested in the well-being of the West than those who reported out this bill. I am a good friend of reclamation. I do not want to do anything that will interfere with its successful operation. I do not want the Congress to take a position that will prevent the people from securing low-cost hydroelectric power. Therefore it pains me to state that H. R. 2873, as amended, in my judgment could be administered so as to be injurious to a vast region of our Western States. It needs clarification and safeguards. It could be construed in a way to break faith with the commitments already made and our agricultural economy. On page 4 of House report 880 on this bill it is shown how it came into being. With such a birth there is abundant opportunity for confused wording. From reading the bill I am convinced that we have such an ambiguous wording in the bill that no amount of amending on the floor can produce a safe result from the standpoint of the West or a proper return to the Treasury. It can be interpreted and applied in several ways. Confusion between the 78-, 50-, and 40-year periods mentioned in this bill is such that the interest-bearing power component period can be so staggered that the pay-out would be jeopardized. This could result in a power rate that would kill western industry and interfere with national defense. Such a rate could prevent a full return to the Treasury and could result in greatly reduced appropriation which would be a calamity to the West.

This bill will also likely injure western Army engineer projects. It goes into subject matter coming under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. The use of the world "probably" throughout the bill nullifies any fixed formula that this bill purports to establish. This bill does not insure repayment on a sound basis. There has not been given opportunity for full consideration of the bill in order to secure safe and sound legislation. Therefore I feel that this bill should be given further study on the points I have raised either here in the House or in the other body.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important issue and it is the important issue in this bill. I realize that there is some misunderstanding. It is true that my friend from Indiana says he wants to maintain the present condition. Then he ought to be for the 78 years, because the 78 years fill in the gap to make feasible those projects that would not be feasible since in the bill we take the 3 percent interest component away from irrigation and give 2 percent of it to the Treasury and retain only one-half of 1 percent where it used to be 3. This is the issue.

Again you are mistaken when you say that all projects are to run for 78 years. That section of the bill provides "78 years or the life of the project, whichever is the shorter." That is the language of the bill itself.

Now let us analyze things a little further to see whether the Government loses any money or not. These are reimbursable projects. If for 50 years the Federal Government received nothing but the interest at 2 percent it would have received back its original investment 100 percent. You cannot get away from that. Suppose no part of the principal is paid for 50 years, the Government would have back its original investment 100 percent and still would have the original obligation coming from the power project. Consequently, it is wrong to assume that the Government is going to lose money on this.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that private companies do this very thing? For instance, the large utility in northern California refinances its bond issues all the time. When they come to the end of the 20-year or 40-year period they refinance and issue a new set of bonds.

Mr. LEMKE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The reason many of these things may not be understood by Members who are not on the committee, and this is no reflection upon them, is because this is a technical bill. There were different viewpoints, but we have gotten together.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read now a letter I have just received from the National Reclamation Association, one of the most powerful and useful organizations in America. This letter is addressed to me and is dated January 21, 1948:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LEMKE: The National Reclamation Association is much concerned as to the disposition which might be made of H. R. 2873 by the House of Representatives today.

This legislation is of vital concern to the Nation as well as to reclamation development in the West, as was so well pointed out by you in the debate on this bill Tuesday.

You and your colleagues also called attention in the House debate to the fact that last spring the report of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate contained a recommendation pointing out that legislation on this particular subject should be passed at the earliest possible moment.

Reason for such legislation comes from the necessity of clarifying the reclamation laws and bring to an end the continued controversy which has come from diverse interpretations of those laws.

The Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the House has had such legislation under consideration for a period of more than 3 years. The legislation is difficult and involved. However, after extensive hearings the Public Lands Committee reported this amended bill which is now before the House. The language of the bill has been most carefully studied and considered, not only by interested parties but by the committee which heard the bill. To amend it further would most likely only lead to further misinterpretation and prolonged complications. It should also be observed that further amendments may bring difficult questions of administration.

The annual convention of the National Reclamation Association, held in October 1947 after this bill had been reported by the Public Lands Committee, unanimously endorsed it.

It is my conviction, Congressman, that this legislation is of such national import that it is worthy of the support of every section of the country, and it is my earnest hope that it may be approved in its present form.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY E. POLK, *President.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am not clear on the gentleman's statement that you have to have 78 years because of the change in the interest component. How can the gentleman say that when the Solicitor's opinion was not handed down until 1944 and these projects were approved before that? It is perfectly evident to me that 78 years is not essentially a figure involved in the approval of the project.

Mr. LEMKE. I would say that reclamation is growing. We are spending millions of dollars in the Missouri River Basin alone; I think something like two hundred or three hundred million dollars, and there are many new projects connected with that that are absolutely essential to make it feasible.

These are perfectly sound, the same as a loan by the Federal land banks. That is feasible if they give me enough time to pay it, but if they do not give me enough time, it is not feasible. But still it is perfectly sound. Therefore, in view of the fact that the private corporations keep on renewing many of their loans, running far more than 78 years—some of them run up to 100 years or more—I feel there can be no legitimate objection to 78 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when you go out West and look at those dams, if you know anything about depreciation, you will not come to the conclusion that they are going to disappear within a few months or a few years. If we are building dams out there and putting our money into them with the idea that they are not going to be any good 50 years from now, you better stop your building. If you ride over New England, you will find frame homes in perfect condition that have lasted anywhere from 75 to 125 years. You can go into the South and see log cabins that have been standing for 75 to 80 years, and still habitable, and if you put a little new plaster on the walls, they will probably be in good shape for another 50 years.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That certainly is not the point of this amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, yes. I will make another point. That is just one point.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think in fairness the gentleman should state it is not that the project is no longer——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just a moment. The gentleman has not heard what I am going to say, so I decline to yield further.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It is a question for the Government to get out of the picture so that we can loan money on other projects.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I did not yield further.

Now, we have another point. You are proposing to sell water and power. You are proposing to sell it to them. If you sell goods and services to the American people, you generally have to sell them at a price that the buyer is willing to buy; at a price that he is willing to pay. So, when I go out here and build a factory or to buy an automobile or a truck, I figure on what the cost of the truck is and how long it will last me and what it will be worth to me while I am using it, and if the price is out of reach, I do not buy it. So, you can go out here and make a study and see whether or not the project is feasible from an economic standpoint; that is, whether or not it will produce something that you can sell at a price which the market will absorb. You have two propositions. You have the life of the project and you have the proposition as to whether or not the customer can afford to pay for it. Now, that is another point I wanted to make before the gentleman drew a conclusion about what I was going to say. If the project is going to depreciate and disappear within 50 years, certainly you do not want to extend your time to 50 or 78 years. If it is going to stand there 100 years and you can sell its products to the people and let them pay out on the basis of 78, that is just as sound as any other project we have in the United States. You could depreciate a factory so rapidly you could not compete in the market.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Going one step further, you do not sell those power projects to the people. When you get through paying for them under this program, they still belong to the Government. The Government is building them for the use of the people and requiring them to pay for them in 50 years when, as a matter of fact, when they get through paying for them they still belong to the Government and not the people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, let us get down to the question of changing the time from 67 to 78 years by mutual consent, you might say. The people who have done the calculating as to how this thing will work out from an amortization standpoint say this, and I am now referring to the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior in his statement to a member of the committee, referring to the 67-year proposition which had previously been established. The Department accepted that.

> This was not unacceptable to the Department, in the light of the fact that it was coupled with provision for application, in aid of irrigation, of all of the interest returned on the power investment. However, when it appeared that only a portion of the interest returned on the power investment might be used to help pay off irrigation costs, then it became necessary to extend the period for amortization of power costs, if rates were to be kept at a level that would permit the disposition of large blocks of power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. You cannot continue to run Grand Coulee and Bonneville on an economically feasible basis unless you sell those big blocks of power. Go up there and look at the situation. The transmission lines are tied in like a piece of fabric through your whole Pacific Northwest. Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, and the other towns are tied into the piece. Your communities are all tied together. You are today furnishing 65 percent of the kilowatt hours used by all the people. It is accepted by everybody. The people who own the private transmission lines and the private power companies are just as agreeable to this as the people who have no financial interest whatever in the transmission or the power plants. You have made it a part of the economic structure of that section of the country, and you have to provide rates which will take care of the stand-by call for big blocks of power at a rate the public can afford to pay. That is the economic fact you are up against. So the Assistant Secretary of the Interior says:

> It became necessary to extend the period for amortization of power costs if rates were to be kept at a level that would permit the disposition of large blocks of power. The compromise, therefore, included extension of the amortization period from the 67 years you had originally proposed to 78 years. By formal communication from the Commissioner of Reclamation to the chairman of the Public Land Committee, the 78-year amortization period was specified as the minimum which the Department could approve in the light of the limitation proposed in the division of the interest rates.

It is a question of calculations as minute as those which determine the mortality tables in our insurance contracts between private holders of insurance policies and the insurance companies themselves. It comes down to the cold-blooded economic facts. You should not disturb this situation here by this amendment.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here concerning whether or not the Government is going to lose money in permitting the extension of these projects to a period of 78 years. I can point out to you where the Government will actually lose money if you do not permit the extension of the projects to a longer period than 50 years. When many of the projects which are now under construction were authorized, the cost of construction was much lower than it is now. It has taken 10 years to complete some of these projects. But when the authorization was made, the labor and

material costs and other items of cost of construction were low compared to what they are now. To fix the period of amortization at 50 years for these projects which were started, let us say, 10 years ago, or 8 years ago, or which were authorized for a period of time 7 years ago, would be manifestly unfair and unreal. Let us take the Big Thompson project in Colorado, as an example, where the cost jumped from $55,000,000 to over $100,000,000 purely because the cost of construction went up. To amortize that project over a period of 50 years would put the project out of business. The Federal Government has already invested up to $50,000,000 or more on that project. It would mean the Government would lose that investment. If this project is held to a 50-year amortization period it will fail. This is not an expenditure; it is an investment of money. The Government in 50 years on the interest alone will receive its return, if you permit the projects to go forward in a healthy condition. All you want to do is to get the Government's money back and to make these particular projects healthy. If the Government is going to come out on this proposition, we must make the project healthy. Anyone who will fight to limit the period of time so as to prevent a project from becoming healthy is not in favor of irrigation and reclamation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Coming from a district which has no reclamation project in it, but always having voted as I felt for what was in the national interest and not from a sectional viewpoint, it seems to me that the argument made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is a very powerful and convincing one on this particular question. Whatever doubts I may have had prior to that, I want to state frankly that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], in his clear and analytical way, dissipated them. Some of these projects that are being built are going to last for hundreds of years. They will serve a public purpose. I feel that my people in New England will receive benefits indirectly from these great projects. That is a matter of national concern. It seems to me that the convincing logic of the various speakers, and particularly spearheaded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], has convinced the Members that we ought to support the committee. Bear in mind that this is a unanimous report of the committee, and they are all hard-headed individuals representing all shades of thought and opinion.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. He has shown wise and fair judgment in his actions. We from the West wish we had more eastern Congressmen who would exercise such broad and forward-looking viewpoints.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member of Congress who can look ahead 78 years. But every Member does know that the 78-year amortization period will have the effect of loading more of the cost onto our posterity.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Does the gentleman think anyone can look ahead to infinity? The fact is that the present law leaves it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior without any limitation as to the number of years. It is his judgment as to what is a reasonable term of years. He looks ahead to infinity before prescribing the rates.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Are you suggesting that he ought to make it 100 years or 150 years?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, I am not. But I am saying that under the present law he can. This bill proposes to change the law by placing a limitation when at the present time there is no limitation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The proper answer to your position would be to make it 50 years, if you want to place a limitation, as you suggest.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the debate should be on what would be reasonable economics.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not believe that changes my proposition in the least. I still contend that the burden will fall largely upon our posterity. Of course, that is quite in keeping with the mentality of the Congress—charge it to future generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] asked the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] a question, rather in jest I think. He asked him if he thought a 99-year lease could be compared to a mortgage such as they were talking about here. When you come to think about it, that is exactly what it is, a lease and not a mortgage. When the people who are paying the power rates sufficient to reimburse the Government for the principal and interest, have paid out the principal, the Government still owns the plant. As a matter of fact, they have not paid a mortgage, else they would own the plant. They have paid on a lease for a definite term of years that we have provided, at a power or rental rate sufficient to repay the Government in that period of years, but after it has paid out the Government still owns the project and can continue charging the same rate.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is it not inescapable that if they put a limitation of 50 years in here we will have to raise the electric rates on some of these projects?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Undoubtedly. I do not have the record before me, but you will find the record is replete with evidence to that effect. On some projects we will have to raise the rates considerably; not only that, but charts were made, both by the proponents and the opponents of this matter, and they are in the record. What we started to do was to amend the 3 percent and see to it that the principal and interest were paid. Then they asked us to put in a limitation of 50 years. That was entirely too short. Some projects cannot be built and paid for in 50 years. They just would not be built. As to Congress being reluctant to allow more than 50 years, as stated by the gentleman from New York, perhaps that is the reason the Bureau of Reclamation has never asked for more than 50 years or 69 years, and the latter was in one case only. So they would no doubt continue to do the same thing under this law, and will ask for an additional period only where absolutely necessary. But undoubtedly the Bureau of Reclamation will continue to try to get projects to pay out in 50 years where possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that the point in this legislation is not so much the rate of the interest or the period for which these projects will repay themselves as it is the fact that primarily this is helping to develop the country and looking after the welfare of the people?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Undoubtedly. There are some of these projects now that simply cannot be built unless this Government builds them; unless the Government invests the money, and leases it to the people at a rate which will eventually pay back the Government the money it has invested. That is all the law provides. That is all that is required. But the Government still owns the plant when it is paid for. Under the circumstances, I do not think we are out of order in considering it different from a mortgage, in giving a longer period of time in such cases where it is necessary. As far as I am concerned, I think the life of the project should be the limit. But members of the committee finally compromised on this 78-year period. I hope that this committee will back up the Committee on Public Lands who studied this matter so seriously and so carefully over such a long period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think it will help the Members if we understand what the present law provides, and compare that with what the pending bill proposes.

At the present time there are two agencies of the Government that build dams for power; one is the Army engineers and the other is the Bureau of Reclamation. They are the two agencies which construct dams that produce hydroelectric energy.

What is the present law on power charges?

I have in my hand the Flood Control Act of 1944—Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress. It prescribes rates and how they shall be fixed on power dams built by the Army engineers where the power is sold by the Secretary of the Interior. The present law states:

SEC. 5. Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects, shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The pertinent sentence is this one:

Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years.

It will be noted there are really three components to figure in determining rates—the cost of producing and transmitting, including amortization of capital investment. This means operation and maintenance in reclamation language, and construction charges with interest to amortize the capital investment.

In other words, the law on Army engineer projects is that the power sold by the Secretary of the Interior from Army engineer dams must keep up operation and maintenance and repay construction charges with interest, but has infinity as to the number of years within which the construction costs may be repaid. The law—read it for yourself—does not say 50 years or 75 years. It simply says "over a reasonable period of years."

And what is the law with respect to power from projects constructed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation?

I call your attention to the existing law, which you will find on page 6 of the committee report, section 9 (c), the latter half of which, dealing with power, reads as follows:

Any sale of electric power or lease of power privileges, made by the Secretary in connection with the operation of any project or division of a project, shall be for such periods not to exceed 40 years and at such rates as, in his judgment, will produce power revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, interest on an appropriate share of the construction investment at not less than 3 percent per annum, and such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper: *Provided further*, That in said sales or leases preference shall be given to municipalities and other public corporations or agencies; and also to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations financed in whole or in part by loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and any amendments thereof. Nothing in this subsection shall be applicable to provisions in existing contracts made pursuant to law for the use of power and miscellaneous revenues of a project for the benefit of users of water from such project. The provisions of this subsection respecting the terms of sales of electric power and leases of power privileges shall be in addition and alternative to any authority in existing laws relating to particular projects. No contract relating to municipal water supply or miscellaneous purposes or to electric power or power privileges shall be made unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, it will not impair the efficiency of the project for irrigation purposes.

So the present law provides three components for the power from reclamation-built dams. First, enough to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance; second, interest on a proper share of the construction investment of not less than 3 percent, and third, such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper.

The present reclamation law then places no limit as to the number of years for the repayment that the Secretary of the Interior provides. Not only that, it does not even require the Secretary of the Interior to get back the cost of construction. He only has to get back operation and maintenance and 3 percent interest.

This point in this bill, as I understand its history, came up because someone had ruled that that was all the Secretary had to provide, that he did not have to provide any more than the collection of operation and maintenance, plus 3 percent, perhaps for infinity. And here is the simple wording of the act to support that interpretation.

There is no requirement that the Secretary get back construction costs. The law merely says "And such other fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper." If he deemed no other fixed charges proper, he would assess none and there was no requirement that he ever get back any construction other than a minimum of 3 percent interest. The only reference to years is the limitation of 40 years on the life of a sales contract to a power distributor or consumer; that has nothing to do with the time for repayment to the Government. So, again there is no time limit within which repayment must be made, only infinity for interest.

The bill before us proposes to change all that and requires that there shall be four components in the charge for power. First, operation and maintenance; second, the return within 78 years of the cost of construction, plus interest at 2½ percent. It combines those two components in one clause (2), construction costs coming back within 78 years plus 2½ percent interest; and then finally in clause (3) a further interest charge of one-half of 1 percent may be made and the funds from that would be used to help irrigation.

In other words, the bill is infinitely better than the present law and the committee is to be commended for having put some brakes on the situation.

Under permission given in the House, I will insert the language from the bill for convenient comparison with the existing law which I have cited:

Any sale of electric power or lease of power privileges made by the Secretary in connection with the operation of any project or division of a project shall be for such period, not to exceed 50 years, and at rates as in his judgment will produce power revenues which, together with power revenues from all other sales or leases or power privileges, will be at least sufficient to cover (1) an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost, including reasonable provision for replacements; (2) the return, within 78 years from the date upon which each feature becomes revenue producing or the useful life of such feature, whichever may be the shorter, of an appropriate share of the construction investment properly allocable by the Secretary to commercial power, together with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate of not less than 2½ percent per annum; (3) the return, without interest, within a reasonable period of years not exceeding the useful life of the irrigation features, and with respect to each irrigation block, in a period conforming so far as practicable to the period within which water users are required to repay their share of the irrigation costs, of that share of the investment found by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 9 (a) hereof to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power revenues: *Provided*, That the power revenues to be applied toward the fulfillment of the obligation to return that share of the investment found by the Secretary pursuant to section 9 (a) hereof to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power revenues may include no more than one-fifth of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates in addition to any and all sums otherwise assigned for such purpose from power revenues: *Provided further*, That all revenues derived from the interest component of power rates not so assigned shall be accounted for as interest and shall, together with all other moneys so required to be returned to the United States, be returned to the United States as provided by the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318); and (4) such other costs and fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper. In said sales or leases preference shall be given to municipalities and other public corporations or agencies; and also to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations financed in whole or in part by loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and any amendments thereof. Nothing in this subsection shall be applicable to provisions in existing contracts, made pursuant to law, for the use of power and miscellaneous revenue of a project for the benefit of users of water from such project, and the provisions of this subsection respecting the terms of sales of electric power and leases of power privileges shall be in addition to and alternative to any authority in existing laws relating to particular projects. No contract relating to municipal water supply or miscellaneous purposes or to electric or power privileges shall be made unless in the judgment of the Secretary, it will not impair the efficiency of the project for irrigation purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we should know precisely what the situation is at the present time as far as the law is concerned. The gentleman from Indiana made the statement that these projects have a 10-year development period and then they are required to be paid out at the end of a 40-year period thereafter. He is mistaken about that. The gentleman from South Dakota has stated the situation precisely as it exists. I can see where this confusion arises. It is true that as far as that part of the cost of construction that is to be repaid by the farmers is concerned, there is a 10-year development period and the farmer is then required to pay the cost of construction allocated to him over a period of 40 years without interest.

Now, what is the situation as far as the power portion of the cost of construction is concerned? As the gentleman from South Dakota has pointed out, the law at the present time requires that that portion of the construction cost allocated to power must be repaid over a reasonable period of years, limited only by the useful life of the project.

What is the effect of the pending amendment? The effect of the gentleman's amendment is to prejudice the irrigation farmer. It has no effect whatsoever on the power end of the project, but it is a terrific handicap to the irrigation farmer. That is all it is.

I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that under the law as it exists at the present time and under the practice followed by the Bureau of Reclamation, the great majority of these power projects are paid out over a period of 60 years and not 50 years. So his amendment is really a restriction on the practice that exists at the present time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman knows that all of the projects that have been authorized thus far have been based on a policy of 50 years' amortization; does he not?

Mr. BARRETT. No; I do not know that.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It is not going to cause any more hardship to continue that practice; is it?

Mr. BARRETT. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. They have not suffered in the past. Why does the gentleman now say it is going to cause them a great deal of harm?

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is mistaken. The projects are estimated so far as cost is concerned over a period of 50 years in the beginning, that is true, but as far as the actual pay-out is concerned the average pay-out is 60 years. So the gentleman is absolutely mistaken when he says it does not affect the irrigation farmer.

Now, why does it affect the irrigation farmer? The fact of the matter is that irrigation can only pay a portion of the cost of constructing its part of the project. Power must pay the balance. If we provide that power can repay its portion of the cost over a period of 78 years, it is a certainty that it can pay more than if we require it to repay the cost of construction of the power installation over a period of 50 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana), there were—ayes 48, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star, January 21.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Detroit Teachers Association.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by his colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before a Senate committee.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in revising the remarks I made in Committee this afternoon, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert the exact provision of the law to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks I made in Committee this afternoon I ask unanimous consent to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

NATIONAL HEART ACT

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment simply to call attention to the fact that I am today introducing a piece of legislation which I conceive to be of far-reaching importance to the people of America which is entitled and may be cited as the National Heart Act. It relates to an effort on part of those interested in the public-health activities of the United States to do some reclaiming of the human reserves of these United States. We have spent a lot of time talking about reclamation in the last few days, and the people of America are much interested in what this Congress is going to do in initiating and carrying forward the program which we started last year to provide adequate research into the entire field of cardiovascular diseases. This bill is the next step in implementing that program that the people of America are demanding.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, some years ago I compiled and revised a pamphlet which I called The Making of a Congressman.

I have made it a practice to see that each newly elected Member has had a copy. As a result many have sought to amplify the information contained in the pamphlet by seeking further information from me.

I have found that what bothers the newly elect most is to know how to find out how to vote; what and how much attention should he pay to pressure groups, so-called, or/and to hostile criticism of his votes; and a half dozen other matters growing out of the three questions above suggested. So when they have come to me, after I have tried to tell them the sources of information on which they can rely, I have called their attention to the statement of Edmund Burke relating to the duties and obligations of a representative of the people, and to the philosophy of Benjamin Franklin, antedated by that of Epictetus, and followed by that of Abraham Lincoln.

I have been asked to prepare and make this speech and later to have it made a part of The Making of a Congressman, which latter I intend to do.

EDMUND BURKE

Edmund Burke said:

Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs, and above all, ever and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

But, his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you; to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Benjamin Franklin said:

We must not in the course of public life expect immediate approbation and immediate grateful acknowledgment of our services, but let us persevere through abuse and even injury. The internal satisfaction of a good conscience is always present, and time will do us justice in the minds of the people, even of those at present the most prejudiced against us.

EPICTETUS

Epictetus said, long before that:

Is a little oil spilt,
A little wine stolen,
Say to yourself—
This is the purchase
Paid for peace, for
Tranquillity, and nothing
Is to be had for nothing.
Be content to be
Thought foolish and stupid.
Do not wish to be thought
To know—and though
You appear to others
To be somebody—distrust
Yourself!
Remember that
You are an actor
In a drama of
Such a kind as the
Author pleases to make it.
If short, of a short one;
If long, of a long one.
It is your business
To act well the character
Assigned you; to choose it
Is another's.

POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Then I have volunteered out of experience to venture the statement that there are no such words as "political expediency" in the vocabulary of anybody who "hews to the line of right," does and votes as he sees the right, let the chips fall where they may.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

And finally, we all may well listen to Lincoln, who said:

Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

A PRELIMINARY REPORT ON A SURVEY AND STUDY OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has unanimously approved a preliminary report to this House, summing up activities of the committee pursuant to House Resolution 176. This resolution, among other things, authorized and directed the committee to conduct a survey and study of the postal service. When this study was directed, Members of this House pointed to the need for a survey as a preliminary to action on the rate-revision bill recommended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Hope was expressed by some that ways and means might be found whereby the entire postal deficit of $300,000,000 annually might be resolved by economies.

This report represents the combined efforts of the members of the committee who have diligently concerned themselves with this problem and approached it in a constructive manner. I want again to commend the membership of our committee for their fine cooperation in dealing with this important problem. We have pointed to substantial savings. Our committee estimates that, based upon its findings, there could be savings in the amount of $50,000,000 annually if certain changes are made in organization, procedures, and use of modern mechanical equipment.

The suggested savings of an estimated $50,000,000 are considered in such items as replacing postal notes and money orders by a prepunched card; by complete utilization of space, reduction of deficiency time, and using less expensive forms of transportation in the railway mail service; elimination of unnecessary special-delivery forms and clerical work; the proper allocation of the air-mail subsidy; simplifying the payment of insurance claims; and items included in additional new services.

All these items are discussed in the preliminary report and I commend them for your study and consideration. I believe there are a number of changes in mechanization in the handling of mail that would result in annual savings of several million dollars. Such changes, of course, would require time to procure equipment, train the employees, and amortize the initial cost of such equipment.

It should be pointed out that even though savings can be made in line with the committee's report, costs of the postal service are rising rather rapidly. For example, since this study was authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission has granted an interim increase in payments to railroads to carry mail in the amount of $37,000,000 annually. At the same time there is a continual loss of $9,000,000 per month in the delay in the enactment of the postal-rate increase. This deficiency is, of course, charged to the Federal Treasury.

The members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee have spent considerable time and effort since the end of the first session in exploring every possible avenue of savings. We have proceeded with this study with a minimum expenditure of funds by utilizing to the maximum the committee staff, the facilities of the General Accounting Office, and the traffic engineers on the staffs of large mailers. We are supplementing this by the assignment of specific problems to management engineers.

Seven of the largest post offices have been visited by members of the committee and the staff as a means of seeking out where economies might be made. They have discussed postal problems and ideas for improvements with local postal officials and employees, and held public hearings at which large mailers, editors and publishers, and the general public participated. These visits also served as a means of checking, on the ground, recommendations which were being considered.

Fifteen subcommittees were appointed to consider matters of general concern to the postal service and to determine within their respective jurisdiction:

First. What new services could be added which would pay their own way and possibly show a profit?

Second. What charges are being assessed against the service not properly the responsibility of the service?

Third. Where could economies be placed into effect?

Fourth. Where could the service be improved?

We have found several answers to these questions. Answers that I believe you Members of the House, should know. Answers that I should like to outline briefly.

For every dollar of indemnity paid on insured mail, it is costing the Post Office Department $5.50 in administrative and investigative expense.

In one Federal building where the postal service is paying $561,000 annually for maintenance and custodial services, less than 7 percent of the space is occupied by the post office.

There is a need for better controls over subsidy payments to air lines for carrying air mail. For example, one air line was paid seven times as much money in 9 months of 1947 than it received in all of 1946, and in this 9 months carried 200,000 less pounds of air mail than in 1946.

Under the current rate set up for mail pay, railroads are paid on a round-trip basis and it is more profitable for them to send the cars back empty than to fill them with nonpostal commodities and freight. This empty space is paid for by the Department at the rate of over $18,000,000 annually.

This year in the old-line departments and agencies—excepting the Department of National Defense—the use of penalty mail increased almost 4,000,000 pieces over last year.

The results of the surveys of the large post offices, subcommittee hearings and digests of material submitted for the consideration of the committee, appear in a summarized form at the beginning of the preliminary report of the committee.

I am including this summary in the RECORD for the information of the Members.

Again, let me suggest that I believe Members of the House will find the information in this report to be worthy of your attention in the consideration of problems relating to the postal service.

COMMITTEE SURVEYS OF SEVEN OF THE LARGEST POST OFFICES

Surveys were made by members of the committee, and the committee staff, at the following large post offices: New York City, Chicago, San Francisco, Dallas, Houston, Minneapolis, and Los Angeles. Similar surveys and studies were scheduled at New Orleans and Nashville, but were postponed because of the special session of Congress. With

respect to the committee surveys of the seven post offices referred to above, the findings of the committee are as follows:

1. Mechanization of the facing, primary, and secondary separation operations will result in savings not only in these operations, but in reducing the costly separation of mails in transit.

As an example of what might be anticipated in mechanization of primary and secondary separation functions of the Post Office Department, one machine, manufactured under a foreign patent, will sort 3,000 items per man-hour as compared to 1,200 to 1,600 items per man-hour by hand.

This machine also has the following advantages:

(a) As already stated, by using the machine 3,000 items may be sorted per man-hour as compared to the speed of sorting by hand which is 1,600 articles per hour for preliminary sorting and 1,200 for final sorting.

(b) In the case of mechanical sorting, mail can be sorted for some hundreds of destinations in one single operation by less experienced personnel.

(c) Owing to the fact that the machines automatically collect in one receptacle all articles for the same destination though dealt with at different keyboards, further collection becomes unnecessary. This greatly simplifies transport, and precludes errors in dispatch as the result of inadvertently combining batches of letters for different destinations.

(d) The postal matter to be sorted is conveniently placed within the operator's reach. Each letter is automatically carried to the same spot in front of him, a slight movement of the hand being all that is required to deal with each article.

(e) The number of articles sorted is registered by a counting apparatus, thus affording an additional means of checking the output of each operator.

(f) Each article sorted is so marked that it is easy to trace by whom a sorting error has been made.

(g) A reduction in the number of appliances used, tending to simplify the task of supervision.

(h) The number of supervisors can be reduced because the output of each sorter is automatically registered and fewer sorters are required.

(i) In the case of the sorting installation, the letters are dropped into a slot from which the receptacles are at some distance. Consequently, the emptying of the receptacles in no way disturbs the staff operating the machines.

(j) The machine sorts the articles into receptacles, automatically stacking them in regular piles. In the case of sorting by hand this stacking depends on the individual sorter's sense of neatness.

(k) In the case of a sorting machine, the keyboard represents the area of operation. This can easily be lighted artificially. To obtain a similar effect in using a sorting case, each pigeonhole would have to be artificially lighted.

2. Replacing the money order and postal note by a machine-record card, keypunched for electrical accounting at the time of issue, will substantially reduce the $35,000,000 annual loss in these items.

3. One large post office maintains daily records of operating costs, which are used for management purposes. Savings directly attributed to these data are far in excess of the cost of keeping such records. Some post offices collect cost data by periodic checks. These data have been helpful in determining the costs of handling the various classes of mail. The collection of both types of data on a standard method basis at all large post offices would be advantageous from the standpoint of management control and comparing the unit costs of such post offices, so that waste and deficiencies may be found and corrected.

4. The Department experiences a large loss resulting from the present method of paying for return movements of mail storage cars at the same rate as is paid for outgoing movements. The procedure for making such payments is established by the Interstate Commerce Commission. If it is to be continued, consideration should be given to a more complete utilization of this space for mail and for other Government shipments. (See letter to Comptroller General, appendix 1.)

5. The Post Office Department provides custodial and maintenance services for other Government agencies in its buildings. The cost of these services, which is paid from post office operating funds, amounts to millions of dollars. In New York City, the annual cost is $1,000,000, and in Chicago, $600,000. In Los Angeles, the Post Office Department pays $561,084 annually for the maintenance of the main post office building although postal facilities utilize only 7 percent of the entire space of the building.

6. The storage and disposition of unclaimed parcel post at the larger post offices is a major problem. Better enforcement of packing requirements at the point where parcel post matter is accepted for mailing will reduce this cost.

7. There is excessive loss in insured mail due largely to investigations and record keeping. In 1947 the expenditures for insured mail were $17,200,000; while the actual amount paid out in indemnity was only $2,641,667. In other words, the clerical and administrative cost of insured mail was 6.6 times as much as the actual indemnities paid.

Authorizing settlement of claims below $10 on insured mail at the office of entry would eliminate much of the excessive administrative cost and place the insured mail on a paying basis, and eliminate the annual loss of $4,500,000 in handling insured mail.

8. Mail bags which are in short supply are accumulated at large post offices because they are in need of repair. The only repair point is Washington, D. C. Decentralizing this operation would save in transportation and repair cost, as well as put into service many thousands of needed mail bags.

9. The periodic inspection of post offices by postal inspectors amounts to a routine check of the observance of postal laws and regulations. These inspections do not include investigations to determine how to improve the operation of the post offices to secure better efficiency and more economy. Detailed surveys of large post offices for this purpose were discontinued 7 years ago and have not been resumed. (See letter of Postmaster General, appendix 2.)

10. Preparation of individual lists of special delivery items on Post Office Form 3959 takes approximately 20 percent of the special delivery messengers' time and the information is seldom used. The elimination of this form would result in a saving of $350,000 annually in the postal service.

11. Operating buildings of the Post Office Department, as well as the railroad terminal buildings, are not constructed with loading docks and other facilities which are required to utilize fully, modern mechanical equipment such as lift trucks, tow motors, and the like. Buildings of more recent design, such as the postal concentration center used by the New York Post Office for overseas mail, have wide ramps and floor arrangements permitting full use of mechanical equipment.

12. Savings would result if, in addition to seniority, postal employees were required to possess minimum qualifications before being transferred to positions within the Post Office Department.

13. Only 7 of the 51 central accounting offices possess electrical accounting machines. This causes delay and additional expense since money order data must be transferred to points where electrical accounting machine units are located.

14. The 51 central accounting offices in the postal service receive funds collected by the post offices in their area. This money is counted many times after it is received by the central accounting office. Savings would result if these funds were counted at the opening unit and an interoffice receipt system used.

15. Valuable floor space is wasted by poor building design and inadequate lighting.

16. Some equipment, e. g., parcel-post slides, is improperly designed and use of it results in damage to parcels and excessive rewrapping costs.

PRESENTATIONS OF LARGE MAILERS

Large users of the mails who appeared at the rate-revision hearings were invited to submit for the consideration of the committee such suggestions as they deemed appropriate. It was contemplated that the traffic managers and postal specialists on the staffs of these organizations would draft for the use of the committee, detailed suggestions as to improvements which could be made in the postal service and practices which have proved economical in private industry which could be adapted to the postal operation.

At the time a subcommittee visited the Chicago Post Office, conferences were held with the National Council on Business Mail and the Postal Committee of the National Industrial Traffic League. Both organizations circularized their members to obtain their views on how improvements and savings could be made in the postal service. A summary of the suggestions made as a result of this action appears in appendixes 3 and 4.

The transportation committee of the National Association of Magazine Publishers presented its views as to what could be done to improve the transportation methods of the postal service. This presentation appears in appendix 5. This organization will later present memoranda covering other phases of postal operations.

Correspondence containing suggestions for improvement in postal service has been submitted by the American Newspaper Publishers Association. This letter appears in appendix 6.

The suggestions made in these presentations will be thoroughly examined.

AIR MAIL

Hearings on the general subject of air mail were held by a subcommittee on December 10, 12, and 15, 1947. At these hearings it was testified that:

1. The scheduled air lines receive subsidies in the form of air-mail pay. Of the $25,000,000 these lines will receive for carrying air mail in 1947, in excess of $15,000,000 may be considered a subsidy.

2. Payments to the air lines are based upon need rather than the service performed. Such a system does not place a premium on efficiency. In commenting on this situation, Secretary of Commerce W. Averell Harriman stated:

"I believe that we should critically examine the habit and method of subsidizing air carriers. We should evaluate the situation to see if there is not a dulling of incentive resulting from the method of fixing of payments. I fully recognize the current need for a sympathetic—and even generous—attitude toward the needs of the air carriers, but we must not get into cost-plus habits in industry. When increased costs do not affect profits, it seems reasonable to presume

that some of the incentive toward efficiency and progress will be lost." [1]

3. A new group of carriers carrying only freight, and not eligible for air-mail subsidies since they are not certificated carriers, has become involved in a rate war with the scheduled carriers. Many of the scheduled carriers have reduced air freight rates in the commodities and at the shipping points available to the air-freight carriers, while at the same time they have applied for increased air-mail pay. This appears to place the Post Office Department in the position of financing a rate war between two groups of air carriers.

4. Separation of the amount of subsidy paid domestic air lines from purely compensatory payments for carrying air mail will correct many evils in the existing situation.

5. In paying the air-mail subsidy, the Post Office Department is called upon to finance inefficient management, parties, hotel suites, entertainment, excessive public relations costs, and to finance competition between existing scheduled carriers.

6. There is a real demand for an air parcel post service by the air carriers and the public. However, such service must be made available to the public at reasonable rates to attract volume. Air parcel post rates should not be affected by the subsidy element and such service should be made available from its inception at points where sufficient volume of air parcel post will be generated to warrant reasonable rates. It is estimated that 144,000,000 parcels will be sent by air parcel post annually. (Draft of a proposed bill appears in appendix 7.)

FOREIGN POSTAL SERVICES

The committee requested the Secretary of State to obtain information concerning the postal services from a number of foreign countries in order to determine whether any foreign postal procedures could be adapted to the United States postal service. (See appendix 8 for correspondence.) This material has been received and is being studied.

RATE-MAKING PROCEDURES

Hearings were held regarding rate-making procedures for the postal service on December 16 and 18, 1947. These hearings developed that—

1. The Post Office Department is without an established rate-making procedure despite the fact that it depends upon rates for $1,800,000,000 annually in postal revenues.

2. Present postal rates do not reflect the many differences in service. This is due largely to the fact that there is no established procedure for analyzing and recommending comprehensive revisions in postal rates to meet changing needs.

3. There is an established procedure for revising rates for fourth-class mail using the facilities of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This procedure requires initiating action by the Postmaster General when parcel-post rates are not sufficiently high to pay for the cost of handling such mail. The Postmaster General has not taken such action although expenditures for handling parcel post are exceeding revenues at the rate of $50,000,000 annually. (See appendix 9 for letter to the Attorney General requesting views on existing law.)

4. Most large users of the mails agree there is a need for a fact-finding unit in the Post Office Department to resolve controversial issues in the many technical problems concerned with rates and costs of specific postal services. A bill drafted as a result of subcommittee hearings, H. R. 4953, which would create such a board and provide for an affirmative postal rate recommendation annually to the Congress appears in appendix 10.

POSTAL SAVINGS

In 1947 deposits in the postal-savings account of the Post Office Department reached $3,396,000,000. This is comparable to deposits in any one of the largest banks in the United States. In analyzing the situation as it relates to postal savings, the committee has determined that there is a need for creating a more flexible postal savings system. The committee finds that—

1. The Postal Savings System is regarded by most depositors as a safe and convenient depository for their savings rather than as an investment. As an investment, United States saving bonds will yield a better return in the long run.

2. The interest rate on postal-savings deposits has remained unchanged since 1910, when the Postal Savings System was established.

3. A reduction in the interest paid on postal savings from the present rate of 2 percent to 1 percent would result in a savings to the Federal Government of approximately $20,000,000 annually, after taking into consideration the withdrawals resulting from the interest-rate reduction.

4. The present 2-percent rate of interest on postal-savings deposits is more than the interest rate paid by most privately owned savings institutions. While the interest rate on postal savings has remained unchanged, the average rate of interest paid on deposits by mutual savings banks fell by more than one-half, from about 3.9 percent in 1910 to about 1.7 percent in 1946. The average rate paid by commercial banks fell even more, from about 3.7 percent in 1910 to about 1 percent in 1946.

REORGANIZATION OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

The committee is in the process of examining the basic organization of the postal service. It believes that the organization of the Post Office Department does not follow the fundamental requirements of a modern business organization. The committee points to the following phases of the Department's organization which do not meet present-day business standards:

1. Each of the four Assistant Postmasters General operates a field organization.

2. Theoretically, 42,000 postmasters report directly to one official in the Post Office Department in Washington.

3. Each bureau has its own budget and in many instances economies in the service are not effected because the expenditure is from one bureau's budget while the saving is in another.

4. Much of the supervision of the field functions of the Department is conducted by use of reports of the inspection service. This limits the personal contact of the officers responsible for specific field functions.

5. The Post Office Department does not have available unit-cost data or management statistics which may be used to compare the efficiency of specific operations or the relative efficiency of post offices of comparable size. (See appendix 11 for correspondence that such cost data be developed for the information of the committee.)

6. The present gross receipts standard for rating post offices has many shortcomings.

7. No independent Government agency checks the efficiency of the postal service. The General Accounting Office has never made a survey of the postal service until requested by the committee on August 13, 1947.

8. Limiting competition for the position of postmaster to individuals within delivery limits of the respective post offices has made it possible to continue the political factor in the selection of postmasters and prevents the promotion of postmasters of demonstrated ability from smaller post offices to larger post offices.

9. There is no uniform organization of the postal service in the field. For example, the railway mail service is organized on a regional basis, while the post offices operate within limited local areas.

10. Fifty-one of the larger post offices are designated as central accounting offices. While these offices have the responsibility of keeping all the accounts of post offices within their area, they lack authority to take direct corrective action when accounts are not submitted properly.

MECHANIZATION OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

The problem of mechanization of the postal service concerns both the type of equipment and the manner in which such equipment is utilized. An analysis is being made of the motor-vehicle equipment of the Post Office Department presently in use and on order. A summary of the status of this equipment appears in appendix 12.

The manner in which most of such equipment is utilized is a part of the project assigned to a management engineering firm which is conducting a detailed study of urban mail delivery.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Although the Post Office Department is a business with operating expenditures in excess of $1,500,000,000 anually, little has been done in the way of research and development to improve and to modernize the operations of the postal service. The following examples may be cited:

(a) The Department does not make maximum use of technical design advancement of the automotive industry when specifications are made for new motortrucks.

(b) The employees' suggestion program of the Department has resulted in only a few suggestions from the employees being considered of sufficient merit for cash awards.

The extent to which the Post Office Department should be authorized to institute a research and development program, the use to be made of existing research and development facilities of the Government and the results which could reasonably be expected if such a program were placed into effect are being studied by a subcommittee.

Engineering studies of mechanical devices used in mail distribution in major foreign countries have been obtained. These will be analyzed to determine their practicability in United States post offices.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE

Preliminary studies by the committee show that—

1. Deficiency time (the difference between the individual's daily average hours on duty and the maximum hours of the assignment set by law) can be reduced by improving coordination between post offices, railroads, and the railway mail service.

2. Under rates set by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Post Office Department pays for storage cars on a round-trip basis. The space deadheaded on the return movement costs $15,000,000 annually. In many instances these "storage cars" are freight cars. (See appendix 13.)

3. Employees assigned to railroad and airport terminals are under the jurisdiction of the railway mail service, and are rarely given road assignments.

4. The responsibility of the railroads for unloading and loading mail from baggage cars is not strictly observed.

5. In connection with the railway mail pay increase applications of the railroads, a one-time compilation was made of all space utilization. This appears in appendix 13.

[1] Statement of the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, to the President's Air Policy Commission, November 26, 1947.

6. More economical means of mail transport should be explored. The following table is an example of comparative transportation costs for periodicals:

Rate from Philadelphia

[All rates shown are per 100 pounds]

	Freight		Truck		Express		Mail (50 percent advertising)
	Less than carload	Carload	Less than truckload	Truckload	Less than carload	Carload	
New York City rate	$0.78	$0.22	$0.60	$0.22	$1.50	----------	$1.50
Transit time	[1] 1	[1] 1	[2] 5	[2] 5	[1] 1	[1] 1	[1] 1
Washington, D. C., rate	$0.88	$0.418	$0.88	$0.30	$1.50	----------	$1.50
Transit time	[1] 1	[1] 1	[2] 6	[2] 6	[1] 1	[1] 1	[1] 1
Chicago rate	$2.024	$0.77	$1.40	$0.96	$1.74	$0.80	$2.75
Transit time	[1] 4	[1] 3	[1] 3	[1] 3	[1] 2	[1] 2	[1] 3
San Francisco rate	$4.774	$1.485	(3)	(3)	$6.07	$3.00	$4.25
Transit time	[1] 10	[1] 9	----------	----------	[1] 6	[1] 4	[1] 7

[1] Days. [2] Hours. [3] No service.

7. Terminal employees' record cards contain data as to the amount of mail distributed and sacked. These data could be compiled and the relative efficiency of terminal operations compared.

A recent order by the Interstate Commerce Commission (No. 9200, Railway Mail Pay, Dec. 4, 1947) has increased payments to railroads by $37,000,000 annually. This emphasizes the need for carefuly computing payments for space in the most complete manner possible.

The problem of accounting for space used by the Post Office Department in baggage cars is being explored by the General Accounting Office. It is also examining the possibility of a more complete utilization of unused space in railway baggage cars for Government shipments both by mail and for other than mail. (See letter from committee requesting this study and reply in appendix 1.)

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

A study is being made of the services performed for other Federal establishments by the Post Office Department for which the Department does not receive revenue. (See appendix 14 for summary of cost to the Post Office Department for furnishing custodial and other services to other Government departments.)

A study will be made of the use of penalty mail by Federal departments and agencies. A statement of the use of penalty mail by Government departments and agencies indicates that the old-line Government departments and agencies (other than Department of National Defense) increased their use of penalty mail during the fiscal year 1947 by about 4,000,000 pieces. This penalty mail in 1946 represented, in actual cost to the Post Office Department, $24,034,005.32. (For a complete report, see appendix 15.) This increase in the use of penalty mail requires a detailed analysis to determine how reductions can be achieved.

A subcommittee held hearings attended by 50 west coast publishers at San Francisco, November 12, 13, and 14, 1947, at which time one of the chief complaints was the excessive use of penalty mail for sending mimeographed press releases to newspapers. Government press releases were submitted to the committee which showed that little thought is given to the local value of such releases and indicated emphasis was on volume rather than on quality or public interest.

Prior to 1933 all post-office building maintenance employees in the field service were under the Treasury Department. In 1933 these employees were transferred to the Post Office Department. At the time of the transfer there were 7,990 such employees, but at the present time there are 19,000.

In some post-office buildings the preponderance of expenditures is for custodial and maintenance services to other Government departments. (See appendix 16 for chart showing cost distribution of space in the main post-office building at Los Angeles, Calif.)

PERSONNEL UTILIZATION

Eighty percent of the expenditures of the Post Office Department are for personnel. Therefore, the proper utilization of this personnel is of utmost importance.

The Post Office Department is engaged in converting war-service appointments to permanent positions. Employees are now being certified to positions from regularly established civil-service registers. While in most instances these certifications have been made in accordance with civil-service regulations, in some cases the manner in which the competitive examinations were held is open to question. In one large post office, only 5 days were allowed in which to file applications. This was later extended to 8 days, but little publicity was given the 3-day extension. The register was exhausted before all the war-service employees were replaced. The result of this action limited the participation of veterans in the examination, and made available for certification and appointment those persons who barely met the minimum requirements. Such a procedure deprives the Government of the best qualified employees.

The Post Office Department lacks a uniform personnel policy. Each of the Assistant Postmasters General operate directly postal facilities in the field service, and each has his own personnel organization in these field installations. This has resulted in four different personnel policies relating to pay, promotions, and administration.

PROCUREMENT AND CONTRACT PROCEDURES

Based upon preliminary studies, it appears that the following are among those phases of the problem which will be considered by the committee:

1. The extent to which the postal service has delegated its authority to make contracts for material and services to the respective postmasters will be examined.

2. There is duplication between the responsibility administratively assigned to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General and that given the purchasing agent by law.

The Post Office Department has been requested to provide the committee with all directives relating to contracts and procurement. This material was furnished on January 6. The letter of transmittal is as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1948.

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Further reference is made to my reply of November 12, 1947, to your letter of October 30, 1947, requesting that there be furnished for the information of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service copies of all directives issued within the Post Office Department and to postmasters in the field concerning procurement of supplies and contracts for services.

There are submitted herewith the directives requested. For your information the First Assistant Postmaster General issues directives in connection with telephone contracts and service, contract vehicle service, contract stations and branches, and miscellaneous services and rentals.

The Second Assistant Postmaster General issues directives pertinent to international postal transport boat service, surface postal transport printing, leasing of quarters for terminals, special contracts, star-route service, mail messenger service, and the Alaska star-route and power-boat service.

The Third Assistant Postmaster General issues no general directives concerning the procurement of supplies and contracts for services.

The Fourth Assistant Postmaster General issues directives and instructions concerning the purchase of fuel for use in leased and rented post-office quarters; local purchases of gasoline, motor vehicle parts, office machines, letter boxes, clocks, and ice. He also issues directives concerning maintenance and operation of vehicles in the motor vehicle service and all contracts related thereto; the procurement and drayage of coal and fuel oil in Federal buildings; telephone and switchboard service; furniture, carpets, and safes; snow and ice removal; window-cleaning services; local purchases of miscellaneous supplies and services, and public-utility services. A copy of the booklet of instructions to postmasters for the operation of public buildings with marked sections and pages is herewith.

The Chief Clerk and Director of Personnel uses the contracts as made by the Federal Bureau of Supply, Treasury Department, for contract services for the Department. Therefore, his office is governed by the directives issued by the Treasury Department.

The chief inspector issues no general directives with respect to the procurement of supplies and contracts for services. Two copies of Form 512, Notice of Reward, are submitted because the notice commits the Postmaster General to pay for services rendered if the conditions prescribed therein are met.

The purchasing agent issues to postmasters in the field routine instructions, samples of which are enclosed.

The solicitor makes no contracts for services and issues only such directives as are amendments to the Postal Laws and Regulations, based on enactments of Congress or suggestions from bureaus and officers of the Department. Copies of such amendments are enclosed. The regulations concerning contracts are embodied in chapter 7, title I, and in sections 227, 244, 250, 480, 575, 706, 1017, 1036 to 1044, 1056, 1376, 1726, 1751, 1827, and 2030 of the Postal Laws and Regulations of 1940.

The comptroller issues no instructions or directives concerning other than the preparation of vouchers and the claiming of credit for payments under contracts.

Officers of the Department will be glad to explain to your committee any features of the directives that you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

A subcommittee has been appointed to explore means of increasing the volume of mail and postal activities which most nearly pay their own way.

Contract stations as distinguished from substations have proved profitable to the Post Office Department and their use should be

extended. The number of contract stations has been reduced considerably since 1940. The Post Office Department has testified that in 1945 contract stations provided $46,000,000 in revenue and cost only $2,242,000.

The committee believes that more extensive use of the mails should be made for parcels shipped by the Government in excess of 4 pounds. The penalty mailing privilege given to Government departments extends only to parcels weighing less than 4 pounds. In cases of parcels weighing more than 4 pounds the Government departments have turned to other transportation service.

Extending the use of metered mail and stamp-vending and other automatic machines will result in a more economical operation of the postal service.

Means and methods for increasing percentage of zoned mail should be developed. Tests show that zoned mail for delivery in cities where zones have been established constitutes approximately 40 percent of first-class mail, 45 percent of second-class mail, and 45 percent of third-class mail, and that the cost of separating nonzoned mail is approximately 30 percent greater than separating zoned mail.

Means will be explored for increasing postal revenues by making additional lock boxes available to patrons.

SURVEYS BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Two General Accounting Office units are making detailed surveys of two of the largest post offices. The letter of the chairman of the committee requesting such surveys and indicating their scope, together with the reply of the Comptroller General, are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., August 13, 1947.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Investigation by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has revealed that the General Accounting Office does not investigate the post offices in the United States except upon specific complaint or as a result of information which would lead to uncovering evidence of misuse of Federal funds.

It is requested that the Investigations Division of the General Accounting Office conduct a complete investigation of the 17 largest post offices in the United States and report its findings to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee by December 1, 1947. It is requested that reports of investigations furnished the committee contain information relating to the expenditure of Federal funds, collection of postal receipts, accounting procedures, unauthorized use of Post Office Department facilities, and all other matters which come under the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office for investigation with respect to the Post Office Department's handling of Federal funds.

Also, it is requested that the committee be furnished, as soon as possible, the decision of the Comptroller General with respect to whether the funds of the Chicago Post Office Canteen are Federal funds and whether the profits resulting from the operation of such canteen are funds which belong to the Federal Government.

Your cooperation in these matters will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1947.

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of August 13, 1947, requesting that the Investigations Division of the General Accounting Office conduct an investigation of certain post offices and report its findings to your committee, and that the committee be furnished my decision with respect to the status of the funds of the Chicago Post Office Canteen.

Following receipt of your letter yesterday, a conference was held in my office this morning attended by Mr. Moore and Mr. Belen of the staff of your committee and by members of my staff. It was brought out at such conference that it would be impossible to fulfill completely the request in your letter, in view of the stringent personnel reductions which this Office is undergoing, and of the large degree of reliance heretofore placed on administrative inspections of post offices, which would necessitate the building up of an additional force in the General Accounting Office to do the work requested. However, as always, I am desirous of lending your committee as much assistance as possible commensurate with the size of our staff and the condition of our work.

Accordingly, it has been decided with the concurrence of your representatives that an investigation of two post offices, the locations of which are to be agreed upon with members of your staff, will be conducted and reports thereof will be furnished to your committee as soon as practicable.

With reference to the funds of the Chicago Post Office Canteen there has been no decision as to whether such funds are Federal funds and whether the profits resulting from the operations of such canteen belong to the Federal Government. The operations of this canteen are within the scope of a study now being made in this Office with respect to concession activities conducted on Federal property. When this study is completed it is my present plan to report the results thereof to the Congress for its consideration.

There has also been received from Mr. Moore a letter of August 13 requesting a list of the defalcations by postmasters during the past 10 years with certain descriptive material. I will be glad to have this information furnished to the extent that it is available in the records of the General Accounting Office.

Sincerely yours,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MANAGEMENT ENGINEERING SURVEYS

One of the major problems which has developed and which requires on-the-spot analysis is that of city delivery service. It has been pointed out to the committee that there has been little change in city delivery service methods in over 100 years. However, there have been many advances in transportation facilities and methods used by commercial delivery services, and which are adaptable to the postal service.

The extent to which the delivery service may be improved is being explored by the Trundle Engineering Co. The results of this survey will present solutions to a number of general over-all postal problems such as special-delivery service, utilization of truck transport, motor-vehicle service, and personnel utilization.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A FRANK ANSWER TO A RANK MISSTATEMENT ABOUT THE HOLY LAND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under some circumstances it may be just as well to permit erroneous statements to get lost in oblivion by the simple expedient of ignoring them. However, when the erroneous statements are of such a nature as to constitute a slander, and when, as now, they may be quoted as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, thus giving a semblance of authentication, they must be corrected. The motives that brought about the insertion of these remarks in the RECORD are quite immaterial. Attributing to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] only the most patriotic of motives coupled with a sincere belief in the truth of what he read to this House, nevertheless the facts are that the contents of the letter he has read are vicious; they are malicious; they are untrue; they are libelous. The prefatory statement of the gentleman from Mississipppi [Mr. RANKIN] intimating that all Jews are Communists and that all Zionists are Communists is such utter nonsense that it needs no comment from me. Was the Jew a Communist who gave to New Orleans the hospital which gave such great comfort to the late Senator Bilbo in his dying days? Is my own boy who served overseas in World War II a Communist? Are the millions of Jews who have fought for freedom of all peoples throughout the world all Communists? But I am digressing. I want to talk to the House about the letter that one Benjamin H. Freedman wrote.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] says Benjamin H. Freedman is, and I quote from the RECORD, "a great American Jew." I take issue with that statement only to demonstrate to you the invidious intent that must have prompted the authorship of that letter. I say that Freedman is neither great nor American nor a Jew.

I was born and bred in New York City. I have been associated with the legal profession there for almost 30 years. I know of nothing, and have been able to find out nothing that Freedman has ever done that entitles him to be called great. As to his being an American, I say that as an immigrant received by this country and permitted by this country to enjoy freedom and liberty equally with its citizens, he has no right to sow dissension among them. No one has the right to call himself an American who sets class against class, religion against religion, or race against race. Hatemongering has no place in America. The real Americans of our country want peace and neighborliness between individuals, between states, and between nations.

Whatever Freedman may be is immaterial, except insofar as he may pretend to speak as something that he is not. I feel compelled to refer to his so-called Jewishness only because he has held himself out as a Jew and pretends to speak as a Jew and for Jews.

I have been very active in Jewish affairs all my life, both in local and in national circles. I have made inquiries about this pretender. I have found no one who has ever known Freedman as a Jew. I have found no Jewish institution that he has ever been or is now connected with. I have here a photostatic copy of his marriage license and certificate. It shows that he was married civilly by a local justice of our municipal court. He has never, so far as the record shows, been married in a religious ceremony. That is quite immaterial except when one professes to be a Jew, he should be ready to establish that fact by showing that he subscribes to the Jewish

tenets, and that he subscribes to and practices the beliefs and the preachments of Judaism. None of these things does Freedman do.

Accident of birth has never made anyone a Jew or a Christian. It is what he does and how he lives that measures him.

No one will pretend that when Earl Browder was speaking as leader of the Communist Party, he was talking for Christian ministers, a ministry that he deserted for communism.

No one has the right to claim that all Jews or all Zionists are Communists.

I respect the opinion of those Jews, few in number though they may be, who disagree with the millions of Jews who, like myself, believe in Zionism. We find no division in patriotic allegiance to the United States in that belief. We are no less patriotic in that belief than when we sustain the right of free peoples everywhere to resist aggression.

Possibly I have no right to find fault with Freedman for his allying himself and his money on the side of the Arabs and against the Jews. That is his right.

What is it, then, that this nonentity has said that disturbs me so much? I quote from his letter which appears on page 204 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1948. Referring to Palestine, he says:

> The reason it [Palestine] is called the Holy Land today is because Jesus of Nazareth lived and died there. To Christians He [Jesus] is the Son of God and Saviour. To Mohammedans he is a great prophet. To official Jewry he is an executed blasphemer.

That last sentence is what I take issue with.

I want now to destroy that malicious slander, which I believe was made by him with full knowledge of its entire falsity.

First, let me make plain that there is no such thing as an official Jewry. There are, and have been for thousands of years, Jews in every part of the world—native Chinese, native East Indians, Europeans, Asiatics, Africans, and Americans—who have subscribed to and followed the tenets of the Jewish religion. Never since the dispersion of the Jews from the Holy Land, never since the destruction of the second temple, has there been a united Jewry or an official Jewry.

Like Christians, we Jews have our religious differences. We have our Orthodox, our Conservative, and our Reform Jews. We have no world-wide chief rabbi; we have no national chief rabbi. Even the Jewish laity is not organized into one single unit. Obviously, no one has the right to speak for official Jewry—least of all this renegade Freedman.

Now, let us see if there is any substance to his nefarious charge.

Has any Jew, official or unofficial, anywhere or at any time said anything disparaging about Jesus? I could call before this House outstanding clergymen and laymen, whose greatness, whose Americanism, and whose Jewishness could not be questioned, who would unanimously and vigorously deny Freedman's venomous insult. Instead of doing that, let me quote, from authoritative sources, the answer to this calumny—answers written by persons who never heard of Freedman; answers written without any idea that their words would be quoted here.

Let me first quote this statement from a work written by Milton Steinberg entitled "Basic Judaism." There we find this:

> To Jews, Jesus appears as an extraordinarily beautiful and noble spirit, aglow with love and pity for men, especially for the unfortunate and lost, deep in piety, of keen insight into human nature, endowed with a brilliant gift of parable and epigram.

That is the most recent word on the subject.

Let me quote another which was written in 1920 by a renowned rabbi, H. G. Enelow, entitled "A Jewish View of Jesus." There we find this:

> Of course, it must be stated that there is no official attitude of modern Jews to Jesus. Neither the Jewish people nor any considerable part of it has made any formal declaration on the subject.

He concludes his treatise as follows:

> The love He has inspired, the solace He has given, the good He has engendered, the hope and joy He has kindled—all that is unequaled in human history. Among the great and the good that the human race has produced, none has even approached Jesus in universality of appeal and sway. He has become the most fascinating figure in history. In Him is combined what is best and most mysterious and most enchanting in Israel—the eternal people whose child He was. The Jew cannot help glorying in what Jesus thus has meant to the world; nor can he help hoping that Jesus may yet serve as a bond of union between Jew and Christian, once His teaching is better known and the bane of misunderstanding at last is removed from His words and His ideal.

I suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] move to expunge the offending document from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As to those who agree with the sentiments of Freedman, I give them the last words uttered on earth by Jesus:

> Father, forgive them for they know not what they do.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a bill she introduced today together with a brief description thereof.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FOOTE, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of California), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3111. An act for the relief of Louis H. Deaver.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 22, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1231. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and financial statement of the Bonneville Administrator covering the transmission and sale of electric energy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Public Works.

1232. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records disposed under the provisions of section 7 of the act approved July 7, 1943, as amended July 6, 1945 (57 Stat. 382; 59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Seventh intermediate report concerning an investigation of the disposition of a steam power-generating plant at Oklahoma Ordnance Works, near Chouteau, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5063. A bill to provide for assistance by the Federal Government in the repair of damage caused by erosion by waves and currents to the shores of the United States and in the prevention of future damage to such shores; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 5064. A bill to increase the personal exemption, reduce income taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5065. A bill to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 5066. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the war dead of all wars in which the United States has participated; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 5067. A bill to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 5068. A bill for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5069. A bill for the relief of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 5070. A bill to authorize an appropriation in the amount of $500,000 for the expansion of hospital facilities at the United

States veterans hospital at Muskogee, Okla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5071. A bill to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 5072. A bill to provide for the application of 10 percent of the annual revenue of the United States on the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5073. A bill to amend the acts providing for the parole of United States prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5074. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 5075. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5076. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Westerport, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5077. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Woodsboro, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5078 A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Lonaconing, Md.; to the Committee on Pubic Works.

H. R. 5079. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Kensington, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5080. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Thurmont, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5081. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Williamsport, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5082. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Emmitsburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5083. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Brunswick, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5084. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Gaithersburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5085. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Hancock, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 5086. A bill to equalize the terms of service required of cadets and midshipmen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 5087. A bill to provide for research and control relating to diseases of the heart and circulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5088. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act to protect the insurance against lapse by crediting to the insured dividends from the excess of premiums over death costs chargeable thereto and by automatic payment of premiums from the accumulated credits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5089. A bill to provide for relief to needy Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 5090. A bill to provide for the extension of the air-mail postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5091. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joel Chandler Harris, author of the Uncle Remus stories; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. Res. 445. Resolution making H. R. 4278, a bill to enact the National Security Training Act of 1947, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 446. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate aircraft accident at Logan International Airport, Boston, January 21, 1948; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Hans Oscar Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 5093. A bill to record the lawful admission of Ernest J. Hoffmann to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Gen. Wincenty Kowalski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Miss Sirkka Aiiri Saarelainen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 5096. A bill for the relief of Primitivo Urcelay-Ruiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1184. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted January 18, 1948, by Lodge No. 3077 of the International Workers Order, repudiating false accusations and allegations of the Attorney General and wholeheartedly endorsing and supporting general council of the International Workers Order in all legal and other actions aimed at protecting the good name, integrity, and security of their organization as well as the rescinding of the Attorney General's list; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1185. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of La Fayette, Ind., opposing compulsory military training and expressing accord with House Resolution 73; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1186. Also, petition of citizens of Kosciusko County, Ind., favoring the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1187. By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Petition of Emmett A. Classing and a large number of other residents of Lawrence County, Ohio, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1188. Also, petition of K. L. Cleland and other residents of Athens County, Ohio, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1189. Also, petition of Mrs. Florence E. Pendergrass and other residents of Chauncey, Ohio, expressing disapproval of H. R. 4278, a bill providing for compulsory military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1190. Also, petition of George E. Burkett, post adjutant, and members of Drew Webster Post, No. 39, American Legion, Pomeroy, Ohio, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1191. Also, petition of Frank Harvey and other residents of Athens County, Ohio, in support of legislation establishing a system of universial training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1192. Also, petition of H. M. Bennett and a large number of residents of Athens County, Ohio, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1193. Also, petition of Mrs. Thora Olson and a large number of residents of Athens County, Ohio, in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1194. Also, petition signed by Mrs. C. J. Ailstock and 230 residents of Athens County, Ohio, in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1195. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 131 residents of Steubenville, Ohio, and vicinity, circulated by the Argonne Post, No. 33, of the American Legion, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1196. Also, petition of 99 residents of Adena, Ohio, and vicinity, circulated by American Legion Post, No. 525, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1197. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Townsend Recovery Plan, Tacoma, Wash., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dominic Brady, of the Order of Preachers, Province of St. Albert the Great, River Forest, Ill., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. O God, unfailing support of those who seek it of Thee, source of freedom and peace to all who ask it of Thee, life of those who believe in Thee, we call upon Thee in behalf of these Thy servants. We pray Thee, O Lord of power, wisdom, and justice, through whom all authority is rightly administered, and just laws are enacted, to inspire with Thy spirit of counsel, fortitude, and love the lawmakers of our Nation. Guide and direct their deliberations so that the laws they propose for

the preservation of our temporal welfare may accord with Thy divine plan for the government of our people in freedom and peace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564).

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1799) entitled "An act for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MCCARRAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. GALLAGHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of January 21, 1948, dealing with fuel oil, and in the other to include an article that appeared in the Washington Post of January 21, 1948.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from a gentleman who is one of the largest lumber dealers on the eastern seaboard. He does not reside in my district.

The writer is the type of man whose observations should be of value to the Members of the House. I will read the part of his letter referring to the Marshall plan:

There is one suggestion I would like to mention that may be of interest.

As you know, I travel considerably. Everywhere I go, north or south, people are really opposed to excessive continued spending of our money in Europe.

The only places I find in favor of it are in the newspapers or on the radio.

I do not see how the newly elected Congress can go along with even part of the program. You know it will lead to higher prices, higher taxes, OPA controls or equivalent, and quite possibly defeat of the Republican Party. That would be a calamity.

I know what you are doing about this spending. I am giving you my observations to encourage you as much as possible.

This is a story that comes from every section of the country. From the noise the administration is making through every channel of communication, it is evident they realize that the people are overwhelmingly opposed to their foreign spending program. The people, from long experience, have learned to detect the artificial crises the administration builds up periodically, and too often, to serve a sinister purpose. The taxpayers are getting tired of this spending, and the Members of the House, above all others, should know it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Pathfinder magazine by Felix Morley.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances; to include in one a letter received from Mr. Carl Holm regarding the matter of commercial fishing in the Trustee Island territory; in one to extend his remarks on proposed rubber legislation; and in three to include a statement of a Government official concerning the vital subject of our rubber program.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one two articles, and in the other a letter.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE NEAR EAST SITUATION IS CRITICAL

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of this House and the public generally do not appreciate the serious situation that exists in the Near East as the result of the partitioning of Palestine which was approved of by United Nations Assembly on last November 29. We are in trouble in the Near East. A release has just been issued showing what Russia is up to. She is determined to get control of the Dardanelles and will do so at any cost. Hitler wanted that control also and now Stalin follows the same course. The men who are in charge of the Armed Services are alarmed, and justly so. Last evening an editorial which appeared in the Star quotes Secretary Forrestal as saying that there is a problem that has been complicated by conflict in Palestine and the generally disturbed situation in the Middle East. Mr. Speaker, unless we take care of this situation now, we are headed straight for war. The Palestine partition action by the United Nations Assembly at this time has created a critical national-security problem. It is fraught with great danger to our country.

The editorial I refer to is as follows:

OIL AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Secretary of Defense Forrestal has presented to the House Armed Services Committee a thoroughly alarming picture of the military oil problem. It is a problem that has been complicated by the conflict in Palestine and by the generally disturbing situation in the Middle East. For the vast oil reserves in the Middle East play a vital role in our military planning. It would be bad enough if we were to be cut off from this supply and worse if it should fall into the hands of an enemy.

Secretary Forrestal says that if war were to break out tomorrow, we would be face to face with a shortage of 2,000,000 barrels a day needed for all-out military operations. During World War II our armed forces consumed nearly that amount every day and our experts predict that double that amount will be needed for another conflict. Our peak-production capacity of the late war thus would have to be doubled to supply what Mr. Forrestal describes as the "lifeblood of the military machine." Today the Army, Navy, and Air Force are having trouble getting the 343,000 barrels a day needed for peacetime operations.

There is still a lot of oil underground in this country, but military authorities are loath to lean completely on this natural supply. Therefore there is increasing interest in development of a synthetic-oil industry that will guarantee enough oil for military purposes in any emergency. Mr. Forrestal stressed the importance of building up such an auxiliary source, so that this country would be wholly independent of any foreign supply of the fuel.

The Bureau of Mines already is giving intensive study to the synthetic-oil problem. Oil may be made synthetically from coal, natural gas, and oil shale. There are virtually limitless supplies of coal in this country, which could be turned into oil. The Bureau will open a laboratory and pilot plant for oil-synthesis research in Bruceton, Pa., this year. Other test plants are in operation or are planned in other coal regions. Tests with oil shale in the Rocky Mountain beds have been very encouraging.

But it will take much more research and large investments by industry or by the Government to bring about a synthetic-oil supply sufficient to meet the war needs of our planes, ships, and other war machines. This is a national-defense problem which is of concern more to the Military Establishment than to private oil interests. If development of a synthetic industry is to be accelerated, therefore, the impetus—and probably most of the funds—will have to come from the Government. It is urgent that the Senate and House Armed Services Committees give special consideration to this pressing phase of national preparedness.

OIL SHORTAGE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina said the other day, after I had stated that I thought we should stop the shipment of oil to Canada, which has increased, I think, 385 percent in a very few months' time, that it was slapping a friendly country in the face and that they would very likely retaliate by stopping sending us wood pulp which is needed as part of our national defense. Canada knows even better than we do the importance to them of our being strong, and I cannot for 1 minute believe that Canada would be so shortsighted as to stop sending us pulpwood if we stopped sending oil to Canada that we so vitally need in order to keep our people from suffering from the cold. I believe in some of our sections of the United States the people are suffering more than in New England, although we have suffering there which will increase if action is not taken to prevent it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

ALLOCATION OF MEAT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the meat-allocation bill offered by Senator FLANDERS and me has been termed "mischievous" on the floor here, for two reasons: First, because it is claimed that per capita meat supply this year will be above average consumption in recent years before 1947, and, second, because even discussion of the problem it is said may encourage hoarding. The figures given on consumption do not prove anything about demand, because people consume only what is available, but it is demand that makes prices go up and demand is estimated at about 165 pounds per capita in 1948 against admitted supply of only 146 pounds. The answer is that beef and veal prices were 18½ percent higher in November 1947 than in November 1946.

I have no desire to engage in characterizations, but assume we are all here to serve the public interest sincerely and according to our lights. We do face a dilemma in anti-inflation measures, for Congress has passed a bill placing its faith in voluntary agreements, but the agency to obtain these is the Executive, who says he needs rationing and price control powers over all cost-of-living items to do the job. Our bill proposes a compromise. It enables Congress to name what it wants rationed and to pass on the rationing plan before it becomes effective and it avoids price control; but it does try to tailor demand to supply. Equal distribution of what is available is authoritatively given much credit for the success of British wartime food rationing. If there is a better plan advanced to help the city dweller with admittedly run-away prices, and perhaps also the meat producers to avoid the consequences of an inevitable crash, or if voluntary controls can really be implemented to accomplish these objectives seasonably, I, and I believe Senator FLANDERS, will certainly be pleased.

Though discussion is objected to, I believe that discussion may have done some real good already; in any case, I was taught in the hard school of earning a living to believe that the customer was generally right—at least he was worth listening to. I am speaking for constituents who are customers. Prices on retail items generally have increased from an index number—Bureau of Labor Statistics—of 119 in 1940 to 165 in 1947, but food prices have increased from an index number of 97 in 1940 to 203 in 1947. I can assure my colleagues that for millions of middle-income families like those in my district there are no deep freezers and that a few days' supply of meat will crowd the refrigerator so that the housewife can hardly get it shut. There is no danger of the average American family hoarding perishable meat. There is danger that we may price ourselves out of prosperity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered over the radio on January 12 by Henry J. Taylor on Exactly Who Gets the Money?

FUEL OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I told the House of the difficulties facing the people of New England at this moment due to the critical shortage in their fuel-oil supply. At that time I spoke of the splendid attitude of President M. J. Rathbone, of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, as expressed in his testimony before Senator TOBEY'S investigating committee with which I have been associated. At that time he suggested that by changing the percentage of distillation of products from crude oil, it might be possible to increase the supply of fuel oil from 5 to 7 percent. This testimony was given during the special session of Congress.

A short time ago I telegraphed to President Rathbone asking him for information concerning the increase in fuel oil refined throughout the industry under the program which he suggested. It is my understanding that owners of oil refineries have not adopted this program or else have not been able to carry it into full effect. However, the answer which I received from President Rathbone is most encouraging and shows the real efforts being made by his company and him to overcome the shortage by every possible means. His telegram is as follows:

Our Everett, Mass., refinery is running for maximum distillate fuel production and latest figures we have show a December distillate fuel yield of 40.5 percent. January yield estimated to be approximately 43 percent. This compares with a yield of 35 percent for November or an increase of 10 percent in yield of distillate fuels from crude refined. All our other refineries are also running for maximum yield of distillate fuels, and Massachusetts is receiving its fair share of our total production. Figures just compiled for the Tobey committee show that in Bureau of Mines Districts I, II, and III, entire industry distillate fuel yield was 17.7 percent in the 4 weeks' period ending December 6 and 18.5 percent for the 4-week period ending January 3. This increase in industry yield plus increased crude runs by all refineries resulted in a 7.6 percent increase in production of distillate fuel by the industry in these three Bureau of Mines districts. This increase in production amounts to 2,436,000 gallons daily. The Tobey subcommittee estimated a 5 to 7 percent increase in production of distillate fuels was possible and above figures show this forecast was conservative. However, feel some refineries can and should go further in direction of increasing distillate fuel yield to meet increased consumer demands. Figures on individual companies' yields not available to our committee, but Tobey is trying to secure them. Reference your question regarding supplies made available to New England State fuel coordinators to take care of hardship cases, our committee does not have such figures but you should be able secure same from State fuel coordinators themselves.

M. J. RATHBONE,
President, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

However, the action of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey alone is not sufficient to accomplish the complete elimination of the shortage. It is my understanding that oil executives are meeting in Washington today with Government officials. They are going to work on a voluntary agreement whereby they can pool their resources to some extent to further the general purposes sought by our committee and by their previous recommendations. I was surprised to learn that the Federal Government may cause a serious loss of time in carrying out any agreement which they may reach. I was told by an official yesterday that any such agreement will have to be checked and approved first by the Secretary of the Interior; second, by the Secretary of Commerce; and, third, by the Department of Justice, in accordance with a delegation of the authority granted to President Truman to approve such voluntary agreements in accordance with the law passed at the recent special session. I was told these checks would require at least 3 weeks.

It will be a shock to the people of the United States and, particularly, those who are actually suffering from lack of fuel oil in New England and along the eastern seaboard to learn that their government is so ineffectively administered. I could scarcely believe that such a delay could be warranted in view of the serious situation which has developed. On December 19 the Massachusetts delegation of Congressmen unanimously adopted a resolution urging President Truman to request the oil executives to enter into such a voluntary agreement as soon as

he approved the law. The law was approved by President Truman on December 29. It is now January 22 and the voluntary agreement can probably be put into words within a few hours, so far as the oil companies are concerned. It seems to me that 3 weeks is far too long to determine whether or not the oil companies shall be allowed to pool some of their fuel oil for the purpose of giving to State coordinators sufficiently large quantities of fuel oil for the State coordinators to meet the demands of all hardship cases of individual householders and to help independent distributors who no longer are able to secure adequate supplies for delivery to their customers.

Any voluntary agreement to bring about full relief should become effective immediately. Instead of tying it up for 3 weeks, I hope that the President's approval may be possible in 3 days. In wartime such agreements were carried out effectively. With that background, it ought to be possible to put any such agreement into operation almost immediately following its adoption by the oil companies, some of whom have indicated their unwillingness to furnish oil to the State coordinators because of the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and other Federal laws.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, General Marshall is a great general, but in my judgment he is not such a hot Secretary of State, because he is doing too much for other countries to the great detriment of America. Our State Department is outdiplomatized by foreign diplomats. They ask for $17,000,000,000 for these foreign countries. Let me show you what we have been doing for some of these foreign countries.

Let us take Great Britain. In 1945 a great many of you voted to give Great Britain $4,400,000,000 to put them on their feet. Now they are in here asking for $5,348,000,000 out of this $17,000,000,000. If they were put on their feet in 1945, what do they want this great amount of money for? That is almost $10,000,000,000 for Great Britain. They have spent their $4,400,000,000 in socializing the country. You bought their railroads, you bought their electric companies, you bought their mines, you bought their gas companies, and now they want you to go over there and pay all their high fees to royalty for running their Government. That is none of your business, but it is your business to take care of your own people. You should get busy now and do that, do not wreck America for any foreign country, especially when they can pay their own way.

Now let us see where some more of that money will go. Holland gets $2,436,000,000, Denmark $582,000,000, and Ireland, that never was in the war, $497,000,000. That is supposed to stop communism. Those three countries get $3,500,000,000 more. Where are you going to get that money? Do you think there is any communism in Ireland? Do you think there is any communism in Holland or Denmark? Certainly not. You are just fooling yourselves if you do think they have more than we have in America. The people who are advocating that in order for us to spend this money think we are nothing but a bunch of boobs. Show them that we are not, and when the time comes for this $17,000,000,000 vote, just vote against it. Save America.

Why, they are asking for $380,000,000 for Iceland; is there any Communist that can live in Iceland? No; everybody has to work in Iceland to keep warm. Norway gets $234,000,000; only 7 percent of the people are Communists there. Portugal gets $150,000,000; they were not in the war. Why? Seven hundred million dollars go to countries that were neutral in the war, Sweden, Switzerland, and others. Why tax our people for countries that became rich during the conflict.

Why, do you know we are talking of giving, out of the seventeen billion, six billion to our enemies during the war—Germany, Austria, and Italy. Did you vote for six hundred and seventy-five million for them in November? Are you trying to wreck America? Boys, it is time now to look after our own country before it is wrecked. I say to you Congressmen, wake up before it is too late.

LOUISE M. CLARKSON

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 410) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Louise M. Clarkson, wife of Frank Clarkson, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Frank Clarkson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGIA REED

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 432) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Georgia Reed, mother of Ruth A. Reed, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Ruth A. Reed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therein newspaper articles.

Mr. PEDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short resolution from the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, of Dallas, Tex.

OUR MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I noted an article in the Washington Star last night stating that British shipyards now have over 2,000,000 tons of merchant ships under construction, a record high for ship construction during the last 25 years. The article also recalls the fact that President Truman, in his message to Congress, suggested that, because of a steel shortage, shipbuilding programs should be curtailed, but that the British Government, which allocates all steel in the British Isles, has stated that its shipbuilders will receive the same allocations of steel in 1948 that they received in 1947.

Mr. Speaker, the United States sells its tankers abroad and our own people shiver and freeze for lack of oil transport; we sell our cargo carriers to foreign lands and throw our own seamen out of jobs and force their families to exist on unemployment insurance; we ship our steel across the sea to permit foreigners to reach new record highs in ship construction while we refuse authority for the construction of needed tonnage in the United States because of a steel shortage; we throw away the favorable position we have earned in world shipping; we sacrifice the needs of the national security; we play directly into the hands of our competitors as we accept the policies deduced by a few "bright boys" in the State Department, whose experience with ships is likely limited to celluloid toys in family bathtubs.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the people are appealing to this Congress to save them from their own public officials?

The article from the Washington Star follows:

TWO MILLION TONS OF SHIPS BEING BUILT IN BRITAIN

LONDON, January 21.—Lloyd's Register reported yesterday that more than 2,000,000 tons of merchant ships, a record figure for the last 25 years, were under construction in British and northern Ireland yards during the last quarter of 1947.

Shipbuilding is one of Britain's busiest industries, and the level of production about equals the prosperous years of the early 1920's.

Capacity production, however, is deterred by a shortage of materials. President Truman, in his message to Congress December 20, suggested that "because of world steel shortages," countries participating in the Marshall plan should curtail or defer their shipbuilding programs. The British Government, which controls steel allocations, later announced that shipbuilders would receive in 1948 the same steel allocations as in 1947.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may sit on Monday during the session of the House while the House is engaged in general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thought it was the rule of the House that committees would not be permitted to sit during general debate but only during debate under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I like to attend the hearings and I am quite scrupulous in my desire to attend the meetings of the House. It seems to me that we could hold these hearings in the morning during the time that the House is not in session and not have the Members on double duty. Of course, I am not going to object, but I think it is a wrong policy.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this opportunity to announce, not only for the benefit of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, but for the benefit of the membership, generally, that earlier we had thought we might call up the bill H. R. 4040, the so-called Hinshaw bill, for consideration today. It has been determined not to call that bill up. The House has just agreed to adjourn over until Monday, so I might suggest to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that if she would amend her request to cover such time as the House might be in session after the disposition of the bill now being considered under the 5-minute rule, I am quite sure there would be no objection. In other words, the only thing involved then would be such special orders as may be scheduled for today.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it the purpose of the leadership to bring up the Hinshaw bill on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. A little later in the day I shall announce the program for next week. At the moment that has been tentatively determined, but I would prefer not to make any definite statement about it but to make certain further determinations as to the program.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would say that the request of the lady from Massachusetts was that the committee be permitted to sit on Friday and Monday. Of course, the House not being in session on Friday, that request is not necessary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. For Monday, in accordance with the gentleman's suggestion. It may not be necessary to sit on Monday, but there are certain witnesses to appear before the committee, and the committee dislikes very much to keep them too long.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts revises her request, that the committee may be allowed to sit on Monday during general debate. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I understand the majority leader is going to announce the program later. Then, after the program is announced, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts could have the information that she desires. However, she asks that it be granted now, and I feel she should wait. Therefore, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror of January 20.

STRIKES IN GOVERNMENT CAFETERIAS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, which lets out a squawk every time you prick a pink or a Red, is at it again today. They are mad because a congressional committee wants to know by what authority the administration, the President, and the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach, disregard the Taft-Hartley Act and advocate closing two cafeterias operated in Federal buildings for the benefit of Federal employees. As I tried to explain yesterday, the officials of the union whose members operate this cafeteria refuse to sign anti-Communist affidavits. Why should the President, unless he wants the political support of the CIO, interest himself or ask his Secretary of Labor to interest himself in behalf of that union which refuses to deny it is in control of the Communists? The closing of these cafeterias keeps all those people who want to be served there from eating there and keeps those who want to work there out of their jobs. I cannot understand the President's action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that organized pressure is being brought to bear continuously through the press and over the radio on Members of Congress to swallow the so-called Marshall plan, without investigation, or reservation.

Yet, when we ask for a small amount to begin the construction of one of the greatest inland waterway projects in America, that would not amount to a drop in the bucket compared to the amount they are asking us to put into Europe and Asia, we are told that we do not have the money.

I always respect the military when they are doing their duty.

I submit that the greatest military leader this Nation has ever seen was Robert E. Lee. Theodore Roosevelt said he was undoubtedly the greatest commander of the English-speaking race, although he said his last and greatest antagonist was the equal of Marlborough or Wellington.

Major General Maurice of the British Army in the First World War wrote a book entitled "Lee, the Soldier." He wound up by saying:

> I place Lee above Wellington as the greatest commander of the English-speaking race.

One day General Lee was walking down the streets of Richmond during the height of the War Between the States, when it looked as if the South was going to win. One of his enthusiastic supporters met him and said: "General, as soon as this war is over we are going to elect you President to succeed Jefferson Davis." If you remember, we had a 6-year term provided for in the Confederate constitution, and the President could not succeed himself. General Lee said: "No, sir; I do not believe in military Presidents or political generals."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 3]

Barden	Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.
Bell	Hardy	Morgan
Blatnik	Hartley	Morrison
Boggs, La.	Hays	Multer
Bolton	Hébert	Murray, Tenn
Buckley	Heffernan	Nixon
Buffett	Hendricks	Norton
Bulwinkle	Horan	O'Toole
Chadwick	Jenkins, Pa.	Passman
Chapman	Jones, N. C.	Philbin
Chiperfield	Judd	Poulson
Clark	Kee	Powell
Corbett	Kefauver	Price, Fla.
Cotton	Kerr	Richards
Cravens	Kilburn	Rivers
Davis, Wis	King	Rooney
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Sabath
Dirksen	Lichtenwalter	Scott, Hardie
Domengeaux	Ludlow	Somers
Douglas	McDowell	Stratton
Fellows	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Fulton	Marcantonio	Thomas, Tex.
Gamble	Mathews	Tibbott
Gavin	Meade, Ky.	West
Gillie	Merrow	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two tables.

Mr. MORTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the distilling holiday.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a weekly news letter.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his re-

marks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the navy veterans of East St. Louis.

TO AMEND THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2873, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 2 of the committee amendment. Are there any further amendments to section 2?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the drive toward complete socialization or communization—Marx used the terms synonymously—of our industry and way of life, as the bill before us exemplifies, grows in intensity. The passage of this measure, H. R. 2873, should be a sharp reminder of the direction in which the Nation is headed and the speed at which it is traveling.

This proposal further sanctions and implements one of the New Deal's pet schemes for destroying the Constitution and the contract society that great charter vouchsafed the people of this land. I refer to the provisions in the bill which relate to the further political intrusion, on the national level, into the business of producing and distributing electric power.

This proposal would give point to the New Deal's recommendation for erecting a multiplicity of TVA's all over the country, the darling plan of all who regard liberty as an anachronism and who would make the good old United States of America completely over into the Russian model.

The TVA is held up as a paragon of political achievement. Gustave Le Bon, one of the outstanding students of socialism, pointed out that facts, however presented, can make no impression upon a socialist mentality because it is a stereotyped mentality. We see this illustrated by the devotees of TVAism in their persistent and dogmatic claim that the TVA is a self-liquidating project and that it furnishes electric current to the Nation at a lower rate than is generally charged by private concerns and implying that it has effected a reduction in the general cost of living when there is not a scintilla of evidence to support any of these claims.

The fact that the General Accounting Office and the private accounting firm that check the TVA's books have never approved the respective allocations to power development and flood control which the TVA hierarchy itself made and upon which rates are based makes no impression upon the minds of its defenders, except to elicit approval of such allocations. The artificially fixed low-interest rate which the TVA pays on the loans extended to it by the taxpayers under compulsion has no effect upon their thinking. Nor is there any evidence to substantiate the persistent claim being made that the philosophy back of TVAism has been influential in lowering electric rates generally in the sense of being a net gain to the economy as a whole, that is, in raising the general standard of living. But there is abundant evidence to the contrary.

What madness possesses us lawmakers to presume to obligate the taxpayers of the Nation for a period of 78 years for the development of hydroelectric power or irrigation or anything else? To what degree of anomalous thinking have we come when Members arise in their places and solemnly make assertions, as was done yesterday, that the term "reasonable," as it is used in connection with the administration of the provision of the law relating to the time limit for amortizing the cost of reclamation projects is synonymous with infinity, and that the 78-year period now provided in the bill seeks to do nothing more than obviate the existing infinity provision in the law? It seems to me that when rationalization has reached a point like this, the last hope for appeal to reason has completely vanished.

This body has no right, morally or legally, to obligate the taxpayers of the Nation, as this bill provides. It has only the might to do so.

Lenin said, "Communism means the power of the Soviets, plus electrification."

We can well adapt this statement to our own situation by saying, "Communism means the power of votes, plus electrification."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it was my very great privilege last September and October to visit the great reclamation projects in the West.

To all intents and purposes, most of the projects are worthy, and we hope that they will in the years to come prove meritorious. I have no doubt that the great majority of them will.

I had intended offering an amendment to this section which deals with municipal water supplies, but after consultation with the chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. ROCKWELL, and Dr. MILLER, member of the committee, I decided to make a few brief remarks or observations which are the result of the trip I made.

It is my contention that any of those multiple-purpose projects that include supplying municipalities with drinking water should not be contaminated by having recreational projects included in the same project. Certainly from a sanitation point of view it is ridiculous to include water supplies and recreation in the same project. However, since the State boards of health—if they are on their toes and look after the welfare of health in their respective States—have or should have control of such sanitary problems, I believe an amendment is not necessary.

But I did want to bring this situation to the attention of the House, and I see no reason why the State health authorities cannot take care of this problem. Certainly, it is not my intention to thwart the general over-all objectives of reclamation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] so that I may ask him and the Committee a question. I refer to page 10 of the bill and to the language beginning in line 4 following the period down to and including line 11. I agree with and approve this language as I understand its meaning.

I want to ask specifically about the purpose of that language. Is it not the intent of this language of the bill at that point to make certain that no other act other than the one referred to in the bill is to be modified by its enactment? To be a little more specific may I illustrate by pointing out that in the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1947 appears the following language:

> Utilization of power revenues: No power revenues on any subject shall be distributed as profits before or after retirement of the project debt, and nothing contained in any previous appropriation act shall be deemed to have authorized such distribution: *Provided*, That the application of such revenues to the cost of operation, maintenance, and debt service of the irrigation system of the project, or to other purposes in aid of such irrigation system, shall not be construed to be such a distribution.

This is in existing law. The Comptroller General has ruled that such is permanent legislation. My question is: It is not the intent of the language cited on page 10 to repeal or modify that measure of 1944, is it? Am I correct?

Mr. ROCKWELL. The gentleman from Arizona is correct. The reenactment of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, containing the language the gentleman refers to is not intended in any way to modify or affect the paragraph captioned "Utilization of power revenues," in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1947. The committee assures the gentleman that nothing in this bill is intended to affect or modify in any respect the provisions contained in the appropriation act to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman. That was my understanding. I wondered if it was part of the legislative history of the enactment of existing law that we have no intent to change.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two points that I desire to discuss, and one of them is in answer to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] in his attack on the Tennessee Valley Authority.

As a matter of fact, those men who claim that we ought to charge up flood control and navigation to the power consumers of the Tennessee Valley area overlook the fact that not a single dollar that is spent for that purpose on either

the Ohio or the Mississippi or any other stream is charged to the power consumers in the area. They jump on the interest proposition and try to make several points on it. He says that it is an element of cost, but as any regulatory commission will tell him the interest is not a cost but a part of the return on the profits. It is included in the price we pay for the electric power.

Now, I know they keep talking about the TVA being socialistic. One of the greatest public power systems in America, or probably in the world, is at Cleveland, Ohio; and if the rest of the people in Ohio had received their electricity at the rates the people in Cleveland did last year they would have saved about $50,000,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if this bill does not give the Department of the Interior a lot of power.

Mr. RANKIN. The Department of the Interior, or whoever handles this proposition, ought to have a lot of power. I wish you would give them the power to fix the retail rates of electricity generated at these dams.

Now, they talk about the time element.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman from Mississippi and I have argued this question many times off the floor and on, but I want the gentleman to be reminded of one fact, and that is that the private utilities pay an average of 3 mills per kilowatt-hour in Federal and State income taxes on every kilowatt-hour they produce, and if they were not required to pay that Federal and State income tax their rates would be less than TVA rates are today, and the record will prove it.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, the gentleman from Iowa will please keep tuned in for my reply.

Mr. JENSEN. I will be right here, and I will say to my good friend that I never run away.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that.

Twenty years ago your party was in power and you were selling electricity produced at Muscle Shoals to the private power companies at 1.59 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. JENSEN. I am talking about today, my friend.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, I understand. I am talking about when you really had some authority, and you came in here and showed that it was at a profit that would pay the dam out in a reasonable number of years. Today the people I represent pay 4.72 mills per kilowatt-hour for that power; in other words, we add the amount that the gentleman talks about their paying as taxes.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, the gentleman knows better than that. You know you do not pay any Federal income taxes.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not say that. I said we pay that in the rate we pay for the power.

Mr. JENSEN. I am talking about Federal and State income taxes.

Mr. RANKIN. I know what the gentleman is talking about. You are repeating the same old Power Trust propaganda that we have had thrown at us for the last 15 years.

Mr. JENSEN. But the gentleman always runs when we talk about income taxes that the private power companies have to pay and that TVA does not, or any other power projects owned by the Government.

Mr. RANKIN. We are paying enough in addition to what you were selling this power to private power companies at to make up the difference.

Mr. JENSEN. Let us get up to date. Let us talk about today.

Mr. RANKIN. That dam was built about the time of the First World War.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, I know that; but I am talking about today, not way back then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman ought to know that the private power companies have these vast holding companies fastened upon them. I might say stacked upon them. They remind me of that little verse:

Great fleas have little fleas upon their backs to bite 'em,
Little fleas have lesser fleas, and so, ad infinitum.

They are sucking the lifeblood out of the power consumers all over the country.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me remind the gentleman that we will not only have fleas on this Federal control, we will have bedbugs, rattlesnakes, and everything else eating up the American people.

Mr. RANKIN. If you did not have this reclamation and power development in the West there is no telling what you would have.

Let me get back to the time element. They are raising a great hue and cry about the time element. The Federal Government will not lose a dime as a result of the extension of this time. In 1926 on this floor the party in power then brought in a resolution to extend the life of the foreign loans 62 years. Remember that $2,000,000,000 of that was loaned to Italy. It was to help Mussolini's regime. They would have no objection to extending that loan for 62 years, but when you come to the proposition of aiding these farmers in the arid areas not only to develop their water power but to reclaim their arid lands, you squawk to high heaven about a 78-year period. I submit that the Government will not lose a dime, and that it will add probably billions of dollars to the Nation's wealth.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I am sorry for the gentleman from Massachusetts. His people pay the highest rates for electricity of anybody in the United States. They are almost freezing to death up there now because you will not help us develop either the Florida ship canal or the Tennessee-Tombigbee project so we can get oil to you. It is going to be worse in the years to come. The gentleman has the island of Nantucket in his district. Nantucket has the highest power rates in the world, probably. If you help us develop these inland waterways so we can get the oil from Mississippi up there to you, and the oil from Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas up there to you, you can develop electricity and distribute it just as cheaply as we do in the TVA area.

Let me say to my friend the gentleman from Iowa, if you would take a different attitude, you could generate power with natural gas, or with oil, or with coal, and distribute it at the TVA retail rates, probably.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we did get all that oil, the administration would ship it over to Greece and other foreign countries, so what is the use?

Mr. RANKIN. We would ship it to you and the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Iowa. I want to take care of all of you.

Mr. JENSEN. Since the gentleman has talked about me, will he yield to me?

Mr. RANKIN. It has been in the best of humor.

Mr. JENSEN. I know it has.

Mr. RANKIN. I have the kindliest feeling for the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I have great respect for the gentleman from Mississippi, who is fighting communism at every turn, but may I say to the gentleman that if the program that he recommends, of having an authority in every river basin in America, is followed out, you will have communism.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no.

Mr. JENSEN. You certainly will.

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly the antithesis of communism. What is doing more to offset communism than to enable every American to live decently and comfortably in his own home and enjoy modern conveniences?

Rural electrification, which I have fostered, or I should say fathered, has done more to keep the farmers of America from following off after communism than anything else that has been done. We are making them feel that they are real Americans. It is American policy. Thank God they cannot ship our water power abroad. They have to use it within 350 miles of the place where it is generated.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman wants every river basin in America organized into an authority, each one controlled by about 3 men, so there will be about 30 men that will control the water-power resources of America. You can be sure that anyone who controls the water power and resources of America controls America.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the reason I am interested in fighting this little group

in New York that controls private power companies over the whole country.

We need more TVA's and fewer holding companies.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi would not yield to me so that I could ask him a question. Being a new Member, I realize that I cannot compete with him and I realize also that he is a very influential Member of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are now considering, as I see it, gives the Department of the Interior a great deal of legislative business to do which we, the Congress, should be doing ourselves. It gives him the right to do what he wants. Before I take my seat, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Mississippi with reference to the TVA that we, the people of Massachusetts, have to pay for it and we are more or less watching how much more we will have to spend. We do not want the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this bill to decide what we are going to be taxed. That is a function of the Congress. I do not mind these reclamation projects. I think they are good for New Mexico and Arizona and other States. But I also realize that we do not get anything down in Cape Cod from anybody, anywhere, anytime, and we are not asking you for anything of that sort. Of course if I do happen to have a bill I hope you will vote for it anyway.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, as I see it and I am only a freshman here, gives much authority to some department in the Government, authority which we the Congress ought to exercise. If we are going to pass laws here, the Congress should do it and not the Department of the Interior. I realize what I am up against here. I asked the gentleman from Mississippi to yield so that I could ask him a question, but he declined to yield. I was informed by a friend of mine from Massachusetts that I had better not clash horns with the gentleman from Mississippi or I would get beat.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to point out to the gentleman that there were three Members on their feet, and I yielded to the ones who were talking the loudest. Of course I did not mean to be discourteous to the gentleman from Massachusetts and would be glad to answer his question now, if I can.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, back in 1935 the Congress found it necessary to pass a National Labor Relations Act. The American Federation of Labor had a great deal to do with the writing of that act. It was hailed throughout the country as labor's Magna Carta. Then certain factions of organized labor went so far that there came an overwhelming demand from the people to the Congress to amend it. We did amend the National Labor Relations Act by the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. That act was vetoed by the President. But the Congress passed it over the veto. Then the President assured us and again in his last message he reassured us that the Taft-Hartley Act being the law of the land, he and those departments which would accept his advice would endeavor to enforce it wholeheartedly according to the letter and according to the spirit of the law. We were so assured by the Secretary of Labor.

You will recall that when the Congress passed the Taft-Hartley bill, because of certain acts and procedure on the part of the National Labor Relations Board, the Congress took from that Board the right to act as conciliators and mediators, and we put that power in a separate and distinct branch of the agency charged with its administration. So that brings us down to the morning press or the press of last night, which advises us that now the Secretary of Labor has asked the attorneys in his Department whether or not those labor organizations, which have not complied with the act, could bargain with employers. Of course, everyone knows that both before the passage of the original act, since the passage of that act, and since the Taft-Hartley enactment has been on the books, there is no law that prevents organized labor and employers from bargaining, if they so desire, outside of and beyond the provisions of the labor law. There is nothing anywhere on the books that says that this corporation and that union cannot get together and bargain without paying any attention to the national labor relations law. It is only when either the employer organization or a labor organization wants the benefits of the Taft-Hartley Act that they have to comply with its provisions.

If the President of the United States and the Secretary of Labor mean what they said when they told the people they were going along with the spirit and letter of the Taft-Hartley Act, I ask why is it that now they have closed the cafeterias in two Government buildings and taken the position that by their advice and counsel this corporation should be induced to bargain with a labor union whose officials refuse to accept that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which requires them to sign an affidavit that they are not members of the Communist Party or do not follow the Communist Party line. Was the President sincere? Did he mean what he said when he told us he was going along and would enforce the Taft-Hartley Act? Why is it that last night he asked the Secretary of Labor to intervene in that strike? Of course, the President has the right, just the same as every one of the 435 Members of this House has the right, to put out a statement or to go to these people and say, "Why do you not get together?" But if the President, in good faith, intends to enforce the Taft-Hartley law which he vetoed, why does he follow a course which aids a union, whose officers refuse to deny that they are Communists, in closing these two cafeterias in Government buildings, thus discriminating against members of the A. F. of L., against would-be employees who do not belong to either union?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, apparently there are no further amendments to section 2. I move that all debate on this section do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, or modify in any way the provisions of section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, now that the gentleman from Michigan has given the history of the labor bill, and that is all settled and we know exactly where we stand on that, I think it is proper that we talk about the history of the bill now before the House. It was hoped when the matter was first considered by the committee that this would be brought out as a simple bill to recapture the interest component which the Solicitor of the Interior Department some 5 years ago had ruled did not have to be covered into the Federal Treasury but could be kept by the Reclamation Bureau and spent at will. That, however, was not the kind of bill the bureaucrats in the Interior Department wanted, for there was not any additional power in such a bill, any additional authority for them; there was no extended period for the pay-out program.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] labored hard and long to bring out a simple bill to recapture the interest component. I heard on what I thought was very good authority that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], went so far as to lock the subcommittee door on the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] so that he could not get into the subcommittee room to write a bill. So they brought out the pending bill which was forced on them by certain Interior Department officials.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Not right now.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California because I mentioned his name.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman stated that he heard that I ordered the doors of my committee room locked so you could not enter.

Mr. JENSEN. Not me; no. I did not ask to enter the subcommittee room. But it came to me, my friend, very straight, now, since we have got into this thing, about you ordering the door locked so that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], could not hold a hearing on his bill.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman accept an answer to this absurd statement from the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL]?

Mr. JENSEN. I will be glad to, if the gentleman from Colorado will state what he told me.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I feel quite sure, Mr. JENSEN, I did not say that because the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] did not lock me out of the committee room.

Mr. JENSEN. He did not put chains on you but he did keep the door locked.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I would not say that.

Mr. JENSEN. I am simply giving the membership an idea of the pressure that has been brought on the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] to bring out what they call a compromise bill.

Also, I do not mind telling you that the National Reclamation Association was just the same as backed into a corner by the "hot shots" in the Department of the Interior—to such an extent that they had to approve this bill at their national convention where I spoke the 29th of last October and knew what was going on. A number of Reclamation Association head men had a meeting with me at Phoenix and told me what was going on and what they were up against.

Mr. ELLIOTT. It was not this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. A very similar bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. No.

Mr JENSEN. It had the 78-year period in it. I am just giving a little of the history of this thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the question of these reclamation irrigation and power projects has been constantly before the Congress as long surely as I have been a Member and even preceding that period. Much has been said about the relative charges for power whether it happens to be from Massachusetts, Idaho, San Francisco, or some other place. Of course, we who come from the industrial East do not object to the development of these reclamation projects, irrigation projects, and power projects if they are economically sound and fill a need that cannot be met otherwise and if the beneficiaries of these projects pay the bill and do not pass it on to the great industrial sections of the country that derive no benefit except perhaps a part of the production of the farms that may be brought into being as a result of those irrigation and reclamation projects.

Let us take Bonneville as an illustration which originally was constructed for the purpose of navigation and reclamation and then after it was under construction, the possibilities of power were considered and then made part of the project. I well recall the project at the time it was built. It was built without any authority at all by the Congress. It was built under the direct authority of the President of the United States without coming to the Congress to get authority. That is the history of Bonneville. After they built the first segment of the dams they said, "Let us develop power." When the entire structure was completed they allocated a proportionate cost to power. We find as a result of the allocation of power costs that that represented about 22 percent of the entire cost. If we are going to establish a basis of charges to the consumers of power at 22 percent of the basic investment under such circumstances it is quite obvious that such a power-plant project can be developed at a very considerably less cost than a separate steam plant developing the same amount of power and therefore result in a lesser charge to the consumer. In addition to the extra cost of a steam plant taxes are assessed on it by the community in which the plant is located and it runs into considerable taxes. That is the basis on which we claim that we cannot have lower charges in the great industrial areas of the country than they can in these irrigation and reclamation areas.

So far as rates in these industrial areas are concerned, let me say that all States have what are called public service commissions which have full power to determine what the rates shall be. The members of those commissions are appointed by the governors of our various States. We have a change in governors. We have Democratic governors one year, we have Republicans other years, and those governors, whether Democrats or Republicans, have the power to replace those members of the public service commission who are not representing the interests of the public or the consumers of the State.

We have constantly before those public service commissions petitions for increases in rates. From time to time that occurs, although the power rates have gone down considerably in my State over a period of years.

Mr. Chairman, our complaint is not the building of the dams if there is justification for it and if those who get the benefit of the dams are willing to pay the cost; but certainly it is unfair to allocate that cost in the final analysis to the great industrial parts of this country that receive no direct benefit from it.

We get back now to the question of amortization. It seems to me that the Government outlay ought to be established on a sound basis. Up to the present time the allocation of costs is amortized on about a 50-year basis, in some cases 40 years. Under the provisions of this bill I understand that is fixed at 78 years. It seems to me 78 years is entirely too long.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to increase the value of these lands, if we are going to make them available for agricultural development, if we are going to improve properties around that area so far as value is concerned, and also increase the value to the tenants and the producers on the lands, those people ought to be willing to pay the bill. Certainly there should be economic justification that the improvements thereon and the yield per year from those improved lands will be sufficient to amortize those projects over a period of 40 or 50 years.

I well recall going out to Boulder Dam some years ago and looking over that project. The city of Los Angeles gets its water from Boulder Dam.

As I understand, the amortization period is 50 years that the city of Los Angeles is compelled to pay in water charges toward the amortization of the water part of that project. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we are justified, first of all, in keeping the amortization period down to what it is today, 50 years, and we certainly are justified in compelling the Secretary of the Interior, before he embarks upon another prodigious program of public construction of irrigation and reclamation or power projects, to come to Congress for authorization, in the first instance, so that the Congress will know what is going on in this country of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, everybody in this House knows that I have no brief for the National Reclamation Association. They do not do my thinking, but since we are giving testimonials here this morning, I want to add my testimonial in order to keep the record straight. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] a while ago said that the National Reclamation Association was backed up to the corner and was forced to accept this bill. Well, I was down at Phoenix for the convention myself. By the way, I heard your speech at Phoenix, Mr. JENSEN; it was a very fine speech. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I enjoyed it very much.

Mr. JENSEN. When will you get ready to put the knife in me?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That I would never try to do. I also heard the great speech made by the president of the National Reclamation Association, Mr. Sawyer, who spent all his time up here while this bill was under consideration, telling the National Reclamation Association what a wonderful victory this was, this Rockwell bill, and recommending that everybody support it. That was his statement, and if you do not believe it you turn to the proceedings of the National Reclamation Association and read that great speech praising this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the debate yesterday and today by the opponents of the development of our natural resources rather than letting them go to waste——

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, there are no opponents of the development of reclamation in the West in this House that I know of, on either side.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was not referring to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I am speaking for everybody.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am stating for the RECORD that I did not have the gentleman in mind. I will yield if the gentleman wants me to, but I would prefer to make a statement, because I like my friend, and when we have these colloquies

we sometimes inject a note that when we sit down we wish we had not made.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman name some enemy of reclamation in the House, please?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say "enemy." I said "opponents."

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, well.

Mr. McCORMACK. An enemy is different than an opponent. An enemy may be an opponent, but ar opponent may not be an enemy.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for that definition. Will he please say that those gentlemen in the House——

Mr. McCORMACK. I like to pray for my friend so that he will see the light——

Mr. JENSEN. That do not agree particularly with the gentleman's views are definitely opponents of reclamation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, my friend did not even know what I was going to say when he got up and wanted to place himself on record in the light that he feels represents his views, and I am glad he did. What I started out to say was that I listened to the opponents of this legislation in the House for 2 or 3 days—opponents of the development of power, in the building of dams, where flood control and power and reclamation and all of these important activities in the interest of our country can be carried on. I can remember back 9 or 10 years ago when I stood in the well of this House fighting for the passage of a bill which is now the organic law of the land, that would authorize the Federal Government to make 100-percent appropriations for flood-control projects and for flood-control dams.

Prior to that, as we will remember, it was a cooperative activity on the part of the Federal and the State Governments, where the States had to furnish land free and clear from encumbrances and had to pay the administrative expenses, as I recall. The Federal Government was authorized to appropriate money to build the dams. For all practical purposes, flood control, the building of dams to control floods was meaningless, because the burdens upon the several States were such that they could not comply with that part of the law.

I do not have a dam in my district. The only river in my district is the Neponset River, a small river, yet I introduced this legislation with no problem confronting the people of my district because from the time this legislation was first considered in this body, from the time I became a Member in 1928, and then throughout the early thirties, I always thought that flood control was a national challenge and that it should be assumed entirely by the Federal Government.

I can remember when that bill came out of committee, my very good friends on the Republican side, with few exceptions, voted against it, but particularly every one of my Republican friends from New England was hollering States' rights in opposition to flood-control legislation where the Federal Government would be authorized to make full appropriations for the building of the necessary dams.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that is over, that is through. We have gotten over the opposition on that ground. This is another subject. I do not agree with my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr BATES] when he talks about the allocation of cost to the industrial States of the country. I come from Massachusetts. A lot of the income the people of Massachusetts get comes from other States of the Union, from money invested there. I cannot look at this from a sectional angle. The development of this country has to be viewed from the angle of the national interest. I do not take the position that because we pay three or four dollars intc the Treasury and get only $1 back in Federal aid we should not help other sections of the country. That is a callous position to take. True, the people in Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania make a much larger payment in the form of income and corporate taxes in proportion to other States, but a fair part of their income is earned in other States of the Union, from money invested in Kansas, Arizona, Texas, Montana, Mississippi, and other States, and as a result of the goods we manufacture in New England and sell in other parts of the country. I am speaking as one from Massachusetts. I cannot sit here and let that argument go by unanswered, because I cannot agree with it, respecting my friend's views as I do. I sharply disagree with that kind of an argument. It is purely a sectional argument which disregards the national interests of our country. We are a Union of 48 States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am very glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts has brought out that point. The insurance written on farms and farm buildings and properties throughout the West is paid to companies organized in Connecticut and Massachusetts and other States and the taxes that they pay on that business comes out of the earnings in the Western States, but the Eastern States get the credit for the taxes, as they do in other lines of activity where the home office pays the taxes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. The gentleman is right. As I see it, intellectual honesty does not permit that argument to dominate my thought in passing upon legislation affecting the 48 States comprising the Union, whether it is reclamation, farm legislation, or any other legislation that concerns any section of our country or a substantial segment of American society.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate a few of the things that have been mentioned here regarding this bill. I believe that if we understand what we are doing in our reclamation program, practically every Member of the House would agree to it. The last gentleman who addressed the House mentioned the fact that the allocation of costs was proper. I know they are. Here is what is done. When a multiple-purpose dam is built, it is determined what part of the cost of it is properly chargeable to flood control, and that is wiped out. Why? Because when we build a flood-control dam on the Connecticut River, the National Government pays for the whole thing, and Massachusetts and Connecticut do not pay one cent. That has been the national policy since 1938 and I think it is a good policy. When a certain amount is allocated for fish control, they figure out what that will be and then they wipe that out. It is a national policy to help the fisheries. When we come to irrigation or to a hydroelectric development, it is determined what part of the cost of the dam should be charged to each of those two functions. With respect to those allocations the water users pay back every single dollar which is allocated for irrigation. In other words, the irrigationists who get the benefit of the dam and the water stored behind it are the only people in the United States who pay for it. They pay back every dollar. When it comes to the allocation for hydroelectric features, the consumers of that power pay back every single dollar together with interest averaging about 2½ percent. In this bill we provide not over 20 percent of the amount that is paid in interest may be put back into the irrigation fund. That is not a very large item. It is not a very important one, and we could either wipe it out or leave it in. I see no objection to leaving it in.

There has been a great deal of confusion, in my opinion, over the 78-year amortization period. There is nothing to be horrified over that. After all, as I told you before, these people who pay for these projects, and remember these are dams that will stand for centuries and perhaps thousands of years, should pay for them over an appropriate number of years. Why should we not spread it over a period of 78 years? Why should the beneficiaries of these projects pay it all up in 40 years and let the rest of the people as long as the dam exists just pay for the maintenance costs?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there anyone in your district who is not willing to pay a sufficient rate for water and power so that these projects for which we are providing hundreds of millions and billions of dollars will be paid for in 50 years? I did not run across a single one of them on my 7 weeks' trip out in your State and in the 17 Western States.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Perhaps there are not, but it is not a vital problem—you ought to know that.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean to say it is not vital to the Treasury of the United States at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Government will get back every dollar

that your committee will appropriate, whether it be repaid in 50 or in 78 years.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; about 70 years from now.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Why should the people who get the benefit of it in the first 40 years have to pay for the whole thing? Why should they pay for the total capital investment which may continue to give benefits for centuries?

Mr. JENSEN. Why do you not try to save a little money for your children?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am sorry I do not really get the point that the gentleman is trying to make.

Mr. JENSEN. Why do you insist on spending all the money and making your children and your grandchildren pay?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Our children or our grandchildren are going to get the benefit of this capital investment and therefore I have no hesitancy for my boy to pay for something that he is going to get the benefit of. That is the answer to the gentleman's question. My boy, and even his children, should be glad to pay for part of the capital investment in a dam, which will exist long after he is gone, from which he gets direct benefits.

Mr. JENSEN. But they will not have any money to pay for anything at the present rate that money is being spent.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. I challenge you to show me one district where payments are in default.

Mr. JENSEN. I am talking about everything we are spending.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But I am talking about this reclamation proposition.

Mr. JENSEN. There will be no money to spend for reclamation if we keep on spending as we have in the past 15 years, to every Tom, Dick, and Harry in the United States and every nation in the world, wasting money by the billions and billions.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There will be plenty of money if you will give us the money for reclamation. We bring you back your appropriations a thousandfold by reclamation, in the way of increased value of land and its enhanced productivity because of the water and power which the reclamation project made possible.

Mr. JENSEN. Have I not been liberal?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with you. But you could be more generous.

Mr. JENSEN. Now you are throwing a monkey wrench into the machinery. I am not so sure I will be as liberal in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] comes from one of the great agricultural areas of the world. He should not overlook the fact that these projects involve farmers, and that when it is decided to undertake a project there is a burden placed on the farmers for so-called water rent, which the farmer has to pay annually. Now, if you place that price for water at a level where the farmer cannot afford to pay for the water on the basis of his cost of farming operations, what are you going to do to the farmer?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. You will probably injure the farmer, and that is one of the reasons why you divert power revenues from the irrigation features of the project.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It makes it impossible for the farmer to operate, and therefore the project would become in a state where it would not be economically feasible, and the project would pass out of the picture and the land would not be brought under cultivation and the food would not be produced.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Now, there is another matter that has been discussed and that seems somewhat confusing to some Members who are unfamiliar with reclamation. There seems to be some objection to the fact that interest is paid. Do you not realize that every private utility in the country simply borrows most money that goes into the works of the utility? They put out a bond issue repayable in 20 or 30 or 40 years, and I have never seen one yet, where when the expiration time of the bonds came around, that they did not refinance it. The consumers in California pay on into eternity, not only the capital cost but also the interest on the borrowed money that the utility used in developing the utility. Private utilities do the very same thing as the Reclamation Bureau, but they never end it. Their debts are perpetual, and added into the rate is the interest paid on utility bond issues. The Reclamation Bureau will at least in 78 years at most finally get the capital investment paid up and terminate the interest payments.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California Yes; certainly I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Almost invariably those power companies, especially where they are owned by a large holding company, inflate their investment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They do not do that in my State. I disagree with you there, because, as far as it applies to my State, our utilities are well regulated; have no watered stock, and they are very efficient.

Mr. RANKIN. But you are overcharged $60,000,000 a year. If you did not have Los Angeles as a yardstick, you would be overcharged $100,000,000 a year.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That may be true, but I personally do not know it to be a fact. But the point is the committee made a thorough study. It determined that the 78-year period was advantageous and necessary in certain cases. Frankly, I would like to have seen them designate a shorter period to amortize these investments, but I am willing to accept their judgment after they have had these full and complete hearings. But the point we must remember continuously is that there is not one single dollar that is ultimately taken out of the general taxpayers of America to take care of these projects. The beneficiaries, and they alone, pay for these projects.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to compliment the gentleman. I have watched his work in connection with this and many other bills. He comes from the heart of the great central valley in California, an empire in the making. It is already a rich empire but its possibilities have scarcely been touched. The gentleman has the right philosophy. He is thinking of his children and his grandchildren. If we allowed salt to take possession of the delta region around the great bay there would not be anything much for his children and his neighbor's children. If we control it as we think this bill will help do, it will be there for many centuries, not only for his grandchildren but for many generations to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I hope my present conduct and my future conduct may justify the compliment. Salinity control is one aspect of the reclamation program that is not often thought of. We are trying to reclaim, and we have reclaimed, land against water in the low reaches of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers. During the past 25 years on two separate occasions the encroachment of salinity from San Francisco Bay has seriously impeded the productivity of the soil, and in some cases actually damaged and put these lands out of production. This bill would take care of that situation.

But the point that I want to emphasize again is that all the people are getting the benefit of every last dollar of this money and the result adds immeasurably to the wealth of the United States. Again I emphasize that only the beneficiaries pay the capital cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, what I am about to say cannot be termed a political statement in any way. As a matter of fact, when I finish my work here in 1948 I will not be with you in 1949. I have already made that announcement in my district. I have had the pleasure of serving this House for 11 years. I think I can truthfully say that I am the only Member of the present Congress who has ever paid a power bill in the amount of $485 each month for electric power to pump water. If there is any Member here who has paid that much

or more to pump water out of the ground, I wish he would stand up so I may meet him.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a professional man by trade or in any sense of the word; I am a farmer, a livestock raiser, and have been all my life. I believe that I know something about irrigation and reclamation—if and when we ever get it. More than 30 years ago I was privileged to pay about $1,500 at a little public gathering to set in motion the first study of the Central Valley project now under construction in the State of California.

I have heard various remarks during the last 3 days about this bill, and part of those remarks are not truthful, I am sorry to say. I have heard Members say we have had this under consideration by this committee for 3 years. If those who say that will just stop to think back, they will realize that this Committee on Public Lands and the other committees that are merged with it did not come into being until January of 1947. The chairman of the present committee was not a member of the Committee on Public Lands or the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the House during the 11 years I have been here; and a lot of the other members now on the committee were not even Members of Congress 3 years ago.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Not at this particular moment. If I have time later I will yield. I may say that the chairman of the subcommittee was a member of the committee. I think that takes care of what the gentleman had in mind.

I have sat here and tried to go along from time to time with Members of this House. I hear men severely criticized for the position they take. For instance, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], in his capacity, has taken a lot the last 3 days. With the kind of beans and bread I was raised on I would not take some of the remarks that have been fired at him by many Members of this body in public, out in the road, or in the park, because I think there is a time and place for everything.

I have seen men acting in the capacity of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] stand up and defy the Bureau of the Budget and tell them to give us more money to carry on and complete projects as badly needed as we have needed flood control and irrigation in recent years. Just last December was a fair example. The President and the Bureau of the Budget sent to the House a certain amount for a supplemental appropriation. We appeared before the committee and justified our statement that more money was needed to complete work on our projects. What did the members of the committee do? They overrode the Bureau of the Budget and the President's recommendation to give us more money to carry out a great project. We have not had rain in my area to speak of. There were about 3 inches of rain in 1947, none so far this year. We needed that additional money to build the project in order to provide water for the San Joaquin Valley.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has been blamed in the eyes of the public, through the press, and speeches that have been made on the floor of this House. Who are the ones that should answer? The bureaucrats.

We convened here on the 17th of November 1947. No one in the Department of the Interior said we were out of money for these four major projects that were going on at that time in the United States; but on the 30th day of November the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, announced that the Central Valley project was one of the four projects for which funds were exhausted. It was stopped. To date work on the project has not started. It will cost millions of dollars to get that in motion again.

Was that the fault of the gentleman from Iowa? Oh, no. He and two other members of the committee were in California in the latter part of 1947. They toured the entire State with people from the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. I asked the direct question of the men representing the Department of the Interior in the presence of the Congressmen: Do you have plenty of money? Their answer was yes. Yet a few days later the project was stopped.

The whole blame has been placed on the entire Congress. It is stated that we did not provide enough money to do a job. The blame was placed on the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. Mr. Chairman, it is a good thing I was not chairman of the committee, because I would not have taken the abuse that was piled on him and his committee because the project was stopped.

What did your bureaucrats down here say? What did they do? They sent out letters requesting that all of the money be spent by January 1 or before if possible in order to put the Congress in an embarrassing position.

Mr. Chairman, this bill here gives the Bureau of Reclamation a great deal more power. What are we thinking of? Where is your intestinal fortitude that your forefathers injected into you? We have lost the punch. We are only interested in passing out bouquets to Members to make them feel they have done a great job. You will not do a great job if you pass this bill, in my estimation. I think it is a disgrace and a shame to think that legislation is brought in here when people in the irrigation and reclamation districts have been treated like they have. Congress is going to pay out more money to start new projects rather than complete the ones they have already started.

I stayed in California when Congress convened in January to cover the entire Central Valley project in my State from one end to the other in order to get a complete break-down as to what percentage was needed for each additional unit to be constructed. I say to you in all sincerity, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to get our house in order and control these bureaucrats down here on the Avenue or your people from back home will hear results later on that you will not like, and I do not care what State you are from.

Mr. Chairman, practically every Member of this House in 1946 ran on a platform providing for taking control away from the bureaucrats, yet I have not seen a piece of legislation go through here to take away one thing. In 9 cases out of 10 a bill that passes this Congress is written by a bureau, not the Congress. When you attempt to amend it here you are stopped in your tracks. Why?

Those are questions that go through my mind and it is one of the reasons I am not going to run for office in 1948 along with the rest of you.

I will go home and run my own little business like I did before. I do not propose to be pushed around by a bunch of dillywackers down here that never got a vote from anybody. But, we are being pushed around all the time. You know that that is the truth just the same as I do. I want to say, in all sincerity, that I propose to offer a motion to recommit. I think it should be sent back to the committee. I think the rug should be pulled out from under the bureaucrats downtown here so that the Congress will have something to say about what is going on, how, and where.

As far as the 78-year provision is concerned, I think the time is coming when we ought to pay our bills as we go along. I raised my children by saying, "When you buy something, and buy it on time, you pay more for it." The California Central Valley project has a 39-year provision. Here we come along and we extend it to 78 years. We better be paying these bills as we go along, because the time has come when the taxpayers are going to say, "We want a little reduction in taxes," and we should pay now when we can afford to pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, this Congress, before its adjournment, will be called upon to appropriate huge sums of money to build for national defense the greatest air force in all history. Airplanes are built principally of aluminum. It will require millions of tons of aluminum to carry out this program. Aluminum can be only electrically processed. Were it not for the electricity provided by publicly owned hydroelectric projects, the demands for airplane aluminum, which were in excess of over a million tons per year during the war, could not have been met. Let someone challenge that statement.

There is a shortage of electric power in every section of the United States. More electric power is being used at the present time than during the peak of the war. Great projects such as TVA, Grand Coulee, and Bonneville on the Columbia River furnished the electric power necessary to process the aluminum used in the construction of the planes which won the war. The Columbia River projects are taxed to the limit. Every kilowatt of power produced on the Columbia River is contracted for and applications for more power are pouring in.

To carry out this program of a mighty air force, every kilowatt of hydroelectric power which can be produced by either private or public enterprise is absolutely necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: That I have listened to the speech of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] with great interest. I think it took a lot of courage for him to come down here and say what he said. The thing that has been going on in here the last 3 or 4 days is what worries me. I think he is eminently correct.

I am going to insert in 2 or 3 days a letter that I wrote to a REA manager, Mr. Howard G. Crocker, manager, Northwest Electric Cooperative, Inc., Woodward, Okla., in my State, and I will tell you why I am going to do it, and it applies to the bureaucrats in charge of the REA administration here in Washington and the national legislative representative of the REA, Mr. Clyde Ellis, here in Washington. I believe in REA, and on two occasions here I supported REA amendments, that are record votes, offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. Yet I got a letter 3 or 4 days ago from a REA co-op manager, Mr. Crocker, down in my State that said "it was becoming increasingly difficult to explain to our farmers in Oklahoma why Congress takes the attitude it does in refusing to set up funds for REA." I took about three pages to write Mr. Crocker and tell him this: That I wish he would use due care in talking to his farmers when he points out that these amendments were defeated, and not leave the impression with my farmers and with my people that I am against the REA program. I opposed the sale of the Chouteau steam-generating plant out at the Oklahoma Ordnance Works to the Grand River Dam Authority there in my State because I do not believe in any steam-generating plant being sold there to the GRDA plant in direct competition with the taxpaying utility industries in my State. And because I did that, this little $15,000 squirt, Clyde Ellis, up here and Claude Wickard over in the REA and the REA managers in my State are going to tell my people down there that I am against REA. It is going to cause me to have to come out on the stump and tell them that time after time I have voted for REA, and what the Oklahoma farmers and what the other farmers of this country want is electric energy out on their farms, and not having these high-salaried experts up here to fight the private power companies.

I will tell you this: I have had friends of TVA talk to me about what a grand proposition it was; and when I questioned them in some respects, they said, "Why, it is going to pay out in 35 years." Now, I do not know if it will ever be paid out. But, anyway, now this bill provides 78 years for paying out, and probably 10 years from now they will be wanting 100 years or 150 years. I am for these projects, but they must be on a sound basis. I say to you that if this thing keeps going which we saw here last spring when a few of us tried to cut appropriations sought for the Southwestern Power Administration, another grandiose plan that they have down in the southwestern part of the United States to gradually take over the States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, and Missouri, and build up another TVA, like you have got up in Nebraska and Tennessee, and like you have got up in the Northwest, you are going to finally accomplish what a group of planners set out to do years and years ago; you are going to find that gradually you are going to nationalize the whole industry.

You are finally going to do what they set out to do back about 1914—you are going to find that gradually you are going to get the whole industry nationalized, and this will be the camel's nose under the tent. Then you are going to get the railroads and you are going to get the oil industry all nationalized, so that we will find ourselves some fine day in the same position they are finding themselves over in England. That is what this bureaucratic control will eventually lead to—nationalization of all our basic industries.

This is the point I want to make: The gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has been for irrigation and reclamation. He has fought for it. Yet he told you what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] did—that you have to go with them all the way—you have to help socialize or nationalize this country, so that finally we will be in the shape they are in over in England.

This thing will no doubt be fully discussed down in Oklahoma this summer. I know there are probably some Members here who will say—and if they do not, Mr. Clyde Ellis will—that because I am not for the Southwestern Power Administration, which will eventually drive every private utility company in my State out of business, I am against REA. That is what they tell my farmers down there. They say, "We cannot extend the line out to you because Congress will not appropriate the money." Then, when the farmers write me and I tell them the truth, those REA managers come back and say, "Well, it is because we cannot get poles or condensers," or that sort of thing. What they are trying to do—these REA co-op managers in my State—is to make the farmers think that we are not appropriating the money—that I, for instance, am an enemy of REA—so they can keep putting the good old heat on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is discussing a subject which is out of order. I am not going to object to this request, but I think we would like to finish with this bill, and I shall object from now on to anyone speaking out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. To satisfy the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], the point I am trying to make is this: There are those of us that believe in REA, who want to get some electricity out to the American farmer, but the REA managers down in my State go out to the farmer and say, "If we could get more money here, Johns-Mansville, Inc., or some other industry, would come in here and put up a lot of manufacturing plants and we would get a lot of industrial users." When that time comes in my State, when they start thinking about the industrial users, they will be just as bad as the private utilities once were. They will be trying to sell electric energy in large blocks, and the American farmer can go to hades, as far as they are concerned. I want to get electricity out to the Oklahoma farmers, and I do not want to have my integrity challenged every time I am against this bureaucratic bunch who are trying to extend their control over the lifeblood of this country.

The reason I make this talk is this: I am going to go along with this bill; I am for it in principle; but I do not like this business of talking about the TVA when you come in here one day trying to prove one point and say what a grand thing it is and say it will pay out not in 50 years but in 35 or 40 years, and then the next month you try to make another point, and state that it is going to take 78 years to pay out and the 2½-percent interest rate is going to cause you to raise rates. Do you not think that is something the private utility industries of this country have been fighting when they have to go out and borrow money? And they also pay taxes. That is the reason you get the rates you do. There is no such thing as cheap electricity, as far as I am concerned. Somebody has to pay for it. You do not get anything given to you in this world for nothing.

I have schools in my State where this Grand River Dam Authority is located where they had to close 12 schools last year on account of lack of funds, and the other 76 counties had to send in $70,000 a year to keep their schools going, so that up in that area they could get what they call cheap power. It is time to give some consideration to our taxpaying industries and stop forcing them into competition with a tax-free sovereign.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the bill close in 15 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] be allotted five additional minutes with the 5 minutes remaining to be allotted to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it can truthfully be said historically in our country that men who sit in the House and Senate of the United States have to assume the responsibility of legislating for our people. Those who have no special responsibility to the electorate can deal with matters in such manner and make statements as rash as they desire to make. The fact remains that this Congress and the Congresses that have gone before have established an irrigation and reclamation program in this country which I think you will find covers

about 17 of the Western States. In those projects you have invested a considerable amount of money. Irrigation and reclamation has been accepted as an institution in the United States. You are shifting populations and bringing thousands of acres of land into cultivation which was previously desert land. You are producing fantastic tonnages of foodstuffs on those lands where a sufficient amount of water has been made available. It is my suggestion that you not scuttle this program by getting all heated up here in the closing minutes of debate on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have not been on this committee in recent years, except since the first of January 1947. When I first came to Congress I spent several years on the committee and was introduced to this whole program. I have not been ignorant of some of the things that have been going on, because I continually travel this section of the country to try to keep myself informed of what is going on out there. I have seen some great changes. During the past fall I took the time to go down through the great Central Valley project of California. That is a vast food empire. The country will need every pound of food that can be produced there during the next 50 to 100 years. The irrigation and reclamation projects which have been approved heretofore and which are now under way and which future Congresses will approve will see that the natural waters on those ranges are harnessed and put through the dams and spillways and that the power will be harnessed and that the soil will be watered: make no mistake about that. Incidentally, you know that this is a political question. The men who are going to handle the work on the floor of the House and the Senate during this year, next year, and in the years to come are not going to ignore the 17 Western States: if you want to think of that for awhile, you can do so. This year I have been devoting all of my time to work on the Committee on Public Lands. I resigned from the Committee on Banking and Currency voluntarily because I thought I saw something coming up in the West that would need a little bit of attention and I wanted to give some of my energy to the proposition out there. I have no financial interest out there in this area. My State is not particularly interested in this, except that we want to sell automobiles out there, and we want to sell other things that we produce in Michigan. So here is a national undertaking. I think it would be in order to observe that it may not be many months before you will be building such projects as you have before you on this map, in the River Jordan Valley, over in the Holy Land, and in other countries—a la Marshall plan. I can comprehend that you will go in there and harness those areas in connection with your efforts in Palestine, and furnish the money on a 50-year basis, or even a 100-year basis if necessary. It may be better to do that and let those folks produce some foodstuffs themselves and have some electricity rather than to produce it here and ship it over there to them as a gift. You have accepted as a national institution the proposition of REA.

Are there any political party leaders who want to repeal that work in this country? I do not think so. If you want to, get up, and I will yield you the time to say that you want to do that.

This bill is to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 in such a way as to include among the purposes to which the estimated costs of proposed Federal reclamation projects may be allocated certain additional purposes, to wit:

> Recreation, salinity control, and silt control, to authorize the reexamination of projects heretofore authorized for the purpose of determining whether any part of their costs is allocable to fish and wildlife preservation and to such additional nonreimbursable purposes to permit allocations to such purposes, where appropriate; to provide for the nonreimbursability of operation and maintenance costs attributable to nonreimbursable purposes; and to reduce the rate of interest required to be returned on the power investment from 3 to 2½ percent per annum. The bill would settle the long-standing controversy over application of interest returned on the power investment by providing that not more than one-fifth of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates may be applied on irrigation costs charged to power and that the balance of such revenues must be accounted for as interest.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has an interest in the Central Valley project and he spoke about giving great powers that have not been given before. Take the report of the committee, on pages 4 and 5, and see where the present law authcrizes the Secretary of the Interior:

> If the proposed construction is found by the Secretary to have engineering feasibility and if the repayable and returnable allocations to irrigation, power, and municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes found by the Secretary to be proper, together with any allocation to flood control or navigation made under subsection (b) of this section equal the total estimated cost of construction as determined by the Secretary, then the new project, new division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, covered by his findings shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken by the Secretary.

I am reading the present law.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. You are reading the present law which gives the Secretary of the Interior more power than he could possibly have under the bill before us?

Mr. CRAWFORD. And why did you give him that power? Because here are projects of such a nature that you do not go out and bring those great undertakings into operation until some department of Government first performs. That is the reason you put it in the law. This bill is not giving him new power with respect to that authority to go out and do these things. So do not get excited about that.

Now, when his proposition first came to my attention—and this arose during my absence from the committee during the years I was not serving on the committee—I told the men on the committee, I am interested in three things: First, I want to know that the interest paid on these projects is sufficiently high to take care of the bond buyers and taxpayers of this country who advance the money for these operations.

Second. I want to know that the life of the project will come within the cost or the concept which is established to make these charges against farmers and against power users.

Third. I do not want to be a party to financing projects which burden the people in the State of Michigan, for instance, to pay for power used by people in the Western States at a price to those people in the Western States which is unfair to the people in Michigan.

In my opinion, this bill squares with those proposals which I laid down; otherwise I would not be supporting it.

You can get all excited about this, and throw this back into the committee and let the committee work another year or two upon the proposition—and certainly this thing has been under discussion since the Solicitor gave his ruling. And may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee when that was?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. 1944.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That was in 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to answer the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

First, he talked about Bonneville and the development of the Columbia River, stating that it was primarily for flood control and navigation. I was here when that bill was passed, and was one of the leaders in the fight for the development of the Columbia River. It was understood then that Bonneville was essentially a power project.

When a movement was made to cut the Grand Coulee Dam off and make it a low dam, I led the fight against it. Some Members at that time said they did not need this power. I asked them, When? They said, "Now." I asked them, "What about 25 years from now, or 50 years from now?" We are looking at this proposition from a long-range standpoint. The power development in these irrigation projects is just as necessary as the irrigation itself.

Now, you talk about the cost of TVA power. You are making power generated at Boulder Dam available in Los Angeles at 4 mills a kilowatt-hour wholesale, 268 miles away.

My home town, Tupelo, Miss., is approximately 100 miles from Muscle Shoals and we are paying 4.72 mills a kilowatt-hour for TVA power, wholesale.

In other words, we are paying a slightly higher rate for power transmitted a hundred miles than Los Angeles is paying for Boulder Dam power transmitted 268 miles.

When the Secretary of the Interior got ready to fix a yardstick rate for the Bonneville administration he called me and asked me if I would object to their making those rates lower than the TVA yardstick rates.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; not now.

The Secretary said: "We can supply this power cheaper than they can from the TVA."

I said: "Then, certainly I have no objection."

Therefore the power distributed from the Bonneville Dam, and the Grand Coulee Dam, and from the Umatilla or McNary Dam is being supplied to the people of that area at a cheaper rate than we are paying in the TVA area.

If they can get power in the Central Valley distributed for that area economically at a lower rate than we are paying in the TVA area, then I say go ahead and do it.

Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am one of the men in this House who advocated from the beginning the development of the water power on the St. Lawrence River. There are 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year going to waste there.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am going to tell the gentleman something now.

Six billion kilowatts of that power belong on the American side. That power can be generated at 1.77 mills a kilowatt-hour. That means all prime power; that is, steady all-the-year-around power, and also secondary power that comes only with flood waters. That power can be transmitted at .04 of a mill a kilowatt-hour for every hundred miles.

I am telling you what the engineers for the opposition as well as the engineers supporting the project testified to before the committee. They said that power could be transmitted at four-tenths of a mill per kilowatt-hour for every 100 miles. It could be transmitted 300 miles for 1.2 mills a kilowatt-hour. That would reach every point in Massachusetts, and I think it would reach every point in the district represented by the gentleman now standing.

You can take that power and lay it down within that distribution radius at a cheaper rate than we are paying throughout the TVA area.

Therefore, here is a yardstick that would probably break the power rates in New York by $200,000,000 a year, and probably wipe out the $62,000,000 that the people of Masachusetts are overcharged every year as compared with the Bonneville rates or the Ontario rates.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the development of all this water power that can be developed, and for getting it to the people in the area at the lowest possible rates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I wish to stress a matter of national importance upon which this bill will certainly have a substantial effect. I refer to the depletion of our expendable resources of oil and gas which, once used, can never be replaced and which are being depleted at an alarming rate. We have been made most uncomfortably aware in the last few days of the necessity of conserving these supplies. In fact, we are now being warned by many large oil companies that production cannot keep up with our consumption. Yet in 1946, California alone used over 10,000,000 barrels of oil for the production of electric power when, at the same time, potential hydroelectric plants of proposed multipurpose projects on the Colorado River, within reach of the California and Arizona markets, could have produced three times the amount of energy produced by this oil.

Our experts tell me that these potential hydroelectric developments with reasonable maintenance and replacements will last upward of 100 years while some facilities such as dams, reservoirs, and canals will be useful for a much longer period. The bill we have under consideration calls for repayment of the investment in power facilities within 78 years or within the life of the project, if that is less than 78 years.

A repayment period of up to 78 years for all power facilities is quite conservative since, in most cases, it will be much less than the useful life of the project. Lengthening the repayment period will make many future projects financially feasible which otherwise may be unfeasible.

Today we should not dare to say that we cannot afford to develop our comparatively perpetual water power, particularly when it is only one feature of vastly important multipurpose projects, if such a stand means the greater use of expendable fuel, especially oil and gas. Rather, we should change our arbitrary yardstick of measuring feasibility to require the more logical and realistic repayment of the project throughout its life.

In calendar year of 1946, 35 percent of the electric energy produced by all electric utilities in the United States was from hydroelectric plants. In that same year, 36,000,000 barrels of fuel oil, 307,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas, and 72,000,000 tons of coal, were used in the production of electric energy. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that in the next 6 years new hydroelectric plants developed in connection with their great multipurpose projects throughout the West, can be added, to produce electricity, the equivalent of over 30,000,000 barrels of fuel oil.

Let us view this matter from another angle. The development and use of the water resources of our country must be accomplished on a basin-wide basis. We have already developed immensely successful projects, but all components of such a basin development should logically be developed. We have no business to develop the first part and then sit down and twiddle our fingers because later developments do not have as much butterfat in them as the original developments. We must develop all of our practically perpetual water resources if only to save our expendable resources of fuel.

Our great conservation agencies are, by congressional direction, in the business of developing the country to make it most useful to the people of today and to assist the generations of tomorrow by conserving our resources. This may sound like we are trying to have our cake and eat it, too, but actually we can have a fuller life today and still save more of our expendable resources if we take full advantage of those nearly perpetual resources of hydro power. With full development of potential water resources now known to exist, it is estimated that the Columbia River Basin alone could produce 60,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy a year, central and northern California 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, and the upper and lower Colorado Basins 30,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. These three areas could therefore produce an average of 110,000,000,000 of kilowatt-hours a year. This compares to about 255,000,000,000 of kilowatt-hours of electric energy produced last year by all of the utility plants of the country, both fuel and hydroelectric.

In these three basins alone, we have now developed capacity to produce annually about 30,000,000,000 of kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric energy. The difference between this and the full present and potential hydroelectric output, or nearly 80,000,000,000 of kilowatt-hours, corresponds to at least 160,000,000 barrels of oil, or 960,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas. If this hydroelectric capacity is not developed as fast as it can be used it will be necessary to make up the deficit from fuel-electric plants.

To sum this matter up, I believe that it is logical to consider that repayment of reimbursable investment for these great multipurpose projects can be made with safety to the Government if the pay-out period is extended to more nearly coincide with the life period of the project. If this is done, the maximum development of our water resources will be made possible. My second conclusion is that we should not burn our precious and expendable resources of oil and gas under the boilers of our stationary plants any more than we can help and, to prevent this, we must develop our hydro resources as fast as possible. Such fuel should be conserved for use in those places which have little or no other source of supply, such as oil for ship drive, automobiles, and planes, and gas for domestic and industrial uses.

I advocate the passage of this bill as a logical and proper basis for determining repayment requirements and as a powerful aid to the fullest conservation of our most valuable but expendable reserves of oil and gas.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOBBS moves to strike out the enacting clause of H. R. 2873.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this motion because it is the only way I can override the opposition of the gentleman in charge of this bill who moved to close debate and refused me 5 minutes. I do not wish to be understood, however, as pressing this motion because I think the House ought to have a chance to vote on this important bill, 99.44 percent of which, the percentage of purity in Ivory soap, I am in favor of. But I do wish to present a thought.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, sir, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROCKWELL. May I inform the gentleman that there were 8 or 10 gentlemen who wished to speak on the bill and we felt it was about time to close debate. There was nothing against the gentleman individually.

Mr. HOBBS. If that be so, that is all the more reason why the gentleman should not have offered his motion. I am only one of the least of the unimportant Members of this House. If there were 8 or 10 Members who wished to speak why should we be denied that privilege, especially when the House is recessing till Monday?

But be that as it may, I want to go on and give you this one point and I wish you would listen to me. I am not talking to hear myself talk. I want to read to you what this law in section 9 (a) says:

No expenditures for the construction of any new project, new division of a project, or new supplemental works on a project shall be made, nor shall estimates be submitted therefor, by the Secretary until after he has made an investigation thereof and has submitted to the President and to the Congress his report and findings on-

That has to do with new projects. Subsection (7) provides:

(7) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, * * *, or recreation, * * *, or general salinity control, or silt control. Costs allocated pursuant to such findings, together with the annual operation and maintenance costs attributable to the same purposes, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

These are the purposes in point in the consideration of the motion to recommit, which I had planned to offer and which is on the Clerk's desk.

I favor every word of these quotations from the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, what I am inveighing against is not these features, but the new retroactive feature that I sought to strike out by the amendment I offered yesterday, which was defeated, and which appears in lines 5 through 15, on page 7. This would eliminate the requirement of an estimate of the cost after investigation, report, and findings of the Secretary.

So, my motion to recommit the bill simply instructs the committee to report with an amendment requiring the retroactive effect be limited to those projects heretofore authorized as to which an estimate of the cost was made as required by law. There is the joker in this bill. It stipulates that without any estimate of cost, the Secretary may go back 40 years and give away some $40,000,000. Without such amendment we open the door on all of these projects heretofore authorized. You say there need not be made any estimate of the cost, and no report or findings that are required in the cases of new projects, although two of these projects have paid out in full over the years. You say that that contract which was then made is no good and the Secretary could charge the cost of these benefits up to the Federal Treasury. I do not know what will become of the money. But you say that these safeguards which are desirable as to new projects, are not desirable as to the old.

Therefore, I submit that my amendment, the offering of which would be required by my motion to recommit—making the forgiveness apply only to those old projects as to which there had been, as required by law in the case of every new project, an estimate of the cost in advance—is not merely wise, but vital, and should have been adopted. That is the reason I wanted to make a motion to recommit on that ground, and that ground only, but since I am not going to have that opportunity, I asked for these 5 minutes to explain to you that this is an important change and it may take out of the Treasury some $40,000,000 without any justification or finding of fact or estimate of cost.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, pursuant to House Resolution 430, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee substitute amendment.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker; yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion to recommit: Mr. ELLIOTT moves to recommit the bill H. R. 2873 to the Committee on Public Lands and report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 6, line 11, strike out all of line 11 and the remainder of the page down to the word "new" on line 25, and insert the word "A."

On page 8, line 21, strike out "78" and insert "50."

On page 9, line 2, strike out all of the line beginning with the word "within" and all of the remainder of the page down to the word "of" (where it appears the second time) in line 7, and insert "within 50 years from the date when each power feature becomes revenue producing or the period of years provided in subsection 9 (d) hereof, whichever may be the shorter."

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELLIOTT) there were—ayes 109, noes 84.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 210, nays 152, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—210

Abernethy	Gathings	Miller, Conn.
Allen, Calif.	Gearhart	Miller, Md.
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Mills
Allen, La.	Goff	Mitchell
Almond	Goodwin	Muhlenberg
Andersen, H. Carl	Gossett	Nicholson
	Graham	Nixon
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ind.	Nodar
Andrews, N. Y.	Gross	Norrell
Arends	Gwynne, Iowa	O'Hara
Arnold	Hagen	Owens
Auchincloss	Hale	Patterson
Bakewell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips, Calif.
Banta		Phillips, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Leonard W.	Pickett
Beall		Ploeser
Bell	Halleck	Poage
Bender	Hand	Potter
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Potts
Bennett, Mo.	Harness, Ind.	Ramey
Bishop	Harris	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Harrison	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs, Del.	Harvey	Rees
Bolton	Herter	Reeves
Bonner	Heselton	Regan
Boykin	Hess	Rich
Bradley	Hinshaw	Richlman
Bramblett	Hobbs	Rogers, Mass.
Brophy	Hoeven	Rohrbough
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Ross
Buck	Hope	Sadlak
Burke	Jackson, Calif.	St. George
Busbey	Jenkins, Ohio	Sarbacher
Butler	Jensen	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Ind.	Scoblick
Church	Johnson, Okla.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Clason	Jonkman	
Clevenger	Kean	Scrivner
Clippinger	Kearney	Seely-Brown
Coffin	Kearns	Shafer
Cole, Kans.	Keating	Sheppard
Cole, Mo.	Keefe	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, N. Y.	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Colmer	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Kilday	Smith, Va.
Cox	Kunkel	Snyder
Crow	Landis	Stanley
Cunningham	Larcade	Sundstrom
Dague	Latham	Taber
Davis, Wis.	Lea	Talle
Deane	LeCompte	Towe
Devitt	Lewis	Twyman
Dolliver	Lodge	Vail
Dondero	Love	Van Zandt
Doughton	Lucas	Vorys
Durham	McConnell	Vursell
Eaton	McCowen	Wadsworth
Elliott	McCulloch	Walter
Ellis	McDonough	Weichel
Elsaesser	McGarvey	West
Elston	McGregor	Whitten
Engel, Mich.	McMahon	Whittington
Fallon	McMillen, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Fellows	MacKinnon	Wilson, Ind.
Fenton	Mahon	Wilson, Tex.
Fisher	Maloney	Winstead
Fletcher	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Foote	Mason	Wolverton
Fuller	Meade, Md.	Youngblood
Gallagher	Meyer	
Gary	Michener	

NAYS—152

Albert	Gregory	O'Konski
Andrews, Ala.	Griffiths	Pace
Angell	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Barrett	Hart	Peden
Bates, Ky.	Havenner	Peterson
Battle	Hays	Preston
Beckworth	Hedrick	Price, Fla.
Bland	Hill	Price, Ill.
Blatnik	Holifield	Priest
Brehm	Holmes	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Huber	Rankin
Bryson	Hull	Rayburn
Burleson	Jackson, Wash.	Redden
Camp	Jarman	Richards
Cannon	Javits	Riley
Carroll	Jenison	Rizley
Carson	Jennings	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Calif.	Robsion
Celler	Johnson, Tex.	Rockwell
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Chenoweth	Jones, Wash.	Russell
Combs	Karsten, Mo.	Sabath
Cooley	Kelley	Sadowski
Cooper	Kennedy	Sanborn
Courtney	Kirwan	Sasscer
Crawford	Klein	Short
Crosser	Knutson	Sikes
Curtis	Lanham	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	LeFevre	Smathers
Davis, Tenn.	Lemke	Smith, Kans.
Dawson, Utah	Lesinski	Smith, Wis.
Delaney	Lusk	Somers
D'Ewart	Lyle	Spence
Dingell	Lynch	Stefan
Donohue	McCormack	Stevenson
Dorn	McMillan, S. C.	Stigler
Eberharter	Mack	Stockman
Ellsworth	Madden	Taylor
Engle, Calif.	Manasco	Teague
Feighan	Mansfield	Thomas, Tex.
Fernandez	Meade, Ky.	Thompson
Flannagan	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Fogarty	Monroney	Trimble
Folger	Morris	Vinson
Forand	Morton	Welch
Garmatz	Mundt	Wheeler
Gordon	Murdock	Williams
Gore	Murray, Wis.	Wood
Gorski	Norblad	Worley
Granger	Norton	Zimmerman
Grant, Ala.	O'Brien	

NOT VOTING—68

Andresen, August H.	Evins	Macy
Barden	Fulton	Marcantonio
Bloom	Gamble	Mathews
Boggs, La.	Gavin	Merrow
Brooks	Gillie	Miller, Calif.
Buchanan	Gwinn, N. Y.	Morgan
Buckley	Hartley	Morrison
Buffett	Hébert	Multer
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Murray, Tenn.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hendricks	O'Toole
Byrnes, Wis.	Horan	Passman
Chadwick	Jenkins, Pa.	Pfeifer
Chapman	Jones, N. C.	Philbin
Chiperfield	Judd	Plumley
Clark	Kee	Poulson
Corbett	Kefauver	Powell
Cotton	Keogh	Rivers
Cravens	Kilburn	Rooney
Dawson, Ill.	King	Scott, Hardie
Dirksen	Lane	Stratton
Domengeaux	Lichtenwalter	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	Ludlow	Tibbott
	McDowell	Woodruff

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Tibbott for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Marcantonio against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Lane against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Judd with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.

Mr. Horan with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Buffett with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Domengeaux.

Mr. Corbett with Mr. Evins.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Rooney.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Mathews with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Plumley with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Cotton with Mr. Brooks.

Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Gamble with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Gillie with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.

Mr. COFFIN, Mr. BRADLEY, and Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BLAND changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House as contained in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 11, strike out all of line 11 and the remainder of the page down to the word "new", on line 25, and insert the word "A"; and on page 8, line 21, strike out "78" and insert "50"; and on page 9, line 2, strike out all of the line beginning with the word "within" and all of the remainder of the page down to the word "of" (where it appears the second time), in line 7, and insert "within 50 years from the date when each power feature becomes revenue producing or the period of years provided in subsection 9 (d) hereof, whichever may be the shorter."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 220, nays 134, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—220

Abernethy	Brown, Ga.	Dorn
Allen, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Doughton
Allen, Ill.	Bryson	Durham
Allen, La.	Burke	Eaton
Almond	Burleson	Elliott
Andersen, H. Carl	Busbey	Ellis
Anderson, Calif.	Butler	Elsaesser
Arnold	Camp	Elston
Auchincloss	Canfield	Engel, Mich.
Bakewell	Carson	Fallon
Banta	Case, N. J.	Fellows
Bates, Mass.	Church	Fenton
Beall	Clason	Fletcher
Bell	Clevenger	Foote
Bender	Clippinger	Fuller
Bennett, Mich.	Coffin	Gallagher
Bennett, Mo.	Cole, Mo.	Gary
Bishop	Cole, N. Y.	Gathings
Blackney	Colmer	Gearhart
Boggs, Del.	Coudert	Gillette
Bolton	Crow	Goff
Bonner	Cunningham	Goodwin
Boykin	Dague	Gossett
Bradley	Davis, Wis.	Graham
Bramblett	Deane	Grant, Ind.
Brooks	Devitt	Gross
Brophy	Dolliver	Gwynne, Iowa
	Dondero	Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCulloch	Rohrbough
Hall, Leonard W.	McDonough	Ross
Halleck	McGarvey	Sadlak
Hand	McGregor	St. George
Hardy	McMahon	Sarbacher
Harness, Ind.	McMillan, S. C.	Schwabe, Mo.
Harris	McMillen, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Harrison	MacKinnon	Scoblick
Harvey	Mahon	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Herter	Maloney	Scrivner
Heselton	Manasco	Seely-Brown
Hess	Martin, Iowa	Shafer
Hinshaw	Mason	Sheppard
Hobbs	Meade, Md.	Simpson, Ill.
Hoeven	Meyer	Simpson, Pa.
Hoffman	Michener	Smith, Maine
Hope	Miller, Conn.	Smith, Ohio
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Md.	Smith, Va.
Jenison	Mills	Snyder
Jenkins, Ohio	Mitchell	Stanley
Jensen	Muhlenberg	Stevenson
Johnson, Ill.	Nicholson	Stigler
Johnson, Ind.	Nixon	Sundstrom
Johnson, Okla.	Nodar	Taber
Jonkman	Norblad	Talle
Kean	Norrell	Towe
Kearney	O'Hara	Twyman
Kearns	Owens	Vail
Keating	Patterson	Van Zandt
Keefe	Phillips, Calif.	Vorys
Kerr	Phillips, Tenn.	Vursell
Kersten, Wis.	Pickett	Wadsworth
Kilday	Ploeser	Walter
Kunkel	Plumley	Weichel
Landis	Potter	West
Larcade	Potts	Wheeler
Latham	Ramey	Whitten
Lea	Reed, Ill.	Whittington
LeCompte	Reed, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Lewis	Rees	Wilson, Ind.
Lodge	Reeves	Wilson, Tex.
Love	Regan	Winstead
Lucas	Rich	Wolcott
McConnell	Riehlman	Wolverton
McCowen	Riley	Youngblood
	Robsion	
	Rogers, Mass.	

NAYS—134

Albert	Gregory	O'Konski
Andrews, Ala.	Griffiths	Pace
Angell	Hagen	Patman
Barrett	Harless, Ariz.	Peden
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Peterson
Battle	Havenner	Poage
Beckworth	Hays	Preston
Bland	Hedrick	Price, Fla
Blatnik	Hill	Price, Ill.
Bloom	Holifield	Priest
Brehm	Holmes	Rains
Cannon	Huber	Rankin
Carroll	Hull	Rayburn
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson, Wash.	Redden
Chelf	Jarman	Richards
Chenoweth	Javits	Rizley
Combs	Johnson, Calif.	Rockwell
Cooley	Johnson, Tex.	Rogers, Fla.
Cooper	Jones, Ala.	Russell
Courtney	Jones, Wash.	Sabath
Crawford	Karsten, Mo.	Sadowski
Crosser	Kelley	Sanborn
Curtis	Kennedy	Sasscer
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Short
Dawson, Utah	Klein	Sikes
Delaney	Lanham	Smathers
D'Ewart	LeFevre	Smith, Kans.
Dingell	Lemke	Smith, Wis.
Donohue	Lusk	Somers
Eberharter	Lyle	Spence
Ellsworth	Lynch	Stefan
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Stockman
Feighan	Mack	Taylor
Fernandez	Madden	Teague
Fisher	Mansfield	Thomas, Tex.
Flannagan	Meade, Ky.	Thompson
Fogarty	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Folger	Monroney	Trimble
Forand	Morris	Vinson
Garmatz	Morton	Welch
Gordon	Mundt	Williams
Gore	Murdock	Wood
Gorski	Murray, Wis.	Worley
Granger	Norton	Zimmerman
Grant, Ala.	O'Brien	

NOT VOTING—76

Andresen, August H.	Buffett	Cole, Kans.
Andrews, N. Y.	Bulwinkle	Corbett
Arends	Byrne, N. Y.	Cotton
Barden	Byrnes, Wis.	Cox
Boggs, La.	Celler	Cravens
Buchanan	Chadwick	Davis, Ga.
Buck	Chapman	Dawson, Ill.
Buckley	Chiperfield	Dirksen
	Clark	Domengeaux

Douglas
Evins
Fulton
Gamble
Gavin
Gillie
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hartley
Hébert
Heffernan
Hendricks
Horan
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kee
Kefauver
Keogh
Kilburn
King
Knutson
Lane
Lesinski
Lichtenwalter
Ludlow
McDowell
Macy
Marcantonio
Mathews
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Morrison
Multer
Murray, Tenn.
O'Toole
Passman
Pfeifer
Philbin
Poulson
Powell
Rivers
Robertson
Rooney
Scott, Hardie
Stratton
Thomas, N. J.
Tibbott
Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Tibbott for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Marcantonio against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Lane against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Celler against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.

Mr. Horan with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Buck with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Corbett with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Davis of Georgia.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Evins.

Mr. Judd with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Buffett with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Lesinski.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Fulton with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Gamble with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Gillie with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Mathews with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Domengeaux.

Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Hendricks.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Rooney.

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Clark.

Mr. D'EWART, Mr. SANBORN, Mr. GORE, and Mr. GRANT of Alabama changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HARRIS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 121, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—231

Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Barta
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bell
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Bland
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bonner
Boykin
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brophy
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Burke
Burleson
Busbey
Butler
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Mo.
Colmer
Coudert
Crow
Cunningham
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Deane
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Dorn
Doughton
Durham
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Folger
Foote
Fuller
Gary
Gathings
Gearhart
Gillette
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hardy
Harness, Ind.
Harrison
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Hoffman
Hope
Jackson, Calif.
Jarman
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jensen
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.
Jonkman
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilday
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Larcade
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lewis
Lodge
Love
Lucas
McConnell
McCowen
McCulloch
McDonough
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillan, S. C.
MacKinnon
Mahon
Maloney
Martin, Iowa
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Mills
Mitchell
Morton
Muhlenberg
Nicholson
Nixon
Nodar
Norrell
O'Hara
Owens
Patterson
Peden
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Ploeser
Plumley
Potter
Potts
Ramey
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Rees
Reeves
Regan
Rich
Riehlman
Riley
Robsion
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheppard
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Stanley
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Walter
Weichel
West
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Worley
Youngblood

NAYS—121

Albert
Angell
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Blatnik
Bloom
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Chelf
Chenoweth
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Crawford
Crosser
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Dingell
Donohue
Eberharter
Elsaesser
Engle, Calif.
Feighan
Fernandez
Fisher
Flannagan
Fogarty
Forand
Garmatz
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Gossett
Granger
Gregory
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Hart
Havenner
Hays
Hedrick
Hill
Holifield
Holmes
Huber
Hull
Jackson, Wash.
Javits
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Wash.
Karsten, Mo.
Kelley
Kennedy
Kirwan
Klein
Lanham
Lemke
Lusk
Lyle
Lynch
McCormack
Mack
Madden
Manasco
Mansfield
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Nebr.
Monroney
Morris
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Wis.
Norblad
Norton
O'Brien
O'Konski
Pace
Patman
Peterson
Poage
Preston
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rains
Rankin
Richards
Rizley
Rockwell
Russell
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Short
Sikes
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Somers
Spence
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Thompson
Tollefson
Trimble
Vinson
Welch
Williams
Wood
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—78

Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Arends
Barden
Boggs, La.
Buchanan
Buck
Buckley
Buffett
Bulwinkle
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Chadwick
Chapman
Chiperfield
Clark
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Cravens
Dawson, Ill.
Dirksen
Domengeaux
Douglas
Evins
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gavin
Gillie
Gwinn, N. Y.
Hartley
Hébert
Heffernan
Hendricks
Horan
Jenkins, Pa.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kee
Kefauver
Keogh
Kilburn
King
Lane
Lesinski
Lichtenwalter
Ludlow
McDowell
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Marcantonio
Mason
Mathews
Merrow
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Morrison
Multer
Murray, Tenn.
O'Toole
Passman
Pfeifer
Philbin
Poulson
Powell
Rayburn
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
Robertson
Rooney
Stratton
Thomas, N.J.
Tibbott
Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Rayburn against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Marcantonio against.

Mr. Tibbott for, with Mr. Lane against.

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Rooney.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Gillie with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Corbett with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Horan with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Evins.

Mr. Buffett with Mr. Heffernan.

Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Davis of Georgia.

Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Gamble with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Domengeaux.

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Pfeiffer.

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Judd with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.

Mr. Mathews with Mr. Lesinski.

Mr. Merrow with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Cravens.

Mr. Buck with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Multer.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Barden.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ANGELL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to announce the program for next week.

Next Monday is District day. I do not yet know whether or not there will be any bills from that committee, but if there are, of course, they will be disposed of first. Then we propose to call up the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for the relief of internees in certain cases. The consideration of that bill will be continued on Tuesday if it is not completed on Monday.

The program for Wednesday is undetermined.

It is expected that on Thursday and Friday of next week there will be general debate on the tax bill, H. R. 4790.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the West Virginia plan for veterans' housing.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the January issue of the Southern Banker by Hon. John D. Goodloe, Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times entitled "The Nazi-Soviet Documents."

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each editorials from the New York Post.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor and in the other some data concerning the veterans' subsistence bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include a letter written to the Speaker by General Gray asking for money for an investigation of insurance matters, and in the other to include a letter from the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts enclosing a bill that he requests be introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SUGAR PRICES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution in the House asking for a complete investigation of all phases of the sugar industry. My purpose in doing this was to find out just how much sugar prices can be reduced since there is evidence that they are too high. I feel that if we can take one commodity at a time and reduce prices on it, we might get somewhere in our fight against inflation. Six days after I introduced my resolution the price of refined sugar in New York fell 40 cents a hundred pounds. That may not seem like a lot of money, but if all segments of the sugar industry drop their prices by this amount, we already have a saving to the American housewife of some $64,000,000, since we will consume about 8,000,000 tons of sugar in this country this year. It is unfortunate that this price reduction was not announced before I introduced my resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] be granted leave of absence for today on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE IN THE ARMY

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this will be my fourteenth year as a Member of Congress and my twelfth year as a member of the Military Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. During that time I have done everything in my power to prevent waste of the taxpayers' dollars. During the war, because of war conditions, I have refrained from calling the attention of the House to the outrageous, willful, and unnecessary waste of the taxpayers' money. The war is over. The War Department continues to throw money down the military rat hole despite every effort I have made to prevent their doing so. I have come to the conclusion that only by following what Woodrow Wilson called a policy of "pitiless publicity" can we hope to protect the taxpayer from the profligate and inexcusable waste of his money on the part of the military forces and other agencies. This is the only way we can reduce waste and expenditures necessary to reduce taxes. I shall call the attention of the House and of the public to such cases of waste as they come up from time to time during the present session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to now call the attention of the House to such an instance of inexcusable waste. In August and September of 1945 the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee visited various military installations overseas. During the early part of September we flew the hump from Kunming, China, to Chabua, India. From there we went to Calcutta, to Agra, to New Delhi, and then to Karachi, India, making various inspections. This is the story of Maj. Gen. George C. Richards. War Department budget officer, and Karachi, India. For some unexplainable reason we were held at New Delhi for 2½ days. We arrived at Karachi at 11 o'clock in the forenoon and despite the fact that we were told we were to have a full day there we were scheduled to leave at 1:15 p. m. on the same day. Immediately upon our arrival we were taken in jeeps to various installations with an army officer on each arm. At approximately 12 o'clock we passed through the officers' club to get to the officers' mess. I stopped to talk to a number of young air officers, mostly second and first lieutenants who were apparently waiting for us. The other members of the party went into the dining room. It wasn't very long before General Richards called me saying that we had to eat and leave at 1:15 p. m. After eating a sandwich I came back and talked to these young officers. They told me that according to the schedule they were to have 1 hour with the committee, from 1 to 2 o'clock p. m., and that the enlisted men were to have an hour, between 2 and 3 o'clock; that apparently they were rushing us out of Karachi because they did not want us to talk with them. I informed them that I was glad to hear what they had to say, but that I wanted no hearsay but only statements of people who had first-hand information. These young officers were very bitter. They assured me that they had first-hand information. I asked for a pad and pencil and began to take their statements. The rest of the members of the committee and officers were still in the mess hall. After about 30 minutes they came out and started for the plane which was scheduled to leave as I stated at 1:15 p. m. General Richards remained behind to round up everybody and, apparently missing me, came back to the club rooms. He saw me talking to these young officers and informed me that the plane was leaving and requested me to go to the plane. I kept on taking the testimony stating that I would be along in a little while. He came a second time and insisted that I come, stating that the plane was leaving. I replied that I had flown 30,000 miles to obtain information and that I was going to obtain the information these men had if it took me until Christmas; that he could take the plane and leave, I was going to stay. General Richards then walked up to a second lieutenant with whom I was talking and said, "Lieutenant you report everything you say

here to your commanding officer." Here we had a major general, the budget officer of the United States Army, ordering a second lieutenant to report everything he said to a Member of Congress to his commanding officer.

General Richards could have had only one purpose in making that statement and that was to bluff the young officer into keeping still. In the meantime the other members of the committee and of the party, including the Commanding General of Karachi area, had come back to the club room and were standing a short distance from where we were talking. I turned to General Richards and said, "Come on, we are going to see that commanding officer." We walked over to the commanding officer, a general whose name I do not recall. I informed him that if he or any officer in the Army asked any soldier or officer to whom I had talked, any questions or made them report to them anything they had told me, I was going to hang his hide on the floor of the House, shoot it full of holes, and then introduce a resolution demanding that the War Department court martial such officer for interfering with a congressional investigation. By that time we had some 40 or 50 young officers in the mess hall. I insisted that everyone leave the room with the exception of the members of the committee and the committee clerk, and that these young officers be permitted to tell their story to the members of the committee. General Richards, the commanding officer, and all others left the room, and I then continued my questioning of the various witnesses. Here is a partial list of the things that I learned. For fear of reprisal on any officer who may still be in the Army, I shall for the present omit names.

Fancy tile had been hauled by air from Bombay, India, 500 miles to Karachi, the latter part of August 1945 and a patio was constructed for the officers' club in which we were then conferring. This was done after VJ-day. I have the name of the copilot who piloted the plane. They transported a small Austin car by air from Karachi, India, to New Delhi for an American colonel, Russell W. Munson, without a manifest or billing. The colonel did not like the color of the car so it was transported back from New Delhi to Karachi by air. A flight officer testified that during the 3 months previous he only carried two cargoes which he considered necessary. They transported an 8,000 pound printing press by air with type from Karachi to Agra where it was left setting on a warehouse floor. The supply officer made the statement that it was the only way he could get rid of it. New tools and instruments in the original packages were destroyed. An enlisted man, a welder, showed a captain a new welding set of tools, instruments, and so forth, that he had taken from one of the packages which was about to be destroyed. They hauled a great deal of equipment and supplies by air from Khartoum and Cairo, Egypt, to Karachi, a distance from two and three thousand miles. Many of these supplies were burned at a base called Malair about 8 miles east of Karachi. A lieutenant saw them burning gloves worth $2 a pair, 75 parachutes, new A-2 flying jackets, aircraft spare parts and some aircraft instruments were smashed with an axe. A lieutenant did the smashing. Another lieutenant heard a Major Griffith, assistant technical supply officer from Calcutta, state that he had been sent there from headquarters to get rid of the supplies. Flying jackets and equipment were taken from the men who were on the way back home and then were destroyed and burned. They transported the following from a project in Africa known as the Peacock project to Karachi, India, during April and May 1945: 570 Simmons mattresses, 270 springs, 240 bedsteads, chairs, commodes, barbed wire, and a plane load of empty "coke" bottles.

When I got to Cairo, Egypt, I personally checked the manifests and found where they had shipped hundreds of beds, springs, and mattresses by air for officers. Later, when I got to Rome, I found battle-fatigued men at a rest camp sleeping on board bunks with light pads, without springs. It is about 2,000 miles from Khartoum, Egypt, to Karachi, and about 3,000 miles from Cairo to Karachi. One officer told me he had carried a cargo of bamboo poles over the Hump by air. I have two photographs of the burning grounds at Malair, India, where the material was burned which they hauled from the Peacock project in Africa. These two photographs were taken August 25, 1945. This was all done after the war was over. I never saw a group of young officers whose morale was lower, who felt more bitter toward their superior officers than did this young group of flying officers at Karachi, India.

When we came to Chungking, China, I was told by some young air transport pilots that they were hauling India cotton over the Hump to China. The trip over the Himalaya Mountains—some 20,000 feet high—was the most dangerous flying that has been engaged in. Some 1,200 fliers lost their lives flying the Hump. I questioned the officers in charge at Chungking, but they professed to know nothing about it. I picked up the same story at Kunming, China, and again was told by the officers they had no information about cotton being flown over the Hump. The next day our committee flew the Hump from Kunming, China, to Chabua, India. When we arrived at Chabua an attempt was made, in my judgment, to rush us from the airport to the mess hall. After some insistence, they took us finally to the warehouse from which supplies were being shipped across the Hump. I found 375 tons of India cotton on the warehouse floor waiting for air transportation across the Hump. I examined the manifests and found 375 more tons had already been shipped by air, or a total of 750 tons of India cotton was being shipped by air across the most dangerous air route in the world, a route where 1,200 boys lost their lives. I was later informed that the cotton was worth from 15 to 20 cents a pound, the cost of transportation was more than $2 a pound. The British got the price of the cotton and we paid the cost of transportation. These facts were verified by some of the pilots at Karachi who had taken part in the shipping of some of this cotton. The bitter feeling among these Air Corps men was brought about, in my judgment, by the loss of lives of their comrades in flying across the Hump material which these men considered useless.

MEETING WITH ENLISTED MEN

After the meeting with the officers, we went to a meeting for enlisted men in a rather large hall. The hall was packed. I estimated that some 300 men attended that meeting. The chairman of the subcommittee took charge, everyone in the crowd tried to talk at once and the turmoil was so great it was difficult to do anything in the short time available. At least nothing was done and no notes of any information were taken to my knowledge. These men were all very bitter at the treatment they had received and particularly because of the way matériel was being destroyed. I personally was unable to obtain any information at that meeting with one exception. I did obtain at that enlisted men's meeting the two pictures of the burning grounds at Malair. After a rather fruitless and unsuccessful meeting with the enlisted men we continued on our trip.

Maj. Gen. George C. Richards, budget officer of the United States Army, following his usual practice, did everything in his power to cover up and prevent our committee from obtaining information. I had a recent conference with Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, in my office. I gave him all these and other facts regarding Maj. Gen. George C. Richards, Army budget officer. I shall give the House some of these other facts from time to time. When Secretary Royall asked me what was the matter with General Richards, I told him personally in my office that the only difference between Gen. George C. Richards and an old Tom cat was that the old Tom cat had the common decency to cover up only his own dirt. Gen. George C. Richards covered up or tried to cover up Army dirt wherever he saw there was danger of uncovering it. The initial "C" must stand for "Coverup" and his full name should be Maj. Gen. George "Coverup" Richards. General and Secretary Royall's answer was to appoint Maj. Gen. George "Coverup" Richards, Comptroller of the Department of the Army where he will undoubtedly be made a lieutenant general. Apparently the chance of a man's promotion in the Army is enhanced by, and sometimes based on, his ability to cover up Army waste and extravagance. Secretary Kenneth Royall, by his action has placed the stamp of approval upon Maj. Gen. George "Coverup" Richards' action and conduct in preventing Congress from obtaining necessary facts in framing a budget and must therefore assume the responsibility for General Richards' conduct in the above and other instances which I shall give from time to time. I am wondering whether the Secretary's full name is

Kenneth "Coverup" Royall. If it is not, he earned that name by his naming Maj. Gen. George "Coverup" Richards, Comptroller of the Department of the Army.

Modern science tells us that sunlight is a great remedy for some diseases. I am from here on going to use Woodrow Wilson's method, hoping that the light of pitiless publicity will cure some of these cankerous diseases in our Military Establishment and protect the taxpayer who foots the bill. In the meantime I want to suggest to Secretary Royall that inasmuch as he is apparently basing the promotion of Maj. Gen. George "Coverup" Richards upon his ability to cover up Army dirt, he is entitled to at least seven instead of three stars. Anything less than seven stars would not be justified on the basis apparently used in his promotion. In fact, why not make him Secretary of National Defense, if that is to be the policy of the newly established Department of the Army?

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of Members of the House and the country facts in connection with the so-called Marshall plan. We have heard a great deal about the necessity for approval of the Marshall plan because it is designed to defeat and contain communism all over the world.

A very interesting report has been made by the committee representing the 16 nations that met in Europe. I have gone through that report, but nowhere in it do I find that these countries are worried about communism taking over if this plan is not reported favorably.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the public interest for Members of the Congress to keep the public informed on important legislative matters such as the so-called Marshall-plan bill, H. R. 4840.

Much is at stake as we come to consider the merits of this legislation. There is a wide difference of opinion as to its objective and certainly a wide gulf between those who are for it and those who are in opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the objective of the bill we are considering must be viewed in relation to the request made by the 16 cooperating nations of Europe. A report was compiled by the Committee of European Economic Cooperation, and it seems to me that if we are to fully understand the request that has been made we should become familiar with it.

Let us first consider a statement in the bill before us which has a bearing on this problem. On page 2, line 5, of the bill is this statement:

> Unless normal economic conditions and stable international economic relationships are restored in Europe, it will not be possible for the countries of Europe to achieve a working economy independent of abnormal outside assistance, or to maintain free institutions and national independence.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we are to believe that those countries cannot maintain free institutions and national independence unless the Marshall plan is adopted. That is what we say. But what does the report of those nations say?

Mr. Speaker, I can find no language in the report to the effect that the aid requested is necessary to maintain free institutions and national independence. Not one word anywhere to indicate that there is the fear of communism, as we have been led to believe by witnesses who have appeared before congressional committees. Is this not very strange?

In the preamble to the general report, page 1, the objective of the meeting in Paris was "for the purpose of developing an economic recovery program." The State Department, in its report to our committee, page 25, says that "6 years of war and enemy occupation have wrought heavy toll on the people and the economic structure of Europe." There is no mention of communism there. Unless there is more convincing proof, Mr. Speaker, no case has been made to justify such a fear.

Again referring to the CEEC report, the point made by the State Department is that the war and enemy occupation of those countries destroyed their economic structures. On page 7, however, is a significant statement which seems to deny the allegation:

> 12. Nevertheless recovery proceeded well, indeed, much faster than after the end of the First World War. Eighteen months after the end of fighting in Europe, industry and transport were moving again vigorously and the work of reconstruction was getting under way. This was made possible by the efforts of the European countries themselves, with generous assistance from the United States and other countries and from UNRRA. So successful were these efforts that by the end of 1946 industrial production in Belgium, France, and the Netherlands had recovered to 85–95 percent of the prewar level, whilst Italian industrial production was back to 60 percent of prewar level. In the United Kingdom the process of demobilization of the war economy had been accomplished smoothly and the prewar level of national output had been fully restored. In the Scandinavian countries production was steadily rising. In the case of agricultural production, which, though hard hit by the war, had not declined to the same extent as industrial production, the beginning of recovery was evident in all countries in 1946. Indeed, the participating countries as a whole had made a good and resolute start on their task.

To me this is an amazing statement, in fact it is a confession that from the end of the war to the end of 1946, industrial production in those countries had reached 85 to 95 percent of prewar levels and Italy was up to 60 percent of prewar, and, believe it or not, in the United Kingdom the prewar level of national output had been fully restored. Even agriculture had made a good recovery in all countries in 1946.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the story that has been told to the people of the United States. I have honestly believed that the present chaotic condition in Europe was a result of war damage and enemy occupation. Obviously that is not the case, for the facts are that a prewar level of production had been reached up to the end of 1946.

We do know, Mr. Speaker, that Europe had a severe winter in 1946–47 and also suffered a record-breaking drought, which may have added considerably to the present situation, but those facts are not stressed in the CEEC report.

As the record now stands, the break in the economic structure occurred in 1947, but there is not much information on the reasons therefor. If there was a rapid recovery, more rapid than after World War I, what, aside from the weather, has caused this break-down? The record thus far is silent. I shall not attempt to answer that question, but ask what do these countries now seek under the Marshall plan, as reflected in the legislation before us?

There is language in chapter II, page 11, No. 25, of the CEEC report, which leaves no doubt that the participating countries are not asking for a restoration of their economies to a prewar level, but are actually requesting assistance over a 4-year period and at a level of production comparable to what the United States had attained in the period from 1940 to 1944. Here is the exact language, on page 11, No. 25:

> The production expansion which is envisaged by 1951 is similar in general scale to that achieved by the United States in the mobilization years 1940 to 1944.

Then follows this footnote:

> In the United States from 1940 to 1944, coal output increased by 34 percent, steel output by 31 percent, electric power output by 61 percent. The European coal output is planned to increase by 33 percent from 1947 to 1951, steel output (excluding Germany) by 60 percent, and power output by 39 percent.

Particular attention is called to the significance of production objectives of the plan which envisage production "expansion achieved by the United States in the mobilization years of 1940–44." How much did we expand in those war years? According to one Federal report, in 1940, the physical volume of our production was 25 percent higher than for the average of the years 1935–39. In 1944, however, physical volume was up 88 percent over the 1940 level.

From this it must be concluded that the European countries do not want our support of a program that would assist in establishing their economies on a prewar basis. But they want assistance to establish an economy equal to our own during the most productive period in our history.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If Europe is to be put on the same productive level as we, does not the gentleman think the people in the various countries of Europe should all work as hard and for as many days of work per week and as many hours of work per week as we do?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed. I think that follows, of course.

Again, referring to the report by the Committee of European Economic Cooperation, volume 1, page 58, chapter VIII, dealing with conclusions, paragraph 161 states:

The participating countries are determined to overcome their difficulties as far as they can by their own exertions, and the realization of the 4-year program will restore the prewar level of agricultural production in the participating countries as a whole and will exceed it in coal, steel, and manufacturing industry generally. The scale of this effort will not only solve the immediate production problem but will also provide the basis for a further raising of European production in the following years to levels never before contemplated in Europe. This is the foundation for a sound and workable European economy which can once again play its full part within the wider framework of world trade.

Mr. Speaker, feeding the hungry is a humane objective. So is preventing Communists from overrunning the countries of Europe. But the basic objective of H. R. 4840 is an economic one, namely, financial assistance. If that fails, the social and political byproducts go down with it. If we take the Paris report and use it as the basis for our action here, I do not see how the economic rehabilitation of Europe can be achieved. The theory seems to be that American help should remedy the deficiencies of European production which had reached a prewar level at the end of 1946, or about 1 year ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is a remarkable fact that the major part of the help sought consists in commodities which Europe itself can produce.

First, there is plenty of coal to be mined in England, Germany, and France, if men can be induced to mine it.

Second, there is plenty of tillable soil in France and French North Africa if it can be put into cultivation.

Third, there are large steel plants in England, France, Belgium, Germany, and Luxemburg if they are put into production. The Paris report confirms these facts but asks for temporary supplementation of the deficiencies now existing.

Will the deficiencies become temporary or chronic? It takes a measure of optimism to say they will be temporary.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the policies of European governments are conducive to these deficiencies as a result of the beliefs and influences of political parties, unions, and pressure groups. There is no promise that these policies will be changed. And the bill under consideration does not cure that situation.

The present European economy is based upon a system of rations and allocations. What the Paris report really asks for is the commodities to implement the rations of food, the allocations of raw materials, and the equipment for capital investment. In other words, even with our help the same old system that is bankrupting the world will continue to operate. Does it make sense?

Thus, American help is not going to provide what is most needed in Europe today, namely, incentives. Without incentives to increase production there is little chance that European production will pick up and fill out the deficiencies which the American contribution is called upon to remedy temporarily.

French food production will remain low so long as present conditions endure. The market towns have not been supplied or restocked since 1940. The French farmer is accused of hoarding, but so-called hoarding is the result of the lack of other incentive goods in exchange for agricultural produce. For a number of years these farmers have fed the city people without ever getting goods in exchange. They are now weary of giving something for nothing. Thus the American farmer must supply these deficiencies so long as the French farmer remains unrewarded. This factor is disregarded in European plans. A Sears, Roebuck catalog with the goods would stimulate agricultural produce to a great extent.

Take our American drugstore complete with its display of merchandise and set it up in any district of Europe and the psychological effect would be tremendous. It would also be the best possible propaganda for the American way of life.

Why not revive key sectors of European economy through recourse to American consumer goods, to be paid for with dollar scrip which was earned as wages by the workers? For instance, the Coal Board of England might receive a grant-in-aid allowing it to stock mine-town shops with American goods and priced in dollars and payable in this scrip. The vital problem is to reward labor of all kinds with a means of payment valid wherever the merchandise is available.

Mr. Speaker, European governments today have a fear of a free-market economy. It does not seem prudent to strengthen in practice the control of national governments upon foreign commerce by the complete recognition of their monopoly of dollars and dollar goods. This is what is actually proposed under the Marshall plan.

The Paris plan pays lip service to European cooperation when it is in fact nothing more than a shopping list of the European governments.

Our administration has taken the Paris plan, altered its figures, but it has failed to question the underlying assumptions of the plan. The fact is that those assumptions are based upon economic policies which have proved disastrous to date.

Ultimately, it is not beneficial to aid Europe in such a way that economic rehabilitation shall not be achieved. Yet that is what happens under the bill before us.

It would appear necessary to restore normal breathing to the European economy by some artificial means, such as the direct lifting up of some key sectors by the introduction of consumer goods and the distribution of real dollars as suggested above.

The gradual introduction of freely circulating dollars into Europe may be the way to European salvation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. MATHEWS (at the request of Mr. TOWE) was granted leave of absence on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to take all of the time allotted to me. I regret that due to the lateness of the hour there are so few Members here. I hope those who are here may read my speech in the RECORD tomorrow and possibly prevail upon some of our colleagues to read it as well.

I believe it is terribly important at this particular time to give some thought to the problem which I want to present to you now.

Mr. Speaker, man's inhumanity to man is nowhere more spectacularly displayed today than in the Arab peninsula. It is probably true that in this very hour in which I speak some unarmed man or woman has been shot and killed for no other reason than the defiance of the United Nations by medieval Arab chieftains with the acquiescence and possible connivance of the British in Palestine.

PROMISES LOST IN SEA OF OIL

Many of you in this Chamber are of Irish extraction, and your family traditions tell you of the slaughter of Irishmen for the sake of absentee British landlords. You may have been brought up to revere that stirring old song of the Irish fight for liberation, "They're hangin' men and women for the wearin' of the green."

Since the League of Nations mandate was given Great Britain a similar situation has developed in the Holy Land.

For almost 10 years the struggle of the Jews in Palestine has been directed toward a corrupt and cynical British repudiation of the terms of the mandate. The bright promises of 1917 have been forgotten, perhaps drowned in a sea of oil.

The national Jewish home has become a world issue, and overwhelmingly world opinion has leaned toward full sympathy with the Jewish cause.

Time after time after time the British Government has betrayed its own promises.

PARTITION OF PALESTINE DETERMINED

Despite this, the hopes of the world for peace and justice arose anew with the creation of the United Nations. The issue was decided last November in the general assembly of the United Nations when, by a decisive majority vote, the assembly agreed to carry out the recommendations of its own interim committee on Palestine, and to determine and enforce a partition which was acceptable to the Palestine Jewish Agency.

Out of that partition was born the new Palestinian state.

From the moment the vote on partition was taken the Arab states have asserted that they are not bound by the solemn covenants into which they entered by their acceptance into the United Nations.

They have rejected the most fundamental concept of democratic action—the principle of majority rule.

UN CHALLENGED BY ARABS

The Arab states have said, in effect, that in spite of the most binding agreements of their membership in the United Nations, they refuse to recognize majority action if the majority votes against them.

This is a clear challenge to the United Nations.

The whole structure of voluntary world government, for which the world fought and bled 6 years, can fall on this single defiance.

The Arab states have not waited to debate the issue.

They have once more plunged an unhappy world into an undeclared warfare—a shooting war.

Innocent men and women, and little children too, Jew and Arab alike, are being uselessly slaughtered.

The United States Government stands today in an equivocal position in Palestine.

There can be no doubt but that American leadership in the General Assembly brought about the successful vote on partition.

Furthermore, the American delegation acted upon direct instructions from the President and the Secretary of State, overriding the timid State Department apologists for English double-dealing.

UNITED STATES POSITION ILLOGICAL

Yet simultaneously the embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act and the powers of the Export Licensing Act have been invoked to deprive the citizens of the new Palestinian state of all means of self-defense, while the Arabs find arms on every side—some stolen, some purchased, some merely appearing by magic out of the boundless desert.

The position of the United States becomes illogical, indefensible, and untenable, especially with the discovery that American shotgun ammunition can be shipped to Arabs while explosives intended for Palestine are seized and destroyed and the shippers imprisoned. New and startling disclosures about shipments to Arabs will come out soon.

We cannot take the lead in the creation of an infant state, and then deprive that state of all means of self-defense.

This is a monstrous illogic which can only suggest that our Department of State has learned nothing from the tragic results of our neutrality in Spain a decade ago.

The analogy is not complete, because there do not exist today two powerful Fascist states anxious to make the Arab peninsula a testing ground for the war of the future.

BLOOD NEEDLESSLY SHED

But the analogy does hold true to this extent: That the Arabs who are rioting in Palestine are doing so only at the instigation of that bloody ally of Hitler, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, with the full blessing of the surrounding Arab states, which can readily supply food, arms, trucks, supplies, and ammunition to the Mufti's mobs.

The blood being shed in Palestine today is being needlessly shed.

The Jews in that tiny new principality of Palestine do not want battle and riot and sudden death. They want peace in which to organize their government and prepare to take over their new responsibilities, peace in which to build their irrigation works and till their fields and operate their factories.

Nor do the Arab inhabitants of Palestine want violence, except for the mobs of pillagers led by the Mufti and his coconspirators. The Arab workmen want only an opportunity to work in peace, side by side with their Jewish neighbors, as they have done for the last 60 years. The Jews have brought to Palestine new standards of living, new ideas of material comfort, new visions of a democratic way of life.

PALESTINE DISORDERS INSTIGATED BY ARABS

Their Arab neighbors like this new life. They live, work, play, and prosper side by side with the Jews. They benefit by the Jewish irrigation works, new agricultural methods, factories, fisheries, newspapers, radios, and solid low-cost modern houses.

The disorders in Palestine are completely artificial.

They are inspired and encouraged by the governments of the Arab states, who are themselves members of the UN and by their membership morally and legally bound to support the majority action of the assembly. There is and can be no moral justification, in the eyes of the world, for the campaign of violence directed against the new Palestinian government and the decision of the Assembly.

The pattern of Nazi terror in the disorders is not accidental.

The moving spirit of armed resistance to the United Nations is the murderous ex-Mufti and his crew, supported by former officers from the German Army, some Arab, some outlaws from other nations. Some of the officers in the Arab forces are retired British officers.

In Palestine itself the British troops have openly sided with the insurgent Arab marauders. They have disarmed and immobilized the Jewish resistance forces while ignoring Arab outrages.

JEWS ARE LEFT DEFENSELESS

The embargo against the shipment of weapons and ammunition to Palestine by our own State Department has exactly the same effect.

The Arabs can obtain all the weapons they can possibly need from the government forces of the Arab states.

Great Britain has announced that the Government feels bound to carry out contracts already entered into for the delivery of war material. No one knows how much German material reached Arab hands during the early years of World War II.

Only the Palestinian Jews are left utterly defenseless.

The American position is unworthy.

It raises the ugly suspicion that again the Middle East Division of the Department of State is indulging in rapid double talk, sabotaging the policies laid down by President Truman and Secretary Marshall, and betraying the people in favor of the feudal landlords and oil companies.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America took the initiative for strong action by the United Nations.

The world hailed the moral courage of that act.

To maintain our position of moral leadership in bringing justice to a brave people, we must now continue our bold course.

RAISING OF EMBARGO URGED

Most earnestly, most respectfully, and with clear understanding of the diplomatic and political problems involved, I urge the administration to raise the embargo at once.

I urge the administration to warn the Arab states against their continued insolence, and to make it crystal clear that the United States will take all necessary steps to enforce the warning by economic and diplomatic sanctions.

I urge our Government to insist to Great Britain that she abide equally by the majority action of the United Nations and that she join with the United States at once in providing arms to the Haganah for police work, not by stealth and by private individuals, but openly and officially on a commonsense selective basis.

This raises the delicate issue of a United Nations police force. There is no time now for the establishment, arming, training, and dispatch of United Nations forces, entirely aside from the debate which quite properly would precede such action.

No such issue is involved in allowing the underground forces to become an effective constabulary to carry out police powers in the Jewish territory of Palestine.

NO TIME TO BE LOST

Many of the Haganah members are veterans of the war against fascism. They have had military training. They are disciplined, brave, and able. Knowing that the United States, England, and Russia, are backing them in carrying out the mandate of the United Nations, the Haganah can, if armed and equipped, defend the new government effectively and with skill and justice, and can prevent the present violence from moving into open and naked warfare.

There is no time to be lost.

The moral leadership and inspiration of the United States is at stake. The future of the United Nations is at stake. The future of the Middle East is at stake. And, Mr. Speaker, I say this with all solemnity, it may well be that the peace of the world is at stake.

The Middle East is the powder keg of the earth today.

The world is exhausted, prostrated, worn out by 10 years of war and destruction.

Yet here in the sands and oil fields of the Middle East, with its medieval feudalism, its violent currents of religious fanaticism and supernationalism, its vast but undeveloped riches, and its historic significance, could develop the long struggle which might, too easily, flare into another world war.

That must not happen.

WE CAN INSURE PEACE

If we act decisively we can ward off the evils of war. We can bring peace and prosperity to the Middle East. We can make sure of continued peace. We can create a haven for the ravaged, helpless Jews of Europe, and make it possible for them to create a new life and a new country, thus relieving the rest of the world of the burden of supporting them.

We can make a substantial payment of the debt modern civilization owes to a rugged indomitable people who have preserved their culture and their national and religious entity through centuries of oppression and dispersal.

We can bolster the world food supply by encouraging new agricultural production in the Mideast under the industrious Jews.

We can support the United Nations as a force for universal peace, and make certain that the United Nations survives its first major test.

Mr. Speaker, I not only urge an affirmative and positive course of action on the administration, and particularly on the Department of State, toward the Palestine question, but I urge this House, as it loves freedom and justice and prosperity, to support the administration in that course. This is something far above any question of politics, and I do not speak here as a Democrat, nor as an adherent of the Jewish faith. I speak only as an American believing profoundly in America and in democracy.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, an advertisement of the American Christian Palestine Committee, and several short news stories from the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, and other newspapers:

To the United States and the United Nations:

Since the United Nations General Assembly voted for the partition of Palestine on November 29, 1947, a shameful and deeply disquieting situation has arisen to which public opinion cannot remain indifferent.

Openly defying the United Nations, the governments of the Arab states, themselves members of the UN, are deliberately encouraging aggression against the Jews of Palestine. They are using Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, and Iraq as bases for these operations. They are providing funds, ammunition, and military training, and have already launched attacks in force from Syria and Lebanon against Palestinian Jews. In Palestine itself this state of affairs has resulted in unbridled violence by armed Arab bands organized by Haj Amin el Husseini, the same Arab leader who during the war immeasurably aided Hitler in broadcasts from Berlin urging the Moslems of the Middle East to revolt against the Allies.

This campaign of violence has no moral justification. It is directed against a decision of the United Nations made after nearly 20 committees of inquiry had investigated the problem of Palestine over a period of more than 25 years. The decision of the United Nations was, moreover, a compromise which granted national states in Palestine to both Jews and Arabs.

The campaign of violence we now witness is not a spontaneous uprising by the majority of Palestine's Arabs. On the contrary, they wish to live in peace with their Jewish neighbors. But they are terrorized by the ex-Mufti's bands assisted by his confederates in Cairo, Baghdad, Beirut, and Damascus. Significantly, Arab violence is largely directed against Jerusalem which, according to the UN decision, is to be an international territory because it is sacred to the Christian world.

The campaign of Arab aggression, led by a group of former Nazi allies and their accomplices across the frontiers, is therefore directed not only against the Jews, not only against the peaceful majority of Palestine's Arabs, but against the authority of the United Nations itself.

This is a bold attempt to blackmail the United Nations into submission. It is an attempt by violence to render impotent the first great decision of the United Nations. If this campaign succeeds, it will reduce the United Nations to a debating society. At a moment when world peace is the hope of all men of good will, it will smash the effectiveness of the only instrument for international peace we possess. It will disillusion those millions who had hopes that at last some way other than the holocaust of war could be found to settle international problems.

If the United Nations cannot make its Palestine decision stick, if a handful of willful men can prevent a UN decision from being carried out because they do not like that decision, then no future action of the UN will have more worth than the paper upon which it is written.

For this state of affairs not only the ex-Mufti and his cohorts are responsible. Other powers are not wholly free of responsibility. The British Government, which insisted that it retain control over Palestine and sole responsibility for law and order until the termination of the Palestine mandate, seems either unwilling or unable to maintain law and order. We do not attempt to judge whether this policy is dictated by unwillingness or inability. But the fact remains that the security situation in Palestine is steadily deteriorating.

One thing is certain, while Arab bands attack Jewish settlements, blockade wide areas, and waylay traffic on the highways, British officials and forces have repeatedly interfered with Jewish defense and counterattack, repeatedly arrested and disarmed the defenders, and repeatedly confiscated their armaments.

The United Nations has not yet taken action against those overt acts of its Arab member-governments which constitute an open defiance of the resolution of the General Assembly and of the Charter itself. Nor has the United Nations reacted as yet to the fact that the ex-Mufti's bands and the attitude of the British administration are a clear challenge and threat to the authority of this international body.

Even if the only issue at stake were the safety of the 700,000 Jews of Palestine, American public opinion should have been deeply concerned. Our Government was largely instrumental in bringing about the United Nations decision on partition. What had we in mind when we encouraged the aspirations of the Jewish people to nationhood in Palestine? Was it our intention to leave them there defenseless?

Much more is at stake than our moral responsibility toward the Jews. We repeat, the very future of the United Nations is in jeopardy. This open defiance of the United Nations' decision comes from a group of middle eastern states which depend upon the UN and the Western World for sovereignty and international recognition, for political and military protection, as well as economic development. If we permit such conduct on the part of the Arab states, then the authority of the United Nations will suffer a staggering blow which can result in incalculable harm to men everywhere.

Let us make no mistake about the danger involved in this situation. The conflict may assume world-wide dimensions, or, alternatively, this aggression of the Arab states can be restrained, thus making the Palestine solution a potent factor for peace and stability in the world. America must help to determine whether the effectiveness of the United Nations shall be destroyed or strengthened.

The United States wants peace in the world. It is to its vital interests to uphold the Palestine decision of the United Nations. Our Government should, therefore, actively support the following measures:

1. A stern warning to the Arab states calling for an end to the sabotage of the UN decision.

2. An unmistakably clear declaration to Great Britain that as long as she remains in Palestine, her armed forces can be neither neutral nor quasi neutral, but must act in defense of public law and the UN decision.

3. Immediate use of the proper UN agencies to provide international military protection for Palestine Jewry and make immediately available the necessary military force to implement the United Nations decision on Palestine.

4. Immediate equipment of the Haganah under United Nations auspices to enable this Jewish constabulary defense force to carry out police powers within Jewish territory in Palestine.

Only in this manner can the United States and the United Nations prevent the threatened conflagration. The delay in implementing the UN decision has encouraged the Arab League and the ex-Mufti in their defiance of the UN and have forced the Jewish people to resort to desperate means to provide themselves with arms for their defense and for the maintenance of the UN decision.

American Christian Palestine Committee: Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, Senator Owen Brewster, Frank Buxton, Bartley C. Crum, Samuel Guy Inman, Senator Edwin C. Johnson, Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, Senator James E. Murray, Prof. Harry A. Overstreet, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Senator Charles W. Tobey, Senator Robert F. Wagner.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 20, 1948]

ARMS FOR PALESTINE

It is indefensible, as the newly formed committee to arm the Jewish state declares, for the United States to put its whole influence behind the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine and then impose an embargo on the export of the arms which are more and more plainly indispensable to such a state's survival. The notion that there is something immoral about providing arms in a situation which one has deliberately created with the full knowledge that arms would be necessary is redolent of that mawkishness which seems too often to confuse every in-

ternational issue. The first and simplest answer to the sudden question of arms for Palestine is to lift the embargo at once. The least which the United States can offer to the Jewish agency and to Haganah is free access to the available supplies or weapons for self-defense.

This is the first and obvious answer. It is not the full answer. The questions of security and of enforcement were obviously central to the United Nations' decision for a partition of Palestine; yet these were precisely the questions which were shirked by all the great powers. They cannot be shirked much longer. The legal foundations for the partition of Palestine have been left on swampy ground. Legally, partition has been recommended by the General Assembly as a measure for meeting a situation, in the language of the Charter, "likely to impair the general welfare of friendly relations among nations." The Arab states are fomenting a warlike rebellion against this recommendation. They can truthfully assert that the Assembly has no binding power; on the other hand, they are themselves bound by the general obligation on all United Nations members to settle international disputes only by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Administration of partition, in the transition period, was vested by the Assembly in its Palestine Commission. But the Assembly, aware of the uncertainty of the authority thus conferred, specifically requested that if a threat to peace arose during the transition period, the Security Council should act under its general power to deal with such threats. The threat has not only arisen; it is imminent. There is no reason why the United States should deny arms to the Jewish community in Palestine. But there is at the same time every reason why the United States should raise the basic question of enforcement in the Security Council, at once and emphatically, and demand a clear decision on the underlying responsibilities. Without it, this country will have to give Jewish Palestine access to arms, since this country was so largely instrumental in offering Jewish Palestine a freedom which everyone knew would be dangerous. But since it is the UN Assembly, under the aegis of the Security Council, which has decreed and is immediately responsible for partition, the United States both may and must ask a decision on enforcement from the Council.

WASHINGTON MEMO

(Editor, Charles Van Devander; associates, Oliver Pilat, James A. Wechsler, and William O. Player, Jr.)

UNITED STATES TO BLAME FOR ZION BLOODSHED—ARABS THINK WE DON'T BACK PARTITION

WASHINGTON, January 20.—Unless there is a drastic change in Washington policy the United States Government—meaning the Truman administration—is going to find itself bearing full responsibility for continued bloodshed in Palestine.

Confidential reports reaching here show that the Arab people are being assured by their leaders that the United States does not really support the United Nations plan for partition of the Holy Land. They are being told that the official United States position was merely a "necessary political gesture," and that the great western democracy doesn't intend to do anything to back it up.

Unfortunately nothing that has happened in Washington supplies a convincing refutation of this unlovely view of American motives. The Arab leaders, themselves, now are apparently accepting their own propaganda and testing it out with increasing audacity.

Last week, for instance, some 600 Arabs, reportedly commanded by Syrian officers, crossed the border to attack two Jewish settlements (Kfar Szold and Dan) in Upper Galilee.

A confidential report received here from within the Arab territory said the raid was "intended to be a trial balloon to sound out the UN and American reactions." If that was indeed its purpose, the result can only have been to encourage Arab boldness. The American Government took no action and the UN—without such initiative from Washington—continued to twiddle its thumbs nervously.

Actually, there is no real secret about the strategy of the Arab leaders. Shortly after the UN decision in favor of partition two of the principal Arab leaders began their attack openly on the sincerity of this Government by declaring that American public opinion was turning against the official United States stand. These Arab spokesmen were Faris El Khoury, of Syria, and Jamal Husseini, representative of the Mufti's Higher Committee for Palestine.

Just last week an Arab daily newspaper in Brooklyn, Al-Sameer, reported the sailing of an American Arab, Yussus Ahmad Nijim, for Lebanon.

According to the Arab newspaper: "Nijim asked the people in the State Department to furnish him with arguments for the defense of United States policy on Palestine. He was told 'What has taken place in the UN is not an act of state, for the UN is no government. The Arabs may accept the UN decision or repudiate.' "

That account, it may be taken for granted, has by now been widely circulated among the Arab populations of Syria, Lebanon, and the rest of the Near East. Its natural result, in the absence of any affirmative United States support of the UN partition decree, will be to increase Arab intransigence.

The British position on Palestine is reasonable, straightforward, and aboveboard. The British opposed the partition plan, and since its approval by the UN they have been remarkably frank about their moral and military support of the Arabs.

The United States, however, having been chiefly responsible for UN approval of partition, has a moral obligation, as certainly as it has the moral and material prestige, to see that the plan is effectuated without unnecessary loss of life.

What is needed, observers here agree, is a clear demonstration that the United States genuinely supports the UN decision. This could be provided not only in words, but by removal of the arms embargo which hampers the Palestinian Jews in their self-defense and by a protest to the UN Security Council against Syrian violations of the Palestinian border. Until steps are taken, many Americans will be inclined to wonder whether the Arabs—and the British—may not be right in believing that Washington is just "playing domestic politics" with the future of Palestine and with the lives of its unhappy people.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 20, 1948]

ZIONISTS ACCUSE BRITAIN, AND INVERCHAPEL REPLIES

The American Zionist Emergency Council, 342 Madison Avenue, made public yesterday an exchange of correspondence with Lord Inverchapel, British Ambassador at Washington, beginning with a telegram of January 8 in which the council charged the British with "quasi neutrality" in Palestine. It said the British military and police, "while suppressing, disarming, and imprisoning Jewish defense forces, tolerate and actually abet terrorist attacks of Arab bands."

Replying on January 12, Lord Inverchapel said he could not "accept the implication," and it "is not surprising that in some cases Jews have been prevented from taking the law into their own hands, as this can only increase the confusion." To prevent incidents altogether, he said, "it would very probably be necessary to put the whole country under martial law."

He said also that "while I have no wish to condone Arab attacks or to underestimate the suffering which they have caused, I do believe that consideration must be given to the difficulties which face the administration in Palestine."

To this Israel Goldstein, acting chairman, replied on January 19. In his letter he said: "You will forgive me for telling you that a growing segment of public opinion is unable to explain the British attitude on any other grounds than that the British have deliberately embarked upon a policy of benevolent toleration toward the Arab riots in the beginning in order to encourage their growth; and that now with the riots having assumed major proportions, British forces become somewhat more active in combating them in the hope this would lead to a request by the United Nations or by the Jews themselves for continued British occupation of Palestine."

ARABS IN KHAKI ATTACK COLONY WITH MORTARS—JEWS BEAT OFF ORGANIZED THRUST AT YEHIAM, SUFFER FOUR DEAD; FOUR KILLED NEARBY

(By Fitzhugh Turner)

JERUSALEM, January 20.—Uniformed Arabs attacked the isolated Jewish colony of Yehiam in northern Palestine today, in an operation conducted along military lines and employing mortars for the first time on the Arab side in Palestine's undeclared war.

Members of Haganah, the Jewish defense force, fought off the attackers but, according to an official communique, suffered four dead and six injured.

An armored car escorting a tank truck carrying water to the besieged settlement was stopped by 150 to 200 Arabs at a roadblock 9 miles from its destination, according to Haganah. In an ensuing fight four Jewish settlement police were killed and six wounded. A British constable also was wounded.

FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY REPORTED IN ATTACK

Jewish sources in Jerusalem said three men in uniform resembling those of the Iraq Army led the attack of 450 Arabs on the colony, but this was not confirmed tonight. British police and a company of the Middlesex Regiment of the British Army were at the scene, and reported the Arabs had been dressed in khaki uniform. They used machine guns and rifles as well as mortars.

The fight was one of the heaviest thus far, but although Haganah claimed it inflicted a number of Arab casualties, no figures were available here.

Yehiam, a settlement with 800 acres of land, is built on a hilltop in western Galilee, near a ruined Crusader castle and 11 miles northeast of the old Crusader port of Acre. It was established in June 1946, and was named for a Haganah commander killed while blowing up bridges during a campaign against the British mandate government. About 80 persons lived there in peacetime, but recently children had been removed and Haganah had sent in reinforcements.

(Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, an advertisement of the American Jewish Palestine Committee, and other matter.)

MAJ. GEN. GEORGE C. RICHARDS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I listened quite attentively a few minutes ago to the address delivered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] in which he made some very serious charges against Maj. Gen. George C. Richards. As I understood the speech made by the gentleman from Michigan he complained because General Richards directed some junior officers to report the things they were saying to our distinguished colleague to their commanding officer. I cannot think of a more proper order to be made than that one. Certainly if any action was to be taken by anyone for misconduct it was incumbent upon the officer in the theater who was directly in command to take whatever action was proper under the circumstances. To attack General Richards through innuendo is, indeed, unfair.

General Richards has served as budget officer of the Army under three Secretaries of War. That his services were recognized is proven by the fact that he was decorated for the services that he rendered in those positions. I do not think that any Member of Congress wants to be unfair about as distinguished an officer as General Richards has proven himself to be.

I have discussed the incidents complained of by the gentleman from Michigan with other members of the committee who were on the same trip with the gentleman and they did not view the things that our distinguished friend discussed in the same light in which he saw them.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp;

S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;

S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Liona;

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.

S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil;

S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;

S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard;

S. 1020. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss;

S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.;

S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; and

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gandiaga.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on January 21, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3111. For the relief of Louis H. Deaver;

H. R. 3342. To promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations; and

H. J. Res. 232. Providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 26, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1233. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of all claims paid by this Agency for the period August 2, 1946, to December 31, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1234. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational rehabilitation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1235. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1236. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reimburse the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for certain sums expended in connection with its study of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1237. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1238. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 298 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1239. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 and prior fiscal years in the amount of $1,320,174,315, contract authorizations in the amount of $218,486,000, and a rescission of an appropriation in the amount of $150,000,000, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 502); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1240. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $319,500 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 503); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1241. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $2,450,000 for the Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 504); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1242. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949, involving a decrease of $35,000,000 for the Civil Service Commission, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 505); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1243. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $140,000 for the Department of Commerce, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 506); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1244. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $445,000 for the Office of Defense Transportation, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 507); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1245. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 410. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Louise M. Clarkson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1251). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 432. Resolution for the relief of Georgia Reed; without amendment (Rept. No. 1252). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4838. A bill to extend the period

of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Preliminary report pursuant to House Resolution 176, Eightieth Congress, first session, regarding survey and study of civil service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4426. A bill to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisco Bednar, Ruth Eva Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 5097. A bill to incorporate the National Quartet Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 5098. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5099. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOBLICK:

H. R. 5100. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period of 52 weeks in which unemployed veterans may receive readjustment allowances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 5101. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5102. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 5103. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5104. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5105. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 5106. A bill to provide for changes in the time of holding court in certain divisions in the eastern and western districts of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 5107. A bill to relieve the shortage of fuel oil to home owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 5108. A bill to provide free postage for gift packages of food and clothing mailed to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 5109. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemptions of single persons to $1,000 and of married persons to $2,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5110. A bill relating to the eligibility for pensions of certain widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5111. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to change the base period for the determination of parity for Maryland tobacco from August 1919 to July 1929 to the period from January 1936 to December 1945; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOBLICK:

H. R. 5112. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reimburse the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for certain sums expended in connection with its study of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution to establish standards for education in American history and the Constitution of the United States in the public-school system of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 5113. A bill for the relief of the estate of John W. Mitchell, deceased; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 5114. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. McGurn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 5115. A bill for the relief of Chiyoko Michimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. J. Res. 306. Joint resolution for the relief of Hans Kraney and Clare Felten Kraney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1198. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 27 residents of Bridgeport, Ohio, and vicinity, circulated by Unit 227, American Legion Auxiliary, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1199. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Downtown Civic Club, Inc., Bayonne, N. J., urging the enactment of legislation to increase the rates of pensions to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1200. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lithuanian American Council, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enacting legislation designed to facilitate voluntary relief assistance to displaced persons in Europe; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JANUARY 9, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Geo. L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	$10,000.00
Joseph O. Parker	Attorney	10,000.00
Dr. Walter W. Wilcox	Economic consultant	10,000.00
John J. Heimburger	Research specialist	9,524.13
Hugh H. Soper	do	7,022.40
Katherine Wheeler	Assistant clerk	5,392.20
Mae Toole	Stenographer	4,288.68
Mary Elizabeth Laxton.	do	3,323.10
Lorraine Adamson	do	3,047.22

H. Res. 298 and H. Res. 317 authorized and appropriated $25,000 for the House Committee on Agriculture to conduct hearings during the recess. The funds so appropriated have been used for travel, hotel and other expenses of the committee in conducting hearings in various parts of the United States. No personnel has been employed from these funds.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$25,000.00
Amount expended	10,964.32
Balance unexpended	14,035.68

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	$4,999.98
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	4,999.98
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk.	4,827.90
Arthur Orr	Assistant clerk	4,498.68
Robert E. Lambert	do	4,498.68
Corhal D. Orescan	do	3,374.01
Robert P. Williams	do	4,169.52
Paul M. Wilson	do	4,169.52
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.	do	3,178.86
Bert J. Skinnard	Junior assistant clerk.	2,558.16
Lawrence C. Miller	do	2,144.34
Earl C. Silsby	Clerk-stenographer	1,316.70
John D. Cook	do	1,316.70
Melvin E. Lefever	do	190.19

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	$1,440.84
Richard J. Denney	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.	288.42
F. D. Plumley	do	288.42
Dorothy Davis	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.	1,730.52
Eleanor L. Fox	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.	1,730.52
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	do	1,730.52
Marjorie H. VanRiper	do	1,730.52
Veronica Strozak	do	1,730.52
David J. Phillips	do	1,442.10
Molly J. Turner	do	1,211.36
Helen Knechtel	do	1,730.52
Dorothy Lydic	do	1,442.10
Charlotte Plumley	do	1,153.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $165,000.00
Amount expended 63,893.26

Balance unexpended 101,106.74

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JANUARY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Robert E. Lee	Chief, investigative staff.	$4,498.68
James J. Kerr	Investigator	3,511.20
Harris H. Huston	do	3,511.20
Harry S. Barger	do	3,511.20
Jay B. Howe	do	3,511.20
Enid Morrison	Legal clerk	2,144.34
Jean E. Morrow	Clerk-stenographer	1,454.64
Mildred E. Emerson	do	1,316.70
Laura J. Ames	do	321.86
Wilfred H Sigerson	Investigator (special employee).	4,999.98
Arthur J. McCrary	do	2,642.1.
Arthur B. Roberts	do	2,453.43
J. M. Ashton	do	587.13
Arthur E. Hald	do	419.38
A. P. Learned	do	356.47
Evan B. Nutt	do	524.22
Thos. J. Quinn	do	419.38
Geo. E. Shipway	do	545.1.
Paul L. Tracy	do	293.57
Tom Wortham	do	188.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $150,000.00
Amount expended 41,171.29

Balance unexpended 108,828.71

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

JANUARY 2, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Robert H. Harper	Chief clerk	$4,575.49
John R. Blandford	Professional staff	4,081.77
Bryce N. Harlow	do	4,081.77
Robert W. Smart	do	4,081.77
Clinton B. D. Brown	do	4,059.82
Townsend Hoopes	Assistant clerk and assistant to chairman.	3,366.90
Agnes H. Johnston	Stenographer	1,845.44
Rosemary Curry	do	1,753.51
Berniece Kalinowski	do	1,753.51
James Deakins	Clerk	1,477.63

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $25,000.00
Amount expended 2,707.44

Balance unexpended 22,292.56

W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

JANUARY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff director.	$4,284.75
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	3,949.51
Elsie L. Gould	Deputy clerk	3,265.60
Margaret P. Battle	Stenographer	2,040.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure: None.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1947.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Mabel G. Haller	Executive secretary, at $694.92 per month.	$4,169.52
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Minority clerk, at $585.20 per month.	3,511.20
Ruth Pingley	Stenographer, at $357.39 per month.	2,144.34
Harriett G. Mossburg	Typist (temporary, month of July only).	154.91
Edward P. Morgan	Attorney (temporary, month of July only).	833.33
Ann Elizabeth Coker	Stenographer (temporary, Sept. 22 to Sept. 30).	60.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure: None.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chairman.

HOME RULE AND REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE (UNDER AUTHORITY OF H. RES. 195)

DECEMBER 31, 1947.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
George B. Galloway	Staff director, Home Rule Study, at $833.33 per month.	$4,999.98
Clarence M. Pierce	Assistant staff director, Home Rule Study, at $683.95 per month.	4,103.70
Geraldine W. Eaker	Stenographer, Home Rule Study, at $242.44 per month.	1,333.42
Ann Elizabeth Coker	Stenographer (temporary), Home Rule Study, at $242.44 per month.	666.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $15,000.00
Amount expended 11,528.87

Balance unexpended 3,471.13

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chairman.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

JANUARY 2, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
W. Manly Sheppard	Chief clerk	$5,000.00
F. Albert Reiman	Assistant clerk (professional staff).	5,000.00
Irving G. McCann	Chief counsel (professional staff).	5,000.00
Frank S. McArthur	Investigator (professional staff).	4,166.67
John J. O'Connor	Special counsel (professional staff).	833.33
Bingham W. Mathias	Minority clerk (professional staff).	5,000.00
Jennie Ward Carter	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96
Mary Pauline Smith	do	2,433.96
Mary Ellen Gilbert	do	2,433.96
Myrtle S. Locher	do	2,433.96
Frances A. Los	Clerk-stenographer (minority).	2,433.96
Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111		
Frank S. McArthur	Investigator	833.33
Henry A. Bates	do	2,670.17
Henry B. Mitchell II	Special counsel	3,315.00
John O. Graham	Special investigator	2,666.68
Robert Graham	do	1,947.16
Agnes Ainilian	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $65,000.00
Amount expended 51,369.24

Balance unexpended 13,630.76

FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
Chairman.

EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 10, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1,

1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Annual base salary rate
Helen M. Balog	Clerical, Sept. 1 to Dec. 1.	$3,500.00
	Clerical, Dec. 1-31	3,700.00
Helen M. Boyer	Clerk, Dec. 1-31	6,000.00
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerical-stenographer.	2,700.00
Carl E. Hoffman	Professional	6,000.00
Hazel Huffman	Investigator, July 1-31.	4,620.00
	Clerical, Aug. 1 to Dec. 31.	6,200.00
Francis T. O'Donnell	Professional	5,000.00
Martha C. Rowland	Clerical	3,700.00
Lawrence Sullivan	Professional, Nov. 17 to Dec. 31.	7,265.00
Elaine M. Vaupell	Clerical, July 1-31	3,000.00
William A. Young	Professional	5,000.00
Annabell Zue	Clerk, July 1-31	4,000.00
	Clerk, Aug. 1-31	4,500.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$1,500.00
Amount expended	775.07
Balance unexpended	724.93

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA-LEGAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 10, 1948.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
None	All work done by staff of full committee.	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$40,000.00
Amount expended	5,867.41
Balance unexpended	34,132.59

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman Subcommittee on Extra-Legal Activities.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 6, 1948.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Frank T. Bow	General counsel, July 1, 1947, to Jan. 1, 1948.	$4,821.30
Oscar L. Hume	Investigator, July 1, 1947, to Jan. 1, 1948.	3,006.42
Pansy G. Haines	Clerk, July 1 to Aug. 8, 1947.	285.97
Barbara Yeaple	Stenographer, July 1 to Oct. 1, 1947.	589.38
Sylvia Deane	Clerk, July 26, 1947, to Jan. 1, 1948.	2,205.15

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$36,000.00
Amount expended	13,389.67
Balance unexpended	19,931.72

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1947.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
None	None	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	92.70
Balance unexpended	9,907.30

J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Chairman.

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1947.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Edmond J. Donohue, Jr.	General counsel	$3,469.50
Edward E. Fine, Jr.	Investigator	1,992.60
Anna-Marie Hogin	Stenographer	1,916.71
Blanche M. LeMan	Stenographer (employment terminated July 31).	288.42
Joseph C. Lewis	Investigator (resigned July 31).	490.15
George V. McDavitt	Investigator (resigned July 23).	375.75
Pau. F. Morrison	Investigator	2,868.50
George L. Quinn, Jr.	Associate counsel (resigned July 31).	543.50
Kathryn E. Smith	Clerk	2,109.84
Elmer B. Solomon	Investigator	2,655.10
Charles G. Tomerlin	Consultant (employment terminated Jule 31).	749.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$65,000.00
Amount expended	[1] 58,806.42
Balance unexpended	6,193.58

[1] This figure does not include approximately $300 outstanding.

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman.

PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1947.

Name of employee	Profession	Total base salary per annum	Total gross salary per annum
Francis Coleman Rosenberger.	Counsel	$6,000.00	$8,339.10
Robert Brown	Special counsel	4,340.00	6,144.00
Mrs. Fritzie P. Manuel.	Investigator	4,250.00	6,012.93
Mrs. Gertrude Weber.	do	3,660.00	5,199.08
Mrs. Clara D. Terry.	Clerk	4,250.00	6,012.93
Miss Kathleen H. Hart.	Secretary	2,090.00	3,033.42
Herbert Schimmel.	Consultant, part time.	(1)	{3,805.50 [2] 250.00

[1] Per diem basis, total 137 days ($25 per day base; $27.77 per day gross).
[2] 9 days worked in June, but paid for in period reported.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$40,000.00
Amount expended	24,199.15
Balance unexpended	15,800.85

GEORGE H. BENDER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JANUARY 5, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Boyd Crawford	Clerk and administrative officer.	$5,000.00
George Pettee	Staff assistant	5,000.00
Charles B. Marshall	do	5,000.00
John W. Easton	do	5,000.00
Howard S. Piquet	do	5,000.00
June Nigh	First assistant clerk	2,144.34
Winifred Osborne	Assistant clerk	2,558.16
Doris Leone	do	2,144.34
Mabel Henderson	do	1,569.56
William M. McGovern.	Staff assistant	2,149.36
Warren E. Morrell	do	1,038.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$125,000.00
Amount expended	23,810.85
Balance unexpended	101,189.15

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary (annual)
Marjorie Savage	Clerk, Committee on House Administration.	$6,357.78
Frank Specht	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.	6,081.90
Jack Watson	do	6,081.90
Irene Gilchrist	do	3,598.98
Gladys Riggs	do	3,598.98
Maureen B. Sandiford.	do	3,598.98
Dennis A. Lyons	Counsel to Subcommittee on Elections.[1]	7,022.40

[1] Died Sept. 3, 1947. Salary received from July 1 to Sept. 3, 1947, amounted to $1,228.91.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (H. Res. 339, 80th Cong.)	$5,000
Amount expended	None
Balance unexpended	5,000

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JANUARY 5, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary per annum
	CLERICAL STAFF	
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$10,000.00
Mrs. Marjorie A. Biddle.	Assistant clerk	4,288.68
Royice Reno	do	4,288.68
Mrs. Margaret H. Smith.	Assistant clerk-stenographer, resigned Oct. 15, 1947.	4,040.38
Miss Georgia G. Glasmann.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	4,040.38
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,909.28
	PROFESSIONAL STAFF	
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant.	10,000.00
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	10,000.00
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant.	8,075.76
John H. Frederick	Consultant	7,285.68
	ADDITIONAL STAFF PERSONNEL	
Miss Pauline Mickelsen.	Clerk-stenographer, July and August only (under H. Res. 163—Transportation Survey).	4,040.38

The following additional amounts have been expended from the appropriation under H. Res. 163, transportation survey:

House stationery room, July 1947	$47.45
Western Union Telegraph Co. July August, September, and October, 1947	94.71
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., September, October, and November, 1947	7.15
Reimbursement to combined airlines ticket offices for expenses incurred in connection with committee trip to New York, June 10-12, to investigate the LaGuardia Field air accident	153.18
Reimbursement to Dr. John H. Frederick for expenses incurred in official committee business in New York City, Aug. 7-8, 1947	39.91
Reimbursement to Elton J. Layton, clerk, for expenses incurred for the committee trip to Alaska to investigate air transportation, Aug. 4-15 1947 (total expenses of the trip)	669.78
Reimbursement to Elton J. Layton, clerk, for expenses incurred for the committee trip to Europe to investigate air transportation, Sept. 15 to Oct. 22, 1947 (total expenses of the trip from Washington, D. C., and return, except for certain hotel bills which will be sent in through State Department)	3,240.61
Reimbursement to the following members for additional expenses incurred in connection with the European trip in traveling from their homes to Washington D. C., and return:	
Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS	50.73
Hon. MARION T. BENNETT	108.56
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH	74.20
Hon. OREN HARRIS	150.08
Reimbursement to the following members for expenses incurred in connection with the trip from Istanbul, Turkey, to Washington, D. C., via the Orient:	
Hon. LEONARD W. HALL	1,044.54
Hon. RICHARD F. HARLESS	833.65
Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.	748.69
Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER	711.05
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$25,000.00
Total amount expended to date	14,904.48
Balance unexpended	10,095.52

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JANUARY 1, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
C. Murray Bernhardt	Chief clerk	$4,498.73
Velma Smeedley	Assistant chief clerk	4,169.55
Walter R. Lee	Claims specialist	3,511.20
Walter M. Besterman	Clerk stenographer	2,891.51
Anne J. Berger [1]	do	490.45
Frances Christy	do	1,868.40
Harriet B. Lamb	do	2,006.40
Eileen R. Browne [2]	do	668.80

[1] Employment effective Nov. 17, 1947.
[2] Resignation effective Aug. 31, 1947.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (July 1, 1947, unexpended balance of appropriation for U. S. Code preparation)	$96,771.17
Amount expended (all for preparation of U. S. Code)	48,632.95
Balance unexpended	48,138.22

EARL C. MICHENER, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JANUARY 21, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to January 1, 1948, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Marvin J. Coles, separated	Counsel	$3,333.32
Guy LaBounty, separated	Investigator	2,499.99
Elizabeth Bedell	Clerk	2,834.04
Katherine Cole, separated	Clerical	1,959.35
Mae H. Stewart, separated	do	1,153.68
Gus Caras	Staff investigation.	922.66
Leonard Pliska	Clerical	259.57
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure		$50,000.00
Amount expended		3,104.37
Balance unexpended		46,895.63

ALVIN F. WEICHEL, *Chairman.*

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

JANUARY 5, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
George M. Moore	Chief counsel	$4,999.02
Frederick C. Belen	Counsel	4,169.52
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	2,006.40
Elayne Morelle	Secretary	1,799.46
Margaret Barnes	do	1,523.58
Dorothy Francisco	Stenographer (July 1 to July 5).	50.00
Lillian Hopkins	Secretary	1,451.05
Edward J. McCormack.	Chief, studies and investigations (July 14 to Dec. 31) (H. Res. 176).	4,601.35
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure		$25,000.00
Amount expended		9,123.42
Balance unexpended		15,876.58

EDWARD H. REES, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

JANUARY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary 6 months
Ernest A. Grant	Chief clerk	$5,000.00
Claude A. Ragan	Clerk	2,696.10
Nancy J. Arnold	do	2,696.10
Forrest Reeve	do	2,696.10
M. L. Bennett	do	2,696.10
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (H. Res. 94)		$25,000.00
Amount expended		11,480.17
Balance unexpended		13,519.83

RICHARD J. WELCH, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Professional staff member.	$8,013.06
Robert F. McConnell	Clerk of committee	5,943.90
Mrs. Vera Watts	Stenographer-clerk	4,978.38
Elaine H. Jackson	do	4,978.38
Violet V. Schumacher	do	4,978.38
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.	Minority clerk	4,288.68

Re appropriations:	
H. Res. 259	$30,000
H. Res. 373	25,000
	55,000
Unexpended balance below takes into account $1,086.75 refunded to disbursing clerk on transportation purchased but not used.	
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$55,000.00
Amount expended	12,305.95
Balance unexpended	42,694.05

GEO. A. DONDERO,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 9, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary (annual)
Snader, Lyle O.	Clerk	$10,000.00
Montgomery, Donald O.	Assistant clerk	5,943.96
Shaw, Humphrey Scott.	Minority clerk	5,419.78
Wright, Jane E.	Stenographer-assistant clerk.	4,219.71

LEO E. ALLEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Robert E. Stripling	Chief investigator	$4,999.98
Benjamin Mandel	Director of research	4,169.52
Louis J. Russell	Investigator	3,906.18
Donald T. Appell	do	3,642.84
John W. Carrington	Minority clerk	3,379.50
Anne D. Turner	File chief	3,511.20
Juliette P. Joray	Clerk stenographer	2,144.34
Margaret S. Kerwan	do	2,144.34
Rosella A. Purdy	do	2,144.34
Gladys A. Slack	do	1,429.56
Carolyn Graham [1]	File clerk	714.78

[1] Replaced Gladys A. Slack, Nov. 1, 1947.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure ($50,000 Jan. 30, 1947, H. Res. 77; $50,000 Apr. 2, 1947, H. Res. 152)	$100,000.00
Amount expended	84,572.73
Balance unexpended	15,427.27

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 15, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Karl Standish	Chief clerk of committee.	$4,999.98
Bessie N. Kenyon	Assistant clerk of committee.	3,399.30
Frances Montayne	Clerical	2,144.34
Lucille Porter	do	2,144.34
Louise M. Peter	do	1,929.90
Harriet Oliver	do	142.95
George Turner	do	1,868.46
Casey M. Jones	Professional aide to committee	4,999.98
Ida Rowan	do	4,169.52
Victor C Cole	do	833.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$25,000.0
Amount expended	9,700.45
Balance unexpended	15,299.55

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JANUARY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
	CLERICAL STAFF	
James A. Tawney	Lawyer	$8,997.45
T. J. Polsky (Schnitz)	Assistant clerk	7,022.45
Gladys L. Kullberg	Stenographer	4,288.68
Don E Larson	Stenographer and accountant.	3,928.00
Susan Taylor	Stenographer	3,792.09
Margie Halsey	do	3,461.04
Sam Hardy	Messenger	2,222.00
Hughlon Green	do	2,222.00
Harry Parker	Retired messenger	2,372.00
	PROFESSIONAL STAFF	
Lynn L. Stratton	Tax adviser	10,000.00
Serge Benson	Lawyer-economist	8,997.45
Charles W. Davis	Lawyer	8,339.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (Special Tax Study Committee)	$25,000.00
Amount expended	2,457.91
Balance unexpended	22,542.09

HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

JANUARY 14, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 22, 1947, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Edward Ames	Consultant	$649.80
Werner Baer	do	384.14
Barbara Berry	Economic analyst	232.56
Carl J. Friedrich	Consultant	916.64
Theodore Geiger	do	1,277.75
Charles R. Gellner	International relations librarian.	1,321.83
Edwin B. George	Consultant	680.02
Dorothy I. Gray	Secretary	564.54
Simon G. Hanson	Consultant	500.00
Maurice H. Hellner	do	178.70
Gene Patrick Henry	do	491.01
Robert J. Landry	do	195.70
Phyllis H. Leuchtenburg.	Secretary-executive assistant.	1,630.25
Franklin A. Lindsay	Consultant	3,166.64
Brunson MacChesney	do	2,027.77
Max F. Millikan	do	166.66
Dorothy S. Neilson	Secretary	1,821.23
Wallace Parks	Consultant	2,142.13
Winfield W. Riefler	do	2,166.65
John Kerr Rose	Geographer analyst	3,299.28
Frances K. Topping	Secretary	2,131.80
Fulton Want, Jr.	Clerk-typist	425.13
Philip H. Watts	Consultant	2,499.99
Emily Whitman	Secretary	1,393.80
Rose Mary Woods	do	1,846.51

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$125,000.00
Amount expended	81,682.81
Balance unexpended	43,317.19
Plus credit	29.36
	43,346.55

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY

JANUARY 14, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from June 30, to December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
Alyce E. Warren	Clerk	$3,047.22
Sidney Freidberg	Counsel [1]	3,000.00

[1] Contract fee basis, not to exceed $3,000 per annum.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$25,000.00
Amount expended	5,929.22
Balance unexpended	19,070.78

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 23, 1948 (corrected from January 12, 1948)

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1947, to and including December 31, 1947, together with funds if authorized or appropriated to and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary
M. W. Rowell	Chief of Staff	$4,166.65
Allen W. Maddren	Staff member	3,998.24
J. G. Crost	do	1,692.43
Leo Cullinane	do	1,482.51
Willis J. Ballinger	Economic adviser (per diem).	3,973.69
William Warmack	Staff member (per diem).	1,808.00
Grace F. Purdy	Clerk	494.50
Arvilla Benson	Stenographer	643.29
Gladys Flanagan	do	1,269.65
Kathryn O. Keyes	do	823.89
Dorothy Henry	do	1,385.64
Willie E. Foristel	do	461.88
Margaret Denny	do	194.67
Ethel M. Zider	do	90.54
Virginia Flatley	do	207.77
Margaret M. Koeln	do	230.94
C. J. Reynolds, Jr.	Messenger	1,110.96
Total		24,035.25

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure		$60,000.00
Mar. 24 through June 30, 1947		18,622.21
		41,377.79
July 1 through Dec. 31, 1947		39,075.44
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1947		2,302.35

WALTER C. PLOESER, *Chairman.*

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 21, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, let not Thy servants become discouraged or grow weary in well-doing.

Bolster their faith that with Thee there is an answer to every question and a solution to every problem.

Under Thy guidance, let them know that they are not leading a forlorn hope, but are the spokesmen for a good way of life.

Help us all to keep it good and to make it better. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY P. CAIN, a Senator from the State of Washington, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CAIN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 21, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Commodity Speculation of the Senate Committee on Appropriations be granted permission to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be authorized to hold hearings during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

PUBLIC HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT OF RIVERS AND HARBORS, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to announce that the Subcommittee on Flood Control and Improvement of Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works will hold public hearings in room 412, Senate Office Building, beginning at 10:30 a. m., March 15, 1948, on Senate bill 1277, to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes. At that time the subcommittee will be glad to hear all interested parties who may wish to offer testimony on the provisions of this measure. Witnesses are requested to file with the committee written statements of their proposed testimony at least 3 days in advance of the hearing date.

Mr. President, I also wish to take this opportunity to announce that the Subcommittee on Flood Control and Improvement of Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works will hold public hearings on Thursday, January 29, 1948, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution No. 155, rescinding an order of the Federal Power Commission authorizing redevelopment of the Wilder Dam project. The subcommittee will also hold public hearings on Friday, January 30, 1948, at 10:30 a. m., on Senate bill 1651, to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946. All interested parties will be afforded the opportunity to be heard concerning these bills. Witnesses are requested to file with the committee written statements of their proposed testimony at least 3 days in advance of the hearings.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have a very important meeting to attend in Connecticut tonight and I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate after 12:30 p. m. today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent that Mr. FLANDERS be excused from attendance on Monday and Wednesday next.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent that Mr. FLANDERS be excused from attendance on Monday and Wednesday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 298 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all claims paid by that Agency under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the period August 2, 1946, to December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO HOWARD UNIVERSITY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRAVEL EXPENSES INCURRED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BENEFICIARIES AND ATTENDANTS

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational rehabilitation purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REIMBURSEMENT OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH FOR CERTAIN EXPENDITURES

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reimburse the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for certain sums expended in connection with its study

of the Veterans' Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES BY UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director, administrative office of the United States courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS ON DISPOSAL OF RECORDS BY THE NATIONAL ARCHIVIST

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports as to the records authorized for disposal by the Archivist of the United States (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STOCK PILING

A letter from the Chairman of the Munitions Board, National Military Establishment, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report concerning stock piling (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services (in confidence).

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

BALANCE SHEET OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the National Board of Directors, Fleet Reserve Association, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMAHON:

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of H. R. 4695, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages, for persons who have completed 30 years of service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by sundry members of the Georgia Women's Christian Temperance Union and 669 citizens of the State of Georgia praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A memorial signed by 60 citizens of Fredonia, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RESOLUTION BY LONG BEACH (CALIF.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RELATING TO AIR SUPREMACY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Long Beach (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce on December 29, 1947, relative to the necessity for America to regain air supremacy.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST REGAIN AIR SUPREMACY

Whereas the United States has demonstrated its desire to live in peace with the world; and

In every generation it has been drawn into a terrible war for which it was unprepared; and

This unpreparedness has cost many thousands of lives and billions of dollars; and

The security of our homes, families, property, and Nation depends upon adequate national defense; and

An air force superior to that of any enemy is the strongest deterrent to aggression and the best immediate means of defense: Therefore it is hereby

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urgently requested to adopt promptly a national air policy which will assure:

1. A modern powerful Air Force in being.
2. Enough trained personnel to man this Air Force.
3. Sufficient research and development to guarantee that America remains first in this field.
4. Strategically located bases of operation.
5. An adequate system of air transportation which in effect is an auxiliary and supplement to the Air Force.
6. A strong independent aircraft industry capable of rapid expansion.
7. Designation of standby plants from those already constructed to provide a stronger basic production nucleus to meet any national emergency.
8. Creation of an additional separate stock pile of critical materials for aircraft manufacture and maintenance.

Adopted December 29, 1947.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
LONG BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

PROTEST AGAINST RATIONING OF BUTTER—RESOLUTION BY KANSAS BUTTER INSTITUTE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an appropriately referred resolution adopted in Manhattan, Kans., on January 12, 1948, by the eighth annual meeting of the Kansas Butter Institute. They make a strong argument for their stand, and I am glad to bring this resolution to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE KANSAS BUTTER INSTITUTE, JANUARY 12–13, 1948

Whereas the eastern subcommittee for Price Investigation of the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report has recently recommended consideration of a return to rationing of butter along with meat and poultry. Whereas the President's message to the special session of Congress on November 17, suggested a possibility of the return of rationing and price controls: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Kansas Butter Institute record their unalterable opposition to rationing of butter in peacetime, with or without the imposition of control over butter prices. Rationing of butter in wartime resulted in gross inequities of distribution, which would be intolerable in peacetime. These maladjustments would be magnified and intensified in a situation where the wartime influences which brought about some degree of compliance would be virtually nonexistent today; be it further

Resolved, That the Members of Congress be reminded that if this country is to have an adequate supply of butter in the future the price of butter must be permitted to find such levels as will permit the dairy cow to compete against beef cattle, hogs, poultry, and world grain markets for a share of the feed necessary for milk production. The OPA ceiling prices on butter were arbitrarily low in relation to other farm products and caused a severe cut in butter production. If we are ever to regain adeqate production for recommended nutritional needs it will be because butter prices find such levels or will induce our American farmers to produce more cream for butter making; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to all Kansas Members of the Congress of the United States.

Whereas the establishment of a fund to be used for the specific purpose of research pertinent to the butter industry of Kansas would be beneficial to all members of this association and contribute to the further development of the Kansas dairy industry: Be it

Resolved, That the board of directors give consideration to ways and means of creating such an annual fund to be granted to the dairy husbandry section of the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution endorsing the Marshall plan, adopted by the Mississippi Legislature, as I understand, by unanimous vote.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

Concurrent resolution approving the Marshall plan as presented to the American people and Congress by General Marshall and memorializing Congress to pass adequate appropriation to insure the recovering of western Europe

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the house of representatives concurring therein), That—

Whereas the objective of the Communist Party of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics is to sovietize and enslave the universe

through stealth, trickery, treason, subversive and dictatorial power, and to this end Russia dominates or has absorbed such nations as Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, parts of Austria, Germany, Manchuria, northern Korea, Outer Mongolia, and northern China; and

Whereas to accomplish these ends Russia has ignored the Atlantic Charter, violated the agreements of Yalta and Tehran, and broken every precept of man and God; and

Whereas poverty, sickness, hunger in proud democratic nations are the instrumentalities by which the Soviets seek to conquer; and

Whereas if Greece, Italy, and France succumb to the revolutionary and brutal tactics of the Communists, then western Europe, with its 270,000,000 people, will be encompassed by the Communists and enslaved by its commissars and secret police; and

Whereas the arrogance of the Soviet leaders, the propaganda of the Communists, and the infiltration of their fellow travelers, have tended to confuse and bewilder our own citizens; and

Whereas the aggression of the Communists must be stopped or the 2-year cold war may evolve into another world war; and

Whereas the insults and injuries of the Communists have exhausted our patience; and

Whereas to prevent World War III, Secretary Marshall has proposed a program known as the Marshall plan to restore the operation and production of western Europe; and

Whereas the late war cost the United States $100,000,000,000 in the last 12 months of hostilities, and the cost of the Marshall plan will amount only to a 2-month expenditure of World War II: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the house of representatives concurring herein), That the Marshall plan as presented to the American people and Congress by General Marshall be, and is hereby, approved and that Congress be memorialized to pass adequate appropriations to insure the recovery of western Europe at the earliest possible moment, and the Members of Congress from Mississippi in the House and Senate are hereby petitioned to aggressively support and vote for such legislation, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Members of Congress from Mississippi and to the author of the plan, the distinguished Secretary of State, General Marshall; be it further

Resolved, That the other sovereign States of the Nation be requested to urge Congress to take favorable action on this great issue; be it further

Resolved, That a member of this body be designated by the Speaker to deliver a copy of this resolution to General Marshall at Atlanta, Ga., on Thursday, January 22, at the meeting of the National Cotton Council.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on January 21, 1948, the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi adopted a concurrent resolution endorsing Governor Wright's warning to the national leadership, which resolution was concurred in by the State senate on January 22. I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 15

Concurrent resolution commending Gov. Fielding Wright and approving his stand in defense of the South and the principles and traditions for which she stands against political activities designed to destroy them

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That the courageous and fearless stand taken by Gov. Fielding Wright in defense of the South against political aggression, abuse and misrepresentation, designed to disrupt and destroy southern institutions, traditions, and way of life, and which do violence to fundamental principles of constitutional, democratic government, and particularly the right of the States to solve their domestic problems, and adopt laws and policies for local self-government, be, and the same is hereby commended and approved, and we, the duly elected representatives of the people of Mississippi, join the Governor in the warning given to the leaders of the National Democratic Party and to the Nation, that Mississippians and southerners will no longer tolerate these abuses and efforts to destroy the South and her institutions, and hereby pledge our full support to the Governor in his efforts to protect and uphold the principles, traditions, and way of life of our beloved Southland.

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR WRIGHT OF MISSISSIPPI TO THE LEADERS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the newspapers a few days ago carried a story of a warning issued by the Governor of Mississippi to the leaders of the Democratic Party, which warning was incorporated in his inaugural address. I have in my hand a correct copy of the statement made by the Governor, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks, in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Facing the future, as your chief executive, I would be remiss in my responsibilities if your attention were not directed to the fact that we are living in unsettled, uncertain, and even perilous times. One need not be a diplomat nor a student of international affairs to see the many danger flags flying throughout the world in the field of international relations as democracy clashes with communism in a struggle which will determine whether or not these two ideologies can live together in cooperation or if we must once again maintain our heritage and our freedom in the cold and cruel crucible of war. Nor need one be an economic prophet to realize that the inflation running rampant in this country today—if allowed to continue its mad flight unchecked—will eventually, and in the not-to-far-distant future, lead us into the depths of another great depression.

But, serious as these problems may be, they can be met and solved if approached in the spirit of common sense, honesty, and unselfishness which has characterized our efforts in so many difficult and trying times in the past.

And as we search for the answers to these problems, there is yet another most serious conflict being thrust upon the people of Mississippi and our beloved Southland; thrust upon us in the Congress of the United States and through press and radio services throughout the country. That is the campaign of abuse and misrepresentation being levelled against our section by those who seek to tear down and disrupt our institutions and our way of life. They are using as their tools such infamous proposals as FEPC, anti-lynching legislation, anti-poll-tax bills, and now the antisegregation proposals.

The charge of dereliction of duty could be hurled at me by the citizens of this State were I to fail to direct your thoughts to the vicious effect of the proposals of the committee appointed by the President of the United States to study and make recommendations under the guise of preservation of civil liberties. Those of you who read and studied the report recognize in it a further, and I might say, the most dangerous step, toward the destruction of those traditions and customs so vital to our way of life, particularly in our Southland.

These measures and the proposals of this committee are deliberately aimed to wreck the South and our institutions. But they are far more sinister than being mere pieces of antisouthern legislation and recommendations, for hidden under their misleading titles and guarded phraseology are elements so completely foreign to our American way of living and thinking that they will, if enacted, eventually destroy this Nation and all of the freedoms which we have long cherished and maintained.

The advocates of today's antisouthern legislation disregard the great instrument creating this Government which makes of us a union of sovereign States. This Nation, of which we are so justly proud, has grown great amid our very many differences of ideas. Each of our 48 States has made singular and specific contributions to the national whole because while they are different the people had the individual leeway to decide their own best methods for solving their local problems. Individuals in this Nation have achieved the heights because they had the right to use their own personal talents, and no man was standardized or limited to any given level of attainment or service to or among his fellows.

With this record of achievement which has made our country the greatest in the world—with our structure of republican government which has enabled our sovereign States to live together in relative harmony and progress and which has brought to all our people a standard of living never before achieved in human history—I cannot understand why there are those in this land today and in the Congress of the United States who would begin its disintegration by such types of nefarious legislation as I have previously mentioned. The legislation to which I have referred flagrantly invades the sovereign rights of the individual States. It undertakes to destroy our proper privilege of solving our own individual problems in the light of all our circumstances.

Aside from this fundamental right, such legislation violates the very experience of man, namely, that the problems of human relationships are so varied and diverse that we can never begin to solve all of them by laws. They can only be answered by education and continuing progress in the light of truth as God may give us wisdom to see and embrace the truth. And they can only be solved by the people who understand and know and are familiar with the problem.

Here in Mississippi and the South may be found the greatest example in human history of harmonious relationships ever recorded as existing between two so different and distinct races as the white and the Negro, living so closely together and in such nearly equal numbers. The uninterrupted progress which has been made will be continued in an orderly, effective manner if both races are left alone by those unfamiliar with the true situation. This problem is being solved by Mississippians and by southerners in a wholesome and constructive manner. We know that human relationship cannot be equalized

and balanced by legislation, unless through such legislation the power of the State is exercised to force all men into a pattern—a rigid pattern which would operate to destroy the freedoms of all and cut off our march of progress.

We believe that the people of each of the 48 States—north, south, east, and west—are the most capable of judging their own respective local needs and meeting them. We know that this was the program set up by our founding fathers and guaranteed in our Constitution.

In Mississippi, and I think in the other States known as the South, we feel that our rights are being threatened by enemies of the South who are in fact also enemies of the Nation. We are convinced that in upholding our position in this current struggle, we are in fact maintaining the interests of all the American people and each of the 48 States. Yes, we are confident that we are by our position upholding the rights of the members of all races and sections.

As a lifelong Democrat, as a descendant of Democrats, as the Governor of this Nation's most Democratic State, I would regret to see the day come when Mississippi or the South should break with the Democratic Party in a national election. But vital principles and eternal truths transcend party lines, and the day is now at hand when determined action must be taken.

We have repeatedly seen the proposal of various measures in the Congress which were not for the best interests of the Nation but definitely designed to appeal to certain voting groups holding the balance of power in other States. We of the South will no longer tolerate being the target for this type of legislation which would not only destroy our way of life, but which, if enacted, would eventually destroy the United States. The time has come for the militant people of the South and the Nation, who have never shirked any patriotic responsibility, to band together for the preservation of true Americanism. United in our cause, we serve not only ourselves and our neighbors, but all of our fellow citizens throughout the Nation.

As we face this particular task I invite the patience, calm deliberation, counsel, and cooperation of all men of good will and true Americanism, wherever they may be. We are Democrats; we have been loyal to the Democratic Party at all times, in its periods of success as well as in the dark days of despair. We voted the Democratic ticket when no other section stayed with the banner. We have never shirked, nor have we ever faltered in our loyalty to our party. There are some who subscribe to the belief that due to this record of faithful service we are taken for granted and are not deemed worthy of consideration in formulating party policy and platforms. A continuation of the harassing and unfair legislation to which I have referred will compel all of us to such a conclusion.

This is a new day in State and national politics and circumstances may make necessary a new, and, we hope, a temporary approach to national politics by our State and Southland. We have always remained true to the traditions of our party and will continue to do so, but when the national leaders attempt to change those principles for which the party stands, we intend to fight for its preservation with all means at our hands. We must make our national leaders fully realize we mean precisely what we say, and we must, if necessary, implement our words with positive action. We warn them now, to take heed. Drastic though our methods may be, and as far reaching as the results may prove, we are certain that the ultimate consequence will fully justify any temporary set-back that may follow our action.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I have been informed that the statement made by the Governor of Mississippi has been endorsed editorially by practically all the daily newspapers in the State of Mississippi, and by a number of special meetings of county bar associations in Mississippi.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1528. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to accept and use gifts, devices, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, museums, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the War Department, or Navy Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 829).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1470. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 830), and

S. 1802. A bill to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 831).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1214. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946; with amendments (Rept. No. 832); and

S. 1521. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to detail scientific and technical employees of the War Department or the Army, and the Naval Establishment, to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories; with amendments (Rept. No. 833).

By Mr. GURNEY (for Mr. BRIDGES), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1783. A bill to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army personnel, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 834); and

S. 1961. A bill to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 835).

By Mr. GURNEY (for Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1791. A bill to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the War Department; with amendments (Rept. No. 836).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1673. A bill to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial number O20712, as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 837).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1298. A bill to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 838).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1796. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 839).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1794. A bill to authorize the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting pool at the United States naval hospital, Houston, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 840).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1800. A bill relating to the restrictions on the use of crypt and window spaces of the United States Naval Academy chapel; without amendment (Rept. No. 841).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 774. A bill to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments; with amendments (Rept. No. 843).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3645. A bill relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 844).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1799. A bill to amend the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to make it applicable to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 842).

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

H. R. 2239. A bill to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 845).

SENATE WAR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask permission for the Senate War Investigating Committee to file reports any time during the month of February. That will mean an extension of 1 month from the time originally fixed. I also ask for permission to use whatever assistance may be necessary for that purpose. I call this request to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky. I think he would like to be apprised of the request for the extension of time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Maine repeat the request?

Mr. BREWSTER. I asked to have the time extended for the filing of reports by the War Investigating Committee during the month of February, and that it might use whatever assistance is necessary for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I understand that is only for the purpose of enabling the committee to make a report?

Mr. BREWSTER. To make reports.

Mr. BARKLEY. But not for the purpose of conducting further hearings or investigations?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. To make reports on the testimony already adduced?

Mr. BREWSTER. We shall conclude all hearings before the end of this month.

Mr. BARKLEY. This month?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that the extension through February is for the purpose of enabling the committee to make reports based upon the hearings it will have conducted by that time?

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

The order was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the time for filing reports of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, pursuant to Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, be, and the same is hereby, extended to February 29, 1948, inclusive; and that the said committee be, and it is hereby, authorized to continue up to and including said date the employment of necessary clerical assistants to complete the performance of its duties and to pay incidental expenses incurred in connection therewith.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 2048. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renata Cuff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MALONE introduced Senate bill 2049, for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MALONE also introduced Senate bill 2050 for the relief of Gracy Mariluch, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2051. A bill for the relief of Samuel Ezratty; and

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Father Louis Naclerio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON (by request):

S. 2053. A bill for the relief of Collins Sterling Smith; and

S. 2054. A bill for the relief of Engebert Axer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2055. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages, for persons who have completed 30 years of service; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 2056. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to change the base period for the determination of parity for Maryland tobacco from August 1919 to July 1929 to the period from January 1936 to December 1945; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2057. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Indonesia, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2058. A bill to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2059. A bill for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; and

S. 2060. A bill for the relief of Edward Wikner Percival; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALAMO IRRIGATION CO.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., and I request that the explanatory statement be printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2049) for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co., introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explantory statement presented by Mr. MALONE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

The Alamo Irrigation Co. is asking for a waiver of interest on a loan made to them by the Farmers' Home Administration on August 7, 1947, for the purpose of building an irrigation canal. They were prevented from applying for the funds granted under this loan first, because of the impossibility of securing acceptable bids during the fall of 1936, and thereafter by the necessity of using the existing canal to transport irrigation water to farms until the 1947 crops were matured.

They feel they were not actually entitled to use the funds until June 10, 1947, when a representative of the FHA and the board of directors of the company met and approved the type of lining to be used in construction of the canal.

The interest which would be waived under this bill is for the period August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947, and amounts to $1,193.50.

The amount of the loan, $46,200, was deposited in a joint account, on August 7, 1946. No funds could be drawn against the account without both the signature of an officer of the Alamo Irrigation Co. and a supervisor appointed by the FHA.

The first withdrawal was made June 17, 1947, in the amount of $165. Up to the present time they have spent $26,732.61.

None of the money was used for any purpose during the period for which the refund of interest is claimed, August 7, 1946, to June 17, 1947.

The matter has been discussed with Mr. R. W. Hollenberg, State director of the FHA in Nevada and California, who directly handled the case, who says the FHA would like to waive the interest, but that it must be done by means of a bill in Congress.

GRACY MARILUCH

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Gracy Mariluch, and I request that an explanatory statement by me may be printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2050) for the relief of Gracy Mariluch, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MALONE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

Miss Gracy Mariluch, 24, who has lived in France since 40 days after her birth, had intended to accompany her mother, sister, and brother to the United States to make their home in Elko, Nev.

Her mother is a former resident of Nevada and her brother was born in the United States and served in World War II.

Her mother is studying to prepare for application for citizenship.

The necessary papers had been prepared for the entire family to live in the United States under the French quota when it was discovered that Miss Gracy Mariluch would come under the Spanish quota, since she was born in Spain while her parents were en route from the United States to France.

To await her admission under the Spanish quota would necessitate a separation of the family for nearly 10 years.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

CHALLENGES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF AMERICAN LAW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Challenges and Responsibilities of American Law," delivered by him before the Federal Bar Association, Washington, D. C., January 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN IN REPLY TO SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GREEN at Providence, R. I., January 19, 1948, in reply to Senator TAFT, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPPOSITION OF CERTAIN RAILWAY BROTHERHOODS TO THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the opposition of certain railway brotherhoods to the St. Lawrence seaway project, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MANITOWOC (WIS.) HERALD-TIMES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Backing the Seaway," published in the Manitowoc (Wis.) Herald-Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway," published in the Washington Post of January 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEAT RATIONING — EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Thin Line Between," from the Omaha World-Herald of January 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

IDEOLOGY OR BALANCE OF POWER?—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM G. CARLETON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ideology or Balance of Power?" by William G. Carleton, professor of political

science at the University of Florida, published in the Yale Review, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STRANGE CASE OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—ARTICLE FROM THE READER'S DIGEST

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Strange Case of the Taft-Hartley Law," by Claude Robinson, president, Opinion Research Corp., published in the September 1947 issue of the Reader's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL OF USE OF GRAIN FOR PRODUCTION OF SPIRITS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Wednesday, the unfinished business, Senate bill 637, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, will be temporarily laid aside, and the Senate will proceed to consider Senate bill 1842, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1842) to amend the Second Decontrol Act of 1947.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the legislative program for the day has already been stated by the Chair. The business to be proceeded with now is Senate bill 1842, reported by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of that bill at this time.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1842) to amend the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest that the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] be recognized, when it will be my purpose to ask for a quorum, so that all Senators may be present to hear the discussion.

Mr. FLANDERS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Murray
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Buck	Ives	Pepper
Bushfield	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Knowland	Sparkman
Connally	Langer	Stennis
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McClellan	Thye
Ecton	McFarland	Tobey
Ellender	McGrath	Tydings
Ferguson	McKellar	Umstead
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
George	Malone	Wherry
Green	Martin	Wiley
Gurney	Maybank	Williams
Hatch	Millikin	Wilson
Hawkes	Moore	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on official State business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is necessarily absent on official business of the Committee on Public Lands.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I report Senate bill 1842 with amendments. This is a bill which was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for himself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to amend the Second Decontrol Act of 1947. The bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and by the chairman of that committee referred to a subcommittee of which I was chairman. On examining the bill I think we found that there was more in it than appeared in the words as quickly read. It appeared that it was a grant of power for the allocation of grain for any purpose, rather than simply for the allocation of grain for distilling or brewing.

Furthermore, we found that there was a very great divergence of opinion among those in the distilling industry with regard to the bill, which made it seem completely necessary to have full hearings on the bill. Since the act which it would replace expires at the end of this month, there was evidently going to be no time to hold the necessary hearings, and have the measure passed through the Senate and the House and sent to the President. That would have been particularly unfortunate, because should it turn out to be the intention of the Congress to extend the powers of allocation, there would very evidently have been an interregnum between the expiring act and the new act during which the purposes of the new act would have been defeated.

Furthermore, a suggestion came to the chairman of the subcommittee from the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] asking particularly that we be sure of having time enough for hearings on the bill. The junior Senator from Kentucky has had a great deal of experience with this matter because the subject of allocation had previously been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and he had had the primary responsibility for handling the subject of grain allocation.

In view of all this it seemed wise to the subcommittee to recommend an amendment and the subcommittee so reported to the full Banking and Currency Committee, and the Banking and Currency Committee has reported to the Senate the amendment which I shall read, which is an amendment in the way of substitution. The amendment is as follows:

That section 4 (b) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to aid in the stabilization of commodity prices, to aid in further stabilizing the economy of the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 30, 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out "January 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 29, 1948."

The entire purpose of the amendment is to give time for proper hearings on a subject on which hearings must be held if we are to handle the legislation with knowledge and understanding of the situations involved in it.

I wish to state two things quite clearly. The first is that the motion for continuing the present existing authority for allocation for another month was not made by the Department of Agriculture or by any part of the administration. It had its genesis in the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is solely our responsibility.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the Senator first rose he said something about reporting the Kilgore bill. I did not understand that he was reporting the bill, but that he was reporting on it. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. We are reporting the bill amended as I indicated; and the amendment is in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am a little confused as to the legislation on which it is proposed to hold hearings. I assumed that the motion was to take up the bill extending the time until the 29th of February. The time will expire on the 31st of January. Is it on the Kilgore bill or similar legislation that hearings are to be held?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that it is proposed that the bill as reported is to be amended by an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. All the bill does is to extend the time from January 31 to February 29.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is all it does.

Mr. BARKLEY. That, of course, is different from the Kilgore bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is my idea—and I will check with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency—that the hearings to be held on this subject will be of such a nature as to guide our conclusions on the subject matter of the original Kilgore bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the Senator is asking that the date be extended in order to give the committee time to hold hearings on the general subject.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And to obtain all the facts upon the subject. A week or so ago I urged upon the Senator that the facts

could not be obtained by hearings scheduled originally for last Tuesday, which hearings were postponed.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The pending measure merely changes the date of expiration of the present law. So if the extension is granted by the Congress, the committee will then fix another date upon which to hear all interests involved and determine whether there should be further legislation after the 29th of February, or a further extension, and if so, under what conditions the extension should be granted. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is correct. I should like to say also that it is the intention of the subcommittee to proceed with the utmost possible expedition so that we may have satisfactory hearings and reach proper conclusions as to further legislation long before the date stated in the amendment, the last day of February.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that he could not have better expressed the intent of the committee and of the subcommittee as to the purpose in extending the time. The committee will use the additional time to prosecute as diligently and continuously as possible hearings on the entire subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. All Senators will understand, I am sure, the importance of settling this question. With month-to-month extensions, not only is the industry in a state of uncertainty, but the employees working for the industry do not know whether they are to have work for 30 days or whether they are to be cut off entirely. It is very necessary that the question be determined as soon as possible, so that this constant suspension in midair on the part of those who depend upon this industry for their work and the support of their families may be ended, and they may have some reasonable opportunity to know what to expect.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator realizes the conditions within the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate them. I am expressing the hope that if this extension is granted the committee will, with all possible diligence, arrive at a final conclusion as to what should be done.

Mr. TOBEY. It is a great characteristic of Vermont to prosecute everything with diligence and with great effect. I pay tribute to the State of Vermont.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in response to the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire, we in Kentucky are in a position to pay tribute to the diligence of Vermont, because if it had not been for such diligence Kentucky would have been the fourteenth State instead of the fifteenth. Vermont got in a little ahead of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with the interrogatory which I propounded awhile ago to the Senator from Vermont, a letter which I have received from Miss Margaret Comley, of Louisville, Ky., who writes to me on the stationery of the Brown-Forman Distillers Corp., giving in some detail the situation with reference to unemployment in connection with this industry. I do not know what her interests are in the company, or whether she has any financial interest. She says that she has been in charge of the unemployment division in this institution. She writes a very earnest letter, and I think it would be worth while to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN-FORMAN DISTILLERS CORP.,
Louisville, Ky., January 22, 1948.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE BARKLEY: This letter is written directly to you in protest against Secretary Anderson's action insofar as the grain allotment in the distilling industry is concerned. I, a distillery worker, resent to the utmost the discriminatory legislation directed against the distilling industry, which, in my opinion, is quite un-American.

Immediately following the attack on Pearl Harbor the distilling industry without hesitation converted their industries over to the producing of alcohol for governmental purposes. This alcohol was used for ammunition, medicinal purposes, etc. We very graciously accepted the whisky holidays granted us. This procedure was following through until the war in both the European theater and Pacific theater was ended.

However, this country, although not still at war, is extending an unnecessary hardship on the distilling industry. When one considers that the distilling industry uses less than 1 percent of the total grain crop it is most unfair that we should be bled completely, thus causing a catastrophe where many, many thousands of American citizens are concerned and in actuality feathering the nest of our foreign distillers. Why should it be that we, due to the fact that grain allotment to us has been curtailed to an impossible quota to permit us to function, sit by and watch Europe use the grain allotted to them to manufacture spirits and in turn ship same to this country under the recently reduced import duty? This is undermining the American principles of free enterprise.

The revenue received from the whisky industry is an item in itself. When the production of this product ceases this revenue will also cease. The State and Federal Government will nave to be reimbursed for this loss, and therefore the taxpayer will have another burden placed upon him.

Without the proper amount of grain to manufacture whisky distillery plants must be closed down. This means unemployment. It would do well for Secretary Anderson and others responsible for the curtailment of grain to our industry to witness the behind the scenes. When a man bearing the responsibility of providing a livelihood for himself and his family is laid off, he is at a loss to provide rent, food, clothing, medical expenses, etc., for his family. I have been affiliated with the employee relations department. This meant coming in contact daily with the office workers and the laborers. It wasn't a very easy pill to swallow, Mr. BARKLEY, when a man's face bore the traces of worry because he was told he was no longer employed as we were unable to furnish work for him due to the grain shortage, and it was even worse to try to answer the question invariably put to you, and that was, "How much longer do you think it will be before we resume operations?" The distilling industry is a profession just as any other profession. Men are trained and skilled in the art of this work. When this knowledge has been taken away from him due to unemployment he is at a complete loss to find employment in another field. This applies most strenuously to a man who is up in age. This condition does not affect a handful of people, but very close to a million people in America. I fail to understand why a million American citizens should be forced to seek charity, while a foreign nation benefits. This is a draw-back on our charity organizations, which are wholly dependent on the balance of Americans supporting same, and who are trying earnestly to make ends meet with the ridiculously high prices involved on any item purchased these days. It can only be termed as a vicious circle.

It isn't a question as to whether we of the distilling industry are demanding that the hungry families of Europe not be fed. We Americans very freely exercise the privilege of sending clothing to those less fortunates, and we are more than willing to do our share toward helping to fed them. But, why should the feeding of these people be primarily at the expense of the distilling industry? I feel that a certain amount of grain should be alloted to them, that is, the countries in dire stress, but in my opinion, the amount allotted to them should be curtailed exclusively to the proper sources for the making of flour, bread, etc. But, definitely, when it is evidenced that any part of this grain allotment is being used for the making of spirits then that country should be cut off from their allotment entirely. This would mean that our allotment to those countries could be cut in half, and give us, the distilling industry, an opportunity to function, and not prove a fight for survival as it now is.

Congress will recall the days of prohibition. Why should we discontinue the making of a product that is pure and can be consumed without poisonous effects, thus permitting the bootlegging of a product made in basements, and filthy surroundings, the ingredients of which are injurious? Bootlegging was performed on a large scale during the prohibition days, and once the distillers are forced to close their doors, we again will be faced with this desperate problem.

Several days ago a commentator made the announcement, that the grain crop for this year is not quite as large, but almost equivalent to that of last year, but, in all probability we would be forced to ration grain for this country next year. Presently, here in Louisville, the price of a loaf of bread is 17 cents—an exorbitant price. This is truly an unnecessary condition. Now, how can a man who is unemployed combat this? And, why should we be forced to do so at the expense of taking care of our foreign countries?

I am, with the other million of Americans, asking, Mr. BARKLEY, that something be done to put a stop to this situation. As a member of the distilling industry, I ask that we be extended more leniency where the grain allotment is concerned. We are American citizens, and ask to be treated as such. By this I mean, permitting us to continue operations, and on a full-time scale. You, our representative, are our voice in this matter.

Respectfully,

MARGARET COMLEY.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire if it is the intention of the subcommittee to introduce a bill on which to hold hearings.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is my assumption that the bill would not be written until we were well along with the hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the intention to hold hearings and then write the bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. The hearings will be in anticipation of a bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that procedure is entirely satisfactory.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to

the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That section 4 (b) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to aid in the stabilization of commodity prices, to aid in further stabilizing the economy of the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 30, 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out "January 31, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 29, 1948."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1842) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend to February 29, 1948, the period during which the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes may be controlled under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942."

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 637) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the bill the Senate is now to consider is the civil service retirement bill. The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], is present and will be in charge of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be stated.

The amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. (a) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have attained or shall hereafter attain the age of 60 years and have rendered at least 10 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 4 of this act.

"(b) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have attained the age of 55 years and have rendered at least 10 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 may voluntarily retire and shall be paid an immediate life annuity computed as provided in section 4 of this act, reduced by one-half of 1 percent for each full month such officer or employee is under the age of 60 years.

"(c) Any officer or employee to whom this act applies, after having rendered at least 25 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, (1) upon involuntary separation from the service not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, or (2) upon voluntary separation from the service if such officer or employee had accepted a position with a lower rate of basic salary, pay, or compensation after having been so involuntarily separated from a position with a higher rate of basic salary, pay, or compensation, and was receiving less than such higher rate at the time of his voluntary separation, shall be paid an immediate life annuity computed as provided in section 4 of this act reduced by one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month such officer or employee is under the age of 60 years."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in section 204 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 404), and section 3 of the act of July 13, 1937 (50 Stat. 512), any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have completed 10 years of service computed as provided in section 5 of this act shall, on the last day of the month in which he attains the age of 70 years, or completes 10 years of service if then beyond such age, be automatically separated from the service, and all salary, pay, or compensation shall cease from that date, and the head of each department, branch, or independent office of the Government concerned shall notify each such employee under his direction of the date of his separation from the service at least 60 days in advance thereof: *Provided,* That should the head of the department, branch, or independent office fail, through error, to give timely notification, the employee's separation from the service shall not be effected without his consent until the expiration of said 60-day period. Upon such separation, the officer or employee shall be eligible for retirement on annuity as provided in section 4 hereof.

"(b) No person who is receiving an annuity under the provisions of this act and who has reached the age of 60 years shall be eligible again to appointment to any appointive office, position, or employment under the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia, unless the appointing authority determines that he is possessed of special qualifications: *Provided,* That no deductions for the retirement fund shall be withheld from the salary, pay, or compensation of such person, but there shall be deducted from his salary, pay, or compensation otherwise payable a sum equal to the retirement annuity allocable to the period of actual employment: *Provided further,* That the annuity in such case shall not be redetermined upon such person's subsequent separation from the service."

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (6) of section 3A of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) (a) In the case of a Member of Congress who becomes separated from the service before he completes an aggregate of 6 years of service as a Member of Congress, and who is not retired for disability, the total amount deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation as a Member of Congress shall be returned to such Member of Congress. No such Member of Congress shall thereafter become eligible to receive an annuity as provided in this section unless the amounts so returned are redeposited with interest at 4 percent compounded on December 31 of each year, but interest shall not be required covering any period of separation from the service.

"(b) In case a Member of Congress shall die the total sums deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation or deposited by him, together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and at 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in sction 12.

"(c) In case a former Member of Congress receiving an annuity under this section shall die without having received in annuities an amount equal to the amount of annuities purchasable with the total sums deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation or deposited by him, together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and at 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, the difference and/or any accrued annuity due shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in section 12."

(b) Except as provided in this section the amendments made by this act shall not apply to any person subject to the provisions of section 3A of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) The annuity of an officer or employee retired under this act shall be a life annuity, terminable upon the death of the annuitant and shall be an amount equal to the following: (1) 1½ percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the officer or employee multiplied by the years of service, or (2) 1 percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the officer or employee multiplied by the years of service, plus a sum equal to $25 for each year of such service: *Provided,* That if deposit or redeposit under section 7, 9, or 12 (b) hereof has not been made, the annuity for the period or periods of service covered by the deposit or redeposit shall be in an amount equal to 1 percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the officer or employee multiplied by the years of such service: *Provided further,* That in no case shall the annuity exceed an amount equal to 90 percent of the highest average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during five consecutive years of allowable service.

"(b) Any officer or employee retiring under the provisions of this act may at the time of his retirement elect to receive in lieu of the life annuity described herein a reduced annuity payable to him during his life, and an annuity after his death payable to a survivor annuitant, duly designated in writing and filed with the Civil Service Commission at the time of his retirement, during the life of such survivor annuitant equal to 50 percent of such reduced annuity and upon the death of such survivor annuitant all payments shall cease and no further annuity shall be due and payable. The annuity hereunder payable to the officer or employee shall be 90 percent of the life annuity otherwise payable if the survivor annuitant is the same age or older than the annuitant, or is less than 5 years younger than the annuitant; 85 percent if the survivor annuitant is 5 but less than 10 years younger; 80 percent if the surivivor annuitant is 10 but less than 15 years younger; 75 percent if the survivor annuitant is 15 but less than 20 years younger; 70 percent if the survivor annuitant is 20 but less than 25 years younger; and 60 percent if the survivor annuitant is 25 or more years younger: *Provided,* That no person may be designated as survivor annuitant unless he shall be related to the employee within one of the following classes: husband or wife; child (including stepchild or legally adopted child but excluding grandchild); parent (including stepparent or adopted parent); brother or sister (including those of half or whole blood, stepbrother or sister).

"(c) For the purpose of this act all periods of service shall be computed in accordance with section 5 hereof, and the monthly annuity installment shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

"(d) The term 'basic salary, pay, or compensation,' wherever used in this act, shall be so construed as to exclude from the operation of the act all bonuses, allowances, overtime pay, or salary, pay, or compensation given in addition to the base pay of the position as fixed by law or regulation."

SEC. 5. The first paragraph of section 5 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of section 9 hereof, the aggregate period of service which forms the basis for calculating the amount of any annuity provided in this act shall be computed from the date of original employment, whether as a classified or an unclassified officer or employee in the civil service of the United States, or in the service of the District of Columbia, including periods of service at different times and in one or more departments, branches, or independent offices, or the legislative branch of the Government, and also periods of service performed overseas under authority of the United States, and periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States; in the case of an officer or employee, however, who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of military or naval service, the period of service upon which such retired pay is based shall not be included, except that in the case of an officer or employee who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of a service-connected disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or resulting from an explosion of an instrument of war, the period of the military service shall be included: *Provided,* That an officer or employee must have served for a total period of not less than 5 years exclusive of such military or naval service before he shall be eligible for annuity under this act. Nothing in this act shall be construed as to affect in any manner an officer's or employee's right to retired pay, pension, or compensation in addition to the annuity herein provided."

SEC. 6. The first three paragraphs of section 6 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have served for a total period of not less than 5 years computed as provided in section 5 of this act, and who, before meeting the age and service requirements for retirement under section 1 (a) hereof, becomes totally disabled for useful and efficient service in the grade or class of position occupied by the officer or employee, by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on the part of the officer or employee, shall upon his own application or upon the request or order of the head of the department, branch, or independent office concerned, be retired on an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 hereof: *Provided,* That proof of freedom from vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct for a period of more than 5 years next prior to becoming so disabled for useful and efficient service, shall not be required in any case. No officer or employee shall be retired under the provisions of this section unless examined by a medical officer of the United States, or a duly qualified physician or surgeon, or board of physicians or surgeons, designated by the Civil Service Commission for that purpose, and found to be disabled in the degree and in the manner specified herein. No claim shall be allowed under the provisions of this section unless the application for retirement shall have been executed prior to the applicant's separation from the service or within 6 months thereafter. The time limitation for execution of claims for retirement under the terms of this section may be waived by the Civil Service Commission in case of an officer or employee who at the date of separation from service or within 6 months thereafter is receiving hospital treatment, but the application in such case must be filed with the Civil Service Commission not later than 6 months after the termination of such hospitalization; in the case of any such person heretofore separated from service application may be filed within 6 months after the effective date of this act. Such time limitation may similarly be waived in the case of an officer or employee who at the date of separation from service or within 6 months thereafter is mentally incompetent, but the application in such case must be filed with the Civil Service Commission within 1 year from the date of restoration of such person to competency or the appointment of a fiduciary whichever is the earlier.

"Every annuitant retired under the provisions of this section unless the disability for which retired be permanent in character, shall at the expiration of 1 year from the date of such retirement and annually thereafter, until reaching age 60, be examined under the direction of the Civil Service Commission by a medical officer of the United States, or a duly qualified physician or surgeon, or board of physicians or surgeons designated by the Civil Service Commission for that purpose, in order to ascertain the nature and degree of the annuitant's disability, if any. If an annuitant shall recover before reaching age 60 and be restored to an earning capacity which would permit him to be appointed to some appropriate position fairly comparable in compensation to the position occupied at the time of retirement, payment of the annuity shall be continued temporarily to afford the annuitant opportunity to seek such available position, but not in any case exceeding 1 year from the date of the medical examination showing such recovery. Should the annuitant fail to appear for examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability shall have been satisfactorily established. The Civil Service Commission may order or direct at any time such medical or other examination as it shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any officer or employee retired on an annuity under this section.

"If a recovered disability annuitant whose annuity is discontinued subsequent to June 30, 1945, shall fail to obtain reemployment in any position included in the provisions of this act, he shall be considered as having been involuntarily separated from the service within the meaning of section 7 (a) of this act as of the date he was retired for disability and shall, after the discontinuance of the disability annuity, be entitled to a deferred annuity in accordance with the provisions of such section."

SEC. 7. Section 7 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Should any officer or employee to whom this act applies, after having served a total of 5 years computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and before becoming eligible for retirement on annuity under section 1 (a) become involuntarily separated not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, such officer or employee shall be paid as he may elect, (A) a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 62 years computed as provided in section 4 of this act, or (B) the total amount credited to his individual account plus a reduced deferred annuity beginning at the age of 62 years computed as provided in section 4 of this act.

"(b) Should any officer or employee to whom this act applies, other than an officer or employee described in subsection (a), after having served a total of 10 years computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and before becoming eligible for retirement on annuity under section 1 (a), become separated from the service, such officer or employee shall be paid as he may elect, (A) a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 65 years computed as provided in section 4 of this act, or (B) the total amount credited to his individual account plus a reduced deferred annuity beginning at the age of 65 years computed as provided in section 4 of this act.

"(c) No officer or employee who receives a return of deductions under this section shall thereafter receive full credit for the period of service covered by the refund unless he shall be reemployed in a position within the purview of this act and redeposit the amount so returned."

SEC. 8. Section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. In the case of any officer or employee who before the effective date of this act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or section 8 (a) of the act of June 16, 1933, the annuity shall be increased, effective on the first day of the fourth month following the month in which this act is enacted by 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser: *Provided,* That each such annuitant may, prior to the effective date herein prescribed, elect to retain his present annuity, in lieu of the increased annuity provided by this section, and name his wife to receive upon his death one-half of his present annuity during the remainder of her life and upon her death no further annuity shall be due or payable.

"In case any officer or employee shall have been separated subsequent to January 23, 1942, and prior to date of approval of this act and have acquired title to annuity under section 7 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, beginning after such date of approval, such annuity shall be computed in accordance with section 4 of this act, but any reduction applicable thereto shall be determined as if this act had not been enacted: *Provided,* That any such officer or employee may elect to forfeit his right to such annuity and elect in lieu thereof to receive the benefits provided by section 7 of this act."

SEC. 9. Section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Each officer or employee within the purview of this act may deposit to the credit of the 'civil-service retirement and disability fund' a sum equal to 2½ percent of his basic salary, pay, or compensation received for services rendered after July 31, 1920, and prior to July 1, 1926; 3½ percent of the basic salary, pay, or compensation for services rendered from and after July 1, 1926, and prior to July 1, 1942; 5 percent of such basic pay, salary, or compensation for services rendered from and after July 1, 1942, and prior to the first day of the first pay period in 1948, and also 6 percent thereafter, covering service during which no deductions were withheld for deposit in the said fund. Each such officer or employee may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his service in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Civil Service Commission. The amount so deposited shall be credited to the individual account of the officer or employee in the said fund. Upon making such deposit, the officer or employee shall be entitled to full credit for the period or periods of service involved: *Provided,* That no deposit shall be required for any service rendered prior to August 1, 1920, or for periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States."

SEC. 10. The first two paragraphs of section 10 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Beginning as of July 1, 1942, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee to whom this act applies a sum equal to 5 percent of such officer's or employee's basic salary, pay, or compensation: *Provided,* That from and after the first day of the first pay period in 1948, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee to whom this act applies a sum equal to 6 percent of such officer's or employee's basic salary, pay, or compensation.

The amounts so deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee shall, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the 'civil-service retirement and disability fund' created by the act of May 22, 1920, and said fund is hereby appropriated for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided in this act.

"Any officer or employee may at his option and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission deposit additional sums in multiples of $25 but not to exceed 10 percent of his annual basic salary, pay, or compensation, for service rendered since August 1, 1920, which amount together with interest thereon at 3 percent per annum compounded as of December 31 of each year, shall, at the date of his retirement, be available to purchase, as he shall elect and in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, an annuity in addition to the annuity provided by this act. The life annuity shall consist of $7 for each $100 in case the officer or employee has not reached age 60; $8 if he has reached age 60 but not age 65; $9 if he has reached age 65 but not age 70; and $10 if he has reached age 70. In the event of death or separation from the service of such officer or employee before becoming eligible for retirement on annuity, the total amount so deposited with interest at 3 percent per annum to date of death or separation compounded on December 31 of each year shall be refunded in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of this act."

SEC. 11. Section 12 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. (a) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission the amounts deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee for credit to the 'civil-service retirement and disability fund' created by the act of May 22, 1920, covering service from and after August 1, 1920, shall be credited to an individual account of such officer or employee.

"(b) (1) In the case of any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall become involuntarily separated not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, before he shall have completed an aggregate of 5 years of service computed in accordance with section 5 of this act, the amounts credited to his individual account together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter to date of separation shall be returned to such officer or employee.

"(2) In the case of any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall be transferred to a position not within the purview of this act, or who shall become absolutely separated from the service (other than by involuntary separation not for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency) before he shall have completed an aggregate of 10 years of service computed in accordance with section 5 of this act, the amounts credited to his individual account shall be returned to such officer or employee.

"(3) All amounts returned to an officer or employee under this subsection must, upon reinstatement, retransfer, or reappointment to a position within the purview of this act, be redeposited by such officer or employee before he may receive full credit for the service covered by the refund.

"(c) (1) In case any officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and is survived by a widow, such widow shall be paid an annuity beginning the first day of the month following the death of the officer or employee or following the widow's attainment of age 60, whichever is the later, equal to one-half the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof with respect to such officer or employee: *Provided,* That such payments shall cease upon death or remarriage of the widow.

"(2) In case any officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and is survived by a widow and a surviving child or children, such widow shall be paid an immediate annuity terminable upon death, remarriage, or upon termination of payments to the last surviving child, equal to one-half the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof with respect to such officer or employee. There shall also be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-fourth the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof with respect to such officer or employee, but not to exceed $900 divided by the number of such children or $360, whichever is lesser. Upon the death of such widow, the annuity of such child or children shall be recomputed and paid as provided in section 12 (c) (3) hereof.

"(3) In case any officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and leaves no surviving widow but leaves a surviving child or children, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-half the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof with respect to such officer or employee, but not to exceed $1,200 divided by the number of such children or $480, whichever is lesser.

"(4) The annuity payable to a child under this subsection shall be terminable upon (A) his attaining the age of 18 years, (B) his marriage, or (C) his death, whichever first occurs, except that if such child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability his annuity shall be terminable only upon death, marriage, or recovery from such disability. In any case in which the annuity of a child, under this subsection, is terminated, the annuities of any other child or children, based upon the service of the same officer or employee, shall be recomputed and paid as though the child whose annuity was so terminated had not survived such officer or employee.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'widow' means a surviving wife of an individual, who either (A) shall have been married to such individual for at least 5 years immediately preceding his death, or (B) is the mother of issue by such marriage.

"(2) The term 'child' means an unmarried child under the age of 18 or an unmarried child who because of physical or mental disability is incapable of self-support, a dependent stepchild, or an adopted child.

"(3) Questions of dependency and disability arising under this section shall be determined by the Civil Service Commission and its decisions with respect to such matters shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review. The Commission may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as it shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any annuitant or applicant for annuity under this section, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any such examination.

"(e) In case an officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die (1) before having rendered 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act or without a survivor or survivors entitled to annuity benefits provided by section 12 (c) hereof the total amount of deductions credited to his individual account with interest thereon at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of death or (2) leaving a survivor or survivors entitled to such annuity benefits the total amount of deductions credited to his individual account without interest, shall be paid upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated in writing by such officer or employee and recorded with the Civil Service Commission;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such officer or employee;

"Third, if there be no such beneficiary or executor or administrator payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from the date of the death of the officer or employee, to such person or persons as may appear in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission to be legally entitled thereto, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(f) In case a retired employee who has not elected a joint and survivorship annuity as provided in section 4 (b) of this act shall die without having received in annuities an amount equal to the total amount credited to his individual account with interest thereon at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of retirement, the difference and/or any accrued annuity due shall be paid upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated in writing by such annuitant and recorded with the Civil Service Commission;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such annuitant;

"Third, if there be no such beneficiary, or executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from the date of the death of the annuitant, to such person or persons as may appear in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission to be legally entitled thereto, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(g) Where any payment under this act is to be made to a minor, or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate: *Provided,* That where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, the Civil Service Commission shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate.

"(h) In case a former employee entitled to the return of the amount credited to his individual account shall become legally incompetent, the total amount due may be paid to a duly appointed guardian or committee of such former employee. If the amount of refund due such former employee does not exceed $1,000, and if there has been no demand upon the Civil Service Commission by a duly appointed guardian or committee, payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from date of separation from the service, to such person or persons, in the discretion of the Commission, who may have the care and custody of such former employee, and such payment shall be a bar to recover by any other person.

"(i) Each employee or annuitant to whom this act applies shall, under regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries to whom shall be paid, upon the death of the employee or annuitant any sum remaining to his credit (including any accrued annuity) under the provisions of this act."

SEC. 12. The first paragraph of section 13 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Annuities granted under the terms of this act shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued. Payment of all annuities, refunds, and allowances granted hereunder shall be made by checks drawn and issued by the Treasury Department in such form and manner and with such safeguards as shall be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations governing accounting that may be found applicable to such payments."

SEC. 13. The third paragraph of section 13 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"An annuity granted for retirement under the provisions of section 1 or 2 of this act shall commence the 1st day of the month following the date of separation from the service, or on the 1st day of the month following the month in which salary shall cease provided the employee meets the age and service requirements for retirement at that time, and shall continue during the life of the annuitant. An annuity granted under the provisions of section 6 or 7 hereof shall be subject to the limitations specified in said sections."

SEC. 14. Section 14 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby repealed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the principal purposes of the bill as amended by the committee are to provide benefits for dependent survivors of employees dying in service, to permit retired employees now on the annuity rolls to obtain certain increased annuity benefits or in lieu thereof to obtain certain benefits for their widows, to provide simpler and more equitable methods for computing annuities, to reduce service requirements for both age and optional retirement, to permit refunds upon separation prior to retirement without regard to length of service, to increase the rate of employees' contributions to the retirement fund, and to simplify administration of the Retirement Act.

I may say that shortly after the Senate committee reported this bill, by a vote of 12 to 1, the House passed House bill 1427, known as the Stevenson bill. We have had various conferences in an effort to agree upon certain amendments. The proposed Taft substitute which the Senator from Ohio submitted on Monday, and which is printed and on the desks of Senators, has been carefully considered by the staff of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Not only that, but all the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee whom I have been able to see in connection with it agree with me that substantially the substitute bill, which is known as the Taft bill, meets with the approval of the various members of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LANGER. Not now, Mr. President. So far as I, as chairman of the committee, am concerned, I believe the Taft substitute bill in many respects is a more liberal bill and a better one than the original Senate bill 637 as introduced by my distinguished colleague [Mr. CHAVEZ] and myself.

I therefore move that all the language after the enacting clause be stricken out and that the Taft bill be substituted therefor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. The difficulty in doing that is that I do not know whether amendments to the substitute bill would be in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been informed that such amendments would be in order. The committee substitute is to be considered as original text and an amendment thereto subject to amendment in one degree.

Mr. LANGER. I call the attention of the Senate particularly to this fact, that Senate bill 637——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Not at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A point of order, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am trying to get back to the subject of the Taft bill as a substitute. Has that bill been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's question is, Has the so-called Taft amendment been agreed to by the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The answer is that it has not been.

Mr. LANGER. I wish particularly to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the House no provision was made for children of deceased employees, while in the Taft substitute that matter is taken care of. Another very desirable feature is the fact that the age at which a widow may become eligible has been reduced from 60 years to 50 years.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and I also yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee has been working on Senate bill 637 many months. Extended hearings were held, and the committee came to the conclusion that a retirement bill was in order and that the matter had too long been delayed. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has submitted a substitute. I have studied the substitute very carefully, and have come to the conclusion that notwithstanding the changes made by the Taft substitute, the main purposes of Senate bill 637, as originally introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself are carried out in the Taft measure. The point I should like to make is that a retirement bill should be passed, and that the Taft substitute carries out practically everything that was included in the Langer-Chavez bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to explain how I happened to become connected with this matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will permit, let me say that in my opinion the substitute bill changes the Langer-Chavez bill very little, in such unimportant respects that the big proposition of passing a retirement bill should be carried out even if we have to pass the Taft substitute, which I am perfectly willing to do. I hope the Senate will realize that the most important thing to be considered now is whether a retirement bill shall be passed at this time. The committee felt that it should. The Taft substitute, as I stated before, which the Senator from Ohio will explain, is entirely satisfactory to the majority of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield. As a matter of fact, I yield the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this has nothing particularly to do with the bill under discussion, but I have been attempting at the last session and at this to try to obtain some reconciliation of differing views. There is on the calendar, as the Senator knows, the House bill, the so-called Stevenson bill, which in some respects is different from the Langer-Chavez bill. In working it over we took some sections of one bill and some sections of the other and endeavored to reconcile differences and to fill some of the loopholes that existed. So that this substitute is not particularly a bill of mine; it is really the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson bill. I do not wish to maintain that there are any important changes; it is simply an attempt to reconcile differences in existing views.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure the Senator from Ohio is entirely correct. I have stated heretofore and will state again that it is still the Langer-Chavez bill with some amendments submitted by the Senator from Ohio in the way of a substitute which would endeavor to compromise the views on the House side and the views on the Senate side. The main purpose is to try to pass a retirement bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will be printed in full in the RECORD without reading.

The amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 2 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in section 204 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 404),

and section 3 of the act of July 13, 1937 (50 Stat. 512), any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have completed 10 years of service computed as provided in section 5 of this act shall, on the last day of the month in which he attains the age of 70 years, or completes 10 years of service if the beyond such age, be automatically separated from the service, and all salary, pay, or compensation shall cease from that date, and the head of each department, branch, or independent office of the Government concerned shall notify each such employee under his direction of the date of his separation from the service at least 60 days in advance thereof: *Provided,* That should the head of the department, branch, or independent office fail, through error, to give timely notification, the employee's separation from the service shall not be effected without his consent until the expiration of said 60-day period. Upon such separation, the officer or employee shall be eligible for retirement on annuity as provided in section 4 hereof.

"(b) No person who is receiving an annuity under the provisions of this act and who has reached the age of 60 years shall be eligible again to appointment to any appointive office, position, or employment unde the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia, unless the appointing authority determines that he is possessed of special qualifications: *Provided,* That no deductions for the retirement fund shall be withheld from the salary, pay, or compensation of such person, but there shall be deducted from his salary, pay, or compensation otherwise payable a sum equal to the retirement annuity allocable to the period of actual employment: *Provided further,* That the annuity in such case shall not be redetermined upon such person's subsequent separation from the service."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act of May 9, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) The annuity of an officer or employee retired under this act shall be a life annuity, terminable upon the death of the annuitant and shall be an amount equal to the following: (1) 1½ percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the officer or employee multiplied by the years of service not exceeding 35 years, or (2) 1 percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years of allowable service at the option of the officer or employee multiplied by the years of service not exceeding 35 years, plus a sum equal to $25 for each year of such service but not exceeding 35 years: *Provided,* That in no case shall the annuity exceed an amount equal to 80 percent of the highest average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during five consecutive years of allowable service.

"(b) Any officer or employee, if a husband, retiring under the provisions of section 1, 2, or 6 of this act may at the time of his retirement elect to receive in lieu of the life annuity described herein a reduced annuity and an annuity after his death payable to his surviving widow equal to 50 percent of such life annuity. The annuity of the officer or employee making such election shall be equal to 90 percent of such life annuity, reduced by three-fourths of 1 percent of such life annuity for each full year, if any, his wife is under the age of 60 at the date of such election; but shall in no case be less than 75 percent of such life annuity. The annuity of such widow shall begin on the first day of the month in which the death of the husband occurs or the first day of the month following the widow's attainment of age 50, whichever is the later, and shall terminate upon her death or remarriage.

"(c) For the purpose of this act all periods of service shall be computed in accordance with section 5 hereof, and the monthly annuity installment shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

"(d) The term 'basic salary, pay, or compensation', wherever used in this act, shall be so construed as to exclude from the operation of the act all bonuses, allowances, overtime pay, or salary, pay, or compensation given in addition to the base pay of the position as fixed by law or regulation."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 5 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of section 9 hereof, the aggregate period of service which forms the basis for calculating the amount of any annuity provided in this act shall be computed from the date of original employment, whether as a classified or an unclassified officer or employee in the civil service of the United States, or in the service of the District of Columbia, including periods of service at different times and in one or more departments, branches, or independent offices, or the legislative branch of the Government, and also periods of service performed overseas under authority of the United States and periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States; in the case of an officer or employee, however, who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of military or naval service, the period of service upon which such retired pay is based shall not be included, except that in the case of an officer or employee who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of a service-connected disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or resulting from an explosion of an instrument of war, the period of the military service shall be included: *Provided,* That an officer or employee must have served for a total period of not less than 5 years, exclusive of such military or naval service, before he shall be eligible for annuity under this act. Nothing in this act shall be construed as to affect in any manner an officer's or employee's right to retired pay, pension, or compensation in addition to the annuity herein provided."

SEC. 4. The first three paragraphs of section 6 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall have served for a total period of not less than 5 years computed as provided in section 5 of this act, and who, before becoming eligible for retirement under the conditions defined in the preceding section hereof, becomes totally disabled for useful and efficient service in the grade or class of position occupied by the officer or employee, by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on the part of the officer or employee, shall upon his own application or upon the request or order of the head of the department, branch, or independent office concerned, be retired on an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 hereof: *Provided,* That proof of freedom from vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct for a period of more than 5 years next prior to becoming so disabled for useful and efficient service, shall not be required in any case. No officer or employee shall be retired under the provisions of this section unless examined by a medical officer of the United States or a duly qualified physician or surgeon, or board of physicians or surgeons, designated by the Civil Service Commission for that purpose, and found to be disabled in the degree and in the manner specified herein. No claim shall be allowed under the provisions of this section unless the application for retirement shall have been executed prior to the applicant's separation from the service or within 6 months thereafter. The time limitation for execution of claims for retirement under the terms of this section may be waived by the Civil Service Commission in case of an officer or employee who at the date of separation from service or within 6 months thereafter is receiving hospital treatment but the application in such case must be filed with the Civil Service Commission not later than 6 months after the termination of such hospitalization; in the case of any such person heretofore separated from service application may be filed within 6 months after the effective date of this act. Such time limitation may similarly be waived in the case of an officer or employee who at the date of separation from service or within 6 months thereafter is mentally incompetent, but the application in such case must be filed with the Civil Service Commission within 1 year from the date of restoration of such person to competency or the appointment of a fiduciary whichever is the earlier.

"Every annuitant retired under the provisions of this section unless the disability for which retired be permanent in character, shall at the expiration of 1 year from the date of such retirement and annually thereafter, until reaching age 60, be examined under the direction of the Civil Service Commission by a medical officer of the United States, or a duly qualified physician or surgeon, or board of physicians or surgeons designated by the Civil Service Commission for that purpose, in order to ascertain the nature and degree of the annuitant's disability, if any. If an annuitant shall recover before reaching age 60 and be restored to an earning capacity which would permit him to be appointed to some appropriate position fairly comparable in compensation to the position occupied at the time of retirement, payment of the annuity shall be continued temporarily to afford the annuitant opportunity to seek such available position, but not in any case exceeding 1 year from the date of the medical examination showing such recovery. Should the annuitant fail to appear for examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability shall have been satisfactorily established. The Civil Service Commission may order or direct at any time such medical or other examination as it shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any officer or employee retired on an annuity under this section.

"If a recovered disability annuitant whose annuity is discontinued subsequent to June 30, 1945, shall fail to obtain reemployment in any position included in the provisions of this act, he shall be considered as having been separated from the service within the meaning of section 7 (a) of this act as of the date he was retired for disability and shall, after the discontinuance of the disability annuity, be entitled to a deferred annuity in accordance with the provisions of such section."

SEC. 5. Section 7 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Should any officer or employee to whom this act applies after having rendered 5 years of civilian service, computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, and before becoming eligible for retirement under this act become separated from the service, such officer or employee shall be paid as he may elect, (A) a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 62 years, or the age at separation if beyond the age of 62 computed as provided in section 4 (a) of this act, or (B) the total amount credited to his individual account together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of separation.

"(b) All amounts returned to an officer or employee under this section must upon reinstatement, retransfer, or reappointment to a position within the purview of this act be redeposited, together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 1, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, by such officer or employee before he may receive any credit for the service covered by the refund."

SEC. 6. Section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. In the case of any officer or employee who before the effective date of this act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or section 8 (a) of the act of June 16, 1933, the annuity shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following the month in which this act is enacted by 25 percent or $300, whichever is the lesser: *Provided*, That each such annuitant may, prior to the effective date herein prescribed, elect to retain his or her present annuity, in lieu of the increased annuity provided by this section, and name his wife or her husband to receive upon his or her death one-half of his or her present annuity but not to exceed $600 per annum during the remainder of the life of such surviving husband or wife and upon the death of such survivor no further annuity shall be due or payable.

"In case any officer or employee shall have been separated subsequent to January 23, 1942, and prior to effective date of this act and have acquired title to annuity under section 7 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, beginning after such effective date, such annuity shall be computed as if this act had not been enacted: *Provided*, That any such officer or employee may elect to forfeit his right to such annuity and elect in lieu thereof to receive a refund as provided by section 7 of this act."

SEC. 7. Section 9 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. Each officer or employee within the purview of this act may deposit with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the 'civil-service retirement and disability fund' a sum equal to 2½ percent of his basic salary, pay, or compensation received for services rendered after July 31, 1920, and prior to July 1, 1926; 3½ percent of the basic salary, pay, or compensation for services rendered from and after July 1, 1926, and prior to July 1, 1942; 5 percent of such basic pay, salary, or compensation for services rendered from and after July 1, 1942, and prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins after June 30, 1948, and also 6 percent thereafter, covering service during which no deductions were withheld for deposit in the said fund. Each such officer or employee may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his service in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Civil Service Commission. The amount so deposited shall be credited to the individual account of the officer or employee in the said fund. Unless such deposit is made, no credit shall be allowed for the period or periods of service involved: *Provided*, That no deposit shall be required for any service rendered prior to August 1, 1920, or for periods of honorable service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States."

SEC. 8. The first paragraph of section 10 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Beginning as of July 1, 1942, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee to whom this act applies a sum equal to 5 percent of such officer's or employee's basic salary, pay, or compensation: *Provided*, That from and after the first day of the first pay period which begins after June 30, 1948, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee to whom this act applies a sum equal to 6 percent of such officer's or employee's basic salary, pay, or compensation. The amounts so deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee shall, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the 'civil-service retirement and disability fund' created by the act of May 22, 1920, and said fund is hereby appropriated for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided in this act."

SEC. 9. Section 12 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. (a) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, the amounts deducted and withheld from the basic salary, pay, or compensation of each officer or employee for credit to the 'civil-service retirement and disability fund' created by the act of May 22, 1920, covering service from and after August 1, 1920, shall be credited to an individual account of such officer or employee.

"(b) (1) In the case of any officer or employee to whom this act applies who shall become absolutely separated from the service before he shall have completed an aggregate of 5 years of service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act, or who shall be transferred to a position not within the purview of this act, the amount credited to his individual account together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of separation shall be returned to such officer or employee: *Provided*, That in computing interest under this subsection, a fractional part of a month in the total service covered by the refund shall be disregarded, and no interest shall be allowed in any case unless the service covered by the refund aggregates more than 1 year.

"(2) All amounts returned to an officer or employee under this subsection must, upon reinstatement, retransfer, or reappointment to a position within the purview of this act, be redeposited by such officer or employee before he may receive any credit for the service covered by the refund.

"(c) (1) In case any officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and is survived by a widow, such widow shall be paid an annuity beginning the first day of the month following the death of the officer or employee or following the widow's attainment of age 50, whichever is the later, equal to one-half the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof with respect to such officer or employee: *Provided*, That such payments shall cease upon death or remarriage of the widow.

"(2) In case any officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and is survived by a widow and a surviving child or children, such widow shall be paid an immediate annuity terminable upon death or remarriage, equal to one-half the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof with respect to such officer or employee. There shall also be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-fourth the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof with respect to such officer or employee, but not to exceed $900 divided by the number of such children or $360, whichever is lesser. Upon the death of such widow, the annuity of such child or children shall be recomputed and paid as provided in section 12 (c) (3) hereof.

"(3) In case any officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act and leaves no surviving widow but leaves a surviving child or children, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-half the amount of an annuity computed as provided in section 4 hereof with respect to such officer or employee, but not to exceed $1,200 divided by the number of such children or $480, whichever is lesser.

"(4) The annuity payable to a child under this subsection shall be terminable upon (A) his attaining the age of 18 years, (B) his marriage, or (C) his death, whichever first occurs, except that if such child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability his annuity shall be terminable only upon death, marriage, or recovery from such disability. In any case in which the annuity of a child, under this subsection, is terminated, the annuities of any other child or children, based upon the service of the same officer or employee, shall be recomputed and paid as though the child whose annuity was so terminated had not survived such officer or employee.

"(5) Any surviving widow entitled to an annuity under this subsection may elect to waive the right to receive such annuity and to receive in lieu thereof a refund of amounts credited to the individual account of the officer or employee with interest thereon at the rate of 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year to the date of such officer's or employee's death. In any case in which a surviving widow elects to receive a refund under this paragraph, no annuity shall be payable to such widow or to any surviving child of the officer or employee under this subsection. This paragraph shall not be applicable in the case of the surviving widow of any officer or employee if such officer or employee shall have filed a notice in writing with the Civil Service Commission to the effect that he does not desire such paragraph to be applicable in his case.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'widow' means a surviving wife of an individual, who either (A) shall have been married to such individual for at least 5 years immediately preceding his death, or (B) is the mother of issue by such marriage.

"(2) The term 'child' means an unmarried child, including a dependent stepchild or an adopted child, under the age of 18, or an unmarried child who because of physical or mental disability is incapable of self-support, a dependent stepchild, or an adopted child.

"(3) Questions of dependency and disability arising under this section shall be determined by the Civil Service Commission and its decisions with respect to such matters shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review. The Commission may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as it shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any annuitant or applicant for annuity under this section, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any such examination.

"(e) In case (1) an officer or employee to whom this act applies shall die before having

rendered 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in section 5 of this act or without a survivor or survivors entitled to annuity benefits provided by section 12 (c) hereof the total amount of deductions credited to his individual account with interest thereon at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of death, or (2) the annuity of an annuitant under section 12 (c) shall terminate before he and any other persons who shall have received an annuity based upon the service of the officer or employee shall have received in annuities an aggregate amount equal to the amount to the credit of such employee's individual account as of the date of commencement of the annuity under section 12 (c) and no other person is entitled to an annuity based upon such service, the total amount of deductions remaining to the credit of the individual account of such officer or employee, with interest thereon at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of commencement of such annuity, shall be paid upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated in writing by such officer or employee and recorded with the Civil Service Commission.

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such officer or employee.

"Third, if there be no such beneficiary or executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from the date of the death of the officer or employee, to such person or persons as may appear in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission to be legally entitled thereto, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(f) In case a retired employee who has not elected a joint and survivorship annuity as provided in section 4 (b) of this act shall die without having received in annuities an amount equal to the total amount credited to his individual account with interest thereon at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded on December 31 of each year to date of retirement, the difference and/or any accrued annuity due shall be paid upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated in writing by such annuitant and recorded with the Civil Service Commission.

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such annuitant.

"Third, if there be no such beneficiary, or executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from the date of the death of the annuitant, to such person or persons as may appear in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission to be legally entitled thereto, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(g) Where any payment under this act is to be made to a minor, or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate: *Provided*, That where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, the Civil Service Commission shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate.

"(h) In case a former employee entitled to the return of the amount credited to his individual account shall become legally incompetent, the total amount due may be paid to a duly appointed guardian or committee of such former employee. If the amount of refund due such former employee does not exceed $1,000, and if there has been no demand upon the Civil Service Commission by a duly appointed guardian or committee, payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from date of separation from the service, to such person or persons, in the discretion of the Commission, who may have the care and custody of such former employee, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(i) Each employee or annuitant to whom this act applies shall, under regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries to whom shall be paid, upon the death of the employee or annuitant any sum remaining to his credit (including any accrued annuity) under the provisions of this act."

SEC. 10. The first paragraph of section 13 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Annuities granted under the terms of this act shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued. Payment of all annuities, refunds, and allowances granted hereunder shall be made by checks drawn and issued by the Treasury Department in such form and manner and with such safeguards as shall be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations governing accounting that may be found applicable to such payments."

SEC. 11. The third paragraph of section 13 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"An annuity granted for retirement under the provisions of section 1 or 2 of this act shall commence the first day of the month following the date of separation from the service, or on the first day of the month following the month in which salary shall cease, provided the employee meets the age and service requirements for retirement at that time, and shall continue during the life of the annuitant. An annuity granted under the provisions of section 6 or 7 hereof shall be subject to the limitations specified in said sections."

SEC. 12. Section 14 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 13. Except insofar as amendments made by this act change rates of interest, such amendments shall not apply to any person subject to the provisions of section 3A of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and the rights and obligations of such person under such act shall continue as though this act had not been enacted.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to address an inquiry to the chairman of the committee. At the last session a retirement bill was passed. As I understand, there is nothing in this substitute which in any way conflicts with the rights granted in connection with the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the last session?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that the provisions relating to the Federal Bureau of Investigation stand without amendment in this substitute bill.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask how many retirement plans are in effect besides this bill. How many agencies of the Government have their own retirement plans?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know exactly, but the intention is to cover in this bill everyone we possibly can.

Mr. BYRD. Has not the committee any information as to how many agencies have their own retirement plans?

Mr. LANGER. No; it has not.

Mr. BYRD. There are quite a large number, are there not?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, has the amendment been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it has not.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment which has been offered in lieu of the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer three amendments. I think I have the right to modify the substitute. These three amendments are on the desk of the Senators in mimeograph form and will be part of the substitute to be discussed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to determine whether the Senator from Ohio desires to have the amendments considered and acted upon en bloc or individually.

Mr. TAFT. I think I have a right to modify the amendment simply by requesting that it be thus modified. So I request that it be modified by the adoption of these three amendments. Then a motion to strike out will be in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, these are very important amendments. I happen to favor two of them, but I am opposed to one. I wish to enter my protest against having all three of them considered and acted upon at one time.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I modify my request, and I now ask that the substitute be modified by adopting the amendment to section 14 and the amendment on page 18, as to which I understand the Senator from Virginia has no objection.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct; I have no objection at all to them.

Mr. TAFT. And thereafter I shall move the other amendment, which then can be discussed.

Mr. BYRD. The amendment which the Senator from Virginia wishes to hear fully discussed is the one on page 11, in line 15.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I shall reserve that at this time, and shall offer it later for action by the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The modifications proposed by the Senator from Ohio to his own amendment will be made.

The modifications are as follows:

On page 18, line 12, after "(2)", insert the following: "any separated officer or employee who is entiled to a deferred annuity as provided in section 7 hereof shall die before having established a valid claim for annuity, the total amount credited to his individual account with interest at 4 percent per annum

to December 31, 1947, or the date of separation, whichever is earlier, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to date of death, or (3)."

On page 23, after line 3, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 14. Section 3 (a) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any officer or employee in the legislative branch of the Government within the classes of officers or employees which were made eligible for the benefits of this act by the act of July 13, 1937, serving in such position on the effective date of this act, may give notice of his desire to come within the purview of this act at any time prior to July 1, 1948.' "

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now offer to my amendment in the nature of a substitute the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 15, it is proposed to strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall."

On page 12, beginning with the word "Unless", in line 10, strike out through the word "involved", in line 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "notwithstanding the failure of an officer or employee to make such deposit, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered, but the annuity of such employee shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of annuity such deposit would purchase if made, unless the officer or employee shall elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit under this act."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to his amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement at this time as to the general purposes of the bill.

This bill revises the civil-service retirement system which covers most of the civil-service employees in various employments under the Federal Government. As the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, there are perhaps 12 other retirement plans applying to Federal employees. The State Department has a separate plan, the TVA has a separate plan, and so forth. It is unfortunate that this entire subject has not been subjected to more complete study and coordination.

Nevertheless, this particular proposal, covering the bulk of the employees of the Government, has been before the Senate for a year, now.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator from Ohio addressing his remarks to the bill, as presented, or to the substitute which he is offering?

Mr. TAFT. I am addressing my remarks to the substitute. We are working now on the substitute which I have offered, but which is a combination of the House bill and the Senate bill. However, I am speaking now of the program as amended by the substitute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has any estimate been made of the prospective cost to the Government of the substitute bill?

Mr. TAFT. The last estimate which has been made is that it will cost approximately $42,000,000 a year, in addition to the present cost. However, if the Senator does not mind my doing so, I prefer first to make a statement as to the general nature of the bill, and what it does.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator yield at this point for a further question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I notice that the chairman of the committee has said that the substitute is a more liberal measure. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio feels that this is a more expensive bill than Senate bill 637, or whether it is a cheaper bill.

Mr. TAFT. It is a cheaper bill; its cost will be approximately $42,000,000 less, according to the estimate of the actuaries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the committee report on Senate bill 637, which is the bill before us, the cost is estimated as follows:

It is estimated by the Civil Service Commission that the contributions from the employees plus the savings brought about through the economies cited above would almost totally finance the cost of S. 637, as amended. On the basis of maximum estimated expenditures and minimum estimated savings, the ultimate cost to the Government when the system reaches maturity, approximately 30 years hence, may be four or five million dollars per year; no immediate increase in appropriations is required.

I now understand from the Senator from Ohio that he has a bill which will be $60,000,000 cheaper than this bill, but still will cost us $40,000,000 a year more than the original bill. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. The statement I made was that after the present plan is amended by the bill as presented under the substitute plan, it will increase by $42,000,000 a year the annual pensions paid by the United States Government. It will be less expensive than the Langer bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It will be less expensive by $60,000,000, and yet it will cost us $42,000,000 more. I do not quite understand that.

Mr. TAFT. I have no defense to make for the various varying estimates submitted by different Government departments in the past, but the one upon which I am relying shows that the Stevenson bill, the House bill, would cost approximately $84,000,000 more than the present system, and the substitute would cost approximately $42,000,000 more than the present system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio when the estimate of $84,000,000 as to the House bill was made, and by whom.

Mr. TAFT. Under date of January 16, by a letter of which the Senator from Delaware has a copy, I am sure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. It was addressed to the Honorable Harry B. Mitchell, President of the Civil Service Commission, by the Government actuaries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As the Senator has said, I have received a copy of the letter. But the point I cannot quite understand is that I hold in my hand at this time a copy of another letter, under date of July 24, signed by Mr. Mitchell, President of the Civil Service Commission, in which he gave a report on the same bill, House bill 4127; and at that time he said the cost would be only $15,000,000. The report is signed by the same group of actuaries, and no amendments have been made to the bill thus far.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, I do not propose to reconcile different statements submitted by different Government officials at different times.

All I can say is what this letter shows. I ask consent that it be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1948.

Hon. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: In accordance with the request of the Civil Service Commission, the Board of Actuaries, joining with Mr. John D. Phenix, actuary and statistician of the Senate Civil Service Committee, and Maurice S. Brown, actuary of the Civil Service Commission, has prepared a new valuation of the cost to the Government of the existing Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund as of September 30, 1947, and the corresponding cost as it would be if the bill H. R. 4127, passed by the House of Representatives on July 21, 1947, became a law. The figures have been rushed and the results are submitted in this communication without delaying the submission for the preparation of a report. The work was done under the immediate supervision of Mr. Brown.

On August 29, 1947, you joined WILLIAM LANGER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, in requesting data as to sex, years of service, age, and salary from all departments and agencies having members under the Civil Service Retirement Act. From some departments complete returns were secured, and from others, sample returns were submitted. The results gave a sample of better than 30 percent of the entire membership. For departments which submitted on the sampling basis, the results were adjusted to represent the total number of current employees as reported by such departments. The total membership thus obtained was 1,510,670 members on an annual compensation base of $4,438,862,859, and all figures of cost presented herein were predicated on this membership.

Records of annuitants are maintained by the Retirement Division of the Commission. Including an allowance for applications and the process of adjudication, the retired roll on September 30, 1947, was 120,684 persons drawing allowances at the rate of $109,760,951 per annum.

In calculating the costs under the two sets of retirement provisions, the Board has shown the contribution rates necessary to liquidate the accrued liability, that is, the liability on account of prior service, as the percentages of the total active pay roll, which represent interest at the valuation rate of 4 percent on the respective amounts of the accrued liabilities under the two plans. This procedure gives a lower percentage rate of

pay roll than does the one previously used by the Board with respect to prior service contributions under the existing law. However, it was deemed desirable to proceed in this manner in order not to include in the figures comparing the relative costs of the two groups of provisions, an allowance for the amortization of the accrued liability which might tend to overstate the true differences between the plans. The revised normal cost of the provisions under the existing law and the normal cost of the provisions under the proposed law as obtained from the present valuations are as follows:

TABLE 1.—*The normal cost of the various benefits allowable under the existing plan, expressed as percentages of pay roll, compared with the corresponding costs under H. R. 4127 as passed by the House of Representatives on July 21, 1947*

Benefit	Normal rates		Ratio of H. R. 4127 to existing plan
	Existing plan	H. R. 4127	
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Service	4.59	5.09	111
Disability	.75	.84	112
Discontinued service:			
Voluntary	.39	.38	97
Involuntary	.58	.82	141
Return of contributions on withdrawal without a retirement benefit and on death	1.14	1.08	95
Subtotal	7.45	8.21	110
Widows:			
Payments deferred to age 60	----	.47	----
Payments during period youngest child is under age 18	----	.09	----
Subtotal	----	.56	----
Total rates	7.45	8.77	118
Less rate payable by employees	5.00	6.00	120
Net rate payable by Government	2.45	.77	113

The Board then determined the total present value of the liabilities under the present plan and under the proposed act and the respective present values of the future normal contributions under the plans. Deducting the funds in hand and the present value of the future contributions from the total liability gives the accrued liability for each plan. The figures obtained from the valuation are shown on the following page.

TABLE 2.—*Comparative statement of assets and liabilities under the existing plan and of the corresponding assets and liabilities under H. R. 4127, as passed by the House of Representatives on July 21, 1947, prepared as of Sept. 30, 1947*

ASSETS (MILLIONS)

Item	Existing plan	H. R. 4127	Ratio of H. R. 4127 to existing plan
			Percent
Funds in hand	$2,707	$2,707	100
Service credit payments payable by members who wish to receive credit for past service	209	97	46
Present value of prospective contributions of employees	2,663	3,195	120
Present value of prospective contributions by Government:			
Normal	1,304	1,481	114
Accrued liability	2,866	4,616	161
Subtotal	4,170	6,097	146
Total assets	9,749	12,096	124

TABLE 2.—*Comparative statement of assets and liabilities under the existing plan and of the corresponding assets and liabilities under H. R. 4127, as passed by the House of Representatives on July 21, 1947, prepared as of Sept. 30, 1947*—Continued

LIABILITIES (MILLIONS)

Item	Existing plan	H. R. 4127	Ratio of H. R. 4127 to existing plan
			Percent
Value of voluntary deposits	6	6	100
Present value of annuities payable to retired annuitants as of the valuation date:			
Annuitants now on roll	963	1,187	123
Annuitants eligible for deferred annuities	369	437	118
Subtotal	1,332	1,624	122
Present value of prospective benefits payable to or on behalf of present active members:			
Retiring on account of age	6,011	7,221	120
Retiring on account of disability	804	868	108
Retiring on a discontinued service benefit:			
Voluntary separation	249	261	105
Involuntary separation	558	774	139
Withdrawing without a retirement benefit or dying	789	637	81
Subtotal	8,411	9,761	116
Present value of prospective benefits payable to widows of deceased members:			
Upon attainment of age 60 by widow	----	618	----
During period that youngest child is under age 18	----	87	----
Subtotal	----	705	----
Total liabilities	9,749	12,096	124

The normal cost figures combined with the accrued liability figures, as previously presented, may be expressed in terms of the annual appropriations needed to support the benefits, as shown in table 3:

TABLE 3.—*Annual contributions required to support the existing plan compared with corresponding contributions under H. R. 4127 as passed by the House of Representatives on July 21, 1947, prepared as of Sept. 30, 1947*

Contributions payable by—	Normal cost as—		Deficiency cost as—		Total cost as—	
	Percentage of pay roll	Annual amount as of Sept. 30, 1947 (millions)	Percentage of pay roll	Annual amount as of Sept. 30, 1947 (millions)	Percentage of pay roll	Annual amount as of Sept. 30, 1947 (millions)
EXISTING PLAN						
Total	7.45	$331	2.59	$115	10.04	$446
Employees	5.00	222	----	----	5.00	222
Government	2.45	109	2.59	115	5.04	224
H. R. 4127						
Total	8.77	389	4.17	185	12.94	574
Employees	6.00	266	----	----	6.00	266
Government	2.77	123	4.17	185	6.94	308
RATIO OF H. R. 4127 TO EXISTING PLAN	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Total	118	118	161	161	129	129
Employees	120	120	----	----	120	120
Government	113	113	161	161	138	138

We trust that the above figures and comments will give the committee such information as it needs in order to arrive at the relative difference in cost between the existing law and H. R. 4127 as passed by the House of Representatives on July 21, 1947.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE B. BUCK.
EDWARD B. FACKLER.
R. B. REACH.
JOHN D. PHENIX.
MAURICE S. BROWN.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as we see from reading the letter, it shows that the cost of the Stevenson bill is approximately $84,000,000 a year. I may say that informally the same actuaries have estimated that the cost of the substitute will be approximately one-half of that cost, or $42,000,000 a year additional.

Mr. President, let me finish the general statement in regard to the bill: What the bill does, in the first place, is to increase the pensions of those who already have retired. The bill will increase their pensions by 25 percent, or $300, whichever is less. That amounts to an average increase in pensions of approximately 23 percent for those who already have retired. Of course, that is a straight gift. Their pensions accumulated under a certain plan; and, frankly, this would be a gift on the part of the Government, in order to increase their pensions somewhat. No one has suffered in the United States as much from the increase in the cost of living as the people who have been on fixed pensions. While I do not know that we can adopt any such policy for other employees, I think the Government, as an employer, can properly go back and make that increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator inform us whether the additional amount to be given pensioners is to be borne entirely by the Federal Treasury, or will any of it come from the pension fund?

Mr. TAFT. It will be borne by the Federal Treasury. Obviously that is done in respect to those who are drawing the pensions to which their contributions entitle them, with the additional Government contribution. This is an additional Government contribution. It makes up about $24,000,000 of the additional cost of $42,000,000. It is the most expensive single item, but one which I think on any basis of fairness and justice is justified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us what differences, if any, exist in his substitute to the pending bill, as to the age of retirement of employees?

Mr. TAFT. The age of retirement is left exactly as it is in the existing law. We eliminated entirely section 1 of both bills. It is left exactly as it is in the existing law. Some modification may be necessary, but that is one feature which was eliminated. Roughly speaking, a man may retire at 62 after 15 years' service; at age of 60, if he has had 30 years of service; or with 30 years' service, he may retire at 55, but in that case the pension is calculated as being of the same value as the pension he would have received at age 60.

Mr. ELLENDER. In any event the age of retirement is not affected by the

substitute; it remains as it is in the present law, does it not?

Mr. TAFT. Exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. How about the payments to be made by the employees? What difference is there between the present law, the pending bill, and the Senator's substitute?

Mr. TAFT. The provision of the present law is 5 percent. All the bills, including the substitute, increase that to 6 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Relative to the matter of the payment of the additional $300 a year just discussed, is it not true that the Government must appropriate each year sums additional to those paid by employees to make payments to annuitants?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; obviously. In many private pension funds, the employer pays in half and the employee pays in half, but the Government has never paid in anything. Its payments are made on a current basis, as the pensions are paid, and about $223,000,000 is appropriated today by the Government as its share of the pensions. To that, of course, is added whatever the employee is entitled to, from what he has put into the fund.

Mr. COOPER. Then it will be necessary to increase appropriations to provide for the payment to each annuitant of the additional $300, will it not?

Mr. TAFT. The appropriation will be enlarged, as far as I can judge, by approximately $24,000,000 over the present payments to those who have already retired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the distinguished Senator from Ohio would explain what was in section 1 of Senate bill 637. It is cut out, and the amendment substituted.

Mr. TAFT. It raises a question as to whether a man may retire at 55 after 25 years of service. That provision expired in 1947. Whether it should now be renewed and made permanent is debatable. I mean, those matters are still in the House bill, and they may be discussed in conference, but in order to avoid furious controversies, as I thought, it seemed desirable to leave the law as it is. There is no objection that I can see to the present law, except that it makes a little more difficult the calculation of pensions on a reduced basis.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senate bill have this provision in it?

Mr. TAFT. The House and Senate bills adopted a special, arbitrary type of deduction, when one retired at 55 and got a pension at 55. This leaves it to be determined on an actuarial basis by the actuaries, and that is the provision of the present law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. First, I want to ask the Senator a question, so that we may be very clear on this point. The bill covers and applies, does it not, to employees of the Congress, the officers of both Houses of Congress, and the office employees of Senators, on their retirement?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It applies to legislative employees.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I call the Senator's attention to page 3, section 4, line 8, of his substitute, in which it is provided that "1½ percent of the average annual basic salary, pay, or compensation received by the officer or employee during any five consecutive years" shall be the basis of the payments to annuitants. On page 4, subsection (d), it is provided as follows:

(d) The term "basic salary, pay, or compensation," wherever used in this act, shall be so construed as to exclude from the operation of the act all bonuses, allowances, overtime pay, or salary, pay, or compensation given in addition to the base pay of the position as fixed by law or regulation.

As I understand, the annuity is based and calculated upon what we call the base pay, but I am advised that the amount of the deductions is based upon the gross pay, including overtime payments. There seems to be a discrepancy between deductions based on gross pay and the payment of annuities figured on base pay, exclusive of overtime.

Mr. TAFT. I am informed that at least as far as legislative employees are concerned, the calculations are made on gross pay. It is so interpreted. Why it is so interpreted I cannot tell the Senator. The provision is in the existing law, and in all the other bills. I had not had it called to my attention, but I am informed that because of the way the legislative provision was drawn, it is based on gross pay. I imagine that is because the legislative salary is not stated as a bonus, but as pay calculated on statutory pay, plus certain additions and percentages.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But those additions and percentages were made in lieu of overtime payments, and were paid in some of the departments. Does not the Senator feel that it is rather inequitable, so far as the employees of the legislative branch may be concerned, to have deductions made upon gross pay, and annuities paid only upon base pay?

Mr. TAFT. No. I understand the annuity is based on gross pay, as far as legislative employees are concerned. I am so informed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I did not have that information. If that is correct, then there is no inequity.

Mr. TAFT. The deductions are also made on gross pay, but the pension is figured on gross pay. I am so informed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, I ask the Senator again, does the provision which states that the annuity shall be calculated upon base pay apply to legislative employees?

Mr. TAFT. Apparently it does not. Why it does not, I do not know. As I have said, this has been in all the bills, and my attention had not been called to it until the Senator brought it up. If the Senator finds the situation is otherwise and has an amendment to offer, we should certainly be glad to consider it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I certainly feel, I may say to the able Senator, that, in order to be fair, deductions and calculations of annuities should be upon the same basis.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, they are on the same basis. There is no question about that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If there is any question of the new bill affecting that or changing that in any way with respect to employees of any branch of the service, I think it ought to be taken care of.

Mr. TAFT. It does not change in any way the existing law. That much I can tell the Senator with certainty.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If it does not change the existing law, then it does not change the situation with respect to employees of the legislative branch, I take it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I just wish to remark, in connection with what the Senator from Ohio has said, that in the committee it was our intention at all times to have the annuity fixed on the same basis with the deductions, so far as the retirement fund is concerned.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. With respect to legislative employees, they were given a percentage increase in lieu of overtime. That is the reason why the total would not be included in the base pay.

Mr. TAFT. I suppose that the base pay for legal purposes is what we regard as the gross pay, and that what we refer to as base pay is just a basis of calculation to determine the legal base pay. I assume that is the reason for the ruling.

Mr. BYRD. An exception was made that an increase in salaries be provided for by giving to those in the legislative branch the percentage increase in lieu of overtime because it was impossible to calculate the overtime. I should like to know, as the Senator from West Virginia asked, whether this will include the percentage of overtime which was a part of the increase of the legislative branch. It was impossible to calculate the overtime.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the base pay includes that increase, and that the calculations of the pensions and deductions, in the case of legislative employees, are all based today on the gross pay. I am so informed, and I have every reason to believe that is the fact. In any event, it is exactly the same as the present law.

Mr. President, section 4 of the act is amended on page 3 of the substitute by changing the basis of calculating the annuity. It makes the procedure simpler. It will be, I think, very little more expensive than the present system, but it is much more easily understandable, and under it calculations can be made much more easily.

There are some differences between section 2 of my substitute and the Langer-Chavez bill. One has to do with

the 35-year limitation, which is the current law. Another is that the annuity shall in no case exceed an amount equal to 80 percent instead of 90 percent, which is the provision contained in the Langer-Chavez bill. That is the maximum. In other respects my substitute is very much the same as the present law.

Section 3 on page 4 of the substitute requires that 5 years of civilian service be rendered before any employee may be eligible to an annuity, rather than a combination of civilian and military service as provided in the present law. Under the present law we got into a situation where a man could serve in the Army, and then be brought into the civilian service. He could then take advantage of the years he had served in the Army, without paying any back money, and after a very short time begin to draw a pension after he retired, by receiving credit for his years of service in the Army. The substitute requires that an individual must have at any rate 5 years of civilian service before he is entitled to a pension under the civilian pension law.

Section 4 is not material. It will allow employees who are receiving hospital treatment an additional period to file claims for disability annuities. The provision will cover only a few meritorious cases. It will also eliminate the necessity for medical examination of disabled annuitants after they have reached the age of 60.

Section 5 on page 9 of the bill makes perhaps the most important change in the Langer law. Under the law, as amended, after 5 years of service, an individual may retire at any time. He may then receive the money he has paid into the pension fund, no matter how long he served, either less or more than 5 years. He may receive back the money he has paid in with interest at 4 percent, and 3 percent after December 31, 1947. Or he may take a deferred annuity beginning at age 62 which, of course, will only be equivalent to the number of years which he served. The amount involved may be very small. If he has served 5 years it would be a small amount, of course, but the amount is based on the number of years he has served.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. In other words, an employee of the Government can receive back, whenever he desires it and terminates his service, any deposit he has made?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. He may get back what he has paid in with interest.

Mr. BYRD. Regardless of how long he has served?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Or he may receive a deferred annuity.

Mr. BYRD. When he does take the deposit he separates himself entirely from any annuity in the future?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I am very much in favor of that provision.

Mr. TAFT. Not only that, but the measure provides further that if subsequently he returns to the service—and this is something which has produced some of the cases of serious abuse—if he subsequently returns to the service he cannot get back into the pension system except by placing in the fund the money he had previously drawn out. So if a man had served 4½ years, and retired, and draws out the money he has paid into the fund, and then later returns to the service and serves a half year more, and then makes a claim for a pension, he must return the money he previously drew from the fund if he again wants to come in under the law and receive a pension.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. With respect to the question which I raised, and which was discussed a few moments ago, concerning the provision on page 4, subsection (d), I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 is very clear that the employees of the judiciary branch and of the legislative bodies shall have their deductions based on gross pay, and their annuities based on gross pay. There may be some question respecting the language of the pending measure, and I suggest that on page 4, line 19, in subsection (d), the word "the" be stricken, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof, "except as provided in sections 501 and 522 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, the."

Then the language would continue "the term 'basic salary, pay or compensation'," and so forth.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, has the Senator the amendment in written form?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator would care to submit the amendment I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the word "the" and insert in lieu thereof the words, "except as provided in sections 501 and 522 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, the."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, is there anything in the substitute which affects section 602, I believe it is, of the Reorganization Act of 1946, which gave to Members of the House and the Senate the benefits of the retirement system? Is there anything in the substitute which affects that section?

Mr. TAFT. No. I left out the provision respecting Senators and Representatives entirely.

It seemed to me that it was wise, if we were going to revise that section, to revise it at a separate time. There is one exception to that statement, however. The measure reduces the rate of interest after the 1st of January 1948 to 3 percent. Otherwise it makes no change in the existing pension for Representatives and Senators.

Mr. GEORGE. That is, in case deductions are withdrawn?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and the rate of interest affects the size of the annuity to some extent in the future.

Mr. President, perhaps the thing which is most sought after by the employees, and to which I think they are most entitled, is survivorship payments. The measure provides for them. If a man dies, his wife will receive an annuity equal to 50 percent of the annuity which he would have received, from the time that she is 50 years of age. In that respect the bill is more liberal than the Langer bill. Under the Langer bill she would not become eligible until 60 years of age. The measure now before us provides that she can start receiving her pension at 50 years of age if she has not remarried by that time; that is, unless she has a minor child or children. There is then provided an annuity for minor children left by a man who dies in the service.

Most pension plans today provide for such survivorship benefits, and I think it is certainly only putting this system in line with other systems to provide that additional matter. I think I am correct in saying that the entire cost of those survivorship benefits is paid by increasing the payment from 5 percent to 6 percent. That is substantially what the increase in the deduction from the pay is for—to pay for the survivorship benefits. The other cost additions in the substitute are covered by the increased cost to the Government, which is approximately the same proportion as the increased cost to the employee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Upon the question of survivorship, is there any particular reason, actuarial or otherwise, for providing that the benefit shall not be paid until the widow reaches the age of 50 years?

Mr. TAFT. The bill, after all, is a pension bill, to take care of people in the upper-age groups. It is not primarily life insurance. I cannot answer the Senator's question. I suppose it can be done anyway. But the bill as presented, I think both in the House and Senate, provided for the widow's pension to begin at age 60. If the man has retired, he may accept a reduced annuity in consideration of the fact that after his death his widow shall continue to receive a 50-percent pension. That is true, I think, no matter what her age may be, after the husband has retired, if he accepts a reduction in his own pension. He may provide his widow with a pension by accepting a reduction. But this provision is to cover cases of death in the service, and in most cases I suppose that the widow under 50 is presumably able to work. Most widows are unless they have minor children. If a widow has a minor child or children, then she may draw her pension.

Mr. COOPER. I note also on page 17 the substitute defines a widow as "a surviving wife of an individual who * * * shall have been married to such individual for at least 5 years immediately preceding his death."

Is there any particular reason for requiring as a condition of eligibility that a widow must have been married 5 years?

Mr. TAFT. I think that provision is contained in both measures, and I suppose it was placed in the substitute in order that a man on his deathbed might not marry for the purpose of giving a woman a pension. I think that is undoubtedly the reason for the language. Unless there were a time limit such a situation may be open to serious abuse.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me that only in rare cases would a marriage occur for such a reason. There would be greater possibility that a deserving widow who had married within 5 years before the death of her husband would be deprived of the advantages of the survivorship provision.

Mr. TAFT. If she had a child, that provision would be waived, and she would receive the pension. If she had been married only a short time, and her husband died, presumably she would be just as well off as before she was married, just as able to work again, and possibly just as able to marry again.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has placed this provision in his amendment to meet abuses which he assumes might occur. It seems to me that it is more likely the provision will work a hardship upon many surviving widows who need and deserve benefits and who did not marry for the purpose of securing benefits.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think I have covered the main features of the bill, as proposed to be amended by the substitute, except for the matter of the amendment which is now pending.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state the question involved in the amendment. When the bill was drafted I did not understand the exact issue raised in this amendment, so it is not in the bill which was introduced day before yesterday; but I favor the amendment.

The amendment provides, on page 12, that any person may make deposits for past service. That is the general purpose of section 9. A person may make deposits for past service at certain percentages of his salary plus interest, and thereby bring himself into the pension system and receive a full pension. However, the present law provides that a person who does not wish to make back payments may still receive a pension based upon the Government's contribution, or the contribution which the Government would have made if he had made such deposits. In other words, a man who comes into the system may pay his share, which is, let us say, half the cost of his pension, by making back payments. The Government then puts up approximately the same amount, and the pension which he receives is based upon those amounts.

Under the present law a man who does not wish to make the back payments—and a man who has been in the service for 20 years may not be able to make such payments—even though he does not make the payments, may receive that part of the pension which would have been contributed by the Government if he had made his payments. It does not cost the Government any more than if he made his deposits, except that without this amendment, in the case of a person who did not make the deposit, the Government would not put up anything.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Suppose an employee had not made a deposit for 10 years, and then made a deposit under this provision. This provision would give him an advantage, as contrasted with other employees by reason of the contribution by the Government.

Mr. TAFT. Anyone who has been able to come into the system and has not elected to come in, cannot get in now, as I understand.

Mr. BYRD. In previous years there was a smaller deposit, and in some previous years no deposit was required. As I understand, under this provision a person who did not make any deposit would get the benefit of the Government contribution, which would give him an unfair advantage over employees who made the deposit.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand that a person who failed to elect to come in can come in at this time. The provision covers only cases of new employees.

Mr. BYRD. The language is:

> Notwithstanding the failure of an officer or employee to make such deposit, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered, but the annuity of such employee shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of annuity such deposit would purchase if made, unless the officer or employee shall elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit under this act.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. It is exactly the same provision as that which applies to Senators and Representatives. Perhaps it is a disputable point, but any Senator or Representative who came in during the past 2 years may refuse to make a deposit, and yet receive in his pension a reflection of the contribution which the Government would make if he made the deposit. That has been the law for civil-service employees and for Senators and Representatives. I think it is a very liberal provision.

As I understand, this provision would not give any new right to any employee that he does not have under existing law.

Mr. BYRD. It must apply to a present employee, because a new employee would automatically come under the system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, it merely retains the provisions now contained in the act. Under those provisions it is possible for a man who has had 10 or 20 years' service to withdraw from the Government service and take all his money back. If he can obtain employment for 1 day with some Government agency, or on some Senator's staff, he can be fired, and will still be eligible for a pension. By resigning or being removed, either voluntarily or involuntarily, he can withdraw all his money; and by reinstatement for as little as 1 day he can become eligible for a pension based upon his entire length of service. That was one of my objections with respect to the bill in the beginning. That provision was eliminated in the original so-called Taft substitute, but this amendment now proposed would restore the provision. I think the Senator from Ohio will agree with me.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Unless this provision goes into the bill we shall be changing the existing law.

I should like to have the Senator cite a case in which he thinks this provision would give a person an undue advantage over someone who has been in the system all along.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One case I shall cite is a case which was described in the Washington Daily News of December 10, 1947, in an article written by Mr. John Cramer. In that article he referred to the case of a Mr. Geoffrey May, a Government employee who had been working with the Bureau of the Budget for about 14 years. The article states—and this was later confirmed—that he had decided to leave the Government service. I understand that he is now employed by the Government in the Greek relief program. Mr. May, with the knowledge and consent of Mr. Flemming and Mr. Irons, of the Civil Service Commission, arranged a deal whereby he would be employed by the Federal Security Agency on a newly created job which was to last for 45 days, at the end of which the job was abolished as prearranged, making Mr. May eligible under the involuntary separation provision of the act. He thereby became eligible for a greatly increased annuity valued at about $9,000. He went to this job at a salary of $10,000 a year. He paid into the fund for 45 days. His contribution amounted to approximately $50 in that period. He thereby increased his annuity valuation $9,000 for a payment of approximately $50. I communicated with the Civil Service Retirement Division, and the story was confirmed. The job was started on May 15. It was abolished on June 30. No one seems to know what the man did, except that he set up his retirement privileges during the 45 days. I understand that the benefits which Mr. May received have since been taken away. I was also told that this was an isolated case, and that the same situation arose in very few cases. However, this is not true, as I find that it has happened 6,439 times in the past 12

months. That is confirmed in a letter under date of December 11, 1947, which I received, signed by Mr. Irons, of the Civil Service Commission, in which he stated that there had been 6,439 such cases during the past 12 months. I asked Mr. Irons to pull from their files for me copies of the first 50 cases of persons retired during the month of March, as well as 50 who retired under that provision during the month of October. I took those 2 months, and the first 50 names in each month, in order to obtain a cross-section. I have the names of those retired under that provision.

To illustrate some of the extreme cases, I have the name of Mr. George W. Bunce. The total amount of his contribution was $116.11 for his entire period of service. He is now on retirement at an annuity of $409.56. The total value of his annuity is $8,109.

Mr. TAFT. How long did he work for the Government?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Sixteen years and 10 months. His age is 55. He is retired under a reduced annuity. He was in the system only long enough to pay $116.11, based upon an average salary of $4,155. That means that he was in the system for only 2 or 3 months. He is now retired; and, according to the life-expectancy tables of the Civil Service Commission, there will be payments for nearly 20 years, amounting to a total of $8,109.

Another case is that of James M. Bedford, who worked for the Government for 12 years and 10 months. Mr. Bedford has $72.86 in the fund. He is on retirement, and at the age of 56 years and 11 months he has a paid-up retirement worth $4,640.24.

Another case is that of Mr. George J. Barber. Mr. Barber worked for 34 years and 2 months. He was blanketed into the system in 1942. Mr. Barber has paid a total of $138.18 into the fund.

Mr. TAFT. Let us take the case of a man who worked 34 years and 2 months and finally, for one reason or another, a law was passed placing him under the act and providing for compulsory deductions thereafter from his salary. The Government will add its share of his pension, covering 34 years. I do not know why it should not do so, even though he does not have the money to pay back a number of thousands of dollars which he might have paid year by year if he had been covered by a retirement plan at the beginning of the 34 years. This pension is an addition. The Government is saying, "If a man has worked for the Government for many years we will recognize that fact and give him a certain amount which will be in addition to his salary." To the extent that he himself has paid money into it it adds to the amount of this Government gift. It is true that various persons have been covered in. Sometimes they were not subject to the system. Of course no one was subject to it at one time. Groups of persons have been added in, and the Government took care of their past service also. There may be some abuses, but I think the principle of it is perfectly sound. Incidentally, if it is not sound, then it is clearly unsound with reference to Representatives and Senators who have been covered into the system. I do not know of any private company which establishes a pension system which does not base its pension at the beginning on a certain number of years' service to which neither the employee nor the employer contributes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no question at all that the Representatives and Senators have a special privilege given them in the law. I happened to be the one who offered an amendment to strike that out, and it received 20 votes out of 96.

Consider, for example, a man who has served 20 years in the legislative branch of the Congress, as a clerk to a committee, during which time there was no applicable retirement plan. There was no assessment made. That man can go to one of the departments of the Government and receive temporary employment and, by paying 5 percent of his salary for 1 year, can receive retirement pay for the rest of his life.

Mr. TAFT. I understand it has to be based upon permanent appointment, not temporary appointment.

Mr. BYRD. I happen to know of some appointments which were not permanent.

Mr. TAFT. That may have been the fact in the past. I do not think temporary appointments are covered by the plan at all.

Mr. BYRD. It is possible for a man to hold a position for 6 months or a year and pay in 5 percent of his salary and receive a life pension based on 20 years service in some other branch of the Government.

Mr. TAFT. Every pension system established today gives some credit for past service and contributes gradually a sum to bring up the necessary amount. Nearly every industry has done that. There is no particular reason why the Government should not add its share. It is not giving an employee any more than he would receive if he had paid up all of his deductions all those years. He receives the same amount which he would have received from the Government if he had paid those deductions. That is the only difference.

Mr. BYRD. Suppose the salary were $3,000. He would pay in 5 percent. That would amount to $150. He could then obtain a pension for his service, including all of his service in any other agency of the Government where there was no retirement system at that time. Consecutive service is one of the main factors in the determination of the amount of retirement.

Mr. TAFT. I suppose that any private employer is faced with the necessity of paying a man a pension, although that man contributes nothing. Every employer today thinks he has a moral obligation to take care of people who have worked for him a long time. I see nothing wrong with the theory that the Government contribute, out of the Government's pocket, if you please, a certain amount for pensions based on the number of years of service employees have had, in addition to the salaries paid at that time. The Government will not pay any more whether an employee pays or does not pay in his deductions. If he paid during that time he will receive a larger pension, and he receives the value of the money which he may deposit later. The Government does not pay any more. The Government simply recognizes the fact that a man who has worked for the Government for a certain number of years is entitled to a pension. There are some features of this system that are perhaps too liberal, but I do not think that principle is wrong. I think that when we begin a pension system and someone comes under its provisions because of the passage of a new law, it is fair that the Government should give a man a pension based on the number of years of his employment, whether or not he is able to pay up the back payments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Ohio followed the particular case which I cited, that of a man who had 34 years of service. This particular gentleman, Mr. George J. Barber, who was the twenty-fifth man who retired during the month of March 1947, under the involuntary separation clause, held a position with the Government to the extent that he had been a substitute mail driver, I have been informed, for approximately 30 years, and also held an independent job with a private industry. He drove the mail only on occasions when the regular mail driver was absent. He was blanketed in and retired on an annuity, nothwithstanding the fact that for 30 years he had worked in private industry. The Senator from Ohio seems to think he was entitled to it. The value of the annuity to be received under the present law is $17,850.60, for a payment of only $138.18. The law passed in 1942 made that possible. The examples I have cited may be extreme cases, but there is not one of them in which the Government has not been "taken for a ride." The total amount of deductions from the salaries of these 100 employees sampled amounted to $69,394.96, and the amount of the accrued liability of the Government required to pay their retirement pensions for the duration of their lives is $501,607.33.

The Ramspeck Act was passed on the assumption that it would cost the Government very little. I have no objection to the Government's paying retirement benfits to employees based upon service, but I do not see any reason why we should pass a law providing for the payment of benefits for which the employees make no contribution.

According to the Department of Commerce there are 10,000,000 persons in this country over the age of 60 years. I do not see why we should give a special privilege just because a person is fortunate to have a Government job for as

short a time as 1 week. The Senator from Ohio says that we cannot give benefits under a temporary appointment. But the law says that a man can work as short a time as 1 week on the assumption that he has a permanent appointment, and then can separate from the service, and be eligible for such benefits.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of the 100 cases to which I have referred, containing the figures which I have cited.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Analysis of 100 involuntary separation annuities

FIRST 50 AWARDED DURING MARCH 1947

Annuitant	Service		Age at commencing annuity		Average salary	Amount contributed to fund	Annuity awarded [1]	× Years of life expectancy	= Total of annuity to be received under present law	Present law annuity at 62 if voluntary separation [1]	H. R. 4127 annuity at 62 if voluntary separation [1]
	Years	Months	Years	Months							
1. Fred E. Boyd	5	5	67		$1,800.00	$471.72	$216.72	11.94 M	$2,587.63	$202.56	$232.91
2. Edwin Kline	8	7	59	9	2,600.00	893.32	282.00	16.49 M	4,650.18	332.52	416.67
3. Lewis H. Holliday	5	11	55	3	1,850.00	470.05	135.48	19.62 M	2,658.11	228.48	205.29
4. James M. Bedford	12	10	56	11	700.00	72.86	251.64	18.44 M	4,640.24	391.04	227.33
5. Rafael A. Gandia	5	1	55	3	1,300.00	259.19	101.04	19.62 M	1,982.40	171.50	166.08
6. William Girard	6	10	55		1,600.00	354.24	154.20	19.80 M	3,053.16	240.96	281.45
7. Peter Wagner	19	1	58	2	1,592.29	1,150.14	545.76	17.57 M	9,586.98	672.48	761.23
8. May A. Gartland	5	2	55	4	1,554.17	333.10	124.44	22.51 F	2,801.14	188.04	209.46
9. Wm. F. Emerson	7	2	56	8	2,400.00	708.79	187.20	18.62 M	3,485.66	282.96	351.17
10. Lonnie Riley	17	7	55	0	2,100.00	408.30	382.56	19.80 M	7,574.78	570.48	685.55
11. Willis E. Hackley	18	7	56	10	2,000.00	1,580.93	486.12	18.50 M	8,993.22	703.56	796.00
12. Albert I. Decker	6	0	70		2,605.00	652.39	243.00	10.28 M	2,498.04	243.00	301.26
13. S. May Allen	12	5	62		2,100.00	899.17	505.68	17.68 F	8,940.42	443.52	579.73
14. Dayton D. Beverage	6	3	59	10	1,100.00	233.75	170.52	16.44 M	2,803.34	207.48	225.00
15. John J. Menotti	5	4	55	6	1,700.00	238.58	127.32	19.44 M	2,486.10	204.00	234.83
16. Bernhard Lawrence	5	9	67		2,600.00	676.49	230.52	11.94 M	2,752.40	230.52	293.00
17. Thomas A. Crawford	18	3	57		3,253.75	556.57	488.64	18.38 M	8,981.20	585.48	777.19
18. Daniel F. Sullivan	13	1	60		2,281.46	373.65	387.24	16.32 M	6,319.75	411.48	429.68
19. Hugh J. Carr	6	1	62		3,211.52	632.18	288.12	15.00 M	4,321.80	243.48	347.42
20. George W. Bunce	16	10	55		4,155.00	116.11	409.56	19.80 M	8,109.28	503.04	712.62
21. Frank J. Coombes	9	6	67		1,750.00	376.98	373.08	11.94 M	4,454.57	315.00	364.17
22. Millard Markland	13	8	68		1,522.07	445.71	520.08	11.38 M	5,918.51	441.00	549.67
23. Gustave Rummell	6	7	56	5	2,500.00	605.98	163.20	18.79 M	3,066.52	256.48	303.52
24. Omer M. Richley	5	3	59	6	2,000.00	448.19	167.40	16.66 M	2,788.88	192.50	222.25
25. George J. Barber	24	2	62		2,000.00	138.18	1,190.04	15.00 M	17,850.60	914.04	1,035.75
26. George W. Rogers	5	0	62		1,862.88	416.16	198.00	15.00 M	2,970.00	185.00	211.90
27. Paul K. T. Kirk	5	4	55	5	2,300.00	546.51	126.24	19.50 M	2,461.68	212.00	259.09
28. Frederick S. Nyham	5	8	55	6	1,800.00	384.07	134.28	19.44 M	2,610.40	211.00	220.33
29. Thomas J. Shea	5	0	64	0	2,296.93	541.74	207.00	13.74 M	2,844.18	204.00	231.69
30. Clinton D. Crouch	13	5	64		1,800.00	529.13	533.64	13.74 M	7,332.21	457.50	422.68
31. David W. Myers	5	10	58	3	2,650.00	720.39	183.72	17.51 M	3,216.93	246.00	301.17
32. Frank J. McCarthy	10	2	57	7	2,600.00	805.47	282.00	17.98 M	5,070.36	372.00	502.82
33. Barco Newcomb	12	2	67		4,812.73	2,135.44	836.52	11.94 M	9,988.04	558.00	889.75
34. Camille C. Malmgren	17	1	62		2,698.33	1,200.64	683.28	16.99 F	11,608.92	605.50	888.00
35. George P. Thompson	8	11	57		2,887.79	584.66	213.00	18.38 M	3,914.04	311.50	350.94
36. James E. Wilson	8	2	77		1,517.53	242.76	293.16	6.97 M	2,043.32	275.23	209.38
37. Mary W. Pearson	8	2	57	8	1,262.70	28.57	231.96	20.78 F	4,820.12	231.96	234.18
38. Thad Evans	9	2	55		1,555.05	109.52	180.36	19.80 M	3,571.12	281.00	207.12
39. Elmer E. Linn	8	5	71		1,673.57	153.01	335.76	9.76 M	3,277.01	267.50	349.14
40. Chester E. Colerane	20	11	66		1,666.39	433.29	846.60	12.53 M	10,607.89	676.50	871.38
41. Robert P. Halland	5	8	62		2,600.00	705.65	230.00	15.00 M	3,450.00	230.00	288.84
42. Francesco D. Amico	6	1	56	5	1,737.41	401.40	152.88	18.79 M	2,872.61	218.50	257.76
43. Francisco Revera	5	10	56	8	2,600.00	681.33	156.24	18.62 M	2,909.18	235.00	297.00
44. Nettie K. Blundell	16	10	55		2,100.00	1,172.33	402.24	22.76 F	9,154.98	604.00	730.06
45. Leon S. Maue	6	0	56	2	1,700.00	377.29	148.08	18.97 M	2,809.07	216.00	254.00
46. Oscar Williams	5	10	65		1,642.65	365.98	229.32	13.13 M	3,010.97	204.00	216.67
47. Lucius Charles	5	7	55	10	1,700.00	204.97	123.72	19.20 M	2,375.42	187.50	193.33
48. William P. Burke	6	11	57	5	2,300.00	592.80	188.52	18.09 M	3,410.32	259.50	342.23
49. Alexander E. Lenczer	5	11	67		2,000.00	391.52	244.68	11.94 M	2,923.45	216.50	277.55
50. Patrick M. Murphy	5	2	69		1,600.00	374.79	210.60	10.82 M	2,278.69	197.00	203.34

FIRST 50 AWARDED DURING OCTOBER 1947

51. Otto Wagner	5	6	55		$2,695.21	$1,735.71	$140.40	19.80 M	$2,879.92	$245.04	$285.72
52. Mary V. Kilgallon	14	6	64		1,800.00	482.71	538.92	16.32 F	8,795.17	462.00	430.69
53. Gilbert K. Johnson	11	8	68		3,000.00	347.79	377.04	11.38 M	4,290.71	341.04	397.92
54. Gustave A. Almquist	6	2	63		2,000.00	468.78	242.76	14.36 M	3,486.03	221.04	250.36
55. Harry L. Cash	20	4	55	8	2,765.94	656.87	400.68	19.32 M	7,741.13	662.04	785.33
56. Van L. White	8	3	62		2,200.00	594.06	327.96	15.00 M	4,914.40	290.52	396.33
57. Benjamin S. Thomas	6	5	55		2,400.00	544.22	147.12	19.80 M	2,912.97	244.56	311.33
58. Michael J. Moloney	12	4	70		4,756.50	1,973.10	838.03	10.28 M	8,615.46	560.04	894.90
59. Ludwig Saal	22	0	67		1,800.00	699.00	879.96	11.94 M	10,506.72	717.96	980.10
60. Frank L. Mortimer	5	0	64		3,088.42	768.74	220.56	13.84 M	3,030.49	213.00	279.40
61. Louis Soncini	12	0	62		2,100.00	573.20	464.04	15.00 M	6,960.60	400.00	476.62
62. Timothy J. O'Neil	8	3	70		1,756.12	431.55	330.00	10.28 M	3,392.40	206.48	355.12
63. Irvin A. Shiffer	6	0	66		2,100.00	527.94	237.95	12.53 M	2,981.51	227.00	260.43
64. Earl G. Arnold	11	8	64		1,780.00	750.33	478.68	13.74 M	6,577.06	425.00	498.87
65. Harry E. Clark	5	1	66		2,347.00	569.31	203.28	12.53 M	2,547.09	200.52	245.68
66. Annie L. Caldwell	11	10	56	11	2,300.00	892.61	323.16	21.33 F	6,893.00	429.00	561.14
67. Glenn H. Shaw	5	0	65		1,800.00	435.64	209.04	13.13 M	2,744.69	197.00	216.95
68. Edward M. Tetreault	5	11	63		2,500.00	610.64	232.68	14.36 M	3,341.28	229.48	286.00
69. Charles F. Uhl	9	8	76		7,525.04	2,087.49	879.24	7.39 M	6,497.58	523.24	928.05
70. Joseph L. Wall	12	0	57	1	2,100.00	506.92	280.40	18.33 M	5,323.03	412.00	378.29
71. Ole M. Axness	9	10	67		2,716.69	1,011.25	393.36	11.94 M	4,696.71	389.04	513.00
72. J. C. Pendergast	5	7	72		2,200.00	544.48	222.48	9.26 M	2,060.16	222.48	252.60
73. Albert I. Oien	5	0	66		2,100.00	514.34	200.04	12.53 M	2,506.50	198.00	229.80
74. Robert A. Davis	5	3	62		1,755.95	426.47	278.04	15.00 M	4,170.60	261.48	233.44
75. Viggo L. Yepsen	5	1	63		5,548.80	1,464.54	426.00	14.36 M	6,117.36	293.52	423.08
76. John P. Rinn	6	0	58	8	2,000.00	487.74	187.44	17.22 M	3,227.71	231.96	272.04
77. Rufus C. Allen	28	3	55		2,882.34	2,264.58	683.88	19.80 M	13,540.82	1,104.56	1,516.24
78. Fred H. Mund	12	11	60	6	3,829.73	1,024.10	533.52	15.99 M	8,530.98	457.56	626.93
79. Eben H. Andrews	17	1	55		2,600.00	1,572.20	390.00	19.80 M	7,722.00	662.50	856.67
80. Winfred W. Bradbury	10	0	56	5	2,300.00	608.57	250.80	18.79 M	4,712.53	360.00	480.00
81. Edward W. Blood	6	1	57	2	2,800.00	686.20	172.80	18.27 M	3,157.05	252.48	304.85
82. Philip Willett	5	5	56	9	1,750.00	378.47	140.64	18.56 M	2,610.27	198.48	230.21
83. Richard J. Carter	5	6	60	4	2,300.00	611.05	197.28	16.10 M	3,176.20	225.00	265.88
84. Charles E. Leach	6	6	55		7,027.25	1,831.66	378.60	19.80 M	7,496.28	374.04	685.16
85. Alexander D. Larson	12	0	64		2,920.14	761.70	462.60	13.74 M	6,356.12	420.00	487.90
86. Jett H. Davidson	6	3	55		2,000.00	478.99	147.00	19.80 M	2,910.60	239.52	279.62

[1] Annuity reduced according to outstanding deposits or redeposits, if any.

Analysis of 100 involuntary separation annuities—Continued

FIRST 50 AWARDED DURING OCTOBER 1947—continued

Annuitant	Service		Age at commencing annuity		Average salary	Amount contributed to fund	Annuity awarded [1]	× Years of life expectancy	= Total of annuity to be received under present law	Present law annuity at 62 if voluntary separation [1]	H. R. 4127 annuity at 62 if voluntary separation [1]
	Years	Months	Years	Months							
87. Charles M. Rittman	18	7	55	----	2,600.00	1,383.52	423.84	19.80 M	8,392.03	696.48	947.75
88. Charles T. Hoist	5	1	65	----	1,800.00	445.39	224.28	13.13 M	2,944.79	211.56	221.02
89. Tom D. White	11	7	69	----	1,750.00	370.36	449.28	10.82 M	4,861.20	380.52	310.60
90. William J. Dolan	7	4	70	----	1,700.00	1,866.03	293.28	10.28 M	3,014.91	264.00	308.00
91. Cyrus E. Eubanks	8	7	55	----	2,300.00	703.35	196.44	19.80 M	3,889.51	325.56	412.00
92. Alice L. Heffle	7	11	55	8	1,800.00	502.65	199.32	22.26 F	4,436.86	291.48	325.83
93. Claude J. Hinman	7	5	62	----	2,500.00	414.47	302.64	15.00 M	4,539.60	264.48	355.41
94. Walter M. Adams	13	0	60	6	3,229.54	1,517.34	526.32	15.99 M	8,415.85	512.04	732.24
95. Herbert G. Gortner	10	11	79	----	2,910.94	761.47	408.96	6.17 M	2,523.28	408.96	455.28
96. Charles A. Terry	16	8	64	----	2,831.53	721.86	574.20	13.74 M	7,889.50	559.00	640.58
97. William C. O'Hara	12	0	61	1	2,859.72	750.86	405.12	15.60 M	6,319.87	411.00	489.70
98. Carl A. Hanson	5	0	57	11	1,700.00	1,211.68	204.36	17.74 M	3,625.34	259.00	273.95
99. Roy C. Loucks	5	0	68	----	1,650.00	417.03	198.00	11.38 M	2,253.24	191.00	206.50
100. Martin Sweitzer	11	8	59	6	2,300.00	544.72	374.16	16.66 M	6,233.50	397.00	541.18
Total, 100 cases						69,394.96	32,878.83		501,607.33	35,107.95	43,007.27

[1] Annuity reduced according to outstanding deposits or redeposits, if any.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk at this time an amendment which I offer as a substitute to the Senator's amendment and ask that it be agreed to. This amendment provides that Members of Congress shall make contributions before becoming eligible to receive retirement benefits. I see no reason at all why a Member of Congress should expect a retirement benefit from the Government for services which he renders in Washington during any period in which he contributes nothing to the fund.

I ask that the amendment which I offer, making it mandatory that every Member of Congress, in order to receive the benefits of the fund, shall be required to pay contributions into it, be agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senator from Delaware that the Chair has been informed that the amendment which the Senator wishes to offer at this time is not in order, for the reason that it is an amendment in the third degree to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Ohio, which must first be disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would it be in order to move to substitute my amendment in place of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the same objection would be applicable to the Senator's last request.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule may be waived, and that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware may be offered as a substitute for the amendment to my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. If the Senator from Delaware will send to the desk his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to his amendment in the nature of a substitute, it will be read by the clerk.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to his amendment in the nature of a substitute:

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after the section number in line 21, it is proposed to insert "(a)."

On page 22, after the comma in line 22, insert the following: "and except as provided in this section."

On page 23, after line 3, insert a new subsection as follows:

(b) Paragraph (5) of section 3A of such act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "In computing years of service for the purpose of this paragraph, there shall be excluded all periods of service for which no deductions have been made as provided in paragraph (2) and no deposit shall have been made as provided in section 9."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment to my amendment in the nature of a substitute, in order that the Senator from Delaware may first offer his amendment to my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to his own amendment in the nature of a substitute is withdrawn.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to the so-called Taft amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment merely provides that Members of Congress shall be treated in exactly the same manner as it is proposed that all other Government employees shall be treated under the so-called Taft substitute—for instance, employees making as little as $1,000, or $1,200 a year. In other words, all will pay into the fund, or else they will not participate. I ask that my amendment to the Taft amendment in the nature of a substitute be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware a question. In the first place, is the amendment retroactive?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is.

Mr. TAFT. That is to say, Representatives and Senators who have taken advantage of the option under which they pay nothing into the fund but simply come under the act and receive the benefit of the Government's payments for their past years of service, will have that option canceled, and hereafter they will have to make all payments for past years of service. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Mr. President. As I understand this amendment, it does not affect any Member of Congress who has retired during the past 12 months under the act as it was passed.

Mr. TAFT. But I have in mind Members who are now serving in the Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my intention, if this amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, that every Member of Congress now serving will pay into the fund in the same manner that all other Government employees are required to pay into the fund.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the Senator from Delaware has so drafted his amendment. As I read it, I do not think it is retroactive. It seems to me that those now serving, who have already made the election, would not be affected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am advised that my amendment will apply to all Members of Congress who now are serving, and it will apply to all annuities which are computed after the date of the enactment of this measure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I myself feel that Representatives and Senators should be treated in exactly the same manner as other persons who have belatedly come under the Retirement Act for some particular reason. I myself believe that this amendment to the Taft amendment, in the nature of a substitute, should be rejected, and that my amendment to the Taft amendment should be adopted. If that is done, Members of Congress will be on the same basis as other Government employees.

Of course, the present congressional pension system provides that a Representative or Senator who has served for 30 years, let us say, may come into the system and may pay nothing, and yet he will receive from the Government its

contribution for those 30 years. Of course, he will receive a smaller pension in that way, as compared to the pension he would receive if he made the back payments on his part for the 30-year period.

As I have said before, when a pension fund is established and when someone who has not been subject to it and could not be subject to it and had no right to come into it is brought under it by law or in some other way, it seems to me to be a perfectly sound principle that he shall not have to make up all those back payments which he would have made if he had been a member of the fund. If he has had that length of service, it seems to me that the Government should be willing to contribute the same amount that it would contribute if he did make the back payments. In that way there will be no special advantage to him, except that he will be spared the very difficult job of making all past payments or deposits.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, prior to the adoption of the retirement system for Members of Congress, there were no deductions, and they were not proposed. But when the bill was passed and went into effect, I could not find in the RECORD anything to show that any Member of Congress objected to having the Government make its portion of the payments for his past years of service.

The bill as now before us for discussion provides that every civilian employee of the Government shall make back payments into the fund. So I do not see why we Members of Congress should consider ourselves privileged officials to the extent that we do not have to pay for all retirement benefits we receive.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I fully agree with the Senator from Delaware that Members of Congress should have no advantage over anyone else in Government service, and that is one reason why I presented my amendment, because apparently we were taking away from the ordinary civil-service employees the rights they had had, and which we had given to Members of Congress last year or the year before. I thought we should restore that right.

I see no reason why the Government, in setting up the pension system, should not assume a liability for all the years of service on the part of such a Government employee, regardless of whether he has made payments. Of course, if he has made the payments, he will receive a larger pension or annuity. If he has not made payments, under the amendment he would receive from the Government the same amount of Government contribution that he would have received if he had made payments on his own part and, to match them, had received payments by the Government on its part.

If we recognize the principle of having salaries based on the number of years of service, I do not see why we should not recognize that same principle as applied to pensions based on the number of years of service, regardless of whether the employee has made payments on his own part, at least insofar as payments by the Government are concerned.

So I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the Taft substitute should be rejected, and that my amendment to my substitute should be adopted. Then all Government employees will be treated on the same basis.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware to the Taft amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as I understood the reading of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, it would serve the purpose of seeing to it that as of the present and in the future no person shall draw any retirement annuity benefits from the Government unless he has contributed his proportionate share of those benefits.

Mr. TAFT. Unless such Government employees had contributed for all their years of service, beginning with the date of the original employment, thus picking up payments which they could not have made prior thereto, during many years of service with the Government.

Mr. CAIN. That is not my interpretation of the intention of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. I think we must clear up that point before we shall be able to know precisely what the amendment is intended to achieve. I should like to ask that question of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the purpose of my amendment to the Taft substitute to provide that any Member of Congress who in the future goes on retirement must first have paid into the retirement fund his deductions for all years which he wishes to have included in calculating the amount of his pension. In other words, if a Member of Congress served for 6 years in the Congress and during that time made payments into the fund, and if thereafter he served six other years for which he did not make payments into the fund, he would have to make his payments for the 6 years for which he had not made payments, or else he would not be able to receive credit under the retirement or pension fund, except for those years for which contributions had been made.

In other words, in my own case, if I served 6 years as a Senator and during that time did not make payments into the retirement fund, I would receive nothing. On the other hand, after serving those 6 years and making no payments, I perhaps could get a job in a Senator's office and could serve the Government in that way over a brief period of time, and during that time could make a few payments, and thus I would receive a pension for the rest of my life.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not able to say whether the Senator from Delaware is accurate in that statement or not. But certainly I would not object to a provision that if a man had been able to make such payments, but elected not to join the fund, he could not later join the fund, even in some other capacity. To such a provision I would be entirely agreeable. But if that person had been in a position in which he was not eligible to join the fund, and under which he had no way of joining the fund, then it seems to me the principle I am advocating should apply. I had rather understood that was the objection at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand the present law, every time a man accepts a new job with the Government, he is eligible to come under the retirement fund. In the legislative branch, if he does elect to go under the retirement system at that time, he is credited with all the years of his prior service with the Government, regardless of whether he made contributions to the fund during those years, although if he has not made such contributions he will be paid a pension under a reduced formula.

But I say that no one is entitled to a pension unless he has paid for it. If I come to the Congress and serve for a certain period of time and do not make payments to the retirement fund, certainly I am not thereafter entitled to receive a pension based on such service when I attain the age of 62. That is particularly true when it is proposed in the bill now before us to grant that exemption to Members of Congress only and not to extend it to the rest of the people. What will be done later on the Senator's amendment is a matter to be discussed, but the bill as now before the Senate proposes that everybody in the Government service except Members of Congress shall pay into the fund. I ask that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, payment of this deduction on the part of employees is not optional except in the legislative branch. In other words, the question does not really arise, except that the Senator has pointed out one possible loophole. It is apparently true that if somebody in the legislative service who has the right to elect to go in or not to go in, a right not shared by others, should elect not to go in, then if he obtains a job in the civil service he apparently may, as the Senator points out, pay nothing in, pick up his past years' service, and go on with the pension. I should be perfectly willing to modify the bill to provide that anyone who has had the optional right to pay in or not to pay in, and who chooses not to go in, shall not thereafter have the right to go in, if he becomes an administrative employee. I think some such an amendment as that might be appropriate, but I think the general principle that a man who has not been able to pay because the law did not permit him to pay, should not be required to go back and pay at a future time in order to take advantage of the Government's share of his pension.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I differ with the Senator from Ohio to this extent: In my opinion, the Government has no obligation to Members of Congress dating back prior to the enactment of the retirement legislation, as incorporated in the Reorganization Act. That act provides that the Government give credit for the number of years which a Member of Congress has served, and pay into the fund the Government's share without requiring that Congressman pay anything for those years antedating the act. I say this is inequitable and unfair to the other employees who are denied

this advantage under the present proposal. I do not see why any man should stand up and argue for the right to participate in a retirement fund toward which he has made no contribution. I therefore ask that my amendment, which corrects this inequity, be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have a division?

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I want to modify my amendment before I offer it again, and if there are other amendments to be offered, I would suggest that they be submitted, and that we then proceed with this amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. When the able Senator was discussing the features of his substitute bill, I was called from the Chamber. I was not present when he discussed the details of his substitute bill which have to do with present annuitants; that is, former Federal employees who have already been retired. I should like to get from the Senator, if I may, information with respect to provisions of the so-called Langer-Chavez bill, which allowed an increase, in the event of the enactment of that bill, of $300 a year to each of the present annuitants, and also additional privileges to the widows of present annuitants and to dependents, whether those provisions are altered or changed by the substitute bill offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LANGER. If I may answer the question, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that they are all included in the substitute bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Are the provisions of the substitute bill on this point identical with the provisions of the Langer-Chavez bill?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. As a matter of fact, they are more liberal, because the widow gets in at age 50 instead of 60.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear that. I appreciate the information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to the Taft substitute?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to take some time to amend the amendment along the lines suggested to the Senator from Delaware, before I offer it again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has asked for other amendments. None seem to be available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate take a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m., when called to order by the President pro tempore.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which is based on the amendment I offered previously. My amendment is on page 11, line 15, to strike out the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof "shall," and on page 12, beginning with the word "Unless" in line 10, strike out through the word "involved" in line 12, and insert in lieu thereof, "notwithstanding the failure of an officer or employee (other than an officer or employee who had an opportunity to elect to come within the provisions of this act and who failed to exercise such election) to make such deposit, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered, but the annuity of such employee shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount of annuity such deposit would purchase if made, unless the officer or employee shall elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit under this act."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I discussed this matter awhile ago with the Senator from Ohio. The purpose is simply to change that portion of the section defining a "widow," which reads, "a surviving wife of an individual, who * * * shall have been married to such individual for at least 5 years immediately preceding his death," to make it, "2 years immediately preceding his death," so as to read, "a surviving wife of an individual who shall have been married to such individual for at least 2 years immediately preceding his death."

I believe that with this change protection is maintained against abuses which the author fears, and at the same time the benefits of survivorship will be made available to a large class of widows who deserve benefits, and whom the husband would want to protect.

Mr. TAFT. Recognizing the typical courtesy of all Senators from Kentucky, I am glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out the words "as if this act had not been enacted", and insert in lieu thereof the words "as though this act had been in effect on the date of such separation."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the amendment merely provides that in the cases of all of those who are now out of Government service, or have an accumulated equity in the retirement fund, such equity will be figured from the formula of the new act and not from the formula of the old act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again please explain the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The bill as it now reads states that—

> In case any officer or employee shall have been separated subsequent to January 23, 1942, and prior to effective date of this act, and have acquired title to annuity under section 7 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, beginning after such effective date, such annuity shall be computed as if this act had not been enacted.

What I am proposing to do is to say that in the case of those persons who had an equity under section 7, as the act now stands, their annuity must be computed under the new formula. That merely removes from those who have been separated from the service on an involuntary basis the privilege of being granted a 25-percent approximate increase to their pension due to the fact that they were involuntarily severed. I might say that there are 75,800 such annuitants who are now waiting, who left the service last year, and according to the Civil Service Commission they were eligible to receive an annuity under section 7 of the old act upon reaching retirement age. I merely propose under this amendment that those annuities shall be computed under the new formula.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not perfectly certain of the effect of the amendment, but I am willing to have it placed in the bill and be taken to conference with the House conferees and there worked out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be presented to the substitute amendment?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that there are 16 different pension systems in the Federal Government, and I express the hope that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will conduct an investigation with respect to that situation and make a recommendation to the Congress. I will name the 16 retirement systems. They are as follows:

First, Civil-service; Panama Railroad.
Second. Canal Zone.
Third. Alaska Railroad.
Fourth. Foreign Service.
Fifth. Federal Reserve.
Sixth. Tennessee Valley Authority.
Seventh. Comptroller of the Currency.
Eighth. Civilian Teachers at Naval Academy.
Ninth. District of Columbia teachers.
Tenth. District of Columbia policemen and firemen.
Eleventh. Federal judiciary.
Twelfth. Judiciary of Federal Territories and possessions.
Thirteenth. Construction period workers, Panama Canal.
Fourteenth. Canal Zone employees, disabled.
Fifteenth. District of Columbia judges.
Sixteenth. Panama Railroad, disabled.

It seems to me that some study should be made so as to consolidate, if possible, the various retirement systems into the regular system.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I might say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia that at the beginning of the drafting of the bill we did consider that subject, but the railroad men did not wish to come in. The result is we did not investigate any other systems, but decided to complete the bill. I can assure the Senator from Virginia that a full and complete investigation of the subject will be made at the present session of Congress.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted that the Senator from Virginia has called the attention of the Senate and the country to the situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any further amendments to be offered to the substitute amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after the colon in line 19, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided*, That no such increase shall (1) exceed an amount which, when added to the present annuity of any such officer or employee, exceeds the amount of annuity which such officer or employee would have received had the provisions of this act been in effect at the date of his retirement, or (2) be payable in any case in which the present annuity of any such officer or employee exceeds the amount of annuity which such officer or employee would have received had such provisions been in effect on such date."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment merely proposes that any annuitant who is now on the rolls shall not be eligible for an increase if such increase brings his pension over and above that which would be allowed under the proposed act. It was recognized by some that there are bound to be inequities in the change-over under the new bill. The amendment merely irons out those inequities as they arise. In other words, a man who now receives an annuity will not be eligible except for that portion of the increase which would bring him up to the amount allowed under the new act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not think the amendment is necessary, but I am perfectly willing to have it inserted in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. —. (a) There is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of (1) three Members of the Senate, one from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, one from the Committee on Finance, and one from the Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and (2) three Members of the House of Representatives, one from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, one from the Committee on Ways and Means, and one from the Committee on Appropriations, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study of all retirement systems applicable to officers and employees of the United States (including military and naval personnel), with a view to ascertaining the extent to which such systems should be revised or combined, and to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date the results of such study, together with its recommendations.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(e) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment speaks for itself. I think the general spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act was not to set up any more committees than were provided for by that act, and that if any committees were to be proposed the proposal should come to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Special committees have been provided for, and the procedure is to submit the matter to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The amendment makes a proposal for the establishment of a joint committee. The proposal has not gone to the Committee on Rules and Administration. It has never been submitted to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I should hesitate very much to set up on top of our existing committee structure another joint committee. It is true that probably a study of the matter involved should be made. The funds in question are quite numerous. However, altogether the whole 12 funds, I understand, cover only about 1½ percent of the employees, and the 98½ percent are under the general system we have been considering. It seems to me it is unnecessary to set up a new joint committee with a new joint staff, which would be expensive, and particularly without adequate consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration or by any standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, generally speaking I would agree with the Senator from Ohio as to the objections to setting up a special committee, because I think it is true that perhaps many of these conditions could be worked out in the regular Senate committees and committees of the House. But the truth of the matter is that that has not been done. We have before us here a major change in the retirement legislation. We are trying to work it out on the floor when it should have been worked out in the committees. In order to show how this retirement legislation has been worked out in committees, and why there has been so much confusion regarding the cost of the particular provision in question, I wish to read from a letter which I hold in my hand.

This letter is dated March 13, 1947, signed by Mr. R. R. Reagh, the Government actuary of the Treasury Department, addressed to Mr. Riley, staff director of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In this letter Mr. Reagh points out a possible $200,000,000 cost for Senate bill 637.

Again, on May 9, 1947, in a letter from Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, Acting President of the Civil Service Commission, addressed to the Chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, he

estimated the cost as being negligible. I quote from the letter:

> The committee will appreciate, I am sure, that there is no current precise statistical data upon which to base a firm estimate of cost under this or any other proposal with regard to retirement; but with the facts available to us it is our judgment that the liberalized provisions are balanced by modifications elsewhere in the bill, plus, of course, increased contributions of 1 percent made by the Federal employees.

In other words, it was his opinion on May 9, 1947, that there would be no appreciable cost. The same error was repeated in the committee report.

Five days later, on May 14, 1947, a letter was written, signed by George Buck, the same Mr. Reagh and Mr. Edward Thacker, who were consulting actuaries for the Civil Service Commission. In this letter they stated that the cost would be $109,000,000. That was 5 days after the statement that the bill would not cost anything.

We ran into a little trouble on the question of the cost of the bill before the Senate. For that reason I objected to it and insisted upon realistic estimates before any further action. A month later, on June 9, 1947, there was another letter, written by one Harry B. Mitchell, President of the Civil Service Commission, addressed to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], in which the cost of the same retirement bill was estimated at $39,160,000.

On July 22, 1947, I asked the Bureau of the Budget if it could not straighten us out as to the cost of the bill. I have a letter signed by Mr. James E. Webb, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. This time he agreed with the actuaries that the cost of the bill would be $39,160,000. Those are the only two letters that agree.

Two days later, on July 24, 1947, I received another letter from the Civil Service Commission. Apparently in order to get the bill through the last session of Congress the estimate had been revised down to $15,000,000. Bear in mind that in the meantime no amendment to the bill had been submitted which could account for these discrepancies.

On January 16, of this year, in connection with the same bill, the Civil Service Commission made another estimate. This time its estimate was $84,000,000.

We are endeavoring on the floor of the Senate to pass a piece of legislation which the Senator from Ohio now says is supposed to cost us about $42,000,000, yet at the same time we are told that the cost of this bill is $60,000,000 cheaper than the cost of the bill which the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee had been claiming would not cost anything.

I think it is time for some committee to go to work on retirement legislation. It has been pointed out by the Senator from Virginia that we have 16 different retirement systems in the Federal Government. They are administered by 11 different agencies. I have a copy of every one of these retirement systems. We have some retirement systems with a complete organization to administer the affairs of as few as 175 Government employees. It is costing more to administer some of the funds than the annuitants are receiving from them. I think it is time for Congress to make a study of the problem. Such a study has not been made in our committee. We have been too much concerned with getting a piece of legislation which will not cost anything and at the same time materially increase present benefits.

I have reviewed most of the retirement legislation for the past 14 years, and I have yet to find a single piece of legislation which has been passed with respect to which it was stated that it would cost any appreciable amount. Notwithstanding that fact, on various occasions we have doubled and trebled the obligations of the Government. In 1945 we passed retirement benefits for Members of Congress. At that time it was stated that the system would not cost the Government any money; yet every Member of Congress in computing his pension, was given benefits for all the years he served in Congress. It was not going to cost the Government anything; and at the same time it was stated that a Member of Congress did not need to pay anything back.

Mr. President, I urge that my amendment be agreed to, and that a special committee be established to study the various retirement systems, perhaps with the thought of consolidating them into one system, to insure uniformity, to insure economy in administration, and to remove the remaining inequities not removed by the bill now under consideration. To do this the joint committee would secure experts on insurance and retirement from outside sources.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the Taft amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think it is due the Civil Service Commission and the United States Senate that I should make the statement that the Civil Service Commission has cooperated wholeheartedly with our committee. Time and time again Mr. Irons gave us estimates of cost. Over a period of several months we asked for various estimates. We asked for estimates based upon one and a half million employees, two million employees, and two and a half million employees. We asked for estimates based upon a retirement fund of 1 percent, 1½ percent, 1¼ percent, and 2 percent. So far as I know, all the letters which were received by our committee were honest expressions of the Civil Service Commission, and I wish to say publicly that I think the Commission is doing a fine job.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to point out one further reason why I think we should not create more joint committees than we already have. There are no rooms left in which any new committee could find space to live. We have reached the point where I do not believe we should create any new committees unless we abolish some of the old ones. Unless there is some very strong reason for it, I do not believe that we should create new committees.

Furthermore, this is largely a technical actuarial subject. If such a study as has been suggested is to be made, it ought to be made in the first instance by the executive department of the Government. If the Senator from Delaware will introduce a measure directing some existing Government bureau to make the study, or establishing some agency to do it, such a proposal might be proper. If he does not like the Civil Service Commission, he might propose that the Bureau of the Budget or some other agency make this study. Such a study would seem to me to be more within the scope of the ability of the executive department than that of Congress. However, I believe that we ought not to create another joint committee at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I certainly will not sponsor a resolution creating another Government bureau.

A further example of the inefficient and biased advice we have received from the Civil Service Commission on all these proposals is revealed in the discussion to eliminate the so-called tontine payment, which is a deduction of $1 a month from the salary of all Government employees. All the testimony which was given before our committee by officials of the Commission was to the effect that its cancellation would not cost anything. This is another example of misleading testimony inexcusable in any competent Government official.

I read from a letter signed by Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, a member of the Civil Service Commission, under date of May 9. The letter is addressed to the chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, and in it Mr. Flemming states:

> This charge of $1 per month levied against each Federal employee has been an administrative problem ever since its inception. It is grossly unfair, in that the $1 per month is charged against the account of the low-salaried employee as well as the high-salaried employee. When full account is taken of the administrative handling charges, there is actually little net gain in income to the fund. Administration of the act by the agencies and by the Commission will be greatly simplified by the elimination of the tontine.

All the testimony which was given before the committee—and I think the chairman of the committee will agree with me—was to the effect that the elimination of the $1 a month so-called tontine charge would not change the cost of the bill, yet in another letter dated July 13, 1947, signed by Harry B. Mitchell, President of the Civil Service Commission—

> I was advised that the income from this tontine charge during the last year (1946) was $16,809,186.30.

Yet, Arthur Flemming, his associate member, says that it is a negligible amount, and that we can eliminate a $16,000,000 income without making any appreciable difference in the cost of the bill. My argument is that if we reduce that income, we must increase the appropriations to offset it. I agree that it would be much better and simpler to eliminate that charge and figure it in the percentage cost. I am not opposing the elimination of the tontine charge, but I do say that we should squarely recognize the cost. Yet prior to this letter representatives of the Civil Service Commission appeared before our committee, and the testimony was to the effect that such a provision would not cost anything.

The net income for the past 12 years has been more than $47,000,000. I have very little respect for the advice of any official in the Civil Service Commission who regards $47,000,000 as a negligible amount.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has spoken of the cooperation of Mr. Irons, the Chief of the Civil Service Commission retirement fund. Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Irons appeared before our committee and testified that the bill would cost nothing, during the summer months he has been campaigning all over the country for this piece of legislation, a fact which I think should be called to the attention of the Department of Justice. I wish to read a part of one of his speeches. In speaking before a group on this retirement bill Mr. Irons said:

> It is not the most generous survivorship program that can be reasonably designed, but the important thing, I think, is to get that principle across in legislation, to get it a firm part of the Retirement Act. There are other years coming. There will be more generous Congresses in the future.

Apparently he is going to help see to it that more liberal-minded men come to Congress. It appears to me that it is a violation of law for any official of any Government executive agency to go about the country lobbying for a piece of legislation. That is particularly true when he has appeared before the committee and has given false testimony on the bill.

I think it is time to establish a special committee to study this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to make one point clear. The bill is simple in its application and purpose. There are only two things involved in the entire picture.

Of necessity the bill had to be a technical bill; but the only two things involved are, first, whether we are willing to allow the Government employee, when he retires, to receive an extra $300 a year. That is a simple question.

The next point, which deals with a liberalization of the old law, is whether a widow should be allowed to collect what the husband, when he was an annuitant, would receive, and whether the dependent children would be involved.

The rest of the provisions relate to what class of employees will receive the benefits of the bill. They are technical provisions. Those are the principal things involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming from the House of Representatives, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the House bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill, and in lieu thereof to insert the text of Senate bill 637, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4127) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 637 is postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 4127 be printed, showing the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the statute it is necessary to name four Members of the Senate to the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy. On the recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Chair appoints the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the calendar is called on Monday next, Calendar No. 862, Senate Joint Resolution 111, approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

CONTROL OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I quote very briefly from an Associated Press story appearing in the last edition of the Washington Star under today's date:

> LONDON, January 23.—Winston Churchill declared today western Europe must unite quickly and demand a show-down with the Soviet Union before the Russians develop atomic weapons, possibly in a year or so.
>
> "Even an early show-down would not guarantee that war would not come," Churchill said, but:
>
> "I believe it would give the best chance of preventing it and, if it came, we would have the best chance of coming out of it alive.
>
> "I believe the best chance of preventing war is to bring matters to a head and come to a settlement with the Soviet Government before it is too late," Mr. Churchill told the House of Commons.
>
> "You may be sure the present situation cannot last. There are very grave dangers in letting everything run on and pile up until something happens and the matter passes all of a sudden out of your control."

Mr. President, I read these words with a deep sense of conviction that the former Prime Minister of Great Britain spoke words of prophecy when he made the statement which I have quoted.

Last May I addressed the Senate and pointed out, in connection with the problem of the peace, the importance of the control of weapons of mass destruction, and that unless and until complete and effective control of weapons of mass production was accomplished we were attacking the effects of the tragic situation in the world today and not the causes thereof.

I shall support aid for the stricken countries of Europe, but when I do so I shall be under no illusion that, successful though the program may be, we shall have accomplished the laying of a safe foundation of a peaceful society and a peaceful world as long as an atomic armament race is being engaged in by the two great powers of the earth.

I went on to point out last May, as the former Prime Minister of Great Britain points it out today, that unless we successfully conclude an arrangement for the control of weapons of mass destruction we are facing and proceeding straight to World War III. If, in engaging upon the Marshall program, so called, we are under any illusion that we are doing anything else except taking an important step toward the accomplishment of peace, and not striking at the hub of the matter, we shall be in error.

At a future time and on a future occasion I shall address the Senate on what I believe is necessary for the supplementation of the Marshall program, but I think it is well for the Senate and for the country and the Congress to have in mind now the basic fact which cannot be too much emphasized, that as long as this arms race proceeds, anything else we do to bring about the peace is preliminary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Guy Mason, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the nominations in the Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to direct a question to the senior Senator from Ohio. Our committee has been importuned to secure as rapid action as is possible on two small bills. I believe I previously notified the Senator of our interest in them. I understand the St. Lawrence seaway matter is going to be considered next week, and I wondered what chance there would be for consideration on Monday.

Mr. TAFT. I have no particular feeling about it. I think perhaps we ought to have a little notice, however, that the bills are coming up. That is my only reservation.

Mr. GURNEY. Then at this time I wish to mention the two bills which I should like to have called up on Monday. The first is the procurement bill. The other one would modify the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act in regard to the purchase of materials for the Navy and the Air Force.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, prior to the suggestion made just now by the Senator from South Dakota, the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution was made the unfinished business for Monday. Of course, the Senator from South Dakota has a perfect right to move that these other bills be brought up first on Monday, temporarily displacing the St. Lawrence seaway measure. But since the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is not in the Chamber at this time, I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota will withhold his request until Monday.

Mr. GURNEY. I do not believe it is necessary to make a formal request in regard to these bills, but I simply give notice of a desire to have them taken up for consideration as soon as possible. They are Calendar No. 597 and Calendar No. 657.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a week ago I asked to have the procurement bill passed over, during the call of the calendar, because other departments of the Government, particularly the Treasury procurement service, felt they should have the right to make purchases in emergency conditions in the same way that the armed services might have. However, I understand that the Comptroller General objects to having the procurement service given that right, and really is not enthusiastic about having the armed services given it.

In view of that situation, and inasmuch as I am not able to spend the necessary time in endeavoring to work out amendments and have them adopted, or possibly rejected, I shall not object to having the procurement bill acted upon at any time the Senate sees fit to take action upon it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that possibly the St. Lawrence seaway legislation will not consume all Monday afternoon; so probably after the termination of the consideration of that legislation on Monday, there will be an hour or so during which it will be possible to consider the two bills mentioned by the Senator from South Dakota.

Also there is another bill, I believe.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I would prefer not to have other bills brought into the picture at this time, until we determine what we shall do in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway measure. I submit that the proper time to bring up other bills will be on Monday afternoon, after we begin to consider the unfinished business, the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator from Ohio to say that the St. Lawrence seaway legislation will not consume very much time?

Mr. TAFT. My understanding is that on the first day of the consideration of such measures, Senators very often run out of speeches at about 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, the Senator from Ohio does not think the Senate will take final action on the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution on Monday?

Mr. TAFT. I do not.

THE UNTIMELY ENDS OF MY SENATOR FRIENDS—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, a poem by Horace C. Carlisle entitled "The Untimely Ends of My Senator Friends."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNTIMELY ENDS OF MY SENATOR FRIENDS

"The path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

These dear Senators who have now passed from my view
Out into the great Unknown Beyond,
All of them loved this life, with its struggle and strife,
But when Death called they had to respond—
And, tho these have all gone, still the Senate runs on,
Little changed by the passing of years,
As they sweep swiftly by, to where past ages lie,
Undeterred by life's turmoils and tears.

In their faces, now gone, their sweet characters shone
With a beauty that can't be expressed,
As they toiled on and on, toward the eternal dawn,
Without taking time for needed rest.
All of these, whom I knew, bade the Senate adieu,
To re-live in the sweet by-and-by—
And they all I've enshrined in the heart of my mind,
There to stay till I meet them on high.

Underwood, Harrison, Blease, and Sheppard are gone—
I saw Fletcher and Trammell both pass—
I saw death still the tongue of Maloney and Long,
Johnson, Norris, McNary, and Glass—
And, from this life below, I saw Bailey, Bilbo,
Bankhead, and Andrews, too, slip away—
In the harness they died, by their works glorified,
And the Senate mourns them to this day.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 26, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 21), 1948:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Joseph T. Sylvester, of Portland, Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance:

Frederick A. Johansen

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

Harold M. Janney
Russell O. Settle

Surgeon to be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Maurice A. Roe

Senior surgeon to be temporary medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Maurice A. Roe

Surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Harold M. Janney
Russell O. Settle

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be temporary sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Donald L. Snow
Roscoe H. Goeke

Senior assistant engineer to be temporary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

George L. Carley, Jr.

Senior scientists to be temporary scientist directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Floyd S. Daft
Justin M. Andrews

Senior assistant scientists to be temporary scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Harry D. Pratt
Roy F. Fritz
Ralph C. Barnes
Francis M. Middleton
H. Page Nicholson

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Raymond E. Hopper
William P. Battell
Cornelius P. Van Ness
Edson L. Lyman
George H. Cloud
Charles E. Shepard, Jr.
Peter A. McDonald
Thomas B. Hughes
William B. McKean
Fred D. Beans
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
Paul W. Russell
Frank M. Reinecke
John M. Davis
Walfried H. Fromhold
James T. Wilbur
Charles H. Hayes
Donald M. Weller
Edward A. Montgomery
Edgar O. Price
Robert E. Hill
James M. Daly
Ronald D. Salmon
Russell Lloyd
Ernest W. Fry, Jr.

The following-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

August Larson

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

William R. Williams
William F. Harris
Gordon D. Gayle
James D. McBrayer, Jr.
Jack Hawkins
James B. Glennon, Jr.
William A. Stiles
Edwin C. Aiken
Russell Duncan
Richard M. Huizenga
George M. Lhamon
William A. Cloman, Jr.
Alfred N. Gordon
Alfred F. Robertshaw
Jino J. D'Alessandro
Henry J. Revane
Melvin D. Henderson
Eliott B. Robertson
Chester A. Henry, Jr.
Sidney F. Jenkins
George F. Gober
John D. Howard
Fred T. Bishopp
Cecil W. Shuler
Glenn R. Long
Samuel D. Mandeville, Jr.
William G. Thrash
Louis Metzger
Luther R. Seibert
Wendell H. Best
John I. Williamson, Jr.
Robert S. Riddell
George T. Fowler
Warner T. Bigger
Charles A. Rigaud
Roger S. Bruford
Randall L. Stallings
Edwin C. Godbold
Warren P. Baker
James Taul
Homer E. Hire
George V. Hanna, Jr.
Richard Quigley
Royce W. Coln
Henry S. Massie
Alfred T. Greene
Melville M. Menefee
Wayne M. Cargill
James B. Moore
Louis L. Frank
Joseph W. Kean, Jr.
Theodore F. Beeman
Wyatt B. Carneal, Jr.
William C. Kellum
Richard K. Schmidt
Thomas V. Murto, Jr.
Morris E. Flater
Frank H. Collins
Albert H. Potter
Gordon A. Hardwick
Lyman D. Spurlock
Howard E. King
Waite W. Worden
James R. Anderson
Lee A. Christoffersen
Deryle N. Seely
Harold S. Roise
Roger C. Power, Jr.
Hoyt U. Bookhart, Jr.
Albert F. Moe
Martin W. Storm
John E. Morris
Randolph S. D. Lockwood
Robert D. Heinl, Jr.
Guy B. Smith, Jr.
Fred J. Klingenhagen
Clyde T. Smith
Wilbur F. Meyerhoff
Carl J. Cagle
John A. Burns
Francis C. Clagett
William G. Muller, Jr.
Benjamin B. Manchester III
Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.
Robert C. McDonough
Boyd O. Whitney
Richard D. Strickler
Frederick R. Findtner
James W. Keene
John F. Kinney
Michiel Dobervich
Robert F. Jenkins, Jr.
Lewis A. Jones
Norman E. Sparling
Julian V. Lyon
Carl M. Longley
Francis W. Benson
George R. Stallings
William J. McKennan
LeRoy P. Hunt, Jr.
Claude S. Sanders, Jr.
William R. Dorr, Jr.
Henry E. W. Barnes
Walter H. Stephens
Clarence R. Schwenke
John F. Mallard
George B. Thomas
Henry J. Smart
John E. Rentsch
Charles T. Hodges
Kenneth H. Black
William C. Humberd
Robert R. Burns
Marion E. Carl
Charles W. Somers, Jr.
Arthur H. Adams
Angus M. Fraser
Robert Hall
Ralph M. Wismer
Donald J. Robinson
Alfred M. Mahoney
Robert M. Hanna
Erik W. Ritzau
Earl W. Gardner
John C. Brewer
William D. Morgan
William E. Clasen
"J" Frank Cole
Lowell S. Reeve
Homer G. Hutchinson, Jr.
Allen H. Anderson
Glenn L. Todd
Elkin S. Dew
Erwin F. Wann, Jr.
Otis V. Calhoun, Jr.
Talbott F. Collins
John H. Partridge
Frederick J. Karch
Lawrence F. Fox
Horace H. Figuers
Joseph S. Skoczylas
Gerald G. Williams
John W. A. Antonelli
Edwin C. Kimball
George W. Herring
David C. Wolfe
Edward V. Mendenhall, Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Frederick Belton
John G. Johnson

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

Harold A. Strong

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Thomas B. Tighe
Bert Davis, Jr.
Robert W. Nelson
Hugh J. Irish
Thomas M. Leineweber
Thell H. Fisher
Daniel H. Davis
James L. Fawley, Jr.
Henry Matsinger
John E. King
James H. Naylor
Thomas T. Grady
William W. Curtis
Carl O. J. Grussendorf
Bertil E. Larson
Arthur L. Adams
George P. Wolf, Jr.
Franklin C. Bacon
Webster R. Hood
Robert W. Anderson
Vernon L. Bartram
Robert B. Neville
Howard F. Stevenson
George Codrea
Thomas C. Dutton
James A. Pounds III
Karl G. Palmer
Robert R. Fairburn
Robert B. McBroom
Charles A. Lipot
Walter E. Reynolds, Jr.
George J. Debell
Donald B. Otterson
James G. Juett
William E. Baugh
Drew J. Barrett, Jr.
Harry B. Smith
Robert L. Cochran
Charles D. Barrett, Jr.
Gerard T. Armitage
Frank J. Clarke
William A. Murphy
James F. Lawrence, Jr.
Walter J. Ridlon, Jr.
James A. Moriarty, Jr.
Jerrold O. Cote
Marshall R. Pilcher
James H. Crutchfield
Madison C. Whiteside
Orvin H. Ramlo
Cruger L. Bright
William J. Sims
George D. Wolverton
Thomas W. Furlow
Herbert A. Peters
Howard L. Walter
Leo F. Tatro, Jr.
Samuel Richards, Jr.
Matt S. Ober, Jr.
George L. Hollowell
Jack Cosley
Samuel B. Folsom, Jr.
Conrad G. Winter
Philip W. Kelly
Robert G. Howie
Richard L. Nickerson
Walter R. Bartosh
William E. Crowe
Robert R. Ayres, Jr.
Jack L. Brushert
George M. Dawes
Thomas A. Heaton
Arthur F. O'Keefe
William B. Freeman
Sidney L. Groff
Wallace G. Wethe
Thomas H. Mann, Jr.
Kenneth D. Frazier
Arvid W. Blackmun
John L. Mahon
Homer S. Hill
Elmer P. Thompson, Jr.
Louis F. Ferguson
Lawrence W. Smith, Jr.
Richard J. Flynn, Jr.
Willard C. Lemke
Carroll E. McCullah
Robert R. Read
Clarence H. Moore
Gordan E. Gray
Arthur N. Nehf, Jr.
Russell L. Janson
Martin B. Roush
Lawrence L. Herzog
Harry F. Schwethelm
James E. Johnson
Frank P. Barker, Jr.
Vance F. McKean
Richard H. Pierce
Charles E. Kollmann
Milton M. Cook, Jr.
Howard E. Cook
Lowell D. Grow
William L. G. Hughes
Jack B. Winters
Henry W. Horst
Carol D. Dalton
James E. Grubbs
Francis X. Witt, Jr.
Wallace J. Slappey, Jr.
William P. Dukes
John D. Noble
Roy R. Hewitt
John G. Babashanian
Gale W. Roberts
Jay E. McDonald
Harlen E. Hood
Joseph F. Wagner, Jr.
Scott G. Gier
James A. Etheridge
Robert D. Bachtel
Billie K. Shaw
James P. Wilson
Richard W. Schutt
Henry V. Joslin
Daniel J. Regan
Lyle K. London
Robert H. Daley
Harry A. Hadd
Floyd M. Johnson, Jr.
Richard M. Elliott
John C. Lundrigan
Victor J. Barringer
George S. Saussey, Jr.
Alexander S. Walker, Jr.
Ashby J. Fristoe
Paul D. Parker
Henry G. Gatlin, Jr.
Carl W. Hoffman
Robert R. Weir
Edward L. Bale, Jr.
Edward K. Pedersen
John W. Beebe
Robert K. Dahl
John C. Landrum
Robert L. Thomas
Dean S. Hartley, Jr.
Grant W. McCombs
William G. Johnson
Harold F. Brown
George B. Herlihy
Robert I. Conrad
William P. Mitchell
Robert F. Conley
Walter T. Warren
William D. Patterson, Jr.
Floyd C. Kirkpatrick
Ralph C. Rosacker
Harry C. Dees
Richard W. Batdorff
James W. Hendrick
Robert J. Bolish
Kenneth C. Greenough
Robert E. Brown

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Willis R. Lucius
Theodore A. Petras

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

John D. Case
Robert S. Stubbs II
Benjamin S. Read
Frederick A. Quint

Carl L. Hill
John S. Canton
Richard M. Giddens
Reverdy M. Hall
Edward O. Alsip
Edmund K. Griswold
Joseph P. Cushing
John D. Fair
Edward S. Fris
Harry B. Persinger, Jr.
Robert Baird
James W. Baker
Thomas H. Miller, Jr.
Frank C. Lang
Monroe E. McNiel
Ronald L. Bruce
John S. Parrott, Jr.
William J. Wachsler
Thomas R. O'Dell, Jr.
Robert M. Keim
Glenn L. Rieder
Laurel M. Mickelson
Edward R. Agnew, Jr.
William G. Dair, Jr.
James M. McGrew
Kenneth L. Moos
Theodore R. Yachik
John C. Donovan
George E. McClane
Chester R. Harris
John K. Sinderholm, Jr.
Alton F. Vergote
Charles B. Chambers
Wilbur G. Patton
William E. Greiner, Jr.
Benjamin G. Martin
George Nasif
James R. Martin
Frank J. Faureck
William R. Earney
Garth K. Sturdevan
William E. Melby
William M. Streeter
Peter A. Tonnema, Jr.
Robert E. Dawson
Robert D. Thurston
James B. Ord, Jr.
Charles F. McKiever
James T. Pearce
William A. Kerr
John B. Harney
Don E. Wegley
Lester E. Veigel
Charles C. Cresap
Clarence E. Corley, Jr.
Robert F. Seward
Victor A. Kleber, Jr.
Kenneth T. Whitescarver, Jr.
Harold E. Smith
Vincent J. Smith
Robert C. Lehnert
John H. Glenn, Jr.
Harry A. Stahlstrom
Earl W. Johnson
Robert J. Barbour
Rolland E. Marker
Robert J. Lynch, Jr.
Edward B. Winston
John W. Muldoon, Jr.
Rudolph L. Bittman
Victor A. Armstrong
David G. Johnson
Richard S. Rash
Robert M. Marshall
Robert L. Lamar
Albert G. Schoneberger
Herbert P. Mosca, Jr.
Royce W. Watson
Donald I. McKamy
Zaphney O. Humphreys
Ray T. Lemmons
Roy S. Bachstein
Donald S. Thornbury
George F. Lewis
Herbert E. Roser
Wilford L. Stone
Robert W. Lowe
Gordon A. Kroodsma
William E. Mack
Jess Thierry, Jr.
Gerald J. Tice
George M. Bryant
Arnold L. Emils
Ralph A. Soderberg
Charles D. Fredrick
Calvin C. Crum
Melvin J. Flannagan
"J" "P" Nixon
Eugene W. Nelson
James A. Harper
Charles H. Church, Jr.
Carl W. Lindell
Edwin H. Finlayson
Thomas J. Burnam
Manning T. Jannell
Loren K. Bronleewe
William R. Nowadnick
George W. Brewer
Harrold J. Eiland
Warren G. Hopkins
Thomas J. Ross
John E. Barnett
Alfred W. King
Donald L. Fenton
Harland E. Troy
Vernon J. Peebles
Rex Wilson
William L. Devinney
Jesse V. Booker
Floyd W. Earnest
Harry R. Moore
Nathan B. Peevey, Jr.
Francis C. Jennings
William M. Crapo, Jr.
Basil T. Idler
Herbert G. Manning, Jr.
John A. Gibson, Jr.
Donald T. Doxey
Fred C. Houser
James C. Stanfield
George E. Kelly
Frank G. Parks
John J. Richards
Stephen Shervais
Clifford D. Miller
William J. Wagner
Joseph E. Davies
Johnny D. Lindley
Robert L. Dominick
Edwin L. Hickman, Jr.
Charles C. Samis
William E. Brandon
Richard A. Bjorson
Joseph L. Freitas, Jr.
Harry E. Leland, Jr.
Walter E. Ottmer
John P. Roden
Myron E. Wilcox, Jr.
John Lomac
William H. Cowper
Frederick A. Vernon
Elwood H. Potter
Harvey M. Patton
John E. Hansen
Robert D. Limberg
Elwood D. Bush
Victor E. Allen
Earle E. Bagnall
John E. Vanhousen
Lynn W. Griffitts
Valdemar Schmidt, Jr.
William H. Livingston
Robert D. Janssen
David Cleeland
Paul N. Storaasli
Michael D. Harvath
Clifford P. Blankenship
James T. Cotton
Earl B. Sumerlin, Jr.
Reuel H. Pietz
Joel L. Neuman
John H. Lavoy
William E. Zimmer
Andrew L. McVicars
Emilius R. Ciampa, Jr.
Robert J. Lesak
Lee B. Swindall
James C. Jewell
Arthur F. Wilson, Jr.
Walter S. Metzger
Nathaniel H. Carver
James A. Blakely, Jr.
Edward F. Danowitz
Walter M. Atherton
Ross M. MacAskill
Vincent J. Robinson
James R. Poe
Frank J. Hubka
John H. Wagner
Leonard A. Lemback
James A. Gallo, Jr.
Elmer A. Anderson, Jr.
Albert A. Black
Leslie L. Page
Edward I. Lupton
Mervin B. Porter
William R. Van Ness
Thomas J. Bardon
Charles C. Schwartz
William M. Derby, Jr.
John R. Gill
Bruce A. Goewey
James A. Dorsey
James Payette
Lawrence P. Hart
Francis C. Buxton
Edwin J. Mika
Ernest A. Buford, Jr.
Robert Sabot
Roy L. Reed

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

James W. Tuma
Thomas H. Cutler
Good Burleson
Arthur A. Compton
James D. Swinson
Allen F. Stockdale
Richard W. Sinclair
Donald L. Shenaut
Edwin M. Clements
Max C. Taylor
Mainerd A. Sorensen
John E. Bugary
Ray M. Burrill
Reginald M. George
William A. Willett
Albert F. Rinehart
Fernand A. Landry
William T. Smith
Victor E. Sellers
Judson Vanderhoof
Donald W. Houston
Frederick V. Osborn
Alexander Gagyi
Jerome Hieronymus
Chester H. Fritts
Elwood E. Gebhart
Thomas C. Palmer, Jr.
Herman T. Barbee
Paul F. Brandenburg
Stanley P. Bulkowski
William G. Reid
Robert J. Corbett
Paul Kerns
John Gerey
Henry F. Camper
Fred R. Philpot
Arthur C. Fix
James E. Brown
Alfred M. Jones, Jr.
Charlie H. McGee, Jr.
Walter L. Simpson
Charles O. Diliberto
Edward E. Burt
Albert J. Assad
Wilbur C. Conley
Vernon L. Hendley
Anthony J. Roscoe

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 21), 1948:

In the Army

Lt. Gen. Joseph Lawton Collins to be Deputy Chief of Staff, United States Army, with the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Willard Stewart Paul to be Director, Personnel and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin to be Director of Intelligence, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy to be Director of Army Education System and Commandant, Command and General Staff College, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand to be Director, Service, Supply and Procurement, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Military Liaison Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission and Armed Forces Special Weapons Project

Maj. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to be Army member of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission and Chief of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project with the rank of lieutenant general.

Air Force

Appointments in the United States Air Force

Lt. Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg, to be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Lauris Norstad, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, to be commanding general, United States Air Force in Europe, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and Administration, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Howard Arnold Craig, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Matériel, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw, to be Deputy Commander, Air Matériel Command, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada to be commanding general, Tactical Air Command, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings to be air comptroller, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general with rank from October 1, 1947.

Temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States

To be major generals, with rank from October 1, 1947

Franklin Otis Carroll
Joseph Hampton Atkinson

To be brigadier generals, with rank from October 1, 1947

Edward Higgins White
John Beverly Montgomery
Horace Armor Shepard

In the Army

Appointment in the regular Army of the United States

To be major generals

Manton Sprague Eddy
Joseph Lawton Collins
Matthew Bunker Ridgway
LeRoy Lutes
John Reed Hodge
John Edwin Hull
Lucius DuBignon Clay
Albert Coady Wedemeyer
Raymond Stallings McLain
Stephen J. Chamberlin
Willis Dale Crittenberger
Geoffrey Keyes
Harold Roe Bull
Henry Spiese Aurand
James Alward Van Fleet
Clarence Ralph Huebner
Willard Stewart Paul
Robert Sprague Beightler
George Fleming Moore
William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr.
Walter Melville Robertson
Archibald Vincent Arnold
Louis Aleck Craig
Frank William Milburn
George Jacob Richards
Charles Wolcott Ryder
Stafford LeRoy Irwin
John William Leonard
Alfred Maximilian Gruenther
Joseph May Swing
Edward Hale Brooks
Wilton Burton Persons
Glen Edgar Edgerton
Everett Strait Hughes
Donald Hilary Connolly
Raymond Albert Wheeler
John Porter Lucas
Ira Thomas Wyche
John Louis Homer
Albert Monmouth Jones
Clift Andrus
Harry James Malony
Edwin Pearson Parker, Jr.
John Breitling Coulter
Lunsford Errett Oliver
William Richard Schmidt
Robert Walter Crawford
Orlando Ward
Jens Anderson Doe

Thomas Bernard Larkin
James Allen Lester
Paul John Mueller
Leland Stanford Hobbs
Roscoe Barnett Woodruff
Horace Logan McBride
William Morris Hoge
Willian Glenn Livesay
Robert Walker Grow
Edward Mallory Almond
Percy William Clarkson
Robert Chauncey Macon
William Curtis Chase
Leven Cooper Allen
Withers Alexander Burress
Daniel Noce
John Matthew Devine
Frederick Augustus Irving
William Willis Eagles
Ernest Nason Harmon
Arthur McKinley Harper
Milton Baldridge Halsey
Charles Love Mullins, Jr.
Frank Augustus Keating
Herman Feldman
Andrew Davis Bruce
Charles Lawence Bolté

To be brigadier generals

Joseph Cowles Mehaffey
Jonathan Waverly Anderson
Roscoe Campbell Crawford
James Kirk
Alfred Bixby Quinton, Jr.
Henry Balding Lewis
Charles Gardiner Helmick
Douglas Lafayette Weart
Henry Benton Sayler
Vernon Evans
Arthur Arnim White
Stanley Lonzo Scott
Charles Andrew Willoughby
Roderick Random Allen
Frank August Heileman
Albert Cowper Smith
William Frederick Marquat
Abram Franklin Kibler
John Ernest Dahlquist
Lester Johnson Whitlock
George Anthony Horkan
Ray Tyson Maddocks
Harry John Collins
Hobart Raymond Gay
Jerry Vrchlicky Matejka
Lewis Andrew Pick
William Herschel Middleswart
Russel Burton Reynolds
William Oliver Reeder
Robert Battey McClure
Lawrence Carmel Jaynes
Floyd Lavinius Parks
Hugh John Casey
William Maynadier Miley
Walter Leo Weible
Leslie Richard Groves
James George Christiansen
Paul Wilkins Kendall
Anthony Clement McAuliffe
Willard Gordon Wyman
William Benjamin Kean
Ewart Gladstone Plank
Lyman Louis Lemnitzer
Clovis Ethelbert Byers
Maxwell Davenport Taylor
Rollin Larrabee Tilton
Francis Page Hardaway
John Millikin
Benjamin Curtis Lockwood, Jr.
Edward Montgomery
Kenneth Thompson Blood
Harry Lewis Twaddle
Gordon Russell Young
Charles Morton Milliken
Edwin Albert Zundel
Pearson Menoher
Barnwell Rhett Legge
Roy Charles Lemach Graham
Robert Marks Bathurst
Elbert Louis Ford
William Kelly Harrison, Jr.
Aaron Bradshaw, Jr.
Laurence Bolton Kesler
George David Shea
Willard Wadsworth Irvine
Everett Ernest Brown
Eugene Martin Foster
Lewis Charles Beebe
George Leland Eberle
William Brooks Bradford
Ward Hale Maris
William Edward Bergin
Ralph Julian Canine
John Kirkland Rice
Robinson Earl Duff
Thomas Wade Herren
Hubert Don Hoover
Robert Oliver Shoe
Roy Victor Rickard
John Huston Church
Alonzo Patrick Fox
Josef Robert Sheetz
Truman Casper Thorson
William Arthur Beiderlinden
Thomas Francis Hickey
Harry Benham Sherman
Jesmond Dene Balmer
Reuben Ellis Jenkins
Robert Homer Soule
Whitfield Putnam Shepard
Ira Platt Swift
Walter Joseph Muller

To be major generals, Medical Corps

John Mitchell Willis
Raymond Whitcomb Bliss
George Corwin Beach, Jr.
Albert Walton Kenner
Malcolm Cummings Grow

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Omar Heinrich Quade
Edward Allen Noyes
James Albertus Bethea
Guy Blair Denit
Joseph Ignatius Martin

To be major general, Dental Corps

Thomas Lovet Smith

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Walter Duncan Love

To be brigadier general, Veterinary Corps

James Alexander McCallam

To be major general, Chaplain

Luther Deck Miller

To be brigadier general, Chaplain

Chaplain (Col.) James Hugh O'Neill

To be captain, Adjutant General's Department

Gordon M. Johnson

To be first lieutenants, Air Corps

George W. Gorman
Paul N. Harlow

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps

Benjamin G. Musser

To be first lieutenant, Air Corps

Howard R. Schroeder

To be second lieutenant, Air Corps

Kenneth B. Smith

To be second lieutenant, Infantry

Samuel T. Rhodes

To be second lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps

Andrew J. Roach

To be second lieutenant, Infantry

Robert K. Weaver

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Doyle Overlton Hickey
Joseph Cowles Mehaffey
Jonathan Waverly Anderson
Roscoe Campbell Crawford
James Kirk
Alfred Bixby Quinton, Jr.
Henry Balding Lewis
Charles Gardiner Helmick
Douglas Lafayette Weart
Henry Benton Sayler
Vernon Evans
Arthur Arnim White
Stanley Lonzo Scott
Charles Andrew Willoughby
Roderick Random Allen
Frank August Heileman
Albert Cowper Smith
William Frederic Marquat
Abram Franklin Kibler
John Ernest Dahlquist
Lester Johnson Whitlock
George Anthony Horkan
Ray Tyson Maddocks
Hobart Raymond Gay
Jerry Vrchlicky Matejka
Lewis Andrew Pick
William Herschel Middleswart
Russel Burton Reynolds
William Oliver Reeder
William Maynadier Miley
Walter Leo Weible

To be brigadier generals

Wendell Westover
Franklin Prague Shaw

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

William Henry Draper, Jr.
John Francis Williams
Julius Ochs Adler

To be brigadier generals

Paul William Johnston
Robert West Chamberlin
Edwin Norman Clark
Henry Russell Drowne, Jr.
Charles Birdsall Ferris
Ernest Henry Hawkwood
Kenneth Barnard Keating
Norman Miller Lack
John Williams Morgan
Washington Platt
Albert Hummel Stackpole
William Miles Stokes, Jr.
Kenneth Castle Townson
Alfred Girard Tuckerman
Elbert Parr Tuttle
Morris Carlton Troper

To be brigadier general, Honorary Reserve

Gordon Cloyd Hollar

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals of the line

Raymond Hartwell Fleming
John Hall Manning

To be brigadier generals of the line

Ronald Cornelius Brock
Brendan Austin Burns
Hugh Melvin Fanning
Joseph Bacon Fraser
Karl Frederick Hausauer
John Calhoun Henagan
Albert Sidney Johnson
Ralph Andrus Loveland
Donald Wilson McGowan
Howard Hebbard Maxwell
Robert Edward Moffet
Russell York Moore
Fritz Albert Peterson
William Childs Purnell
Joseph Wallace West
Harold Theodore Weber
William Frank Weiler

To be brigadier generals, Adjutant General's Department

Theodore Albert Arndt
Kenneth Buchanan
Chester William Goble
Mark Walter Lance
Spencer Hurley Mitchell
John Francis Mullen
Joseph Evelyn Nelson
Irving Otto Schaefer
Floyd Wayne Stewart
John Edward Walsh

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS

To be rear admirals, officers of the line

Maurice E. Curts
Dixwell Ketcham

Vice Adm. John L. McCrea, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as deputy commander in chief, Pacific Fleet.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Miles, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of the Material Division, Office of the Under Secretary of the Navy.

Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander in chief, Pacific and United States Pacific Fleet.

Vice Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, United States Naval Forces in the Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. John D. Price, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Vice Adm. Harold B. Sallada, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, United States Pacific Fleet.

Capt. Homer N. Wallin, United States Navy, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Earl E. Stone	Francis X. McInerney
Augustus J. Wellings	John P. Womble, Jr.
William S. Parsons	Byron H. Hanlon
James E. Maher	Robert F. Hickey
Leon S. Fiske	Ruthven E. Libby
Harry R. Thurber	Herbert E. Regan
John E. Whelchel	John P. Whitney
James H. Doyle	Hugh H. Goodwin
Clarence E. Olsen	Edgar A. Cruise
Lucian A. Moebus	

APPOINTMENTS TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL IN THE NAVY

Howard M. Shaffer	Alfred W. Chandler
William N. Thomas	Spry O. Claytor
Thornton C. Miller	

APPOINTMENTS TO THE TEMPORARY GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL IN THE NAVY

Herbert L. Pugh	Herbert C. Lassiter
Bertram Groesbeck, Jr.	John Ball
	Clemens V. Rault
Howard M. Shaffer	

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be ensigns

John C. Shannon	Jerry W. Bates
Charles R. Mischke	Edward F. Krueger
Charles B. Teal	

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Lowell K. Cuuningham	Robert W. Jessee
	Lee W. Stewart
James H. Harris	

To be ensigns

Marshall V. Perry	Charles R. E. Deily
Thomas H. Boothman	Earl F. Liebtag, Jr.
James C. Carroll	Harold H. Reichert
Fred L. Cofer, Jr.	William D. Warne

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert C. Doerpinghaus
William E. Nims

NURSE CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be ensign

Patricia L. Ratcliffe

APPOINTMENTS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY

To be commander

William L. Eagleton

To be lieutenant commanders

Roger VanN. Powelson
Gerald V. Reynolds

To be lieutenants

Harold M. Gutekunst
Dick M. Wheat

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MEDICAL CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenant commanders

Joseph A. Forte, Jr.
Henry W. Miller

To be lieutenants

Alfred J. DelRey
Dominic A. Kuljis

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Jay S. Broadbent	John M. Jones
Carleton J. Brown	James M. Keirman
David M. Butler	Jay R. Longley
Richard B. Connor	John S. Neill
Kevin A. Doyle	John M. Packard
Adolphus W. Dunn	Bernard H. Pender
John G. Esswein	Robert W. Ratton
Frederick L. Evans	Stanley E. Reese
Mack M. Hill, Jr.	Lawrence F. Smith

APPOINTMENTS IN THE DENTAL CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenant commanders

John E. Carson
John R. Wible

To be lieutenants

William J. Harrison	Grant A. MacLean
James F. Keenan	Joe A. Teaff

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Malcolm E. Boone	Charles E. Oxar
William J. Carter	Eugene P. Weigand, Jr.
Blayne A. Gumm	

APPOINTMENT IN THE MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenant commander

William P. Briggs

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NURSE CORPS OF THE NAVY

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Gladys LaV. Kennedy
Ruth C. Vickers

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Clifton B. Cates to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 4 years from January 1, 1948.

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Watson to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general in the Marine Corps while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, we pray that the people of America, who have made such progress in material things, may now seek to grow in spiritual understanding.

For we have improved means, but not improved ends. We have better ways of getting there, but we have no better places to go. We can save more time, but are not making any better use of the time we save.

We need Thy help to do something about the world's true problems—the problem of lying, which is called propaganda; the problem of selfishness, which is called self-interest; the problem of greed, which is often called profit; the problem of license, disguising itself as liberty; the problem of lust, masquerading as love; the problem of materialism, the hook which is baited with security.

Hear our prayers, O Lord, for the spiritual understanding which is better than political wisdom, that we may see our problems for what they are. This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FORREST C. DONNELL, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DONNELL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

GUY CORDON, a Senator from the State of Oregon, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 23, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp;

S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;

S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.;

S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil;

S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564);

S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard;

S. 1020. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss;

S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.;

S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; and

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gandiaga.

ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that beginning next Monday, February 2, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold hearings on the Legislative Reorganization Act. We are conducting these hearings in connection with the performance of the duty laid upon us by the act itself of "evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government."

We have scheduled meetings for this purpose for Monday morning, February 2, Tuesday morning and afternoon, and Wednesday morning, and have invited a number of witnesses to appear because of their known special interest in the act, or because of the congressional offices which they hold. I am sure that there are many others, both Members of Congress and private citizens, who have followed closely the operation of the act, and whose comments on its effectiveness to date and suggestions for further improving congressional organization and procedure would be of great value to the committee. I wish to take this opportunity of inviting all such persons to make known to the committee their interest in testifying at this series of hearings. Our schedule for the first 3 days is fairly full, but we shall certainly give everyone who expresses an interest an opportunity to be heard before the hearings are concluded.

PUBLIC HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS ON S. 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to announce that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works will begin public hearings on Monday, February 2, 1948, at 10 a. m., on Senate bill 1954, "to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes." All interested parties will be afforded an opportunity to be heard on the provisions of the bill. Witnesses are requested to file with the committee written statements of their proposed testimony at least 1 day in advance of the hearings. The hearings will be held in the committee room of the Senate Committee on Public Works, 412 Senate Office Building.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee may be permitted to meet this afternoon, because unexpectedly a number of individuals came down from New York to give testimony before the subcommittee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Training of Foreign Nationals

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the President to permit nationals of other nations to receive instruction and training in schools, training establishments, ships, units, and other installations maintained or administered by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Operations Under Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on operations under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, for the period January 1 to December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands.

Report of Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth annual report on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Report of National Archives Trust Fund Board

A letter from the Chairman of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report of Operations of the Government of the District of Columbia

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, Etc.

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifteenth annual report of that Administration, covering reports of all its constituent units, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the State Water Resources Board of California, Sacramento, Calif., favoring an appropriation of $52,181,000 for construction of federally authorized flood-control projects in California, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

INDIAN RESERVATIONS—RESOLUTION OF ANCHORAGE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the directors of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, relating to Indian reservations, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Senators H. BUTLER (Nebraska) and ARTHUR V. WATKINS (Utah) on December 4, 1947, introduced in the Eightieth Congress, first session, Senate Joint Resolution 162, which, if enacted, would rescind the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to establish Indian reservations at Akutak, Karluk, Wales, Unalakleet, and Venetie, or any other Indian reservation in the Territory of Alaska, and would also rescind the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to make Indian reservations in the future;

Whereas this resolution would settle, once and for all, the question of aboriginal titles in Alaska;

Whereas documents pertaining to the transfer of Alaska from Russia to the United States, and actions of the United States Government throughout the 80 years of American ownership of Alaska, have not and do not recognize the rights of natives based on the use and occupancy of lands in Alaska;

Whereas the development of Alaska has been and is now deterred and impeded in that no private interests will now risk the financing of any enterprise so long as Alaskan lands remain in their present uncertain condition of turmoil and confusion: Therefore be it

Resolved by the directors of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, acting for and in behalf of their members, That Senate joint resolution be endorsed and approved and the authors congratulated on their recognition of one of the foremost problems of the Territory and for their action in initiating legislation which should eliminate it.

———, *President.*

C. J. ABEL, *Secretary.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2061. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER) introduced Senate bill 2062, to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2063. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2064. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to 25, inclusive, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2065. A bill to provide for the payment of national service life insurance benefits in the case of John J. Garot; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2066. A bill for the relief of Pasch Bros.; and

S. 2067. A bill for the relief of John F. McKenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2068. A bill for the relief of Dr. Benea Sih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 2069. A bill for the relief of Elmer Beller; and

S. 2070. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2071. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2072. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code entitled 'Copyrights,'" approved July 30, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2073. A bill to provide for a temporary embargo on petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT TO FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT RELATING TO MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill dealing with the subject of the minimum wage, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief explanatory statement of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The bill (S. 2062) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in introducing this bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, I am not merely carrying out a routine legislative function. The Fair Labor Standards Act is a cornerstone of the social legislation for which Americans have fought for generations, and it occupies a special place in our history.

The principle behind the wage-hour law was stated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in his message to the Congress on May 24, 1937. He said:

> A self-supporting and self-respecting democracy can plead no justification for the existence of child labor, no economic reason for chiseling workers' wages, or stretching workers' hours.

When, Congress, almost 10 years ago, enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act, the representatives of all the people agreed for the first time in our history that there would be at least a bare minimum which a man must be paid for his work. They defined a general maximum working week and provided that work in excess of that maximum receive special compensation.

Today, the act is still on the books, but its purpose has been to a great degree negated. The passage of years, a war, and resulting inflation have combined to render the 40-cent minimum completely meaningless. Those 40 cents today will buy barely half as much food as they did when the law was passed. And over half of our working population is still excluded from the benefits of the act.

The time is long overdue for action to change this law from a historical landmark to a living reality. Wage-hour legislation was originally conceived as a continuous and expanding process. Standards set up were to be extended and improved to match the growth of the Nation. President Roosevelt said, and the Congress then agreed, that we must "take further action to extend the frontiers of social progress" for the benefit of those "who toil in factory and on farm." And it was recognized that the rudimentary standards set up in the act were but a first step.

We have hesitated and we have allowed the minimum wage to be slashed by inflation. To maintain the wage-hour law we must again make it meaningful. In the amendments I am introducing, I have sought to take the next steps in the continuous process by which we will approach not merely bare minimum standards but fair standards.

The bill I am proposing would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act in a number of principal respects:

First. It would raise the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour 120 days after its enactment. It would again put into operation the procedure of the original act whereby industry committees composed of industry, labor, and the public may raise the wage to $1 an hour where this is found feasible. The special procedure for determining wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are not changed.

Second. It would broaden the coverage of the minimum wage and overtime provisions by extending these provisions to workers engaged in any activity affecting interstate or foreign commerce. The exemption for employees in retail selling and servicing enterprises is narrowed so that it would not apply to employees in chain stores or department stores. Seamen are granted protection under both the wage and hour provisions. Industries processing agricultural or horticultural commodities or fish are covered by the minimum wage and overtime provisions. Both the seasonal industry exemption and the unworkable area-of-production exemption provisions have been deleted. Employees of motor carriers are covered by the overtime-pay provisions, unless, at the time the work was performed, the Interstate Commerce Commission had set qualifications and maximum hours of service for the covered occupation. The newspaper exemption is the same as in the present act. The telephone-operator exemption is removed so that switchboard operators of all exchanges will be covered by the minimum-wage and overtime provisions. The agriculture exemption is narrowed so that workers on large, industrialized farms—those regularly employing eight or more, not including the children of the farmer—will have the protection of the wage provisions of the act.

Third. It would abolish the exploitation of children in industry and industrialized agriculture. It would do this by directly prohibiting the employment of children in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and by narrowing the agricultural exemption to the child-labor provisions so that this exemption would not apply to children in industrialized agriculture; that is, to children employed on farms with more than eight employees. I deem it a matter of national shame that we have for so long permitted the narrow coverage of section 12 in the present act to limit the so-called prohibition of child labor to service performed in and about plants producing goods for interstate commerce. By interpretation this has been held to exclude from protection of the act thousands of minors who need and are entitled to such protection. Now the weakest and most necessitous wage earners will be given protection equivalent to the protection which has, for 10 years, been given adults under this act.

Fourth. The definition of "wage" in section 3 (m) is changed to exclude the cost of food and lodging in the calculation of minimum wages for seamen and dining-car employees. This amendment is necessary in order to assure an adequate minimum wage for a group of employees who have no choice in the acceptance of certain subsistence facilities.

I recommend these amendments with the same pride and spirit which I felt when I came before this body years ago in recommending the original Fair Labor Standards Act. It is with a full understanding and thankfulness for the good that has come for the thousands and thousands of people who have benefited by this act that I urge this body to give serious consideration to these proposals which would take us another step toward assuring a secure and full life for our millions of working people.

REDUCTION IN INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes. The language of the amendment I am submitting is the same as that used by me in an amendment I submitted to the tax bill in 1944.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS—RESIGNATION OF MR. TAFT AS CONFEREE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it has been called to my attention that it appears in the RECORD of the 23d instant that I was appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate on House bill 4127, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I be relieved from service on the conference committee. I am not a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I do not think it is a wise precedent to go outside the membership of committees sponsoring bills in the appointment of conferees.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's resignation is noted.

Subsequently, Mr. FLANDERS was appointed a conferee on the part of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, in place of Mr. TAFT, resigned.

TIVOLI BREWING CO.—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during a previous call of the calendar I moved for the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 551, a bill for the relief of the Tivoli Brewing Co. It is my information from the clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary that the subject matter of the bill has been settled by a Government department, and the Senator from Michigan is agreeable to having it indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill is indefinitely postponed.

ABBOT LOW MOFFAT—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF A BILL

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1336 for the relief of Abbot Low Moffat, introduced by me on May 26, 1947, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DAYLIGHT SAVING FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that at an appropriate time, either today or as soon after today as it may be in order, I shall move to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1481, Calendar No. 485, to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 26, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp;

S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;

S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.;

S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil;

S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564);

S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard;

S. 1020. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss;

S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.;

S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; and

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gandiaga.

PEACE ON EARTH—ADDRESS BY ARTHUR GAETH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, Peace on Earth, broadcast December 24, 1947, by Mr. Arthur Gaeth, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT AND INSTALLATION OF ARCHBISHOP O'BOYLE

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Archbishop O'Boyle to the people and an excerpt from his installation address, as reported in the Catholic Review, which appear in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN AID PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM JOPLIN (MO.) GLOBE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Would You Vote the Bonds?", published in the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of January 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PAWTUCKET TIMES

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "HOLC Report," published in the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of January 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS' MAJOR SURGERY FOR TRUMAN'S BLOATED BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM THE SAN ANTONIO EXPRESS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress' Major Surgery for Truman's Bloated Budget," from the San Antonio (Tex.) Express of January 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate previously entered, it is provided, that on Monday, January 26, 1948, at the conclusion of morning business, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 863. The clerk will state in order the bills on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hill	Overton
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hatch	O'Conor	
Hayden	O'Daniel	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on official State business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTED] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE PROPOSED RESUMPTION OF MEAT RATIONING AND PRICE CONTROLS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a short statement on the subject of meat rationing and price controls.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Fred W. Heine, president, and Will J. Miller, secretary-treasurer of the Kansas Livestock Association, protesting against reimposition of meat rationing and price controls.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I want to say that I am in thorough agreement with the protest against meat rationing and price controls.

Both these things amount to deceiving the people as to actual facts in the food situation.

Price controls, which sooner or later again would require Government subsidies to secure needed production, deceive consumers as to the actual cost of the goods they buy.

Unless price controls are established all along the line, from prices on the raw materials to the finished product, they cannot be really effective.

Also, unless producers, handlers, and consumers cooperate in observing the controls, the real price of goods will be set in black markets operating more closely to the law of supply and demand. During the war emergency, the patriotic urge to help win the war helped price controls to work after a fashion. But everyone knows that toward the end of wartime controls, black markets set the prices in many lines.

Rationing of meat while other foods are left in a free market will tend to reduce still more the supply of meats available, when what is needed is more production, not less.

Incidentally, rationing can only be justified as an emergency measure when there is a real scarcity of the rationed article, and when only by rationing can such scarce article be made available to consumers in the markets.

Consumers this year, according to all reliable estimates, will have 20 pounds more meat per capita the coming 12 months than they had in the 5-year period before the war, and only about 10 pounds less than last year.

High prices are the effect of continued Government spending, continued high-dollar incomes, and the export of goods not in surplus supply. Price controls and rationing will simply add to and continue the inflation with a resultant worse collapse when the break does come.

I am opposed to programs calling for price controls and rationing, and wish to join especially in the protest of the Kansas Livestock Association against reimposition of meat rationing. I ask that the letter from officers of the Kansas Livestock Association be printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Topeka, Kans., January 20, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Press and radio reports indicate that meat rationing and price controls are being seriously considered in Washington.

The Kansas livestock interests are violently opposed to any action by Congress or Executive order by the President which would reestablish such regulations.

Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that our livestock production for 1948 will make 145 pounds of meat available per capita for the Nation's 143,000,000 consumers. This will be approximately 20 pounds more per person annually that was available for the period 1935–39.

The anticipated meat supply for 1948, given an opportunity to flow through regular channels without restriction will reach consumers on an equitable basis.

Meat rationing and price controls did not work under wartime regulations and certainly will not work now.

In the past they were responsible for black-market unequal distribution, meat shortages, and exorbitant prices to the public at large in practically every city and hamlet of the Nation.

Meat rationing and price controls, if forced upon the American people, will not only be responsible for decreasing the meat supply in 1948 and 1949, but will result in the loss of many animal byproducts used by the medical profession for the protection of the Nation's health; and, furthermore, will mean the destruction of a significant percentage of the Nation's meat supply because of improper processing and handling of meat by black-market operators.

We further know that consumers in the lower-income brackets, because of unequal distribution and exorbitant meat prices, would suffer the most severely under such restrictions and regulations as may be imposed.

We respectfully request that you use your influence to avoid the initiation of rationing or price controls now under consideration in Washington.

Cordially yours,

FRED W. HEINE,
President.
WILL J. MILLER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered on Monday, January 19, the call of the calendar is in order, beginning with Calendar No. 863, Senate bill 1485. The bill will be stated by title.

SALE OF ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN SCHOOL LANDS

The bill (S. 1485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion and subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to sell or exchange all or any part of those certain areas heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico, situated within tracts Nos. 97a, 97b, and 98 as shown on the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District map, comprising approximately thirty and seventy-five one-hundredths acres. In effecting any sale or exchange hereunder the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute such deeds or other instruments as may be necessary to transfer the title to any land so sold or exchanged. Any exchanges of land effected pursuant to this act shall be on an equal-value basis.

SEC. 2. That the proceeds derived from any sale made under authority of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as school revenues, pursuant to the act of May 27, 1926 (44 Stat. 560), and shall be available in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase of other lands and improvements or interests therein for the use of said Albuquerque Indian School.

PAYMENTS TO SEMINOLE INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

The bill (S. 1733) to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in making the payment to the enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma or their heirs, authorized in section 1 of the act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.), the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior under date of October 14, 1942, shall be followed in ascertaining the heirs of the enrolled members entitled to share in the funds of said tribe as to those persons who died prior to the act of December 24, 1942 (Public, No. 833, 77th Cong.), and payment shall be made accordingly.

CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY TO OSAGE INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3326) to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the bill should be passed, but the Committee on Public Lands has received a suggestion from the Osage Tribal Council of Oklahoma proposing an amendment, which is recommended by the committee and also by the Department. I propose such an amendment. On page 1, line 3, the amendment would strike out the words "upon request of the Indian."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the name "Interior", it is proposed to strike out "upon request of the Indian."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REPEAL OF INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS IN CERTAIN PARTS OF MINNESOTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1049) to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, I will give the explanation.

This bill removes the restrictions of the Indian liquor laws as applied to Indians in the State of Minnesota away from the Indian reservation.

Many decades ago, laws were passed commonly known as the Indian liquor laws, designed to prevent Indians from securing liquor. It was felt at that time that use of liquor by the Indians led to debauchery and enabled the white man to exploit the Indian. Now conditions have changed, and many Indians feel keenly their inability to buy any type of liquor even when outside the Indian reservation. In practice, the Indian liquor laws are not enforceable when the Indians are away from the reservation, because in many cases bartenders do not know whether their customers are Indians or not, and are not familiar with the laws. This bill would simply repeal all such restrictions in Minnesota against purchase of liquor by Indians away from the Indian reservation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Legislature of Minnesota, at its last legislative session, amended the laws of the State of Minnesota relating to Indians, so as to permit Indians to buy liquor away from the reservation. This bill would permit Indians to buy liquor off the reservation in the same manner that you or I might buy it. The bill would conform to the laws already enacted in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In view of the explanation, I will leave it to the State of Minnesota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question about the bill. I did not quite hear the explanation which was made, because of the confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the old statute forbade the sale of liquor to Indians, particularly as related to States where there are Indian reservations. The State of Minnesota, at the last session of the legislature, in 1947, amended the statute so as to permit the Indians to buy liquor in public liquor places, just as any other citizen would buy it.

One of the reasons why the State found itself in favor of such an amendment was that returning World War II veterans, as well as World War I veterans, would enter liquor establishments anywhere in the State, and they would be confronted with the fact that they would be denied the right to purchase liquor, even though they had but a fraction of Indian blood in them. That was the law. So the State amended its law. The purpose of the pending bill is more or less to conform to the type of correction which we have attempted to make in that State.

Mr. HATCH. There are Indians on reservations in Minnesota, are there not?

Mr. THYE. In any liquor establishment in the State, if it were known to the keeper that a man had Indian blood in him, he would be denied the right to sell liquor to him. The correction is to permit him to buy liquor in the same manner that any other citizen would be privileged to buy it.

Mr. HATCH. The law to which the Senator refers is one of general application throughout the United States in States where there are Indian reservations. What the bill proposes is to make a separate provision for Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The title of the bill is "An act to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota."

Mr. HATCH. Then it does not relate to the entire State of Minnesota, but only to certain parts of the State.

Mr. THYE. Of course, it could not and would not relate to the reservations, but it relates to territory off the reservations. If an Indian came to Minneapolis, St. Paul, or any other town off the reservation, the bartender could not legally sell him liquor. This bill would amend the law so as to permit such sales.

Mr. HATCH. I shall not object at this time. However, after I examine the bill and the report further, I may ask for reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed, because I think it establishes a rather dangerous precedent by making a certain act of Congress not effective in one section of the country, but effective in all other parts of the country where similar conditions prevail. I doubt the wisdom of such procedure, making separate provisions for the State of Minnesota. I shall not object at this time. However, I shall look into the question.

Mr. O'DANIEL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to the consideration of House bill 1049, Calendar No. 866.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. The bill was passed during the call of the calendar today, was it not?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I assume there is no objection to the Senator's request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the reconsideration of the vote by which House bill 1049 was passed?

Mr. THYE. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

RIGHTS-OF-WAY THROUGH OSAGE INDIAN LAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3322) to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, empowered to grant rights-of-way for all purposes, subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, over and across any lands now or hereafter held in trust by the United States for individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations, or any lands now or hereafter owned, subject to restrictions against alienation, by individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations, including the lands belonging to the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico, and any other lands heretofore or hereafter acquired or set aside for the use and benefit of the Indians.

SEC. 2. No grant of a right-of-way over and across any lands belonging to a tribe organized under the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended; the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250); or the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), shall be made without the consent of the proper tribal officials. Rights-of-way over and across lands of individual Indians may be granted without the consent of the individual Indian owners if (1) the land is owned by more than one person, and the owners or owner of a majority of the interests therein consent to the grant; (2) the whereabouts of the owner of the land or an interest therein are unknown, and the owners or owner of any interests therein whose whereabouts are known, or a majority thereof, consent to the grant; (3) the heirs or devisees of a deceased owner of the land or an interest therein have not been determined, and the Secretary of the Interior finds that the grant will cause no substantial injury to the land or any owner thereof; or (4) the owners of interests in the land are so numerous that the Secretary finds it would be impracticable to obtain their consent, and also finds that the grant will cause no substantial injury to the land or any owner thereof.

SEC. 3. No grant of a right-of-way shall be made without the payment of such compensation as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be just. The compensation received on behalf of the Indian owners shall be disposed of under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. This act shall not in any manner amend or repeal the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended by the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 838), nor shall any existing statutory authority empowering the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way over Indian lands be repealed hereby.

SEC. 5. Rights-of-way for the use of the United States may be granted under this act upon application by the department or agency having jurisdiction over the activity for which the right-of-way is to be used.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe any necessary regulations for the purpose of administering the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. This act shall not become operative until 30 days after its approval.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations."

TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS ADJACENT TO MUNCIE, IND.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2361) to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818, which had been

reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment, on page 3, line 8, after the words "September 1", to strike out "1947" and insert in lieu thereof "1948"; and at the end of line 13, to strike out "1947" and insert in lieu thereof "1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DISPOSAL OF SUBMARGINAL LANDS IN MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND SOUTH DAKOTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3153) to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Lands was, in section 7, on page 2, line 18, after the word "county", to insert "in which the major portion of the Indian reservation lies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 3, line 12, after the word "units", to insert "for experimental purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 2, to strike out:

The title to any lands remaining unsold or otherwise undisposed of after 2 years from the date of approval of this act are hereby declared to be in the United States in trust for the Indians of the reservation for whose use and benefit the lands were assigned by Executive order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 9, after the word "be", to strike out "divided as follows: (a) One-fourth shall be paid to the county in which the lands are located; (b) one-fourth shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States; (c) one-half shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribe of the reservation for whose use and benefit the tract concerned was assigned by Executive order" and insert "covered into the Treasury of the United States for credit to miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO MRS. MARY E. LEAF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 773) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary E. Leaf, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "upon application in writing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Mrs. Mary E. Leaf, of McIntosh, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to her in Corson County, State of South Dakota: The west half of section 20, township 22 north, range 21 east, of the Black Hills meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FORT PECK RESERVATION

The bill (S. 1591) to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in aid of the administration of the Fort Peck project, there is hereby granted to the United States, for use by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau"), in the discharge of its duties pursuant to the act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403), the electric-transmission lines, substations, rights-of-way, and other property described in section 7 of that certain permit and memorandum of understanding, dated November 2, 1945, between the Bureau and the Office of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Indian Office"): *Provided, however*, That the Bureau shall continue to furnish electric service for the uses and purposes of the Indian Office on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, pursuant to the terms and conditions of said permit and memorandum of understanding, except as the same may be modified by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. That the amount of money to be paid for said property shall be $58,577.52, or so much thereof as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be needed pursuant to the provisions of said permit and memorandum of understanding. Such sum shall be paid, from funds now or hereafter made available to the Department of the Interior for the construction of transmission lines and substations of the Fort Peck project, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who shall deposit such sum in the Treasury of the United States as a credit on expenditures made for irrigation and power construction on the Fort Peck Indian irrigation project.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts as may be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

PATENT IN FEE TO MABEL TOWNSEND PRETTY ON TOP

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 400) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mabel Townsend Pretty On Top, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "upon application in writing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Mabel Townsend Pretty On Top, of Lodge Grass, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in the State of Montana: The southwest quarter of section 13 and the southeast quarter of section 14, township 7 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO CLARENCE M. SCOTT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 401) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, upon the filing of a written application by the Indian owner named in this act, to issue to Clarence M. Scott, of Billings, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands, including homestead lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The south half of section 16, and the north half of the northwest quarter and the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 21, township 6 south, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES PERRY DOYLE

The bill (S. 1517) authorizing the issuance to James Perry Doyle of a patent in fee to certain lands in Big Horn County, Mont., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to James Perry Doyle, a Crow Indian allottee No. 1661, of Sheridan, Wyo., a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: Southeast quarter of section 17, township 8 south, range 37 east; the northwest quarter and the north half of the north half of the southwest quarter, section 21, township 8 south, range 37 east; the east half of the east half of the northwest quarter, the northeast quarter and the north half of the southeast quarter of section 20, township 7 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 640 acres.

ROBERT E. DOYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1407) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Robert E. Doyle, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "authorized" to strike out the words "and directed" and insert "in his discretion"; on page 1, line 9, after the words "half of the", to strike out "northeast quarter, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the southwest quarter, and the east half of the southeast quarter, section 29; township 8 south, range 36 east", and to insert "northwest quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter, section 28; the north half of the northeast quarter, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the southeast quarter, and the east half of the east half of the west half, section 29; township 8 south, range 37 east", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized in his discretion to issue to Robert E. Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The north half of the northwest

quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter, section 28; the north half of the northwest quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter, section 28; the north half of the northeast quarter, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, the southeast quarter, and the east half of the east half of the west half, section 29; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 640 acres.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE, MINNESOTA

The bill (S. 1611) to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn., authorized to be built by the Minnesota Department of Highways and the counties of Benton and Stearns in Minnesota, by an act of Congress approved October 9, 1940, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved June 1, 1944, is hereby extended 3 years from October 9, 1946.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION NEAR YORKTOWN, VA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1545) to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 1, line 5, to insert after the word "him" the words "and to the Secretary of the Navy"; on page 2, beginning in line 2, to insert after the word "bridge" the words "the level and design of which shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy, such bridge"; to strike out on page 2, line 24, the words "The value of park lands involved shall be determined by a committee of three appraisers, one to be chosen by the Governor of Virginia, one to be chosen by the Secretary of the Interior, and the third to be chosen by these two", and to insert the following:

The value of the park lands to be conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia as herein provided shall be determined by a committee of three appraisers, one each to be selected by the Governor of Virginia and the Secretary of the Interior, with the third appraiser to be mutually satisfactory to them. The Secretary may, in his discretion, approve the value agreed upon by a majority of the appraisers or he may require a new appraisal to be made in a similar manner. The decision of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive as to the value of the easement lands conveyed pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Nothing in this act or in any grant of right-of-way or other easement issued pursuant to this act shall be construed to affect the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 847).

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, upon such terms and conditions as to location, type, or design of the structure or otherwise as to him and to the Secretary of the Navy may appear proper to protect the interests of the United States, is authorized to grant to the Commonwealth of Virginia or to its agency the Highway Commission of said Commonwealth right-of-way or other easement as may be proper to enable a highway bridge the level and design of which shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy, such bridge to be erected, operated, and maintained across the York River in the State of Virginia at or near Yorktown, Va., and for the purpose of permitting such portions of said bridge, the roads and approaches thereto, together with any necessary structures connected therewith as may be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and operation of said bridge, and for safe, reasonable, and proper ingress thereto or egress therefrom, to be located and erected across, over, or upon the property of the United States forming a part of the Colonial National Historical Park.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed and authorized to secure and accept payment in cash or by land exchange as compensation to the United States for any lands used for such right-of-way and any moneys received may in turn be used by the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase of other privately owned historical lands within the boundaries of Colonial National Historical Park. Any lands so received or so purchased shall become part of Colonial National Historical Park.

The value of the park lands to be conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia as herein provided shall be determined by a committee of three appraisers, one each to be selected by the Governor of Virginia and the Secretary of the Interior, with the third appraiser to be mutually satisfactory to them. The Secretary may, in his discretion, approve the value agreed upon by a majority of the appraisers or he may require a new appraisal to be made in a similar manner. The decision of the Secretary shall be final and conclusive as to the value of the easement lands conveyed pursuant to the provisions of this act.

Nothing in this act or in any grant of right-of-way or other easement issued pursuant to this act shall be construed to affect the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 847).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRAINING OF OFFICERS FOR THE NAVAL SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1214) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 5, after the parenthesis to insert "as amended"; on line 6, after the word "hereby", to insert the word "further"; on page 2, line 6, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out the word "part" and insert "paragraph"; on page 2, line 13, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out "subsection 2 of section 6 (a)" and insert "paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6"; on page 3, line 11, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out "subsection 2 of section 6 (a)" and insert "paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6"; on page 3, line 17, after the word "terminated", to strike out "at the end of his period of accrued leave which shall commence"; on page 3, line 23, after the word "terminated", to strike out "at the end of his period of accrued leave which shall commence"; on page 4, line 14, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out "subsection 1 of section 6 (a)" and insert "paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6"; on line 15, after the words "pursuant to", to strike out "section 6 (b)" and insert "subsection (b) of section 6"; on line 20, after the word "terminated", to strike out "at the end of his period of accrued leave which shall commence"; on page 5, line 2, after the word "terminated", to strike out "at the end of his period of accrued leave which shall commence"; on line 9, after the words "with the", to strike out the word "rank" and insert "grade"; on line 10, after the words "junior grade" in parentheses, to strike out "in the grade appropriate to that rank", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) In clause (b) of section 2 after the word "Navy" insert the following: ", or his designated representative."

(b) Amend the first sentence of the first proviso of section 4 to read as follows: "*Provided*, That such benefits and retainer pay shall commence to accrue on the day each midshipman or apprentice seaman commences his first term of college work under the provisions of this act and that such benefits and retainer pay may be received by midshipmen appointed pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3 for a period not exceeding four academic years."

(c) Amend section 8 to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Navy shall during the second quarter of each calendar year cause to be examined (a) the records of all ensigns of the line of the Navy and second lieutenants of the Marine Corps commissioned pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6 who apply prior to April 1 of that calendar year or prior to the first anniversary of the acceptance of their commissions, whichever is earlier, for retention in the Regular service as permanent officers and who in the then current calendar year will reach the first anniversary of the date of acceptance of their appointment as ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, selecting from among such officers the number he may determine necessary for retention, and (b) the records of all other officers appointed pursuant to this act who apply prior to April 1 of the third calendar year following that in which they accepted their commissions or prior to the third anniversary of the acceptance of their commissions, whichever is earlier, for retention in the Regular service as permanent officers and who in the then current calendar year will reach the third anniversary of the date of acceptance of their appointment as ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, selecting from among such officers the number that he may determine necessary for retention."

(d) Amend section 9 to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) The commission of each officer commissioned pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6 who, prior to April 1 of the calendar year following that in which he accepted his commission or

prior to the first anniversary of the acceptance of his commission, whichever is earlier, shall not have applied for retention in the Regular service, shall be terminated not later than the first anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, and the commission of each such officer who applies for retention as a permanent officer within the time limits prescribed by this subsection, but who is not selected for retention under clause (a) of section 8 shall be terminated not later than June 30 of the appropriate calendar year or the first anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, whichever is the later date. Upon termination of commission, each such officer who thereupon accepts appointment to commissioned rank in the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve may apply for and receive retainer pay at the rate of $100 for each calendar month or part thereof during which, while an officer of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve, he pursues full-times instruction in an accredited college or university but not to exceed a total of $2,000, such instruction to commence not later than a date to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy; in addition, each such officer shall be entitled to the benefits provided for him by section 10 of this act.

"(b) The commission of each officer commissioned pursuant to paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6 and pursuant to subsection (b) of section 6 who, prior to April 1 of the third calendar year following that in which he accepted his commission or prior to the third anniversary of the acceptance of his commission, whichever is earlier, shall not have applied for retention in the Regular service, shall be terminated not later than the third anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, and the commission of each such officer who applies for retention as a permanent officer within the time limits prescribed by this subsection, but who is not selected for retention under clause (b) of section 8 shall be terminated not later than June 30 of the appropriate calendar year or the third anniversary of his acceptance of his commission, whichever is the later date. Upon termination of commission, each such officer may be commissioned in the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) or first lieutenant, as the case may be (if in a staff corps, with the grade of lieutenant (junior grade)), and to rank from a date 3 years after the date of rank stated in his original commission in the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes', approved August 13, 1946, as amended."

RETENTION IN SERVICE OF CERTAIN DISABLED ARMY PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1783) to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army personnel, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, on page 1, beginning in line 5, after the word "Army", to insert the words "and the Air Force", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized and directed to retain in service disabled officers, warrant officers, and flight officers of the Army and the Air Force of the United States until their treatment for physical reconstruction has reached a point where they will not be further benefited by retention in a military hospital or in the military service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes."

EXEMPTION OF NAVY OR COAST GUARD VESSELS FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS

The bill (S. 1961) to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of December 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 590), is hereby repealed.

JAMES Y. PARKER

The bill (S. 1673) to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712 as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, to the temporary grade of major in the Army of the United States under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), with date of rank as of March 1, 1942. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to carry such officer upon such appointment on the records of the War Department and of the Army as having served in the grade of major from March 1, 1942, to the date of his subsequent appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing additional pay and allowances to the aforesaid James Y. Parker: *Provided*, That all payments of moneys heretofore made to such officer on the assumption of a previous legal appointment to the grade of major are hereby validated.

MEDAL OF HONOR TO UNKNOWN AMERICAN

The bill (S. 1802) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized and directed to award, in the name of the Congress, a Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War, and who will lie buried in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., as authorized by the act of June 24, 1946, Public Law 429, Seventy-ninth Congress.

CARE AND TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD, ORGANIZED RESERVES, ETC.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1470) to amend the act entitled "An act to make provisions for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers Training Corps, and Citizens Military Training Camps who are injured, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 2, section 2, line 12, to strike out the word "section" and to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The foregoing amendment shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force to the same extent as if enacted prior to the passage of the National Security Act of 1947.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1507), as amended (act July 15, 1939, 53 Stat. 1042; sec. 5, act Oct. 14, 1940, 54 Stat. 1137; 32 U. S. C. 164d; 10 U. S. C. 455e), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term 'in time of peace' shall include that period after September 2, 1945 (the date of formal surrender by Japan), which is prior to the first day on which the United States is, by action of the Congress, or the President, or both, no longer engaged in any war in which the United States is engaged on the date of enactment of this section.

"SEC. 3. The foregoing amendment shall be applicable to the Department of the Air Force to the same extent as if enacted prior to the passage of the National Security Act of 1947."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes', approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes."

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED SERVICES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1521) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to detail scientific and technical employees of the War Department or the Army and the Naval Establishment to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Defense (with respect to personnel of the National Military Establishment, any department or agency thereof, or any field activity of such establishment, department, or agency), or the Secretary of the Army, the

Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force (each with respect to his respective department or any field activity thereof), or the Secretary of the Treasury (with respect to the United States Coast Guard or any field activity thereof), is authorized to detail to duty, by contract or other agreement, in privately owned plants or laboratories, any scientific or technical employee of any establishment, department, agency, service, or field activity administered by such Secretary when, in the opinion of the Secretary concerned, such detail will materially increase the value of such employee to such establishment, department, agency, service, or field activity: *Provided*, That no such employee shall be detailed in any plant or laboratory for a continued period of duty in excess of 6 months: *Provided further*, That no provision of this act shall be construed in such manner as to authorize the expenditure of Federal funds by such Secretary to pay any privately owned plant or laboratory for the privilege of detailing an employee or employees to duty therein.

SEC. 2. Any employee selected for detail to duty in accordance with the provisions of this act shall, before being so detailed, make a definite statement in writing that he will, unless involuntarily separated, remain in the employ of the establishment, department, agency, service, or field activity from which detailed for a period of not less than 18 months after completion of such detail or reimburse the establishment, department, agency, service, or activity concerned for any expenses incurred in effectuating said detail.

SEC. 3. Any detail to duty provided for by this act shall be effected only after the plant or laboratory concerned in the arrangements for such detail signifies in writing to the Secretary of the establishment or department concerned its concurrence with said arrangements.

SEC. 4. Each such Secretary is authorized to establish and administer such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem necessary to effectuate the provisions of this act, or he may, should it be deemed necessary or advisable, delegate the authority to administer said rules, regulations, and procedures, in whole or in part, to such official or officials of his respective establishment, department, agency, service, or field activity as he shall designate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Treasury to detail certain scientific and technical personnel employed by or within the National Military Establishment or the United States Coast Guard to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does that mean a complete substitution, or only a substitution for one section?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a complete substitution, striking out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we should have a word of explanation from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the substitution is merely to bring the bill into line with the unification bill, and to expand it to include the Air Corps.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

TRANSFER OF LANDS AT CAMP PHILLIPS, KANS.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1791) to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the War Department, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, to strike out the words "War Department" and insert "Department of the Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all land owned by the United States in section 7, township 15 south, range 3 west of the sixth principal base and meridian, containing approximately 640 acres, together with the buildings, improvements, and facilities located thereon, which comprised the hospital area at Camp Phillips, Kans., and now under the control and jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, is hereby transferred, without reimbursement of funds, to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army."

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS MADE BY DISBURSING OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1298) to invalidate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to insert at the end of the bill sections 2 and 3, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That payments heretofore made by disbursing officers covering the cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees of the Government of the United States made under orders directing permanent change of station of said employees where such shipments were made from the last permanent-duty station of said employees or from some other place, to some place other than the new permanent-duty station of such employees, are hereby validated, if otherwise proper, and such employees shall be relieved of indebtedness to the United States on account of such shipments to the extent that such payments do not exceed the cost which would have been properly borne by the United States for such shipments under laws and regulations in effect at the time of such shipments, had such shipments been made from the old to the new permanent-duty station of such employees: *Provided*, That in any case where a civilian employee has made refundment to the United States on account of payments herein validated, reimbursement of the amount so refunded is hereby authorized to be made to such employee on the presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That employees who paid the carriers the amount due covering the shipment of their household effects shall be entitled to reimbursement of so much of the amount expended, if otherwise proper, as does not exceed the cost of such shipment from the old to the new permanent-duty station upon presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office: *And provided further*, That amounts due deceased persons or persons determined to be mentally incompetent shall be paid to the extent herein provided upon presentation of a claim therefor to the General Accounting Office by their heirs or personal representatives.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of accounts of disbursing officers of the Government of the United States covering payments for the shipment of household effects of civilian employees which are, and to the extent that such payments are, validated by section 1 hereof.

SEC. 3. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provision of this act are hereby authorized.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESERVATION OF THE FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION"

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1796) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, after line 7, page 1, to insert:

All costs of repairing, equipping, and restoring such frigate, other than pay and allowances of naval officers and enlisted men engaged in such work, shall be defrayed from a fund consisting of such donations or contributions and the net proceeds of the sales made pursuant to section 2 of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to repair, equip, and restore the frigate *Constellation*, as far as may be practicable, to her original condition, but not for active service, and to accept and use any donations or contributions which may be offered for the aforesaid purpose. All costs of repairing, equipping, and restoring such frigate, other than the pay and allowances of naval officers and enlisted men engaged in such work, shall be defrayed from a fund consisting of such donations or contributions and the net proceeds of the sales made pursuant to section 2 of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby further authorized to give or to sell, under such regulations as he may prescribe, such parts or pieces, including rigging, of the frigate *Constellation*, as are suitable for use as relics, souvenirs, or mementos, and which cannot profitably or advantageously be used in restoring this vessel to original condition, to clubs, associations, or individuals making donations or contributions for the restoration of the frigate *Constellation*. The cost of converting the aforesaid material into relics, souvenirs, or mementos shall be charged against, and the proceeds of such sales shall be added to, the fund created by authority of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF REFLECTING POOL AT UNITED STATES NAVAL HOSPITAL, HOUSTON, TEX.

The bill (S. 1794) to authorize the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting pool at the United States Naval Hospital, Houston, Tex., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting

pool on the grounds of the United States Naval Hospital, at Houston, Tex.

SEC. 2. The site of the reflecting pool and its design and construction shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. The design and construction of the reflecting pool shall be without cost to the United States.

SEC. 3. Upon completion of the construction of the reflecting pool, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to accept it as an unconditional gift to the United States from the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States.

USE OF CRYPT AND WINDOW SPACES OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY CHAPEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1800) relating to the restrictions on the use of crypt and window spaces of the United States Naval Academy Chapel, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the final paragraph under the subheading "Contingent, Naval Academy" under the heading "Naval Academy" of the act of March 3, 1909 (34 U. S. C. 1111), as it appears on page 773 of volume 35 of the United States Statutes at Large, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The crypt and window spaces of the United States Naval Academy chapel are to be used only for memorials to United States naval officers who have successfully commanded a fleet or force in battle, or who have received or may receive the thanks of the Congress of the United States for conspicuously distinguished services in time of war, and no memorial shall be accepted for or installed in said crypt or window spaces until at least 2 years after the death of the officer in question; the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to appoint a board which shall recommend to the Secretary of the Navy the names of officers whose service is considered to qualify them to be so memorialized: *Provided*, That nothing in this provision shall be considered as invalidating any agreement made by the present or any former Superintendent of the Naval Academy, authorizing a memorial window in the old Naval Academy chapel to be transferred to the new Naval Academy chapel."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of this bill and the one which immediately follows.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the report is very brief. The existing law is sought to be changed only to a slight degree in reference to the windows in the chapel. The present language refers to naval officers who have successfully commanded a fleet or squadron in battle. The term "squadron" is changed to bring it into line with the modern organization of the Navy. The second change reduces the waiting period after the death of the officer concerned from 5 to 2 years. That is the gist of the bill.

Mr. GREEN. I am also interested in having an explanation of the following bill. I thought it would save time to have it now.

Mr. WHERRY. I call for the regular order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 1528) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to accept and use gifts, devises, and requests for schools, hospitals, libraries, museums, cemeteries and other institutions, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to have an explanation.

Mr. GURNEY. This bill would authorize the Secretary of National Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force to accept gifts for museums, libraries, and so forth.

Mr. GREEN. I wish to know whether that means unconditional gifts, or whether there might be conditions which the Government would be obligated to carry out.

Mr. GURNEY. Does the Senator mean conditions in regard to the upkeep of the gifts, and so forth, after they are accepted?

Mr. GREEN. I mean any conditions which might be imposed.

Mr. GURNEY. They have to be approved by the Secretary before the gifts are accepted.

Mr. GREEN. That would give the Secretary absolute discretion to undertake the carrying out of any conditions which might be attached; is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. The bill provides that he cannot accept a gift unless the conditions are satisfactory to the Government.

Mr. GREEN. No, unless they are satisfactory to him.

Mr. GURNEY. I presume that would follow.

Mr. GREEN. There have been cases in which the conditions which were attached proved to be very onerous. If the officer who has the discretionary power has a friendly disposition, he may accept the gifts under almost any conditions. I think there should be some restrictions in regard to this matter.

Mr. GURNEY. I understand that where such things as ship models are offered to the Academy, frequently a sum is provided for their upkeep, although it is not a large sum.

Mr. GREEN. But sometimes the condition is that the gift must be placed in a certain conspicuous position or in a certain building, or something of that sort; and sometimes such conditions prove to be very onerous.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the bill passed over until the Senator is satisfied about this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

DISPOSITION OF CONDEMNED MATERIAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 774) to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, in line 8, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War and" and insert "the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force"; on page 2, in line 20, after the word "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES WITHIN GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The bill (H. R. 3645) relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNLAWFUL WEARING OF UNIFORMS IN CANAL ZONE, GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The bill (S. 1799) to amend the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to make it applicable to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 125 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216; 10 U. S. C. 1393), as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting between the first and second paragraphs thereof the following new paragraph:

"The provisions of this section shall apply to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, as well as to all other places within the jurisdiction of the United States."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that this bill has a very far-reaching effect in regard to the Surplus Property Act. I believe that Senators would like to consider the bill further. I have spoken to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who reported the bill, and he understands that I object to its present consideration. Therefore I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, and Mr. LYLE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have the Senate take up at this time two bills which have been passed over during the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. For the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, I should like to state that a week ago it was announced that the calendar would be called today, beginning with Calendar No. 863, the point at which the call of the calendar was concluded on January 12. Let me also state that it is the intention, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, to have the calendar called regularly each Monday. For that reason, I shall be forced to object to any request to have the Senate consider at this time bills prior to No. 863 on the calendar, because there are those who have been informed that that is the procedure which we shall pursue relative to the calling of the calendar.

I should also like to say that if the Senator from Connecticut desires to do so, of course, he can bring up the bills by motion, but in that event I think notice should be given, so that all Members of the Senate can be advised.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the bills to which I have reference were called during the previous call of the calendar, but at that time there was some objection to their consideration. However, I understand that objection has been withdrawn. I refer to Senate bill 357, Calendar No. 702, providing for the incorporation of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, and Senate bill 1375, Calendar No. 704, providing for the incorporation of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. But if the Senator from Nebraska objects to the consideration of those bills at this time, in view of the order which has been entered, of course I do not press the request. I understand the calendar will be called next Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. I further understand that these bills will be included in that calling of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. Under the circumstances, I withdraw my request.

Mr. LODGE. Let me inquire whether the call of the calendar at that time will include the bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the calendar which will be called then will include all bills on the calendar.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I understand the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] requested that at some opportune time he be permitted to bring up the daylight-saving bill. That is a rather indefinite request, and I should like something specific about it. I should like to know when it is coming up.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may respectfully state the situation to the Senator, no request was made. A simple notice was given that at some appropriate time in the near future the Senator would present the matter to which the Senator from Louisiana refers.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope, and I am sure, the Senator from Rhode Island will give me due notice of his intention.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I have no desire to interfere with the orderly processes laid out by the leadership, but it is imperative, if we are to get action on the measure at this session, so that it will be in effect by the time the rest of the country goes on daylight-saving time, that we have some time fixed within the next week or two when the matter can be brought up. I have been consulting and conferring with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana about an appropriate time. We were not able to agree on a particular time, so in order to protect whatever rights we may have in the situation, I give notice, and I have given notice, that at an appropriate time I shall move that the bill referred to be taken up. It would be most agreeable to me if the leadership on both sides of the aisle could agree upon a time and a day certain, when consideration could be given to the matter. I realize that it is an inconvenience to the Senator from Louisiana to have to remain here during all the sessions, awaiting the time when I may call up the bill. It is just as inconvenient to me to have to be here to carry out what I regard as my responsibility in the matter. Probably the distinguished leader of the majority could agree with us on a time when we could know definitely that the matter could be taken up for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for an observation, I shall be glad at any time to consider any measure any Senator would like to have taken up. I should like to say, however, that in the orderly process of debate the pending business is the St. Lawrence seaway, and I hope, if other matters are to be taken up, Senators will confer with the leadership, so that we can work out an orderly program, but at the same time preserve the continuity of debate, and bring the pending business to a conclusion. I assure the Senator from Rhode Island we shall be glad to take it up with him and see if something can be worked out that will be satisfactory to those who are interested in the legislation.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, that is more than satisfactory to me, and I assure the Senator from Louisiana that until an agreement is reached with the leader of the majority by the Senator from Louisiana and myself, I shall not press the motion concerning which I have given notice.

Mr. OVERTON. I wished to make an additional observation, that I do not desire to interpose any objection to taking up the bill at any time. The Senator from Rhode Island has been very courteous to me, and I am very glad to reciprocate. I shall be perfectly willing to have the bill taken up at any time. The only suggestion I make is I should like to have some definite time fixed. If I can have adequate notice, any time will be satisfactory.

Mr. WHERRY. Ample notice will be given.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

PROCUREMENT OF SUPPLIES AND SERVICES BY THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is our purpose to call the calendar, as I have stated before, beginning where the call was concluded on January 12, and then to carry out the further order of the day. Last Friday, however, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was about to request consideration of two bills, which I asked him to withhold until today. I asked that he give notice of his desire that the bills be taken up today.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of Calendar No. 597, House bill 1366, to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes, be resumed.

The Senate will recall that when the bill came up there were several amendments that were considered and agreed to, and at the request of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon to have them printed for the benefit of Senators, the bill went over. The Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is now present. I think this matter can be disposed of within a few moments. Should it provoke any lengthy discussion, I shall call for the regular order, because I feel that the time has arrived when we should proceed to the consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway bill, and the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is prepared to address the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILEY. With the understanding stated, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill is for the purpose of improving the method of purchasing supplies by the Army, Navy, and Air Force. One of the reasons why it is necessary is because of the unification of the services. The matter was very carefully considered by the committee, and the bill has the approval of the Comptroller General, of the Budget Director, and of the interested agencies of the Government. I shall be glad to make any further explanation that may be desired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have just received word that during the consideration of this particular bill, the in-

sertion of the words "the Secretary of the Air Force" was inadvertently omitted from one of the amendments. I therefore ask the Senate to agree to a committee amendment on page 31, line 25, of the bill as it was amended January 12, after the word "Army," to insert "and the Secretary of the Air Force."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill H. R. 1366 was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. (a) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to all purchases and contracts for supplies or services made by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Coast Guard, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (each being hereinafter called the agency), for the use of any such agency or otherwise, and to be paid for from appropriated funds.

(b) It is the declared policy of the Congress that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government shall be placed with small business concerns. Whenever it is proposed to make a contract or purchase in excess of $10,000 by negotiation and without advertising, pursuant to the authority of paragraph (7) or (8) of section 2 (c) of this act, suitable advance publicity, as determined by the agency head with due regard to the type of supplies involved and other relevant considerations, shall be given for a period of at least 15 days, wherever practicable, as determined by the agency head.

(c) All purchases and contracts for supplies and services shall be made by advertising, as provided in section 3, except that such purchases and contracts may be negotiated by the agency head without advertising if—

(1) determined to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress;

(2) the public exigency will not admit of the delay incident to advertising;

(3) the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $1,000;

(4) for personal or professional services;

(5) for any service to be rendered by any university, college, or other educational institution;

(6) the supplies or services are to be procured and used outside the limits of the United States and its possessions;

(7) for medicines or medical supplies;

(8) for supplies purchased for authorized resale;

(9) for perishable subsistence supplies;

(10) for supplies or services for which it is impracticable to secure competition;

(11) the agency head determines that the purchase or contract is for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test: *Provided*, That beginning 6 months after the effective date of this act and at the end of each 6-month period thereafter, there shall be furnished to the Congress a report setting forth the name of each contractor with whom a contract has been entered into pursuant to this subsection (11) since the date of the last such report, the amount of the contract, and, with due consideration given to the national security, a description of the work required to be performed thereunder;

(12) for supplies or services as to which the agency head determines that the character, ingredients, or components thereof are such that the purchase or contract should not be publicly disclosed;

(13) for equipment which the agency head determines to be technical equipment, and as to which he determines that the procurement thereof without advertising is necessary in order to assure standardization of equipment and interchangeability of parts and that such standardization and interchangeability is necessary in the public interest;

(14) for supplies of a technical or specialized nature requiring a substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, as determined by the agency head, when he determines that advertising and competitive bidding may require duplication of investment or preparation already made, or will unduly delay procurement of such supplies;

(15) for supplies or services as to which the agency head determines that the bid prices after advertising therefor are not reasonable or have not been independently arrived at in open competition: *Provided*, That no negotiated purchase or contract may be entered into under this paragraph after the rejection of all bids received unless (A) notification of the intention to negotiate and reasonable opportunity to negotiate shall have been given by the agency head to each responsible bidder, (B) the negotiated price is lower than the lowest rejected bid price of a responsible bidder, as determined by the agency head, and (C) such negotiated price is the lowest negotiated price offered by any responsible supplier;

(16) the agency head determines that it is in the interest of the national defense that any plant, mine, or facility or any producer, manufacturer, or other supplier be made or kept available for furnishing supplies or services in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense in maintaining active engineering, research, and development, are otherwise subserved: *Provided*, That beginning 6 months after the effective date of this act and at the end of each 6-month period thereafter, there shall be furnished to the Congress a report setting forth the name of each contractor with whom a contract has been entered into pursuant to this subsection (16) since the date of the last such report, the amount of the contract, and, with due consideration given to the national security, a description of the work required to be performed thereunder; or

(17) otherwise authorized by law.

(d) If in the opinion of the agency head bids received after advertising evidence any violation of the antitrust laws he shall refer such bids to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

(e) This section shall not be construed to (A) authorize the erection, repair, or furnishing of any public building or public improvement, but such authorization shall be required in the same manner as heretofore, or (B) permit any contract for the construction or repair of buildings, roads, sidewalks, sewers, mains, or similar items to be negotiated without advertising as required by section 3, unless such contract is to be performed outside the continental United States or unless negotiation of such contract is authorized by the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (10), (11), (12), or (15) of subsection (c) of this section.

SEC. 3. Whenever advertising is required—

(a) The advertisement for bids shall be a sufficient time previous to the purchase or contract, and specifications and invitations for bids shall permit such full and free competition as is consistent with the procurement of types of supplies and services necessary to meet the requirements of the agency concerned.

(b) All bids shall be publicly opened at the time and place stated in the advertisement. Award shall be made with reasonable promptness by written notice to that responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered: *Provided*, That all bids may be rejected when the agency head determines that it is in the public interest so to do.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, contracts negotiated pursuant to section 2 (c) may be of any type which in the opinion of the agency head will promote the best interests of the Government. Every contract negotiated pursuant to section 2 (c) shall contain a suitable warranty, as determined by the agency head, by the contractor that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure such contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business, for the breach or violation of which warranty the Government shall have the right to annul such contract without liability or in its discretion to deduct from the contract price or consideration the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

(b) The cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting shall not be used, and in the case of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract the fee shall not exceed 10 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the agency head at the time of entering into such contract (except that a fee not in excess of 15 percent of such estimated cost is authorized in any such contract for experimental, developmental, or research work and that a fee inclusive of the contractor's cost and not in excess of 6 percent of the estimated cost, exclusive of fees, as determined by the agency head at the time of entering into the contract, of the project to which such fee is applicable is authorized in contracts for architectural or engineering services relating to any public works or utility project). Neither a cost nor a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract nor an incentive-type contract shall be used unless the agency head determines that such method of contracting is likely to be less costly than other methods or that it is impracticable to secure supplies or services of the kind or quality required without the use of a cost or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or an incentive-type contract. All cost and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts shall provide for advance notification by the contractor to the procuring agency of any subcontract thereunder on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis and of any fixed-price subcontract or purchase order which exceeds in dollar amount either $25,000 or 5 percent of the total estimated cost of the prime contract; and a procuring agency, through any authorized representative thereof, shall have the right to inspect the plants and to audit the books and records of any prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of a cost or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract.

SEC. 5. (a) The agency head may make advance payments under negotiated contracts heretofore or hereafter executed in any amount not exceeding the contract price upon such terms as the parties shall agree:

Provided, That advance payments shall be made only upon adequate security and if the agency head determines that provision for such advance payments is in the public interest or in the interest of the national defense and is necessary and appropriate in order to procure required supplies or services under the contract.

(b) The terms governing advance payments may include as security provision for, and upon inclusion of such provision there shall thereby be created, a lien in favor of the Government, paramount to all other liens, upon the supplies contracted for, upon the credit balance in any special account in which such payments may be deposited and upon such of the material and other property acquired for performance of the contract as the parties shall agree.

SEC. 6. Whenever any contract made on behalf of the Government by the agency head or by officers authorized by him so to do includes a provision for liquidated damages for delay, the Comptroller General on the recommendation of the agency head is authorized and empowered to remit the whole or any part of such damages as in his discretion may be just and equitable.

SEC. 7. (a) The determinations and decisions provided in this act to be made by the agency head may be made with respect to individual purchases and contracts or with respect to classes of purchases or contracts, and shall be final. Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the agency head is authorized to delegate his powers provided by this act, including the making of such determinations and decisions, in his discretion and subject to his direction, to any other officer or officers or officials of the agency.

(b) The power of the agency head to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraphs (12), (13), (14), (15), and (16) of section 2 (c) and in section 5 (a) shall not be delegable, and the power to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraph (11) of section 2 (c) shall be delegable only to a chief officer responsible for procurement and only with respect to contracts which will not require the expenditure of more than $25,000.

(c) Each determination or decision required by paragraphs (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), or (16) of section 2 (c), by section 4 or by section 5 (a) shall be based upon written findings made by the official making such determination, which findings shall be final and shall be available within the agency for a period of at least 6 years following the date of the determination. A copy of the findings shall be submitted to the General Accounting Office with the contract.

(d) In any case where any purchase or contract is negotiated pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (c), except in a case covered by paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) thereof, the data with respect to the negotiation shall be preserved in the files of the agency for a period of 6 years following final payment on such contract.

SEC. 8. No purchase or contract shall be exempt from the act of June 30, 1936, as amended (49 Stat. 2036), as amended by the act of June 28, 1940, 54 Stat. 681, and by the act of May 13, 1942, 56 Stat. 277; U. S. C., title 41, secs. 35 to 45) or from the act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494, as amended by the act of August 30, 1935, 49 Stat. 1011, and by the act of June 15, 1940, 54 Stat. 399; U. S. C., title 40, secs. 276a to 276a–6), solely by reason of having been entered into pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof without advertising, and the provisions of said acts and of the act of June 19, 1912, as amended (37 Stat. 137, as amended by the act of September 9, 1940, 54 Stat. 884; U. S. C., title 40, secs. 324 and 325a), if otherwise applicable, shall apply to such purchases and contracts.

SEC. 9. As used herein—

(a) The term "agency head" shall mean the Secretary, Under Secretary (if any), or any Assistant Secretary of the Army, of the Navy, or of the Air Force; the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Treasury Department; and the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively.

(b) The term "supplies" shall mean all property except land, and shall include, by way of description and without limitation, public works, buildings, facilities, ships, floating equipment, and vessels of every character, type and description, aircraft, parts, accessories, equipment, machine tools and alteration or installation thereof.

SEC. 10. In order to facilitate the procurement of supplies and services by each agency for others and the joint procurement of supplies and services required by such agencies, subject to the limitations contained in section 7 of this act, each agency head may make such assignments and delegations of procurement responsibilities within his agency as he may deem necessary or desirable, and the agency heads or any of them by mutual agreement may make such assignments and delegations of procurement responsibilities from one agency to any other or to officers or civilian employees of any such agency, and may create such joint or combined offices to exercise such procurement responsibilities, as they may deem necessary or desirable. Appropriations available to any such agency shall be available for obligation for procurement as provided for in such appropriations by any other agency through administrative allotments in such amount as may be authorized by the head of the allotting agency without transfer of funds on the books of the Treasury Department. Disbursing officers of the allotting agency may make disbursements chargeable to such allotments upon vouchers certified by officers or civilian employees of the procuring agency.

SEC. 11. (a) The following acts are hereby repealed:

Revised Statutes, section 3716 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1202);

Revised Statutes, section 3717 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 9);

Revised Statutes, section 3718 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 561);

Revised Statutes, section 3719 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 562);

Revised Statutes, section 3720 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 563);

Revised Statutes, section 3721, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 569–570);

Revised Statutes, section 3722 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 572);

Revised Statutes, section 3723 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 573);

Revised Statutes, section 3724 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 574);

Revised Statutes, section 3726 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 577);

Revised Statutes, section 3727 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 578);

Revised Statutes, section 3729 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 579);

Act of June 14, 1878, No. 30 (20 Stat. 253; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 565);

Act of March 3, 1893 (ch. 212, sec. 1, 27 Stat. 732; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 566);

Act of March 2, 1907 (ch. 2512, 34 Stat. 1193; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 571);

Act of March 4, 1913 (ch. 148, 37 Stat. 904; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 575);

Act of June 30, 1914 (ch. 130, 38 Stat. 393; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 567);

Act of May 15, 1936 (ch. 400, 49 Stat. 1277; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1199 (a));

Act of July 13, 1939 (ch. 265, 53 Stat. 1000; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 313);

(b) The following acts shall not apply to the procurement of supplies or services by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Coast Guard, Treasury Department, or the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:

Revised Statutes, section 3709, as amended (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5);

Revised Statutes, section 3735 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 13);

Act of October 10, 1940, ch. 851, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 1109, as amended (U. S. C., title 41, secs. 6 and 6a).

(c) The following parts of acts are hereby repealed:

(1) That portion of the act making appropriations for fortifications, approved February 24, 1891 (26 Stat. 769), relating to "Armament of fortifications," which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That no contract for the expenditure of any portion of the money herein provided, or that may be hereafter provided, for the purchase of steel shall be made until the same shall have been submitted to public competition by the Department by advertisement."

(2) Those portions of the Army Appropriation Acts approved March 2, 1901 (ch. 803, 31 Stat. 905; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1201); and June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 514), relating to "Quartermaster's Department, Regular Supplies," which read as follows: "*Provided further*, That hereafter, except in cases of emergency or where it is impracticable to secure competition, the purchase of all supplies for the use of the various departments and posts of the Army and of the branches of the Army service shall only be made after advertisement, and shall be purchased where the same can be purchased the cheapest, quality and cost of transportation and the interests of the Government considered."

(3) That portion of the Army Appropriation Act approved June 12, 1906 (ch. 3078, 34 Stat. 258; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1205), relating to "Ordnance Department," which reads as follows: "Hereafter the purchase of supplies and the procurement of services for all branches of the Army service may be made in open market, in the manner common among businessmen, when the aggregate of the amount required does not exceed $500; but every such purchase exceeding $100 shall be promptly reported to the Secretary of War for approval, under such regulations as he may prescribe."

(4) That portion of the Army Appropriation Act, approved May 11, 1908 (ch. 163, 35 Stat. 125; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1199), relating to "Ordnance Department," which reads as follows: "Whenever proposals are invited for the furnishing of articles of ordnance property, the character of which or the ingredients thereof are of such a nature that the interests of the public service would be injured by publicly divulging them, the Chief of Ordnance is authorized to purchase such articles in such manner as he may deem most economical and efficient."

(5) That portion of the War Department Appropriation Act, approved May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1299), relating to "arms, uniforms, equipment, and so forth, for field service, National Guard," which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That specifications for motor vehicles, which shall be so drawn as to admit of competition, shall to the extent otherwise practicable conform with the requirements of the National Guard."

(d) All other laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Navy shall have the same authority with respect to contracts of the Department of the Navy as the Secretary of the Army has with respect to contracts for the Department of the Army under the act of April 10, 1878, as amended (20 Stat. 36, as amended by the act of March 3, 1883, 22 Stat. 487; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 218). The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force shall have the same authority with respect to emergency purchases of war material abroad as the Secretary of the Navy has with respect to such purchases under the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. 399; U. S. C., title 34, sec 568).

SEC. 13. This act shall become effective 90 days after the date of enactment.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will recall that it has hitherto been ordered that upon conclusion of the call of the calendar on today, January 26, 1948, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 111, a joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, in section 1, on page 2, line 16, after the words "on the", to strike out "Saint Lawrence River" and insert "Great Lakes-Saint Lawrence System"; in section 3, page 3, line 25, after "(4)", to insert "that tolls may also be charged for passengers but that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of $1.50 per passenger; (5)", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That, as provided by article XIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Great Britain, the agreement made by and between the Governments of the United States and Canada, dated March 19, 1941, published in House Document No. 153, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, is hereby approved, with the exception of article VII, article VIII, paragraph (c), and article IX thereof, and the President is hereby authorized and empowered to fulfill the undertakings made on behalf of the United States in said agreement, with the exception of article VII, article VIII, paragraph (c), and article IX, upon the receipt by him of satisfactory evidence of the approval of said agreement with the exceptions provided above, by reciprocal or concurrent legislation of Canada: *Provided*, That the President, before said agreement enters into force, obtains satisfactory assurances, by exchange of notes or otherwise, that the Government of Canada agrees to the principle of making the new deep-water navigation works on the Great Lakes–St. Lawrence system herein authorized self-liquidating by charging reasonable tolls, this principle to be implemented through the conclusion of arrangements satisfactory to both Governments pursuant to section 3 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that it would be desirable for the President to negotiate with Canada a treaty or treaties with reference to the matters provided for in articles VII and IX of the agreement of March 19, 1941, including provisions with respect to perpetual navigation rights on the Great Lakes, on the connecting channels and canals and in the wholly Canadian sections of the St. Lawrence River, and the provisions for the amendment of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 with respect to diversion of waters at Niagara River; and to submit such treaty or treaties for the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States.

SEC. 3. (a) During the period of construction the President is authorized and directed to negotiate a further agreement with the Government of Canada, under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, defining the rates of charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the new deep-water navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River, authorized in this joint resolution: *Provided*, That (1) the total charges shall be fair and equitable and shall give due consideration to encouragement of increased utilization of the navigation facilities, and to the special character of bulk agricultural, mineral, and other raw materials; (2) that tolls shall vary for ships in ballast and according to the character of cargo with the view that each classification of cargo will so far as practicable derive relative benefits from the use of these facilities; (3) that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of $1.25 per short ton of laden cargo, and may be less, depending on character of cargo; (4) that tolls may also be charged for passengers but that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of $1.50 per passenger; (5) that tolls shall apply only on traffic utilizing the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River, with such exception of local or way or Government traffic as may be agreed upon by the two countries: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall become effective only after approval by the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada.

(b) The President may, at his discretion, appoint a St. Lawrence Advisory Commission, to cooperate with similar representatives of the Government of Canada, for the purpose of studying and, after public hearings, making recommendations to their respective Governments on the administrative, technical, and economic aspects of a toll system on the proposed 27-foot St. Lawrence Canals, as a basis for the agreement on tolls proposed in this section.

SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and to enable the United States to carry out the undertakings hereby authorized.

(b) Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, no amendment of the agreement, and no exchange of notes under article I, section 4 thereof, shall impose additional financial or other obligations on the United States.

SEC. 5. The President is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate an arrangement with the government of the State of New York for the transfer to the appropriate agency of that State of the power facilities on the United States side of the International Rapids constructed pursuant to this joint resolution, the cost to be determined in accordance with the method of allocation included in the joint recommendation of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Power Authority of the State of New York, dated February 7, 1933, presented at public hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations February 10, 1933, Seventy-second Congress, second session: *Provided*, That such arrangement is consistent with the laws of the United States and protects the interests of the United States and of other States: *And provided further*, That such arrangement will be effective only after approval by the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of the State of New York.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is a privilege as well as an honor for me to speak in favor of the passage of so vital a piece of legislation as the St. Lawrence seaway, vital not only to 50,000,000 people in the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Basin, but vital to 145,000,000 people who are citizens of this country, vital to another twelve to fifteen million people dwelling in Canada, and vital to those who are to come hereafter, affecting in all from two hundred to two hundred and fifty million people.

Mr. President, prior to the time that Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, became a candidate for the Senate of the United States, he occupied an office in the legislative branch of Illinois, and one of the challenging problems that came before the people of Illinois was whether or not they would permit bonds issued by the State of Illinois to go to default. There was a great deal of discussion. Finally, Mr. Douglas crystallized the matter by means of a simple resolution, reading:

Resolved, That Illinois be honest.

That resolution was adopted, and Illinois made good on the bonds she had issued.

Mr. President, in facing the issue of the St. Lawrence waterway I have no question in my mind respecting the honesty and integrity and the good judgment of every Member of the Senate. I have been associating with the Members of the Senate for 9 years. But I also know that we are all only human, and I know that many times we are creatures of emotion, fear, doubt, and frustration when we ought to be creatures of logic. So, prefacing my remarks, I say, let us use that God-given judgment in this case, bearing in mind the world in which we are living, a world contracted by man's inventions and man's ingenuity. Let us try to see in all its implications the project we are undertaking to discuss and understand.

Mr. President, I need not say that the Congress of the United States has before it, and will begin consideration within the next few weeks, the question of whether or not we shall appropriate four or five or six or seven billion dollars for foreign aid. Let us be honest and realize that a great problem exists nearer home.

I hope to make of these remarks merely a summary of the principal arguments advanced for the seaway. May I ask of my colleagues their kind indulgence so that I may complete my statement without interruption. I shall then be happy to answer any questions which they may care to submit.

Following my presentation, I understand that a number of my colleagues will give to the Senate the benefit of their judgment on behalf of this vital project. The proponents include the Senate President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the worthy minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who introduced the seaway joint resolution in the Senate during the Seventy-ninth Congress; the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has ably championed the project since his coming to this great body; the worthy Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who headed up the subcommittee which extensively explored the seaway measure in 1946 and favorably reported it, the senior and junior Senators from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER and Mr. YOUNG], and other Senators.

LITERATURE ON SEAWAY

I ask that during the next few days my colleagues try to find time to consult some of the literature on this subject. I invite their particular attention to the following:

First. The majority report on the seaway, Senate Report No. 810, part 1, which includes the 1946 majority report.

Second. The booklet of questions and answers on the seaway, prepared by the Commerce Department.

Third. The summary by the Library of Congress, giving the historic background of the seaway.

Fourth. The digest of hearings before my own foreign relations subcommittee on the seaway.

If Senators have sufficient time they might try to glance through the hearings held in 1947 and perhaps the more voluminous hearings held in 1946. I believe that even with the limited time which they can reserve for this matter amidst all their other responsibilities, they will be impressively convinced, as I am, of the need of this Nation—of all its sections—for the seaway now and in the period to come.

PROCEDURE WHICH I SHALL FOLLOW

It will be my aim, in the course of my remarks, to present the arguments as I see them on behalf of this long-deferred project. I do not intend to indulge in personalities, nor do I intend to make a large number of references to some of the organizations which oppose the seaway. I shall, however, cite some of them and endeavor objectively to disprove their arguments. I may say, however, that I recognize and respect the able character and that I treasure the friendship of many of my colleagues in this body who are unfortunately opposed to this valuable project, as well as many private individuals who also are opposed to it. But my personal deep feelings for them do not and will not change my unalterable desire to see the joint resolution passed by the Senate and House during the Eightieth Congress.

PREVIOUS SUPPORTERS OF SEAWAY

We are not alone here today, Mr. President, as we begin the debate on this historic project. The generations of men who have nobly contributed toward the advancing of this great idea and its fulfillment, as well as the 50,000,000 men and women of the Midwest and the Great Lakes area whose welfare depends on this project, are with us in spirit today. They are looking to us for statesmanship, for the national view, the larger perspective. They are hoping that we will serve them and the generations of Americans who are to follow.

The Halls of the United States Senate have been graced by countless statesmen who have worked nobly for the objective of the bill which we are taking up today.

I could not, of course, undertake to cite all the names of my illustrious predecessors who have worked for this objective. No list would, however, be complete without the names of Senator William Edgar Borah, of Idaho, Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, Senators Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Senator Irving Lenroot, Senator Burton K. Wheeler, and countless other Senators—some now with us, some now departed, but all of them great servants of the Republic.

NATIONAL VERSUS SECTIONAL VIEW

These great statesmen recognized that although the Midwest would be the primary area which would feel the favorable impact of this mighty waterway, it would benefit all sections of the land, and we are concerned here today with the national welfare, with the public interest of 143,000,000 Americans and countless millions yet unborn.

I recall the words spoken in the United States Senate in 1848 by Henry Clay, who stated:

> I have heard something said about allegiance to the South. I know no South, no North, no East, no West, to which I owe any allegiance. * * * The gentleman speaks of Virginia being my country. The Union, sir, is my country.

America is our country—not Wisconsin, not Massachusetts, not Pennsylvania, but the 48 States and all the people within it, who will be benefited by the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

SUPPORT BY UNITED STATES PRESIDENTS

No introduction to this resolution could be adequate without reference to the great Chief Executives of America in recent history who have unanimously endorsed this project. Although history may not have yet given a final evaluation to their life endeavors, nevertheless their stature and importance are uncontested. Let the opponents of the seaway bear in mind that when they oppose this project they put their views in contrast alongside the resounding statements of these American Presidents.

FORMER PRESIDENTS HOOVER'S AND ROOSEVELT'S ENDORSEMENTS

One former Chief Executive of our land testified for the seaway. A great engineer, a great organizer of foreign relief, a selfless servant of this Nation, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, stated:

> The signing of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway treaty marks another step forward in this, the greatest internal improvement yet undertaken on the North American Continent. * * * Its completion will have a profoundly favorable effect upon the development of agriculture and industry throughout the Midwest. The large byproduct of power will benefit the Northeast. * * *

Mr. Hoover has consistently supported the seaway for over two decades.

Mr. Hoover's successor in the White House, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, also took his stand forthrightly on behalf of the seaway. He remarked:

> I subscribe to the definite belief that the completion of the seaway will greatly serve the economic and transportation needs of a vast area of the United States and should, therefore, be considered solely from the national point of view.

Franklin D. Roosevelt stated also that he was convinced that the St. Lawrence seaway would not "injure the railroads or throw their employees out of work," nor would it "interfere with the proper use of the Mississippi River or the Missouri River for navigation." It is this American President who stated in words that rang throughout a then panic-stricken Nation, "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." So today, the only thing we have to fear about this project is fear over the most minute details, and fear that it may, if only temporarily, hurt the interests of this or that small segment of our country.

Fear did not build America. Fear did not see us through every one of our wars. Fear will not answer the needs of America in this atomic age. Rather it is faith which moves mountains; faith in the words, for example, of these great men. You and I know that lesser men have always followed the great stars on the horizon—the great statesmen like those whom I have mentioned, who serve as guides to a nation in doubt.

HARDING, COOLIDGE AND LA GUARDIA ENDORSED SEAWAY

I could cite the names of other great Americans. Warren G. Harding, for example, stated:

> The feasibility of the project is unquestioned; and its cost, compared with some other great engineering works, would be small.

Calvin Coolidge, in commenting about projects such as this, said that their completion:

> Is not incompatible with economy—

Get that, Senators—

> for their nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which will be reproductive, as evinced by the marked increase in revenue from the Panama Canal. Upon these projects depends much future industrial and agricultural progress.

I could cite the testimony of so forthright a figure as the late Mayor LaGuardia, of the great metropolis of New York City, who, testifying in 1946, remarked:

> I am from the greatest port in the whole world. I have confidence in my port. * * * It is not the St. Lawrence seaway that I fear.

I could cite the testimony of great builders of American railroads who have testified for the seaway. Yet, to be sure, there are other and lesser railroad men who have opposed projects such as this, just as the purchase of Alaska was opposed. There were those who ridiculed the Panama Canal, who jeered at the possibilities of Duluth Harbor; fearists who opposed the purchase of Louisiana, doubting Thomases and others who have always opposed the expansion of this Nation. But fortunately their counsel was not heeded; and I trust and believe that the counsel of the seaway's opponents will not be heeded in our day.

This is a revenue-producing, self-sustaining project which will not drain the Treasury, but on the contrary will increase the material wealth of the American people and will retire its own investment.

FOUR-F OPPOSITION

The grounds for opposition to the seaway seem strictly four-F in their basis—fear, fancy, folly, and frustration—fear of progress, fancy in relying on questionable statements rather than facts, folly because of lack of vision, and frustration because this great Nation will frustrate the ambitions of a few selfish interests. I am not referring to any of my colleagues in this statement, but rather to the general grounds on which most of the opposition seems based.

INITIAL SUMMARY OF ARGUMENTS FOR SEAWAY

Mr. President, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 111 is to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The reasons for the affirmative recommendation by an overwhelming majority of the Foreign Relations Committee are spread in the volu-

minous records of the committee, which held extensive hearings on this subject in 1933, 1946, and 1947.

Before this debate is concluded, the following facts will be amply proved:

First. The St. Lawrence seaway is a needed navigation facility which will relieve recurrent shortages of transportation and eliminate the economic wastage that results from the inability of the railroads to carry the peak traffic of the summer months.

Second. The St. Lawrence seaway will reduce transportation costs in an area which contains more than 50,000,000 people, an area which has become not only the arsenal of democracy for war but also the hope of the world in the revitalization of human and material welfare in food production and in manufactured and mineral products.

Third. The St. Lawrence power project, which is a byproduct of this undertaking, will supply 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity to Canada and the United States in an area which has been suffering from the beginning of World War II with recurrent power shortages. This power is cheaper than any alternative source now available or hereafter to be available in the northeastern part of the United States.

Fourth. The St. Lawrence project as herein presented will be an addition to our national defense potential by virtue of the additional and much-needed navigation and power facilities which it will make available for necessary industrial mobilization in a time of emergency.

Fifth. The St. Lawrence project will be self-liquidating, returning to the Government and the people, the taxpayers of this Nation, the capital investment and interest upon that investment, as well as all operating costs. It will be self-liquidating in its navigation aspects as well as in the sale of power.

Sixth. It will be amply demonstrated that the opposition to the St. Lawrence project seems mainly centered in certain small economic and financial groups in the East who seem anxious to maintain their hold on transportation from the Middle West to the seacoast and their hold upon the power supply for the northeastern area.

It will be demonstrated that no economic harm is actually threatened to those interests, but that their position seems motivated principally by their desire to maintain their hold upon the future growth of this whole territory.

These facts will be proved by documentation in these proceedings.

I ask my colleagues to suspend judgment until they have heard the full case, not only my statement but also the statements which will be given by other proponents of this resolution, as well as the statements of the opponents.

HISTORY OF THIS LEGISLATION

This and similar resolutions have been considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at various times during the past 3 years. My colleagues will recall that Senate Joint Resolution 104 of the Seventy-ninth Congress was the subject of extensive hearings and a favorable report by the full Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a vote of 14 to 8. Being reported near the end of the congressional session, Senate Joint Resolution 104 was not acted upon by the Senate.

Early in the Eightieth Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 111 was submitted by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on behalf of himself and 15 other Senators. On May 14, 1947, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee appointed a subcommittee consisting of myself as chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. The Senator from New Mexico had previously served as chairman of a subcommittee in the Seventy-ninth Congress on Senate Joint Resolution 104, thereby establishing a continuity in the deliberations of the present subcommittee.

WHY 1947 HEARINGS WERE LIMITED

In view of the voluminous record accumulated over a period of 3 weeks by the subcommittee on Senate Joint Resolution 104 in 1946, the record of which extends through 1,383 pages, the present subcommittee confined the scope of the hearings to the two main subjects of immediate importance, namely, the extent to which national defense interests were involved in the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and means of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating. Although major emphasis was placed upon these two subjects, no testimony was excluded on other phases of the project and there was considerable repetition, particularly by opponents of the project, of the arguments previously presented on the economic phases of the subject.

Our subcommittee held hearings during 6 days, and the record of hearings, in spite of the abbreviated scope of the inquiry, consists of 603 pages. All who sought to be heard were heard by our subcommittee.

In deliberating on the subject, the committee had before it the hearings as well as the majority report of its predecessor subcommittee in the Seventy-ninth Congress. The majority report which I presented on January 7 does not repeat the substantive facts and arguments of the report on Senate Joint Resolution 104, but accepts them as an integral part of this report, except for costs and self-liquidation, which are on a new basis and are thoroughly discussed in the present report.

In view of the fact that the subcommittee which considered Senate Joint Resolution 104 of the Seventy-ninth Congress—of which subcommittee the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] was chairman—held most exhaustive hearings, and prepared a report which covers every aspect of this project thoroughly, it has been deemed helpful to the Senate to append this previous report to the present majority report, as well as the minority views of the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. Thus the Senate has before it a most comprehensive and fair record.

Our subcommittee of five Senators voted unanimously to report the resolution to the full committee, and the committee on July 18 voted 9 to 4 to report to the Senate, with the proviso that the minority would be accorded the courtesy of ample time to prepare its report. A minority report has been filed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and is available in printed form.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RESOLUTION

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will present in due course a detailed statement on the evolution of Senate Joint Resolution 111 and the constitutional aspects of the form of this legislation. He has taken the lead, over the past 3 years, in cooperation with the State Department and through them with the Canadian authorities, in redrafting the legislation into its present form in order to meet objections raised by several Senators in 1944.

Without elaborating on the issue of contitutionality of the procedure herein recommended, I will say briefly that the basic authority of Congress to legislate as proposed rests in the constitutional power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States"—Constitution of the United States, article I, section 8.

The Supreme Court has, on numerous occasions, held that this clause vests in the Congress power to authorize the construction of navigation and power works in river basins. In addition to this constitutional authority, article 13 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 with Canada establishes a procedure whereby special agreements may be entered into between the parties for the development of boundary waters, which agreements, or any mutual arrangements, are subject to approval by concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of the Congress and the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada. This is exactly the procedure herein adopted as this agreement is subject to a majority vote by both Houses of Congress and after that by the Parliament of Canada. It does not go into effect until such approval is obtained.

The pending proposal thus adequately meets all legitimate questions regarding constitutionality. On this subject, pending a full discussion of the subject by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, I commend the attention of Senators to the memorandum of the Department of State on the constitutionality of the St. Lawrence legislation, which is available as a committee print, and the conclusions of the majority of the Foreign Relations Committee embodied in the report on Senate Joint Resolution 104, Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and his committee performed a herculean task, and I am sure that anyone who is vitally interested in the constitutional question will find all the answers there.

Mr. President, I wish to give a brief explanation of the provisions of the bill. As I said some time ago, most of us in Congress have to follow leaders. We are very busy in our own committee work, we have our individual problems, so that matters outside of our committee jurisdiction necessarily do not come to us, and we therefore look to men of judgment,

men who have given study and who have had time to contribute deliberation to the subject.

DESCRIPTION OF BILL'S PROVISIONS

Suffice it to say that section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 111 authorizes the President to carry out the provisions of the agreement of March 19, 1941, with Canada, with the proviso that the President shall obtain, prior to such undertaking, assurances that the Government of Canada agrees to the principle of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating. This measure, in effect, authorizes the President to contract for our share of the joint undertaking at the international section of the river. The actual appropriations would still await congressional action, of course.

Section 2 authorizes the President to negotiate certain treaties with Canada to expand provisions of existing navigation rights between the two countries and to authorize additional diversion of water at Niagara.

Section 3 authorizes the President to enter into a new agreement with Canada to define the conditions and rates of charges for making the seaway self-liquidating.

Section 4 authorizes the necessary appropriations but limits the powers of the President so that the financial commitments of this Government may not be altered by executive action or exchange of notes between the two governments.

Section 5 authorizes the President to enter into an agreement with the government of the State of New York, to transfer the power facilities authorized by the agreement to the State in consideration of a price equal to the cost of the power project and one-half of the joint costs allocated to the United States.

FUTURE SENATE APPROVAL OF TREATIES

It must be made clear that the treaties to be negotiated pursuant to section 2, the agreement concerning tolls on the seaway, and the agreement for the transfer of the power project to New York State are all subject to approval by the Congress according to appropriate procedure applicable in each case. The Congress, therefore, will have full opportunity to express itself on the conditions of operation of both the seaway and the power project.

The effect of this resolution, therefore, I repeat, is simply to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, subject to similar approval by the Canadian Parliament, insuring at the same time that both the navigation and power aspects of the project will be self-liquidating. In short, the Congress is called upon to make an investment in this project, which will be returned ultimately with interest on the investment.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The St. Lawrence project now before Congress has two purposes: First, it will make it possible for oceangoing, deep-draft vessels to travel directly from the Atlantic Ocean into the Great Lakes. It will make seaports of such great cities as Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth. It will bring the great agricultural and industrial productive capacity of the Middle West into direct communication by cheap water transportation with the rest of the world and with the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts of the United States.

As a navigation project, it is as important to our country as the Suez Canal is to Europe, as the Dardanelles is to Russia, as the Panama Canal is to the east and west coasts of the Western Hemisphere.

In building the necessary dams and canals on the St. Lawrence River, there will be a large byproduct of cheap hydroelectric power in northern New York. The capacity of this single powerhouse will be 2,200,000 horsepower, the largest power capacity of a single project with the exception of Grand Coulee. This will be three times as large as the Dneiper Dam, the pride of Russia. The annual output of electricity will be larger than all the power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1944. It is cheap power, costing one and two-thirds mills per kilowatt-hour of average output at the station, one-quarter as expensive as the cheapest source of steam power in that area.

The power will be divided equally with Canada. The American share will be available for distribution as far south as New York City, and throughout the New England States. Cheap water power in that area of 20,000,000 people means lower monthly electric bills, more industries, more jobs, greater sales of electric appliances, more farms electrified.

PREVIOUS CONSTRUCTION

This is not a new project, but a bid for final completion of a waterway that has been in process of construction for 40 years. The Great Lakes now provide deep-water navigation throughout their length and breadth.

We start at Duluth and swing up to the Soo. I call attention to the fact that through the Soo locks in 1946 there were carried 120,000,000 tons of freight, most of it one way, and through the MacArthur Lock approximately 50,000,000 tons at the Soo alone.

The MacArthur Lock at the Soo, built by the Army engineers in 1943 as a war project, connects Lake Superior and Lake Huron. That part of the seaway, as originally proposed, is now completed.

Eight locks of the Welland Canal, completed by Canada in 1932, scale the difference in the levels of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, 324 feet. Except for a little dredging operation, that part of the seaway is completed too, and deep-draft ships can now proceed from Duluth at the head of Lake Superior for 1,200 miles to Ogdensburg, N. Y., on the upper St. Lawrence River.

The eastern end of the St. Lawrence River is navigable for ocean ships for a thousand miles from the Atlantic Ocean to Montreal, Canada. This city, on the St. Lawrence River, is the second largest seaport in North America, next only to New York City.

We have, therefore, deep-sea navigation for a thousand miles inland from the Atlantic on the lower St. Lawrence River to Montreal. We have deep-sea navigation for 1,200 miles in the Great Lakes and the upper St. Lawrence to Ogdensburg, N. Y.

The only impediment that prevents through navigation is the presence of some rapids in the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg, on the upper St. Lawrence, and Montreal on the lower St. Lawrence. Over this distance of 119 miles, the water level drops some 223 feet in three series of rapids. The project now before Congress contemplates the construction of the necessary dams, canals and locks by Canada and the United States to complete this work, with a huge byproduct of cheap water power. We can join the Great Lakes and the Atlantic together for ocean navigation by helping to knock away the rocks in the St. Lawrence rapids through congressional approval of Senate Joint Resolution 111.

ARMY ENGINEERS' COST ESTIMATE

What will this work cost? Everyone is rightly interested in this subject and there is unfortunately much misrepresentation of the facts. Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of the United States Army engineers, during his testimony before the subcommittee submitted a table showing the total cost of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and the cost to complete the project, based on May 1947 price levels. The subcommittee accepted the Army engineers basic cost figures as they relate to the United States portion of the works. It has, however, found it desirable from the standpoint of appraising the feasibility of self-liquidation to bring the Canadian cost figures up to date. The Army engineers table showed all Canadian costs with the exception of those in the international rapids section at 1941 levels. The subcommittee therefore added 54 percent to put them upon a basis uniform with the American costs. This results in an overstatement, since Canadian construction costs have not advanced as much, but it has the advantage of making our estimates conservative.

TOTAL COST OF PROJECT—LOCKS AND POWER FACILITIES—SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY MILLIONS

The cost to complete the project on this basis is in round figures $720,000,000, of which the Canadian cost is approximately $230,000,000 and the United States cost $490,000,000. This $720,000,000 figure is the one adopted by the subcommittee as the starting point for determining the amount to be liquidated. The resolution provides for the self-liquidation of new works and the subcommittee considers that it properly excludes from self-liquidation the cost of work done in the past. The construction already completed—chiefly the Welland Canal by Canada and the MacArthur lock and past dredging of channels in the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers by the United States—will form an integral part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, but they also have served and will continue to serve Great Lakes shipping which will not be subject to tolls.

FIRST COST OF SEAWAY, THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHT MILLIONS

As already indicated, the subcommittee considers that all expenditures for

new work should be liquidated. Accordingly, the actual payments by the State of New York to the United States Government under the provisions of section 5 of the resolution, and the payments by the Province of Ontario to the Dominion Government for the power facilities, must be taken as the total cost of the power project, and must be deducted from the total cost of $720,000,000. In this way, we arrive at the out-of-pocket contributions by the Federal Governments of Canada and the United States for navigation to be liquidated by charges on tolls. The cost of the power projects thus to be deducted is estimated at $322,000,000 leaving as the first cost of the seaway $398,000,000.

TOTAL SEAWAY NET INVESTMENT, FOUR HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHT MILLIONS

Using the interest rate of 2½ percent, which is closer to the actual rate—2.06 percent—at which the United States Government borrows money today, the total net investment would be about $428,000,000. This is the total cost of the seaway to the two Governments. I am dealing with total cost figures because, if the seaway is to be self-liquidating, and the users will pay for it, then the economic and financial calculations must be made on a total basis, for the traffic going through the St. Lawrence deep seaway must pay for both Canadian and American costs.

ANNUAL COST OF SEAWAY, SEVENTEEN AND ONE-HALF MILLIONS

We now have the total cost, including interest during construction, namely, $428,000,000. What is the annual cost that must be met by annual revenues? The annual cost must consider interest, amortization, and operation and maintenance. Taking $428,000,000 as the investment and applying an interest rate of 2½ percent, which more closely approximates actual borrowing rates, and using a sinking fund of 1 percent at 2½ percent compound interest, which would retire the investment in 53 years, and maintenance and operation at $2,460,000, the total annual charges would be $17,450,000.

ALTERNATIVE POLICIES FOR SELF-LIQUIDATION

The committee is cognizant of the fact that there are several alternative financial and accounting policies that may be adopted in bringing about a sound administration of this project on a self-liquidating basis. There are choices to be made in the matter of interest rates, in the matter of amortization policy—whether straight or sinking-fund or a depreciation policy—and in the period over which the retirement of investment should be effectuated. Any one of these alternatives would be sound and acceptable, and they have been used both by private industry and by Government. The exact details may not be established by unilateral action of the United States Government alone, but must be settled through negotiation and agreement with the Canadians. The committee has applied these available alternatives to the St. Lawrence seaway project, and finds that the results show annual cost of figures that vary between fifteen million and twenty-one million dollars. Mr. President, I ask Senators to note that amount. That is the annual overhead, on this basis, for maintenance, depreciation, and so forth.

Any one of these alternatives would be a sound policy. If the accounting system used on the Panama Canal by the War Department is used on the St. Lawrence seaway, the lower figure of $15,000,000 a year would be obtained. If the system recommended by the opponents is used, the figure is $21,000,000.

RAILROADS' PADDED COST ESTIMATES

Before proceeding to consider traffic and revenue potentials, let me briefly dwell upon some of the accounting legerdemain that the opponents employ in order to pad and exaggerate cost figures.

In the course of the hearings on this joint resolution it became abundantly clear that the principal opponents of this proposition are certain groups who seem afraid of the effect of the competition of this waterway upon their businesses. Of these, the Association of American Railroads is apparently in the forefront.

MAGNIFICENT RECORD OF UNITED STATES RAILROADS

Let me first state that as I take issue with the association's attitude on this proposition, I am not without appreciation of the splendid work the association has done and the railroads have done, both during the war and since, in carrying the Nation's military and civilian traffic. The railroads reached great heights of accomplishment under terrific handicaps; in fact, they have carried the enormous traffic of our wartime and postwar economy with equipment which, both in capacity and age, dates back to the First World War. In spite of the superhuman efforts of the operating officials of our railroads, there have inevitably developed, during each peak season, shortages of transportation which have caused wastage of production in many parts of our land. All of us are aware of that. It has become a common and perennial experience, one that we have come to expect every summer, that staple foods, such as grains, stored in the open fields because of lack of elevator capacity and lack of boxcars, and perishable foods in California, Texas, Florida, and many other States are wasted because the railroads are unable to render the service, upon demand, which their franchise requires them to do.

INADEQUACY OF RAILROAD FACILITIES

I am not criticizing or blaming anyone for this condition. I am merely pointing out a fact, namely, that we are trying to run a $200,000,000,000 economy with transportation equipment that was designed and constructed and expected to serve a sixty- or seventy-billion-dollar economy 25 or 30 years ago.

Any effort on the part of rail transportation interests to put impediments in the way of expanding transportation services will result in putting the economy of this country into a straitjacket, and such a procedure is directly contrary to public interest. I make that definite statement. It is possible that if I were not in the Senate of the United States, I might, as an attorney, be on the opposite side of this issue, having served in my time, in a local way, two railroads. But, fortunately, I am in the Senate, and I must take the national view. My own judgment is, with that background, that not in the long run, but in the short run, if this St. Lawrence waterway is constructed, it will ultimately improve not only the business of the railroads, but the business of everyone in America. Perhaps I shall have something more to say about that later on.

SEAWAY WILL MEET FUTURE UNITED STATES NEEDS

In discussing the St. Lawrence seaway project, we must conceive of it as a facility that is designed to meet transportation requirements not this year, not next year, not in 1950 or 1951, but 10, 20, and 30 years from now. Under peacetime conditions of construction this project will take 6 years to complete. If approved this year, we cannot expect the seaway to be utilized until 1954 or 1955, or perhaps even later.

It must be obvious to everyone that in the light of the experience of the last 7 years, with the growth of population and the working force of this country, with greater efficiency and productivity of workers, with greater utilization of mechanical devices and of electric power, and with increased productivity per man-hour, this country will experience over the next 10 or 20 years a growth in total national production and the standard of living which will necessitate enormous expansion in transportation facilities. So the St. Lawrence seaway must be considered as a part of the additional new facilities the country needs.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WILEY. I have asked not to be interrupted during the presentation of this part of my remarks; but if the Senator from Maryland has a specific question, I am willing to be interrupted for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to defer to the Senator's request. I do not wish to take issue with him on any particular matter, but I wish to ask whether he has any data, to be presented during the course of his address, which tend to show the purported volume of business likely to be carried over this canal in 5, 10, 15, or 20 years, if it is constructed.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, we have the judgment of the best men available, and they have considered the future situation. I refer to men of about as high integrity as we can find, men of high position in Government, men like former President Hoover and others who have given their judgment; and all that information is to be found in the hearings. If I do not refer to all of it during my remarks, I shall be happy to refer the distinguished Senator from Maryland to the evidence set forth in the hearings, where he can read what they have said about it.

In response to the Senator's question, I wish to say that the expressed fear that there will not be sufficient tonnage to carry the load of $15,000,000, or even $21,000,000, is to my mind the usual fear that has been expressed throughout the history of mankind in regard to such projects. A similar fear was expressed,

for example, in regard to the Panama Canal. The same interests opposed the building of the Panama Canal. The fear was that America would remain static, would not grow. However, in the case of the Panama Canal, subsequent events indicated, as I shall show, a tonnage growth to a point where it is a good business proposition, even from the standpoint of dollars and cents; and the same is true of the other large canals of the earth. I do not wish to be diverted into a discussion of that point at this time, but I shall come to it later.

At this time I simply wish to say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Maryland that all of us should refer to the map and see what this seaway project will mean—a route of 1,200 miles from Duluth, on Lake Superior, through the Great Lakes to Ogdensburg, N. Y., where there are rapids for a short distance—approximately 116 miles—which will be avoided by the building of locks, and where at the same time great quantities of electrical energy will be developed. New York is short of such energy, the East generally is short of it, and if we ever encounter another emergency, we shall be able to use that power, transmitting it as far west as Chicago.

The whole picture is one that simply calls upon us to get rid of the fear that the completion of the project is going to hurt this locality or that locality. We see that men like Secretary Harriman, a railroad man, Dewey, of New York, Roosevelt, of New York, LaGuardia, of New York, and numerous others, were returned by their constituents time and time again, by increasingly large majorities. They were men who stood for the project. They were not limited to the local view, but had the over-all view that by improving part of the Nation we improve the whole Nation. We had in the picture the railroads, as I will show, who said they would not oppose the project if it were put on a liquidation basis. It is put on a liquidation basis. They now question repeatedly all the estimated items. Of course, it is necessary to estimate futures, but we Americans have been rather good at that. There was testimony by the engineer, Mr. Wheeler. Figures will be placed in the RECORD showing that the Army engineers through the years have done such a tremendously accurate job of estimating that it is almost miraculous, comparing the estimated costs with the actual costs.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to refer the Senator from Maryland to the Industry Report on Domestic Transportation, which came off the press just a little over a month ago. It is a study made by the United States Department of Commerce on the very subject about which the Senator from Maryland was inquiring. The summary of the report does not appear in either the report of the committee or the minority views on the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution, because the study was not completed until late last fall, whereas the hearings were concluded last spring. I am sure if the Senator from Maryland will get this industry report, which is available at the Department of Commerce, he will find just what the estimated amount of tonnage may be, and what the estimated amount of receipts and tolls may be. Of course, no one can tell to the ton or to the dollar just what either will be.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. TYDINGS. I again thank the Senator from Wisconsin and apologize for violating his request, which I had no intention of doing when I arose.

Mr. WILEY. There is no need to apologize. I should like to have any Senator interrupt, but it does not make for continuity, that is all.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I should like to have is evidently the data suggested by the able Senator from Vermont. I should also like to have for my own consideration the data as to what traffic would likely be diverted, and from where, to make up the volume which he has suggested.

Mr. WILEY. I think there will be found testimony on that subject by men like Harriman, who testified there might be a little diversion. One might find testimony by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, who fears there will be a great diversion, but I think by and large the testimony overwhelmingly shows that the traffic is going to be in the nature of the shipment of grains and heavy materials out-bound, with various materials in-bound. I shall go into that later in my remarks. The coastwise traffic was estimated in one place at from 1 to 3 percent, possibly, to begin with, but I think it will be found in the over-all picture that will all be caught up, with the Midwest economically healthy, which it may not be unless they get the St. Lawrence seaway, which I hope the Senator will note as I develop that subject. With the Midwest healthy, there is no question that, as we grow in population and in economic health, the tonnage in the East ports and in New Orleans will be increased rather than decreased.

Mr TYDINGS and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILEY. I will finish first with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think the Senator's primary premise is a sound one, that anything that benefits part of the country benefits the whole of the country. I think the converse is also true, that anything that hurts a part of the country hurts the whole country. My point was that if the seaway were not built, the traffic would move by other routes. If the seaway is built, some of the traffic that would not flow on it, of course, if it were not built, will be taken from other transportation routes and diverted to the St. Lawrence seaway. I want to know, and I am hoping someone who has been on the committee will tell me, where the traffic that would normally be carried by the existing routes is to come from if the St. Lawrence waterway is built.

Mr. WILEY. We will see that the Senator receives that break-down. Most of the information will be found right in the RECORD, but in the report referred to by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] there will be found additional testimony. I shall develop that point later on, when I present the picture of what the Middle West is facing in relation to its economic life. There is no buncombe about that conclusion.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am going to take my seat, but before I do so I should like to state to the Senator that he can understand the primary motive for my asking the question. The city of Baltimore is the second port in exports and imports in the United States. The port of Baltimore was first in exports for 5 months of 1947. I want to help any other section of the country to improve, but it would be asking a good bit, if the building of the St. Lawrence seaway would cripple the great investments in the facilities that have already been installed in Baltimore to handle the freight received there. I do not want to approach the question on a narrow or provincial basis, but certainly that would be one of the great questions that ought to be considered not only by me but by the entire Senate in arriving at the feasibility of the project.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood the Senator did not want to be interrupted, so I did not interrupt him before, but on this point I should like to ask a question, or make a statement. The Senator from Vermont referred to the industry report of the Department of Commerce, headed by Mr. Harriman. I read that report, and if my memory is accurate—and I should like the Senator from Vermont to check it—the three principal commodities which the report says will be carried, and which will make up the most of the toll, are iron ore from Labrador and from Brazil, which will make up approximately fifteen million of twenty-one million estimated, or possibly twenty-seven million estimated, the balance being grain and coal shipped up the canal. In other words, if my understanding is correct, the report indicates that most of the revenue will come from iron ore shipped up to the Great Lakes ports, rather than from iron ore which is now in the Duluth section of Lake Superior, and which is used for the steel mills of the Middle West, and in the rest of the country.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I should like to continue, but if it be a matter of courtesy, I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. It would be along the line that is now being discussed. The Senator has been courteous to other Senators. I thought he might yield to me.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator will recall that I had inserted in the RECORD during the closing days of the last session letters addressed to the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey, of North Carolina, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, from all the principal

ship lines operating under the American flag. They stated, with one exception, that they did not propose to use the St. Lawrence seaway, and they gave their reasons for not doing so. It is a very voluminous record. Has the Senator any evidence to the contrary, indicating that American shipping would be benefited by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; there is plenty of evidence, I am sure, but I do not care to go into the subject, except to say that that is one of the arguments made. Of course, first, there is a fear that the tonnage will be taken away from them, and then the argument is made that there will not be any tonnage taken away, that there will not be any ships to carry it. That is just one of the arguments that is used continually.

Mr. VANDENBERG rose.

Mr. WILEY. I want to place in the RECORD at this time the Harriman report. I shall then be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Maryland has gone. The report, on page 73, indicates roughly the possible range of toll charges and toll revenues. The estimate is from thirty to thirty-seven and one-half million tons of ore, which would yield from $15,000,000 to $18,750,000 of revenue; grain, six and one-half to eleven and one-half million tons, that would yield $1,625,000 to $4,025,000; coal, 4,000,000 tons, which would yield from $1,000,000 to $1,400,000; and ballast, nineteen and one-half to twenty-two million tons, which would yield from $3,300,000 to $2,925,000, depending upon the toll. The toll ranges from 50 cents down to 15 cents. That is the Harriman report on the potential tonnage, totaling, as may be seen, in the neighborhood of fifty-odd million tons.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not care to interrupt the Senator, as I know he will reach all the related matters in good time. But I do not like to have the Senator from Maryland left even in temporary suspense regarding an overriding fundamental fact in connection with this contemplated traffic. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has referred to it. I think he was very gracious in providing us with an exhibit, which thus substantially destroys his own position in connection with the issue.

The fact is that by far the major portion of the traffic contemplated is a brand-new traffic in iron ore moving in to the steel production of the Middle West, something which has not occurred in hardly any degree heretofore. The truth of the matter is that we have exhausted our inland iron ore reserves, under war pressure, to such an extent that there certainly is no fooling about the proposition that we confront a crisis in respect to raw ore materials if the steel production of the Middle West is to continue.

All that traffic, as the able Senator from Massachusetts has so graciously indicated, is brand new traffic which is not being taken away from the port of Baltimore or the port of Boston or any other port, because it has not existed heretofore, and it would have to exist on a water-borne basis. It could not possibly be shipped cheaply enough in any other manner because of the tremendous bulk and weight of the product.

We could not have developed the steel industry in the Middle West, even during the past years—and without it I do not know how we could have won the war—with rail transportation, because the ore does not lend itself to rail transportation. It has to be water-borne, and, if possible, without breaking cargo.

That is the chief source of contemplated revenue. And I respectfully submit to the Senator that he need have no fears that that sort of traffic is going to reduce any existing traffic, either in his great port of Baltimore or anywhere else on the Atlantic seaboard, because it is new traffic.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask one question. I see on the sheet the Senator from Wisconsin has handed me the item "Grain, 11,500,000 tons." Is that new traffic?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, probably not. I am not undertaking to give the Senator, I ask the Senator please to understand, a complete answer, because I do not want to intrude on the able Senator from Wisconsin, and I know he is going to reach this point in the course of his address. I simply wanted to underscore immediately the fact that there is a tremendous traffic involved here, which is entirely new traffic.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hand back to the Senator from Wisconsin the sheet which he permitted me to examine. I am very glad the Senator from Michigan has been fair enough to say that two of the items on the list, which are to be new traffic, and which he did not enumerate in his remarks, are not new traffic at all, they are old traffic, traffic that will be diverted from existing lines to this new line. Perhaps some of the old lines—it is not certain—possibly might go into bankruptcy. What I do not want to do is to hurt one part of the country while I am very anxious to help another part.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the gracious remarks of the Senator from Michigan, because they give me the opportunity to make myself, to use his term, crystal clear. As I understand, this iron ore which provides $15,000,000 of the $21,000,000 of prospective toll is to come from Labrador. The extent of the reserves of the prospective mines there have not even been tabulated. A 325-mile railroad has to be built before the ore can be brought to a port where it can be placed on boats. The question of the building of the railroad, the grades, and so on, the cost of building the road and the cost of operating it, are matters which are yet utterly unknown. I said what I did say to the Senator from Michigan, and I reply to him equally as graciously as he did to me, in an effort to point out that these tolls are illusory and in the future rather than of today or tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence seaway has been centered in a few ports, and among those ports have been the ports of Baltimore and Boston. Let me say that the development of the seaway will not take business from those ports. It will probably add greatly to the business of those ports. But there are in both Boston and Baltimore a few persons who have dreams of the days when the high-grade iron ore of the Midwest will be exhausted, and the steel industry will have to be forced to move to the Atlantic coast in order to get the low-cost foreign ore.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is stealing part of my argument.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, am I? Perhaps Members of the Senate do not know that the Sparrows Point steel plant of Baltimore used Chilean ore all through the war. They would stand for an expansion of that business in Baltimore if they could blot out the steel industry of the Midwest States. That would mean also that the Pennsylvania Railroad and possibly other lines would reap a harvest in hauling the finished products from Baltimore and possibly other eastern ports to the midwest. But the farmers, and others living in the midwest, would pay that cost. It would not be good for our country to destroy one of the greatest industries we ever had, which is the midwest steel industry.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

RAILROADS ACCEPT SELF-LIQUIDATION IN THEORY

It must be said to the credit of the Association of Railroads that they do not oppose—at least in their public statements—waterway facilities which are self-liquidating. Although the spokesman of the association was unable to recall any waterway which they had supported, still as a matter of principle it is clear that they do not oppose waterways, including the St. Lawrence seaway, if they are self-liquidating. This is what Dr. Julius H. Parmelee, vice president of the Association of Railroads said before the committee under cross-examination by me:

Senator WILEY. We understand now that this association that you represent has reached the conclusion that if it could be demonstrated with reasonable certainty that this could be a 100 percent liquidating project, a self-liquidating project, you would not be against it.

Dr. PARMELEE. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. We take that position, and it is a position we have held for many years. There has been no change in that position.

We have taken them at their word and are sincerely trying to make this project self-liquidating. We have no crystal ball. We cannot look into the future, but we will not sell America short, as some of the opponents of the seaway have. We have watched the progress of this Nation for 60 years, and we have seen that during every decade the level of the economic life of the Nation has risen, the standard of living of the Nation has increased, until today

we have a national income of $220,000,000,000. We have balanced our budget, and we are paying off on our debt. We are contemplating building works in Europe like the one now under consideration, and yet we hesitate to build such works at home.

Since Dr. Parmelee made the statement I just read, however, the association of railroads has shown increasing activity in opposing the legislation in spite of its provisions for self-liquidation. Now they try to point out that the project cannot be made self-liquidating. A careful reading of their thesis, published in a pamphlet entitled "The Great Delusion," shows, however, that having conceded the primary principle that they favor the development of waterways on a self-liquidating basis, they are now driven to quibbling on facts and figures—a transparent strategem.

OPPONENTS AND PROPONENTS AGREE ON FIRST COSTS

A careful study of their figures indicates there is not much difference between the proponents and opponents of the waterway on the initial costs. The association accepts the cost estimates of the Corps of Engineers which, for the total project, including both the seaway and power, amounts to $720,000,000. Eliminating the cost of the power project which Ontario and New York will pay, some $322,000,000, this leaves $398,000,000 for the first cost of the seaway, including both Canadian and American expenditures. From here on, there are divergences between the opponents and the proponents.

WHY ADD INTEREST AND PRINCIPAL OF POWER COST TO SEAWAY COST?

The Association of American Railroads prefers to charge 3 percent interest during construction instead of 2½ percent, and to pad the account further, adds the interest on construction of the power project to the cost of the seaway—an amount of nearly $29,000,000. By this device the association of railroads reaches a figure of $464,000,000 for the cost of the seaway, with interest during construction at 3 percent, including interest on the power project. Why the seaway should pay the cost of interest on the power project is not explained. This is one example of the manner in which the association pads the figures. However, if we take the $398,000,000 and add interest at 3 percent we would get $435,000,000 for the cost of the seaway. At 2½ percent interest, a more reasonable and realistic figure, the cost of the seaway would be $428,000,000. That is, take the cost of $398,000,000, add the interest at the rate of 2½ percent during the period of construction, and we will have what the seaway will cost.

SPURIOUS RETIREMENT POLICY PROPOSED BY RAILROADS

The Association of Railroads again pads the account when considering the annual costs of the project. The annual costs consist of interest, amortization, and operating expenses. The Association of Railroads prefers to retire the entire investment of the seaway in 40 years, which requires an annual charge of 1.33 percent on the cost of the project on a sinking-fund basis.

I know of no project of the nature and magnitude of the St. Lawrence, either in private or public hands, in which the total investment is retired in 40 years. Power companies apply at least a 50-year period of retirement for the dams and structures in water-power plants; railroads practically never retire their fixed investments, and one often wonders if they have any provision for retirement of their rolling stock, in view of the antiquated equipment used for passengers and freight.

The Congress only now has begun to develop a policy for the retirement of public works and reclamation projects which require at least a 50-year period of amortization.

In the case of the Panama Canal, which, by the word of every witness who appeared before our committee is a successful business enterprise, because it has paid all of its expenses—2½ percent interest and a small profit above that from the beginning up to 1940—there is no provision for retirement of the investment. However, improvements and upkeep are met out of current revenues, and a depreciation reserve is set aside for contingencies. Here is a successful enterprise run by the War Department which does not have a retirement system, but a system of depreciation applied only to depreciable property.

The Association of Railroads insists upon applying onerous conditions to the retirement of the proposed investment in the St. Lawrence in order to show that it is uneconomical. When asked whether they would be satisfied if we applied the same depreciation policy as the railroads applied to their own business, Dr. Parmelee said, Oh, no, he did not think that those principles would be applicable.

I can well understand his reaction, because if we applied railroad policies toward amortization of this project, the cost of the seaway would be even lower than the committee estimates.

RETIREMENT POLICY RECOMMENDED BY COMMITTEE

The committee, in its majority report, recommends a 53-year amortization period, which will require a 1 percent sinking fund annual charge. This will retire the total investment in the seaway, including interest during construction, in 53 years. This includes not only the locks and lock gates, dams, and spillways, which are the only depreciable items, but also the canals and the excavation work, which are of more permanent nature.

I personally would prefer the application of the Panama Canal principle to the St. Lawrence, whereby a depreciation reserve is set up to take care of depreciable property, but in deference to my colleagues on the committee, particularly the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who feels that the total investment should be retired within a reasonable time, I am willing to endorse the principle of total retirement in a period of 53 years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am seeking light. The Senator cites the example of the investment in the Panama Canal. Is the amortization of the St. Lawrence seaway figured on the basis of the tonnage which will go through during the period when it will be navigable? If so, is that a direct analogy for a comparison? The Panama Canal operates 12 months in the year. As I understand, the seaway will operate during only a part of the year.

Mr. WILEY. Seven months.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the operation of the Panama Canal on a 12-month basis affords a proper example for comparison of earnings and investment with the St. Lawrence seaway, in view of the fact that it will operate only 7 months in the year?

Mr. AIKEN. Eight months.

Mr. WHERRY. Whatever the number of months may be. I am only seeking light.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy that the Senator has asked the question. We have shown, and will show further in the debate, that the estimated income will run between $15,000,000 and $21,000,000 on a 7-month basis. It will probably be more than that. That is more than ample to take care of depreciation.

In connection with the estimate of tonnage which will pass through that canal, when we take into consideration the fact that through one lock, the MacArthur Lock, in 1946 more than 50,000,000 tons passed, in the down-passage alone, we can see the possibilities of earnings of this canal. I believe that within the lifetime of some of the younger Members of the Senate the population of that area will be possibly 100,000,000. There is the upper basin of Canada, with all its fertility. There are the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Montana, and Nebraska, and other States in the Senator's section. The Senator has some idea what the population will be, and what the load on transportation will be. I am sure that if the Senator will look at the tables in the books which are available, he will understand very clearly that the estimates are made on a business basis.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the amortization is based upon the actual tonnage which has gone through, and estimates of what the tonnage might be in the event certain locks were built.

Mr. WILEY. It is based upon the best opinion of men like former President Hoover, Secretary Harriman, and others who testified, including witnesses from New York and New England.

Mr. WHERRY. Where do they get their figures? I am trying to learn the facts as to the present tonnage, and what the estimate is.

Mr. WILEY. That information is all contained in the Department of Commerce report.

Mr. WHERRY. Upon whom does the Department of Commerce rely? Upon what basis is the survey made?

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator speaking now about the estimate of tonnage?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. I would prefer to have the Senator consult the record and see what it is. It is set forth in detail, showing who testified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on the point raised by the Senator from Nebraska?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILEY. I yield. I prefer to carry on with my argument, because there is no continuity when there are interruptions such as this. Many of the questions which are asked will be answered later by the argument. However, I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think it is fair to say to the Senator from Nebraska that there is now a 14-foot canal which goes down the St. Lawrence. It is my understanding that the traffic which goes through the Welland Canal and down the 14-foot canal is not to pay any of the proposed tolls. The tolls are to be charged only on ships going up or down the new seaway. So when we estimate tonnage, and particularly when we use the figure of 50,000,000 tons going through the MacArthur locks in the past, we must remember that much of that tonnage would not pay tolls when it gets down into the seaway.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the opposition reflected in such arguments has its mind pinned on Boston, New York, and a few other cities. It fails to take into consideration the dramatic statement of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], which is the testimony of every great American.

We of Wisconsin have given of our timber. Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota have given of their iron ore. We have given 2,000,000,000 tons of it to build cities, railroads, and skyscrapers. Now the iron ore is being exhausted. There are 500,000,000 tons left. It is being taken out at the rate of 100,000,000 tons a year. The businessmen of the East are planning and scheming deliberately to transport the iron industry of the Middle West into the East. They want to cut the throat of the Middle West. If they do, what do Senators suppose the ports of the East will get? There are fifty million or sixty million of us living out there, building an economy upon iron. We have given of the lifeblood of our economy. In this war we gave 100,000,000 tons a year. Now all we ask is that there be opened up a stretch of 113 miles in the St. Lawrence River. The businessmen of the East say, "No; you are going to hurt us." If the heart of any man is hurt, I would not give much for his limbs. If we hurt the heart of an industry like the United States of America, we know what will happen to what is outside.

We lived through the prewar period, when the farms of America were being foreclosed. Before the war, insurance companies and banks were taking over farms, and industry was being centralized on the east coast. Some of us had to open the eyes of the people. We finally got them to the point where they saw the need of keeping the great Mississippi Valley industrially and economically sound.

We have given of our iron. We have given of our timber. All we ask is that we be given an opportunity, that the rapids of 113 miles may generate the electric power needed for the lifeblood of industry in the East, and that we may have an opportunity to transport our surplus wheat rather than let it rot on the farms of the Dakotas and Montana.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has said that I am opposing him on sectional grounds. I simply point out that I oppose the joint resolution in its present form, and at the present time. I have never said, and I do not now say, that I will oppose the joint resolution ultimately, if I believe it is practicable.

The Senator was discussing with the Senator from Nebraska the question of making the seaway self-liquidating through tolls. I simply pointed out to him—and I reiterate and point out to him again—that much of the traffic which goes through the Great Lakes, the Welland Canal, and the MacArthur locks, will not pay any tolls on this seaway.

There will be some traffic, of course, which will pay tolls, and I think it is fair to point it out. It is not, in my humble judgment, a sectional argument; it goes to the question of whether this seaway will be practically a self-liquidating project.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, everyone knows that under this resolution and under the treaties we have with Canada the Lakes are open. When we put in 113 miles of channel, cutting out the rock in the rapids, we are asking that the ships which pass up and down those lakes pay toll. Travel from Superior and Duluth down to Ogdensburg is free to the boats of Canada and of the United States. We are not interfering with that traffic. We are saying what former President Hoover said, that if we had had this canal built during World War II it would have been a great help. Miiltary men have said the same thing. Former President Hoover said, further, that if we had a canal we could attend to the job of feeding Europe and getting wheat over there. We are now limited to a capacity of approximately a million bushels a month for export.

The whole fear is built upon a straw man—that this great America of ours has not the iron in her system to come through. The argument which is advanced at this time was advanced when it was stated that we should have built the canal years ago. There was procrastination, there were Fabian tactics and delay. If we fail to pass this resolution we will be called upon—mark my words—to spend billions in making taconite practical as an iron base.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say, first, that the traffic to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] refers as going through a 14-foot canal at the present time, and which would not pay toll, is largely traffic in grain from the Great Lakes ports to the port of Montreal, which would not be expected to pay tolls under the proposed St. Lawrence development.

I think now is the time to say this. I am a loyal New Englander, but my country comes first, last, and all the time, and I am mortified and ashamed at the smallness of a little group of selfish businessmen in Boston.

Not long ago I heard Mr. Laurence F. Whittemore, secretary of the New England Council, and the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, who was an official of the Boston & Maine Railroad, speaking to a group of New England businessmen and telling them to consider the effect of the impact of the St. Lawrence seaway upon them, and hinting to them that with the development of ore in Labrador the steel industry would expand tremendously and New England could become a great steel center. He was misleading the people of New England, just as much as he was misleading the people to whom he was speaking, because he did not tell them that ore was already available to them, that they had to have hundreds of thousands of tons of coal to operate the steel industry, and that there is no coal within hundreds of miles of New England. I think he was imposing upon the businessmen of New England and upon the people of New England who now pay outrageous prices for their electricity. When anyone talks of taking the steel industry away from the Midwest, centering it on the Atlantic coast, and giving our railroads an opportunity to make outrageous profits in transporting iron and steel, farm machinery, and other things that are made from iron or steel, it should be remembered that the additional cost comes right out of the pockets of the farmers and the businessmen of the Midwest who would then have to depend upon their high-cost steel from the central part of the continent, or else take the low-cost steel on either coast and pay transportation charges to get it inland.

That is my sentiment as a New Englander.

Mr. WILEY. I will say, Mr. President, that the sentiment which the Senator has just expressed was also expressed by a great man from Massachusetts, who was regarded as America's greatest forensic speaker, Daniel Webster. He said:

> Let our object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country.

On another occasion he said:

> There are those in each party who are more concerned for their State than for national politics. Their objects are small and their views are narrow.

Daniel Webster, "Black Dan," gave leadership to the Nation.

I said a few moments ago that prior to our getting into the war, when we were in the prewar days, I spoke on the floor of the Senate and stated that if my little city of Chippewa Falls, a town of 10,000 people, could have a pay roll equal to that of the people who were taken out of that little town and lived in Washington it would be economically healthy. Those were the days when grass was growing in the streets. That was simply because there was a taking of pay rolls from those communities that needed them, taking men and hiring them and paying them here. Then started that centralization. Thank God, they woke up. We did build in the

Middle West war plants. But how would it be now if into this eastern area the conspiracy of some of these folks is effectuated so that the plants that have built up Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, and other places, because they could not meet competition in the East, should migrate. How much traffic will the railroads lose?

All we are asking is a loan of $700,000,000 for the building of great productive institutions, a seaway, an electric energy producing plant. We are not asking that Congress do for us what it did for TVA. TVA seems to be panning out. We are asking that the money be loaned to ourselves. There has been no hesitation in sending into Europe between $5,000,000,000 and $7,000,000,000, but there is an unwillingness to take a little risk of our own.

I shall go on now with debunking the proposed padded interest rate.

The opponents insist on padding annual expenses in addition by insisting on a 3 percent interest rate as an annual charge. As stated before, the cost of money to the Federal Government is around 2 percent. Any revenue that yields beyond that amount brings a profit to the Federal Government. It seemed to the committee that a 2½ percent interest rate is reasonable and adequate. It is a fact also that in the case of power projects built and operated by the Reclamation Bureau, the Government has accepted a 2½ percent interest rate as adequate.

The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, in proposing a draft agreement with the State of New York for the transfer of power facilities on the St. Lawrence River, recommended a 2½ percent interest rate. There would seem to be no logical reason whereby the Corps of Engineers should recommend a 2½ percent interest on the St. Lawrence power facilities and a different rate on the seaway. A 2½ percent interest will meet all the costs of money to the Federal Government and show a profit besides.

SEVENTEEN MILLION FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ANNUAL SEAWAY COST

The committee therefore calculates that on the basis of 2½ percent interest, and 1 percent sinking fund amortization which will retire the total investment in 53 years, and, in addition, a $2,400,000 annual operating expense, the St. Lawrence seaway will cost annually $17,400,000. This is the toal cost, to both Canada and the United States.

The Association of Railroads, by using 3 percent interest and 40 years amortization, arrive at an annual figure of $21,600,000. The difference between the padded figures of the opponents and the reasonable calculations of the committee is a matter of $4,000,000 a year.

Under these conditions, after having conceded the desirability and acceptability of the St. Lawrence seaway on a self-liquidating basis, I find, with all due respect to our learned adversaries, no logic or legitimate reason to justify the continued opposition of the Association of American Railroads. I requested counsel for the association to submit his recommendations in a constructive spirit on this legislation for the purposes of improving it and making it acceptable, but to this day I have, unfortunately, heard no word.

Instead, we have, regrettably, only had evidences of oblique opposition, such as I have described. Such an attitude on the part of so distinguished an organization is really disturbing to me.

TRAFFIC POTENTIALS

It is my belief that the traffic that will utilize the St. Lawrence seaway during the succeeding decades will be able to meet not only the reasonable cost estimated by the committee, but even the inflated cost figures of the opponents.

The essential character of the St. Lawrence seaway is that it connects by cheap water transportation the greatest concentration of agricultural and industrial products in the Middle West with all the ports of the world. The traffic and the need for transportation are there. Given the facilities, the traffic will grow decade by decade, until the works now authorized will appear inadequate.

PANAMA CANAL QUICKLY EXCEEDED TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

In the case of the Panama Canal, the initial estimates of traffic, conducted under the auspices of the Isthmian Canal Commission, were not realized during the first year of operation; but within 10 years, by 1924, the Canal carried 27,000,000 tons of traffic—10,000,000 tons above the earlier estimates; and since then it has brought in revenues of as high as $27,000,000 a year. A similar experience can be confidently expected for the St. Lawrence seaway project.

I have dwelt extensively on the position of the opponents on cost because they have conceded their agreement to the construction of the St. Lawrence project on a self-liquidating basis and because they now base their opposition upon what I regard as indefensible annual cost accounting principles which have no basis in fact or theory.

RAILROADS FEAR CHEAP SEAWAY TRANSPORTATION COST

Mr. President, the continued opposition of the Association of American Railroads, and also of the port interests in Boston, New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans, seems predicated on the belief that even with all reasonable charges added to the cost of constructing and operating the St. Lawrence seaway, it still will provide cheap transportation. These interests are concerned with possible diversion of traffic from the established rail lines and ports to the more economical route. This concern cannot be general with all the railroads, but is specifically applicable to the eastern trunk lines connecting Chicago with the eastern seaboard. Their influence goes into New England.

I, of course, have no objection to having the New York Central, the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad come forward in their own name and in their own right to express their opposition to this project because they feel it will impinge on the future traffic potentials of their lines. They have a right to do that. They have a right to take the position, as the case seems to them, that even with all charges paid through tolls, the St. Lawrence seaway would still be competing with the future business of the territory they serve. The Senate, of course, will have to decide whether the economic interests of the 50,000,000 people that live in the whole area of the Great Lakes and the national defense interests of the country as a whole are primary or secondary to the desire of those lines to have a hold on all future growth of traffic in that territory. The testimony of former President Herbert Hoover and Secretary of Commerce Harriman indicated that there might be some temporary inconvenience to the eastern trunk lines, but that future growth in traffic would smooth things out.

My own personal feeling is that the St. Lawrence seaway will be utilized primarily for the transportation of bulk commerce in grain, coal, iron ore, petroleum, bauxite, and many other products as to which water carriage is the most convenient and economical means of transportation, and that without the St. Lawrence seaway such traffic would be strangled, for the railroads could not economically carry the quantities of this traffic that the country will need.

Mr. President, I do not have to tell the Senate right now, with the oil situation in the Middle West what it is at the present time, and with people there freezing—and I just came from there this morning—that the trouble is transportation; and I do not have to assert that the St. Lawrence seaway will be utilized to provide fuel for the Middle West and fuel storage along the Great Lakes, so that people in that great industrial area will not freeze.

Mr. President, on the basis of the testimony presented to the committee by former President Hoover, Secretary Harriman, the Department of the Interior, the American Farm Bureau, and the National Grange, as well as by other business and technical witnesses, the committee estimated an annual traffic of from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 tons, bringing revenues of from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000. The opponents questioned these figures, principally on the premise that no recent studies were made, and that Secretary Harriman's figures were preliminary. I was very much surprised to see that statement in the minority views.

REPORT OF COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. President, those figures are no longer preliminary. The minority views must have been written before November, while most of us were in Europe, for early in November the Secretary of Commerce made public an exhaustive report entitled "An Economic Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project." There is no reference in the minority views to this work, although there is repeated reference to the preliminary nature of the Secretary's testimony. This report is thorough and definitive; and I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska, particularly in view of his questions, that he read the report. It reveals that three commodities alone—grain, iron ore, and coal—would supply 40,000,000 or more tons of traffic, with revenues of between twenty million and twenty-seven million dollars. The report also states that if the United States oil reserves are dimin-

ished off-shore imports of oil would amount to between 15,000,000 and 20,000,000 tons of cargo.

These figures do not include such other important traffic items as newsprint and wood pulp, iron and steel, machinery and vehicles, sugar and coffee, bauxite and chrome ore, and many other products.

NARROW VERSUS NATIONAL VIEW

No, Mr. President, the opponents may not be concerned about the taxpayers' interest. They know full well that there is enough traffic to and from the great industrial empire of the Middle West to utilize the capacity of the seaway and to pay for it. The few interests who benefit from the toll gates of commerce in Boston, New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans are apparently afraid they will lose their financial grip. But that is a narrow and limited view, limited even in perspective as to their own interests.

This country will continue to grow, and by the time the seaway is fully utilized there will be such large transportation requirements and improvement in industry and employment in the country that their children and grandchildren will look upon the present opposition to the seaway with the same amusement with which we view the efforts of the stagecoach interests 100 years ago to stop railroads from having terminals inside city limits. The stagecoach interests did just that, Mr. President.

RAILROAD OPPOSITION TO PREVIOUS COMMERCE PROJECTS

The real possibilities of the seaway probably will not be realized until 10 years after its completion, which will take us into 1965. This means that we are not now considering primarily the present fate of the longshoreman in New York or Boston or the ticket collector on the Long Island railroad who is about to reach his retirement age. We are considering the needs and welfare of their children and of the Nation in an expanding world of economic opportunities 15, 20, or 30 years from now.

I might reiterate, in passing, that I have the deepest respect, generally speaking, for the Association of American Railroads, which in countless instances has rendered magnificent service to American industry and the American Nation, particularly in our war effort. I have high esteem and personal friendship for the association's distinguished president, Mr. William T. Faricy, and for his fellow officers. I have always had, too, real admiration for the railroad brotherhoods and for their membership. That does not, however, alter my appraisal of the objective facts in this situation.

Mr. President, I contend that the common railroad man is in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway, and I say that the letters from the railroad brotherhoods and from others who pretend to speak for the railroad employees, and who say that the railroad employees generally are opposed to construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, are mere buncombe. I have talked to the railroad employees. I talked to some of them only yesterday, as I was on my way to Washington on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. I have talked to them in my own section of the country. These people, the common people, of whom Abraham Lincoln said, "God Almighty must have loved them, for He made so many of them"—have a vision of what the St. Lawrence seaway means in the building of America.

What is the situation as to the leadership of the railroad employees, Mr. President?

When this subject first arose, the presidents of many of those railroads—as we shall show from the record—endorsed this project. The president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the president of the New York Central Railroad, and the presidents of the western railroads were independent souls then; but somehow or other they got into the Association of American Railroads, for which only one man speaks. But he does not speak for the common laboring men. As one man in my own State said to me, "Why, we are for anything that will build America. We know that the railroads have to get busy. They are not serving the interests of the people as they should. It took a lot of the truckers to wake them up and to give the country part of the equipment that was needed. The railroads have to wake up some more, for we are growing faster than our transportation system is growing."

Mr. President, that man spoke with wisdom and with vision.

It is well known that the railroads opposed the construction of the Panama Canal on the theory that it would take traffic away from the transcontinental railroads. Let us read the debates of those days. Today those same railroads are enjoying the fruits of the expanding empire of the West, largely stimulated by the Panama Canal; and not one railroad man will deny now that the Panama Canal has been a boon to this Nation. I asked that question of Mr. Parmelee when he appeared before us. He said, "Yes, now we agree. Now we agree the Panama Canal was a good thing."

WHY THE COAL INTERESTS OPPOSE SEAWAY

The National Coal Association and John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, are opposed to the St. Lawrence project, both as a power-generating facility and as a means of transportation. Why? Just stop and think of it. Why? He averred that if the canal were built, foreign countries would be shipping in coal and taking away our market in this country. Ever since his appearance before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, in 1941, John L. Lewis and his representatives have taken the position that the St. Lawrence seaway will open up the whole Great Lakes area for the invasion of imports of cheap coal from abroad, principally from England and Russia, and that both the domestic as well as the Canadian market will thereby be threatened. John L. Lewis went as far as to state that the 96,000,000-ton market for coal in the Great Lakes region may be taken away from the American producers if the seaway is opened.

Since then we have had the unusual experience of exporting 40,000,000 tons of coal last year, and the only limit upon further exportation is lack of transportation and dollars with which other countries can buy from us. John L. Lewis, himself, in many statements and articles has said that no foreign country can compete with us in the production of coal. Extensive studies by British working parties on coal indicate that one miner in the United States produces 4 or 5 tons of coal a day, as compared with 1 ton a day in England, and 1½ tons a day on the Continent of Europe.

Of course, our wage rates are high in view of the high productivity of our miners. In spite of low wages in Europe they cannot compete with us either in the American or the Canadian market on a price basis. The proof of that is in the fact that even before the war our greatest markets for coal have been open to imports without hindrance. Yes, these various cities, New York, Boston, Baltimore, and New Orleans, have been open to the import of coal. Did they import it? They did, in an infinitesimal amount. Nothing but small dribbles of imports are to be found in all the statistics of the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Commerce. Yet the bugaboo has been used repeatedly on Members of this body to show that John L. Lewis and his miners are against the project, they being afraid that European coal could come in and steal their market.

Since the facts John L. Lewis presented in 1941—and I may say that the coal operators repeat his contentions—are unsound, what is the reason for their continued opposition? Why do they mislead the thousands of upright American working men in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Kentucky with these untrue statistics? The answer is clear. They seem to be responding with enthusiasm and loyalty to the interests of their first customers, namely, the railroads. Yet the strange situation is that those very interests for whom coal miners and operators raise the hue and cry against the St. Lawrence seaway are the ones who are now running out on them, for it is obvious that the railroad industry is converting rapidly from the use of coal to the use of oil.

CONVERSION OF RAILROADS TO DIESEL ENGINES

If the coal interests have any delusions that they have a primary interest in keeping all traffic on rails, the recent statistics showing orders for locomotives must disabuse them. Time magazine of December 2 reported that of the 1,176 locomotives on order on December 1, only 33 were for steam. The rest were Diesels.

The New York Central, which is spearheading the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway, recently placed a $21,000,000 order for 111 locomotives and all of them are for Diesels. The coal interests are misdirecting their efforts in fighting the seaway. They ought to keep their eye on the revolution taking place in railroads' motive power. Paradoxically, John L. Lewis, with his capricious strikes, is himself mainly responsible for the loss of the principal coal market, and not the St. Lawrence project.

The opposition of the coal interests to the St. Lawrence seaway has no justified basis in fact. Insofar as it is a "secondary boycott" on behalf of the railroads, it is just as intelligent as locking the barn door after the horse is stolen.

I come now to a second major element of my case: The value of the seaway for national security.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In their heedless and headstrong desire to defend their interests, opponents have presumed to take on the responsibility of deprecating the recommendations of the President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the heads of the armed services, and the present Secretary of State who was, during the war, chief of staff. We have sent our boys to die upon the battlefields of the world at the command of anyone of these people who have the responsibility of the defense of the Nation, but when it comes to putting mortar, steel, and stone together for the harnessing of natural resources, the opponents—the railroads, the eastern ports would have us believe that these officials' words are not to be trusted.

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF ENDORSE PROJECT

The Joint Chiefs of Staff's report on the St. Lawrence project carried the signature of Admiral Leahy, Chief of Staff of the President, Admiral Nimitz, General Eisenhower, and General Eaker. It was transmitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 16, 1946, with the expressed concurrence in the conclusions of the Secretary of the Navy, now Secretary of National Defense, James Forrestal. It must be remembered that this report was prepared and transmitted to the Senate many months after the general public knowledge of the destructive potentials of the atomic bomb and certainly after many more months of private and secret knowledge of not only this, the most fearful instrument of war, but also of many other secret devices yet unknown even to the opponents of this project. In spite of that knowledge of the latest devices of destruction, the Joint Chiefs of Staff in February 1946 recommended strongly construction of this project. The grounds upon which they based their recommendations are as follows:

First. The St. Lawrence seaway will provide an alternate- and protected-transportation route in case of a national emergency.

Second. The St. Lawrence project will provide a large block of power in an area which was a power-deficit area in World War II.

Third. The St. Lawrence seaway project will make it possible to construct larger ships within the protection of the Great Lakes area where resources of steel and manpower are abundantly available.

The fundamental thesis of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is that total war requires the complete mobilization of the resources of the country, and the St. Lawrence project will materially help in such mobilization in another emergency. Basically, it comes down to the fact that the St. Lawrence is going to save manpower, materials, and transportation facilities which in effect will increase the industrial capacity of the country in times of peace and in war.

In his appearance before our committee, former President Hoover stated definitely that the St. Lawrence project would have been of immeasurable value in World War II and that if it had been available in this last war, it would have paid for itself several times over. Secretary Marshall, in addition to reiterating recommendations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the basis of his knowledge as Secretary of State as well as former Chief of Staff, stated that he considered it important to the defense of the North American Continent. To this effect, he presented to the committee the conclusions of the Canadian-American Joint Defense Board which is charged with planning and coordinating the common defense interests of the two countries which recommended strongly this project as necessary to the joint defense of Canada and the United States.

OPPOSITION OF MINORITY REPORT TO DEFENSE STATEMENT

Such is the evidence upon which the majority base their recommendations for the completion of this project as a contribution to national defense. Yet the junior Senator from Massachusetts, in the minority report which he has prepared, undertakes diligently to obliterate the recommendations of those to whom this Nation has entrusted our security and defense. What is the basis of his skepticism?

It is the opinion of two retired officers, one of the Army and one of the Navy, who were hurriedly brought before our committee, having studied the subject of the St. Lawrence project only in a matter of days and not having read any of the extensive documentary evidence which was easily available to them. These two retired officers may have been, I assume, retained by those who are motivated less by national consideration than by their own peculiar situation.

THE SO-CALLED INDEFENSIBILITY ARGUMENT

One of these retired officers, Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley—I emphasize, this is Follett, not Omar, Bradley—stated that that part of the St. Lawrence now in operation—the Soo locks—and the Welland Canal are not defensible against air attack. Here was a man who was entrusted with the air defenses of our east-coast shipping, who says that the two most vital waterways in our continent are not defensible. Just think what would have happened in World War II if the Soo locks were really attacked, and according to this man, were put out of commission. Members of the Senate must realize that, actually, our whole industrial and agricultural economy depend upon the Soo locks. Eighty percent of all the steel in the United States is made of the iron ore that passes through the Soo locks. Gen. Follett Bradley says that those locks are not defensible. I say to General Bradley, if they are not defensible, then I say the steel industry is not defensible; Chicago and Detroit, Cleveland and Pittsburgh, are not defensible; power plants at Niagara, Montreal Harbor—yes, Washington and Boston—are not defensible.

MINORITY DOES NOT QUESTION DEFENSIBILITY OF POWER PROJECT

The opponents would have us believe that the major part of our industrial civilization of North America is not defensible and that therefore we should not add any new works in that part of our country. Yet the minority, which makes much ado about the vulnerability of the seaway, is careful to distinguish between the seaway, which they oppose, and the power project which they say they do not oppose. The seaway must be considered vulnerable but not the power project, apparently. The seaway project and the power project are all one. They are all built together in this 113-mile stretch. In other words, we should stop growing; we should not build any weapons of defense or provide for the future development of this country, because we are liable to be destroyed by an atomic bomb. Of course, after our experience in Japan we know well that nothing is safe from the atomic bomb, but that is no reason why we are going to stop building and growing and hoping that we shall find a defense against an atomic attack. That is the business of our great generals and admirals, the commanders of our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The main dams and power plants are the major part of the works involved in this undertaking and if anything is not defensible in that area, dams and the powerhouse will be the most vulnerable, more so certainly than the locks and canals. Obviously the opponents cannot argue against any power plant because they know that if this project is not constructed, some equally vulnerable steam power project must be constructed in the same general area. Yes, Senators representing the East know that steam plants must be constructed in the East, plants which are just as vulnerable, if not more so, than the ones in question.

One is entitled to question the consistency of their argument that the seaway is vulnerable when they exclude the power plants from their arguments.

In New England, it seems unpopular these days to talk against cheap additional power, because they have an acute shortage, and industry is moving away. The logic of the opponents must lead them to the conclusion that the country must stop adding new works to increase industrial potential because whatever is built above ground is vulnerable to bombing.

I have yet to hear of a constructive suggestion from the opponents as to what to do to protect Grand Coulee, the Soo locks, the cities of Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland and Pittsburgh, Boston and New York. If any enemy ever reaches these shores with atomic bombs, I can assure Senators that the first target would be New York and Washington, and not some canal on the St. Lawrence. Mr. President, this vulnerability thesis is the most transparent smoke screen. Those who raise that issue seriously do not do credit to the intelligence of this body.

SHALL WE DEVELOP POWER ABROAD BUT NOT AT HOME?

I note that the junior Senator from Massachusetts, after his brief trip to Europe, has recommended to the people of the country enactment of some form of the Marshall plan with all its costs and with all its works in western Europe. If my distinguished colleague from the Bay State has read and studied the reports of the European Coordinating Committee on the Marshall plan, he must know that a good deal of the resources required will go into the very type of works which he opposes in our own country. The program developed for western Europe for the next 4 years calls for in-

creased capacity of electric power plants of 25,000,000 kilowatts, a 60 percent increase over what they had before the war. It calls for rehabilitation of railroads and canals, and increase in their capacity. It seems unlikely that we will get back any of that investment.

The Senate will be interested to know that one of those projects is international in nature, a hydroelectric project of the TVA type, straddling Italy, France, and Germany, a truly international project even more complex than the St. Lawrence waterway between Canada and the United States. We are going to be called upon to finance such projects as these in western Europe, and I assume my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, is all in favor of it.

VULNERABILITY OF EUROPEAN PROJECTS

I do not wish to raise the issue of consistency of such a position in view of his opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway. I merely wish to analyze the military security of works in western Europe as against our own project here. The idea is that the project now proposed to be built on this continent can be destroyed. How about the projects proposed to be built in Europe in the construction of which we shall participate? How much more vulnerable will these works in western Europe be to any potential enemy of democracy that may decide to launch an atomic attack by air without warning. We will be called upon to increase production potentials of democracy in an area in Europe which is much more vulnerable to attack by a continental power, while complacently and blindly the opponents of this program oppose a development of our own resources certainly at a much safer distance from a potential enemy.

We who are called upon to give moral encouragement and material assistance to the other democracies of the world would be making a poor showing of strategic thinking by such an inconsistent position. What a fine example we will set for the world. What fine geographical strategy to prevent developments in this country while we pour cur substance into the more vulnerable areas of western Europe.

LACK OF BACKGROUND OF ANTISEAWAY "EXPERTS"

What, I repeat, is the "informed opinion" upon which the opponents of the St. Lawrence project base their case? Vice Adm. Russell Willson, retired, appeared on behalf of the opponents by arrangement of the National St. Lawrence Projects Conference, which has its offices in the Transportation Building in Washington. This is, unfortunately, the extent of the admiral's knowledge of the St. Lawrence project:

Senator WILEY. Have you studied the voluminous documentary background on this project?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The International Joint-Commission's hearings of 1920?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The report of the Joint Board of Engineers in 1926?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The Hoover report of 1927?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The interdepartmental report of 1934?

Admiral WILLSON. No, sir.

Senator WILEY. The congressional hearings of '32–'33, '41, and '46?

Admiral WILLSON. I have seen some of the documents, sir. I have the great advantage of approaching the subject with an open mind, sir.

Senator WILEY. I have no question about that.

Here is the other witness whom the opponents bring against Admiral Leahy, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, and other heads of our armed forces. He is Maj. Gen. Follett—not Omar—Bradley, retired.

Senator WILEY. Have you read the various reports. Have you studied the reports that have been given on this project heretofore?

General BRADLEY. No. The only report that I studied, and I have not studied that, I read it through hurriedly, was dated 1941, I think, prepared by the then Secretary of Commerce, and I do not remember the title of it. It is a gray volume, and one of several volumes.

Senator WILEY. When did you first get interested in studying this report?

General BRADLEY. About 10 days ago.

It is a despairing case, indeed, when at the last moment the counsel for the defense, knowing that he has lost the case on its merits, rushes to bring in witnesses with little knowledge of the subject matter to bolster an indefensible position.

SUMMARY OF CONFLICTING ARGUMENTS OF SEAWAY FOES

Let me summarize briefly the conflicting and confused arguments made by the minority to disqualify the St. Lawrence project.

They said, without due proof, that all works from Grand Coulee Dam to Sault Ste. Marie and all the works, establishments and cities around the Great Lakes are indefensible to air attack; therefore the St. Lawrence would be equally vulnerable and should not be constructed.

However, they do not express any opinion on the St. Lawrence power project which is located in the same spot. Apparently they object only to the seaway which, for that matter, is much more defensible than the main dam and the power plants.

They claim that the locks on the St. Lawrence would be just as vulnerable as the Panama Canal; in fact, Admiral Willson stated that he almost damaged one of the gates of the Panama Locks when he was guiding a destroyer through the canal. Hence one must conclude, according to the opponents, that the St. Lawrence would also be subject to damage. On the same theory, we should not have built the Panama Canal because some future Admiral Willson might by mistake damage the gates.

They say the St. Lawrence would not give relief to transportation in time of war because its carrying capacity would be small. To the contrary, however, they claim that the waterway would seriously damage the rails and the eastern ports.

They claim that the season of navigation is only 7 months of the year and will necessarily limit the usefulness of the St. Lawrence as a national defense asset. This argument, of course, does not apply to the power project, which will operate 12 months of the year. As far as the seaway is concerned, exactly the same argument can be made against the Great Lakes, upon which our whole western industry is based, including our steel industry, the key to national defense. It would be just as logical to argue that the Mesabi iron range, the Harbor of Duluth, the Soo locks, the Great Lakes, are all of limited use to national defense because they, too, have a 7-month navigation period.

NEED FOR NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Mr. President, we must come back to first principles in determining the value of an undertaking such as the St. Lawrence for national defense. As before, I grant the right of any economic group, of any transportation agency and of any port authority to come forward and express their views and particularly what they mistakenly regard as their own interests in relation to any given piece of legislation. I grant sincerely and sympathetically the right of any Senator to represent, as best he can, what he construes to be the interests of his constituents. But to go beyond that in defense of these interests and to try to cast out the judgment of the leaders of our national defense establishments, from the Commander in Chief through the military heads of our Armed Forces, is a serious responsibility and should not be undertaken lightly upon such flimsy conclusions and with such witnesses as the opponents have brought forward.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. President, there is one further phase of the St. Lawrence seaway project of paramount national interest and which deserves thorough discussion in these proceedings. I refer to the need of natural resources, particularly iron ore, copper, and petroleum and the role that the St. Lawrence seaway project will play in the future stability of industry in these United States. It requires no proof that the welfare of this country in peace and war and its ability to withstand contingencies and dangers in succeeding generations will depend upon the availability of energy resources, food, and industrial raw materials such as iron, steel, and copper. It is because the St. Lawrence seaway makes a direct contribution to these factors of national strength that the majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee urges the adoption of the present agreement with Canada.

STRATEGY OF FOOD AID FOR OVERSEAS

We have come to realize now more than ever before that food is one of the vital weapons of warfare and one of the essential weapons of democratic strategy. Yet, the food-producing districts of the United States and Canada are the only areas in the world removed from cheap water transportation on the high seas by a thousand miles or more. It is only because we have had the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence canals and the Mississippi River system that that area has been able to develop as a major source of foodstuffs for the world.

But now we realize that those facilities are inadequate for the production and transportation of enough supplies to meet world demand, and they will continue to remain inadequate until, learning by the lessons of experience, we undertake through this project to bring deep-draft vessels into the Great Lakes,

or to allow the Lake carriers to proceed down the St. Lawrence to Montreal without expensive transfer of cargo. In that way, the immense productive capacity of our farms and fields can be easily and quickly made available to our friends in this and any future times of crisis. There can be no economic nor strategic excuses and defense for a program as presented by the opponents which would make it difficult and expensive to bring this food to the needy millions of the world.

The St. Lawrence project, under present conditions of high transportation costs, would save as much as 10 cents a bushel. Even if only half of our 500,000,000-bushel exports came down the lakes, this would mean a direct saving of $25,000,000 to the taxpayers, where the exports are subsidized, or that much more income to the farmer if sold on a commercial basis.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We now ship grain from Omaha via New Orleans to London, do we not?

Mr. WILEY. I so understand.

Mr. WHERRY. What will be the difference in freight rate, if any, in shipping from Omaha to London via New Orleans, as compared with shipping from Omaha to Chicago, and via the St. Lawrence to London?

Mr. WILEY. I would have to consult the freight schedules. Of course, that rate has not been determined, so far as shipment north is concerned. In that case, of course, there would not be continuous passage.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the distance? I can see that possibly the freight rate cannot be established until after the seaway is built. However, the point upon which I should like information is this: A wheat producer in Colorado, Wyoming, or Nebraska may ship his grain either to Omaha or Chicago, and have it transported via the Mississippi and New Orleans to London. Some products, of course, might require deeper draft vessels; but such shipments of grain are certainly being made now.

Mr. WILEY. Before we are through I shall try to get the figures. If some of that grain moves to Chicago, it must be transported to Ogdensburg; and under present conditions it must be reloaded into smaller vessels, and transported in smaller vessels until it reaches Montreal. Then it must be reloaded again into ocean-going vessels. However, we can easily ascertain what the present cost is. It has been estimated that there would be a saving of 10 cents a bushel.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been so informed. The estimate has ranged all the way from 3 to 10 cents a bushel, representing the saving to be made by the wheat producer. I have not yet placed my hands upon any study which has been made which shows what the wheat farmer will save, if anything, by transporting wheat from Omaha by way the proposed St. Lawrence seaway to London, as compared with shipping it by barge to New Orleans and then to London by ocean freight.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that if the grain were shipped to Chicago from Omaha it would be necessary to pay a rail rate?

Mr. WHERRY. If it were shipped from Omaha to Chicago; but we have water transportation from Omaha down the Missouri and Mississippi to New Orleans.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. Also there is a waterway from Chicago to New Orleans and by way of the ocean. I think we should have the facts, because it is of vital interest to the wheat producers to know what saving will be possible in connection with wheat originating at Omaha. We know what the freight rate is now if the wheat is loaded on a barge and transported down the Missouri and Mississippi to New Orleans, and then shipped by ocean from New Orleans to London. What we do not know is what the freight rate would be if the wheat were shipped from Omaha by rail to the nearest port on the St. Lawrence seaway, and then shipped by water down the St. Lawrence seaway and across the ocean to London.

Mr. CONNALLY. The point I wish to make is that in that sort of a transaction there would be two changes. The grain would have to be shipped to Chicago by rail. When it reached Ogdensburg it would have to be placed in light vessels. Then there would be another operation in getting it off the light vessels and into larger vessels. So there would really be three operations.

Mr. WILEY. Under present conditions.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand. Also, the grain would be placed on a line which would involve payment of a toll, which would not be operative in the case of shipment by New Orleans. From Omaha to New Orleans there would be only one operation. The grain would be taken to New Orleans and placed on ocean-going vessels. The seas are pretty free.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I am raising.

Mr. WILEY. Is Omaha south of St. Louis?

Mr. WHERRY. No; it is north.

Mr. WILEY. The answer would be this: Suppose the grain is transported by water. There is probably not more than a 9-foot channel in the Missouri River.

Mr. WHERRY. A 9-foot channel is what we have.

Mr. WILEY. It is transported in small boats, which do not carry large loads. One would have to figure what the costs would be under those circumstances in the case of shipment to New Orleans. The grain would be reloaded at New Orleans, and it would be necessary to add the tariff from New Orleans to London.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any testimony anywhere in the hearings on that subject?

Mr. WILEY. No. It would be necessary to have a tariff board figure the costs.

Mr. WHERRY. Such information would certainly be informative. Those of us in the Great Plains area ought to have the information. If a purported saving of from 3 to 10 cents a bushel on grain is to be effectuated, we should know how it is to be done, as compared with our present-day costs. I should like to have the information.

Mr. WILEY. I shall try to obtain the information for the Senator. This question takes us back to the field of the individual interest of the individual Senator in an individual State. We are asking Senators to raise their visors and see the larger perspective.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the Senator would not judge how far I am looking. I am very open-minded on this question.

Mr. WILEY. I assume the Senator is, or he would not have asked the question.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason why I am suggesting the question to the distinguished Senator is that we are appropriating large sums of money to develop navigation on the Missouri River with the idea of bringing the ocean close to Omaha, Nebr. However, other States and cities are interested. There are 9 or 10 States in all which have an interest in this question. A number of cities receive wheat from the producing areas. Wheat is one of our large transportation items in that section of the country.

Let us be brutally frank. If there is a saving, I want to be convinced of it. My reason for asking for the production of the records is that I have not seen them. I should like to know where I can place my hands on any testimony bearing upon the purported saving of from 3 to 10 cents a bushel on grain.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The great Wheat Belt of this country is divided into two sections. Wheat from one section naturally gravitates toward the port of New Orleans or the port of Galveston for shipment. Wheat from the northern States naturally gravitates toward Duluth or Chicago for shipment by way of the Great Lakes or by rail. I do not believe that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would change the amount going either way to any great extent. Shipments destined for Mexico and South America, which are large export markets, would probably continue to come from the Midwest. Nebraska and Kansas are approximately in the center of that belt. Wheat from that section could be shipped either way almost equally well.

Shipments destined to South America would go out by way of New Orleans, thus saving a couple of thousand miles distance. Shipments destined for northern Europe, France, and England would go out by way of the Great Lakes, saving a couple of thousand miles as compared with shipment from New Orleans. In other words, there would be two alternate routes.

Of course, a great deal of that grain must be placed on railroad cars to get to

Omaha, Kansas City, or wherever it is shipped from. It must go by rail either to one of those river ports or to Duluth or Chicago. If it went to Duluth or Chicago, then, with the seaway completed, it would be loaded on ships destined for Rome, Oslo, Liverpool, Berlin, or some other European port, and would go through directly.

Heretofore it has been estimated that there would be a saving of 5 or 6 cents a bushel in the shipment of wheat to northern European ports if the St. Lawrence seaway were completed. There would be a saving in the cost of unloading the grain at Buffalo and transshipping it to New York or Baltimore—mostly to New York—and reloading it on the vessels. However, the cost of labor has gone up, and rail transportation costs have risen, so that now Mr. Julius Barnes, who is one of the great wheat shippers of the country, estimates that the saving, even with the payment of the tolls, would amount to approximately 10 cents a bushel.

If we can save 10 cents a bushel in the export of wheat to the world market, or to the Atlantic coast cities such as Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, it will mean either that the consumers in the world market will save money or that the western wheat grower will have an additional few cents a bushel to put in his pocket.

However, I do not believe that we can force the farmers of the North Central States to ship down a 9-foot channel to New Orleans if they want to ship to northern Europe, and I do not believe that we should try to force the farmers of Nebraska and the surrounding area to the south, who are supplying the Mexican and South American markets, to ship their grain by way of the Great Lakes. I think it would be bad for the economy. I hope to see alternate routes provided so that they can ship their wheat and get the most they possibly can get for it.

Something was said about shipping from Chicago south to New Orleans by way of the canal. I believe it is a 9-foot canal at present. It may be a 12-foot canal some of the distance. I visited that canal approximately 2 years ago and found 75 to 80 percent of the Illinois Canal traffic was moving north-bound, not south-bound.

Mr. WILEY. I want to say, Mr. President, that it seems to me that the junior Senator from Nebraska might well consider——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In answer to what the Senator from Vermont said regarding the traffic on the Illinois Canal going north, I think that is primarily due to arrangements which the railroad companies have with the present utilities commission in Chicago, whereby they ship coal from the little town of Taylorville, Ill., to my home city of Havana, Ill. When the coal reaches that city it is placed on barges and shipped on to Chicago. That is a tremendous operation. Of course all of that goes north. That is not the only traffic we have that goes north, but there are thousands of tons of coal coming out of the coal fields at Taylorville, Ill., to Havana which then is transferred some 175 miles.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course it is only natural for a producer of grain in the West to want to get his product to the ultimate market at the lowest possible over-all transportation cost. But I should like to direct the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to the fact that the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway, so-called, would perhaps be an outlet for Canadian wheat rather than for grain produced in the United States. The Grain Belt of the United States now has a water outlet down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers up to the Minneapolis market. That is almost to our northern border. It has been moving down for many years at a low water rate to New Orleans, and sent by ocean transport to foreign markets—South American markets as well as European markets. So I should like to have the distinguished Senator bear in mind perhaps the inequitable division of the costs on the proposed seaway as between Canada and the United States. I should also like to have the point developed as to whether the project will bring grain to the markets of the United States for a less cost, in greater or less quantity, than it will take the Canadian grain to market.

Mr. WILEY. I assume from the statement of the distinguished Senator that he is interested in developing the Missouri River waterway system. If this country is to be regarded as a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, or a Missouri River system, a western system, or eastern system, instead of being one Nation, we shall find ourselves blocked.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would yield for my own personal observation as to the St. Lawrence seaway and its benefits to this great Nation.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. As I have read the testimony of various persons who appeared before the committee to testify in behalf of the St. Lawrence seaway, the most significant of the benefits is in the low-cost hydroelectric development that is possible if the project is permitted. That would be one of the greatest benefits. If this Nation is ever again confronted by such a world situation as World War II we shall need all the generating capacity of which the St. Lawrence seaway project can be capable in order to furnish us the power for the various installations necessary to conduct the warfare with which we would be confronted.

As I read the testimony I found that the anticipated rate for generating electricity under the St. Lawrence seaway project would be one of the lowest in the world, and that we would have in the flow of water the greatest potential generating capacity that can be found anywhere in the world. It would be the most uniform and steady flow of water for generating purposes of any project in the world.

If we want to look back into the past 5 years and consider the demand for hydroelectric power and the installations necessary for the production of electric current, and realize what the demand would be if we are ever confronted again with any such armament program as that to which we were subjected, we would need the electric current itself a great deal more than we would need any other phase of the entire project.

As to whether the rate down the St. Lawrence seaway would be a benefit to Omaha, Nebr., or Southwest producers, I think there is no question that it would be a benefit. Every year we in the Northwest are confronted with the fact that we cannot move our wheat. It lies in piles all over that part of the country because we have not the facilities to move it East. That has been a constant problem every year, and it will continue to be a problem. So the St. Lawrence seaway has so many benefits that we have merely scratched the surface in enumerating what it can do for us.

Insofar as the taconite deposits in Minnesota are concerned, they are lying there waiting for the St. Lawrence seaway development. The time will come when the high-grade ores will be depleted. When that time comes, we should be able to utilize that which this project has in store for us.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the best answer as to whether the St. Lawrence seaway would benefit the farmers of Nebraska and other Western States lies in the fact that every major farm organization having members in those States is already on record as favoring the project. That would include the Grange, the Farmers' Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Association of Milk Producers' Cooperatives. The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives has not endorsed the development of the St. Lawrence River specifically, but it has endorsed the development of all our major river systems collectively.

It may be said that every major farm organization and also the National Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives has unanimously at annual conventions endorsed the development of this great river.

Mr. WILEY. I thank both of the Senators for their contributions.

I want now to get back to the question of the Missouri River.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the freight rates from Omaha.

Mr. WILEY. When I yielded to the Senator from Illinois I had started to say that it seemed to me that, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the development of the St. Lawrence waterway could not help being of material assistance to the farmers of the northern two tiers of States.

We have before us a map showing Minnesota, Iowa, the Dakotas, and Nebraska. The statement was made that if we wanted to develop the Missouri Valley, we could put the wheat in small barges on a 9-foot channel and it could be carried down to New Orleans. There is no

objection to that. But I think the testimony shows, as was stated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that there is a territory in this country, particularly Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, that feeds as a matter of course into the Mississippi River. But they are not great wheat-producing States.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. To correct the RECORD, let me point out that Texas is a great wheat-producing State, and we have seven ports of our own on the Gulf coast. So our wheat does not necessarily flow into the New Orleans or the Mississippi outlet.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to have that correction, because I do not have in mind at the present time the statistics State by State.

But in the north central section of the United States, including my own State of Wisconsin, where a great deal of grain is grown, and Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and Minnesota, great quantities of wheat are produced. The point is that certainly no harm can come to the farmers of Nebraska or the other States I have mentioned by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. If the seaway does not result in giving them a cheaper transportation rate, then they can use other transportation facilities; but at least a choice will be available to them.

At the present time a great many of the products of the farm move from the central area of our country by train, but the trains are inadequate to carry the total load. As Mr. Hoover has said, they have not been able to carry it.

Mr. President, I wish to return to a discussion of the situation in the Midwest, a situation which I think is tremendously significant. I now hold before me a map which shows the development of hydroelectric power. I wish the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] particularly to note this point. The map shows the major State, Federal, and municipal hydroelectric power developments, either authorized or under construction. Just consider that situation. There are no such developments in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, or Ohio. But see how many such developments there are in the other States. The Government has subsidized them and in many instances has, in conjunction with the States, paid the bill.

In the case of the St. Lawrence seaway we are not asking that that be done, but we are asking that the Government put up the money and see to it that this great project is developed between two great Nations.

DEPLETION OF MESABI ORE

Mr. President, I was discussing the subject of food. Even more important than the strategy of food is that of materials. It is generally known and accepted today that the iron ore deposits of the Mesabi range have a life expectancy of from possibly 5 to 10 years. A few years ago the estimate was 12 to 20 years; but in view of the rapidity with which we are depleting those deposits of high-grade ore, it is now estimated that they will be exhausted in between 5 and 10 years. That testimony comes from such reliable sources as President C. M. White, of the Republic Steel Corp., and President R. C. Allen, of the Reserve Mining Co. The latter authority appeared before the predecessor committee in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project, but he admitted that the iron ore resources in the Great Lakes region were diminishing rapidly. Mr. Oscar Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior, and the Department of Commerce in a recent report on the St. Lawrence seaway project affirm the same condition.

SEARCH FOR FOREIGN ORES

In fact, the steel companies are so concerned about this situation that they are now engaged in exploring new sources of iron ore. The Oliver Mining Co., a subsidiary of United States Steel, the Reserve Mining Co., which represents the consolidated interest of Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., American Rolling Mills, and others, are engaged in experimentation for the development of concentrated low-grade taconite iron ore which must be put through expensive processes in order to obtain merchantable iron ores. Hanna & Co., in conjunction with some Canadian interests, are heavily engaged in iron-ore exploration in Labrador. The Republic Steel Co. is developing magnetite ores in the Adirondack area of New York, as well as exploring new deposits in Mexico. The United States Steel Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Corp., are exploring the Orinoco Basin of Venezuela for the same vital product.

DEPENDENCE OF NATION ON MESABI ORE

These activities and these expenses are not taken in vain. They are undertaken because of the certainty that the life of the Mesabi range is limited. Over 80 percent of the iron and steel produced in the United States has depended on iron ore shipped from Mesabi through the Soo, and down the Great Lakes to the mills of the lower lake States. Our whole industrial structure is based on the happy conjuncture of cheap surface ores, such as those the Mesabi Range furnishes, cheaper water transporation down the lakes, and easily accessible coal resources in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and Illinois. If the ores in the Mesabi Range are exhausted, a terrible blow will be dealt to the stability and security of this whole Nation.

FUTURE USE OF LOW-GRADE ORES

To meet this situation we must plan on a national basis to make certain that adequate ore resources will be available to sustain and expand our productive capacity in the Middle West, and to do this the St. Lawrence seaway is a necessity. True, some portion of the future requirements will come from low-grade ores, but for them $15 per ton of annual output is required in plant investment. To obtain an adequate capacity of, let us say, 80,000,000 tons a year, this Nation would have to spend $1,200,000,000 in beneficiating plants. There is even some doubt that technically this can be accomplished, let alone the enormous expense of capital investment, plus the expensive operation of such an undertaking.

It is estimated that even if technically possible, iron ores obtained from such sources would cost about $3 more per ton and the price of steel would increase $6 per ton for this one reason alone. Fifty or sixty million tons of steel from this new source would cost the consumers of this Nation $300,000,000 or $360,000,000 more a year.

To the extent that there will be foreign sources of ore on the east coast and the Gulf coast of the United States, it is to be doubted that the steel industry in the Middle West could sustain the competitive pull and dislocation of the cheaper sources of ore that could be brought into the eastern harbors by deep-water transportation. Regardless of whether it will be technically feasible to develop taconite ores, the higher cost will in itself bring pressure upon many units of the steel industry to move to tidewater areas.

POSSIBLE RELOCATION OF MIDWEST INDUSTRY

Mr. President, I now wish to call particular attention to what is involved in the St. Lawrence seaway development. There is evidence that the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway realize the implications of the iron-ore situation. Disregarding the tremendous cost to the Nation and the dislocation of industry and communities and peoples that this situation will create in the established industrial areas of the Middle West, they may still feel that such a dislocation may redound to their advantage. This is a serious thought, and I would not state it but for the fact that it is a matter of record.

I have in my possession an article written by Mr. Bowditch, president of the New England Council, which appeared in the New England Newsletter of September 1947. Mr. Bowditch and the New England Council are opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project, but they combine their opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project with a plea that the council make every effort to invite units of the steel industry to establish themselves in New England.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that Mr. Dudley Harmon, executive vice president of the New England Council, advised me on Friday afternoon that the New England Council is now taking no position in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway, but is leaving it to each member of that council to determine his position for himself.

Furthermore, I wish to say that the New England Council never took a vote of its membership in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway, but proceeded on the basis of a vote of the board of directors, and it depended on the advice of Mr. Bowditch; Mr. Ned French, president of the Association of New England Railroads; and Mr. C. L. Campbell, president of the Association of Electric Power Companies of New England.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to have that information.

As I have said, when Mr. Bowditch wrote the letter to which I have referred, he suggested that they make every effort to invite units of the steel industry to establish themselves in New England.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. Let me ask when the letter was written.

Mr. WILEY. It was written in September 1947. I have the exact date on file in my office. It was a news letter issued at that time.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the view there expressed is not shared by a large part of the membership of the New England Council.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to hear that, and I am glad to say in that connection that it is not shared by the common people of even the great State of New York and the great city of New York. Senators are familiar with the polls which have been taken.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. They clearly indicate that in Boston and other cities that are so ably represented in this body by Senators of distinction, the people voted in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway—over 57 percent in one city, for instance, voted in favor of the seaway—recognizing the over-all national demand and necessity for it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the RECORD should show that Mr. Bowditch is a director of the Boston and Maine Railroad, of which the largest stockholders are the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Mr. WILEY. I may say that Mr. Bowditch, in cooperation with the railroads of New England, is trying to channel public opinion in Massachusetts, for instance, against the St. Lawrence seaway project. There is no doubt at all about that.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; there is no doubt at all.

Mr. WILEY. Yet at the same time they are making plans to receive the benefits of all the sorry dislocations which will result from the migration of the steel industry when the Mesabi range is exhausted. Certainly that migration and those tremendous dislocations will occur if we cannot open up the St. Lawrence, and thus make it possible for high-grade ores to reach the great steel region of the Midwest.

Mr. President, in this situation the responsibility rests on the Members of the Senate. I have been a Member of this body for 9 years, and during that time I have never, I think, in any endeavor, except when seeking to get reasonable prices for milk products, been provincial in my thinking. I respond to the present challenge by stating, echoing the sentiments of Daniel Webster, that I am an American. In the case of this great project, I do not think one can decide the issue on the basis of whether the development will or will not help his particular State. The question is, Will it help America?

In this article, to which reference has been made, Mr. Bowditch proposes that in the light of the exhaustion of middle-western ore resources and the proximity to Boston of Labrador ore, they make every effort to invite the steel industry to settle in New England. I have not heard from my friend the junior Senator from Massachusetts whether in the interest of national defense he considers a steel plant in Massachusetts a more secure target than one in Pittsburgh or Cleveland or Chicago, or whether there would be particular gain to national security and stability by such a shift—a movement to the east coast, which at present is already overcentralized, I believe, to a suicidal degree in the event of a national emergency.

The Canadian mining authorities, as well as the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior of the United States, agree that the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway project is a guaranty of stability of the Middle West steel industry, and that it will in time become a necessity if we are to prevent the industrial dislocation of this Nation in the next 5 or 10 years.

MOVEMENT OF OIL TO MIDWEST

The same situation exists concerning copper, oil, and many other mineral projects. It is expected that in the foreseeable future, this country will become a direct importer of these products, particularly of petroleum which is so essentially a source of energy. When the great Southwestern oil fields give out, the Middle West again will be at the mercy of shortages and higher costs, and the St. Lawrence seaway project would be needed to bring some South American or near eastern oil, which the industrial empire of the Middle West will need in large quantities.

Perhaps some of my friends in Texas or Oklahoma are afraid that the St. Lawrence Seaway if authorized now would threaten the market for their present oil wells. They need not have this fear, for as long as reserves are available in the southwestern fields, the pipe lines will continue to carry those supplies to the Middle West. It is against the contingency of their exhaustion that we must protect ourselves. So again I invite my friends from the Southwest of our country to think of this project in the terms of the next 10 to 20 years rather than as a threat to their present production.

UNITED STATES INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS AND EXPANSION VITAL TO WORLD

No one can foretell, Mr. President, what the future holds for us or for the world. All we can do today is to prepare within the limits of our own judgment and knowledge for all possible contingencies which we can foresee. Basic to the survival of nations is their ability to be strong in the spirit and physical condition of its human resources, and in the material wealth that they create. We are a country of only 145,000,000 people. We are called upon to pour out our labor and resources to those who are friendly to us.

In the ultimate analysis, however, the survival of our own life and institutions will depend on our capacity to keep ahead of the world in development of resources and technology. A project like the St. Lawrence seaway, when presented on a businesslike basis, as a self-liquidating project, must be considered by us sympathetically, because such projects are designed to increase the productive capacity of our manpower, to replace mineral resources, such as copper, iron ore, oil, and bauxite, and to help carry products over distances with economy in regard to labor, money, and materials. It is by these devices that we can increase our national productivity. It is by these means we must continue to grow in strength and vitality.

These are some of the considerations, Mr. President, which lead me and the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations to advocate and urge speedy passage of Senate Joint Resolution 111.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks some pertinent questions and answers on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project prepared by the Transportation Division, Office of Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, dated January 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

1. WHAT IS THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT?

The purpose of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is (a) to remove the remaining obstructions to deep-water navigation between the Great Lakes and the lower St. Lawrence River, permitting the passage of deep-draft ocean vessels from the Atlantic Ocean to Great Lakes ports and the pasage of large lake freighters from Lake ports to ports on the lower St. Lawrence River; and (b) to provide power facilities with a total installation of 2,200,000 horsepower, divided equally between the United States and Canada.

Navigation between the Great Lakes and the lower St. Lawrence River is now restricted to small vessels because of the 14-foot maximum draft of the canal system maintained by Canada around the rapids on the St. Lawrence River. This canal system will continue in operation even after completition of the seaway. The completed waterway will establish a minimum depth of 27 feet over the entire 2,347-mile route from Duluth on Lake Superior to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Of the 18 large locks required to overcome the 600-foot difference in waterlevel between Lake Superior and the ocean, nine (the MacArthur lock at the Sault Ste. Marie, connecting Lakes Superior and Huron and eight locks at the Welland Canal connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario) are completed.

2. WHAT IS THE LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT?

Several attempts have been made to obtain legislative approval of the project, first in the form of treaty ratification and then in the form of approval of an executive agreement between Canada and the United States. In February 1933, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably upon ratification of a treaty authorizing the project. The resolution on ratification received a majority in the Senate in 1934, but, requiring a two-thirds vote, failed of Senate approval. In 1941, an executive agreement was signed with Canada to promote the project. A resolution approving the agreement was favorably reported by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in November 1941 but was deferred as a result of the attack on

Pearl Harbor in December. Efforts were renewed in 1943, 1944, and 1946 to obtain legislative approval, but for various reasons final approval was not obtained.

3. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE PENDING LEGISLATION?

The current legislation authorizing the project was introduced in the Senate in 1947 by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG with the cosponsorship of a bipartisan group of 15 Senators (S. J. Res. 111) and in the House by Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO (H. J. Res. 192). The two resolutions, which are companion measures, are generaly similar to previous resolutions authorizing the executive agreement, with one significant point of departure. The new resolutions, as distinct from earlier proposals, contemplate converting the navigation venture from a public-works project into a project which would be self-supporting and self-liquidating by means of toll charges on traffic and passengers utilizing the deep-water facilities on the St. Lawrence River. Self-liquidation of the cost of the power works to the National Government is provided for by authorizing the sale of the power facilities on the United States side of the river to the State of New York.

4. WHAT HAPPENS AFTER SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 111 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 192 ARE APPROVED?

The Canadian Parliament is awaiting adoption of the pending legislation in the United States Congress before actively undertaking consideration of the project. Following approval by both legislatures, the two governments will establish a joint Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission which will supervise actual construction of works in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. Engineering plans for the section are complete and actual construction may be undertaken whenever the Commission so decides.

With respect to navigation tolls, the President of the United States is authorized and directed under the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 111 and House Joint Resolution 192 to negotiate a further agreement with Canada during the period of construction defining the rates of toll charges to be levied for use of the new deep-water navigation facilities in accordance with certain specific standards set in the resolutions under consideration. The tolls agreement will not become effective until approved by the legislatures of the two countries.

With respect to power, the President is authorized and directed to negotiate an arrangement with the State of New York for transfer of the power facilities on the United States side of the river, the cost to be determined in accordance with the method of allocation jointly recommended in 1933 by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the Power Authority of the State of New York, provided that such arrangement is consistent with the laws of the United States and protects the interests of the United States and of other States. This arrangement will also not become effective until approval by the Congress of the United States and the legislature of the State of New York.

5. HOW MUCH WILL THE PROJECT COST?

The most recent authoritative estimate of cost is printed in the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee favorably reporting Senator VANDENBERG'S resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 111. This estimate is based on data supplied by Lieutenant General Wheeler, Chief of the Army Engineers, with certain adjustments to bring Canadian costs up to date. The Senate committee's estimate of total cost of the project, including expenditures to date and based on May 1947 construction cost levels, amounts to $884,000,000, of which the United States share would be $523,000,000 and the Canadian share $361,000,000. Inasmuch as Canada has already spent $133,000,000 and the United States $32,000,000 on existing works comprising integral parts of the project, the cost to complete the project is estimated at $720,000,000, of which the United States share would be $492,000,000 and the Canadian share $228,000,000.

In the event that construction costs drop below May 1947 levels before actual construction of the project is initiated, then, of course, cost of the project will be less than the estimates indicated.

6. HOW IS COST OF THE PROJECT TO BE DIVIDED BETWEEN POWER AND NAVIGATION FOR PURPOSE OF SELF-LIQUIDATION?

The pending United States legislation excludes from self-liquidation the cost of work done in the past on the grounds that these expenditures have served and will continue to serve Great Lakes shipping, even though the works will form an integral part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. The cost to be liquidated, therefore, is the cost of the new work only.

On this basis, the actual payments for the power facilities by the State of New York to the United States Government and by the Province of Ontario to the Dominion Government would represent the proportion of total cost liquidated by power and the remainder would constitute the proportion to be liquidated by charges against navigation. The payments for power are estimated by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at roughly $161,000,000 each for New York State and the Province of Ontario. Accordingly, the costs chargeable to navigation for the purpose of self-liquidation would be the total cost of new work ($720,000,000) minus the payments for power ($322,000,000), or $398,000,000, of which the United States share would be $330,000,000 and the Canadian share $68,000,000.

7. WHAT AMOUNT OF TOLL REVENUE WOULD BE REQUIRED ANNUALLY TO COVER THE NAVIGATION COSTS?

The Army engineers calculate annual navigation charges for the project by adding interest during construction at 3 percent for 3 years to the first cost of the navigation works. By following this procedure, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee calculated the net investment in navigation at $434,000,000. Applying to the net investment the Army engineers' formula of interest and amortization at 4.33 percent and annual maintenance and operating costs of $2,460,000 yields total annual charges against navigation of $21,260,000, of which the United States share would be $16,840,000 and Canada's $4,420,000. This is the amount of annual toll revenue required to make the navigation works self-sustaining and self-liquidating.

In addition to the above estimate, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee established a low range of annual charges by using an interest rate of 2½ percent, which is closer to the actual rate at which the United States Government borrows money today, and a sinking fund of 1 percent and 2½ percent compound interest. This results in reducing annual charges to $17,448,000, of which the United States' share would be $13,677,000 and Canada's $3,771,000.

8. WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT?

The benefits divide into three main categories: National security, navigation, power.

The benefits will be discussed in the following questions.

9. WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF NATIONAL SECURITY?

Supporters of the project as a factor in national defense include President Truman, former President Hoover, the late President Roosevelt, General Marshall, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Permanent Joint Board on Defense for the United States and Canada, and Kenneth C. Royall. These authorities advance four principal advantages of the project to national security:

First, the establishment of a new and vital line of water communication directly into the heart of the continent;

Second, provision for the construction and repair of ocean-going vessels in the relatively secure area of the Great Lakes;

Third, the development of a tremendous source of electric power in an area containing no developments comparable to the TVA or Columbia and Colorado River projects;

Fourth, the over-all economic and industrial advantage accruing from the development of one of the world's greatest waterways.

10. WHAT ARE THE NAVIGATION BENEFITS?

The seaway will result in substantial reductions in the cost of transportation between the Middle West and foreign ports. Likewise it will permit large vessels to operate between Great Lakes points and United States seaports. Transportation savings will result from the fact that the seaway will eliminate the cost of the rail haul or, in some cases, the water haul in small high-cost carriers, between Midwest points tributary to the Great Lakes and Atlantic coast ports, as well as the transshipment charges involved.

At the hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in June 1947, Secretary of Commerce Harriman estimated potential seaway traffic at thirty-eight to fifty-two million tons annually, based upon a preliminary analysis of the advantages of the waterway in the light of current conditions and the proposal for navigation toll charges. Of the total estimate, iron ore made up twenty to thirty million tons, general merchandise six to ten million tons, grain 5,000,000 tons, coal 4,000,000 tons, wood pulp, pulp wood, and newsprint 1,000,000 tons, manganese, chrome, and bauxite ores 1,000,000 tons, and immediate traffic in petroleum and gasoline 1,000,000 tons. In summarizing the benefits, the Secretary stated:

"By making less costly the importation of foreign ores and raw materials the seaway will ease the drain on our dwindling natural resources. By furnishing alternate sources of supply to the great steel industry located in the Lakes area, the seaway will bring an added degree of economic stability to the Lake industries. Finally, the seaway will enable the great midwestern area to receive more fully the benefits of international trade and to make a greater contribution to international trade, so essential to world economic and political stability."

A detailed and carefully prepared study, published by the Transportation Division of the Department of Commerce in November 1947 (Industry Report, Domestic Transportation, August–November 1947, Transportation Division, An Economic Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project), defines the Department's estimates of potential traffic for certain bulk commodities, which, it is anticipated, will furnish the major share of the traffic. In this study, potential traffic in iron ore, grain, and coal is estimated at forty and one-half to fifty-three million tons, shortly after completion of the seaway. Long-range potential traffic in petroleum is estimated at fifteen to twenty million tons.

11. WHAT ARE THE POWER BENEFITS?

The power facilities will have a total capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower, with an annual average output of over 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, or almost as much as was produced in all of the United States in 1914. The development will be the second largest single-dam project in the world, being exceeded only by Grand Coulee. Total production will be shared equally by Canada and the United States. The power market area within feasible transmission distance includes the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Is-

land, Connecticut, northeastern Pennsylvania, and northern New Jersey. The emergency range could be extended as far as Chicago and Washington, D. C. The St. Lawrence market is a power-deficit area. As a matter of fact, the War Production Board had what amounted to an informal embargo on the expansion of war production in that area due to the unavailability of adequate power. Power requirements in the area in 1946 were greater than at any time during the war and were cutting deeply into reserve capacity needed to assure dependable service. The Federal Power Commission estimates, on the basis of loads that may be reasonably expected, that the full United States share of St. Lawrence output could be utilized within a relatively short period of time—as short, under certain conditions, as 1 year after the power becomes available.

According to the Federal Power Commission, delivered cost of St. Lawrence power at current high construction costs would be 3.1 mills per kilowatt-hour, or less than the bare operating cost, exclusive of fixed charges, of generating steam electric power in the most efficient steam stations in the area. The latter costs range from just over 3 mills to 5.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. The delivered cost of 3.1 mills of St. Lawrence power represents only 50 percent of average cost in the St. Lawrence market area of producing equivalent output at alternative new private steam plants, including fixed charges and operating expenses, where cost is as follows: New England, 7.2 mills for kilowatt-hour; New York City and Long Island, 7.1 mills per kilowatt-hour; rest of New York, 6.8 mills per kilowatt-hour.

12. WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS TO THE PROJECT?

The principal objections fall in the categories of denying the benefits of the project to national security and to transportation and power. The project is assailed (by some groups) as a waste of money. Others claim that the project would result in great damage to the railroads, eastern ports, railroad labor, power companies, and other interests. Most of the specific objections are included in the following questions.

13. IN VIEW OF THE VULNERABILITY OF THE GREAT LAKES AREA TO AIR ATTACK VIA THE NORTHERN POLAR REGION, COULDN'T A FEW WELL-PLACED BOMBS COMPLETELY CRIPPLE THE POWER WORKS AND THE SEAWAY?

The Lakes area is already a major center of United States and Canadian production, and would, in any event, require protection from every attack. The locks and powerhouse of the St. Lawrence project are no more vulnerable than any other defense asset in the area. They are no more vulnerable than the Soo Locks, the cities of Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, Gary, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Rochester, the Niagara power plants, as well as Canadian cities and production facilities. All of these centers are vitally strategic and require an adequate system of defense. The problem of defending the St. Lawrence powerhouses and locks against air attack is not strategically different nor does it appear to create substantially larger commitments on the part of the armed forces of the two countries than those now confronting them in the defense of the centers above named.

14. HOW CAN THE SEAWAY HELP NATIONAL SECURITY BY PERMITTING THE IMPORTATION OF IRON ORE WHEN ONE OF THE GREATEST DANGERS TO NATIONAL SECURITY IS INCREASED RELIANCE ON FOREIGN SOURCES FOR THIS IMPORTANT RAW MATERIAL?

Secretary Harriman indicated the national security benefits of seaway-routed ore imports, as follows:

"All of the estimates with respect to the Superior ore deposits indicate that in the foreseeable future the maintenance of an adequate supply of ore will become a serious problem to the operation of the great steel industry centered around the Lake region. Construction of the seaway serves as a sort of national insurance by making it possible to bring into the Lake region great amounts of foreign ore. The high-grade ores of Labrador are particularly significant from the standpoint of national security. If, because of a shortage of upper Lake ore, we are obliged to go on an increased import basis, ore from Labrador in time of national emergency could move to the Lake area from the Gulf of St. Lawrence via a relatively sheltered route as compared with the hazardous open-ocean route of ore from present sources such as Chile or Cuba."

Assistant Secretary Warne, of the Department of the Interior, testified:

"Now we are confronted by the cold, stark fact that our beds of richer ores at the head of the Great Lakes are approaching exhaustion. Although we still have large deposits of inferior- and low-grade ores, we are confronted by a serious economic problem of utilizing them, in view of the costs of concentrating and refining them into suitable ore for industrial use. We are having to import more and more high-grade ore from abroad, and we can expect that trend to continue at an accelerated rate in proportion to the decline of our domestic supplies. Without doubt, this will affect the stability of the iron and steel industry very materially and speed up the trend of steel production migration which is already in process.

"The St. Lawrence seaway, by providing an avenue for ocean traffic into the heart of the existing Great Lakes steel industry, no doubt would be of benefit to those companies which no longer will have access to adequate quantities of high-grade ores from domestic sources."

15. HOW CAN A WATERWAY WHICH WILL BE OPEN ONLY 240 DAYS OF THE YEAR JUSTIFY SUCH VAST EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC FUNDS?

The seasonality of navigation is no handicap to extensive commercial utilization of the seaway. The St. Mary's Canal at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., connecting Lakes Superior, Huron, and Michigan, is also icebound for 4 months every winter. Yet, it can hardly be said that this canal is uneconomic when the tonnage moving through it during an 8-month season exceeds the combined tonnage of the Panama and Suez Canals during a 12-month season. The Great Lakes, which are also closed for the same period, carry two-thirds as much traffic in 8 months as all United States Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast ports combined.

The navigation season on the St. Lawrence River is roughly the same as on the Lakes. Despite the limited season, the port of Montreal, which lies on the St. Lawrence River 1,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean, is the second largest exporting port on the North American continent, being exceeded only by New York.

16. HOW CAN OCEAN VESSELS OPERATE ECONOMICALLY OVER THE FOGGY, CIRCUITOUS, AND HAZARDOUS SEAWAY, WHICH PERMITS VESSELS TO TRAVEL AT ONLY VERY SLOW SPEEDS?

Records of the Canadian Department of Railways and Canals show that fog conditions on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River during the navigation season are much more favorable than those at New York. Montreal, for example, had 4 days of fog per year as compared with 44 days for New York Harbor.

The best indication of the hazardousness of navigation is the accident record on the St. Lawrence, which compares favorably with that of the Panama Canal. During the 5-year period, 1935-39, a total of 116 accidents was reported, of which 65 resulted in damages, amounting to $419,000, 34 involved no damages at all, and in 17 cases the amount of damage was unknown. This record should be viewed in relation to the number of vessel passages over the St. Lawrence River during the same period, which was roughly 50,000 and involved the movement of 40,000,000 short tons of cargo. Accordingly, the accident rate was less than ¼ of 1 percent, which would not indicate a very great hazard to navigation. New radar devices, which have already been successfully employed on a number of Great Lakes vessels, should reduce the accident rate even further.

With respect to the speed of navigation over the seaway, the actual over-all reduction as compared with ocean travel for an average vessel with normal operating speed of 12 miles an hour would be only 14 percent. Reduced speed on the 2,347 mile route would be required only in the 75 miles of canals and restricted channels and the 18 seaway locks. This would lengthen travel time for a round trip between Duluth and Montreal by 1½ days. In view of the heavy volume of traffic moving over the existing shallow canals and through 31 locks, it seems reasonable that oceangoing vessels will not find this small increase in travel time an obstacle militating against their economical use of the seaway.

17. WHY SHOULD THE UNITED STATES BEAR A DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE OF THE TOTAL COST OF THE NEW NAVIGATION WORKS ($330,000,000 OUT OF $398,000,000)?

When the 1932 treaty was negotiated, the division of total cost, including past expenditures, was practically equal for the United States and Canada. The reason for the changed cost relationship today is that past expenditures were primarily Canadian and were made at a time when construction costs were comparatively low. Canada has already expended 133 million dollars on navigation works which are integral parts of the seaway as compared with 32 million for the United States. Future expenditures, on the other hand, for the most part cover works assigned to the United States and have been estimated on the basis of the higher construction costs now obtaining. In any event, the pending legislation provides for self-liquidation of the new navigation works, so that the proportion of cost borne by each country is not a primary factor in evaluating the project. The users will pay for the new navigation works.

18. WHY SHOULD THE UNITED STATES COMMIT ITSELF TO EXPENDITURE OF VAST SUMS OF MONEY WHEN OUR PERPETUAL NAVIGATION RIGHTS ON THE GREAT LAKES, THE CONNECTING CHANNELS AND CANALS AND IN THE WHOLLY CANADIAN SECTION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE HAVE NOT YET BEEN ESTABLISHED?

Treaties between the United States and Great Britain have vested in the United States reciprocal rights to navigation in boundary waters and in those waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system which are wholly located in Canadian territory. These rights have been secured by the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation of 1794, the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, the Treaty of Washington of 1871, and the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. The protection afforded the United States under these treaties is indicated by the fact that no insoluble disputes have arisen over United States navigation rights on the Great Lakes or the St. Lawrence River during their lifetime, nor has either party to the treaties in all the years that the treaties have been in force indicated any desire to renounce them.

On the other hand, since the treaties are terminable by either party after due notice, it would certainly be desirable to establish the perpetual navigation rights of the United States. The original 1932 treaty on the St. Lawrence project sought to accomplish this objective by including a provision on perpetual navigation rights. When the treaty failed of ratification because of lack of a two-thirds majority, the same provision was incorporated in article VII of the Executive Agreement of 1941. Opponents of the

project opposed the provision on the grounds that it had no place in the Executive agreement but required a treaty with Canada. The pending legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 111 and House Joint Resolution 192, as well as resolutions authorizing the project, have accordingly excepted from approval article VII of the Executive agreement and have expressed the sense of Congress that it would be desirable for the President to negotiate a treaty with Canada on perpetual navigation rights and certain other matters.

19. WHY SHOULD THE PROJECT BE APPROVED BEFORE THE MATTERS RELATING TO TOLLS, WHICH ARE SUBJECT TO FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS WITH CANADA, ARE SETTLED?

Both the United States and Canadian Governments have agreed in principle that the seaway be made self-liquidating through a system of toll charges.

Section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 111 and House Joint Resolution 192 authorizes and directs the President to negotiate, during the period of construction of the project, a further agreement with Canada defining the rates of tolls to be levied on the seaway, subject to approval by the legislative bodies of both countries. Reversal of the procedure in order to reach agreement on the tolls system before approval of the project might be justified if the fear were well founded that the two Governments may not be able to reach agreement. It appears inconceivable, however, that the two Governments would agree to enter into a venture of such magnitude, commit themselves to the expenditure of such large sums of money, accept the principle of self-liquidation of the project and then fail to agree on implementation of the principle. The two countries have an equally strong interest in self-liquidation. Both have large national debts and high rates of taxation. Neither would wish to add to these debts or taxation levels. There is no sound reason to doubt that details of a satisfactory system of tolls can be worked out during the period of construction. It is instructive that this procedure was followed in connection with the Panama Canal and was worked out satisfactorily.

20. HOW CAN TOLL REVENUE ADEQUATE TO MAKE THE SEAWAY SELF-LIQUIDATING BE REALIZED WHEN THE TOTAL CAPACITY OF THE SEAWAY IS ESTIMATED BY THE UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AT 25,000,000 TONS ANNUALLY?

The 25,000,000-ton estimate, prepared in 1934 by the Army engineers, was an estimate of practical as distinguished from theoretical capacity and apparently was based on the assumption that the traffic pattern on the seaway would resemble that prevailing on the Great Lakes. This assumption involved an exceptionally unbalanced cargo movement with 80 percent of the traffic moving down-bound and only 20 percent up-bound. On this basis, the Army engineers arrived at an average tonnage per vessel passage through the locks of only 3,800 tons. This relatively small tonnage per vessel multiplied by 7,230 vessel passages produced a maximum tonnage of 27,473,000 tons, which was then reduced to 25,000,000 tons.

Theoretical capacity of the St. Lawrence project represents the total traffic which could be moved through the seaway during a normal 240-day navigation season if the locks were constantly operated at top speed and if every vessel passing through the locks in each direction were fully loaded. The Canadian Government has estimated that the limiting lock of the seaway, lock No. 2 on the Welland Canal, has an effective capacity of 28 single lockages per day with the largest bulk freighters on the Lakes. Assuming that each vessel passing through the locks carried 10,000 tons of freight, the Canadian authorities arrived at a capacity figure of 67,200,000 tons for 6,720 vessel passages.

The Department of Commerce points out that if vessels such as the new lake ore freighters, which can carry more than 15,000 tons each, comprised the entire seaway traffic and were fully loaded in both directions, the theoretical capacity of the project would be in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 tons annually. The Department also points out that the MacArthur lock, which is of the same general dimensions as the limiting lock on the Welland Canal, actually handled 42,000,000 tons of traffic in 1945, despite the fact that most of the tonnage moved in one direction.

In its recent industry report on the seaway project, the Department of Commerce estimates potential seaway traffic in three major bulk commodities at forty and one-half to fifty-three million tons annually, composed of thirty to thirty-seven and one-half million tons of up-bound iron ore, six and one-half to eleven and one-half million tons of down-bound grain and 4,000,000 tons of down-bound bituminous coal. Because they will be able to quote lower rates than other vessels, the Department anticipates that the ships which carry ore up-bound will carry most, if not all, of the down-bound grain and coal traffic. Accordingly, the number of lockages required to handle the maximum traffic of 53,000,000 tons for the three commodities will be the same as that required for handling the ore boats, or an estimated 5,000 lockages per season of navigation. Theoretical capacity of the locks for large vessels is estimated by the Canadian Government at about 6,720 per season of navigation.

21. IT MAY WELL BE TRUE THAT THEORETICAL CAPACITY OF THE LIMITING LOCK OF THE SEAWAY (LOCK NO. 2 OF THE WELLAND CANAL) RANGES UPWARD FROM 68,000,000 TONS ANNUALLY, BUT HOW CAN A CAPACITY OF OVER 20,000,000 TONS BE REALIZED WHEN ABOUT 70 PERCENT OF LOCKAGE CAPACITY OF THE WELLAND CANAL IS NOW ABSORBED BY VESSELS ENGAGED IN PURELY INTERLAKE TRAFFIC BETWEEN LAKE ONTARIO AND THE UPPER LAKES?

The Industry Report of the Department of Commerce carefully considers this question and arrives at the conclusion that interlake traffic through the Welland Canal should not seriously restrict the canal's capacity for seaway traffic. Over 90 percent of total traffic through the Welland Canal in 1945, it is observed, was down-bound. The down-bound traffic was made up almost exclusively of bulk items, such as grain, iron ore, coal, petroleum, and gasoline. Before they can seriously affect the capacity of the Welland Canal, the down-bound ore and petroleum and gasoline movements will probably be reduced to insignificant volume or eliminated entirely as a result of growing shortages in the United States, which furnishes this traffic. The down-bound traffic in grain and coal will be handled at very low rates by the vessels carrying ore up-bound since they would otherwise make the down-bound trip in ballast. It is not anticipated that the small vessels now carrying most of the Welland Canal traffic can compete successfully against large lake or ocean bulk carriers for this traffic and accordingly virtually the entire capacity of the Welland Canal will be available for the large vessels.

22. WHAT PROOF IS THERE THAT, WITH THE IMPOSITION OF TOLLS, IT WILL BE MORE ECONOMICAL FOR TRAFFIC TO USE DEEP-DRAFT VESSELS OVER THE SEAWAY RATHER THAN SMALLER VESSELS OVER THE TOLL-FREE ST. LAWRENCE CANALS OR VIA WHATEVER OTHER MODE OF TRANSPORTATION IS CURRENTLY USED

The transportation savings in using deep-draft vessels over the seaway rather than smaller vessels via the toll-free St. Lawrence canals are unquestionable. The principal cargo carried by the small canallers is grain. The president of Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd., which operates the largest fleet of small canallers, is quoted in the Commerce Department's recent industry report as stating:

"When the seaway is in operation, it will mean that the large lake freighters and ocean vessels will navigate between the head of the Lakes and Montreal, and so far as upper Lake freighters are concerned, their cost of carrying grain will be applicable to the entire route, instead of only a portion of it. The cost of carrying grain on upper lakers is less than one-third of the cost of carrying grain in small canallers, and, therefore, under the proposed conditions the canaller cannot compete."

The Commerce Department estimates that the seaway rate on export grain in large Lake freighters from Duluth to Montreal, at current high operating costs, would be from 4.90 to 7.40 cents per bushel less than the actual 1946 rate to Montreal via Port Colborne in small canallers. This compares with a suggested toll charge of slightly more than 1 cent a bushel on seaway grain.

Since the small canaller rate on export grain is cheaper than rates via existing competing routes, it is clear that use of the seaway by deep-draft vessels, especially the large Lake freighters, will be considerably more economical, despite toll charges, than any existing mode of transportation. A similar conclusion is drawn by the Department in its study of comparative transportation costs for seaway traffic in coal, iron ore, and petroleum.

23. WHAT PROOF IS THERE THAT TRAFFIC WILL MOVE VIA THE SEAWAY IN SUCH VOLUME AS TO YIELD TOLL REVENUE SUFFICIENT TO MAKE THE PROJECT SELF-LIQUIDATING?

In its recent Industry Report, the Department of Commerce estimates annual toll revenue from 3 bulk commodities which it anticipates will furnish the major volume of seaway traffic at from 21 to 27 million dollars per year.

Possible range of toll charges and toll revenue

Commodity	Potential traffic (million tons)	Per ton toll charge (cents)	Total revenue
Ore	30 -37½	50	$15,000,000-$18,750,000
Grain	6½-11½	25-35	1,625,000- 4,025,000
Coal	4	25-35	1,000,000- 1,400,000
Ballast	[1] 19½-22	15	3,300,000- 2,925,000
Total			20,925,000- 27,100,000

[1] Dead-weight tonnage.

This compares with total annual charges against navigation, estimated by the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of from $17,500,000 to $21,250,000.

Inasmuch as the estimate of annual charges is based on current high construction costs, while the traffic estimates are not only conservative in volume, but do not include all potential traffic and are based on modest toll charges. it would appear that traffic will move in sufficient volume to make the seaway self-liquidating.

24. WILL NOT SUCH TRAFFIC AS DOES MOVE VIA THE SEAWAY MERELY REPRESENT A DIVERSION FROM THE RAILROADS AND ATLANTIC AND GULF PORTS?

Carrier opponents of the project argue contradictorily that the seaway is a waste of taxpayers' money because it will not be used and that it will be used to such an extent as to damage seriously their interests by diversion of traffic. Both extremes appear to lack foundation.

Some diversion of traffic to the seaway will occur, particularly in grain, as the recent Industry Report of the Department of Commerce points out. But the principal item via the seaway will be new traffic in iron ore (30,000,000 to 37,500,000 tons) which will not represent diversion from any existing mode of transport. Indeed, in-bound ore traffic, by

permitting continued location of the major section of the steel industry in the Midwest, will retain as traffic for the rail lines serving the industry a large volume of ore, coal, and iron and steel products which otherwise might be lost by removal of sections of the industry to the Atlantic coast.

It is axiomatic that benefits to any region of the United States almost always redound to the benefit of the entire country. The transportation savings of the seaway will be of great benefit to Midwest industry and agriculture. The entire Nation will eventually share in these benefits.

25. WILL THE SEAWAY ACT AS A STRONG DETERRENT TO THE COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC TACONITE?

The charge that the seaway will act as a deterrent on commercial production of taconite implies the admission by the domestic ore industry that taconite, at the present stage of technological development, cannot compete with low-cost foreign ore. From this standpoint, it is true that the seaway will inhibit production of high-cost ore from taconite. On the other hand, the real deterrent is not the seaway but the high cost of taconite-ore production. Whether the seaway is built or not, taconite ore will still face competition from foreign ore, because of the former's high cost of production.

Without the seaway, many experts predict a substantial migration of sections of the Midwest steel industry to the coast in order to take advantage of low-cost foreign ore. If taconite ore cannot compete with foreign ore via the seaway in the Midwest, it most certainly could not compete with foreign ore at the coast where it would suffer the further disadvantage of a costly rail haul from the Lakes area.

Finally, it might be pointed out, the seaway capacity limits the amount of foreign ore to less than half of the peak requirements of the Midwest steel industry. Remaining requirements can be met by ore from taconite, if low-cost methods of production are developed.

26. WILL NOT THE SEAWAY ADVERSELY AFFECT THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE BY DIVERTING TRAFFIC TO FOREIGN VESSELS?

The competitive advantage of foreign vessels in terms of lower shipbuilding and ship-operating costs has long been recognized by the United States Government. It would be no different on the seaway than elsewhere. In meeting competition of foreign carriers, our Government has authorized subsidies to United States vessels on essential lines, routes, or services in the foreign commerce of the United States. American-flag vessels utilizing the seaway would be eligible for such subsidies.

Furthermore, the recent Industry Report of the Department of Commerce indicates that the principal vessel movement over the seaway between the head of the Lakes and Montreal will be large lake freighter rather than ocean carrier, with transfer to and from ocean vessels at Montreal. Such a movement is predicated on the economies afforded by the large bulk lake freighters which can carry 15,000 to 20,000 tons of cargo over the seaway as compared with 8,000 to 10,000 tons for the ocean vessels capable of navigating the seaway. As is well known, the lake fleet, particularly in the large bulk carriers, is predominantly composed of American-flag vessels.

27. IS THE 27-FOOT WATERWAY DEEP ENOUGH TO ACCOMMODATE MOST OCEANGOING VESSELS?

The engineering plans of the seaway call for a minimum depth of 27 feet and ultimate depth of 30 feet through additional dredging when necessary. The 27-foot channel would have a normal depth of 27 feet but would be deeper in the rockier or more dangerous spots and will permit vessels of maximum loaded draft of 25 feet to pass through the seaway fully loaded. The 30-foot channel will permit vessels of 27½ maximum loaded draft to navigate fully loaded.

The most recent authoritative statement on the share of the world and United States fleets that could traverse the seaway at the initial depth of 27 feet was made by Edward Macauley, Acting Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission in 1946:

"What share of the United States Fleet and of the world fleets could traverse the proposed 27-foot channel? Whereas vessels having a maximum loaded draft of 25 feet would be able to carry full dead-weight capacity through the waterway, vessels having a maximum loaded draft of more than 25 feet would have to proceed on less than full draft. For the latter vessels an allowance has been made. It has been estimated that the preponderance of vessels transiting the Panama Canal normally have been composed of vessels loaded only to two-thirds of capacity. With an allowance of an additional 8 or 9 percent of the total dead-weight capacity for fuel, water, and supplies, a load of 75 percent of dead-weight capacity would appear to be typical of vessels which would transit such waterways as the St. Lawrence seaway. Of the ships of greater than 27-foot draft, the Victory and Liberty are of special interest. Victorys could go through the canal loaded to 79 percent, and the Liberty to 85 percent of total dead-weight carrying capacity.

"With these considerations in mind, it becomes apparent that there are many vessels in the United States Fleet and in the world fleets that are capable of navigating the proposed waterway.

"An analysis of the fleets of 30 of the principal countries of the world (and the British colonies), as of September 30, 1945, shows that, including vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over, there were 3,354 vessels within the 25-foot draft range and 5,191 vessels within the 27-foot draft range. The aggregate gross tonnages of these vessels were 12,283,972 and 24,592,103 tons, respectively. Freighters predominated, but there were also substantial representations of tankers and combination passenger and cargo vessels. If there are added Libertys and Victorys, which have drafts of 27 feet 9¼ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively, the number reaches 8,015 and the gross tonnage 45,031,682.

"A somewhat corresponding situation is revealed by an analysis of the United States fleet of similar vessels. This shows that as of the same date there were 763 vessels within the 25-foot draft range and 1,173 vessels within the 27-foot range, have aggregate gross tonnages of 3,490,770 and 6,232,356, respectively. As in the case of the world fleet, the United States vessels consisted largely of freighters but with some tankers and combination passenger and cargo ships. If there are added Libertys and Victorys which have drafts of 27 feet 9¼ inches, and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively, the number reaches 3,997 and the tonnage 26,671,935."

28. WILL NOT THE SEAWAY PERMIT CHEAP FOREIGN COAL TO GLUT THE UNITED STATES MARKET AND REPLACE UNITED STATES COAL?

If foreign coal could compete with United States coal in the Midwest, it would first have to be able to compete on the Atlantic coast. Yet foreign coal has never succeeded in undercutting United States coal in coastal markets. In spite of availability of foreign shipping and the absence of an import duty, average annual United States imports of coal during the 10 years 1929–38 were at the relatively insignificant rate of 669,000 tons or a tiny fraction of 1 percent of United States production during the same period.

The fear of foreign competition in coal has little merit today when the United States is exporting over 60,000,000 tons of coal annually to a coal-hungry world.

Far from facing any danger from foreign competition, the recent industry report of the Commerce Department estimates that the seaway will facilitate an annual export movement of 4,000,000 tons of United States bituminous coal to the Canadian Province of Quebec and an undetermined quantity abroad.

29. DOES NOT THE POWER PROJECT DUPLICATE PRESENT FACILITIES WHICH ARE ADEQUATE FOR DEMAND?

Far from duplicating existing facilities, the Federal Power Commission estimates that, on the basis of present loads, the entire United States share of the power project (5,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year of firm energy) would be absorbed by about 1950.

Availability of low-cost power creates its own market. In our modern age, industries, particularly electro-chemical industries, are looking for cheap power. Wherever cheap power may be found within the limits of transportation of materials, it is fairly a certainty that it will be used. The Niagara-St. Lawrence frontier has abundantly indicated the willingness of industry to go to that area and take advantage of any cheap power which is available. The same phenomena may be observed in the Northwest and TVA areas, as well as in Canada.

30. HOW WILL NEW ENGLAND BENEFIT FROM THE POWER PROJECT WHEN THE LAW OF NEW YORK STATE PROHIBITS SALE OF ELECTRIC ENERGY PRODUCED IN THE STATE TO ANY CONSUMER OUTSIDE THE STATE BOUNDARIES?

Senate Joint Resolution 111 and House Joint Resolution 192 stipulate in section 5 that arrangement for transfer of the power facilities must be consistent with the laws of the United States and must protect the "interests of the United States and of other States" and that such arrangement will be effective only after approval by the Congress and the legislature of the State of New York.

It is assumed that Congress will take care of the interests of the New England States in the preparation of the above-mentioned legislation.

In the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 111, representatives of the New York Power Authority stated that they were already on record as ready to recommend to the State legislature that the State law be amended to permit sale of power outside the State, if such an amendment were necessary to clarify the State law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question, which I think is a fair one. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has figured, or whether the committee has figured, as a part of the costs of the seaway, the costs of deepening the harbors and the approaches to the harbors in the various ports of the Great Lakes. I ask that because I understand that Canada is deepening the canal from Quebec to Montreal, I think, from 30 feet to either 32 or 35 feet, the latter, I believe. I also understand that this seaway is to be 27 feet, which the proponents say will take a vessel of 25½-foot draft. I am informed that there is no harbor in the Great Lakes that will take a ship of 25½-foot draft, with the exception of Detroit. That includes Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, Duluth, and several other harbors. Has the committee figured in the costs of deepening the channels up to those harbors, and the cost of building the new docks that will make it possible for an oceangoing vessel to turn around quickly and return to sea?

Mr. WILEY. I am frank to say the committee has not. There was some

testimony on that subject, some by the mayor of Milwaukee. There was testimony in the record. I must say that in hurrying to the Senate Chamber I forgot certain cards which I had prepared for use in giving answers to the numerous questions which I expected would be forthcoming.

Let me read a card I have before me:

NUMBER OF SHIPS WHICH CAN USE CHANNEL

Analysis of fleets of 30 principal countries as of September 30, 1945, including vessels of 1,600 gross tons and over. There were 3,354 within 25-foot-draft range and 5,191 within 27-foot-draft range. Aggregate tonnage 12,283,972 and 24,592,103 tons, respectively. If we add Liberty's and Victory's which have drafts of 27 feet 9¼ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively, the number reaches 8,015 and the gross tonnage 45,031,682.

I realize that does not answer the question. I have a statement to the effect that most of the cities themselves would do the work the Senator suggests as necessary, and the estimated cost I think was $8,000,000. I have that information. I intended to carry over my address until Wednesday, at which time I had expected to subject myself to questions. I shall have that information available.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish the Senator would furnish that, because my information is to the effect that instead of $8,000,000 it is something around $250,000,000. At the docks, as well as in the channels and the harbor facilities themselves, there will have to be very substantial dredging, and in one or two of the harbors, particularly at Cleveland, a great deal of the bottom is ledge, so that it will not only have to be dredged, it will have to be dynamited in order to increase the depth of the water sufficiently to make it deep enough for a seagoing vessel.

The Senator read various amounts of tonnage. Is it not true that the report of the Committee on Merchant Marine stated that the one dry-cargo ship that is practical should be 32 feet in draft and a tanker 35 feet in draft? Is it not also true that at the present time only 9.4 percent of the United States dry-cargo tonnage, and I think a little less than that of the tanker tonnage, could get within a 25½-foot draft?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has asked several questions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are two questions.

Mr. WILEY. First, I want to put in the RECORD the answer to the claim that the harbors will have to be dredged. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, at this time, as a preliminary to answering the question, that some of the greatest harbors in the world do not qualify to accommodate ships with ocean-going draft. Of the ports with less than 27-foot draft, I may cite the following:

	Feet
Stettin, Germany	26
Seville, Spain	18–21
Vera Cruz, Mexico	27
Bangkok, Siam	14
Nassau, Bermuda	24
Canton, China	16
Guayaquil, Ecuador	26
Hypong, Indochina	21
Rosario, Argentina	22
Basra, Iraq	27

I shall try to provide answers to the questions, though I realize that one is supposed to know a great deal about this subject that I do not know. If one looks at the map of the Great Lakes hanging on the wall here, he realizes that through this one little port at the Soo pass 120,000,000 tons down-traffic practically in one season of 7 months, and he gets an idea of the commerce on the Lakes. I, who have been living close to the Lakes, though I live in the western part of Wisconsin, have seen man's ingenuity in developing boats to such an extent that, whereas formerly the boats had a capacity of 1,000 to 2,000 bushels of wheat, the shippers will now transport in the boats 10,000 tons. The development in the building of boats is such that all the bugaboo as to what can be done will, I think, disappear in the mist, when it is realized that here is an area served by the St. Lawrence Canal, with 50,000,000 souls, who are doing more business in tonnage than is handled in three-fourths of all the ports of the Pacific and Atlantic together.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If all this business is done in the area referred to, and I assume it is, as the Senator from Wisconsin says it is——

Mr. WILEY. I will secure the exact figures and place them in the RECORD on Wednesday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I am getting at is that we want to build a seaway which is practical for oceangoing steamers, and if the President's own committee states that only 9.4 of our dry-cargo ships, and fewer of our tankers—I think it is 5-point something—can go up a 27-foot channel, then if we are going to build it we ought to build it deeper, ought we not?

Mr. WILEY. I am willing to take the judgment of those who have studied the matter. I am not one of those who are building blocks in the road for others to stumble over. First it is contended there will be no traffic for the canal. Then it is contended that the canal will not provide proper facilities to handle the traffic. Then it is contended that the canal should be deeper, which would entail more and more expense. Now I say, let us build it. Let us make an outlet to the sea so that we can take care of the vast dynamo which is operating in the central portion of our country, which is generating power, and wealth, and doing the job which is building up the Nation. Do not keep us hemmed in any longer.

On that very point, Mr. President, I will secure the exact figures involved, and will present them for the RECORD Wednesday. I previously stated I returned from Wisconsin just this morning.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask another question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The United States' share of the costs of the power is estimated at $160,795,000, and the same for the Canadian share. There is also a figure estimated by General Wheeler—and I am reading from page 14 of the committee report marked "Calendar No. 862"—of $91,000,000 as one-half of the item common to power and navigation.

As I understand, that $91,000,000 is going to be chargeable to navigation. Now if it is a power cost common to both power and navigation, why should tolls be required to pay and liquidate that $91,000,000, half of which is chargeable to power? I want to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am in favor of the power project. I believe it should be built in due course. But I believe it should be built entirely apart from the navigational features of the seaway, and I think it could be done and a very substantial amount of money saved. Why should this $91,000,000 be chargeable to tolls if half of it is common to power and to navigation?

Mr. WILEY. I think the answer is very simple. I assure the Senator he does not have to assure me that he is in favor of power and against the navigation project. I have known that for some time. I appreciate his strenuous efforts to block navigation. But I cannot see the consistency in saying "Give us all this power. We of the East need that. And we want to keep you of the Middle West locked in."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. WILEY. Let me finish one question at a time. The question of $91,000,000 is simply a matter for the Army engineers in determining what is the appropriate cost. First, it will be understood that under the Constitution the Federal Government regulates navigation, and so forth, on our streams. If Senators will look at the chart which hangs on the wall they will see why it is not reasonable to say that it is only an electric project or only a navigation project. We will have a large map placed on the wall to show the situation in detail. The electric development is made at the point I indicate. At this other point on the chart is where the ships come through. It is a combination of power and navigation. The engineers who apportion the cost to flood control, to navigation, and the cost of erecting these structures took the figure the Senator has referred to and they felt it was a reasonable figure. I must say that I understand this is the first time that question has been raised.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILEY. I think some are trying to confuse the larger issue before us.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has stated that I was attempting in every way to block the navigational features. I respectfully say to the Senator that I want to see the navigational features made practical, to see them made useful, so that they will surely be self-liquidating. I am not blocking them. I am opposing the joint resolution at this time because I do not believe that the joint resolution in its present form provides for a practical seaway for modern ocean-going vessels developed by the war since 1945 and onward.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate fully the position of the Senator from Massachusetts, and I probably was a little harsh with him, but I nevertheless have to restate the position that every argument the Senator from Massachusetts has made was made time and time again in relation to the Panama Canal, and every argument he has made has been made against every progressive advance the Nation has made. It is always a question of something not being quite practical. It is said that there has not been demonstrated to the *n*th degree the certainty that the proposal will be self-liquidating. It is contended that it has not been demonstrated that the people in my section as against the people in other sections are going to get their full 100 percent of value out of it. Such arguments have been constantly used, and if it were not for the common sense of the jury which has to decide the question—and in this case we are the jury—this matter would be blocked interminably. But I cannot conceive for one moment that such things as insinuating that ocean-going ships will not use the canal are going to decide the matter.

There are five countries using the waterway now and sending small ships which are traveling to the Lake ports. Two of the countries are Sweden and Holland. I will place the names of the other three in the RECORD on Wednesday. They are sending through the waterway such ships as Liberty ships and Victory ships loaded approximately 80 percent. All such ships, and there are thousands of them plying the seas, can go through the canal.

Mr. President, we know what is meant by the draft line on a ship. When the ship gets down to the draft line it is full. We know that, if that ship is full of feathers, as distinguished from iron ore, the draft line will be about at the point which I indicate on this sheet of paper which I am using as an illustration, 10 or 15 feet above the line at which the ship would be in the water if it were loaded with iron ore. Suppose automobiles are shipped from Detroit, as distinguished from wheat, which is shipped in bulk. A ship such as a Victory ship or a Liberty ship can be loaded up to its full capacity with automobiles, but the ship will not go down in the water to the draft line. Why? Because automobiles do not have the solid weight that wheat or iron ore shipped in bulk have. That is the answer.

Mr. President, when the Senate reconvenes on Wednesday next I shall place in the RECORD a statement of the number of vessels using the seaway. I will demonstrate to the Senate that the seaway canal, as outlined by the best military and business brains, and by every President since President Harding, is practicable and will do the job. But up comes this objection and that objection. Some will say, "The construction of the canal is going to hurt my baby." But those who say so cannot demonstrate that it will hurt their baby. When such talk is begun it is well to ask a few questions as to how their baby is going to be deprived of any milk. We have many babies in the Midwest. I say to the Senate again that it will be a sorry day if the Congress loses its vision and turns down the project.

Mr. President, I have an understanding with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that he is to speak on Wednesday, with the understanding that my statement begun today will be continued over to Wednesday, and that I will occupy some of the time on Wednesday for questions and answers. Then the Senator from Massachusetts is to speak.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my understanding was that I was to begin when the Senate convened on Wednesday. That was the understanding I had with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry, but I understood that if I had not completed my statement I would continue, of course, on Wednesday.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator continue now?

Mr. WILEY. No; I would prefer not to. I do not want to take much time on Wednesday. The Senator from Massachusetts can have most of the time then. I want to answer some of the questions that have been put to me today and place certain things in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. My understanding with the Senator was that he was to begin today, but I was to begin on Wednesday.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator will begin on Wednesday, but after I am through.

Mr. LODGE. That will be 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. LODGE. That is not satisfactory to me, and that is not my understanding of the agreement we had.

Mr. WILEY. Then the Senator from Massachusetts and I disagree in that respect. I certainly do not want any misunderstanding. Will the Senator from Massachusetts agree that I shall have an hour on Wednesday?

Mr. LODGE. So far as I am concerned, the Senator can take all day Wednesday, and then I will try to take the floor on Friday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. An understanding can be worked out between the two Senators, and between the opponents and proponents of the measure. An understanding obviously cannot be reached on the Senate floor. I suggest that Senators get together during the recess and endeavor to reach an understanding.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska. I do not wish to have any misunderstanding with the Senator from Massachusetts. I stated my understanding. He has another understanding. I shall waive my understanding in his interest if he does not think I am entitled, under these circumstances, to at least an hour to reply to the questions which have been asked and to present the material which I know I have, but which I have not had time to assemble because of absence from the city. If he is insistent that his understanding is correct, and that he is to proceed at 12 o'clock on Wednesday, I waive any rights which I may have. Of course, we shall expect to take the floor after he has concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield the floor.

Mr. WILEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Fraser Challenges Wiley's Statement on Seaway Plan," from the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette for January 23, 1948.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRASER CHALLENGES WILEY'S STATEMENT ON SEAWAY PLAN

Harry W. Fraser, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association and president of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, locked words Friday afternoon with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on rail labor's stand on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

From Washington Senator WILEY was quoted earlier in the day as telling the Associated Press that he "is convinced that the overwhelming rank and file of American railway labor knows that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will inevitably involve a vast expansion of railroads."

The Wisconsin Senator was also quoted as describing resistance to the seaway as "the most reactionary effort conceivable."

Fraser's answer is as follows:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, boosting for the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, presumes to speak for railroad labor and to tell both railroad management and the workers what is good for them and what their attitude should be on this highly visionary project. Senator WILEY asserts that the rank and file of railroad labor knows that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will inevitably involve a vast expansion of railroads. He declares that our transportation system is good for a $70,000,000,000 economy, but is hopelessly inadequate for a $210,000,000,000 economy of the future.

"Has he forgotten the job done by the rail carriers and their employees under all of the shortages and stresses and strains of war? It would be interesting to know how Senator WILEY expects the diversion of millions of tons of shipping from the railroads to the seaway to bring about an expansion of rail facilities. The seaway, if developed, would be navigable for 7 months out of the year and frozen over during the other 5 months, during which the traffic would necessarily be moved by the rail transportation systems. Is this expansion?

"What about the power and equipment, and the personnel which the railroads would be obliged to maintain on a stand-by basis during the 7 months the seaway was navigable? And in addition to these disastrous elements, the development of the seaway project would impose upon the people of the United States indebtedness of multiplied millions of dollars over and above the load they now carry and must carry until the job of world reconstruction is accomplished.

"Senator WILEY finally asserts that railway labor is serving as a dupe for a few selfish interests which have always fought the workers. I suggest that the Senator could profitably study the relationships of management and labor in the railroad industry and reexamine the source of his information on this subject. Let me say finally that our job is to face the realities and to strengthen and support our basic industries. This is no time to waste either money or effort in the furtherance of experimental dreams."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 26, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBURG,
President of the Senate pro tempore,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I should like to express again the hope that Congress will soon enact legislation approving the agreement of March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada for the development of the Great Lakes-St Lawrence seaway and power project.

This great engineering enterprise will develop one of the richest natural resources of the continent for the benefit of the whole United States. It will make deep draft ocean transportation available to the most highly industrialized area of North America. It will develop the largest potential hydroelectric power site of the Nation. It will strengthen and expand our industry, our agriculture, our domestic commerce, and our foreign trade. That is why every President during the past 25 years has given it his strong support. That is why it has been a measure strongly supported by both parties.

This momentous project will confer correspondingly great benefits on our friend and neighbor, Canada. That is why every Canadian administration during the past 25 years has also strongly supported it.

Plans for this great international undertaking are now based upon the principle of making the new deep draft navigation features self-liquidating by a levy of reasonable tolls on shipping. The Government will also be reimbursed for the new power facilities. The application of the principle of self-liquidation to the navigational features as well as to the power phases of the seaway should remove objections concerning the economic soundness of the enterprise.

The St. Lawrence project is an important measure of national defense in both its navigation and power phases. Our security rests in large measure on the development of our natural resources and our industrial potential. The transportation system and the power facilities which the St. Lawrence offers—if only we are willing to develop them—will generally strengthen our national economy and provide in particular cheap water power and water transportation facilities needed in peace as well as in a time of emergency. Our security depends also upon a vigorous and prosperous Canada, our ally in both World Wars. The St. Lawrence project will strengthen the economy and the defenses of Canada as it will our own.

I am convinced that the great majority of Americans realize that the St. Lawrence seaway must be developed if we as a Nation are to continue to receive the fullest benefits from our natural resources. I am personally convinced of the need for this project, both from the standpoint of our common economic welfare and of our national security. I therefore strongly recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing this great undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter will lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next meeting of the Senate, which I understand is to be on Wednesday, I be recognized at the outset of the session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say for the information of the Senate that I intend to state the reasons which actuate me in opposing this project. They are not the reasons which the able Senator from Wisconsin has attributed to me.

THE FUEL OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, several weeks ago, the oil situation being very acute, and suffering and privation impending in the Eastern Atlantic States, particularly, and to some extent all over the Nation, in connection with fuel supplies and oil for this winter's use, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate appointed a subcommittee of five, of which I was appointed chairman, to consider the problem.

The steps taken were to call together a group of approximately 200 in the Banking and Currency Committee room. The group consisted of oil producers, representatives of shipping interests, tank experts, and railroad officials. There was an all-day discussion of the question. At the conclusion I appointed a committee of seven oil men in the Eastern Atlantic States to consider the problem and to report adequate remedies—not suggestions—for the trouble impending. That committee has held several meetings, and will make a report to us tomorrow. I shall place in the RECORD the substance of its report.

Meanwhile, in response to many inquiries, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point a list of the coordinators appointed by the governors of the various States at my request—27 already having been appointed. They are now at work with organizations in each State. I also wish to place in the RECORD letters to and replies received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Interior Department, the Maritime Commission, the Department of the Air Force, the State Department, the Navy Department, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Association of American Railroads, in an effort to cooperate with the committee in the solution of the problem of oil shortage.

I ask unanimous consent to have these documents printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE, GOVERNOR, AND FUEL COORDINATOR APPOINTED

Connecticut: James L. McConaughy; Charles N. Mitchell, Hartford, Conn.

Delaware: Walter W. Bacon; Leon Walker, 827 Market Street, Wilmington, Del.

District of Columbia: Board of Commissioners; Thomas J. Kennedy, East Administration Building, Washington, D. C.

Georgia: Melvin E. Thompson; Frank Arnold, Atlanta, Ga.

Illinois: Dwight H. Green; Carl Johnswold, Forest Park, Ill.

Indiana: Ralph F. Gates; A. W. Groves, attorney, State Conservation Department, State Library Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

Iowa: Robert D. Blue; no fuel coordinator appointed.

Kentucky: Earle C. Clements; Joseph Hutchinson, 1202 South Third Street, Frankfort, Ky.

Maine: Horace Hildreth; Harold W. Nicholson, 561 Preble Street, South Portland, Me.

Minnesota: Luther W. Youngdahl; J. W. Clark, Business Research and Development, St. Paul, Minn.

Maryland: William P. Lane, Jr.; no fuel coordinator appointed.

Massachusetts: Robert F. Bradford; George H. Rockwell, 989 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass.

Michigan: Kim Digler; Donald Leonard, East Lansing, Mich.

Missouri: Phil M. Donnelly; Bert Cooper, director, Department of Business and Administration, Jefferson City, Mo.

Nebraska: Val. Peterson; Rufus M. Howard, Department of Agriculture, Lincoln, Nebr.

New Jersey: Alfred E. Driscoll; Joseph L. McLaughlin, 107 West State Street, Trenton, N. J.

New York: Thomas E. Dewey; Charles Sell, Albany, N. Y.

North Carolina: R. Gregg Cherry; W. Z. Betts, department of purchase and control, Raleigh, N. C.

North Dakota: Fred G. Aandahl; no fuel coordinator appointed.

New Hampshire: Charles M. Dale; John E. Holden, Newington, N. H.

Ohio: Thomas J. Herbert; Eric V. Weber, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Oklahoma: Roy J. Turner; no fuel coordinator appointed.

Pennsylvania: James H. Duff; Brenton G. Wallace, 764 Mount Pleasant Road, Byrn Mawr, Pa.

Rhode Island: John O. Pastore; Fletcher Burton, Providence, R. I.

South Carolina: J. Strom Thurmond; E. H. Talbert, Columbia, S. C.

South Dakota: George T. Mickelson; C. F. Overton, natural resources commission, Pierre, S. Dak.

Tennessee: Jim N. McCord; Hilton Butler, Adjutant General, Nashville, Tenn.

Vermont: Ernest W. Gibson; M. A. Campbell, adjutant general of Vermont.

Virginia: William M. Tuck; C. F. Joyner, Jr., Twelfth and Main Streets, Richmond, Va.

West Virginia: Clarence W. Meadows; no fuel coordinator appointed.

Wisconsin: Oscar Rennebohm; Anthony E. Modler, department of agriculture, Madison, Wis.

Maryland: William P. Lane, Jr.; Judge Emory H. Niles, Court House, Baltimore, Md.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
OFFICE OF RUBBER RESERVE,
January 8, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Reference is made to your telephone call requesting information with respect to pressure tank cars owned by RFC Office of Rubber Reserve, and the present use position of these cars in the rubber program.

The Office of Rubber Reserve owns 450 type 104–A pressure cars which were constructed for its use during the war period for the transport of materials which are utilized in the production of synthetic rubber. The actual requirements for tank cars in the program are not fixed, but increase and decrease as the conditions surrounding individual plant operations necessitate in relation to the quantity of synthetic rubber produced. Present requirements are approximately 350 cars, which is the reason some of the cars that we have released for other uses are being recalled for our service.

Inventories of GR–S in the hands of Government and the rubber fabricating industry are too low to meet manufacturing requirements. There are some 800 rubber-fabricating companies in the United States which are presently using synthetic rubber, employing from as many as 60,000 people to as few as 10. These companies are now receiving from 10 to 30 percent less GR–S than they request for their operations, and many of them have

indicated to this office that further cuts would necessitate closing their plants.

The pressure cars which are owned by Rubber Reserve are managed under a contract with the Union Tank Car Co., and when cars are not needed in the Rubber Reserve operations, the Office of Defense Transportation is notified, which in turn advises the Union Tank Car Co. to whom the cars are to be leased. In the event Rubber Reserve finds it necessary to recall any cars from lessees, the Office of Defense Transportation is again notified and informed of the number of cars required, and in turn advises the Union Tank Car Co. from whom the cars are to be recalled. It will be noted, therefore, that the Office of Defense Transportation has complete control over the allocation of pressure tank cars for essential uses.

I hope the foregoing will give you adequate information with respect to the subject of your inquiry, but if it does not, I shall be most pleased to furnish such further information as you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

G. B. HADLOCK,
Executive Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OIL AND GAS DIVISION,
January 17, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Your suggestion of a meeting of State fuel oil coordinators proved its value beyond question at the meeting held day before yesterday.

The meeting was attended by representatives of 23 States and the District of Columbia, by representatives of the National Petroleum Council's Committee on voluntary programs under the Anti-Inflation Act, and by representatives of other Government agencies. The registered attendance was as follows:

State representatives and their advisers	65
Congressional:	
Senators	1
Representatives	2
Representatives of Senators and Representatives	7
Total	10
Representatives of 24 executive agencies	54
Representatives of National Petroleum Council and its committee	16
Association of American Railroads	1
Council of State Governments	1
Representatives of the press	20
Total registered attendance	167

A list of those who attended and were registered in is attached. A few who attended may have been missed in the registration.

I suspect that one or two State coordinators, who apparently came expecting that the meeting might in some fashion point the way to additional supplies for their States, were disappointed to learn that the problem is basically one of supply and that no one could out-of-hand allocate them additional supplies. The great majority, however, had correctly anticipated the purpose and scope of the meeting, as set out in the carefully worded invitation, and were anything but disappointed.

All of the State representatives, to judge from their expressions from the floor and from private conversations, felt that they had benefited from the comprehensive review of the petroleum situation that was given them and from the discussions by the various State coordinators, particularly those who have been functioning longest, of the problems encountered in their respective States and the methods devised to meet them. The benefit was greatest, no doubt, to those most recently appointed, but coordinators who have been in office for weeks or months were equally emphatic in their commendation of the meeting.

A number of the industry representatives present have said that they derived much benefit from the discussion of the problems and methods of the State coordinators, and I know that my associates and I did.

As you doubtless know, Secretary Krug lent force to the oil-conservation aspect of the meeting by issuing, coincident with it, an appeal to the public to conserve fuel oil, gas, and gasoline. I enclose a copy. As you suggested, copies of his letter of January 10 to you were given to the State representatives and their advisers.

I feel that the meeting was successful and will have fruitful and long-lasting consequences, and I am deeply grateful to you for suggesting that it be held.

Sincerely,

MAX W. BALL.
Director.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, January 12, 1948.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Reference is had to your letter of December 20, 1947, transmitting copy of the report made by an industry committee which you appointed after a hearing of your subcommittee on December 9 concerning fuel shortages in various areas, particularly the North Atlantic States. You refer specifically to those sections of the industry-committee report dealing with the shortage of tanker transportation facilities and request our comments thereon.

This Commission has spent a large part of its time of late on matters pertaining to the oil- and tanker-shortage problems and has endeavored in every way possible to expedite the getting into operation of laid-up tankers and to assure the most efficient use of the vessels which it still directly operates, in meeting domestic needs, particularly those of the Atlantic Seaboard States.

Between November 1 and January 1, 74 T-2 and Liberty-type tankers were moved from Reserve fleet sites for repair and reconditioning for operation, which number includes the 50 T-2 vessels to be operated directly by the Navy. In the week from January 1 to 8, 10 more vessels of these types were withdrawn from lay-up. As of January 9 there remained 45 such tankers still tied up, but these are being moved out day by day, and every effort is being made to expedite the process. As you are aware, all of these vessels have been allocated for sale, and purchasers who have shown indications of being dilatory in completing the sales arrangements, with a consequent delay in breaking the vessels out of lay-up for repair, have been warned that they must promptly comply with our requirements in this respect.

Highest priority has been given to concluding purchase arrangements and physical delivery of all tankers in the laid-up fleet. In this connection the Commission has appointed the Chief of its Bureau of Operations as Coordinator for the purpose of speeding up administrative work incident to such deliveries from lay-up. Second highest priority has been given in the case of citizen buyers of operating tankers who give assurances that the vessels will be used exclusively in domestic service during the balance of the winter and the early spring months.

Every practicable measure is being taken to shorten the sales and delivery processes, to the end that no vessel will be unnecessarily delayed in entering upon or continuing operation.

The Commission and its staff has been in daily contact with purchasers of tankers, with oil companies seeking the use of the tankers which we still operate, and with Members of the Congress and State and city officials seeking to meet the tanker transportation needs of various areas along the eastern seaboard. On January 7 we held a meeting with 15 of the larger oil companies serving United States Gulf- and east-coast States, for the purpose of determining the extent to which those companies have been and are using the American registered tankers which they themselves own in meeting our domestic needs. We are pleased to advise that the information adduced at that hearing indicates that virtually all of the 236 tankers owned by these particular companies are now being used in the United States coastwise and import trades. The Commission has requested these companies immediately to endeavor to divert to our import trade additional tankers under foreign registry which they own or control directly or through subsidiary or affiliated companies.

Vessels recently withdrawn from the Reserve fleets for repairs and refitting are now beginning to enter operation, and we estimate that by the end of this month between 40 or 50 such vessels will be in active operating status. This, coupled with the many additional vessels which will enter operation in the early days of February, should greatly relieve the present difficult situation by the end of that month.

You may be assured that the Commission is keenly aware of this acute situation and will continue to exert its best efforts to assist.

Sincerely yours,

W. W. SMITH,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 14, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Mr. Symington has referred to me, for study and action, your letter of December 20, 1947, bearing on the impending fuel-oil shortage. The report of the problem transmitted by your letter is excellent and the recommendations contained therein appear to be a sound approach to the ultimate resolution of current fuel-oil difficulties.

The only petroleum products being purchased by the Air Force consist of aviation gasoline, aviation lubricants, and jet fuel. Heating fuels for our installations are purchased by the Quartermaster Corps and the Treasury Department.

Our purchases of petroleum products are handled throughout the United States on a current requirement basis so that there is no program for maintaining reserve stocks of these products. In recent months requirements have not been fully met at certain installations for short periods of time, but aviation fuels available for the remainder of the fiscal year are estimated to be sufficient for our minimum requirements.

Further, in conjunction with the Federal Works Agency a survey is being made of Air Force installations east of the Rocky Mountains for the purpose of determining the practicability of conversion from oil to coal heating.

Please be assured that the United States Air Force will cooperate fully in holding requirements to the minimum during this critical period.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. BARROWS,
Under Secretary of the Air Forces.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 9, 1948.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have your letter of December 20, 1947, with regard to

the threatened shortage of fuel oil in the New England and Atlantic seaboard areas this winter, and to the recommendations made by the industry committee appointed by you to study this problem. I also have the report of the industry committee and its letter of December 17, 1947 transmitting this report to you, both of which were included as enclosures to your letter.

In your letter you asked that the Secretary inform you of his reaction to the report and its recommendations. As the report is primarily concerned with aspects of the problem regarding which other agencies of the Government can better advise your committee, it is hoped that it will be satisfactory if my comments are confined to the recommendations relating to the responsibilities of the Department of State. I believe two such recommendations are touched upon in the industry committee report and in your letter. One of these is the recommendation that negotiations be inaugurated at once with foreign governments who are parties to the international load line agreement for the purpose of securing their agreement to the increasing of the load limit on tankers during the present shortage period. The other recommendation relating to the responsibilities of the Department of State is that exports of petroleum products be restricted during the next 2 or 3 months to the minimum quantities necessary to maintain the economies of certain foreign nations.

In order to assist in relief of the fuel-oil shortage this winter, the practicability of securing a temporary suspension of the International Load Line Convention, 1930, has been given consideration by the Department of State. This question also has been taken up with the British Government. The preliminary discussions with the British indicate certain complexities which would be involved in securing a suspension of the convention. The British wartime defense regulations to permit deeper loading of tankers have been revoked, and the Department has been advised informally that these regulations cannot be reissued without new legislation. It is doubtful that parliamentary approval could be secured within a sufficiently short period for such action to be helpful in the current emergency. The possible saving of United Kingdom tankers, it is estimated, would be equivalent to not more than six such vessels in continuous employment. If deeper loading were permitted in the older tankers, there appears to be doubt that there would be any saving because of increased repair time due to greater strain and damage to the vessels caused by high seas.

Even if the necessary British legislation were secured, deeper loading would necessitate obtaining prior acquiescence of all convention countries before the contemplated relaxation could be made effective. There are, as you may know, 45 countries which have either ratified or adhered to this treaty. In addition, classification societies and sea labor also should be consulted. With so many countries and interests involved, it is doubted that their concurrence to a suspension of the convention could be secured in the time available if the desired result is to be achieved. It is believed that the necessary agreements could not be obtained in less than 2 months.

The industry committee recognized in its report that some exports of oil products are necessary to maintain the economies of foreign nations. The committee, therefore, recommended that only minimum export requirements from the United States be met during the present shortage in this country. You may be sure that the Department of State will cooperate in the carrying out of this recommendation to the fullest extent consistent with our national interest in supplying petroleum products essential to the economies of foreign nations. This cooperation will of course be indirect since the responsibility for the administration of export controls under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 is that of the Department of Commerce.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 20, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The special industry committee appointed by you in early December to study the critical petroleum situation subsequently rendered a report which contained many well considered recommendations for action to be taken by both Government and private interests to conserve fuel-oil supplies, and increase the transportation means engaged in the movement of these supplies.

Because of your keen interest and effective leadership in these matters you will, I know, appreciate a report of what measures the Navy Department has taken to comply with the suggestions made to you by the special industry committee. Accordingly I am listing below certain steps which the Navy Department had already taken in addition to those flowing from the recommendations of that committee:

(a) On November 6, 1947, issued a directive to all shore establishments regarding the necessity for utmost fuel conservation and included detailed instructions for achieving that result.

(b) On December 6, 1947, reemphasized the directive mentioned in (a) above and further directed that the installation of new or conversion fuel-oil-burning equipment be suspended immediately except in those cases where extreme hardship could be proved and approval for work continuance on that basis be obtained.

(c) On January 12, 1948, submitted Navy requirements for petroleum products for the second half of the current fiscal year to the Department of the Interior for notification to industry. These requirements have been searchingly scrutinized and now represent only the actual consumption needs of the Navy during the 6 months' period in question.

(d) On January 12, 1948, an agreement was reached with the Governor of Rhode Island and representatives of the Governors of the other five New England States whereby the Navy will release, subject to replacement in kind by June 30, 1948, a total of 940,000 barrels of petroleum products from Navy-owned storage in the New England area for emergency relief of distressed consumers in that area. This amount of fuel represents a distinct sacrifice of the Navy's inventory position and was made only after thorough consideration of the suffering and hardship which will prevail in the New England States should this fuel not be made available.

I regret to advise that it is wholly impracticable for the Navy to comply with that recommendation of the special industry committee regarding temporary employment in the Gulf Coast Atlantic service of some of the 50 tankers being reconditioned for use of the military services. As you are probably already aware, the program of reconditioning these vessels was initiated by the Navy department for the very purpose of aiding the critical petroleum transportation problem by releasing operating tankers regularly chartered by the military services from the Maritime Commission. It is difficult to understand, therefore, by what logic the special industry committee arrived at the conclusion that the Navy could release vessels formerly chartered from the Maritime Commission and at the same time, at least temporarily, the tankers obtained as replacements therefor. In this connection you will be pleased to note that in anticipation of the availability of some of the 50 tankers being reconditioned the Navy has requested the allocation of only eight chartered tankers from the Maritime Commission for January liftings. This is in marked contrast with the 37 vessels assigned to the Navy by the Maritime Commission in December of which nine did not actually arrive at loading ports until early January thus making a total of 17 chartered tankers from the Maritime Commission in use during the current month.

The Navy Department is keenly aware of the serious situation confronting many sections of the country and stands ready to render any further assistance to alleviate hardship and suffering which is compatible with the Navy's basic responsibility in matters of national security.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN,
Acting.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, January 15, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: The very excellent report, submitted by the committee organized by you of representative oil producers and distributors, which was forwarded to me in your letter of December 22, 1947, has received intensive study in the Navy Department. The recommendations submitted for alleviation of the current fuel shortage are most sound and extremely constructive.

Action to implement the recommendations made by your committee, as applying to the Navy, has been initiated and some effective results have already been accomplished.

Since early last summer, the Navy has been operating under directives to exercise the utmost economy with respect to the consumption of petroleum products consistent with the performance of assigned missions and training operations necessary to maintain the fighting efficiency of the fleet and naval aviation. Current requirements are being reduced to a minimum and during this period of critical short supply the Navy where it can is making oil available on a replacement basis. In addition, those Navy installations which can burn coal in lieu of oil are being shifted to coal.

Assistance to veterans' hospitals and other Federal institutions has been provided in the eastern seaboard States by the supply of fuel from Navy stocks. This form of relief has resulted in a correspondingly additional amount of fuel becoming available to civilian consumers from their regular commercial suppliers in those localities.

The 50 tankers recently acquired by the United States Maritime Commission are being placed in operation with the utmost dispatch. In anticipation of their readiness, the Navy released, during December, a considerable number of tankers that were under charter from the United States Maritime Commission which have been diverted to the transportation of commercial cargoes. Inasmuch as this tanker program has been temporarily delayed, the Navy is about 20 cargoes behind schedule for December. However, this delay is being accepted and reinstatement of chartered tankers has not been requested. During January an appreciable number of the 50 tankers will be in operation, and their addition to the world tanker fleet will contribute greatly to the solution of the transportation difficulties.

Please be assured that the Navy will keep the fuel situation under continuous study and will continue to institute any possible action consistent with protection of the national security toward rendering assistance in relieving the critical shortage of fuel which is now facing the country. The Navy is most desirous to cooperate with your committee in this common cause and to contribute in the accomplishment of the task.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1947.
The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Oil and Coal Shortage, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 20, to which was attached a copy of a report of the special committee appointed by you to inquire into the fuel situation and make suggestions to overcome it.

I think your committee has done a good job in making recommendations and feel sure that if they are carried out with the full cooperation of all participating agencies that they will go a long way toward ameliorating the fuel shortage.

I feel, however, that there should be some over-all committee and perhaps a small committee of the oil industry, car owners, and railroads that will attempt to equalize the supply between the several geographical areas where the shortage may develop, and to this end the Office of Defense Transportation pledges its full support to your committee and stands ready to meet with such a group whenever you may suggest.

Cordially,

J. M. JOHNSON,
Director.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C. December 23, 1947.
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Oil and Coal Shortage, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: I have and thank you for your letter of December 20. Your courtesy in sending me a copy of the report presented to you by the committee which you appointed to consider and submit recommendations dealing with the threatened shortage of fuel oil throughout the country is appreciated.

This report has been carefully examined and I agree with you that a voluntary effort on the part of all concerned is the desirable way of dealing with this matter. You may be assured of the wholehearted cooperation of the railroads and this association with any and all groups which may be created for the purpose of taking such action as seems desirable. We are in position to be helpful in the movement of tank cars and shall promptly respond to any request which may require action so far as the movement of these cars is concerned. We have been in touch with the tank car companies, as suggested in your letter, since early in the summer and are cooperating with them in every way possible. You will probably recall the statement to this effect made by our representative at the conference held on December 9.

It occurs to me that it would be desirable if you would arrange to have someone named representing the oil industry from whom we may obtain information as to the transportation of crude oil and distillates. I believe it would also be helpful if you would arrange for the creation of a committee representing the tank-car owners, with representatives of the oil industry, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Army, Navy, and this association serving thereon. Through such a committee we should be able to meet and deal with any requirements which may arise so far as transportation is concerned. If this suggestion meets with your approval, I shall be glad, upon receipt of advice, to designate a representative of the association to serve as a member.

You indicate that both the Senate committee and the committee of oil representatives will continue in existence and keep in touch with one another. It would also be helpful and appreciated if you would advise me through what source I may contact the committee of oil representatives for the purposes of discussing the desirability of meeting with the representatives of the oil industry, tank-car owners, ODT, Army, and Navy. I have in mind that possibly such a meeting would be helpful in setting up an arrangement which would be fully responsive to what you have in mind.

Sincerely,

W. T. FARICY,
President.

REPEAL OF INDIAN LIQUOR LAWS IN CERTAIN PARTS OF MINNESOTA—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote taken today on House bill 1049, Calendar 866, a bill to repeal certain acts of Congress known as Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until Wednesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, January 28, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 26, 1948:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

M. S. Szymczak, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1948. (Reappointment.)

Thomas Bayard McCabe, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1942.

MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Frank Hammett Myers, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Nathan R. Margold, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF OF STAFF

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley to be Chief of Staff, United States Army, effective on date of appointment, vice General of the Army Dwight David Eisenhower.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major

*Lt. Col. Leo Murphy, [redacted], Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army), with rank from September 7, 1947.

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Ralph Gunther Tross, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 3, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Holt Dolson, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 4, 1948.

First Lt. Leland Boyd Fair, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 4, 1948.

Capt. Joseph Daniel Hughes, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Thomas McAtee, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 5, 1948.

Capt. Clarence Ames Martin, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Francis Lester Wycoff, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Durell Benner Hartman, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Luther Leon Halbrook, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Lawrence Edward Spellman, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 9, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Edwin Cross, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 9, 1948.

Capt. Joseph Aaron Goldes, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 13, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Arnott Cady, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 15, 1948.

Capt. Norman Maynard Stephens, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 17, 1948.

First Lt. John Hamilton Burke, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 17, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Preston Davis, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 18, 1948.

First Lt. Gilbert Harry Amis, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 20, 1948.

First Lt. William Paul Hartman, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 26, 1948.

First Lt. William Thornton Coburn, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 26, 1948.

First Lt. William Carlton Wilkinson, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Henry Kelly, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 29, 1948.

Second Lt. Harold Elwin Maier, [redacted], U. S. Army, with rank from January 29, 1948.

First Lt. Alvin Carl Jensen, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 30, 1948.

First Lt. John Christian Wallman, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 30, 1948.

First Lt. Milton Max Nemky, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 30, 1948.

First Lt. Willard Almur Dodge, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 30, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Burnham Brewer, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from January 31, 1948.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

*Col. Paul Herbert Martin, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 1, 1947.

*Col. Otto Leonard Churney, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 29, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Richard Barr Jones, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 18, 1947.

*Col. Francis Patrick Kintz, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 4, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Augustus Alonzo Hall, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 20, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Frank Eric Hagman, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 22, 1947.

To be majors

*Lt. Col. Richard Irving Crone, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 1, 1947.

*Maj. George Augustine Goder, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 24, 1947.

*Lt. Col. John Randolph Hall, Jr., [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 11, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Lucio Ernest Gatto, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 12, 1947.

*Lt. Col. David Harry Naimark, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 14, 1947.

*Maj. Aniello Francis Mastellone, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 20, 1947.

*Maj. William Leroy Vogt, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 24, 1947.

*Col. Raymond Taylor Jenkins, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Col. Carl Bennett Stilson, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Robert Nathan Lehman, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Louis Franklin Saylor, [redacted], Medical Corps Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Maj. Raymond Bender Croissant, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Maj. Jon Olafur Stefan Sigurdsson, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Lt. Col. John Warren Guerin, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 9, 1947.

*Col. George N. Schuhmann, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 30, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Alonzo Allan Towner, Jr., [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 4, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Wilbur Dwight Dice, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 10, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Ralph Everett Reiner, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 15, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Joseph Robert Vivas, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 22, 1947.

*Maj. William Nelson Donovan, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 29, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Norman Clemm Veale, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 30, 1947.

To be captains

*Capt. Clarence Blake Hewitt, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 2, 1947.

*Capt. Byron Landt Miller, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 2, 1947.

*Maj. Carl Barry Weller, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 4, 1947

*Maj. James Barnes Hartgering, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 7, 1947.

*Capt. Zbigniew John Baczewski, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 15, 1947.

*Capt. Wayne Robert Oelhafen, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 20, 1947.

*Capt. Charles Walter Metz, Jr., [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 8, 1947.

*Capt. Richard Earl Mardis, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 15, 1947.

*Capt. Robert Blair Franklin, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 18, 1947.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

*Lt. Col. George Emil Naselli, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 13, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Wallace Jacob Morlock, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 15, 1947.

To be majors

*Maj. William Ralph Thomas Oakes, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 24, 1946.

*Maj. Benjamin Lee Brooks, Jr., [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 14, 1947.

*Maj. Arthur Hastings Vollertsen, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 14, 1947.

*Maj. Donald William Grove, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 5, 1947.

*Maj. Charles Stewart Jones, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from September 7, 1947.

*Maj. William Joseph McAllister, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 8, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Theodore Emmett Fischer, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 17, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Gerald Arthur McCracken, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Maj. Douglas Monroe Beebe, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Kenneth David Eye, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Maj. Virgil Gordon Walker, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Jack Menefee Messner, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 9, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Hal David Oakley, Jr., [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 12, 1947.

To be captain

*Capt. John Everett Gaynor, [redacted], Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 1, 1947.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

*Lt. Col. Arvo Theodore Thompson, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (major, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 8, 1947.

To be majors

*Lt. Col. Don L. Deane, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 30, 1947.

*Maj. Don Lee Mace, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1947.

*Maj. Howard Curtis Maxey, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 16, 1947.

*Maj. Karl Harry Willers, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 9, 1947.

*Maj. Manuel Charles Kastner, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 15, 1947.

*Lt. Col. Harry Ruyle Lancaster, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 26, 1947.

To be captains

*Capt. William Gordon Brooks, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 31, 1947.

*Capt. Samuel Garwood Forester, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 13, 1947.

*Capt. Elmer Richard Pede, [redacted], Veterinary Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 14, 1947.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Robert Newell Gilliam, [redacted], Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 15, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Isaiah Anderson, [redacted], Medical Service Corps, United States Army, with rank from January 31, 1948.

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Lt. Col. Kathleen Mitchell, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Margaret Elizabeth Aaron, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jeanette Blech, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Florence I. Lee, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nora G. Freeman, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Velma Fay Grove, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States(second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from December 21, 1947.

First Lt. Anna Veronica Michelitsch, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 1, 1948.

First Lt. Geraldine Massingill, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 9, 1948.

First Lt. Keitha Pauline Zeisloft, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 15, 1948.

First Lt. Mary Ann Strauss, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 20, 1948.

First Lt. Nancy Carol Leftenant, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 22, 1948.

First Lt. Barbara L. Hughson, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 31, 1948.

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieutenant Margaret A. Kraybill, J18, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from December 20, 1947.

First Lt. Melna Adams Farmer, [redacted], Dietitian, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 1, 1948.

First Lt. Katherine Cecelia Ehrhart, [redacted], Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from January 10, 1948.

(NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were promoted during the recess of the Senate prior to December 31, 1947, pursuant to the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 which prescribed that until December 31, 1947, Regular Army promotion list officers should continue to be promoted to and appointed in the permanent grades of lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and first lieutenant in accordance with previously existing provisions of law. The officers of the Army Nurse Corps being nominated for promotion to lieutenant colonel will be given dates of rank as of the date of their promotion.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Daniel Joseph Boyle, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 1, 1948.

First Lt. Patrick Henry Kenny, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 2, 1948.

First Lt. Bruce Wendell Pope, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 3, 1948.

First Lt. James Allen Burton, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 4, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Brice Moore, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 4, 1948.

First Lt. DeForrest August von Laufer, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 5, 1948.

First Lt. Mark Carlyle Noble, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 5, 1948.

First Lt. Armand Edouard Reiser, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Raymond Adolph Groh, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Julian Daniel Shofner, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur John Ulrich, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Russell Perrine Morris, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Wilford Tipton, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 6, 1948.

Second Lt. James Theodore Seymour, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from January 6, 1948.

First Lt. Roy Enright Guy, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 8, 1948.

First Lt. Lester T. Kearney, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from January 9, 1948.

Capt. Jack Byron Owens, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 9, 1948.

First Lt. Julian Franklin Berry, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 11, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Keith MacGregor, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 12, 1948.

First Lt. Russell Millward Heller, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 13, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Frank Holst, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 13, 1948.

First Lt. Hubert Neil Skidmore, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 13, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Francis Watson, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from January 14, 1948.

First Lt. Jacob Milton Freeman, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 15, 1948.

Second Lt. Henry Leo Rauch, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from January 16, 1948.

First Lt. John William Menard, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 17, 1948.

First Lt. Newell Dwight Mitchell, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 18, 1948.

Capt. Dempsey Ernest Ballard, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 19, 1948.

First Lt. Claude Merrill Trawick, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 20, 1948.

First Lt. Francis Eris Wilkie, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 20, 1948.

Capt. John Raymond Kern, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 20, 1948.

Capt. Harry Holt Moreland, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 20, 1948.

Capt. Charles Francis Hoy, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 21, 1948.

First Lt. Conrad John Lindemann, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 21, 1948.

First Lt. John Scales Hardwick, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 23, 1948.

First Lt. James Marshall Anderson, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 26, 1948.

Capt. Doyle Dean Dickson, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 27, 1948.

Second Lt. Richard David Klingenberg, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from January 27, 1948.

Second Lt. Walter Thomas Gentile, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Richard Croft, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. Warren L. Simpson, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. William Francis Ramsey, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 27, 1948.

First Lt. John A. Saffell, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 28, 1948.

Capt. Bruce Ward Carr, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 28, 1948.

First Lt. Warren Glenn Van Houten, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 31, 1948.

First Lt. Leroy Peter Zotter, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 31, 1948.

First Lt. Hollie Alonzo Wilkes, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from January 31, 1948.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Joe N. White, Beaverton, Ala., in place of R. B. Dennis, retired.

Robert L. Roberts, Boylston, Ala., in place of M. H. Wilson, resigned.

James Ernest Lambert, Darlington, Ala., in place of A. H. Lambert, retired.

William E. Smith, Glen Allen, Ala., in place of W. O. Smith, retired.

John J. Howell, Gordo, Ala., in place of R. G. Davis, transferred.

Leland M. Cox, Mentone, Ala., in place of S. E. Selman, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Willard C. Wall, Coal Hill, Ark., in place of H. M. Shrigley, retired.

Ernest J. Stroub, Lavaca, Ark., in place of Dayton Brewer, resigned.

Leo J. Schreick, Osceola, Ark., in place of G. M. Doyle, deceased.

Albert A. Hill, Scranton, Ark., in place of S. M. Heim, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Cecilia A. George, Castroville, Calif., in place of F. E. Faustino, removed.

June R. Dolcini, Davis, Calif., in place of V. F. Dolcini, deceased.

Paul R. Todd, Garberville, Calif., in place of D. E. Knapp, deceased.

LaVerna N. Strawbridge, Westminster, Calif., in place of M. M. Sitzer, resigned.

COLORADO

R. Terrell Ellington, Grand Junction, Colo., in place of C. D. Moslander, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Herman F. LeDoyt, South Coventry, Conn., in place of G. H. Robertson, deceased.

DELAWARE

Warren Francis Comstock, Farnhurst, Del., in place of R. R. Veasey, deceased.

Bertha M. Carrow, Saint Georges, Del., in place of G. E. Bright, resigned.

FLORIDA

Chandos W. McMullen, Bay Pines, Fla., in place of A. W. Martin, declined.

John F. Pelot, Belleview, Fla., in place of C. G. Hanson, resigned.

James L. Mayton, Carrabelle, Fla., in place of R. G. Bradford, deceased.

Theodore L. Latimer, Deleon Springs, Fla., in place of Flode Jones, retired.

Ruth F. Muir, Everglades, Fla., in place of A. W. Lewis, retired.

George P. Adams, Greenacres City, Fla., in place of E. M. Adams, deceased.

Willie H. Andreasen, Greenwood, Fla., in place of H. A. Stevens, retired.

Loice J. Jones, Killarney, Fla., in place of J. W. Jones, retired.

Billie S. Campbell, Lake Harbor, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Bernice M. Stefurak, Rockledge, Fla., in place of A. C. Fiske, resigned.

John O. Rogers, Sebastian, Fla., in place of M. H. Futch, resigned.

Stanton M. Gideons, Webster, Fla., in place of P. A. Tompkins, resigned.

GEORGIA

Henry C. Geer, Bogart, Ga., in place of O. H. Bradbury, retired.

Eleanor K. Pitts, Chattahoochee, Ga., in place of H. E. Malaier, retired.

Bernarr B. Adams, Dewyrose, Ga., in place of L. G. Brown, deceased.

James H. Sellers, Jr., Graham, Ga., in place of S. E. O'Quinn, resigned.

Walter E. Ard, Iron City, Ga., in place of T. A. Drake, retired.

Robert C. Harris, Leesburg, Ga., in place of Kate Harris, retired.

Daniel L. Murphy, Sr., Moreland, Ga., in place of S. K. Polk, deceased.

Tommie Louise Pressey, Rocky Ford, Ga., in place of W. E. Fitts, retired.

Julius M. Engram, Scottdale, Ga., in place of J. S. Farrar, resigned.

Horace C. Kelly, Jr., Toomsboro, Ga., in place of W. H. Freeman, retired.

HAWAII

Robert K. Matsueda, Kahului, Hawaii, in place of L. W. Holt, resigned.

IDAHO

Charles E. Ruger, Bancroft, Idaho, in place of Z. G. Steele, resigned.

Marvin F. Crockett, Bliss, Idaho, in place of G. D. McIntosh, resigned.

Thomas W. Rogers, Glenns Ferry, Idaho, in place of H. H. Tate, removed.

Harold E. J. Wayne, St. Maries, Idaho, in place of M. H. Moshinsky, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Mabel H. Green, Alvin, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ted Bauer, Benton, Ill., in place of J. W. Williams, resigned.

Winifred Hughes, Broughton, Ill., in place of R. M. McElvain, resigned.

Margaret Carlson, Bureau, Ill., in place of J. F. Fredrickson, transferred.

Albert J. Buehler, Chestnut, Ill., in place of L. C. Rentschler, resigned.

Leland Adams, Dieterich, Ill., in place of R. L. Graham, resigned.

Joseph J. Holloway, Elmhurst, Ill., in place of J. F. Grogan, deceased.

Ruth Sartain, Fithian, Ill., in place of O. E. Bantz, retired.

Mary E. McCarl, Kinderhook, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Richard R. Atkins, Kinmundy, Ill., in place of F. O. Grissom, retired.

Helen F. Gleich, Menard, Ill., in place of F. V. McNabney, deceased.

Adam A. Munsterman, Nameoki, Ill., in place of J. A. Miller, resigned.

Charles J. Murphy, Oak Park, Ill., in place of J. L. Lynch, resigned.

Joseph J. Smaron, Posen, Ill., in place of G. B. Livesay, resigned.

Francis L. Weghorst, South Pekin, Ill., in place of R. C. Morris, removed.

Herbert M. Bowman, Thompsonville, Ill., in place of A. M. Akin, resigned.

Orville L. Glasford, Trivoli, Ill., in place of R. A. Swan, resigned.

INDIANA

Harlan C. Dodd, Charlestown, Ind., in place of J. C. McKillip, resigned.

Walter H. Fried, Corydon, Ind., in place of G. C. Rainbolt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

May Reiff, Deputy, Ind., in place of F. A. Anderson, deceased.

Margaret A. Horseman, Dublin, Ind., in place of G. A. Adrion, retired.

John Edgar Sachs, Evansville, Ind., in place of H. M. Mayer, deceased.

Henry O. Kipfer, Grabill, Ind., in place of G. R. Woods, resigned.

Arthur C. Welch, Lapaz, Ind., in place of I. B. Carbiener, resigned.

Geneva K. Gant, Laurel, Ind., in place of B. F. Russell, transferred.

Pearl L. Smith, New Market, Ind., in place of Ethel Martin, resigned.

Roy L. Strange, Plainville, Ind., in place of E. J. McWilliams, resigned.

Richard B. Miller, Rushville, Ind., in place of W. L. Newbold, removed.

Sylvia Swanson, Twelve Mile, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Vernon M. Zylstra, Bussey, Iowa, in place of Z. P. Way, resigned.

Francis L. Porter, Clarion, Iowa, in place of Richard Tomke, deceased.

Marion W. Palmer, Clearfield, Iowa, in place of J. S. Walton, removed.

William G. Strunce, Creston, Iowa, in place of T. M. Conway, deceased.

Baird Jennings Okey, Dayton, Iowa, in place of K. C. Warner, retired.

Frank E. Orwan, Lorimor, Iowa, in place of N. T. Nixon, deceased.

Harold A. Lofgreen, Montezuma, Iowa, in place of R. A. Mortland, retired.

Wilda Stephenson, Packwood, Iowa, in place of L. L. Lockhart, retired.

James E. Brunt, Russell, Iowa, in place of G. J. Mettlin, transferred.

Fred J. Ehrhardt, Sac City, Iowa, in place of C. L. Anderson, resigned.

Pearl L. Smith, Woden, Iowa, in place of V. L. Eaton, resigned.

KANSAS

Victor A. Zeckser, Alma, Kans., in place of Louie Haller, removed.

Earle F. Hill, Altamont, Kans., in place of C. H. Kessler, transferred.

Wayne M. Stoffer, Haven, Kans., in place of L. C. Forker, resigned.

Howard D. Meisel, Haviland, Kans., in place of H. R. Ellis, declined.

Alvin A. Pfeiffer, Linn, Kans., in place of D. L. McGregor, transferred.

Ralph M. Plotner, McCracken, Kans., in place of E. W. Shiney, transferred.

Elmer G. Jackson, Manhattan, Kans., in place of W. E. Moore, retired.

Ola J. Canny, Mound Valley, Kans., in place of C. L. Hinds, transferred.

Wayne B. Blackburn, Rozel, Kans. Office become Presidential July 1, 1945.

David Mallory Howell, Winfield, Kans., in place of R. T. Henderson, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Edna T. Holman, Cerulean, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James Paul Dodson, Scottsville, Ky., in place of Roy Dye, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Alton I. Carter, Jonesville, La., in place of E. R. Ford, retired.

Marion T. Files, Oak Ridge, La., in place of T. E. Barham, retired.

Harvey J. Rabalais, Simmesport, La., in place of L. L. Ehrhardt, resigned.

MAINE

Corice B. Feindel, Denmark, Maine, in place of M. L. Jack, retired.

Hurschel A. Ryerson, North Bridgton, Maine, in place of B. M. Kendall, resigned.

Delmar C. Ellinwood, North Windham, Maine, in place of L. H. Hern, resigned.

Ella Mae Quimby, Oquossoc, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Frank C. Creteau, Sanford, Maine, in place of L. J. Emery, deceased.

Cyril Paul Pelletier, St. Francis, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Robert M. Heggeman, Standish, Maine, in place of A. H. Butterfield, retired.

MARYLAND

C. Gorman Griffith, Gaithersburg, Md., in place of M. L. Ridgely, transferred.

Donald B. Canada, Glen Echo, Md., in place of S. E. Canada, retired.

Calvin Burns, Grasonville, Md., in place of T. H. Collier, declined.

Cora L. Sappington, Keymar, Md., in place of G. U. Koons, retired.

Milton W. Corkran, Mount Wilson, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William E. Spoerlein, Oakland, Md., in place of I. R. Rudy, resigned.

E. Raymond Bounds, Ocean City, Md., in place of L. D. Lynch, resigned.

Edward P. Harris, Snow Hill, Md., in place of E. W. Marshall, deceased.

Maybelle R. Baker, Union Bridge, Md., in place of J. W. Baker, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Maurice R. Savage, Buzzards Bay, Mass., in place of F. C. Small, retired.

Elizabeth S. Russell, Carlisle, Mass., in place of F. E. Daisy, deceased.

Bernard N. Powers, Hadley, Mass., in place of E. C. Pelissier, retired.

William J. Powers, Leicester, Mass., in place of J. A. Bell, retired.

Georgia R. Harvey, Lynnfield, Mass., in place of A. T. Doyle, resigned.

Hazel F. Tenney, West Townsend, Mass., in place of G. H. Tenney, retired.

Eleanor P. Hatton, Woronoco, Mass., in place of W. P. Hatton, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Perry F. Frownfelder, Adrian, Mich., in place of H. I. Bourns, resigned.

J. Willard Krause, Manistee, Mich., in place of E. J. Talbot, deceased.

August M. Huotari, Mass, Mich., in place of C. J. Maloney, resigned.

Lionel R. Haight, Mount Pleasant, Mich., in place of A. S. Warner, resigned.

Emanuel W. Rupprecht, Reese, Mich., in place of M. M. Rupprecht, resigned.

Clarence F. Bushman, Rochester, Mich., in place of J. M. Stackhouse, deceased.

MINNESOTA

Henning O. Mickelson, Carson Lake, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Walter L. Franti, Coleraine, Minn., in place of J. K. Sloan, deceased.

Otto W. Anderberg, Grove City, Minn., in place of D. G. Sundahl, resigned.

Alfred F. Ess, Hopkins, Minn., in place of F. D. Markham, resigned.

Leslie E. Toleen, Hopper, Minn., in place of Irene Pfeifer, resigned.

Edward S. Thomas, Nashwauk, Minn., in place of J. P. Lanto, resigned.

Carl S. Fischer, Sauk Centre, Minn., in place of B. F. DuBois, Jr., resigned.

Fred P. Schroeder, Sauk Rapids, Minn., in place of T. G. Schaefer, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Jennie S. Catching, Georgetown, Miss., in place of M. B. Catching, retired.

Dickson L. Hall, Hollandale, Miss., in place of Grant Hamilton, resigned.

Claude W. Johnson, Kilmichael, Miss., in place of William Liston, transferred.

Valley L. Carpenter, Morgan City, Miss., in place of J. J. Dent, retired.

Kay Eakin, Pattison, Miss., in place of E. E. Holder, retired.

Barney W. Burnett, Rienzi, Miss., in place of E. J. Robins, retired.

Norman Terrence Poore, Jr., Tunica, Miss., in place of G. O. Robinson, retired.

MISSOURI

Frank W. Wildhaber, Beaufort, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Edna M. Keesling, Belleview, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Henry H. Womack, Catron, Mo., in place of Ollie Bullock, resigned.

Fred V. Hogan, Flemington, Mo., in place of R. L. Whited, transferred.

George K. Evans, Gower, Mo., in place of Fannie McClintock, deceased.

Arthur G. Emmons, Grandin, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Willie L. Anderson, Green City, Mo., in place of V. B. Watt, transferred.

John B. Robinson, Half Way, Mo., in place of O. C. Gamel, transferred.

Willis R. Tapscott, Knox City, Mo., in place of C. M. Eoff, transferred.

Henry E. Bowers, Langdon, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Elmer H. Temme, Leslie, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Florence E. Godman, Miami, Mo., in place of E. A. Hisle, transferred.

Desmond Earl Todd, Pevely, Mo., in place of V. G. Guidicy, resigned.

T. Ray Gourley, Phillipsburg, Mo., in place of F. E. Dennis, retired.

Archie Norman Cooper, Rushville, Mo., in place of L. D. Dyer, transferred.

Jefferson D. Marsh, Steelville, Mo., in place of A. E. Thurman, transferred.

Billie B. Cooper, Windsor, Mo., in place of F. L. Stafford, resigned.

MONTANA

Joseph Kelly, Glendive, Mont., in place of D. J. O'Neil, resigned.

Alfred E. Heikkila, Roberts, Mont., in place of J. C. Abrahamson, deceased.

Edwin Russell Bennett, Superior, Mont., in place of R. W. Spangler, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Viola Calhoon, Benedict, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Mrs. Mina M. Paulson, Bloomington, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mrs. Audrey Ida Babb, Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Bert Winters, retired.

Cyrus F. McDowell, Chadron, Nebr., in place of R. L. Isham, resigned.

Troy Kenneth McCown, Elsie, Nebr., in place of W. O. Troxel, transferred.

Charles Edmond Rock, Geneva, Nebr., in place of G. L. Koshler, resigned.

Harry L. Dresslar, Grant, Nebr., in place of U. V. Dobbs, resigned.

Henry A. Davis, Louisville, Nebr., in place of E. L. Ossenkop, deceased.

Mary L. Wunderlich, Martell, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Adaline L. Breslin, Newcastle, Nebr., in place of J. A. Hoy, resigned.

Raymond Stevens, Orchard, Nebr., in place of F. D. Strope, deceased.

Rolland L. Winkle, Pickrell, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leslie W. Niel, Plattsmouth, Nebr., in place of M. W. Price, resigned.

Walter A. Aregood, Rising City, Nebr., in place of P. W. Barker, transferred.

Myrtle C. Stewart, Whitney, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

NEVADA

Teresa A. Mahoney, Beowawe, Nev., in place of F. J. Smyth, retired.

Sue Smith, Fernley, Nev., in place of A. B. Jackson, resigned.

Thelma R. Studer, Gabbs, Nev., in place of G. P. McMichael, resigned.

Wilberta G. Silveira, Searchlight, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Carolyn W. Parshall, Stewart, Nev., in place of D. E. Larson, transferred.

Alice I. Strieby, Wellington, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Rodney B. Wright, Brookline, N. H., in place of C. A. Morse, deceased.

Albert G. Blais, Gilmanton Iron Works, N. H., in place of F. A. Goodwin, retired.

NEW JERSEY

William A. Allen, Allenwood, N. J., in place of K. D. Morton, retired.

Edward N. Hoffman, Birmingham, N. J., in place of F. H. Hammell, resigned.

William F. Kuhn, Brigantine, N. J., in place of S. H. Smith, resigned.

Kathryn W. Haines, Browns Mills, N. J., in place of Delbert Bush, resigned.

Catherine Gleason, Cresskill, N. J., in place of R. A. McGrath, resigned.

Damon Caccese, Franklinville, N. J., in place of G. W. Karge, retired.

Edwin L. Glesner, Naughright, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

John F. O'Donnell, Phillipsburg, N. J., in place of W. H. Fisher, deceased.

William A. Kearns, Ridgewood, N. J., in place of A. W. McNeill, deceased.

Henry O. Kopp, Riverdale, N. J., in place of J. W. Potter, resigned.

George Majoros, Jr., Roebling, N. J., in place of Eleanor Tarling, deceased.

Joseph E. Lyons, Vineland, N. J., in place of T. H. Hall, resigned.

NEW YORK

David E. Dodge, Apalachin, N. Y., in place of Asa Camp, resigned.

William A. Clukies, Bellmore, N. Y., in place of A. J. Lee, deceased.

Chester E. Canniff, Cairo, N. Y., in place of L. A. Timmerman, resigned.

Dorothy N. Lyke, East Bethany, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Phoebe J. Varney, East Nassau, N. Y., in place of L. B. Pulver, deceased.

Mary H. Bunt, Elka Park, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Elvira Reppucci, Glenwood Landing, N. Y., in place of F. J. Burns, Jr., resigned.

Elizabeth C. FitzPatrick, Hamilton, N. Y., in place of M. F. Dixon, deceased.

Doris D. Smith, Hemlock, N. Y., in place of D. D. Smith, resigned.

Arnold D. Case, Hinsdale, N. Y., in place of D. B. Allen, retired.

Julia M. Conway, Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., in place of Henry Karchmer, deceased.

John L. Barrett, Minetto, N. Y., in place of Z. I. Seymour. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Victor A. Willette, Mooers, N. Y., in place of P. F. Plante, transferred.

Carrie M. Bame, North Chatham, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Mildred C. Sigrist, North Evans, N. Y., in place of S. M. Waltz, retired.

James F. Byrne, Norwich, N. Y., in place of H. M. Bulger, deceased.

Robert G. Payne, Quogue, N. Y., in place of E. H. Stevens, resigned.

Robert L. Simmons, Ripley, N. Y., in place of I. R. Bennett, deceased.

Louise H. Allen, Sandy Creek, N. Y., in place of A. H. Wart, resigned.

Mae Carroll, Sound Beach, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Bert P. Wood, Springfield Center, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Francis A. Brophy, Stony Point, N. Y., in place of Mary Lynch, removed.

Hyman Sasnowitz, Swan Lake, N. Y., in place of Frank Kilcoin, resigned.

William J. Yaeger, Webster, N. Y., in place of P. J. Smith, retired.

Frederic Francais, Westhampton Beach, N. Y., in place of M. B. Williams, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Raeford E. Brown, Burgaw, N. C., in place of S. H. Ingram, transferred.

Claiborne R. Oakley, Carrboro, N. C., in place of T. N. Mann, deceased.

William E. Newton, Currie, N. C., in place of Minnie Brinson, retired.

Henry D. Johnson, Farmville, N. C., in place of B. O. Turnage, deceased.

Thurman R. Smith, Hazelwood, N. C. Office established April 1, 1945.

Columbus Few, Hendersonville, N. C., in place of E. W. Ewbank, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mathilda A. Johnson, Adams, N. Dak., in place of N. H. Koppang, resigned.

Lloyd P. Aanrud, Balfour, N. Dak., in place of R. L. Driessen, transferred.

Vernon H. Lane, Carson, N. Dak., in place of Anna Holkesvik, resigned.

Virginia P. Allen, Coleharbor, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Esther A. Dahlen, Edmore, N. Dak., in place of A. S. Reynolds, resigned.

James A. Kreitinger, Golva, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Carl V. Larson, Gwinner, N. Dak., in place of H. F. Nelson, resigned.

Merwin G. McGregor, Litchville, N. Dak., in place of L. J. Savage, resigned.

John J. Murray, Mandan, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Hudson, retired.

Edward N. Swanson, McHenry, N. Dak., in place of R. J. Leahy, deceased.

Norman N. Berg, McVille, N. Dak., in place of J. F. Swanston, resigned.

Nelmer L. Talmo, Portal, N. Dak., in place of S. A. Smith, resigned.
Daniel F. McMenamy, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of H. J. Mealy, transferred.
Lewis E. Peterson, Wimbledon, N. Dak., in place of J. P. Mohr, transferred.
Herbert William Whalen, York, N. Dak., in place of S. M. Cascaden, resigned.
Henry Lemke, Wishek, N. Dak., in place of J. H. Case, removed.

OHIO

Ralph C. Bennett, Amesville, Ohio, in place of W. L. Carpenter, resigned.
Harry B. Davis, Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of F. W. Thomas, resigned.
Woodrow E. Cecil, Caldwell, Ohio, in place of A. C. Barnhouse, deceased.
Robert S. Keadey, Centerburg, Ohio, in place of R. W. Litzenberg, resigned.
Mary C. Dick, Cleves, Ohio, in place of R. J. Schwing, declined.
Byron R. Phillips, Collins, Ohio, in place of G. M. Reer, retired.
Mary C. Debney, Corning, Ohio, in place of Virgil Davis, resigned.
Harry F. Schiewetz, Dayton, Ohio, in place of C. N. Greer, deceased.
Willis W. Hill, Dublin, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Walter L. Bervinkle, Jr., Fort Jennings, Ohio, in place of C. B. Brockman, transferred.
Clarence N. Emrick, Germantown, Ohio, in place of R. V. Condrey, transferred.
William R. Hapner, Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of E. V. Miller, resigned.
William Schroeder Warren, Jacobsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
J. Gilbert Coil, Jeffersonville, Ohio, in place of G. W. Blessing, resigned.
Ivor W. Cowell, Lake Milton, Ohio, in place of O. A. Holzbach, resigned.
Mildred C. Sellars, Little Hocking, Ohio, in place of P. A. Bond, retired.
William C. Simon, Metamora, Ohio, in place of E. L. Churchill, transferred.
Homer E. Omen, Millfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Albert D. Borer, New Riegel, Ohio, in place of A. C. Klein, retired.
Howard B. Acker, Perry, Ohio, in place of M. C. Hickman, resigned.
George J. Stoll, Piketon, Ohio, in place of G. E. Leist, resigned.
Ella L. Clare, Richmond, Ohio, in place of J. R. Simpson, retired.
Robert E. Erwin, Richwood, Ohio, in place of M. L. Dickason, transferred.
Glenn G. Rex, Rome, Ohio, in place of J. P. Statler, deceased.
Philip F. Dickerson, Scio, Ohio, in place of L. H. Duswald, resigned.
Robert N. Stroup, Spencer, Ohio, in place of G. N. Stroup, resigned.
Eugene Victor Grevencamp, St. Henry, Ohio, in place of A. J. Beckman, resigned.
Lena G. Konneker, Sawyerwood, Ohio, in place of A. L. Milhoan, resigned.
John M. Daly, State Soldiers' Home, Ohio, in place of A. M. Speir, removed.
Laura V. Tipton, The Plains, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Roger M. Crites, Tuscarawas, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Ermel Ward, Vinton, Ohio, in place of H. D. Devore, retired.
Lester Gerber, Walnut Creek, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Elijah H. Jackson, Waverly, Ohio, in place of A. S. Keechle, resigned.
Harry A. Hahn, Waynesburg, Ohio, in place of H. C. Brubaker, resigned.
Glen M. Haas, Woodville, Ohio, in place of J. K. Faist, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Glenn H. Newell, Nash, Okla., in place of Roy Rine, resigned.
Ina L. Snyder, Piedmont, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edward P. Souligny, Ponca City, Okla., in place of W. B. Lucas, resigned.
William R. Smith, Tryon, Okla., in place of Loyd Barclay, transferred.

OREGON

Joseph Omlin, Jr., Gold Beach, Oreg., in place of Vincent Byram, deceased.
Chester O. Stallard, Nelscott, Oreg., in place of O. C. Gardner, declined.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas J. Zimmerlink, Allison, Pa., in place of Steve Latsko, Jr., removed.
Pearl E. Chappell, Barnesville, Pa., in place of Orabel Rarick, retired.
Harry E. Grim, Boyertown, Pa., in place of H. L. Breidenbach, resigned.
Ruth Findley Stem, Buckingham, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Claude B. Maurer, Colmar, Pa., in place of L. C. Rosenberger, retired.
Clarence R. Tobin, Cresson, Pa., in place of E. C. Bishop, resigned.
Joseph Ersagovich, Crucible, Pa., in place of W. D. Thompson, retired.
Emerson K. Musser, East Earl, Pa., in place of C. P. Shirk, resigned.
A Chester Dietrich, East Petersburg, Pa., in place of E. S. Harry, resigned.
William E. Zediker, Eightyfour, Pa., in place of W. A. Johnston, resigned.
Gladys M. Parry, Elrama, Pa., in place of D. C. Buell, resigned.
Wilma Nan Stuart, Emeigh, Pa., in place of E. M. Krug, resigned.
Leonard R. Devilbiss, Fawn Grove, Pa., in place of L. E. Devilbiss, deceased.
Douglas James McHenry, Fort Washington, Pa., in place of M. M. Kavanagh, resigned.
John Allen Habel, Garrett, Pa., in place of L. B. Habel, resigned.
David T. Herlehy, Glassport, Pa., in place of W. P. Kohler, resigned.
Edna I. Keefer, Grantham, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Kenneth E. McQuiston, Home, Pa., in place of Iolabell McElhoes, declined.
Harry T. Ritchey, Hyndman, Pa., in place of M. D. Rees, resigned.
Jane E. Steuart, Irvine, Pa., in place of J. J. Myers, retired.
Mabel S. Merz, Ivyland, Pa., in place of A. C. De Hart, resigned.
Erma K. Hay, Jennerstown, Pa., in place of J. H. Palmer, resigned.
Clarence R. Miller, Mont Clare, Pa., in place of M H. Wahl, resigned.
Louis Joseph DePaul, Mount Pocono, Pa., in place of W. S. Mervine, resigned.
Anna L. Splain, Mountville, Pa., in place of J. W. Hoover, retired.
Steve J. Vrotny, Natrona Heights, Pa., in place of J. J. Roll, retired.
Raymond T. Stuckey, Newport, Pa., in place of W. G. Loy, deceased.
Walter A. Hilsbos, Jr., Oakford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
William G. McCurdy, Pitcairn, Pa., in place of L. H. Deviney, resigned.
Winifred C. Brendel, Reinholds, Pa., in place of S. E. Hornberger, retired.
Jane M. Martin, Saint Thomas, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
George H. Davis, Saxonburg, Pa., in place of A. G. Lassinger, resigned.
Abram Miller Kurtz, Scotland, Pa., in place of A. M. Kurtz, resigned.
Mildred E. Thomas, Shelocta, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Clarence K. Kratz, Silverdale, Pa., in place of Herman Gerstlauer, resigned.
Renald R. Vogelsong, South Enola, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Charles W. Henne, Strausstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Howard A. Rathburn, Sugargrove, Pa., in place of W. C. Jamieson, deceased.
Leon D. Kingsley, Townville, Pa., in place of L. L. Childs, deceased.
Albert Howe, Vanport, Pa., in place of J. A. Jones, retired.
Benjamin F. Sherick, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of R. E. Funk, deceased.
Eugene Patrick J. McMahon, Waymart, Pa., in place of M. L. McMahon, declined.
Marian H. Van Wyk, Whitford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Thurlow C. Brenneman, York Haven, Pa., in place of M. E. M. Busser, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Della S. Beaty, Crescent Beach, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
John Woods, Marion, S. C., in place of P. W. Johnson, deceased.
Alfred D. Parker, Sr., Pacolet Mills, S. C., in place of W. W. Goudelock, retired.
Raymond W. Coleman, Pamplico, S. C., in place of L. G. Myers, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Otto Weller, Eureka, S. Dak., in place of E. L. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Mildred M. Abernathy, Gannvalley, S. Dak., in place of B. A. Drips, resigned.
Ralph G. Garvey, Gayville, S. Dak., in place of T. M. Cowman, retired.
Rubin A. Madsen, Lake Preston, S. Dak., in place of S. A. Archer, removed.
Herby J. Bakkehaug, McIntosh, S. Dak., in place of M. W. Funk, resigned.
Wilbur E. Prann, Timber Lake, S. Dak., in place of Agnes Schirber, resigned.

TENNESSEE

John G. Hughes, Clifton, Tenn., in place of W. B. Miller, deceased.
Samuel G. Bazemore, Cordova, Tenn., in place of J. L. Arrington, resigned.
Samuel A. Leftwich, Hampshire, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Edgar W. Marshall, Surgoinsville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Richard A. Bowers, Caldwell, Tex., in place of G. R. Kocurek, removed.
Louise I. Lintelman, Crosby, Tex., in place of C. A. Fortner, retired.
Euna C. Kelly, Freer, Tex., in place of M. H. Freeman, resigned.
William R. Ginnings, Frisco, Tex., in place of F. P. Shrader, retired.
Sam S. Devall, Hallettsville, Tex., in place of Joseph Kopecky, resigned.
Ernest A. Cryer, Jr., Hamshire, Tex., in place of O. H. Brent, resigned.
Herschel P. McCown, Kerens, Tex., in place of J. C. Clayton, resigned.
Robert A. White, La Porte, Tex., in place of C. M. Boyle, resigned.
Roy B. Hennington, McCaulley, Tex., in place of L. H. Rector, retired.
Homer O. Gainer, Melvin, Tex., in place of J. A. Able, resigned.
Marvin C. Warncke, Needville, Tex., in place of Effie Rasmussen, transferred.
Pearl H. Hardy, Shepherd, Tex., in place of Verna Appling, resigned.
Dessie K. Bowden, Whiteface, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Kenneth W. Brady, Bakersfield, Vt., in place of A. C. Wells, retired.
Bernard H. Lilley, Hyde Park, Vt., in place of O. N. Campbell, resigned.
John R. Kennett, Montgomery Center, Vt., in place of W. J. Wright, retired.
Marguerite D. Wolcott, Orwell, Vt., in place of J. J. Cain, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Willie W. Paulette, Drakes Branch, Va., in place of N. H. Fulton, resigned.
Archie W. Arthur, Evington, Va., in place of A. G. Davey, deceased.
John P. Arehart, Fairfield, Va., in place of E. R. Flippo, deceased.
Louis H. Suddith, Jr., Highland Springs, Va., in place of W. D. R. Proffitt, retired.
David J. Lee, Middleburg, Va., in place of J. D. Simpson, resigned.
Olive G. Kidd, Roseland, Va., in place of M. B. Harvey, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Charles O. Jackson, Auburn, Wash., in place of A. J. Kralowec, resigned.

Emanuel A. Anderson, Carnation, Wash., in place of J. B. Simmons, retired.

Emanuel Lindberg, Custer, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Malcolm P. Hutton, Edwall, Wash., in place of J. F. Hall, retired.

Ernest W. Wendelin, Grays River, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Esther L. Coleman, Harper, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Virgel M. Newman, Kingston, Wash., in place of M. R. Joyce, resigned.

LeRoy P. Jensen, Lopez, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

James C. Banta, Millwood, Wash., in place of A. H. Byram, resigned.

David N. Judson, Jr., Oak Harbor, Wash., in place of D. N. Judson, deceased.

Daniel F. Coulter, South Bend, Wash., in place of H. M. Connor, removed.

Lawrence C. Tompkins, Suquamish, Wash., in place of R. I. Matheson, deceased.

Lavon B. Kelly, Zenith, Wash., in place of L. B. Kelly, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick C. Page, Beechbottom, W. Va., in place of J. W. Thomas, resigned.

Herman A. Stowers, Griffithsville, W. Va., in place of W. B. Linkous, resigned.

Charles H. Callison, Hillsboro, W. Va., in place of G. L. Carlisle, retired.

Andrew J. Nemeth, Osage, W. Va., in place of J. L. Badzek, deceased.

Marie N. Fox, Prenter, W. Va., in place of M. J. Nutter, resigned.

May H. White, Roderfield, W. Va., in place of H. A. Hetherington, retired.

Jane B. Graham, Thurmond, W. Va., in place of B. M. Gwinn, resigned.

Gloria C. Greene, Ward, W. Va., in place of E. G. Hilton, resigned.

L. Stanley Gibson, Widen, W. Va., in place of Louis Knakal, retired.

WISCONSIN

William George McCoy, Brookfield, Wis., in place of F. W. Plank, deceased.

Robert S. Grogan, Kaukauna, Wis., in place of R. H. McCarty, resigned.

Edwin L. Saykally, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of R. H. Wirth, deceased.

Ernest H. Thorpe, Mattoon, Wis., in place of G. A. Prenzlow, resigned.

Harry A. Nohr, Mineral Point, Wis., in place of Levy Williamson, deceased.

Mervin J. Helgerson, Mount Sterling, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Louis W. Kurth, Neillsville, Wis., in place of L. W. Kurth. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Albert G. Willgrubs, Norwalk, Wis., in place of H. T. Karis, deceased.

Joan T. Sullivan, Ojibwa, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Gordon J. Hansen, Oregon, Wis., in place of C. A. E. Manion, removed.

Jay P. Phillips, Palmyra, Wis., in place of C. S. Thayer, resigned.

August E. Mecikalski, Pelican Lake, Wis., in place of M. A. Whalen, removed.

John H. Hennessey, Roberts, Wis., in place of W. R. Johnston, declined.

Casimer C. Ruthe, Somers, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Florence E. Dexter, Trevor, Wis. Office made Presidential July 1, 1946.

Otis M. Rude, Viroqua, Wis., in place of R. L. Graves, resigned.

Richard W. Gillett, Wausau, Wis., in place of O. L. Ringle, resigned.

Otis L. Holman, Westby, Wis., in place of R. M. Grimsrud, resigned.

Richard R. Williams, Wild Rose, Wis., in place of M. A. Potter, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord and our God, as man has a hard time getting through this distracted world, with Thy sheltering arms come to the bewildered and the perplexed. Keep them within our Creator's will, with no impatience or evasions of Thy moral law, which is perpetual in its obligations.

We pray for that longed-for mysterious power which lifts men into the comradeship which shares the higher bread of life. Grant that those who are overborne with care, with privations and afflictions, may find comfort in the compassion of the more fortunate, who are led by the inspiration of a common Saviour and the vision of a common destiny. Let us rid ourselves of our enemies by making them our friends, and Thine shall be the praise.

In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 22, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FOM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bil of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LANGER, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. TAFT, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1842. An act to extend to February 29, 1948, the period during which the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes may be controlled under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Federal Communications Commission.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
9. Office of Selective Service Records.
10. United States Maritime Commission.
11. War Assets Administration.

REMOVAL OF INDUSTRIAL PLANTS FROM GERMANY BY WAY OF REPARATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Department of State, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

JANUARY 24, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By his letter of December 19, 1947, the Honorable John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, forwarded an attested copy of House Resolution 365 of the Eightieth Congress, adopted by the House of Representatives on December 18, 1947. The resolution requests the Secretaries of State and of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practical moment certain information, specified in 11 questions set out in the text of the resolution, regarding the removal of industrial plants from Germany by way of reparation.

The Department of State, for itself and the Department of Defense, herewith respectfully submits a basic reply to the questions asked by the House of Representatives. Every effort has been made to obtain to the fullest extent and as rapidly as possible the information requested by House Resolution 365. Because of the urgency of putting the requested information before the House, the submission has not been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, to which, however, copies are being sent.

It will be observed that much of the detailed information requested is lacking regarding the British, French, and Soviet zones of occupation in Germany. Through both diplomatic channels and through the office of military government (United States), the British and French Governments have been asked to supply the additional information needed. These Governments have not been able to comply quickly with this request, because their occupation authorities have not maintained such data in the form in which it is desired by the House of Representatives. The representatives of these Governments have given assurances, however, that they will make every effort to obtain the information which is presently lacking. This additional information and the checking of the information herewith submitted will probably require further communications to the House of Representatives from the Department of State and the Department of Defense.

No official information on reparation removals is available for the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany, nor has there been in response to the resolution a request to the Government of the Soviet Union for such information. Since the Soviet Government has repeatedly, the most recently at the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers at London in December 1947, refused to comply with requests of this nature, it was

not considered that a reiteration would be effective.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Under Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Human Events.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

WATER AND POWER SHORTAGE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include excerpts from an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in yesterday's Washington newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress will provide, and I shall support, vast sums to restore the economy of European nations. At the same time, we should provide adequately for our own economy and our national defenses. On Saturday last, I made a statement before the Subcommittee on War Department Civil Functions Appropriations which is directly related to this situation in California.

Flood control as it applies to semiarid California means conservation of rain and snow waters which normally come in that State during the short season from October to April. To hold these waters for beneficial usage instead of permitting them to run unharnessed and at times cause great damage in their mad rush to the Pacific Ocean, means large storage dams, including dams for multiple purposes, are imperatively necessary. They will serve a dual purpose—not only protecting valuable farm lands, but also assisting in meeting the critical shortage of power.

There is both a critical water and power shortage from one end of the State of California to the other. A primary cause of the growing demands for both water and power in California is the tremendous increase in population taking place in that State. Census statistics show that there were 6,907,387 persons in California in 1940. By July 1, 1947, this population increased 43 percent to 9,876,000. In the single year from July 1, 1946, to July 1, 1947, the population of California increased by over 350,000, which means people have been entering the State at a rate of over 6,000 per week. It is, therefore, imperative that not one acre-foot of water be permitted to run wild into the sea and that every kilowatt of potential hydroelectric power be produced to meet this enormous and unprecedented shift in population which has been taking place in such a short period of time. This population movement exceeds any shift in population that has taken place throughout our entire history in a similar length of time. It is a condition over which California has absolutely no control.

The critical situation California is already facing is being made more severe by the drought now taking place. An Associated Press dispatch of January 24 from Los Angeles calls attention to the fact that there has been no rainfall whatever for the 31 preceding days in that section and the preceding 39 days in the San Joaquin Valley at the southern end of the great Central Valley. This drought is occurring in the middle of the normal wet season. The following quotation from that dispatch indicates how gravely critical the situation is:

THIRTY-ONE-DAY DROUGHT PLAGUES FARMERS AS HEAT CONTINUES IN CALIFORNIA

Thirty-one days without rain and not a drop in sight was the parched picture today as southern California moved deeper into its winter of dry discontent.

The dryness has been accompanied by near-record heat—rising to 85 several days in Los Angeles. It was 80 in San Joaquin Valley, and 73 today in San Francisco, the warmest January 24 the bay city has had since 1899.

With closest rains expected somewhere in Utah and moving eastward, the weatherman was unable to brighten the outlook for agriculturists, frankly worried as they have not been in years over crops which last year grossed $120,000,000.

Winter grain crops were stunted or drying from lack of moisture, and orange growers increased irrigation by 25 percent over last year. * * *

Three cities—Santa Barbara and Ventura in the south and Benicia in northern California—have adopted forms of water rationing. It was the thirty-ninth rainless day for southern San Joaquin Valley.

There has been only 1.92 inches of rain since July 1, as compared to a southern California norm of 6.68 inches.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, hats off to the civilian or producing population of France for throwing the International Monetary Fund out the window.

By forcing their politicians to make the official value of the franc conform more nearly to its true or black-market value in spite of fund opposition, the French workers—those who produce the necessaries of life—have rendered an invaluable service to the workers of all countries.

The repudiation by France of the monstrosity called the International Monetary Fund comes as no surprise to those of us who opposed the measure creating it. We expected it and said so. This is clearly shown in the hearings.

This repudiation of one of the pet schemes of the American one-worlders ought to have a sobering effect upon them. It is doubtful, however, that it will because we already hear suggestions for an international monetary conference to do, I suppose, what was promised the International Monetary Fund would accomplish but failed to carry out.

It is too early to know just what the international repercussions will be from the action taken by France. All we can say now is that the printing-press-money pot all over the world is boiling. I wish this might be a sign that a vigorous movement has been started to put a torch to all the fiat money in the world and restore to the people their gold for making their exchanges and settling their contracts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE AVIATION INDUSTRY

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the Westwood Hills Press, Westwood Hills, Calif., of January 15. The headline carries a grim warning to America and to Americans. That headline is as follows: "Drastic cut at Douglas. Skeleton force of 2,600 by mid-April seen by officials."

This plant, which contributed with the rest of the aviation industry so much to the winning of the war, is to all intents and purposes ready to close. This plant, which at the peak of its production employed 41,000 technicians and skilled workers in the aviation industry, is about to bow out of mass production. Our American wings carried the free world and carried the Allies to victory. They played a major role in the winning of the war. The lack of those wings, unless we take immediate and drastic action, may lose us the peace. In a world in turmoil we must protect the aviation industry or suffer again the consequences of inaction and inertia.

A TEACHER'S EXPERIENCE WITH COMMUNISM

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we are doing all we can to help the other countries of the world gain enough strength to withstand communism in their midst. It would seem as if we should be careful to be certain of our strength at home.

I want to read from a letter written by a teacher in this country:

I was thrown by the recommendation of the Harvard appointment bureau into the educational front of the Communist underground, for although on the surface, I was teaching in a sleepy New England village—in reality, the headmaster was a friend and classmate of John Reed—and thought as he did. I now know that he chose an inexperienced teacher to mold in the Communist pattern but my background and a thorough course in all of Russian history at Harvard Graduate School were my weapons with which I fought the fight until the end of the year and then resigned.

Being in the so-called progressive movement of education, I was thrown once again into the Communist front in a midwestern city where I signed a 3-year contract. This principal told his teachers not to go to church. I went. He assembled them at his home not for teachers' meetings but to talk communism. Countless are the times I have argued against his ideas—just so that someone on the faculty would still think and not be taken in. The only contract I ever broke was with this man. I'm informed that one of the archbishops of the Catholic Church (whose nuns were attending the summer school at that same place) when told of the true state of affairs there stopped their attendance.

Having been on leave of absence from the New York schools I joined Textile High School (not five blocks from Communist headquarters) simply taken over by the Communist teachers, the hammer and sickle on the blackboard of every classroom, the principal threatened with his life if he told on them.

Their ablest leaders concentrated on "getting" me. They told me how terrible capitalists were and, of course, I knew so many more than they did that I simply laughed at them. Then they pestered me with literature, including In Fact. My constant answer was the brief, capitalist phrase, "not interested." I never entered a teacher's room that I was not approached at once.

Not having to continue there I returned to my own city and entered its public-school system in 1939. Many school officials wonder why I have taught so many places. Communism in our schools and colleges, as you must know, is the answer. The reason is simple—there are too many schools in which communism is taught and I will not teach communism.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Washington Post, entitled "The Fulcrum of Democracy."

SENATOR BUSHFIELD'S SERVICE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, thousands of South Dakotans read Senator BUSHFIELD's statement, Friday, withdrawing from the political arena, with deep regret. People may not always have agreed with HARLAN BUSHFIELD but they always knew where to find him. He has been what is known as a strong man, firm in his convictions, fearless in his opinions, and able in his advocacy of any cause.

Senator BUSHFIELD became chairman of the Republican Party in South Dakota for the 1936 campaign when Republican strength was at an all-time low. Under his leadership, South Dakota became the spearhead of a Republican revival that was gradually to sweep the Nation.

Leslie Jensen took the brunt of the battle and was elected Governor with Don McMurchie as Lieutenant Governor and Roy Doherty joined J. J. Murphy as railroad commissioner. The New Deal clung to most of the other State offices. I was elected to Congress, one of two new Republicans that year to come from west of the Mississippi.

It was the start of a great comeback for the Republican Party.

Two years later, BUSHFIELD, himself, was elected Governor with a complete slate of State officers, while CHAN GURNEY and KARL MUNDT were elected to the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. BUSHFIELD was reelected Governor in 1940 with an increased majority and in 1942 was elected to join GURNEY in the United States Senate.

In Washington, Senator BUSHFIELD quickly demonstrated his ability and today holds high rank in the Committees on Agriculture and Finance, as well as party councils. His decision to conserve his energies for his official duties is characteristic. When he announced early for reelection, doubtless he hoped for a second term without the strain of a primary contest. When circumstances decreed otherwise, he placed his official responsibilities first. When he retires at the conclusion of his term, he will be entitled to the rest he has earned and to the respect of the people he has served.

THE FUEL-OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks we have heard almost daily complaints from colleagues who represent constituents who are suffering property damage and personal discomfort because of the unjustifiable fuel-oil shortage.

This morning I want to take just a minute to commend one of our colleagues, the gentleman from the First District of Massachusetts, JOHN HESELTON, for the effective work he has done week after week in an effort to get to the bottom of this unhappy situation. Sundays, holidays, and evenings JOHN HESELTON has been hard at work searching out the truth and trying to find a solution to the problem, so that we won't face these shortages in the future.

Without in any way casting reflections on the fine work done by other Members of this House, I express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and extend to him the well-known orchid.

EXPORT OF GRAIN TO CANADA

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a short table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it is about time the American housewife learns that the greatest competitor which she has today when she goes to purchase a loaf of bread or a pound of meat is the United States Federal Government.

I want to give you a few figures that were contained in the Times-Herald under date of January 24, 1948. Listen to these exports of corn to Canada:

In August 1946, I will read only the round figures, 255,000 bushels.

In 1947, the same month, 816,000 bushels.

In September 1946, 63,000 bushels.

In September 1947, 542,000 bushels.

In October 1946, it was 23,000 bushels; in 1947 it was 592,476.

In November of 1946 it was 261,745; in 1947, 573,658.

In December of 1946 it was 379,246. For the same month in 1947 it was 730,611.

And listen to rye. What do you suppose they made out of this rye? I will let some of the Congressmen on my right tell me.

In August of 1946 we shipped 666 bushels. In August 1947, 1,977 bushels.

In September, October, November, and December of 1946 we shipped exactly none, but listen to these figures for 1947: September, 194,259 bushels; October, 744,096 bushels; November, 436,815 bushels.

Now let me give you the totals: The total for the year 1946 was 2,378,858 bushels of corn; for 1947, 8,085,768. For rye the total shipped for the entire year 1946 was 666 bushels; in 1947 it was 1,433,356 bushels.

It is about time the American people began to understand who is getting this grain and where it is going.

For your convenience in studying these figures, I set them forth in the table from which I read:

If you want to know where the United States grain went that was alleged to have been saved by restriction on United States industry, read the following:

[Bushels]

	Exports of United States corn to Canada		Exports of United States rye to Canada	
	1946	1947	1946	1947
August	255,338	816,687	666	1,977
September	63,418	542,046	0	194,259
October	23,095	592,476	0	744,096
November	261,745	573,658	0	436,815
December	379,246	730,611	0	(1)
Total for year	2,378,858	8,085,768	666	1,433,356

[1] Embargo.

WHAT IS AN INSIDER?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, what is an insider? Some profess to not know what this word means. Ordinarily when you or I want to know the meaning of an ordinary word the customary place to turn is the dictionary. "Insider" is an ordinary word. Webster's New International Dictionary, second edition, unabridged, page 1285, defines an "insider" as:

A person inside; hence, one in a position to have first-hand information; opposed to an outsider.

An "insider" is thus found to mean a person in a position to have first-hand information. Mr. Speaker, that definition exactly fits Mr. Edwin W. Pauley, Special Assistant on Procurement and Reparations to the Secretary of the Army, Democratic national committeeman from California, and formerly United States Ambassador at Large on Reparations, and treasurer of the Democratic National Committee. It is apparent therefrom that during all times pertinent to the pending inquiries Mr. Pauley was an "insider."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

THE FUEL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, all the newspapers published in New England last Friday, which I have seen, carried warnings of the blizzard which struck that storm-weary region this week end. Today's reports are that between 12 and 14 inches of snow were added to the from 49.8 inches in Boston up to 85.9 inches elsewhere, which has blanketed New England to date. All this was accompanied by low temperatures, ranging from zero to 45° and was accompanied by high winds from 30 to 60 miles per hour. The storm here, which brought 5 inches of snow and a low of 10°, tied activities up rather badly and resulted in 34 greater Washington families sending emergency calls for fuel oil as supplies dwindled, was a slight imitation of the one in New England. What the results were in New England so far as their fuel-oil supplies are concerned remains to be seen.

Uncomfortable as this storm was here, it may have a healthy effect in at long last making clear to some persons in authority how serious the situation has been, is, and will be in other parts of the country unless effective action is taken even at this late date under the authority vested in the Secretary of Commerce under the Export Control Act of 1940, as amended (50 Stat. 463) and extended to February 29, 1948, by this Congress by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (Public Law 188, 80th Cong., July 15, 1947), and to February 28, 1949, by the action in December (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.).

In the same New England newspapers, another interesting dispatch was carried with a Washington date line. I am confident that the news dispatch is entirely correct. If it was read in full, it would be clear that the comfortable warmth in the House and Senate Chambers and in our offices is supplied from coal, not fuel oil. But we all realize the tendency to read headlines only, and I am confident you will recognize the possible impressions left on those readers who were trying desperately to obtain fuel oil to heat their homes, hospitals, schools, and industries up there.

I have in my hand the article appearing in the Boston Post. I wish it could be reproduced exactly in the RECORD, with the ½-inch block headline, "Solons' offices will not be cold." I will ask for the return of the clipping to my office so that any of you receiving letters about the warmth of your working conditions may see it. And I shall include in my remarks at this point the full article and the headline:

SOLONS' OFFICES WILL NOT BE COLD—OIL SHORTAGE MAY HIT OTHER AREAS, BUT CONGRESSIONAL BUILDING IS HEATED WITH COAL

WASHINGTON, January 22.—There may be a fuel shortage in some parts of the country but don't worry—your Congressman is cozy.

His office, as well as the House and Senate Chambers, is heated by coal, not fuel oil.

For that reason he is not affected by President Truman's recent order that the temperatures of oil-heated Government buildings must be held down to 68° during the working hours and 60° at night.

A spot check of thermometers in the House wing of the Capitol showed that nowhere was the temperature below 72°. One just outside Speaker JOE MARTIN'S office registered 76° this afternoon.

Of five thermometers in the House Chamber, four have been broken and contain no mercury. In a fifth the mercury stood at 140°, but it seemed to be broken, too.

In the two House Office Buildings, where individual Members can control the temperature through room regulators, the readings ranged from 60 up to the high 80's.

Timothy Murray, engineer in charge of the Senate wing, assured a reporter that "We have plenty of coal."

"We keep the Senate Chamber at 75°," he added. "They like it a little warm in there."

The Pentagon, frequently described as the world's largest office building, also uses coal. The engineer said he tries to keep the heat up to 74° or 76°.

At the White House, served by a central heating plant which supplies several other Government buildings, the thermostat was set at 68°.

Let me now read some other sample headlines: Boston Herald, "Congressmen cozy and warm"; Hartford Courant, "Congressman cozy in fuel shortage"; Worcester Telegram, "Thermometers broken in United States House Chamber."

I suggest that you may want to make a note of the page number covering these headlines. While I was not here, I understand those who were, received considerable correspondence when the campaign for bundles for Congress was on and also when the debate as to assigning gasoline-ration cards to Members of Congress was raging. Some of us may have to face another kind of blizzard—correspondence on this subject of heat in the Capitol and office buildings.

Three sentences from an editorial appearing in one of these papers are interesting and possibly prophetic. They are:

The tempers of thoughtful New Englanders do not improve when they study this terrible winter in terms not of snow and ice but of dollars and cents. * * * Little wonder that the patience of New Englanders snaps now and then. The other day a Rhode Island man seized a gun and went out shooting icicles.

I hope that a companion article may be prepared covering the facts as to the amount of floor space owned and operated by the Federal Government, apart from the Capitol and the office buildings, and covering how much of that space has been heated by oil. Certainly we of the New England delegation know that as early as December 13 we requested an investigation of the possibility of conversions in all Government buildings, not only in the affected areas but throughout the country, to determine the wisdom of such means of relieving the fuel-oil situation and that we urged vigorous action be taken to that end. We know that we repeated that request on December 19. We regret that, as of this afternoon, the only affirmative steps reported to us were those taken by the Navy at four of its installations, as reported in the letter of January 9 from Acting Secretary of the Navy Kenney, and the less vigorous action taken by the Army at Fort Myer, Va., and Stewart Field, N. Y. The latest authentic report is that the Government controls, owns, or operates approximately 138,000,000 gross square feet of space in over 5,800 buildings in our country. My latest advice is that there are about 1,700 average rooms in the four buildings here. I doubt if all four contain as much gross square feet as the Navy Annex. Certainly they are dwarfed by the gross square feet in the 360 Federal Government buildings operated by the Federal Works Agency in the District

of Columbia; too, it should be mentioned that while the power plant heats the Capitol and the three office buildings, it also heats the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the Washington City Post Office, the Supreme Court Building, the Annex to the Library, and the Botanic Garden while burning coal to heat these four buildings. The latest figures on the employees in the executive departments are 1,999,853 people. In contrast to the 435 Members of the House and the 96 Members of the Senate, with their committee and personal staffs, it is doubtful if there are more than 3,500 persons working in the Capitol and in the respective office buildings, heated, incidentally, exclusively by coal. I think it safe to assert that the relative heating problem is about 1 to 1,500 as to buildings alone.

In his letter of January 19, Mr. Steelman advised that the final report of the Federal Works Agency, which is conducting the requested investigation, should be available to the White House shortly after January 22. Perhaps our friends of the press can help us develop the facts.

WE MUST RAISE THE PAY OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, two apparently unrelated news stories in yesterday's press prompt me to join them together in order to draw therefrom an observation, the soundness of which is supported by each.

Mr. T. P. Wright announced his resignation as Civil Aeronautics Administrator assigning as his principal reason the inadequate salary provided for the position. He has accepted private employment at almost twice the $10,000 Government pay. This is a common story. Almost every week an able administrative officer of the Government quits for the more remunerative field of private employment. Indeed, in resigning, Mr. Wright observed that his case was not unique but rather the rule with those in Government posts who do not possess independent wealth.

The second story from Washington concerned a high Government official who does possess independent wealth, Mr. Edwin W. Pauley, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army. It was charged, and I believe proved, by former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, that Mr. Pauley, largely through his Government associations, was able to profit personally on the commodity markets of this country to the extent of almost $1,000,000.

My observation is that we must do something in the field of legislation in order to attract and retain able and honest Government administrators. They should come, principally and preferably, from the ranks of those who do not possess great wealth. Ten thousand dollars a year is not commensurate pay for a proven top-flight Government official.

To engage an inordinate number of independently wealthy persons to help administer our laws is neither consonant with our accepted concept of democratic ideals nor conducive to the most vigorous and disinterested execution of those laws.

The remedy lies in raising the pay of Government officials. We have been penurious employers long enough. If we want good government in America, we must hire good men at good pay to run that government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I received permission to extend in the RECORD an article on reclamation. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE FUEL SITUATION

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, just before the Christmas recess last December I informed the House in detail of the hearings by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce upon the current petroleum situation, culminating in the recommendation by the committee of a nine-point program which it believed would provide much relief if the program were speedily carried out by the executive agencies involved. As I said at that time, the committee and its staff would diligently pursue the situation during the holidays and ensuing weeks to determine what more, if anything, need be done.

I am today filing a detailed report by the committee covering both the immediate and longer-range situation, and making five specific recommendations:

First. The prompt execution of the nine-point program recommended by the committee on December 19 to alleviate the immediate petroleum situation.

Second. The immediate cessation of the exportation of all petroleum products until it can be determined whether they are at the expense of our national economy or national security.

Third. The deferment of making any foreign commitment involving the supply of petroleum and petroleum products until a complete review has been made of the entire petroleum problem to determine to what extent such commitments can be made without injury to our national economy or security.

Fourth. The immediate authorization of additional funds and continuing authority to the Department of the Interior for accelerating the program of development of oil from coal, shale, and other substances.

Fifth. The immediate establishment of a congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy.

Recommendation 1 involves the execution of the nine-point program adopted by the committee December 19 to meet the immediate situation. Briefly, these nine points are:

First. The export-control authority should be exercised to prohibit or curtail the exportation of fuel oil and other petroleum products to alleviate the present shortage.

Second. Navy vessels should be employed to transport fuel oil.

Third. The Maritime Commission should defer transfer of tankers to foreign purchasers.

Fourth. The Maritime Commission should arrange for tankers sold to be temporarily returned to the United States trade.

Fifth. The Secretary of the Interior should coordinate his and other activities of the Government with those of State fuel coordinators.

Sixth. Voluntary petroleum industry committees should be established to secure most efficient use of petroleum facilities.

Seventh. The Office of Defense Transportation should secure most efficient use of tank cars.

Eighth. The President and departments and agencies of the Government should take all other possible and appropriate steps in alleviating the shortage;

Ninth. The Maritime Commission should be authorized and required to repair and operate its laid-up tanker fleet.

We understand that some action has been taken on each recommendation, such as: Some reduction in export licenses covering petroleum products, some reduction in exports of fuel oils to Canada, assistance from Navy stocks and tankers, retention of American tankers in the American trade, placing in service of the laid-up American tanker fleet, meetings with State fuel coordinators, and meetings of the industry. In committee hearings starting tomorrow full reports on action taken on these matters will be made by the heads of the respective agencies involved. I shall report promptly thereafter on the action which the committee finds has been taken and recommends further must be taken.

In the midst of much conflicting testimony given to the committee regarding the nature of the causes of the shortage and ability to meet this winter's demand, one thing has stood out regarding the situation, especially in the Middle West and on the east coast. This is the fact that the industry estimates of available

supply and probable demand, even taking into account reduction in household temperatures, rested upon favorable weather conditions without any undue cold snap. The weather we are experiencing has wiped out whatever margin there might have been. The committee, accordingly, in recommendation 2, is calling for immediate cessation of exports until it can be determined whether they are at the expense of our national economy.

The Middle East situation currently looks far from good, with the Moslem reception of the partition of Palestine raising considerable doubt as to the security of further transportation of oil. This is important inasmuch as under the European recovery program the Middle East was heavily counted upon as a source of supply for the expanding petroleum requirements of Europe. Testimony recently has been offered by responsible governmental authorities that if this source cannot be counted upon, Europe must receive its supply of oil from the United States, which would mean rationing here. Committee recommendation 3, accordingly calls for the deferment of any foreign commitment covering petroleum and petroleum products until the world-wide demand and supply picture, and the reliance hitherto placed upon the Middle East as a source of supply, can be reviewed.

The longer range petroleum supply situation does not look much more favorable during the next few years at least. For the first time petroleum and natural gas have so risen in dominance in our economy that they are supplying more than half of the Nation's fuel and energy. Although further examination into this area as well as that of alternate and substitute sources of fuel and energy is required, we do know at this time that we are possessed of vast oil shale and coal deposits susceptible of being converted into oil. The committee, therefore, in recommendation 4, calls for the immediate acceleration and expansion of the current Bureau of Mines experimental and developmental work into the commercial practicability of extraction of oil from coal, shale, and other substances.

The committee's fifth recommendation relates to further examination into the entire field of fuels and energy. We have been informed that the petroleum shortage of this past winter is likely to be recurring during the next 4 or 5 years at the very least. So far it is not apparent to the committee that either the Government or the industry has given this problem the energetic attention which it deserves.

From the evidence it appears that there are shortages of facilities all along the line: First, at the refineries which, if there were additional oil today, could not handle more; then in tanker, tank car, and barge transportation facilities which, if there were additional products, are insufficient to handle more; in pipe lines for the transport of either additional crude or products; and in the final distribution system of bulk stations, storage, and transport. If all of these facilities, on which the industry indicates it proposes to expend some $4,000,000,000 over the next few years, were available, however, it is still far from clear that assured additional crude oil is provided at the well-head source to flow through and fill these enlarged facilities. Nor is it at all evident that adequate supplies of crude remain in the ground long to sustain such flow.

The committee does not believe that we are forced to accept the panaceas which so far have been offered to us by Government and by industry, namely: the cheerful acceptance by the consuming public of the inevitability of these tight situations; the leaving to industry to work out without governmental interference this problem which for some time now they have assured us would not arise and the solution to which they so manifestly so far seem unable to reach; or acquiescence to the superficial remedy suggested of allocating or rationing available supplies without maximum effort to effectuate a real cure through bringing supplies and demand in line.

The shortage of natural gas in many areas is all too well appreciated by consumers dependent upon this source of fuel. Utilization of electric energy also has increased at unanticipated rates with the country getting by this past December only through great efforts by the industry and much good luck, and with entirely too low reserve capacity.

The fast increasing requirements of our expanding economy for fuels and energy, plus ever-important considerations of national defense, therefore warrant comprehensive study of all fuels and energy sources, their supply, their demand, and their interrelationships. Such study is prerequisite to a national fuel policy, the formulation of which cannot be delayed. This study the committee embarked upon through its staff some weeks ago, the outline of which is carried in detail in the committee's report of today. In such outline the committee has had the cooperative assistance of all industries involved.

While the committee is specifically charged with the responsibility, under the Reorganization Act, of a large share of our fuels, it recognizes that many committees properly have interests in many separate phases of the fuel problem. Some dozen committees in both Houses currently are in various aspects of the problem. This is not a problem which can be approached piecemeal. It must be essayed at once. The committee, accordingly, recommends the establishment of a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy.

In this connection, at the committee's direction, I have today introduced a House Concurrent Resolution to establish such committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "A Redeclaration of Rights."

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement appearing in the Wall Street Journal entitled "A Statesmanlike Appraisal."

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Oregon Daily Journal.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject Pertinent Observations Concerning the Taft-Hartley Labor Law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] be granted leave of absence on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISM IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we all want to get rid of the Communists, in and out of the Government. The President wants to do the same thing, but he wants $50,000,000 to do the job.

I have been thinking a good deal about this, and I believe that the President, our Secretary of State, and other executives in the Federal Government could get rid of most of the Communists without spending any money.

The Civil Service Commission, in its regulations, should require as the first qualification of an applicant, or present officeholder, a certificate or statement from an election-board official indicating that they are registered voters, registered with one of the two major parties, and exercising their privilege to vote granted them under the Constitution.

Someone might ask: Why registered with one of the two major parties? The answer is simple. It is essential in our system of government that we have two parties, but we do not need more than two parties. As for the 12,000,000 registered nonpartisan voters, they could present a sworn statement that their voting is within the two major parties.

I believe that this would get 98 percent of the Communists out of the Government and keep them out. Apparently the Government is employing many people who do not have sufficient interest, loyalty, or patriotism to vote on election day, and I am convinced that any man or woman in America who holds a position and is receiving public funds for his services should at least take sufficient interest in his government to vote regularly.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of this letter dated January 20 from an oil company in Texas.

The letter reads in part:

DEAR MADAM: The voluntary response to assist in bringing about the release and transportation of the inventory of finished fuel oil at our Texas City refinery and the resumption of production at the refinery of vitally needed fuel oil was indeed praiseworthy. Your contribution was of such value that had it not been for this effort, great distress might have occurred.

Your assistance and cooperation have been of untold value in the public interest and your efforts in that direction must be sincerely appreciated by and gratifying to all concerned. Thank you sincerely.

Respectfully yours.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with the long-range program that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has brought forth. His House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is to be congratulated in recommending an immediate ban on all exports of petroleum products. I say that today we need action in getting oil to the people for their burners. The embargo of the exporting of oil for the immediate emergency I recommended weeks ago. The Administration's recommendation to convert from oil to coal is slow and unsatisfactory. The Government cannot do it in many instances as it would take several months. When it can be done, it is an enormous expense to shift from oil to coal and from coal to oil and back again. The embargo against the shipment of oil to foreign countries is necessary so that the American people will not have to endure the terrible suffering on account of the cold. The delay in issuing the embargo has been incredible and outrageous.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, righteous indignation and the pent-up wrath of the American people will compel the Congress to repeal the unconstitutional, unjustifiable tax on oleomargarine. I do not complain so much about the fact that we have to pay 15 cents tribute to the butter interests on oleomargarine. We can do that and get it. But, this morning I have introduced a resolution repealing the law which makes it prohibitive to serve the armed forces with oleomargarine even though they cannot get butter. That bill will be referred to the Committee on the Armed Services, it will be reported out, and I venture the opinion and the prophecy that this Congress will repeal the law making it prohibitive to serve oleomargarine to the armed forces of our country even if they wanted to serve it. Remember this, you do not get Bang's disease from oleomargarine; you do not get tuberculosis from oleomargarine. You get a lot of good calories. Get on my wagon now before it gets loaded. I am now taking applications.

UNIFORMITY OF FEDERAL PENSIONS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire today to call the attention of the Congress particularly to one aspect regarding our pension system that is at long last receiving the serious consideration of many Members. That aspect is uniformity of Federal pensions.

In fact, I do not feel that it is going too far to say that any Federal grant which does not apply uniformly among recipients is not really a pension at all. It is therefore proper that we characterize our present old-age benefits as old-age assistance rather than pensions.

Old-age assistance is a dole, not a pension. While I am in no way discrediting old-age assistance, or discounting the benefit that it has been to millions of our people, I do charge that it is not what many of us consider an honorable American pension. I charge also that it is not large enough. It is not adequate even where the largest or maximum grants are paid to meet the requirements for the mere necessities of life. I believe that all Members will agree to this. How would a Member of the Congress like to live an entire day and night on what might be termed only about half the price of a reasonable meal? How would one like to do that every day and every night? Yet this is not the aspect that I started out to talk about. Even though payments now are small, and should by all means be increased now, they should also be uniform. That is, whatever amount we pay to one recipient we should pay to everyone qualified to benefit under our legislation. There should be no discrimination, regardless of State or residence. We should not only increase the amount of benefits now, we should also change our old-age assistance to a uniform American pension. We should do both now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Clarence Poe from the Progressive Farmer.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon delivered by Bishop Kearney, of Brooklyn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter he wrote to a constituent.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes this morning I want to discuss Federal aid to education. Two bills have been drawn up with great care and introduced in both Houses of the Congress, House bill 2953 and Senate bill 472, providing for Federal aid to education. These bills differ in some minor details, but either of them would be a great help to our school children at a time when they are suffering from educational neglect.

In my own State of Oklahoma our educational system faces a financial crisis. This same situation exists in many of the other States. This is manifested in Oklahoma by a shortage of teachers, low salaries, run-down and inadequate school buildings and equipment, and most all of this stems directly from a lack of funds.

President Truman stated, in part, in his state of the Union message on January 8, 1948, that "another fundamental aim of our democracy is to provide an adequate education for every person." This fundamental aim is not being provided in many States because those States and local communities cannot provide the funds to anywhere near adequately support their school systems. In most instances it is simply a matter of not being able to foot the bill.

The Federal aid to education program throughout the Nation would work much like the equalization program in some of our States, including my own State, Oklahoma. I grew up with this problem. My father taught in typical small country schools in Oklahoma for 27 years. I remember well how much it meant to him as a teacher, to his pupils, and to the entire community when a minimum school program was established in Oklahoma about 1926. It meant that at last State funds would be used to develop educationally all of the people in the State of Oklahoma. It meant that these funds would be used to maintain better schools in the poorer communities, thus bringing the educational opportunities of the underprivileged children nearer the standard of those who were fortunate enough to live in the richer communities.

There has been expressed by some the fear that Federal assistance to education would mean Federal domination of public-school systems. I would point out that such domination cannot be achieved without the consent of Congress and that the Congress is never likely to give that consent.

In that connection I would like to point out that the two bills, H. R. 2953 and S. 472, give protective guaranty that State control will be continued. Under the terms of those bills every one of our States will be given some assistance as the Federal money will be distributed on the basis of need, economic ability, and effort to support the schools.

I can think of no valid reason for delaying action on the Federal aid to education bills in view of the conditions existing in this country today. Under the Constitution the Federal Government is authorized to levy taxes to provide for the general welfare. Education is included in this category. The revenue resources of the Federal Government have increased at a much greater rate than the sources of revenue within the States and local governments upon which the causes of public education must depend. These States must be helped. Every day of postponement of action on the Federal aid to education bills is costly because every day of good schooling that is missed is a loss that cannot be replaced.

During the first session of the Eightieth Congress, hearings were held on S. 472 and more than 50 witnesses, representing educational, civic, agricultural, labor, church, and other organizations were heard. Those witnesses were virtually unanimous in agreeing that Federal assistance for schools is needed. If we had any doubt as to the need for Federal aid for the schools, or apprehensions as to the practicability of it, they should have vanished during the convincing arguments presented at the hearings on this pending legislation.

Under the provisions of S. 472 the State of Oklahoma would receive in allocations approximately $9,195,000 per annum. Since education is the basis of our national security and our economic welfare, this amount of money being allocated to the State of Oklahoma to augment her own educational financial structure would mean that she could assume her basic responsibilities in these respects along with the rest of the Nation.

It seems incredible to me that Congress will fail to act upon a measure upon which so much depends, and the time for action is now. I sincerely hope that the Federal aid to education bill will pass at this the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

INCOME-TAX REDUCTION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the much publicized Republican tax bill is about to reach the floor. It was originally what the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee described as an across-the-board cut. The Democrats revealed the inequity of such a bill, and the Republican majority has yielded and included just half of the relief to low income-tax payers that President Truman asked. The part of the bill that gives relief to the masses was forced in by the Democrats.

The other substantial tax cut in the bill is a bold and brazen appeal to the voters of the higher income groups in politically doubtful States. The bill proposes to give reductions in non-community-property States without asking those taxpayers to assume the obligations of community property.

The interesting feature to this vote-getting device is that it gives reductions only where the Republicans can hope to get votes in return. Texas and Louisiana were evidently considered hopeless, so the bill made no effort to get votes there. This bill is clearly intended to give tax relief only in return for Republican votes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a paper prepared for him by the office of the secretary of state of Rhode Island.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address on the life of Matthew Fontaine Maury, Robert Edward Lee, and Thomas Jonathan Jackson.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement with regard to the proposed restrictions as well as the already existing restrictions on the manufacture of alcoholic beverages.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in connection with the European recovery program, and to include therein an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of Little Rock, Ark., entitled "The Price of Defeat."

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to extend his remarks with reference to the late Honorable Josephus Daniels, in another to include part of the proceeds at a national meeting of the Junior Chamber of Commerce together with an address by Mr. Edward Wimmer, and in another instance with reference to the Federal Housing Act.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently delivered by him before the medical association.

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some newspaper editorials.

SLACK-WATER ROUTE FROM THE GULF OF MEXICO TO THE GREAT LAKES BY WAY OF THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY—RELIEVE THE OIL SHORTAGE IN THE NORTHEASTERN STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Members from many of the Northern States are complaining, and justly so, of the inadequacy of our transportation system to furnish fuel oil to their areas. People are actually suffering for the want of heating facilities. This situation must be corrected. It never should have been permitted to exist in the first place.

We have a project that was authorized by the last Congress which will go a long way toward relieving the situation. I refer to the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway. When completed it will provide what amounts to a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, and to all other points on the upper Mississippi and the Ohio Rivers.

We are asking for funds with which to begin the construction of this great project, which, as I said, when completed will provide what is virtually a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, as well as to Minneapolis and St. Paul on the upper Mississippi, and to Pittsburgh, Pa., on the Ohio. These may sound like astounding statements, but I can show you they are correct.

The Army engineers say that there is not another project on the face of the earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances. They have sent up a statement of the amount needed to

begin this work, and the Bureau of the Budget has sent up an estimate.

This new project would provide a slack-water route from Mobile, Ala., up the Tombigbee River to the Tennessee River, 481 miles, and a downstream route from where this project enters the Tennessee River to Cairo, Ill., on the Mississippi River, 262 miles. It is only 218 miles from Cairo to where the Illinois River intersects the Mississippi. That 218 miles is upstream, but it is more than offset by the 262 miles down the Tennessee River from where this project connects with that stream to Cairo, Ill.; and then you have a slack-water route along the Illinois River 326 miles to Chicago on the Great Lakes.

There are seven locks and dams on the Illinois River which provide this slack-water route, and then there are 26 locks and dams between St. Louis and Minneapolis and St. Paul which provide a slack-water route to those points on the upper Mississippi.

It is 215 miles from where this project connects with the Tennessee River downstream to Paducah, Ky., on the Ohio River. There are 46 locks and dams on the Ohio River above Paducah, which provide a slack-water route all the way from Paducah to Pittsburgh. This simply means that downstream traffic from all of those points, including Sioux City, Iowa; Omaha, Nebr., and Kansas City, Mo., would take advantage of the swift current of the Mississippi from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, La., 869 miles, for downstream traffic, but would return by the way of this slack-water route, in order to save the expense of fighting the swift current of the Mississippi.

Now let us see what that would mean.

A 14,000-ton barge would save $9,800 on its fuel bill alone in going from New Orleans to Cairo by way of this slack-water route, up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee and then down the Tennessee to Cairo. That would mean that every bargeload of wheat, corn, rye, oats, and other commodities going down from any of the Western States would save $9,800 on its fuel bill by returning by way of this slack-water route to Cairo, if it carried a similar load of, we will say, cottonseed meal, sulfur, bauxite, or any other material.

If it went from Mobile, it would save $20,160; and if it went from Birmingham, Ala., to Cairo, or from Demopolis, Ala., to Cairo, the saving would be $28,140 on a 14,000-ton load.

That means that oil from those vast new oil fields in southeastern Mississippi and southwestern Alabama would be transported by barges into the Great Lakes by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway at 67 cents a ton as against $2.68 a ton that it now costs them to fight their way upstream against the swift current of the Mississippi River.

That means that this oil could be transported into the Great Lakes for one-fourth the amount it now costs to take these barges back up the Mississippi.

Going from New Orleans to Paducah, one of these 14,000-ton barges would save $11,760 on its fuel bill alone; going from Mobile to Paducah it would save $22,160 on its fuel bill alone; going from Birmingham or Demopolis to Paducah, the savings would be $30,100 on the fuel bill alone.

The traffic would move counterclockwise, going down the Mississippi, in order to take advantage of the swift current of that stream, and returning by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway in order to take advantage of the slack-water route.

I am inserting at this point a table, worked out by the Army engineers, showing the tremendous savings which this great project will provide. It shows the savings on the small tows of 3,500 tons and also on the large ones of 14,000 tons.

The table referred to follows:

From—	To—	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400	$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.74	9,590	1.60	5,600	1.14	3,990	15,960
New Orleans, La	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
Mobile, Ala	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala	Cairo	2.96	10,360	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	3.04	10,640	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
Demopolis, Ala	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,000
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590	38,360
Columbus, Miss	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610	34,440
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,940
Aberdeen, Miss	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,360	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.28	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
Fulton, Miss	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

I hope every Member of the House and Senate will read this table carefully and see what this great project will mean to their people, now and for generations to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4127) entitled "An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended," with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. REES, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, and Mr. LYLE.

REPEALING REPRESSIVE LAWS AGAINST OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is evident there is widespread interest in this question affecting the continuance of the iniquitous tax on oleomargarine. It is really not a revenue provision; it is a repressive measure intended not only to injure but to deliberately put out of business a legitimate industry which manufactures the wholesome edible product known as oleomargarine.

On tomorrow morning in executive session I intend to present before the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the tax bill an amendment to repeal all Federal excise taxes levied upon oleomargarine. If the interest of this House is what I think it is and what it ought to be, you will immediately get in touch with your member on the Committee on Ways and Means and ask his support of my proposal, which will once and for all wipe out what should never have been on the statute books of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each certain clippings.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—BEN W. COLBURN (H. DOC. NO. 511)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 645, a bill "for the relief of Ben W. Colburn."

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $4,529.55 to Ben W. Colburn, of Tulare, Calif., by reason of losses alleged to have been sustained by him in connection with the purchase of certain smoke generators from the Treasury Department under contracts dated May 12, 1944.

It appears that Mr. Colburn purchased a total of 7,417 smoke generators under two sales contracts for a total contract price of $7,529.55; that the smoke generators were located at Fort Hahn, Calif., and San Diego, Calif.; that bids on this commodity were invited on the basis of "as is, where is," without recourse; that the description of the generators was based on the best available information, but no warranty, written or oral, was given or authorized by the Treasury Department as to the exact quantity, quality, condition, size, or description of the property, or that it was in condition to be used for the purpose for which it was originally intended.

It appears, moreover, that Mr. Colburn, in reliance on a private report as to condition of the generators failed to avail himself of an opportunity to inspect the property offered for sale. Since he did not avail himself of the opportunity offered for inspection of the property prior to entering into the contracts but relied on a report of a third party as to the condition of the property, there appears to be no legal or equitable basis for charging the Government with the consequences of his negligence. So far as concerns the condition of surplus goods offered for sale by the Government on an "as is, where is" basis without warranty or guaranty of any kind, the law is clear that a bidder who fails to take advantage of an opportunity to inspect cannot subsequently recover on the ground that the goods are of an inferior quality.

In view of the facts and circumstances as set forth above, and since the bill selects a single purchaser of surplus property for special treatment by directing the payment to him of a refund denied to others, all others similarly situated being discriminated against, there appear to be no circumstances which would warrant the granting of the relief authorized by this bill. I am therefore constrained to withhold my approval of the measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 24, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the message, together with the bill to which it relates, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—OSCAR AND ANNA CARLBLOM (H. DOC. NO. 510)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3754, entitled "An act for the relief of Oscar and Anna Carlblom."

The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $32, or such other sums as he has, or may hereafter, collect from Oscar and Anna Carlblom of Lisbon, N. Dak., as income tax for the calendar year beginning January 1, 1944, and ending January 1, 1945. The bill asserts that for the stated taxable year the taxpayers had no net income that was subject to taxation, their total net income being $489.96.

An examination of the records indicates that the parties to whom relief is afforded by the bill filed Form W–2 (Rev.) as their income-tax return for the calendar year 1944. The filing of Form W–2 (Rev.) constitutes, under the law, an irrevocable election to take the optional standard deduction, and, accordingly, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is without authority to permit a change once the election has been made. The record in this case further shows that even if the taxpayers could have been allowed to file a Form 1040, itemizing deductions, only part of the tax paid could have been refunded since a part of certain deductions which the taxpayers proposed to itemize would not have been allowable under the law in any event.

The Congress has specifically provided that the election to take or not to take, the optional standard deduction shall be irrevocable. The granting of the proposed relief would constitute a discrimination against many similarly situated taxpayers and would set an undesirable precedent.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the message, together with the bill to which it relates, will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 431, providing for the consideration of H. R. 4044, a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to consume any considerable period of time in presenting this rule. I realize, of course, that the gentleman from Illinois is entitled to 30 minutes, which I yield to him at this time.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4044 has been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. As announced by the Clerk, it is a bill looking toward amending the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The bill is divided into three titles. The first title is highly important, and with the possible exception of a committee amendment, which will be open for discussion when the bill is read for amendment, is intended to make the policy of the United States with respect to the treatment of enemy-alien property conform with agreements already reached between the Allied Powers with respect to such property found within their respective borders and certain other agreements relating to enemy-alien property found within neutral countries at the termination of the recent war.

Title II of the bill provides for the creation, temporarily, of a commission to study a very difficult and complex problem; that is the proper procedure by which the Government of the United States, including the Congress of the United States, may proceed to accomplish a solution in accordance with sound policy of the claims of American citizens against enemy countries and nationals.

The third title relates to the extension of certain relief to American citizens, nonmilitary, who suffered fearful punishment and torture in certain detention camps maintained in American territory by the Japanese during the recent war, American civilians who were caught as it were in the Philippines, on the island of Midway, and at Wake, and perhaps one or two other places.

That in brief is a recital of the general purposes of the bill. I do not intend to discuss it in detail, believing, as I do, that the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who have studied this for a good many months are far better equipped to do so than I am.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposing the adoption of the pending rules resolution, but I do wish to direct attention to title I

of the bill, consideration of which House Resolution 431 makes in order.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has told you what the bill contains. I regret that he did not elaborate his views upon title I. I have the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the policy laid down in title I is a policy for which this Congress can take little credit. It is an abandonment of a policy heretofore followed by civilized nations with respect to the property of nationals of enemy countries. Hurriedly looking over the report which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce filed on the bill, I find a statement to the effect that title I violates no international understanding of what constitutes good morals. I hope this is so. Mr. Speaker, we are at this moment practically endeavoring to win the favor of all the peoples of the world. We are spending billions of dollars to carry the impression to other peoples that we are just and fair. We are doing this because we desperately need their support. We are in greater need of this support than our people have been told or that is understood. I do not believe that the amount of property that this Government would acquire through the confiscation of enemy alien property as this bill provides will compensate us for the damage that it may do.

The other provisions of the bill, of course, are entirely satisfactory to me, and I take it that this House will adopt the bill as a whole. But I would call attention to studious and serious-minded Members of this body, interested in the protection of the good name of our country, to see if title I cannot be so framed as would insure that the bill be not left in such shape as to have it characterized as legalized robbery. I know that under the existing state of public feeling, it is difficult to sustain the position that I suggest, but nevertheless I do have these misgivings. We are here proposing to take the property of aliens, nationals of enemy countries, which represents investments made in this country, in thousands of instances upon the invitation of our country, and we are going to confiscate that property and cover it into the Treasury of this country for no reason in the world other than that owners happen to be nationals of alien countries. Many perfectly innocent people will, under the bill, lose their all.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I appreciate the concern the distinguished gentleman from Georgia feels, but I cannot agree with him that the procedure suggested in section 1 is at all out of line with precedent, nor can I agree with him that it marks a change in American attitude toward the properties of enemy aliens.

Mr. COX. Certainly, it is a complete reversal of the policy we pursued following the late war.

Mr. GEARHART. I understand that Professor Borchard in some of his writings made statements in line with the gentleman's contention, but eminent international lawyers of just as great repute challenge his statements, and they are borne out by the fact that the Versailles Treaty, which was signed by all the countries involved in World War I, contained just such a provision; and, although the United States did not sign it, we did later sign a treaty with Germany, known as the Treaty of Berlin, and in that treaty some provision was carried and was partially executed, until another scheme was entered upon later, which resulted in our losing 20 percent of the German assets and in $100,000,000 of American claims going unsatisfied.

Mr. COX. I am not disposed to combat the position the gentleman takes. He may be right. I would, however, like very much if the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] would find it agreeable to elaborate upon the statement he made, which was that title I is in keeping with an understanding formally arrived at by the Allied countries in the late war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, may I quote from a letter which was addressed to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] by the State Department, in which there is quoted the language of certain agreements made between the Allied Powers during this recent war. For example, article 6 (A) of the final act of the Paris Conference on Reparations for Germany, to which this and 17 other governments are signatory, provides as follows:

> Each signatory government shall, under such procedures as it may choose, hold or dispose of German enemy assets within its jurisdiction in manners designed to preclude their return to German ownership or control and shall charge against its reparation share such assets.

May I call the attention of the gentleman to that language, "to preclude their return to German ownership or control and shall charge against its reparation share such assets."

Mr. COX. In spite of the fact that it is my profound conviction that the agreement is in violation of good morals, I withdraw even such suggestion of opposition as may have been carried in the remarks I made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, there are other documents which bear upon this situation and which defend the bill most definitely. It was stipulated in one of those agreements that Germany undertakes to compensate her nationals with respect to the detention or sale of their property rights or interests in allied or associated states.

The government assumes the duty to reimburse its nationals for loss due to its own action in waging war. It has become perfectly apparent, Mr. Speaker, that war today is total war and that the people of a country that goes to war under the government of that country must share the responsibility for what happens. It is along those lines and in conformance with other agreements which I shall not take the time to read now because I would prefer to permit the gentleman from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to do so that this bill is offered.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman had made this very clear statement before the Committee on Rules when the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] appeared asking for a rule, I would not have taken the position that I have expressed.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

COMMITTTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in view of the reference made to my appearance before the Committee on Rules in behalf of this bill, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia that after my appearance I immediately called the Department of State to ask for a full explanation on this subject as it was by recommendation of the Department of State, I believe, that this title was included in the bill. They sent me a letter which I transmitted to the Committee on Rules before the Committee on Rules took action on the bill. I assume that the letter having been sent to them, it was made known to all those who were present, and I believe, although, of course, I do not know, that the action of the Committee on Rules was taken subsequent to the receipt of this letter from the Department of State.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the gentleman that I did not see the letter and was not present at the time the rule was granted. In view of the statements made, may I say that so far as I personally am concerned I can see no basis for opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I too deplore the necessity, as does my colleague the gentleman from Georgia, of taking over the property of enemy aliens. I wish that it would not be necessary, but I know that the matter has received a great deal of consideration and study on the part of those upon whom we must, after all, rely. It has also received careful study and consideration by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which unanimously reported the bill. I would prefer, if there is any property owned by any individual that is worth less than $5,000, that it should be exempted from the operation of this act. But, as I understand, this legislation applies to 355 pieces of real-estate property and about 129 pieces of unimproved property in the custody of the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman will be pleased to know, I am sure, that in title I of the bill, section 1, the last line provides:

Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of the provisions of section 32 of this act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946.

Section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act exempts a great deal of property from being taken over by the Alien Property Custodian. Any property that has been wrongfully taken over from a friendly alien living in the United States I understand may be returned to him.

Mr. SABATH. I am thankful to the gentleman for calling my attention to the provisions of section 32, although I had been familiar with it heretofore, but somehow it had escaped me.

If ever a committee of Congress was justified in reporting a bill to take over alien property, it has surely been justified in this instance against the German-Nazi and Japanese owners. These two nations have been guilty of the most brutal war against us which took 300,000 American lives and inflicted 700,000 casualties, saying nothing of the forced expenditure of $280,000,000,000, now reduced to $258,000,000,000, which the American taxpayers will continue to pay beyond the lives of us here before this tremendous debt is wiped out.

I concur in the viewpoint of the gentleman from Georgia that we should demonstrate to the world that we are even now financing and aiding in world rehabilitation; that we are fair and do not wish, as has been stated by someone, however, without authority, to deviate from our old-established policy.

I feel that no one can accuse us that we have not been extremely fair, liberal, and humane with the peoples of the world, including those, who, as I stated before, viciously and murderously and without provocation or justification, warred against us—whilst their representatives were talking peace in Washington, they attacked us at Pearl Harbor.

The leaders of these nations with the approval of at least 95 percent of their peoples massacred, murdered, poisoned, and burned millions of innocent men, women, and children. The Japs murdered our boys who were obliged to surrender, and in defenseless position were tortured in a manner that exceeded the atrocities of barbarians of olden days. But even with that inhuman treatment, I feel that there may be some alien enemy nationals who have not been guilty or sanctioned those atrocities who should receive fair consideration in the disposition of their property. However, as stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] certain exemptions are provided in section 32, and such alien enemy nationals may be exempted from the operation of the act.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely difficult for me to understand how some Members and some people permit themselves to be influenced by the propaganda, emanating from the same sources as after the First World War but now with still greater determination and resourcefulness, in behalf of the very leaders who originally supported Hitler to war against nearly the entire world. A few of these leaders have been convicted, some are now on trial, but there still remain hundreds who represented the Farben interests that aims again to rebuild their war industries and attain the power and influence that may enable them within a few years to start another war.

I read in today's paper a statement by General Clay that we have turned over a billion of dollars of surplus property for about 20 cents on the dollar which is to be paid for, if I am not mistaken, in 20 years. I am constrained to say that there is no more assurance that this money will be paid than their failure to pay their obligations and reparations after the First World War. I feel that the value of this surplus property exceeds that of the property now in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian which the bill before us provides to be taken over by our Government.

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that men in high positions should show such interest in rebuilding Germany in the hope that she may cooperate with us in any future conflict with any other country? I think it is but wishful thinking on their part. I have the utmost sympathy for the innocent hungry and starving people, and especially for the children, and am willing that they be aided, but I am unwilling that we should lend aid to the militaristic group controlled by the Farben cartel interests. At the same time we must be mindful that we have in this country—the greatest and richest in the world—thousands of children, orphans, and old people that we must not neglect while we are aiding the starving peoples of other nations that are striving to establish a real democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation is in the right direction, and I compliment the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who have brought this bill before us.

I am in favor of the rule as well as the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing to the floor legislation dealing with this very, very important problem.

Following World War I, we blundered and blundered badly in the handling of alien property, alien assets, and alien funds that were seized during the course of that war, with the result that today the United States Treasury holds a $500,000,000 German gold bond, and American claimants, with claims totaling $100,000,000, have gone totally uncompensated for their losses, all the consequence of enemy action.

I am, however, not in accord with all of the provisions of the act. I cannot accept the procedure without protest. So bad is the procedure that I am constrained to and will at the proper time offer an amendment to the bill which will provide an entirely different method of establishing the legality of claims and for their satisfaction by the Treasury. I offer this amendment setting up a new procedure because of our unhappy experiences, disastrous as they were, in meeting similar situations by use of the so-called claims commission procedure.

If the bill made in order by this rule is passed as now written it will end up with the establishment of an international claims committee with men appointed who will strive for the rest of their lives to keep their business going, and American national claimants will wait, and wait; and, like the claims arising out of World War I, will, in all probability be waiting until their dying days. Their claims against the enemy powers, the result of enemy action, will be paid, if they are ever paid, not to the claimants who suffered the damage but to their heirs. It is the way of claims commissions.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am mighty glad the gentleman has seen fit to bring that point up because this very day we have a record that shows that more than $2,000,000 has already been returned to people some of whom were not American citizens. That which the gentleman is talking about is taking place already; this very day we are returning property to so-called friendly nationals of other countries while at the same time we are setting up a commission to study the claims of our own citizens.

Mr. GEARHART. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Every minute that we delay in the paying of these claims is a minute when crafty gentlemen in the employ, undoubtedly, of foreign nationals, enemy nationals at any rate, will be busily engaged in devising, by one method or another, ingenious schemes to repossess their foreign clients of this property; to get it away from the United States and back into the hands of those who a short time ago would have destroyed us in war.

Mr. Speaker, as between our fellow American citizens who have suffered detriment as a consequence of enemy action and those foreign nationals who but a short time ago would have destroyed us, there should be no difference in opinion. We owe it to ourselves to see to it that our fellow citizens do not lose as we debate fanciful questions. If the former owners of this vast estate are innocent of wrongdoing and suffer inconvenience as a consequence of this procedure, let them look to their own government for reimbursement and redress, not to us.

Here is the procedure that will be applied if my amendment is adopted, and I offer it with the endorsement of a great number of eminent lawyers: Our American citizens will be permitted to go into their own American courts and present their claims and establish them by proof as Americans are accustomed to and in accordance with the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice; and when they have established their claims, and the courts have rendered judgments upon them, the

procedure which my amendment would authorize would then be satisfied out of the funds on deposit in the Treasury, funds which have found their way into the Treasury as a consequence of the sale of seized alien property. This is a simple procedure and it is an American procedure, one which if adopted will meet the situation completely. It is an efficient method. Our American claimants will get their money within a reasonable time, within their lifetime, if you please. Remember, 2 years and more have already gone by since the fighting in the Second World War was brought to a triumphant conclusion—and nothing has yet been done.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I know the gentleman has studied this matter thoroughly and I want to supplement that which he has already said.

On March 8, 1946, we had a law come into being, and also on August 8, 1946, we had a law come into being, whereby the kinds of people the gentleman is talking about can get this property back and it is being given back.

This morning our committee discussed a bill (H. R. 4903) to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act and a part of an amendment we considered is as follows: After the words "citizen of the United States" the following would be inserted "or an individual who at any time after December 7, 1941, and prior to the expiration of the time during which return may be properly made under this act has been or is deemed to be a citizen of the United States."

In other words, we have another bill that would broaden the scope of those eligible to get property back. The effort is already in the making to invite those people to come in and get back the property just like they did at the conclusion of World War I.

Mr. GEARHART. The evil forces are again at work. The gentleman's presentation is not only convincing; it is alarming. I am suggesting the opening of our constitutionally established tribunals to allow American national claimants to go into their courts and, in accordance with the principles of Anglo-Saxon justice, to there establish their claim. Is there anything wrong in that? It is not considered a wrong method by so eminent a jurist as the late Chief Justice of the United States, Harlan F. Stone, who in penmanship endorses the principles of my amendment. Neither is it not considered a wrong method by the Chief Justice of the United States Court in the District of Columbia, Mr. Justice Bolitha J. Laws.

Mr. Justice Laws in his letters affirms his faith in our courts in no uncertain terms. Let me read it into the RECORD. These are his words:

OCTOBER 12, 1943.

HAROLD G. ARON, Esq.,
1620 I Street NW.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ARON: Because of my absence from the city on cases of the United States Emergency Court of Appeals, I have been delayed in receiving your letter of August 9 and therefore have not been in a position to make answer to it.

I have read the article written by you and Frederick W. Eisner entitled "American Property Claims Against Germany and the Coming Peace Treaty" and have found it most interesting and instructive. I feel there can be no question of the advisability of setting in motion a definite plan for the liquidation of claims against German nationals and against the German Government.

Your suggestions with respect to the manner of adjudicating claims impressed me as being both fair and expeditious. While the Federal judiciary doubtless will have unusually heavy dockets following the war, yet claims of our citizens against German interests and property are of great importance, frequently are for large amounts, and it would seem entirely appropriate that Congress should confer jurisdiction upon the Federal courts to hear them.

I feel that you and Mr. Eisner made a real contribution to a constructive program by your timely article.

Very sincerely,

BOLITHA J. LAWS.

I may point out at this time that Mr. Harold G. Aron, a very eminent and outstanding lawyer of both New York and Washington, in collaboration with Mr. Frederick W. Eisner, also a New York lawyer, wrote the article to which these two eminent jurists refer for the American Bankers Magazine. In that article they stressed the necessity of devising a new method for the adjudication and satisfaction of claims against foreign nationals arising out of war action, this as the years of cruel miscarriages of justice and the indeterminable delays attending the commission method of procedure. They suggest as a substitute the adoption of a judicial procedure, which, as I stated a moment ago is endorsed by the late Chief Justice Harlan Stone, and by Mr. Chief Justice Laws of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he will make in Committee certain letters and other matter.)

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4044, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce that the time on this side will be under the control of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] served as chairman of the subcommittee that drew up this legislation, has given considerable time to its study, and will be in charge of the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the fundamental purpose of the bill now under consideration, H. R. 4044, is to provide a means by which American citizens, having war claims against either Germany or Japan, may be compensated out of the property of Germany or Japan and their nationals which has been taken over by the Government of the United States.

Title I of the bill provides that no property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the United States Government at any time after December 17, 1941, shall be returned to former owners thereof or their successors in interest, nor shall the United States pay compensation therefor. It further provides that the net proceeds remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of the law of any such property or interest therein shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Title II of the bill establishes a War Claims Commission, to be composed of three members to be appointed by the President and who shall hold office for 1 year. The Commission shall cease to exist after the expiration of 1 year after the date on which a majority of its members first appointed take office, but the President may by Executive order fix an earlier expiration date.

It shall be the duty of the Commission to inquire into and report to the President with respect to war claims arising out of World War I or World War II, as follows:

First, the estimated number and amount of such claims, classified by types and categories; and, second, the extent to which such claims have been or may be satisfied under international agreements or domestic or foreign laws.

It is also provided that the report of the Commission shall contain recommendations with respect to, first, categories and types of claims, if any, which should be allowed and the legal and moral bases therefor; second, the administrative method by which such claims should be adjudicated and paid, and any priorities or limitations which should be applicable; and, third, any limitations which should be applied to the allowance and payment of interest or fees in connection with such claims.

Furthermore, the Commission is to include in its report recommendations as to the policies which, in its judgment, should be followed in the national interest with respect to the application of any property or interest vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian, or the proceeds thereof, to the payment of debts owed by the persons who owned such property or interest immediately prior to such vesting or transfer, and shall make such proposals for legislation

as it deems appropriate for carrying out such recommendations.

In addition thereto, the Commission shall include in its report, first, such other recommendations as it deems appropriate; and, second, such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out the recommendations made in such report.

It can be readily seen from this brief description of titles I and II of the bill, that there is no intention to determine by the legislation now before us any general or specific policy with respect to the character of claims to be recognized, or, priorities as between different categories or types of claims, or the basis on which the amount of compensation is to be determined. The testimony before the committee revealed so many different classes of claims with conflicting rights, and alleged priorities, and so varying in degree, that it seemed unwise, if not impossible, at this time and without further study to lay down hard and fast basic principles to govern the disposition of the enemy assets now in the hands of the Government among the numerous and varied claimants. The questions and issues that have been raised are too technical and complicated, both from a legal as well as a factual standpoint, to permit of decision without the fullest information and most careful consideration. The only intelligent and common-sense way, in the opinion of the committee, is to provide for a commission to make the necessary detailed study and examination of facts and principles that is necessary if justice and equity are to prevail.

The committee, however, does recognize that there are some claimants who stand in such an acknowledged position of priority of right, and who are so greatly in need of immediate relief, that it would be unfair and unjust not to recognize their claims immediately and provide emergency relief.

Therefore title III is set up under the terms of the bill to care for such cases as I have just described.

It provides emergency relief benefits to those American citizens who were taken by the Japanese on Midway, Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippines, or while in transit to or from any such places and were interned. Persons who went into hiding in order to escape internment are treated on the same basis as those who were interned.

The committee held extensive hearings in which testimony was presented as to the suffering of many American civilians who were taken in the Philippines and other American territories and possessions, and were interned by the Japanese for the duration of the war. Innumerable acts of almost unbelievable cruelty were perpetrated by the Japanese upon many of the internees. In addition, in the final battles of our troops to liberate our people from the Japanese, many of our internees were killed or seriously wounded. Beyond that, however, there was the general suffering caused by starvation and the deliberate withholding of medical care.

About 3,000 calories are required for the average man on light labor. Many men in the camps were required to do heavy labor and yet they did not receive even the 1,750 calories which the Japanese military had promised to supply daily. By September 1944, for example, in the Santo Tomas camp, the internees received an average of about 1,350 calories; in October and November, 1,100 calories; and in December 1944 and January 1945 the ration was reduced to 650–800 calories per day. By that process of slow starvation the average weight lost for men was 51 pounds, and for women 32 pounds. Witnesses testified that in spite of repeated requests and remonstrances, medicines and hospital supplies and equipment were refused the internees by the Japanese. What little was received, was supplied by the American and Philippine Red Cross.

The committee has also been deeply impressed by the medical expert testimony received by it with respect to the actual and potential after effects of the prolonged starvation. For example, it has been known that sometimes it takes several years before the symptoms of beriberi, the most frequent disease resulting from malnutrition, disappear. Heart diseases and conditions quite commonly result from extended malnutrition, and many deaths are yet expected to occur as a direct consequence of starvation. Likewise, various kinds of eye conditions have been manifest.

While not each and every internee has been seriously affected, it is the considered opinion of medical experts that a great many of them will in years to come suffer serious ill health from the latent effects of the prolonged starvation experienced by them. Many have died already and the life expectancy of most of these internees is expected to be materially shortened.

In the course of the hearings, a letter was received from Mr. Francis B. Sayre, diplomatic adviser of the State Department and United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, prior to the outbreak of the war, stating that these civilians were left in the Philippines. It reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 21, 1947.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: In connection with the hearings on bill H. R. 1823, may I send you this word to urge the Congress to give favorable consideration to such relief as is possible to those civilians who, caught in the Philippine Islands by the Japanese, suffered personal injury at the hands of the enemy.

As United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands during the time, the unfortunate and unhappy position of American and Filipino civilians weighed heavily upon me. During the months immediately preceding the war, it proved impossible, as High Commissioner, to give official notice that American civilians should leave the islands. At that time it was impossible to predict whether a direct attack would be made upon the Philippines by the Japanese, when such might occur, or, indeed, whether hostilities would break out. Although I seriously debated in my own mind issuing such a notice, my advice from Washington was not to do so. Washington felt that with due regard to the national interest it would be inadvisable to issue such a notice. As a result no such official notice was issued.

A number of Americans called upon me to ask my personal advice. I could only reply that no one at the time could foretell whether an attack would occur or, if so, when, and that I must leave it to each individual citizen to decide for himself whether or not it was wise to return or send his family back to the United States.

When the Japanese did attack in early December 1941, it was too late for civilians to leave the islands. By that time all commercial sailings had been interrupted by Japanese action and when I conferred with Admiral Hart, the commander of the East Asiatic Fleet, I was informed that it was quite impossible for the Navy to get the civilians out of Manila under the war conditions then prevailing.

As a result, American civilians found themselves entrapped in the Philippines with no way of escape.

Many American civilians thus trapped by the Japanese suffered pitiably at their hands. I urge that Congress take such action as is appropriate for the relief of those American civilians still in distress as a result of their injuries and losses suffered in the Philippines.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS B. SAYRE.

The record shows that while as a matter of national policy no warning was given to American civilians to leave the Philippines and other American Territories and possessions, ample warnings were given to American civilians who resided in Europe and Asia. The State Department press releases are set forth in the appendix of the committee report. It may therefore be said that the American Government discharged its obligation to American citizens who resided in Asia and Europe and that they chose to stay on at their own risk. It will be the duty of the War Claims Commission established pursuant to title II of this act to advise the Congress as to the rights of those citizens. On the other hand, it appears to your committee that the United States Government has a clear moral obligation to relieve the distress of those citizens who resided in the Philippines and other American Territories and possessions and who, as a matter of national policy, were not given any warnings to leave and who consequently, as stated by Mr. Sayre, "found themselves entrapped."

Title III makes it clear that any relief provided thereunder is by no means to be considered in satisfaction of any war claims which those citizens have against the Japanese Government and which are to be considered by the War Claims Commission established by title II of this bill.

Title III makes applicable to the case of internees who are entitled to relief the provisions of the act of December 2, 1942, with some changes to meet specific conditions. The act of December 2, 1942, provides for benefits for detention, disability, and death in respect to employees of Government contractors. The conditions which that act was designed to meet are substantially parallel to the cases of civilian internees which title III intends to cover. The measure would be administed by the Federal Security Administrator, who presently administers the 1942 act.

The act of December 2, 1942, utilizes and integrates the provisions of two earlier acts, namely, the Employees' Com-

pensation Act of September 7, 1916 and the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act of March 4, 1927. The first of these—Employees' Compensation Act—provides the administrative features and sections dealing with the furnishing of medical care; the second—Longshoremen's Act—furnishes the provisions which control the payment of benefits for disability and death. Reference to the act of December 2, 1942, furnishes some additional provisions, such as those dealing with detention benefits, time limitations, and other procedural matters. Title III of the bill utilizes all three of such acts, and at the same time provides such additional checks and balances as are deemed necessary to meet the specific case situations with which the title deals.

Furthermore, both the Employees' Compensation Act and the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act are Federal workmen's compensation acts. The Longshoremen's Act benefit provisions were adopted because they are full and complete with respect to proper indemnities to be payable for disability and death. The amounts payable as such benefits are in accord with proper concepts of indemnity for injury and death as reflected in State workmen's compensation laws. Rather than to adopt an entirely new scale of benefit payments or a new concept of indemnity, the committee adopted a tried and proven plan. In addition, considerable advantage is obtained by reason of judicial constructions and interpretations which greatly facilitate administration; moreover, there would be no necessity for the creation of an administrative agency to administer title III, as experts in this field are presently carrying out similar functions. This factor should expedite materially the payment of benefits and reduce greatly the cost of administration.

The cost of the benefit payments provided for under title III is approximately $50,000,000. The net proceeds which will be covered into the Treasury of the United States pursuant to title I of the bill are estimated to amount to between $235,000,000 and $275,000,000.

In the work of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] our distinguished colleague, has rendered very worth-while service before the committee in preparing this legislation. We have, likewise, had the very helpful interest of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]. Both of these gentlemen introduced legislation dealing with this matter in the early part of this session and this bill H. R. 4044, now before the House, is the outgrowth of these two bills, plus the long and careful consideration of the entire committee. Nor should I overlook the suggestions made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] in connection with the legislation he had introduced on the subject.

The bill now before the House is so worth while in purpose, and so necessary if real justice is to be done in behalf of these war claimants, that I ask for its approval by the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New Jersey has said, this subject when brought before our committee appeared to be and was found to be exceedingly complicated. There were so many ramifications to the claims and claimants as well as to past actions, laws, treaties, and international agreements that it was considered by the committee that it would be necessary to have a Presidential commission appointed to study the types of claims, and the international laws and customs and precedents and the various relationships that might follow them, and that that commission should properly prepare itself to make recommendations to the Congress for legislation. Frankly, while the committee worked long hours and weeks on this bill and employed its staff to the utmost, it was unable to spare the time to make a full and complete study. Therefore, the recommendation for a commission to make this study and make recommendation to the Congress was incorporated in the bill. It originally provided that the recommendation be made by March 31, 1948. Obviously, that could not be done, so the committee has authorized me to offer an amendment later giving the date January 3, 1949, as the date of reporting by this commission.

There were many worthy claimants for reparations and damages. This bill does not in any way attempt to settle or make payment for any claim of damages or reparation. That should be understood. My beloved colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] proposes to offer an amendment to establish a method of settling these claims and damages. It is possible that his method would be the method ultimately recommended by the commission. I do not know. Personally, I think the matter should go to the commission for its full study and complete report, and I will discuss that matter further when the amendment is offered.

When we were debating this matter under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] mentioned a letter from the Department of State, which was transmitted to me, in which the State Department sets forth its reasons for supporting title I, section 1, of this bill.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, under a previous unanimous-consent request, I shall insert in the RECORD the letter from the State Department, under date of January 19, 1948, in full. This letter sets forth the reasons why the State Department agrees with this bill, that all of this property should be liquidated and turned in to the Treasury of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 19, 1948.

The Honorable CARL HINSHAW,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HINSHAW: The Department understands that in connection with congressional consideration of H. R. 4044, a bill "to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases," objection has been raised with respect to section 1 of the proposed measure which contains an express declaration of legislative policy that no vested property of Germany or Japan, or of any national of either, shall be returned to the former owners, and that the United States shall pay no compensation therefor to such former owners.

I may say that the Department has repeatedly reported to committees of Congress its agreement with the basic policy stated in section 1 of the proposed measure. The Department understands that similar reports have been made by other interested agencies of this Government, including the Treasury Department, the War Department, and the Department of Justice. With respect to the position of this Department in relation to the matter of enemy external assets, attention may be invited to the following international commitments entered into by this Government.

1. In the Potsdam agreement it was stipulated that with a view to compelling Germany to compensate to the greatest possible extent for the loss and suffering that she had caused to the United Nations "and for which the German people cannot escape responsibility":

* * * * *

"3. The reparation claims of the United States, the United Kingdom, and other countries entitled to reparations shall be met from the western zones and from appropriate German external assets."

2. Article 6A of the Final Act of the Paris Conference on Reparations from Germany, to which this and 17 other governments are signatory, provides as follows:

"Each signatory government shall, under such procedures as it may choose, hold or dispose of German enemy assets within its jurisdiction in manners designed to preclude their return to German ownership or control and shall charge against its reparation share such assets (net of accrued taxes, liens, expenses of administration, other in rem charges against specific items and legitimate contract claims against the German former owners of such assets)."

3. The United States, the United Kingdom, and France were designated by the Inter-Allied Reparation Agency to act as trustees for the 18 countries which are members of that Agency, to carry out the following resolution of the Paris Conference on Reparation:

"That the countries which remained neutral in the war against Germany should be prevailed upon by all suitable means to recognize the reasons of justice and of international security policy which motivate the powers exercising supreme authority in Germany and the other powers participating in this conference in their efforts to extirpate the German holdings in the neutral countries."

Pursuant to this obligation, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have signed accords concerning German assets with Switzerland (May 25, 1946), and Sweden (July 18, 1946), and are currently negotiating with Portugal and Spain. Under the Swiss and Swedish accords, those countries are obliged to liquidate German assets within their territory. Under the Swiss accord, 50 percent of the proceeds of liquidation is to "be placed at the disposal of the Allies for the rehabilitation of countries devastated or depleted by the war," and 50 percent is to accrue to the Swiss Government. Under the Swedish Accord, substantial contributions were to be made by Sweden from the proceeds of liquidation of German assets for the rehabilitation of countries and peoples devastated by the war. Both of these accords provide for indemnification of the Germans whose property is affected by payment in German money.

It may be observed that in the annex to section IV of part X of the Treaty of Versailles (the rights and benefits of which were accorded the United States by the treaty between the United States and Germany concluded August 25, 1921) the Allied and Associated Powers reserved the right to retain and liquidate all assets of German nationals within their respective jurisdictions, such liquidation to be carried out in accordance with the laws of the allied or associated state concerned. It was also stipulated that:

"Germany undertakes to compensate her nationals in respect of the sale or retention of their property, rights, or interests in allied or associated states."

While a portion of the German assets in the United States after World War I were returned, a portion thereof is still retained by the United States pursuant to the Harrison resolution approved June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1267).

In the Treaties of Peace with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, which came into force September 15, 1947, each of the Allied and Associated Powers are accorded the right to "seize, retain, liquidate, or take any other action with respect to all property, rights, and interests" in its territory of those former enemy nations or their nationals, and to apply such property or the proceeds thereof to such purposes as it may desire within the limits of its claims and those of its nationals against the particular former enemy country or its nationals. Each of these treaties stipulates that the former enemy country will undertake to compensate its nationals whose property has been retained by the Allied Powers.

It will be noted, therefore, that the policy of nonreturn of German and Japanese assets in the United States, as provided in section 1 of H. R. 4044, is in accord with that stipulated in international agreements in relation to external enemy assets concluded by the United States and other countries as a consequence of World War II. Moreover, it is assumed that any peace settlements with Germany and Japan will contain provisions for the nonreturn of German and Japanese assets, as well as provisions requiring Germany and Japan to pay compensation to their respective nationals for such assets.

In conclusion, I may observe that the amount realized from the liquidation of German and Japanese assets in the United States, which would constitute the major portion of reparations receivable by the United States, will doubtless represent only a very small proportion of the losses and damages sustained by the United States and its nationals as a consequence of the war which those countries waged against the United States. I may add that, as you know, several measures are pending in the Congress which contemplate that the proceeds obtained from the liquidation of German and Japanese assets shall be utilized in satisfying claims of American nationals against those countries for losses and damages sustained by them as a consequence of the war.

Because of the urgency of the matter, this communication has not been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget, to which a copy is being sent.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. LEA. If this bill is enacted as proposed, would it be within the jurisdiction of the commission to recommend payment to interned Japanese in compensation of property taken from them? That is, Japanese interned in the United States.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would say if they were American citizens, they would.

Mr. LEA. If they were aliens, would it be within the jurisdiction of the commission?

Mr. HINSHAW. No. Any alien who has a claim against the property of his own government can settle that with his own government, as I understand it, and it is no matter of concern of the United States, unless the claimant came under the provisions of section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, in which case he has a right to make application now for the return of his property, or the equivalent, as I understand section 32 of that act.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. I am impelled to question about this letter that you have from the State Department. I agree that probably they have removed any doubts as to the strict legality of the procedure contemplated here. However, I do think a word of commendation is due the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] as to the strict morality of taking private property to settle these claims. I think it speaks well for his natural sense of justice.

On the question of the matter just raised as to whether this fund can be used to remunerate Japanese who were detained in this country during the war by this Government, I think I will have to disagree with my distinguished colleague from California, because an entirely different situation exists there. The Japanese that we interned were treated with the strictest consideration, according to our various conventions with other countries. They were treated well and fairly. In this case we have civilian internees who were treated with cruelty, men and women, whose stories I have heard——

Mr. HINSHAW. I must interrupt the gentleman; I did not yield to him for a speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I suggest to the gentleman that he read title 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. I recognize with him that the Alien Property Custodian who is now in the Department of Justice, has certain powers in reference to seized property of persons who may be enemy aliens in a technical sense but who were nevertheless friendly with the United States. If those people prove to be unfriendly to the United States which we consider to be inimical to our interests, I am sure there will be nothing done for them.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wish to know whether under the provisions of this bill individuals who suffered losses and damages because of the attack on Hawaii on December 7, 1941, will be in a position to be heard?

Mr. HINSHAW. Indeed they would under title 2 of the bill. Their claims should be considered by the Commission and the recommendations made by the Commission to the Congress for legislation to handle such claims will then be heard by the Congress and the matter settled.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I assume from the gentleman's statement, then, that persons who have suffered can look forward to presenting their claims when and if this bill is enacted into law.

Mr. HINSHAW. They will have an opportunity of presenting their claims for the purpose of information when the commission is established, but the claims would not be adjudicated until after the Commission had reported the proper machinery for the adjudication of those claims and enabling law enacted.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. GEARHART. In further consideration of the subject raised by the Delegate from Hawaii, I do not believe the gentleman wants him to understand that title 2 will validate claims of that type.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is nothing in the bill anywhere that validates any claim. I have not said so.

Mr. GEARHART. That is true; and under title 2 a Commission is set up which will decide whether or not claims of that type shall be considered by the Congress, and recommend legislation accordingly.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Commission does not decide anything; it makes a recommendation to Congress.

Mr. GEARHART. And recommends to Congress accordingly.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right, that is perfectly right.

Now, I would be very glad to answer to the best of my ability any questions the Members may have in mind concerning any portion of the bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Under title 2 of the gentleman's bill is it not correct for me to assume that those men who were in the armed forces and who were prisoners of war and victims of atrocities, especially at the hands of the Japanese, will have their day in court to present their claims?

Mr. HINSHAW. Not for adjudication of the claim but for the presentation of the type of claim for consideration by the Commission in connection with its recommendations to the Congress for handling such claims. They are entitled, in my opinion, of course, to the greatest measure of damages of any persons in the United States who suffered damages at the hands of enemy governments; and I trust that the Commission will in its report recommend that priority No. 1 be given to the claims of members of the armed forces who suffered so horribly at the hands of the Japanese.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the gentleman will yield for another question.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not proper for me to say that title 2 was written into this bill mostly because of the highly complicated problem confronting the

committee in its effort to perfect a bill which would set up the machinery to take care of the claims of former military prisoners of war.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is, of course, absolutely correct. It was written in the bill, not in the terms of the language of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania known as H. R. 1000, but his having called that subject so forcibly to the attention of the committee as an exceedingly important type of claim made it incumbent upon the committee to order the study made and a probability that in the course of this study to be made by the Commission that such claims as the gentleman refers to would be given priority No. 1.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. That does not in any way indicate that there might be a change in the present law with reference to the responsibility of the Government in connection with the compensation paid to men of the service who for one reason or another have become disabled.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not quite understand the gentleman. There is no reference to compensation of servicemen in this bill. They are compensated under Veterans' Administration laws and regulations.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand it, this proposes to set up a war-claims commission whereby anyone who receives injuries, whether in the military service or otherwise, and who becomes disabled because of the action of the Japanese or the Germans, may file a claim for damages for that injury.

Mr. HINSHAW. The veterans of the war are now taken care of under veterans' legislation by the Veterans' Administration and by laws that were passed in the interest of the armed forces. There is no question, in my mind, but what such persons who engaged in the march of Bataan, and other similar horrible cruelties, are entitled to reparation and damages for violation of the Geneva Convention. However, this committee in its inability to spend sufficient time to go completely into the subject has recommended the commission to make a complete study and report to the Congress.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I insert a resolution adopted by the American Legion at its national convention last August. The resolution follows:

Resolution 811

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled in New York City, N. Y., August 28–31, 1947, That the legislative committee urge the Congress to expedite prompt consideration and fair settlement of the claims of American citizens and their dependents who were interned as civilian prisoners by enemies of the United States during World War II, and further urge the Congress to immediately consider and determine their requests for rehabilitation and relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EFFECT OF BECKWORTH COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO TITLE I OF H. R. 4044

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, prior to the passage of section 34, American creditors had recourse to section 9 of the act, which permitted them to sue the Custodian for payment of their debts. Section 34 took away this right and substituted an equitable distribution principle for the first-come-first-served principle. In order to be eligible as a claimant under section 34, the creditor must be an American or Philippine citizen, resident, or corporation. The statutory scheme also provides for a system of priorities in the event the vested property account of the debtor is insufficient to pay all the claims. Under this priority schedule, wage and salary claims under $600 and all other claims for services rendered, for expenses incurred in connection with such labor or services, for rent, for goods and materials delivered to the debtor, and for payments made to the debtor for goods and services not received by the claimant are to be paid prior to the payment of any large creditors. The experience of the Office of Alien Property has been that the average claim asserted is a small claim in connection with services rendered, such as claims for wages and salaries in fairly small amounts, and claims for goods sold and delivered.

After the passage of the statute, the Office of Alien Property took extensive steps to notify American creditors that their rights under section 9 (a) no longer existed and that the sole procedure was under section 34. Approximately 80,000 claim forms have thus far been distributed to the public upon request. No forms have been distributed except on request. Approximately 30,000 debt claims have thus far been received by the Office. It is anticipated that 50,000 claims will eventually be filed. These claims total approximately $400,000,000. Although it is difficult to estimate the amount which will eventually be paid out as the result of the allowance of debt claims, it is believed that a maximum of $35,000,000 will be paid to American creditors under section 34. A great many of the claims will be disallowed because of ineligibility of claimant or invalidity of the debt. Other claims, while allowed in full, will not be paid in full because the debtor's account is insolvent in respect to the amount of claims asserted against it.

The energies of the Office of Alien Property have been directed to answering requests for information concerning the program and preparation of necessary procedures for its successful and efficient operation. An average of from 8 to 10 attorneys have been working on all aspects of the debt claims program, and the services of 35 administrative personnel have been utilized. This personnel has been receiving and docketing debt claims, processing the claims to eventual allowance or disallowance, and handling correspondence with reference to claims. More than 2,000 letters a month have been sent in response to inquiries from the public.

The statute provides for the issuance of bar orders barring claims in respect of particular debtors named therein. Thus far, three bar orders have been issued and a fourth is in process:

First. Bar Order No. 1, affecting 308 debtors, fixed September 2, 1947.

Second. Bar Order No. 2, affecting 50 debtors, fixed December 17, 1947.

Third. Bar Order No. 3, affecting 150 debtors, fixed February 25, 1848.

Approximately 1,500 creditors' claims are involved in the issuance of these orders. Eleven claims, totaling $17,000, have been allowed thus far. Processing of eleven additional claims have been completed and they are now before the Director of the Office of Alien Property for approval. All the claims against the debtors listed in the three bar orders have been processed to some extent, and many of them are in their final stage. In excess of 200 claims are presently being actively worked on by the debt claims personnel.

It would be impossible to estimate the amount of money expended by the Office of Alien Property on the debt claims program, or the amount of money spent by persons to assert and perfect their claims filed in reliance on the statute. The statute, in general, is designed to protect the interest of the small American creditor. Many claims have been asserted by holders of bonds issued by the German or Japanese Government, and individual concerns of these countries. These claims by the American investor will not be allowed until the smaller claims have been allowed in accordance with the statutory priority.

The effect of the amendment would be to place Congress in the position of having reneged on its promise to satisfy the valid claims of American creditors, while at the same time having deprived them of their previous right of suit under section 9 of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

I understand this amendment, suggested by Representative BECKWORTH, was passed by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by a slender margin.

The Judiciary Committee, which considered a similar amendment, when that committee presented its bill concerning enemy alien property in the last Congress—which bill passed—rejected it decisively in committee. That was August 1946. The Congress passed the bill without the amendment. What we rejected then, should we accept now?

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LOY HENDERSON: THE MAN WHO RUNS OUR STATE DEPARTMENT'S NEAR EAST DIVISION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, for many months we have been hearing charges and denunciations of our State Department's Near Eastern Section. Usually

the name of Loy Henderson, Director of Near Eastern and African Affairs, is repeated as the man who has been willfully and wantonly distorting the foreign policy of the United States as enunciated by the Congress and the President.

Today, at last, we have a careful analysis of the facts, a sifting of the evidence regarding the record of this controversial State Department official. I am referring to the current series of articles in the New York Post entitled "Man in the Saddle, Arabian Style," by Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler, in which a meticulous and dispassionate study exposes the true danger involved in permitting the direction of the enormously powerful and strategic Near Eastern Section to rest in the hands of Loy Henderson.

HENDERSON HAS POLICY OF HIS OWN

The Van Devander-Wechsler series does not indicate any deep Machiavellian plots by Henderson; they do not show any instances where this man has personally gained or profited by distorting our foreign policy. They do show that Henderson has been working, with fanatical zeal, for a backward and decayed policy—out of conviction. This man Henderson has a foreign policy of his own, based on such deep-seated prejudices and biases that he functions as a virtual propagandist for feudalism and imperialism in the Middle East, in conflict with progressive principles and democratic interests of the United States.

Essentially, the charge against Henderson is that he is pro-Arab League, that he is a fellow traveler of the British Colonial Office as regards Palestine, that he has built up an organization within the State Department which has persistently aided and abetted Anglo-Arab policies in Palestine and elsewhere. This group has thwarted every practical attempt to assist the Jews in Palestine, and to support any program of political change in the Near East. I know not, and care less, what Mr. Henderson's motives may be. Presumably he believes that he can best serve his country's interests by yoking us to every wazir, satrap, and pasha of the Near East. We are not interested in motives, but in results, and the evidence has now been presented which clearly demonstrates that this man is completely unfit, on the basis of his record and performance, to develop a policy in accord with our interests and traditions.

ARGUMENT FALLS APART

In closing I should like to point out that Henderson will probably justify everything he has done by claiming that he has been building a "bulwark against communism." This argument falls apart when one realizes that it is the British-Arab feudal policy in the Middle East which is the greatest cause for communism among the Arab masses. We, the United States, must not be trapped into the belief that we can check communism in the Near East by subsidizing barbarism, polygamy, savagery, and banditry. If it is Mr. Loy Henderson's pleasure to advocate such a course, let him do so on his own as a private citizen and not as an official of the State Department and a servant of the American people drawing public pay.

Since we are so economy minded, I strongly recommend that we find out if we are not throwing our money away by tolerating a key official in the State Department whose very presence is a stumbling block to the effective execution of American foreign policy.

I call on the Foreign Affairs Committee to investigate the entire role of the Near Eastern Division and Henderson in particular, and further, I urge that the House Appropriations Committee consider their appropriation for Henderson's division in the State Department in the light of the findings of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

MAN IN THE SADDLE: ARABIAN STYLE—1

LOY HENDERSON RUNS OUR STATE DEPARTMENT NEAR EAST DIVISION

(By Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler)

WASHINGTON.—Loy Henderson's name is seldom in the headlines. Most Americans have never heard of him; and few would include him in their list of men who today are decisively shaping great world events.

This comparative obscurity is of Henderson's own choosing. It is one of the significant and enlightening facts about the man who, more than any other individual, influences day-to-day American foreign policy in the critical hot spots of Greece, Palestine, and the whole Near East.

Behind his private silken curtain Henderson pursues certain deeply held objectives for America with selfless intensity. When, as sometimes happens, his personal foreign policy deviates from the basic principles laid down in higher echelons of the Government few sounds of the resultant struggle seep out through the muted walls of the State Department.

There is no front-page crisis that might precipitate a show-down over who is really running American foreign policy.

Represents the firm hand of United States foreign policy

Henderson occupies one of the more luxurious offices in the new State Department Building. The card on the door identifies him as director of the department's "Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs." After he passes through this portal at an early 8 o'clock each morning, the director's glance sweeps around a large room in which the spectacular decorations are a brilliantly colored tiger-skin rug and an 8-foot oil painting of a nineteenth century Bey of Tunis. In one corner is an intimate grouping of leather sofa, chairs, and coffee table for relaxed conversation.

As he crosses to his desk, Henderson's gaze lingers for a moment on a glass-covered table-top map of the vast territory throughout which he represents, not the disembodied voice but the very material hand, of American foreign policy. Henderson almost automatically directs attention to this map as he discusses his work with visitors. The territory there outlined starts with Greece in the west, crosses the Dardanelles to Turkey, embraces Palestine, Iran, and Iraq and sweeps on to include Pakistan, India, Ceylon, and Burma, newly freed from British rule and established as an independent state. Southward Henderson's sphere of influence within the State Department includes all of still-somnolent Africa.

It's a big responsibility, taken very seriously

For United States relations with this tremendous area, Henderson accepts a personal responsibility, and it is a responsibility that he takes very seriously. He has more than the normal career diplomat's contempt for the lack of information, and the possibly ulterior motives, of political superiors who may not share his approach to any given problem.

When there is disagreement a process of patient attrition sets in, which almost inevitably results in Henderson's winning a partial, if not a total, victory. After all, the Secretary of State and even the President are dependent on Henderson's office and its consular outposts for information about events and forces in the Middle East, as well as for the execution of established United States policies in that area.

In carrying out the duties of his vitally important and strategic office Henderson is guided not only by the directives of established authority but equally by the inner prickings of an exceptionally severe and stubborn conscience which from earliest boyhood has made it either difficult or impossible for him to deviate from what he conceives to be the line of duty. There is no record of his conscience ever having won less than a draw against high Government policy.

Henderson is not a product of political patronage. As a civil-service employee he has steadily risen in the State Department's ranks through the administrations of five Presidents — Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman. The results of next November's elections are unlikely to affect his position or diminish his influence, though it may be suspected that he would be happier with a Taft in the White House.

One of his guiding principles is a firm belief that friendly relations with the Arab world are of great, if not overriding, importance to the people of the United States. Problems in the Near and Middle East are likely to be inspected chiefly in the light of what he calls "our Arab policy"—a fact which has not increased the confidence of Jewish groups in his impartiality on the burning issues of Palestine. That the suspicion with which these groups regard him has some justification is indicated by his admonition to a new colleague several years ago that American espousal of a Jewish state would "wreck our whole Arab policy."

When the issue of partitioning Palestine recently came before the United Nations for decision Henderson tacitly recognized a widespread distrust of his motives by requesting Secretary of State Marshall to relieve him of any direct participation in the United Nations discussions.

Palestine case settled, no talk of resigning

The Palestine issue has now been adjudicated, and the United States is committed to a solution of Arab-Jewish rivalries which would appear to confront the Director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs with a personal problem. He has shown no disposition to resign, however, and his superiors apparently are willing to leave the day-to-day conduct of Palestinian policy in his hands, although there are unconfirmed rumors that a transfer to another post may be in the works.

Henderson's passion for anonymity has provided a shield against widespread criticism. One of the few frontal attacks on him was made last year by Bartley C. Crum, liberal Republican lawyer who served on the joint Anglo-American Committee on Palestine.

Bart Crum, writing of his experience in The Silken Curtain, reported initial briefing, included this admonition from Loy Henderson:

"There is one fact facing both the United States and Great Britain, Mr. Crum. That is the Soviet Union. It would be wise to bear that in mind when you consider the Palestine problem."

Bartley Crum's guns clearly aimed at him

This interesting insight into Henderson's approach to the Palestinian issue was allowed to pass without challenge; but when Crum later charged flatly that State Department officials on the "middle level" were deliberately sabotaging Palestinian policies laid down by the President and the Secretary of State and conveying private assurances to the Arabs, there was a resounding backfire. Al-

though Crum did not name names, his guns clearly were aimed at Loy Henderson.

Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State, intercepted the attack. He replied with considerable heat that the responsible officials of the State Department stood behind everything that went out from the Department.

The incident demonstrated, as perhaps Loy Henderson's whole career proves, that an able, single-minded, and determined individual can swing a lot more than his own weight as long as he is able to give the boss the right answers at the right time. The career organization of the State Department provides exceptional opportunities for such exceptional men.

MAN IN THE SADDLE: ARABIAN STYLE—2

HENDERSON'S FORTUNES SAG IF UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN AMITY GROWS

(By Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler)

WASHINGTON.—To people who meet him socially, Loy Wesley Henderson seems like an orthodox member of the striped pants diplomatic club. The director of the State Department's Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs is amiable, urbane, and mannered, as if conscious that he is the wearer of an old-school tie. His personality is concealed—or perhaps illuminated—by a sort of gray protective coloration.

He has a faint gray mustache and sparse gray hair, starting well back from the forehead. He dresses in conservative grays and wears sedate ties.

If the portrait conforms to the stereotype of the wealthy young man of the upper classes who has set the prevailing fashion in our diplomatic league, it is slightly deceptive; or perhaps simply an evidence of Henderson's adaptability. He is in fact—as his middle name inevitably suggests—the son of a Methodist minister. There were no silver spoons around at his birth, and he toiled at a variety of jobs—in a steel mill, a rubber factory, and the Kansas wheat fields—to help finance his own education.

Henderson and an identical twin brother, christened Roy, were born not quite 56 years ago—the date was June 28, 1892—on their grandfather's farm in the foothills of the Ozark Mountains 3 miles from Rogers, Ark. Their grandfather, who was of Scotch (and some Irish) extraction, was a veteran of the Indian, Mexican, and Civil Wars who had taken his family south in reconstruction days. Loy remembers him as a valiant soldier, blind in his old age, who told fascinating stories of Indian warfare.

As a minister's son he belied the old legend

Loy's father was not the typical Methodist minister, which may explain why Loy has confounded all of the form players by his sober and painfully conscientious progress through a quarter-century up the State Department's career ladder, instead of going to the dogs as ministers' sons are—perhaps fictionally—supposed to do.

The Reverend George Milton Henderson, who now is retired and resides in Colorado, was only 22 and just finishing his theological studies when the twins were born. The young minister was a hearty extrovert, a man of broad social consciousness and of virtually no bigotry. In most of the middle-western towns where he preached during his active career, the local Catholic priests became his closest friends.

The budding diplomat whom he had fathered turned out to be a serious, introspective, and studious youth. Young Loy discovered Shakespeare early in life. By the time he was 13 he had read most of the English classics and was eager to go on to Latin and Greek. The ancient classics still are his favorite bedtime literary fare.

Death of twin brother altered course of his life

Loy Henderson would have become a lawyer, and doubtless a shrewd and successful one, if it had not been for the death of his twin brother in 1920. This was a deep personal tragedy which altered the whole course of the surviving twin's life. And in view of the powerful and highly individual influence which Henderson has since acquired over vital phases of American foreign policy one is tempted to consider his personal tragedy as an event of more than passing importance in world history.

The twins were physically identical and spiritually closely attached to each other. They shared a passion for individuality which was constantly thwarted by their similar tastes—not only in clothes, but in girl friends. Minor problems which arose from this struggle for individuality were settled by the toss of a coin. As the result of one such chance judgment, Loy grew an adolescent mustache, while Roy went clean-shaven.

The boys had decided to study law and set up a partnership. Loy, after being graduated from Northwestern University, was in his second year at Denver University Law School, and Roy was at Harvard Law, when the United States entered the First World War in 1917. Both promptly volunteered. Roy was accepted for officers' training camp, but in the course of his training suffered an injury from which he later died after he had resumed his studies at Harvard.

Loy was turned down by the Army because of a partial stiffness of his right arm—the permanent result of a boyhood fall from a tree. He thereupon joined the Red Cross and was sent to France and later Germany, where he also served after the war as a member of an interallied commission for reparations and for repatriation of prisoners of war.

Upon his return to the United States in the fall of 1921, Henderson decided to abandon law and to seek a career in diplomacy. The springs of that decision went back many years to the summer of 1904, when Loy was a boy of 12 and his father was pastor of a church in Jefferson, Ohio. The leading citizen of Jefferson was the American author and editor, William Dean Howells. That summer Howell's brother, a United States consular official, visited Jefferson and excited the romantic imagination of all of the small boys by appearing on the streets as an exotic figure in shorts, with helmet, and deep tropical tan.

He took the civil-service examination in January of 1922, and 4 months later received his first appointment. The assignment was a disappointment, because Loy had asked for service in eastern Europe, and he was sent to Ireland instead.

His fortunes go down when alliance thrives

Looking back, it is significant that Henderson's chief interest as long ago as 1922, was in eastern Europe. Way ahead of his fellow citizens he had spotted the new Soviet Union of Russia as the villain in the world drama. During the twenties and the thirties, when he served in many parts of the world, his intellectual hobby was to keep track of the activities of the Communist International. His premonitions were strengthened into a firm conviction during 2 years he served at Riga, the outpost from which we kept an eye on the Soviet homeland during the long era of nonrecognition, and later by 2 years in the Embassy at Moscow.

To some extent, Henderson's fortunes in the State Department have gone up and down in reverse ratio to the cordiality of United States-Soviet relations. His influence was in temporary eclipse during the period of the wartime grand alliance, when he was shunted off to Baghdad for 2 years as Ambassador to Iraq.

It was in mid-April of 1945, just as prospects of postwar differences began to cloud United States-Russian relations, that he was recalled to Washington and placed in his present key office, from which he directs United States policy in the tinder-box area.

Responsibility for the steady deterioration of relations between the world's two greatest powers since that time cannot be isolated in Moscow or Washington and certainly not in the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs. The downward course of those relations has, however, had the result of increasing the prestige and strengthening the hand of the man who now has no doubt that he was right all along about Russia.

MAN IN THE SADDLE: ARABIAN STYLE—3

ATMOSPHERE ABOUT HENDERSON AGGRESSIVELY ANTI-SOVIET

(By Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler)

WASHINGTON.—Mrs. Loy Henderson, wife of the State Department's Director of Near Eastern and African Affairs, frequently is referred to by casual acquaintances as a White Russian. This is a technical error, but the political connotations are accurate enough. Mrs. Henderson is forthrightly and, for a diplomat's wife, even indiscreetly anti-Soviet in her feelings.

She is a Latvian by birth, the former Elise Marie Heinrichson, daughter of a once well-to-do landowner whose fortunes have shrunk as a result of German pillaging and Communist expropriation. She and Henderson met when he was a United States consul at Riga in 1927–29, and she was a music student at the conservatory. They were married in 1930 and she is now an American citizen.

As such she was with her husband in Moscow from 1934 to 1938 when he served as second secretary and, later, first secretary in the American Embassy. Mrs. Henderson apparently made very little effort to conceal her political dislike of her Communist hosts during that period. Several years later, when she was back in Washington, diplomatic circles buzzed eagerly with the story of how Mrs. Henderson, a charming and gracious figure in Capital society, had verbally and almost physically assailed Mme. Oumansky, wife of the then Russian ambassador to the United States, at a dinner party in the home of Joseph E. (Mission-to-Moscow) Davies.

The incident occured when the ladies had retired to the drawing room for after-dinner coffee. A horrified butler summoned Davies from his brandy, and an actual physical encounter was averted.

His anti-Soviet emotions are constantly cropping out

While Henderson's own anti-Soviet feelings are necessarily suppressed in public, his colleagues in the State Department are well aware that he shares his wife's personal reaction to the present Russian regime. His strong emotions on this subject constantly crop out in top-level staff meetings, even on details which do not fall within his own territorial sphere of influence. In several specific cases with which he was not directly concerned he has argued vehemently against granting visas for known Communists to enter—or leave—the United States.

Publicly, Henderson makes no secret of the fact that he has viewed world Communist activities with alarm for some 30 years. His early concern apparently sprang from a basic political conservatism, but in the present atmosphere of Washington this consistently held bias can readily be made to pass for keen foresight.

The Hendersons tend to associate with persons of similar views. One of his closest friends is Constantine Brown, venerable conservative diplomatic columnist for the Washington Star, who regularly indoctrinates his readers with the inevitability, if not the desirability, of an armed decision with Russia.

Enjoys all of his work, including the soirees

Mr. and Mrs. Henderson live unpretentiously at the Blackstone Hotel in Washington. They attend diplomatic social events, but as a rule only those relating to the Near and Middle Eastern countries which constitute Henderson's chief area of responsibility in the State Department. Henderson regards attendance at such affairs as a duty, but not necessarily as a chore. It is just another part of his work, all phases of which he enjoys.

The Hendersons share an interest in music. He studied violin from the age of 6 until 16 and became more than ordinarily proficient. He never touches the instrument now, because he cannot spare the time for regular practice, and he thinks there is nothing more unpleasant than poor violin playing. Their indulgence in music consists of attendance at concerts and an occasional evening of recorded music—usually the works of Brahms, Beethoven, or Tchaikovsky. They go to the movies only three or four times a year. Henderson likes "good" movies—a category from which he specially excludes tawdry musicals in technicolor.

A social smoker and drinker, has little time for exercise

Henderson is moderate in his self-indulgences. He smokes four or five cigars a week, usually in the afternoon when he has a visitor in his office. He never thinks of smoking when he is alone. Drinking is on a similar basis. He takes a social drink—preferably a dry martini—only when the occasion seems to call for it. He gets very little exercise. He has played golf from time to time in the past, but without ever taking the game seriously.

All of this adds up to the picture of a man who finds complete outlet for his energies in his work. Henderson arises at 6 and his normal day at the office is from 8 a. m. to about 7 p. m. He retires by midnight, and finds that 6 or 6½ hours' sleep a night is sufficient.

The extensive State Department organization over which Henderson presides is a remarkably tight-knit unit of men who agree generally with each other and with the chief. Its ideological and political orientation has changed little under Henderson; his predecessor as head of the office, Wallace Murray, was a Foreign Service officer of very similar views.

His staff joins in calling for friendship with Arabs

The Near Eastern and Middle Eastern Divisions of his office are packed with men who share Henderson's outlook on the world in general and on the overriding importance of our relations with the Arabs in particular. Many of the east Asian specialists are sons of missionaries who labored long in Arab territory. To them Beirut is the capital of Arab nationalism and a crucial zone in the world diplomatic struggle. They have grown up to believe that there is, as one of them is reported to have observed, no point in risking our friendship with 80,000,000 Arabs for the sake of a few thousand Jews.

This attitude is deeply engraved in the minds of most of Henderson's colleagues in the Near Eastern Division, in which the counterbalancing influence of pro-Zionist partisans is notably lacking. The explanation—if one were ever made—of the virtual exclusion of Jewish employees from the division would probably be that they are likely to suffer from bias. And it would be strongly emphasized that there was nothing personal in this comment.

In the past, anti-Zionist voices in the State Department have skillfully exploited the divisions among Jewish organizations as justification for American apathy, and this tendency still continues. Henderson, for example, is now inclined to attribute Arab intransigence to the agitation of Jewish revisionists, a comparatively small faction which spurns the UN partition plan and would like to extend the Jewish state to all of Palestine and Transjordan.

He has been known to suggest that there would be infinitely greater chance of a peaceful conclusion of the Palestine strife if the Arabs were convinced that the Jewish homeland would be permanently confined within the boundaries laid down by the United Nations. Meanwhile, Henderson fears that if there should be any armed clash between Americans and Arabs over Palestine it would embitter relations between this country and the Arab world for generations.

MAN IN THE SADDLE: ARABIAN STYLE—4

GREEKS MUST HAVE A WORD FOR HENDERSON'S ENTHUSIASM

(By Charles Van Devander and James A. Wechsler)

WASHINGTON.—For 25 years Loy Henderson has served in widely scattered areas of our diplomatic network. He has accumulated a substantial body of fact, local lore, and incidental intelligence. He has not been subject to congressional cross-examination, campaigns for reelection, or any other grueling review.

He is a member of the United States foreign-service "club," one of the most tightly knit mutual protective associations ever formed anywhere. He has seen Cabinets, Secretaries of State and department heads rise and fall.

In most other areas of Government his own fortunes would have been affected by these fluctuations. But while the State Department changes at the top and bottom (there was, for example, an influx of young liberals into lower-echelon places during the war) it remains extraordinarily constant in the crucial middle. That is where the civil-service career men hold sway.

And the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, which Henderson took over in April of 1945, after two wartime years in the relative oblivion of Iraq, is peculiarly loaded with members of that fraternity.

Two big diplomatic fights involve his department

In the ensuing 2½ years, Henderson's division has been intimately involved in two of the fateful diplomatic battles of the postwar era—the Greek crisis and the fight for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. The record of his deeds in these affairs is not spelled out in public communiqués. In accordance with State Department protocol, he formally depicts himself as an agent carrying out orders shaped by men of higher rank than himself.

These reticent disclaimers are not entirely justified. For the fact is that, in the long and decisive intervals between top policy decisions, day-to-day judgments are made, cables are dispatched, answers to inquiries are drafted. Even if a superman were designated Secretary of State he could scarcely be expected to read and review all the documents that are sent out under his name.

Both the Secretary and the Under Secretary must perforce rely on division heads for guidance and information as well as for the performance of carefully defined chores. With the advent of Secretary Marshall this dependence was increased; the Secretary would be the first to admit that he had not been briefed on all the complex facts of international life before he took office. Unlike former Secretary Byrnes, Marshall does not attempt to carry the State Department in his brief case.

His enthusiasm centers on our role in Greece

Just what part Henderson played in the formulation of the so-called Truman doctrine of aiding Greece and Turkey to resist Communist encroachments is not a part of the public record; presumably it was substantial. In any event, he has accepted the Truman doctrine, with its scarcely hidden threat that this country might use force to preserve Greek and Turkish national integrity, with an enthusiasm that has not always characterized his views of high policy as laid down by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Henderson is much less alarmed over the prospect that United States troops might have to be sent to Greece than he is, for instance, over the possibility of their employment against Arabs in Palestine; which he thinks would be a major tragedy.

Opinions differ as to his real position

Evaluations of Henderson's role in the execution of some phases of the Greek-aid program differ markedly in the Capital. For example there are those who regard him as a supporter of the rightist government, but men who were identified with Paul Porter's early economic mission found to their avowed surprise—that the head of the Near Eastern Office appeared sympathetic to the desperate need for economic reconstruction and reform in Athens as a corollary of our anti-Communist stand.

Last autumn Henderson flew to Greece to iron out a sharp clash between members of ex-Governor Griswold's administrative group and the embassy crowd over the extent to which we should unofficially insist on a broadening of the Government and a clean-up of corruption. He is credited here with being instrumental in bringing the elderly Liberal leader, Themistocles Sophoulis, into the Government as Premier. But whether this was an actual concession by the ruling bloc in Athens, or whether Sophoulis merely became a prisoner of the rightists are matters of current controversy.

The greater question is whether Henderson and his prototypes in the State Department have really accepted the concept to which they so often pay lip-service—the notion that effective resistance to communism requires a genuine tolerance of non-Communist leftists who may be committed to varying degrees of social change.

Historically our emissaries abroad have wined and dined with kings and rarely felt the common touch. They have tended to identify American interests with maintenance of the economic status quo everywhere. In the light of his background in that service an address which Henderson delivered last October on some current problems of modern Greece may be revealing.

He challenges aspersions on Greek politicians

After declaring that the people of Greece still cherish the ideals of tolerance and democracy, he went on:

"This spirit of liberalism is not the monopoly of any Greek party or group. It is deeply imbedded among both royalists and republicans and in most of the political parties of the present parliament regardless of whether such parties are in the center or to the right or left of center."

In the same address, Henderson challenged the widespread American belief, which he is inclined to attribute to skillful Communist propaganda, that most Greek politicians are venal. He agreed that there are some unworthy politicians "in Greece as elsewhere," but he added emphatically:

"I have come back from Greece with the firm conviction that among the political leaders of that country can be found the same spirit of lofty patriotism and broad statesmanship as exists among political leaders in the United States or in any other country the government of which rests upon the freely expressed will of the population."

Steeped in classics, puts finger on changes

For an appropriate comment on that statement one can turn to the Saturday Evening Post's correspondent Demaree Bess, who in the January 3 issue wrote with scornful amusement of Americans who got along so well with Greek Government politicians that they described them to me as just like our politicians at home. As most SEP readers know, Bess is anything but a leftist.

It has been mentioned earlier in this series that Henderson still enjoys reading the ancient classics and contemplating the change in mores since ancient times. One of the significant changes that he likes to point out is that the ancients judged men solely by what they did, while our law and custom gives major weight to the question of intent.

Henderson regards our modern standard as an advance in jurisprudence, but he still philosophizes, somewhat tritely, that a man who means well can do as much harm as one bent on evil. Time will show whether or not that may be for himself a fitting epitaph.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with what has been said before that this legislation is worth while. It is good legislation. It should have been passed immediately after the conclusion of the war rather than at this late date, in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, a number of Members of the House have indicated a great deal of interest in the passage of legislation that will bring about a definite policy with reference to alien property. I have spoken to quite a number of the Members. Often it is said that this is a complicated subject, which is true. It is one of the most complicated subjects to handle, if the individual Members of Congress undertake to be fair to all concerned, but because it is complicated is no reason why the Congress should not undertake to solve it in a just and equitable way.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], for the good work he has done in the past on this question. I am aware of the fact that long before most of us were paying much attention to the enemy-property problems he was doing a very substantial and constructive work with reference to this important subject.

The policy that we shall have as our own with reference to alien property, if this legislation passes, will be a just and fair policy. Much has been said about confiscating property. We are not confiscating any property. The property already is the property of the American Government. It is our job now to try to handle it in a fair and just way, being fair to everyone who feels he has an interest in this particular property.

Let us examine for a moment some of the values of property which our Alien Property Custodian contends we now have in our alien-property fund.

The report to which I refer was issued March 7, 1947. It showed that we have in round figures $205,000,000 worth of German property; Japanese property of $56,000,000; Italian property of $17,000,000; Hungarian property of $2,000,000; Rumanian property of $1,000,000; Bulgarian property of about $600,000, and over $4,000,000 of property of nationals of formerly enemy occupied countries, making a total of some $288,000,000. Of course some Italian property is in the process of being returned. That is a good deal of property which this Government already has title to.

Now, with reference to the question of claims, I have a clipping here which illustrates the kind of claims that are sometimes advanced. This headline says, "Swiss firm sues United States for release of $4,000,000." I will just read a part of it:

A Swiss firm said to be controlled by Germans asked the district court yesterday to compel the Justice Department to release securities said to be worth more than $4,000,000. A court injunction was asked by the trustees for Henkel & Cie., of Basil, Switzerland. The company said the securities were seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act. However, the company contends it is not controlled by enemies as defined in the act.

I want to make this point at this time. Of course, a person who is seeking to recover enemy property today is not going to admit that he is an enemy of this Government. No. When he undertakes to get it back he comes as a friend. He comes alleging it was a mistake for our Government to have taken over his property. Of course, with a good deal of property available there are going to be hundreds of smooth and smart people coming in and presenting claims. You cannot censure anybody that has even a remote chance to recover for presenting a claim against a sum of money of around $300,000,000. So the claims are coming in again as they did at the conclusion of World War I.

What took place after World War I? That is very significant with reference to enemy property. Incidentally, may I say at this point that in March and August 1946—I feel sure the dates are correct—laws were enacted on the statute books whereby our Alien Property Custodian could return enemy property and already he is giving enemy property back. With reference to what took place after World War I, I think you will find it mighty interesting to note this. Our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], a very able man, presented before the Congress not long ago a bill which has just been passed recently. The report has this significant paragraph in it. This bill, mind you, was before our committee in July:

The purpose of the Reed bill, H. R. 4043, as amended, and reported by the committee, is to change the order of the remaining unpaid priorities under section 4 of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 so as to place claims arising out of World War I of American citizens ahead of German claims.

That is a significant statement. The Congress had to pass a law with reference to World War I as late as July of 1947 to place the claims of American citizens ahead of German claims. How the Congress back in the years gone by ever came to the conclusion of placing its own citizens at a disadvantage to the citizens of a country that we fought, I cannot understand. But we had to do it; we passed the law to which I refer in 1947. What was said with reference to that legislation by its proponents?

German nationals as a result of World War I made claims against the United States for about $650,000,000 as compared with $1,500,000,000 of American claims against Germany. The claims of German nationals were allowed to the extent of $453,000,000 as compared with $275,000,000 allowed to American nationals on their much larger claims, and German nationals have actually been paid approximately $409,000,000 as compared with only about $173,000,000 to American nationals.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. While the gentleman is talking about World War I, what is the effect, the intent, or the purpose of extending at this time the provisions of section 203 (a) to war claims arising out of World War I?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am not sure I understand the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. I am referring to page 4 of the bill. Title II is entitled "War Claims Act of 1947," which is the subject of the legislation that is presently proposed. Section 203 (a) proposes to authorize the Commission that is established hereby to submit information also with respect to war claims arising out World War I. What is the point of it?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Some claims of American citizens have not yet been settled, claims which arose out of World War I. That is just exactly what the Reed bill was trying to get at—to give some American claims a preference over German claims they did not have.

Mr. MACKINNON. Claims against the United States Government?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No; claims against the German Government by American citizens.

Mr. MACKINNON. Does the gentleman believe there is any possibility of recovering any money on these claims?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I do not know. We passed the Reed bill in July of last year, undertaking to help American citizens in that connection. Yes, I feel this legislation stands a chance to help American claimants to which the gentleman refers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

I want to read a little bit more from Mr. REED'S statement. Speaking before our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] said:

I call attention to the fact that following the passage of the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, heretofore referred to, and the release of the bulk of the property pledged for the American awards and claims, the United States concluded with Germany an agreement, heretofore referred to, known as the Debt Settlement Agreement of 1930 (45 Stat. 500). The United States under this agreement accepted German Government bonds, to be paid in 103 installments over a period of years, as evidence of Germany's indebtedness to American award holders and claimants and agreed "to accept the full faith and credit of Germany as the only security and guaranty for the fulfillment of Germany's obligations."

Germany paid only three of the 103 installments required to be paid by the Debt Settlement Agreement of 1930, its last payment being the installment due March 31, 1931.

Yes; I say it is incumbent on the Congress to take care of its own citizens who have claims against the nationals or against the governments that fought us. Under this legislation we can certainly do that.

I introduced a bill about 2½ years ago that included and would include our military personnel who suffered at the hands

of the enemy inhuman treatment. I definitely feel that the boys on Bataan who suffered inhuman treatment at the hands of the Japanese, and our soldiers in Germany and other European countries that suffered inhuman treatment at the hands of the Germans and others in European countries, should profit under the terms of legislation like this. Personally, if I had my way about the legislation, I would enable them to get something now. I think they deserve it. But this bill does better than nothing in that respect in that it gives them a chance to come before the Claims Commission and to present their claims. Of course that is not a lot of help. The fact that a person has a right to go before a Commission and present his side of something does not necessarily mean that he is going to get anything to satisfy his claim. One thing I hope for, however, by the terms of the legislation which we have before us is to retain in the bill an amendment which will stop the return of property "to American citizens and friendly nationals that had been vested under findings that it was owned by nationals of Germany"; also, I would like to do the same thing with reference to Japanese property. We passed alien-property bills in 1946, and, in my opinion, that was a great mistake, because already over $2,000,000 of property has been returned. As I pointed out when the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] was addressing the committee a while ago a bill was discussed before our committee that morning having for its purpose the return of alien property to a person who "has been or is deemed to be a citizen of the United States." Who knows whether it will pass? If enough weight is brought behind it, it might pass. As the situation stands today, we are actually giving back to so-called foreign friendly nationals property they contend is theirs and at the same time saying to our own civilians and our own servicemen, "You wait, we want to study this question, and maybe then we will give you a chance to adjudicate your claims." My amendment should remain in the bill in the interest of keeping this property intact and giving all legitimate claimants an even break. I might mention this, that at the beginning of World War I, we took over a certain enemy property. At the beginning of World War II, we again took over property from some of the same companies, mind you, the same companies. I hope we will not have to take it from some of those same companies a third time.

A way to prevent that is to be careful about the return of the property.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman's statement that we should retain in the bill the amendment which will keep the property intact until we can adjudicate those claims. But there is one thing that is not clear in my mind about this bill. We set up a Commission here to do something, but they do not have any power to adjudicate those claims, do they?

Mr. BECKWORTH. They do not. They just study them.

Mr. RIZLEY. Then what happens?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Well, you know what may happen or could happen. The same thing might happen as in the case of the study of a commission which made a report on transportation headed by a fellow named Webb, from Kentucky, with reference to freight rates. Nothing was ever done, which I regret. There is no guarantee that anything will happen. That is the reason I say that my original bill carried a provision, and I am still in accord with that original bill, which would definitely help our service people at this time and our civilians, too. As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] said, even though we shall pay or give emergency relief to a group of these people who suffered in the Philippines and on Wake, Guam, and Midway, yet we are not undertaking to say that we are adjudicating their claims at all by this legislation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would like to clear up one matter. On page 6, section 302, of the bill, we find the following:

> The term "civilian" means only a person who, at the time of the occurrence of the event which gave rise to a claim for benefits under this title, was a citizen of the United States.

I would like to know if the Filipinos before they obtained their independence were considered citizens of the United States and would therefore come under this title.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am not sure I can give you an accurate answer on that, but I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] to answer that question please.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Filipinos were not.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time at this time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman mean he has finished debate on his side?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No; I did not mean that. I simply meant I did not have any requests for time just now.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, we have used more time on this side than the gentleman has used. Will the gentleman use some of his time?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was being considered I appeared before the committee, because the committee was also considering the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and the bill which I had introduced, which would give the same relief to veterans who were prisoners of war of the Japanese that it would give to civilians.

As the bill has been reported out, I am very much disappointed that although the relief given by title III is very meager, nevertheless, the veterans who were prisoners of war have been left out. I propose to offer an amendment so as to give them some relief. Those veterans who served under the flag of the United States in the Philippines were made prisoners of war and were maltreated almost beyond description. For example, one of the boys from New Mexico who came back, was maltreated by the Japanese. While a prisoner of war and while he was unconscious, they drove a nail through the top of his head. Fortunately, he did not die, but returned to this country after being a prisoner of war for many, many months; but he suffered continuously. Finally, he was taken to the hospital in Denver and the doctors there X-rayed his head and found this nail right in the top of his head. They drew the nail out. The result was that he became paralyzed completely for a period of time. Fortunately, he has recovered the use of his hands, but he has suffered beyond description.

Like this youngster, there are any number of cases of boys who were prisoners of war in Japan. I do not understand why we are going to leave them out. It may be said that they have received from the Federal Government some relief, but where they have so received some relief, this bill will permit the administrator to deduct the amount that has been received.

I hope that when the time comes the amendment which I will offer will be accepted by the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman is under some misapprehension.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I hope I am. I hope they are included.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a matter of fact, as has been stated on the flocr before, this bill does not intend by its terms to provide for the payment of any reparation or any damages whatsoever. It provides for study of that question which is to be completed within 10 months and at the beginning of the next session of Congress a report will be made to the Congress concerning its recommendations about such things as priorities, standards, law, and, finally, legislation to provide for such priorities.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I understand that, and that is the reason I said the bill was not satisfactory. But, nevertheless, by title III you do give some relief to certain civilian internees, prisoners of war, but you excluded veterans from that category.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can assure the gengleman that the relief provided in title III for internees who were citizens of the United States in a lawful place, under the flag of the United States, is no more than has already been provided such people as are veterans, war contractors' employees, and others.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If the veterans have been paid a sum because of their suffering, it can be deducted under this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no payment in title III of the bill that has anything to do with suffering. This is relief to people—Americans—who are destitute and sick because of long internment, starvation, and maltreatment at the hands of our enemies. In no sense is this a reparations bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Call it injury if you will, but the veteran should be entitled to the same consideration.

Mr. HINSHAW. It is a disability payment just as the veteran's compensation is a disability payment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The veterans have not been paid disability payments commensurate with the suffering and injuries they received at the hands of the Japanese.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the veteran is found to have a disability that entitles him to compensation under the provisions of the present law he is taken care of, is he not?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Certainly, and under the bill those payments would be deducted and he would be paid only the difference between what he has received and what the administrators determines to be the amount due for the actual injury. As I say, the amount the Federal Government pays for disability does not begin to pay for the suffering they underwent.

Mr. HINSHAW. Neither will the amounts to be paid under this bill compensate for the damage suffered by civilians. The claims for damages and reparations of the military personnel and the civilian internees and all others constitute another subject that is provided for as best we may at present under title II.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as I have seen several times during the course of the discussion of this bill and its provisions, there is a considerable amount of confusion in the minds of many people as to whether reparations or damages for suffering for maltreatment and so forth will be paid to the internees, the civilian internees in the Philippines.

There is no such intent in the bill. They have a claim or will have a claim which they can make for damages for maltreatment similar to the claim that will be made by a member of the armed forces who found himself being horribly maltreated by the Japanese military. Title 3 merely provides that certain civilians who were on their lawful enterprises, on United States Territorial soil, under the flag of the United States, and who were in fact encouraged to remain there, who were not warned to leave, and who performed noble and valiant service of a different kind than military to the United States, who now find themselves destitute and homeless, in want and suffering, and dying—just as the other people who were placed in internment camps and prisons—are entitled to such relief as the United States can give them; but it is no greater certainly than the relief proposed for veterans of the war who had similar and even worse treatment, or for the employees of contractors of the Navy who have already been taken care of under another bill passed in 1943. It merely makes current the condition of the civilian internee. They have claims for damages for maltreatment. The veterans have damage claims for maltreatment. The employees of the contractors who were taken on Wake and Guam and elsewhere have claims for reparations and damages against the Japanese Government; and I trust and hope that those claims with all of the other varieties of claims for damages and reparations which will no doubt be presented to this commission will be considered and proper standards drawn for, let us say, the guidance of any court or any international reparations commission, and that furthermore, they will recommend to the Congress of the United States what shall be desirable on the part of our Government in the nature of additional reparations from the Japanese Government certainly, and perhaps also from the German Government, which is not now contemplated as receiving them.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in support of this bill presented here today. It is a good bill and, as the gentleman from Texas said, one that should have been enacted into law some time ago. I call attention to the fact that it is a technical bill. There are some phases of it that are somewhat difficult to understand but when we keep our thought on just what the bill proposes to do after all it is not so difficult to understand.

In the first place, there was something like $235,000,000 to $275,000,000 taken over by the United States on December 17, 1941, belonging to the Japanese and German Governments and the nationals of those governments. That money has been impounded. The question of what to do with it has arisen and, of course, up until now has not been definitely settled.

This bill proposes that the money shall be placed in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury of the United States. In other words, it becomes a part of the general fund out of which a determination later will be made as to what shall be done with it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has given a great deal of time and study to this important bill and the Nation is indebted to him for his efforts not only during this year but in the last session of Congress for bringing to the attention of the people the importance of this legislation and how this money should be expended in order to compensate those who we feel are justly entitled to receive it.

The question then arises as to the war claims commission, what kind of recommendations it will make and what will be done after those reports and recommendations have been made. It is important to remember, as I tried to bring out a few minutes ago in colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] that there is no intention whatsoever that this proposal will change or offer any indication of changing the compensation that veterans receive under veterans' laws. This would merely place them in the category of receiving consideration in dispensing of these funds of the German and Japanese Governments and their nationals for damages sustained and injuries suffered during the time they were interned and in many instances suffered grave disabilities.

Mr. Chairman, we then have the problem as to what claims will be registered against this fund. There is some indication that the claims will go far beyond the amount of money available. This bill provides that the commission shall make a report and the Congress will have at least 6 months to make a determination as to what claims shall be paid, to whom, the priorities, the amounts, and so forth, under an amendment which the committee adopted offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]. We might well keep in mind that at that time, according to the report here, it will be the prerogative of the Congress to determine if the Treasury of the United States will be called upon to pay not only the money that has been taken from the German and Japanese Governments and their nationals but any additional money that the commission might report and the Congress might determine justified to pay the entire claims presented to the commission. That is an important provision that the Congress should not overlook.

This provision and others that have been discussed are very well worth considering in adopting the policy contained in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of this matter I think it has become apparent to everybody that this is a matter of considerable complication. It is a bit obscure to try to find out what the very meat of this thing is. I will therefore try to address myself to two of the portions of the bill which perhaps are most obscure to me, in the hope that in illuminating my own mind I can, perhaps, assist some of you who, like me, are asking questions of yourselves.

In the first place let me say this, that after listening to the witnesses before the committee there was no doubt in the mind of any member of the Committee, but that there was a great need for legislation on this subject. My command of the English language is utterly insufficient to portray the cruelties, the tortures, the hardships, and the indignities that were heaped upon our nationals, civilian and military, in this war. There is a great variety in those just claims for wrongs done by the enemy. They are as different as day is different from night, and that is a very poor parallel. They are as diverse as the human mind could imagine.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has pointed out, the

committee felt that in order to classify these claims, and in order to get some rationality out of this situation, the claims should be classified by experts who are qualified so to do; men who could spend a considerable amount of time, certainly much more time than the committee could spend, to determine the categories of claims that should be allowed.

Accordingly, the bill provides that a commission shall be set up for that precise purpose of determining the categories of claims which ought to be allowed, and that the commission shall then report back to the Congress as to what further legislation ought to be passed to implement those categories and claims which they might designate. Admittedly that is a slow process and is not going to come to fruition right away.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. As a matter of fact, that commission will not be able to complete its work and report to this Congress. Whatever report it renders will be submitted to another Congress which might be of an entirely different frame of mind than we are.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That may be very true, but of course we have to act in the light of the information we have at this time.

Mr. GEARHART. That is the very reason why I am suggesting in my amendment that we confer jurisdiction upon the Federal courts and allow them to proceed to adjudicate these claims and render judgment. They can be adjudicated against the cash which will be on deposit in the Treasury.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will perhaps have something to say at the time the gentleman offers his amendment on that subject.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman believe, according to the language in the bill, that any claimant for a fishing boat, a fishing boat that was sunk by German submarines, would have a proper opportunity under this bill to make a claim?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman has suggested one of a very great number of claims that might be presented for this Commission to recommend to the Congress. That is what this committee, which passed upon this legislation and prepared it, felt it was not qualified to pass upon. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not have the time to go into all the ramifications and the great variety of claims that might be presented.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But the Commission, under the provisions of this bill, would have the right to recommend and consider such a claim.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes, and they come back to us, setting up the kind of claims and categories which they think should be considered as proper claims.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. We now come to a very important matter, and that is the question that was raised by our colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. He questioned the morality of taking the private property of alien citizens for the satisfaction of claims of American citizens as distinguished from claims of the Government.

Admittedly this is a very complex and difficult question. I have been able to convince myself that such a procedure is proper and morally correct, but I recognize quickly that there may be differences of opinion.

Let us consider it from the standpoint of whether it is morally objectionable for the United States Government to liquidate the assets now held or to be held by the Alien Property Custodian to be used for the claims of American citizens. In the first place, let it be said that from one standpoint there is no such thing as private property during time of war. Indeed, we nearly found that out in the United States, because our Government actually during the war periods, both in 1917 and 1941, took what it needed to carry on the war and to bring it to a successful conclusion. Most of us would recognize that as proper, whether morally right or not. The exigencies of the situation demanded it. We all know that there are few limitations on the power of the Government in time of war.

A rule which has been alluded to by the gentleman from Idaho in his discussion with another speaker on this subject originated, as I read history, back in the days when the Hanseatic League, a trading league in Europe, was in its ascendency, toward the end of the Middle Ages. The wars of those days were matters between petty principalities primarily and to a considerable extent were private affairs.

So the international law grew up that private property, particularly as it applied to members of the Hanseatic League and the merchants trading in that League, should be inviolate in time of war. But I call your attention to the fact that now, under the situation in which we now live, as our warfare is now carried on, there is no such thing as private property in the sense that it is not subject to the exigencies of war.

From the standpoint it is morally proper for the United States Government to take the property of Japanese or other enemy aliens and apply it to the legitimate claims of American nations to compensate them for the hideous wrongs which were perpetrated on them.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. GOFF. May I preface my remarks by saying that I favor the bill in general, but there are some doubts I should like to have removed? There is no question about the right to take private property due to the necessities of war, but there is an equally strong right to give just compensation for that particular property.

Mr. DOLLIVER. To my mind, the obligation to make just compensation for the taking of that private property rests not with the United States Government but with the enemy government. If there is a Japanese national whose property is taken from him by the United States in the exigencies of war, then the duty to compensate that Japanese national rests not with us but with the Japanese Government.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It occurs to me that the gentleman is perfectly correct in what he says, that if there had been any issue as to whether or not this Government has a right to take someone's property, that issue should have been resolved when the war began because, according to the Department of Justice in a letter written June 18, 1947, this is the current status of the property. If the gentleman will bear with me I will read just a short paragraph:

> The Department is unreservedly in favor of the principle of this title.

Reference is there made to title I of the bill.

> The property of enemy countries and enemy nationals vested by the Government is, under existing law, the property of the United States.

We are not taking anybody's property.

> The bill recognizes and states explicitly that the former owners of such property have no claim for its return.

That is the current situation today. The only claim they could have is what we might in our wisdom in the future give them.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman and thank him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, may I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that these claims which our citizens will have against the enemy countries will far exceed the conceivable amount which might be garnered from the private property of enemy nationals in this country.

The question therefore presents itself whether we should treat the enemy nationals in a way that we do not treat our own nationals and whether we should compensate enemy nationals first and our own nationals second, or, to put it in another way, whether we should put on the backs of the American taxpayers the burden for the compensation of our own nationals and relieve the enemy taxpayers from carrying that load.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I suggest to the gentleman that he remind the Members of the Congress that if perchance the United States had not won this war that the damages that would be paid by the United States in the form of reparations and things of that kind to the ones who might have been the victors, perhaps the Japanese, would be something out of this world. Practically all Americans would be indebted to the Japanese for the rest of their natural lives.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think the gentleman is entirely correct and thank him for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, one final aspect of this thing which I think is worth thinking about is that in recent months and years we have been called upon to assist some of our allies with loans and gifts. Some of us have said on the floor of the House that before we make any more gifts or loans we should require our Allies to liquidate the private holdings of their citizens in this country and apply that upon their needs. To my mind, there is considerable merit to such an argument.

But our failure to pass this kind of legislation and recognize the morality of this principle which is involved in this law would result in our compensating our enemies and penalizing our friends. We would require our Allies as a condition to our helping them that their citizens liquidate their holdings in the United States and at the same time return to our enemies' nationals their private holdings. We would give back to our enemies all the private property which we have taken and require our friends to liquidate all their private holdings in this country before they could get help from us.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Does not the gentleman feel that the Government of the United States was very careful before it took over anybody's property at the beginning of this war?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Of course. We have to rely upon the administrative agencies and the executive department to see that that is done. Personally, I have the same confidence that the gentleman has expressed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, most of the provisions of this bill have been pretty thoroughly discussed by other members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I voted to report the bill out of the committee and I believe it is good legislation, although I am frank to say that I do not think it deals adequately with the men and women who served in the armed forces and who were taken prisoners of war. I have no objection to the bill in its present form. It is perfectly all right with me to have this Commission study the problem, but I do not think the Congress should make payments dependent on certain assets that our Government has taken from enemy nationals or enemy countries for the funds with which to pay just compensation to those who served in the armed forces. I think that servicemen who were prisoners of war are in a category separate and apart from the civilian internees. I hope that before this proposed Commission has a chance to complete its study of this problem and make its report to the Congress that the Congress itself, will approve other legislation that I believe should come out of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Such legislation should make just and generous provision for those in the armed forces who were taken prisoners of war.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think the thought that is being expressed by the gentleman from Connecticut with respect to the rights of service men and women is one in which we all concur, so that if the language in the bill as now drawn does not sufficiently cover the subject to the gentleman's satisfaction, I am certain there will be no objection on the part of the committee in adding such language as would make it certain.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am glad the gentleman interrupted me. I did not intend to leave any impression of criticism of the committee or the bill. I said I voted for it, but I do not think this committee can deal with the problem thoroughly in the way it should be dealt with. It is perhaps a stop-gap. I certainly did not intend to be critical of the legislation. If I were, I would not have voted to report it out.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The veterans legislation which the gentleman has in mind, which would throw a presumption of disability in certain cases, a presumption which is not now granted by the Veterans' Administration, I think would be pretty much in order for the Veterans' Administration committee to bring out. I think I would be very happy to support such legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is exactly the thing that I wanted to express, that I think the Congress should write into law, so that the Veterans' Administration will have direct instructions, to grant a definite presumption of service connection for every man who was a prisoner of war for any length of time. Those men cannot prove that on a certain date they suffered from a certain illness. There were no records kept. They should not be called upon to offer any proof to the Veterans' Administration that the disability from which they are suffering today was in fact due to their term as a prisoner of war. They should be granted a very substantial rating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I welcome these last few minutes to make it clear that I am not finding fault with what this bill tries to do for men in the service, but rather to take advantage of the opportunity to express the hope that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will before this commission completes its work, come in here with legislation that will put these men in a class separate and apart from either other service men or civilians.

It is rather difficult to write into a law adequate provisions that will take care of physical suffering. I listened to the testimony of men who appeared before our committee who described the indignities and suffering that prisoners of war were subjected to in the Japanese prison camps. It was beyond human comprehension; but still there is a degree of suffering that is just about 100 percent, and we must not forget that there are men who were not prisoners of war who came back from the battlefields, who suffered year after year in Veterans' Administration hospitals, who had gangrene, and who had to lie in their beds and watch their flesh decompose and drop off their bones. That is suffering about all any human being can stand. It is pretty difficult to supply a monetary compensation for suffering. It certainly cannot be done by any amendment offered on the floor of the House to legislation under consideration.

So I hope the bill will be passed in the form in which it was reported from this committee. This committee has gone as far as it can in this matter. I hope that other committees will take up where we have left off and see that these men have justice for the suffering they have undergone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I feel rather strongly that if there is any opposition to this bill it is opposition based on misunderstanding of what the bill accomplishes and of what it fails to accomplish. I merely wish to direct my attention to title II of the bill which very emphatically does not make any provision whatever for the adjudication of claims. It provides only for a War Claims Commission to determine and recommend as to the character of claims which should be allowed and as to their priority and so on.

I wish particularly to call attention to the third paragraph on page 15 of the report which contains a letter from Douglas W. McGregor, the Assistant to the Attorney General, in which he comments on title II and says:

> This title recognizes that the problem of payment of war claims is a highly complex one. In view of the great number and variety as well as the agggregate amount of such claims, it would seem highly desirable that proposals for payment of them from public funds should be preceded by the careful study called for by the title. Aside from the problems of what claims should be paid and the equitable treatment of various types of claimants, with respect to priorities, ratable distribution, and the limitations on the interest and fees to be paid, there is involved the fundamental problem of the ultimate source and amount of the funds to be used for satisfaction. Moreover, the problem is intimately connected with the

reparations to be paid by the German and Japanese Governments and the burdens in general which the economies of those two countries may be expected to bear.

If an attempt is made to superimpose upon this legislation some provisions about the actual adjudication of claims, the attempt will, in my opinion, be subject to a point of order because that is not the subject matter of this bill. The War Claims Commission, when it gets around to reading its conclusions and reporting them, will, under a committee amendment to be offered, have until January 3, 1949, in place of the present date of March 31, 1948, found on line 7 of page 4. I repeat that when the War Claims Commission has done its work, then it must make recommendations to the Congress as to legislation which will fix the character of the claims to be allowed, the priorities in which they should be allowed, and the funds from which payment will be made. Then, and not until then, it seems to me, could Congress appropriately legislate machinery for the adjudication of those particular claims, whether in the district courts of the United States, as the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] desires, or in some special tribunal like that which adjudicated the so-called Alabama claims after the Civil War. All those questions require further legislation which cannot be enacted today and which should not be enacted today.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. SNYDER. In what time does the gentleman estimate we will be able to pay some of these claims after we go through all this machinery set up here and in further legislation and hearings on the merit of the claims?

Mr. HALE. If the War Claims Commission reports on January 3, then it ought to be possible in the next Congress to pass the necessary legislation regarding claims which will be recognized as valid and the machinery for the adjudication of those claims. Once that legislation is passed, adjudication and payment of the claims can be begun forthwith. I anticipate that some claims may be in shape to be proved immediately on the passage of appropriate legislation, while other claims, for one reason or another, not necessarily within the control of the claimant, may not be approved for many years. That has been the experience in all matters of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that the question of policy is eminently one that Congress will be called upon to pass on. Congress may in its wisdom elect to say that all claims against the United States or against the fund or whatever it may be shall be offered for proof and adjudicated before some specified date of limitation. That is a question of policy that we ought to consider at the appropriate time.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the question was raised, and it is a very important one and very timely, When will those claims be paid? Well, in the light of experience with claims commissions it can be safely said, that is, if this bill is adopted in its present form, they will, in all probability be paid to the grandchildren, the heirs of those who suffered the injuries and detriment upon which the claims are based. The claims of World War I, which were intrusted to another claims commission, have not been paid to this day. Claims arising out of World War I, to the extent of $100,000,000, remain unsatisfied up to this very moment. Such is the work of claims commissions.

I raise the question here, Mr. Chairman, is it necessary for us to create another commission of three, each at $12,000 a year, to perform a congressional function when there is already an available agency of the Government, one held in very high repute, the Federal judiciary system, which is right now ready and willing to accept the jurisdiction of the subject matter, to proceed to the adjudication of these enemy war-action claims? The purpose of my amendment is to accomplish a result within the lifetime of people now living. "Strangely radical," a bureaucrat would exclaim.

Mr. Chairman, let us do this through the Federal courts. I referred previously, and will incorporate in the RECORD at the proper time, a letter from a former Chief Justice of the United States, Harlan F. Stone, who has approved the procedure which I have incorporated in the amendment I shall offer to this bill. I have read to you, and there will be incorporated in this RECORD, a letter from the Chief Justice of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia in which approval of the court procedure method my amendment proposes is expressed. If the time available, and the patience of the committee would permit I could at this point list a most impressive group of eminent American jurists and publicists who likewise and with equal enthusiasm, endorse my proposal for court action rather than the slow and unsatisfactory claims commission method. However, if you reject my amendment and go through with this claims commission procedure, it merely means, my friends, that you have set up one more commission whose members will draw $12,000 a year, three men who will learn to like their jobs very, very much. They are required to report within 1 year. Well, that is fine, but I will tell you what they are more apt to do, if I know anything about commissioners and bureaucrats. At the end of the year they will come in and say that they have not been able to complete their work and therefore will ask Congress to extend their time, and they will keep on asking for extensions until the Congress grows restive. Then what will they recommend to the Congress of the United States? They will recommend the setting up of another claims commission to adjudicate the claims in accordance with the recommendations of the first commission. And then their friends will say that they should be appointed to the new claims commission because they are better qualified by experience and thorough-going knowledge of the subject they will go on when they are appointed to the new claims commission and they will be like Tennyson's babbling brook, as all claims commissions do, ad infinitum, on into eternity, and after a while the grandchildren of the claimants who, Lord knows, ought to have their claims satisfied right now, will probably get the money to spend on new, bright and shiny airplanes. No one will want jeeps in that distant day.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman will agree, will he not, that the life of the Commission is very definitely fixed at approximately 10 months, when a report must be made.

Mr. GEARHART. That I know, and I thank the gentleman for mentioning it, but if the gentleman had been listening, he would have known that I have already pointed that out very carefully. At the end of the year they will come in and recommend that they need a little more time and get themselves reappointed for another year, and then they will recommend that a new commission be set up and that they be appointed to it so that they can go on with the adjudications. You see, they will be experts by then.

That is the old, old gag, the thing which Members on this side of the aisle are supposed to be turning their backs upon; this forever setting up of commissions to do things that there is already an efficient and going arm of government ready to handle.

Do you not trust the Federal courts? I want to say to you that I trust the Federal courts, and I think every claimant who has a war action claim against the United States or any foreign power would be willing to submit his claim to the constituted judicial authorities of this great Republic of ours. Why not? Do you want this thing to go on forever and ever and ever?

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. Does the amendment that the gentleman proposes provide the standards that would govern the action of a court in determining the claim?

Mr. GEARHART. My amendment confers jurisdiction upon the courts and gives them the power to make such rules and regulations as they shall need to govern the procedure in these cases. It was approved as sufficient by Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Harlan Stone and by Chief Justice Laws of the District Court. It was approved in principle in a letter sent to me by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, when I incorporated the subject matter of this amendment in a bill which I introduced in a previous Congress. It was also approved

in principle by Secretary of State James Byrnes at a time when I had another bill up to the same effect, both saying, though, that they wanted the matter delayed, and we certainly have gotten 100 percent of the delay they requested. Years have rolled by, and the end is not yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEARHART. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. Is it not a fact that in most instances there is no legal authority to justify an award by the court for these claims, and Congress must adopt a standard by which the courts would be governed before they could render judgment? In most instances they automatically have to deny these claims because there is no legal authority for granting them.

Mr. GEARHART. With all due respect to the gentleman from California, whom I hold in very warm affection, I cite the expressions of the former Chief Justice of the United States and the present Chief Justice of the United States Court of the District of Columbia. They are ready to proceed under this legislation grant.

Let us do something now. Let us not set in motion a procedure which may never result in anything being achieved. Remember, the report of that Commission will not be made to this Congress. It will be made to another Congress, one which may be of an entirely different frame of mind than this. We know not what they may do, we know not how quickly they will act. We do not have the slightest idea whether they will act with expedition or whether it will allow this legislative subject matter to lie without action, as the three or four Congresses before this one has allowed this same question to lie in their dockets without any action at all. I plead with you, let us get action, and get action now, for these people who need it and need it so badly. My amendment would do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from California is a very distinguished member of the bar, and I am an engineer. I am not as cognizant of the procedures in the district court of the United States as he is, but as an engineer I can say to my lawyer friend that in any case standards must be applied. I do not know how many judges there are in the district court nor how many courtrooms there are where they meet, but it is a quite considerable number, from my observation. There are 8 or 10 of them in my own county, to my certain knowledge.

If these cases are to be brought before all of these judges, who is going to know, for example, how much money there will be available to pay off these claims? Suppose they allow claims in the total of $1,000,000,000. We know that we are covering into the Treasury by this bill $250,000,000. If someone does not examine the number of cases and the kinds of cases, and set standards for the awarding of damages, and so forth, there may be money to pay only the first few who put in their claims, and there may be none for the remainder.

Those are some of the matters that require study. It is not as though the United States Government itself were paying these claims as such. If we want to pay what the Japanese Government should pay for the maltreatment of our prisoners and the sinking of our ships and all the other things they, as a defeated nation may be held to account for, then we should be mighty certain that we are going to be able to have the money from the proper sources to pay all the claims and not just merely the first few that are filed.

That is one of the reasons why we require a commission to study this subject. The quality of the claims, the standards by which they should be adjudicated, the amounts that may be paid for personal suffering and loss, under the Geneva convention, for example, all of those things must be taken into consideration, and the claims should be handled in accordance with priorities, priorities to be established for, we will say, the veterans of Bataan and others who have suffered similarly, as being No. 1 for consideration by these courts, and not merely in the order of filing the dockets.

There are many things to be discussed here which my friend from California knows are exceedingly important.

It was the hope of this committee that this bill could be passed last July, that it would then have become law, and that the Commission which was to be established would have reported by March 31 of this year, so that before the end of this Congress we could have had the necessary law and establishment to apply to this subject. That was not possible. We therefore must extend it to the nearest date of which we can conceive as a possible legislative date beyond the appointment of the Commission, namely, January 3, 1949. For myself, if I am a Member of that Congress, I could say here that if that Commission fails to report with the proper legislation I would be happy to see the matter taken completely out of its hands and turned over to the appropriate committee of the Congress for spending its time, and a very long time it takes, to examine these claims and set up standards and priorities.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I do not know how it happened that the word "standards" was injected into this discussion, because "standards" is not a proper description.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not a lawyer. A standard is an engineering practice. It may be something else in the legal practice.

Mr. GEARHART. We use the word "standard" when we direct certain commissions created by Congress to do certain things.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish the gentleman would apply the correct term quickly as my time is limited.

Mr. GEARHART. I would have done so a long time ago if I had not been interrupted three times, so I trust the gentleman will not chide me for taking up his time.

The way this is done by this act and this amendment which I would introduce is by conferring jurisdiction upon the courts in these cases, just as the Congress has in other cases conferred jurisdiction upon the courts to hear, determine, and render judgment. That is covered in my amendment, if there is any doubt about it.

Mr. HINSHAW. In every case that the gentleman mentions, there are legal standards for the guidance of the court, a measure of damages that is established by law in accordance with long precedent. There are no precedents in this matter. There are no standards established, and it would be a hodge-podge job for the many district courts of the United States to try to resolve this question.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are no further requests for time, and unless the gentleman from Texas has any further requests for time, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate having been concluded, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 1. The Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 39. No property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country vested in or transferred to any officer or agency of the Government at any time after December 17, 1941, pursuant to the provisions of this act, shall be returned to former owners thereof or their successors in interest, nor shall the United States pay compensation therefor. The net proceeds remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of this act of any such property or interest therein shall be covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of the provisions of section 32 of this act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 13, insert as follows:

"SEC. 2. No property or interest therein shall be applied to the payment of debts, under the provisions of section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, during the period beginning with the date of the enactment of this act and ending 6 months after the date on which the report of the War Claims Commission, made pursuant to title II of this act, is received by the Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this being a committee amendment originally offered by the gentleman from Texas, may I suggest that he now speak if he

desires to do so in support of the amendment, as I would like to speak in opposition to it.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. If there is not going to be any support for this amendment, I would like to rise in opposition to it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment and do expect to advocate its passage, but if the gentleman desires to speak, he certainly has the right to rise in oposition to it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEARHART. As a point of information, Mr. Chairman, I am offering a substitute amendment to the committee amendment. Do I not have the right to offer it at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must first recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. This amendment was agreed to by a very small majority of the committee. I believe it was largely because we are so very fond of our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas. I personally could not support the amendment because I believe it is not in the interest of proper legislation. Certain of the Members have come to me, who joined in supporting the amendment, and have indicated that they would have another viewpoint at this time, and I know particularly the chairman of my committee has so authorized me to state. In addition, there is opposition on the part of the Department of State and the Department of Justice to this amendment. The matter was taken up with them last July while the committee print was still under consideration. I have letters from them under date of July 7 and 8, in which they oppose this amendment and another amendment which may be presented by the gentleman from Texas. I might read from a letter from the State Department:

> This is a matter primarily affecting the operations of the Department of Justice. It may be stated, however, that in view of the length of time already elapsed in which creditors have been denied payment of their claims, further delay of more than 1 year before consideration of payment of their claims may be taken would be undesirable.

Then, in the Department of Justice letter, similar words were used. Then they refer particularly to the words "inimical to the welfare of the United States." The Department says, "It will be very difficult to define, except in the most extreme cases, and which would operate in many cases to penalize conduct which at the time when it occurred was lawful under the laws of the United States." Then it refers to other matters.

Therefore, I would be personally in opposition to the amendment. I think the committee is about evenly divided.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, practically every person who has been on the floor today has said he believes these claims should be adjudicated. I made the statement originally that, in my opinion, this legislation should have been passed long ago. It should have been. The trouble is that today property is being returned, and the veterans of Bataan cannot even submit their claims. I repeat, today property is being returned and the veterans of Bataan cannot even submit their claims. There is nobody to whom they can submit them.

To whom is the property being returned? According to a table which I placed in the RECORD, January 20, 1948, it is being returned in the following manner:

> Property returned to American citizens and friendly nationals that had been vested, under findings that it was owned by nationals of Germany.

Of course, people are coming before the Alien Property Custodian today and saying, "I am a friend of America." Why? Because they want their property back. That is what they did after the First World War, and the Germans got 80 percent back and many Americans do not have their World War I claims satisfied today.

I say to you it is not consistent with the policy of the legislation we have before us today to continue to give back this property, as we are doing.

One of the firms, at the conclusion of World War I, that got property back, was the General Aniline & Film Co. At the beginning of this past war it had its property taken over again, if I understand correctly. Let us see who is getting some property back, according to the tables supplied me by the Alien Property Custodian. Some examples are: 1. First National Bank of Chicago, $30,-861.64; 2. Maurice Stern, 1,734 shares of common stock General Aniline & Film Co., $109,000; 3. Leopold H. P. Klotz & North American Investment Co., $457,000. We find one R. E. Stern got back 1,734 shares of that property, worth $109,000. What kind of property is this, in most cases, anyway? Let me read to you a little bit of it. The Alien Property Custodian compiled this statement:

> Continental Hendel Bank, $5,000,000 claim already filed.

Here is another one for $201,230, filed in behalf of a Swedish concern.

Here is another one for $215,000, filed in the interest of a Swedish concern.

Just as companies and people did after World War I, they are getting it back again, while we are compelling our veterans of Bataan to wait; while we are compelling our citizens to wait. We should make everybody wait—including those who were dealing with the enemy in such a way that this country of ours had to take over their property at the beginning of the war. If you want to be fair to the veterans of this country, if you want to be fair to the civilians of this country who have not yet received a penny, you will certainly keep in this legislation the committee amendment. Many veterans suffered inhuman treatment in the Philippines and in Japan and in Germany and other European countries. I have letters in my files which describe that treatment. The prisoner or the civilian has to wait while these people are getting back sums of money as I have described. How this can happen I cannot understand. I certainly hope the Members of this Congress will see fit to retain this important amendment in the legislation before us.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GEARHART as a substitute for the committee amendment in the bill: Insert a new section to be known as section 2, as follows:
>
> "SEC. 2. (A) No property or interest therein shall be applied to the payment of debts, under the provisions of section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411) as amended, nor shall any part or any portion of the proceeds from the sale or disposition of property or any interest therein of Germany or Japan or any national of either of such countries covered into the general fund of the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts be applied to the satisfaction or reduction of any claims of American nationals save and except pursuant to a judgment or judgments sought and obtained in the manner and in the form as in this title provided.
>
> "(B) The United States district court for the district wherein the claimant is resident, including the United States district courts for the Territories and possessions of the United States, sitting without a jury, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on claims of American nationals, their heirs and legal representatives, in respect of damage or injury inflicted upon their persons, property, rights, or interests, by measures of enemy governments, including acts of force, violence, or duress, or legislative, administrative, judicial, and other measures, undertaken or enacted after January 1, 1931, including (but not limited to) all personal injury and death claims arising out of maltreatments of former prisoners of war by the Governments of Germany or Japan, their armed forces, or their nationals, in violation of the International Convention Relating to Treatment of Prisoners of War, signed at Geneva, Switzerland, on July 27, 1929, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States, Germany, Japan, and other nations therein represented: *Provided*, That such jurisdiction shall not extend to claims for loss, damage, personal injuries, or death, with respect to which compensation is authorized under other laws of the United States.
>
> "(C) The clerk of United States district courts in each district shall certify to the Congress, at the beginning of each new session of the Congress, the judgments of the court with respect to such claims, for such action as the Congress may deem advisable.
>
> "(D) (a) The United States district courts in the several districts are authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out their functions under this act.
>
> "(E) The Attorney General is authorized and directed, upon the request of any district court, to appoint a law officer to aid the court in the performance of its functions under this act and to protect the interests of the United States.
>
> "(F) Every claim cognizable under this act shall be forever barred, unless within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this act, it is presented in writing to the United States district court having jurisdiction of such claim pursuant to this act, in accordance with the rules and regulations of such court."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment and desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman from Maine is talking about the substitute, is he not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will answer by stating that he is.

The Chair will hear the gentleman from Maine on his point of order.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane to the subject matter of the bill. If it were germane either to the title of the bill or to any part of the bill it would presumably be with respect to title II with the provisions of which it is entirely inconsistent. Neither the title of the bill nor the language of title II purports to make any provision at all for the adjudication of claims. Title II purports simply to set up a commission to recommend to Congress what claims shall be received as valid in whatever tribunal shall be determined upon to pass upon them, the priority of the claim, the funds from which payments shall be made once the claims have been adjudicated valid, and so on.

The whole machinery suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is machinery which could be set in motion only after the Congress had laid down a basic law as to what claims should receive favorable consideration. That is a question of policy that this Congress must fix before any question of adjudication can arise. The amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], as I understand it, relates only to the question of adjudication.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] desire to be heard?

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, the bill provides ultimately for the payment of claims against German and Japanese nationals in accordance with a formula not clearly defined in the bill, but the bill in general does deal with the subject of claims arising against alien enemies and their property.

Title I provides for the disposition of money derived from that source—alien property—and this addition to title I merely directs in detail an ultimate disposition of that same property. Title I creates the deposit, and my amendment merely provides a method of withdrawal.

Title II provides for an investigation, that is true, but title III contemplates an ultimate payment of claims. My amendment most certainly complements and completes that which title II leaves loose in space.

My amendment is most certainly germane to title III, as that title does provide for the adjudication and payment of a certain type of war-action claims out of the former property of enemy aliens.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, my amendment is germane to the bill the Committee now has under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

If the substance of the matter set forth in the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] were introduced as a separate bill in the House of Representatives, it would, of course, be immediately referred by the proper authority to the Judiciary Committee for consideration. There is, of course, a relation between everything contained in the gentleman's substitute and the matter contained in this bill; however, the gentleman seeks to set up a completely new agency which is recognized in the Constitution and is recognized in legislative procedure as an institution unto itself, with its own jurisdiction fixed by law. The gentleman seeks to place the material of this bill under the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, which would be a matter not within the jurisdiction of the committee having charge of this bill.

For that and other reasons, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the committee amendment which I and other Government departments oppose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment appearing on page 2.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I wish the Chair would state clearly what the vote is. I would like it fully understood that the committee amendment is in the bill and we would be voting to strike out the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote is on the committee amendment as printed in the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 29, noes 5.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "War Claims Act of 1947."

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

SEC. 202. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the War Claims Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of three persons to be appointed by the President. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 a year. One of such members shall be designated by the President as chairman of the Commission. Two members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Any vacancy that may occur in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of an original appointment.

(b) The Commission may employ a secretary, and such legal, clerical, and technical assistants as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

(c) The Commission is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this title, including regulations covering the filing with it of war claims.

(d) The Commission shall cease to exist at the expiration of 1 year after the date on which a majority of its members first appointed take office, but the President may by Executive order fix an earlier expiration date. Upon expiration of the Commission, all books, records, documents, and other papers in the possession of the Commission shall be deposited with such department or agency of the Government as the President may designate.

INQUIRY AND REPORT WITH RESPECT TO WAR CLAIMS

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission shall inquire into and report to the President, for submission of such report to the Congress on or before March 31, 1948, with respect to war claims arising out of World War I or World War II, and shall present in such report its findings on—

(1) the estimated number and amount of such claims, classified by types and categories; and

(2) the extent to which such claims have been or may be satisfied under international agreements or domestic or foreign laws.

(b) The report of the Commission shall contain recommendations with respect to—

(1) categories and types of claims, if any, which should be allowed and the legal and moral bases therefor;

(2) the administrative method by which such claims should be adjudicated and paid, and any priorities or limitations which should be applicable; and

(3) any limitations which should be applied to the allowance and payment of interest or fees in connection with such claims.

(c) The Commission shall include in such report recommendations as to the policies which, in its judgment, should be followed in the national interest with respect to the application of any property or interest vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian, or the proceeds thereof, to the payment of debts owed by the persons who owned such property or interest immediately prior to such vesting or transfer, and shall make such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out such recommendations.

(d) The Commission shall include in such report (1) such other recommendations as it deems appropriate, and (2) such proposals for legislation as it deems appropriate for carrying out the recommendations made in such report.

(e) Such report, with accompanying evidence, shall be printed as a public document when received by the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW (interrupting the reading of the section). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the section be dispensed with and be printed in the RECORD, and that the Clerk read the amendment which has been offered on behalf of the committee to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW as a committee amendment: On page 4, line 7, strike out "March 31, 1948" and insert "January 3, 1949."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 4, line 8, after the comma at the end of

the line, insert the following: "including particularly, but not limited to, claims on account of abuse, starvation, and other forms of mistreatment of prisoners of war in violation of the provisions of international agreements or the laws and customs of war or principles of international law."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this amendment concerns members of the armed forces who as prisoners of war were victims of atrocities during the period of World War II. In discussing this amendment I am reminded of my assignment by the commander in chief of the forces of the Southwest Pacific to proceed to Manila and report to a congressional committee headed by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Before the gentleman goes further, I would like to say to him that the committee has considered his amendment and believes that it is a very worthy one, and agrees entirely that it should be adopted as a part of this bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman.

While in Manila with this congressional committee it was my privilege to visit personally with the members of the armed forces who had been prisoners of the Japanese, and who were at that time returning to their homes in the United States, many of them for hospitalization. Like many who served in World War II, I know what a broken body looks like, but to me the most ghastly sight that I witnessed during the war was the condition of these boys as they passed through Manila en route home. Never in the history of warfare have so many atrocities been committed, especially the type of atrocities that the Japs inflicted on our men. When talking to these liberated prisoners of war I solemnly vowed that if it was my privilege to return to the Congress of the United States I would see to it that legislation would be introduced and considered for their benefit.

It was my privilege to come back to this Congress after my service in World War II, and to introduce H. R. 1000 early in the Eightieth Congress. The committee was kind enough to consider H. R. 1000, but during the discussion of the bill it developed the matter was so highly complicated it was beyond the ability of the committee to perfect the bill. Realizing this, a resolution was then introduced, known as House Joint Resolution 173, incorporating practically the same language contained in title II of H. R. 4044 now under consideration. It is of title II that I wish to refer to at this moment.

First, I want to commend the committee for their action in adopting title II. As a matter of fact, they are to be commended for the entire bill. The provisions of title II will give to these former prisoners of war who were so brutally treated by the Japs an opportunity to file their claims, after a commission has been created and the necessary machinery perfected, to process such claims.

If the recommendations of this Commission are accepted by Congress these veterans will receive payment of their claims.

For your information let me read from the hearings on H. R. 4044 a statement attributed to William Horabin, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., a former prisoner of war in which he recites the horrible treatment he received at the hands of the Japanese. I read from page 359 of the committee hearings:

Our boat moved from Davao to Zamboanga Harbor. Then we lay in that harbor for 18 days without leaving the hold or receiving any explanation from the Japs. On the eighteenth day we left Zamboanga for Manila. Three days later at 4:30 p. m. an American submarine sent two torpedoes into our ship, which was in no way marked as a prisoner-of-war ship. The suffering and agony that followed is indescribable. The Japanese immediately turned their machine guns on the trapped men in the hold and dropped hand grenades on them. A few men, including myself, escaped through a crack in the ship's hull that had been caused by the concussion of the explosion and a few more forced their way out through the hold entrance. Many men reached the water only to be killed by rifle and machine-gun fire from the remaining ships in the convoy or were hunted down in motor launches and killed with the stroke of a saber.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I commend the gentleman on the work he has done to help the veterans. As I understood, this amendment also takes in the soldiers who suffered atrocities in Germany and other European countries?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Many of the atrocities these men suffered were just as violent as some of the ones the gentleman has described.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They were probably as violent, but there were not as many of them.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered provides that when the Commission established in title 2 reports to Congress through the President, such report shall definitely designate that claims arising from abuse, starvation, and other forms of mistreatment of prisoners of war shall have priority over all other claims. Let us remember that these boys who were prisoners of war and victims of cruel and barbarous treatment are still broken in mind and body from such a terrible experience. Knowing Congress as I do and since Chairman HINSHAW of the committee informed us there was no objection to my amendment I sincerely hope that it will receive unanimous approval.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is the gentleman's definite purpose by the amendment he offers, and which I wholeheartedly support, to include within the word "abuse" abuse amounting to death, such as where a man has been beheaded, and things of that character?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. His dependents would be involved then.

Mr. MACKINNON. You intend by your amendment that that class of case should be specifically covered.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right, and the dependents would take their place alongside of the veteran and be given priority in the report submitted by this Commission relative to claims that should be paid or recognized.

Mr. MACKINNON. I just wanted to make that clear, Mr. Chairman, that that group of cases was covered by the gentleman's amendment. I have such a case in my district.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the committee adopted a committee amendment to title I, section 2, the effect of which will be to prevent the payment of adjudicated claims to American nationals. It is indeed unfortunate that this amendment was adopted. It has the effect of repealing the law that the Committee on the Judiciary reported during the last session after very careful consideration and after unanimous action by the committee, which was passed by the Congress.

I call your attention to the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary last year in which it was stated that the purpose of the bill and the amendment to the First War Powers Act was to provide machinery for paying claims of creditors against the former owners of vested properties on an equitable basis to the extent that the assets vested from each debtor permit.

The adoption of this amendment prevents the payment of claims that have been long outstanding, claims of American nationals against the property vested by the Alien Property Custodian. Unless when we get back into the House, the action heretofore taken is rejected, it is going to mean that the Alien Property Custodian will never wind up his work. I distinctly remember in 1932 when I first came to Congress there were literally hundreds of cases in the office of the Alien Property Custodian that should have been terminated. It was with that experience in mind that the Committee on the Judiciary, after long and thorough hearings at which representatives of the Department of State and the Department of Justice testified, unanimously reported this measure. I trust that you will give consideration to the rights of American citizens in this property at the proper time and when we get back into the House reject this amendment when the opportunity is given you for such action.

I yield to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I was necessarily momentarily absent from the floor when this amendment was considered. I agree wholeheartedly with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said. I do hope that the House in its wisdom will take action different from that which was taken by the Committee a minute ago.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; I am certain that the amendment was not considered as

thoroughly as it should have been because we must bear in mind that ever since the Alien Property Custodian started to function, he was looking to the day when the legitimate claims of American nationals could be paid, in part at least. If this amendment is permitted to stand, it is going to place a premium in the hands of those who have already acted. The disposition of claims will not be made equitably and it will be a case of first come, first served. Certainly, as the committee pointed out in its report, all of our people will not be fairly dealt with.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just preceded me would seem to indicate that only American citizens are denied the right of getting their property back under the amendment which has just been adopted. I do not think that is quite the fact. I think that foreign friendly nationals likewise can get property back today. The amendment does not repeal anything. It does not repeal a single law. It simply causes American citizens and foreign friendly nationals, who had property that was taken over by our enemy property custodian at the beginning of World War II, to wait like the boy who fought on Bataan must wait, and like the civilian must wait, until this whole thing is settled. It takes these classes out of a preferred position. It does not permit a foreign national, for example, to be in a preferred class compared to an American citizen.

The gentleman refers to what the Department says. Let us see what the Department says. I am referring to the Justice Department. In one place it says:

> The Department is unreservedly in favor of the principle at this time—

Talking about title I—

> that property of enemy countries and enemy nationals vested in the Government is, under existing law, the property of the United States. The bill recognizes and states conclusively that the former owners of such property have no claim for its return.

Not a bit in the world do they have any claim for its return. Now, let us find out how complicated this whole issue is, why the entire matter should be carefully studied. I further quote from the same letter that the Justice Department wrote our chairman June 18, 1947; the quoted part refers to title 2;

> This title recognizes that the problem of payment of war claims is a highly complex one. In view of the great number and variety as well as the aggregate amount of such claims, it would seem highly desirable that proposals for payment of them from public funds should be preceded by the careful study called for by the title. Aside from the problems of what claims should be paid and the equitable treatment of various types of claimants, with respect to priorities, ratable distribution, and the limitations on the interest and fees to be paid, there is involved the fundamental problem of the ultimate source and amount of the funds to be used for satisfaction. Moreover, the problem is intimately connected with the reparations to be paid by the German and Japanese Governments and the burdens in general which the economies of those two countries may be expected to bear.

I said that this bill should have been passed long ago, and it should. The Judiciary Committee passed enemy property legislation in 1946. It was my contention at the time that one their bills passed the House that not enough attention was given to the over-all subject. You will find that I was on the floor and said I was opposed to the legislation. That was in December 1945. There was not a treaty written at the time; but they brought in legislation and passed it through the House of Representatives in 1945, which was only a little after war had been concluded, and this is 1948, when American citizens are coming in here asking for a chance to be heard with reference to their claims; not to get any property back; and the interesting angle about this whole thing is that while a man is pleading for a chance to get his property back, to be reimbursed for inhuman treatment at the hands of the enemy, here come some people who day by day are getting their property back—some not even citizens of this country. So I say to you this provision should be kept in the bill. In fairness to whom? Not foreign nationals. What does this table say that I put in the RECORD on January 20, 1948?

Property returned to American citizens and friendly nationals that had been vested under findings that it was owned by nationals of Germany.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman is talking about a bill that was reported in 1945. We are talking about two different things. I am talking about the bill approved August 8, 1946.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The bill I am talking about was approved in 1946. Were there not two of them?

Mr. WALTER. One in 1945 and one in 1946.

Mr. BECKWORTH. No. Both of them were in 1946; one in March and one in August. If I am not mistaken, the House passed the bill that became law in March, in December 1945.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. According to the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], a moment ago, that the committee amendment would repeal provisions of the law referred to, this does not repeal any law. Does it not merely suspend payment and operation of that law until 6 months after the Claims Commission has made its report?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is right. Some of these claims are for as much as $5,000,000. As I recall, one firm has already recovered nearly $1,000,000 and one person $100,000. What this does is to put all American citizens and friendly nationals on the same basis. Let us study this thing and see how much each who has a just claim can ultimately recover.

If that is unfair, I do not know what fairness means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request and again ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, and the bill be considered as read.

Mr. HINSHAW. Just a moment. I think that is a prerogative of this side. To start with, we were giving a couple of Members the opportunity to offer amendments in due course.

The CHAIRMAN. There being objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 204. For the purpose of this title the Commission is authorized to hold hearings and to conduct investigations, and to make full use of pertinent information, including war claims or statements relating thereto, available in other departments or agencies of the Government. The President may designate an existing department or agency which shall furnish the Commission with such administrative services as may be required. Department and agency heads are authorized to assign for temporary duty with the Commission any of their officers or employees and may utilize their officers or employees to perform for the Commission any technical services which the Commission may request. The Commission is authorized to reimburse departments and agencies for the cost of services furnished and personnel assigned to or working on behalf of the Commission.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 205. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $325,000 to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE III

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Internees' Relief Act of 1947."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 302. When used in this title—

(1) The term "civilian" means only a person who, at the time of the occurrence of the event which gave rise to a claim for benefits under this title, was a citizen of the United States.

(2) The term "detention" means any restraint of personal liberty (a) due to capture by the enemy, as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or otherwise; or (b) in hiding to avoid capture or internment by the enemy.

(3) The term "Administrator" means the Federal Security Administrator.

EXTENSION OF THE ACT OF DECEMBER 2, 1942

SEC. 303. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, the provisions of titles I and II of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes", approved December 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 1028), as amended, are extended and shall apply in respect to the injury, disability, or death resulting from injury, or detention of a civilian, in the same manner and to the same extent as if such civilian were an employee within the purview of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

(b) For the purpose of determining the benefits extended and made applicable by subsection (a)—

(1) the average weekly wage of such civilian, whether employed, self-employed, or not

employed, shall be deemed to have been $37.50;

(2) no compensation shall be paid for detention of any person with respect to any period during which such person was under the age of 16 years;

(3) any disability incurred or aggravated during, or caused by, detention shall be regarded as having resulted from injury from a war-risk hazard as defined by such act;

(4) the benefits for detention shall be payable for the period of detention, beginning with first day thereof and ending with the date upon which the civilian was returned to the jurisdiction of the United States, or the date upon which the particular area in which such person was situated was liberated by the military or naval forces of the United States or its allies, whichever is the earlier;

(5) the provisions of such act shall be applicable whether or not the civilian was employed;

(6) notice of injury or death shall not be required; and limitation provisions with respect to the filing of claims for detention, injury, disability, or death shall not begin to run until the date of the enactment of this title.

(c) For the purpose of determining the right to benefits under this title of a person claiming as widow, status as widow may be accepted upon a showing, satisfactory to the Administrator, sufficient to establish a common-law marriage, whether or not such marriage is recognized by the law of the place of residence of the parties, unless acceptance of such status should operate to deprive a lawful widow of her right to benefits. The acceptance of such status shall not operate to increase the maximum aggregate amount of benefits payable in any case should a lawful widow be found entitled to benefits, after acceptance of status as herein authorized.

(d) The following provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, shall not apply in the cases of such civilians: So much of section 101 (b) (1) as provides for payments of detention benefits to dependents of the detained person; section 101 (d); section 104; and section 105.

(e) Any unpaid promissory notes or other evidences of indebtedness executed by or on behalf of such civilians to the Government of the United States in consideration of their transportation or repatriation may be canceled whenever the head of the department or agency of the Government to which such notes or other evidences of indebtedness are payable finds that recovery in respect thereof would be impracticable or would cause hardship to the maker thereof.

(f) Rights or benefits which, under this title, are to be determined with reference to other provisions of law shall be determined with reference to such provisions of law as in force on January 3, 1947.

(g) Except as may be modified by this title, the terms used in this title shall have the same meaning as such terms have under such act of December 2, 1942, and for purposes of taxation benefits payable under this title shall be regarded in the same category as benefits under such act of December 2, 1942.

EXCLUSIONS

SEC. 304. (a) This title shall not apply to a person who, at the time of the occurrence of the event which gave rise to a claim for benefits under this act, was—

(1) a person within the purview of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or

(2) a person within the purview of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or

(3) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force.

(b) This title shall not apply to a person who at any time voluntarily gave aid to, collaborated with, or in any manner served the enemy or the purposes of the enemy.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 305. (a) The provisions of this title shall apply with respect to injury, disability or death from injury, or detention, only if the event giving rise to the right to benefits occurred at Midway, Guam, Wake Island, the Philippine Islands, or at any other Territory or possession of the United States, attacked or invaded by the Imperial Japanese Government, or while in transit to or from any such place.

(b) The money benefit for disability or death shall be paid only to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall not upon death of the person so entitled survive for the benefit of his estate or any other person.

(c) The benefit for detention shall be paid to the person entitled thereto, or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one, and shall in case of death of the person so entitled be payable only to or for the benefit of the following persons:

(1) widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;

(2) widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares; and

(3) child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband.

(d) The benefit of a minor of or an incompetent person who has no natural or legal guardian may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be paid, in whole or in such part as he may determine, for and on behalf of such minor or incompetent, directly to the person or institution caring for, supporting, or having custody of such minor or incompetent.

(e) No person, except a widow or child, shall be entitled to benefits for disability or detention in respect to himself, and to death benefits on account of the death of another. No person shall be entitled to money benefits in excess of $7,500 on account of the death of another person or persons. A person, other than a widow or child, whose right to money benefits is derived from his own detention or disability and from the death of another, or on account of the death of more than one person, shall elect which benefit he shall receive, and any payment accepted prior to such election shall be charged against the benefits so elected.

(f) Benefits for injury or disability shall not be payable for any period covered by the benefit for detention; but the right to benefits on account of disability continuing after detention ceased, including benefits on account of the loss, or loss of use, of a member or function of the body, shall not be affected.

REDUCTION OF BENEFITS

SEC. 306. (a) If a civilian or his dependent receives or has received from the United States any payments on account of the same injury, death, or detention, or from his employer, in the form of wages, or payments in lieu of wages, or in any form of support or compensation (including workmen's compensation) in respect to the same objects, the benefits under this title shall be diminished by the amount of such payments in the following manner:

(1) Detention benefits shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the detained person or to his dependents on account of the same detention;

(2) Benefits on account of injury or disability shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the injured person on account of the same injury or disability;

(3) Benefits on account of death shall be reduced by the amount of payments to the dependents of the deceased civilian on account of the same death.

(b) Should the civilian or dependent receive any payment under this title, made under mistake of fact or law, the recovery of which is not waived under the applicable provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, any other benefit payment in the same case to which the same civilian or dependent is entitled shall be reduced so as to recoup any overpayment of benefits. The reduction of any benefit under this section shall be accomplished in such manner as the Administrator shall determine to be equitable.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 307. The provisions of this title shall be administered by the Federal Security Administrator, in accordance with the provisions of titles I and II of such act of December 2, 1942. All provisions in such titles, relating to matters other than benefits or administration, unless made inapplicable by other provisions of this title, shall be applicable with respect to this title as though embodied therein.

PAYMENTS UNDER THIS TITLE NOT TO AFFECT WAR CLAIMS

SEC. 308. The payment of benefits to any person under this title shall not affect the right of such person (1) to file any war claim with any domestic or international tribunal or agency having jurisdiction to consider or adjudicate such claims, or (2) to receive any payment or award made by any such tribunal or agency.

TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 309. This title shall take effect as of December 7, 1941, and the right of individuals to benefits shall be held to have begun to accrue as though this title had been in effect as of such date.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 310. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Mr. HINSHAW (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and that the bill be open to amendment at any section, the sections to be handled in sequence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ (when section 304 was called). Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 10, line 18, after the word "amended", strike out the semicolon, insert a period, and strike out the word "or" in line 18, and all of lines 19 and 20, and insert at the end of line 23 the following:

"(c) In this title wherever the words 'civilian' or 'civilians' are used those words shall be construed to include members of the military or naval forces who were citizens of the United States."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, section 304 of the bill, on page 10, contains this language:

This title shall not apply to a person who, at the time of the occurrence of the event which gave rise to a claim for benefits under this act, was * * *

(3) a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force.

My amendment merely strikes that language out of the bill, that is, the words "a regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of any military or naval force."

It ther adds another clause making it definite that wherever the words "civilian" or "civilians" are used they shall be construed to include members of the armed forces who were citizens at the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to repeat the argument I made in favor of this amendment a while ago, but I do want to point out that the heroes of Bataan appeared before the committee because they want action now. They do not want a lick and a promise such as that contained in title II. They want to be included in any legislation which may pass this House and they want the same treatment that civilians who were prisoners of war of the Japanese are given by this bill.

I hope that the committee will approve my amendment.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I congratulate the gentleman on offering such an amendment. I realize this is a very difficult problem to get at, but this amendment does undertake to do what I wanted to do with my original legislation, that is, to include servicemen in the awarding of anything that went to those who suffered cruel and inhuman treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to speak for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, it is obvious that the gentleman has in mind extending the benefits contained in this title to members of the armed forces who were captured. Actually, the bill provides elsewhere that where benefits have been paid from any other fund, either by contractors or by any employer, they shall be deducted from the benefits to be received under this bill. Consequently, I am very much afraid that it would not benefit the people the gentleman has in mind one iota. From that standpoint, it really does not matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I repeat that I am not at all satisfied with the bill, but it is the best we have. For what it is worth, I want the men of Bataan to have at least whatever benefit would accrue under this bill to others, meager though it is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the amendment as I have read it seeks to include for the purpose of this title military personnel and no one is more concerned with those men than I am. I am a member of both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as are other Members of this distinguished body. To say that the term "a person within the purview of this title" and so forth, shall include the regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted members of any military or naval force, which I believe is the sense of the amendment, would really change the entire title, which is intended to be an internees' relief bill of 1947 as stated in the title and applies only to internees. I do not see how you can include prisoners of war among internees, as they have no relationship to each other except that they were both incarcerated, but they were incarcerated under different international law.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the term includes prisoners of war, and if the gentleman's contention is correct, then the so-called Van Zandt amendment was also subject to a point of order. If my amendment is subject to a point of order, so was his amendment subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Referring to the remarks of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] relative to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] the Chair may say that no point of order was lodged against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Referring to the point of order made by the gentleman from California, even if the language which the gentleman from New Mexico seeks to strike out were not in the bill the Chair doubts very much if the gentleman's amendment would be germane because the title of section 3 definitely refers to one class and only one class. This legislation affects the rights of that class known and designated as internees, and then they have strengthened the bill, evidently intending to strength their position, by adopting the language used on page 10, which the gentleman seeks to strike out. Consequently, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are no further amendments to be offered to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, pursuant to House Resolution 431, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called committee amendment, being section 2, as published in the bill on page 2, lines 13 to 20, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. No property or interest therein shall be applied to the payment of debts, under the provisions of section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, during the period beginning with the date of the enactment of this act and ending 6 months after the date on which the report of the War Claims Commission, made pursuant to title II of this act, is received by the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HINSHAW) there were—ayes 37, noes 17.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BROPHY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the day, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, Senator from Connecticut.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Fleet Reserve Association.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. J. C. Penney.

Mr. LANDIS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today and tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order heretofore granted the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] for Wednesday next be vacated and that he be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the message which President Truman delivered on the state of the Union on January 7 caused a number of Members of the House, on the Republican side of the aisle, to make severe criticisms of nearly all—if not all—of his message.

I listened to the President very intently, and it brought back to my mind another document which was issued some 2½ years ago.

I also remembered that shortly after the campaign of 1946 that letters were issued by the treasurer of the Republican National Committee over his signature to a number of citizens of the United States. This letter read as follows:

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Chicago, November 29, 1946.

DEAR MR. ———: I hope you are as happy about the election results as I am. In my opinion we have made a tremendous start toward turning the American Government back to the American people and bringing order out of the present chaos at home and abroad.

I assume you have contributed to some of the local Republican finance committees but thus far we have not had the pleasure of including you as a contributing member of the Republican National Committee.

We need $500,000:

1. To take care of campaign and other expenses payable before December 31.

2. To expand our publicity services; including our monthly and semimonthly publications, to tell the Republican story to the American people.

3. To provide research facilities to help the new Republican House and Senate to do the job the voters clearly have indicated they should do with respect to putting the ship of state back on an even keel.

Will you be one of 1,000 persons to contribute $500 to the Republican National Committee for these purposes? Or, if you prefer, would you be willing to raise that sum among your friends and associates?

Now that we have won the election we should not fail in our obligation to carry on with respect to the important work which lies ahead.

Your sympathetic and favorable consideration will be deeply appreciated and I shall await your reply with much interest.

Sincerely,

JAMES S. KEMPER,
Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I wondered when I saw this letter in December of 1946 why it was necessary for the Republican National Committee to provide research facilities to help the new Republican House and Senate do the job the voters clearly have indicated they should do with respect to putting the ship of state back on an even keel. As this was one of the major purposes for collecting $500,000, it was clearly to instruct the new Republicans in the House as to what they should do. Evidently, they were not instructed properly and the money was wasted, or on the other hand, the money was collected and never used for the purpose stated in the letter.

As I stated, when I sat listening to the President's message, it brought another document to my mind. That document was the Republican platform of 1944—the platform that you new Members who needed instruction on were elected on. In some 29 or more particulars, there is a similarity between these two documents. For the purpose, therefore, of instructing the Members which the Republican National Committee failed to do, I will read these sections from both documents to you:

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7, 1948

HUMAN RIGHTS

The United States has always had a deep concern for human rights. Religious freedom, free speech, and freedom of thought are cherished realities in our land.

Any denial of human rights is a denial of the basic beliefs of democracy and of our regard for the worth of each individual.

Today, however, some of our citizens are still denied equal opportunity for education, for jobs and economic advancement, and for the expression of their views at the polls. Most serious of all, some are denied equal protection under our laws. Whether discrimination is based on race, or creed, or color, or land of origin, it is utterly contrary to American ideals of democracy.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

HUMAN RIGHTS

In times like these, when whole peoples have found themselves shackled by governments which denied the truth, or worse, dealt in half-truths or withheld the facts from the public, it is imperative to the maintenance of a free America that the press and radio be free and that full and complete information be available to Americans.

We pledge the establishment of Federal legislation of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission.

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections, and

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7, 1948

HUMAN RIGHTS

ALASKA AND HAWAII

I believe that the time has come for Alaska and Hawaii to be admitted to the Union as States.

SOCIAL SECURITY

We should now extend unemployment compensation, old-age benefits, and survivors' benefits to millions who are not now protected. We should also raise the level of benefits.

HEALTH

The greatest gap in our social-security structure is the lack of adequate provision for the Nation's health. We are rightly proud of the high standard of medical care we know how to provide in the United States. The fact is, however, that most of our people cannot afford to pay for the care they need.

I have often and strongly urged that this condition demands a national health program. The heart of the program must be a national system of payment for medical care based on well-tried insurance principles. This great Nation cannot afford to allow its citizens to suffer needlessly for the lack of proper medical care.

Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health.

HOUSING

Within the next decade, we must see that every American family has a decent home. As an immediate step we need the long-range housing program which I have recommended on many occasions. This should include financial aid designed to yield more housing at lower prices. It should provide public housing for low-income families, and vigorous development of new techniques to lower the cost of building.

VETERANS

We have had, and shall continue to have, a special interest in the welfare of our veterans. Over 14,000,000 men and women who served in the armed forces in World War II have now returned to civilian life. Over 2,000,000 veterans are being helped through school. Millions have been aided while finding jobs, and have been helped in buying homes, in obtaining medical care, and in adjusting themselves to physical handicaps.

All but a very few veterans have successfully made the transition from military life to their home communities. The success of our veterans' program is proved by this fact. This Nation is proud of the eagerness shown by our veterans to become self-reliant and self-supporting citizens.

NATURAL RESOURCES

We need to protect and restore our land—public and private—through combating erosion and rebuilding the fertility of the soil.

We must expand our reclamation program to bring millions of acres of arid land into production, and to improve water supplies for additional millions of acres.

We must protect and restore our forests by sustained-yield forestry and by planting new trees in areas now slashed and barren.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

HUMAN RIGHTS

we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

We favor legislation against lynching and pledge our sincere efforts in behalf of its early enactment.

ALASKA AND HAWAII

Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood; and to equality with the several States in the rights of her citizens and in the application of all our national laws.

Alaska is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Extension of the existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered.

HEALTH

A careful study of Federal-State programs for maternal and child health, dependent children, and assistance to the blind, with a view to strengthening these programs.

The continuation of these and other programs relating to health, and the stimulation by Federal aid of State plans to make medical and hospital service available to those in need without disturbing doctor-patient relationships or socializing medicine.

HOUSING

The stimulation of State and local plans to provide decent low-cost housing properly financed by the Federal Housing Administration, or otherwise, when such housing cannot be supplied or financed by private sources.

VETERANS

The Republican Party has always supported suitable measures to reflect the Nation's gratitude and to discharge its duty toward the veterans of all wars.

We approve, have supported, and have aided in the enactment of laws which provide for reemployment of veterans of this war in their old positions, for mustering-out pay, for pensions for widows and orphans of such veterans killed or disabled, for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, for temporary unemployment benefits, for educational and vocational training, and for assisting veterans in acquiring homes and farms and in establishing themselves in business.

NATURAL RESOURCES

A comprehensive program of soil, forest, water, and wildlife conservation and development, and sound irrigation projects, administered as far as possible at State and regional levels.

We favor a comprehensive program of reclamation projects for our arid and semi-arid States, with recognition and full protection of the rights and interests of those States in the reclamation and control of water for present and future irrigation and other beneficial consumptive uses.

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7, 1948

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

NATURAL RESOURCES

We favor full development of our forests on the basis of cropping and sustained yields; cooperation with private owners for conservation and fire protection.

STOCK PILING

We need accurate and comprehensive knowledge of our mineral resources and must intensify our efforts to develop new supplies and to acquire stock piles of scarce materials.

We favor adequate stock piling of war minerals and metals for possible future emergencies.

PUBLIC WORKS

We must continue to erect multiple-purpose dams on our great rivers—not only to reclaim land, but also to prevent floods, to extend our inland waterways, and to provide hydroelectric power. This public power must not be monopolized for private gain. Only through well-established policies of transmitting power directly to its market and thus encouraging widespread use at low rates can the Federal Government assure the people of their full share of its benefits. Additional power, public and private, is needed to raise the ceilings now imposed by power shortages on industrial and agricultural development.

We should achieve the wise use of resources through the integrated development of our great river basins. We can learn much from our Tennessee Valley experience. We should no longer delay in applying the lessons of that vast undertaking to our great river basins.

The Federal Government should plan a program for flood control, inland waterways, and other economically justifiable public works, and prepare the necessary plans in advance so that construction may proceed rapidly in emergency and in times of reduced employment. We urge that States and local governments pursue the same policy with reference to highways and other public works within their jurisdiction.

AGRICULTURE

Price supports

We need to continue price supports for major farm commodities on a basis which will afford reasonable protection against fluctuations in the levels of production and demand. The present price-support program must be reexamined and modernized.

An American market price to the American farmer and the protection of such price by means of support prices, commodity loans, or a combination thereof, together with such other economic means as will assure an income to agriculture that is fair and equitable in comparison with labor, business, and industry. We oppose subsidies as a substitute for fair markets.

CROP INSURANCE

Crop insurance should be strengthened and its benefits extended in order to protect the farmer against the special hazards to which he is subject.

Serious study of and search for a sound program of crop insurance with emphasis upon establishing a self-supporting program.

FARM COOPERATIVES

We also need to improve the means for getting farm products into the markets and into the hands of consumers. Cooperatives which directly or indirectly serve this purpose must be encouraged—not discouraged.

Support of the principle of bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-operated cooperatives.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

We need to go forward with the rural electrification program to bring the benefits of electricity to all our farm population.

To make life more attractive on the family type farm through extension of rural electrification services to the farm * * *.

SOIL CONSERVATION

We can, and must, aid and encourage farmers to conserve their soil resources and restore the fertility of land that has suffered from neglect and unwise use.

A comprehensive program of soil, * * * conservation and development.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Growth and vitality of our economy depend on vigorous private enterprise. Free competition is the key to industrial development, full production and employment, fair prices, and an ever improving standard of living.

We shall promote the fullest stable employment through private employment.

MONOPOLY

Competition is seriously limited today in many industries by the concentration of economic power and other elements of monopoly. The appropriation of sufficient funds to permit proper enforcement of the present antitrust laws is essential. Beyond that we should go on to strengthen our legislation to protect competition.

Small business must be preserved by the enforcement of laws against monopoly and unfair competition.

WAGE EARNERS

The Government has wisely chosen to set a floor under wages. But our 40-cent minimum wage is inadequate and obsolete. I

The Republican Party accepts the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the Social Security Act,

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7, 1948

WAGE EARNERS

recommend lifting the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.

In general, however, we must continue to rely on our sound system of collective bargaining to set wage scales. Workers' incomes should increase at a rate consistent with the maintenance of sound price, profit, and wage relationships and with increasing productivity.

ARMED FORCES

We believe that the United States can be an effective force for world peace only if it is strong. We look forward to the day when nations will decrease their armaments. Yet, so long as there remains serious opposition to the ideals of a peaceful world, we must maintain strong armed forces.

UNITED NATIONS

We have learned that a healthy world economy is essential to world peace—that economic distress is a disease whose evil effects spread far beyond the boundaries of the afflicted nation.

For these reasons the United States is vigorously following policies designed to achieve a peaceful and prosperous world.

We are giving, and will continue to give, our full support to the United Nations. While that organization has encountered unforeseen and unwelcome difficulties, I am confident of its ultimate success.

WORLD TRADE

We are seeking to restore the world trading system which was shattered by the war and to remedy the economic paralysis which grips many countries.

To restore world trade we have recently taken the lead in bringing about the greatest reduction of world tariffs that has ever occurred. The extension of the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which made this achievement possible, is of extreme importance. We must also go on to support the International Trade Organization, through which we hope to obtain world-wide agreement on a code of fair conduct in international trade.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Our present major effort toward economic reconstruction is to support the program for recovery developed by the countries of Europe. In my recent message to the Congress I outlined the reasons why it is wise and necessary for the United States to extend this support. I want to reaffirm my belief in the soundness and promise of this proposal. When the European economy is strengthened, the products of its industry will be of benefit to many other areas of economic distress. The ability of free men to overcome hunger and despair will be a moral stimulus to the entire world.

INFLATION

Already inflation in this country is undermining the living standards of millions of families. Food costs too much. Housing has reached fantastic price levels. Schools and hospitals are in financial distress. Inflation threatens to bring on disagreement and strife between labor and management.

ECONOMY

Government expenditures have been, and must continue to be, held at the lowest safe level. Since VJ-day Federal expenditures have been sharply reduced. They have been cut from more than $63,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1946 to less than $38,000,000,000 in the present fiscal year. The number of civilian employees has been cut nearly in half—from 3,750,000 down to 2,000,000.

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

We favor the maintenance of postwar military forces and establishments of ample strength for the successful defense and the safety of the United States, its possessions and outposts, for the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, and for meeting any military commitments determined by Congress.

We favor responsible participation by the United States in postwar cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

Such organization should develop effective cooperative means to direct peace forces to prevent or repel military aggression. Pending this, we pledge continuing collaboration with the United Nations to assure these ultimate objectives.

If the postwar world is to be properly organized, a great extension of world trade will be necessary to repair the wastes of war and build an enduring peace. The Republican Party, always remembering that its primary obligation, which must be fulfilled, is to our own workers, our own farmers and our own industry, pledges that it will join with others in leadership in every cooperative effort to remove unnecessary and destructive barriers to international trade. We will always bear in mind that the domestic market is America's greatest market and that tariffs which protect it against foreign competition should be modified only by reciprocal bilateral trade agreements approved by Congress.

We favor the prompt extension of relief and emergency assistance to the peoples of the liberated countries without duplication and conflict between Government agencies.

We favor immediate feeding of the starving children of our allies and friends in the Nazi-dominated countries and we condemn the New Deal administration for its failure, in the face of humanitarian demands, to make any effort to do this.

We favor assistance by direct credits in reasonable amounts to liberated countries to enable them to buy from this country the goods necessary to revive their economic systems.

We shall maintain the value of the American dollar and regard the payment of Government debt as an obligation of honor which prohibits any policy leading to the depreciation of the currency.

We shall eliminate from the budget all wasteful and unnecessary expenditures and exercise the most rigid economy.

SPEECH OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE STATE OF THE NATION, JANUARY 7, 1948

TAXATION

On the other hand, Government revenues must not be reduced. Until inflation has been stopped there should be no cut in taxes that is not offset by additions at another point in our tax structure.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that my speech today giving in detail a number of portions of the Republican platform will be extremely beneficial to you gentlemen on the left because it will refresh your recollection—if you have forgotten—or it will inform you what the platform was if you do not know.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Marshall plan—who knows exactly what it is? Nobody. It seems to be something one day and something else the next day. Its origin, apparently, was accidental and it now seems to have no definite purpose or direction.

One day they say it is economic in its principal purpose and the next day they say it is military.

One day they say it is a fixed 5-year program and the next day someone high in the administration says 1 year or 15 months at a time is better.

One day they say about $25,000,000,000 is necessary to carry on the program and the next day they say $17,000,000,000 will do. Then someone says $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 will be enough.

One day Marshall said "take is as it is or leave it." The next day other men high in the administration said in effect, "We must have it to prevent war and we are willing to modify it."

Mr. Speaker, all this simply means that the Marshall plan is no definite plan at all but is a designation of another movement to have the United States give away a large amount of money and supplies without any satisfactory system of distribution and without any lasting benefits to our country.

There is little wonder that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House is having difficulty in disposing of this matter.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the American people are willing to do whatever is reasonably necessary to relieve hunger and suffering in Europe and in Asia, but they demand a different system of distribution than that which has heretofore been followed. The situation is entirely different now than it was during the war. Then it was principally a matter of food and clothing and temporary relief. Now it is a matter of strengthening weak and discordant governments so that they can unify their people—stabilizing the unstable and depreciated currencies of these countries so that they can trade among themselves—rehabilitating the industrial, commercial, and agricultural activities of these countries so that they can provide employment for their people and

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OF 1944

TAXATION

As soon as the war ends, the present rate of taxation on individual incomes, on corporations, and on consumption should be reduced as far as is consistent with the payment of the normal expenditures of Government in the postwar period.

---

thereby increase their national wealth and security.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is a difficult one and the task before us requires our best efforts. It is a matter for Congress and not a departmental matter that can be handled by the State Department or any of the other departments of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress should realize the importance of this matter and proceed immediately toward giving it affirmative and courageous consideration. Too much time has been wasted in an attempt to satisfy departments of the Government that do not want to yield power and prestige.

To this task Congress should call to its assistance the best financial and business experts of the Nation—men who know finance and the importance of a stable currency to the welfare of a country. Men who know foreign transportation and its complications. Men who know construction here and abroad and men who know how to set up business on a world-wide scale.

This task can only be done well by congressional action putting foreign aid under a separate authority. This authority should be in the form of a separate corporate agency with a bipartisan board of directors of the caliber and qualifications that I have already mentioned. The Board should be empowered to select a chairman or administrator to carry out its wishes.

This Board should immediately make a survey of the needs and facilities of the several countries with the purpose of assisting them to strengthen their currencies and to rehabilitate their industries and production agencies. When a preliminary survey is made, which should not take more than a month, this Board should immediately make recommendations to the Congress or to the President or both. The Congress should supply this Board with a few millions which it can use for emergency relief while it is making these surveys.

When more thorough surveys and recommendations are made the Congress and the President will then better know what to do and how to do it. Congress will then be better able to know how much money and how much national aid will be necessary. Congress will also then know how much these countries are willing to do for themselves.

Moneys and credits of these countries and their citizens on deposit or hidden in the United States or elsewhere should be applied to this relief program. Since no other countries are collaborating with the United States in this program, it is not only our privilege but it is our duty to make our own plans and to carry them out as we think best, always keeping in mind our obligation to protect our own economy.

Unless serious political or military contingencies arise this task should be completed in 3 years at a total outlay of not more than three or four billion dollars.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHERE DOES OUR FOREIGN RELIEF MONEY GO?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures of the Congress of the United States, Senate Document No. 112, Eightieth Congress, first session, is truly an amazing report. It shows that the total estimate of postwar assistance for foreign relief, rehabilitation, and so forth, has reached the staggering sum of nineteen to twenty billions of dollars, exclusive of what may be contemplated under the Marshall plan proposals. This report covers the period from July 1945 to September 1947.

What is especially interesting to note is that Germany and Italy, two of the enemy nations, received $1,674,000,000, while Poland, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and the U. S. S. R., together with Ukraine and White Russia, received a total of $1,644,000,000. Germany and Italy, the enemy nations, received $30,000,000 more than these much devastated nations of eastern Europe.

I ask you, gentlemen, is this the way to make friends?

England, France, and Greece received $7,288,000,000.

Maybe this policy makes sense to some people, but I am sure that it will not be understood by the vast majority of our citizens, and that it does not have their approval. I am sure that our citizens expected a humane policy which would give fair and equal assistance to the nations devastated by war. Must we continue to follow a relief or rehabilitation program based on politics?

Our original purpose was to work out a relief, rehabilitation, and recovery program for European nations in conjunction and in cooperation with the United Nations. This was the honest and proper way to pursue a world-recovery program, but the selfish and greedy bankers and international cartelists, under the guise of a bipartisan program, wrecked the plan that the honest and decent American citizens were supporting. A world-recovery program under the United Nations would have cost our taxpayers less than one-half of what this selfish and inequitable program is costing us, and it would have brought us the respect, gratitude, and love of the whole world, instead of envy, fear, suspicion, and hatred.

I believe that our support of the rightists, or of the prewar status quo, can only bring us the enmity and hatred of the European people. That is why our position is so bad in Greece today, and that is also why we have made a mess of it in China. The people of Europe do not want communism, but likewise, and even more strongly, they do not want a return to their old governments, and to the misery, intrigue, war, and starvation that those governments have brought upon them.

I am not in sympathy with a program which will shower billions of dollars on some nations and some people, and ignore the plight of other people who suffered so much at the hands of the Nazis. How do you feel when you read that 2,500,000 German children could eat American ice cream for Christmas, and 1,000,000 Polish orphan children, who went through all kinds of hell for six long years, are ignored and forgotten?

It seems like our bipartisan, big business, and international cartelist program will only bring us the hatred and enmity of all the people of the world. We appropriated $600,000,000 for German civilan relief on July 23, and then 2 weeks later canceled a miserable $15,000,000 relief fund for Poland. This is something that my constituents cannot understand.

We had originally embarked on a sound American program which would give aid and credits to all people and all nations. This was the right policy to pursue, as it was in the old American tradition that has made America strong and respected. The present policy has resulted in a lot of confusion and misunderstanding. For example, we have now three groups of people in America: Those who are sincerely supporting a program of genuine relief and assistance out of the charity of their big Christian American hearts. Then there is the second group that has always opposed old-age pensions, school-lunch programs, aid to veterans, Federal aid to school teachers, aid to the incapacitated, the blind, and crippled. Yes; those who wouldn't give a bone to a starving dog we find strongly supporting the Truman plan and the Marshall plan, because it is a policy of anticommunism and a restoration of the rightists and reactionaries in Europe. Thirdly, there is the group of big bankers and international cartelists, and all of those speculators in petroleum products, grain, and commodities who see for themselves an opportunity to make big profits quickly out of these free dollars that are being given to certain countries. Their motives for supporting the program are not based on patriotism, on a sound foreign policy that would work for peace, or because of sympathy for the destitute and hungry, but they have only one purpose in mind, and that is high prices, greed, and big profits that they can realize quickly out of this program.

I would like to see a genuine relief program, where the gifts from America would be distributed directly to the needy people by established charitable organizations, such as the Red Cross, the various religious relief organizations, and the many other societies that for years have been doing this kind of work, so that our gifts would not fall into the hands of the profiteers and black marketeers, or into the hands of political cliques, where the people must sell their souls to get bread or are bled white by the profiteers. This method of distribution has brought us

the hatred and enmity of the destitute and hungry.

This program should be supplemented further by the bill which I introduced, and the amendment that I offered to the recent relief bill, which provides for free postage on gift packages being sent from the citizens of the United States to the people of Europe. In the first 9 months of last year Americans spent $44,000,000 for postage alone to send these gift packages. They are sending old clothes, shoes, food, and those things that the people in Europe desperately need. These packages go directly to the needy and the recipients know that they come from the United States. These gift packages have brought us more goodwill than any other thing that we have done, and it is my firm conviction that this program should be encouraged, as it would bring the greatest benefits in goods to the needy and genuine appreciation to the American people who send these packages.

Then, further, I believe that we should junk the present Marshall and Truman program, and instead, we should give loans and credits, without interest, to all nations and their people who have suffered from the ravages of war. We should not play favorites and try to rebuild one country as against another, and particularly, as we have been doing recently, where we ignore nations and people who have been our loyal friends for centuries, and who have been on our side in every struggle. It is said "but they have a government that we do not like." And I say in reply, "So what? The people of that nation also may not like their government, but governments come and governments go, but nations and people remain forever."

We cannot drop the American iron curtain that Churchill created for us on these unfortunate people and say "you must go to Russia for bread and sustenance." These people have fought for freedom and liberty for centuries. Both Germany and Russia have tried at various times to swallow and devour them, but each time they were unsuccessful and had to yield them up.

These people stand in ghastly fear of our policy of rebuilding Germany. They know that Germany has sprung at their throats at every opportunity, and in some nations, such as Poland, there is hardly a family who has not suffered the loss of fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters. Here is a nation that had 30,000 orphans in prewar days. Today it has 1,000,000 orphans as a result of German barbarism and bestiality. Twenty thousand tons of human ashes were found at one crematorium just outside of Warsaw. These people and these nations have a right to be alarmed about our present policy. They also have a right to ask, "Why do not you give us an equal opportunity to rehabilitate and reestablish ourselves?"

Now, let us turn to the recent London Conference at which Russia asked for $10,000,000,000 in reparations from Germany, and which we opposed so strongly. From my viewpoint, this is not an unreasonable request. It is estimated that Poland suffered over $100,000,000,000 in property damage by the Nazis. Russia's damages in all probability are two or three times as great as that of Poland. Now, why should not the Germans work and pay for their sins? Certainly $10,000,000,000 is not a great amount of compensation for the damages they inflicted upon the Russian people. Since the war the United States has already contributed twice that much for the relief of European nations, and the funny part of it is that we won the war. It will serve America no good to be identified as supporting the Fascists and antidemocratic forces anywhere in the world. Certainly, that is not the desire nor the program of the rank and file of the American people. We love our liberty, and we have advanced steadily in our fight for better economic and living conditions. I am sure that the sympathies of the average American are with the downtrodden, and not with the kings, queens, dukes, and the big-landed aristocracy of Europe, or with the European cartelists and monopolists. The people of Europe desire liberty, freedom, democracy, and better living conditions just as much as we do. I believe that they shall get them. I believe that neither the left nor right shall win in Europe. I only hope that when the clouds over Europe roll away that we shall not be hated and despised by everyone. I am sure that the United States will be respected, loved, and admired if we follow the program on relief that I suggested, and also the program on credits and loans to all nations, without interest, and so as to give all of them an equal opportunity to rehabilitate themselves without playing favorites one way or another.

After the last World War our country was whipped into a frenzy and hysteria over Bolshevists and Reds, and many thousands of people were rounded up and lodged in jail. In recent months we have witnessed a rebirth of this program. Unless the citizens awaken they will find themselves stripped of their civil liberties, as I find that already, even in Congress, many liberals and progressives fear to speak out their thoughts and feelings, because today it takes courage to speak out frankly and buck the press, radio, and the big international cartelists.

It will be different 4 or 5 years from now when these cartelists will be flooding the world markets with goods made in Germany and other European countries by 35 cents an hour labor. When our industries in Detroit will have to shut down and our labor will be unemployed because they will be unable to meet the competition of these international Americans.

It would be revealing to find out just what American firms have made European business connections in the last 2 years—and to what extent have they invested in European industry, banking, and business.

This, I am sure, would explain, "Where does our foreign relief and rehabilitation money go?"

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1842. An act to extend to February 29, 1948, the period during which the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes may be controlled under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1246. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, National Military Establishment, transmitting a report detailing the activities with respect to stock piling between July 1 and December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1247. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a comparative general balance sheet of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1248. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1947, which is to be substituted for the report submitted on January 6, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1249. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1250. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting certain information required by House Resolution 365 regarding the removal of industrial plants from Germany by way of reparation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1251. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the President to permit nationals of other nations to receive instruction and training in schools, training establishments, ships, units, and other installations maintained or administered by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1252. A letter from the Chairman, the National Archives, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1253. A letter from the Chairman, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, covering reports of all its constituent units, the Federal Home loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the fiscal year 1947 (H. Doc. No. 508); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1254. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the transactions of the government of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1255. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on operations under the Synthetic Fuels Act for the period January 1 to December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1256. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the agreement of March 19, 1941, between the United States and Canada for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project (H. Doc. No. 509); to the Committee on Public Works.

1257. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report on the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2000. A bill for the relief of Jeffersonville Flood Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Preliminary report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; relating to fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4478. A bill to provide basic authority for certain administrative expenditures for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1411. A bill for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 380. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson; with amendments (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of Dave Hougardy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3089. A bill for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3425. A bill for the relief of the Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker; with amendments (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1929. A bill for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Jacob Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROW:

H. R. 5116. A bill to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 5117. A bill to transfer to the Territorial government of Alaska the administration within such Territory of laws relating to Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5118. A bill to authorize the sale of certain individual Indian land on the Flathead Reservation to the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 5119. A bill to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5120. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as amended to provide homes for veterans by assistance to the various States, including the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 5121. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5122. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5123. A bill to increase World War I and II disability and death compensation and pension rates; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 5124. A bill to provide automobiles for disabled veterans of World War I under the same terms and conditions as are now applicable to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5125. A bill to grant increased subsistence allowances to veterans undergoing courses of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5126. A bill to amend subsection 602 (d) (5) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to extend for 2 years the time within which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous insurance benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5127. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 with reference to condemnation powers of the Administrator; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 5128. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5129. A bill relating to the taxation of certain property owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5130. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of public-school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5131. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 5132. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 5133. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to concerts conducted by civic and community membership associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 5134. A bill to amend Public Law No. 432, Seventy-sixth Congress, to include an allowance of expenses incurred by Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants in authorized travel for vocational rehabilitation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5135. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $80,000 for improvements to the harbor in St. Andrews Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5136. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5137. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5138. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death while on 2 weeks' active duty, and for their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 5139. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 5140. A bill to amend the act approved August 5, 1947, entitled "An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5141. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 5142. A bill to encourage enterprise capital investment in production facilities, private research laboratories, rental homes, and other long-term assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5143. A bill amending the Internal Revenue Code to provide an alternative tax, at the election of the taxpayer, on income derived from an unincorporated business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 5144. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution designating the 25th day of April 1948 as the fiftieth anniversary of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to permit the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution designating Horace C. Carlisle as poet laureate of the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution to create a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Concurrent Resolution 134; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 447. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to continue its investigation on matters coming within jurisdiction of the committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 5145. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Joe Tortoloni; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5147. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 5148. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5149. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renata Cuff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5150. A bill for the relief of George E. Finnegan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 5151. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1201. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 26 residents of Salem, Ohio, and vicinity, circulated by Charles H. Carey Post, No. 56, American Legion Auxiliary, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1202. Also, petition of 74 residents of East Liverpool, Ohio, circulated by the American Legion Auxiliary of East Liverpool Post, No. 4, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1203. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by Lodge No. 2018, International Workers Order, Racine, Wis., repudiating Attorney General Clark's statement with reference to the loyalty of that organization; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1204. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of Local No. 464, International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, Dixfield, Maine, signed by Raymond Hanson, president, and Mrs. Jennie C. Haines, secretary, urging Congress to enact the Stratton displaced-persons bill into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1205. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Racine, Wis., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1206. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Detroit Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local No. 295, NFPOC, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 4710; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1207. Also, petition of the State Water Resources Board of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a request to make adequate 1949 appropriations for flood control in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1208. Also, petition of Cassius M. McDonald, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1209. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress for judicial wrongs or grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for Thy blessed promise: Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee. Amid the blinding flashes of a world convulsed in the throes of misery, be Thou the holy benediction of strength and encouragement, blessing us with zest of soul and those rugged virtues which make nations live. We pray that our passion to serve may match our privileges, linking us to a might that shall forever surmount a tyrant's ambition. O keep America in a crusade that makes secure the freedoms of the individual and that blasts the corrosive evils of human slavery. O Lord, cause Thy face to shine forth, and we shall be saved, to help generations to come. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3645. An act relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 774. An act to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments;

H. R. 1366. An act to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818;

H. R. 3153. An act to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota;

H. R. 3322. An act to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3326. An act to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 400. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mabel Townsend Pretty On Top;

S. 401. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott;

S. 773. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary E. Leaf;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes;

S. 1407. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Robert E. Doyle;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Train-

ing Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico;

S. 1517. An act authorizing the issuance to James Perry Doyle of a patent in fee to certain lands in Big Horn County, Mont.;

S. 1521. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Treasury to detail certain scientific and technical personnel employed by or within the National Military Establishment or the United States Coast Guard to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories;

S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.;

S. 1591. An act to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes;

S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

S. 1673. An act to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes;

S. 1733. An act to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.);

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army;

S. 1794. An act to authorize the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting pool at the United States naval hospital, Houston, Tex.;

S. 1796. An act to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes;

S. 1799. An act to amend the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to make it applicable to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands;

S. 1800. An act relating to the restrictions on the use of crypt and window spaces of the United States Naval Academy chapel;

S. 1802. An act to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; and

S. 1961. An act to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had—

Ordered, That the Senator from Vermont, Mr. FLANDERS, be appointed a conferee on H. R. 4127, an act entitled "An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended," in place of the Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT, resigned.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE TODAY

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Foot and Mouth Disease of the Committee on Agriculture be allowed to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

NEED FOR SCRAP IRON

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a situation of grave concern to all of our citizens. At the present time, there is a tremendous shortage of pig iron in this country—such shortage resulting from increased use of this commodity because of the lack of steel scrap available for melting. Furnaces producing pig iron have diverted almost their entire output to steel companies, thus forcing out of the market foundries which have been, in the past, producing the necessary castings and parts to keep our industrial machine running.

I contend that this situation has become serious enough to warrant action along the lines of a Nation-wide scrap drive. I believe that we in America, who did so well in this respect to aid in our total production for war, should again be asked to participate in a project of this kind so that our postwar needs might be more adequately filled. There is available in practically every city of Europe tremendous quantities of the scrap resulting from military destruction. Harbors, fields, and streets of Europe are cluttered with broken implements of war which might well now be utilized to be bent into the plowshares necessary for peace.

In the New England area alone, a goodly percentage of the foundries now engaged in production of parts from pig iron are readying plans for either partial or complete curtailment of production facilities. The situation is a truly serious one and could very easily result in the unemployment of thousands upon thousands of workers not only in these factories but in the industries dependent upon these suppliers for the manufacture of their own appliances. The factors entering into this current shortage are of great diversification and I intend to make a more complete study to ascertain whether or not our exports of pig iron to foreign countries are, in part, responsible for our shortage at home. There can be no justification for the export of material necessary to maintain our industrial life line here in America.

I ask that the Congress consider very seriously the question of recommending to our people here at home, and to our own military government and allies abroad, that they use every concerted effort to gather in available steel scrap so that this situation might be alleviated to some degree. The problem is one of tremendous significance and should be faced squarely now by the administrative agencies of our Government, as well as by the Congress so that some remedial action may be taken before a complete shut-down of our production facilities is an actuality.

LABELING OF FERTILIZER SHIPPED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, during the first sessions of this Congress, I introduced a bill, H. R. 869. I introduced a similar bill in two previous sessions. This bill, if passed, would require the manufacturers to label as to its contents fertilizer shipped in interstate commerce.

For some reason I have not been able to get a hearing on this bill. Of course, the Fertilizer Trust is opposed to it. That goes without saying. They have not only circularized Congress but the Nation against this bill. The question is, "Why?" You can guess.

This bill requires the shipper to print on, or affix to each bag, package, or container, a statement showing the different kinds of materials, and the percentage of each contained in such fertilizer. This act is similar to the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Whisky Act, and the Wool Labeling Act.

Surely no honest manufacturer can object to letting the farmers know what he is selling to them. We talk about long-range agricultural programs, and short-range programs, but in reality have overlooked many of the vital things agriculture is interested in.

We are confronted with a serious shortage of nitrogen in this country, and

we are shipping some of our limited supply to the war-stricken peoples of Europe to help them grow the necessary food crops.

In order to conserve our supply of nitrogen, I am in favor of returning to the methods of making fertilizer that were in vogue in other years, when the farmers grew good crops with considerably less fertilizer per acre, and were not plagued with the plant diseases that give them so much trouble today.

In those days the farmers grew good crops with 30 to 40 percent less fertilizer per acre than they are using today.

In fact, the cotton that clothed the Nation, the corn grown in the South, the Middle Atlantic, and some of the northern States, and the tobacco that made R. J. Reynolds and Buck Duke rich, was grown with fertilizer made this way.

The methods of making fertilizer have undergone radical changes during the past 25 years, and this has been costly and hurtful to the farmers.

During this period the manufacturers have cheapened the quality of fertilizer from time to time by using more and more of the cheap water-soluble sources of nitrogen, and less and less of the organic sources of nitrogen.

Prior to the time these formula changes were made, only one-third of the nitrogen had been obtained from water-soluble sources and two-thirds from organic sources.

Federal and State plant pathologists recommended these proportions, and it was generally believed that one-third of the nitrogen from quickly soluble sources was as much as the plant could take up before some of it was washed in the soil water beyond the reach of the plants.

It was also believed that two-thirds of the nitrogen from organic sources was needed to give the plant a healthy growth and feed it to maturity.

As the manufacturers began to increase the water-soluble nitrogen content of the fertilizer, and to use less of the organic sources of nitrogen, the farmers found it necessary to use more and more fertilizer per acre in order to get enough organic nitrogen to give the plants a healthy growth.

When the manufacturers found that the Federal and State plant experts offered no objection to these formula changes, they became bolder and actually secured the removal from the State laws of some of the restrictions that were necessary for the protection of the farmers.

These rewritten State laws permitted the manufacturer: First, to increase the nitrogen content of the fertilizer 21 percent; second, to remove from the bags what were known as source tags which told the farmers what materials had been used in making the fertilizer; and third, to use almost unlimited proportions of the cheap water-soluble sources of nitrogen without letting the farmers know that this was being done.

The use of so little of the organic sources of nitrogen forced the farmers to use at least 30 percent more fertilizer per acre in order to get enough organic nitrogen to feed the crops to maturity.

The use of so much of the water-soluble sources of nitrogen resulted in an extensive spread of destructive plant diseases that had never plagued the farmers prior to the time these radical formula changes were made.

The losses to tobacco growers resulting from the ravages of blue mold, and black shank, run into millions of dollars each year, and the tomato and potato blights have done much damage to garden and truck crops.

Men of such eminence as Sir A. D. Hall, M. A., and Fellow Royal Society, London, England, and Lyon and Buckman, Cornell University, had discovered long ago the harmful effects on the crop of too much nitrogen—particularly soluble nitrogen.

Hall said that high nitrogenous manuring made all plants more susceptible to disease, and Lyon and Buckman said that an excess of soluble nitrogen would result in harmful effects on the crop, and decrease the plant's resistance to disease.

You are no doubt aware of the fact that 102 fertilizer firms and individuals were indicted in the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of North Carolina for violations of the Sherman Act, and for having exerted an undue influence on State lawmakers and State commissioners of agriculture.

The defendants admitted their guilt, and paid over a quarter of a million dollars in fines, but they are still exerting an undue influence.

Robert M. Salter, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, made a surprising suggestion to the fertilizer industry in a speech that he delivered at their convention at Hot Springs, Va., on June 25, 1946.

This is what he said:

> Probably you can spend a little more money advantageously in subsidizing research on special problems through fellowships and grants to States. A little financial oil applied to the squeaks in the research machinery often produces surprisingly good results.

A subsidy places the recipient of the funds under obligations to the donor, and I think it ill behooves a branch of the Federal Government to accept gifts of money from men who have violated the Sherman Act and have exerted undue influence on some State officials.

I hope the Committee on Agriculture will find the facts, and let the Congress have the benefit of its conclusions at the earliest possible moment.

We cannot afford to temporize with a matter of such vital concern to the farmers, gardeners, and truck growers of the Nation.

The enactment of my bill would enable the farmer to know whether he was spending his money for such good materials as blood, fish scrap, animal tankage, and cottonseed meal, or for such inferior materials as leather scraps, hair, wool waste, and feathers.

It would prevent the use of coloring matter and enable the farmer to know whether the fertilizer contained harmful proportions of the cheap soluble sources of nitrogen.

The facts that I have cited lead me to believe that a properly made fertilizer would enable the farmers to grow better crops with 30 percent less fertilizer per acre, and would probably be helpful in the prevention of plant diseases.

A 30-percent reduction in the farmers' expenditures for fertilizer in 1946 would have saved the farmers $156,300,000.

The constitutional guaranties of equal protection under laws clearly place on the Federal Government the duty to see that all fertilizer that moves in interstate commerce is honestly labeled.

Congress has enacted laws for the protection of the purchasers of food, drugs, woolen goods, and whisky, and justice requires that the farmer be given the same information and protection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

ERP! WHOSE PLAN IS IT?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include copies of two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, early in June 1947 the Secretary of State made a short speech of about 1,200 words at Harvard University. Possibly he, as well as many others, was surprised when the radio, press, and administration spokesmen called it the Marshall plan or Marshall doctrine.

After several days of this publicity I began to receive letters seeking information regarding this so-called Marshall plan. To get first-hand information I addressed a letter to Secretary Marshall on July 9, 1947, which read as follows:

> In order that I may have a clear conception of the proposed program and be better prepared to answer many inquiries relative thereto, I would appreciate your furnishing me a concise statement, in easily understandable language, of just what the Marshall doctrine is. Particularly I would like to know:
>
> 1. When and by what authority was the proposal made?
>
> 2. What does it propose to do?
>
> 3. What obligations have already been made under it?
>
> 4. If adopted, what further obligations will this country be expected to assume?
>
> 5. What control will this Government have as to commitments which would become a charge against American taxpayers?
>
> 6. When will our Government cease to be financially responsible for the program (a) as to any one of the participating countries? (b) as to all European countries covered by the program?
>
> An early response will be appreciated.

One would expect an immediate reply if a plan had really existed. Three weeks passed before I had any response.

Mr. Speaker, you can see for yourself a surprising statement which confirmed the idea many had of the nonexistence of any plan, for the Secretary said: "It is neither a doctrine nor a plan."

It is to be noted that the Secretary, in the last paragraph of his letter, quoted below, calls attention to the fact that they—the European nations—were then talking in terms of a 4-year program:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 29, 1947.

DEAR MR. SCRIVNER: Your letter of July 9 asking for a statement on the Marshall doctrine undoubtedly refers to the speech I made at the commencement exercises at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. I enclose a copy of the speech which discussed the critical economic situation in Europe and emphasized the importance to this country of having it improve. The speech contained a suggestion to the countries of Europe that additional American aid depends, however, upon agreement among as wide a group of European countries as possible on their requirements and on what they can do in their own behalf. The speech also suggested that any assistance the United States might extend in the future should provide a cure for Europe's disordered economy rather than a palliative.

These suggestions constitute neither a doctrine nor a plan. They were made by me under my authority as Secretary of State, responsible to the President, and subject to the laws and Constitution of the United States in conducting the foreign affairs of this country. Although no specific obligations have been assumed under them, the suggestions involve a moral obligation in our own interest to do what we can to help Europe carry out any general program it develops.

What particular obligations may be assumed by the United States in the future, I am unable to say. We stand at a turning point in our relations to our traditional friends among the nations of the Old World. Either we must finish the task of helping them adjust to the changed demands of the new age, or be reconciled to seeing them move in directions not consistent with our traditions and with consequent far-reaching implications for our future prosperity and security. However, when the 16 European countries which have just met in Paris complete their present study of their requirements and the extent of their own ability to meet them, Congress will have the challenging opportunity to make the vital decision on what obligations the United States can assume. It is expected that the studies of the European countries will be forwarded to this Government about September 1, 1947, but they will be carefully examined by the interested agencies of the Government before any proposals for legislative action are sent to the Congress by the President.

Through Congress this Government will have complete control over commitments which would become a charge against American taxpayers. As is well realized in Europe, the United States cannot be committed to any specific program of aid without congressional authorization and appropriation of funds.

Until a program is completed and Congress has determined the participation of this country in it, a definitive answer to your question regarding when our financial responsibility in the program would end is not possible. While it is purely a reflection of their own thinking, you may be interested to know, however, that a number of the European countries are talking in terms of a 4-year program.

G. C. MARSHALL.

Although the President's message on the $590,000,000 interim-aid bill hinted that a long-range program was being developed, the first statement approaching a definite program was the President's message on European relief. This message of December 18, 1947, presented the proposed European recovery program—ERP—in detail; in so much detail, with the exhibits, it is almost beyond assimilation.

The Harvard speech of Secretary Marshall bears the earmarks of offhand remarks prepared somewhat in haste to meet a dead line for a speaking engagement to which little importance was attached. If we knew the author of the speech, we might learn the source of the idea for it, which may cost American taxpayers billions of dollars and possibly the return to wartime controls.

Is it any wonder that the question is often asked, "Whose plan was it?"

Can we be blamed for looking at some of these proposals with skepticism?

Despite Secretary Marshall's ultimatum to a Senate committee that it was the European recovery program as presented or nothing, attention should be called to his letter in which he recognized the position the Congress occupies. What could have changed his views in the 5 or 6 months between the time he wrote the letter and his appearance on the Hill?

Have the American people forgotten that President Truman's plea for Greek-Turkish aid was based on the need for seeds, fertilizer, food, fuel, clothing, medical supplies and medical aid, with only a passing reference to the military? The relief asked was based on those needs. We find now that practically all of the aid to Turkey and the greater portion of funds allotted to Greece went for military aid—something not disclosed in the President's message. Have they forgotten that Congress was told that only a few military advisers would be sent to Greece, and those only to supervise the use of financial and material aid in the tasks of reconstruction?

I would like to have the answers to many questions, but right now especially to these:

First. When did the Marshall plan really come into being? It did not exist in June. There was no plan in July, or in September.

Second. If the plan itself was not formulated until November or December, what was behind the Marshall plan ballyhoo which began in June?

Third. Whose idea is or was it?

Fourth. What is its real purpose?

Fifth. Was it proposed as a face-saving measure because someone did not carefully weigh the import and impact of his words?

Sixth. Will it, too, as did the Greek-Turkish aid, call for more than is now suggested?

Seventh. What program of self-help has been adopted in Europe for which our support is supposed to be needed?

Eighth. And how far can we go in helping Europe without increasing our own troubles, especially our high food costs?

With these questions answered honestly, directly, concisely, and simply, many of us could more soundly form our opinions as to the merits of the various versions of the proposed program.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, you can bet your bottom dollar—and this is not speculation, being a certainty—that after the present bill to authorize ERP gets under way the Congress will be faced with a similar proposal for Japan, Korea, and other far eastern countries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Reader's Digest.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

HARMONY

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, harmony is what the world needs today. The problem is how to get it. We hope the United Nations can achieve it. There is one group that I know, and to which I belong, in which complete harmony prevails. This is an international organization known as the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.

Currently this organization fosters fellowship and harmony through nearly 400 chapters with some 22,000 members in the United States and Canada. Founded 10 years ago in Tulsa, Okla., the society will hold its 1948 tenth annual international convention and quartet contest, June 10, 11, and 12, at Oklahoma City. If only harmony such as this could prevail in other international assemblies what a fine world this would be.

A love of harmony, musical and otherwise, is an attribute of many Members of this body. Some of us who belong to the SPEBSQSA are arranging to give this harmony an outlet in the form of a congressional quartet night, to be held at the Hotel Statler next Friday evening, January 30, at 8 p. m. How fine it would be if we could gather that evening and lift our voices in a blending of song together and set an example of harmony to the Nation. Keeping America singing is a noble aim. A nation that can do this will retain its balance and sanity and not go wrong. It will do us good to swell our voices in song together and seek that harmony that characterizes a close barber-shop chord. All Members of Congress are invited as well as their staffs.

THE OIL SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. NICHOLSON, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received word that there are in my district cities, towns, and villages that are without oil. The surest way I know of to make a man a Communist is

to have either his father or his mother freeze. Now, I realize that as a new Member I cannot do anything about it, but I further realize that there are in this body strong, intelligent, and serious-minded men who know what to do. As far as I am concerned, from now on I am an isolationist; I always was one anyway, but I am getting stronger and stronger all the time, and you can talk about your Marshall plan and the other plans in the world to help out these Europeans. Well, who wants anybody here to freeze? Am I my brother's keeper? Yes, I am. Well, what is he going to do when I freeze? Now, then, there is a place here in this Congress—I do not know where it is, I am a new Member and I have too much to learn—but I know that somewhere in this picture here we can say, "Do not send another drop of oil to anybody as long as our people are freezing."

FISH STORY

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I want to tell a fish story.

After wading through correspondence day after day, letter after letter, on rent control, tax reduction, universal military training, reducing the budget, cutting the Federal pay roll, the Marshall plan, the Taft-Hartley law, housing, agricultural programs, reciprocal trade treaties, and what not, I thought this letter from my good Waltonian friends up in Pennsylvania—those great friends of wildlife, clean streams, and the great outdoors—was indeed a somewhat different and refreshing approach from the many requests made of us. It reads as follows:

FRANKLIN, PA., *January 20, 1948.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GAVIN: Greetings, salutations, and best wishes from Franklin chapter, Izaak Walton League of America. It is the pleasure of this chapter that I write you requesting your assistance in securing Federal fish, most any kind available, for stocking local streams. In these times, with the fate of this Nation and the world itself in the balance, such request may appear, to you, most irreverent; but, while we fully realize the gravity of present-day conditions, and daily pray for the better guidance of great and small alike, we also believe that all must go ahead with plans for what, we do trust, will be a better, brighter, and more peaceful world for the future.

Believe-it-or-not for Congressman LEON H. GAVIN from Franklin chapter, Izaak Walton League of America:

We do not ask for tax relief, no, that is not our wish
We only ask, with all respect, can you get us any fish?

With all best wishes from Franklin chapter,
Very truly yours,

R. E. ELLIOTT,
Chairman, Fish and Game Committee, Franklin Chapter, IWLA, Franklin, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two resolutions.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a speech.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief description of Dr. Paul Magnuson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce started its hearings on the results of its recommendations December 19. The Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Foster, was present and testified. Many interesting things developed. There will be further developments. But there is one thing to which I call your attention because, again, I am interested that you should be forewarned against what I think is going to be a blizzard of correspondence you will have to answer.

Late yesterday afternoon the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] called my attention to a picture which appeared in one of his papers. On arriving home last night I found to my amazement that my own local newspaper, the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette, had it on its front page also. You had better check your papers and see whether it is not on their front pages too.

It has a headline "Milk for Europe's children and oil for Russia." There are two ships pictured. An arrow points to one ship and it bears the notation "Oil for Russia." Another arrow points to the other ship and it bears the notation "Milk for Europe." The legend underneath the picture reads:

Prepared to sail from San Diego, Calif., with a precious cargo for the hungry children of Europe is the California good-will milk ship, *Golden Bear* (right). In sharp contrast is the steamship *Kohlozonick* (left), which flies the Russian flag and is being loaded with hundreds of drums of transformer oil for the Soviet machines. Colorful ceremonies, in which 5,000 took part, marked the milk ship's sailing.

I asked Mr. Foster when this had occurred. He said, "That must have been last spring. There has been no shipment of that sort since June 30." I then asked International News Service to find out when the picture was taken. I received a message just before we recessed advising me the picture was taken in San Diego harbor on January 22, 1948.

I informed Mr. Foster and the committee of that and also advised that the American Petroleum Institute had reported to the committee staff, upon my request, that—

Transformer oil or transil oil is used in electric transformers and electric oil switches to submerge electric elements to provide a cooling or spark-quenching medium which is an insulator; that it is very sensitive oil and must be handled with great care to avoid contamination as it must not have any moisture in it.

It is my recollection that Mr. Foster stated, in substance, that such oil was not under the control exercised by the Department. If I am incorrect in that, I will make the proper correction as soon as I can obtain the transcript of the hearing.

I shall certainly tell Mr. Foster, as well as Mr. Harriman, that, in my opinion, such oils should be promptly included. Certainly the use of electric transformers in the manufacture of machinery and other items is well known to all of us.

TRANSPORTATION IN ALASKA

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today a report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on transportation in Alaska. This report is made in connection with the national transportation survey which the committee has been making with a view to recommending legislation on a national transportation policy. Certain preliminary reports on the survey already have been issued and others will be forthcoming as they deal with broad aspects of this vital subject. The committee feels, however, that by reason of the immediate significance of special transportation problems in that great Territory relating both to the development of the country and to the national defense, an interim report on the Alaskan situation is extremely timely.

In some 50 pages of critical analysis and important exhibits relating to all forms of territorial transportation, the committee thus presents the first all-inclusive report on Alaska transportation since 1913.

The committee is tremendously impressed through its study and examination of the importance of promptly improving and enlarging the transportation facilities of the Territory.

As part of a program to promote the necessary transportation expansion the committee offers seven specific conclusions and recommendations on each form of transportation and looking to the creation of a coordinating Alaskan Transport Authority.

Mr. Speaker, in the report on transportation in Alaska, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recommends the creation of an Alaskan Transport Authority to administer a comprehensive and integrated transportation program for the Territory. This, it feels, is the first requirement in assuring the transportation development so manifestly needed.

The report points out that rail, air, highway, water, and pipe-line facilities are almost entirely financed by Federal, not private, funds, and calls attention to the competition among and the unconnected programs of the various agencies now responsible for different kinds of transportation. It states "that a thoroughly thought-out and comprehensive approach to the sponsorship required to maintain and expand all Alaskan transportation facilities is called for. This is desirable in the interest not only of intelligent and efficient expenditure of Federal funds, but also in most successfully achieving the adequate, reasonable, and continuous transportation service essential to that great Territory."

Stressing the importance of transportation to the development and settlement of the Territory and for provisions for national defense, the committee states that it has been tremendously impressed with the "importance of promptly improving and enlarging the transportation facilities of the Territory." The report blocks out six other specific recommendations of steps which should be taken immediately as part of a program to promote this necessary expansion:

First. Construction of the required civil airport facilities at the cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, and enlargement within the Territory of other necessary aids to air navigation.

Second. Substantial improvement of the existing highway system and its material expansion by some of the routes indicated.

Third. Assurance of adequate and uninterrupted coastal water communications with the States and within the Territory.

Fourth. Rehabilitation of the Alaska Railroad generally as projected, but a review by the departments and committees concerned of the entire railroad picture.

Fifth. Establishment of a system of accounts for the Alaska Railroad which would offer opportunity for correct analysis of the financial operations of the road.

Sixth. The construction and rehabilitation of pipe-line facilities.

The report is frankly critical of the success of the past rail and highway programs in developing the Territory. It points out that in fact until the recent communication afforded by the airplane, the Territory in terms of both population and commerce was declining. Saying that "aviation is destined to remain dominant in the transportation system of Alaska" the report supports pending legislation for the construction of additional air facilities. Adequate air facilities are necessary not only since the airplane offers accessibility to places not otherwise easily reached and the airplane in Alaska is competitive economically with other forms of transportation, but also owing to considerations of national defense.

The one principal highway artery was not accompanied by any connecting road system until the war period. This the report states should be promptly enlarged, with specific roads immediately constructed.

While indicating that the difficulties in coastwise maritime operations and connections with the States are partly understandable owing to prewar decline in volume of civilian traffic and seasonal character of the trade, the report states immediate consideration must be given to providing adequate and uninterrupted service at reasonable rates.

The Alaska Railroad, the report finds, has not been operated best to induce expansion of the Territory with rates much too high. While the continued civilian traffic would not appear to warrant the current $50,000,000 rehabilitation program, this appears necessary for defense purposes. On such basis the report concludes that the future rate structure should be adjusted so that military, not civilian traffic, bears the burden of the project improved to standards necessary to support the military tonnage.

The accounting for railroad operations, the report also finds is not such as to give a clear picture of costs. Depreciation on the investment is not taken, nor any consideration given to a reasonable return on the investment. Indeed, if a reasonable rate of interest were assumed and depreciation taken, the $50,000,000 rehabilitation program would represent far more than the discounted present value of the operating savings claimed possible by this expenditure.

The importance of petroleum traffic is stressed in the report's recommendation of immediate construction of pipeline facilities. While acknowledging that the loss to the railroad of this tonnage would be significant, it is urged that this should mean only reconsideration of the railroad program. Indeed, the report recommends such reconsideration in any case owing to the location of new military installations. The suggestion is made for rail, pipe line, and highway facilities directly into the interior of Alaska from points east of the present railroad location.

In view of the current and anticipated petroleum shortages, the report is sharply critical of the conversion of railroad motive power from steam, with coal locally procurable, to Diesel-electric. The flat recommendation is made that all such conversion cease until a complete review has been made of the American and Alaskan petroleum situation.

THE OIL SITUATION AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, during the last 10 days we have heard cries of anguish in the well of the House relative to the shortage of oil in the East and that people are cold. Well, I feel sorry for you folks in the East who are cold. I feel sorry for such people wherever they are when they are cold or hungry. It is interesting to note that my colleagues who are complaining so bitterly about the lack of oil have been speaking for the Marshall plan and in the past have supported these hand-outs. Do you realize that the Marshall plan calls for the shipment out of this country of huge quantities of coal and oil? Do you know that? Do you know that at the present time all our exports are about $1,000,000,000 more per month than our imports? How long do you think that we can continue shipping vital supplies out of this country which are needed at home and not get in trouble ourselves, especially when we do not have a promise of a fair return for what we export? Think that over. If you are cold in the East and need oil, think about not only oil but the lumber, steel, grains, and other vital products being exported. We need those materials at home—inflation is more money than goods, the cure is more goods than money—its simple but true. I just cannot have too much sympathy for you who are crying about being cold and who are still going to vote for the Marshall plan. The administration now has all the power needed to stop these exports. They are not doing it. Why? The administration has the power to put powerful brakes on inflation. It is not being done. Can anyone answer why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include three separate quotations.

THE BARD PLAN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 5143, which I desire to designate as the Bard plan. One of my leading constituents, Mr. F. N. Bard, recently testified at length before the Committee on Ways and Means, and this bill represents his suggested revision of our present revenue laws. Congress has lent a very attentive ear to any proposals designed to increase production, increase employment, and decrease costs. Committee hearings and committee work have been energetically directed to this end.

The first requisite to increased production, increased employment, and lower prices is adequate capital to carry

on these activities, provide new machinery, and add increased inventories.

The largest employers of labor and white-collar workers in this country are the proprietors and partnerships scattered throughout the Nation in the smaller and larger cities. There are 8,000,000 of them. They produce considerably more tax revenue percentagewise than the corporations do. Proprietorships and partnerships are now treated by income-tax laws as individuals; no recognition is given to the fact that they are conducting their business with their venture capital just as the corporations are. Any proprietor getting a return over $5,000 a year begins to pay a higher tax than corporations pay, and the rate of increase is very rapid. A proprietor earning over $200,000 pays in the 85-percent bracket, retaining only 15 percent for his personal expenses, business losses, expansion, and so forth. It takes $10,000,000 worth of sales at 10 percent profit to earn $150,000, and this is a gross injustice and thoroughly unfair. A corporation on the same sales would retain approximately $620,000.

H. R. 5143, which I am including with my remarks, provides, in effect, that proprietors and partners may elect to separate their venture from their investment capital, keep a separate set of books on their business operations, and pay the corporate tax just as the corporations do.

There are many reasons why certain men prefer to operate as proprietors and partners, and they should be privileged to do as they please. That is the American way. All tax authorities agree that no man should be penalized by taxes because of his choice of a method of doing business.

These 8,000,000 proprietors and partners are industrious, hard-working citizens—taxpayers and voters. They are entitled to the utmost consideration by Congress, and if their tax relief is granted, the increased volume of business which they will produce will probably result in no loss in tax revenue. There will be a great loss in tax revenue because of the inability of these men to continue in business if the tax relief is not granted.

The bill referred to is as follows:

H. R. 5143

A bill amending the Internal Revenue Code to provide an alternative tax, at the election of the taxpayer, on income derived from an unincorpoated business

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income tax is hereby amended by inserting after section 15 the following new section:

"SEC. 16. Alternative Tax on Income Derived From Unincorporated Business.

"(a) Definitions: As used in this section—

"(1) Unincorporated business: The term 'unincorporated business' means any trade or business (other than a trade or business which if incorporated by its owners or owner would be a 'personal holding company' as defined in section 501 or a 'personal service corporation' as defined in section 725) which is regularly carried on by one or more persons either individually, as a partnership, or through the medium of a trust, and is not otherwise taxable as a corporation under this chapter.

"(2) Unincorporated business net income: The term 'unincorporated business net income' means the excess of the income (exclusive of dividends and interest) from such trade or business or from any property or funds used in or held for use in such trade or business, over the deductions allowed by this chapter, which are attributable to the carrying on of such trade or business or to any property or funds used in or held for use in such trade or business.

"(b) Imposition of alternative tax: If for any taxable year a taxpayer has unincorporated business net income, there shall be computed, in lieu of the tax imposed by sections 11 and 12, a tax determined as follows:

"(1) A partial tax shall be first computed under sections 11, 12, and 117 upon the net income of the taxpayer reduced by an amount equal to the taxpayer's share of 100 per centum of the unincorporated business net income of such trade or business at the rates and in the manner as if this subsection had not been enacted.

"(2) A partial tax shall be computed under sections 13, 14 (a) and (b), and 15, on 100 per centum of such unincorporated business net income in the same manner, at the same rate, and with the same credits, deductions, exclusions and exemptions as if 100 per centum of such unincorporated business net income was the net income of a trade or business operated as a corporation during the taxable year.

"(3) The tax under this section shall be the sum of the partial tax computed under paragraph (1) plus the taxpayer's pro rata share of the partial tax computed under paragraph (2).

"(4) The tax under this section shall be levied, collected, and paid in lieu of the tax imposed by sections 11 and 12 if and only if the tax of the taxpayer to whom a pro rata share of such unincorporated business net income is otherwise taxable computed under this section, shall be less than the tax of such taxpayer computed without regard to this section.

"(c) Filing of statement: The alternative tax imposed by this section shall not be applicable unless the taxpayer shall, at the time of filing a return under section 51, submit a statement showing the following:

"(1) The name under which such trade or business is carried on and the taxpayer or taxpayers to whom the income therefrom is otherwise taxable under sections 11 and 12.

"(2) A schedule showing the property and funds used in or held for use in such trade or business, and the reserves and liabilities applicable thereto.

"(3) The amount of the tax computed under this section."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about the high cost of living, but evidently it is going to get higher. A farmer writes me this morning, a neighbor of mine, and he says we are now paying wholesale for bran $102 a ton, middlings $103, soybean meal $125, ground oats $109 a ton—meat scraps off the market. Heavy whole oats are quoted at $1.77 a bushel. The price paid for corn delivered to warehouse, $2.75 a bushel. Wholesale laying mash price $117 to $120 a ton. Five days ago he says he received 53 cents a dozen for large white eggs. They are now quoting them at 48 and 49 cents a dozen.

Now there is no question about the cost of living getting higher and if we continue to send grain abroad, the dairy cows will go to market faster than ever. And when I think that the Department of Agriculture is recommending that the farmers put three chicks in for every one they sell so that we will have plenty of eggs next fall, it seems to me that the Department of Agriculture is just what they have always said it to be, filled up with a lot of fellows who just do not know. It ought to be brought back into Washington where it belongs and trimmed down to buttonhole size. These farmers ought to be left alone. If we do not do that, this country is going to be not only cold, but is going to be just as hungry as the people in Europe.

This farmer closes his letter by saying "and we do not want you to take our boys and put them in military training."

Had the Department of Agriculture stayed out of the poultry and eggs market the industry would have adjusted itself from time to time and we would not have the confusion, surpluses, and scarcities coupled with uncertainty as we have today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by him before the American Road Builders' Association.

EXTENDING PROVISIONS OF STEAGALL AMENDMENT TO THE PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revised and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced bill H. R. 5131, to extend the provisions of the Steagall amendment to the Price Control Act, and the provisions of the LaFollette-Taft amendment to the CCC for an additional period of 2 years. This will extend the support program until December 31, 1950.

There are a few facts about this support program that should be presented at this time:

First. Support prices of 90 percent of parity are not high prices.

Second. While the administration of this support program is open to much justified criticism, that is not the fault of the law. The criticism is a result of very undesirable administration. For example, the placing of 165 percent of parity floor on one farm product and

allowing other farm products to sell for 50 to 60 percent of parity is the result of faulty administration of the law.

Third. The enactment of H. R. 5131 will take the question of a support program out of partisan politics and neither party will be called upon to place the support program in their platforms.

Fourth. Since 40 percent of the manufactured goods are purchased by the rural people, a support program even if only 90 percent of a fair price will prevent a major deflation if the program is administered on the basis of common sense.

Fifth. This support program is the best insurance against a depression that can be suggested.

I feel sure that our colleague the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JESSE WOLCOTT, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, will give this legislation every consideration.

The Steagall and La Follette-Taft amendments were and are the two most beneficial agricultural legislative acts that have been enacted into law in the past 20 years, and I hope the legislation will have the wholehearted approval of the Congress.

Some may say that this proposal to extend the support program was expected to be proposed. This bill will bring the question up for consideration at a time when due consideration can be given the legislation.

The bill referred to is as follows:

H. R. 5131

A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (a) of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, Supp. V, title 50, sec. 968), is amended by striking out "before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "on or before December 31, 1950."

SEC. 2. Section 4 (b) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 15, sec. 713a–8), is amended by striking out "the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated" and by inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act entitled "An act to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years, and for other purposes," approved January 31, 1935, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp V, title 15, sec. 713), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1950."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday I may address the House for 1 hour following the legislative business of the day in order that I may have the honor, privilege, and pleasure of giving the other side of the story so far as the question of oleomargarine is concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes on next Tuesday following the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a citation given 5 minutes ago in Statuary Hall to Gen. EDWARD MARTIN, Senator from Pennsylvania, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "The Rights of Labor and Democracy Against Totalitarianism," published by the international labor relations committee of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. James A. Farley, before the National Foreign Trade Convention at the Hotel Jefferson, in St. Louis, Mo., on the timely subject of prospects for trade in the Far East.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the commander of the Department of Mississippi Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Let the Present Board Decide."

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement from the American Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and insert a speech by William Doherty, president of the Letter Carriers' Association.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

THE OIL SHORTAGE EMPHASIZES NEED FOR PLACING ERP ON BUSINESSLIKE BASIS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] with regard to the critical fuel-oil shortage in New England caused by shipment of oil abroad. I also listened to the speeches critical of the Marshall plan that followed. As I listened to both these points of view it occurred to me that one thing is very apparent and that is that all of us in the United States Congress give real and serious consideration to the suggestions made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], namely, that the entire European recovery program be put on a businesslike basis.

PERMISSION TO WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority and minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file their respective report and minority views on H. R. 4790.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE TODAY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon notwithstanding the fact that the House may be in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PARITY PRICE FOR CHICKENS AND EGGS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, why is it that the Department of Agriculture has failed to carry out a law as written by Congress? The farmers of the country have been guaranteed 90 percent of a parity for their products. The poultry raisers of the Middle West are receiving far less than 90 percent of a parity for chickens and eggs yet no move has been made by the Department of Agriculture to support the price.

It is my information that the parity price to farmers for chickens amounts to approximately 24.8 cents per pound, and on eggs 58 cents a dozen. Yet this is what a farm woman at Humboldt, Nebr., wrote in a letter to me dated January 20:

I am writing you in regard to the price of eggs. Why are the poultrymen completely ignored. I am not so young any more and my husband an invalid. I worked just as hard as I could last summer to raise a nice flock of chickens to help relieve the food shortage and for my pains am forced to sell eggs at 35 cents a dozen and corn selling at $3 a bushel, mash at $6.10 a hundred and I've borrowed $200 with which to buy feed. Had my chickens culled and received 13 cents a pound. If that isn't a disgrace, what is it? Unless something is done at once, there will soon be neither eggs nor chickens in the country and our own people will be going hungry. If more time were spent correcting such conditions and less at hatching up ways to ration food, we would all be better off.

This morning, Mr. Dent Holcomb, secretary of the Nebraska Poultry Improvement Association, wired me:

We urge you to support egg price to 90 percent parity. An emergency.

The Department of Agriculture has excused itself for not bringing about a rise in the price of poultry and eggs to the farmers of the Middle West by saying that the national average is already above 90 percent of a parity. Such a position is neither fair nor in accord with the previous practice of the Department of Agriculture. This Congress should insist that the present law be enforced and that these prices be supported.

Mr. Speaker, the support-price program inaugurated by the Congress has many fine features. It is this program that has made possible the loans on corn and wheat and other basic crops. The law authorizing these support prices expires December 31, 1948. I have introduced a bill to extend that program for two more years. The Congress should pass this legislation. The Congress should also demand that the Department of Agriculture take action at once under the existing law to carry out the intent of Congress in respect to poultry and egg prices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article in reference to Bridgeport, Conn.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD regarding the constitutionality of the so-called Herter bill.

CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE OSAGE INDIAN TRIBE

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3326) to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "upon request of the Indian."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIGHTS-OF-WAY THROUGH RESTRICTED OSAGE INDIAN LAND

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3322) to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, empowered to grant rights-of-way for all purposes, subject to such conditions as he may prescribe, over and across any lands now or hereafter held in trust by the United States for individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations, or any lands now or hereafter owned, subject to restrictions against alienation, by individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations, including the lands belonging to the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico, and any other lands heretofore or hereafter acquired or set aside for the use and benefit of the Indians.

"SEC. 2. No grant of a right-of-way over and across any lands belonging to a tribe organized under the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended; the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250); or the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), shall be made without the consent of the proper tribal officials. Rights-of-way over and across lands of individual Indians may be granted without the consent of the individual Indian owners if (1) the land is owned by more than one person, and the owners or owner of a majority of the interests therein consent to the grant; (2) the whereabouts of the owner of the land or an interest therein are unknown, and the owners or owner of any interests therein whose whereabouts are known, or a majority thereof, consent to the grant; (3) the heirs or devisees of a deceased owner of the land or an interest therein have not been determined, and the Secretary of the Interior finds that the grant will cause no substantial injury to the land or any owner thereof; or (4) the owners of interests in the land are so numerous that the Secretary finds it would be impracticable to obtain their consent, and also finds that the grant will cause no substantial injury to the land or any owner thereof.

"SEC. 3. No grant of a right-of-way shall be made without the payment of such compensation as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be just. The compensation received on behalf of the Indian owners shall be disposed of under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 4. This act shall not in any manner amend or repeal the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended by the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 838), nor shall any existing statutory authority empowering the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way over Indian lands be repealed hereby.

"SEC. 5. Rights-of-way for the use of the United States may be granted under this act upon application by the department or agency having jurisdiction over the activity for which the right-of-way is to be used.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe any necessary regulations for the purpose of administering the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 7. This act shall not become operative until 30 days after its approval."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO QUIET TITLE TO LANDS DESCRIBED IN A TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE DELAWARE INDIANS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2361) to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 7, strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

Page 3, line 12, strike out "1947" and insert "1948."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN THE STATES OF MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3153) to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after "county", insert "in which the major portion of the Indian reservation lies."

Page 3, line 10, after "units", insert "for experimental purposes."

Page 4, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

Page 4, line 7, strike out all after "be" down to and including "order" in line 13, and insert "covered into the Treasury of the United States for credit to miscellaneous receipts."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances to include in one an address delivered by Walter Van Hoesen, president of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, and in the other an address delivered by Commodore Robert C. Lee.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include letters.

THE OIL SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, again today the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] and also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] have complained of the distressing conditions in the Northeastern States, due to the lack of fuel oil in that section of the country. On yesterday I pointed out some phases of the long-range programs that we have that we hope will relieve the situation in the years to come, particularly the slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes by way of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

You will find my speech on page 548 of yesterday's RECORD. I hope you will all read it.

I realize that this is an emergency and one that cannot be passed over lightly. If this were a flood disaster on the Ohio or the Missouri Rivers or a cyclone disaster in Mississippi or Oklahoma or an earthquake disaster in some other section of the country we would be clamoring for Federal relief, and the Congress would respond to our pleas.

It seems to me that the Government should use the tankers that we now have to take oil to that section of the country to relieve the distressed conditions that now exist.

I do not know whether you realize it or not, but there is more oil produced in the State of Mississippi than is produced in every State east of Illinois and north of the Ohio and the Potomac Rivers. But the trouble is that this oil is being sent abroad, and the big tankers that are supposed to serve the northeastern seaboard are being used in international trade. The New England States have neither coal nor gas nor oil and very little water power. They are not looking to me to represent them. They are ably represented here by Members of both parties. But, as a Member who wants to see justice done, I suggest that these tankers be put into use, and if there are not enough of them, that we get sufficient tankers to supply those people with fuel until the cold winter months are over. They have not asked me for this contribution, but I just felt that under the circumstances, if I were in their place and they were in mine, that this is the attitude I would expect them to take; and I believe it is the attitude of a majority of the Members of Congress on this question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement showing the number of barrels of oil produced monthly and daily in each State in the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. The statement is as follows:

Total oil production, monthly and daily, as of Oct. 31, 1947

State	Monthly	Daily average
New York	416,000	13,400
Pennsylvania	1,120,000	36,100
West Virginia	253,000	8,200
Florida }	26,000	800
Virginia }		
Illinois	5,602,000	180,700
Indiana	447,000	14,400
Kansas	9,336,000	301,200
Kentucky	842,000	27,200
Michigan	1,469,000	47,400
Nebraska	20,000	600
Ohio	291,000	9,400
Oklahoma	12,571,000	405,500
Missouri }	6,000	200
Tennessee }		
Alabama	40,000	1,300
Arkansas	2,626,000	84,700
Louisiana	14,124,000	455,600
Mississippi	3,326,000	107,300
New Mexico	3,808,000	122,800
Texas	73,713,000	2,377,900
Colorado	1,486,000	47,900
Montana	771,000	24,900
Wyoming	4,055,000	130,800
California	28,565,000	921,500
Total	164,913,000	5,319,800

You will see where the oil supply has to come from, and it must be carried by trains or by barges or by tankers or by pipe lines in order to reach that section of the country.

As I said, this is an emergency, and I feel that immediate action is vitally necessary.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi just mentioned that he thought the tankers which the Government has should be used to carry oil to New England. As of last December 17, or thereabouts, the Maritime Commission had only 17 tankers, 15 of them small and not all of them serviceable, which could be used for that purpose. Therefore, that is not the answer. This House in the closing days of last July passed a resolution to require the Secretary of Commerce to certify on any export of petroleum products that they were not needed for national defense or domestic consumption. Now, if he had carried out the mandate and the command explicit in that resolution to limit exports, we would not have the tremendous shipments of oil abroad. It is not Government-owned tankers that will serve our needs up there in New York and New England, because we do not have them. It is the putting into effect of the export controls so that this tremendous amount of oil is not sent abroad; and if it is unable to be sent abroad, private shippers get it up to New York and New England.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I overlooked the pipe lines. Of course, there are pipe lines that take some oil to that area, but you are going to have to depend on them or the tankers or the barges or the railroads to get the oil to that territory.

Mr. POTTS. They do not take it now. I understand those pipe lines carry natural gas now.

Mr. RANKIN. But oil is not going to the New England States.

Mr. POTTS. Certainly not; and we also need it in New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I inserted in the RECORD an extension of remarks that included an article from the Sunday editions of the Washington Times-Herald. This article was highly complimentary to you, Mr. Speaker, and in my zeal to make it a matter of record I failed to observe that one paragraph contained an unfortunate and unfounded statement regarding our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], to the effect that he is a leader of antiveteran Democrats in the Rules Committee. I am personally deeply disturbed at being a party to having such a statement made a part of the record because it not only reflects on the excellent reputation the gentleman from Virginia enjoys in the Congress but on other patriotic Democrats on the Rules Committee who are rendering able service. I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that there is no such thing as an antiveteran bloc in this body. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the entire extension of remarks be expunged from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Human Events.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, a good many Members of Congress have been voicing the complaint that there is no fuel oil in their States. There is not a State in the United States that is suffering like the State of Wisconsin, where we are having subzero weather, the temperature going as low as 50° below zero. Those of you who live south of the the Mason and Dixon's line, south of the Ohio and the Potomac, do not know what cold weather is. The people in Wisconsin are cold, they are suffering and freezing. They cannot get fuel oil. Some of those who do get it are complaining that they have to pay exceptionally high prices for fuel oil.

In November a complaint was made to the President of the United States asking him to use his authority to stop the export of fuel oil that averages 12,000,000 barrels a month, now being shipped to foreign nations. The President has done nothing. He has not even acknowledged the requests and the pleas of the Congressmen who have written him. The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Harriman, testified last November before a committee of Congress that he could regulate the export, or stop the export, of oil to foreign countries. He was asked if he could do it immediately, and divert it to the areas in this Nation that are suffering from the cold. He said he could. His assistant, Mr. Blaisdell, said he could do it in 15 minutes, that he had that power. Why in the name of common sense and humanity have they not done something? The people in this country need help. We have shipped on the average 12,000,000 barrels of fuel oil a month to countries abroad. In the first 9 months of 1947 we sent $2,800,000 worth of oil to Russia alone. I should like to have you figure out that nonsense. Some of those gentlemen in the executive department had better get busy and help the people of the United States. Our people are cold and they are freezing.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES AND PALESTINE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, since the decision of the United Nations on the Palestine question on November 29, 1947, approved by 33 of those members of the United Nations voting—33 for partition, 13 opposed, 10 abstentions—there has been a great outcry among those opposed to this decision, making three principal objections: First, that it might put Russian troops on the Mediterranean; second, that it may endanger the peace; and, third, that it may interfere with the flow of oil to aid the European recovery program. It has also been argued that the United States used undue pressure on other nations to vote for partition, but when it is noted that Cuba and Greece, two states largely dependent on the United States for their economic life voted against partition, this charge would not appear to be tenable.

OBJECTIONS TO UNITED STATES ACTION

It is well, however, to consider the substance of the three major objections and also to consider their purpose. Their purpose—whether wittingly or not—is nothing less than to scare the American people into a new Munich to appease a group of small Arab states which are defying the United Nations. This purpose could be successful because the United States is the main support of the United Nations, and if it reverses itself on Palestine under pressure, many of the rest of the nations who voted partition would quickly follow. If they did, it would be the signal for the end of the United Nations, just as the Japanese walk-out on Manchuria was the signal for the end of the League of Nations.

For the issue in Palestine now is the continuance and survival as an instrument of peace of the United Nations. If after a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly, the United Nations cannot deal with five new Arab states which were vassals of the Ottoman Empire until after World War I, and were enabled to become states only by the actions of the victorious Allied Powers in World War I, it could hardly hope to be an effective force for peace in the world.

I think it will be useful, first, to be sure that we are all clear on the existing situation in Palestine. Britain administers that territory under a League of Nations mandate given to her in 1922. This followed a decision of the victorious Allied Powers in World War I taken at San Remo in 1920, which stated that the mandatory should put into effect the terms of the Balfour Declaration made by the British on November 2, 1917. According to this declaration, the British Government agreed to use their best endeavors to facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. This agreement was also contained in the Treaty of Sevres between the Allied Powers and Turkey, and finally in the covenant of the League of Nations. Though not a member of the League of Nations, the United States consented to this arrangement in the American-British-Palestine Mandate Convention of 1924 and stipulated that its assent should be required to any change. Britain has since administered the territory of Palestine, and one of the main objectives of its administration she agreed, was to have been to carry out the Balfour Declaration for the establishment of a Jewish national home.

As Britain's situation became more precarious internally, following World War II, and she could not maintain her imperial position; and as the pressures from the Jewish population in Palestine seeking to rescue the remains of their martyred brothers from the DP camps of Europe, upon her for more immigration increased, she finally turned to the United Nations for help.

It may be useful, too, at this point, to consider why the Jews fought for an independent state and did not believe that a true Jewish national home could be established in any other way. The reason was simply that Great Britain had used Palestine as a pawn in her own foreign policy and was not really administering it as a trustee. This was best shown by the decision of the British Government in 1939, made under Arab pressure and in order to gain what Britain thought would be Arab support for the coming war against the Axis, limiting the aggregate of Jewish immigration into Palestine to 75,000, and stopping it entirely after 5 years. The order came in May 1939, at a time when the urgent need for millions of Jews to escape from the Nazi executioners was the greatest. This MacDonald white paper of 1939 resulted, many believe, in the obliteration of a million or more Jews who might have been saved if they had been able to enter Palestine. There was no basis in law or justice for any such action by Great Britain and she needlessly spent the lives of unfortunates in an attempt to better her own political fortunes. Tragically, and perhaps with divine justice, the Arabs took the first opportunity to turn on Britain in the Iraqian revolt of 1941, of which one of the principal leaders was the Mufti of Palestine, the present leader of the Arabs against the Jews. This was the first experience of the Jews, the second came at the London Conference in 1946 where the British tried to arrive at a negotiated settlement with Jews and Arabs. There the Arab proposals and the British proposals in effect cut off any important Jewish immigration which was then continuing on an interim basis at 1,500 a month. The Jews realized by these hard experiences that there was no hope for immigration in a negotiated agreement with the British and Arabs.

Britain's appeal to the United Nations General Assembly in 1947 was for that body to recommend a solution so she could give up the Palestine mandate. The General Assembly of the United Nations—the twentieth committee to consider a solution for Palestine—decided on partition into Arab and Jewish states with economic union under United Nations auspices. Great Britain received this decision sullenly and stated that she would not cooperate in carrying it out, though she had asked for it, but would move her troops out of Palestine as soon as possible, beginning the movement not later than May 15. She has already shown her purpose to refuse to help implement the UN decision by refusing to comply with one of its early provisions to vacate a port in Palestine by February 1, 1948, which she could easily do, for the purpose of facilitating Jewish immigration. But she does give every indication of actually getting out of Palestine and at least leaving the country open to partition if anybody can effect it. This is the job which the United Nations has given to a commission appointed by the General Assembly under its decision—actually to bring about the partitioning of the country. The British still refuse to cooperate with this commission or even to admit it into Palestine until very close to the time when their troops will leave, although they know that this embarrasses the effort to effect partition very materially.

In order to have a suitable frame of reference, we should also consider the terms of the partition decision of the United Nations General Assembly.

Great Britain's Palestine mandate is to be ended not later than August 1, 1948, and the independent Jewish and Arab states are to come into existence not

later than October 1, 1948. In the meantime two critically important events are to take place: First, a provisional council of state is to be designated and recognized for each of the Jewish and Arab states by the United Nations Palestine Commission; and, second, within the shortest possible time the UN decision states that an armed militia composed of the residents of each state and sufficient in number to maintain internal order and prevent frontier clashes is to be recognized by the United Nations Commission.

The present situation finds the United Nations Commission just beginning its work; Arab guerrillas attacking the Jews to discredit partition, with widespread disorder and bloodshed in Palestine, and the Jews endeavoring to defend themselves; the British taking the position that all they need to do is see that none of their own troops get hurt before they can pull out; and the Arab states, member nations of the United Nations, almost openly supporting the guerrilla attacks on the Jews, persisting, to use their word, in defying the United Nations' decision and in the threat of an organized invasion of Palestine as soon as the British move out.

That is the present situation, plus one other very important factor—on December 5, 1947, there was announced by the United States a cessation of the licensing of arms shipments to the countries of the Middle East, including Palestine—in this way effectively cutting off the Haganah, the informal Jewish militia, from any arms, while leaving free the Arab guerrillas through the Arab countries, to obtain arms. For the British, with brutal callousness, confirm a report that they are continuing to sell and ship large quantities of arms admittedly not less than $25,000,000 to Iraq, Egypt, and Transjordan, as a continuing fulfillment of treaty obligations, which is in addition to the arms and armaments they have as organized states with standing armies.

The first of three major arguments now made against United States support of the Palestine decision, is that it may result in putting troops of the Red Army on the Mediterranean. This argument assumes that there will be so much disorder in Palestine created by the neighboring Arab nations, that the United Nations Security Council, to restore order, will have to call on the forces of the great powers, that this will mean that American troops must be sent to Palestine and that, the Soviets, too, will insist on sending troops with the result that the Soviets will have successfully arrived on the Mediterranean. The decisive fallacy in this argument is that no one, neither the Jews nor the United Nations has requested, or contemplates requesting, that the troops of any great power participate in implementing the Palestine decision; or possibly even that the troops of any power so participate. The Jews have expressed themselves decisively on the point that given arms—and it is clear that they cannot fight against the organized armies of the Arab nations, or against extensive guerrilla activities which they foment, with olive trees or with clandestinely obtained rifles—they will defend themselves to the last man and will seek no troops of any nation. Secondly, the United Nations Commission is contemplating an appeal for a token police force of small nations. In no case by any authoritative statement has there been any request for or indication of a request for the forces of any great power. The very organization of the United Nations Commission to implement the Palestine decision reflects the same end; the nations chosen are Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Panama, and the Philippines—not a single great power is represented. The argument, therefore, that the decision will result in the Red Army being on the Mediterranean, finds no basis in fact in the acts of the Jews or of the United Nations, and is created to further the effort to defeat the UN decision. But if the Arab nations are appeased, and the United States, by inaction or reversal of its position, lets the Arabs get away with defying the United Nations and thereby destroys the United Nations, we may again see Russian troops in northern Iraq without a UN to stop them.

There is, however, a grave danger of the revival of nazism in the Middle East, and that arises because the principal character, who is the leader of the Arab guerrillas, is the Grand Mufti of Palestine—Haj Amin El Husseini. There is no question about his leadership. It is widely advertised by him, by the Arab countries, and by the Arab press.

The Mufti is one of the most distinguished Nazi collaborators at large in the world today. Aside from leading the Arab riots which took a toll of hundreds of British, Jewish, and Arab lives in Palestine in 1936, as the head of the Arab Higher Committee there, he was an important factor in the organized revolt in Iraq in 1941, which sought to stab the British in the back. When he fled from Iraq to Hitler's Germany on the failure of the Iraqian revolt, he was responsible for organized Arab opposition to the British and ourselves throughout the war, for the sullen inaction or active opposition of certain of the Arab states during the war, and was one of the inciters to the extermination of millions of Jews by the Nazis during the war. As an agent of Hitler, he openly organized Moslems against the United Nations, including the United States, who were fighting the war, and preached the extermination of the Jews in meetings and over the radio. Yet, when the war was over, the British, into whose power the Mufti had fallen, refrained from trying him as a war criminal and, I believe, under pressure of the Arab states, permitted him a convenient escape from his forced residence in Paris to Egypt in June of 1946. There he promptly became head of the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine and has since been the head and front of Arab violence in resistance to the Palestine decision. It is his family, the Husseini family, which controls the Arab Higher Committee and is the backbone of the Arab position on Palestine.

I have a book which any interested Member may examine, which is a documentary record submitted to the United Nations in May 1947, and which contains the complete story of the intimate relationship of the Mufti with Adolf Hitler throughout the war. It contains pictures of the Mufti in close consultation with Heinrich Himmler, Hitler himself, and other Nazi bigwigs, as well as a mass of documentation showing his complicity in the Nazi war against us.

The Mufti is very ambitious and is already establishing a powerful influence on the Arab Governments of the Middle East due to the political explosiveness of the Palestine issue. But the Mufti is still only a religious leader; he needs a big political success with which to build up his prestige so high that he has not only influence but control over the Arab Governments. If he can successfully defy the United Nations, then he will indeed have established his position at the head of the Arabs in the Middle East and we shall have a disciple of Hitler to face there. In all the Mufti's plans and plotting, the Jews are in the way because they are a bridgehead of democracy in the Middle East—a window on the world. They have suffered enough from Nazi totalitarianism so that they do not want it in any form. It is for that reason that Soviet penetration, also, is very difficult in the Middle East with the Jews in it.

I might say to those who make sly intimations that communism exists in Palestine, not only that there is no Communist Party there, but that not a single Communist sits on the Jewish Agency or the Jewish community councils—Vaad Leumi. No; the Jews have had their fill of totalitarianism and know that to them, to exist at the will of some dictator is to live on the edge of death. Is it not unthinkable that the Jews of Palestine would exchange the concentration camps and gas chambers of Hitler and the Gestapo for the forced labor camps and inquisition chambers of the Soviet OGPU?

The alarmists who say there is communism in Palestine, and who add to the tortures of an already martyred and harassed people by this charge, have picked up the sailings of two vessels from Constantsa recently, the *Pan Crescent* and the *Pan York*, as evidence that Balkan Communists are going to Palestine. The charge is baseless. In the first place, it was a rumor story from London and the British certainly do not like Jewish emigrants to Palestine. But more important, I was in the DP camps of Austria this past summer, and saw the miserable condition of the refugees from Rumania and Hungary seeking to get to Palestine by the underground route through Italy. What was more logical than that, with the ability to argue that the U. S. S. R. now having voted partition for Palestine it should favor immigration there, the Zionist organizations should try to head off the movement of Jews, which was already in progress anyhow from Rumania to Palestine via the already overwhelmed DP and refugee facilities in Austria and Italy, by seeking the Rumanian Government's permission for direct sailings. This was exactly what happened. Is it not unthinkable that the Zionist organizations would openly get together thousands of people whom they knew would end up in Cyprus as detainees of the British, who

would be Communist infiltrees? Is it not clear that these could never get through the British screening and that if it was Communist workers that were to be gotten into Palestine, they would certainly be smuggled in by the Soviets much less obtrusively.

There are several hundred thousand Jews still in Rumania, most of whom want to go to Palestine. If they were Communists, they would certainly not want to move. The answer is that they are definitely not Communists, that they see no hope for themselves in Communist-dominated Rumania, but that they are nationalists for Palestine.

The second major argument made against the Palestine decision is that it is a threat to the peace. But is it not true that it will only result in extensive hostilities between Arabs and Jews, if the leading nations fail to show decisively that they will not tolerate it? Is it not true that widespread disorder and conflict in defiance of the United Nations is what will constitute a threat to the peace? Let us examine for a minute the Arab situation itself. It is the Mufti and his guerrillas who are attacking the Jews in Palestine and even press reports show that many of the Palestine Arabs resent it, as they have enjoyed excellent relations with the Jews. And indeed they might, for Arab improvement in Palestine during the period of the greatest Jewish settlement, from 1930 on has been enormous. The value of Arab land has gone up from $120 to $640 per acre. The Arab cattle population has increased by 60 percent. The Arab school population has risen from 20,000 to about 70,000, and the daily wages of Arab workmen in Palestine are generally five times what they are even in the more advanced Arab countries.

We should also bear in mind the condition of the Arab countries which persist in defying the United Nations and, indeed, the civilized world. The total population of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, and Transjordan is about 34,000,000. The total square miles occupied are 1,189,804. Compare this with 700,000 Jews in 5,500 square miles of partitioned Palestine. Who is the threat to the peace? Contrast the enlightenment, education, and economic progress the Jews have brought into the Arab world with the following record. Saudi Arabia and Yemen are absolute monarchies with the King holding the power of life and death over all his subjects. In Saudi Arabia slavery is recognized by law. In Egypt and Iraq, it is reported that about 85 percent of the men and well over 90 percent of the women are illiterate, and the infant mortality is 50 percent or higher. And even in the most advanced Arab country, Lebanon, 56 percent of the men and 77 percent of the women are illiterate. In the Arab countries, feudal landlords control the peasant in feudal ways, and types of disease which have been much reduced or have disappeared from westernized countries are rife.

Arab nations who propose war on the United Nations muster armed forces of 120,000 men, 35,000 of whom are in Egypt, but have no adequate mechanized means with which to cross the Sinai Desert to Palestine. The most effective force, Transjordan's Army of 25,000, is British trained and under British command. If the Arab armies are to invade Palestine, it would be because in the main the British arm and lead them. Should that happen, it will be the most sardonic joke the world has ever seen.

And what is the war record of the Arab countries? Iraq revolted and declared war on Great Britain on May 2, 1941, with the Mufti who is now the anti-United Nations leader as one of the chief conspirators, while Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Lebanon declared war on the Axis in February 1945 in order to qualify to get into the United Nations, the last date for which was March 1, 1945. And with the Arab population in Palestine not less than two to one Arabs, one-half the number of Arabs volunteered for service in World War II, compared with the Jews. Montgomery said that the Jews of Palestine were heavily responsible for the equipment which won at Alamein, while the Egyptian Arabs were largely uncooperative. None of this is said critically, but we should know the facts. Much can and must be done to bring higher standards of living, education, and health to the Arab countries, and in encouraging democratic ideas, but the way to do this is not by exterminating the Jews, because they are the principal source for improvement in the Middle East.

Finally, one of the big hush-hush things about Palestine is Middle East oil, and while we are speaking frankly we should talk about that, too. It is said that the flow of Middle East oil is necessary to undertaking the European recovery program, but that is not the situation. Middle East oil is largely potential reserve, rather than present production, and right now the bulk of it is moving to Australia and the Far East to compensate for the cutting off of East Indies production. Europe is getting its oil from the Caribbean, in the main; 50 percent of Europe's supplies come from there, about 25 percent from the United States, which makes up for it through imports from the Caribbean, and only 25 percent from the Middle East. Though the Middle East's production is only about 9 percent of the world production right now, it does have estimated reserves in the ground of 27,000,000,000 barrels of crude, or 40 percent of the known crude reserves of the world, against 32 percent for North America. The situation, therefore, must be considered from the longer range.

Middle East oil is being developed on the American side by private companies, like the various Standard Oil companies, the Texas Co., and Socony Vacuum, who are paying for it in dollars. It is intimated that the Russians would like to get their hands on this oil. But nobody has as yet thought up a way for them to pay for it, for they have neither dollars nor manufactures to give Iraq and Saudi Arabia, and if anyone doubts that these countries are so dependent on this oil income, that they can neither sell it on credit nor, indeed, refrain from selling it, he need but examine the figures.

Secretary of the Interior Krug testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee only the other day to his estimate that 90 percent of the Government revenues of Saudi Arabia come from oil payments. It is now getting oil royalties of seventeen to twenty-five million dollars a year against a last-known prewar budget of $4,500,000 a year. For Iraq, also, the oil income of about $10,000,000 a year now makes or unmakes the country's budget—and so it goes. Middle eastern oil and its possessors have been well compared to the cow and the calf. The cow will die if she doesn't give her milk, and the calf must have it, too.

Looking at the situation for the longer term, the large oil-royalty payments flowing to the Arab States tend to aid the Arabs who persist in resistance to the UN decision. Yet despite these large payments, the position of the oil companies is likely to prove very precarious as they run the serious risk of having to deal with fanatical followers of the Mufti after they have been intoxicated by success. For disorder in the Middle East and defiance of the United Nations will only lead to greater excesses of fanaticism and to intense nationalism there. Britain is learning it to her sorrow in negotiating her proposed treaty with Iraq, and the oil companies saw the result in the hold up of Syrian approval for the Transjordan oil pipe line. The oil companies are best served by tranquillity and by independent governments in each country and not by having to deal with the Mufti in all Arab countries. Besides, these companies are headed by Americans and I do not believe they would consciously want to frustrate United States foreign policy and the United Nations by their own operations.

Cooperation in strengthening, not weakening, the United Nations, and in suppressing rather than encouraging international lawlessness, will prove to be far more conducive to the effective utilization and continued availability of Middle East oil.

To sum up—there will be no danger of the Red Army being poised on the Mediterranean in Palestine, or of lighting the spark of war in the Middle East, or of the material cutting off of middle eastern oil, unless the Arab forces arrayed against the United Nations in its Palestine decision, prevail. The question now is, what can we do to hold up the hand of the United Nations, considering the three forces that threaten its Palestine decision—the British, the Arabs—oil. I do not put in this class the Mufti's guerrillas who will disappear in the night if the others fail to cooperate.

With respect to Great Britain, I believe we can act at once. She has already stated that she will not implement the first recommendation of the United Nations decision by vacating a port in Palestine to make it available for Jewish immigration, on February 1, 1948. It was one thing to deal with Britain when she claimed the right to exercise her judgment of how to keep order in Palestine while she was in undisputed control there. But it is quite another to deal with her when she ignores and in fact seeks to defeat the mandate of a United Nations which she has invited to prescribe what shall be the future government of Palestine. She asked for the

recommendations of the United Nations on Palestine and she got them. Her answer now is to "play horse" with the United Nations Palestine Commission, to arm the Arab states which tacitly admit that they are arming the Arab Palestine guerrillas, and to fail to protect life and property in Palestine while disarming the Jews who want to protect it. I think the time has come to call a decisive halt to Britain's double-dealing with the United Nations on Palestine, and it may prove necessary to cut her off from aid if she persists in acting so as to defeat the world's cooperative organization for peace.

Second, I believe we can act with regard to the Arab nations at once. For they have stated openly through the Syrian delegation on January 19, 1948, that they persist in their refusal to recognize the United Nation's General Assembly's decision on Palestine. United States policy on this point has already been made very clear. The United States delegate in his statement to the ad hoc committee of the UN General Assembly on the Palestine question said:

> We do not refer to the possibility of violations by any member of its obligations to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force. We assume that there will be Charter observance.

And on November 22, 1947, only a week before the partition vote, the same representative said before the same committee:

> The United States hopes to obtain a great majority for this plan—
>
> The Palestine partition plan—
>
> and expects loyal cooperation from all members of the United Nations once this plan has been approved.

It is time that the United States again declared to the Arab nations that we expect cooperation—that they have undertaken to give it under the United Nations Charter—and that we shall insist that they account before the Security Council for harboring Arab guerrillas conspiring to defeat the UN decision—we did no less in the matter of the Balkan Border Watch Commission regarding the guerrillas in northern Greece.

Finally, oil—I think it is high time, while we consider the European recovery program, to find out if and to what extent the oil reserves of the Middle East are and will be available for our national security, and if and to what extent the operations of American oil companies are helping or hindering American foreign policy. I appreciate fully their delicate position but I do not see why they should be on the defensive. I should think, for example, that the oil companies might be considering how they could curtail their payments to the Arab nations, with our support, so long as these nations flout the United Nations, rather than what measures they can take to please Arab rulers threatening them with retaliation for the United States vote on the Palestine question.

We come now to the last point of American implementation of the UN's decision—how can we appropriately help those who are laying down their lives to defend that decision—the Jews in Palestine? Right now they are fighting with clandestine rifles not only the Arab guerrillas, but in a cold war with the British, who disarm the Jews at every opportunity, leaving them defenseless before the Arabs. If we do not want armies of the big powers in Palestine and if we do want the United Nations to survive, we must put these valiant Jews in a position to fight the battle. They need machine guns, vehicles, light artillery, and liaison aircraft. Certainly we cannot ship these until an armed militia of the Provisional Council of Government of the Jewish state is recognized by the United Nations Commission, but we can lift our embargo and ship these arms and weapons immediately when that occurs. The path of policy is not to wait until there is the maximum of bloodshed, but to act before there is much bloodshed, or at least as early as possible. Therefore, the United States should announce now, that upon the recommendation of the United Nations Commission, it is prepared to lift its embargo on the shipment of arms to the Middle East so that they may be shipped to such armed militia whether Jewish or Arab, as is recognized by the United Nations Commission under the Palestine decision—for we must never forget that there are decent elements among the Arabs, and that the Palestinian Arabs who would set up a state pursuant to the United Nations decision, will themselves be subject to attack by the Mufti's guerrillas. The attitude of the bulk of responsible Arabs right now seems to be to let the Mufti beat the Jews and the United Nations if he can, but if he cannot then we should protect them against being terrorized in turn if they help to implement the decision.

Such an announcement by the United States would be notice to the Mufti and his friends that we mean business—will considerably depreciate the influence of the Mufti among the other Arabs and upon the middle eastern Arab nations—will fortify the United Nations Commission, and will be the greatest contribution we can make to avoiding the threat to the United Nations which exists in the Middle East.

We are now at the crossroads with the United Nations. If it is ineffectual, in the matter of a little country like Palestine, and permits itself to be successfully defied by a handful of small and recently created Arab states, then it, like the League of Nations, is finished. But if we as its greatest friend back it up, we have demonstrated more than a thousand speeches will demonstrate, no matter from how eminent the source, that we are determined to work out the problems of the world through international cooperation and not through international coercion.

I would like to emphasize that I am dealing here with a question of the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States and with no other question. I have stated before in the House in the course of a debate on Palestine that "I will be just as exercised, just as solicitous, just as vigilant of the rights and interests and security of the United States in respect to it (Palestine) as any other Member"—RECORD, page 11654, December 18, 1947. As a result my recommendations on the subject are based on thorough study and the most devoted consideration and are premised on the interests of our own country in world peace and prosperity and in justice. The measures I have suggested are entirely consistent with our bipartisan foreign policy and with the United Nations charter. They are temperate and objective. They could well result in the first great postwar victory of the rule of international law over the rule of international force.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by his colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FOOTE].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution signed by several thousand members of the Connecticut National Guard in support of universal military training.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEMKE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I must give a little background information as a preface for the remarks which I am about to make. Without doubt the question which I am soon to present to you is a fundamental question of democratic government which directly or indirectly affects every Member of Congress and every citizen of America, and the rights of members of parliamentary governments throughout the earth.

Now for the background. The House placed me on the Appropriations Committee 9 years ago. I have served for years on the subcommittee which handles appropriations for the War Department. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is the present chairman of the subcommittee.

I wish to emphasize the fact that I have no desire or disposition to make a personal attack on the gentleman from Michigan. We originally came to Congress together for the Seventy-fourth Congress. The gentleman has been most kind to me personally and our relations have always been most friendly and cordial. The matter involved is not a personal difference but a matter of congressional procedure and principle.

I had much preferred and hoped that it would not be necessary to present this matter to the House of Representatives, as I had hoped that the matter could be worked out in the Appropriations Committe, where I think it should and could have been worked out. However, the gentleman from Michigan presented the matter to the floor of the House of Representatives on Thursday last, and the issue has been widely discussed in the press, so there was no other alternative for me except to take the same forum to discuss the problem.

I am glad to work with the gentleman from Michigan on any project which promotes national defense and security, and I am glad to make any reduction in Government spending which can safely

be made. Moreover, I stand ready and anxious, as always, to cooperate with the chairman in uncovering and exposing to the sunlight any and all evidence of waste and extravagance by the War Department, General Richards, or any official or officer of the Army, or the Government.

Last Thursday the gentleman from Michigan made a speech in the House in which he bitterly attacked Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, and Gen. George J. Richards, former budget officer and now Comptroller of the Army, branding the Secretary as Kenneth "Cover-up" Royall, and the general as George "Cover-up" Richards.

The gentleman referred to an experience which he had in India and Egypt in 1945. He complained of Army waste and mismanagement in those theaters of operations. I was present with the group in India and Cairo and I saw much evidence of bad management and waste which I condemned at the time and reported to high authorities in Washington, and I am glad to renew my condemnation now.

However, Mr. Stimson was then Secretary of War, and Secretary Royall and General Richards were not in command in India and Egypt and I did not personally blame them for the unhappy situation which all members of our group saw there.

It must be understood that General Richards was with our group at the time, he having accompanied us to that part of the world at the insistence of the then chairman of our subcommittee, Hon. J. Buell Snyder, now deceased.

The gentleman from Michigan in his talk in the House last week charged General Richards with having tried to cover up evidence of Army waste and mismanagement on the occasion of our visit some 2½ years ago. Every man is entitled to his own opinion. Insofar as I know, the gentleman from Michigan is the only Member of our group who has made this charge against General Richards. I would not defend General Richards or any other man who was guilty of improper conduct. Insofar as I know all members of our group except the gentleman from Michigan felt that General Richards was doing the best he could to be of service to the committee and follow the instruction of Congressman Snyder, the chairman of our group, whose lips have been sealed in death and he cannot report to you. Our understanding and interpretation of events on this particular point do not coincide with those of the gentleman from Michigan. It might be noted that Secretary Royall and General Richards do not have the privileges of the floor and they cannot arise in the House of Representatives and defend their good name. But I will not take your time to rehash the details of far away events. I have risen for a more important purpose.

Last Saturday I read in a Washington paper a United Press story, the Associated Press having carried a similar story, which shocked me very much. I quote it in part as follows:

RICHARDS BARRED BY HOUSE GROUP

Chairman ENGEL, Republican, of Michigan, said yesterday he had barred Maj. Gen. George C. Richards, the Army's budget officer, from appearing before the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee.

ENGEL said he has informed Secretary of Army Royall not to send Richards before his subcommittee. Royall gave no indication whether he would comply.

ENGEL, who vented his wrath on both Richards and Royall in a House speech Thursday, said he would make another speech Monday explaining why he was barring the budget officer.

He contended that the committee could get all the information it needed for consideration of Army appropriations from Richards' subordinates.

Now let me again read paragraph 1 of the press story:

Chairman ENGEL, Republican, of Michigan, said yesterday he had barred Maj. Gen. George C. Richards, the Army's budget officer, from appearing before the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee.

Now, I was present downstairs in the committee last Thursday when General Richards was barred. He had accompanied Secretary Royall, Gen. Lucius Clay, our military governor for Germany, and many others in a joint hearing before the Deficiency and War Department Subcommittees on Appropriations.

I saw General Richards come into the committee room where he belonged and where he had been brought by the Secretary of the Army as his chief fiscal adviser, to be at his side when he discussed an Army request for appropriations. Presently, I saw him leave the room and was told that he had been barred by the gentleman from Michigan. Mind you, that General Richards was not barred from the committee room by the joint action of the committee, after discussion and a vote on the question. Even then, such action would have been indefensible. He was barred by one man, and insofar as I know, without the approval of any other member of the committee. Most of the members of the committee were present at the time this unfortunate incident happened in this Capitol Building.

The gentleman from New York, Chairman JOHN TABER, was there but, in my opinion, he had no personal desire to bar General Richards. I am not authorized to speak for him, but I think that is a fair conclusion. Other members of the committee, excluding the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and myself, are as follows: Representatives WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts; STEFAN, of Nebraska; CASE of South Dakota; KEEFE, of Wisconsin; TIBBOTT, of PENNSYLVANIA; SCRIVNER, of Kansas; and on the Democratic side, Representatives CANNON, of Missouri; KERR, of North Carolina; and NORRELL, of Arkansas; and myself, as I have said. In my opinion none of these men whose names I have called, with the exception of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] wanted the Secretary of the Army and General Richards to be humiliated by the barring of General Richards from the room where he belonged and where he had come at the request of the Secretary of the Army to discuss an appropriation of over $1,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. There were 10 or 15 other officials of high or low rank who were in the committee room at the time. None of them were thrown out.

I want to quote again from the press statement:

ENGEL said he has informed Secretary Royall not to send Richards before his subcommittee.

He contended that the committee could get all the information it needed for consideration of Army appropriations from Richards' subordinates.

Mr. Speaker, for a committee chairman to independently bar a major witness of the executive branch of Government from the committee room and deny him the right to testify on matters presented to the Congress by the executive branch smacks of some form of government which is utterly foreign to democracy, and the principles of freedom. I do not expect to hear that statement challenged.

It is unbelievable that this thing should have happened under the dome of this Capitol, and under the direction of the Republican chairman of a Subcommittee on Appropriations. Under this procedure a subcommittee chairman could, if he wished, bar the testimony of all the witnesses with whom he disagreed—it is the inevitable next step—and stack the testimony according to his own personal whim and caprice. I do not say he would do it, but I say he could do it. Our liberties have been jeopardized and democratic government has been challenged.

Of a truth it has been said that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and I rise today not in defense of General Richards or Secretary Royall—they can defend themselves—but I rise in the defense of the democratic processes of government and in defense of the individual Members of the Congress who do not feel that a committee subchairman can by a personal edict deny committee members the right to hear witnesses and cross-examine witnesses, and the executive branch the right to present them.

If the gentleman from Michigan can bar from the committee and close the mouth of the chief financial officer of the Department of the Army when an appropriation bill is under consideration by your committee, he can bar the Secretary of the Army, he can bar the Secretary of State, or any other spokesman of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield briefly.

Mr. KNUTSON. Put that in the reverse: Suppose Secretary Royall should refuse to receive the gentleman?

Mr. MAHON. I think if Secretary Royall should refuse to receive the gentleman he would be guilty of a breach of comity between the branches of government that would be utterly inexcusable.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think so too.

Mr. MAHON. The question is not, Is General Richards good or bad? For the purpose of this discussion that question is unimportant. This question is bigger than General Richards, General Eisenhower, or any other official in America. It is a question of democratic government.

Let me read again from the press dispatch:

He—

Meaning the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman ENGEL—

contended that the committee could get all the information it needed for consideration of Army appropriations from Richards' subordinates.

In other words, the gentleman, in effect, proposes to suppress the testimony of General Richards, who is the responsible official as the Comptroller of the Army, and require members of the committee to hear the testimony of subordinates who are not responsible though, of course, the committee will be glad to hear subordinates too. He proposes to suppress the testimony of General Richards; suppress the information which only the chief fiscal officer of the Army is able to give.

Why all this effort to suppress and cover up evidence which our committee, the Congress, and the Nation are entitled to have? It seems that the contrary would be true, that witnesses would be haled, if there is something that should be uncovered to the shining light of day for 140,000,000 Americans to see, it seems that the contrary would be true, that witnesses would be haled ruthlessly before the committee, if necessary, and against their will, if necessary, and not only be permitted to testify, but required to testify, and not in a closed hearing, where even a Member of Congress who is not a member of the committee can appear if he desires to listen to the proceedings of government.

But the gentleman from Michigan, according to the press dispatch—and I looked in the Sunday and Monday papers for a denial—says the committee can get all the information it needs from General Richards' subordinates. Heaven forbid, Mr. Speaker. I did not come here from western Texas to serve on the Appropriations Committee as a representative of west Texans and the Nation to get evidence from subordinates, chosen by the whim of a subcommittee chairman, be he Democrat or Republican; and I do not think other Members came here for such a purpose. I do not want second-hand information from subordinates. The fact is, and you and I know it, that the best evidence you can get is often insufficient. We want first-hand information from the people who know—or should know—we want access in behalf of the taxpayers to the best sources. We do not want anything suppressed. All information from any source—from the top officials and from the subordinates and others should be available to Congress.

This astounding effort to suppress information from a witness which the committee needs cannot be allowed to succeed. The 435 Members of the House and 140,000,000 other Americans are entitled to have a chance to read, if they desire, the proceedings before the Appropriations Committee, especially from the chief fiscal officer of the War Department, about expenditures and requested funds. You are asked to appropriate many billions of dollars for military purposes. Certainly you should have the right to read a printed statement from the top fiscal officer of the War Department. And the people have a right to read it, and the world is entitled to know that part which is not secret. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan, is privileged to cross-examine General Richards, as are all other Members, and refute if he can the testimony which the General gives.

I now demand of the Speaker of the House, and will continue to demand, that General Richards, the chief fiscal officer of the Department of the Army, be called before the committee at the proper times in order that Members may hear his statements and have a chance to cross-examine him.

Let the American people have all the available facts in regard to Army spending. Let there be no effort to suppress or cover up evidence which Congress is entitled to have.

President Truman is asking Congress to appropriate this year about $11,000,000,000 for national defense—a staggering sum. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I am required to act on that budget, as are other members of that committee and eventually every Member of the House, and I do not propose to be thwarted in my efforts to get the necessary information which all Members desire, deserve, and must have.

Some talk of the threat of war, and tension is running high.

Mr. Speaker, I serve notice now that nobody is going to suppress the public information which General Richards can give our committee or deny Members the right to cross-examine him. I say that with due modesty in behalf of all Members of Congress, having in mind our inherent prerogatives as Members sent here by our constituents to represent the Nation as a whole.

The chairman may be satisfied with subordinates but the times are too critical, adequate national defense is too important, liberty is too precious for me to agree to that. We want the facts, the people want the facts, not from subordinates but from the top officials of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I have not arisen to defend General Richards, but these few facts are in point.

General Richards is the former budget officer, and is now the fiscal Comptroller of the Department of the Army, and in such capacity he is the chief adviser of the Secretary of the Army and of General Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, in fiscal and budget matters. The General has held the position of budget officer for 4½ years. Prior to that time he was assistant budget officer for a number of years. Before the war, throughout the war, and since the war he has worked in close contact with the War Department and with the Congress.

He enjoyed the confidence and esteem of Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, a Republican and a good one. He enjoyed the confidence and esteem of Secretary of War Patterson, another Republican and a good one. He enjoyed the confidence and esteem and worked closely with Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff, during the war. I should make it clear perhaps that it was General Marshall, that great American, who selected Richards as budget officer. He was later selected as budget officer by General Eisenhower, and a short time ago General Eisenhower selected him as Comptroller of all fiscal affairs of the Army. He has the confidence and esteem of the present Secretary of the Army, Secretary Royall. He has the confidence and esteem of the present Chief of Staff, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, who selected him for his present job.

Insofar as I know, General Richards enjoys the confidence and esteem of all Members of Congress who have worked with him, with the exception of the gentleman from Michigan. Insofar as I know, he enjoys the respect and esteem of the gentleman from New York, Congressman JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Undoubtedly, I can say that General Richards enjoys the confidence and esteem of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, for just a few weeks ago he was selected by Chairman BRIDGES, of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to accompany him and other Senators on an important mission overseas, where he joined with them in conferring with Prime Minister Attlee, Foreign Secretary Bevin, Mr. Schuman, now the Premier of France, Prime Minister de Gasperri, of Italy, and others. In passing, I might add that it is strange indeed that an official of our Army who joined Senator BRIDGES and other Senators in conferring with the heads of state in Europe, where we understand that democracy is on trial, should be barred from exercising his rights as a spokesman for the Army in appearing before a congressional committee in America where we had hoped that democracy was secure. Our country, the major democratic nation on earth, would thereby give to all the world a very poor lesson in American democracy.

Others accompanying Senator BRIDGES on the trip to Europe a few weeks ago were Senators BROOKS, KNOWLAND, YOUNG, SALTONSTALL, DWORSHAK, GORDON, GREEN, and RUSSELL. All of these Senators, insofar as I know, have a high regard and respect for General Richards.

In my humble opinion, and I base it upon years of observation, General Richards has the confidence and respect of Senator CHAN GURNEY, chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, with whom we do battle every time we sit in on conference on an Army appropriation bill. In fact, only last week, January 23, the Senate approved unanimously the elevation of Gen. George Richards to the permanent rank of major general. He has held the temporary rank of major general for several years.

Members of the Senate must not have been impressed with the grave charges made on the House floor against General Richards last Thursday because it was on Friday, the day following, that the Senate took unanimous action in elevating General Richards to the permanent rank of major general.

Many officers are approved for high rank by the Senate who are practically unknown to the individual Senators. But General Richards has worked closely with both branches of the Congress for years and is well known to many individual Members. The fact that the Senators—men who have personally worked with him—unanimously approved his elevation in permanent rank is persuasive evidence that his work with that body had been highly acceptable.

As I have previously said, I have not risen to defend General Richards as the principle involved in this great issue is not dependent upon the merits or demerits of any individual. I take it for granted that the general is not perfect, and that he, like every other man in the world, may make mistakes from time to time. It would seem that the above facts which I have recited establish the fact that General Richards is an able officer who possesses an excellent reputation for honesty and public service. Were he permitted to take the floor and speak in his own behalf he could no doubt defend himself. But he is denied the forum of the House of Representatives and he is barred from speaking before the committee, and the committee members are barred from hearing him, in this land of the free and the home of the brave.

In conclusion, let me say, if any Member wishes to join the gentleman from Michigan in denying the right of the executive branch of the Government to present important Government witnesses before congressional committees in matters concerning which such witnesses have special information—thereby in effect suppressing important official testimony—I challenge that Member to state and defend his position on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Moreover, if any Member wishes to join the gentleman from Michigan in denying members of congressional committees the right to hear and cross-examine such witnesses and bring out their testimony to the committee, the Congress and the country, I challenge him to state and defend his position on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I will gladly yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. At what time, and when, and where did the gentleman get the idea that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] had ever taken a position that he would not allow General Richards to appear as a witness? I say this because the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] did not say that in his statement before the House the other day, nor did he say that in talking with me as late as yesterday.

Mr. MAHON. I take it that the gentleman from New York feels that General Richards has a perfect right to accompany Secretary Royall to our committee and to testify at any time.

Mr. TABER. As a witness, but not as a budget officer unless he is requested so to appear. There is a difference between testifying and coming there for some other purpose.

Mr. RAYBURN. Just a moment. Now, what other purpose does the gentleman from New York attribute to Secretary Royall for bringing General Richards there or General Richards being there?

Mr. TABER. He did not have any idea that General Richards was to testify. I can say that positively.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman from Michigan announced to the papers, and it was not denied, that he was not going to allow General Richards to appear before his subcommittee. The gentleman from Michigan has not denied that.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman from New York repudiate the action of the gentleman from Michigan if he did announce to the papers, as it was quoted in the Evening Star and other papers on Saturday and on Sunday, as follows:

> ENGEL says he has informed Secretary Royall not to send Richards before his committee. He contended that the committee could get all the information it needed for the consideration of Army appropriations from Richards' subordinates.
>
> Chairman ENGEL, Republican, of Michigan, said yesterday he had barred Maj. Gen. George C. Richards, the Army's budget officer, from appearing before the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee.

This is the press dispatch I previously quoted.

I did not understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] to say anything different, and I do not now understand that he takes any other position than that he will bar General Richards.

The statement appears——

Mr. TABER. I do not know what was in the papers, but I do know what he has told me, and told me repeatedly. I feel that that was an entirely different proposition than the one that has been described.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, since some of the gentleman's time has been taken up in colloquy, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague from Texas yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I address this inquiry to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Does the gentleman know or does he not know whether General Richards was asked to leave the hearing the other day?

Mr. TABER. Certainly he was. He was not there as a witness, he was there as a budget officer.

Mr. RAYBURN. He was there accompanying the Secretary of War at the request of the Secretary of War.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] I am sure, has no relish for this, and I have nothing by way of criticism to offer to the gentleman from New York, but the gentleman and I both know that on Thursday when General Richards came into the committee with Secretary Royall, General Clay, and others, none of whom was barred, except General Richards. Secretary Royall came down to testify in regard to more than a billion dollars which he was requesting that we appropriate. He brought his comptroller, his chief fiscal officer there with him, as he always does; as General Marshall usually did; as General Eisenhower usually does, and as Secretary Patterson usually did. What happened? By a request which originally emanated from the gentleman from Michigan, as I am informed, he was asked to leave the room, not because the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] personally wanted him to leave—I do not think he did want him to leave—but because of the desire of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not a fact that General Richards prepared the estimates that the Secretary was called on to testify about?

Mr. MAHON. That is right; he certainly had some part in making up the budget estimates as the budget officer.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say that I am a member of the War Department Appropriations Committee. I was a member of the committee when this little trouble arose between General Richards and the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman ENGEL. Chairman ENGEL is a good man, and I like him.

Mr. MAHON. So do I.

Mr. NORRELL. However, there is no Army officer in the Nation for whom I have a higher regard than General Richards. I feel that it is an unfortunate misunderstanding, and I subscribe to everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman wishes, no doubt, to inject another subject into this discussion. If he will let me continue, at the end of my remarks we will discuss the other subject.

If the leaders of the Republican Party in the House wish to approve the position of the gentleman from Michigan in these matters, I challenge the leadership of the Republican Party to take the floor and state and defend their position.

The Congress and the country are entitled to an immediate statement from the Republican leadership in the House approving or disapproving and repudiating the position of the gentleman from Michigan in barring—as has been admitted on the floor by my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]—from the committee important witnesses from the executive branch, thereby in effect suppressing vital public information and in effect denying committee members the right to hear such testimony and cross-examine such witnesses presented by the executive branch.

Let me make it clear that I do not mean to make this matter a political or partisan issue at this time because the

rights of both Republicans and Democrats have been placed in equal jeopardy by the astounding events of the last few days.

However, failing to secure the rights which I am insisting upon for all Members of Congress—though the issue is not now on a partisan basis, the Democrats will have no other alternative than to stand up and fight. I hope the Democrats will not have to stand alone in defending the flickering torch of liberty from the gales which assail it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes. I want to hear the last part of his statement. It is beginning to get good now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. I hope the Democrats will not have to stand alone in defending the flickering torch of liberty from the gales which assail it, but if necessary, we are amply able to do so, and we do so with full confidence. There is no doubt in my mind but that American public opinion will be our ally, and that the battle in behalf of democracy will be won.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. I understand one of the main points of the gentleman's speech is that the top man in the War Department ought to be permitted to testify on this in preference to the subordinates in his own organization.

Mr. MAHON. We want the subordinates and we want the top men. We want all witnesses who have anything to say or any truth to reveal.

Mr. MACKINNON. But one of your main points was that the top man in this section of the Army knew what was going on in his own organization.

Mr. MAHON. I made no such claim. I said the top man should be called before the committee to testify and that his testimony should not be suppressed.

Mr. MACKINNON. The point I make is that Mr. Edwin W. Pauley who also is in the Army Department as special assistant on procurement and reparations to the Secretary of the Army in defense of his commodity speculations claims that he knew practically nothing of what was going on in his section of the War Department.

Mr. MAHON. I am not bringing other issues into this controversy. I do not defend Mr. Pauley. If he is guilty of any offense, he should be vigorously prosecuted. I defend no man of evil. I denounce him if he is guilty. Let all evidence of waste and improper conduct on the part of officials and others be brought out into the open so that the people may know the truth and justice may be done.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 449) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That KEN REGAN, of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Admiral Kinkaid at the Australian Embassy on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROPAGANDA BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I shall intrude only very briefly upon our crowded time. But I wish to express the sincere appreciation of all Members of our Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda in the Executive Agencies for the many applauding and encouraging words communicated to us by so many Members of the House.

Our assignment is a challenging one, for often it is difficult to separate the merits of pending legislation from the larger question of Government propaganda designed to provide a system of national thought control. But we have set our course resolutely against the whole system and theory of Government-made public opinion; and we have attempted conscientiously and fairly to distinguish that great issue from all subsidiary questions touching the merits of various legislative proposals.

As we have stated in our several interim reports, our inquiry is not directed to the merits of this program or that, but solely to the question whether the Federal agencies are engaged in generating public opinion for or against pending legislation. Such activity by the Federal agencies, whether for or against any particular piece of legislation, is clearly beyond the law. And that is the beginning and end of our inquiry—whether the Government agencies are, in fact, making the public opinion which comes back upon Congress in the form of pressure-group activities.

We all recognize that the average American citizen is only vaguely aware of the fact that the Federal Government continuously touches and influences his daily thinking. But, when he stops to think about it, he must realize that a host of Federal agencies and activities exert a constant and often decisive influence upon his own and his neighbors' opinions. Yet, I doubt that any but the most thoughtful students of American Government understand how vast is the range of this influence; how tremendous is the machinery in our Federal establishment through which this influence of molding opinion is exercised.

Every one of us here in Congress ought to be keenly conscious of the tremendous, unmeasurable power of this machine, for he comes in direct, personal contact with it every day. He lives with the lobbies, good and bad, which constantly seek to influence the course of legislation; and he can hardly fail to know that the most powerful, most persistent of them all is the Federal lobby. It works around the clock, every day of the year.

I wonder how many among us actually realize the nature and extent of this threat to free representative government? The very range and intensity of official information can be confusing.

At the risk of repetition, I remind the House again that at the last official tabulation the executive agencies were spending annually some $75,000,000 in definitely identified publicity and propaganda activities.

Some 45,000 Federal employees devote their time wholly or in part to these definitely identified information activities. I use the term "definitely identified" advisedly, for we can be sure that other officials and employees, as well as funds from other sources, contribute directly or indirectly to the volume of Federal publicity and propaganda. What the total cost in money and manpower may be, we can only guess. However, we do know that it is tremendous.

But the tangible cost, large as it is, should be the least of our concern. Our real worry should be the direct violence which this phase of bureaucracy does to the very philosophy of our Constitution; the insidious threat it poses for our free institutions.

The first instinct of bureaucracy is self-preservation. The second is expansion. Just like any living organism, an administrative agency, once launched, seeks constantly to justify its existence, to perpetuate itself and to expand. In the salubrious climate of Government paternalism which has prevailed under this and the preceding administrations, bureaucracy has luxuriated into a tropical jungle. It has grown to the alarming extent that it touches and shadows the daily life and daily thinking of every citizen.

Now that we have a majority in Congress determined not merely to halt this bureaucratic growth, but to clear away the propaganda jungle which enmeshes us, the American people begin to see the true nature of big government. Bureaucracy fights not merely for existence. It battles for greater powers and constant expansion. Its most effective tools are publicity and propaganda.

Let me make it clear, as I have stated so often in our committee meetings, that I have no objection to the legitimate publicity functions of Federal agencies. In fact, it is a prime duty of free government to keep the people fully and accurately informed. Administrative officials at policy-making levels should be entirely free to express and discuss policy on any issue.

But beyond the routine duty of releasing such expressions to the regular news channels of press and radio, no agency may properly go. The information services of administrative agencies may not lawfully use public funds to "sell" ideas, to editorialize, or to influence public opinion on any issue. Federal officials and employees may not lawfully devote time and talents paid for from public funds to mold public thinking.

The sole legal and ethical function of a Federal information service is to issue factual, objective, and studiously unbiased information. Specific safeguards against the abuse of that function is provided in section 201, title 18, of the United States Code. Unfortunately, however, the law has been, and is being, repeatedly violated by numerous administrative agencies. In hundreds of ways, some devious, some blatantly open, Federal agencies, their officials and employees, are ignoring or flouting this legal safeguard, often for the deliberate purpose of fostering sentiment and support for administration policy or viewpoint.

Certainly no Member of Congress, no responsible administrative officer, no thoughtful individual anywhere, doubts the wisdom of this specific prohibition against Federal propaganda. Certainly it is unnecessary to argue that the citizen and taxpayer should not be forced by the Federal agencies to pay for publicity and propaganda designed to influence and direct his own thinking.

You can justify such tactics only if you belong to that school of thought dominant in Washington in recent years that Government must guide and direct the average American in everything because he is incapable of thinking and acting wisely or safely for himself. Or you might so thoroughly approve the policy being advanced by a particular Federal agency at the moment that you fall into the fatal error of believing the end justifies the means.

Actually, the merits of the immediate issue in any case should not concern our committee. We need only remember that if the power of Federal propaganda is applied for a good and wise purpose on one occasion it can be applied on another for a purpose mischievous and dangerous.

And whether the immediate purpose of Government propaganda is good or bad, the fact remains that individual liberty and free institutions cannot long survive when the vast power of Government can be marshaled against the people to perpetuate a given policy or a particular group of officeholders. Nor can freedom survive if all Government policies and programs are sustained by overwhelming Government propaganda.

The limited work our committee has done in the short time since its establishment last May convinces me that it can render a vital service.

Congress cannot, of course, remedy at once all the serious abuses which we are able to expose; for enforcement of the law is solely the responsibility of the executive. I hope, however, that we shall have the united support of the House, in our intention to employ all the facilities at our command to bring this grave danger to the attention of the Nation.

Thought control is a device of dictatorship. It has no place in free America.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I certainly wish to thank the gentleman for the very excellent statement he has made.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. May I say that there is nothing being done in this Congress more important than the committee's work on propaganda. A representative government can only function successfully if the people get information on both sides of every issue. The people's judgment is only as good as their information. For several years the people of America have been subjected to drenching propaganda for certain philosophies and certain policies that have made it impossible for either the people or the Congress to think through intelligently a decision on great issues. I hope this committee goes forward with its work.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I assure the gentleman that with the support of the House this committee will continue to unfold and bring to public attention the many abuses I have discussed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As chairman of the full committee for which the gentleman has been acting, I know I express the appreciation of all members on the committee. I do not know that anyone on the committee objects. I know the gentleman's reports have been unanimously supported. They were signed by the minority members, as well as by those on the majority side.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Thus far, they have been unanimous.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to thank the gentleman for the very careful and painstaking factual reports he has submitted. Certainly the subject needs further consideration by the gentleman's committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANBORN). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PERTINENT OBSERVATIONS CONCERNING THE TAFT-HARTLEY LABOR LAW

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after spending considerable time and effort last spring in analyzing the so-called labor problem, I told the House that it was not a labor problem at all but rather a problem concerning the rights and interests of labor, of management, and of the public—the three essential factors that make up our economic life. I said then that the job confronting Congress, was one of clearing up and defining anew the rights and interests of labor, of management, and of the public; also, that in order to do that job properly Congress should pass legislation to accomplish four things, namely:

First. Clarify the legal status of labor and management that has been so beclouded by recent court decisions.

Second. Equalize as much as possible the collective-bargaining powers of labor and management.

Third. Require equal responsibility from labor and management for the carrying out of agreements or contracts entered into.

Fourth. Protect the welfare and health of the public whenever differences between labor and management threaten the general welfare and health of the public.

I gave warning then, however, that the right to work, the right not to work, the right of association for mutual advantage, the right to bargain as an individual or collectively are inherent in our American way of life and should not be limited or curtailed by legislative fiat.

Mr. Speaker, when the labor situation was before the Congress for action, much was said pro and con about the Taft-Hartley labor-management bill. Its backers claimed it was a bill of rights for labor. Its opponents called it a slave-labor bill. The truth is it was a labor bill that sought to place labor and management on a par as to their bargaining powers; to bring peace to the troubled field of labor relations; to eliminate many undesirable labor practices that had developed under the National Labor Relations Act; and to make paramount the interest of the general public over that of any minority group, whether employers or employees. The Taft-Hartley labor-management law does just that and nothing more.

The gentleman from Indiana, Representative CHARLES HALLECK, the majority leader of the House—an active, well-known champion of the rights of organized labor during his 13 years in Congress—said, during the debate in the House on the Taft-Hartley labor bill:

> It is sane, fair, decent, reasonable—yea, courageous—legislation dealing with the problems of labor-management relations. * * * It preserves the guaranty of the Wagner Act giving labor the right to organize and to bargain collectively. * * * It provides remedies for activities and practices by labor and by management that almost everyone condemns. It forbids boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, violence in strikes, strikes in violation of contracts, strikes to compel employers to break the law, coercion of employees by unions. It imposes upon unionism restrictions far less stringent than those in the Railway Labor Act, under which the railroad brotherhoods have flourished for years. It preserves the constitutional guaranty of free speech. It provides for separating the functions of the Labor Board, requires the Board to decide cases before it according to the facts, and gives to the courts real power to review the Board's decisions. And it puts the public interest, in maintaining output so essential to our national well-being, above the selfish interests of employers or of employees.
>
> Now these are not provisions that destroy unions. Those who say they will destroy unions say, in effect, that unions, in order to exist, must be free to coerce workers, to engage in violence, to break their contracts, and to break the law, even the very law that protects them. I say this is not true. The great trade-union movement, which protects so many of our people and which has contributed so greatly to raising their standard of living, can and will thrive under the bill now before us. That is my conviction.

Because I agreed with Congressman HALLECK's analysis of the bill, I voted for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, in order to understand the Taft-Hartley labor-management

law we must know something about the situation concerning labor that confronted the Congress last spring.

The Wagner Act, commonly known as the National Labor Relations Act, was passed in 1935. That act is the magna carta of American labor. It was passed to encourage and strengthen labor organizations so they could bargain collectively upon an equal footing with organized management. Under the Wagner Act labor organizations grew rapidly, both in power and in members. In a few years they grew from a membership of 4,000,000 to a membership of 15,000,000. As a result of this tremendous growth the labor-relations pendulum swung over from one extreme to the other. Instead of big-business barons dictating to and asserting their power over the laboring men of America and saying under their breath, "The public be damned," we now had labor czars dictating to and asserting their power over the rank and file of union members, and saying out loud, "The public be damned." As a result, jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts became common, with labor disturbances and physical violence everyday occurrences.

Mr. Speaker, some Congressmen said, "Repeal the Wagner Act and take away from labor organizations the powers they are now abusing." Others said, "We should not rob organized labor of the privileges and benefits of the Wagner Act just because some labor leaders have abused those powers. We should amend the act so as to curtail the powers of labor leaders and make them again responsible to the rank and file of their own membership and to the public in general." The latter program is what Congress set out to do, and that is exactly what the Taft-Hartley labor law does.

Boiled down, the law seeks to accomplish four things, namely:

First. Place labor and management on a par as to their bargaining powers, and make them both responsible for living up to their signed contracts.

Second. Bring peace to the troubled field of labor relations.

Third. Eliminate undesirable labor practices that have developed under the National Labor Relations Act.

Fourth. Make paramount the interest of the general public over that of any minority group, whether employers or employees.

The Taft-Hartley labor law does just that and nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, the Wagner Act of 1935 was a private one-way street upon which organized labor could march forward to power and influence. The so-called Taft-Hartley law of 1947 is a public street upon which organized labor and organized management can each march forward under rules and regulations that protect the interests of organized labor, the interests of organized management, and the interests of the unorganized public. Instead of being a "slave-labor law," as it has been dubbed, it is a "save-labor law," a law designed to save the rank and file of organized labor from the dictatorial and domineering actions of such labor leaders as James Petrillo, John L. Lewis, and Harry Bridges.

Mr. Speaker, "the proof of the pudding is in the eating." Under the Taft-Hartley Act, and even before it was passed, we have had a greater degree of labor peace, more labor contracts signed without strikes or strife, and a greater degree of satisfaction among the rank and file of labor than at any time during the last 10 years. As proof of this, in the first quarter of 1946 work stoppages amounted to 54,700,000 man-days, the highest figure on record; while during the first quarter of 1947 work stoppages amounted to only 3,300,000 man-days, the lowest record for any quarter since the end of the war. At the same time, the industrial production index of the United States shot up by almost 30 points, and the national income was higher by over $22,000,000,000. Those are Government figures, not my figures. In addition, every single labor contract signed since the passage of the act has provided either better wages, better hours, or better working conditions, and quite often all three have been included.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago President Truman asked Congress to pass legislation giving him the power to conscript railroad workers. He asked for the passage of a resolution to draft all railroad men into the Army in peacetime and make them work under penalty of martial law. It was properly called Truman's slave-labor resolution. Congress refused to pass that resolution to give the President such power during peacetime. It was Senator TAFT, the author of the Taft-Hartley law, that blocked President Truman's draft-labor proposal. How times do change. Today President Truman condemns Congress for passing the Taft-Hartley labor bill. He tried to prevent it from becoming a law by using his veto power. He placed his judgment on the Taft-Hartley labor-management bill above the judgment of 80 percent of the 435 duly elected Members of the House of Representatives and 70 percent of the 96 duly elected Members of the United States Senate who voted for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, millions of the rank-and-file members of unions all over the Nation consider the Taft-Hartley Act good legislation because it has given the local unions greater control over their own affairs, and emphasizes the rights of the individual union worker as against the power of the union leaders. Union leaders call the Taft-Hartley labor bill a slave-labor bill, but the average union man today finds that he has been freed rather than enslaved. The Taft-Hartley labor bill certainly did not hinder or handicap John L. Lewis in his dealings with the coal operators.

Mr. Speaker, labor leaders are still screaming in public against the so-called Taft-Hartley Act, but in private they are beginning to acknowledge that it is not nearly as bad as they have painted it. They have been both shocked and sobered by the law just passed by the British Labor Government giving that government the power to direct where every man between 18 and 50 must work, and also every woman between 18 and 40 who is not tied down with children. The law carries a fine of $500 and 3 months in jail for refusal to obey. As one of our labor leaders put it, "We do not want our Government telling us where we must work as the labor government is now doing in England." The fact is the British Labor Government has imposed upon its people greater restrictions and more rigid controls over their everyday life than were in force during the war. Perhaps the idea that the Taft-Hartley law is a save-labor law instead of a slave-labor law is beginning to penetrate the hard heads of some of our labor leaders when they think about what has happened in England.

Mr. Speaker, Woodrow Wilson said:

> The history of liberty is the history of limitation of government power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties.

Whether the concentration of power is in the hands of bureaucrats in Washington, or in the hands of the labor czars of today, it is a bad thing for the rank and file of the people, and it must be restricted and curtailed. That is the purpose of the Taft-Hartley labor law. That is what the Taft-Hartley labor law does; it curtails the powers of the labor czars of today.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. I congratulate the gentleman on his very fine address and wish to express to him the gratitude of the entire membership for having expressed himself so forthrightly. If I could use any word to describe that which the gentleman has done I would use the word "courage," a quality in the gentleman's character for which we all admire him.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman may be interested to know that I gave this speech with ramifications to 150 labor leaders of the State of Illinois who challenged me to come before them and explain the Taft-Hartley law or at least defend my attitude toward it, and my vote upon it, which I was glad to do.

Mr. GEARHART. I feel certain that after that presentation you won many an adherent in the camp of what some might be inclined to describe as the enemy.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANBORN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

VETERANS

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have now served for a year on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and, so serving, I have heard much testimony regarding the problems confronting the veterans of all wars.

The most worthy problem—and the one deserving immediate solution—is the

neglect that has thus far been shown the veterans of World War I.

The Congress has provided, for a number of years, for the veterans of the Spanish-American War and their widows and dependent children.

There are today some veterans of World War I who saw much greater service and made much greater sacrifices than did their brothers in the conflict with Spain, who are older than some of the Spanish-American War veterans who have been provided for by our Government.

Mr. Speaker, the average age of the veterans of World War I is now approaching 55. Many are much older than this; a few are younger.

The time has come when it is the duty of our Government to give the fullest consideration to these veterans, who have apparently been forgotten through the years.

At this point, I wish to say that we are proud of our Spanish-American War veterans, and we know that they are highly appreciative of the provisions that have been made for them and that every one of them will join with us in endorsing their program for the veterans of World War I.

I am today introducing a bill to provide for the granting of pensions to World War I veterans and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions of the veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and children.

I urge the immediate enactment of this legislation, and I am confident that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am proud to be a member, will immediately take this legislation under consideration. It is my sincere hope that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join with me in this effort to provide for the welfare of our aging veterans of our First World War conflict of 1917–18.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced H. R. 5139, which provides for Federal payments for old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month beginning April 1, 1949, to any individual who is 60 or more years of age, who has been a citizen and resident of the United States for 10 years, and whose gross income for the preceding tax year was less than $750. Last year a group of liberal progressive Members of Congress met on several occasions to discuss the matter of old-age pensions. At that time we came to certain definite conclusions which were embodied in a resolution addressed to the Committee on Ways and Means. There was a general meeting of the minds on the basic problems involved. This original group of 25 or 30 Congressmen prepared the following resolution, or as we termed it, a friendly letter. Today there are over 120 Members of Congress who have joined as cosponsors for an equitable and reasonable old-age pension bill. The letter reads as follows:

A FRIENDLY REQUEST TO THE HONORABLE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Subject: Old-age pensions.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee:

We, the undersigned Members of the Eightieth Congress, respectfully represent:

1. That our present pensions for the aged are inadequate.

2. We feel they should be increased to at least $60 per month.

3. The age of the availability should be reduced from 65 to 60 years.

4. That the Federal appropriation should be available uniformly in all the States, irrespective of whether the various States find themselves in position to match the Federal grant.

5. We feel there is abundant evidence in the records of this and previous sessions of Congress to support these statements.

Will you therefore report to the floor an open bill that will accomplish these very reasonable objectives? May we also ask that the said bill may be reported far enough in advance of any recess that it may have thorough consideration and vote?

We have, as we should, found the time and the means to legislate and appropriate funds liberally for the relief of needy people in other lands. Millions of our deserving elders are now in dire need. In fact, with the increased costs of living, many are in desperate circumstances. Many of us have promised them we would do our best to secure for them a reasonable pension, and during this session of the Congress. We trust your honorable committee will cooperate with us to this end.

Respectfully,

(120 signers.)

Various old-age pension bills have been introduced by Members of Congress requesting revisions and changes in the present old-age pension laws. For myself, I may state that I have also signed the petition to bring out H. R. 16, introduced by the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL, the bill that provides for the Townsend plan. Many other Members have done likewise. Let me say at the outset that the sincere and honest Members of Congress who truly are fighting for an adequate old-age pension payment are first of all interested in the primary objective, and that is to give full and adequate assistance to the aged. No one is looking for glory, no one is looking for credit. We are all fighting for a cause, a cause which we think is of first and paramount importance. If there is anyone in the United States of America who will stand up and say that we have already taken care of our aged, disabled, and incapacitated, in a proper American way, let him stand up and say so now but let him not carp and criticize any Member of Congress who is sincerely trying to solve a most important problem.

My bill, H. R. 5139, which I shall call the 60–60 old-age pension bill, reads as follows:

A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Social Security Board (hereinafter called the Board) shall pay, out of any funds hereafter appropriated for such purpose, old-age assistance to qualified individuals at the rate of $60 per month.

(b) For the purposes of this act an individual shall be deemed to be a qualified individual—

(1) who is 60 years of age or over on the first day of the payment year;

(2) who has been a citizen and resident of the United States for not less than 10 years;

(3) whose gross annual income is not more than $750, or whose gross income combined with the gross income of a spouse, as the case may be, for the tax year preceding the year in which the payment year begins is less than $1,500; and

(4) who makes timely application for the benefits of this act.

(c) Payments to qualified individuals shall be made monthly for each month during a payment year. A "payment year" shall begin April 1 and end March 31. Application for the benefits of this act during any payment year shall be made on or before March 15 of the calendar year in which the payment year begins.

SEC. 2. Any individual making application for the benefits of this act shall furnish such evidence of age and citizenship as the board may by regulation prescribe. The gross income of any individual for the purposes of this act shall be established from records and data in the possession of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall upon request furnish to the board any documents, records, or information which he may have relating to the gross income of any applicant for the benefits of this act.

SEC. 3. The first payment year under this act shall begin April 1, 1949. No payment to any State under title I of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be made for any quarter beginning on or after such date. .

SEC. 4. The Board shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. As used in this act the term "United States" shall include the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill that I have introduced takes care of the basic problem; it takes care of the aged who have lost their earning power. It provides for a Federal pension of $60 per month to persons over 60 years of age who earn less than $750 per year. Of course, I shall be willing to accept amendments that will provide for pension assistance for the aged in the income class of people earning a little more than $750—say, up to $1,000—annually. Any reasonable adjustment which will bring the income of every aged citizen up to at least $100 a month is necessary and will be worked out.

I am positively and definitely opposed to any old-age-pension legislation which will becloud the issue by restricting an aged person to the type of a home that he can own, or would restrict his capital assets to any particular sum, or compels him to take the pauper's oath. After all, let us be reasonable. A man cannot eat his house, or some stocks or bonds that he may own. When we talk about old-age assistance, the only thing that we should take into consideration is the individual's income. His house, his lots, his little farm, his few shares of stocks and bonds should not disqualify him from old-age benefits. His income is the only fair method that we can use to

arrive at an honest conclusion as to whether the aged person should receive a pension or not.

At this point I want to include a recent statement on old-age-assistance payments:

	State maximums on OAA payments			Average OAA payment per recipient		
	September 1942	September 1946	September 1947	September 1942	September 1946	September 1947
Alabama	$40	$40	$45	$9.82	$18.39	$17.23
Alaska	45	60	60	29.68	40.92	37.54
Arizona	40	40	50	34.74	38.79	47.79
Arkansas	None	30	45	9.01	17.25	18.19
California	[1] 40	[1] 50	[1] 60	36.49	47.72	57.04
Colorado	[1] 45	[1] 45	[1] 45	37.02	41.52	64.93
Connecticut	40	40	45	29.66	42.56	43.66
Delaware	25	[1] 30	[1] 40	12.99	19.66	23.79
District of Columbia	30	None	None	26.99	38.32	38.90
Florida	40	40	45	14.32	31.06	37.00
Georgia	30	30	45	8.98	13.54	16.96
Hawaii	40	None	None	15.66	26.03	34.91
Idaho	None	None	None	24.68	38.25	41.56
Illinois	40	45	50	27.16	35.89	39.75
Indiana	40	40	45	20.21	26.86	30.84
Iowa	25	None	None	21.74	34.65	40.49
Kansas	None	None	None	22.93	31.46	38.94
Kentucky	30	30	30	10.10	12.02	17.34
Louisiana	None	75	90	13.47	23.04	21.33
Maine	30	40	[1] 40	21.45	31.15	34.02
Maryland	30	40	45	19.53	28.65	31.15
Massachusetts	[5] None	[5] None	[8] None	33.41	47.45	51.16
Michigan	40	40	45	20.15	34.24	37.57
Minnesota	[1] 30	[1] 40	[1] 50	22.59	34.60	41.70
Mississippi	[1] 30	30	30	9.04	16.81	17.50
Missouri	[1] 30	40	45	13.63	29.50	32.00
Montana	[1] 30	40	45	22.99	32.76	38.79
Nebraska	[1] 30	40	50	20.79	34.03	37.51
Nevada	[3] 40	[6] None	[6] 50	30.94	38.97	48.06
New Hampshire	30	46	48	23.06	33.47	38.13
New Jersey	40	None	None	23.08	34.03	41.34
New Mexico	40	50	[7] 60	16.80	31.25	35.22
New York	None	None	None	28.03	41.20	47.30
North Carolina	[1] 30	40	45	10.35	14.08	18.14
North Dakota	[2] 40	None	None	18.87	35.92	38.94
Ohio	[1] 40	[1] 40	50	24.35	32.62	39.96
Oklahoma	40	40	45	20.58	35.72	42.43
Oregon	40	None	None	24.02	40.15	40.59
Pennsylvania	30	None	None	24.48	31.35	33.96
Rhode Island	[1] 40	None	None	24.29	35.69	41.01
South Carolina	[4] 20	[4] 20	22	10.30	16.52	19.71
South Dakota	[1] 30	40	45	19.31	27.67	32.23
Tennessee	25	40	45	12.36	16.39	20.59
Texas	[1] 30	40	45	20.31	23.60	29.98
Utah	[1] 30	[6] 40	[8] 45	27.02	39.35	43.01
Vermont	[1] 30	40	45	17.83	24.53	32 69
Virginia	[1] 20	40	45	10.39	15.89	17.47
Washington	[1] 40	[9] None	None	33.63	53.93	50.02
West Virginia	40	40	45	17.74	16.73	20.35
Wisconsin	[1] 40	40	45	23.91	32.03	36.33
Wyoming	[1] 30	50	60	24.89	41.78	48.56

[1] Assistance plus income.
[2] Minimums.
[3] Minimum, $30.
[4] $240 per year.
[5] Minimum, $40.
[6] Minimum, $40 less income and resources.
[7] Effective Nov. 1, 1947, maximum is $55.
[8] Maximum on budgetary need.
[9] Minimum, $50 per month, less income and resources.

Mr. Speaker, you will note from this schedule that Michigan could have paid a maximum of $40 in 1942, but it only paid an average of $20.15; in 1946, Michigan could have paid a maximum of $40, but only paid an average of $34.24; in 1947, Michigan could have paid a maximum of $45, but only paid $37.57.

Now let us look at California—of course, they have a slightly different State formula or law than Michigan has—they include assistance plus income, but their average old-age pension for September 1942 was $36.49; for September 1946, $47.72; for September 1947, $57.04. Now, of course, everybody knows that the climate in California is milder than it is in Michigan; you do not need as much fuel or warm clothing—fresh vegetables and fruits, which are most essential, are cheaper and more abundant in California than in Michigan. And then there is the State of Colorado, which in September 1947 gave an average old-age-assistance payment per recipient of $64.93 per month. Has not our State administration been lacking in making the same equitable and ample provisions for our old people?

Now, of course, you can look down this list and find many States which gave far less than Michigan, such as Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and several others. But what does this prove? Certainly, no one will say that the old and aged citizens of our State should be dragged down to the poverty and pauperism that these few States practice. But on the other hand, if you will examine this schedule you will find that not only do California and Colorado pay more than Michigan, but also that the States of Arizona, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, give greater assistance to the aged.

Yes; all of these States take better care of the needs of their aged citizens than does our great State of Michigan.

Now, in my bill I propose to take care of those over 60 years of age and have incomes of less than $750 a year by giving them an additional $60 per month. This is approximately $2 a day. Now, the great State of Michigan can supplement this by whatever amount it would desire. It will be up to the good Governors and the legislatures to measure the charity in their hearts toward the aged in their States. They likewise could give additional State assistance to those earning more than $750 a year, if they would desire to do so.

Every last human being has a longing in his heart for security. All of us at some time have thought about the evening of life. We look forward to those days of happiness with our life companions, when we will be able to reflect on the active days of the past, enjoy the quiet hours of the present, and think of the blessed days which shall come on the morrow. Some in life are more fortunate than others in acquiring the material things of this earth. For the most part every man is active and considered a worker in the best days of his younger and middle life. In this great country of ours few are lazy and still fewer are without ambition to attain all that is necessary for the protection of himself and those whom he loves; but all of us in this great country must have an appreciation of the beauty and wholesomeness which comes with age. We must prepare the economy of this Government and of this rich Nation to accommodate the needs of those who have grown old. We have too long been thinking of self in the active days and have failed to account for the coming of the winter of life. I propose in my bill to approach this whole question of care realistically, practically, and with a basis of sound economy. We have the wealth—we are motivated by the highest of impulses, and we must translate our wealth and our human motives into practical intention to this important matter.

Would it not be a great sense of satisfaction to us all to feel that we have contributed in a measure to assuring the old men and women of this country security in the latter days of life? Back in the Old Testament somewhere there is written:

> When ye gather the harvest of your lands, ye shall not wholly glean the corners of thy fields, thou shalt leave them for the poor and needy.

Today we are the richest nation of all the nations of the world. We must remain strong—we intend to remain strong. We have shared our wealth with those who have been struck with the horror of a shooting war. We recognize that their homes have been burned, their barns have been knocked down, their factories have been destroyed, and their businesses wrecked.

We have not failed the peoples of the world, but I am insisting that we shall not fail the old people in our own country. To have the greatest degree of happiness, and to be able to contribute to the greatest degree of that happiness to the world, we must not overlook a great segment of our own population. We must not forget that many who have reached 60 years of age or more have, in their quiet, unassuming, honest way, worked hard to produce the very wealth

that we are now able to share with the world.

In working for an adequate old-age pension program we are striving for a very noble, humanitarian objective. Today we are faced with communistic and socialistic philosophies. Now is the time that we must demonstrate to other political philosophies that ours is the best. We must demonstrate by positive action that we do take care of our aged, infirm, and disabled better than any other government, or political philosophy, in the whole world. We must not be weighed in the balances and found wanting. After all, we are the richest nation, we are the people that are economically best able to do so. We must do the same thing for our own people that we ask and encourage the rest of the world to do for their own. Democracy will fail if we do not maintain happiness and security for our citizens in their later days.

We have demonstrated that we have the strength and power and inventive genius to mobilize our resources, our wealth, our industry, our agriculture, and our labor; to build up a fighting force of 11,000,000 men and women to win a world war. Now, with this evidence of our power and our might, will it be said of us that we failed in time of peace to win the war against fear which faces the aged of these United States?

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 400. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mabel Townsend Pretty on Top; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 401. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 773. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Mary E. Leaf; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1298. An act to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1407. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Robert E. Doyle; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1517. An act authorizing the issuance to James Perry Doyle of a patent in fee to certain lands in Big Horn County, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1521. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Treasury to detail certain scientific and technical personnel employed by or within the National Military Establishment or the United States Coast Guard to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1591. An act to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1673. An act to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, as a major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1733. An act to authorize payment to certain enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1794. An act to authorize the Houston council, Navy League of the United States, to construct a reflecting pool at the United States naval hospital, Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1799. An act to amend the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to make it applicable to the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1800. An act relating to the restrictions on the use of crypt and window spaces of the United States Naval Academy Chapel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1802. An act to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1961. An act to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3645. An act relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 29, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1258. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961, 16 U. S. C. 513), to relieve the Secretary from serving as a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1259. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1260. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury Claim Board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to House Resolution 318, Seventy-ninth Congress, and House Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, on transportation in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4790. A bill to reduce individual income tax payments, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEWIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3366. A bill to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5152. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 5153. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment

station in the Appalachian region for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 5154. A bill to extend the period within which the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by making payments to agricultural producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5155. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., and to report to the Congress upon the advisability and practicability of constructing thereon a parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 5156. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5157. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5158. A bill to authorize payment of benefits for injuries or death incurred by veterans as a result of training under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 5159. A bill to provide for research relating to diseases of the heart and circulation, including high blood pressure, in a supreme endeavor to develop speedily more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 5160. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 5161. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5162. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5163. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Green Bay, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5164. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Manitowoc, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 5165. A bill to confer concurrent jurisdiction upon the Commonwealth of Kentucky over certain highways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 5166. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5167. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 448. Resolution to create a special committee to investigate lawlessness in Palestine and activities and intentions in the Middle East of United Nations, United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and United States of America; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5168. A bill for the relief of Louis Kesselman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 5169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5170. A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of United States against Doheny Executors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5171. A bill for the relief of John G. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1210. By Mr. HESELTON: Petition signed by 59 members of the Clarence W. Allen Post, No. 178, American Legion Auxiliary, Turner Falls, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1211. Also, petition signed by 26 members of the American Legion Auxiliary post, Adams, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1212. Also, petition signed by 26 members of American Legion Post, No. 172, Orange, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1213. Also, petition signed by 15 members of Lieutenant Roger B. Warfield Post, American Legion, Templeton, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1214. Also, petition signed by 11 members of the American Legion Auxiliary post, Ashfield, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1215. Also, petition signed by 15 members of Holyoke Post, No. 25, American Legion Auxiliary, Holyoke, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Military Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1216. Also, petition signed by 63 members of Colrain Post, No. 43, American Legion, Colrain, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1217. Also, petition signed by nine residents of North Adams, Mass., in favor of legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1218. Also, petition of Miss Arlene Miller and sundry citizens of Huntington, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1219. Also, petition signed by 11 residents of Housatonic, State Line, and West Stockbridge, Mass., in favor of legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1220. By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT: Petition of 18 members of Frankford Post, No. 68, American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1221. By Mr. HESELTON: Petition signed by 15 members of the American Legion Post, Adams, Mass., favoring a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, it seems hard to care for those we find it far easier to hate, to love those whom we regard as unlovely, to spend our lives for those who are so ungrateful.

If we are to learn, Thou must be our teacher.

Since we will be criticized, let it be for doing too much or too little, rather than for doing nothing.

Teach us to trust not to cleverness or learning, but to that inward faith which can never be denied.

Lead us out of confusion to simplicity. In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. IRVING M. IVES, a Senator from the State of New York, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. IVES thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 26, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On January 26, 1948:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;

S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.;

S. 298. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 1020. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Ada B. Foss;

S. 1324. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the National Library for the Blind; and

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Damian Gandiaga.

On January 27, 1948:

S. 339. An act for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil;

S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;

S. 929. An act to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564); and

S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3326) to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818;

H. R. 3153. An act to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota; and

H. R. 3322. An act to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3645) relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Friday next.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury Claim Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Comptroller General of the work of the General Accounting Office, for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

STATEMENT BY NEBRASKA SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared and unanimously adopted by the soil conservation district supervisors of Nebraska, assembled in annual meeting at Lincoln, on January 7 and 8, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Members of the Congress of the United States:

We, the supervisors of the soil conservation districts of the State of Nebraska, being subdivisions of the State and the agency charged under the laws of the State of Nebraska with local guidance of the action program of conservation on the land, respectfully submit for your consideration the following recommendations:

We urge that the conservation districts of the various States be delegated by the Federal Government with the same responsibilities they have under State laws so that there will be no misinterpretations of functions.

We wish to call to your attention that the number of soil conservation districts in the United States has increased from 826 to 2,000 in the past 5 years and now covers most of the agricultural areas of our States. Of these districts there are 82 in Nebraska including 97 percent of the farms of the State. The land owners of the Nebraska districts are deeply interested in the program but are not receiving this technical service nearly as fast as they desire, consequently we urge that an adequate appropriation be made to the Soil Conservation Service to staff the various districts with technical help so that a high standard of work may be maintained and carried on more rapidly.

We, the members of the Nebraska State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, wish to go on record as being ready and willing to fully assume all responsibilities properly delegated to us by State and Federal law.

We favor a national land-use policy based on sound principles.

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives at a recent meeting in Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANKS IN PARTY PLATFORM

Whereas farmer cooperative associations have been recognized and encouraged by the American people, in the public interest, under the administration of the Federal Government, by both the great political parties of the United States; and

Whereas for many years the Democratic and Republican parties have recognized by their actions the fundamental right of farmers to cooperatively market their own farm products and cooperatively purchase their own farm supplies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives hereby calls upon the leadership of both great political parties to reaffirm by platform pledge and prompt affirmative action their belief and faith in farmer cooperative associations. This council to denounce the activities of those individuals who have violated the pledges of their parties by attempting to cripple agricultural credit and seeking to destroy the right of farmers to cooperatively market their own products and to cooperatively purchase their own farm supplies.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 846).

CHANGE OF NAME OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS TO COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report four resolutions, and request their immediate consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I under-

stand that all the resolutions were ordered unanimously reported by the Rules and Administration Committee?

Mr. BROOKS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 179, submitted by the Senater from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] on December 18, 1947, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph (1) (m) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "Committee on Public Lands" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs."

INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I also ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 185, submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] on January 7, 1948, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO MAKE CERTAIN EXPENDITURES, ETC.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I also ask unanimous consent to report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 189, submitted by Mr. AIKEN on January 14, 1948, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, in line 6, after the word "authorized", to insert "during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 75, Eightieth Congress, agreed to February 21, 1947, which is hereby made available for the purposes of this resolution, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

PRINTING OF FIFTIETH ANNUAL REPORT OF SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. BROOKS. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I also ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 190, submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] on January 16, 1948, and I request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Fiftieth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1947, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 2074. A bill to record the lawful admission of Ernest J. Hoffmann to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2075. A bill for the relief of Wisia Paryzenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 2076. A bill to authorize Defense Homes Corporation to convey to Howard University certain lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2077. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2078. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961; 16 U. S. C. 513), to relieve the Secretary of the Army from serving as a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2079. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Archangelo Straneri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself and Mr. MARTIN):

S. 2080. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 2081. A bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2082. A bill for the relief of H. R. Barney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2083. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians and Estonians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2084. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2085. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building at Enumclaw, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. TAYLOR (for himself and Mr. MORSE) introduced Senate bill 2086, to require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 2087. A bill to authorize the refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission of the sum advanced for certain water facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. THYE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 178, to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Territory of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to change the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

FILING OF REPORT ON SOURCES OF OUTSIDE INCOME BY CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill; and I should like to make a brief statement in connection with the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2086) to require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities, introduced by Mr. TAYLOR (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the recent disclosures of speculation on the commodity market by Government employees who were alleged to have inside information have again highlighted the need for full disclosure of outside financial activities of policymaking officials in all branches of the Government. The public has a right to know something about the financial interests of the men who write laws, who execute them, and who interpret them.

A year ago, when newspapers were alleging improper market deals by Members of Congress, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I proposed an amendment to the rules of the Senate which would require all Senators to make such disclosures. That bill has not even been given a committee hearing, let alone discussion or vote on the floor. Nevertheless, many Members of the Senate felt the need for searching investigation of Government employees.

I feel that all of us—Senators, Representatives, judges, and all employees of the executive branch—earning $9,000

per year or more should file an annual statement setting forth the amounts and sources of all income received during the preceding year, including all fees, salaries, income from law partnerships, trusts, estates, and so forth. We should further be required to give a full description of all dealings in securities and commodities in which we may have engaged.

This method would put all of us on the spot equally. It would eliminate the present unfair system of selecting special goats. It would enable the public to know if and when the judgment of their elected representatives and their other public servants was being affected by their outside interests.

ISSUANCE OF MINNESOTA'S CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Territory of Minnesota.

In approximately a year Minnesota will celebrate its one hundredth birthday, for it was on March 3, 1849, that the organic act establishing the Territory of Minnesota, became law. With the establishment of that government in 1849 began the growth of the farms and towns and cities, the organization of counties, the development of Minnesota's great natural resources, the expansion of industry, the establishment of newspapers, the building of schools and churches, the movement of organized civilization and culture into an Indian wilderness.

So significant was the development of Minnesota in those years when these foundations were laid that the establishment of the Territory has even more significance historically than the admission of the State to the Union, which came 9 years later, in 1858.

Plans are already being made for the centennial observance. The Minnesota Historical Society, established in Territorial days and thus an organization which is older than the State itself, has been designated as the official agency to prepare for commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary next year.

The Minnesota centennial is worthy of the national recognition which a distinctive commemorative stamp affords, and it is for that reason that I offer this bill for the issuance of such a stamp on the date of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Territory of Minnesota, namely, March 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 178) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Territory of Minnesota, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DATE FOR FILING REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I ask unanimous consent to report an original joint resolution, and I request its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to change the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 5 (b) (3) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "February 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the report is signed by all the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator give us a brief explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the joint resolution merely changes the date from February 1 to March 1, to give the committees time to make their reports to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The joint resolution relates to the report of the Committee on the President's Economic Report. The President's Economic Report was not received until January 13, so we have had only a little more than 2 weeks to meet the statutory date of February 1. The date will always be too short. This is a provision that the statute be changed to permit the report to be made on March 1 instead of February 1.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that the joint resolution was unanimously reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. WHERRY. All members of the committee have signed the report.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is the second section of Senate Joint Resolution 116, which was submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I should like to have him make a brief statement about it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nebraska in recommending the second part of my joint resolution of May 19 of last year, which extended the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. We still have before us, of course, the problem inherent in the first part of the resolution, namely, whether or not there should be an extension in connection with the legislative budget. I understand that that question is under advisement in connection with either a further amendment to the Reorganization Act, or an agreement on a legislative budget prior to the date now set out in the act.

I want to say that I think the problem of the budget, like the poor, will always be with us until we know what the appropriation problems and the needs of the various sections of our appropriation bills as represented by the various departments thereunder will be.

The only purpose of the first part of my resolution, which we are not acting upon today, is to give us enough time so that if we are to have a legislative budget, it shall not become a guessing budget, because I do not think we can possibly have a scientific budget based even on intelligent guesses.

I am very happy to join at this time in the passage of at least the second part of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PEPPER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2014) to establish effective rent control until June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4044) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him regarding the St. Lawrence waterway, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN PALESTINE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him; memoranda dealing with the statutory and constitutional situation in Palestine, and clippings from sundry newspapers dealing with conditions in Palestine, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENTS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two statements on the St. Lawrence waterway issued by him January 28, 1948, together with an editorial from the Detroit News of January 26, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

PRESENTATION OF GOLD MEDAL TO DR. ARCHER CHESTER SUDAN—ADDRESS BY FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, before the house of delegates of the American Medical Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on January 7, 1948, on the occasion of the presentation of a gold medal to Dr. Archer Chester Sudan, of Kremmling, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN AND THE PRICE OF GOLD—LETTER FROM J. F. LITTLE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from J. F. Little, of Denver, Colo., dealing with the Marshall plan, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS IN 1948—ADDRESS BY ARTHUR GAETH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, United Nations in 1948, broadcast December 31, 1947, by Mr. Arthur Gaeth, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIDE IN SERVICE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NATIONAL TRIBUNE AND STARS AND STRIPES

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pride in Service," from the November 27, 1947, edition of the National Tribune and Stars and Stripes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FARM PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION—STATEMENT BY ALLAN W. KLINE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the farm program of the American Farm Bureau Federation, by Mr. Allan W. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, January 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PHILOSOPHY OF CYRUS P. CHING—ARTICLE BY LOUIS STARK

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our No. 1 Labor Catalyst," by Louis Stark, from the New York Times magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC OPINION POLLS—ARTICLE BY HARVEY M. BROWN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "There Are Jokers in Opinion Polls," written by Harvey M. Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, and published in The Machinist, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF GEN. OMAR NELSON BRADLEY TO BE CHIEF OF STAFF

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Senate Armed Services Committee has acted favorably upon the nomination of Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley to be Chief of Staff. Believing it to be a fine gesture and a recognition of the high esteem in which the Congress holds General Bradley, I at this time ask unanimous consent that I be authorized, as in executive session, to report the nomination from the Armed Services Committee, and I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object—and I will say now that I am not going to object, because I know the general personally—I merely wish to say that it is an unusual procedure for the Senate to consider a nomination immediately after it has been reported from committee. I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, however, in asking that the Senate confirm the nomination now as an indication of the high esteem in which it holds General Bradley. I feel that this is one time when the Senate rule should be suspended. I believe all Members of the Senate will be glad to join in confirming General Bradley for the high post of Chief of Staff at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from South Dakota will be received and placed upon the Executive Calendar.

The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley to be Chief of Staff, United States Army.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

REPORT BY THE OIL INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE OIL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the second report submitted by the Oil Industry Advisory Committee, a special committee of oil producers appointed by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate the oil shortage, especially in the Atlantic coast area. The report is submitted by J. C. Richdale, chairman of the Oil Industry Advisory Committee.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO SENATOR TOBEY FOR OIL SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE BY OIL INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Oil Industry Advisory Committee has had two meetings since our last report to you, one on January 16 and the other on January 26. The following topics were discussed:

1. Tanker situation: Insofar as the tanker situation is concerned, from the best information available approximately 15 to 16 additional tankers have already been placed in the service of moving oil to Atlantic coast ports since our first report. Within the next 30 days we feel that a substantial additional number will be made available from industry and Maritime Commission sources. However, we wish to reiterate the comment made in our report of December 17, that we consider it highly important that the Navy endeavor to place in the Atlantic coast service tankers which are under repair as soon as such vessels come out of repair yards. This would merely be a temporary measure until the present emergency situation has been alleviated and would eliminate long trips in ballast to replace other tankers which they are using at present in the South Pacific and Far East service. We feel that approximately 20 additional ships from this source would give all the necessary transportation to straighten out the transportation shortage which has obtained up to now.

In addition, we also strongly urge that necessary legislation be passed to permit the Maritime Commission to continue their present functions beyond February 29, 1948, on which date their present authority expires.

2. Tank-car transportation: The committee considered the correspondence exchanged between you and Col. J. M. Johnson, Director of Office of Defense Transportation, and Mr. W. T. Faricy, President of the Association of American Railroads, in which it was recommended that a committee be set up including representatives of the oil industry, the Office of Defense Transportation, the tank-car owners and the Association of American Railroads to review and make recommendations regarding tank-car transportation problems. The committee endorses this recommendation and suggests that the appropriate subcommittee of the National Petroleum Council be requested by Secretary Krug to work out the organization and functioning of this over-all tank-car committee.

3. The committee received a report on the meeting which had been held in Washington, called by Secretary Krug, of the fuel coordinators of 22 States. It appears from this report that practically every State in the shortage areas has acted on your suggestion to establish State emergency fuel coordination organizations. Some States have very comprehensive and well-organized activities under way, others have barely started and are yet not too well equipped to deal with the situation. In general, however, it is felt that the various affected States have accepted the principles of dealing with their situations on a local basis, and their work will be appreciably effective in meeting the problem. Certainly the presentation of this plan to the various State governors constituted a definite contribution toward the handling of this difficult situation.

There have been numerous variations of the original so-called Tobey plan as set up in the various States. These have been made to suit best the geographical, political, and administrative factors affecting each State, and there is little doubt that as time goes on each will become better organized and more effective. We are convinced that this approach to the handling of emergency fuel distribution and supply problems is a sound one.

4. Refinery yields: The committee had before it the refinery yield data which you forwarded to me. Some of our members have been advised by their counsel that the anti-trust laws make it impossible for the committee to inquire into the operations of individual companies or attempt to secure their agreement to make changes in their refinery operations. If anything is to be done along this line, it would appear that it should be done by your Senate committee. Our discussions and recommendations on the question of refinery yields have therefore been confined to a general over-all basis, although you will note later a suggestion as to an individual company follow-up which can be made by your office.

The attached compilation of the individual company yield figures furnished by you has been handicapped by a lack of comparability. This must be kept in mind when interpreting the figures. You will also see that the tables are incomplete, since the data from some companies have not been received.

Some companies have reported their product yields on crude-oil runs and have shown the totals for districts I and III only. Others

have reported for all their refineries throughout the whole United States. Still others have shown their production of each principal product as a percentage of the production of the total of four principal products only. That leaves out all the production of specialty products, and thus inflates the magnitude of the percentage figures shown. These and other differences are noted in the column under "Remarks."

In spite of these limitations it is possible to get some pertinent ideas by comparing the individual figures with the very first line of the tables, which first line shows the over-all industry performance in districts I and III as reported by the American Petroleum Institute. The trend or rate of change in the various product yields over a period of time is indicative of efforts to maximize the output of any particular product. In recognition of this the data in the accompanying tables have been prepared on a 4 weeks' running average basis, since the individual week's yields are not trustworthy in determining trends. It should be emphasized that the real value of these figures is to compare any particular company's performance with itself over a period of time and that cross comparison between companies' yields cannot be made properly from these figures.

By using a 4-week running average we mean that the yield figure given in the table under date of November 22, for example, is the average yield for the 4 weeks ending on that date, and the yield figure given under the date of November 29 is the average yield for the 4 weeks ending on November 29. The second figure would thus include 3 weekly yield figures included in the November 22 average and the fourth weekly figure for the period November 22 to 29. This method of presentation tends to average out weekly fluctuations and is the best method of determining trends.

You will see that the industry over-all in districts I and III has accomplished a gain in distillate fuel yields of 2.4 percentage points, or from 18.9 to 21.3 percent between the 4-week period ended November 22, 1947, and that of January 17, 1948. With one exception, the 4-week period ended November 29, the improvement in yield has been continuous. The 2.4-percent yield increase represents an improvement of 12.7 percent in the 18.9-percent yield from crude in effect at the start of the period covered by the figures in early November.

You will recall our original report expressed the thought that a 5- to 7-percent increase in the volume of distillate fuel production could be secured by adjusting refinery yields. This forecast has already been exceeded by industry in districts I and III on an over-all basis. Recent severe weather, however, points toward the need for a still further shift in refinery yields toward distillate fuel oil than was originally anticipated necessary to meet consumer demands.

Not apparent from these tables, but important to the problem of increased supplies, is the increase in the amount of crude run to stills that has occurred concurrently with this achievement of higher heating-oil yields. Crude-oil runs in districts I and III averaged 2,875,000 barrels daily in the 4 weeks ended November 22, with distillate production at 542,000 barrels daily. For the 4-week period ended January 17, runs averaged 3,021,000 barrels daily and distillate production 644,000 barrels daily. This record shows that the contribution of an additional 102,000 barrels daily in distillate output was made up of 70,000 barrels daily from increased yield, and 32,000 barrels daily from increased runs. It is of great interest to note that the cumulative effect of increased distillate yields on increased crude runs has resulted in an over-all increase in the production of distillate fuel of 18.8 percent since November 1947.

In spite of this commendable achievement, your committee feels that it is both desirable and possible for the industry to get still more distillate production by some further adjustment in refinery yields.

Review of the individual company yields shows that some companies' distillate-fuel yields have shown a definite upward trend indicative of efforts to increase distillate-fuel production. Nine of the 16 companies included in the tabulation show a definite upward trend in distillate-fuel yields over the period. Four of the companies show no change in yields and two show a downward trend. The sixteenth company's figures are impossible to interpret as this company apparently operates in a rather unusual manner which it is difficult to judge through the figures as presently presented. It seems reasonable to conclude, however, that it may well be possible to secure an additional increase in distillate-fuel yields in the industry. It is recognized that equipment limitations, variations in crude supply, and other factors may influence materially each refiner's ability to increase heating-oil yields, but even allowing for this the committee feels it is possible for the industry to achieve a further yield increase.

The kerosene yield has shown no significant change in the period. There has been some increase in the production of kerosene along with total crude runs. It is not likely that a great deal more can be done to improve that situation without still further increases in crude runs. Kerosene yield is governed largely by the type of crude run and little flexibility in the output of this product can be obtained from present refinery plants so that current yields approximating 7.5 percent may represent pretty close to maximum for kerosene so far as the industry is concerned. This can only be ascertained by a specific review by each company of that particular problem. However, there have been some few increases and decreases in the kerosene yield of some companies which may indicate that if all companies press for maximum kerosene yield some over-all increase in production of this particularly critical product may be achieved.

The production of residual fuel oil has increased somewhat, again due more to increased total runs, although you will see that there also has been an improvement in yields of this product. Not much further improvement can be expected from increasing yields of residual fuel, since it would have to be at the expense of distillate fuel production, that is, home-heating oil, which is likewise in a critical supply position. It is not always realized that a large part of our residual fuel-oil requirements along the Atlantic seaboard are supplied from imports. There has been some improvement in receipts of imported fuel oil in recent months, and that has helped the situation, but the residual picture is still one of the tightest of all the major products.

The gasoline yield was practically unchanged during the period reviewed, although barrels of total production increased because of higher crude runs. The important thing is that in general the industry has resisted the inducements to make larger quantities of gasoline from a barrel of crude, and has thus obtained increasing fuel supplies that might have been put into gasoline.

While this performance of the industry in the voluntary production of more heating oils is indeed encouraging, your committee reiterates that there is room for still more improvement. Even though the individual company figures reported in the attached tables possess the limitations of comparison noted above, we believe that it may be appropriate for you to direct a further inquiry to each of the reporting companies to ascertain (a) whether it is possible to produce still more kerosene and heating oil through yield adjustments or otherwise, and (b) if not, to request the reasons for that inability. We suggest that you direct the inquiry to all companies because there are too many unknown factors to justify a precise interpretation of the company versus industry comparisons contained in the attached tables.

For any short period of time the relative yields may be misleading in that they might reflect operations that result from circumstances peculiar either to the timing or historical pattern of a company's business. There are limitations on the ability to shift yields, e. g., type of equipment, type of crude, ability to finish fully all production in a given period, timing of receipts of raw materials, storage problems, etc. Explanations of individual company performance in many cases are contained in the replies transmitting the data. It is suggested that reference be made to these explanations before conclusions are drawn regarding respective company performances.

5. Comments on industry stocks in districts I, II, and III: The industry does not have information on all the storage of petroleum products from the customers' household tanks back through various distribution steps to the refinery, but it does get weekly reports of supplies held in primary tanks at refineries and at major bulk terminals.

The attached table shows what has been happening to those stocks during the past month. On January 17 there were 66,296,000 barrels of the three heating oils in primary storage in districts I, II, and III. That was 11,322,000 barrels less than was on hand a year ago on the same date, but it was 15,736,000 barrels more than 2 years ago when demands for heating oils were considerably less. Primary gasoline stocks in the three districts were 79,792,000 barrels on January 17, which was 1,770,000 barrels more than a year ago.

It is worth noting that the unfavorable position of the three burning oils results entirely from the depleted stocks in districts I and III. District II, which is the Midwest, had more of each of the heating oils in primary storage than a year ago. Districts I and III had slightly more residual in each case, but the kerosene and distillate oils were both very much below a year ago. That is the difficulty the industry has been compelled to face for most of the current heating season.

The extent of its recent success can be best measured by the rate of depletion shown under the column headed "Four weeks' change." The kerosene position has deteriorated relative to a year ago, and the situation is anything but comfortable. A 3,855,000-barrel draft in the last month compares with a draft of less than 3,000,000 barrels a year ago in the same period. The present level in district I is almost 2,500,000 barrels less than on the same date in 1947.

By way of contrast, the draft on distillate stocks was about 2,000,000 barrels greater last year than this year, which suggests that in spite of the very large demands that are being made against the industry, production efforts have resulted in the industry more than holding its own.

On both kerosene and distillate renewed efforts must be made to expand production still further. Stocks are uncomfortably low for this time of the year, even though they are above the level of 2 years ago in each case. An extension of very cold weather for

another month could make inroads that would be difficult to cope with.

The residual fuel picture is a little bit better. Primary stocks have been drafted in the 4 weeks ended January 17 at a slower pace this year than last year—1,212,000 barrels against 3,962,000 barrels. Stocks of residual fuel in each of the three districts are slightly better than a year ago. The residual situation has been helped both by increased imports and by the high level of crude runs of the industry, but it is still a tight position relative to demands.

The weather has not been any help. On a degree-day basis in New York City, the first 17 days of January were 2 percent colder than normal, and nearly 12 percent colder than a year ago. For the heating season to date the weather in New York has been about 17 percent colder than last year, even though about 5 percent warmer than normal. The latter figure is likely to be misleading, however, since October was a very warm month, and that is a time when limited quantities of heating oil are required in any event.

6. Press reports today indicate that the National Petroleum Council has recommended to Secretary Krug that oil industry advisory committees be established in each district over the country and their activities in respect to advising local, State, and Federal officials and authorities regarding the status and solution of oil industry and oil consumer problems be certified by the Department of Justice as legal. If this recommendation is accepted and acted upon it seems likely that such committees will be able to perform the services which your oil industry committee has been performing. Your attention is directed to this possibility.

Respectfully submitted.

J. C. RICHDALE,
Chairman.

JANUARY 26, 1948.

Industry product stocks

(Current figures from API. Prior years on Bureau of Mines basis)

[Thousands of barrels 42's]

	District I	District II	District III	Total, districts I, II, III	4-week change
TOTAL GASOLINE					
Jan. 17, 1948	22,772	28,683	28,337	79,792	+10,081
Jan. 17, 1947	23,146	28,840	26,036	78,022	+5,130
KEROSENE					
Jan. 17, 1948	5,165	3,078	3,583	11,826	−3,855
Jan. 17, 1947	7,650	2,367	4,548	14,565	−2,931
GAS OIL AND DISTILLATE					
Jan. 17, 1948	11,170	9,357	10,169	30,696	−6,485
Jan. 17, 1947	18,802	7,182	15,311	41,295	−8,544
RESIDUAL					
Jan. 17, 1948	7,609	6,504	9,661	23,774	−1,210
Jan. 17, 1947	7,561	5,054	9,143	21,758	−3,962
TOTAL, 4 MAJOR PRODUCTS					
Jan. 17, 1948	46,716	47,622	51,750	146,088	−1,469
Jan. 17, 1947	57,159	43,443	55,038	155,640	−10,307

ECONOMIC REPORTS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as sponsor of the Employment Act of 1946, I am gratified to note the widespread attention that has been given throughout the country to the Economic Reports of the President.

It has just come to my attention that a private publishing firm, Reynal and Hitchcock, has seen fit to reprint these economic reports of the President in book form. This is a tribute not only to the enterprise of the publishers, who have indeed performed a public service, but also to the high quality of the documents themselves.

The Economic Reports of the President brings together in one volume the best information obtainable on the present condition of our economy. They chart the goals toward which we should strive. They map out the broad principles of a concrete program for achieving these goals. Above all, the reports are written in simple, direct language—with an abundance of striking charts and informative tables.

It is my hope that proper attention will be given the Economic Reports of the President not only by the reading public, but also by the Congress. It was the clear intent of the Employment Act that the Congress, with the aid of its Joint Committee on the Economic Report, would use the Economic Reports of the President as the basis for its action on economic affairs.

Let me quote from what the President's Council of Economic Advisers has said on this matter in its introduction to this recently published volume, the Economic Reports of the President:

These reports are referred, as soon as received by the Congress, to its Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President, where they become the subject of critical reexamination and the basis of formulation of a legislative program and the coordination of the work of the various committees of both Houses. After analyzing the President's program, the joint committee is to report to the Congress its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report. This is the first time in the history of the Congress that any congressional committee has been given the task of appraising the President's economic program as a whole and of developing economic policies to serve as a guide to the many individual committees of Congress dealing with legislative matters. To those Members of the Congress who agree with the President's point of view, they are a stimulus to translating general economic principles into the specifics of feasible and workable legislation. To those who take issue with the President's analysis of the economy or with his legislative proposals—and there will always be diverse viewpoints in a democracy—they are a call to produce a preferable alternative. To all Members of the Congress, whatever their party or personal point of view, it is a challenge to spare no pains in broadening the area within which the President and the Congress can work together harmoniously toward attaining the objectives of the Employment Act.

Last year, unfortunately, the joint committee failed to hold public hearings on the President's economic reports. Still more important, the committee failed to formulate its own conclusions on the President's major recommendations, as it was required to do under the act.

It is my sincere hope that this year the joint committee will hold public hearings on the President's Economic Report, with full testimony from the executive branch, from business, from labor, from agriculture, and from consumers. The committee should then bring forth its own conclusions on the President's analysis of the economy, on the President's goals for the future, and on the President's proposals for congressional action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks the introduction prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers to the privately printed volume of the Economic Reports of the President.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION TO THE ECONOMIC REPORTS OF THE PRESIDENT (JANUARY 1948, JANUARY 1947, JULY 1947)

(As published by Reynal & Hitchcock)

Since 1789, when President Washington appeared in person before the first session of the First Congress, hundreds of Presidential messages have been carried down Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House to the Capitol. But in January 1947 America saw a new type of Presidential message—the Economic Report of the President. For the first time in the history of the country, the President placed before the Congress at the beginning of its session a comprehensive picture of the state of the economy and an integrated program for promoting national prosperity and soundness in the year ahead. It embraced also the outlines of a longer-term program.

This first annual Economic Report was followed on January 14, 1948, by a second report, addressed to a somewhat different short-run situation, since in the intervening year adverse weather conditions had been encountered, political developments abroad had followed a disappointing course, and some unexpected limitations in domestic reconversion had revealed themselves. These developments pointed all the more surely to the need of periodic reviews and projections by the President as a lead and supplement to the thinking of the public and the action of the Congress. The second Economic Report placed more emphasis upon longer-range analyses, objectives, and programs.

The annual economic reports are submitted in accordance with a specific requirement of the Employment Act of 1946 that—

"The President shall transmit to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1947) an economic report (hereinafter called the Economic Report) setting forth (1) the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power obtaining in the United States and such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in section 2; (2) current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power; (3) a review of the economic program of the Federal Government and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of their effect upon employment, production, and purchasing power; and (4) a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 2, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable."

But a year is a long time in the fast-moving national life of today. Section 3

(b) of the Employment Act also provided that "The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress reports supplementary to the Economic Report." It early became evident that a midyear recheck would be desirable. Accordingly, on July 21, 1947, the President sent to the Congress a midyear Economic Report. With the legislative session near an end, this report naturally did not present a formal set of recommendations for legislative action. It reviewed the state of employment, production, and purchasing power; analyzed the trends in various parts of the process of economic adjustment to peacetime conditions; and focused attention on four outstanding problems that were receiving immediate study and that would probably be the occasion for later recommendations for congressional action.

These first economic reports of the President have received widespread attention in news stories, editorials, columnist comment, and radio and platform discussion. They have been circulated by study clubs and by business, labor, agricultural, and consumer organizations. They have been assigned work in university classes and graduate seminars. Many individual citizens have purchased copies from the Government Printing Office, but many more, no doubt, have found this procedure too inconvenient. They thus have had only a fragmentary impression of what is, in fact, a comprehensive and continuously developing diagnosis of the state of the Nation's economic health and counsel for its treatment.

Since the Council of Economic Advisers is the professionally equipped agency of nonpolitical character established under the Employment Act to "assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Economic Report," we naturally are gratified that the publishers of the present volume have turned private enterprise to public service by seeing that the Economic Reports of the President may be made promptly and easily accessible to all citizens who wish to keep informed as to how the thinking of Government officials, our congressional representatives, and business, labor, agricultural, and other leaders of thought and action is being marshaled to the winning of maximum well-being under methods of private enterprise and free government.

To understand the governmental process of which these reports constitute an important part, the reader should remember two things.

First, in preparing them, the President has drawn to the fullest extent upon the resources of the Federal Government. Besides the continuous and immediate service of his Council of Economic Advisers, he has had the assistance and advice of the members of his Cabinet and the heads of the various independent agencies, boards, and commissions. Through these agency heads and through the Council of Economic Advisers, he draws upon the rich resources of statistical fact and economic analysis available throughout the Federal establishment. Furthermore, through the medium of the Council and its broad framework of advisory committees, he has been able to draw upon the experience and viewpoints of representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, educational and research institutions, and State and local governments. Needless to say, the ultimate judgments entering into the Economic Reports to the Congress rest with the President.

Second, these reports are referred, as soon as received by the Congress, to its Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President, where they become the subject of critical reexamination and the basis of formulation of a legislative program and the coordination of the work of the various committees of both Houses. After analyzing the President's program, the Joint Committee is to report to the Congress its "findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report." This is the first time in the history of the Congress that any congressional committee has been given the task of appraising the President's economic program as a whole and of developing economic policies to serve as a guide to the many individual committees of Congress dealing with legislative matters. To those Members of the Congress who agree wth the President's point of view, they are a stimulus to translating general economic principles into the specifics of feasible and workable legislation. To those who take issue with the President's analysis of the economy or with his legislative proposals—and there will always be diverse viewpoints in a democracy—they are a call to produce a preferable alternative. To all Members of the Congress, whatever their party or personal point of view, it is a challenge to spare no pains in broadening the area within which the President and the Congress can work together harmoniously toward attaining the objectives of the Employment Act.

Those objectives, as stated in the declaration of policy in the act, may well serve as the concluding paragraph of this introduction to the initial volume of the Economic Reports of the President:

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

EDWIN G. NOURSE,
Chairman.
LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Vice Chairman.
JOHN D. CLARK.

FOREIGN AID AS IT AFFECTS INDIANA—TABLE PREPARED BY SENATOR JENNER

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, at this time in world history I feel it is my duty, not only as a Member of the Senate representing this Nation, but as representing the people of my own State of Indiana, almost 4,000,000 of them, to give some facts and figures showing how our contributions to foreign aid under the Marshall plan, which is pending before the Congress at this session, will affect the people of Indiana and their future lives.

I have had prepared figures showing that Indiana's share of the cost of United States foreign aid granted for the 2-year period ended last June 30, plus aid proposed under the Marshall plan, totals approximately $1,069,849,410.

What does this mean in tax terms that Hoosiers can readily understand?

It means that the presently estimated foreign-aid program for this period is equal to seven and one-half times the total of all property and poll taxes levied in Indiana for collection in 1947, for support of township, town, city, county, and State governments.

To illustrate the portent of this comparison, it should be pointed out that property taxes in Indiana are by far the largest source of revenue—some two and one-half times greater than our next largest revenue producer, the State gross income tax.

If the people of Indiana, on the other hand, had to pay their share of the foreign-aid program through the gross-income tax, it would take more than all the collections from this tax for the next 18 years, even at the current peak of annual gross income-tax collections of about $58,000,000. If we had to pay our share in 1 year we would have to raise gross income-tax rates by 1,755 percent.

Indiana's $1,069,849,410 share of foreign-aid cost would pay for maintaining Indiana's public schools for a period of more than 11 years at the 1946–47 level of school expenditures, $95,310,000.

Indiana's foreign-aid share is $164,584,521 greater than all Federal Government taxes collected in Indiana during the 1947 fiscal year.

These are but a few of the many comparisons which could be made to illustrate, in easy-to-understand terms, the weight of the financial burden of foreign aid.

The Nation-wide per capita share of foreign aid granted from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, based on the 1940 census, was $183. The per capita share of the $17,000,000,000 expenditures proposed under the Marshall plan is $129.11. The total average cost per family of four persons would be $1,248.

A table shows how these foreign-aid expenditures affect every county in Indiana and each community of over 1,000 population.

In my own county of Lawrence, it would require all our property-tax collections for more than 11 years to pay our per capita share of foreign aid. In my home city of Bedford nearly 8 years of property-tax collections would be necessary.

Indiana's share of foreign-aid cost would remain at about $1,070,000,000 if the income of its citizens, rather than a flat per capita, were used as a basis for computation. "Indiana had approximately 2.6 percent of the Nation's population in 1940, and received approximately 2.6 percent of income paid to individuals" according to the United States Department of Commerce figures for 1946.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table I have had prepared and to which I have referred be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States foreign aid provided from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, and aid proposed under Marshall plan, in terms of shares to be borne by each county and by cities and towns over 1,000 population in Indiana, estimated on per capita basis

[County figures represent total for county, including city and town figures shown, plus amounts for all other governmental units in county]

Counties and cities	Share of cost of foreign aid, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947 [1]	Share of cost of foreign aid program under Marshall plan [2]	Share of cost of total foreign aid provided and proposed (for 6 years)	Total local and State property taxes levied, 1946, payable, 1947	Number of years required to pay share of foreign aid with property taxes
State total	$627,286,666	$442,562,742	$1,069,849,410	$142,201,821	7.5
Adams	3,889,482	2,744,104	6,633,586	709,911	9.3
Berne	379,725	267,903	647,628	82,392	7.9
Decatur	1,072,563	756,714	1,829,277	205,596	8.9
Allen	28,380,372	20,022,895	48,403,267	7,537,753	6.5
New Haven	342,576	241,694	584,270	460,960	1.3
Fort Wayne	21,669,030	15,287,915	36,956,945	6,127,606	6.0
Bartholomew	5,174,508	3,650,714	8,825,222	1,264,911	7.0
Columbus	2,148,054	1,515,493	3,663,547	747,505	4.9
Hope	191,418	135,049	326,467	22,185	14.7
Benton	2,034,411	1,435,316	3,469,727	580,146	6.0
Fowler	348,249	245,696	593,945	52,675	11.3
Blackford	2,522,289	1,779,523	4,301,812	460,080	9.4
Montpelier	329,400	232,398	561,798	49,888	11.3
Hartford City	1,271,118	896,798	2,167,916	185,848	11.7
Boone	4,040,823	2,850,878	6,891,701	883,892	7.8
Lebanon	1,194,807	842,959	2,037,766	235,493	8.7
Zionsville	240,462	169,651	410,113	36,297	11.3
Thorntown	224,358	158,289	382,647	22,509	17.0
Brown	1,132,587	799,062	1,931,649	123,736	15.6
Carroll	2,820,030	1,989,585	4,809,615	572,722	8.4
Delphi	404,979	285,720	690,699	74,275	9.3
Flora	268,644	189,533	458,177	41,701	11.0
Cass	6,754,164	4,765,192	11,519,356	1,216,578	9.5
Logansport	3,692,391	2,605,052	6,297,443	616,465	10.2
Clark	5,676,660	4,004,992	9,681,652	1,004,290	9.4
Clarksville	436,638	308,056	744,694	206,899	3.6
Jeffersonville	2,103,219	1,483,861	3,587,080	386,506	9.3
Sellersburg	205,143	144,732	349,875	23,731	14.7
Clay	4,641,795	3,274,875	7,916,670	667,541	11.9
Brazil	1,487,058	1,049,148	2,536,206	235,285	10.8
Clay City	204,411	144,216	348,627	18,476	18.9
Clinton	5,199,213	3,668,144	8,867,357	966,475	9.2
Frankfort	2,508,198	1,769,582	4,277,780	413,987	10.3
Crawford	1,861,293	1,313,178	3,174,471	129,270	24.6
Daviess	4,787,829	3,377,905	8,165,734	625,057	13.1
Washington	1,704,096	1,202,272	2,906,368	230,810	12.6
Dearborn	4,218,699	2,976,373	7,195,072	683,098	10.5
Aurora	883,524	623,343	1,506,867	120,061	12.6
Greendale	283,284	199,862	483,146	219,618	2.2
Lawrenceburg	807,579	569,762	1,377,341	108,500	12.7
Decatur	3,243,126	2,288,087	5,531,213	610,146	9.1
Greensburg	1,109,895	783,052	1,892,947	230,755	8.2
De Kalb	4,530,348	3,196,247	7,726,595	758,734	10.2
Auburn	990,945	699,131	1,690,076	144,599	11.7
Butler	328,302	231,623	559,925	51,579	10.9
Garrett	784,155	553,236	1,337,391	101,968	13.1
Waterloo	230,031	162,291	392,322	36,824	10.7
Delaware	13,718,229	9,678,473	23,396,702	3,079,737	7.6
Muncie	9,098,760	6,419,349	15,518,109	2,199,711	7.1
Albany	297,009	209,546	506,555	46,629	10.9
Eaton	265,899	187,597	453,496	28,034	16.2
Dubois	4,131,957	2,915,175	7,047,132	413,709	17.0
Huntingburg	698,328	492,684	1,191,012	64,375	18.5
Jasper	922,503	650,844	1,573,347	126,692	12.4
Elkhart	13,292,022	9,377,776	22,669,798	3,168,292	7.2
Elkhart	6,118,422	4,316,664	10,435,086	1,738,448	6.0
Goshen	2,081,625	1,468,626	3,550,251	463,112	7.7
Nappanee	554,124	390,945	945,069	103,082	9.2
Wakarusa	189,039	133,371	322,410	36,807	8.8
Fayette	3,552,213	2,506,154	6,058,367	658,334	9.2
Connersville	2,360,334	1,665,261	4,025,595	360,324	11.8
Floyd	6,416,163	4,526,726	10,942,889	1,015,346	10.1
New Albany	4,650,762	3,281,202	7,931,964	868,102	9.2
Fountain	3,348,717	2,362,584	5,711,301	558,332	10.2
Attica	688,080	485,454	1,173,534	85,979	13.6
Covington	383,568	270,615	654,183	37,115	17.6
Veedersburg	325,923	229,945	555,868	26,951	20.6
Franklin	2,637,396	1,860,733	4,498,129	362,529	12.4
Brookville	401,502	283,267	684,769	78,591	8.7
Fulton	2,850,591	2,011,146	4,861,737	633,605	7.7
Rochester	701,805	495,137	1,196,942	157,778	7.6
Gibson	5,619,747	3,964,839	9,584,586	813,082	11.8
Fort Branch	284,016	200,379	484,395	28,497	17.0
Oakland City	561,444	396,109	957,553	58,450	16.4
Owensville	217,404	153,383	370,787	16,233	22.8
Princeton	1,424,838	1,005,250	2,430,088	237,141	10.2
Grant	10,213,779	7,206,016	17,419,795	1,870,261	9.3
Fairmount	435,906	307,540	743,446	57,667	12.9
Gas City	638,304	450,336	1,088,640	83,282	13.1
Jonesboro	327,753	231,236	558,989	61,020	9.2
Marion	4,898,361	3,455,887	8,354,248	1,066,623	7.8
Greene	5,733,390	4,045,016	9,778,406	798,616	12.2
Bloomfield	415,410	293,080	708,490	76,296	9.3
Jasonville	625,494	441,298	1,066,792	68,914	15.5
Linton	1,146,129	808,616	1,954,745	110,321	17.7
Worthington	316,407	223,231	539,638	43,187	12.5
Hamilton	4,504,362	3,177,914	7,682,276	959,510	8.0
Noblesville	1,020,225	719,788	1,740,013	265,424	6.6
Sheridan	314,760	222,069	536,829	49,143	10.9
Hancock	$3,166,266	$2,233,861	$5,400,127	$595,801	9.1
Fortville	267,729	188,888	456,617	48,747	9.4
Greenfield	882,243	622,439	1,504,682	109,584	13.7
Harrison	3,130,398	2,208,556	5,338,954	285,996	18.7
Corydon	341,295	240,790	582,085	57,929	10.0
Hendricks	3,687,633	2,601,696	6,289,329	755,779	8.3
Brownsburg	207,888	146,669	354,557	30,559	11.6
Danville	383,019	270,227	653,246	65,269	10.0
Plainfield	331,413	233,818	565,231	50,032	11.3
Henry	7,358,064	5,191,255	12,549,319	1,627,567	7.7
Knightstown	425,109	299,923	725,032	56,194	12.9
Middletown	278,160	196,247	474,407	32,412	14.6
New Castle	3,041,460	2,145,808	5,187,268	804,462	6.4
Howard	8,738,616	6,165,261	14,903,877	2,388,002	6.2
Greentown	193,980	136,857	330,837	17,967	18.4
Kokomo	6,184,485	4,363,272	10,547,757	1,882,601	5.6
Huntington	5,477,373	3,864,391	9,341,764	1,030,470	9.1
Huntington	2,544,249	1,795,016	4,339,265	506,500	8.6
Warren	254,004	179,205	433,209	24,661	17.6
Jackson	4,869,996	3,435,875	8,305,871	717,952	11.6
Brownstown	340,380	240,145	580,525	42,413	13.7
Crothersville	213,927	150,930	364,857	16,170	22.6
Seymour	1,577,460	1,112,928	2,690,388	280,058	9.6
Jasper	2,634,651	1,858,797	4,493,448	578,652	7.8
Rensselaer	588,162	414,960	1,003,122	103,873	9.7
Jay	4,135,983	2,918,015	7,053,998	756,262	9.3
Dunkirk	538,386	379,842	918,228	68,694	13.4
Portland	1,164,246	821,398	1,985,644	207,297	9.6
Redkey	281,454	198,571	480,025	35,502	13.5
Jefferson	3,643,896	2,570,838	6,214,734	487,172	12.8
Madison	1,266,909	893,829	2,160,738	234,483	9.2
Jennings	2,503,440	1,766,225	4,269,665	361,785	11.8
North Vernon	569,496	401,790	971,286	116,117	8.4
Johnson	4,116,219	2,904,071	7,020,290	925,236	7.6
Edinburg	451,278	318,385	769,663	100,756	7.6
Franklin	1,146,312	808,745	1,955,057	269,408	7.2
Greenwood	457,317	322,646	779,963	78,891	9.9
Knox	8,047,059	5,677,354	13,724,413	1,417,530	9.7
Bicknell	935,130	659,752	1,594,882	90,370	17.6
Vincennes	3,335,724	2,353,417	5,689,141	645,619	8.8
Kosciusko	5,409,663	3,816,621	9,226,284	1,076,593	8.6
Syracuse	246,318	173,782	420,100	39,141	10.7
Warsaw	1,167,174	823,464	1,990,638	248,207	8.0
Lagrange	2,626,416	1,852,987	4,479,403	464,364	9.6
Lagrange	331,962	234,206	566,168	49,312	11.5
Lake	53,654,685	37,854,406	91,509,091	18,374,847	5.0
Crown Point	849,669	599,458	1,449,127	202,155	7.2
East Chicago	9,998,571	7,054,183	17,052,754	3,555,999	4.8
East Gary	622,383	439,103	1,061,486	118,493	8.9
Gary	20,444,577	14,424,040	34,868,617	6,942,830	5.0
Griffith	387,228	273,197	660,425	144,125	4.6
Hammond	12,843,672	9,061,456	21,905,128	4,804,695	4.6
Highland	498,309	351,567	849,876	152,374	5.6
Hobart	1,311,378	925,202	2,236,580	307,195	7.3
Lowell	264,984	186,951	451,935	41,069	11.0
Munster	320,433	226,072	546,505	213,794	2.5
Whiting	1,886,181	1,330,737	3,216,918	841,796	3.8
La Porte	11,649,780	8,219,143	19,868,923	2,711,121	7.3
Lakeland	212,280	149,768	362,048	42,294	8.6
La Porte	2,960,940	2,089,000	5,049,940	761,900	6.6
Michigan City	4,845,108	3,418,316	8,263,424	1,035,997	8.0
Lawrence	6,413,235	4,524,660	10,937,895	970,526	11.3
Bedford	2,290,062	1,615,683	3,905,745	506,436	7.7
Mitchell	620,919	438,070	1,058,989	78,217	13.5
Oolitic	217,038	153,124	370,162	11,513	32.1
Madison	16,209,225	11,435,918	27,645,143	3,479,029	7.9
Alexandria	878,583	619,857	1,498,440	138,790	10.8
Anderson	7,607,676	5,367,361	12,975,037	1,874,842	6.9
Elwood	1,997,079	1,408,977	3,406,056	405,723	8.4
Lapel	209,718	147,960	357,678	18,374	19.5
Pendleton	307,623	217,034	524,657	52,630	10.0
Marion	84,349,458	59,510,156	143,859,614	25,496,905	5.6
Beech Grove	714,981	504,433	1,219,414	169,433	7.2
Indianapolis	70,815,876	49,961,955	120,777,831	22,593,916	5.3
Lawrence	198,921	140,343	339,264	35,775	9.5
Speedway City	425,475	300,181	725,656	327,906	2.2
Woodruff Place	262,422	185,144	447,566	52,423	8.5
Marshall	4,746,105	3,348,468	8,094,573	1,087,972	7.4
Argos	217,770	153,641	371,411	25,009	14.9
Bourbon	209,535	147,831	357,366	37,984	9.4
Bremen	398,757	281,331	680,088	59,708	11.4
Culver	293,715	207,222	500,937	59,153	8.5
Plymouth	1,045,479	737,605	1,783,084	239,999	7.4
Martin	1,884,900	1,329,833	3,214,733	217,083	14.8
Loogootee	425,475	300,181	725,656	54,328	13.4
Shoals	188,673	133,112	321,785	23,408	13.7
Miami	5,110,458	3,605,526	8,715,984	1,048,644	8.3
Peru	2,275,056	1,605,096	3,880,152	461,417	8.4
Monroe	6,685,722	4,716,905	11,402,627	1,213,342	9.4
Bloomington	3,819,210	2,694,526	6,513,736	888,952	7.32

[1] Column 1 figures based on total United States foreign aid of $24,099,211,087 provided from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, as estimated by Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 16, 1948, p. 228).

[2] Column 2 figures based on total estimated United States foreign aid proposed under Marshall plan, amounting to $17,000,000,000 for 4 years.

United States foreign aid provided from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, and aid proposed under Marshall plan, in terms of shares to be borne by each county and by cities and towns over 1,000 population in Indiana, estimated on per capita basis—Continued

[County figures represent total for county, including city and town figures shown, plus amounts for all other governmental units in county]

Counties and cities	Share of cost of foreign aid, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947	Share of cost of foreign aid program under Marshall plan	Share of cost of total foreign aid provided and proposed (for 6 years)	Total local and State property taxes levied, 1946, payable, 1947	Number of years required to pay share of foreign aid with property taxes
Montgomery	$4,983,273	$3,515,794	$8,499,067	$1,077,445	5.1
Crawfordsville	2,029,287	1,431,701	3,460,988	433,729	8.0
Morgan	3,623,583	2,556,507	6,180,090	603,957	10.2
Martinsville	916,647	646,712	1,563,359	181,213	8.6
Mooresville	362,157	255,509	617,666	50,223	12.3
Newton	1,971,825	1,391,160	3,362,985	540,727	6.2
Goodland	200,751	141,634	342,385	31,666	10.8
Kentland	294,264	207,609	501,873	54,500	9.2
Morocco	210,633	148,606	359,239	31,945	11.2
Noble	4,168,008	2,940,609	7,108,617	793,476	9.0
Albion	225,822	159,322	385,144	32,881	11.7
Kendallville	993,873	701,196	1,695,069	155,604	10.9
Ligonier	398,574	281,202	679,776	81,293	8.4
Ohio	692,186	488,294	1,180,400	100,337	11.8
Rising Sun	282,735	199,475	482,210	40,347	12.0
Orange	3,167,913	2,235,023	5,402,936	321,763	16.8
French Lick	370,392	261,319	631,711	59,604	10.6
Orleans	261,324	184,369	445,693	45,467	9.8
Paoli	405,894	286,366	692,260	39,717	17.4
Owen	2,212,470	1,560,940	3,773,410	279,140	13.5
Spencer	434,625	306,636	741,261	58,029	12.8
Parke	3,176,514	2,241,091	5,417,605	475,319	11.4
Montezuma	249,978	176,364	426,342	13,915	30.6
Rockville	404,064	285,075	689,139	68,850	10.0
Perry	3,251,910	2,294,285	5,546,195	325,403	17.0
Cannelton	409,520	289,206	699,126	52,118	13.4
Tell City	987,285	696,548	1,683,833	147,722	11.4
Pike	3,119,235	2,200,680	5,319,915	403,790	13.2
Petersburg	562,725	397,013	959,738	90,092	10.7
Winslow	252,906	178,430	431,336	25,995	16.6
Porter	5,093,988	3,593,906	8,687,894	1,266,778	6.9
Chesterton	452,010	318,902	770,912	81,849	9.4
Porter	217,770	153,641	371,411	51,130	7.3
Valparaiso	1,598,688	1,127,905	2,726,593	308,593	8.8
Posey	3,510,489	2,476,717	5,987,206	559,483	10.7
Mount Vernon	1,031,754	727,922	1,759,676	145,562	12.1
New Harmony	254,370	179,463	433,833	23,364	18.6
Pulaski	2,206,248	1,556,550	3,762,798	430,400	8.7
Winamac	335,805	236,917	572,722	63,071	9.1
Putnam	3,813,537	2,690,523	6,504,060	705,295	9.2
Greencastle	891,576	629,024	1,520,600	164,837	9.2
Randolph	4,898,178	3,455,758	8,353,936	1,066,664	7.8
Lynn	185,562	130,918	316,480	20,168	15.7
Ridgeville	183,549	129,497	313,046	19,057	16.4
Union City	646,905	456,404	1,103,309	139,756	7.9
Winchester	970,449	684,670	1,655,119	199,254	8.3
Ripley	3,458,334	2,439,921	5,898,255	438,805	13.4
Batesville	560,895	395,722	956,617	91,514	10.5
Milan	183,000	129,110	312,110	25,642	12.2
Osgood	219,234	154,674	373,908	33,290	11.2
Rush	3,463,641	2,443,665	5,907,306	771,114	7.7
Rushville	1,090,680	769,496	1,860,176	245,305	7.6
St. Joseph	29,613,609	20,892,968	50,506,577	7,056,550	7.2
Mishawaka	5,178,534	3,653,555	8,832,089	854,077	10.3
South Bend	18,532,044	13,074,711	31,606,755	4,962,068	6.4
Walkerton	215,574	152,092	367,666	33,303	11.0
Scott	1,642,974	1,159,150	2,802,124	268,224	10.4
Scottsburg	400,587	282,622	683,209	73,844	9.3
Shelby	$4,749,399	$3,350,792	$8,100,191	$946,838	8.6
Shelbyville	1,974,753	1,393,226	3,367,970	453,834	7.4
Spencer	2,966,613	2,093,002	5,059,615	357,998	14.1
Rockport	443,043	312,575	755,618	105,527	7.2
Starke	2,243,214	1,582,630	3,825,844	412,255	9.3
Knox	396,195	279,523	675,718	62,528	10.8
North Judson	257,664	181,787	439,451	43,111	10.2
Steuben	2,514,420	1,773,971	4,288,391	488,615	8.8
Angola	574,803	405,535	980,338	122,651	8.0
Sullivan	4,943,562	3,487,778	8,431,340	685,547	12.3
Dugger	257,298	181,529	438,827	19,505	22.5
Farmersburg	183,915	129,756	313,671	16,745	18.7
Hymera	237,534	167,585	405,119	10,666	38.0
Shelburn	293,898	207,351	501,249	18,014	27.8
Sullivan	929,091	655,491	1,584,582	161,870	9.8
Switzerland	1,494,561	1,054,441	2,549,002	195,900	13.0
Vevay	221,227	156,094	377,321	33,779	11.2
Tippecanoe	9,336,660	6,587,192	15,923,852	2,245,220	7.1
Lafayette	5,270,034	3,718,110	8,988,144	1,240,194	7.2
West Lafayette	1,147,410	809,520	1,956,930	333,618	5.9
Tipton	2,769,705	1,954,080	4,723,785	550,138	8.4
Tipton	933,483	658,590	1,592,073	151,066	10.5
Union	1,101,111	776,855	1,877,966	308,987	6.1
Liberty	273,768	193,149	466,917	74,749	6.2
Vanderburgh	23,933,289	16,885,393	40,818,682	6,232,198	6.5
Evansville	17,762,346	12,531,675	30,294,021	5,371,142	5.6
Vermillion	3,987,021	2,812,920	6,799,941	607,088	11.2
Cayuga	206,058	145,378	351,436	24,007	14.6
Clinton	1,297,836	915,648	2,213,484	184,155	12.0
Fairview Park	196,542	138,664	335,206	13,960	24.0
Vigo	18,246,747	12,873,429	31,120,176	4,013,866	7.8
Terre Haute	11,472,819	8,094,293	19,567,112	2,716,187	7.2
West Terre Haute	682,407	481,451	1,163,858	52,752	22.1
Wabash	4,867,983	3,434,455	8,302,438	989,973	8.4
North Manchester	580,110	409,279	989,389	108,531	9.1
Wabash	1,766,499	1,246,299	3,012,798	381,236	7.9
Warren	1,657,065	1,169,091	2,826,156	343,549	8.2
Williamsport	223,626	157,772	381,398	29,918	12.7
Warrick	3,556,605	2,509,253	6,065,858	446,805	13.6
Boonville	828,258	584,352	1,412,610	109,886	12.9
Newburg	251,442	177,397	428,839	24,937	17.2
Washington	3,112,464	2,195,903	5,308,367	364,354	14.6
Salem	584,502	412,377	996,879	112,017	8.9
Wayne	10,838,907	7,647,056	18,485,963	2,391,188	7.7
Cambridge City	403,881	284,946	688,827	71,460	9.6
Centerville	212,646	150,026	362,672	21,507	16.9
Hagerstown	299,754	211,482	511,236	62,108	8.2
Richmond	6,431,901	4,537,829	10,969,730	1,485,319	7.4
Wells	3,495,117	2,465,872	5,960,989	640,291	9.3
Bluffton	991,311	699,389	1,690,700	158,265	10.7
White	3,117,771	2,199,647	5,317,418	645,416	8.2
Monon	230,946	162,937	393,883	35,242	11.2
Monticello	576,999	407,084	984,083	115,277	8.5
Whitley	3,111,183	2,194,999	5,306,182	646,602	8.2
Churubusco	205,326	144,861	350,187	33,655	10.4
Columbia City	772,077	544,715	1,316,792	150,005	8.8

SALARIES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I consider to be one of the most statesmanlike utterances ever made before any committee in connection with Federal employees, dealing particularly with the bill introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and other Senators.

There is a general impression upon the part of some persons, including the administration itself, that Federal employees are now receiving enough pay, but investigation shows conclusively, Mr. President, that even if the $800 salary measure be enacted it will increase the average weekly wage received in 1948 to approximately $40.61, or $1.02 a week less than the 1939 wage. In other words, if that bill should pass, a Federal employee will still be taking home $1.02 less than he took home in 1939.

I suggest, Mr. President, that particularly my colleagues on this side of the Chamber read the article by the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York City published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the statement referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF E. C. HALLBECK, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS, ON PENDING POSTAL SALARY BILLS, TO SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, JANUARY 15, 1948

Senator LANGER and members of the committee, at the outset I want to commend the chairman and the members of this committee for the promptness with which they have moved to consideration of one of the most important subjects likely to come before this session of Congress. Speaking for the membership of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, I know that this evidence of your concern for their welfare is sincerely appreciated.

Several members of this committee, and other Senators as well, have already introduced bills designed to bring about an increase in the salaries paid to the employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and it is my intention to set forth certain facts in support of that objective. Each of us, in our daily lives, has become increasingly aware of the changes that continue to take place in our economic conditions. To some, the burden is perhaps greater than to others, but no person or family is totally exempt. All of us have suffered in some degree.

Statistically, of course, there is ample evidence that the increase in the cost of basic commodities throughout the country has been such as to make totally inadequate wage increases granted by Public Laws 134 and 386 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, will be cited many times during these hearings, and there can be no doubt that those statistics prove the need for salary increases. The special report, City Worker's Family Budget, prepared at the request of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, is designed to show the relative differences in living costs between cities, and in addition, the total number of dollars required for the average worker in overalls to live in these cities. In a forepiece it is stated that this budget is not a subsistence budget, nor yet a

luxury budget, but anyone who takes the time to review it carefully cannot fail to note that in many aspects the allowances upon which the budget is predicated are ridiculous. Take the item of clothing, for example. Under the item of hats for the husband and boy, we note that the husband is allowed 0.76 of a felt hat each year, or about three hats every 4 years, and 0.16 of a straw hat each year, or approximately one straw hat every 6 years. For a boy 13 years they allow 0.29 of a felt hat and 0.30 of a wool cap and 0.08 of a cotton cap each year. Every Senator knows that there has never been an American boy that didn't lose at least one hat or cap each year, and a figure based on one hat and one cap every 3 years is sheer nonsense. The same thing is true of virtually every single item in the clothing budget. The quantity per year bears absolutely no relationship to the amount of clothing needed by the average American family. Imagine a man who is allowed one pair of pants, a light weight, and a winter weight, wool suit each 3 years. If he were a postal clerk working at a window, after the second year he would need a counter high enough to cover him up to the neck or face arrest for indecent exposure. A boy 13 years old is allowed 2.32 cotton undershirts and 2.77 cotton shorts each year. Why, boys 13 years old outgrow underwear faster than that. The clothing allowance for the feminine side of the family is even more ridiculous. Not being qualified as an expert on this subject, I asked my wife to give me her opinion on the quantities allowed in this budget. She told me that "that budget could only have been prepared by a man, and a bachelor at that." The item of underwear seemed to agitate her most. In her opinion, an allowance for cotton, rayon, and woolen union suits for any modern American woman is positive evidence that the person who prepared the allowance didn't know what he was talking about, since to her knowledge garments of that sort are not worn by women of any age. And sportswear—can any of you imagine a woman wearing one bathing suit for 7 years and 9 months, or appearing on a bathing beach in 0.13 of a bathing suit, or 0.11 of a pair of shorts?

The faults to be found with the budget prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics are to be found in almost every scientific budget prepared for studies of this sort. While the white-collar workers' budget of the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics is a whole lot more liberal, showing an addition of $1,666 over the BLS study for San Francisco, it, too, is open to valid criticism. There just isn't an acceptable average that will hold true in all cases, and the margin of error that is necessarily allowed works to prevent the final figures from having any degree of authenticity. For that reason, I have come to the conclusion that the truth has to be shown in another way. A way that will reflect actual existing conditions in terms readily understandable. It seems to me that the problem is best explained in terms of the purchasing power of the dollar. If we are to accept the average of wages for the years 1935–39 as representative of the normal American way of life, then the average post-office employee is today suffering a dollar deficiency of $10.01 per week.

I have chosen to illustrate my position with figures supplied by the Guarantee Survey (Guarantee Trust Co., New York, N. Y.), a thoroughly reputable business survey prepared for the information of the clients of a banking institution, with assets in excess of $2,000,000,000. This, bear in mind, is not a group hired to prove a particular point, but a regular financial service for men who must be abreast of business conditions and trends. According to this survey, "The average weekly earnings of factory workers rose from $24.54 in 1939 to $46.32 in June 1945, but that the benefit to workers was halved by the rise that took place in the cost of living during the same period, despite wartime price controls. In terms of 1939 dollars, the average rose from $24.54 to $34.10. Between June 1945 and September 1947 money wages increased further from $46.32 to $50.42; but the cost of living rose more rapidly, with the result that wages in terms of 1939 dollars declined from $34.10 to $29.46. During the entire period from 1939 to September, of this year, money wages more than doubled; but four-fifths of the increase was offset by the rise in the cost of living, leaving an advance of 20 percent, in real wages or purchasing power." That statement is from the Guarantee Survey for November 26, 1947.

The purchasing power of a single dollar is exactly the same in the hands of a factory worker, a postal employee, or a Senator; so I think it fair to assume that what has happened to the factory worker's dollar, according to the Guarantee Survey, has also happened to the dollar of a post-office clerk. The average wage of post-office clerks and supervisors for the year ending June 30, 1939, according to the reports of the Postmaster General, was $2,165.21, or an average weekly wage of $41.63.

Due to the enactment of Public Law 134, effective July 1, 1945, and Public Law 386, effective January 1, 1946, the average wage of post-office clerks and supervisors for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, was $2,735, or an average weekly wage of $52.59. Parenthetically, I might add here, Senator, that one of the salary increases referred to was followed by the elimination of overtime, which, of course, nullified the increase insofar as take-home pay was concerned. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, the average annual salary was $2,816, and the average weekly wage, therefore, had risen to $54.15. Both annual wage figures were taken from the reports of the Postmaster General. Since the purchasing power of the dollar is the same, regardless of who spends it, it therefore follows that post-office clerks who had a purchasing power of $41.63 as of June 1939 had a purchasing power of $38.70 as of June 1946, and as of June 30, 1947, this purchasing power had declined to $31.62, or exactly $10.01 per week less than they had in 1939, despite two salary increases in 1945–46.

For purposes of illustration, these changes may best be shown as follows:

	1939	1945	1946	1947
Factory workers' dollar wage	$24.54	$46.32	[1] $43.31	$50.42
Factory workers' real wage	24.54	34.10	31.88	29.46
Post-office clerks' and supervisors' dollar wage	41.63	[2] 41.04	52.59	54.15
Post-office clerks' and supervisors' real wage	41.63	[2] 30.20	38.70	31.62

[1] Figure supplied by U. S. Department of Labor.
[2] Does not include $300 per annum temporary increase.

The November-December issue of the Republic News, published by the Republican National Committee, contains a table showing the total 1947 income needed to equal 1939. According to that table, a post-office clerk with an average salary of $2,165.21, as reported by the Annual Report of the Postmaster General for 1939, would require a salary of $3,906.90 in 1947 as against an average actual salary of $2,816, or exactly $1,090.90 more than he is presently receiving. A statement on the same page reads, "It's a pity that $2 bills are so scarce these days when they would be so convenient for buying a dollar's worth of almost everything."

The wholesale-price index indicates that the trend toward increasing prices has not diminished and the figures given above, therefore, are susceptible of adjustment on the basis of an even higher living cost than that which prevailed on the dates given.

There are present here today any number of post-office employees who can furnish expert testimony to the fact that those figures are correct. They know they are correct because conditions are such that many of them, of necessity, have been forced to seek additional employment in private industry in order to try and make both ends meet. In the case of the junior employees, many of them veterans who have entered the postal service following their honorable discharge from the armed services, the situation is even worse. Their salary of $2,100 per annum, based on 1939 purchasing power, is worth about $1,226.40 a year, or $23.58 per week before withholding tax and retirement deductions.

The several bills pending before this committee propose salary increases ranging from $800 to $1,000 a year. Should the committee report, and the Congress enact, S. 1849, the average weekly wage of post-office clerks and supervisors, expressed in terms of the 1939 dollar, will become $42.80, or exactly $1.17 per week more than the 1939 wage. Should the $800 measure be enacted, it will increase the average weekly wage in 1939 dollars to $40.61, or $1.02 per week less than the 1939 wage. We feel that postal employees are entitled to some of the joys and benefits of technological and scientific advancement and have a right to expect a wage far enough in advance of the 1939 standard to make such benefits possible. We feel, therefore, that we are justified in seeking the higher figure.

At a special national legislative conference held in Chicago, Ill., November 21 and 22, 1947, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, following the unanimous recommendation of our executive committee, adopted a resolution embodying a permanent salary increase of $1,000 per annum effective January 1, 1948.

I know that the cost of a measure of this sort has a considerable influence on its chance of enactment and, in this connection, I want to quote very briefly from an editorial in the New York Times for December 19, 1947, entitled "Justice to Civil Servants." This editorial states, in part:

"When the New York Legislature completed action last March on the bill to forbid strikes by public employees this newspaper said: 'This new measure * * * puts the State, this city, and all other municipal government under a solemn obligation. We must see to it that our conduct as an employer of these civil servants is always just and generous, that we never fail to take note of changes in the cost of living that make a change in compensation appropriate, that we never plead poverty as an excuse for pauperizing these, our faithful representatives. That is the bill we pay for exacting this extraordinary but essential obligation from public employees that they will, on no account, abandon their sworn duty.'

"The city is hard pressed for money. The State, too, is wondering how it can keep its budget from exceeding present tax revenues. But we must not plead poverty or balance budgets at the expense of a civil servant who has no recourse against personal bankruptcy except to resign."

Though that editorial referred only to State and municipal employees, it is equally applicable to the Federal Government and to Federal and postal employees. They, too, have only resignation as recourse against personal bankruptcy.

We could not fail to note that in his budget message to the Congress, President Truman was none too encouraging on the subject of postal and Federal employees' salaries. While admitting the need for correction in these words, "The rapid increase in living costs during the last 18 months has placed a serious burden on these groups," the President told the Congress, "I am not recommending at this time cost-of-living increases in pay for military and civilian government personnel * * *." He gave as his reason the belief that such increases would add greatly to the inflationary pressures in our economy, adding, "The wiser approach, which I have

proposed to Congress, is to enact a comprehensive program to hold living costs down."

With the general thought that postal employees have more to gain from a stable economy than they have from a continuing spiral of price, wage, price, wage, and again price, increases, we are in substantial agreement. If it were now a question of raising prices and income together, we would favor the status quo. But prices have already gone up, and, unless wages first catch up to prices, there can be no true stabilization. We submit that there is now no sign on the horizon that such stabilization is likely to be achieved in the near future. In the meantime, post-office clerks are trying to stretch an income that is at least $10 less per week than they enjoyed 10 years ago to cover present prices. Gentlemen, it just can't be done.

In conclusion, let me say that I know that the committee will consider this subject on its merits. Let me suggest also that the President's statement, "In the event that the Congress does not provide controls adequate for this purpose, I may have to recommend further adjustments in pay and benefit rates," be kept in mind. That such a recommendation will be necessary before this Congress adjourns is a reasonable conclusion at this time. The danger to postal employees lies in the fact that there may not then be sufficient time to enact such legislation prior to the adjournment of Congress unless this committee acts beforehand. For that reason, I hope action will be taken leading to an early and favorable report of a measure to provide an adequate upward revision of postal salaries.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The business before the Senate is the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 111, and by unanimous consent agreement entered into at the last session of the Senate the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was to be granted the floor at the opening of the session today. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	McCarthy
Baldwin	Fulbright	McClellan
Ball	George	McFarland
Barkley	Green	McGrath
Brewster	Gurney	McKellar
Bricker	Hatch	McMahon
Brooks	Hayden	Magnuson
Buck	Hickenlooper	Malone
Bushfield	Hill	Martin
Butler	Hoey	Maybank
Byrd	Holland	Millikin
Cain	Ives	Moore
Capehart	Jenner	Morse
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Connally	Kem	O'Conor
Cooper	Kilgore	O'Daniel
Cordon	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Langer	Overton
Downey	Lodge	Pepper
Dworshak	Lucas	Reed
Ecton	McCarran	Revercomb
Robertson, Va.	Taft	Vandenberg
Russell	Taylor	Watkins
Saltonstall	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Smith	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Sparkman	Thye	Williams
Stennis	Tobey	Young
Stewart	Tydings	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my address falls into four major subdivisions, and it is my intention to decline to yield while I am making one of these four major arguments. At the conclusion of each phase of the subject I shall be glad to yield for questions. As a rule I am eager to yield at any time. However, I think it is important that the RECORD show the argument in connected form. So, after a great deal of thought, I have decided not to yield during the argument, but to yield when I reach a natural stopping place in the speech.

As I entered the Chamber I was handed a very fervent telegram from the National Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, expressing opposition to the pending proposal, as well as a telegram from the Massachusetts branch of the organization. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
January 28, 1948.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate:

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen appreciates your opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and wants you to know that our membership throughout the United States, and particularly between the Atlantic seaboard and points west of Chicago and Duluth, are very much concerned. Many of our men now employed on full-time basis would be employed only a few months of the year if this resolution were adopted and the project completed. Past conventions of the brotherhood have taken action in opposition to this project and statements that it would be of benefit to railroad employees or that railroad employees should support it are entirely wrong.

HARRY SEE.

BRIGHTON, MASS.,
January 27, 1948.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.:

All members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in Massachusetts deeply appreciate your opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project. And believe that your opposition to this project will cause its defeat in the Senate.

J. R. MCISAAC,
State Legislative Representative,
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, at the outset of these remarks let me say that I shall not make any one of the arguments of a sectional nature which my able friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] stated on Monday at considerable length the opposition would make. Indeed, I wish that he had given a little more time to speaking for the seaway and less to what must in all candor be called a misrepresentation of the arguments in the minority report. Perhaps I am wrong, but it seems to me that it would be more helpful to the Senate for the proponents to concentrate on giving the arguments for the project, allowing the opponents to give the arguments against it.

I agree with the Senator that we must take Daniel Webster's view that we are one country. I deeply regret that already, before I have even opened my mouth to begin the presentation for the opposition, the insinuation should be made that I am engaged in a nefarious conspiracy to move the steel industry to Boston, or that it is desired to "cut the throat of the Middle West."

Let me say frankly that I have been a citizen of Massachusetts all my life. I have worked as a student, newspaperman, and public official, but no one has ever spoken to me about moving the steel industry to Boston. That, I think, is what the late great Alfred E. Smith would have called a "phonus balonus." So far as cutting the throat of the Middle West is concerned, I hope I do not need enter a denial to a charge of that kind. Ever since I have been a Member of this body I have tried to vote and conduct myself as a servant of the United States. I believe the RECORD will show many occasions when I have voted for projects, policies, and measures which benefited some particular section other than that where I live, or some group from another section, but which I thought were of ultimate benefit to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, my life has been too intimately tied up with and too much lived in the whole of America; I have made too close friendships in college, in Congress, and in the press; I have had too many close, unforgettable brotherly contacts in the Army with men from the Middle West and from every other part of this country, to feel that I am anything other than an American. I shall not impute sectional motives to the proponents, and I hope they will not impute them to me. In the remarks which I shall make I shall not utter one single sectional argument. I shall speak in national terms, and shall present nothing but national arguments.

I agree that there are sectional and local interests opposed to the project we are considering. That has been said very often. I think it is also true that there are local and sectional interests in favor of it. But let us lay those considerations to one side, and consider the problem on a high plane.

First, a word as to the legislative history of this proposal. The movement

to create a deep waterway of 1,194 statute miles from Montreal to the lower end of Lake Ontario and thence for some 1,164 statute miles through the Great Lakes to Duluth gained its initial impetus in 1919. In that year the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association was formed to promote the project, and since that time various national and international commissions, committees, boards, and departments have been appointed to investigate and report on the feasibility of the scheme.

The first great result of all this activity and study was reached in the form of a treaty between the United States and Canada for the joint development and utilization of the St. Lawrence. This treaty was signed on July 18, 1932, and was submitted to the Senate for ratification on January 19, 1933. It was the subject of extended hearings before a Senate committee, followed by a long debate on the floor of the Senate.

The treaty came to a vote on March 13, 1934, but failed to muster the necessary support of two-thirds of the Senators present, as required by the Constitution. It might be noted in passing that the 1932 treaty was never submitted to the Parliament of Canada for ratification. There is nothing on the record to indicate that the Canadian Parliament was favorably disposed toward the undertaking, either then or now, or that it would be willing to ratify a treaty in the event of ratification by the United States Senate.

After what might be described as quite a definite set-back, the administration submitted new proposals to Canada in 1936 and in 1938. There were consultations with Canadian officials in December of 1940. Shortly after this conference, Mackenzie King, as Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, raised a question whether the St. Lawrence project, as then being discussed, was necessary or desirable. Mr. King seemed to have some doubt whether the project warranted the great expenditure of funds required, and was concerned with possible interference with the war effort. The United States, however, advised Mr. King that it regarded the project as vital, and that its construction should be immediately undertaken. As a consequence, a so-called executive agreement between the United States and Canada providing for the construction of the hydroelectric power facilities at the International Rapids Section, and their operation and maintenance, and for the completion not later than December 31, 1948, of the essential links in the deep waterway, was signed on March 19, 1941. This so-called executive agreement could not become effective until approved by the Congress of the United States and by the Parliament of Canada, and thereafter by the exchange of instruments of ratification.

This executive agreement, which in form and substance is almost identical with the 1932 treaty, was sent to Congress by the President on March 21, 1941. The executive-agreement device was, I believe—and this belief is shared by a great many other people—employed for the purpose of bypassing the constitutional requirement that a treaty to be valid must receive affirmative approval of the Senate by a vote of two-thirds of its Members present.

Thereafter, a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin bill was introduced in the House of Representatives during the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and was later incorporated in an omnibus rivers and harbors bill. It undertook to validate the agreement, to authorize the commencement of construction, and to authorize the President to enter into an agreement with the State of New York, whereby the power authority of the State would take over and dispose of the United States share of the hydroelectric power that prospectively was to result from the project. The bill failed of passage; in fact, it never came to a vote in the House at all.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress, the proponents of this project introduced similar authorization bills in both the House and the Senate. In the Senate the bill was numbered S. 1385, and in November of 1944, hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee with a view to determining whether an agreement between the United States and Canada to consummate the St. Lawrence seaway project was of such a nature that it would, in fact, require a treaty. The weight of the testimony before the subcommittee was definitely that a treaty would be necessary and that the executive agreement to which Senate bill 1385 sought to give congressional approval was an obvious subterfuge. In the closing days of the Seventy-eighth Congress this bill was offered as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill then pending before the Senate. The Senate rejected this amendment by a vote of 56 against to 25 for. Thus, for the second time the St. Lawrence project was rejected on the floor of the Senate.

But the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is like a cat with nine lives. It dies very hard. A resolution in the Seventy-ninth Congress, calling for an authorization of the executive agreement of 1941, was the subject of hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but never came to a vote in the Senate. During the first session of the Eightieth Congress a similar resolution was introduced with modifications, but with exactly the same purport and this is the resolution now before us.

The hearings this year before a special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee were, by the direction of the chairman of the subcommittee, limited to two aspects of the project: First, the question whether the project can be justified from a national defense point of view; and second, the new self-liquidating feature incorporated for the first time in Senate Joint Resolution 111. With a view to conserving paper and space, this year's majority and minority reports are both limited in general to these two aspects. In dealing with this matter on the floor of the Senate, however, I do not propose so to limit myself. The national defense and self-liquidating features of the project merit extended attention, but many other important factors must be discussed if we are to see this project in its true colors.

My first consideration, therefore, goes to the basic question, May such an executive agreement, as is here before us, be concluded by executive action only, supplemented by legislative bill, or does it require a treaty submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent? My conclusion is that it definitely does call for Senate ratification by the constitutional method and that the resolution, if for no other reason, should be rejected on that ground alone.

TREATY VERSUS AGREEMENT ASPECT

In dealing with what might be called the treaty versus the executive agreement aspect of the St. Lawrence project, I want to make it absolutely plain that I do not intend to deal with the question of whether we can sanction a so-called executive agreement by the method here proposed rather than ratify a treaty as a matter of law, but rather whether we should do so as a matter of policy. Whether the so-called executive agreement which is before us can constitutionally be legalized by the procedure of a simple majority vote is in my opinion entirely a matter of law. I am not a lawyer and I would not presume to say with any pretense of authority whether this is the constitutional procedure or not. Others will discuss this particular question. Of course, we must bear in mind—and I submit that this is a perfectly reasonable conclusion—that serious differences of opinion do exist among legal experts as to whether an executive agreement of this kind can be approved by simple majority vote in each House as an alternative to ratification of a treaty submitted for advice and consent of the Senate and ratified by two-thirds of the Senators present. No one can deny that a very controversial doubt exists, but I am not here today to resolve that doubt one way or the other. This appears to be a very cloudy area, indeed, from a legal standpoint.

My concern, in brief, is not whether the Constitution permits us to do this, but whether as a matter of policy and as a matter of precedent, we should permit what I have described elsewhere as a palpable invasion of the Senate's treaty-making powers. This is a question which each Senator must ponder very seriously and must decide as his own conscience dictates. It cannot be lightly brushed aside. We are sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States and certainly there is implicit in that obligation a responsibility not to take any steps which may circumvent the Constitution. Please notice that I use the word "circumvent" and not the word "violate." The Constitution under which we live and in which we take such deep pride is not a document that says "do this" or "you cannot do that." It was not intended as such. It is certainly among the most flexible documents of government ever devised by man, but its meaning and its spirit are clear; its signposts are definite and we cannot close our eyes to these signposts.

Let us have a look at the Constitution. Section 2 of article II states:

He—

That is, the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, pro-

vided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

A brief consideration of the background of the Constitutional Convention makes it clear beyond any question that the founding fathers were well aware of the distinction between treaties and agreements. Indeed, there is within the Constitution itself a distinction between these two types of compacts. I refer to section 10 of article I which states in part that—

> No State shall enter into treaties, alliance, or confederation * * * no State shall, without the consent of Congress * * * enter into agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power.

Moreover, the framers of both the Articles of Confederation of 1777 and the Constitution of 1787 had before them the book of the great authority in international law, the Swiss writer, Emeric de Vattel, who distinguished between agreements embracing continuous executory obligations of projected future duration, which he considered properly the subject of treaties, and compacts which have, for their subject, matters of temporary interest or of a single act performed once and for all. This general distinction between an agreement and a treaty, which the framers of the Constitution had before them, and which history tells us they were well acquainted with, is a classic distinction. While it is true that the precise dividing line between the subject matter of treaties and of executive agreements has never authoritatively been determined by the courts of this country, to state it succinctly, the difference has always been that a treaty deals with important matters and an agreement deals with less important and transitory matters. The late Supreme Court Justice Sutherland, in his book, Constitutional Power and World Affairs, declares that the precedents indicate that—

> International agreements which are not treaties in the full constitutional sense are perhaps confined to such as affect administrative matters, as distinguished from policies, and those which are of only individual concern, or limited scope and duration, as distinguished from those of general consequence and permanent character.

It will be remembered that Justice Sutherland is generally considered as one of the most careful scholars of international affairs ever to sit on the Supreme Court.

Another very learned scholar who has studied this matter, Prof. Charles Scheney Hyde, stated:

> From examination of the various permitted modes of agreement-making to which the United States has had recourse, it will be found that in practice the test of whether it is obligatory for the President to work with the Senate, or, to put it differently, whether there has been imposed through the Constitution a duty to make use of a treaty as the instrumentality of agreement, has in the particular case usually been deemed to rest upon the character of the objectives sought to be accomplished. It has not been supposed, for example, that the Executive, with or without the aid of Congress, was free to dispense with treaty-making whenever he might desire to avoid difficulties to be encountered in obtaining the senatorial approval of a desired compact. Deference for the constitutional privilege of the Senate has been constantly manifested in the making of certain well-defined classes of international arrangements; and that deference has revealed a seeming acknowledgment that the constitutional provisions in relation to treaty-making were far more than indicia of a procedure to be followed in case the Executive chose to employ a treaty as a pleasing setting for an agreement, and that the provisions in that instrument were rather to be regarded as declaratory of a constitutional duty on the part of the Executive invariably to submit agreements within a broad and fairly well-defined field to the Senate for its approval. The practice of the United States throughout its life reveals respect for this ideal.

It is quite true that the force of circumstances has made it necessary and indeed entirely desirable for the President in the conduct of military affairs and certain aspects of foreign relations to conclude either with or without congressional authorization various agreements with foreign countries covering such matters as the movement of armed forces, the adjustment of claims, protocols, tariff agreements, postal agreements, and even armistices. All of these may be classed as being either of a routine nature within the President's admitted constitutional powers, or else relating to matters which the Senate has deemed either too unimportant for treaty procedure or which Congress has authorized, or as to which, in certain isolated and quite individual cases, it may be said that the Senate has acquiesced as not requiring the exercise of its senatorial prerogatives under the Constitution. But it must be borne in mind that the treaty-making power of the Senate which is found in article II, section 2, of the Constitution is designed as a definite check upon the Chief Executive's unlimited power to enter into permanent and continuing arrangements with foreign countries, commonly the subject of treaties. And this is to be a permanent arrangement with a foreign country.

As stated before, it is quite true that the Constitution makes no clear definition of what shall be the subject matter of a treaty. It also fails to provide for executive agreements, as they have come to be called. Time and circumstance, however, have given us a guide on these questions, so that we know approximately what types of subjects have been covered by each form.

There are very sound reasons for the rule which provides that two-thirds of the Senators present must advise and consent to a treaty. Certainly this provision did not come into the Constitution by accident. Before the Articles of Confederation, the States by their delegates had to be unanimous in binding the United States to a treaty. Under the Articles, 9 States out of 13 were necessary.

Under the Constitution, the small States insisted upon a preponderant majority as necessary to bind the United States and constitute the supreme law of the land binding the States. In other words, it was strenuously believed and, of course, adopted that a treaty had to be good enough and convincing enough to command a two-thirds vote. Then there arose the question of the participation of the House of Representatives in the treaty-making power. This was very carefully considered, and was expressly rejected by an overwhelming vote. While the House of Representatives is undoubtedly as competent and as patriotic as the Senate, there were reasons why the House was not joined as a treaty partner. Among the historical reasons, as described by Mr. W. Stull Holt in a scholarly study entitled "Treaties Defeated by the Senate," were: the necessity for secrecy, the necessity for quick action, the fact that the House would be in session only for several months of the year, the short terms of the members of the House which would prevent them from mastering the intricacies of foreign relations, and the fluctuating membership of the House. These are the historical reasons.

In the Constitutional Convention a further discussion arose as to whether the treaty-making powers should be placed solely in the hands of the Senate or in the hands of the Executive alone.

Mr. Holt thus describes the compromise which was reached:

> Obviously the treaty-making powers had to be lodged somewhere. With the House of Representatives disqualified for what seemed, at least to the vast majority of the members of the Convention, to be sufficient reasons, with one group opposed to putting the power solely in the hands of the Senate and another group insisting that it should not be given to the President alone, the compromise giving it jointly to the President and the Senate was almost inevitable. Such settlement was particularly satisfying to the members as it exemplified so well the dominant political belief that liberties and good government could be preserved if each branch of the Government could be checked by the others.

The late Senator Bailey, of North Carolina, whom many of us remember with so much admiration and affection, put it this way:

> We must all bear in mind there is a great difference between the House and the Senate. The Senate is a continuing body that is always in existence; it has been in existence since 1785 without a break, while the House ceases to exist every 2 years and starts de novo. We do not have to adopt our rules each 2 years—the House does. We do not have to organize every 2 years—the House does. We are in continuous existence and, for matters relating to treaties with other nations, that continuity is very important. We are bound, but the future House is not bound at all. If Canada goes into this—

And Senator Bailey was here referring to the St. Lawrence agreement—

> and it turns out to be just an agreement based on the action of Congress, Canada would take notice at once that the Representatives could change their minds every 2 years. It is presumed that a future Senate will respect the actions or the agreements of past Senates because it has a continuity of existence. But the next House of Representatives is not bound by anything done by the present House. I think that is the basis for the two-thirds rule in the Senate for ratification.

While it is certainly true that some of the original reasons for the adoption of the constitutional rule may no longer seem to us as forceful as they seemed in 1787, there are additional sound, modern reasons to support this rule, most notably the recognized rise in Executive power and the complexity of our inter-

national relations. These historical factors form an indispensable background against which we must consider the agreement now before us. I have only sketched in this background, but I ask Senators to bear it in mind as I move along to an examination of the St. Lawrence project itself.

On page 82 of the majority report, the statement is made:

Reciprocal legislation has long been recognized as a method of concluding agreements between the United States and Canada.

On the contrary, Mr. President, treaties have been consistently used for this purpose. Boundaries, rights of navigation, and use of contiguous waters have been agreed upon by way of treaty, the most comprehensive of which is the treaty of 1909. Numerous treaties on a variety of subjects have since been concluded. This list includes the fishery treaties of 1924, 1931, and 1937; the antismuggling treaty of 1925; the liquor treaties with Great Britain of 1924, largely affecting Canada; the boundary treaty of 1925; the Lake of the Woods treaty of 1925; the treaty governing salmon in the Fraser River in 1937; the Loadline treaty of 1934; and the income-tax treaty of 1936. All those are treaties which we have concluded with Canada. I would vigorously emphasize that the record shows that matters far less significant than the St. Lawrence seaway project have been dealt with by treaty.

It also should be noted that on our southern boundary, international agreements with Mexico concerning the utilization of the Rio Grande and the Colorado Rivers have always been the subject of treaty settlement, and not of so-called executive agreement.

Referring to the treaty of 1909, which is the comprehensive boundary waters treaty, it is true that some collateral supplemental agreements contemplated in that treaty were subsequently entered into. From this the majority seem to conclude that the provision of the 1909 treaty establishing the International Joint Commission and those provisions of article III providing for special agreement concerning the "uses, obstructions, and diversions" of boundary waters, entrusted to the International Joint Commission or to special agreement or concurrent legislation, constitute authority for the promulgation of the St. Lawrence navigation and power project by executive agreement rather than treaty. In other words, the inference is made that the St. Lawrence navigation and power project is an obstruction or diversion, or is in that category. The majority report recognizes that it is the view of the Canadian Government that the St. Lawrence agreement does not flow out of the 1909 treaty; if the St. Lawrence agreement is supposedly based on the 1909 treaty, is it not most significant that the 1941 agreement is entirely silent with respect to the treaty of 1909?

Just to refresh the memory of the Senate, let me run over briefly the provisions of the 1942 so-called executive agreement concluded with Canada. It provides for a deep waterway, dams, and power works in the St. Lawrence River, and the agreement creates a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission to be composed of not more than 10 persons, the total number of whom shall be determined by an exchange of notes and an equal part of whom shall be selected by each Government. The Commission is to allocate construction costs in the international section between the Governments, is to approve all construction contracts, supervise construction, and report upon the desirability of compensating works in the Great Lakes System, these reports being approved by exchange of notes to be acted upon by the Governments.

Canada agrees, first, to construct—with funds furnished by the United States—operate, and maintain the works situated within Canada in the International Section; second, to construct Canadian links in the seaway, including the deepening of the Welland Canal. The completion date for these latter works is December 31, 1948, which may be modified by an exchange of notes.

The United States agrees, first, to furnish funds to Canada for construction in the international section; second, to construct, operate, and maintain works situated in the United States in the international section; third, to provide, not later than the date of completion of the Canadian links, for completion of works in the Great Lakes system above Lake Erie. It should be noted at this point that the so-called self-liquidation feature of the St. Lawrence project, to which I shall come later, is not provided for in the 1941 executive agreement. This feature, indeed, I want to underline, has not been the subject of any formal negotiation at all between the United States and Canada. In sections 1 and 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 111, the resolution now before us, it will be found that the President is authorized and directed, during the period of construction of this seaway, to negotiate a further agreement with the Government in Canada defining the rates of charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the new deep-water navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River. I shall return to this point later on in my argument, but I think it should be noted here that the self-liquidation provisions do not appear in any existing treaty or formal agreement between this country and the Government of Canada. That will all have to come up here later at some time, assuming that we decide to construct the seaway.

Reverting to the 1941 compact itself, Prof. Edwin Borchard prepared in 1944 a very informative analysis of the 1941 agreement. It will be recalled that Professor Borchard has had wide experience as an official of the Department of State, a practitioner in many important cases before the Supreme Court and other Federal and State courts, was counsel for the United States and for other governments in outstanding international arbitration, was representative of the United States on international legal commissions, and for 29 years was professor of constitutional and international law at one of our leading university law schools. He is also the author of several recognized standard works on constitutional and international law. Professor Borchard took a copy of the 1941 executive agreement between the United States and Canada and underlined in that agreement those provisions which he believed, in his considered opinion, were properly the subject matter of a treaty rather than an agreement. I do not have the time and I do not want to take the time of the Senate to go through this agreement line by line, pointing out Professor Borchard's emphasis. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a copy of the 1941 agreement between the United States and Canada, with Professor Borchard's underlinings included therein. I think that if Senators will take a look at this document, as analyzed by Professor Borchard, they will be impressed, as I am, with the fact that by every test of form, substance, and magnitude the St. Lawrence seaway and power project are most certainly well within our traditional concept of a treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINION

On March 19, 1941, the President of the United States and His Majesty, the King of Great Britain, etc., concluded an Executive Agreement known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Agreement, March 19, 1941.[1] It reads as follows:

"The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, *in respect of Canada*, have decided to conclude an Agreement in relation to the *utilization of the water in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin* and to that end have named as their respective plenipotentiaries:

"The President of the United States of America:

"His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, *for Canada:*

"Who, after having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

"PRELIMINARY ARTICLE

"For the purposes of the present Agreement, unless other expressly provided, the expression—

"(a) *'Joint Board of Engineers'* means the board appointed pursuant to an agreement between the Governments following the recommendation of the *International Joint Commission*, dated December 19, 1921;

"(b) *'Great Lakes System'* means Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, (including Georgian Bay), Erie, and Ontario, and the connecting waters, including Lake St. Clair;

"(c) *'St. Lawrence River' includes the river channels and the lakes forming parts of the river channels* from the outlet of Lake Ontario *to the sea;*

"(d) *'International Section'* means that part of the St. Lawrence River through which the international boundary line runs;

"(e) *'Canadian Section'* means that part of the St. Lawrence River which lies wholly within Canada and which extends from the easterly limit of the International Section to Montreal Harbor;

"(f) *'International Rapids Section'* means that part of the International Section which extends from Chimney Point to the village of St. Regis;

[1] Dept. of State Bulletin, March 22, 1941, Vol. IV, No. 91, p. 307; United States Dept. of Commerce, "The St. Lawrence Survey," N. R. Danielian, Director. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1941 Part VII, p. 138.

"(g) 'Governments' means the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada;

"(h) 'countries' means the United States of America and Canada;

"(i) *'Special International Niagara Board'* means the board appointed by the Governments in 1926 to ascertain and recommend ways and means to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls;

"(j) 'deep waterway' means adequate provision for navigation requiring a *controlling channel depth of 27 feet with a depth of 30 feet over lock sills, from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal Harbor* via the Great Lakes System and St. Lawrence River, in general accordance *with the specifications* set forth in the *Report of the Joint Board of Engineers,* dated November 16, 1926.

"ARTICLE I

"1. The Governments agree to establish and maintain a *Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission,* hereinafter referred to as the Commission, consisting of not more than ten members of whom an equal number shall be appointed by *each* Government. The duties of the Commission shall be—

"(a) to prepare and to recommend *plans and specifications for the construction of works in the International Rapids Section* in accordance with and containing the features described in the *Annex attached to* and made part of this Agreement, *with such modifications as may be agreed upon by the Governments;*

"(b) *upon approval* of the plans and specifications *by the Governments,* to prepare a schedule *allocating the construction* of the works in the International Rapids section on such a basis that each Government shall construct the works *within its own territory or an equivalent proportion of the works so approved;*

"(c) *to approve all contracts* entered into on behalf of either Government for the works in the International Rapids Section;

"(d) *to supervise the construction of the works* and to submit reports *to the Governments* from time to time, and at least once each calendar year, on the progress of the works;

"(e) upon satisfactory completion of the works, *to certify to the Governments that* they meet the plans and specifications drawn up by the Commission and *approved by the Governments;*

"(f) to perform the other duties assigned to it in this Agreement.

"2. The Commission shall have the authority *to employ such persons and to make such expenditures as may be necessary* to carry out the duties set forth in this Agreement. It shall have the authority to avail itself of the services of such governmental agencies, officers, and employees *of either country* as may be made available. The *remuneration, general expenses,* and *all other expenses* of its members shall be regulated and paid by their respective Governments; and the *other expenses of the Commission,* except as provided for under Article III, paragraph (b) of this Agreement, shall be *borne by the Governments in equal moieties.*

"3. The Governments agree *to permit the entry into their respective countries* within areas immediately adjacent to the Niagara River and the International Section to be delimited by exchange of notes, *of personnel employed by the Commission* or employed in the construction of the works, and *to exempt such personnel from the operation of their immigration laws* and regulations within the areas so delimited. *In the event that the Commission,* pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 (b) of this article, *allocates to either of the Governments the construction of works, any part of which is within the territory of the other Government, the latter Government shall make provision for the according,* within the area in which such a part is situated, *of such exemption from customs, excise, and other imposts, federal, state, and provincial, as may be reasonably practicable* for the effective and economical prosecution of the work. Regulations providing for such exemptions may be *settled by the Governments by exchange of notes.*

"4. The Governments shall, by exchange of notes, prescribe rules and *regulations for the conduct of the Commission.* They may by the same means *extend or abridge its powers and duties;* and *reduce* or after reduction *increase* the number of members (provided that there must always be an equal number appointed by each Government and that the *total number of members* shall at no time exceed 10); and upon completion of its duties, the Governments may terminate its existence.

"ARTICLE II

"The Government of Canada *agrees:*

"(a) in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by the Commission and approved by the Governments, *to construct the works in the International Rapids section allocated to Canada* by the Commission; and to operate and maintain or arrange for the operation and maintenance of the works situated in the territory of Canada;

"(b) to complete not later than December 31, 1948, the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway, including the necessary deepening of the new Welland Ship Canal and the construction of canals and other works *to provide the necessary depth* in the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River; provided that, if the continuance of war conditions or the requirements of defense justify a modification of the period within which such works shall be completed, *the Governments may, by exchange of notes, arrange to defer or expedite their completion* as circumstances may require.

"ARTICLE III

"The Government of the United States of America agrees:

"(a) in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by the Commission and approved by the Governments *to construct the works* in the International Rapids section *allocated to the United States* of America by the Commission; and to operate and maintain or arrange for the operation and maintenance of the works situated in the territory of the United States of America;

"(b) *to provide,* as required by the progress of the works, *funds for the construction, including design and supervision, of all works in the International Rapids section* except (1) machinery and equipment for the development of power, and (2) works required for rehabilitation on the Canadian side of the international boundary;

"(c) not later than the date of completion of the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway, *to complete the works allocated to it in the International Rapids section* and the *works* in the Great Lakes System above Lake Erie *required to create essential links* in the deep waterway.

"ARTICLE IV

"The *Governments agree that:*

"(a) *they may,* in their respective territories, in conformity with the general plans for the project in the International Rapids Section, *install* or arrange for the installation of such *machinery* and equipment *as may be desired for the development of power* and as such time or times as may be most suitable in terms of their respective power requirements;

"(b) in view of the need *for coordination of the plans* and specifications prepared by the Commission *for general works in the International Rapids section* with plans for the development of power in the respective countries, *the Commission may arrange for engineering services with any agency in either country,* which may be authorized to develop *power in the International Rapids Section;*

"(c) except as modified by the provisions of Article VIII, paragraph (b) of this Agreement, each country shall be entitled to *utilize one-half of the water available for power purposes in the International Rapids Section;*

"(d) during the construction and upon the completion of the works provided for the International Rapids section, *the flow of water out of Lake Ontario* into the St. Lawrence River shall be controlled and the flow of water through the International section *shall be regulated so that the navigable depths of water for shipping in the Harbor of Montreal* and throughout the navigable channel of the St. Lawrence River below Montreal, as such depths now exist or may hereafter be increased by dredging or other harbor or channel improvements, *shall not be injuriously affected by the construction or operation of such works,* and the *power developments in the Canadian section* of the St. Lawrence River shall *not be adversely affected;*

"(e) upon the completion of the works provided for in the International Rapids section, the power works shall be operated, initially, with the water level at the powerhouses held at a maximum elevation 238.0, sea level datum *as defined in the Report of the Joint Board of Engineers,* for a test period of 10 years or such shorter period *as may be approved by any board or authority designated or established under the provisions of paragraph (f)* of this article; and, in the event that such board or authority considers that operation with the water level at the powerhouses held to a maximum elevation exceeding 238.0 would be practicable and could be made effective within the limitations prescribed by *paragraphs (c) and (d) of this article,* the *Governments may, by exchange of notes, authorize operation,* subject to the provisions of this article, and for such times and subject to such terms as may be prescribed in the notes, at a maximum elevation exceeding 238.0;

"(f) *the Governments may, by exchange of notes,* make provision for giving effect to paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) of this article;

"(g) during the construction of the works *provided for in the International Rapids section,* facilities for 14-foot navigation in that section shall be maintained.

"ARTICLE V

"The Governments agree that *nothing done under the authority of this agreement shall confer upon either of them proprietary rights, or legislative, administrative,* or *other jurisdiction* in the territory of the other, and that the works constructed under the provisions of this agreement shall constitute a part of the territory of the country in which they are situated.

"ARTICLE VI

"The Governments agree that *either* of them may proceed at any time to construct, within its own territory and at its own cost, alternative canal and channel facilities for navigation in the International section or in waters connecting the Great Lakes, and to utilize the water necessary for the operation of such facilities.

* * * * *

"ARTICLE VIII

"The Governments, recognizing their common interest in the preservation of the levels of the Great Lakes System, agree that:

"(a) each Government in its own territory shall measure the quantities of water which at any point are diverted from or added to the Great Lakes System, and *shall place such measures on record with the other Government semi-annually;*

"(b) in the event of diversions being made into the Great Lakes System from other watersheds lying wholly within the borders of either country, *the exclusive rights to the use of waters which are determined by the Governments to be equivalent* in quantity to any waters so diverted shall, notwithstanding the provisions of Article IV, paragraph

(c) of this Agreement, *be vested in the country diverting such waters, and the quantity of water* so diverted shall be at all times available to that country for use for power below the point of entry, so long as it constitutes a part of boundary waters.

* * * * *

"ARTICLE X

"*The Governments* agree that:

"(a) *each Government* undertakes to make provision for the disposition *of claims and for the satisfaction of any valid claims arising out of damage or injury to persons or property* occurring in the territory of the other in the course of and in connection with construction by such Government *of any of the works authorized* or provided for *by this Agreement:*

"(b) *each Government is hereby released from responsibility for any damage or injury to persons* or property *in the territory of the other, which may be caused by any action authorized or provided for by this Agreement,* other than damage or injury covered by the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article:

"(c) each Government will assume the responsibility for and the expense involved in the acquisition of any lands or interests in land in its own territory which may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of this Agreement.

"ARTICLE XI

"This Agreement shall *be subject to approval by the Congress of the United States* of America and *the Parliament* of Canada. Following such approval it shall be *proclaimed by the President* of the United States of America and *ratified by His Majesty* the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, in *respect of Canada.* It shall *enter into force on the day of the exchange of the instrument of ratification* and a copy of the proclamation which shall take place at Washington.

"In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this Agreement in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their seals.

"Done at Ottawa, the ____ day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-one."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the magnitude of this enterprise, the fact that it involves future obligations on this Congress and on future Congresses, the fact that it involves a subject matter which has never been dealt with by executive agreement and is outside the scope of the diplomatic or military functions of the President, all combine to indicate that this St. Lawrence seaway project is not properly the subject of an executive agreement.

Let it be emphasized that the performance of the so-called executive agreement is entirely prospective. It does not have, for its subject, matters of temporary interest, nor is it to be fulfilled by a single act. It calls for the political cooperation of the United States and Canada. It deeply affects the political, economic, and social life of the citizens of both countries. It encompasses commitments requiring for all time the performance of numerous and continuous acts.

Of course one of the very strongest arguments, if not the strongest argument, requiring us to regard the St. Lawrence project as properly the subject of a treaty rather than an agreement, is the very attitude of the administration itself. Is it not highly significant, if indeed not conclusive, that this matter was first submitted to the Senate in the form of a treaty for ratification under constitutional procedure? We have there the strongest possible argument for saying that this is something which should be done by treaty and not by executive agreement. The majority cannot help notice the force of this argument, and let me just read their answer. I read from page 81 of the majority report:

In particular we hav in mind that the negotiation of the 1941 agreement with Canada subject to approval by legislation, followed by less than 10 years the defeat of the treaty with Canada on the same subject and that these facts might at least raise an inference of avoidance by the Executive of a senatorial prerogative of advising and consenting to a treaty by a two-thirds vote of the Members present and voting.

That is all the majority have to say on this particular aspect. They recognize that an inference of avoidance is raised, and they are happy to let it go at that. There is certainly more than an inference here. The majority are walking on ice when they deal with this point, and they realize it. But if there is any doubt as to whether an inference is raised or not, let me read a brief extract from the testimony of the then Assistant Secretary of State, Adolf A. Berle, testifying before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on June 17, 1941. I quote, and I ask my colleagues to give heed to this:

I propose to close this phase of the subject by saying that it did seem that in an issue of this size and this importance it was hardly fair to place in the hands of the minority of one House the ultimate decision of a measure of very great importance to the entire country. For that reason the agreement form was selected, and it is in that form that it is here.

Just ponder those words. The State Department thought the decision was important; therefore, they did not think the Senate ought to exercise its constitutional prerogatives with regard to it. Because they thought it was very important, the State Deparment decided it was to be an agreement rather than a treaty.

It was the position of the State Department in 1941—and I know of no reason for believing that their position is any different today—that we must have an invasion of the Senate's treaty-making powers, because it is not "fair"—and I quote "fair"—to permit a minority of the Senate to exercise its constitutional privilege of rejecting a treaty. Just bear that in mind.

This is, of course, a perhaps unintentionally frank admission by the executive branch of the reason why this St. Lawrence matter is here today as an executive agreement where only a few short years ago it was a treaty. The only difference between the 1933 treaty and the 1941 agreement, as it is here before us, is the elimination of articles VII and IX of the 1941 agreement. Even the majority have to admit that the undertakings of the obligations in those two articles were too much for an executive agreement, and the present resolution says that they shall be dealt with by treaty. But I submit most vigorously that the treaty which is here before us masquerading as an agreement is not cured by the elimination of these two articles dealing principally with the diversion of water from Lake Michigan. It is rendered perhaps a shade less offensive, but that is about the most charitable thing one can say.

The issue, then, as I am discussing it here, resolves itself down to the fundamental question of whether we ought to set a precedent that the Chief Executive can, when it suits his purpose, ignore the treaty-making powers of the Senate and resort to the circumvention of the executive agreement. In an editorial on May 22, 1944, the New York Times put the issue in a nutshell when it said:

This ignoring of a plain constitutional requirement would be a d ngerous precedent. It would put in doubt the validity of treaties and international agreements not ratified in the constitutionally prescribed manner.

And the New York Herald Tribune remarked in an editorial on April 17, 1944:

The Senate's real power in treaty-making is not merely a mechanical one; it resides in the Senate's ability to force public debate, awake doubts and secure popular support for other courses than those proposed by the Executive. The power is anything but anachronistic, nor is it easily waved aside by juggling precedents or calling treaties by some other name.

I can do no better in concluding what I am frank to confess is only a very superficial treatment of this question than to quote the words of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] appearing in the appendix of the minority views.

The Senator from Maine said this, and I urge every Senator to study and ponder his words with the deepest seriousness:

I insist that a project calling for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, which it will take from 4 to 6 years to complete; which involves long-term obligations by both governments; which gives to each government sovereign rights in the other country, is by every test a treaty and not an agreement and always heretofore, the President and the Senate have held this view. Now we witness the challenge by an executive department of the constitutional right of the Senate of ratification, and in its stead acceptance of this new theory that the President may enter into agreements of any and every nature with foreign governments and that Congress may from the majority vote give its consent thereto and effectuate the same. In what is here proposed is bold evasion of constitutional procedure, and the elimination of the Senate as a part of the treaty-making power under our Constitution. It is an effort to accomplish by indirection what the Senate has twice refused to sanction. This constitutional issue is before us. It should be decided, for if the State Department's conception of executive authority prevails, if the Senate yields thereto, then the Senate abandons to the executive branch this right to consent or to refuse consent to foreign commitments of the most solemn character. I am unwilling to be a party to this threatened liquidation of the Senate in this field of foreign relations.

Even if the St. Lawrence seaway project were worth while and meritorious, even if the best interests of the United States would be served by the construction of the seaway, even if no argument could be mustered against its authorization, I would still urge that it be defeated solely on the grounds of the issue which I have placed before the Senate. When the Senator from Maine stated

that he did not desire to be a party to the threatened liquidation of the Senate in the field of foreign relations, he was giving eloquent voice to a profound conviction to which I subscribe with all my heart and mind. No one has deeper respect than I for the high and dignified powers of this body of which I am proud to be a Member. Because of this pride, I am jealous of our powers. I for one cannot stand by, idle and silent, in the face of a threat to a constitutional power. On this ground alone I submit that the joint resolution should be emphatically and decisively rejected.

Mr. President, that concludes the portion of my remarks dealing with the question of whether we should have a treaty or an agreement. I next plan to discuss the self-liquidating aspects. I now yield for any questions which may be asked me.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senater from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I want to compliment the distinguished Senator on his statement respecting the general aspects of the question, and his discussion of the constitutional question. I am sure he has raised every point which has been raised in the past. I understand his constitutional argument is based upon two bases, and I ask him to state whether I am correct. First, he asserts that the proposed agreement is not an implementation of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is approximately correct; yes.

Mr. WILEY. Then I understand also that, irrespective of the 1909 treaty, the Senator takes the position that the matter under discussion is not a subject for international agreement.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is clearly a subject for international treaty. I think it is too big a subject and too far-reaching a subject to be dealt with in a mere executive agreement.

Mr. WILEY. That subject was thoroughly thrashed out in the hearing last year, was it not?

Mr. LODGE. I was not then a member of the subcommittee, I will say to the Senator. I do not know whether it was or not. I was not present at the meeting. The records which have been made in previous studies which were had have brought out the evidence, which I have adduced here, from all the leading authorities, that this matter should be dealt with in a treaty.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure the Senator is not ignorant of the legal opinion by Under Secretary Acheson, and also by the Legal Division of the Department.

Mr. LODGE. I certainly am not ignorant of the fact that the State Department wanted then, and wants now, to have the right to say whether a thing should be a treaty or an agreement; that the State Department wanted then and wants now to be allowed to make up its mind as to whether a proposition in which it is interested should be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, or by a majority vote of both Houses. Of course, all departments of the Government have what might be termed an aggravated case of "grabitis." I have no doubt that the State Department today goes along on the same basis assumed by the State Department when Mr. Berle was Under Secretary.

Mr. WILEY. Did the Senator vote for Bretton Woods agreement?

Mr. LODGE. I was not a Senator at that time.

Mr. WILEY. Did the Senator vote for the Greek loan?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Was that provided for in a treaty?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Massachusetts does not consider that the State Department is always wrong.

Mr. WILEY. He does not?

Mr. LODGE. No; certainly not. Far from it. But I think it is entirely beyond the scope of any Government department to decide a matter which is up to the Senate to decide. I think we are the ones to decide whether a matter should be taken care of by way of a treaty or an agreement. I think the department has transgressed and has trespassed into a field which is not theirs when they undertake to do that.

Mr. WILEY. We are discussing the legal phases of the question. Would the Senator from Massachusetts object to having introduced into the RECORD at this time the opinion which last year guided the committee on which there were three lawyers?

Mr. LODGE. Whose opinion is it?

Mr. WILEY. The opinion is by Under Secretary Acheson, of the State Department.

Mr. LODGE. No; I should rather have the opinion of the State Department dealing with this matter printed in the Appendix, or after the conclusion of my speech. I do not believe they belong right in the middle of my speech.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, then I ask that the memorandum submitted by Under Secretary Acheson on behalf of the Department of State to a Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, on Senate Joint Resolution 104, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, be printed at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts today.

Mr. LODGE. I certainly should be glad to have that done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may I ask what the second subject is which the Senator from Massachusetts proposes to discuss?

Mr. LODGE. The self-liquidation aspect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I am certainly delighted to yield to my friend the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Again asserting my open-mindedness on the question, I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts, and also to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], what is labeled "Minority Report of Mr. WHITE," which appears in the minority views submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I should like to ask if either Senator has called attention to the minority report presented by the majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], relative to executive agreements and treaties. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts first whether he has called attention to that minority report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I conclude my remarks on this phase with a quotation from the Senator from Maine, which I think is very eloquently written. The Senator from Maine said:

> I am unwilling to be a party to this threatened liquidation of the Senate in this field of foreign relations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the constitutional question has been raised, I ask that the portion of the minority report submitted by the Senator from Maine, appearing on pages 44 and 45, be included as a part of my remarks at this point. The majority leader there discusses the question of whether the problem should be settled by a treaty or executive agreement. I think what the Senator from Maine says should be considered by the Senate as we make up our minds as to the constitutionality of this question. Certainly this phase of the matter should be mentioned at this time. I should like to read from the report. The majority leader said in his report:

> The growing resort in late years of the State Department to agreements, so-called, in the stead of treaties to be ratified by the Senate, in itself demands the consideration of this committee, for it marks a bold assertion of Executive authority and of waning Senate importance in the foreign field. From 1940 to 1944, inclusive, there have been but 38 treaties submitted to the Senate as against 256 agreements, of which we have knowledge, not submitted to the Senate. This tendency warns that we of the Senate must assert our rights in this field, or we shall be guilty of acquiescence in their loss.

I think those are powerful words, and I think that statement requires to be reflected upon. If we were carrying out the province of the Senate in respect to the negotiation of a treaty, that would be one thing, but an almost complete surrender to the Department of State respecting an executive agreement is another thing. I certainly do not subscribe to such a theory. I think it is a point which should be considered, and I think that the remainder of the minority report on this question, from the point at which I read, should be inserted at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of Members of the Senate, because it brings up the whole subject, and deals with matters other than the one particularly involved in the discussion at the moment. The State Department proposal would represent an encroachment upon the Senate of the United States in its treaty-making power.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The growing resort in late years of the State Department to agreements, so-called,

in the stead of treaties to be ratified by the Senate, in itself demands the consideration of this committee, for it marks a bold assertion of Executive authority and of waning Senate importance in the foreign field. From 1940 to 1944, inclusive, there have been but 38 treaties submitted to the Senate as against 256 agreements, of which we have knowledge, not submitted to the Senate. This tendency warns that we of the Senate must assert our rights in this field, or we shall be guilty of acquiescence in their loss.

History and practice distinguish between treaties and agreements. Our Constitution provides for treaties. It is silent as to agreements save those which our States are permitted to enter into with consent of the Congress. I do not propose to argue this technical question. I do urge this full committee to give it study before we sanction further abandonment of the Senate's constitutional powers. In this connection, I call attention to the long and patient study given this subject by the Commerce Committee of the Senate and its formal conclusion that certain aviation agreements should have been submitted to the Senate as treaties to be considered and ratified as such; that any executive agreements purporting to grant to a foreign country the right to have air lines nominated by it to operate to or from United States territory without hearings as provided for in the Civil Aeronautics Acts, were illegal and void and that this Government is not bound by such agreements so long as they have not been ratified as treaties. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate may well heed this opinion of the Commerce Committee expressed in formal resolution.

I would concede that there are executive agreements which do not require Senate ratification but authority for which reposes in the Presidential office. Such are agreements made as the diplomatic representative of the United States. As Commander in Chief, the President may enter into armistice and military protocols and arrangements. He may adjust claims against foreign states. Such agreements are generally temporary in time and of relatively minor importance. I do not attempt a more definite statement of what agreements the President may enter into by virtue of his constitutional authorities for manifestly the present agreement is not such an arrangement. It is conceded that at least congressional approval is required.

There is also a class of agreements which the President may enter into under express congressional authorization. This right rests in practice not challenged rather than in express constitutional sanction. In this class of agreements, the President acts as the agent of the Congress and not as an independent Executive. There are many examples of this type of agreement. International organizations such as postal agreements, UN, ILO, UNRRA, food and agricultural organizations, Bretton Woods, reciprocal tariffs, are all within this class. As to some of these the Senate waived its functions.

There is, however, no constitutional warrant for an executive agreement subject to later congressional approval. It is sometimes thoughtlessly contended that if the President may enter into agreements with congressional approval first given, the Congress may approve an agreement already made by the President without its sanction. The answer to this argument is, that the latter procedure is an exercise of the treaty-making power and Congress cannot be substituted for the Senate by the mere calling of the original instrument an executive agreement instead of a treaty. The State Department cannot take from the Senate its constitutional rights by calling a treaty something else.

I insist that a project calling for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, which it will take from 4 to 6 years to complete; which involves long-term obligations by both Governments; which gives to each Government sovereign rights in the other country, is by every test a treaty and not an agreement and always heretofore, the President and the Senate have held this view. Now we witness the challenge by an executive department of the constitutional right of the Senate of ratification, and in its stead, acceptance of this new theory that the President may enter into agreements of any and every nature with foreign governments and that Congress may by majority vote give its consent thereto and effectuate the same. In what is here proposed is bold evasion of constitutional procedure, and the elimination of the Senate as a part of the treaty-making power under our Constitution. It is an effort to accomplish by indirection what the Senate has twice refused to sanction, first by refusing consent to the proposal in treaty form and later by rejection of an amendment to a river and harbor bill.

I recommend (1) that this Senate Joint Resolution 104 be not approved by this committee; (2) that the full committee undertake a study of the constitutional right of the executive branch of the Government to negotiate an agreement having the essential elements of a treaty, but of which approval is sought by a majority of the Congress and not by ratification by the Senate; and that before action is had upon any other phase of this problem, the committee undertake to consider and reach a conclusion as to this constitutional question. This constitutional issue is before us. It should be decided, for if the State Department's conception of Executive authority prevails, if the Senate yields thereto, then the Senate abandons to the executive branch its right to consent or refuse consent to foreign commitments of the most solemn character. I am unwilling to be a party to this threatened liquidation of the Senate in this field of foreign relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not prepared to discuss the thesis of the Senator from Nebraska that this represents one of those "complete surrenders" by the Congress to the disposition and autocracy of the State Department. But I should like to make a very brief suggestion to my able friend from Massachusetts—"God bless her; there she stands."

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator for those kind words.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My suggestion is in respect to the very sincere and earnest and conscientious effort which has been made historically in connection with this enterprise, to evade, and justify assault upon the constitutional point which the Senator submits. I concede that the point is of very fundamental importance. It is of great importance not only in respect to this particular pending proposal, but it is fundamentally important, as the Senator from Nebraska has indicated. When the St. Lawrence seaway was proposed as an agreement in 1941 it was before the Commerce Committee. My able friend, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], was a member of the committee at that time. I do not see any other Senators present who were. As the Senator will remember, with respect to the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts, we spent many days on the question of constitutionality.

At that time the Commerce Committee resolved the argument in favor of an agreement, and I was one of those who voted that it could be an agreement instead of a treaty. However, I did so with the greatest reluctance, and with a very considerable doubt as to whether my position was entirely justified. But it seemed to me at the time that the scales were so evenly weighted that I could give the benefit of the doubt to the decision to which I was attached in respect to the merits of the project.

Immediately after the failure of the agreement of 1941 to come to a final show-down, I took it upon myself personally to pursue with the State Department the question of the constitutionality of an approach by the agreement route. In company with several other Senators who shared my feeling about the matter, we had long discussions on the subject with representatives of the State Department. Those of us who were favorable to the St. Lawrence seaway from the standpoint of merit, and who yet shared the fear that perhaps in the form then submitted it could not qualify as the appropriate subject of an agreement, insisted—and I was one of those who insisted—that the questionable points in respect to the agreement of 1941 should be eliminated before ever the treaty was again brought to the floor of the Senate. As the result, as the able Senator from Massachusetts has shown, two sections of the agreement of 1941 were eliminated. Perhaps there are still some sections left which justify the challenge submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts; but I am very sure that almost any student of the subject will agree that in taking out those two sections we largely eliminated the specific thing upon which the constitutional argument was based.

I recite this history to indicate the extent to which those of us who profoundly believe in this enterprise have gone in an effort to meet the constitutional criticism raised by my able friend from Massachusetts. For example, we eliminated the provision which involved perpetual mutual navigation rights in Lake Michigan. As I look back upon it now, I think it is perfectly clear that an obligation of that sort involves a treaty character. We eliminated some other provisions to which it is unnecessary to refer in detail.

The point I am submitting to my able friend and to the Senate is that perhaps there is still a basis for an argument in respect to the impropriety of proceeding by legislative agreement instead of by treaty; but every effort has been made by the proponents of this enterprise, with the best legal advice we could obtain, to put this agreement in such form that it can be reasonably and honestly supported as a legislative agreement instead of a treaty. If we have not completely succeeded, to the entire satisfaction of all our legal perfectionists in the Senate, at least we have made an effort which, in the opinion of those of us who have participated in this effort, completely meets the charges which are submitted by the Senator. If we have failed to impress the Senator, I am sorry; but I feel that on the basis of this

record, this phase of his argument ceases to be of major importance.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to make this comment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I had not intended to interrupt the able Senator from Massachusetts during the course of his argument. However, in view of the fact that the Senator from Michigan has referred to committee hearings conducted by a subcommittee of the old Commerce Committee, of which subcommittee I was chairman at the time, on the very important issue as to whether the compact now submitted between the United States and the Dominion of Canada is or is not a treaty, or is or is not an executive agreement, I wish to make an observation. I have not read the record of the hearings since they were conducted, but I shall speak from memory. If I am in error, the Senator from Michigan can correct me if his memory is more vivid than mine—and probably it is.

The position then taken by the State Department was that whenever the Executive Department determined that a compact was an executive agreement, it was an executive agreement, and should be so treated by the United States Senate. Thereupon I asked the representative of the State Department this question, in substance: "For the purpose of bringing your argument to a logical conclusion and a definite understanding, suppose that the United States and Great Britain should enter into a permanent compact of offensive and defensive alliance, and it should be submitted by the State Department as an executive agreement. Would it be an executive agreement?" His answer was "Yes." When that occurred, I failed to attach much importance to the opinion of the State Department on this subject.

The able Senator from Michigan says that the two issues involved in this treaty have been eliminated by the joint resolution, and that what remains can be properly considered as suitable material for a purely executive agreement, concerning which, however, he still expresses some doubt.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment those issues have not been eliminated, because the fundamental question as to whether a compact is a treaty or is not a treaty depends upon whether it represents a permanent, continuous agreement between two nations. That is De Vattel's analysis of a treaty, and his definition. It has stood practically uncontradicted by the best authorities through all the years. It was De Vattel's definition of a treaty which the framers of the Constitution had before them at the time they employed the term "treaty" and made provision for it in the Constitution of the United States.

On the other hand, an executive agreement is one which is temporary in character, or one which has but one single object to be achieved, which can be achieved within a limited time. That is a very plain definition. If we follow it, we shall not get into trouble.

What is the project now under discussion? Is it one project to be completed within a certain time? Is the agreement a temporary agreement? Not so. It is a continuous agreement. It contemplates not only the present agreement, but restatements and revisions of that agreement throughout the years. It is permanent in character. It is to last forever, so long as there is a United States and a Dominion of Canada, and a St. Lawrence flowing between them and emptying into the Atlantic within the bounds of the Dominion of Canada. Therefore, it seems to me that the contention is not correct that the objection that this compact is a treaty has been removed by the elimination of the two instances to which the able Senator from Michigan refers, because the issue still remains. The agreement still remains a permanent agreement, continuous in its performance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Louisiana asked me to check his memory in respect to the hearings before the Commerce Committee. I think his memory is entirely accurate. We confronted what to me, as well as to the Senator from Louisiana, was the rather shocking concept from the State Department, that the way to distinguish between a treaty and an agreement was to consult the desire of the State Department as to the particular form in which it wished to submit the question to the Congress.

I rejected that thesis, as the Senator knows, just as specifically as did the Senator from Louisiana. All the points of legal controversy may not have been eliminated, but all I am saying is that those of us who believe in the project, and who are supporting it in the form in which it is submitted, rejected the theory of the State Department, and undertook upon our responsibility to eliminate, with the best legal opinion we could obtain, those factors which were calculated to put it into the treaty aspect. I think we succeeded. The Senator from Louisiana does not think so. The fact remains that the record shows that this agreement has been rewritten in complete repudiation of the original theory to which the Senator refers, that the character of a compact is at the option of the State Department as to whether it shall be an agreement or a treaty. We undertook to cure the errors, if there were any, and we think we succeeded.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry that I did not arrive in the Chamber until after the Senator from Massachusetts was well along in his discourse. Is my understanding correct that the Senator from Massachusetts claims that if the United States and the Dominion of Canada wished to construct a dam across the St. Lawrence River, it would be necessary to have a treaty between those two countries authorizing its construction?

Mr. LODGE. I think anything that is permanent, far-reaching, and significant, anything which is not transitory or routine in character, ought to be done by treaty.

Mr. AIKEN. Would such a dam be supposed to be permanent?

Mr. LODGE. I would think so; yes.

Mr. AIKEN. If the State of New York and the Province of Ontario desired to construct a dam across the St. Lawrence River, does the Senator believe that would require a treaty between the two Governments, inasmuch as it would be probably the same dam, and would permanently affect the flow of the water in the river?

Mr. LODGE. All I could do would be to give a quick answer to that question, because I have never heard of it before. I would say, as Calvin Coolidge once said, that no single State in the Union has foreign relations.

Mr. AIKEN. Then does the Senator believe that a treaty would be at least desirable, if not necessary, in case the State of New York and the Province of Ontario desired to construct such a dam?

Mr. LODGE. I think if a State once starts to run foreign relations on its own and sends foreign ministers around, it will get into trouble.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would require an act of Congress, at least. Does the Senator believe that if the Niagara-Hudson Power Co., a private utility, undertook to construct a dam across the St. Lawrence River, it would require a treaty between the two countries, assuming it is the same dam, at the same place?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know. I have not gone into that subject at all.

Mr. AIKEN. I should think the Senator from Massachusetts would have gone into it.

Mr. LODGE. I have been discussing the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that if the United States and the Dominion of Canada desired to place a bridge across the St. Lawrence River it would require an agreement?

Mr. LODGE. I should think that anything of a permanent character, or which would change the customs, the social life, and the commercial existence of the people on both sides of the border, should be done by treaty, but that anything which is of short view, such as the Greek loan, does not require a treaty. I do not think this project is at all comparable with the Greek loan.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not comparing it with the Greek loan. I was simply asking the Senator's opinion as to whether he thought these actions, taken in different ways, whether by Government or by State or by private interests, would all require a treaty between the two countries concerned.

Mr. LODGE. I think as a general proposition, if it is a far-reaching, permanent matter, it would require a treaty. If it is a routine, transitory thing, it does not require a treaty. But as to special cases involving the State of New York and the Province of Ontario, I cannot go into that.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the Senator is aware that bridges have been thrown

across the St. Lawrence River without a treaty, under the treaty of 1909.

Mr. LODGE. There was a treaty. If a bridge were built under the terms of a treaty——

Mr. AIKEN. Bridges were built under the clause of the treaty which permits bridges or dams or anything affecting the international waters to be acted upon by a simple act of the Congress and of the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a thoroughly constitutional thing, because the fundamental theory is that it is ratified by treaty.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that dams thrown across the St. Johns River between the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick, Canada, which is an international river the same as is the St. Lawrence River, are there now in violation of law, inasmuch as the question of a treaty was never raised when the private power interests desired to construct dams across international waters?

Mr. LODGE. I have not the slightest idea. The Senator is asking me questions on which I know he has very detailed and special knowledge. They are questions which I have never looked into and which have not the slightest connection with the proposition I am discussing. I certainly cannot answer his questions.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator must know whether the treaty of 1909 has been used before.

Mr. LODGE. I know that dams and bridges have been constructed subject to the treaty of 1909, but I do not know where the approaches are located or whether they are two- or three-lane approaches. I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply want to suggest that the question now raised by the Senator from Massachusetts was never once raised by a single one of the opponents of the St. Lawrence project when the private power interests were asking for and getting leave to construct dams across an international river.

Mr. LODGE. I am sure that if the Senator from Vermont says that is true, it is true. I do not happen to know anything about it.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Massachusetts is correct in his contention, it appears to me that those dams of private power companies across the St. Johns River are illegally there, and have no standing in law between the two countries.

Mr. LODGE. I dare say that is correct. I do not know anything about the dam business, and I am not discussing it. All I am talking about is the fact that when something is involved between two governments which is permanent and far reaching, and which changes the social, economic, and commercial life of the people, it should be done by treaty.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator acquainted with the International Bridge at the Thousand Islands, or with the Detroit tunnel?

Mr. LODGE. No. I am not a bridge expert or a tunnel expert. The Senator can ask me about bridges and tunnels in this country or in Iraq or Australia, and I do not know anything about them.

Mr. WILEY. Would the Senator think, if they were put through, it would necessitate a treaty or an agreement?

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps I did not make myself clear to the Senator. The Senator said something about the Greek loan, which the Senator compares with this project. The Senator from Wisconsin said that I voted for the Greek loan and should be in favor of this proposition. The Greek loan amounted to $300,000,000 to be expended for food, clothing, shoes, gas, and maybe a little ammunition—things which are expendable—whereas this project involves something which will permanently change the geographical factors of the North American Continent. If I have not made that distinction clear to my good friend from Wisconsin, I just cannot do it.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has made it very clear that he is following the tactics of bringing up the Constitution every time.

Mr. LODGE. I hope we shall not go into motives. Let us keep the discussion on the merits and on the facts, and we shall do much better.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. As between locks between Canada and the United States and some other place, and the construction of locks on the St. Lawrence River, does the Senator see any difference?

Mr. LODGE. I cannot give an answer to a question such as that, on which engineers and lawyers have spent 40 years of their lives.

Mr. WILEY. Would the Senator say that a lock constructed between Michigan and Canada, which is a border lock, built under agreement and legislative authority, should be differentiated from a lock built between New York and Canada, and that one requires a treaty and the other requires an agreement? Can the Senator make a differentiation?

Mr. LODGE. I just come back to my original statement: That if a thing is fundamental, if it is far reaching and permanent and long lasting, and has a basic effect upon the civilizations of the two countries concerned, it should be handled by treaty. If something that is far reaching and fundamental has not been handled by treaty, then I say two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Would the Senator from Massachusetts think that the incorporation of the State of Texas into the Union was necessary to be done by treaty?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is trying to get me into legalisms. I am not a lawyer; I am not trying to get into legalisms. I am discussing a question of principle, namely, whether we should circumvent the Constitution or should not circumvent it. If the Senator from Wisconsin, who is a very able lawyer, is trying to get me involved in regard to section 408 (b) and the question of where we should put the comma, I am not his man. I cannot go into such things as that.

I am trying to decide the question on its merits, on the basis of the principle involved. If the State Department says, "We shall try to get this done by majority vote, instead of by two-thirds vote," I do not like that.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to compliment the Senator upon evading the question.

Mr. LODGE. I am not evading the question. When the Senator asks me a question about some bridge, I simply refuse to answer. I am not evading.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator from Massachusetts see any difference between a treaty and an executive agreement between two countries, subject to the approval of the legislatures of those countries?

Mr. LODGE. I must ask the Senator to repeat the question, please.

Mr. WILEY. Inasmuch as the Senator from Massachusetts was speaking of executive agreements, I point out that we know there are many types and varieties of executive agreements. Some of them are within the province of the Executive, without legislative approval. I ask whether the Senator would see any difference between those agreements and agreements where legislative approval is required.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I can see where there would be a difference between an Executive agreement that did not require legislative approval and one that did. But all those are legalistic questions.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator from Massachusetts aware that throughout our history, when a treaty has been made, agreements have been made afterwards, implementing the treaty?

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator from Wisconsin ask whether that has been done?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; is the Senator from Massachusetts acquainted with that practice?

Mr. LODGE. I presume it has been done; yes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I did not mean to interrupt, and I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his courtesy.

Mr. LODGE. Not at all, Mr. President; I am always glad to have questions asked me by the genial Senator from Wisconsin. Let me also say that I always welcome questions by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], with whom I am so often in agreement. I admire his candor in telling the Senate the way he was troubled when this matter first arose, and of course I respect his opinion that the parts of the treaty which were of the most fundamental character have been removed from the scope of the joint resolution. I could only wish that all of it had been thus removed, and then there would be no doubt about it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan is not a lawyer, either, so he and the Senator from Massachusetts can chat on this subject on the level. I

did not mean that lawyers, too, cannot speak on the level, if they wish to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Lawyers are wonderful men when you are in trouble.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The point I wish to make with the Senator—and I know he will be fair enough to recognize it—is that it is utterly unfair in this debate to leave any implication that on this question of a choice between action by treaty or action by agreement, the proponents of the pending measure and the majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have simply surrendered to a State Department view in respect to a State Department preference. I simply want, in fairness—and the Senator from Massachusetts would be the first man in this Chamber upon whom I would rely for fairness—to make the record plain that everything he is saying was given faithful consideration by the proponents of the joint resolution, and the State Department was required to change the proposal, so far as we are concerned, so as to bring it into what we believe to be complete conformity with appropriate action.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Michigan is quite correct in saying that I wish to be fair. I think I have been; and in my original statement I made it very clear that sections 7 and 9 of the treaty have been removed from the purview of this joint resolution, and I made reference to that matter at another time. I think some of the most vital matters involved in the treaty have been removed from consideration in connection with the joint resolution now before us, and they will have to be dealt with later by a treaty with Canada. But the complete job of surgery has not been done. I hope that tomorrow Senators will read in the RECORD the analysis which Professor Borchard made of the matters which are still included within the scope of this joint resolution, and which I think bear out my contention that it is a pity that it was not decided to take all of it up in the form of a treaty. So I ask Senators to read that analysis in the RECORD; I shall not burden them with reading it at this point.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now for a question about the first part of his discussion of this matter?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In the course of the hearings, was offer made of any amendments relative to the objectionable provisions which it is claimed should not be subject to such an agreement?

Mr. LODGE. I was not in the committee meeting at the time, so I shall be glad to have the Senator from Wisconsin answer the question.

Mr. WILEY. I think I understand the question. Every point that has been raised is fully answered by the opinion which I have put into the RECORD. In my opinion, at least, as a lawyer, it answers every legal question.

I wish to supplement that by saying that following last year, when the objections were raised, the joint resolution was revised. The result has been that the joint resolution which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] introduced this year has omitted sections 7 and 9, so as to meet the objections then raised.

Now the opponents have raised additional objections; they now come up with other objections. But in the extensive opinion to which I have referred, every point that has been raised is fully answered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not know whom the Senator from Wisconsin means when he says that "they" have raised other questions or objections at this time.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the opinion to which I have just referred, Senators will find an answer to every point raised by the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I did not raise any questions, the last time. This is my first approach to this subject. I have read repeated references to how patient the proponents of this proposition have been because it has been here 34 years or some similar length of time However, I have not been in the Senate 34 years. Most Members of the Senate are now making their first approach to this subject; and this is the first time I have ever had to contemplate this prospectus.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not wish to raise again any question as to the answers. During the last several days I have read quite thoroughly the report, as well as the analysis made by several experts, giving their opinions.

I simply wish to know whether the Senator can answer my question as to whether offer has been made of amendments to clarify the objectionable features which the Senator has so ably discussed here today; and I also wish to know whether such amendments, if offered, have been turned down, or whether any effort has been made to clarify or cure the objectionable features.

Mr. LODGE. So far as I know, none have been.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss the self-liquidating aspect of the pending proposal. This is one of the two issues which were the subject of hearings before the subcommittee last spring. The question can be stated very simply, namely, can this project be made to pay its own way through the imposition of a maximum toll of $1.25 per ton of cargo?

The proponents argue that on the basis of the evidence available to them, the answer is "Yes." The opponents contend that this evidence is not really evidence at all, but is mere speculation, and that on the basis of the available facts there is no justification for a finding that the seaway can be made self-liquidating.

I should point out that the proponents and the opponents, however, approach this problem with rather different fundamental attitudes. Those who favor the seaway and maintain it can be made to pay its own way announce positively that the seaway can be made self-liquidating. Our contention is that the evidence does not conclusively prove this point, and that the data contained in the most authoritative study which has been made of the project to date indicate quite the opposite conclusion. But we do not pound the table and positively assert that the seaway cannot possibly ever be made self-liquidating through the imposition of tolls. We simply say that on the basis of the best evidence available, no reasonable man can fairly conclude that the project could be made self-liquidating. I hope this difference in attitude will be kept in mind as we proceed with the somewhat complicated discussion.

Mr. President, this self-liquidating feature is new just this year. It appears in section 3 (a) of Senate Joint Resolution 111.

In the first place, it will be noted that the question of the tolls through which the principle of self-liquidation is to be implemented is left for negotiation with the Government of Canada during the period of construction of the seaway project.

The implementing section prescribes a maximum toll of $1.25 per ton. In addition, it sets forth certain other principles to be followed which would result in a toll charge much lower than $1.25 per ton on boat cargo, depending on its character, which would probably constitute the majority of the traffic.

This section leaves unanswered some important and material questions having a substantial bearing on determining whether this project could in fact be made to pay its own way. These unanswered questions include such important matters as the following:

First. The amount of the toll to be charged is not designated except for a maximum. Appearing before the subcommittee, the Secretary of Commerce assumed that bulk commodities and agricultural commodities would carry a toll of between 25 cents and 50 cents per ton, and that all other commodities would carry the maximum toll of $1.25 per ton. By the Secretary's own estimate of the potential traffic, he shows that 80 to 85 percent thereof would be bulk commodities carrying the 25-cent- or 50-cent-per-ton toll charge. Thus, we have left undetermined the question of what toll would be charged on 80 to 85 percent of the traffic, with an admitted possible variation of 100 percent insofar as that class of shipping is concerned.

Second. Also to be added to your collection of unanswered questions is the question of how tolls would be collected. It is not known, for example, whether they would be collected partly by the United States and partly by Canada, or whether they would be collected by a joint agency of the two countries.

Third. Still more important, it remains a mystery how the receipts will be divided between Canada and the United States. What is to determine the right of each of the two countries to the receipts from the tolls? Lieutenant General Wheeler, Chief of Army Engineers, assumed an equal division between the United States and Canada, while other proponents took a very different view. In our minority views, we have assumed, simply for the sake of calculation, that the United States would be entitled to tolls from United States ships. We had indeed no other choice, because nobody knows what method of allocation will be agreed upon. Are they to be based on costs, or on the basis of the contribution which each country has made toward

the construction of the waterway, or is some other method to be used? An irrelevant point, say the proponents, but it does not seem so to me.

Fourth. There also remains for decision in connection with this matter the question of who is to determine, and by what standards, just which costs are chargeable to navigation and which are chargeable to power and other purposes. It is not difficult to imagine the facility with which confusion can be introduced in the determination of questions of this type. The proponents leave this to our imagination.

I say at the outset, therefore, that it is really quite difficult to see how we can form any reliable opinion as to whether the St. Lawrence project would in fact be self-liquidating when faced by so many unanswered questions which involve fundamental and basic factors. There are many other uncertainties to which reference will be made later. Certainly these questions could and should be resolved before we are asked to pass judgment on a project of such magnitude, complexity, and importance. The lack of these essential data which we need as a basis for sound decision makes it much more difficult to prove concretely that the project stands no chance of being self-liquidating, and it is for that reason that we are forced to take a somewhat less positive attitude on this point than would otherwise be possible. In the Senate we are in the habit of wanting to know what we are voting on. Good will and pious assurances that everything will come out all right, and replies of "don't worry" usually are out of place here. Why the St. Lawrence is an exception I do not know.

The provisions of section 2 raise other questions. It will be noted that this section would have the United States commit itself to these tremendous expenditures, largely to create an added transportation facility, at a time when our perpetual navigation rights on the Great Lakes, on the connecting channels and canals, and in the wholly Canadian sections of the St. Lawrence, have not been settled. These questions are left for future negotiation by treaty with Canada.

If no difficulties are anticipated in the drafting of such a treaty, I ask, why should it not be done promptly, and in advance of our commitment for the construction of the seaway? In fact, why has this not been done during the many years when this project has been in contemplation? One need not trouble to look in the record of hearings this year or any other year to find the answer to that question. I looked, and it is not there. I certainly am willing to concede, and am glad to concede, the generally friendly and cooperative attitude of our highly esteemed neighbor, but I ask, is it the part of wisdom and prudence that the United States should expend any such large sum of money as would be required for the proposed project without a clear and incontrovertible establishment of our rights of navigation? Since it appears that we are called upon to bear the major share of the cost of the project, would our position in the negotiations be strengthened if we deferred our commitment until our rights were settled?

Certainly no businessman would commit himself to an expenditure of the relative magnitude here involved without being assured in advance as to the extent of his subsequent right to use the project for which he was paying. That is not an unreasonable request, but apparently the proponents of the seaway do not ask or expect the United States Senate to act in a sound business way.

It will also be noticed from section 3 as it is now framed that the project may be proceeded with and completed even though no tolls are ultimately imposed, and even though the project may be wholly government subsidized. Section 1 of the joint resolution merely requires that before the agreement to proceed with the project enters into force, Canada must agree to the principle of making the project self-liquidating. No agreement other than as to principle is required before construction commences and government funds are expended. Section 3 directs that, during the period of construction, the President shall negotiate an agreement with respect to the actual tolls and charges to be imposed. Thus, the project may be proceeded with before any agreement is reached on the tolls themselves, and even though the negotiations required by section 3 may not result in any agreement, and hence in any imposition of tolls. It is a far different matter to agree to something in principle, than to agree in detail. It is apparent that there is nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 111 which gives assurance that the project will be self-liquidating in whole or in part. Those who believe that we should restrict government spending can certainly find little comfort in the provisions of sections 1 and 3 of the proposed resolution.

Moreover, if we examine the best available evidence, it is quite apparent that the project if carried out in accordance with what provisions there are in Senate Joint Resolution 111 cannot reasonably be made self-liquidating. To substantiate this, it is necessary to consider, first, the probable cost of the project; second, the probable traffic; and, third, the limitation of section 3.

The general conclusion of the opponents is that there are no conclusively accurate or reliable recent figures to show whether or not the St. Lawrence waterway project would be self-liquidating. As stated before, there can, however, be clearly indicated how it is unreasonable to assert conclusively, as do the proponents, that it will be self-supporting.

I agree with the statement made on Monday by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, when he presented this matter, that no very constructive purpose is served by quibbling and wrangling over cost figures and bookkeeping methods to be used in arriving at the annual amount which must be met by the collection of tolls if this project is to be considered truly self-liquidating. He himself has stated, and I am quoting from his remarks appearing on page 513 of the RECORD for January 26:

> There are several alternative financial and accounting policies that may be adopted in bringing about a sound administration of this project on a self-liquidating basis. There are choices to be made in the matter of interest rates, in the matter of amortization policy—whether straight or sinking fund or a depreciation policy—and in the period over which the retirement of investment should be effectuated. Any one of these alternatives would be sound and acceptable, and they have been used both by private industry and by Government.

I am willing to accept his assumptions and work from that. But what I should like to express, before passing on to the matter of estimates and figures, is my own astonishment that in a matter of this kind—that is, the financial and accounting policy to be used in computing the retirement of the amount which we will be asked to appropriate for the seaway project—there should at this point be any uncertainty at all. If, as the proponents maintain, the project is to be self-liquidating, it would seem of basic importance that we know for sure just what accounting procedure is to be followed. Why has this not been worked out with Canada? Why must we be asked to put the cart before the horse by first authorizing the project in the expectation or hope that it will be self-supporting before knowing with certainty the mechanics by which the project will be liquidated? Why must this, together with so many other important factors, be left to the uncertainties of the future?

But since we are dealing with alternatives, any of which may or may not be adopted, I agree that it would not be particularly enlightening to embark upon an extended debate regarding the details of the various alternatives. Confusion would be multiplied by further confusion. I am perfectly willing to accept for discussion purposes the cost figures and the table of annual charges to be liquidated which appear on page 15 of the majority report.

There it will be noticed that one of the alternatives adopted by the committee report shows that the total United States amount to be liquidated by tolls every year is, in round numbers, $17,000,000. Now, please keep that figure in mind. That is the total amount to be liquidated every year by tolls, $17,000,000. In our minority views we have used the figure of $20,000,000.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I stated at the beginning, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, that I would decline to yield until I had completed each of these separate arguments, but that at the end of my discussion of each one, I would be glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. I am sorry.

Mr. LODGE. We use the figure of $20,000,000 in our minority views, but, as I have said, there is room for difference on that, and I will accept $17,000,000 for the purpose of discussion. Under the present limitations of section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 111, which prescribes a maximum toll of $1.25 per ton, there is no prospect that the amount which the United States is expected to liquidate by tolls every year can be met. This is true even if we use the lower figure of $17,000,000 as the annual

charges to be liquidated. Certainly $20,000,000 could not be liquidated, and I am going to try to show that $17,000,000 could not be liquidated.

Everything hinges on the crucial figure of expected tonnage to pass over the seaway. This is the estimation upon which proponents and opponents differ sharply.

In 1941, the United States Department of Commerce completed a seven-volume study entitled "The St. Lawrence Survey," of which part VII, the so-called summary report, contained a discussion pertinent to the all-important question of the expected volume of traffic over the seaway. Without any "if's," "and's," or "but's," it was stated in this report that in addition to the 9,000,000 tons of Canadian and United States traffic then using the existing 14-foot channel, there was a potential new capacity of 16,000,000 tons.

So we have $17,000,000 to liquidate, and further we have 9,000,000 tons of Canadian-United States traffic, and a new capacity of 16,000,000 tons. Of this new tonnage of 16,000,000 tons, it was calculated that 6,000,000 tons would be Canadian and 10,000,000 tons would be United States traffic. The 16,000,000 tons is an important figure, and it appears in the report in different connections, three separate times.

Mr. President, I ask that these excerpts, which are unrelated, be printed at this point in the RECORD. I will not read them, but I mention them because not once but three times does this figure of 16,000,000 tons altogether, and 10,000,000 tons American, appear in the figures of the Department of Commerce. I ask that the excerpts may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The total new capacity of the proposed seaway will be 16,000,000 tons, to be divided between Canada and the United States and between incoming and outgoing traffic (p. 46).

The 10,000,000 tons of additional American traffic which may use the St. Lawrence at maximum utilization would be but a fraction of the expected increase in railroad activity (p. 40).

In the face of these magnitudes, it is plain that the additional American traffic of 10,000,000 tons that may use the St. Lawrence seaway at its maximum utilization recedes into insignificance (p. 50).

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a word on this 1941 Commerce Department survey of the St. Lawrence seaway project. I have said heretofore that it is in seven volumes. It is the most complete, thorough, and authoritative study recently made on the economics of the seaway. The estimated additional 10,000,000 tons of American and 6,000,000 tons of Canadian traffic was in harmony with the finding announced by the Army engineers that the total capacity of the proposed seaway, including both old and new traffic, would be 25,000,000 tons a year. Its findings were accepted by a host of expert witnesses appearing before the subcommittee last spring, and among these witnesses was the representative of the Port Authority of the City of New York. I mention this particular witness because it is a well-known fact that the traffic estimates of the New York Port Authority, which operates a vast enterprise, including all the bridge and tunnel entrances into New York, have always come remarkably close to actual performance.

I ask Senators to keep this figure of anticipated 10,000,000 tons of new United States traffic in mind, because it is a key figure. I have accepted it, as have many experts far more qualified than I in these matters, because it represents the result of a long and careful study of the problem. I do not accept this figure simply because it happens to suit my purposes. I submit that such an estimate, in which the Army engineers concurred—and they have not changed their position on this matter—is a perfectly reasonable one.

So, in 1941 the long Commerce Department Survey concluded that we may expect 10,000,000 tons of new American traffic every year over the seaway if it is constructed.

But in 1947, the Secretary of Commerce testified before the subcommittee that the expected total United States-Canadian tonnage would exceed 40,000,000 tons a year and in a table which was submitted later and incorporated in the committee report, the estimate appears as being between 38,000,000 and 52,000,000 tons a year. In other words, the estimates increased as much as 100 percent between 1941 and 1947.

In submitting his estimates, the Secretary used very careful language. Let me quote from page 400 of the record of hearings in 1947:

The Department has not yet made a detailed study of potential traffic on the seaway in the light of these revised capacity estimates.

Notice the statement that the Department has made no detailed study.

Moreover, the Department has been able to make only very preliminary judgments concerning the effect of tolls on traffic which might use the waterway and the level of tolls which can be imposed. My subsequent comments on traffic which might use the seaway must accordingly be considered only as very rough estimates rather than conclusions resulting from careful study.

I will say that they are very rough.

These limitations should be kept clearly in mind in appraising the estimates which are included in the table attached as an appendix to my statement.

Later in his testimony the Secretary again issued a careful warning—and I read from page 403 of the record:

I wish to emphasize again that the traffic figures which I have been indicating do not constitute the results of detailed recent surveys but rather the best judgment of the experts of the Department.

Now, why do the proponents ask the Senate to reject the careful 1941 traffic estimates—the best work done on the subject so far—and to substitute therefor the "very rough estimates" not the "results of detailed recent surveys" submitted by the Secretary of Commerce?

The answer is perfectly obvious. All that is needed is a small calculation in simple arithmetic. Take the annual United States amount to be liquidated by tolls appearing on page 15 of the majority report—the figure of $17,000,000. Divide this figure by $1.25, the maximum toll per ton permitted under the joint resolution. We come out with about 14,000,000, the annual amount of new American annual traffic which must move over the seaway in order to meet this conservative estimate. And this division is more than fair, because it assumes that all the traffic would pay the maximum toll of $1.25, which certainly would not be the case, as we shall presently see. I am assuming, of course, that the shippers are all paying maximum tolls, which they would not. I am assuming that. I want to be more than fair.

Somebody did this arithmetic and discovered that the 1941 survey fell 4,000,000 tons short of the necessary 14,000,000 tons moving at the maximum toll of $1.25, because there are little boats and big boats, and they do not all pay the same amount. It did not take whoever did this arithmetic very long to appreciate that there was a dilemma here. Either the 1941 survey, which estimated 10,000,000 tons of new American traffic, had to be discarded, or the maximum amount of tolls had to be raised considerably. Otherwise a balance could not be obtained. The latter scheme would be obviously unfeasible, so the first alternative was chosen, to throw the 1941 St. Lawrence survey out the window and come up with something more favorable.

I am not attacking the Secretary of Commerce; let me make that clear. He was perfectly frank in submitting what he considered to be a theoretical capacity of the seaway. He warned the subcommittee very carefully that he was giving only very rough estimates. He was perfectly frank in saying that the earlier estimate was an estimate of practical rather than theoretical capacity.

The great error here, as I see it, lies in ignoring his careful warning and, on the basis of certain unsubstantiated assumptions, in completely discarding the thorough and detailed survey prepared by his Department in 1941 because these estimates were square pegs in round holes.

The proponents now seek to transform these very rough estimates into conclusive evidence by referring us to a remarkable document which has recently made its appearance. This document is published by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce and bears the title "Economic Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project." It forms the subject-matter of the August–November 1947 issue of Industry Report on Domestic Transportation.

I am telling the complete truth when I say that this publication came to my attention shortly after Christmas, after the minority report had been submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee. It came to my office in the mail without any covering letter or word of explanation. If this is the great final word on this aspect of the St. Lawrence seaway as now claimed by the proponents, I am somewhat surprised that it came to me in such a casual way. It has been generally known for some time that I am interested in the St. Lawrence project. If this document is the modern authoritative study for which we have been

hoping, it would not seem unreasonable to have expected it to be brought to my attention with at least a word of explanation from its backers.

But be that as it may, I am trying to reconcile this great study with a very significant comment which Lieutenant General Wheeler, Chief of the Army Engineers, made before the subcommittee last spring. He said, as I quote from page 389 of the record:

> Before the Corps of Engineers could render a definite finding as to whether the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River could be made to pay out by the imposition of tolls, it would be necessary to make a thorough study of all prospective traffic, the character and amount of tonnage that would actually move under a toll system in conformity with certain assumed principles and toll rates such as those set forth in section 3 (a) of Senate Joint Resolution 111, and the actual net income from these tolls as compared with the assessed navigation costs.

Then General Wheeler testified—and please get this—

> Such a study by the Corps of Engineers would appear to require definite authorization by the Congress and would take more than 1 year to complete.

That is what General Wheeler said would have to be done in order to obtain really authoritative information on the self-liquidation feature of the problem.

Later on in his testimony, General Wheeler, in reply to a question, elaborated as follows—as appears on page 392 of the record:

> I attempted to point out in my presentation a few minutes ago that such a study involves a great deal of field work and a cost that we feel has not been authorized for us to do. In making such a study we have to canvass the field by field contact and by questionnaires to find out the potential users; we have to study the boundaries of the area that would be economically affected, the nature of the water-adapted commerce and the volume of it, which is a study which requires a long time. We estimate that such a study would take about a year to complete.

I have quoted General Wheeler on this point because I believe, with him, that such a study does require many people, much field work, considerable time, and probably a great deal of money. With reference to this new Commerce Department study, I should like to ask how long it has been in preparation, how many people were involved in it, how much field work and how much money was involved in its preparation—in other words, was it along the lines of study indicated by General Wheeler as being essential? Was it authorized by Congress? I believe that these inquiries are what lawyers call establishing the qualifications of the witness, or laying a basis for the testimony. I am frank to admit that I have not as yet had an opportunity to go through this document with any great care, but I do note from the introduction that there is some apology there because of "limited time and staff." If this was another hurry-up job, accomplished with only a few people and during the summer months and not at all along the lines suggested by General Wheeler, then I think we ought to know about it. Until such time as these pertinent facts are established, I am not inclined to be any more impressed with this document than I was with the Secretary of Commerce's very rough estimates, which raised the careful estimates of 1941 more than 100 percent.

Let me say at this point that I should be glad to vote for a real study. I think this matter is important enough to justify us in appropriating some money, and we should secure a proper staff and get proper direction, and really go to the bottom of the matter. But to undertake to adopt this project on a self-liquidating basis in the confusion which exists regarding the fundamental figures at this time is not wise.

In spite of the hopes of the proponents, we always come back to the 1941 Commerce Survey. We always come back to that figure of 10,000,000 additional American tonnage per year from which will have to come the money to meet the annual $17,000,000 charges set forth in the majority report.

As stated before, the 1941 survey estimates—with which General Wheeler did not differ—shows that we are 4,000,000 tons short of the necessary annual income to meet expenses, assuming that all these tolls go to the United States and assuming the ridiculous fact that the $1.25 maximum toll would be charged on all this new tonnage. We certainly cannot lightly assume that any of the present toll-free 9,000,000 tons of combined United States-Canadian traffic will be diverted to toll-paying vessels. We must reasonably expect that the new traffic will have to bear the brunt of the tolls.

Suppose only half of this new American traffic pays the $1.25 maximum toll and the remainder pays from $1 to 50 cents or 25 cents? The initial shortage of 4,000,000 tons jumps up considerably. In this connection, let me refer again to that part of section 3 (a) of Senate Joint Resolution 111, which states in part:

> Tolls shall vary according to the character of the cargo.

And that they may not—

> Exceed the equivalent of $1.25 per short ton of laden cargo and may be less.

I am giving the utter maximum.

Let me refer to that part of section 3 (a) which states that "the total charges shall be fair and equitable and shall give due consideration to encouragement of increased utilization of the navigation facilities." Let me remind Senators that it is necessary for the Federal Government now to subsidize most of our domestic shipping in order to permit it to meet the lower costs of foreign competition. I ask Senators to keep these matters in mind and ask themselves: How much of this new tonnage will pay the maximum $1.25 toll and how much will be able to bear only nominal tolls?

Look at the table on page 20 of the majority report and note that it is anticipated that only about 20 percent of the expected traffic will bear the $1.25 maximum toll, while the remaining 80 percent will pay from 25 to 50 cents. On the basis of 10,000,000 additional new American tonnage, we can quickly figure out that the revenue from 8,000,000 tons at 25 cents would be only $2,000,000 and the revenue from 2,000,000 tons at $1.25 would yield $2,500,000 for a total of $4,500,000—somewhat short of the needed $17,000,000 income a year. Small wonder that the 1941 St. Lawrence survey estimates are not popular with the proponents of the seaway. Small wonder that they must have inflated figures or nothing at all to justify what they are doing.

Now, Mr. President, I come back to the original cost estimate. In order to prevent this discussion from becoming any more confused than is absolutely unavoidable, I have accepted the majority's figure of $491,609,000 as the total American cost to complete the navigation and power projects. They indicate in their report that they think this figure may be too high. On the contrary, there is every indication based on the evidence of other similar projects, that this figure is far too low. In the construction of the Panama Canal, for example, the actual cost exceeded by 250 percent the original estimate. Of course, there was a change of plans in the Panama Canal, but we have no guaranty that the St. Lawrence seaway will not be subject to a similar change. To mention other examples: The amount of increase over estimated costs in the construction of the Bonneville Dam was about 50 percent. In construction of the Grand Coulee Dam the increase of actual over estimated was about 30 percent. In the case of the Hoover Dam there was almost a 100-percent increase. In the case of the Welland Canal there was a tremendous increase in the actual cost over the estimated cost—some 300 percent—and similar large increases occurred in the case of the Chicago Drainage Canal and the New York State Barge Canal. These figures appear on page 22 of the minority report and I think that they are interesting and significant in this connection. Today's high prices, together with the uncertainties inherent in a project of this nature, certainly cannot lead us to the conclusion that the estimated costs will be lower than those originally submitted. The lessons of experience point in quite the other direction.

Indeed, if the St. Lawrence follows the familiar pattern which has been seen in other similar projects, it may well be that the amount to be liquidated every year by collection of tolls from cargoes passing through the seaway might rise as high as $50,000,000 annually.

No discussion of the cost of this project would be complete without emphasizing one of the most glaring omissions of which the proponents of the seaway have been guilty. This is their total failure to recognize as an essential element in the St. Lawrence project the deepening of harbors on the Great Lakes. It certainly seems elementary to me that adequate harbor and docking facilities in the Great Lakes area constitute an absolutely necessary link in the chain.

Let us look at the facts. Remember what I said earlier concerning the draft of vessels which could use the 27-foot channel. The latest statistical information, which is based on the annual report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army in 1944, discloses that there is no access channel to the outer docks on any Great Lakes harbor with a

depth of 27 feet. Three harbors do have a basin depth of 26 feet. Five harbors have a basin depth exceeding 21 feet, 13 exceed 19 feet. None of the present connecting channels on the Great Lakes have a 27-foot draft.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. What is the date of that report?

Mr. LODGE. It is the 1944 report of the Chief of Engineers. I checked it yesterday afternoon by telephone.

Nowhere in the majority report will there be found a discussion of this all-important point. If it is not fundamental to this whole contemplation, I cannot imagine what is. It certainly does not seem to be of much use to have a 27-foot channel through the St. Lawrence part of the seaway and then to neglect wholly the terminal points to which this seaway presumably leads. Somebody is going to have to pay for these improvements, and I do not think it is a $64 question as to who is expected to foot the bill. Obviously it will be Uncle Sam. Therefore, to the cost of the project as indicated by the proponents there must be added the amount of Federal funds which will be required to make the harbors usable for these great fleets of ocean-going vessels which are supposedly going to steam up and down the St. Lawrence River.

The remarkable part of this aspect of the problem is that there is no authoritative figure whatsoever telling us how much this will cost. Some years ago the Brookings Insitution put the estimate in the neighborhood of one hundred and seventy-five million. I believe that there have been estimates running as high as two hundred and fifty million. I am not aware of any recent estimate on this point adjusted to present-day prices and costs. I have, consequently, no way of knowing what even a reasonably accurate estimate would be. It is probably in the neighborhood of two hundred million—which is almost 50 percent of the total cost of the St. Lawrence navigation and power projects contemplated in Senate Joint Resolution 111. Because I have no way of knowing what the figure is, I have not included it in the calculations which yield the annual 20,000,000 figure to be liquidated by tolls. But certainly, this figure would have to be included either in the annual amount to be liquidated by tolls or in a straight appropriation not to be liquidated at all. No matter how we look at it, it is part and parcel of the picture. If it is to be a straight appropriation, then the proponents of the seaway are being less than frank in emphasizing the self-liquidating feature of the project. If it is contemplated that this figure is to be included in the amount to be liquidated, there does not seem to be anything in Senate Joint Resolution 111 which would authorize such procedure.

If we include the cost of deepening the Great Lakes harbors in the total cost of the St. Lawrence seaway project, then the grand total could well run close to $1,000,000,000—including both navigation and power projects, on both the Canadian and American sides.

We are confronted with an expenditure of $6,800,000,000 for European recovery under the Marshall plan; and we are asked to undertake this added commitment, which, if we add the cost of deepening the harbors and the connecting channels on both the Canadian and American sides, may conceivably run as high as $1,000,000,000. To repeat, if we do include the cost of deepening the Great Lakes harbors in the total cost of the St. Lawrence seaway project, the grand total could well reach the sum of $1,000,000,000, including both navigation and power projects on both the Canadian and American sides.

Let any Senator ask himself if this investment of money is justified, when we stop to consider that at the present time we have projects for flood control and for improvements on our rivers and harbors for which $3,250,000,000 have been authorized by Congress, but for which no funds have ever been appropriated. As far as I know, there are no flood-control problems along the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, but I need hardly point out that this is a very real and pressing problem, indeed, in the valleys of some of our own great rivers. In view of the fact that there is no estimate of the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway project included in this year's budget estimates, I ask how this unnecessary and substantial item is going to affect these unappropriated rivers and harbors projects and flood-control programs. How will it affect tax reduction?

To return for a moment to this very important question of the failure to include the deepening of our Great Lakes harbors in order to match the draft of the St. Lawrence 27-foot channel, when this very question was raised during the course of the address of the Senator from Wisconsin on Monday, the following answer was given, and I quote from page 530 of the January 26 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Mr. WILEY. First, I want to put in the RECORD the answer to the claim that the harbors will have to be dredged. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, at this time, as a preliminary to answering the question, that some of the greatest harbors in the world do not qualify to accommodate ships with oceangoing draft. Of the ports with less than 27-foot draft, I may cite the following:

	Feet
Stettin, Germany	26
Seville, Spain	18–21
Vera Cruz, Mexico	27
Bangkok, Siam	14
Nassau, Bermuda	24
Canton, China	16
Guayaquil, Ecuador	26
Hypong, Indochina	21
Rosario, Argentina	22
Basra, Iraq	27

> I shall try to provide answers to the questions, though I realize that one is supposed to know a great deal about this subject that I do not know. If one looks at the map of the Great Lakes hanging on the wall here, he realizes that through this one little port at the Soo pass 120,000,000 tons downtraffic practically in one season of 7 months, and he gets an idea of the commerce on the Lakes. I, who have been living close to the Lakes, though I live in the western part of Wisconsin, have seen man's ingenuity in developing boats to such an extent that, whereas formerly the boats had a capacity of 1,000 to 2,000 bushels of wheat, the shippers will now transport in the boats 10,000 tons. The development in the building of boats is such that all the bug-a-boo as to what can be done will, I think, disappear in the mist, when it is realized that here is an area served by the St. Lawrence canal, with 50,000,000 souls, who are doing more business in tonnage than is handled in three-fourths of all the ports of the Pacific and Atlantic together.

That does not seem to me really to meet the issue, because in citing the harbors of the world which are less than 27 feet in depth he mentioned Nassau, Bermuda. Nassau is on another island altogether. The harbor in Bermuda is Hamilton. The fact that that harbor is 23 feet in depth will not be of great comfort to our shippers who have occasion to go into our Great Lakes harbors which are much more important, much bigger, and have a greater interest to serve. That is the only answer we have so far on this all-important question.

I submit again that until we have some definite information on what work will have to be done to deepen the access channels to the outer docks of the chief Great Lakes harbors, and until we have some reasonably accurate idea of the cost, the record is fatally defective.

There has been much talk—and I suppose there will continue to be—of traffic estimates and figures and other speculative data quickly brought forward to support the claims of the proponents for the necessary tonnage over the seaway. For a while, may I suggest that we hear not from Government experts, not from people versed in figure-juggling, but from the men who may be presumed to know about as much about shipping and tonnages as any group in this country. I refer to the heads of our important shipping lines. The proponents choose to ignore what is certainly the most significant piece of evidence bearing on the question of expected new tonnage for the St. Lawrence seaway.

On May 8, 1947, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] placed in the RECORD letters from various shipping companies. In placing these letters before the Senate, the Senator from Louisiana said:

> He (referring to the late Senator Bailey) addressed a letter to each of the American flag steamship lines operating from Atlantic and Gulf ports and on the Great Lakes asking the various steamship lines whether they expected to utilize the seaway if constructed, and to what extent, and requesting their views generally on the subject matter of the proposed treaty.

I should like to point out at this point how the Senator from Louisiana very pointedly refers to the so-called executive agreement as a treaty. Continuing with the Senator's remarks:

> He received replies from practically all the steamship companies to which he addressed letters. He addressed them to the American lines operating along the eastern seaboard and the Gulf coast and to quite a number of steamship companies operating on the Great Lakes.
>
> He received 32 replies. He was anxious prior to his death that these replies be laid before the United States Senate. That task has been assigned to me. I regard it as a very solemn obligation. I am proposing now to discharge the duty which I owe to the late Senator Bailey.

I now ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, together with the 32 replies, be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me just read a few extracts—I might add, a few typical extracts—from these letters.

Here is what Seas Shipping Co., Inc., of New York, had to say:

At this time we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence with any of our vessels. The vessels which we own and will operate in commercial service are all large and could not safely navigate the proposed 27-foot channel when fully laden. This condition is true of a very great majority of commercial vessels under the American flag today.

The Colonial Navigation Co. had this to say:

It would appear that the 27-foot depth of the channel would not be sufficient and, further, that because of the fact that for a large portion of the year the waterway will be closed because of ice conditions, it would not seem to warrant the large expenditure of money necessary to carry the project to completion. The shallow draft, plus the very great cost, should be sufficient to dispose of the project unfavorably.

The American Petroleum Transport Corp. has this to say:

It is my firm belief that this seaway would be of very little benefit, if any, to American steamship owners, and I see no possibility of the St. Lawrence seaway being used by our ships.

Cargo Carriers, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., wrote Senator Bailey:

We have no plans for the use of this seaway. Inasmuch as the plans for the proposed seaway appear to provide a channel of no more than 27 feet, we cannot conceive of these newer, better, and more economical ocean ships going into the Great Lakes with cargoes or to get cargoes. It is our belief that should the seaway be completed, it would be found that very few large ships, and therefore comparatively small amount of freight, would make the trip direct between our Great Lakes ports and foreign countries.

The Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., of New York City, declared:

As ship operators, we are opposed to construction of this proposed St. Lawrence seaway, while we do not believe that construction of such a seaway would be to our interest or to the interest of the country. No plans have been made by the company to utilize the St. Lawrence seaway.

The Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc., of Boston, stated:

From the standpoint of the seaway operation, I see nothing whatever in it for a company in the domestic steamship service. I believe that anyone familiar with present-day steamship costs and rates, and land transportation rates, must necessarily reach this unequivocable conclusion. Any studies that I know of that have been made in the past in this connection must now be thrown into the waste basket, as steamship operating costs are so much higher than they were. It must be borne in mind that a preponderant majority of American ships in the enormous fleet which has been built and is now available for ocean operations consists of large vessels which could not sail the seaway with more than about 60 percent of their carrying capacity in tons of cargo.

The Marine Transportation Lines, Inc., New York, had this comment to make:

After careful examination into the possibilities of use of the improved waterway facilities projected and after considering the information gathered as to present and prospective traffic, we arrived at the conclusion that so far as transportation is concerned the expense for the seaway project would be unwarranted. We accordingly felt that there was no justification insofar as our company is concerned for extending our operations into the Great Lakes area via the St. Lawrence other than in small ships which from time to time have been suitable for such trade under existing conditions.

From the Alcoa Steamship Co., of New York, this reply was received:

We have no plans for using the proposed seaway. We doubt very much whether the project can be considered an economic one.

The President of the Grace Line, Inc., wrote Senator Bailey, in part, as follows:

The Grace Line has nearly completed a construction program of 18 new vessels, not one of which could safely navigate the proposed seaway without leaving unfilled some 15 to 20 percent of their cargo capacity. Your familiarity with shipping matters will enable you to understand without further explanation that no vessel can compete in international trade unless it is able to take advantage of its size and capacity. It is conceivable that there might be some economies for shippers from the Great Lakes area to northern Furope by the use of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, but it is our considered judgment and that of the entire shipping industry that such economies would be the aggregate, be insignificant as compared with the cost of the construction, maintenance, and operation of the proposed seaway.

The Calmar Steamship Corp., of New York, wrote:

We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own vessels and are unalterably opposed to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. It is in our opinion economically unsound and highly detrimental to the best interests of the American Merchant Marine.

From the Pan American Petroleum Transport Co., of New York, came this statement:

From an oil-tanker angle, it would be rather difficult for any company to utilize the seaway as at present outlined. As you are aware, the T-2 and T-3 tankers built by the United States Government will make these tankers practically the standard for the carriage of oil on ocean waterways for large numbers of years to come. The proposed channel for the seaway being limited to 27 feet would absolutely eliminate the use of the T-2 or T-3 type of tanker.

This is of interest now, in view of the suffering of people on the eastern seaboard by reason of lack of oil.

The president of the Mississippi Shipping Co., Inc., of New Orleans, wrote:

The St. Lawrence seaway would offer no inducement to us.

The American-South African Line, Inc., stated:

I have given this subject detailed study and consideration and have reached the conclusion that whether or not such a project is completed it is not economically feasible for American-South African Line to use it. * * * this area is noted for the frequent occurrence of fog and mist. If one of our ships were caught in a narrow stretch of this canal, in a fog or mist, it is considered the ship would be in extreme danger, and the danger would be greatly aggravated by the possibility of the current of the river swinging the vessel onto the rocks. I do not believe that a conscientious steamship operator is justified in jeopardizing a large ocean-going vessel by sending her on such a voyage, with its attending risks of loss of life, cargo, and vessel. These added risks would contribute substantially to an increase in insurance rates. This, too, would be reflected in increased rates to the shipper. I do not believe that the St. Lawrence seaway would be attractive to the vast majority of American ship operators.

Mr. J. J. Kelleher, president of United Fruit Co., wrote Senator Bailey:

It appears that the proposed 27-foot channel would preclude something over 90 percent of the American merchant marine, a good part of which was constructed during the war period, and over 80 percent of the world's tonnage, from using the seaway. Even if the seaway project should become a reality in the future, it is most unlikely that this company's vessels would ever make any use of it.

The Strachan Shipping Co., of Savannah, Ga., said:

We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our ships and it does not appear to me that this trade route will prove very attractive to American shipping operators.

The Plant Shipping Co., of New Orleans, wrote:

From the standpoint of risks and increased costs of insurance, the seaway would not be attractive to ship operators. I have no plans to use the St. Lawrence seaway at all and as far as I am concerned, I earnestly hope that it will never materialize.

The Wilson Line, of Philadelphia, Pa., said:

The Wilson Line is not interested in operating steamboats on the Great Lakes or through the proposed new lock and channel.

The Stokard Steamship Corp., of New York, said:

Purely from the point of view of a shipping facility the seaway is absolutely unsound. We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway and sincerely hope that the taxpayers' money will not be wasted on this venture.

From the Barbor Steamship Lines, Inc., of New York, came this reply:

I consider the project unsound economically and of no practical value commercially, and to specifically answer your question my company has no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway.

The United Fruit Co., of Boston, Mass., stated, through Mr. William Jackson, vice president:

This company does not plan to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway.

The Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., Inc., of New Orleans, said:

We have no plans to send our ships into the Great Lakes.

The Chicago, Duluth, & Georgian Bay Transit Co., of Detroit, Mich., wrote:

The proposed seaway would have no direct benefits insofar as our operation as presently set up is concerned.

It is only fair to state that among these letters one reply was favorable, the

reply received from the Tomlinson Fleet, of Bay City, Mich., which said:

The development of the St. Lawrence seaway would be a wonderful thing for America and particularly for the fifty-odd millions of people residing in the middle section of the United States.

The writer does not advance any reasons why he believes it to be a wonderful thing for America, except for the fact that he was associated with an early commission which recommended construction of the seaway.

From the late James Thayer McMillan, long-time president of the Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co., of Detroit, Mich., came the reply:

So far as the Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co. is concerned, we would have no use for the St. Lawrence waterway.

The Pioneer Steamship Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, brought out some interesting points:

Typical oceangoing cargo ships are not equipped to navigate locks. Great Lakes vessels are equipped with mooring engines and chocks of special type passage through the locks. Ocean ships have smaller rudders than Great Lakes ships and are not designed for navigating canals and narrow channels with swift and changing currents. Great Lakes ships are not designed or suitable for ocean navigation nor could they be loaded or unloaded expeditiously in ocean ports. Loading and unloading machinery in Great Lakes ports is highly specialized and the design of the ships is such that they are coordinated with the dock machinery. To our knowledge there are not now in existence ships which embody both Great Lakes and ocean characteristics. While such a ship might be designed, it could not be operated as economically as the vessels built for the special service in one or the other trade. Because of the navigation hazards of the St. Lawrence River, it would be uneconomical to operate large ships between Great Lakes and ocean ports. We have no plans for navigating the St. Lawrence seaway. The passage is more hazardous than the routes of our present traffic.

The Interlake Steamship Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, said:

We have no plans for future navigation of the St. Lawrence seaway should it materialize.

In closing this enumeration, I wish to refer to a letter from Mr. Basil Harris, president of United States Lines, Inc., of New York City, whom some Members of the Senate know. He says:

Speaking out of my long experience as a steamship operator, I must say that the seaway would be too shallow. Our Maritime Commission insists that owners and operators shall sail their ships full and down.

This is the answer to proponents of the seaway who are already arguing that ships using the seaway take aboard smaller loads to keep within the 24-foot draft. Another reason why the project is unfeasible is that for about 5 months of each year it would be closed by winter. In addition, the canalized section at many points would be dangerous. Navigation would menace each other when passing, and the rocky shores of the canalized area would mean sinking and in many instances total losses in case of collision. Then, too, fogs are prevalent and there would be few spots where the channel is narrow for ships to anchor with safety. All in all, from the point of view of feasibility, the proposal to spend hundreds of millions to provide this seaway is a fantastic one. * * * Concluding your letter, you ask me to say: (1) Whether the seaway as proposed would provide a saving to shippers and would prove attractive to shipowners; (2) whether our company, the United States Lines, plans to navigate the seaway. The answer to these questions is a blunt "No." Need I add that I am irrevocably opposed to the construction of this project?

Mr. President, I think these letters are most revealing and most significant, and I do not wonder that the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project simply choose to ignore them. When this point was raised on Monday, the Senator from Wisconsin dismissed it with the remark, "That is one of the arguments that is used continually."

But, Mr. President, I submit that these letters cannot be ignored. They constitute the considered and informed opinion of men whose life work has been in this field of ocean and lake shipping. These men head companies which would, presumably, have the greatest interest in supporting any means of transportation which would be economical and feasible, and which would open up new areas of operations. These men know the problem from top to bottom. They come from the Gulf coast, the Atlantic coast, and the Great Lakes. They are no visionaries; they are hard-headed businessmen who must look at these things realistically; and, with the exception of one, they all reject the seaway.

Now let us go back and take a look at the figures which the Secretary of Commerce submitted as a very rough estimate—those were his words—and upon which the majority base their entire conclusion that the seaway could be made to pay its way through the imposition of tolls. It should be emphasized that all of these replies to Senator Bailey's inquiry were written before the toll-paying feature had been introduced. The record of this year's hearings show that this new feature was not greeted with any enthusiasm by these shipping men, and there is no likelihood that this has changed their minds at all about the economic feasibility of the St. Lawrence seaway.

It will be recalled that Secretary of the Army Royall, when testifying before the subcommittee, said that the seaway would be helpful to the national defense "if found economical." Those were his words. I submit that all the reasonable evidence we have indicates that the seaway would not be economical at all.

I say that the time has come when we must put an end to "very rough estimates"—to use once again the words of the Secretary of Commerce—and to basing decisions of this importance on guesses and tailor-made figures. Let us put away the crystal ball and if necessary put some authoritative independent Government agency to work studying this thing in the light of present-day conditions and the present-day world situation. Let us get the questions answered. I suppose the proponents of the seaway will come back with the stock answer: "Well, we just can't wait any longer on this thing; we've been waiting a long, long time." Of course, the St. Lawrence project has been around for quite a long time, but we should also remember it has been rejected twice. Yet it always comes back for more, and every time it comes back the figures get hazier, the expectations grow larger, and the wonderful benefits flowing from this iceway—I submit that is the better term, rather than seaway—seem more glowing and hopeful than ever. We always seem to be in too great a hurry to get the truth. I, for one, cannot cast my vote in favor of an economic project based on "very rough estimates."

Let us remember, too, that the self-liquidation feature was new in 1947, when it was the subject of only 6 days of hearings before the subcommittee.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on the self-liquidation feature, and I pause now for questions, if there are any to be asked. My next remarks will relate to the national defense aspects of the proposal.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield with pleasure to my able friend the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to know whether the Senator from Massachusetts is acquainted with testimony appearing on page 970 of the 1946 hearings, where it is said that it was authoritatively estimated that, based upon 1941 costs, the cost of providing entrance and access channels to the outer docks of nine of the principal harbors on the Great Lakes would be $9,000,000. I have asked the engineers to bring that cost down to date, and they say now that it would be $14,000,000.

In that connection, I should like to ask whether the Senator is acquainted with the undisputed testimony, given by Mr. Hoan, that the cities of Chicago; Gary, Ind.; Milwaukee, Wis.; and Muskegon, Mich., have already built commercial ports far out into the lake, where the channels are in excess of 30 feet. I also point out the following further testimony:

I defy the opposition to find one single city that will not readily finance whatever additional piers, warehouses, or docks that may be needed to accommodate greater draft vessels.

Is the Senator acquainted with that testimony; and is there any dispute of it?

Mr. LODGE. My statements regarding the inadequacy of the ports on the Great Lakes come from the Army engineers, and I confirmed them over the telephone yesterday.

Mr. WILEY. I may say that the Army Engineers gave the figure I have just referred to with respect to bringing the $9,000,000 figure down to date.

I ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether the harbors throughout the eastern coast and western coast of this country have been improved by the Army engineers.

Mr. LODGE. Are these costs included in the project?

Mr. WILEY. No, for the simple reason——

Mr. LODGE. They are not included in the amount to be liquidated by the tolls?

Mr. WILEY. No, because——

Mr. LODGE. Let me ask why they are not included.

Mr. WILEY. Because of the undisputed testimony, to which no one took

exception, that there is not a city on the Great Lakes that will not finance any expense that is necessary to provide the harbors about which the Senator has spoken. I am ready to quote——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator goes on to his next point, let me say that both he and I have been in public office a little while, and we know that people often say one thing in advance; but when every other harbor in the United States is being dredged and built up with Federal funds, I simply cannot believe that the harbors on the Great Lakes will not come to Uncle Sam for help. I think that cost should be included in the amount to be liquidated by the payment of tolls. The Senator from Wisconsin frankly and honestly says it is not included.

Mr. WILEY. I call the Senator's attention to the mistake he made when he said that there are not any harbors of sufficient size there. I call attention again to the fact that Chicago; Gary, Ind.; Milwaukee, Wis.; and Muskegon, Mich., have already built commercial ports far out into the lake where the channels are in excess of 30 feet. I wish to know whether the Senator is acquainted with the Maritime Commission figures of 1946, provided by Edward Macauley, showing that as of September 30, 1945, there were 763 United States vessels within the 25-foot range; 1,173 United States vessels within the 27-foot range, having an aggregate tonnage of 3,490,770 and 6,232,356, respectively. Also, if there are added to those figures the figures for Liberty ships and Victory ships, which have drafts of 27 feet 9¼ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively, the number reaches 3,997, with an aggregate tonnage of 26,671,935.

Mr. LODGE. My figures from the Maritime Commission are that 91 percent of American ships draw too much water for this proposed seaway.

Mr. WILEY. The figures the Senator from Massachusetts has given are based upon the fact——

Mr. LODGE. They are Maritime Commission figures.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; and they are based upon the fact that if the maximum draft of those vessels were fully utilized they could not clear the locks of the seaway.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator have the figures as to the number of vessels going through the Panama Canal which are only 75 percent filled?

Mr. LODGE. Not very many of them are.

Mr. WILEY. There is a tremendous number of such vessels.

Mr. LODGE. No. I had information as to that yesterday.

Mr. WILEY. I shall give the figure in just a moment.

Mr. LODGE. No; the Maritime Commission wants all ships to be operated at what it calls "full and down." And according to the Maritime Commission, 91 percent of American ships would draw too much water for this seaway.

Mr. WILEY. If loaded, according to the Senator's figures, 100 percent. That is what the Senator means.

Mr. LODGE. But shipowners will not use their ships uneconomically. When they have a ship, they will fill it to capacity.

Mr. WILEY. But let me call attention to the fact that the ships which can sail through the present locks have to transfer their freight to smaller ships going down to Montreal, and there the cargoes are reloaded. If the tonnage which can be carried from the Lakes to Montreal is increased by means of the seaway, so that reloading is not necessary, ships of greater draft will be used; and when they reach Montreal, eastbound, they will be loaded with full supplies of fuel and water for the voyage across the Atlantic, thus increasing their draft to 27 feet. That is the way they will be navigated.

Mr. LODGE. That might be done, of course.

Mr. WILEY. Such ships when making the westward trip across the Atlantic and carrying full cargoes of freight would intentionally almost exhaust their supplies of water and fuel before reaching the locks, and then they would go through the locks. Having passed through the locks, they then could take on the supplies of fuel and water necessary for the remainder of the voyage—on the Lakes. In the meantime they would have carried their full cargoes of freight.

When the Senator talks about the draft of a ship, as was referred to the other day, he is talking about the draft that ship has when she is fully loaded down in the water, carrying her maximum cargo and full water and fuel tanks. However, when she has less than full supplies of water and fuel, her draft will be less than 27 feet. On the other hand, as I suggested the other day, if the ship were fully loaded with automobiles or any other cargo which does not bring her down to her maximum draft of 27 feet when fully loaded—as contrasted with her maximum draft when loaded with ore—her holds could be completely filled, and yet she would have a draft of less than 27 feet, even when her water and fuel tanks were full.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from Wisconsin makes a very appealing contention; but the shipping men who are in this business professionally and for their livelihood do not agree with him. They say that it is not economical to operate a ship otherwise than full, and also that the seaway would be frozen up, or would have little traffic on it, for 5 months of the year.

Mr. WILEY. Who says that?

Mr. LODGE. The shipping men whose names I have just read. I do not want to read them all over again.

Mr. WILEY. No, I say, who said that?

Mr. LODGE. Most of these ship operators.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. Now, let me quote the United States Maritime Commission on that.

Mr. LODGE. They are not operators.

Mr. WILEY. From a letter just received, I quote:

> There is, however, one more element of great importance to be considered in connection with the St. Lawrence River project. The 27-foot channel from the head of the Lakes to Montreal will not limit its use to ships of 27-foot draft or less. On the contrary, ships loaded on the Lakes of maximum draft suited for passage through the channel may, and customarily would, defer bunkering until arriving at Montreal. Bunkering at Montreal for the round-trip passage to Europe or elsewhere would be the normal economical procedure. Practically all of our depth vessels would carry capacity loads to and from the Great Lakes.

That is signed by W. W. Smith, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission.

Mr. LODGE. To ships of what size does that refer?

Mr. WILEY. He does not specify any ship.

Mr. LODGE. He does not say?

Mr. WILEY. But he does say that any ship having a draft of 27 feet or more could navigate the 27-foot channel by following this process.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator asked me earlier where I got my figures regarding depths of the harbors in the Great Lakes. I have found the statement. It is from the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army. I verified it over the telephone yesterday afternoon. The statement is:

> There is no access channel to the outer docks of any Great Lakes harbor with a depth of 27 feet.

Then, I am advised that 3 harbors have a basin depth of 26 feet, 5 harbors have a basin depth exceeding 21 feet, 13 exceed 19 feet. None of the present connective channels on the Great Lakes have a 27-foot draft.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I want to show the Senator again how wrong he was in his statement about the Panama Canal. This comes from Edward Macauley, Acting Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission:

> Of ships greater than 27-foot draft, the Victories and the Liberties are of special interest. Victories can go through the canal loaded to 79 percent, and the Liberties to 85 percent of their total dead weight capacity.
>
> The preponderance of vessels transiting the Panama Canal normally have been composed of vessels loaded only to two-thirds of capacity.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator know why that is?

Mr. WILEY. I am telling the Senator. That is not what the question was, before. The question was what took place, and the Senator stated that what I said then was not correct.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no, I did not. What did I say?

Mr. WILEY. I am giving the Senator the testimony.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no, I did not say that. Wait a moment. I did not say that.

Mr. WILEY. What did the Senator say? I am happy to have him correct himself.

Mr. LODGE. No, I do not need to correct myself yet. When I need to, I certainly shall. There is nobody that I would rather have correct me than the Senator from Wisconsin, because I am so fond of him, but he has not been able to do it.

My statement is that the St. Lawrence seaway is too shallow for about 91 percent of the American ocean-going vessels, and that if a ship goes through the

Panama Canal not completely loaded, it is not because the Panama Canal is too shallow; it is simply because they did not get the business, that is all.

Mr. WILEY. Then the Senator would agree with me that "the preponderance of vessels transiting the Panama Canal normally have been composed of vessels loaded only to two-thirds of capacity"?

Mr. LODGE. That word "normally" is a regular, all-Potomac-fever bureaucratic word. What year is the Senator talking about?

Mr. WILEY. Then will the Senator agree with me in the statement I just read in the RECORD, that vessels with a draft of more than 27 feet could traverse the whole of the St. Lawrence system? Following the practice stated by the Commission, the ships would take on water and fuel at Montreal and they would then traverse the thousand miles to the sea.

Mr. LODGE. I would agree with the Senator that a ship that draws less than 27 feet can go through the St. Lawrence seaway and can go through the Panama Canal. I will say that a ship that draws more than 27 feet cannot get through the St. Lawrence seaway, but can go through the Panama Canal.

Mr. WILEY. Does the Senator mean ships that are loaded 100 percent?

Mr. LODGE. Why, of course. One does not want to make a thing that is not going to be used.

Mr. WILEY. But here is evidence that the preponderance of vessels transiting the Panama Canal are loaded to only two-thirds capacity.

Mr. LODGE. But it is not said when. The statement just says "normally," one of these regular old "gobbledegook" bureaucracy words. "Normally," when do they do that? They would do it when business is slack and the shipping companies cannot get full loads. That is why they do it. They do not go through the Panama Canal unloaded merely because the Panama Canal will not take the business; of course that is not the reason. I do not want the Senator to give people the false impression that this projected seaway is to be anything like the Panama Canal. Another thing, there is never any ice in the Panama Canal, says the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. That is another point to remember. The Panama Canal is never frozen up tight, so far as traffic is concerned, for 5 months of the year.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Now that the Senator speaks about ice, I want to tell him that in the winter we of the Northwest do not hesitate to take railroad cars on car ferries right across Lake Michigan, running to Milwaukee and to another port indicated on the map, right across the lake.

I want to comment further about the transportation.

Mr. LODGE. Just a minute. Mr. President, I thought I heard the Senator admit Monday that this seaway was going to be frozen up for 5 months in the year. I was going to say 4½, but the Senator, with unaccustomed generosity, said 5 months of the year.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad the Senator concedes to me a little generosity.

Mr. LODGE. I do not mean unaccustomed generosity on his part.

Mr. WILEY. I want to say that seasonality of navigation is no handicap to extensive commercial utilization of the seaway. The St. Mary's Canal at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., connecting Lakes Superior, Huron, and Michigan, is also icebound for 4 months of the year. Yet it can hardly be said that this canal is uneconomic when the tonnage moving through it during an 8-month season exceeds the combined tonnage of the Panama and Suez Canals during the 12-month season. The Great Lakes, which are also closed for the same period, carry two-thirds as much traffic in 8 months as all the United States Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast ports combined. The navigation season on the St. Lawrence River is roughly the same as on the Lakes.

Mr. LODGE. But that traffic is not going up the St. Lawrence; that is coming from the lake ports.

Mr. WILEY. Just a minute. Despite the limited season, the Port of Montreal, which lies on the St. Lawrence River, 1,000 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean, is the second largest exporting port on the North American Continent, being exceeded only by New York.

When I start to tell about car ferries going across the lake, I just want to say to the Senator that the tonnage carried on the Lakes in 7 months far exceeds the combined tonnage handled in the Boston and New York Harbors in 12 months. That indicates the "guts" of the people of the Middle West. Then, in the middle of the winter, we do not let a little ice interrupt traffic. We move the freight on car ferries across the lake, allowing trainloads to be transported right through the ice. I say to the Senator that the business exists. If the people of the East want this project, we will keep it open to traffic. It will extend transportation on the Lakes at least from 30 to 60 days longer each year and we will show what the Middle West can do. If they are unwilling to cooperate, as I said the other day, millions of dollars will be spent in plants to take care of the low-grade ores in the Middle West. That is uneconomic. I shall of course seek to answer that argument in detail later on, but I just wanted to set right the few figures about which I thought the Senator was a little bit upset.

Mr. LODGE. No; I am not upset at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator's source material is upset.

Mr. LODGE. No; the source material is correct. Let us just recapitulate. The statement that channels within the harbors on the Great Lakes are not deep enough comes from the Army engineers. Nothing has upset that. The statement that 91 percent of American ocean-going vessels draw too much water to permit transit through the projected seaway has not been upset. I agree that the Senator's figures are correct about the volume of business done on the Great Lakes, during the time when they are not frozen up, and I admit that during the time when the Lakes are frozen up, because of the great virility of the people up there, of which the Senator from Wisconsin speaks, they do a tremendous amount of business, but the fact remains that if the Senator wanted to bring some fuel oil up to his constituents during the winter, he would have to transport it in ice boats.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I assume that when the seaway is constructed there will be a considerable amount of business done between ports on the Great Lakes and ports in other parts of the world. It would obviously not be expected that ships would load and unload at the Great Lakes ports unless they could also load and unload at other ports of the world. Will the Senator from Massachusetts advise us how many ports of the world outside of the United States have a depth of 27 feet or more?

Mr. LODGE. No, I could not tell the Senator that.

Mr. AIKEN. I think if the Senator will investigate he will find that there is a very small number; that we have most of the ports of that depth, with a few conspicuous exceptions, such as Liverpool, and a few other great ports.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, but this area is so important, and it does such a tremendous business, as the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, that it is important to have harbors which are on a par with that at Liverpool, and similar ports.

Mr. AIKEN. It is important, and it would be gratifying, also, to have such ports.

Mr. LODGE. I think that ought to be figured into the liquidation cost, but it is not.

Mr. AIKEN. It probably would not be expected that the *Queen Mary* would want to dock at Manitowoc, Wis., or even at Buffalo, N. Y.

Mr. LODGE. No, but we would want the seaway open to at least 91 percent of the tonnage. Does not the Senator from Vermont think that the cost of the deepening of the harbors on the Great Lakes ought to be included in the amount of money to be liquidated? Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator expect that the Federal Government will deepen all those harbors?

Mr. LODGE. I expect the Government will do for those harbors what it will do for other harbors in America.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator recall that in 1941 Mr. Frank Davis, of Boston, testified before a House committee to the effect that the Federal Government had spent $50,000,000 in deepening and improving Boston Harbor?

Mr. LODGE. Exactly.

Mr. AIKEN. And therefore should not spend money in improving any other harbor to compete with Boston Harbor?

Mr. LODGE. I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. It is in the record. I will read it if the Senator desires that I do so.

Mr. LODGE. There are many things in the record with which I do not agree.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator ought to agree with Mr. Davis.

Mr. LODGE. I am asking the Senator from Vermont a very simple question. Does he not think that the cost of improving these harbors should be counted in with the amount of money that is to be liquidated by the tolls?

Mr. AIKEN. Not if the harbors are to be improved by cities like Chicago and Cleveland. I have not heard those cities raise any question about that.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think the Atlantic ports are the only ones that should receive Federal funds for the improvement of their harbors?

Mr. AIKEN. I think some of the funds for improving Atlantic ports have been misspent. When I see the decline of the shipping out of Boston Harbor I wonder if we were wise in putting so much money into improving Boston Harbor. When I see our shipments declining year after year and swinging over to the Pennsylvania Railroad terminal and other terminals in New York City I wonder if the money for improving Boston Harbor was wisely spent.

However, that consideration was not what caused me to rise. The Senator from Massachusetts said that 91 percent of our ships could not use the St. Lawrence Channel. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. I did not say that. It was the Maritime Commission which said that.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the Maritime Commission officials present such testimony before the committee?

Mr. LODGE. They said that 91 percent of the American ships draw more than 27 feet. They furnished this figure in the statement presented to the Library of Congress. I can produce it for the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Did they include naval vessels, such as battleships and other warships?

Mr. LODGE. I am sure they did not.

Mr. AIKEN. Capt. Edward Macauley, Vice Chairman and Acting Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, testified before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in 1946 as follows:

> A somewhat corresponding situation is revealed by an analysis of the United States Fleet of similar vessels. This shows that as of the same date there were 763 vessels within the 25-foot draft range and 1,173 vessels within the 27-foot range, having aggregate gross tonnages of 3,490,770 and 6,232,356, respectively. As in the case of the world fleet, the United States vessels consisted largely of freighters but with some tankers and combination passenger and cargo ships. If there are added Libertys and Victorys, which have drafts of 27 feet 9¼ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively, the number reaches 3,997 and the tonnage, 26,671,935.

Mr. LODGE. In what year did the Senator say that statement was made?

Mr. AIKEN. Year before last, 1946. I do not think much of a change would have occurred between 1946 and 1947.

So, about two-thirds of the vessels are under the 27-foot draft. But the fact remains, if the Senator wants to bring the testimony up to date, that Secretary Marshall testified before the subcommittee last year, 1947—

> In other words, 80 percent—
>
> Referring to our shipping—
>
> 80 percent could use the waterway, and about 20 percent would be barred by the 25-foot channel.

I am sure the Senator misunderstood the Maritime Commission if they told him that 91 percent of all our ships were over the 27-foot draft.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is a question of whether it is thought to be a good thing to build a seaway that will be used by ships which are not filled, that is all. We can continue reading statements by the various agencies downtown until we are blue in the face, but the fact is that here are all these shipping men whose opinions were read, and it seems to me that their opinions should carry some weight. They say 91 percent of the ships will not use the seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. The testimony I was reading from the 1946 hearings was given by Edward Macauley, who at that time was Acting Chairman of the Maritime Commission. That was before Admiral Smith's testimony. The other testimony given last year was given by Gen. George Marshall.

As far as existing shipping lines not wanting competition is concerned, wanting to have all the export trade go through the terminals which they now own, that is a human feeling. They are simply responding to the urge of monopoly which exists in the breast of practically every human being. They do not want competition. But if we can save the wheat grower of the West 10 cents a bushel, if we can save the automobile manufacturer $15 a car, and so on, I think competition would be good for some of the shipping lines.

Mr. LODGE. I think competition is good for everybody. It never occurred to me that shipping lines would only send their ships to those places where they own terminals. I thought they would send their ships around to other ports. There are many shipping lines which send their ships to places where they do not own the terminals, where they rent them.

I am very sorry that the proponents of this matter are not willing to figure the cost of deepening some of these harbors and channels, and putting that cost into the total cost of the project, and adding those figures to the amount to be liquidated by the proposed tolls. I do not think that is being frank. The Senator from Vermont refuses to answer my question on that point, which it is his perfect right to do, but I want the record to show that that is not being frank with the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. No; Mr. President, I will answer the Senator. Certainly the cost of deepening the Port of Chicago—the Port of Duluth will not need deepening, I believe—and deepening some other Lake ports should not be charged against the seaway, any more than the cost of improving Boston Harbor, which may be the other terminus of the run, should be charged against the seaway.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Wisconsin thinks some of it should be, I understood him to say to me. It seems to me that the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Vermont do not quite agree on that point.

Mr. WILEY. On what point?

Mr. LODGE. On the point as to whether the deepening of the approach channels to the Great Lakes harbors and deepening the Great Lakes harbors should be included in the cost which is subject to liquidation by the tolls.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I will say that that matter was considered by the committee in this respect. The committee had before it the testimony—and no one raised the point until the Senator from Massachusetts raised it now—that the harbors themselves would take care of the expenses, which were figured at that time at some eight million dollars, but because of increased costs—and I have had the calculations made—the amount would now be $14,000,000.

I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. I wonder if my colleague from Massachusetts has been struck by the amazing coincidence that the arguments raised against the St. Lawrence seaway project are similar, and in given cases virtually identical, to arguments which were raised at the turn of the twentieth century against the construction of the Panama Canal. The railroads were opposed to that artery, too. The shipping men were, in many instances, opposed. Many United States Senators were opposed. They, too, questioned whether the Panama Canal would be used at all or whether it would be a drain on the revenues of the country.

I ask my colleague, therefore, whether he has noted this amazing coincidence and similarity of arguments, and I ask him whether he is not impressed by the fact that within a few years all of the contentions of the Panama Canal opponents were smashed to smithereens, were irrevocably refuted and debunked by the actual use of that great artery of commerce?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that is a very well written question. I have listened to its reading with a great deal of admiration. Of course, the Senator knows that the engineers are engaged now in changing the Panama Canal over—they want at least to change the Panama Canal over—to a sea-level canal.

Mr. AIKEN. When was that approved?

Mr. LODGE. That proposal was made some time ago. I am coming to that point in a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator said that they were changing it over from a lock canal to a sea-level canal.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. LODGE. Wait a moment, I have the floor. Let us not all talk at once. If I said that they were changing the Panama Canal over to a sea-level canal, I misspoke, and I correct the statement. It has been officially suggested by the engineers, and a recommendation has been sent up by the President, that the

Panama Canal be changed over to a sea-level canal. That statement is in answer to the Senator's eloquent question. That is one difference between the St. Lawrence seaway and the other proposal, because I do not believe the Senator from Wisconsin, ingenious as he is, has figured out a way to make the St. Lawrence seaway a sea-level affair.

There are other differences between the St. Lawrence seaway and the Panama Canal. One is, as we have already developed, that the Panama Canal is deeper. Another is that there is never any ice in Panama. Those are some of the differences.

Mr. WILEY. There is plenty in Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. There is plenty in Massachusetts; but I am not asking anyone to construct a seaway through the heart of Massachusetts.

It was stated in the Senator's written question that at the time the Panama Canal was proposed there were Senators opposed to it and Senators in favor of it, and that therefore it is like this project, because there are Senators in favor of it and Senators opposed to it. To that extent there is a resemblance. In my opinion, that is about the only resemblance.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I invite the Senator's attention to a statement he made which I think needs a little elaboration. He made the argument that in view of the expense of this project this is no time to enter into such an undertaking. If this project were to be approved, its completion would require 6 years. The pending measure is merely an authorization. It is like many other authorization measures. I invite attention to the fact that some of our great economists say that within the next 5 years we shall have a recession. In my judgment it is a good thing to have projects ready, into which money can be put for really constructive purposes, rather than the many activities which were carried on under the old WPA. In spite of the brilliance of the Senator's argument, I think it is very clear that the opposition springs from a fear on the part of those interested in Boston harbor, and the others whom I mentioned yesterday. I happen to have in my hand the instrument showing that they want to move——

Mr. LODGE. Does this involve the argument that they want to move the steel industry to Boston?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. It is alleged that they want to move it to the East.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. That is what Al Smith would have called a "phonus balonus."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will not yield further, because I wish to answer that argument. I deeply regret that the Senator from Wisconsin should be so hard up for arguments that he has now resorted at last——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I decline to yield. The Senator has now resorted to the sectional argument. A great part of his speech on Monday was occupied in giving the Senate his idea of the kind of argument he thought I was going to make. It was entirely sectional. It involved the interest of the railroads and the port of Boston.

Mr. WILEY. What is it?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LODGE. I did not heckle the Senator from Wisconsin, and I will ask him please not to heckle me.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I decline to yield at this time. I will yield after I have made my statement.

The Senator from Wisconsin spent a large part of his time on Monday telling the Senate the kind of speech which he thought the opponents were going to make, based entirely on sectional and selfish grounds. I announced at the outset of my speech today that I would not make a single, solitary sectional or local argument. I have not done so, and I will not do so. It could be done on the part of those who oppose this project. It could be done by those who favor the project. I will not make such an argument. At the beginning of my speech I expressed the hope that we would discuss this question on a national basis, and that we would not impugn each other's motives, and would not enter into sectional arguments. It was somewhat horrifying to me the other day to hear the statement that there was a desire to cut the throat of the Middle West. I had hoped that Senators would not use violent language of that kind.

I repeat what I said at the outset of my speech, that it is profoundly distasteful to me to have such a possibility mentioned. I have lived in all parts of the country. I have friends in all parts of the country. Those friendships were formed in college, in my newspaper work, and during the time I have been in Congress, as well as during my service in the Army. During such a time one forms a particularly close type of friendship.

I have not made a single sectional argument. I hope we can keep this discussion on a high plane, and that we will not impugn each other's motives.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished Senator that nothing that I said was intended to impute to him anything except the highest motives in seeking to look after his own little section. If that is a sectional argument——

Mr. LODGE. That is precisely what I object to; and it is precisely what I have not done.

Mr. WILEY. I ask the Senator if he is acquainted with the poll of business opinion conducted by Modern Industry magazine.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not know anything about such things.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator acquainted with the fact that even in New England the vote among businessmen was 54 in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway, as against 46 businessmen against it?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not follow such things. That is not the way I try to do my job here.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate that that is not the way the Senator is doing the job.

Mr. LODGE. I must do my job as my conscience tells me how to do it.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct. However, behind that screen there is the result which is desired, and that is to deprive us of our economic lifeblood. That is indicated by the letter from the New England News Letter Service, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want it in the RECORD at this time. I object. This is my speech, and I am not going to have something totally irrelevant, something which is an entire misrepresentation of my whole spirit in this matter, printed in the middle of my speech.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I want to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a few questions in order to clarify my understanding of his position. The first one is this: Even if the proposed seaway should conceivably damage some of the ports on the Atlantic coast, that consideration would have to be secondary to the national interest, if that issue should arise. Does the Senator agree with me that we would have to think in terms of the national interest?

Mr. LODGE. I have been trying consistently to take a national view, and all the arguments I have given are national arguments. There is one Senator who does not agree with me.

Mr. WILEY. I think the arguments are clever.

Mr. SMITH. I come from the State of New Jersey, in which this question might arise in connection with the Port of New York Authority, a body created by the States of New York and New Jersey. But I am raising the question in order to make it clear that the Senator and I agree up to the point that the national interest would be paramount in any consideration of the over-all picture presented by the proposal to build the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. The next question involves the whole issue of transportation. I am advised that a great many of the railroad companies feel that the project would damage the railroad business. I do not share that view. My own judgment is that if we can increase our productivity by any means of transportation, it will be of benefit, although it might cause some temporary dislocations, and that whether it be the railroad industry, the storage truck industry, or whatever industry it may be, we are all interested in seeing the necessary transportation facilities, at low cost, established, to develop the country to its highest productivity. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. I think that is correct. But this proposal does not commend itself to me on that ground. I do not think it would be a practical or valuable

addition to our transportation system, but I agree that that should be the aim.

Mr. SMITH. I want to ask the Senator another question in order to clarify further my own thinking as to his position. Does the Senator at this moment oppose for all time any development of the seaway, or is he criticizing the small capacity of the seaway today, in part, or is he opposed to this type of seaway?

Mr. LODGE. I am not opposed to this type of undertaking, in principle. I think the way it is proposed to handle it at this time makes it unacceptable.

Mr. SMITH. Is the Senator trying to defeat it, or postpone its consideration until agreements with Canada on tolls can be brought about, and further study given as to whether the locks should be larger than proposed or whether the canal should be deeper than is proposed? Is that his position?

Mr. LODGE. My position is that we do not have the answers to enough of the fundamental questions to take up the proposal at the present time. I should like to see it come up after we have had an opportunity to get the final answers.

Mr. SMITH. But would the Senator like to see it developed further through planning in such a way as to take care of all possible benefit to the whole country, and especially giving to the inland cities on the Great Lakes access to the sea?

Mr. LODGE. I announced earlier that I would be willing to support legislation which would provide for the kind of thoroughgoing study of which General Wheeler spoke, for an adequate staff, to take a year to get to the bottom of the economics involved. I have not completed my presentation. I have a good deal to say from the national defense standpoint. I am not opposed to this type of activity in principle.

Mr. SMITH. I did not think the Senator was opposed to it, and I wanted to get it clear that what he is now criticizing is the particular presentation of the plan now before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. It is like many things we see so often in a legislative body, something which at first blush is very attractive, and then the blush wears off, and, on the practicalities, it does not stand up.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator feel that the development of trade in the postwar period may have a bearing on what this particular project should be, or does he think we should build the project before we know what the development of postwar trade will be?

Mr. LODGE. I think it should be considered in the light of a number of bottom facts.

Mr. SMITH. Including, possibly, as the Senator suggested earlier, the fact that larger types of freighters might be used than are being used today, which would make it necessary to enlarge the canal?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I recall in the testimony that even Mr. Hoover, as great an advocate of the project as he is, recommended that we build 30-foot locks now, even though it is proposed to have a 27-foot canal. I think that is a relevant point to consider.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator brought up that point.

Mr. SMITH. I shall have some more questions later, but I wanted to get those two things clarified before the Senator proceeded further.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator asked me the questions. They are very valuable.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Department of Commerce has completed its study on grain, ore, petroleum, and coal? The study relating to ore started long before the hearings on the St. Lawrence project were started. The study involving grain has been carried on for a long period of time in connection with the Department of Agriculture. I do not know how long they have been engaged on the study of petroleum. But the report is not a hasty report. It purports to cover only these four commodities, but the Department of Commerce intends to make a report on other commodities at a later date. It made its report on those four commodities at this time because, in its belief, the tonnage of those four commodities will amount to approximately 40,000,000 tons a year after the traffic is established, and the tolls will be sufficient to pay for the amortization and other costs of the canal. I wanted to make it clear that this study is not yet complete. It is made only on those four commodities on which the report has been presented. The report is in the pamphlet which was issued approximately a month ago.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I turn now to a discussion of what is another most important aspect of the St. Lawrence seaway project. I refer to the contention made by the proponents that in the year 1948 we must construct the seaway because the national defense demands it.

As one who is most vitally interested in the military strength and security of this country, I have undertaken to analyze this argument with great care and in considerable detail. As a consequence, I have come to the firm conclusion that not only would the St. Lawrence seaway project not constitute an asset of national security, but on the contrary it might well prove a most serious liability. Let me undertake to review my reasons for reaching both these conclusions.

One of the most serious limitations on this project as a means of securing the national defense lies in what is generally referred to as the seasonal factor. By this is meant that the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes channels are closed by ice an average of approximately 4½ months during the year. Sometimes the period of closure is 4 months and in other years it goes as long as 5 months. Five months is the period accepted on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin. From the early part of December until the latter part of April ice puts a complete end to navigation through these waters. It is impossible to move a vessel of any kind, except an ice boat, across the channel. I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the Library of Congress and showing for each year from 1920 to 1947 the dates marking the last departure for sea from Montreal and the first arrival from sea at Montreal, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Duration of season of open navigation on St. Lawrence River

	Channel open [1] Quebec to Montreal	First arrival from sea at Montreal	Last departure for sea from Montreal
1920 [2]	Apr. 18	Apr. 25	Dec. 7
1921	Mar. 29	Apr. 21	Dec. 8
1922	Apr. 13	Apr. 24	Dec. 2
1923	Apr. 29	May 3	Do.
1924	Apr. 17	Apr. 24	Dec. 3
1925	Apr. 10	Apr. 22	Dec. 9
1926	May 1	May 3	Dec. 6
1927	Apr. 11	Apr. 12	Do.
1928	Apr. 26	Apr. 26	Dec. 9
1929	Apr. 10	Apr. 20	Dec. 7
1930	Apr. 12	Apr. 21	Dec. 12
1931 [3]	Mar. 19	Apr. 15	Dec. 11
1932	Mar. 27	Apr. 14	Dec. 8
1933	Mar. 23	do	Dec. 6
1934	Mar. 28	Apr. 26	Dec. 8
1935	Mar. 30	Apr. 15	Dec. 9
1936	Mar. 28	Apr. 13	Dec. 11
1937	Apr. 9	Apr. 19	Dec. 8
1938	Apr. 12	Apr. 18	Dec. 4
1939	Apr. 29	Apr. 29	Dec. 12
1940	Apr. 23	Apr. 24	Dec. 5
1941	Apr. 14	Apr. 19	Dec. 17
1942	Apr. 17	May 2	Dec. 16
1943 [4]	Apr. 29	May 24	Dec. 13
1944	Apr. 20	Apr. 21	Dec. 9
1945	Mar. 25	Apr. 9	Dec. 3
1946	Apr. 10	Apr. 12	Do.

[1] Channel open means it can be navigated although there may be floating ice still in river.
[2] Canada Year Book 1942 (1920-30), p. 615.
[3] Shipping Register and Shipbuilder. Montreal, v. 29, July 1946, p. 31.
[4] Canada Year Book 1946 (1942-5).

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is for this reason that quite a large number of people have somewhat facetiously, but certainly quite accurately, described the project as the St. Lawrence "iceway."

Whenever one hears people undertake a favorable comparison between the St. Lawrence seaway and such great canals as the Panama or the Suez, he should bear this one fact in mind: Neither the Panama nor the Suez Canal is ever rendered impassable because of ice. I cannot for the life of me understand how the proponents of this seaway, or "iceway," can seriously contend that it would constitute a national defense asset, in the light of the uncontroverted and plain fact that it is completely unusable for approximately 40 percent of the year.

This seasonal factor raises many important considerations. In the first place, it must be remembered that the cargoes which are now being carried over the present Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system are of a nature which permits seasonal stock piling. In other words, those who use the present system so organize and schedule their activities as to permit them to move an entire year's supply during the open or navigating season. These cargoes amount to an average of about 9,000,000 tons annually. Now take a look at page 20 of the majority report, and in the middle of the page note the proposed traffic of 52,000,000 tons. I am coming

back to this figure later in another connection, but I point it out here in order to raise what, to me, is a somewhat perplexing question, namely, how are these additional 43,000,000 tons which the majority have produced out of a crystal ball to be attuned to the present carefully worked-out system? These 43,000,000 new tons will be able to move only during some 7 months of the year. Are they all to be of a nature which permits stock piling in order that 1 year's supply can be moved during the short season? I do not know the answer, but I raise the question simply to emphasize one of the problems which the seasonal factor poses, and to which the supporters of the project give us no answer.

Another problem which suggests itself is this: When all these vast fleets of ships which are expected to sail up and down the seaway are either bottled up inside or kept outside because of frozen conditions, presumably cargoes will either be stock-piled, and, of course, not moved at all, or else they will have to move over other means of transportation, such as by railroad, truck, and aircraft. The terminal points will, of course, have to be our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports, as they are today. But I ask this question: Will these port facilities still exist if they are used only some 4 or 5 months of the year? How are we to maintain ports, or the personnel and all the organization that goes with them when they will be used during only a relatively short period of the year? To the extent that we come to place reliance on the seaway as a means of transportation, it is inevitable that other means of transportation will necessarily fall into neglect. If the predictions of the majority are true with respect to estimated tonnage, will our railroads, our trucking lines, our air lines, and our port authorities have any incentive to improve their facilities? Consequently, when winter drives the cargo from the "iceway," will they be equipped to handle the peak load? Again I do not know the answer to these questions, but they are perfectly reasonable and certainly typical of the kind of problem which the seasonal factor causes us to consider.

Or look at it from this point of view. One of the reasons advanced by the proponents to justify construction of the seaway is the opportunity which will be afforded for great new shipbuilding and ship-repairing yards within this supposedly secure Great Lakes area. It is fairly typical of the way many people have thought about this project that they completely ignore or purposely overlook the fact that these shipbuilding and ship-repairing facilities will be completely icebound for 4 or 5 months of the year. I utterly fail to see the value of a ship-repairing facility that can be reached only some 240 days out of the year at the most. I utterly fail to see the value of a shipbuilding facility wherein a ship which is constructed during the late fall would be incapable of moving out to the ocean before springtime. It is difficult for me to greet with enthusiasm a project where a slight miscalculation in the coming of the late autumn freeze could bottle up new shipping and ship-repair facilities for a period of 4 to 5 months.

Indeed, it would be most injudicious on our part if we were to place reliance on this area for any major portion of a shipbuilding or ship-repair program in time of war. Keep in mind, if you will, Mr. President, the constant Russian search for ice-free ports, and balance that fact against the alleged wisdom of this iceway. The answer to me is appallingly obvious and I cannot understand how it could be otherwise. I mentioned this seasonal factor at the outset because it constantly enters into any discussion of any phase or aspect of the St. Lawrence project. Every argument which proponents of the seaway bring up must be tempered in the light of this all-important factor of the short season.

When the seaway was first proposed many years ago, it was universally and, at that time, correctly believed that it would traverse a relatively secure area from the point of view of hostile attack. Even during the early days of World War II, this belief could be maintained with considerable justification. Thus, when the late President Roosevelt recommended to the Congress in 1941 the authorization of the St. Lawrence project on national security grounds, it is only fair to say that he had no way of knowing—and certainly very few but the most advanced researchers had any way of knowing—that in 1948 the northern one-third of this country could no longer regard itself as being invulnerable to hostile attack. The tremendous development in the speed and the range and the carrying capacity of modern bombers has changed the picture completely. There have been so many expert pronouncements regarding the possibility that any foreseeable future attack against the United States would come by air, using the polar route, that the point scarcely seems to need much elaboration. The most recent authoritative finding on this point is brought out in the report of the President's Air Policy Commission. The conclusion is unmistakable, and most unhappily so, that the Great Lakes region lies in the most vulnerable area of the United States. When we bear in mind that one of the many arguments advanced for the St. Lawrence project is that it will encourage increased industrialization on the Great Lakes area, and if we set off against this argument the further theory that, in the light of atomic and other scientific developments, industrial mobilization planning is all toward dispersion, even to the point of placing the most important facilities underground, we cannot help but question most seriously the advisability of encouraging an expanded industrial plant in the vulnerable area which is now considered to offer priority targets for hostile air attack. It seems to me that on this score, the St. Lawrence project runs counter to the best interests of national security. If additional facilities which could be readily converted in time of war are to be built, it would seem far more in the interest of national security to disperse future industries toward less vulnerable areas, rather than to impose on the already advanced and congested industrial areas in and around the Great Lakes.

The St. Lawrence seaway would require military manpower and matériel for its defense, thus aggravating what is already one of our primary national security problems. This is what Secretary of the Army Royall told the committee this year:

> The committee will note that the views I express are somewhat less positive than those previously expressed by the War Department.

Note that, Mr. President.

> It would mean an added defense commitment which would require more men and equipment and money than would be necessary if the seaway were not constructed.

I told the subcommittee and I repeat the statement here with all the emphasis at my command, that we cannot assess the value of any kind of a defense project unless we have the manpower to implement it from a military standpoint. Those who saw so many of the defensive works which were hopefully erected in the last World War—and I saw them in Sicily and in parts of the Italian coast and southern France, and there were many others in Normandy and elsewhere—who saw that they were empty and in many cases useless because there were no defending forces in them, certainly will testify to the truth of my statement regarding the lack of value of defense projects without the necessary manpower. Our military forces are already spread so thinly as to cause deep alarm, and our voluntary recruiting system is not producing anywhere near the number of enlistments required to maintain our armed forces at even a minimum peak of efficiency. It is no exaggeration to say that we are from 60 percent to 70 percent short of combat troops at this moment. We already have commitments all over the world which we are inadequately prepared to meet from a military manpower point of view. The ever-increasing seriousness of the world situation suggests that at least a few more commitments may become necessary. We simply cannot be strong everywhere at one and the same time. No country can be. We have to concentrate our military strength at the points where it will do the greatest good. This, I submit, is a most important consideration to bear in mind when evaluating the St. Lawrence project from the national-defense point of view. The question must be asked: Is it wise to increase our burden with one more commitment which requires the expenditure of men as well as money? Is it wise to do this when we do not have the men with which to meet this commitment? No one knows the number of troops which it would take to defend the St. Lawrence seaway. No one knows the extent of the defensive installations which would have to be installed along the more than 2,000 miles of its length. These are some more unanswered questions, and certainly they are questions of primary and fundamental importance. I should like to know the answers. How many men will it take to defend the seaway, and where shall we get them? Or shall we simply not defend it at all? The voluntary recruiting system has broken down and is not producing a sufficient number of men. If the seaway is constructed, will recourse

be had to a selective-service system or some similar system? Certainly if we are to build this great project as a national defense installation, we should have clearly in mind how we shall get the men needed in order to make it defensible and usable.

The subcommittee was presented with emphatic and categorical evidence—and I may add that it is authoritative evidence—to the effect that the seaway could not be defended at all.

One witness was Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley, of the Air Force, whose record during World War II as organizer of air defense was of a highly superior quality. He stated, and I quote directly from his testimony on page 224 of the 1947 hearings:

> That part of the St. Lawrence waterway now in operation, notably the Sault Ste. Marie and the Welland Canal, is not defensible against determined air attack. Its defense would not be strengthened by the proposed additions.

Later on in his testimony, General Bradley said:

> The real question is: Can the project, with its 50 locks, more or less, and its proposed dams and powerhouses be defended against enemy air attack? I answer categorically, "No."

General Bradley reminded the subcommittee—and remember that his evidence was of a first-hand nature—of our successful attacks during World War II against German dams, canals, and similar installations. He reminded the subcommittee of the tremendous and crushingly decisive damage resulting from these attacks. He warned that we could not expect an enemy any the less determined. His emphatic conclusion, and this conclusion was shared by several other military experts appearing before the subcommittee this year, that the project could not be defended, is an argument which, standing alone, seems to me almost entirely decisive of the entire matter. These are the conclusions, not of an alarmist, but of a man of proven experience and authority.

I am utterly at a loss to understand the casual way in which the proponents brush off this question in their majority report. In it they say, on page 10:

> The locks and powerhouse of the St. Lawrence project are no more vulnerable than many important installations in the northern third of the North American Continent, such as Grand Coulee, the Mesabi iron range, the Soo locks.

They also mention various large cities. It seems almost too obvious to point out the utterly different problems involved in the defense of single installations, as against those involved in the defense of a project of the tremendous length of the St. Lawrence. Yet the majority claim that it can be defended. I would be very much interested in seeing a plan, even a tentative one, for the defense of the seaway. I feel sure that there are many other Senators who would be interested in seeing such a plan. But the majority of the committee are silent as to details. They airily dismiss the problem with the simple statement:

> The strategic problem of defending it against air attack does not seem to create additional commitments substantially different or greater than the armed forces now confront in the defense of the centers above named.

But, Mr. President, of course that is the merest assumption. We have seen how this "iceway" lies in the most vulnerable part of the United States, and how in the words of the Secretary of the Army it would mean an added defense commitment which would require more men and equipment, which are not available, and which, even if available, most probably would not be successful in resisting attack. This brings me to a consideration of the effect which hostile attack would have on the usefulness of the seaway as a national-defense asset.

At this point I believe it is very apt to refer to a report which was prepared by the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone, and was concurred in by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and was submitted to the Congress on December 1, 1947, with the approval of the President. This report calls for some $2,500,000,000 for the construction of what the report describes as a safe, sea-level canal in lieu of the present lock-structured Panama Canal. The report stated that a lock-structured canal could be put out of operation for years or perhaps permanently by a single atom bomb hit, and that only a sea-level canal would be bombproof. Gatun Lake, the report said, could be breached with ordinary bombs and closed for at least a year. This report I believe to be of most tremendous significance, and pertinent indeed to the issue now before us. It is now manifestly the considered opinion of the President, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and of the man who is charged with the on-the-spot responsibility for the air defense of the Panama Canal, that a canal constructed and linked by means of locks cannot be defended against air attack. I point this out, Mr. President, that whatever may have been the earlier view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to the value of the lock canal as a national defense asset, this recent recommendation clearly supersedes it.

The same proposition was emphasized again only last Wednesday by Col. James H. Stratton, supervising engineer of the Panama Canal, in an address delivered before the American Society of Civil Engineers in New York. He pointed out, significantly, that at a cost of $2,307,000,000 a lock canal designed for maximum security could be constructed, but, Colonel Stratton emphasized, it would still be deficient in resistance to modern weapons. He also described how a sea-level canal would not require assistance from the shore to operate in an emergency, and if radioactivity made the area uninhabitable it might still be possible for ships to make their way through.

Of course, it is utterly out of the question to convert the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway project into a sea-level canal. Circumstances of geography and geology make it impossible. Yet we are now being asked to authorize the construction of a canal precisely similar to the type which is officially declared to be an easy and dangerous target for air attack, whether atomic or otherwise. I do not know what the outcome of the Panama Canal proposal will be. But I do submit in all seriousness that the Senate is being simultaneously asked to take action in two entirely inconsistent directions. In one breath we are being asked to abandon the lock canal in favor of a sea-level canal and in the other breath we are asked to appropriate vast sums to construct a lock canal. Both cannot be right. The choice seems obvious.

Explicit in the Panama Canal report of last December is the tremendous damage which would come in the wake of the crippling of a single vital link in the chain. Precision bombing is not the exclusive property of this country. One well-aimed bomb could very easily put the proposed St. Lawrence project out of commission for at least a year, perhaps 2 years, or perhaps indefinitely. Then what would happen to all these millions and millions of tons of cargo that are going to move over the seaway? What is going to happen to the railroads and the trucks and the airlines and the port facilities that we have neglected because of our reliance on this seaway? What is going to happen to all the great ships being built or repaired in the Great Lakes area? Can we in good sense and in good conscience put our sanction and our faith in a project which could bring such disastrous results? The dropping of a single well-aimed bomb or the dive of one fanatic suicide plane is not a very big price for an ambitious enemy to pay for so juicy a reward as this.

But it would not necessarily take an attack from the air to put a lock out of commission. An ingenious enemy would experience very little difficulty in working an effective act of sabotage on one of these vital installations with the same disastrous results. Or it could happen by accident. These are no fantasies—these are probable and foreseeable actualities in the tragic event of another war. But the proponents of the seaway still vision these great fleets of ships sailing up and down the seaway, and they show little concern for the realities of the situation.

On page 10 of the majority report, there is quoted a statement by Secretary of the Army Royall to the effect that the St. Lawrence waterway, because of an added advantage of some 1,200 miles less ocean distance, would minimize to some extent the risk and danger of submarine and other attack.

Mild as this language is as a justification for the seaway, it is still an exaggeration. Admiral Willson told the subcommittee that only about one-eighth of the Montreal route can be considered safe from submarines. He pointed out how submarines operated very successfully throughout the entire war in the Gulf of St. Lawrence as far west as the Gaspee Peninsula just below Quebec. While there was not much traffic out of the St. Lawrence, relatively speaking, during the war, Admiral Willson pointed out that there were six ships sunk in this area by submarines and, he added significantly, there were no submarines sunk at all. The reason he gave is that the conditions in this area are very favorable for submarines. Admiral Willson went

on to point out that even an advantage of a one-eighth safety factor was merely theoretical. He said:

> I have recently talked with the officer who ran the operating end of the antisubmarine warfare for Admiral King. There is no higher authority on the subject. It was his opinion, and I fully concur, that due to technical considerations, namely facilities for diversion, weather for air coverage and underwater sound conditions, the routes from New York or Boston to Europe are as safe or safer than the route from Montreal.

In this connection it must be borne in mind that the prevailing theory of defense in naval operations is towards dispersion. Tests Able and Baker at Bikini give this theory validity. When we hear people talking about how the St. Lawrence would provide a safe route to Europe during wartime, remember that it is not possible for a ship to adopt zigzag tactics in a narrow channel. It is impossible to disperse in a narrow channel. A ship caught in any part of the channel is as long from a target standpoint as the channel is wide. One is reminded of the old saying about shooting ducks in a bathtub. No better description could be found to describe the situation in the St. Lawrence insofar as naval defense is concerned.

But the supposed element of safety is illusory not only from the point of view of what the enemy might do but also from the known fact that these waters are notoriously dangerous and treacherous to navigate even under peacetime conditions. One witness, an experienced seaman on the Great Lakes for many, many years, described the seaway's course as being "tortuous, fog-ridden, and hazardous." The area is subject to constant fogs, which increase the dangers of navigation. I am informed that one must indeed be an experienced and ingenious skipper in order successfully to bring his ship through these waters. And I am talking about peacetime conditions. Wartime navigation would, of course, be that much more difficult. You would necessarily have less experienced men in command of ships. Certainly, as an elementary precaution, you would have to navigate under black-out conditions. And remember that even in peacetime the density of ships per square mile upon the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence route is probably greater than on any comparable body of water in the world. During a season a ship passes the city of Detroit every 19 minutes. As one witness pointed out to the subcommittee:

> To permit foreign ocean ships or others to be navigated on the Lakes by persons unfamiliar with the rules for the prevention of collisions and the practices of ship navigation on these waters would jeopardize still further the safe navigation of all ships. Under any circumstances, navigation is difficult and often unsafe.

When the Secretary of the Army testified that this route would minimize to some extent the risk and danger of submarine and other attack, I say with all due respect that I do not think that he could have taken into consideration the factors which I have briefly discussed. Talk to anybody who is familiar with navigation on these waters and he will agree that they are very tricky and often dangerous even under ideal conditions.

The Secretary of the Army's statement, that the seaway would furnish a route which he believed to be somewhat shorter from certain Lake ports to England is adduced by the proponents as a further justification for the seaway from a national defense point of view. This somewhat guarded statement is also a slight exaggeration. It is true that statisticwise there is a slight distance advantage in favor of the St. Lawrence route to Great Britain and to certain north European ports, but it must also be remembered that the mileage advantage is to these points only and that there is no time saving at all to be expected from any Midwest Lake ports to Europe. Under war conditions, of course, the important factor is time and not distance. Let me give a brief example. At the present time, if a shipment is going, let us say, from Chicago to Liverpool by the customary rail and water route, third morning delivery is customary on shipments from Chicago to the Port of New York, for example. Transit time from New York to Liverpool is only slightly greater than from Montreal on ships of comparable speed. It might be added parenthetically that in view of the natural handicaps of the proposed route between Chicago and Montreal via the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence it seems most unlikely that vessels from Chicago would equal the speed of ships from New York. But assume that equally fast ships are operating over these two routes. If you have at Chicago two loads for Liverpool, and if you send one by railroad to New York and the other by ship down the St. Lawrence, the load sent by rail via New York would reach Liverpool first, about 3 days ahead of the load that was shipped via the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence waterway to Liverpool.

I cite this example, because when talking about defense and security one must bear in mind that longer journeys in wartime mean longer exposure to the risks of aircraft attack and submarine attack. Time from a safety viewpoint is always of the essence. Add to that the necessity for getting shipments to their destination in the least time practicable and it becomes apparent that the supposed distance advantage of the St. Lawrence seaway means nothing at all. And remember that the brief example which I just gave assumes ideal conditions. It is far more likely that it would take at least a week and perhaps longer for a shipment to travel from Chicago to Liverpool via the St. Lawrence and Montreal than it would between Chicago, New York, and Liverpool. And let us not forget the ever-present factor of the short season. Even assuming the St. Lawrence route were safer—and of course it is not—it would be a safe route only some 60 percent of the year, because it is utterly unusable for the remaining 40 percent. But the proponents do not like to be reminded of that.

Let me discuss briefly another statement of the Secretary of the Army which is one of the cornerstones of the argument advanced by the proponents to justify the seaway from the national defense point of view. The Secretary said:

> This new route to Europe would serve both as an alternate and as a reserve route in the event of war.

This statement is, of course, subject to the limitations already discussed, the limitations of the short season, vulnerability to air attack, the problem of defense, the problems of dangerous navigation and easy prey to submarine and other attack, and the problem of longer exposure to danger. But it is also subject to another very real criticism.

It will be remembered that the proposed St. Lawrence seaway channel will be 27 feet in depth. This provision is found in the annex of the 1941 so-called agreement between the United States and Canada, where it is stated that "all navigation channels to be excavated to 27-foot depth."

If this 27-foot channel is to be effective as a reserve or alternate route in time of war, as the proponents maintain, it must be manifest that fully-loaded cargo ships will be physically able to navigate this channel. This would seem a basic factor. Let us look at this. Here are some figures now that are utterly binding, on this matter of whether the engineering features of this proposition are sound. Let us look at the facts. The Port Warden Regulations in Montreal for oceangoing ships require a draft clearance of 2½ feet for ships of 8,500 tons deadweight, that is, underneath the bottom; they require 3 feet for ships of 10,500 tons deadweight; they require 3½ feet for 12,000 tons deadweight.

Our ships operating in the overseas trades have a total dead-weight capacity as follows, and these include cargo, bunkers, stores, and so forth, and these figures apply to fully loaded draft in salt water:

A Liberty ship's dead-weight capacity is 10,590 tons. Thus loaded, a Liberty draws 27 feet 9¼ inches. That is already 9¼ too much.

A Victory ship's dead-weight capacity is slightly more than a Liberty's—10,681 tons—and it draws 28 feet 3¾ inches.

A C–2 type ship has a 10,560-ton capacity and draws 27 feet 8 inches.

A C–3 type ship has a dead-weight capacity of 12,041 tons and draws 27 feet and 1 inch.

T–2 and T–3 tankers, which are even larger ships than the C–3's, draw 30 feet. Those are the big Standard Oil tankers.

No prudent ship operator would load ships such as these deeper than 24 feet, as there must be at least a 3-foot clearance under the keel for these sized ships; moreover, allowance for squat and variation of fresh water would amount to nearly one additional foot. "Squat" is the possibility of a ship going down a little lower. They always go down lower when they are running.

A 24-foot loaded draft would be the deepest within a reasonable degree of safety. Obviously to load a Liberty, Victory, C–2, and C–3 to only 24 feet would be economically unsound, although it does not seem to be admitted here by everybody.

From the foregoing—and I hope Senators will look it over at their leisure—it can be readily seen that nearly all ships under United States registry, engaged in the overseas trade, and such ships fully loaded, drawing on the average 28 feet, must necessarily be excluded, on account of draft limitation, from navigation over the proposed St. Lawrence seaway. The figure is about 90 percent. While there may be a few American flagships under 24-foot draft, these vessels are too small, particularly on account of the excessively higher costs of operation, profitably to engage in overseas trades.

In the light of these very specific limitations, it is awfully hard for me to understand how it is possible to go on talking realistically about this project as an effective alternate or reserve route in time of war. Even if we exclude all the other limitations, it might be an alternate or reserve route for a few small ships, but it certainly would not be effective for ships built to our present specifications.

Many of the proponents of the seaway have recognized that a 27-foot seaway would not be an economically feasible waterway. But, fearful of what the cost might be if estimated at a greater depth initially, their strategy apparently is to try to obtain approval for construction of the project at a 27-foot depth, and then wait until after the completion of this depth before seeking to have it deepened and enlarged. There is, of course, no question but that construction of the seaway in piecemeal fashion to a depth, say, of 35 feet would be far more expensive than its initial construction to that depth. I think it is only fair and honest that before we have a vote on this project, qualified proponents should be required to put themselves squarely on record as to the adequacy of the proposed waterway for ships of American registry. Until we have those facts, let us not talk of this seaway as an alternate or reserve route in time of war, or, for that matter, as economically feasible in time of peace.

I have already alluded briefly to the argument which is advanced by the proponents of the seaway that it would constitute a valuable national-defense asset because it would provide for the construction and repair of oceangoing vessels in the relatively secure area, as the proponents describe it, of the Great Lakes. This point merits some further attention.

Of course the reference to the relatively secure area is wholly unsound, and I will not comment further on this extraordinary statement.

I do not want to be understood as minimizing in any way the very notable role which the Great Lakes shipbuilding yards played in the ultimate victory in the last war, but I cannot see anything in the foreseeable nature of future war which requires us to build this seaway in order to provide a different role for the Great Lakes shipbuilding area. The yards there built some 500 small war vessels, up to and including destroyer escorts and submarines. The record of the last war indicates that our 12,000 miles of tidewater are perfectly adequate to meet all our shipbuilding needs for deep-draft vessels, and, significantly, they offer far greater safety, because of the possibility of dispersion, from any polar attack. The small-vessel construction program which was so notably accomplished in the Great Lakes area, and for which I want to express my appreciation, represented only 12½ percent of the number of these small types of vessels constructed during the war.

I ask this question: What justification is there for seeking to change the type of shipbuilding construction now available in the Great Lakes area? It cannot be justified on the grounds that it would tend to decentralize the industrial and shipbuilding arrangements of our other coasts. Certainly, as I said earlier, the Great Lakes area is as much in need of decentralization in this atomic age as is any other region. To build this seaway just so that we can have different facilities in the Great Lakes area would have exactly the opposite effect. So that cannot be the reason.

Another consideration must be borne in mind. If the seaway is constructed so that we can have new shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities in the Great Lakes area, obviously these facilities will have to be built in peacetime if they are to be useful in the swift war of the future. That means that we will have to draw from our tidewater facilities a nucleus of trained personnel. Now, Senators are all probably familiar with the present critical situation which exists in our existing yards because of the lack of experienced men and because of the tremendous decrease in the construction and repair work which these yards need so badly in order to retain their trained and skilled workers. It is obvious, consequently, that if we are going to expand the Great Lakes shipbuilding industry we can do so only by taking men from our existing shipyards. I ask this question, therefore: What justification is there for this diversion of men? It would seem to me to be far more in the interest of national defense to maintain those plants we now have at their highest possible degree of efficiency in order that they may be prepared to meet any future emergency. I have heard no convincing argument which would justify us to embark on an experimental program of this type which at best would be drastically limited by natural and tactical handicaps—I refer, of course, to the ever-present seasonal factor and to the vulnerability of the area.

I come now to an argument which the proponents advance and an argument which is very difficult to deal with because it is so nebulous and general in nature. Senators will find it set forth as point No. 4 on page 11 of the majority report. Let me quote it briefly. This is a point to which a great deal of thought could well be given:

> The subcommittee believes that it is important to recognize that the economic health of the middle western region is a vital component of national defense. Were this region to be economically depressed, as might well occur in view of the potential depletion of iron-ore resources, there would result what would amount to a blighted area of the United States which, in turn, could only serve to weaken the productive potential of the Nation and to aggravate problems of national security.

Mr. President, I certainly agree that the economic health of the Middle West is a vital component of national defense. It is a vital component of national well-being. But it is the subsequent part of the paragraph I wish to analyze.

I am not altogether positive but I think I know what the proponents are driving at here. I think that they are trying to advance their cause by contending that there is immediate need of a deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the iron-ore deposits of Labrador because a supposed complete exhaustion of the Mesabi Range ore is imminent. In this connection, just a little over a month ago, Mr. Wilfred Sykes, president of the Inland Steel Co., made an address in New York City entitled, "The Steel Industry Outlook." I am going to quote a few passages from Mr. Sykes' address because I think that they are very pertinent here.

In that part of his remarks which were addressed to the subject, Future Demand for Steel, Mr. Sykes declared:

> Now what of the future? Prof. Martin Barloon, in an article in Harper's magazine of August 1947 talks about Steel, the Great Retreat. His theme is that the ore bodies—for instance, we have been drawing most of our ore supply in the Mesabi Range—are being depleted to such an extent that future additions or future steel production will have to be on the Atlantic seaboard, and ore will be brought in by boat from foreign lands, such as Labrador, Venezuela, Chile, Brazil, and Sweden.
>
> The only trouble about Mr. Barloon's prediction is that it is not based on fact or knowledge of the facts. At the present time, in spite of the stories you hear, we have in sight or pretty close to sight—in fact, we are pretty sure of some of the things but we don't want always to find our ore—according to competent geologists, about 1,300,000,000 tons of high-grade easily mined ores, and that is not the total by a long way.
>
> Under the present taxation laws, if you find a body of ore you immediately have to pay taxes on it, so we are not so very anxious to go out and drill a hole in the ground and find a nice new mine unless we have need for a mine. If we do so, we may be paying taxes for the next 25 or 30 years before we get down to using it. There are large areas which have not been explored, and in which we are pretty certain there are large bodies of ore, but we don't want to find them under present tax conditions.
>
> I think we have in sight enough ore to last us say for 30 or 40 years; that is, the ordinary, high-grade, easily mined ores. But that is not the end of the steel business by a long way on the Mesabi Range. There are large quantities of magnetic taconites—that is a technical name; it is simply a magnetic iron mixed with silica which has to be concentrated. We have to remove the silica or a large part of it, so as to have material fit to be put into a blast furnace or for any other purpose.
>
> We know the way to do that. In the last few years there has been a great deal of investigation carried on, and we know how to concentrate these ores; but, of course, it will cost more to take these ores, crush them, concentrate them, and then put them together again into lumps that you can use, than it will be to dig ore out of an underground mine or out of an open pit. But the

amount of additional cost is not so much that it would seriously increase the price of steel. I don't think it would be very significant.

Now that kind of material, known, in sight, represents five to ten billion tons of high-grade concentrates, which, depending on what you assume the consumption to be, is good for another 75 to 150 years after the easily mined ores are exhausted.

But that is not all. There is another iron-bearing material which is not magnetic that we think we know how to concentrate today. We could make the iron magnetic so that it could be concentrated by the same methods as the ore previously referred to. And of that material there is in sight from 30 to 40 billion tons of concentrate—enough to last us, oh, for 400 or 500 years, or something like that; and beyond that I don't think we will be worrying about it. But you will see that there is no danger of any exhaustion of the ores or materials that can be used for ores in the Mesabi Range.

I will say again that this is a statement by Mr. Wilfred Sykes, of the Inland Steel Co., a man who certainly speaks with authority on the subject.

This quotation is not merely an isolated opinion. It has been corroborated by many other recognized leaders in the steel and iron-ore industry. Let me, for example, refer Senators to page 188 of the 1947 hearings, where they will find a similar statement by Mr. Alexander C. Brown, president of the Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, which is the third largest shipper and the largest independent merchant shipper of iron ore from the Lake Superior district. Let me also refer Senators to page 191 of the 1947 hearings, where the statement of Mr. R. C. Allen appears. Mr. Allen is president of the Reserve Mining Co. The most recent detailed discussion of this problem which I have seen is in an article entitled "Drama on the Iron Range," appearing in the January 1948 issue of the United States Steel Corp. News. It is too long for inclusion here, but I commend it to Senators' attention.

Of significance in this connection is a news story which was carried in the January 5, 1948, New York Herald Tribune. This brief article tells of the activities and potentialities of Ontario ore mines. Since I believe that it is worthy of attention, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRON-ORE OUTPUT UP, NATION NOW MAJOR SUPPLIER—STEEP ROCK, STILL IN ITS THIRD YEAR, IS SECOND LARGEST PRODUCER ON CONTINENT

North of the Great Lakes lies treasure that is bringing Canada rapidly to the fore as a world source of iron ore.

Ontario's Steep Rock mine, now in its third year of production, was among the biggest iron-ore producers on the North American Continent last year. And on the Quebec-Labrador border new mines are under way in an area believed to contain one of the greatest iron-ore deposits in existence.

Canada produced 1,581,000 tons of iron ore in 1946, a jump of 445,000 tons over 1945. Steep Rock alone produced more than 1,200,000 tons in 1947, making it the second largest single iron mine on this continent.

It was only 4 years ago that the Steep Rock company began the huge task of diverting the Seine River from Steep Rock Lake, pumping out water and removing the waste material that covered its B ore body.

Besides the 1,200,000 tons produced annually from the B body, open-pit mining will be developed on the A ore body, which is expected to step up total output to the 3,000,000-ton mark annually within a short time.

Steep Rock's high-quality ore stands it in good stead at a time when the grade of ore produced from the older ranges in the Lake Superior district is progressively deteriorating.

It is estimated that Steep Rock has 60,000,000 tons of open-pit ore or a 20 years' supply available at the production rate of 3,000,000 tons a year. Then, too, Algoma Steel Co. is said to have reserves of 100,000,000 tons in its Helen deposit, while a large section of the Algoma deposits have not been explored.

The Wabana mines on Bell Island, Newfoundland, are the chief source of iron ore for the Sydney plant of Dominion Steel & Coal Corp., with annual capacity totaling 1,600,000 tons of ore containing 52 percent iron.

Little is known as yet of the C ore body at Steep Rock. No reserves have been calculated, but geological evidence suggests the presence of a considerable amount of ore. In addition, the reserves of 30,000,000 tons for the A and B bodies are calculated on a depth of only 160 feet in A and 400 feet in B. Yet, drilling has proved the ore to extend to 1,600 feet in depth.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, when reading this article, bear in mind that Ontario's Steep Rock mine is on the main line of the Canadian-National Railroad, and is as near Port Arthur as is the Mesabi Range to Duluth. Also bear in mind that Port Arthur is considerably nearer to the Lake Michigan and Lake Erie smelters than even Duluth.

To return for a moment to the matter of Labrador ores, I believe that before we build the St. Lawrence seaway for the purpose of importing these ores it might be well to look into the question quite carefully. I say this particularly with reference to a statement which appears on page 14 of the Commerce Department pamphlet entitled "An Economic Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project."

In this report, after writing off most of the European ores and damning the Newfoundland ores with faint praise, and passing up the Cuban, Venezuelan, and Chilean ores, and having made a case against our own taconites, and having overlooked the newly expanding Ontario sources just mentioned, the concession is made that "incomplete data are available on the recently discovered Labrador deposits."

Then, in language which could emanate only from a Government bureau, the conclusion is drawn:

All indications point to the existence of vast reserves of ore possibly comparable in quantity and grade to those of the Mesabi Range.

"Possibly comparable"—note those two words.

I think we should know, before authorizing construction of this "Iceway" in order to import ore from Labrador for which only "incomplete data are available," something just a little bit more definite than the opinion that "all indications point to vast reserves of ore possibly comparable in quantity and grade" to those sources now available to us. There may or may not be these vast reserves. They may or may not compare favorably in amount and quality to our own ores. But a conclusion based on "incomplete data" does not seem particularly convincing to me.

Before leaving this particular phase of the national-defense aspect of the seaway, one further basic consideration merits careful consideration.

Viewing the situation purely from a national security point of view, it seems obviously far more preferable that we continue to rely upon readily available domestic and Canadian sources of iron ore and concentrates for our steel industry.

For, if we rely upon foreign imports of iron ore, we will be placing ourselves in precisely the same position as we found ourselves during World War II with respect to rubber, for example. If we build the seaway for the purpose of facilitating the import of foreign ores, we discourage further exploitation of our own potentialities. If we bring in foreign and cheap ores to compete with our American market, not only are we in effect subsidizing disastrous competition, but we take a step which seems to me definitely not in the best interests of national defense. On the contrary, we should give every possible encouragement to the further development of our own possibilities and to the development of new processes for extracting high-grade iron ore. To my way of thinking the argument advanced here by the proponents is not progress. This is going backward.

Another illusory argument which is advanced by the proponents of the seaway in the name of national defense and security deals with the question of the relationship between this project and our railroads. The contention is made that national defense would be aided because the seaway would ease the strain on our railroads in time of war. The Secretary of the Army stated:

Rail transportation would be less concerned in a future emergency if water transportation were available for the entire haul from the Great Lakes region to trans-Atlantic destinations.

I think this argument can be dealt with quite briefly. Senator, you will recall that the general consensus, based on the only authoritative study ever made of anticipated new tonnage over the proposed seaway, calculates that we may expect to have a combined American-Canadian increment of some 16,000,000 tons of freight annually over the seaway. Remember, this includes traffic both ways.

During the war, that is, the years 1941–44, our railroads originated an annual average of 1,405,000,000 tons. It takes only a very rapid calculation to compute the percentage by which anticipated new tonnage over the seaway would ease the burden on railroads during wartime. Just divide 16,000,000 into 1,405,000,000 and it will be seen that the amount of easement is about 1 percent. That is taking a favorable view of the subject. Taking into consideration the fact that wartime freight is essentially one way, it

is probably more accurate to take the figure of 8,000,000 tons rather than 16,000,000 tons for this calculation. If we do that, we find that the amount of easement on the railroads is less than 1 percent—about six-tenths of 1 percent. Even if we take the fantastic figure of 52,000,000 annual tonnage which the proponents of the seaway have gleaned from their crystal ball, we find that the amount of easement is only 4 percent.

I leave with Senators the question whether construction of the seaway can be justified on this particular ground.

I do not deny, of course, that our railroads do carry a tremendous burden during wartime.

Remember that during the war the most dire shortage of transportation was in the movement overseas of goods from our ports. This fact makes it seem highly unlikely that vessels capable of employment in overseas traffic would be used to parallel land transportation for more than 1,000 miles. The probabilities are more likely that vessels normally in this trade during peacetime would be diverted to the movement of goods from our eastern ports and Gulf ports, throwing an increased burden on the railroads serving the Great Lakes area. It is a known fact that vessels in coastwise, intercoastal, and Great Lakes service were diverted from these services during and just before the war, leaving their previous traffic to be carried by the railroads.

I think that the solution to the burden which the railroads have to carry during wartime emergencies is a problem which is outside the scope of this discussion today. But I can state with conviction that in my opinion the solution does not lie in building the St. Lawrence seaway.

In concluding this discussion of the national defense aspect of the St. Lawrence seaway project, I can do no better than emphasize the attitude which the Department of the Army has taken with respect to its supposed value. The proponents quote the all-revealing statement which Secretary Royall made before the committee. In one brief sentence, the Secretary made it abundantly clear that the military attitude is one of damning with faint praise. Mr. Royall said:

> The Army's position and the War Department's position is that the St. Lawrence seaway is not vital to national defense but that the project would be helpful to the national defense.

Apparently the implications of this statement totally escape the majority. It should be realized that there are a great many things which would be useful and helpful to the national defense, but upon which we do not embark. It might very well be useful and helpful to construct an immense underground city in which we could put some of our strategic factories. I give that as one example but we do not do it.

We must always decide which of several projects is the most valuable. Is the St. Lawrence seaway more valuable or more helpful to the national defense than the construction of high-powered wind tunnels for the testing of missiles and projectiles? Is it more valuable than the expenditure of an equivalent amount of money for various types of scientific activities? Is it more valuable than making an appropriation for 70 air groups for our Air Force, something which the Senate refused to do last June? Is it more desirable than making an adequate stock piling of strategic raw materials which we must have to defend our country in the event of future war? Is it more valuable than making the Panama Canal a sea-level canal, so that it will be safe against bombardment? Is it more valuable than the recently proposed project to develop synthetic petroleum? We must measure it against those things. We cannot say that it has an absolute value for the national defense. All these things are relative, and we must measure one thing against another when we consider the national defense. I give these simply as examples of the fact that there are a great many things which, from a purely abstract point of view, would be very useful and very helpful if once they had been done, but we do not do them for the very simple reason that they are not quite helpful enough or not quite useful enough to justify the tremendous effort and the tremendous cost. In the case of the St. Lawrence seaway, as I have tried to point out, it is not simply a question of whether it is helpful or not or whether it is more helpful than some other project or not; we must take into consideration the very real dangers and risks involved in relying on such an undertaking.

To summarize what I have said, I have given 12 arguments so far as the national defense aspect of the St. Lawrence seaway is concerned.

First, the seasonal factor: No discussion of any aspect or phase of the St. Lawrence seaway is possible without taking into account the fact that the seaway or the "iceway" as it may more appropriately be called, is closed for approximately 40 percent of the year to traffic of any kind. This raises great problems, such as the adjustment of cargo schedules to the navigation season, the interrelationship between the seaway type of transportation and other existing land and air transportation and port facilities, the problem of scheduling projected shipbuilding and ship-repair activities with this short season, the problem of overhead and other personnel and many other allied questions.

Second, the vulnerability of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence area: The uncontradicted testimony is that this seaway would traverse the most vulnerable area, from a defense point of view, of the United States.

Third, the manpower problem: The seaway is an added defense commitment, in the words of the Secretary of the Army, of such magnitude that it would require an uncalculated amount of additional men and material for its defense. The present depleted condition of our armed forces makes it virtually impossible to assure that such men and material would be available.

Fourth, the actual defense of the seaway: It has been pointed out by several military experts in the field of air defense that the seaway simply could not be defended at all from a determined air attack.

Fifth, special vulnerability to bombing, sabotage, and accident: Almost every witness called attention to the ease with which a lock-structured canal of this type is open to air attack. It has recently come to be acknowledged that even the Panama Canal is, because of its structure, dangerously sensitive to this type of attack. An attractive and remunerative objective is set up for fifth-column activity, either by way of sabotage to the locks themselves or to ship-scuttling, or even accident. There was a great deal of evidence as to the disastrous effect which such action would bring in its wake.

Sixth, navigational and other hazards: Attention has been drawn to the fact that not only is the St. Lawrence a peculiarly hazardous route because of numerous locks, narrow, treacherous and dangerous channels, through islands and reefs of granite rock with currents and frequent fogs and mists, but is also an easy and remunerative target for attack by submarine or aircraft because of the very nature of the channel itself and the difficulty for taking proper evasive tactics.

Seventh, the distance and time factors: I have pointed out that while there is a slight distance advantage, this factor is of little consequence and that the important thing, from a national defense point of view, is that as much time as possible be saved in order to speed up shipments and in order to reduce the period of exposure to hostile attack. It has been conclusively shown that insofar as this vital time factor is concerned, the St. Lawrence seaway offers no advantage whatsoever; indeed it is at a disadvantage compared with existing routes.

Eighth, types of ships which could use the seaway: American shipping lines could not operate through the proposed seaway because of the limited draft. The 27-foot canals and channels mean that vessels can operate only with a draft of about 24 feet. Ninety percent of United States cargo vessels operate with a loaded draft substantially in excess of that, and most of the ships built under our wartime program for cargo carriers exceed this draft. This utterly eliminates the usefulness of the seaway as an alternate or reserve route in time of war. This unquestionably means that substantially all the traffic which might move via the proposed waterway would be in foreign bottoms. Recollection of the sad state in which we found our merchant marine at the outset of the war and of the most unhealthy consequences of such a condition ought to be sufficient to prevent our deliberately contributing to the reestablishment of that situation.

Ninth, shipbuilding and ship-repairing facilities: No convincing justification has been advanced for changing the pattern of our shipbuilding and ship-repair industry. It served us well in the last war, and there is nothing to indicate that the foreseeable war of the future demands any such drastic change as is contemplated here. Not only is there no justification, but the situation itself, because of the other factors involved, would make

such an undertaking very questionable indeed.

Tenth, the iron-ore situation: Testimony from experienced and expert witnesses indicate that the often-reported depletion of iron-ore reserves in the Lake Superior region is distorted. The development of the St. Lawrence seaway would be a very important step in the direction of making this country dependent upon importation from foreign countries for iron ore, one of our most vital raw materials. We still remember with regret our dependence at the beginning of World War II upon importations from foreign countries for rubber and certain other vital raw materials. Our policy in connection with a material as vital to our safety and economy as iron ore should be farsighted and not shortsighted. The farsighted policy in this case certainly calls for development of our own resources of iron ore, and the Federal Government should certainly refrain from placing obstacles in the way of pursuing such a course.

Eleventh, the amount of easement on railroads and port facilities: It has been clearly demonstrated, using even the most favorable and optimistic estimates of proposed new tonnage over the seaway, that the amount by which the seaway would ease the wartime strain on other means of transportation is wholly negligible and cannot be taken into account when dealing with this problem.

Twelfth, the Army's attitude: The Secretary of the Army has testified that the St. Lawrence seaway is not vital to our national defense. The best he could say for it was that it was helpful.

I submit that there are so many things which we have not done and which we should do for our national defense, things which are absolutely vital, that it shows a complete lack of sense of proportion to embark on this project when we have left unsolved the question of adequate American air power, when we have left unsolved the question of military manpower, when we have left unsolved the question of developing a military strategic plan for the defense of the United States, and when we have left in an unfinished condition the project of developing stock piles of strategic raw materials without which we cannot hope to fight a modern war.

I submit, in closing this phase of the discussion, that we would be doing the people of this country a very great disservice if we sought to justify construction of this seaway on the grounds of national defense. I have mentioned other pressing problems pertaining to our national security which demand priority and which have a real potential value as defense assets.

Mr. President, in the remarks which I have made, I have sought to demonstrate, first, that this matter should be before us as a treaty and not as an executive agreement. I have tried to convey to the Members of the Senate how dangerous it is to let the executive branch decide that a matter should be passed through the Senate by a majority vote rather than by a two-thirds vote simply because the executive branch happens to think that it is important. If this principle is carried to its logical conclusion, there may very well never be another treaty before the Senate.

Second, I tried to show that the self-liquidating feature depends on considerations which lead one to the conclusion that the tolls which are contemplated could not possibly pay for the project—although they would increase the shipping costs.

Third, I have sought to demonstrate that the contention which is made in behalf of the St. Lawrence seaway that it will be an addition to the national defense is untrue, and that the reverse might more nearly be the case.

Fourth, I have set forth the opinions of the best experts and engineers to show that the seaway is an impracticality from a realistic standpoint, in that the channel is too shallow for modern ships, that the seaway is frozen for such a large part of the year as to render it unusable, and that a host of the leading shipping men in America have stated over their signatures that they would not use it.

Fifth, this, of course, should disqualify the project even in the minds of those who favor an effective seaway which would actually work. Even the Senator from Wisconsin would certainly not be benefited by a seaway which could not be used by American shipping—and the people of the Middle West certainly would not.

Sixth, Mr. President, we confront enormous expenditures this year for the Government as a whole. We are being asked to appropriate $6,800,000,000 for the first 15 months of the Marshall plan. These huge expenditures are one factor which contributes to those forces of inflation which are threatening the very livelihood of the American people.

Is this the time to add to this burden, and to add to it in an unspecified amount? I say unspecified because no one knows and none of the proponents have asserted what the ultimate cost of this project may be, when we add to the cost of the seaway the cost of deepening the chief harbors of the Great Lakes. Certainly, a figure of $750,000,000 does not seem an extravagant one to claim for the net cost of the project.

These are the arguments which I present to the Senate. I said at the outset of my remarks that I would not present a single sectional consideration. I have not done so. The arguments which I submit must appear with equal force to every Senator, no matter what part of the country he represents. We can all appreciate the importance and value of canals and seaways in principle—I know that I do—and still realize that this project as it is presented to us today does not by any reasonable argument justify itself.

EXHIBIT A

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1947, in the Senate]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, when the proposed compact between the United States and the Dominion of Canada with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway was presented to the Senate, the bill undertaking to improve it and implement it, together with the compact—or treaty, as I prefer to call it—was referred to the Committee on Commerce. Since then another bill has been introduced and has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

When the St. Lawrence seaway treaty was before the Senate, together with the first bill, known as the Aiken bill, and was under the jurisdiction of the old Committee on Commerce, that committee was headed by the late Josiah W. Bailey, of North Carolina. Blessed be his memory. The late Senator Bailey was not only a great student, a man of profound knowledge and great ability but was very thorough in any undertaking to which he applied himself. He wanted all the information he could obtain with reference to the treaties which existed between Canada and the United States regarding boundary lines and boundary waters, and also all the information he could obtain with respect to the proposed compact. Therefore, among other things, he addressed a letter to each of the American-flag steamship lines operating from Atlantic and Gulf ports and on the Great Lakes asking the various steamship lines whether they expected to utilize the seaway if constructed, and to what extent, and requesting their views generally on the subject matter of the proposed treaty. He received replies from practically all the steamship companies to which he addressed letters. He addressed them to the American lines operating along the eastern seaboard and the Gulf coast and to quite a number of steamship companies operating on the Great Lakes.

He received 32 replies. He was anxious prior to his death that those replies be laid before the United States Senate. That task has been assigned to me. I regard it as a very solemn obligation. I am proposing now to discharge the duty which I owe to the late Senator Bailey.

I shall not at this time enter upon a discussion of the treaty. I merely wish to read these letters in order that they may appear in the body of the RECORD. I ask that I may proceed without interruption until the reading of the letters has been concluded.

The first letter which I shall read is from the Robin Line, Seas Shipping Co., Inc., 39 Cortlandt Street, New York 7, N. Y. It is dated April 12, 1946, addressed to Hon. Josiah W. Bailey, and reads as follows:

SEAS SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 12, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 12, 1946, in which you requested my views on the proposal to construct a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and install power production facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River. You asked whether we have any plans to navigate the St. Lawrence with our own ships.

At this time we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence with any of our vessels. The vessels which we own and will operate in commercial service are all large and could not safely navigate the proposed 27-foot channel when fully laden. This condition is true of a very great majority of commercial vessels under the American flag today.

The proposed seaway might be helpful to foreign shipowners who have vessels of medium size and with comparatively shallow draft. The majority of American shipowners seem to be opposed to the proposition since they anticipate that the seaway would be used by foreign-flag vessels with a consequent reduction in freight available to American-flag vessels using the major seaports of the United States.

It does not appear to me that the proposed seaway would offer any very great savings to shippers. Water transportation via the Great Lakes and New York State Barge Canal is

available to Midwest shippers, and I doubt that the savings afforded by direct steamer service from the Great Lakes ports would be of any great consequence.

Leaving aside any power production or national-defense considerations which may or may not be sufficient to justify its construction, I consider the proposed seaway to be economically and commercially unjustifiable. It does not appear to me that there is any possibility that it would ever be a self-liquidating project, since I understand it is to be free of toll.

There have been widely varying estimates of its cost, and even if the most optimistic view is taken, it appears to me that the savings which might be effected would redound to the benefit of one section of the country and one segment of its economy to the prejudice of other very important regions and industries.

There are also, as you know, very conflicting views as to the volume of freight which might move on such a waterway. It would be open to navigation at best for only about 7 months of the year. If it should be used to the extent which its advocates visualize, other forms of transportation would undoubtedly suffer and the shippers using the waterway might find themselves unable to secure adequate transportation for their products during the months in which the proposed seaway would be closed to navigation.

Another consideration which seems to have been overlooked by many of the proponents of the seaway is that in order to accommodate the volume of ocean-going traffic which is contemplated, it would be necessary to construct very extensive and costly harbor improvements at ports on the Great Lakes. This would add very greatly to the over-all cost of the seaway and no doubt impose a burden on States and/or municipalities along the Great Lakes.

I have seen no figures which convince me that the proposed seaway would not constitute a direct drain on the Treasury of the United States, nor that the gains to the national economy would in any degree offset this drain. Consequently, the expense would come from the pockets of the taxpayers, and, in my opinion, it is most necessary that efforts be made to reduce governmental expenditures, reduce our public debt instead of increasing it, and reduce taxes, in order to stimulate business, industry, and employment.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR R. LEWIS, Jr.,
President.

The next letter is from the Colonial Navigation Co., of New York City, dated April 4, 1946, addressed to the late Senator Bailey, and reads as follows:

COLONIAL NAVIGATION CO.,
New York City, April 4, 1946.

Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Since our operations have been confined to the coastwise trade we have not given detailed study to the project, but from my knowledge of the characteristics of American ships operating in the foreign trade, it would appear that the 27-foot depth of the channel would not be sufficient and, further, that because of the fact that for a large portion of the year the waterway will be closed because of ice conditions, it would not seem to warrant the large expenditure of money necessary to carry the project to completion. There are, I understand from statements submitted, a great many other objections, but I think the shallow draft—plus the very great cost—should be sufficient to dispose of the project unfavorably.

Very truly yours,

J. B. DUNBAUGH,
President.

The next letter, which is from the American Petroleum Transport Corp., of New York City, dated April 2, 1946, addressed to the late Senator Bailey, reads as follows:

AMERICAN PETROLEUM TRANSPORT CORP.,
New York, N. Y., April 2, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 12, relative to the proposed seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

I have always felt that this seaway is not justified, that the expense would be totally unwarranted for the traffic involved, and that the present waterway can handle all of the traffic that is required from the ocean to the Great Lakes and return.

It is my firm belief that this seaway would be of very little benefit, if any, to American steamship owners, and I see no possibility of this St. Lawrence seaway being used by our ships.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN PETROLEUM TRANSPORT CORP.

Mr. President, the next letter is from Cargo Carriers, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., and is dated April 1, 1946. It reads as follows:

CARGO CARRIERS, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., April 1, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We appreciate your letter of the 12th asking for our opinion with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway.

We have no plans for the use of this seaway, although we move large amounts of freight from points on Lake Superior and Lake Michigan to the seaboard, both for export and for domestic use, and we also forward substantial quantities of this freight from the seaboard to foreign destinations, principally Europe. Our business is the transportation of bulk commodities, principally grain.

Further it is our belief that the amount of goods moved direct from Great Lakes points to foreign countries over the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, if constructed, will be disappointingly small, very much less than claimed by the proponents of the seaway.

In order to bring about a movement of goods directly between foreign countries and points on the Great Lakes, or between points on the Atlantic seaboard, and points on the Great Lakes by way of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, it would be necessary that ships built for operation on the Great Lakes also operate on the ocean and that ships built for ocean operation also operate on the Great Lakes. We do not feel that either of these operations would be practical or economical for the better classes of ships now in operation.

Practically all of the ships operating on the Great Lakes are a special type of construction, built for operation only on the Great Lakes. It is our opinion, and we believe the opinion of all other operators, that these ships could not operate successfully on the ocean. They carry large cargoes at comparatively shallow drafts because of their length in proportion to the other dimensions. Because of this greater length in proportion to the other dimensions than is used in ocean boats, these lake boats would not be safe for ocean operation.

Just before the war, and during the war, there have been built a great number of new cargo vessels, enough to carry a large part of the commerce of the important maritime nations. These new boats, such as our country's Liberty ships and Victory ships, require a channel much deeper than 27 feet when they are fully loaded; many of them requiring channels as deep as 35 feet. Inasmuch as the plans for the proposed seaway appear to provide a channel of no more than 27 feet, we cannot conceive of these newer, better, and more economical ocean ships going into the Great Lakes with cargoes or to get cargoes.

It may be said that these ships can go to a port on the Great Lakes, such as Duluth or Chicago, and load enough cargo to put them down to a draft of 26 feet or 27 feet, and then complete their cargo by loading to their full draft at Montreal or some such port as that. No doubt that could be done, but it is our opinion it is not economical for ships, especially those with heavy operating costs, to travel more than 2,200 miles with only a part cargo one way, or even both ways.

It may be possible to make changes in the plans for the seaway which would provide a channel as deep as 35 feet. However, if this were done, we would think it would increase the cost to a point which would be considered prohibitive even by those who now favor the seaway. In the case of grain, we do not see how the cost of the transportation alone between a Great Lakes port and a foreign country would be reduced by shipping direct under the cost of the transportation which is now in use. The saving, if any, would be the saving due to the elimination of the cost of transfer from lake ships to ocean ships. At most, this involves two transfers between Duluth and the foreign country at an aggregate cost of no more than 2 cents per bushel. It is our opinion that the greatest possible amount of grain exports over the proposed seaway would be an average of 50,000,000 bushels per year. Assuming the maximum possible saving of 2 cents per bushel, the total possible saving on grain would be $1,000,000 per year.

It is our belief that should the seaway be completed, it would be found that very few large ships, and therefore comparatively small amount of freight, would make the trip direct between our Great Lakes ports and foreign countries. It occurs to us that there may follow a demand for some encouragement for such business to use the seaway. No doubt it would be suggested that some sort of Government subsidies be provided to encourage the through transportation and use of the seaway. We may be needlessly concerned about this, but such a demand seems to arise whenever any new vessel operation is found to be unprofitable and uneconomical.

In this letter we have tried to confine ourselves to approaching the matter from our own point of view as a vessel operator. A number of other thoughts and comments which we have with respect to the proposed seaway have been reported in the newspapers and news letters as having been well covered in Senate committee hearings. In case more detailed information or a statement of our views at greater length is desired, we shall be glad to furnish them.

Yours very truly,

F. J. HAYS.

The next letter is from the Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., of New York City, and is dated March 30, 1946. It reads as follows:

MOORE-MCCORMACK LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 30, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In response to your letter of March 12, in which you have asked for our view with regard to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, with vessels which would be adaptable to operation on the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River, the Welland Canal section, and at the same time be suitable for continuous navigation on the high seas.

We are operating the following overseas routes:

1. North Atlantic ports and South Atlantic ports of the U. S. A. to the east coast South American ports.

2. North Atlantic ports of the United States of America to the Scandinavian and Baltic ports.

3. Pacific coast ports of the United States of America and Canada, to the north coast and east coast South American ports via the Panama Canal.

Of the 16 vessels which were taken over by the Government (only a part of which have been thus far returned to us for private operation) and seven additional C3 vessels which are now in the course of construction, and three other vessels which we plan to build in the immediate future, there is but one—a C1 vessel—which could navigate safely the 27-foot channel of the proposed seaway.

Of course, all these ships could load to a depth which would permit them to traverse this seaway, but it would mean they would have to complete this loading at Montreal and other St. Lawrence ports, in order to give them full cargoes, thereby further building up Canadian commerce and commercial activities.

As ship operators, we are opposed to the construction of this proposed St. Lawrence seaway, for we do not believe the construction of such a seaway would be to our interest or to the interest of the country. It is our opinion that such a seaway, if constructed, would be of particular value to foreign operators of small vessels. The diversion of traffic between the interior points and the Atlantic seaboard ports would militate against the maintenance of a strong and efficient American merchant marine.

No plans have been made by the company to utilize the St. Lawrence seaway. The position of the American steamship operators has been ably presented to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee by the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., and from the Maritime Association of the port of New York, copies of which statements are attached for your convenience. We endorse the position taken by these two associations.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT V. MOORE, *President.*

I next read a letter from the United States Lines Co.:

UNITED STATES LINES CO.,
New York, March 28, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: You were kind enough to ask me in a letter received a few days ago my opinion of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway as authorized in the joint resolution pending before Congress.

You inquire as to the "feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed seaway." Answering this, and speaking out of my long experience as a steamship operator, I must say that the waterway would be too shallow. The proposed 27-foot channel between Montreal and Lake Ontario would, in reality, be only a 24-foot channel because only ships of that or lesser draft could use it. Remember that a vessel should have a clearance of about 2 feet 6 inches, and that in addition a ship will draw 6 inches more in fresh than in salt water. Our Maritime Commission insists that owners and operators shall sail their ships "full and down." This is the answer to proponents of the seaway who are already arguing that ships using the seaway take aboard smaller loads to keep within the 24-foot draft.

Another reason why the project is unfeasible is that for about 7 months in each year it would be closed by winter. In addition, the canalized section at many points would be dangerous. Navigation would menace each other when passing, and the rocky shores of the canalized area would mean sinkings and in many instances total losses in case of collision. Then, too, fogs are prevalent and there would be few spots where the channel is narrow for ships to anchor with safety. All in all, from the point of feasibility, the proposal to spend hundreds of millions to provide this seaway is a fantastic one.

As to economy of navigation, there can be none because in its broader aspects the seaway discriminates against this Nation's merchant fleet. Into the merchant ships constituting this, our American taxpayers have poured more than $50,000,000,000. It is plain that the seaway would help reverse the American policy of fostering an American merchant marine. You might ask why, and my answer would be because only about 8 percent of our merchant ships could use it, and many of those ships are already obsolete. We have a war-built merchant marine of more than 5,000 vessels. Only about 400 of these have a draft of 24 feet or less. And remember, a small vessel such as might navigate the seaway is relatively as costly to operate as a large one and will carry only about one-third the cargo and earn only about one-third the money that its big brother will. The preponderance of ships able to navigate the canalized river would be foreign (more than 70 percent). Most of the traffic would move in tramp ships, none of American registry, and to the great detriment of our regularly operated American lines. Moreover, hazards encountered in the canalized section, due to narrow channels, currents, and fog would send the insurance rates soaring.

Another thing, nearly 100,000,000 tons of iron ore are lifted by America's tremendous lake fleet annually. The presence of this fleet in time of war is a national necessity. But if the seaway is constructed this fleet now carrying ore to the American railroads will languish and ultimately become dissipated.

And what of the domestic carriers which now give regular and satisfactory service from the Great Lakes to our American eastern seaboard? Will the railroads be satisfied and keep rates down if permitted to serve lake traffic only 5 months in the year?

In turn, how can the American steamship companies on the east coast afford to give virtually daily sailings to Europe during 12 months in the year when for 7 months cargo would be diverted from the east coast and carried in foreign tramp ships paying crews subnormal wages? Rate structures, built up through the years, would be shattered.

I shall not attempt to quote statistics to demonstrate that our port of New York, the greatest in the world, will inevitably suffer if the St. Lawrence seaway is built. The loss of commerce here will run into the hundreds of millions. Proponents of the canal have indicated their belief that the traffic diverted from New York would amount to only about 8 percent of the amount which goes through this port normally. They fail to emphasize that this 8 percent by value would amount to almost 25 percent. As an example, may I quote the following:

"Custom figures for 1938 fixing $413 a ton for passenger cars foreshadow an annual loss to the port of New York of $208,937,000 in value should automobile carryings be diverted to the seaway. What would be the loss to New York City, suffered by longshoremen, shipowners, brokers, truckers, warehouses, and pier rentals, cannot be estimated."

Concluding your letter, you ask me to say:

1. Whether the seaway as proposed would provide a saving to shippers and would prove attractive to shipowners.

2. Whether our company, the United States Lines, plans to navigate the seaway.

The answer to these questions is a blunt "No." Need I add that I am irrevocably opposed to the construction of this project?

Thanking you for providing me with this opportunity to express my views, and with kindest personal regards and warmest wishes,

Most cordially,

BASIL HARRIS.

Mr. President, I now read a letter from A. B. Sharp, president of the Eastern Steamship Lines:

EASTERN STEAMSHIP LINES, INC.,
Boston, Mass., March 28, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: This refers to your letter of March 12 regarding the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River.

I cannot add anything to the mass of information that has been submitted to Congress on this subject during recent years, except my personal opinion.

New England is largely against the project, but I think I am not particularly biased on account of being located in this area, as I grew up on the shores of Lake Michigan and have been here only a few years.

From the standpoint of the seaway operation, I see nothing whatever in it for a company in the domestic steamship service, as the length of the haul as compared with the land haul from any American port on the Great Lakes to any American port elsewhere, would positively prevent successful steamship operation. I believe that anyone familiar with present-day steamship costs and rates, and land transportation rates, must necessarily reach this unequivocal conclusion. Any studies that I know of that have been made in the past in this connection must now be thrown into the wastebasket, as steamship operating costs are so much higher than they were when private steamship operations ceased almost entirely because of the war—increases in steamship labor nearly 100 percent; repairs and maintenance probably more than 100 percent, fuel over 50 percent.

With respect to use of the seaway for foreign commerce, there is no possibility of its use in competition with foreign-flag ships unless the Government pays large subsidies. This would appear to accomplish only the elimination of income for the labor and capital now engaged in competitive land transportation, transfer a large part of the income to foreign labor and capital, and place a heavy burden on all the taxpayers of the country.

With respect to both domestic and foreign trade, it must be borne in mind that a preponderant majority of American ships in the enormous fleet which has been built and is now available for ocean operations, consists of large vessels which could not sail the seaway with more than about 60 percent of their carrying capacity in tons of cargo. The 27-foot proposed depth of water simply would not permit it. Smaller foreign craft now in existence, and many more building, would surely have an overwhelming advantage in foreign trade, and again there is no way to overcome this advantage unless the Government builds another fleet for use in the seaway, and provides it with subsidies sufficient to make competition possible.

To me this proposal is a wild, uneconomical scheme which will cost vast sums of money to place in operation, and will impose a never-ending additional great burden upon the people of our Nation.

Very truly yours,

A. B. SHARP,
President.

The following is a letter from Arnold Bernstein, of 17 Battery Place, New York:

ARNOLD BERNSTEIN SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 28, 1946.
Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Responding to your letter of March 12, I would say that, generally speaking, I favor the development of natural waterways and installation of power facilities made possible thereby.

I can give no opinion with regard to any specific development, except perhaps to comment on the effect that a new seaway from the Great Lakes through the St. Lawrence River would have on changing the movement of ocean cargo.

If such a seaway could be operated throughout the whole year and not be closed by ice through the winter months, I would favor this project, despite losses and inconveniences that may be anticipated during the initial period of readjustment and adaptation. Since this new seaway could be used for 6 months of the year only, however, I should think—

(a) Assuming that export and import will reach the prewar level, a substantial percentage of the traffic of the whole lake area will use the new seaway instead of going overseas from New York;

(b) Water transportation does not involve only supplying ships and shipping needs, but railroad yards, warehouse facilities, piers, bunker facilities, and many other installations run by experienced organizations;

(c) Deviation of a great percentage of cargo means proportionate idleness of such installations in New York, and at the same time the construction in the new loading and discharge ports of the same kind of facilities;

(d) The lines serving the various world routes from New York and out-ports will either lose the traffic diverted to the new seaway to new lines founded for this purpose, or will have to open branches of their service, allocating part of their tonnage to the traffic carried directly from the Lakes. Since the most important lines combine passenger and cargo service, and since the passenger service can hardly be transferred from New York, in many cases the provision of additional cargo steamers will be involved, creating quite a serious problem for the established lines.

Without careful study, I do not feel qualified to give an opinion in regard to the benefit industry and agriculture may gain from the project. However, for the reasons indicated above, it seems to me doubtful, at least as far as shipping and port facilities are concerned, if the gain reasonably to be expected from the new seaway would justify the new investment, and at the same time, losses that New York as a world harbor must expect from the loss of part of its traffic.

Respectfully,

ARNOLD BERNSTEIN.

I now read letters from 23 other steamship companies whose names appear on the headlines of the letters:

MARINE TRANSPORTATION LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1946.
Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We have endeavored to keep informed concerning the proposed seaway to the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River and the construction of power facilities contemplated by pending legislation before the Congress, and about which you deal in your letter of March 12.

After careful examination into the possibilities of use of the improved waterway facilities projected, and after considering the information gathered as to present and prospective traffic, we arrived at the conclusion that, so far as transportation is concerned, the expense for the seaway project would be unwarranted. We accordingly felt that there was no justification, insofar as our company is concerned for extending our operations into the Great Lakes area via the St. Lawrence, other than in small ships which from time to time have been suitable for such trade under existing conditions. Our consideration led us to believe that no substantial savings to shippers would result from the development proposed.

From the standpoint of the American merchant marine, it seems to me that the project might prove to be disadvantageous, altogether aside from the matter of initial and recurring costs for the development, both construction and maintenance.

Yours very truly,

W. N. WESTERLUND,
President.

ALCOA STEAMSHIP CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 26, 1946.
The Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In your letter of March 12 you ask for our view regarding the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and inquire whether we plan to navigate the seaway with our ships.

We have no plans for using the proposed seaway. If the seaway is used to any considerable extent for overseas shipping the vessel operators, port facilities, and the railroads serving the United States north Atlantic ports will suffer the disadvantage of a peak during about 5 months of the year and a slump during the balance of the year, resulting in higher costs and less efficiency. Conceivably, an increase in ocean and rail rates would follow. Such a prospect would certainly discourage modernization and improvement of the facilities at Atlantic ports.

Considering the capital required for construction of the canal, the handicaps of seasonal operation, and the adverse effects on the railroads and north Atlantic ports, we doubt very much whether the project can be considered an economic one.

Yours very truly,

HARMAN LEWIS,
President.

GRACE LINE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.
Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 12, asking for our views in respect to the proposed construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River. This project has been under consideration for a long time and has received careful thought and study by the shipping industry of the country. I believe it entirely correct to say that the shipping companies are unanimous in their opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway plan insofar as that plan would contemplate the development of ocean-going traffic as contrasted with that part of the proposal relating to the development of electric power. The American Merchant Marine Institute, whose members own and operate the major portion of the American flag merchant fleet engaged in foreign and domestic deep-sea trade, and of which we are a member, has expressed its opinion on the subject with our entire concurrence in a letter to the Honorable CARL A. HATCH, chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, under date of February 26, 1946.

Replying more specifically to the questions raised in your letter regarding this company's possible interest in operating its vessels through the proposed seaway if it is constructed, I have to advise you that Grace Line has nearly completed a construction program of 18 new vessels, not one of which could safely navigate the proposed seaway without leaving unfilled some 15 to 20 percent of their cargo capacity. Your familiarity with shipping matters will enable you to understand without further explanation that no vessel can compete in international trade unless it is able to take full advantage of its size and capacity.

The normal peacetime operations of the Grace Line are between the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast ports of the United States, and the countries to the south of us in Central and South America. Such of the cargo normally carried in our ships as originates from or is destined to the Great Lakes area is moved to and from seaboard by existing transportation systems such as railroads, canals, and trucks. Particularly as to our ships servicing the United States Gulf area, the Mississippi Barge Canal system has offered cheap and efficient transportation of export and import cargo to the manufacturing centers of the Middle West. Insofar as trade with Central and South America is concerned, it is inconceivable to us that there would be any economy in the transportation of goods originating in and destined to the Great Lakes area via the circuitous route of the St. Lawrence waterway and thence along the entire Atlantic seaboard on the water routes leading to the South.

It is conceivable that there might be some economies for shippers from the Great Lakes area to northern Europe by the use of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, but it is our considered judgment and that of the entire shipping industry that such economies would, in the aggregate, be insignificant as compared with the cost of construction, maintenance, and operation of the proposed seaway.

I trust that these individual views may be of some value and would be delighted to reply to any further questions which you may have.

Respectfully,

R. R. ADAMS,
President.

CALMAR STEAMSHIP CORP.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.
Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 12 in which you advise that there is pending before the Congress a joint resolution to authorize an agreement with the Canadian Government for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River.

We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own vessels and are unalterably opposed to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway for the following reasons:

1. Vessels that may use this proposed seaway will only be able to load up to a draft of 24 feet. At the present time the vessels we are operating, fully loaded, have a draft of 28 feet 6 inches, and the vessels we propose to operate will have a draft of 27 feet 8 inches. Due to the lesser density of fresh water, a vessel will draw 6 inches more than in salt water. The port rules of Montreal require 2 feet 6 inches bottom clearance for the issuance of a sailing permit. Therefore, our vessels could never load full cargoes if we were to use the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

2. We load our vessels at Baltimore, Md., and Philadelphia, Pa., and discharge them at Boston, Mass., New York, Philadelphia,

Pa., and Baltimore, Md. The time for safe navigation on the Great Lakes and through the proposed seaway will be limited to about 7 months a year, depending on weather conditions. To retain dock facilities for only 5 months out of a year at the ports mentioned, such facilities to be idle during the 7 months of open navigation on the proposed seaway and Great Lakes, is economically unsound.

3. The suggestion has been made that American operators could use the proposed St. Lawrence seaway by only partially loading their vessels instead of bringing them down to their legal-load marks. In our opinion, the proposed St. Lawrence seaway would provide little, if no savings to shippers, because of necessity vessels that load such part cargoes and must incur 8,238 miles of extra steaming, would have to secure a great deal higher rate for cargo loading at lake ports.

4. The proposed St. Lawrence seaway has no attraction to the ship operator, either from the standpoint of economy or from the standpoint of business.

The proposal for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River is in our opinion economically unsound and highly detrimental to the best interests of the American merchant marine.

Very truly yours,

H. W. WARLEY,
President.

PAN AMERICAN PETROLEUM & TRANSPORT CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 21, 1946.

The Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In reference to your letter of March 12 regarding the joint resolution which is now pending before the Congress to authorize an agreement with the Canadian Government for the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River and the installation of power facilities in the international section of the St. Lawrence River, we have no plans to navigate the proposed seaway with our ships if and when such legislation should be approved.

Our company operates along the Atlantic coast and points adjacent thereto in the 17 States from Maine to Florida. The seaway would therefore be of no benefit to us. From an oil-tanker angle, it would be rather difficult for any company to utilize the seaway as at present outlined. As you are aware, the large quantity of T-2 and T-3 tankers built by the United States Government, and which were necessary for the successful prosecution of the recent war, will make these tankers practically the standard for the carriage of oil on ocean waterways for a large number of years to come. These boats have a 30-foot draft when fully loaded in salt water and would have a draft of very close to 31 feet in fresh water. The proposed channel for the seaway being limited to 27 feet would absolutely eliminate the use of the T-2 or T-3 type of tanker.

Inasmuch as the normal movement of oil by tanker is from the Gulf coast, the distance to be covered to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, which is approximately latitude 50° north, and then the long southwest movement through the seaway and the Great Lakes, would increase the cost of the movement of products to such an extent that the writer does not see how it would be possible to compete with the more efficient pipe-line movement of crude and products from the Gulf to the central and northern portion of the United States which now obtains.

From the standpoint of the petroleum industry, there certainly can be no justification for the tremendous expenditure which would be required of our Government to make this artificial waterway, and also the heavy annual upkeep which would be necessitated by its use.

Very truly yours,

JAMES PATTERSON,
Vice President.

MISSISSIPPI SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New Orleans, March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I have your inquiry of March 12 concerning the probability of navigation between the ocean and the Great Lakes through the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

The commercial interests in the Mississippi Valley have generally opposed the seaway. The ground of opposition has been that it would divert import and export traffic from the Mississippi system which has already been improved by the National Government at heavy expense.

I have not actively opposed the project, personally, because I have grave doubt that a large two-way traffic could be practically developed. The Great Lakes can and do handle the exportable surplus of grain at costs as low as anything known in ocean transportation under the United States flag.

If the seaway were constructed as planned, it would enable lake boats to carry both American and Canadian grain down to Montreal and shift the transfer point from Buffalo 500 miles farther toward the sea. That would be the big exportable surplus which might attract ocean ships into the Great Lakes. However, in the reverse direction, the canal would be available to merchandise from the western Europe and little else and I doubt whether Middle West distributors of this limited type of freight, when divorced from the great distribution through Atlantic and Gulf ports, would give a paying two-way traffic for many ocean-going ships. Furthermore, while the depth of 27 feet is adequate for Great Lakes boats and most Great Lakes harbors are hardly dredged to this depth, 27 feet would necessarily prove a very definite limitation which would bar the newer and better ships which are now being built for ocean traffic. For example, the standard C-2 and C-3 vessels, the Libertys and Victorys, cannot safely be loaded to full draft and navigate this channel, and certainly 30 feet over the miter sills of the 15 locks would put a very definite limitation upon the seaway's future value.

At New Orleans, we have a lock 75 feet by 600 feet with 30 feet 6 inches over the miter sills which leads from the Mississippi River into the newer inner harbor. This is proving such a limitation upon our harbor development that we are presently urging the United States Government to give us a direct seaway from inner harbor to the Gulf with a depth of 40 feet and a bottom width of 600 feet. It is our belief that any port served by a channel of lesser dimensions will be greatly limited in its future expansion.

The fleet of the Delta Line is made up of Standard C-2 and C-3 ships. We operate between Gulf ports and the east coast of South America. The St. Lawrence seaway would offer no inducement to us.

The barge rates on the Mississippi River from New Orleans, offer the cheapest entrance to the port of Chicago of any we know. It is our judgment that the cost of operating deep-sea ships through inland passages of 2,250 miles with the time spent in passing through 15 locks, would be more expensive than the single cost of one transfer from the ship to barge at New Orleans in view of the existing barge rates for a 1,500-mile haul from New Orleans to Chicago.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE BRENT,
President.

AMERICAN SOUTH AFRICAN LINE, INC.,
New York, March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on
Commerce, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Thank you for your letter of March 12, asking my view on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

I have given this subject detailed study and consideration and have reached the conclusion that whether or not such a project is completed, it is not economically feasible for American South African Line to use it. In the following paragraphs I shall try to set forth my explanation for this belief in greater detail.

The first question to be considered is the draft of the channel. The proposed draft is 27 feet. American ships are expensive to construct and expensive to operate. To enable some degree of competition with foreign lines, we have increased the draft of our ships so as to carry more cargo per voyage. The new fleet of American South African Line is composed of United States Maritime Commission C-3 type vessels. These ships have a draft, when down to their marks, of 29 feet 1 inch. Minimum navigation requirements of the St. Lawrence seaway require 2 feet 6 inches between the bottom of the hull of the vessel and the river bed. Another 6 inches of the draft would be lost by reason of the fact these ships would be operating in fresh water rather than in salt water.

Homeward cargo from South and East Africa is mainly manganese and chrome ore; that is weight cargo. If our ships were to use the St. Lawrence seaway, instead of loading them to the marks, 29 feet 1 inch, they could only be loaded to a draft of 24 feet. For a ship of the C-3 type, approximately 58 tons of cargo are required to change the draft 1 inch. This means that, if one of our ships were to be loaded for the passage through the St. Lawrence, she would carry 3,498 tons of cargo less than her capacity. This is not economically justified.

With the high cost of American ship construction and operation, as opposed to foreign-flag lines, I do not believe it would be sound policy to construct smaller ships specifically for this trade. The St. Lawrence is considered safe for navigation only 7 months of the year. If special ships were designed and constructed for this trade, they would not be able to compete with our present vessels during the balance of the year, inasmuch as their cost of operation would be about the same but carrying capacity would be so much less. It would not be sound policy to leave these ships idle for the 5-month period the St. Lawrence is not navigable. On the other hand, their presence in other routes, during the off season, would only cause great confusion and disorganization in the shipping industry.

If our ships were to go to the Great Lakes ports, we should have to add a considerable sum to our cost per voyage, resulting in greatly increased cost to the shipper. This increase would consist not only of the expense of vessel operation for a longer time per voyage than at present, but we should also have to include the cost of maintaining branch offices or agencies at each of the ports of call for the entire year. I do not consider it advisable to open and close these offices for only a part of each year or to shift

the personnel to various other offices at off seasons. The operation of a ship requires too much detailed knowledge of a port to make such shifting of personnel sound policy.

Another question of vital importance is the question of safe navigation. It is understood many parts of the St. Lawrence seaway will be blasted out of solid rock—that, in parts, the channel will be suitable for one-way passage only.

This area is noted for the frequent occurrence of fog and mist. If one of our ships were to be caught in a narrow stretch of this channel, in a fog or mist, it is considered the ship would be in extreme danger, and the danger would be greatly aggravated by the possibility of the current of the river swinging the vessel onto the rocks. I do not believe a conscientious steamship operator is justified in jeopardizing a large oceangoing vessel by sending her on such a voyage, with its attending risks of loss of life, cargo, and vessel.

These added risks would contribute substantially to an increase in insurance rates. This, too, would be reflected in increased rates to the shipper.

In view of the foregoing, I wish to repeat most emphatically, the St. Lawrence project would not be attractive to American-South African Line, nor do I believe it would be attractive to the vast majority of American ship operators. Further, considering their long-range interests, I do not believe it would provide a real saving to shippers. On the contrary, I believe it would seriously disorganize present services from North Atlantic ports and would react to the detriment of both shippers and ship operators.

I thank you for giving me this opportunity to set forth my views on the St. Lawrence project and hope that they will be of assistance in determining your own actions with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 104.

Yours very truly,

JAMES A. FARRELL, Jr.,
President.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 19, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of March 12, addressed to Mr. John A. Werner, president of the Fruit Dispatch Co. and asking his opinion as to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, has been referred to the undersigned. The Fruit Dispatch Co., a subsidiary of the United Fruit Co., handles the distribution of our principal product, but the operation of the vessels is under the control of the parent company and for this reason Mr. Werner has turned your letter over to me.

For the past several years we have followed rather closely the arguments for and against this project and it is my considered opinion that the rather doubtful gains of a few sections of the country do not warrant the vast expenditure involved. I have read varying estimates of the cost of this project, ranging from $300,000,000 to almost $1,000,000,000, a large portion of which would be assumed by Canada. Is it not possible that Canada might find it difficult to meet this huge expenditure, thereby further increasing the portion that would have to be paid by United States funds?

First of all, it appears that the proposed 27-foot channel would preclude something over 90 percent of the American merchant marine, a good part of which was constructed during the war period, and over 80 percent of the world's tonnage, from using the seaway. In any event, because of the winter freeze the St. Lawrence would be navigable for only about 7 months of the year, and the same holds true to a lesser extent for the Great Lakes.

So far as this company's normal peacetime operations are concerned, it is imperative that the banana, a perishable commodity, reaches its markets with the least possible delay after the fruit is cut in the tropics, and even though the fruit is carried in refrigerated vessels it would be decidedly unwise to expose it to the extended additional distance that would be necessary in transit to Great Lakes ports; not only from the point of view of the additional mileage involved but also the necessarily reduced speed of the vessels in transiting the proposed seaway. It would be much more economical to discharge the fruit at United States Atlantic and Gulf ports and rail it to the interior markets.

Under these circumstances, even if the seaway project should become a reality in the future, it is most unlikely that this company's vessels will ever make any use of it.

I appreciate the opportunity you have afforded us to express our views in this matter.

Yours very truly,

J. J. KELLEHER.

STRACHAN SHIPPING CO.,
Savannah, Ga., March 19, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: Your letter of March 12 has been received.

Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, and Milwaukee and perhaps other outports of the Great Lakes, have for some time been served by relatively small vessels capable of navigating the present locks and crossing the Atlantic Ocean, this service having been initiated and operated by Scandinavian owners.

It has been my understanding that these vessels have been able to select freight which gave the highest revenue, and the operation must have been profitable because I understand now that the war has ended it is about to be resumed.

A very large volume of traffic originates in the Middle West and it appears that the contemplated seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River would be utilized, but I am incapable of expressing an opinion as to whether the projected channel for larger and deeper draft vessels would justify the enormous construction cost.

Again, I seriously doubt if the large, fast, expensive American-flag ships would be able to compete successfully in this trade when their cargoes on regular runs would likely be made up of a large percentage of low-paying freight. There must be a considerable slowdown in negotiating 15 locks, and I am sure these vessels would not be able to run at full speed in the canal.

It also seems to me that vessels with slower speed, and perhaps these would be largely under foreign flags, would get the greatest benefit from this seaway development, because of their cheaper cost of construction and operation.

One thing that impresses me is that at present ships that are operating in the Atlantic and in the Gulf are compelled to make a number of ports of call in order to fill, and if this traffic from the Great Lakes area, which now largely moves to the eastern ports and to the Gulf, is withdrawn, it would make it all the more difficult for the ships serving the eastern and Gulf ports to fill, and would perhaps mean either curtailing of service or additional ports of call.

This proposed direct service from the Lakes would unquestionably provide some savings to shippers during the open season.

While we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with our own ships, and have made no careful study of the possibilities, it does not appear to me that this trade route will prove very attractive to American ship operators.

RONI W. GROVES,
Partner.

SEATRAIN LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 18, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: We have your letter of March 12 regarding the construction of a seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

We wish to advise that we have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway and we have been very skeptical that the additional cost over and above that required for power development would be warranted from a transportation standpoint. We doubt if the difference in cost between rail transportation through the seaway for only portions of the year is so great as to warrant any large expenditure for such a seaway.

Very truly yours,

GRAHAM M. BRUSH,
President.

WEST INDIA STEAMSHIP CO.,
New York, N. Y., March 18, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In response to your letter of March 12, 1946, relative to the projected St. Lawrence seaway, have to advise you that we are opposed to it.

Most of the reasons for our opposition are set forth in the statement made in behalf of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York by Mr. Cornelius H. Callaghan, executive vice president of said association, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on February 28, 1946, which statement has our full endorsement.

Thanking you for having written us, we are,

Yours very truly,

MORRIS MALKIN,
President.

MERCHANTS & MINERS
TRANSPORTATION CO.,
Baltimore, March 16, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter of March 12 regarding the seaway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic and regret that particular section and business is not sufficient to warrant me to express any view on the subject.

Regretting my inability to be of any help in this matter and with kindest regards.

Very truly yours,

A. D. STEBBINS,
President.

PLANT SHIPPING CO., INC.,
New Orleans, La., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of 12 March about the St. Lawrence seaway.

My observation is that, aside from every other consideration, sending vessels through 15 locks would be a most hazardous undertaking at any time, and it strikes me that the cost of insurance on vessels navigating such waterways would be greatly increased. Accordingly, from the standpoint of risk and increased cost of insurance, the seaway would not be attractive to ship operators.

From the standpoint of savings to shippers, I believe that any cheaper inland freight rate to shipside would be greatly offset by the higher freight rate that the shipowner would have to ask for the increased risk and expense just mentioned.

I have no plans to use the St. Lawrence seaway at all, and, as far as I am concerned, I earnestly hope it will never materialize.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE PLANT,
President.

WILSON LINE, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: In reply to yours of March 12, the Wilson Line is not interested in operating steamboats on the Great Lakes or through the proposed new locks and channel.

However, I am greatly opposed to the joint resolution before Congress to authorize these improvements, inasmuch as the railroads would be adversely affected and I believe that they will have a hard enough time in the next 10 years without this competition.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE B. JUNKIN,
President.

STOCKARD STEAMSHIP CORP.,
New York, N. Y., March 15, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your letter of March 12 asking my opinion with respect to the feasibility and economy of navigating the proposed seaway through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, it is my opinion that this seaway is of no practical value. I do not question the feasibility of constructing this seaway, but purely from the point of view of a shipping facility the seaway is absolutely unsound. In the first place it can only be used for 8 months out of the year because of ice conditions. The present shipping facilities available at Montreal and to New York are just as economical to operate as would be the case should oceangoing vessels proceed to load at Chicago and/or other Great Lakes ports.

The seaway would provide no savings to shippers nor would it prove attractive to ship operators except possibly to a few foreign-flag lines that presently operate from the Great Lakes to the United Kingdom, European continent, and Scandinavia during the summer season. Ship operations between ports other than those mentioned in the preceding sentence are more economical via the eastern seaboard of the United States. This can be accounted for by the fact that the earth is round, and if you calculate distances from Chicago to places other than northern Europe, including the United Kingdom, you will find the excess steaming distances too great (say, from Chicago) to make it economical.

We have no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway, and sincerely hope the taxpayers' money will not be wasted on this venture.

Yours faithfully,

L. N. STOCKARD,
President.

BARBER STEAMSHIP LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y. March 14, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, United States
Senate Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: I have received your letter of March 12, with reference to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, and I am enclosing herewith a statement which I made a short time ago, which will acquaint you with my views as to this project.

For the many reasons advanced in my memorandum, I consider the project unsound economically and of no practical value commercially, and to specifically answer your question, my company has no plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway.

In closing, might I express the hope that the replies which you will receive from the steamship owners, whom I gather, you have circularized, will be such as to lead you to the conclusion that you should vote against this proposed bill.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD J. BARBER.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., April 8, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Your letter of March 12 to Mr. Zemurray, president of the United Fruit Co., relative to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project, has been referred to me for reply.

As indicated in your letter, the project calls for a usable channel 27 feet deep. This will prevent the use of vessels drawing more than 24½ feet. It is my understanding that less than 8 percent of the total American merchant marine has this light a draft, and, of course, practically all of this light-draft tonnage is already in use in other trade routes. It, therefore, seems highly doubtful that the St. Lawrence seaway project can have any material advantage to the American merchant marine. It seems more likely that any ships using the seaway would be foreign-flag ships. The operation of small ships under the American flag because of the highly increased cost of wages and other costs is becoming more difficult. The St. Lawrence seaway, in my opinion, would be wholly unattractive to American-flag operators.

* * * * *

One of the principal arguments in favor of the waterway is that it might reduce the ocean rates on grains and other bulk commodities moving from the Great Lakes area into foreign commerce, and that this would be of benefit to the farmers of the Middle West. I suggest that the freight on these commodities is paid by the foreign purchasers and it is doubtful whether a slightly lower freight rate to these foreign purchasers would be of any value to the shippers of the Middle West.

This company does not plan to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM JACKSON,
Vice President.

LYKES BROS. STEAMSHIP CO., INC.,
New Orleans, La., April 26, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Apology is made for delay in answering your letter of March 12 re the effect of proposed St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway on United States flag ships and asking if we have any plans to send our vessels into the Great Lakes.

Because of the high cost of building American ships and operating them, they cannot compete with foreign-flag ships unless subsidized. For American ships to enter the Great Lakes trade, they would need to be subsidized just as they are on the high seas. Would Congress authorize such a subsidy when the Great Lakes seaway would be in fact a competitor of the domestic transportation lines in the United States?

Then there are 15 ship locks to pass through.

Foreign-flag ships would go into the Great Lakes during the open-water season. For the most part, these would probably be tramp ships which do not, as a rule, conform with the rules and regulations applying to regular liners, which would mean disturbance to the economy of the regular liners and to the domestic carriers.

Thus the opening of the Great Lakes seaway would in fact be a subsidy in favor of foreign-flag ships and against the United States merchant marine.

The transportation system of the United States is organized to use existing and developed seaports and domestic transportation, which would be disturbed by the Great Lakes seaway.

The railroads which would compete with the seaway would need to lower their rates not only for the 7 months of navigation but year around, thus again giving the east and west drift of commerce an advantage over the north and south drift, on which much money is being spent.

The Great Lakes region now enjoys low import-export freight rates and has an advantage over most of the country.

It is felt the proposed seaway would be decidedly detrimental to southern ports, from which our company exclusively operates.

We are attaching hereto pamphlet prepared by the Mississippi Valley Association, also copy of letter from American Merchant Marine Institute, dated February 26, to Senator HATCH.

We have no plans to send our ships into the Great Lakes.

Very truly yours,

J. T. LYKES,
President.

CHICAGO, DULUTH & GEORGIAN
BAY TRANSIT CO.,
Detroit, Mich., April 11, 1946.

Hon. Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please do accept our apology for delayed acknowledgment of your letter of March 12 to our Mr. D. Dwight Douglas, president, regarding Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

We note the contemplated plans and data for this project, and we have endeavored to keep in touch with the progress of this proposal.

As to our own service, we are an exclusive passenger line, operating the steamers *North American* and *South American*, between the ports of Chicago, Duluth, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo, in regular service during the period May 15 to September 15.

The probability of operating our present ships outside of the Great Lakes area is most remote, as our company has been built on service on the Lakes. There is a definite demand for such service, and we hope to continue it and improve upon it as time goes on.

Passenger lines on the Great Lakes, as you are aware, are restricted by legislation, permitting capacity operation only during 4 months of the year—May 15 to September 15. During the other 8 months of the year capacity is reduced to such an extent that we cannot operate.

The proposed seaway, therefore, would have no direct benefits insofar as our operation as presently set up is concerned.

We appreciate having this opportunity to express our views.

Very respectfully,

EMERY B. HATCH,
Vice President and General Manager.

DETROIT & CLEVELAND NAVIGATION CO.,
Detroit, Mich., March 18, 1946.

Mr. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: We have your letter of March 12, 1946, in connection with the proposed changes in the St. Lawrence River.

So far as the Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co. is concerned, we would have no use for the St. Lawrence waterway. However, we do feel that the locks should all be the same size as the Welland locks for national security. We believe that the present depths of the locks would suffice.

Yours very truly,

JAMES T. McMILLAN,
President.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *March 20, 1946.*

Mr. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 12th has remained unanswered owing to the writer being absent from the city.

We do not feel that there is any transportation by water that is cheaper than that which prevails on the Great Lakes. We therefore feel that there is no economy in the proposed seaway, as we do not feel that the boats that are adapted for the lakes and ocean navigation, can compete with our lake boats for the long water haul from the Head of the Lakes—Lake Superior—and Chicago, to the St. Lawrence Gulf. It is only at times, when there is a bigger demand than we have boats, that the rate between the head of Lake Superior to the Gulf ports would be of any interest to ocean-borne traffic.

We have had the practical experience in the movement of large tonnages of grain from the Northwest to Montreal, and the majority of years in which we have been in business, there is no ocean ship which could compete with the rates which prevail for the movement of this grain from Duluth and to Fort William to Montreal and also from Chicago.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN STEAMSHIP CO.
JOHN J. BOLAND.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 20, 1946.*

Hon. JOSIAH BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Referring to your letter of March 12, 1946, we have given careful consideration to your inquiries concerning the proposed St. Lawrence seaway as a navigation project. In treating with your letter, we have rephrased the inquiries in question form and have added, under a new heading, additional comments in which we believe you will be interested. The questions, answers, and additional comments are:

"Would it be feasible and economical to navigate the proposed seaway with vessels which would be adapted to the Great Lakes and at the same time be suitable for continuous navigation on the Atlantic Ocean?"

Typical oceangoing cargo ships are not equipped to navigate locks. Great Lakes vessels are equipped with mooring engines and chocks of special type for passage through locks. Ocean ships have smaller rudders than Great Lakes ships and are not designed for navigating canals and narrow channels with swift and changing currents. Great Lakes ships are not designed or suitable for ocean navigation, nor could they be loaded or unloaded expeditiously in ocean ports. Loading and unloading machinery in Great Lakes ports is highly specialized and the design of the ships is such that they are coordinated with the dock machinery. To our knowledge there are not now in existence ships which embody both Great Lakes and ocean characteristics. While such a ship might be designed, it could not be operated as economically as the vessels built for special service in one or the other trade.

"What are the distances from Duluth, at the head of Lake Superior, on the one hand, and Chicago, on the other, to the Gulf of St. Lawrence?"

The distances stated in your letter refer to Cabot Strait lying between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic. The distances from upper Great Lakes ports to the Gulf of St. Lawrence would be about 300 miles shorter. The distance from Duluth to New York via the St. Lawrence is 3,014 miles and via the New York State Barge Canal, 1,477 miles. The distance from Cleveland to New York via the St. Lawrence is 2,204 miles and via the New York Barge Canal, 667 miles.

"From the viewpoint of a ship operator, do you believe this seaway, as proposed, would provide savings to shippers and prove attractive to ship operators?"

The savings claimed for traffic on the waterway are based on the carrying of full loads in ships of the largest class able to navigate a 27-foot channel, or, in some cases, on the assumption that the rates to or from Great Lakes ports would be the same or only slightly higher than rates to Atlantic coast ports.

It seems doubtful that full cargoes could be often assembled on the Great Lakes for transport to one or two foreign ports. Failure to obtain such cargoes would militate against any great amount of traffic in manufactured products. The passage by ocean vessels through a distance of some 2,000 miles and return, including the navigation of several locks and many miles of restricted channels, would add appreciably to the cost of operation, although the distance from Chicago to Liverpool is only about 836 miles farther than from New York to Liverpool.

There is a possibility of some savings in the transport of grain from the Canadian Lake Superior ports, Fort William, and Port Arthur, because of saving in transshipment. The saving might amount to 3 cents a bushel or $1 per ton. The cost of capital charges, operation, and maintenance of the St. Lawrence, however, would mean a United States subsidy of some 2 or 3 dollars per ton for the amount of traffic likely to develop, while the savings would relate mainly to Canadian grain.

The maximum draft of a ship navigating the seaway could probably not exceed 24 feet. It was determined in 1941 that only about 13 percent of American ocean ships would be able to traverse the proposed St. Lawrence seaway at full draft. Doubtless there were built during the war many American ships which could navigate the proposed seaway. However, when fully loaded, those ships draw in excess of the maximum draft which the seaway would furnish. Thus their economy in the Great Lakes trade would be impaired. Our opinion is that seaway commerce would be carried mainly in foreign-owned tramp ships operating on much lower costs as to capital charges and crew wages than American vessels. Such vessels, entering the Lakes for grain, would be at liberty to bring foreign coal to Canada at ballast rates replacing our exports of coal to Canada. These export shipments by lake vessels in 1944 exceeded 12,000,000 tons.

"Have you any plans to navigate the St. Lawrence seaway with your own ships; if so, how many?"

This company owns and operates 18 ships of the Great Lakes bulk-cargo type, having an aggregate trip capacity of about 165,000 tons on a 20-foot draft. The largest is 621 feet in length over-all and carries in excess of 15,500 gross tons at a full draft of 24 feet. We have no plans for navigating the St. Lawrence seaway. The passage is more hazardous than the routes of our present traffic. Our ships are not fitted for ocean navigation. The expense of operation due to initial costs and wage rates, as compared with foreign tramp ships would make competition impracticable without a subsidy, which has never been required or requested for the Great Lakes industry, although transportation rates on the Lakes are only about 1 mill per ton-mile.

COMMENTS CONCERNING OTHER ASPECTS OF THE PROFOSED SEAWAY

Since the hearings before your committee in 1944 on the Aiken bill, you are thoroughly familiar with the manner in which the 1941 agreement deals with navigation rights. We venture, however, to review this subject from the standpoint of the Great Lakes ship operator. Navigation rights of American ships in Canadian waters, and of British ships in American waters, are secured through existing treaties. By the treaty of 1871, American ships are given the right of free navigation in the St. Lawrence River from the place where the international boundary leaves the river to the sea. The treaty provides that this right of free navigation is subject to local laws and regulations not inconsistent with that right. Reciprocal rights of navigation are secured to the ships of both countries, in boundary waters, by the treaty of 1909. For purposes of navigation, Lake Michigan, which lies wholly within the United States, is considered part of the boundary waters. The 1909 treaty contains two conditions not found in the 1871 treaty. Those conditions are (1) any restrictive laws or regulations imposed by either country upon the ships of the other, shall operate with equal effect upon its own ships and (2) any tolls imposed for the sale of canals and locks by one country upon the ships of the other, likewise must be applied with equal force to its own ships.

Since the greater portion of the navigation project would lie in the lower St. Lawrence River, the protection afforded by the 1909 treaty, with respect to the equal applicability of tolls and other restrictions, would not be applicable. It seems most unfortunate that the United States should be committed to a reciprocal policy for the Great Lakes and that the same policy is not expressly extended to waters which lie wholly within Canada. The opportunity for discrimination, if not an actual temptation to place burdens upon the American ships for competitive purposes, would seem too great to permit a disparity of this kind to remain.

We are advised that by article IV, paragraph (d), of the 1941 agreement, Canada would be assured sufficient waters from the Great Lakes to maintain her own channels, at and below Montreal, at such depths as she might choose to improve them. There is some opinion that in the event the navigation project is completed Montreal would grow as a part of transshipment.

Because of the navigation hazards of the St. Lawrence River, it would be uneconomical to operate large ships between Great Lakes and ocean ports. It has been suggested that a special Great Lakes-type ship could be developed so that cargoes moving from Great Lakes ports for export could be transported to Montreal for transshipment in ocean vessels. There is very definite trend toward deeper draft for ocean ships. To enable such ships to operate profitably as far inland as Montreal, Canada might very well improve channels of the lower St. Lawrence River to greater depth. The river is already improved from Montreal to Quebec and beyond. Substantial improvement of the navigable channels in the lower St. Lawrence would be of no avail unless the greater depth were compensated by dams or by the use of additional water. That additional water, according to the agreement, would be obtained

by increasing the flow of water through the St. Lawrence from Lake Ontario. Lake Ontario is the smallest of the Great Lakes. To maintain its level with increased abstraction of water would require greater flow from the other lakes; thus the entire system would be adversely affected.

It is a well-established national policy, reflected in domestic law and in the 1909 treaty, that the waters of the Great Lakes should be preserved for navigation and commerce. Both the Federal Government and the Great Lakes States have opposed the abstraction of water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago Drainage Canal, on the ground that the abstraction would adversely affect the levels of the Great Lakes. By the 1909 treaty, Canada and the United States, bound themselves to refrain from making any diversions, in their respective waters, which would affect the level of the waters in the territory of the other, except as the other gave her consent. The provision of the 1941 agreement, with respect to the maintenance of channel depths at and below Montreal, would obviously sacrifice the Great Lakes for the lower St. Lawrence River.

The history of navigation, through the St. Lawrence River, shows that it serves British commerce to a greater extent than United States commerce. If the navigation project is completed, that situation would be accentuated. The British Isles have always been large consumers of grain grown in the Canadian northwest. The Ottawa conference of 1932 gave tariff preference to Canadian wheat transported from the growing fields to Liverpool by British facilities. Canadian wheat loaded at Fort William-Port Arthur, Ontario, on Lake Superior, was formerly transported in large volumes by means of American ships to Buffalo, N. Y., and then transshipped either by way of New York or Montreal. The imperial preferences had the effect of routing Canadian wheat down the Great Lakes in Canadian facilities. If the United States intends to participate in the proposed navigation project and finance the greater portion of the cost, the United States should insist that Great Britain refrain from asserting discriminatory measures against United States ships.

We greatly appreciate this opportunity to make known to you our views concerning this proposed seaway. It will be considered a pleasure to respond to any further inquiries which may occur to you.

Respectfully yours,

THE PIONEER STEAMSHIP CO.,
J. T. HUTCHINSON, *President.*

THE INTERLAKE STEAMSHIP CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 28, 1946.

Hon. J. W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Because of absence from my office, your letter of March 12 regarding the St. Lawrence waterway, has just come to my attention. I do not believe that there is very much that I can add, from the viewpoint of a bulk-vessel operator on the Great Lakes, to the facts and conclusions already presented before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the Lake Carriers Association. This group, which is composed of substantially all the operators of bulk-dry-cargo vessels operating on the Great Lakes, has made a thorough study of the St. Lawrence waterway proposal and, in my opinion, you can have full confidence in the facts and the conclusions they have presented.

In answer to your first question, it would be folly to say that the proposed seaway would not provide savings to some shippers, nor prove attractive to some operators. However, it is my opinion that it would not provide sufficient savings to a sufficient number of American shippers, nor prove attractive to a sufficient number of American ship operators to justify the required expenditures. I personally fail to see where a sufficient number of Americans will be benefited to justify the expenditure of the public's money on the enterprise.

In answer to your second question, our company is engaged in the transportation of iron ore, coal, limestone, and grain. Our vessels are not adaptable to ocean navigation and, furthermore, the expense of operation due to initial cost and high American wage rates would make it impractical to compete with foreign tramp ships. We, therefore, have no plans for future navigation of the seaway should it materialize.

I trust that the above answers your questions. If you have any further questions, I would be only too pleased to hear from you.

Very truly yours,

THE INTERLAKE STEAMSHIP CO.

THE TOMLINSON FLEET,
Bay City, Mich., March 20, 1946.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On my return from Cleveland, I find your letter of the 12th, addressed to me as president of the Inter-Ocean Steamship Co., 2900 Terminal Tower, Cleveland 13, Ohio. I am very glad indeed to hear from you in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

About 40 years ago the State of Michigan authorized a sum of money to be spent and the Governor, Fred M. Warner, to appoint a commission to see what could be done about improving the St. Lawrence waterway. I happened to be selected by Governor Warner as a member of that commission and I am the only one of that original Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission left, the others having passed on. Our commission set to work at once to interest other States in this great project and eventually we had 23 States contiguous to the Great Lakes that had formed associations favorable to the St. Lawrence waterway.

When this matter was called to the attention of President Coolidge, he decided that it was time to appoint a commission from the United States to act jointly with a similar commission from the Dominion of Canada, and he appointed as the United States-St. Lawrence Commission the following:

Herbert Hoover, chairman; William C. Breed, New York; James P. Goodrich, Indiana; James E. Davidson, Michigan; Charles L. Allen, Massachusetts; James R. Howard, Iowa; James F. Noonan, Missouri.

Joint Board of Engineers: Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers; Col. William Kelly and Lt. Col. George B. Pillsbury, Corps of Engineers.

To work in conjunction with the American commission, the Canadian Government appointed the following engineers: Duncan W. Maclachlan, Department of Railways and Canals; Oliver O. Lefevre, chief engineer, Quebec-St. Lawrence commission; Brig. Gen. Charles Hamilton Mitchell.

Many meetings were held and Herbert Hoover, with the commission and engineers, has been over this route three times. After years of study, preparation of plans and specifications and estimates of cost, we recommended the St. Lawrence route as the cheapest, most accessible, and best route, not only to shorten the distance to the seaboard, but to show the best promise in the reduction of freight rates.

At about this time the Dominion of Canada commenced work on its new Welland Canal locks in anticipation of the St. Lawrence project being completed. These locks now connect Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, so that the only impediment preventing the use of the St. Lawrence seaway by oceangoing ships is the rocky shallows in the river for a minimum distance of 21 miles, or a maximum distance of not more than 24 miles.

I am president not only of the Inter-Ocean Steamship Co., but of all the companies noted at the head of this letter, except the Sierra Steamship Co., of which my son is president. All the ships owned by these companies are large, modern, steel freighters and there are 11 of them altogether. They are now engaged in the general lake trade, carrying ore, coal, limestone, and grain. Our largest ships carry considerable grain from Duluth, Minn., down through the new Welland Canal on to Lake Ontario and to Oswego, N. Y., which is right near the St. Lawrence River entrance to Lake Ontario. The new locks installed by the Dominion of Canada are splendid in every way and will take care of at least 80 percent of all ocean tonnage.

My family has been engaged in the Great Lakes transportation for upwards of 75 years. In the early days the ships were small wooden sailing vessels, carrying about 21,000 bushels of grain, but as time advanced we kept pace with shipbuilding progress and have built larger and larger ships for our fleets.

Buffalo, N. Y., is my former home. My father and mother were born there, as were all their children. I am still interested in companies doing business in that city and would not do anything to hurt Buffalo. However, all the lower lake ports can get along very well without stevedoring business; that is, the transferring of freight from lake ships to the railroads or canal boats navigating the Erie Canal. The development of the St. Lawrence seaway will be a wonderful thing for America, and particularly for the fifty-odd-millions of people residing in the middle section of the United States.

Thank you for your inquiry, and I shall be very glad to answer any specific questions that you have occasion to propound.

With sincere regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

JAMES E. DAVIDSON.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I secured unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts today, a memorandum entitled, "Constitutionality of St. Lawrence Legislation," submitted by the Department of State to a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on Senate Joint Resolution 104, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, the memorandum being signed by Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State. I now present the memorandum for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF ST. LAWRENCE LEGISLATION

INTRODUCTION

There is pending before the Senate a joint resolution [1] "approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes."

Identical proposals are pending in the House of Representatives. The purpose of these measures is to provide for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and certain power facilities in the Inter-

[1] S. J. Res. 104, 79th Cong., 1st sess.

national Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River and for the negotiation of an agreement with the State of New York for the transfer to it of such power facilities.

QUESTION

The question has been raised as to the constitutionality of Senate Joint Resolution 104 on the ground that it is not within the power of Congress to pass legislation authorizing the United States to construct the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in cooperation and pursuant to an agreement with Canada, and that such construction may be undertaken by this country only pursuant to a treaty ratified in the case of this country by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

CONCLUSION

It has been concluded that the United States may validly and constitutionally undertake to perform its share of the construction of these projects pursuant to legislation approving the agreement with Canada and authorizing the execution of the provisions thereof, and therefore that Senate Joint Resolution 104, when enacted by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress and approved by the President, will be a valid and constitutional enactment.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On March 19, 1941, there was executed an agreement between the United States and Canada (herein called the "agreement" or "1941 agreement")[2] providing in substance for the construction of certain works necessary for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway and for the construction of certain power works in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River.

Provisions of the agreement

Article I of the agreement provides that the Governments of the United States and Canada agree to establish and maintain a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission the duties of which would be generally to supervise the construction of the works. Section 4 of article I states that the Governments may, by exchange of notes, extend or abridge the powers and duties of the Commission. In view of fears expressed in the Senate in December 1944,[3] that advantage might be taken of this provision to increase the obligations of the United States Government under the agreement, section 4 (b) of Senate Joint Resolution 104 would provide that unless Congress by law authorizes such action, no amendment of the agreement, and no exchange of notes under article I, section 4, thereof, shall impose additional financial or other obligations on the United States. This provision of Senate Joint Resolution 104 is similar to those which have been inserted in various recent joint resolutions which have been passed to effectuate international agreements of the United States, including those with respect to UNRRA and the Bretton Woods agreements discussed below. A similar provision is included in the bill creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission also discussed below.

Under articles II and III, respectively, the Governments of Canada and the United States agree to construct or complete the respective portions of the works allocated to both countries by the proposed International Commission. Each country is to operate or arrange for the operation of works situated in its respective territory.

Article IV contains certain ancillary provisions related to the construction and operation of the works including a provision with respect to the control of the flow of water out of Lake Ontario into the St. Lawrence River during the construction and upon the completion of the works so as not to impair navigation in the Canadian section of the river.

Article V contains a general reservation of sovereignty over the respective territories of both countries. Article VI provides that either Government may at any time construct within its own territory alternative facilities for navigation in the international section. Article VIII relates to the preservation of the level of the Great Lakes system.

Articles VII and IX of the agreement are proposed to be excepted from the approval of the Congress under the pending legislation. The first of these would provide in effect that the rights of navigation accorded under the provisions of existing treaties between the United States and Great Britain should be made permanent regardless of any termination provisions in such treaties. (The waters primarily affected under this provision would be those of Lake Michigan as to which navigation rights are extended to Canada under article I of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 referred to below, so long as that treaty remains in force.) Article IX relates to obligations with respect to the preservation of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and, in paragraph (b), provides that diversions of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls additional to the amounts specified in the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 may be authorized and permitted by the Governments in accordance with a procedure set forth in article IX. Articles VII and IX of the 1941 agreement therefore purport to amend provisions of an existing treaty through a procedure other than the treaty process. Since this aspect of these provisions has been the primary source of discussion as to the constitutionality of the procedure used in this case, and since these provisions do not relate directly to the principal subject matter of the 1941 agreement, it was felt desirable by the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 104 to limit the approval of the Congress to those provisions of the 1941 agreement which do not purport to alter or extend rights created by previous treaties and which relate to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The pending legislation would except these two articles from approval and would express the sense of the Congress that the subject matter thereof should be dealt with by treaty. In this way every effort is made to facilitate the consideration of the St. Lawrence project on its merits while at the same time articles VII and IX are excepted from approval solely by reason of considerations of a constitutional nature.

Article X provides for the disposition of certain claims which may arise during the course of the construction and certain related matters.

Article XI states that the agreement shall be subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States of America and the Parliament of Canada and that following such approval the agreement shall be proclaimed by the United States and ratified in respect of Canada and that it shall enter into force upon the exchange of the instrument of ratification and a copy of the proclamation.

Legislative background

The agreement was signed on March 19, 1941, and later that year extensive hearings were held before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives on H. R. 4927, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which provided for the approval by the Congress of the agreement and the negotiation of an arrangement with the State of New York for the transfer of the power facilities. These hearings were primarily devoted to the economic merits of the two projects and concluded in a favorable report by the committee on the measure by a vote of 17 to 8. There was incidental discussion during the course of these hearings concerning the constitutional problems herein discussed, and there was submitted the opinion of the then Attorney General of the United States expressing the view that—"it is legally unobjectionable so far as this country is concerned for the executives of the United States and Canada to enter into an agreement regarding the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway project conditioned for its effectiveness upon the subsequent enactment of necessary legislation by the Congress and by the Canadian Parliament"—and that—"if an agreement is executed and approved in this manner its provisions would be binding upon the United States as respects Canada."[4] Although the bill was favorably reported by the committee, further consideration of the matter at that time was prevented owing to the Pearl Harbor attack.

In November 1944, hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate with respect to S. 1385, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, which was substantially similar to the bill considered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. These hearings were specifically limited to the constitutional issue discussed herein, and testimony was taken both in favor of and against the view that the agreement might legally be brought into force as to the United States through concurrent legislation rather than through the treaty procedure. Much of this discussion revolved about the proposed modification by articles VII and IX of the 1941 agreement of rights brought into being by previous treaties. Upon the conclusion of the hearings no report was made by the subcommittee and no action taken by the Committee on Commerce with respect to the proposed legislation. Thereafter, in December 1944, an effort was made to include the substance of S. 1385 as an amendment to the then pending rivers and harbors legislation. This motion was defeated by a vote of 56 to 25.[5] A number of Senators voting in the negative on this motion stated that they were doing so solely out of a desire not to prejudice the rivers and harbors bill or because of their feeling that full hearings should be held on the merits of the St. Lawrence project in the Senate and that, accordingly, their votes were without prejudice to their position at the time that the issue of approving the St. Lawrence project might be presented to the Senate on its merits.

Thereafter considerable time was devoted by a nonpartisan group of Members of the Senate, in cooperation with representatives of the executive department, to prepare legislation which would meet the objections which had been raised on constitutional grounds by Members of the Senate during the hearings and discussion on the floor in November and December 1944, and which would facilitate the consideration of the agreement in the Senate on its merits. The result of these deliberations was the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 104 on which hearings are now being held.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND[6]

The St. Lawrence seaway has been a source of discussion and study for more than 1^0 years and in fact a complete, navigable channel throughout the route in question has been in operation for the greater part

[2] H. Doc. No. 153, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9361.

[4] Hearings, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, on H. R. 4927, 77th Cong., 1st sess., pt. I, p. 44.

[5] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9382.

[6] For a more complete chronological statement, see 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9362. For a statement as to the provisions of earlier treaties with reference to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, see sec. VI below of this memorandum.

of that time. In 1895 an international commission was created to examine the feasibility of constructing a ship canal from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean which would necessitate the deepening of the existing facilities. That commission reported unanimously in favor of the construction of the seaway and accordingly in 1897 the United States appointed a board of engineers which reported in 1900 in favor of the construction of a waterway on United States territory.

In 1905 an International Waterways Commission was created which reported from time to time on various subjects including certain phases of the seaway proposal. In 1920 the United States and Canadian Governments instructed the International Joint Commission created under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 to consider the possibility of improving the St. Lawrence for navigation and for hydroelectric power and recommended in 1922 that engineering plans and specifications be prepared and that the Governments take steps to authorize the project. At this time the Canadian Government requested more time to study the matter. In December 1923 President Coolidge recommended to Congress a program for the development of the St. Lawrence Basin, and in February 1924 the United States accepted the proposal of the Canadian Government for a further engineering investigation. In 1924 the United States appointed a St. Lawrence Commission, of which Mr. Herbert Hoover was named chairman, and, in the same year, Canada likewise appointed a National Advisory Committee, the purpose of both of which was to restudy the entire problem. At the same time both countries created a Joint Engineering Board, which reported back in 1926 in favor of the construction of the seaway, the United States members favoring a single-stage project and the Canadian members, a double-stage project. In 1932 the Joint Engineering Board made another report on the subject which was followed in July 1932 by the signature of a treaty between the two countries for the construction of the seaway and power project. This treaty failed of ratification in the United States, the vote in the Senate on March 14, 1934, in favor of ratification having been only 49 to 43, thus lacking the necessary two-thirds majority.

In May 1938 negotiations were renewed between the two countries for the conclusion of a treaty or agreement with respect to the project. In January 1941 the United States and Canadian committees on the St. Lawrence project again reported favorably with reference to the two projects. On the basis of these reports, the present agreement was signed in March 1941. The principal difference between the agreement and the earlier treaty is that the present document provides for a single-stage project with reference to the seaway whereas the earlier document provided for a double-stage project.

The following is an excerpt from a letter dated May 23, 1944, from former Secretary of State Hull to Senator VANDENBERG concerning the procedure used in this case.

"There were two special considerations which impelled the present administration to sign the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement in a form which would involve its becoming effective upon approval by the Congress and by the Canadian Parliament. The issues involved in the project are largely domestic rather than international. The project would involve the expenditure of approximately $285,000,000 Federal funds to complete our share of the works (of this sum roughly $93,000,000 would be repaid by the State of New York for the United States share of the water power). It, therefore, seemed appropriate that the House of Representatives should have a voice in passing on an international obligation involving so large an appropriation of Federal funds.

"To my mind it is a question of little importance which method is pursued. What is of importance is that we should not lose the benefits of this great international waterway system, with all its potentialities." [7]

II. POWERS OF CONGRESS

The subject matter of the pending legislation relates directly to powers which under the Constitution are vested in the Congress and which repeatedly have been construed by the Supreme Court of the United States to clothe the Congress and the Federal Government with authority to engage in or authorize the construction of projects such as those with which we are here concerned. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, provides that Congress shall have the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States * * *." By virtue of this provision legislative authority with respect to all matters concerned with interstate and foreign commerce is vested jointly in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

In particular the development of the natural resources of the United States through action of the Federal Government under these powers has been a fundamental policy of the Nation regardless of the political party in power for generations. The Congress has repeatedly exercised these powers to authorize the construction of navigation and power projects of great magnitude and of profound significance to the economic life of the United States. Many of the greatest man-made undertakings have resulted from this policy, including Boulder Dam, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the great Federal projects on the Columbia River. Some of these have been built wholly by the Federal Government; others, by the Federal Government in conjunction with the States. The constitutionality of the acts of Congress authorizing these projects is firmly established by a long line of judicial decisions interpreting and clarifying the powers of Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Judicial decisions under commerce clause

One of the earliest and most authoritative examinations of the powers of Congress in this regard is contained in the opinion of Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*,[8] which invalidated an act of the Legislature of the State of New York granting to certain persons the exclusive right of navigation of all of the waters within that State, on the ground that such act was in contravention of the powers of Congress under the commerce clause. In so holding the Court stated as follows:

"But, in regulating commerce with foreign nations, the power of Congress does not stop at the jurisdictional lines of the several States. It would be a very useless power if it could not pass those lines. The commerce of the United States with foreign nations, is that of the whole United States. Every district has a right to participate in it. The deep streams which penetrate our country in every direction, pass through the interior of almost every State in the Union, and furnish the means of exercising this right. If Congress has the power to regulate it, that power must be exercised whenever the subject exists. If it exists within the States, if a foreign voyage may commence or terminate at a port within a State, then the power of Congress may be exercised within a State.[9]

"We are now arrived at the inquiry, What is this power? It is the power to regulate; that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations, other than are prescribed in the Constitution. These are expressed in plain terms, and do not affect the questions which arise in this case, or which have been discussed at the bar. If, as has always been understood, the sovereignty of Congress, though limited to specified objects, is plenary as to those objects, the power over commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, is vested in Congress as absolutely as it would be in a single government, having in its constitution the same restrictions on the exercise of the power as are found in the Constitution of the United States." [10]

Another early decision of the Supreme Court in this regard was *Pennsylvania* v. *The Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Company*.[11] In this case the State of Pennsylvania had brought suit to remove an alleged obstruction to the navigation of the Ohio river caused by the erection of bridges at Wheeling. The Supreme Court had in May 1852 rendered a decree directing the removal of the obstruction as being in violation of an earlier act of Congress which was deemed to have secured to the public free and unobstructed use of the river. In August 1852 the Congress passed a law providing that the bridges in question were declared to be lawful structures anything in the laws of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. Defendants relied on this statute as authority for continuing the bridge and in holding in their favor the Court stated:

"We do not enter upon the question, whether or not Congress possess the power, under the authority in the Constitution, 'to establish post offices and post roads,' to legalize this bridge; for, conceding that no such powers can be derived from this clause, it must be admitted that it is, at least, necessarily included in the power conferred to regulate commerce among the several States. The regulation of commerce includes intercourse and navigation, and, of course, the power to determine what shall or shall not be deemed in judgment of law an obstruction to navigation; and that power, as we have seen, has been exercised consistent with the continuance of the bridge."

In *Wisconsin* v. *Duluth*,[12] there was involved the right of the Congress to control the improvement of the harbor of Duluth and in particular to direct the construction of a canal for navigation on a course approved by the Congress which was objected to by the State of Wisconsin. In holding that the action of the Congress was proper, the court stated:

"Nor can there be any doubt that such action is within the constitutional power of Congress. It is a power which has been exercised ever since the Government was organized under the Constitution. The only question ever raised has been how far and under what circumstances the exercise of the power is exclusive of its exercise by the States. And while this Court has maintained, in many cases, the right of the States to authorize structures in and over the navigable waters of the States, which may either impede or improve their navigation, in the absence of any action of the general government in the same matter, the doctrine has been laid down with unvarying uniformity, that when Congress has, by any expression of its will, occupied the field, that action was conclusive of any right to the contrary asserted under State authority. The adjudged cases in this Court on this point are numerous."

The case of *Arizona* v. *California* [13] carried this doctrine further in upholding the constitutionality of the Boulder Canyon Project Act.[14] This act authorized the Secretary of the Interior at the expense of the United States and in cooperation with the several States of the Colorado River Basin to con-

[7] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9292.
[8] 9 Wheat. 1.
[9] 9 Wheat. 195.
[10] 9 Wheat. 196–197.
[11] 18 How. 421.
[12] 96 U. S. 379.
[13] 283 U. S. 423.
[14] 45 Stat. 1057.

struct at Black Canyon on the Colorado River a dam, a storage reservoir, and a hydroelectric plant; provided for their construction and operation by the United States; and declared that this authority was conferred "for the purpose of controlling floods, improving navigation, and regulating the flow of the Colorado River * * * and for the generation of electric energy. * * *" The constitutionality of this act was attacked by the State of Arizona in a petition which charged the invasion of its rights in the waters of the Colorado River. The Court in upholding the validity of the law specifically stated that "the Federal Government has the power to create this obstruction in the river for the purpose of improving navigation if the Colorado River is navigable" and found that the river was navigable.[15]

In *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*,[16] there was not involved directly the constitutionality of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 [17] but the Court explicitly upheld the constitutional authority of the Federal Government to construct and operate one of the principal component dams, namely, Wilson Dam, which had been constructed under the authority of the National Defense Act of 1916.[18] In so holding the Court stated:

"The act of 1916 also had in view 'improvements to navigation.' Commerce includes navigation. 'All America understands, and has uniformly understood,' said Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, 190), 'the word "commerce" to comprehend navigation.' The power to regulate interstate commerce embraces the power to keep the navigable rivers of the United States free from obstructions to navigation and to remove such obstructions when they exist. 'For these purposes,' said the Court in *Gilman* v. *Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713, 725), 'Congress possesses all the powers which existed in the States before the adoption of the National Constitution, and which have always existed in the Parliament in England.' " [19]

In *United States* v. *Appalachian Electric Power Company*, the Supreme Court stated:

"In our view, it cannot properly be said that the constitutional power of the United States over its waters is limited to control for navigation. * * * In truth the authority of the United States is the regulation of commerce on its waters. Navigability, in the sense just stated, is but a part of this whole. Flood protection, watershed development, recovery of the cost of improvements through utilization of power are likewise parts of commerce control * * * the authority of the Government over the stream * * * is as broad as the needs of commerce. Water-power development from dams in navigable streams is from the public's standpoint a byproduct of the general use of the rivers for commerce. * * * The point is that navigable waters are subject to national planning and control in the broad regulation of commerce granted the Federal Government." [20]

It may be of interest to note that in a case involving the right of the Federal Government to license pilots on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit said: "Congress unquestionably has power to regulate commerce upon the waters involved." [21]

Agreements with Canada through legislation

The 1941 agreement with Canada for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project represents a continuation of the policy of the Federal Government in participating under the authority of the commerce clause in projects for the development of the natural resources of the United States. The commerce clause applies not only to commerce between the States but also to commerce with foreign nations. On numerous occasions Congress has exercised its powers with respect to foreign commerce to provide for the conclusion or effectuation of agreements between this country and foreign countries. As is to be expected many of these instances have involved our nearest neighbor, Canada, whose geographical propinquity brings about many problems of a similar nature with respect to the regulation of commerce and navigation as have arisen domestically. The power of the Federal Government to participate in the development of the resources of the St. Lawrence River, an international stream, rests not only upon its power to regulate commerce between the States but also upon its power to regulate commerce with foreign countries.

International Bridges

One of the most frequent examples of the use of the powers of Congress under the commerce clause in respect of construction projects with foreign countries relates to the construction or authorization of bridges over international streams. Examples of such legislation, the effectiveness of which has been conditioned upon similar action on the part of the foreign country concerned, are found in nearly every volume of the Statutes of the United States. Thus by the act of March 18, 1924,[22] the consent of Congress was granted "for the construction, maintenance, and operation by the State of Maine and the Dominion of Canada, jointly, of a bridge, to be erected across the St. John River * * * : *Provided*, That the construction of said bridge shall not be commenced until the consent of the proper authorities of the Dominion of Canada * * * shall have been obtained."

Other examples include the act of June 3, 1924,[23] relating to a bridge across the Niagara River at Buffalo; the act of June 28, 1935, relating to a bridge across the St. John River at Madawaska,[24] the act of June 16, 1938, creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission;[25] and the act of December 16, 1940,[26] which authorized the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan and "in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes * * * to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Marys River * * * subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities of the Dominion of Canada." It is of particular interest to note the explicit reference in this last act to the facilitation of international commerce as constituting one of the considerations on which the passage of the act was based.

The importance of this type of legislation in relation to the question at issue here has been minimized by the opponents of the St. Lawrence project on the ground that there is nothing unusual about legislation to construct a bridge.[27] With this in mind and in view of the fact that many of the bridges referred to above such as the bridge at Niagara Falls have involved expenditures of many millions of dollars, a detailed examination of one of these cases may be instructive. In particular, the act of June 16, 1933, with respect to the bridge at Niagara Falls has many features which are strikingly similar to certain of those in connection with the St. Lawrence legislation with which we are here concerned.[28] This act, taken in conjunction with the corresponding action of Canada to authorize the construction, in effect brings into being an international agreement through concurrent action of the two countries for the construction of a project of major importance to the commercial relations of the two nations. In enacting the authorizing legislation and order in council, respectively, the United States Congress and the Canadian Government had before them a specific plan for the construction of the bridge. The United States legislation, which again recites that its purpose is "to facilitate international commerce," authorized the construction and operation of a bridge across the Niagara River at Niagara Falls subject "to the conditions and limitations contained in this joint resolution and subject to the approval of the proper authorities of the Dominion of Canada."

The resolution created the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission which was vested with broad powers to sue and be sued; to hold and convey real property; to contract; and in general to exercise all powers necessary to carry out the purposes of the legislation. It was provided that the Commission should consist of four members to be appointed by the Governor of New York and four to be appointed by Canada or the Province of Ontario. The Commission was given power to condemn land in New York and "to exercise in the Dominion of Canada all rights, power, and authority which shall be granted or permitted to the Commission by the proper authorities of the Dominion of Canada or the Province of Ontario, including the entering upon lands and acquiring, condemning * * * such real estate * * * in the Dominion of Canada as may be needed for such location * * * such bridge." The Commission was authorized to charge tolls and to issue its sinking fund bonds in order to provide for the payment of the cost of the bridge, income from which bonds was to be exempt from all Federal, State, and local taxation on the ground that "the bridge constructed under the authority of this joint resolution shall be deemed an instrumentality for international commerce authorized by the Government of the United States." [29]

With respect to tolls the act provided that no toll should be charged officials or employees of the Commission or of the two Governments or their political subdivisions while in the discharge of their duties. After payment of the bonds provision was made for the transfer of the bridge to and its subsequent operation by appropriate authorities of New York and Canada and for the liquidation of the Commission, except that if appropriate arrangements could not be made for the transfer of the bridge to New York and Canada, title to the bridge should remain in the Commission. Section 10 of the act provided that all provisions thereof could be enforced by appropriate remedy brought by the attorney general of New York, the United States district attorney or by the Solicitor General of Canada. Finally, the Congress expressly reserved the right to alter, amend, or repeal the joint resolution. Although the constitutionality of this act

[15] 283 U. S. 452.
[16] 297 U. S. 288.
[17] 48 Stat. 58.
[18] 39 Stat. 166.
[19] 297 U. S. 328.
[20] 311 U. S. 377, 426.
[21] *Williams* v. *Molther* (198 Fed. 460, 463).

[22] 43 Stat. 27.
[23] 43 Stat. 355.
[24] 49 Stat. 426.
[25] 52 Stat 767, amended in certain respects by the act of July 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 1083) and the act of April 12, 1940 (54 Stat. 107).
[26] 54 Stat. 1222.
[27] See sec. V concerning arguments of the opponents.

[28] Concurrent action was taken by Canada to authorize the construction of the Niagara Falls Bridge through the issuance of Order in Council P. C. 890, April 15, 1939, under the Navigable Waters Protection Act (ch. 140, Rev. Stat. Canada 1927). The Niagara Falls Bridge Commission legislation is similar in many respects to the act of June 14, 1933, creating the St. Lawrence Bridge Commission and authorizing the construction of a bridge from Ogdensburg, N. Y., to Prescott, Ontario (48 Stat. 141; 53 Stat. 621).
[29] This provision was subsequently repealed, 53 Stat. 1083.

has not been challenged, the act was cited with apparent approval by the Supreme Court in the case of *Keifer & Keifer* v. *Reconstruction Finance Corporation*.[30]

The Niagara Falls Bridge Act is a complex and important legislative enactment by Congress under its powers with respect to interstate and foreign commerce. The arrangement which this legislation and the concurrent action of Canada brought into being contains provisions of mutual interest to the two countries of a substantial and continuing nature and of such importance as to necessitate the creation of an autonomous commission of representatives of the two countries or their subdivisions to supervise the execution of these undertakings. It is submitted that this legislation constitutes a striking precedent for the procedure with which we are here concerned.

Reciprocal Wrecking Privileges

The powers of Congress under the commerce clause have been used frequently to bring about international arrangements through reciprocal or concurrent legislation with Canada on a variety of other subjects. An important example of this procedure concerned the negotiations which concluded in 1893 in an arrangement expressed in concurrent laws and proclamations with respect to reciprocal privileges to the vessels of the two countries to render aid to wrecked vessels of their respective nationalities in the contiguous waters of each country. The act of June 19, 1878,[31] as amended by the act of May 24, 1890,[32] provided:

"That Canadian vessels and wrecking appurtenances may render aid and assistance to Canadian or other vessels and property wrecked, disabled, or in distress in the waters of the United States contiguous to the Dominion of Canada: *Provided*, That this act shall not take effect until proclamation by the President of the United States that the privileges of aiding American or other vessels and property wrecked, disabled, or in distress in Canadian waters contiguous to the United States has been extended by the Government of the Dominion of Canada to American vessels and wrecking appliances of all descriptions. This act shall be construed to apply to the Welland Canal, the canal and improvement of the waters between Lake Erie and Lake Huron, and to the waters of the St. Marys River and canal: *And provided further*, That this act shall cease to be in force from and after the date of the proclamation of the President of the United States to the effect that said reciprocal privilege has been withdrawn, revoked, or rendered inoperative by the said Government of the Dominion of Canada."

In 1892 the Parliament of Canada passed a law[33] to extend to American wreckers privileges reciprocal to those provided for Canadian wreckers in the United States legislation, conditional upon the issuance of a proclamation by the Governor General of Canada. The Canadian act, however, made no reference to the Welland Canal, as the result of which omission there ensued protracted negotiations between the Department of State and the Canadian authorities in which the United States took the position that it would issue no proclamation until Canada has complied fully with the requirements of the United States legislation.[34] Ultimately, in order to bring the negotiations to a close, the Secretary of State requested the Congress to amend further the legislation of 1878, as amended by the legislation of 1890, by deleting the reference to the Welland Canal, and this was done by the Congress in the Department of State Appropriation Act of 1893.[35] Thereupon the negotiations bore fruit in the issuance by Canada of the necessary proclamation,[36] whereupon the corresponding proclamation was issued by President Cleveland stating:

"I, Grover Cleveland, President of the United States of America, in virtue of the authority conferred upon me by the aforesaid act of Congress, approved May 24, 1890, do proclaim that the condition specified in the legislation of Congress aforesaid now exists and is fulfilled and that the provisions of said act of May 24, 1890, whereby Canadian vessels and wrecking appliances may render aid and assistance to Canadian and other vessels and property wrecked, disabled, or in distress, in the waters of the United States contiguous to the Dominion of Canada, including the canal and improvement of the waters between Lake Erie and Lake Huron and the waters of the St. Marys River and Canal, are now in full force and effect." [37]

It is believed that this is one of the most striking examples of the conclusion of an agreement of vital importance to the two nations through the use of reciprocal legislation. The protracted negotiations which were carried on to arrive at precise reciprocity, culminating in the action of the Congress in reamending the United States legislation to accord exactly with the terms of the Canadian legislation, is of especial significance as bearing upon the mutuality of the arrangement which was ultimately concluded.

Nondiscriminatory Tolls

A simultaneous controversy with Canada which was settled through substantially the same procedure concerned alleged discrimination by Canada with respect to tolls upon traffic through the Welland Canal. In 1891 the Lake Carriers Association complained to the Department of State of such allegedly discriminatory tolls and suggested that in order to remedy the situation the United States should place in effect a system of tolls in the St. Marys Falls Canal which would operate against Canadian vessels in like manner. Formal representations to Canada by the Department of State not having brought about an alleviation of the situation,[38] Congress enacted the act of July 26, 1892,[39] entitled "An act to enforce reciprocal commercial relations between the United States and Canada, and for other purposes" providing:

"That, with a view of securing reciprocal advantages for the citizens, ports, and vessels of the United States, on and after the 1st day of August 1892, whenever and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the passage through any canal or lock connected with the navigation of the St. Lawrence River, the Great Lakes, or the waterways connecting the same, of any vessels of the United States, or of cargoes or passengers in transit to any port of the United States, is prohibited or is made difficult or burdensome by the imposition of tolls or otherwise which, in view of the free passage through the St. Marys Falls Canal, now permitted to vessels of all nations, he shall deem to be reciprocally unjust and unreasonable, he shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, for such time and to such extent (including absolute prohibition) as he shall deem just, the right of free passage through the St. Marys Falls Canal, so far as it relates to vessels owned by the subjects of the Government so discriminating against the citizens, ports, or vessels of the United States, or to any cargoes, portions of cargoes, or passengers in transit to the ports of the government making such discrimination, whether carried in vessels of the United States or of other nations."

By proclamation of August 18, 1892,[40] the President, acting under the authority of this statute, imposed the required toll upon Canadian traffic. Further negotiations between the Department of State and Canada having resulted in the passage of an order in council of Canada suspending the Canadian toll in the Welland Canal,[41] President Harrison on February 21, 1893, issued a proclamation [42] suspending the provisions of the earlier proclamation. In communicating this information to the British Embassy in Washington, the Secretary of State, Mr. Foster, expressed his "gratification that this understanding in the mutual interest of the commerce of the United States and her Majesty's Dominion of Canada has thus been reached * * *." [43]

Tariff Reciprocity

Another example of the exercise by Congress of its powers under the commerce clause to reach agreement with Canada on economic matters was the procedure followed during the administration of President Taft with respect to tariff reciprocity. By exchange of notes dated January 21, 1911, between the Secretary of State and the Canadian Minister, there was set forth an agreement of the two Governments in regard to reciprocal tariff legislation which provided that the President of the United States would communicate to Congress the conclusions reached therein and recommend the adoption of legislation to give effect to the "proposed arrangement"; and that simultaneously parallel action would be taken in Canada. It was agreed that the United States legislation might contain a provision that it should not come into operation until the United States was assured that corresponding legislation had been passed by Canada and that a similar provision might be included in the Canadian legislation.[44] On July 26, 1911, the President approved the Canadian Reciprocity Act [45] which set forth a schedule of duties on imports of specified products from Canada and provided that such duties should take effect whenever the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that, on certain specified articles exported from the United States, duties at not in excess of the rates set forth in the act should be charged thereon when imported into Canada. Under section 3 of the act the President was authorized and requested to negotiate further trade agreements with Canada, provided that "said trade agreements before becoming operative shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection."

Although the agreement was not effectuated, since the Canadian Parliament did not take the requisite action to enact the reciprocal legislation required, the act of July 26, 1911, is nevertheless a striking example of the exercise by Congress of its powers over foreign commerce to carry out an agreement with a foreign nation. The argument of the opponents of the St. Lawrence legislation that the Canadian Reciprocity Act of 1911 is not a precedent, on the ground that tariff measures customarily originate in the House of Representatives, is entirely inconsistent with their principal thesis that agreements with foreign countries must be handled through the treaty process regardless of whether the subject matter of the agreement relates to one of the delegated powers of the Congress.

[30] 306 U. S. 381, 391.
[31] 20 Stat. 175.
[32] 26 Stat. 120.
[33] 55, 56 Vic., ch. 4.
[34] See Foreign Relations of the United States, 1892, pp. 277, 289–292, 294–295, 295–296, 304–305, 307–308, 331–333; Foreign Relations of the United States, 1893, pp. 334, 340, 346, 347, 348, 351, 352, 354.
[35] 27 Stat. 683.
[36] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1893, 343.
[37] 28 Stat. 1220.
[38] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1892, 250 et seq.
[39] 27 Stat. 267.
[40] 27 Stat. 1032.
[41] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1893, pp. 329–330.
[42] 27 Stat. 1065.
[43] Foreign Relations of the United States, 1893, 330.
[44] The text of the exchange of notes of January 21, 1911, and of the special message of President Taft to Congress of January 26, 1911, are published in S. Doc. 787, 61st Cong., 3d sess.
[45] 37 Stat. 4.

Joint Regulation of Fur Seals

Another example of legislation under the commerce powers of the Congress to effectuate an agreement with Canada is the act of February 26, 1944, to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States and Canada; to protect the fur seals of Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes.[46] By exchange of notes between the Secretary of State and the Canadian Minister in Washington in December 1942, there was brought into being an agreement for the protection and utilization of the fur seal herd of the Pribilof Islands, which agreement defined the rights of the nationals of the two countries in respect thereof.[47] Under article IX of the agreement, each of the parties agreed—"to enact and enforce such legislation as will be necessary to make effective the foregoing provisions with appropriate penalties for violations thereof" and "to cooperate with each other in taking such measures as will be appropriate for the enforcement of the foregoing provisions."

Article X provided that the agreement should enter into force when concurrent legislation should be adopted by both countries to provide for its enforcement.[48] Finally it was provided that the agreement should remain in effect for the duration of the emergency and 12 months thereafter unless either Government should enact contrary legislation or until 12 months after either Government shall notify the other of its intention of terminating the agreement. The act of February 26, 1944, in effect enacted an elaborate series of regulations designed to bring the provisions of the agreement into force as to the United States. Section 19 of the act provides that—

"The provisions of this Act which implement the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 concluded between the United States of America and Canada shall remain in effect only for the duration of the present hostilities, and 12 months thereafter unless either the Government of the United States or the Government of Canada enacts legislation contrary thereto, or until 12 months after either Government shall have notified the other Government of its intention to terminate the agreement."

Taken together, the exchange of notes and the implementing acts of the United States and Canada, therefore, form a binding arrangement on a subject of mutual interest to the commercial relations of the two countries. Although this agreement was provisional, the power of Congress to act with respect to the matter did not arise because of that fact but was based rather upon its inherent constitutional powers.

Alaska Highway

One of the outstanding examples of cooperation between the United States and Canada in recent years was furnished by the construction of the Alaska Highway pursuant to the terms of an agreement effected in March 1942 by an exchange of notes between the United States Minister in Ottawa and the Canadian Minister of External Affairs.[49] Under this agreement, the United States Government agreed at its expense to construct the road and maintain it until 6 months after the end of the war. While this action was taken under the special war powers of the Executive, there is a long record of action in Congress with respect to the highway which is of interest to this study. By act of May 15, 1930,[50] the President was authorized to designate three special commissioners "to cooperate with representatives of the Dominion Government in a study regarding the construction of a highway to connect the northwestern part of the United States with British Columbia, the Yukon Territory, and Alaska, with a view to ascertaining whether such a highway is a feasible and economically practicable project," and there was authorized the appropriation of $10,000 for such subject. The commissioners made an exhaustive study of the project[51] and concluded that the highway was feasible and could be built at a reasonable cost. They further recommended that the financing of the road should be primarily the responsibility of the nation within its own jurisdiction, but realized the possibility of equity involving other arrangements and suggested that "any departure from the plan of primary responsibility of financing by each nation should be by international agreement."

By act of August 1935,[52] it was provided:

"That the President of the United States is requested, through such channels as he may deem proper, to negotiate and enter into an agreement or agreements between the Governments of the United States and of the Dominion of Canada, for the survey, location, and construction of a highway to connect the Pacific northwestern part of continental United States with British Columbia and Yukon Territory, in the Dominion of Canada, and the Territory of Alaska; in cooperation with the Government of the Dominion of Canada to cause a survey or surveys to be made to determine the most practicable route for such highway, as well as specifications and estimates of the probable cost thereof, and plans for financing its construction and maintenance.

"SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized, upon the conclusion of the negotiations and the execution of the agreement or agreements herein authorized, to designate such existing agency of the Government of the United States as he may select for this purpose, or such officials or agency as he may specially appoint or create for the purposes of this act, to carry on the work of survey and location of the route for such highway, and of the construction thereof after such route shall have been determined and approved by the President. And such agency or officials, so designated or appointed by the President hereunder, shall be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to communicate directly with a like agency or officials to be appointed by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, for the purpose of coordinating and expediting the work of such survey, location, and construction of such highway."

Thereafter negotiations under the authority conferred by the act of August 20, 1935, failed to produce tangible results,[53] and by act of May 31, 1938,[54] there was created the Alaskan International Highway Commission to conduct negotiations and studies with representatives of Canada with respect to such a highway. The act of June 11, 1940,[55] extended the life of the Commission. Appropriations have been made for the work of this Commission,[56] parts of which have been used in connection with surveys in Canada. Both the acts of May 31, 1938, and June 11, 1940, required the Commission to report to the President on the results of their activities and provided that the President should transmit such reports to the Congress. Owing to the intervention of the war, the construction of a highway from the United States to Alaska became a matter of military concern, and a highway was built as noted above under the Presidential war powers rather than through action by the Congress. The Alaska Highway was built from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska, rather than along more westerly routes which had been studied under the earlier acts of Congress. Since the conclusion of the highway there has been considerable interest in the Congress for the construction of another highway to Alaska through Canada from northwestern United States, and various measures have been introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress looking to that end.[57]

At all times in the long history of the consideration of this project, which is of major importance, economically as well as militarily, to the United States, it has apparently never been questioned that the Alaska Highway was a proper subject for congressional action. It has apparently always been assumed, furthermore, that the power of Congress to legislate with respect to this matter would not cease to exist simply because an agreement with a foreign country would be required for the consummation of the project. It should also be particularly noted that although most of the acts of Congress with respect to the highway have been of a preliminary nature, the act of August 20, 1935, constituted a final and complete authorization to the President to enter into an agreement with Canada for the construction of the project. In addition, all of the other acts indicate a clear intention that Congress should retain jurisdiction over this subject until its consummation, and provisions to this effect are included in all of the pending bills. It is submitted, therefore, that the history of the Alaska Highway in the Congress constitutes a striking example of the exercise of the powers of Congress with respect to a construction project analogous to the St. Lawrence project and that this history is highly pertinent to the subject here under consideration.[58]

---

[46] 58 Stat. 100.

[47] Executive agreement series, 415.

[48] The Canadian Order in Council was issued May 30, 1944, Order in Council P. C. 4112.

[49] 56 Stat. 1458.

[50] 46 Stat. 335.

[51] Department of State Publication No. 474, May 1933.

[52] 49 Stat. 869.

[53] See letter of Apr. 13, 1938, from the Secretary of State to the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, H. Rept. 2239, 75th Cong., 3d sess.

[54] 52 Stat. 590.

[55] 54 Stat. 262.

[56] E. g., 53 Stat. 987.

[57] See H. R. 2654, 79th Cong., 1st sess.; H. R. 2871, 79th Cong., 1st sess.; H. R. 3547, 79th Cong., 1st sess.; H. R. 3548, 79th Cong., 1st sess.; S. 548, 79th Cong., 1st sess.; and S. 849, 79th Cong., 1st sess. These bills would either recreate the Alaskan International Highway Commission in order to make studies in cooperation with Canada with regard to the western highway or would authorize the President to enter into an agreement with Canada to provide for the construction of the highway.

[58] The following excerpt from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate with respect to the act of May 31, 1938 (S. Rept. 1782, 75th Cong., 3d sess.), contains language which is so pertinent to the St. Lawrence situation that it is reproduced in part at this point:

"This Government has for many years sought a basis of cooperation with Canada for the construction of a highway to Alaska. Because the major part of the territory to be traversed lies in the Canadian Province of British Columbia, an unsettled portion, difficulties have been encountered. Canada's desire to aid cannot be questioned. Its ability to share the cost of the portion of the road in British Columbia has remained the main obstacle. Were this territory between Alaska and the United States within the confines of our country, this road would have been built 25 or 30 years ago by our Government. Although most of the remaining construction is in Canadian territory, the benefits resulting are as great for us as for Canada. The feasibility and necessity for the highway to both countries is unquestioned. Now, more than ever, should the project be pushed and efforts made by both countries to reach a solution for its construction. The project has been a matter of some concern and interest to every administration for the past 20 years.

"* * * It appears, with all this evidence of desire for international cooperation to build the road, that all that remains to be done to culminate a plan of construction and finance would be for two specially designated bodies to have the opportunity to sit around a table and work out the details. It is sincerely hoped and believed that this legislation will accomplish this purpose."

Agreements with Panama

The relations of the United States with Panama have also required from time to time the exercise by Congress of its delegated powers to authorize the construction of projects in foreign territory in cooperation with the Republic of Panama. Thus, by act of February 25, 1939,[59] the Secretary of Commerce was authorized "subject to the consent of the Republic of Panama and suitable diplomatic arrangements for protecting the interests of the United States, to establish and maintain aids to navigation, including the purchase of sites, if necessary, on Jicarita Island and on Morro Puercos * * * said sites belonging to the Republic of Panama."

By act of July 20, 1939,[60] there was authorized to be appropriated the sum of not to exceed $1,500,000 "to enable the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Panama in connection with the construction of a highway between Chorrera and Rio Hato, in the Republic of Panama: Provided, That the expenditure of such sum shall be subject to the receipt of assurances satisfactory to the President from the Government of Panama of its cooperation in such construction.[61]

By act of May 3, 1943,[62] there was authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,700,000 to compensate the Republic of Panama for expenses which it had incurred in connection with the Rio Hato Road owing to certain changes which had been brought about by reason of military considerations arising after the date of the original authorization.[63]

Inter-American Highway

One of the most important projects involving foreign construction in which the Congress has exercised its powers in recent years is the Inter-American Highway. The first expression of congressional interest in this matter was the act of May 4, 1928,[64] which referred to a resolution of the Sixth International Conference of American States at Habana recommending the adoption of agreements for the construction of a Pan American Highway; directed that the Government of the United States should manifest the utmost interest in the project and cooperate to this end; and requested the President to keep the Congress informed in the premises. The act of May 4, 1929, authorized appropriations of $50,000 to enable the Secretary of State to cooperate with the other American Republics in surveys and to report to Congress as to the possible routes, probable cost, economic service and other relevant facts pertaining to the proposed highway.[65] Pursuant to this act, the Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with certain Central American governments, made a survey for an inter-American highway between the United States and Panama and in a report dated January 22, 1934, stated that the construction of such a road would be feasible and economically desirable from the standpoint of the United States.[66] On the basis of this report, the Congress passed the act approved June 19, 1934,[67] which appropriated the sum of $1,000,000 "to meet such expenses as the President may deem necessary to enable the United States to cooperate with the several governments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection with the survey and construction of the proposed Inter-American Highway. * * * The expenditure of such sum shall be subject to the receipt of assurances satisfactory to the President from such governments of their cooperation in such survey and construction."

By the act of March 5, 1938,[68] an additional amount of $34,000 was appropriated for this purpose and by the act of August 9, 1939,[69] a further amount of $40,000. The latter act stated that the appropriation was "for continuation of cooperation with the several governments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection with the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway as provided in * * * 45 Stat. 1097, as amended or supplemented, and for performing [by the Public Roads Administration] engineering service in Pan American countries * * *."

With the funds authorized by these acts, a substantial amount of work was done toward the construction of the Inter-American Highway up to the close of fiscal year 1938 through the execution by the Public Roads Administration of some 39 separate projects connected with the highway in Panama, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica.[70]

In the meantime, in order to secure the cooperation of all of the American republics in this project, there was signed at Buenos Aires December 23, 1936, the Convention on the Pan American Highway, which, after receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification was proclaimed September 16, 1937.[71] In this convention the parties agreed to collaborate toward the speedy completion of the Pan American Highway; to form an expert commission to complete studies and formulate projects in those countries which might need the cooperation of the Commission; and to consult with a view to appointing a financial committee of representatives of three of the governments to study problems concerned with the construction of the highway and report thereon.

In 1941 preliminary work and cooperative arrangements under the earlier acts of Congress having progressed to such a point that it was desirable to push to completion the work on the highway in Central America, the Congress passed the act of December 26, 1941—"to provide for cooperation with Central American republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway."

This act provided, in part: "That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $20,000,000 to enable the United States to cooperate with the governments of the American republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and construction of the proposed Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid republics. Expenditures of such sums in any such country shall be subject to the receipt of a request therefor and of satisfactory assurances from the government of that country that appropriate commitments have been made by such government to assume at least one-third of the expenditures proposed to be incurred henceforth by that country and by the United States in the survey and construction of such highway within the borders of such country. In no such country shall the expenditures of this Government from the appropriations herein authorized exceed two-thirds of the total expenses henceforth incurred for said survey and construction in that country. No expenditures shall be made hereunder for the construction of said highway until the government of each of the above-named countries shall have given satisfactory assurance to the United States that it will assume at least one-third of the expenditures proposed to be incurred henceforth by that government and by the United States in the survey and construction of such highway within the borders of such country, or has given other assurances satisfactory to the President that it has made appropriate arrangements to complete such survey and construction within a reasonable period."[72] Under the authority of this act the United States has entered into agreements with individual Central American countries relating to the construction of the highway in those countries.[73]

These acts of Congress with respect to the Inter-American Highway extending over a period of many years constitute another important example of the use by the Congress of its powers to authorize the construction of a project in foreign countries of primary

---

[59] 45 Stat. 1261.

[60] 53 Stat. 1071.

[61] The Chorrera to Rio Hato Road is entirely independent of the Trans-Isthmian Highway provided for in the Convention proclaimed July 27, 1939, between the United States and Panama, Treaty Series No. 946.

[62] 57 Stat. 74.

[63] See S. Rept. 201, 78th Cong., 1st sess. The act of May 3, 1943, also authorized the transfer to the Republic of Panama of the title of the United States, acquired pursuant to the Treaty with Panama of 1903, to certain water and sewerage systems in the cities of Colon and Panama, in anticipation of the requirement of said treaty that such property should be transferred to Panama in 1957, as well as the transfer to Panama by the Panama Railroad Company of certain lands in the same cities. These provisions of this act in themselves constitute an example of the exercise by Congress of its powers to effect through legislation a settlement of major importance with a foreign country with respect to property in said country.

[64] 45 Stat. 490.

[65] 45 Stat. 1697. The act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 993, 996), authorized an additional amount of $75,000 for the continuation of such surveys.

[66] S. Doc. No. 224, 73d Cong., 2d sess.

[67] 48 Stat. 1021, 1042.

[68] 52 Stat. 88.

[69] 53 Stat. 1305.

[70] See letter dated May 26, 1941, from Commissioner of Public Roads to Chairman of House Foreign Affairs Committee, hearings before House Foreign Affairs Committee on S. 1544, 77th Cong., 1st sess., June 3, 1944, in which the Public Roads Commissioner reported favorably upon the bill which later became 55 Stat. 860 referred to below. The following excerpts from this letter are of some interest in connection with the subject matter of this memorandum:

"* * * In every case the funds appropriated have been spent under the supervision of the Public Roads Administration, Federal Works Agency, under conditions agreed upon with the Department of State. The rights of the United States have been amply protected by Executive agreements and by specific contracts. These agreements and contracts have taken care of such questions as free entry for American machinery, the disposal of the machinery after the termination of the work contemplated, purchase of gasoline free of customs duty, admission of American personnel, and similar matters. * * *

"In view of the satisfactory accomplishments through the use of Executive agreements described above, and the expressed interest of the several governments of the countries concerned in the proposed road, it is not believed that any condition requiring prior or simultaneous formal agreement by all countries should be made a condition of participation, nor does it appear that the details of cooperation need be established by law. Agreements to be entered into by negotiation through the Department of State, will, it is confidently believed, effect the desired purpose of completing the construction and protecting the interests of the United States * * *"

[71] 51 Stat. 152.

[72] 55 Stat. 860.

[73] See for example the agreement with Panama effected by exchange of notes in May and June 1943, Executive Agreement Series 365, in which the Government of Panama stated that it "desired to avail itself of the benefits of law 375 (55 Stat. 860) of the Congress of the United States on the construction of the Inter-American Highway and that it agreed to assume one-third of the total cost of said work in the Panamanian section."

importance to the United States.[74] It is true that some 10 years after Congress began to legislate on this project the United States became a party to a treaty obligating the parties thereto to collaborate in the speedy completion of the highway. However, it seems clear that such treaty was not necessary in the case of this country to lay the basis for United States participation in this work on which substantial progress had already been made by the time the treaty was signed and that the treaty was desired primarily in order to lay the basis for the cooperation of all nations in developing the entire Pan American Highway system. The act of December 26, 1941, does not refer to the treaty as giving authority for the legislation nor does the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in connection therewith. Subsequent appropriation acts have made separate appropriations to the Public Roads Administration for the purpose of the treaty and for the purpose of carrying out the work under the act of December 26, 1941. Thus one such act made appropriations—"(a) * * * to enable the President to utilize the services of the Public Roads Administration in fulfilling the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Pan American Highway * * * [and] for the continuation of cooperation with the several governments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection with the surveying and construction of the Inter-American Highway as provided in * * * 45 Stat. 1697 * * * $100,000," and "(b) * * * for surveys in connection with the construction of the Inter-American Highway, in accordance with the provisions of the Act approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860) * * * $5,000,000."[75]

Thus it is submitted that the action of Congress in relation to the Inter-American Highway, and in particular the act of December 26, 1941, represents an extremely important example of the use by Congress of its powers to adopt legislation substantially similar in concept to the legislation with which we are here concerned.

Summary

The cases and statutes cited above have been included at this point in order to show that (1) Congress has far-reaching powers over interstate and foreign commerce, and in particular, to regulate navigation and to authorize the construction of projects related thereto; and (2) Congress has frequently exercised its powers under the commerce clause to authorize or effectuate agreements with foreign countries in connection with matters related to such powers and, in particular, to authorize the participation by private persons, by States, or by the Federal Government of construction projects in, or in cooperation with, foreign countries.

The legislation with which we are here concerned would represent simply another exercise by Congress of its traditional powers in this regard. No new principle is involved nor will any precedent be set with reference to the respective functions of the two branches of the Government in the field of foreign affairs. As in the case of the Boulder Canyon project, it is proposed that a State government, in this case New York, participate in bearing the cost of the program. In this case, however, owing to geographical requirements, a foreign country will also be associated in the enterprise. In general the agreement provides that each country will construct the works in its own territory, although there will be occasions upon which the nature of the construction involved will require that operations be performed by employees of one country in the territory of the other. In this respect, however, the arrangement under consideration does not go as far as many of the instances cited above in which the United States undertook all or a major part of particular construction projects in foreign countries.

The question at issue in this case is whether the Congress is deprived of its powers to authorize a navigation project simply because the construction involved is related to or is designed to effectuate an agreement with a foreign country. In considering this question it should be borne in mind that the broad questions of policy to be decided by the Congress in relation to this project would be in large part the same if the entire project were to be constructed within the United States. The fact that an agreement with a foreign country is involved arises solely by reason of geographical considerations and is entirely incidental to the substantive questions to be considered by the Congress in passing upon the merits of the project. The foreign relations aspects of this case are of much less prominence than in the case of the usual international treaty or agreement, at least in relation to the total importance and magnitude of the program. Thus, if the St. Lawrence River ran entirely through the United States in the northern part of the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, for example, the questions involved in relation to a decision to open the Great Lakes area to ocean commerce through an overland water route and to construct a public-power project of this magnitude in this area would be largely the same as they are given the actual geographical circumstances. With respect to the power project, the issues are of a substantially similar character to those with which the Congress has been confronted in considering the authorization of other great power projects.

To summarize this point, the subject matter of the legislation under consideration involves powers which under the Constitution are vested in the Congress and present issues of domestic economic import which have been traditionally in the province of the Congress to decide. If the legislation is passed, it will involve the appropriation of substantial sums of money and the negotiation of an agreement in connection therewith with the State of New York, both of which matters involve important powers of Congress. For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that unless section 2 of article II of the Constitution provides the only method, namely, the treaty power under which the United States may proceed to enter into international arrangements, the St. Lawrence agreement may constitutionally be acted upon by the Congress in the form presented.

There have been enumerated above many instances in which Congress has exercised its delegated constitutional powers in situations analogous to those under consideration here. There are set forth in the next section several important and long-standing additional examples of legislation to authorize, effectuate, or approve international agreements where the subject matter thereof concerns a power vested in the Congress under the Constitution.

III. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT THROUGH LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The following are important examples of foreign negotiations in which apparently the fact that a particular international act affected a legislative power vested in the Congress was deemed to override, or present a preferable alternative method of procedure to the treaty power.

1. Commerce and Navigation

As early as 1815, the Congress was concerning itself with problems incident to reciprocal rights with reference to commerce and navigation. In that year a statute[76] was enacted repealing provisions of earlier statutes imposing on ships or goods imported in them duties that were discriminatory as compared with vessels of the United States and their cargo, provided that such repeal should take effect in favor of any foreign nation whenever the President should be satisfied that the discriminatory duty of such foreign nation as applied to the United States had been abolished. These provisions were extended in other closely related acts of Congress.[77] Under the authority of this legislation the United States completed an arrangement with Austria[78] providing for equality of treatment for the vessels of each nation in the other's ports.

In 1830 Congress enacted legislation providing for equality of treatment with reference to commerce and navigation between the United States and Great Britain and certain of its colonial possessions[79] under which President Jackson subsequently proclaimed, after negotiations with the British Government, an arrangement in relation to trade between the United States and British possessions.[80] Under this general authority the United States during the years 1884–88 entered into a series of agreements with Spain for the elimination of discriminatory customs duties and establishment of national treatment of shipping with respect to certain Spanish possessions.[81] Likewise in 1925, the United States and Finland entered into an agreement providing for substantially the same matters.[82]

2. Postal Treaties

A notable example of the exercise of congressional power in the foreign field concerns postal arrangements with foreign countries under the power of Congress "to establish post offices and post roads." The act of June 8, 1872, provides in part: "That for the purpose of making better postal arrangements with foreign countries, or to counteract their adverse measures affecting our postal intercourse with them, the Postmaster General, by and with the advice and consent of the President, may negotiate and conclude postal treaties or conventions, and may reduce or increase the rates of postage on mail-matter conveyed between the United States and foreign countries."[83]

Under this authority President Grant in 1874 entered into a "treaty concerning the formation of a General Postal Union," which provided for an extensive system of regulation of postal rates and transmission of correspondence on a multilateral basis and for the organization of the General Postal Union and of a congress of plenipotentiaries to meet every 3 years to consider changes in the system of the Union.[84] Although the "treaty" dealt comprehensively with a vital aspect of our economic and social relations with virtually all of the nations of the world, it was not submitted to the Senate for its

[74] Justifications of the Inter-American Highway have repeatedly stressed the commercial importance of the project to the United States; see, for example, Rept. No. 354 of the Committee on Foreign Relations, 77th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 1544 (55 Stat. 860).

[75] 57 Stat. 179. For substantially similar provisions see 56 Stat. 101 and 409; 58 Stat. 370.

[76] 3 Stat. 224.

[77] 4 Stat. 2, and 4 Stat. 308.

[78] 3 Miller, 521.

[79] 4 Stat. 419.

[80] 4 Stat. 417.

[81] 2 Malloy 1680, 1681, 1683, 1684, 1685. See McClure, International Executive Agreements (1941), p. 60.

[82] United States Treaty Series (731).

[83] 17 Stat. 283, 304.

[84] 19 Stat. 577. The name of the organization was later changed to the Universal Postal Union.

advice and consent in view of the specific action of the Congress in authorizing the executive to enter into such treaties. Presumably the reason for this course of action on the part of the Congress was the fact that matters relating to the transmission of mail to and from foreign countries were intimately related to domestic postal matters for which the Congress had made provision under its constitutional powers.[85] The same practice has been adhered to practically without exception in connection with our negotiation of postal arrangements with foreign nations. In 1934 the authority granted by the act of 1872 was renewed and the Postmaster General was authorized "by and with the advice and consent of the President [to] negotiate and conclude postal treaties or conventions and * * * reduce or increase the rates of postage or other charges on mail matter * * * between the United States and foreign countries."[86]

In connection with the postal conventions it is of interest to note that section 273 of the act of June 8, 1872, contains a provision for reciprocity with Canada with respect to transit of mails which is of special interest in relation to the various reciprocal arrangements with Canada discussed above. This section authorized the Postmaster General, by and with the advice and consent of the President, to make arrangements to allow the mails of Canada to be transported over the territory of the United States upon obtaining a like privilege for the transportation of United States mail through Canada. Similar arrangements were authorized with respect to any other country bordering upon the United States.[87]

3. Copyrights and Trade-Marks

With respect to copyrights and trade-marks, the Congress has also exercised in the foreign field its power under article I, section 8, of the Constitution "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries." In 1891, in a statute making comprehensive provision with respect to copyrights, it was provided that the benefits of the act should "only apply to a citizen or subject of a foreign state or nation when such foreign state or nation permits to citizens of the United States of America the benefit of copyright on substantially the same basis as its own citizens; or when such foreign state or nation is a party to an international agreement which provides for reciprocity in the granting of copyright, by the terms of which agreement the United States of America may, at its pleasure, become a party to such an agreement."[88]

Under this legislation, agreements on this subject were entered into with Germany in 1892;[89] with Spain in 1895;[90] with Italy in 1915;[91] with Argentina in 1934;[92] and in 1911 with France in relation to rights in China.[93]

With respect to trade-marks, Congress in 1881 enacted a statute providing that "the owners of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations, or with the Indian tribes, provided such owners shall be domiciled in the United States, or located in any foreign country or tribes which by treaty, convention, or law, affords similar privileges to citizens of the United States, may obtain registration of such trade-marks by complying with"[94] certain requirements. Under this authority agreements recognizing the existence of the reciprocal requirements were concluded in 1883 with the Netherlands[95] and Switzerland[96] by exchange of diplomatic notes. A similar agreement was concluded in 1889 with Great Britain with respect to reciprocal protection of trade-marks in Morocco.[97]

4. Reciprocal Trade Agreements

Of all the examples of the exercise of congressional power in the foreign field, one of the most notable is the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as subsequently amended, which provides that the President shall have authority "to enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof" for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States.[98] Under this authority some 27 reciprocal trade agreements have been entered into and promulgated by the President, making provision with reference to customs duties, most-favored-nation treatment, and reciprocity. The act and the agreements negotiated thereunder have constituted during the last 10 years the cornerstone of this country's foreign economic policy. The Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which had been successively extended in 1937, 1940, and 1943, was again extended by the act of July 5, 1945,[99] which also increased the authority of the President to reduce tariffs. Each time that the trade agreements program has been before the Congress, serious questions have been raised as to the constitutionality of the legislation in relation to the treaty power. Each time the Congress has sustained the validity of the procedure of congressional authorization of foreign-trade agreements. During the consideration of the 1945 extension, the issue was again thoroughly debated. The following is an excerpt from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on this bill:

"On the treaty issue the precedents and authorities are equally conclusive. Again the precedents go back to the early days of the Republic. Many of the agreements entered into by this Nation which have been brought into force without being submitted to the Senate under the treaty-making procedure were concluded pursuant to congressional authorization; for example, the postal conventions and, notably, the reciprocal tariff agreements negotiated pursuant to the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 and the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897. These latter reciprocity agreements, some 27 of which were concluded without Senate ratification, constitute inescapable precedents on the treaty issue for the trade agreements which are authorized by the Trade Agreements Act. In 1937 the Supreme Court spoke unmistakably to the point when it stated in respect to certain executive agreements concluded by this Government:

" 'The assignment and the agreements in connection therewith did not, as in the case of treaties, as that term is used in the treaty-making clause of the Constitution (art. II, sec. 2), require the advice and consent of the Senate (*United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324, 330).'

"Five times now, beginning in 1934, this committee has given the most serious study to the so-called constitutional objections which have been raised by the opponents of the program, and our conclusion remains the same as in 1934: We consider that it is clear, on the basis of precedent and authority, that no constitutional or other legal considerations require Senate ratification of trade agreements * * *."[1]

5. Civil Aviation Agreements

Congressional power under the commerce clause has been exercised in the field of civil aviation to facilitate international negotiations with foreign countries for the extension of reciprocal rights for commercial and other types of airplane travel. These statutory provisions and the negotiations with other countries thereunder are similar in many respects to the developments in connection with maritime navigation discussed above.

Section 6 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926,[2] as amended by section 1107 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938,[3] provides that "If a foreign nation grants a similar privilege in respect of aircraft of the United States and/or airmen serving in connection therewith, the Civil Aeronautics Authority may authorize aircraft registered under the law of the foreign nation and not a part of the armed forces thereof to be navigated in the United States."

Sections 802 and 1102 of the 1938 act provide, respectively:

"SEC. 802. The Secretary of State shall advise the Authority of, and consult with the Authority concerning, the negotiation of any agreements with foreign governments for the establishment or development of air navigation, including air routes and services.

* * * * *

"SEC. 1102. In exercising and performing its powers and duties under this act, the Authority shall do so consistently with any obligation assumed by the United States in any treaty, convention, or agreement that may be in force between the United States and any foreign country or foreign countries, shall take into consideration any applicable laws and requirements of foreign countries and shall not, in exercising and performing its powers and duties with respect to certificates of convenience and necessity, restrict compliance by any air carrier with any obligation, duty, or liability imposed by any foreign country."

Under these statutes the United States some 15 years ago commenced the negotiation of a series of bilateral agreements with foreign countries.[4]

One of the most recent and significant of these agreements is the "Agreement for Civil Air Transport" between the United States and Canada dated February 17, 1945,[5] which provides, among other things, for the reciprocal granting of rights for international air routes and services of the carriers of the two countries; for the prevention of discriminatory practices by agreement that each government shall not permit higher charges for airports and similar facilities to the aircraft of the other country than are paid by its

[85] See opinion of William H. Taft, Solicitor General of the United States, passing upon the practice followed in entering into "postal treaties" in which he stated:

"Foreign mail is so closely connected with a proper system of inland mail as that the power to organize and carry on a general post-office system would seem to imply a power to organize, in connection therewith, a system of foreign mails, and, in the maintenance of such a system, a power to conclude contracts with the post-office departments of other countries" (19 Op. Atty. Gen. 513, 520).

[86] 48 Stat. 983.

[87] 17 Stat. 283, 316.

[88] 26 Stat. 1106.

[89] 1 Malloy 557.

[90] 2 Malloy 1687.

[91] 3 Malloy 2705.

[92] 160 LNTS 57.

[93] 3 Malloy 2585.

[94] 21 Stat. 502.

[95] 2 Malloy 1265.

[96] 2 Malloy 1769.

[97] 1 Malloy 778.

[98] 48 Stat. 943.

[99] Public Law 130, 79th Cong., ch. 269, 1st sess.

[1] H. Rept. No. 594, 79th Cong., 1st sess.

[2] 44 Stat. 572.

[3] 52 Stat. 973.

[4] See agreements with Germany, 1932; Italy, 1931; Sweden, 1933; Norway, 1933; Union of South Africa 1933; Denmark, 1934; Great Britain, 1935; Executive Agreement Series 38, 24, 57, 50, 54, 58, 76, 110.

[5] Executive Agreement Series 451. Similar agreements have been executed with the following countries since the International Conference on Civil Aviation referred to below: Denmark, Sweden, Spain, Iceland, Executive Agreement Series 430, 431, 432, 463; Ireland, Switzerland, Norway, France, Portugal, State Department press releases, 1945, Nos. 84, 587, 736, 970, 920; Czechoslovakia, State Department press release, 1946, No. 26.

national aircraft, nor give any preference to its national aircraft in relation to customs and similar matters; and for the requirement that the aircraft of the two nationalities shall conform with the airworthiness requirements of their respective governmental authorities.

Under the authority of existing legislation in the field of aviation the United States has entered into a series of multilateral international agreements in this field as the result of the International Civil Aviation Conference held in Chicago, November–December 1944. This conference concluded in the preparation of four multilateral agreements, namely, an Interim Agreement on Civil Aviation, a Convention on International Civil Aviation, an International Air Services Transit Agreement, and an International Air Transport Agreement.[6]

The interim agreement provides, among other things, for the creation of a provisional International Civil Aviation Organization to conduct certain research and recommendatory functions relating to standards and procedures in the field of civil aviation; for the adherence to certain principles relating to flight over the territory of members and with respect to such matters as documents carried by aircraft, certificates of airworthiness, and licenses of personnel; and for certain undertakings whereby members agree to file copies of contracts with the Organization and to apply certain recommendations with respect to aviation practices. All of these matters are within the power of the executive branch of this Government to perform under provisions of existing legislation; consequently, this agreement has been accepted by this Government subject only to compliance with the constitutional processes of the United States in respect of the contribution of funds for administrative expenses of the Organization.[7]

The transport and transit agreements, commonly referred to as the two-freedoms and five-freedoms agreements, provide primarily for the reciprocal granting by each signatory country to the other signatories of certain privileges in respect of scheduled international air services; in the first case, the privilege to fly across its territory without landing and to land for nontraffic purposes, and, in the second case, the same privileges plus the privileges to carry passengers, mail, and cargo to and from each signatory country and intermediate points. In view of the provisions of existing law with reference to the granting of commercial right to foreign aircraft, these agreements are within the power of the executive to carry out without additional legislative authority and consequently they have been brought into force as to the United States.

The convention has been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification.[8]

6. World War Debts

The powers of Congress under article I, section 8, of the Constitution with respect to monetary and financial matters have been frequently used during the history of this Nation to bring about agreements with foreign countries in matters of vital interest to the welfare of the United States. An interesting and important example of the exercise of congressional power with respect to financial arrangements with other countries is found in the history of the debts arising out of the last World War. The First Liberty Loan Act of 1917[9] authorized the President to enter into arrangements for the purchase of obligations of other governments with the view to establishing credit and providing for the prosecution of the war. Under this authority the United States entered into a series of agreements with foreign countries in the form of contracts concluded by the Treasury Department under Presidential authority.[10] After the conclusion of hostilities the liquidation of these and other credits extended during the war became an economic problem of major importance in the efforts to reestablish normal intercourse between nations. By act of February 9, 1922, as amended by the act of February 28, 1923, Congress provided for the creation of a World War Foreign Debt Commission consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury and four (later seven) other members to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This Commission was authorized, subject to the approval of the President "to refund or convert, and to extend the time of payment of the principal or the interest, or both, of any obligation of any foreign government now held by the United States of America or any obligation of any foreign government hereafter received * * * arising out of the World War * * *."[11] The legislation, as amended, also provided that "the settlements with foreign governments * * * [should be] subject to the approval of the Congress by act or joint resolution."

As a consequence of this legislation, agreements were effected with 13 foreign countries providing for various adjustments and extensions of maturity of the debts of those countries to the United States. The agreements were subsequently approved by acts of Congress.[12] Similarly the subsequent moratoria agreements with reference to the debts so funded, which were negotiated by President Hoover in 1931, were carried out in conjunction with specific authority conferred by joint resolution of Congress,[13] rather than through the treaty procedure.

7. Stabilization Agreements in World War I

During World War I the Congress, under the banking and currency power, also granted authority to the Executive to make arrangements with foreign countries to stabilize foreign exchange and to obtain foreign currencies. This was contained in section 4 of the supplement to the Second Liberty Bond Act, which provided: "That the Secretary of the Treasury may, during the war and for 2 years after its termination, make arrangements in or with foreign countries to stabilize the foreign exchanges and to obtain foreign currencies and credits in such currencies, as he may use any such credits and foreign currencies for the purpose of stabilizing or rectifying the foreign exchanges, and he may designate depositaries in the foreign countries with which may be deposited as he may determine all or any part of the avails of any foreign credits or foreign currencies."[14]

Several such stabilization agreements, including agreements with Argentina, Bolivia, and Peru, were negotiated by the Treasury Department under the authority of this act and were consummated by exchanges of notes between the State Department and the representatives in the United States of these Governments.

8. Chinese Loan

An interesting example of an international financial agreement entered into by the executive branch pursuant to congressional authorization under the banking and currency power is the agreement with China of March 21, 1942, providing for the extension of financial aid in the amount of $500,000,000.[15] This agreement was authorized by the act of February 7, 1942,[16] which gave the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, broad authority to "loan or extend credit or give other financial aid to China in an amount not to exceed in the aggregate $500,000,000 at such time or times and upon such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President shall deem in the interest of the United States."

9. International Silver Agreement

Another significant financial agreement, which was the memorandum of agreement between the United States, Australia, Canada, China, India, Mexico, Peru, and Spain, with reference to the world price of silver which was negotiated at the Monetary and Economic Conference held in London in July 1933 and was signed on behalf of the United States by Senator Key Pittman, then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, who was a delegate to the conference.[17] The agreement was based upon a proposal submitted by the United States delegation to the conference designed to provide permanent measures with respect to the use of silver for monetary purposes which would give necessary assurances both to the silver mining countries and to countries using silver as a basis for their currency. Important commitments were imposed upon the signatory nations under the agreement. Thus the United States, Australia, Canada, Mexico, and Peru agreed that during the existence of the agreement they would not sell any silver and would also in the aggregate purchase, or otherwise withdraw from the market, 35,000,000 fine ounces of silver from the mine production of such countries for each of the next 4 years, and that the silver so purchased or withdrawn should be used for currency purposes or retained from sale during such period. By a supplementary agreement the share of the United States of the aggregate amount to be so purchased was fixed at 24,421,000 fine ounces. The main agreement stated that "this memorandum of agreement is subject to ratification by the governments concerned. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited not later than the 1st April 1934, with the Government of the United States. It shall come into force as soon as the ratifications of all the Governments concerned are received. * * * A notice by any government that the affirmative action necessary to carry out the purposes of this agreement has been taken will be accepted as an instrument of ratification." The supplementary agreement contained the following provision: "That this memorandum is subject to ratification by the proper governmental authorities of the United States, whose delegate has executed this agreement, and the undersigned delegate undertakes to use his good offices to secure such action at the earliest possible date."

The United States gave the necessary notice of ratification on December 21, 1933.[18] The commitments undertaken by the United States under this agreement were in harmony with, and could be carried out under, the authority conferred upon the President by virtue of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.[19] On December 21,

---

[6] International Conference on Civil Aviation, Final Act (pt. I). The original of the final act is deposited in the archives of the Department of State.

[7] State Department press release No. 101, Feb. 9, 1945.

[8] 79th Cong., 1st sess., Executive A.

[9] 40 Stat. 35.

[10] See (1921) Treasury Department Annual Report to Secretary of the Treasury, 32 et seq.

[11] 42 Stat. 363, 1325.

[12] 42 Stat. 1325; 43 Stat. 20, 136, 719, 720; 44 Stat. 329, 376, 377, 378, 385; 45 Stat. 399; 46 Stat. 48.

[13] 47 Stat. 3; TR (1932) Treasury Department Annual Report to Secretary of Treasury 34, 286, and 290.

[14] 40 Stat. 965, 966.

[15] Department of State Bulletin, March 21, 1942, p. 263.

[16] 56 Stat. 83.

[17] Executive Agreement Series 63.

[18] Department of State press release (December 30, 1933) 365.

[19] 48 Stat. 31. Also relevant in this connection are the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1178, and the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 337.

1933, the President of the United States issued a proclamation under the foregoing provision of law directing the appropriate agencies of this Government to carry out the provisions of the agreement so far as they concerned the United States.[20] The agreement was not submitted for ratification to the Senate. The statutory authority on the basis of which the agreement was entered into by this country specifically contemplated that "agreements" would be entered into with foreign countries in order to "protect the foreign commerce of the United States."

10. International Wheat Agreement

Another development of the Monetary and Economic Conference of 1933 was the calling of a conference in London in August 1933 which resulted in the signing of the International Wheat Agreement, 1933, between the nations concerned with international trade in wheat.[21] Important commitments were undertaken by the United States by virtue of provisions that the United States, Argentina, Australia, and Canada would adjust total exports of wheat from their countries during the crop year 1933–34, taking into consideration the exports of other countries, by the acceptance of export maxima fixed on the assumption that world import demand for wheat would amount during that period to 560,000,000 bushels. The same countries also agreed to limitations of exports for the year 1934–35. In return, the wheat-importing countries made certain commitments under the agreement with respect to production and consumption of wheat.

Although the agreement imposed these obligations upon the United States, ample legislative authority already existed to carry out these obligations by virtue of the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.[22] Although various difficulties prevented the execution of the agreement in accordance with its terms, it is nevertheless pertinent to this study as an example of international agreement reached through the exercise of a combination of legislative and executive authority.

11. Stabilization Agreement of 1936

A further and more important effort to bring about international cooperative action in the monetary field was the Tripartite Stabilization Agreement of September 25, 1936, which was brought about by simultaneous and identical declarations issued on that date by the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the United States, to which Belgium, the Netherlands, and Switzerland adhered shortly thereafter.[23] The declaration of the United States stated that it was joining with the other governments to restore order in international monetary relations and to that end to endeavor to maintain the greatest possible equilibrium in international exchange; that the French Government had informed the United States of its intention to readjust its currency; and that the three Governments intended to use appropriate available resources to avoid as far as possible exchange disturbances arising from the proposed readjustment and to arrange for consultation for this purpose among the governments and their authorized agencies. The United States entered into this agreement under the authority of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 providing as follows:

"For the purpose of stabilizing the exchange value of the dollar, the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, directly or through such agencies as he may designate, is authorized, for the account of the fund established in this section, to deal in gold and foreign exchange and such other instruments of credit and securities as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this section. * * *"[24]

International organizations

During the last 75 years there have been repeated and important instances of the exercise of congressional power to bring about United States membership in international organizations. It is significant that, with a few exceptions, our participation therein resulted in the imposition upon this country of commitments of a substantial and continuing nature.[25]

12. International Labor Organization

One of the most important international organizations to which this country belongs is the International Labor Organization which during the last 25 years has assumed a vital and dynamic role in labor affairs. This organization is primarily a recommendatory and fact-finding organization, its activities consisting to a large extent in recommending for adoption by the member governments draft conventions on a variety of subjects within its competence. However, membership in this organization does entail important commitments on the part of the members in respect of observance of conventions promulgated by the organization and accepted by the members. Thus, under article 22 of the constitution of the ILO, all members must file reports of measures taken to give effect to such conventions and any other member has the right to file a complaint with the labor office if it is not satisfied with the action of the first member. Such complaint may be referred to the International Court of Justice, whose decision shall be final. The court may "indicate the measures, if any, of an economic character which it considers to be appropriate, and which other governments would be justified in adopting against a defaulting government."[26]

The constitution of the International Labor Organization was originally promulgated as part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles, and payment of its expenses, with certain exceptions, was to be made from the general funds of the League of Nations. Although the United States was not originally a member of the International Labor Organization, since it was not a member of the League of Nations, Congress by joint resolution of June 19, 1934, enacted that "the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States of America in the International Labor Organization, which, through its general conference of representatives of its members and through its International Labor Office, collects information concerning labor throughout the world and prepares international conventions for the consideration of member governments with a view to improving conditions of labor."[27]

The Organization thereupon invited the United States to accept membership therein, it being understood that the United States should not thereby assume any obligations under the Covenant of the League of Nations. The statement also authorized the Organization's governing body to settle with the Government of the United States the question of the latter's financial contribution. Pursuant to this invitation the President, under the previous congressional authorization, accepted the invitation and his acceptance was transmitted to the Director of the International Labor Office at Geneva by a letter from the American consul at Geneva.[28]

13. UNRRA

A somewhat different procedure was employed to bring about United States membership in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. After consultation over a period of several months with Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, President Roosevelt, on November 9, 1943, signed an agreement creating the Administration, providing in part as follows:

"Insofar as its appropriate constitutional bodies shall authorize, each member government will contribute to the support of the Administration in order to accomplish the purposes of article I, paragraph 2 (a). The amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision shall be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies."[29]

After the signature of the agreement and the conclusion of the first session of the Council of the Administration, the Congress, by joint resolution approved March 28, 1944, authorized appropriations to the President of "such sums not to exceed $1,350,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States * * * in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, established by an agreement concluded * * * on November 9, 1943, reading as follows * * *."[30] The agreement was set forth in full at this point in the legislation. Subsequently the Congress appropriated funds for the work of the Administration in accordance with this authorization.[31]

While the agreement creating the Administration did not impose specific commitments on the United States and by its terms left the question of contributions to the discretion of the member governments, the Congress subsequently adopted as the basis of appropriations the financial plan devised by the Council at its first session.[32] Although UNRRA is to a large extent an emergency organization and the UNRRA agreement in itself imposes no binding obligations upon the United States, the proceedings in this case, nevertheless, present a striking example of interdependent action between the executive and legislative

[20] 48 Stat. (pt. II) 1723.

[21] State Department Treaty Information Bulletin No. 48, September 1933.

[22] 48 Stat. 31.

[23] Federal Reserve Bulletin, October 1936, p. 760.

[24] 48 Stat. 337, 341. In addition to the 1936 agreement, stabilization agreements have been entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury under these powers with the Governments of Brazil ((1938)—Rept. Secretary of the Treasury 21); China ((1941) Rept. Secretary of the Treasury 52); Mexico ((1942) Rept. Secretary of the Treasury 42); Ecuador (ibid.); and Iceland (ibid.). The powers contained in sec. 10 were renewed in 1937 (50 Stat. 4); 1939 (53 Stat. 998); 1941 (55 Stat. 395); and 1943 (57 Stat. 68).

[25] See statement of Manley O. Hudson, the United States in the International Labor Organization, 28 Am. Jour. Int. Law 674, October 1934:

"On numerous occasions in the past, the United States has accepted membership in international organizations by action taken by the President with the authorization of Congress, and it can hardly be questioned that obligations may be assumed by the United States in consequence of such membership."

[26] ILO constitution, art. 32.

[27] 48 Stat. 1182.

[28] Department of State press release, August 25, 1934.

[29] 58 Stat. 122.

[30] 58 Stat. 122; amended to provide for authorization of additional appropriations, Public Law 262, 79th Cong., ch. 580, 1st sess., approved December 18, 1945.

[31] 58 Stat. 629; Public Law 259, 79th Cong., ch. 577, 1st sess., approved December 14, 1945; Public Law 269, 79th Cong., ch. 589, 1st sess., approved December 28, 1945.

[32] First session of the Council of UNRRA, Res. 14.

branches to effectuate an important step in United States foreign policy through association and agreement with foreign countries.

14. Food and Agriculture Organization

Another international organization of which the United States has become a member through a combination of legislative and executive action is the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. This Organization has been created pursuant to a constitution prepared and submitted to the governments by the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture set up by the Hot Springs Conference on Food and Agriculture of May 1943.[33] A subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations conferred with United States Government officials who were concerned with the drafting of the constitution and several changes were made in the drafts as the result of this consultation. The members of the subcommittee also concerned themselves with the constitutional questions involved in relation to the procedure for bringing about United States membership in the Organization.[34] It was decided, partly on the basis of examples such as the ILO and UNRRA legislation referred to above, that the joint resolution procedure would be entirely in order. The constitution as finally submitted to the governments provided that it should be open to acceptance. The joint resolution approved July 31, 1945,[35] provided that "the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations * * * the constitution of which is set forth in * * * the First Report to the Governments of the United Nations by the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture dated August 1, 1944."

It also authorized appropriations for the expenses of the United States in connection with such membership and provided that in the absence of congressional action no amendment to the constitution of the Organization imposing any new obligation on the United States shall be accepted on behalf of the United States. Pursuant to this authorization the United States filed its instrument of acceptance of the constitution and became a member of the Organization. The principal difference between the procedure followed in this case from that which was used with respect to UNRRA is that the UNRRA agreement was signed by the President before the authorizing legislation was enacted, whereas here acceptance of the constitution was delayed until after the approval of the joint resolution. There does not appear to be any substantial difference between these methods, so far as concerns the constitutional question herein discussed.

15. Bretton Woods Agreements

One of the most important acts ever passed by Congress in relation to an international agreement is the Bretton Woods Agreements Act approved July 31, 1945.[36] The primary purpose of this legislation was to authorize the President to accept membership for the United States in the International Monetary Fund and in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development provided for in the respective articles of agreement prepared at the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944. The legislation also prescribes certain conditions and limitations with respect to United States participation in the respective institutions; provides for authority to carry out certain commitments provided for in the basic agreements, including the payment of subscriptions to the two institutions aggregating approximately $6,000,000,000; and establishes a National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. The United States representatives on the bank and the fund are directed by the legislation, in the event of the failure of the bank and fund, to give satisfactory interpretations with respect to certain phases of the functions and authority of the respective institutions, to propose corresponding amendments to the respective articles of agreement.

The Bretton Woods agreements are among the most important international agreements ever entered into by the United States. They impose important obligations on this country and contain provisions which are of great advantage to the international economic relations of the United States. During the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate on the Bretton Woods bill, the question was raised as to the constitutionality of the legislation in relation to the treaty issue and there was inserted in the record a memorandum prepared by the State and Treasury Departments which made a detailed review of the precedents and expressed the view in substance that the legislation was entirely appropriate as being within the scope of the power of Congress over monetary and financial matters, and that the Congress was not deprived of jurisdiction in the matter on the ground that the bill was related to an agreement with foreign countries.[37] This contention was apparently accepted since the constitutional point did not thereafter arise during the consideration of the legislation in the Senate.

16. United Nations Participation Act

Another instance in which the treaty-making power was thoroughly discussed during the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress was the debate in the Senate on the United Nations Charter and the subsequent debate on the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945,[38] in relation to the method by which the military agreements with the Security Council should be negotiated and approved in the case of the United States. This question was originally raised during the debate on the Charter, and the preponderant view in the Senate was that the military agreements when subsequently negotiated with the Security Council should not be viewed as treaties but rather as agreements subject to approval by Congress. This view was expressed on the ground not only that the agreements were to be entered into in pursuance of a treaty obligation but also on the ground that these agreements would relate to powers which under the Constitution are vested in the Congress.[39]

The bill was designed, among other things, to prescribe exactly the procedure to be followed in this regard and to this end provided in part as follows:

"The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter."

The report of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate stated, with respect to this provision, that:

"At the same time the bill, by providing that the Congress shall approve any such agreement or agreements as may be negotiated, insures that the Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the terms and provisions thereof.

"The bill provides that such approval by Congress shall be expressed by appropriate act or joint resolution. During the debate in the Senate on the Charter last July, there was considerable discussion as to whether the military agreements should be considered as treaties or whether they might be approved by the Congress through the joint resolution procedure. The preponderant view was that the latter procedure was preferable since the agreements would be entered into for the purpose of giving effect to the obligation assumed by this country under article 43 of the Charter to make available to the Security Council the armed force necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Under this view, the precise details of the obligation—such as the exact amount of the forces to be contributed and the places where they are to be stationed—is not a matter for treaty consideration but for legislative sanction by the Congress under its constitutional powers to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces (art. I, sec. 8, pars. 12, 13, and 14 of the Constitution.) * * * On the last day of the debate in the Senate, July 28, the President, then attending the Potsdam Conference, sent a message to the Congress in which he stated that 'When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated, it will be my purpose to ask the Congress by appropriate legislation to approve them.' The committee believes that it is desirable to determine this question once and for all, and that it is appropriate to specify that the military agreement or agreements should be submitted for approval to the Congress." [40]

This provision caused considerable discussion in the Senate, and an amendment was offered so as to provide that the military agreements must be entered into only as treaties by and with the advice and consent

[33] See S. Rept. 357, 79th Cong., 1st sess.

[34] Ibid., pp. 10–11, 20, 21.

[35] Public Law 174, 79th Cong., ch. 342, 1st sess.

[36] Public Law 171, 79th Cong., ch. 339, 1st sess.

[37] Hearings, pt. V, June 28, 1945, pp. 533–566. Agreement with this view was shared by Mr. George E. Smith, research assistant to the minority leader of the Senate, in whose article, entitled "Summary Report on Bretton Woods Monetary Conference," it is stated (91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. A915, A922) that:

"So far as the United States is concerned this leaves the question open to a debate over the appropriate form of congressional approval. A cogent argument can be made that the agreement amounts to a treaty and must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. But an equally valid argument could be made that this is an agreement that can be approved by a simple majority resolution of both Houses on the ground that the agreement contemplates operations either exclusively left to the House of Representatives (such as bills for raising revenue—for example, the American quota to the fund) or shared equally by both Houses as in powers given to Congress by art. I, sec. 8 of the Constitution."

[38] Public Law 264, 79th Cong., ch. 583, 1st sess.

[39] See especially 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 8121–8133, 8157–8169, 8275, 8324–8326. With respect to the argument that the procedure is valid because the military agreements are to be entered into under the terms of a treaty, reference is made to the discussion in sec. VI below of the relationship of the St. Lawrence agreement to the procedure prescribed in the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 for the execution of special agreements subject to approval by reciprocal legislation.

[40] S. Rept. 717, 79th Cong., 1st sess.

of the Senate.[41] This amendment was supported on the ground that the only constitutional method of entering into foreign agreements subject to ratification "in accordance with the constitutional processes" of the United States is through the treaty process. The original provision of the bill was defended on the ground that the procedure of ratification by joint action of the two Houses of Congress is "strictly a constitutional process," and that such process had never "been challenged in any court in the land as an unconstitutional process." The joint resolution procedure was also defended on the ground that "the House has equal responsibility with the Senate in respect to raising armies and supporting and sustaining them. The House has primary jurisdiction over the taxation necessities involved in sustaining armies and navies and in maintaining national defenses." [42]

The amendment was defeated by a vote of 57 to 14 and the original provision of the bill was retained.

Acquisition of territory

Probably the outstanding examples of the exercise of congressional power to effect action in the international field other than through the treaty process are the cases in which Congress has authorized the acquisition of foreign territory under its power to admit States and make regulations respecting the territory of the United States. In particular, the cases of Texas and Hawaii, described below demonstrate strikingly the possibility of alternative use of the power of Congress with respect to a matter which is likewise a proper subject for treaty action.

17. Annexation of Texas

After Texas had established its independence from Mexico and had gained the recognition of the United States as a sovereign power, negotiations were undertaken for its incorporation into the United States. On April 12, 1844, a treaty of annexation was signed by representatives of the two countries.[43] This treaty was rejected by the Senate on June 8, 1844, by vote of 16 ayes to 35 noes. President Tyler immediately submitted the matter to the entire Congress in a message in which he stated that "the power of Congress is, however, fully competent in some other form of proceeding to accomplish everything that a formal ratification of the treaty could have accomplished * * *." [44]

Subsequently President Tyler again called upon Congress saying that "the two governments having already agreed through their respective organs on the terms of annexation, I would recommend their adoption by Congress in the form of a joint resolution or act to be perfected and made binding on the two countries when adopted in like manner by the Government of Texas." [45]

A joint resolution was thereupon enacted by majority votes of both Houses (the vote in the Senate being 27–25) and approved March 1, 1845, which expressed the conditional consent of the Congress to the admission of Texas and authorized the President to initiate negotiations.[46] This resolution was transmitted to the American Charge d'Affaires in Texas to be presented as an offer of agreement to the Texas Government with the request that Texas should signify "their acceptance and ratification of the provisions contained in this joint resolution." [47]

In due course the Congress and people of Texas voted to accept "the proposals, conditions, and guaranties" contained in the offer of the United States. Thereafter President Polk reported to Congress that Texas had "complied with all the terms and conditions of the joint resolution" of March 1, 1845, and requested the passage of additional legislation to admit the State of Texas into the Union.[48] Such legislation was adopted [49] and the matter was thus successfully concluded.

The opponents of the St. Lawrence seek to deny the relevance of this case on the ground that the act of Congress was not supplemental to an executive agreement and the annexation was not outside the inherent powers of Congress * * *."[50] This seems to be a very narrow view of the case. Although there was never any executive agreement expressed on one piece of paper, the entire negotiations were in terms of offer and acceptance of specific terms resulting in agreement through combined action of the executive and legislative agencies of the two countries. The case remains as a remarkable demonstration of the exercise of the powers of Congress in relation to a foreign negotiation. The fact that a treaty on the same subject had failed of ratification did not in any sense restrict the exercise of congressional jurisdiction over the matter.

18. Hawaii

The annexation of Hawaii was similar in many respects. In 1897, President McKinley submitted to the Senate for ratification a treaty with Hawaii for the annexation of the islands which had already been approved by the Hawaiian authorities.[51] The treaty failed of ratification. On July 7, 1898, the President approved a joint resolution providing that "the Government of the Republic of Hawaii having * * * signified its consent * * * to cede * * * to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands * * * said cession is accepted, ratified and confirmed * * * said Hawaiian Islands * * * are * * * annexed * * *." [52]

19. Horse Shoe Reef

By act of March 3, 1849,[53] the Congress appropriated funds for the construction of a lightboat on Horse Shoe Reef in the Niagara River. Subsequently it was found that the best site lay on the Canadian side of the boundary line and the necessary territory was thereupon ceded by Great Britain to the United States.[54] Since that time Congress has consistently voted appropriations to maintain the light. This, then, is another example of congressional action to effectuate or ratify an international act of the executive branch.

Summary

The foregoing and other examples point strongly to a constitutional practice whereunder the power of Congress has been exercised through legislation in a particular field to authorize the executive branch to enter into arrangements with foreign governments, or to effectuate or approve agreements negotiated by the executive branch. In each case the subject matter dealt with was one which concerned a function specifically delegated to Congress in the Constitution. These cases constitute some of the most notable as well as some of the most successful specific acts of the United States Government in the field of foreign affairs during recent years. While in none of these cases has the constitutionality of the action been passed upon by the Supreme Court, it is of perhaps greater significance that the method employed to bring about United States participation therein has never been questioned.

IV. JUDICIAL RECOGNITION OF AGREEMENTS OTHER THAN TREATIES

It is not proposed in this paper to review in detail the familiar thesis that the Constitution does not require all arrangements with foreign nations to be concluded through the treaty procedure. From the point of view of constitutional law, the validity of executive agreements, whether entered into under the authority of Congress or under the authority of the President, or both, and not subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, is clearly established by precedent and judicial decision. Nor is the line of demarcation between treaties and executive agreements dependent upon whether or not a particular treaty or agreement imposes a binding commitment on the United States; many executive agreements, in fact the vast majority, have imposed such obligations.,

It may be noted, however, for the purpose of clarifying the issue, that the use of the term "executive agreement" has contributed to some of the confusion in the thinking on this subject to the extent that it has been used as a generic term, descripitive of all arrangements with foreign governments which are not submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification. Since some opprobrium appears to attach to the term "executive agreement" because of the implication that such an instrument may involve the bypassing of a constitutional prerogative of the Senate, it is essential to point out that there are several varieties of agreements to which the term "executive agreement" is customarily applied or situations in which some procedure other than the treaty procedure has been or may be resorted to. These divide themselves in two general categories, as follows:

1. The classical example of "executive agreement" would appear to be an agreement entered into by the President, irrespective of specific congressional action, in the exercise of his powers as the principal military and diplomatic officer of the Government. These may either take the form of statements of policy such as the Root-Takahira agreement of 1908 [55] and the Lansing-Ishii agreement of 1917 [56] which dealt with the special interests of the United States and Japan in China; or they may be agreements incidental to the waging of war such as the undertakings with reference to the prosecution of the war entered into at the Crimea Conference in February 1945 [57] or the transitory provisions of the act of Chapultepec which specifically contemplated the use of force by this country during the war and before the final adoption of a treaty.[58] A closely related form of executive agreement entered into under the power of the President is an agreement which is nonexecutory and in effect relates to a specific act and imposes no further binding commitments upon this country. Outstanding examples of this type of agreement are the exchange of notes between President Roosevelt and Foreign Commissar Litvinov in 1933 relating to the recognition by the United States of the Soviet Union and the assignment by the latter to the United States of certain claims against United States nationals arising from confiscatory decrees of the Soviet Government; [59] and the so-called Hull-Lothian agreement of September 1940 by which the United States transferred to Great Britain 50 destroyers in exchange for the

[41] 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1135.
[42] 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11483–11484.
[43] 4 Miller, Treaties, 697.
[44] H. Doc. 271, 28th Cong., 1st sess.
[45] 4 Richardson, A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789–1897, p. 334.
[46] 5 Stat. 797.
[47] 4 Miller, Treaties, p. 711.
[48] 4 Miller, Treaties, p. 724.
[49] 9 Stat. 108.
[50] Edwin Borchard, opinion, hearings before subcommittee of Committee on Commerce on S. 1385, 78th Cong., 1st sess., November 27, 1944, p. 134.
[51] 1 Moore, Digest of International Law, 503.
[52] 30 Stat. 750.
[53] 9 Stat. 380.
[54] 1 Malloy, Treaties, etc., 603.
[55] 1 Malloy, 1045.
[56] 3 Malloy, 3720.
[57] 79th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. 8.
[58] 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2058 et seq., March 12, 1945.
[59] Department of State publication (528).

rights for 99 years to military bases in British possessions in the Western Hemisphere.[60]

2. An entirely different type of constitutional procedure is involved in the case of an agreement with one or more foreign nations which is entered into by the executive branch in conjunction with legislative action by the Congress under one of its delegated powers. While for want of a better term such an agreement is customarily referred to as an "executive agreement," it might with equal correctness be called a "congressional agreement" since in the nature of this type of instrument its provisions could not be binding upon the United States without legislative action by the Congress. In practice there may be several variations in the interplay of executive and congressional action with reference to undertakings of this nature. The simplest type of case is an agreement which is entered into by the executive branch under general powers vested therein by previous act of Congress; examples of this type are the International Silver Agreement of 1933 and the International Air Services Transit Agreement and the International Air Transport Agreement discussed above. Secondly, there are examples of specific prior congressional authorization to enter into international agreement as in the case of Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and United States membership in the International Labor Organization. Thirdly, there may be an Executive agreement submitted for subsequent approval to Congress such as the debt-funding agreements of 1923 or for subsequent legislative action to provide for the carrying out of the provisions of the agreement as in the case of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the subsequent legislation providing for contributions of funds by the United States. In any of these three types of cases the necessity of congressional sanction is present in order that the terms of the agreement may be carried out by this country, and in all of these cases the constitutional problems involved are different from those in relation to executive agreements entered into solely on the authority of the President.

This memorandum is concerned exclusively with the constitutionality of the procedure followed in the executive-legislative approach to international agreements as applied to the execution by the United States of the specific agreement dealt with herein. Nevertheless, since the treaty issue has been raised in relation to the propriety of the procedure followed by the United States in connection with the St. Lawrence agreement, it is necessary to make reference to judicial decisions of the Supreme Court upholding the validity of agreements with foreign nations concluded otherwise than through the treaty process, whether under the authority of the President alone or in conjunction with congressional action. Time and again agreements of these kinds have been upheld; never has their validity been impugned by the Court[61] on the ground of failure to comply with the treaty procedure, regardless of whether such agreements have been entered on the authority of the President or in conjunction with legislative action. Whether the question of their constitutionality has been presented to the Court on the issue of unlawful delegation of power or on the treaty issue, the decisions have been the same. Summaries of outstanding Supreme Court decisions are set forth below:

1. In *B. Altman & Co.* v. *United States*,[62] there was involved the question of the power of the Supreme Court to review a judgment of the circuit court of appeal in a case involving the interpretation of a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and France under the authority vested in the President by section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897[63] which authorized the President to make reciprocal agreements with foreign countries with reference to certain articles. The contention was made that the judgment of the lower court was not reviewable under the provisions of the Circuit Court of Appeals Act of 1891 because the negotiations with France had concluded in an agreement rather than a treaty. The court rejected this contention and stated as follows:

"While it may be true that this commercial agreement made under authority of the Tariff Act of 1897, section 3, was not a treaty possessing the dignity of one requiring ratification by the Senate of the United States, it was an international compact, negotiated between the representatives of two sovereign nations and made in the name and on behalf of the contracting countries, and dealing with important commercial relations between the two countries, and was proclaimed by the President. If not technically a treaty requiring ratification, nevertheless it was a compact authorized by the Congress of the United States, negotiated and proclaimed under the authority of its President. We think such a compact is a treaty under the Circuit Court of Appeals Act, and, where its construction is directly involved, as it is here, there is a right of review by direct appeal to this court."

2. One of the leading cases on the subject of the powers of the executive in the field of foreign affairs is *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.*[64] which involved an attack upon the constitutionality of a joint resolution of Congress of May 28, 1934,[65] which provided that: "If the President finds that the prohibition of the sale of arms and munitions of war in the United States to those countries now engaged in armed conflict in the Chaco may contribute to the reestablishment of peace between those countries, and if after consultation with the governments of other American Republics and with their cooperation, as well as that of such other governments as he may deem necessary, he makes proclamation to that effect, it shall be unlawful to sell, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President prescribes, any arms or munitions of war in any place in the United States to the countries now engaged in that armed conflict, or to any person, company, or association acting in the interest of either country, until otherwise ordered by the President or by Congress."

Under the authority of this statute the President issued a proclamation prohibiting the sale of arms in the United States to the countries engaged in the Chaco War, namely, Bolivia and Paraguay. The Curtiss-Wright Corp. was indicted for conspiracy to violate the joint resolution and on appeal attacked the constitutionality of the joint resolution on the ground that it constituted an unlawful delegation of legislative power to the Executive. Excerpts from the opinion of the Court follow:

"It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality. Neither the Constitution nor the laws passed in pursuance of it have any force in foreign territory unless in respect of our own citizens (see *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.*, 213 U. S. 347, 356); and operations of the Nation in such territory must be governed by treaties, international understandings and compacts, and the principles of international law. As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States in that field are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family. Otherwise, the United States is not completely sovereign. The power to acquire territory by discovery and occupation (*Jones* v. *United States*, 137 U. S. 202, 212), the power to expel undesirable aliens (*Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States*, 149 U. S. 698, 705 et seq.), the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense (*Altman & Co.* v. *United States*, 224 U. S. 583, 600–601; Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, 2d ed., p. 102, and note 1), none of which is expressly affirmed by the Constitution, nevertheless exist as inherently inseparable from the conception of nationality. * * *

"Practically every volume of the United States Statutes contains one or more acts or joint resolutions of Congress authorizing action by the President in respect of subjects affecting foreign relations, which either leave the exercise of the power to his unrestricted judgment, or provide a standard far more general than that which has always been considered requisite with regard to domestic affairs.

* * * * *

"The result of holding that the joint resolution here under attack is void and unenforceable as constituting an unlawful delegation of legislative power would be to stamp this multitude of comparable acts and resolutions as likewise invalid. And while this Court may not, and should not, hesitate to declare acts of Congress, however many times repeated, to be unconstitutional if beyond all rational doubt it finds them to be so, an impressive array of legislation such as we have just set forth, enacted by nearly every Congress from the beginning of our national existence to the present day, must be given unusual weight in the process of reaching a correct determination of the problem. A legislative practice such as we have here, evidenced not by only occasional instances, but marked by the movement of a steady stream for a century and a half of time, goes a long way in the direction of proving the presence of unassailable ground for the constitutionality of the practice to be found in the origin and history of the power involved, or in its nature, or in both combined."

3. *United States* v. *Belmont*[66] involved certain aspects of the agreements between President Roosevelt and Foreign Commissar Litvinov in 1933 referred to above. This agreement, among other things, provided for the assignment to the United States of all claims of the Soviet Government against United States nationals arising by virtue of a decree of 1918 of the Soviet Government nationalizing and appropriating certain property, including a sum of money deposited prior to 1918 by a Russian corporation with Belmont. The United States sued to recover the deposit under the assignment. The lower court dismissed the complaint on the ground that a judgment for the United States would be contrary to the controlling public policy of the State of New York. The Supreme Court reversed the decision of the lower court and held that the United States was entitled to recover. In so holding the Court stated:

"We take judicial notice of the fact that coincident with the assignment set forth in the complaint, the President recognized the Soviet Government, and normal diplomatic relations were established between that Government and the Government of the United

[60] Department of State Bulletin, August 24, 1940, p. 154.

[61] McClure, International Executive Agreements, p. 221.

[62] 244 U. S. 583.

[63] 30 Stat. 151.

[64] 299 U. S. 304.

[65] 48 Stat. 811.

[66] 301 U. S. 324.

States, followed by an exchange of ambassadors. * * * The effect of this was to validate, so far as this country is concerned, all acts of the Soviet Government here involved from the commencement of its existence. The recognition, establishment of diplomatic relations, the assignment, and agreements with respect thereto, were all parts of one transaction, resulting in an international compact between the two Governments. That the negotiations, acceptance of the assignment, and agreements and understandings in respect thereof were within the competence of the President may not be doubted. Governmental power over internal affairs is distributed between the National Government and the several States. Governmental power over external affairs is not distributed, but is vested exclusively in the National Government. The assignment and the agreements in connection therewith did not, as in the case of treaties, as that term is used in the treaty-making clause of the Constitution (art. II, sec. 2), require the advice and consent of the Senate.

"A treaty signifies 'a compact made between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare.' *Altman & Co.* v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583, 600). But an international compact, as this was, is not always a treaty which requires the participation of the Senate. There are many such compacts, of which a protocol, a modus vivendi, a postal convention, and agreements like that now under consideration are illustrations. (See 5 Moore, Int. Law Digest, 210–221.) The distinction was pointed out by this Court in the Altman case, supra, which arose under section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897, authorizing the President to conclude commercial agreements with foreign countries in certain specified matters. We held that althought this might not be a treaty requiring ratification by the Senate, it was a compact negotiated and proclaimed under the authority of the President, and as such was a treaty within the meaning of the Circuit Court of Appeals Act, the construction of which might be reviewed upon direct appeal to this Court."

4. *United States* v. *Pink*[67] involved the recognition of the effect in the United States of another decree of the Soviet Government which purported to nationalize the insurance business and all of the property, wherever situated, of all Russian insurance companies, including the First Russian Insurance Co., which had a branch in New York. The United States Government, suing as assignee of the Soviet Government under the Litvinov Assignment, was held entitled to recover the surplus of the New York branch of the Russian Insurance Co. subsequent to its liquidation. In so holding and in reversing the decision of the lower court, the Court stated:

"If the priority had been accorded American claims by treaty with Russia, there would be no doubt as to its validity. (Cf. *Santovincenzo* v. *Egan*, supra.) The same result obtains here. The powers of the President in the conduct of foreign relations included the power, without consent of the Senate, to determine the public policy of the United States with respect to the Russian nationalization decrees. 'What government is to be regarded here as representative of a foreign sovereign state is a political rather than a judicial question, and is to be determined by the political department of the government.' *Guaranty Trust Co.* v. *United States* (supra, 304 U. S. at p. 137). That authority is not limited to a determination of the government to be recognized. It includes the power to determine the policy which is to govern the question of recognition. Objections to the underlying policy as well as objections to recognition are to be addressed to the political department and not to the courts. See *Guaranty Trust Co.* v. *United States* (supra, p. 138); *Kenneth* v. *Chambers* (14 How. 38, 50–51). As we have noted, this Court in the Belmont case recognized that the Litvinov Assignment was an international compact which did not require the participation of the Senate. It stated (301 U. S. pp. 330–331): 'There are many such compacts, of which a protocol, a modus vivendi, a postal convention, and agreements like that now under consideration are illustrations.'"

* * * * *

The foregoing cases are referred to herein for the sole purpose of establishing (a) the validity of agreements with foreign countries entered into as to this country otherwise than as treaties and (b) that the treaty process is not the only constitutional method for concluding arrangements with other countries. Despite the assertions in the past of the opponents of the St. Lawrence project that all or some of these cases may have been incorrectly decided by the Supreme Court, it is submitted that they conclusively establish the propositions above stated and that, consequently, such decisions, in conjunction with the legislative and other precedents discussed above, are conclusive authorities with respect to the constitutionality of the St. Lawrence legislation.

V. ARGUMENTS OF OPPONENTS

The opponents of the St. Lawrence project have endeavored to sustain the thesis that the project cannot be passed upon by Congress under the commerce clause in view of the fact that any such legislation would be related to an agreement with a foreign country. The argument is made that an "executive agreement" transmitted to Congress for information to be approved by a majority vote in each House may not be constitutionally used as an alternative to the conclusion of a treaty submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent by two-thirds of the Senators present.[68] The arguments of the opponents are based on a series of considerations of both a legal and political[69] nature which, it is submitted, do not successfully refute the points which have been developed herein with respect to the exercise powers of Congress.

Before any detailed analysis is made of the arguments of the opponents, two points should be stressed. First, the line of argument taken by the opponents tends to be misleading to the extent that, for certain arguments at least, it lumps all "executive agreements" as being subject to the same alleged legal disqualifications. The argument fails to differentiate between those executive agreements which are made on the authority of the President alone under the powers vested in his office by the Constitution, and, on the other hand those agreements which in their nature require authorizing or effectuating legislation in order to carry them out and are in fact entered into either under congressional authorization or, as in the case of the 1941 agreement and others noted above, subject to the enactment of adequate implementing legislation. Thus, the alarm expressed by the opponents[70] over the alleged evils of secrecy in the case of "executive agreements" is totally inapplicable and misleading in relation to an agreement which is in fact public and which by its terms and by the very nature of its subject matter cannot become a perfected and binding agreement until it has been passed upon by Congress.

Secondly, it should be clearly understood that it is not the thesis of this memorandum that any international arrangement can be entered into through the procedure which has been used in this case. The only precedents which have been cited as being of any relevance in this case are those in which Congress has enacted legislation to authorize, effectuate, or approve international agreements in a field related to one of the delegated powers of Congress, and certain additional and very special considerations with respect to the legal basis of the 1941 agreement are referred to in the next section of this memorandum. There are obvious limitations upon the types of cases in which the Congress as a whole can act in relation to an international agreement. The most important limitation is that the subject matter of the agreement must be in a field of congressional responsibility under the constitution.[71]

These limitations do not exist with respect to the use of treaties. On the other hand, however, while it is beyond argument that the treaty method might be employed in this case or in any of the cases of agreement with foreign countries which have been referred to in this memorandum, there are obvious advantages in the use of the procedure employed in this case to the extent that it gives the Congress as a whole an opportunity to pass upon a case which involves a wide range of subjects which are normally passed upon by Congress, including the construction of navigation works and power projects, the appropriation of substantial sums of money, and the authorization of an important agreement with a State government concerning a matter of vital domestic import.

Supreme Court Decisions Incorrect

The opponents, while maintaining generally the thesis that all international arrangements, except possibly some relating to administrative matters, must be entered into through the treaty procedure,[72] nevertheless note that several decisions of the Supreme Court have recognized and upheld the validity of "executive agreements" in certain types of cases as valid alternatives to the treaty method. The answer of the opponents to this is apparently that the decisions of the Supreme Court are wrong,[73] and that, according to the law as they recognize it, the treaty method is the only constitutional method of concluding agreements with foreign countries, at least in respect of any matters but

---

[67] 315 U. S. 203.

[68] Edwin Borchard, opinion, hearings before subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce on S. 1385, 77th Cong., 1st sess., November 27, 1944, pp. 103, 111–112.

[69] See Borchard, hearings, p. 186, where the witness admits that his objections are "more on the ground of policy" than "constitutionality."

[70] Hearings, p. 185.

[71] See, for example, David M. Levitan, Executive Agreements, 35 Ill. Law Rev. 365, 394, in which the writer states:

"* * * Only international issues of which the domestic counterpart is within the range of congressional authority can be dealt with satisfactorily by means of executive agreements. Executive agreements can be domestically validated as long as they deal with subjects within the legislative competence of Congress, for then Congress assures internal enforcement of the agreement. It must be remembered, however, that this is a federal state and that Congress has but limited authority. Many of the international problems are on the internal level beyond the competence of Congress to legislate; these problems can only be dealt with by treaty."

See also Henry S. Fraser, Treaties and Executive Agreements, S. Doc. 244, 78th Cong., 2d sess., in which the writer states at p. 2 that—

"Not infrequently the Congress by joint resolution has accomplished what might have been achieved by treaty. So long as the legislation is within the delegated or implied powers of Congress, there would appear no constitutional objection to this method."

[72] Borchard, hearings, p. 114.

[73] Borchard, hearings, p. 133.

those relating to routine details. It is believed that this position of the opponents indicates a tendency to overemphasize the alleged evils of international agreements as distinguished from treaties, and that if upheld in any court it would cast doubt upon the validity of innumerable international acts of the United States since the foundation of the Republic. The Altman case was decided 24 years ago; the Belmont case 9 years ago; and the Pink case 4 years ago. No Supreme Court decision has ever questioned the argument maintained in this memorandum, or impugned the validity of any agreement with a foreign country on the ground that it had not been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Congressional Authorization and Senatorial Waiver

The opponents also concede that there have been instances in which matters of importance have been handled with foreign countries other than through the treaty process. Certain of these cases are explained away on the ground that in such cases the procedure was one which "was authorized by Congress." [72] In so explaining these cases, the opponents have admitted exactly what they have devoted so much of their energies in attempting to disprove, namely, that in certain types of cases the Congress can act despite the fact that a foreign agreement is involved and consequently that the treaty process is not the only method of concluding agreements with foreign countries.

At another point, however, a different explanation is made with respect to the instances where the treaty process has not been used with respect to agreements that were allegedly appropriate only for ratification by the Senate, namely, that in these cases the Senate waived its right to have the particular agreement submitted to it for ratification.[74] Thus, in commenting upon the Canadian reciprocity legislation of 1911, Mr. Borchard states that "the Senate gave its approval by majority vote, which was itself a waiver of its treaty prerogative even if that were an issue. Besides, Congress had authorized the President to make the agreement."

As to the case of Horse Shoe Reef, Mr. Borchard pointed out that the Senate joined in an appropriation for a lighthouse and that therefore the Senate may be deemed to have waived any question of senatorial prerogative. With respect to the Root-Takahira Agreement of 1908, Mr. Borchard states that this was communicated to the Senate for its information, and received Senate acquiescence. In discussing the case of UNRRA, Mr. Borchard explains that the procedure was first discussed with a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, which consented to the agreement with a commitment to recommend to the Senate a waiver of its insistence upon a treaty. It appears, therefore, from the arguments of the opponents that the question at issue is not a legal or constitutional question in any sense but simply a question of senatorial prerogative which can be waived either by majority vote of the Senate on a bill to approve a foreign agreement, or by action of a subcommittee of one of its committees, or even by silent acquiescence of the Senate upon the communication to it of an agreement negotiated by the Executive. Thus, according to the opponents' own arguments, it would be entirely legal if the Senate desires for it to pass the legislation upon consideration regardless of the treaty issue, and, if the House should join with it, the propriety of the action could not thereafter be questioned. If the opponents' arguments are accepted this would appear to be conclusive of the whole problem which they have raised.[75]

Durability of Treaties and Agreements

That the question raised by the opponents is in fact primarily a political one is quite clear from an examination of other arguments made by them. One such political argument relates generally to the alleged weakness of executive agreements on the ground that they are subject to repeal whereas treaties are supposedly more durable.[76] It is not entirely clear whether this argument is advanced in support of the thesis that the procedure under consideration is unconstitutional—since such an argument is hardly relevant to a legal discussion—or whether it is advanced out of solicitude with respect to a supposed defect in the position of the foreign contracting party. It is not clear either whether Mr. Borchard's point is that the United States Congress might repeal the dams, powerhouses, etc., after they are built. As to the intrinsic merits in this particular of a treaty as compared to an agreement approved by legislation, the opponents do not deny that a statute of Congress may validly be enacted and enforced in this country even though such statute would result in a violation of treaty obligations.[77]

A breach of an international obligation could arise in this case, just as in the case of a treaty, if the reciprocal legislation should be enacted by the two countries and the agreement should be proclaimed in accordance with its terms, and later the Congress should adopt inconsistent legislation after Canada has expended funds in reliance upon the agreement so proclaimed.[78] As to the fears expressed by the opponents that the approval of the St. Lawrence agreement by simple legislation rather than by a two-thirds vote would leave the situation insecure and subject to continued agitation by the St. Lawrence "lobby" [79] the same argument might quite as well have been made in respect of the authorization by simple legislation of such controversial projects as the Tennessee Valley Authority, or the Boulder Dam, where important rights of the Colorado River Basin States were involved. In fact, as has been noted above, the act creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission specifically reserved in Congress the right to alter, amend, or repeal the legislation in question. However, although the construction of this bridge was a matter of considerable controversy in Canada, the reservation by the United States Congress of its right to repeal the legislation did not impede the conclusion of that project.

Effect of Importance of Negotiation

A substantially similar line of argument by the opponents is their claim that subjects of importance must be handled only through the treaty process and that, since the St. Lawrence agreement is such a subject, resort cannot be had to any other method of approval.[80] This again is a political rather than a legal argument since the constitutionality of a particular procedure cannot depend upon the relative importance of the particular problem with respect to which the procedure is sought to be employed. Is it to be assumed, for example, that Congress can act upon a matter involving $30,000,000, for example, as in the improvement of the Great Lakes channels referred to below—but not on a matter involving $300,000,000—and, if not, what is the limit of its authority and whence does the limitation stem? The obvious answer is that the test lies in whether or not the subject matter is within the power of Congress, and not in the importance of the subject. Few international agreements are of greater importance to the United States, for example, than the Bretton Woods agreements which have been adhered to by the United States under authority granted by Congress in the exercise of its constitutional powers. Mr. Borchard has stated that "the very magnitude of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project, involving, as it does, hundreds of millions of dollars, probably 4 years of time, a special governmental commission,

[72] Borchard, hearings, p. 114.

[74] Borchard, hearings, p. 117.

[75] In commenting upon the inconsistency of the position of the opponents (which is also contained in an article by Mr. Borchard on the subject of executive agreements, 53 Yale Law Journal 664) Messrs. Myres S. McDougal (a colleague of Mr. Borchard at Yale Law School) and Asher Lans, in their article entitled "Treaties and Congressional-Executive or Presidential Agreements," 54 Yale Law Journal 181, 223, have stated:

"There is in fact a curious, backhand recognition of this completely adequate constitutional procedure, independent of the treaty-making clause, for effecting international agreements even in the writings of those who most vigorously oppose the use of this alternative procedure. Thus Professor Borchard, after writing at great length to prove that agreements negotiated with the approval of the whole Congress are not interchangeable substitutes for the treaty and that 'there is no constitutional warrant whatever for the suggestion that the President has an option to submit his compact either to the Senate as a treaty * * * or to the Congress for majority approval,' paradoxically reverses his position and seeks to dispose of the many precedents contradictory of his point of view * * * by the suggestion that all of these agreements can be justified either by congressional statute or by senatorial waiver of the particular assumption of power."

[76] Borchard, hearings, p. 121.

[77] See Borchard, Executive Agreements, A Reply, 54 Yale Law Journal, 616, 659; "Even an act of Congress departing from the treaty does not relieve the country of its liability thereunder." As to the power of the Congress generally to pass laws inconsistent with treaties, see McDougal and Lans, op. cit. 318-348.

[78] McDougal and Lans, op. cit. 348-350; Green H. Hackworth, hearings before subcommittee of Senate Commerce Committee, November 29, 1944, pp. 220-230.

The opponents, in taking the contrary view, rely heavily upon an alleged precedent indicating that "executive agreements" entered into under legislative sanction do not create binding international obligations. This was a case involving a trade agreement with Brazil negotiated in compliance with general authority under the Tariff Act of 1890, in which the United States gave notice of immediate termination of the agreement upon the repeal of the act and claimed that it had not breached its international obligations when the underlying legislative authority was repealed. (See Foreign Relations of the United States, 1894, 76, 79-82.) But examination of the Department of State's correspondence with Brazil shows that the terms of the underlying legislative authority of the two countries was well known to each government and that Brazil was on notice from the beginning of the negotiations that the arrangement was subject to termination upon repeal of the authorizing act, and the possibility of this action was an implied condition subsequent to the agreement. This case then, to quote Messrs. McDougal and Lans, "furnishes no authority whatever for the position that a congressional-executive agreement may, as a general rule, be unilaterally abrogated by the United States without breaking international law." In any event that case is not apposite to the St. Lawrence case, in which the agreement will not come into force by its terms unless special legislation is enacted to approve the agreement.

[79] Borchard, hearings, p. 186.

[80] Borchard, hearings, p. 115.

obligations to be imposed in the future, both on the United States and on Canada" require that it be handled as a treaty. Precisely the same considerations were present in the legislation with respect to the Niagara Falls and St. Lawrence Bridge Commissions, as to which Mr. Borchard states merely that, while "Congress may of course pass an act creating, conditional upon similar authorization by Canada, the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission, and authorize it to construct and operate a bridge across the Niagara River * * *, there is nothing unusual about such an establishment."

The fact that there is nothing unusual about a matter hardly proves that it is not important. The Niagara Falls Bridge case does appear for the reasons noted above to be a close parallel to the case under study and the fact there is nothing unusual about it would appear to constitute in itself an argument for the use of the same procedure here.

Congress Cannot Approve or Amend Agreements

The opponents have laid great stress upon the claim that it is out of order for Congress to "approve" an agreement with a foreign country.[81] That the Congress may authorize an agreement or that an agreement may be entered into under the authority of existing legislation is admitted by the opponents, but if an agreement is negotiated by the Executive without prior authorization the submission of the agreement to Congress for its approval would, it is claimed, vitiate the power of Congress with respect to the subject matter of the agreement. On the other hand, if the Congress authorizes the President to negotiate an agreement and in so doing specifically enacts a requirement that the agreement must subsequently be submitted by the President to the Congress for its approval, then apparently Congress may validly retain and exercise its constitutional powers to the extent of acting upon the agreement.[82] Furthermore, instances in which the Congress has actually acted in approval of a previous agreement negotiated without prior congressional authorization may apparently be again explained, according to the opponents, on the ground that the method in question was authorized by Congress or that any objections to the procedure of approval by Congress were "waived" by the Senate.[83]

The claim that Congress cannot approve agreements negotiated by the President is not only untenable on its face but it is refuted by the precedents and is in any case entirely inconsistent with the power of Congress by majority of both Houses to pass legislation on any subject within the scope of its constitutional powers. As has already been seen, there are numerous precedents for congressional approval for particular agreements negotiated by the Executive. One of the most striking of these is the case of UNRRA where, although the agreement which had been signed by the President was not in so many words "approved" by the legislation, it was set forth in full therein and the Congress went to the extent of amending the law so as to include several reservations therein. The fact that the agreement had been previously discussed with a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee does not in any sense detract from the relevance of this important case.

In the case of the Bretton Woods agreements and the Food and Agriculture Organization, the basic agreements creating the organizations were negotiated by the Executive with the other nations but were not signed until after the passage of the enabling legislation. The legislation in each case authorized the President to accept membership in the organizations provided by the respective agreements and enacted other provisions to facilitate the execution of the agreements by the United States. This action is tantamount to approval of the agreements. The Bretton Woods legislation went further and directed the executive branch to take action to amend the agreements in certain respects. It would have been equally in the power of Congress to place any other conditions upon United States adherence to the agreements or to legislate, for example, that the United States quota in the Monetary Fund could not be paid until the agreement had been amended in a given respect.

In the case of the debt-funding agreements referred to above, each of the individual agreements with the countries concerned was approved by the Congress after it had been negotiated by the Debt Funding Commission. This, as the opponents point out,[84] was done pursuant to provisions of the debt-funding legislation that the agreements should be approved by Congress after having been negotiated. The opponents appear to believe that although Congress cannot approve an agreement which has been negotiated by the President without prior congressional authorization, the Congress nevertheless can on its own initiative vote itself the right to do what it otherwise has not the power to do, namely, to approve an agreement with a foreign country.

In the case of the fur-seal legislation, as has previously been described, the action of the Congress was in a slightly different form since the legislation was passed to implement the provisions of the agreement negotiated by the Executive—and the legislation in effect enacted the terms of the agreement in full—but the effect is substantially the same as if the agreement had been approved in so many words.

The United Nations Participation Act also recognizes the right of Congress to approve agreements entered into by the Executive in the provision which authorized the President to negotiate a military agreement with the United Nations Security Council and directed that such agreement "shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution." As noted above, this provision was passed by Congress after a long debate in which substantially the same contention was expressed in the Senate as has been made by Mr. Borchard, namely, that the only constitutional method by which foreign agreements negotiated by the Executive can be approved is through ratification as treaties by the Senate.

It is believed, therefore, that the contention of the opponents in this respect is entirely without substance and that whether the action of the Congress with respect to a foreign agreement takes the form of (a) authorization, (b) approval, or (c) enactment of implementing authority, the substantive result in each case is precisely the same. Whichever method may be used, the power of Congress to act in the matter rests upon its delegated powers under the Constitution.

In this connection the opponents have also stated that the procedure at issue here is faulty because Congress has no power to amend the agreement.[85] While it may be literally true that Congress cannot amend the agreement, there can be no doubt whatever as to its power to make its approval conditional upon certain changes being made in the agreement or, as is proposed to be done in the bill under reference, to withhold approval of certain separable provisions of the agreement, and suggest that the President negotiate treaties with respect to the substance thereof. There is no doubt as to the propriety of this procedure any more than there would be as to the propriety of action by the Congress, for example, to direct the President to renegotiate all or certain phases of the agreement or to take the whole thing back and negotiate it as a treaty. In commenting upon this point, Messrs. McDougal and Lans have stated:

"This same semantic confusion about what is involved in the 'making' of an agreement seems to underlie Professor Borchard's novel and repeated insistence that when an agreement is referred by the President to the Congress, the Congress has power only to consent or disapprove, but lacks the power to suggest amendments, such as the Senate possesses in the case of treaties. Professor Borchard's notion seems to be that a legislative body cannot amend an agreement unless it has a document physically before it and itself makes verbal changes on the parchment. Thus, he states: 'This is not submitted to the Senate in the form of a document which you have to consider and have the right to amend as we have amended 162 of our treaties. You have got to take this or leave it. You can't modify the thing, you can't place a comma in it.' To Senator FERGUSON'S question 'Is there anything in the law to say that we could not change it? Couldn't we draft laws as we see fit?' he replies, 'You can draft laws, but you can't draft agreements between foreign countries.'

"It should be obvious that when the legislative function is conceived as that of forming policy, rather than of pushing pens on specific pieces of parchment, there is no difficulty in the Congress making amendments to agreements. The powers of the Congress to tell the President to go back and do his job over and do it in a specific way, if he does it at all, are fully as great as those of the Senate. Senator FERGUSON'S answer to Professor Borchard on this point, illustrated by reference to the amendments made by Congress to the UNRRA agreement, would appear conclusive." [86]

Construction in Foreign Countries

Finally, the opponents have made it clear that the proposed legislation is invalid because Congress cannot authorize the expenditure of funds for construction in foreign countries.[87] This claim, of course, does not take into account the fact that the whole tenor of the agreement is that in general the work in Canada should be performed by Canada, and the work in the United States by this country, and that any work done by the United States in Canada would be entirely incidental to the construction of indivisible units, the construction of which do not lend themselves to performance by separate groups of operators. The opponents suggest that it is permissible for United States funds to be used in connection with the construction of a bridge across an international stream because the responsibility of each party would extend simply to the boundary line in the middle of the river. It is hard to visualize how construction work on a bridge could be so divided so as to provide that workmen and materials of the respective nationalities would refrain from crossing an imaginary boundary line. It is more difficult to understand how there could be any difference in principle between the two cases.

Furthermore, there does not appear to be any basis in law for the opponents' contention. There have already been listed above, in section II above, a long list of cases in which the Congress has authorized the expenditure of appropriated funds for use in construction projects in foreign countries.

[81] Borchard, hearings, p. 127.

[82] See Borchard, hearings, p. 127, where, in discussing the Canadian Reciprocity Agreement of 1911, he states: "But what invalidates the whole episode for purposes of precedent is the overlooked fact that Congress first authorized the President, by act of July 26, 1911, to negotiate a reciprocal agreement with Canada for freer trade relations, provided, however, that before such agreements become operative they should be submitted to Congress 'for ratification or rejection.'"

[83] Borchard, hearings, p. 127.

[84] Borchard, hearings, p. 123.

[85] Borchard, hearings, pp. 146, 148, 201 et seq.

[86] McDougal and Lans, op. cit. p. 225, note 46.

[87] Borchard, hearings, pp. 166–169.

In each of these cases the entire project was located in the foreign country unlike the case at issue in which, as has been noted, any expenditure of funds abroad would be entirely incidental to the construction of a project at an international boundary stream which will be located as much in this country as in the foreign country. The previous projects referred to include the Alaska Highway, where funds were authorized to be expended abroad and were so expended in surveys long before military considerations made necessary the building of the road under the war powers; the Inter-American Highway; the Rio Hato to Chorerra road, in Panama; and the construction of certain aids to navigation in islands in Panama near the Panama Canal. Another example is the very recent act of Congress approved February 12, 1946, authorizing the Weather Bureau to "take such action as may be necessary in the development of an international basic meteorological reporting network in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, including the establishment, operation, and maintenance of such reporting stations in cooperation with the State Department * * * with the meteorological services of foreign countries and with persons engaged in air commerce" and authorizing appropriations for this purpose.

Another example which is as pertinent in many respects to the discussion in section II as it is at this point concerns the construction of certain works by the United States in Mexico in 1911. In 1907 the entire lower valley of the Colorado River and the Imperial Valley were threatened owing to a change in the course of the Colorado River. It was essential to perform construction work in Mexico in order to protect investments in the United States of millions of dollars. President Roosevelt laid the matter before Congress and simultaneously undertook negotiations with Mexico. By act of June 25, 1910,[88] the Congress appropriated $1,000,000 for the purpose of protecting American property against changes in the course of the river and authorized the President "to expend any portion of such money within the limits of the Republic of Mexico as he may deem proper in accordance with such agreements for the purpose as he may make with the Republic of Mexico."

By exchange of notes in December 1910 an agreement was reached between the two countries for the construction in Mexican territory by the United States of protective works necessary to guard the Imperial Valley against floods of the Colorado River. The agreement provided, among other things, that the Executive of Mexico propose to the Mexican Congress legislation to facilitate the work by the United States, including free entry of machinery and supplies and also provided that the United States should not acquire "by virtue of this agreement" any right of ownership over the works or any part of Mexican territory.[89]

[88] 36 Stat. 883.

[89] For full information as to this matter, including copies of the exchange of notes, see Foreign Relations of the United States, 1911, 525–565.

A similar piece of legislation is the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 374), which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to prevent the spread of bollworm in Texas and other parts of the United States, to make surveys and determine the actual distribution of bollworm in Mexico; and to cooperate with the Mexican Government in the extermination of local infestations near the border. Similarly, by the act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 440), there was appropriated $2,700,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct operations for the control of insect pests and plant diseases "including surveys and control operations in Canada in cooperation with the Canadian Government or local Canadian authorities."

Rivers and harbors legislation has frequently made provision with respect to construction projects by the United States in international boundary streams requiring work to be performed, and appropriated funds to be expended, by the United States in foreign territory. An outstanding example of construction work carried on in foreign countries under authorization of Congress is furnished by the improvement of the channels in the mouth of the Detroit River, the greater part of which channels lie in Canada. Work upon the improvement of these channels has been authorized by various acts of Congress of which the earliest appears to have been the act of June 23, 1874 [90] which appropriated $25,000 for "removing boulders and rocks from the Detroit River, partly in Canadian waters * * *."

The act of June 13, 1902 [91] authorized further work in the channel of the Detroit River and in the Middle and West Neebish Channels, St. Mary's River, Mich., in accordance with plans furnished to the Congress,[92] which indicated that part of the work was to be performed in Canadian territory. In the River and Harbor Act approved January 21, 1927,[93] Congress made further provision for the improvement of Middle Neebish Channel, St. Marys River, in accordance with plans furnished to the Congress,[94] which again indicated that parts of the channel in question overlapped the international boundary and required work to be performed in Canadian territory. Apparently this fact did not deprive the Congress of its power in these cases. In the River and Harbor Act approved July 2, 1930,[95] Congress authorized the construction of Great Lakes connecting channels and authorized appropriations therefor of $29,266,000. The testimony in support of the legislation again indicated that the improvement of the channel in the St. Marys River, the St. Clair River, and the Detroit River as authorized by this legislation involved work in Canadian territory.[96] Again no question was raised with respect to the propriety of the action.

The only legislation which has been found which might be construed as having even a remote connection with the argument advanced by the opponents with respect to the use of appropriated funds for construction in foreign counries is section 355 of the Revised Statutes,[97] which provides that no public money shall be expended upon any site or land purchased by the United States for the purpose of erecting thereon any public building until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land or site may be, to such purchase, has been given. This statute at the very most relates to title to real estate and does not pose any broader issue along the lines of the contention of the opponents. Furthermore, it is merely a legislative, as distinguished from a constitutional, requirement, and therefore subject to subsequent contrary action by the Congress. In any event this provision is not applicable with respect to construction of the type involved in this project. This is clear from a decision of the Comptroller General in 1938 that it was proper for the Department of Agriculture Forest Service to expend an appropriation available to that Service for the construction of a dam a considerable portion of which lay in Canada on the boundary between Minnesota and Ontario. In so holding, the Comptroller General stated:

"While, as stated in the decision reported in 6 Comptroller's Decisions 877, referred to in your letter, certain statutory provisions referred to in said decision, including sections 355 and 1136, Revised Statutes, indicate that it is the general policy of the Congress that no public building should be erected on land not owned by the United States, the present submission does not involve a question of the erection of a public building—a dam being obviously not a public building—and in that respect differs from the cited case. It may be stated, however, as a general proposition, that in the absence of express statutory provision there is no authority to use appropriated funds for the construction or erection of improvements on property not owned by the Government.

"It appears from your letter that the portage benefited would be within the United States but that it is not possible to construct the dam wholly on land within the United States, and it is understood therefrom that the greater part of the dam is to be within the United States. The construction of a part of the dam on Canadian soil would appear from the facts as set forth in your letter to be a necessary incident to the construction and use of the portage within the United States. Under these circumstances, this Office will not be required to object to the use of an appropriation otherwise properly available for the project merely because the dam may be partly on Canadian soil, provided, of course, that appropriate consent therefor be first obtained from the Canadian Government." [98]

For the foregoing reasons the contention of the opponents that the United States cannot participate in the St. Lawrence project because it involves construction work in a foreign country appears to be wholly without substance.

Rights of navigation in St. Lawrence system

By the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation of 1794 between the United States and Great Britain, it was provided in part as follows:

"ART. III. It is agreed that it shall at all times be free to His Majesty's subjects, and to the citizens of the United States, and also to the Indians dwelling on either side of the said boundary line, freely to pass and repass by land or inland navigation, into the respective territories and countries of the two parties, on the continent of America (the country within the limits of the Hudson's Bay Co. only excepted), and to navigate all the lakes, rivers, and waters thereof, and freely to carry on trade and commerce with each other.

* * * * *

"ART. XIV. There shall be between all the dominions of His Majesty in Europe and the territories of the United States a reciprocal and perfect liberty of commerce and navigation. The people and inhabitants of the two countries, respectively, shall have liberty freely and securely, and without hindrance and molestation, to come with their ships and cargoes to the lands, countries, cities, ports, places, and rivers within the dominions and territories aforesaid, to enter into the same, to resort there, and to remain and reside there without any limitation of time. Also to hire and possess houses and warehouses for the purposes of their commerce, and generally the merchants and traders on each side shall enjoy the most complete protection and security for their commerce; but subject always as to what

[90] 18 Stat. 237, 238.

[91] 32 Stat. 331, 360–362.

[92] H. Doc. 712, 56th Cong., 1st sess., and H. Doc. 128, 56th Cong., 2d sess.

[93] 44 Stat. 1014.

[94] H. Doc. 270, 69th Cong., 1st sess. It is of interest that in this and other similar cases the consent of the Canadian authorities was requested and granted through exchange of notes with the Department of State.

[95] 46 Stat. 930.

[96] H. Doc. 253, 70th Cong., 1st sess.

[97] 5 Stat. 468.

[98] 18 Decisions of the Comptroller General 463.

respects this article to the laws and statutes of the two countries respectively." [0]

By the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 between the United States and Great Britain, regulating commerce and navigation between the United States and the British possessions in North America, it was provided that:

VI. EFFECT OF PREVIOUS TREATIES

All of the foregoing is concerned with establishing that the legislation in question may be justified as being within the powers of Congress under the commerce clause of the Constitution and that the fact that such legislation is related to an agreement with a foreign country does not prevent the Congress from exercising jurisdiction over the subject matter. For purposes of emphasis and clarity, that part of the memorandum has been prepared as if the United States had no treaty rights with respect to the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system where they are wholly in Canadian territory, and as if the 1941 agreement had been negotiated, and this legislation were being presented, without any background of earlier dealings between the two countries with respect to such waters. In fact, the arrangements which have been created by previous treaties and the rights which have been brought into being thereby are of such importance as to be determining of the question at issue here. Although it could not be claimed that the United States has acquired sovereignty to or title in any part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system lying outside of its boundaries, the rights which it has acquired therein by previous treaties—in recognition of its natural interest in navigation in such system by virtue of geographical considerations—are of such special character as to lift any agreement with Canada relating to construction by the United States in connection with navigation in such waters, outside of the usual class of foreign agreement. Furthermore, the procedure for special agreements prescribed in the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 lays a clear foundation for the conclusion of the 1941 agreement through reciprocal legislation entirely aside from considerations discussed above as to the power of Congress to legislate in connection with foreign agreements.

"ART. IV. It is agreed that the citizens and inhabitants of the United States shall have the right to navigate the river St. Lawrence, and the canals in Canada used as the means of communicating between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, with their vessels, boats, and crafts, as fully and freely as the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, subject only to the same tolls and other assessments as now are, or may hereafter be, exacted of Her Majesty's said subjects; it being understood, however, that the British Government retains the right of suspending this privilege on giving due notice thereof to the Government of the United States.

"It is further agreed that if at any time the British Government should exercise the said reserved right, the Government of the United States shall have the right of suspending, if it think fit, the operations of article III of the present treaty, insofar as the province of Canada is affected thereby, for so long as the suspension of the free navigation of the river St. Lawrence or the canals may continue." [1]

By the Treaty of Washington, 1871, it was provided that:

"ART. XXVI. The navigation of the river St. Lawrence, ascending and descending, from the forty-fifth parallel of north latitude, where it ceases to form the boundary between the two countries, from, to, and into the sea, shall forever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of Great Britain, or of the Dominion of Canada, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

"The navigation of the rivers Yukon, Porcupine, and Stikine, ascending and descending, from, to, and into the sea, shall forever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of either country within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

"ART. XXVII. The Government of Her Britannic Majesty engages to urge upon the Government of the Dominion of Canada to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion; and the Government of the United States engages that the subjects of Her Brittanic Majesty shall enjoy the use of the St. Clair Flats Canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, and further engages to urge upon the State governments to secure to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty the use of the several State canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by or contiguous to the boundary line between the possessions of the high contracting parties, on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States." [2]

By the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Great Britain it was provided that:

"ARTICLE I. The High Contracting Parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purpose of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.[3]

"It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force, this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the High Contracting Parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof, but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the High Contracting Parties and the ships, vessels, and boats of both of the High Contracting Parties, and they shall be placed on terms of equality in the uses thereof."

The effect of these treaties has been to vest important rights in the United States with respect to the waters affected by the 1941 agreement, even where said waters are wholly in Canadian territory. Thus Assistant Secretary of State Adee in 1913, in discussing the difference between the status of the Welland Canal, in Canadian territory, and the Panama Canal, stated:

"The cases are quite distinct and parity between them is almost wholly lacking. In the case of the Welland Canal it must be remembered that from the signature of the treaty of peace with Great Britain down to the conclusion of the Treaty of Washington in 1870 [sic] the coterminous waters between the United States and Canada and their outlet to the sea were a joint waterway of the two countries, the citizens and commerce of each having equal rights in the waters common to both countries. The Welland Canal is not an independent waterway but is part of the coterminous water system, being merely a loop around an unnavigable portion of the common waterway. Its common use by citizens and commerce of the two countries is just as necessary to the fulfillment of the convention compact as the common use of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, which passes in American territory. None of these conditions are discernible in the case of the Panama Canal." [4]

Similarly, Senator Townsend, of Michigan, in introducing an amendment with respect to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway during the debate in the Senate on the Canadian Reciprocity Act of 1911, stated that "it is well known that one of the objects of the treaty of 1854 was the improvement of the St. Lawrence River." [5]

There is considerable legal authority in support of the view expressed by Assistant Secretary Adee. Thus in the case of *Canada Malting Co.* v. *Paterson Steamships,* the Court stated:

"On this motion for rehearing proctors for respondent point out that by treaty relations between Great Britain and the United States the boundary waters of the Great Lakes, meaning thereby the entire body of water comprising lakes, rivers, and waterways separating the two countries, with respect to navigation have become international waterways and equally free to citizens of Canada and citizens of the United States. (See Root-Bryce Treaty of 1909, and President's proclamation of May 13, 1910 [36 Stat. 2448]; Moore's Digest of International Law, vol. I, p. 674.)

"In view of this treaty, there exists, it seems to me, additional reason for declining jurisdiction and relegating the parties to pursue their remedies and rights in the country of which they are citizens and subjects, in the place where the contract of carriage was made and performed, and, further, where the witnesses reside." [6]

Similarly, in the act approved February 8, 1895, regulating navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting tributary waters, the Congress specifically stated that "the following rules for preventing collisions shall be followed in the navigation of all public and private vessels of the United States upon the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal." [7]

These treaties, then, have vested in the United States reciprocal rights to navigation in boundary waters and in those waters of

[0] 8 Stat. 116, 117.

[1] 10 Stat. 1089, 1091.

[2] 17 Stat. 863, 872.

[3] 36 Stat. 2448, 2449.

[4] II Hackworth, Digest of International Law, 770.

[5] The amendment of Senator Townsend was to add a new section to the Reciprocity Act providing that "for the purpose of improving the St. Lawrence River from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean, and waterways connecting the Great Lakes, the President of the United States is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with the Dominion of Canada which shall provide * * * for a waterway * * * for the common use and benefit of both countries and in furtherance of reciprocal trade relations between them: *Provided, however,* That said agreement before becoming operative shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection." Although the amendment was rejected, the discussion disclosed no doubts as to the propriety of proceeding in the manner suggested in the amendment, namely, through agreement with Canada to be submitted to the Congress for approval (47 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pt. 4, 3136).

[6] 49 F. (2d) 805, 806, aff'd 285 U. S. 413.

[7] 28 Stat. 645.

the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system which are wholly located in Canadian territory. The only question that remains, therefore, is the method of further developing the usefulness of these rights through reciprocal improvements. For this purpose the parties agreed upon such a method in the 1909 treaty whereby special agreements may be entered into to improve the navigation of the system on the basis of reciprocal legislation.

Procedure for agreement in 1909 treaty

The preamble of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 stated that its purpose was "to prevent disputes regarding the use of boundary waters and to settle all questions which are now pending between the United States and the Dominion of Canada involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along their common frontier and to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all such questions as may hereafter arise."

Article III of the treaty provides as follows:

"It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission, to be known as the International Joint Commission.

"The foregoing provisions are not intended to limit or interfere with the existing rights of the Government of the United States on the one side and the Government of the Dominion of Canada on the other, to undertake and carry on governmental works in boundary waters for the deepening of channels, the construction of breakwaters, the improvement of harbors, and other governmental works for the benefit of commerce and navigation, provided that such works are wholly on its own side of the line and do not materially affect the level or flow of the boundary waters on the other, nor are such provisions intended to interfere with the ordinary use of such waters for domestic and sanitary purposes."

Article IV provides in part as follows:

"The High Contracting Parties agree that, except in cases provided for by special agreement between them, they will not permit the construction or maintenance on their respective sides of the boundary of any remedial or protective works or any dams or other obstructions in waters flowing from boundary waters or in waters at a lower level than the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the effect of which is to raise the natural level of waters on the other side of the boundary unless the construction or maintenance thereof is approved by the aforesaid International Joint Commission."

Article VIII provides in part as follows:

"The following order of precedence shall be observed among the various uses enumerated hereinafter for these waters, and no use shall be permitted which tends materially to conflict with or restrain any other use which is given preference over it in this order of precedence: (1) Uses for domestic and sanitary purposes; (2) Uses for navigation, including the service of canals for the purposes of navigation; (3) Uses for power and for irrigation purposes."

Article XIII provides as follows:

"In all cases where special agreements between the high contracting parties hereto are referred to in the foregoing articles, such agreements are understood and intended to include not only direct agreements between the high contracting parties, but also any mutual arrangement between the United States and the Dominion of Canada expressed by concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of Congress and the Parliament of the Dominion."

The term "boundary waters" is defined in a preliminary article to the treaty as follows:

"For the purposes of this treaty boundary waters are defined as the waters from main shore to main shore of the lakes and rivers and connecting waterways, or the portions thereof, along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes, including all bays, arms, and inlets thereof, but not including tributary waters which in their natural channels would flow into such lakes, rivers, and waterways, or waters flowing from such lakes, rivers, and waterways, or the waters of rivers flowing across the boundary."

It seems entirely clear that the 1941 agreement with Canada is a special agreement within the meaning of article XIII of the 1909 treaty—being a mutual arrangement between the United States and Canada to be approved by concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada—which falls within the provisions of articles III and VIII of the 1909 treaty since it (the 1941 agreement) provides for uses, obstructions, and diversions of boundary waters or affecting the flow of boundary waters—which uses, obstructions, and diversions are within the purposes referred to in article VIII of the 1909 treaty. Consequently, the 1941 agreement may be appropriately brought into force as to the two countries through concurrent or reciprocal action of their legislative bodies.

Various objections have been raised by the opponents of the St. Lawrence project to this interpretation during the hearings before the subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee in December 1944. One objection is that construction of the kind to which the 1941 agreement refers is not contemplated by the procedure prescribed in the 1909 treaty. It would seem impossible to sustain this contention. It is entirely beyond argument that ship canals and power dams are "uses, obstructions, or diversions" for purposes referred to in article VIII, namely "navigation and power." Another objection is that since the 1909 treaty is by its terms terminable upon 1 year's notice, special agreements entered into pursuant to the procedure prescribed in such treaty are insecure. Even though this were a valid legal reason against resort to the procedure under the 1909 treaty, which it does not appear to be, the argument does not in any event seem sound. The termination of the 1909 treaty could not conceivably be held to invalidate an agreement which had become operative under the procedure prescribed in the 1909 treaty while said treaty was in effect between the parties. Such a contention if sustained might invalidate a whole series of fully executed, partially executed, or executory undertakings between the two countries in entire contravention of the purposes of the 1909 treaty. Any agreements under such procedure, once they have become binding, must be deemed to stand on their own feet and to be legally terminable only in accordance with their own respective terms.

The objection has also been made that the 1941 agreement goes beyond the scope of the provisions of the 1909 treaty on the ground that the 1941 agreement purports to grant perpetual navigation rights to Canada in the waters of Lake Michigan, which, it was claimed, could not be considered as falling within the definition of boundary waters included in the 1909 treaty. Although these claims on the part of the opponents of the 1941 agreement are open to question, this particular aspect of the matter is now academic since the pending legislation would specifically except from the approval of the Congress, article VII of the 1941 agreement having to do with navigation rights, and expresses the sense of the Congress that a separate treaty should be entered into in respect of this matter. Similarly, with respect to the questions raised by the opponents that the provisions of article IX of the 1941 agreement could not be based upon the special agreement procedure of the 1909 treaty insofar as such article IX purported to amend the provisions of the treaty with reference to diversion of waters, this point is likewise academic in view of the exception from approval of the provisions of article IX.

Objection was also raised by the opponents of the St. Lawrence project that the provisions of the 1909 treaty could not be used as a basis for the 1941 agreement since such agreement affects waters of the St. Lawrence River from the International Rapids section as far as Montreal, which waters again are not "boundary waters" within the definition contained in the 1909 treaty. This argument does not take into account the fact that the effect of the agreement upon this particular section of the river is entirely incidental to the main purpose of the agreement which is to provide for the construction of works in the International Rapids Section, a purpose clearly within the purview of the special agreement procedure. Paragraph (d) of article IV of the agreement provides that during the construction and upon the completion of the works provided for in the International Rapids Section, the flow of waters out of Lake Ontario into the St. Lawrence River shall be controlled and the flow of waters through the International Rapids Section shall be regulated so that the navigable depth of waters for shipping in the harbor of Montreal and throughout the navigable channel of the St. Lawrence River below Montreal shall not be injuriously affected by the construction or operation of such works and so that existing power developments in the Canadian section of the river shall not be adversely affected. The fact that, in order to facilitate the construction and operation of the projects agreed upon in the agreement, provision is incidentally made with reference to the water level in the wholly Canadian portion of the river is entirely subsidiary to the principal purpose of the agreement and amounts to no more than the traditional recognition under Anglo-American law of the rights of downstream users. To hold that the provisions of the 1909 treaty would be inapplicable to an agreement to construct works in the International Rapids Section simply because such works have an indirect consequential effect upon waters in other portions of the system, would be to render entirely meaningless the procedure prescribed in the 1909 treaty and to ignore the geographical realities of the situation.

It is inconceivable that there would be any substantial use, obstruction, or diversion of the waters of any part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system which would not affect in some direct or indirect manner the flow of waters in other sections of the system and require in some manner adjustment of rights between the two countries in relation thereto. If the availability of the special agreement procedure as a basis for reciprocal legislation with respect to construction projects were to depend upon proof that each such project had no direct or indirect effect upon waters lying wholly in either country, an impossible situation would be created that clearly could not have been intended when the 1909 treaty was drafted. The same considerations apply to article VIII of the agreement concerning the preservation of the levels of the Great Lakes system and the regulation of diversions by each party therefrom. This provision is intimately related

to the successful operation of the uses, obstructions, and diversions of boundary waters provided for in the agreement and like the provisions of article IV (d) is entirely ancillary to the main purpose of the agreement.[8]

It is also of importance in connection with article IV (d) that the 1941 agreement does not deal with any waters that are not covered by the 1909 treaty and the previous treaties referred to above. As has been noted, the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system covered by such treaties may be deemed to be a continuous waterway in which the rights of the United States and Canada are clearly fixed by treaty. With the omission from approval of article VII of the 1941 agreement, this agreement does not purport to alter the rights of either country in such waters as established by previous treaties.

The provisions of the 1909 treaty have been discussed only once by the Supreme Court of the United States, and although the case concerns the adjustment of private rights, it is of interest to the problem here under consideration. The case in question is that of *Pigeon River Improvement, Slide & Boom Co.* v. *Charles W. Cox, Ltd.*[9] The Pigeon River is a boundary stream between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Ontario which flows along the boundary for about 40 miles, discharging into Lake Superior. The boundary is approximately midstream. The Pigeon River Co., a Minnesota corporation, entered into an agreement with a Canadian corporation under which each improved the river on its side of the boundary, the improvements constituting complements to each other and making possible the driving of logs. The Court found that the construction of improvements on the United States side had been authorized by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1901,[10] which authorized the improvement of the Pigeon River by the Pigeon River Co. but did not refer to cooperation with Canadian interests or authorization by Canadian authorities. The question at issue in the case involved the right of the Minnesota corporation to collect tolls from the Cox Co. for using the improved section of the river. In holding that the American company did possess such rights, the Court stated in part as follows:

"Further, in 1909, for the purpose of settling all questions pending between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, 'involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other, along their common frontier,' the United States and Great Britain entered into a treaty concerning the boundary waters. By article I of this treaty the parties formulated their agreement 'that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally.' The treaty expressly refers to uses and obstructions of boundary waters which had theretofore been permitted, and sets up an International Joint Commission with jurisdiction to deal with future uses and obstructions as stated. Article III of the treaty thus provides: 'It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission to be known as the International Joint Commission.'

"We think it may fairly be said that the improvements here in question on the Pigeon River constituted structures and uses which had been permitted by the parties prior to the treaty of 1909 and were recognized by that treaty. It does not appear that any action has been taken by either Government or by the International Joint Commission inconsistent with this view."

If the Congress can authorize a private corporation to enter into a contract with another private corporation in Canada to construct cooperative works of this nature in boundary waters, the Congress can certainly authorize the Government of the United States to contract with the Government of Canada with respect to a similar matter. If for any reason the 1941 agreement should not come into force, it is submitted that in the light of the foregoing decisions of the Supreme Court there would exist no impediment under the Constitution or laws of the United States to the conclusion, under the procedure prescribed in the 1909 treaty, of a contract between private corporations in the United States and Canada to build the same projects for profit, provided that the necessary legislative authority could be obtained under the procedure prescribed in the 1909 treaty. In considering any such proposed legislation, the treaty issue would not be involved so that the only question for decision would be the economic merits of the project. In other words, the contention of the opponents would result in the conclusion that while the Congress could not authorize the construction of these projects by the Federal Government in agreement with the Canadian Government, it could nevertheless exercise such powers to authorize the execution of a private contract with respect to the subject matter.

It is for this reason among others that it has been contended elsewhere in this memorandum that the issues in this case are unlike those which are present in the usual case of a foreign treaty or agreement. The average foreign negotiation relates to matters which are the proper subject for agreement only between governments. That the construction provided for in the 1941 agreement is not exclusively of such character is sharply highlighted by the foregoing discussion as to the availability of the 1909 treaty procedure as a basis for private construction projects. It was doubtless, in part at least, because of the possibility of "uses obstructions, or diversions" being made either by the two Governments or by private interests that the special-agreement procedure was prescribed in the 1909 treaty and it seems clear that such procedure was intended to be available in respect of governmental as well as private negotiations and agreements.

It has been urged by the opponents of the seaway that resort cannot be had to the provisions of the 1909 treaty as a justification for handling this matter through agreement because no reference to the 1909 treaty is made in the 1941 agreement. It is pointed out in this connection that, in his testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941, Assistant Secretary of State Berle stated that "we did not relate this agreement directly to article XIII" although he did say that the provisions of the 1909 treaty constituted "an expression of policy employed in a formal treaty between the two countries on which we could appropriately rely in suggesting or choosing this method as against the treaty method." [11]

The provisions of the 1909 treaty do not specifically require any recitation in a later special agreement of its relation to these provisions and the liberal construction given to these provisions in the Pigeon River case should put an end to any such claim.

The opponents of the St. Lawrence rely heavily upon a memorandum dated March 12, 1941, of Mr. J. E. Read, then legal adviser of the Canadian Department of External Affairs, expressing the view that article XIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 could not be relied upon for proceeding on the basis of an agreement subject to approval by reciprocal legislation.[12] Whatever the view of the Canadian authorities may be on this point, those views would not affect the right of the Congress of the United States to interpret the 1909 treaty as it sees fit, and if it so desires, to rest its approval of the 1941 agreement on the basis of the procedure provided for in the 1909 treaty. If the Congress should determine to proceed on such basis, a binding international agreement with Canada would be concluded upon fulfillment by Canada of the requirement of action on its part under the 1909 treaty procedure, namely, the enactment of legislation approving the 1941 agreement corresponding in terms to the United States legislation. The fact that the Canadian legislation might not rest either explicitly or otherwise upon the 1909 treaty would be immaterial to the validity of the procedure so far as concerns either (a) compliance with United States constitutional requirements or (b) the creation of a valid international obligation in accordance with the terms of article XI of the 1941 agreement stipulating that the agreement shall be subject to approval by the legislative bodies of the two countries. So far as concerns the constitutional procedures of the United States, the Congress may with full propriety base its action upon the procedure set forth in the 1909 treaty regardless of the basis of the concurrent Canadian legislation in terms of Canadian constitutional requirements, and the action of the Congress of the United States in so doing would be conclusive on this point.

It is furthermore of interest that in an explanatory opinion dated December 5, 1944, commenting upon his earlier opinion Mr. Read stated as follows:

"Looking at the matter from the United States point of view, it is more difficult for me to express an opinion. I was, however, satisfied that the procedure contemplated, either under the 1932 treaty or under the 1941 agreement, was in conformity with the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty and would give rise to a valid obligation which would be recognized as legally effective in the United States and which would create a valid international obligation. I had in contemplation, insofar as the 1941 agreement was concerned, not merely the agreement itself, but appropriate legislation by Congress.

"It is, I think, clear that the Boundary Waters Treaty looked forward to the conclusion of special agreements and arrange-

[8] Recognition of the relationship of diversions from the Great Lakes system to boundary waters as defined in the 1909 treaty is found in the important Supreme Court case of *Sanitary District of Chicago* v. *United States*. The Court held in this case that the United States had a proper basis to complain of excessive diversions from Lake Michigan under the provisions of the 1909 treaty concerning regulation by the two countries of uses "affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters" (266 U. S. 405, 425).

[9] 291 U. S. 138.

[10] 31 Stat. 1455.

[11] Hearings before House Rivers and Harbors Committee on H. R. 4927, 77th Cong., 1st sess., pt. I, p. 56.

[12] A copy of the opinion is contained at p. 275, hearings, subcommittee of Senate Commerce Committee on S. 1385, 78th Cong., 1st sess. The opinion goes on to maintain that the agreement may validly be concluded through reciprocal legislation without reference to the 1909 treaty, and that such procedure could be based in the case of the United States upon the legislative authority of Congress.

ments of this sort. The treaty did not contemplate that the exceptions in articles III and IV would necessarily take the form of 'treaties' in the strict sense of the term. It contemplated that there would be special agreements and arrangements based upon concurrent or reciprocal legislation and that they would be contracted in such a manner that they would be binding on both the United States and Canada. * * *

"If this view is accepted it is clear that procedure by agreement implemented by legislation results in a legally effective arrangement which comes within the scope of article XI and dispenses with the necessity of obtaining the approval of the International Joint Commission under article III of the Boundary Waters Treaty 1909."

A complete copy of his supplementary opinion is attached hereto as annex I.

For all of the foregoing reasons it seems clear that the 1941 agreement may be appropriately entered into, at least so far as concerns United States legislation, under the procedure set forth in the 1909 treaty.

VII. SUMMARY

In summary it is submitted that the foregoing discussion establishes without question that—

1. Congress is vested under the Constitution with power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. These powers have been exercised by the Congress to authorize the construction of important navigation and power projects.

2. Throughout this country's history Congress has exercised its delegated powers in matters affecting the foreign relations of the United States and to bring about agreement with foreign countries on matters relating to its delegated powers in such fields as control of foreign commerce, financial and monetary affairs, and the annexation of territory.

3. In particular Congress has on numerous occasions enacted legislation to bring about agreement with Canada on matters of mutual interest to the economic relations of the two countries, which agreements have been brought into force in Canada through concurrent legislation of that country. In this regard Congress has legislated concerning such matters as the construction of international bridges, the improvement of international streams, and the construction of international roads.

4. The Supreme Court has recognized the validity of agreements entered into with foreign nations by the Executive either with or without congressional action, and without resort to the treaty procedure. The Court has never held such an agreement invalid.

5. The arguments of the opponents of the St. Lawrence project do not successfully refute the foregoing conditions. In fact, many of the opponents' arguments appear to admit that Congress has the power to legislate with respect to foreign agreements covering matters within the field of congressional responsibility.

6. The Congress therefore may validly exercise its power under the commerce clause to approve the St. Lawrence agreement with Canada.

7. The United States has acquired special rights by treaties in the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system which form an additional basis for the legislation here concerned.

8. The 1941 agreement with Canada is a "special agreement" within the meaning of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and consequently may be approved by reciprocal legislation of the United States and Canada in accordance with the procedure set forth in that treaty.

9. For all of the foregoing reasons there can be no question whatsoever as to the constitutionality of Senate Joint Resolution 104.

DEAN ACHESON,
Under Secretary of State.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at this time I wish to make a brief announcement. As I understand the program, the Senate is to take a recess until Friday. When we recess from Friday until Monday, I shall ask that we continue through next week with daily sessions, until we have completed consideration of the pending measure.

Mr. President, I expect to reply at length to the very able argument of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, but not at this time. I merely wish to say that everything he has said reminds me, when I consider the distinguished men who have stood for this project, of the story of the mother who saw marching down the street the regiment in which her son was out of step, and she said, "Everyone is out of step but my boy."

I do not see how the Senator can make his argument when one of his great friends, Herbert Hoover, has stated definitely that the seaway would pay. Every Secretary of State, Republican and Democrat, has said, in substance, the same. When the Senator talks about national defense in the way he has, he has forgotten, I think, that for a hundred years we have never needed a soldier across the entire line between Canada and the United States. If the time shall ever come when there shall be need for national defense, the soldiers will not simply be our boys, but the Canadian boys also. We have a defense treaty. General Marshall said it was important to supplement the defense treaty with Canada. The Defense Commission said the same thing. But not my dear friend from Massachusetts.

I call his attention to another statement. He said something regarding fog. The fog is not on the St. Lawrence River; the fog is in the mind of my distinguished friend. The records of the Canadian Department of Rivers and Canals show that the fog conditions on the Great Lakes and on the St. Lawrence River during the navigation season are more favorable than those at New York. For example, Montreal had 4 days of fog per year as compared with 44 days in New York Harbor. Montreal is the second largest city on the American Continent, as far as tonnage is concerned.

The best indication of the hazards of navigation is the accident record on the St. Lawrence, which compares favorably with that on the Panama Canal. During the 5-year period from 1935 to 1939 a total of 116 accidents was reported, of which 65 resulted in damage amounting to only $419,000. Thirty-four involved no damage, and in 17 cases the amount of damage was unknown. This record should be viewed in relation to the number of vessels passing over the St. Lawrence River, which was approximately 60,000, carrying 40,000,000 tons of freight. Accordingly, the accident rate was less than one-fourth of 1 percent. That would not indicate a very great hazard to navigation. Radar development, which has already been successfully employed on a number of Great Lakes vessels, should reduce the accident rate even further.

Mr. President, I was very much interested—and I want to get it in today's RECORD—in the so-called statistics produced in relation to the iron ore exhaustion in the Middle West. It is strange that we can get testimony on any proposion, and, apparently, letters or statements, when persons are not under oath.

I am not producing a witness in my favor; I am producing the New England Newsletter, in which one of the subheadings is "Mesabi Range running out." That is the range which has given to the Nation 2,000,000,000 tons of ore which has helped to build the railroads and steamships of the country.

At the eighty-eighth quarterly meeting of the New England Council, held at the Wentworth-by-the-Sea, Portsmouth, N. H., September 12–13, Council President Richard L. Bowditch announced that the Econometric Institute of New York had been retained under council sponsorship to study the possibilities for the establishment of a steel industry in New England. Mr. Bowditch's remarks are followed by a summary of the institute's proposed study.

One subheading is "Mesabi Range running out," and the other is "Other ore deposits." There referred to is what was mentioned in our argument regarding Canadian ore and ore from Sweden, Venezuela, and other places, sustaining the position which I took on Monday.

I shall not be diverted by a very able argument which veneers the real issue in the case; and I trust that no Member of the Senate will be overpersuaded by all the colored propaganda which has come in purporting to speak the mind of the railroad men. When I take the floor again to continue my argument I shall put into the RECORD the testimony of former Senators, men like the late Senator Walsh of Massachusetts, and the late Senator Walsh of Montana, governors of Middle Western States, the Governor of Ohio, the Governor of Montana, saying that the railroad men themselves are not against this project. We have seen the multicolored paper slips which have been passed around containing a picture of men being put out of work by this project. It is argued that it will be successful so far as tonnage is concerned, but the Senator from Massachusetts argues that it will not be successful.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is fearful that it will take considerable tonnage from Baltimore; and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] will argue that New Orleans will suffer.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is mistaken. I shall not make that argument.

Mr. WILEY. That is the argument which was previously made. Perhaps he will argue the question of constitutionality.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Neither am I intending to make the argument which the Senator has suggested, because I think the arguments already made are sufficient to sink the project without that argument.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have a little faith to the contrary. I believe that we must have courage. We have to remember the pressure we experienced when the Taft-Hartley bill was being debated, and when courage was demonstrated. But now, when an election is approaching, there are those who feel that they can make men inadequate.

I stated, Mr. President, that a poll had been taken. I want to put that poll into the RECORD. It comes from a periodical entitled "Modern Industry Magazine." It contains a poll of business opinion conducted with the following results:

Should modern industry favor the St. Lawrence seaway project?

New England, 54 percent yes; 46 percent no.

Mid-Atlantic, 55.1 yes; 44 percent no.

North central, 75.1 yes; 24 percent no.

South—

God bless the South—

South, 55.5 percent yes; 44.5 percent no.

Midwest, 73.8 percent yes; 26.2 percent no.

Mountain and Pacific, 62.1 percent yes; 37.9 percent no.

Average for the United States the country over, 63.7 percent yes; 36.3 percent no.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Let me read just one paragraph:

Other polls of public opinion show overwhelming approval by the general public. National leaders over the past 25 years have without exception recommended the construction of this project.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I merely wanted to ask the Senator under whose auspices that poll was taken. Is that a Gallup poll?

Mr. WILEY. No. It is a poll conducted by the Modern Industry magazine, and the question was, "Should modern industry favor the St. Lawrence seaway project?"

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the magazine has a circulation of approximately 50,000 or 55,000, and the poll was taken among those who subscribe to the magazine.

Mr. WILEY. I have just a few moments more, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] asked regarding the comparative costs of shipping wheat to Chicago. I made inquiry of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and have received a reply from the Chief of the Rate Branch of the Commission advising me that the all-rail rate on wheat from Omaha to Chicago is $3.20 a ton, in car lots, with a minimum of 80,000 pounds.

The water rate from Omaha to Chicago, with a minimum of 1,000 pounds, is $2.80 per ton.

The barge rate on wheat from Omaha to New Orleans, minimum 400 net tons, is $3.60 a ton.

The rate from Kansas City to Chicago by rail is $2.50 a ton.

From Kansas City to Chicago, by barge, the rate is $2.20 a ton.

From Kansas City to New Orleans, by barge, the rate is $2.90 a ton.

Therefore it is evident that all grain originating in the Missouri Basin, north of St. Louis, will be shipped to Chicago at somewhat less cost that it can be shipped to New Orleans; and, of course, it could go to New Orleans only by barge; and there would be the cost of transferring it from the barge to the ocean-going vessel, in either case. These figures come from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was very much interested in learning the freight rates; and when I asked about that matter on Monday, I was requesting information. I thought possibly the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin had it.

When I returned to my office, I also inquired about the freight rates, because I think that matter is vital to all the Great Plains States.

Today I have received certain figures, which I shall place in the RECORD; and then I wish the distinguished Senator from Vermont would try to clarify them.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask what they are.

Mr. WHERRY. They are both maritime figures and railroad figures. For instance, the rate on wheat, in cents per bushel from Omaha to Liverpool—which is the first route I asked about, is stated as follows:

Omaha to New Orleans via rail, 20.52 cents a bushel.

New Orleans to Liverpool (based upon advices from U. S. Maritime Commission) that rate is 13 shillings per quarter (8 bushels or 480 pounds) (20.15 cents per shilling) 32.74 cents a bushel. Total, 53.26 cents a bushel.

Mr. AIKEN. The figure I have is that from Omaha to New Orleans by rail, the rate is $7.50 a ton.

Mr. WHERRY. If that figure is comparable, then I point out that according to the information I have received, the rate from Omaha to Liverpool via New Orleans is a total of 53.26 cents a bushel, whereas the rate from Omaha to Chicago by rail transportation and then via the Lakes to Montreal, and then from Montreal to Liverpool, according to the United States Maritime Commission, is a total of 56.03 cents a bushel.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator in that, and we must also bear in mind the added cost of unloading the grain at Chicago from the railroad car, loading it on the ship, transporting it by lake ship to Buffalo, unloading it at Buffalo, transporting it by rail to New York or Baltimore, and then reloading it on ship for transportation to Liverpool. So we find that it costs as much to ship by rail from Buffalo to New York as it would cost to ship from Chicago to Liverpool if we had an all-water route available.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, I do not wish to dispute in any way the figures presented by the Senator. I simply wish to have the figures harmonize, because the ones I have received, to which I have referred, show, according to this authority, that the rate for shipment from Omaha to Chicago by rail, and then by water on the Lakes to Montreal, and then to Liverpool, is 56.03 cents a bushel, whereas the freight rate for shipment from Omaha to New Orleans by rail and from New Orleans to Liverpool by ship is 53.26 cents a bushel.

Mr. President, I ask that these figures be placed in the RECORD at this point, so that all Senators may have the benefit of them.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wheat, in cents per bushel, Omaha to Liverpool

Omaha to New Orleans via rail	20.52
New Orleans to Liverpool (based upon advices from U. S. Maritime Commission that rate is 13 shillings per quarter (8 bushels or 480 pounds) (20.15 cents per shilling))	32.74
Total	53.26
Omaha to Chicago via rail	13.32
Via lakes to Montreal	15.00
Montreal to Liverpool (from U. S. Maritime Commission)	27.71
Total	56.03
Omaha to Duluth via rail	14.40
Lakes to Montreal	15.40
Montreal to Liverpool (from U. S. Maritime Commission)	27.71
Total	57.11

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, perhaps we should also have printed in the RECORD the letter giving complete information, which I have received from the Interstate Commerce Commission. Probably the figures given in it are based on different material, as compared with the figures presented just now by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, I am glad to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, January 28, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Responsive to your telephone request that certain rates on wheat, carloads, given to your Mr. Hall, by telephone on January 27, be confirmed in writing, the following statement of the said rates is submitted as follows:

Present all-rail rates in cents per 100 pounds on wheat, carloads.

From—	To—	Proper	Proportional
Omaha, Nebr	Chicago, Ill.	29	18½
Kansas City, Mo	do	29	18½

PRESENT BARGE RATES ON WHEAT, CARLOADS

From Omaha, Nebr., to Chicago, Ill., 16 cents per 100 pounds in packages. Minimum weight, 80,000 pounds.

From Kansas City, Mo., to Chicago, Ill., 12½ cents per 100 pounds in packages. Minimum weight 80,000 pounds.

PRESENT BARGE RATES ON WHEAT IN BULK—MINIMUM, 400 NET TONS

From Omaha, Nebr., to Chicago, Ill., 330 cents per net ton.

From Kansas City, Mo., to Chicago, Ill., 250 cents per net ton.

MINIMUM 1,000 NET TONS

From Omaha, Nebr., to Chicago, Ill., 280 cents per net ton.

From Kansas City, Mo., to Chicago, Ill., 220 cents per net ton.

Present all-rail rates on wheat (carloads), for export, in cents per 100 pounds

From—	To—	Proper	Proportional
Omaha, Nebr.	New Orleans, La.	37½	28½
Kansas City, Mo.	do	35½	26½

PRESENT BARGE RATES ON WHEAT, CARLOADS (FOR EXPORT)

From Omaha, Nebr., to New Orleans, La., 360 cents per net ton.

From Kansas City, Mo., to New Orleans, La., 290 cents per net ton.

Minimum, 400 net tons.

From Omaha, Nebr., to New Orleans, La., 480 cents per net ton.

From Kansas City, Mo., to New Orleans, La., 410 cents per net ton.

Minimum, 200 net tons.

From Omaha, Nebr., to New Orleans, La., 500 cents per net ton.

From Kansas City, Mo., to New Orleans, La., 440 cents per net ton.

Minimum, 140 net tons.

From Omaha, Nebr., to New Orleans, La., 27½ cents per 100 pounds, plus tollage at New Orleans.

From Kansas City, Mo., to New Orleans, La., 24 cents per 100 pounds, plus tollage at New Orleans.

In packages.

Present all-rail rates on wheat (carloads), for export, in cents per 100 pounds

From—	To—	Proper	Proportional
Chicago, Ill.	New York, N. Y.	27	20
Do	Baltimore, Md.	25½	18½

Effective January 15, 1948, all shipments moving under the foregoing rates are subject to a 20-percent surcharge which is added to the total freight charge.

Respectfully,

A. F. CLOW,
Chief, Rate Branch.

Attention Mr. Hall.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it should furthermore be stated that if we could load grain on ocean-going vessels at Chicago, it could be delivered at Liverpool for several cents a bushel less than it can be delivered there now by any existing route whatsoever. By water, Detroit is just a little nearer to Liverpool than Baltimore is. Of course, that is hard to realize, but the mapmakers tell me that is the fact.

So I have asked to have the letter from Mr. Clow printed in the RECORD. It gives all the rates to which I have referred, as well as others.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Mr. Paul M. Zeis, Acting Chief of the Transportation Division of the Department of Commerce, at my request has furnished very clear and, I think, detailed information on the subject, and I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Transportation from Omaha to London

Water via Chicago:	*Ton*
Omaha to Chicago (large load lots)	$2.80
Estimated total handling costs	1.00
Chicago to Montreal	2.00
Montreal to London	9.24
Total	15.04
Water via New Orleans:	
Omaha to New Orleans	3.60
Estimated handling costs	1.00
New Orleans to London	10.91
Total	15.51

Difference in rate approximately 47 cents a ton or $1.41 a bushel.

Rail via Chicago:	*Ton*
Omaha to Chicago	$4.40
Chicago to Montreal	2.00
Montreal to London	9.24
Total	15.64
Rail via New Orleans:	
Omaha to New Orleans	6.80
New Orleans to London (berth rates)	10.91
Total	17.71

Difference in rate approximately $2 a ton or about 6 cents a bushel.

NOTE.—Very little traffic moves over water from Omaha. If shipments are to be made from other points in Nebraska, they would include the cost of rail shipment.

Source: Paul M. Zeis, Acting Chief, Transportation Division, Department of Commerce, January 27, 1948.

Mr. WILEY. Much was said today about costs. I am sure that when we take into consideration the $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 authorization bill which the Senators from Massachusetts are going to support in the way of the foreign-aid program for 1 year, and for which we expect to get nothing back, it is obvious that they might well consider authorizing and possibly appropriating from $50,000,000 to $70,000,000 a year over a period of 6 or 7 years—in short, to see that the cost of the seaway is paid and that this utility on our own soil is made operative, in view of the fact that much of the money which will go into foreign aid is to be used for the building of canals and electricity-producing plants on foreign soil.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that he is correct in saying that I plan to vote for the giving of foreign aid. But the Senator is not correct when he says that I expect that we shall get nothing back for it. I expect that every foreign-aid measure I vote for will bring a great deal back to the United States. Otherwise I would not vote for it.

Mr. WILEY. I think I follow the Senator's reasoning, and logic. But I think he is blind in not being able to see the value of such an investment as is proposed in the great natural resources of his own country, although he can see the green pastures of Europe more productive than our own.

THE INCREASED COSTS OF LIVING

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post there is an interesting article by Miss Mary Spargo. I wish to read several paragraphs from it:

Congress heard plain speaking from a plain citizen yesterday on just what it means to try to support a family on $40 a week, with prices of food as they are.

Cyrus J. Waud, 36, a soup-factory worker, father of six children, settled into the witness chair before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and said his children were undernourished and "you fellows have got to help me out."

With him were his blonde wife, Pauline, and his two eldest daughters, Lois, 11, and Ruth, 9, who turned grave young eyes toward the Senators as their father unfolded his story.

* * * * *

The short, thin, prematurely bald young factory hand stumbled a bit as he tried to tell the Senators about what it means to have no orange juice, insufficient milk, and six meatless and poultryless days a week.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article to which I have adverted be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTY-DOLLAR-A-WEEK FATHER OF SIX TELLS SENATORS ABOUT LIVING COSTS

(By Mary Spargo)

Congress heard plain speaking from a plain citizen yesterday on just what it means to try to support a family on $40 a week, with prices of food as they are.

Cyrus J. Waud, 36, a soup-factory worker, father of six children, settled into the witness chair before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and said his children were undernourished and "you fellows have got to help me out."

With him were his blonde wife, Pauline, and his two eldest daughters, Lois, 11, and Ruth, 9, who turned grave young eyes toward the Senators as their father unfolded his story.

Waud, who works in the Campbell Soup factory at Camden, N. J., was sent here by his union, the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers of America (CIO), which paid expenses of the trip.

The short, thin, prematurely bald young factory hand stumbled a bit as he tried to tell the Senators about what it means to have no orange juice, insufficient milk, and six meatless and poultryless days a week.

Committee Chairman CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, New Hampshire, helped him out.

"Our job here is to have an understanding heart of human needs," he said.

And a little later, after Waud had gone into all the details of his family budget, including no movies and no bus fare for the youngsters, TOBEY called Lois, a thin little sprite in pigtails, to his side, and slipped a $5 bill into her hand.

TOBEY also arranged to have a car put at the family's disposal so the youngsters could see Washington.

But what Waud was asking for was some action by Congress to bring prices down, a question now before the committee.

Angered at the contrast between the soup worker's meager existence and the skyrocketing prices of food, TOBEY announced that he is sending telegrams to representative firms in the food industry asking them to be ready to produce evidence next week to justify their present high prices.

With six children under 11, Waud told the Senators, the family should have 28

quarts of milk a week—an allowance most nutrition experts would say is too low. But on a $40-a-week salary, Waud can afford only 12 quarts. Two quarts cost 45 cents.

Last week the family's one meat day found 2 pounds of hamburger on the table. It cost 65 cents. Company dropped in, so they even had to skimp on the hamburger.

For meat substitutes they use 4 dozen eggs a week.

Food is what crimps the budget most, Waud explained, but clothes are a problem—clothes for the kids, that is. The older Wauds haven't bought any clothes for 4 years. But school means shoes and socks and clothes to be decent in.

The Wauds don't budget anything for recreation—there's nothing left by the time they get around to that. They don't smoke or drink, they said, and as for movies, "They are away out of our reach." The youngsters walk to school because they can't afford bus fare and there's no school bus.

"How often does Mrs. Waud buy a dress?" inquired TOBEY gently.

"Never," said Mrs. Waud softly.

"Once in a while," Waud commented, "Mrs. Waud's sister gives her a dress."

"We have $20 in savings," Waud said, "but it isn't ours. We owe about $300 for medical bills, doctors, the hospital, so it really belongs to them."

Waud said if the committee would roll prices back to 1946 levels maybe he could get along. Then he was paying $10 or $12 a week for food which now costs $18 to $20.

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART (Republican, of Indiana) wanted to know what Waud thought about rolling back wages as well as prices.

"Can't you see we're underfed?" replied Waud. "What good would that do us?"

Mr. PEPPER. I also wish to read from the Gallup poll, dated January 27, appearing in the Washington Post of January 28 of this year, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

With political implications of high living costs much in the minds of Senators and Congressmen, the weight of voter opinion today favors a return to rationing and price control.

I ask that the whole poll, as I present it, may appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Gallup poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—MAJORITY OF VOTERS FAVOR RETURN TO CONTROLS, RATIONING

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., January 27—With political implications of high living costs much in the minds of all Senators and Congressmen, the weight of voter opinion today favors a return to rationing and price control.

Throughout the country representative voters were interviewed by institute reporters who asked:

"Do you think the Government should or should not put rationing and price controls on some products?"

The national averages:

	Percent
Approval	48
Qualified approval	3
Disapproval	41
No opinion	8

On Friday the institute will report what products the public thinks should be placed under price controls.

Qualifications reported by field reporters are significant, and, in general, represent the major blocks to congressional action on prices. The biggest "if" in the minds of voters who qualify their approval is: If we can have price control without rationing.

Other qualifications are: If the black market can be eliminated; if the law can be impartially and honestly administered; and if controls are placed on all items, not just some.

This being a Presidential-election year when Washington's ears are attuned to votes, the opinion of farmers has an important bearing on the fate of price-control legislation. And farmers, in contrast to the rest of the population, oppose both rationing and controls by a vote of almost 2 to 1.

On the other hand, manual workers on whom candidates also must keep a wary eye, favor new control legislation almost as strongly as farmers oppose it.

Votes by occupational groups are shown in the following tables:

Occupation	Approve rationing and controls	Qualified approval	Disapprove	No opinion
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Professional and business	47	2	47	4
White-collar	49	3	41	7
Farmers	31	1	56	12
Manual workers	53	3	34	10

The same divergence of viewpoint exists between people in the smaller communities in the country and the larger cities:

Size of town	Approve	Qualified approval	Disapprove	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Farmers	31	1	56	12
Under 10,000	45	3	43	9
10,000 to 100,000	52	3	37	8
100,000 and over	55	3	35	7

As in past surveys of voter opinion on price controls, the present poll reveals strong disagreement between Democrats and Republicans, as follows:

	Approval	Qualified approval	Disapproval	No opinion
	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Democrats	57	2	32	9
Republicans	37	3	54	6

Historically, the people of this country have been ready to submit to price controls long before their representatives voted the necessary legislation. Two months before Canada adopted a price-wage control program in 1941, and more than a year before the United States took similar steps, the majority of American voters were ready to see similar curbs put into effect in this country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have before me the consumer price index for December 15, 1941, which is 110.5; for June 15, 1946, it is 133.3; and for December 15, 1947, it is 167. In short, the last index is 11 percent above that of June 15, 1920, 69 percent above that of August 15, 1939, 51 percent above that of December 15, 1941, and 25 percent above that of June 15, 1946.

I ask that a table showing a steadily increasing scale of wholesale prices since 1939, which I send to the desk, appear at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wholesale prices index (weekly)

(1926=100)

Dec. 20, 1941	94.0
June 15, 1946	111.8
Jan. 18, 1947	140.8
Dec. 20, 1947	162.5
Week ended Jan. 17, 1948	165.5

1.8 percent above Dec. 29, 1947.
17.5 percent above Jan. 18, 1947.
48 percent above June 15, 1946.
76.1 percent above Dec. 20, 1941.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have appear at this point in the RECORD statistics showing net weekly pay, after deductions for taxes, and net pay adjusted for increase in cost of living, since 1939.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Net weekly pay (after deductions for taxes) and net pay adjusted for increase in cost of living since 1939

	Net pay after taxes		Net pay adjusted for cost of living in 1939	
	Single worker	Head of family of 4	Single worker	Head of family of 4
November 1947	$43.85	$49.33	$26.43	$29.74
June 1946	37.30	42.78	27.81	31.90
March 1945	39.32	45.09	[1] 30.82	[1] 35.35
December 1941	30.39	31.86	27.34	28.66
August 1939	23.50	23.53	23.69	23.72

[1] Peak month.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that there appear at this point in the RECORD a statement showing savings and spending of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVINGS AND SPENDING

1. Percent of disposable income (income after taxes, etc.) used for spending:

	Percent
1941	89.4
1944	75.6
1946	90.7
1947	93.3

2. Percent of disposable income saved:

	Percent
1941	10.6
1944	24.4
1946	9.3
1947	6.7

3. Families with incomes under $3,000 equal 65 percent of total in 1946 and saved only 4 percent of total savings, and in 1945 were 70 percent of total families and saved 24 percent. Families with incomes between $3,000 and $5,000 constituted 25 percent of total and saved 36 percent of total savings. Families with incomes over $5,000 in 1946 were 10 percent of total and saved 61 percent of total savings, and in 1945 were 8 percent of total and saved 40 percent of total savings.

4. The cost of maintaining a typical family of four in the middle of 1947 on a modest standard of living, ranged from $3,004 in New Orleans to $3,458 in Washington, D. C., which

rose respectively from $2,573 in New Orleans in March 1946 and from $2,985 in Washington, D. C., in March 1946.

5. The net weekly spendable earning adjusted for the cost of living between 1939 and 1947 was at a peak of $35.35 in March 1945 and $29.74 in November 1947 for a family of four and for a single worker $30.82 in March 1945 and $26.43 in November 1947.

6. Rising living costs have swelled our relief rolls. Over 1,000,000 children are now on our relief rolls. In 2 years 350,000 have been added to our relief rolls.

7. Almost one-half of the families and single individuals with incomes under $2,000 had no liquid cash assets in 1947.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask that there appear at this point in the RECORD also a statement appearing in the Florida Labor Advocate, the issue of January 23, 1948, entitled "Food Cost for Family of Three at $670 Record High in 1947."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD COST FOR FAMILY OF THREE AT $670 RECORD HIGH IN 1947

WASHINGTON.—The yearly cost of food for a worker's family of three hit a new all-time high of $670, calculated on the basis of prices prevailing in December, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported.

This figure compares with $340.47 in the 5 years, 1935–39, and $528.28 in 1946, the Bureau said.

Each month for more than 40 years BAE has figured the cost of feeding an average family of three consumed in the 5 years, 1935–39.

Thus, the $670 cost last month may be less than actually is being spent, because BAE has reported several times that the average food consumption last year was considerably higher than prewar.

These foods fall into six classifications, in turn broken down into separate items. The classifications are:

1. Meat products (three items, beef, lamb, and pork).
2. Dairy products (four items, butter, cheese, fluid milk, and evaporated milk).
3. Poultry and eggs.
4. Cereals, including bakery products (four items) and other cereal products (eight items).
5. Fruits and vegetables (23 items, including fresh fruits and vegetables and canned fruits and vegetables).
6. Miscellaneous products (seven items, such as sirup, margarine, cooking oils, sugar, peanut butter, and shortenings).

Since November 1946, soon after price controls and consumer subsidies were lifted, the cost of the family market basket has been steadily rising.

In that month it reached a new all-time high of $635—the previous high having been $615 in June 1920.

Out of the $664 spent at the retail store at the October figures, the farmer got $366.92, or 55 cents out of each dollar. The grower's share varied with each type of food. For meat products he got 72 cents out of each dollar; for poultry and eggs, 68 cents; for dairy products, 62 cents. But he only got 29 cents out of each dollar spent for bakery products and 22 cents out of each consumer dollar spent for canned goods.

In 1935–39 the farmers got only 41 cents out of each dollar spent for food at retail.

"Prices of farm products probably will average as high in 1948 as in 1947," BAE predicted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, to appear at this point in the RECORD, a statement showing the recipients of public-welfare benefits and the payments per family received, showing especially the number of children upon public assistance in the United States, and the benefits received per family for such children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public welfare

	Children on public assistance	Average monthly payment per family
November 1947 (50 State programs)	1,046,028 children in 410,862 families	$62.64
September 1947 (50 State programs)	1,037,094 children in 407,561 families getting assistance	62.50
June 1946 (50 State programs)	799,325 children in 311,250 families	53.71
March 1945 (49 State programs)	645,942 children in 255,970 families	46.49
December 1941 (47 State programs)	934,980 children in 387,159 families	33.63
August 1939 (42 State programs)	721 232 children in 299,264 families	31.20

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, to appear at this point in the RECORD, a statement appearing in the October 28, 1947, issue of the Miami Herald, with the headline "Rising living costs swell child relief," and with another headline "Million get aid—Florida adds 15,000." I read from the article:

High prices have been a chief cause for adding 15,000 children to relief rolls in Florida, 8,000 in Illinois, 6,000 in Ohio—350,000 throughout the Nation in 2 years.

I ask that the whole article appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RISING LIVING COSTS SWELL CHILD RELIEF—MILLION GET AID—FLORIDA ADDS 15,000; FIXED INCOME GROUP ARE NEW POOR

(By James M. Haswell)

WASHINGTON.—News that a million children now are living on public aid in America high lights one of the most pitiful aspects of rising prices.

People living on small incomes and on fixed incomes are caught in a terrific price squeeze.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND IN FLORIDA

High prices have been a chief cause for adding 15,000 children to relief rolls in Florida, 8,000 in Illinois, 6,000 in Ohio—350,000 throughout the Nation in 2 years.

Other reasons for this sensational increase in aid-to-dependent-children cases have been lay-offs of mothers from war jobs and loss of servicemen's dependent allowances, according to Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing.

For every family driven to seek public aid because of rising prices during the past 2 years there are other persons—children, elders, widows, pensioners—who have maintained their self-supporting status.

LIVING LESS WELL

These people, rich and poor, have had to economize. Some have eaten less, some have gone without new clothes, some have passed up vacation trips. But regardless of their places in the economic scale, all fixed-income folk have lived more poorly.

Widows once well provided for by insurance, pensioners and retired folk, people living on bond interest and preferred stock dividends, school teachers, Government workers and thousands of similarly placed persons are suffering from the rise in living costs since VJ-day.

Just how, for instance, are the 126,500 old folk in Illinois getting by on their $39.57 a month old-age assistance checks? Or the 121,600 in Ohio who get an average of $39.56 a month? Or the 52,600 in Florida who get $36.59 a month.

Food costs have nearly doubled since 1939, and other living costs have gone up 40 percent.

Price rises don't bear too heavily on wage earners, businessmen or manufacturers, whose incomes more or less keep pace with prices.

A competent economist explains it this way:

"One part of our population has been made the object of an arbitrary capital levy. We have had what amounts to a vast transfer of real wealth from those who own savings accounts, life insurance, Government bonds and accrued social security to those who receive their income in the form of prices, profits, and flexible salaries and wages."

The big money taken in by business, industry, farmers, and organized labor has not all been "an endowment of heaven." Much of it has been paid over by people who own fixed income-bearing assets or who live on fixed incomes.

The 150,000 families driven to seek public assistance for their 350,000 children since the war are the most visible victims of high prices. But there are many others.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk data to appear at this point in the RECORD, showing juvenile delinquency in the United States, and a further statement showing commitment of juvenile offenders to Federal prisons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Juvenile delinquency—Total number of juvenile defenders whose cases were disposed of in Federal courts

Six months ended Dec. 31, 1947	1,040
For year ending:	
June 30, 1947	2,670
June 30, 1946	3,891
June 30, 1945	3,411
June 30, 1941	1,843

Commitments of juvenile offenders to Bureau of Prisons

First 3 months of fiscal year (July, August, September 1947)	141
First 3 months of fiscal year (July, August, September 1946)	213

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, just one further word. If the United States were invaded by a public enemy, which day by day was destroying our people and wasting our resources, the American Congress would not stand inertly by without exerting every effort it could to

mobilize resistance to such an invasion. If a public enemy were strangling the American family and lowering the level of living in the American home all over the land, the American Congress would not be callous to such an assault. Yet, Mr. President, day by day the high cost of living is wrecking the American family and destroying the American economy. With all that today threatens us, I say that nothing is so dangerous to American welfare, to American security, and to American democracy, as the present and the continuing high cost of living, the present and continuing inflation. What is Congress doing to stop it? According to the records, nothing. The condition is getting worse instead of better.

So, Mr. President, all over the land people are looking to Congress, wanting to know what we propose to do to save them from ruin, and to save our prosperity from loss. Again I say, the record of the Congress is, nothing.

The time has come for the alarm to be sounded and for the American Congress to act, if we are to act before it is eternally too late. Already any competent observer must report that the foundations of the prosperity we now have are collapsing. There is more crime, there are more people on relief rolls, there is more unemployment, there is more juvenile delinquency, there is a lower level of living in the American home, there is an exhaustion of the people's savings. A bank director tells us that every time his board meets there are more notes that are overdue. A collector of internal revenue says that more taxpayers were delinquent in December 1947 in paying their income taxes. Lawyers in three cities of my State say, "For the first time in years my law office is beginning to foreclose mortgages on homes."

Mr. President, if the Congress does not, before it is too late, meet this emergency and save our country, nothing under the sun can prevent the United States from having another disastrous depression that will literally threaten the very democracy that is personified in our American institutions, as well as the security of our country itself.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in reply to the request of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] relative to sessions of the Senate next week, I suggest that it is the intention to recess at the conclusion of business today until Friday, and at that time announcement will be made as to whether or not the Senate will be convened daily next week. I think the suggestion that came from the Senator was in answer to a query made earlier. It is my opinion that the Senate should hold itself in readiness to continue daily sessions starting Monday, until the debate on the pending measure is concluded. A definite announcement will be made Friday relative to the procedure for the week following.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Friday next the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] be recognized, to present his argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

FRANKIE STALNAKER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1100) for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker, which was, in line 6, to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,500."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Vincent C. Burke, of Kentucky, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Jesse M. Donaldson.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerc, I report favorably the nominations of Wayne Coy, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission; of George E. Sterling, of Maine, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission; of John R. Alison, of Florida, now holding recess appointment, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Walter M. W. Splawn, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner; Ward A. Kemp, to be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; Eugene W. Richards, and several other citizens to be ensigns in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and Jack Senior, and sundry other employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to ranks of captain, commander, and lieutenant commander, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be received, and the nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATIONS IN THE COAST GUARD

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, yesterday there were ordered reported favorably from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approximately 1,400 nominations in the Coast Guard. These are the nominations that were received by the Senate on January 16, 1948, and the complete list appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date at pages 283, 284, 285, and 286.

I desire to give notice at this time that it is my intention to report these nominations on Friday, January 30, and ask for their immediate consideration.

My only purpose in handling the nominations in this manner is to save the Government some money. If I were to report the nominations today they would have to be printed in the RECORD and in the calendar, and I am told that the cost would be several hundred dollars. Handling the matter as I have indicated will eliminate that extra printing.

It is a small amount, but I think it is a healthy sign when we do something to cut down the expenses of Government, even to a limited extent. "Mony a mickle makes a muckle."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar.

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Guy Mason, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHERRY. As in legislative session, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate recess until Friday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, January 30, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 26), 1948:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

DeWitt L. Pyburn, of Louisiana, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force), for appointment to the position of senior Air Force member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. St. Clair Streett (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Muir Stephen Fairchild (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Ennis Clement Whitehead (brigadier general, U S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Grandison Gardner (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Franklin Otis Carroll (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Charles Carl Chauncey (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Bonner Wolfe (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Clements McMullen (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Howard Arnold Craig (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Willis Henry Hale (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. James Pratt Hodges (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Robert Morris Webster (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Dresser White (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Frederick William Evans (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Paul Langdon Williams (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Edward Michael Powers (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Edwin Bowman Lyon (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Adlai Howard Gilkeson (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Harold Mark McClelland (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Thomas James Hanley, Jr. (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Robert LeGrow Walsh (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Eugene Lowry Eubank (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Caleb Vance Haynes (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Fred Sidney Borum (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frederick Mercer Hopkins, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Orvil Arson Anderson (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Robert Wilkins Douglass, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Leo Andrew Walton (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Gordon Philip Saville (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Edwin Upston (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Earle Everard Partridge (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lyman Ferley Whitten (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Alvan Cleveland Kincaid (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Bob Edward Nowland (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. William Donald Old (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Robert Wells Harper (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Glen Clifford Jamison (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Earl Seeley Hoag (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Richard Emmel Nugent (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ralph Francis Stearley (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Albert Francis Hegenberger (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Carbee Craigie (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. David Myron Schlatter (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Orval Ray Cook (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Alden Rudyard Crawford (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Trovilla Myers (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Carl Brown McDaniel (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Charles Bertody Stone 3d (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Earl Walter Barnes (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Arthur Thomas (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. George Clement McDonald (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Pearré Cabell (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John DeForest Barker (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles White Lawrence (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Somers Stowell (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Howard McMath Turner (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Tom Christopher Rives (colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Hugo Peoples Rush (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Fay Roscoe Upthegrove (major, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edmund Clayton Lynch (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Frederick Phillips (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frederick von Harten Kimble (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Dale Vincent Gaffney (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Edwin Bowman Lyon, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Leo Andrew Walton, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Alvan Cleveland Kincaid, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Earl Seeley Hoag, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Fred Sidney Borum, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John Edwin Upston, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Bob Edward Nowland, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Caleb Vance Haynes, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Lucas Victor Beau, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Frederick Mercer Hopkins, Jr., Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John DeForest Barker, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Lyman Perley Whitten, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Patrick Weston Timberlake, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Charles White Lawrence, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Alden Rudyard Crawford, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Charles Trovilla Myers, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John Maurice Weikert, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Richard Emmel Nugent, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. James Somers Stowell, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Charles Pearre Cabell, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Earl Walter Barnes, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Glenn Oscar Barcus, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Leon William Johnson, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Gordon Philip Saville, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edwin Todd, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Roger Maxwell Ramey, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. William Fulton McKee, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Richard Clark Lindsay, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Robert Merrill Lee, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Erik Henning Nelson, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Henry Lee Badham, Jr., United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. John Mirza Bennett, Jr., United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Joseph Francis Carroll, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Robert Emmet Condon, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Everett Richard Cook, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Robert Lynn Copsey, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Bradley Johnson Gaylord, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. John Philip Henebry, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Theron Baldwin Herndon, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. James Howell Howard, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. William Chesley Lewis, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Chester E. McCarty, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Arthur Lee McCullough, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Dick Royal Petty (captain, U. S. Air Force Reserve) Air Force of the United States.

Col. William Leroy Plummer, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Franklin Rose, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Robert James Smith, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Ray James Stecker, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Luther Wallace Sweetser, Jr., United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

Col. Joseph Lafeton Whitney, United States Air Force Reserve, Air Force of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals of the line

Brig. Gen. Frank Allen, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 7, 1947.

Brig. Gen. George Griffin Finch, Georgia National Guard, to date from April 22, 1947.

Brig. Gen. Leonard Ewing Thomas, California National Guard, to date from April 22, 1947.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Robert P. Armstrong, June 4, 1948.
Rex R. Berglund, June 4, 1948.
Eugene Bezore, June 4, 1948.
Richard C. Boyd, June 4, 1948.
John M. Brozena, June 4, 1948.
Donald A. Cook, June 4, 1948.
Murray C. Cook, June 4, 1948.
George D. Cryan, June 4, 1948.
Arnold F. Deichelman, June 4, 1948.
Lawrence H. Dickens, June 4, 1948.
Delmar H. Evans, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Edward V. Fineran, June 4, 1948.
Emerson P. Kendall, June 4, 1948.
Benjamin W. Martin, June 4, 1948.
William T. Mitchell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Beverly R. Molony, June 4, 1948.
Clarence E. Parker, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Patrick D. Rotramel, June 4, 1948.
Don LeR. Southworth, June 4, 1948.
John P. Sundberg, June 4, 1948.
Charles E. Waring, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Peter A. Williams, June 4, 1948.
Stanley Williams, June 4, 1948.
Robert D. Wilroy, June 4, 1948.

The following-named (naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Lowry M. Miller, June 4, 1948.
John G. Wissler, June 4, 1948.

George D. Tracy (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

Robert W. Radcliffe (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John W. Murdock
Robert P. Woodworth

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Willis J. Allender	May E. Knudson
Elizabeth G. Anderson	Bertha A. Krumming
Vivian Blasingame	Patricia R. Laisure
Marie M. Boatman	June L. Lunde
Ambia L. Buckner	Katherine A. Massey
Anna V. Bush	Elaine J. Matthews
Sarah V. Callebs	Estelle Morrison
Patricia M. Doherty	Frances K. Oliver
Dorothy L. Gero	Anna M. Reed
Josephine M. Glod	Adah D. Sander
Elsa A. Griswold	Jane E. Steinbrink
Melba L. Haggerty	Juanita J. Strayhorn
Eileen M. Hubbell	Shirley A. Zuelke
Catharine B. Jones	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

LeRoy E. Wible

LIEUTENANTS

John T. Egan, Jr.
Paul H. Pettit

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert E. Baker	Lewis G. Richards, Jr.
Raymond L. Bradley, Jr.	George F. Sager
	Myron E. Samuelson
Robert J. Evoy	Julius H. Spence
James H. Lee, Jr.	James I. Thorn
John R. Lindsay	Theodore H. Wilson, Jr.
Lyle D. Litton	
Harry S. McGaughey	Clayton E. Wood
William S. Markham	

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Robert M. Kehoe

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Gwenn M. Loomer
Clare C. Marshall

LIEUTENANTS

Arthur C. Boughton
Miles W. Cheatham, Jr.
James G. Rogers, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Edwin "R" Black	Wilbur R. McKibben
Harold S. Dexter, Jr.	Jack W. Robinson
Loren F. Enke	Vincent R. Van Eenenaam
Ira Goldstein	
Chester S. McCoy	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Paul R. Kent
Ralph B. Lopez
Ralph L. Vasa

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Noma V. Foster

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Loretta F. Bielecki
Mary E. Kelly

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 26), 1948:

COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Guy Mason to be Commissioner of the District of Columbia, term of 3 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

IN THE ARMY

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley to be Chief of Staff, United States Army, effective on date of appointment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of all mankind, be merciful unto us, for our souls wait upon Thee. Allow no indolence of mind or indifference of spirit to becloud our understanding in the crucial times that await us. We praise Thee that Thou art on the side of free and generous service, in which no untruth or falsehood can defeat.

Deliver us, O God, from all that divides us—from arbitrary love of power, from national complacency, and from fear that enervates and stultifies. Preserve us from all revolutionary passions and continue to be the anchor of our Nation's thoughts and the guardian of its soul. In this testing time, help us by our acts to speak with a voice that may be heard around the world, telling of the hope, the faith, and the nobility of the heart of America. In the name of the Saviour of men. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 27, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the

House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

January 27, 1948:

H. R. 3342. An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations; and

January 28, 1948:

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to change the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

DEFINITION OF "BILLION"

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to strike the word "billion" out of the English language. It is a very confusing word and is being carelessly used. I prefer the actual statement of a thousand million. On January 19, I stated that the deficit on domestic air mail was $19,000,000. Some newspapers carried the story and substituted the word billion for million. I do not blame the newspapers, because even Treasury officials in appearing before committees of Congress frequently have to have their attention called to the fact that they say "million" where they mean "billion," and vice versa.

A billion dollars is a thousand million dollars. Why slur over this tremendous amount? Why not say what we mean?

Webster's Dictionary gives the following definition for the word "billion": "In French and American numeration, a thousand million; in English and German numeration, a million million." What confusion! Let us get rid of the word "billion."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorial material and tables.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include her complete address before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held in Washington, D. C., January 17, 1948.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am back on the old question, what we are going to do about this difficult fuel-oil situation.

Monday afternoon Mr. Foster, Under Secretary of Commerce, appearing for Mr. Harriman, testified before our committee. He did an excellent job, insofar as he could, to justify the Government's policy in terms of the export quota of petroleum and petroleum products during the first quarter of this year. I said at the conclusion of the hearings certain things which I intend to extend fully later in the RECORD, but I should like to quote them in part:

If I did not share your same concern as to the possible effect—

Referring to the full embargo—

I would have introduced such a bill a long time ago, because of the situation that confronts us. But now I think it is about time that I should weigh the known effect on the people in New England and New Jersey and other areas of this country against the possible effect on the people in some of these other countries.

I requested the legislative counsel to prepare two alternate bills. They are not ready yet. They will be filed as soon as they are ready.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I support the action of our friends in Canada. I maintain that the other countries can join and do likewise with us.

CONSTRUCTION MACHINERY

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I have before me an advertisement from the Journal of Commerce of New York of Tuesday, January 27, 1948. It is too bad, I believe, that this advertisement is not headed "Attention, suckers," but what it does say is this:

FORTY MILLION DOLLARS OF SURPLUS CONSTRUCTION MACHINERY

Representative just arrived to dispose of an enormous quantity of construction equipment recently turned over to a Pacific government by the United States.

Over 30,000 items of every make and model of Army engineering equipment, including 800 tractors and bulldozers (Caterpillar, International, Allis-Chalmers, etc.); 600 cranes and shovels (Northwest, Koehring, P. & H., Lorraine, Bucyrus-Erie, Lima, Buckeye, Link-Belt, Michigan, Unit, etc.); 400 road graders (Caterpillar, Adams, Gallion, etc.); 3,000 heavy trucks (International, Federal, Reo, White, Mack, Diamond T, etc.); and hundreds of each of the following: Truck tractors and trailers, ditch diggers, milling machines, asphalt machines and mixers, road rollers, cement mixers, boilers, electric welders, air compressors, rock crushers, crushing and screening plants, scrapers, turnapulls, weapons carriers, cargo and dump trucks, etc.; also, electrical communications and telephone equipment, chemicals, medical equipment, marine engines, refrigeration units, etc.

Inquiries from governmental purchasing agencies and large dealers or contractors invited.

All inquiries will be given immediate and careful attention. State credit references in first letter.

BOX AA 4402, JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.

I guess this Pacific government has heard about the Marshall plan, and now expect us to buy this material which we gave to them, and send it to the other side of the earth at a still further cost to the American taxpayer.

PHILIP C. JESSUP

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, it appears that President Truman has done it again.

He has named as deputy United States representative in the Interim Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations one Philip C. Jessup, a professor of international law at Columbia University.

Professor Jessup will be the principal spokesman in this world forum for the American people, as Senator Austin will be absent most of the time.

Let us look at the record of this man who speaks for America in this world body:

He appears as a member of the board of sponsors of the National Emergency Council for Democratic Rights, a Communist-front organization, cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its Report 1311, dated March 29, 1944.

He wrote an article on lifting the arms embargo to Spain, published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, a Communist-front organization, cited by the Un-American Activities Committee in the same report.

In 1939 and 1940 he was chairman of the American Council of the Institute of

Pacific Relations, and from 1938 to 1942 chairman of its international governing group. Although the Un-American Activities Committee has not yet investigated this group, in an article which appeared in Newsweek on May 5, 1947, page 29, entitled "One Man's Crusade," one of the members of the institute resigned from the organization because it refused to investigate his charges that it was dominated by Communists.

In 1946 Professor Jessup publicly urged the United States to stop producing atomic bombs.

This is a matter of tremendous importance. The American people are entitled to know who recommended this man. Did General Marshall approve him? Why did President Truman appoint him? Is the President trying to fight communism with one hand and appease with the other?

The American people are entitled to a full explanation from their President.

RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee of the House, I give public notice that hearings will be held before the subcommittee in room 1304, New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. on February 11, 12, and 13 to consider river and harbor projects which have been favorably reported by the Corps of Army Engineers for rivers and harbors.

All Members who are interested in any of these projects and other persons who desire to be heard should notify Robert F. McConnell, clerk of the Public Works Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of his remarks.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Walter Lippmann.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a proposed solution to the housing problem.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Money," by Frank C. Waldrop, from today's Washington Times-Herald.

SHORTAGES IN AMERICA AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it would be laughable if it were not so tragic to think that people in this country are running out of fuel oil and their homes are cold while we are shipping millions and millions of gallons of oil abroad, and to think that the American people need steel to build their homes and other buildings when we are shipping so much of it abroad; when the people of this country are clamoring for lower prices and we are shipping one-third of our wheat abroad making a scarcity in foodstuffs; when we think of the things that we are doing now for other people; and when I see the letters coming into my office from old people—75, 80, and 85 years of age—who are asking for this Government to give them something to help them from poverty; and when I think that the people of this country are talking about giving $17,000,000,000 more to foreign countries to try to buy them off from being Communists, I think sometimes that many of our people are rather "screwy." I think we ought to see where we are going and take care of the American people before the American people go communistic. That is your duty and my duty. It is high time that we get busy and give more time and money to the American people and their Government. I tell you that this business of trying to give to foreign countries all they want and everything they ask for will drive us into bankruptcy. It will wreck our economy and weaken our Government. Since the war we have given $22,000,000,000 and since we started lend-lease we have given to foreign countries $68,000,000,000. Our people are being taxed to the limit right now and if you want to give them some relief from taxation, it is time that you looked to that before you wreck this country and its people by giving it away to the world. Before the era of the New Deal was anyone so bold as to suggest giving $500,000,000 of the taxpayers' money away and then ask your taxpayers to pay for your generosity with their money? Would they object to such a procedure? I will say they would. Now the Marshall plan calls for $17,000,000,000 to be given away in 4 years. That is 34 times $500,000,000—an unheard of sum 15 years ago in Government operation. In 1930, that would have paid all bills of our own Government for 4 years. Now Congress, through the recommendation of our State Department and the President, recommends that we make the appropriation and tax our people to pay the bill. I want it understood that will mean $500 to every family of four people in the United States. How many families want that burden added to their now high cost of Government, their high cost of living, their high taxation? Without my people expressing themselves on this point by the hundreds, I would not add the burden to their tax bill, and to unborn grandchildren who will be old people before it is paid. I want to take care of the old people who need assistance in our own country: our soldiers, the sick, those who need help in America. Our foreign policy is too foreign for me.

Seventeen billion dollars to give away
And tax our people every day;
She's too big for me,
She's too big for me,
You can have her,
I don't want her,
She's too big for me.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the commissioner of public works of the State of Massachusetts.

RESTRICTING USE OF GRAIN FOR ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I again call the House's attention to the fact that the present provisions of law providing for the restriction or allocation of grain to be used in the manufacture of alcoholic drinks expires January 31, 1948, which is day after tomorrow. The other body has already passed a resolution extending this allocating authority. I have a resolution pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency which would continue the controls until January 31, 1949. The courts have held that this questioned authority is legal. I sincerely trust that the Committee on Banking and Currency will give further consideration to this vital subject and favorably report the same to the House for action without delay.

The present law expires January 31, 1948—next Saturday—thus it is imperative that action be taken at once to extend the Secretary's authority to decide just how much of the grain so sorely needed for food may be allocated to the Nation's distillers.

The Secretary has asked the Congress for a continuation of this authority, and I am convinced that his request is not unreasonable. I am hopeful that the authority may be extended over a longer period than that contemplated by S. 1842. My own resolution would accomplish that purpose. Obviously, a 29-day extension of this authority would not be sufficient to accomplish the purpose desired.

In the discussion of this matter, many side issues undoubtedly will be raised. But it appears to me that the issue is quite simple.

We need additional grain for food. The manufacture of intoxicating beverages is nonessential. The distillers have refused to cooperate on a volun-

tary basis in an effort to conserve grain. Therefore, it is essential that their supply of grain must be allocated.

Mr. Speaker, I am astounded to hear one ask why the distilling industry has been singled out for compulsory allocation. Surely a man of reasonable intelligence would not place the producers of intoxicating liquors in the same category as millers or bakers or the producers of livestock.

It has been said that a bushel of wheat would keep a person alive for 1 month. If that be true, then it is criminal to waste wheat or other grains by pouring it down the hoppers of the distilleries for the production of a product which not only is useless, but is harmful.

We are told that very little wheat is used by the distillers. But whether the grain used by distilleries is wheat, rye, corn, or barley seems immaterial since the total bread and feed grain supply, for practical purposes, is interchangeable.

This clearly was demonstrated by the fact that the food effect of a bumper wheat crop in the United States last year was offset by a reduction of 800,000,000 bushels in the corn crop.

A hue and cry has been raised by the opponents of grain allocation to distilleries about the grain that is being shipped out of this country and then returned in the form of liquors. I favor legislation to put a stop to this practice. I do not believe that we should import liquors from countries to which we have sent grain. If American importations of such products were stopped the foreign distillers would be required to curtail production thus diverting still more grain to food.

But regardless of the situation with respect to the production of foreign liquors, I can see no justification for allowing our own distilleries to use grains which are needed for food and for livestock feeding.

It is indeed a strange commentary on the times in which we live when we are called upon to debate on whether grain is to be fed to human beings, fed to livestock, or made into hard liquor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SOIL-CONSERVATION PAYMENTS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Government should always act as you would expect any honest man to act. The Government at all times should move in good faith and meet any obligation which it assumes.

The farmers of this country are in grave danger of being let down by their Government. In all good faith, thousands of hard-working farmers last year undertook practices for the conservation of their soil. The Government encouraged this and the farmers did this under a "gentlemen's agreement" with their Government that in return for their worthy efforts they would be repaid.

It now appears that many of these farmers cannot be paid in full for their soil-conservation practices during the crop year of 1947. The reason: There is not sufficient money left for this purpose.

It is my opinion that if the Government fails to make adequate provisions for repaying the Nation's farmers for their soil-conservation practices—practices which the Government rightly encouraged—it will be a deplorable failure to live up to a moral obligation which it assumed and with which farmers cooperated in all good faith.

This is the situation of which I speak: Early in the calendar year of 1946, the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture conducted its annual survey to determine what were the soil-conservation needs which should be included in the 1947 budget. The Government has encouraged in every way—and properly so—the preservation of the fertility and productivity of the soil of the farms of this country.

In this survey, in which the farmers were consulted and polled personally, the Government was given the promise that a certain amount of soil conservation would be practiced by the farmers. The financial experts figured that the program would cost $300,000,000 Accordingly, that sum was marked up in the 1947 appropriation bill for soil conservation. Farmers, meanwhile, began to execute their end of the bargain, believing that their estimates which the Congress had tentatively accepted would be appropriated for the crop year of 1948.

But such was not the case. When the 1947 appropriation emerged in its final form, the $300,000,000 allocation for soil conservation had been slashed to $267,000,000. By the time this fact developed, however, the farmers were too far launched into their programs of conservation to suspend operations.

Budget cuts have plagued the Soil Conservation Service before. And they have been met by the commendable practice of transferring funds that are unused by one State for this purpose to another State whose practices exceeded the amount which had been allocated to it.

This could not be done in 1947. There were, it developed, no funds to borrow. Practically every State used the full amount of its allowance. Around 30 States were therefore left short of funds to meet in full these payments to the farmer.

Now, what is the position of the Government in this situation?

I think the Government should pay up. It should make a special deficiency appropriation for this purpose.

It does not matter at this point whether you are in favor of increasing the appropriation for soil conservation in the new fiscal year, or whether you voted to cut the appropriation the last time. That is immaterial. What matters now is this: The claims which these farmers hold are just. The Government owes this money. It is not only the moral question that the Nation owes these funds to its farmers that is involved here. These claims represent the fundamental faith of the people in their elected Representatives in Congress.

My State of Arkansas is one of the many States affected by this unfortunate situation. Other great States include Oklahoma, North Dakota, Georgia, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, Vermont, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Michigan, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Utah, South Dakota.

I sincerely trust that the Congress of the United States will see fit to allocate to these States the funds that are necessary to meet in full the obligation for which it is morally responsible to thousands of farmers.

FOREIGN RELIEF EXPENDITURES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I find myself in disagreement with my very good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], but I feel I must take at least some little exception to the statement which he made a few moments ago.

I have not approved of everything that has been done heretofore by those representing our Government and our people in international affairs, but I am compelled to say that it is my belief that not one penny that is being sent abroad at the moment is being wasted; that is, insofar as the effort to stop Russia is concerned. It is something that is being used as water to extinguish a flame that threatens to consume the world. It pains me inexpressibly that so many right-motived, high-intentioned, and correct-visioned people do not understand or appreciate the fact that what has taken place heretofore has brought our country to the very brink of disaster, and that we must have the cooperation, the confidence, and support of other peoples or else be pushed over the brink by Russia. If, in order to make possible the fulfillment of our solemn engagements and to do that dictated by enlightened self-interest it is necessary for us to make some sacrifice, then let us make them and do as little quarreling about it as possible.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on Palestine.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances,

one on veterans' subsistence, in the second instance on the European recovery plan, and to include therein a letter and a resolution.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE PALESTINE EDICT MUST BE IMPLEMENTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on November 29, 1947, the General Assembly of the United Nations, by a vote of 33 to 13, endorsed the resolution which partitioned Palestine into two separate states—one for the Jews and one for the Arabs.

This action came as a result of 7 months debate before a special committee on Palestine, composed of 11 small nations. It came also, as a result of the moral indignation of the people of the world against the manner in which the British mandate has administered the Palestine area since its inception after World War I.

Under the terms of the committee's resolution, Great Britain is supposed to withdraw from Palestine by August 1, 1948. Also, according to the terms of the resolution a Jewish militia is supposed to be established in the Jewish part of Palestine for the preservation of law and order, and the protection of its citizens. A similar arrangement is projected for the Arab portion of Palestine.

Pending the establishment of these two militias, the United Kingdom is responsible before the world for the preservation of law and order.

Their record in fulfilling this obligation, in my opinion, has been a complete failure. Up to now, they have refused to allow a United Nations Commission to form the Jewish militia and they have refused to allow the Jews to protect themselves against Arabic armed bands.

Our State Department has declared an embargo on the shipment of arms to several of the Arabic nations surrounding Palestine, but they have allowed Pakistan and Turkey to remain outside of the embargo group.

The net effect of this is to provide an Arabic corridor for the furnishing of weapons and munitions of war to the Arab aggressors, while preventing the helpless Jews from receiving arms to defend themselves.

Not only are the lives of countless Jews jeopardized, but the authority of the United Nations is being flouted by armed bands of Arab gangsters.

I demand that our State Department take steps to correct this situation, and I respectfully request the President of the United States through our delegate to the United Nations, to immediately take steps to see that the edict of the United Nations is upheld by an international police force to be established on a voluntary basis by the signatory nations of the United Nations, as provided for in the United Nations Charter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the National Jewish Welfare Board. The Public Printer informs me it will cost $177.50.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain items and newspaper excerpts.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Gambling With Peace."

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a resolution and in the other a letter.

Mr. NODAR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Steuben Society of America.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on the St. Lawrence seaway, and to extend his remarks in the Appendix on another subject and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next following the disposition of the legislative program for the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour on Monday, February 2, following the legislative business of the day and such special orders as have heretofore been entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HESELTON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN BROADCASTERS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Association of Women Broadcasters of the National Association of Broadcasters is holding its fifth annual convention here in Washington beginning today through February 1. They have come from almost every State in the Union to this their first meeting in Washington, and are finding at first hand how their Congress and their Government works. We are happy to have them in the gallery this morning.

The members of the association for the most part conduct daily radio programs of interest to women. The objects of the association are to promote the interest of women broadcasters and executives and to increase their opportunities for service. The Association of Women Broadcasters collaborates with some 125 major national organizations, participates in college and university conferences, cooperates with radio councils, and is becoming the feminine voice which serves the larger purpose. A very fine field for women, in which they can use their capacities in the building of the future.

There are many concrete evidences of the value of the Association of Women Broadcasters to its members and to the radio industry. It has brought inspiration and help through united effort toward common objectives, through the exchange of ideas for the improvement of program service, through a broader knowledge of radio's over-all purposes and problems, through the interpretation of the changing function of the women broadcasters and through the recognition accorded the association by national, State, civic, and private agencies for important help rendered during the war and since.

There are also many signs of the value of the Association of Women Broadcasters to the industry. Important information is channeled from Government agencies and national women's organizations. The group has developed patterns for the celebration of National Radio Week. It has been cited in a ceremony at the White House for its significant role in the success of the food emergency campaign. It is the channel through which association members may implement their interest, their talents, and their experience, thereby giving greater significance to their contribution to the American system of broadcasting.

INSIDE INFORMATION

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker—

Inside information?
We never heard of that.
So say those in Government,
Who make the budget fat.
Oh, tell me someone here—
If you believe that's so,
How can they do their job
If there's nothing that they know?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech I made on the floor of the House in June of 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE TAX-REDUCTION BILL

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, we will have brought up shortly the so-called tax-reduction bill of 1948. Discussion of the public debt is certainly appropriate to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to get rid of the huge $250,000,000,000 debt, and that is to pay it. There is only one way that we can convince the American people that we are going to pay it, and that is to provide by law that a percentage of our national revenue is applied to its payment.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that now is the time to make substantial payments of the national debt. I further believe that the American people are going to know that the Republican Party is more interested in reducing taxes for the high-income persons than they are in reducing the huge national debt. Certainly the Treasury Department experts say there will be practically nothing left to apply on the national debt if the Knutson bill as now written becomes the law.

I believe certainly that by all means we must begin to pay that debt. While the American people will not believe the Republicans are as much interested in reducing the public debt by payment, on the other hand they are not going to believe that the Democrats are voting against the tax reduction provided in the Knutson bill because they intend to take the money collected and apply it on the national debt.

I have now pending before the Ways and Means Committee H. R. 5072, which provides that 10 percent of all revenue collected each year shall be applied to payment of the principal of the national debt. That provision should be an amendment to any tax bill considered. We cannot bring it up in consideration of the Knutson bill, for it comes up under a closed rule, and the Republicans who could bring it up will not do so. There is only one way for the provisions of that bill to be considered, and that is for the Democrats in their motion to recommit the Knutson bill, to provide in the bill included in such motion a provision that 10 percent of the revenue collected shall be applied to payment on the principal of the national debt. That is a simple and practical approach, and is the only way that the American people will believe that a vote against tax reduction was really for the purpose of taking the revenue and applying it to debt retirement. Actually that is the only basis for maintaining high taxes.

The American people have for years seen the Congress pass its appropriation bills and if anything is left, then apply that on the national debt. They know that is what will be done again and they are not going to believe that the Democratic leaders are going to have any considerable amount left, even if the present rates of taxation are retained, for application on the national debt.

I say to the Democratic leaders of the House that by all means you should include in the motion to recommit the provision that 10 percent of revenues collected should be set aside by law each year and applied to the payment on the principal of the national debt. All give lip service to such a provision. It is sensible. It is what an individual would do and it is the only way the Democratic Party will ever be able to persuade the American people that they are opposing tax reduction for the purpose of making payments on the national debt.

During the last fiscal year the United States collected something over $42,000,000,000 in revenue. Under this bill, if it had been law, $4,200,000,000 would have been committed to application on the national debt. It may be said that a larger amount was applied on the national debt last year and perhaps more will be so applied this year. This bill does not prohibit such larger payments but merely fixes a minimum payment that must be made each year. By fixing a percentage we would be required to apply more during times of high income, less in time of low income.

I have introduced this bill because from my observation it is the only way we will ever pay the national debt. We are a political country. All parties promise more and more in each campaign. This takes more and more money to meet these promises. Thus each succeeding Congress and each party in the White House comes in committed to spending more and more money. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for 5 years and the requests for appropriations made of that committee always exceed the annual revenue of the Nation. When one group holds down appropriations usually some other group increases them and the tendency to spend all we take in is just as great as in the case of the individual American. Money left over, if any, is then applied to the national debt. Such a practice is thoroughly unsound.

In the last Congress I voted on two different occasions against tax reductions partly because of the unfair provisions of the bill which were weighted in favor of the person with the extremely large income and partly because I thought that in this time of large national income we should collect taxes and apply such money on the national debt. I find that such is not to be and that more and more is being spent at home and abroad.

If the bill I have introduced becomes the law we, as a Nation, will then have to live on 90 percent of our revenue. In view of the serious situation we find ourselves in, certainly we should not only be willing to do that but we should see the absolute necessity for it. If we have to then live on 90 percent of our revenue, more care will be taken to see that appropriations are made for the more essential needs of our own people and greater care taken before decisions are made to send of our own to the governments of the world.

I believe I have offered a sensible approach to this problem. I believe the Congress should see to it that this bill is enacted into law. If it should not, then the only course for me and others who see as I do is to vote for tax reduction with exemptions raised and community-property provisions, for the only way then to save money is not to collect it. I know from experience here if money is collected, it is mighty likely to be spent and the $250,000,000,000 debt will most likely be carried forward to face many future generations yet unborn.

I plead with the Democratic leadership to include this provision in any motion to recommit. We owe it to our country to do so, and I feel that is the only way you can give the American people the assurance that as a party we mean to meet our obligations and really to pay the debt.

I would plead with Republicans but I know my plea would in no way deter them in their efforts to go their way regardless of the public debt.

WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today is former President McKinley's birthday. Heretofore for a number of years the Ohio delegation in Congress has requested time of the Speaker and the House so that we might discuss the character and achievements of this great statesman. Today we are only asking for a few minutes, because we appreciate the fact that the tax-reduction bill is the next thing on the calendar.

You will notice that we have again this year the flowers, as we have had year by year, the red carnation, which was Mr. McKinley's favorite flower and the favorite flower of many of the people in Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, while Ohio has given to the Nation a number of great Presidents, all of whom were men of great ability, one of these Presidents achieved his principal distinction on the floor of this House. It was because of his activities on the floor of this House that he was elected Governor of Ohio and President of the United States. We respect McKinley as a Governor and as a President, but his services here in this House were

transcendent, as will be attested to by those who served with him and by those who served after him.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and wish to insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial by the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled "Yardstick for Statesmen," which refers to William McKinley.

This editorial is as follows:

YARDSTICK FOR STATESMEN

It is 105 years today since William McKinley was born in Niles, Ohio. His life, until it was cut short by an assassin in 1901, was the typical American success story of the nineteenth century, a story of honesty, courage, and ability rewarded by increasing public trust.

To many in a generation that has been led to associate chicanery and demagogy with political success, these may seem stodgy virtues. It is unfortunate for the Nation that the lessons of William McKinley's life have not been studied more closely by some of the would-be statesmen of today.

President McKinley found the country in the grip of a war fever when he entered the White House in 1897. A savage insurrection in Cuba had provoked equally savage repression by the Spanish government. The island was in chaos, its trade with the United States disrupted. The fighting and resultant starvation and disease cost, in the end, some 200,000 Cuban lives.

It was unnecessary for McKinley to make any public protestations of his hatred of war. He had entered the Civil War as a private of 18 and finished it, at 22, a major with a distinguished field record. His whole course of action over Cuba, however, was designed to avoid a war, even in the face of protests by leaders of his party that he was damaging his popularity by flouting the public will.

For a year he worked patiently (as President Cleveland had before him) to induce the Spaniards to remedy their treatment of the Cubans. His efforts were unavailing. In retrospect it seems that the Spanish Government suffered less from malevolence than procrastination. Its concessions always came too late to satisfy American opinion.

The *Maine* was sunk and the war became inevitable. In a final effort to save Spanish rule in Cuba, six European powers joined in a representation to the United States. Austria-Hungary, Germany, Italy, France, and Russia were, in effect, seeking a revival of the Holy alliance that had tried to freeze the political geography of the world after Napoleon. The British joined in, but played both sides by insisting that the United States be told in advance of the contents of the European protest.

President McKinley had every reason to be brusk with the Ambassadors who called on him. The Spanish Ambassador had a short time before written a letter, which became public, in which he berated McKinley as a puppet of public opinion at the very time that the President was doing his utmost to prevent war. The Ambassadors were courting a rebuke. Instead, McKinley had waiting for them a reply as suave as their own message.

"The Government of the United States," he said, "appreciates the humanitarian and disinterested character of the communication now made on behalf of the powers named and, for its part, is confident that equal appreciation will be shown for its own earnest and unselfish endeavors to fulfill a duty to humanity by ending a situation the indefinite prolongation of which has become insufferable."

The last serious effort of the European concert to interfere in the Western Hemisphere was thus quietly squelched. McKinley could, of course, have said more, and with justice. The European nations were all guilty of the same colonial oppressions that had brought the Spaniards to ruin in Cuba. In the polite society of Europe, Americans were regarded as upstart barbarians, and individual Americans were berated and insulted, because their Nation presumed to question this characteristic European morality.

The language which McKinley chose was more effective than any rebuke because it was sincere. He knew war and genuinely desired to avoid it. At the same time, he saw at the doorstep of the Nation a wrong which he conceived it our duty to correct. The key to his action was a deep and lifelong religious belief. He was a Christian, not for show but for the guidance of his life. He was one of our greater Presidents.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, a former majority leader of this House and always a highly intelligent gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is well and proper that the House pause today in its consideration and in its deliberations to pay respect to a great American, and I compliment the gentleman from Ohio for his efforts in this direction. No matter what our affiliation might be, we honor and respect the previous Presidents of the United States and the office of President of the United States. No matter what our party angle may be, we, as Americans, we on our side of the House, the Democrats—and I think I can speak the sentiment of all Democrats—join with the gentleman from Ohio and our Republican colleagues in honoring the memory of one of our great Americans—one of our former Presidents.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman tremendously and profoundly, and we from Ohio especially wish to thank the minority Members for the fairness and nonpolitical attitude which they manifest each year as we make these yearly observations. They have entered into these observances with us most sincerely, and we appreciate it fully.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of course, I join in what the gentleman says about President McKinley. He was one of our greatest Americans, and the last President who ever served in this House.

In those days we not only had President William McKinley, but we had William Jennings Bryan in the House. While they did not always agree, they were able and sincere advocates of their respective views.

They knew something about the money question. Today we are in a spiral of inflation that is more dangerous to this Nation than the atomic bomb. What a pity that we do not have McKinley and Bryan here today. God give us more such men.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman. He always makes timely observations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to my esteemed friend the able gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to say to the gentleman that President McKinley was, for many years, a part-time resident of my district. He maintained a home in Thomasville for a great many years. He was known by the people in that vicinity as a very kind, wise, and very cooperative vistor or part-time resident. It was in that home where it was generally understood that the powers in the Republican Party at that time determined that he should be the party's candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much. It was proof of the magnanimity of this great man that many of his most stanch friends were the men who served on the Democratic side of the aisle contemporaneously with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], who will speak of the statesmanship of Mr. McKinley.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today the birthday anniversary of a great Ohioan and a great American—William McKinley. While we had been interested as a nation in foreign affairs before his time, it was during his legislative and administrative work that we first heard of reciprocity treaties with other nations; and definitely became one of the great powers with far-flung world commitments. How different was the approach of McKinley and Hay to world problems then, than that of today. Then we were introducing very actively our way of life to the rest of the world on a mutual basis; today we seem to be somewhat of an Atlas with a large part of the burdens of the world upon our shoulders.

McKinley was tremendously interested in world problems as well as domestic affairs. He understood the nature of geographic influences on the course and history of nations. He knew these immutable forces and also the effects of expanding populations on nations. If California had 48,000,000 people, as have the British Isles of similar area, and Texas had 68,000,000 people as had prewar Germany of similar area, he would have understood something of the problems involved.

Perhaps the following passage from the last speech made by William McKinley prior to his death expresses his point of view on the position of our country then. He saw what the transoceanic cable and fast steamship had already done. His words are as appropriate today as when they were spoken:

Geographic and political divisions will continue to exist, but distances have been effaced. Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. God and men have linked the nations together. No nation can longer be indifferent to any other. And as we are brought more and more in touch with each other, the less occasion is there for misunderstandings, and the stronger the disposition, when we have differences, to adjust them in the court of arbitration, which is the noblest forum for the settlement of international disputes. We have a vast and intricate business built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of

the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or undue selfishness. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home productions, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. The period of exclusiveness is past.

Let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict, and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war. Our earnest prayer is that God will graciously vouchsafe prosperity, happiness, and peace to all our neighbors and like blessings to all the peoples and the powers of earth.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the Sixteenth District of Ohio, a native Ohioan, and a resident of the city of Canton, the home of the late President William McKinley, I am proud to have the honor of paying tribute to one of our country's great men on the one hundred and fifth anniversary of the birth of our beloved martyred war President.

President McKinley is recorded in history as a President who met the crisis of his day and steered the ship of state to safety. It is well that we pause as Americans to honor this great man and his contribution to our country and to pay tribute to his memory. I hope and pray that, when Americans of this generation are gone, if a future generation of Americans is faced with a dangerous crisis there will be in the White House on that occasion, regardless of what party elects him, what his name may be, or what his religion may be, a man of vision, a man of courage, a man of judgment—the type of man we honor today.

I join with the Ohio delegation in everything that has been said about this great man in honoring his outstanding contributions to the progress of our country.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, to different persons words have different meanings. The word "great" is an example. To some a certain person is greatest of all, while to others he is a demagog. One visits an inauguration and sees in the man all the regal look of a king—to some he is even God's anointed. Another sees in him self-will in action. All of us are inclined to call the man great whom we like; yet, at the same time, we are unable to see the good qualities in anyone whom we do not like.

Today the test of a true statesman is to have an open mind—to give up his preconceived prejudices. Then, in the words of Henry Van Dyke, and then only do we "think without confusion clearly." In every walk of life there is a distressingly large number of individuals who will go to great lengths to avoid mental exercise. Even greater numbers are hindered by their emotions or self-will, and even self-pity, from thinking unselfishly.

I have been seeking to find the acid test for true greatness. For a score of years, scholars have endeavored to define it. Not long since, a group of eminent scholars and philosophers of the world, including Dr. H. G. Wells, sought to name the seven greatest persons in the world. A former member of this distinguished body, Bruce Barton, discussed it at length in one of his books. It is not of so much interest as to the names of the persons chosen as it is that a definition of greatness can be wrought from the list of names. The real test is this: "That life is the greatest which costs the world the least and gives to the world the most in return."

One thousand names of men and women, great and near great, are on a list and all eliminated but seven. Remember, now, they were chosen not because of religious standing or faith, but by using this test given. Here are the names and the reasons:

First on the list was the man Jesus. He was chosen, not because He was the most religious man, but by reason of the fact that He cost the world nothing and gave to the world everything, even what was mortal in His own life, for the redemption of the world.

Second on the list was an old man, who could have been the ruler of his subdivisions had he chosen to be a handshaker or a honeyfugler and sought to be popular. But he dared to speak the truth—yes, the truth—in order that man may be free. Yes; he, too, cost the world nothing, but gave his all—his life—that men might know the truth. I refer to Socrates, of course, who was compelled to drink the poisonous hemlock.

Third on the list was the only American in the group. A man born as lowly as the Son of God. His first meal was a little goose grease off the end of a string which Mrs. Sparrow placed in his mouth, at the same time saying, "It would be better if Nancy's baby could only die, because he ain't got no chance." We know his life. He had nothing but sorrow and suffering. Yes; Abraham Lincoln cost the world very little, but gave his own life to save this greatest of nations and for the freedom of a race.

Fourth on the list is a lady. Her prayers resulted in visions, then convictions; and with the aid of divine providence she conquered mighty enemies and was betrayed by those whom she saved. Joan of Arc cost the world so little, but gave her all; and in the end, like Bruno, went heavenward in the chariot of fire.

The fifth was Asoka. He was placed on this list as the most unselfish man who ever walked the globe and who not only gave himself but completely forgot himself.

Sixth on the list we have a man who did not suffer martyrdom but suffered much worse—banishment. He saved the people of Austria-Hungary and was banished by those whom he saved. I refer to Louis Kossuth. He loved those who in the world's terms said they were his enemies, and in his famous speech at Birmingham, after suffering, he said, "I did not save the people of Austria-Hungary. They saved me." It has been said that the three greatest orations ever delivered were Christ's Sermon on the Mount, Kossuth's speech at Birmingham, and the speech which John Brown made to the judge who sentenced him to death.

The seventh, and last but not least, on the list is Savonarola, priest and prophet, who likewise cost the world practically nothing, but in the end was compelled to forfeit his life because he loved the lowly and the weak.

Why do I mention these names in discussing the life of William McKinley? I think it better illustrated this way:

I must tell you of a little girl. She was compelled to listen to a crank deliver an address on a street corner. The crank was ranting, "I tell you there is no heaven. I tell you there is no heaven. I can prove there is no heaven." The little girl looked to the face of her father and said, "Daddy, then why doesn't he go to h—— and quit making so much fuss about it?"

I think we have one of the greatest in the person of William McKinley, who demonstrated more love for his fellow men than any citizen of this country—without making a fuss about it.

William McKinley, twenty-fifth President of the United States, was born in Niles, Ohio, in 1843. He was educated at Poland Academy and Allegheny College, though he never finished his course in the latter institution. In 1861 he volunteered in the Union Army and entered the Ohio Infantry as a private. He served 4 years, rising by merit to the captaincy of his company and to the rank of major when mustered out in 1865.

Entering politics as a Republican, he was elected to Congress in 1876, and was reelected for six successive terms. In 1882 his election was contested and he was unseated, but he was returned at the next election. In 1890 a Democratic legislature grossly gerrymandered his district, making it easy to defeat him for reelection.

His reputation in Congress rests chiefly on the tariff bill that bears his name. This bill and his able advocacy of it before the House distinguished him as the leader of the Republican Party on the tariff question.

In 1891 McKinley was elected Governor of Ohio by a large plurality and was reelected in 1893. In 1895 a systematic canvass in McKinley's behalf for the Presidential nomination was instituted by his supporters and was continued until the convention of 1896. He was nominated, and, after an extremely bitter campaign on the issue of the gold standard versus free coinage of silver, was elected as champion of the gold standard.

President McKinley's first term is memorable chiefly for the occurrence of the Spanish-American War. That his policy during 1896–1900 was acceptable was shown by his unanimous renomination and by his reelection in 1900 by an electoral majority of 137. His second term began most auspiciously but ended tragically. On September 5, 1901, he visited the Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, that day having been set apart in his honor and called the President's day. On the afternoon of the following day, while holding a public reception in the Temple of Music, he was shot twice by Leon Czolgosz. The wounded President was removed to the residence of John G. Milburn, president of the exposition, and he died there September 14.

One time while a Member of this Congress of these United States of America, friends from the district which he had the honor to represent reported to Congressman McKinley that enemies back in the district were circulating malicious gossip about him and that he had better make a public reply. He answered, "I have no enemies. My constituents have a right to express what they claim to be their opinions. I need criticism and I love those who criticize me. They help me most."

Conciliatory and gracious, respectful of his opponent's point of view, he never would consent to belittle those who did not see eye to eye with him. He would have been shocked, and his great heart would have recoiled in horror at a "smear" campaign. Never pugnacious, never profane or vulgar, never self-assertive, he sought no quarrels, he put on no airs, he cherished no ambition to be the master of anyone, he refused to indulge in personalities.

Members of Congress, might this not be a charter of action for all of us? If we love our enemies, we lose them. The man who indulges in personalities or gossip is talking about himself. The man who smears, either by public utterance or by use of the printed page, exposes his own cheap biography to public view and places his asininity on parade.

Selfish groups did not intimidate Congressman McKinley. He never followed a personality. He stood for principle. His only concern was, Is it right? And to those who could not share his convictions he was so affable and genial, so friendly and sincere, so kind and generous, so humble and genuine that people who differed with his policies did not for an instant distrust him. People believed him, consequently they believed in him.

One day in this great body a Member, who was temporarily under domination of self-righteousness, endeavored to coin a phrase "Midwest isolationist." We do not know how the other Midwestern States reacted to the remark, but we of Ohio followed the example of William McKinley. We hold no resentment. Never reply to an untruth. Let me direct your attention to his last address setting forth his views on the future of America:

Geographic and political divisions will continue to exist, but distances have been effaced. Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. God and men have linked the nations together. No nation can longer be indifferent to any other. And as we are brought more and more in touch with each other, the less occasion is there for misunderstandings, and the stronger the disposition, when we have differences, to adjust them in the court of arbitration, which is the noblest forum for the settlement of international disputes. We have a vast and intricate business built up through years of toil and struggle, in which every part of the country has its stake, which will not permit of either neglect or undue selfishness. Our capacity to produce has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention. Only a broad and enlightened policy will keep what we have. No other policy will get more. By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt our home production, we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus. Reciprocity is the natural outgrowth of our wonderful industrial development under the domestic policy now firmly established. The period of exclusiveness is past. Gentlemen, let us ever remember that our interest is in concord, not conflict; and that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war.

Post mortem eulogy is only back pay. For our living great we have only epithets; only for our dead, epitaphs.

Long before men, who were too lazy to think, were calling others whom they wished to discredit such names as "Communists," "isolationists," "Fascists," "visionary daydreamers," "pink professors," our beloved McKinley from the then forward Midwest—as it always has been and it is now—reflected his beloved Ohio as one of the first internationalist Congressmen and later as one of its first internationalist Presidents.

The leader of the minority side of this great deliberative body, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], once said, "To me a philosopher is a man who seeks the truth." A man unselfishly guided seeking the truth soon lives the truth. Many of us will need that this week. May we have that guidance which McKinley had while we are adjudicating this great question we will be debating this week. May we have this courage which will automatically guide the truth-seekers to refrain from any statement unless we are led by that truth in these critical hours. If millions of men have courage over there, surely we can have the moral courage to do what is right in the great issues debated this week as well as the great issues which will follow regardless of consequences to ourselves. Is the issue on which we are asked to vote this week imperative and needed, or is it one which if adopted will place free men in shackles and chains? Rightly guided like the great martyred McKinley and thoroughly garrisoned with this truth which guided him, we will have the courage to do right as He gives us to see it right. The harvest of right action needs no word of explanation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address which he made in Missouri on January 27 on the life of William McKinley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CONSERVATION OF GRAIN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 512)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 6 (a) of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, first session, provides that whenever the President shall determine that there is or threatens to be a critical shortage of any raw material, commodity, or product which jeopardizes the health or safety of the people of the United States or its national security or welfare and that there is no prospect that such critical shortage may soon be remedied by an increase in the available supply without additional governmental action and that the situation cannot be solved by voluntary agreement under the provisions of that act, the President may prepare proposed measures for conserving such raw material, commodity, or product which he shall submit to the Congress.

Upon the basis of information furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture, I have determined that there is at present a critical shortage of grain, which threatens to become even more serious during the next few months; that such shortage jeopardizes the national security and welfare of the United States; that there is no prospect that such critical shortage may soon be remedied by an increase in the available supply without additional governmental action; and that the situation cannot be solved by voluntary agreements under the provisions of Public Law 395. Therefore, pursuant to section 6 (a) of that act, I am submitting a proposed measure for the conservation of grain. This proposed measure relates to the use of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol, including but not limited to distilled spirits and neutral spirits.

As a result of the devastation brought about by the war and extremely unfavorable weather conditions, the grain situation of most European countries is extremely grave. Careful studies have indicated that the United States should endeavor to export at least 500 million bushels of wheat from the crop harvested in 1947.

The available grain supplies in the United States in relation to essential domestic and export requirements indicate a real need for conserving as much grain as possible, especially between now and the harvest of the wheat crop this summer and the corn crop this fall. There is attached hereto a table, prepared by the Department of Agriculture, which summarizes the current grain situation. Although the domestic wheat crop in 1947 was 212 million bushels greater than the domestic wheat crop in 1946, the current domestic and foreign demands are so

great that the Congress included a provision in the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 requiring a carry-over of reserve stocks of wheat as of June 30, 1948, of 150 million bushels. It is now estimated that taking into consideration essential domestic needs and the carry-over required by law, approximately 450 million bushels of wheat will be available for export. As indicated above, this is considerably below the minimum amount necessary to meet pressing needs in other countries.

In 1947 the crop of corn, which is the chief feed grain in the United States, was only 2,401 million bushels as compared with 3,250 million bushels in 1946. Production of oats was 282 million bushels less in 1947 than in 1946. Changes in the production of barley, grain sorghum and rye about offset each other. As a result the supply of feed grains is extremely short.

The grain situation can best be summarized by saying that every bushel of grain which can be saved between now and the harvest of the new crops this summer and fall will exert an immediate and direct influence either on grain supplies available for feed and use in this country or on the amount of wheat which can be exported. The feed situation is so acute that a saving of corn will be in effect the equivalent of a saving of wheat. The amount of wheat which can be secured for export will depend considerably upon whether there are sufficient supplies of other grains available for feed. If other grains are not available for feed, farmers may find it necessary to feed greater quantities of wheat to livestock.

Under these circumstances, definite steps to conserve grain and reduce all nonessential uses of grain in the United States were, and are, required in the national interest. The Citizens Food Committee, which I appointed on September 25, 1947, to bring about voluntary food conservation, developed a number of voluntary grain conservation agreements with industry, agricultural groups, and others.

In this connection, I am informed that brewers agreed to make a reduction of 25 percent in the quantity of corn used per barrel of beer, to use no wheat, table grade rice, or feeding barley, and to make other economies for a 90-day period ending January 31, 1948; that the distilling industry agreed to close down for 60 days beginning at midnight October 25, 1947; that bakers were urged to discontinue consignment selling and to practice other economies; that wet and dry corn millers agreed to conserve by making maximum use of perishable high-moisture corn; that the mixed feed industry was requested to substitute, wherever possible nonfood grains for wheat; that poultry producers agreed to cull flocks and to reduce the production of baby chicks and turkey poults; that farmers in general cooperated with the Government in grain conservation by feeding hogs to lighter weights, putting less finish on beef cattle, and culling dairy herds; and that restaurants and hotels agreed to make savings in the use of scarce commodities.

After the voluntary shut-down of the distilling industry became effective on October 25, 1947, it became apparent that a program for a continuing reduction in the use of grain by the distilling industry would be necessary to meet the critical emergency with respect to the supply of grain for authorized foreign aid programs and essential domestic uses. Consequently, exhaustive efforts were made to effectuate a voluntary agreement with the distilling industry for the conservation of grain.

During the period of the voluntary shut-down of the industry, meetings of the distillers' coordinating committee, the membership being composed of representatives of the industry, labor, and the Department of Agriculture, were held in an endeavor to work out a voluntary program which could be made effective after December 24, the termination date of the voluntary shut-down. The last of these meetings was held on December 9, 1947. At this meeting, it became apparent that it was impossible to reach an agreement on any effective program which would result in the saving of grain.

Therefore, the Department of Agriculture prepared a program proposing the allocation of two and one-half million bushels of grain for the period to January 31, 1948, and monthly thereafter based upon a formula giving weight both to historical use and capacity. A public meeting to consider this program was held on December 17. Notice of this meeting and the proposal to be considered was given through the press and by individual telegrams to every distilling plant. This meeting was presided over by the Secretary of Agriculture and all members of the distilling industry were afforded an opportunity to express their views as to the desirability of a voluntary program, the form that such program should take, if initiated, and the feasibility or practicability of the program suggested by the Government. The industry representatives present, after considering a variety of proposals including that suggested by the Government, were unable to reach agreement on any effective proposal for the conservation of grain by the industry, although they were informed by the Secretary of Agriculture that, in the absence of some voluntary agreement, he would feel called upon to recommend to the Congress the granting of authority for mandatory control.

Upon being informed by the Secretary of Agriculture of the impossibility of effecting a voluntary agreement to conserve grain by the distilling industry, I instructed him to recommend to the Congress the granting of authority to exercise mandatory control over the use of grain by distillers for beverage purposes. Thereafter, authority for the allocation of grain for the production of distilled or neutral spirits for beverage purposes was granted by section 4 (b) of Public Law 395. This authority was delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture by Executive Order No. 9915, and the Secretary of Agriculture issued under such authority on December 30, 1947, an order, a copy of which is attached hereto, allocating grain to distillers for the period ending January 31, 1948.

Throughout all negotiations with the distilling industry, various factions of the industry have advocated different methods of allocation and there is apparently no possibility of reconciling their views and solving the situation by voluntary agreement. Therefore, further action will be required by the Congress to conserve grain and to reduce its nonessential use.

The attached order is self-explanatory. It sets forth a formula, by means of which the quota of each distilling plant is determined, together with the specific quota for each plant, and it also indicates the detailed procedure for administration. It is contemplated that if the present power to allocate grain is continued beyond January 31, 1948, substantially the same procedure as that provided for in the present order will be used, with such modifications as may be required should the Congress enlarge the grant of authority to include the control of additional uses as recommended in this proposal.

If the allocation powers with reference to grain are continued through October 31, 1948, the Department of Agriculture estimates that the sum of $52,000 will be required for administrative expenses, including the salaries of additional personnel. Of this amount $26,000 will be required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and $26,000 will be required for the following fiscal year.

The present order allocating grain to distillers contemplates the use of approximately 2,500,000 bushels of grain by the distilling industry for beverage purposes during the period ending January 31, 1948. If the allocation controls are extended by the Congress, it is now contemplated that the use permitted will be at the rate of 2,500,000 bushels of grain per month. However, the total amount to be allocated monthly will depend upon the amount determined to be available after considering all demand and supply factors.

During the 1947 fiscal year approximately 59 million bushels of grain were used for beverage purposes by the distilling industry. However, a considerable portion of this amount was utilized by the industry to build up depleted stocks. The distilling industry was under control, as to the total amount of grain to be used, during the war and until November 30, 1946. As a result of this, stocks of whiskey on hand were necessarily depleted below the average yearly stocks of 475 million gallons which prevailed in the 5 years preceding the war. The total stocks reached a low point on June 30, 1945, of 307 million gallons. These stocks were increased during the 1946 fiscal year by 67 million gallons so that on June 30, 1946, the stocks were 374 million gallons. During the fiscal year 1947 the stocks were further increased by 90 million gallons to 464 million gallons as of June 30, 1947. This increase took place at a time when the sales of bottled whiskey were the highest in the history of the industry. The production of distilled spirits and neutral spirits during that year was the highest in the last 10 years.

The average stocks of whiskeys of 475 million gallons which prevailed during the years preceding the war constituted a 4-year supply. The stocks of whiskey on hand now are approximately equal in quantity to the stocks which

were normally on hand prior to the war, but due to the greatly increased sale of blended whiskey at the present time the stocks represent a 6-year supply even at the present high rate of consumption. No additional build-up in stocks, therefore, is justified and the industry can withstand a substantial depletion of its present stocks without undue hardship.

In determining the amount of grain used in the normal production of distilled spirits and neutral spirits for beverage purposes during the fiscal year 1947, the amount of grain used in producing the 90 million gallons of whiskey which were added to the stocks on hand should be deducted from the total use of grain. Upon this basis, allowing for the full replacement of the gallonage depleted by the extremely high sales, the average monthly use during 1947 fiscal year would have been 3,250,000 bushels. Thus, the reduction in the average normal monthly grain consumption by the distilling industry as a whole brought about by this order, for all practical purposes, amounts to only 23 percent on a replacement basis. However, it should be recognized that, if there are no controls, it would be quite possible that the distilling industry would use an amount of grain equal to or even in excess of the amount used in the 1947 fiscal year.

The formula used in determining quotas for each distiller is set forth in paragraph (c) of the order. This formula is based two thirds upon the use of grain by distilling plants during a base period and one third upon the capacity of the plants, with a specific minimum provided for each distilling plant.

Various formulas have been suggested as a basis for allocating grain to distillers. Some have advocated distribution based entirely on use during a base period, others have advocated distribution entirely on a capacity basis, others have advocated a formula giving weight to both of these factors, and still others have advocated distribution based upon sales of bottled goods during a base period. In all past programs the formula for distribution has been based either upon the usage of grain by distilling plants during some past period or the capacity of the distilling plants for the use of grain based upon past operations, or a combination of both. The sale of bottled goods has never been used as a standard of allocation. In view of the diversified character of the industry, it has been considered that the use of bottled sales as a basis for allocation would result in an unworkable, unfair, and inequitable method of allocation.

The formula contained in the order of December 30, 1947, was arrived at after thorough consideration of all proposals and of the experience gained under previous allocation orders. It was considered to be the most equitable formula which could be used under the circumstances. It is contemplated that if the Congress continues the allocation authority beyond January 31, 1948, a formula substantially in conformity with that contained in the present order will be used.

Public Law 395 revives and reenacts title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, with respect "to the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes." If the allocation authority is continued beyond January 31, 1948, it would be desirable for the legislation to grant such authority with respect to the production of ethyl alcohol from grain rather than use the language of the present act.

The same manufacturing process is required in connection with the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes and some kinds of industrial alcohol. Because of the nature of the industry it would be desirable to have an integrated control over the production of ethyl alcohol from grain regardless of the use to which the product is to be put.

In view of the fact that the authority granted by Public Law 395 was for a period of only 1 month, and that the practice of the industry is to make purchases of grain weeks ahead, it was impracticable to provide for inventory controls. However, if the allocation controls are continued beyond January 31, 1948, provision should be made for inventory controls.

Upon the basis of the foregoing information, I recommend that the Congress provide for the exercise, at least until October 31, 1948, of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon the President by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, with respect to allocation and inventory control of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol regardless of the use to which the product is to be put.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 29, 1948.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELSAESSER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

REVENUE ACT OF 1948

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 450 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income tax payments, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the immediate consideration of H. R. 4790, a bill to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes.

This is a closed rule, providing 2 days of general debate on the tax bill. We can expect the same hue and cry that they always send up when a closed rule is reported on a tax bill. The Democrats know as well as I do that a tax bill cannot be brought up under any other kind of rule, but they are committed to a policy of obstruction to Republican-sponsored measures. All of you know that a closed rule is necessary, so I will not try selling it to you. And all of you know that a tax reduction is necessary now, so I will not try selling that to you, either. But I would like to give you just a few of my thoughts on the tax-reduction bill.

For the past half decade, the American people have borne a tax burden of such proportions that it would have crushed the individual initiative of a less patriotic people. During the war and subsequently, taxes have consumed nearly one-third of our national income—but the principal reason for high taxes was eliminated with the cessation of hostilities. The proponents of continuing the present high rate of income tax are therefore left with no reason, and they are grasping vainly for an excuse.

The excuse generally offered by those who would keep taxes on wage earners at the present high level, is that an income-tax reduction would contribute to the inflationary spiral. In almost every instance, I find that the proponents of continuing the high rate of taxes are those who also advocate huge Government-spending programs. It is these huge spending programs which are inflationary—and not an income-tax reduction.

By reducing taxes, we merely make it possible for the people to offset part of the increased cost of living. Federal and State Governments are now taking one-third of the national income in taxes. And what does the Government put into the market for all of this money? Absolutely nothing. In other words, the Federal and State Governments are putting $65,000,000,000—more or less—into circulation and they produce no goods or services on which the money can be spent. That is one of the principal factors in the present high cost of living. The way to combat it is to reduce Government spending, but prices cannot be reduced by keeping taxes high.

Another excuse offered for maintaining the present income-tax rate is that any reduction would result in an insufficiency of funds for the operation of the Federal Government. Simple arith-

metic contradicts this excuse. The cost of operating the Government will be $39,700,000,000 this year, according to the President's budget. The Republican Congress will reduce this figure by $3,000,000,000, simply by removing the padding. And we will trim the remaining $36,700,000,000 figure by eliminating some of the superfluous Government functions, and actual expenditures will be around $35,500,000,000. Now, assuming that our national income continues to be $200,000,000,000, $44,500,000,000 would be produced under present tax laws.

The bill contemplates a reduction in individual income taxes of $5,800,000,000. That means that the Government would still have $38,700,000,000 to finance its operations. After judicial pruning by the Congress, the national budget will be $35,500,000,000—leaving $3,200,000,000 to apply toward reducing the national debt after the income-tax reduction provided in this bill.

The Republican Congress recognized the need for a tax reduction last year, but our efforts to enact it were stopped by the President. Now, even the President recognizes the need for reducing the tax burden on individuals. His change of mind was, no doubt, brought about by a changed condition. Last year was not an election year—and this year is. The President's tax-reduction proposal was made for just one reason—to get votes—and I doubt that it will be successful even in that respect. But nevertheless, it is obvious that every thinking person is now aware of the necessity for reducing the income tax for individuals.

This year, at the present rate of taxation, the Government will have a surplus of between four and nine billions of dollars—depending upon the cooperation Congress receives from the administration in reducing Government spending. It is now for Congress to decide how this surplus can best be used to advance the welfare of the people and of the Nation. Three courses are open to us: First, we can apply the entire surplus toward retiring the national debt; second, we can reduce taxes by the entire amount; and, third, we can apply a portion of the surplus toward retiring the national debt and return the remainder to the people. I think the latter course is in the best interests of our national economy.

Do not misunderstand me. It is vitally important that we start now to reduce the national debt—and a portion of our surplus should be applied to that purpose. But the national economy also needs increased production to cope with high prices—and the keyword to increased production is increased incentive to work. A tax reduction now will give wage earners that incentive—and increasing the incentive of workers to produce is the primary purpose of this tax bill.

For one reason or another, a number of prominent individuals have found it appropriate to propose an income-tax reduction recently. One theory advanced is that we should establish a tax system to redistribute the income of individuals. Another proposal would exempt the first $2,500 of income for a married couple. Most of these proposals served the purpose for which they were intended—which is too obvious to those with even a slight knowledge of politics. But, to date, nearly every proposal has fallen short of the mark. On the other hand, the tax-reduction plan incorporated in H. R. 4790 meets every test of a sound tax policy.

Now allow me just a moment to summarize the Republican conception of a tax policy. First of all, the Republican Party believes that the purpose of taxation is to raise revenue to support the Government and its operation. We do not agree with those foreign ideologies which would levy taxes for the purpose of redistributing the wealth. It is only common sense that a sheep can be fleeced many times, but it can only be skinned once.

Most of the "me too" tax-reduction proposals fail to meet even this first test. Sufficient revenue to support the operations of the Government would not be possible if the exemption for individuals was increased by amounts which have been proposed. Proposals to redistribute the wealth would also be eliminated by this test.

The Republican Party also believes that income taxes should be levied according to the individual ability to pay, while preserving a margin to promote initiative. This margin for incentive is provided in the present bill.

Now let us test the income-tax reduction reported Tuesday by the Ways and Means Committee against the standard for a sound tax policy.

First, will this bill raise sufficient revenue to operate the Government? I have already answered that question in the affirmative.

Secondly, does this bill distribute the tax burden according to the ability to pay? Again the answer is yes. This bill raises the personal and dependency exemptions from $500 provided in the present bill to $600. Tax reductions are graduated from 30 percent for persons having $1,000 of taxable income or less down to 10 percent on the portion of an individual's income in excess of $4,000.

A community property provision has also been included in this bill to permit married couples to file a joint return, each paying taxes on the rate charged for one-half of their total income. Persons over 65 years of age and the blind would be given an increased exemption. In every respect this bill meets the requirement that taxes should be levied according to the ability to pay.

Now, I have said that taxes should be levied according to the ability to pay while preserving incentive. By incentive I mean not only the reward for personal services rendered, but also the anticipated reward which attracts venture capital into our industrial machine. During the next 10 years this country will require an additional $50,000,000,000 in risk capital to meet the demands for production. The President's income-tax proposal would increase the income tax on corporations and thereby diminish the incentive for risk capital. In making this proposal the President would like to have the American people believe that he is shifting the tax from the individual to the corporation. On that point it should be remembered that corporations are nothing more than joint business ventures of the stockholders. The stockholders make the investment and the stockholders take the profits or the losses of the corporation. And who are the stockholders? The stockholders are the American people. Therefore, the President would shift the taxes from the people to the people. It should also be remembered that under the President's proposal no income-tax payer—large or small—would receive as much relief as this bill has afforded them.

On every point this bill meets the requirements of a sound tax policy. It provides sufficient revenue for the operations of the Federal Government, and it distributes the tax burden according to the ability to pay while still providing the incentives to increase production. It is an excellent bill, and I hope it receives your impartial and unbiased consideration and your ultimate support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables and figures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] chairman of the Committee on Rules, stated, in justifying the bringing in of this most vicious "gag" rule that we, in past years, had done likewise. It is true that we have from time to time brought in so-called closed rules on measures, but in such cases they were on highly complicated and technical tariff and revenue bills and I direct attention to the fact that the one before us is not a complicated revenue or tariff bill. It is to be regretted that the bill has been designated as the "Revenue Act of 1948." To cite it as such is misleading. Its proper title should be "A bill to reduce taxes of the wealthy and to preclude the reduction of our national debt."

The bill proposes to reduce the income taxes, not of the needy persons as my colleague stated, but those of the wealthy people of our Nation who will be benefited to about 80 percent of the reduction, and the lower-income groups to the extent of about one-fifth. I shall later insert the figures on which I base my statement.

To my mind, this is the most drastic and unjustifiable gag rule that could possibly be brought in. In the first place, the rule waives points of order against the bill. It then provides that the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment, precluding it being read, after the debate, but no amendment shall be in order to the bill except amendments offered by the committee, and even the amendments offered by the committee are not subject to amendment.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I would prefer not to yield at this time.

Mr. GEARHART. I just wanted to point out that the gentleman has brought in similar resolutions many times.

Mr. SABATH. I am mindful of that fact, but, as I stated a moment ago, they were on complicated and technical tariff and revenue bills.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] in his statement yesterday to the country said that ample opportunity under this gag rule would be given the Members to speak on the bill. He did not say they would be prevented and deprived of the right to offer any amendments or to vote on any amendments or provisions of the bill. They must take the bill as it is. Yes; 2 days have been set aside for talk. Talk is always cheap on that side, and that is the only cheap thing the country has received and is receiving from the Republican Party.

I feel that the vast majority of the American people are not asking for a reduction in taxes when the country is in as prosperous condition as it is. The demand comes from the owners of large corporations such as United States Steel and other steels—not "steals"—who made 11½ percent in dividends in 1946, twice as much as they did in 1936; and this also applies to the poor packers such of Armour, Swift, Wilson, and other corporations who have doubled profits. Yes, the demand for tax reductions come from these corporations who acquired over $17,000,000,000 in profits after taxes, who put aside an additional 10 billions of dollars in reserves, and whose profits enabled them to expend millions for plant expansion and improvements. The demand for relief does not come from the rank and file of the American people, because they are patriotic, yet they are the people who are entitled to the reduction because of the tremendous increase in the cost of living brought about by the Republican Party when it forced the repeal of the OPA. Since that time the cost of living has gone up over 40 percent, and the people with low incomes find it is impossible to provide decently for their families. So, if there is need for a reduction, it is for those people who are earning less than $3,000 and who are unable to cope with the ever-increasing cost of living.

I realize that all the people dislike paying taxes. I myself would prefer to pay less than I am paying. But all those who have the interest of the country at heart should realize that we owe certain obligations to the 85,000,000 people who upon our recommendation bought savings stamps and bonds and are holding billions of our bonds. They should be protected. Consequently I feel that the first duty we owe to them and to the country is to reduce our bonded indebtedness and our liabilities. As it is today, we are obliged to pay over $5,200,000,000 in interest. By reducing the indebtedness we can also reduce the interest which will materially help the holders and owners of these Government securities. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that if a fair submission of the question was made to the American people, the vast majority, while they might be interested in reducing their taxes, would vote in the first place to reduce our indebtedness. We owe it to the country. We owe it to ourselves. Under this bill it will be impossible to pay anything toward the national debt. In fact, after a careful examination by those in a position to know and who have studied the matter, they believe that there will be a deficit because in addition to the cuts that will be provided in the bill by the adoption of a principle which we all favor, the community-property provision, there will be a reduction of $880,000,000 in revenue and again 97½ percent of that amount will go to the wealthy in the upper brackets who do not need a reduction in tax.

In this connection, I wish to point out to those who have voiced criticism of the President's budget recommendation that 79 percent of the proposed budget is allocated for the Army, Navy, Air Corps, veterans' compensation and subsistence, payment of debt interest, and appropriations for relief purposes under the Marshall plan.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman is greatly disturbed about this tax bill. The gentleman knows that under the rules, in the motion to recommit, the gentleman from Illinois and my good friend, the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], can write a tax bill of your own in that motion. Therefore I suggest to the gentleman that Mr. DOUGHTON and the minority leader and you get together on that motion to recommit and write a tax bill in that motion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it, of course, that the gentleman is a great administration leader as well as follower and that if he does have such a motion to recommit, it will embody that which the President has asked for; is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. That is right. You are right, sir, but unfortunately, you and my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, know that the motion to recommit is the only motion that can be made. What I want is that the membership on your side as well as on our side be given an opportunity to offer an amendment to make this unfair, vicious, yes, dishonest bill, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has stated, acceptable to the rank and file of the American people. We know that while a motion to recommit is possible under the rules in all cases, it never really has succeeded and during my 42 years of service, I think in only one instance has a motion to recommit on an important measure prevailed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] really is overwhelming with its admitted kindness. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] admits that he takes away from the minority every right under the rules; that under the rules they could not take away from us the right of a motion to recommit. So that in this rule they have ruthlessly taken away from the minority every legislative right that the general rules provide for, and when the gentleman refers to a motion to recommit, he knows that the Rules Committee, under the rules of the House, could not take that right away from the minority. So they have taken away everything they could from the minority party in the consideration of this bill, under the general parliamentary procedure.

Mr. SABATH. Not only have they taken away from the minority the right, but they have taken it from their own membership. They have deprived them of the opportunity to offer amendments to try to make the bill less objectionable. There are many Members on that side that I know do not approve of this bill, but, due to the powerful forces behind the Republican Party, they are compelled to go along, and they are whipped into line, so that each and every one of them will have to vote "yea" on the bill, it matters not how vicious, how bad, how dishonest the bill is, and in view of your majority of 60 Members, no doubt, you will be able to force it through the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I served for many years on the Rules Committee under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who is now addressing the House, during a Democratic Congress, and when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] was the majority leader. I believed at that time, and had the courage to come onto the floor and say so and vote with the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Illinois in granting a closed rule exactly like this on every tax bill but one, and at that time we let down the bars. I insisted, with others, and we had an open rule; and after 7 days' debate in the House, the House adjourned, and the Ways and Means Committee came before the Rules Committee and we who had voted for an open rule under Democratic leadership's insistence and crack of the whip, admitted we were wrong, and we voted a closed rule. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] if that is not true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My distinguished friend overlooks the fact that there was never a closed rule during the 6 years that I was majority leader——

Mr. MICHENER. On taxes?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; on taxes, unless the Ways and Means Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, came before the Rules Committee and unanimously asked for it.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not have such memory.

Mr. SABATH. I wish to say to the gentleman from Michigan, and I again repeat, those closed rules that were brought in were on highly complicated

and technical tariff and revenue bills. This is not a tariff bill or a revenue bill. This is a tax-reduction bill, for the rich and the wealthy, and, surely, due to our great prosperity they have accumulated millions and millions in profits, and are continuing to accumulate additional millions.

PENNIES VERSUS DOLLARS

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Republican majority, for political reasons and, I presume, to obtain additional contributions from those whom this bill will relieve of taxes, will vote unanimously for the rule as well as for the bill. My complaint is that it is not only an unfair bill but an inequitable one because it reduces the taxes of those in the lower earning brackets by pennies while giving reductions to those in the higher income and salaried brackets by thousands of dollars. If the Republican Party aimed to do the right thing by the people they would bring in a bill that would be fair and afford relief to those that need it most instead of to those that need it the least.

I believe the President's recommendation of a $40 reduction to all taxpayers is eminently fair. It would afford a tax reduction of $160 a year for a family of four and surely those wage earners receiving a wage of less than $3,000 a year are desperately in need of relief in view of the high cost of living. That cannot be said of those persons whose incomes are above $10,000 and to the wealthy whose incomes range up to a million dollars. I insert at this point a small table showing what the Knutson-National Association of Manufacturers' bill will do and what relief the President's recommendation, if enacted into law, would bring about:

Income	Present tax	Reduction under Knutson bill	Reduction under President's proposal
$3,000	$190	$110	$160
$10,000	1,862	652	160
$100,000	62,301	18,077	160
$1,000,000	838,880	105,914	160

The Knutson bill would reduce the tax of the individual with a $100,000 income by $18,077 compared with a $160 reduction under the Truman plan—those with a millon income would obtain a reduction of $105,914 compared with $160 under the Truman plan.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the testimony of a $2,500-a-year New Jersey cannery worker before a committee in the other Chamber who testified that under the prevailing high prices of food stuffs he was only able to provide his family of eight children with 60 cents' worth of meat a week and could not buy more than 14 quarts of milk weekly while the minimum requirement for proper nourishment called for 28 quarts. I feel that anyone who read that evidence could not conscientiously vote for the measure before us but would be in honor bound obliged to vote for a bill carrying the President's recommendation that will actually give relief to people of small earnings.

OUR NATIONAL DEBT MUST BE REDUCED

You Republicans maintain that our national income in the next fiscal year will be $209,000,000,000. It is conceded by the Treasury Department and those in position to know that our national income will be over $200,000,000,000, which will be five times greater than our national income in 1932. In consideration of these figures, I ask whether you want to hold off paying our national debt until such time when the incomes of all persons will be reduced? Is not this the time to start reducing our debt when we are enjoying the greatest prosperity in the history of our Nation?

REDUCE TAXES OF THOSE IN THE $3,000, EVEN $4,000 INCOME BRACKETS

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, if we must have income-tax reductions, let us grant it to the average American whose earnings are at least $3,000 or even $4,000 a year, the white-collar workers, the retired Government, State, county, and municipal employees, and persons of low fixed incomes who, due to the high cost of living, find it impossible to decently provide for their families or to sustain themselves. I insert as a part of my remarks, a table giving the 1939, 1946, and 1947 comparative consumer retail prices as charged in my home city of Chicago during the years in question, as follows:

Comparative consumer retail prices, Chicago, Ill.

Commodities	Unit	1939	July 1946 range	October 1947 range
MEATS		*Cents*	*Cents*	*Cents*
Round steak	Pound	35	62-89	79- 98
Rib roast	do	30	51-75	67- 89
Chuck	do	25	43-69	60- 75
Veal cutlets	do	43	57-79	83-130
Pork chops	do	30	50-75	81- 95
Bacon	do	36	48-65	69- 88
Leg lamb	do	28	48-75	61- 79
Roasting chickens	do	29	52-69	52- 65
DAIRY PRODUCTS				
Butter	do	31	77-95	78- 98
Cheese	do	25	47-69	58- 79
Milk	Quart	12	18-29	21- 22
Eggs	Dozen	29	53-63	76- 89
FRUITS AND VEGETABLES				
Apples	Pound	5	14-19	12- 21
Bananas	do	6	11-20	15- 22
Oranges	Dozen	33	59-92	51- 72
Beans, green	Pound	11	16-27	22- 35
Onions	do	3½	6-12	7- 12
Cabbage	do	3½	4-10	5- 10
Sugar	do	5½	7-10	10- 12
Flour	do	3½	4- 4½	5- 6

The above table shows that the cost of living has gone up from 100 percent to 200 percent and over in some items, and I am for tax relief for those in the lower income brackets. While it is true that there are a considerable number of workers belonging to organized labor and have obtained increases in their wages, yet on account of working reduced number of hours their increased wage has amounted to only 22½ percent, while the cost of living has advanced over 100 percent.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] states that there were some business failures last week. I am sure they did not involve any of the large concerns who will derive the greatest benefits under this bill. I am sure they consisted of failures of small manufacturers and businessmen whom the big boys prevented from obtaining steel and other material to continue in production.

Mr. Speaker, on the whole, I repeat, the country has never been as prosperous as it is now. I hold in my hand a report showing that all banks in the United States had on deposit as of December 31, 1947, the sum of $143,000,000,000. Surely those deposits are not those of the low-earning groups who are obliged to borrow money and go in debt to maintain themselves because of the high cost of living. Yet the demand and clamor for tax reductions are loudest from financial and investments groups who do not need it, nor is it needed by the officers and stockholders of our 12 insurance companies who have increased their assets from $20,000,000,000 in 1938 to $35,000,000,000 in 1946, with the probability that today figures would show assets close onto $40,000,000,000, or nearly double the amount of same in 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have consumed nearly 20 minutes and I must conclude to yield some time to other members of the committee. In conclusion, I am satisfied that the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means during the course of general debate in the next 2 days will more thoroughly explain than I the iniquities and unfairness of the provisions of the Knutson bill to the taxpayers of the low-income groups.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I know how to dissemble, and I am glad it is so. I do not want the good opinion of my fellows if it can only be had at the cost of deception, misinformation, or misimpression.

I wish that we might at some time reach the point where a bill of this character could be considered wholly upon its merits. I am not interested in laying the basis for a political contest to come this fall. I want to cooperate with the right-intentioned people of this body in the adoption of a bill that will give some reasonable relief to the taxpayers of this country. It is believed that the revenues of the Government are sufficient to authorize a reasonable tax reduction and certainly the people of the country are expecting some reduction. My colleague the gentleman from Illinois said it was his impression that the motion to recommit the bill would embody the recommendations of the President contained in his recent message. I hope that is not so because such a motion would meet with certain defeat. What we want and the country expects is legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What gentleman from Illinois is the gentleman from Georgia speaking about?

Mr. COX. I am not talking about the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. I refer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

So far as I am concerned I do not find myself too critical of the formula for the reduction in taxes which is set up in the Knutson bill. If we are going to pass tax-reduction legislation it ought to be fair and honest legislation. If we are to make a cut it ought to be a cut entirely across the board. I know that the low-income people contribute to the full extent, possibly, of their ability; and yet I cannot take the position that the entire burden should be imposed upon the larger producers, because in the higher brackets of the tax law we have, the point of confiscation is closely approached.

For many years as a Member of this body I have as regards tax matters, found it pleasing to me personally to follow the leadership of that great American, that man of fine understanding, our colleague from North Carolina, BOB DOUGHTON. When he was before the Rules Committee, and with the view of having him develop his views about this whole proposition many questions were propounded to him. On the question of amount he very honestly and very forcibly presented the view that it was his opinion that $7,000,000,000 was more than the revenues of the Government would stand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] further made the observation that the provision of the bill which increases exemptions—and the title which treats with the community property question—should be in any bill that this House might adopt. He further said, as I got the impression, that if you will cut the percentage reductions provided for in the Knutson bill in half you would reach a conclusion that would be equitable, fair and just, and it would not go beyond the point that the anticipated revenues can stand.

Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for gentlemen on both sides of the aisle to forget politics in this case and come together in an earnest endeavor to reach an equitable compromise. I trust that before the debate is ended the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] will present his views to this House and that the views expressed by him before the Rules Committee when application for the rule was made will be embodied in a motion to recommit, because that kind of a motion to recommit will give the House an opportunity to adopt legislation which could stand some chance of being accepted by the President.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish the House to believe that he has thrown overboard the President's tax proposal?

Mr. COX. The gentleman persists in bringing politics into this question.

Mr. KNUTSON. No.

Mr. COX. The gentleman knows something of my fondness for him.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am very fond of the gentleman too.

Mr. COX. He ought to know that I know he understands this whole tax question and I trust that the gentleman will be sufficiently impressed by the appeal of the gentleman from North Carolina, if he does take the floor, to be willing to meet him on halfway ground and split percentage reduction in half, thereby giving the President something that he can sign and giving the country something that the anticipated revenues of the Government will stand and that which the people have a right to expect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4790, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, as usual, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] embraced this opportunity to play politics, and he referred to the resolution that was just agreed to as the most vicious ever adopted by this House. I think that is the term he used. The gentleman from Illinois has a very convenient, forgetful memory. I would like to remind the House that on October 11, 1945—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9603—the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], as chairman of the Committee on Rules, brought in an identical rule for the consideration of the legislation that later eventuated into the Revenue Act of 1945. The gentleman from Illinois not only brought the resolution to the House, but he spoke in favor of it, notwithstanding the fact that the bill that he then advocated gave $4,000,000,000 in relief to the corporations of America and $2,000,000,000 in relief to individuals in the face of a deficit of $21,000,000,000. And they call that statesmanship.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Did the gentleman vote for that bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. I certainly did, and I did not criticize it. I do not criticize this bill, and neither do I criticize the bill that the gentleman refers to. The Republicans on the committee unanimously supported the bill, and so did the gentleman from Tennessee. He voted for the bill as the roll call here indicates.

Now, the Bible says something about straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. I may not have the words exactly correct, but that is it in substance, and if I am wrong, Dr. Montgomery, who is sitting in front of me, will correct me. But here they are gagging at this bill, while they swallowed a bill wholeheartedly that gave $6,000,000,000 relief to the taxpayers of America back in 1945, $4,000,000,000 of which went to corporations.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That was a straight 5-percent cut clear across the board.

Mr. KNUTSON. Straight across the board, and when we proposed such a cut 2 years later they were horrified. They said it ought to be done according to ability to pay, or I have forgotten just what. But I will say one thing about the minority, they are never at a loss for an issue, and they have no difficulty in weaving the material at hand into a plausible presentation. But enough of that.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the provisions of H. R. 4790, which were reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means on Tuesday, January 20, 1948.

This bill is both an individual income-tax reduction bill and a tax equalization bill. Under existing law, there are 55,000,000 taxpayers. All of the 55,000,000 taxpayers will receive a tax reduction under H. R. 4790. About 7,400,000 will be relieved from the individual income tax entirely. Of the total reduction provided by the bill, approximately 72 percent will go to taxpayers with net incomes under $5,000 and only 28 percent to taxpayers with net incomes above $5,000.

The bill provides the following relief:

First. It raises the $500 per capita exemption to $600. Thus each taxpayer will receive a $600 exemption for himself, a $600 exemption for his spouse, and a $600 exemption for each of his dependents. This will benefit all taxpayers, but over 90 percent of the benefit will accrue to those whose net incomes are $5,000 or less. By virtue of this change, over 6,000,000 taxpayers will be relieved of their entire income-tax liability.

Second. The bill provides for reductions in the amount of tax payable by each taxpayer. These are as follows:

First. Taxpayers whose incomes, after deductions and exemptions, are $1,000 or less, receive a reduction of 30 percent in the amount of tax payable under existing law, after taking into account the increase in the per capita exemption from $500 to $600. There are 25,000,000 taxpayers in this group, excluding the 6,000,000 taxpayers eliminated from the rolls by raising the per capita exemption from $500 to $600. This group includes single persons earning up to $1,778 per year, married persons earning up to $2,444, and married persons with two de-

pendents earning up to $3,778. This group pays approximately 14 percent of the tax under present law and receives approximately 21 percent of the tax reduction.

In my statement last year on H. R. 1 I pointed out that this group suffered most severely as a result of the rise in the cost of living during recent years. The need of these people for tax relief is even greater today. They received no tax reduction last year and living costs have since increased by an additional 9 percent. In addition to the 30-percent tax reduction this group obtains substantial relief by the increase in the exemptions from $500 to $600.

Second. Taxpayers with incomes, after deductions and exemptions, between $1,000 and $1,396, receive, in addition to the increase in the per capita exemption, a reduction ranging from 30 percent to 20 percent in their tax computed after taking into account the increase in the per capita exemption from $500 to $600. There are approximately 13,000,000 taxpayers in this group.

Third. Taxpayers with incomes, after deductions and exemptions, over $1,396 and not over $4,000 receive, in addition to the increased per capita exemption, a reduction of 20 percent in the amount of their tax. There are approximately 7,000,000 taxpayers in this group.

Fourth. Taxpayers with incomes, after deductions and exemptions, in excess of $4,000, will also receive substantial tax reductions. On the tax computed on the first $4,000 of their taxable income, after giving effect to the increase in the per capita exemption from $500 to $600, they will receive a reduction of 20 percent. On the balance of their tax they will receive a reduction of 10 percent. There are approximately 2,000,000 taxpayers in this group. As a group they pay approximately 44 percent of the total individual income tax and receive approximately 28 percent of the reduction.

In the group with incomes in excess of $4,000 we find the greatest source of risk and venture capital. I cannot emphasize too strongly that if we are really concerned with the welfare of the low-income groups, we must not confine relief to the bottom brackets. By reducing the income tax in the middle and higher brackets, income is released for investment in new and expanding businesses and the managerial group is stimulated to greater efforts. A larger volume of output results, more jobs are created, prices are reduced, and the cost of living is lowered. The primary beneficiaries of these changes are persons in the lower income brackets.

The real answer to inflation is more production. We cannot have more production unless there is sufficient capital to finance it and enough incentive to make people assume the risks and managerial effort which an expanded and improved output involves.

The present high taxes leave too small a reward to guarantee the desired results. Taxes take a bite of 50 percent or more out of each dollar over $16,000, and the bite goes deeper as the income rises. It amounts to 86.5 percent on incomes in excess of $200,000.

Primarily, because of these high tax rates it is becoming increasingly difficult to find the venture capital needed to finance business expansion, development, and replacement. Faced with these tax rates, investors hesitate to take the risks involved in supplying equity capital. They insist on gilt-edged securities. Corporations are forced to sell bonds instead of stocks in order to provide the necessary capital. The task of raising new capital in the capital markets is a tremendous challenge to business and to all sources from which capital is derived. In fact, as many business economists have said: "It is an impossible task under the present tax system."

New and small businesses are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain risk capital. Large, well-established enterprises with good credit ratings have much less difficulty in floating new securities. This additional advantage, enjoyed by large firms, strengthens the tendency toward monopoly and concentration. Evidence of the increasing financial difficulties encountered by small manufacturers is found in the statistics of business failures. Records of the first 10 months of 1947 show that there were 2,846 failures among small manufacturers as compared with 885 in a like period of 1946—an increase of 222 percent. This condition must be corrected.

The President's proposal of levying an excess-profits tax will make matters worse by reducing what is today almost the sole source of equity capital, namely, the undistributed profits of corporations. In this connection, I wish to quote from an editorial in the New York Times of January 21, 1948, in reference to Secretary of Commerce Harriman's testimony before our committee:

CAPITAL AND MR. HARRIMAN

Testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee in opposition to Republican tax-reduction plans, W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, argued that it would be economically dangerous at present to divert capital into private investment at a rate higher than that now prevailing. To increase that rate, said he, would necessitate a painful readjustment later.

Now, it may well be true that industry can raise funds to cover the replacement and expansion needs regarded as desirable under present inflationary conditions. It is by no means as clear that it can raise such funds on terms which are consistent with the needs of a stable economy. In 1946, security issues floated in the investment market for purposes of raising new capital amounted to $3,500,000,000. The total included $2,000,000,000 in common and preferred shares. That is a fairly healthy ratio of debt to equity capital. But in the first 9 months of 1947, while the rate of financing was almost identical with that of 1946, the pattern showed a pronounced change. In the latter period $2,500,000,000 of the new issues took the form of borrowing and only $1,000,000,000 equity financing. In other words, where corporations had found it necessary to raise but 57 percent of their new capital through borrowing, in the first 9 months of 1947 the percentage had risen to around 71 percent.

What do these figures suggest? They suggest, first, that in boom times, such as the present, corporations do not cease expanding because of a shortage of risk capital; they merely shift to less desirable methods—methods which, if long continued, would almost certainly make the "painful adjustment" of which Mr. Harriman speaks vastly more serious than otherwise. They suggest, second, that we have already reached the saturation point so far as financing through equity capital is concerned. Mr. Harriman, as a matter of fact, admits that the trend toward financing through credit is an unhealthy one, but observes that it has "not yet reached the danger point."

Very well. Let us agree, for purposes of argument, with Mr. Harriman's diagnosis that although the patient is sick, its condition is not yet critical. What is to be said, then, for Mr. Harriman's going beyond the point of defending the present tax structure and supporting the President's proposal to add $3,200,000,000 to the corporate tax burden?

On the face of figures which he himself presented before the Ways and Means Committee, this is a preposterous suggestion. These figures are an analysis of the methods by which corporations financed their expenditures in 1947. The expenditures included $14,500,000,000 for plant and equipment, $7,000,000,000 for inventory enlargement, and $5,000,000,000 for added trade receivables, a total of $26,500,000,000. Of this $26,500,000,000, no less than $15,000,000,000 was met out of retained profits. Of the remainder, $4,000,000,000 was raised through new issues, $3,500,000,000 through bank loans, and $3,000,000,000 through trade and other payables. In other words, the chief source of financing—and almost the only source of legitimate risk capital—was retained profits. Yet, while he himself admits that too much risk investment is already being financed through the medium of nonrisk securities and other forms of borrowing, the Secretary of Commerce blandly approves the President's plan to soak corporate profits, and thus deal a crippling blow to what is today almost the sole source of business capital. It simply doesn't make sense.

Fifth. Husbands and wives are permitted to split their income for tax purposes. Those who avail themselves of this opportunity file joint returns, divide their net income and exemptions by 2, compute their tax on this basis, and multiply the result by 2. Since this automatically increases the maximum standard deduction for married couples to $1,000, the maximum standard deduction for single persons is also increased to $1,000. The purpose of this provision is to permit husbands and wives, whether they live in a community-property State or a common-law State, to pay the same tax on similar amounts of income. At the present time, husbands and wives living in a community-property State pay less Federal tax on the same amount of income than husbands and wives living in non-community-property States. The provision will permit uniform treatment for husbands and wives regardless of the State in which they reside.

Husbands and wives living in the community-property States will receive a substantial benefit from this provision, since they will be able to split their income from separate property as well as their income from community property. Under existing law, the only income which they can split for Federal tax purposes is the income from community property.

There are approximately 12,000,000 married persons in the country who will receive additional benefits under the income-splitting provision.

At this point I am inserting a table which compares the tax under present law in a community-property State with

that in a common-law State for a married couple with no dependents:

Difference in amount and percentage of income tax in community-property and common-law States (for a married couple with no dependents)

Net income before personal exemption	Tax payable in—		Excess of tax in common-law States over tax in community-property States	Percent by which tax in common-law States exceeds that in community-property States
	Community-property States	Common-law States [1]		
$1,000				
$1,200	$38.00	$38.00		
$1,500	95.00	95.00		
$2,000	190.00	190.00		
$2,500	285.00	285.00		
$3,000	380.00	380.00		
$4,000	570.00	589.00	$19.00	3.33
$5,000	760.00	798.00	38.00	5.00
$6,000	969.00	1,045.00	76.00	7.84
$7,000	1,178.00	1,292.00	114.00	9.68
$8,000	1,387.00	1,577.00	190.00	13.70
$9,000	1,596.00	1,862.00	266.00	16.67
$10,000	1,843.00	2,185.00	342.00	18.56
$15,000	3,154.00	4,047.00	893.00	28.31
$25,000	6,460.00	9,082.00	2,622.00	40.59
$50,000	18,724.50	24,795.00	6,070.50	32.42
$100,000	50,274.00	63,127.50	12,853.50	25.57
$150,000	86,953.50	105,383.50	18,430.00	21.20
$200,000	127,081.50	148,124.00	21,042.50	16.56
$250,000	169,337.50	191,339.50	22,002.00	12.99
$500,000	383,543.50	407,464.50	23,921.00	6.24
$750,000	599,668.50	623,589.50	23,921.00	3.99
$1,000,000	815,793.50	839,714.50	23,921.00	2.93
$2,000,000	1,680,293.50	1,704,214.50	23,921.00	1.42
$5,000,000	4,273,793.50	4,275,000.00	1,206.50	.03

[1] Entire income reported by husband on joint return.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Sixth. An additional exemption is granted to taxpayers who are 65 or over. If both husband and wife have attained the age of 65, the $600 exemption is granted for each spouse. This will benefit about 3,700,000 taxpayers, of which 1,400,000 will be taken off the tax rolls. This provision will be of particular benefit to retired school teachers, municipal workers, and others who have retired from private industry, and who have as their sole source of livelihood the small amount which they receive as a pension, annuity, or retirement pay. The incomes of such persons will not, in the large majority of cases, increase in an expanding economy, since a vast majority are unable to engage in a gainful occupation.

Seventh. An additional $600 exemption is granted to taxpayers who are blind, in lieu of the present $500 deduction. If both husband and wife are blind, the $600 exemption is granted to each spouse. These exemptions are given to the blind irrespective of their age. The blind also receive the additional exemption granted to persons of 65 or over when they reach that age.

The blind will be materially benefited by this provision. There are approximately 250,000 blind persons in this country and all who pay income taxes under existing law will receive substantial relief under this bill, either in being taken off the tax rolls or in having their income taxes substantially reduced.

By treating this allowance as an exemption instead of a deduction, the bill permits blind persons to receive this allowance and also to use the standard deduction or compute their tax under the tax tables. Under existing law blind people lose the $500 deduction unless they itemize all of their deductions. Furthermore, under the bill, blind persons will be able to get an immediate benefit from their allowance in the form of increased take-home pay. The allowance will be taken into account in the withholding tables. Under existing law, blind persons whose tax is withheld at the source must wait for over a year to get a refund based on this allowance.

I will insert at this point a table showing the number of taxpayers by States who are relieved of income taxes entirely as a result of the exemption features of this bill:

Estimated distribution by States of the taxpayers relieved of all tax liability by increasing the present $500 per capita exemptions to $600 and by allowing an additional exemption of $600 to those persons 65 years of age and over

State:	*Number of taxpayers relieved*
Alabama	92,240
Arizona	27,280
Arkansas	50,100
California	589,400
Colorado	58,800
Connecticut	129,360
Delaware	15,680
District of Columbia	54,720
Florida	97,680
Georgia	107,040
Hawaii	23,380
Idaho	26,360
Illinois	513,660
Indiana	206,720
Iowa	136,760
Kansas	96,120
Kentucky	102,480
Louisiana	93,840
Maine	47,380
Maryland	134,520
Massachusetts	293,180
Michigan	331,700
Minnesota	153,400
Mississippi	46,280
Missouri	203,160
Montana	28,080
Nebraska	69,820
Nevada	10,860
New Hampshire	30,400
New Jersey	284,680
New Mexico	17,760
New York	876,920
North Carolina	117,260
North Dakota	27,480
Ohio	453,960
Oklahoma	84,740
Oregon	77,560
Pennsylvania	563,400
Rhode Island	47,860
South Carolina	57,720
South Dakota	25,320
Tennessee	111,560
Texas	290,740
Utah	31,440
Vermont	17,080
Virginia	121,640
Washington	154,000
West Virginia	78,080
Wisconsin	184,840
Wyoming	13,040
Total	7,407,480

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
JANUARY 27, 1948.

I wish to insert at this point a table showing the percentage distribution of the tax relief afforded by this bill to persons in various net-income classes:

Estimated distribution of the individual income-tax liability and taxpayers under present law compared with estimated distribution of total tax reduction under H. R. 4790

Net income class	Percentage distribution of—		
	Total taxpayers	Total tax paid under present law	Total reduction under H. R. 4790
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$0 to $3,000	69.5	32.4	44.3
$3,000 to $5,000	26.1	23.8	27.3
Total under $5,000	95.6	56.2	71.6
$5,000 to $10,000	2.9	8.0	6.9
$10,000 to $25,000	1.2	12.3	8.8
$25,000 and over	.3	23.5	12.7
Total over $5,000	4.4	43.8	28.4
Grand total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

This table shows that under H. R. 4790 taxpayers with incomes under $5,000 pay approximately 56 percent of the total tax. These taxpayers will receive about 72 percent of the total relief under this bill. Taxpayers with incomes over $5,000 pay about 44 percent of the present tax and receive approximately 28 percent of the relief.

Eighth. The bill also applies the principle of splitting to the estate and gift taxes. The 1942 amendments, which refused to recognize equal division of community property between husband and wife for estate and gift tax purposes, are repealed. A new provision is being prepared by our draftsmen which will permit the splitting of property between husbands and wives for estate and gift tax purposes in all States. The result is a new national system for taxing estates and gifts. These provisions, including the repeal of the 1942 amendments, are made effective with respect to decedents dying after the date of enactment of the bill.

Husbands and wives in the community-property States will not only benefit from the repeal of the 1942 amendments but also from the provision permitting the splitting of their separate property. If action were limited to the repeal of the 1942 amendments, only community property could be split for estate and gift tax purposes.

The chief argument made against H. R. 4790 is the claim that it gives too large a reduction. Those who make this claim quote the Treasury to the effect that the bill will result in a deficit for the fiscal year 1949 of $2,100,000,000. But, my colleagues, the Treasury deficit is arrived at by using a $200,000,000,000-level of personal income in estimating receipts of $45,000,000,000, and also by assuming that there would be no decrease in the budget estimate of expenditures in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

As the committee report shows, personal incomes during the last quarter of 1947 were running at an annual rate

of $205,300,000,000. Moreover, there is rising trend.

The Treasury admitted in testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means that if a personal income figure of $205,000,000,000 had been used instead of $200,000,000,000, receipts for the fiscal year 1949 would have been increased by $1,100,000,000.

This is the same Treasury which estimated a $4,500,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. We had an actual surplus for that year of $754,000,000. It is the same Treasury which estimated revenue receipts for the fiscal year 1948 at $38,800,000,000 and refused to revise these figures until August 1947, after the tax bills had been vetoed and the Congress had adjourned. In August the Treasury estimated that the 1948 receipts would be $41,700,000,000.

I wonder how many of my colleagues refused to vote to override the Presidential vetoes, and thereby denied taxpayers in their States sorely needed income-tax relief, because they relied on the Treasury estimate of $38,800,000,000.

Now, in the budget for the fiscal year 1949, the Treasury has revised even its August estimate of receipts. It now says that receipts for the fiscal year 1948 will be $45,210,000,000. This is an increase of $6,000,000,000 over the estimate of $38,800,000, made last year when the tax bill was being considered by Congress.

The amounts by which the Treasury underestimated the revenues for the fiscal year 1948 would have been sufficient to provide the relief contained in the two tax-reduction bills of last year, and still leave ample surplus for debt retirement. At the rate receipts are running now even the most recent budget figures are too low.

My colleagues, do not again be misled. We are faced with the same situation now. The Treasury estimate of receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, is again on the low side.

According to conservative estimates made by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, our receipts for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 are $46,490,000,000 and $47,317,000,000, respectively. These figures do not take into account the fact that the passage of this bill may result in a substantial increase in the flow of income during the fiscal year 1949 which would produce large additional revenues. Let us take the staff estimates of receipts and see what effect they have on the budget for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1948, and June 30, 1949, as presented by the President:

FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1948

Net receipts, $46,490,000,000.

Expenditures (budget estimate), $37,728,000,000.

Surplus (existing law), $8,762,000,000.

Effect of H. R. 4790 on budget, $1,000,000,000.

Surplus after tax reduction, $7,762,000,000.

FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1949

Net receipts, $47,300,000,000.

Expenditures (budget estimate), $39,700,000,000.

Surplus (existing law), $7,600,000,000.

Effect of H. R. 4790 on budget, $7,100,000,000.

Surplus after tax reduction, $500,000,000.

These figures show conclusively that after providing for the tax cut under H. R. 4790, we will have to reduce the President's budget for the fiscal year 1949 by only $2,000,000,000 to have a surplus of $2,500,000,000 to apply against the national debt. This amount, combined with the surplus after tax reduction for 1948 will provide $10,262,000,000 for debt retirement. For every additional billion we cut from expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 we will have an additional billion dollars to apply against the national debt.

I feel certain that we can reduce governmental expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 by at least $3,000,000,000. Why, even the President in his August revision of the 1948 budget gave the Congress credit for reducing expenditures in that year by over $1,500,000,000. A substantially larger reduction can be expected in 1949. No less than $5,000,000,000 in the 1949 budget is merely proposed legislation, as contrasted with $484,000,000 in the 1948 budget.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us what some of those larger payments are? Is universal military training one of them?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the Marshall plan be in there in any form?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; it is.

Mr. MASON. It is covered in the budget without these extra figures.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Marshall plan is in the budget.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the five billion one hundred million is in the budget in the form of proposed legislation and all in excess of whatever you enter for the Marshall plan; is that right?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, since expenditures based on proposed legislation are easier to reject, we have reason to expect that the cuts in the 1949 budget will be much greater than in 1948. This is especially true because of the fact that the President's budget is the largest peacetime budget in the history of the country.

A $3,000,000,000 reduction will provide a surplus for debt retirement of $3,500,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949, and a total surplus for debt retirement for the two fiscal years 1948 and 1949 taken together of $11,262,000,000.

In his budget message for 1949, the President made the following statement:

The public debt on June 30, 1947, was $258,000,000,000. Budget surpluses of over $7,000,000,000 in the current fiscal year and nearly $5,000,000,000 next year should permit further reduction to $246,000,000,000 by June 30, 1949.

In other words, gentlemen, the President was setting up for you a target of $12,000,000,000 debt reduction in these two fiscal years. The figures which I have just given you show that we are substantially meeting that target.

If you use the figures which the President submitted to you, and the tax program which he suggested, you will not be able to see a debt reduction of $12,000,000,000 in the two fiscal years 1948 and 1949. The President's budget speech is amazingly inconsistent with his tax proposal. In his testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, Secretary Snyder admitted that the President's tax proposal would actually reduce his estimated surplus for the fiscal years June 30, 1948 and 1949 by $3,000,000,000 and that $2,400,000,000 of the reduction would be attributable to the fiscal year June 30, 1949, reducing his estimated surplus for the fiscal year 1949 from four billion eight hundred million to two billion four hundred million. Therefore, if the President's tax plan were adopted it would be impossible, according to his own figures, to reduce the debt to $246,000,000,000 by June 30, 1949.

My colleagues, what a different picture we had when we passed the tax-reduction bill of 1945 in the face of a $21,000,000,000 deficit. That bill was before the Congress in October 1945. It was sponsored by the party on the other side of the aisle, and we Republicans were happy to assist in its enactment. When that bill was being debated on the floor, I made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, the tax bill now before us marks an innovation that will be welcomed by the country. Since the New Deal came into power in 1933 we have had 17 tax bills, all of them imposing new and increased burdens in the form of additional taxes. This is the first tax bill in 13 long years that is designed to lighten the tax burden of the American people and as such will be hailed with varying degrees of satisfaction by those who foot the bills.

In 1945 the Federal Government had a deficit of $54,000,000,000, the deficit for the fiscal year 1946 was to be $21,000,000,000, and the Treasury indicated that there would be a deficit ranging from $5,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1947. At that time Government economists were predicting a major recession with 8,000,000 unemployed.

I know my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] will remember when the President sent a message up here and asked us to authorize and appropriate $300,000,000 to carry over the 8,000,000 that would be unemployed in the transition from war to peace. Well, under the able guidance of my good friend from North Carolina we put the request in the pigeonhole and saved the American taxpayers $300,000,000, just as we saved them $300,000,000 right after Pearl Harbor when a similar request was made by President Roosevelt, who said that there would be 8,000,000 unemployed in the transition from peace to war. We also stuck that request in the pigeonhole. So, under the able guidance of my good friend from North Carolina the Committee on Ways and Means in those two instances was instrumental in saving the Federal Treasury $600,000,000. I merely mention that to show how much dependence can be placed on estimates made by Government economists.

I applaud my friends on the other side of the aisle for sponsoring the 1945 bill under those conditions. That bill, provided, among other things, for a repeal of the excess-profits tax, a reduction of

the corporate income tax, and some reduction in the individual income-tax rates, including the 5 percent straight-across-the-board cut proposed by Senator BARKLEY. The purpose of the 1945 bill is explained in the following paragraph of the House Ways and Means Committee report:

The bill has been designed to aid both individuals and businesses in the difficult period of transition from war to peace. To accomplish this your committee believes that it is necessary to reduce the high wartime tax rates to provide incentives for business to expand and to increase consumer purchasing power. Certain expenditures necessary after the end of a war, however, will keep Federal revenue requirements at a high level during 1946 if a large deficit is to be avoided. Federal expenditures for the fiscal year 1946 have been estimated by the Bureau of the Budget at $66,400,000,000, and the deficit for fiscal year 1946 at $30,400,000,000. Federal expenditures for calendar year 1946 are expected to be much lower, but it is anticipated that the deficit will still be sizable. In view of the probable extent of the deficit in 1946, it is necessary to limit the over-all reduction in taxes.

The loss in revenue from that bill was estimated at $6,000,000,000. At present levels of income the reductions would have cost around $12,000,000,000.

The effects of the bill were startling. We had no recession, we had no unemployment, and instead of a deficit for the fiscal year 1947 there was an actual surplus of $754,000,000.

We who were then in the minority were glad to join with the majority in enacting the revenue bill of 1945. We hope that you, who are now in the minority, will join with us in enacting H. R. 4790.

I do not see how those who voted for the Revenue Act of 1945 with an estimated deficit for 1946 of $21,000,000,000 can vote against this bill with the present large surplus. If there ever was need to encourage production to combat inflation it is today. If there ever was a need to provide relief to the individual income taxpayer from the oppressive war income taxes which are stifling initiative and preventing business expansion, it is today.

Our taxpayers who have received only one reduction since the war ended will look to the north to see how Canada has treated her taxpayers since the war. Canada has made at least three major cuts in its individual income tax to relieve its citizens. The last of these is fully effective in 1948 and provides an average reduction of 29 percent in the tax due. This is over and above the reductions made in 1945 and 1946.

I am inserting at this point a statement from the Winnipeg Free Press comparing individual income taxes in Canada and the United States. The Winnipeg Free Press is one of the ablest-edited and most reliable papers in the Dominion of Canada.

HOW TAXES VARY

Those who pay Canadian income tax, and feel themselves hard done by, will be interested in a comparative table on income taxes payable in this country, and the United States. The rates shown are those effective in the latter part of 1947 and are applicable to earned income, as distinct from investment income.

In the case of the United States, the compiled Federal and New York State tax is shown. Canada and the United Kingdom have no State income taxes. In the United States case also the tax payable was calculated after making the standard deduction of 10 percent from gross income up to $5,000, in lieu of contributions to nonprofit organizations, interest paid, State and local taxes, and medical and other personal expenditures exempt. For gross incomes over $5,000 there was also deducted the New York State income tax in excess of the amount of such a tax on a $5,000 gross income.

No similar deductions from gross income were made in calculating the Canadian tax.

For the purposes of comparison the family allowance received by a Canadian taxpayer with children is deducted from the income tax payable by him, since for income taxpayers the family allowance takes the place, in part, of the former income-tax exemptions for children. This accounts for the negative income tax equal to the family allowances shown at low incomes in the following tables:

Gross income	Single person		Married person without children		Married person with 2 children	
	Canada	United States	Canada	United States	Canada	United States
$600	-------	$8	-------	-------	−$144	-------
$750	-------	33	-------	-------	−144	-------
$1,000	$29	76	-------	-------	−144	-------
$1,250	70	121	-------	$24	−144	-------
$1,500	120	167	-------	66	−144	-------
$1,750	170	212	$29	109	−139	-------
$2,000	220	257	70	152	−108	-------
$2,250	270	304	120	195	−64	$5
$2,500	320	350	170	238	−14	48
$3,000	420	447	270	328	86	133
$3,500	520	548	370	421	186	221
$4,000	620	650	470	523	286	311
$5,000	835	858	670	726	486	505
$7,500	1,465	1,536	1,260	1,367	1,064	1,108
$10,000	2,253	2,333	1,990	2,141	1,786	1,824
$20,000	6,515	6,692	6,140	6,414	5,896	5,922
$35,000	14,478	15,416	14,065	15,088	13,811	14,471
$50,000	22,728	25,338	22,315	24,980	22,061	24,287
$75,000	37,690	43,706	37,240	43,310	36,976	42,534
$100,000	53,903	63,757	53,415	63,334	53,141	62,503

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The very distinguished and able gentleman from Minnesota has served a long time in the House. I wish to ask if in all your 30 years here, have you heard from your constituents and others all over the Nation a more determined demand and request to reduce taxes and to give particularly the middle class and white-collar worker a little relief.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say to my friend from Missouri that the demand that we cut out needless and useless spending in the Government is just as strong. The two go hand in hand.

Mr. SHORT. The greatest cause of inflation is spending money that you do not have and a nation or a corporation is no different from an individual. You cannot go on spending more money than you take in without getting into serious difficulty.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, the New Dealers have found out how, apparently.

I want to read a news story. Canada wants fourth tax cut in fourth year. They have had three. Now they want another one.

Let me read this:

Ottawa, Canada, January 22.

I want my good friend from North Carolina to hear this. They are asking for a fourth tax reduction in the fourth consecutive year.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman will excuse me, I prefer not to.

Mr. DINGELL. I could shed some light on that point.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, I dare say the gentleman could. I never knew him to fail.

This newspaper article reads as follows:

CANADA WAITS FOURTH TAX CUT IN 4 YEARS—SURPLUS GROWS; DOLLARS VANISH

(By Eugene Griffin)

OTTAWA, January 22.—Already paying lower income taxes than Americans in all income brackets, Canadians expect to receive another tax cut this spring for the fourth consecutive year.

Reductions last July gave 9 out of 10 Canadian taxpayers a savings of 29 percent below their 1946 tax rates. More than half of all Canadians with incomes pay no income tax. Exemptions here are much higher than exemptions allowed American taxpayers by the United States Government.

REDUCED 51 PERCENT

Finance Minister Douglas C. Abbott estimated in his last budget that Canadian income taxes have been cut back 51 percent from the wartime peak rates fixed by the 1942 budget. Partly to halt Canadian emigration to the United States, where incomes are higher, the Canadian Government purposely lowered Canadian income taxes below American scales.

A growing surplus in the Canadian Treasury encourages belief in many Ottawa quarters that Canadian income taxes will be cut again in the budget which the Government will propose in Parliament in March. In the first 9 months of this fiscal year—April 1, 1947, through December 31—the treasury reported a surplus of $646,230,921, almost twice as much as the total surplus for the last full fiscal year.

Despite the treasury surplus and demands for reduced taxes, Canada is suffering from a shortage of American dollars. The huge American dollar reserve acquired as a result of the 1941 Hyde Park agreement between Prime Minister Mackenzie King and the late President Roosevelt is being exhausted on Canadian purchases of American goods, many of which are in short supply in the United States.

H. R. 4790, like the two previous bills, which passed the Congress last year but failed to become law because of the Presidential vetoes, seeks to provide relief to the individual income-tax payers from the burdensome income taxes which our citizens so cheerfully and patriotically bore during the war. We are now entering the third year of peace and the country is demanding tax relief. Our taxpayers are suffering from a rise in the cost of living due to the inability of production to keep pace with demand.

To those who complain about the high cost of living, let me point out that the individual income tax is a vital factor in living costs. The income tax must be paid before the worker can provide for his food, clothing, and shelter. In fact, the worker's take-home pay is reduced by the income tax. He can only provide for his family out of what he has left.

Why should we not have some relief? Canadians are getting their fourth tax reduction. Last year alone Canadians received an average reduction of 29 per-

cent, but when we ask for a tax reduction for our citizens, the administration says "No. We have got to feed the world. We have got to rehabilitate the world." In other words, keep your noses to the grindstone and work for the Government. We know better how to spend your money than you do yourselves.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. There is a lot of propaganda about the country that the high cost of living and inflation is due to the canceling of OPA and price control. The gentleman knows it is due to deficit spending and to the increase in the circulating medium of exchange. In 1940 we had about $7,000,000,000 of this lettuce, greenbacks. Now we have got $28,500,000,000, which dollar is worth about 50 cents, and, if we keep on spending, it will be worth about a dime. The gentleman knows that since the New Deal came into power in 1933, until last year when we had a Republican Congress, we ended every year in the red, with a debt of $258,000,000,000 on our backs now.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true, but of course the increase in the currency is not alone responsible. The fact that the Government has repeatedly gone into the markets in this country through the Commodity Credit Corporation and paid premium prices on grain——

Mr. SHORT. They bid up cotton and wheat and corn and everything else.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course. Then, our domestic users had to meet that price, and then the Government hiked the price again. It was just a spiral that seemed to have no end. Oh, there are so many things that contribute to high prices. We are shipping too much abroad. We are finding that out now when we are told that we cannot build a pipe line from the Texas gas fields to Chicago and Milwaukee because the steel that should have gone into that project was shipped abroad.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, my farmers want tractors, but we are shipping them to France. They want fertilizer, but we are shipping fertilizer to Italy. They want grain to feed their families and livestock, but it goes to Austria. And now we are going to send $20,000,000,000 more in addition to the $20,000,000,000 we have already sent since VJ-day.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not want to discuss the Marshall plan although I realize it plays a very large part.

I observe that my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], is in the room. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York at this point, if I may, just how much he thinks we can cut the President's budget without impairing any necessary function of government.

Mr. TABER. To begin with, there are $1,590,000,000 of items in that budget to be spent in 1949 that are not yet authorized by law.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I have called attention to that.

Mr. TABER. If the Congress is at all alert we could start with that before we get to cutting the departments. On top of that the departments' budgets are padded.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did the gentleman say "padded?"

Mr. TABER. Yes, "padded," although I think perhaps we could better say "bloated."

Mr. KNUTSON. I believe Senator BYRD uses the term "padded."

Mr. TABER. I think bloated is better. And they are still hanging on to a lot of wartime employees who failed to take the civil-service examinations when they had a chance, or who tried the examination and failed to pass it. They are still on the pay rolls and they are absolutely totally incompetent almost by their own admission, at least as shown by the result of the examinations. There is an enormous saving to be made there, if we go after it right.

Mr. KNUTSON. Could we save $3,000,000,000?

Mr. TABER. I think there is no question but what we could save $3,000,000,000; and we could add on top of that the billion and a half, if the Congress would stand up and go down the line and do what it should do. I think we could do that easily.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am very much interested in what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has to say, and he is a very consistent advocate of economy; but judged by what the budget committee directed and the cut in the budget at the first session of this Congress and by the action of the Congress it seems to me that the gentleman's prediction now is the substance of things hoped for, and that the things hoped for will never be seen. We had this experience once before.

Mr. TABER. That is not exactly the picture because there was a direct cut of $3,000,000,000 in the request for appropriations; and there was a saving further of $1,400,000,000 in cut-backs of appropriations that had already been made. The only way they got as high as they did this year on expenditures was because of the backlog of appropriations that were hanging over before the Republican majority came into power in this Congress.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly.

Mr. RAYBURN. It will be brief. I just wonder if the gentleman's $3,000,000,000 figure is as far away as was his $6,000,000,000 figure a year ago?

Mr. TABER. The $6,000,000,000 figure was, and the $3,000,000,000 figure is, entirely possible if the Congress had stood up and does stand up and make the cuts it should make.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the gentleman will yield further, that is the great difficulty. Can cuts be made that will stand up in the future?

Mr. TABER. I think they will. I do not think the Congress is going to fail to take advantage of the lesson of experience. I do not believe the Congress is that dumb.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman give us an itemized statement on where these cuts are going to be made?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is asking a great deal. He will see them when the bills come out, and I hope we will have the support of gentlemen on that side of the House to sustain those cuts.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Is the gentleman certain he will have the unanimous support of all the gentlemen on his side?

Mr. TABER. We will have the support of the biggest part of them. I am sure of that because we had the support of men over on that side too.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I pledge the gentleman my support so long as his request is consistent with the needs of the Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is no necessity for the gentleman from North Carolina defending his record.

The following table will show how H. R. 4790 will increase the take-home pay of workers at certain income levels:

Married persons, two dependents:	
Annual wage	$2,400
Increase in take-home pay	35
Annual wage	2,600
Increase in take-home pay	67
Annual wage	3,000
Increase in take-home pay	94
Annual wage	3,500
Increase in take-home pay	119

Assuming that the average family consists of a man, his wife, and two children, that the breadwinner works 40 hours a week and earns $3,500 a year, H. R. 4790 is the equivalent of a 6-cent-an-hour wage increase.

I will insert at this point a table showing the relief granted taxpayers in the various States under H. R. 4790:

Estimated distribution of the tax reduction provided by H. R. 4790 (Knutson bill) by States in calendar year 1948

[Millions of dollars]

States and Territories:	*Estimated distribution of reduction*
Alabama	51.7
Arizona	21.0
Arkansas	26.2
California	677.2
Colorado	53.0
Connecticut	132.3
Delaware	24.2
District of Columbia	60.9
Florida	93.2
Georgia	72.0
Hawaii	32.7
Idaho	15.7
Illinois	520.7
Indiana	155.9
Iowa	80.6
Kansas	66.1
Kentucky	55.7
Louisiana	66.1
Maine	28.2
Maryland	115.9
Massachusetts	256.1
Michigan	307.8
Minnesota	108.7
Mississippi	26.2
Missouri	145.4
Montana	19.0
Nebraska	47.8
Nevada	11.8
New Hampshire	18.3
New Jersey	283.6
New Mexico	13.1
New York	1,051.8
North Carolina	69.4
North Dakota	14.4
Ohio	388.4
Oklahoma	53.0
Oregon	76.6

[Millions of dollars]

States and Territories—Con.	Estimated distribution of reduction
Pennsylvania	488.6
Rhode Island	41.9
South Carolina	30.1
South Dakota	13.1
Tennessee	69.4
Texas	233.2
Utah	19.6
Vermont	9.2
Virginia	88.4
Washington	126.4
West Virginia	43.9
Wisconsin	129.7
Wyoming	9.8
Total	6,549.3

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
JANUARY 27, 1948.

I hope that every Member of the House will study this table and see how the bill affects the people of his State. I also hope that he will find his way clear to vote for this bill and give his constituents the tax relief they need and deserve.

We must reduce taxes; and not increase them as advocated by the President. The President is advocating the imposition of an excess-profits tax on corporations with a rate as high as 75 percent. We must reduce Federal expenditures; and not increase them as advocated by the President. The President is advocating an increase in Federal expenditures for 1949 over 1948 of almost $2,000,000,000. It is only through tax reduction and retrenchment in Federal spending that we can hope to combat inflation and preserve the American system.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include such tables and excerpts to which he might refer.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of my good friend and distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina in yielding to me at this time because I have some very prominent constituents here and I may have to be out of the Chamber for a while later this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, "An act to borrow money and reduce taxes" should be the title given to the Knutson bill, H. R. 4790, because that will be the effect of this bill if enacted into law. It is with regret that I find I am unable to agree with the majority of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means in their support of this measure. All 10 of the Democratic members on the committee voted against reporting this bill and have joined in a minority report stating their reasons for this position. It is my conviction that the maintenance of a sound fiscal policy is one of the greatest obligations of the Congress to the American people. I do not know of any way that money can come into the Treasury of the United States without an act of Congress providing revenue legislation for that money. I do not know of any way that money can come out of the Treasury of the United States without an act of Congress appropriating those funds. So the obligation rests upon the Congress to maintain a sound fiscal policy for this Government, and under the pending bill that will not be done.

The gentleman from New York was convenient in his presence while the gentleman from Minnesota was addressing the House, but he is conspicuous by his absence now. It was prearranged, I suppose, that he would be here in a position to help out the gentleman from Minnesota in the course of his speech. The gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, says that the reason that the $6,000,000,000 was not saved from the President's budget last year, or the $4,500,000,000, as suggested by the other body, was because Congress would not stand up and vote for that reduction. His own party was in control during all last year, and still is in control, so he condemns his own colleagues on his side of the aisle when he says that Congress would not stand up and vote for the reductions necessary to reduce the President's budget.

The estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury is that the enactment of this bill will result in a deficit next year of $2,100,000,000 and will require an increase in the public debt by that amount. With the national income the highest in all history, and at a time when we are enjoying the greatest prosperity we have ever known, this would mean that we will borrow money to pay the expenses of the Government because we have reduced taxes. How anybody can take the position that that is sound fiscal policy is more than I can understand.

Now, a great deal has been said here about the estimates that have been presented by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. By their own record, by their own report, it is shown that if the national income or the personal income continues for next year at the rate of $200,000,000,000, about where it is now, under their own figures and their own estimates, in their own report, there will be a deficit of $400,000,000 next year. Now, they have to assume that there will be an increase in personal income before they can even arrive at the point of insisting that there will be a balanced budget next year; in other words, they have to resolve every doubt in their favor before they can reach the point of insisting that there will even be a balanced budget next year. And under their own assumption that there will be personal income of $209,000,000,000, after indulging in that degree of speculation, even then their own report claims only that there will be a surplus of $500,000,000—half a billion—to pay on the national debt at the period of greatest prosperity we have ever known in the history of the country, and when that national debt is now more than $257,000,000,000.

I insist that their estimates cannot be sustained by the experience we have had, and when they take the position by their own figures that they have to assume something that has not thus far happened before they can even reach the point of claiming that there will be a balanced budget next year, that is certainly an untenable position upon which to rest their case.

Let us bear in mind that last year the House of Representatives passed a resolution providing that there should be a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the President's budget. The other body took the position there should be a reduction of only $4,500,000,000. What actually happened? They were unable to get together. No final action was ever taken. But by the record as it stands now, there has not been any reduction of any consequence, and supplemental requests for appropriation of about $1,300,000,000 are now pending in the Appropriations Committee, much of which will have to be appropriated. Included in that item is the largest reduction in appropriations that was claimed when the measures were before the House, and that is the $800,000,000 for the payment of tax refunds. Nobody can question for a moment that that $800,000,000 will have to be provided, just as was insisted by many of us on this side of the aisle at the time. When the taxpayers of this country overpay their taxes, under the law they are entitled to a refund of that money, and the debt has to be paid.

It is fair to assume here now, as was true last year, that there will not be any substantial, if any, reduction in the budget submitted by the President of the United States. Under the tables presented here in the majority report in support of this bill, they have to assume that there will be a reduction of $2,000,000,000 in the President's budget before they can claim any reasonable payment on the national debt.

I invite your attention to just a few figures that were of interest to me and may be of interest to you in connection with the budget. After all, that is one of the most important phases of the question here under consideration, whether under the budget necessary to provide for the expenses of this Government of ours we can now safely reduce taxes and thereby reduce the revenue so that we may not be able to balance this budget in the next fiscal year.

I have heard over the years claims from this side of the aisle about the great dangers of deficit financing. By your action on this occasion, you are inviting a return to deficit financing.

I invite your attention to some figures which I received from the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget when he appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means. In passing, I might say that he made a splendid presentation of the question there. He was invited by the chairman of the committee to appear before the committee and respond to certain questions that the chairman had presented to him in a letter. He came and gave the explanations in a very clear and forceful manner, and I think made one of the best witnesses that I have heard during my period of service on the committee.

He called attention to the fact that there were five items in the budget that accounted for 79 percent of the total

amount of the budget. I was interested by those figures. I asked him to enumerate those five items and give the amount for each one of them. I ask your indulgence that I may give them to you now because it was interesting to me to see these figures that were given on these five items which cover about four-fifths of the entire Federal budget. I requested those figures for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, and asked him then to give the figures for 10 years before that, namely, for 1939, so that we might compare the Federal budget for the next fiscal year with that of 10 years ago, in the belief that it would shed considerable light on this important question.

The first item of the five is national defense. In the fiscal year 1948, the budget provided $10,746,000,000. In 1949, the figure is $11,026,000,000.

Ten years ago in 1939 it was $1,074,000,000.

The next item is international affairs. That includes the United Nations, the Marshall plan and programs of that type. In 1948 the budget provided $5,533,000,000 for this item. In 1949 it provided $7,009,000,000. Ten years ago in 1939 that item was $19,000,000.

The third of the five items is veterans affairs. In 1948 the budget provided $6,632,000,000. In 1949 the budget provides $6,102,000,000.

In 1939 it was $559,000,000, substantially half a billion dollars 10 years ago; and now it is more than $6,000,000,000.

The fourth item is interest. In the 1948 fiscal year this item was $5,200,000,000. In 1949, it is $5,250,000,000.

Ten years ago, in 1939, it was $941,000,000.

The last of these five items is tax refunds. In 1948 it was $2,049,000,000. In 1949 it is $1,990,000,000.

Ten years ago in 1939 it was $68,000,000.

Those five items cover substantially four-fifths of the budget for the next fiscal year, 1949.

I submit to you, as a practical proposition, How are you going to substantially reduce any one of those five items?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. MASON. In my opinion, the one for international relief can and should be reduced at least $2,000,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's answer. Judging by his record in the past, I would expect him to take that position. But that has not been the position taken by a majority of the House or by the Congress throughout the years of the past. I do not believe there is any encouragement now that the gentleman's position will be followed by the House or by the Congress. I have observed that a distinguished and great American of the distinguished gentleman's party, a former President, has taken a position something like that—that there should be a reduction in the Marshall plan.

I sat here for 4 years during Mr. Hoover's administration. I saw the country almost wrecked, and the Republican Party wrecked. It has not recovered from it yet. So I do not know that even your own party is going to follow his leadership now, after the disastrous experience you had in the past.

But I submit to you that, for every dollar you take off international affairs, you will have to put on national defense. If you reduce national affairs by any substantial amount, the part of prudence and wisdom dictates that you must increase your expense for national defense by that amount, or even more. Only recently we have seen the report of the President's Air Policy Commission, and some gentlemen on this side of the aisle have introduced bills to provide for carrying out the recommendations of that report, to provide for the air defense of this country of ours against attacks by atomic weapons. As I recall the figures, that amounts to something like $2,000,000,000. Who knows but what that will have to be provided for? Certainly, unless you can establish some degree of permanent and lasting peace in this world of ours, you are going to have to take steps necessary for the protection of this country of ours and our people. You know that as well as I do. When you reduce these programs for international affairs, you will find yourselves having to increase your appropriations for national defense to provide for the protection of this country and our people.

That is the only point to which any gentleman has arisen and said there could be a reduction. I think you will readily understand there cannot be any substantial reduction there. There cannot be any substantial reduction in national defense. Can you expect any substantial reduction for veterans' affairs—the care of the sick and the disabled and wounded, and the hospitalization of the defenders of our country? The distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, who spoke in favor of this bill while the rule was under consideration, is quoted in the newspapers in the last day or so as favoring legislation providing additional benefits of several hundred million dollars for the veterans of the country. I have no doubt that, if the rule is brought out of the gentleman's committee, making the legislation in order, as it has already been favorably reported by the legislative committee having jurisdiction, that it will pass. Other similar measures could also be passed. You cannot, with any degree of certainty or any degree of confidence, take the position that there will be a substantial reduction in the cost of caring for the veterans of this country.

Then comes the question of interest on the national debt. Certainly that is fixed. You are not going to be able to reduce that.

The fifth and last item to which I have invited attention is that of tax refunds of about $2,000,000,000. You are not going to be able to reduce that because, when the taxpayers of this country overpay their taxes, under the law they are entitled to a refund and the money has to be paid. That brings you down to the 21 percent of the Federal budget for all the other expenses of Government, for aid to the States, for building roads, for your veterans' hospital program, flood control, reclamation, and all the various projects that have been going on. My recollection of the budget figures is that the public-works program, where some have said there might be a reduction made, amounts to about $2,800,000,000; and all of that except about $183,000,000 is for works already started and already under way.

So, when you examine this budget you have to be an extreme optimist if you figure you are going to be able to make any substantial reduction unless you get into one of these five items to which I have invited attention; and I submit you are not going to be able to reduce any of them to any considerable degree.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again at that point?

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. MASON. I would suggest that there is another item that we could, if we would, make a real reduction, and that is in the pay roll of $7,000,000,000 in the President's budget which could and should be cut to $5,000,000,000 at least.

Mr. COOPER. Does the gentleman mean the pay roll of Federal employees?

Mr. MASON. Yes; that is the pay roll.

Mr. COOPER. I have been reading in the newspapers where there is a bill under active consideration in the other body intended to increase Federal workers' pay. I have been reading about that in the newspapers. I certainly think there is more indication from what I have been reading and hearing that there may be an increase in the pay of Federal employees rather than a reduction. I know I am hearing a great deal about the requests of postal employees, that they need an increase in their pay rather than a decrease, and they submit some very strong evidence, based on the increased cost of living and the increase in their expenses. So there is some indication that, rather than reducing the pay of Federal employees, consideration may be given to increasing it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. MASON. I agree with the gentleman that the postal employees and, perhaps, some other Government employees should be increased, but I am not talking about salaries now, I am talking about the number of people on the pay roll, and that is over 2,000,000 right now when normally and naturally the number should be down to 1,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. As I remember the figure, we have reduced it about half a million already. I agree with the gentleman that there are too many employees on the Federal pay roll. I hope there may be some further reduction in the number of Federal employees, but how many of the little stenographers and the little clerks are you going to have to reduce before you get it into the billions of dollars that is being talked about here? You can reduce right and left, and you will wind up with a small total in comparison with the billions of dollars that are being discussed here. And remember that in your own report on the pending bill you took the position that there will have to be a reduction of $2,000,000,000 in the budget before there

will be any considerable payment made on the national debt. So you are going to have to scratch deep and long to get enough stenographers and clerks off the pay roll to make up the $2,000,000,000 that you say you must have.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. In the light of the extremely dark and dismal picture the gentleman is now presenting of the finances of the Government that confronts its administrators and the taxpayers of the Nation, does the gentleman see any hope whatever for any tax reduction in the foreseeable future?

Mr. COOPER. I would like to see tax reduction, and the sooner it comes the better. I am presenting here facts taken from the pages of the RECORD. Does the gentleman disagree with any of these figures?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Very materially, and I will explain my reasons for disagreeing a bit later.

May I ask the gentleman whether he is opposing any tax reduction at this time?

Mr. COOPER. No; I am not opposing all tax reductions.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman care to elaborate?

Mr. COOPER. I will try to elaborate, but I am not sure that the gentleman really wants me to. I appreciate my good friend's effort to try to embarrass me.

I voted for amendments in the committee, as the gentleman well knows, that would have resulted in some reduction of taxes. I can conceive of conditions that would justify some reduction in taxes. Above all things, there ought to be some adjustments made. Consideration ought to be given to some other taxes now on the statute books. Certain of the excise taxes need attention. You should not rush in here with a bill designed primarily and principally by the gentleman's party to give relief to the high income-tax group.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman states that when I inquired as to whether he has a recommendation for the American people with respect to hopes for tax reduction I attempted to embarrass him personally.

Mr. COOPER. That is true.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I assure the gentleman that was not my purpose any more than to assume he has been seeking to embarrass me personally because I see fit to support this bill. I did not bring the personal matter into it. I again ask, without any attempt of embarrassment, whether he believes the American people can have a tax reduction in the foreseeable future?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know just when we can reach the point where we can have a tax reduction. I hope it will come soon. I certainly would like to see the taxes reduced. I would like to have my taxes reduced as much as anybody here. I am in favor of tax reduction as soon as the sound fiscal policy of this country will permit it. As to just the day or the hour that that time will arrive, I am unable to say now and I know the gentleman cannot say, because from the figures taken from the majority report on this bill the whole case is based upon a reduction of $2,000,000,000 in the Federal budget before there can be any surplus in any substantial amount to apply on the Federal debt.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will refer to page 7 of the report I would like to have his views on two questions I should like to raise here.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under (b), fiscal year 1949, as I understand that table, the committee is first assuming that the national income will flow at a rate of $209,000,000,000 per annum.

Mr. COOPER. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Which, as the gentleman pointed out, is something like nine billion over the present flow.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; that is higher than it has ever reached. Some claim two hundred and four, two hundred and four and one-half, or two hundred and five, but the estimates are two hundred.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; and we have an assumption that the $39,700,000,000 budget will be cut $2,000,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the assumption that the budget is not cut, the surplus will only be $500,000,000, that the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. COOPER. That is right. Is that not what I said?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I meant to say that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then, following on, there you have the assumption of a $3,000,000,000 cut, which would give a $3,500,000,000 surplus. Now, I want to ask this question, because you gentlemen have a chance to get into the details of this: Assuming that this Congress approves the supplemental requests before the Committee on Appropriations, which the gentleman referred to, of, roughly, $1,500,000,000, will that not affect the $2,500,000,000 and the $3,500,000,000 adversely?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly, it will; to the extent that such items have to be taken into account in fiscal year 1949.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So, then, we might, in the event there is no cut in the budget of $39,700,000,000, and assuming a $209,000,000,000 flow, wind up with a considerable deficit under A and just about a break-even under B.

Mr. COOPER. Exactly. There is no question about that. The gentleman is exactly right about that. And, bear in mind this, too: Another point that might be mentioned, which is brought out in our minority views, under an amendment that will be offered to this bill affecting the estate and gift taxes, there may be a considerable loss of revenue, so that it is just about an even break, according to their own figures and under their own assumption.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us go one step further. In this budget of $39,700,000,000, I understand the President has included $400,000,000 for European aid, or, let us say, a 12 months' request instead of 15 months.

Mr. COOPER. I think that is correct. The figure is given in the RECORD.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the joint committee study, I believe, is where the figures are cited.

Mr. COOPER. I think so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So then we have that provided for to that extent in the $39,700,000,000. Now, any additional supplemental appropriation that might come in in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, would likewise affect these figures adversely.

Mr. COOPER. That is right; certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, will the gentleman tell us then what he thinks would be available for an application of the reduction of the debt in the event the estimated income materializes and these cuts are made in the budget in the light of the supplemental appropriations, if I make myself clear?

Mr. COOPER. I think I understand the gentleman and I give it to you as my best judgment. I might say, in passing, that I have been working with these things for some time. It has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means longer than any other man on it except my distinguished friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I have been trying to give the best attention to these things that I could. It is my best judgment, that you will be doing extremely well if you come out even. You see, this happened last year: In January, the President submitted a budget of $37,500,000,000. Well, now, the last supplemental estimates up to now increased that $200,000,000, raising it to $37,700,000,000. I asked the Director of the Budget when he was before the committee, and you will find it in the hearings, what his best judgment was, what the best guess was that he could give me. I was seeking light and information; I wanted to be as nearly accurate as I could. I asked him what his best guess was as to how we would finally wind up at the end of this fiscal year with respect to saving any amount under the President's budget. He said, "All indications are that there won't be any saving under that budget."

I do not think the facts or our experience or the situation would justify anybody in assuming that you are going to have any substantial reduction in the budget.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that the President's recent economic report estimated the national income for the last quarter of 1947 at a rate in excess of $205,000,000,000?

Mr. COOPER. I know what the gentleman is talking about. Of course, the gentleman and his assistants have tried to break it up in every way they could to try to present a more favorable picture.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan in his question. A more favorable picture is just not there.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Is it not a fact that the national income for the first half of the calendar year 1948 of $212,000,000,000 will gradually decrease to $205,000,000,000 for the second half, and $195,000,000,000 for the first half of 1949, with the result that with every loss of $3,000,000,000 of national income there will be a loss of $1,000,000,000 of revenue to the Government?

Mr. COOPER. That is my recollection of the figures about that.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, has the gentleman changed his position in regard to fiscal policy since the Revenue Act of 1945?

Mr. COOPER. I assumed the gentleman would try to get back to something like that. It has no relation to this at all.

Mr. CURTIS. I am seeking enlightenment, just as the gentleman was seeking it in the committee.

Mr. COOPER. It has no relation to this at all. The chairman of the committee referred at great length to what happened in 1945. That has no relation to this at all. The gentleman voted for that bill just as I did.

Mr. CURTIS. Sure, and I am for this one.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. To clear up the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, the supplemental appropriations of $1,500,000,000 to which he referred are already in the President's budget?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; that is correct, certainly, the supplemental requests.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield, that is not the essence of my question.

Mr. COOPER. I did not understand that was the essence of the gentleman's question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My question is, If the $1,500,000,000 is appropriated in addition to what has gone before, the $1,500,000,000 must be raised somewhere.

Mr. COOPER. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Either it has to come out of the forthcoming revenue or you have to deficit-finance it.

Mr. COOPER. That is true.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the members of the committee agree on where that money is to come from? If they cannot, I will have to draw my own conclusion about it.

Mr. COOPER. If you pass this bill, you are going to have a deficit of $2,100,000,000 the next fiscal year. That is exactly what is going to happen. You cannot take the majority report on this bill and prove anything different than that. You cannot take what the Republican members of the committee themselves say in their own report and prove anything any different than that.

Mr. LYNCH. That deficit of $2,100,000,000 is over and above the $1,500,000,000 that would be added in the event of the supplemental appropriations; is not that correct?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; certainly. The $1,500,000,000, however, is intended largely for the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. On the subject of cutting the budget estimates at present, I understand that the departmental requests have already been cut as deeply as it is possible to cut them without hampering the necessary and essential services to the public.

Mr. COOPER. The testimony of the Bureau of the Budget in the hearings shows that the President reduced the requests of the various departments and agencies of the Government $7,000,000,000 before he made up his 1949 budget.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Was not the same statement made the last fiscal year by those same people, that they had reduced the budget before it was brought in here; yet we reduced it some $4,500,000,000?

Mr. COOPER. You may think you did. You have not reduced it anything like that. You cannot point out where you have, nor anything resembling that.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask if the gentleman believes in deficit financing?

Mr. COOPER. No, I do not.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Have we not been doing that for the last 14 or 15 years?

Mr. COOPER. That is true, yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I am asking if the gentleman has had a change of heart.

Mr. COOPER. No. Was the gentleman in favor of levying all the taxes needed to pay for the war as it was being fought?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No.

Mr. COOPER. All right; there you are. Some people seem to forget the fact that we had to fight the most destructive and expensive war in all human history. We won the war, but we have not yet paid for it, and we will not pay for it until we reduce this national debt of ours, and you cannot do that under the pending bill. Is the gentleman for the bill? Are you supporting this bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I thought so. Well, you cannot pay off the national debt by passing this bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. You asked me about the war in 1941. We have had deficit spending here since 1932.

Mr. COOPER. That is true.

Mr. NICHOLSON. And we kept going deeper and deeper.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. So do not bring up the matter of the war to me.

Mr. COOPER. We had some, yes, but considerably over $200,000,000,000 of the present national debt is the cost of this war. That is the big thing.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I presume the gentleman bases his contention on the inability to reduce the debt on the basis of income and outgo. The debt has been reduced in the last 2 years I think something like $20,000,000,000 or more.

Mr. COOPER. To answer the gentleman's question, the public debt has been reduced by $23,000,000,000 since 1946.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Where did the larger part of that reduction come from? What was the source of the revenue? It was not current revenue, was it?

Mr. COOPER. Of course, there was a rescission of appropriations. Something like $60,000,000,000 of appropriations were rescinded by act of Congress. Then, as explained by the Secretary of the Treasury, and I cannot undertake to quote him from memory here, he explains how the $23,000,000,000 has been paid on the public debt since 1946. As I recall, a large part came from a reduction in the cash balance of the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not ask your indulgence much longer. I simply want to invite attention to the fact that we have 85,000,000 individual bondholders in this country. We went out during the war and made the patriotic appeal to the people of this country, even to the school children, to buy war stamps and war bonds. They responded to a remarkable degree. Those bonds are outstanding. Unless you and I assume our responsibility here of providing the revenue to finance this Government of ours and make a substantial payment on the national debt, we are not keeping faith with the 85,000,000 people of this country who responded and invested their money in war bonds and war stamps. I believe we owe a responsibility to them. I believe we should meet the obligations of maintaining a sound fiscal policy for this country, and then we will have a right to feel proud of the efforts we have exerted.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from Tennessee. I think this is the first time since 1933 that I have known him to get excited over the question of deficit financing. In fact, it is the first time since 1933 that I have known of any of the New Deal leaders becoming alarmed about running into huge deficits. Their whole philosophy has been "tax and spend." They have not worried about deficits. I want to make just a few comments now because I see a great many carnations being worn by Members on both sides of the aisle. I am very glad to see that, because it is in honor and in memory of a man who believed in sound currency, in sound fiscal policies. I refer to Hon. William McKinley. He was not an advocate of rag money, and he carried on a great campaign in order to put us on

a safe fiscal basis and on a sound money basis. You remember he was gerrymandered out of power when he was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. After the election in which he had been defeated and the Republican Party had lost, a newspaper editor of his own town went to Major McKinley and said:

What have you got to say, Major McKinley, with reference to this election and the defeat of the Republican Party?

He had gone down to defeat under a smear campaign, and the country later revived under the very legislation that was condemned by the Democrats at that time. This is what he said to the editor to send out to the country:

The Republican Party values its principles no less in defeat than in victory. It holds to them after a reverse, as before, because it believes in them, and believing in them is ready to battle for them. They are not espoused for mere policy, nor to serve in a single contest. They are set deep and strong in the hearts of the people, and are interwoven with its struggles, its life, and its history. Without discouragement our great party reaffirms its allegiance to Republican doctrine, and with unshaken confidence seeks again the public judgment through public discussion.

That was his answer, and it sent a thrill through the American public, and eventually he was reelected to put this country on its feet after a disastrous Democratic administration.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the home State of William McKinley.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am glad the gentleman has taken time to speak about this great apostle of sound money. I want to say to him that the people of Ohio, after he was gerrymandered out, indicated their faith in him by nominating him for Governor of Ohio, without any opposition, and he had very little opposition in the election, indicating that the sensible men in both parties realized his honest, sincere stand, and rewarded him in that respect.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

I was here following the first war. In looking about the room I see no other Member who was serving in the Congress at the close of that war.

Mr. ROBSION. The gentleman is referring to 1919?

Mr. REED of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not see him. The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Representative ROBSION, was here.

Following that war we were faced with a tremendous debt, so considered those days, of $26,000,000,000. The country was staggering under that load. People had the highest taxes they had ever had in the history of the country at that time. Democratic taxes, of course. I heard the same arguments then when it was proposed to reduce taxes. The Democrats said, "What will become of our bonds?" Almost the same words were used then as now. "We have sold them to the children and to the people. Speakers stood on the back end of trains and told the purchasers how safe the bonds were." What was the proposal? To reduce taxes. In spite of the lugubrious howls that went up from the Democratic side, which created the debt, we received more revenue as a result of the reduction in the tax. Then, we started to pay on the naitonal debt, which the Democratic side said we could not do. It was just folly to attempt it. We reduced taxes again, and more revenue came in, and we did that four times. Each year for 10 straight years we reduced the national debt by $1,000,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I have taken occasion to check a little on this matter of the reduction of the national debt. Since the turn of the century, from 1901 to 1911, that is, the Fifty-seventh to the Sixty-first Congresses, inclusive, the Republicans controlled the Congress and there was continuous debt reduction in each Congress. In the Sixty-second Congress the Democrats controlled the House. They continued to control the Congress, and by March 1917, all of which time was peacetime, they had doubled the national debt. The Sixty-fifth Congress, of course, was a war Congress, and the debt rose almost 10 times. From 1921 to 1931 the Republicans controlled the Congress and they reduced the national debt by 44 percent. In 1931 the Democratic Party captured this House where appropriations and tax bills must start. They continued to control the entire Congress and the debt rose, and by the end of 1940 the national debt had more than doubled. The national debt increased by two and seven-tenths times in the prewar years of the New Deal.

In the last 30 years there has never been a bond paid off by surplus financing at any time when the Democrats have controlled the Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution; and in order to verify his figures, I shall ask unanimous consent just a little later to insert a table which will cover the question. Here it is:

Roosevelt's peacetime expenditures

1936	$9,000,000,000
1937	8,000,000,000
1938	7,000,000,000
1939	9,000,000,000

Truman's peacetime expenditures

1946	$64,000,000,000
1947	43,000,000,000
1948	38,000,000,000
1949	40,000,000,000

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Let us not forget that during the time we were reducing the debt by $1,000,000,000 a year our national income was way down to probably not more than $35,000,000,000 as compared with a national income now of $209,000,000,000.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; and you remember that during that time, coupled with the sound fiscal policy which we were pursuing, we were cutting expenditures and we were cutting them to the bone. There was not this great New Deal propaganda agency that for surpasses anything Hitler ever dreamed of, pouring out its international boondoggling propaganda to spend, spend, spend. Nobody in New Deal cares where in the world we spend just so long as we spend.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Will the gentleman recall that during the Hoover administration when you had this sound fiscal policy that we had the greatest unemployment we ever had in the history of the country?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, that is true, but it was after——

Mr. LYNCH. I am glad to know it is true.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was after the Democratic war that you folks promised to keep us out of in 1916.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. REED of New York. I have but a limited time and I do not want to have it all used up in colloquy between other gentlemen.

Mr. LYNCH. The chairman states that he will grant the gentleman more time.

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman from Minnesota ties the unemployment of the Hoover administration in 1930 back with the war in 1917, World War I. If that is the best explanation the distinguished chairman of our committee can give, I am sorry for the Republican Party.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman will remember that between 1931 and 1940 the gentleman's party had 10,000,000 unemployed, estimated by the Department of Labor.

Mr. LYNCH. There is no question about it.

Mr. REED of New York. After having spent more than double the national debt that existed prior to that time.

Mr. KNUTSON. After having spent $68,000,000,000 on relief they still had 10,000,000 unemployed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] very conveniently forgot that the so-called Hoover depression started in Germany in 1926, swept all over Europe, came to Canada, and then came down here in the latter part of 1929. I suppose Mr. Hoover was responsible for the depression in Germany just like the Irish are responsible for all the good things they have here in the United States.

Mr. LYNCH. There is no question about the Irish being responsible for the good things and there is no doubt but what Mr. Hoover and the Republican Party were responsible for the unemployment in 1930.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman lets his blind partisanship overcome him. Now, will the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have gone through the minority report and I find to my dismay there is no reference whatever to the President's plan to give everybody

$40, 40 acres, and a mule. Why was that left out? Are you ashamed of your Commander in Chief? Have you repudiated your great leader or what is the matter?

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I shall have to do so out of courtesy. This is a matter of repartee between members of my committee, which I fear is not adding to the information of the Members.

Mr. LYNCH. I appreciate the fact the gentleman has yielded because I want to make response and reply to the 40-acre-and-mule proposition. As far as I know, Mr. Chairman, there has been no reference to any 40 acres and a mule. There has been reference made to a $40 credit which the Republicans just do not like because it goes primarily to people with incomes under $3,000.

Mr. REED of New York. I will answer that question. You know the bill that the President wanted you to sponsor and which you did not mention in your minority report was one which you felt you could not present to the House unless you brought it in with a disinfectant which you apparently did not want to do. The thing that worried you was the fact that President Truman entitled his proposal as a "Cost-of-living credit bill," but he forgot about the 19,000,000 people who were so poor and so destitute they could not even pay an income tax. Of course, under the vote-getting formula of the New Deal the 19,000,000 destitute did not need $40 each, but the other people had more votes, provided, of course, their votes could be bought for $40 each.

Mr. LYNCH. Let me ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to say another thing, too, about the mule business. You will remember you tried to fake the people with 40 acres and a mule in foal. You remember that?

Mr. LYNCH. I am not so good on agriculture, but let me ask you this: Is there anything in your bill that puts back those 19,000,000 people who are trying, as the gentleman claims, to get back on the tax rolls?

Mr. REED of New York. Certainly there is.

Mr. LYNCH. We would like to know what it is.

Mr. REED of New York. Every item in the bill will stimulate industry and the growth of it, income pay rolls, create more property to tax; so instead of their being down in the lower level, the 19,000,000 persons under the prosperity that will follow this bill will be paying an income tax because of their property under H. R. 4790. There is no question about that.

Mr. LYNCH. That will be a great improvement when under a Republican bill you can add taxpayers to the tax rolls.

Mr. REED of New York. Certainly. They will be happy to get on the tax rolls. They will never be able to under the gentleman's administration.

Now, I will discuss the bill a little bit.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4790, a tax-reduction and tax-equalization bill, is designed to relieve three serious problems. I refer to the high cost of living, the lack of incentives to increase production, and the inequality of the tax burdens in common-law and community-property States.

The burden the present high cost of living has placed on our citizens is all too obvious. For the average taxpayer, income after taxes expressed in terms of 1947 prices, has decreased almost $100 in the past year. Your committee's bill recognizes this fact and proposes a $100 increase in the per capita exemptions. At present a married man with two dependents receives exemptions amounting to $2,000. Under the bill this will be increased to $2,400. Furthermore, because of deductions such a man will not be taxable until his income reaches the level of almost $2,700.

Your committee's bill also recognizes that the present high prices have placed a special hardship on both persons of advanced age and the blind. For this reason, it provides an additional exemption of $600 for those 65 years of age and over. It also provides an exemption of $600 for the blind in lieu of the present $500 deduction. These groups have been particularly hard hit by the increase in the cost of living. They have been less able than the average taxpayer to obtain the high paying jobs which it is necessary to have in order to offset the increase in the prices of the goods and services they must buy.

To a large extent they are dependent upon small pensions or other fixed incomes for their living. These incomes have by no means kept pace with rising prices.

The need for incentives to increase production should be apparent to everyone. The current demand for goods and services is clearly in excess of the volume that can be produced today at anything like normal prices. The most obvious indication of this is the upward trend of prices since the war. Thus, it seems apparent to me that greater production is the key to the solution of our present inflationary problem. This greater production can be supplied by increasing the productivity of labor, by stimulating the incentive of managers to break the bottlenecks which are stopping the flow of industrial products, and by increasing the willingness of investors to assume the risks necessary for the expansion of our business enterprise.

The present wartime tax rates are not designed to provide these necessary incentives to produce. They are a relic of the war period, when it was possible to depend upon stronger patriotic motives for production incentives. Today if we are to obtain this increased production, we must see to it that our tax system leaves sufficient income after taxes for the taxpayer to be willing to put forth the required effort.

Abundant evidence of the discouraging effect of the present tax rates on the American taxpayer in all walks of life is shown by the relatively small amount of income he has left after paying his taxes. It must be remembered that out of this remaining income he must provide not only for the necessities of life, but also for his security in the future. Furthermore, the portion of this income which he is able to save represents the only real source of risk capital in our economy today. Let us take as an example a married man with two dependents. If he has income of $4,000 a year after deductions, he has only 90 percent of his income left after paying his taxes. If his income is $8,000 after deductions, he has only 84 percent of his income left after taxes. A business manager with an income of $25,000 after deductions has only 66 percent of his income left after taxes, and a man with an income of $60,000 after deductions may actually have less than half of his income left after paying taxes. It seems obvious to me that with tax rates such as these it is impossible to expect labor, management, or investors to put forth the necessary effort or to assume the risks which must be taken if we are to increase production in the immediate future, or if we are to maintain the American standard of living in the future.

H. R. 4790 reduces these obstructions to increased production. It increases the income after taxes at all income levels. To use the examples just given, H. R. 4790 makes it possible for a man with an income of $4,000 after deductions to retain 95 percent of his income after taxes. For the taxpayer with an income of $8,000 after taxes, nearly 90 percent remains after taxes. For the business manager with an income of $25,000, nearly 80 percent is available after taxes, and for the man with a $60,000 income, 65 percent is left after paying his taxes. I do not contend that this represents a sufficient increase in the spendable income for these taxpayers, but I do believe that it certainly represents a step in the right direction.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand that the bill as originally drawn provided for $600 additional exemption for the blind, but when they reached 65 years of age it was to be discontinued because of the $600 exemption after 65.

Mr. REED of New York. They will now get $1,800 individually.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That has been changed in the bill as reported out, and they will get it as long as they live.

Mr. REED of New York. That has been taken care of.

This increase in the spendable income of all of our taxpayers is accomplished through the combination of several provisions in your committee's bill. The principal provision in this respect is the percentage-rate reduction. For those taxpayers in the lowest tax bracket a 30-percent reduction is provided. For those with incomes between $1,400 and $4,000 after deductions and exemptions, a 20-percent reduction is provided. Income above $4,000 receives a 10-percent reduction in tax. However, this is not the only feature of your committee's tax bill which will increase the incentives to produce. For labor the increased exemptions are particularly significant. For those with incomes above about $5,000, the so-called income-splitting provision which I shall describe later, will be a stimulant to production.

The third major provision of your committee's bill equalizes the tax burdens of

our citizens in community property and common-law States. It is a well known fact by now that given the same income, a family unit in a community-property State is apt to pay less taxes than is true in a common-law State. This arises from the fact that one-half of the income earned in community-property States belongs to the husband and one-half to the wife. The same is true with respect to income from community assets. In the common-law State, where the husband earns most of the income, the entire amount is taxed to him. Because of our highly progressive rates, this means a higher tax in the common-law State where the family income is taxed as one unit than in the community-property State where it is taxed as two separate, smaller units.

This is a particularly pressing problem at the present time because of the rush of many States to change their property laws to a community-property basis. In the past 2 years the number of States shifting to a community-property system has increased by one-third. Furthermore, there is evidence that many other States, including my own State of New York, may well shift over to a community-property system if this Congress does not provide for an equalization in tax burdens between common-law and community property States. The common-law States cannot afford to permit their residents to pay a disproportionately heavy part of the tax burden.

The Tax Commission of New York has recently made a careful study of the desirability of adopting a community-property system. The commission recommended that this system be adopted. This recommendation was made reluctantly because to quote the commission a "near catastrophic disturbance of property rights would result from the adoption of a community-law system." However, the tax commission estimated that married couples in New York were paying $170,000,000 in income taxes each year which would not have to be paid if New York had a community-property system. This difference in tax burdens is so great that the commission considered the adoption of a community-property system desirable despite the serious confusion which would result with respect to property values.

Governor Dewey in releasing this report of the New York State Tax Commission emphasized the difficulties involved in a community-property system when he said:

> Adoption of a community-property statute in New York would not only disrupt the whole foundation of our legal system, but would also involve the question of constitutionality which might severely limit the adequacy of such a statute.

It seems apparent to me that the failure of Congress to equalize the tax burden in community-property and common-law States can only result in ill-advised and hurried changes to community-property systems by most of our common-law States. Chaos in State property laws would be the inevitable result. Furthermore, the Federal Government will lose a substantial proportion of the revenue from this differential, even if no income-splitting provision is adopted.

Your committee's bill provides for this problem by permitting husbands and wives to file a joint return and split their income between them. The effect of this is to provide the same tax burden in common-law States as is imposed upon a married couple with a similar community income in a community-property State. There are, however, also advantages to be derived for community-property States from this income-splitting provision. It will be possible under this provision for couples in community-property States to split, not only their community income as at present, but also their separate income.

In order to completely equalize the tax burden between community-property and common-law States it is also necessary to amend the estate and gift-tax provisions. In 1942 an attempt was made to equalize tax burdens under the estate and gift taxes. Unfortunately, however, these amendments rather than equalizing the burden resulted in discrimination against community-property States. Therefore, your committee's bill provides for the repeal of these amendments.

Repeal of the 1942 amendments alone, however, is not sufficient. Estate- and gift-tax splitting is also necessary in much the same fashion as H. R. 4790 provides under the income tax. Your committee intends to offer a floor amendment to accomplish this. The amendment provides that if one-half of the estate of a husband is left to the wife, this portion of the estate will not be included in the estate-tax base of the husband. Under the gift tax, one-half of all gifts made by married couples are considered to be made by the wife and one-half by the husband. This provision will aid community-property States as well as common-law States, since separate property in these States will benefit from this splitting provision.

I believe the summary of the provisions of H. R. 4790 which I have just presented, show that this is the right kind of tax reduction. I also believe that this is the right time for a tax reduction. The reduction will leave an adequate surplus for debt retirement, can be made without increasing inflationary pressures, and is necessary to offset the present shortage of risk capital.

EFFECT OF H. R. 4790 ON EXPENDITURES

The charge has been made that if we pass H. R. 4790 we shall have a deficit in the fiscal year 1949. Nothing can be further from the actual facts. The estimates made by the administration on which this deficit is forecast seriously misrepresent the fiscal picture for 1949.

Revenue forecasts of the President have been based on an estimate considerably below the current level, despite the fact that the administration says it fears the continuation of inflationary pressures. Expenditure estimates have been based upon the assumption that Congress will not be able to make any reduction whatsoever in the President's budget.

Your committee has attempted to use only the most conservative assumptions regarding both the income level and the reduction in expenditures which Congress will make. On this basis the minimum surplus forecast for the fiscal year 1948, after making provision for the tax reduction provided in your committee's bill, is $2,500,000,000. This is based upon the very conservative assumption that Congress will reduce the President's expenditure budget by only $2,000,000,000. For every $1,000,000,000 of additional reduction in expenditures which it is possible to make, the surplus available for debt reduction will be increased by a like amount.

In this connection it is worth noting that a surplus of $2,500,000,000 is larger than that which the administration itself would provide in the fiscal year 1949 under its own calculations. The President reported that the surplus in the fiscal year 1949 would be $4,800,000,000. However, the Secretary of the Treasury indicated that the President's tax proposal would reduce this surplus in the fiscal year 1948 to $2,400,000,000, or a surplus of $100,000,000 less than your committee provides after the tax reduction under its minimum assumptions as to expenditure cuts and the income level.

In concluding my remarks on receipts and expenditures I should like to point out that with the tax reduction proposed, of $7,100,000,000 it still will be possible to reduce the debt by at least $10,000,000,000 in the two fiscal years 1948 and 1949.

TAX REDUCTION AND INFLATION

Critics of your committee's bill have contended that it was inflationary. The President's proposal presumably was not, because it provided for an increase in the taxations levied on corporations. Incidentally, the minority evidently thinks so little of the President's tax proposal that not even a reference to it can be found in the minority report.

Anyone who assumes that the President's proposal will not reduce taxes in the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 is laboring under a misapprehension. The Secretary of the Treasury admitted in the hearings before your committee that the President's proposal would reduce receipts in the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 by $3,000,000,000. This results from the fact that much of the President's proposed excess-profits-tax collections will not affect receipts until the fiscal years 1950 or even 1951—a period when deflationary pressures might well not be desirable.

Your committee makes no attempt to hide the fact that its bill provides a tax reduction in the fiscal years 1948 and 1949. However, it is my opinion that Congress will reduce the President's expenditure proposals to offset much, if not all, of the reduction in taxes proposed by your committee. To the extent that this is true, the tax reduction provided by H. R. 4790 will result in no increase whatsoever in inflationary pressures.

The real effect of the President's budget upon consumer and business demand is shown by the amount of the cash taken from the public through taxation and the cash restored to them through expenditures. The President's Economic Report indicates that on this basis there was a cash surplus in the calendar year

1947 of $5,600,000,000, and it is estimated that in the calendar year 1948 there will be a cash surplus of $8,800,000,000. After your committee's tax reduction is made and even if expenditures are decreased by no more than $2,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year, the cash surplus in 1948 will be substantially higher than it was in 1947. This indicates that the Federal Budget in 1948 will be less inflationary than it was in 1947. Moreover, this is based on very conservative estimates of receipts and expenditures.

I have already pointed out that H. R. 4790 will be a stimulus to increased production. This means that H. R. 4790, rather than increasing inflationary pressures, actually will reduce them.

It seems safe to me to conclude from this that the decreases in expenditures which Congress will make plus the stimulus to production resulting from the tax reduction proposed will decrease rather than increase inflationary pressures in the near future.

I have given some study to the question of venture capital. This subject of venture capital has been discussed in the magazines recently and in the leading financial newspapers. It is a subject that we must not lose sight of if we are going to increase the pay rolls of this country, if we are going to increase new property to tax by stimulating new industries, which is of great importance to our veterans and others who want to go into business for themselves.

Here is a survey, The Market for Risk Capital, that is edited by Jules I. Bogen. There are comments about it by Mr. Hazlitt, of New York, a great student of finance, a publisher, and editor. Here is a very startling statement:

Available statistics show that American industry requires huge amounts of new capital to maintain and expand its capacity and to increase its efficiency. The Department of Commerce has estimated that "gross capital formation" amounted to $17,600,000,000 in 1929 and to $19,000,000,000 in 1941. Even in the depression year—1932—private gross capital formation aggregated $2,200,000,000.

Production of consumer goods and services—at least for several years to come—is generally expected to be at a rate 50 percent or more over the prewar level. An expansion of the output of goods and services of such magnitude cannot be attained without huge capital outlays exceeding any prewar level. A study by the Twentieth Century Fund estimates that aggregate investment of new capital in commerce and industry, transportation, urban development, and rural development may exceed $280,000,000,000 over the next 15 years, exceeding $18,000,000,000 annually.

Then I want to read a survey. Any person can make the same kind of a survey in his own community.

The Chamber of Commerce of Gastonia, N. C., and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States recently cooperated in a case study of the "investment per job." This is something to which the businessmen of this country ought to give some attention. The survey revealed an average investment in fixed and working capital per worker in Gastonia manufacturing industries of $8,000 in food processing, $3,941 in apparel and finished products, $3,850 in beverage bottling, and $2,179 in textile mills. In distribution and service industries, the investment per job varied from $45,762 for cotton merchants, $9,000 in warehouses, $8,385 in furniture, and $7,200 in automobile repair to $2,357 in barber shops and $1,567 in cleaning shops.

I happen to know of a case at home where, if a company can get the capital which they need, they will have to invest $133,000 per job for 300 well-paid workers, and you can go through the country and multiply that many times. That is what has built up this country. This bill, I will admit, does not go as far in the matter of tax reduction as I would like to go in those brackets from which venture capital comes. It just cannot come from below, where there is not enough take-home pay to permit savings to be made.

Some day labor is going to realize this fact and they are going to urge a tax bill that will supply venture capital to give them jobs. That is the one thing that will prevent unemployment.

THE SCARCITY OF VENTURE CAPITAL

This production is also necessary for the welfare of our economy in the long run. One phase of this problem has particular significance—namely, the availability of risk capital. Your committee, recognizing the importance of this risk capital, asked the Secretary of Commerce to testify on this subject. The Secretary took the position that ample funds were available to meet business needs. However, he spoke only of the over-all needs for business funds and did not mention the need for venture capital, the true source of increased production. In spite of this, his testimony gave abundant evidence of the shortage of these risk-taking funds. Let me give you a few examples:

First. Retained corporate profits in 1947 represented an unusually large proportion of total business investment. This heavy dependence on retained profits indicates the difficulty corporations have been having in floating new security issues.

Second. Of the new security issues actually issued in 1947, an unusually large proportion took the form of bonds or notes. An unusually small percentage represented new issues of common stocks. This heavy reliance on debt financing and reduced emphasis on common stocks also reflects the difficulty of obtaining risk capital.

Third. Life-insurance companies and banks which cannot afford to invest their funds in risk-taking ventures represented the chief source of funds for the new securities issued in both 1946 and 1947.

Fourth. New securities issued by manufacturing and similar concerns dropped in 1947, while the safer issues of utilities increased substantially.

If any further evidence is needed of the scarcity of venture capital, attention need only be turned to the unprecedented existence of a sluggish stock market in an inflationary period.

The present high steeply progressive tax rates must be substantially reduced if we are to obtain the necessary funds for the expansion of business enterprise. H. R. 4790 takes the first step in this direction. It should be emphasized that this is proposed not for the benefit of the well to do, but is necessary for the entire American economy. Consumers cannot have more goods and services if they are not produced. Moreover, sufficient jobs will not be available in the long run if business enterprise is not expanded.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed with my prepared statement, I would like to comment very briefly and make some observations on what has transpired heretofore. My good friend from Minnesota so frequently refers to Canada, which he cites as an example of a good tax system. Of course, the situation in Canada is vastly different from that of the United States. Prices are pretty well under control in Canada. I do not have the schedules of food prices here with me, but one of these days I intend to answer his list of facts and tables as regards taxes which was inserted in the RECORD at one time in order to show the relatively low food prices prevailing there. The Canadian Government has held inflation in check.

Mr. Chairman, at this juncture I want to state that Canada not only has excused one-half of the total income taxpayers in that country, but also pays those who are not on the income-tax rolls a child bonus, the amount of which I do not recall at the moment, but I believe it amounts to something like $160. That is a significant fact. This is $160 a year bonus for each child of a family up to 16 years of age. The gentleman from Minnesota failed to disclose that fact in his discourse about the taxpayers in Canada.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON All I did was to read this article from the Winnipeg Free Press. I had no further information.

Mr. DINGELL. I grant the gentleman that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was not trying to cover up anything.

Mr. DINGELL. I grant the gentleman that. I would not imply even remotely that the gentleman was trying to conceal anything. I merely state that it is a significant fact that Canada also goes a long way in the direction of helping the people in the lower brackets by paying them a child bonus which in America we do not do and we seem to find fault with the President's proposal of a $40 cost of living credit.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Would not the very fact that the Government can afford to pay $165 to a family with children seem to prove that their tax system with its reductions must be a good system?

Mr. DINGELL. I concede it is a good system. What I am trying to defend here is the President's position of trying to give a cost-of-living credit of $40, which, to a family of five, means a total

of $200 per annum. That seems to have stuck in the craw of some people.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Can the gentleman reconcile the two points made by our friends on the other side? They seem to gloat in the fact that in Canada less than 50 percent pay taxes, yet they have been howling and howling that we should maintain a very wide tax base so that everybody in this country will be tax conscious. I cannot see how the two points are consistent.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman has taken the words out of my mouth. I have a little scratch memorandum here which indicates that under my proposal, which I introduced on behalf of the President, the total number to be taken off the tax rolls would have been about 10,300,000, and under the Knutson proposal—which, by the way, contains two important items of Democratic origin, increasing exemptions and income splitting between husband and wife, which we proposed in the consideration of H. R. 1 and H. R. 3950, both of which were killed by veto and sustained by the House or the Senate—the Knutson bill excludes 6,300,000 income taxpayers. So, the President's proposal is more liberal by 4,000,000. When the gentleman from Minnesota cites that in Canada about half of the people are exempt from income tax under that same argument he ought to go along with the President's proposal. But, his views are that it is all right in Canada and that it is all wrong in this country. He stood on this floor time and again in favor of making people tax conscious, and derided and opposed the views of the Democrats in striking from the tax rolls those who needed tax relief most.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one or two other comments and to say, in congratulating my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], that I doubt whether anybody will ever be able to answer the factual data which he presented. They were cold, merciless, implacable figures that were presented to the House, and I do not care what your arithmetic is, or how you manipulate figures, you cannot get away from the fact that five principal irreducible items constitute 79 to 80 percent of the budget. When the time comes to make savings, remember you are going to have to make them very largely out of the 21 percent which covers expenditures for dams, roads, for trails and forests, for drainage and flood control, and all of the other things which are so essential throughout the great West and the South. Now, after some of you men went home to your districts after the last attempt to cut the heart out of the irrigation and reclamation projects, you came back, and as I recall, there was a clamor for the reinstitution of some of the cuts that had previously been made. And if I am correct in my assumption, I believe that more money was appropriated than the President originally asked for.

As was stated by my good friend from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was conveniently here to answer questions about the amount of cuts that could properly be made. I believe he stuttered some when he approached the $3,000,000,000 figure, and as I recall he limited his commitment here on the floor to about $2,000,000,000.

Let me read to you what he said, according to the Times-Herald, on Monday, January 26:

> The Congressman continued—

So says the paper, referring to Mr. TABER's ideas about budget cuts—

> Three billion is not enough. I won't be satisfied with four billions. I'm sure we can cut five billions. I think we can cut six billions from the budget. We might even be able to cut seven billions. That, however, depends on a number of things that we'll have to look into.

Evidently at that point, before he reached the ten- or twenty-billion-dollar figure, the distinguished chairman of the committee was awakened. Today he speaks of a possible two or three billion dollars.

Reverting to the remarks of my good friend from Minnesota, the distinguished chairman of our committee, in which he makes reference to the bill H. R. 4790 and how much it means toward the relief of the small taxpayer, I believe that a person with two dependents under his bill, with an annual wage of $2,400, would have an increase in take-home pay of $35. A man with a $2,600 income would have $67. In the $3,000 classification the take-home pay increase would amount to $94. A small taxpayer with a $3,500 income would enjoy an increase of $119 in his annual take-home pay.

After all of these calculations, if you will take the President's proposal you will find without any strained calculation whatsoever that the President's proposal for a married person with two dependents amounts to a $160 increase in take-home pay.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the President's tax proposal is so meritorious, why is it not mentioned in the minority report?

Mr. DINGELL. The minority report deals with the bill, and my friend should know that. I do not think he would willingly want to mislead anybody, because I think he knows that the report deals with the bill which was reported by the committee and not with the bill that did not get the approval of the committee.

Now we are going into why the President's bill was not adopted. The first reason is that there are 15 Republicans and 10 Democrats on the committee. The second reason is that some Democrats disagreed, like the gentleman from Minnesota, with the idea of $40. But if the $40 is reduced to its proper basis of calculation, it is the equivalent of about a $200 additional exemption, which is twice as much or a little more than the exemptions in the bill introduced by the gentleman who is now making the inquiry.

Further, some of the gentlemen on the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, do not like the idea of an excess-profits tax. That is their lookout, and that is something they are going to have to answer for by themselves. But I will say this to my friend, that I think there are a lot of good Republicans on this floor that like this idea of a limited reimposition of excess-profits taxes in order to skim off the unconscionable profits that are salted away in the coffers of some of our corporations.

Mr. KNUTSON. It would look to me as though common decency would have dictated that at least a paragraph should be devoted to the President's tax plan. I really feel hurt to think that my Commander in Chief was so ignobly ignored.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is dripping with tears. I can see his ducts now.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know about that.

Mr. DINGELL. His ducts are turned inside out, or are those your tonsils that I see?

Mr. KNUTSON. I regret to see that the gentleman's own party is running out on his Commander in Chief.

Mr. DINGELL. Let us get away from the crocodile tears so that I can proceed with my statement. Maybe I can make myself clear.

Mr. Chairman, I joined in the unanimous report of all the Democratic members of the committee in protest against enactment of H. R. 4790, the dishonest, iniquitous Knutson bill. Although H. R. 4790 should not be enacted for the reasons fully expressed in our minority report, I believe that the excessively high cost of living makes mandatory an immediate adjustment of the tax burden of the lowest-income people. As the President said in his message to Congress on the State of the Union:

> Certain adjustments should be made within our existing tax structure that will not affect total receipts, yet will adjust the tax burden so that those least able to pay will have their burden lessened by the transfer of a portion of it to those best able to pay.

President Truman's tax program, which I have had the honor to introduce in the House as H. R. 4968, provides a cost-of-living credit of $40 per person—$160 reduction in taxes for the average American family of four. Unlike the Knutson 10–20–30 tax-cut plan, it gives an honest across-the-board tax cut of the same dollar amount to all taxpayers. Just because a person is in a higher-income bracket should not give him a higher priority for tax relief than his neighbor at the bottom of the scale, who is scraping to pay the butcher, the baker, and the landlord.

My bill would drop 10,300,000 taxpayers with lowest incomes from the income-tax rolls. Ninety-three percent of the total tax relief would go to taxpayers with net incomes under $5,000.

The $40 cost-of-living credit is roughly the equivalent of a $200 increase in personal exemptions for taxpayers earning $5,000 or below. Since the President proposes a tax adjustment on the basis of need and not a tax-reduction program, the taxpayers above $5,000

receive $200,000,000 reduction in taxes, in contrast with the $2,100,000,000—10 times as much as they would receive in added take-home pay under the Knutson bill. No wonder the spokesmen for Wall Street cry "demagogery." Their investment in the Republican Eightieth Congress is in issue.

No sooner had the President delivered his message on the state of the Union, than the gentleman from Minnesota, Chairman KNUTSON, issued a statement to the press complaining because the $40 credit "is the most extreme of the available devices for concentrating relief in the lowest income brackets. It is more extreme in this sense than an exemption increase would be."

Mr. KNUTSON. Can the gentleman give me the source of that quotation?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; that appeared in the public press.

Mr. KNUTSON. It appeared in the public press?

Mr. DINGELL. That appeared in the public press.

Mr. KNUTSON. The chairman has no recollection of ever having made that statement.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sorry for that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman tell us in just what paper that was supposed to have been printed?

Mr. DINGELL. I will give that to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not want it in secret, but I would like to have it read in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL. I will give it to the gentleman for the RECORD. I told the gentleman I will present it to him and I will do that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not want it in secret, but put it in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL. Very well.

Yet this same Republican tax authority—Chairman KNUTSON—now has the audacity to claim that his bill, and not the President's program, really has at heart the interests of the vast majority of working people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 15 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. The undeniable truth is that my bill, H. R. 4968, provides greater relief to the average American family of four earning up to $4,300, and it does this without booty for the favored few.

The President is concerned with the low-income groups who are suffering most under the dangerous pressures of inflation. These people are paying taxes at the expense of their health and that of their dependents.

From June 1946 to November 1947, consumer food prices rose 39 percent; all consumer prices rose 24 percent. The consumers' price index has risen about 66 percent above the 1939 level. Meanwhile, personal exemptions under the individual income tax law have been reduced from $1,000 for a single person and $2,500 for a married couple to a $500 per capita level. If the equivalent of the 1939 income-tax exemption for a family of four were to be allowed, it would have to be almost $5,500 exemption under the prices prevailing today.

We cannot raise the exemption to this level in view of the pressing needs for tax revenues to meet essential budgetary requirements. We should, however, concentrate the maximum possible tax relief in the low-income areas under present conditions. This is accomplished most directly by the $40 per capita cost-of-living credit in H. R. 4968.

The majority still are trying to sell their original across-the-board tax plan pledged in the 1946 campaign. They have been forced to make vital modifications in their 20 percent across-the-board promise. The result, however, still is a discriminatory patchwork of political expediency. For example, a family of four with a net income of $100,000 receives a tax decrease of $18,076 under H. R. 4790, or 180 times the $99 tax reduction for the $2,800 family. H. R. 4968, on the other hand, is an honest across-the-board tax reduction—it gives the same amount of tax relief at every income level.

As the President said in his message to Congress on the State of the Union:

> During this period in which the high cost of living is bearing down on so many of our families, tax adjustment should be made to ease their burden. The low-income group particularly is being pressed very hard. To this group a tax adjustment would result in a saving that could be used to buy the necessities of life.

As emphasized by the President, Secretary of the Treasury, and the eminent elder statesman, Mr. Bernard Baruch, however, Government revenues must be maintained at substantially present levels. The gross public debt is still at the enormously high level of $257,000,000,000, and we have just begun making real reductions of this debt from surplus tax revenues. The maintenance of Government receipts at or near present levels would enable us to provide for adequate debt retirement and, moreover, it would maintain a wholesome pressure against inflation. The moderate excess-profits tax incorporated in H. R. 4968 is the most equitable and effective method of doing this.

The proposed reimposition of an excess-profits tax would be applicable to only 22,000 of the highest profit-making corporations. Smaller corporations would be exempt by a specific exemption covering the first $50,000 of excess profits.

Corporations whose earnings are not excessive would pay no excess-profits tax, inasmuch as the standard for the wartime credits under either the average-earnings or invested-capital methods would be increased by 35 percent. Furthermore, the rate of the excess-profits tax would be reduced from 85.5 percent—the 1945 rate—to 75 percent. Corporations which would be subject to this tax are the ones with the largest profits and the greatest capacity to pay. These modifications in the wartime excess-profits tax would be equitable because they would exempt completely the hundreds of thousands of corporations with moderate profits and would present few of the difficult problems of administration and compliance encountered under the wartime tax.

If, during the war, when the excess-profits tax was considered an integral part of the anti-inflation, antiprofiteering programs, why should it not be used now? Corporation profits after taxes for 1947 were at an annual rate of $17,000,000,000, or more than 67 percent above the peak profit level of the war year 1943. Profiteering in peace can be as dangerous to the economy as is profiteering in war. The Nation needs protection now from profiteering just as it did during the war.

H. R. 4790 threatens deficit spending in fiscal year 1949 and provides the greatest tax reduction to those who need it the least. Its predominant character is the presentation of tax windfalls to the wealthy. In contrast, H. R. 4968 combines the recommendations of the President for a cost-of-living credit to those whose need is greatest and maintains the strength of our revenue system in order to permit effective use of fiscal measures in the fight against inflation. H. R. 4968 would make it possible for the Committee on Ways and Means to continue its systematic study of the most pressing needs for reform, while H. R. 4790 precludes a safe, sane, and sensible approach toward revision of the wartime tax structure into a sound, permanent peacetime tax system.

In conclusion, the President's program grants tax relief to those who need it the most. It is a realistic recognition of what Republican NAM high prices have done to the lowest income groups. It also recognizes the responsibility of certain corporations for charging the highest possible prices out of which greater excessive profits are now being made than during the peak war years. It would discourage these corporations from charging all that the traffic will bear.

It grants the same tax relief to everybody without jeopardizing the financial soundness, or the international responsibilities, of the Nation.

Now I will be glad to yield to my friend the gentleman from Minnesota if he wants to present any questions.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am glad to see that the gentleman has come over to our side. I recall that a year ago when we first proposed an across-the-board cut in taxes the gentleman and a few of his associates who are on the more liberal side raised their hands to high heaven that we were giving the same reduction to John D. Rockefeller that we gave to the shoemaker or the ditch digger.

Mr. DINGELL. No, no; let me correct the gentleman. He is making a speech instead of asking a queston.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and I shall confront the gentleman with his remarks tomorrow. Now, the gentleman wants to give John D. Rockefeller a $40 reduction.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. KNUTSON. And also John Smith.

Mr. DINGELL. We are willing to give John D. Rockefeller a $40 reduction and we are willing to give the same amount to Pete Klutch on the lowest rung of the

ladder. But the gentleman's idea about an across-the-board reduction in taxes goes something like this, and it is in the bill only in worse form now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, here is what happens on this across-the-board proposition. H. R. 1 and H. R. 3790 are now resting in peace, vetoed, the vetoes sustained by the House or the Senate. Those bills proposed a cut that worked out something like this: The little fellow in the lowermost brackets got 54 cents a week.

Mr. KNUTSON. How much did he pay in taxes?

Mr. DINGELL. That does not make any difference. Suppose he paid $50, and let us say he got a cut of $25. That only amounted to 50 cents a week. Now, the gentleman's bills proposed a 10½ percent cut in the upper brackets. He did not dare go above that percentage, because the rich would have been paying less under his proposal than they paid before the war in 1939. So you made it as high as you could without reducing them below what they were paying before the war. Here is the way it would work out: The 10½ percent would have amounted to over $100,000 for the big fellow, or $2,000 a week. That was our objection to the across-the-board cut. It amounted to 50 cents a week for the little fellow, and it was $2,000 a week for the big fellow. That was our objection. We were willing to go across the board; we are willing to go across the board now at $40 for each taxpayer, for his dependent wife, and for his hungry dependent children. That is the kind of an across-the-board I can go for. I am willing to give the man in the upper brackets a cut, too, as I said on this floor, on the basis of take it off as we put it on, but not to cut 10 percent for a man who pays on a million-dollar income. You are going to give him $100,000 in this bill. When we add the advantage of the split income it will be even higher than it was in H. R. 1 or H. R. 3790. It is even worse, it smells worse, than the two previous bills which were massacred by the President and buried by the House or Senate. That is what will happen to this bill. I wager that this bill will never see the light of day. It cannot, because in the first place the Republican-controlled Senate will not permit it. So it will not be a Knutson bill. At least, he will not recognize it when it comes out of conference.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. What effect will this Knutson bill have on contributions to the Republican National Committee?

Mr. DINGELL. I have an idea it might play a very, very encouraging part. As a matter of fact, that is where most of the cut will go—that is, the attractive cuts.

Mr. Chairman, let me say one thing more about incentive investments. Here is an ad taken from the Washington Post of Wednesday, the 28th:

> Bendix Corp. advertises 399,990 shares of common stock, par value $5 a share, price $28 a share.

That is nearly six times the par value. Why does not the corporation venture some of its surplus into this expansion? From what we hear on this floor all of these profits go into the corporation coffers, then they are plowed back into the business. Yes; they are plowed back into the business if there is no risk involved. If there is any risk involved, they advertise it, and the public is expected to take the risk. The risk capital will come only from those to whom we can give a tax reduction in the lower brackets. Then they will go out and buy stock in all corporations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the zeal for tax equalization as displayed by the gentleman who has just taken his seat reminds me of the liberal butcher who believed in giving the horns and the hoofs to the poor.

I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no Member of this body but who wants tax reduction. There are a number who question the manner of giving the tax reduction, and there are others who question the wisdom of tax reduction at this time. I would like, first of all, to speak with respect to those who question the wisdom of tax reduction at the moment and to give one of the principal reasons why we on this side of the House believe that this bill is proper and that the economy of our country will this year allow the tax-reduction bill we have brought in.

I am informed that in the past 20 years when the Treasury Department came before the Committee on Ways and Means with its estimate of receipts for the ensuing year that they were wrong 17 times out of 20; that is to say, they have underestimated the receipts when the amounts were actually collected. In 1944, when the original estimates for that year were made, they amounted to $33,000,000,000, and when the collections were made they totaled $44,000,000,000. In 1945 the estimates were $40,000,000,000 and the collections were $46,000,000,000. In 1946 the estimates were $41,000,000,000 and the collections were $43,000,000,000. In 1947 the estimates were $31,000,000,000—now mark this, gentlemen—and the collections were $43,000,000,000. In 1948, the year in which we are now operating, the original estimates made by the Treasury Department were $38,860,000,000. The date of that estimate compares with the date of the estimate which is applicable to the tax reduction bill we are now considering. That estimate was $38,860,000,000 and the estimated receipts for the current year are $45,210,000,000. Thus each of you will see that the Committee on Ways and Means is justified in questioning the accuracy of those figures presented by the Treasury Department in its presentation of estimates for each year, for in those five instances they have been wrong 100 percent of the time, not wrong by a few hundred million, but wrong by billions of dollars.

Anyone with a reasonable approach to this taxing problem, anyone who seriously is determined to give the taxpayers some relief, will certainly justify the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means when we assume in the face of present-day facts and figures that the estimate of income for 1949 fiscal year will exceed the actual personal income for the year 1948. Indeed, since Mr. Snyder appeared before our committee and stated he was basing his estimates upon the figure of $200,000,000,000, the Department of Commerce has advised the Congress that at the moment it seems as though our estimates for personal income in 1949 will be $205,000,000,000. Our committee, under the expert guidance of our joint committee staff, headed by Mr. Stam, have adopted as our basis a most reasonable amount of but $209,000,000,000. Based on that $209,000,000,000 we recommend and present to the Congress a tax-reduction bill, a bill I emphasize, that provides tax relief. Unlike the bill my distinguished colleague who just preceded me described in detail, which he further described as President Truman's bill, our bill is a tax-reduction bill. It does not promise tax reduction and conceal a new tax on the same persons promised relief. They this year with one hand promise tax relief and with the other hand impose another tax. That is exactly what President Truman has proposed.

If it were possible to give tax relief to one group and collect the taxes from another group there might perchance be some justification for such a proposal. I hope to demonstrate that the proposal submitted by President Truman—and incidentally that proposal must be your recommittal plan, unless you are willing to disregard the President—but promises relief and then at the same moment reimposes another tax. Under his proposal a credit of $40 is to be provided to each income taxpayer for himself, and an additional $40 for each of his dependents, making a total amount of $3,200,000,000, which when divided by $40 indicates that some 80,000,000 people are to receive that $40 credit for themselves or for their dependents. The $3,200,000,000 is not to represent a tax reduction; it is to represent a transfer of tax. Consequently, a brand new tax is being imposed, a tax of $3,200,000,000. Thus the minority group change their position from that of 2 years ago, when they were the party in the majority, which lifted the particular tax now again recommended.

They propose to collect this $3,200,000,000 by levying an excess-profits tax, a tax which it is stated will apply to only some 22,000 corporations in the country. These 22,000 corporations are the corporations which, according to the formula stated in that bill, are described as earning too large profits. Assuming that condition does exist, then those 22,000 corporations are under the type of management which will take all the

money the traffic will bear. Consequently, they will be the very corporations to add that $3,200,000,000 to their selling price. Once they add that $3,200,000,000 to their selling price, every consumer in this country will pay that tax.

Who are those consumers? Why of course they are the 80,000,000 who are getting back $40 apiece. In addition to this 80,000,000, there are 65,000,000 people in this country who are too poor to pay any kind of income tax. They will not get the $40. They have had living costs increase on their shoulders day after day just as much as have the people who can pay income tax. They are consumers, and they will be forced to pay part of this $3,200,000,000 which is being levied against corporations. Everyone in this Chamber knows that the only source of money that a corporation has to pay taxes is from the consumer of its products. In a seller's market the new tax is certain to be passed on. So I repeat, all we are doing in this proposal of President Truman's is to promise tax reduction to needy people, to those people for whom the cost of living presents the real problem of the day and then on the other hand levy a new tax applying to those very people. It is entirely wrong in principle. I cannot conceive that the great Democratic Party would present such a proposal as its position when the time comes, to recommit the bill which the Republican Party is here presenting. Rather I would think the gentlemen of that party would choose to follow the man who is known as your great tax authority, the former chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. DOUGHTON] who without ever having told me so, has by his past record in this body given every indication that he could not accept the proposal of the President. I would suggest that he is the man who knows that what the people want today is a real tax reduction within the limits that he in his conscience believes the country can afford.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Did the gentleman hear the radio broadcast the other day when that same question was asked and Mr. Leon Keyserling of the President's Economic Committee answered that the reason higher taxes would not be levied was that the President had recommended price controls and that price controls would stop the corporations from putting the prices up.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is correct. Further, this Congress a month or more ago passed a bill asking for voluntary agreements on the part of industry in order to maintain the price levels. Now I understand the President himself proposes that a new tax be levied against industry. Certainly every industrialist in this country and every man who provides jobs for others must be worried lest this Congress determines upon imposing new taxes upon all business. How is it possible to hold prices on a level basis when we impose new taxes? How can business cooperate through voluntary agreements under such uncertainties?

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, any corporation is allowed a profit, first of 135 percent of what they made in the period from 1936 to 1939, and also about $50,000 additional exemption. Anything they make over that, if the Government took 75 percent of that in taxation, do you think that we are not taking away their incentive to increase their prices when the Government would take 75 percent of that money in taxation? If that be not true, why is it that the corporations are the ones who are fighting against this excessive profits tax, and that the people of the lower income groups and workingmen are for it? It seems strange to me that if the corporations are not affected by the excess-profits tax and that they can simply pass the additional tax on to the consumer, they would not be concerned at all over it. They certainly are concerned about it. Therefore, I think the gentleman's premise is entirely wrong.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I did not say that they are not affected by a tax. I say they are affected. They are affected by having to increase their prices and once having increased their prices, sales resistance increases and these hard-headed businessmen can see that with increased prices, they are going to have less production rather than more production without which we can never lick the inflation problem.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. RICH. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] speaks about corporations making great profits, does he not realize that corporations are not just a few individuals, but there are millions of stockholders in this country; that they comprise millions and millions of workers in this country who get their livelihood from the corporations. Suppose the big corporations were wrecked, what would happen to the millions of workers and stockholders?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am sure the gentleman does know that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman said if this excess profits tax was enacted, it would increase the consumers' sales resistance. If we increase sales resistance, will that not tend to hold the inflationary pressures? The more sales resistance you have, the more tendency there is to retard inflation.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I would point out to the gentleman the President's plan is recognition of the fact that our income taxpayers do not have enough money with which to live. That is why he has this cost-of-living plan. He wants to get $40 into the hands of each one of them. Consequently, I do not think the gentleman is right in his point.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield for an observation so that I may correct the RECORD?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. If it is not too long.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Minnesota questioned the reference made to a quotation which I gave. I hope I will not have to reread it into the RECORD, but it comes from a press release which is headed, "For immediate release by Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, January 7."

I am informed the gentleman had prereleases of the President's speech. I do not know. Does the gentleman confess that he never heard of it? If he does, it may have emanated from the Republican National Committee and not from his office, but, at any rate, it is labeled with the gentleman's name appearing.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman's name appears there, he assumes full responsibility for it.

Mr. DINGELL. I thought he would.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in summing up, I simply want to repeat my support of this legislation and my belief that the economy of the country can this year properly withstand this proposed tax-reduction bill. I believe it will be of great advantage to every individual taxpayer. It will benefit those who do not earn enough money in order to be liable to pay taxes, by providing them with better earning opportunities through greater efficiency and modern improvements in industry, with increased production, so necessary to defeat inflation.

The Republican bill will give relief to the taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. We do not seem to have anyone else to speak just now.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the people of this country and the Congress want tax reduction. I think the bill that is presented here is about the kind of bill that the Ways and Means Committee has figured out would be the right thing for the people, if it were enacted into law. It gives the lowest taxpayer the most, 30-percent deduction; then the medium taxpayer gets 20-percent deduction, and the large taxpayer only gets 10-percent deduction. Everybody gets $100 deduction.

I have been wondering very very much ever since this session of Congress convened what we could do and what we would do if we did the thing that was right. We would have no difficulty whatever enacting this bill into law if the Chief Executive of the United States and the Congress decided they were going to economize in the operation of government. To be wise we must economize.

The people of the country want tax reduction more and more, but even so the people of this country want less and less spending. If we have less spending, we will not have any trouble keeping

within the budget after this tax reduction, and we could give the people a lot more reduction and pay billions on our debt. It is just because of inefficiency in the President and Congress during the last 15 years that this extravagant spending has been possible.

The thing that burns me up is the fact that the Chief Executive of this Nation comes here and addresses us on the State of the Union, and all we hear throughout that long, long speech is spending and more spending, greater opportunity for building bigger and better bureaucracies and governmental institutions than we now have for spending, but he did not say anything on the subject of how we could stop spending. What a pyramid we would have if we enacted into law all the things he asked for in the state-of-the-Union address. He wanted socialized medicine, which right away would add another eight or nine hundred million dollars to the cost of government annually. Then he wants Government aid to education to the extent of between half a billion and a billion a year. He would have every school teacher in the United States in politics, and then would we not have a fine situation in our educational system with all the school teachers in the country in politics. I am for education, and I believe that every State in the Union ought to make every effort possible to give a good education to the boys and girls of the country; but, for goodness' sake, keep politics out.

Then the President asked for universal military training. I grant that it may be necessary to have a somewhat larger Military Establishment than we used to think was necessary, but by no means do we need as many more men in the Army as would be brought in by universal military training. What we need today is not mass induction of men into the military system, but the proper number of men scientifically trained. We have the atom bomb, we have the airplane, we have the technical skills and experience gained in the last war. These show us that we do not need 15,000,000 men. UMT is going to cost inside of 3 years $3,000,000,000 annually. What a large expense to be absorbed by taxation.

The President asked for all these additional things, but he did not say a word about cutting down expenses in his own department of Government. Now he says he is going to scatter around $40 bills. Of all the proposals ever made for a tax-reduction bill that is about the silliest thing I ever heard of in all my life.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman want to answer my statement that it is a silly thing?

Mr. DINGELL. Yes.

Mr. RICH. All right. It is about the silliest proposal I ever heard of. If the gentleman will not take all my time and wants to answer that one proposition, then I will yield to him.

Mr. DINGELL. I have not said a word about it yet.

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The proposal under the gentleman's bill would give about $20 to the little fellow. Measured by that standard, I suppose the President's proposal of $40 could be called, in the gentleman's words, twice as silly as his own proposal.

Mr. RICH. We want to give relief all the way down the line from the top to the bottom. We propose a 30-percent decrease in taxes to the low-income brackets, besides giving them $100 more exemption. Suppose we reduced the cost of Government 30 percent. If that were done, the rates in this bill could be increased by 40 or 50 percent. The gentleman and his associates who say they are opposed to this 30, 20, and 10 proposition would be just as opposed to the proposition submitted by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who would have Congress reduce the taxes by 15, 10, and 5, because the same argument applies equally to each. Are you also going to be against the inclusion of community-property rights under which a husband and wife can share the salary of the husband or the combined salaries of both, and thus reduce their taxation? There are 12 States now enjoying this privilege, and all should have it. Is the gentleman going to object to making that uniform in all the States, putting the people of all the States on a comparable basis with those of the 12 that now enjoy community-property rights in the matter of taxation?

This waste and extravagance in government that are the cause and necessity for these high taxes just burn me up. The gentleman says the President would not have a bill like this. I say go ahead and pass it—pass it quickly—and let us see what he does. If he does not stop spending but keeps on taxing, the people will rebel, and rightfully so.

Then we have the President's proposal of the Marshall plan—aid for the rest of the world. I think it is about time we think of America. We went abroad to lick Germany and Japan. We had allies who we fought with and for during the war. Today it seems we are at loggerheads with some and financing the others, and, in fact, trying to run their countries—telling them what kind of government they shall have; also, our war enemies, under the Marshall plan, are to get $6,000,000,000—Germany, Italy, and Austria. We gave them much already. Where are you going to get all this money? Why, the American taxpayers must foot the bill or our country goes broke. With a $257,000,000,000 debt, how much more can we stand? I want to help the starving and needy, but the Marshall plan goes way beyond that. It just goes too far for me and my people. I am not here to wreck the people who elected me to serve them; I am more considerate and grateful to them. The propaganda for the plan is great. Who furnishes that money? They pay it over to our propagandists, but, Mr. Taxpayer, it is your money in the end.

We gave them sixty-eight billions since lend-lease—a law I am glad I did not vote for. We gave those countries twenty-two billions since the war. What an amount to give away. We gave Britain $4,400,000,000 to put them on their feet—same as the Marshall plan proposes. We did so in 1945; it was to last 5 years; it is all gone now, and they want $5,348,000,000. Under the Marshall plan, that makes, to Britain, $9,748,000,000. What for? To buy their coal mines, railroads, utilities—with your money—socializing Britain. It is a sin and a shame to do such a thing. Britain and other countries pay their monarchs fabulous sums for being their rulers. You pay the bill. You tax your people to do it. Wake up, America, before it is too late.

The Marshall plan gives three and one-half billions to Holland, Denmark, and Ireland. Ireland was not in the war. Why? Why pay them? Portugal was not in the war. Why help them to the tune of $150,000,000 with your taxpayers' money? Sweden and Switzerland were not in the war. Why give them millions? I ask, Why all this gratuity? You say communism. Oh, bosh! You cannot buy people to stop communism; you must educate them. I say to you: Get a new President; then a new State Department; then less spending; then less taxes; then lower prices; then more happiness and a safer America. Waste, inefficiency, Communist trickery would drain America. Let us feed the starving, help rebuild Europe, without inviting economic collapse here. Save America or we bust.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, taxes today are higher than ever before in the peacetime history of our country. Do you know that for every dollar you earn, you pay out 31 cents for taxes? Do you know that the average American citizen spends almost 4 months out of every year working to support his Federal, State, and local governments. The American people are entitled to intelligent tax relief now.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight brings a grim reminder of a certain significant centennial. One hundred years ago Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels announced a program for the destruction of the capitalistic system. One of the key planks advocated by them was a heavy and steeply graduated income tax. As the first of the original planners, they knew full well that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." Their present-day Communist followers are making every effort to destroy our American system of free initiative and enterprise.

As a people, we have not always been quick to learn from the experience of history, even though we may have seen certain of these events take place before our own eyes. Let me give you a brief example.

First—and I must add in direct contrast to the traditional American system—the British industrialists have long tended to draw down their profits without plowing back any substantial part of these profits in order to provide for the expansion and modernization of their business plants.

In addition to this lack of private foresight, the British Government adopted a confiscatory income-tax policy following World War I. This policy drained off the most important reservoirs of

wealth—reservoirs which might have furnished the new capital for their much-needed industrial improvement and expansion.

Having thus killed the goose that laid the golden egg, the Government of Britain was forced to turn to the American Government—which means the American taxpayer—for help in reestablishing her industries.

We cannot, we must not, make that same mistake. If this same trend in this same direction is not reversed—and reversed immediately—here in America, we will find ourselves likewise in need of help. And to whom shall we turn for aid?

We must benefit by our century of experience with the fabulously successful American way of creating wealth, based as it is on the cornerstone of venture capital for an ever-expanding production.

The whole matter of tax relief has been drawn into the arena of partisan politics by the approach of the 1948 election. I think you will agree with me that political arenas are not always the healthiest of places for a fair consideration of tax proposals.

I have definite responsibilities in this matter. I must do all within my power to bring tax relief to those in need—to bring tax relief to those in the low-income groups who are fighting such a desperate battle against inflation—to bring tax relief to those whose advancing age makes further full-time work impossible.

I also have a responsibility to the person who is willing to invest his own money in creating new jobs and new goods for others. Every new job created by private industry in the Second Congressional District of Connecticut requires that someone invest a sum of approximately $6,000 in order that a worker by holding the job thus created may support his own family.

With these responsibilities firmly in mind, I shall vote in favor of the Republican tax-relief program.

Our goal must be to preserve the American system. Once that goal is seen, we must adhere to the maintenance and functioning of those principles which will guide us in the formation and administration of a sound fiscal policy. Political freedom and economic freedom go hand in hand. We cannot have one without the other.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOEVEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income tax payments, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MASSMAN CONTRUCTION CO.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 2192, an act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENNINGS, REEVES, and CRAVENS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. THOMPSON (at the request of Mr. HAYS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address entitled "Rose Ellen Speaks for Democracy."

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 179.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 5 (b) (3) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "February 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1."

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar in order on Monday next be transferred to Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MACKINNON, for Friday, January 30, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE FUEL-OIL SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope to make clear in what I shall say the proposals I have introduced today, but before proceeding to discuss them briefly I want to read at this point the headlines in the Boston Post of Wednesday, January 28, generally regarded as the great Democratic newspaper of New England:

Free heavy oil for 17 hospitals. One hundred thousand barrels also go to schools and to other buildings.

The list of hospitals includes such well-known New England and Boston hospitals as Boston City, Boston Children's, Carney, Beth Israel, Massachusetts Memorial, New England Baptist, New England Deaconess, and Framingham Union.

The schools are located in Malden, Newton, Braintree, and Wellesley. Some of the laundries are located in Brockton, Lynn, Somerville, Quincy, and Salem. The list also includes a public utility plant in Boston and other plants in Lowell, Lawrence, and Weymouth.

I also want to read a brief editorial from that edition of that paper. It bears upon the problem which concerns so many of us in New England. The editorial is entitled "Petroleum Products":

It seems strange that exports of petroleum products should continue in the face of existing shortages to the extent that the House Interstate Commerce Committee should deem it necessary to ask Congress to put an immediate ban on all such exports.

The committee decided on this course of action after a study of the petroleum situation and the ban on exports was suggested "until it can be determined whether further exports are damaging to the economy of this country."

There have been statements from several authoritative sources that oil shortages are likely to continue for a while, and in some instances the predictions have been that this shortage may last for several years. Consumers, therefore, may well ask why action was not taken when the indicated shortage first became known.

Mr. Speaker, just before I came to the floor a colleague from the Detroit area of Michigan informed me that not only are 200,000 people in that State out of work today but, apparently upon latest reports, there is every indication that they will remain out of work for a long time, until we meet this crisis which faces us.

Earlier today I reported that I had requested the office of the Legislative Counsel to prepare two joint resolutions which I proposed to introduce as soon as they were ready.

I stated that in my later remarks I would include a statement I made to Hon. William C. Foster, Under Secretary of Commerce, who testified during the day Monday with reference to the Department's announced export program of petroleum and petroleum products for the first quarter of 1948.

Because I inserted the Department of Commerce press release of January 16 as to the details of the allocations to

countries and types of petroleum products, I shall not repeat it here. You will find it at page 329 of the RECORD, January 19.

My full statement to Mr. Foster is as follows:

I want to read to you from your testimony in July, and I have reference particularly to the question the chairman asked about the wisdom of an embargo by Mr. SADOWSKI and others of us who have had to seriously consider it in terms of our own critical domestic situation.

I have in mind your insistence throughout the day on the possible results and the hardship to the other nations which you said would be extreme. I think that I quote you accurately on that point. It strikes me that it was an important point.

I have in mind your statement that even as of this date, you do not believe that there can be any essential change made in your quota program for the first quarter of this year.

I assume that it might be possible to recoup some of the reserves set up there in the press release. I do not know what they are for, but perhaps we could get some heating and industrial oil from that source.

But upon the assumption that you do not see any constructive method of having a single gallon of this oil going to other countries diverted to domestic use, although you are willing to have the review committee examine it thoroughly, I do want to reemphasize Mr. HALE'S questions and your answers as far back as last July, and I think it was on July 7.

Mr. HALE said, "I was struck by this paragraph on page 3 of your statement that the concern over the domestic supply does not lead us to the belief that exports of petroleum and petroleum products should be prohibited or drastically curtailed. To do this should upset the world system of distribution and make petroleum a source of international friction."

Mr. HALE said, "There must certainly be some limitations on that, Mr. Foster."

You replied, "Yes, that is right."

Mr. HALE then said, "There must be some point where you would be opposed to any export at all." You said, "Yes, but we do not feel, so far, that that point has yet been reached where we should completely prohibit. We think we might, as a matter of fact, lose more than we gained at the present, now that conditions may change in the next 60 to 90 or 120 days."

This afternoon is more than 6 months from the time you made that statement.

You continued:

"We are currently studying the problem, and as we obtain from countries to whom we are exporting their figures on requirements and their figures on urgency and we relate those to our own domestic needs, that statement may have to be changed. However, as of today we do not feel it would be wise to prohibit or even drastically curtail those shipments."

It is true, of course, that those shipments were not curtailed during the ensuing months, and it is true also that this committee made a very vigorous recommendation on December 19 which I know reached your attention, or at least reached the attention of the Department. If the assumptions you have made today, on the basis of which you have given us certain other information, are correct, and I submit to you, Mr. Foster, that many of your answers have been based on assumptions which are not provable by any information we have, or you have, or anyone has in this country, then I think it will be proven beyond any doubt that in terms of licenses and in terms of military requirements as against the first quarter of 1947, something like 29,595,000 barrels of petroleum and petroleum products were shipped to other countries. It will also become clear that under the announced program this year 29,885,000 barrels will go to other countries.

In other words, it seems to me that it is a very unfortunate situation, one that should be corrected, and if there is any recapture possible, you should not lose 24 hours in setting the machinery in motion.

Now, because of our deep interest in this, which must be evident to you, and has been evident all through the year, I cannot let this day pass without stating with all possible emphasis to you officially as a representative of the Secretary of the Department which has the full power to take the action which some of us think is necessary if we are going to solve this problem, that it is the only method possible of immediately helping these people who need your assistance. I call your attention again to the paragraph in the full statement submitted by the chairman on behalf of the committee yesterday, and I call your attention to the fact that it is printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages 545 and 546. I want to read that paragraph:

"The committee does not believe that we are forced to accept the panaceas which so far have been offered to us by Government and by industry—namely, the cheerful acceptance by the consuming public of the inevitability of these tight situations. The leaving to industry to work out without governmental interference this problem which for some time now they have assured us would not arise, and the solution to which they so manifestly so far have seemed unable to reach. Our question goes to the superficial remedy suggested of allocating or rationing"—I refer to your frequent references to Mr. Krug's testimony—"available supplies without maximum effort to effectuate a real cure through bringing supplies and demand in line."

I do not believe that it has been demonstrated to any member of this committee today that we do not have enough fuel oil in this country to take care of these shortages at once if you use the ingenuity I know exists in the Department.

I am sorry that you stress so repeatedly that you do not find it possible to act because it is only permissive. So frequently departments tell us that they do not want us to tie their hands; that they want some flexibility.

You must have anticipated this when you were before us in July. Certainly you know it has been increasing all through the fall.

I can assure you it is desperate in certain areas in our districts. Speaking personally, I want you to know that if you cannot give us a more specific assurance of prompt, vigorous, and effectual action through your review committee and under the laws the Congress has passed, I shall be compelled to introduce a bill somewhat along the line that the chairman has suggested, and to urge its immediate adoption. I feel rather confident that the people and the Members of Congress who represent these people to whom we have a moral responsibility are going to give a great deal of attention to it. I hope that you will not force us to that point. But surely if the Department cannot devise the means of helping us you are laying it right in our laps. We must recognize the heavy responsibility we have toward those now in need of assistance now—not next month or next year.

I appreciate your consideration of the possible hardships in other countries. I have expressed myself more emphatically, perhaps, than I need to, because I realize that you are an honorable American, deeply interested in what is going on here in this country; but you do not have to listen to and read about, day in and day out, as we do, some pretty tragic stories in our districts.

You do not have to hear of industries being shut down, the possibility of schools being shut down. You do not have to read telegrams from the heads of hospitals, begging us to do all we can individually so that they do not have to limit their services. You do not have to read accounts in the newspapers of people standing in line for a gallon of kerosene.

I do, and the rest of the Members of Congress do. Unless you can come up within a very short time—and I do not mean within a matter of a week; I mean within a matter of hours—unless you can come up with something better than has been suggested today, I repeat I shall feel compelled to introduce a bill of some nature, such as the chairman suggested, not necessarily along the lines of the Senate bill, but which will indicate with a great deal of definiteness that Congress insists the American people have a standing in this world, too.

Mr. FOSTER. May I speak very briefly to Congressman HESELTON'S statement?

I do think it was a question.

Mr. HESELTON. It was an emphatic warning.

Mr. FOSTER. Briefly, I have exactly the same concern you do. The reason I have taken here the attitude that I have is that I am still fearful that the action contemplated is that proposed legislation will lead rather to more trouble than a solution of the problem.

I can assure you that with the powers we now have, we are taking steps, and we have taken steps to the effect of cutting down the amount that is going out. I am still unconvinced that an embargo is the method to use to accomplish the results that both you and I are interested in obtaining.

I am interested in giving you the benefit of what I hope is the experience we have had in this, and I hope the decision you ultimately reach will be a wise decision.

Mr. HESELTON. If I did not share your same concern as to the possible effect, I would have introduced such a bill a long time ago, because of the situation that confronts us. But now I think it is about time that I should weigh the known effect on the people in New England and New Jersey and other areas of this country against the possible effect on the people in some of these other countries.

I am sure that you will agree with me that there is no campaign on throughout Canada to our knowledge, asking individual householders to reduce their heating. I am sure that you will agree that it cannot be true in South Africa, and in Central American countries, and in New Zealand, and in Australia.

In other words, unless you can give a better explanation than you have been able to give today, speaking individually, unfortunately the lack of the explanation is going to force me to take this action. I shall do so with a great deal of reluctance recognizing the possibility of its creating difficulties in the administration of disclosed and, perhaps, undisclosed foreign policies.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry that I have not been competent to answer those questions. I again commend to you the question of whether the solution you propose is adequate to meet the conditions you have outlined. There is where I think you and I differ in the conclusions.

May I just comment on the last statement concerning Canada. They cut off the installation of oil burners last May by action of the Canadian Government so that there is an attempt to meet this in Canada, at least, and there is a definite attempt to cut down that consumption.

Mr. HESELTON. That is encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, the resolutions were given to me by the legislative counsel during midafternoon and I have introduced them.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the first of these resolutions may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The resolution is as follows:)

Resolution to place temporary restrictions on the exportation of certain petroleum products

Whereas there are current and anticipated shortages in the United States of petroleum products essential to satisfy fuel needs; and

Whereas while such shortages continue the health, safety, and welfare of the American people are threatened; and industry is severely handicapped in the effort to attain production of commodities necessary (1) to the economic welfare of the United States, and (2) to insure the success of such program as may be adopted for aiding in the economic recovery of Europe; and

Whereas this critical situation requires the temporary exercise of emergency powers for the purpose of relieving such shortages: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That during the period of 60 days beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and notwithstanding commitments heretofore made, it shall be unlawful to export kerosene, gas oil, distillate fuel oil, or residual fuel oil from the United States to any foreign country, except that—

(1) exports of any such product necessary for use by the armed forces of the United States may be made.

(2) there may be exported to any foreign country during such 60-day period an amount of any such product not in excess of 50 percent of the amount thereof allocated to such country under the quota allotments made by the Secretary of Commerce for the first quarter of 1948; and

(3) this joint resolution shall not require reduction of exports so as to reduce the imports into the Dominion of Canada from the United States below amounts conforming with the voluntary import-reduction program heretofore undertaken by Canadian authorities and Canadian industry.

SEC. 2. Whoever violates the provisions of section 1 of this joint resolution shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 3. As used in this joint resolution the term "United States" includes the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have been reading a little about this subject of oil and about this matter of our not exporting oil. We are now importing oil. If we stop exporting oil, will it not cut down on some of these very necessary imports of oil which we must have?

Mr. HESELTON. May I say to the gentlewoman that I have heard that argument repeatedly before our committee in the hearings in July and the hearings in December and in our current hearings. I think it probably would have that effect if we enacted legislation calling for a complete embargo. I hope to address myself to that very point in terms of what I believe to be a constructive suggestion to help our people in New England, New York, Ohio, and Illinois, and Michigan, because they have been suffering and if the people in authority in the executive department are correct, they will continue to suffer until we provide some means to help them. If I may proceed I will try to answer the gentlewoman further.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HESELTON. The second resolution reads as follows:

Resolution to place temporary restrictions on the exportation of certain petroleum products

Whereas there are current and anticipated shortages in the United States of petroleum products essential to satisfy fuel needs; and

Whereas, while such shortages continue, the health, safety, and welfare of the American people are threatened; and industry is severely handicapped in the effort to attain production of commodities necessary (1) to the economic welfare of the United States, and (2) to insure the success of such program as may be adopted for aiding in the economic recovery of Europe; and

Whereas this critical situation requires the temporary exercise of emergency powers for the purpose of relieving such shortages: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That during the period of 60 days beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and notwithstanding commitments heretofore made, it shall be unlawful to export kerosene, gas oil, distillate fuel oil, or residual fuel oil from the United States to any foreign country, except that—

(1) exports of any such product necessary for use by the armed forces of the United States may be made;

(2) in the case of any foreign country which regularly imported any such product from the United States during the period from 1935 to 1940, both inclusive, exports thereto of such product may be made during such 60-day period in an amount not in excess of one-twelfth of the average annual amount thereof exported to such country from the United States during such period from 1935 to 1940;

(3) this joint resolution shall not require reduction of exports so as to reduce the imports into the Dominion of Canada from the United States below amounts conforming with the voluntary import-reduction program heretofore undertaken by Canadian authorities and Canadian industry.

SEC. 2. Whoever violates the provisions of section 1 of this joint resolution shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 3. As used in this joint resolution, the term "United States" includes the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that subsection (3) of section 1, of each resolution exempts any reduction of exports into the Dominion of Canada from this country below amounts conforming with the voluntary import reduction program heretofore undertaken by the Canadian authorities and Canadian industry.

I have a number of reasons for suggesting that exemption. For your reference, may I say that I quoted the press release from the Department of Commerce issued on January 2 as to this voluntary reduction. Again, you will find it at page 329 of the RECORD, January 19.

Substantially, it is an agreement to reduce on the part of industry in Canada its imports of finished kerosene, stove oil, furnace oil, and Diesel oil from this country to 50 percent or less of the monthly average of imports in the first quarter of 1947. While the announcement made it clear that the current program would merely run through the month of January, I have been reliably informed that the Canadian industry is now in session in an effort to continue, and perhaps even lessen, their requests for these types of oils during February and March.

Therefore, it is my contention that if our neighbors in Canada, where conditions, so far as temperature and snow are concerned, are at least comparable, if not more severe, than prevailing conditions in New England and the northern part of the United States, can join hands with us to help relieve the desperate situation in this country, there is every reason to believe that the other friendly countries to which we propose to export substantial quantities of needed fuels would do as much, had they been requested. Since the Department of Commerce has, at various times, indicated a doubt as to what this Congress intended in legislation to which I shall refer later, and since during the testimony Monday it was stated repeatedly that the legislation was construed to give only a "permissive" authority to the Department, I submit that no time should be lost in declaring at least an emphatic statement of congressional intention in terms of existing conditions.

I must add that I do have some reservation as to whether more cannot be accomplished through negotiations between our officials and our industry and the Canadian officials and their industry. Evidence developed before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in December 1947 indicated an increase over 1946–47 of exports of oil to Canada of approximately 385 percent. It is further my understanding from the testimony before the committee last Monday that the oil shipped through the Portland (Maine)-Montreal pipe line is not included in our export data; that it is considered in transit from South America to Canada. I know it is the intention of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to obtain much more information as to the facts, but I do feel that we would be fully justified in exempting exports to the Dominion of Canada from any such resolution in view of their friendly initiative and efforts to assist us.

Next, I want to call your attention to the fact that this first resolution is keyed to the Canadian effort and is restricted to a period of 60 days. It is intended to tie the legislation directly into the quota program so that there can be no misunderstanding.

Finally, you will find in each of the resolutions that exports necessary for use by the armed forces of the United States may be made.

There still remains a great deal of doubt about the facts justifying the apparent allotment of 2,025,000 barrels of this particular fuel for Japan and the Ryukyus. The justification should be carefully examined.

Next, turning to the second resolution, a different approach is taken, but basically it rests upon the assertion frequently made that we have been historically the suppliers to many of our neighboring countries and that if we were to place even a limitation on the amounts of fuel oil shipped to them it would create a very delicate and dangerous situation. I understand such proposals have been characterized as silly.

In reply to that, it seems to me self-evident that these very countries are most anxious that the United States should remain at its full productive capacity and that they would gladly join with us, as Canada has, in trying to bring that about. The news today of the shut-down in the Detroit area simply points up similar desperate conditions in other localities which have not received wide notice. I do not know what the loss of production over the entire country in January has been, but I submit that any loss is unfortunate in this sense.

Moreover, I do not believe our friends in these other countries want to see the working men and women of America injured in terms of loss of work and wages. I think it is silly in the extreme to argue that the people of these countries would not be willing to share any shortages with us, and work out on a cooperative basis a program such as is suggested in these resolutions.

To go back to the second resolution, there are two methods of approach. I have suggested that wherever any foreign country on this allocation program actually imported any of these products from the United States in the period between 1935 and 1940, both inclusive, then the same rule should apply—50 percent reduction in the allocations for 60 days—in other words, one-twelfth of the average monthly amount exported to those countries during that period.

However, you will note that the resolution as phrased would have the effect of completely prohibiting any exports of these desperately needed fuels to any country which, in fact, cannot demonstrate that we were historically a supplier in this period. In other words, it would result in an embargo, so far as new postwar customers are concerned.

Let me add that it is my understanding that up to a few weeks ago, the only screening undertaken by our Government was by approving requests of "end users" relayed to us by the representatives of the sovereign governments involved. Reference has been made during testimony that the "end users" submitted their requirements and that it was presumed that their governments had checked against the necessity of these requirements. That may be so, but I rather suspect that the gentlewoman from Ohio, having sat, as she has now for several days, on the proposed European aid program, will agree with me that the history of the written requirements submitted by the sixteen nations was indicative of the desire to get more than perhaps was necessary and that they would accept a substantial reduction upon the suggestion from American officials.

I have no pride of authorship of these resolutions. As a matter of fact many of my colleagues, who feel as I do, joined with me and have made very constructive suggestions. I think the resolutions probably can be improved. I shall be glad to accept any suggestions from anybody; but I do submit that the time has come, the time is now, when, if we are going to be as productive as we must be, if we are going to carry out the promises we say we should undertake, we must turn our eyes and our attention to the only great source outside of Canada in this world today for the things the people in the other democratic nations say they need. I have to discharge my responsibility to the people of my district. I hope those of you who represent people in other districts who are old, who are sick, who are young, who are suffering, who are out of work will look into this matter carefully.

It is my intention tonight to propose further references to significant testimony presented to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last July, last December, to the Committee resolution of December 19, and to evidence during the current hearings. If you do not have a copy of the Preliminary Report of the Committee, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed January 26, I suggest you will find it a most helpful document. It is Report No. 1270, Eightieth Congress, second session.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SPECULATION BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have been shocked by the recent revelations concerning the scope of speculation in commodities by employees in the Federal Government. We have been shocked, not because these employees have engaged in illegal activities in any form under our present statutes and not because we feel that speculation in the commodity markets is evil, per se, but because of the flagrant disregard of an ethical code which most of us had taken for granted.

We contend, and I believe I speak for the vast majority of the Members of this body, that everyone shall have the opportunity in this country to make a profit so long as he is willing to compete within the law on an equal basis with everyone else. What shocks us is that persons who are in a position to obtain information because of their Federal jobs which is not freely available to everyone else have seen fit to violate an unwritten law which says that personal profit, or the speculation for personal profit, shall be denied to anyone who might possibly have such information because of his acceptance of Federal responsibility.

It boils down, then, not to the question of whether or not such individuals actually made a profit, nor to a question as to whether they actually sought information which might help them make a profit, but to the basic question, "Did these individuals, while holding Federal jobs, enter the commodity markets for the purpose of making money?" If they did, they stand convicted of a strange sense of personal ethics, of breaking, to our shock and sorrow, a well-understood but unwritten law, and of lowering the faith of our citizenry in the Government which these individuals have sworn to support.

I need not discuss here today the strange sense of ethics which permits Edwin Pauley to display extensive charts showing his huge and detailed speculative activities during years when he held responsible, top-ranking, Presidential appointments. A recent editorial in the Washington Post states very well the incongruity of the position of Pauley and other inside speculators who attempt to defend or dismiss lightly their speculations. I quote from the editorial:

> There are three arguments against speculation by Government employees so obvious that they ought to be comprehensible even to so stubborn a mind as Ed Pauley's: (1) A man engaged in speculation is not a man devoting his whole time and attention to his job; (2) a man engaged in speculation cannot have that disinterestedness which is indispensable to the proper formulation or discharge of Government policy; (3) a man engaged in speculation cannot enjoy the confidence of his colleagues since they can never be sure that he will not take advantage of some casual remark, some casual revelation about departmental affairs. A man may be completely honorable but he still does not belong in the Government if he speculates any more than an honorable judge belongs on the bench in a case concerning which he might be biased or have an interest.

Let us apply these standards to another Federal employee who recently was revealed by the Secretary of Agriculture as having speculated in grain during the period from January 1, 1946, to December 15, 1947. He is Winthrop G. Brown, at present Chief of the Division of Commercial Policy in the Department of State. According to the Associated Press, Mr. Brown when questioned as to his appearance on the list, protested as follows:

> Winthrop G. Brown told a reporter he made about $2,715 in grain trading from April 1945 to May 1946.
>
> He said he had nothing whatever to do with determining when to buy or sell, leaving this in the hands of an investment counselor in New York.
>
> Brown added that at no time did he have any inside information. Nor did he attempt to advise his counselor in any way.

From the ethical point of view, these protestations fall flat. To my mind, it is of small importance whether Mr. Brown made or lost a small or a huge amount of money in grain speculation; it is of small importance how his speculative accounts were handled whether by himself or by his investment counselor; it is of small importance whether he actually advised his counselor or not.

What is of paramount importance is this: Mr. Brown did speculate. Mr. Brown is a responsible employee of the Federal Government. Mr. Brown, by his action, has seriously impaired the confidence of the people and of this Congress in his moral standards, and has contributed materially to a feeling of no confidence in the Federal Government itself.

Mr. Brown did speculate; he admits that. What is Mr. Brown's record of Federal employment? The Library of Congress has supplied me with this in-

formation concerning his record since 1941:

Winthrop Gilman Brown: Attorney, Lend-Lease Administration, June–November 1941; executive officer, Harriman Mission and Mission for Economic Affairs, London, 1941–45; appointed Chief, Division of Commercial Policy, Department of State (P–8, annual salary, $8,750), July 26, 1945; Chairman, Trade Agreements Committee, 1945—; member, Committee for Reciprocity Information, 1945—.

Mr. Brown did speculate. Mr. Brown has been a Federal employee almost continuously since 1941. Was Mr. Brown ever in a position to obtain information that might contribute to his success in commodity market speculation?

Let us look at the record. His only admitted speculation is between the dates April 1945 and May 1946. If that is his only speculation in commodities, was he ever in a position during that time to obtain inside information, which he claims he did not have at any time?

During that period, Mr. Brown was not only Chief of the Commercial Policy Division, but he was chairman of the Trade Agreements Committee, and a member of the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

According to the Congressional Directory, the Division of Commercial Policy "has responsibility for the formulation, coordination, and maintenance of the international commercial policy of the United States, and action in regard to protection and promotion of American foreign trade—on a basis of private enterprise; elimination of international discriminatory trade practices; and general promotion of multilateral world trade."

Here then is a man who has the responsibility for the formulation of the international commercial policy of the United States who speculated while holding that responsibility and who now claims that at no time, did he have any inside information. If he had no inside information concerning every facet of our domestic economy and of the general world situation, he was remiss in his duties as Chief of his Division. If he did, he either tells an untruth, or he has been misquoted by one of our major news services.

Further than this, however, Mr. Brown was a member, during this time, of the Committee for Reciprocity Information. This committee, formed to carry out section 4 of the Reciprocal Trade Act, receives the views of interested parties in any foreign trade agreement. According to the Congressional Directory, it "may receive information on any phase of the trade-agreements program, whether relating to the operation of an agreement already made or to one under consideration."

Thus, the scope of the work of this committee is almost unlimited and may cover any segment of our industrial or agricultural life. It deals intimately with supply and demand and costs of production. Is it ethical for a man on this committee to speculate in the commodity market for the purpose of making a personal profit?

Further than this, Mr. Brown is chairman of the trade agreements committee. The report of the majority—a Democratic majority—of the Ways and Means Committee on the extension of foreign trade agreements on May 18, 1945, had this to say about the scope of the trade agreements committee's information:

The Department of Commerce's full resources are utilized. * * * The Department of Agriculture, through its representatives on all committees, furnishes full information and advice on all items pertaining to both imports and exports of agricultural products. * * * The Treasury Department supplies information and advice on all items pertaining to its field of interest—

And so forth. As chairman of this committee, Mr. Brown had complete charge of the negotiations at Geneva which resulted in a general lowering of agricultural tariffs, and he is, in fact, the man who signed the final agreements for the United States. These negotiations began in April of 1947. According to Assistant Secretary of State Thorp, the initiative for beginning these negotiations were undertaken by the United States in late 1945. Suffice to say, the chairman of this trade agreements committee would be remiss in his duty if he did not have every scrap of information he could get his hands on concerning supply, demand, and costs of production, both present and future, of every agricultural and industrial product produced in this country. He would be remiss if he did not know what foreign supply and demand was likely to be. But, further than this, he must, by the very nature of his work, have been in a position to judge accurately what the rates of duty on hundreds of agricultural products were going to be after January 1, 1948. If this does not constitute inside information, then I believe Mr. Brown owes us his personal explanation of what constitutes inside information. The fact that the rates of duty on wheat, barley, cereals, butter, and a great many other products were considerably lowered by the trade agreements committee in its negotiations with other powers enters into this discussion only to point up the fact that a wide and definite knowledge of these commodities must have been made available to the chairman of this committee.

One other comment on the inside character of Mr. Brown's information. In order that the Ways and Means Committee could intelligently study the operation of the reciprocal trade agreements, it was necessary for them to pass a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish pertinent information concerning the agreements to the committee. Such information had previously been refused point-blank. The Ways and Means Committee, further, on occasion has asked the Tariff Commission for information about its own work, and it has replied that it was not permitted by the State Department to release such information. Does Mr. Brown refuse to classify this information—to which he must have access by nature of his work—as inside information?

The plain facts of this whole matter are: Mr. Brown did speculate. He speculated while he was a Federal employee. His Federal position gave him access to information which was not only inside, but which has been refused to the Congress of the United States. It is up to the President to judge whether this man has the high moral qualifications necessary for a position of grave importance. It is up to the Congress to determine whether we shall permit, under law, such a lack of moral responsibility in our public servants.

I believe Mr. Brown should either explain himself to the full satisfaction of the American people, or should resign, or should be removed from office.

For what they are worth, I offer the information contained in these remarks to the Select Committee Studying Speculation, and to its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818.

H. R. 3153. An act to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

H. R. 3322. An act to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3326. An act to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 30, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1261. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the Twelfth Semiannual Report of the Administrator of Rent Control, for the period July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1262. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls, that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1263. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report of the Comptroller General of the United States of the work of the General

Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1264. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo Ordnance, near Terre Haute, Ind., to supplement the farm lands required for the United States prison system; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1265. A letter from the President, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering operations of Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1947, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1277. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1278. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Joint Committee on the Observance and Celebration in Cuba of the Fiftieth Anniversary of American and Cuban Victories in the War With Spain. Report pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress without amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1878. A bill to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4427. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 332. A bill for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1733. A bill for the relief of G. C. Hedrick; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1780. A bill for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2136. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2433. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; with amendments (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 5172. A bill to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5173. A bill to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Home Commission Act, designating certain public lands available home lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 5174. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5175. A bill to confirm and ratify Act 205 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, relating to the issuance of public-improvement bonds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 5176. A bill to amend section 603 (a) of title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 5177. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing food, clothing, or medicines mailed to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 5178. A bill to provide for assistance by the Federal Government in the repair of damage caused by erosion by waves and currents to the shores of the county of Chatham, State of Georgia, and in the prevention of future damage to such shores; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 5179. A bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to extend certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5180. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 5181. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange certain property with the city of Kearney, Nebr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5182. A bill to authorize the President to permit nationals of other nations to receive instruction and training in schools, training establishments, ships, units, and other installations maintained or administered by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5183. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury to accept and use gifts, devises, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of the Treasury, respectively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5184. A bill to repeal the provision of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1948, prohibiting free instruction in the public schools of the District of Columbia of pupils residing outside of the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 5185. A bill to amend section 202 (c) (2) of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase children's insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 5186. A bill to adjust the compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5187. A bill to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 5188. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 5189. A bill to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5190. A bill to repeal the provision of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1948, prohibiting free instruction in the public schools of the District of Columbia of pupils residing outside of the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 5191. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant a right-of-way; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 5192. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 5193. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5194. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement, annuities, and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5195. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5196. A bill relating to the disposition of certain surplus property located outside the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 5197. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947, so as to extend the period during which actions or proceedings by the United States or any State or local public agency to recover possession of certain housing accommodations may not be maintained in cases of undue hardship to occupants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 5198. A bill authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of the streams and their larger tributaries flowing through the Brazoria-Galveston soil-conservation district, the Trinity Bay soil-conservation district, the Coastal Plains soil-conservation district, and the Matagorda County soil-conservation district, in Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5199. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5200. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution to temporarily prohibit the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution to place temporary restrictions on the exportation of certain petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. J. Res. 312. Joint resolution to place temporary restrictions on the exportation of certain petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by continuing to maintain an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution to refer the plight of Archbishop Stepinac to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 137. Concurrent resolution to call a conference for the revision and strengthening of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution relative to the expenses of a delegation to attend the ceremonies in Habana, Cuba, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine;* to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses on Monday, April 19, 1948, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution extending the life of the Joint Committee on the Observance and Celebration of the Victory Over Spain; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution to authorize the National Academy of Sciences to report upon developments in the mathematical aspects of the apportionment problem as it affects the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 5201. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 5202. A bill for the relief of B. L. Pond (Ben Luke Pond); his wife, Mrs. B. L. Pond; and his minor son, David Pond; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5203. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Ted G. Miodinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 5204. A bill to authorize cancellation of deportation in the case of Anthony Consola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5205. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ling Shee Tai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5206. A bill for the relief of Dementina Camara, Mary Kapola Kaleikini, and John Kaleikini, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5207. A bill for the relief of James P. Kalogris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Dimple Benoit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 5209. A bill for the relief of Alexander Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 5210. A bill for the relief of the Reese & Argust Wrecking Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 5211. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Abuan Dalao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. R. 5212. A bill for the relief of James Alfred Beckett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1222. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of Staten Island Women's Post, No. 1598, of the American Legion, urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1223. Also, petition of American Legion Auxiliary, Washington Square Unit, No. 1212, New York City, containing the signatures of 26 residents of lower Manhattan, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1224. Also, petition of American Legion Huttner-Pasqualini Post, No. 1367, signed by Robert J. Frey, adjutant, and 98 residents of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1225. By Mr. CROSSER: Petition of Ladislaus L. Szavi and 50 other residents of Cleveland, Ohio, urging universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1226. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of Local 387, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Providence, R. I., urging representatives in Congress of the United States to support all legislation designed to increase the basic salary of postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1227. By Mr. HART: Petition of the New Jersey State Grange, relating to taxation of farmer cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1228. Also, petition of the New Jersey State Grange, urging that, in permitting shipments of farm machinery to other nations, careful consideration be given to the needs of agriculture in this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1229. Also, petition of the committee on social education and action of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in New Jersey, expressing opposition to the establishment of compulsory military training during peacetime; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1230. Also, petition of the board of directors of the New Jersey State Organization for Public Health Nursing, urging that all discriminatory taxes and restrictive legislation as would apply to fortified margarine be abolished; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1231. Also, petition of 24 residents of Jersey City, N. J., urging the establishment of a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1232. By Mr. HESELTON: Petition of 29 residents of Cheshire and Pittsfield, Mass., favoring legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1233. By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania: Petition of Mrs. A. Kollar, Unit 495, American Legion Auxiliary, Shickshinny, bearing signatures of 37 residents of Shickshinny, Pa., urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1234. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition signed by approximately 3,500 residents of the city of Gloversville and Fulton County, N. Y., requesting the Congress and our President to instruct our delegates to the United Nations to secure machinery to enforce world law in order more promptly and effectively to carry out the purposes of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1235. Also, petition of Francis G. Corneau and other residents of Schenectady County, N. Y., in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1236. Also, petition of S. E. Brande, adjutant, and members of Niskayuna Post, No. 1092, American Legion, Schenectady, N. Y., in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1237. Also, petition containing the signatures of 34 citizens of Indian Lake, Hamilton County, N. Y., in the Thirty-first Congressional District, advocating the enactment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1238. Also, petition of Mrs. Eleanor M. Burton, unit legislative chairman, and members of American Legion Auxiliary Post, No. 578, Unadilla, N. Y., in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1239. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 61 residents of East Palestine and vicinity, circulated by George F. McBane Post, No. 31, American Legion, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1240. Also, petition of 13 residents of Powhatan Point, Ohio, circulated by Unit 228, American Legion Auxiliary, of Powhatan Point, for legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1241. By Mr. REGAN: Petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars of Texas, to amend the provisions of the Social Security Act in respect of benefits now denied dependent survivors of members of the armed forces who were insured when they entered the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1242. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Frank Kresen Post, No. 24, of the American Legion, Lake Geneva, Wis., urging legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1243. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. E. Weaver, Ocala, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1244. Also, petition of Peter Turner, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of

their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1245. Also, petition of Wayne B. Albers, West Palm Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1246. Also, petition of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1247. Also, petition of H. A. Harber, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the fourth calendar quarter 1947.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSON REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:

(1) _____

(2) In whose interest he appears or works:

(2) _____

(3) The duration of such employment:

(3) _____

(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:

(4) _____

(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:

(5) _____

(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:

(6) _____

(7) What expenses are to be included:

(7) _____

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____

Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:

(1) _____

(2) To whom paid:

(2) _____

(3) For what purposes:

(3) _____

(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:

(4) _____

(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:

(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the fourth calendar quarter 1947, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Babbitt, Elizabeth Clarke (Mrs. George Harris Babbitt), delegate, 1819 Wyoming Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Mrs. B. G. Shay, national president, Service Star Legion, Inc., 361 Indiana Avenue, St. Joseph, Mo., through the secretary. (2) In interest of service men and women and their families, Service Star Legion, Inc. (3) By appointment—usually for 1 year. (4) $25. (5) By the national president (through the secretary). (6) $25. (7) Stationery, books, transportation, postage, typing, etc.

Bargeron, Carlisle, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carrole B. Huntress. (2) National St. Lawrence project conference. (3) Indefinite. (4) For quarter, $2,800 and bonus of $800. (5) National St. Lawrence project conference. (6) Out of pocket. (7) [Blank.]

Bennet, William S., 44 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Forest Lumber Co., 1116 R. A. Long Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Algoma Lumber Co. in liquidation, care of Mr. George R. Birkelund, Baker, Fentress & Co., 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill.; Lamm Lumber Co., care of Mr. Ralph H. Case, Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Same as No. 1. (3) The remainder of Eightieth Congress. (4) For services referred to in Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, not to exceed a contingent 10 percent. (5) Companies named in No. 1. (6) Amounts actually expended. (7) Ordinary expenses such as traveling, meals, hotel rooms, telegrams, telephone, and the like.

Black, Robert I., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. Will advise Washington address as soon as office space obtained. (1) National Association of Magazine Publishers, Inc. (2) He is vice president of the NAMP. The member magazine publisher companies of the NAMP. (3) Permanent. (4) $12,500 per annum. (5) National Association of Magazine Publishers, Inc. (6) This amount can only be determined at the end of each quarter. (7) Necessary day-to-day operating expenses.

Bledsoe, Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,500 monthly. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Hotels, meals, taxis, travel, mimeographing, and distribution costs, entertainment, and miscellaneous.

Blumberg, Samuel, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc. (3) I have been under retainer as general counsel to the above association for many years; the arrangement expires at its annual meeting in January of each year. (4) As general counsel I represent the association in all of its matters and receive a fee of $15,000 per annum, plus expenses. (5) Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc. (6) All expenses. (7) Traveling expenses, long distance calls, and miscellaneous office disbursements.

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Guaranty Trust Co. of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) The trustee named in (1). (3) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal Gift Tax Acts involving gifts in trust, and the effect for gift-tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected. (4) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, which firm may receive compensation for my services from Guaranty Trust Co. as trustee at the customary rates for professional services charged. (5) The trustee named in (1). (6) The firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses incurred by me in connection with the aforesaid amendment. (7) The usual and normal expense items, such as, for example, traveling expenses, telephone and telegraph charges, printing, etc.

Burke, William R., Southern California Committee on Displaced Persons, 215 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) Terminable at will. (4) $460 per month plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) To include such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr.,[1] American Veterans Committee, 1200 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Veterans Committee, Inc. (2) Above organization. (3) At will. (4) $5,600 per annum for performance of all duties as national secretary of organization. Activities under the Lobbying Act constitute no more than 25 percent of these duties. (5) American Veterans Committee,

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

Inc. (6) Variable. (7) Taxis, occasional lunch.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) New York Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, and members thereof, New York, N. Y. (2) New York Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association. (3) Employment is for an indefinite period. (4) Registrant will receive a retaining fee of $2,500. (5) New York Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association. (6) Registrant will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Usual and normal expense items, such as traveling expense, telephone and telegraph charges, taxis, printing, etc.

Cortright, Frank W., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Home Builders. (2) Said association. Registrant has been advised by counsel that he is not subject to the Lobbying Act. This registration is therefore filed under protest and merely as a matter of personal precaution in view of the indefiniteness of said act and the lack of judicial interpretation thereof. It does not in any way constitute an admission by registrant that he is subject to the act. (3) Indefinite. (4) $17,500 a year as salary, plus $7 per diem plus out-of-pocket expenses as indicated below. Said payments are for general services as executive vice president of the association and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered lobbying. (5) National Association of Home Builders. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, telephone, taxicabs, lunches, etc.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Publicker Industries, Inc., 1429 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not fixed; to be determined on the basis of legal services rendered. (5) Publicker Industries, Inc. (6) Not fixed. (7) Normal disbursements only, such as taxis, long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, mimeographing, etc.

Davis & Gilbert, a partnership consisting of A. M. Davis and A. M. Gilbert, 1 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The Best Foods, Inc., 88 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) The Best Foods, Inc. (3) We are not employed specifically for the purposes set forth in the first sentence of section 308 (a), Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. We are paid a yearly retainer for acting as legal counsel for the above-named company, and as such counsel we may, from time to time, be called upon to present the cause of the company in respect to legislation affecting its business. Such activity, if any, would constitute only an incidental and minor part of our duties. (4) Our retainer as legal counsel is $35,000 per year, plus necessary expenses and disbursements. We are not paid specifically for engaging in any activities which might come within the purview of Public Law 601. We have been receiving this retainer in monthly payments for many years and have continued to receive it during the entire period since the effective date of Public Law 601, but to date we have not engaged in any activities encompassed by said law. (5) The Best Foods, Inc. (6) Expenses incurred by the registrant law firm and by any member or associate thereof on behalf of said company. No such expenses have thus far been incurred in connection with activities within the scope of Public Law 601. (7) See (6) above.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) Terminable at will. (4) $1,500 per month plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) To include such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Downs, Thomas J., Commonwealth Building, 1625 K Street NW. (1) Fur industry, through Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers, 393 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Until December 1, 1948. (4) $10,000 per annum as a retainer as Washington counsel on all matters affecting the economic and legal welfare of the industry plus a fee of $15,000 in the event excise tax on furs is cut from 20 percent to 10 percent plus an additional fee of $25,000 in the event the entire excise tax on furs is repealed on or before July 1, 1948. (5) Fur industry, through Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses for railroad fare, travel sustenance, telephone, and telegraph tolls.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Ray W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (2) See No. (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. (5) See No. (1). (6). Not yet determined. (7) Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

Ferguson, John H., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery. (2) In behalf of the committee named above. (3) Up to 6 months. (4) $1,000 a month beginning December 1, 1947. (5) Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Typical expenses, such as travel, meals, telegrams, etc.

Fort, J. Carter (amended registration), 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. This is a supplement to the registration (Form B) filed by registrant on December 18, 1946, for the purpose of bringing up to date the information therein shown. With respect to item (2), rider A, of said registration: The director of the bureau of railway economics is now also a vice president of the Association of American Railroads. The public-relations work of the association has been placed in a separate department, headed by a vice president. An assistant general counsel has been added to the staff of the law department. With respect to item (4) of the registration: The compensation there shown has been increased by $10,000 per year effective January 1, 1948.

Fort, Josiah, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Tobacco Association of United States, Greenville, N. C. (2) American tobacco-exporting trade. (3) Present year's contract expires April 15, 1948. (4) $10,000 per year salary and actual expenses. (5) Tobacco Association of United States. (6) Actual only. (7) Transportation and incidental.

Foster, Charles E., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of service-connected disabled American war veterans and their dependents. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,500 per annum; 10-percent bonus. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Any expense incurred (see No. (7)). (7) Taxis, lunches, and other expenses incidental to work at the Capitol; also actual traveling expense.

Francis, Joseph H., Morgan, Utah. (1) National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (2) National fur farming industry. (3) Employed on a yearly basis from August to August of each year. (4) Annual salary of $12,000. This represents full salary for acting as executive secretary of the organization; attending to legislative matters is only a small percent of the duties. (5) National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (6) Necessary traveling expenses. (7) Travel and lodging.

Gerrity, Harry J., Hill Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Oregon-Washington Bridge Co., Security Building, Olympia, Wash. (2) Same. (3) Remaining session of Eightieth Congress. (4) $2,500; paid January 2, 1948. (5) Oregon-Washington Bridge Co. (6) No specific amount. (7) Expenses customary in legal work, outside of office and overhead expenses.

Glazier, William, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) The membership of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary or personal expenses. Receive $100 a month for office expenses. (5) Office expenses of $100 a month paid by the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards. (6) See 4. (7) See 4.

Graham, Chester A., 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (2) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (3) December 1947 to May 1, 1948. (4) $333 per month, on the basis of $4,000 a year. (5) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. (7) Railroad and other transportation together with lodging and meals when on field trips or committee business, telephone calls, taxis. Field trips are for keeping the Society of Friends and others aware of legislative developments, urging a generous program of aid for world recovery, and defeat of universal military training.

Haas, John A., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Same as original. (2) Same as original. (3) Same as original. (4) $6,500 per year. (5) Same as original. (6) Same as original. (7) Same as original.

Haddon, George A., Police Pension Fund, 420 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association. (2) Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association. (3) Indeterminate. (4) Expenses only. (5) Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association. (6) Approximately $100 per week while in Washington, D. C. (7) Fares, hotels, meals, taxis, etc.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) National Livestock Tax Committee. Employed not for lobbying but for services as tax expert drafting tax legislation and explaining tax problems of livestock industry—appearing before House and Senate committees and Bureau of Internal Revenue. (2) American National Livestock Association, National Woolgrowers' Association, and various State cattle and sheep associations. (3) Indefinite. (4) $50 per day at my office; $100 per day out of town. (5) National Livestock Tax Committee. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Transportation, meals, hotel, telephone, mimeographing, etc.

Hays, William J., 902 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Martin Popper. (2) Aivah Bessie, Herbert Biberman, Lester Cole, Edward Dmytryk, Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Samuel Ornitz, Adrian Scott, Dalton Trumbo. (3) Two weeks. (4) $466.76. (5) Martin Popper. (6) Amount necessary to cover items under (7). (7) Telephone calls, taxicabs fares, and other incidentals.

Hester, Ewart A., 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The law offices of Clinton M. Hester. (2) The law offices of Clinton M. Hester (see attached statement[2]). (3) Annual basis. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) The law offices of Clinton M. Hester. (6) All necessary expenses. (7) Usual expenses—travel, telephone, etc.

Holman, Charles W., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Same as original. (2) Same as original. (3) Same as original.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

(4) $16,500. (5) Same as original. (6) Same as original. (7) Same as original.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Corn Industries Research Foundation. (3) Continuously since May 1936. (4) Compensation for legislative activities not determined. (5) Corn Industries Research Foundation. (6) No specific sum authorized. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred.

Huff, George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc. (2) The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., which committee is composed of and represents businessmen and firms in all lines in Indiana in an effort to further equality of taxation among competing businesses. (3) From November 10, 1947, to indefinite. (4) Expense reimbursement only. (5) The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for all expenses incurred on behalf of committee. (7) Hotels, meals, automobile, and all other living and travel expenses incurred in service on behalf of committee.

Huntress, Carroll B., vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York City. (1) Acting as chairman for National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National St. Lawrence Project Conference, without compensation, but with reimbursement for expenses for travel, hotel, postage, and long distance telephone calls for New York office. (3) Indefinite. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) These are for travel and hotel expenses, postage, and long distance telephone service. See (2).

Hyman, Joseph B., 215 North Pitt Street, Alexandria, Va. (1) Publicker Industries, Inc., 1429 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not fixed; to be determined on the basis of legal services rendered. (5) Publicker Industries, Inc. (6) Not fixed. (7) Normal disbursements only, such as taxis, long distance telephone calls, telegrams, etc.

Irvin,[3] Isaiah Tucker, DeLand, Fla. (Washington address: Raleigh Hotel.) (1) National Conference of Veteran Trainees Person: Fred Owen, Jr., national chairman, 810 West Highland Boulevard, DeLand, Fla. (2) Veterans of World War II generally, more specifically for student and on-the-job trainees who are utilizing the provisions of Public Law 346 or Public 18, commonly known as the GI bill of rights. (3) Until such time as legislation is passed which will give the veteran of World War II all that he is entitled to, not more, but certainly not less. (Specifically: For 6 months from date or more if necessary.) (4) He is to be paid no personal compensation for his services, only expenses which must at all times be reasonable and subject to the approval of the national officers each week. (5) He will be paid expenses from the national treasury, which expense checks shall be signed by the national director of finance and no other. (6) His expenses shall at no time exceed $500 a week. (7) Phone calls, telegrams, radio time, taxi fare, hotel lodging, food, entertainment, and any other reasonable expenditure which is incurred in furthering the movement to obtain what the veteran of World War II so richly deserves.

Johnson, Vernon A., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (2) Lockheed Aircraft Corp. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary at the rate of $10,000 per year until March 31, 1948. Salary at the rate of $11,000 per year beginning April 1, 1948. (5) Lockheed Aircraft Corp. (6) Indefinite amount to cover out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Entertainment, travel, and miscellaneous local expenses.

Judd & Gurfein, 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Metropolitan Motion Picture Theatres Association, Inc., Paramount Building, Times Square, New York, N. Y. (2) Metropolitan Motion Picture Theatres Association, owners and operators of motion picture theaters in metropolitan area of New York State. (3) Year to year employment as general counsel. (4) Annual retainer as general counsel covers services of which those rendered under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress are merely a part. (See separate sheet.)[2] (5) Metropolitan Motion Picture Theatres Association, Inc. (6) Actual out-of-pocket disbursements. (7) Travel expenses and living expenses away from New York City, subscriptions to special periodicals, stenographic overtime, etc.

Kline, Allan B., 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $15,000. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement of actual necessary expenditures approved by officers of American Farm Bureau Federation. (7) None, except as noted under (6).

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado. Address of superintendent: Window Rock, Ariz. (2) In the interest of the Navajo Tribe of Indians, if, as, and when matters pertaining to the tribe come before committees of Congress. (3) Undersigned is employed as chief counsel for the Navajo Tribe of Indians for 10 years, with possible termination in 5 years. (4) $7,500 per annum as compensation for legal services by the undersigned and his associates, S. King Funkhouser and Leland L. Yost. That portion of compensation payable for possible appearances before congressional committees is not separately indicated, but may be said to be a very small portion of the $7,500 retainer which is primarily for legal services in the handling of the many legal problems of the Navajos. (5) From funds in deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians. (6) There is no provision for expenses other than a general limitation that the travel and other expenses of general counsel shall not exceed $2,500. This sum is for expenditures involved in the legal work of the tribe and it is not anticipated that any such expenses will be incurred for possible appearances before congressional committees in connection with tribal business. (7) None, except as indicated in question (6).

Loft, George, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (2) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (3) Three to four months. (4) $333 per month, on the basis of $4,000 per year. (5) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. (7) Railroad and other transportation together with lodging and meals when on field trips or committee business, telephone calls, taxis. Field trips are for keeping the Society of Friends and others aware of legislative developments, urging a generous program of aid for world recovery, and defeat of universal military training.

Lorence,[3] Walter E., 730 Chamber of Commerce Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Chamber of Commerce Building, Cincinnati, Ohio, of which I am the executive vice president, and which has for its purposes those listed on the attached sheet.[2] My activities in connection with legislative matters are only incidental to the principal purposes of my employment. (2) I will appear, when necessary, in the interests of the association for the purposes for which it was formed. (See (1) above.) (3) No definite duration. (4) My salary is $12,000 per year, less withholding and social-security taxes, of which only a small part is for services in connection with legislative matters. (5) The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc. (6) No allowance, actual out-of-pocket expenses in connection with association activities to be reimbursed. (7) Transportation and lodgings when away from home; also taxis, telephone calls, and other proper business expenses.

McDonald, Gairl F., 902 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Martin Popper. (2) Alvah Bessie, Herbert Biberman, Lester Cole, Edward Dmytryk, Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Samuel Ornitz, Adrian Scott, Dalton Trumbo. (3) Two weeks. (4) $70. (5) Martin Popper. (6) Amount necessary to cover items under (7). (7) Telephone calls, taxicab fares, and other incidentals.

McLaughlin, Robert E., Central Building, 805 G. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Storekeeper-Gaugers of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue (legislative work only incidental to employment as legal representative). (3) Renewable annually on November 1. (4) $2,000 per annum. (5) See (1). (6) No provision for expenses. (7) None.

Masaoka, Mrs. Etsu, 501 B Street NE., Washington D. C. (1) Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc. (3) Second Session, Eightieth Congress. (4) $200 per month as full salary, which includes many other duties than those relating only to legislation. (5) Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc. (6) Actual expenses involved in legislative work. (7) Telephones, telegrams, transportation, other actual expenses.

Mathews, J. Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) The Reformed Presbyterian Church, Synod of North America, 309 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., care of J. S. Tibby, stated clerk and treasurer. (2) The Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (3) Until October 1, 1950. (4) A salary of $3,000 per year. (5) The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. (6) Travel, clerical, stationery, and such expenses only as are incurred in actual assignments connected with this work. No definite sum has been fixed. See No. 7 for details. (7) Railway, bus, taxi, or streetcar fares; 5 cents per mile if driving a car; stationery and postage costs, clerical help as needed. Hotel rooms, meals while traveling on this work; telephone or telegram costs incurred while on duty.

Maudlin, C. V., 716 Mills Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (2) Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co. (3) Indefinite. (4) The undersigned registrant has served as industrial representative of the Georgia Power Co. in Washington for the past several years. He is paid a regular monthly retainer, as well as extra compensation for time devoted to matters of particular interest to the company. He is frequently called upon for advice as a consulting engineering and economist and whenever necessary, he acts also as a liaison for the company in dealing with various governmental agencies, including the Rural Electrification Administration, Power Division of the Department of the In-

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Registration with the Clerk only.

terior, Federal Power Commission, etc. During recent years he has assisted in the preparation of data and reports with reference to the lands and interests of the Savannah River Electric Co. at Clark Hill on the Savannah River and there is likelihood that he will be called upon to render assistance in connection with legislation affecting these lands and interests during 1948. (5) Georgia Power Co. and/or Savannah River Electric Co. (6) No amount is specified. Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, transportation, and other out-of-pocket expenses.

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (2) Members of the UAW-CIO, all working men and women, and consumers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $100 per week. Covering duties as a Washington representative for functions which include representation of UAW-CIO and its members before Government agencies, service on special labor committees, distribution of information to our members on Government activities, laws, and regulations, as well as presentation of UAW-CIO views to Members of Congress and congressional committees. (5) UAW-CIO. (6) $9 per day, plus transportation, hotel, etc., expense when traveling, not to exceed $6 per day. (7) Transportation, and hotel, etc., not to exceed $6 per day.

Morris, Curtis, Box 1592, Longview, Tex. (1) East Texas Chamber of Commerce, Longview, Tex. (2) East Texas Chamber of Commerce. (3 January 1930, and indefinitely into the future temporarily assigned to Washington until about July 1, 1948. (4) Last annual salary $8,250. (5) East Texas Chamber of Commerce. (6) Actual expenses while away from home office, Longview, Tex. (7) Transportation, lodging, meals, telephone, and telegraph.

Morrow,[1] Giles, (revised registration), 225 Colorado Building, Fourteenth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (2) The Freight Forwarders Institute and members thereof. (3) January 1, 1940, continuously to present time. Elected annually by board of governors. (4) $10,000 per year. (NOTE.—This is a revised form, intended to reflect change in salary over that reported on Form B executed and filed on January 24, 1947. The explanatory remarks contained in the original form filed by me, as well as the supplemental statement attached thereto, are still applicable and should be considered as incorporated here.) (5) Freight Forwarders Institute. (6) Reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses incurred on the business of the institute, including taxi fare on office business and necessary traveling expenses while out of town on institute business. (7) (Same as answer to (6)).

Munro, Walter J., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland 13, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Annually. (4) $760.39 monthly. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, etc.

Myers, E. Pauline, 3209 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) E. Pauline Myers, Information Associates, 3209 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) I appear and work under my own auspices in the interest of Negro-interest legislation. (3) My employment in this capacity is indefinite. (4) I am paid nothing for my services. I hope to receive voluntary contributions from as many individuals and groups as I can interest in behalf of the specific piece of legislation. (5) I am self-employed. (6) Nothing. (7) [Blank.]

Neal, William S., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Manufacturers. (2) National Association of Manufacturers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $1,000 per month. (5) National Association of Manufacturers. (6) No fixed sum; actual expenses. (7) Taxis, telephone calls, dinners, lunches, transportation, hotel, and similar expenses.

Paul, Randolph (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (2) Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. The fee will be determined on the basis of legal services rendered and time expended. (5) Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Telephone, telegraph, and incidental out-of-pocket expense customarily reimbursed in connection with legal services.

Peebles, Ivey E., 636 Equitable Building, Baltimore, Md. (1) Maryland Public Expenditure Council, Inc., 636 Equitable Building, Baltimore, Md. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) To June 1, 1948. (4) Quarterly pro rata of salary is $1,375. (5) Maryland Public Expenditure Council, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for actual transportation, food, and lodging. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, entertainment, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph, and gratuities.

Peterson, Dutton S., 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (3) Three to four months. (4) $333 per month, on a basis of $4,000 a year. (5) Friends Committee on National Legislation. (6) Refund of actual expenses incurred. (7) Railroad and other transportation together with lodging and meals when on field trips or committee business, telephone calls; taxis. Field trips are for keeping the Society of Friends and others aware of legislative developments, urging a generous program of aid for world recovery and defeat of universal military training.

Plumley, F. D., Rialto Building, State Street, Montpelier, Vt. (1) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite. (4) $650 per month. (5) National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (6) Indeterminate; transportation, taxi, postage, etc. (7) Transportation, taxi, postage, etc.

Popper, Martin, 902 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Robert W. Kenny, 629 South Hill Street, Lost Angeles, Calif. (2) Alvah Bessie, Herbert Biberman, Lester Cole, Edward Dmytryk, Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Samuel Ornitz, Adrien Scott, Dalton Trumbo. (3) Two weeks. (4) $750. (5) Robert W. Kenny. (6) Amount necessary to cover items under (7). (7) Telephone calls, taxicab fares, and other incidentals.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Corn Industries Research Foundation. (3) Continuously since January 1946. (4) Compensation for legislative activities not determined. (5) Corn Industries Research Foundation. (6) No specific sum authorized. (7) Actual expenses necessarily incurred.

Proffitt, George W., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Apartment Owners Association, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Apartment Owners Association. (3) Permanent. (4) $4,800. (5) National Apartment Owners Association. (6) $75 a month. (7) Commuting transportation, Baltimore to Washington, and city transportation.

Ramsey, Donald J., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Silver Users Association, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) Indefinite. (4) $12,000 per annum for all services rendered Silver Users Association, which include duties other than those related to legislation. (5) Same as (1)above. (6) Reimbursed for actual out-of-pocket expenses of character set forth in (7) below. (7) Office expenses, traveling expenses, meals, entertainment, taxis, and other miscellaneous items.

Ray, J. Franklin, Jr., 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, room 4416, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (2) Committee for the Marshall Plan. (3) About 5 months. (4) $800 per month. (5) Committee for the Marshall Plan. (6) Actual business expenses. (7) Travel and miscellaneous.

Rector, Stanley, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (2) The employing person. (3) Year to year. (4) $20,000 per annum plus reimbursement for expenses incurred in connection with employment. (5) By the employing person. (6) Reimbursement for expenses incurred in connection with employment. (7) Expenses incurred for travel and entertainment.

Reidy, William G.,[2] 914 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,500 annually. (5) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (6) Travel and actual living expenses when away from Washington, D. C. (7) Actual living expenses only—maximum $7 per day.

Rice, Robert A., president, Railway Mail Association, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Railway Mail Association, American Federation of Labor Building, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Railway Mail Association. (3) President, elected to serve for a period of 2 years. In the opinion of the registrant, none of his activities fall within the terms of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) Salary of $8,500 per year. (5) Secretary-treasurer, Railway Mail Association. (6) No fixed amount. (7) Traveling, taxi, telephone, and other expenses incidental to the office of president, Railway Mail Association.

Riggs, Frank E., Police Pension Association, City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association. (3) Indefinitely. (4) Expenses only. (5) Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association. (6) Approximately $100 per week while in Washington, D. C. (7) Fares, hotels, taxis, meals, etc.

Russell, Francis M., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Broadcasting Co., Inc. (3) Indefinite period of employment as vice president of National Broadcasting Co., Inc. (4) Registrant's compensation covers all his activities as vice president in charge of Washington office of NBC, including supervision of the company's Washington broadcasting operations. No specific part of such compensation is allocable to legislative matters. (5) National Broadcasting Co., Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred in carrying out duties as officer of the company. (7) Membership dues, travel, entertainment, etc.

Sawyer, Ray, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington,

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

D. C. (2) To promote proper care and assistance for veterans of World War II, consistent with the best interests of the country. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) National headquarters, AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II). (6) See (7). (7) Actual transportation expenses.

Shearon, Marjorie, Ph. D., legislative consultant, the Shearon Medical Legislative Service, 610 Columbian Building, Washington, D. C. (1) I am self-employed as consultant, writer, and lecturer. (2) The people of the United States. (3) I opened my office on July 1, 1947. (4) I have not been paid anything. When and if the number of subscribers to my releases warrants it, I shall take a reasonable salary for my work. Thus far I have given my services in the public interest. (5) I am not paid or to be paid by anyone. I sell subscriptions to an analytical news release, and I also sell my publications dealing with legislation, Government, and State socialism. (6) Nothing for personal expenses. My subscriptions pay for rent, cost of printing, cost of mailing, and secretarial help. (7) None.

Shufelt, Bernard E., legislative chairman and legislative committee, Ward 44, McGuire Veterans' Hospital, Richmond, Va. (1) Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America, 218 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America. (3) From September 27, 1947, until national convention, August 1948. (4) Expenses only. (5) Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America. (6) $500 per annum. (7) Travel, medical attendant, hotel expenses.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Union, United Automobile Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (2) Members of the UAW-CIO, all working men and women. (3) Indefinite. (4) $100 per week. Covering duties as national legislative representative of the UAW-CIO. (5) UAW-CIO. (6) $9 per day, plus transportation, hotel, etc., expenses when traveling, not to exceed $6 per day. (7) Transportation and hotel, etc., not to exceed $6 per day.

Singer, Leon, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., 38 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc. (3) Samuel Blumberg, with whom I am associated in the practice of law as a partner, has been under retainer as general counsel to the above association for many years; the arrangement expires at its annual meeting in January of each year. (4) Samuel Blumberg, as general counsel, represents the association in all of its matters and receives a fee of $15,000 per annum, plus expenses. (5) As an associate of general counsel, I receive a share of the profits of the partnership referred to in item 3 above. (6) All expenses. (7) Traveling expenses, long-distance calls, and miscellaneous office disbursements.

Stack, Thomas George, 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (2) Rank and file of railroad employees. (3) Until injustices caused by the Crosser Act, Public Law 572, are eliminated (4) No salary. (5) National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (6) No fixed amount. All legitimate expenses approved by National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc. (7) Living expenses, legal, travel, and all other expenses incidental to my stay in the National Capital.

Stein, Harold, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (2) Committee for the Marshall Plan. (3) About 6 months. (4) About $10,000 per annum. (5) Committee for the Marshall Plan. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Strackbein, Oscar R., Carpenters Building, Washington, D. C. (1) America's Wage Earners Protective Conference, Carpenters Building., Washington, D. C. (2) National and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. (3) Indefinite. (4) $12,000 per year. (5) America's Wage Earners Protective Conference. (6) No fixed amount. Only legitimate expenses incurred in the rental of office space, secretarial help, traveling, and similar activity will be paid upon itemization. (7) Answered under (6).

Taylor, Hugh W., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky., John W. Jones, president. (2) Burley and dark tobacco producers, dealers, and warehousemen. (3) October 1, 1947, to September 30, 1948. (4) Salary of $10,000 per annum. (5) Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel and incidentals in connection with travel.

Uhl, Raymond, Equitable Building, Baltimore, Md. (1) Maryland Public Expenditure Council, Inc., Equitable Building, Baltimore, Md. (2) Same as (1) above. (3) To June 1, 1948. (4) Quarterly pro rata of salary is $1,375. (5) Maryland Public Expenditure Council, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for actual transportation, food, and lodging. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, entertainment, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph, and gratuities.

Van Nostrand, George C., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Airlines System, including American Airlines, Inc., and American Overseas Airlines, Inc., both of 100 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1437 K Street NW, Washington, D. C. (2) American Airlines System (see (1) above). (3) Indefinite. (4) I am employed permanently as assistant vice president of American Airlines and receive an annual salary of $10,000. Only a portion of my time is devoted to legislative matters, for which I receive no additional compensation. (5) American Airlines, Inc., and American Overseas Airlines, Inc. (6) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Meals, taxi fares, and incidentals.

Van Osdol, Paul, Jr., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Missouri-Kansas Business Men's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (2) Missouri-Kansas Business Men's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (3) Indefinite. (4) Nothing except expenses. (5) Missouri-Kansas Business Men's Association, Inc. (6) No fixed allowance. Only actual expenditures as they are incurred. (7) All actual travel expenses, telephone, telegraph, postage, and special stenographic expenses.

Weitzer, Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, national headquarters, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (2) He appears and works for the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, whose purposes are expressed in the preamble to its constitution, as follows: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead." (3) Employment on a yearly basis. (4) $8,000 per annum. (5) Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. (6) No amount fixed (see (7). (7) Such expenses as are mutually agreed upon as reasonably necessary from time to time in carrying out the work as described in (2) above.

White,[3] John C. (Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White), Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Cotton Shippers Association. (See attached.[2]) (2) American Cotton Shippers Association. (3) Annual. (4) $5,000 per annum unless otherwise agreed for all services. There is no engagement to influence legislation but such action may be the incidental result of other activities. (5) American Cotton Shippers Association. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Traveling expenses, telephone and telegraphic expenses.

Wiley, Mrs. Harvey W., chairman of legislation, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs (not employed for pay—volunteer worker). (2) As chairman of legislation of the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs. This organization supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare of the community. (3) Appointed for 3 years—summer of 1947 to 1950. (4) No salary. (5) No salary. (6) Yearly appropriation of $5 for postage. (7) Postage.

Wood, Lorenzo K., Louisville Trust Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) Burley Leaf Tobacco Dealers Association, Inc., 1113 West Main Street, Louisville, Ky. (2) The growers, cooperatives, warehousemen, dealers, and processors of all types of United States grown tobacco, looking toward export of same. (3) 1 year, plus renewal. (4) $300 salary, $75 per day and expenses while out of home office, Louisville, Ky. (5) Burley Leaf Tobacco Dealers Association, Inc., Louisville, Ky. (6) Actual hotel, transportation, and incidentals while out of Louisville, Ky. (7) See above. No collection of any nature or kind made.

Wormhoudt, Marion P., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Ray W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (2) See No. (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No fee yet determined. (5) See No. (1). (6) Not yet determined. (7) Usual disbursements customary in legal work.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the fourth calendar quarter, 1947, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 718) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Adkerson, J. Carson, National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, International Association of Machinists, District No. 44, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $2,000.06. Legislative expenses during quarter, none. (2) No expenses charged during quarter. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 25 percent of time

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Registration with the Clerk only.

spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received, however, expended approximately $100 per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Nurses' Association, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Fifty cents for postage. (2) Edith M. Beattie, chairman of American Nurses' Association Special Committee on Federal Legislation. (3) See item (1). (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, the membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses, or nursing. Specifically, promotion of legislation to amend the Social Security Act to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to the self-employed, and to employees of nonprofit agencies.

Aring, Hector M., Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947—tax legislation.

Babcock, Charles E., Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $50 per month for out-of-pocket expenditures. No salary whatever. (2) Various—see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations (gasoline, oil, etc.); postage, telephone, telegrams, meals and hotel rooms. (All personal). Transportation to and from Washington. (4) The Junior American. Official organ of the Junior Order United American Mechanics of North America. Address: Philadelphia, as above. (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization matters; free public school measures; and occasionally other legislation that the order believes for the general good of the country.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, October, November, December, $900; travel expenses, $252.20. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) The organization sends a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Baldinger,[4] Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received pay of $120 at $10 per working day and $27.63 expenses. (2) Office supplies, transportation, telephone, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the basic principles of civil liberties and rights, freedom of speech, opinion and religion, and the welfare of racial and other minorities.

Baldinger,[5] Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $173.56 at $15 per working day and $71.73 expenses. (2) Office supplies, transportation, telephone, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the basic principles of civil liberties and rights, freedom of speech, opinion, and religion, and the welfare of racial and other minorities.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month or $6,000 for the quarter. No money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) In support of H. R. 4075 and S. 1584 (last session). No legislation at present nor any contemplated.

Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Retainer from Hershey Corp., $6,750; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $1,292.65. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co., New York Telephone Co., post office, Jelinek Letter Service Co., Henry Wallace-Photograph, Seaboard Railroad, P. & O. Steamship Co., Hollywood Advertising Co., International News Photos, Baldwin & Mermey. (3) Telephone and telegraph service, postage, travel, carfares, messenger service, photographs, mimeographing, miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Bannister, L. Ward, 504 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; California Electric Power Co., Riverside, Calif. (1) Received $1,117.82, whereof $920 for professional services and $197.82 for disbursements. (2) Various. (3) Travel, telephone, telegraph, etc. (4) None. (5) Support bills for development of water resources of river basins in the West by Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers and oppose developments under "Regional authorities" bills, unless they subordinate consumptive uses of water to State law.

Barber, Hartman, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) No expenses incurred. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received, expended $15.12. (2) Telephone companies. (3) Telephone calls. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; the Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $3,375 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $425.18 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, bookstores, and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation, $201.60; hotel and restaurants, $172.98; bookstores and stationers, $2.90; telephone and telegraph, $12.65; gratuities and miscellaneous, $35.05. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Bell, John Dickinson, editor and publisher of Unveiling the Universe, True Order PMA for UTU, P. O. Box 3214, Washington, D. C., and P. O. Box 943, Scranton, Pa. (1) Received: Nothing during quarter, expended $2. (2) Notaries public for notarizing these reports, $2. (3) For notarizing reports to the Congress of the United States. (4) Unveiling the Universe (trade mark registered U. S. Patent Office). (5) To implement the new declaration of independence to have a righteous commonweal: To enact laws which will more effectively control crime and subversives, to have more equitable labor laws which will prevent racketeering, etc.

Bennett, Hugh M., Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $99.18 expended by me and not yet reimbursed for. (2) Various. (3) To attend meeting of the industry tax committee of the Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc. (4) None. (5) Jewelry excise-tax elimination or revision.

Benson, Ernest H., 105 Chaddock Avenue, Hornell, N. Y.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) No legislative work done since July 31, 1947. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Bernard, William S., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Berns, Karl H., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,750, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative service $350 expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 511–516 Commerce Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., none; received for actual expenses, $222.12; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) Northwest Bell Telephone, $48.41; McClain Hedman, $11.81; travel expenses, $44.75; postage, $10.80; A. B. Dick Co., $2.85; Mary Lou Kustelski, $100; M. S. Martin, $3.50. (3) Phone calls, office supplies, travel expenses, postage, typing. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr. (Tyre Taylor), 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,375.03 expenditures for living purposes only except for $200 for general office expenditures. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Bloch, Charles J., Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received by registrant were six semimonthly payments of $150 to his firm on annual salary as stated in paragraph 4 of

[4] Filed for third quarter.

[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

registration. Salary for clerk paid by Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. directly to Miss Gertrude Thorner. Also $9.10 paid Hall & Bloch in November 1947, and $9.10 paid in December 1947, and $9.35 paid in January 1948 for expenses stated in paragraph 6 of registration. (2) Salary paid to registrant's firm was retained by it, and salary paid clerk was retained by her. The sum of $27.55 was expended by registrant in carrying on his work. (3) The sum of $27.55 was expended by registrant on three trips to Atlanta, Ga., and was expended for meals, railroad fare, and taxicabs while in Atlanta and traveling to and from there. These items of expense were incurred in the general work of the Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., and not as a part of any activities in connection with any legislation pending before Congress. (4) None. (5) The primary purpose of registrant's employment is not to support or oppose any legislation. As counsel for Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., as stated in paragraph 4 of registration, sworn to June 25, 1947, and filed June 26, 1947, he has been requested to and will support the passage of Senate bill 110 and H. R. 1639.

Blunt, Joseph R., 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 1410 Southwest Morrison Street, Portland, Oreg. (1) No money received nor expended during the quarter for lobbying purposes. (2) Same as (1). (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation directly affecting the west coast lumber manufacturing industry.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Expended, $477.84. (2) Various. (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) None (other than the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade-association periodicals, and in our trade-association bulletins. (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, $900; postage and printing, $42.63; total, $942.63. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for above association. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of Bureau of Internal Revenue collector's offices.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.); Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses, during the preceding calendar quarter, $3,000. Money expended, see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistance, transportation, routine and other customary expenses only. Also see (6) form B heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, Saginaw, Mich. (1) $150.95 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contracts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received for salary $1,894.20 and for expenses $698.21. (2) Various. (3) Travel, telephone, and postage. (4) None so far as known. (5) Legislation affecting the grain and/or feed trade. None specifically during this quarter.

Boyd, H. B., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyle, James J., Seventeenth and I Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; United Public Health League, 450 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from employer United Public Health League, $5,704.29. (2) To the undersigned, salary, $4,197.78—(6 months); miscellaneous expense, $1,505.51; rent, $450; secretarial service, $150; stationery supplies, $29.56; postage, $8.50; telephone, $75.41; travel expense, $660; general expense, $89. (3) All moneys received were paid on for salary, rent, secretary, telephone, postage, office supplies, travel to west coast and return. (4) An occasional bulletin by the United Public Health League. (5) To support any and all legislation in the interest of public health and to oppose what may not be of such interest.

Boyle, Samuel E., The Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) September 30 to November 1, 1947, final report. Salary from J. S. Tibby, treasurer, for October, $247.25; preaching fees at Bloomington, Ind., applied on travel expenses (Reformed Presbyterian Church of Bloomington), $32.80; balance from Treasurer J. S. Tibby, of Reformed Presbyterian Church, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa., $27.09. (2) Salary privately used; not reported here. Travel fund: Paid to travel expenses on trip to St. Louis and Indianapolis per attached itemized account.[2] (3) Publicizing Senate Joint Resolution 150 and House Joint Resolution 239. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 150 (80th Cong., 2d sess.) and House Joint Resolution 239.

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co. of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None received—funds used those of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., of which firm undersigned is a member. Amount expended, $81.20. (2) American Airlines, New York, N. Y., transportation, $25.53; meals, taxis, and other transportation and similar miscellaneous travel expense, New York to Washington, D. C., $54.67; notary, $1. (3) Transportation and similar expense, New York to Washington; notary fee. (4) None. (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal Gift Tax Acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift-tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Bream, John H.,[4] [6] 22 South Third Street, Harrisburg, Pa. (1) $101.12. (2) Postage, rail and bus travel fare. (3) Personal expenses. (4) None. (5) Tax equality for all competitive business.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employers, $1,115.06; expenditures, $1,115.06. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, and railroads. (3) Traveling—attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research patents and trademarks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Brickman, Paul B., Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None, other than regular salary as reported on Form B. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Bronson, Ruth M., 1426 Thirty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; not employed; working for the National Congress of American Indians. (1) Nothing except $350 for travel to NCAI convention; $336 to attend another conference. No salary; no funds of any kind for lobbying expense or lobbying activities. (2) Telephone and telegraph company, approximately $40; stenographic hire, Sylvia Hecht et al., not more than $150. (3) Telephones and telegrams, not more than $35 of which had to do with attempting to influence legislation; stenographic hire. (4) The Christian Century, August and December; NCAI Newsletter and NCAI Washington Bulletin. (5) I am not employed. I receive no salary for any purpose.

Brooks,[4] A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F.; $3,151.16 (fee, $2,500; expenses, $651.16). (2) American Airlines, $408.18; Raleigh Hotel, $85.32; meals and tips, $96.30; other miscellaneous, $61.36; Fritz G. Lanham, $1,000. (3) Fee, Fritz G. Lanham, $1,000; air travel, $408.18; hotel and meals, $181.62; telephone and telegraph, $24.61; taxi, $10.55; paper and supplies, $21.70; laundry, $4.50. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks,[5] A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F.; expenses, $143.90. (2) Bull Letter Co. (stencils), $30.25; Stafford-Lowdon (stencils), $6.54; National Foreign Trade Convention, $34.07; Century Warehouse System, $39.04. (3) Preparation 55 stencils, 55 cents each, $30.25; purchase of 55 stencils, $6.54; convention expenses, $34.07; advance for travel expenses, $39.04; total, $143.90. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expense received during period amounted to $2,650.05 of which less than $5 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of $1.50. (3) Transportation. (4) None other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown, Earle P., 1737 K Street NE., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $15.90.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

(2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, dues, etc. (4) Attached list [2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Brown, Frederick E., National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payments made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Brown, Robert E., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Inc. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual expenses, $441.32. (2) American Airlines, Hotel Statler, various filling stations, taxi cab operators and restaurants. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) Releases were provided all daily and many weekly papers in Indiana concerning testimony of Indiana witnesses before House Ways and Means Committee in current hearings concerning tax exempts under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Brown, Russell B.,[4] Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $10. (2) See (3). (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the asscciation.

Brown, Russell B.,[5] Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $25. (2) See (3). (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry. (NOTE.—Delay in filing this return was due to absence from city.)

Blair Buck, Mrs. J. L.,[4] 1734 N Street NW, Washington, D. C. Not employed for pay. Elected to office of president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, June 1947. (1) Monthly allotment for travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the general federation, total for 3 months, $1,050. (2) See above. (3) See question No. 1. (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Blair Buck, Mrs. J. L.,[5] 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. Not employed for pay. Elected to office of president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, June 1947. (1) Allotment for travel and general expense in connection with work of the general federation, total for 3 months, $1,050. (2) See above. (3) See question No. 1. (4) The General Federation Clubwoman and State federation publications. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Bugbee, George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $896.52. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $31.75. (2) Various transportation, telephone, and telegraph companies and United States Post Office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burger, George J., 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5,979.99 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service and publishing National Independent and as acting as director in charge of Washington Office of National Federation of Small Business. Expended $5,027.16 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publication weekly bulletin, travel expenses. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Tire bill; all legislation affecting small business.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33⅓ per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Burke, Thomas F., the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5 on October 9 and $20 on October 23 for a total of $25 from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits as part payment of $31.22 due me for expenses incurred during June, July, August, and September, leaving a balance of $6.22 due me plus $58.10 expended during October, November, and December 1947. (2) The $58.10 mentioned above was spent by me for carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses on behalf of committee work. (3) To preserve the committee's limited funds. (4) Article printed in publication Railway Age, issue of December 6, 1947, titled "Rank and File Fight Crosser Law," (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Burke, William R., 6612 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500 and expenses, $135.03, minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are deductible expenses, such as transportation, meals, and incidental items. None for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroads, bus companies, taxis for transportation; telephone companies for telephone calls; hotels and restaurants for meals and lodging. (3) Transportation, telephone calls, meals, lodging, and also for entertainment during east coast conference of Navy Yard Metal Trades Councils. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal is available to me. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical workers in particular and labor in general.

Butler,[4] Eugene J., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,758.96 salary for 3 months. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Butler,[5] Eugene J., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,758.96 salary for 3 months. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,000 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel to prepare and present to congressional committee legal aspects of tax advantages enjoyed by cooperatives and other tax-exempt corporations.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., 229 East Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) $2,500 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. At irregular intervals UBA publishers and distributes to its members, public officials who administer social-security programs, and a few others mimeographed material related to current social-security problems, including legislation. I usually prepare the material. (5) All legislation affecting social-security benefits and contributions.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation: Reimbursed $656.55 for expenses advanced. Expended $885.99 which will be reimbursed, as follows: Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $38.50; Munsey Real Estate Co., $525; travel expense, Southern Pacific Co., $313.28; incidental, $9.20. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Munsey Real Estate Co.; Southern Pacific Railroad Co. and incidentals. (3) Telephone service, rent, transportation, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. Employed by petitioners and their due successors and joining associates at and after War Department File No. 7040, April 7, 1933. (287 U. S. 627.) Address (supra) extended to all abutters on B-line duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $108.56, costs and disbursements herein divided: Petty cash, clerical work, searching records, and addressing mail, $62.36; and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, etc., $46.20. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a Rainhill prize for the best B-line electric-pipe-train locomotive for major heavy freight—maximum ton-miles and minimum time and space for passageway, rolling stock, etc. (Ocean electric power and no tunnel costs at sea.) (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors and their due and immediate representatives. (5) (See (3).)

Carver, Leslie O., assistant general counsel, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association, Inc. (1) No money received except regular annual salary as shown in registration form filed. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C., (a) the Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; (b) the Quinault Tribe, Washington (State). (1) (a) The Three Affiliated Tribes, $1,372.40; (b) the Quinault Tribe, none. (2) (a) Baltimore and Ohio and Northern Pacific Railway Co., Pullman Co., stenographers, etc., $372.40; and (b) B. S. Adams, stenographers, etc., $89.41. (3) Travel, meals, stenographers, and sundry others in small amounts less than $10 each, and for printing briefs and similar court papers. (4) None. (5) None pending.

Casey, D. E., 339 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., American Taxpayers Association, Inc. (1) Received as salary, $2,649.99. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specified.

Castiglioni, Paul M., 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees. (1) Salary, $811.80 less withholding and social-security taxes. Expenses for quarter, $120. (2) Paul M. Castiglioni. (3) To promote the welfare of the motor-vehicle employees of the Post Office Department. Covering both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) Rotor and bulletins called Motor Vehicle News. (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to motor-vehicle employees.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received for services rendered, $1,753.57; received $183.05 as expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, communications, meals, stationery, general office expenses. (3) Transportation, hotels, communications, meals, stationery, general office expenses. (4) Air line pilot. (5) Support any legislation to improve the safety of commercial aviation or concerning the working conditions of the air line pilots.

Chace, W. E., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., The National Fertilizer Association. (1) $2,375 salary applied to personal uses; none to lobbying activities. Reimbursed by The National Fertilizer Association for out-of-pocket expenses for cab fares, phone calls and totaling approximately $20. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specified legislation. During preceding quarter worked in general on public relations as to several matters affecting agriculture.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $1,085.94; expenditures in Washington, $1,085.94. Out of town expenses reimbursed by the company: Railroads, $101.25; hotels and meals, $681.66; total, $782.91. Reception at Carlton Hotel, November 21, invitations for which were issued over my name. This amount was not paid out of my personal expense account but by the New York office, $722.25. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting: National labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, control powers, revision of the SEC and RFC Acts, and foreign aid.

Chandler, E. L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., American Society of Civil Engineers, 53 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) From American Society of Civil Engineers, $17. (2) Taxicabs, postage. (3) Taxicab fares, $14; postage, $3. (4) None. (5) International interchange of information and education, advance planning of public works, stream pollution control, national science foundation.

Clements, J. C., Carroll Arms Hotel, Washington, D. C., National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2499.99, quarterly compensation paid to me. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Postal rate legislation. My contract of employment expires February 1, 1948, and will not be renewed.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Veterans Committee, Inc. (1) Salary at rate of $5,600 per annum. No more than $10 a month expenses in connection with activities under this act. (2) Joseph A. Clorety, Jr. (3) To implement veterans' national and international platforms of American Veterans Committee, which occupies a minor portion of my time. The major duties of the office of national secretary include administration of national office, handling correspondence and other relations with chapter secretaries and treasurers, acting as secretary to national planning committee and national administrative committee and as secretary for all national members. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting veterans' national and international platforms of the American Veterans Committee.

Clott, Herman, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, CIO, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,144, salary; $110, taxi fares. (2) Herman Clott. (3) Paid as salary and taxi expenses around Wasington. (4) The Union, official organ of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. (5) Support all legislation in favor of membership of above-mentioned union and to oppose all legislation detrimental to said membership and to the welfare of the American people.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $93.75; for expenses, $98.45. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) Travel, telephone, and office expenses. (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) No specific legislation with the exception of immigration. See original registration statement and exhibit A.

Colborn, (Miss) Fern M., 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, United States of America. (1) Personal expenses refunded: Meals, $45.03; lodging, $23; travel, $60.77; total, $128.80. Salary, quarterly, $300. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian general assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. (3).

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association. (1) We have received a total amount of $2,330 as legal fees from members of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association. Our expenditures have been $50.07. (2) Expenditures have been purely for incidental matters, such as telephones, lunches, and transportation, and have been paid to the telephone company, taxicab company, restaurants, etc. (3) Telephones, luncheons, transportation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and the governmental agencies concerned information concerning foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members. (5) None.

Compton, R. T., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., National Association of Manufacturers. (1) Receipts: Salary, $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $610.36; expenditures, $610.36. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, Legislative Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Education Association. (1) Salary: $1,175, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $235; expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon,[4] Arthur D., attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) July, August, September 1947, received $3,400 in fees; expended none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Condon,[5] Arthur D., attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) October, November, December 1947, received, $1,500 (reasonable compensation to be agreed upon); expended none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Condon, Arthur D.,[4] attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.: Morton Salt Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) July, August, September 1947 received $2,616.0 fee; expended, $116.50. (2) Expended $116.50 for long-distance telephone calls, printing of pamphlet, and transportation. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) none.

Condon, Arthur D.,[5] attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.: Morton Salt

[4] Filed for third quarter.

[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) October, November, December 1947 no money received (reasonable compensation to be agreed upon); no money expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Cone, D. C., Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Annual compensation for 1947, $5,250. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Conn, Donald D., Transportation Association of America, 105 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached.[2] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Connaughton, John H., 717 District National Building, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Cecil N. Broy, 524 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) A bill to provide for subjecting German assets to payment of claims on behalf of American citizens.

Connett, William C., IV, 1630 Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis, Mo.; American Crossarm and Conduit Co., 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,100 received as final fee. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) This is a final report. Registrant was originally employed to present and support H. R. 2422. The matter was compromised with the War Department and accordingly American Crossarm & Conduit Co. has requested no further action on the bill.

Conover, Julian D., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously stated; expended, $10.30. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $5.85; telephone, $4.45. (4) An editorial director of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooley, Thomas M., II., 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans' Association Federal Employees Naval Ship Yard, N. Y., Lenruth Hall, Waverly and Myrtle Avenues, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) Support veterans preference legislation. (4) None. (5) None this quarter.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,681.70 as wages; $200.01 for office rental. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $4,375.02; per diem, $644; expenses, $521.07; for additional data see rider attached.[2] (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephone, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscribing papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications, utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association of the home-building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home-building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Courtney, Paul Lawrence, the National Tax Equality Association, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that supports the principle of tax equality.

Cowan, Nathan E.,[4] 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America-CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,354.98; expenses, $103.98. (2) Hotels, railroad, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Services and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowan, Nathan E.,[5] 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,354.98. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Services and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowling, W. C., National St. Lawrence Association, 1728 Buhl Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) $44.06 gross back wages due previous to October 1946; expenses, $24.08; total, $68.14. (2) Expenses, $68.14; taxis and luncheons. (3) For purpose of promoting seaway. (4) None. (5) St. Lawrence seaway legislation.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Agnes E. Meyer (through June 30, 1947), 1624 Crescent Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Our fee for professional legal services rendered from July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1947, has been fixed at $2,765, plus disbursements of $15.70 for taxis, telephone calls, stenography, etc. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Bills to create a new executive department to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security The services which we were retained to perform have been concluded as of June 30, 1947.

Cox, Langford, Stoddard & Cutler, 1210 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Publicker Industries, Inc., 1429 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Bills dealing with Government's power to allocate materials used or produced by Publicker Industries, Inc.

Crampton, Charles J., attorney, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.; State Rights Association, Post Office Box 2371, Houston, Tex. (1) Retainer fee $7,500; for expenses $932.32. (2) Various. (3) Hotels, travel fares, etc. (4) None. Distributed copies of American Bar Association Recommendation for Tax Equalization, published by the association, to attorneys. We did not cause it to be published. It was the official report of the association. (5) To bring about constructive cooperation between community-property and common-law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization, whereby husbands and wives in all States may be permitted to divide their property and income, after marriage, for Federal estate, gift, and income-tax purposes in the same manner as is provided in the community-property State concept. Any such practice to be based on the ownership of their property and income as determined by the State law. This principle is stated in the recommendation of the American Bar Association tax equalization proposal which has been presented in hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. To support the retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate- and gift-tax amendments, as they apply to community-property States in a very unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner. To cooperate with all States for the development of a general income, gift- and estate-tax plan which will equalize Federal taxes with fairness to all, and recognize the laws of the several States as they determine the ownership of property and income by their citizens.

Crawford, James M., Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Deponent has neither received nor expended any money for attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress. He has merely been reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in traveling to and from the District of Columbia. (2) No payments have been made, except as stated, for deponent's own transportation and subsistence. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) That relative to the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia.

Cruse, Donald, the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cullum, Robert M., Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 261 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary totaling $1,500 for quarter; traveling expenses, $98.58. (2) Paid out miscellaneous traveling expenses: Fare, hotel, taxis, etc. (3) To attend executive-board meetings in New York City. (4) Leaflet entitled "In Our House But Not of It." (5) Legislation to provide that the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

Cuneo, John C., Modesto, Calif.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received from Townsend National Recovery Plan, $2,540.49; less deductions, $426.40; deposited for operations in California, $2,114.19; received for reimbursement for phone calls and booklets bought, $50.60; salary drawn by John C. Cuneo, $1,080; balance to be used for operations in California, $1,084.79. (2) $1,526.28. (See detailed schedule attached.[2]) (3) See schedule attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Support of the Townsend plan.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $775.95; expended, $125.95. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, hotels. (3) Travel expense. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Daley, William L., 528 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago,

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Ill. (1) $991.57. (2) Communication, transportation, and office supply companies, $166.57. (3) Telephone, telegraph, office supplies. (4) Interpretative articles in official bulletins of national and State publishers associations; also in trade publications of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Danielian, N. R., National St. Lawrence Association, 1830 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,000 received from National St. Lawrence Association (retainer); $332.35 received as reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and incidental expenses; total, $2,332.35. (2) Railroads and air lines for fares, hotels, etc. (3) Official travel for association. (4) [Blank.] (5) The principal purpose of engagement by the National St. Lawrence Association is to foster and increase trade for the products of manufacture, agriculture, natural resources, and any and all other forms of commerce between the ports of the Great Lakes, its tributaries and waterways of the United States and Canada relating to the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the development of navigation and power.

Daugherty, Paul J., 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (Columbus to Washington and return), October 10–11, $47.85; meals and miscellaneous travel expense, October 10–11, $15; total, $62.85. (2) See above statement. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, labor, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davidson, John B., Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

d'Avila, Sarah H., National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $72.91 (on unpaid basis most of period). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Southern Patriot. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Davis, John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, December 1947, $2,748. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington situation, a weekly mimeo newsletter of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davis & Gilbert (a partnership consisting of A. M. Davis and A. M. Gilbert), The Best Foods, Inc., 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) Inapplicable. (4) None. (5) As counsel to The Best Foods, Inc., formerly of 88 Lexington Avenue and now of 1 East Forty-third Street, New York 17, N. Y., we may from time to time be called upon to present the cause of the company in respect to legislation affecting its business.

Dawson, Clarence E., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers (formerly National Publishers Association, Inc.), 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services rendered plus $331.78 for personal expenses in connection with work for the National Association of Magazine Publishers. (2) William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $49.90; travel expense, October and November 1947, including miscellaneous expenses for meals, hotel room, telephone and telegraph, tips, etc., while out of Washington, $481.63; total, $3,031.53. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the Association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Dickinson, A. W., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C., American Mining Congress. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously stated; expended, $2.40. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $2.40. (4) Am associate editor of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government. (1) Salary, October, November, and December 1947, $1,043.54. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) Quarterly Retirement News Bulletin. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Scuthern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For the quarter ending December 31, 1947, my total compensation for all services, including work related to legislation, was $4,619.18. This amount is reported for the reason that it is impossible to determine from the language of Public Law 601 what part, if any, of this compensation is in consideration of services within the scope of the regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Amendments to Natural Gas Act, percentage depletion tax relief.

Dixon, Karl S., Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., United States Business Organizations, Inc. (1) $3,000 as straight salary; $12,000 total salary for the year 1947. All items of expenditure which have anything whatsoever to do with lobbying, even remotely, are listed on the attached sheet which is made a part of this report. (2) The attached information sheet [2] gives the detail required. (3) These expenditures all represent telephone charges, expenditures for telegrams, taxicabs, travel and hotels, letters, pamphlets, mimeographing, etc. (4) Other than letters to members and mimeographed material sent to business organizations there is just one pamphlet, namely, "How Cooperatives Escape Income Taxes." Copy is attached.[2] (5) Equality of taxes between private enterprise and cooperatives and other tax-exempt corporations and organizations; taxes generally; public expenditures; Government corporations; labor relations; social security.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) $600 salary and $225 expense allowance. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government publications, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty, John E., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. (1) Salary: $619.36 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. $64.05 was expended by me as expense money, during the fourth quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $382.05 for expense incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $64.05 was expended by me as expense money, during the fourth quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Douglas, Proctor, MacIntyre & Gates, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., Western Cemetery Alliance. (1) Received from Western Cemetery Alliance, $2,000, as compensation for legal services rendered; expended in connection with all matters for client, $46.71. (2) Telephone company, $29.75; telegraph company, $8.16; and miscellaneous, including principally taxicab fares, $8.80. (3) Long-distance telephone, telegraph, and miscellaneous expense, including principally taxi transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the establishment or extension of national cemeteries.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Dresie, Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans., Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Friendly Dollar, Wichita, Kans.; the Wichita Independent, Wichita, Kans. (5) Tax equality.

Dryden, Mrs. Mildred L., 1700 I Street NW., Washington D. C., Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (1) Salary, $4,400; no expenses with which this report is concerned. (2) [Blank.] (3) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

DuBois, Ben, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) No money spent lobbying this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Dudley,[6] Harold and Ruth, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 a month for October, November, and December; total of $80 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold and Ruth Dudley, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

Dunbar, Charles E., Jr., care of Phelps, Dunbar, Marks & Claverie, United Fruit Building, New Orleans, La., Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee. (1) Retainer fees, as attorney, $3,000; received as reimbursement for traveling expenses to Washington, stenographic expense and postage, $566.02, itemized in attached statement. (2) Self. (3) Retainer for October, November, December, 1947. See explanatory statement attached to form A filed March 6, 1947,

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to Form A filed March 6, 1947; and supplemental statement attached hereto, and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) My salary is $11,000 annually; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,034.96. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling, and incidental expenses, newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc.; meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Dyer, Gus W., 1107 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn., Southern States Industrial Council. (1) $450 salary, economic adviser, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Editorials in Bulletin Southern States Industrial Council. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Echols, Oliver P., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (1) Nothing received except salary, no part of which was paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, Textile Workers' Union of America (CIO), 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,200 salary; $504.84 to reimburse actual expenses incurred, $106.20 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington, remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Elliott, John Doyle, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received $990; expended $588.63. (2) Various. (3) Contacting Townsend clubs, other organizations, and citizens in the interest of the Townsend national recovery plan and maintaining New York State Townsend plan headquarters. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session.

Ellis,[6] Clyde T., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, quarter, $3,000; car allowance, $300; expense accounts, $363.68; American Airlines, $315.32; total, $3,979. (2) Self, for salary and expenses, including reimbursement for meals, hotel, transportation, and tips, $3,663.68; American Airlines, $315.32; total, $3,979. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings, board of directors' meetings, etc. (4) Rural electrification. (5) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public power and public utility districts, and legislation affecting public power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public power and public utility districts.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Re Arabian-American Oil Co.: None received and none expended during previous quarter, except incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and for taxis. (2) Telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C., R. W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (1) None received and none expended during previous quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to partnerships.

Ely, Northcutt, report as legal representative of Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received during the quarter. Bills have been rendered and are outstanding for $5,240. The entire amount represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in legislation and litigation affecting California interests in the Colorado River. Of this figure $2,000 is payable by the Colorado River Board and $3,240 is payable by the Six Agency Committee. Part of these amounts are for services rendered prior to October 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 1616, S. 1175, House Joint Resolution 236, Senate Joint Resolution 145, and related bills, H. R. 1848, S. 693, H. R. 2873, H. R. 3194.

Ely, Northcutt, report as attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, 730 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions, and legislative matters incidental thereto. Part of this amount represents payment for services rendered prior to October 1, 1947. (2) Office staff, building owner, for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to client on H. R. 4748.

Fairbanks, Joseph, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Milton Addison Thomas, secretary general, 212 West Highland Avenue, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) No payments. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2673, a bill to incorporate the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Farrington, Charles J., 803 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., National Coal Association. (1) $3,142.81, salary and expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Western Union Telegraph Co., postage, taxi, lunches, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting bituminous coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Management Planning of Washington, Inc. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $179.25 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Fenning, Karl, Press Building, Washington, D. C., R. D. Pittman, Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $813.91; expended, nothing. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860.

Ferguson, John A., 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (1) Salary for this quarter as heretofore reported on Form B: expenses, $241.61. (2) Taxicabs from office to Capitol and return, $15.75; Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, travel, $225.86. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Ferguson, John H., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery. (1) Salary, December 1, 1947–January 2, 1948, $1,153.50; travel and transportation expenses; December 1–December 31, 1947, $101.03. (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery. Travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Ferris, Muriel, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., League of Women Voters of the United States. (1) Received $172.92 salary every 2 weeks; expended: Carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $28.30. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government action, publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1946, attached.

Filer, Harry L., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn., Howard S. Palmer et al. (1) Salary, $5,300; no expenses. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Fillius, Maurice W., 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., Puerto Rico Rum Institute. (1) Received retaining fees as reported on form B filed January 7, 1947, plus $25.55 for expenses incurred during quarter ended December 31, 1947. (2) $24.45 paid to hotels and restaurants and 80 cents for taxicabs. (3) Food and transportation. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3282 and H. R. 3283.

Finkel, William H., 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y., the Employees Committee For Low-Cost Retirement Benefits. (1) Received $12 on October 22 from above-mentioned committee as part payment of $97.40 due me for expenses incurred June, July, August, and September, leaving a balance of $86.40 due me, plus $71.35 expended by me for expenses in October, November, and December. (2) The $71.35 mentioned above was spent for carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses on behalf of committee work. (3) To preserve the committee's limited funds. (4) Article printed in publication Railway Age, issue of December 6, 1947, entitled "Rank and File Fight Crosser Law." (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Finucane, James F., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Council for Prevention of War. (1) Compensation at the annual rate of $3,600 since November 10, 1947; expenses approximating $20. (2) Inapplicable clause. (3) Inapplicable clause. (4) Routine news releases moved on press wires, to clients throughout United States, as well as local dailies and general circulation religious magazines. (5) To oppose UMT and similar bills of a war-provoking nature and to support such bills as the bills for disarmament and world peace.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street, NW., Washington, D. C., and Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z. (1) Receipts from National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Washington, D. C., $300. (No receipts from the Canal Construction Service Committee.) Expenditures, $159.95. (2) Various individuals and companies. (3) Taxicabs, $3.95; postage,

$8.50; telephone, $30; office help, $90; stationery, $14; seven meals, $13.50. (4) Annuitant. (5) Support of legislation in the interest of annuitants, potential annuitants, and civilian pensioners.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (1) Received: salary, $2,708.33; expenses, $26. Expended: Transportation, $1; lunches, $25. (2) Taxi companies and the Statler Hotel. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol; other necessary normal expenses. (4) American Highways, published by American Association of State Highway Officials (reprint of lectures on city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing given at Yale University). (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Flinn, W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C., International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Floyd, William M., 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Regular Veterans Association. (1) Salary from September 30, 1947, through December 31, 1947, $900. (2) No one. (4) [Blank.] (4) The Regular, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington D. C. (5) Legislation in behalf of veterans.

Forbes, E. F., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif., Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (1) Salary, $5,000.04; expenses, $313.42. (2) For ordinary traveling expenses, such as, railroad fare, pullman fares, hotel accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph, etc. (3) Ordinary expenses in connection with routine work as president and general manager of the Western States Meat Parkers Association, Inc. (4) None. (5) Not employed to propose or oppose legislation. This work is only incidental to the regular work of the president and general manager of the association.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Approximate average, $30 per week. (2) Hotels, meals, and traveling expenses when away from my own home. (3) Above. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) H. R. 16 and H. R. 2476, bills to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Fort, J. Carter, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C., Association of American Railroads. (1) In addition to salary as shown on registration form B, filed December 18, 1946, received no money except $460.53 as reimbursement for traveling expenses away from Washington. Both salary and expenses covered all services rendered the Association of American Railroads as set forth in the registration. (2) Hotel Kimball, Springfield, Mass.; Algonquin Club of Boston; Palmer House, Chicago; Chicago Club, Chicago; Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Wash.; Palace Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.; Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles; Adolphus Hotel, Dallas, Tex.; Coronado Hotel, St. Louis, Mo.; various restaurants and taxis in the cities named above, railroad dining cars, etc. (3) Personal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Generally all proposed legislation in which railroads are interested. Proposed legislation which is being supported includes H. R. 221 and S. 110; H. R. 2298; H. R. 3150 and S. 670; H. R. 1639 and S. 1567; and tax legislation. Proposed legislation which is being opposed includes H. R. 3140; Senate Joint Resolution 111, House Joint Resolution 192, and House Joint Resolution 194.

Fort,[7] Josiah, 1424 K Street NW., Tobacco Association of United States, Greenville, N. C. (1) Expenses: Salary, $2,500; stenographer, 8 weeks at $45, $360; rent, $165; office furniture, $900; travel, $150; entertainment, $50; office supplies and periodicals, $135; total, $1,400. (2) Receipted bills available for inspection. (3) See (1) above. (4) [Blank.] (5) To assist in getting fair consideration for American leaf tobacco in connection with aid program, for delivery through private trade channels.

Foster, Charles E., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Disabled American Veterans. (1) $339.25. (2) Charles E. Foster. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to disabled veterans, their families, and the dependents of deceased veterans.

Franklin, L. S., director, Greensboro, N. C. National Tax Relief Coalition. (1) $1,440; October, November, and December, 1947; paid L. S. Franklin, salary, $375; auto upkeep, 3 months, $390; hotel, meals, other expenses, $519; stamps and mailing costs, $25; printing, $125; total, $1,434. (3) Salary and so forth. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Lafayette Hotel, Washington, N. C.; home address, Valley City, N. Dak.; North Dakota Resources Board, Fargo, N. Dak., and North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for October, November, and December, 1947, and bonus, $1,629.98, and reimbursed expenses for same period of $960.82. Only a very small part of those items, if any, were for legislative work. (2) Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., and other hotels in various places; eating establishments; railroad, airline, telephone, and telegraph companies; taxicabs, busses, mimeographers, office suppliers, and post offices. Only a very small part thereof paid out for legislative work. (3) Lodging and office space, meals, transportation, communication, mimeographing, office supplies, and postage. (4) None. (5) Various bills affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, and development of water, land, and other natural resources in North Dakota.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October, $405.79; November, $27.10; December, $351.89. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Gannon, Peter J., 1060 Broad Street, Newark, N. J., American Shore and Beach Preservation Association. (1) None received. (2) None paid out. (3) See (2) above. (4) Shore and beach. (5) Preservation of shore lines.

Geary, Paul M., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C., National Electrical Contractors' Association. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation under consideration.

Geaslin, Ben, 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter, and no money received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded, travel, $175.06; meals, $28.15; lodging, $55.83, total, $259.04. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation, on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress Magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

George, Leo E., 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks. (1) Salary; October, November, December, 1947, $2,499.99. Travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $598.06. (2) The travel and organization expenses referred to in (1) above were a reimbursement for actual expenses for transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental minor expenses. (3) See above. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Education Association. (1) Salary: $1,300, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative service, $250. Expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses; hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn., Southern States Industrial Council. (1) $1,500, salary as secretary, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as affects industry.

Glazier, William, 930 F Street NW, Washington, D. C., International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 604 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Gross salary, approximately $1,104; expenses in Washington, $195; out-of-pocket expenses paid while traveling. (2) Expenses paid to taxicabs, phone calls, subscriptions to periodicals, etc. (3) See (2). (4) Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, the Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest of American workers and longshoremen, warehousemen, and maritime workers specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C., American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received or expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657.

Goss, Albert S.,[7] 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., the National Grange. (1) $1,875. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Goss, Bert C., 300 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., Hill & Knowlton, Inc. (1) Received only salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton. (2) [Blank.] (3) Not exceeding $150 for lunches, cab fare, and phone calls. (4) Various releases issued for clients, but unaware of extent of their use. (5) No specific legislation. Disseminate information about interests and operations of various clients.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., American Osteopathic Association, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Retainer, $3,000. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Graham, Chester, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Friends Committee on National Legislation. (1) Gross salary, October, November, December, $222.33; travel expenses, $188.90. (2) October-December: carfare, $138.13; room, $18; meals, $17.82; telephone and telegraph, $3.15; miscellaneous, $11.80; total, $188.90. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training legislation, and to organize opposition against it. (4) The organization sends a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Greenway, J. Cole, 3C Vesey Street, New York, N. Y., New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No expenses incurred in connection with work done for New York State Conference in Opposition to the St. Lawrence Project.

Grimes, Weston B., 821 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C., Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received (includes office, travel, and general expenses, totaling, $1,193.58), $9,518.57; expended (for purposes designed in the Lobbying Act), $11.60. (2) Taxicabs, $9.10; restuarant, $2.50. (3) Taxicabs to and from Capitol, $9.10; meals, entertainment for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act, $2.50. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning Commodity Exchanges, exports and imports, taxes, and regulation of business generally.

Grinberg,[7] P. Irving, 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y., Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc. (1) No expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trade & Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applying to jewelry.

Groom,[7] B. E., 11½ Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., North Dakota Tax Equality Committee. (1) For the months of October, November, December, 1947, $2,554. Receipts for previous three quarters reported in April, July, and October, 1947. See attached explanation. Receipts, approximately, $7,000. (2) To North Dakota Taxpayers Association, for office space, help, and equipment and for stationery supplies, wire service, travel, and travel expense. (3) To organize businessmen and farmers of North Dakota in support of legislation in State legislatures and Congress to support tax equality. (4) None. (5) To support tax equality.

Grosscup, Ambler, & Stephan,[7] 711 Central Building, Seattle, Wash., Alaska Transportation Co. (1) Firm received fee of $150 for professional services in connection with preparation and appearance before Alaskan Subcommittees of House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on hearing November 21, 1947, re long-range solution of Alaska shipping problem to follow after expiration June 30, 1948, of Public Law 12, Eightieth Congress. (2) Expense payments totaling $251.95 were not segregated because they were billed with separate charges for other legal work in Washington, D. C., before the United States Maritime Commission. (3) Expenses covered hotel, meals, taxis, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) None.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Haas, Frank E., 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill., Western Association of Railway Executives. (1) Salary as per registration and reimbursement of expense incurred in total amount of $1,002.56. (2) Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Congress Hotel, Chicago, Ill.; the Pullman Co.; and to various restaurants, taxicab companies, and individuals in nominal amounts. (3) Meals, $380.85; lodging, $164.18; pullman expense, $210.21; taxicab and local transportation, $105.02; local and long-distance calls, telegraph, postage, and miscellaneous, $142.30. (4) None. (5) Legislation of mutual interest to western railroads and their employees.

Haas, Herbert A., 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y., the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits. (1) Received $71.80 from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits during October, November, and December as part payment of $121.80 due me for expenses incurred June through September, leaving a balance of $50 due me plus $75.40 expended by me during October, November, and December. (2) The $75.40 mentioned above was spent by me for carfare, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses on behalf of the committee. (3) To preserve the committee's limited funds. (4) Article printed in publication Railway Age, issue of December 6, 1947, titled "Rank and File Fights Crosser Law." (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946.

Haas, John A., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (1) Expended $21.45 for taxi fares. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producer.

Haddock, Hoyt S., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., CIO Maritime Committee. (1) $1,560 salary and $130 expenses. No legislative activities participated in for this quarter. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (4) NMU Pilot. (5) All legislation affecting seamen.

Haddon, Georga A., treasurer, 419–420 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund. (1) Received $500 and paid out $500 for commuting to Washington, D. C., and for fares and expenses during the following 5 weeks: November 3, 17, 24, also December 2 and 8, 1947. (2) George A. Haddon, treasurer, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419–420 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For taxi and train fares commuting daily to Washington, D. C., also for breakfasts and dinners on trains, and for taxis, lunches, refreshments, etc., in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt up to $1,440 from income tax, the same as railroad pensions are under existing Railroad Retirement Act.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C., Automobile Manufacturers Association. (1) Salary, as secretary, committee on taxation, Automobile Manufacturers Association, $750; expenses, same, none. (2) See 1. (3) See 1. (4) None. (5) Automobile excise taxes.

Hallback, E. C., 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks. (1) Salary, $1,999.98; legislative expenses, $71.70; expenses attending convention American Federation of Labor, $212.45; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $707.40; expenses attending executive board meeting and legislative conference held at Chicago, Ill., November 1947, $162.65. (2) Incidental expenses, streetcar, taxi, meals, etc., $71.70. (3) Expenses attending the convention of the American Federation of Labor; travel and organization expenses, and expenses attending executive board meeting and legislative conference referred to in (1) above are an actual reimbursement for transportation, meals, hotels, and incidental minor expenses. (4) The Federation News Service Bulletin, Federation Press Service, the Union Postal Clerk. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the Civil Service Retirement System; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post office clerks and to improve the postal service; and to improve and strengthen the United States civil service.

Hamlet, Harry G., 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Retired Officers Association, Inc. (1) Received $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. Expended, nothing. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers and nurses, of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Hanscom, William A., 1118 Twenty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Oil Workers International Union, CIO, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,080; expenses, $345. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations. (1) Salary, $375; expenses, $269. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social, and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harper,[4] Ford C., 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City, Okla., Chamber of Commerce of the State of Oklahoma. (1) None; no money was received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Harper,[5] Ford C., 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City, Okla., Oklahoma State Chamber of Commerce. (1) None; no money was received or spent by me for lobbying purposes. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Harris, Ronald B., T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif., Irrigation Districts Association of California. (1) Since July 15, the filing of my last report, I have engaged in no activities in Washington. In my registration as to statement (4) I stated that no agreement, as yet, as to the amount I should receive had been agreed upon but that the amount would depend on what remained in the budget at the year end. There was paid to our firm by the Irrigation Districts Association of California the sum of $360.53, which was for not only services rendered in Washington but also locally in connection with matters that had nothing to do with legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harris, Winder R., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: Office expense, $190.83; personal expense, $141; total, $331.83. Expended: Office, $190.83; personal, $141; total, $331.83. (2) Various. (3) Towel service, telegraph messages, magazine subscription, postage stamps, stationery supplies, rental

[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

of electric water cooler, Government publications and documents, drinking water, paper and envelopes, typewriter repairs; taxicab, streetcar, bus, and railroad transportation; hotel accommodations, convention registration fee, and convention luncheon ticket. (Office rent, telephone account, and secretary's salary paid directly by employer from New York.) (4) None. (5) None in quarter of year covered in this report.

Hart, Merwin K., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., National Economic Council, Inc. (1) None for lobbying activity. Salary, $1,583.33. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Economic Council Letters, issued semimonthly. (5) [Blank.]

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo., National Livestock Tax Committee. (1) $600 for services, $60 for typing and mimeographing, $453.14 for expenses of two trips to Washington. Services almost entirely involving in appearance before House Ways and Means Committee, preparation of statement and follow-up with tax experts of committee and Bureau of Internal Revenue. (2) Foregoing payments and services believed to be exempt from Public Law 601. (3) Activities merely those of tax expert, drafting tax legislation, and explaining tax problems concerning the livestock industry—appearing before House and Senate committees and Bureau of Internal Revenue. Not really lobbying. (4) None. (5) Amendments to Internal Revenue Code—recognizing capital-gains limitations on sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures.

Harter, Dow W., 412–414 Washington Building, Washington, D. C., the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Receive annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during fourth quarter 1947, $1,875. In addition receive reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fare, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: $1,850 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $305.32 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., the American Legion, national organization, 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $233.24 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $19.20 incidental expenses for months of October, November, and December, 1947. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $19.20 incidental expenses for months of October, November, and December 1947; taxi, carfare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hayes, William E., executive representative, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., 601 Washington Building, Washington, D. C., Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary and out of pocket expenses as reported in original registration, none of which was used within the terms of this act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.

Hays, Joseph H., 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill., Western Association of Railway Executives. (1) Salary as per registration, and reimbursement by employer for expense incurred in total amount of $655.27. (2) To Mayflower and Shoreham Hotels, Washington, D. C., to Pullman Co. and to various restaurants, hotels, taxicab companies, to postage, and to various individuals in nominal amounts. (3) Hotels, $151.77; meals, $279.13; pullman space, $149.96; taxicabs and local transportation, $48.45; and miscellaneous including postage, telephone calls, etc., $25.96. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting railroads in western district.

Hays, William J., 902 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Martin Pepper. (1) $558.56. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $65.46; United States Post Office Department, $16.09; taxicabs, $10.25. (3) Telephone service, postage, transportation. (4) None. (5) House Resolutions 363, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 374, 375, 376, 377.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Meals, $192.65; hotel, $60.58; taxis, $61.05; miscellaneous, $13.70; transportation, rail, plane, $88.54. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington D. C., Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $98.85. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., American Parents Committee, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $103.69 for traveling expenses, entertainment, etc.; expended, $103.69. (2) Various railroads, hotels, etc. (3) Railroad fare, hotel accommodations, miscellaneous expenses. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act (H. R. 1980).

Heckendorn, William, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1947, $1,875. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities assigned directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Agriculture legislation.

Heiney, Robert B., 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Canners Association. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; less than one-third of time is spent on following legislative matters; $71.80 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $71.80. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Routine following through CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and newspapers, and otherwise keeping informed of legislation affecting the canning industry.

Henderson, Elmer W., 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Council for a Permanent FEPC. (1) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, October 1 to December 31, 1947, $392.27; salary, October 1 to December 31, 1947 (after tax deductions), $1,156.20. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $392.27; salary after tax deductions, $1,156.20. (4) [Blank.] (5) Permanent fair-employment legislation, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Henderson, Joseph D., 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La., American Association of Small Business. (1) Salary of $1,500 (based on $6,000 per year) received this quarter from the American Association of Small Business. No money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Small Business Review, official monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations. (5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Hensel, Robert E., 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $3.51 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) New York Telephone Co., $3.51. (3) Telephone toll calls totaling $3.51. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Herndon,[4] Maurice G., 1001 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington, D. C., National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herndon,[5] Maurice G., 1001 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C., National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herrmann, Louis F., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (1) Expended, $1.20. (2) Taxi fares. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Hess,[7] Amiel Edgerton, 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y., Oil Heat Institute of America, Inc. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Nothing at present.

---

[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Hester Ewart A., 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. (1) October: Salary, $416.67; office rent and stenographic service, $100; telephone, $10.15. November: Salary, $416.67; office rent and stenographic, $100; telephone, $13.57. December: Salary, $416.66; office rent and stenographic service, $100; telephone, $6.95; miscellaneous, $1. (2) Clinton M. Hester. (3) Office rent, stenographic service, telephone, and transportation. (4) None. (5) Wool legislation.

Hewes and Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the followings partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Stepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn., 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached detailed statement.[2] (2) See attached detailed statement.[2] (3) Expenses for transportation, communication, and mail and express charges, as listed in the attached statement. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hines, Lewis G., 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., American Federation of Labor. (1) $109. (2) Lewis G. Hines. (3) National legislative representative, taxis and phone calls. (4) [Blank.] (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc. (1) Salary, $1,250. (This represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act.) Reimbursement for traveling expenses, $237.83; total, $1,487.83; money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $237.83. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Holloway, William J., 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Holman, Charles W., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (1) Expended, $6.80. (2) Taxi fares. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Holmes, Geo. T., Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.; Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Library Association. (1) $4,772.79; see attached.[2] Paid by the American Library Association, Chicago. (2) See attached.[2] (3) Operation of office. Not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) American Library Association Bulletin, Library Journal, Wilson Library Bulletin, Washington Evening Star, and San Antonio Express. Have no record of others, since we do not subscribe to clipping services. (5) Library demonstration bill, Mundt bill support.

Howard, S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, none; expenses, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary and $590.36 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. See answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer, the American Institute of Laundering. See also letter attached to registration form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,875 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,427. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses, such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C. Fee, $1,800; expenses, $14.26. (2) Western Union, $6.31; taxis, $2; telephone company, $3.50; three Federal Registers, October 8, 45 cents; notary fees, $1; analysis of general agreement on tariffs and trade and schedule 20, $1; total, $14.26. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Huff,[1] George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses, $142.50. (2) American Airlines, Pennsylvania Railroad, Hotel Statler, taxicab operators. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) The Seymour Daily Tribune and the Brownstown Banner. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York City; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York City, acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses of travel and hotel. (2) Railroads, hotels, New York Telephone Co., and United States post office, $1,008.40; $132.51; $70. (3) To carry on duties as chairman. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., chairman, national legislative committee, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for October 1947, $39.70; November $56.70; December $37.50; total for 3 months, $133.90. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Hyman, Joseph B., 215 North Pitt Street, Alexandria, Va.; Publicker Industries, Inc., 1429 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Bills dealing with Government's power to allocate materials used or produced by Publicker Industries, Inc.

Ingles, William, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. et al., 717 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., $900; American Mining Congress, $900; J. I. Case Co., $900; the Falk Corp., $900; Foremen's League for Education and Association, $1,485; Fruehauf Trailer Co., Inland Steel Co., National Association of Electric Companies, $900. Expenditures: Office salaries, $750; lunches, taxi fares, and incidentals (no individual expense exceeding $10), $360; office rent, $120; telephone, $91.41; office services, supplies, and general expenses, $631.45; traveling expenses, $101.82. (2) Agents of the Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Bureau of National Affairs, Washington, D. C.; Library Binders Co., Washington, D. C.; Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.; M. S. Ginn & Co., Washington D. C. (3) Normal office operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jackson, Robert C., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Council, Empire Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) In addition to regular salary from National Cotton Council, as reported on Form B, received expense reimbursements amounting to $120.90 that might be construed as relating to legislative activity. (2) Meals for guests, $11.50; taxi fares, $20.40; out-of-town hotel and meal expense, $11.25; railroad transportation, $77.75. (3) Luncheon and dinner conferences, transportation, and out-of-pocket expense reimbursement. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During past quarter have supported legislation to remove antimargarine taxes and fees.

Jackson, Thomas J., Retired Officers League, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 for self. (2) T. J. Jackson. (3) Payment or bonus. (4) Not applicable. (5) Veteran if requested.

Johnson, Curtis E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $315.65 was received during the fourth quarter 1947. (2) None. (3) Fee of $100 per month; $15.65 to cover transportation and purchase of meals. (4) the Annuitant, official organ of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson, W. D., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1948, annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Jones, Bascom F., Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers' Association, 509 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $1,500; expense, none; total, $1,500. (2) [Blank.] (3) No lobbying expense for fourth quarter 1947. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) None sponsored or opposed.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Filed with the clerk only.

Jones, L. Dan,[4] Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $21.75. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, L. Dan,[5] Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $29.80. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Small Business Men's Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $600 monthly salary less withholding tax and social-security tax; $200 personal expenses during October, November, and December 1947. (2) Lyle W. Jones, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous incidental expenses. (4) Pulling Together—monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

Judd & Gurfein,[7] 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Metropolitan Motion Picture Theatres Association, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The only money received by registrant has been reimbursement of traveling expenditures, and that portion of the annual retainer attributable to Federal legislative matters. Based on an allocation of time, the compensation amounts to approximately $350 during the fourth quarter of 1947, plus disbursements of $46.84. (2) Hotel Statler, taxicab drivers, and Pennsylvania Railroad and restaurants. (3) Traveling and living expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Provisions of tax laws relating to amount of admissions taxes on moving-picture theaters.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B, heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer $231.51. (2) Various taxicab companies; restaurants; hotels; other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses; transportation; meals; gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Keller, Joseph E., secretary, District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 930 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,595.99 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, including $1,400 as salary; $195.99 has been expended on behalf of the committee during the preceding calendar quarter, which, plus the salary payment is shown in schedule A attached.[2] (2) See schedule A attached.[2] (3) See schedule A attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Kennedy, Harold L., Suite 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Received monthly salary; amount of salary previously reported in form B heretofore filed with Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate. Expended $36. (2) See No. (3) below. (3) Expended $24 for 60 taxi fares (at 40 cents each) to and from the Capital; eight meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $12. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co., July 11, 1947, $1,[illegible]9.99; August 13, 1947, $939.93; September 10, 1947, $178.54; total, $2,288.46. (2) (a) Mono-Lino Typesetting Co., $140.30; (b) Riegers Duplicating Service, $105.91; (c) Anstead Letter Shop, $58.19; (d) Trinity Court Studios, $6.25; (e) R. L. Forsythe Co., $149; (f) Romeike Press Clipping Bureau, $28; (g) Kechum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $[illegible]4.81; (h) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $1,706; total, $2,288.46. (3) (a) Type composition for folders descriptive of tax plan; (b) mimeographing and mailing charges; (c) Letter shop service; (d) photographic service charge; (e) printing of folders; (f) clipping service; (g) postage, telephone, telegraph, transportation; (h) services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The incentive income tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters' office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes, $76.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW legislative newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

King, Joseph T., National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary and $263.51 expenses. (2) Pullman Co., railroads, restaurants, hotels, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business. Business luncheons. (4) National Affairs Reports and Bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Emergency Price Control Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, wage and hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, and Second War Powers Act.

King, Willford I., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received no salary during this quarter, but have received the following for expenses: $15.75 for travel and $135.63 for secretarial and other incidental expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 703 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $1,000 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the fourth quarter of 1947. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $20 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 total salary for quarter. Although I spent no time whatever in the fourth quarter of the year in any kind of lobbying activities, I spent not more than 25 percent of my time in studying pending legislation and in conferences with other private industry groups on the subject of pending legislation. Therefore, not more than 25 percent of the total salary for the quarter, or $937.50, should be chargeable to legislative work. (2) None of the expenses incurred nor reimbursements received by me in the fourth quarter was chargeable to legislative expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Bills to improve the facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home ownership, are supported, while legislation inimicable to the interests of the savings and loan business is opposed.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No activity during quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Lacques, Paul H., Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (October, November, and December) at various times a total of $232.50 from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. None of such receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies, hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph charges (4) None. (5) H. R. 669.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) None received and no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) None paid. (3) No payments. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting nonresident United States citizens engaged in business abroad.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York City; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer $1,500; from American Fair Trade Council as retainer $1,000 and $36.03 for expense of business trip to New York and a telegram; from Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses and clerical help $750. There have been no expenditures except for postage and as above recited. (2) No ex-

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

penditures except as shown in (1) above. (3) Rental, garage, traveling, and postage. (4) None. (5) Those I represent are all nonprofit organizations, and I serve in an advisory capacity and not for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (1) I have received no money and expended none except small sums for postage. (2) No payments made. (3) No payments made. (4) None. (5) Legislation to preserve and promote the rights of the States under our system of government, to return to the States such normal functions as they should rightfully assume, to restrict Federal agencies to Federal functions, and to equalize taxation in accordance with State laws.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Possible legislation relating to cost of Federal meat inspection.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $750. No money expended only for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning, and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary of $19,000 per year for all services; not apportioned. He expended a total of $6.90. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) Legislative Outlook for 1948 written for Go magazine. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., American Medical Association, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, October 1 to December 31, 1947, $3,750; retirement savings bond, $5,000; reimbursements for travel expenses, $650.53; total receipts, $9,400.53. Expenses: travel, $343.21; hotel, $52.87; meals, $55.15; taxi, $21; conferences, $12.80; total expenses, $485.03. (2) Roosevelt Hotel, Biltmore Hotel, Palmer House, Eastern Airlines, Van Curler Hotel, Pennsylvania Central Airlines. (3) Travel, hotels, meals, local transportation, conferences, incidental expenses. (4) None. (5) bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Lee, Ivy, and T. J. Ross, United States Cuban Sugar Council, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $6,248.17, expended $498.11. See appended statement I.[2] (2) See appended statement I.[2] (3) See appended statement. I.[2] (4) See appended statement II. (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public-relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1948 and the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

Leopold, Joseph F., 936 Liberty Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Nothing received except regular salary. (2) Nothing paid out other than regular travel expenses for which I was reimbursed by National Tax Equality Association. (3) Hotel, transportation, and usual travel expenses. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. Tax equality in general.

Letts, David S., 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,300 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association. Received $205.81 reimbursement for actual business expenses. None for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc.; hotels and restaurants; merchants and others. (3) Traveling and living expenses away from Washington. Expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment, and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) He may support or oppose legislation affecting the transit industry.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary; $130 expenses; 25 percent of time devoted to legislative activities; the remainder of time was spent solely in economic research. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, ACA News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, the American Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in the intent of seamen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers, and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,125; expenses, $180.31; total, $1,305.31. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telephone and telegraph service (out of town), postage, and miscellaneous expenses. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences and meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist, L. Blaine, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; E. F. Forbes, president, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary for quarter October 1 to December 31, 1947, inclusive, $1,875; reimbursement for expenses incurred during this period, $479.01; total quarterly salary and reimbursement for expenses, $2,354.01. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, communications, entertainment, and miscellaneous office expenses incurred in the regular business activity of the association. (4) None. (5) As Washington representative of the association many of my duties do not come within the purview of the act. With respect to legislation, I am interested in that which affects the meat-packing industry.

Linton, Donald H., Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass. (1) None during period. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Little, Charles R., Kenwood Road, box 153M, route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio; executive secretary, Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, president; Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Receiver for expenses, $600; expenses, $641.77. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation, $372.91; lodging, $74.31; meals, $84.81; tips, $15.31; office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies), $94.43. (4) None. (5) Any dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriation bills.

Little, Walter J., Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co., et al., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry., Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northwestern Pacific, and Western Pacific Railroads for expenses, $724.94. (2) Railroads, air lines, and other transportation, $296.66; hotels, meals, and lodging, $252.28; incidentals, $176. (3) Transportation and living costs. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Lockwood, Maurice H., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $200 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News and Fertilizer Review, published by NFA. My address, Firm Foundations, at the 1947 fall meeting was reproduced in Commercial Fertilizer, Atlanta, Ga.; the American Fertilizer, Philadelphia, Pa.; Agricultural Chemicals, New York City. I issued and distributed a press release on the association's fall meeting and one regarding my testimony on the fertilizer supply situation before the subcommittee on fertilizer of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, December 10, but do not know what publications may have published them in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighteenth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lodge, F. S., The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $50 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighteenth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York; 1614 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4043, Eightieth Congress.

Lorence, Walter S.,[1] The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Chamber of Commerce Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary for December 1947 as reported on Form B; reimbursements of $191.64 for personal out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses (various). (3) Personal out-of-pocket expenses for lodgings, food, travel, telephone calls while in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $51.10. (2) Taxi drivers, restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expenses for quarter, $633.76. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

McAvoy, Clifford T., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received for purposes covered by this act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation for the general welfare.

McAvoy, Harold,[7] 907 Lormer Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; National Association Post Office Railway Mail Service & Mail Handlers, 1113 Arch Street North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,200 which must cover all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McBride, Don,[6] secretary-manager, National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period (see schedule VI),[8] $9,657.39; total expenditures for period (see schedule V),[8] $11,145.67. (2) See attached Schedules V and VI.[8] (3) See attached Schedules V and VI.[8] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosed).[8] (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, Purposes, 1st page, our constitution enclosed in first quarterly report).

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) (a) Salary as vice president and national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, $2,500; (b) Salary of Glenn C. Russell, clerk, $935; (c) personal expenses of Jonas A. McBride, $671.46; printing and supplies, $94.40; rent (paid to Labor, 10 Independence Avenue SW), $270; telephone and telegrams, $44.39; postage, $30. (2) (a) To Jonas A. McBride for salary; (b) to Glenn C. Russell for salary; (c) personal expenses to hotels, Pullman accommodations, etc., printing and supplies to various printers and stationers, telephone, telegrams, and postage are self-explanatory. (3) For maintenance of the office of the vice president and national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,232.50 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. $126.28 was expended by me as expense money, during the fourth quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $834.47 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $126.28 was expended by me as expense money, during the fourth quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of The Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McClure, Warren C., Box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McCrory, Samuel H., 6811 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hemp Producers Association, Paul A. Hemmy, Jr., secretary, Juneau, Wis. (1) None during quarter beginning October 1, 1947. Engagement terminated as of November 25, 1947. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

McDonald, E. L., Townsend National Recovery Plan, Box 534, Cheney, Wash. (1) Received for quarter ending December 31, 1947, the sum of $318.62 from Townsend National Recovery Plan, Broadway 6875, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Transportation. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, the Townsend plan.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Salary, $750; expenses, $350; total, $1,100. (2) Salary for home expenses. Expenses for travel—rail and bus fare, hotel, restaurants, etc. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Support a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows: "The preamble shall be amended to read: 'We, the people of the United States, devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ the Saviour and King of nations,' in order to form a more perfect union, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

McGough, Richard, Washington Railroad Association, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures in connection with Federal legislation: None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 626 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., Taxpayers of United States of America, United States Treasury. (1) Approximately, $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To use as I see fit, which fitness I use in lobbying for Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) Published for fee—none. Soliciting press support via lobbying, numerous. (5) It's my desire to run the gauntlet of all legislation before Congress, but with 400 plus Representatives and 90 plus Senators, the Executive, press, etc., to contact, I fall far short of my objective. I do the best I can with only 24 hours in a day—holidays et al.

McGrath, Tom J., 324 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Richmond, Va.; Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, Boston, Mass.; National Coal Association, Washington, D. C. (1) No payments received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Participating in the consideration of natural-gas legislative matters as the interests of clients may appear to be affected by such legislation.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, a partnership, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; The Holstein-Friesian Association of America, Brattleboro, Vt. (1) Received $93.32 for disbursements made for this client. (This sum includes disbursements made for this client in other matters. The disbursements made in this matter and included in said sum were reported in previous reports). Expended $15.19. (See paragraph (3).) (2) Telephone Co. Telephoning, $15.19. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 3884.

McLaughlin, Robert E., 410 Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended, except petty cash for taxi fares. Since May 1, 1947, I have been acting as legislative consultant for AMVETS at a modest per-diem rate for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., National Association of United States Storekeepers-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received quarterly retainer (see Form B). (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil-service employees in general.

McMahon, John A., president, National Association of Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Dorchester Center Station, Boston, Mass.; National Association of Postal Supervisors, box 1225, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,145.20 received from Michael C. Nave, treasurer, National Association of Postal Supervisors, room 326, Main Post Office, Chicago, Ill. (2) John A. McMahon, president, National Association of Postal Supervisors, Pennsylvania Railroad; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, Hotel Continental, Washington, D. C. (3) Reimbursement for loss of salary while absent from regular duty; railroad transportation; hotel accommodations; telephone and telegrams. (4) The Postal Supervisor; official magazine of the National Association of Postal Supervisors. (5) Legislation pending in Congress involving salary adjustments, hours of labor, and the liberalization of the retirement laws in the interests of the supervisors employed in the postal service.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, Inc., 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500, which is in payment for all services rendered, only a part of which deal with legislation. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 123, S. 265, H. R. 2571, Senate Joint Resolution 167, and H. R. 4388.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,226, with less than one-twentieth of the time and service for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $43.10, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Remington Rand, Inc., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; and American Optometric Association, 142 South State Street, Marion, Ohio. (1) None. (2) Telephone and telegrams, $34.56; taxis and miscellaneous, $16.75; total, $41.31. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association, I have been requested to support the action of the District of Columbia Optometric Association in requesting an amendment to the optometry law for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession and providing better visual care for residents of the District of Columbia; also, to support legislation which would afford veterans who are entitled to visual care at Government expense outside of the veterans' facilities to select the services of a licensed optometrist where the veteran so elects. This right is at the present time denied him by the Veterans' Admin-

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[8] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

istration. On behalf of Remington Rand, Inc., I have been requested to support an amendment to the provision in the appropriation bill limiting the price which the Government can pay for typewriters. At the present time the statutory limitations are so restrictive that it is practically impossible for the Government to purchase any typewriters.

Mack, James Edward, National Home and Property Owners Foundation, 1773 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1947, and up to January 1, 1948, I have received the proportionate part of my salary as reported in registration filed October 3, 1946. In addition I have received $5, being the amount of expense incurred by me. My expenditures have been only the said amount. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses. (3) Travel to Baltimore, Md., and return. (4) None. (5) Any legislation vitally affecting the owners of homes, the owners of other real property, and those interested in the private ownership of property.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association. All reimbursed by association, $1,200.77. (2) Railroads, etc., $512.57; hotels and miscellaneous, $688.20. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

Manly, Milo A., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, October 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947, $968.36; salary, October 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947 (after tax deductions), $1,070.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $968.36; salary after tax deductions, $1,070.40. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate bill 984 and House bill 2824.

Margolin, Leo J., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Margolin, (Mrs.) Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $875 in salary received from National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y., none of which spent in connection with work; $30.32 received from above spent for carfare, postage, and office supplies. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Mark, James, Jr.,[1] United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1947, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $1,750, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,302. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Nothing to report for the fourth quarter 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $3.51 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) New York Telephone Co., $3.51. (3) Telephone toll calls totaling $3.51. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85 percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., the Peoples Lobby, Inc., 810 F Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts and largest contribution, $100; in all, $3,323.98. Salaries and wages, $1,384.15; bulletin and printing, $674.15; postage, $353.60; rent, $110; withholding tax, etc., second and third quarter, $252.52; A. Ryan bonus, 1947, $50; Delaware registration, $50; A. J. Walker, $47; addressograph, $34.52; A. B. Dick, supplies, $10; incidentals, $157.56. (2) Salaries and wages, Benjamin C. Marsh Arlene Ryan, Marie McEnaney, Graphic Arts Press, postage, rent, J. B. Stein, A. J. Walker, supplies, withholding tax, etc., A. Ryan, bonus 1947, Delaware registration, A. B. Dick, supplies, Addressograph Corp., incidentals. (3) Salaries and wages, for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We have not caused any article to be published, but have sent material to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program and oppose that against it.

Marshall, Mrs. Katherine Lee, 1734 F Street NW, Washington, D. C.; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (United States section), 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) $600 salary, $80.08 expenses. (2) $600 salary; to landlord, grocers, United States Government, savings, etc.; $80.08 expenses, to railroads, restaurants, and taxicab drivers. (3) $600 salary, for personal living expenses, taxes, savings, etc.; $80.08 expenses, for my own expenses incurred while attending meetings, conferences held by WILPF or other organizations; for my own taxi fare to such meetings and to Capitol Hill. (4) None. (5) Support strengthening UN and its specialized agencies; extension reciprocal trade program; European relief and aid to reconstruction; emergency admission displaced persons on nonquota basis; permanent and Federal FEPE; Federal anti-lynch law. Oppose UMT; United States arming Latin-American countries; reduction Federal income taxes; restrictions of imports.

Marston, R. B., director, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $2,012.50, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $402.50, expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative news flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazine. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 22, 1947. See attached supplementary sheet.[2] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[2] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received fee for services of $112.50; expended, $32.57. (2) Rail and hotel expenses on one trip to Washington to address National Bar Association. (3) Same as (2). (4) Iowa Law Review, November 1947, book review; Law and Social Action, September, October, November, and December, 1947. (5) Support legislation designed to eliminate racism and religious or racial discrimination; to keep separate church and state; to preserve civil liberties; to liberalize immigration laws; specifically, bills listed under question 5, quarterly report, July 2, 1947, plus H. R. 29 antipoll tax.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $130. (2) Walter J. Mason. (3) National legislative representative; taxis and phone calls. (4) [Blank.] (5) Affecting labor.

Mecartney, Malcolm, associate counsel, 10 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; C. R. I. & P. Ry. Co. Protective Committee for Preferred Stock, 209 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received from the above-named committee $380 to apply on account of fees (see note below), and $785.89 for expenses. (NOTE.—Payment of $75 per week on account of fees under conditions stated in item 4 of Registration Form B was subsequently modified by the committee to $100 per week under the same conditions, retroactive to January 1, 1947.) (2) and (3) Hotel Harrington, Washington, $236.95; operating expense of automobile on trip from Washington to Chicago (estimated), $32; other operating expense of automobile, including garage and repairs (estimated), $37; Pennsylvania Railroad, fare and pullman, Chicago to Washington and return, $79.42; meals for self and guests (estimated), $248.52; stenographic and mimeograph services (estimated), $78; entertainment for self and guests (estimated), $18; miscellaneous personal expense (laundry, cleaning, pressing, drugs, etc.) (estimated), $27; incidental (taxis, postage, telegrams, telephone tolls), $29; total, $785.89. (4) None. (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any legislation. I was employed as associate counsel for said committee to represent the interests of the preferred stockholders of the Rock Island Railroad in the pending reorganization proceedings, and incident to such general employment, I was asked by the committee to urge the support of legislation (such as S. 1253, 79th Cong.) designed to prevent the unwarranted forfeiture of railroad securities, including Rock Island preferred stock, imminently threatened in pending reorganization proceedings.

Mechem, Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co., Libby, McNeill & Libby Food Products et al, 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees and the total amount of reimbursement for traveling expenses was $468. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks, E. A. National League of District Postmasters of the United States, 1110 F Street NW., Washington D. C. (1) $1,500 salary for quarter ending December 31, 1947. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Postal legislation affecting postmasters.

Messer, Ross A., National Association of Post Office Custodial Employees, 525 New Jersey Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,250; expenses, $168.63; expenses includes telephone, telegraph, post-office-box rent, taxi, office supplies, etc., necessary for the operation of an office handling legislation and grievances. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for Postal Employees, and in handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) The Post Office Custodial News and the Postal Mechanic. (5) All beneficial legislation for all postal employees, and custodial employees in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from October 1 to December 31, 1947, was $4,000 in salary gross. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I have during this period, as executive vice president of the Railway Business Association, urged the members of that association to support the Reed-Bulwinkle bill in regard to which the Railway Business Association has approved a resolution in favor of it and has appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Miles, Clarence R., United States Chamber of Commerce, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $4,000; expenses, $40.60. Expended: Transportation, $25.60; meals, $15. (2) Taxi companies, restaurants. (3) Transportation to, and communication with the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Miller, Charles C., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I received from my employer, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., during the past quarter a total of $1,262.50, prorated to cover time spent in legislative activities. Additional payments by our general office, allocated on the basis of 50 percent for time spent on legislative work totaled $993.52, including rent, secretary's salary, office supplies, printing, phone, and out-of-pocket expenses for transportation, luncheons, etc. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports covering the routine monthly reports of rubber consumption, tire production, etc., one release covering excise taxes paid on tires and one covering industry testimony on rubber legislation before the House Armed Services Committee. (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on proposed revisions of excise taxes, and on the regulation of transportation of flammable material.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y. (1) Received: $1,500, plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500, plus $20.40 expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500, plus $595.28 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended: $1,365.68. This sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States Post Office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food, and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $453; office rent, $375; taxi fares, etc., $108; telephone and telegraph companies, $102.31; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $136.87; entertainment and miscellaneous, $190.50. (4) Monthly article in Dallas Magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin, F. E., American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trips to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose was $241.34; telephone and telegraph, $11.88; Washington stenographer, $5.20. (3) Hearing before the House Committee on Agriculture on Mexican foot-and-mouth-disease program. (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) [Blank.]

Molnar,[7] Joseph, 229 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $48 in October, $58 in November, and $48 in December as old-age assistance. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Living expenses. (4) None. (5) For the needy and unemployed.

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary (10 weeks at $75 and 3 weeks at $100), $1,050; subsistence, $984; expenses, $1,881.26; total, $3,915.26. This amount covers nonlegislative work as described under (4) in Form B, as well as legislative work. Legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Workers and Ammunition (UAW-CIO publications), Economic Outlook (CIO publication), Antioch Review, Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Mooney, William W., 505 South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend National Recovery Plan Organization, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Credited with $1,489.48. Out of this, $220.69 was deducted for withholding tax and $9 for hospitalization protection while traveling, leaving a balance of $1,259.79. Out of this, all travel expense for train, bus, auto, hotel, taxi, and other promotional expense is paid, amounting to $586.02, leaving a balance of $673.77 to maintain wife and home. (2) William W. Mooney. (3) Am working on a commission basis, so must pay all travel expense in traveling over all sections of the State of Washington. This commission is paid by Townsend National Recovery Plan headquarters in Cleveland, Ohio, on revenue coming to them in the form of contributions, etc., from the State. (4) At times do send in notices and short articles to the Townsend National Weekly, printed at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio; also, State bulletins and literature to the different clubs over the State to create interest and build morale. (5) To support the Townsend National Recovery Plan bills—H. R. 16 and H. R. 2476—now in Congress of the United States. These bills are in the Ways and Means Committee with a discharge petition now in the well of the House.

Moore, Chester B., 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Received my regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To my regular accounts of my business and personal life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid a regular salary covering all duties as managing director of Western Growers Association. Am not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do support or oppose any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $146.21. (Salary now at annual rate of $20,000 for full-time services as associate counsel, as is more fully set out in registration form.) (2) Hotels, meals, and phones, $81.53; railroad and pullman fares, $44.68; airlines, $11.50; taxicabs, $8.50. (3) Hotels, meals, phones, travel, and taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Morelock, Phil D., Massman Construction Co., Commerce Trust Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192 for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Morrow, Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,499.99, plus $407.23 as reimbursement for traveling expenses, taxi fares, and other incidental expenses incurred on office business. Salary and reimbursement of expenses covered, services rendered Freight Forwarders Institute, none of which related to legislation during this quarter. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Eastern Airlines, hotels Governor Clinton and McAlpin in New York City, and taxicabs and restaurants in Washington and New York. (3) For actual expenses while away from Washington and for transportation on office business in Washington. (4) Articles in I. C. C. Practitioners' Journal regarding matters of interest to practitioners before the Interstate Commerce Commission. (5) Any legislation directly affecting the interests of freight forwarders subject to part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass.; Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove Builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C.; the Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) As previously reported, registrant receives compensation of $1,000 per month for his services. As described in greater detail below, in the course of performing these services registrant has made certain expenditures for travel, subsistence, communications, etc., for which he has been or will be reimbursed. Payment of these amounts so expended has been made directly to the hotels, railroads, restaurants, etc., which rendered the services to which reference is here made. Following is a summary of the expenditures referred to: Expense items: Railroad fare, $43.78; Pullman, $4.21; taxi fare, $117.75; breakfast, $10.50; lunch, $3.50; dinner, $16.50; postage, $3; telephone and telegraph, $61.60; tips, $46.40; entertainment, $98.92; total, $406.16. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $100 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., National Chiropractic Insurance Co., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None specified. At present time supporting S. 1428, the Langer bill.

Myers, E. Pauline, E. Pauline Myers Information Associates, 3209 Georgia Avenue NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Shiloh Baptist Church (old site) Fredericksburg, Va., $8; Methodist Ministers Conference, Washington, D. C., $9; Baptist Ministers' Conference, Washington, D. C., $15. (2) E. Pauline Myers Information Associates. (3) To carry forward a campaign necessary to the abolition of segregation in the United States Armed Forces. (4) Information Please, published by the Elks Civil Liberties Department, I. B. P. O. E. W., 1412-26 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa., and The Case Against a Jim Crow Army, published by same organization. (5) I seek an antidiscrimination amendment to the National Security Training Act, 1947, H. R. 4278.

Myrup, Andrew William, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union, 2719 North Wilton Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $108 per week; $1,404 per quarter. (2) To the registrant. (3) Salary for conducting the research department of the international union with the following duties in the interests of our membership: To collect statistical data and compile same for use of the member locals in negotiations, such surveys to cover hours and earnings, contract clauses, economic data on the industries in which our members work. Also to act as liaison between our organization and various Government agencies, such as NLRB, Labor Commerce, Agriculture, Social Security, etc., and to watch the progress of Federal and State legislation. (4) None. (5) None.

National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (See registration for statement of membership of committee.) (1) Receipts, $119.13; received from 10 members or representatives of the committee in reimbursement of traveling expenses (average $12). Disbursements to Meredith Wood, 385 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., 129, in reimbursement of committee's traveling expenses, less his own share. (2) See answer to question 1 above. (3) See answer to question 1 above. (4) None. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postal rates and discrimination in postal rates such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

Neel, Samuel E., 1427 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Money received (October 1–December 31, 1947): (a) Retainer, $2,749.98; (b) traveling expenses, $223.75; (c) office expenses, $205.47. Money expended: (a) traveling expenses, $223.75; (b) office expenses, $205.47. (2) The only money expended was that for travel expenses and office expenses. The travel expenses were paid to various railroads, hotels, etc., and the office expenses were paid for postage, office supplies, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage-banking industry.

Nelson, George R., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Newton, R. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) October 10, expense account, $28.74; October 14, salary, $354.17; October 14, expense account, $161.77; October 31, salary, $354.17; November 3, expense account, $17.90; November 13, salary, $354.16; November 18, expense account, $470.15; November 26, salary, $354.17; December 12, salary, $354.17; December 12, expense account, $52.66; December 31, salary, $354.16. (2) R. Wayne Newton. (3) [Blank.] (4) Co-ops and Income Tax Exemptions; October 1947 Philadelphia Business Almanack. (5) Employed to counteract the anti-farmer-coop lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association; (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association, or as a firm of organization and industry counselors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; (3) all State and local tax equality associations and all National, State, and local small business or other associations, however known, which are subsidized from or contributors to the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expense, $286.20. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. Merely to check legislation that may be of interest to proprietary schools. This report covers the period April 1, 1947, to September 30, 1947.

Nyce, Peter Q., 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received and none expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to lands of the United States.

O'Connor,[7] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,124.94; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $738.37. (2) Paid out $738.37 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion Senate bill, S. 670, by Hawkes, and S. 1320, and its companion, H. R. 3548.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,500 compensation; $45.53 on account of expenditures previously reported for which reimbursement had not been made. (2) [Blank.] (3) $45.53 taxicab fares, telephone tolls, and telegrams (previously reported). (4) None. (5) S. 814—amendment to section 4 as reported by House Agriculture Committee; H. R. 2860—amendment to section 1 (b)—both in Eightieth Congress, first session.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Ogg, William Raymond, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $15.05 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946). (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) Interim foreign aid, long-range agricultural program, taxation. (In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the above matters has been supported or opposed.)

O'Hara, Bart, secretary-treasurer, Colorado Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Oliver, John P., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October 1947, $583.33 plus $27.25; November 1947, $583.33 plus $31.20; December 1947, $583.33 plus $8.70. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, the taxidriver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

O'Neal, Edward A., American Farm Bureau Federation, 53 East Washington Street Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $370.33 expended. (See item (6) of Form B filed December 1946). (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) Interim foreign aid, long-range agricultural program, taxation.

O'Neil, Thomas G., Up-State New York Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 83 Main Street, Sidney, N. Y. (1) $62.50. (2) Reimbursement for expenses of trip to Binghamton, N. Y., October 28, 1947, $7.50. Reimbursement for trip expense to Washington, D. C., November 19, 20, 21, 1947, $55. (3) As stated above. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation—legislation tending toward tax equality.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers of America, URWA Building, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $868.70. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and other travel expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) United Rubber Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, and prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Disbursements: Railroad fare, $12.92; hotel, $11; meals and taxis, $6.08. (2) Mrs. Theodor Oxholm. (3) Trip from New York to Washington, D. C., November 19–20, 1947, to attend meeting on national school-lunch program. (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $18.20 expended (see item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946). (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) Interim foreign aid, long-range agricultural program, taxation. (In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the above matters has been supported or approved.)

Paul,[7] Randolph (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison), Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) 1640 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Receipts, none; expenditures, $3.20. (2) Taxis, $2.20; notarial fee, $1. (3) Expenses were incurred in connection with filing form B. (4) None relating to the subject below.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

(5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Paulson, Nathan J., 1536 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Investors League, Inc., 175 Fifth Avenue, New York City. (1) $237.85. (2) Railroads, taxis, telephone company, stenographers, stationers, etc. (3) Transportation, telephone calls, stenographic work, office supplies, etc. (4) I write a monthly column for the League Bulletin. (5) All legislation affecting the investor.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $669.99 for expenses incurred. (2) Various. (3) Travel fares, taxi fares, lunch, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Petersen, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Peterson, Dutton, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, October, November, December, $333.33; travel expense, $51.59. Carfare, $36.14; meals, $4.40; telephone and telegraph, $5.75; miscellaneous, $5.30; total (October–December), $51.59. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training legislation, and to organize opposition against it. (4) The organization sends a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,105. Received $684.23 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $189.25 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Pierson, A. T., 71 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815. No expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Place, Henry C., Townsend, Elliott & Munson, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) (Quarter ending December 31, 1947.) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $380.66 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone, and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $190.55; hotel, $94.76; telephone and telegraph, $86.85; miscellaneous, $8.50. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Pollitzer,[7] Miss Anita, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Pope, Ballard & Loos, California Fruit Growers Exchange, et al., 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $858.38; disbursements, $858.38. (2) Railroads, hotels, etc., for travel expenses. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) H. R. 452, S. 306, H. R. 1825, H. R. 2160.

Posner, Stanley I., attorney, Linen Supply Association of America et al., Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Linen Supply Association of America, fees, $1,500; disbursements, $303.03; Institute of Industrial Launderers, fees, $1,250; disbursements, $499.18. (2) No disbursements for purposes of section 307. (3) None. (4) Mimeographed bulletins of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers. Also Linen Supply News. (5) Labor legislation.

Poston, Robert R., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C; the American Legion, national organization, 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $201.63 salary semimonthly less withholding tax; $132.93 for traveling expenses during October, November, and December 1947; $14.90 incidental expenses for October, November, and December 1947. (2) Robert R. Poston. (3) $132.93 reimbursement for traveling expenses, round trip to Indianapolis, Ind.; $14.90 incidental expenses for October, November, and December 1947, car fare, luncheons. (4) The American Legion magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense, Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Poulton, J. E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, W. Royce, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee of Americans, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md.; Railroad Security Owners' Association, New York, N. Y. (1) Committee of Americans, Inc., $3,475; Magothy River Association, $2,000; Railroad Security Owners' Association, $450. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, Baltimore Sun, various member periodicals of Associated Press. (5) Oppose S. 230, Magothy River Association; publicity opposing Reed railroad reorganization bill, Railroad Security Owners Association; publicity and surveys in support tax reduction, Committee of Americans, Inc.

Pratt,[4] Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As president he received a monthly salary, $600; minus withholding and social-security taxes, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, American Federation of Labor; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, American Federation of Labor, Weekly Federal News Letters; Railroad Bulletin and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Pratt,[5] Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As president he received a monthly salary, $600, minus withholding and social-security taxes, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Unions, American Federation of Labor, lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, American Federation of Labor, Weekly Federal News Letters and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, Star Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; expenses, $115.90. (2) Miscellaneous taxis and transportation, $32.65; miscellaneous dinners, lunches, etc., $45.55; miscellaneous expenses of visitors, $37.70. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers—Evening Star, Washington Post, Times-Herald, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and traveling expenses in connection with his usual duties as assistant to the manager of the National Lead Co. Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended during this quarter in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, Oliver & Donnally, 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally. No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the October, November, and December issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Publicity Associations, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) From Na-

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[4] Filed for third quarter.

[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

tional Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $3,095.55; for professional services, $2,250; for out-of-pocket expenses, $845.55. (2) Publicity Associates, Inc., for professional services, $2,250. See exhibit A[2] (attached) for detail of out-of-pocket expenses totaling $845.55. (3) Compiling and distributing information. (4) See exhibit B[2] (attached). (5) To support legislation designed to free margarine from unfair taxes and other unfair trade barriers, and to oppose legislation creating such taxes and other trade barriers.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary for this period, which amounted to $2,500. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Pyle, Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,112.50 pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None. My job is to keep the membership informed on legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Raesly, Leon, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Thornton & Taylor, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) None at present.

Ramsey, Donald J., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Silver Users Association, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Money expended during quarter ended December 31, 1947: Railroad and airplane tickets, $316.61; hotels, $135.30; taxis and tips, $64.97; meals, $163.08; telephone calls, $19.48; club dues, $123.60; office expenses, including supplies, furniture, and expenses of employee, $310.57; total, $1,133.61. Money received during quarter ended December 31, 1947: (1) Salary (before tax deductions), $3,000; (2) reimbursement for expenditures incurred before current quarter, $298.70; (3) I have also been reimbursed for the amount of expenditures listed under schedule A, $1,133.61; total, $4,432.31. (2) Railroads, airlines, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, telephone company, office supplies, etc. (See (1) above). (3) Maintaining office, visiting members of association and attending conferences (see (1) above). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the silver-using industry. (None at present.)

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Have received no compensation other than my regular salary as previously reported. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the airplane industry in the public interest. For specific legislation supported and opposed during this quarter: (1) Supported legislation to repeal the Federal transportation tax; (2) supported the establishment of an air parcel-post system; (3) opposed changing existing law in determining compensation for transportation of air mail; (4) opposed any raise in air-mail postage rates.

Rankin, J. Lee, Beghtol & Rankin, a partnership, 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Rapp, Leslie M., Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Activities under registration in behalf of Wabash Railroad Co. terminated in July 1947. Registrant has heretofore filed quarterly reports for the quarters ending June 30, 1947, and September 30, 1947, showing reimbursement from the law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, by which he is employed, for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in behalf of Wabash Railroad Co. In addition, said law firm of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett incurred expenses of $170.19 for railroad fare for registrant, $46.53 for telephone and telegrams, and $21.79 for stenography. Under date of December 26, 1947, it billed Wabash Railroad Co. in the amount of $1,208.82 for the foregoing disbursements (including those heretofore reported by registrant) and in the amount of $55,000 for professional services in behalf of said railroad (including services rendered before the effective date of the Federal Lobbying Act). Said bill was paid January 2, 1948.

Registrant is not a partner of said law firm. He is employed by it as a tax attorney at a fixed annual salary.

This constitutes registrant's final report under his registration in behalf of Wabash Railroad Co. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3861, which became Public Law No. 189 on July 15, 1947.

Ray, J. Franklin, Jr., 1740 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $407; travel and transportation expenses, $11.40; periodicals, $7. (2) Salary received used for personal expenses—no part spent on behalf of the committee fo. the Marshall plan. Travel and transportation expenses cover my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. Periodicals purchased in connection with and use of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) European recovery program.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 ($1,200 yearly). (2) Me. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting disabled emergency officers.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None for lobbying purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association Bulletin, which is issued by registrant in his capacity as counsel and Washington representative of National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association. (5) H. R. 3825. This activity is a small portion of my other duties as counsel for the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association.

Reidy, William G.,[7] 914 G Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $250; received expenses, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in October 10, 1947, quarterly report form C, namely $1,033.33 per month for October, November, and December; nothing was received nor expended by me for purposes covered in the act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $2.95. (2) Taxicab fares to various taxicabs, car mileage, and parking, $2.45. Notary public, $0.50. (3) Trips to House and Senate Office Buildings, and notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended September 30, 1947. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Rice, Richard M.,[6] 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality as between similar businesses.

Richman, Paul, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Approximately $125. (2) Paul Richman. (3) Office telephone. (4) Washington Newsletter. (5) Fair employment practices; immigration.

Riggle, John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, December, 1947, $1,875. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest. A mimeograph résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture. Distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riggs, Frank E., first vice president, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419–420 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received $500 and paid out $500 for commuting to Washington, D. C., and for expenses during the following 5 weeks: November 3, 17, and 24, also December 2 and 8, 1947. (2) Frank E. Riggs, first vice president, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419–420 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For taxi and train fares commuting daily to Washington, D. C., also for breakfasts and dinners on trains, and for taxis, lunches, refreshments, etc., in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt up to $1,440 from income tax, the same as railroad pensions are under existing Railroad Retirement Act.

Rising, E. W., 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont.; National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Western Beet Growers Association, $562.37; (b) Water Conservation Conference, $76.52; (c) National Water Conservation Conference, $357.95. (2) E. W. Rising. (3) (a) Time and expenses of E. W. Rising for members' information service and transportation and expenses attending beet growers convention; (b) and (c) office expenses, postage, stationery, stenographic services in connection with members' information services. (4) None. (5) None during fourth quarter of 1947.

Rivers, T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ending December 31, 1947, I spent one-half day checking on the status of S. 1229. No money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 1229.

Roark, L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel and meals, but none this quarter. (2) No expenses this quarter. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 2517 South Salina Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; the Christian Amendment Movement (now without salary, expenses only), 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

(1) No salary; for expenses, $160 from J. S. Tibby, treasurer, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh 22, Pa. (2) $104.37 was expended in making trips to Washington and Pittsburgh in behalf of legislation. (3) For railroad fare, hotel bills, meals away from home, literature, stationery, and incidental travel expenses as indicated on itemized account. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for October, November, and December 1947, for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer, legislative bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Roemer, Ruth, 1029 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses covered both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Root, Ballantine, Harlan, Bushby & Palmer, 31 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.; 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Greenwich Country Day School, Inc., Old Church Road, Greenwich, Conn. (1) No receipts or expenditures. (2) See No. (1). (3) See No. (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation to extend old-age and survivors insurance benefits on a permissive basis to school teachers.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received by the undersigned for purposes of influencing legislature except (a) $30 (10 hours' time, estimated, at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,480 as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to compilation of results of questionnaire to members on taxing tax-exempt cooperatives, which was used in the association's appearance before congressional committee in public hearing; (b) $3 (1 hour) in preparation of other printed material in which Federal legislation was mentioned. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) Washington News Letter Service to United States Wholesale Grocers' Association. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association to suport or oppose general labor legislation and fair employment practice legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Revenue Code relative to the foreign tax credit.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Spencer Gordon, counsel for American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) Associate work with Mr. Gordon in opposing H. R. 2657. (4) None. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I received only my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B. The corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue press releases; some of which are printed, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received the retainer heretofore reported. No expense the second calendar quarter of 1947. See attached memorandum.[2] (2) See attached memorandum.[2] (3) See attached memorandum.[2] (4) Three articles in Investment Dealer's Digest, 150 Broadway, New York, N. Y.—"What Are the Comparative Merits of Insurance Under FDIC and FSLIC?" May 26, 1947, "Bank Deposit Insurance vs. Savings and Loan Insurance," November 24, 1947, "Is the Savings and Loan Field Too Narrow?" December 29, 1947; contents of Legal Bulletin, United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago; "Comparison of FDIC with FSLIC," August 1947 Savings & Loans News, "Something New in Trust Accounts," December 1947 Savings & Loans News, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting savings and loan associations and cooperative banks.

Ryan, M. O., 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,300. October 1 to December 31, 1947, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxis, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $1,580.61, of which insignificant amount was for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxis, Washington restaurants, and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

St. Clair, Labert, National Automobile Dealers' Association, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Automobile Dealers' Association which I represent as public contacts counsel estimates that one-third of my monthly fee is properly chargeable to my congressional contact duties. This would be a total for the fourth quarter of $1,250. I spent nothing. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation affecting the interests of retail automobile dealers.

Sanders, J. T.,[3] the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Transportation, $9.60; meals, $25.45. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) None. (5) General agricultural legislation, labor legislation, and other bills related to agriculture.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union, AFL., 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) None except my salary at the rate of $7,200 yearly. (2) No. (3) No. (4) None. (5) For all labor legislation and social legislation endorsed by the American Federation of Labor. Opposed to all antilabor and antisocial legislation.

Saville, Russell, 1434 Harvard Street NW, Washington, D. C.; American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.. (1) Salary $75 per week and expense allowance for the time spent outside the city on business for the organization to include 5 cents per mile travel and actual hotel bill. (2) Russell Saville. (3) Compensation as legislative representative. (4) Comet, the weekly pension report sent to American Pension Clubs. (5) H. R. 781, an old-age pension bill offered to take the place of the old-age assistance provisions of the Social Security Act.

Saylor, Richard D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received and expended by this registrant was used solely for the maintenance of the Washington office in carrying out its function as manufacturer's representative and no part of it whatsoever was expended in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) Office lessor, telephone company, stationers, etc. (3) Rent, telephone service, supplies needed in carrying out duties as manager of the Washington office. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co. including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Schoene, Freehill, Kramer & Fanelli, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, Milton Kramer, and Joseph A. Fanelli, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Schoen, Paul W.,[3] Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Valdosta, Ga. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Schoenhals, E. L.,[3] Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League $600; this is paid for my acting as executive secretary and attorney and maintaining office, steno, phone, mailing address, and other service. (2) To my secretary, Jean Powers, telephone company, United and other air lines, to Kearns Building for office rent, postage and stationery, to U. P. and B. & O. (3) To maintain my office and permit work to be carried on and to counsel. (4) Tribune and Telegram and Deseret News have had some items. (5) To eliminate tax exemptions extended to cooperatives.

Scott,[4] Jack Garrett, National Association of Motor Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement. No expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motor bus industry. Thus far this session I have made presentations before congressional committees on S. 110, H. R. 221, excise-tax legislation, H. R. 584 and S. 1126.

Scott,[5] Jack Garrett, National Association of Motor Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement. No expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motor bus industry. Thus far this session I have made presentations before congressional committees on S. 110, H. R. 221, excise-tax legislation, H. R. 584, and S. 1126, and House investigation of Fair Labor Standards Act.

Scott, John W., attorney, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; as previously stated in my registration statement with exception noted below. Victor J. Evans & Co. et al. (1) None. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (NOTE.—The firm of McMorrow,

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.
[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

Berman & Davidson are attempting to cancel contract of employment with me.)

Scott, Vernon, and Loring A. Schuler, constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; see attached statement.[2] (1) No money received.[2] No money expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to equalize the taxes borne by various types of business corporations.

Scott, William C., attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: For transportation, meals, and hotel rooms, $65.16. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad and various restaurants and hotels. (3) Transportation, meals, hotel rooms, and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Seay, Temple W., 815 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192, for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Selby, Mrs. Meredith, Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Shandros, Geraldine, 5 Beekman Street, New York City, and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York City. (1) Salary, $280 (this constitutes one-half of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitute about one-half of working time); travel expense, $11.50; miscellaneous, $25; total, $316.50. (2) Travel, Pennsylvania Railroad; miscellaneous taxis, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communication industry and American work men and women generally.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose 76, Mass. National Council for Prevention of War (New England section), 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $400; traveling expenses, $137.86 (refund of actual amounts paid for travel away from office). (2) Railroads, bus lines, gas stations, hotels, restaurants, phones, etc. (3) Travel for speaking dates, conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW. (5) Universal military training, oppose; economic relief measures for Europe and Asia (not military aid), favor; other measures related to the issues of war and peace.

Shearon, Marjorie, Ph. D., legislative consultant, the Shearon Medical Legislative Service, 610 Columbian Building, Washington, D. C. Self-employed as consultant, writer, and lecturer. (1) Sale of subscriptions to American Medicine and the Political Scene and sale of publications, $12,311.41 (for period July 1 to December 31, 1947). (2) Printing (Gibson Bros.), $2,313.15; mimeographing, $349.75; (rent Shannon and Luchs), $972; clerical help, $685.96; furniture and equipment, $1,188.25; telephone, $107.15; postage, $810.18; miscellaneous (copyright, office supplies, etc.), $200; in all, $6,626.44. (3) Publishing and mailing analytical news releases to subscribers. Publishing and mailing pamphlets to persons who buy them. (4) I myself am editor and publisher of the weekly analytical release American Medicine and the Political Scene. I have published pamphlets, including a reprint for nationalization of medicine—Plans to Enchain Medicine by Unwarranted Regulative Interference, and Federal Propaganda for the Welfare State. (5) [Blank.]

Shields, Robert H., 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Beet Sugar Association. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shorb, Paul E., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. Railroad Security Owners' Association, Inc., New York, N. Y. (1) Received $8,077.68 for fee for legal services and reimbursement for disbursements. (2) Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Chicago Journal of Commerce, Cheapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union. (3) Railroad tickets and travel expenses, $35.19; Chicago Journal of Commerce, 4 months' subscription, $7.83; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., calls to New York, $33.57; Western Union, telegram to New York, $1.09. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support legislation as proposed in H. R. 2298 and S. 249 as originally introduced and to oppose H. R. 3237, H. R. 3980, and S. 249 with Reed-Myers amendments.

Shufelt, Bernard E., Ward 44, McGuire Veterans' Hospital, Richmond, Va. Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America, 218 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received from Paralyzed Veterans' Association of America, $200; expended, $89.90. (2) Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., for accommodations, $26.50; Mr. Mike Zohab, Richmond, Va., for attendant service, $25; Mr. David F. Reininger, Richmond, Va., for traveling, $12.80; Mr. Bill Prickett, Richmond, Va., for traveling, $12.80; Mr. Bernard E. Shufelt, Richmond, Va., for traveling, $12.80; total, $89.90. (3) Accommodations, attendant service, and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Wheel chair housing bill; amputee car bill (affecting quadriplegics); charter for Paralyzed Veterans Association of America.

Shuford, Helen Alcott, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) None. (Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement.) (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO (UAW-CIO), 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Home office, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) From National Council for a Permanent FEPC, September 15–December 8, 1947; salary, $1,125; expenses, $250.22; National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, November 1947, salary, $200; UAW-CIO (3 weeks at $100), $300; expenses, $189, total, $2,064.22. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Slayman, Charles H., Jr., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on regisration statement. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Smart,[4] Miss Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received $649.01 salary. Received and paid out $85.85. (2) Postoffice, Washington Times-Herald, Western Union, Ace Letter Service, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Government Printing Office, and Royal Typewriter Co. (3) Postage, newspaper subscriptions, telegrams, mimeographing letters and addressing envelopes, telephone service, copies of speeches in Congress, and repairs to typewriter. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, and interracial relations.

Smart,[5] Miss Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received $665.07 salary. Received and paid out $91.64. (2) Cheasapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Thomas Hall, secretary of state, North Dakota; Washington Times-Herald; E. Morrison Paper Co.; Western Union; post office; Government Printing Office; Brentano's; Maude Wilson; employees of Methodist Building. (3) Telephone; State liquor laws; subscription; office supplies; telegrams; postage; subscription to Survey of Current Business; maps, stencils, Christmas presents. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., secretary-treasurer, Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., 1212 Louisiana National Bank, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received nor expended for lobbying. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support any legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts, $5,238.35, for legal fees and disbursements, paid to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: No expenditures for legislative purposes during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) American Journal of Nursing. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand; specifically to support the extension of social-security coverage to include employees of nonprofit institutions and private-duty nurses.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000 in October, $1,000 in November, and $1,250 in December from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believe could be construed as lobbying. Serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade association executive and any contacts with Members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade-association work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) October salary, $750; November salary, $750; December salary, $750. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed for third quarter.

[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

Arizona Project Association, 507 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary (travel expense, board and room when engaged in travel). (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, and California's Stake in Arizona's Share of the Colorado River. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $1,650 for the period October 1 to December 31, 1947, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., as well as reimbursement for routine expenses of $440.20 in October, $317.60 in November, and $352.35 in December. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, Pullman Co., stationers, etc. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration form B, which involve legislation only incidentally and to a limited extent. Affiant states upon information and belief that none of his activity during the period covered by this report was within the scope of section 307 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of his work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $981.93 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $150.53; hotel, clubs, and restaurants, $330.88; gratuities and miscellaneous, $184.28; subscription, $250; telephone and telegraph, $66.24. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, suite 1110, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2,268.44, expended $541.13. (2) Various. (3) Travel fares, meals, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith, Robert E., National Conference of Railroad Investors, suite 1110, Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,100.80. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith,[4] Russell, National Farmers Union, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All pending legislation.

Smith,[5] Russell, National Formers Union, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) Nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Snyder, Calvin K., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $1,431.11 for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, taxi fares, lunches, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

Stebbins,[4] Frank L., Illinois Associated Businessmen, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $15. (2) Blackstone Hotel. (3) Food. (4) None. (5) Any legislation designed to bring about tax equality between competing businesses of all types.

Stebbins,[5] Frank L., Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received. Money expended, $408.25. (2) Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C. (3) Room rent, food, valet, laundry, tips, phone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Supports all legislation designed to bring about equitable taxation between competing corporations of various types.

Steele, Raymond E., general counsel, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2.45 for taxicabs to attend hearings on wage-and-hour law (Fair Labor Standards Act); 80 cents for taxicab to secure copy of wage-and-hour-law brief (Fair Labor Standards Act). (2) Taxicab operators. (3) Transportation to Capitol. (4) None. (5) Wage-and-hour law (Fair Labor Standards Act).

Steffan, Arthur A., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. Petrol Corp., 2012 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None; no work carried on. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None used. (5) Private bill for the relief of Petrol Corp.

Stein, Harold, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,568. Travel and transportation expenses, $328.24. (2) Salary received used for personal expenses; no part spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan. Travel and transportation expenses cover my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None except through ordinary press channels. (5) European recovery program.

Stein, Margaret I., Committee for the Nation's Health, 914 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $666.68; received expenses, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Stellwagen, Herbert P., Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Deponent has neither received nor expended any money for attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress. He has merely been reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses in traveling to and from the District of Columbia. (2) No payments have been made except, as stated, for deponent's own transportation and subsistence. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) That relative to the regulation of insurance rates in the District of Columbia.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500 (half time); expenses, $646.34. (2) Various. (3) Membership fees, transportation, etc. (4) Attached list [2] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by those publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October 1 to December 31, 1947, $850 salary (half time) and $538.17 for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Dues, lunches, transportation, etc. (4) Attached list [2] shows names of paper, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 605–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1947, $1,500, less income tax. Traveling expenses for October, November, and December 1947, $337.04. (2) $337.04 traveling expenses paid to various railroads, taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, and lodging and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and National, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; to oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, and December 1947 (after withholding and social-security tax), $1,691.40; incidental expenses, October, November, and December 1947, $20; travel expenses, October 1947, $131.73. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Salary for October, November, and December 1947 (after deduction of withholding and social-security taxes), $1,691.40; travel expenses from Washington, D. C., to Cincinnati, Ohio, $71.42; travel expenses from Washington, D. C., to Manchester, N. H., $60.31; incidental expenses, taxis, lunches, etc., $20. (4) DAV semi-monthly. (5) Any legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, salary $2,000; expenses reimbursed by employer, $300.92; expenditures, $300.92. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $5.20. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in transporting registrant between his office and the Capitol. (3) For taxi transportation between office and Capitol. (4) Prepared articles dealing with Federal automotive excise taxes which have appeared in Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office, I have carried out the work outlined above. I am also required, among my other duties, to report on the status of pending highway legislation. My interest has been limited to reporting on the Federal automotive excise taxes concerning which no bills have as yet been introduced.

Swomley,[6] John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington, $207.12. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indi-

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.

cated above. (4) Conscription News Weekly, Gospel Messenger, the Denver Post, and Commercial and Financial Chronicle. (5) I serve as acting director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, worldwide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Taylor, Hugh W., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association for salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $620.40. (2) Various. (3) Rent, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $417.77 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $231.79 reimbursement for traveling expenses during October, November, and December, 1947; $7.30 incidental expenses for October, November, and December, 1947. (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $231.79 reimbursement for traveling expenses from Washington to Boston, Mass., to Columbus, Ohio, and return to Washington; one round trip to Indianapolis, Ind.; $7.30 incidental expenses for October, November, and December, 1947. (4) The American Legion magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $16.30. (2) Taxi fares. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers.

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $3,375.02 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: Adjusted regular office expenses amounting to $464.72; research and technical assistance, $1,375.02; travel expense, $78.96 (estimated). (2) Landlord, stamps, telephone, etc.; Henry Bison, Jr.; Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council; National Grocers' Bulletin (published monthly). (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free enterprise system.

Temple, Miss Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, National Headquarters, 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received in salary for the calendar quarter $1,000 (possibly slightly over half of this was for duties in connection with legislative work). (2) None of the money received by me was paid to anyone in connection with legislative work. (3) None. See under (2). (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women. Quarterly; AAUW General Director's Letter, issued three or four times a year; sent to leaders in the American Association of University Women. (5) See the legislative notes of general director's letter for November 1947 stating the legislation supported and opposed.

Thompson, Chester C., the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., of $4,666.66, covering October, November, and December 1947. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $38.25. (3) Local transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., American Parents Committee, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $43.44 for miscellaneous expense; expended $43.44. (2) Various. (3) Telephone calls, cab fares, lunches, and other miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act (H. R. 1980).

Tinney, William H., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $519.36 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation. Sixty-two dollars and ninety-three cents was expended by me as expense money during the fourth quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $382.02 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) Sixty-two dollars and ninety-three cents was expended by me as expense money during the fourth quarter of 1947, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) My salary was $3,250 for quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. As the liaison representative between various Government agencies and International Union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation both Federal and State for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $15 expended (see item (6) of form B filed December 1946). (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation proposed legislation on the following matters have been supported or opposed: Interim foreign aid; long-range agricultural program; taxation.

Tone, Joseph M., legislative representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $9.75. (2) Carfare, taxicabs, etc. (3) Transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Vance, C. W., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) Salary, $140; expenses, $104.39; no money expended for personal maintenance. (2) Hamilton Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, postage, laundry, cleaning, pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication, and living expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system.

Van Osdol, Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Business Men's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. Note: Employing association is newly organized and no funds as yet have been received from it nor have I expended funds for it. Future receipts or expenditures will be included in later quarterly reports. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. Note: Am secretary-treasurer of Missouri-Kansas Business Men's Association. As secretary, I may in the future write letters to inspire businessmen, civic organizations, and the public to write letters to Congress with regard to Federal laws, including tax laws, which relate to or affect business and businessmen.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Vogt, Joseph F., The Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $20 from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits on October 20, 1947, as part payment of $57.30 in expenses due me for June through September, leaving a balance of $37.30 due me, plus $66.40 expended by me for expenses during October, November, and December, 1947. (2) The $66.40 mentioned above was spent by me for carfare, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses on behalf of committee work. (3) To preserve the committee's limited funds. (4) Article printed in publication, Railway Age, issue of December 6, 1947, titled "Rank and File Fight Crosser Law." (5) Crosser law, passed July 31, 1946.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, et al., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total money received fourth calendar quarter, 1947, $12,394.72. Total money expended during quarter, $11,352.56; including $6,249.99 personal withdrawals (salary); $363.63 against personal withdrawals (salary); $4,132.74 for office expenses; and $606.20 for personal business expenses to be broken down as follows: Taxis, $184.30; meals, $253.35; phone calls, $31.50; entertainment, $43.65; publications, $39.90; miscellaneous, $53.50. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) All pending or proposed Federal legislation affecting the interests of the electric utility industry.

Ward, D. J., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Imported Nut Section, Association of Food Distributors, Inc., 161 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting imports of tree nuts.

Warfel, George L., the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary gross, withholding and social security taxes deducted, $1,250; expenses, legislative, none; organizational, attending American Federation of Labor convention, and extended trip visiting local unions, including transportation, hotel, meals, etc., $912.36; total, $2,162.36. (2) George L. Warfel. (3) To promote the welfare of the special-delivery messengers of the Post Office Department, including liaison contacts with administrative Government officials and legislative work. (4) The Special Messenger; Special News (mimeographed bulletins to membership). (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to special-delivery messengers.

Warfield, Ethelbert, attorney for American General Corp., 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) Receipts: $61.36 received by Satterlee, Warfield, and Stephens for disbursements (current and past) by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: No expenditures for legislative purposes during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert, attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: For transportation, meals, hotel rooms, etc., $43.55. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad, and various restaurants, hotels, and taxicab companies. (3) Transportation, meals, hotel rooms, and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio. (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period July 1, 1947, to July 31, 1947, inclusive, $2,250. Expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $460.56. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Services were rendered on behalf of housing, labor, credit, and railroad reorganization legislation on a sound basis and protective of the interests of the policy owners of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Waterfield, Maynard H., Citizens National Committee, Inc., 2844 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,128; expense, transportation, $145.72. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Washington Close-up, 'Round Washington, and miscellaneous research reports. (5) None.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, District No. 44, I. A. of M., Machinists' building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; $10 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 2 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received for salary, $1,069.60; for expenses, $853.63; expended, $621.96. (2) Registration Committee, Propeller Club, Chas. F. Kraft, treasurer; Barry-Pate Motor Co.; Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office; Hamilton National Bank; District of Columbia Tuberculosis Association; Central Union Mission; various individuals; Mrs. Mae A. Parrott; Little Sisters of the Poor; National Press Club; Postmaster, Washington, D. C. (3) For miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weitzer, Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Railroad fares, $133.63; hotel bills, including room and meals, $37.10; taxi fares, $14.80; miscellaneous office expenses, $13.72; postage, $2.77; salaries, $1,666.67. (2) Pennsylvania and B. & O. Railroads, Park Plaza Hotel, N. Y., various restaurants, various taxi drivers. (3) As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1). (4) None. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution, which follows, and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag, and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $20.30. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wescott, James B., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) Photostats, $37.60; telephone, $1.50. (2) The Huey Co. and Illinois Bell Telephone Co. (3) The expenses incurred were in connection with H. R. 2717. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717.

West,[4] Oscar H., 1001–2 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets, Washington 4, D. C. National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank]. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

West,[5] Oscar H., 1001–2 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C. National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Westfall, Mrs. Edna, 1800 Sigma Chi Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex. (1) $225.75. (2) Mrs. Edna Westfall. (3) Actual expense of Washington trip. (4) Passage of bill for claims against Japanese for frozen assets in this country. (5) [Blank.]

White, John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $63.98. (2) Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Mimeographing statement of witnesses before Joint Committee on Economic Report. (4) None. (5) During the special session of Congress just completed the American Cotton Shippers Association has endorsed: Removal of tax exemption from competing cotton cooperatives before the House Ways and Means Committee; opposed: Amendment to Commodity Exchange Act giving administration right to prescribe minimum margins on futures exchanges before Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employer, $185.82. (2) Expenses paid to various airlines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxis, associations, and so forth. (3) Attending meetings of association committees, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1834 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $1,937.52; reimbursement of travel expenses, $268.12. (2) Various airlines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute. (1) From Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.: Fee, $1,500; expense, $148.63. (2) Telephone and telegraph, $40.13; restaurant, $37; notary fee, $1; taxi, $1; travel, $69.50. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which

[4] Filed for third quarter.
[5] Filed for fourth quarter.

may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Independent Natural Gas Association of America. (1) Salary, $7,700 annually. No expenses with which this report is concerned. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News. (5) Am interested in legislation proposing amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, American Public Welfare Association, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $800 (half time) salary received. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) APWA letter to members. (5) Any legislation affecting public welfare administration.

Wicklein, L. M., general vice president, Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $3,750; total expenses for quarter, $3,873.84. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Wiley, Mrs. Harvey W., chairman of legislation, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. Not employed for pay, volunteer worker. (1) Not any. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) District of Columbia Federation Clubwoman, November and December 1947. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, interested especially in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body of the District of Columbia Federation.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., Wilkinson, Glen A., and Deem, Woodruff J., doing business under the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribes of Indians, Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received legal fees totaling $1,125, a portion of the work being devoted to legislative matters. No money was expended during the past quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2501, H. R. 2502, H. R. 2775, and opposing S. 1222.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., Wilkinson, Glen A.; and Deem, Woodruff J., doing business under the name of Ernest L. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Reservation, Keshena, Wis. (1) $650 received for legal services, only a small portion of the work being directed toward legislative matters. (2) No payments made to others. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2501, H. R. 2502, H. R. 2775, and opposing S. 1222.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Retired Officers Association, Inc. (1) Received $750. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses, of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williamson, C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) During the last quarter of 1947 none of my activities fell under the provisions of title III, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. .(2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. (1) $500 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization; the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

Wilson, E. Raymond, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Friends Committee on National Legislation. (1) Gross salary, October, November, December, $1,374.99; travel expense, $378.43. (2) October-December: Carfare, $262.99; room, $5.45; meals, $37.76; telephone and telegraph, $26.89; miscellaneous, $45.34; total, $378.43. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) The organization sends a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., McKinley, Wyo., Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (1) Salary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,500 and $438.88 expenses paid by the National Wool Growers Association and Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (2) J. B. Wilson, whose principal employment is as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association; lobbying for or against legislation is a part of his duty, but not his principal occupation and for which he receives no added compensation. His expenses, however, are paid by the National Wool Growers Association as chairman of their legislative committee and by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (3) Transportation, hotels, meals, etc. (4) J. B. Wilson is secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association and editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication, published by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for its members. (5) To support any legislation affecting wool growing industry, including wool bills, tariff, public land legislation, etc.

Wilson, Lacey C., Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) Salary and expenses while working in the interest of the brotherhood. (4) Wilmington Sunday Star. (5) Any legislation affecting labor in general, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in particular.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Possible legislation relating to cost of Federal meat inspection.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Seatrain Lines, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Clark & La Roe, law firm, received from Seatrain Lines, Inc., $1,875, monthly payments on annual retainer, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payments made to any other person. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) I have not supported or opposed any legislation during the past quarter.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr., Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Wisdom, John Minor, c/o Wisdom and Stone, 312 Whitney Building, New Orleans, La., Louisiana Community Property Taxpayers Committee. (1) Retainer fees, as attorney, $1,249.48; received as reimbursement for traveling expenses to Washington, stenographic expenses, and postage, $402.75, itemized in attached statement. (2) Self. (3) Retainer for October, November, and December, 1947. See explanatory statement attached to form A filed March 6, 1947, and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947. (4) None. (5) See explanatory statement attached to form A filed March 6, 1947; and supplemental statement attached hereto, and supplemental statement filed July 14, 1947.

Withers, Hamilton E.,[1] 417 North Main Street, Salisbury, N. C., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received $79.65 from Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio, to cover loss of time and expenses for 3 days; expended this for meals and living expenses for 3 days. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To oppose legislation detrimental to organized labor.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No funds received or expended during preceding calendar quarter for the purpose of directly or indirectly influencing legislation. Please see explanatory letter filed with original registration. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson, George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I received as a commission $1,198.29 and the only money I spent was for hotel, traveling, meals, postage, supplies, telephone and telegraph, and clerical work. None spent for political campaigns. (2) I

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

paid no money to individuals for anything except clerical work. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Townsend bill, H. R. 16.

Woodul, Walter F., 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported and $530 for months of September, October, and November, 1947. (2) Hotel Baker, Dallas, Tex., $10.50; and to various other hotels, restaurants, telegraph and telephone companies, Pullman Co., and others in amounts less than $10. (3) Hotels, $14; meals, $34.40; transportation, $24.34; telephones, telegrams, tips, taxis, and incidentals, $28.03; entertaining, $33.35. (4) None. (5) All railroad legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly, salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) Proposed amendments to Internal Revenue Code affecting wine and brandy production and representations with respect to agricultural exemptions under Fair Labor Standards Act.

Worley, Harry F., president of the National Customs Service Association, 5353 Reno Road NW., Washington, D. C. (1) He received only salary and reimbursement of travel, postage, office supplies, and office and incidental expenses. No part of money received for salary or expenses was expended in support of or opposition to any legislation. (2) See No. (1). (3) See No. (1). (4) Customs Service News, published monthly by the National Customs Service Association. He is the editor. It covers the activities of the association, news of prospective and enacted legislation, and news of personal interest to the membership. (5) He supports legislation which would benefit officers and employees of the Federal Government and opposes legislation which is against their interests. He directs legislative, administrative, or court action affecting the interests of the officers and employees of the United States Customs Service. His appearance before the committees of Congress is incidental to other activities, and forms only a small portion of the aggregate.

Wormhoudt, Marion P., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; R. W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (1) None received and none expended during previous quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to partnerships.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers Association, 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex. (1) $3,000 fees for services (received by firm of Case & Wozencraft); $700 reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph expenses. (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved; Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Walter C., Jr., Tax Equality Committee of New Jersey, Inc., 44 Cooper Street, Woodbury, N. J. (1) Receipts, $77.09; expenditures, $76.94. (2) and (3) Railway express, expressage, $1.95; United States Post Office, postage, $34.09; Secretary of State of New Jersey, filing fee, $2; county clerk, Mercer County, N. J., filing fee, 25 cents; Roy Sampson, Woodbury, N. J., sign, $2.50; New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., phone calls, $5.55; Western Union Co., telegram, $1.07; various restaurants, meals, $3.14; various common carriers, carfare, $6.53; various gas stations, gas, oil, etc., $19.86; total, $76.94. (4) Woodbury Daily Times, Woodbury, N. J., and perhaps some of the other 55 or 60 newspapers in New Jersey that I sent the same news release to. (I have no way of knowing which of the other papers printed this.) (5) I am supporting any and all legislation tending to place cooperative associations on the same tax basis as noncooperative associations. More particularly, I am opposed to the virtual exemption from Federal income taxes the co-ops enjoy at present.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, salary, $875 (this represents one quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act); reimbursement for traveling expenses, $172.35; total, $1,047.35. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $172.35. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., United States Chamber of Commerce, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $2,500; expenses, $36.68. Expended transportation, $18.35; meals, $5.25; telephone, $13.08. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, restaurants. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Zook, John D., Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, labor, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, even at this moment as we come blundering into Thy presence in prayer, we are haunted by memories of duties unperformed, promptings disobeyed, and beckonings ignored.

Opportunities to be kind knocked on the door of our hearts and went weeping away.

We are ashamed, O Lord, and tired of failure.

If Thou art drawing close to us now, come nearer still, till selfishness is burned out within us and our wills lose all their weakness in union with Thine own. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KNOWLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 28, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On January 29, 1948:

S. 944. An act for the relief of Oran Curry.

On January 30, 1948:

S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to change the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JENNINGS, Mr. REEVES, and Mr. CRAVENS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker;

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818;

H. R. 3153. An act to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota;

H. R. 3322. An act to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3326. An act to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two Senators from Florida [Mr. PEPPER and Mr. HOLLAND] may be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate for the balance of this week and next week, in order that they may attend hearings on flood-control matters pertaining to the State of Florida.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning with the present week end I may be absent from the Senate for a week or

10 days on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCOME FROM CHEROKEE NATIONAL FOREST—LETTER FROM W. R. PADDOCK

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter under date of January 19, relating to the Cherokee National Forest, from W. R. Paddock, forest supervisor of the United States Forest Service.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE, FOREST SERVICE,
CHEROKEE NATIONAL FOREST,
Cleveland, Tenn., January 19, 1948.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I have just been informed that the Tennessee State treasurer has been paid $30,988, which represents the annual return to the State of 25 percent of the income from the Cherokee National Forest. These funds, as you probably know, are distributed to the 10 counties which contain national forest lands for use in supporting their schools and roads.

In addition, 10 percent of the forest income is spent within the national forest to maintain the road system. This forest-road system is important locally, as it serves the local residents living within or adjacent to the national forest. Also, forest products are hauled over these roads, and they are used by recreationists, hunters, and fishermen.

Federal acquisition of the lands within the Cherokee Forest has been carried on progressively over a period of 35 years with the present acquired area being 565,000 acres. Most of these lands were acquired in a cut-over condition. Part of the area is rough, at high elevations and protection results are mainly intangible watershed values. However, the greater part of the forest is becoming increasingly productive. The present timber yield should continue and even increase in future years. In addition to timber-sale income, the national forest has a considerable revenue from miscellaneous land uses, such as summer-home-site rental, recreation concessions, and grazing.

For your information, the payments to the individual counties are listed. Payment is on the basis of the national forest acreage in each and amounts to nearly 6 cents per acre:

Carter	$4,090
Cocke	2,076
Greene	1,704
Johnson	2,324
McMinn	124
Monroe	7,716
Polk	7,654
Sullivan	1,921
Unicoi	2,789
Washington	589

I trust the foregoing information concerning the Cherokee National Forest will be of interest to you.

Very truly yours,
W. R. PADDOCK,
Forest Supervisor.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency now considering the subject of meat rationing may hold a session this afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY RETURNS FOR 1915

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the returns of a primary election held in Tennessee more than 30 years ago, in 1915. It is very difficult to get these returns, and I wish to have them preserved in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the returns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Counties	Democratic primary, Nov. 20, 1915			Run-off primary, Dec. 15, 1915	
	Lea	McKellar	Patterson	McKellar	Patterson
Anderson	56	156	92	199	91
Bedford	477	641	702	740	555
Benton	322	182	346	324	175
Bledsoe	90	136	61	123	52
Blount	306	234	102	307	211
Bradley	67	296	132	240	122
Campbell	296	61	72	175	82
Cannon	219	270	390	323	192
Carroll	371	291	476	557	353
Carter	283	63	97	195	129
Cheatham	172	96	304	336	227
Chester	176	229	128	228	99
Claiborne	359	248	168	552	164
Clay	73	148	152	225	115
Cocke	143	215	129	372	147
Coffee	391	292	524	426	392
Crockett	153	542	491	408	259
Cumberland	36	93	101	142	100
Davidson	3,302	1,177	4,683	2,493	4,387
Decatur	148	175	194	175	113
DeKalb	151	375	331	358	199
Dickson	292	142	472	390	353
Dyer	361	754	529	1,099	478
Fayette	78	629	397	579	272
Fentress	39	117	29	85	23
Franklin	624	386	466	620	417
Gibson	534	1,238	992	1,627	753
Giles	661	179	1,090	779	644
Grainger	37	384	68	378	96
Greene	368	596	252	920	213
Grundy	61	57	212	105	115
Hamblen	189	291	128	384	132
Hamilton	1,400	1,696	648	1,955	861
Hancock	66	112	25	79	20
Hardeman	192	920	568	864	161
Hardin	96	315	130	222	61
Hawkins	165	349	361	589	299
Haywood	407	466	384	640	317
Henderson	608	177	97	204	208
Henry	761	920	628	1,178	620
Hickman	353	165	471	412	334
Houston	169	112	169	233	115
Humphreys	343	74	462	263	271
Jackson	281	221	445	341	313
Jefferson	82	165	135	234	190
James	13	24	3	(1)	(1)
Johnson	49	28	13	53	14
Knox	1,178	1,568	502	2,050	1,038
Lake	438	159	336	321	194
Lauderdale	196	597	324	657	280
Lawrence	271	295	360	405	222
Lewis	130	89	157	124	108
Lincoln	516	673	650	939	652
Loudon	185	220	108	271	168
McMinn	198	579	121	508	114
McNairy	55	215	250	260	157
Macon	24	195	159	171	109
Madison	761	842	796	1,311	844
Marion	155	422	242	486	219
Marshall	267	287	811	545	556
Maury	1,425	525	1,049	1,271	829
Meigs	79	140	88	101	76
Monroe	145	534	156	570	133
Montgomery	480	292	611	612	531
Moore	103	202	82	161	184
Morgan				132	74
Obion	703	985	1,027	1,069	653
Overton				338	244
Perry	270	265	316	178	148
Pickett	14	181	36	170	21
Polk				249	114
Putnam	673	244	807	494	605
Rhea	193	355	115	372	161
Roane	164	194	229	276	282
Robertson	577	782	843	1,156	718
Rutherford	561	660	1,102	1,076	821
Scott	8	29	15	21	52
Sequatchie	19	69	103	101	69
Sevier	51	89	37	83	35
Shelby	136	5,222	2,222	5,781	1,865
Smith	369	411	970	605	626
Stewart	355	284	312	375	221
Sullivan	1,257	863	122	1,472	550
Sumner	487	1,463	838	1,091	685
Tipton	42	1,090	553	1,266	527
Trousdale	91	444	294	335	174
Unicoi	37	9	51	23	101
Union	66	169	32	149	64
Van Buren	106	90	19	202	20
Warren	239	516	337	466	242
Washington	965	294	339	942	503
Wayne	51	60	75	48	46
Weakley	836	905	951	1,197	792
White	208	340	608	404	423
Williamson	616	562	565	579	473
Wilson	266	799	702	810	760
Total	31,786	41,645	39,270	55,054	33,927

[1] No election.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FOREIGN SURPLUS DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, including therein a report from the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner under section 202 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period October 1 through December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WITHDRAWAL OF PUBLIC NOTICES IN YUMA RECLAMATION PROJECT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the withdrawal of public notices in the Yuma reclamation project, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY ASSOCIATED COOPERATIVES, INC.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control, for the period July 1, 1947, to December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1947, together with a balance sheet as of December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of the business of that company, together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of sport-participation establishments as an aid in the reduction of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of the West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, West Palm Beach, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a uniform national pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of Ida Thompson and Howard Lipscomb, of Paces, Va., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 984) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to direct the War Department of the United States to maintain the complete operation of the facilities at the Charleston ordnance depot

"Whereas Charleston ordnance depot, a facility of the United States Army, situate in the county of Charleston, S. C., is an installation operating upon an area of over 6,700 acres of land with a present valuation of over $56,000,000 and possessing one of the finest deep-water dock facilities on the east coast of the United States; and

"Whereas this facility has been in operation for a period of 25 years and has rendered outstanding and invaluable services in the field of Army ordnance in respect to the storing, assembling, renovating, and shipping of ammunition in World Wars I and II; and

"Whereas the geographical location of this depot together with its most advanced and complete physical properties combined with its employment of outstanding technicians and highly trained ordnance personnel, which technicians and personnel have made their homes in the area adjoining such depot and to offer to such depot skilled labor unexcelled in this country; and

"Whereas the present international emergency confronting the world today has placed this country, together with its armed forces charged with the protection of life and liberty of its people, on notice that its national integrity and even its physical boundaries are only so safe as its state of military preparedness; and

"Whereas the past history of the participation of the Charleston ordnance depot as an instrumentality of national defense of this country has been an outstanding value and assistance to the protection of this country and to her allies in waging war; and further that should this country become involved in another major conflict, the Charleston ordnance depot, its services and facilities, would be necessary military establishment in the protection of our beloved country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be hereby memorialized to direct the War Department of the United States to maintain in a full and complete status the facilities of the Charleston Ordnance Depot, Charleston, S. C.

"January 29, 1948, Columbia, S. C., House of Representatives."

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Dr. DeWitt B. Nettleton, of Pinehurst, N. C., referring to a petition containing the signatures of 2,053 citizens from 23 States endorsing the Marshall plan. Pinehurst is a well-known winter resort in North Carolina, and the people signing this petition are in Pinehurst from all over our country.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Nettleton's letter be printed in the RECORD, and that the letter and petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter and petition will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

PINEHURST, N. C., *January 29, 1948.*

The Honorable CLYDE R. HOEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOEY: I have just mailed you the petition in favor of the Marshall plan which you so kindly offered to place in the hands of Senator VANDENBERG.

The total of 2,035 signatures is most gratifying to the committee having the matter in hand, although we might have had a few more; Mrs. James Boyd told me this morning that people wishing to sign were still coming to her office.

Signed as it is by a substantial number of citizens who are residents of 23 different States and the District of Columbia, and who represent both major political parties, this committee requests that this petition be given the weight implicit in these facts.

May I express to you the thanks of this committee and of all the signers of the petition for your personal interest in this matter, and for delivering the same into the hands of Senator VANDENBERG.

Respectfully yours,

DEW. B. NETTLETON,
Chairman, Pinehurst-Southern Pines Committee for the Marshall Plan.

LEGISLATION BENEFICIAL TO WIDOWS AND OTHER DEPENDENTS OF WAR VETERANS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by Captain Lester S. Wass Post, No. 3, American Legion, Gloucester, Mass., and endorsed by the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter 74, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Post 1624, the AMVETS, and the newly formed National Guard Veterans' Organization, all of Gloucester, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation beneficial to widows and other dependents of war veterans.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPTAIN LESTER S. WASS POST,
NO. 3, AMERICAN LEGION,
Gloucester, Mass., January 12, 1948.

Be it resolved in regular meeting assembled of Captain Lester S. Wass Post, No. 3, American Legion, Gloucester, Mass., That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to amend all present laws and regulations pertaining to widows and other dependents of veterans of any war participated in by the Armed Forces of the United States to allow (authorize) the previously mentioned widows and other dependents to draw the existing pensions regardless of any other income which they may be receiving from any source whatsoever; also be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to make all income received by any widows or other dependents of any veteran exempt from all taxation by the Federal Government.

Unanimously passed, December 23, 1947, by Captain Lester S. Wass Post, No. 3, American Legion, Gloucester, Mass.

EDWARD S. DEGNAN,
Adjutant.

This resolution has also been passed unanimously by the Disabled American Veterans, Chapter 74, of Gloucester, Mass., and by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Post 1624, of Gloucester, Mass. Also by the AMVETS of Gloucester, Mass., and the newly formed National Guard Veterans' Organization of Gloucester, Mass.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 30, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1100) for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY (for Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1195. A bill to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 847).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1520. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects; without amendment (Rept. No. 848).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1478. A bill to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the War Department to the Interior Department; with amendments (Rept. No. 853).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 849).

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

S. 1004. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic

Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; with amendments (Rept. No. 851).

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 856).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereupon pursuant to law.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY (S. REPT. No. 850)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have here a report in the nature of a general outline of the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to be made to the Congress. The law contemplates that the Joint Committee shall inform the Congress from time to time as to its general activities, and this report has been adopted. I send it to the desk, and without taking the time to read it, I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the report was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT AND CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

FIRST REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

This report is submitted to the Congress by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in order to give the Members of Congress a brief outline of the general fields of activity of the joint committee from the time of its active organization to date. The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 imposes strict injunctions of secrecy against revealing details or other information falling within the classification of restricted data and in order that these legal prohibitions be observed, it will be necessary to make this report in general terms.

Section 15 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (Public Law 585, 79th Cong.), among other provisions, states:

"The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy."

History of the act

Shortly after the first military use of the atomic bomb in August 1945, a number of proposals for exercise of control over the production, use, and development of atomic energy were introduced in both Houses of Congress. On October 3, 1945, the President sent a message to the Congress stressing the necessity of legislation. On October 29, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 179 establishing the special committee on atomic energy, and all bills concerning atomic energy introduced in the Senate were referred to this committee. Bills concerning atomic energy introduced in the House were referred to the Military Affairs Committee. Both committees held open and executive hearings, receiving the testimony of a large number of witnesses in the scientific, technical, military, business, and Government fields.

Following weeks of discussion in the Senate special committee, S. 1717, introduced by Senator MCMAHON, chairman, was reported back to the Senate on April 19, 1946, as amended in committee. On June 1, the bill was passed by the Senate and was referred to the House Military Affairs Committee. After a number of amendments, this committee reported H. R. 5364 (S. 1717 as amended), which passed the House of Representatives on July 20 and went to conference. Here the bill was agreed upon in its final form and the conference report was accepted by both Houses on July 26. With the affixing of the President's signature on August 1, 1946, Public Law 585 came into force and effect.

With the enactment of this law, it was declared to be the policy of the people of the United States that:

"Subject at all times to the paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security, the development and utilization of atomic energy shall, so far as practicable, be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition in private enterprise, and promoting world peace."

Following the effective date of the act, the President, on October 28, 1946, announced the recess appointments of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, as follows: David E. Lilienthal, Chairman; Robert F. Bacher, Sumner T. Pike, Lewis L. Strauss, William W. Waymack.

These appointees took their oaths of office and assumed their duties on November 1, 1946, and it was directed by the President in Executive Order 9816 that title to the properties of the Manhattan Engineer District be transferred to the Atomic Energy Commission effective midnight, December 31, 1946, and this was done.

On December 12, 1946, the President appointed, as provided by the act, members of the General Advisory Committee, as follows: Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University; Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, president of California Institute of Technology; Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, University of California; Dr. Enrico Fermi, University of Chicago; Dr. I. I. Rabi, Columbia University; Hartley Rowe, chief engineer of United Fruit Co.; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, University of California; Dr. Cyril S. Smith, University of Chicago; Hood Worthington, chief chemist of E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co.

These appointments are not subject to Senate confirmation.

Thereafter, on January 4, 1947, Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer was named chairman of this General Advisory Committee.

On December 30, 1946, the President announced the recess appointment of Carroll L. Wilson to be general manager of the Commission, subject to Senate confirmation. The announcement of this appointment completed the Presidential appointees provided for in the act who are subject to Senate confirmation.

Pursuant to section 2 (c) of the act, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy appointed, as representatives of their respective Departments, members of the Military Liaison Committee, as follows: Lt. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton, United States Army, chairman; Maj. Gen. Lunsford E. Oliver, United States Army; Col. John H. Hinds, United States Army; Rear Adm. Thorvald A. Solberg, United States Navy; Rear Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy; Rear Adm. William S. Parsons, United States Navy.

On January 31, 1947, Maj. Gen. Lunsford E. Oliver was reassigned and Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves was appointed to this vacancy.

On August 2, 1946, the day of adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as provided by the act, was appointed as follows:

By the President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. MCKELLAR, on the part of the Senate: Mr. BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut; Mr. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia; Mr. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado; Mr. TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia; Mr. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan; Mr. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado; Mr. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; Mr. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California.

By the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, on the part of the House of Representatives: Mr. R. Ewing Thomason, of Texas; Mr. Carl T. Durham, of North Carolina; Mr. Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island; Mr. Chet Holifield, of California; Mr. Melvin Price, of Illinois; Mr. Charles H. Elston, of Ohio; Mr. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey; Mr. Carl Hinshaw, of California; Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut.

This joint committee organized on August 2, 1946, and Senator MCMAHON was elected chairman and Representative Thomason vice chairman.

On January 20, 1947, after the commencing of the Eightieth Congress, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was appointed as follows: Mr. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; Mr. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan; Mr. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado; Mr. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California; Mr. JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio; Mr. BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut; Mr. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia; Mr. EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado; and Mr. TOM CONNALLY, of Texas.

By the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Martin, on the part of the House of Representatives; Mr. W. Sterling Cole, of New York; Mr. Charles H. Elston, of Ohio; Mr. Carl Hinshaw, of California; Mr. James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania; Mr. James T. Patterson, of Connecticut; Mr. R. Ewing Thomason, of Texas; Mr. Carl T. Durham, of North Carolina; Mr. Chet Holifield, of California; and Mr. Melvin Price, of Illinois.

The first meeting of the joint committee was held on January 21, 1947, at which time Senator HICKENLOOPER was elected chairman and Representative COLE, vice chairman. Later, upon his appointment to the Federal district court, Representative Thomason resigned from the House of Representatives and Representative LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, was appointed by the Speaker to succeed him on the joint committee.

The Presidential nominations for the members of the Commission and the general manager were referred to the Senate section of the joint committee on January 20, 1947. Hearings on these nominations were conducted by the Senate section of the joint committee over the period from January 27 through March 4, 1947, and consisted of 32 public sessions and 6 executive sessions. Fifty-five witnesses were heard and interrogated, including all of the nominees, and the committee afforded full opportunity to other Members of the Senate who were not members of the committee to request witnesses, to question witnesses, and to participate in the hearings.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the committee voted to and did recommend to the Senate that the Senate advise and consent to the appointment of all of the nominees and on April 9, 1947, they were confirmed by the Senate. Under the provisions of the act, the terms of the Commissioners will expire 2 years after August 1, 1946, which was the effective date of the act. The terms of each member of the Commission will eventually be 5 years, but the terms of the members appointed in 1948, when all present terms expire, are as follows: One Commissioner to be appointed for a period of 1 year, one Commissioner for a period of 2 years, one Commissioner for a period of 3 years, one Commissioner for a period of 4 years, and one Commissioner for a period of 5 years. Each of these terms expires on

August 1 of the year in which the respective term ends, and as each term expires, an appointment for that position is to be made for a period of 5 years.

Activities of the joint committee

Section 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, among other provisions, defines the activities of the joint committee as follows:

"The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use and control of atomic energy. The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Commission or to the development, use, or control of atomic energy shall be referred to the joint committee."

It also provides:

"The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government."

Fully aware that the field of atomic energy is of vast significance to the people of the United States and of the world, and conscious of the unprecedented problems created by this revolutionary development of science, the committee members undertook, as their first activity, the task of familiarizing themselves with the general nature of this new field. It seemed axiomatic that there must be general comprehension of the nature of this complex subject before the committee could undertake to evaluate the activities of the Commission or to make future recommendations to the Congress.

Immediately subsequent to the confirmation of the Commissioners and the general manager, the joint committee began a program of consultations and executive hearings with the Atomic Energy Commission and with other departments and agencies of the Government that have varying degrees of responsibility in the program. These meetings have been held frequently and for the purpose of acquainting the committee with the operation of the program and policies of the Commission and to keep the committee informed with respect to the efficiency of the integration of the various activities and responsibilities of all departments and agencies of the Government in the advancement of the research and development of atomic energy in this country. These inquiries have, in general and in varying degrees of detail, covered the fields of overall objectives, physical plant, security, production, personnel, materials, town management, labor, international objectives, health and biological programs, raw materials, weapons, industrial and agricultural prospects, military application, and other matters incident to these general fields.

Beginning with the organization of the committee, the selection of a staff was commenced. This staff now numbers 16 people and is set up under an executive director, a deputy director, and 4 sections: information, production, security, and development. Five members of the staff spend a substantial portion of their time visiting the various installations for inspection of activities coming within their particular fields, and they, together with other members of the staff, keep in constant touch with the Atomic Energy Commission through its headquarters staff. A constant liaison and flow of information from the field and the headquarters is maintained, designed to keep the joint committee currently and fully informed. In addition, the committee maintains continuous liaison with the Atomic Energy representation of the United States at the United Nations headquarters, with one member of the staff in continuous assignment there.

It should be stated at this point that the joint committee does not attempt to pass judgment on specialized scientific or technical procedures involved in the program. The committee represents the legislative branch of the Government and is not equipped to be an authority in highly specialized fields of research or technology. Moreover, the committee has not assumed the responsibilities for administrative policies that are clearly vested in the Atomic Energy Commission under the act, but is attempting to gain as much information and knowledge from an over-all standpoint as will enable the committee to recommend, from time to time, any legislation that may be desirable and to keep abreast of the potentially changing needs and requirements of a tremendous program that, without doubt, is still in its infancy.

Following numerous hearings and consultations by the committee between April and the 1st of August 1947, most of the committee members undertook inspection trips to the major physical installations of the Commission, such as those at Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, the Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, the Hanford Works, the Argonne National Laboratory at Chicago, and some other installations. These inspections by committee members, based upon a background of information previously developed by studies, are invaluable in creating a more comprehensive understanding of the project and a first-hand view of the physical properties and the objectives and progress of this development.

The value of these inspection trips has proven itself in many ways. The sheer size and complexity of the plants and the diversity of the laboratory activities cannot be comprehended without personal observation. Information secured on these trips has helped provide the committee with factual background against which to evaluate progress. Many opportunities to acquire information and make independent appraisal of specific activities presented themselves. Such personal observation and inquiry provide an important means for independent judgment which the committee feels is essential to the fulfillment of its duties under the act.

Close liaison with key personnel of the Commission also has been maintained through continuous contact by the committee staff members with the Commission headquarters in Washington. Numerous conferences have been held with the chiefs of the statutory divisions, other division heads, and with personnel at varying levels within the organization, both in Washington and in the field. Periodic reports of these activities are made to the committee which keep the constantly developing picture available to its members.

The joint committee has also been aware of the importance of keeping fully informed of the progress of international purposes and plans for the control of atomic energy. For the achievement of this purpose, the committee maintains a staff representative at the United Nations who acts in the capacity of unofficial observer for the committee at the meetings of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. Studies have been made of the various proposals for international control, the working papers of the subcommittees and the progress of the negotiations. In this connection, the committee has also heard reports from the Under Secretary of State and the Deputy American Delegate to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

Besides the information which comes to the committee directly from personal inspections and conferences, from the Commission, and from its own staff, committee members have examined and considered a vast quantity of information obtained from other sources. Staff members have carried on a continuous program of research, compilation and analysis of unclassified information relating to scientific development, practical applications, international negotiations and activities in foreign countries. This has made it possible for the committee to continue its educative program as well as to carry out the directive of the Atomic Energy Act to "make continuing studies * * * of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy."

Much information of a classified nature, especially information relating to security, production, and military matters has been presented to the Committee in executive session. In addition to the Chairman and the Commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission, witnesses appearing before the committee in executive session have included the General Manager of the Commission, and his principal technical aides; the General Counsel; the Director of Security; Secretary of National Defense; Under Secretary of State Lovett; former Under Secretary of State Acheson; Dr. Frederick H. Osborn, deputy delegate to the United States; the Joint Chiefs of Staff; members of the Military Liaison Committee; the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency; Gen. Leslie R. Groves, Chief of the Armed Forces Special Weapons Project; Dr. Vannevar Bush, Director of the Research and Development Board, and Harry A. Winne, vice president in charge of engineering of the General Electric Co. Further meetings will be held periodically with these and other persons.

It is the considered conviction of the committee that, until such time as an effective, enforceable and reliable program for the international control of atomic energy is in successful operation, the most vital business of the Atomic Energy Commission must be the meeting of the atomic requirements of national defense. Executive and administrative responsibility for adequately meeting these requirements is combined by law in the President, the Department of National Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The joint committee has been assured that those charged with these responsibilities are keenly aware thereof. This phase of the atomic energy program is of paramount and continuing interest to the Joint Committee and the committee considers that continuous knowledge and reassurance of the adequate discharge of these responsibilities is fundamentally necessary to its reliable evaluation of the general success of our program.

The concern which large segments of the public, the press and Members of Congress have shown for the security of our atomic energy program, is shared most actively by the members of the joint committee.

The joint committee is informing itself as completely as possible on all phases of the vital problem of maintaining security in the whole field of atomic energy. The scope and ramifications of the security responsibility which faces the Atomic Energy Commission are tremendous. Clearance for employment of thousands of persons, physical protection of numerous plants, adequate safeguarding of production, as well as accounting for and protection of millions of restricted documents are major problems of the security program.

Numerous visits have been made to the various facilities of the commission for the specific purpose of observing the status of physical security at these installations. Such matters as physical protection afforded by fences and protective lighting; the qualifications, training and efficiency of the guard force; the visitor control system; shipment security; document control; and the storage of restricted materials have been the subjects of intensive study.

The joint committee has reviewed the investigative files of the Atomic Energy Commission relative to the employees of the commission and its contractors. In a number of these cases reviewed, certain questions were raised by the committee and the matters were discussed in detail with the Atomic Energy Commission and its security staff. (In cer-

tain of these cases, the committee has requested that the commission outline in detail its security policy as applied to these specific instances. In the majority of these cases, the personnel involved had been employed during the time when the project was operated by the Manhattan engineer district.) The committee feels strongly that it must continue to follow closely, as it has in the past, the type of personnel engaged in the atomic energy program. To this end the committee staff will continue to conduct these studies of the personnel investigative files of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is the opinion of the committee that the matter of security of personnel is of extreme importance in the over-all problem of the protection of the vital aspects of this important program.

The joint committee has been assured by the Atomic Energy Commission that it is vitally concerned with the problem of personnel security and has recently established a Review Board, headed by former Associate Justice Owen J. Roberts, to assist it in establishing standards and criteria with regard to the employment of personnel in this program. In this connection, the Commission is increasing its efforts to assure itself that there will be no weak links in the chain. The Commission is mindful of the importance of guarding against losses of security through weaknesses or disloyalty of personnel. The Canadian incident involving Dr. Allen Nunn May is ample warning to all of us of the consequences of relaxed vigilance.

The intent of the Congress with regard to security is clearly indicated in the terms of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. The joint committee is convinced that the Atomic Energy Commission is devoting continuous attention to the responsibility of carrying out this intent. It has inaugurated programs designed to strengthen security and to further protect the vital phases of the project.

While recognizing that the Atomic Energy Commission is unique among Federal agencies, the committee, nevertheless, is aware of parallels, in many of the Commission's production activities, with major American industries such as petroleum refining, heavy chemical production, construction, and power equipment manufacture. It is, therefore, the policy of the committee to apply certain criteria applicable to private industry as yardsticks in studying the operations of the Commission.

To this end, the joint committee has requested from the Atomic Energy Commission a statement of its major programs in terms of present accomplishment and long-range forecasts for future activities. While the difficulties of formulating and stating such programs against a background of currently changing events are acknowledged, the committee believes it is impossible to examine current activities, expenditures and programs intelligently without possessing a clear-cut definition of the aims of the Commission in discharging their responsibilities under the Atomic Energy Act. The first report has been received and is being studied. Subsequent reports will be received on a quarterly basis.

Inquiries are made on such matters as production; construction; contractor performance; town management; personnel policy; power development; radioisotope sales; medical, biological, agricultural, and basic research; fiscal policy; stock piling; expert licensing; health and safety standards; and national research laboratories.

The relative importance of each of the above, and other subjects, to the joint committee's activities varies, but every effort is being made to integrate the total information so as to compose a relatively complete picture of atomic energy development today and in the months and years to come.

As a result of the threatened strike at Oak Ridge in November and December 1947, the joint committee has undertaken a thorough investigation of the important problem of a formula that will assure continuity of work in the atomic-energy program. The committee is unanimous in its conviction that the national security demands uninterrupted operation of the critical facilities of the Atomic Energy Commission. Of the several operating production plants of the Atomic Energy Commission, Oak Ridge is the only one where labor is organized and bargains collectively for the production workers involved. The threat of a strike posed serious potential results as a consequence of interruption in the flow of materials from a possible shut-down of facilities and pointed up sharply the necessity for such an investigation. The committee expects to continue with its investigation and to recommend such action as its conclusions may justify.

Legislation

The committee has heretofore requested, and the request is in continuous effect, from the Atomic Energy Commission and from the Secretary of Defense, that any problems which they believe to exist or are reasonably foreseeable in the future, and which may require legislation or alteration of the act, be suggested to the committee from time to time for study and recommendation. At the time of filing this report, no such suggestions or recommendations have been received. It is the opinion of the committee that sufficient time has not yet elapsed to warrant any conclusions as to whether or not additional or supplemental major legislation will be needed in the program but constant attention is given at all times to this subject.

Summary

The joint committee is a legislative committee which was created as a special servant of the Congress to follow this vast and complex program within the terms of the act. The joint committee does not at this time recommend to the Congress any major legislation affecting the policies or the philosophy of the act. As a legislative committee, it does not feel that it should at this time draw any final conclusions respecting the operation of this program or the administrative policies in effect. Sufficient time has not elapsed to warrant conclusions of this kind. This is not to be construed either as an attitude of hostility or an attitude of approval, but on the contrary expresses an attitude on the part of the committee to objectively evaluate the various phases of the program as a result of more mature opportunity.

The Nation is presently far ahead of any other nation in the over-all knowledge and development in the atomic energy field, and the joint committee believes that we must continue to maintain our preeminence in this field in the future.

Respectfully submitted.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, *Chairman.*
W. STERLING COLE, *Vice Chairman.*

INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS—SURVEY OF ALASKAN NEWSPRINT RESOURCES (S. REPT. NO. 852)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, I ask unanimous consent to submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, appointing a special committee to study problems of American small business, an interim report relating to a survey of Alaskan newsprint resources, and request that it be printed with illustrations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE IN EUROPE (S. REPT. NO. 855)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 161 of July 26, 1947, authorized the Committee on Foreign Relations to appoint a subcommittee to make a "complete study and investigation with respect to the nature, manner of performance, and effect of all activities carried out by the State Department or any other agency of the Government for the purpose of acquainting the peoples of foreign countries with the United States, its peoples and their activities, and the policies and objectives of its Government." The subcommittee was authorized for the purpose of this resolution to cooperate with a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and to report not later than February 1, 1948.

I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to submit to the Senate this report and appendixes entitled "The United States Information Service in Europe."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2088. A bill to provide that the farm-acreage allotments for type 21 fire-cured tobacco for the marketing year 1948–49 shall not be less than such allotments for the marketing year 1947–48; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2089. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the heirs of William H. Peters and Washington Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2090. A bill to authorize the President to permit nationals of other nations to receive instruction and training in schools, training establishments, ships, units, and other installations maintained or administered by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 2091. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2092. A bill to amend section 8 of the act of June 19, 1886, as amended, and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended, to enable the people of Alaska to obtain needed shipping service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2093. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 2094. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Shizuko Okada Pape; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2095. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and

maintain the Central Utah project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2096. A bill to except from the Federal admissions tax the first $100 collected in any calendar year from the sale of admissions the proceeds of which inure to the benefit of any high or elementary school; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-securtiy benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1454) to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CAIN, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 191), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution No. 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947 (creating a special committee to study the problems of American small business enterprises) and continued by Senate Resolution No. 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is hereby continued until the expiration of the Eightieth Congress.

Such committee is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $50,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

INTEROCEANIC SHIP CANAL ACROSS ISTHMUS OF TEHUANTEPEC

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 192), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Resolved, That in the furtherance of inter-American defense and Western Hemisphere economic progress and solidarity, the President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Government of the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of ascertaining the willingness of that Government to make a treaty providing for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an interoceanic ship canal across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec.

A PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Program for American Agriculture," delivered by him at the annual banquet of the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, at St. Paul, January 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PENNSYLVANIA GOALS CONFERENCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him in introducing Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, at a dinner meeting of the Annual Pennsylvania Goals Conference, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, at Harrisburg, Pa., on January 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN BEFORE UNION LEAGUE OF KANAWHA COUNTY, W. VA.

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MARTIN at a luncheon meeting of the Union League of Kanawha County, W. Va., and the Kanawha County Women's Republican Club at Charleston, W. Va., on January 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN STABILITY AND WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Stability and World Peace," delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Dress Manufacturers' Association at New York City on January 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CITATION OF SENATOR MARTIN BY VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AND STATEMENT TO COMMUNIST WAR VETERANS

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a citation given to Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and a statement made by Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, to Communist war veterans on May 9, 1947, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE CHICAGO SUBWAY—ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. PHILIP B. FLEMING

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the Chicago subway, delivered by Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, before the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, at Chicago, January 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOSEPHUS DANIELS, FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to the late Josephus Daniels, published in the New York Times of January 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OLD MASTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY ADVANCE, OF LYNCHBURG, VA.

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial referring to a speech delivered by former Postmaster General James A. Farley at Lynchburg, Va., published in the Daily Advance, Lynchburg, Va., January 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORE POST OFFICES, MORE MONEY FOR POSTMEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE HOME NEWS (BRONX AND MANHATTAN, N. Y.)

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Want More Post Offices; Postmen Need More Money," from the Home News (Bronx and Manhattan, New York City), of January 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR PACIFIC POSSESSIONS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CORDON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Pacific Possessions," from the New York Times of January 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—EDITORIAL COMMENTS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Not Phony," from the Washington Star of January 29, and one entitled "Phony Economy," from the Washington Post, of January 30, which appear in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY — EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Lawrence Ascension," published in the Boston Herald of January 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROGRAM OF BALTIMORE YOUTH ADVISORY BOARD—ARTICLE FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Award Honors Helpfulness," published in the Baltimore Sun of January 25, 1948, dealing with the program initiated by the Baltimore Youth Advisory Board, and certain awards in connection with that program, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF RENT CONTROL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him on January 30, 1948, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, in connection with Senate bill 1741, to continue rent control, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the St. Lawrence seaway prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN AID TO THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD—STATEMENT BY WALTER WHITE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, January 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO MAKE CERTAIN EXPENDITURES, ETC.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Wednesday there was a report from the Committee on Rules and Administration of Senate Resolution 189. I regret that I was not here when the resolution was acted upon. There are some things in it which, it seems to me, ought to be discussed. It calls for an appropriation of $125,000. It was agreed to, apparently, without any objection. I ask unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered and the resolution placed on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the distinguished Senator withhold the request, if he will, at least until the chairman of the Committee on Expendi-

tures in the Executive Departments is in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. LUCAS. I will do that.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the Senator that he make the request later in the afternoon, when the chairman is present.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to comply with the request.

POSTPONEMENT TO MARCH 1, 1948, OF SUBMISSION OF REPORT BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT TO STUDY CONSUMERS' PRICES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, which was the concurrent resolution that created the subcommittees of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to study consumers' prices, provided that the report of the committee should be submitted by the 1st of February. The three subcommittees, Mr. President, held very extensive hearings all over the country. As a matter of fact, I doubt if in recent years, if ever before, such an extended attempt has been made to get to the people and discuss with them any single problem. The result of it is that we have a tremendous amount of material. I think it is the sense of the committee, as a result of the meeting held a couple of days ago, that we would ask unanimous consent to extend the time for filing that report from the 1st of February until the 1st of March this year.

Personally I regret very much that we have to ask this extension, and I am extremely hopeful that the report of the committee will be available before the 1st of March, because it deals with the all-important subject of consumer prices. I am familiar, however, with the task with which the staff has had to labor, and with which the committee has had to labor. We desire to compile and submit a complete report, and to do so we shall need this additional time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 2 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Eightieth Congress, first session, is amended by striking out "February 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Connecticut whether the concurrent resolution has been adopted by the members of the subcommittee to which the Senator refers?

Mr. BALDWIN. I know that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], were he present, would offer this concurrent resolution. It was his office which got in touch with me about it. I have talked with two members of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Perhaps they can advise the Senate concerning that matter. I did not happen to be present at the last meeting of the committee myself because I was attending the funeral of a dear friend in New York, so I cannot speak from my actual knowledge, but I am sure the resolution was favorably acted upon by the subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator requested that the concurrent resolution be presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration for its action?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is asking unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from from Connecticut desires that the resolution be immediately acted upon on the floor of the Senate, without having gone through the usual procedure of having been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator states that the subcommittee is in favor of the resolution. The procedure is an unusual one.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution was agreed to by the subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution without reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not going to object. I am stating to the Senate that the procedure requested to be taken now is an unusual one. The Senator in making his request does not follow the regular procedure, which is to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which would then act upon it, and, if it acted favorably, it would report it to the Senate for its consideration. In the future I believe we should adhere more strictly to that rule. I realize that the request is only for an extension of time to submit a report. I desire to accommodate the Senator. I believe the time should be extended. Therefore, I shall waive any objection. However, again I wish to say that the procedure is in violation of the rule. I think the rule is a very important one, which Members of the Senate should follow, if they can do so.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I want to make it perfectly clear for the RECORD, so far as I am concerned, that I wish the report could be made available on the 1st of February, but it could not be made available as of that date. The concurrent resolution is one which the chairman of the committee, apparently, at the request of the full committee, was going to present today himself; but, not being present, his office has asked me to present it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) was considered and agreed to.

CELEBRATION IN CUBA OF FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN AND CUBAN VICTORIES IN WAR WITH SPAIN (S. REPT. NO. 854)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Observance and Celebration in Cuba of the Fiftieth Anniversary of American and Cuban Victories in the War With Spain, created by House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, submits the following report pursuant to section 2 (b) of said resolution:

In the discharge of its duties under House Concurrent Resolution 108, your committee has considered various plans for the observance contemplated by the resolution, and has had the active cooperation of representatives of the Cuban Embassy in Washington. After discussion of all plans, your committee has unanimously agreed upon the following recommendations:

(a) In connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor, it is recommended that a delegation be appointed to be composed of two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, and two representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans, consisting of the commander in chief and one other member of that organization, to attend the ceremony that will be held in Habana, Cuba, on Sunday, February 15, 1948. This action was approved after it was indicated by a spokesman for the Cuban Embassy that the Cuban Government would formally invite the delegation, through diplomatic channels, within the next few days. Expenses in connection with the visit of the delegation to Cuba are to be paid from the moneys authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 108.

(b) It is recommended that a joint session of the Congress of the United States be called for Monday, April 19, 1948, at which time the President of the United States will address the joint session. The President has already agreed to such action. In Habana, Cuba, on the same date, a joint session of the Cuban Legislature will be held, with the President of Cuba addressing the joint session. National and international broadcasting companies have indicated their willingness to cover these two joint sessions.

(c) While your committee is submitting this report not later than February 2, 1948, as provided in House Concurrent Resolution 108, it is recommended that the committee, together with its authority and authorized moneys, should be continued for a period of 30 days after April 19, 1948.

The necessary resolutions to carry out the foregoing recommendations will be submitted contemporaneously with this report.

To carry out this proposal, I ask unanimous consent that a concurrent resolution, which I submit, be now considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has asked unanimous consent to have considered at this time, without reference to committee, a concurrent resolution. Or does the Senator merely ask unanimous consent to submit the concurrent resolution?

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to have consideration of the concurrent resolution now, because it is necessary to have the committee continued if we are to carry out the plan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain, resulting in the liberation of Cuba, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, on Monday, April 19, 1948.

That the joint committee created by House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, is empowered to make suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises for the joint session of Congress herein authorized.

That invitations to attend the exercises be extended to the President of the United States and the Members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the diplomatic corps (through the Secretary of State), the general of the armies, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the commandant of the Marine Corps, and the commandant of the Coast Guard, and such other persons as the joint committee shall deem proper.

That the President of the United States is hereby invited to address the American people at the joint session of the Congress in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how much money will this cost?

Mr. MARTIN. The committee had an appropriation of $25,000, none of which has been expended. The proposed expenditure would be entailed by the sending of six persons to Havana, Cuba, for the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*.

Mr. LUCAS. Where does the $25,000 come from?

Mr. MARTIN. It comes equally from the contingent funds of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the original concurrent resolution provide for the kind of trip now proposed to be made?

Mr. MARTIN. The original concurrent resolution called for the appointment of four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House to recommend a suitable celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the freedom of Cuba, and the report which I have just read, unanimously agreed to by the joint committee, recommends that we send a committee to Cuba to join in the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, and that on the 19th of April, which is the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the resolution that Cuba ought to of right be a free and independent state, there be held a joint session of the two Houses of Congress, to be addressed by the President of the United States. This would make a very fine and dignified recognition of this very important point in history. The broadcasting companies have signified their willingness to give us a world-wide hook-up. At this critical period in the history of the world it seems a fine opportunity for those two nations, which have gotten along so well during the past 50 years, to afford an example to the world that America is not an aggressive nation, but is interested in having free government established throughout the world. The Cuban Government has very enthusiastically entered into these plans.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold his objection for just a moment so that I may ask a question?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Is my understanding correct, that a former concurrent resolution of authorization has already been passed, and that this simply amends the former concurrent resolution?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. Of course, if it is desired to refer the concurrent resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, that is entirely agreeable to me.

I also ask unanimous consent to submit two other concurrent resolutions to carry into effect the recommendations of the committee. We must remember that the committee is to make its report on or before February 2, 1948.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to accommodate the Senator from Pennsylvania; but a little while ago I asked unanimous consent for the reconsideration of a resolution which was passed on Wednesday. My request was objected to, and I think under the circumstances I shall object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator will not allow that observation to stand in the RECORD. I did not object to reconsideration of the resolution. I asked the distinguished Senator to withhold his request until the chairman of the committee could be present.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; but the Senator told me later in the corridor that two Senators would object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois objects.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit two other concurrent resolutions in connection with this report, for appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

EXTENSION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON OBSERVANCE AND CELEBRATION OF VICTORY OVER SPAIN

Mr. MARTIN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is amended by striking out the last sentence of section 2 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The committee shall cease to exist upon the expiration of 30 days after April 19, 1948."

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SINKING OF UNITED STATES BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Mr. MARTIN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is amended by adding at the end of section 3 thereof the following: "The funds made available under this concurrent resolution shall be available for paying the expenses of a delegation to attend the ceremonies that will be held in Habana, Cuba, on Sunday, February 15, 1948, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine*, to be composed of two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, and two representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans, consisting of the commander in chief and one other member of that organization, together with the expenses of any of the employees of the committee whose services are required in connection with this ceremony."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, just prior to the continuance of the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I should like to suggest to the membership of the Senate, because some have asked me about it, the program for next week. It is the intention now to adjourn, at the conclusion of the session today, until Monday next at noon. Such a motion, of course, will mean that there will be a morning hour on Monday, during which the calendar will be called from the beginning for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, after which the order of business again will be the St. Lawrence seaway, as the unfinished business on the calendar.

It is also our intention to have an executive session today when the debate is concluded for the day. On the calendar there are certain nominations which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senators at this time, because we shall ask that they be confirmed today.

It is also the intention, beginning Monday, to have daily sessions until the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway is concluded, if that meets with the approval of the Senate, at least until Thursday night. If it has not been concluded by that time, we will make further announcements about the program for the Friday session and also for next week.

If there is any question any Senator would like to ask, I shall try to answer it, but the program for next week is about as I have outlined it. I make this statement for the benefit of those who are interested in the program and who have telephoned me about it.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Wednesday last, the Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. If it is the purpose of the Senator to suggest the absence of a quorum, I think there are about as many Senators now present as would be here after a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to say that if the Senator from Louisiana desired a quorum call, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. OVERTON. I would not object to yielding for that purpose a little later.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, when the Senate was last in session, day before yesterday, we were addressed on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. His discourse upon this subject was very thorough, very able, and brilliant. It covered the whole subject matter, all that the proponents are now urging, and the opposition, in their arguments. After that masterly address by the junior Senator from Massachusetts I do not feel that I can add very much to the subject matter of the controversy, but I find myself face to face with one acquaintance. Shortly after I had been in the Senate, in 1934, I spoke against what was known in that day as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway treaty. It was presented to the Senate as a treaty, and it always has been presented as a treaty. Traditionally there has not been any agreement between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America with respect to the boundary waters between the two countries, which has not been submitted in the form of a treaty. The agreement regarding the St. Lawrence project lost its aspect as a treaty, not by any act of the Senate, but by a decree of the State Department because it was felt that as a treaty possibly it could not muster a two-thirds vote in the United States Senate. Therefore, as a matter of strategy, it was considered better to offer it as an executive agreement, in the hope that it would command a majority vote of the Senate and of the House.

When the project was presented in 1934, the principal argument was that it would give employment to the unemployed. It came up again in 1945 as a national-defense project. Now, in 1948, it comes before us dressed in all the togs it had worn before—unemployment relief, navigation, power, national defense, plus the new theory presented, of self-liquidation through the levying of tolls.

It is doubtful if any measure ever considered by Congress has been the subject of more extensive hearings, more prolonged debate, and more decisive action than has the project for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. Time after time for nearly a quarter of a century it has been paraded, in one form or another, through the legislative halls, each time to be decisively beaten back. When it was last presented as an amendment to a river and harbor bill it was defeated by a vote of more than 2 to 1. Impractical though it may be, economically unsound as it is, nevertheless, its proponents, in a critical hour like this, are insisting again that we dissipate our time and energy and sorely needed national funds on a proposition which the people of the country, through their chosen representatives, have repeatedly rejected.

To my mind, the one thing which strongly indicts the St. Lawrence project as insupportable is the readiness with which it has been able through the years to change outwardly its shape and form, and yet inwardly remain the same stupendous blunder. It has been presented to the Congress as a treaty; it has come here as a public works project; and it has been here in the form of an agreement between the United States and Canada, in which form it now appears. Furthermore, the project continues to be, even in its more favorable aspects, highly questionable in its economics. Perhaps its proponents hope to becloud even further its economic unsoundness, and lull the Congress into agreement by covering its obvious defects with the lures of self-liquidation and national defense.

I fail to understand the reluctance, yea, the refusal, of the proponents of the St. Lawrence project to allow it to be the subject of the same searching study to which all our public works, in whatever category, are put. Could it be that they know it will fail to meet the test? Could it be that they, too, are convinced that if the searchlight of practical engineering and sound waterway economics is applied to it, it will be exposed as thoroughly unsound? It must be that their failure to demand this study proves their own apprehension that the project is not only impractical, but would never be able to stand on its own feet economically. This refusal of the proponents to allow the project to be carefully scrutinized in the regularly established way thunders its economic weakness. I know that the proponents of the St. Lawrence would have Senators believe and would have the country believe that such a study has been made, but I assert now that the thoroughgoing engineering and economic study which the Congress for nearly half a century has required on all waterway projects has not been made on the St. Lawrence. The established method for such examination has been ruthlessly and strangely ignored.

Congress many years ago established a method for examining all waterway projects, and since early in the present century the Congress has scrupulously insisted repeatedly that each project it authorized must first be handled in this established, orderly, and thoroughly sound manner.

The adopted method provides for the direction by the Congress of a preliminary examination and survey by the Army engineers. If the report is favorable, a complete survey and examination is undertaken, first by a district engineer, and then by a division engineer, who reports his conclusions to the Chief of Engineers. The Chief of Engineers first sends the report to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, which then conducts a hearing on the project. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors then submits its report to the Chief of Engineers, who, in turn, also studies the entire case and drafts a report, which report, as a precaution, under recent legislation, is submitted for comment to the governor or governors of the State or States involved. Thereupon the Chief of Engineers submits the entire report to the Congress.

If the report of the Chief of Engineers is favorable, the proper committee in the Senate or House calls for public hearings. These hearings are exhaustive and frequently extend over a considerable period of time. If the congressional committees then decide that the project is meritorious, appropriate authorization legislation is reported. The project then bears the scrutiny of the entire Congress, and to be effected must be adopted by it.

I insist that the St. Lawrence seaway is in no different category from any other waterway project in the country.

I am well aware of the argument which has been advanced by the proponents that the St. Lawrence seaway is different, and that it cannot, and should not, be treated as are our other waterway projects because of its international aspects. That argument collapses of its own weight. The St. Lawrence, except for length, is no different from the St. Mary's River, which connects Lake Superior and Lake Huron. It, too, is on the international boundary. The improved project falls within both Canada and the United States. But, mark you, they reckoned without their hosts, because the improvements on the St. Mary's River were, in truth and in fact, subjected to the same study and authorization process as were the improvements on the Ohio River.

In recent weeks many of us have been disturbed about the developments in Panama in connection with the great Canal which crosses that Isthmus. Many in this body on both sides of the aisle have become so disturbed that they have presented bills which would eventually lead to construction of other canals, one in Nicaragua, one in Mexico, and suggestion has been made of other routes through other Central American countries. Those who have taken the lead in this matter have not, however, attempted to circumvent the well and long-established policy of Congress. They could have followed the example of the proponents of the St. Lawrence and set out to evade the necessary engineering and economic study which should be given to such a huge undertaking. To their everlasting credit, however, they have not pursued that course, but rather have presented legislation which calls for a survey and examination by the Army engineers to determine the engineering practicability and the economic soundness of the various routes under discussion. And it is significant to point out that, at least from the standpoint of national defense, the situation to the south of us roars its importance, in comparison with that of the St. Lawrence, as a national-defense measure.

The claims of the proponents of the St. Lawrence project have been heard here. They are given in the report which accompanies the joint resolution now under consideration. They say, and would have the Senate believe, that an engineering and economic study has been made on this waterway. Just what, then,

is the so-called study which they use as the foundation of their entire argument? Who made it? How was it made? And why was it made as it was?

Well, first of all, someone asked the Army engineers to state whether the project was practical from an engineering standpoint, and if it was practical, how much it would cost to build it. That is all the Army engineers have been asked about. Then the proponents turned to the Department of Commerce and asked, in effect, How much commerce will such a waterway carry? That, in substance, was the problem which the Department of Commerce was given. So the Army engineers on the one hand go out and determine if such a channel can be built and then sit down with their pencils and figure the cost of construction. Simultaneously the Department of Commerce sits down and sends out some questionnaires, looks up a few figures here and there, does a bit of meditating and a bit of simple arithmetic, and profoundly states that so many millions of tons of commerce would use the waterway annually.

I have no animosity toward the Department of Commerce. As a matter of fact, I think the Department of Commerce, in its own particular fields, has done a reasonably able job. The Department of Commerce has had no experience in inland-waterway economics, and, so far as I know, has never conducted any economic studies in connection with the construction of any of our coastal harbors or inland waterways. The Department of Commerce did not then have and does not now have the personnel and the background which such a highly technical study demands.

Why were not the Army engineers asked to make the usual study of the St. Lawrence? Over and over that question repeats itself in every consideration of the St. Lawrence, in every test to which it is subjected. I do not know the answer. But I repeat that I suspect that it is because even the proponents know, as do many of us, that such a searching study might sound the death knell of the St. Lawrence project.

Now let us turn for a while to the national defense aspects of the St. Lawrence project. If ever a bubble burst wide open and dissipated into thin air, so has this empty claim of the proponents of the St. Lawrence that the project is of immeasurable and incalculable worth to our national defense. The claim is so thoroughly fantastic that it raises a serious doubt in my mind whether it was seriously advanced by the advocates of the proposal. So weak and lame is this contention that I have become convinced that it could not have been advanced in seriousness, but rather was held out as alluring bait in the absence of more substantial arguments. What does the official witness of the Department of National Defense, as it is now constituted, say about this fantastic claim? That witness before the committee was Secretary Royall. What did he say? I quote his testimony:

> The Army's position and the War Department's position is that the St. Lawrence seaway is not vital to national defense, but that the project would be helpful to national defense.

Through several pages of testimony in the hearings before the subcommittee an effort was made to obtain a stronger statement from Secretary Royall. I commend him for his honesty and frankness. Again and again he repeated verbatim and in substance this statement.

There is not a creek in Indiana, there is not a marsh in Florida, or a bayou in Louisiana about which Secretary Royall could not have made the same statement. The improvement of a creek, if it permitted full and extensive agricultural operations, would, of course, not be vital to the national defense, but the production of the food and fibers would quite obviously be helpful in time of war. I recall that during the war there were even some creek improvements which the War Production Board said were vital to the national defense. But the War Department will not say that the St. Lawrence is vital to the national defense. They say of the St. Lawrence what the War Production Board said of Loggy Bayou in north Louisiana, that its improvement would be helpful to the national defense. But the War Production Board would not allow the improvement of Loggy Bayou because it was not vital to the national defense.

The subcommittee and the majority report of the full committee make a valiant but vain effort to substantiate the claim of national defense necessity. The testimony shows that again and again an effort was made to make the project appear as one without which our great Nation no longer can defend itself from a foreign foe.

Mr. President, I submit that very far from being vital to our national defense, the St. Lawrence project, if built, may serve as the agent for seriously challenging our ability to protect that which we hold so dear from assault from without. I assert that the St. Lawrence waterway is not only not vital to the national defense, but that it would be harmful—perhaps even fatally harmful—to our national security.

This is not the first time in our national history that a situation similar to this has come under the eye and comment of one of our greatest statesmen. Before the Louisiana Purchase, the boundary of the United States did not extend beyond the western bank of the Mississippi River. The region extending westward beyond the Mississippi was owned and controlled intermittently by France and Spain, and then France again. It was a serious menace to our national defense as well as to our national economy. France owned and controlled the mouth of the Mississippi from the approximate latitude of Baton Rouge on down and held dominion over the remaining half of the mighty river.

In his third annual message to Congress on October 17, 1803, Mr. Jefferson, as President of the United States, who had negotiated the Louisiana Purchase, commenting on it, said:

> The property and sovereignty of the Mississippi and its waters secure an independent outlet for the produce of the Western States and an uncontrolled navigation through their whole course, free from collision with other powers and the dangers to our peace from that source.

Previous to this message to Congress, Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Dickinson as follows:

> MONTICELLO, *August 9, 1803.*
>
> DEAR SIR: Your friendly favor of the first instant is received with that welcome which always accompanies the approbation of the wise and good. The acquisition of New Orleans would of itself have been a great thing, as it would have ensured to our western brethren the means of exporting their produce; but that of Louisiana is inappreciable, because, giving us the sole dominion of the Mississippi, it excludes those bickerings with foreign powers, which we know of a certainty would have put us at war with France immediately, and it secures to us the course of a peaceable nation.

From the standpoint of national peril the St. Lawrence situation is more acute, in one important sense at least, than the situation with respect to the Mississippi River. The United States did have control of one-half of the Mississippi in practically its entire length. The St. Lawrence rises in the United States, leaves its borders and flows many miles through the Dominion of Canada. A foreign nation owns and controls not only its mouth, but its borders on both sides. While we are happily at peace today with the Dominion of Canada, and I hope will ever be, there can be no prediction as to what may occur sooner or later in a world so torn with bitterness, greed, and the prospects of additional warfare. Even if we remain on friendly terms with Canada, some strong foreign power may seize the outlets and lower reaches of the St. Lawrence, wrest it from the hands of the Dominion of Canada and have it backfire upon us as a menace, and perhaps a disaster to our national defense. Except for the unnavigable Rio Grande, the St. Lawrence is the only river rising in the United States and debouching its waters into the open sea through a foreign land. We have absolute power and dominion over all our streams and inland navigable waters from source to mouth.

Little consideration seems to have been given to the effects of this gigantic supposedly national cure-all upon one of the most vital cogs in our national-defense machinery, namely, the merchant marine, which may well be dealt a crippling if not fatal blow by construction of the St. Lawrence Channel. A few years ago the late Senator Josiah Bailey, of North Carolina, then chairman of the old Senate Commerce Committee, asked the principal ship operators in the country to express to him their views on this project. Their responses to the Bailey letter were read by me into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last May 8, and may be found on pages 4771–4779, volume 93, part 4. All except 1 of the 32 responding to the inquiry opposed the seaway, and stated that in the event of its construction they would be unable to extend operations to the Great Lakes area. That response was from the operators of vessels under the American flag. The late Senator Bailey communicated with 32 of the principal ship operators, and 31 of them answered that if the St. Lawrence

project were built they never expected to use it, and they showed that they could not use it.

These are the men who carry our goods to the four corners of the earth and bring back in their ships the raw materials, the finished products, and the produce our economy demands from around the globe. They qualify as the best experts on shipping. Day in and day out, year after year, they have engaged in it as a business enterprise.

Never have they been unwilling to enter into any shipping trade which offered economic merit. But what do they say of the St. Lawrence project? Our ships, they say, cannot and will not operate there. Since the channel would be only 27 feet in depth, ships drawing more than 24 feet could not use it. American ships, practically all of which have been constructed to much greater draft, could not operate on the route, but many foreign ships could.

Mr. President, I should like to read a statement showing the depths of the principal ports of the United States. Bear in mind that the depth of the St. Lawrence Channel is to be 27 feet, and that vessels drawing more than 24 feet could not use that channel.

These are the depths of the ports for which I have figures:

	Feet
Portland, Maine	35
Boston, Mass	40

Those are the minimum controlling depths in those harbors.

	Feet
Providence, R. I	35
New York, N. Y	45
Philadelphia, Pa	37–40
Baltimore, Md	35–39
Norfolk, Va	40
Newport News, Va	40
Wilmington, N. C	32
Charleston, S. C	35
Savannah, Ga	34
Jacksonville, Fla	30
Tampa Harbor, Fla	30
Mobile, Ala	32
New Orleans, La	35–40
Lake Charles, La	35
Port Arthur, Tex	36
Beaumont, Tex	34
Houston, Tex	34
Texas City, Tex	34
Corpus Christi (Port Aransas), Tex	34
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	35
Richmond, Calif	30–32
Oakland, Calif	30–35
San Francisco, Calif	40
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif	30
Portland, Oreg	35
Seattle, Wash	34
Tacoma, Wash	29–30
Everett, Wash	30

Those are the actual depths authorized by Congress with respect to those ports of the United States.

Now, let us turn from the main ports of the United States and look at the ports on the Great Lakes. Let us see how they can utilize even vessels of 27-foot draft. The following are the authorized depths of the principal ports on the Great Lakes:

	Feet
Duluth-Superior, Minn	25–26
Two Harbors (Agate Bay), Minn	26
Milwaukee, Wis	21
Ashland, Wis	25
Chicago, Ill	21
Calumet Harbor, Ill	25–26
Indiana Harbor, Ind	25–26

I regret that the senior Senator from Wisconsin, who has charge of the joint resolution and who is so interested in the Great Lakes region, is not here to get these figures. Apparently he is not apprised of them.

	Feet
Gary Harbor, Ind. (private)	27
Muskegon, Mich	21
Detroit, Mich. (in through channel)	25–26
Toledo, Ohio	25
Cleveland, Ohio	25
Sandusky, Ohio	21–22
Buffalo, N. Y	22–25
Rochester (Charlotte) Harbor, N. Y	20
Oswego Harbor, N. Y	21

There is the story.

So, Mr. President, we see that in the Great Lakes there are harbors of insufficient depth to accommodate themselves to the proposed new traffic without the expenditure of vast sums of money.

The St. Lawrence would open our shipping to the tramp steamers of the world, thus taking from American bottoms American goods which should be transported on American-flag ships. For many, many years our Government has subsidized our merchant marine to make it competitive with the fleets of other nations, who build ships and man them for a fraction of the cost which a United States operator must pay. Even then, an inadequate merchant marine always has been a source of anxiety to our military leaders when they were faced with the problem of defending our country.

Certainly the American seamen who transported fighting men to fronts which covered the globe, and then made it possible for them to stick there by the constant flow of ammunition, food, clothing, and equipment played an extremely vital role in the victory in the last war. Without our merchant marine, we would never have been able to have maintained ourselves in the dark days of 1942 and 1943.

I think it would be just as unwise for us now to scrap our merchant marine as it would be to say that in these days of rockets and atom bombs, the tank no longer is a practical means of warfare, and we will therefore abandon our armored forces. That would be nonsensical. Yet the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway are asking us to do to the American merchant marine what they would not dare propose for our tank and air forces—cripple and destroy them.

Among the objections offered by the ship-line operators was that the seaway would be in use only 7 months each year, since ice conditions would prevent operations during five winter months. They explained that port facilities and offices would have to be maintained the year round, even though cargoes could be handled only 7 months. At the same time, they said, similar facilities would have to be continued at Atlantic ports to provide for traffic during the time the seaway was inoperable.

One operator pointed out that Chicago is only 1,500 miles from the ocean via the Mississippi River system to New Orleans, whereas the route through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence to the ocean would be in excess of 2,200 miles. He expressed the opinion that current freight rates, including the cost of transfer from barge to ship at New Orleans, are cheaper than the ship rate would be from Chicago to the Atlantic by way of the St. Lawrence, since the reduced draft and high insurance rates caused by the rocky canal channels and 15 locks through the St. Lawrence project would, along with the distance involved, offset any other considerations.

Are we, then, Mr. President, going to trade our merchant marine, which so recently so well proved its worth to our national defense, for something which even the Secretary of War has damned with faint praise as "helpful to our national defense"? Are we to say to those brave men who struggled so bravely against the elements and against enemy submarines only a short time ago that we no longer need them? Are we to say to those who felt the impact of hot enemy lead or who sat hungry in open lifeboats for days, awaiting rescue, that their sacrifices were unnecessary? Yet that is what we would do if we were to build the St. Lawrence seaway and open it to the tramp steamers of the world, and thus take from our own merchant marine that which would keep it virile and ready against the day when it might again be called to arms.

Mr. President, in presenting this joint resolution, the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have gone even farther astray than they ever dared before. By inserting a section providing for the imposition of tolls on the use of the proposed waterway under the guise of self-liquidation, they are undertaking to overturn a policy so firmly imbedded in our national life that its origin is found in the ordinances under which this then infant Nation was governed under the Articles of Confederation.

Mr. President, the matter of tolls is very important. It is a brand new phase of this subject; it has been injected into this proposal only recently. Now for the first time it has been brought to the attention of the Senate. During my 17 years in the Senate of the United States I have had occasion to make some study of waterways. Therefore, if I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing the floor——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Moore
Baldwin	Hatch	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	Murray
Barkley	Hayden	Myers
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Bricker	Hill	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Overton
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Wilson
George	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there is no policy which is more thoroughly embedded in our national life than the policy of no tolls on any waterways within the jurisdiction of the United States. That policy was established in the very dawn of the Nation. Its origin is found in the ordinance under which the then infant Nation was governed under the Articles of Confederation. Repeatedly since that time the Congress and our administrative agencies reaffirmed our national belief that our waterways should be open to all on equal terms. I am of the view that the proposal now before us is the greatest threat which has ever faced the use and continued development of our great inland-waterway system.

I was particularly struck by the testimony of the representative of the Association of American Railroads when he appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate and discussed the toll feature. I think his statement perhaps best illustrates the fear which I am sure many Senators share with me that the imposition of a toll on the St. Lawrence would serve as only the forerunner of an attempt to levy similar assessments on our other waterways. Dr. J. H. Parmelee, vice president of the association, had this to say:

> Now, if a principle of tolls is established on the St. Lawrence waterway, presumably that will be continued into other waterways. It at least would be an opening wedge for its consideration by Congress in connection with waterway developments elsewhere. We would welcome that as a development of thought and principle in this country, and to that extent it seems to me that every railroad in the United States, regardless of its position and location, is interested in this principle of self-liquidation as proposed to be applied to the St. Lawrence waterway. In other words, I am putting it on a somewhat broader basis than that of merely traffic competition.

Dr. Parmelee's statement is the view of the railroad industry, for many times the railroads have come forward advancing proposals to levy tolls on our inland waterways.

Let us go back to the beginning and trace as best we can this national policy of toll-free waterways. Apparently the earliest national declaration on the subject of taxation for use of navigable waterways was in the Ordinance of 1787 for the Government of the Territory of the United States northwest of the Ohio River, in which article 4 states:

> The navigable waters leading into the Mississippi and St. Lawrence and the carrying places between the same shall be common highways and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of the said territory as to the citizens of the United States and those of any other States that may be admitted into the Confederacy, without any tax, impost, or duty therefor.

In the early days of our Republic when our great rivers served as the principal avenues of commerce, our natural waterways remained free for use by all. The Federal Government faced waterway development as one of the important issues of the day, for many of the leading statesmen of that period recognized the necessity for the development of our great natural resources and the extension of our avenues of travel if we were to become strong and virile. In those early days in the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Congress authorized surveys and provided funds for clearing and snagging our rivers. A great city in my own State, Shreveport, was named for Captain Shreve, whose name became legend on the rivers for his efforts to clear them of obstructions and open them to navigation. With meager funds and primitive methods, he traveled the great rivers of our country—the Missouri, the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Red, and the Arkansas—keeping them as best he could open to the commerce of a growing Nation. Captain Shreve's career was a fitting parallel to the history of his day. But in his day, as now, there were no tolls on these great natural waterways. I doubt seriously that our great western development could have ever been accomplished if the leaders of that day had been so blind as to have insisted upon or allowed the imposition of tolls on those streams.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator make a distinction between the Mississippi River, the Missouri River, the Ohio River, and the St. Lawrence River, the latter river being an international waterway?

Mr. OVERTON. None whatsoever, because the St. Lawrence River rises in the United States, flows within the jurisdiction of the United States for a large part of its course, and then flows through the Dominion of Canada. I make no such distinction as that, because if tolls are imposed on the St. Lawrence River, they will be imposed on a river which is within the control and jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. The same thing took place on the Suez Canal and on the Panama Canal.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall reach that in a moment, and show the difference between the two situations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the 1909 treaty between the United States and Canada provides, in effect, that tolls might be charged on this international waterway?

Mr. OVERTON. There has been no agreement as to the imposition of tolls on the part of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the treaty provide for such tolls?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not recall exactly whether it so provides. If the able Senator from Michigan says it does, I accept his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. OVERTON. But, as a matter of fact, tolls have never been imposed. There has to be an agreement by the Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Up to this time they have not been imposed. Is the Senator seriously objecting to a provision for the self-liquidation of the St. Lawrence waterway project?

Mr. OVERTON. I am.

Mr. FERGUSON. And that objection comes principally from the fact that he fears that would cause the Congress to impose tolls on the Mississippi, the Ohio, and various other rivers of this country?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I see a great distinction, because the St. Lawrence River is an international waterway. The treaty provides that such tolls may be imposed, and therefore self-liquidating projects could be established. But I do not see any precedent whatever for any fear the Senator may have that that would make domestic waterways in America toll waterways. I hope the Senator does not feel that way about it.

Mr. OVERTON. It certainly is an entering wedge. The President of the National Association of American Railways testified that he felt it was an entering wedge, in effect, and said that we could not very likely escape that conclusion. If tolls are imposed on the use of the St. Lawrence River, tolls could also be imposed on the use of other navigable streams within the domain of the United States. I just read a quotation from his testimony.

Mr. FERGUSON. Were not the railroads the ones who first objected to transit of the St. Lawrence River being free of tolls, because it involved competition which was unfair to them, because they paid taxes on their rights of way, and had to pay all the expenses of private enterprises, and therefore objected to building a waterway to be free of tolls? Now they reverse themselves and say, "We are fearful, now, that there will be tolls upon the Mississippi River." Does not the Senator think that they are bringing that forward for the purpose of giving the people on the Mississippi River occasion to feel that they will be prejudiced by this particular project?

Mr. OVERTON. I am not talking about the Mississippi River only; I am talking about all the streams throughout the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. So am I. I am interested in the Mississippi River, and in every other river in the United States.

Mr. OVERTON. I know, because I have dealt with river and harbor bills for a number of years in the Senate, that every time one of those bills provided

that navigation projects be authorized, railroad companies appeared in favor of tolls being imposed upon the waterway involved. They pointed out that the competition was unfair; that they had to pay taxes, and so forth, that they had great burdens to bear, and that therefore there should be tolls imposed upon the use of such waterways. They take the position now before the Committee on Foreign Relations, "If you start with the St. Lawrence waterway, all right and good. We will be glad of it, because we will consider that as an entering wedge."

Mr. FERGUSON. I think they are opposing it. They first opposed it on the toll idea. They thought there should be tolls, and then when the committee arranged legislation to provide for tolls, they said, "You people on the Mississippi, be careful, because if the Government ever puts a toll on the St. Lawrence River you can expect tolls on the Mississippi River and every other waterway."

Mr. OVERTON. They are opposing and have opposed, as the Senator knows, the St. Lawrence waterway from the very beginning. They have opposed it on the ground of undue competition with railroads. However, they are not opposing the imposition of tolls on the St. Lawrence waterway; they are opposing the St. Lawrence waterway itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The early railroad people of America had great vision; there is no doubt about it. I hope that the present operators of the railroads will acquire the same vision, and not oppose a project like the St. Lawrence waterway, because at the outset it may take a few dollars from them, for I am satisfied that when the project is completed the whole Nation will be benefited, and the railroads will be carrying local traffic to various inland points of America, even across the border into Canada, and it will bring to them a much greater harvest than they have experienced up to the present time. It will require vision. Railroad men in the past were men of vision. I hope the present railroad operators will look at what is proposed from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole, and not merely from the standpoint of a particular waterway.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me say, Mr. President, that the early development of the West was not by the railways. It was by those who had the vision to use the waterways. They used canoes, skiffs, and flatboats, and carried their produce along the rivers which had their sources in the western area. After the West was built up sufficiently to invite the railroads, the railroads went in and, under big land grants given by the United States, proceeded to construct railroads.

I am not in sympathy with the railroads in their desire to impose tolls on waterways. On the contrary, I have continuously fought the imposition of tolls upon our waterways. Let me tell the Senator what happened. The railroads ran commerce off the waterways of the United States when they got entrenched with their roadbeds and their rolling stock which carried freight swiftly, and they were in competition with the steamboats and finally drove them off the rivers. Water transportation has come back. We have barge lines and towboats, with their modern Diesel engines, and the waterways are able now to maintain themselves.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am in sympathy with the waterways. We are appropriating great sums for them, without the imposition of tolls. Coming from Michigan, I favor the development of the whole United States. Let me read what one of the railroad men said—Dr. Parmelee—on page 212 of the record of the hearings. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was asking the question, and this is his question:

> What your answer means now is that you would be in favor of it if you could get all of the competing facilities with the railroads put on a self-liquidating basis.
>
> Dr. PARMELEE. I would not say in favor of it; no. I don't know that any business enterprise goes out and works hard for its competitors. But at least we would not be before Congress opposing it.
>
> Senator WILEY. We agree, then, that you are in favor of the self-liquidating idea?
>
> Dr. PARMELEE. Absolutely; yes, sir.

Mr. OVERTON. He explained in another statement why. He said:

> If the principle of tolls is established on the St. Lawrence waterway, presumably that will be continued in the other waterways.

That is the reason why.

> It at least would be an opening wedge in the consideration by Congress in connection with waterway development elsewhere.

Mr. FERGUSON. On what page is that?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not have the page, but it is a verbatim quotation from his testimony. I am sorry I do not have the page.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator really take seriously the statement that if the waterway is put on a self-liquidating basis this Congress would impose tolls on waterways inside the United States?

Mr. OVERTON. I am not talking about this particular Congress, but I have read enough of history and have lived through a large enough portion of it to know that policies can gradually be upset and overturned. I have seen that in my day. It has happened sometimes from one session to another. But as a rule policies are gradually undermined. That is what can happen. I take it very seriously. It may happen if we undertake to impose tolls on a waterway simply because a part of the stream flows through another country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator really believe that constructing this waterway would be a detriment to Louisiana?

Mr. OVERTON. I am not making any such argument. I said at the outset that I would not. I would rather discuss the subject from a broad national standpoint. Is the Senator upholding it simply because he thinks it will benefit Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I think it will benefit Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to have the Senator's opinion on that question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The development of the Midwest has been a great benefit to Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I am certain the imposition of tolls will not be of any benefit to Louisiana, or to Missouri, or to Michigan.

Mr. President, I was talking about Captain Shreve. Following that, I began to make the statement that in 1884, 64 years ago, Congress adopted legislation declaring free waterways to be the national policy. Now the proponents of the project undertake to say, "Yes; it is a free waterway; but if a part of it goes into the Dominion of Canada it is no longer to be a free waterway, but is to be taxed with tolls because the Dominion of Canada wants it"—or because of some other reason, perhaps because they want to build this project into a scintillating rhapsody of self-liquidation.

Mr. President, I shall undertake to show that there will not be any self-liquidation about it.

In 1884, 64 years ago, the Congress adopted legislation declaring free waterways as the national policy; and then in 1909 reiterated the policy in language which is, so far as I am able to determine, the law of the land today. This language, which is contained in a River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1909, reads as follows:

> That no tolls or operating charges whatever shall be levied upon or collected from any vessel, dredge, or other watercraft for passing through any lock, canal, canalized river, or other work for the use and benefit of navigation now belonging to the United States or that may be hereafter acquired or constructed.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has followed that policy and has stated it succinctly on numerous occasions. Perhaps the Commission's clearest expression on the policy is contained in its decision in the case of Decatur Navigation Co. against Louisville & Nashville Railroad, which was decided on July 14, 1914. In that decision the Commission made this statement:

> A natural waterway improved by the expenditure of public funds should be thrown open as far as possible to the free and unrestricted use of all those who desire to avail themselves of it. It differs materially from a privately constructed and privately owned roadbed which, though quasi-public in nature, is built by individuals or corporate interests primarily for their own gain. A navigable river is a public highway, a natural avenue of commerce, and the public interest demands that its advantages be utilized to the fullest extent.

I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin, who apparently is very much interested in this question, consider carefully that statement by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Certainly the Interstate Commerce Commission has given as much study to this question as anyone else has and is not inclined to favor the waterways.

Mr. President, I shall repeat the opening sentence of the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission which I have already quoted.

Mr. WILEY. What is the date of that decision, please?

Mr. OVERTON. July 14, 1914. It is to be found in the case of Decatur Navigation Co. against Louisville & Nashville Railroad:

> A natural waterway improved by the expenditure of public funds should be thrown open as far as possible to the free and unrestricted use of all those who desire to avail themselves of it.

Mr. President, what is it proposed that we do with the St. Lawrence? Would not we be pouring money out of the coffers of the United States Treasury to build up the St. Lawrence as a waterway? If we do that, does not it come within the purview of the statement made by the Interstate Commerce Commission that such waterways should be free and unrestricted in their use?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Of course the distinguished Senator from Louisiana realizes that the St. Lawrence River, after passing the northern boundary of New York, is wholly in Canada; that the portion of the river which flows out of Lake Ontario to Montreal runs between two nations; after that, on its way to the sea, it flows entirely in Canadian territory. The Senator from Louisiana understands that, I am sure; does he not?

Mr. OVERTON. I also understand that the Great Lakes are a part of this whole project, and that one-half of all of them, with the exception of Lake Michigan, lies within the United States. All of Lake Michigan lies within the domain of the United States.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Louisiana also understands, does he not, that his statement that the St. Lawrence rises in the United States is incorrect?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I was not incorrect.

Mr. WILEY. The St. Lawrence is the outlet for the Great Lakes system, and the Great Lakes system provides a boundary between the United States and Canada.

Apropos of the discussion about the railroads which the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] had with the distinguished Senator who now has the floor, let me say now that in 1900 or thereabouts, the great railroad men of the United States, including Howard Elliot, of the Northern Pacific; H. E. Byram, of the Milwaukee & St. Paul; C. H. Markham, of the Illinois Central; Fred W. Sargent, of the Northwestern; Ralph Budd, of the Great Northern; Charles Donnelly, of the Northern Pacific; Edward Pennington, of the Soo; S. M. Felton, of the Chicago North Western; Hale Holden, of the Burlington; and Henry Thornton, of the Canadian National, the men who had the vision and built the railroads, saw the possibilities of the St. Lawrence project, and endorsed it.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not question that. But the Senator from Wisconsin now takes the position that the American railroads are opposed to this project. That is quite true.

Mr. WILEY. No, Mr. President. If the Senator will further yield, let me say that the situation is that the railroads have gotten into the hands of the eastern interests, and they have formed an association; and my dear personal friend, Mr. Faricy, has been elected by all the railroads and has come to Washington, and it is now his business to look after the business of the railroads before the Congress.

But many eminent Members of this body—and among them I mention such outstanding Senators as the distinguished Senator Walsh, of Montana—have said and demonstrated, I think, without any question, that all railroads to the west and even those south of the Great Lakes will essentially be benefited by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and that if any railroads are injured, it will be those that go from Chicago to the east coast.

Mr. President, although the railroads now have one great organization and one gentleman who speaks for all of them, the actual fact is, as indicated by former Senator Walsh and other outstanding men, that the best interests of the railroadmen will be promoted by seeing to it that this waterway is constructed.

I agree that the situation we now confront is somewhat similar to that in the case of the Taft-Hartley bill, with respect to which the leaders of certain movements made very positive statements, and in that connection said they voiced the views of American labor. They attempted to influence some legislators, and to a certain extent they did influence some of them. However, those leaders did not actually express the opinion of the common workingman of America. The polls which have been taken since that time have clearly indicated that those leaders did not correctly express the views of the American workingman.

So it is that today the organized voice of the railroads, the big fellows, whose interests are closely allied with those of the financial interests in the East, does not represent the heart and soul of the railroads or the heart and soul of the men who work for and are interested in the railroads; at least, that is my own conclusion, based upon conversations I have had with many of those who are directly concerned, and also based upon a study of the practical situation and a consideration of the outline map of the United States.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, after all is said and done, the Association of American Railroads is opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, and is in favor, if the seaway is authorized, of the imposition of tolls on its navigation, and in that connection it makes the frank statement that that would be an entering wedge for the imposition of tolls on other waterways in which the United States is interested or over which it has dominion.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be very glad to yield, if the Senator from Wisconsin can throw any light on this matter. If he can show me that the Association of American Railroads is not opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project, and is not in favor of the imposition of tolls if the project is authorized, then I shall be very glad to hear about it.

Mr. WILEY. I admit that on the record the Association of American Railroads is opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway. That is why that organization is lobbying around here. But that is not the question.

I should like to have the Senator from Louisiana indicate the page of the hearings from which he quoted a few moments ago when he made the statement that the imposition of tolls on the St. Lawrence seaway project would be an entering wedge.

Mr. OVERTON. That statement is to be found at the bottom of page 211, and I should like to have the Senator read it.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator from Louisiana referring to the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 104?

Mr. OVERTON. I refer to the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 111, held on May 28 and 29 and June 11, 12, 13, and 20, 1947.

Mr. President, in 1939 the House of Representatives Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had before it legislation proposing the imposition of tolls on the users of inland waterways. So we see that the matter of the imposition of tolls on our inland waterways is something that is being agitated and is pressed from time to time, and we see that in 1939 there was pending in the House of Representatives a legislative proposal for the imposition of tolls on the users of inland waterways. At that time the Secretary of War made a statement in regard to that legislative proposal. Of course, the very able and distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] likes to quote the Secretary of War as being in favor of this project, but I should like to have the Senator listen to what the Secretary of War had to say in reference to the question we now are discussing:

> The establishment of a tolls system would be a reversal of a long-established national policy regarding navigable waterways as highways open to all without restrictions in the form of charges for use. The great preponderance of freight transported on inland waterways is composed of bulky, low-grade commodities that would not move in volume if low-cost transportation were not available. Any influence, therefore, which resulted in an increased transportation cost would be reflected in a decreased movement of freight.

That is just as true of the St. Lawrence as it is true of the Mississippi River, of the Arkansas, or of the Missouri.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. No, not until I finish this quotation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I continue the quotation:

> It is believed that the imposition of a toll system would, at this stage of waterway development, almost certainly defeat its primary purpose. Faced with ever-lessening traffic requiring ever-increasing tolls per ton to meet the requirements of this bill, the situation would progress toward a total absence of tonnage, an impossible toll charge, and a complete break-down of the waterway transportation system.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Would the Senator support the bill if the toll feature were eliminated?

Mr. OVERTON. Not a bit. I never have supported it. I do not expect to support it.

Mr. WILEY. When a similar bill without a toll feature in it was considered at a former time, I believe the Senator argued it would be a great detriment to the port of New Orleans and the South, if the St. Lawrence waterway were put through. Is that not correct?

Mr. OVERTON. That was at a time when there was a limitation on the amount of water that could be taken out of an American lake, namely, Lake Michigan, and sent down the Illinois River. I made the argument, among other arguments, that that limitation should not be imposed upon the United States of America under the guise of a treaty.

Mr. WILEY. Were not all the witnesses from New Orleans, at that time, and at the hearings on the pending measure, this time, basing their testimony on the theory that if the St. Lawrence seaway were completed New Orleans would lose a considerable amount of traffic?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know. I did not attend the former hearings, and I have not attended the latter hearings, nor have I read the evidence before the committee.

Mr. WILEY. Was the testimony not based on the theory that New Orleans would be economically injured?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know. I do not know what the New Orleans people said, and I do not care; I am speaking for myself. Now, that is being perfectly frank.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is always frank and always responsive. He has made it definitely clear now that, no matter what kind of resolution were offered, no matter what the people of the country asked in relation to the St. Lawrence, whether that it be toll free or accompanied by the imposition of tolls, the Senator would be against it. That is very clearly the situation.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not say anything of the kind. I do not recollect the people of the United States rising en masse and blocking office 135, begging me to support the St. Lawrence seaway. When that time comes, I shall give such a bill consideration.

This comment, particularly the last portion of it, could be made just as pertinent to the proposition now before us. I have stated publicly in recent months and repeat here that the toll provision in this resolution can well become, if enacted, one of the most ironic chapters in our legislative history, for by its enactment we will be destroying what the proponents of this measure have stated is their principal purpose—the lowering of freight rates by development of ocean navigation on the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes. The cost of the toll will materially narrow the margin between present rates and anticipated lower rates on the St. Lawrence. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will listen to this, because I am making a direct attack on one of his favorite arguments.

Mr. WILEY. I am listening.

Mr. OVERTON. The cost of the toll will materially narrow the margin between present rates and anticipated lower rates on the St. Lawrence to such an extent that the use of the waterway will not be attractive, anticipated tonnages will not be forthcoming, higher tolls will become necessary, and a vicious spiral will be begun which will result in destruction of the very goal which is now sought.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask, what is the distinction? We spent over a billion dollars maintaining a 9-foot channel in the Mississippi River from Chicago to New Orleans. Not 1 cent of that has come back, and we have had a pittance of traffic. The undisputed testimony showed that not one carload of wheat moved from Kansas City to the South. We have spent a billion dollars on the project, and have received nothing in return. We are now asking that the St. Lawrence seaway project be put on a self-sustaining basis. The undisputed evidence, even of the opposition, is that it would be a paying proposition, today, if operated on a toll basis. Let us take their own figures from the record. The opposition has failed to concede the fact, apparent in all history, that wherever the railroads have gone, wherever we have developed our resources, our action was not based upon an assured promise that the costs would be recovered. It was the increased industry and improved economic life of the community that made the railroads and canals successful.

Mr. OVERTON. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. I did not yield to him for a dissertation on the Mississippi River or the Ohio River. I called his attention to this statement of mine, and I wanted to see if he could answer it. It is logical. I repeat, the cost of the toll will materially narrow the margin between present rates and anticipated lower rates on the St. Lawrence to such an extent that the use of the waterway will not be attractive, anticipated tonnages will not be forthcoming, higher tolls will become necessary, and a vicious spiral will be begun which will result in destruction of the very goal which is now sought.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure if the Senator listened to my argument the other day, he obtained the basic figure, and he will find the testimony in the RECORD. I should like, in answer to the precise question the Senator has asked me, to call attention right now, to the distinguished people from New York, men of outstanding business ability, engineers, if you please, including the engineers of the Army, and others, who have said the project would be self-liquidating. They have so stated, and have given us the figures. I repeat that no one can look into the future with absolute certainty, but one may look into the future and not sell this country short by saying "This is a growing country."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not yield further. The Senator goes far afield when I try to narrow him down. This is a long debate, and I want to narrow him down to the point under consideration. I am unable to do it. Every time he gets a chance, he goes floating down the Mississippi River.

Mr. WILEY. And back to New Orleans.

Mr. OVERTON. I should be very glad to welcome the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I want to answer the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin, then I will yield. He says the Army engineers say it is self-liquidating. Let me read what General Wheeler, the Chief of Army engineers, has to say. I quote from his testimony:

> Before the Corps of Engineers could render a definite finding as to whether the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River could be made to pay out by the imposition of tolls, it would be necessary to make a thorough study of all prospective traffic, the character and amount of tonnage that would actually move under a toll system in conformity with certain assumed principles and toll rates such as those set forth in section 3 (a) of Senate Joint Resolution 111, and the actual net income from those tolls as compared with the assessed navigation costs.

The Chief of Engineers said it would take 1 year of hard study to arrive at that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, just along that line, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if it is not true that a great deal of the grain now moving through the 14-foot canal and using the Welland locks would have to go into bigger bottoms, which would have to pay toll, in order to make the seaway supporting? There would not be room enough in the Welland locks to take all the present toll-free traffic and also enough additional toll traffic to make the seaway self-liquidating.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is absolutely correct on that point. I am very glad to have him make that observation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not only are the observations of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Massachusetts sound, in my judgment, but the situation is even worse than either one of them has pictured it. On the one hand, all the taxpayers of the United States would have to put up the money to build the canal, yet a great many of the taxpayers would have to put up the money and at the same time father and favor a project which would injure irreparably their own business, because in order to support the traffic, the traffic would have to be siphoned from countries that now enjoy it, because of natural advantages. Those people would be injured by the loss of that traffic, and in addition, they would be taxed to create something that would injure their own business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question right along the line of the statement of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not a fact that in all the harbors and seaways on the Atlantic and Pacific, up to 1944, approximately $705,000,000 was spent on new improvements? This one seaway, if built, will cost as much as the improvements put into all the harbors that are operating 12 months in the year, if not more, and this seaway, which will take at the maximum 30,000,000 tons of traffic, is operating only 7 months in the year, yet it will cost just as much as all the improvements up to 1944. Is that not a fact?

Mr. OVERTON. That is my recollection of the figures, but I am not absolutely accurate as to the figure of $705,000,000. It is approximately that amount.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. At this time, as an answer to what has been said by my three distinguished opponents, I want to say that the American Farm Bureau, representing the farmers——

Mr. OVERTON. May I interrupt? Are they discussing tolls?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; that is part of the proposition.

Mr. OVERTON. Very, well, I should like to know what the farmers think.

Mr. WILEY. They represent the National Farmers Union, and they are indirectly and directly interested in their own economic welfare.

Mr. OVERTON. What do they say about tolls? God bless the American farmer. I am for the farmer, but I want to know what the farmer has to say about tolls.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has never before been against the farmer, but now we have got him on the spot.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator say I have always heretofore been against the farmer?

Mr. WILEY. No, the Senator has never before been against the farmer, but he is now.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not against the farmer now.

Mr. WILEY. In answer to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, in which I think his able collaborationist from Maryland concurred, I want to say that they have neglected entirely the argument which one Great Lakes shipper was patriotic enough to advance, and which is also included in the final letter from the shippers that was introduced yesterday by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. In one of the letters sent to the late Senator Bailey a Great Lakes shipper frankly says that it is in the interest of America to have the seaway developed, and that it would be well to do so, though it might result in hurting his own business.

The point I want to make is that last season 50,000,000 tons of freight were carried through the MacArthur lock alone. Through the Soo locks over 100,000,000 tons of freight were carried in one season of 7 months. Some eastern Senators boast about what can be done on the east coast. Let me say to them that the Welland Canal can accommodate a considerable amount of freight, but at a certain point in the canal the cargo carried in the larger boats must be unloaded and reloaded into smaller boats. Stevedores are obliged to handle the cargo. If cargo is destined to Montreal by way of the Welland Canal it must be transshipped—it must be unloaded and reloaded.

I call attention to the last letter introduced into the RECORD by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in which it is pointed out that it is only common sense that the cost of transportation must be greater when there must be transshipment, when cargo must be unloaded from larger boats and placed in smaller boats. It is admitted that larger boats can handle cargo better than the small ones, and that if the shipment can be made through in larger boats it will result in a saving of at least 10 cents a bushel of grain for the farmer.

Mr. President, it has been estimated by Julius Barnes that if the present condition in Europe continues, we will have to ship, not a hundred million bushels but 400,000,000 bushels from Canada and the United States through the ports, and with such heavy traffic shipment by canal will be advantageous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts after I have replied to the Senator from Wisconsin. I should in all seriousness like to make an observation to the able and distinguished and beloved Senator from Wisconsin. I have sat here now for 2 days of debate and observed the criticisms which have fallen so profusely from the lips of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana speak a little louder?

Mr. OVERTON. I said, Mr. President, that I had sat here now for 2 days and listened to the rapid fire of criticism which has shot from the lips of the Senator from Wisconsin. He has leaped on the Senator from Louisiana and said, "He is prejudiced in favor of the Mississippi River; he is an enemy of the farmer"; he has leaped on the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and said that he is being influenced by selfish interests in order to help his own city of Baltimore; he has leaped upon the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for 101 different arguments that he has made. The Senator from Wisconsin has been drawing sectionalism into this cause, which ought to be a national cause. The debate ought to be free from all such censure.

Mr. President, I am going to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not rise and bow his head with me in prayer, and utter the words from the Universal Prayer, by Alexander Pope:

> Let not this weak, unknowing hand
> Presume Thy bolts to throw,
> And deal damnation round the land
> On each I judge Thy foe.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I shall bow my head, surely. I am sure the distinguished Senator has indulged in a very clever retort. But now I bow my head and I pray that wisdom may be granted to the opposition and that they may have a larger vision, and see the needs of a great country, not simply for today or tomorrow, because the job cannot be done in 6 years. I pray that their children and grandchildren will not look back upon the record and say, "There they stood thinking they were right, and once again they brought a Pearl Harbor upon America." So I do pray, sir, but I pray that unto this great body there will be granted a larger vision, so we will not think simply in terms of Wisconsin or Massachusetts, or New Orleans, or other cities, but that we shall think of our country, as Webster did, as one country, inseparable, and that we may see the need in this hour and in the future for the development of the great St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am a little disturbed after listening to poetry and the invitation to pray. I cannot speak poetry. I can pray, but I am not going to pray just at this moment.

Instead, it is my desire now to answer one set of facts which the Senator from Wisconsin has just presented. He stated again that over 50,000,000 tons of freight had gone through the MacArthur lock in the past year. I would call to his attention a fact with respect to which I think I am correct. The MacArthur lock has two sets of locks—one of which accommodates large vessels and one which accommodates small vessels. The Welland Canal, through which all kinds of vessels must go in order to make the proposed seaway self-liquidating, has only one set of locks, and those locks can be used either by toll-free ships of small cargo capacity or toll-paying ships of big cargo capacity. There we find a bottleneck. The Senator cannot rightly compare the traffic which may go through this seaway and the traffic which has gone through the MacArthur lock.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to clear up the matter of the MacArthur lock. The Soo locks and the MacArthur lock are one, but the MacArthur lock is only part of the whole Soo lock system. Through the Soo locks last season were carried more than 100,000,000 tons of freight. Traffic going one way through the MacArthur lock amounted to nearly 50,000,000 tons. That is my answer with respect to the MacArthur lock. The MacArthur lock, and the lock in the Welland Canal, as I understand, and the locks contemplated to be built in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway will have 30 feet clearance, and the channel will have a clearance of 27 feet. If one lock at the Soo can accommodate 50,000,000 tons of traffic going only one way—it was not a two-way traffic, as it will be when the commerce of tomorrow utilizes this great lock system—Senators can imagine what will happen when ships come back loaded. On that basis, as was testified,

it is estimated that practically 70,000,000 or 80,000,000 tons of freight will be handled through the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The genial, able, and distinguished Senator from Wisconsin a moment ago charged the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself with that narrowness of vision which is sometimes attributed to those afflicted with sectionalism. As I look at Wisconsin, and I look at this great canal, which is a dream, and I think how the people, the farmers, the merchants, the businessmen, and the boatmen will be penalized, hurt, injured, put at a disadvantage, discriminated against if the canal is built, then I must say that my admiration for the Senator from Wisconsin mounts even higher than mountains, because here is one man who has approached the question without the slightest vestige of narrow sectionalism.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if, as I predict, the imposition of tolls on the St. Lawrence is followed by the placing of tolls on our other inland waterways, the situation becomes even darker. Existing rail rates in much of the territory which would be served by the St. Lawrence waterway are pegged to a great extent on rates which prevail on existing waterways and the Great Lakes. The placing of tolls on the Upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, the Illinois, and numerous of their tributaries, would almost immediately remove from them great tonnage, and in the matter of a few years we would find them used scarcely at all, and the way would be open for increased transportation costs by overland carriers. This feature, therefore, is a very real threat in that it not only would not allow cheap movement, but would serve as a means to force even higher the existing tariffs.

Now, I think it might be well, since the point is certain to be raised, to dispose of the contention that the use of the Panama Canal is subject to tolls. That was a contention which some Senator raised, I think it was the Senator from Wisconsin, and I told him that I would touch on that point later. We may as well take it up and dispose of it now.

In the first instance, the Panama Canal was not constructed with the view of equalizing competition between waterway and overland carriers, which is among the stated reasons for construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. Nor is the Panama Canal entangled with any hypothesis about the relation of specific toll rates to the theoretically more efficient utilization of natural resources. Nor is the Panama Canal picture spotted with any elaborate allocation of costs among the several functions served by the enterprise.

I have found a very interesting statement in House Document No. 159, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, which is the Report on Public Aids to Domestic Transportation. This report quite fully discussed the matter of tolls on waterways and had this to say, among other things, regarding the Panama Canal:

> Because the Panama Canal is the only Federal waterway on which tolls are charged and because it is the only interoceanic canal among all the Federal navigation projects, there is no need to consider the consequences—immediate or remote—if the level of tolls established should prove to be inequitable in comparison with the level of tolls on some other waterway. Because the Canal is only a 50-mile passage in a journey, for each vessel, that is thousands of miles long, there is little likelihood that a small increase in tolls would greatly restrict, or, a small decrease largely encourage, the use of the waterway by commercial vessels.

This document was written long before there was any thought, so far as I know, of injecting a toll feature into the St. Lawrence waterway legislation. But there is nothing in this legislation as now before us which would change the statement in the slightest.

I think it unnecessary to burden the Senate at this time with a detailed discussion of the toll feature as applied to the St. Lawrence waterway. Such a discussion, in the first instance, would be entirely beside the point, if for no other reason than that the necessary engineering study and economic data upon which a reasonably accurate estimate of construction costs can be based is entirely lacking. Any discussion, therefore, of the details of the toll would be entirely superfluous, because there is not the beginning of a basis for discussion.

But, then, this is typical of the entire proposition. Someone apparently had a dream one night and undertook to translate it into reality the next day by inserting into this measure a so-called self-liquidating proviso through levying of tolls. This feature has had just about the same study as any other feature of the project, which means that it has been handled rather haphazardly and superficially. Nowhere can I find where any study has been made of what commodity will pay how much toll between what points, what traffic will be considered local and not subject to tolls, how the tolls will be collected and by whom—in fact, there is no answer to any question which might be raised by the toll provision. I am aware of some obviously hastily arrived at figures in the majority report which fail to reflect the detailed study required in such a far-reaching undertaking. I think it might be pertinent to point out that General Wheeler, Chief of the Army Engineers, in his testimony before the committee estimated that at least 1 year would be required to make a study of the toll feature alone. Of course, it is quite obvious that the time which has elapsed since introduction of the resolution under consideration has not yet reached a year.

The very agency upon which the proponents relied for their economics has testified with great emphasis on the necessity of a thorough study of the toll feature.

I should like to have the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], as well as the Senator from Michigan, listen to this. Probably it escaped their notice. I want to show them that the Department of Commerce damns the very method by which it is undertaken to determine that tolls would make the St. Lawrence waterway self-liquidating.

I quote from part VII of the St. Lawrence Seaway, prepared by the Department of Commerce in 1941. On pages 30 to 32 of this survey are the following very pertinent comments:

> Whether or not tolls should actually be levied on the St. Lawrence seaway is a matter of national policy which requires careful study and analysis. The question of charging tolls on waterways has been a highly controversial issue in American history and has become enshrouded in tradition and practice which does not allow a quick and partial solution. With the exception of the Panama Canal, waterways established by the United States have been notably free of tolls. This policy is embedded in the law of the country. * * *
>
> Furthermore, a consideration of tolls in any one case, such as the St. Lawrence seaway, necessitates an examination of the effect of such tolls upon competitive routes. Tolls cannot be charged on the St. Lawrence without studying the effects of this practice upon the Ohio and the Mississippi River systems and the New York State Barge Canal.
>
> The problem of charging tolls on the St. Lawrence is further complicated by the fact that there already exists an extensive canal system from Lake Superior to the lower St. Lawrence River which is free of tolls. The effect of a new schedule of toll charges upon existing traffic must certainly be studied very carefully and the possibilities of discriminatory charges in order to preserve the relative position of industries and commerce established on a principle of free water transportation must be examined. This is particularly important since Canadian national policy in the St. Lawrence watershed, which is the Dominion's economic life line, is based upon the principle of toll-free water transportation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that the Department of Commerce, being a part of the executive branch, would naturally rather have this a free highway. But it was a congressional idea. The able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is responsible, and the Congress is responsible, for this self-liquidating idea. When the Department of Commerce was speaking about the waterways of America being free from toll, it was correct, but the international highways, such as this canal would be, are an entirely different problem. The United States Congress, being the policy-making body, being responsible for appropriating the people's money to build a project like this, naturally conceived the idea, and should conceive the idea, that it should be self-liquidating. So, after all, while it is a great international project, it will in the end cost the taxpayers nothing. If we put more projects such as this in our international relations on a self-liquidating basis, America and the other countries will all be better off.

Mr. OVERTON. The point I raise, and the point I am undertaking to emphasize as I go along, is that once the committee says, "We are going to make it self liquidating," instead of leaving the question of self-liquidation to those who had made a study of it through the century and a half of existence of this Nation, it turned it over to the Department

of Commerce. The Department of Commerce was not in a position to make a study of the question. It says so in effect. It could not make a hurried report, and no one else could. Let me repeat:

Whether or not tolls should actually be levied on the St. Lawrence seaway is a matter of national policy which requires careful study and analysis. * * * Furthermore, a consideration of tolls in any one case, such as the St. Lawrence seaway, necessitates an examination of the effect of such tolls on competitive routes.

Tolls cannot be charged on the St. Lawrence without studying the effects of this practice upon the Ohio and the Mississippi River systems, and the New York State Barge Canal.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, what is the date of that report?

Mr. OVERTON. Nineteen hundred and forty-one.

That is what our authority says. I quote further from the report of the Department of Commerce:

The problem of charging tolls on the St. Lawrence is further complicated by the fact that there already exists an extensive canal system from Lake Superior to the lower St. Lawrence River which is free of tolls. The effect of a new schedule of toll charges upon existing traffic must certainly be studied very carefully, and the possibilities of discriminatory charges in order to preserve the relative position of industries and commerce established on a principle of free water transportation must be examined.

This is particularly important since Canadian national policy in the St. Lawrence watershed, which is the Dominion's economic life line, is based upon the principle of toll-free water transportation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. As soon as I finish another sentence or two.

The peculiar nature of traffic through the St. Lawrence River—

I should like the Senator to digest all of this as I go along.

Mr. WILEY. I am listening to the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not making this argument. The Department of Commerce is making it. They are the Senator's authority.

The peculiar nature of traffic through the St. Lawrence canals at present and through the prospective seaway also creates some problems that require careful examination. Low-priced staple agricultural products form a considerable part of this traffic. Hence a flat charge on a tonnage basis, as at Panama Canal, may not be effectively applicable in the case of the St. Lawrence seaway. It is important, therefore, to study the possibilities of discriminatory rates between classes of products that utilize the seaway.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, and, when he has finished, I will shoot the last barrel of the Commerce Department's criticism of the Senator's method of procedure.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to have every Senator listen. I agree fully with what the Department of Commerce stated in 1941. But 7 years have gone by since then. The Department of Commerce has made a study. Apparently the Senators who signed the minority report of the committee have not studied it. The report of the Department of Commerce was made in November of 1947. It gives all the evidence and the statistics, and answers everything which has been said. It took the Department 7 years to get the facts. In view of the great objection made, and the ignorance which exists as to what the Department of Commerce has found, in view of the fact that Senators apparently have not read the record, and because Secretary Harriman was a great railroad man, and gave estimates of tonnage and the possibilities of return on a self-liquidating basis, I ask that excerpts from the report of the Department of Commerce be printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection. One thing that should be carefully stated is the effect of the tolls on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. I think it will be found that the Department never made such a study.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Wisconsin asking permission to have the report printed in the Appendix, or at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. WILEY. The latter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator's last question was, I think, an appropriate one, as to what effect tolls on this international waterway would have on domestic waterways. I think I can answer that by saying that they are in an entirely different category. One is an international highway; the others are purely domestic highways. When Congress lays down the theory and policy of a toll on this particular highway it is not in the least affecting the policy which has already been established on the other highways.

Mr. OVERTON. The Department of Commerce, apparently, differs with the Senator from Michigan. I read what the Department had to say. In plain words they said that the effect upon the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri Rivers, should be considered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I followed with a great deal of interest the statements regarding tolls. May I inquire if it is not a fact that if tolls can be established in any amount or at any rate for passage through the project there must be an agreement between Canada and this country? Is not that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And no such agreement has been had?

Mr. OVERTON. Not at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In fact, no rate has been made, no provision for tolls has been agreed upon. So, as a matter of fact, as we stand here today in the Senate and discuss the question, we do not know whether there will be any toll charged, or if a toll shall be charged, we do not know what the rate will be. Is not that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We do not know whether Canada will agree to tolls or to any rate. It seems to me that we are not in position to discuss it. It has not developed far enough, in fact, for us to discuss the question of tolls. Everything seems to be based upon surmise. We are here engaged in a long discussion as to what the toll will be, what the return will be, when no tolls have been fixed. We do not know whether they will ever be fixed. They cannot be fixed until Canada agrees with us regarding them.

I make that observation because it has occurred to me that before we discuss how much return will come in to liquidate the project we should at least know what the rate will be. That we do not know, because no move to establish the facts has yet taken place.

Mr. OVERTON. That point is well taken by the Senator. The treaty contemplates that in the future there shall be an agreement between Canada and the United States as to whether there shall be any tolls, and, if so, what shall be the rates, and the other necessary provisions to be inserted in such an agreement. Of course, one man's prophecy is as good as that of another man. My prophecy may not be worth anything in this connection.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. These are all prophecies. We are not talking about facts. We are not talking about established tolls; they are surmises.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. The treaty provision itself on the subject of tolls is a mere hope.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Or a desire. Even if a toll be established we do not know what part of it will come to this country and what part will go to Canada, do we?

Mr. OVERTON. How much of it?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. We do not know how much of the revenue will come to this country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No one knows at this time. We are talking about liquidating with money that we do not know will exist, and even if it shall exist, we do not know what it will amount to.

Mr. OVERTON. I want to make this prophecy. I think Canada is so wedded to a toll-free system on the St. Lawrence waterway, which is her principal waterway, that she will never agree with the United States on any system of tolls. I may be incorrect about that.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is wrong about that, because already Canada and the United States have agreed in principle that the seaway be made self-liquidating through a system of toll charges. I say again to the Senate that this is simply an authorization. An agreement was made in 1941 and it would have come before the Senate if it had not been for Pearl Harbor. It provided that tolls should be levied subject to negotiation and approval of the two

Houses of this Congress and of the Canadian Parliament. I may say that it is stated in the agreement that the tolls shall not exceed $1.25 a ton.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I take it from the statement of the able Senator from Wisconsin that an amount has not been agreed upon. Until such amount has been agreed upon there can be no talk of self-liquidation, as the term is used here. We do not know how long it will require. We do not know that an amount will be agreed upon. No minimum is fixed; only a maximum is fixed. How can any of us say that there will be liquidation? Within what time will it be liquidated? We cannot tell that when we do not know what the charge will be upon the various types of commerce and cargoes carried.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to interrupt to call attention to the rule that no Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and that in order to get consent he must first address the Presiding Officer. It will help the parliamentary situation if there are not two or three Senators seeking recognition at the same time.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The joint resolution lays down a pattern or standard for the guidance of the executive branch in relation to the liquidating provision. Section 3 provides as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) During the period of construction the President is authorized and directed to negotiate a further agreement with the Government of Canada, under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, defining the rates of charges or tolls to be levied for the use of the new deep-water navigation facilities on the St. Lawrence River, authorized in this joint resolution—

This is the provision which sets up the standard. That standard may be reviewed; that is, the question of whether or not they have lived up to it may be reviewed by both Houses of Congress—

Provided, That (1) the total charges shall be fair and equitable and shall give due consideration to encouragement of increased utilization of the navigation facilities, and to the special character of bulk agricultural, mineral, and other raw materials; (2) that tolls shall vary for ships in ballast and according to the character of cargo with the view that each classification of cargo will so far as practicable derive relative benefits from the use of these facilities; (3) that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of $1.25 per short ton of laden cargo, and may be less, depending on character of cargo; (4) that tolls may also be charged for passengers but that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of $1.50 per passenger; (5) that tolls shall apply only on traffic utilizing the new deep-water navigation works in the St. Lawrence River, with such exception of local or way or Government traffic as may be agreed upon by the two countries: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall become effective only after approval by the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada.

That is similar to the provisions with respect to the Panama Canal. It is said that such procedure with respect to the Panama Canal worked out satisfactorily.

Mr. President, it is practically impossible to work out in advance all the details of a toll agreement. Therefore the President is given this right and is provided with this standard to guide him in applying the agreement, after it is ratified, so that we may proceed to work out a satisfactory arrangement.

In the past, Canada and the United States have been able to work out satisfactory arrangements. They have been negotiating on this matter. At the present time both of them approve the idea of self-liquidation.

The 1909 treaty provides for tolls. Therefore I see no reason why we should not start this project, and then proceed in an orderly way, as we did in the case of the Panama Canal, to work out a satisfactory toll arrangement.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. In just a moment.

First, Mr. President, let me say that we are a long way from any agreement with respect to tolls. Canada may at any time fail to agree with us in regard to any of the various toll provisions contained in the joint resolution. Such action would then end the matter of tolls.

In the meantime we are to authorize the canal and it is to be built. But before we receive any tolls we shall have to wait and wait until some agreement is made with Canada with respect to all the intricate details of revenue tolls, some of which are outlined or stated in this joint resolution. It will be necessary for both countries to agree that the total charges are fair and equitable. In other words, both the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada will have to agree that they are fair and equitable. They will also have to agree that the tolls properly vary for ships in ballast and according to the character of cargo with the view that each classification of cargo will so far as practicable derive relative benefits from the use of these facilities.

How difficult it will be for there to be a meeting of the minds in regard to such an indefinite clause. That is my point. The joint resolution clearly provides:

(3) That in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of $1.25 per short ton of laden cargo, and may be less, depending on character of cargo.

That is most indefinite. The joint resolution also provides:

(4) That tolls may also be charged for passengers.

The amount to be charged is set forth as a dollar and a half, but only as a maximum.

It is also provided that the tolls shall apply only on traffic utilizing the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River.

So for purposes of charging tolls it will be necessary to separate the traffic that uses the new navigation works on the St. Lawrence from the traffic that now uses that waterway. The latter traffic will be free from tolls. With respect to all those complicated matters and the arrangements made regarding them, the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada must agree.

Now I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, when I first made my inquiries of the able Senator, I did not know that I was going to precipitate such an extensive discussion of this point. But I think it is well to have this debate occur, because it seems to me that in the discussion of this very important question, when so much emphasis has been laid upon the self-liquidation feature, and when the appeal is made to the Members of the Senate, "Oh, no; this project will not cost the Government anything in the end; eventually it will pay for itself," we should realize that today we do not know how much will be paid or whether, indeed, any amount will be paid.

Section 3 of the pending joint resolution, which has been read by the able Senator from Michigan, points out emphatically that no agreement has been made. It says that the Government of the United States is willing to enter into an agreement or negotiations with Canada to make an agreement. That clearly indicates—and it seems to me it clinches the point—that today we do not know what the return from the canal will be.

So it seems to me that we are putting the cart somewhat before the horse when the Congress, which is asked to pass this joint resolution, is also told that in the future it will be necessary to decide what rates shall apply to the use of the waterway.

Also, I note in section 3 the statement that—

In no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of $1.25 per short ton of laden cargo, and may be less, depending on character of cargo—

And the further statement that—

Tolls may also be charged for passengers but that in no event shall the total charges exceed the equivalent of $1.50 per passenger.

I point out that those are maximum amounts or charges. Today we do not know whether in the suggested negotiations with the Government of Canada, which may or may not desire to negotiate upon this subject, the maximum will be fixed at $1.25 a ton. Canada may say, "We want a free canal here; we are going to benefit by it, and we want no tolls; but we will agree upon 10 cents a ton"—or perhaps they will suggest 20 cents a ton, Mr. President.

So it seems to me that we cannot talk about liquidating the cost of a project or paying for it until we know what the project will pay in the way of returns, or at least until we know the basis of the returns.

Certainly no one would undertake to build a toll bridge until he had calculated in advance what the returns from it would be, if it were desired to obtain a return from the investment. We are

told that this canal will provide sufficient return on the investment; but certainly no one would ordinarily attempt to build a toll bridge, for instance, until the tolls for persons or the tolls for traffic across the bridge had been determined.

Likewise, in connection with the canal, one of the strongest appeals which is made by the proponents is that it will pay for itself. But today they are forced to place in the very measure that is now before the Senate evidence that there is no provision in regard to what the returns will be, and that we cannot say at this time what returns will be made.

So it seems to me we are discussing a very nebulous and unreal matter when we say that the St. Lawrence seaway will pay its own way, inasmuch as we do not know whether there will be any payment at all; and even if there is payment, certainly we do not know what amount will be paid. It is obvious that we cannot seriously consider the alleged self-liquidation feature of the project until we know what the income from it will be. However, we do not know that today.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, first let me shoot this last bolt from the Department of Commerce against the claim that this system will be self-liquidating. This is the last paragraph, which I have been wanting to read for the last half hour. Of course I am always glad to yield to my associates, especially when they throw a great deal of light upon a question.

Here is what the Department of Commerce said in 1941, but it is just as true today as it was then:

> The St. Lawrence seaway is not a continuous canal system. It consists, in fact, of a series of canals separated from each other by lakes, rivers, and channels. There is waytraffic over part of the distance in this extensive Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, between, for instance, Lake Superior and Lake Michigan, or between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, or between Lake Ontario and Montreal. Some traffic utilizes one segment, other traffic uses two links in the waterway system, and there is also through traffic which utilizes all of the canals in this interconnected system. Hence the establishment of tolls must be studied in the light of this situation, which is immeasurably more complicated than at either the Suez Canal or the Panama Canal.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. More important than the question of tolls is the question of navigation and its effect upon the parts of the United States that are concerned. We must consider the effect on the Senator's part of the United States and also its effect on my part of the United States. The question is whether the transportation made possible by this project will afford benefits, and, if so, what benefits, to the great central section of the United States. We need that transportation. We need it in order to develop the real resources of our Nation.

But more important than that is the fact that today the New England area is handicapped for lack of power, and because of that very lack of power, at this time, it is necessary to ration electricity to certain functions within the economy in the New England area.

So again I say that more important than the actual capacity of this project are the benefits that the great United States, my country and yours, will derive from it.

We must remember that even our great Secretary of State, General Marshall, has said that we need this project so far as national defense is concerned. If the Senator and I wish to study the question from the standpoint of national defense and the need for electricity on the part of our Nation should it ever again be confronted with a world conflict, we should consider carefully the words of the Secretary of State. In addition, we realize that we need electricity for industrial uses in these great United States—not only in the New England area, but in the more central portions of our Nation. So I say——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, let me say I doubt seriously that very much electricity from this particular project will be used in the United States, except in the State of New York.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further to me——

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. However, let me point out that I am not discussing the question of power, and I shall not go into that subject matter.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. OVERTON. I should rather not reargue the whole subject matter, but I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I will yield to him, if he will confine himself to the tolls question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in connection with the matter of tolls?

Mr. OVERTON. I want to conclude, as it is getting late. I will yield, but this will be the last time I will yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his courtesy.

Mr. OVERTON. I have just a few more remarks to make, and I should like to conclude my presentation of the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has been very kind, and I appreciate his yielding, because I should like to say something on the question raised by the able Senator from West Virginia about the fact that the agreement has not been entered into prior to the building of the canal, and also the statement that possibly Canada would never enter into this agreement about tolls. In paragraph 1 of the pending resolution itself will be found these words:

> *Provided*, That the President, before said agreement enters into force, obtains satisfactory assurances, by exchange of notes or otherwise, that the Government of Canada agrees to the principle of making the new deep water navigation works on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system herein authorized self-liquidating by charging reasonable tolls, this principle to be implemented through the conclusion of arrangements satisfactory to both governments pursuant to section 3 of this joint resolution.

In other words, before the resolution becomes effective the President of the United States, through exchange of notes, shall be satisfied that Canada agrees to the self-liquidation. Naturally, it is impossible to tell at the present time what the amount will be, but they must agree that over so many years it would be liquidated.

As I said before, the 1909 treaty provided for tolls. We have here a recognition of the fact that certain parts of the canal are wholly within the United States, and therefore we have some right to say what tolls should be charged. We could impose even our own tolls upon it, so as to be able to obtain a fair liquidation. But as I see it, the whole agreement is a fair and reasonable one providing for self-liquidation. All that is required is that the Executive, whoever he may be, should enter into a reasonable agreement for liquidation, subject, however, to paragraph 3, which sets up certain limitations or standards. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I answer the Senator from Michigan by renewing my prediction. I do not think they will ever reach an agreement on the subject of tolls.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will yield to me for just one moment, I should like to suggest that if the matter is of such extreme importance and is yet in an embryonic state, that is all the more reason why we should be patient enough at least to have a treaty which would become binding upon the two countries.

I should like to call attention, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so, to the result of our impatience in the case of Panama very recently. We were too impatient to have a treaty when we could have had one, and we paid out vast sums of money in Panama. We are now invited to leave Panama without regard to the expenditures of money we have made therein. I do not suggest that that may occur in the case of Canada, but I do suggest that no nation can predicate its action upon the assumption that any other nation will act otherwise than in its own self-interest under any circumstances.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I shall proceed to conclude my address as soon as the Senator from Georgia concludes.

Mr. GEORGE. I conclude with the statement that very recently we negotiated a treaty with Mexico dealing with the waters of the Colorado River and the Rio Grande. We had the patience then to approach the subject in the way in which we should approach the pending question. We are here asked hurriedly to commit ourselves, and, at the least that anybody can say, we are allowing the camel to get his nose under the tent, so that hereafter we shall be bound to do things that we do not now intend, unless there is first concluded a dependable agreement.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I am sorry, I should like very much to yield, but I am tired. I must conclude. I have but a few more remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, one of the main purposes of my trespassing upon the time of the Senate in the consideration of the pending business has been to bring the Senate's attention to the new phase of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, and that is the unscientific, impractical, and indefensible levying of toll charges. I hope that this phase of the problem will be commented upon by other Senators, either for or against the measure.

There are many phases of the proposed venture which time does not permit me to present for the consideration of this body. I have had under study the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project since my entrance into the Senate in 1932. I have spoken against it on a number of occasions and have covered practically every question and issue involved in prior debates. I have omitted, for instance, what to me is one of the most interesting and, at the same time, most important issues involved, and that is whether the proposal submitted by the President is a treaty or an executive agreement. I respectfully insist that it is a treaty, and have in hearings conducted before committees of the Senate and in debate on the floor undertaken to show why unquestionably under international authority and in the light of our traditional relations with Canada with respect to our boundary waters the compact before us has all the elements and all the importance of a treaty between two sovereign powers.

Neither, Mr. President, have I commented on the obsolete and antiquated method of construction of the St. Lawrence channel in the light of our own experience with inland waterways and harbors. Modern merchant ships have caused us to throw into the discard on our projects authorized for inland waterways and harbor projects the 27-foot channel. We have substituted the 30- to 35-foot channel. I am speaking now of channels to be used by oceangoing vessels, and not by barge lines. We are, on all waters that are to be used by our merchant vessels, providing as rapidly as possible channels of no less depth than 35 feet. And the day is not far off when we shall be obligated to utilize 40-foot channels to take care of the advancements in modern merchant-ship construction.

Neither have I alluded to the power program contained in the proposal—a power project in which the United States is to furnish the money for Canada to build the dams and make all the large capital investment, leaving only to Canada the burden of installing its own generating equipment at a comparatively small cost and, at the same time, giving to Canada the right to utilize one-half of all the power generated.

In fine, Mr. President, the proposal is one that seeks to gather all the votes that it can of either the Senate or the Senate and House combined by unsubstantiated offers of lower freight rates to the Middle West, of cheaper power to New York—and when I say New York I mean New York only—and to navigation, both domestic and foreign, and the further untenable argument of a superior and grandiose bastion of national defense. Mr. President, the project falls crashing to the ground with its overweighted cargo of inept rhetoric and futile promises that can never be realized.

EXHIBIT A

CAPACITY OF THE SEAWAY

SEAWAY CAN ACCOMMODATE ESTIMATED ORE, GRAIN, AND COAL TRAFFIC

From the foregoing commodity studies, potential seaway traffic has been estimated at thirty to thirty-seven and a half million tons of iron ore, six and one-half to eleven and one-half million tons of grain, and about 4,000,000 tons of bituminous coal, making a grand total for these three commodities of forty and a half to fifty-three million tons. In addition there is a distinct possibility that a huge traffic in petroleum might develop although any substantial traffic in this commodity should be regarded as a long-range rather than an immediate possibility. Accordingly the following discussion is in terms of the three commodities, ore, grain, and coal, which would move in large volume on the seaway shortly after its completion.

The question now arises as to whether the capacity of the proposed seaway will be adequate to handle such a heavy volume of traffic. For more than a decade, discussion of the St. Lawrence project has been in terms of a capacity of approximately 25,000,000 tons. This figure was derived from an estimate prepared in 1934 by the United States Army Board of Engineers.[1] The 1934 estimate of the Army Engineers was one of practical, as distinguished from theoretical, capacity, and apparently was based on the assumption that the traffic pattern on the seaway would resemble the pattern then prevailing on the Great Lakes. This assumption involved an exceptionally unbalanced cargo movement with 80 percent of the traffic moving down-bound and only 20 percent up-bound. On this basis, the Army Engineers arrived at an average tonnage per vessel passage through the locks of only 3,800 tons. This relatively small tonnage per vessel multiplied by 7,230 vessel passages produce a maximum tonnage of 27,473,000 tons, which was then reduced to 25,000,000 tons.

Theoretical capacity of the St. Lawrence project represents the total traffic which could be moved through the seaway during a normal 240-day navigation season if the locks were constantly operated at top speed and if every vessel passing through the locks in each direction were fully loaded. The Canadian Government has estimated that the limiting lock on the seaway, lock No. 2 on the Welland Canal, has an effective capacity of 28 single lockages per day with the largest bulk freighters on the Lakes.[2] Assuming that each vessel passing through the locks carried 10,000 tons of freight, the Canadian authorities arrived at a capacity figure of 67,720,000 tons for 6,720 vessel passages. If vessels such as the new lake ore freighters, which can carry more than 15,000 tons, comprised the entire traffic of the seaway and were fully loaded in both directions the theoretical capacity of the project would be in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 tons.

Obviously it is impractical to expect that either the 100,000,000- or the 67,000,000-ton figure will ever be realized, but it is equally obvious that under conditions of full utilization with relatively balanced traffic in each direction, the practical capacity of the seaway is far in excess of the 25,000,000 tons assumed in previous discussions of the subject. As a matter of fact, in 1945 the MacArthur Lock in the upper lakes, which is of the same general dimensions as the limiting lock on the seaway, handled 42,000,000 tons of traffic, despite the fact that most of the tonnage moved in one direction.

With specific reference to the traffic estimates on ore, coal, and grain of from forty and one-half to fifty-three million tons, it appears likely that the seaway should be able to handle such a volume. The number of vessel passages required to move ore up-bound by lake freighters with carrying capacities of 15,000 tons would be 2,000 vessel passages for 30,000,000 tons of ore and 2,500 vessel passages for 37,500,000 tons. These same lake freighters would be available for carrying down the river the estimated potential volume of grain and coal. More than half of the boats would have to make the down-bound trip in ballast. The utilization of from 2,000 to 2,500 vessel passages one way and 4,000 to 5,000 vessel passages in both directions for ore, coal, and grain would leave an excess theoretical capacity of 850 to 1,350 one-way vessel passages, and 1,700 to 2,700 vessel passages in both directions.

Some questions have been raised about the effect of present interlake traffic utilizing the Welland Canal on the capacity of the Canal for seaway traffic. It has been contended that interlake traffic would absorb all but about 10 of the lockages available per day at the Welland Canal, thus reducing the capacity of the Welland Canal for seaway traffic to 10 large vessels per day.[3] Consideration of the actual movement of interlake traffic utilizing the Welland Canal and the anticipated movement in ore, grain, and coal vessels indicates that such a restriction is highly unlikely.

Total traffic through the Welland Canal in 1945 was about 13,000,000 tons, of which down-bound traffic constituted 91 percent.[4] Canadian statistics do not show how much of the down-bound traffic actually terminates in Lake Ontario and how much is transshipped in small canallers down the St. Lawrence River. However, the interlake items may be derived from the following table showing down-bound through and way traffic over the Welland Canal: [5]

Down-bound Welland Canal traffic, 1945

(In thousands of short tons)

Wheat	3,014
Gasoline	610
Petroleum	1,398
Soft coal	4,313
Iron ore	1,391
Hard coal	114
Total	10,840

If interlake traffic is to constitute a restriction on the seaway capacity of the Welland Canal, it would have to be the result of the movement of the above-listed commodities, which made up 92 percent of the total down-bound tonnage in 1945.

Most of the tonnage in wheat and coal either moved directly from the Welland Canal down the St. Lawrence River or was transshipped from Lake Ontario ports in small St. Lawrence canallers. The data on through

[1] Survey of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project. S. Doc. 116, 73d Cong., 2d sess., 1934, p. 76.

[2] Letter to Transportation Division, Department of Commerce, from H. H. Wright, Secretary of the Canadian Embassy, April 15, 1947.

[3] Testimony of Chauncey J. Hamlin, Chairman of Niagara Frontier Planning Board, on S. J. Res. 111, op. cit., p. 251.

[4] Canal Statistics, Dominion Bureau of Statistics; 1945 canal statistics were used by Mr. Hamlin in advancing his contention on the highly restrictive effect of interlake traffic on capacity of the Welland Canal for seaway traffic.

[5] Ibid.

traffic via the St. Lawrence canals show that 2,000,000 tons of wheat were shipped down the St. Lawrence in 1945, or two-thirds of the amount which moved through the Welland Canal. Two million six hundred thousand tons of soft coal went down the St. Lawrence in 1945, or about 60 percent of the volume moving through the Welland Canal.[6] All of the wheat and most of the soft coal shown as moving down the St. Lawrence River are the same wheat and coal which moved through the Welland Canal. On the other hand, the iron-ore movement is strictly interlake. No iron ore moved down the St. Lawrence.

No matter what precise proportion of the volume of wheat, coal, and ore was interlake, the movement of these commodities should not seriously restrict the capacity of the Welland Canal for seaway traffic. It has already been demonstrated that more than 50 percent of the boats carrying ore up the seaway will not have return cargo. These vessels will probably pick up interlake bulk cargo on an out-of-pocket cost basis rather than return light down the seaway. Since their down-bound rates do not have to be fully compensatory, the large lake freighters will be able to compete most effectively with smaller carriers for the down-bound interlake trade. Further, the present down-bound interlake iron-ore movement will probably be eliminated altogether as a result of diminution of the ore flow from the head of the Lakes and the advantages of restricting upper lake ore tonnage to destination points on Lakes Erie and Michigan.

There remains only for consideration the down-bound movement of petroleum and gasoline, which totaled in 1945 roughly 2,000,000 tons, of which no more than 160,000 tons continued down the St. Lawrence River.

The growing shortage of petroleum supplies in the United States, which furnish the down-bound tonnage via the Welland Canal, will probably lead to the development of an up-bound seaway petroleum movement to Lake Ontario points before the down-bound petroleum movement becomes an obstacle to seaway traffic. Even if down-bound traffic continues at present levels, the number of lockages absorbed by the down-bound tankers at 2,000,000 tons would be only about 660 one way, if each tanker required a single lockage. The existing lake tankers are about 250 feet long, 43 feet wide, with a loaded draft of about 14 feet and an average carrying capacity of 3,000 tons. Two tankers can easily be locked simultaneously, indicating a maximum reduction in the number of lockages required to about 330 one way. Neither the minimum nor the maximum number of lockages required for the small tankers would interfere with estimated seaway movement of forty and one-half to fifty-three million tons of ore, grain, and coal.

TOLL CHARGES AND REVENUES

There are three questions with respect to the provisions for toll charges in the pending legislation which are germane to the purposes of the present study. These are:

1. Will the indicated volume of ore, grain, and coal move via the seaway if the cost of the movement is increased by the imposition of tolls?

2. Can toll rates be so adjusted as to encourage the use of the largest lake freighters in order to assure the most efficient and economical utilization of the limited capacity of the seaway in relation to the huge volume of potential traffic which it is estimated will be available?

3. What amount of total toll revenue might be derived from the estimated tonnage of ore, grain, and coal traffic without interfering with the above two objectives?

It is clear from the section on iron ore that the delivered cost of imported ore via the seaway, particularly if it originates in Labrador, will be considerably less than that of taconite under present technological developments. A toll charge of as much as 50 cents per short ton would apparently not interfere with the seaway movement or force diversion to other methods of transport.

Inasmuch as up-bound ore would constitute the principal seaway tonnage, it would be desirable to give maximum encouragement to down-bound bulk commodities in order to stimulate the development of a balanced traffic in both directions. While apparently most grain and coal could support a toll charge equal to the indicated rate for iron ore, without eliminating the rate savings on the seaway movement as compared with alternative routes, it may be desirable, in order to promote the maximum volume of grain and coal shipments, to set somewhat lower charges for these commodities. A rate of 25 to 35 cents per ton would probably assure maximum grain and coal seaway traffic. Tolls for vessels in ballast might be set at 15 cents per dead-weight ton. Vessels going down the seaway could accordingly carry coal or grain at toll charges only 10 or 20 cents a ton higher than if they sailed in ballast. With the net burden of coal and grain tolls at such low levels there is no question but that the large, low-cost lake freighters will displace the small, higher-cost vessels which can use the existing free-canal system.

In view of the limited capacity of the seaway in relation to the volume of traffic now anticipated, it is essential that toll charges be graduated in such a way as to furnish the maximum advantage for using vessels of great carrying capacity. Accordingly, for vessels carrying bulk commodities and for vessels operating in ballast, it would appear desirable to fix a minimum charge based on vessels of at least 12,000 tons carrying capacity. The net effect of this measure would be to make the toll per ton of cargo, on a vessel carrying 8,000 tons, 50 percent higher than for a vessel carrying 12,000 tons. Combined with the low operating-cost advantages already enjoyed by the large lake carriers because of their huge carrying capacity, the toll differential would insure that bulk commodities, which require no transfer or can be transferred at low cost, would be handled on the seaway by lake carriers of greatest carrying capacity.

On the basis of the suggested toll charges discussed above, the toll revenue from ore, coal, and grain, and from ore carriers returning light would range from 21 to 27 million dollars. It is not intended to advance these figures as the revenue which should or will be derived from seaway traffic in ore, coal, and grain. The sole purpose of the estimate is to indicate the revenue which might be raised by assessing tolls at levels which do not interfere with the volume of seaway traffic, and which would encourage maximum use of the largest carriers.

Possible range of toll charges and toll revenue

Commodity	Potential traffic	Per ton toll charge	Total revenue
		Cents	
Ore	30-37½ million tons	50	$15,000,000-$18,750,000
Grain	6½-11½ million tons	25-35	1,625,000- 4,025,000
Coal	4 million tons	25-35	1,000,000- 1,400,000
Ballast	19½-22 million tons (deadweight tonnage)	15	3,300,000- 2,925,000
Total			20,925,000- 27,100,000

[6] Canal Statistics, 1945. Op. cit.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the pending joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) providing for improvement of the existing St. Lawrence waterway. My constituents are entitled to know my reasons for reaching this decision, and I therefore desire to set them forth clearly on the record.

This is another one of those questions upon which the public is inclined to take strong positions for and against, without having the opportunity to give the proposal the detailed study that it deserves. I have received numerous highly emphatic letters from friends in my State, expressing strong convictions in favor of the proposal. I have also received many letters expressing equally strong opinions against it. My correspondents, in most cases, have not had an opportunity to study the financial and engineering aspects of the problem. They have not had available to them the detailed hearings, committee reports, and other studies which delve into the practical considerations involved. Their opinions are, therefore, necessarily based to a large extent on incomplete information—brief statements of public officials as reported in the press, and the like.

Those of us who must vote on this matter have a definite responsibility to inform ourselves more fully. The responsibility lies with us to decide whether it is in the interests of the United States to authorize the expenditure of several hundred millions of dollars. This particular question revolves, to a large extent, around detailed figures setting forth the estimated costs and anticipated benefits of the waterway. On the basis of my study of these figures, I have come to the conclusion that this project is not sound from an engineering and financial standpoint.

As a matter of fact, the principal conclusion to which I have come is that the studies and preparations that have been made to date for the project are hopelessly inadequate to justify us in going ahead. This question has been under consideration now for almost half a century in one form or another. In all that time, it might be thought that by now enough facts would have been developed to enable us to render a clear-cut judgment on its advisability. In my opinion, that is not the case. Let me mention some of the things on which we do not yet appear to have enough information on which to act.

First of all, the evidence in the record as to the capacity of the waterway when it is constructed is inconsistent and inconclusive. The only real study we have to date is that of the Army engineers, which indicated a capacity of 25,000,000 to 27,000,000 tons.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Nebraska understands that the Army engineers' estimate was based on one-way traffic?

Mr. BUTLER. I am making my statement, I will say to the Senator from Vermont, on the basis of the report I have read from the Army engineers.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. And their report took into consideration that there would be almost wholly one-way traffic, at the time they made that estimate, I believe, of 30,000,000 tons a year.

Mr. BUTLER. They included, however, any estimate they thought was reasonable for traffic both ways. They did not limit it to traffic one way.

Mr. AIKEN. But the two-way traffic was not included in the estimate of 30,000,000 tons.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Army engineers have not made any revision of this estimate on capacity and were not willing to do so without making a thorough study of the subject. Proponents of the measure have insisted that the physical capacity would run somewhere between 40,000,000 and 100,000,000 tons. On a question of this sort, we certainly should be able to secure a fairly definite figure from competent engineers, since it is an engineering question. The question is all the more important since estimates justifying the waterway as a self-liquidating proposition are based on a traffic of at least 35,000,000 tons annually. I very earnestly believe we should not be asked to support this proposal until the Army engineers go definitely on record that the waterway has a physical capacity of at least 35,000,000 tons.

Secondly, we do not have any definite up-to-date study from an impartial authoritative source of the potential traffic that might use the waterway. On the question of the economic potentialities of the waterway we have only the St. Lawrence survey of 1941, prepared by the Department of Commerce. This study claimed a tonnage of only 25,000,000 representing an increase of only 16,000,000 tons over present traffic, and numerous errors have been pointed out in this old report.

It is true that last summer during the Senate hearings, the Department of Commerce presented us with revised estimates which are much more optimistic. In presenting these estimates, however, the Secretary of Commerce admitted frankly that the Department had not yet made a detailed analysis of potential traffic on the waterway. It is also true that late last year the Department of Commerce went much further in presenting detailed estimates in a publication in the series of industry reports on domestic transportation, entitled, "An Economic Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project." This study makes a fairly full analysis of some of the important factors involved. It does not, however, attempt to deal with all the principal types of cargo which might be expected to move over the waterway. The discussion is confined to only four commodities—iron ore, grain, coal, and petroleum—and traffic in two of these items—iron ore and petroleum—is entirely hypothetical. This study does not touch at all on most of the commodities dealt with in the 1941 report by the Department of Commerce.

In the same way, General Wheeler told us that the Corps of Engineers had never made an exhaustive study of this subject. He went on to say that a definite finding of the economic feasibility of the project by the Corps of Engineers would require a full study of all prospective traffic, which would take more than one year to complete. In other words, neither the Department of Commerce nor the Corps of Engineers has given us firm estimates that would justify us to assume the project can be self-liquidating.

Proponents of the measure before us apparently base most of their optimism on the assumption that a very heavy traffic in iron ore or petroleum upstream may develop at some time in the future. They do not attempt to prove that this traffic will develop; they merely say that it might. In other words, the case is built on hypothetical possibilities. We should not authorize this project on the basis of guesswork. We can find out a great deal more definitely just what is in prospect. If the upper-lake ore deposits should become depleted to such an extent as to require upstream movement of substantial tonnages of iron ore, we will know about it in plenty of time to make provision for improved transportation when the time comes. The same is true of the hypothetical traffic in petroleum products.

Thirdly, no definite determination has yet been made that the tolls which could be charged on traffic would return sufficient revenue to pay the cost of the construction. The recent study by the Transportation Division of the Commerce Department attempts to show that these costs could be liquidated by a low level of tolls which would not unduly burden the prospective traffic. This section of the report, however, is based on the assumption that gigantic quantities of traffic would be handled. In fact, the section implies that about 75,000,000 tons might be handled each year. This figure is in sharp contrast with even the optimistic estimates of the physical capacity of the waterway. Furthermore, it is based on the assumption that tremendous quantities of iron ore would move upstream. If the iron ore traffic does not develop or if it should happen that the waterway cannot accommodate anything like 75,000,000 tons, the conclusions of this tabulation would fall to the ground. In that case, a sharply higher level of toll rates would be necessary which might place such a heavy burden on the commerce as to divert traffic from using the waterway. What we should do is figure out whether the potential traffic can afford a toll of $1.25 a ton or higher. Then we should compute whether there will probably be enough traffic on that basis to pay the costs. Until we know these essential facts, we should not authorize this waterway.

Fourthly, the whole question of tolls is so much up in the air that we should insist on some definite decisions before we go ahead. The level of tolls is to be set through negotiation with Canada. We do not know precisely what the Canadian viewpoint on this question is, and whether Canada will be willing to agree on a level of tolls high enough to make the project self-liquidating. That is something that could well be settled in advance of the enactment of this legislation. Although it would not be possible to settle on exact toll rates for every item, it would certainly be advisable to agree on the general considerations and the type of formulas to be used in arriving at the toll rates. As it is now, we are asked to assume that there will be no trouble at all in reaching an agreement with Canada that will be satisfactory to us, and we are asked to approve this legislation before negotiations on that point have even begun.

Fifthly, from a reading of the record, it is not apparent exactly how much electricity will be generated and how much of that power will be firm power available the year around. Testimony from recognized authorities appear to differ by as much as 100 percent in the estimate of power to be generated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator state for the record the authority for the statement he has just made respecting such a wide range of difference in the estimates of power which would be developed. I have no such knowledge as the Senator has just stated. I know that when the power companies tried to secure the St. Lawrence development they estimated a certain amount of power. Herbert Hoover's committee estimated a certain amount of power. The Army engineers estimated a certain amount of power. The Federal Power Commission estimated a certain amount of power. All those I have mentioned are quite good authorities on the subject. But so far as I know they have not varied greatly in their estimate, and I know they have not varied as much as 100 percent. Perhaps the Senator means that the flow of the river will vary 100 percent. That is true. The high-water flow of the St. Lawrence is approximately double the low-water flow. The St. Lawrence has the most constant flow of any river in the world. Most rivers will have about 30 to 40 times as much water in high water as they will in low water. So I am wondering if that is what the Senator refers to. I wonder if the Senator's reference to a variation of as much as 100 percent does not refer to the flow of the river, between the high- and the low-water marks. However, I should like to know who the Senator's authorities are.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, whom I respect very highly, especially on the question of public power, that I think if he will listen to the very brief comment which I intend to continue to make on this particular phase of the subject, he will be perfectly satisfied with my position.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am a little surprised at the Senator's attacking the power phase, because at the last national meeting of the Rural Electrification Associations every delegate from the State of Nebraska voted in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway. Knowing the Senator's admiration for the REA and his support of the REA, I am rather surprised to see him take issue with the delegation from his own State, which seems to have an entirely different viewpoint.

Mr. BUTLER. I will say to my friend from Vermont that if he will be patient

and allow me to continue my statement on the subject I think he will find that there is very little difference, if any, between his position and mine with reference to REA and the development of power.

Testimony from recognized authorities appears to differ—and for the benefit of the Senator from Vermont I shall endeavor to supply him with the source of the authority for this statement.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have those authorities.

Mr. BUTLER. Facts of that sort can be developed fairly accurately, and I shall do my utmost to satisfy my friend from Vermont.

In the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs we have had to do with a number of projects dealing with the generation of electric energy, and we have never found too much difficulty in determining fairly exactly how much power will be generated by a particular project. Until we get some definite figures on this phase of the proposal, I do not believe we should go ahead.

Sixth, there has been no definite determination at all of the harbor improvements that will be necessary for the various Great Lakes ports, in order to permit them to handle the larger boats that supposedly will come to them if the St. Lawrence waterway is deepened to 27 feet. This is a very important point which has been almost completely glossed over in the hearings. The Brookings Institution report estimated this item at $175,000,000. We should insist on full and accurate data on this question before we go ahead.

In short, the whole project appears to be enveloped in a maze of conflicting testimony and optimistic guesswork. If we are to go ahead with this development, we have a right to expect fairly definite answers from competent authorities on all of these points. We should refuse to accept any such proposal until we are supplied with much more exact and adequate data than we have been supplied with in this case.

This is the part which I thought might interest the Senator from Vermont:

I hope my previous remarks regarding the power phase of this particular measure will not be construed as opposition to an expansion of the Federal Government in this field where such developments can be worked out on a sound basis. The power side of this project in particular seems to have a great deal of merit, even though the facts that have been given to us on this point are not as complete as they might be. The project has been presented to the public in such a way as to imply, however, that we cannot proceed with the power development unless we also authorize the waterway. That is not true. Facilities for generating tremendous quantities of additional power could be constructed without necessarily going ahead with the other plans for deepening the channel. I should be happy to see plans along this line developed further, so that rural electrification cooperatives and other consumers in that area could be assured of an additional supply of low-cost power without burdening the entire Nation with the excessive cost of this entire project.

There are other important considerations to which we should give careful attention. Much has been made of the supposed advantages of the project from the standpoint of national defense. Under the new conditions which we are likely to face, however, there is no reason to think that our Great Lakes ports will be any safer from attack than our Atlantic ports. Chicago and Detroit are about the same distance from Europe by air as are Boston and New York. More important, nine-tenths of the proposed waterway lies in the territory of a foreign power, although we are expected to put up two-thirds of the money for the construction. Our relations with Canada have been extremely friendly for well over a century, and I trust will always remain so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I presume the Senator expects his constituents at home to read his speech. I know that he wants them to know the facts as they are. He states that the United States is supposed to put up approximately two-thirds of the total cost of this project. I know that he wants his folks at home to know that that is because Canada has already completed a great part of the work which she was expected to do, including the Welland Canal and other works, and will, of course, be given credit for the work which has been done previously. In fact, Canada spent $133,000,000 in developing her part of the waterway, as far as she has gone, while the United States was spending only $18,000,000 on our part. I know that the Senator wants his constituents to know that; and I hope that if he prints his speech and sends it to them, he will not omit my remarks.

Mr. BUTLER. I can assure my good friend from Vermont that his remarks will be included when the speech is spread over the State of Nebraska—as very likely will be the case.

However, I repeat that nine-tenths of the waterway is within the Dominion of Canada, while about one-tenth is in our area, and the costs are not so divided.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that all the main dams will be within the borders of the United States, and all the locks and canals which it is proposed to build will be within the United States. The part which will be in Canada is the Welland Canal, and the deepening of the bed of the St. Lawrence River after it leaves the international boundary. Most of the construction work to be done, including all the main dams, will be in the United States; and one-half of the power plant and the power dam will be in Canada, and one-half in the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Since the point has been raised, let me ask the Senator from Vermont upon what basis it is proposed that the United States shall pay so much more of the construction cost than Canada is expected to pay.

Mr. AIKEN. Because Canada has already expended $133,000,000 in developing her part of the waterway, at a time when costs were much lower. Of course, Canada is being given credit for her farsightedness, and is being credited with the development at present-day costs. I think there is no difference of opinion as to that basis of reasoning.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to my able friend from Vermont that there is quite a difference of view upon that division, certainly from the standpoint of the Senator from West Virginia.

The able Senator has stated that the division of cost is based upon the fact that the Welland Canal was built several years ago by Canada. Let me say to the able Senator that the cost of this project was estimated last May by the Army engineers at more than $838,000,000. The cost of $838,000,000 is to be divided as follows: $523,531,000 to be paid by the United States, and $315,770,000 to be paid by Canada.

That is not the whole of it. Canada is to be credited with $132,672,000 for her part of the construction involved in the Welland Canal. Upon what basis was the cost originally divided, with more than $523,000,000 against the United States, and only $315,000,000 against Canada? That was before credit was allowed for the Welland Canal. What is the basis for that division?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BUTLER. I think the Senator from Vermont had better answer the question of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I can answer the question.

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. That question was put to the Government authorities, and I have the answer before me, verbatim:

When the 1932 treaty was negotiated the division of total cost, including past expenditures, was practically equal for the United States and Canada. The reason for the changed cost relationship today is that past expenditures were primarily Canadian and were made at a time when construction costs were comparatively low. Canada has already expended $133,000,000 on navigation works which are integral parts of the seaway, as compared with $32,000,000 for the United States. Future expenditures, on the other hand, for the most part cover works assigned to the United States, and have been estimated on the basis of the higher construction costs now obtaining. In any event, the pending legislation provides for self-liquidation of the new navigation works so that the proportion of cost borne by each country is not a primary factor in evaluating the project. The users will pay for the new navigation works.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, we have talked about the question of the users paying for the project. I take it that is the idea of liquidating the project by tolls. I think it has been very clearly brought out that the tolls are not fixed. We do not know what they will be. We do not know how long it will take to liquidate the project, if it shall ever be liquidated. So that the statement made by representatives of the Administration hardly answers the question which I have asked regarding the division of costs. The plain figures show that the division is put down as $523,000,000-plus against the United States and only $315,000,000 against Canada, originally. Canada's proportion of $315,000,000 is credited with $132,000,000, leaving Canada's estimated share at $183,098,000.

I bring that up because of the question being raised regarding the proportion of costs. It seems to me that is an unfair apportionment of costs. I ask why the United States should have to put up so much more than should Canada.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I was going to reply in a general way in the same manner that the Senator from Wisconsin replied to the Senator from West Virginia, but inasmuch as the Senator from Wisconsin had the reasons written out verbatim, I think that is the best answer to leave in the RECORD. Certainly costs are lower on the Canadian side. The costs of labor are lower, and Canada was far-sighted enough to complete much of her work while costs were not over half what they are today. Therefore she is being given credit for that work.

I hope that the views of the Senator from West Virginia are not colored by the fact that the power generated at the St. Lawrence side would effect a saving of 7,000,000 tons of coal a year, if it were used to take the place of coal. As a matter of fact, it would not be used for that purpose. The use of coal would increase as a result of this great development. But here is where a saving might be effected. The power generated at the St. Lawrence dam would have an equivalent energy of 21,000,000 barrels of oil. Everyone in the United States knows how necessary it is to save oil today. Everyone in the St. Lawrence area knows how difficult it is to get oil today. It is costing our people 14 cents a gallon to buy oil. That amounts to $7 a barrel. There is $140,000,000 worth of oil going to waste down the St. Lawrence River every year. Why do we quibble over whether Canada is getting credit for $1,000,000 or $10,000,000 more than she should get? I feel that it would be impossible to propose a bill of any kind for the development of water power for the benefit of the people which would satisfy the Senator from West Virginia or the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me assure the Senator from Vermont that the views of the Senator from West Virginia are not colored by anything that should not color them; and I am certain that the Senator's views are not colored by the fact that he hopes to get some cheap power in his State.

Mr. AIKEN. I never in my life saw so many broadminded people in one spot as we find right here.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, when I asked why there was such an unfair apportionment of the costs and asked upon what basis the division was made I heard a discourse upon coal, oil, and power. It is brought out that Canada paid for the Welland Canal, and that we ought to credit Canada $132,000,000 more than that amount against her apportioned costs for the construction of the Welland Canal. The Senator from Vermont has stated that when Canada constructed the Welland Canal labor was cheaper and materials were cheaper. I am wondering if the Senator means to tell us that we are not only giving Canada credit for the cost of the Welland Canal, but are giving her the value of the Welland Canal as if it were constructed as of today. Will the Senator answer that question for me?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not wish to yield for a digression.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska yields to the Senator from Wisconsin for the purpose of answering the question raised by the Senator from West Virginia, but not for a digression.

Mr. WILEY. I want to say that Herbert Hoover, a good Republican, said that the determination of the amount of tolls should be made by the two countries for construction and completion, otherwise they will have no idea what the actual necessary amounts are.

The total cost of the canal is estimated at $720,000,000. The total Canadian cost is $230,000,000. Deducting that from the total cost would leave $490,000,000. We deduct the power cost to the United States of $161,000,000, and that leaves the total cost of the power to the United States $329,000,000. The cost to both Canada and the United States is $398,000,000. Then we get into the question of the interest charges and what they should be.

Answering directly the question, I want to say that, as was stated yesterday, the former Governor of New York always looked at the record. We should look at the record, and here it is:

> When the 1932 treaty was negotiated, the division of total cost, including past expenditures, was practically equal for the United States and Canada. The reason for the changed cost relationship today is that past expenditures were primarily Canadian and were made at a time when construction costs were comparatively low. Canada has expended $133,000,000 on navigation works which are integral parts of the seaway as compared with $32,000,000 for the United States. Future expenditures, on the other hand, for the most part cover works assigned to the United States and have been estimated on the basis of the higher construction costs now obtaining. In any event, the pending legislation provides for self-liquidation of the new navigation works, so that the proportion of cost borne by each country is not a primary factor in evaluating the project. The users will pay for the new navigation works.

In relation to that, my good friend from West Virginia has throughout the day suggested that we cannot with any degree of certainty evaluate the future return. There are men like former President Hoover, men like Mr. Stimson and others, who have said that the construction of the project would be in the public interest. No farmer can tell what his crop will be, but he has faith and he plans and hopes that the sunshine, the rain, and other factors will help him to produce his crop. That is the sort of faith that has produced America.

We have the great potential savings suggested by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in connection with millions of dollars worth of potential oil going down the river, generating electricity to take care of the heat units needed by the people of New York.

Montreal is the second port in America from the standpoint of tonnage. It feeds only 15,000,000 Canadians. But when we start to feed Milwaukee, Chicago, Cleveland, and the other Lake ports, with their population of 50,000,000, what does the Senator suppose the traffic will be?

I have faith in the future of America which, it seems to me, some of my distinguished Republican colleagues do not have.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yielded a moment ago for the purpose of permitting the Senator from Wisconsin to answer the question which was asked by the Senator from West Virginia. I did not yield for a digression, but I believe that in the answer we got a hundred-percent digression. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to say to the Senator that I appreciate very much his yielding in order to get an answer. I have not received the answer yet. The only answer I got to my question was that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] talked about coal and power, and the Senator from Wisconsin spoke of the future of the country, and tolls. That did not answer my question. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding. I shall have to wait and let the question be answered later.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to plead guilty to that with which the Senator from West Virginia, by inference, charges me. I do wish to see the power rates in New York and New England cut in half. They should be cut in half in order to bring them down to the level of the power rates which exist in more favored parts of the country. I am afraid I am guilty of partiality in that direction.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. For a digression or for a question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. A question.

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to reiterate that it seems to me the question pends unanswered. Later in the course of the discussion I hope to bring into the RECORD the inequitable division, as I consider it, which is made between the two countries.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. For a question or an answer?

Mr. WILEY. For a question.

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr WILEY. The Senator has stated that my answer was a digression. However, I ask whether my statement does not answer expressly, directly, and dynamically, the question of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BUTLER. I can say——

Mr. WILEY. I wish to point out that this is the question, and I have read it twice to the Senate:

When the 1932 treaty was negotiated, the division of total costs——

Mr. BUTLER. Let me interrupt the Senator right there to ask whether I correctly understood him to refer to "the 1932 treaty"?

Mr. WILEY. That is what it says.

Mr. BUTLER. I observe that it was a treaty, not an agreement.

Mr. WILEY. I repeat, Mr. President:

When the 1932 treaty was negotiated, the division of the total costs, including past expenditures, was practically equal for the United States and Canada.

I have read that twice before.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, before continuing my very brief statement, which I have practically completed, I wish to point out very plainly at this time, inasmuch as this statement may be circulated in toto among the people of my State, that neither the distinguished Senator from Vermont nor the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin nor any other Member of the Senate is more friendly to the development of the power facilities of the United States than I am.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted for this digression, I was touching upon the subject of our relations with Canada, which for a period of more than a century have been extremely friendly, and we all trust they will remain so forever. The fact remains, however, that Canada is a sovereign nation, just as we are, and she may very well have different interests and may take a different course of action in case another conflict occurs. In 1898, we were at war, but Canada was not. From 1914 to 1917 and from 1939 to 1941, Canada was at war, but we were not. In case of a future conflict, there is no reason to think that our interests will be identical. In those circumstances, we shall have no real control whatever over the use of this waterway, which is proposed to be built largely with our money. We shall not be in a position to insist that the lower nine-tenths of it be made available to our traffic.

One other point deserves attention: The proposed waterway will not be usable for 4 or 5 months each year. It is unfortunate that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system is located so far north. It would be better if it started in Nebraska for instance. Although the winter freeze there would impede transportation to some extent for several months, the period would not be as prolonged as for the location of the proposed St. Lawrence project.

Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to emphasize just one further point which seems to me rather important: Inasmuch as this is a proposal to improve conditions for ocean navigation, it might be thought that the steamship companies would be among its strongest advocates. However, that is not the case. In fact, the oceangoing steamship operators seem to be less interested in this whole question than almost any other group is. Just 2 years ago, 32 leading American steamship companies were asked what would be their practical reaction to construction of the waterway. Only one of those companies replied that its vessels would use it, and one other was unable to give a definite opinion. Thirty companies stated that they had no intention of using the waterway, if constructed. What stronger testimony could we have on the practical value of this project? If the steamship operators themselves—practical men who know the problems of navigation—have no confidence in this plan—how can we of the Senate overrule their judgment and determine to construct it anyway? If oceangoing steamers are not going to use the waterway, its construction will not benefit even those lake ports and other groups which have been most vocal in support of the idea.

Mr. President, we are still laboring under the load of a gigantic wartime debt. We are still paying taxes at a record rate for peacetime. We are still struggling to find some way of reducing a Federal budget which is over four times as high as our greatest prewar peacetime budget. This resolution proposes that we spend another half billion dollars on a proposal for which no clear case has been made, and which would be of very doubtful value. If we mean what we say about reducing the cost of Government, we cannot possibly afford to approve this measure at this time.

AWARDS IN VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it is most encouraging and inspiring in these times, when democracy is on trial throughout the world, to find that here at home a widespread interest exists among our young people in respect to the ideals and privileges we enjoy as citizens under our American form of government.

Recently a national contest for scholarships, under a program entitled "Voice of Democracy," was conducted among high school students of the country. This program was sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Radio Manufacturers Association, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. The winners in the contest were selected by a panel of distinguished judges on the basis of having written and voiced the best 5-minute broadcasts on the subject, "I Speak for Democracy." Approximately 20,000 students participated, and four young ladies, representing the States of Ohio, Maryland, Oklahoma, and Montana were selected as co-equal winners of the contest. These four successful contestants were awarded prizes at a National Awards Luncheon held in Washington, D. C., at the Hotel Statler, on January 28, 1948, presided over by Dr. John W. Studebaker, commissioner of the Office of Education. The awards were presented by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, consisting of a certificate designating each as a winner in the contest, together with a $500 scholarship award.

In this contest, 38 States and Alaska entered contestants, representing approximately 20,000 high-school students, boys and girls, in 500 communities. Twenty of the State winners were boys, but the preliminary screening of entries to 12 found 7 girls and 5 boys among the finalists. Three finalists were selected by the screening judges in each of the four sections of the country. In the final contest, the panel of judges was made up of Attorney General Tom C. Clark, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Father Edward J. Flanagan, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, United States Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, and Mr. James Stewart, of Hollywood. The winners in the contest were Miss Janet Geister, of Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio; Miss Laura Shatto, of Hagerstown, Md.; Miss Alice Wade Tyree, of Lawton, Okla.; and Miss Rose Ellen Mudd, of Missoula, Mont.

I think it is significant that these four young ladies were the winners in this contest. It is indicative of the growing influence of American women in public affairs.

I am especially proud of the fact that a Montana girl, Miss Rose Ellen Mudd, a student at the Sacred Heart Academy at Missoula, was one of the winners. She was entered in the contest by radio station KGVO, of Missoula, with the cooperation of the Montana Junior Chamber of Commerce of that city. I have been deeply impressed by her radio talk on the subject of democracy, and feel justified in bringing it to the attention of Senators.

I am sending to the desk a transcription of Miss Rose Ellen Mudd's broadcast, copies of the addresses delivered at the national awards luncheon by Hon. Tom C. Clark, United States Attorney General, and by Dr. John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of Education, and an editorial from the Washington Post of January 28, 1948, entitled "Speak for Democracy." I ask that these may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, in the order presented.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Rose Ellen Mudd)

I am an American. As an American, I can do many things. Is it a coincidence that the word American ends in "I can"? That "I can" is the basis for democracy? It expresses the free will and determination of a free people—people who govern themselves.

"I can" was the spirit of the pioneering Americans when they faced the hardships of an unknown, uncivilized land and overcame them. Their spirit remained when they faced overwhelming odds and great dangers to gain their freedom from England.

"I can" was the spirit of the Nation, when, looking at the political systems of the other countries of the world, and their results, the American statesmen formed our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They vowed to insure, to themselves, and to us, their posterity, the rights of mankind—freedom of speech, of the press, of religion. Freedom from want, and from fear. Freedom from the tyranny of government—the right to rule ourselves. The voice of America—the Constitution—was born.

"I can" was the spirit of the people when our liberty was threatened in 1918, and again in 1941. We had to win to save an ideal. The voices of democracy spoke, and we did. The cost was great, but the willingness to pay was greater, for we knew the worth of the prize that was threatened.

The men of America who instituted our democratic principles, the great Emancipator who enforced them, the American people who have held them so securely—all have the spirit of the Constitution, and a wholesome pride in their superior government which gave them freedom. With this spirit democracy has triumphed many times in many things.

To share this great gift with the rest of the world is our goal. But first we must show the world the worth of democracy, and help others to see its advantages. Our spirit of brotherhood, tolerance, and respect for our fellow men—that is the essence of democracy. We must speak for democracy in a strong voice—telling the world of its greatness, and urging it to enjoy it with us.

I am an American citizen of 1947, in whose hands a portion of the peace of the world lies. I too remember the Constitution, its meaning, and its worth. I have a share in the voice of democracy, and I wish to speak in its behalf. I want the people of America to live democracy. I want to share the blessings of freedom with the world, for I know that to keep the world, I must help to keep the peace.

I have the spirit of "I can." I want to share that spirit, and with God's help, I will.

REMARKS OF TOM C. CLARK, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, IN AWARDING PRIZES TO FOUR WINNERS OF VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, THE RADIO MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, AND THE UNITED STATES JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SOUTH AMERICAN ROOM, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1948

I am happy to join in honoring these four young ladies this afternoon.

Before turning to the very pleasant task allotted me of awarding the prizes, I should like to say a few words about Our American Way of Life.

This occasion is significant of what can happen in America. Four young ladies, in a national contest, have won the final awards. They competed with the Nation's best—both boys and girls. This could happen only in a land where equality of opportunity is a part of the national creed. I do hope it symbolizes an era in which women will take a more active interest in public life.

The greatness of America is grounded in enduring principles. Our American heritage is something more than a rich continent lying between two oceans.

It is a land where its citizens can get joy out of achievement and thrill out of creative effort.

In this land of freedom, each of us has undreamed-of opportunities.

You, young people, are living in the most challenging age of all times. You now have wonderful tools with which to explore and utilize the rich resources of the earth for the betterment of mankind. Mind you, I said, betterment of mankind.

Although many of the geographical frontiers are closed to exploration, there are still frontiers of science, of medicine, of law, and of thought—all frontiers of fuller living that challenge each of us to the highest endeavor.

As we meet this challenge, we are determined to make this America a better, a more Christian-like, a more beautiful place in which to live. Each of us is proud of our country; we must each so live that our country will be proud of us.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By John W. Studebaker, U. S. Commissioner of Education)

(Introductory remarks on Station WOL and the Mutual Broadcasting System network in Washington, D. C., January 28, 1948, honoring the four national winners in the high school radio-speech contest under the title, "I Speak for Democracy")

Ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to honor the youth of our country. Twenty thousand young Americans, in 500 communities, did some real thinking about our way of life last November. They thought about their responsibilities, their opportunities, and the future of the United States. In a Nation-wide contest, they delivered brief speeches with the title "I Speak for Democracy."

These speeches about our representative form of government were made in response to an opportunity provided by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Radio Manufacturers Association, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. This contest, in addition to developing a wholesome competitive spirit among these young people, has had the effect—we hope—of stimulating new interest, on the part of teachers, in the usefulness of radio as a teaching instrument. Those of us who share the responsibility of educating the young people of our Nation have long recognized the great value of radio as a learning tool.

The radio industry and the Junior Chamber of Commerce are to be commended for their role in this unique program.

Here is how the contest worked. First, a school, next the community, then the entire State, selected a winner. Finally, recordings made by the State winners were sent to the national judges. We are now about to make the national scholarship awards to the four co-equal national winners representing the four major divisions of the country.

One of the national judges is here for the climax of this contest, Attorney General Tom Clark. Admiral Nimitz, Gen. Omar Bradley, Senator Warren Magnuson, Jimmy Stewart, the motion picture star, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, wartime director of the Women's Army Corps, and Father Flanagan, of Boys' Town; the other judges—unable to be here—are probably listening now.

In a moment you will be introduced to the four successful contest winners who today will receive their awards. You may have been surprised, as I was, to learn that they are all girls. Perhaps this result portends a large increase in the representation of the fair sex in places of leadership.

I have known these girls for about 24 hours. I have seen them conduct themselves with poise and dignity but with great natural spontaneity before the President of the United States, who received them yesterday at the White House. So long as our schools and our homes can produce such earnest and intelligent young people as these, we can be reassured about the future of our Nation.

It is my pleasure now to introduce the Attorney General of the United States, who will make the presentations to our guests, the Honorable Tom C. Clark.

REMARKS BY JOHN W. STUDEBAKER TO THE LUNCHEON GUESTS, FOLLOWING THE PRESENTATION OF AWARDS TO THE WINNERS BY THE HONORABLE TOM C. CLARK, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Now that you have been introduced to the national winners in the I Speak for Democracy contest, I know you are all eager to hear their winning speeches. That opportunity will be afforded you in a few minutes. Before presenting excerpts from the speeches, may I say a further word about what I conceive to be the significance of this contest.

First, I think it is significant that the judges who heard many of the State finalist entries were impressed by the extent to which these high school students had a firm hold on the central concept of democracy, namely, the concept of the dignity and worth of the individual human person. It is from this concept that our democratic convictions about human freedom stem—convictions so superbly expressed in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution but more especially in the Bill of Rights—convictions succinctly summarized in the freedom pledge, given currently in the schools in connection with the Freedom Train and its exhibits of the priceless documents of our American heritage:

"I am an American. A free American. Free to speak without fear. Free to worship God in my own way. Free to stand for what I think right. Free to oppose what I believe wrong. Free to choose those who govern my country. This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold for myself and for all mankind."

Second, it is significant that this contest has been conducted at this particular time, when the democratic concept of freedom, exemplified in our American way of life, is under serious attack in many areas of the world, when doctrines of class hatred, proletarian dictatorship, a completely planned economy, and atheism, struggle for supremacy with democratic ideals of human liberty. The impact of this struggle is centered in Europe and Asia. But it is by no means limited to those continents.

Inasmuch as the conflict is ideological, it can best be resolved by educational means. Our schools and colleges, together with the radio, the press, the motion pictures, and other instrumentalities of free inquiry and free communication have a vital responsibility here—a responsibility to make clear to our own citizens, and indeed to all men wherever they can be reached, the crucial differences between democracy and its rivals. When those differences have been made entirely clear, and when the practices which flow from them are also made apparent, I have no doubt about the eventual choice mankind will make.

It is my conviction that our schools and colleges, as well as the press and the radio, must clearly recognize and aggressively accept the responsibility of propagating the democratic faith. Let me add that in so doing we shall need propagation through deeds as well as by words. The message of democracy, especially if it is to carry hope to the millions of discontented, groping, hungry people in other parts of the world, must be accompanied by deeds of understanding and helpfulness and reconstruction.

Third, I think it is significant that the radio industry in America, represented by the National Association of Broadcasters and the Radio Manufacturers Association, should have been active sponsors of this educational contest. The educational uses of radio have tremendous possibilites. These possibilities are as yet largely unexplored. I do not refer alone to the uses of radio by teachers in schools and colleges. I refer as well to the

educational uses of radio by broadcasters who reach the great rank and file of citizens of all ages, but especially the adult citizens, in a program of education for democracy. Such a program can be replete with drama and interest—a powerful force for the further development of social intelligence and concern for human welfare. I congratulate the industry and the broadcasters for their growing interest and effort in this field.

Finally, it seems to me significant that we in this audience should all of us by our presence here today be giving testimony to our interest in and concern about what the schools of this country are doing in the development of an understanding of and a zeal for American democracy. In just a moment now you will have evidence of the way in which the cream—I was about to say the peaches and cream—of our high school youth think and feel about democracy. It is heartening to know that these young ladies are representative of more than 20,000 contestants who submitted speeches, and of some 7,000,000 high school youth of this country who in their homes and schools and communities are learning to know and to live, as well as to speak for, democracy. The United States Office of Education is proud of these young ladies, representative of the high school youth of this Nation, proud also, with the support of Congress, to have a part in assisting the schools and colleges throughout the country to strengthen and improve at every possible point their programs of instruction designed to develop zeal for American democracy.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

The four high school girls to whom Attorney General Clark will today present awards as winners of the Voice of Democracy competition are honored visitors in the Capital. They topped some 20,000 contestants in all parts of the country, boys among them, although one would never suspect it from the outcome, to win trips to Washington and $500 scholarships in a contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Radio Manufacturers Association. The contest as a whole afforded reassurance as to the soundness of democracy in this country at the grass roots. Each contestant made a 5-minute speech, I Speak for Democracy. They spoke not alone with fervor but with a maturity of outlook and a sense of the significance of their subject that went entirely beyond the conventions of patriotism. We congratulate the winners, Laura Shatto, Janet Geister, Alice Wade Tyree, and Rose Ellen Mudd, on their triumph—and even more on their understanding of the richness of their heritage.

THE FUEL-OIL SHORTAGE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of executive business, I should like to make a brief comment in regard to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont that the New England States are short of fuel oil—which of course is the fact, and I do not want in any way to attempt to detract from the force of his argument that the St. Lawrence seaway should be developed in order to provide improved and increased transportation for fuel oil and other commodities. Nevertheless, I now call attention to the fact that the acute shortage of fuel oil which is being experienced in the United States is due to many factors. One of them, and a prime factor it is, is transportation. I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the report which was filed approximately 60 days ago by the Committee on Small Business. In it the committee pointed out that this administration was selling to foreign governments 100 T–2 tankers, 51 of which were taken out of the active fleet, and 29 of which were taken out of the active service which has been bringing fuel oil from the Gulf States to the port of Baltimore and to other ports on the Atlantic coast as far north as Boston, Mass. A letter of protest was written to the President of the United States before those sales were confirmed, and in that letter attention was called to the acute situation in regard to transportation, and it was pointed out that such a shortage of fuel oil would develop unless the sales were made to citizen applicants, instead of to noncitizen applicants. That was pointed out clearly, and it cannot be disputed or denied.

So the acute fuel-oil shortage in which we now find ourselves is partly caused by the fact that we have transferred to foreign countries these 100 T–2 tankers, which cost $4,500,000 apiece, but were sold to foreigners for $1,500,000 apiece.

Mr. President, that is not all that report reveals. I say this not only as a United States Senator but as an American citizen and an American taxpayer: Twenty-seven percent of the steel which went into tubular steel has been exported from the United States during the past year. That is what has caused the shortage in pipe-line construction and also the loss in the bringing in of new wells in proven territories, and also wildcat wells. But primarily the loss thus caused is a loss of transportation, because increased pipe-line facilities would provide added transportation for fuel oil and natural gas. Three hundred and thirty thousand tons of pipe-line steel was provided for the Saudi Arabia oil fields, but now the portion of it which has been shipped cannot even be used, because of the troubles in Palestine. It is because of those shipments that pipeline construction in the United States has been blocked. That is extremely regrettable, because such construction in this country would afford the transportation facilities which are so badly needed in order to bring fuel oil and natural gas to the consumers in the United States.

So I desire to call attention to the fact that transportation is a vital factor in this situation. If the present trouble is to be cured for the balance of the present fuel-oil season, and also in the future, next summer, we must reconsider what has been done and we must see to it that a sufficient number of vessels are repaired or reconditioned so as to replace the vessels which have been taken from our active service, the loss of which is so largely responsible for the present acute situation in regard to supplies of fuel oil.

Mr. President, although there has been this shortage, as we all realize, yet it would not have been as acute as it is at this time but for the sale of those vessels. So if the present acute situation is to be alleviated, we shall have to obtain more vessels by way of having ships reconditioned, and thus put more vessels into the service of carrying fuel oil between the Gulf and the eastern seaports, so as to alleviate any further suffering this winter from cold.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I realize that under the rules of the Senate it is not possible to have cartoons reproduced in the RECORD. If that were possible, I should certainly ask unanimous consent to have reproduced a cartoon by C. K. Berryman which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, January 28. It shows a snow-covered scene, with John Q. Taxpayer standing in front of a bulletin board on which the following items appear:

LATEST BULLETIN

Prices continue to rise. Housing prospects dim. Oil shortages alarming. Peace prospects terrible. New fight against tax-reduction. White House balcony under way.

On the other side is shown a picture of the President saying to John Q. Taxpayer, "I tell you what—let's build the St. Lawrence Canal!"

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram from the aluminum workers' union, one from Walter P. Reuther, international president of the UAW–CIO and a letter from Julius H. Barnes, president of the National St. Lawrence Association, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSENA, N. Y., *January 29, 1948.*

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Employment is dropping steadily and metal orders are delayed in filling because of a power shortage in Massena, N. Y., today. Ninety-four men have been laid off at the Aluminum Co. of America plant this week. Power supply present operations at this aluminum plant is largely imported from Canada. One pot line that reduces alumina to aluminum by an electrolytic process was shut down Monday, January 26, for lack of power. The power that would be available by harnessing the St. Lawrence River for producing electric power is desperately needed in this entire area. The United States Senate must approve the St. Lawrence project in its entirety.

ALUMINUM WORKERS' UNION, No. 19256,
J. J. CALLAHAN, *Secretary.*

WASHINGTON OFFICE, UAW–CIO,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1948.

Walter P. Reuther, international president of the UAW–CIO, today sent the following wire to Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, urging prompt passage of the pending St. Lawrence seaway resolution:

"On behalf of almost 1,000,000 UAW–CIO members in the United States and Canada, I urge prompt, favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 111, approving the United States-Canadian agreement on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. Production in the Northeast is already suffering from power shortages.

"The development of the St. Lawrence project will end the risk of similar power deficits in the future. It will create additional wealth for the whole Nation through

the expansion of transportation and power facilities and will contribute to the creation of a full production and full employment economy. In such an economy the Great Lakes region can have its rightful outlet to the sea without detriment to the ports and industries of the Atlantic seaboard.

"More than 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy a year which the St. Lawrence project can add to the power output of the United States and Canada will be a tremendous boon to the peoples of both countries.

"WALTER P. REUTHER,
"International President, UAW-CIO."

NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1948.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to you concerning a matter which I feel has overriding national importance. During many years of service as president and chairman of the board of the United States Chamber of Commerce, I came to appreciate the fair-minded and enlightened devotion to public interest which characterizes our public officials. It is in this spirit that I address you regarding the St. Lawrence seaway project.

In these momentous days we must ever keep before us the mainspring of the strength of American democracy—the free development of our natural and human resources and the great skill in technology and management which is the marvel of the world. The St. Lawrence project is one of those magnificent achievements within our grasp, and of immediate interest. Currently the project will come before you as Senate Joint Resolution 111, which authorizes its construction on a self-liquidating basis.

The St. Lawrence seaway, like the Panama Canal, will be a national investment, meeting all its expenses and interest on the investment. All of us can approve and support such a businesslike proposition, which puts it above criticism on the ground of Government economy and eliminates the danger of diversion of business from existing transportation systems through Government subsidy. The St. Lawrence seaway as now proposed is a self-supporting investment in national security and prosperity.

In the accompanying brief summary you will note the importance attached to this project by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the United States Corps of Army Engineers, and the United States Maritime Commission for peacetime commerce and national security in periods of emergency.

Five former Presidents of the United States Chamber of Commerce are enrolled with us in support of this great undertaking: Eric Johnston, John H. Fahey, James Kemper, Henry I. Harriman, and the writer. In addition, such prominent business and civic leaders as Henry Ford II, John Cowles, Cyrus Eaton, Edward J. Noble, Owen D. Young, Marshall Field III, Laird Bell, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, William L. White, and a host of others are associated with us in our plea to you that you give sympathetic consideration to this measure.

Business opinion is in favor of the St. Lawrence project. A poll of business opinion conducted by Modern Industry magazine gave the following results: Should Modern Industry favor the St. Lawrence seaway project?

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
New England	54.0	46.0
Mid-Atlantic	55.1	44.9
North Central	75.1	24.9
South	55.5	44.5
Midwest	73.8	26.2
Mountain and Pacific	62.1	37.9

United States average, 63.7 percent, yes; 36.3 percent, no.

Other polls of public opinion show overwhelming approval by the general public. National leaders over the past 25 years have, without exception, recommended the construction of this project. Presidents Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman; Secretaries of State Charles Evans Hughes, Henry L. Stimson, Cordell Hull, James F. Byrnes, Edward Stettinius, and George C. Marshall; Governors Alfred E. Smith, Herbert H. Lehman, Thomas E. Dewey, Charles Edison, Harold Stassen, and a host of others. These leaders have not been mistaken. Their support is based on the best engineering and business analysis and study of the project.

A project of such national importance needs your earnest consideration, untrammeled by temporary local considerations. In urging the approval of this, we are asking you to join with us in building up America for our children and grandchildren.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Valley is the lifeline of the continent of North America. Our own industrial and agricultural civilization is based upon cheap transportation on this waterway. Canada is wholly dependent on it. The further development of this area will be a contribution to the wealth and progress of these two nations which stand today as the bulwark of democracy. The 12,000,000 people of Canada are the best customers of the United States, barring none. With the development of the St. Lawrence project it can be expected that Canada, as well as the United States, will grow in industry and population, thereby making a greater contribution to public well being in peacetime, and to defense of the continent in event of danger to our security.

The stakes are high; the decision is yours.

Very truly yours,

JULIUS H. BARNES,
President.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I present a telegram from Mr. W. C. Hushing, chairman of the national legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor, in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 28, 1948.*

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building:

Under date of January 27, President Green advises me that the executive council of the American Federation of Labor now in session reaffirms the American Federation of Labor's position in opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project. Our testimony as presented on March 1, 1946, by Legislative Representative Lewis Hines to Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, sets forth our views. I wish to advise you and the other Members of this fact because the project is now under debate in the Senate.

W. C. HUSHING,
Chairman, National Legislative Committee, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the hour having arrived when the opponents of the measure have apparently concluded for the day, I should like to suggest, in fact, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request, that after the Senate reconvenes on Monday next at noon, and after the morning hour, the pending business, which is the St. Lawrence seaway bill, shall continue to be considered, and that the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin shall be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY UNDER TITLE III OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT, 1942

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see proceedings of the House of Representatives for Thursday, January 29, 1948, on p. 686.)

MASSMAN CONSTRUCTION CO.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WILEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. MCGRATH conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXPENDITURES, ETC., BY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote on Wednesday, January 28, 1948, agreeing to Senate resolution 189, authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to make certain expenditures and to employ temporary assistants.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Vincent C. Burke, of Kentucky, to be First Assistant Postmaster General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senate has just confirmed the nomination of Mr. Vincent C. Burke to be First Assistant Postmaster General of the United States. I did not want the occasion to pass without taking a moment to express my very high opinion of the character and ability of Mr. Burke. It was my good fortune to be First Assistant Postmaster General in 1933. At that time Mr. Burke was selected as Deputy First Assistant Postmaster General, and I can say from personal experience that he has all the qualifications that go to make an excellent Postmaster General. With Mr. Donaldson as Postmaster General and Mr. Burke as First Assistant Postmaster General, the people of the United States may be certain that the Post Office Department is headed by two of the ablest career men in the service of the Government. I feel we are all fortunate today that the Senate, acting upon the recommendation of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, has confirmed the nomination of Mr. Burke. I thank the Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John R. Alison, of Florida, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter M. W. Splawn, of Texas, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wayne Coy, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George E. Sterling, of Maine, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

COAST GUARD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and at the request of the Acting Chairman, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], I report favorably sundry nominations in the Coast Guard, and I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration. There are approximately 1,400 of the nominations, a complete list of which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, at pages 283, 284, 285, and 286.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the nominations.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, so there may be no mistake about the procedure next week, I may suggest to Members of the Senate that the motion tonight will be a motion to adjourn, so that we shall proceed under the morning hour Monday, at which time there will be a call of the calendar, from the beginning, on bills to which there are no objections, after which the pending business, which is the St. Lawrence seaway bill, will be resumed. At that time, because of the unanimous-consent request just granted, the Senator from Wisconsin will be recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. In order that those who read the RECORD may comprehend what is to take place on Monday, the Senator from Wisconsin does not expect to take the floor and speak at that time, but he does expect that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and possibly the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] may, if we can apportion the time among ourselves. My understanding with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is that on Tuesday he will have the day, and then, after that, we shall try to work out an amicable allotment of time, in an effort to conclude debate, if possible, next week.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I again call to the attention of Members of the Senate the fact that it will be the intention, if the Senate approves, beginning Monday, to have daily sessions up to and including Thursday night, if the pending business is not then disposed of. On Thursday, we shall make an announcement relative to a session on next Friday, and the proposal for the following week. All of this, of course, is subject to the approval of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I desire to inquire whether any unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into other than the agreement to recognize the Senator from Wisconsin on Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the only unanimous-consent agreement that has been entered into.

Mr. LODGE. The understanding is that on Tuesday the opponents of the pending measure will have a day in which to present their views on the subject, although there are a great many who want to speak in opposition, and I do not know whether they can complete their addresses on Tuesday or not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think there should be a clear understanding that the only unanimous-consent agreement that has been made is that when the Senate proceeds with the pending business, after the call of the calendar on Monday, the Senator from Wisconsin shall be recognized. Any further understanding or unanimous-consent agreement will have to be reached or made at that time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, of course, I would move that that be done. Under the strict parliamentary rule, the Chair can at that time recognize anyone he wishes to recognize.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Aside from the Senator from Wisconsin, who will be recognized; but whoever the occupant of the Chair is at that time certainly from that point on will recognize, under the rules of the Senate, whatever Senators seek recognition on the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that the Senate can at this time by unanimous consent enter into an agreement whereby the Chair is duty bound to rec-

ognize some one Senator on Monday next, when the session convenes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say that he has not been a Member of the Senate as long as the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois, but he has always been informed that the Senate could do anything by unanimous consent, and the effect of such an agreement is to suspend the rule up to that point.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Chair repeat that?

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I think this is very important, because I have always understood, since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, that a unanimous-consent agreement could not be made whereby a Senator would be recognized on the following day, and that it was definitely up to the Senator presiding at the time as to whom he would recognize. If there is a new ruling on that, I should like to know it, although I know such practice as we have been discussing has been followed consistently and continuously without any objection. I merely raised the point for the information of the Senate, in order to get a parliamentary ruling on it. I am sure, if the Chair makes that ruling, he is making a ruling which is diametrically opposed to many rulings that have been made in the past.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is simply a unanimous-consent agreement which has been asked from the floor, and that was agreed to by the Senate of the United States, which acts as a temporary suspension of the rule up to that point. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian it is not an unprecedented action on the part of the Senate or of the Presiding Officer in a similar situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad to know that, and I should like to take a look at the precedents, myself, on this point, between now and next Monday, because if I have been laboring under a delusion all the years that I have been in the Senate, upon this parliamentary question, I certainly should like to know about it. I still maintain that there is no unanimous-consent agreement that can bind the then Presiding Officer to recognize the Senator from Wisconsin on Monday next when we meet on a new legislative day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say to the able Senator from Illinois that the latest precedent that he would cite to the Senator from Illinois is the precedent whereby the senior Senator from Louisiana obtained the floor today.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning that at all. I say to the Chair that it is done frequently. The only question I raise is this: Assuming that the President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan, on Monday next recognizes the Senator from Illinois, what will the Senate do about that, under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would say that very likely the Presiding Officer on next Monday would have read the RECORD, and the matter may take care of itself.

Mr. LUCAS. That is not the question. Of course, it is a hypothetical question, and if the Chair does not care to answer, he does not have to do so, but I maintain I have a material point involved in this parliamentary situation. We have a great parliamentarian in Mr. Watkins. I am certain I have talked with him some time in the past about this very point. It may be I wholly misunderstood him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is going to rule that the request of a Member of the Senate was for unanimous consent that this action be carried out, the consent was given by the Senate itself that the procedure be followed on Monday, and therefore it is in order.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may have one more word, I just want to add that I seriously submit that whoever occupies the chair on next Monday can recognize the Senator from Wyoming or the Senator from Illinois, if he rises, notwithstanding the terms of the unanimous-consent action taken today, and if such were done, no point of order would be in order upon such recognition.

THE DROPPING OF 66 KANSAS CITY VOTE INDICTMENTS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a newspaper clipping entitled "Sixty-six Kansas City Vote Indictments Dropped."

Mr. President, I can well understand the reason for dismissing these indictments, because they were based upon stolen ballots and in the absence of the ballots fraud with respect to them is not susceptible to proof. I hope, however, that this action will not mislead anyone into thinking that the Kansas City, Mo., vote scandals are cleared up. That is by no means the case. The Attorney General has never satisfactorily explained his gross failure to act as the duties of his office require. The Kansas City, Mo., vote scandals still remain a blot on the elections in 1946.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1948]

SIXTY-SIX KANSAS CITY VOTE INDICTMENTS DROPPED

KANSAS CITY, January 29.—Vote-fraud charges against 66 persons indicted by a State grand jury which investigated the 1946 Kansas City primary election were dismissed yesterday in circuit court.

The mass dismissals followed a ruling by Circuit Court Judge James W. Broaddus that testimony of former grand jurors as secondary evidence was not admissable under Missouri law.

Ballots and records which the grand jury used in its investigation were stolen, and Prosecutor James G. Kimbrell had proposed to use grand jurors as witnesses to offer testimony regarding the missing information.

Among the contests in the 1946 primary was the Fifth Missouri Congressional District race for the Democratic nomination. Enos Axtell, backed by President Truman, defeated Roger C. Slaughter, the incumbent. In the general election, however, Republican ALBERT L. REEVES defeated Mr. Axtell.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 30 (legislative day of January 26), 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Isaac N. P. Stokes, of the District of Columbia, to the position of Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Joseph T. Evans, Elkmont, Ala., in place of R. B. Evans, retired.

Benjamin F. Screws, Shorter, Ala., in place of S. B. Baker, transferred.

Charles B. Brock, Steele, Ala., in place of J. T. Wheeler, resigned.

Larry Robinson, Tuskegee Institute, Ala., in place of J. A. Johnson, transferred.

ALASKA

Marietta M. Benson, Metlakatla, Alaska, in place of T. E. Benson, resigned.

ARIZONA

Edward S. Brewer, Cactus, Ariz., in place of F. V. Howey, resigned.

H. Fay Hall, Chloride, Ariz., in place of C. L. Kinsey, resigned.

Nellie C. Sawyer, Inspiration, Ariz., in place of L. L. Horan, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Woodrow M. Freeze, Jr., Cash, Ark., in place of Claude Gregory, retired.

Dallas Johnson, Pollard, Ark., in place of J. C. Latta, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Floyd M. Harvey, Adin, Calif., in place of F. M. Harvey, resigned.

Ernest W. Hutton, Agoura, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Edna Stratton Hamilton, Bolinas, Calif., in place of H. I. Hoirup, deceased.

Anita V. Reid, Burrel, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Florence E. Kahmar, Camino, Calif., in place of E. M. Carsten, deceased.

Charles W. Ray, Cedarpines Park, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Keith L. Tobin, Cutler, Calif., in place of D. M. Tobin, resigned.

Viola S. Pambianco, French Camp, Calif., in place of V. F. Gorrell, retired.

Beatrice K. Geiger, Herlong, Calif., in place of G. E. McIntire, resigned.

Grace R. Aldridge, Joshua Tree, Calif. Office became Presidential October 1, 1946.

Fern C. Barber, Lemoncove, Calif., in place of F. J. Darby, resigned.

John L. McKindley, Lockeford, Calif., in place of J. A. Coil, deceased.

Joseph J. Joaquin, Madrone, Calif., in place of N. K. Kirby, retired.

John E. McSweeney, Mill Valley, Calif., in place of J. C. Strouss, deceased.

Louise H. Blanchard, Occidental, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Mary E. Bailey, Piru, Calif., in place of F. E. Cornelius, retired.

Lillie E. Connor, Richvale, Calif., in place of LaVerne Friberg, resigned.

James W. Kern, Santa Susana, Calif., in place of L. R. Riave, retired.

Ernest D. Robinson, Willow Creek, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

COLORADO

Harold Iacovetto, Artesia, Colo. Office established March 25, 1946.

Richard Ernest Lemesany, Calhan, Colo., in place of C. N. Funk, resigned.

Elma N. Adams, Collbran, Colo., in place of Loudene Humeston, resigned.

Donald W. Kelly, Lafayette, Colo., in place of M. F. O'Day, retired.

Raymond H. Talbot, Pueblo, Colo., in place of C. F. Horn, deceased.

Netta M. Finch, Springfield, Colo., in place of V. L. Finch, deceased.

FLORIDA

Mary R. Buzbee, Gibsonton, Fla., in place of P. L. Buzbee, deceased.

IDAHO

Claude L. Overson, Firth, Idaho, in place of H. W. Winschell, resigned.

Mabel Logue, Stibnite, Idaho, in place of E. N. Martin, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Daniel J. Boyd, Blue Island, Ill., in place of A. J. Lagod, resigned.

William K. Armstrong, Chandlerville, Ill., in place of G. J. Armstrong, resigned.

Ray B. Brockhouse, Chapin, Ill., in place of W. R. Fisher, transferred.

Andrew J. Rogers, Jr., Cordova, Ill., in place of L. A. Cooper, transferred.

James O. Brown, Long Point, Ill., in place of G. F. Turner, retired.

John W. Bosaw, New Haven, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank C. Spengler, Shannon, Ill., in place of A. J. Geiseman, transferred.

Besse M. Hewitt, Steward, Ill., in place of T. F. Kirby, deceased.

Beatrice E. Reck, Winslow, Ill., in place of H. M. Deam, resigned.

INDIANA

Bernice West, Castleton, Ind., in place of N. M. Sigman, resigned.

Dale M. Sands, Claypool, Ind., in place of Walter Bouse, transferred.

George W. Horan, Collegeville, Ind., in place of F. A. Hehn, resigned.

Everett J. Laun, Kingsford Heights, Ind., in place of W. J. Rash, resigned.

Robert D. Long, Millersburg, Ind., in place of W. D. Stoner, transferred.

Arnold B. Rhodes, Tippecanoe, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

IOWA

Robert B. Christopher, Huxley, Iowa, in place of Albert Johnson, retired.

KANSAS

Allen M. Hunter, Garden City, Kans., in place of L. N. Green, resigned.

KENTUCKY

James A. Hamblin, Buckhorn, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Arthur Kelly Hearon, Clay, Ky., in place of P. L. McGraw, deceased.

Orland C. Seeley, Corbin, Ky., in place of N. M. Elliott, removed.

John M. Magee, Cynthiana, Ky., in place of S. F. Sprake, deceased.

Lillian Bodenheimer, Freeburn, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Helen Jaeger, Independence, Ky., in place of A. B. Jaeger, deceased.

Roy P. Peters, Lily, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John C. Ryan, Pine Knot, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert F. Gillespie, Sadieville, Ky., in place of W. A. Marshall, transfererd.

Hodge J. Slayden, Salem, Ky., in place of Jessie Mitchell, resigned.

Mary M. Deaton, Toner, Ky. Office became Presidential April 1, 1947.

Rachel A. Galvin, Waverly Hills, Ky., in place of M. F. Beck, transferred.

George G. Wilson, Whitley City, Ky., in place of B. K. Morris, removed.

LOUISIANA

Allen J. Lorio, Hahnville, La., in place of P. D. Lorio, Jr., resigned.

Erna P. Watts, Walker, La., in place of W. A. Rheams, resigned.

MAINE

Donald F. Lord, Belgrade Lakes, Maine, in place of N. A. Harnden, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

William P. Stone, Jr., Monson, Mass., in place of J. R. Crowley, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Alexander S. Lynch, Carney, Mich., in place of V. R. Moran, transferred.

Ernest A. Sackerman, Grand Rapids, Mich., in place of F. C. Jarvis, retired.

Clarence F. Goerner, Howard City, Mich., in place of Sidney Reynolds, resigned.

Edward J. Murphy, Kawkawlin, Mich., in place of H. J. Staudacher, retired.

MINNESOTA

Olice S. Erickson, Willmar, Minn., in place of A. G. Erickson, retired.

MONTANA

Donald R. Lamoreux, Corvallis, Mont., in place of S. E. Dickson, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Joseph E. Hurley, Wilton, N. H., in place of J. R. K. Kelley, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Charles M. Kammerer, Carlton Hill, N. J., in place of F. J. Baker, resigned.

Walter C. Farley, Oldwick, N. J., in place of M. D. Farley, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Antonio J. Trujillo, Questa, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Paul Madrid, Vaughn, N. Mex., in place of Leon Panebouef, resigned.

NEW YORK

Manuel Fisher, Harris, N. Y., in place of H. A. Monroe, resigned.

Alvah P. Saulpaugh, Red Hook, N. Y., in place of A. P. Saulpaugh, transferred.

Winston R. Reel, Schuylerville, N. Y., in place of D. J. Falvey, deceased.

Arthur J. Kane, Waverly, N. Y., in place of M. G. Baldwin, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Thomas E. Bivins, Hillsboro, N. C., in place of Shepperd Strudwick, retired.

Robert H. Ballew, Nebo, N. C., in place of J. C. Parks, transferred.

William Lester Farrell, Pittsboro, N. C., in place of F. C. Mann, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Richard S. Rhoades, Killdeer, N. Dak., in place of Fred Hollingsworth, resigned.

OREGON

Agnes M. Hashberger, Coldton, Oreg., in place of C. P. Hunter, retired.

Kenneth P. McCollum, Elkton, Oreg., in place of G. K. McKinney, resigned.

Myra M. Brinker, Freewater, Oreg, in place of R. O. Brinker, resigned.

Merle R. Brown, Philomath, Oreg., in place of M. M. Cummings, resigned.

Celia W. Smith, Wauna, Oreg., in place of G. E. Wright, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Chester J. Kukleski, Braddock, Pa., in place of Jennie Moran, retired.

Frank W. Coughanour, Jr., Hopwood, Pa., in place of A. L. P. Lieb, resigned.

Wiley C. Hamby, Salona, Pa., in place of C. B. Herr, retired.

George L. Strausbaugh, Seven Valleys, Pa., in place of S. E. Henry, resigned.

Willis C. Latshaw, Spring City, Pa., in place of R. E. Walley, resigned.

Ida M. Christie, Starford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Charles A. Brader, Tannersville, Pa., in place of W. E. Kresge, retired.

Robert A. Lanzendorfer, Twin Rocks, Pa., in place of M. E. Ford, resigned.

Joseph Walter Petrovich, Wilburton, Pa., in place of Wilbert Larzelere, retired.

Eaton A. Hartman, Windsor, Pa., in place of E. C. Smith, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Domingo Lopez, Maricao, P. R., in place of L. B. Lopez, retired.

Josefa G. Lorenzi, Yauco, P. R., in place of L. M. Diaz, transferred.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Jesse W. Parris, Clifton, S. C., in place of B. F. Cannon, retired.

Helen A. Geraty, Yonges Island, S. C., in place of J. W. Geraty, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leo V. Marek, Avon, S. Dak., in place of M. A. Hornstra, deceased.

Nettie A. Boatman, Columbia, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Franklin deHaai, Corsica, S. Dak., in place of C. J. Ver Steeg, transferred.

Vernon Morgan, Pine Ridge, S. Dak., in place of Orval Ogle, resigned.

Milton B. Tracy, Pollock, S. Dak., in place of H. M. Boschker, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Lee T. McDaniel, Pittsburgh Landing, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Ross Bass, Pulaski, Tenn., in place of W. F. English, deceased.

Earnest T. Browder, Sweetwater, Tenn., in place of J. N. McGuire, resigned.

TEXAS

Glenn H. Henderson, Bryson, Tex., in place of S. C. Milburn, retired.

Walter G. Marek, Burlington, Tex., in place of F. A. Krause, transferred.

James R. Brown, Denison, Tex., in place of J. H. Parrish, retired.

Charles H. Yowell, Dodd City, Tex., in place of R. H. Mills, deceased.

Frederic E. Edgar, High Island, Tex., in place of J. H. Bugg, resigned.

Granville W. Elder, Houston, Tex., in place of John Dunlop, retired.

Harold Sparks, La Villa, Tex., in place of W. E. Cooper, resigned.

John C. Groce, League City, Tex., in place of V. L. Platzer, resigned.

Charley J. Nichols, Mansfield, Tex., in place of E. O. Driskell, retired.

Isaac E. White, Markham, Tex., in place of C. B. Fisher, resigned.

Otis Avary, Seymour, Tex., in place of J. E. McDuffey, resigned.

Joe R. Christian, Tenaha, Tex., in place of I. B. Davidson, resigned.

Wallace Fred Cannon, Thornton, Tex., in place of M. E. Cannon, transferred.

Ralph W. Palmer, Tornillo, Tex., in place of O. H. Palmer, retired.

UTAH

C. Henry Nielsen, Brigham, Utah, in place of Nello Christoffersen, resigned.

Donald L. Vance, Fairview, Utah, in place of N. S. Brady, Transferred.

Claud M. Glazier, Kanab, Utah, in place of A. C. Ford, resigned.

Andrew W. Swanson, Kanosh, Utah, in place of C. C. Cutler, resigned.

VERMONT

Kathleen H. Shove, South Woodstock, Vt., in place of Louis Bartel, retired.

VIRGINIA

Pauline B. Hatfield, Hurley, Va., in place of N. J. Carroll, removed.

Minna D. Deane, Nottoway, Va., in place of E. L. Deane, deceased.

Delia M. Lawson, White Stone, Va., in place of B. N. Hubbard, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Edward W. Schoenholz, Alderwood Manor, Wash., in place of H. L. Parker, resigned.

Daniel B. Killion, Bryn Mawr, Wash., in place of W. L. Killion, retired.

Walter A. Oliver, Hoodsport, Wash., in place of W. H. Lunt, resigned.

William Lorin McClure, Oakesdale, Wash., in place of R. V. Browder, removed.

Sherman T. Combs, Packwood, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Harley E. Chapman, Prosser, Wash., in place of Paul Hamilton, resigned.

Lonnie D. Leeper, Pasco, Wash., in place of A. A. Barnes, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

William G. Meredith, Dailey, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William W. Hammond, Kearneysville, W. Va., in place of F. O. Trump, retired.

Eulan N. Lester, Panther, W. Va., in place of Ethel Cline, resigned.

Marietta Walker, Peach Creek, W. Va., in place of A. O. Shelton, resigned.

Troy R. Swecker, Valley Head, W. Va., in place of N. S. Wood, resigned.

Walter S. Bambrick, Weirton, W. Va., in place of S. P. Shlanta, removed.

WISCONSIN

Claude A. Thomas, Forest Junction, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Norbert I. Lehmann, Hustisford, Wis., in place of P. A. Panetti, resigned.

Donald L. Schulz, Irma, Wis., in place of Henry Magnuson, resigned.

WYOMING

Kenneth L. Wingo, Encampment, Wyo., in place of M. C. Corum, retired.

Roxanna M. Smith, Lingle, Wyo., in place of M. N. Hanna, transferred.

George L. Gibson, Powell, Wyo., in place of L. O. Stephens, resigned.

Silvio J. Pedri, Reliance, Wyo., in place of Naomi Grove, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 30 (legislative day, January 26), 1948:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Vincent C. Burke to be First Assistant Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John R. Alison to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Walter M. W Splawn to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for a term expiring December 31, 1954.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Wayne Coy to be a member for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1944.

George E. Sterling to be a member for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1943.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE CAPTAINS FROM THE DATE INDICATED AFTER THEIR NAMES

Jack Senior, January 1, 1948.
Ronald D. Horne, March 1, 1948.
Charles K. Green, March 1, 1948.

TO BE COMMANDERS, FROM THE DATE INDICATED AFTER THEIR NAMES

Henry C. Warwick, January 1, 1948.
Benjamin H. Rigg, March 1, 1948.
Albert J. Hoskinson, March 1, 1948.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, FROM THE DATE INDICATED AFTER THEIR NAMES

Ernest B. Lewey, January 1, 1948.
John C. Mathisson, March 1, 1948.
George E. Morris, March 1, 1948.

TO BE ENSIGNS FROM THE DATE INDICATED AFTER THEIR NAMES

Eugene W. Richards, December 20, 1947.
Samuel D. Parkinson, December 30, 1947.
Harrison F. Dunbrook, January 7, 1948.
Ward A. Kemp, October 10, 1947.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following nominations for permanent commissions in the United States Coast Guard, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 16, 1948, and are shown in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Gordon T. Finlay appearing on page 283 and ending with the name of Robert G. Frye appearing on page 286:

Gordon T. Finlay et al.,
Claude H. Broach et al.,
Robert E. Combs et al., and
Willard L. Jones et al.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 30, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Earl F. Nauss, Congregational minister from Rindge, N. H., Navy chaplain, retired, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, before whom the generations of men do rise and achieve and pass away, age after age the living seek Thee and find that of Thy goodness there is no end. Grant that, as our fathers trusted in Thee and found the fulfillment of their lives and their highest dreams, we, too, in this fateful hour of the world's life may be true to our finest and noblest moral obligations, so that we can assume our rightful place of leadership in the life of our country and in the life of the world, so the truth may prevail and prejudice be set aside, and the ways of freedom and of peace and of happiness be fully known.

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure minds. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail.

Now may the blessing of Almighty God be upon you, leading your minds and hearts into the way of peace, your hands that they be generous, your thoughts that they be true. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BOARD OF VISITORS—UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., Pennsylvania; Mr. BRADLEY, California; Mrs. ST. GEORGE, New York; Mr. JOHNSON, Texas; Mr. SASSCER, Maryland.

BOARD OF VISITORS—UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MCMAHON, New York; and Mr. KEOGH, New York.

The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 28, 1948.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I am hereby appointing the following members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to serve on the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Hon. T. MILLET HAND, Hon. JOHN C. BROPHY, Hon. EDWARD J. HART.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Respectfully,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

BOARD OF VISITORS—UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SADLAK, Connecticut; Mr. FORAND, Rhode Island.

The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

JANUARY 28, 1948.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1948: Hon. EDWARD T. MILLER, Hon. MITCHELL JENKINS, Hon. EMORY H. PRICE.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Respectfully,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as a

member of the Committee of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SARBACHER] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and include therein an editorial from a New York paper and in another instance to include a statement by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE OIL SITUATION—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 311 AND 312

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I discussed two resolutions which I introduced providing for temporary restrictions on the exportation of certain petroleum products. The text of the resolutions can be found in my remarks on page 713 of the RECORD, have been numbered House Joint Resolutions 311 and 312, and have been referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Yesterday I said it was my intention to prepare further references to certain material which I felt would be of interest to my colleagues. Unfortunately, I have not been able to complete that work, but I shall insert the material as soon as possible.

In the meantime, may I again call your attention to the committee's recent report which is now printed and is numbered 1270 of this session of the Eightieth Congress.

Also, yesterday I read an editorial from the Boston Post, commenting on the committee's recommendation with reference to these exports. Today I want to insert in my revision of these remarks certain other editorials commenting on the committee's recommendation.

I call your particular attention to the fact that these are expressions of opinion by people who have lived in this area of shortage and cold during the last month and who face an even worse period of discomfort and difficulty these next 2 months unless we here join in providing the only immediate source of assistance available to them.

One sentence in the editorial of the Post is significant:

> Consumers, therefore, may well ask why action was not taken when the indicated shortage first became known.

In the editorial from the Athol (Mass.) Daily News, there are these three sentences:

> As the days lengthen, and the weather gets snowier and snowier, and colder and colder, the great petroleum mystery becomes more and more mysterious. * * * To date, we know of only one really constructive recommendation that has been made by an official group. The House Interstate Commerce Committee has called for at least a temporary halt in exports of American oil.

The full editorial is as follows:

THE PETROLEUM PUZZLE

As the days lengthen, and the weather gets snowier and snowier, and colder and colder, the great petroleum mystery becomes more and more mysterious. And nearly everybody who says anything about it becomes more and more confusing. We confessed our own confusion a long time ago, and wish to report that our state of mind has not improved. Nevertheless, we feel it is our turn to say something on the subject.

The thing that troubles us the most is that persons in high official positions have not been telling the truth all through the discussion. Perhaps they told a little truth occasionally, but not all the time. For instance, they gave us a merry song and dance about the reason for the New England shortage. At first it was a lack of tankers. This reason disappeared when it became known that tankers were lying idle, and others had been turned over to foreign nations. So the practiced prevaricators in Washington dug up another one. This time it was a lack of refining facilities and a lack of materials for drilling new wells. Now they have fallen back on an explanation that has been argued for 30 years or more; that there is a basic shortage of petroleum in the ground under the United States. So Secretary of the Interior Krug wants a few billions to develop production of synthetic oil and gasoline.

No doubt it would be a good idea for Americans to get started in the production of petroleum from sources other than wells. The materials are available, but have been considered in the light of a long-range reserve. But we would like to know a whole lot more about the entire oil situation before getting into a $9,000,000,000 proposition. This time, incidentally, we would like to hear nothing but the truth, and we would like to hear most of it from persons who know their stuff and who do not hold political office.

There are some pretty able men outside that charmed circle who have been maintaining that there is no immediate shortage of oil in the ground. And there are others who have been pointing to American exports of oil and asking why they have been permitted. Japan received much oil from us before Pearl Harbor. Russia continued to receive American oil long after the shooting stopped in Europe. During the war, there were various weak explanations of why supplies in other parts of the world were not tapped to a greater extent. Among others, a question we would ask is: Where is all the oil produced outside the United States going at the present time, and is the United States getting its fair share of it?

To date, we know of only one really constructive recommendation that has been made by an official group. The House Interstate Commerce Committee has called for at least a temporary halt in exports of American oil. Representative JOHN W. HESELTON of the congressional district which includes Athol and Orange, says this recommendation is of the utmost importance. We agree with him, and hope somebody will make a few more that are as fundamentally sound.

Mr. Speaker, the news dispatches continue to bring very dismal reports as to the situation, not only in New England, but practically all over this country, including even Tennessee and Texas.

I understand that 20,000 people idle yesterday in the Detroit area will be out of work for at least a week.

It is reported that approximately 15,000 steel workers are out of work in the Pittsburgh area. In Ohio, 10,000 are out of work in Cincinnati, 3,500 in Dayton, 1,100 in Toledo, 200 in Youngstown, 1,000 in Steubenville, 2,300 in Warren, 2,000 in Massillon, 1,200 in East Liverpool, and 500 in Cleveland.

It is reported that all industrial users, schools, and most commercial establishments in 333 Texas and Oklahoma towns were cut off from their service of gas and gas supplies due to the tremendous demands arising from the fuel-oil shortages in their areas. Gas was also cut off from 900 industrial users in the Kansas City area of Missouri, apparently for the same reason.

An editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram makes very interesting reading. You will note the reference to the statement by the Assistant Area Fuel Oil Coordinator, "It is a real shortage; no one is fooling anybody."

While the editorial is entirely correct that "Embargoes, fuel policies, automobile slow-downs, and synthetic oil plants just will not bring oil to New England today," I believe sincerely that we should not relax our efforts on any score. We should continue to press the Government to conserve every drop of oil possible. We should demand that unrelenting efforts should be made to put additional tanker service into the east coast. We should act promptly in trying to conserve whatever oil is possible from our export program and turn it to the shortage areas.

The editorial follows:

OIL CRISIS DEEPENS

Probably because the administration has, in the past, cried "Wolf" too often, an unfortunate skepticism seems to exist among

some persons that the oil shortage isn't too bad.

Roscoe H. Goddard, assistant area fuel oil coordinator, has issued a statement to straighten these people out. The time has come, he said, when consumers must wake up to the fact that the oil crisis is even worse than had been predicted. "It is a real shortage; no one is fooling anybody," he said.

A succession of quick developments in Washington served to underscore Mr. Goddard's local warning. Senator BRIDGES, New Hampshire Republican, demanded an embargo on all oil exports. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee asked that a national fuel policy be established. There were suggestions made that wartime speed controls be reimposed on automobile drivers in order to save gasoline. Secretary of the Interior Krug asked the expenditure of some $9,000,000,000 over a 5- to 10-year period to build synthetic oil plants.

Whether these ideas are sound or unsound must be beside the point at the present time. Embargoes, fuel policies, automobile slowdowns, and synthetic oil plants just won't bring oil to New England today. The consumer still has the responsibility of cutting down on his own fuel consumption, while hoping that measures will be taken to relieve the situation quickly—and to make sure it won't happen again next year.

While he's shivering in his poorly heated home, he can't be blamed for thinking, however, that a little planning by the administration last summer would have saved much of his present discomfort. A few tankers allocated to this region would have helped a great deal. The cold New England resident has, indeed, had enough, and he's likely to remember this winter's oil shortage when the chilly days of next November roll around.

I have been reliably informed today that under the immediate jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency there are 18 buildings heated by oil with a fuel oil consumption daily of 3,200 gallons. I am advised that within the District 4 buildings have been converted to fuel oil, but as yet I do not have the exact date. I cannot reconcile this with the report made by General Fleming to Mr. Steelman, but I shall try to do so over the week end.

Finally, Mr. James Terry Duce, vice president of the Arabian Oil Company, gave some extremely important testimony before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning. It is my understanding that the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] expects to insert the full statement in the Appendix of the RECORD so all Members may have this information immediately. In the meantime, I wish to quote a few sentences.

Mr. Duce said:

It is the impact of the scarcity of materials which results in such shortages, as we are now facing in the United States. I am inclined to believe that even this shortage would have been averted if the Maritime Commission had put in operation early this year the tankers which they had moored in their various yards. There is an abundance of oil in the world. We have immense reserves in the Middle East. If all the world produced from its reserves at the same rate as the United States is producing from its reserves, there would be a surplus instead of a shortage in oil at the present time. We have pushed our production in Arabia up from 200,000 barrels per day last year to over 300,000 barrels per day at the close of 1947.

I recognize, as all of you do, that this is not just a problem of locating fuel oil, but one of transporting it. During the December hearings, I devoted a good deal of attention to the Maritime Commission's decision to sell the remaining T–2 tankers to foreign purchasers. I remained completely unsatisfied with the explanations given in terms of the then-known increasing difficulties in this country. It has recently developed that some 11 of these tankers are on our coasts and apparently the Maritime Commission did in January make a commendable, although belated, effort to secure assurances from a number of purchasers that the tankers would be used on the east coast run north of Norfolk until spring.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELSAESSER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the recommendation of the American National Livestock Association.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Northside High School at Fort Wayne, Ind.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Gov. Dwight H. Green of the State of Illinois.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on hydroelectric power by Ivan Bloch.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News, and in the other instance to include an address on juvenile delinquency by Mr. J. Pope Dyer.

Mr. BLAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Merchant Marine and to include an article from News Week.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

GENERAL DEBATE ON THE TAX BILL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the bill H. R. 4790 be extended 2 hours on Monday, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from North Carolina and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]?

There was no objection.

THE MEAT SITUATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that so much pressure seems to be going on in the United States today concerning the return of rationing of meat, I wanted to present to the House this morning the recommendation of the American National Livestock Association at its fifty-first annual convention in Boise, Idaho, on January 14. I want to read one short portion of their recommendation:

Maximum production coupled with a sound fiscal and monetary policy on the part of the Government will provide the most effective remedy for inflation. This would insure the consumer a maximum supply of meat at equitable prices. It can be accomplished only under an economy free from rationing, price controls, or other arbitrary restrictions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

THE LATE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to insert a brief letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on this day, in 1882, was born a man destined to guide his country through its greatest perils. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt loved his countrymen, so they loved him. That affection of one man for the many—and of the many for one man—bound our Nation together in a unity we have missed since he left us.

The altogether personal affection so many millions of us felt for Mr. Roosevelt was brought into poignant focus when he died. In our teeming cities, in small towns, at crossroad stores, and along lonely country trails, almost unbearable grief came to the people of America.

To those shocking words, "Roosevelt is dead," men, women, and children reacted as though the news concerned one near and dear to them. Some wept. Some were swept by black despair. Some were appalled at the unfillable gap left in the world's leadership.

In the small town of Lockhart, Tex., in my congressional district, one who loved Roosevelt found some comfort in the way so many of us find it: He told his wife what was in his heart. She was away from home, and he wrote her. I lately obtained a copy of that letter, written by Fleetwood Richards, of Lockhart.

Mr. Richards has a distinguished record of public service in our Texas Legislature. Because his letter so beautifully expressed the sorrow so many of us felt on that fateful day in 1945, and expressed it in language beyond our capacity, I have presumed upon my friendship with Mr. Richards to offer the letter today as a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

LOCKHART, TEX., *Friday, April 13, 1945.*

MY DEAREST GUSSIE: Roosevelt is dead. Sorrow and gloom shrouds the town of Lockhart, and its people. Business and people are

almost at a standstill. Golf has not been mentioned in almost a full day. The report of his death reached me in the Domino Hall. That is where Americanism lingers in the rough. There is where it is most typical. There is where Roosevelt is most loved and appreciated. There is where labor relaxes and recreates. The news stopped every game. No sounds were audible, except sighs. The leader of their hopes, the prince of their cause, their refuge, had gone. Silently, they went away. They walked slower, they talked less, and they thought more. It was the saddest moment in all American life. Their ship was without a rudder.

In his going, anxiety reached its greatest peak. Determination did not seem to falter or hesitate. It seemed to absorb vengeance. Hope was uncertain. It must wait. The future must build and sustain it. World peace took a body blow. It did not fall. It did not take the count. It is disappointed, and that disappointment should be, and must be, its inspiration and determination to work, to sacrifice and to succeed. It is humanity's only hope.

In a weak and humble way, on every occasion, and at every call, I have tried to shoulder my responsibility to him, and the cause that he represents. Maybe I have been a small part of a great undertaking. I feel so. I served him, and his cause, and the people's cause, as I see it, with an apostle's devotion, free of selfish motive.

I say, and maybe I never could have said it before, a man is dead that I never doubted or questioned. Somehow, I followed him and his leadership with a faith and confidence, free of every doubt. He gave a part of his life's span to the cause of humanity and liberty. In it all, I think that he was conscientious. To the down-trodden, he was as faithful as Paul was to Christ. He served and saved others, "himself he could not save."

I never committed an act, or spoke a word that made his road longer or his burden heavier. I never added weight to his weakened body or his troubled mind. I tried to give him strength. I might have been, and I think that I was, a little more diligent and devoted to him, and the purposes and ideals that he championed, than I have been to myself and my own soul. In it all, I am satisfied.

Love,

FLEETWOOD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today on the bill H. R. 4790, and to include therein certain data.

Mr. REGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in Tom Breneman's magazine Old Age.

Mr. LESINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter written jointly by Mr. August Scholle and Mr. Hopkins, of the Michigan Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include therein certain quotations and tables.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Morgan L. Fitch, retiring president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole and include therein certain tables.

SLACK-WATER ROUTE FROM THE GULF TO THE GREAT LAKES, PITTSBURGH, ST. LOUIS, MINNEAPOLIS, AND ST. PAUL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, you heard the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] to the effect that the oil shortage is not only causing suffering throughout the New England States but is also having a serious effect in Detroit, Mich.

Today we are going before the Committee on Appropriations to ask for funds to begin a project that will provide a slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to Pittsburgh, Pa., by way of the Ohio River to Chicago, Ill., by way of the Illinois River to St. Louis, St. Paul, and Minneapolis on the Mississippi River.

If that great project were in operation today, that vast wealth of oil produced in Mississippi, Texas, Louisiana, and Arkansas could easily be transported into the Great Lakes by barges and distributed, not only throughout that area but throughout the Northeastern States as well.

You noticed where two barges arrived here in Washington yesterday with 10,000 tons of oil. If we had this great inland waterway completed, providing this slack-water route, as I said, to Pittsburgh, Pa., to the Great Lakes, St. Louis, St. Paul, and Minneapolis, there would be no shortage of oil in that area, the people in the Northeastern States could be supplied.

This great slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the upper Mississippi and the Ohio, is absolutely necessary if those great industrial centers are to maintain their present positions in that respect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 1

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask uninamous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the majority leader the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], I take this time for the purpose of informing the House what the program will be for the following week.

Monday we hope to complete action on the tax bill.

Tuesday, unanimous consent has already been granted to take up the Consent Calendar which otherwise would have been called on Monday. Following the Consent Calendar, the Private Calendar will be called. Immediately after consideration of these two calendars we will take up the independent offices appropriation bill, which bill we hope to complete on Wednesday.

On Thursday we will start consideration of House Resolution 447, continuing investigation already begun by the Armed Services Committee under authority of H. R. 141.

At the present time Friday's business remains undetermined.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that the majority leader is not present today; however, I have talked to him about the possibility of the Committee on Rules reporting a rule for the consideration of a bill to extend the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Corporation. I want to express the hope that if the rule is reported it can be included in the program which the gentleman has just announced.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include a newspaper article.

Mrs. LUSK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the American Council on Education in reference to a survey that has been made of veterans' education.

MAHATMA MOHANDAS K. GANDHI

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, peace, perfect peace is now the reward of the

world's foremost recent disciple of peace, martyred, while on his way to prayers, in the cause to which he has devoted his life.

Mohandas K. Gandhi was more than a great political leader. He was a great spiritual leader, almost a saint, to uncounted millions of our brothers in the vast subcontinent of India. The report is that he met his death at the hands of one of the Hindu extremists who disagreed with his advocacy of nonviolence in the settlement of the raging clashes with the Muslims in his unfortunate, strife-torn country.

It may be said the course he advocated lacked realism. Most, probably all of us, would doubt the soundness of his methods. Often firmness, unfortunately sometimes a show or even the use of force, is necessary to achieve domestic tranquillity or international harmony. Nevertheless, one is bound to admire the unconquerable spirit of a figure who was willing to lay down his life, so often in jeopardy from his prolonged fasts, for the sake of a principle in which he believed.

Most recently, since the partition and creation of India and Pakistan, his crusade, waged with prayer and entreaty rather than the sword, was for the protection of the Muslim minority in predominantly Hindu India. Equally zealous was he in the preservation of freedom from oppression for those with whom he differed and the establishment of national freedom for those with whom he agreed.

During the 3 years it was my high privilege to serve my country in India and the Far East I acquired a deep respect for this spiritual giant, who, passionately devoted to the faith of his fathers, possessed a sweet religious tolerance so essential for us to emulate. To me, therein lies the essential greatness for all time of this courageous world figure. Therein the lesson of his life for us who follow Christ as our Master.

It seems fitting, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we pause for a moment in the deliberations of this great body to pay tribute to a renowned son of a sister nation and a dauntless spiritual leader who now belongs to the ages. With this encomium, however, as the martyred Gandhi would wish it, should be uttered our fervent prayer that bloodshed may cease and that the peace for which he died may descend upon and rest permanently with his native land.

DIVERSION OF GRAIN FOR DISTILLERIES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I would like to make a brief statement regarding Senate bill 1842, which would extend the President's authority to control the diversion of grain from foods to the distillation of liquor. I hope that a reconsideration of this bill may be accomplished without emotion. It is a matter of grave importance.

There are psychological factors involved and I think it would be unfortunate for the people of the world to get the impression that the American people are unwilling to reduce our supply of liquor or, at least, to suspend for the time being its rapid accumulation in reserve stocks, when there is such a critical need for this gain for food purposes.

The Committee on Banking and Currency by a close vote refused to report the bill. I am endeavoring to get in touch with our chairman who is necessarily away from the city. I believe the splendid message which the President submitted yesterday will influence his thinking to the point of giving us at least a chance to reexplore the problem.

The President's request is a reasonable one and the Senate bill should be adopted. The passage of this bill would prevent a race between the distilleries to acquire huge supplies of grain and would enable the Congress to assemble further facts on this important issue. This much I am sure of the people of the United States would approve reasonable limitations on the manufacture of liquor in a period of great scarcity when such grains might be used for food for our own people and for those abroad who are in a less favored position.

I am pleased to learn that several members of the Banking Committee who were absent when the vote was taken and even some who voted with the prevailing side have expressed the view that there should be a reconsideration of this matter. We shall request the chairman the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] to call a special meeting of the committee and I trust that he will grant this request. Otherwise, with the expiration of the President's authority to control purchases by distilleries there will be competitive buying of grain sorely needed for food.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

THE LATE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1882, 66 years ago, there was born one of the world's great figures, our late beloved President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Down through the passage of time, as the happenings of the past are recorded in history, we find two minds or types of prominent world figures, one outstanding in the pages of history because of his constructive contribution, and the other occupying prominent mention in the pages of history because of his destructive contribution. The life of Franklin D. Roosevelt is now a part of the history of all times. I remember his last appearance in this Chamber, and my colleagues who were present on that occasion also do, when he addressed his last joint session of the Congress. He spoke for the first time from the well of the House as we, who were present on that occasion, will remember, due to the pain and suffering that the braces, that he was compelled to wear for so many years during his life, imposed upon him.

In paying tribute to his memory today it is not my purpose to recount the acts and the deeds of his great career; of his fearless and constructive contributions in time of economic upheaval or in time of war, but to make reference to the place in history he will occupy for all time as long as the past and the present is connected with the future. Franklin D. Roosevelt is this generation of Americans' contribution to the outstanding constructive figures of all time, and among them his name will appear in the top group. We, of this generation, are unable to fully grasp the significance of life and the influence his life will have upon the peoples of all lands for countless generations to come. But even today, within a few years after his death, whether one was a supporter or a critic of Franklin D. Roosevelt, they will recognize that he will be recorded in history as one of the outstanding constructive personages of all times. So, my colleagues, without regard to political affiliations or the position one may have taken on his recommendations while Franklin D. Roosevelt was with us as our President, but as Americans, we pause to pay our respects to the memory of a great man, a great American, a great President, a great figure in the history of all times.

I now yield to the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party, our former Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it matters not how Mr. Roosevelt was appraised during his lifetime or how he is appraised at this early date after his passing. It is my opinion that he was of such a character and type that, as we move from him, his stature will grow larger and he will be one of the outstanding leaders not only in the history of his own country but in the history of the world. He had the rare gift of interpreting the inarticulate longings of vast masses of plain, simple people, and that is why so many loved him. He was truly their voice and their hope.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall always highly appreciate my good fortune in knowing the very great American and personality that attracted and held world renown for more than 12 years by his transcendent contribution not only in bringing the United States from the Slough of Despond but to rescuing the whole world in freedom's darkest hour, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, intimately for more than 30 very active years. Moreover, I shall never cease to be grateful for the opportunity and privilege that was mine to sustain and follow his unparalleled leadership in establishing a fair degree of equilibrium to a distraught world. For his efforts during the more than 12 years he occupied with such

singular success the highest office within the gift of a free people, history is increasingly doing him justice. It is indeed a great tribute to his marvelous accomplishment that the tongues of his erstwhile critics grow progressively weaker.

Surely nobody would deny that this good man gave his life for his country, just as a soldier at the battlefront may have given his life; and I do not believe he would have chosen a different result, so fervently did he strive to make this a better world for men of unselfish and high purpose. Indeed, he was the apostle of the so-called common man wherever found.

It is easy to believe that his efforts to promote the welfare of suffering mankind through establishment of the United Nations Organization were something closest to his tired heart.

We have had many great men at the head of our Government, Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson; but it seems to me that, considering the enormity of the scenes in which Mr. Roosevelt played such an important part, compared to the restricted work of other Presidents, the attributes of all his illustrious predecessors were concentrated quite largely in him.

With the passage of time this great man's work will be better understood and appreciated, and his name will properly range alongside those of Washington, founder of the Republic; Jefferson, the fountain of its idealism; and Lincoln, the exemplar of its magnanimity and the preserver of its unity, among the colossal world figures of all time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. On April 12, 1945, this great American passed away in his Warm Springs, Ga., cottage. He was the thirty-second President of the United States.

We have had many beloved Presidents, many who have rendered great service to their Nation in times of peace and war. But history does not record a time when problems were greater, when leadership was more needed, when faith and confidence in constitutional government was more at stake, than during the 12 years of his service.

At a time when dictators throughout the world were capitalizing on economic chaos for their own selfish desire for power, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, faced with unparalleled conditions of economic collapse, used the power of government to rebuild our shattered economy and to preserve our constitutional and civil liberties.

History will accord him greatness commensurate with his service to humanity. Long after his detractors have given up their futile effort to blacken his memory, the stature of this great man will grow in the hearts of the people, not only in our Nation but throughout the world.

It was chiefly through his encouragement that the age-old quest for universal peace was crystallized into the framework of the United Nations. No greater task remains to those of us who face the terrible responsibilities of an atomic world than that of supporting with all our heart and soul the purposes of the United Nations, which he bequeathed to us.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who have spoken previous to me on the subject of our beloved former President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. His memory will always be green to many, many millions of people not only of the United States but of all the world. His ascendancy to the greatest office within the gift of the American people, in my opinion, marked a new era of history not only for this country but for the world. I know that his good influence today is still great, not only among the people of this country but among the people of the world. His powerfully beneficent influence will long remain a factor in the history of the entire world to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add a word for the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, among whom our great humanitarian leader lived and was loved and was known as a good neighbor. It was there that he came to regain his health. It was there he passed on to his eminent reward. Every man, woman, and child in that part of the country reveres him as the greatest humanitarian.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt was a symbol of the hopes and aspirations of countless millions of people. In death his memory will still be a symbol for countless millions of people until the history of man ceases.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I often felt the grip of the iron hand of this great man upon my throat, but there was never bitterness on my part and there is none now. Time may prove that heaven alone is tall enough to place a wreath upon the brow of his fame.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my friend from Georgia, having been very close to the late President for many years, as I was, and as our beloved leader, Franklin D. Roosevelt had a very high personal regard for my friend from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. In conversations that I had with him, I know of the warm personal feeling that he had for him. I welcome this opportunity to express this so that the gentleman from Georgia will know it and so that his people will know it and so that the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will record that fact. Today, my colleagues, as we did yesterday in honoring another great President, we pause to pay our respects to one who during his lifetime by his leadership and his constructive contributions has placed his name forever uppermost in the pages of history of all time as one of the great constructive leaders of men.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a schedule of 1948 State primary elections.

MAHATMA GANDHI

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, sad news is the order of today. Mahatma Gandhi, that ardent and devout exponent of universal peace, has fallen before the bullet of an assassin. It is doubtful if the Western World could every fully understand the working of Gandhi's mind, but we can understand one thing about his passing, and that is the fact that he fell victim to the one thing he abhorred above all else, violence. Not even his high motives, his strong character, his firm faith in the goodness of his fellow men, were sufficient to turn aside the fatal bullet. Force, brutal and undisguised, has for this moment won a victory over ideals and the welfare of mankind. Whether this defeat is of a permanent nature, none can say.

As there are violent fates for men who dare to plead for and live in the cause of peace, so there are like fates for nations. There are nations dedicated to peace, and others dedicated to force. The wise nation works for human happiness and human welfare in a peaceful universe, with the full knowledge of these facts, and in order that its service may not be rendered null and void in the face of brute force, goes always prepared to meet and repel that force in pursuit of its objectives.

The object lesson is clear in the tragic death of Mohandas Gandhi. I trust that we shall see and appreciate its application to present world conditions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement made before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning by James Terry Duce, vice president of the Arabian-American Oil Co., which I consider of such great importance that I believe the House should have the benefit of it at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the statement is as follows:

THE ALL-IMPORTANT QUESTION OF MIDEAST OIL

(Statement by James Terry Duce, vice president of the Arabian American Oil Co., delivered before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on January 30, 1948)

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, my name is James Terry Duce. I am vice president of

the Arabian American Oil Co. I was director of the Foreign Division of the Petroleum Administration for War during the war period. I have just returned from an extensive trip to the Middle East. I assume that the committee wishes to hear the latest developments in that area and to know something of our plans.

In starting, however, I would like to make a general statement about the oil situation. A great deal of the testimony that has been given on the Hill during the last few months in respect to oil does not differentiate between the two separate problems, that of general supply in peacetime and the question of wartime supply. In peacetime when steel and other commodities used in the production of oil are abundant, no problem has ever arisen regarding oil supply. It is the impact of the scarcity of materials which results in such shortages, as we are now facing in the United States. I am inclined to believe that even this shortage would have been averted if the Maritime Commission had put in operation early this year the tankers which they had moored in their various yards. There is an abundance of oil in the world. We have immense reserves in the Middle East. If all the world produced from its reserves at the same rate as the United States is producing from its reserves, there would be a surplus instead of a shortage in oil at the present time. We have pushed our production in Arabia up from 200,000 barrels per day last year to over 300,000 barrels per day at the close of 1947.

The war supply problem is somewhat different. There we have the interaction of a great many factors—the strategic one which the military people can best tell you about, and the constant problem of supplying steel sufficient to cover the thousand and one separate requirements of waging war. If we have the necessary steel and the manpower, we can produce the oil. If we don't, then shortages appear. It was always a question during the last war as to which had priority—guns and tanks or wells and factories, and we were always faced with the question—whether you should use manpower in the Army or in manufacturing and production. In oil production itself there also arose the question as to the most efficient source of supply, where the largest amounts of oil could be produced by the smallest amount of steel, and manpower to supply a special theater of operations. The Middle East and South America used less steel in production than the United States, but processing plants were not available and some of the areas were subject to the hazards of attack. In the early stages of the last war, the Middle East was a very unsafe zone and it was hardly the place at that time to invest in steel and manpower. Later as the enemy was driven back into Italy from northern Africa, it became desirable to build up production for these military supplies.

First I present chart 1. This chart is for the purpose of showing the size of the Middle East. On it you will notice we have thrown a shadow of the United States on the same scale, so you can compare roughly the area of the Middle East to that of the United States. The prospective area for oil in the Middle East extends from the Turkish border to the southern boundary of Saudi Arabia, a distance equal to the distance from the Canadian line to Houston, Tex.

Chart II shows the concessions already held with the present interest in these concessions. You will note first the Anglo-Iranian concession in Iran owned by Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., a British corporation. Second, there is the Iraq Petroleum Co. group of concessions which include all of Iraq, part of Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Cyprus, Oman Qatar, Trucial Coast and the Hadramout. There used to be a concession to an Iranian Petroleum Co. affiliate in Saudi Arabia, but this has been surrendered. The concession on the Sheikhdom of Kuwait is held jointly by the Anglo-Iranian and the Gulf, an American company. The Saudi Arabian concession is held by the Arabian American Oil Co., whose stock is owned by the Texas Co. and the Standard Oil Co. of California and will, as and when certain conditions are satisfied, also be owned by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.; the division of ownership will then be 30 percent to the first three and 10 percent to the last. In the case of the Iraq Petroleum Co., this stock is owned 23¾ percent by Shell, a British and Dutch corporation; 23¾ percent by the Anglo-Iranian Co., an English corporation; 23¾ percent by the Near East Development Co., which in turn is owned 50 percent by Standard Oil of New Jersey and 50 percent by the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. In addition, a gentleman by the name of Gulbenkian owns a 5-percent interest in the corporation. The areas of these concessions are shown in the chart.

Chart III shows the reserves of the world and on the same chart I show roughly the prospective areas of the world. They are marked in red. I have done some reestimating of the reserves on the basis of the discoveries during the past year, and it is to be noted for instance that we have somewhat increased the reserves in the Middle East as the Anglo-Iranian has discovered a new field in Lali and there have been extensions to the Kuwait field and in Saudi Arabia we have extended the Abqaiq field to the north and discovered a new producing horizon. The United States estimate I have used is the American Petroleum Institute estimate for 1946. I believe there will be a slight upward revision of the reserves in this country for 1947. Preliminary estimates indicate that this may mean a proved reserve of 21,345,000,000 barrels. This figure does not include distillate, casing-head gasoline, and similar hydrocarbon products not ordinarily counted as crude oil. I would like to point out that, with a reserve of 32,000,000,000 barrels in the Middle East, we are now approaching a point where the reserves are one-third greater than those in the United States. If we were producing these at the same rate as we are producing the reserves of the United States, we would be producing about 9,000,000 barrels per day. The Middle Eastern production is still somewhat under 1,000,000 barrels per day. It is divided about as follows:

Country	Production	Producing wells average
	Barrels per day	*Barrels per day*
Bahrein	29,000	426
Iran	405,000	7,105
Iraq	97,000	8,818
Kuwait	61,000	5,545
Saudi Arabia	299,000	7,119

This production comes from 189 wells, or an average of about 5,000 barrels per day per well. In the United States there are about 440,000 wells, producing 5,341,000 barrels per day, or an average of about 12 barrels per well.

The figures for South America are as follows:

Country	Production	Producing wells average
	Barrels per day	*Barrels per day*
Colombia	70,000	48
Mexico	153,000	151
Trinidad	58,000	34
Venezuela	1,250,000	244

The production comes from 9,299 wells, or an average of 164 barrels per well.

I have not at the present time in my possession full information on the number of operating strings of tools in the Middle East. In Arabia we are operating presently five strings. In Bahrein there is one string operating and there are two strings in Qatar, the peninsula south and east of Bahrein. In Kuwait, I believe there are seven strings operating, but that is subject to correction and after I have had time to make a definite inquiry, I will give the information to the committee. I do not have information on the situation either in Iraq or Iran, but at any rate, there are relatively small numbers of strings operating there. I do not believe that in the entire Middle East there are operating more than 30 strings of tools. This will be somewhat increased as the pipe-line construction goes forward.

As the average string of tools drills about 4 wells per year, you can see that the total wells completed during any single year probably is in the neighborhood of 120. I would estimate that this will not increase greatly even though the takings from the Middle East should exceed 2,000,000 barrels per day within the predictable future. In the United States we are running continuously about 4,000 strings of tools, as noted in the Oil and Gas Journal.

So much for the present production situation. There are, of course, now in planning or under construction a number of pipe-line projects in the Middle East. The one furthest along is the 16-inch line from Kirkuk to Haifa by the Iraq Petroleum Co., which will be completed during this year and will then start to run 120,000 barrels per day to the Mediterranean. Following the construction of this line is the trans-Arabian pipe line. This has now been surveyed and pipe is being moved to the Middle East for its construction. It will be a 30–31-inch line running a distance of 1,040 miles from the Abqaiq field to Sidon on the Lebanese coast. The initial capacity of this line will be approximately 300,000 barrels per day, but it can be increased to 450,000 barrels per day by the addition of some five pump stations. It will consume 287,950 tons of steel. Of this amount 235,250 tons is main-line pipe, 2,700 tons is small pipe incidental to the construction of the line and 50,000 tons of other steel which includes tanks, piling, and structural steel. It may be that we will reroute the line slightly in the south in order to facilitate the dispatch of oil either from the Mediterranean or the Persian Gulf, which would have certain strategic advantages. If so, an additional 8,360 tons of steel may be required in late 1949 in which case the total requirements for the line will be 296,310 tons.

Theoretically, it would require 59 T–2 tankers to carry 300,000 barrels per day to Suez from Saudi Arabia. The construction of this number of tankers would require 337,000 tons of steel. If the pipe line is brought up to its ultimate maximum capacity of 450,000 barrels per day, an additional 29 tankers would required, or 168,500 tons of steel, making a total steel requirement of 505,500 tons to construct this many tankers. I must, however, warn you in giving these figures for T–2 tankers that they require completely efficient operation and that there is very little allowance made for stand-by and other time-consuming operations and that this is the minimum number of tankers required to produce the same result as the pipe line. In talking of the steel requirement for the pipe line, I might point out to you that the American Iron and Steel Institute recently published figures that 2,500,000 tons of new steel-making capacity is being added in the United States during the year 1948. The production of steel for 1947 exceeded the production of any other peacetime year by 17,000,000 tons. The requirements of the pipe line are approximately 1.7 percent of this increase or 10 percent of

the new capacity to be added during this year.

Some time ago I also gave some figures to Mr. Averell Harriman, the Secretary of Commerce, on the subject of the requirements of steel per well in Saudi Arabia compared with the United States average. This steel refers to tubular goods, both casing and connections. Abqaiq wells require about 247 tons per well. The average production per well is something over 10,000 barrels per day, so roughly they produce 3,000,000 barrels per year or 12,146 barrels per ton of steel. The United States average well requires 49 tons of steel for casing and other tubular goods. The production per new well is about 36,500 barrels, or 745 barrels per ton per year. I would not, however, submit to this committee that these are the only factors to be considered. They are, however, the factors which you might well consider in relation to the present situation.

Last week the production in Saudi Arabia was 315,000 barrels per day. We have, however, about reached the capacity of our present facilities. Of this amount of oil, 107,000 barrels per day goes to the island of Bahrein for processing and an additional 120,000 barrels per day goes to our refinery at Ras Tanura. That leaves 88,000 barrels per day to be shipped offshore. Our capacity to ship offshore is limited by our loading facilities and also by our stabilizer capacity. Saudi Arabian oil contains an appreciable percentage of hydrogen sulphide and it is necessary to remove this by a preliminary distillation process which boils off the hydrogen sulphide and reconditions the oil. Oil thus treated is harmless on tankers. We used the unstabilized oil, however, in our refinery without serious results, but it is the stabilizer capacity which at the present time limits our offshore shipments. We are increasing our stabilizer capacity 17,000 barrels per day at Dhahran as of the 17th of March. We are starting to build a new stabilizer at Abqaiq and expect to build another new stabilizer at Abu Hydriya. When this stabilizer capacity is completed we expect to be able to still further step up our shipments of crude through our sea terminals on the Persian Gulf, if it is desirable to do so. We are making plans already to increase the shipments of crude and products to 500,000 barrels per day by July 1, 1949, and could relatively easily increase the available crude 100,000 barrels per year if we are given permission to export the steel necessary to construct stabilizer, pipe line, and port facilities.

I am sure similar conditions apply to the Kuweit Oil Co. in Kuweit and to the Anglo-Iranian production in Iran. The production in Iraq, of course, depends upon the pipe-line outlets from the Kirkuk and other fields to the Mediterranean.

With this background, I would now like to talk a little bit about other pipe lines. Probably the next line to be built will be the Middle Eastern line which will run from Abadan, and probably Kuweit, to a point on the Levant coast, probably in Syria. The pipe line will pass through the Houms Gap in the Lebanese Mountain Range. This line will be a 34–36-inch line, with a capacity of about one-half million barrels per day. It will be built by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. in partnership with the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. It is scheduled for completion about 1953. The Iraq Petroleum Co. is also considering a major line from Kirkuk and some of the fields in that area to the Levant coast. It will probably be a 30–31-inch line with an ultimate capacity of somewhere in the neighborhood of 400,000 barrels per day. In addition, the Gulf Oil Corp. and the Shell Co. are considering the construction of a line from Kuweit to the Levant coast. Size and capacity of this line is still under discussion. I might add also that the Iraq Petroleum Co. affiliate in Qatar is developing a new field and that may mean an additional capacity on the Persian Gulf. This field, the Dukan field, would, from the preliminary information we have on it, appear to be one of major consequence. When all of these lines are completed, there will be at least one and one-half million barrels of oil delivered daily upon the shores of Lebanon, Palestine, and Syria and this will be available for European markets and will enable the producing companies in Venezuela and Colombia to ship oil to the United States of America instead of to the European markets. If part of Middle Eastern oil were available at the present minute, there would be a better supply situation on the eastern seaboard of the United States in that Middle Eastern oil would be brought to the European market and substituted there for oil now sent to that area from Venezuela, Trinidad, and Colombia.

The construction of the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. has been disturbed this winter by the outbreak of cholera in Syria along the route of the line. It was further interrupted by the riots and civil disturbances incident to the UN decision to partition Palestine. Nevertheless, we will strive to complete the construction of our line on time, as we believe the construction of this line is in the interest of all the people in the Middle East and of the people of the United States, and is a prime essential in the implementation of the Marshall plan.

Now I have stated that it is in the interest of the people of the United States that this line be built and I think it is now up to me to give you some information on the oil situation which will substantiate that opinion. I submit chart IV. This chart shows the consumption of petroleum products, crude-oil production and refinery runs for the latest available period compared with similar forward estimates for the year 1951. These estimates were made by the statistical department of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey). The estimate shows that the present total world petroleum demand is in the neighborhood of 8,000,000 barrels per day and that this will reach 10,000,000 barrels per day by the year 1951. Now how will we supply this oil? I am making assumptions here that the United States crude oil production will be maintained at the present level and that the added requirements will have to come from foreign sources. I might remark in passing that if the United States crude oil production continues to increase, I still believe it will only be enough to allow the necessary leeway in such estimates as I am here laying before you. You will note, therefore, that we now estimate that the Western Hemisphere is producing 6,931,000 barrels per day and that this will increase by the year 1951 to 7,337,000 barrels per day or an increase of 406,000 barrels per day. We believe this will come mainly from Venezue'., with some additions from Colombia. Production in the Marshall plan countries will increase but slightly. In the Middle East we expect to increase from 872,000 barrels per day to 1,624,000 barrels per day by 1951, or an increase of 752,000 barrels per day. The Eastern Hemisphere, including India, Japan, and the Dutch East Indies, will increase from 219,000 barrels per day to 379,000 barrels per day or an increase of 160,000 barrels per day, coming mainly from the Dutch East Indies. We believe that there will also be some increase in natural gasoline and synthetic petroleum products amounting to 86,000 barrels per day. There is one point which I should emphasize and that is that all of these estimates are dependent upon a continuous and prompt supply of essential materials to the operating fields. These results are also dependent upon the refining capacity available. There is no use in building the facilities to bring crude to refineries unless we further increase the refinery capacity of the world, for the refineries of the world are working almost at capacity at the present time, the efficient and the inefficient. The bulk of the Middle East production will be required for the European recovery plan, where it is expected that consumption will increase to 1,375,000 barrels per day and most of this oil must be processed in refineries to be built in Europe. Conversely, there is no available crude for the European refineries to operate on unless Middle Eastern crude oil supplies are made available to them. The crude oil sources in the Western Hemisphere cannot supply both the increased demand in the Western Hemisphere and the requirements of the European recovery plan.

Our figures indicate that net exports from the Western Hemisphere to the Eastern Hemisphere will decline from a figure of 690,000 barrels per day in 1947 to 390,000 barrels per day in 1951, and as more refining capacity is installed in the Eastern Hemisphere beyond this period, it is expected that exports from the Western to the Eastern Hemisphere will be reduced to a nominal figure and will be mainly lubricating oil and similar special products. The present drain on the Eastern Hemisphere runs about 700,000 barrels per day or is equivalent to a billion barrels every 4 years. So new refineries and new crude are essential.

I now turn to chart V. This shows the world demand and production and refinery runs in 1947 versus 1951. You will note that this provides an increase in Western Hemisphere production from 6,931,000 barrels per day to 7,337,000 barrels per day and in the Eastern Hemisphere from 1,760,000 barrels per day to 2,464,000 barrels per day. Taking the last quarter of 1947 as an index crude refinery runs in the Western Hemisphere will increase from 6,624,000 barrels per day to 7,299,000 barrels per day, while the Eastern Hemisphere will increase from 1,173,000 barrels to 1,926,000 barrels per day. The net exports from the Western Hemisphere will drop from 694,000 barrels per day to 392,000 barrels per day. All of this is dependent upon steel allocations and judging from such estimates which have been made in the past will be subject to considerable variation in actual practice. If more serious disturbances occur in the Middle East, they will interrupt production and an impossible load will be thrown on the petroleum resources of the Western Hemisphere. Further than that, the tanker situation may affect the transportation of petroleum. If the demand continues to increase, there will be need also for additional tanker construction despite the pipe lines built in the Middle East. This will depend partially upon the policy of the Maritime Commission and also upon the opening of the European yards for the construction of the tankers where tanker construction has always been cheaper than in the United States. I am not an expert on this matter, but I think if war were to break out tomorrow, we would find we were desperately short of tanker capacity. The construction of the pipe lines in the Middle East is in itself a contribution to the solution of this question, for as long as they are available, tankers will not have to travel around Arabia to the Mediterranean and back, 7,200 miles.

As to the present shortage in the United States, I cannot plead to be an expert on the many complex factors which have resulted in this situation. I point out to you that the estimates of consumption made at the close of the war were on the conservative side with the result that the construction of facilities did not proceed as rapidly as might have been expected. I would like to recite to you a story of my own. During the tail end of the war period we built a refinery at Ras Tanura with a capacity of 50,000 barrels per day. A great many estimates were made of the markets which this refinery would reach and the general conclusion was that if we did not have war business, the refinery would stand on the Ras Tanura Peninsula as a monument to the folly of the men who built it, and I am now quoting the words of

a major executive of one of the large oil companies. We opened the refinery. We never operated at less than 100-percent capacity and we have now pushed this 50,000-barrels-per-day refinery up to something over 120,000 barrels per day, and we could sell more oil if we could process it. I believe the gentleman who made this statement about the refinery being a monument to our folly was entirely sincere. I was a little more optimistic and thought we might run at one-half capacity. I believe the statisticians who made these estimates were entirely honest, but they simply did not allow for the astounding increase in demand.

The oil industry, gentlemen, is a vast and complex affair. Oil from the Middle East is absolutely essential to the implementation of the Marshall plan. The middle eastern reserves should be so developed that the people who wish to use oil should have it without any great to do. The industry must create the ways and means of getting this oil to the markets where it can be used. To do this, there are only two requirements, peace and a supply of those essential materials necessary to get the oil out of the ground to process and transport it. The nub of the materials question at the present time seems to be steel, particularly tubular goods. I would like to impress the committee with one thing and that is that you cannot regulate the export of steel satisfactorily unless you at the same time consider its use in the United States. I see people building ornamental steel fences, using steel for cans where bottles would do while at the same time we get complaints that the essential industries which are dependent upon steel are short. We cannot continue to supply areas abroad with essential crude oil and products unless we have the steel to produce it. We can make efficient use of that steel.

Furthermore, abroad we have the problem of housing. It has been difficult at times for us to get licenses for building material. The housing of Americans abroad, largely ex-GI's is just as much a problem as at home. As a matter of fact, we can build houses abroad with less steel and less products of other types than we can at home because as far as possible we use native material. We expect to do our job in the Middle East. We expect to present our plans to the constituted authorities in the United States and I hope that we will get the necessary materials to carry out the plans which we have which are an essential in the plans for European recovery.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAND (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

THE TAX-REDUCTION BILL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4790, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has used 2 hours 7 minutes; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has used 1 hour 20 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that the committee has been unable to bring before the House at this time a more comprehensive tax-revision bill than the one now before us. I also regret that we must consider the bill under a closed rule. I in no way criticize the Committee on Ways and Means or the Rules Committee for the rule. I know it is the same rule under which we have considered tax legislation for many years, but our tax system at this time is so complex and so replete with inequalities and injustices that I deplore the fact that we cannot be more comprehensive in this legislation.

During the great war just closed, when we were making every effort to pay at least half of the war expense as we went along, not only for that economic reason but in order to prevent inflation, we resorted to every means we could conceive of to raise money by taxation. We levied a great number of excise taxes. We placed $5 stickers on everybody's automobile. We placed a tax on telephone messages; on railroad tickets; on trunks and luggage; on auto parts. Every conceivable article in interstate commerce was taxed. We were taxing the pots and pans of the poor. We had a 60-cent tax, and we still have it, on a $3 lady's handbag. Many of those taxes are not only unjust but some of them are confiscatory.

We have put out of business a very fine little industry in the United States, that of raising fur-bearing animals. We have practically paralyzed one of the great industries of one of my southern neighbor States, that of trapping. I am convinced that this Congress should, without great delay, make these taxes more real and less confiscatory and less burdensome.

If this bill which is before us is passed reducing as some say the national revenues by $7,000,000,000, what hope do we have of making any further revision of these excise taxes unless we operate this Government in the red? It is deplorable to think of this Congress in this year when our national income is at the highest level in all history, with corporate profits double what they were a year ago and 10 or 12 times what they were in 1939, with more people employed than ever before in our history, operating this Government in the red. Deficit spending in the years 1948 and 1949 ought not to be even considered or thought of. Because of the high levels of taxation which now exist, to my mind I think it necessary that we have tax revision, and tax revision necessarily means some tax reduction.

It did not matter so much about the inequality of the privilege which the community-property States enjoyed when tax rates were low; nobody said much about it. However, at present levels this is such an injustice to the residents of the common-law States that we must in all conscience grant that same privilege to the people of all the States. I favor that part of the bill that is before us. It ought to be made the law.

There is another group of citizens in this country who need and should have at once some tax relief. Why, we are taxing under our present system people who make as little as $50 a month. With eggs at a dollar a dozen and meat nearly that high, how can that man live? Some relief ought to be given to people in those low brackets. In that direction this bill in my opinion does not go far enough. Raising the exemption only $100, from $500 to $600, I believe is not enough relief for those people.

Another class of citizens about whom we do not think much is the man who makes around $5,000 a year on the main streets of these little American towns, the backbone of the country, the man who has to support the church in that town and pay the city taxes, keep up the schools. That man's tax burden at the present time is high. Something ought to be done to lower it, and yet we cannot in good conscience grant reduction here which will endanger the financial integrity of our country.

Any bill which reduces our national income as much as six or seven billion dollars will prohibit any payment on the national debt. During the war we actually asked for the pennies of the school children. We sold our bonds and securities in every school in this land. It is estimated that 80,000,000 of our people hold these bonds and with this large national debt and with our national securities all over our land, anything which might affect their value 1 cent might produce national calamity. I do not think this Congress can consider for a moment failure to make a payment on the national debt this year. As a matter of fact, I would like to support the proposition mentioned here on the floor yesterday of our setting aside a certain percentage of the national income and place the confidence of our people even higher in these securities.

Mr Chairman, I am not one of those who criticize this bill too much. There are two features in it I am heartily in favor of. I am in favor of granting some reduction, but I just cannot see how you can cut taxes $7,000,000,000 and pay anything on the national debt.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is one of the valued members of the committee.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know of a fairer man in the House, and I say that in all sincerity. The gentleman from Georgia is always fair. His figures are based on an income of $200,000,000,000. The Department of Commerce estimates the income at $205,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year. Now, we have a very good staff that is not given to going off half-cocked. Their figures are always reliable. I know the gentleman will concede that. The staff figures are based on an income of $209,000,000,000. It depends upon what base one argues from.

Mr. CAMP. Absolutely. I understand that there are various estimates of the

national income and I also understand that no matter how competent or how expert these people are they cannot guess it exactly, but some of these experts tell us that it may result in a reduction of $7,100,000,000. We know what the budget request is. A speaker who preceded me explained that 80 percent of the budget is in such items that we cannot effect any reductions. We cannot reduce the amount that we will have to pay back to our taxpayers who have overpaid their taxes. That cannot be reduced 1 cent. I do not believe the Congress will consider for a moment repealing any of the laws we have passed granting veterans hospitalization and other benefits. I know that we are going to pass an appropriation bill for national defense affecting the Army and Navy and we may actually increase the amount proposed for our atomic energy defense. We have only $7,500,000,000 within which to make any reduction.

I just cannot in conscience consider any bill which will reduce our income and our Federal revenues to the point where we must have deficit spending.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he is making on this important bill, but I am wondering about this, knowing, as I do, your interest in the small taxpayer. How is it that your great committee has not up to now given any consideration—at least, as far as I know, they have not—to reduce some of these burdensome taxes that are plaguing the little fellow and the big fellow, the excise taxes?

Mr. CAMP. I have been clamoring for it and discussing it for the last year and a half.

Mr. GRANGER. The telegraph, the telephone, railroad freight rates, and passenger tickets are not luxuries any more. Why are they not removed?

Mr. CAMP. I think my friend knows the answer to that.

Mr. GRANGER. No; I do not.

Mr. CAMP. I think you will find that one of the first acts of the Eightieth Congress was to pass a resolution that we would not do anything about excise taxes.

Mr. GRANGER. We may have passed it, but I cannot see any rhyme or reason for worrying about the little taxpayers when every one of them has to pay taxes for the cheap amusements they have, their telephones, and their telegrams, and nearly everything else, such as talcum powder and similar articles for the care of children. It would mean a whole lot more than this trifling reduction they will get on taxes under this bill.

Mr. CAMP. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent, and I believe the gentleman knows that I have worked toward that end.

My friends, our people are willing to pay taxes in this country. Their response to the call of this Nation during the last 10 years has been one of the grandest defenses that we have ever shown to the rest of the world. The world knows that America is going to preserve her integrity, but the people of this country are relying on you to do justice. Who is representing them here in the preservation of their fiscal policy and their financial integrity? It is you and I. We are the chosen representatives of our people. What are our businessmen going to think of us if we reduce the Federal income to the point where we have to borrow money in the good years 1948 and 1949? Do you reckon they will have the same respect for or confidence in their chosen representatives that they do now?

I regret exceedingly that there is not a reduction of excise taxes in the bill that is here before us. Any consideration of reducing taxes that leaves out those revenues is not comprehensive and will not be understood by our people. You can look for criticism wherever you go. A lady's handbag is just as necessary a part of her wardrobe and her daily necessities as a man's hat, and perhaps more so, and there is 60 cents tax on the lowest-priced bag. We are forgetting those things. They ought to be in this bill. I will go along for some tax reductions so long as it enables us to meet our fiscal requirements, to make a substantial and a decent payment on the national debt, and leave us free to go home uncriticized.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. Gladly, sir.

Mr. HOBBS. I wonder if the gentleman will answer this question or if it should not be addressed to a member of the committee? Was there a serious effort made by the committee to increase the deduction or exemption based upon the increased cost of living? Does the gentleman think that $100, about the price now of one Christmas dinner for a family of four or five, with all the "trimmings," is a sufficient deduction?

Mr. CAMP. I do not. I would favor raising the present exemption from $500 to $700.

Mr. HOBBS. Has the committee seriously addressed itself to that problem?

Mr. CAMP. I think so, but not too seriously. I think the bill was too well prepared when we started, and I do not think they wanted to change it very much. I deplore the fact that we have not changed it.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, last year I supported the tax-reduction bills because I recognized the need for tax reduction not only in the lower brackets, which is important, but in all brackets. It is unhealthy for any nation to tax its people to a point where taxation means confiscation of property, and that is the situation which confronts us today, 3 years after the termination of war. These wartime taxes must be reduced so that those in the lower brackets can better meet the cost of living and so that other capital will be released for investment and expansion in business enterprise. Only in this way can we increase production and maintain full employment. For these and other reasons, I will support the tax bill before Congress today.

COMPARISON BETWEEN TAX LAWS IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

Recently I read the budget speech of the Honorable D. C. Abbott, Minister of Finance for the Dominion of Canada. In comparing Canada's finances and tax pattern with ours, some very revealing facts have come to light, and I should like to bring some of these facts to your attention. First I should like to include a table taken from page 16 of Minister Abbott's budget speech of April 29, 1947, comparing proposed taxes in Canada with existing tax rates in the United States, and also H. R. 1 as passed by the House of Representatives March 24, 1947:

Comparison of personal income tax—Canada and United States—Married taxpayer, no children

Income	Canadian tax at new rates	U. S. A. tax at present rates [1]	U. S. A. tax at rates in bill passed by House of Representatives
$1,200	----------	$15	$11
$1,300	----------	32	23
$1,400	----------	49	35
$1,500	----------	67	47
$1,600	$10	84	59
$1,800	36	118	82
$2,000	70	152	105
$2,250	120	195	138
$2,500	170	238	183
$2,750	220	289	224
$3,000	270	323	258
$3,500	370	411	329
$4,000	470	505	404
$5,000	670	694	555
$7,500	1,260	1,292	1,034
$10,000	1,990	2,024	1,619
$20,000	6,140	6,142	4,913
$30,000	11,315	11,676	9,340
$50,000	23,043	24,453	19,562
$75,000	38,968	42,707	34,166
$100,000	56,143	62,714	50,171
$200,000	132,493	147,697	118,157

[1] The U. S. A. taxes shown are Federal taxes only; most States have income taxes in addition to the Federal tax. In Canada no personal income tax is levied now by any province. Under the United States income tax law every taxpayer is allowed a deduction of 10 percent of income up to a maximum of $500 in lieu of deductions for medical expenses, charitable donations, etc., and this is taken into account in calculating the taxes for United States; Canadian taxpayers who can claim such deductions would pay less tax than shown by this table, since no allowance has been made for such deductions in calculating the Canadian tax.

NOTE.—In calculating the above Canadian taxes it has been assumed that all incomes up to $30,000 are entirely earned incomes, and that incomes of more than $30,000 include earned income of that amount and additional investment income to make up the total. No distinction is made between investment and earned income under the United States tax.

It is obvious that the tax proposals offered last year, and the one now being considered, are not extreme, when we study the foregoing table. Since the war's end, the Dominion of Canada has enacted two tax reductions, one averaging 22 percent and one averaging 29 percent, aggregating 51 percent. During this same period of time, the people of the United States were granted two Presidential vetoes, the only vetoes handed down and sustained during the 160 years of United States existence since the Constitution, through article I, gave the revenue power to Congress.

Our Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, contends that a tax reduction in 1948, 3 years after the war, would

produce a Treasury deficit. Canada's Minister of Finance, on the other hand, reported that instead of producing a deficit, the first tax cut of 22 percent yielded $500,000,000 more revenue than advance estimates and resulted in "a surplus larger than the accumulated total of all the previous surpluses in our history."

Much is made of the theory enunciated by the President in his veto messages that tax reduction would increase inflationary pressures. This did not occur in Canada. From August 1939 to September 1947, a period of 8 years, Canada's cost-of-living index rose 38.3 percent. In that same period here in the United States the cost-of-living average rose 66.1 percent. It is interesting to note that prices increased more than 15 points on the cost-of-living index in the 90-day period immediately after the President's two tax vetoes. Whether there is a relation between the vetoes and the price boom is debatable, but nevertheless the facts indicate that the boom occurred after such vetoes. There are many sound economic arguments which indicate that there is a definite connection. Farmers, merchants, industrialists, and labor all concede that increased production is the true answer to high prices. Yet, when we take money to maintain government, which is nonproductive in the material sense, and take this money from the people who would invest it in productive enterprise, then we are thwarting production and adding to inflationary pressures. If business expands more revenue can be obtained even though the tax base is lower, for the tax base broadens from the creation of more jobs and more taxable property. Canada seems to have proved this basic theory.

FARMERS LOSE BY FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO REDUCE TAXES

We need not rely upon statistics from Canada to prove the direct relation between prices and taxes. Hark back to the days following World War I. It was not until 1924 that Congress began cutting taxes on a broad scale. The "bust" in 1921–22 hit the farmer especially hard. He is in better shape today primarily because he has had record crops, record production per man and per farm, and the need for his products has been exceptionally high. He does not have the same farm indebtedness on real and personal property. However, he will be the first to feel another depression, and the wage earner's plight will quickly follow. After a long delay after World War I three tax-reduction acts were passed in a row: the Revenue Acts of 1924, 1926, and 1928. These acts were followed by the greatest prosperity boom—without price inflation—in modern times. National income increased by $20,000,000,000 over 1922. Pay rolls in factories, cash farm income, every phase of our economy established new and healthy records. Tax reduction netted American farmers $2,000,000,000 as the economic effect of three tax reductions after the First World War. It can be done again, and not only the farmer, but the entire Nation will benefit, through passage of bill 4790.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of sympathy for the position taken by my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], who has just preceded me, in his discussion with reference to excise taxes. There is no question but that we must reduce excise taxes. This is a major task and belongs in a category of its own. The Ways and Means Committee decided that it would be wise to consider only personal income tax at this time. Tax legislation divides itself into about four categories, as follows: Personal income taxes, corporation income taxes, excise taxes, and estate and gift taxes, and so forth. The Ways and Means Committee should by all means, in the near future, give consideration to the matter of reducing excise taxes on some of the commodities the gentleman named and some other commodities. I should be glad to give consideration to the reduction of taxes on telegrams, telephone calls, railroad tickets, ladies' handbags, medium-priced cosmetics which are in great general use, and other commodities.

The bill that is before us today has come before us in a most natural way. It is inevitable that we have this bill. The country is looking to Congress for tax relief. I am going to give you briefly the progress of this legislation.

Last year, in the first part of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the Ways and Means Committee brought in a bill just like this bill in principle and in purpose, but not, of course, exactly like it as far as the rates and exemptions and so forth are concerned. We brought in what was then known as H. R. 1. H. R. 1 passed this House by a tremendous vote. It went to the Senate and passed by a tremendous vote. The President vetoed it. It came back and failed of passage in this body by a two-thirds vote. As you know it is a very difficult matter to pass a bill by a two-thirds majority over the veto of the President. The members of the President's party usually want to stand by their President.

At that time the President and those who were close to him took the position that there should be no tax reduction at all. I do not mean to imply that all the Members on the Democratic side favored that position at all, because I know they did not. However, the Administration itself took the position that it was not in favor of any tax reduction. Maybe that is not a bad position, and I am not condemning it, but the people of the country think we should have tax reduction. I am just stating historically what happened in connection with the progress of this legislation.

The people of the country, we thought, were demanding tax reduction, so when Congress came back into session we brought H. R. 1 back into the House again for consideration under another number, with a few amendments to it. What were these amendments? How did H. R. 1 differ from the bill that we passed a little later? There was no great material difference in principle; about the same amount of tax reduction was involved. I think maybe we gave some consideration to giving a little more advantage to those in lower brackets. One change that we made was to change the date when the bill should become effective. The first bill would have been effective January 1, 1947, while the second bill was to be effective on January 1, 1948. This second bill passed the House by a tremendous vote. It then went to the Senate where it was passed by a tremendous vote. It then was sent to the President who vetoed it. It came back to the House and we passed it over the President's veto by a two-thirds vote. Many Democrats must have voted to override the President's veto. What is the use now of these, or any of us straining at a gnat as we discuss this matter? Let us stand as we did when we voted to override the President's veto.

Many on the Democratic side, many of the leaders on the Democratic side, have heretofore taken a position in favor of tax reduction, and voted to override the President's veto. I do not find fault with my colleagues on either side with reference to their position on this tax matter. But let us place the responsibility where it should be. Who is responsible for this program? Who is responsible for our being here now? It was the action of the President of the United States in vetoing a tax bill. Of course he had a perfect legal right to do that. But no President in the history of the Nation ever vetoed a tax bill except Mr. Roosevelt, who on one occasion vetoed a tax bill with a great deal of gusto. That was the time that the famous incident of "Dear Alben" occurred. And President Roosevelt was at that time overwhelmingly overridden in both branches of the Congress by a two-thirds vote. That taught Mr. Roosevelt a lesson which he learned well enough not to attempt it again. No other President ever vetoed a tax bill except our present President, Mr. Truman. Why do I seem to speak so earnestly and with so much zeal on this question? I will tell you. Under the Constitution of the United States, the House of Representatives has been given some prerogatives above the President and above the Supreme Court and above everybody else. One of those prerogatives is the right to control the purse strings of the Nation. That is our right and more than that, it is our duty under the Constitution. That duty was given to us solemnly and up to this time, we have been able to carry that duty out with only one exception. And that was last year when President Truman intervened and exercised his veto. He took advantage of his right to veto a bill. It never was intended in principle that the President should veto tax bills. The House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States representing the people are charged with the duty of managing the finances of the country. It is not primarily the business of the President. His responsibility is to wisely and honestly manage the spending of the money that the Congress appropriates to him.

I am sorry that this bill may contain some provisions that will not permit some of you to vote for it. That is only proof that it is good legislation. You stand up one after the other and you

say, "I would like to do this but the amount of the reduction is too much," "Something else ought to be done." That only proves that this is good legislation and that it was carefully prepared and is fundamentally right, although it may not meet the desires and wishes of everybody concerned. I want to call to your attention again and I do not want to be obnoxious about it, but I want to put the responsibility where it belongs.

What is the reason that we have to consider tax legislation at all? What is the reason that we have to collect so much more in taxes now than we formerly did? Just before the last World War the national budget was about eight or nine billion dollars. The President now asks for a budget four or five times that much. What is the reason for all this increase? It was brought out yesterday that we have gone through a great war. Certainly we have, but that war has now been over for several years. But we still have in the White House and in the many other branches of the executive department of the Government an apparent irresistible tendency to spend money. That is the real trouble. I have said this on the floor repeatedly, and I challenge anybody today to point to a single instance when Mr. Roosevelt ever demanded economy. I will go further and say that you cannot show me where he ever even suggested that economy should be practiced. Nobody has ever met that challenge. I ask you again today, Where has the present incumbent at the White House ever indicated that he wants to save any money? Is there anybody who wants to stand up and tell me that Truman has orally or in writing ever advocated economy in Government spending? I honestly do not know of any instance. Why do I say with some degree of boastfulness that nobody will say that I am wrong? Reason with me while I ask you, Why is the President's budget this year larger than it was last year by several billions of dollars? Is the time ever going to come when anybody in this New Deal administration is ever going to try and save some money? Is it always going to be spend, spend, spend?

During the last 16 years nobody at the White House has ever said a word about economy. Now, we have to do something about this economy business, just as sure as you live. It would be small of me to say that the President shows his desire to spend by defiantly building that little balcony down there at the White House. That is a small item to refer to. I love my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] because he has always stood for economy. He has been compelled to swallow a lot of extravagant expenditures that he did not like, and so have I; but, by nature, by reputation, by character, he is economical. If he were in the White House, he would not build that veranda. No, sir. He would take that money and pay it on this debt, and so would I. But the President is different. I say to you in all solemnity and sincerity that the President must show some economy, and if he does not we have little hope of reducing our national debt as we go along.

The President at this time has now recommended some tax reduction. He is now willing for it although last year he was against it. I wish to compliment the Secretary of the Treasury. When he comes before the Ways and Means Committee he indicates that he wants to do the right thing. I know that in his heart he does not favor this $40 suggestion that the President so "boyantly" recommends. Nobody in the Treasury has ever stood up and admitted that he is the father of this $40 idea. Just who is the father of it? Strange as it may seem I have heard that a woman is the father of that $40 idea. Be that as it may I do not chastize the Secretary of the Treasury for he should stand by the President. They owe him an obligation to stand by him or else resign.

Now, what kind of a tax expert is this President of ours? Is he a tax expert? Has he shown by his capacity since he has been in the office of President that he knows more about taxes than does the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. DOUGHTON], or the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. COOPER], or the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. RAYBURN], or the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], or Members on our side. Has he shown anything like that? If he has, why has not somebody stood up on this floor and defended the $40 payment completely and enthusiastically? Nobody has. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] would not do it, because he is a scientific tax man and he is a good tax man and he knows whereof he speaks. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] would not do it. Nobody has done it. Never before in my experience in this Congress have I seen the President's party turn him down on his recommendation for taxes. They have done that in this case. Nobody champions the President's suggestions. He surely has not shown himself to be such a tax expert that any sound thinking Member of Congress should follow him should he veto this bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Is there any real difference in the President's proposition of a $40 credit and raising the exemption to $700? Is there any real difference?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. I should be glad if the gentleman would ask some of the tax experts on his side of the aisle to tell him the difference——

Mr. LANHAM. I am asking you to tell me.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Well then, I will answer the gentleman. Taxation is a science. It is not a hodgepodge. You cannot say, "Eeny, meeny, miney, mo, $40." It does not work that way. Taxation is a science; Congress has built up a symmetrical tax structure, and tax experts recognize certain principles in taxation. One is that all taxes must be just and fair, and they must be general in their application. For many, many years men on both sides of the aisle have recognized what we call progressive taxation, graduated taxation. That is the only way I can explain that this provision is not in consonance with good tax legislation. In other words, we must make those pay who are able to pay. Whenever you adopt a scheme like this $40 pension it is almost childish. I dare say you cannot find a tax expert anywhere who will approve that suggestion of the President.

Maybe I have not answered the gentleman to his own satisfaction. He may be one of those who wishes to insist on the $40 across the board. Now I will give the gentleman another answer to it. Under our tax systems for many years we have given different rates and different advantages to certain people down in the lower brackets as against those in the higher brackets, but under the President's program a man gets a $40 credit and no more; the relief quits at $40. A person whose taxes amount to only $40 gets just as much relief as a man whose taxes amount to $400 or $4,000 or $40,000. Their is absolutely no sense to such a program. I believe that the man who only has a $40 tax to pay should have a much higher percentage reduction than the man who pays $40,000 in taxes. But a reduction of only $40 would not amount to anything to one called upon to pay $40,000 in taxes.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman has not answered my question at all as to what difference there is between a $40 reduction and a lifting of the exemption from $500 to $700.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I have just told the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman has not answered my question at all.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I repeat, that nobody gets more than $40; that is all.

Mr. LANHAM. Suppose the exemption were raised, would anybody get more than $40?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not follow the gentleman if the exemption were raised.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am not talking about just one exemption, I am talking about a whole symmetrical tax bill. I think I have answered the gentleman and now, if you please, I shall go ahead.

There are two important problems at stake in the consideration of this bill. I do not find any fault with those who say we should not make such a big reduction as is provided in this bill. That is a matter to be debated, a matter to be discussed. Many people are sincere in that belief.

We have heard a good deal about the effect of the program we have before us, two widely differing sets of figures as to the amount of tax reduction. But for the moment let me discuss the statement of my good friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and my good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], who has just spoken. They say we are going to have to borrow money to pay taxes. I most respectfully and emphatically disagree with them, that we are going to have to borrow money to pay taxes; that is just not true at all. That is a very catchy statement because a lot of people do not stop to figure it out. The truth is that we are going to have plenty of money to do more than pay our expenses, and I am going

to prove that with the figures shown in the report.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman spoke of his tax experts a short time ago. That is a thing that confuses me, how people can arrive at these two vastly different answers. Am I to understand that the gentleman has a group of tax experts that got the answer he wanted and that the Democrats had a group that got the answer they wanted?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; I can explain that. There is an important and a very good reason for it. The gentleman knows that the Treasury under every administration has always been very conservative. Their guess must go out to the country. When they make their guess it goes out to the country as the Treasury's guess, as the administration's guess, as the Government's guess. They have always underestimated. I have never found fault with that, but that is the fact, they have always underestimated. Here we are talking about the facts and we have got to deal with the facts, and we want the opinion of these other experts whose opinions have been more accurate time after time and upon whom we rely. They are employed for that purpose, employed by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and by the Finance Committee of the Senate, employed to give us the best basis for legislation, not for politics, not to save the administration, but what is best for now. Nobody knows what their politics is. As far as I am concerned I do not know how any of them voted or whether they voted, nor do I know where they live.

Mr. GRANGER. All the more I cannot understand how the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Tennessee are so far apart.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I do not know how far apart we are. Wait until I get through with these figures and then see what the situation is. Let us take first the fiscal year 1948–49. I have a chart here which I shall have printed in the RECORD at the end of this statement. I appreciate that it is not easy to get all that we might say about these figures into the RECORD, but we can understand each other as I point out these figures to you. Here are the estimated receipts for 1946. They are given by our experts. I do not have room to put the figures of the Treasury on the blackboard, but they are in the report and the same explanation would follow.

Here are the estimated receipts for 1948 as given by our experts, and they have proven to be more accurate always than the other estimates.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In using the term "our experts" does the gentleman mean the experts of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I mean the Nation's experts in a legislative way, not that they belong particularly to our Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. In arriving at the estimated receipts what was the amount of the total personal income that the gentleman worked on? Was it $209,000,000,000?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; $209,000,000,000 which is different than the amount taken by the Treasury, and my answer. Why do we take that? The Treasury estimates two hundred billion. We have long since passed $200,000,000,000. The figures if issued today by the Treasury would, I feel, be up to $209,000,000,000 because that is what they are, and every safe prediction indicates that they are going to keep up at that rate. Here is what the President's estimate was.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I would like to know what the gentleman's authority is for saying that the Treasury is for saying that the Treasury would give us the figure of 209?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I assume they will tell you the truth. I did not say I spoke to or for the Treasury.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman stated that if you called up the Treasury they would give you this figure. I want the gentleman's authority for that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I would have as much authority for it as the gentleman would have.

Mr. FORAND. I would not get the 209.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Why not?

Mr. FORAND. Because I know that the gentleman would not get it either.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman such additional time as he may desire.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is no use quibbling about this. I maintain that the figure should be 209 billion, and my figures are based on that amount. This is not a fake figure. This is a figure that is wholly justified. Of course, I have not the time to go through all of the ramifications to show how it is justified.

Here is a figure that is also justified. The President's estimated expenditures for 1948 are $37,728,000,000. He estimated first either 35.7 or 37.5, and then increased it two or three hundred million dollars during the session. That is the kind of economy I am complaining about.

Here are the figures. This leaves a surplus of $8,762,000,000. Now, how do we propose to reduce the taxes here? Some say 6 billion, some say 7 billion, some say 7.1 billion. Why the difference? The difference is that they estimate in the year when the taxes are paid. You know, of course, that the heavy part of the taxes are not paid in the first part of the year. They are paid in the last part of the year. The estimated amount of taxes to be paid in the year 1948 between now and June is $1,040,000,000. This will leave a surplus in the Treasury of $7,772,000,000.

What will they do with that money? That money will carry over until next year, into 1949; but the Secretary of the Treasury has the power to pay on the debt any time he wants to. Any time he has surplus cash in the cash drawer he may pay on the debt, but he cannot pay on it when there is a President spending all the time and finding some other place to spend the money. Until we have cooperation and coordination, we will not have real economy. We are not going to pay our debt off very fast.

Let us take 1949. What are the estimated tax receipts for 1949? $47,317,000,000. The budget has already come up with a total of $39,669,000,000. It is much more than the budget last year. At that rate we will go into debt. That is why we will have to borrow money if we do have to do it. If the President spends more year after year, of course we are going to have to borrow the money. If he is going to spend $2,000,000,000 more next year than this year we might as well give up the ghost. But we have to do our duty, we have to economize and get the facts.

When we make this deduction there is a surplus of $7,648,000,000. This is the surplus for 1949.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. How is the President going to spend money if Congress is not going to appropriate it?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Because you fellows will vote with him.

Mr. FORAND. But you fellows are in the majority. If this Congress does not vote the money, the President cannot spend it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Certainly, that is all right, but he can run out and make a lot of obligations and bind the country, and the country feels obligated to carry on. I am one who likes to respect the President, and whenever the President makes a deal, I like to stay with him, especially if the honor of the country is at stake, and we had to do that many times under the Roosevelt administration, and many commitments were made on matters we did not know anything about. We trusted him, and now we find out that things were not done the way we thought they were.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. There is nothing to prevent the President from borrowing, is there?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No; that is right. He has a right to borrow under laws already passed, and sell bonds, and so forth.

Now, let us go back where I was. There is a good round $7,648,000,000 of surplus, and here we take $7,100,000,000 off of that. Now then, that is the biggest tax-reduction figure that we can get from these computations. I could slip a figure in there and say $6,000,000,000, or I could take $6,000,000,000 for this year and $6,000,000,000 for next year and divide

the 2 years, but we wanted to be fair, because this is what we are going to have to pay. This tax reduction is going to come off just about that time in 1949. Deducting this figure of $7,100,000,000, we will have a balance. That will give us a balance of $548,000,000 saving in money. We get this much of a balance without cutting anything from the President's budget. We would save that much even if we paid out everything that the President has been able to think of. Now, how much money are you going to save? Do you think we will save any? Someone said here yesterday, "We have not saved any in the last session of Congress." But some other person said, "We saved $6,000,000,000." You heard the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, say yesterday on this floor that he was going to cut the budget this coming year by $4,500,000,000. Add $4,000,000,000 onto this figure of $548,000,000 and you will have approximately $5,000,000,000 that they ought to pay on the debt, and that should be a handsome payment on the debt. I would like to go down with you some day, Mr. DOUGHTON, to the Treasury and say, "We expect you to pay that amount on the national debt because it is a surplus. How much more will be there? Well now, do you think that we are going to spend $6,000,000,000 on this foreign business, that we call this Marshall plan business? Your guess is just as good as mine. But, we are not going to spend that $6,000,000,000 this year on this Marshall plan. I repeat, no; we are not. The temper of the House is not going to stand for it, and you on that side are not going to vote for it, either. It will not be that much. Suppose it will be $3,000,000,000. Add the $3,000,000,000 which you will thus save to the $548,000,000 and you will have quite a surplus. What else will we do? We do not know. We do not know if we are going to spend all these items that the President has in his budget, and we surely know that the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, and his crowd will save us three or four billion dollars. So, I would not be surprised; in other words, I will be very much disturbed and disappointed if we do not have a balance of about eight or ten billion dollars. Of course, we cannot have this much if we do not try to economize and if we give it away.

Now, you talk about this business of borrowing money with which to pay taxes. Let us be fair and take the figures, and take the honest-to-God figures, and be courageous. Let us go ahead and cut some taxes. I would prefer to have the amount a little less than it is, but we cannot change this bill. What will you take out? You surely do not ask me to take away from these poor people at the bottom $1,000,000,000. You do not want me to do that. You do not want me to take out the community-property program that the country is demanding, do you? You do not want me to take off from the blind, do you? You do not want me to take off for the old school teachers and elderly people who get some consideration in this bill? What do you want me to do? Well, I will tell you. I would like to cut, too, but we cannot cut in a reasonable way unless we just cut the tree clear out of shape. I want to see a symmetrical system built and I want to keep up the economic strength and then have a well-balanced budget and pay off on the national debt, and we will reduce taxes, and business will be satisfied and the people will be happy.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman should point out—and I think I am correct in this—that included in the $39,669,000,000 is this $4,440,000,000 which the President put in the budget, anticipating that the Congress would probably support that amount for foreign aid.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; and $1,500,000,000 besides that. But, it never has been voted on yet, and we are going to save some money on that if I guess right.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. This includes an additional $600 for the blind, does it not?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Take the physically handicapped who are barred from civil-service employment, why were they not included in that?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Well, sir, my good friend, it is a long story, but let me give you this story. When the social-security bill was passed in 1935—that is a long time ago and many of you were not here then—that was a great piece of legislation. That legislation came up from the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt. And, do you know, he did not have a provision in that proposed legislation making any provision for the blind. There was no provision in there for the blind. I want to claim the honor of having such a provision placed in the bill, if you will permit me to do so without seeming egotistic, for it was largely by my efforts on this floor and in the Committee on Ways and Means that the blind got the first legislation giving them a pension. I am willing to give the handicapped some attention and give them some consideration, but it is a big, long story. You go back and start with the question of how much you will give a man with one leg off or with two legs off, or with two eyes gone. Where are you going to stop? That is a serious situation to contemplate.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. When the social-security bill was under consideration, your humble servant that is speaking now offered an amendment to that bill to give a Federal pension of at least $25 a month to the needy blind and the needy totally and permanently disabled. Nearly all the Republicans voted for it, but our Democratic friends, who had a three or four to one majority in the House at that time, stuck to their bill and defeated that amendment.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman is right.

Mr. ROBSION. After that, the gentleman from Ohio did the very thing he told you he did.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. When the Senate took up the legislation it inserted my amendment, word for word, in the bill, and it became part of the law. It was a long battle and it took a lot of work and a lot of trouble to get the provision for the blind into that bill. I hope we may sometime be able to do something for the handicapped.

For the benefit of the Members, Mr. Chairman, and for ease of reference, under permission previously secured in the House I include these blackboard figures in tabular form, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years	
	1948	1949
1. Estimated receipts	46,490	47,317
2. President's estimated expenditures	37,728	39,669
3. Surplus before tax reduction	8,762	7,648
4. Tax reduction, H. R. 4790	1,040	7,100
5. Surplus after tax reduction	7,722	548

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Fennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, during this period when there is so much discussion of tax reduction and tax relief for low-income groups, it is a good time to reflect upon the status of a group that has been entirely neglected in the last few years. This is the group over 65 years of age who come under the social-security program and those who have never been covered by the program.

The time has long since passed when the benefits for these people should be increased. It is difficult to understand how those responsible for tax relief could overlook these vast numbers of our aged and dependent people. The increased cost of living has placed their meager income in the bracket of the almost nonexistent.

It is incumbent on the Congress to give some relief here and to do so without delay. If it is not advisable to increase social security payments and broaden the coverage, then let us make some other provision for these people. It is hard to imagine that they can keep their bodies and souls together, as matters now stand. I know I have had many come to me with tears in their eyes, appealing for help, and I am just one Member of Congress and not even on the committee with jurisdiction over such legislation. Surely it is the same with every other Member of this body, and I take this means to urge the committee to give immediate attention to the needs of this group.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the enactment of the Knutson bill into law means the wrecking of the Marshall plan

for foreign aid and rehabilitation and the certain weakening of our national defense. These results will follow as surely as night follows day. When you vote for this bill it seems to me that it is a vote either for the sabotage of the Marshall plan and the crippling of national defense or for an uncontrolled inflation that will pay off our Government bonds with 50-cent dollars or less. Mark well my words. Those who vote for this bill will go down in history as the hatchet men of the Marshall plan.

The majority is assuming a cut in Federal expenditures of two or three billions in the President's 1949 budget. We all want to see expenditures cut to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient operation of our governmental functions on the domestic scene and sufficient to accomplish effective aid on the foreign scene. We can judge from the experience of the past year how successful the Congress may be this year in making substantial reductions below the President's budget of $39,700,000,000.

You will recall that with great fanfare it was declared last year that the House would cut the President's budget by $6,000,000,000. The legislative body at the other end of the Capitol was not so enthusiastic and limited their boasts to four and five-tenths billions. We were told, during the course of hearings on the present bill, by the Director of the Budget, that actually the expenditures of Government for fiscal 1948, instead of being reduced below the President's budget, will exceed the original estimates by $200,000,000 by June 30 of this year. I know that the majority exerted every effort to fulfill their boast of drastic reductions in the 1948 budget, but the result was the verification of the accuracy of President Truman's estimate on expenditures during the present fiscal year. With that experience in mind, is there any reasonable ground for belief that in fiscal year 1949, which commences on July 1, 1948, that the majority will be able to cut expenditures $3,000,000,000, or even $2,000,000,000? Upon both these assumptions they predicate a surplus to justify the tax loss the Government would incur under this bill.

Assuming an inflated personal income of $209,000,000,000 in calendar year 1948 and assuming a cut in the President's budget of two billion, it is claimed by the proponents of the bill that there will be then a surplus of $2,500,000,000 which can be paid off the national debt. Let us find out the basis for such an assumption and then determine, as practical businessmen, whether we can take the financial risk involved.

Personal and corporate incomes were as follows—and these figures are furnished me by Mr. Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation:

First half 1948:	
Personal	$212,000,000,000
Corporate	31,000,000,000
Second half 1948:	
Personal	205,000,000,000
Corporate	25,000,000,000
First half 1949:	
Personal	195,000,000,000
Corporate	20,000,000,000

You will note that the first half of 1948 is the anticipated high-water mark. At the hearing I made special inquiry of the joint staff's economist as to whether this $212,000,000,000 personal income for first half of 1948 was due in part to inflation and not to real productivity, and I was advised in the affirmative. This inflation is likewise reflected in the average of $209,000,000,000 for calendar year 1948, so it must be evident that for this bill to work out successfully, we must have either or both continued inflation or a reduction in Government expenditure below the President's budget, which the majority tried to effect in this present fiscal year and failed miserably. I might state here that the estimate made by Secretary Snyder with respect to personal incomes, and assuming that a determined effort is made to stem inflation, is $200,000,000,000. Will we hold the line against further inflation, or will we—as we must under this bill—hope for and encourage further inflation so that total personal incomes will hold to the swollen $209,000,000,000 figure.

Under the Republican theory that when this bill passes, assuming $209,000,000,000 of personal income and a $2,000,000,000 reduction in Government expenditures, there will still be a $7,100,000,000 tax reduction, resulting in a $2,500,000,000 surplus. Let us look at the second half of the proposition, viz, reduction of $2,000,000,000 in expenditures. Can the Republicans do more cutting on the President's 1949 budget than they did on the 1948? I doubt it. Seventy-nine percent of the 1949 budget of $39,700,000,000 goes to five big functions: First, national defense; second, international affairs; third, veterans affairs; fourth, interest; fifth, tax refunds. Let us take them in reverse order. Tax refunds—are we not going to pay the claims of persons who have proper tax claims against the Government? Are we going to tell the taxpayer whose withholding collections exceeded the tax due, "We are sorry. We can't pay your claim. We must reduce taxes before we pay claims." What about interest on War Savings bonds—can the interest be cut down or can we fail to pay interest in order to have a tax cut. I think not. What of the veteran? Are you going to cut down on the President's estimate of what the veterans' program requires? If so, what becomes of the recent announcement that the bill to increase subsistence pay and on-the-job training pay for veterans will come before the House this very week. So thus we come to national defense and international aid. There is where the two or three or more billions of dollars must be cut, if you put through this bill. You cannot cut anywhere near two or three billion dollars on the 21 percent of the remaining budget. You tried last year and failed. You cannot do it this year. Your cut, if any, must come in national defense or the Marshall plan. Every dollar that you fail to give to the effective implementation of the Marshall plan is a dollar that you must needs give to national defense in payment of your folly. Every dollar that you fail to give for the needed rehabilitation of western Europe and China is going to be spent manifold, not alone in money, but mayhap again in sweat and toil and blood. I regret that I cannot entertain the hope that the Republican majority will place our national defense and foreign aid, which is another form of national defense, above the political expediency of a tax-reduction program in a Presidential election year, when we in the House also run for reelection.

I call your attention to an article that appears in today's New York Herald Tribune, a strongly Republican paper. It is entitled "Real Issue in the Tax-Bill Debate Is Viewed as Russia's Cold War." The article reads as follows:

REAL ISSUE IN THE TAX-BILL DEBATE IS VIEWED AS RUSSIA'S COLD WAR—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS THAT, EVEN THOUGH WE MAY NOT LIKE IT, WE MUST GIVE AID TO EUROPE, AND THIS RAISES ISSUE OF NO TAX CUT

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—The House is debating a tax-reduction bill formulated by the Republicans, with the practical certainty it will be passed early next week. From that point on, developments can only be estimated. The bill as passed by the House will be changed in the Senate. If the bill ultimately passed approximates the present House measure, President Truman is likely to veto it. Throughout the process there will be further complications. Democrats in Congress, reluctant to make a record which looks like outright opposition to any tax reduction whatever, may propose or endorse a measure not greatly unlike the one now before the House but with the amount of the reduction much smaller.

Somewhere along the line—probably when and if there is a veto and Congress is debating whether to override the veto—the basic question will come to the front. This is, should there be tax reduction at this time?

Tax reduction is to be distinguished from tax revision. Tax revision is a need crying to heaven. The structure and details of the existing tax laws, as distinguished from the amounts laid and collected, are a monstrosity. Among other harms, too complex for discussion here, it puts difficulty in the way of small businesses growing and otherwise creates a motive for them to sell their businesses, hence to make big businesses bigger. However, tax revision as such is not pertinent here. What is before us is tax reduction and the amount of it.

BARUCH'S PROPOSAL

A school of thought which holds tax reduction at this time to be unwise is reflected by, among many other thoughtful persons, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who says tax reduction should be postponed for 2 years at least. His recommendation on this point is one in a program of related steps designed to meet what he called the Siamese twins of our over-all problem—the stopping of inflation coupled with aid for European recovery.

Our over-all problem begins with our relation to Russia. The leaders and government of that country are conducting a "cold" war upon us—meaning, as forthrightly described by officials of our Government and as coming to be recognized by our people—an everything-short-of-shooting war. For meeting this war we need to be strong in every respect, including financial strength on the part of our National Treasury.

The need for financial strength is double. For the economic and ideological war that is actually on we need financial strength in order to aid European countries toward economic help. We want them to have economic help in order to enable them to resist the advance of communism and Russia domination across western Europe towards us.

We need financial strength for a related purpose, to the same end of defense against the Russian threat to us. We need it, that is, for military preparedness. Not only must we take into account the possibility that the everything-short-of-shooting war may come to a stage which includes shooting. Further than that, military strength on our part is a deterrent to the Russian threat even so long as it remains economic and ideological. If the Russian and Communist heads felt that we were militarily weak or were likely to become so, they would already have been bolder and would have advanced farther.

There is a phrase used by lawyers to forestall alternative contingencies, "and/or." But in our resistance to Russia and communism, there is no "or"; the word is "and." At one and the same time we must lay out money for European recovery and for strengthening our Military Establishment.

AIR POLICY REPORT

The latter need was stated explicitly and starkly early this month by a group of distinguished citizens whom President Truman had appointed as an Air Policy Commission. Their report, entitled with somber emphasis, "Survival in the Air Age," said that if we are to have relative security against atomic air attacks we should spend on our air forces in 1948 and 1949 the amount of $1,300,000,000 each year more than now planned in the budget. The report added, "The Air Force is inadequate even for this (period) when we are relatively free from danger of * * * attack."

Meanwhile, the need of funds for aid to Europe is essential to defense against the economic and ideological war already on. We may not like it, we may see the disadvantages of it; we may argue over the amounts and the methods of administration, but we must go on with it and probably enlarge it.

Whether, in this condition, we should reduce taxes, and if so how much, or use the whole of any surplus revenue for strengthening the Treasury or for reducing the national debt, is the real base of the debate now going on in Congress.

Mr. Chairman, thus far I have confined myself to the statistics and optimistic assumptions of the Republican majority. Very briefly I shall give you the contrast as I see it from the minority view.

Briefly, we base our position on the Treasury and Bureau of the Budget analyses that the personal incomes for 1948 will approximate $200,000,000,000, assuming the holding of inflation within present confines. On that basis and assuming no cut in the President's budget, at the end of June 30, 1949, the Government would be in the red by $2,100,000,000. Imagine in the years of greatest national income, that the Government would have to go out to borrow money in order to reduce taxes. It is just too fantastic. It is contrary to every sound fiscal policy. It is dangerous; it is imperiling our national solvency; it is jeopardizing the earnings of 85,000,000 American citizens who, during the war, patriotically invested every thin dime they had in war stamps and war bonds. It is almost unbelievable that any tax proposal such as this would be advocated by responsible legislators that would produce a budget deficit and an increase in the public debt at a time when the country is not at war, where personal and corporate incomes are at their highest, and where unemployment is at its lowest ebb.

From all estimates, these high personal and corporate incomes will not continue if we control inflation. It is estimated that personal incomes will drop from an estimated $212,000,000,000 in the first half of 1948 to $195,000,000,000 in the first half of 1949, a decrease of $17,000,000,000, which means a loss in income to the Government of approximately $4,250,000,000. Corporate revenues are anticipated to drop from $31,000,000,000 in the first half of 1948 to $20,000,000,000 in the first half of 1949, a decrease of $11,000,000,000, a revenue loss to the Government of approximately $2,750,000,000.

Again repeating the figures so that you may note the downward trend:

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Personal income	Corporate profits
1948 (first half)	212	31.0
1948 (second half)	205	25.0
1949 (first half)	195	20.0

These figures were officially sent me by the counsel for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and are partially set forth in the majority report. They lead to the inescapable conclusion that the downward trend of personal and corporate income will soon be upon us. For every $4,000,000,000 loss of national income there is a $1,000,000,000 loss in Government revenue.

This shows that instead of the estimated deficit under the Knutson bill the deficit will be increased to $4,000,000,000. If there is a falling off of 10 percent of the estimated personal incomes there will be a deficit of $6,000,000,000, and if there is a falling off of 15 percent there will be a deficit of $8,000,000,000 instead of the original anticipated deficit of $2,500,000,000.

Therefore, if we pass this bill—and assuming no reduction in the President's 1949 budget—at the end of June 30, 1949, we will have a deficit of $2,100,000,000, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, or a small surplus of $500,000,000, according to the figures of the majority, to pay on the national debt. What will happen to the country after July 1, 1949, or do not the Republicans feel that they will have any responsibility at that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate on this soak-the-poor tax proposal with increasing amazement.

So far as I can discover, the gentlemen on the other side want to reduce taxes, reduce the debt, reduce prices, reduce inflation, and reduce everything except corporation profits, all at the same time.

The Republican Party has tried to draw an analogy between a family budget and a governmental budget. It cannot be done, because they are two different things, but there are points of comparison.

Suppose for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that you are just a private citizen working for a living, and not too good a living, with a big family. Almost imperceptibly you slip into debt. Along comes the opportunity of a lifetime, but just for a limited period. For say 5 years you have a guaranty of an income just double what you are making. When it ends it ends, and you have to go back to the old income.

Now, if you are a smart and prudent householder, Mr. Chairman, you will pay off your debts, increase your savings, pay your insurance premiums in advance, and maybe pay cash for things you absolutely have to have, even if it means a little squeezing and cutting down on luxuries. At the end of your 5 years of clover you are prepared.

THE PRODIGAL SON

Your debts are paid. You have money in the bank. You are ready to return to the old inadequate income free of worry and able to work toward a secure old age.

With this bill, Mr. Chairman, you are proposing that the American people do just the opposite of what prudence tells us we should do.

You are willing to play the role of the prodigal son, to spend our substance and let our debt ride.

This is not the time to cut taxes.

This is the time to cut debts.

We know that right now the national income is the highest in all history. We also know that the cost of living and corporation profits are the highest on record.

How long will it last?

We do not know. I do not know, you do not know, the wisest men in our land do not know.

We do know that we have a staggering debt load—a debt which many of the Republican who now support this bill said would smash our economy.

Why have they changed their minds? Is it because retirement of the debt would mean that some people who are receiving a comfortable income from investments in Government securities would have to find new places to put their money?

NO END TO GREED FOR PROFITS

Is it because the big corporations, the wealthy money barons, the bankers and merchants and manufacturers have no end to their greed, and hey want more and more profit, less and less responsibility for government?

Again, I do not know the answer.

I do know that not one argument advanced in support of this bill makes sense. It is inflationary; it is against public policy; it is inconsistent with high statesmanship and even good business methods; it discriminates against the poor and gives special benefits to the rich.

If the Republican leadership really wants to help the great mass of our people, then send this phony tax-reduction bill back to committee to die, and bring out instead a real price-control bill to stop inflation, reenact the excess profits tax, raise minimum wages to 75 cents

an hour, and repeal the Taft-Hartley Act just for a start.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who has for many months been urging a reduction of taxes in this country with the one proviso that the tax reduction be made so as to help those little people who have not enough left today to meet the needs of their families. Proof of that fact lies in the introduction last March of my bill, H. R. 2577, to increase exemptions from $500 to $700 for all taxpayers and their dependents. This was before H. R. 1, the first Knutson tax bill, was brought to the floor.

I followed that up with an expression of my views when I offered a motion to recommit the second Knutson bill, H. R. 3950. In the hope that my colleagues would give some study to the matter, I introduced, last July, in behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and myself, H. R. 4405, proposing a different approach to tax reduction.

In considering the question of income-tax reduction we should bear in mind the inflationary spiral now prevalent in this country. The over-all effect that a tax cut will have on prices people will have to pay for the things they purchase merits our most serious consideration.

An over-all tax reduction at the present time would means billions of dollars added to the purchasing power of the people; it would mean billions of dollars in the stream of commerce in this country at a time when people with money are bidding against one another for goods that are in short supply.

I think we ought to note just where the bidding comes from. It does not come from the 29,000,000 taxpayers whose weekly pay is less than $20. Nor does it come from the other 14,000,000 taxpayers whose wages are from $20 to $27 a week. And very little of this bidding up of prices comes from the 9,000,000 who earn from $27 to $77 a week.

In other words, the bidding comes from the 1,700,000 whose annual income is above the $4,000 mark, and it is for that reason that I stand on record and shall continue to do what I can to see that the tax on the low-income taxpayer is relieved to a marked degree. I am urged to move on in that direction, particularly now that we have the result of the studies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics recently, which show that for a family of four the minimum budget requirement in the city of Washington, for example, is $3,562 a year.

I am not going to go into a great deal of detail as to how much deficit financing the bill under consideration will mean, because that has been discussed at great length, but I concur with my colleagues on this side of the aisle in their statement that if the bill now under consideration should ever become law, as it is now written, there will be deficit financing, and, as the Secretary of the Treasury testified before our committee, at the end of the fiscal year 1949 we would be in the red by something around $2,000,000,000. You know and I know that if we are short $2,000,000,000 in budget revenue, that means an increase in the public debt by that amount. I am seriously concerned regarding that point. I think that we should pay a reasonable amount on the public debt every year in order to get away from paying that enormous interest which is now running at the rate of $5,200,000,000 a year, and the sooner we eliminate the payment of such huge interest the sooner we will be in a position to reduce taxes for all concerned. But at the present moment I think that we should be reasonable. I think that we should strive to help those who need help, but that we cannot afford to lose any of the revenue.

The proponents of this bill argue that there is an actual need today for a tax reduction in the higher brackets in order to provide incentives for risk capital, for new business, and so forth. Now, what is the record as of today? Figures produced by the Treasury Department show that in 1939 there were 3,316,000 operating businesses in this country. That dropped during the war to 2,860,000 in 1943. In 1945 there were 3,134,000 operating businesses. In 1946 there were 3,503,000 operating businesses. As of June 1947 there were 3,783,000 operating businesses, an increase in the period of 1 year of 200,000 new businesses. Are people scared? Proponents of this bill talk about the bad effect that the proposed reinstatement of the excess-profits tax would have upon business. I hold in my hand here part of a survey that was made of 50 corporations in this country. That shows that the one that made the least profit in 1947, over and above its profit in 1946, after taxes—remember, after taxes—made a net profit over 1946 of 25.9 percent. I also have in this list another corporation whose profits, after taxes, in 1947 were 246.9 percent over its net profits, after taxes, in 1946. I do not think they are doing bad at all for themselves. Do you?

They talk about the lack of investment capital, and so forth, but according to a press release of the Securities and Exchange Commission dated January 13, 1948, expenditures for new plants and equipment of business in the United States, and that includes manufacture, mining, railroad transportation, and all others, amounted to $15,680,000,000 as compared with $5,200,000,000 in 1939.

We also have a very, very interesting statement made by the Secretary of Commerce before our committee on that point, and this I am going to quote verbatim. I take this from page 10 of the mimeographed copy of the Secretary's statement before our committee. It reads as follows:

> So much for the current and prospective rate of investment. Let me turn now to the question raised by your committee about the availability of funds. We have two sets of data which bear on this point. The first shows the various sources of savings which make the investment of the economy as a whole possible; that is, how much of the saving is made by persons, by corporations, and by governments. The second shows the various direct sources of funds used for investment by corporations; that is, the amount arising from internal sources and the amounts obtained from bank loans, bonds, common stock, etc.
>
> Table 3 on the following page presents the first set and shows the sources of saving and their use for investment purposes in 1947. Total investments amounted to $39,000,000,000, of which $30,000,000,000 was domestic investment referred to in the discussion of table 1, and the remaining $9,000,000,000 represented our net foreign investment. The foreign investment includes, it should be noted, $5,000,000,000 of goods financed by Government loans.

Then, going over to page 16 of this same document, we find the Secretary saying:

> In 1947, corporations expended $14,500,000,000 on plant and equipment, $7,000,000,000 on enlarging their inventories, and added roughly $5,000,000,000 to their trade receivables. This aggregate of $26,000,000,000 was financed by approximately $15,000,000,000 of retained profits and depreciation reserves, $4,000,000,000 of net new capital issues—that is, new issues in excess of pay-offs—and $3,500,000,000 of bank loans, as well as by a $1,000,000,000 increase in trade payables, a $2,000,000,000 increase in other payables, and a $1,000,000,000 reduction in liquid assets.
>
> In liquid assets, of course, is included Government bonds.
>
> It appears, therefore, that to finance $26,000,000,000 in capital requirements, corporations needed to raise not much over $7,000,000,000 through new issues and bank loans, nor were they compelled to reduce their liquid assets to a significant extent, as had been the case in the previous year.

What does business think of the future? The proponents of this bill seem to think that business is scared. Well, I will quote from that Republican bible, the New York Herald Tribune:

> Corporate profits for 1947 after taxes are estimated at about $17,000,000,000. In 1946 they were $12,500,000,000. In 1939 they were $5,000,000,000.

They failed to show this additional point, which is very interesting:

In 1932, the last year under a Republican President, corporate profits after taxes were zero.

In fact, corporate losses after taxes were $3,400,000,000.

That same newspaper, in its review of 1947, says that farm income in 1947 was $18,000,000,000, while in 1946 it was $15,000,000,000. But in 1939 it was only four and a half billion dollars.

They show that the gross national production for 1947 is about $235,000,000,000.

The national income for 1947 exceeds $200,000,000,000, and the final figure will probably reach $225,000,000,000.

Much has been said about lack of savings being available for capital. I have said repeatedly that your drop in savings is a real one. But let the New York Herald Tribune of January 2 speak on that subject. I quote:

> The 131 savings banks of New York grew from $5,500,000,000 in 1941 to $9,700,000,000 in November of 1947, an increase of 76.5 percent. The peak rate of increase for net savings deposits was reached in 1945 when increases amounted to $1,100,000,000. In 1947 the gain was only $470,000,000, or 48 percent below the gain in 1946.

This is attributable to people in the low-income groups withdrawing their

savings in order to meet their daily expenses instead of being able to continue banking savings.

How does business look upon the future? General Electric in 1947 exceeded all peacetime production records. Its sales in 1947 exceeded their estimated goal by $1,000,000,000. This is according to Charles E. Wilson, president of the corporation, and he estimates that 1948 will exceed 1947 by another 20 percent.

Westinghouse Electric reached a production peak of $800,000,000 in 1947 and expects greater gains in 1948. The entire electric manufacturing industry's total output for 1947 was 50 percent higher than it was in 1946. It was 40 percent above the peak war year of 1941 and surpassed 1940 production by 150 percent.

The machine tool industry had a volume of $300,000,000 in 1947, and expects to surpass that in 1948.

The freight car builders have set a target of 10,000 a month during 1948. On December 1, 1947, they had orders for 125,395 cars.

That, my friends, is the picture. So those of you who fear that your corporations will not fare well need not be afraid of imposing the type of excess-profits tax recommended by the President.

After all, we will collect excess-profits taxes only from those corporations that actually make excess profits. Someone has said, "You are going to hit only 22,000 of these corporations out of all the corporations in the United States, and that is discrimination." Let me tell you, those corporations in that category have been discriminating against the American people, and they deserve to be discriminated against, if that is your interpretation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island yields back 1 minute.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, we have once again arrived at the time to discuss that all-important, universally unpopular subject of taxation. I think the American people expect some definite action and would like to have it as nearly unanimous as possible. Personally, I am going to vote for a tax-reduction bill. I would prefer a bill along the lines outlined by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who for many years was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I think his views are conservative, safe, and sound. I would like to see a reduction in the tax bill of from $3,500,000,000 to $4,500,000,000. I think the country is expecting that. I think we can safely rely on that much reduction and at the same time take care of the necessary expenditures of the Federal Government and pay an appreciable amount on our national debt.

Now, that opinion is the result of what reading I have done, the debates to which I have listened, and the best conclusions I can deduce.

I would be more disturbed than I am at this particular moment if I thought the majority side really expected this bill to go through as now written. I do not think it will. I do not think they expect it will. I think it will be changed and I think my friends will be greatly disappointed if it is not changed, because we cannot afford to get too close to the border line with our Government balance. We cannot play with red ink when we are financing a great Government.

As far as expenditures are concerned, I am not one of those who subscribe to the theory that the principal job of the Federal Government is to collect all the money it can from the people and then spend it. I think the Federal Government owes the same type of good common sense and economy in the handling of the people's money as is expected of any other trustee, real or theoretical. If we apply that principle and occupy the position of a trustee and practice the principles and rules that we are supposed to, Government expenditures can be reduced. I do not know how much is expected to be cut from our so-called foreign expenditures, but I do know that the American people are looking more and more each day and are lifting their eyebrows a little higher each day as they gradually realize how much a billion dollars is, and how many billions we expect to send abroad. It is highly probable that that amount will be considerably reduced. If so, then I think it is timely, I think it is safe, sane, and sound that the American people be given that credit on their 1948 tax bill.

For a long time I have been in favor of the community-property provisions. Up until this good hour it has been a very unfair arrangement in this country. This bill seeks to level that off. Of course, we are in favor of increasing the exemption, because at the outset that exemption was supposed to be what you might term bread and meat money—actual living costs. That was the idea that was back of that exemption, but we kept trimming it down until there is not one single man in this House who would dare to say he thought $400 or $500 was an honest exemption. It simply does not represent what we started out to do. So I am definitely in favor of those provisions.

I cannot go along with the $40-per-man proposition. I get some consolation out of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee share that same view. I think the Republicans are of the same opinion, that that will not work and is not the best solution. So I cannot go along.

It looks now that some kind of a motion to recommit will be offered. I do not know just what it will include but, as I said in the outset, I want it to be sound; I want it to be safe for my Government; I want it to provide for what we may term a reasonable amount for application on our national debt; a reasonable reduction in taxes for the American people generally, because when we legislate in this body we do not indulge in class legislation. We legislate for all the American people.

I am not irritated at any particular group. I think there should be a tax reduction in the full sense of the word. Not knowing just what the motion to recommit will include, I may find myself voting for the bill offered by the majority, not with the idea that that bill is going to pass as is—I do not believe it will—but with the fervent hope that the bill will be put in line, that it will draw back just a little bit away from the danger line, and that it will provide for approximately $4,000,000,000 reduction. Then we will have that little safety margin we so often need and yet so seldom see a year or two ahead.

With the expression of these few views I hope we will continue this debate and when the bill comes back that it will be a bill in the general interest of the American people and provide for payment of our debt a reasonable amount, and provide some real tax relief because the American people are getting a little tired. They have been carrying a burden, they have been through a hard war, and they have paid a lot. So let us begin to take them into consideration and not get frightened over this subject of inflation. I do not know why the argument has turned so much on that point because in one breath some say that even though we turn loose some $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 to foreign lands for purchases in this country that will not produce inflation, yet in the same breath they say if we give our own taxpayers $3,000,000,000 or $4,000,000,000 credit on the payment of their taxes that will create inflation. My mind is not that limber; it just cannot take curves that sharp; I cannot reason that way.

I heard the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and I congratulate him on his very reasonable and sound views, and I hope we shall have an opportunity to express ourselves in favor of the propositon he has outlined.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, in the beginning may I say that I am in agreement with much that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], who has just preceded me, has said. This does not mean that I subscribe in toto to his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in arriving at the attitude which I am to assume toward this bill, three questions present themselves: First, should there be Federal tax reduction at this time? Second, in case the first question is answered in the affirmative, then how much should the reduction be? And, third, how should the reduction be applied?

When President Truman vetoed two tax-reduction bills in the last Congress and opposed any tax reduction of any name or nature at this time, I gave much

thought to his objections. However, recent experience convinced me that the administration will spend all of the money made available by the Congress, and that there seems to be a perfect willingness on the part of the executive branch of the Government to take from the people as much tax money as possible with little regard for the ability of those same people to continue war taxes in peacetime.

With a national debt of $258,000,000,000, with a larger Presidential budget for the ensuing year than was even asked for in the current year, I am forced to the belief that unless the amount of money provided by taxes is reduced there is little prospect of any reduction of Government spending. Yes, I believe in reducing the national debt and the report of the Ways and Means Committee, buttressed by tax expert testimony as shown in the hearings, shows that there can be tax reduction without interfering with the essential functions of government and at the same time make payment on the public debt. In short, it seems to me that a case has been made for adequate money to support an efficient government with assurance that there can also be made a sizable payment on our national indebtedness.

The amount of tax reduction cannot be determined by guess and by golly. The tax experts in the Treasury Department have submitted income estimates for the coming year. The tax experts of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of of the Senate have also submitted estimates. The Treasury estimates are more conservative; however, the Treasury is naturally under obligation to the administration of which it is a part. The congressional experts are nonpartisan and serve as our advisers during Republican administrations and Democratic administrations alike. We have no knowledge as to their politics and no one will question their sincerity and their expert ability. Their job is to get the facts, whatever they are. Long experience has taught us that the congressional tax experts have over a period of years been more accurate in their estimates than have the Treasury experts. As I recall, the Treasury experts base their submitted figures on a contemplated $200,000,000,000 national income. The congressional experts base their figures on a prospective $209,000,000,000 income. Now somebody is wrong here and generally I believe in deciding honest differences of this kind on the side of caution. If the figures which have been presented on the blackboard by the very careful and efficient gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, are correct, then there can be tax reduction and debt retirement, irrespective of whether there is any reduction in the President's budget. Members of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the Appropriations Committee, give assurance that there can be a reduction in the President's budget somewhere between $2,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 for the coming year. Personally, the $6,000,000,000 mark seems too ambitious to me; however, certainly there can be a cut of $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 in the budget without curtailing necessary activities on the part of the Government.

Now I would like to go into further detail; however, time will not permit. My thought is that we will not be doing violence to a sound fiscal policy by reducing income taxes at this time.

I have always believed that in the levying of taxes ability to pay should be an important factor. At the same time, I realize that we all enjoy the blessings of our Government and that we should all be willing to contribute to its support. While the President is opposed to any tax relief at this time, he demands, however, that if any reduction is made everybody from the humblest wage earner to the wealthiest millionaire be given a deduction of $40 each in income tax. This violates the philosophy of levying taxes according to the ability to pay and is in every way unsound from a tax standpoint. It is purely a political suggestion. Give everybody an exemption of $40 and then make the business of the country pay the amount of that exemption in additional taxes. This economic royalist and soak the rich and the corporations talk just does not appeal to me. It is production, jobs, wages, and income that the American people must have if we are to continue as the greatest nation on earth, with our people enjoying a standard of living undreamed of in the Old World.

The tax bill now before us follows the ability-to-pay principle. Exemptions are raised. Taxes are reduced more on the lower income and less on the higher income. The graduated bracket system is invoked and I have heard no one criticize the soundness of this principle from a tax-collecting standpoint. Let us think these things through in a business way and eliminate all demagogic thinking.

Above all else we must be sure that tax legislation provides enough money to operate the Government, maintain our national commitments, and make a reasonable payment on the national debt the coming year. We have already had too much deficit spending. Indeed, that has been the habit since 1930. Each year the national debt is larger. Each year the spending on the part of the Government is greater and each year it has taken more red ink to balance the Treasury's books. This deficit spending must stop or our country will be bankrupt. It is easy to talk about cutting expenses but talk is not enough.

Mr. Chairman, within a few days the Congress will again be called upon to estimate the over-all budget for the coming year. This responsibility must be approached on a sound basis. Personally, I am opposed to promising something in the way of governmental spending that cannot be realized. This is not only unfair but it is also injurious politically. Let us be candid and only approve a budget that will do the job which must be done. The Congress in the end will be measured by what it does and not by what it promises. Possibly I am a little conservative. I know that the people whom I represent are demanding more economy in Government, and the more economy we practice the less money we will be compelled to take out of the pockets of the taxpayers and the more money we will have to apply on the national debt. All the people are asking of Congress is that it use the same judgment in carrying on the Government business that common, everyday, sound businessmen, big and little, use in their own affairs. I want to do that very thing. To this end I shall support this tax bill. Maybe the estimated reduction of present taxes is a little large. I am sure that many Members have this feeling. Be it remembered, however, that all tax legislation must originate in the House, and this bill is what the Ways and Means Committee gives us. Therefore, if we believe in tax reduction at this time we will vote for this bill and send it on its way to the Senate. In that body the bill will be reviewed, amendments will possibly be added, and eventually the bill will come back from the Senate. Then a conference committee will iron out differences, if any there be, between the House bill and the Senate bill. At that juncture we will all be given a final vote on the perfected bill. Feeling as I do, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to send this bill on its way to the end that there may be an early vote on a final bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], who just preceded me, made an observation which I think is worthy of attention. He said that should this present bill become law he would be fearful of the consequences. He also stated that he believed the majority who are sponsoring this bill would be fearful of the consequences if this proposal became law. I believe the gentleman from North Carolina is absolutely correct in his observation that the sponsors of this proposition hope that it does not become law in its present form, because I believe they agree with the minority that it would be bad for this country not only for this fiscal year but for ensuing fiscal years. If my memory is correct, it used to be that the Ways and Means Committee of the House was very jealous of its prerogatives in writing tax bills. It used to come before the country and before the House membership and say: "We have labored long and diligently on a bill and we think we have something that will stand up, something that is right, something that is good for the country." But the attitude seems to have changed. In effect they now say: "We will get a start on a tax-reduction bill, then we will let the other body perfect it."

I hope that when the Democratic Party takes over control of the House we will assume and resume the responsibility which correctly belongs in the House of Representatives of proposing

tax legislation that is sound, that is timely, that is equitable, and that will be to the best interests of the country as a whole. This bill is not timely, this bill is not sound, this bill is not equitable, and I intend this afternoon to devote most of my time in an endeavor to prove to you beyond any question of doubt that it is not equitable, that it is unfair, that it gives relief where relief is not needed and denies a proper amount of relief to those who are entitled to and need relief.

First, let me take a few minutes to review what occurred since the Republicans took over control of the Congress on January 1 of last year. There was introduced H. R. 1, that famous H. R. 1, that bill which is unlamented now. "H. R. stands for House of Representatives. It could also stand for "House Republicans No. 1" proposal because it was the first bill introduced by the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress.

We all remember the proposition of the 20-percent reduction in taxes across the board. It sounded pretty good; it looks like a fair proposition when you say 20 percent across the board; it sounds like everybody gets the same reduction. But when we began to examine the effect of a 20-percent reduction across the board, when we began to understand the import of it we were all astounded. We found and the country as a whole found, and the Republicans agreed with us, that it was unfair, that those in the high income brackets, the people who have a real high income, would have a reduction in the payment of taxes to a less sum than they paid before the war. I repeat, they would be reduced to paying less taxes than they paid in 1939. While on the other hand the wage earner, the white-collar worker, the professional man not in the high brackets, and the great majority of taxpayers would have been faced with the proposition of paying taxes amounting to several hundred percent greater than they paid in 1939, several hundred percent greater than they paid before the war.

What would be the result? We have a debt of $257,000,000,000 or $258,000,000,000. The result would be that the lower-income groups would be saddled with that debt and the higher-income groups reduced to paying less taxes than they paid before the debt was incurred. That was the result of the proposed 20-percent across the board reduction, House Republican proposal No. 1. It would have resulted in the veterans and their children being saddled with the war debt. The Republicans could not get that across. The Democratic Members of Congress and President Truman are entitled to the thanks of the people of this country, not only the people living today but their children, for rejecting that proposal.

Well, the second bill came along and they changed their original proposal a little bit. They made it a 10-percent, a 20-percent, and a 30-percent reduction instead of a straight 20-percent-across-the-board reduction. That was a little bit of an improvement, but it was not much of an improvement; because an examination of the figures again demonstrated that there would be the same end result, and they can get up all the charts they want and all the figures they want, and it would still be found that the 10, 20, and 30 proposition that was embodied in the second proposal of the Republicans had the same end result of putting the burden of paying the war debt on the shoulders of the veterans and the low-income groups; and reducing the tax payments of those in the upper income groups to close to the low level of 1939. So, for the second time President Truman and the Democratic Members of Congress are entitled to the thanks of the people for saving them from such unhappy consequences.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are in the midst of considering their third attempt to reduce taxes, and I can show you, and that is going to be my endeavor right now, that the end result will be almost the same and in some respects worse. This bill makes three principal changes in the present tax structure. The first important change is the increase in the per capita exemption from $500 to $600. The second is the feature of permitting married persons to split their incomes and pay on the basis of one-half of the income of the husband, if he earns the entire income, instead of paying on the principal amount, thereby reducing him to a lower bracket. The third important change is the reduction in estate and gift taxes to the extent of about 50 percent. As for the first proposition, Mr. Chairman, I have no particular quarrel with that. I think the Democrats, as they have shown last year and this year, have consistently fought for a tax program at the proper time that would increase the exemptions above their present levels. It was not embodied in the first or second Republican proposals, and it is only embodied in here to a very slight degree because it has been forced on them. It is a recognized principle that if you increase exemptions a great deal of benefit does go to those who are not receiving high incomes. The Republicans were practically forced by the action of the President and the Democrats in Congress to include this increase of $100 in exemptions. But now as to the second proposal, a lot of people all over the country are hailing with a good deal of satisfaction the proposal to permit a husband and wife to split their total incomes and thus be placed in a lower tax bracket. I wonder if the people of this country know who it is that gets the benefit of that provision? Mr. Chairman, unless you make over $5,000 a year and are married, you do not get any benefit whatsoever from that provision. You do not get one cent tax reduction from that splitting provision. Who gets the benefit? When your income is at $6,000, $7,000, $8,000, $10,000, $12,000, $15,000, then you get a great benefit. But, as to those wage earners making $50 a week, $60 a week, $75 a week, those making $90 a week, if they are married, this provision does not help them in the slightest degree. The benefits go to those making more than that. So, in that respect, Mr. Chairman, the bill does not give any relief where it is most needed.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. I believe it would be wise for the gentleman to tell the House that 97 percent of the benefits of the split-income provision go to those with incomes in excess of $5,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman. That is exactly correct. Ninety-seven percent of the benefits of this split-income provision go to people who make more than $5,000 a year. Of course, below that, there is no possibility whatever of getting any benefit.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I think it might be well to point out as well that more than 70 percent of the benefits of the entire bill go to those with incomes under $5,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes, you give a few small crumbs to those in the lower income groups, but the big benefit goes to those making a lot of money. That is where the savings are.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. REEVES. The gentleman represents a district in the State of Pennsylvania. Did not Pennsylvania last year adopt the community-property system for the express and avowed purpose of helping people with incomes exceeding $5,000?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad the gentleman brought that subject up. That is correct. But what I am pointing out now is that the total effect of this bill is to give the big relief to the big-income group. That is true with respect to taxpayers living in Pennsylvania. It is fair in a lot of respects, because 13 States already have that provision. But I say that the benefits go to those who are above the $5,000-a-year income bracket.

Mr. REEVES. Does the gentleman feel that we should perpetuate this discrimination in favor of the 11 remaining community-property States and against the other 37 non-community-property States?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No, I do not say that. The split-income provision is all right, but at the same time the way it should be corrected is to put that provision in but make an adjustment of the percentages so that benefits to the same extent would also go to the lower income groups. This Knutson bill provision is an unscientific way of doing it, giving special relief just to one group of taxpayers.

Mr. REEVES. May I ask if the gentleman considers that it is scientific from the standpoint of tax theory to continue to require a married man in a common-law State to pay as much as 40 percent more Federal income tax on his income than a married man in a community-property State?

Mr. EBERHARTER. No; I said when you put any split-income provision in a tax bill you should make some provision so that those in the lower-income group can get commensurate relief with those in the upper-income groups.

Mr. Chairman, I think the main provision of this bill is a reduction in the

personal-income tax, the so-called 10-, 20-, and 30-percent reduction. What is the true measure of tax reduction? What is the proper yardstick? The proper yardstick of tax reduction, in my opinion, is how much more money will a taxpayer have to spend, how much will his spending money increase by reason of a tax reduction? How much will he have left after he pays his taxes? That is the true measure of how much relief is being given to the taxpayers of the country.

I call your attention to page 69 of the committee report, table 3. Under the Knutson bill, if a married man, who has no children makes $1,200 a year, he will get an increase in his spending money of $38 a year, a 3.3-percent increase, a little over $3 a month. It will give a man earning $2,000 a year $84 more to spend per year, $7 a month, a 4.6-percent increase in his spending money. The fellow making $4,000 a year is given $164 a year more to spend or $14 a month or about 6 percent more. Is not that a lot of relief to give to a man making $1,200 a year if he is married—to give him $3 a month; and to give the $2,000-a-year married man $7 a month more to spend; and then cry out to the country that we are giving relief where it is needed?

To the $10,000-a-year married man it gives $730 a year more to spend or 9 percent more, which is about $60 a month more.

But they take a little better care of the $25,000-a-year man, too. The fellow that needs it so bad—they give him $3,493 more a year to spend, which is $300 a month more, or 21.9 percent more. That is what they are giving in this bill. Yet they give the little fellow 3 percent more to spend. They give the $25,000-a-year man 21 percent more to spend. Let us go along to the $100,000-a-year man. They give him $18,163 a year more to spend, which is $1,500 a month—that poor fellow—he needs that money. They increase his spendable income by 49.3 percent. And yet they increase the $1,200-a-year man by 3 percent. Let me give you one more example. The $500,000-a-year man gets $62,590 a year more to spend, which is $5,000 more a month, or 67.6 percent more than he had before. Relief for the poor, relief for the fellows who need it? Relief for the married man, the workingman, or even the fellow making $5,000 a year? They give the poorest fellow 3 percent more and give the chap who has a $500,000 income 67 percent more.

We have a chart here in our report, No. 1 on page 68. Note that this is a chart by percentages. The line indicates percentages. Right here is the $1,000 figure and it goes on up to the $2,000, $3,000, $4,000, and $5,000 figure. Notice how the percentages go almost straight up when they get to the $15,000 and $20,000 bracket. The percentages with reference to those fellows go way up high. That is very graphic, Mr. Chairman, and very informative. This bill is truly a windfall for the wealthy and those who do not need relief.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. How would the gentleman increase the percentage of these little men with $1,200 a year that he is crying about so much? How would the gentleman increase the percentage more than that 3.3 percent of this little man with $1,200 a year income that he is crying about so much? The figure is 3.3 percent, because we are taking away all his taxes by the Knutson bill. That is why the percentage is small. Do you want to give him a bonus?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Take the $2,000-a-year man. You give him only $84 a year or $7 a month.

Mr. KEAN. I was asking you how you could increase the fellow getting $1,200 a year about whom you are crying so much.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You can increase the exemption so that he would not have to pay any tax.

Mr. KEAN. He does not have to pay anyway under the Knutson bill. The little fellow you are talking about pays no taxes under the Knutson bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The chap making $2,000 a year gets the percentage that I have indicated.

Mr. KEAN. You are talking about the fellow with $1,200 a year income.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am talking about the fellow making $2,000 a year.

Mr. KEAN. Now you are talking about a new one.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No, I said take the fellow with $2,000 a year income. You give him $7 a month relief. That is not much money. He should not have to pay any taxes. Instead of giving the fellow who makes $500,000 a year $5,000 a month more to spend, you should help the person in the lower income bracket. The people in the higher income brackets do not need such relief. This bill is worse than the original bill, H. R. 1.

Under H. R. 1, a man with a $50,000 income had his spendable money increased by 19.7 percent, but under the bill before us today, instead of having an increase in his spendable income of 19.7 percent, he gets an increase of 32½ percent. So as bad as H. R. 1 was, this is a great deal worse.

Take the $100,000-a-year man. Under the original H. R. 1 he got an increase of 34.2 percent, but in the bill under consideration today you are going to give him an increase of 49.3 percent. Oh, yes; they are giving relief where it is needed.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. REEVES. In the case of a man with a $100,000 income, the gentleman understands that in the community-property State he pays an income tax of nearly $13,000 less than in the non-community-property States.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Oh, yes. I appreciate that.

Mr. REEVES. So that a great majority of the reduction which he gets comes from the income-splitting feature, which the gentleman's State adopted last year. So that your $100,000 taxpayer is already safe.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That act in Pennsylvania was declared unconstitutional. You just confirm any statement I have made that all relief is going to the big fellow. It is not only the result of one provision of the bill; it is the result of a combination of all these provisions; adding a little here and a little there as you go on.

Mr. REEVES. I would like to make one more observation, if I may. The majority of that difference results from the income-splitting feature which, as I understand, the gentleman has endorsed in this debate.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I call the committee's attention to the chart on page 71 to verify what I have previously stated with respect to reducing the taxation to nearly the level of the prewar period for those in the very high brackets, and increasing it by several hundred percent in the low-income brackets. The $4,000-a-year man, under the Knutson bill under consideration today, would pay 868.2 percent more taxes than he paid in 1939, before the war; whereas the millionaire would pay only 8.1 percent more. All the figures along the line show that the higher the income bracket the more his percentage of reduction is in comparison with what he paid in 1939. So here, Mr. Chairman, they are trying to reverse the historic principle under which taxes have been levied in the past, particularly under Democratic administrations; the principle of taxation based on ability to pay. That is a sound principle. That is a principle on which this country should operate. Let those pay who can afford to pay—pay their fair share. So this bill is wrong in principle. This House should not, by its vote, sanction a reversal of that principle which I have just mentioned. I cannot subscribe to a measure of this sort. It is unfair.

There are other provisions in the bill. I do not want to take up too much time. But, for instance, if you leave a large estate, if you leave $60,000 to your children, you do not have to pay any Federal tax, but if you leave more than $60,000 you will be taxed on everything you leave over $60,000. That is the present law. What do they do in this bill? Instead of making you pay as you did before you only pay on 50 percent of what you leave over $60,000. Is that relief for the poor? Is that an equitable thing? Giving, according to the Treasury, $245,000,000 more every year to those people who leave more than $60,000 when they die? That is not relief for the needy, Mr. Chairman. That is not relief for the needy. The benefits there go to those who die and leave more than $60,000 to their children or whoever they leave it to.

O, Mr. Chairman, there are lots of other provisions in here. This bill is not going to help those who need it. It is not going to help cut down the high cost of living. It is not going to reduce the inflationary spiral. It is giving the money where it is not needed. It is dictated solely by political considerations, political expediency. It will further devalue the dollar. The dollar is not worth very much now but it is certainly going to be worth less if this proposal should become law.

It is not going to contribute to better relations between labor and management. Union labor leaders know what this bill is doing. Do you think they are going to be less demanding for an increase in wages for the workingman when they know what this bill provides? They will say: "No; we will go on strike." That will retard production. This bill will not help increase production.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is untimely, it is unsound, it is not equitable, it should not pass, and I am certain it will never become law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 28 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. LOVE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 4790, and I shall vote for this legislation. The terms of the present bill are particularly pleasing to me as I do not believe that the same yardstick should be used in measuring a fair tax relief to taxpayers in all brackets. In my opinion, a percentage reduction, although helpful, is not sufficient relief to those in the lower-income groups. Neither do I believe that increased exemptions are sufficient relief to those in upper-income brackets. I firmly believe the total amount of taxes should be cut, not shifted, and exemptions should be increased for all, and that a percentage should be cut from all tax payments.

In February 1947, I introduced H. R. 2171, to increase exemptions to $700 and cut all payments 10 percent. The present bill substantially follows these principles. All exemptions are increased to $600, relieving those of the lower-income groups, in particular. All taxes are cut from 30 to 10 percent, relieving the burden in the upper brackets, in particular, and thereby fostering venture capital, increased production, and additional jobs. The bill also provides additional $600 exemptions for those over 65 years of age and for the blind. Married people are also permitted to split their income for tax purposes as provided in the community-property States. Seventy-two percent of the tax relief in this bill goes to those having net incomes, after exemptions, of less than $4,000.

Due largely to the economy of the Eightieth Congress, we are approaching a sound fiscal policy. We have been cutting Federal expenditures. Incidentally, we have not cut deep enough, in my opinion. It is sound economy to make substantial payments on our national debt and it is sound economy to relieve the wartime tax burdens of our people. The time is at hand to legislate and execute all three of these basic principles.

Continuing the economy measures of the Eightieth Congress, it may be conservatively estimated that the Federal surplus for the fiscal year 1948 will be $8,800,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1949 a surplus of $10,000,000,000 is probable. The present bill would reduce Federal revenue by $7,100,000,000 in fiscal 1949. It follows, therefore, that we could have an actual tax reduction this year by passing H. R. 4790 and also pay approximately $10,000,000,000 toward our national debt during the fiscal years of 1948 and 1949.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, we, as citizens and taxpayers, must be honest and realistic in our approach to the problem of national financing. We must fully realize that we cannot cut our national revenues by a large arbitrary figure and still request and obtain full appropriations for western reclamation and power projects, adequate Federal aid to our public schools which are in great need of funds at this time, and adequate funds for construction of necessary public buildings which many of our communities need desperately.

Last year I voted for the tax-reduction bill. A new issue has arisen this year, however, which completely changes our national financial picture. I refer, of course, to the need to adequately finance necessary features of the Marshall plan in order that we may lay the ground work for a lasting peace throughout the world. I feel that we should make every honest effort to determine the exact cost of our domestic and foreign programs before we arbitrarily cut our national revenues.

And there is another matter which disturbs me greatly. We taxpayers are paying a yearly interest, largely to private financial institutions, of $5,225,000,000 on our public debt. Think how much more good an expenditure of this size could bring if it were channeled in the direction of aid to our schools and development of our resources. It is sound economic practice that we use every possible surplus of Government revenue to retire our huge national debt and eliminate, therefore, this tremendous yearly interest charge.

I strongly favor higher exemptions than H. R. 4790 provides for low-income groups and those living on annuities such as pensions and blind benefits. Equitable taxation reforms which are not included in H. R. 4790 are needed for partnerships and small businesses. The percentage cut on surtaxes should be made more equitable than that presently advocated in H. R. 4790 so that in terms of dollars the increased purchasing power will be placed in the hands of those who need it most, namely, the low-income groups.

The income-tax reduction of $4,000,000,000 as proposed by several Republican Senators is more realistic than the $6,000,000,000 reduction proposed by H. R. 4790. It would be realistic, also, from the standpoint of veto-proof legislation. I shall support a more equitable and workable tax-reduction bill which undoubtedly will result from the House-Senate compromise, and which actually could be made law.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, under the present Democratic tax structure the chief burden of income taxes is on the lower-income group. The Knutson bill, while reducing the burden of all classes of taxpayers, shifts the chief burden to the higher-income group so that those with incomes over $4,000 are in aggregate paying more income taxes than those in the group below $4,000.

Under the present law those with incomes under $4,000 pay $11,987,000,000, while those with incomes over $4,000 pay $9,293,000,000. Under the Knutson bill those with incomes under $4,000 will pay only $7,284,000,000, while those with incomes over $4,000 will pay $7,446,000,000.

This is a well-balanced bill and that is the reason why our friends on the other side of the aisle are finding it so hard to settle on a proposal which will reduce the cost and still be fair to all classes of taxpayers.

The cuts for the low-income group are substantial, and while the percentage cuts in the medium- and higher-income brackets are small, they at least lend some encouragement and hope to those in these brackets upon whom we must rely to provide the jobs which employ the great mass of our people.

I suppose there is not much use in burying dead cats any deeper, but I want to again call your attention to the statement of Leon Keyserling, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers on the Town Meeting of the Air the other night. Keyserling has been reputed to be the author of the fantastic $40-cost-of-living bonus for everyone except those who need it most.

When one of the speakers stated that an increase in corporation taxes would increase prices, Keyserling said that this would be prevented by the price controls which the President had recommended.

Of course this would not mean only selective-price control, but price control for the products of 22,000 corporations.

So, evidently, this proposed corporation tax is part of the pattern for regimentation of our people which the smart boys around the President are trying to put across.

The gentleman from North Carolina—the esteemed former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for whom I have the greatest affection and respect—has suggested that the percentage reduction be cut in half. This would reduce the estimated loss to the Treasury by $1,859,000,000. I wonder if he realizes that $1,314,000,000, or 70 percent, of this reduction would be taken out of the hides of the lower-income group—those whose incomes are under $4,000?

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] has just tried to prove that there is ample capital available for risk investment.

Let us look at the record as supplied by the Department of Commerce. In 1946 out of corporate funds available of $23,600,000,000, only $900,000,000, or about 4 percent, was derived from new investments in their common stocks.

In 1947 out of corporate funds available of $26,000,000,000, only $800,000,000, or about 3 percent, was derived from new investments in their common stocks, and of this amount more than 50 per-

cent was invested in relatively riskless public-utility stocks.

But in this same year, 1946, these corporations borrowed four and one-half billion, while in 1947 they borrowed approximately six billion.

Do you think for a moment that these corporations would have sold bonds and borrowed money from the banks if they could have fulfilled their needs by selling common stocks?

The gentleman from Rhode Island is a good enough businessman to know that this is so.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Is the gentleman questioning the statement I read from the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. KEAN. I am certainly questioning the Secretary's conclusion as I did when he appeared before us.

Mr. FORAND. What the gentleman from Rhode Island said on that score was a quotation from the Secretary of Commerce and if the Secretary of Commerce is wrong then I am wrong.

Mr. KEAN. He is wrong.

Mr. FORAND. I do not think he is wrong.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We should also bear in mind that interest rates are advancing with respect to future capital construction. Your corporations have substantially diminished their liquid assets with respect to cash on hand and Government bonds in order to increase the inventories the Secretary has referred to, in order to partially pay for the expansion in plant which they have already accomplished. Now they move into a tightening credit market, higher interest rates, higher cost of production. I wish I could believe what the Secretary of Commerce has said through the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], but I cannot come to an agreement with his forecast.

Mr. KEAN. Neither can I.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. REEVES. The gentleman made the point that there was a measurable shift in new corporate financing from equity financing, that is, the issuance of common stock, to debt financing. I think it is particularly significant that between 1946 and 1947 there was a drop of from 58-percent equity financing to only 29-percent equity financing in 1947, indicating that the necessary capital for new venture and new investment is not available, and all business is now obliged to resort to debt financing, which is manifestly an unhealthy condition and inflationary.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that the Secretary of Commerce also testified that it is not so much the difficulty of obtaining capital as it is the difficulty of obtaining materials that are in short supply now?

Mr. KEAN. He said that, and it is true in some cases.

Mr. FORAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] based their objections on the impossibility of further cuts in the budget. This is a doctrine of despair.

Every speaker seems to have acknowledged that taxes are too high for every segment of our population. They are too high for the employee trying to support his family in a decent way in the face of the high cost of living.

They are too high for the small businessman, and the junior executive who is trying to set up a competence to protect his family.

They are too high for the well-to-do. There is no reason to be especially sorry for this group, but confiscatory taxes destroy their historical function which is to supply capital to expand business and thus provide more wages.

It has been estimated that it takes from seven to ten thousand dollars of capital to provide one job in industry. This must come from some source. If individuals cannot supply it the only recourse is the Government itself, and you have socialism and all that it implies.

If we are going to take the attitude that it just cannot be done, it is most discouraging for I doubt that we can continue the dynamic economy which has built up our country with a Federal expenditure of $40,000,000,000 a year.

Present taxation is a millstone around the neck of anyone who is trying to get ahead, and cannot help but lower our American standard of living of which we are so proud.

But I am glad that the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from New York have brought out the fact that the key to reasonable taxes is a reduction in Government spending.

If we are going to carry out our many commitments, we must have a powerful United States—a Nation which is economically strong.

I refuse to accept the premise that we cannot under a free competitive system fully develop our resources—both human and material. We must prove to the doubting nations of the world that we have here that system which will bring the greatest welfare to the average man.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, last year in 1946 the Republican leadership in Congress passed a tax-income-reduction bill in an effort to relieve the American taxpayers of about $4,500,000,000 in taxes. The President vetoed the bill, and not quite enough courageous Democrats voted with us Republicans to get the two-thirds majority necessary to pass that tax bill over his veto.

We, who promised relief from these high wartime taxes to the American people in the last campaign and who were prevented from carrying out that promise by the Presidential veto, are back again this year attempting to keep our promise by passing this tax bill, H. R. 4790, that will give the people about $6,000,000,000 in tax relief. As usual, the President is against this bill and is asking the members of his party in the House and Senate to line up solidly against it. We will pass this bill in the House and send it to the Senate. The Senate will pass it with possibly some revisions, and then it will go again to the White House for the President's decision.

Mr. Chairman, the people in the third year after the war are demanding a reduction of the highest taxes they have ever been called upon to pay. We can give the people a $6,000,000,000 tax reduction, balance the budget and have $3,000,000,000 left over to pay on the national debt. If we can cut the $42,000,000,000 budget request of the President for the running expenses of the Government in the next year by $3,000,000,000, we can have more billions for payment on the national debt. If the President would cooperate with the Republican House and Senate, we could cut his request over $3,000,000,000. Of course, it is too much to expect that he will cooperate when we recall that 1 year ago when we attempted to cut the budget by $5,000,000,000 he and his entrenched administrative bureaucrats opposed every reduction we sought to make at that time.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, know that this is a fair, just, and equitable tax bill. Were it not for the pressure of the administration on the Democrat Members of this House, it is my firm belief that they would join almost solidly in support of the measure before us, and I predict when the bill comes back from the Senate and they are placed in a position on the final roll call where they will have to vote for or against tax reduction, that enough of them will vote for this bill to carry it over a Presidential veto. A great majority of the Democrat Members as well as the Republicans, are anxious to give their people tax relief. The greatest obstacle in the way of the Democrat Members of the House, is the effort and the power of the President to prevent them from joining with us to give the people they represent the tax relief this bill offers.

Mr. Chairman, the administration raises the old cry of a year ago that if $6,000,000,000 in tax relief is left in the pockets of the American taxpayers the spending of it will be inflationary. They want to keep this amount of the taxpayers' money and have the Government spend it. How will the Government spend it? The administration intends to give this money to European and other countries. What will these countries do with it? The administration has already planned through the Marshall plan for these foreign countries to spend this money here in the United States buying the grain, food,

farm machinery, fertilizer, and manufactured products, which is more inflationary than to let the taxpayer spend his own money for the food, clothing, doctor, and dental bills, and the things he needs for the comfort of his own family.

To deny the taxpayer who earns this money by the sweat of his brow the right to spend it himself, or save it for a rainy day by claiming such use of it by him would be inflationary, and on the other hand, take the taxpayers' money and give it to foreign countries to spend in this country, which is twice as inflationary, is a policy of sacrifice and punishment against the American people never before attempted in the history of this Nation by any administration.

WHAT THIS BILL DOES

Mr. Chairman, this bill raises the exemption on every taxpayer and his dependents from the present exemption of $500 to $600. The man with a wife and two children will get an extra $100 exemption on each of the four. While this will benefit every taxpayer, over 90 percent of the benefit in this exemption raise will go to those whose net incomes are $5,000 or less.

The raising of these exemptions alone will free 6,000,000 small taxpayers from paying any taxes whatsoever.

The taxpayer who, after taking these exemptions, has a net of $1,000 or less on which he must pay taxes will then get a 30-percent tax reduction.

First. He gets a large percentage in relief by the $100 extra exemption and then he gets a 30-percent relief in the amount upon which he must pay. This will give probably a general 40-percent relief to the little taxpayers who pay on any amount up to $1,000. There are 25,000,000 taxpayers in this group in the low-income brackets who will get this big reduction in addition to over 7,000,000 in the lowest-income group who will pay no taxes whatsoever. This high percentage rate of reduction for those in the low-income bracket is an attempt to give them much greater relief because we realize that they need greater relief to help meet the present rise in the cost of living.

Second. The taxpayer, after exemptions, who pays on a net of from $1,000 to $1,396 will receive in addition to his added $100 per capita exemption a sliding scale reduction of from 30 percent to 20 percent. This will give substantial relief to 13,000,000 taxpayers.

Third. The taxpayer who, after exemptions, will pay on a net of $1,396 up to $4,000, will receive in addition to the increased per capita exemption of $100, a reduction of 20 percent. There are 7,000,000 taxpayers in this group.

Fourth. Taxpayers who, after exemptions, pay in excess of $4,000 will receive a reduction of 20 percent on the first $4,000, and above that in earnings, only 10 percent. There are 2,000,000 taxpayers in this group. Even though this group is relatively small as compared with the other groups these 2,000,000 taxpayers will pay 44 percent of the total income tax of the Nation. And, out of the over $6,000,000,000 of tax relief provided in this bill this group that pays 44 percent, only receives a reduction of 28 percent of the over $6,000,000,000, while those in the lower brackets will get 72 percent of the over $6,000,000,000 in reduction which they can use and spend as they like.

This bill also gives great relief to those over 65 years of age, as follows: Those 65 years of age will get an added exemption of $600, making a total exemption of $1,200.

This should wipe out the tax on many of the school teachers of the Nation who are now paying either taxes on their salaries, or taxes on their annuities.

It practically wipes out all tax against the blind of the Nation by raising exemptions higher for them than any others.

It provides for married people to divide their incomes and will give relief to a great many married couples.

Mr. Chairman, yet, when the figures prove that those in the lower brackets get 72 percent of the reduction, yet the President when he gets ready to veto this bill will most likely make the same charge that he made against a similar bill a year ago, that this bill benefits the rich and penalizes the low-income group. Of course, there was no truth in his statement a year ago, and will be none if he repeats it as to this bill.

Those in the highest brackets are allowed a 10-percent reduction because we Members of the Congress and everyone who has thought tax legislation through realizes that you cannot take from 50 to 75 percent in taxes away from those who must replace worn-out machinery and keep their machinery repaired and in good condition year after year, without finally throwing millions of laboring men out of employment. They must have this encouragement now to renew equipment and expand plants if we are to keep 60,000,000 people employed. This 10 percent which will encourage risk capital to be spent, is probably worth more to the employees in the lower-income groups by way of insuring them employment than the big tax reduction we give them in the beginning of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a political tax bill like the $40-a-vote bill offered by the President, which is so worthless that neither the Democrat Members of the House nor Senate have attempted to substitute it for this bill. This is an American equity tax bill seeking to push the economy of the United States Government forward for continued employment and greater production. This is not an inflationary tax bill. It is a tax bill to combat inflation. Greater production is the only real cure for inflation. This bill will greatly increase production. And, as we greatly increase production, more wealth is made against which these lower tax rates will operate, and by the expansion and creation of greater production and greater wealth the passage of this tax bill will not likely cut $1,000,000,000 out of the revenue of the Government, while at the same time it will give $6,000,000,000 relief from these high wartime taxes to the taxpayers who are carrying this terrific load.

Mr. Chairman, after the last World War when the Republicans came into power when a depression was on, they passed a tax-reduction bill every year for three successive years. Every time they reduced the tax levies business expanded so much that they collected more money with the result that they balanced the budget and reduced the national debt by a billion dollars a year for 10 successive years. Sound policies written into this tax bill will not only give the people the relief they seek but will continue employment at a high peak, the production of wealth at a high peak, will expand business and probably bring in more extra revenue at these lower rates than the $6,000,000,000 in relief we insist the American people shall have in 1948.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot support the tax bill before us.

Inflation—that is the No. 1 problem in America today.

Inflation is the monster that is eating up wages and savings.

How to pay for milk, meat, bread, rent, and still pay the doctor and buy a pair of shoes is the constant worry of the mothers and fathers living on limited and low incomes.

If prices are allowed to continue unchecked, no one will escape the final debacle, not even the corporations which today are enjoying profits 67 percent higher than they were during the peak war year of 1943.

Mr. Chairman, what have the Members of this body done to protect the living standards of the people they represent? Whistled in the wind, sung lullabies, or offered poison—unadulterated poison—sugar-coated, of course. That is what this tax bill is—poison, sugar-coated.

The Knutson bill will cut your taxes—that is the sugar.

The poison the sugar covers is that the bill is economically unsound and socially immoral.

We cannot whistle away our $258,000,000,000 war debt, the debt we incurred to remain freemen.

We ought to pay that debt out of swollen profits today and not out of the mouths of men tomorrow.

We cannot pay off the war debt and at the same time cut taxes the way this bill proposes we cut them.

We must balance our budget if we are not to further accelerate the inflationary spiral. And it is nonsense to talk of balancing proposed tax cuts with cuts in the budget.

How can one talk of reducing the budget, 79 percent of which directly reflects the cost of the war, the effects of the war, and our efforts to prevent a future war, a budget which leaves only 21 percent for national housekeeping? To cut this 21 percent would retard the expansion and development of our economy and would seriously threaten a reduction in our national income.

Of course, everyone wants his taxes cut, but not if taxes are cut in such a way that it places an unbearable burden

tomorrow on the shoulders of those least able to carry it.

And that is what this tax bill will do.

There are many ways taxes can be cut. The 10–20–30 plan is not the only one. Taxes can be cut for the benefit of those who have the most or those who have the least.

Historically it has been the American principle to tax according to the ability to pay.

Are the low-income groups who are being priced out of the durable market and who are struggling with the cost of food, clothing, and rent helped in this tax bill before us?

Oh, yes; they are given a few dollars relief, but those in the high brackets are given a windfall.

Since I fall in the high-income bracket that ought to seem attractive, but my common sense tells me that what is not good for the country as a whole cannot, in the long run, be good for me either.

If we continue as we are going, our economy is in danger of pulling apart. As prices rise, walls are built between the producer and the buyer.

How to keep the buyer in the market and pull prices down?

That is the answer we should be seeking.

The President has outlined a tax program that would give relief without jeopardizing our ability to balance the budget or pay off our war debt.

I introduced a bill along these same lines in the special session. I would have given a cost-of-living credit of $100 to every taxpayer and each of his dependents.

My bill would restore a tax on excess profits. Restoration of the excess-profits tax would hold Government revenues up where they are needed to keep our house in order.

This tax is not punitive, indeed, it is highly desirable. It is a positive step toward controlling runaway prices and a positive step toward saving business—big and little. Federal Reserve indexes show that the volume of physical production is 20 percent below wartime level. Profits are not based today on increased production but on unfair and inequitable prices. Inflated prices if allowed to continue will destroy the savings of the people and business itself.

If we needed an excess-profits tax during the war to control inflation, how much more do we need it now? An excess-profits tax now would go a long way to finance the Marshall plan of aid to Europe, to pay off the debt, and to provide the basis for reducing the tax on low-income groups which are suffering most from inflation.

My bill would have also removed excise taxes on telephone and telegraph and on transportation of property and persons—taxes which are discriminatory against the consumers of the West, and even ruinous to many businesses.

It is all very well to talk of stimulating management incentive and piling up investment capital, but how much stimulating and how much piling up of capital do we have to have, and at what cost?

Surely we must think, too, just a little about keeping the consumer in the buying market.

Increasing taxes on swollen corporation profits would remove the incentive to charge all the market can bear.

The President's proposal of a cost-of-living credit of $40 for every taxpayer and each of his dependents is an honest, straight, across-the-board tax reduction—with the same amount of tax relief for everybody.

Surely the rich man does not need more tax relief than the poor man at this time. And the more money we release in the high-income brackets the more we add to inflation.

The profit incentive is very important but the incentive to keep on living is also important. I cannot support the Knutson tax bill. I hope that the recommittal motion will contain basically the President's recommendations.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the Republican tax bill before the Congress today is the ARP. It will revitalize America. It adheres to the principle that free men may work and toil, earn, save and have, and be unhampered by unreasonable demands from their Government. It will restore a proper incentive for Americans to think, to dream, to invent, to build, to dare, and to undertake. It promises a reward for those who have the courage to take a risk. It means more enterprise, more production, more jobs, more of the products of civilization at reasonable cost, more revenue for the Government, and more take-home pay for all the workers of the land.

This bill is the only proposal that will bring tax relief to all of the American people. It is an honest bill. It does exactly what it purports to do.

All citizens are entitled to fair and equitable treatment. The sons of the poor and rich alike fought and died in the recent war. The honest and ethical thing to do is to grant a proportionate tax reduction to all the taxpayers of the Nation. This the Knutson bill does.

It calls for the most generous reduction for those people in the lowest income-tax bracket. We are told that the average American family consists of the taxpayer, his wife, and two children. The Republican bill would increase the personal exemptions for such an average family by $400. In addition to that, it calls for a 30-percent tax reduction for those taxpayers whose surtax net income is a thousand dollars or less. In this group are found half of the taxpayers of America.

At the present time a married taxpayer in a non-community-property State whose income is $10,000 pays a tax of $2,640 annually. If that same man lived in a community-property State, half his income would belong to his wife and the total tax paid by the two of them would be $2,000, or $640 less. Is that fair? Should it be corrected? This bill corrects the inequity which now exists between the community-property States and the non-community-property States.

Among our older citizens, some now receive a retirement check that is tax free. Others pay taxes on their retirement checks. Still others receive no retirement check and continue to work and pay taxes to pay somebody else's retirement check which is tax free. The pending proposal gives an additional $600 personal exemption to all persons over 65 years of age. It is especially helpful to the older person who still must work to eat. It is sound; it is fair—and no other tax proposal carries it.

The approximately 250,000 blind taxpayers in this Nation will, under the Republican proposal, have their personal tax exemption raised from $1,000 to $1,200.

It is tax relief for all. It does bring more relief to the poor than to the citizen a little better off, but it is not of exclusive benefit to any one income group. It might be argued that the handful of extremely wealthy people in America need no tax reduction, but it can never be argued that the great middle class does not need tax reduction. The Republican bill is the only one that brings a noticeable tax reduction to that group.

Businessmen, office workers, skilled artisans, doctors, editors, leading farmers, and like citizens who are neither rich nor poor are the group who make America what it is. America is the land of the middle class. In every community in this Nation it is they who carry on, managing and supporting our schools, helping our churches, the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, and every other worth-while thing. The Republican tax bill is the only one which would bring an equitable reduction in taxes to the middle class.

A tax-reduction bill can be given to the country and we will still be able to make a substantial payment on the national debt. The Treasury Department contends otherwise, but it seems to have a set of figures to justify any argument that it wishes to make. Last year the Treasury Department made an error of approximately six and one-half billion dollars in its estimate of the national income. Other estimating authorities revised their figures following the income-tax payments in March 1947. But the Treasury stuck by its erroneous figures until after Congress had adjourned.

High taxes create an atmosphere that invites excessive spending. Tax reduction is an essential part of budget reduction. The objectives of tax reduction are greater production, more goods at less cost, more jobs, more take-home pay, and a greater incentive for new enterprises, new plans, and new jobs for the citizens of America. This tax proposal will relieve our citizens of part of their wartime taxes; it will provide incentive capital and will be the structure for new dreams, new plans, new undertakings, more jobs, greater production and more good things in life within reach of all. The payment of the national debt requires, more than anything else, a strong, vigorous, forward-looking economy that will produce more from which taxes can be paid to get America's economic job done. Unless we have tax reduction, the sources of our private enterprise will dry up and socialism will be upon us.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not take the well of this House to try

to bring any light to the experts of the Ways and Means Committee on the subject of taxation. I do not consider that I am qualified to bring them figures which they do not have; but I do take the floor to express the way this tax problem looks to me. I have listened attentively to the debate and I have read the different tables which were printed in the committee hearings and the report. To me this problem is not so much a matter of percentage or a matter of charts as it is a matter of human beings. When I think of a tax bill—and I can modestly say that I approach it as a man who is in the upper income tax brackets, having business interests outside of my Congressional income—I think of it from the standpoint of the 300,000 people in my district and the maintenance of their standard of living. We often use these phrases without reducing to the terms of whether a family of four will have two bottles of milk delivered this morning or only one bottle of milk; whether they will be able to eat three pounds of hamburger meat this week or no hamburger meat; and then I think of most of the people in my district who receive $3,000 a year or less. I will take the figures from your own chart of 52,000,000 taxpayers in the United States, and tell you that 40,000,000 of those taxpayers make less than $3,000 per year. The families of those taxpayers have less than $3,000 a year to spend for food and clothing and medical attention; and I am not going to be facetious and refer to the recreational opportunities of life because when they pay for food, clothing, and medical attention they have a deficit at the end of the year and they dip into their savings to maintain even the semblance of a decent standard of living. I said semblance, not a real standard of living.

If the President's proposal of a $40 credit to each dependent were given to a family of four making $3,000 a year it would mean it would eliminate from the tax roll approximately 8,000,000 families or 10,000,000 taxpayers. That would mean they would have $160 a year more with which to buy shoes for their children, to buy food for their children to eat, possibly to get a little dental work done and have some medical attention. That is what it would mean, and therefore I unhesitatingly state that when you get through with all of your charts and all of your figures you come back to the proposition: Do you want to give to a family of four, the families of 40,000,000 American taxpayers, the difference between a $2,520 a year standard of living—and I will explain that figure in a minute—and a $2,680 standard of living?

Let me explain that. The family with $3,000 income in June of 1946 can buy today with the 26-percent increase in the cost of living $2,520 worth of food, clothing, and medicine. In other words, that family has already received a reduction in their standard of living of 26 percent. Those figures are unassailable and cannot be questioned. So when we give them a $40 credit per person per family of 4, we do not give them the standard of living they had in June 1946, when the OPA price controls were removed. We merely raise the actual wages or actual purchasing power in terms of commodities from $2,520, plus $160, up to $2,680 per year. In other words, they are $320 per year behind their standard of living of June 1946.

Mr. Chairman, remember that applies to 40,000,000 taxpayers out of the 52,000,000. So I say that I am for giving tax relief where it is needed, where it means food to eat, clothes to wear, medicine to cure the sick. I want to make it very plain at this time that I am not for a tax reduction from the over-all tax income figure. I believe that the over-all taxes should remain at their present total and that such relief as is given from a humane standpoint to the 40,000,000 taxpayers should be assessed in the higher brackets, and I am talking about myself when I say that, and the other 12,000,000 taxpayers who earn over $3,000 per year, I think they should make up the difference and any surplus that accrues therefrom should be paid on our national debt. That is the only way you are going to stop this inflationary rise.

Do not worry about inflation when you give a family of four another bottle of milk a day. Do not worry about inflation when you allow them to have meat four times a week instead of three times a week. The thing that you should be worried about is the maintenance in America of a decent family standard of living. You can save money for those in the high-income brackets, you can take it out of the living standards of the poor, and you will widen the gulf between the 40,000,000 people and the 12,000,000 people. May I point out to you that when that gulf becomes wide enough the middle ground vanishes and you have economic chaos on the one hand and over-privileged classes on the other. That naturally brings about a condition that was brought about in the nations of Europe, when the middle ground vanished and the people, because of economic desperation, turned to the man on horseback, the man in the public square, the man on the soap box who offered them the palliative of communism or some other form of totalitarian government.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman comes from California?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman today has the benefit of the community-property law?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. Would not the gentleman give to the common-law States the same benefits?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad the gentleman brought up that point because I intended to speak on that point. I do not believe there is any moral argument against extending to the other 37 States besides the 11 that have it at the present time, the same split income tax privilege. I say that as a man coming from a community-property State. However, I did not pass the law. It was there. It is a hold-over from the Napoleonic code which all the Spanish areas, such as Texas and California, had at the time they became States in the Union. I certainly agree with the gentleman that the split income privilege should be extended to every State in the Union. I might point out, however, that in return for that split income privilege certain laws which apply to property relations between husband and wife, and husband and wife and children, occur in the State of California, which I think might well be also extended in other States for the protection of the American family which is, after all, the basic element in our civilization.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman knows that the largest part of the increase in benefits given to the upper income group under this bill is due to the community-property provision.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I do not know that. I have heard the figure that approximately $800,000,000 relief would be given to the other 37 States. I think that that relief should be given to them. I think it is just a question of moral equity, of adjusting an inequitable tax situation, which has existed for many years.

Mr. KEAN. As the gentleman knows, that benefit goes to the group of married men with children. It does not benefit anybody unless he has an income of $4,450.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There are many points in the tax law, of course, which apply only to certain brackets. In all fairness, I think that the split income tax privilege should go to the people in the higher brackets in other States, the same as in the community-property States, and I will apply the same principle to them that I applied to the relief of the low income bracket families. I believe that that amount which is reduced from tax income should, in turn, be levied against excess profits, in the high corporate income brackets. About 22,000 corporations would be affected by such a change, I understand.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that he favors this tax reduction for these non-community-property States. By the same token, if the Congress does that, does the gentleman not think that they should extend some tax reduction to the middle class of persons, for instance, the widow or widower, who have no one with whom to split their income, toward adjusting all the burdens of the household?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, that is a complication which might be taken care of by your honorable committee. I have no particular thought on that subject. It would introduce an additional principle which I do not think at present is in the law in the community-property States.

Mr. CURTIS. I think if you examine the pending bill it does that very thing, and that if you try to do equity to all the groups you will find it most difficult to cut down the cost of the bill. When you deal with 50,000,000 taxpayers and Fed-

eral revenue amounting to 45, 50, or 55 billion dollars, if you are going to extend equity to all the groups you are going to have to deal with some big figures.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly agree with the gentleman that it is a complicated matter, but as I said in the beginning of my talk, I did not expect to bring a great deal of light to the members of the committee who have studied this law. But I wanted to give my own opinion in all honesty.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Under the bill we are now considering, in excess of 52,000,000 of our taxpayers have incomes of less than $5,000 on which they receive tax reductions of $4,691,000,000. In view of what the gentleman has stated about the need for increased funds for that group under $5,000, with which I have no disagreement whatever——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Under $3,000.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The figure I gave, sir, was under $5,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I see.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thought the gentleman would have no objection to those people obtaining that relief.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No objection at all. I want them to get every bit of relief which is put in the Knutson bill and more, too. I would like to see that relief given strictly on the basis of the need of human consumption for the necessities of life, that is all.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Excepting the need for that $4,691,000,000 for those under $5,000, and the community-property provision, and a little bit to equalize those who are widows or widowers with one dependent, perhaps, you practically get all the benefit included in the Knutson bill; the gentleman is in favor of it. I think we have really got a very good argument for the Knutson bill if you include those items.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly want to tell the gentleman that so far as the Knutson bill goes toward relief in the lower-income brackets that I certainly will go along with it. The only place that I would part with him would be in the fact that it does not go as far as the President's proposal, and in the overall reduction, which would not allow a payment on the public debt. I think it is just a prime business principle that each individual should pay his debts out of his income just as soon as he can. This principle should apply to our Nation also.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Under the President's proposal of allowing $40 reduction to each, the aggregate reduction would be somewhere around $3,000,000,000 for the taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000. Under the Knutson bill that total is $4,600,000,000-odd. Therefore, under the bill we are now considering there is substantially more dollar relief for individuals with incomes of less than $5,000 than there is under the proposal of the President to give $40 to each taxpayer and dependent.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The figure the gentleman used of $5,000 is different from the figure I used of $3,000. I applied my reasoning to those with incomes of $3,000 or less. It may be true that what the gentleman says about $5,000 or less is right. I cannot argue with him on that. I applied my figures to $3,000 or less because out of the 52,000,000 taxpayers in the United States 40,000,000 are making $3,000 or less. That is the point I made.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Under the $3,000 limit there are 38,000,000 people. Under the Knutson bill their saving will be $2,900,000,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Which would be less than the $40 tax credit application to people of that income bracket.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask where the so-called middle class comes into this picture? What salaries do they get? Is it $3,000 to $12,000, or $4,000 to $10,000? Are not they in the majority?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If I understand the gentleman right, he wants to know about the middle class. I consider the middle class as among the 40,000,000 taxayers. I do not judge the middle class by the income brackets; I judge the middle class by the 40,000,000 taxpayers out of the 52,000,000, which is a preponderant majority, and which I think includes people such as our firemen, policemen, school teachers, the little professional men, the wage earners in the factories that produce the wealth of America, and their wives and their children. Eighty percent of the people of the United States I include in the bracket under $3,000 per year.

May I ask the gentleman if he would not rather see a family of four get $160 relief than have the percentage of relief which the Knutson bill will give him in the bracket he is in.

Mr. NICHOLSON. In answer to the gentleman, may I say that all I know——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is a simple question. I know the gentleman will be glad to answer it yes or no.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I cannot answer it yes or no. All I know is that the middle class of the people are the people who pay the taxes in this country. Under this bill, as I see it, we middle-class people are getting the advantage of it. The poor pay in proportion, yes. There are so many of them, and we will always have them. There are only a few rich people, but there are so many of us middle-class people. That is where we are protecting them. That is what I think we are doing. I am asking the gentleman if he can give me any figures on it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has had figures. He can read my speech tomorrow and he will see that the 40,000,000 taxpayers I speak of who subsist on less than $3,000 a year need the $160 a year more than the gentleman needs the reduction this bill will give him in his tax bracket, or that I would get in my tax bracket.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I understand the gentleman's argument, he proposes to rob Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That depends. If the gentleman speaks of robbing the man in the high-income bracket to feed the children of the people under $3,000 a year of annual income, the children that grow up to be the soldiers who fight the battles to preserve this Nation, yes, I will be glad to rob Mr. Rich Peter to pay Mr. Poor Paul, so his children can have an adequate diet and adequate medical attention.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am a little hard of hearing. Will the gentleman repeat that?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I merely started to say that I hope I am not taking too much time.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will yield the gentleman more time since he is making such an interesting statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentlemen on my side have not asked me to leave the well of the House as yet. I will do so if they ask me, or I may be glad to take advantage of the gentleman's kind offer.

Mr. KNUTSON. We have some right to hear the gentleman even if they do not want to hear him. Besides, the gentleman is making an interesting statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I am sure the gentleman would be interested in my remarks.

Mr. KNUTSON. Just what was the gentleman's reply about "robbing Peter to pay Paul"?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the gentleman would like to have a full answer on that. There are 12,000,000 taxpayers above the $3,000 bracket. I will select the classification of a man who makes $100,000 a year. He gets approximately an $18,000 reduction in his taxes. Under the present law he has a tax of $55,000 and under the Knutson bill as I understand it he will have a tax of roughly $36,000. Now I would gladly take from that gentleman some of the $18,000—not all of it, but some of the $18,000—benefit which he gets under the gentleman's bill and distribute it at the rate of $40 per person, thus affecting 40,000,000 families in America who are under the $3,000 per year annual income. If the gentleman says that that is "robbing Peter to pay Paul," then I say that I am perfectly willing to do a little robbing of that kind.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that if Jim Pendergast knew that any member of his party——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope the gentleman will not get political when we are engaged in an economic discussion.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that if Jim Pendergast knew that any member of his party was increasing the price of votes from $2 to $40, he would roll over in his grave?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was hoping that the gentleman would not get political.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not getting political. I am merely making an observation. I think we must be practical.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would not be unkind enough to bring up the name of Joe Pew and some of the other sponsors of the gentleman's party.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would be glad to bring up Joe Pew's name.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would not want to associate the gentleman with some of the fine men who finance the gentleman's party and who under the gentleman's bill will get the highest take-home percentage of anyone in America.

Mr. KNUTSON. I deny that statement, and if the gentleman would read the bill he would not make that statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I did not say percentage of relief but I said percentage of take-home pay, so let the gentleman correct that in tomorrow's RECORD if he wishes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I think that the middle-class people in the United States pay the bill. I do not believe that any middle-class person objects to taking care of the poor. Furthermore, we middle-class people have fought this war that you are talking about. I was in it and my two children were in it and that is all that they had to give, and yet we are willing to take care of the poor people that you are talking about. It is the great middle class that is in this picture.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman wants to identify himself with the 40,000,000 taxpayers, that is perfectly all right with me. I feel that they are honorable people. I feel that they are the ones who are in need and that they should have more help than the people in the upper-income brackets. I am sure my friend is in that bracket because I know that his salary as a Congressman raises him into the 12,000,000-taxpayer class out of the 52,000,000. Although the gentleman may be middle class in other ways, he is not middle class in his income earning.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I want the gentleman from California to understand that I share with him the desire to give greater benefits to the people in the lowest-income tax brackets. In other words, proportionately they should share more in that relief for the simple reason that they are greatly the more in need of it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. I am glad the gentleman takes that position and I am sure that he will vote for the recommittal motion in order to achieve that purpose.

Mr. GEARHART. I wonder if the gentleman will remain as firm in that conviction in the light of my further inquiries. Of course, I don't know what the motion to recommit is to contain. I do not want to foreclose myself the opportunity.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hope the gentleman does not get too complicated in his tax knowledge. I have heard him make some wonderful speeches on this floor on the theory of taxation. Frankly, I have not been able to follow him, and I do not think the Members on his side have been able to follow him as far as supporting his ideas on tax matters is concerned, but I will be glad to listen to the gentleman's question.

Mr. GEARHART. With that prelude, for which I thank the gentleman—for a part, at least—I would like to comment upon the gentleman's statement of a moment ago in which you stated that you would cut down the tax benefits of certain groups in the higher brackets and credit the money saved in that way to the poorer people in the lower brackets.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. GEARHART. I was wondering if the Dingell bill, the President's proposals in legislative form, is not subject to the same critcism that you level upon the Knutson bill. Would you not take the $40 cost-of-living credit from John D. Rockefeller and Henry Ford, Jr., and the many big taxpayers like them, and spread it among the poor people at the other end of the tax rolls?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. My understanding of the President's proposal was that John D. Rockefeller would be allowed $40 credit on his tax bill.

Mr. GEARHART. You, it would seem, are willing to grant this cost-of-living credit to John D. Rockefeller, and others like him. Would it not be better to give the rich less and the poor more, as would the Knutson bill under its 30-, 20-, and 10-percent formula?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not follow the gentleman. I am surprised to hear the gentleman's opinion of the Knutson bill. He certainly did not speak today in defense of the Knutson bill but on his own economic theories, which may or may not be right. But I believe in a straight-across-the-board credit to John D. Rockefeller and also to the man who is working in the rubber factory or the steel factory in my district. When you get into the higher brackets, I feel that in the higher brackets a graduated tax, according to ability to pay, is certainly equitable from all moral standpoints, because it takes from the surplus of those people. It does not take from their standard of living or their necessities of life. I am willing to have John D. Rockefeller have $40 credit on his exemption, along with the worker in my district.

Mr. GEARHART. That is because it is so denominated in the bond, as they say in Shakespeare—in the Dingell bill, in this instance. I have just one thought in my mind upon which I would like to have the gentleman's opinion. I am not indulging in any invidious comments on the gentleman's position. I am merely seeking enlightenment. I am wondering about some of the comments the gentleman has made and I really would like to have his views because I value them. In the Dingell bill the $40 deduction is denominated a "cost-of-living credit." The theory behind it is that the cost of living has gone up, and that it hurts the people in the bottom brackets the most. If I understand you correctly you want to give each of them a $40 credit to help them meet these increased costs.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now, the gentleman realizes that the cost of living has gone up 26 percent.

Mr. GEARHART. Oh, I am assuming that. But let us not lead ourselves up a blind alley.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Well, the gentleman said it was a theory. It is an acknowledged fact.

Mr. GEARHART. I quite agree, it is a fact. I am now endeavoring to point out that the $40 deduction is granted on the theory that it is a cost-of-living credit, on the ground that these people at the bottom are poor and are in dire need of relief; that they should have, for a family of four, $160 additional spending power. That is true?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has already said that he agrees with that principle.

Mr. GEARHART. I am not disagreeing with it. Let us assume that, and pass on. That credit you are speaking of is needed by this group.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think so.

Mr. GEARHART. But there is another group that needs it more than any of those in the lowest income brackets. I am referring to the 19,500,000 gainfully employed who earn so little that they are not on the income tax rolls at all. Now what does the Dingell bill do for them?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In just a moment. Of course the status of the people who do not pay any taxes under the Knutson bill or under the President's bill is not changed by either bill. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. GEARHART. I know that, but I also know that the Knutson bill is a tax reduction bill and it only reduces taxes for people who pay taxes; but the President's, or the Dingell bill, as we call it, is more than that. It is a cost-of-living credit relief bill. It is supposed to afford a special benefit to people because of the rise in the cost of living. If you are dealing with the cost-of-living hardship from which the poor taxpayer suffers, I ask you, Why should you not do something for the 19,500,000 who are suffering far more than the group for which you are now pleading?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be glad to join with the gentleman in doing something for that group. I can only say to the gentleman that I have no power. I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee. If the gentleman will secure the help of his colleagues and bring out a bill to do something for those people, I will be glad to join with the gentleman. I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The answer, of course, to the question of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] is that we are discussing, and the Democrats are attempting to defeat, a tax bill. The Ways and Means Committee, however, has nothing to do with a relief bill. The gentleman is talking about relief. That goes to a different committee of the Congress.

Mr. GEARHART. I hesitate to inject myself again, but the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has placed his finger upon the fundamental difference between the two bills. One, the Dingell bill, is a relief bill and the other, the Knutson bill, is a tax-reduction bill.

The Dingell bill falls far short of granting relief to those who are most in need of it, while the Knutson bill scientifically reaches the objective it was designed to achieve.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The proposition of giving relief to those who are in need of relief is something this Congress has acted on since 1933. We have always given help where help was needed and we will do so again.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I appreciate the generosity of the chairman of the committee in extending my time far beyond that which I requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has consumed 31 minutes.

The Chair wishes to state at this time that the majority side has now consumed 3 hours and 24 minutes; the minority side 3 hours and 39 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support the Knutson bill, H. R. 4790, which provides for badly needed tax reductions. The Knutson bill is well developed and it is fair. It should be enacted into law without delay.

I have just completed my first year of service on the Committee on Ways and Means and consequently I do not have at my command first-hand recollections of the experience of the committee in the handling of the President's estimates of revenue. I do have many recollections of the President's estimates as presented during debate on the House floor, and I have very strong recollections of the use made of the President's estimates of revenue last year to discourage passage of the Knutson bills, H. R. 1 and H. R. 3950. I have always favored conservative estimates of revenue, but I do not favor the use of overconservative estimates for the purpose of prolonging a tax schedule that is grinding the wheels of industry down to a stop. I think it is important to judge the present estimates of revenue for the fiscal year 1949 by the record of like estimates for recent years and because of the abnormal and unpredictable expansion of our wartime industry in the early years of World War II, I have limited my comparison of such estimates with actual collections to the last 5 years.

The President's first estimate of revenue for the fiscal year 1944 was $33,081,000,000, whereas actual collections were $44,149,000,000. In other words, the President's estimate was off 25.07 percent. For the fiscal year 1945, the President's first estimate of revenue was $40,769,000,000 and actual collections proved to be $46,457,000,000, an error of 12.25 percent. For the fiscal year 1946 the President's first estimate was $41,255,000,000 and actual collections $43,037,000,000, an error of 4.14 percent. For the fiscal year 1947, the President's first estimate was $31,513,000,000 and actual collections $43,259,000,000, an error of 27.16 percent. For the fiscal year 1948, the President's first estimate made in January 1947 was $37,730,000,000 and the latest revision of the estimate for the current fiscal year ending next June 30 is $45,210,000,000, or an error by the President of 16.55 percent. The average error made by the President for the last 5 years is 17.23 percent. If we apply the President's average percentage underestimate of revenues to his first estimate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, it would increase estimated revenues for the next fiscal year by $7,663,000,000.

I do not predict a definite percentage of error in the President's estimates. I am giving you the foregoing information to counteract the apparent determined effort of the President and certain Democratic Members of Congress to use these underestimates of revenue as a leverage for forcing the further extension of wartime tax rates.

In addition to the underestimate of revenues, I have witnessed during the past year a determined effort by certain Democratic Members of Congress to prevent any reduction in expenditures below estimates. Furthermore, we have heard on this floor during the current debate charges by senior Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means that little or no reduction in expenditures below budget estimates can be achieved by the Eightieth Congress. The underestimation of revenues and the preaching of a policy of futility in the matter of reducing expenditures have for their common purpose the continuation of the New Deal program of spend and spend and tax and tax regardless of the possible disastrous effect of high taxation on agriculture, business, and industry.

High taxation has already helped to produce dangerous trends in our domestic economy. There has seldom been a time when these trends have been more dangerous and more manifest.

For a healthy agriculture we must preserve above all else a good home market maintained by full employment and the ability to buy enough food to maintain a good American diet.

Jobs and full employment mean much to me. I listened with interest to the discussion of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who just preceded me, and I think he will agree with me that it is quite important to keep the wheels of industry turning, and jobs available for all who need them.

Full employment can be maintained only if the wheels of business and industry are kept turning by the investment of new money and especially the use of new money as risk capital. An examination of table No. 7 on page 14 of the committee report shows a trend to bonded indebtedness carrying fixed interest obligations and some reduction in preferred stocks and a sharp reduction in common stocks. There has in fact been an inadequate supply of risk capital notwithstanding unprecedented demand for goods. There has also been a dangerous reduction in the net purchases by individuals and an enforced reliance of business and industry upon life insurance companies, commercial banks, and mutual savings banks for the purchase of new securities. There is shown also an increase in the percentage invested in public utilities as compared with investments in industrials. To me this indicates an unwillingness of investors to invest venture capital in industrials to the extent we need new capital in these industrials if we are to provide jobs and increase our industrial production to the extent needed.

The dangerous shrinkage in net purchases of new corporate securities by individuals cannot be charged entirely to any one factor. It is more likely to be the result of a combination of factors such as the drying up of individual savings by those who customarily invest their money in venture capital and by the discouragement and fear of loss that goes hand in hand with the President's threat of penalizing corporations. With a sellers' market and a backlog of waiting orders and unsatisfied demand for new goods, it is little short of amazing that adequate venture capital has not been forthcoming. The low level of individual investments in new capital and especially in venture capital is literally driving business and industry into the camp of large investors and away from the great body of small investors who have contributed so much to the health of our domestic economy in years gone by. I commend rather than condemn the large investors for supplying the needs for new capital as they have supplied them in this crisis, but I deplore conditions that have the effect of driving the great body of middle-income earners of our Nation out of business and industry in this way. Such concentration of our business and industry in the hands of large investors will seriously weaken the economic health of our Nation. High individual income taxation has contributed to this trend and the constant threat of warfare against the corporations has disturbed their ability to secure venture capital when they need it so badly to provide jobs and to produce goods to meet our needs.

I was interested in Dr. George Gallup's analysis that appeared in the Iowa newspapers of Wednesday, January 14, 1947, showing that heavy taxation is blamed by the British for low initiative. The British Institute of Public Opinion asked this question: "What do you think is the main reason why many people are not prepared to work harder than they are doing at the present time?" The high level of taxation was given as the principal reason by one-fourth of those who expressed an opinion and this factor was given by more people than any other. While the British income-tax rates have been higher than the American rates, our people have other kinds of taxes such as State and city taxes and on a per capita basis the Americans pay more in all forms of taxes than the British. Incentive is, in fact, a strong point in national productivity in any country operating under a system of free enterprise.

In the recent report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Americans were shown to have cut their savings operations in 1947 by $3,600,000,000 under 1946. This figure was reached by the world staff of the Associated Press by deducting consumer expenditures from disposable income. Disposable income in effect is income after taxes, and the difference between consumer expenditures

and disposable income each year presumably is saved.

We must modify our tax structure and our attitude toward business and industry if we are to maintain a sound competitive private-enterprise system. If we fail, these trends can precipitate our Nation's plunge into socialism, economic chaos, and collapse.

Early in my discussion I gave you some averages on estimated receipts. I would like in the few minutes I have remaining here to call the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to a further carrying out of his discussion of yesterday. He discussed the subjects of national defense, veterans' service and benefits, international affairs and finance, interest on the public debt, and refunds of taxes, and he argued that these items were irreducible and that they made up more than 80 percent of the 1949 budget. I would like to add, however, that we have still other items in the general budget of expenditures and that we can make comparisons of these items over the years gone by with today's budget estimates. If you take those five items that he discussed completely out of the actual expenditures for the years 1940 to 1947, inclusive, and the estimates for 1948 and 1949, you will find that the estimated balance of estimated expenditures for 1949, taking out those five items, is higher for 1949 than for any of the last 10 years. That shows a very dangerous trend in the expenditures for these other expenses of our Government. I have those figures here. For 1940, taking out the five items, actual expenditures were $6,067,000,000; for 1941, $5,493,000,000; for 1942, $4,901,000,000; for 1943, $6,990,000,000; for 1944, $7,946,000,000; for 1945, $7,658,000,000; for 1946, $4,867,000,000; for 1947, $6,460,000,000; for 1948, only estimates are yet available and they are $7,568,000,000; and for 1949 they go up to $8,293,000,000. The average for the 9 preceding years, 1940 to 1948, inclusive, for all those other items in the budget was $6,461,000,000. The President's estimate of expenditures for 1949 is $8,293,000,000. If you are looking for $2,000,000,000 budget savings, you would not have to look further than the reduction of the budget estimates for 1949 to the average budget for the last 9 years for these other items to find that much. By taking out the five items I am not committing myself to the endorsement of the full estimates of the President on the five items the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] gave us yesterday. I add this discussion only to show you that there is a very high budget of expenditures in the other items that can be reduced without too great hardship. I think we must examine the entire budget most carefully. That is the answer I gave Mr. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, when he was before the committee on tax legislation. I had suggested that it was most inequitable and dangerous to single out one small field for imposing the entire load of additional taxes to offset reductions in personal income-tax revenues. Mr. Snyder finally answered me and said, "If the gentleman will help us find other revenues I will be glad to look into the matter." I said, "Would you mind my looking to the budget and my examining the budget of expenditures?" I had in mind the continued increases in estimated expenditures for 1949 over the average expenditures for the 9 preceding years. Holding the line against this constant increase of Government expenditures is the challenge we should meet effectively and without delay. Some of those five items can be challenged also, but I am talking now principally about the items outside the five. We must examine the budget of estimated expenditures from top to bottom if we are going to do a good job in representing and protecting the American taxpayers and the American economy.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the homely American philosophy—sometimes called the code of the grass roots—which holds that the time for a man to pay his debts is when he has the money to do so.

By a strange perversion of this philosophy the bill now under consideration would have the American people do just the contrary. This bill would set a precedent which would lead to permanent repudiation of our national debt. If the Congress refuses to make a sizable debt reduction at a time when the national income has reached the highest point in history, it will certainly refuse to do so in future years when income levels will inevitably diminish.

Proponents of this strange measure attempt to justify it by saying that the American people prefer tax reduction to debt reduction, so that they may have plenty of money to spend as they see fit in the immediate future. Will someone please picture for me any conceivable situation at any time in the future when human beings will not want to have their taxes reduced?

Let us imagine, if we can, that the American people had borrowed $250,000,000,000 from some private banking institution, instead of from their own Federal Treasury, and had promised to tax themselves over a period of years in a sufficient amount to repay the debt. Let us suppose further that in a short while the taxes had produced a sufficient revenue to enable an important payment to be made on the debt. Then let us imagine, if possible, that the American people said to the banking institution, "We do not want to reduce the debt now; we prefer to spend this money as we see fit." What do you suppose the bank would say?

This is precisely the situation which exists in America today with the exception that the creditor is the United States Government instead of a private banking institution. And yet the leaders of the majority party in the House of Representatives, who control the purse strings of our Nation and are responsible for its solvency, have the effrontery to make this preposterous proposition to our people.

The pending bill has been denounced during this debate as a dishonest measure. It is exactly that, because its proponents are appealing to the cupidity which is inherent in human nature, and attempting at the same time to delude the American people into the belief that any important debt reduction may safely be postponed until some future time. They certainly know that postponement of adequate debt reduction in a period of great national prosperity can only mean permanent repudiation of the debt in the years of lesser prosperity which will inevitably ensue. Such a proposition can only be characterized as wholly dishonest.

There are other reasons why this bill has been denounced as dishonest. Its proponents in the House are obviously proceeding on the theory that its proposed $6,000,000,000 tax cut, which they know cannot be accomplished, will be cut back by the other body to a more rational figure. What a strange code of ethics to be followed by the leadership of a legislative body which is supposed to have primary responsibility for the Nation's purse.

The proposed $6,000,000,000 tax cut is being railroaded through the House of Representatives before Congress has even decided on the size of the Government's spending budget for the next fiscal year. No one knows how many unforeseeable necessities for great Federal expenditures may occur between July 1, 1948, and June 30, 1949. But all of us do know that the President's budget for the present fiscal year, which was bitterly attacked as extravagant and excessive when it was sent up to this body a year ago, has proved to be not an overestimate but an underestimate of the necessary Federal expenditures for the current fiscal period.

Mr. Chairman, I will support tax relief in the lower brackets to enable wage earners, veterans, pensioners, and social security beneficiaries to exist on their meager incomes, but I submit that it would be sheer fiscal dishonesty, in this critical period in our national history, to legislate large tax reductions for our more prosperous citizens in order to buy their favor at the polls.

Far more important than tax reduction at this time, Mr. Chairman, would be effective legislation to reduce the high cost of living in this country. I believe that the Congress should restore at least half of the repealed excess profits taxes, enact adequate price-fixing and rationing laws, restore rent control, increase social security benefits, repeal excise taxes, and adopt practical anti-inflationary measures. Such a program would attack the causes of economic distress among our people, and would not be a mere political palliative.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say that I am committed to a program of tax reduction—committed by speeches I have made in my district, by letters I have written to many of my constituents, and by news letters I have issued from time to time. I am definitely committed to a program of tax reduction.

It is true my idea has been to accomplish this in part by raising the personal income-tax exemption. I think it is un-

fortunate that we have pursued the program of the past by placing that personal exemption at such a low point as it is today. We are now reaching an era where we have a country of only small families. The day of the large family is rapidly disappearing.

A low tax exemption for children especially is not in the interest of the country as a whole. I have a child of my own, and I know that you cannot rear a child on any five or six hundred dollars personal tax exemption, and if you have two, you cannot do it on a thousand, or three on fifteen hundred dollars. We are definitely working against the best interests of the country as far as encouraging larger families. A poor man cannot afford to raise a large family. The economy of the country is against him, and the struggle to properly take care of his children, send them to school, and start them off in life is too much under our present income-tax laws. The tax rate in the lowest bracket is too much to permit this to be done. As a result of this fact, and other economic laws, the people of this Nation are no longer providing themselves with large families but are content to bring into this world one or two children and give them the best they can afford. I think we should all study this situation and try from the national level to change our tax structure in the interest of those with larger families.

There are those who have suggested an increase of one or two hundred dollars in the personal tax exemption for each person. This is not enough. In my judgment, it should be increased to $1,000 for each living person in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I do not suggest this as the sole means of giving tax relief. I suggest it as an urgent need. I do not mean to preclude other changes which will reduce the burden upon the great masses of average people throughout the Nation. A reasonable reduction by percentage is necessary, always bearing in mind the fact that taxes should be in accordance with ability to pay.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, during the war the taxpayer dug deeper and deeper into his pocket for taxes, and more taxes. The war was costly. We had to pay that cost. The taxpayer understood that.

But the time has now arrived, it is more than ripe, for the tremendous wartime tax burdens to be lightened, most especially for those millions of Americans whose incomes are in the low or middle brackets but who pay as much for a pound of meat as anybody else.

These people are in no position to continue to support excessive taxation and spending by the Government—spending that is much too high for peacetime operations.

In other words, we have got to give the taxpayers relief. He has reached and passed his saturation point.

Here is the sort of thing I am talking about. The other day I had a letter from one of our fine women of Arkansas. She cited her own record of the income tax she has paid in the past few years. She wrote me that in 1940 she paid an income tax of $10.21. The next year, 1941, her tax had almost trebled to $28.73. The following year, her tax burden was 10 times greater and by 1944 she was paying a total of $415 in income taxes. Her taxes dropped slightly in 1946 but she estimated that for 1947 she would still be carrying a tax load of $339.

Now, this good woman wrote me:

> This increase has been so great that with repairs and insurance I find I am rapidly heading toward the confiscation of what little real estate I have.

Then she added something that a great many of us here in the House cannot help agreeing with. She wrote:

> I do not think that the President's suggestion to deduct $40 from the tax is worth the time it would take to write it off.

In my opinion and, I sincerely believe, in the opinion of many distinguished colleagues on this side of the House, Mr. Truman's so-called $40 tax bonus is merely an admission on his part that taxes should be reduced. The President has found that he must abandon his former untenable position that the time is not ripe for a tax reduction. But how can he ask the taxpayers of this country to be satisfied with so little?

I hope that the American people can soon obtain relief from excessive income taxes. I have voted before to reduce the Federal income tax. I have also voted to override the veto of the President when he sent the tax-reduction proposals back to Congress. I shall continue to fight for the needed tax reductions.

I do not know, nor does anyone know, the form and the scope of the inevitable tax-reduction bill which Congress is going to pass. But whatever is in the bill that Congress sees fit to pass, I shall support it. And I expect again to exercise my legislative privilege of casting my vote to override a veto, if Mr. Truman should see fit to return it to Congress without his signature.

As I see it, the country can stand a reduction in income taxes of between $4,000,000,000 and $5,000,000,000 and pay a goodly sum of the national debt. But to do it, we must carefully cut out every penny of unnecessary Government spending. That may mean trimming Mr. Truman's budget, but if it does, then I must support efforts to trim it.

I do want to say here and now, however, that I favor giving Americans in the low- and middle-income brackets their deserved tax relief before we undertake any costly aid program for the European nations. After all, charity begins at home.

I do not, however, believe we can afford to economize at the expense of our military preparedness, our agriculture, and our flood-control programs. The reductions in Government spending can readily come from other sources.

I hope that this Congress will write a tax-reduction bill which will raise the individual exemptions and reduce the tax rate somewhat. And I consider it most important that the measure also include a community-tax provision.

My own State of Arkansas is caught in this wicked web of tax discrimination which stems from nonuniform community-property laws. It is surrounded by States where the laws are more favorable for tax purposes. Louisiana, Texas, and Oklahoma all have such laws, and to be bordered by such States works to the disadvantage of Arkansas in attempting to attract and hold capital within its borders.

The Federal tax laws must wipe out, as far as it is possible, these deplorable discriminations. It is not right, it is not just, and it should not be tolerated that residents of one State should pay more Federal income taxes than those who live in another State.

I do not believe that the Government can much longer expect the citizens of this country to continue to bear their tax burdens with which they are now confronted. They are already complaining; they are begging for relief and I shall do all in my power to help those in the lower and middle brackets to get it. I sincerely trust and firmly believe that the Congress will work out the solution in a manner that is best for all without weakening one bit the solid foundation of our economic well-being.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the merits of the bill H. R. 4790 have been well explained by those members of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, who have preceded me on this floor. Indeed, some members of the minority have taken the floor to say that they, too, believe in the urgent need for relief for the 52,000,000 individual income-tax payers of America.

I hope that over the week-end recess the Members will have an opportunity to re-read the record of this debate. In particular the report of the Committee on Ways and Means ought to be required reading for every Member. The majority report points out the urgent need that exists for tax relief, and furthermore, points out how real tax relief can be accomplished, and all within a balanced budget and with assurances of a substantial payment upon the national debt.

Last evening I first had an opportunity to read the report of the minority Members of the committee. A careful reading of the minority report readily discloses the mistaken assumptions on which the case of the minority has been built.

I have read this minority report with great interest and am struck far more forcefully by what it omits than by what it contains. This report is devoted exclusively to a series of ill-founded criticisms of H. R. 4790. It is almost entirely negative in character.

The minority report contains nothing at all about the President's tax program. Not a single line is written in its defense. This can mean only one thing. The minority cannot bring itself to support that program. It is important that this failure to support the President be recognized by all, because it must mean that H. R. 4968 is not the tax program of the Democratic Party in Congress. It is merely the President's tax program.

At the very heart of the minority's argument is the contention that the 1949 budget will not absorb the tax reduction provided by H. R. 4790. A deficit is predicted if the bill is enacted. In support of this contention, the estimates presented in the President's budget message are cited. They seem to show that H. R. 4790 would produce a deficit of $2,100,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949. This conclusion is incorrect. The revenues used are understated substantially, and it is assumed incorrectly that Congress will make no reduction in the President's budget.

The reasons why the President's revenue estimates are much too low are set out at length in the majority report and I need only summarize them here. His estimates are based on an assumed level of personal income of $200,000,000,000. This is a flat estimate applying to the entire 18-month period, January 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949.

It is alleged that $200,000,000,000 represents "current levels." This, of course, is not so. Personal income during the last quarter of the calendar year 1947 was $205,000,000,000. The level presented in December 1947 is now estimated at $206,500,000,000. In other words, the $200,000,000,000 assumption is actually substantially below current levels.

Moreover, the President's estimators have ignored the rising trend in personal income, a trend which can reasonably be expected to continue for at least a few months in the spring of 1948. This trend is very important for tax collections in the fiscal year 1949. Yet, this trend—this fact—is ignored completely in the assumption upon which the President's revenue estimates are based. This fact contributes materially to the understatement of the estimated tax collections in the fiscal year 1949, upon which the minority's whole case depends and has been built.

The majority believes that the revenue estimate of $47,300,000,000 prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is based on far more reasonable assumptions, and should be the estimate used in discussing this basic question of policy.

With respect to expenditure cuts, the minority assumes that Congress will make no reduction in the President's budget for 1949. In this the minority ignores the fact that by the President's own admission Congress made a reduction of $1,500,000,000 in the 1948 budget. The 1949 budget is even larger. It contains no less than $5,000,000,000, which represents proposed legislation—unauthorized items—while all but about $400,000,000 in the 1948 budget was based on existing legislation. Therefore, the majority believes that it is reasonable to forecast a cut of at least two to three billion dollars in the President's budget for 1949.

I would like to call your attention to table 5 on page 7 of the majority report. This table makes it clear that if the 1949 expenditures are cut by $3,000,000,000, there will be a surplus of $3,500,000,000 even after allowing for the full effect of H. R. 4790 on revenues in that year. Even if expenditures are cut by only $2,000,000,000, a surplus of $2,500,000,000 will remain.

Thus, the minority is clearly wrong when it says that H. R. 4790 threatens a deficit in 1949. This is very important because there are inferences in the minority report that if it were not for the possibility of a deficit in 1949 the minority would support a tax cut.

For instance, on page 65, they say:

> The minority Members believe that the capital requirements of industry, and the maintenance of a healthy stimulus of managerial incentive and investment capital, do not call for tax reduction which might require deficit spending for fiscal year 1949.

Evidently they believe that the capital requirements of industry, managerial incentives, and investment capital do call for tax reduction, if deficit financing can be avoided. If this inference is correct, I believe that the minority on the Ways and Means Committee should support H. R. 4790.

Despite the hedging which takes place in the statement from the minority report just quoted, the minority spends much of its time attempting to minimize the need for tax reduction now. Apparently they are willing to ignore the pressure of the high cost of living, to deny the restrictive effects of the high individual income-tax rates upon investment and enterprise, and to disregard the pressing need for an adequate solution to the problem of the difference in tax burdens between community-property and common-law States.

The pressure of rising prices on the incomes of persons in the lower-income brackets is so real and so generally appreciated that it is unnecessary for me to belabor this point. Did not the President ask us to enact legislation specifically designed to relieve the lower-bracket-income taxpayers who are suffering from the high cost of living? We have made provision for such relief in H. R. 4790. We have raised the per capita exemption by $100. To a family of four this means an increase in the breadwinner's personal exemption, in his wife's exemption, and in the dependency credits from $2,000 to $2,400 a year.

We have also made special provision for the low-bracket taxpayer in the percentage tax reductions provided by the bill. Persons with net incomes of $1,000 or less after exemptions receive a 30-percent reduction in tax in addition to the increase in exemptions. Persons with larger incomes receive percentage reductions which grow smaller as the income grows larger, the minimum reduction being 10 percent. This applies to income in excess of $4,000. Taxpayers with incomes below $5,000 receive no less than 71 percent of the relief provided by this bill.

The minority's contention that the present high tax rates on individual incomes do not impede production is also fallacious. The minority argues that since production has reached a maximum, no material increase can occur, even though the incentives for investment and managerial effort are increased. Apparently the minority thinks that bottlenecks are no longer a problem, and that no possibilities for improvements exist in the utilization of our labor supply, in the techniques of production, or the patterns of business management. In this they are at odds with the administration's own Council of Economic Advisors which has set as a goal for 1948 a net increase in production of 3 percent.

The minority claims that there is no shortage of savings or investment at the present time and cites testimony of the Secretary of Commerce in support of this contention. If you will look at pages 13 through 16 of the report on H. R. 4790 you will find a summary of evidence presented at the hearings on this bill which demonstrates conclusively that there is a shortage of the most essential element in investment, namely, risk capital. Even if it is so that we have enough savings, and this, of course, I do not admit, it would still be true that the people who do most of the saving are showing an increasing tendency to prefer investment in relatively riskless securities.

May I call your attention to an exhaustive study on the subject which appeared in the United States News in its issue of January 23, 1948? That article states that $700,000,000 in corporate stock issues, which were filed for approval, have been withdrawn because of unfavorable market conditions. Other issues that were planned were not even submitted for approval, all because of the scarcity of venture capital.

I quote from that article:

> Records of the Securities and Exchange Commission show that $700,000,000 in corporate stock issues, which were filed for approval, have been withdrawn because of unfavorable market conditions. Other issues that were planned were not even submitted for approval.
>
> The mystery deepens when a study is made of some of the other sources of capital for investment.
>
> Total issues of new securities in 1947 amounted to $6,700,000,000, biggest year since 1929 and $2,300,000,000 more than securities issued in 1946. There is no evidence that capital has dried up. But there is a sign that capital is not eager to take today's risks in common stocks.
>
> State and municipal bonds issued last year established a record at $2,200,000,000. That was more than double the local-government issues of 1946.
>
> Corporation bonds floated during the year totaled $3,300,000,000—another record—and a gain of $1,300,000,000 over 1946.
>
> Stocks issued by corporations, on the other hand, amounted to $1,200,000,000, a $300,000,000 decline from 1946.
>
> This trend in financing is a sign that investors prefer securities that carry specific and fixed promises to pay over issues whose earnings depend upon profits. The tendency to borrow money rather than to issue new shares of stock also shows up in another direction.
>
> Bank loans in 1947 jumped $7,000,000,000 to reach a record of $42,600,000,000. Commercial banks have become a major source of new money for United States business enterprises, a more important source than the security markets.
>
> Insurance companies also have loaned heavily to industry and to public utilities to finance expansion.
>
> Business investment in plant, equipment, and inventory in 1947 is estimated at $25,000,000,000. Most of this came from earnings that were plowed back into industry. During 1947, new money raised in the investment

markets provided only a sixth of the total funds required by business.

A different situation prevailed in the earlier boom in 1929. In that year, three-fifths of industry's financial requirements came from investors, and investment markets were tapped for a total of $8,000,000,000, of which $5,900,000,000 was in corporate preferred and common stocks.

The 1929 boom was reflected strongly in security prices. At that time investors were willing to put money into stocks that were yielding an average of 3.5 percent, although bond yields were as high at 5.2 percent. Confidence in future earnings appeared to be high. When stock prices broke in that period, the boom ended.

Today there is no boom in the stock market. Stocks are selling at prices that yield 5.4 percent and still fail to attract buyers. The prices of shares at the end of 1947 averaged about the same as at the beginning of the year, despite the earnings records of corporations in that period. Federal Reserve Board officials find some comfort in the fact that security markets are the one place that inflation has bypassed.

What is developing, however, is a situation where new money is becoming harder to get. Banks and insurance companies are stiffening their terms and are more cautious in advancing loans. Corporations have drawn heavily on cash reserves and cannot get all the money they need—or think they need—from retained earnings. Bond prices have declined, raising the average interest yield from 2.4 percent in 1946 to 3.13 percent late in 1947. That means new issues will have to carry higher interest rates.

These are signs that corporations soon may face a condition where they cannot get as much money as they want at terms they would like. It could lead to a postponement of plans for expansion and cause the boom to weaken.

Causes of sluggish investment markets are found to be many by people who analyze conditions and trends.

Uncertainty about the business outlook appears to be the major factor. Persons with money to invest obviously have little confidence that the boom will persist. A majority apparently hold the opinion that the present inflation in prices and earnings will lead to trouble and that, during the trouble, they can pick up securities at lower prices. This opinion evidently has dominated investors since August of 1946, when the business boom really took hold and when stock markets entered a slump.

Investment money, partly as a result of this uncertainty, is running strongly into insurance companies, savings banks, building and loan societies, and other investment institutions. Flow of savings into stocks and into enterprises that carry risks has been reduced to a trickle.

Suspicion also appears to be widespread that industry expansion at the present level of prices is unwise. Often when a company announces expansion plans, the value of its outstanding shares drops.

Current profits also fail to impress investors. Apparently people with money are looking behind profits at high-wage rates, high prices, and high-cost inventories. Break-even points for most corporations are believed to have gone up, so that a relatively moderate downward adjustment in output could turn profits into losses.

Speculation in securities is at a low ebb. The shift of speculative funds from stocks to commodities is viewed by stock-market analysts as a factor that weakens the market for stocks. Lack of speculation to support stocks is regarded further as an influence that works against business financing through risk-bearing equities rather than through debt obligations, such as bonds or bank loans.

Credit for speculating in stocks also is harder to get. Federal Reserve officials require a speculator in stocks to put up 75 cents for every dollar's worth of securities he buys. Money can be borrowed more cheaply to speculate in commodities, where the margin is only 33⅓ cents on the dollar, or in housing and real estate, where Government guaranties sometimes run almost as high as 100 percent of building costs.

Tax policy is another factor that is regarded as discouraging investment in securities.

High individual taxes, particularly in the upper income brackets, leave less money, after living expenses, for saving and investment. At $16,000 of net income, for example, taxes begin to take a 50 percent bite, and that bite deepens as incomes rise, going to 86.5 percent at the topmost bracket. These groups provide the bulk of individual investment funds. A number of plans for tax reform call for lower surtaxes in order to stimulate private investment. The capital-gains tax also is viewed as a contributor to sluggish security markets by discouraging both buying and selling. Thus, some tax reformers suggest a lower rate on gains.

Corporation taxes are widely regarded as having a depressing effect. A corporation pays 38 percent on its net profit, and shareholders in that corporation are taxed again when they receive dividends. This form of double taxation is held to discourage investors. Also, a corporation that borrows money, either from banks or in the form of bonds, can deduct as a business expense the interest payments on its loans. But no deduction is allowed on dividends distributed to stockholders. This feature of the tax laws encourages companies to borrow, rather than to seek investment funds.

The doldrums in the stock market continue at a time when industry needs large amounts of new capital. Electric utilities, steel and oil industries are being forced to expand. But one major source of funds for expansion is about closed, and other sources—bank loans and bond issues—are narrowing. This raises a question as to whether needed new money will be forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, this makes it very difficult to finance the relatively speculative ventures which produce the new products, the new processes, and the new managerial techniques upon which increased production and economic progress depend. Behind this increasing shortage of risk capital lies the extremely heavy taxes imposed on the incomes of the people who would ordinarily provide the required funds. The marginal rates are so severe that the savers do not think it worth their while to take any substantial risks. By ignoring this essential element in the picture, by concentrating attention on the over-all figures, the minority reaches the completely erroneous conclusion that tax reductions are not required.

The minority's objection to tax reduction at this time is hard to reconcile with their quite evident satisfaction over the income-splitting portion of H. R. 4790. As a matter of fact, the minority go to some length to explain how it was all their idea in the first place. We would be happy to let them share in the credit for this highly desirable reform if they will support H. R. 4790. However, a few Senate Democratic votes for a hastily drawn piece of legislation, presented with no idea of its ever being passed, hardly represents support for income-splitting. We shall be glad to share the credit, however, with those Democrats who vote for H. R. 4790.

In spite of their evident satisfaction over the income-splitting portion of the bill, the minority takes exception to one of the subordinate features of the present bill. I refer to the fact that they list as one of the so-called inequalities resulting from the bill, the increase to $1,000 of the maximum standard deduction for single persons. In fact, from the relative amount of space devoted to this point one could easily conclude that this is what they consider to be the principal so-called inequality in the bill.

Because of the prominence given this item in the minority report, let us examine closely the major argument they present.

After admitting the necessity of increasing the maximum standard deduction for married couples to $1,000, they say that such an increase is not necessary for single persons. Although their report is confusing on this point, they apparently mean the following: Married couples in common-law States must be given a maximum standard deduction of $1,000, because married couples in community-property States at present have a combined maximum standard deduction of $1,000. However, they apparently believe that since single persons in community-property States cannot receive a maximum standard deduction of over $500, single persons generally do not need an increase in their standard deduction.

This is a remarkable admission on the part of the minority. It indicates that they are interested in equal tax burdens only between one married couple and another married couple. They evidently are wholly unconcerned with the relationship of the tax burden between married couples and single individuals. They are wholly unconcerned with the fact that under their suggestion the maximum standard deduction for a married couple would be $1,000, and that for a single person, only $500.

This is such an unusual admission that I can hardly believe that the distinguished Members of the minority fully realized what was being written in the minority report. Were the minority Members aware of the implications of putting this in their report? I would be glad to yield a minute of my limited time to get their assurance on this point.

The two remaining arguments presented on this standard deduction can be disposed of briefly. In the first of these, the minority report specifies the maximum tax saving this increased deduction will bring a single person. I do not know whether the statistics are correct or not. However, in any case, is the minority unaware of the fact that increasing the standard deduction for married couples, with similar incomes, of which they approve, will result in a similar tax saving? In this connection I wish to emphasize that I am not speaking of the advantages gained from income splitting, but only the standard deduction.

Finally, the minority say that increasing the standard deduction for single persons will not aid those with incomes under $5,000. This should be obvious to anyone. Of course, it will not, and

neither will the increase in the standard deduction for married couples, of which they approve, aid those with incomes under $5,000.

The minority does not like the special exemption of $600 for persons aged 65 and over. The minority is unwilling to acknowledge the perfectly obvious fact that persons over 65 cannot adjust themselves to high taxes and a higher cost of living as easily as younger people can. Small fixed incomes occur far more frequently among taxpayers over 65 than among persons in lower-aged groups. These people need special relief and special relief is being provided.

The minority argues that if the $600 exemption for the aged is adopted, there will of necessity be a flood of similar exemptions for teachers, veterans, retired civil servants, the partially and totally disabled, and other groups. In this the minority is deliberately overlooking the fact that the special exemption for persons aged 65 and over was developed as a substitute for the extension of the very troublesome system of exclusions of particular types of pensions, annuities, and retirement pay which characterizes existing law. The special exemption for the aged is the reason why it will not be necessary to institute specific exclusions for the benefit of teachers, veterans, and retired civil servants.

We have already made provision for the relief of the blind. That action has been applauded by our blind citizens from one end of the land to the other. Following is a letter which I have received from the American Foundation for the Blind:

AMERICAN FOUNDATION
FOR THE BLIND, INC.,
New York, January 28, 1948.

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRANT: I have just received word that the Ways and Means Committee has removed the age limit on the exemption on account of blindness.

I want to thank you most sincerely for this correction.

I was very concerned about this matter as I know that blindness carries with it as much additional expense over expenses incurred by seeing people after a blind person reaches age 65, as it does before.

I also want to say that I appreciate your changing the blind "deduction" to an "exemption." This will simplify reporting for the blind people and will be of some financial advantage to them also.

Here's hoping the bill now receives kind treatment from Congress.

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT B. IRWIN,
Executive Director.

If it were administratively possible to do so, it would be appropriate to extend this same relief to physically handicapped persons.

The minority takes strong exception to the portions of the bill and to the proposed floor amendment which will apply the splitting technique to the estate and gift taxes. In so doing the minority ignores the unequal impact of the existing law which is spelled out on pages 24 to 26 of the report on this bill. We all seem to be agreed on the necessity for the equalization of the impact of the income tax. The minority's unwillingness to follow through and equalize the estate and gift tax as well, apparently stems from the fact that most of the beneficiaries of this equalization will be persons of substantial means. This seems to me to be a ridiculous kind of argument. The fact that the benefits are limited to persons of considerable property is an inevitable result of the fact that the gift and estate taxes are concentrated on such persons. Moreover, the fact that the taxpayer who suffers under an inequality is a person of means does not make the inequality any less painful.

The minority argues that the adoption of H. R. 4790 would preclude any further tax revision. This seems to imply that the current level of expenditures will persist indefinitely. I sincerely hope that this is incorrect. We cannot go on forever on $40,000,000,000 budgets. The present level of spending is clearly excessive, and the majority will make every effort to see to it that this forecast which the minority is making just simply is not true. It is our firm conviction that expenditure reductions will make possible additional tax reduction and revision in the future.

Moreover, in their concern over the need for general tax revision, the minority ignore the fact that the first step in revision is being taken in the bill. I refer, of course, to the equalization of the income, estate, and gift taxes.

The minority report on H. R. 4790, like the minority report which accompanied the revenue-reduction bills of the first session of this Congress, makes a great noise over the relationship between the rate reductions provided in this bill and the increases in taxes which occurred between 1939 and 1945, when the wartime tax system had reached its peak. We pointed out last year, and we say again, that this comparison is fallacious and downright misleading. Lurking behind it is the assumption that the tax system which we had in 1939 is the right kind of a tax system for 1949, 1950, and 1951. But the tax system of 1939 was the end product of a long series of New Deal tax-reform measures. The policies of the New Deal are no fit pattern for us to follow now. This is particularly true of the New Deal tax policy which deliberately set out to reduce the volume of savings and which paid little or no regard to the important relation between risk capital and the increase of production which is basic to the development of the American standard of living.

There is at the conclusion of the minority report a section in which the minority complains about the so-called administrative complexities which H. R. 4790 will produce. Your committee went into this matter with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue at the time of the hearings on this bill. If you will refer to pages 254 to 258 of the hearings on H. R. 4790 you will find an interchange between the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the Commissioner, Mr. Schoeneman. You will note first of all that Mr. Schoeneman registered a complaint about the fact that H. R. 4790 splits the first bracket. You will note, however, that Mr. Schoeneman admitted that the splitting of the first bracket is in accordance with the principle of ability to pay, and also that a proposal to divide the first bracket into four parts was sponsored by the Treasury Department itself in 1943. Note also Mr. Schoeneman's statement that the net result of splitting the bracket will be the addition of only three lines to the income-tax form.

The minority report reproduces a portion of the form now in use, as well as a proposed form submitted by the Commissioner and intended for use after the enactment of H. R. 4790.

The form used after the enactment of the bill looks far larger and far more complicated than the one now in use. This is supposed to prove the minority's case. This is supposed to show why H. R. 4790 will produce intolerable administrative burdens.

May I point out first of all that almost all of the expansion in the form is due to the introduction of the income-splitting proposal which is now generally regarded as highly desirable. The small additional amount of work which income-splitting will impose upon the taxpayer who is filling out his form, is minor in comparison with the improvement in equity which income-splitting will produce.

I think particular attention should be given to the minority's complaint that the tax reduction in H. R. 4790 results in extreme complexities. On this point the Commissioner advanced a positive suggestion. He recommended that a revised rate schedule be substituted for the percentage reductions in tax which are an integral part of this tax-reduction bill. But upon examination it turned out that the tax-rate schedule which the Commissioner was offering had rates in it which were carried out to the third decimal place. I am quite willing to agree to the desirability of incorporating the tax reductions into a new rate shedule. It is certainly true that generally this would simplify the tax form slightly and perhaps reduce the taxpayer's labor. but I do not think that a rate schedule which involves rates carried out to the third decimal place is a satisfactory solution. Therefore, I am unwilling to accept the Commissioner's proposal, and I reject the minority's contention that the form which H. R. 4790 takes is inappropriate. May I point out again, that the great increase in complexity which the tax reduction involves actually amounts to the addition of three lines to the form, and no taxpayer has to use any more lines as a result of the rate reduction than he does now. It seems to me that the minority's complaint on this score is, to say the least, trivial.

In closing, I should like to say a few words about the statistics used in the minority report.

I must admit considerable amazement when I first examined these statistics. To say the least, the use made of them must be considered rough and ready rather than accurate. Let me give you a few examples.

On page 63 of the report the minority states that the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation

estimates a deficit of $400,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949, after the tax reduction provided by H. R. 4790, using the same income level predicted by the Secretary of the Treasury. By the way, I am interested to learn from the minority report that this $200,000,000,000 is a prediction. This must mean that it is a forecast rather than a mere assumption.

In using this $400,000,000 deficit the minority somehow failed to grasp what the staff of the joint committee emphasized at some length, namely, that an income level of $200,000,000,000 for the calendar year 1948 is unreasonably low, and, therefore, estimates based on it are unrealistic. Any adequate presentation of a staff estimate at this level would, therefore, at least require that this fact be indicated.

Again on page 63 the minority report says that any surplus in the fiscal year 1949 must be decreased by—I quote: "any revenue loss from the prospective 30-percent reduction in estate and gift-tax labilities."

This does not, of course, actually say that there will be a large reduction in fiscal year 1949 collections, but the implication is certainly there. Yet surely the minority must know that the estate- and gift-tax amendments do not go into operation until the effective date of this act. They also must know that the estate-tax returns which will reflect the bulk of any possible revenue loss from this provision need not be filed until 15 months after the death occurs. If the minority appreciates these facts, and I cannot help feeling that they must, it is hard for me to see how they could help but agree that the estate- and gift-tax amendments would have no appreciable effect on the fiscal year 1949 collections.

Another inaccuracy occurs on page 67 of the report. The minority refers to, I quote, "the $25,000 of public funds expended for the report of the Special Tax Study Committee."

I have been informed that almost none of this money has been expended. If the minority has any facts to back up the statement made in the minority report, I should appreciate receiving them.

Again, on page 67, the minority refers to the percentage increase in spendable income at different income levels resulting from H. R. 4790. I thought we made it clear last year that such percentages were only a statistical trick. I did not think we would see them try it again. Nevertheless, there it is.

To show the indefensibility of using such percentages, let me draw upon a homely illustration:

If I already have nine-tenths of a pie and am given the remaining one-tenth, it is obvious that the amount of pie that I have is increased by only about 11 percent. However, if in the beginning I have only one-tenth of the pie and I am given an additional one-twentieth, it is obvious that the amount of pie I have is increased by 50 percent. Yet, assuming I am fond of pie, am I not better off in the case where I am given the 11-percent increase than where I am given the 50-percent increase?

I am sure that if the minority will substitute—for the pie held in the beginning in the illustration—will substitute the words "spendable income before a tax reduction," and think of the remainder of the pie as the taxes presently paid by a taxpayer, it will become obvious to them that the percentage increase in spendable income is an absolutely meaningless term.

On page 64 of the report the minority refers to the present high level of private gross capital formation, and implies from this that the present rate of business investment is adequate. Surely they must recognize that something like one-third of the $30,000,000,000 figure represents residential housing and that a sizable portion of the remainder represents the change in the value of inventories. Surely this is not business investment.

The minority must also recognize that only $800,000,000 of the remainder, or 2⅔ percent of the total, represents investments in net issues of common stocks. The portion of the total which represents risk capital is therefore very, very, very small.

On page 58 of the report the minority attempts to belittle the expenditure cuts made by Congress last year. To do this they quote the original expenditure estimate of the President and show that the current estimate is $200,000,000 above this. Surely the minority must recognize that the President's total requests for expenditures for fiscal 1948 were far and away above the original $37,500,000,000 that President Truman started out with. How much were they in all?

During the hearing on this bill I asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. James E. Webb, if he could give us the answer to the question.

He replied that it would require a great deal of work to make such a calculation. However, he said that he would "give us something on that." He did supply them for the RECORD.

On page 238 of the hearings you will find Mr. Webb's figures showing additional amounts totaling almost $2,000,000,000 were requested by the President for fiscal '48 following the presentation of the original budget for that year.

The table follows:

Changes in the 1948 budget, January to December 1947

[Millions]

Type of change	Authorizations: Appropriations[1]	Authorizations: New contract authorizations	Estimated expenditures
January budget	$31,292	$1,542	$37,528
A. Revisions due to changes in recommendations:			
1. Amendments to the Budget through December (net)	1,671	498	1,044
2. Anticipated supplemental recommendations to be considered by 2d sess. of Congress	7,627	179	901
Subtotal	9,298	677	1,945

Changes in the 1948 budget, January to December 1947—Continued

[Millions]

Type of change	Authorizations: Appropriations[1]	Authorizations: New contract authorizations	Estimated expenditures
B. Revisions due to changes between fiscal years and in program outlook:			
1. 1947 appropriations delayed to 1948	$360	-------	$63
2. Transfers of expenditures between fiscal years	-------	-------	245
3. Changes in estimates of outlook for Government programs and revisions of related permanent and indefinite appropriations	301	-------	−518
Subtotal	661	-------	−210
C. Revisions due to Congressional action:			
1. Reductions in authorizations which may be regarded as final	−1,691	−$3	−1,272
2. (a) Reductions in authorizations which will require offsets by deficiency appropriations	−1,074	-------	−913
(b) Estimated offsets by deficiency appropriations (or anticipated contract authorizations)	955	75	57
3. Reductions in Government corporation expenditures	-------	-------	−345
4. Rescissions of authorizations of earlier years	-------	-------	−153
5. Substitution of contract authorizations for appropriations	-------	181	-------
6. Increases initiated by Congress	373	148	291
Subtotal	−1,438	401	−1,535
Total, 1949 Budget	39,813	2,621	37,728

[1] Includes reappropriations and appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations. Totals may not add because of rounding.

In other words, the total expenditures requested by the President for fiscal 1948 were not 37.5 billion, but were in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000. In any case, as I pointed out before, the President himself admitted last August that Congress had cut expenditures in the fiscal year 1948 by $1,520,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget now admits that savings enforced by this Congress are another $15,000,000 more than that.

On page 63 of the report, the minority refers to the "85,000,000 individual bondholders who share in the public debt." It seemed to me that it was peculiar that there were more bondholders than taxpayers, so I checked up on this. I was informed that the 85,000,000 represents the number of bond purchasers in the Seventh War Loan drive, and that that figure is a considerable overstatement of the number of individual bondholders today. There is a lot of double-counting behind the 85,000,000 figure which the minority uses, and many of the purchasers of the Seventh War Loan bonds have long since cashed them in. I challenge the minority to show us any current statement of the Treasury stating that

there are 85,000,000 individual bondholders.

It is obvious that this "free-wheeling" use of statistics in the minority report casts considerable doubt on the conclusions which the minority reached by the use of statistics. Unfortunately for them, it appears that almost their whole case is based on statistics. Like a house built on sand, it must fall when the sand is washed away.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have served but a very short time on the Committee on Ways and Means and therefore do not pretend to appear before you in the expert capacity of many of the Members who have preceded me and who have served on that committee and studied tax matters over a long period of years. I do, however, want to express a few sentiments that have occurred to me in the study of this particular tax bill at this particular time.

I think too often many of us are inclined to look at a tax-reduction bill or tax-reduction legislation as if we were voting a gift to the American people. I think it was probably in that light that the President made his tax proposal under which he proposed to give every taxpayer a cost-of-living bonus of $40 for himself and each of his dependents. The President tried to picture himself before the American people as a Santa Claus who was giving them something for nothing. Of course in this way the President makes use of that principal tactic that has been used by the New Deal since its inception to keep itself in office, namely, to make the people believe you are giving them something for nothing. I am convinced the American people have a better concept and knowledge of the tax question than the President gives them credit for having. I am convinced that they know, no matter what form the tax credit or adjustment takes, that they are not getting something for nothing. They know that what the President was attempting to do was purely and simply to play politics with their own money.

A tax reduction is not a gift. It is simply saying to the American people "We are not going to take away so much money from you." By this tax bill the Congress is not saying "We are giving $6,000,000,000 to the American taxpayer." What the Congress is saying is that the people need that $6,000,000,000 more than the Government needs it and the people are going to keep it for their own needs.

In considering any tax legislation, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Congress should weigh the needs of the people individually against the needs of the Government. What do the people need? Today the needs of people in the low-income group and the old people to purchase the necessities of life are apparent to all of us. They certainly cannot afford the high extractions being made from them by the Federal Government today. They must be given not only relief from the high cost of food, clothing, and shelter but relief from the high cost of Government. Their need for food, clothing, and shelter is greater than is their need for some of the operations now being carried out by the Federal Government. This bill recognizes this fact. Exemption for taxpayers and each of their dependents is increased by $100. An additional exemption of $600 is provided for the persons over 65 years of age. The amount of the tax is further reduced for these persons by from 30 to 20 percent. I call your attention at this point to the fact that 71 percent of the reduction made by this bill is reflected in the taxes of this group.

What do the people in the middle and upper income groups need? The needs of this group can more accurately be described as the needs of our economy. If private enterprise is to continue strong and virile, its needs must be recognized. If American enterprise is to carry us to victory over the forces that are today opposing the American way of life and a free world, as it carried us to victory in the war, if it is to produce to lick inflation, if it is to produce to keep our people employed and raise our standard of living, if it is to produce to aid in the rehabilitation of the devastated areas of Europe and Asia, if it is to produce to win the battle against communism, we must recognize its needs. That need is to be relieved from the shackles of taxes which discourage investment and expansion. Its need is to be relieved from taxes which discourage the operation of our productive system at the highest possible capacity.

The need of our economy for this relief is greater than is the need for many of the present and proposed activities of the Federal Government.

The question that we are to decide here today is, How much can the people of this country and our economy afford to pay for the operation of the Federal Government? It is the position of your committee by reporting out this bill that the maximum that our people and our economy can afford to pay is $40,000,000,000 during the fiscal year 1949. I concur in that position. That is no small sum. That figure of $40,000,000,000 is the absolute maximum. You may inquire as to where this $40,000,000,000 figure comes from. It is estimated by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that receipts under our present revenue laws will amount, during the fiscal year 1949, to $47,300,000,000. Assuming that H. R. 4790 becomes law, the collections during the fiscal year will be reduced by $7,100,000,000. Thus, should this bill become law, the total receipts will amount to $40,200,000,000. By using the figure $40,000,000,000 we are also providing a cushion of $200,000,000 to absorb any errors in the estimates. So let us take this figure of $40,000,000,000 with which to work. This, in my opinion, is the most that the people can afford to pay for the operation of the Federal Government during the fiscal year 1949. Let us realize very frankly that in voting for this bill we are obligating ourselves to certain responsibilities beyond the tax bill itself. We are obligating ourselves to certain very grave responsibilities.

First, we must keep our governmental expenditures under $40,000,000,000 during the fiscal year 1949. We must do this in order to keep our Government income and expenditures in balance. We certainly do not believe in deficit financing. Therefore, that is our first responsibility. I do not believe the contention has been made any place or at any time during this debate that our expenditures during 1949 are going to exceed $40,000,000,000. I think everybody is agreed up to that point.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], stated yesterday that the budget will be pared by not less than $3,000,000,000, and he hopes to make it more.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am acquainted with that fact, Mr. Chairman; but what I am pointing out is that even looking at the gloomiest picture that can possibly be painted and, of course, we recognize that the minority is doing just that, painting the gloomiest picture possible, we will under all circumstances have a balanced budget. But another and very grave responsibility we assume by voting for this tax-reduction bill is to keep governmental expenditures safely enough below $40,000,000,000 to provide for payment on the national debt. I believe that not only should this be done but that it must be done. Now let us look at what we can pay on the national debt and what we can do with expenditures of Government. I am pleased that the gentleman from Tennessee is here. I would like to refer now to the figures which he used in addressing this House yesterday in connection with his argument that it was impossible to reduce the expenditures of the Federal Government as called for by the President's budget at all. He called particular attention at that time to the five big categories of expenditure that the minority takes such pride in pointing to and calling the "untouchables," the "sacred cows." Those categories are: National Defense, International Affairs, Veterans' Affairs, interest, and tax refunds. Those expenditures under the President's budget will amount to $31,000,000,000. Now, I am going to assume for a minute that cuts cannot be made in those items. I am willing to go to that extent for the sake of argument and assume that that amount cannot be cut although I do not agree with the assumption. I will, therefore, eliminate $31,300,000,000 from the President's budget of $39,700,000,000. This leaves a figure of $8,300,000,000. That apparently is the field the minority will grant us the privilege of cutting. The gentleman from Tennessee used 1939 figures and showed how tremendously these five untouchable items have increased, ascribing that as the reason for the big budget we have today. He compared national defense figures of 1949 of $11,000,000,000 against 1939 figures of $1,000,000,000. The 1949 cost of international affairs of $7,009,000,000 to the 1939 cost of $19,000,000, the 1949 cost of veterans' affairs of $6,102,000,000 to the 1939 cost of $559,000,000, the 1949 cost of interest on the debt of $5,250,000,000 to the 1939 cost of $941,000,000, and the cost

of tax refunds of $1,990,000,000 to the 1939 cost of $68,000,000. The total expended in the five categories in 1939 was $2,661,000,000. I think it is permissible to substract that total from the total of all expenditures during 1939 so as to make an analogous situation in determining the cost of those functions of Government with which we can deal in cutting the expenditures of Government. When we subtract this $2,600,000,000 from the total cost of operating the Government in 1939 of $8,700,000,000, we have an expenditure in 1939 of only $6,000,000,000; but in this figure we have some very interesting items. I checked this morning to determine what some of these items were that constituted this $6,000,000,000, and I found that $290,000,000 went for CCC; $78,000,000 for NYA; $306,000,000 for PWA, and that WPA got $2,161,000,000. This makes a total of $2,835,000,000 spent in 1939 that we shall not have to spend in 1949. We thereby reduce our balance further and find that the expenditures in 1939 for the other function was only $3,000,000,000. This makes a difference between the 1939 figures of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and his 1949 figures of better than $5,000,000,000.

It may be that we cannot cut back 100 percent to 1939 in these functions. It may be we cannot cut out the complete $5,000,000,000 that has been added in the last 10 years to these items, but we certainly can take steps in that direction and long steps ir that direction.

And may I remind our minority friends who at this time take so much glee in supporting the cause of a balanced budget, in supporting the cause of payment on the national debt, that every cent by which those expenditures of Government can be reduced will be available for application upon the national debt and should be applied on the national debt.

I just hope that fact is remembered when the Appropriations Committee comes in with its appropriation bills reducing the President's budget, and that they will remember that every cent saved under the President's budget can go to this great cause which I believe in; namely, payment on the national debt.

Those are our responsibilities, Mr. Chairman, and that is the direction that we can go. I intend to carry out the responsibility that this tax bill involves, namely, to vote consistently to cut out all expenditures of Government that are not absolutely necessary and essential. If we limit governmental expenditures to only those things that are necessary and essential there is no question but what we can attain a balanced budget and make a substantial payment upon the national debt.

It is my hope that others will be stimulated by the needs of the people as contrasted with the needs of the Government, the needs of the people for tax relief and that they will be stimulated by the need for making a reduction in the national debt to be consistent in their demands for economy and their vote for economy. If you do not desire to be consistent by supporting every possible economy in our expenditures you should not support this bill. If you intend to support every possible economy in our expenditures, then you can honestly vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to invite the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and those present to an article appearing in today's Washington News. The chairman stated a few moments ago that his party is certain they are going to reduce the budget by $3,500,000,000 or $4,000,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not less than three billion.

Mr. COOPER. I invite the gentleman's attention to this news item:

GOP'S FIRST BUDGET SLASH HITS FEW JOBS

(By John Cramer)

The House Appropriations Committee today reported out the new 1949 independent offices appropriations bill—but, surprisingly, recommended little or no personnel reductions for the 19 agencies involved.

Under the committee's bill, minor cuts in some agencies would be balanced by minor increases in others, and over-all personnel would be left at just its present level.

The new bill was the first of the 1949 appropriation measures.

In reporting it, the committee trimmed $56,215,313 from the $1,047,798,864 recommended by President Truman, but allowed $196,686,000 more than the same 19 agencies received last year, mainly because of a mandatory increase of $195,599,000 in public roads funds.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, we are not going to debate an appropriation bill on news stories. On this side we are going to wait until the bill has been reported to the House, and I can promise the gentleman that there will be some substantial reductions in the independent offices bill, the newspapers to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I just wanted to say that I did not know it was a crime to reduce expenditures in Government, even if you did not reduce them quite as much as you tried to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, we cannot discuss appropriation bills before we receive them or before they have been reported to the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives now has under consideration the bill, H. R. 4790, the purpose of which is to reduce individual income-tax payments and to raise revenue for the Federal Government.

This is the third bill providing for the reduction of the income taxes of the individual taxpayers during the life of this Congress. In 1947, two bills giving income tax relief to people of this country, were passed by the Congress. Each of these bills were vetoed by President Harry S. Truman.

As you know, when the President vetoes a measure passed by Congress, such veto kills it unless two thirds of both the House and the Senate vote to pass it over his veto. The Republicans do not have a two-thirds majority in either the House or the Senate. The House voted by a two-thirds majority to pass the second tax-reduction measure of 1947 over the President's veto, but the Senate sustained his veto of it. The first of these 1947 individual income tax-reduction measures would have saved the individual income taxpayers $4,000,000,000; the second which would have applied to the last half of 1947 ,would have saved them only $2,000,000,000.

The President's arbitrary, petulant, and unprecedented use and abuse of the veto power thus continued in force against the people of this country, the poor, the people of moderate incomes, the fairly well to do, and those better off—and the wealthy, the burdensome wartime high rate of income taxes notwithstanding the war had ended more than 2 years previous to the time he vetoed these tax-reduction measures.

President Truman thus earned the name of High Tax Harry, and gained the unenviable distinction of being the only President to successfully veto and thereby defeat a tax-reduction measure passed by Congress.

He is threatening to veto the present measure. This bill will be passed by both the House and the Senate. Under its provisions, it will leave in the pockets of the American people more than six billion dollars of their income with which to protect themselves against the high cost of living. And it will leave in the pockets of those earning moderate to high incomes, money that they can and will invest in their business and in new business enterprises. Only by putting earnings back in the business concerns of the country and into new business ventures can the solvency and expansion of our present manufacturing plants be preserved and new ones constructed and put in operation.

Now let us examine the provisions of the measure we are about to vote upon. It provides to the citizens of this country what the President has twice denied them by his abuse of the veto power.

It gives to the men and the women of this country who are staggering under the paralyzing burden of war-tax rates, lower taxes, and equalization. The tax rates Mr. Truman seeks to rivet on the limbs of our people are wartime tax rates. He seeks to perpetuate them in time of peace.

The passage of this measure will increase the production of goods, materials, furniture, machinery and the food, clothing and fuel the American people so desperately need. This will reduce the high cost of necessities and it will permit our people to keep and use their own money. The average man and woman in this country are convinced of one thing above all others. They feel that they are more competent to use the money they earn than Mr. Truman or any bureaucrat or set of bureaucrats under him. They feel they can put their money to a better and

more intelligent use than he can suggest or devise.

Relief from the ever-increasing Truman era of inflationary high cost of living is provided by an increase in the exemptions given individual taxpayers. This relief is extended to those who most need it—to those whose incomes are low. This bill, if enacted, will remove more than 7,000,000 low-income people from the tax rolls. Of the total reduction in taxes provided in the bill 72 percent will go to taxpayers with net incomes under $5,000 and only 28 percent to taxpayers with net incomes above $5,000.

Additional relief is granted to those who are 65 and over and to the blind.

Equalization is extended to married people in common law and community property States. In other words, husband and wife in all States, under this bill will be permitted, for purposes of computing and paying their individual income taxes, to divide the sum of their joint incomes, and each will then pay on one-half of their joint incomes. This will reduce the tax of each and will put the married couples of Tennessee on an equality with married couples in the community-property States.

When, and if this bill becomes law, collections in the fiscal year of 1949 will be reduced by as much as at least $7,000,000,000. This will leave a surplus of more than two and one-half billion dollars. This will make possible the payment on the national debt during the years 1948 and 1949 of from ten to eleven billion dollars.

The individual income taxpayers under this bill, if Truman does not succeed in killing it with another veto, will get the following relief:

First. Personal and dependency exemptions will be increased from $500 per capita to $600 per capita.

Second. Tax reductions ranging from 30 percent to 10 percent according to the amount of income, are provided all taxpayers. The following relief is given:

(a) Persons with net income of $1,000 or less after exemptions receive a 30 percent reduction in their tax.

(b) Persons with net incomes of $1,000 to about $1,400 after exemptions receive a reduction of from 30 percent to 20 percent in their tax.

(c) Persons with net incomes of from $1,400 to $4,000 after exemptions receive a reduction of 20 percent in their tax.

(d) Persons with net incomes in excess of $4,000 after exemptions receive a reduction of 20 percent on the tax imposed on their first $4,000 of net income after exemptions, and 10 percent on the tax imposed on any remaining net income after exemptions.

A blind person 65 or over may claim an exemption of $600 for both blindness and on his age.

Under this bill, if it survives a Truman veto, the individual taxpayers of the country will have a saving of from six to seven billion dollars on what they would have to pay under existing law.

That this proposed law is far better than the bill proposed by President Truman is demonstrated by the fact that neither the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, nor the ranking Democratic member on that committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative JERE COOPER, introduced the bill proposed by President Truman. Both the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative DOUGHTON, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative COOPER, are men of the highest integrity and ability and have the admiration and respect of their colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans. The beloved former chairman of the committee, Uncle BOB DOUGHTON, fully realizes the necessity for individual income tax relief and he along with the distinguished Democrat from Georgia, Judge EUGENE COX, have the intellectual honesty and the courage to let their views be known.

Tax relief for the Federal taxpayer is long overdue.

I know how the people of my district feel, both Democrats and Republicans. They are demanding relief. This is not a partisan matter.

By this bill Congress is proposing to carry out a mandate from the people. This measure proposes to write into law the right of the men and women who toil in industry, in business and on the farms to retain and enjoy the fruits of their toil.

I shall support the bill. It merits the support of every Member of the House, both Democrat and Republican.

The people who think, and most of them do, are getting increasingly weary of those who are seeking to destroy free enterprise in this country by endeavoring to array class against class and who daily sow the seeds of hatred, envy, and strife in the hearts of our people.

We have heard in this debate from those who oppose any tax reduction the exulting boast that the despoilers of this Republic and the wasters of the people's money have gotten this Nation so hopelessly in debt that from now on there can be no tax relief for the man or the woman who is engaged in business.

When these apostles of the New Deal discover a man, a woman, a company who is making a profit, they raise a hue and cry against such person or company.

Under our system of free enterprise, which is the envy and admiration of the world, the American people have enjoyed more of the good things of life and a higher standard of living than has been attained by any other people on earth.

In the eyes of those who fight this bill the people who have made this possible are guilty of a crime—the crime of success. The answer to those who would swap this country for socialism or communism is: In America prosperity and success are not restricted to any privileged class. Prosperity and success are within the reach of all.

Who are the people the champions of high taxes would tax out of existence? For the most part, the men and the women they seek to destroy came up from scratch through their own industry, thrift, and ability.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, we have heard considerable discussion on the floor of this House of the cold war, which is now in progress in Europe. Anyone who visits that continent is impressed with the fact that we are engaged in a war of ideologies between totalitarianism and democracy. In a war of that nature, psychology plays an important part. If we are to win that war we must strengthen our allies and at the same time remain strong and virile at home. To do this we must not only maintain our military strength, but we must remain strong economically and financially as well. Any evidence of weakness on our part at the present time will deprive us of our position of leadership and will have tremendous repercussions abroad which might easily lead to world chaos.

Moreover our domestic prosperity and tranquillity are contingent upon our economic and fiscal stability. We have today a stupendous Federal debt of $256,500,000,000. This debt in less prosperous times might easily become a threat to our national security.

It is estimated that as of October 1947, there were oustanding $256,300,000,000 of interest-bearing securities issued or guaranteed by the United States Government. Of these securities $69,800,000,000 were owned by commercial banks, $12,200,000,000 by mutual savings banks, $22,200,000,000 by Federal Reserve banks, and $24,900,000,000 by insurance companies. The Federal securities owned by commercial banks constitute 60 percent of their assets. Those owned by mutual savings banks constitute 62 percent of their assets. Those owned by Federal Reserve banks constitute 47.3 percent of their assets. Those owned by insurance companies constitute 45 percent of their assets.

You will recall that after World War I, Federal securities depreciated in value to such an extent that at one time $100 bonds sold on the market as low as $80. If we were to suffer a similar experience now, the solvency of every bank and insurance company in the United States would be seriously jeopardized. We cannot permit this to happen. To prevent it we must maintain the faith of the American people in the fiscal stability of their Government and this can be accomplished only by adopting sound fiscal policies.

Our present fiscal condition, therefore, demands a balanced budget and a definite program of substantial debt retirement. Unless some progress is made toward debt reduction during the period of prosperity and inflation, through which we are now passing, we will inevitably face disaster in the lean years which are certain to follow.

If the Knutson bill is adopted, we will increase, rather than diminish the debt during the fiscal year 1949. Nothing that we could do would bring greater discouragement to our own people and

greater encouragement to the communistic forces of Russia.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, nearly 53,000,000 persons, under our present heavy, wartime revenue laws, are paying Federal, individual income taxes. We are now in our third peacetime year since the war, but these heavy individual income taxes are still on the backs of housemaids, workers in factories, shops, mills, mines, small farmers, teachers, other with small incomes, and persons with higher incomes. The people of the Nation were willing to pay these heavy taxes to prosecute successfully our war efforts. For more than 2 years now, there has been a general demand on the part of the American people for a reduction of unnecessary governmental expenditures and a reduction of their tax burdens.

Both parties and Members of Congress of both parties in the campaign of 1946 pledged themselves to a reduction of expenditures and a reduction of taxes. I heard no Member of this House, before the election in 1946, express opposition to the program—neither Democrat nor Republican. I promised the people of my district that I would work to cut out waste, balance the budget, pay on the national debt, and reduce taxes. The Republican Party, its members, as well as myself, and I might say, many Democrats, have been doing their utmost to keep this pledge. The Republicans, on this platform at the November elections, 1946, won control of the House and Senate, and one of the first bills to be introduced in the new Eightieth Congress by the Republicans attempted to carry out these pledges. This bill, with appropriate amendments, was passed by an overwhelming majority of the House and Senate, but President Truman vetoed it. The Republicans were unable to get a two-thirds majority in the House and Senate to override his veto and later on in 1947 a similar bill was introduced by Republicans and passed by a big majority in the House and Senate. It, too, was vetoed by the President. The House passed this second bill over the veto, but it lacked a few votes of receiving a two-thirds majority in the Senate, and President Truman and his leaders were able to deny this tax relief to the nearly 53,000,000 individual income taxpayers in 1947.

The first bill introduced in the present session of the Eightieth Congress was by Mr. KNUTSON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The Ways and Means Committee, after having spent a year in studying this problem, reported the bill favorably to the House by a vote of 16 to 9. Of course, each and every Republican on the committee voted to report the bill favorably. The bill, as reported, is H. R. 4790, now before us for consideration. This bill does not deal in any respect with excise taxes or corporation taxes. The Ways and Means Committee is making a careful study and survey of these taxes, and are very hopeful that they can report and have considered and adopted at the present session of Congress a bill that will cut out many of these excise taxes and reduce others and that corporate taxes will be treated in a way that will be to the best interest of the people of this country and at the same time, be just and fair to those who have invested their money.

H. R. 4790—SANE, FAIR, HONEST, AND SOUND

This bill meets the requirements of sane, fair, honest, and sound taxing principles.

(A) It recognizes that the American people, 3 years after their war sacrifices, are justly entitled to relief from these excessive war taxes.

(B) It strikes from the rolls approximately 7,500,000 taxpayers now in the lower brackets.

(C) It gives relief to all of the 53,000,000 income taxpayers, according to their ability to pay.

(D) The reduction comes out of surplus taxes.

(E) There will be a surplus to make a substantial payment on the national debt.

(F) There will be a surplus remaining to carry on the expenses of the Government and avoid a deficit.

TAXES CUT $6,500,000,000

H. R. 4790, the Knutson bill, gives relief to approximately 53,000,000 Federal individual income-tax payers.

First. Let us see in what way the nearly 53,000,000 taxpayers are benefited by this bill:

(a) It increases the personal exemption for each and every taxpayer and his or her dependents to $600. The husband and wife will be entitled to $1,200 for themselves and $600 for each other dependent. They are also entitled to such other exemptions and deductions for medical care and contributions, and so forth.

(b) It gives an additional $600 exemption for each person above the age of 65 years. If the husband and wife are both 65 years of age or over, this additional exemption will amount to $1,200 also, and with the other exemptions allowed to all income taxpayers, they would have $2,400 exemption.

(c) There is a double exemption allowed for blind persons.

Second. These increases in exemptions will remove, according to the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], author of H. R. 4790, 7,500,000 Federal individual income taxpayers from the rolls who are now paying Federal income taxes. Under this bill these will not be required to make any return or to pay any taxes. These seven and one-half million are now in the lower income brackets. One hundred and two thousand of these who will be removed from the rolls under this bill reside in Kentucky. This measure will save the Federal individual income taxpayers of the State of Kentucky $55,000,000.

Third. Twenty-five million others in the low-income brackets will receive a cut of 30 percent—nearly one-third—on whatever income taxes they may owe as well as their personal exemptions for themselves and their dependents and other deductions that are now provided by law.

Fourth. There are many millions of taxpayers whose net taxable income, after all deductions and exemptions are made, is as much as $1,000 or not more than $1,396. These would receive reductions ranging from 30 percent to 20 percent and also the increased personal exemptions and other deductions.

Fifth. Those with net taxable incomes between $1,396 and $4,000 would receive a 20-percent reduction in their taxes after allowances for increased exemptions. There are several million of these. There are approximately 40,000,000 Federal individual income taxpayers of this Nation, the taxable income of whom is $4,000 or less. These millions of taxpayers will receive increased exemptions, and for nearly 2,000,000 of them who are 65 years of age or over, or blind, will receive double exemptions, and they will also have a cut on whatever taxes they may pay ranging from 30 percent in the lowest group, to 20 percent for low middle group.

Sixth. There are several million income taxpayers whose incomes are $4,000 or more. They will receive a 20 percent reduction on the first $4,000 and 10 percent on the remainder of their taxable income.

It can be seen at once that this bill benefits each and every one of the 53,000,000 income-tax payers and gives just and fair consideration to each individual according to his ability to pay taxes. All in all, it takes a burden of $6,500,000,000 from the backs of these 53,000,000. Under present law, the Federal income tax rates go to 87½ percent in the higher brackets, and on down to 20 percent for those whose incomes are between $4,000 and $8,000. It can be seen at once that those with net incomes of $4,000 or less are the chief beneficiaries under this act.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AGAINST ANY TAX REDUCTION

While President Truman has taken the lead in giving to foreign countries over $24,000,000,000 since the shooting war closed and now proposes to aid foreign countries with $17,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 more, he opposes any over-all tax reduction for the American people although England, Belgium, France, Australia, and many other countries that have been the beneficiaries of our bounty, have made more than one tax reduction. Canada is considering a fourth tax reduction. They have greatly relieved their taxpayers. The Republican Party and many Democrats now insist that we give to the American people some relief.

The President in his message to Congress proposed a so-called "cost of living" tax bill whereby he would give to each income taxpayer and each of his or her dependents $40. He would give the Rockefellers, the Fords, and other persons of great wealth, and the housemaids, the workers, and others of low incomes, the same $40. He would increase the taxes of business concerns enough to cover the sums paid out under his $40 proposal, so that as an over-all matter he does not favor any reduction in the taxes of the people of the United States. The President's proposal was at once denounced generally by the press, the radio, and the people, in which many Democrats in and out of public life joined. It was generally denominated as an open bid for votes at $40 per head.

None of the Democratic leaders in the House would introduce the President's tax bill. I have heard scores of persons speak on the tax bill before us and only two persons, both Democrats, spoke in favor of the President's tax proposal. Many other Democrats, directly or indirectly, condemned his proposal. There was no effort made to have the President's bill adopted, as I understand, either in the Ways and Means Committee or by a motion to recommit in the House. I have never known of a proposal of a President of the United States being given so little consideration as his tax bill proposal.

We have observed that the President and his advisers are thinking up new ways to spend money. They now are planning to give Greece and Turkey another helping of approximately a billion dollars. The President is determined to consume every dollar of the American people's tax money. The people must look to Congress alone to give them relief.

WE CAN NOW CUT TAXES SIX AND A HALF BILLION

The Republicans of the House, of course, favor this bill and perhaps not more than one of them will vote against the bill. A great many Democrats favor a substantial cut in taxes but not the President's plan. They agree with the Republicans' proposal as laid down in the Knutson bill, H. R. 4790, but they insist that the cut is too much. The President does not want taxes cut. He has submitted a budget calling for nearly $40,000,000,000—many billions greater than any request made by any President in peacetime in this country or in any other country. President Roosevelt was considered some spender and waster in peacetime. The highest amount he ever asked for was approximately twelve and one-half billion for a peacetime year. Last year, President Truman asked for thirty-seven and one-half billion—three times as much as President Roosevelt ever asked for in a peacetime year. The American people were astonished when President Truman made that demand but they are much more so this year when he calls for nearly forty billion to spend in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1948, our fourth peacetime year. The Democrats insist that if we pass this bill, we will have a deficit. The Republicans deny this charge.

Of course, we can and must cut the budget several billions of dollars. The amount of revenues for the present and the next fiscal year will depend upon our total national income. On a basis of a national income of two hundred billion, the Treasury Department states that we will have net revenues and receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, of forty-five billion, but our national income is now running at more than two hundred and five billion and it is estimated by the experts in the Commerce Department, as well as the special revenue committee, whose members are experts in the income and revenue field, that our total national income will reach two hundred and nine billion. If it is two hundred and five billion the net receipts and taxes for the present year will be forty-six billion four hundred and ninety million and if it is two hundred and nine billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the net tax receipts will be forty-seven billion three hundred million.

The President's budget calls for thirty-nine billion six hundred million but this includes six billion eight hundred million as a down payment on the Marshall plan for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. It will be some time before any type of Marshall plan will be approved by the Congress, in my opinion. Those who know state that it will be 6 months to a year before an organization could be developed and information gathered to put the Marshall plan into actual operation. Former President Hoover insists that there should not be appropriated for the first year of the Marshall plan more than three billion and should be limited to 1 year so that we may determine what our financial situation is as of June 30, 1949. I think it can safely be said that this six billion eight hundred million for the first year of the Marshall plan will be reduced to at least three and one-half billion. That will cut the President's budget back to approximately thirty-six billion and that would leave a surplus of something like eight or nine billion, but there are other cuts of the budget that can and will be made. Many useless officeholders will be removed from the rolls. Much waste will be cut out and there likely will be a surplus for each one of the present and also the next fiscal year of ten billion to take care of the tax reduction and pay at least three billion on the national debt.

It is somewhat amusing to hear leaders of the Democratic Party express fear of having a deficit or increasing the national debt. Their party has been a party of debts and deficits in peacetime. The Republicans have always favored a balanced budget, reduction of the national debt, reduction of taxes, and economy and efficiency in Government, and this tax bill was prepared with that policy in mind. President Cleveland, 60 years ago, had a deficit in peacetime. President Wilson had deficits in peacetime. Presidents Roosevelt and Truman have followed in their footsteps. They believe in—spending, borrowing, and taxing.

In October 1945 with a Democratic Congress, President Truman and his party put through a tax-reduction bill. They cut taxes six billion with a certain percentage straight across the board—for the great corporations and for the housemaid, the workers, teachers, and small farmers. Each one got the same percentage cut. Their tax-reduction bill contained a provision to repeal the excise-profits tax and gave another mighty lift to the great corporations of the country. Were Mr. Truman and his party alarmed in October 1946 that there might be a deficit and the Government might have to borrow money to carry on its operations? They certainly were not. The Ways and Means Committee, controlled by the Democrats, in reporting that bill, pointed out that there would likely be a deficit of as much as thirty billion at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1946. There was an actual deficit of twenty-one billion but Mr. Truman and his party put the bill through and also repealed the excess-profits tax. At the time this bill was being considered in October 1945, Mr. Truman's Secretary of the Treasury put on a bond sale throughout the Nation and sold more than $15,000,000,000 worth of bonds to borrow money to carry on the Government, but they went ahead with their tax-reduction bill. That bill gave four billion relief to the corporations and only two billion to the individual income taxpayers and how inconsistent it is for them now to oppose tax reduction when we know we are going to have a surplus of billions this fiscal year and the next fiscal year ample to take care of this tax reduction and pay several billions on our national debt.

Their tax-reduction bill of October 1945, of course, was a phony. There can be no real tax-reduction bill unless there is a surplus out of which to make the tax reductions. Our Democratic friends are schooled in the policy of creating debts and increasing taxes. It has always been true that the Republican Party reduces taxes and reduces debts created by the Democrats and that is the very thing that the Republican Party is doing in the passage of H. R. 4790. President Truman is willing to give relief to anybody and everybody in the world but is unwilling to give relief to the overburdened taxpayers of our own country. He is willing to pour billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money into countries whose governments have given more than one tax reduction to their people since the war was over.

REDUCE TAXES AND LIVING COSTS

We must cut the President's budget. We must eliminate all unnecessary expenditures. We must give to the American taxpayers one dollar in value for every dollar of taxes taken from them. The cost of government is too great. The American people this year will pay approximately $55,000,000,000 to carry on their Federal, State, county, and city governments. That is approximately $1,600, on an average, for each and every family in this Nation. The cost of food is high, but the American people will spend about $42,000,000,000 a year for food. The cost of government to the American people is about $55,000,000,000.

If we follow President Truman and his group we will continue to increase the cost and burden of government. There is no good reason on earth why the American people should be called upon to pay more for government than they pay for their food and clothing.

President Truman does not help the American people when he gives them $40 tax reduction in income taxes and then places it on the business concerns that prepare the raw material, process, transport, and distribute it, because corporations can pass on to the consumers these taxes. These become what is known as concealed taxes. Every consumer then becomes a taxpayer. So Mr. Truman takes the $40 taxes off of the individual income-tax payers and puts it on the corporations, and they in turn, in the way of concealed taxes, get it back from the

American people in increased prices. The individual income-tax payer cannot pass his tax on to the consumer.

In October 1945 President Truman, as we have pointed out, favored giving the same percentage of reduction to the big and little income taxpayers alike, and let us not forget his bill repealed the excess-profits tax, and now he talks long and loud about excess-profits tax. There would be such a law on the books now perhaps if he and his party had not repealed it in 1945.

If we favor sane, fair, honest, and sound tax relief we must vote for this bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of my friend from the hills of Kentucky. He and I have come from similar neighborhoods. I happened to be born over in the hills of east Tennessee. He was talking about tax reduction. It will be remembered that at the end of the last war, the national debt was about $26,000,000,000, including what we had spent and what we had loaned to our allies. But this time our debt is about $256,000,000,000. This is in the statement that I inserted in the RECORD at the instance of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. Today the commercial banks of the United States own $69,800,000,000. The mutual savings banks own $12,200,000,000. The Federal Reserve banks have $22,200,000,000, and the insurance companies, $24,900,000,000. After the last war many of these bonds and Federal securities dropped from their par value of 100 cents on the dollar to 80 cents on the dollar. I just wonder how many banks, commercial, and otherwise, as well as insurance companies, could keep their doors open if bonds that they own now dropped to 80 cents on the dollar.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am asking the gentleman from Kentucky a question.

Mr. ROBSION. The same alarm was expressed in 1921 as it is now by your side of the House. We did reduce taxes and we did pay $1,000,000,000 on the national debt and we did have a surplus when the prediction was that we would have a deficit. In 1922 the same thing was done and in 1924 and '25 and '26 and '27 and '28, and so on.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, to go one step further, the gentleman from Kentucky knows there is no more chance for a $6,500,000,000 tax-reduction bill to become law or a $7,200,000,000 tax-reduction bill to become law, because the House will never have a chance to vote on any such thing in the conference report.

Mr. ROBSION. Our national debt was larger in 1945 than it is now.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION. Yet it was predicted that there would be a deficit of $30,000,000,000 at the time the bill was brought here and rushed through cutting taxes at the time the gentleman was the distinguished Speaker of the House. There was an actual deficit of $21,000,000,000. How can the gentleman complain about this bill when he helped to put a bill of that kind through as Speaker of the House?

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, I remember also when we got excited about the statements made by somebody downtown in some of the departments that there were going to be six or eight million unemployed in the United States in April and May 1946, and we repealed the excess profits tax in response to that.

In the spring of 1946 there were fewer unemployed people in the United States than there had ever been before.

In the spring of 1947 there were fewer unemployed people in the United States than ever before.

Mr. ROBSION. Who was it who gave you those exciting statements? Perhaps the same folks downtown are exciting you now.

Mr. RAYBURN. The National Association of Manufacturers joined in the chorus, as I remember it.

Mr. KNUTSON. And so did Mr. Vinson, who is now Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and a very valuable member.

Mr. RAYBURN. Even I have made mistakes in the past, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I arise to express my opposition to this Knutson tax bill. My objection to it is that this Nation, with a $253,000,000,000 war debt, cannot stand a cut in its revenue which will total between six and seven billion dollars per year.

The biggest task before the Congress today, I believe, is to preserve the economic security of this Nation. The hope of the world for recovery along the lines of freedom rests in the United States and the way we guard its economic security.

The public debt is the cornerstone of our financial security. On the soundness of this debt rests the soundness of our banking and insurance enterprises, the personal savings of 85,000,000 owners of Government bonds.

Today the national debt is far greater than the debt ever carried by any nation in the world's history. It totals about $7,000 per family or about $1,900 per capita. Never before has it ever exceeded $400 per capita.

From the study made by the committee on public-debt policy, a committee composed of the Nation's leading bankers and insurance executives, comes startling evidence of the enormity of this debt.

An apt comparison of the per capita debt during representative periods of our history is contained in the following tables based largely on their debt studies:

Per capita national debt

War of 1812	$15
Civil War	78
World War I	240
World War II	1,900

Figured another way, the comparison of the national debt, even to our staggering national income, gives like reason for concern:

Percent of debt to national income

Revolutionary War	20
War of 1812	20
Civil War	50
World War I	45
World War II--approximately	130

Our ability to carry this record-breaking debt is measured on that portion of our national income required for interest charge on the debt. It, too, has varied greatly through our history as shown by these sample periods:

Percent of interest cost to national income

Revolutionary War	0.5
War of 1812	.8
Civil War	2.5
World War I	2.0
World War II	2.6

Thus, it is clear, that even with the all-time low interest rate that now obtains on carrying the debt, $2.60 out of every $100 earned in this country must go for the never-ending cost of interest on the debt.

Should interest rates return to their more historic normal rate of 4 percent, instead of its present 2.1 percent, the interest charge in relation to national income would take more than $5 out of each $100 earned.

Charts on the interest charges through our history show how abnormal the present 2.1 percent interest on the public debt is.

Interest rates on national debt

	Percent
Revolutionary War	4.8
War of 1812	5.5
Civil War	6.0
World War I	4.3
World War II	2.1

Throughout the years of our history, only one other period shows any comparable low-interest rate similar to the one we now have. That was for a brief period from 1910 to 1914 when the rate was 2.3 percent.

The best way I know to insure low interest is to pay off the debt as rapidly as is humanly possible. This is proven by the historic charts, which, during the brief period of our country when the debt was eliminated in 1835, the interest rates dipped from 5.5 to 3.9 percent as the bonds were being retired. By retiring the bonds as rapidly as we can, we help to prevent added costs to all not for just a year—but from now on. And, further, we help to insure a continuing favorable interest rate on this debt charge.

Should interest rates rapidly climb, the problems of financing and refinancing this enormous public debt would be tremendously increased. Since the individual savings bonds are redeemable at par by the Treasury, a strong increase in the rate would start an endless chain of demands for cash from the Treasury—if for no other reason than to reinvest them in bonds bearing the new higher interest rate.

The open-market operations of the Federal Reserve bank, which has supported all negotiable bonds at par, also would be thrown into confusion, if not

destroyed altogether. New issues bearing a greatly higher rate, would quickly drop the market price of older and lower yielding bonds and result in a difficult and very troublesome refinancing job.

SEVENTY-NINE PERCENT OF BUDGET

If the present income of the Government can be maintained, even with the vast demands made on the United States for military preparedness of more than eleven billions; for foreign aid, seven billions; for veterans' programs, six billions; for interest on the public debt, five billions; and for refunds of taxes, two billions—we can still retire four billion eight hundred million of the public debt.

The following table shows the breakdown of the President's budget defining the most urgent expenses—almost all of which cannot be substantially reduced without seriously affecting our military or foreign policy:

	Most urgent expenses
National defense	$11,000,000,000
Foreign policy	7,000,000,000
Veterans program	6,100,000,000
Interest on debt	5,300,000,000
Tax refunds	2,000,000,000
Total	31,400,000,000
Debt retirement	4,800,000,000
Remainder of entire budget, including all governmental expenses	8,300,000,000

Seventy-nine percent of the President's budget of thirty-nine billion seven hundred million is included in military costs, veterans' programs, foreign aid, interest on the public debt, and tax refunds. As much as can be reduced from other programs, from the remaining eight billion three hundred million in the budget, should be reduced, but in view of the tremendous cost of paying for the last war and trying to prevent the next, it is doubtful if enough can be saved to permit a six-billion tax reduction and any sizable debt reduction as well.

BARUCH'S RECORD

Mr. Bernard Baruch, who has been right more often than any other leader in the United States on the problems of inflation, has urged against any tax cuts at this time—and urged instead the imposition of additional excess-profits tax in order to help preserve our national economy.

Surely Mr. Baruch's advice is worth more than the pigeonhole treatment given it by the Ways and Means Committee. The sanity of his advice to pay your debts while you have the national income to do so—to reduce the never-ending interest cost as much as possible, presented a challenge to this House which deserves serious consideration—rather than the treatment given it.

CONFIDENCE HARD TO REGAIN

National confidence in our economic stability once lost is most difficult to regain. Witness the years of tedious effort and slow recovery that took place after the crash of 1929.

Yet in the callous disregard of danger signals that are flying throughout the country, the Congress is trying to take the place the stock market had in 1929 as the major force in bringing about our insecurity.

The country is threatened with even more serious inflation—the falling purchasing power of the dollar. Yet this bill would send this Nation into the fiscal year 1949 faced with a deficit of two billion in our budget if we pass this bill. What greater contribution could the Congress make to the collapse of our economy than to steer such a hazardous course.

A WEAPON AGAINST INFLATION

We have dozens of examples of worthless or near-worthless currencies of other governments today. At the base of most of their difficulties is the always-present fact that they are spending more than they are willing to collect in taxes—that they are increasing their indebtedness—not reducing it.

I do not know of any nation that went completely through the wringer of inflation that went that way on a balanced budget and was making a substantial reduction in its national debt. Reduction of the national debt is the one effective thing that this Congress could do to help lessen present inflationary pressures—yet instead this bill proposes reducing revenue and foregoing any appreciable debt retirement.

If pressing living costs for the low-income group require, as is claimed, a reduction of their tax, the prudent policy is to shift this burden and make up this loss elsewhere—but surely not to reduce Government revenue and thus invite financial instability.

CHART A SOUND COURSE

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the House defeat this dangerous legislation. If a tax cut is to be considered—or economies are to be gained in the cutting of appropriations—then let the tax reduction be made after—after but not before—these economies are effected. To cut revenue in the anticipation that drastic reductions can be made, is not borne out by our experience of last year—no matter how bright the promises.

Within the next 90 or 120 days, all of the appropriation bills will be acted on by the Congress. Surely, the time for a tax reduction at this moment is not nearly as important as to chart a well-planned fiscal course. After these appropriations have been made, we can know, not guess, what our governmental expenses will be.

In addition, at that time we can tell better what the national level of income will be—and how much money the Government is likely to receive over the next fiscal year. To rush headlong into this ill-considered bill at this time is to disregard every sound financial practice—and to invite grave fiscal danger.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOEVEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4790, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution extending the time for the submission of the report of an investigation of consumer goods prices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was granted permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain tables and a letter.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. GRANT of Indiana) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from James C. Petrillo, president of the American Federation of Musicians, together with a newspaper item.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

AMENDING SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 38.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 2 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Eightieth Congress, first session, is amended by striking out "February 1" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GWINN of New York, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. LUCAS, on account of official business, from Tuesday, February 2, to Friday, February 5, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FUEL-OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon the Department of Commerce announced a revised program on exports of fuel oil.

I have not had an opportunity to examine the report in terms of the resolution I introduced yesterday, and particularly in terms of the countries of destination, but at least it is an encouraging development. The report in part reads as follows:

In view of the serious shortage of fuel oils in certain areas of the United States, the Department of Commerce announced to-

day in its revised downward report, the first quota of petroleum products for foreign export from 11,850,000 barrels to 9,650,000 barrels, a reduction of 18.5 percent.

I might add parenthetically that a similar announcement was made in the previous quota program, but it turned out that the major reductions were in articles of petroleum products that are not in shortage here and were not involved in this question of heating and industrial use.

The release says also:

In addition, the Department announced it would eliminate licenses for export of petroleum products to exports from those areas of the country where fuel can best be spared during this emergency period.

The Department announced also that a separate quota of gas oil, and distillate fuel oil, which had been established for the first quarter for shipments to Japan and the Ryukyus had been drastically reduced from 1,600,000 barrels to 1,000,000 barrels. The difference would be met from oil-producing areas outside the United States.

That is very significant in terms of a report made to the Senate last week that we were shipping into certain areas of the Pacific a greatly excessive quantity of these kinds of fuel oils, when as a matter of fact historically those areas had been obtaining their oils from available sources in the Pacific.

My best information is that, exclusive of Japan and the Ryukyus, this means a saving of 1,500,000 barrels of desperately needed heating and industrial oils. Adding the 600,000-barrel savings in the Japanese and Ryukyus, we have a total saving of 2,100,000 barrels. The tabulation follows:

	Barrels
Aviation gas:	
Original first quarter quota	700,000
Revised quota	700,000
Motor gasoline:	
Original first quarter quota	5,250,000
Revised quota	4,550,000
Kerosene:	
Original first quarter quota	900,000
Revised quota	600,000
Gas oil and distillate fuel oil:	
First quarter quota	3,200,000
Revised quota	2,800,000
Residual fuel oil:	
Original first quarter quota	1,800,000
Revised quota	1,000,000

This is an obvious concession of the merits of the recommendation made December 19 by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is regrettable that the recommendation was ignored in setting up the program announced in January. But that is "spilt fuel," so to speak.

Nonetheless 18.5 percent reduction is a far cry from the voluntary 50 percent reduction made by Canada. This action strengthens the arguments for immediate action on House Joint Resolutions 311 and 312. I am beginning to wonder who, in the executive department, is charged with any responsibility for the welfare of the American people. Still it is encouraging to have this cautious, belated, and insufficient step taken. At least there is now recognition of "the serious shortages of fuel oils in certain areas of the United States." But let me assure you that as far as I am concerned this is only round one. The bell for round two will ring as soon as I can get an official copy of the revised program.

I have also a press statement here adding that the Department of Justice approves a steel industry agreement between the steel industry and freight-car manufacturers on a voluntary allocation program for production of 10,000 freight cars a month. The report says:

Tom Clark has O. K.'d it.

I suppose that means the Attorney General. The agreement calls for 1,000,000 tons more steel in 1948 than went into freight cars in 1947.

So far, so good; but this is the bad news: I have a telegram signed by the Governor of Massachusetts, received this afternoon. It reads as follows:

Regarding telegram and telephone conversation the estimate for the first 10 days of February indicates a worse condition particularly on available kerosene supply.

As I have previously said, Mr. Speaker, this is the supply upon which the people with small incomes depend, the people who do not have money enough to buy a whole winter's supply of oil, the people who do not have storage facilities, and the people who buy only a 5-gallon can at a time which they take down to the depot every week and try to get their next week's supply.

Continuing, the Governor in his telegram states:

For the month of January figures indicated an 87.7 percentage supply of demand.

In other words, we were down 12.3 percent below normal.

For the first 10 days this figure has changed to 80 percent approximately.

So we are down 20 percent within the last 10 days.

On No. 2 fuel oil the figures indicate a slightly better condition but no major improvement. There is no apparent change in the industrial oil situation.

In the afternoon press from a reputable news service appears an article headlined: "United States tankers leased abroad at 100 percent profit."

The article states:

Despite the acute shortage of ships to carry petroleum for domestic users, some American companies are leasing oil tankers to foreigners at, roughly, 100 percent profit, informed sources said today.

These companies are leasing or buying tankers from the United States Maritime Commission, it was said, and then are turning the same ships or their own over to foreign interests at "roughly twice" the Maritime leasing fee.

This was brought to light shortly after Chairman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of the House Interstate Commerce Committee promised an investigation into the leasing of tankers abroad.

WOLVERTON said he intends to find out who has bought Maritime tankers and on what terms. He said the Petrol Corp., a Philadelphia concern now running out of oil—

And, incidentally, that is the same company now complaining that they cannot supply the people of Washington, D. C., with their needed oil—

has leased one Maritime tanker to a foreign government for 3 years.

Table I furnished the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee showed that Petrol Tankers Industries, Inc.—wholly owned subsidiary of Petrol Corp.—chartered one T–2 tanker on June 11, 1947, to French Government for 3-year period. It adds:

Replaced by another T–2 tanker purchased from USMC.

That table indicates that another major oil company transferred a T–2 from domestic to foreign service on June 27, 1947, which is expected to return to domestic service when spring arrives, on April 10. It transferred another T–2 from domestic to foreign service, according to the table on June 26, 1947, but the date of anticipated return is not stated.

While we are discussing tankers, this announced revision of foreign exports should result in releasing approximately 14 long overseas voyages to the short voyage, coastwise service—another step in the right direction. If they can be added to the possibility of release from naval service and the holding on coastwise service of the T–2s sold foreign in December by the Maritime Commission, as recommended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, December 19, we may be able to furnish the industry with the 40 tankers it says it needs to relieve the shortage in the Northeast.

I call your attention again to the fact that an informed witness this morning, the president of the American-Arabian Oil Co., stated flatly to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that if we had sufficient tankers there would be no shortage in this country or in the world. Rather, there would be, as he described it, a surplus.

Secondly, I want to call attention to two or three other significant statements made by him:

If part of Middle Eastern oil were available at the present minute, there would be a better supply situation on the eastern seaboard of the United States in that Middle Eastern oil would be brought to the European market and substituted there for oil now sent to that area from Venezuela, Trinidad, and Colombia.

The construction of the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. was disturbed this winter by the outbreak of cholera in Syria along the route of the line. It was further interrupted by the riots and civil disturbances incident to the UN decision to partition Palestine.

If the demand continues to increase, there will be need also for additional tanker construction despite the pipe lines built in the Middle East. This will depend partially upon the policy of the Maritime Commission and also upon the opening of the European yards for the construction of the tankers where tanker construction has always been cheaper than in the United States.

Here is a statement that is mighty terrifying for a man who is well informed to make:

I am not an expert on this matter, but I think if war were to break out tomorrow, we would find we were desperately short of tanker capacity.

That whole statement, I hope, will be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD early next week by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] chairman of the committee, so that each of you might have full opportunity to immediately study it. I know of no member of my committee who is interested in hunting scapegoats. We are interested in getting at the facts in the interest of

the American people we represent. If someone has made an error, be it in the executive department, among ourselves, or by industry, those errors should teach us a lesson. We do not want to face the next 4 or 5 years with this continuing threat. It is a matter of sheer national security.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself once again with my colleagues who have from time to time come to the well of this House to voice complaints over the failure of the administration to take appropriate action in the current fuel-oil shortage.

As a member of the committee appointed by the Speaker to seek information relative to the powers of the Maritime Commission in the sale of tankers, I have been privileged to participate in an effort to relieve the transportation difficulties in connection with the fuel crisis. As a result of our efforts, quite a number of additional tankers were assigned by the Navy and the Maritime Commission to relieve the emergency.

But the shortage continues and is aggravated by substantial shipments abroad. I should have thought that recent weather conditions in Washington would serve as a reminder to those in authority that the people in our Northern States are really suffering from intense cold because of the lack of fuel. The citizens of Connecticut are suffering, and the people of Fairfield County want immediate relief.

In November the President was asked to use his authority to curtail the export of fuel oil to foreign nations. The President has failed to act. I believe the situation to be such that immediate steps must be taken with regard to exports of oil while this severe fuel shortage in the United States continues. We cannot meet the great demands which the European crisis makes upon us unless the American people are able to work at their highest efficiency. We cannot meet the challenge of European recovery if the American people are unheated and if the great American workshop lacks adequate petroleum products for production and transportation. Accordingly, it is also in the interest of those nations who hope to receive American aid that our economy should remain strong. It is to their advantage that the American worker should be adequately heated. No reasonable man can deny that in considering the requirements of European recovery, we must take our own essential needs into account.

In view of the intimate relationship between foreign aid and domestic needs, I regret very much that the President has seen fit to blame the Congress for this fuel shortage. Surely we must be as nonpartisan in considering the needs of our own people as we are in considering the needs of others. The Congress is not responsible for the present fuel oil crisis. The solution to this problem has for a long time rested in the hands of the President. The President has the power to relieve this distress.

Since he has failed to exercise his authority, the Congress must take action. We must compel the Executive to take the necessary steps. This is urgent. It is imperative. It is vital not only for the health and comfort of the American people, not only to assure a full functioning of our economy, but in order that we may remain at all times strong enough to meet the problems which face us in a very dangerous world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to change the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1266. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the eighth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1267. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the withdrawal of public notices in the Yuma reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1268. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 514); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1269. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of August 5, 1947, entitled "The Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act" (Public Law 369, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1270. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Fourteenth Quarterly Report on Contract Settlement, covering the period October 1 through December 31, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1271. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 515); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1272. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders for the year ended December 31, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5214. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. First report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 5213. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 5214. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5215. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least $2,500,000,000 during each fiscal year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5216. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall take office as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 5217. A bill to prohibit the exportation of crude petroleum and certain petroleum products until domestic requirements are being currently met; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5218. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 5219. A bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act so that it will apply to fishermen who are paid wages and will not apply to fishermen who are compensated by sharing in the catch; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri:

H. R. 5220. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to clarify provisions of the act relating to employees of establishments engaged primarily in local activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5221. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United

States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5222. A bill to provide additional options with respect to endowment contracts under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 which mature by reason of the completion of the endowment period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 5223. A bill to cover appropriation items for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in the 1949 budget which may be subject to points of order; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 5224. A bill to provide that Federal grants-in-aid to States for the purpose of assistance to dependent children be based in part on the economic capacity of the States rather than on a fixed percentage for all States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5225. A bill to permit judicial determination of the title to sec. 36, T. 30 S., R. 23 E., Mount Diablo base and meridian, in Elk Hills, Kern County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5226. A bill fixing rank of retired Army officer war veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5227. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls, that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 5228. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 5229. A bill to provide that at least 10 percent of all amounts collected as income taxes from taxpayers other than corporations shall be applied to the reduction of the Federal debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5230. A bill to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5231. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 5232. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5233. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the central Utah project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 5234. A bill for the relief of Alvin Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5235. A bill for the relief of the Jansson Gage Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 5236. A bill for the relief of Davis Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 5237. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their three daughters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1248. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 36 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1249. By Mr. HAND: Petition of members of the American Legion and others, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1250. By Mr. HART: Petition of Beacon Unit, No. 419, American Legion, of Jersey City, N. J., urging the establishment of a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1251. By Mr. JENISON: Petition of the American Legion Auxiliary, Watseka Unit, No. 23, Watseka, Ill., signed by 23 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1252. Also, petition of the American Legion of Georgetown, Ill., signed by 37 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1253. Also, petition of the American Legion of West Union, Ill., signed by 80 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1254. Also, petition of American Legion Auxiliary, Unit No. 85, Kankakee, Ill., signed by 85 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1255. Also, petition of Kankakee Post, No. 85, American Legion, Kankakee, Ill., signed by 73 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1256. Also, petition of American Legion, Post No. 643, Ashkum, Ill., signed by 71 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1257. Also, petition of the American Legion, of Watseka, Ill., signed by 24 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1258. Also, petition of the American Legion, of Momence, Ill., signed by 62 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1259. Also, petitions of the American Legion, of Danville, Ill., signed by 136 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1260. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. Belle Dreymiller, president, Auxiliary Unit No. 680, the American Legion, Hampshire, Ill., containing the signatures of 24 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1261. Also, petition of Miss Laura Steffen, Hebron, Ill., containing the signatures of 23 residents of Hebron, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1262. Also, petition of Arnold N. May, Spring Grove, Ill., containing the signatures of 36 residents of Spring Grove, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1263. Also, petition of Milan C. Hromadka, commander, Frank H. Nagel, Jr., Post, No. 119, American Legion, of Fox River Grove, Ill., containing the signatures of 19 residents of Fox River Grove, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1264. Also, petition of Ray E. Bassett, Joliet, Ill., containing the signatures of 29 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1265. Also, petition of Mrs. S. S. Schmieding, Auxiliary Unit No. 13, Marine Post, the American Legion, Plainfield, Ill., containing the signatures of 13 residents of Plainfield, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1266. Also, petition of Raymond O. Miller, West Chicago, Ill., containing the signatures of six residents of West Chicago, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1267. Also, petition of Mrs. G. R. Janak, of Algonquin, Ill., containing the signatures of 104 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1268. Also, petition of Mrs. Gail Pertiet, secretary, Dundee-Carpentersville Auxiliary Unit, No. 679, the American Legion, Dundee, Ill., containing the signatures of 54 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1269. Also, petition of American Legion Auxiliary, Alexander Bradley Burns Unit, No. 80, of Downers Grove, Ill., containing the signatures of 40 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1270. Also, petition of Lombard Post, No. 391, American Legion, Lombard, Ill., containing the signatures of 40 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1271. Also, petition of Alexander Bradley Burns Post, No. 80, American Legion, Downers Grove, Ill., containing the signatures of 76 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1272. Also, petition of Perrottet-Nickerson Post, No. 76, American Legion, Wheaton, Ill., containing the signatures of 100 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1273. Also, petition of Wood Dale Post, American Legion, Wood Dale, Ill., containing the signatures of 51 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1274. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of Richard Ellis Post, No. 205, American Legion, Janesville, Wis., urging legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1275. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Automobile Association and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the repeal of special Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, we are finding that without Thee we can do nothing. Let not foolish pride or stubborn will keep us from confessing it.

Help us, O Lord, when we want to do the right thing, but know not what it is. But help us most when we know perfectly well what we ought to do and do not want to do it.

Have mercy upon us, Lord, and help us for Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 30, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) extending the time for the submission of the report of investigation of consumer goods.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to change the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the Senate for a period of 2 weeks.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a meeting of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be held this afternoon at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO MERCHANT MARINE AND COAST GUARD ACADEMIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the provisions of the act of May 11, 1944, the Chair appoints the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

Also, in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 15, 1939, the Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in behalf of the acting chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. TOBEY], I desire to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] have been appointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, and the Senator from Mr. Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] have been appointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy. Under the law, the chairman of the committee [Mr. WHITE] is an ex officio member of the Boards.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of December 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third semiannual report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

PROGRESS REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly progress report for the calendar year 1947 of that Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co. (successor in interest of Washington Railway & Electric Co.), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Engineering Association of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., favoring statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to have included in the forthcoming rivers and harbors bill the project of dredging Bullock's Cove in the town of East Providence

"Whereas the United States Army engineers held a public hearing upon December 1946 which was attended by over 100 representatives of the commercial fishing industry, business interests, yachting clubs, and other prominent groups, at which hearing evidence was presented to show that if the dredging of Bullock's Cove in the town of East Providence could be undertaken and completed it would be of inestimable value to said town and to the State of Rhode Island; and

"Whereas, following said public hearing, the United States Army engineers then recommended to Congress that the dredging of Bullock's Cove as proposed should be undertaken: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now urgently requests the Members in the Congress of the United States of America and in particular the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress to use their utmost efforts to have included in the forthcoming rivers and harbors bill the proposed project of dredging Bullock's Cove in the town of East Providence; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America and to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives."

PRESSURE GROUPS IN THE FIELD OF RECLAMATION—RESOLUTIONS BY NEBRASKA RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Nebraska Reclamation Association, at its recent annual meeting at Kearney, Nebr., adopted five resolutions, with particular significance and, I think, interest to Congress. I present the resolutions and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Com-

mittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 1

Whereas we recognize that the greatest obstacle to progress in the field of reclamation is the subversive influence of special-interest groups; and

Whereas these groups operate under various pretenses as interested in the public welfare and under names often misleading; and

Whereas associations with genuine interest in progress are frequently infiltrated with a purpose to hamper their efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge State associations and the National Reclamation Association to safeguard democratic processes in their activities and to avoid undue influence of special-interest groups seeking selfish ends.

Resolution 2

Whereas a Nation-wide as well as a State-wide shortage of electrical energy exists: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. The Nebraska Reclamation Association reaffirms its faith in public-power development as a corollary of irrigation as the most beneficial and efficient means of providing ample electrical energy for every use.

2. We commend the Nebraska public power and irrigation districts for the efforts they have put forth to meet the emergency involved in the current shortage of electrical energy and for their effective coordination and planning under the most difficult conditions.

3. We ask the utmost of cooperation from both State and Federal governmental bodies in the efforts of the Nebraska hydros to erect additional facilities for the production of electrical energy and we, as an association, pledge our complete cooperation toward that end.

Resolution 3

Whereas the conservation and effective use of water resources is undeniably essential to the welfare of all of the people of Nebraska; and

Whereas the harnessing of the tributaries of the Missouri River flowing through Nebraska is an integral part of the development of the whole Missouri Valley; and

Whereas the solution to the most beneficial use of water in Nebraska can only be achieved through the mechanism of such an over-all program as the Pick-Sloan plan, which already has been given the approval of the Federal Congress; and

Whereas attempts to obstruct the development of the Missouri Valley can only serve to delay the further application of water to Nebraska acres: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. We endorse the Pick-Sloan plan and we call for an acceleration of that plan in conformity with Nebraska law in Nebraska, as well as in conformity with the laws of other States in the entire Missouri Valley, so that we may enlarge our available supply of electrical energy, bring more acres under irrigation, and strengthen our existing means of flood control.

2. We recommend the construction of a high-level dam at Fort Randall so that the maximum amount of electrical energy may be produced there to help alleviate the present power shortage, and contribute materially to the repayment of reclamation district construction costs, thus reducing the cost of irrigation to the farmers.

Resolution 5

Whereas in the expenditure of Federal funds for the reclamation of lands by the application of water from a Government-financed project, the national policy under which the Bureau of Reclamation functions has been to limit the acreage owned by individual persons, before construction costs are paid, to 160 acres: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Reclamation Association favors a policy of limitation of acreage of individual farmers on family-sized farms and opposes the application of water from Government-financed projects to large tracts of land under centralized ownership farmed by tenants under corporate management.

Resolution 6

Whereas the need for an adequate knowledge of the supplies of ground water in the State of Nebraska has long been recognized; and

Whereas the various State and Federal agencies studying ground water have collected immense amounts of data and are diligently continuing their surveys: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend the substantial progress that has been made and urge the various agencies involved to fully coordinate the data obtained so that the greatest possible benefits may be derived therefrom; be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Nebraska delegation in Congress to continue diligently to seek adequate appropriations for the further development of this investigation to the end that at the earliest possible date we may have a subsurface map of our State which will not only give information as to water levels but also the permeability of materials and the rate and directions of movement of our ground water.

PEACETIME RENT CONTROL

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to peactime rent control. It is un-American, unconstitutional, and unnecessary. I receive many letters on this subject. One of my replies to an advocate of rent control attracted so much attention that I have received requests for thousands of copies of it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE.

DEAR FRIEND: Nobody could be more sympathetic toward the rank and file of our people than I am, because I was brought up in poverty. My parents were tenant farmers. I have worked hard at manual labor much of my life. I have no desire to do anything that would benefit landlords as a group at the expense of any other group.

I beg of you to look at my appraisal of the rent-control situation from the standpoint of a lawmaker for this great Republic. I cannot find in the Constitution of the United States any power delegated to the Government by the people, that gives the Government the right to take sides in personal affairs or welfare of any group of people, whether they be poor or rich, high or low, saint or sinner, white or black. The tenants are citizens of this Nation, just the same as are the landlords. The subject of what amount of money should be paid by one American citizen to another American citizen is no business whatever of the Federal Government. It is strictly a matter between landlords and tenants. If you were a landlord, it would be no concern to the Federal Government whether you received $10 rent or $100 rent, and the same thing applies to a tenant.

Of course, you know that if the Government has a right to tell you what you must charge for rent of property you own, it has the right to tell the farmer what he must charge for a pound of butter, or a pig, and it has the right to tell a laborer what he must charge for an hour's work. And, the Government, by the terms of our Constitution, simply does not have that power. When our forefathers wrote the Constitution, they delegated certain powers to their government, and then they specifically wrote into the Constitution that all powers not delegated to their government were retained by the people.

Now there are other nations which have different forms of government, and those other forms of government permit the public officials to regulate and regiment the people in every line of endeavor. If the people of this Nation want to change their form of government, they can do it by the legal process of amending our Constitution, and if the people amend our Constitution so as to give the Federal Government power to set the price of rent, or the price of anything else, I, as a public official, will uphold that amended Constitution just the same as I now uphold and defend the Constitution we now have. In other words, I believe the people should rule themselves by constituted law. If they want to change their Constitution, they have the right to do so, but I want our Constitution obeyed as it is now, or as it may be amended in the future by the people themselves.

May I tell you something else. I am here on the ground, and I know what I am talking about. The only reason that some of our high public officials want rent control is because there are more tenants who vote than there are landlords, and the main objective of most public officials is to do the thing that will get themselves reelected and reelected and reelected so they can continue to live and grow fat off of the Government pay roll the rest of their lives.

Now you know that selfish deceitful public officials like that will always try to favor the group which has the most votes, so whenever it comes to pass that the census records show that there are more landlords than there are tenants, this same group of public officials now voting to keep the rents low for the tenants, will still want rent control, but they will use it for another purpose. They will use it for the purpose of boosting the rents to make the landlords happy. So people who advocate Government control of rents, or food, or anything else are only subscribing to a policy that may at some later date be very damaging to them.

Our Nation has grown strong because we have had a Government which grants the people the God-given right to pit their own ability, talents, experience, and energy against each other, without taking sides in the competition. I think it is the best form of Government ever devised by human beings, and so long as I am a public servant of the people I am going to uphold and defend our Constitution.

I trust I have made my position clear.

Sincerely yours,

W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senator, Texas.

REIMPOSITION OF RATION AND PRICE CONTROLS—LETTER FROM A. C. CLAASSEN

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a letter received by me from A. C. Claassen, of Golden Rule Farms, Whitewater and Potwin, Kans. Mr. Claassen is president of the Butler County Farm Bureau. He writes me in opposition to the reimposition of ration and price controls.

Just how the powers that be in Washington expect to get increased production of food,

clothing, and other consumer goods by resorting to rationing and/or price controls is beyond our simple reasoning powers—

Mr. Claassen writes.

It is quite true that if price controls, or rationing, or both were imposed, that, as far as agricultural products are concerned, there would be a temporary liquidation which would temporarily increase supplies of food for perhaps 60 to 90 days after such controls were imposed. But that would inevitably lead to a scarcity immediately thereafter that would make the wartime scarcities seem a period of plenty by comparison.

The present ratio between feed grain prices, and the market price for hogs, cattle, and sheep, certainly precludes finishing animals to prime or even choice grades, and anyone with reasonable intelligence should know that without being told.

For the consumer, the present situation contains dynamite if the matter is tampered with by legislation. Recent control history is too vivid in the producers' memory, and he is going to, if the controls are imposed, profit by past experience, or should one say, learn how quickly to avoid former losses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present Mr. Claassen's letter for appropriate reference and request that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks. I urge Senators to read the letter. I want to say that I think Mr. Claassen is entirely right, and I certainly shall oppose reimposition of price controls and rationing, and certainly the proposal to impose rationing on meat only. Such action would be decidedly opposed to the public interest. I send the letter to the desk for inclusion as part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDEN RULE FARMS,
WHITEWATER AND POTWIN, KANS.,
January 9, 1948.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Recent news in the daily press seems to indicate that the Republican-controlled Congress is seriously considering submitting to the President's and the administration's demands, and passing some sort of price control, rationing, and allotment measure at this session of Congress.

Of course, being this far removed from Washington and the political scene, perhaps we do not see all the political implications or expediences involved, but we can scarcely believe that the press is right, and that Congress would even consider such legislation seriously.

This letter is written to you both as an individual, and in my official capacity as president of the Butler County Farm Bureau. At the regular monthly executive board meeting last Saturday, by motion, I was instructed to officially let you know the views of the local farm bureau in this matter in no uncertain terms.

Let me say at the outset, that being farmers and producers of more products than we consume, that our viewpoint may be both prejudiced and biased. However, viewing this matter from the standpoint of the consumer alone, we must certainly arrive at these basic conclusions:

1. If price controls are to be instituted, and benefit the consumer at all over his present status, then retail prices will somehow have to be reduced from present levels.

2. It follows that price control calls for rationing if anything like equitable distribution is to be even approached.

3. If No. 1 above is achieved it then follows that prices to producers will have to be lower than present levels.

4. If we cannot get adequate production of food and fiber at the present high level of prices how can we reasonably expect even greater production if prices are rolled back?

5. Meat seems to be one of the biggest scapegoats just now, especially beef, due to its high price and scarcity. Does it never occur to bureaucratic Washington that the present scarcity of beef could be directly blamed upon the continuance of price ceilings and rationing for such a long period after hostilities ceased?

Just how the powers-that-be in Washington expect to get increased production of food, clothing, and other consumer goods, by resorting to rationing and/or price controls, is simply beyond our simple reasoning powers. It is quite true that if price controls, or rationing, or both were imposed, that, as far as agricultural products are concerned, there would be a temporary liquidation, which would temporarily increase supplies of food for perhaps 60 to 90 days after such controls were imposed, but it would inevitably lead to a scarcity immediately thereafter, that would make the wartime scarcities seem a period of plenty by comparison. The plea has been made in the press that as far as farm commodities are concerned, controls are necessary to conserve our dwindling grain supplies. The farmer has been accused in the past of being quite dumb, and perhaps with reason, but he is scarcely so dumb that he will deliberately squander and feed grain to livestock beyond the stage where it is profitable for him to do so. The present ratio between feed-grain prices and the market prices of hogs, cattle, and sheep, certainly precludes finishing animals to prime or even choice grades, and anyone with reasonable intelligence should know as much without being told.

The ratio of 13 to 1 has been generally accepted by the trade as the minimum of where pork production is profitable, and will increase. In the case of beef, the ratio of 15 to 1, while not as generally accepted or known, is a very conservative estimate of the cost of gain on beef cattle in the feedlot. Now if you will take the trouble of multiplying the Kansas City or Chicago market quotations on corn by 15, and then turning to the price of finished beef on the hoof on either market, you will find how small a percentage of each day's receipts are paying for their feed costs. This does mean that the feeder has not or is not making a profit on his operations, but it does mean that his profit must be made on margins and not in the feeding operation. In other words his profit, if any, derives from the fact that his stocker or feeder steers were purchased over a year ago at an average of around 17 cents per pound. If they had to be purchased at today's prices he certainly could not afford to feed cattle, and that is the reason that he is not feeding as many as last year, as even the United States Department of Agriculture is finally finding out now, and raising the cry of "wolf, wolf."

In the even price controls and rationing are imposed, what will the end result be? The answer: Temporarily large supplies of meat and grain for 60 days, followed by a dearth that will make wartime shortages pale into insignificance. There is no shortage of meat now, the city press to the contrary notwithstanding, as United States Department of Agriculture figures show, but there is a larger per capita demand than ever before. The present seeming shortage of meat is directly traceable to wartime ceilings and controls, which made it unprofitable for too long a time to produce meat. This would have been much worse were it not for the fact that farming and livestock production is relatively inflexible, and individual producers tend to continue usual practices from year to year. For the consumer, the present situation contains dynamite if the matter is tampered with by legislation. Recent control history is too vivid in the producers memory, and he is going to—if controls are imposed—profit by past experience, or should one say, learn how quickly to avoid former losses.

We hope that if control and rationing legislation does come before the Senate, you can see fit to vigorously oppose such legislation, both by voice and with your vote. We believe such action will not only be to the present interest of your constituency, but in the interest of the country as a whole in the years to come.

Very truly yours,

A. C. CLAASSEN,
President, Butler County Farm Bureau.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 2, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to change the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2097. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755) as amended, to provide that regulations for any area, section, or flyway of the country shall be based on conditions and needs existing within such area, section, or flyway; and

S. 2098. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755) as amended, to provide for an advisory committee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2099. A bill for the relief of the estate of Cornelia Mayr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2100. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 2101. A bill to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 2102. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An Act to Facilitate and Simplify the Administration of Indian Affairs," approved August 3, 1946; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2103. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2104. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Beaver Creek, Lincoln County, Oreg., for the purpose of determining what action should be taken to control floods of such creek and to make it adequately drain the area through which it flows; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 2105. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2106. A bill for the relief of Elza Friedrych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2107. A bill to establish a Division of Cooperatives in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 2108. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Friends Service Committee; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. MARTIN (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. CAIN, Mr. IVES, and Mr. ELLENDER) introduced Senate bill 2109, to relieve the critical shortage of iron and steel scrap, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2110. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Plays With Himself;

S. 2111. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary One Goose;

S. 2112. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Richard Cummins, Sr.;

S. 2113. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence Badboy (Florence Badboy Old Dwarf);

S. 2114. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Laforge;

S. 2115. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ruby Good Horse;

S. 2116. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Thomas Charles La Forge;

S. 2117. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Josephine Good Horse;

S. 2118. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Edward Badbear; and

S. 2119. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Alice Little Light; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2120. A bill for the relief of William E. Gillespie, Jr.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2121. A bill authorizing the issuance to Mountain States Development Co. and Crescent Eagle Oil Co. of patents for certain placer-mining claims located in Grand County, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CRITICAL SHORTAGE OF IRON AND STEEL SCRAP

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], members of the Subcommittee on Steel of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to relieve the critical shortage of iron and steel scrap. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would have joined in the introduction of the bill, but he is now away from the Senate on official business.

The bill (S. 2109) to relieve the critical shortage of iron and steel scrap, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MARTIN (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. CAIN, Mr. IVES, and Mr. ELLENDER), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement relative to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the unanimous report of the Steel Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee which I introduced on the floor of the Senate on Friday, January 16, had as one of its recommendations the following:

> Section 6, page 2, the subcommittee recommends that the committee do all in its power to develop immediate sources of ferrous scrap. The best potential for immediate recovery of scrap is in Government surpluses and inventories. To assist in expediting the declaration of surplus military and industrial equipment and its subsequent determination as scrap, the subcommittee recommends that legislation be prepared to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, in order (1) to set a time limit for the sale of all remaining consumer and producer durable goods in War Assets Administration surplus stocks; (2) to effect a prompt determination and sale of all Government-owned obsolete and unserviceable materials of ferrous content, whether in War Assets surplus stocks or held by other Government agencies. The subcommittee further recommends that the Military Departments bend every effort to secure the prompt return of all war-generated scrap from overseas. The Steel Subcommittee is absolutely opposed to the export of scrap to foreign nations, or the export of unfinished steel whereby a loss of home scrap would occur.

The bill introduced to carry out this recommendation in section 1 makes a finding that the lack of adequate scrap is holding back production of steel and steel products which is necessary to the security and economy of the United States. A subsection of section 1 of the bill declares it to be the policy of the United States to increase supplies of ferrous scrap by liquidating surplus stocks of ferrous material under the control of the United States Government and by return of scrap to this country from foreign shores.

Section 2 of the bill defines the terms used in it.

Section 3 of the bill requires all Government agencies which are holding materials declared to be surplus and consisting wholly or in principal part of ferrous metals, to be offered for sale within 60 days after the bill's enactment. This section also requires that any materials consisting principally of ferrous content and declared to be surplus after the enactment of the bill, must be offered for public sale within 60 days of their designation as surplus. Such surplus property of ferrous content remaining after sales under such offers must, within a further 60-day period, be offered for sale and sold as scrap, according to the terms of the bill.

Section 4 of the bill provides that scrap in the custody or control of United States Government agencies in foreign lands must be offered for sale within 6 months after the date of the enactment of the bill and must be returned for use in the United States not later than 1 year after the date of sale. The reason for this section is that it has been brought to the attention of the steel subcommittee that there are currently large quantities of war-generated iron and steel scrap located in foreign countries throughout the world, which scrap is not being returned as promptly as it should be.

Section 5 of the bill amends section 33 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to allow importation of surplus ferrous scrap to the United States.

Section 6 of the bill provides for quarterly reports to the Congress by the President of ferrous surplus property so that the Congress may determine the location of such property and the speed of liquidation of it to see that the intent of the bill is carried out.

FLOW OF VENTURE CAPITAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MILLIKIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, The Flow of Venture Capital, by Senator MILLIKIN, before the forum of the Investors' League, Inc., in Philadelphia, Pa., January 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR MONETARY AND CREDIT PROBLEMS TODAY—ADDRESS BY M. S. SZYMCZAK

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Monetary and Credit Problems Today," by M. S. Szymczak, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, at the annual stockholders' meeting of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, New York City, January 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHALLENGES TO DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Challenges To Democracy," delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Danville Chamber of Commerce, January 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

I BELONG HERE—ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP CUSHING

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "I Belong Here," delivered by the Catholic archbishop of Boston, Richard J. Cushing, before the Ninth Constitutional Convention of the CIO, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOOD CONTROL—PORTION OF ADDRESS LT. GEN. R. A. WHEELER

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an address recently delivered by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, on the subject of flood control, before the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association, in St. Louis, Mo., which appears in the Appendix.]

PRAYER BY MINISTERS REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL FRATERNAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO CHURCHES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the national prayer offered by the ministers representing the National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, on the steps of the Capitol of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISLOYALTY TO AMERICAN CONSUMERS—LETTER FROM BENJAMIN C. MARSH

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Benjamin C. Marsh, executive secretary of

the People's Lobby, entitled "This Congress Must End Disloyalty to American Consumers," which appears in the Appendix.]

WHISKY OR BREAD?—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Whisky or Bread" from the Christian Science Monitor of January 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ERP TOBACCO PROGRAM—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "ERP Tobacco Program Linked to World Trade," from the Christian Science Monitor, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEEPING GUARD ON OUR FISHERIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE SEATTLE POST INTELLIGENCER

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Keeping Guard On Our Fisheries," from the Seattle Post Intelligencer of January 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DRIFT TO WORLD WAR III—EDITORIAL BY DR. CLARENCE POE

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Can We Stop the Dangerous Drift to World War III?" by Dr. Clarence Poe, which appears in the Appendix.]

PARTICIPATION OF GARFIELD'S MOTHER IN HIS INAUGURATION AS PRESIDENT—ARTICLE BY E. E. PATTON

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Eliza Garfield—First Woman To See Son Sworn In as President of United States," by E. E. Patton, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—HISTORY OF APPROPRIATIONS, BY EARL W. COOPER

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, so much has been said recently about the inauguration and management of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and so many falsehoods have been told in reference to how it came to be organized that I ask that a history of the appropriations made for the Tennessee Valley Authority, prepared by Mr. Earl W. Cooper, an employee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, be reprinted in the RECORD. So many statements of a misleading nature have been published that the true facts should be given.

I merely wish to say that I saw in two papers in my State recently editorials containing the statement that I was the enemy of the TVA. Mr. President, I was one of the first Members of Congress, if not the earliest, to introduce a bill providing for the building of the dams along the Tennessee River and its tributaries, some 30 years ago.

If I recall aright, I became a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate more than 20 years ago, and during all these years I took the lead in getting appropriations for the construction of this great project. The record I am asking to have printed as a part of my remarks shows that I took the lead in getting every dollar of the money that went into the Tennessee Valley Authority, and that Authority was vigorously and continuously opposed by some of the leading Members of the Senate.

I ask that Mr. Cooper's compendium giving the records be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF APPROPRIATIONS MADE BY CONGRESS FOR THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

FOREWORD

In order to better understand the history of the appropriations made by Congress for the Tennessee Valley Authority, it is helpful to follow the events over the years which led to the formation of the Authority by the Federal Government. The interest in the development of the Tennessee River evidenced by Senator McKELLAR during the course of these events is particularly noteworthy, since on February 1, 1926, he introduced in the Senate the prototype of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and then, after the formation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, he became the leading proponent of the appropriations necessary to carry out the Government's program of development on the Tennessee River.

ORIGIN AND BACKGROUND OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The Report of the Joint Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, made April 1, 1939, pursuant to Public Resolution No. 83, Seventy-fifth Congress (S. Doc. 56, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), contains on page 11 a chapter on origin and background of the Tennessee Valley Authority, from which the following excerpts are quoted:

"The Tennessee Valley Authority statute enacts no radical or even novel program. The Tennessee Valley Authority is, rather, the latest stage of a long revolutionary process in the development of the policies of the Federal Government in navigable rivers. To understand the Authority it is necessary to trace this development, culminating in the synthesis of what were once thought of as divergent uses—navigation, flood control, power—into a single unified river control.

"The interest of the Federal Government in rivers, and particularly in the Tennessee, goes back more than a century. Federal control over navigation was established in the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden* in 1824. Shortly thereafter President Monroe sent to the Congress a report by Secretary of War Calhoun recommending a national plan for roads, canals, and river improvements, including a survey of Muscle Shoals, as one of the most important projects for improvement of navigation.

"Several attempts were made to build a canal around Muscle Shoals. Between 1852 and 1918, 17 surveys and projects were authorized on the Tennessee and 10 on its tributaries. As early as 1909, Congress authorized a survey for a 6-foot channel from Knoxville to Chattanooga and a 9-foot channel from Chattanooga to Paducah.

"The idea of a dual project appeared in 1899 when the Congress granted an application to construct a canal and power stations, which was not, however, undertaken. President Theodore Roosevelt, 4 years later, in vetoing a similar project, expressed the principle of combining different utilities in the same project: * * *

"The principle of allocation, that the receipts from power should be made to cover the costs of the improvement so far as practicable, is here stated in clear terms. * * *

"In 1906 the Muscle Shoals Hydro Electric Power Co. proposed a joint investment with the Government in a navigation and power project, but this and other similar plans were rejected by the Congress. * * *

"In 1912 the National Waterways Commission recognized that the Federal Government would be required to combine the conflicting interests of navigation, flood control, water power, and irrigation on the great rivers: * * *

"This principle of combining multiple uses in single structures is to be taken in conjunction with the previously stated principle of using power to help pay for the project. * * *

"A report from the Corps of Engineers in 1916 showed that nearly $10,000,000 had been spent on the river, with some improvement to navigation but without completing the work. An exhaustive study over a 5-year period led to a plan adopted in the River and Harbor Act of 1930, looking to a 9-foot channel to be obtained by building 32 low dams or 7 high dams.

"The leasing of surplus water power by the Secretary of the Interior at dams operated by the Reclamation Service was authorized in 1906 in an amendment to the Reclamation Act of 1902. Flood control was recognized as a proper feature of multiple-use dams, in the report of the Inland Waterways Commission appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907. Reforestation of headwater areas was mentioned as an element in stream regulation in the comprehensive statute of 1911 and in a report of the Geological Survey in the same year. Fertilizer as a means of soil conservation was noted by the Bureau of Soils under President Taft, with the observation that—'Fertilizers * * * involve problems * * * which obviously call for governmental assistance." Thus, the various elements that were to be combined in the Authority were appearing as public responsibilities even before the World War.

"The problems of national defense presented by the World War changed the picture and brought definite action. In 1916 the Chief of Engineers suggested that the plans of Muscle Shoals Hydro Electric Power Co. for developing Muscle Shoals be held up for consideration of the possibility of nitrate production, in view of our dependence on imported nitrates."

At this stage of events, in 1916, Senator McKELLAR was then a Member of the House of Representatives and ranked third on the Military Affairs Committee of the House, of which James Hay, of Virginia, was chairman. He had served in the House from 1911, when he was elected to fill the unexpired term created by the death of General Gordon, until 1916, when he was elected to the United States Senate.

FORMATION OF SECTION 124 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT OF 1916

The House Committee on Military Affairs began hearings in January 1916 and on March 6, 1916, reported out a bill prepared in the committee. The minutes of the committee do not show the responsibility of any individual members for any particular section of the bill. The bill as prepared by Chairman Hay was considered section by section for several days in the committee and was unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR, though not taking a leading part on the bill, was present in the committee at all times when action was taken and voted consistently on the floor in favor of the bill.

The members of the House committee at that time were Hay (chairman), Dent, McKellar, Quin, Gordon, Littlepage, Shallenberger, Dill, Caldwell, Wise, Olney, Nicholl, Kahn, Anthony, McKenzie, Greene, Morin, Tilson, Crago, and Hull.

The nitrate provision in the bill as reported stated:

"SEC. 82. That to provide for the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen by the development of water power, or any other means, necessary to establish an adequate supply of nitrogen, the appropriation of such sum or sums of money to construct the necessary plant for such purpose is hereby authorized."

This section was stricken from the bill as it passed the House on March 23, 1916, by a vote of 224 to 180. In the Senate the bill from the Senate Military Affairs Committee was substituted in its entirety for the House bill, with no provision being made for nitrates.

Senator Smith, of South Carolina, on April 7, 1916, introduced an amendment to the national defense bill based on his bill (S. 4971) as reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—"to authorize the designation and withdrawal of water-power sites and the construction of water-power and other plants by the United States for the manufacture of nitrates."

He based the interest of the Agriculture Committee on the startling fact that no other bill had taken cognizance of the need for nitric acid and its use for explosives in time of war and for fertilizers in time of peace.

The nitrate provision was attacked in the House by many of the Members, including Mr. Lenroot and Mr. Longworth, but it finally became section 124 of the bill which passed on the adoption of the second conference report in the House on May 20, 1916.

Thus was formed section 124 of the National Defense Act of 1916, which was the legislative basis for the Muscle Shoals development and was the antecedent of provisions now contained in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

In view of its importance in the history of events, section 124 is quoted here in full.

Section 124 of the National Defense Act of 1916, as passed, reads as follows:

"SEC. 124. Nitrate supply: The President of the United States is hereby authorized and empowered to make, or cause to be made, such investigation as, in his judgment is necessary to determine the best, cheapest, and most available means for the production of nitrates and other products for munitions of war and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products by water power or any other power as, in his judgment, is the best and cheapest to use; and is also hereby authorized and empowered to designate for the exclusive use of the United States, if, in his judgment, such means is best and cheapest, such site or sites, upon any navigable or nonnavigable river or rivers or upon the public lands, as, in his opinion, will be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act; and is further authorized to construct, maintain, and operate, at or on any site or sites so designated, dams, locks, improvements to navigation, powerhouses, and other plants and equipment or other means than water power as, in his judgment, is the best and cheapest, necessary, or convenient for the generation of electrical or other power and for the production of nitrates or other products needed for munitions of war and useful in the manufacture of fertilizers and other useful products.

"The President is authorized to lease, purchase, or acquire, by condemnation, gift, grant, or devise, such lands and rights-of-way as may be necessary for the construction and operation of such plants, and to take from any lands of the United States, or to purchase or acquire by condemnation materials, minerals, and processes, patented or otherwise, necessary for the construction and operation of such plants and for the manufacture of such products.

"The products of such plants shall be used by the President for military and naval purposes to the extent that he may deem necessary, and any surplus which he shall determine is not required shall be sold and disposed of by him under such regulations as he may prescribe.

"The President is hereby authorized and empowered to employ such officers, agents, or agencies as may in his discretion be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes herein specified, and to authorize and require such officers, agents, or agencies to perform any and all of the duties imposed upon him by the provisions hereof.

"The sum of $20,000,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, available until expended, to enable the President of the United States to carry out the purposes herein provided for.

"The plant or plants provided for under this act shall be constructed and operated solely by the Government and not in conjunction with any other industry or enterprise carried on by private capital.

"In order to raise the money appropriated by this act and necessary to carry its provisions into effect, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the President of the United States, may issue and sell, or use for such purposes or construction hereinabove authorized, any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed $20,000,000: *Provided*, That any Panama Canal bonds issued and sold or used under the provisions of this section may be made payable at such time after issue as the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deem advisable, and fix, instead of 50 years after date of issue, as in said act of August 5, 1909, not exceeding 50 years."

SECTION 124 SAVED ON POINT OF ORDER AND DEBATE BY M'KELLAR

February 21, 1917, during the debate in the House on the Army appropriation bill Mr. Longworth of Ohio submitted the following amendment:

"On page 48, line 2, strike out '$150,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: '$140,000, and that section 124 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, is hereby repealed.' "

Mr. Longworth stated at the time:

"Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, will be to repeal section 124 of the National Defense Act, the act which authorizes the expenditure of $20,000,000 for the acquisition of a nitrate plant.

"Gentlemen will observe that up to now none of that money has been expended, and that no site has been chosen, and no recommendation made. Therefore the effect of my amendment, if adopted, will be to save to the Government of the United States $20,000,000 that I regard as a useless expenditure of the public money."

He went on at considerable length to scathingly denounce the expenditure.

Mr. MCKELLAR argued the nitrate proposition with Mr. Longworth and finally made a point of order against the amendment, as follows (p. 3824, vol. 54, pt. 4):

"The mere fact that incidentally if this nitrate plant is established on the Tennessee River it will open up that entire river to navigation is no objection to it. It is absolutely apparent that the Government needs nitrate and needs to manufacture it in our own country. It needs to be done in the cheapest manner possible. It is believed from expert testimony that it can be done by water power cheaper than by any other method, provided we can get water power in sufficient quantity. It is understood that on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals you can get more water power than anywhere else in the country, unless it be at some place in Oregon very near the coast and outside of the safety zone. There is no doubt whatever about the Muscle Shoals being the ideal place in all the United States for the location of this plant. That is why these gentlemen down there on the Tennessee River have believed that this was the proper place for it. Now, I say this because I do not believe that the plan to establish this nitrate plant upon the Tennessee River is subject to the criticism that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] has seen fit to visit upon it, and if the point of order has not been made, I make the point of order against the amendment, because it is not a germane amendment."

The point of order was then argued, but was sustained in a lengthy ruling by Mr. Saunders as the chairman.

NAMING OF MUSCLE SHOALS

Under the provisions of section 124 of the National Defense Act of 1916, President Wilson had two committees organized to report upon processes for nitrogen fixation. The first committee, from the National Academy of Sciences and the American Chemical Society, submitted a final report on January 20, 1917. The second committee, from the Bureau of Mines and the Ordnance Department, submitted a final report on April 30, 1917, after making studies abroad. These reports were reviewed and coordinated by a third committee.

At this same time President Wilson had organized a committee on the location of the nitrate plant, consisting of Secretaries of War, Agriculture, and Interior, which held hearings at places in the East and South but made no formal report, since the urgent need of the Ordnance Department for ammonia (as a result of the declaration of war on April 6, 1917) compelled earlier action by the President.

The studies of the War Department, meanwhile, had indicated four places as particularly favorable for the location of the experimental nitrate plant, including Sheffield, Ala., at the foot of Muscle Shoals. President Wilson finally made the decision by placing on the edge of the memorandum before him "Advise Chief of Staff I have selected Sheffield." On September 28, 1917, accordingly, the Secretary of War notified the Chief of Ordnance that the President had decided upon Sheffield as the location for nitrate plant No. 1.

Muscle Shoals was selected as the site immediately after the visit of Senator McKellar and Senator Underwood to President Wilson.

Continuing with the excerpts from the report of the Joint Committee Investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority (S. Doc. No. 56, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

"Section 124 of the National Defense Act authorized the President to determine the best means of producing nitrates and to build dams and power equipment for this purpose. Two nitrate plants were built but not fully equipped at Muscle Shoals; and Wilson Dam, the most important of three planned by the Corps of Engineers, was completed in 1925.

"After the war various attempts were made to find a use for the Muscle Shoals plants. A bill to set up a Government corporation to sell fertilizer and power failed of passage in the House. * * *

"Meanwhile, there were various attempts to interest private industry in the Muscle Shoals plants. In 1921 Henry Ford offered to complete the dams and lease them for 100 years and to purchase the nitrate and steam plants for $5,000,000 and produce fertilizers to be sold at an 8-percent profit. This offer passed the House but was rejected in the Senate."

(Senator MCKELLAR was favorable to the Ford offer, took active part in the debate in the Senate, and offered several amendments, some of which were accepted and others rejected, to the bill that finally failed of passage in 1925, Mr. Ford having withdrawn his offer October 18, 1924.)

"There were many other proposals. A commission, appointed by President Coolidge in 1925, recommended that the properties should be used to make nitrogen compounds but not to sell power. A joint committee was directed to negotiate with private interests to lease the property, but was unsuccessful. In March 1928 the Senate adopted a resolution of Senator Norris providing for construction of a transmission line to

sell power. The Alabama Power Co. had at that time the only line to the plant. The House substituted a bill for a corporation to produce and sell both fertilizer and power, which passed both Houses on May 25, 1928. This bill provided among other things for a dam on Cove Creek, now Norris Dam. The bill was pocket-vetoed by President Coolidge.

"A similar bill was vetoed by President Hoover on March 3, 1931, on the ground, among others that the Government should not compete with its citizens. At President Hoover's suggestion, the Muscle Shoals Commission was appointed. The Commission recommended a 50-year lease of Muscle Shoals and the construction of Cove Creek (Norris) Dam for 'navigation, flood control, and incidental power development.'"

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS BY SENATOR M'KELLAR TO GET THE MUSCLE SHOALS PROPERTIES OPERATED

During this time referred to in the joint committee's report when Congress was seeking some way to get the Muscle Shoals properties operated, Senator McKELLAR was constantly active and proposed the following:

December 6, 1923, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 12 on the Ford offer, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken; Senate Joint Resolution 14, to investigate the legal right of the Secretary of War to dispose of the Gorgas plant at Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses, with no action taken; and Senate Joint Resolution 18, authorizing an investigation of charges regarding lobbying against the resolution accepting the Ford offer, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken.

December 3, 1924, offered an amendment to the McKenzie bill on the Ford offer to limit leasing to American citizens, which was agreed to; also offered an amendment that power in interstate commerce shall be regulated by the Secretary of War, which was rejected. Senator McKELLAR participated at great length in the day-after-day debate. The McKenzie bill failed of final passage after getting to conference.

In March 1925, during the special session, Senator McKELLAR offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That a select committee of four Senators be appointed by the Vice President, two Republicans and two Democrats, two of whom voted for what is known as the Underwood proposal for the disposition of Muscle Shoals and two of whom voted against that proposal, which committee shall investigate, during the coming recess of Congress, the question of what is the best disposition to make of the Shoals property and report its findings and recommendations to the Senate at the next session of the Congress to be held in December 1925."

The resolution also provided for holding hearings and for visiting Ontario for a power study but failed on the objection of Senators Bruce and Jones.

February 1, 1926, introduced S. 3081, to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and no action was taken on it. (This bill is printed in full in later pages.)

January 17, 1927, Senator McKELLAR introduced an amendment to the Federal Power Act, to limit jurisdiction to navigable streams.

March 1, 1927, he presented the following notices to suspend the rule and offer amendments to the second deficiency appropriation bill:

"To enable the Secretary of War to be on a fair basis in securing current generated at Muscle Shoals, Ala., the sum of $2,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be used by the Secretary at his discretion for building transmission lines from Muscle Shoals to such point, or points, as he may select."

Also:

"*Provided further*, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to use any funds at his disposal for river and harbor work not exceeding $200,000 for the purpose of making investigations and borings to ascertain and report to the Congress the feasibility of building a dam on Clinch River at Cove Creek, Tenn. (afterward named Norris Dam) and in the event the Federal Power Commission shall issue either a permit or a license to any private company under the Federal Power Act, such company shall repay to the United States the money so expended by the Secretary of War."

No action was taken on these proposed floor amendments.

December 9, 1927, introduced S. 839, to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken.

March 12, 1928, and on the following day, Senator McKELLAR materially aided in the formation of Senate Joint Resolution 46 as presented by Senator Norris, which was later pocket-vetoed by President Coolidge. He offered the following amendment, which became section 3 in the final passage:

"The Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the purposes of this act shall locate a fertilizer plant in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, in Alabama, and there shall be turned over to him the nitrate plant, together with the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 1, and such other buildings, houses, and shops there located as shall be necessary for the Secretary and his employees in the construction and maintenance and operation of such plants; and when such fertilizer plant is thus located and established in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals all the power necessary for the requirements of said plant shall be supplied from said steam plant located at nitrate plant No. 2 or from Dam No. 2."

And section 2 as finally passed contained amendments submitted by Senator McKELLAR and other Senators to Senator Norris', as follows:

"(e) Whenever the Secretary determines that it is commercially feasible to produce any such fertilizer, it shall be produced in the largest quantities practicable, and shall be disposed of at the lowest prices practicable, to meet the agricultural demands therefor, and to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to make alterations, modifications, or improvements in existing plants and facilities and to construct and operate new plants and facilities in order to effectuate properly the provisions of this section."

January 5, 1929, introduced S. 5218, which he explained as being the provisions that were not objectionable in the vetoed bill, authorizing the Secretary of War to build the transmission lines and dispose of the power; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken.

April 29, 1929, Senator McKELLAR introduced S. 813, to create a commission for Muscle Shoals; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with no action taken. Also reintroduced as S. 815 the bill authorizing the Secretary of War to build the transmission lines and dispose of the power.

March 3, 1931, Senator McKELLAR argued at length on the overriding of the veto of President Hoover on Senate Joint Resolution 49, during which Senator Norris stated President Hoover had proposed a new solution, "Turn Muscle Shoals over to Alabama and Tennessee." The bill failed to pass over the veto for lack of two-thirds on a roll-call vote of 49 yeas to 34 nays.

THE PROTOTYPE OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

Among these legislative proposals submitted by Senator McKELLAR is one that stands out as a likely forerunner and prototype of the eventual Tennessee Valley Authority Act, but since it was submitted during the Coolidge administration it received no favorable action. While not at all phrased in the same language, it does contain many of the principles which were later enacted into the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and might well have superseded it under a friendly administration.

The bill was S. 3081, introduced by Senator McKELLAR on February 1, 1926—7 years before Tennessee Valley Authority—and is in full as follows:

[69th Cong., 1st sess.; S. 3081; in the Senate of the United States, February 1 (calendar day, February 10), 1926; Mr. McKELLAR introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry]

"A bill to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, and for other purposes

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Muscle Shoals Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the 'commission') to be composed of three members, one of whom shall be the Director of Fixed Nitrogen Research Laboratory in the Department of Agriculture, and his successors in office, and who shall be a member of this commission, ex officio, and the other two commissioners shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall hold their offices for a term of 4 years and until their successors are appointed and qualified. The salaries of all three of said commissioners shall be $7,500 a year, payable monthly, but the salary herein authorized to be paid to the Director of Fixed Nitrogen shall be in lieu of any salary now paid him as director.

"TRANSFER OF PLANTS AND FACILITIES

"(See sec. 7 (a) of TVA Act)

"SEC. 2. The United States nitrate plants Nos. 1 and 2, located, respectively, at Sheffield, Ala., and Muscle Shoals, Ala., together with all real estate and buildings used in connection therewith, all tools, machinery, equipment, accessories, and material thereunto belonging, and all laboratories and steam and other plants used as auxiliaries thereto; the Fixed Nitrogen Research Laboratory; the Waco limestone quarry in Alabama; and Dam No. 2, located in the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, its powerhouse, and all of its hydroelectric and operating appurtenances (except the locks), and all machinery, lands, and buildings in connection therewith, are hereby transferred to the commission for use by it in executing the functions vested in it by this act.

"FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION

"(See secs. 4 (i and j), 5 (d) of TVA Act)

"SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this act all functions vested in the President by the first two paragraphs of section 124 of the act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916 (including such of those functions as are now being exercised by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively), shall be exercised by the commission.

"DEVELOPMENT OF POWER

"(See secs. 10, 11, 12 of TVA Act)

"SEC. 4. (a) The commission is authorized and directed to utilize to the fullest extent the plants and facilities made available to it under sections 2 and 3, and to construct, maintain, and operate such additional plants

and facilities as it considers necessary, for the development of power by steam or water, at Muscle Shoals, for the purposes specified in section 5. Any excess power developed may be disposed of, under such terms and conditions as the commission may prescribe, as hereinafter provided.

"(b) In the disposition of such excess power the commission may give preference to the power requirements of States and political subdivisions of States, including municipalities, and thereafter dispose of the remainder to farmers, manufacturers, and all other users or distributors of current, whether individuals, partnerships, associations, or corporations, in territory within economical transmission distance from Muscle Shoals, equitably and without discrimination, and without reference to State lines, and at rates fair and reasonable and as low as practicable. The commission is authorized and directed to make classifications and shall serve all customers in the same class at like rates and under same conditions of service, and no locality or section shall be favored over any other locality or section. Should the commission sell a portion of such power to a public utility company for distribution, it shall have the power and it is hereby directed to regulate by provisions in the contract the prices to be charged by such utility company in the resale of such power to consumers. In fixing a basis of rates the commission shall consider (1) the cost of operation; (2) the cost of repairs and replacements; (3) the actual value of the steam plant; and (4) the cost of the plant at Dam No. 2 expended after the World War, less the reasonable cost of the navigation facilities of the enterprise, and the current used in the manufacture of fertilizers. After fixing the aggregate of these costs and expenditures the commission shall fix rates so as to bring in income not in excess of 4 percent per annum.

"(c) In order to dispose of such power in the manner which the commission considers most advantageous to the United States and to the public interest, the commission may enter into leases for terms of years not exceeding 10, may make contracts, may construct and/or operate either singly or with any State or political subdivision thereof, or any individual, partnership, association, or corporation, transmission lines, or other power projects, and do all other acts which it considers necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. Any of such power shall be subject to recall when and as needed for the production of fertilizer or ingredients to be used for fertilizer; but such recall of such power shall be made in a fair and just manner, looking to just rights of all users.

"PRODUCTION OF FERTILIZER

"(See sec. 5 of TVA Act)

"SEC. 5. (a) In order to further develop the art of nitrogen fixation, experiments shall be undertaken to produce mixed fertilizers on a commercial scale, so that the actual cost of such fertilizers may be determined. Fertilizers produced as a result of such experiments shall be offered to farmers, farm organizations, and to dealers at such prices as will cover the cost of production; or, in the event that the cost of production of such fertilizers is excessive, they shall be offered at prices which the commission finds fair in order to meet commercial competition. In order that definite results may be obtained in such experiments, the facilities and equipment for each such experiment shall be utilized until it is satisfactorily shown that it is or is not commercially feasible to produce fertilizers by the method or process used in such experiment. The result of each such experiment and a statement of cost and sale prices of the fertilizers so produced shall be reported to Congress in the annual report provided for in section 9.

"(b) Whenever the commission determines that it is commercially feasible to produce any such fertilizers, it shall be produced in the largest quantities practicable, and shall be disposed of at the lowest prices practicable, to meet the agricultural demands therefor, and to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"(c) The commission is authorized to make alterations, modifications, or improvements in existing plants and facilities, to dispose of any part of such facilities, and to construct and operate new plants and facilities in order to properly effectuate the provisions of this section.

"(d) Should processes for the economical production of nitrogen be developed by the commission, the use of such processes may be transferred to other manufacturers of fertilizer or fertilizer ingredients on condition that the transferee shall agree to resell fertilizers at rates to be regulated by the commission so that no more than a reasonable profit shall be exacted: *Provided,* That the commission shall not have power by the transfer of such processes to regulate rates so as to form a monopoly, but such regulation shall at all times keep in view commercial competition.

"MUSCLE SHOALS FUND

"(See sec. 26 of TVA Act)

"SEC. 6. There is hereby established in the Treasury a fund to be known as the 'Muscle Shoals Fund,' and all amounts received by the commission in executing the functions vested in it by this act, together with all amounts appropriated or made available by section 7, shall be covered into such fund, and are reserved, set aside, and appropriated to be available for use by the Congress in building Dam No. 3 as provided in this act and by the commission in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"(See sec. 27 of TVA Act)

"SEC. 7. All unexpended balances of the amount appropriated under section 124 of the act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and all unexpended balances of appropriations made for Muscle Shoals under any act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department are hereby transferred to the Muscle Shoals fund and made available for expenditure as are other amounts in such fund.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000,000, to be available until expended for the purposes of this act.

"CORPORATION

"SEC. 8. That said commission is hereby incorporated under and by the name, style, and title of the 'Muscle Shoals Commission' (herein referred to as the commission). Said corporation shall exist until the Congress shall repeal this provision of the act. Said corporation shall have power—

"(See sec. 4 of TVA Act)

"(1) To adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

"(2) To sue and be sued and to complain and to defend in any court of law and equity within the United States;

"(3) To make and enforce such contracts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(See sec. 3 of TVA Act)

"(4) To appoint and fix the salaries of such advisers and experts and, in accordance with the civil-service laws, appoint and, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, fix the compensation of such other officers and employees and make such expenditures, including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for law books, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding, as may be necessary, for the execution of the functions vested in the commission and as may be provided for by the Congress from time to time.

"(See secs. 4 and 18 of TVA Act)

"(5) To prescribe, amend, and repeal by-laws not inconsistent with this act for the conduct of its business;

"(6) In the name of the United States Government to exercise the right of eminent domain, and in the purchase of any real estate or in the acquisition of real estate by condemnation proceedings the title to such real estate shall be taken in the name of the United States Government;

"(7) To exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred upon it by this act, and such additional powers as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(See secs. 5 (1), 17, and 19 of TVA Act)

"(8) To purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire United States or foreign patents and processes or the right to use such patents or processes, and to obtain from the United States or foreign countries patents for discoveries or inventions of its officers or employees; and

"(9) The commission shall, to the extent deemed advisable by it, exercise its functions by and through the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture, and the engineering, technical, clerical, and other personnel of such Departments. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture shall detail for service with the commission such of the personnel of their respective departments as the commission deems necessary in carrying out the provisions of this act.

"(10) All of the stock in said corporation shall be in the name of the United States and shall be voted by the commissioners in equal amounts.

"(11) The board of directors shall be the members of the commission above named.

"ANNUAL REPORT AND REGULATIONS

"(See sec. 9 (a) of TVA Act)

"SEC. 9. (a) The commission shall submit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a detailed report of its operations for the preceding fiscal year.

"(See sec. 4 (g) of TVA Act)

"(b) The commission is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to effectuate the functions vested in it by this act.

"PROVISION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

"(See sec. 20 of TVA Act)

"SEC. 10. The commission shall utilize the plants and facilities under its jurisdiction and shall dispose of the power developed under authority of section 5 in such manner and subject to the limitation that in the event of a national emergency such plants and facilities and such power shall be immediately available for use by the United States for national defense.

"DAM NO. 3

"SEC. 11. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to complete the construction of dam No. 3 in the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Ala., in accordance with report submitted in House Document 1262, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session: *Provided,* That the Secretary of War may in his discretion make such modifications in the plants presented in such report as he may deem advisable in the interest of power or navigation, and such sums as may be

necessary for the construction of dam No. 3 are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the funds, when available, arising under sections 6 and 7 of this act."

Continuing with excerpts from the joint committee's report:

"When President Franklin D. Roosevelt came into office the idea of unified management of the river was well developed but was opposed by the idea that power ought not to be sold in competition with private interests. Numerous unsuccessful efforts had been made on the one hand to find a way of turning the plants over to private operation and on the other to operate them as part of a general river program. President Roosevelt took the side of public operation * * *.

"On April 10, 1933, in a brief message to Congress President Roosevelt said:

" 'It is clear that the Muscle Shoals development is but a small part of the potential public usefulness of the entire Tennessee River. Such use, if envisioned in its entirety, transcends mere power development; it enters the wide fields of flood control, soil erosion, afforestation, elimination from agricultural use of marginal lands, and distribution and diversification of industry. In short, this power development of war days leads logically to national planning for a complete river watershed involving many States and the future lives and welfare of millions. It touches and gives life to all forms of human concerns.

" 'I, therefore, suggest to the Congress legislation to create a Tennessee Valley Authority—a corporation clothed with the power of Government but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise. It should be charged with the broadest duty of planning for the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin and its adjoining territory for the general social and economic welfare of the Nation. This authority should also be clothed with the necessary power to carry these plans into effect. Its duty should be the rehabilitation of the Muscle Shoals development and the coordination of it with the wider plan.'

"The Tennessee Valley Authority Act, therefore, was an outgrowth of many previous attempts to deal with Muscle Shoals, as well as a development of long-standing public policies in regard to navigation and flood control. The main feature of the act was the combination of all the governmental interests connected with the river, and the creation of a regional agency based on local, State, and Federal cooperation, to drive all these interests in a single team for the general benefit of the region and of the Nation."

FORMATION OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

April 11, 1933, the day following the President's message, bills were introduced to accomplish the purpose therein stated.

Senator Norris introduced S. 1272, which was reported immediately, with minor amendments, from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

In the House, identical bills were introduced by Mr. McSwain, Mr. Almon, and Mr. Hill, which were all referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs. The bill of Mr. Hill, H. R. 5081, with certain amendments, was reported out.

The difference between the reported bills was stated by Mr. Hill on the floor of the House on April 22, 1933, as follows:

"As the Norris bill now stands, it has none of these business elements that I have been talking about. There is nothing in the Norris bill today that would cause the Authority to amortize out the cost of any dam. There is nothing in that bill that would cause the Authority to pay any interest to the Government for any money that might be used in the construction of a dam. This bill is on a much better business basis."

Mr. McSwain, chairman of the House committee, also stated on April 24, 1933:

"Why, I have introduced at this session of Congress two bills on Muscle Shoals. On the 9th of March I introduced the first bill that proposed to call the corporation that should be created the Tennessee Valley Authority. I set up in that bill my individual views about how this project should be developed.

"Then, after we had conferred with the President, I introduced another bill, which was H. R. 4559, identical with the bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Almon] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. These bills represented in principle, along with Senator Norris' bill, not identical as to words, the views of the President of the United States.

"It is not improper for me to say that when my friend, Mr. Norris, and I conferred with the President he said to us, 'You gentlemen draw the bills that you think represent our collective views that we have been expressing here'; and it was never understood or contemplated that the bill that would be introduced by myself or Mr. Hill and Mr. Almon on this end of the Capitol would be identical in every particular respect with the bill to be introduced by Senator Norris."

There were various substitutions of sections and parts of sections between the Senate and the House, and finally the bill that passed bore the number of H. R. 5081, introduced by Mr. HILL; S. 1272, introduced by Senator Norris, having been indefinitely postponed.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was thus created by the approval of H. R. 5081 on May 18, 1933 (Public, No. 17, 73d Cong.). All that was needed to start the operation and begin the construction of the contemplated dams in the development of the Tennessee River were the appropriations.

MEMBERSHIP OF SENATOR M'KELLAR ON SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The record shows that Senator MCKELLAR took a leading part in securing the necessary appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority in order to construct the many dams and install the needed facilities.

Senator MCKELLAR was first appointed to the Senate Appropriations Committee on December 10, 1923, at the beginning of the Sixty-eighth Congress and just 3 months after Calvin Coolidge became President on the death of Warren G. Harding. The members of the committee at that time were Francis E. Warren, Wyoming; Reed Smoot, Utah; Wesley L. Jones, Washington; Charles Curtis, Kansas; Frederick Hale, Maine; Selden P. Spencer, Missouri; Lawrence C. Phipps, Colorado; William B. McKinley, Illinois; Irvine L. Lenroot, Wisconsin; Henry W. Keyes, New Hampshire; Lee S. Overman, North Carolina; William J. Harris, Georgia; Carter Glass, Virginia; Andrieus A. Jones, New Mexico; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Edwin S. Broussard, Louisiana; Thomas F. Bayard, Delaware; M. M. Neely, Virginia.

By the Seventy-second Congress, under the Hoover administration, Senator MCKELLAR had advanced to second on the minority side of the committee.

In the Seventy-third Congress, under the Roosevelt administration, Senator MCKELLAR was second only to Chairman Carter Glass, of Virginia, on the committee.

In the Seventy-eighth Congress, during the absence of Chairman Glass, Senator MCKELLAR has taken a leading part as acting chairman of the committee.

HISTORY OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority (Public, No. 17, 73d Cong.), approved May 18, 1933, provided in section 27:

"All appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1934

Fifty million dollars was allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority from the appropriation for National Industrial Recovery Administration of $3,300,000,000 carried in the Fourth Deficiency Appropriation Act, approved June 16, 1933 (Public, No. 77, 73d Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1935

Twenty-five million dollars was allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority from the appropriation to carry out a number of acts, including the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, of $899,675,000 carried in the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (Public, No. 412, 73d Cong.)

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1936

Thirty-six million dollars was the amount of the first direct appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority, carried in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved August 12, 1935 (Public, No. 260, 74th Cong.).

DETAILS AS TO SECURING FIRST DIRECT APPROPRIATION

The budget estimates for the independent offices appropriation bill, 1936, considered in connection with the Second Deficiency Act, 1935, contained an item of $300,000,000 for public works, of which $50,000,000 was proposed to be allocated to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The bill as it passed the House made no reference to any dams to be constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Hearings began before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 24, 1935; those present being Senators Adams (chairman), McKellar, Hayden, Tydings, Hale, Keyes, and Dickinson. Two sessions of these hearings were devoted to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Senator MCKELLAR proposed to the subcommittee the following amendment:

"*Provided*, That for the purposes of securing uninterrupted navigation on the Tennessee River from, at, or near Knoxville to the Ohio River and maximum flood control in the Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi River Basins and of otherwise carrying out the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority is authorized and directed, out of the funds herein and heretofore appropriated, to continue the construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, and Pickwick Dam, to begin a dam at or near Guntersville, Ala., a dam at Chickamauga Creek on the Tennessee River, and the Fowlers Bend Dam on the Hiwassee River, a dam at or near Aurora Landing, and at Whites Creek on the Tennessee River."

Senator MCKELLAR also stated:

"The purpose of this amendment is that, last year, when a similar appropriation was made, we were told by the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, that these dams would be built. Senator Bailey, let me pass this down to you, if you will. We were told that these four dams were to be built. Only one has been started, and we think that the Congress ought to direct that the money be used for the purpose of building dams."

Statements were also made in these hearings by Senators Bailey and Reynolds, of North Carolina, and Congressman Weaver, of North Carolina.

Three days later, June 27, 1935, Senator BARKLEY also appeared as a witness in favor of the appropriation, particularly as to Aurora Landing.

Senator Adams, chairman of the subcommittee, read from a lengthy letter he had received from Arthur E. Morgan, chairman of the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, stating that Aurora should be investigated first to determine whether the building of another dam might make Aurora unnecessary, and similar reasons on the other dams, and requesting a moderate appropriation to

build approach roads to the Hiwassee Dam so the equipment at Norris Dam could be transferred to there instead of being dismantled. (The complete letter is in the hearings at pp. 88 to 90.)

Senator McKELLAR replied:

"That just illustrates our friend, Dr. Morgan. Last Saturday he agreed with me on every word in this resolution except—wait a minute, let me show you what he afterward put in—except this—

" 'And maximum flood control in the Tennessee, Ohio, and Mississippi River Basins, and of otherwise carrying out the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933.'

"Those were sent to me, Monday, and inserted in this resolution.

"The remainder of the resolution, as to the five dams, were absolutely agreed upon by Dr. Morgan and me, on last Saturday, and at his earnest request; and I say that his change of mind is just indicative of what has happened before; and the only way we will get these dams built is for the Congress to direct them to be built."

The amendment, as included in the bill by the Senate subcommittee, approved by the full committee and the Senate, and finally enacted into law, was as follows:

"The continued construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, and the beginning of construction on a dam at or near Guntersville, Ala., and a dam at or near Chickamauga Creek, both on the Tennessee River, and a dam on the Hiwassee River, a tributary of the Tennessee River, at or near Fowlers Bend, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the location and desirability of a dam at or near Aurora Landing, a dam at or near Whites Creek."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1937

The budget estimates for the independent offices appropriation bill, 1937, considered in connection with the first deficiency bill, 1936, contained an item of $43,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the following as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Norris Dam, Wheeler Dam, Pickwick Landing Dam, and the beginning and continuation of construction on a dam at or near Guntersville, Ala., and a dam at or near Chickamauga Creek, and a dam at or near Whites Creek, all on the Tennessee River, and a dam on the Hiwassee River, a tributary of the Tennessee River, at or near Fowlers Bend, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the location and desirability of a dam at or near Aurora Landing and a dam at or near Coulter Shoals."

The Deficiencies Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee added the following amendment, which was approved by the full committee and the Senate but was lost in conference: "the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at or near Watts Bar."

The amendment was the result of two identical amendments offered by Senator McKELLAR and Senator BARKLEY requesting $1,000,000 additional for each of these dams, necessary to complete navigation.

Thirty-nine million nine hundred thousand dollars was the amount finally approved in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1936, approved June 22, 1936 (Public, No. 739, 74th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1938

The budget estimates for the independent offices appropriation bill, 1938, considered in connection with the Second Deficiency Act, 1937, contained an item of $43,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the following as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, Chickamauga Dam, and Hiwassee Dam, and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries."

During the hearings before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies of the Senate Appropriations Committee, on May 3, 1937, Senator McKELLAR stated as follows during the testimony of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, of the Tennessee Valley Authority:

"Senator McKELLAR. It is my purpose to offer this amendment, and I want to get your views about it. On page 8, strike out the words in lines 8, 9, and 10: 'and the continuation of preliminary investigations as to the appropriate location and type of a dam on the lower Tennessee River,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'and for construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and a dam at or near Watts Bar, Tenn., and for a preliminary investigation of a dam at or near Coulter's site on the Tennessee River, Tenn.'

"What have you to say in reference to that amendment?

"Dr. MORGAN. I would like to make an additional change by adding the words: 'and such other investigations on the upper Tennessee River and its tributaries as are essential to the development of a unified river-control system.'

"There is certain planning necessary, and it is very essential that before we finish these dams that we know how they fit into others—what is the relationship that is going to be. If we could get cheaper storage at some other site, we will cut down the total cost by adequate planning."

Dr. Morgan described Gilbertsville as the largest proposed unified river-control project, and stated in answer to questions that 4 years and five or six million dollars had been spent on planning investigations.

"Senator HALE. But what I want to know is whether you have definitely decided that you are going ahead at Gilbertsville, because this amendment of Senator McKELLAR's provides for starting construction, and also at Watts Bar.

"Dr. MORGAN. We are satisfied that the Gilbertsville Dam is an essential, profitable, and proper element of our construction. It is for Congress to tell us whether we are going ahead with it.

"Senator HALE. This amendment of Senator McKELLAR's does tell you to go ahead. So it is a very important amendment to be put in."

Dr. Morgan stated the budget had cut the amount asked for from $2,750,000 to $750,000.

Senator BARKLEY also appeared as a witness and testified extensively on the amendment.

The subcommittee inserted the following amendment, which was approved by the full committee, passed by the Senate, and enacted into law: "and for the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky., and for preliminary investigations of sites for dams at or near Watts Bar and at or near Coulter's site on the Tennessee River, Tenn."

The vote in the full committee on May 10, 1937, relative to the amendment on Gilbertsville Dam was 9 to 8, as follows:

Ayes, 9: McKellar, Hayden, Russell, McCarran, Overton, O'Mahoney, Duffy, Hitchcock, Nye.

Nays, 8: Glass, Copeland, Byrnes, Adams, Green, Hale, Steiwer, Townsend.

Forty million one hundred and sixty-six thousand two hundred and seventy dollars was the amount carried for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, approved May 28, 1937 (Public, No. 121, 75th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1939

The budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1939 were in the amount of $40,000,000, and contained the following as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, Chickamauga Dam, and Hiwassee Dam, and for construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville Ky., and for preliminary investigations of sites for dams at or near Watts Bar and at or near (Coulter's site) Coulter Shoals."

The House committee reduced the amount of the appropriation to $37,237,000, stating in its report as follows:

"Gilbertsville Dam: The committee has applied $2,613,000 of the cut to the Gilbertsville Dam, for which there was alloted $2,898,000, of which $185,000 was set up for 'project investigations', the remainder being for construction on the dam and various other items incident to such construction. The committee has eliminated all items incident to construction."

On the floor of the House, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH was successful in striking from the bill "and for the construction of a dam at or near Gilbertsville, Ky."

The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations restored this language, which was approved by the full committee and by the Senate and was finally enacted into law.

During the debate on the floor of the Senate on February 25, 1938, Senator McKELLAR stated:

"Mr. President, I have only a few words to say regarding the pending amendment, which has to do with the Gilbertsville Dam. This same question was thoroughly discussed last year. In fact, this is the same fight that we had last year. Substantially the same arguments were then made; and the Senate, by a large majority, held that the Gilbertsville Dam should be built. Much money has already been spent, and to postpone the beginning of construction until next year would simply cost the Government more. While postponement is argued for, that is not the ultimate purpose. The purpose is to kill the project. The project ought to go on. * * *

"The effect of building the dams has already been to reduce power rates in that entire region. In north Alabama, Tennessee, and even in Arkansas, power rates have been reduced by the use of Tennessee Valley Authority power. The Tennessee Valley Authority has recommended building this dam. It has fixed the site, and $2,600,000 will be required to begin the dam; and that is all that is provided for by the amendment to the pending bill."

Forty million dollars was the amount carried for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1939, approved May 23, 1938 (Public, No. 534, 75th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1940

The budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1940 were in the amount of $40,000,000 and contained the following as to the dams: "Including the continued construction of Pickwick Landing Dam, Guntersville Dam, Chickamauga Dam, Hiwassee Dam, Gilbertsville Dam, and for the construction of a dam at or near Watts Bar on the Tennessee River and for preliminary investigations of sites for dams at or near Coulter Shoals on the Tennessee River, and on tributaries of said river."

Details as to the close fight on Gilbertsville, Watts Bar, and Coulter Shoals Dams

The bill as reported to the House provided for the continued construction of "Gilbertsville Dam, and for construction of a dam at or near Watts Bar on the Tennessee River, Tenn., and for preliminary investigations of a site for a dam at or near Coulter Shoals on the Tennessee River, Tenn."

Mr. Faddis, of Pennsylvania, on the floor of the House, was successful in having this language stricken from the bill, so that as it came to the Senate the bill made no reference to the Gilbertsville or Watts Bar Dams.

Senator McKELLAR offered an amendment in the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to restore this language, which was approved after a close fight

by the full committee, approved by the Senate, and enacted into law.

In the meeting of the full committee on Thursday, February 16, 1939, of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Deficiencies Subcommittee, Senator Adams, moved to strike out the Watts Bar Dam item, which was at first carried by a vote of 11 to 10, as follows:

Yeas, 11: Byrnes, Tydings, Adams, Maloney, Hale, Townsend, Bridges, Lodge, Holman, Taft, chairman.

Nays, 10: McKellar, Hayden, Thomas, Russell, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Green.

Senator McKellar, after talking with Senator Nye, voted him against the motion of Senator Adams, creating a tie vote, and the committee adjourned to meet the next day.

When the committee met on Friday, February 17, 1939, Senator Adams asked that the amendment be divided into three parts: Gilbertsville, Watts Bar, and preliminary investigations of site at or near Coulter Shoals.

Gilbertsville was approved by a vote of 18 to 6, as follows:

Yeas, 18: Glass, McKellar, Hayden, Thomas, Byrnes, Russell, Adams, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Burke, Green, Maloney, Chavez, Nye, Holman.

Nays, 6: Tydings, Hale, Townsend, Bridges, Lodge, Taft.

Watts Bar was adopted by a vote of 13 to 11, as follows:

Yeas, 13: McKellar, Hayden, Thomas, Russell, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Green, Chavez, Nye, Holman.

Nays, 11: Glass, Byrnes, Tydings, Adams, Burke, Maloney, Hale, Townsend, Bridges, Lodge, Taft.

Coulter Shoals was thereupon approved by a voice vote.

On the floor of the Senate, during the debate on the committee amendment and increasing the amount of the total appropriation for Tennessee Valley Authority from $21,797,000 to $39,003,000, Senator Adams again sought to defeat the amendment, as follows:

"Senator ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment to the amendment, to strike out the words beginning on line 5, after the word 'Gilbertsville', down to and including the words 'Watts Bar' on line 6, the language being 'and for the construction of a dam at or near 'Watts Bar.'

"Mr. President, this represents a point of issue which was discussed at length in the Committee on Appropriations. It represents a very definite issue which I wish to have submitted to the Senate.

"When the relief bill was before the Senate those of us who were arguing for a reduction in the amount to be appropriated were told that we should not begin economies with relief; that there were other places. There is now presented what some of us think a very good place, which is not subject to the objections which were made in reference to the relief bill.

"The Tennessee Valley Authority now has in the process of construction the dams on the list which appears in the pending bill on lines 3 and 4, page 48, which includes the Pickwick Landing Dam, the Guntersville Dam, the Chickamauga Dam, the Hiwassee Dam, and the Gilbertsville Dam. The item which I have asked to have stricken out is the authorization for the construction of a new dam.

"In considering the item the committee divided, 13 to 11, and then only after most persuasive and effective efforts by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] who is sometimes down but is never out. Twice during the committee's deliberations the Senator from Tennessee lost, but he always came back with another vote. The result was that our efforts to strike out this authorization for a new dam were defeated by a vote of 13 to 11, representing the vote of every Senator on the committee.

"The votes of the 11 members of the committee whose views I am seeking to express were in accord with the vote in the House of Representatives. The House eliminated both the Gilbertsville Dam and the Watts Bar Dam. The motion which I have made is merely to eliminate the authorization for the construction of a new dam upon which work is not now being done, and it does seem that if we authorize the construction of the Gilbertsville Dam in addition to four other dams now being constructed, we are being extremely liberal.

"Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority has already spent over $220,000,000. The completion of the plans of the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority will involve the expenditure of $560,000,000, and it does seem that at least we might be a little less impatient, that we might wait a little longer, and not crowd construction of a new dam while we have under construction four great dams involving expenditure of $200,000,000.

"The Gilbertsville Dam will involve a cost of $95,000,000 without the installation of power facilities. With the installation of power facilities the cost will run substantially over $100,000,000. These Senators who have been here during the past few sessions know that the construction of the Gilbertsville Dam was authorized after vigorous battles, and I think I am not exaggerating when I say that it was only the persuasiveness of two great Senators from two great States, and the personal affections of many Senators, that secured the authorization of the Gilbertsville Dam."

After lengthy debate, during which Senator MCKELLAR defended the Tennessee Valley Authority as having come through the recent investigation by a joint committee with a clean bill of health, the amendment offered by Senator Adams was rejected, 49 to 31.

Thirty-nine million three thousand dollars was the amount carried for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1940, approved March 16, 1939 (Public, No. 8, 76th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1941

The budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1941 were in the amount of $40,000,000, and contained the following as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Chickamauga Dam, Hiwassee Dam, Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky., Watts Bar Dam, and for construction of a dam near Lenoir City, Tenn."

This language remained in the bill as it passed the House, and continued on through passage in the Senate and enactment into law. In the meeting of the full committee of Senate Appropriations Committee on January 31, 1940, Senator TAFT sought to strike out "and for construction of a dam near Lenoir City, Tenn," but the motion was lost on a voice vote.

Forty million dollars was the amount carried for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for 1941, approved April 18, 1940 (Public, No. 459, 76th Cong.).

Supplemental estimate; Public Resolution 95

Based on the supplemental estimates in Senate Document 241 (76th Cong., 3d sess.), identical resolutions were introduced by Senator MCKELLAR (S. J. Res. 285) and Congressman TAYLOR (H. J. Res. 583), providing for $25,000,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority and stating: "including the funds necessary to begin construction of a dam on the Holston River near Jefferson City, Tenn.; to begin installation of two additional electric generating units at Wilson Dam, Ala., and one additional electric generating unit at Pickwick Landing Dam, Tenn.; and to begin construction of steam electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 120,000 kilowatts in the area served by the Authority."

The resolution was not changed as it came from the House.

At the meeting of the full committee of Senate Appropriations Committee on July 11, 1940, Senator Adams moved to strike out the references to construction of additional dam and hydroelectric facilities but to provide steam electric generating facilities to produce 220,000 kilowatts in lieu of approximately 120,000 referred to in the resolution. The motion was lost by a vote of 7 to 6, as follows:

Yeas, 6: Hale, Lodge, Adams, Taft, Bridges, Townsend.

Nays, 7: McKellar, Hayden, Thomas, Overton, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Holman.

Senator MCKELLAR spoke at length on the resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Twenty-five million dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the resolution, approved July 31, 1940 (Public Resolution 95, 76th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1942

The budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1942 were in the amount of $60,800,000, and contained the following as to the dams: "including continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky.; Watts Bar Dam and steam plant; Fort Loudoun Dam; and Cherokee Dam." A supplemental estimate contained in Senate Document 11 was for $10,000,000 to expedite the work on the Fort Loudoun Dam.

On the Watts Bar and steam plant item, Senator MCKELLAR at the meeting of the full committee of Senate Appropriations Committee on February 24, 1941, moved to add: "including additional steam-electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 60,000 kilowatts," which was adopted by a show of hands, 9 to 4.

On the Fort Loudoun Dam item, the amendment adding $10,000,000 for expediting work on the dam was agreed to by a show of hands, 11 to 3.

Seventy-nine million eight hundred thousand dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, approved April 5, 1941 (Public, No. 28, 77th Cong.).

Additional appropriation in Public, No. 179

Supplemental estimates were made for Tennessee Valley Authority in House Document 230 (77th Cong., 1st sess.) in the amount of $40,000,000, and stated as to the dams: "beginning construction of two additional hydroelectric projects and two additional storage projects on the Hiwassee River and its tributaries, (2) installing additional electric generating units in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority, and (3) building the transmission facilities needed to connect these projects and units to the existing transmission system of the Authority and to deliver the power produced by these projects and units to the market."

No change was made in this provision for additional appropriation by the Senate.

Forty million dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by House Joint Resolution 194, as introduced by Mr. Taylor in the House, approved July 16, 1941 (Public, No. 179, 77th Cong.).

Third supplemental national defense appropriation

Supplemental estimates were made in House Document 376 (77th Cong., 1st sess.) for the Tennessee Valley Authority and were included in the third supplemental national defense bill, 1942, in the amount of $40,000,000, and stated as to the dams: "(1) beginning construction of hydroelectric projects on the Little Tennessee River near Fontana, N. C., and on the French Broad River near Dandridge, Tenn.; (2) installing additional electric generating units with a total rated

capacity of approximately 324,000 kilowatts in existing hydroelectric projects owned by the Authority; (3) installing an additional steam electric generating unit with a rated capacity of approximately 60,000 kilowatts in the Watts Bar steam plant."

As the bill came from the House, the Douglas Dam was eliminated and the amount reduced to $25,000,000. The Senate did not change this item, and the final language read: "(1) beginning construction of a hydroelectric project on the Little Tennessee River near Fontana, N. C."

A new section was added by Senator McKELLAR in the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, first calling for $24,000,000 and later being reduced in conference to $22,000,000; stating as finally enacted: "(1) for a site on the south fork of the Holston River near Bristol, Tenn., as recommended by the Tennessee Valley Authority July 7, 1941, with an installed capacity of 75,000 kilowatts, $10,000,000; (2) for building a dam on the Watauga River east of Elizabethton, Tenn., as recommended by the Tennessee Valley Authority July 7, 1941, with an installed capacity of 60,000 kilowatts, $10,000,000; (3) for the completion of the uncompleted unit of the steam plant at or near Sheffield, Ala., $2,000,000; in all, $22,000,000."

During the hearings before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on December 9, 1941, Congressman B. Carroll Reece, Republican from Tennessee, made a statement as to the need for the Watauga Dam, and also stated as to the interest of Senator McKELLAR in the Tennessee Valley Authority (p. 186 of the hearings):

"Mr. REECE. I have been familiar with the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority since its inception and I am familiar with the circumstances that resulted in its inception, and I do not see how anyone who is familiar with the facts can for one moment question Senator McKELLAR'S profound interest in the development of the Tennessee Valley area and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and because of the eight or nine dams now that are embraced in the Tennessee Valley Authority, as I recall the facts, all except three were authorized in the Senate upon Senator McKELLAR'S initiative, in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, and those of us in Tennessee and in the South who are interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and its continued development, have looked upon Senator McKELLAR as the greatest friend that the Tennessee Valley Authority has had, and now because of a difference of view on the part of Senator McKELLAR and some particular official in the Tennessee Valley Authority, I do not see how his interest in the Tennessee Valley Authority could possibly be questioned, because he has demonstrated his interest and friendship and usefulness in the development of this great project.

"Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Reece, I will ask you if you recall whether or not it is a fact that after the Norris and Wheeler Dams were built, that the Tennessee Valley Authority made—and the Wilson Dam being already built, and those are the three that I suppose that you referred to, that after that the Tennessee Valley Authority did not ask the Budget Director for the building of any further dams; the Budget Director did not report to the House the building of any further dams; the President did not recommend the building of any further dams, and the dams that you speak of as having been initiated here in the Senate, were they not the Pickwick Dam, the Guntersville, Ala., Dam, the Chickamauga, Tenn., Dam, the Hiwassee Dam, the Watts Bar Dam, the North Loudoun Dam, and the Gilbertsville Dam in Kentucky? Is it not true that all of those seven dams were initiated here in the Senate?

"Mr. REECE. That is right.

"Senator McKELLAR. The House agreed to them in conference.

"Mr. REECE. And the people in Tennessee were looking to the Senator from Tennessee to save these projects for them when they were being agitated, and he performed.

"Senator McKELLAR. Of those seven dams, is it not true that the Pickwick Dam, the Guntersville, Ala., Dam, the Chickamauga Dam, and the Hiwassee Dam, four out of seven, are now furnishing in very large quantities the power for the making of aluminum in Tennessee?

"Mr. REECE. And except for them the Tennessee Valley Authority would have been in pretty bad shape."

Forty-seven million dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved December 17, 1941 (Public, No. 353, 77th Cong.).

Fourth supplemental national defense appropriation

Supplemental estimates were made in House Document 566 (77th Cong., 2d sess.) for the Tennessee Valley Authority and were included in the fourth supplemental national defense bill, 1942, in the amount of $30,000,000, and stated as to the dams: "(1) the construction of a hydroelectric project on the French Broad River near Dandridge, Tenn.; (2) the purchase or building of transmission facilities needed to connect this project to the existing transmission system of the Authority; and (3) the acquisition of land necessary for and the relocation of highways in connection with the accomplishment of the above project."

No change was made in this item in the Senate.

Thirty million dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Fourth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved January 30, 1942 (Public, No. 422, 77th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1943

The budget estimates for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1943 were in the amount of $136,100,000, and stated as to the dams: "including the continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky., Watts Bar Dam and steam plant; Fort Loudoun Dam (including an extension to bring the waters of the Little Tennessee River within the pool of this project); Cherokee Dam; Apalachia Dam; Ocoee Dam No. 3; Fontana Dam; a dam on the south fork of the Holston River; a dam on the Watauga River; and an additional unit at the Sheffield steam plant; and the beginning of construction immediately of a fertilizer and elemental phosphorus manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala."

No change was made in this language in the Senate.

Senator McKELLAR did propose a committee amendment, however, to add $36,120,112 to the bill, being an amount equal to the estimated receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to strike from the bill the language putting such receipts into the fund known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943. The bill passed the Senate with those changes, but in conference the Senate receded from the amendments.

One hundred thirty-six million one hundred thousand dollars was the amount provided for the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, approved June 27, 1942 (Public Law 630, 77th Cong.).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1944 AND 1945

The unexpended balances were the only appropriations made to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1945.

Summary of amounts appropriated for Tennessee Valley Authority

Law	Name of act	Congress	Amount
Public No. 77	Fourth Deficiency	Seventy-third	$50,000,000
Public No. 412	Emergency	do	25,000,000
Public No. 260	Second Deficiency	Seventy-fourth	36,000,000
Public No. 739	First Deficiency	do	39,900,000
Public No. 121	Second Deficiency	Seventy-fifth	40,166,270
Public No. 534	Independent Offices	do	40,000,000
Public No. 8	do	Seventy-sixth	39,003,000
Public No. 459	do	do	40,000,000
Public Res. 95	Resolutions (S. J. 285; H. J. 583)	do	25,000,000
Public No. 28	Independent Offices	Seventy-seventh	79,800,000
Public No. 179	Resolution (H. J. Res. 194)	do	40,000,000
Public No. 353	Third Supplemental	do	47,000,000
Public No. 422	Fourth Supplemental	do	30,000,000
Public No. 630	Independent Offices	do	136,100,000
Public No. 90	do	Seventy-eighth	(1)
Public No. 358	do	do	(1)
Total			677,969,270

[1] Unexpended balance.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES MADE BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL UNITS

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act as approved May 18, 1933, contained section 13 relating to payments in lieu of taxes, as follows:

"SEC. 13. Five percent of the gross proceeds received by the board for the sale of power generated at dam No. 2, or from any other hydro power plant hereafter constructed in the State of Alabama, shall be paid to the State of Alabama; and 5 percent of the gross proceeds from the sale of power generated at Cove Creek Dam, hereinafter provided for, or any other dam located in the State of Tennessee, shall be paid to the State of Tennessee. Upon the completion of said Cove Creek Dam the board shall ascertain how much additional power is thereby generated at dam No. 2 and at any other dam hereafter constructed by the Government of the United States on the Tennessee River, in the State of Alabama, or in the State of Tennessee, and from the gross proceeds of the sale of such additional power 2½ percent shall be paid to the State of Alabama and 2½ percent to the State of Tennessee. These percentages shall apply to any other dam that may hereafter be constructed and controlled and operated by the board on the Tennessee River or any of its tributaries, the main purpose of which is to control floodwaters and where the development of electric power is incidental to the operation of such flood-control dam. In ascertaining the gross proceeds from the sale of such power upon which a percentage is paid to the States of Alabama and Tennessee, the board shall not take into consideration the proceeds of any power sold or delivered to the Government of the United States, or any department or agency of the Government of the United States, used in the operation of any locks on the Tennessee

River or for any experimental purpose, or for the manufacture of fertilizer or any of the ingredients thereof, or for any other governmental purpose: *Provided*, That the percentages to be paid to the States of Alabama and Tennessee, as provided in this section, shall be subject to revision and change by the board, and any new percentages established by the board, when approved by the President, shall remain in effect until and unless again changed by the board with the approval of the President. No change of said percentage shall be made more often than once in 5 years, and no change shall be made without giving to the States of Alabama and Tennessee an opportunity to be heard."

In the Seventy-sixth Congress several bills were introduced in the House and Senate for the purpose of amending this section of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. The House Committee on Military Affairs held a hearing on these bills beginning on January 23, 1940, at which the purposes of the proposed amendments were stated by William C. Fitts, Jr., general counsel and secretary of the Tennessee Valley Authority, as follows:

"Now the first question that might arise is, Why do we need any legislation, if we can change the percentages under that section? The reason is threefold. In the first place, while we could change the percentages, we could not change the States to which payments are to be made, because they are stated in the section and there is no power in the Authority to change them. The only power to change them is by Congress, and this section provides only for payments to Alabama and Tennessee, leaving out Kentucky, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Georgia, in which States there is the same problem, although not to as large a degree as in Tennessee."

Chairman MAY of the committee also stated the reason, in brief, as follows:

"At the time the original act containing section 13 which you just read there was enacted, it was not contemplated that the Authority would handle it otherwise than in the two States of Tennessee and Alabama. * * * Since then, of course, it has extended its operations into other States and it is necessary to repeal this section and write some other provision in, if we are to cover the whole field."

Mr. Fitts also explained the changes that had taken place in the generation of power through acquisition of steam plants and construction of dams, and cited acts making similar payments from other agencies of the Government.

One of these bills, S. 2925, passed the Senate on April 30, 1940, and was referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs, where no action was taken on it.

Senator MCKELLAR thereupon offered the proposal as an amendment to the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1941, in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The statements on the subject made during the hearings on May 30, 1940, are as follows:

Senator MCKELLAR stated:

"When the Tennessee Valley Authority took over or bought the power companies' interest in a very large area of Tennessee last year, in some of the counties the properties of the power companies constituted a very large proportion of the taxable property of the county. * * * Of course, under our system, the property, after the Tennessee Valley Authority bought it, is not taxable by the counties or by the State. In that situation, the Tennessee Valley Authority felt that they should pay to the counties their proportion of the taxes lost, and Senator Norris introduced a bill providing therefor and I have introduced the Norris amendment as an amendment to this bill. Take for instance, the county of Polk, as I remember, in Tennessee, 41 percent of all the taxable property in that county belonged to one of the power companies that sold out to Tennessee Valley Authority. That county will lose, after the 1st day of July, 41 percent * * * of its taxable values, and that will result in the closing of schools and very great injury to the county if those taxes are lost. * * * The Government does not pay a cent. These payments, in lieu of taxes, come from the revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"They agreed on the bill that passed the Senate, and the State and county authorities agreed on it, and Senator Norris introduced it and it was passed and it went to the House Military Affairs Committee, under a long-established rule that that committee has jurisdiction over navigable waters, streams, and the result was that the Military Affairs Committee, presided over by Mr. May, who seems to be a very great antagonist of the Tennessee Valley Authority—he comes from a coal district, but I have no doubt is sincere and honest in his antagonism to the Tennessee Valley Authority—but at all events his committee has had that bill ever since it passed the Senate, I think, since last January, and their first vote on it was 12 to 12, and, of course, the bill was not reported out. The other day the bill was brought up in the committee again and by a vote of 12 to 10 they declined to report it favorably. I am advised two members favoring the bill were absent.

"Now I have offered it as an amendment to this bill, because it not only affects my State but very seriously affects the State of Georgia—I think in Fannin County, Ga., the amount of taxable property taken out is more than 50 percent of the entire taxable property in the county, and that will close some of the schools, so the testimony in the House record shows.

"Under those circumstances, I have offered this bill introduced by Senator Norris, as it passed the Senate, as an amendment to this bill. I do not believe there can be any real objection to it in either the House or the Senate, but of course the House will have to pass on it if it is put on as an amendment to this bill."

On being questioned as to why it was put on as an amendment to the emergency relief bill, Senator MCKELLAR stated further:

"If ever relief was furnished to certain counties or certain people in certain counties, this is in that sense a relief bill, because it has been testified by the officials of these several counties in the House hearings * * * that their schools will close, and many other activities that they now have will be obliged to close unless this money is furnished. If the Senate puts it on, as I hope it will—I hope this committee will recommend it—it has to go to conference, of course, and may have to go to a separate vote in the House, but, under the circumstances, it seemed best to those of us who are so vitally interested in it. * * * I am advised by the parliamentary clerk of the Senate that this amendment is in order on this bill but that it would not be in order on the deficiency bill."

Statements were also made at the Senate hearings by Senator Stewart, of Tennessee; Senator George, of Georgia; Senator Hill, of Alabama; Congressman Sparkman, of Alabama; and Congressmen Byrns and Kefauver, of Tennessee.

The attitude of the House committee is particularly stated by Senator HILL, as follows:

"I served on the Military Affairs Committee. I had the honor of being chairman of that committee. They are all my personal friends, all splendid gentlemen, but the majority of them do not look with favor on very many matters that affect the Tennessee Valley Authority, and you have an impossible situation unless we can get in this bill the relief so much needed. The relief ought to be granted as a matter of fairness and justice and right. I ask that the committee put the bill on as an amendment to this relief bill."

The conference committee reported in disagreement to the House on the amendment, which was extensively debated on the floor of the House, and on the motion of Mr. CANNON to recede and concur, a division showed 154 ayes to 155 noes, whereupon a roll-call vote was ordered, resulting in 205 yeas to 179 nays.

So that once more Senator MCKELLAR took a leading part in securing needed legislation for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The amended section 13 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, passed as section 39 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public Res. 88, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), is in full as follows:

"SEC. 13. In order to render financial assistance to those States and local governments in which the power operations of the Corporation are carried on and in which the Corporation has acquired properties previously subject to State and local taxation, the board is authorized and directed to pay to said States, and the counties therein, for each fiscal year, beginning July 1, 1940, the following percentages of the gross proceeds derived from the sale of power by the Corporation for the preceding fiscal year as hereinafter provided, together with such additional amounts as may be payable pursuant to the provisions hereinafter set forth, said payments to constitute a charge against the power operations of the Corporation: For the fiscal year (beginning July 1), 1940, 10 percent; 1941, 9 percent; 1942, 8 percent; 1943, 7½ percent; 1944, 7 percent; 1945, 6½ percent; 1946, 6 percent; 1947, 5½ percent, 1948 and each fiscal year thereafter, 5 percent. 'Gross proceeds,' as used in this section, is defined as the total gross proceeds derived by the Corporation from the sale of power for the preceding fiscal year, excluding power used by the Corporation or sold or delivered to any other department or agency of the Government of the United States for any purpose other than the resale thereof. The payments herein authorized are in lieu of taxation, and the Corporation, its property, franchises, and income, are hereby expressly exempted from taxation in any manner or form by any State, county, municipality, or any subdivision or district thereof.

The payment for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among said States in the following manner: One-half of said payment shall be apportioned by paying to each State the percentage thereof which the gross proceeds of the power sales by the Corporation within said State during the preceding fiscal year bears to the total gross proceeds from all power sales by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year; the remaining one-half of said payment shall be apportioned by paying to each State the percentage thereof which the book value of the power property held by the Corporation within said State at the end of the preceding fiscal year bears to the total book value of all such property held by the Corporation on the same date. The book value of power property shall include that portion of the investment allocated or estimated to be allocable to power: *Provided*, That the minimum annual payment to each State (including payments to counties therein) shall not be less than an amount equal to the 2-year average of the State and local ad valorem property taxes levied against power property purchased and operated by the Corporation in said State and against that portion of reservoir lands related to dams constructed by or on behalf of the United States Government and held or operated by the Corporation and allocated or estimated to be allocable to power. The said 2-year average shall be calculated for the last 2 tax years during which said property was privately owned and operated or said land was privately owned: *Provided further*, That the minimum annual payment to each State in which the Corporation owns and operates power property (including payments to counties therein) shall not be less than $10,-

000 in any case: *Provided further,* That the Corporation shall pay directly to the respective counties the 2-year average of county ad valorem property taxes (including taxes levied by taxing districts within the respective counties) upon power property and reservoir lands allocable to power, determined as above provided, and all payments to any such county within a State shall be deducted from the payment otherwise due to such State under the provisions of this section. The determination of the board of the amounts due hereunder to the respective States and counties shall be final.

The payments above provided shall in each case be made to the State or county in equal monthly installments beginning not later than July 31, 1940.

Nothing herein shall be construed to limit the authority of the Corporation in its contracts for the sale of power to municipalities, to permit or provide for the resale of power at rates which may include an amount to cover tax-equivalent payments to the municipality in lieu of State, county, and municipal taxes upon any distribution system or property owned by the municipality, or any agency thereof, conditioned upon a proper distribution by the municipality of any amounts collected by it in lieu of State or county taxes upon any such distribution system or property; it being the intention of Congress that either the municipality or the State in which the municipality is situated shall provide for the proper distribution to the State and county of any portion of tax equivalent so collected by the municipality in lieu of State or county taxes upon any such distribution system or property.

The Corporation shall, not later than January 1, 1945, submit to the Congress a report on the operation of the provisions of this section, including a statement of the distribution to the various States and counties hereunder; the effect of the operation of the provisions of this section on State and local finances; an appraisal of the benefits of the program of the Corporation to the States and counties receiving payments hereunder, and the effect of such benefits in increasing taxable values within such States and counties; and such other data, information, and recommendations as may be pertinent to future legislation.

REPORTS BY SENATOR BREWSTER ON AVIATION AND TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES IN EUROPE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two reports made by me dealing with foreign aviation.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTS OF SENATOR OWEN BREWSTER ON SURVEY OF AVIATION AND TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES IN EUROPE, NOVEMEER 10, 1947, TO JANUARY 4, 1948

REPORT NO. 1

DECEMBER 13, 1947.

Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHITE: This report is submitted in accordance with your request concerning conditions observed in Europe in connection with matters under the jurisdiction of this committee.

Congressional Aviation Policy Board

Following the recess of the Congress I was named as a member and subsequently as chairman of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the last session of the Congress with instructions to investigate and report our recommendations on long range aviation policy to the Congress by March 1, 1948.

The difficulty in assembling members who had been scattered to their respective States delayed our functioning so that it was impracticable to carry out the more comprehensive survey that had been planned regarding aviation facilities and operations in more remote areas of the world.

The Congressional Joint Board, however, has now been organized and very competently staffed and careful studies are in progress as a basis for the formulation of policy recommendations.

Air safety

Meanwhile the technical member of the staff assigned to the Subcommittee on Aviation has been extremely busy investigating the various accidents which have occurred and there is attached hereto copies of the several reports made to date for the information of the full committee. Additional copies of these reports are available as may be desired. It is contemplated that recommendations based upon these reports may be considered by the full committee during the next regular session of the Congress.

International Aviation Conference at Geneva

Following the adjournment of the Congress I was also asked by the President on the recommendation of the State Department to act as chairman of the congressional advisory group for the American delegation at the International Aviation Conference at Geneva on the development of a multilateral aviation pact. Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, was also named as a member of this advisory group but was unable to attend the Conference.

During the latter part of November I spent 7 days in Geneva with the American delegation in connection with the Conference. It was a matter of profound regret that the Conference should have ended in such deep-seated differences of opinion between the United States delegation and the majority of the 28 states represented at the Conference that no agreement was possible.

Irrespective of what may be one's opinion as to the desirability of a multilateral pact at this particular stage in the development of international aviation or as to its content there can be no question that it is extremely unfortunate when an international conference of this importance assembled primarily at the urging if not the insistence of the United States results in a division in which a majority of the states oppose the viewpoint of the United States delegation on matters of such fundamental importance that the Conference ends by the United States serving notice that it will not yield to the views of the majority and that accordingly no further discussion regarding an international agreement on this subject at this time will take place. Such a result cannot enhance the prestige of the United States among our sister nations nor cultivate the spirit of good will which is so essential for the achievement of the objectives we have in view. The situation is only slightly alleviated by the fact that several other countries with large stakes in international aviation shared our viewpoint.

There can be no doubt as to the earnestness and constancy with which the United States delegation worked to achieve the policies which they deemed were wise. There is also recognition of the considerable number of international conferences which are now in progress or preparation and the very severe strain that is thus placed upon our distinctly limited reservoir of diplomatic talent. But after saying all this it does not seem that those immediately concerned with aviation in the State Department are receiving the support and cooperation in the upper levels that is demanded by the critical importance of international aviation in the postwar world from the standpoint of our defense.

The rock upon which the Conference found itself wrecked was the vote by a majority of 13 to 9 against the position of the United States in favor of including the so-called fifth freedom in the multilateral pact. This meant that the majority of the countries participating in this vote would not agree that the fifth freedom should necessarily be included in any bilateral route agreements which they might hereafter negotiate.

As a result of this vote the United States delegation announced to the conference that they felt no further useful purpose would be served by continuance of discussions and that the long labors of the Conference at that time should be incorporated in form for reference to the next gathering of the International Civil Aviation Organization known as ICAO and the Conference terminate its labors without issue. This was accordingly done.

Without discussing the wisdom of the decisions of the United States delegation, one must pay tribute again to the earnestness and the zeal with which the viewpoint of the United States was advanced and the united front which was presented by the United States delegation so far as the dealings with the other nations represented at the Conference were concerned.

Civil aviation in Germany

While the drafting committees were engaged in preparing the documents resulting from the earlier deliberations of the Conference, Representatives CARL HINSHAW and ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, who were the other two members of the congressional advisory group at the Conference, decided on a survey of conditions in Germany and this afforded an opportunity for a survey of the position of civil aviation in northern Europe. I accompanied the Representatives on this trip, spending 4 days in the Berlin area and 4 days in a survey of the airports north of Berlin at Hamburg, Bremen, Copenhagen, and Stockholm, where I was accompanied by a representative of the civil-aviation division of the administration of Gen. Lucius Clay in Germany. We were prevented from getting into Oslo, Norway, by the weather conditions, which are rather difficult at this season of the year.

Representatives BULWINKLE and HINSHAW visited the Frankfurt area. We met again at Geneva for the last 5 days of the Conference when the decisions were in process of being reached.

Copenhagen

Copenhagen, in Denmark, has one of the finest airports observed during the entire trip with one runway of over 7,000 feet in length and others of five to six thousand feet and with splendidly developed approaches as a result of its location on the shore and with excellent landing aids and direction facilities and meticulously developed instructions for landing, copies of which are hereto attached, for the committee records.

Copenhagen seems likely to be a center of very considerable activity by reason of its location and comparatively favorable weather conditions. During November most of the overseas operations for the Scandinavian area were being conducted through Copenhagen because of weather conditions and also because of personnel problems. The Scandinavian countries are extremely active in the air and have merged their efforts in overseas operations to become one of the most formidable competitors of the United States.

ABA for the Swedes, DUL for the Norwegians, and DDL for the Danes carry on local and continental services and at the same time merge their overseas activities through SILA in the Scandinavian Air Service, SAS, under the very able leadership of Per Norlin, of Sweden.

Stockholm

Stockholm has an airport adjacent to the city but with approaches that present some

problems because of the comparatively hilly nature of the country in the vicinity of Stockholm, which makes operations during bad weather rather hazardous and results in intermittent service. A larger airport that will be entirely adequate is in process of development. The importance of this development can be appreciated, particularly from the standpoint of American overseas air lines, when it is realized that there were 40,000 American visitors to Sweden this past summer and a constant increase is anticipated as more and more Americans are able to enjoy the attractions of this remarkable region and as more and more Americans of Scandinavian ancestry are able to return and visit their ancestral homes.

Conferences in Stockholm with the Director of Civil Aviation, Hon. C. Ljungberg, and Mr. Per Norlin, representing private interests in aviation, developed the interesting fact that an accommodation has been reached covering the joint participation of the Government and private finance in the expansion of Swedish civil air operations, and this may well mean further strengthening of the Scandinavian position in international air operations.

Arrangements for these meetings were made by Mr. Francis L. Spalding, the very efficient second secretary of the Embassy in Stockholm in charge of aviation matters.

The Scandinavian air lines, SAS, representing Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, are rapidly extending their service to all quarters of the Atlantic and now have a fleet of 17 DC-6's, secured from the United States, which they anticipate adding to their overseas service this coming year.

No arrangement by any of these countries for reciprocal service with Russia has been found possible because of the refusal of Russia to allow planes from other countries to fly into the interior. An interchange of traffic is accomplished at Helsinki, in Finland, where the Soviet air line flies from Moscow and where the American Overseas Airlines also make connection.

Customers of international air routes

The significant thing about the return journey from Europe to the United States was the number of people in obviously moderate circumstances who were using the air to fly to the United States. One of my seat mates was fresh from an English workhouse, where he had spent several years of his later life, and was now en route to Australia to join his son. Several of the other passengers were clearly not in affluent circumstances, and it was interesting to learn that a survey of air traffic overseas had disclosed that a very substantial portion of the traffic was originating from people in the ordinary walks of life, while the so-called luxury travel was in substantially greater measure going by steamship.

As increased facilities for air travel become available and costs are reduced, this indicates that the mass market which has accounted for the amazing development of the United States economy may very readily be tapped and that the average American will be very ready to use the air because of the saving of time and ultimately of expense.

Geneva

Geneva is one of the chief airports in Switzerland, where much of the international traffic centers and different services are available to most European points with a 2-hour flight to London or Paris and facilities on the ground to accommodate this traffic.

Orly Airport in Paris

Air France uses the Orly Airport in Paris but is handicapped by the lack of equipment, as is the case, of course, with most air lines in the world today. The French are seeking to develop both continental and colonial services, and this places a very considerable strain on their resources. A 5-inch snowstorm descended on Paris on November 28 and added very greatly to the difficulties which Paris was experiencing as a result of the extremely unsettled conditions incident to the strike and the controversies there were in progress and resulted also in considerable confusion in air schedules under the necessity of trying to carry on traffic to various parts of the Continent and Africa, England, and America with insufficient equipment.

Civil air in Germany

A discussion of the situation in Germany was left to the last because it is the situation which invites imperatively the most immediate attention. Germany is forbidden under existing agreements to resume civil air service. This means that a vacuum in the air is created over Germany, which is the heart of Europe, with air traffic centering in Frankfurt, where the Rhein-Main airport, with one hard-surfaced runway, is the center of American air activities. A hard-surfaced runway seems extremely unusual in Germany, as most of the airports are grass, including the great Templehof Airdrome at Berlin, with one of the most magnificent terminals to be found in the world, where 15 DC-4's or Constellations can roll on the apron under cover for unloading their passengers at one time, but where we are still operating on a steel mat laid down on the grass. The same situation prevailed at Munich and at Frankfurt following the war, as I observed on visits there in May 1945.

To what extent German planes during the war used the autobahns on which all obstructions had been removed for a very considerable distance on each side with no poles or wires or trees to obstruct is not clear but in many places it seemed evident this had been the plan.

The United States Government is maintaining these airports in Germany and the landing facilities with military supervision and equipment but under instructions to curtail the landing aids as rapidly as they are no longer required for military service. This means that the landing facilities in the airports in many of the smaller centers are already being put on a stand-by basis and that others will be closed out as rapidly as military necessities require.

Meanwhile the normal difficulties incident to the attempt to coordinate civil air operations with military operations are developing since military operations naturally present somewhat different requirements. It seems highly desirable that civil air personnel for operating ground facilities comparable with that with which we are familiar in the United States is to continue to carry on.

Two American overseas air lines at present fly into Frankfurt—the American Overseas Airlines and the Pan American Airways—and carry on a service from there to points beyond in countries both to the north and to the south. Meanwhile many other foreign lines are also flying in Germany using the American facilities.

The problem of the development of local air service in Germany and contiguous territory is an extremely pressing one. All concerned in Germany, from Gen. Lucius Clay down, were extremely desirous that the United States should not miss this opportunity for the development of air services in Germany, particularly in the areas under our control and in contiguous areas both in Germany and outside. Since we are at the present time responsible for the airports and the landing facilities, it would be a curious anachronism if we should carry these on largely for the service of foreign lines; but this is likely to be the result unless there is early coordination of all American air activities in this area.

I shall not undertake to discuss the advantages or significance of American air service in this particular strategic area from the standpoint of our defense with all its implications of familiarizing our pilots with operations over this terrain and with the weather conditions that prevail at all seasons of the year and with the activity of other countries particularly to the east that are in immediate contact with this area.

From the standpoint of American civil aviation interests, however, there can be no doubt as to the very great advantage of feeder services for the American overseas air lines serving this area and there seems every reason in the world why the United States, since it provides the airports and the landing aids, should have some measure of priority in the development of the air service without violation of our obligations to the other countries also concerned.

In Germany is offered an ideal opportunity for demonstrating to all Europe the superiority and advantages of American ground equipment and operating techniques for traffic control and landing aids and all-weather flying.

Standardization of operating facilities on a world-wide basis on American methods is one of the greatest contributions that could be made to United States security and that means to world peace.

Here in Germany is the ideal opportunity to show to all friendly nations the offer of the United States in this all-important field.

All that is needed is recognition by all concerned with American aviation development of this opportunity and its proper exploitation and coordination in this transitional period.

Soviet air activities

The situation with the Soviet is rapidly developing along the lines anticipated by some of those who had expressed concern over the policies originally enunciated by the United States delegation at the Chicago conference in 1944. If the plans then envisioned had been carried out, any airports of entry in this country that were opened up to the use of any international carrier must immediately be made available to any other country which would subscribe to the agreement and furnish a reciprocal opening of whatever airport or airports they might designate in their country.

Thus the United States having opened up 25 airports of entry, both along the borders and within the interior of the United States, for foreign air lines would then be obligated to open each of those airports to a Soviet air line if in turn one port in Russia at the border was opened to all countries alike and nothing more.

The danger of this situation finally dawned upon those in authority and the United States drew back in implementing this arrangement and has since conducted the development of the international aviation picture with considerably more caution—particularly as the Soviet plans have unfolded. To the various satellite states and to other states within easy flying range of the Soviet there have been made proposals that the Russians should be allowed to fly to the capitals or other aviation centers of those countries and in return Russia would allow those countries to fly their national air lines to a border port in Russia but not to fly across Russia to Moscow or to any other major interior population center.

New Swedish plane

The Swedes are developing a plane for continental service carrying 28 to 32 passengers somewhat more powerful than our DC-3 and have high hopes that it may prove serviceable in their area. It is interesting to note, however, that they are securing their engines from the United States.

British air plans

By far the greater proportion of the planes that one sees operating all over Europe are of American design and manufacture or are the older types of European-produced planes that are no longer in production. The Eng-

lish are having great difficulty in the production of a transport plane and a parliamentary committee has been recently constituted to investigate the merits of the controversy between the manufacturer of certain types of planes and the Government-owned British air lines who are apparently not satisfied with the type which is being developed.

This controversy is resulting in considerable stagnation in the plans of the British air lines coupled with the Government injunction this past spring against the purchase of any more American transport planes.

The result of this interruption of the development of their plans seems to be to give the United States somewhat more time than might have been anticipated for the development of our overseas services, but certainly there is no time to lose and very careful thought should be given to the ways in which American aviation may continue to expand its service in all parts of the world.

Atlantic flights

In going over from LaGuardia Field in New York in a Constellation one left the airport at 5 o'clock at night with only seven passengers aboard for the eastern trip which is now running very light and as a result a nonstop flight was possible and the course followed was south of Cape Cod and Newfoundland in the direction of the Azores as a result of weather conditions prevailing at that time, giving a fair wind for an extended portion of the trip and bringing us into the Heathrow Airport near London at 7 o'clock the next morning, New York time, or 12 o'clock London time.

The London Airport is in process of development with terminal facilities still of an improvised character but with an excellent field and adequate development of landing facilities well under way. European air services are carried on in part from this airport and in part from another airport some 10 miles away. The inconvenience of such widely separated terminals is obvious and it is presumed that as time goes on effort will be made to concentrate more services at a single port as far as traffic congestion would permit.

On the return trip from Paris one left the Paris Airport at 6 o'clock, reaching the London terminal at 8 o'clock and taking off immediately with connecting plane for Shannon in Ireland, Gander in Newfoundland, and LaGuardia in New York, with practically a full load of 45 passengers, arriving over LaGuardia the next morning at 9 o'clock New York time, which was 3 o'clock in the afternoon in Paris.

During the recess of the Congress, insofar as time permits, it is hoped to complete a survey of the aviation activities in southern Europe and possibly the Mediterranean.

REPORT NO. 2

Aviation and transportation in Europe

A survey of commercial aviation in Europe brings home the infinitely more difficult problem presented there in contrast with what we have thought was a somewhat challenging situation here in the United States.

The loss of $20,000,000 by American commercial air lines in a recent 12-month period looks less serious when compared with the $40,000,000 loss of the Government-owned lines of Britain, with all the other countries of Europe still to be heard from.

We find difficulty in maintaining an aircraft industry in America with our vast domestic air networks and our military procurement. Consider when England and the other countries of Europe are faced with the problem of developing a postwar transport plane almost from scratch.

British policy

A parliamentary commission has just completed an extended study of the production and procurement of transport planes for the British air lines, and it is indicated that on the basis of its report the Government may not be inclined to favor the current British transport planes that are available or any that may be envisioned in the immediate future. A discussion with some of the responsible aviation authorities in Britain indicated the likelihood that Britain might decide for the present to give up the policy adopted last May of not procuring planes from across the Atlantic.

It would be hardly gracious of the United States to intimate that this indicated our complete superiority in this field, since, to some extent, the situation is attributable to the division of inventive and production efforts during the war between the fighter planes of England and the transport and long-range bombardment planes of the United States.

The situation does, however, strongly suggest that in the present economic plight of the world and particularly of Britain and the United States, there might well continue a division of effort in our joint enterprise that might measurably ameliorate the losses on both sides.

Commercial aviation

Commercial air plays at least as important a role in our national defense and aviation development as the merchant marine played historically in the development of our Navy and our maritime defense. If we also recognize the community of interest among liberty-loving peoples in this most unpeaceful postwar world, then we should realize that Britain and America have as much reason as during the war for coordinating their aviation plans with due regard to the economical development of aviation services calculated to take care of our varying world-wide interests and, at the same time, developing a sound industrial foundation upon which to build adequate aviation production in the event of any future conflict, in which almost inevitably we should be associated.

England in front line

The last war brought home with tragic force the exposed position of England in this era of aerial war because of its nearness to the Continent and its position as practically a front-line outpost.

There seems every reason to anticipate a more rapid change in the significance of aerial warfare during the next decade than in the last 20 years between the two world wars. This must inevitably mean that England would be a more and more precarious location for the development of a vast aircraft industry upon which to depend in the event of any difficulty.

On the other hand, if these considerations are to govern, there is every reason for the United States to recognize the vital interest of England in its Empire air routes and to see to it that their proper concern in the development of these routes is not prejudiced by the strategic position which the United States occupies in the location of an aircraft industry.

American planes in Europe

These considerations were brought home with compelling force as one flew on the various foreign air lines in Europe using, almost without exception, American planes. The British Government has recognized the vital significance of aerial transportation and communication in this postwar world and has made available more than $600,000,000 of Government funds for the development of a great aircraft industry and aviation enterprises that may spread around the world. The startling losses in this first year, running into $240 a passenger on the British Overseas Airlines, is compelling reconsideration of the whole picture and causing everyone concerned to ponder whether or not $40,000,000 worth of British energy and resources, human and material, might not better be diverted into channels having a higher priority in the solution of British economic problems.

As aviation takes off its swaddling clothes and begins to walk, it becomes more and more evident that airports and navigation and adequate landing aids are the foundation of any successful expansion in air transport as well as in military operations. Here one is startled in traveling over Europe to discover the contrast in the development of airports and navigation and landing aids as compared with what has gone on in the safe security of America during the last decade.

Airports lacking

While the Air Forces of the United States developed a vast number of air fields in Europe, the development from a commercial standpoint is still in its early stages and the facilities to handle commercial traffic are still in very great contrast to those available almost anywhere in the United States. Here again it is certainly not for Americans to be critical but simply to appraise the situation.

On the Continent, including Germany, most of the airports—even at the great Templehof Airdrome in Berlin—do not have hard-surfaced runways, and were still using grass at the end of the war. This was true as well in Munich and many of the other largest airports in Germany. This was apparently a result of the German emphasis upon fighter aircraft carrying a far lighter load than our long-range bombers or transport planes.

Air transport in Europe

This all adds up to the necessity of vast expenditures for the development of adequate airports and navigation and landing aids throughout Europe and in England as well during the next few years if air transport is to come to occupy anything like the significant position which it is rapidly assuming in the United States.

These considerations also emphasize the very great desirability of standardization of airport facilities and navigation and landing aids so that pilots may fly anywhere in the world, exactly as we have developed standardized practices for navigation at sea.

Here again there has been somewhat of a tendency for a competitive approach between Britain and the United States in the development of facilities and practices, and it would seem high time that there should be recognition of the wisdom of avoiding the competitive extravagance that has threatened to develop in the postwar period.

The bitter lessons of the losses of the early postwar years seem calculated to bring about a far more conciliatory frame of mind in responsible quarters and to make possible the reexamination of the world air picture from the standpoint of the interests of all the countries concerned on this side of the iron curtain.

Greece

In Greece, the airport at Athens is almost at the point of being abandoned by the commercial services as well as by our military planes as a result of the deplorable condition of the field, which is now being operated with a steel carpet that is approaching the end of its usefulness, while the navigation and landing aids are practically useless as a result of their improvised character (a combination of British and American material), and their operation by those who are not sufficiently experienced. Those concerned with military and civilian aviation, both in the American mission and the American Embassy, were alike in emphasizing the dangers of the situation and the threat by some of the commercial lines to give up entirely operations into Athens unless conditions should be rapidly improved.

The problem of diverting some of our Grecian aid to the development of the airport at Athens also presented problems because of the very great demands in other directions, and also because of the question of developing certain airports farther north that would serve the purposes of Greek defense. If Greece, however, is to be one of the factors

in the democratic world, it is certainly desirable that there should be modern facilities for air transport and for air operations which might at any time become a very crucial factor in the struggle that is going on.

It is clear that all concerned with air operations in the Grecian area would agree with the very strongest representations upon this situation.

Turkey

Airports

Turkey has a fair airport near Istanbul, but without adequate navigation or landing aids. Twenty million dollars is being allocated from the funds made available to Turkey for the development of further airport facilities and there is certainly ample warrant for this action, although it is in sharp contrast to what has so far been provided for Greece.

Traditionally the Turkish defenses have depended primarily upon the lack of any adequate road system as the chief obstacle to the invader. To some extent, similar considerations may be raised as to the development of airports, but it seems folly to think that in the modern world such primitive notions of defense can possibly be adequate.

Harbor Developments

In Turkey, one of the major problems brought home very forcibly was the congestion in the port of Istanbul where the docks are piled high, both in warehouses and on the open docks, with goods in condition that indicates very rough handling in the unloading, with much of the material exposed to the elements and in a confusion that makes its location extremely difficult. This condition apparently has prevailed a long time, rendering almost impossible the movement of goods in and out of Istanbul.

Warehouse and rail and dock facilities have been made available for the bringing in of American relief supplies, which are expected to reach Istanbul around the first of February.

However, the arrival of American relief supplies will mean almost complete stagnation in all the other operations of the port, with all commercial shipping unable to move cargo of any character.

This situation results from the dependence upon lighters for unloading the ships. There are 400 lighters in the harbor, but over 300 of these are now filled with merchandise, being used as warehouses because of the inadequacy of storage facilities elsewhere, and the very moderate demurrage charges being made for the use of lighters in this way.

The result is that not over 40 lighters are available at any time for their intended purpose, and this means that when they are in use for unloading American relief supplies, no other ships would be able to get service in this port, with disastrous result upon the entire Turkish economy which we are seeking to aid.

This position has been presented very forcefully by the American Mission and by the American Embassy and consular officials, without thus far securing relief. It seems impossible for the American officials in Turkey to justify the bringing of American relief supplies to Istanbul until this situation is materially improved, since the only result would be to make the Turkish economic problem worse instead of better as a result of the stagnation in commercial transport that must inevitably result.

There is a naval facility in the port that is 90 percent unused, with ample dock facilities and 27 feet of water that could contribute very greatly to the relief of this situation, if proper authorization and cooperation could be secured from the Turkish authorities concerned and without prejudice to the military security.

Egypt

In Cairo, Payne Field—now Farouk Airport—constructed by the United States during the war, has now been turned over to the Egyptian Government, but the American air line—Trans-World Airline—operating in this area has not up to this time been able to secure satisfactory arrangement for the utilization of this field, in spite of the very great contribution that the United States made to its development. This, of course, is a very important point in travel to the Middle East. The American interests concerned are entitled to the fullest cooperation of those concerned in securing appropriate arrangement for the utilization of these facilities.

Italy

In Italy there are a number of airports developed in earlier days as a result of the Italian activity in aviation, and in later years incident to the war that swept over this country and compelled the development of numerous airports incident to military operations.

The Italian Government is also showing great interest in the further development of its facilities, as well as in the maintenance of the navigation and landing aids that were left over from the war period. TWA is the American line serving this area and rights and arrangements were developed with the Italian Government for domestic services by an Italian line in which TWA and the Italian Government could join in their investments. Approximately $400,000 has been invested in this enterprise for the development of local air lines in the Italian area.

This situation, however, gave concern to the British, who insisted upon a comparable arrangement with the Italian Government during the joint occupation. It is interesting now to note that the British-Italian air lines in which the British Government air line represents the British interest is now making available $5,000,000 for expansion of the air services under the British-Italian line—including an air service to Trieste, where British-American forces are located—or more than ten times the amount which the American company has found it possible or prudent to invest.

This situation affords a very forceful demonstration of the British enterprise in seeking to develop air facilities. One of the objects of these arrangements is to give priority to British equipment and operating practices. The object of the British Government allocation of a $600,000,000 credit for commercial aviation is well illustrated by the Italian arrangement.

Ireland

In Ireland, where the Irish Airline is similarly in partnership with the British with a 50-percent investment by British Overseas Airlines, the Irish have decided not to make further use of the Victor Vikings, an English plane, but to secure American planes because of their greater serviceability and economy of operation. The Irish are showing great enterprise in the development of their aviation lines and plan this spring to open a trans-Atlantic operation to New York if the American planes can be secured.

SUMMARY

In the two reports covering northern Europe and the Mediterranean area, there appears very definitely the opportunity for America, by taking proper leadership, to consolidate our own position in the aviation world and, at the same time, render a service of incalculable value to the welfare and future security of all the liberty-loving peoples of the world.

We know what it takes in the modern world to support a great and changing aviation industry. We know the problems presented in developing and preserving the necessary skills in designing and creating the airplanes of tomorrow.

If the United States is staggered by the challenge to its vast economic resources, what must one think of the problem in the war-ravaged countries of Europe? If America is to assist in a recovery program, can America afford to have vast amounts of European resources—material and human—diverted to enterprises that are at present uneconomic and that necessarily mean the neglect of enterprises far more urgent?

This does not mean any failure to recognize the concern of Europe with aerial transport, but rather, the most effective mobilization of our common resources to serve the common welfare.

This is exactly the position our State Department has taken in refusing to give priority to the European proposal to build 10,000,000 tons of merchant shipping to put our American ships off the sea. Such a diversion of steel and labor was characterized as unjustified in the current crisis when manpower everywhere outside of Italy is one of the critical shortages.

Very similar considerations apply to the aviation problem of the countries outside the iron curtain. None of us can afford to waste our energy or take other than the most efficient course for the maximum utilization of our resources, both human and material.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY EUGENE MEYER

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement entitled "European Recovery Program," by Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board of the Washington Post, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 20 last. This statement, I am sure, will be of tremendous interest to the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and your committee for giving me the privilege of appearing before you.

If your time was unlimited, I would speak of a dozen different aspects of the European recovery program, but, instead, I shall confine myself only to a few matters where, by reason of a trip to Europe last summer and fall, and by reason of my own past experience, I hope I may offer this committee something of interest.

Specifically, I would like to address myself to what seem to be the three principal contentions of those who oppose our granting aid to western Europe in the full measure that appears necessary.

Many changes are rung on each of the three major objections, but generally the arguments boil down to these themes:

First, the European peoples are said to show insufficient willingness to buckle down to the hard work necessary to recovery. They are said to be slackers on their jobs and to rely on Uncle Sam to bail them out.

Second, aid to Europe is called operation rat hole because the present governmental forms and policies of European nations are foredoomed to failure. It is argued that, until they are revamped, stem to stern, there can be no promise of economic recovery no matter how generous American aid will be.

Third, the political danger to western Europe is said to have passed. The menace of its engulfment by the Communists is supposed to have abated to the point where little if any assistance from us is needed.

I would like to discuss these in turn. My comments are the fruit of my own observations in Europe—not just on this last trip but on a great many others, beginning with a stay of a year and a half in my youth, when I worked and studied in Germany, England, and France—and a lifetime of interest in and study of international trade and finance. The factual data are fortified by official figures from our own and foreign governments.

One hears the first argument stated in many ways:

"The people won't work in Europe. They go to a 5-day or even a 4-day week, when a 6-day week is needed. Here it is, almost 3 years after the war, and they have made no progress. They have squandered the billions we have already given them. If they got down to work, instead of conniving in black markets, they could recover by their own efforts."

These comments, I assert, are not even half-truths. But they can be stated in much shorter time than they can be answered.

As I saw it, the surprising things were the amount of progress that had been made, and the diligence of the effort of the people, not the contrary.

At the outset, it must be pointed out that no consideration of the postwar western European economy is possible without recalling the effect of the virtual disappearance of enormously important commercial relationships with Germany and middle Europe. I will not go into detail, because I am sure you know about the low state of German production and how the iron curtain has been drawn on the once-flourishing east-west trade. But I do want to point out that when we try to appraise the extent of progress in recovery, we must remember that a great many of the processes of production and distribution have been impaired and disorganized. The European recovery plan seeks to work toward reconstruction of some of the old relationships and the establishment of new ones where necessary.

It used to be, as statesmen put it, that a nation could recover from a war with two good harvests. That once was equal to a nation's total wealth. But now a nation's wealth is in large part in its plant and equipment.

In Europe, much of this plant and equipment was destroyed. That was the technique of World War II, and it was applied with terrible efficiency both by us and by the Axis. Consider the deadly success with which we and the Germans destroyed French and Italian bridges, rail facilities, and utilities. Yet in less than 3 years after the end of that process, the French and Italian rail and utility systems were restored to about 85 percent of prewar capacity.

The next point to remember is that western Europe had two bad instead of the two good harvests that were once supposed to heal the wounds of war.

The weather for the past 2 years in western Europe was a tremendously important factor and one which I think has been given too little consideration here, especially by critics of the aid program.

There was a drought in the summer of 1946. It was followed by a winter of almost unparalleled severity from Narvik to Naples. Then last summer there was a drought such as has not been experienced in a hundred years.

I am not suggesting that without this bad weather Europe would today be on its feet, or that, given good weather, Europe will need no aid from us. I mean only to say that the terrible freezes and droughts contributed in a major degree to rapid using up of the credits and aid we accorded European nations.

A few figures on the European harvest in 1947 show the plight.

In France, wheat production was only 40 percent of the 1930–39 average. Rye was only 47 percent. The total of all cereals was less than half the prewar average. Potato production was only 74 percent of normal; legumes were 69 percent; dairy production was so low that the milk ration is available only to children under four.

In Belgium, total wheat production, despite efforts to replant after the winter freezes, was just one-third of the previous year. Rye, an important Belgian bread crop, was less than half the prewar figure.

The illustrations can be multiplied. But they all show why Europe had to spend its dollars on food. They did not buy a very lavish diet. Certainly this committee, and Congress as a whole—which made such a remarkable and responsible study of the situation first-hand last summer and fall—does not need to be told that Europeans for the most part are living on a miserable ration.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, of my surprise to find how hard these people are working, despite that low ration.

Considering what the Europeans get to eat—an intake in calories from two-thirds to one-half of our usual diet—one could expect their physical labor would be keyed accordingly. The astonishing thing is that this is not the case.

Except for what the English call casual labor—dockside workers and those in the building trades—the labor efficiency in that country is up to prewar standards. In France it appears to be about 85 percent of prewar. This is remarkably high, in the light of the diet and the amount of time which workers must spend coping with the complex black market to provide enough food for their families.

I was given these figures by industrialists, and I assure you they were not the sort who would have stretched a point to toss wreaths at labor. They were hard-headed businessmen. Their figures are borne out by official statistics.

In Italy there is no question about the vigor of the labor force. Everyone remarked on the virility and energy of the industrial labor force.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, my conviction that the stories that Europeans are not working in a sufficiently long week for maximum production are not justified. In almost all cases where the workweek is shorter than we would like to see it, the limiting factor is not the unwillingness or indifference of the men, but rather the scarcity of raw materials and power.

In Italy and France the most important limiting factors are coal and steel. Production figures indicate that those countries are turning out all the coal and steel they can from their own resources—more coal in both countries, for example, than before the war. But both were dependent on coal from outside their borders, British and Ruhr coal. As we know, these imports are not flowing in anything like adequate quantities.

In France the scheduled workweek is 45 hours, as compared to 39 hours in 1938, the last full prewar year.

I would like to present just a few figures about the economies of the principal countries. These data concern the industries to which one should look to appraise, first, the degree of effort being put forth, and, second, the measure of significant progress.

In England steel production is at a higher rate than prewar. Mining of iron ore is back to the 1938 rate. Coal miners have temporarily given up the 5-day week which they won last spring. Thus, coal production, running at only 85 percent of prewar for the first 9 months of 1947, was better than prewar during December. It was at a rate in excess of that set as a target for 1948 in the Paris Conference Report. It permitted resumption of British coal exports, a circumstance the economic importance of which to the rest of Europe cannot be exaggerated.

In France, using 1938 as the base of 100, coal production was 87 percent in January 1946. It was 102 a year later. In October, before the Communist political strikes, it was 118. As of January 1946 steel was only 46 percent of the 1938 base. It was 95 by last June, and in October pig iron was at 93, steel at 108, and finished steel products at 117. The general index of production, only 66 percent of prewar in January 1946, exceeded prewar levels by June 1947, reaching 102.

In Italy the general index of production was as low as 46 last February. For the last 3 months preceding the Communist-led strikes, it was 81.

It should be noted that in both Italy and France the big improvements came with the accession to power of governments in which there was no Communist participation.

Many other figures are available and, I believe, have already been presented to you in much detail. All of them, I feel, belie the charge of idleness or diffidence on the part of the people and the governments. Further, they deny the assertion that no progress has been made in recovery.

By the same token, they go far to answer the second major criticism to which I have referred—that the governments of the 16 nations are so riddled with unsound policies and forms that their situations are hopeless and that no industrial or economic progress can be expected.

In more specific terms, this criticism maintains that European governments cannot hope to succeed until they set their monetary houses in order, until they balance their budgets, let their currencies find their proper levels, cut down their bureaucracies and Federal expenses, curtail their subsidies, and cease costly experiments in socialism.

Of course, this is true, but it is like the question of the hen and the egg. Production and commerce are essential to a balanced budget. All of them ultimately go hand in hand, but I think it is idle to expect that war-smashed countries, their production reduced and their commerce disrupted, could balance their budgets when the last bomb fell. The conditions simply did not exist for immediate budgetary and monetary stability.

The important thing is to look at the direction in which the governments are moving. The implication of the criticism is that western European countries are moving in a direction away from these goals of financial stability and order. The fact is, however, that they are taking substantial and promising strides in the direction we recommend.

Italy provides a rather neat illustration. In the first quarter of last year, its revenues amounted to less than one-third of its expenditures. Under the new government, in the next quarter, more than half of its expenses were met by receipts, and in the month of June receipts were 70 percent of governmental outgo. The estimated deficit for the current fiscal year will still be large—larger than anticipated because of the bad harvest—but it will be only half of the deficit of the preceding fiscal year.

From June to December of last year, governmental measures reduced prices in Italy by about 20 percent. And a few weeks ago the government revalued the lira at the level set by the free market.

Steps taken in France would appear to be promising. From interviews I had, and from further information since my return from Europe, I am confident that the French Government has full appreciation of the importance of balancing its budget and revaluing the franc to realistic levels. I believe that they are working earnestly to these ends.

The level of production in France at the end of the war and the necessity for Federal outlays were such as to make a balanced budget impossible. But since that time, and especially during the Ramadier and Schuman governments, France has taken off almost all its Government subsidies—those on wheat, coal, and fertilizers, for example. Several hundred price controls, including those on most foods, have been lifted and only a minimum remain on key commodities.

By raising rates for the nationalized industries—railroads, public utilities, coal mines and the like—France has put them on

a basis which ought to make them self-supporting or nearly so, and no longer a drain on the public exchequer.

In the third step to cut Federal expenses, France has already discharged 50,000 Government employees and has adopted a program to knock off 150,000 more. All of these steps took real political courage and reflected real economic understanding.

In connection with the move to reduce Government personnel, and my observation that that took courage, may I say that the concentrated political power of an overexpanded bureaucracy is something which we have never experienced in this country to anything like the extent it exists in France.

To increase receipts, France made a capital levy in 1946 and last year increased its surtaxes to a very high rate. The latest measure of Premier Schuman, on which he staked the life of his government, is a drastic tax law to bring in more revenues from classes which have traditionally escaped their fair share—farmers and professional men. It also will bring in more money from the upper brackets.

These steps are necessary to a balanced budget in France. Then only can the franc be stabilized at a level to promote exports and restore its valuable tourist industry.

The trend in Europe is running in a welcome direction and I think that this is as much as we may properly or wisely expect of European nations. On the evidence, we can believe that they will progress more and more in the direction of a free-enterprise economy. I cannot feel, however, that they should be required or expected to throw over all their controls. Let us remember that conditions vary between our Nation and those in Europe. What might be sound economic practices for us would not always be sound for them.

There are those who would have us attach conditions to our aid to Europe which would amount in effect to orders for fundamental changes in their government. I believe those ideas are misguided. The governments of the 16 nations give promise of improvement and one of the reasons for this is that they are independent. Indeed, the whole aim of our program is to preserve that independence.

On the other hand, I believe it is perfectly proper and most essential to demand as a condition for our continuing help that the European governments live up to the representations they made and the commitments they undertook in the Paris Conference report. These are promises for measures to reorder their single and several economies and establish mutually beneficial and sound business cooperation. Such undertakings were volunteered. Our proviso that they must be carried out, if we are to keep on extending aid, is in no way offensive and is a far different thing from an unwelcome and unwholesome intrusion into their independent governing processes.

I fully agree with the feeling in Congress that no step can be neglected to make sure that the money and materials going to Europe be used for the proper and specified purposes. To carry out this aim, either one of two ways may be adopted. Either we can formulate a plan—detailed, full of rules, and necessarily complex—and impose it, or we can ask the Committee for European Economic Cooperation to make a plan which we can approve, with such suggestions and modifications as may be desirable. To me, the second alternative is greatly preferable.

The problem is to make sure that aid-seeking countries carry through on the representations they have made. I believe they want to do it and will want to make a sound plan to assure performance if for no other reason than because continuity of help depends on it. Secondly, they ought to know how to plan it better than any American committee or officer could possibly do it. Finally, this approach conforms to the fundamental conception of the Marshall plan, which was not a plan but a suggestion to a group of European countries to formulate a plan and submit it to us for our consideration.

I sympathize deeply with the problem of the Congress in considering the question of the execution of the plan. It is difficult because of a few simple facts. With the deep sense of responsibility which is involved in this proposed program, Congress rightly wants to safeguard the proper operation of the plan as a whole. To do this, the temptation is considerable to try to draw firm, precise blueprints in the light of existing facts, economic and financial.

In a static world, this might be feasible. But with circumstances so fluctuating here as well as abroad—weather conditions for crops is an illustration—the need for flexibility and elasticity in the administration is obviously vital.

The more there can be a joint follow-through, with joint American and European checks on how the money is being used, the better will be the chances of achieving what must be a dual goal of your legislation: Safeguarding the purposes of the aid program, and allowing the latitude appropriate to a world in which conditions can at times change rapidly and unexpectedly.

A word about the third argument of the program's critics that the danger of Europe going totalitarian has passed. I wish I could believe that that were so, but I cannot. To be sure, the events of recent months have been encouraging; we can count ourselves fortunate that the Communist strikes in France and Italy were surmounted. But the reason they did not result in the overthrow of the independent governments of those nations was precisely that by that time Europe could look with some assurance to aid from the west.

Without concrete and effective steps taken here to help those countries over the crisis, the majority of their people would not have backed the present governments. They would have looked to Moscow because there would have been no point in looking to us.

The French municipal elections of last autumn convinced some people that France will never go Communist, but will turn far to the right instead. Perhaps; but, if so, I suspect that will either be a temporary expedient, followed by a swing sharply in the other direction, or else that the right will become such an extreme right that it will be just as much a dictatorship, just as totalitarian, as the far left. This, no less than communism, means an end to democracy, an end to the hope of expanding international trade and amity.

Before I close, may I refer to a point eloquently put forth by Secretary Marshall. That is that our aid must be sufficient to lay the groundwork for recovery, not merely the prolongation of relief. We can expect no great good result for our foreign policy by granting a dole or by following a coffee-and-sandwiches approach.

This proposition which you are considering is something like an atomic pile. As our scientists discovered, that pile—the amount of uranium put in one place—had to be of a sufficient size or else it would not operate; there would be no reaction at all. Too many of the neutron bullets which were supposed to smash into other nuclei and thus create still other atomic projectiles escaped into space, outside of the system, unless the whole agglomeration was built up to a point known as the critical size.

So also there is a critical size to our foreign aid. I would not presume to say what the size is, but would only point out that the Paris Conference Report, the Harriman Report, and the administration—good people working independently—reached figures not too far apart, in their appraisal of what it will take to make the operation truly chain-reacting, capable of sustaining itself in a process of economic rehabilitation, capable of getting Europe off our backs and on its feet.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I announced on Friday that it was the intention to have the Legislative Calendar called today from the beginning for the consideration of measures to which there was no objection. If the RECORD does not show that, I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Murray
Baldwin	Gurney	O'Conor
Ball	Hatch	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stennis
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Wilson
Fulbright	Moore	Young
George	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the order just made, the clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

OBLIGATIONS OF OPERATORS OF GOLD AND SILVER MINES—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and

silver mines who were forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill has been pending on the calendar, a long time. I ask unanimous consent that it may be recommitted to the committee from which it was reported, the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be recommitted, as requested.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 669) to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) amending rule XXII relating to cloture was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 354) to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 866) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 408) to repeal section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, to amend section 13 of the said act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 299) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 309) designating American Indian Day, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that the amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary to Senate bill 309 has been agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] asked that the bill go over when it was reached on the last call of the calendar. He is not present at the moment. I ask that the bill will be temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1179) to aid in defraying the expenses of the seventeenth triennial convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1125) to amend the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] reported this bill from the Committee on the District of Columbia. The junior Senator from Washington and I conferred on the bill during the last session of Congress. I should like to ask if the changes which we then suggested have been incorporated in the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that at the moment I am not certain whether the changes referred to have been made. I must admit I am not familiar with the present status of the bill. Under the circumstances, I ask that it go over until I have had opportunity to make further investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, what action was taken on Senate bill 866, Calendar No. 139?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill went over under objection.

The bill (S. 140) to create an executive department to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security was announced as next in order.

Mr. McMAHON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 18) to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 518) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF REMOUNT SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who has been ill, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection for just a moment, I should like to make a brief 2-minute statement on the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I withhold the objection for that purpose. I am not objecting on my own behalf.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the basis for the objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that at an early date House bill 3484 can be made the order of business of the Senate for reasons of economy, because, after all, we have got to make a decision as to what we are going to do with the Federal properties which are involved in the bill. It is costing the Government a good many thousands of dollars to leave the problem in suspension. I believe the Army and the Department of Agriculture are entitled to know one way or another what disposition is going to be made of the properties. Hence I wish to make the request that at a very early date the bill be taken up for consideration, because I do not think it will take very long to debate the bill. In the interest of economy and wise expenditure of Federal money, a decision on the disposition of the remount stations involved should be made.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I merely wish to say that I heartily endorse all the Senator from Oregon has just said. One of the remount depots in question is in Virginia. We in Virginia are very much interested in its continuation. It cannot be efficiently and properly handled until the Department of Agriculture knows whether it is going to have jurisdiction over the depot. I join with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in the expression of hope that at an early date the leadership of the Senate will permit us to vote on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the opinion which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] holds on the matter at issue, but I believe we ought to stop the little game of simply objecting to the bill when it is reached on the calendar. He and I know that disposition should be made of the subject. As he also is aware, one branch of the legislature of his own State is opposed to the very bill which he proposes in connection with this matter. I have received a great many telegrams from residents of Oklahoma who feel that the matter ought to be disposed of in accordance with the bill which I have pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under objection, the bill will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

REGULATION OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 612) to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

The first committee amendment was, on page 1, line 3, after "section", to strike out "35" and insert "36."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on the same page, line 5, after "amended", to strike out "is amended to read" and insert "is hereby repealed, and that section 35 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, is amended to read."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 13, after "Canada", to insert "any Province of the Dominion of Canada."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this bill, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], permits life-insurance companies domiciled in the District of Columbia to expand their present field of investment. The bill also affords additional outlets for investment funds. It has the approval of the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia and the committee representing the life-insurance companies of the District.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 8, to strike out:

(6) Equipment trust certificates or adequately secured instruments evidencing an interest in railroad or other transportation equipment, wholly or in part within the United States, or the Dominion of Canada, and a right to receive determined portions of rental, purchase, or other fixed obligatory payments for the use or purchase of such transportation equipment.

And insert:

(6) Notes, bonds, or trust certificates secured by any transportation equipment leased or sold to a common carrier, domiciled within the United States or the Dominion of Canada, with gross revenues exceeding $1,000,000 in the fiscal year immediately preceding purchase, which notes, bonds, or trust certificates provide a right to receive determined rental, purchase, or other fixed obligatory payments adequate to retire the obligations within 20 years from date of issue and also provide (a) for the vesting of title to such equipment, free from encumbrance in a corporate trustee or (b) for the creation of a first lien on such equipment, provided at the date of purchase such notes, bonds, or trust certificates are not in default as to principal or interest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "That (1) no company shall invest in such obligations of any one corporation an amount in excess of 2 percent of its assets" and insert "That (1) no company shall invest an amount in excess of 2 percent of its admitted assets in any one issue of such obligations of any one corporation;"; and on page 7, line 21, after the word "in", to strike out "principal or", so as to read:

(7) Bonds and other evidences of indebtedness of any solvent corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada or any Province thereof: *Provided*, That (1) no company shall invest an amount in excess of 2 percent of its admitted assets in any one issue of such obligations of any one corporation; (2) the net earnings of the issuing corporation available for its fixed charges for a period of 5 fiscal years next preceding the date of acquisition by such insurance company shall have averaged yearly, and during the last year of said 5-year period shall have been not less than one and one-half times its annual fixed charges at the time of the investment, or, if a new issue, as shown by the pro forma statement of the corporation; and (3) there shall have been no defaults in interest thereon, or on any such obligations of such corporation which are of equal or higher priority with those purchased, during the period of 5 years next preceding the date of acquisition, or, if outstanding for less than 5 years, at any time since said obligations were issued. The term "net earnings available for fixed charges," as used herein, shall mean the net income after deducting all operating and maintenance expenses and taxes other than Federal, State, and District of Columbia income taxes, but nonrecurring items of income and expense may be eliminated. The term "fixed charges" as used herein shall include interest on all of the fixed interest-bearing debt of the corporation outstanding and maturing in more than 1 year, as of the date of acquisition, and in case of investment in contingent interest obligations, said term shall also include maximum annual contingent interest as of said date. The earnings of all predecessor, merged, consolidated, or purchased companies may be included through the use of consolidated or pro forma statements provided the fixed charges of all such companies are also included.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 19, to strike out:

(9) Preferred stock of any corporation (other than its own) created under the laws of the United States, or any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada or any Province thereof, which has earned and paid regular dividends in cash at the regular prescribed rate each year upon its preferred stock for not less than 5 years next preceding the purchase of such preferred stock, or during such part of said 5-year period as it shall have had preferred stock outstanding, and which corporation or its predecessor shall have earned each year during said 5-year period dividends upon its stocks of at least $100,000: *Provided*, That no company shall invest in the preferred stock of any one corporation an amount in excess of 1 percent of its assets.

(10) Common stocks of any corporation (other than its own) created under the laws of the United States, or any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada or any Province thereof, which shall have earned and paid common dividends in cash for not less than 5 years next preceding the purchase of such stocks: *Provided*, That no company shall invest in the common stock of any one corporation an amount in excess of 1 percent of its assets.

And insert:

(9) Preferred stock of any solvent corporation (other than its own) created under the laws of the United States, or of any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada, or any Province thereof, where such corporation has not failed in any one of the three fiscal years next preceding such investment, to have earned a sum applicable to dividends on such preferred stock equal at least to three times the amount of dividends due in that year, or where in case of issuance of new preferred stock such earnings applicable to dividends are equal to at least three times the amount of pro forma annual dividend requirements after giving effect to such new financing, and where the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness, if any, of such corporation are eligible as investments under the provisions of subsection (7) of this section, and where the total investment in any one issue of such preferred stock of any one corporation does not exceed 1 percent of the investing company's admitted assets.

(10) Common stocks of any solvent corporation (other than its own) created under the laws of the United States, or of any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada, or any Province thereof, which shall have paid common dividends in cash for not less than 5 years next preceding the purchase of such stocks, and where the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness, if any, and the preferred stock, if any, of such corporation are eligible as investments under the provisions of subsections (7) and (9), respectively, of this section, and where the total investment in the common stock of any one corporation does not exceed 1 percent of the investing company's admitted assets.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 7, after the word "all", to strike out "profits therein" and insert "amounts payable thereunder", so as to read:

(12) A life-insurance company may also purchase for its own benefit any policy of life insurance or other obligation of the company and claims of the holders thereof, and may lend to the holders of its life-insurance policies sums not exceeding in any case the reserve value of the policy at the time the loan is made, and for the payment of any such loan the policy and all amounts payable thereunder shall be pledged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 13, to strike out:

(14) A life-insurance company in addition to the types of real estate specified in section 36 of this chapter may purchase or hold real estate for the production of income. It may improve or otherwise develop in any manner such real estate and the improvements thereon, and may own, maintain, manage, collect and receive income from, and sell or convey the same. No investment shall be made by any company pursuant to this subsection (14) which will cause such company's investments in all real estate, other than its home office, owned by the company, to exceed 10 percent of its admitted assets.

And insert:

(14) A life-insurance company may also acquire, hold, and convey real estate for the purposes and in the manner following:

(a) the building in which it has its principal office and the land on which it stands;

(b) such as shall be requisite for its convenient accommodation in the transaction of its business;

(c) such as shall have been acquired for the accommodation of its business;

(d) such as shall have been conveyed to it in satisfaction of debts, previously contracted, in the course of its dealings;

(e) such as it shall have purchased at trustee sale or sales on judgments, decrees, or mortgages obtained or made for such debts; and

(f) such as it may purchase or hold for the production of income. It may improve or otherwise develop in any manner such real estate and the improvements thereon, and may own, maintain, manage, collect, and receive income from, and sell or convey the same. No company may, in any period of 12 consecutive months, invest in or agree to pay for real estate, including improvements thereon, under the authority of this item (f) an aggregate amount in excess of 2 percent of its admitted assets as shown in its most recent annual statement; nor shall the

total value of real estate and improvements thereon acquired or held by a company for the production of income under the provisions of this item (f) at any time exceed 5 percent of its said admitted assets. No investment shall be made by any company pursuant to this item (f) if such company then owns real estate having a total value in excess of 10 percent of its said admitted assets or if such investment will cause such company's aggregate investments in real estate owned by it to exceed 10 percent of its said admitted assets: *Provided,* That for the purpose of applying said 10 percent limitation real estate shall include all real estate then owned by the company and such real estate as it may have owned and sold on contract, to the extent of the balance unpaid on such contract of sale; or if the balance unpaid on account of real estate owned and sold by a company is secured by mortgage or other instrument, there shall be included as real estate the amount, if any, by which the balance unpaid exceeds 75 percent of the value of such real estate. A company may, subject to the limitations and conditions of this item (f), elect to consider property acquired as specified in items (c), (d), and (e) as real estate for the production of income as defined in this item (f). Such election shall be duly authorized and recorded by the board of directors or by a committee thereof charged with the duty of supervising loans or investments.

All such real estate specified in items (c), (d), and (e) of this subsection (14), which shall not be necessary for its accommodation in the convenient transaction of its business, and which it has not elected to hold for the production of income, shall be sold by the company and disposed of within 5 years after it shall have acquired the title to the same, or within 5 years after the same shall have ceased to be necessary for the accommodation of its business, unless the company file with the Superintendent an application for extension of time, supported by such evidence as may be required by the Superintendent, establishing to his satisfaction that an extension would be to the advantage of the company and that the interests of the company would be affected adversely by a forced sale thereof, in which event the time for the sale may be extended to such time as the Superintendent shall direct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 36 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, is hereby repealed, and that section 35 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Investments of funds of domestic companies: A domestic company shall invest its funds only in—

"(1) Bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness of the United States, any State, Territory or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Dominion of Canada, any province of the Dominion of Canada, or of any administration, agency, authority, or instrumentality of any of the political units enumerated.

"(2) Bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness guaranteed or insured as to principal and interest by the United States, any State, Territory or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Dominion of Canada, any Province of the Dominion of Canada, or by an administration, agency, authority, or instrumentality of any of the political units enumerated.

"(3) Bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued, guaranteed, or insured as to principal and interest by a city, county, drainage district, road district, school district, tax district, town, township, village or other civil administration, agency, authority, instrumentality or subdivision of a State, Territory or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, or of the Dominion of Canada, or any province thereof, provided such obligations are authorized by law and are (a) direct and general obligations of the issuing, guaranteeing, or insuring governmental unit, administration, agency, authority, district, subdivision, or instrumentality; or (b) payable from designated revenues pledged to the payment of the principal and interest thereof.

"(4) Legally authorized bonds, debentures, notes, collateral trust certificates, and other such evidences of indebtedness, and share certificates, which have been or may be issued by (a) the Federal home-loan bank; (b) the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; (c) any Federal savings and loan association; (d) the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; (e) the Federal Farm Loan Board; (f) any Federal land bank; (g) the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank; (h) any housing authority organized under the public housing laws of the District of Columbia or any State of the United States, or in notes, bonds, or loans secured by mortgage or deed of trust insured under the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or guaranteed or insured pursuant to the provisions of title III of an act of Congress of the United States of June 22, 1944, cited as 'Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944', as heretofore or hereafter amended, or by any entity, corporation, or agency which has been or which may be created by or authorized by any act which has been enacted, or which may hereafter be enacted by the Congress of the United States, or any amendment thereto, which has for its purpose the relief of, refinancing of, or assistance to owners of mortgaged or encumbered homes, farms, or other real estate.

"(5) (a) Bonds, notes, or loans secured by first lien on real estate in the United States or Dominion of Canada worth at least 40 percent more than the amount loaned thereon: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to any of the classes of securities mentioned in subsection (4) of this section, if guaranteed or insured in whole or in part as therein provided; but nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit a company from renewing or extending a loan for the original amount where there has been a shrinkage in the value of such real estate nor to prohibit a company from accepting, as part payment for real estate sold by it, a lien theron for more than the percentage herein specified of the purchase price of such real estate. For the purpose of this section real estate shall not be deemed to be encumbered by reason of the existence of taxes or assessments that are not delinquent, instruments creating or reserving mineral, oil, water, or timber rights, rights-of-way, joint driveways, sewer rights, rights in walls, nor by reason of building restrictions or other restrictive covenants, nor when such real estate is subject to lease in whole or in part whereby rents or profits are reserved to the owner.

"(b) Bonds, notes, or loans secured by first lien on leasehold estates in improved real property located in the United States or Dominion of Canada, where such real property is unencumbered except by rentals to accrue therefrom to the owner of the fee, and where there is no condition or right of reentry or forfeiture under which such lien can be cut off, subordinated, or otherwise disturbed, so long as the lessee is not in default, provided the value of such leasehold, with improvements thereon shall be at least 50 percent more than the amount loaned thereon: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not apply to any of the classes of securities mentioned in subsection (4) of this section, if guaranteed or insured in whole or in part as therein provided. Such loan shall be completely amortized during the unexpired portion of the lease or leasehold estate securing its payment.

"(c) Loans or advances by a company for the purpose of making repairs, alterations, additions, or improvements to homes or other buildings on improved real estate upon which real estate or upon a leasehold estate in said real estate, such company then holds a first lien to secure a loan previously made: *Provided,* That no such loan or advance shall be made in a sum in excess of $2,000: *And provided further,* That the amount of such loan or advance when added to the balance due on the original indebtedness shall not exceed the amount originally secured by the first lien.

"(d) Ground rents in the District of Columbia or any State of the United States: *Provided,* That in the case of unexpired redeemable ground rents the premiums paid, if any, shall be amortized over the period between the date of acquisition and earliest redemption date, or charged off at any time prior to redemption date; and in the case of expired redeemable ground rents the premiums paid, if any, shall be charged off at the time of acquisition. Redeemable ground rents purchased at a discount shall be carried at an amount not greater than the cost of acquisition.

"(6) Notes, bonds, or trust certificates secured by any transportation equipment leased or sold to a common carrier, domiciled within the United States or the Dominion of Canada, with gross revenues exceeding $1,000,000 in the fiscal year immediately preceding purchase, which notes, bonds, or trust certificates provide a right to receive determined rental, purchase, or other fixed obligatory payments adequate to retire the obligations within 20 years from date of issue and also provide (a) for the vesting of title to such equipment, free from encumbrance in a corporate trustee or (b) for the creation of a first lien on such equipment, provided at the date of purchase such notes, bonds, or trust certificates are not in default as to principal or interest.

"(7) Bonds and other evidences of indebtedness of any solvent corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada or any province thereof: *Provided,* That (1) no company shall invest an amount in excess of 2 percent of its admitted assets in any one issue of such obligations of any one corporation; (2) the net earnings of the issuing corporation available for its fixed charges for a period of 5 fiscal years next preceding the date of acquisition by such insurance company shall have averaged yearly, and during the last year of said 5-year period shall have been not less than one and one-half times its annual fixed charges at the time of the investment, or, if a new issue, as shown by the pro forma statement of the corporation; and (3) there shall have been no defaults in interest thereon, or on any such obligations of such corporation which are of equal or higher priority with those purchased, during the period of 5 years next preceding the date of acquisition, or, if outstanding for less than 5 years, at any time since said obligations were issued. The term 'net earnings available for fixed charges,' as used herein, shall mean the net income after deducting all operating and maintenance expenses and taxes other than Federal, State, and District of Columbia income taxes, but nonrecurring items of income and expense may be eliminated. The term 'fixed charges' as used herein shall include interest on all of the fixed interest-bearing debt of the corporation outstanding and maturing in more than 1 year, as of the date of acquisition, and in case of investment in contingent interest obligations, said term shall also include maximum annual contingent interest as of said date. The earnings of all predecessor, merged, consolidated, or purchased

companies may be included through the use of consolidated or pro forma statements provided the fixed charges of all such companies are also included.

"(8) Bank certificates of deposit and bankers' acceptances, and other bills of exchange of the kind and maturities made eligible by law for purchase in the open market by Federal Reserve banks.

"(9) Preferred stock of any solvent corporation (other than its own) created under the laws of the United States, or of any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada, or any Province thereof, where such corporation has not failed in any one of the three fiscal years next preceding such investment, to have earned a sum applicable to dividends on such preferred stock equal at least to three times the amount of dividends due in that year, or where in case of issuance of new preferred stock such earnings applicable to dividends are equal to at least three times the amount of pro forma annual dividend requirements after giving effect to such new financing, and where the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness, if any, of such corporation are eligible as investments under the provisions of subsection (7) of this section, and where the total investment in any one issue of such preferred stock of any one corporation does not exceed 1 percent of the investing company's admitted assets.

"(10) Common stocks of any solvent corporation (other than its own) created under the laws of the United States, or of any State thereof, or the District of Columbia, or the Dominion of Canada, or any Province thereof, which shall have paid common dividends in cash for not less than 5 years next preceding the purchase of such stocks, and where the bonds and other evidences of indebtedness, if any, and the preferred stock, if any, of such corporation are eligible as investments under the provisions of subsections (7) and (9), respectively, of this section, and where the total investment in the common stock of any one corporation does not exceed 1 percent of the investing company's admitted assets.

"(11) Loans upon the pledge of any of the securities aforesaid.

"(12) A life-insurance company may also purchase for its own benefit any policy of life insurance or other obligation of the company and claims of the holders thereof, and may lend to the holders of its life-insurance policies sums not exceeding in any case the reserve value of the policy at the time the loan is made, and for the payment of any such loan the policy and all amounts payable thereunder shall be pledged.

"(13) A company doing business in a foreign country may invest the funds required to meet its obligations in such country and in conformity to the laws thereof in the same kind of securities in such foreign country that such company is allowed by law to invest in the United States.

"(14) A life-insurance company may also acquire, hold, and convey real estate for the purposes and in the manner following:

"(a) the building in which it has its principal office and the land on which it stands;

"(b) such as shall be requisite for its convenient accommodation in the transaction of its business;

"(c) such as shall have been acquired for the accommodation of its business;

"(d) such as shall have been conveyed to it in satisfaction of debts, previously contracted, in the course of its dealings;

"(e) such as it shall have purchased at trustee sale or sales on judgments, decrees, or mortgages obtained or made for such debts; and

"(f) such as it may purchase or hold for the production of income. It may improve or otherwise develop in any manner such real estate and the improvements thereon, and may own, maintain, manage, collect, and receive income from, and sell or convey the same. No company may, in any period of 12 consecutive months, invest in or agree to pay for real estate, including improvements thereon, under the authority of this item (f) an aggregate amount in excess of 2 percent of its admitted assets as shown in its most recent annual statement; nor shall the total value of real estate and improvements thereon acquired or held by a company for the production of income under the provisions of this item (f) at any time exceed 5 percent of its said admitted assets. No investment shall be made by any company pursuant to this item (f) if such company then owns real estate having a total value in excess of 10 percent of its said admitted assets or if such investment will cause such company's aggregate investments in real estate owned by it to exceed 10 percent of its admitted assets: *Provided*, That for the purpose of applying said 10 percent limitation real estate shall include all real estate then owned by the company and such real estate as it may have owned and sold on contract, to the extent of the balance unpaid on such contract of sale; or if the balance unpaid on account of real estate owned and sold by a company is secured by mortgage or other instrument, there shall be included as real estate the amount, if any, by which the balance unpaid exceeds 75 percent of the value of such real estate. A company may, subject to the limitations and conditions of this item (f), elect to consider property acquired as specified in items (c), (d), and (e) as real estate for the production of income as defined in this item (f). Such election shall be duly authorized and recorded by the board of directors or by a committee thereof charged with the duty of supervising loans or investments.

"All such real estate specified in items (c), (d), and (e) of this subsection (14), which shall not be necessary for its accommodation in the convenient transaction of its business, and which it has not elected to hold for the production of income, shall be sold by the company and disposed of within 5 years after it shall have acquired the title to the same, or within 5 years after the same shall have ceased to be necessary for the accommodation of its business, unless the company file with the superintendent an application for extension of time, supported by such evidence as may be required by the superintendent, establishing to his satisfaction that an extension would be to the advantage of the company and that the interests of the company would be affected adversely by a forced sale thereof, in which event the time for the sale may be extended to such time as the superintendent shall direct.

"No loan or investment, except loans on the security of life-insurance policies, shall be made by any such company, unless the same shall have been authorized or be approved by the board of directors or by a committee thereof charged with the duty of supervising loans or investments.

"No such company shall subscribe to or participate in any underwriting of the purchase or sale of securities or property, jointly with any other corporation, firm, or person, or enter into any agreement to withhold from sale any of its securities or property; but the disposition of its assets shall at all times be within the control of the company.

"Nothing in this act shall prohibit a company from accepting in good faith, to protect its interests, securities or property, other than herein referred to, in payment of or to secure debts due or to become due the company."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled 'An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia,' as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments."

USE OF MODERN MORTALITY TABLES BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1634), to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? What is the difference between this bill and the one just passed? I notice that they amend the same act. Why is it necessary to have two bills to accomplish the same purpose?

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, this bill permits life insurance companies domiciled in the District of Columbia to use modern mortality tables, which are now in use in every State of the Union except one. This bill also has the approval of the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1038) to amend the Federal Airport Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 6) to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let the concurrent resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 493) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 249) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

The bill (S. 1502) to authorize the contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations of an amount equal to the moneys received by the Selective Service System for the services of persons assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the present situation is entirely different from the situation at the time the bill was reported. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The bill (S. 1454) to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in regard to the bill, if the Senator will withhold his objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the bill came up the last time the calendar was called. Certain amendments were agreed to, and then it was suggested by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the amended bill be placed on our desks so that we could see the bill before we passed it. Consequently the bill has come back to us in that form. I believe that if I may have the opportunity to make a brief explanation, there will be no objection. The bill has been reprinted at the request of several Senators.

Mr. President, this bill, which amends the Public Health Service Act, is mainly a technical bill to aid the Public Health Service in overcoming its professional personnel problems. Most of these problems relate chiefly to the difficulties experienced by the Service in securing and retaining adequately trained physicians and other technical and professional personnel for work in the field of public health.

In the past, the Congress has kept the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service on a parity with the Army and Navy in regard to rates of pay and rates of promotion. The Public Health Servict Act provides specifically that Public Health Service officers shall be promoted after the same length of service as officers of the Medical Corps of the Army. The present Army promotion plan provided in Public Law 381, approved during the first session of this Congress, contains substantial revisions of the Army system. That bill has been passed. It became necessary, therefore, to make corresponding changes in the Public Health Service system. Most of the amendments proposed by S. 1454 are attributable to the Army revisions. The bill includes minor amendments of substance to make S. 1454 conform with H. R. 3924, as reported.

S. 1454 as reprinted now conforms with H. R. 3924, with one exception, namely, it does not include a corresponding provision which enables graduates of accredited colleges of osteopathy to be eligible for appointment as commissioned medical officers in the Public Health Service. As I have pointed out, these are technical changes, which have been so far approved by the Senate.

Subsequent to January 12, when the amendments were agreed to, a number of Senators have made inquiry and expressed their interest in this provision concerning the eligibility for appointment of osteopathic medical officers. In view of that, I offer an amendment which makes the same provision as that contained in H. R. 3924.

This amendment is in the nature of enabling legislation; it is not a compulsory provision. Similar provisions permitting the appointment of osteopathic physicians have been provided for the Veterans' Administration (Public Law 293, 79th Cong., sec. 5) and for the Navy (Public Law 604, 79th Cong., sec. 41).

I ask that the amendment be read. If it shall be approved, I shall ask for passage of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if the amendment he has offered is the exact amendment which was offered and accepted in the House relative to osteopathy.

Mr. SMITH. I am so advised.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator sure about the amendment?

Mr. SMITH. I am so advised by my assistant.

Mr. WHERRY. If the amendment is exactly the amendment offered and accepted in the House, it would bring the Senate bill in line with the House provision.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct. The amendment has been on the desks of Senators, with the bill as amended the last time the calendar was called.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Am I to understand that the amendment now offered by the Senator will make it possible to include osteopaths in the bill?

Mr. SMITH. If the amendment which I have offered, covering graduates of colleges of osteopathy, shall be approved, it will make such graduates eligible under the provisions of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the Senator's request?

Mr. SMITH. I should like to have read the amendment which I offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 23, after the word "therefrom", it is proposed to insert the following:

Graduates of colleges of osteopathy whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy in a majority of the States of the United States, or approved by a body or bodies acceptable to the Administrator, shall be eligible, subject to the other provisions of this act, for appointment as commissioned medical officers in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, which amendments had been previously agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether or not there is an error in printing on page 3, line 9, where there was evidently intended to be an amendment. However, the italicized words as well as the original text are stricken out.

Mr. SMITH. I am advised by my assistant that there has been an error in printing. It should read:

That the number of Assistant Surgeons General having a grade higher than that corresponding to the grade of brigadier general shall at no time exceed one-half of the number of positions created by subsection (b) of section 205 or pursuant to subsection (c) of such section.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the printing error has been corrected.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (j) of section 2 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A), is amended by inserting immediately after the semicolon at the end thereof the words "isonipecaine and its derivatives, compounds, salts, and preparations; opiates (as defined in section 3228 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code)."

SEC. 2. Section 203 of such act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 205 of such act is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, is authorized to create special temporary positions in the grade of Assistant Surgeons General when necessary for the proper staffing of the Service; but the number of such special temporary positions, when added to the eight positions created by section 204 and subsections (a) and (b) of this section, shall not on any day exceed three-fourths of 1 percent of the highest number, during the 90 days preceding such day, of officers of the Regular Corps on active duty and officers of the Reserve Corps on active duty for more than 30 days. The Surgeon General may assign officers of either the Regular Corps or the Reserve Corps to any such special temporary positions, and while so serving they shall each have the title of Assistant Surgeon General."

SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 206 of such act is amended to read: "The Surgeon General, during the period of his appointment as such, shall be of the same grade, with the same pay and allowances, as the Surgeon General of the Army; and the Deputy Surgeon General, while assigned as such, shall have the grade corresponding with the grade of major general, with the same pay and

allowances. Assistant Surgeons General, while assigned as such, shall have the grade, with the pay and allowances thereof, corresponding with either the grade of brigadier general or the grade of major general, as may be determined by the Administrator after considering the importance of the duties to be performed: *Provided*, That the number of Assistant Surgeons General having a grade higher than that corresponding to the grade of brigadier general shall at no time exceed one-half of the number of positions created by subsection (b) of section 205 or pursuant to subsection (c) of such section."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Any commissioned officer below the grade of director who is assigned to serve as chief of a division shall, for the duration of such assignment, have the grade of director and receive the pay and allowances applicable to such grade.

"(d) Within the total number of officers of the Regular Corps authorized by the appropriation act or acts for each fiscal year to be on active duty, the Administrator shall by regulation prescribe the maximum number of officers authorized to be in each of the grades from the junior assistant grade to the director grade, inclusive. Such numbers shall be determined after considering the anticipated needs of the Service during the fiscal year, the funds available, the number of officers in each grade at the beginning of the fiscal year, and the anticipated appointments, the anticipated promotions based on years of service, and the anticipated retirements during the fiscal year. The number so determined for any grade for a fiscal year may not exceed the number limitation (if any) contained in the appropriation act or acts for such year. Such regulations for each fiscal year shall be prescribed as promptly as possible after the appropriation act fixing the authorized strength of the corps for that year, and shall be subject to amendment only if such authorized strength or such number limitation is thereafter changed. The maxima established by such regulations shall not require (apart from action pursuant to other provisions of this act) any officer to be separated from the Service or reduced in grade."

SEC. 5. (a) Such act is further amended by striking out section 207 thereof and by redesignating sections 208 and 209 as sections 207 and 208, respectively.

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of the section herein redesignated as section 207 is amended by striking "surgery," therefrom. Graduates of colleges of osteopathy whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy in a majority of the States of the United States, or approved by a body or bodies acceptable to the Administrator, shall be eligible, subject to the other provisions of this act, for appointment as commissioned medical officers in the Public Health Service. The second sentence of paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended to read: "Reserve commissions shall be for a period of not more than 5 years and may be terminated at any time, as the President may direct."

(c) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read:

"(b) Not more than 10 percent of the original appointments to the Regular Corps authorized to be made during any fiscal year may be made to grades above that of senior assistant, but no such appointment may be made to a grade above that of director. For the purpose of this subsection the number of original appointments authorized to be made during a fiscal year shall be (1) the excess of the number of officers of the Regular Corps authorized by the appropriation act or acts for such year over the number of officers on active duty in the Regular Corps on the first day of such year, plus (2) the number of such officers of the Regular Corps who, during such fiscal year, have been or will be retired upon attainment of age 64 or have for any other reason ceased to be on active duty. In determining the number of appointments authorized by this subsection an appointment shall be deemed to be made in the fiscal year in which the nomination is transmitted by the President to the Senate. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this subsection unless he meets standards established in accordance with regulations of the President."

(d) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) thereof as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; by changing "subsection (c)" to "subsection (e)" and changing "subsection (d)" to "subsection (f)" in the subsection hereby designated as subsection (g); and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) Commissions evidencing the appointment by the President of officers of the Regular or Reserve Corps shall be issued by the Administrator under the seal of the Federal Security Agency.

"(d) (1) For purposes of pay and pay period and for purposes of promotion, any person appointed under subsection (a) to the grade of senior assistant in the Regular Corps, and any person appointed under subsection (b), shall, except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, be considered as having had on the date of appointment the following length of service: 3 years if appointed to the senior assistant grade, 10 years if appointed to the full grade, 17 years if appointed to the senior grade, and 18 years if appointed to the director grade.

"(2) For purposes of pay and pay period, any person appointed under subsection (a) to the grade of senior assistant in the Regular Corps, and any person appointed under subsection (b), shall, in lieu of the credit provided in paragraph (1), be credited with the service for which he is entitled to credit under any other provision of law if such service exceeds that to which he would be entitled under such paragraph.

"(3) For purposes of promotion, any person originally appointed in the Regular Corps to the senior assistant grade or above who has had active service in the Reserve Corps shall be considered as having had on the date of appointment the length of service provided for in paragraph (1), plus whichever of the following is greater: (A) The excess of his total active service in the Reserve Corps (above the grade of junior assistant) over the length of service provided in such paragraph, to the extent that such excess is on account of service in the Reserve Corps in or above the grade to which he is appointed in the Regular Corps or (B) his active service in the same or any higher grade in the Reserve Corps after the first day on which, under regulations in effect on the date of his appointment to the Regular Corps, he would have had the training and experience necessary for such appointment.

"(4) For purposes of promotion, any person whose original appointment is to the assistant grade in the Regular Corps shall be considered as having had on the date of appointment service equal to his total active service in the Reserve Corps in and above the assistant grade."

(e) Beginning as of the date of enactment of this act, any officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service on active duty on such date shall, in lieu of the service with which he was credited for the purposes of pay and pay period at the time of his appointment to such corps, receive credit, if it is greater, for 3 years if his appointment was to the senior assistant grade, 12 years if it was to the full grade, 20 years if it was to the senior grade, and 26 years if it was to the director grade.

(f) Any person appointed to any grade above the assistant grade in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service after enactment of this act and prior to July 1, 1948, shall, for purposes of pay and pay period, and (except in the case of an appointment to the director grade) for purposes of promotion, receive the credit provided under section 207 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act, or shall receive credit, if it is greater, of 3 years if appointed to the senior assistant grade, 12 years if appointed to the full grade, 20 years if appointed to the senior grade, and 26 years if appointed to the director grade. In the case of an officer so appointed to the full or senior grade (1) he shall receive 2 years' seniority in grade if appointed to the full grade and 3 years' if appointed to the senior grade, and (2) he shall be considered as having completed the 1 year of service in grade required for promotion to a restricted grade or to the director grade, as the case may be.

(g) Subsection (b) of the section herein redesignated as section 208 is amended to read:

"(b) Reserve officers, except when otherwise provided by law, shall receive the same pay and allowances when on active duty as commissioned officers of the Regular Corps, including allowances for travel and transportation of household goods and effects."

(h) Subsection (h) of the section herein redesignated as section 208 is amended by striking out "section 208 (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 207 (f)".

(i) Such act is further amended by inserting after the section herein redesignated as section 208 the following new section:

"PROFESSIONAL CATEGORIES

"SEC. 209. (a) For the purpose of establishing eligibility of officers of the Regular Corps for promotions, the Surgeon General shall by regulation divide the corps into professional categories. Each category shall, as far as practicable, be based upon one of the subjects of examination set forth in section 207 (a) (1) or upon a subdivision of such subject, and the categories shall be designed to group officers by fields of training in such manner that officers in any one grade in any one category will be available for similar duty in the discharge of the several functions of the Service.

"(b) Each officer of the Regular Corps on active duty shall, on the basis of his training and experience, be assigned by the Surgeon General to one of the categories established by regulations under subsection (a). Except upon amendment of such regulations, no assignment so made shall be changed unless the Surgeon General finds (1) that the original assignment was erroneous, or (2) that the officer is equally well qualified to serve in another category to which he has requested to be transferred, and that such transfer is in the interest of the Service.

"(c) Within the limits fixed by the Administrator in regulations under section 206 (d) for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall determine for each category in the Regular Corps the maximum number of officers authorized to be in each of the grades from the assistant grade to the director grade, inclusive.

"(d) The excess of the number so fixed for any grade in any category over the number of officers of the Regular Corps on active duty in such grade in such category (including, in the case of the director grade, officers holding such grade in accordance with section 206 (c)) shall for the purpose of promotions constitute vacancies in such grade in such category. For purposes of this subsection, an officer who has been temporarily promoted or who is temporarily holding the grade of director in accordance with section 206 (c) shall be deemed to hold the grade to which so promoted or which he is temporarily holding; but while he holds such promotion or grade, and while any officer is temporarily assigned to a position pursuant to section 205 (c), the number fixed under subsection (c) of this section

for the grade of his permanent rank shall be reduced by one.

"(e) The absence of a vacancy in a grade in a category shall not prevent an appointment to such grade pursuant to section 207, a permanent length of service promotion, or the recall of a retired officer to active duty; but the making of such an appointment, promotion, or recall shall be deemed to fill a vacancy if one exists.

"(f) Whenever a vacancy exists in any grade in a category the Surgeon General may increase by one the number fixed by him under subsection (c) for the next lower grade in the same category, without regard to the numbers fixed in regulations under section 206 (d); and in that event the vacancy in the higher grade shall not be filled except by a permanent promotion, and upon the making of such promotion the number for the next lower grade shall be reduced by one."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 210 of such act is amended to read:

"SEC. 210. (a) Promotions of officers of the Regular Corps to any grade up to and including the director grade shall be either permanent promotions based on length of service, other permanent promotions to fill vacancies, or temporary promotions. Permanent promotions shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and temporary promotions shall be made by the President. Each permanent promotion shall be to the next higher grade, and shall be made only after examination given in accordance with regulations of the President.

"(b) The President may by regulation provide that in a specified professional category permanent promotions to the senior grade, or to both the full grade and the senior grade, shall be made only if there are vacancies in such grade. A grade in any category with respect to which such regulations have been issued is referred to in this section as a 'restricted grade.'

"(c) Examinations to determine qualification for permanent promotions may be either noncompetitive or competitive, as the Surgeon General shall in each case determine; except that examinations for promotions to the assistant or senior assistant grade shall in all cases be noncompetitive. The officers to be examined shall be selected by the Surgeon General from the professional category, and in the order of seniority in the grade, from which promotion is to be recommended. In the case of a competitive examination the Surgeon General shall determine in advance of the examination the number (which may be one or more) of officers who, after passing the examination, will be recommended to the President for promotion; but if the examination is for promotion based on length of service, or is one for promotions to fill vacancies other than vacancies in the director grade or in a restricted grade, such number shall not be less than 80 percent of the number of officers to be examined.

"(d) Officers of the Regular Corps, found pursuant to subsection (c) to be qualified, shall be given permanent promotions based on length of service, as follows:

"(1) Officers in the junior assistant grade shall be promoted at such times as may be prescribed in regulations of the President.

"(2) Officers with permanent rank in the assistant grade, the senior assistant grade, and the full grade shall (except as provided in regulations under subsection (b)) be promoted after completion of 3, 10, and 17 years, respectively, of service in grades above the junior assistant grade; and such promotions, when made, shall be effective, for purposes of pay and pay period and for purposes of seniority in grade, as of the day following the completion of such years of service. An officer with permanent rank in the assistant, senior assistant, or full grade who has not completed such years of service shall be promoted at the same time, and his promotion shall be effective as of the same day, as any officer junior to him in the same grade in the same professional category who is promoted under this paragraph.

"(e) Officers in a professional category of the Regular Corps, found pursuant to subsection (c) to be qualified, may be given permanent promotions to fill any or all vacancies in such category in the senior assistant grade, the full grade, the senior grade, or the director grade; but no officer who has not had 1 year of service with permanent or temporary rank in the next lower grade shall be promoted to any restricted grade or to the director grade.

"(f) If an officer who has completed the years of service required for promotion to a grade under paragraph (2) of subsection (d) fails to receive such promotion, he shall (unless he has already been twice examined for promotion to such grade) be once reexamined for promotion to such grade. If he is thereupon promoted (otherwise than under subsection (e)), the effective date of such promotion shall be 1 year later than it would have been but for such failure. Upon the effective date of any permanent promotion of such officer to such grade, he shall be considered as having had only the length of service required for such promotion which he previously failed to receive.

"(g) If, for reasons other than physical disability incurred in line of duty, an officer of the Regular Corps in the junior assistant grade is found pursuant to subsection (c) not to be qualified for promotion he shall be separated from the service. If, for reasons other than physical disability incurred in line of duty, an officer of the Regular Corps in the assistant, senior assistant, or full grade, after having been twice examined for promotion (other than promotion to a restricted grade), fails to be promoted—

"(1) if in the assistant grade he shall be separated from the service and paid 6 months' pay and allowances;

"(2) if in the senior assistant grade he shall be separated from the service and paid 1 year's pay and allowances;

"(3) if in the full grade he shall be considered as not in line for promotion and shall, at such time thereafter as the Surgeon General may determine, be retired from the service with retired pay (unless he is entitled to a greater amount by reason of another provision of law) at the rate of 2½ percent of his active-duty pay at the time of retirement for each complete year, not in excess of 30, of his active commissioned service in the service.

"(h) If an officer of the Regular Corps, eligible to take an examination for promotion, refuses to take such examination, he may be separated from the service in accordance with regulations of the President.

"(i) At the end of his first 3 years of service, the record of each officer of the Regular Corps originally appointed to the senior assistant grade or above, shall be reviewed in accordance with regulations of the President, and if found not qualified for further service, he shall be separated from the service and paid 6 months' pay and allowances.

"(j) (1) The order of seniority of officers in a grade in the Regular Corps shall be determined, subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), by the relative length of time spent in active service after the effective date of each such officer's original appointment or permanent promotion to that grade. When permanent promotions of two or more officers to the same grade are effective on the same day, their relative seniority shall be the same as it was in the grade from which promoted. In all other cases of original appointments or permanent promotions (or both) to the same grade effective on the same day, relative seniority shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the President.

"(2) In the case of an officer originally appointed in the Regular Corps to the grade of assistant or above, his seniority in the grade to which appointed shall be determined after inclusion, as service in such grade, of any active service in such grade or in any higher grade in the Reserve Corps, but (if the appointment is to the grade of senior assistant or above) only to the extent of whichever of the following is greater: (A) His active service in such grade or any higher grade in the Reserve Corps after the first day on which, under regulations in effect on the date of his appointment to the Regular Corps, he had the training and experience necessary for such appointment, or (B) the excess of his total active service in the Reserve Corps (above the grade of junior assistant) over 3 years if his appointment in the Regular Corps is to the senior assistant grade, over 10 years if the appointment is to the full grade, or over 17 years if the appointment is to the senior grade.

"(k) Any commissioned officer of the Regular Corps in any grade in any professional category may be recommended to the President for temporary promotion to fill a vacancy in any higher grade in such category, up to and including the director grade. In time of war, or of national emergency proclaimed by the President, any commissioned officer of the Regular Corps in any grade in any professional category may be recommended to the President for promotion to any higher grade in such category, up to and including the director grade, whether or not a vacancy exists in such grade. The selection of officers to be recommended for temporary promotions shall be made in accordance with regulations of the President. Promotion of an officer recommended pursuant to this subsection may be made without regard to length of service, without examination, and without vacating his permanent appointment, and shall carry with it the pay and allowances of the grade to which promoted. Such promotions may be terminated at any time, as may be directed by the President.

"(l) Whenever the number of officers of the Regular Corps on active duty, plus the number of officers of the Reserve Corps who have been on active duty for 30 days or more, exceeds the authorized strength of the Regular Corps, the Administrator shall determine the requirements of the Service in each grade in each category, based upon the total number of officers so serving on active duty and the tasks being performed by the Service; and the Surgeon General shall thereupon assign each officer of the Reserve Corps on active duty to a professional category. If the Administrator finds that the number of officers fixed under section 209 (c) for any grade and category (or the number of officers, including officers of the Reserve Corps, on active duty in such grade in such category, if such number is greater than the number fixed under section 209 (c)) is insufficient to meet such requirements of the Service, officers of either the Regular Corps or the Reserve Corps may be recommended for temporary promotion to such grade in such category. Any such promotion may be terminated at any time, as may be directed by the President.

"(m) Any officer of the Regular Corps, or any officer of the Reserve Corps on active duty, who is promoted to a higher grade shall, unless he expressly declines such promotion, be deemed for all purposes to have accepted such promotion; and shall not be required to renew his oath of office, or to execute a new affidavit as required by the act of December 11, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 21a)."

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, no promotion shall be made under section 210 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act, prior to July 1, 1948. Until that date officers of the Regular Corps may receive temporary promotions to higher grades with the pay and allowances thereof pursuant to section 210 (a) (1) of the Public Health Service Act, in force prior to the enactment of this act, notwithstanding

the termination, prior to such date, of the war and of the national emergencies proclaimed by the President. Any officer holding, on June 30, 1948, an appointment pursuant to such section to a higher temporary grade shall continue in such grade until such appointment is terminated, as the President may direct.

(c) Effective as of the date of the enactment of this act, each officer of the Regular Corps on such date, in addition to the credit he has under preexisting legislation for purposes of promotion, shall be credited with 3 years of service.

(d) (1) Officers of the Regular Corps who have, or who on or before July 1, 1948, will have, the years of service prescribed in paragraph (2) of section 210 (d) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act, for promotion to the senior assistant, full, or senior grade, shall be recommended to the President for such promotion, to be effective as of July 1, 1948, whether or not vacancies exist in such grade. Such promotions shall be made without examination, except that no promotions shall be made to the senior grade or any grade immediately below a restricted grade until the officer is found qualified for promotion pursuant to subsection (c) of section 210 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act. No promotion shall be made pursuant to this paragraph to any grade in any professional category if such grade has been made a restricted grade pursuant to subsection (b) of section 210 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act. For purposes of seniority an officer promoted under this paragraph shall be credited with the years of service in the grade to which promoted equal to the excess of his years of service on the date of promotion over the years of service required for promotion to such grade under paragraph (2) of section 210 (d) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act.

(2) Officers in the junior assistant grade in the Regular Corps who have, or who on or before July 1, 1948, will have four or more years of service in the junior assistant grade, shall be recommended to the President for promotion to the assistant grade, to be effective as of July 1, 1948, without examinaton and whether or not vacancies exist in such grade. For purposes of promotion and seniority in grade, an officer promoted under this paragraph shall be credited with the years of service equal to the excess of his years of service on the date of promotion over 4 years.

(e) For purposes of seniority, any officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service on the date of enactment of this act shall be considered as having had service in the grade which he holds on such date equal to the excess of the service credited to him for promotion purposes over the length of service required under section 210 (d) (2), as amended by this act, for promotion to such grade.

(f) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section the provisions of this section shall not, prior to July 1, 1948, affect the term or tenure of office (including any office held under temporary promotion) of any commissioned officer of the Service in office upon the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 7. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 211 of such act is amended to read: "A commissioned officer shall be retired on the first day of the month following the month in which he attains the age of 64 years; and a commissioned officer may be retired by the Administrator, and shall be retired if he applies for retirement, on the first day of any month after completion of 30 years of active commissioned service in the Service."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of such section is amended to read:

"(2) The retired pay to which an officer, who has served 4 years or more as Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General, is entitled shall be based on the pay of the highest grade held by him as such Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by changing the words "for age" to "under the provisions of subsection (b)."

(d) Section 211 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) An officer of the Regular Corps in the senior assistant grade in a category in which the full grade is a restricted grade, who has had 20 years of active commissioned or noncommissioned service in the Service (including any active Federal service in the armed forces) or has attained the age of 50, or an officer of the Regular Corps in the full grade in a category in which the senior grade is a restricted grade, who has had 25 years of such service or has attained the age of 55, may be retired in accordance with regulations of the Administrator if he has not been found pursuant to section 210 (c) to be qualified for promotion to the full grade or the senior grade, as the case may be. The retired pay of any such officer shall be at the rate of 2½ percent of his active-duty pay at the time of retirement for each complete year, not in excess of 30, of such service.

"(h) Retired pay pursuant to this section shall be terminated if the officer receiving such pay is recalled to active duty or, in the case of an officer of the Reserve Corps, if he is found to have recovered from his disability. Such pay shall be suspended for any period during which an officer fails without good cause to comply with a request by the Surgeon General that he submit to a medical examination, and shall be terminated if such failure continues for 6 months."

SEC. 8. Title II of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TRAINING OF OFFICERS

"SEC. 218. (a) Appropriations available for the pay and allowances of commissioned officers of the Service shall also be available for the pay and allowances of any such officer on active duty in the Regular Corps while attending any educational institution and, subject to regulations of the President and to the limitation prescribed in such appropriations, for payment of his tuition, fees, and other necessary expenses incident to such attendance.

"(b) Any officer whose tuition and fees while attending an educational institution are paid pursuant to subsection (a) shall be obligated to reimburse the Service for such tuition and fees if he voluntarily leaves the Service within 2 years after the cessation of such attendance."

SEC. 9. (a) Section 706 of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682, 713), as amended, is amended to read:

"SEC. 706. In the case of any commissioned officer of the Service appointed prior to July 1, 1944, there shall be included, in determining the amount of retired pay pursuant to subsection (b) (1) of section 211, and in determining whether he should or may be retired pursuant to subsection (b) of such section, noncommissioned service in the Public Health Service, as well as all commissioned service."

(b) Title VII of such act is amended by changing sections 711 and 712, and references thereto, to section 713 and 714, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 710 the following new sections:

"APPOINTMENTS TO HIGHER GRADES FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 711. Twenty officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act with respect to mental health and 20 officers may be appointed to such grades in the Regular Corps to assist in carrying out title VI of this act. Officers appointed pursuant to this section in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 percent of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b); but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b). The 20 officers authorized by this section to be appointed to carry out the purposes of this act with respect to mental health and the 20 officers so authorized to be appointed to carry out title VI shall be reduced by the number of officers appointed under clause (A) and the number appointed under clause (B), respectively, of section 208 (b) (2) of this act, in effect prior to the enactment of this section.

"CERTAIN RETIREMENTS FOR DISABILITY

"SEC. 712. An officer of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service who was separated from the Service or returned to inactive status by reason of a disability incurred in line of duty after December 6, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1944, and who would have been eligible for retirement by reason of such disability if section 211 of the Public Health Service Act had been in effect on and after December 7, 1941, shall be considered as though he had been retired at the time of such separation or return to inactive service. Any such officer, and any other officer of the Reserve Corps retired for a disability which was incurred in line of duty after December 6, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1944, shall be entitled, for periods both before and after the date of the enactment of this section, to the same retired pay to which he would have been entitled if such section 211, as amended simultaneously with the enactment of this section, had been in effect on and after December 7, 1941."

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1481) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 84) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1372) authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell its tribal cemetery, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 116 was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS IN THE BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

The bill (S. 1089) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930,

was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Any agent, agent in charge, field supervisor, district supervisor, assistant to the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, or Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics of the Department of the Treasury, who is not less than 50 years of age and has rendered 20 years or more of service in one or more of the positions enumerated, may, on his own application and with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, retire from the service. Any such person shall upon retirement be entitled to an immediate annuity equal to 2 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of such service, not exceeding 30 years."

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, what action was taken with regard to Senate bill 1089?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the vote is reconsidered, and the bill will be restored to the calendar.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 144) authorizing an investigation of law enforcement and police administration in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 48) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3051) to amend the act of July 19, 1940, and to amend section 2 and repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF JUNE 27, 1944

The bill (S. 1493) to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the final period in section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), be changed to a semicolon and that the following be added thereto: "*Provided*, That any recommendation by the Civil Service Commission, submitted to any Federal agency, on the basis of the appeal of any preference eligible, employee or former employee, shall be complied with by such agency."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1356) for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill and similar bills were before the Senate in the last session. At that time I objected to this bill and others the purpose of which was to grant national charters to veterans in specific categories. I based my objection on my belief that it is unwise to grant a Federal charter to veterans organizations unless the qualifications are such as to admit to membership any veterans of the particular war in question without reference to religion or antecedents, or without any other qualification than that the veterans served and were honorably discharged from the service. I still entertain that feeling, Mr. President. On the other hand, so far as I know, there is no objection elsewhere in this body, and if that be the case I can see no immediate object to be served in continuing to present these bills or requiring that they be presented as the original order of business, with the loss of time entailed. Therefore, although I continue to have the same feeling, I shall not object to any of the several bills on that subject.

Mr. OVERTON. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 430) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations and production-credit associations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1557) to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, this bill and two similar ones have been on the calendar for a considerable length of time. They were on the calendar in the middle of last spring. Although they have been previously explained, I should be perfectly willing to explain them again. I think, however, in order to save our time, we might set these bills down for a definite time so they can be disposed of. I would ask, Mr. President, that the three bills referred to be made the order of business following the decision of the Senate on the St. Lawrence seaway. I am referring to the bill for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans, the bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans, and the bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans.

Mr. WHERRY. That would require unanimous consent, would it not, because of the agreement under which we are now operating?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It would.

Mr. WHERRY. I feel that I should suggest that as soon as the St. Lawrence seaway matter is disposed of the Senator can make his request. The Senator's motion would then be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska object to the present request?

Mr. WHERRY. My feeling is that we are working on a call of the calendar under a unanimous-consent agreement. The request cannot be effected unless it be agreed to by unanimous consent. There are those who would possibly like to argue the question. In order to expedite matters I would suggest that the request be not taken up until the pending matters have been disposed of. I dislike to object to a unanimous-consent request, but, on the other hand, it might involve discussion which would delay the St. Lawrence seaway matter. After the St. Lawrence seaway debate has been concluded, the Senator's request will be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: If the Senator will permit me, I would like to state for the RECORD, returning to Calendar 702, Senate bill 1557, and Calendar 704, Senate bill 1375, that I have no personal objection to those bills. The ruling of the Chair was that there was objection, and for fear the Chair might have been referring to the Senator from Nebraska, I wish to say that I was referring to the procedure, in view of the unanimous-consent request under which we are laboring. But I want it perfectly understood that I am not personally objecting to either one of these bills.

The bill (S. 1375) to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3978) to provide for the temporary advancement in ranks and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, serving as supervisors of certain squads was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CARIBBEAN COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I made an objection to this resolution on several occasions when it was reached on the

calendar. I wish to withdraw my objection. I have gone into the whole matter of the Caribbean Commission. I think the work it is doing is good, and I hope there will be no further objection to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may be permitted to say so, he would like to thank the Senator from Ohio for withdrawing his objection. The resolution involves a very modest sort of an adventure. It involves only cooperative civil relationships in the Caribbean area, and it is a matter with which our Latin-American friends are greatly concerned.

The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, on page 2, in line 14, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "not more than $142,000 annually"; in line 16 to strike out "For" and insert "Not more than $142,000 annually"; on line 21, to strike out the word "For" and insert "Such additional sums as may be needed for."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 968) to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of taxicabs licensed and operated in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4042) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1653) to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The bill (H. R. 1350) to amend the act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the transfer of records which are now occupying space in various departments to the National Archives. The Government has imposed restrictions upon those records which last only for the duration of the particular agency involved, so that the Archivist is at a loss to continue the restrictions in effect after the expiration of the term of the particular agency head who does transfer them. Also, another difficulty has been encountered, in that the department heads are unable to certify to records which have been transferred to the National Archives, and which they consider out of their jurisdiction.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I recall that a bill of this general nature was before the Senate at another time. At that time I made objection to it. Later I had conversations with the attorney for the Archivist in an attempt to correct the language of the bill. I have not had an opportunity to examine this particular bill. Therefore I ask that it go over temporarily.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to have that done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over temporarily.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1015) to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal savings deposits to 1 percent per annum was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ENTERING CLOSED NATIONAL FOREST LAND

The bill (H. R. 1826) making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the last call of the calendar I objected to the consideration of this bill. Since then I have discussed the bill with the national-forest officers, and I wish the RECORD to show that I have now withdrawn objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

FREE IMPORTATION OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER SCRAP

The bill (H. R. 2029) to provide for the free importation of synthetic rubber scrap was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to learn what the objection is.

Mr. WHERRY. I have on my desk a note that the junior Senator from Colorado would like to have me object to the passage of this bill during the call of the calendar. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator for his vigilance.

Mr. President, I should like to have the bill considered at this time, and I have an amendment which I should like to send to the desk and have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2029) to provide for the free importation of synthetic rubber scrap.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, after the word "refuse", it is proposed to strike out the words "india or synthetic" and insert in lieu thereof "synthetic or india."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the amendment is entirely technical in nature, and is for the purpose of clarifying the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire from the Senator from Colorado whether this provides any means or requirement for the closing of synthetic plants, or will it result in the closing of synthetic plants in this country?

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is no such purpose, and the bill cannot be given such a construction, not even under the farthest reach of the most violent imagination.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that is a very good answer of assurance. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. How much rubber of this sort has been imported into this country during the past year?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We imported from Canada 500 tons in 1945, 800 tons in 1946, and 700 tons in the first 3 months of 1947, as compared with the current domestic consumption of natural and synthetic rubber scrap in the amount of approximately 400,000 tons a year.

Mr. BRICKER. Are we now importing such rubber from any other country which is producing synthetic rubber?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We are now importing most of it from Canada.

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to put synthetic-rubber scrap on the same basis of preference with india-rubber scrap.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this measure does not change the synthetic-rubber situation in any way. It relates only to scrap. Most of the rubber articles are originally made in this country and exported, and now the scrap is being sent back to this country.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, at the present time, under a miscellaneous classification under the Tariff Act of 1930, the synthetic-rubber scrap would carry a 7½ percent ad valorem duty as waste not specifically provided for. This measure takes the synthetic scrap out of that miscellaneous category and

puts it under the same category with india-rubber scrap or refuse.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS TO NEUTRAL COUNTRIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1605) to provide for payment of compensation to the governments of foreign countries for losses and damages inflicted on neutral territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 5, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War or the Secretary of the Navy" and insert "National Defense"; on page 2, line 6, after the words "prior to", to strike out "January 1, 1948" and insert "July 1, 1948: *And provided further*, That the total amount of compensation authorized herein shall not exceed $21,000,000," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized to pay to the governments of foreign countries such sums as the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of National Defense, shall determine to be necessary to provide compensation, including interest, for losses and damages inflicted on persons or property in neutral territory during World War II by units of the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights: *Provided, however*, That no compensation shall be paid under this act unless the claim shall have been presented prior to July 1, 1948: *And provided further*, That the total amount of compensation authorized herein shall not exceed $21,000,000.

SEC. 2. Appropriations are hereby authorized to carry out the purpose of this act.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on December 18, the Committee on Foreign Relations reported favorably to the Senate a bill (S. 1605) to provide for payment of compensation to the governments of foreign countries for losses and damages inflicted on neutral territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor. That bill provided for authorization for the payment of not to exceed $21,000,000 to foreign governments for such losses and damages inflicted on neutral territory during World War II by the armed forces of the United States, in violation of neutral rights.

When the matter came up during the previous call of the calendar, objection was made by several Senators, including the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] questioned me in regard to the matter. Their objection was that they did not wish to have a bill of this sort left open, providing authority to adjust claims which have not already been liquidated.

Consequently, at their suggestion I have had prepared, and the committee now submits, an amended bill which provides for the immediate payment of $12,000,000 to the Government of Switzerland as partial compensation for damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by the United States armed forces, in violation of neutral rights.

As stated in the committee report, Switzerland has claims of $19,500,000 for damages caused by United States armed forces in violation of Swiss neutrality. Although investigation of the claims has not been completed, it has been determined that upward of $16,000,000 is due the Swiss Government for the claims which have been investigated.

The United States already has paid $4,070,183.31 to Switzerland, through allotments made from the President's Emergency Fund for National Defense. An appropriation of $12,000,000 is needed at this time to enable our Government to make further payment to Switzerland for items of claims which already have been investigated. One of the most immediate reasons for the enactment of the proposed legislation is the desirability of stopping the accrual of interest on the claims which already have been processed. Interest accrues on these claims in the amount of several hundred thousand dollars a year.

So, Mr. President, I now send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, providing for a straight-out payment at this time of $12,000,000, which amount already has been determined by our representatives as being due the Swiss people. I think this payment should be made now; and when further claims arise from the Swiss Government, as fast as they are reported and justified I shall introduce further legislation to take care of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the substitute, it limits the entire amount of payment to $21,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH. No. The original bill provided an over-all ceiling of $21,000,000 for the entire amount of the claims. The amendment is in the nature of a complete substitute, and provides for the payment to Switzerland of $12,000,000, which all of us recognize is due the Swiss now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that all the bill as thus amended will do?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. President, I should like to have the substitute reported from the desk, so that all Senators may know exactly what we shall be enacting.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to say that of course we shall have to pay these claims, but I do not like to see them dragged along. If we keep on making payments on them, new claims may be brought forward from time to time. Why has there been such delay in processing the claims? It has been over 2 years since any damage has been done by any war anywhere, and I should like to know why this delay has occurred. We should determine the claim finally, so that when we make payments we shall make final payment. It seems to me that someone has been very dilatory in having the final determination made.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think I can answer the Senator on that point. The original bill, which was on the calendar, contemplated doing exactly what the Senator from Georgia has suggested. There was a difference of a million dollars or so, but we placed a $21,000,000 over-all ceiling on the entire matter, and provided for leaving the adjustment to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the National Defense Establishment, so that together they could determine the exact amount of the claims.

However, objection to such a provision was made during discussion of the bill on the floor of the Senate, on the ground that we should not give an open hand to anyone in connection with the adjustment of these claims.

So I now submit a measure providing for payment of the actual amount of money which we have determined is due Switzerland today.

The reason for the delay is that these claims arise from bombings of the city of Schaffhausen, on the Swiss border. Private claims were made by the Swiss people to their own government, and were taken care of by their government. Then the Swiss Government made claim on the United States. Naturally, the Swiss people did not make claim on the United States Government, but made claim on their own government, and now the Swiss Government has made claim upon the Government of the United States.

We at once set up, through the Army, our regular adjustment machinery to discuss every one of the claims. There were hundreds of claims from different individuals in this area, and as fast as can be done, our machinery is having those claims proved. Up to date, as I stated earlier, we have discovered that we owe on the claims upward of $16,000,000. The payment of $12,000,000 in addition to the $4,000,000, plus, which we have heretofore paid, will take care of our obligation. I have served notice on the Senate that when another claim arises, because of our adoption of the practice of approving only such claims as are certified to us as closed, I shall then have to bring in other bills. I cannot help that. It would have been better, in my judgment, to have had one over-all bill giving authority to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to adjust the balances remaining, which would be less than $2,000,000 over what we admit.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the Senator assure the Senate that the $21,000,000 level in the bill to which he refers, which he is now eliminating, would have been sufficient to pay and to have wound up all the claims?

Mr. SMITH. I am sure we know of every violation of neutral territory that occurred during the war, and that was an all-inclusive figure. There was a claim from the Vatican that is now being adjusted. I forget certain other minor claims.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does it include the San Marino claim?

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I can say, from the best information I can obtain from the War Department, that $21,000,000 is a higher figure than we shall actually have to pay when these claims are adjusted, but I feel it is only just to Switzerland now not to keep the Swiss people waiting to be paid the amount to which they are definitely entitled, and which we admit, just because we are holding up other matters.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not keeping the Swiss people waiting, because the Swiss Government has already paid its nationals, and all it is doing is running an interest bill against the United States, which is why I did not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. That is the reason why I am urging payment, because there is a ceiling.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is better than having them coming up for consideration piecemeal. It is my observation that we have never won one of these piecemeal procedures, that we always wind up by paying more in the long run than we would have paid had there been an entire settlement at the start.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD that I did not object to this claim when it was presented the last time on the calendar. I interrogated the Senator. I felt that approving the $21,000,000 would provide a ceiling, and that it was an invitation to countries not to file their claims until the claims had been proved. I simply interrogated the Senator. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming then objected to paying claims which had not yet been proved, but agreed to authorize an over-all ceiling to pay the claims that might come in afterward from other countries. If all the claims were here and proved, and the ceiling established, I think it would be agreeable to everyone to pay them. The method now proposed is entirely satisfactory to the Senator from Wyoming. It certainly meets with my approval, and I think it is a proper way to proceed, because we will be paying now a claim which has been proved, rather than placing a ceiling on claims, which might be an invitation to other countries to come in and establish claims which otherwise might not be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order to keep the parliamentary situation straight, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey offers a substitute, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That the Secretary of State is authorized to pay to the Government of Switzerland the sum of $12,000,000 which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, has determined to be due to the Government of Switzerland as partial compensation, including interest, for losses and damages inflicted on persons and property in Switzerland during World War II by units of the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights.

SEC. 2. Appropriations are hereby authorized to carry out the purpose of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question then is on agreeing to the substitute for the amended committee bill, submitted by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor."

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND SECURITY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 249, Senate bill 140, a bill to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security. I made objection when the bill was called. I think I was the only objector. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator asks unanimous consent to recur to Calendar Order 249, Senate bill 140. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The CHIEF CLERK. The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. WHERRY. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will go over.

AUTHORITY FOR THE ARMY AND NAVY TO ACCEPT GIFTS, DEVISES, AND BEQUESTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1528) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to accept and use gifts, devises, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, museums, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the War Department or Navy Department, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized in his discretion to accept, receive, hold, administer, and expend any gift, devise, or bequest of property, real or personal, made on condition that it be used for the benefit of, or in connection with, the establishment, operation, maintenance, or administration of any school, hospital, library, museum, cemetery, or other institution or organization under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army or the Army, the Department of the Navy or the Navy, the Department of the Air Force or the Air Force, or the Treasury Department or the Coast Guard, respectively. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, is further authorized to pay all necessary fees, charges, and expenses in connection with the conveyance or transfer of any such gift, devise, or bequest.

SEC. 2. Gifts or bequests of money or the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts or devises pursuant to this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States under the title "United States Department of the Army General Gift Fund," "United States Department of the Navy General Gift Fund," "United States Department of the Air Force General Gift Fund," or "United States Coast Guard General Gift Fund," as the case may be, and any funds so deposited shall be subject to disbursement by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, for the benefit or use of the designated institution or organization, subject to the terms and conditions of any particular gift, devise, or bequest.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, any gift, devise or bequest of property, real or personal, accepted by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury under authority of this act shall be deemed to be a gift, devise, or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, upon request of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or, in his own discretion insofar as the Coast Guard general gift fund is concerned, as the case may be, to invest, reinvest, or retain investments of the money or securities composing the United States Department of the Army general gift fund, the United States Department of the Navy general gift fund, the United States Department of the Air Force general gift fund, or the United States Coast Guard general gift fund, as the case may be, or any part thereof deposited in the Treasury pursuant to section 2 of this act, in securities of the United States of America or in securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States of America. The interest and profits accruing from such securities shall be deposited to the credit of the United States Department of the Army general gift fund, the United States Department of the Navy general gift fund, the United States Department of the Air Force general gift fund, or the United States Coast Guard general gift fund, as the case may be, and will be available for disbursement as provided in section 2 of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury to accept and use gifts, devises, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of the Treasury respectively, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2239) to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, was announced as the next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

TRANSPORTATION OF IRON ORE BY VESSELS OF CANADIAN REGISTRY

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 172) to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1948.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the resolution is only to extend the use of Canadian vessels to ore-carrying purposes. As the Senator from Ohio knows, a vessel may not operate between ports, both of which are within the United States, unless it be a vessel of American registry operating coastwise. In 1941, because of the volume of traffic on the Lakes, in coal and ore particularly, and in grain, it was necessary to extend the regulation and to change the law to permit Canadian vessels to participate in such traffic. That permission was continued under the War Powers Act. When the war powers were repealed it became necessary to extend the privilege of using Canadian vessels. It is expected there will be more iron ore moved in 1948 than was moved in 1947. The joint resolution merely continues a practice that has been followed continuously since 1941. The report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is unanimous, and the measure is supported by all the interests involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That by reason of the continued extraordinary requirements of the iron and steel industry for Lake Superior iron ore, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act of Congress approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 999), as amended by act of Congress approved April 11, 1935 (49 Stat. 154), and by act of Congress approved July 2, 1935 (49 Stat. 442), or the provisions of any other act of Congress or regulation, vessels of Canadian registry shall be permitted to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the year 1948 or until such date prior to the end of said year as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1004) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation, with respect to character, associations, and loyalty of such persons shall have been made by the FBI was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR (and other Senators). Over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should just like to request that Senators withhold their objection, so that I may make a brief explanation at this time regarding the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing to withhold the objection so far as I am concerned. It may be I shall be in favor of the bill when I learn about it, but at the present time I reserve the right to object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I recognize there is some objection to the bill. However, I intend to ask for early consideration of the proposed legislation in the Senate. It grows out of a loophole that was found in the law at the time of the confirmation of members of the Atomic Energy Commission very early in 1947. As the Members of the Senate know, every employee of the Commission is required to have an FBI check. That does not apply to Members of the Commission, who have complete control over the situation. When the Congress decided that this question of atomic power was so different from any other question ever presented to the Congress they set up a commission with an unprecedented amount of power. It has control of something which can, for good or evil, have a tremendous effect not only on the American people but on the people of the whole world.

At the time of the confirmation early last year, the question was raised on the floor of the Senate as to whether or not there had been a complete investigation by the FBI. It was pointed out at that time that there had not been such an investigation, that the President had merely asked the FBI for what is known as a file check. While the members of the Atomic Energy Committee feel that there is sufficient power in the Atomic Energy Act giving to the Atomic Energy Committee power to require of the FBI that they furnish all the information they may have, there is nothing in the act that requires the same kind of investigation for the members of the Commission as is required concerning the employees of the Commission. It is the opinion of the Atomic Energy Committee that this does not in any way interfere with the President's constitutional right to make appointments. Since the Senate itself has a responsibility in the confirmation of the appointments, we believe that it is proper; in fact, that it is essential that this type of investigation be made and the facts presented to the Atomic Energy Committee prior to their acting upon appointments by the President of the United States. It in no way interferes with the President's right to appoint, but, the Senate having an equal responsibility, it gives them the information which I believe to be essential to the proper functioning of this body in discharging its responsibilities and to the security of the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR (and other Senators). Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill goes over, under objection.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to our farmers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the joint resolution will be passed over.

REIMBURSEMENT TO POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT BY THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 1520) to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended (39 U. S. C., Supp. V, 135), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Every Navy mail clerk and assistant Navy mail clerk and every Coast Guard mail clerk and assistant Coast Guard mail clerk shall give bond to the United States in such penal sum as the Postmaster General may deem sufficient for the faithful performance of his duties as such clerk: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy may waive the giving of bond in the cases of Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks. Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks whose bonds are so waived shall not be entitled to the extra compensation otherwise authorized to be paid them by law. The Post Office Department shall be reimbursed annually by the Navy Department in an amount equal to funds embezzled by unbonded Navy mail clerks, assistant Navy mail clerks, and commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and funds expended in payment of claims arising from errors, losses, or defalcations by unbonded Navy mail clerks, assistant Navy mail clerks, and commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That 'commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps' as used in the foregoing provision shall be construed to mean only those commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who have been designated custodians of postal effects by the commanding officer."

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

TOURS OF DUTY AT CERTAIN FOREIGN STATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1195) to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, to add the following new section at the end of the bill:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Defense shall advise the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the first of April and the first of October of each year concerning the regulations

governing the lengths of tours of duty outside the continental United States of personnel of the Army, and Air Force, and of any changes therein.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That that portion of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (10 U. S. C. 17), which reads "No officer or enlisted man of the Army shall, except upon his own request, be required to serve in a single tour of duty for more than 2 years in the Philippine Islands, on the Asiatic station, or in China, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Panama Canal Zone, except in case of insurrection or of actual or threatened hostilities and except in the discretion of the Secretary of War for temporary emergencies: *Provided,* That the foregoing provision shall not apply to the organization known as the 'Philippine Scouts' " is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of Defense shall advise the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the first of April and the first of October of each year concerning the regulations governing the length of tours of duty outside the continental United States of personnel of the Army, and Air Force, and of any changes therein."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN THE FORT WINGATE MILITARY RESERVE, N. MEX.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1478) to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the War Department to the Interior Department, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the words "Secretary of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Army"; and in line 5, after the words "Department of", to strike out "War" and insert "the Army", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to transfer from the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that portion of the Fort Wingate Military Reserve in the State of New Mexico bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the south boundary of unsurveyed township 15 north, range 16 west, New Mexico principal meridian, with the existing Wingate Ordnance Depot boundary fence; said point of intersection being approximately four and three-tenths miles easterly from the southeast corner of lot 4, section 34, township 15 north, range 17 west; then along said boundary fence approximately north sixty degrees east one-quarter mile to the western boundary of the right-of-way of the western branch of the road from Fort Wingate to Wingate railroad station; thence along the western boundary of the right-of-way of said road approximately north eight degrees east two and two-tenths miles to the southern boundary of the right-of-way of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad; thence along the southern boundary of said right-of-way approximately south seventy-two degrees east one and five-tenths miles, south seventy-six degrees east two and two-tenths miles, and east two miles to the intersection of the southern boundary of said right-of-way with the east boundary of the Fort Wingate Military Reservation; thence south along the east boundary of the said military reservation approximately one and two-tenths miles to the northwest corner of section 5, township 14 north, range 15 west; thence west approximately three miles to the point for the quarter-section corner common to sections 2 and 35, unsurveyed townships 14 and 15 north, range 16 west; thence south approximately three miles to the point for the quarter-section corner common to sections 14 and 23, township 14 north, range 16 west; thence west approximately four and two-tenths miles to the southeast corner of the Wingate Ordnance Depot; thence north approximately one and nine-tenths miles to the existing Wingate Ordnance Depot boundary fence; thence along said fence approximately north forty-six degrees east one-half mile; thence along said fence approximately north sixty degrees east one and one-half miles to the point of beginning. The tract as described contains approximately thirteen thousand one hundred and fifty acres.

Title to the land so transferred shall remain in the United States for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the Department of the Army to the Interior Department."

AUTHORITY OF MARITIME COMMISSION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is preparing a couple of amendments to this measure. They are not yet ready. On his behalf, I ask that the measure go over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is that the last calendar number?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not hear what the Senator from Kentucky said.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is preparing two amendments to the joint resolution, which he has not completed. On his behalf, I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I urge upon the Senator from Kentucky that time is of the essence with reference to the joint resolution just passed over. I am sorry that any Senator interested in the measure is not present. I should like to make a brief statement respecting the joint resolution, and urge that the Senator from Kentucky, if possible, get in contact with the Senator from Alabama to see if we cannot remove the objection he has to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not asking that the measure go over permanently. The Senator from Alabama is not now on the floor. I think he is working on the amendments. I ask that the measure be passed over temporarily. Such action is frequently taken on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I withhold it for a moment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Kentucky send for the Senator from Alabama so he may be present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am objecting only on his behalf.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Alabama does not appreciate the necessity for acting upon the measure today.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will withhold his objection, I should like to state, as briefly as I can, and within the time limit, the purpose of the joint resolution. There are three things which will be accomplished by the passage of the joint resolution. The first is the extension of the period in which the Maritime Commission may operate or sell vessels from February 29 this year to July 1, 1949. The President, in his message of December 2, recommended that that extension be made. All interests agree that the time ought to be extended. The shipping interests, the labor interests, the administration, and the Maritime Commission are all in agreement upon that point.

There is an amendment contained in the joint resolution which I shall discuss when we get to it.

Next, it is proposed to extend the time in which the Coast Guard may authorize the operation of vessels which do not fully conform to safety regulations. In other words, there is such a severe shortage of tankers that it is necessary to operate them sometimes even though such vessels may be loaded below the load line. That does not mean that such vessels are going to be operated without any regard for safety. In each case confirmation is required by the Coast Guard before the vessel is permitted to operate. The Coast Guard, however, agrees that the time should be extended. We have not made the progress in improving these Government-owned vessels it was thought might be made by this time. Therefore, if we are going to use the Government-owned vessels which cannot comply strictly with all the requirements of the safety rules, we have got to give the Coast Guard authority to waive certain requirements, and the joint resolution provides that that may be done.

There is an amendment to the joint resolution which provides that if the time is extended in which the Maritime Commission may sell or charter these vessels the Commission is forbidden to sell any of these Government-owned vessels to foreign governments or citizens of foreign governments. As a matter of fact, the Maritime Commission has never authorized the charter to anyone except a citizen of the United States. We had about 2,000 such vessels to begin with. About 1,000 of them have been sold, and a considerable number have gone to foreign governments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the RECORD ought to show certain facts. To begin with, I believe the authority in question ought to be renewed, or extended. I think particularly it ought to be extended so far as the chartering of vessels is concerned. I say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that I make that statement with considerable reluctance, the reason being that the Small Business Committee of the Senate objected strenuously to the sale of 100 T–2 tankers to noncitizen applicants. Such sale, I think, is one of the chief reasons for the acute oil shortage which is developing in the United States today. I do not make that statement in a spirit of destructive criticism. I make the statement because it is a fact. If any amendments are offered to the joint resolution, it seems to me they ought to be in the form of directives, that these vessels should not be taken out of active service in plying coastwise, and hauling petroleum products from the Gulf States to seaboard ports, because an examination of the facts shows that petroleum is backing up at the production points, and that there are not sufficient supplies along the Atlantic seaboard, and at other points in the United States.

However, I think the proposal contained in the joint resolution offers the only way to operate successfully. I think the Maritime Commission should charter these vessels. I think every vessel that needs repair should be repaired, and should be brought into operation in the tanker fleet as quickly as possible. I agree with the purposes of the measure in toto, but I certainly feel that there should be some directive or directives issued, and that amendments to that effect should be placed in the measure.

I will say that the Maritime Commission was not in unanimous agreement with respect to the sale of the 100 T–2 tankers. In that connection, I wish to commend to the Senate the testimony by Commissioner Mellen, who objected violently to the sale of these vessels to noncitizens. Senators should read that testimony. If an amendment can be offerred to the Ship Sale Act of 1946, I think it should be adopted as a directive, and as indicating just how far the authority in question goes.

Personally I am not going to object to the joint resolution. The Small Business Committee stopped the sale of 16 vessels. That came about as a result of the presentation of the testimony before it. I think the matter has been very forcibly brought to the attention of the administration now. I pointed out that a shortage of oil would result from lack of transportation facilities. Now the shortage is upon us. I think that shortage has been called to the attention of the administration very forcibly. As I said, I shall not object to the joint resolution, but I do suggest that there should be a definition and a clarification made of the statute, so that the Maritime Commission may be advised in no uncertain terms that priority to citizen applicants should be given, rather than to noncitizen applicants.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair get the parliamentary situation straight. The Senate is proceeding now under the 5-minute rule. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] objected. Does the Senator withdraw his objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has now come into the Chamber, and so far as I am concerned I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama object to present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I feel constrained to object to the present consideration of the joint resolution. I should like to state my reasons, as follows. Earlier today I received a memorandum from the Waterman Steamship Co., which has its home office in the State of Alabama, calling my attention to the fact that the joint resolution was to be called up today, and stating that they wished to have an amendment or two offered when the joint resolution was up for consideration. I know nothing about the joint resolution. It has been on the calendar for only a couple of days. I should like to have the opportunity to present at least the views of the Waterman Steamship Co.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Alabama will find that those views were presented to the committee. The views of the Waterman Steamship Co. and of all other steamship companies were presented by the American Shipping Association. They had two or three amendments which they suggested. They were mainly interested in the amendments which are included in the measure prohibiting the sale by the Maritime Commission of ships to noncitizens, which has been the policy of the Commission for 4 or 5 months. There also was considerable discussion about the tanker situation. I might say, in order to clarify the record, that I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], but what actually happened was that the Maritime Commission told everyone who might be interested in buying tankers that tankers were available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just a moment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have yielded to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The American citizen operators who might be interested in tankers did not take advantage of the offer. Some vessels were sold to noncitizens. The American citizen operators testified that they were asleep at the switch; that they did not realize the importance of buying these tankers. All the testimony was to that effect. They admitted that. The reason why we did not place in the measure the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, with which we all agree, is that there is not a single available tanker for anyone to buy, including citizens or noncitizens.

The other amendments were of minor, technical nature, with which the shipping people agreed. One of them, I believe, involves some technical consideration of register. They all agreed to those amendments. But the main objective was to clarify, by law, the announced policy of the Maritime Commission not to sell ships to noncitizens. That is in the law. I think we are all pretty much agreed on that point. I hope we can do something about this problem. This measure must pass the House. There must be opportunities for hearings in the House. I am sure that if the Waterman Steamship Co. has any further suggestions, the Senator from Kansas and I will be glad to bring such suggestions to the attention of the House committee. The authority expires at the end of this month. The President has asked for an extension of the authority, and has strongly urged it. If the authority is not continued, the entire American maritime situation will be disrupted. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection. I know that the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from New Hampshire, and others of us who handled the joint resolution will be glad to present to the House committee any legitimate objection or amendment. However, time is of the essence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am not in a position to argue any point with the Senator from Washington. However, the joint resolution was placed on the calendar only Friday. Not until I received the calendar this morning did I know that it was on the calendar; and not until I started for the Senate Chamber did I know that my constituent was interested in having the Senate consider an amendment, which the Senator from Washington says is minor. It may be; I do not know. I see no reason why a unanimous-consent agreement could not be obtained to consider the joint resolution at a later date during the week. I do not ask for more than a couple of days' delay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator object to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I must object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. That concludes the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to correct the statement of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who made a statement relative to Senate Joint Resolution 173, Calendar 902, dealing with the sale and chartering of vessels by the Maritime Commission. He stated that the record of the T–2 tankers was that when the sale was made there were no citizen applications on file. That was the testimony of the shippers.

I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the various reports made by the Small Business Committee, which show that as early as last July, when this subject was being investigated, the tankers were being used under charter. I believe that that is the way the tankers should be used, rather than to sell them to noncitizen applicants.

In September, at the time the announcement was made by the Department of State that it then had firm commitments with foreign countries—which it did not have—and when 51 of those vessels were being used under charter by the oil companies, because they are not in the transportation business, immediately the companies, which had relied upon chartering facilities through the Maritime Commission, submitted applications to buy the vessels. So at the time when the vessels were sold, at which time there were no firm commitments to foreign countries, there were 165 citizen applications on file. As I stated a moment ago, the reason for the chartering of the vessels was that the companies were not in the transportation business. They had relied upon operating those vessels under charter, under the American flag, to haul petroleum products. But when the policy was announced, as late as September, when Mr. Ball stated that there was ample transportation, and that the vessels would be sold to noncitizens, the applications were placed on file. If the distinguished Senator from Washington will examine the record, he will find that there were 165 citizen applications to buy those vessels when it became known that they were to go out from under the jurisdiction of the United States flag.

As I have previously stated, I am entirely in sympathy with the extension sought. I think it is the only thing left to do. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington that, so far as the T–2 tankers are concerned, that issue is not involved, because there are no more T–2 tankers to sell to anyone, whether citizens or noncitizens. However, I wish to keep the record straight, and I know the distinguished Senator from Washington wishes to do so. While it is true that in June and July the number of citizen applicants was down to 12, and while in that respect the record shows that these applications were not on file at that time, it is also true that there was no record of noncitizen applications on file. This issue did not become acute until the latter part of September, when the State Department announced that it was necessary to sell these vessels because of the situation across the water in regard to dollar balances. The Department wanted the vessels sold. When the industry learned about the situation it immediately filed citizen applications; and before the foreign commitments were made to foreign countries there were 165 citizen applicants who would have purchased the vessels, which would have been used to haul petroleum products domestically.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question. If the joint resolution were to be passed containing the amendment which has been submitted by the committee, would it not prevent the sale of any of our old Liberty ships and outworn vessels to any foreign government after March 1?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would prevent the sale of any type of vessels under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission to any foreign citizen or foreign government. I appreciate what the Senator is suggesting. Suppose that the proposal in the Marshall plan is to sell so many ships. If the Congress should pass the Marshall plan with such a provision, it would supersede this section. But unless something is done affirmatively by the Congress of the United States, if this proposal should become law, it would prohibit the sale of ships to foreign countries and noncitizens.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would that be a wise provision, taking into account the very old ships? Would it be wise to make a flat prohibition of all sales?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are various shades of opinion; but the Maritime Commission, all members of the American Shipping Association, and all members of the so-called seafaring and maritime labor unions, are in complete agreement that, if the Maritime Commission should change its policy and sell to noncitizens and foreigners, it would seriously damage our American merchant marine, which is now one of the sickest segments in the American economy.

Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that unfortunately we were in executive session when the representatives of the American Shipping Association and the Maritime Commission discussed the question of tankers. As the Senator well says, it is water over the dam. There are no tankers available. I was speaking generally of the testimony, and the dates which were testified to. I think the Senator is probably correct in his dates. However, the sum and substance of the testimony, as I understood it, was that vessels were offered and no one took advantage of the offer, so the Commission went ahead and sold them. There is some dispute between the Maritime Commission and some of the oil companies as to the dates when applications were submitted; but that is all water over the dam, because there are no tankers available now.

Mr. WHERRY. But we have an oil shortage.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The testimony was to the effect that this situation has nothing to do with the bottleneck, because the vessels which were sold are now transporting oil which we sorely need from other countries.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator read the record of the Small Business Committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I did not.

Mr. WHERRY. The record is that 51 of the vessels went out of active service. Did the Senator know that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, I did not.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will read the record, it will tell him the story. The fact is that we are short of oil today because of lack of transportation. That is the primary reason. If the Senator wishes to examine the record, I shall be glad to make the entire record available to him. As early as last August, a letter was sent to the President urging that these vessels be not sold. That letter was disregarded. Only now it is being brought to light that 51 of those vessels went out of active service in hauling petroleum domestically from the Gulf ports. I refer to the T–2 tankers. They are now being operated under foreign flags. We have not the vessels necessary to haul petroleum today. That is in the evidence. It is true that the Senator's committee held one hearing, which lasted for 10 hours. Some of the representatives of the Department of Commerce testified. I have given the Senator the picture. Those are the facts.

I know that the Senator is interested in the Maritime Service. So am I. We are losing crews off those vessels. We have lost 86 of them. I know what the Senator is interested in, and I am entirely in sympathy with him. I agree with him; but the fact still remains that when this subject was brought to the attention of those who were interested, which was not until September, immediately 165 applications were filed, and they were ahead of the foreign applications. There were only commitments or so-called agreements by the State Department with foreign governments, if and when the vessels should be sold.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to enter into a controversy on this question with the Senator from Nebraska, because he probably has gone into the subject much deeper than the subcommittee which held a hearing last week. There was a great deal of general discussion. The conclusions reached were testified to by the representatives of the Maritime Commission and representatives of the American shipping interests and oil interests. Those conclusions are somewhat in conflict with the conclusions of the Small Business Committee.

At any rate, so long as the Senator is in sympathy with what we are trying to do, I hope he will join with us and see that this extension is granted as quickly as possible, because of the time element.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Before the Senator from Wisconsin proceeds, the Chair would like to say that when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into at the last session of the Senate, providing for the recognition of the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] argued at some length a point of order that the procedure was not appropriate.

The present occupant of the chair agrees with the then occupant of the chair, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that his rulings were correct. The Chair would like to have printed in the RECORD at this point the reasons for that statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOGNITION BY PRESIDING OFFICER

The Constitution of the United States prescribes no duties for the Vice President. It merely says that he "shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided." Article I, section 3, clause 4.

The Constitution further provides that "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Article I, section 5, clause 2.

The Senate, in the exercise of this constitutional right, has formulated a set of rules, one of which at the present time, relating to the question of recognition, is in part as follows:

"When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him." (Rule XIX, par. 1.)

The President pro tempore of the Senate, or any other Senator temporarily occupying the chair, has no greater power of recognition than the Vice President, and derives his power to recognize Members of the Senate from the above rule.

Rule XL, relating to suspension and amendment of the rules, provides in part that no motion to suspend, modify, or amend a rule shall be in order, except on 1 day's notice in writing, etc. The rule, however, further provides that—

"Any rule may be suspended without notice by the unanimous consent of the Senate, except as otherwise provided in clause 1, rule XII."

The exception referred to relates to voting by yeas and nays, and has no bearing on the question of recognition.

A rule may be suspended either directly or indirectly. Unanimous-consent requests in the Senate for the most part are made for the purpose of obtaining some result or action that otherwise would be in violation of some rule of the Senate. The parliamentary effect of the granting of unanimous consent to give a Senator the floor at a specified time is to suspend that part of rule XIX providing for the manner of recognition; and such action of the Senate is as binding and effective as if a request had been made for unanimous consent for the specific suspension of the rule for the purpose of giving such Senator the right to the floor.

The Senate, when it gives unanimous consent for any purpose, is not acting in contravention of, but in accordance with, that provision of rule XL authorizing the suspension of any rule without notice by unanimous consent, with, of course, the exception provided in rule XII.

Such suspension of the rule, or the equivalent granting of unanimous consent, whereby a Senator is given the right to the floor at a specified time, therefore takes away from the Presiding Officer the right of recognition, which otherwise he would have; and such action in granting unanimous consent operates in the same manner and to the same extent as any other order of the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am happy to see that the two distinguished Senators from Massachusetts are in the Chamber. I shall not consume much time this afternoon, because other Senators are scheduled to speak.

In view of the situation which occurred a moment ago, when we heard that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was to be absent for 2 weeks, that I find that a number of Senators on both sides of the Chamber are leaving on Wednesday and Thursday, and that each side has 10 or 12 speakers to be heard, and in view of the significance of the subject before the Senate, I would seek to get some kind of an agreement to vote on the 20th of this month, because I understand there is an agreement that there will be no vote next week. I specifically ask for agreement on the 20th, because I have received information from Senators who are going to the Pacific coast that they will not get back until the 18th or 19th, and they desire to be present when the vote is taken. Many of them have fixed speaking engagements. If they had to cancel those engagements, it would create misunderstanding. So, Mr. President, I drop this suggestion into the hopper, so to speak, and ask that the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts who are leading the opposition give consideration to the suggestion.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I told the Senator from Wisconsin at the beginning of the debate that I would neither directly nor indirectly seek to drag the matter out. So far as I am personally concerned, I should be willing to vote this week, on Wednesday or Thursday. How does the Senator from Wisconsin feel about that?

Mr. WILEY. I have talked to those Senators who wish to be heard. I can assure the Senator that there is no purpose to drag the matter out. If after the special session we could have proceeded with this subject in the forepart of January and had gone on day after day, we should now have been through with it. But the fact is that we have had only two speaking days, and only three Senators have been heard. There are practically a dozen on each side who desire to speak. If it were humanly possible to get to the point where all the speakers who desired to speak could be present and be heard, that would be well and good. But I understand that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has left, as have other Senators. That is why I make the suggestion about the vote. I think the matter is of sufficient importance that if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will bear with me I would suggest that we let it be understood that there will be no votes next week, but that a vote on the St. Lawrence seaway project will be had on the 20th. By that time Senators who want to vote will be back. It will discommode no one. The speaking will be concluded, and we shall be ready either to put life into the legislation or to execute it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator does not want to vote this week, of course that is his privilege, and I shall not raise the question again, but I somehow feel that the 20th being a Friday, is not a very good day on which to secure a quorum. I would rather have the debate end on Monday the 16th, or Monday the 23d, although I think that using a whole month for the consideration of the matter is a little out of line.

Mr. WILEY. The 23d will be agreeable to me.

Mr. LODGE. I think Friday is rather a bad day because of Senators leaving for the week end, and so forth.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would respectfully call to the Senator's attention the fact that the 23d will probably be a holiday on which Washington's birthday will be celebrated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that Friday would be a bad day on which to take a vote. It seems to me that if we cannot get a vote within the next 3 or 4 days, as now appears to be the case, we should perhaps let it go over until the following Tuesday, because nearly all Senators will be present on that day. It seems to me it would be a good idea not to make any agreement as to a time for voting until the debate of the next 2 or 3 days shall be concluded. Probably by Wednesday night or Thursday morning we can tell better when we shall be in position to vote. I do not think any Senator wants to delay the vote, which is extremely important to the country and to the whole world at this time. We do not want to shut off any Senator who might have something to add to the arguments which are being placed before the Senate. I shall have something to say regarding the subject. I am not in a great hurry, but I do want to speak on the subject before the debate is concluded. The subject is extremely important. It is a matter which might be of great importance to the United States in the event we engage in a foreign war within the next 10 years. So let us not be too hasty, but if we decide to have a vote after the 20th, I suggest that Tuesday, the 24th, would be a much better date.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. So far as I am concerned, I should be willing to cancel speaking engagements or anything else, and I stand ready to do so in connection with this matter. That applies to the remainder of this week and to next Tuesday. However, the 24th is a very bad day for me, not because of a speaking engagement; and if the Senator would be willing to accept a suggestion I would suggest the 25th. Certainly if the Members of the Senate are to be here during the week they ought to be here by Wednesday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to have a voting date set it would be necessary to have a unanimous-consent agreement. I think the place to arrange for that is off the Senate floor. We are debating the project, and if it is as important as it is said to be, I think we should continue with the debate. I think we should conclude debate on the proposal, and when debate is concluded, we should take a vote. As far as setting the 20th or 25th or some later date is concerned, I would not give unanimous consent to any such arrangement. I suggest that the regular order be followed and that the matter be debated today, tomorrow, and the next day, and then we can see if we can get a vote on this important measure.

Mr. LODGE. I quite agree that we can whip up the details of a unanimous-consent agreement much better off the floor than on the floor. So far as I am concerned, I will stay here and vote, no matter what the date. I am willing to vote right now. I am willing to agree to vote by next Thursday, but if that is not desired, I think it would be a great convenience to Members of the Senate to agree on a date certain, a date which will be fairly soon.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] whether there is an understanding that next week no important matters will be taken up and voted on in the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the distinguished Senator that it is the wish of the Policy Committee that during the week of February 12 the work of the Senate be so lightened that we can accommodate several Senators who would like to make addresses on Lincoln's birthday. That has been the custom for years. But that has not anything to do with making a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote on the pending joint resolution. If the opponents and proponents of the measure can get together and fix a date I shall be glad to propose a unanimous-consent request. But it seems to me we are wasting the time of the Senate at this time in attempting to arrive at a unanimous-consent request when we do not know the purpose of it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think we have a date. I think the Senator from Wisconsin suggested the 25th. Is not that correct? That is agreeable to me.

Mr. WILEY. That is agreeable; yes.

I want to say, Mr. President, it shows that even on the floor of the Senate two men widely separated geographically can get together in the spirit of compromise and arrive at something constructive. I did not make the request, I merely suggested it in my opening statement. I do not think I should be severely criticized for suggesting something constructive as between the proponents and the opponents of the pending matter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I think the suggestion which has been made was that we proceed with the debate, and on Wednesday or Thursday decide whether or not we wish to postpone action to a definite date. It may be that on Thursday, early in the day, we shall be ready to act upon the matter. That might be a very good suggestion, and I believe it is the suggestion which was made by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WILEY. No; his suggestion was not exactly that. His suggestion went further, and related to agreeing on a date.

Mr. THYE. Yes; but I referred to agreeing later in the week, when we have ascertained the number of Senators who still wish to speak on the question.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I appreciate the suggestion, and in view of the tentative agreement, we shall see what we can work out. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Then may we hope to work out something later today?

Mr. WILEY. Yes—along the line suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Vermont.

ST. LAWRENCE—THE TWENTIETH CENTURY'S NORTHWEST PASSAGE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to make some remarks relative to the St. Lawrence waterway.

Let me say, Mr. President, that to our north lies one of the great landmarks of hope in this strife-torn and war-weary world. It is the longest unfortified international boundary in the world, the ocean-to-ocean frontier between the United States and Canada. For more than 150 years the people of the United States and Canada have lived along that line in unbroken peace, a symbol of the mutual trust the world is seeking today.

For generations, ever since the revival of trade after our Civil War, citizens of the United States and Canada have been looking to a portion of that boundary and thinking of a seaway from the St. Lawrence Basin to the Great Lakes, a modern Northwest Passage leading, not to the treasures of the Orient, as the early explorers believed, but to the equally fabulous treasure house that is midcontinent America.

The mutual interests of the United States and Canada in the waterway were reflected in treaties of 1871 and 1909 which gave the United States perpetual rights to navigate in boundary waters and in the wholly Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River, and the same navigation rights in the Welland Canal as Canadian vessels have in Lake Michigan.

As early as 1895 the Governments of the two countries appointed a Deep Waterways Commission, and in 1897 this Commission reported that the St. Lawrence route was feasible, and recommended further detailed surveys. Such surveys have been made from time to time since then. The Treaty of 1909 established an International Joint Commission, and in 1921 the Commission rendered a unanimous report, which was followed in later years by the supporting reports of other commissions and boards, favoring early undertaking of a through deep-sea navigation project over the St. Lawrence River route.

It has not been because opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway project has outweighed its support that its design has not been completed. For a generation Presidents of the United States have advocated it. Leaders in Federal and State governments have encouraged it. Business groups, labor groups, and farm groups have supported it. Members of Congress have stood up for it on the floor of the Senate, the floor of the House of Representatives, and in committees. It has not been a project of one party, of one section, or of one economic interest. It has belonged to all parties, to all sections, to all interests. Only the interruption of war could possibly have interfered with its earlier realization.

But this is not to say that much has not already been accomplished. Dr. N. R. Danielian, in an address before the Engineering Society of Detroit, on May 6, 1946, pointed to some of the progress. He said:

> The Great Lakes now provide deep-water navigation throughout their length and breadth. The MacArthur Lock at the Soo, built by the Army engineers in 1943 as a war project, connects Lake Superior and Lake Huron. That part of the seaway, as originally proposed, is now completed.
>
> Eight locks of the Welland Canal, completed in 1932, scale the difference in the levels of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, 324 feet. That part of the seaway is completed, too, and deep-draft ships can now proceed from Duluth, at the head of Lake Superior, for 1,200 miles to Ogdensburg N. Y., on the upper St. Lawrence River.

Mr. President, the remaining work to be done on the St. Lawrence project has been summarized by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in reporting on Senate Joint Resolution 104 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and the summary is printed in the full committee's favorable report on the present Senate Joint Resolution 111. It states:

> The main work to be undertaken by the United States will be concentrated in a 46-mile stretch of the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

In other words, the vessels can now go 1,200 miles, but because of the obstructions in the distance of 46 miles it is necessary that that short section be made into a deep waterway.

I quote further from the report:

> This involves the construction of a control dam, the construction of the Long Sault Dam and a power station, and the construction of necessary canals and locks in this section to bypass the dams. Canada will install the machinery in its half of the station and will construct canals and other works to provide a 27-foot channel in the wholly Canadian part of the river in the 68 miles from St. Regis, N. Y., to Montreal, Canada. Chief among the proposed works are the dredging of shoal areas in Lake St. Francis and the improvement of the Soulanges Canal with the construction of the twin flight locks near the Beauharnois powerhouse. Canada will also build a new Lachine Canal connecting Lake St. Francis and Montreal Harbor, which is the present head of ocean shipping on the St. Lawrence.

According to estimates of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, it will cost $719,928,000, at May 1947 prices, to complete the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects. Of this total, $228,319,000 would be borne by Canada. The State of New York, under provisions of this legislation, would pay $160,795,000 of the United States share for power, leaving $330,814,000 as a Federal charge.

But the great virtue of the present legislation is that the project will be placed upon a self-supporting and self-liquidating basis by the charging of tolls, so as to remove the financial burden of the completion from the United States taxpayer. It is this feature of the proposal which eliminates, in my opinion, the only reasonable doubt which could have been entertained in opposition to the project.

I personally happen to be one of those who believe in the self-liquidation of projects such as this.

It will be argued that the Federal Government is not justified, in terms of the expense involved, in embarking upon a public-works project of such magnitude. With specific reference to the seaway it will be argued that such a public-works project would mean that the Government would in effect be subsidizing a form of transportation to compete with existing means of transportation, the railroads.

The present proposal, however, would provide that the users of the new deep-water works of the St. Lawrence seaway should pay for the construction and maintenance which make such use possible. It is therefore no longer possible to argue against the St. Lawrence seaway as a public works program extravagant in outright expenditure or providing free transportation to certain interests in competition with other interests.

The Department of Commerce, on the basis of recent and detailed studies, is authority for the conclusion that revenue from the imposition of tolls on shipping should be sufficient to provide for amortization of the cost of completing the seaway project and also to cover the annul maintenance charges.

An explanation is due as to why the present resolution contains the self-liquidating provision.

Senate Joint Resolution 104 did not reach the Senate Calendar until the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and hence it was not acted upon. Upon the convening of the Eightieth Congress, the question was raised whether the same resolution should be reintroduced. In view of the magnitude of the national debt, the burden of taxation, and the complaints of existing transportation systems against the prospects of subsidized competition, there was much interest as to whether it was possible to put the St. Lawrence seaway, as well as the power project, on a completely self-sustaining and self-liquidating basis. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], took the initiative to institute inquiry, through the State Department, with the Canadian Government, as to whether they would accept the principle of self-liquidation. Upon their affirmative reply, Senate Joint Resolution 104 was redrafted, making our approval conditional upon Canadian acceptance of self-liquidation, and rewriting section 3 so as to provide machinery and to define the principles to be followed in determining the details of self-liquidation.

In presenting the pending measure on a self-liquidating basis, we have the precedent of the Panama Canal. The St. Lawrence seaway will be an international waterway in that the ships of all nations will be entitled to use it on a basis of equality. Furthermore, the applicable law of the land, the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, in article 1 specifically recognizes the right of Canada and the United States to charge tolls. Thus in adopting the principle of self-liquidation in the St. Lawrence seaway, we are not changing the established practice of Congress regarding inland waterways, but following the precedent of the Panama Canal and the letter of the Boundary Waters Treaty which applies to the St. Lawrence River. Secretary Marshall's testimony on this subject is conclusive, and I quote it:

> The Department of State supports the principle of self-liquidation by means of tolls levied on traffic using the new deep-water works. Section 3 of the Senate Joint Resolution 111, which your committee has under consideration, authorizes the President to negotiate an agreement with Canada, under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, for the establishment of a tolls system. I am able to report that this matter has been discussed with Canadian Government officials and we have been informed that "the Canadian Government is prepared to agree to the principle of making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating by means of toll charges, subject however to the conclusion of arrangements satisfactory to both Governments for the implementation of this principle. * * *"
>
> Section 3 provides that after investigating the two Governments will negotiate during the construction of the project a new agreement defining the details of tolls, and will submit it for the approval of the legislative bodies of both countries. In the case of the Panama Canal, the matter of tolls was considered during the latter part of construction in 1912, and a satisfactory system was developed just before the opening of the Canal in 1914. There does not appear to be any reason why an analogous timetable cannot be successfully followed in the present case.
>
> I should like, however, to point out that tolls will not be levied on traffic using the existing 14-foot canals on the Canadian side nor on navigation within the Great Lakes system nor on vessels traversing the Soo lock and connecting channels.
>
> The St. Lawrence seaway project is an international enterprise. The support of the Department of State for the principle of self-liquidation is based in part upon the fact that comparable international projects such as the Panama Canal embody the tolls system.
>
> This is a time for necessary financial retrenchment for the Government of the United States, and the St. Lawrence seaway project will cost a great deal of money. It therefore seems to us in the State Department that there is a good reason for having the cost of the seaway construction paid over the years by the traffic using the new facilities.

I wish to repeat these three conditions:

First. Our approval is conditional on Canada agreeing to self-liquidation. This is explicit in section 1 of the joint resolution:

> *Provided*, That the President, before said agreement enters into force, obtains satisfactory assurances, by exchange of notes or otherwise, that the Government of Canada agrees to the principle of making the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River herein authorized self-liquidating by charging reasonable tolls, this principle to be implemented through the conclusion of arrangements satisfactory to both governments pursuant to section 3 of this joint resolution.

Second. The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 sanctions the charging of tolls:

> Either of the high contracting parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof, but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting parties and the ships, vessels, and boats of both of the high contracting parties, and they shall be placed on terms of equality in the use thereof.

Third. There is no danger that we shall fail to make the seaway self-liquidating by disagreement with Canada.

(a) Because Canada, faced with the same financial problems as we, would prefer it that way.

(b) The canals at International Rapids are on United States soil and by the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 we could levy tolls unilaterally, but I do not anticipate that this will be necessary, as Canadian interest in self-liquidation is similar to ours.

Mr. President, I have a memorandum from the Digest of International Law, volume I, pages 603 and 604, that may be of assistance on this question. I should like to insert at this place in my remarks the memorandum from that textbook, by Judge Hackworth, who is now a member of the International Court. It relates to a provision for tolls in the Pigeon Bay district of Lake Superior. The court held that such toll could be charged upon the international highway, because of the treaty there involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE LEGAL ADVISER,
January 29, 1948.

To: Mr. Battle.

From: Mr. Vallance.

Subject: Charging of tolls on St. Lawrence Waterway.

I have found a statement in Hackworth's Digest of International Law (vol. I, pp. 603–4), that may be of assistance. It reads as follows:

"Pigeon River, a small international boundary stream between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Ontario, has its source in lakes on the international boundary, whence it flows in a southeasterly direction along that boundary for about 40 miles and discharges at Pigeon Bay into Lake Superior. The boundary is approximately midstream. In 1928, 1929, and 1930 Charles W. Cox, Ltd., a Canadian corporation and dealer in timber, drove quantities of pulpwood and railway ties down the river toward Lake Superior, making use of improvements in the river, consisting of sluiceways, booms, and dams, belonging to the Pigeon River Improvement, Slide & Boom Co. (a Minnesota corporation) and refusing to pay tolls thereon. The latter company brought suit against the Canadian corporation to recover the tolls. The case was removed to a Federal court, a demurrer to the amended complaint was sustained without leave further to amend, and the judgment of dismissal was affirmed by the circuit court of appeals.

"Upon appeal the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the judgment dismissing the complaint and held that the provision in article II of the Webster-Ashburton Treaty of 1842 that 'all the water communications and all the usual portages along the line from Lake Superior to the Lake of the Woods, and also Grand Portage, from the shore of Lake Superior to the Pigeon River as now actually used, shall be free and open to the use of the citizens and subjects of both countries,' did not preclude improvements of the stream by sluiceways, booms, and dams nor did it prevent the exaction of a nondiscriminatory charge for the use of such improvements. In the course of the decision (Mr. Chief Justice Hughes rendering the opinion), it was pointed out that under the decision of the Canadian Supreme Court in the case of the *Arrow River & Tributaries, Slide & Boom Co.*, decided in 1932, it had been held that the Ontario company might impose charges upon citizens of the United States for the use of its works on the Canadian side of the line." (*Pigeon River Improvement, Slide & Boom Co.* v. *Charles W. Cox, Ltd.*, 63 F. (2d) 567 (C. C. A. 8th, 1933); 291 U. S. (1934) 138, 148. *Arrow River & Tributaries Slide & Boom Co., Ltd.* v. *Pigeon Timber Co., Ltd.*, 1932 Can. Sup. Ct. 495.)

W. R. V.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, further justification for the project, if necessary, is abundant.

The region to be opened to cheap water-transportation benefits includes 40 percent in value of all American farm property, producing 67 percent of the Nation's corn and 36 percent of the Nation's wheat. Moreover, 40 percent of the Nation's manufacturing volume is produced in this area—nearly three-fourths of our automobiles and a corresponding percentage of our steel ingots. In this area lives one-third of our population.

There is no difficulty in visualizing the importance of the development to the people immediately affected. Established industries would profit. New industries would be encouraged. Quantity shipment would be possible during peak-production periods, there would be additional shipments of raw materials, there would be more of the production which is our Nation's and the world's paramount economic requirement of today and the years ahead—an endless series of chain reactions in a cycle of plenty and prosperity.

It may be asked, Is this not provincialism? I think not.

I need not dwell at unnecessary length on the fact that we of the United States are a living example of the motto of the Three Musketeers—"All for one and one for all." What affects one of us in the United States for good necessarily affects all for good.

The greater prosperity of the directly affected area would result in greater markets for the manufacturers and raw materials of all the Nation, and a means of transportation would be ready at hand to take up the additional demand from coastal points. Far from causing losses to railroads and trucking concerns, the St. Lawrence project would, by stimulating trade throughout the United States, promote fuller use of their facilities not only to and from the seaway ports, but to the far reaches of the land. The chain reaction cycle of prosperity is all encompassing.

Of further mutual interest to the entire Nation is the project's place in our scheme of national defense. It has been said, and we have learned its wisdom not without pain, "In time of peace, prepare for war."

No nation could be suspicious of us if we were to bring ocean transport 2,400 miles inland as a means of promoting our national economic interests. Yet it would be a step toward a broader interest if we were to write "finis" to a project which might well tip the scales of battle toward victory should another criminal aggressor arise to challenge the security of the United States and the world.

The Liberty ships, the Victory ships, the C-type cargo carriers, and the tankers, which did so much to win the last war, could, if necessary, go through the locks and canals of the St. Lawrence enterprise to facilitate and enhance their essential contributions. The automotive industry of Michigan, the shipbuilding of Wisconsin, the ores of northern Michigan and Minnesota, the munitions of Illinois, the steel of Gary and Cleveland, and the breadbasket of America, which lies in the Midwest and West, would be placed at the immediate disposal of an embattled United States. With the St. Lawrence seaway in operation there would be slight occasion for the charge "too little and too late."

Former President Hoover has keynoted the strategic importance of the project by saying, "There can be no doubt of its value as a defense measure." That concept of the seaway's place in national and hemispheric defense has been amplified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who reported to a Senate subcommittee considering this matter:

> In the light of the experience of World War II, in which total mobilization became a near actuality, it is evident that the prospective increase in our war potential that would have been contributed by these projects, had they been completed, would have been of material assistance in prosecuting the war. It is probable that attainment of success in any future world conflict would require utilization of the ultimate production and transportation facilities of the United States and Canada. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that it would be in the interest of national security to complete projects such as these, which would have distinct military advantages and would materially increase the industrial and transportation potential of the United States.

Thus far, the picture of the St. Lawrence project that has been spread before the Senate has included only the discussion of the project as a seaway. The seaway has been discussed as an economic stimulant to the region which it would directly affect and to the country at large. It has been discussed as a means toward attaining national and hemispheric security. There remains to be taken up a phase of this enterprise that has an equally vital bearing on war and on peace, that of hydroelectric power.

The electric-power phase of the project contemplates the construction of facilities with a capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower and an average annual output of 13,200,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity.

As such the St. Lawrence would be the second largest single-dam source of power in the world, being exceeded only by Grand Coulee. The output of the proposed plant would surpass the output of both hydroelectric and thermoelectric plants in all but eight countries of the world. It would generate as much power as all of the hydroelectric development of the Tennessee Valley area at a lower cost than any plant in the United States, with the possible exception of Niagara.

Of this power the United States will have half, for it is provided that the power generated by the project shall be divided equally between the two participating countries.

Let us look at what this 1,100,000 horsepower, this average output annually of 6,600,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity will do for the people it will reach. Draw a great circle with Massena, N. Y., as the center and a 300-mile radius. It will touch or include New York City, New England, and the industrial area around Buffalo. And, by shifting loads over existing and projected transmission lines, this power could be extended over an expanding southern arc to take in Boston on the east, Washington, D. C., on the south, and Chicago on the west. The Department of Commerce St. Lawrence survey states that the project has it within its scope to reduce the cost of power to industrial and commercial users 25 percent below the 1937 rates and the cost to residential and farm consumers 64 percent below the 1937 norm. The New York State Power Authority translated these figures into terms of cold cash when it reported in 1944 that St. Lawrence power would represent savings amounting to $25,000,000 a year to all types of consumers.

In this connection, I like to recall the story from the pamphlet, New England and the St. Lawrence Project. It appears that opposition to cheap St. Lawrence power was registered before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941. The opposition witness claimed that cheap power would ruin Massachusetts. One Representative asked incredulously, "Do you mean that giving the people of New England electricity at reasonable rates, and taking this overcharge of $97,000,000 off of them would ruin New England?"

Most of us, certainly most Members of Congress, agree with the implication of the Representative's question, that savings for all will eventually result in savings for the concern or concerns dispensing the service.

But, cheap power does not alone concern individuals. It concerns industries, large and small, old and new. Power is the universal factor in machinery. Without power, each factory would be a silent city. With power each factory is a contributor to production. Right now, in the face of an inflationary state which is to be answered in terms of production and more production, this is more than ever important, and will continue so. With power, established industries expand and new industries will arise.

This is the type of expansion and creation which gives strength and impetus to the American system of free enterprise. Industry needs power to build or to expand, whether it is a shoe-repair shop employing two men, a shoe factory employing 2,000, or one of the hundreds of small businesses in vital new fields to whom a source of cheap power means survival.

There must be borne in mind here, too, the thousands of veterans who have set up shop for themselves since the war and of necessity have been compelled to start out on a small scale. As such they are small business, and in small business an access to reasonably priced power may spell the difference between failure and success. And the encouragement of that sort of small business is the soundest hedge toward a nation's economic security. By providing this type of power the St. Lawrence project could be not only the most practical manifestation of the enduring gratitude of the United States and Canada toward those who served their countries well during war but a peacetime investment paying long economic dividends.

Who will lose by the creation of this low-cost source of transportation and electrical power, or rather, who fear they will be the losers?

Certainly our coal-mine operators, miners, and dealers can have no fears. American coal, when it is available, is cheaper in Ontario than either Nova Scotian or British coal and the cost of producing coal in the United States, despite wages running five times as great as those in Great Britain, is so much lower than the cost of British coal that even decreased freight charges possible on the seaway could not affect the difference. And statistical studies in other great hydroelectric power development areas have proved that far from reducing coal consumption there the stimulus to industry over-all has greatly increased demands for coal.

Mr. President, why is Britain today asking for machinery with which to mine coal? It is because we here in America use electrically operated machinery for the mining of coal. Our use of such machinery is the reason why we can mine coal cheaper than coal can be mined in England today. We all know the old expression, "carrying coals to Newcastle." Today that is really an eventuality, the reason being that we in America use electric power to mine coal. If we develop the great power industry in the St. Lawrence it will not cause a loss to the coal miners or the coal-mine owners, but it will provide stimulation to them, and will result in an even better life for them than they live today, which is something of which we all are hopeful.

Existing transportation? The increased demand for transportation of all kinds, resulting from increased industrial output, will more than make up for what slight shift there might be from rail to water traffic. Then, too, railroads and trucking companies would still lead the field in the carrying of perishable and urgent-demand goods for transshipment at coastal ports.

Lake shipping concerns should have no objections. Augmented trade would go to those established lines ready to take up the opportunity. No fear at all could be held for foreign competitors because alien craft would be prevented by Federal law from freight movements between American ports on the Great Lakes as that transport is reserved exclusively to ships of American construction and registry.

The earlier attitude of privately owned power companies toward the St. Lawrence project has undergone a gradual but marked change. Earlier, in 1921, it was proposed by a group of these companies to the International Joint Commission that they would make a gift of the navigation facilities on the project if the two governments would give them franchises for electrical developments in the rapids region. More recently there has developed a feeling that power companies in the affected area would benefit rather than lose from the creation of this added public power. It would mean increased utilization of their facilities and the extension of electricity to more users. Even their subsidiaries would profit, as another phase of the endless series of chain reactions which I have mentioned.

Finally, industrial and coastal cities, which have expressed concern for the project, would be materially aided. Where one industry would suffer temporary inconveniences in the adjustment process it would ultimately gain, as many industries would be stimulated into renewed activities and new fields of enterprise would emerge. In the same fashion, where coastal cities might lose some ocean shipping, this loss would be offset by waterway-coastal vessels, plying directly to and from Great Lakes ports.

Mr. President, the surprising thing is that we in America did not have the vision to put this plan into effect many years ago. Here is a great source of power, a great highway, which has been the natural boundary between these two great countries—America and Canada. We have allowed it to lie dormant because we have lacked the vision of many of our forefathers who built the highway—yes, who carried the canoes from one rapids to another. I think the time has come when we must have greater vision on this particular point, to see to it that we use this highway.

One of the issues before the Senate today is, Should the present resolution be ratified as a treaty—by a two-thirds vote of the Senate or approved as in executive agreement by a majority vote of the Senate?

After the Treaty of 1932 failed of ratification the President and Secretary of State reopened negotiations with Canada with a view to arriving at a new agreement. These negotiations resulted in the agreement of March 19, 1941, which was then submitted to both Houses of Congress. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee of 25 members held hearings over a period of 7 weeks in the summer of 1941, and finally sent it to the floor on November 21, having approved it by a vote of 17 to 8. This was only 2 weeks before Pearl Harbor, and with other projects in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, of which this was a part, it was laid aside. Then we were faced with a war. We faced an all-out effort, upon which we had to concentrate. That war having passed, in order that we may prepare for the future, Mr. President, we should take hold and accomplish something.

The subject did not come before the Senate until 1944. It was then within the jurisdiction of the Senate Commerce Committee. A subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] held hearings upon the constitutionality of the particular procedure adopted by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull. I attended many of the hearings of that subcommittee. Although the subcommittee came to no conclusion, it was apparent that the chairman of the full Senate Commerce Committee, the late Senator Bailey of North Carolina, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Louisiana, had doubts about the constitutionality of the particular method of ratification by majority vote of both Houses of Congress. Failing to obtain a hearing on the merits of his bill, S. 1384, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] decided to offer it as an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill then before the Senate. This move failed, but the debate before the Senate was both enlightening and helpful. It was obvious that many Senators voted against the amendment not because they did not favor the project, but because they objected to the procedure. Their objections can be summarized as follows:

First. No Senate committee had held hearings on that agreement and reported on the substantive merits of the St. Lawrence project. That was not the fault of the senior Senator from Vermont, for he had tried in vain to obtain such hearings from the committee to which S. 1384 had been referred. The committee discussed only the constitutional question.

Second. Being late in the congressional session the St. Lawrence project should be considered separately, so as not to jeopardize the rivers and harbors bill which had already passed the House.

Third. The agreement with Canada contained provisions regarding perpetual navigation rights in connecting boundary waters which in effect modified existing treaty arrangements and could be ratified only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Fourth. The agreement contained provisions for increasing diversion of water at Niagara which was fixed by the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, and which could only be modified by treaty procedure.

I have quoted these four reasons because I think they are material, and we should consider them in the light of what we have before us today.

As of the time when the subcommittee was considering the matter in 1944, I shared the view which I have described relative to the constitutionality of the agreement with certain provisions in it, namely, sections 7 and 9; and I personally advocated that they be eliminated from the agreement and be separately approved by a treaty. Although in doubt, I felt that they could be approved in the agreement; but I am better satisfied as I appear on the floor of the Senate today to debate this subject with sections 7 and 9 eliminated, because in my opinion that eliminates all question about whether or not this proposal should be submitted to us as a treaty, or submitted, as it now is, in the form of an agreement. I think we have eliminated all questions about the treaty, as I shall now try to show.

I shared the view of Senators as to the third and fourth reasons, and advocated that the provisions referred to in the fourth reason be eliminated from the agreement and be separately approved by a treaty.

Mr. President, I am just as jealous of the Senate's prerogatives in making international treaties as is any other Member of this body. Although some of these arguments were advanced by Senators who might not favor this proposition under any guise, as seems obvious from the present debate, the proponents decided that we should do everything in keeping with good international relations to keep any legitimate objections upon procedural grounds. All through the winter and spring of 1945 a series of meetings were held to work out a modification of the agreement which

would meet these objections. This was accomplished by the sponsors of the bill and the State Department.

As a result of these conferences it was decided to inquire from the Canadian authorities whether they would agree to the deletion from the agreement of those provisions which gave rise to the constitutional questions, namely articles 7 and 9, dealing, respectively, with navigation rights and diversion of waters at Niagara. The objection to these provisions had been that they had previously been the subject of treaties between the two countries, and therefore those treaties could be amended only by the treaty procedure. The Canadian Government agreed to their deletion. Whereupon a new resolution was drafted, approving the agreement minus those two provisions, and requesting the President to negotiate treaties to effectuate the purposes of the deleted provisions.

After the resolution was drafted, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], then majority leader, submitted the draft of the resolution to the Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the late Senator Bailey, of North Carolina, and to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who took the matter up with the full Commerce Committee. After study and deliberation, that committee agreed that the resolution could, under the rules of the Senate, be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Upon introduction by the then majority leader, Senate Joint Resolution 104 was so referred by the then President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

I recite this somewhat lengthy history to show that every rule of comity, legal and jurisdictional procedure was followed with scrupulous and meticulous care. The question is not one of evading the treaty-making power of the United States Senate. It is a question of bringing something before the Senate which does not need ratification as a treaty, and is, in fact, I am informed, not a treaty.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The agreement went from the Commerce Committee to the Committee on Foreign Relations because after hearing testimony on the question as to whether the agreement was an executive agreement or a treaty, Senator Bailey called the full committee together and stated that hearings had been held and that it seemed to be the conclusion of the majority of the members of the committee that the compact represented a treaty, and that therefore it should not be lodged in the hands of the Commerce Committee, but should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. He stated that without objection he would write a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he did so, stating that it was the view of the Commerce Committee that the Committee on Foreign Relations should take jurisdiction over the question because it involved a treaty.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have that explanation from the able Senator from Louisiana, because he, being a member of the subcommittee, had personal and actual knowledge of what took place. But after the compact came over to the Foreign Relations Committee, that committee eliminated from it the provisions of section 7 and 9 which we have discussed.

But we have contemplated the vision of a St. Lawrence seaway long enough. It is now time that this vision be made into a reality. The decision is simple. Let us get on with it.

We will know in the doing that we are following in the footsteps of the great. We will be treading the ground of accomplishment where De Lesseps and Goethals, the canal builders, trod. We are on the trail blazed by the hydroelectric giants of our times and other times. We are following in the course of Champlain, of La Salle, and of the forgotten coureurs de bois, with the benefit of their pioneering and our new knowledge.

The gates are opening before us to the northwest passage of the twentieth century and to riches that far exceed those of the fabled Orient. The treasure trove of this discovery is the legitimate gain of every citizen of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the debate on Friday on the St. Lawrence seaway, I made the statement that the quantity of power and the savings in fuel which would result from construction of the power facilities connected with the project had not been definitely determined. This statement was challenged by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I promised to supply authority for my statements.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a short excerpt from the minority views submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

I wish to emphasize again that the power facilities could be constructed without proceeding with the proposed navigation works. I am personally in favor of developing all the power possible on rivers where the power is not harnessed. If the St. Lawrence power development should be presented to us as a proposition separate from the navigation plan, I should be disposed to favor it, assuming, of course, that it were found to be economically justified in terms of costs and returns.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Another illustration will suffice to indicate the need for a more careful examination in the power phase of the St. Lawrence project. Federal Power Commissioner Leland Olds, and Maj. Gen. Francis B. Wilby, at the Senate subcommittee hearings on the same day, gave widely different estimates of the fuel to be saved by developments of hydroelectric power in the International Rapids section.

Mr. Olds stated:

"In terms of fuel this would mean making available over 8,000,000 tons of coal or 41,000,000 barrels of oil annually for other war needs, if we consider both the United States and Canadian developments."

General Wilby said:

"The St. Lawrence power development will produce 12,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, or the equivalent of the output of steam-power plants consuming annually 5,355,000 tons of coal or about 20,000,000 barrels of oil."

Since General Wilby's kilowatt-hour figure is the possible annual output of the United States and Canadian plants combined, it is clear that his fuel figures, like Mr. Olds', were intended to apply to the developments on both sides of the river at the International Rapids section.

As both of these witnesses have ready access to all of the official estimates ever made for the St. Lawrence project, no reason is apparent for such a large discrepancy in their estimates of coal to be saved. It may be only the difference between conservative and optimistic figuring.

It is interesting to note also that they have made very different assumptions as to the physical relationship between coal and oil as fuel for power. Mr. Olds' figure implies that a ton of coal will do the work of 5⅛ barrels of oil, while General Wilby's figures balance a ton of coal with only 3¾ barrels of oil.

Hence, these authorities on the St. Lawrence power development differ by 2 to 1 as to the amount of fuel oil that could generate the same amount of electric energy. This physical relationship is not a matter which should be subject to wide differences of opinion. It is a simple matter of fact. This appearance of carelessness in the simplest kind of evaluation of the St. Lawrence power output does not give us confidence in their supposedly comprehensive evaluations of the project.

As stated before, these examples are cited not so much on the merits but merely to corroborate our contention that much of the evidence on the power project as a national-defense asset carries a suspicion of not having had the foundation of very careful study.

As in the navigation aspect of the St. Lawrence project, the seasonal aspect is of significance when dealing with the power question. One would have expected that this consideration would have received careful attention, for obviously, if the power project is to stand as a vital contribution to national defense it must be capable of year-round operation at full capacity. This, in some 550 printed pages of testimony, is the only elucidation we have on the matter:

"Senator SMITH. I want to ask one question on this matter of the short season, just so we will get it into the record. The way we understand that power will be developed 12 months of the year is because of the constant flow of the river, irrespective of the weather conditions; is that correct?

"Mr. OLDS. That is correct. The project is carefully designed so that the flow of water from the head of Long Sault Rapids, between the Long Sault Dam and the powerhouses at the foot of Barnhardt Island—the grade is planned in such a way that it will not be disturbed during the cold weather. The design of the project is such that the power will be developed right straight through the year and will be available in freezing weather."

This is all literally correct except, we think, where Mr. Olds confirmed Senator Smith's understanding as to a constant flow of the river irrespective of weather conditions. Mr. Olds should have known that the flow and the head will be substantially decreased and that the power available similarly will be decreased in the winter period because of the weather conditions and because there is always a greater demand for power during those months. Therefore, Mr. Olds was right in saying that there will be power straight through the year, but his answer was scarcely responsive to the clear meaning of Senator Smith's pertinent inquiry. The question of how much power will be available during the cold months remains unanswered. And still the majority asks the Senate to author-

ize the construction of the power dam without being able to furnish the vital information as to the effect of the cold weather on the power potential.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD two editorials from the Cleveland Plain Dealer regarding the St. Lawrence seaway, the first in the issue of June 15, 1947, the second in that of January 30, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 15, 1947]

GOOD FOR ALL

We have noted before (but the point is worth making again) that the arguments used against the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway cancel each other out.

With perfectly straight faces, the opponents tell us that there is no longer need for the seaway because the type of traffic it is intended to carry is becoming obsolete, then they go on to argue that the project would be unfair to existing transportation facilities and to other regions of the United States because it would take business away from them.

Obviously, they cannot be right on both counts. We are convinced they are wrong on both. Every Department of Commerce survey has disclosed that if ocean-going bottoms could come freely into the Great Lakes, there are scores of commercial products which would be hauled into and out of this great region of the United States via the waterway. This would reduce the cost to consumers of the goods hauled both ways.

If we believe in progress we must accept this as a desirable accomplishment even if it were to the disadvantage of some minority interests, for our goal must always be the greater good of the greater number.

But the fact is—as the whole history of industrial progress demonstrates—that anything which reduces costs must, in the end, benefit everyone. More prosperity in the Great Lakes region will mean more prosperity for the railroads, for it will increase industrial and agricultural production and thus give all forms of transportation more goods to carry.

Every President since Taft has favored the project. It has been blocked by Senators from other regions who imagined that their constituents will be in some way harmed. The men in the White House, looking to the best interests of the Nation as a whole, have understood that the seaway is needed by all the people of the United States.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 30, 1948]

COMMERCE, POWER, DEFENSE

The Plain Dealer's position as an ally of those holding the conviction that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project is eminently sound and desirable, is a matter of record.

The refusal of Congress for many years to accede to Presidential requests for approval of legislation clearing the way for this great national enterprise has only buttressed our belief that approval would be forthcoming if, for once, Congress would adjudge the project on the basis of broad national interest, instead of allowing local and regional loyalties and narrow economic considerations to affect its decision.

We ask that the Members of this session of Congress, particularly those who represent the people of this section of the country, which would undoubtedly derive important benefits from the project, be guided not by considerations of sectional benefits, but by their appraisals of the project as an aid to the Nation's international commerce, to the development of hydroelectrically produced power, to the strengthening of the national defense, and on the basis of greatest economic good to the greatest number of United States citizens. We believe that if the question of authorizing fulfillment of this momentous project is approached on this basis, the authorizing legislation will at last be enacted.

In asking that sectional loyalties and those to special economic groups be eschewed, we also request that rabid proponents of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power program cease indulging in such tactics as those of Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, who intemperately asserted that failure to approve the legislation now the subject of debate in the Senate, would cause rejoicing in Moscow. Such assertions amount to accusations by indirection that those who are opposed to the project are, willingly or otherwise, playing the Communist game of trying to create such dissension over matters relating to American security and economic development as to preclude decisive action on those matters. Such assertions are not valid arguments in favor of the seaway and power program.

In its consideration of the question whether to sanction the program for construction of immense hydroelectric-power facilities on the St. Lawrence rapids and the creation of a waterway that could be traversed by deep-water vessels to the Great Lakes ports, this session of Congress should give especial attention to one aspect of the matter stressed in President Truman's letter of request for approval of the project.

That is the apparent ability of the shipping and the power-production facilities included in the program to produce revenue sufficient to make the whole project self-liquidating.

"Plans for this great international undertaking are now based upon the principle of making the new deep-draft navigation features self-liquidating by a levy of reasonable tolls on shipping," Mr. Truman wrote. "The Government will also be reimbursed for the new power facilities. The application of the principle of self-liquidation to the navigational features as well as to the power phases of the seaway should remove objections concerning the economic soundness of the enterprise."

It does, indeed, cut much of the ground from under those opponents of the project who contend that this country cannot afford to "sink" $490,000,000 into the undertaking as its share of the $720,000,000 that will be required. (The remainder, $230,000,000, is to be provided by Canada, which has already expended considerable sums in work connected with and valuable to the completed seaway.)

It is pertinent to the debate now being conducted in the Senate to point out that every President since World War I, Republican and Democratic, has advocated the St. Lawrence project, and all of them regardless of great differenes of opinion over other matters of state, have stood at the forefront of those who are convinced that the whole project is in the broad national interest and is desirable and necessary for commerce, for power, and for defense.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in my opening statement last Monday, I referred to the countless men and women who have given to their efforts nobly and self-sacrificing in support of the St. Lawrence waterway throughout its long history.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point a very brief statement I have prepared on the subject of one of the able business leaders who has worked valiantly for this project. I wish that there were time for me to comment on many of the other far-sighted businessmen who have rendered similar yeomen work.

TRIBUTE TO MR. WALTER OLEN

One of the many outstanding business leaders of our Nation, who has led in the long and valiant struggle for the St. Lawrence seaway, is Mr. Walter Olen, president of the Four-Wheel Drive Auto Co., of Clintonville, Wis.

Mr. Olen is a great industrial leader of the Badger State, whose company stands among the most distinguished industrial enterprises of Wisconsin. Like so many other businessmen, however, he has extended his horizons and has worked nobly in the public interest in many vital areas, one of which is the St. Lawrence seaway.

I have received and read many statements on the importance and value of the waterway to America, but there are few, if any, that I have read in all my long study of this problem that compare with the brilliant clarity of the statements which Mr. Olen has submitted to the Congress, and principally to the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on behalf of the seaway. In his statements, Mr. Olen always took the larger view, demonstrating the importance of the seaway to the continued welfare and development of America's great Middle West, and indeed, the continued progress of our Nation as a whole.

I feel that in paying this brief tribute to Mr. Olen, I am helping to afford recognition not only to him but to all the other practical-minded, level-headed, common-sense businessmen who have been striving valiantly for this great historic project.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Murray
Baldwin	Gurney	O'Conor
Ball	Hatch	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stennis
Capper	Lodge	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Wilson
Fulbright	Moore	Young
George	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. I wish to speak for just 1 minute.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I wish to say that in the last hour or so I have been talking to a number of the Members of the Senate who have expressed a great deal of consternation at the thought that the pending matter would go over to the 20th or 25th of February. The thought was expressed to me in no uncertain terms that, if that were done, we would have to look to the country for considerable opposition and objection to such unnecessary delay of the business of the Senate. So I express the view that we should reach a vote this week.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what I shall have to say in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway project divides itself roughly into three parts, but the part to which I shall speak at greater length than the other two parts is the manner in which the proposition comes to this body, to wit, by executive agreement rather than by treaty.

The first part of what I shall have to say is more or less a summary of what has already been better said and in greater detail by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who, addressing the Senate last Wednesday on the St. Lawrence seaway project, made one of the best and most comprehensive expositions of a great subject that I have heard in the Senate for many, many years. Likewise the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] contributed mightily toward information which should lead us in passing on this important question.

The building of the St. Lawrence seaway at this time is unwise, unsound, and unconstitutional.

It is unwise because it will mean a further substantial drain on the finances of the United States, already carrying a $257,000,000,000 debt. It will tend to keep up the present already high tax rate. With such a huge expenditure as is called for by the Marshall plan, it is not wise now to add upward of a billion-dollar commitment to it, which the seaway is likely to entail eventually.

By consuming money that would otherwise be available, it will postpone important river, harbor, flood-control, and other projects, upon which little work has been done since the beginning of the war, and which it is wise now to rehabilitate, improve, and bring up to date.

The project is unsound because it has not been proved that the revenues to be derived from the tolls imposed on the St. Lawrence seaway will be sufficient to carry the project.

It is estimated that from thirty to thirty-seven and one-half million tons of iron from Canada and points in South America will be carried up the seaway to the steel mills of the Middle West. The iron deposits in Canada have not been uncovered sufficiently to estimate their volume; and even when that is done, there is no railway to transport the ore. A railroad would have to be constructed as a condition precedent to transporting such iron ore from the mines in Canada to the St. Lawrence seaway.

In regard to the estimated six and one-half to eleven and one-half million tons of grain to be carried on the seaway, no thought has been given to the effect on the remainder of the country of diverting such a large tonnage from the routes and places and installations which now are handling it. The same observation is true as to the 4,000,000 tons of coal which it is estimated the seaway will carry.

But finally, Mr. President, the proposition is unconstitutional because it attempts to do, by executive agreement supported by an act of Congress, what can be done only by a treaty ratified by the United States Senate. Executive agreements between governments are proper vehicles which have for their objective the disposition of matters of temporary interest, such as covering the movement of armed forces, the adjustment of claims, protocols, tariff agreements, postal agreements, the making of armistices in time of war, and the like.

The St. Lawrence seaway, on the other hand, is a project of very exceptional magnitude. It will take 4 years to build it. It will impose obligation upon our Government for many years in the future. It gives partial control to our Government over the territory of another country. It may involve executory and administrative action lasting for a century. Therefore, this matter should be dealt with through the medium of a treaty, if at all, and not through the medium of an executive agreement supported solely by an act of Congress. Any succeeding Congress can repeal the legislation which supports an executive agreement. No Member of the Senate will deny that. A treaty is not in this status. It is morally and legally binding on the Government, and cannot be revoked except within the terms which the treaty itself provides.

If an executive agreement between the United States and Canada, supported by an act of Congress is valid to deal with the St. Lawrence seaway project, then there is no conceivable international agreement, no matter for how long a time or no matter what the tremendous sweep of its import embraces, that hereafter cannot likewise be effected through executive agreement, rather than by treaty.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield for interruptions, as I now come to the part of my remarks which deals with the manner in which this matter comes before the Senate, as the principal reason why it should be rejected. So if I make a statement to which any Senator takes issue, I shall welcome interruption.

If the St. Lawrence seaway project can be handled by executive agreement between the United States and Canada rather than by treaty between the two countries, the treaty-making provisions of the Constitution of the United States are practically nullified, to all intents and purposes.

Let us keep in mind that the Executive agreement between President Roosevelt, on behalf of the United States, and His Majesty, the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the seas, et cetera, providing for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, dated March 9, 1941, embraces a gigantic engineering undertaking, which will cost upward of a billion dollars, largely to be paid for by the United States, to take 3 or 4 years to build, and to be maintained thereafter for centuries, and contemplates a permanent, exceptional, and far-reaching and primary relationship without the limitation of time between our own and another great country in any way, shape, or form.

If such an arrangement between two great countries, one of which is the United States, can be effected by executive agreement, supported only by congressional statute, then any other conceivable arrangement between our country and any other nation can be effected by similar processes.

I should like to have every Senator's attention to what I am saying, and I should like to have a denial of its accuracy if it is not a true statement of fact. The St. Lawrence agreement comes to the Senate in the form of an executive agreement rather than as a treaty, and if such an arrangement can be made between two great countries supported only by congressional statute, any other conceivable arrangement between our country and any other nation can be effected by similar processes.

This logic leads us to conclude that if President Wilson, in negotiating the treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations Covenant, instead of reducing the conclusions of the heads of the governments present to the form of a treaty, had done the very same thing through the medium of executive agreement, then a mere statute passed by the Congress supporting it would have been sufficient to give it complete validity.

Is there any lawyer in this body who advocates the St. Lawrence seaway through the medium presented who takes exception to what I have just said? I say that if President Wilson had by executive agreement submitted to this body the same proposition that was contained in the Treaty of Versailles, and it had been approved by a mere statute of the Congress, the agreement of Versailles, with the League of Nations Covenant, would have been the supreme law of the land. If there is any Senator who takes issue with that, I wish he would rise, because I do not think anyone can take issue with it who says that an executive agreement in the instant case is different from the Treaty of Versailles.

Both the Treaty of Versailles and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project involve long-time agreements and undertakings between nations. If the St. Lawrence compact can be ratified in the fashion proposed, so could have the Treaty of Versailles, with the League of Nations Covenant included.

The able Senator from Wisconsin says, in effect, in supporting the process of

executive agreement, supported by congressional statute, for the St. Lawrence project, now pending, that had President Wilson, in the fateful years following World War I, submitted the Treaty of Versailles to Congress in the form of an executive agreement instead of a treaty, so far as the legality and propriety of the matter were concerned there would have been nothing wrong in ratifying by a majority vote of the Congress the Treaty of Versailles, or the "executive agreement" of Versailles, and that it would have had all the standing and the durability the Treaty of Versailles would have had, had it been ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

The able Senator from Wisconsin directly tells this body that treaties made between our Government and other nations never again need be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. He says, in effect, "Strike out the word 'Treaty' and substitute therefor 'executive agreement,' but otherwise let the document remain intact, and no action of the Senate to ratify as provided in the Constitution is necessary; a bare majority of the votes of the two Houses is all that is required."

I am begging for interruptions, but no one seems to desire to take issue with the points I have expressed. Therefore I assume that they are accepted at their face value.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I cannot agree, first, with the legal conclusion the Senator has stated, nor do I agree with what he has stated as a fact: that I made a certain statement. I made no such statement as that he quoted, and when he stated, in effect, that I concluded such and such, I am sure he was mistaken. If the Senator will yield for just a few moments, I shall be very happy to reply to him on the subject of the distinction between executive agreements and treaties.

In 1909 the United States entered into a treaty with Canada, and, as was so ably stated by the representative from the State Department, as well as the representative from the law department of this Government, the particular joint resolution now pending would authorize the making of the agreement which implements the treaty. Second, for 50 years there have been on the Canadian border instances in which we have built bridges and tunnels, and other obstructions, as we might call them, in relation to the St. Lawrence, which have been effectuated by executive agreements, as they have been called, or by agreements known as legislative agreements, when the Parliament of Canada and the Congress of the United States have passed resolutions. Of course, since that time we have entered into great international agreements, like the Bretton Woods agreement, and we have gone into the United Nations, and none of those commitments have been by treaty.

Different from that, however, we have had a basic treaty with Canada which we are attempting to implement by the agreement now before us.

I wish to say again as I said on a previous occasion, that silence does not lend consent. What I am trying to do is to be very fair in this matter. I have always enjoyed the very clear thinking of the Senator from Maryland, though I think many times his premises are wrong and his conclusions erroneous, and they are in this case.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield in a moment. I merely wish to say I think the case I have made is even stronger after the Senator from Wisconsin has spoken than it would have been if he had remained silent. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to make one or two observations at this point very briefly. One is that I have been very greatly interested in the argument being presented by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, in whose judgment and learning I have great confidence, and for whom I have great admiration.

I wish to say, in the second place, however, that I do not consider that merely because a Senator shall not instantaneously rise and present arguments in opposition to those of the Senator he is thereby estopped from later presenting his views if they happen to differ from those so eloquently and skillfully presented by the Senator from Maryland.

I wish to say, in the third place, that I have been considering the constitutional question involved, and have been much disturbed in regard to the arguments pro and con on the question of the constitutionality of the proposed action. While I think I have arrived at a conclusion, my mind is at least reasonably well disposed to hearing argument on both sides.

I wish to present a thought for the consideration of the Senator from Maryland, and ask him for his judgment with respect to it.

It has been said by an author, Mr. James W. Garner, in 29 American Journal of International Law, that—

> There is no inconsistency between the authority of the President and the Senate to regulate foreign relations through agreements in the form of treaties, and the power of the Fresident and Congress to deal with matters of foreign policy through legislative action. Which of the two procedures shall be employed in a given case is a matter of practical convenience or political expediency rather than of constitutional or international law.

I am not certain as to the answer to the question. I am looking for information and for light upon it. I suggest to the Senator from Maryland this inquiry. Suppose it be true that a given subject matter as, for illustration, that which is now before us, does legitimately come within the sphere of the regulation of interstate or foreign commerce, or both. Suppose we start with that as an assumption. Suppose we take the further assumption that it would be entirely proper to proceed through the method of treaty in the bringing about of the final decisions or agreements upon the particular topic under consideration. If Congress is willing to legislate upon that particular subject matter, and the subject does fall within the power of Congress, namely, in the sphere of interstate and foreign commerce, may it not still be true that it may be perfectly legitimate, perfectly constitutional, for Congress and the President, through the method of executive agreement approved by Congress, to enter into the foreign undertaking, even though it would likewise be perfectly permissible, and perhaps wiser, from the standpoint of practical convenience or good judgment, to follow the other course?

Mr. President, I do not know whether I have made my position clear, but the point to which I direct the attention of the Senator is that we are dealing here today with the St. Lawrence seaway, a subject matter, we will say, within the scope of the subjects over which Congress may legislate, namely, interstate or foreign commerce. Even though it might better accord with the Senator's and my own ideas of the proprieties to use the treaty method, without action by both Houses of Congress upon an executive agreement, would not the method now proposed be an exercise of political expediency or of practical convenience, which would leave the ultimate agreement perfectly valid, even though the Senator and I might disagree as to the propriety of the method pursued?

Do I make my point clear to the Senator?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator makes his point clear. I will attempt to answer him first by drawing two illustrations which came to mind as the Senator asked the question, which form the premise for my ultimate reply to him, so that he will know what my line of thinking is in line with the supposition he is presenting.

The Constitution provides that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. Let us suppose that a bill for raising revenue originated in the United States Senate. Let us suppose it went to the House, and the House did not stand on its constitutional ground. The bill originated in the Senate contrary to the Constitution, but it went through the House, and the House, we will say, waived its right of initiation of a revenue bill, and the bill passed both Houses and was signed by the President. In order that I may answer the Senator more clearly, I should like to ask him, would or would not that be a constitutional procedure?

Mr. DONNELL. My personal judgment is, Mr. President, that neither House of Congress can waive the positive provisions of the Constitution. Therefore, in a case of the type suggested, I should say that, if tested properly in the courts, unless there were involved some political question of which the courts would take no cognizance, the act would fail, because there had been a violation of the Constitution. That is purely an off-hand opinion, and I might change it upon further reflection. My answer may well illustrate the fact that it is hardly proper to say or to take the view that Senators are estopped from taking a position because we do not instantaneously rise and contradict the Senator as he speaks after

the careful thought he has given to the subject.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say first, that the Senator from Maryland baited his hook before he answered that question, because he thought the best way to get the issue discussed from all sides was to challenge those who disagree, so that the conflict of opinion would shed light upon the subject, and show what was right and what was wrong. In the case I presented, the Senator said the action would be a clear violation of the Constitution. Now I ask the Senator to show me in the Constitution any provision dealing with executive agreements or with agreements between this country and another country, outside of treaties.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I do not know offhand of any provision in the Constitution which mentions executive agreements. The word "agreement," I think, is used here and there in the Constitution. But that does not at all establish that there are not legitimate constitutional executive agreements. The Senator has himself, I think, indicated, at least intimated, that there may be executive agreements upon matters of merely temporary concern—I think I may use the Latin expression "modus vivendi"—matters in wartime, matters of movements of troops, matters of a temporary nature. Even if there is nothing in the Constitution which authorizes such executive agreements, I take it that it has been generally considered that the executive department may validly enter into such agreements.

But as I see it, Mr. President, that is not the question here at issue. I have not come to a final conclusion, though I think I have arrived at a tentative conclusion, at least. To my mind the question here is: When Congress has jurisdiction over a particular subject matter, as, for illustration, interstate and foreign commerce, does the mere fact that it would be appropriate or perhaps wiser to use the treaty method make unconstitutional the legislative method, namely, the passage of a statute by Congress, supported ultimately by the signature of the President? As I see it, that is the question which is primarily involved here.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator has asked a very pertinent question. Of course, I am sure he already knows, as I know, that we are both in agreement that the first thing we have to do, as the French say, is to define the subject matter about which we are talking in order that there may flow from that definition a discussion which leads to a logical conclusion. I should like to know what is an executive agreement and what is a treaty, and if there is any difference between them.

Mr. DONNELL. I am not prepared at this time to give an extended answer to that question. I have in my file here, for instance, a Senate document, No. 244, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, issued by Mr. Henry S. Fraser, formerly assistant counsel, Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources, addressed to Hon. TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, under date of August 14, 1944, in which over a period of some 30 pages Mr. Fraser discusses, under the heading "Treaties and executive agreements," an analysis prepared on that subject.

I think an executive agreement may be of one of two types. On this question, Mr. President, I am proceeding, not as the result of a carefully thought-out address, such as the distinguished Senator from Maryland has been delighting us with here this afternoon. There are two types of executive agreements. One is an agreement made by the President himself, not supported at all by legislation, as, for illustration, something that is of a temporary nature, something in the course of an uncompleted transaction, which the President may do, validly, which he may enter into without legislative approval at all. That may be one type of executive agreement.

I am inclined to think, Mr. President, that that type should be very much limited, and I doubt very much whether the Executive in past years has remained within the limits in which he should remain. On the other hand, I think there may be a second type of executive agreement, and that is the one, as I see it, which is before us here—an agreement entered into by the executive department, subject, however, to confirmation and approval by legislative enactment, causing the agreement to be binding finally. There I think we have perhaps an entirely different legal situation than applies in the case of the executive agreement entered into solely by the Executive, without legislative confirmation or approval.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt right there?

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that my own thoughts go pretty closely along with those of the Senator. I wish to make a statement, and I am not making it offhand, just by way of chance remark. I look upon the Senator from Missouri as one of the best informed men on fundamental law in this body. I am very glad to have his opinion. Now I am going to give him just a small distinction between a legislative agreement on the one hand and a treaty on the other. Let us assume that we consider the matter before us to be an executive agreement.

Mr. DONNELL. If I may interrupt the Senator for just a moment, before I overlook one point I have in mind. I am a little fearful that my remark about being estopped by reason of sitting silent and not interrupting might be an indication that I took an unpleasant attitude.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no, no, Mr. President.

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is only fair to have it understood that merely because any of us sat here without raising our voices on this question, the Senator would not, I am sure, want to estop us from a later presentation after we may have made an appropriate investigation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator. Let us assume that this is an executive agreement. Let us assume that it passes the Senate. Let us assume that it passes the House. Let us assume that the money is appropriated and that the canal is built. Six months after the canal is built, let us assume that the Congress wishes to repeal the law. I ask the Senator whether that would be any violation of any agreement with Canada?

Mr. DONNELL. My answer to that question offhand, is that I think it is within the power of Congress to repeal a statute. Six months or a year after we enacted a statute the Congress could repeal it. However, I think that opens up another question which is quite independent of the one which the Senator has put to me, that is, whether, under international law, there might not still be a liability on the part of this country toward the other contracting party, even though the statute had been repealed.

If the Senator will indulge me for a moment longer, I think it is likewise true that if a treaty is negotiated by the President and approved by the Senate with the constitutional two-thirds majority of Senators present, a statute may repeal the treaty. In that connection I quote from 63 Corpus Juris, 842—and I may interpolate to say that the writer is referring to the Constitution of the United States:

> Treaties and acts of Congress are placed on the same footing and are of like obligation, so that, neither having any inherent superiority over the other, either may supersede the other; and in case of conflict the one which is later in date will control, provided, in the case of a treaty subsequent in time, it is self-executing.

I quote from 52 American Jurisprudence, 817, the following:

> The latest expression is the prevailing one. A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty.

So my answer to the Senator would be that, even though it be true, both in the case of treaties and in the case of statutes, that the Congress may be able, by subsequent statute, to set aside a previously enacted statute or a treaty which has been previously approved, there may nevertheless be a liability created in both instances, under the rule of international law, from which the United States Government cannot escape.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator, but I think he has missed the point. If we have a treaty and its duration is set out, and the Senate ratifies it, we cannot abrogate it unless the other party breaks the treaty. A treaty is more or less a contract between two countries, and runs for its life. The supposition is, when it is entered into, that it will not be violated by either of the contracting parties.

But our Constitution and mode of government are wide open. So, if we enact a mere statute to supplement international action, whoever deals with us must deal at arm's length. He knows, at the time we ratify through the medium of statutory action, that the next month, the next year, or 5 years from that time, we can repeal it, because that is inherent in the contract. I do not think that is in the same category with a treaty, the limitations of which are defined in the instrument itself.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further brief observation?

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator see my distinction?

Mr. DONNELL. I see the Senator's distinction, but to my mind the distinction is not sound. It seems to me that the same rules apply as to the right of Congress to repeal by legislative act, on the one hand a statute, and on the other hand, a treaty.

I want my statement to be clearly understood. In the first place, I am not at all advocating that Congress should repeal a solemnly enacted statute upon which another party relies—in this case Canada—nor am I advocating that this country violate the terms of any treaty, or by statute set aside such treaty. My point is, however, that just as in the case of a contract, to which the Senator has alluded, it is true that either party has it within its power to break the contract. Nevertheless, the mere fact that he has the power to break the contract does not necessarily relieve him from an obligation to pay damages under the contract. Although it may be true that either the United States or Canada might on the one hand set aside a statute by subsequent legislative enactment, or might, in effect, repeal a treaty through subsequent legislative action, it does not at all follow that either of those nations which might break the solemn undertaking entered into under the authority of the statute, or by confirmation of the statute, or might violate a treaty, would be relieved from an obligation under international law.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator; but I do not think he has yet focused his fine mind on the point which I have tried to bring out.

If we adopt and approve this executive agreement through the medium of statutory congressional approval, it is a known fact that such approval is subject to recall at the whim of this or any other Congress. But if we ratify a treaty by a two-thirds vote, that is a binding obligation upon the Congress and the Government of the United States for such length of time as the treaty says it shall be binding, whereas in the case of a statutory act, the other power, whether it be Canada or any other foreign country, knows that our Constitution provides that we can, with no impropriety, no breach of the contract, and no breach of the executive obligation, recall any statute at any time when any future Congress sees fit to do so.

That is the point. One type of agreement has sanctity of duration. The other has indeterminate duration. Both may be for the same duration, assuming that the Congress does not repeal its act. In one case the treaty cannot in good conscience be repealed, revised, rejected, struck down, or revoked. But in the other case, in good conscience any succeeding Congress may repeal ratification of an executive agreement; or this Congress may do so, within 1 hour after it becomes a law. We know, and all the world knows, that no Congress under God's sun can bind a succeeding Congress, whereas, on the other end, in the case of a treaty to last for 50 or 60 years, it is an obligation, and it is outside the sphere of Congress to review and strike down the time limitations defined.

For the purpose of discussion, let us assume that Congress may deal with the subject in one way or the other. However, always in every executive agreement which relies on ratification solely by congressional statutes, there is notice to the other party that within 1 hour after it is ratified a succeeding Congress or the present Congress may repeal it. That is the distinction, as the Senator already knows, I am sure, made by the overwhelming majority of authorities on constitutional law with regard to the treaty-making power of the United States. One set of agreements known as treaties stand with sanctity, with long duration, with the pledged word of the Government. The other, known as executive agreements, which may rely in part upon congressional approval, are good only so long as the Congress which approved them, or a succeeding Congress, determines they shall be good.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator is in error in his view of the law as to the inviolability of treaties. As I understand the law, it is perfectly true, as he has stated, that when an act of Congress has been passed it may be revoked by a subsequent act of Congress 1 hour or 1 month or 1 year thereafter. His point is that a foreign nation dealing with us and receiving an agreement entered into in compliance with legislative authority, by the passage of a statute, takes such agreement knowing the fact that Congress can set aside the agreement.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. But I respectfully invite the attention of the Senator again to the citation which I read from 52 American Jurisprudence, 817, and which I think is supported by the overwhelming weight of authority, if it is not the sole authority:

> A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty.

As I see it, we have a situation here in which, if Congress passes the pending measure, Congress may, under well-established law, repeal the act. If on the other hand a treaty is entered into, Congress likewise, under the law as I have read it from the Encyclopedia of American Jurisprudence, may repeal such treaty.

Mr. President, I want it to be perfectly clear, first, that I am not advocating any such course of action, either in the case of a statute or a treaty. I want it perfectly clear also that it seems to me that in the case of a treaty there is no different rule than applies in the case of a statute. In either case, even though Congress has the power on the one hand to set aside a prior enacted statute, and on the other hand to set aside a prior approved treaty, nevertheless, under the principles of international law, our country may remain responsible to the other contracting party for the violation of the contract which would be thus violated.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall take two or three different sides of the Senator's argument, and should like, first, to take a concrete case so that we shall both be discussing the same thing. Let us suppose that the executive agreement now before us is to run for 50 years, and it is so set forth in the agreement. We will suppose that by treaty the same words are used, with the same condition, that the treaty is to be in force for 50 years, and may not be revoked by either government except with the consent of the other. There is the same proposition, whether it be called a treaty or whether it be called an executive agreement. Let us assume that it is ratified by the Senate by a two-thirds vote——

Mr. DONNELL. That is, the treaty?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I now ask the Senator whether Congress would have the moral, the contractual, and the legal right to strike down that treaty.

Mr. DONNELL. My answer is that Congress would have the legal power to do it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say that.

Mr. DONNELL. I know it. I am coming to that. It may well be that it would not have any moral right to do it any more than a person has the right to violate a contract. It may be that it would have no legal right in the sense that it may do so with impunity, without damages, but I would undertake to say that in both the cases which the Senator has set forth Congress has the legal power to set aside a prior enacted statute and a prior ratified treaty; but at the same time in both cases it might be entirely reprehensible or improper. But, whether reprehensible or improper or not, it may well be that our country would be liable in damages to the other contracting party under the terms and principles of international law.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the Senator's answer, but I do not believe it is an answer. I did not ask if we had the power. We have the power to do anything with Canada we want to do. We could go into Canada with our Army, Navy, and Air Force and take the whole country over. We would not need an executive agreement. What I asked the Senator was whether we had a moral or legal right to strike down a treaty to which we had given our solemn word, and which was binding on this Nation for 50 years, unless Canada consented to its revocation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should say, in the first place, that on the question of moral right of course we would have to be guided by the circumstances of the particular case. There might arise conditions under which we would have a moral right.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us assume that none arose.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well. I would say that in the absence of other controlling circumstances, we would not have any moral right to do it.

Mr. TYDINGS. How about a legal right? If we were bound by a 50-year treaty, with no violation of its terms, would we have the legal right to strike down that treaty?

Mr. DONNELL. I would like to say, first, that there is no intention on my

part, and, I am confident, on the part of my distinguished friend, to violate the proprieties of debate.

Mr. TYDINGS. I only hope the Chair and the other Senators are enjoying this as much as are the Senator from Missouri and myself.

Mr. DONNELL. I concur in that observation. I will say that the answer to the Senator's question as to whether this country would have any moral or legal right—I have answered as to the moral right, I think—is that in the absence of exceptional and unusual circumstances it would appear to me that this country would not have the moral right either to set aside and disregard an obligation entered into in pursuance of a statute, or an obligation entered into or in pursuance of a treaty. When it comes to the legal right, I think it depends upon the definition which one applies to the word "legal." If it means the power which, under the law, may be exercised, I would say that Congress does have the legal right, both in the case of the statute and the case of the treaty, to set aside and make void the prior action taken by it in each respective case. If, on the other hand, by the use of the term "legal" is meant the right of a nation to seek to avoid liability for damages, I would say we would not have a legal right in that sense. I think the law gives the Congress of the United States the right either to set aside a statute or to set aside a treaty. I do not think that international law would permit the United States to escape liability, under the principles of international law, to the other contracting party, in the event we set aside and annulled either a statute or a treaty.

I hope I have answered the question of the Senator, which is perfectly proper, and most interesting to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to have the Senator's answer, but in his answer he used a phrase to which I wish now to direct his specific attention. I cannot quote him verbatim, I may have a word out of place here and there, but he said that the treaty or the executive agreement gives the right. Am I incorrect?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes. At least I did not mean to say that. I say that the law gives us the right, either in the case of the treaty or in the case of the statutory confirmation of the executive agreement, to set aside in the one case the treaty and to set aside in the other case the statute under which the approval of the executive agreement was given.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will ask the Senator to show me a provision of constitutional law or of statutory law which gives Congress the right to revoke a treaty whose duration has not yet run, of which there has been no violation, and to which we have pledged our solemn word for a period of years.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am unable to take a particular set of words in the Constitution, as the Senator himself is unable to find anything in the Constitution, which says that Congress cannot set aside a treaty previously enacted. But I think I can cite plenty of decisions. I do not have them at hand, but certainly there are decisions to the effect which I have quoted here this afternoon from encyclopedias of law, namely, as one encyclopedia says, either a treaty or an act of Congress may supersede the other, but in case of conflict, the one which is later in date will control.

Another rule says that a treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, or an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty. There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which says that the Supreme Court of the United States may declare an act of Congress unconstitutional. The Senator cannot find it from one end of the Constitution to the other. But if we go from the time of Marshall down to the present minute we find that the Supreme Court has asserted, and, I think correctly, that the judiciary has the power to declare unconstitutional acts which violate the fundamental law of our country. By analogy—perhaps not a perfect one—it would seem to me that the mere fact that there is no express language in the Constitution which authorizes Congress to set aside a treaty, does not mean that Congress may not have that power.

I will say to the Senator and to the other Members of the Senate that I am not unmindful of the fact that Congress has only such power, at least as to our domestic affairs, as was expressly given to it by necessary implication. Nevertheless, the courts have clearly held that if we make a treaty today, on this Monday afternoon, on Tuesday morning Congress may set aside that treaty; and the mere fact that the treaty may be drawn to run for 50 years does not, it seems to me, preclude Congress from exercising that power as a matter of legal power, or if the term "legal right" be interpreted to be a right which the law contemplates, then as a matter of legal right.

At the risk of some repetition, I again want it perfectly clear on the record that I am not advocating that Congress, in either case, after we have given our solemn word either by statute or by treaty, should revoke and set aside what we have done.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure that what the Senator has just said would be of great interest to the people of the Republic of Panama. We spent many millions of dollars in Panama to build the Canal. We built it under treaty. During World War II we found it necessary to have air bases in Panama to protect the Canal. We got those air bases through an executive agreement. Panama did not want the agreement to run any longer. As there is no time limit in the executive agreement, we have no military bases in Panama with which to defend the Panama Canal. If by treaty they had agreed to let us stay there for 20 years, and if we had done nothing to violate the treaty, they would not have the legal right to withhold our presence from the precincts of Panama. The fact that we had an executive agreement puts us out of Panama, and we have not a leg to stand on. That is an illustration, with concrete facts, of a situation with which this Government is now confronted. What does the Senator say to the right of Panama in that case under an executive agreement as differentiated from our right if we had made a treaty for 25, 30, or 50 years?

Mr. DONNELL. In response to the question of the Senator, I am unable at the moment, without thorough study of the Panama situation, to answer his question with any degree of exactness, but I say that upon general principles which are well accepted in the law, if this country had entered into an agreement with Panama by a treaty—and I know of no reason why Panama could not also have done it—this country could have violated the treaty, could have set it aside by legislative act, leaving itself, however, subject to the right under international law which accrued to the other party under the particular obligation which had been entered into. I certainly would not want to comment on the Panama situation on the spur of the moment without carefully considering it and carefully analyzing it, and without undertaking to do that, my answer to the proposition, and it is a fundamental one, is that if an agreement be entered into by this country, either by statute or by treaty, Congress, plus the Executive signing the statutory provision, can set aside and annul the treaty which it entered into, just as a subsequent Congress may set aside and annul a legislative enactment of that Congress. In both cases it may well be, however, that under the terms of international law there would be liability against the United States for violation of the contractual obligation entered into by virtue of either the treaty or the statute, as the case might be.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Missouri and I are discussing, not the form in which this matter should come before the Senate, but the form it is in and the imports which flow from it. I can tell from his argument—of course, I do not mean to steal his thoughts, but I have this feeling as the colloquy develops—that fundamentally he and I are rather in agreement as to the better form in which this matter should be presented to the Senate. However, I shall not go into that field.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will permit me to finish stating this thought I shall be glad to yield to him.

I do not want to leave the point as to Panama for the moment, but another matter has just occurred to me. Just to state a hypothetical case, Mr. President, suppose the great powers, when they reach the ultimate disposition of Germany, should agree that each of the four occupying countries should keep for its own territory the part of Germany which its troops now occupy, and suppose that were effected by executive agreements between the heads of Russia, England, France, and the United States, and that that proposition were submitted to the Congress, and suppose a statute were passed approving that action. I ask the Senator whether he thinks that would be a proper and a legal transaction?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has asked two questions, by incorporating the two terms, "proper" and "legal." I point out that it was as to this matter that I attempted to interrupt the Senator a moment ago, and that I wish to say now

I am not sure there is any great difference between the Senator's mind and mine as to what he or I may think is the appropriate way in which to deal with matters of permanency, matters involving vast sums of money, and so forth. I may tell the Senator that I had the privilege, over a year ago, I should say, of reading the minority report made by the senior Senator from Maine on the very subject matter of the St. Lawrence seaway. I was greatly impressed both by his legal argument and by the implications which came from it.

I am strongly impressed by the point that the appropriate and proper way, and perhaps the better way, would have been to handle the matter by treaty, although there may have been some reason why it was not taken up by treaty, some reason to which the Senator from Maryland and I would not lend our personal approval, perhaps. But I take it that what we are now engaged in is a discussion of the Senator's point that if we follow the method presently proposed—that is to say, the statute method—we shall be taking an unconstitutional action. I understood the Senator from Maryland to use the term "unconstitutional" this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it that although we may later discuss the propriety of handling this matter by statute, the Senator is now going far beyond that point, to the question whether such a statute, if passed by Congress and signed by the President, would be a valid and constitutional action. I understand that is the point the Senator from Maryland is now discussing.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say now, because I do not wish to hold tenaciously to a point that in my opinion would not be sustained—that I think—and I hope I do so with some modesty, let me say—that the opinion I have expressed would not be upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. I think that if this matter comes up in 4 or 5 years, the action which it is proposed that we take, namely, approving the executive agreement on the part of the St. Lawrence seaway, will not be upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. Likewise, I believe that if a matter of this magnitude had come up previously—I do not say how many years ago—perhaps the opposite would have been true.

But I wish to say right now that I do not think the Supreme Court never made a mistake in its life. We have to accept what it says, and I shall accept what it says, and I shall live under its rulings, because that is inherent in our system of government; but there is no man-made institution beneath the stars that I know of whose whole life has been one devoid of mistakes; and one of the most serious mistakes that could be made at this juncture of international affairs would be for the Senate of the United States to condone the substitution of executive agreements, which for approval require but a bare majority of the Congress, for treaties, which require a two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States.

I wish to be fair, Mr. President, and so it is that I say I think my own argument that it is not constitutional would not be upheld by the present Supreme Court, with all due respect to the learned judges who sit there. But that does not in any way dull my own belief that when the Constitution of the United States remains silent as to executive agreements, except as they relate to the States, and so forth—and I shall not go into that matter; the Senator from Missouri knows what I mean—and when the Constitution mentions only treaties, as it does in paragraph 2 of section 2, article II, it means that all long-time, extensive, binding arrangements to last over a period of time, and to have durability, must fall within the category of a treaty. If the founding fathers, who drafted the Constitution, did not mean that; if we can do by executive agreements the same things that we are supposed to do by treaties, then I wonder why they included in the Constitution the provision that all treaties must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States; if, forsooth, we can simply call a treaty an executive agreement, and can strike out the word "treaty" all the way through it, but otherwise leave it exactly the way a treaty would be, and then say it is not necessary to have the Senate ratify it by two-thirds vote, but that it is sufficient to have a statute as to such executive agreement enacted by a simple act of Congress, with action thus taken by 26 percent of the Members of the House of Representatives and 26 percent of the Members of the Senate—in other words, with the other 74 percent absent—and, if that be done, say it is equivalent to a treaty.

Mr. President, if that is the case, why in the world did the founding fathers ever refer to treaties in the Constitution?

Let me say that I think the fact is, as has been said by Professor Borchard and Mr. Justice Sutherland, Mr. Justice Hughes, and other great members of the Supreme Court, namely, that this matter is not in the hands of the courts at all, but is in the hands of the United States Senate, and that the Senate can whittle away its right of ratification until it will no longer be valid, for want of use. That is what we are doing now, Mr. President. Those are the words of several of our great justices on the Supreme Court of the United States. They point out that the great responsibility to see that the Constitution is interpreted as it is written rests right here in the Senate. We cannot exculpate ourselves for our failure to act in accordance with our own belief in that great document simply by stating that we act as we do now because of what we think a particular court will do at a particular time. The document speaks for itself.

Now I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has spoken of what might be done by executive agreement in settling the situation in Europe at this time. As I recall, his question was that if an agreement were entered into by the four great war powers, and if that agreement were brought back to the Congress of the United States, would a statute passed in approving it be valid? Was that the question? If so, my judgment is that it would be. I see nothing at all in the Constitution to prevent Congress from adopting that particular method of approving a treaty.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has addressed himself eloquently and powerfully, and with much logic, I think, to the question of the propriety of the particular type of legislation now proposed. On that point I wish to say that I am not at all decided as yet. I may be slow in coming to an opinion on this seaway matter. When I do decide, I shall vote as I think is right. But I am not decided as to whether what I consider to be a lack of propriety, if it be such, should prevent me from voting for the particular measure before us.

But as I view the Senator's argument that we should not be able to exculpate ourselves from blame for following an improper type of approach or procedure, I think his argument is addressed, not to the constitutionality of the procedure, but as to whether it is the appropriate, the right, the proper, and the moral method.

The Senator from Maryland has indicated the tremendous, I hardly know the word to apply to it, sanctity, I may say, which attaches to treaties, as opposed to statutes. Of course, I realize the profound respect we have for treaties. I think we should have respect for any type of agreement that our country enters into. I am free to say that my impression is that our country has probably gone much too far in the executive agreements which have previously been entered into.

But when we come down to any particular sanctity that is set forth in the Constitution in favor of treaties, as against statutes, I fail to find anything to that effect in the Constitution.

I call to the attention of the Senator the fact that although there is the power given to the Executive, in section 2 of article II, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties," nevertheless, likewise by section 8 of article I, "The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." Then I call the Senator's attention to the language, with which he is so familiar, in the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The point to which I direct the distinguished Senator's attention is that article VI, when it makes mention of the supreme law of the land, includes the laws of the United States along with the treaties, and neither one of them has any special sanctity over the other. If the

Senator will permit me to repeat the language I have previously quoted this afternoon from 63 Corpus Juris 842:

> Treaties and acts of Congress are placed on the same footing and are of like obligation, so that, neither having any inherent superiority over the other, either may supersede the other; and in case of conflict the one which is later in date will control, provided, in the case of a treaty subsequent in time, it is self-executing.

I hope I have answered the Senator's question to his satisfaction.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. With great respect for the Senator from Missouri, it seems to me he is confusing two fundamental things. A treaty is an agreement between two countries. A simple act of the Congress is the decision of the majority of the Congress at a particular time, with, of course, the President's approval; or, if he disapproves, with an overriding by the two Houses. When a solemn agreement is entered into by the President with Country X, the agreement becomes binding only when ratified by the Senate; in other words, when the Senate gives a solemn pledge and obligation that the United States will live up to the letter of the agreement. So it is our agreement; it is not merely the President's agreement. True, it is the agreement negotiated by the executive branch of the Government, but the Constitution arises then and there with the bold declaration that he can make it only by and with the consent of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate. By construction, that means by two-thirds of the Members present and voting upon the question. So, in the case of a treaty, it is a contract of the highest dignity and solemnity, negotiated in the first instance by the President, ratified by the Senate.

The Senator is entirely correct in saying that the Congress may abrogate a treaty, just as anybody may breach a contract. But the Congress has no power in the first instance to make a contract with any nation on the face of the globe, except under the Constitution. It may ratify an agreement negotiated by the President. The Congress itself cannot make an agreement with Country X. In the case of an Executive agreement which the President sees fit to ask the Congress to approve, if it approves, it does so as the legislative branch of the Government, by a majority of those sitting here at the moment, a majority that may not sit here tomorrow, or the next day. And so I say, with great respect, that the Senator seems to be confused between the power of Congress to make an agreement with a foreign country by mere ratification of an Executive agreement, and the authority to the President in advance to make an Executive agreement. It can be done either way; I grant that. In the making of a real agreement with a foreign country, the Senate of the United States is a necessary and a vital part, so that a treaty, in any proper consideration at all of the subject, attains the solemnity and dignity of a contract which the Senate itself makes with a foreign country. That is not so in the case of the mere passage of a law. The Congress may today say that it regards a pension of a certain amount as a proper pension to be paid to a former employee of the Government. Tomorrow it may say that it does not regard that pension as properly having been provided by a previous Congress, or by itself at a previous session. May I submit in all candor, because I may want to discuss this question later, it is simply loose thinking to talk about the Congress making an agreement with a foreign country. It has no authority or power to do it. It has no instrumentality through which it can act, except the President alone. If the Congress becomes a party to an agreement, it can do so only under the Constitution, by ratifying the contract and thereby becoming a party to it.

The Senator also seems to be a bit confused, I submit, in assuming that there may be some liability on the part of our Government, because the Congress, having made an agreement, thereafter abrogates it; that is, because the Congress, having passed a law, thereafter passes a contrary law. That cannot be so. Upon the highest ground of public policy, no Congress can bind this country, if a subsequent Congress in its wisdom thinks the decision made by it was wrong. So there can be no liability to Panama, if the decision be reversed, and there can be no liability on our part to Canada, if all we do is merely pass a law, if hereafter the Congress, speaking for this country as a whole, shall say that that decision was wrong, and that it is going to pass another law. There could be no liability, there could be no responsibility. There could be only the responsibility of the Congress sitting at the moment to act up to the full level of its moral perception and conception. But when the Senate of the United States becomes a joint partner, aye, more than that, when it gives life and validity to an agreement itself with a foreign nation, any man who would suggest that we could depart from that course within the life of that agreement would be callous to all the high political morality which always has characterized us as a nation. I know that the Senator is conscientious, and I think the Senator is confused a bit in his own thinking by starting with the premise that the Congress may abrogate a treaty. Surely it can under ordinary conditions. But certain it is that the Congress of the United States has not, except in rare instances, when all the morality was on its side, dared to abrogate a treaty except by the ratification of another treaty or by the passage of an act which under the circumstances had complete moral justification. I am perfectly certain that the Congress of the United States can make no agreement with any foreign country, for that would fly in the face of the whole theory of our government. It would abrogate the power of the executive branch. Congress cannot do it. Congress can do only one thing; it can come along and say legislatively "What you have done, Mr. President, is all right with us." But, tomorrow, another Congress can, without any breach of moral faith, to say nothing of any transgression of its legal power and of its constitutional obligation, come along and say "What the President and the Congress did last year is not all right with us, at all." But not so if there is an agreement which rises to the high dignity of a treaty, to which we have become a party, the important party, because we alone breathed life into the treaty, not the President, not the State Department—we alone breathed life into the treaty by ratifying it by a two-thirds vote, and it is our contract. We could abrogate it, yes, just as we could do any other political or moral wrong, but surely we would not do so unless there were the strongest moral ground impelling us to do so.

The truth is, if I may suggest to the Senator, that in the Department of State in these recent years the loosest possible thinking has grown up. There are men in that department, and such men have pretty well permeated the whole government, who think that the President can do anything if only the Congress will come along thereafter and expressly or impliedly approve it. It may be quite possible for him to do many things with our express or implied approval, but such action does not partake of the dignity of a contract to which we have set our hand and seal. It does not partake of the high solemnity of an obligation which the makers of the Constitution believed that its successors would exercise through all the subsequent years.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure that we have all been very greatly moved and instructed by the very fine remarks which have been made by the Senator from Georgia. It is with some degree of reluctance that I say anything further upon this question, but I think I should reply briefly.

In the first place, I concur with the Senator thoroughly that it would be immoral and improper for this Nation to violate a treaty once it had been entered into.

Mr. President, while it is true that Congress has the power next year, or the next year, to set aside a statute, I can well see in my mind that if a contract shall have been entered into, pursuant to the approval of Congress by the enactment of a statute, and the other contracting party shall have relied upon that contract, at least some moral obliquity would rest upon the Congress in setting aside the agreement upon which reliance had been had. True it is that we have the power to set aside a statute 1 hour after it has been enacted. True it is likewise, Mr. President, that we have the power to set aside a treaty 1 hour after it has been approved and ratified. And true it is, it seems to me, as has been stated previously this afternoon, that a treaty or an act of Congress are placed on the same basis, and are of like obligation and footing, so that neither has an inherent superiority over the other.

Mr. President, in the case we have at hand, there is no talk here of Congress itself entering into any contract. I do not know whether the Senator from

Georgia was present at the outset of the colloquy or not. I want to say to him, if he was not, that I have not yet formed a final opinion about the pending joint resolution. But I do say that what we are called upon to do is to approve an agreement which has already been signed, and which has been entered into subject to the approval by the Congress of the United States of America and the Parliament of Canada. When I stated those words, I was referring to article 11 of the Contract of 1941.

Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia said something to the effect that in the case of treaties the Senate breathes into those treaties the spirit which causes the treaties to spring into life. That is true, of course, in the sense that a treaty cannot have validity or force until the Senate shall have passed upon the treaty. Nevertheless, the Constitution says this with respect to treaties, and I quote section 2 of article 2:

He—

That is, the President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

In the case of treaties, Mr. President, just as in the case of contracts which are entered into subject to approval by the Congress, it is true in each instance that the actual making of the agreements has been by the executive department. It is true that the President, or, at any rate, that representatives of the State Department, have entered into this agreement with Canada. But it is likewise true that that agreement entered into in 1941 has no force, no validity, no effect, until and unless the Congress of the United States, as is stated in the Constitution, shall have approved the contract so entered into.

So, Mr. President, we have in both cases—both in the case of the treaty and in the case of the statute—an instrument before us which does not become final or binding or effective until the breath of life shall have been breathed into it, in the one case by the Senate, in the other case by the Congress of the United States.

I should like to touch for a moment on the question of liability for violations of statutes by subsequent repeal.

I may be in error with respect to liability for the violation of treaties. I distinctly recall, however, that in what I regard as an exceedingly able and comprehensive opinion which was introduced into the RECORD a few days ago by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the State Department representative, Mr. Acheson, indicated I think quite clearly his thought that although there exists the power of Congress to pass upon a matter of this kind, there may be a liability in the case of the breach of such a contract. That is my recollection of his position. Now, he may be wrong. I may be wrong. I do not regard that opinion as at all decisive of the question which the Senator from Maryland and I have been discussing, namely, the constitutionality of the joint resolution which purports to approve an agreement which was expressly made subject to approval by the Congress of the United States.

I understand the Senator from Maryland to state that in his judgment the Supreme Court of the United States, as presently constituted, would sustain the constitutionality of the joint resolution. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that there has been a development and change in certain of the decisions of the Supreme Court. I may say, in that connection, that I have no quarrel with any Member of the Senate in regretting some of the changes that have been evidenced in some of the decisions. Though I have not comprehensively studied the matter, I doubt if there can be any decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which would hold in the slightest that a statute such as we have before us here would not have been sustained at any time in the history of our country.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has given us the benefit of his great wisdom. I want to say, by the way, in passing, that I have the greatest respect for him. I have heard him move the Senate on more than one occasion with the majesty of his diction, the clarity of his thought, the fine character that stems forth and is evident upon his countenance. This afternoon I realize that in taking a position at some points, at any rate, in variance with that which he has submitted, I may be wrong and he may be right. I am glad to have the benefit of his learning.

I do want to call attention to a remark which he himself made, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, reported in volume 78 of the RECORD, part 9, page 10072, Seventy-third Congress, second session. He was referring then, as I recall, to the tariff act. Was that the subject the Senator was discussing some years ago?

Mr. GEORGE. The reciprocal trade agreements, I think.

Mr DONNELL. I think that was the subject. The language which the Senator used I think is of importance at this time. He said:

The distinction between treaties and Executive agreements rests on more than a technical difference. It rests upon a fundamental theory of government. The Constitution places a check upon the President's power to enter into treaties by imposing the requirement that the advice and consent of the Senate by a two-thirds vote must be obtained. But no such extraordinary requirement exists with respect to commitments with foreign governments when such commitments give effect to the will of the people as expressed by previous acts of Congress. The only question which can arise is the validity of the particular act.

And then comes this important sentence:

The two-thirds rule obviously is designed as a check, not on the power of Congress, but on the power of the President.

A commitment to a foreign government can be effective as domestic law without approval by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. From the beginning of our national history down to the present day, the Executive, acting in conformity with previous acts of Congress, has entered into Executive agreements with foreign nations without obtaining the approval of the Senate by a two-thirds vote, and such agreements have been recognized and held valid by the courts.

Mr. President, the particular point to which I invite attention is the fact so wisely and properly brought out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that—

The two-thirds vote obviously is designed not as a check on the power of Congress, but on the power of the President.

So it seems to me that as applied to the case which we have before us this afternoon, it may well be pointed out that the provision with respect to treaties and the necessity of ratification by two-thirds vote of the Senate is designed not at all as a check on the power of Congress to legislate upon the subject matter—which might well have also been acted upon by treaty—but as a check on the power of the President.

If I may say one or two sentences further, I think the statement of the Senator from Georgia that "A commitment to a foreign government can be effective as domestic law without approval by a two-thirds vote of the Senate," might well leave the inference—though perhaps it was not so intended—that the commitment to a foreign government can be effective as local law by an act of Congress, even though as a matter of international law a violation of an agreement which is supported by statute might lead to liability. I wanted the Senator from Georgia to be present while this quotation was read. I appreciate, of course, the fact that he was talking about a temporary type of statute, quite different from this. But it seems to me that the philosophy evidenced in what he said, namely, that the two-thirds vote "obviously designed as a check not on the power of Congress, but on the power of the President," is applicable to the case which we are arguing this afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question. I should like to place before him a case, because it is plain all through his remarks that so far as concerns the question of propriety, wisdom, and even constitutional inducement, the argument is all on the side of the contention that a treaty would be a better way than an executive agreement to handle this subject. That philosophy is woven all the way through the remarks of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Georgia, and I hope my own remarks as well.

The question which I should like to put is this: Let us suppose that 10 years ago our Government had entered into an agreement with the Republic of Panama, by way of treaty to run for 25 years, permitting us to have certain bases on the soil of the Republic of Panama. Suppose that treaty provided that it should last for 25 years, and could not be revoked by either party, except with the consent of the other party.

Now let us suppose that when that treaty was formulated 10 years ago it had come to the Senate and had been approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Let us further suppose that, word for word, 10 years ago the same thing had come before us under the caption of an executive agreement, but that in every other respect—as to date, time,

circumstances, and limitation—the executive agreement and the treaty were identical. There might or might not have been a provision in the executive agreement as to the length of time it should run. I ask the Senator, if he will, to draw the distinction with respect to damages, as between the breach of a treaty on the one hand by the Panamanian Government, and on the other hand a repeal of the act of Congress approving the executive agreement.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have not come here this afternoon prepared for an exhaustive discussion. This colloquy was brought about by reason of the fact that I rose and pointed out that neither I nor any other Senator should be considered to be estopped by not answering instantaneously the able, forceful, and convincing argument of the Senator from Maryland. I believe that what I may say should be qualified by saying that it is extemporaneous, with the exception of the quotations which I happen to have in my hand.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course it would be only fair to suppose, on a question upon which so much research and time could be expended, that anything the Senator and I say by way of diverging from the narrow issue, we might wish to revise on further study. This is a profound subject, and I do not wish to be placed in the position of trying to make it appear that whatever the Senator says is taken by me to be his last word on the subject.

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate the Senator's generous comment, and I am sure that that is the way he feels.

It seems to me that in both instances to which he has referred, namely, the creation of a 25-year irrevocable treaty with Panama on the one hand, ond on the other hand a 25-year agreement with Panama supported by statute, there is no difference as to liability. His question is, What is the difference with respect to liability for damages in the event of a breach by this country or on the part of the other country?

My present judgment is that there is no difference with respect to the right to damages. However, the World Court, for example, which might pass upon the question of international law, might take into consideration the very solemnity, in the case of a treaty, to which the Senator from Georgia has invited attention.

However, my judgment is that if there is liability at all, it exists in both cases, There may be no liability. It may be, as the Senator from Georgia has indicated, that any country which deals with us when we enter into an agreement under a statute may be entitled only to our limited commitment, and may be successfully confronted with the argument that when we signed everyone knew that we could turn around in the next 10 minutes and back out of it. But I find no escape from the proposition that we could do likewise in the case of a treaty.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator will be fair enough to admit that there is a very fundamental difference between the two propositions, which he has not mentioned, and which perchance has escaped his thoughts in this more or less extemporaneous discussion.

If on the one hand we repeal—I prefer the word "recall"—the approval of an executive agreement by subsequent statutory action, we have acted within our rights. However, if on the other hand we have agreed in a treaty that we will not do that very thing, then we have not acted within our rights. There is a distinction between a subsequent act which flows from an executive agreement under which such an act is permitted, and a subsequent act which flows from a treaty, under which we are not permitted to do the act. In the one case we are acting within our rights, and comply with all the proprieties by passing an act of Congress recalling the act of some other Congress. But when we invade the sacred precincts of our pledged word in a treaty, we have neither the right nor the power to do so except in violation of our pledged word, whereas in the second case there is no violation of the pledged word.

Mr. DONNELL. Of course that goes to the question at issue here. It seems to me, from the observations which I have read here this afternoon that the courts hold that it is within the legal power of the contracting party to violate either type of agreement. Again let me say that I am not advocating either the violation of a treaty or of an agreement entered into by statute. However, as I have read several times—

A treaty may supersede a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersede a prior treaty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not wish to shorten the time of the Senator on the floor, but I am sure he feels that I would like to contribute a few thoughts, somewhat in agreement and somewhat in disagreement with some of the observations which he had made.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for his generosity in yielding to me from time to time, and I appreciate the opportunity to engage in this discussion with him.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no one to whom the Senator from Maryland would rather yield on such a question as is involved here than the Senator from Missouri, for whom I have a very high regard, and for whose legal ability I have profound respect.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me ask the Senator from Maryland whether he proposes to discuss the question whether the agreement of 1941 is a mere implementation of the treaty of 1909. Does he intend to discuss that question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Only remotely.

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is of some importance.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not have time to do so. However, if the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will remain and listen, I shall be glad to discuss the question. Would he like to have me take an hour or two to discuss that subject? He is smiling. Let him not think that I am running away from a battle. I am perfectly willing to stay here if he would like to have me discuss the question. However, I have not even completed the first point as yet.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me finish this statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to my friend from Georgia. In the meantime my friends who gave me the "ha-ha" can be meditating on whether the answer to my question is "yes" or "no."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Missouri to this actual circumstance:

During the war, as I related, by executive agreement we obtained certain bases in Panama for our Army and Air Forces, so that we could guard our property, the Panama Canal, which we could not do completely with bases within the Canal Zone itself. After the war was over Panama said: "We do not want you to stay on these bases which we let you have during the war. Get off them. This is an executive agreement, and we will end it when we see fit."

If we had built those bases under a treaty with the Republic of Panama, presumably Panama would not have the right at this hour to cancel our right to occupy the bases.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Please let me finish. We would have been proceding with an assurance that no executive agreement supported by statutory action could ever give to an international agreement.

To take that case and transpose it with the St. Lawrence seaway, let us suppose that after we build the St. Lawrence seaway, having put up the money for it, the legislature of Canada should see fit to say, "We have had enough of this. We do not want to go on any further with this executive agreement. We want to repeal the action that permitted Canada to acquiesce in this whole arrangement." Can Canada legally do that?

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator asking me that question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. I think, Mr. President, it would depend entirely upon Canadian law as to the power of the Canadian Parliament. I am not able to answer the question without a study of it. I would say that if our country, after Canada had put up its share of the money, should desire to have the agreement set aside, Congress would have the power to do so. However improper it may be—and I say again that in my judgment it would be improper—there is a legal power to do it. I would say, also, that there would be a legal power under the terms of a treaty.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's answer is to the point, and, in my opinion, is unassailable. Assuming that we want to strike down our part of the transaction, we can do so by act of Congress. Presumably—and I say this only for the purpose of discussion—the same power rests with the Canadian Parliament, and it can strike down Canada's part of it without the violation of any legalities at all inherent in the situation.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not follow the Senator at that latter point, because it may be that both the Parliament of Can-

ada and the Congress of the United States have the power to set aside, annul, and rescind the agreement. I say this with the qualification that it would require careful study to be certain of it. It may be that the Permanent Court of International Justice would hold that there would be a violation of international law arising from that act, particularly after the Government had acted upon it and had expended money.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to say to the Senator that if next year the United States of America should repeal the statute which is now before us, there is no tribunal under God's heaven, including the Canadian Government, which could appeal for damages against the United States. Why? Because we would have acted within our full rights, known to the other party, Canada, and at the very time the executive agreement was being entered into the Congress which ratified it could not bind succeeding Congresses. Either party could repeal the act. That is the feature in which it is different from a treaty. If a treaty provided that it should run a certain number of years, we would be clearly violating our pledged word, whereas in the case of congressional repeal we would not.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Missouri has quoted a declaration made by me in the discussion of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I am prepared to repeat what I then said, which I think was correct, especially that the two-thirds provision in the Constitution is a check on the Executive power. I am glad to say to the Senator, who I know is open-minded and is always in search of the truth, that when Congress by legislative act changes some prior legislative position, it has back of it the soundest considerations of public policy. In other words, if the Congress should be of the opinion that a mere legislative act passed was wrong, then the soundest consideration of public policy would require its change. For that there can be no liability. No one can be held responsible for what he says here or for a vote taken here. Certainly no Congress can be held responsible for whatever it says with respect to any agreement which our President may have made with any other country.

But it is quite a different thing when a treaty is involved. When we enter into a solemn agreement which rises to the dignity of a treaty, both in its subject matter and in the method of its negotiation, we enter into the realm of international law. Any international tribunal, now exisiting or hereafter set up, if it carries with it the authority to review the question, could properly consider whether we were right in breaching our treaty. But no international court, no tribunal, and no domestic court or tribunal can ever question a decision made by the Congress itself with respect to its own decision, or with respect to any legislative approval or disapproval of any measure or of any agreement which the Chief Executive may have made, because in the one instance the highest consideration of public policy is in favor of a change if there should be one, whereas in the instance of the treaty the highest consideration of international morality and public policy is against any breaching upon our part of any treaty stipulation or agreement. I quite agree with the Senator that there may be instances and situations which fall within the borderline of matters which might be handled by executive agreement and others which must necessarily be handled by treaty, but I submit that any casual consideration of the obligation which we are now asked to approve rises to such dignity, such solemnity, and such tremendous importance to our country and to Canada as to require a treaty executed by both countries as provided in the organic laws of the two countries.

I am not discussing, and I do not want the Senator to think I am discussing, those cases more or less of temporary duration, those matters which are more or less temporary in character, and those matters which might necessarily be dealt with by means of an executive agreement. The primary reason why we say an executive agreement deals with something essentially temporary in character I think is due to the one fact that since the Congress itself may always, upon the ground of the highest morality, reconsider its legislative acts—actions taken in its legislative capacity—therefore an executive agreement deals purely with a temporary situation for a limited or necessarily short period of time, one which we might with propriety authorize the Executive to make upon our part.

I say to the Senator that if I have occasion to discuss this matter subsequently I shall not depart from anything said in the discussion of the Trade Agreement Act, because I do not think anything I then said is contrary to what I now think. I do want to say again to the Senator that I am quite sure that he has not taken any firm, positive, and final position in this important matter, because in the field of domestic law and domestic legislation we cannot be held responsible anywhere, but in the international field, when we enter into a solemn agreement or contract with another nation, we may be held responsible, and properly so, in any tribunal having jurisdiction of the matter.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator so that he may reply, but I would ask him to confine his reply to 2 minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall use every possible effort to comply with the request of the Senator. In the first place, even though the Senator from Georgia may be correct on the proposition which he so clearly set forth, yet it does not affect the question now under discussion, namely, the question of the constitutionality of entering into this agreement by statutory authority.

In the second place, I submit that when he dwells upon the great importance of the matter of permanency, and so forth, his argument, as I see it, goes rather to the point of propriety than to the point of constitutionality.

Finally, if I am still within the 2 minutes, I may say that the distinguished Senator from Maryland has himself twice this afternoon, I think, very clearly and frankly indicated that in his judgment the Supreme Court of the United States, as he says, as presently constituted, would today sustain the constitutionality of the proposed legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think I said "might," but I think I might well say "would."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to complete my sentence; but if the Senator wishes to ask a question, I shall yield to him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to have the Senator finish his sentence.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, Mr. President, I have quite a little more to say on this subject, so I am glad to yield now to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I merely wish to take advantage of this opportunity to say that I am somewhat in the situation of the Senator from Missouri. Earlier in the debate the Senator from Maryland challenged any Senator sitting on the floor of the Senate to arise and dispute his assertion that the proposed statute will be unconstitutional.

Mr. TYDINGS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I read a series of things that could be done under the guise of executive agreements, and I challenged any Member of the Senate to take issue with me on that point. At the same time I said that I had no doubt that such an executive agreement as is now proposed would be held to be constitutional by the present Court, but that, in my judgment, without any reflection on the members of the Court, because they are more learned and wise in the ways of the law than I profess to be, I still think the proposed method is unconstitutional, and I believe that if this question had gone to such a court some years prior to the present, perhaps the Court—composed then of Mr. Justice Sutherland and other distinguished and eminent members of the Court who, in bygone days, rendered important decisions—might have held otherwise in a matter of this magnitude.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so far as the Court is concerned, I think it can be shown that long before the present members of the Court were appointed, the Supreme Court held in a number of cases that there could be such agreements.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree as to that.

Mr. BARKLEY. So there is no use in casting reflection on the members of the present Court.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not doing that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because even before that, I think the Court held that such an act and such an agreement was constitutional.

I merely wish to be assured that I am not estopped because I did not rise and say I did not agree with the Senator from Maryland, at the moment when he issued his challenge. I am going to discuss the matter at a later date. I shall not do so now.

But because I do not wish to be regarded by those who read the RECORD as failing to respond to the challenge issued by the Senator from Maryland, I desire to excuse myself at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I said that if the Treaty of Versailles had come before the Senate in the form of an executive agreement, instead of in the form of a treaty, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would have seen no impropriety in that arrangement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator's reference to the Treaty of Versailles occurred subsequent to the reference to which I have referred.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I have all my remarks set forth in outline form, and it is very short.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course there is a great difference between the Treaty of Versailles and an arrangement between two nations disposing of rights to the use of water that runs between them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no; there is no difference, because the water involved in this matter will run much longer than the Treaty of Versailles ran. So from the standpoint of permanence, durability, and propriety, it would have been much better to have stated the matter in the form of a treaty.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky is a great advocate of the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just think, Mr. President, President Wilson could have submitted it to the Congress in the form of an executive agreement, and it would have been adopted.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the waters of the St. Lawrence are no more in the United States than are the waters of the Colorado or the Rio Grande.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; because in the case of the Colorado all the waters happen to be in the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; not until we dammed them up.

Mr. TYDINGS. But it was well within our jurisdiction to legislate on the waters of the Colorado in the United States without any agreement with Mexico.

Mr. BARKLEY. But we did not do that.

Mr. TYDINGS. My good friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], who is sitting near me, says it was done by treaty, and I think he is better informed on that point than either the Senator from Kentucky or I. So I think the premise of the Senator from Kentucky is totally unsound.

Mr. BARKLEY. But there was a treaty between the United States and Canada.

Mr. TYDINGS. A moment ago the Senator from Kentucky referred to Mexico.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know; but now I am talking about a treaty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Was the Senator from Kentucky wrong before, when he said it was done by executive agreement?

Mr. BARKLEY. If I was wrong, I confess I was.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. But in 1909 a treaty was entered into between the United States and Canada, and by reason of it we are now bringing this agreement to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, perhaps I may conclude by referring to three or four other instances of the possibility of substituting an executive agreement supported by congressional action, in lieu of a treaty supported by ratification by two-thirds vote of the Senate.

The able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his view now say that if the President of the United States by executive agreement enters into a mutual military assistance pact with Soviet Russia or any other country, it is not necessary to submit such agreement to the Senate, for ratification under the Constitution. If that were done, Mr. President, a mere statute, enacted by a bare majority of the Members of each House of Congress, a quorum of each House being present, would give such a transcendental matter all the durability, prestige, and legality that its handling by treaty would have given it. Am I wrong in such a supposition, Mr. President? I am saying it would be valid if done in that way.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a war measure it would not be done in that way at all, for——

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Wisconsin is begging the question.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will be courteous to me. Certainly I have been courteous to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course I shall be.

Mr. WILEY. First, Mr. President, I take exception to the Senator's statement that I have given him the ha-ha. I have been waiting all afternoon, as a matter of fact. I want that point straightened out.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for that. However, he did give me the ha-ha, and I heard him.

Mr. WILEY. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland is so sensitive——

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not sensitive, Mr. President, but I am giving the facts.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure the Senator from Maryland will admit that although he requested 40 minutes, he has taken all afternoon.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not had 30 minutes as yet; I have been yielding to my colleagues.

Mr. WILEY. Well, it was a battle royal, and a good battle, anyway.

Second, Mr. President, in relation to Panama, I wish to say that if at that time those who were conducting the military affairs of this country had entered into an agreement in relation to their fields, for a term of years, it would have been binding. As it was, their fields were to go out of United States control when the war ended. That is why Panama has said that now we had better get out, and of course we carried out our agreement.

In relation to the other proposition, I wish to say that any agreement made by the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States depends upon conditions. If we are in war, of course the war powers of the President are ample, as they were when we did enter into an arrangement with Russia and we fought by her side. That happened. There is no question that if in a war emergency it became necessary for us to make an alliance, the war powers would be adequate in that connection.

Mr. President, something of the character of an alliance running down through the years, something such as we have had in years past, and which Washington said we had better keep out of, undoubtedly rises to the dignity of requiring a treaty, in the opinion of the Senate, of course.

But I wish to call attention to the situation the world is in today. What are we doing and what will we do in a month or so by resolution when we appropriate, for the benefit of 16 nations, $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000? Is any alliance involved? Back of that proposal is there any purpose to see to it that we preserve our own? Let us consider the testimony. General Marshall has said emphatically that is the purpose. If we talk to others—those in the Navy Department and elsewhere—they say it is significant. So in that case we shall be doing by resolution what the distinguished Senator from Maryland apparently says cannot be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has misunderstood my question.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think I have.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not refer to any alliance made in the past. I said that the able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his view now say that if the President of the United States by executive agreement enters into a mutual assistance military pact with Russia or any other country, it is not necessary to submit such an agreement to the Senate for ratification under the Constitution. Am I wrong?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator say that would have to be done by treaty?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then when does a matter stop having to be done by executive agreement, and start having to be done by treaty?

Mr. WILEY. I tried to tell the Senator, but he says I have not answered. This is my answer: First, if the world situation were such that Russia became an ally of ours, as she has done in the past, it would not require any agreement on behalf of the Congress of the United States. The war powers would come into existence as they did before. When Hitler went into Russia, what happened? We became an ally of Russia. We gave her $12,000,000,000 without an agreement confirmed either by the Congress or by the Senate. In ordinary times the world was quiet, things looked peaceful; there was no need of emergency action. There came a question of joining in a defensive arrangement. It could be done by treaty, ratified by the Senate of the United States, or if in the judgment of the Senate and the House it came within some provision of the Constitution, such as the commerce clause, it could be done by agreement.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it would be necessary for them to derive the power under the commerce clause. The Congress has the power to raise and maintain armies and provide for the common defense, so there would be plenty of constitutional ground for taking action. But the point I make is, the Senator is on different ground from that

taken either by the eminent Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], or myself, in a general way, for the question asked by all three of us was, if it were possible to do a thing by statute, could the same thing be done by executive agreement? It was rather generally argued here this afternoon, and I thought very well decided, that, aside from the proprieties of the thing, the present Supreme Court, in view of the way we are heading, would find no distinction between an executive agreement supported by statutory action, and a treaty supported by action of the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not want to put myself in concurrence with the Senator in any view that the present personnel of the Supreme Court is responsible for that state of the law. I think the law has been, right along, that even though the matter could be accomplished by treaty, yet if it relates to a subject matter within the jurisdiction of Congress, as, for illustration, the power over interstate and foreign commerce, the same thing might be done by executive agreement, if Congress and the President were to select that vehicle for carrying it into effect. I do not at all want to be understood as saying that merely the present personnel of the Supreme Court are responsible for what the Senator from Maryland conceives, in his judgment, will be the decision of the Supreme Court as to the validity of the instrument now before us.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to say that my remarks were not intended to reflect on the Supreme Court, but just to pass my opinion based on previous decisions, as to how they would differ perhaps from the courts of yesteryear. But the point is that the Senator from Missouri holds the same view I hold, namely, that the President of the United States could now make a military alliance with Soviet Russia, and, assuming that Congress approved it by a statute, that would have the same effect, as long as the statute remained unrepealed, as if it were done by treaty. Am I wrong?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I do not think it devolves upon me at this moment to decide a question of that tremendous international magnitude. There may be some distinction between it and the case now before the Senate. I do say this, however, that as a general proposition, when Congress has power over a given subject matter, as, for example, commerce between the States or with foreign nations, Congress, as I presently understand the law to be, may, with the concurrence of the President, adopt the legislative method of entering into commitments with foreign governments in that field, even though it would be perfectly permissible and perhaps vastly more appropriate for the entry to be made by treaty. In saying that, Mr. President, I may say that I do not want to leave the implication that I have arrived at a definite conclusion as to the relative propriety of the two modes in the case now before us. I started in this afternoon extemporaneously, except as to a few notes of some citations I have read, to discuss with the Senator the question of constitutionality rather than of propriety.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought the Senator made his point very clear, that as to the propriety of having a treaty as against an executive agreement, he thought, for major matters, the proprieties were on the side of the treaty, and for minor matters of short duration they were on the side of the executive agreement. I thought the purport of his whole argument was that notwithstanding what should be the proprieties of the question, if the President made an agreement with Soviet Russia in the nature of a military alliance for 20 years, and Congress passed a statute supporting it, it would have the same binding effect as would a treaty ratified by the United States Senate. Am I in error?

Mr. DONNELL. I cannot answer that by "Yes" or "No," but I must make a brief statement.

I think I said this afternoon that I was in general concurrence with the view of the Senator that there should be no deviation from the rule that executive agreements should be confined, generally speaking, to matters not of a permanent nature. I take that view, and my present thought is that it may well be that this St. Lawrence compact should have been entered into by treaty. As a matter of fact, it impresses me that way. It is my personal thought that that should have been done.

On the other hand, Mr. President, from what study I have made of the record and from what I have heard of the argument, I am not prepared to say conclusively, and I am not saying conclusively at this time, that I concede the matter should have been handled in some other manner, because it seems to me that there may be many, many things that will enter into a determination of which of the proposed methods should be followed.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the point is, I did not want to misquote the Senator. He argued with tremendous persuasion and, I thought, with a good deal of conviction, almost putting himself in a position that I could not attack, when he, by his forcefulness and the illustrations that he conjured up, finally reached the conclusion, which I am sure was repeated several times in his remarks, that the same thing can be accomplished by executive agreement supported by statute as can be accomplished by treaty, ratified by the Senate. Am I wrong on that?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think there may be extreme cases, which we do not have before us now, in which it cannot be done. I do not think of one, but it is entirely possible that something, upon which the very life of the Republic would rest, would require a treaty rather than an executive agreement. Generally speaking, as I now understand the law, when Congress has power over a particular subject matter, as for illustration commerce, I think, as Mr. Garner states, the question of "which of the two procedures shall be employed in a given case is a matter of practical convenience or political expediency," or perhaps of some other considerations, I interpolate—"rather than of constitutional law or international law." I think there is an opportunity for the exercise of an option as between those two methods.

My present thought is that if I had been conducting the negotiations I believe I would have agreed with the Senator from Maryland that a treaty would be advisable instead of an executive agreement, but in saying that, I do not want to preclude myself from voting for the pending measure. All things considered, in the wisdom of the State Department and of the President, and in the wisdom of Congress, if it decides to approve the pending measure, it may be that the legislative method is preferable.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will allow me, I am not trying to get into a debate with him, because the fact is I want to get out of the debate and conclude. I do not want to misrepresent his position, but I think the Senator did say that as far as the constitutionality or the legality of the matter was concerned—not the propriety but the legality of the matter—the executive agreement supported by congressional statute was just as good or just as legal as was the treaty supported by Senate ratification.

Mr. DONNELL. If I may answer the Senator, I think that is substantially what I said, and of course I am applying it to the case we have before us. There may be other cases I do not think of at the moment. There may be other cases, as I have said, involving the very existence of the Republic, in which a treaty would be the only legal way to proceed. That is entirely possible. But the case here before us, it seems to me, is an illustration of a situation in which Congress has it within its power to deal with commerce; therefore, there is an option as to whether the matter should be concluded by treaty or by statute.

If I may add but one sentence further, I think the question as to whether this particular statute, if it be passed, is a matter of implementing the treaty of 1909, is a matter of very great importance, and should not be left undiscussed in the course of the argument as it shall proceed.

Mr. BREWSTER rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield in a minute, but I will continue, because I want to repeat what I said a while ago. Those who hold that executive agreements supported by a mere act of Congress are valid, constitutional, and legal, as compared with treaties ratified by the Senate, must hold with the able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his view. I am not arguing the proprieties of the proposal before us, I am arguing the constitutionality of it, because the Senator and I pinned each other down on that, and he wrung from my reluctant lips an admission that the present Supreme Court would hold such agreements constitutional, just as they would treaties. We were speaking generally. We were not speaking of the particular agreement before us; we were speaking generally. So I have come over, and I am now arguing from the place on the floor where the Senator stood that if the President of the United States, by executive agreement, enters into a mutual military assistance pact

with Russia in the future it is not necessary to submit such agreement to the Senate for ratification under the Constitution. A mere statute, with a bare majority of the Members of each House, a quorum in each House being present, will give such a transcendent matter all the validity, prestige, and durability which the ratification of a treaty would have given.

Now if we are going to say that the Supreme Court will find that the St. Lawrence seaway can be dealt with either by treaty or by executive agreement, even though the question of propriety does not enter, then we must concede that the treaty-making power of the Senate of the United States is as dead as Hector's goat, but only because we have let it die through lack of usage.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to complete my statement. However, I will yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. What I wish to say is addressed to the matter now under discussion. I wonder whether or not in the discussions there have been references to the very ingenious theory advanced by the Solicitor for the State Department before the Committee on Commerce when the committee was considering this matter some time ago, that the President of the United States could make any agreement he desired with any foreign country, and that cognizance need not even be taken of the Constitution of the United States or the ratifying power of the Senate. Has that been referred to at all?

Mr. TYDINGS. Indirectly it has, because, I may say to the Senator from Maine, the precedents which we have gradually built up from the beginning of the history of the Republic down to this good hour, are briefly these. In the early days the only executive agreements that the President entered into had primarily to do with war, or with simple acts of what might be called administration, as differentiated from policy. Gradually there has been a whittling away of that policy over the years, and with tremendous Niagara Falls rapidity in recent years, so that such an eminent authority as Professor Borchard predicts that if this trend continues our position will be directly contrary to that taken by the Founding Fathers. I do not think there is anybody who can speak on the treaty-making power of the Congress and the President with greater authority than the eminent Yale professor, who has written many books on the subject, who has taken part in numerous arbitrations, who has been a lecturer in several universities, who has been an adviser to our own Government. Certainly if there is any more eminent authority than Professor Borchard I do not know who he is. He is supported in large part by utterances by Mr. Justice Sutherland.

All of them say what the Senator from Maine has just put his finger on, that if the Senate continues to neglect to use the treaty-making arm, the requirement of a two-thirds majority to flex its great power, and will only flex it partially, by using a mere 26 percent of its membership, a bare quorum being present, the great muscles which were created to serve a certain purpose will become dormant and die, and we will have adopted a contrary philosophy on the matter of international relations to that which the fathers had in mind, in my judgment, because it is shown in the debates of the Constitutional Convention over and over again that executive agreements were contemplated as things that would have to be entered into by the President, but it was argued it was not necessary to provide for them in the Constitution because they would be acts that would flow after legislation, or after the signing of treaties, or in carrying out the great exigencies of a war.

No one conceived that executive agreements would invade the wide field of international relations, and I think the debates in the Constitutional Convention will prove the accuracy of my statement.

There is the great Swiss author, de Vattel, who has written on the treaty-making power of the Congress of the United States. I meant to quote from his book. He had much to say respecting the point of view of the members of the Constitutional Convention. De Vattel portrayed all the nuances between treaty-making on the one hand and executive agreements on the other. He showed that treaties, for which a two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States were required, were given a dignity commensurate with international dealing as differentiated from mere administrative acts which it was contemplated the executive agreements would be.

Where are we going? We have already driven the nail and now we are beginning to rivet the nail, that is, that congressional approval of international agreements is all that will be necessary in the future.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the suggestion I made——

Mr. TYDINGS. Goes further than that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Goes much beyond anything which the Senator from Maryland has suggested. When a responsible legal official of the State Department, the Solicitor, before a senatorial committee considering this matter advances the proposition that an agreement entered into by the President, without congressional action of any character, binds the United States in international law, we certainly have reached the limit of the evolution of this series of precedents, and yet that was what he calmly testified to before the very amazed Committee on Commerce, then presided over by the late lamented Senator Josiah Bailey, who certainly was a profound constitutional lawyer, and heard this theory with amazement and profound disturbance. And yet it shows how far this tendency will go if it is continued unchecked.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

I should like to conclude. What I may say may be controversial, and I think I ought to say to my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] that I will permit him to interrupt me, although I make reference to him in no disparaging sense. I have a high regard for him in every way, but I refer to him to illustrate a point of view. I hope he will not feel called upon to interrupt, because I want to turn over the floor, which I hold by his courtesy, which I deeply appreciate.

The able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his view now say in effect, mark you, that if a President of the United States enters into an executive agreement with Britain and France, providing that each country shall annex that part of Germany which its military forces now occupy, and thus wipe western Germany off the map as a Nation, that only a mere statute of Congress is necessary to make that action legal. A two-thirds vote on ratification by the Senate for such a far-reaching event will not be necessary in the future.

The able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support him now say that if the United States and Russia, lately allies in conquering Japan, decide through executive agreement to divide Japan in half and to award one part of divided Japan to the United States and the other part to Russia, that a mere act of Congress, supported by a bare majority in each House, with a quorum present, will give that executive agreement all the majesty, so far as practical purposes are concerned, as if it had been done through the medium of a treaty between Russia and the United States, looking to the same purpose and which would have had to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

The able Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and I discussed on the floor of the Senate this afternoon the constitutionality of such action. I think the Senator from Missouri is one of the great lawyers of this body, and he has assured me that it is his view that an executive agreement, if the statutory procedure follows, is just as good as a treaty with ratification.

Additional illustrations could be offered ad absurdum. The point is that notwithstanding the congressional statute of so-called validation to such supposed executive agreements they could be repealed a month or a year or 10 years thereafter, whereas a treaty would run in all its honorable and unassailable majesty for its duration and could not, either in morals or law, be repealed. The Senator from Wisconsin seems to see no distinction between these two processes. The Senator and those who support his position that executive agreements supported by congressional statute are proper vehicles for international dealings say they are willing to commit the United States to an expenditure of upward of a billion dollars on the soil of a foreign country in times of peace, even though a succeeding Congress may strike down all our right and connection therewith when all of the expenditures are made and when all of the work is completed. By this process he would expose the American taxpayer to a loss of upward of a billion dollars out of our own Treasury through the medium of

executive agreements supported by congressional action, when by treaty ratified by the Senate this risk of upward of a billion dollars could be avoided.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has one fact decidedly wrong. The canal system is not on the soil of another country. The canal system is entirely within the boundaries of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. None of it at all is in Canada?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct. It is all within the boundaries of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. And it will not be necessary to use the bank of the river, which is in Canada?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; that is true. I will show the situation to the Senator on the map which hangs on the wall.

Mr. TYDINGS. So no part of Canadian soil will be touched by this operation?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct. The point I indicate on the map is where the power operation is to be located. That is split 50–50. But the canal system is at the other point which I now indicate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, it is all a part of the St. Lawrence seaway. That is my point. I am speaking not only about the canal. I am talking about the whole project. We are committing our country to the expenditure of a huge sum of money to be spent on foreign soil. That is what I said. That is what is true.

Mr. WILEY. That is just one-seventh of what Senators are going to vote for in a month or so from now.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be so.

The able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his views say that if at any time in the future the President of the United States shall make an agreement to take over the finances, the customs, the courts, or the legislative body of any other country through the medium of executive agreements with the then head of such country, that so far as the legality of the situation is concerned, if Congress by a simple statute ratifies that act, it has no legal imperfections.

I am referring to the Santo Domingo case, which the Senator from Wisconsin will recall. President Theodore Roosevelt operated the customs of Santo Domingo without the approval of the Santo Domingan people, and for 3 years without the approval of the Senate or the Congress of the United States. He said that there was an executive agreement, and that he was going to employ it so long as he was in office.

The able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his view hereby pledge themselves now to make not the slightest legal objection to any final disposition of conquered Germany among the victorious Allies provided the President, by executive agreement with the heads of the other Allied Powers, agrees thereto and that a mere majority of Congress will support his position.

The able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his view today say to President Truman: "It is not necessary hereafter for you and your State Department to make treaties with foreign governments affecting the welfare of our own people and the world."

They say: "Mr. President, you make such agreements with them as you see fit to make on any subject, no matter how far reaching, no matter how involved, no matter how pregnant it may be with forebodings to our country. If after you have made such agreements, a mere majority of the Congress representing 26 percent of the membership of each House—if but 51 percent of the membership of each House happened to be present—supports your view, we are willing to have the future of this country committed through such mechanics as are here outlined."

These are but a few of the hostages to fortune that could be given under the procedure which the able Senator from Wisconsin and those of like view could impose on the Nation, if the ratification processes he espouses today become the custom of the Congress.

Here the advocates of this measure stand, ready to commit the United States in time of peace to an expenditure of upwards of a billion dollars, for a project to be built on foreign soil, through a mere executive agreement between the heads of the two governments affected, even though they must admit that on the instant the project flowers into completion all of this money, by a mere repeal of the Congressional Act, could be thrown to the four winds so far as the people of our nation are concerned.

And this from the spokesman of a great party which is advocating tax reduction, economy in government, and curtailed expenditures in the foreign field, which expenditures are directly related to the successful winning and termination of a bloody world war.

The second paragraph of section 2 of article II of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

> He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

What the able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his point of view are attempting to do in this process is to amend the Constitution of the United States.

Instead of it reading as I have quoted it, the able Senator from Wisconsin and those who support his point of view say it should read as follows:

> He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, or he (the President) shall have power, with the approval of a majority of each House of the Congress provided a quorum of each House be present, to make treaties.

It takes no student of the Constitution to see at once the fallacy of the position of the Senator from Wisconsin. If the Constitution was intended to give validity to international agreements by a simple statute, then why does the Constitution provide in express terms that such international agreements are binding only if they are ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate?

If ever "little boys who swim on bladders these many summers in a sea of glory, but far beyond (their) depth" went further than the distinguished sponsor of this bill is now going, Mr. Shakespeare fails to give us the words in his great writings to portray it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point the following paragraphs from an article entitled "Acts and Joint Resolutions of Congress as Substitutes for Treaties," written by James W. Garner and published in volume 29 of the American Journal of International Law, at page 487:

> The conclusion of the whole matter would seem to be that if it is within the constitutional competence of Congress by means of acts or joint resolutions passed by a simple majority vote of both Houses and approved by the President, to make the United States a member of such institutions as the International Labor Organization, to annex foreign territory to the United States, terminate war with foreign countries, to authorize commissions to conclude foreign debt funding agreements, to authorize the Postmaster General to conclude postal conventions and to empower the President to enter into trade and tariff agreements with foreign countries, it could certainly by either of these processes make the United States a member of the Permanent Court of International Justice and possibly also a member of the League of Nations. Indeed, it is believed that Congress might with the approval of the President create a relationship or undertake an engagement on behalf of the United States with a foreign state or states, in respect to any matter which is a proper subject of international regulation, or it might authorize the President to do so, provided it were within the constitutional competence of the Congress to deal with such matter at all. The delegation by the Constitution to the President and the Senate of the power to make treaties does not exhaust the power of the United States over international relations. The will of the nation in this domain may be expressed through other acts than treaties and such acts do not necessarily need to be ratified by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate in order to be valid and binding, unless they so expressly provide by their own terms. In short, the power of the President and the Senate to regulate foreign relations is not an exclusive power. It is only when an agreement takes the form of a treaty, as that term is used in the Constitution, that this power belongs exclusively to them. There is no inconsistency between the authority of the President and the Senate to regulate foreign relations through agreements in the form of treaties and the power of the President and Congress to deal with matters of foreign policy through legislative action. Which of the two procedures shall be employed in a given case is a matter of practical convenience or political expediency rather than of constitutional or international law. If the procedure of treaty regulation proves ineffective in a particular case because of the constitutional impediment relative to ratification, there is no reason of constitutional or international law why recourse to the easier alternative of legislative action cannot be had, if the President and a majority of the two Houses of Congress so desire, as has been done with success on various occasions in the past.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have canvassed as many Senators as I could who are opposed to this project, and I will say to the Senate that I believe that all of them, in the aggregate, will not

consume more than 2 hours in speaking. Therefore I renew my hope that it will be possible to obtain an agreement to vote the joint resolution at a fairly early date.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I heard what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said. I thought that earlier in the day we had agreed in substance between us—not a binding agreement—that because of the absenteeism which is too evident today, and will be greater tomorrow and the next day, we would postpone a vote until the 25th. I have already mentioned the fact that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has left and several other Senators have left and cannot be present. Those facts are known to all Senators.

I feel that the country is entitled to have as near a 100-percent vote as possible on this question, so necessarily this matter will go over. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will lead the opposition tomorrow, and I trust the courtesy shown today to one of his speakers, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], will be shown us tomorrow, so that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] may speak, because he is leaving the next day. Under those circumstances I feel that we shall have to carry on and see if we cannot talk things through tomorrow and get somewhere.

I wish to express sincere appreciation to both the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for having given us a very interesting and learned debate on the Constitution. I am happy to see that the Senator from Missouri was not taken into camp by anything that was said by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. The discussion was as fine a piece of Senatorial debate as can be found anywhere in the books. However, it related distinctly to the question which has been discussed for 75 or 100 years, as to the power of the President and the Congress in relation to executive agreements, or whether there should be treaties.

The statement just read by the distinguished Senator from Missouri is as fine an outline of the whole subject as can be found anywhere. But, Mr. President, there is one other field involved, which was stressed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri and left alone by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and that is a field about which there is no dispute, namely, that when there is a treaty there is no way to carry out the provisions of it except to implement it by administrative acts of the two governments, and then they pass the same agreements. At least one Senator, who does not agree that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] can put words into his mouth, as he attempted to in his 15 minutes of concluding remarks, is thoroughly convinced that when this Government in 1909 entered into an agreement in relation to the St. Lawrence seaway it had the right down through the years to make that agreement effective and valid. That is what the President of the United States did in 1941.

All we are asked to do now is to approve the President's act by implementing the Treaty of 1909.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I would like to say that tomorrow the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] desire to speak very briefly on the St. Lawrence seaway matter; that on Wednesday, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] desires to speak, and that on Thursday the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] desires to speak. So far as I have been advised, that will complete the speaking on the joint resolution on our side. As near as I can calculate it now, it will amount in the aggregate to not more than 2 hours.

I am sorry that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is unwilling that a vote be had this week. If we postpone voting to the twenty-fifth, I believe the country will feel that we are dawdling and not paying attention to business. That will make almost a full month which will have elapsed since we first began consideration of the project on the floor. I believe it will seem to a great many Americans that with all the many problems which are pending today a full month of debate on this matter will be excessive. Of course, if the twenty-fifth is the earliest date on which the Senator can see fit to agree, under the procedure we have in the Senate I have no choice but to agree to it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts understands that I personally will be here. My own personal accommodation is not involved. I am trying to protect the rights of Members of the Senate, and I want to see that the people of this country have full and complete knowledge of the sentiments of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. There is no one more assiduous than is the Senator from Wisconsin. I know he would be here every day and every night if it were necessary. In the remarks I was making I was in no way reflecting on the Senator from Wisconsin, who is most diligent in the discharge of his duty. I agree that the people want a complete exposition of the matter, but I think 30 days is a longer time than is necessary.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. There was no thought of debating for 30 days. The statement was made that there would not be a sufficient number of Members of the Senate present next week to vote. I was willing to agree to the 18th, but I think the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] or some other Senator thought that would be inconvenient. Then it was decided to put it over to the 25th. If we can agree tomorrow on some other date, I shall be glad to do so. I do not want the impression to go out that we expect to require 30 days of debate on the St. Lawrence seaway. I understood from the majority leader that he was already contemplating taking up other matters. If the suggested arrangement does not take place, someone will have to talk. If it takes place, they will not have to talk, and other matters can be disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. I did not mean that any Senator would hold the floor for 30 days. We began consideration of the matter on the 26th of January, and if we do not vote until the 25th of February the Senator can see that that would amount to 32 days in which the Senate would have had the subject under consideration. I believe that will be interpreted by the country as putting too much time on the proposition, and that we ought to be able to make up our minds and vote it up or down.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that there may be no misunderstanding so far as the membership of the Senate is concerned, let me say that a unanimous-consent agreement has not yet been entered into. There is always a big doubt as to whether one can be reached in the Senate. So, keeping that in mind, in order that no Member of the Senate may be under any misapprehension, the program will be as it has been announced. There will be daily sessions on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, at least, when the debate will continue upon the St. Lawrence seaway. On Thursday afternoon, or before that time if an agreement can be entered into, I can make an announcement regarding a voting date under the agreement, but until such an arrangement shall be entered into—and I reiterate that the place to make such an arrangement is not on the floor of the Senate—I shall insist that we conclude the debate, if possible, on Thursday; but if the Senate desires to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement either before that time or by that time, an announcement will be made as to when a vote will be taken.

I hope the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Massachusetts will continue to try to work it out.

Mr. LODGE. Many Senators want to make their plans for the week end.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me it would be a very convenient thing and a very considerate thing not to wait until Thursday before the agreement is made, but to try to make it tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I said that if a unanimous-consent agreement is entered into prior to Thursday, we shall make the announcement; but that if we have not arrived at such an agreement before Thursday, then on Thursday, at the conclusion of the session, we shall announce the program for the next week.

I may say also that in the following week the Senate will be in session on Monday and will recess until Thursday, and then again recess until the following Monday. That is to carry out the precedent relative to Lincoln's Birthday. The Senate will have to reconvene on Thursday and go over to the following Monday. I think I have the assurance of the minority leader, for whom we all

have the highest regard, that he will cooperate in that plan.

In the following week, in order to accommodate those who will have Jackson Day engagements, we will agree on the days to assemble. I want to assure the minority leader at this time that I shall cooperate with him in the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In regard to the so-called dawdling to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred, if we do not vote on the bill until the 23d of the month, I think it appropriate to say that a week or two ago the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] spoke to me about the possibility of having sort of a gentleman's agreement that during the week of the 12th of February there would be no legislation that would interfere with Members on the other side of the aisle making their annual pilgrimage to the various celebrations carried on in the name of Lincoln, but having in mind the next election.

The Democratic Members are not limited to any one day. We are celebrating both Jackson and Jefferson this year. We have so much more to say than have the Members on the other side of the aisle that it takes longer to say it. We are not limited by any particular rule as to time. It was not contemplated, I think it is fair to say, in our conversations with Members of the Senate, that they should begin leaving today, the 2d day of February, in order to make speeches on the 12th day of February. I have no control over them, and neither has the Senate. But, in view of the situation, I do not think that an agreement to vote on the 24th or the 25th, within which time we seek respectively to enlighten the people for and against the things of which we speak here, would be regarded as dawdling. I do not think it would be dawdling to agree to vote toward the end of the month. It does sound like a long time off, and I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that on the surface it is an unhappy situation. But I doubt very much whether anyone will accuse us of dawdling, especially if we do not lose any time in the sum total of legislation that will be before Congress at this session.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, let me say I quite agree that it will be violating a great many long-standing agreements and traditions if we start voting in the middle of the week of Lincoln's birthday or the middle of the week of Jackson's birthday. I was thinking that we might vote before this week end, and that our reluctance to vote by or before the coming Thursday would be misconstrued. Of course, I do not wish to violate the agreement whereby Senators will be away next week.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would be happy to vote this week, but as has been stated, Senators have already begun to leave the city, for reasons which they feel justify them in doing so. So I think it would be unwise for us to vote at a time when numerous Senators will unavoidably be absent. In the long run, I do not think any time will be lost by delaying the final vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to thank everyone for the helpful suggestions. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is welcome, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. However, Mr. President, I cannot quite understand why it takes so long for the Democrats to answer, on Jackson Day, the things the Republicans say on Lincoln's birthday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, Mr. President, we have more good birthdays; I will say that.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought perhaps it was because the Democrats talked longer.

Mr. President, I wish to say that it will be the purpose of the acting majority leader to keep the pending measure before the Senate until at least the end of the session on Thursday afternoon; and in the absence of a unanimous-consent agreement, I shall drive to get a vote at that time. I think that is the only way to legislate. Certainly I agree with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts: I think it is unreasonable to bring up here, for discussion, a question of this kind, and then put it aside and take up other legislation because of the absence of some Senators. Certainly Senators should protect themselves. Certainly Senators should make it their business to be in the Senate Chamber at least during this week. The announcement has been made, and certainly the program will be to continue during Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, in the hope that a vote can be had.

Of course, if a unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, it will be perfectly agreeable to the acting majority leader, and at that time an announcement will be made. But I say that in the absence of an agreement, we ask the Members of the Senate to be here, and this matter will be the order of business; and certainly I will do my level best to drive for a vote on the proposed legislation.

CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 516)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 927.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if we have concluded the work of the Senate for the afternoon, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 2, 1948:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Harold M. Stephens, of Utah, to be chief justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. D. Lawrence Groner, retired.

Hon. James M. Proctor, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Harold M. Stephens, elevated.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance:

Percival E. Faed

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major, effective date of acceptance:

Walter P. Griffey

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Charles F. Blankenship
Curtis R. Chaffin
Erwin C. Drescher
Henry A. Holle
John B. Hozier
James G. Telfer
Hugh L. C. Wilkerson

Senior surgeon to be temporary medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Percival E. Faed

Sanitary engineer to be temporary sanitary engineer director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Harry G. Hanson

Surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Walter P. Griffey
James G. Telfer

Assistant surgeons to be temporary senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Gleb A. Nedzel
Kirkland C. Brace
Lewis Francis
Frederick G. Germuth, Jr.
Vincent E. Price
Hans R. Huessy

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Paul T. Erickson
Eugene W. Green
Frederick J. Krueger
Marion B. Noyes

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Gladys M. Ray
Emijean Snedegar
Edith M. Hettema
Jeannette E. Westlake
Rose G. Ernsberger
Amy L. Cawley
Ina L. Ridlehoover
Philomene E. Lenz
Loretta M. Schroll
Gladys C. Guydes
Mary Raprich

Senior assistant scientist to be temporary scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Don E. Eyles

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of hosts, who has committed unto us the solemn trust of free government, we pray Thee to renew within us the gift of wonder and the freshness of discovery, whereby new paths are made plain. Speak to us in the secret chamber of our hearts, that we may cast out of our thoughts all unworthy motives and seek the robust stature of Christian character as exemplified by our Galilean Teacher.

In this hour of her tragedy, our Father, we beseech Thy blessings upon India; grant that out of her sorrow she may have the assurance that, though the workman dies, the work goes on forever.

We commend unto Thee our President, our Speaker, and all Members of the Congress, that at all times and places we may revere the sanctity of our personal honor and obligation, by which we may attain unto a larger and better and more useful life. Hear our humble prayer as we pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 30, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On January 31, 1948:

H. R. 3645. An act relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUNDSTROM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier entitled "Bipartisan European Aid."

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short statement, and also to include extraneous matter in the speech he expects to make today in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Frank C. Waldrop entitled "Let's Face It."

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement of the Thoughts at Seventy, by Dr. Frank S. Hackett, headmaster of Riverdale School, on the value of education in settling the problems of a troubled world.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the junior Senator from Virginia, Senator ROBERTSON.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an article on observance of Boy Scout Week and in the other an article that appeared in the Boston Herald entitled "The United Nations on Trial."

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of our greatest need today, a first-class air force, and include therewith a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement and an editorial in the remarks which he expects to make today in Committee of the Whole.

THE LATE HONORABLE T. WEBBER WILSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] be recognized at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to this House the death of one of its former most distinguished Members. On last Friday, at his home in Coldwater, Miss., the Honorable T. Webber Wilson, lawyer, statesman, administrator, and orator, and one of Mississippi's most beloved and honored citizens, passed into the Great Beyond from which no man returneth.

Thomas Webber Wilson, affectionately known to his friends as T. Webber, was born at Coldwater, Miss., on January 24, 1893. He was the son of Lucy Yancey and Dr. Joseph James Wilson. As a boy, Webber was educated in the public schools of Coldwater and the University of Mississippi at Oxford. He was graduated from the latter institution in 1913. He was a member of the Presbyterian Church, the Kappa Alpha Fraternity, the Masons—being a Knight Templar and a thirty-second degree Scottish Rite—Elks, Odd Fellows, and Woodmen of the World. He was admitted to the bar and began the practice of law in Laurel, Miss., in September of 1913; he was elected prosecuting attorney of Jones County, the twelfth judicial district of Mississippi, over two opponents in the first primary in 1919; he was nominated to the Sixty-eighth Congress in the Democratic primary in August of 1922. He represented the Sixth Congressional District of Mississippi, which I have the honor to represent, with great ability and distinction for a period of 6 years.

Those who are still Members of this body, and who served with him during his term of office here, will bear witness to the fact that nature had endowed Webber Wilson with many of her choicest virtues and attributes. He was as handsome as a Grecian god, as eloquent as a Demosthenes, and as faithful a friend as a Damon. During his service in this House he was easily one of its most popular Members. Born and reared as he was in a land of natural orators, Webber Wilson had few equals, and it is doubtful that he had any superiors as an orator either in his native State of Mississippi or in this body in which he served so ably for 6 years.

Retiring from the House in 1928, Congressman Wilson made the race for the United States Senate against the incumbent, the late and lamented Hubert Stevens. In the spirited race that ensued, he was defeated by the narrow margin of approximately 5,000 votes. Subsequently, in 1933, President Roosevelt appointed Mr. Wilson as a Federal judge in the Virgin Islands. A lover of his fellow man, and of justice and fair play, Judge Wilson soon differed with the then Governor of these islands over differences arising from his administration of that office. Rather than become a party to what he conceived to be an injustice to the Negro inhabitants of those islands, Judge Wilson resigned and returned to his native State of Mississippi. Thereafter, President Roosevelt appointed him as a member of the Federal Parole Board in 1935. He served ably and capably, and with a great humanitarian heart, as a member and subsequently as chairman of that Board until he resigned that commission September 1, 1947. He then returned to his native Mississippi, as he told me in the last conversation I had with him, to enjoy the remaining days of his life in the hills of his native State which he loved with a devotion beyond expression.

Mr. Speaker, Webber Wilson was a man among men. He was a leader and a man of courage and deep convictions. He was a man's man. And, yet, with it all, his disposition was gentle and he always was considerate of the rights of his fellow man. The State and the Na-

tion has truly lost a valuable and honored son.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have seldom received a more profound shock than I did when the news came of the passing of Webber Wilson, one of the best friends I ever had.

I have often said that the two most eloquent men with whom I ever served in this House were the Honorable James M. Beck, of Pennsylvania, and the Honorable T. Webber Wilson, of Mississippi.

He died at a time when he would have been of most value to his country. He was only 55, right at the zenith of his usefulness. He was a man of courage, integrity, and ability. His passing is a great loss to the Nation, and a most profound loss to the State of Mississippi.

He was a great Mississippian as well as a great American.

His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to know Mr. Wilson personally, but as a Mississippian, I am familiar with the accomplishments of Mr. Wilson during his distinguished career. He was a great statesman and a great man. In these troubled times, Mr. Speaker, this Nation can ill afford to lose the services of a man of his caliber.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, unlike the preceding speaker, I knew Mr. Wilson well. All who knew him loved him for his many fine qualities. He was never so happy as when he was rendering assistance to those less fortunately situated. I happen to know of one particular case involving a veteran of the late war who had gotten into difficulty. Mr. Wilson interested himself in the young man's case. He came up to my office and talked to me about it. He was as much concerned over that young man who, by the way, did not live in his own State, as though he had been his own son. No one but a gentleman of the finest qualities and the noblest instincts could have done more for that young man than did T. Webber Wilson.

I join with his colleagues, and with the great State of Mississippi, in mourning his untimely passing.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any other Members so desiring may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of a great American, a great Mississippian, T. Webber Wilson.

The lives of few men have been more successful or eventful than that of our departed former colleague. As a self-made man his ambitions early in life were fired with an urgent desire to serve his fellow man. In the field of public service he contributed bountifully to the good of his State and country. He was a lawyer of marked ability. For 6 years he served as a faithful and diligent Member of this body. He was a fair-minded Federal judge and a scrupulous member of the Federal Board of Paroles. A few months ago he tendered his resignation as a member of this Board and returned to Mississippi with the hope of recovering in health and of performing many more years of service among the people he loved so well and who so loved, honored, and respected him. But the hand of the unerring One intervened and called this great man to his reward.

Webber Wilson was a convincing public speaker. Frequently he swung sentiment to his side with well-chosen words, a resonant voice, and sound reasoning. As an individual he was one of the most lovable men I have ever known. He was accommodating, kind, courteous, considerate, and possessed a most pleasing personality. I well recall that shortly after I had been first sworn in as a Member of this body he paid me a personal call and made himself and his counsel at my command. To be of service to others wherever and whenever he could was characteristic of him.

We appreciate his Christian life and his great contributions to humanity in private as well as public life. Our departed friend has brought honor to the great State of Mississippi whose people are proud to claim him as their own.

The last chapter has been enrolled on a life and public career which we would do well to emulate.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, T. Webber Wilson was born January 24, 1893, and died at the ancestral home in Tate County, Miss., on January 31, 1948.

His parents were among the most prominent citizens of north Mississippi. After completing high school, he was graduated from the law department of the university and began the practice of law at Laurel, Miss., as soon as he became 21 years of age. Shortly after his admission to the bar he was elected county attorney and after 4 years was elected prosecuting attorney of the judicial district in which he resided. He rose rapidly in his profession and in political preferment. Without opposition he was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress for the term beginning March 4, 1923, and he was reelected to the Sixty-ninth and Seventieth Congresses. He was not a candidate for reelection to the Seventy-first Congress, but was a candidate for United States Senator to succeed Senator Hubert D. Stephens, who defeated him by a very narrow margin.

After his retirement from Congress Representative Wilson was appointed United States District Judge in the Virgin Islands. Service in the islands did not appeal to him. He was appointed a member of the Board of Parole on July 25, 1935, and he served continuously on the Board until September 1, 1947, when he resigned. He was chairman from April 12, 1946, until his retirement.

For about a year prior to his resignation from the Board his health had not been good. He resigned from the Board to return to his plantation home in Tate County and to engage in the practice of law at Senatobia, Miss. His health continued to decline and, while some of his friends knew that he was suffering from an incurable malady, his death was unexpected to his many friends.

Judge Wilson had been in the House of Representatives 2 years when I became a Member. I had known him in Mississippi and my relations with him both during his congressional service and while he was a member of the Parole Board were most cordial. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to his memory. When elected to the House he was one of the most popular men in Mississippi. He had a pleasing personality. He was a handsome man and always attracted attention.

While a college student he became an accomplished speaker. Following his admission to the bar he was always in demand as a speaker. He was familiar with literature and with history. His diction was unique and his delivery always pleasing. Judge Wilson at the bar or in Congress will best be remembered as an eloquent advocate and as an accomplished speaker.

T. Webber Wilson loved people. He was always sympathetic with the unfortunate. He took peculiar pride, as a member of the Board of Parole, in carefully examining all applications for parole. He believed that Federal prisoners should be given another chance and he practiced what he believed.

With ill health he looked forward to relief from the duties of public office and to retirement in the ancestral home and to the practice of law as he might choose in his native county.

Few men have ever served in the House of Representatives who had more devoted admirers than our late lamented colleague, T. Webber Wilson of Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Mississippi in expressing deep regret in the untimely passing of the Honorable T. Webber Wilson, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives from Mississippi.

Judge Wilson was only 55 at the time of his death and only a short time ago retired from public life to return to his native county of Tate, where he had planned to practice law and operate his farm in that area. I shall always treasure my last visit with him during October of last year shortly after his return to Mississippi. He was so very proud to be back home and free of the cares of public office.

Webber Wilson was one of Mississippi's outstanding sons. He was a splendid man in appearance, possessed of an excellent character and pleasing personality. Without question he was one of the greatest orators and public speakers our State has ever produced, and in every way a splendid public servant.

Born and reared at Coldwater, Miss., he lived for many years at Laurel, Miss., from which district he was elected to the Congress of the United States. He had an excellent record here, retiring to run for the United States Senate. After his

distinguished service in Congress, Judge Wilson was appointed Federal judge to the Virgin Islands. As Federal judge, he was able and fair to all and later he became a member of the United States Parole Board, rising to the chairmanship. Here he served many years and built a reputation for his attention to the conscientious discharge of the duties of the office.

Judge Wilson was a member of a very distinguished family of my district. He was a true friend, and in his untimely passing we all have lost a good friend and the State and Nation have lost an outstanding citizen. To his loved ones we express our deepest sympathy.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of Hon. T. Webber Wilson brought great sadness and sorrow to Mississippians and all Americans who knew him.

Judge Wilson, a former Member of this House, served with honor, credit, and dignity in every position of high honor to which he was entrusted. In addition to his service in the United States Congress, he served as Federal Judge of the Virgin Islands and was a member of the United States Parole Board.

Judge Wilson was among the first men I met when I first came to Washington. He offered every assistance and was indeed very helpful to me in many ways.

Few Members of this body ever possessed the unusual personality, outstanding ability, strong character, and high sense of devotion to public service as was true in the case of this distinguished Mississippian.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short report by the Committee on Health Education on book building citizenship.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Hon. Dillard B. Lasseter, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, and an excerpt from the Budget of the United States, 1949.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Bennett, Mo.	Hart	Murray, Wis.
Bloom	Hartley	O'Toole
Boggs, La.	Javits	Poage
Bulwinkle	Jonkman	Powell
Burke	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Cannon	Kee	Short
Chiperfield	Keefe	Smathers
Coudert	Kefauver	Smith, Me.
Cox	Kilburn	Somers
Dawson, Ill.	Lanham	Spence
Dirksen	Lichtenwalter	Stockman
Domengeaux	Meade, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Fernandez	Monroney	Trimble
Hand	Morgan	West
Harless, Ariz.	Morrison	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 384 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SESSIONS OF THE COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a special committee of the Committee on Armed Services may be permitted to sit during the 2 hours of general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request with reference to a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the American Automobile Association.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Samuel Pettengill, former distinguished Member of the House.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permissio to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include comments on two matters.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Chester Bowles.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a letter from a constituent and a statement which he made before a committee.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on oleomargarine.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by Frank S. Davis.

A YEAR OF GROWTH IN CLEVELAND

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD relative to the happy situation in which Cleveland finds itself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in these days, when there is so much uncertainty and discouragement, it is sometimes wise to look back over accomplishments of the immediate past. We in Greater Cleveland, Ohio, enjoyed a year of growth in 1947. One hundred and twenty-six new manufacturing concerns were established in our community and more than $7,000,000 was spent by 506 of the established concerns for expansion and new equipment. This growth represented an addition of 4,700,000 square feet of manufacturing facilities.

During the year employment continued at a high level with the trend upward and the end of the year found planning on expansion and added employment.

Great Lakes shipping, essentially a Cleveland industry, since Cleveland offices operate 88 percent of the total tonnage, had one of its bigger years. Nearly 78,000,000 tons of iron ore came down the Lakes from the northern ranges; over 58,000,000 tons of coal were shipped, most of it up the Lakes; 418,000,000 bushels, or 11,500,000 tons of grain were moved.

The total net tons shipped on the Great Lakes was over 176,000,000 as compared with 148,000,000 in 1946 and 184,000,000 in the biggest war year—1944.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven also saw Cleveland become the eleventh city to establish television stations when the Cleveland Press started operation of WEWS.

Many developments of importance industry-wise took place in Cleveland during last year. Among them was a new mercury lamp developed by the Nela

Park laboratory of General Electric Co., a lamp which can be used for "black light" in theaters and on streets. The Midland Steel Products Co. installed the largest mechanical press ever built. It can, in one stroke, form a complete side rail for the steel frames for the largest busses, trucks, and trailers now in production. I could cite many more instances, not the least of which is the NACA Flight Propulsion Research Laboratory, where one of its outstanding engineers, Mr. Lewis A. Rodert, received the Nation's highest aviation award, the Robert J. Collier Trophy. The award was based upon the development leading to the use of heat for reducing the hazard of ice formation on planes in flight.

I could not help but take a minute or two to remind you that progress is being made and that my own city of Cleveland is contributing its full share.

BURIAL OF ORVILLE WRIGHT

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend a 1-minute speech at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at 2:30 this afternoon at Dayton, Ohio, will be buried Orville Wright, a man who probably did as much for the comforts and general welfare of the people of the world as any man in American history. He will rank with Edison and other great scientists and inventors. The Wright brothers will be remembered as long as time runs and as long as history is written.

High up in the dome of the United States Capitol building is a frieze, most of which was painted more than 50 years ago. These pictures in the frieze represent a number of the most important epochs in our history. There is a vacant section which should be filled. Since aviation is distinctively an American achievement and since it has played such an important part in the advancement of our country and the world, I feel that in that space should be painted a picture depicting the invention of the airplane and the great progress resulting therefrom.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress I introduced a bill providing for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze to portray the story of aviation by using as the theme, the all important achievements of Wilbur and Orville Wright. That bill passed the House by unanimous consent in 1941 but as the war clouds were then threatening I did not want to incur additional expenditure and did not press it in the Senate. To keep the matter alive, I have reintroduced that bill in each succeeding Congress and House Joint Resolution 37 is now pending in the Eightieth Congress. In due course I shall ask the committee to which it has been referred to give it consideration. I hope that both branches of the Congress will agree that this is an appropriate way to give recognition to these great Americans. In so doing they will also rightfully claim recognition for the United States as having been the country which gave to the world this great method of transportation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech from the Small Business Men's Organization.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two different instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements, excerpts, and tables.

WHAT SHOULD OUR FEDERAL BUDGET BE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1949?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. This is the most important question confronting the American people today. We have just gone through an expensive and horrible war that cost us about $450,000,000,000. Of this total, $180,000,000,000 was collected in taxes, and $27,000,000,000 was borrowed from the people of the United States.

From a government costing $734,000,000 for the fiscal year 1916, we have gone to one estimated to cost approximately $40,000,000,000 in 1949. We never spent as much as $1,000,000,000 in any 1 year, from the year we acquired our liberty in 1776 to the year 1917. We became a billion-dollar government in the fiscal year 1917, which was at the beginning of the First World War. As late at 1939, which was at the peak of the spending for national recovery, we only spent $9,270,000,000. At that time our national income was $5,165,000,000.

We now have a public debt of about $257,000,000,000. It is estimated that the interest on the public debt during the fiscal year 1949 will amount to about $5,200,000,000, which amount equals the total tax receipts of the Federal Government in 1939—just 10 years ago.

What should our Federal budget be for the fiscal year 1949? The President says that the budget should be $39,700,000,000. The Republican leadership of the House Ways and Means Committee says it ought to be about $35,500,000,000. Senator BYRD's Economy Committee of the Senate says the budget should be about $32,000,000,000. The National Association of Manufacturers says it should be approximately $30,979,000,000. Nearly all organizations and individuals have an opinion as to what the Federal budget should be in 1949. The question is presently undergoing very careful consideration by the Congress here in the debate in the House on the tax-reduction bill.

The national debt today is the largest that has ever been carried by any nation in the world's history. If divided among the families of the United States, each family would owe about $7,000; if divided among the individuals of the Nation, each individual would owe approximately $1,900. It is so large that I fear sometimes we are unable to understand just how serious it can become to the national economy.

We have the highest national income in the history of the country. It is estimated that the income for the fiscal year 1949 will be not less than $209,000,000,000; and there are persons who believe that the income may exceed this and possibly reach the staggering figure of $225,000,000,000. I do not know what the income may be, but I do know that we are now enjoying a high degree of prosperity. It is time to cut appropriation bills to the core and, I think, to apply all of the surplus in the Federal Treasury toward retirement of this public debt.

If all of the surplus were to be applied toward retirement of the public debt, of course there would be no reduction in taxes. I am also afraid that Congress will not cut appropriation bills as they should be cut, so long as there are surplus funds in the Treasury of the United States. I have observed through my long years of experience in both the Arkansas State Legislature and in the Congress of the United States that the legislative body has a way of appropriating the available funds. If Congress first enacts all appropriation bills and then permits the surplus, if any, to be applied on the public debt, I fear there would be no surplus to be applied on the debt.

That being true, I think the people of the United States should be given some tax reduction. The bill presently pending in the Congress, in my judgment, cuts taxes too much. However, I am strongly in favor of the passage of the provision with reference to the community-property law. All States should enjoy the same treatment so far as Federal taxes are concerned. However, the bill probably reduces other taxes too much. There are some items in the Federal budget that cannot be reduced very much, such as: national defense, presently estimated to cost about eleven billion twenty-five million; veterans' affairs, about six billion one hundred and two million; interest on the public debt, five billion two hundred and fifty million; tax refund, about one billion nine hundred and ninety million. I believe that the total of these items which cannot be reduced, at least in this session of the Congress, is $24,367,000,000.

The President has submitted a total budget of $39,700,000,000. Consequently, if you take these items that cannot be cut by the Congress from the total budget you have $15,323,000,000 to cover the other expenditures of the Federal Government. These other expenditures necessarily will have to cover such items as international finance, social welfare, health and security, housing, community facilities, education, general research, agriculture, agricultural resources, natural resources not primarily agricultural, transportation and communication, finance, commerce, industry, labor, general government, and other contingencies. These items necessarily should be kept at a minimum.

Our estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1949 are about $45,000,000,000, according to the best estimates obtainable. Consequently, if we make the appropriations as suggested by the President, we will have but $5,300,000,000 surplus in the Treasury. Of course, the President has included such big items as international affairs, or the Marshall plan, in his budget. If we pay any part of the principal on the public debt, it will have to come out of the surplus fund.

I would like to see the entire surplus, I repeat, applied toward the retirement of the public debt. I know that this cannot be done, or will not be done—and I also know that if we make our annual appropriations first, with the idea of paying whatever remains of surplus funds on the public debt, there will be no surplus for this purpose.

I fear that the Knutson bill now pending makes too drastic cuts for us to continue to live within our national income, or without creating future deficits. I understand there may be offered a motion to recommit, with instructions to substitute another bill for the pending Knutson bill. I am not in favor of all of the provisions of the substitute bill. However, since I am in favor of some form of tax reduction, such as the adoption of the community-property provision, an increase in exemptions, and other provisions, it may be that I shall vote for the motion to recommit, realizing that that motion shall be defeated; and then vote for the Knutson bill on final passage, on the theory that what we do in the House will constitute a basis for consideration by the Senate, and that the Senate may—and I hope will—eliminate the objectionable features of the present proposal to reduce taxes, pass a fair and just reduction in taxes so that all of our citizens shall be treated equitably, and submit a possibly passed bill that the President will approve. And I hope that I shall be able to support the Senate amendments when the bill is returned to the House for further consideration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

THE TAX-REDUCTION BILL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4790, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under order of the House entered on Friday last, debate on the pending bill was extended 2 hours for today, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I trust that in the closing hours of this debate all of us may reach a correct conclusion as to what we should do regarding H. R. 4790. It is my own personal view that on the basis of figures that have been submitted to us during the course of the debate by both our Republican and Democratic colleagues, we cannot reach the conclusion, in good conscience, that the receipts of Government during the next fiscal year can be reduced $7,000,000,000 and still make an adequate and substantial payment on the public debt, or even with any degree of certainty remain on a balanced budget.

Had we taken the word of those who sponsored H. R. 1 as it was originally considered on the floor of the House in 1947 as to what the results would have been had that bill become law, we would have ended the fiscal year on June 30, 1947, with a deficit of $570,000,000 instead of a surplus of $753,000,000 as we did without its passage.

Do any of you know as a matter of certainty, based on what you have heard so far, that a similar result will not be reached at the end of the fiscal year 1949 if you pass this bill now before the House? In view of the uncertainties that must exist in your mind in regard to the figures that have been mentioned on the floor of the House, do you not think it is wise, therefore, that we take some other action than that called for by H. R. 4790?

Mr. Chairman, if there is any doubt in the mind of any Member that the fiscal affairs of our Government will not permit a reduction of $7,000,000,000 for the next fiscal year, I do not understand how in good conscience he can support that type of reduction. If there is no concern or doubt in your mind, if you know that we can remain on a balanced budget and pay a substantial amount on the public debt and at the same time support this bill, then you know more than any of us on the committee have been able to determine with any degree of certainty.

What is the alternative? There is an alternative that you can support in all good conscience and with the utmost degree of certainty that its passage will not result in the unbalancing of the budget for the fiscal year 1949, and that there will be a substantial payment made upon the public debt, and also provide needed relief for individuals. That is the motion to recommit which today will be offered, as I understand, by the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. That motion to recommit will provide, as you have been informed through the press and radio, an increase in personal exemptions of $200 per capita, from $500 to $700, at a loss in revenue of $3,250,000,000. It will provide further for the splitting of income on the principle of the community-property States. In other words, the motion to recommit removes the inequity that we have referred to since 1913 as existing in income-tax laws as between community- and non-community-property States.

There is another and third item in the motion and, Mr. Chairman, I feel that because of its inclusion in this motion to recommit there may be some cause for concern on the part of some of the Members of the House. The third item of the motion is the one perhaps on which there now rests some degree of controversy. I feel certain that everyone on the floor of the House who desires any degree of reduction in individual income tax levies can support the first two propositions. It is the third about which there is some concern.

Let us consider it. The excess-profits tax contained in the motion to recommit is not the same excess-profits tax that we had in time of war. It differs in three primary respects. First of all, the normal profit under this motion is increased from 100 percent of prewar normal profit to 135 percent. How does that affect corporations? Even those corporations that figure normal profits on the basis of invested capital would be permitted under this proposition, for the purpose of this tax, to consider 11 percent as normal earnings, 11 percent, Mr. Chairman, on the first $5,000,000 of invested capital. In addition to that, there is an excess-profits tax exemption of $50,000 contained in the motion to recommit. A corporation that was permitted to make $100,000 in time of war as normal profits under this proposition would be permitted to make $185,000 as normal profits and before the excess-profits tax would apply. The rate of tax is different under the motion excess profits, as determined, would be taxed at a rate of 75 percent, not 85 percent. It is not, therefore, the same old excess-profits tax; it is entirely different.

How can we justify repealing it in 1945 and reimposing it now? That is a question that may be bothering you. Congress did repeal the excess-profits tax, the old wartime tax, in the fall of 1945. But do any of you doubt that now the circumstances, the economic conditions, are entirely different than they were in the fall of 1945. Business, Government, all said that by April of 1946 there might be unemployment of six to eight million people. We could not afford to leave in the law anything that we were told by business or Government might serve to defeat production during the year 1946. Just because the results were not those predicted does not minimize the fact that the Congress may have been wise then in repealing the tax. Yes, it gave us some degree of insurance. But we are now under entirely different circumstances. We are under circumstances where corporations during the year 1947 have made greater profits after taxes than in all of their peacetime history and perhaps even in wartime history. You must make up your minds in the spirit of fairness whether some corporations now making these great profits are in a position to better make more substantial payments on the national debt than are some of those in the first and second brackets of our individual income tax. Are they in better position to make this payment?

For all my life I have heard it said, that this great party in opposition to us, the great Republican Party, is the party of big business. We have heard it, and the party is so charged. This is the one opportunity you have had since I have been a Member of this body to remove yourselves from that characteriza-

tion and finally and utterly convince the people during this year 1948 that you are not the party of big business, that you are a party that believes in a sound fiscal policy, that you are a party that believes in splitting and dividing the costs of Government on the basis of ability to pay.

If the corporations have a greater ability to pay than the individuals in the lower brackets, what answer will you give these individuals if you vote against the motion to recommit? That is the big question involved. They must know your bill, H. R. 4790, will not pass, that they will not get relief through it. Can you bring yourselves to the conclusion that we can justify, in equity and fairness, the reimposition of a greater tax on these corporations, 22,000 of them out of a total of 360,000 taxable corporations so that individuals may have a saving in their yearly tax bills? "Yes," is the only answer you ran reach.

Since over-all revenue losses must be held to a minimum if substantial payment on the public debt in fiscal 1949 is to be made and since we do desire relief for individual taxpayers, I know of no other way to obtain both goals than the motion to recommit. This motion should prevail.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, it is said that life is but a succession of disillusionments. Fallacies which we have taken unto our hearts and embraced with fervor, must so often be yielded in the light of immutable truth. Someone is always breaking our dolls; and from iconoclastic rudeness I, too, have suffered at times.

In the days of my high-school debating, I was easily convinced that the income tax was the fairest, the most just, and the most equal of all methods for revenue raising. Years of observation of the impact of income taxes upon the economic structure of the country, of years of experience gained both as a Member of Congress and as a member of the tax levying Committee on Ways and Means, has brought me my disillusionment. Instead of the income tax appearing to me now as the fairest, the most just, and the most equal of all taxes, it is to me the most unfair, the most unjust, and the most unequal tax ever devised by man.

It is my considered opinion that the time has arrived when it should be exposed to the American people for what it really is, an instrument of discrimination, a destroyer of incentive, a penalty upon the talented, a sapper of our national economic strength, a rattler of the chains of communistic slavery in a country that asks nought but the right to remain free.

Great changes have come over the tax structure of the United States, the economic system under which our country has achieved its present greatness, in these last several years. Because of those great changes that have occurred in our system of taxation, changes of the greatest significance, it is now incumbent upon us to reinvestigate the tax structure, to restudy the influence of the income tax upon our economic system, and to arrive at a determination as to whether we can go on with it as we have in the past without endangering the very things which we hold nearest and dearest, among them, the American way of life, that indefinable thing of which the poets sing and bards recite.

A glance at the record discloses that, in 1939, the over-all of the national budget was only $9,000,000,000. By 1948 it had crept up to the stupendous figure of $39,600,000,000, to four and one-half times what it was in 1939, the last peace year.

Reference to these same statistics discloses that, in 1939, we had 4,000,000 taxpayers but, by 1947, the number had grown to 52,000,000—to 13 times as many as we imposed the income tax upon during that year next preceding the commencement of war.

Then we notice, to our astonishment that in 1939 we raised but $1,000,000,000 in individual income taxes but that by 1947 the collections had jumped more than 17 times, to the stupendous figure of $17,600,000,000.

Then, as we scrutinize the entire revenue system, we notice to our still greater amazement that we are now taking over 80 percent of our total national revenues by the income-tax method; and last year we found that that levy only reached 40 percent of the national income, this by reason of exemptions, exclusions, and deductions. In fiscal 1947, $105,000,000,000 of the national income escaped the income tax completely. Have we not too many of our golden eggs in one basket?

These are startling facts, amazing figures. The time has arrived when this Congress should give very, very serious consideration as to what we are going to do about it. We cannot go on much longer as we are. We must make up our minds in respect to where we are going, and chart our course accordingly. Disaster stalks us.

Can we justify a system of income taxation which places 52,000,000 taxpayers on the rolls and expects but 52,000 revenue bureau employees to collect the full amount which is due the Government? Is it not manifestly impossible for 52,000 revenuers to properly police 52,000,000 taxpayers? If it were possible, it would mean that each one of them would have to check a thousand income-tax returns, not only check them with a red pencil but to ascertain from them and by independent investigation whether or not the returns reflect the true tax situation of the individuals who filed them.

In this situation of sheer helplessness in which the Internal Revenue Bureau finds itself is the invitation to fraud which all the power of government is unable to stem.

Let us look into the history of the income tax. Where does it come from? What are its antecedents? Who were its first apologists? How did it come to be fastened upon the country? I have listened to many income-tax speeches but I have never heard anybody devote much time to the history and philosophy of this system under which the American people have grown so restive.

It is interesting to note that income tax was first written upon the statute books in England in 1799, under the Pitt government. It was laid upon the British people because the English were in great need of funds with which to win its war with France, a war in which much was involved and the outcome was most uncertain. The war came to an end in 1802 with the signing of the Treaty of Amiens. In accordance with the demands of the people, its first venture into income taxing was quickly repealed, to the rejoicing of the entire nation. Bonfires were lighted all over England as the people celebrated the elimination of a tax system which they abhorred. Later, under bills introduced in Parliament, all records of taxes collected under this inquisitorial system, so hateful to a free people, were to be burned and destroyed. Every name, every figure, every record having to do with it was to be blotted from the papers of the King's Remembrancer. As a result of this agitation, only a bare statistical outline of the war income tax remained in the musty files of that ancient day.

The Treaty of Amiens failed along in the middle of the next decade and the British and the French were again at war. With the resumption of hostilities, the income tax was reimposed upon the English people to make certain that the fruits of the victory over France would remain England's. This time it remained on the statute books for a few years more, only to be again repealed, in 1816, in response to the insistent demands of an aroused people grown restive under the inquisition which is so inseparably a part of that hated program. And, again, there were bonfires and rejoicing among the people everywhere as the traditional British right of privacy in their books and papers and business transactions was restored unto them by the Parliament that had taken it away.

Then there was a long period in which there was no income tax in England.

It was not until 1846, at a time when the repeal of the corn laws had so reduced the customs revenues of England as to have created a crises in British finance, that the then government of Prime Minister Robert Peel, over the violent objection of the tax-paying public, but in response to the demands of the demagogues of that day, the "soak the richers" and the "spread the wealthers," reimposed a third income-tax law upon the people.

At that time, who were the outstanding advocates of the graduated income tax? During the course of my remarks I will mention some whose names will be familiar to you, but, first let me digress to point cut that this is a very important year in the estimation of a lot of people, far too many for the good of our country. If you do not know it, permit me to remind you that this year is the one hundredth anniversary of the Communist manifesto of Karl Marx.

Karl Marx is the real father, the first real proponent of the income tax as we now know it. In his manifesto he listed the graduated income tax as the second of his 10 most important steps to be taken in the communistic drive to destroy the capitalistic system of free enterprise in

all countries, this as a means to the nationalization of private industry. And as we evaluate the force of his recommendation, let us not forget that it was Marx who said:

The theory of communism may be summed up in one sentence: Abolish all private property.

His partner in communism, Frederich Engels, also a prolific writer of subversive literature in those days, placed the graduated income tax, the progressive income tax, as he referred to it in his Grundsätze des Kommunismus, as point No. 1 in his list of steps to be taken as a means of accomplishing the destruction of private enterprise everywhere.

Why did they advocate it? Why did they so earnestly desire the graduated income tax? What magic is there in it as a means of getting rid of the private enterprise system, the system under the influence of which England, Germany, and the United States have become, each in its turn, the greatest and most powerful nation the world has ever known? The answer should not be difficult to fathom. Capitalism must be constantly fed with new capital and new capital can only come from savings, from the accumulations of the people. The source of new capital must be destroyed. That is why Karl Marx constantly admonished his followers to advocate graduated income taxes in whatever country they might reside.

Both Marx and Engels counseled their disciples not to be concerned over how light the levies might be in the beginning. As they and others pointed out, the graduated income tax is essentially a politicians' tax, so much so that one need not worry about what would happen to it in the future. Just get it on the statute books, they counseled. Place this incomparable money raising potential in the hands of the politicians and bother not as to how they will use it, for as a certainty, every time a budget gets out of balance, every time there is a pet extravagance to finance, the politicians will raise it a point or two, and keep on raising it a point or two at a time, until they break the back of their camel with their last straw.

To Marx and his crew it was as certain as night followed the day that it would not be long before the politicians and their blessed income tax would be taking all of the earnings of the people over and above that which they need for a day-to-day living. When this point is reached, the capacity of the people to save and accumulate capital will have been effectively destroyed and the saving groups, upon whom private enterprise depends for the new capital which is indispensable to its continued existence, will have been liquidated. With this drying up of new capital accomplished, there will be no way for private enterprise to turn save to socialism, or to what is worse, to that collectivism in which England flounders today.

Coming on down into this modern era, we hear the Honorable Cordell Hull, then a Representative from Tennessee, talking about this politician's tax. He said—smacking his lips, no doubt:

With the income tax a permanent part of our fiscal system, Congress can readily prevent a deficit or reduce a surplus in the Treasury without disturbing business by the simple lowering or raising of the income-tax rates.

Scoffing at the predictions of the Honorable Elihu Root, a great Secretary of State in his day, and, in debate, a worthy antagonist of the best of them, that the keeping of income-tax records would, in time, become a burden to the people, and that the rates would be gradually raised until they would become confiscatory, this same Representative Hull, in 1913, reassured the country in these honeyed words:

Every good citizen * * * should be willing to devote a brief time during some day of the year when necessary to the making up a list of his income for taxes (and to contribute) * * * not the Scriptural tithe, but a small percentage of his net profits.

Despite these comforting assurances from our distinguished Secretary of State-to-be, it is interesting to note that, within less than 5 years, this ingenious legislator, then a high-ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported a revenue bill to the House of Representatives in which the normal income-tax rate was fixed at 12 percent and the surtax rate at a top of 65 percent.

What happened to the genial Tennessean's "Scriptural tithe" is too sad a tale to dilate upon at this moment. Nor is there profit to be gained in commenting upon his soothing assurance that but "a brief time during some—1—day of the year" would be "when necessary" sufficient to make out an income-tax return. The harried businessman, all but driven to distraction by his income-tax calculations, will have his own ideas on that.

So let us return to merry old England and weigh carefully the words of her greatest statesmen, Gladstone and Disraeli, often at dagger's points, but on the issue of the income tax as one.

As a means of achieving the socialization of private enterprise in all countries, it was not only Karl Marx and Frederich Engels who saw in the graduated income tax the instrument for which they were searching. Other great minds of the day, and they were indeed great minds, those of Prime Minister Gladstone and Prime Minister Disraeli, saw in the graduated income tax the same evil potential. Each of them—and many others—opposed the income tax for the selfsame reason that Karl Marx and Frederich Engels and their subversive followers favored it.

Mr. Gladstone said in public debate upon the floor of the Parliament:

Of all the taxes on the statute books, the income tax is the one tax through which it is possible that socialism or communism or anything like them can, in the nature of things, find an entrance into our system. It cannot be done by indirect taxation.

The debate rushes on, down through England's eventful history. Gladstone, indeed an authority whom we must respect, again and again cries out against the inequities of the income tax. We hear him declaiming:

I believe it (an income tax) does more than any other tax to demoralize and corrupt the people.

Later he said, when apologizing to his countrymen for not bringing about the repeal of this hated system of taxation:

I think some happier chancelor of the exchequer may achieve this great accomplishment and that some future poet may be able to sing of him: "He took the (income) tax away, and built himself an everlasting name."

Disraeli, whose name will ever live in history as the builder of the British Empire, said:

The odious feature of this tax (the income tax) cannot by any means be removed or modified.

Then, when the income-tax debate shifts to the United States in later years, we hear the prophetic voice of Representative Sereno Elisha Payne, not one of the lesser but one of the greatest chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means, as he rises to his feet in this House one day—in 1909—to thunder his denunciation upon those who would impose this soul-destroying tax upon the American people. Harken to his words:

As to the general policy of an income tax, I am utterly opposed to it. I believe with Gladstone that it tends to make a nation of liars; I believe it is the most easily concealed of any tax that can be laid, the most difficult of enforcement; and the hardest to collect; that it is, in a word, a tax upon the income of the honest men and an exemption, to a greater or lesser extent, of the income of the rascals; so I am opposed to any income tax whatever in time of peace.

At this point I want to pause to make a comment. Until we added two amendments to the Constitution of the United States there was indeed a recognized constitutional right of privacy, in this freedom-loving country of ours. But when we got the sixteenth amendment, the income tax, and the eighteenth amendment, prohibition, that constitutional right to privacy was dealt a staggering blow. That mythical figure, Uncle Sam, had been a beloved member of everyone's family. Until then, he was held in the highest esteem and warmest affection. He led us in all of our parades and celebrations and presided at all of our ceremonials. As a symbol of liberty, he was large in the hearts of the American people. But, when the sixteenth amendment and the eighteenth amendment were written into our Constitution, that beloved figure almost overnight became a symbol of inquisition, of something hateful in our way of life, something to be despised rather than loved—and respect for him visibly waned. To those who revere law and ever plead for order, this was tragedy.

Under the influence of these two amendments, twin instruments of disaster, Uncle Sam's eye went to everybody's key hole. His long nose was soon in everybody's books. He went about sniffing everybody's breath and making himself generally obnoxious. His surveillance was such that everyone was soon under the sense of oppression which results from being watched. With it all, he became an American inquisitor, and with him crafty men matched wits.

Mr. Chairman, we struck one blow for freedom and rid the Constitution of the eighteenth amendment. And the statute books of the Volstead Act.

Mr. Chairman and friends, is the time not here when the American people must rise up once again and strike another blow for freedom, this time against the sixteenth amendment and all of its incentive-destroying intendments?

To further illustrate the un-American character of the sixteenth amendment, I want to read something which I have culled from a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, a paragraph from the decision rendered in the case of *Boyd* v. *United States* (116 U. S., p. 631):

> Any compulsory discovery, by extorting the party's oath or compelling the production of his private books and papers to convict him of a crime or to forfeit his property, is contrary to the principles of a free government. It is abhorrent to the instincts of an Englishman. It is abhorrent to the instincts of an American. It may suit the purposes of a despotic power, but it cannot abide the pure atmosphere of political liberty and personal freedom.

To revert again to Gladstone, let me read these words as I pass from this subject:

> The public feeling of its (the income tax) inequity is a fact most important in itself. The inquisition it entails is a most serious disadvantage. And the frauds to which it leads are an evil which it is not possible to characterize in terms too great.

Karl Marx was for it as a means of achieving a nationalization of industry. He predicted that any nation that adopted the graduated income tax would in time be compelled to turn toward socialism. He was for it for that reason—which he deemed desirable. Just how accurate was he in his predictions? In England has come the very thing for which Marx and Engels struggled and against which Gladstone and Disraeli warned.

The gradual raising of the income-tax rates to the point of confiscation, as Marx advocated and Gladstone predicted, has completely liquidated England's saving groups. The source of new capital, so essential to the preservation of the private-enterprise system, has been effectively destroyed. The people could no longer supply the capital which industry needed; and, because they could not, English industry fell into obsolescence. Their productivity per man-hour fell lower and lower with the passing of time.

Finally the time arrived when English industry could no longer finance its own modernization, could no longer reequip itself with new tools and machines, could no longer avail itself of new inventions or make use of the newest methods. Such was the natural consequence which was the prophecy of Karl Marx. It left England with no way to turn but into the morass of socialism in which it now flounders.

All this is as easily traceable in the statistical records of that country as is the evolutionary development of the world in the rocks of antiquity.

Prior to World War I, the British people were saving from 13 to 15 percent of their national income. As income taxes rose to higher and higher levels under the influence of the doctrines of the Lloyd George government, the saving capacity of the English people fell, by 1919, to but 7 percent of their national income. In 1924 it was down to but 5 percent of the national income. Continuing in its downward course, it hit bottom in 1938, leveling off at 3.84 percent. It was then too late to save England from socialism. Today she is just where Karl Marx said she would be 100 years ago.

Many eminent economists say that the United States is but 10 years behind England in this process. The dark picture which they paint does, indeed, find color of correctness in the statistical records of the Department of Commerce. We note that in 1944 the American people were saving 24.4 percent of their disposable income. In 1945 they were saving but 19.3 percent. In 1946 it fell to 9.3 percent. In 1947 it was down to 6.4 percent.

What do these figures portend? Is the same immutable process at work in America today that, 10 years ago, foretold England's destruction? Is this another deadly parallel?

Let me say to the greater glory of both the Republican and Democratic Parties that neither of these truly American political agencies ever urged the imposition of a graduated income tax upon the American people. It remained for the Communist Party, the Greenback Party, the Union Labor Party, the People's Party, the Farmers' Alliance, the Industrial Union, and the Socialist Party to advocate the adoption in America of the graduated income tax; as the 1912 platform of the Socialist Party recites: to raise funds, the proceeds of which "to be employed in the socialization of industry."

What is the sum total of it all, and what is the warning that I bring to you now? The saving groups in America are liquidated as they were in England a decade ago. The saving groups in the United States are no longer able to supply the capital necessary to the maintenance and the modernization of private industry in America. All the great financial magazines in this country are proclaiming over and over again the utter unavailability of new capital, of which industry is in such desperate need.

According to the economists, we are going to need $105,000,000,000 to modernize American industry, which is now largely in obsolescence, in the next 5 years. That means we must raise $21,000,000,000 every year for 5 years. Private industry can provide two-thirds of that, or $14,000,000,000, by internal savings, but the remaining portion must be supplied from the savings of the people, and the people cannot provide those savings under the confiscatory income-tax levies now the vogue.

In the light of this discouraging trend, no wonder the National City Bank in their report of November 1947 cry out in these words:

> In the present structure, the supply of new savings out of current incomes of individuals is seriously deficient in relationship to the demands of capital. For example, the individual investor has come close to disappearing as the source of new capital for private business. Estimates of the Securities and Exchange Commission indicates that individuals in all of 1946 added nothing net to their holdings of corporate stocks and bonds. The same is true for the first half of 1947. A major cause is income tax levels so high as to force continuous dissaving in the higher income brackets and shut down new supplies of savings further down the line—

And so on for page after page.

So I come to the end of my discussion, not because I have cited anything like the full amount of authority I have in my folder here, but because I know that I am intruding upon the time of others who themselves have a right to express their views upon this great question.

I am for the Knutson bill earnestly and sincerely, not because I consider it complete in its levies, or because I think it is a perfect bit of legislation, but because it points in the right direction. It makes levies which will bring our income-tax levies down—true, not far enough, but far enough, indeed, to revive a very necessary saving group which is so essential to the welfare of our country and its future. It is this group which must supply the savings out of which will come the capital which will modernize industry, provide it with the necessary new machinery and tools, making it possible for industry to avail itself of the most modern methods, the only thing which will preserve America as the kind of a country that we all want it to be.

And the workingman must be reminded that in the restoration of this saving group lies his salvation. He must not forget that it takes from $8,000 to $10,000 of newly invested capital to create one new job. If industry is to be deprived of the new capital it needs for its modernization, to reequip its plants with the newest tools and machinery, to avail itself of the newest methods, this deprivation will be reflected in obsolescence—and that spells out, in plain English, less production, fewer jobs, and lower wages, all to be reflected in a lower standard of living for everyone.

May God forbid it!

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, the individual income taxpayers of the Nation are still paying the same high percentage of taxes that they were paying during the war years. This is unjust, especially when we have the history of the past to guide our actions. After the First World War ended, the taxes were lowered immediately. The result was that business and the national income expanded, and it was possible to reduce the national debt. Taxes were lowered further and further, with the same favorable result, so that within a period of 10 years the income-tax burden upon the people was insignificant, and in the same period of time the national debt was reduced almost 40 percent.

It clearly appears that the present bureaucratic administration feels that it is dangerous to allow money to remain in the hands of the people. The guiding geniuses at the helm know how to spend the money better than those who work so long and hard to earn their weekly wages. But what have these geniuses been doing with the vast sums which have been collected each year? They

are continuing to retain on the pay rolls of the Government many persons who might better be out in the industrial world helping to increase production which is so greatly needed. At the same time, the necessary Federal employees cannot be paid the wage to which they are entitled, and which they desperately need to meet the advancing living costs. The administrative leaders are continuing to maintain bureaus, departments, and commissions which could well be discontinued now that the war is ended. In the effort to maintain such a status quo, they have conjured emergencies here and abroad, and have as a result thereof, entered into competition with private business in order that many commodities might be exported to foreign countries. This has caused shortages, and our prices have increased. Then they have asked the people to desist from consuming certain food products such as poultry and eggs and then, in fear that the prices might drop on those items, they have gone into the open market to compete for them in order to maintain the price thereof. Does that make sense?

The same persons who are opposing H. R. 4790, the Republican sponsored income-tax reduction bill, and predicting dire consequences if the same should be passed, are hardly in position to act as prophets of the future, if we are to judge from the past. They, and this includes the Secretary of the Treasury, estimated a budget for 1947 which was $11,700,000,000 under the final figure. In other words, they missed by approximately 37 percent. And at the end of the war they stated that within 6 months there would be 8,000,000 persons unemployed, and they took definite inflationary action to offset such possibility. They were 80 percent wrong in their estimate. Therefore, how are we to judge their present prognostications?

They well know that the President's proposal, which has been introduced as H. R. 4968, would be very costly to both the people and the Government. While it would give a $40 credit which would have the effect of causing approximately 10,000,000 persons to pay no tax, such persons would have to file returns, and deductions would have to be made from their weekly pay, both of which operations would be very expensive to business and to the Government, although it would thereby continue many persons in tax administrative work for the Government who could otherwise be in private industry. While H. R. 4790 would cause approximately 7,000,000 persons to have no tax to pay, they would be completely removed from the tax rolls, and there would be no expense incident thereto.

The President's proposal will undoubtedly be ignored by the Members of his party in Congress, as it should be, but from remarks which have been made it is apparent that an effort will continue to be made to seemingly give tax relief to the most numerous of the taxpayers, who are in the lower tax brackets, but retaining practically the same amount of revenue by increasing the taxes of certain corporations. They well know that those corporations have the power to pass such tax on to the consumer by increased prices all along the line of distribution, so that, in the final analysis, the millions who were supposed to be removed from the tax rolls, as well as 19,000,000 others who have not been receiving enough wages to pay taxes, and also every person who continues to pay taxes, will have to respond by payment of high prices which in turn will constitute a further argument in support of the administration's effort to secure price control.

The people of this Nation want relief. If the money is returned to the States, then the people can use it for living costs, education, municipal improvements, charity, to purchase housing which is greatly needed, and also for a few luxuries which they crave. They know how to spend the money as well as the Federal Government and will waste much less. They should have the opportunity for a change.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the Eightieth Congress should not delay tax reduction. The American people are looking to this Congress for tax relief. It is the constitutional duty of the Congress to enact tax legislation. The Members of Congress are familiar with the history of the present Knutson tax bill, H. R. 4790. I supported this bill before the first session of the Eightieth Congress, when it was first introduced as H. R. 1. I thought it was a good bill then, and I am now more convinced than ever that it is sound and constructive tax legislation. The present Knutson tax bill was not thought up overnight. It represents the study of thousands of man-hours of careful research by the finest tax experts available. The bill before us is based upon lengthy hearings and testimony from many able witnesses. The Ways and Means Committee has reported a good bill.

Tax rates are so high they have arrived at the point of diminishing returns. Taxes should not continue to be the highest in our history. Under a proper tax reduction new business and new taxpayers would come into existence. The present high level of taxation has considerable influence upon the present high cost of living. It is alarming to realize that it costs the average American more money to pay his taxes than it does to eat. The present high rate of taxes has crippled business and has eaten into the buying power of the Nation, and is in many cases depriving those in need of food and clothing. Under the present rate of taxation the big item in the cost of living in these times of inflation is not the expense of food, shelter, and clothing, but the amount of the American dollar which the Government takes in the form of taxes. The steadily increasing prices of essential commodities since the war is greatly aided by both direct and indirect taxes. When the average American spends money for clothing, food, shelter, and luxuries there is a choice, and the decision in many cases is an individual matter. However, the estimated 31 cents taken out of every dollar for your taxes, together with a multitude of hidden taxes, is a burden over which the average citizen has no voice. The only legislative body that can give actual relief is the Congress.

It is estimated that the present tax bill will give back to the American people, or leave with them, $6,500,000,000, That amount of money placed into the channels of trade and business development will greatly strengthen the purchasing power of America and will stimulate business.

The American people have historically opposed unjust and suppressive taxation. Our forefathers fought to unshackle themselves from taxation without representation. The American Colonies fought against unjust taxation by the British Government. It has been truthfully said that the power to tax may be the power to destroy. The taxing power can be, and is now being, used as a weapon to deprive millions of people of that which belongs to them.

We are passing through a period of readjustment similar to the aftermath of the First World War. As far back as 1918 many people opposed tax reduction. The Congress after the First World War wisely lowered taxes, both personal income and corporate taxes. History shows that this action was in the interest of our national economy. Many people today advocate that there should be no tax reduction, but that any surplus which may accumulate should be applied to the payment of the national debt. Debt reduction is essential, but we cannot justify burdening our citizens throughout this land with a heavy wartime tax. We now have oppressive wartime taxation in this country. America should take the lead in convincing the world that our Republic is founded and maintained upon the principle that all of our citizens shall receive just treatment at the hands of the Federal Government. Canada, to the north of us, since the recent World War has given its people three substantial tax reductions. England has given heavy tax reduction to its people since the close of World War II, and has taken from its personal income-tax rolls millions of its people by raising the personal exemptions. The British Government has received large amounts of money from our Treasury through gifts and loans since the war closed. Yet, they have given tax reduction to their people. It is difficult to sustain a position of opposition to tax relief, and at the same time offer to vote billions of dollars to foreign countries for the relief and rehabilitation of nations all over the world.

The British loan, which amounts to a gift of some $3,750,000,000, is difficult to explain in the light of the heavy tax reduction by the British Government for the people of Britain. The continuation of voting billions of Federal dollars for foreign aid by this country will weaken the spirit and desire for self-help on the part of foreign countries. Our economic stability and the safety of our productive power will depend upon the protection of our standard of living by encouraging individuals as well as business by fair tax reduction. It is now time that we give more attention to our own people. In the hour of desperate trouble, and when this Republic is in danger, we must rely upon the resources, the tax dollars, and

the energy of the people of the United States to defend our Nation. We cannot look to other people throughout the world to help us. History proves that we must pay the bill, and that we must likewise contribute not only materials but men on the fields of battle. The best guaranty to national security is a strong nation of united people, who are 100 percent in support of their Government, because they think it is fair, just, and honest with them, and willing to cut unnecessary expenses, reduce taxes, and maintain its financial solvency. The hue and cry is now going up all over America that we must be mindful of our own people, and stop the present trend of tax, spend, and tax for millions of people all over the world at the expense of Americans, who are being bled white by excessive taxation.

Reduction in taxes is essential to improve the American standard of living. Millions of workers throughout this land are paying such high rates of taxes that their fixed salary and wages under the high cost of living makes it difficult for them to pay their bills. The tax relief in this H. R. 4790 will amount to the equivalent of a wage increase throughout this country, and will thereby increase the purchasing power of our people. The reduction in taxes will boost the pay envelope of millions of people in this country, but at the same time the unit cost of production in industry will not be increased. Tax reduction will, therefore, help solve the problem of inflation and at the same time will not require the producers to add the added cost to the price of commodities sold on the market. For the average family, and especially the poorly paid worker with a large family of little ones to support, this necessary tax reduction will increase the purchasing power.

The farmer who is struggling to make both ends meet is in need of tax reduction, and the present bill will aid him. Many of our farmers are feeling the heavy hand of Federal taxation. It is a wise policy on the part of this great Congresss to lift the oppressive yoke of taxation from that great group of farmers, in order that they might continue to produce and defend the liberty and freedom of this country as they have in the past. The people of this country are today seeking freedom from the shackles of taxation, and waste of public funds, with as much zeal as they used in the fight of other great battles in the history of this glorious Republic.

Under the present high cost of living the present bill will give relief to more than 6,000,000 taxpayers, who will be taken from the tax rolls when the personal and dependency exemptions are increased from $500 per capita to $600 per capita. Tax reductions ranging from 30 percent to 10 percent, according to the size of the income, will be provided for all taxpayers. It is estimated that approximately 25,000,000 taxpayers will receive a 30-percent reduction under the provisions of this bill. Persons with net incomes of $1,000 or less after exemptions receive a 30-percent reduction; persons with net incomes of $1,000 to $1,400 after exemptions receive a reduction of 30 to 20 percent; persons with net incomes of from $1,400 to $4,000 after exemptions receive a reduction of 20 percent; and persons with net incomes in excess of $4,000 after exemptions receive a reduction of 20 percent on the tax imposed on their first $4,000 net income after exemptions, and 10 percent on the tax imposed on any remaining net income after exemptions.

Under the provisions of H. R. 4790, the inequality of the tax burden in common-law and community-property States is corrected so as to permit husbands and wives to split their income for tax return purposes. Under this theory the husband and wife may receive considerable tax relief because they may not be subject to the high percentage increase of the income tax paid under the progressive plan of taxation. As I understand it the husband or wife under the existing law in common-law States may be subject to the high-bracket income-tax percentage where the income for the whole family is earned by either the husband or wife, but the present bill under consideration corrects that situation, and permits the husband and wife to file two separate income-tax returns, and thereby places each one of them in a lower tax-income bracket, which gives considerable tax relief. The bill, therefore, corrects the Federal income-tax differences existing between common-law and community-property tax law States.

When we talk about tax reduction, it is well to take into consideration that great group of Americans who have attained the age of 65 or over, many of whom are unable to engage in active earning pursuits. Under the provisions of this bill an additional exemption of $600 is granted if the taxpayer is 65 or over by the end of the year. It is estimated that this provision will benefit 3,700,000 taxpayers, and will remove 1,400,000 persons from the tax rolls. The above provision is a very worthy provision, because persons in this age group are handicapped in economic opportunity, as well as in physical strength. This group of individuals for the most part are not acceptable for full-time jobs at prevailing wages, and therefore, are in need of this extra exemption and consideration in view of the present high cost of living. It is commendable that the committee has reported a bill providing a special exemption of $600 for blind persons. Blind persons who are 65 or over may claim this special exemption in addition to that based on age.

I come from a small town, and throughout the congressional district which I represent, there are many small business enterprises, small shops, retail stores, dairy businesses, tobacco establishments, farming interests, and business establishments of every kind, all of which taken together constitute the economic strength of that congressional district. These people have indicated that they desire tax reduction. It is my opinion that increased production will strengthen our national economy. To accomplish this goal business managers and agricultural producers must be stimulated, and profits after taxes must be of sufficient size to attract investors into risk-taking enterprise. The present high wartime tax rate is one of the chief obstructions to the achievement of a high level of production. The availability of risk capital to meet the needs of business is greatly reduced by the present high wartime taxes.

The bill under consideration will leave an estimated surplus of at least $2,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 which can be applied on debt reduction. Therefore, the Knutson tax bill will help solve the high cost of living, increase the production in industry, equalize the inequality of the tax burdens in common-law and community-property States, give relief to millions of low-income taxpayers by removing them from the tax pay rolls, increase the amount of take-home pay for millions of people, will give millions of veterans who have worn the uniform with honor and returned to their homes the extra necessary amount of money to pay for a home, rather than pay money into the Government under the high rate of taxes, give relief and hope to deserving old people who have reached the age of 65; will place venture capital into circulation, and will aid agriculture by placing more purchasing power in the hands of millions of Americans in the white-collar group, middle classes, and men and women in all walks of life.

When the Eightieth Congress enacts the present tax bill into law, we will have kept faith with the American people, and will have given a ray of hope to a tax-ridden and sorely burdened American people. For the reasons heretofore stated, I am pleased to have the privilege to vote for tax reduction.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, as the newest member of the Committee on Ways and Means I have not had the benefit of previous studies and experience with tax legislation enjoyed by other members of the committee but during that limited period of service I have endeavored to be diligent in study and research, and I enthusiastically support the Knutson bill, H. R. 4790.

The passage of this bill today will be hailed with great rejoicing. The people are confidently looking to this Congress to grant them relief from the excessive burden of individual income taxes.

It is a fair bill. It affords the greatest measure of relief, something well in excess of 72 percent to those with incomes less than $5,000. At the same time it reduces the rate in the middle and higher brackets and will thereby have the effect of giving some encouragement to those taxpayers from whose earnings our industrial economy so largely relies for venture capital.

Nothing will contribute so much to bringing prices down to a lower level as production and more production. We must have risk capital to insure the expansion of business enterprises and the promotion of new ones. Business expansion means more and better jobs for more people and more goods to satisfy the wants of ready buyers. We have

been stifling venture capital by keeping income taxes high, thus impeding production and continuing the inflationary spiral.

Even some of the soundest of American business enterprises are having difficulty today in financing needed expansion through the sale of stock. More money is continually needed to build and equip new plants, expand and modernize existing ones, and replace obsolete, outmoded, and worn-out equipment. Without fresh venture capital business expansion suffers, without business expansion production suffers, and without more and fuller production of wanted goods we continue to postpone the day when supply and demand will again be brought into balance, and prices, through the normal and natural working of economic laws, brought down to a reasonable level.

I have had many letters urging a uniform rule embodying the advantage heretofore enjoyed by taxpayers in the community-property States. Thus I know that the provision in H. R. 4790 permitting married couples to split their income for tax purposes will meet with great favor. In addition to being highly desirable because it has an equalizing effect by removing an unfair discrimination which has been a source of justifiable complaint in the common-law States, I regard this feature as definitely anti-inflationary. By allowing uniform treatment for husbands and wives, no matter in what State they live and permitting them to split their income for income-tax purposes, there will be such a substantial cut in the middle and upper brackets that a large amount of savings in the hands of the taxpayers affected should become available for investment. So we are encouraging saving rather than spending, and that is certainly a salutary policy in a period of high prices.

It is estimated that the number of married persons in the United States who will receive additional benefits by the provision for split incomes under the Knutson bill will be approximately 12,000,000.

It is understood that a recommittal bill will be suggested as a substitute for the Knutson bill, containing a proposal to reenact the excess-profits tax. Whatever other unwise features it may contain, that one alone is enough to condemn the substitute and make it entirely unacceptable.

The reason alleged for increasing corporate taxes must be to produce additional revenue to offset that which will be lost in granting tax cuts to individuals. If the argument is that individual taxpayers, including in particular those in the lower income group, are going to get the benefit of a tax cut and not suffer a corresponding detriment through an increased tax on corporations, it ought not to be difficult to show that the argument is fallacious.

It seems to me absurd to believe that bringing back the excess-profits tax will not work to the disadvantage of those who most need relief from taxes and high living costs. An increase in corporate taxes is certain to be reflected in the price to the consumer of goods produced. What is the use of giving the taxpayer a cut in his income tax and at the same time threaten to take the saving away from him in higher prices for the things he will buy? Contrast with this the incentive features of the Knutson bill which should bring about lower prices while granting a tax cut which will be really effective and beneficial as money saved.

And let us not make the mistake of thinking that none of the great rank and file of taxpayers in the lower brackets would be adversely affected if bringing back the excess-profits tax should result in the cutting of dividends. The holding of stock in corporations is by no means limited to the ranks of the wealthy. Stockholders, the real owners of the corporations, are found widely represented in every community in the country, and in many cases are those for whom the cost of living is a very real problem, and in countless cases where such holding constitutes all or a major part of the income.

I hope we will pass the Knutson bill by a vote so overwhelming that the people may know the House is determined to give them the relief they are enttiled to by taking from their shoulders a portion of the tax burden which they have been bearing too long.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES].

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, we are well into the third year since the close of hostilities in World War II. Excessive income taxes are still overburdening our people and smothering our economy. Tax reductions are long overdue for the people of the United States, and I shall support H. R. 4790 because it makes a start in that direction. This country is actually lagging behind other nations in the matter of postwar tax reductions. Australia has reduced income taxes; England—to whom we are asked to give more than $5,000,000,000 in relief under the Marshall plan—has reduced personal income taxes twice; Canada, which sent more aid per capita abroad during the war than we did, is about to reduce income taxes again for the fourth time in 4 years—last year she reduced taxes an average of 29 percent in all income brackets; even the Benelux countries, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg—to which we are asked to give more than three and one-half billions in aid under the Marshall plan—have reduced taxes and are prospering. The able members of the Ways and Means Committee have established beyond question the availability of surplus funds sufficient to permit the reductions proposed by this bill and provide funds for debt reduction as well. The American taxpayer is entitled to relief and will get it this year upon the final passage of this bill.

It is gratifying to see support for this bill coming from the Democratic side as well as the Republican side of the aisle. It is a little surprising to see where the opposition to tax reduction comes from.

Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed carefully the 2 days of debate we have already had on this bill. The principal argument made against it is that it provides a measure of tax reduction for middle and upper bracket incomes. It has been pointed out repeatedly that by far the greater part of the tax reduction in these brackets arises out of the fact that the privilege of reporting income on a divided basis, now enjoyed only by married couples in the 11 community-property States, is extended by this bill to husbands and wives in all States.

Married taxpayers in the 37 non-community-property States may pay as much as 40 percent more Federal income taxes than married couples in the community-property States pay on exactly the same income, as shown by the following table:

Comparison of tax liabilities of married couples (with no dependents) in community-property and in non-community-property States

Combined net income before personal exemption	Total tax on married couples		Amount and percent greater tax paid in non-community-property State	
	Non-community-property State (only 1 spouse has income)	Community-property State (income divided equally between spouses)	Amount	Percent
$4,000	$589.00	$570.00	$19.00	3.33
$5,000	798.00	760.00	38.00	5.00
$6,000	1,045.00	969.00	76.00	7.84
$7,000	1,292.00	1,178.00	114.00	9.68
$8,000	1,577.00	1,387.00	190.00	13.70
$9,000	1,862.00	1,596.00	266.00	16.67
$10,000	2,185.00	1,843.00	342.00	18.56
$15,000	4,047.00	3,154.00	893.00	28.31
$25,000	9,082.00	6,460.00	2,622.00	40.59
$50,000	24,795.00	18,724.50	6,070.50	32.42
$100,000	63,127.50	50,274.00	12,853.00	25.57

Who is it who objects so loudly to eliminating this obvious and unfair discrimination against taxpayers in the non-community-property States? Who is it who denounces us for giving married taxpayers in the non-community-property States the same benefits now enjoyed only by taxpayers in the community-property States? Why, Mr. Chairman, eight of the Democratic Members of this House who attacked this tax-reduction bill last Thursday and Friday represent districts in community-property States. Three of them represent districts in States which adopted the community-property system for the express and declared purpose of giving their middle- and upper-bracket taxpayers the very same equalizing reductions which we are giving married taxpayers in all States under the provisions of this bill. It seems to me that their opposition comes with exceedingly bad grace.

The thing that prompted me to request this time was the discovery of an amazing statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] on this floor during the debate last Thursday afternoon. He said, according to the RECORD, that the present bill—

> Contains two important items of Democratic origin, increasing exemptions and income splitting between husband and wife, which we proposed in the consideration of H. R. 1 and H. R. 3950.

Mr. Chairman, I will not let that statement go unchallenged. During all the years the New Deal Democrats controlled the Congress and increased surtaxes to unprecedented and confiscatory levels, they permitted this vicious and

inequitable discrimination to develop. They did absolutely nothing to correct it, except to make an ineffectual attempt to deny married persons in community-property States the privilege of making separate returns. The idea of permitting all married couples to make tax returns on the divided-income basis never occurred to them; if it did, they neither said nor did anything about it. As a matter of fact it was not proposed by anyone, so far as I have been able to learn, until a tax legislative counsel for the Treasury Department mentioned it late last year as a possibility, but obviously without the sanction of the Department.

Simply to keep the record straight, and to refute the claim made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that he and other Democratic Members of the Ways and Means Committee originated legislation on the subject, I desire to relate the facts.

The first bill introduced either in the House or in the other body to authorize "income splitting" by all married taxpayers was H. R. 1759, which I introduced on February 6, 1947, and discussed under a special order a few days later. That bill set out the principle and formula which have been incorporated into this bill. Ten days after H. R. 1759 was introduced in the House, its entire title and text were borrowed and an identical measure was introduced in the other body. Since that time various other identical or substantially identical measures have been introduced in the other body, including the amendments to the two tax bills which were considered last year.

On March 14, before H. R. 1 was considered in committee, I filed a memorandum with each member of the Ways and Means Committee, including the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], attaching a copy of H. R. 1759 and urging that committee to incorporate its provisions in H. R. 1.

The Treasury Department filed a report on H. R. 1759 with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee on April 24, 1947, expressing "sympathy with the desire to equalize the impact of the income tax on family income." But it listed universal income splitting as only one possible approach, and in effect suggested that the whole question be deferred.

On April 28, 1947, almost 3 months after my bill was introduced, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the ranking minority Member of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced a bill (H. R. 3228) on the same subject. He gave out a press release on it. It was not merely a similar bill. It was an identical bill. I defy anyone to find a word of difference between the text of his bill and the text of the bill which I had introduced nearly 3 months earlier. It is an exact copy.

During hearings conducted by the Ways and Means Committee, on June 19, 1947, I filed a further statement with the committee reiterating my conviction that there should be reported out and passed a single bill which would combine a graduated percentage reduction in income taxes for the lower-income brackets with the "income splitting" privilege for middle- and upper-income brackets. I incorporate the text of that statement in these remarks, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ALBERT L. REEVES, JR., OF MISSOURI, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1947

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the purpose of my appearance before the Ways and Means Committee today is to urge the enactment of appropriate legislation to correct the discriminatory application of the Federal income-tax laws against citizens of the 36 remaining non-community-property States.

That such discrimination exists is not seriously questioned by anyone. The Federal Government recognizes the community-property system and permits husband and wife in the community-property States, of which there are now 12, to divide their income, each reporting and paying the income tax upon one-half of the community income. In this period of extremely high surtaxes the result is that incomes in the community-property States pay substantially less in income taxes than identical incomes in the 36 non-community-property States. The inequalities of this situation are recognized by the Treasury Department. Stanley S. Surrey, tax legislative counsel for the Department, who has favored universal application of the split-income principle, is the source of tables which clearly illustrate the tremendous tax advantages enjoyed by taxpayers in the community-property States. The tables are as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of tax liabilities of married couples (with no dependents) in community-property and in non-community-property States*

Net income before exemption	Total tax on married couples		Tax saving in community-property States	Tax saving in community-property States as a percentage of tax liability in non-community-property States
	Non-community-property State (only 1 spouse has income)	Community-property State (income divided equally between spouses)		
				Percent
$5,000	$798	$760	$38	4.8
$10,000	2,185	1,843	342	15.7
$15,000	4,047	3,154	893	22.1
$25,000	9,082	6,460	2,622	28.9
$50,000	24,795	18,725	6,070	24.5
$100,000	63,128	50,274	12,854	20.4

TABLE 2.—*Aggregate tax savings of married couples (with no dependents) in community-property States in the income years 1937 through 1946* [1]

Combined net income before exemption	Aggregate amount of tax savings
$5,000	$320
$10,000	2,864
$25,000	20,633
$50,000	53,144
$100,000	132,187

[1] Tax for non-community-property States is computed on the assumption that only 1 spouse has income, and in community-property States that income and exemption are divided equally between the spouses.

Various State legislatures, the American Bar Association, and many other organizations have urged the Congress to enact legislation to rectify this manifest inequity.

Under the existing situation most of the non-community-property States are experiencing a loss of capital, business, and income to the community-property States. It is common for an individual of means to carry on his business or profession in a non-community-property State, where he earns his income, and to maintain his domicile in a community-property State in order to enjoy a more favorable tax status. In self-defense, several States, such as Oklahoma, have very recently adopted the community-property system, although with considerable reluctance because it creates multiple problems affecting estates, domestic relations, and commercial credit. Congress should not, by failing to take action on the matter, compel other States to take so serious a step. Many are contemplating it as a last resort, if the Federal laws are not changed.

Sentiment in the Congress and throughout the country overwhelmingly favors extension of the right to split incomes for Federal tax purposes to all married taxpayers.

Early in this session of Congress I introduced H. R. 1759, which would accomplish this purpose. Under its provisions a husband and wife could elect to file a joint return of all their income. The tax would be computed upon one-half the aggregate income, and then multiplied by two. The result is exactly the same as though each filed a separate return on one-half the income, but the number of returns would be greatly reduced. The bill provides also necessary adjustments in the standard deduction. It seems to be agreed by many that a simple and effective approach to the problem is provided by this method, and a number of identical or similar bills have been subsequently introduced in both Houses of Congress.

But the change should be included in a tax-reduction bill, not in a tax-revision bill as the committee apparently contemplates. I shall endeavor to show why.

Extension of the privilege of splitting income to all married taxpayers is not actually a matter of revision of existing laws. The tax advantages now enjoyed by citizens of the community-property States does not arise from anything inherent in the Internal Revenue Code. It arises out of a situation altogether extraneous to the Federal tax laws—namely, the existence and characteristics of the community-property system in a limited group of States. In this respect it differs from matters which could be reached only by revision—such as the double taxation of dividends. I do not mean to take a position at this time on the question of double taxation of corporation income, but it is an excellent illustration of the kind of situation which inheres in existing law and is subject to revision, in contrast to the extraneous origin of "split income" practice.

Moreover, extension of the "split-income" privilege would not affect all taxpayers in all States. With relatively minor exceptions, it would affect a geographical segment of the population—that is, taxpayers in the 36 non-community-property States only. In addition—and more important—the amounts involved are larger than ought to be included in a revision bill. As examination of table 1, above, will show that the "split-income" privilege would reduce the tax liability of a $25,000 income by 28.9 percent, or by $2,622. Such a reduction cannot properly be regarded as a "revision"; it is a substantial tax cut.

But there is a vastly more important reason for including the "split-income" privilege in a tax-reduction bill, rather than in a revision bill. It is reported that in consequence of the veto of H. R. 1 it is proposed to offer a new tax-reduction bill, providing percentage cuts, early in the next session, and to follow it with a revision bill which among other things would extend the "split-income" privilege to all married taxpayers. I submit that if a straight tax-reduction bill is passed, it will be impossible thereafter to extend the "split-income" privilege to the non-community-property States.

If a new tax-reduction bill were to provide, as did H. R. 1, a 30-percent reduction

in the lowest brackets and a 20-percent reduction in the medium and higher brackets, extension of the "split income" privilege would be effectively foreclosed by the fact that, taken in conjunction with the tax reduction, it would discriminate in favor of the surtax brackets. For example—referring again to table No. 1—the percentage reduction of 20 percent (assumed), coupled with the percentage tax savings realized from the "split-income" privilege, would give total reductions of more than 30 percent at the $10,000-income level, almost 40 percent on a $15,000 income, and 45 percent on a $25,000 income. At the $50,000 level the total tax reduction would be about 40 percent, and at $100,000 and above only slightly less. The result would be extraordinary tax relief in the middle and higher brackets, far exceeding the moderate reductions provided in the lowest-income brackets. For this reason if the Congress first passes a straight tax cut bill it will find itself unable to authorize universal application of the "split income" privilege with its additional advantages to the surtax brackets only. Thus the inevitable effect of a straight tax reduction would be to perpetuate the existing tax discrimination against the 36 non-community-property States, and to enable the community-property States to continue to exploit their advantage by further siphoning off business and wealth from the non-community-property States.

It is therefore my conviction, and my urgent recommendation to the Ways and Means Committee, that a single bill be prepared which would combine a graduated percentage cut in the lower brackets with the "split income" provision, the latter being of benefit only in the surtax brackets. To illustrate: A substantial percentage cut of 30 percent or perhaps more should be provided in the lowest-income brackets. The "split income" privilege should be made of universal application. "Income splitting" alone would provide a reduction of 20 percent or more in all income brackets above about $12,500. In surtax brackets below $12,500 percentage reductions should be made which, in combination with the "split income" feature, would provide an aggregate cut of 20 percent. At the $10,000 income level, for example, the "split income" privilege would produce a reduction of only 15.7 percent. A total tax reduction of 20 percent could be accomplished by a percentage adjustment in the appropriate surtax bracket. The same formula would result in a uniform 20-percent reduction (if that percentage of reduction is agreed upon) in still lower surtax brackets where the benefits of income splitting are less—as at the $5,000 level, where income splitting reduces the tax liability by only 4.8 percent.

Preparation and passage of such a combination bill is still possible in the present session of Congress, even though the time remaining is short. I feel that, in all justice, we should not leave the people of this country without definite assurance of relief from the terrible burden of taxes they are now carrying. Uncertainty as to whether, and when, income-tax reductions will become effective is creating confusion and exerting a sharply depressing effect on business activity.

Strong equities support the kind of a bill I have proposed. It should be made effective January 1, 1948, which is the effective date of the income-splitting bill I have already introduced. I do not think it would encounter veto. If it did, sentiment for adoption of the income-splitting proposal is sufficiently strong in both Houses of Congress to assure that it would be overridden.

This recommendation is not made lightly, or without encouragement from others in the House. I earnestly urge the committee to give immediate consideration to the introduction at this session of a tax-reduction bill, designed to accomplish the objectives I have outlined, and effective January 1, 1948.

We have an obligation to the American taxpayer to clarify the Federal tax situation and to tell him in advance how he may plan his affairs for next year.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan did not get around to originating the income-splitting measure until he embodied it in the tax bill which he introduced last month and which is not before the House. His State, Michigan, adopted the community-property system last year for the express purpose of reducing Federal income taxes for their well-to-do people. It did not give a nickel's worth of tax relief to the little fellow.

"Of Democratic origin"? The Treasury Department is still opposed to authorizing income splitting by married couples in all States. In his testimony before the committee on January 16 of this year the Secretary of the Treasury said, with reference to this proposal:

> I believe, however, that it would be unwise to make this or any other major structural change in the current situation which would result in a substantial revenue loss. As previously indicated, splitting the incomes of husbands and wives would result in a loss of $803,500,000.

So the Secretary was against it as recently as less than 3 weeks ago. His testimony simply means that the present administration is perfectly satisfied to continue the rankest and most unjust discrimination that exists anywhere in our tax laws. Ever since I introduced H. R. 1759 in the House in February last year, there has been a growing and insistent demand that the Internal Revenue Code be amended to eliminate the discrimination, so that the citizens of my State, Missouri, and other non-community-property States would not be obliged to pay more Federal income taxes than the citizens of 11 community-property States pay on identical income.

No, Mr. Chairman, the bill to equalize the Federal income-tax burden through universal income splitting was not an "item of Democratic origin which we proposed in the consideration of H. R. 1," as the gentleman from Michigan so blandly said on Thursday. He knows better. The origin was H. R. 1759, and it was of Republican origin. It was the rank discrimination against citizens of the non-community-property States which was of Democratic origin 15 years ago, and it has taken a Republican bill to point the way to correct it.

In view of the Nation-wide approval of the measure I suppose I should not be surprised at the efforts which have been made by others to purloin it and claim credit for it.

There is this much to be said for the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from North Carolina and others who have had more than a passing interest in this measure. They know a good thing when they see it. But the record speaks so clearly for itself that there can be no doubt as to where income-splitting legislation originated, and it was unquestionably not on their side of the aisle.

[From the Kansas City Star of April 30, 1947]

EQUALITY ON INCOME PAYMENTS

Important aid to a needed tax reform has been given by Representative DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, former chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. He has introduced a bill to apply the community-property tax principle to all the States. This would enable husbands and wives to make an equal division of income for tax reporting, as now is done in nine of the States, with the consequent benefit of lower income-tax payments.

Early in the present session Representative ALBERT L. REEVES, JR., of Kansas City, introduced such a bill. Mr. DOUGHTON might simply have endorsed this bill instead of submitting one of his own. Mr. REEVES pointed out at the time and since has emphasized that the nine States have an unfair advantage over the others, that additional States are looking to adoption of the community-property system, and that as a matter of justice it should be applied uniformly to all.

A measure of this nature could be incorporated in the pending tax-reduction bill, as Mr. DOUGHTON says and as Mr. REEVES previously had advocated. But this phase of tax relief would not become effective until next year, whereas the broader proposal would apply to the current year, beginning either with July or becoming retroactive to January 1, as Congress may decide.

Families would be saved an estimated $1,000,000,000 a year under the community plan. The States now without it desire the plan for their own protection. But, as Mr. REEVES has explained, the trend to State action should be halted because of numerous legal complications in the varying systems adopted. The most effective means of dealing with the problem is a change in the Federal system. A companion bill to the Reeves measure has been introduced in the Senate. Both should have the attention they deserve in order to end an unjust situation and to establish equality under the law.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I was unaware that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES] would question the veracity of my statements with regard to the split-income provision which is included in the Knutson bill, H. R. 4790. I claim this provision as having originated with the Democrats, as did the demand for liberalizing dependency exemptions. I restate most emphatically that the record supports my position. Long before the gentleman from Missouri gained membership in this body, I have examined witnesses and discussed the question and the desirability of splitting incomes for tax purposes only, in order to equalize the tax burdens whether or not the taxpayer resided in a so-called community-property State.

The Committee on Ways and Means pursued this question over a period of many years. In fact, the Committee on Ways and Means in the early part of my 14 years of service on this committee sought to wipe out this inequality. We decided, by direct action, to eliminate the preferential status of the taxpayer residing in the community-property States, but the House did not sustain our position, and it was then that I advanced the idea that we may well arrive at the same result by splitting the income of husband or wife for tax purposes only

and thus eliminate the tax advantage of the community-property States.

I pursued this question over the years. I discussed it with Secretary Morgenthau and with his successors, Secretary Vinson and Secretary Snyder.

Bringing the matter up to date, it will be recalled that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the ranking member of the minority, had an understanding in committee that this question would be considered, and if my memory serves me correctly, I believe it was agreed that it would be inserted in the present tax bill. Therefore the Knutson bill, H. R. 4790, contains a provision, the formula of which antedates the service of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES] by many years. When the gentleman charges others with having purloined an idea which seemingly he claims as originating with himself he is either in error or seeks to mislead his constituents. Members of this House are not impressed with the claims of originality advanced by the gentleman because it is known that the alternative of the split income was advanced and advocated by those of us who explored the problem involved in the community-property question and who sought to solve it for the benefit of all.

I would not go so far as to claim that the idea of splitting the income to accomplish the purpose is original with me. I would not even say I was the first to advance such an idea. I do, however, claim that I have advanced this argument over a period of years and insisted upon its adoption at the earliest possible date. The gentleman from Missouri, in his enthusiasm, has resorted to some rather unkind and unwarranted references when he charges members with purloining ideas that in his estimation originated in his mind. I am quite certain that members of the Committee on Ways and Means have thought of this and other similar ideas long before the gentleman introduced his bill.

Mr. Chairman, now let me discuss briefly the prospective motion to recommit. I am as anxious as any individual Member of this House to bring the earliest possible cut in taxes and to make it as deep and as widespread as might be justified.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means charged with the responsibility of providing a sufficiency of revenues for the Treasury, I have no choice but to fulfill my obligation to all of the people. I must take into consideration first and above all, the needs of Government and then to assess the burden on the basis of ability to pay. Such relief as might be given from time to time must be brought about by periodic adjustment of rates and schedules.

The minority offers today a motion to recommit the Knutson bill for reasons which are obvious and tenable. The motion for a taxpayer's increase of $200 for each individual dependent, which will strike from the tax rolls approximately 10,300,000 income taxpayers, will, however, effect a saving to all taxpayers from the lowest to the highest bracket. The greatest percentage of benefit in volume, however, will go to the great number of overburdened and needy in the lowermost brackets. This $200 exemption figure will be approximately the same amount as the President's flat $40 cost-of-living credit. The total amount in this reduction approximates a loss to the Treasury of $3,200,000,000. Over 70 percent of the relief will go to taxpayers with incomes below $5,000.

Furthermore, the minority motion to recommit provides relief by way of allowing the splitting of incomes, for tax purposes only, between husband and wife and is intended to equalize the tax burden as between community and noncommunity States. This provision will give great benefit to the taxpayer with an income of above $5,000. To be more specific, the split-income provision will give relief to approximately 97 percent of the taxpayers enjoying a taxable income above $5,000. The loss to the Federal Treasury as a result of the adoption of this amendment would amount to approximately $800,000,000 per annum.

In order to offset as far as possible these losses to the Treasury and thereby help maintain the solvency and credit of the Government, the motion provides for the imposition of a limited excess-profits tax to be levied upon 22,000 corporations out of a total of approximately 360,000 income-tax-paying corporations. This provision is taken from the President's recommendations as included in H. R. 4968, which bears my name. This provision would recapture an amount approximating $3,200,000,000, which would offset a like figure occasioned by the tax cut accruing to the benefit of the small income-taxpayers. The net loss, therefore, to the Treasury would amount approximately to $800,000,000, occasioned by the split-income provision. It may be desirable, although not necessary, to briefly restate facts and figures with which most people are familiar as regards the reimposition of the excess-profits tax.

There can be no question of justification under present conditions. First, it must be borne in mind that the move conforms with the practice of periodic tax adjustments, not only in rates but in sources of income. Today when the corporations of America are enjoying the highest rate of net taxable income in the history of the country and at a rate never before anticipated, the volume of profits which have pyramided to over $17,000,000,000 after payment of Federal taxes which top previous figures by successive increases and only the future will tell how much higher they will go, makes mandatory some method of recouping losses resulting from tax relief given in the low and needy brackets. This excess-profits provision is not so stringent and it cannot compare with the wartime excess-profits tax which applied to a far lower amount of income and which skimmed off greater percentages without allowing the latitude which is provided in this motion to recommit. In fact, I should say that this provision is most generous to the corporations in that it would affect only those with the highest average income. It will affect only about 6 percent of such corporations as might be classed as the favored few. It will exclude all small corporations. It provides a $50,000 exemption for the specific purpose of letting out these small corporations.

Taking the 1936–39 base for the calculation of average earnings, this provision would in addition allow 35 percent more in profits to a corporation than was permitted the same corporation on the same amount during wartime. The amount subject to excess profits after allowing an exemption of $50,000 plus a 35 percent above-wartime-earnings credit would be subject to 75 percent as compared with 85½ percent, which was the wartime excess rate, but in no instance would the gross tax exceed 70 percent as compared with the over-all tax of 80 percent in the wartime act. I cannot too strongly emphasize the fact that this tax would not affect the stockholders or the rate of dividends, it would not jeopardize the financial standing of the corporation, or in any manner reduce allowances for obsolescence, or restrict expansion. This excess-profits levy would be imposed on corporations where the amount of profit is so great that it is being held in reserve in amounts far in excess of what is deemed as prudent and necessary. This move could not be passed on to the consumer because the tax would be imposed on the corporation whose products have already brought an unreasonably high price for their products and further increases would be reflected in excess profits and be subject to further levies of the excess-profits tax.

Then, too, there is a powerful element of constriction upon inflation and the ever-present temptation to increase prices to the consumer for all that the traffic will bear.

The amount of revenue going to the Treasury from this imposition will still leave the corporations after taxes, on the basis of present calculation, approximately $14,000,000,000 per annum which will remain as a record unmatched in either peace or wartime. The tax would apply to profits earned during the year 1948.

While it would have been better not to reduce the Treasury receipts at this time, it seems inevitable. If the income taxpayers in the lower brackets are to benefit from tax reduction, it is only fair and logical that taxpayers in the higher brackets must receive a fair share of consideration.

This motion to recommit will in my estimation not jeopardize the Nation's credit and it is hoped it will leave unimpaired our financial solvency. The bonds in the hands of over 85,000,000 American citizens, in the portfolios of insurance companies, in banks, in trust funds, and in possession of corporations will remain intact. More specifically, they will be redeemed as pledged by the Government at 100 percent of their face value. Because this move will permit the greatest possible reduction of our national debt, it will save the taxpayers approximately $2.50 in interest for each dollar of deferred or suspended debt reduction which may be occasioned by unwarranted and premature tax cuts.

However much I dislike to oppose overall tax reduction at this time, I am in

conscience bound to discharge my duty as I see it and thus to protect the people's interest. In this instance the people's interest and the Treasury of the United States are one and inseparable. You cannot underream or jeopardize one without injuring the other.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, unless this Knutson tax-reduction bill is amended today by a motion to recommit, I find that I must vote against it on final passage. This determination to vote against the bill is not due to political reasons and it is not due to my not wanting tax reduction of a proper kind. I have heard some of my colleagues on the minority side proposing a substitute which is the only amendment we, of the minority, may offer when a motion to recommit is made. As I understand this substitute to be offered by our minority leader, it is much to be preferred over the bill brought in by the committee.

There are several reasons why I cannot vote for the Knutson bill, but I can only list some of them, although I recognize that the committee bill does have some good features. Without going into the merits of the question of how much aid we shall give to rehabilitate war-torn countries or furnish them immediate and long-range relief which I favor, I believe that it will be impossible to extend such relief if this measure, known as the Knutson tax-reduction bill shall pass and become law in its present form. As I see it, a vote in favor of this bill means a vote against extending any further aid to Europe or to other critical areas because we simply will not have the money to give such relief unless we borrow it.

Again, I cannot bring myself to vote in favor of this bill because it means a return to deficit spending, a thing which we hoped we could get away from soon after ending this most expensive of all wars. The total reduction in our next year's revenues under this measure as law would mean that the Government would have to borrow money to carry on its legitimate functions and commitments. When I consider the situation as it was a year ago and the similarity of the present time, I am convinced that no sufficient reduction in expenditures can be made or will be made that we may have a balanced budget under this reduction of revenue, even though absolutely nothing be paid on the great public debt.

Another reason why I cannot bring myself to vote for this Knutson tax bill is that we must have some regard for the Nation's credit. There are more than 80,000,000 bondholders and others who are creditors of this Government. This bill in seeking to give tax relief to a few taxpayers would thereby jeopardize the credit of the Nation and the savings of a much larger number of those who have the bonds and to whom the great debt is owed. No one can convince me that ignoring payments on the public debt in these prosperous times is sound fiscal policy.

Furthermore, I cannot bring myself to vote for this bill in its present form because I do not regard it as a fair and just measure. It furnishes least relief for those who need it most and most relief for those who need it least. We have had plenty of figures to show that fact. It is not at all surprising that the Republican majority should bring in a revenue bill that heavily favors big business and scantily favors the great multitude of our taxpayers. The Democratic policy, which I think is the correct policy, would exactly reverse the results.

If a bill is offered by the minority leader as a substitute for the committee bill when the motion to recommit is made, I shall support the motion to recommit and offer such substitute. What are the provisions proposed to be substituted? One would increase the personal exemption and raise it from $500 to $700. That would give more relief to more low-salaried taxpayers than would the Knutson bill. I have felt even during the war itself that a $500 personal exemption was too low, and I had hoped before this to see that exemption raised, not merely $100 as in the Knutson bill, but raised $200 or more as in the proposed substitute and thereby release from Federal taxation about twice as many low-income taxpayers as the committee bill would release.

On the question of excess profits it is said that we must not touch the excessive profits of our leading corporations, for they must "plow back" these profits into their capital investment in order to make expansions and increase their facilities. As a member of the Colmer committee I voted to help business, but I cannot see this claim and I know of no economist who advocates so large a reserve for capital investment as the present excess profits permit. While recognizing the truth of the statement that corporate enterprise must have suitable reserves for replacements and expansion, I think that this obvious economic fact is being put up as a front in an effort to make the public believe that these phenomenal profits are not only justified but necessary for business growth. It is often said, that a corporation like an individual should lay by something for a rainy day and that is understandable, but as I see this philosophy used at the present time these corporations are preparing for a cyclone instead of the proverbial rainy day, and well they might prepare for a cyclone like the French Bourbons a century and a half ago who said, "After us, the deluge." This committee bill is an exceedingly dangerous bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

KNUTSON BILL, IF ENACTED, WILL CREATE FURTHER INFLATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, shortly after opening his speech today, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] made it clear that the Knutson bill will not permit the reduction of our great war debt; that nearly 80 percent of the tax reduction will go to those in the higher income brackets, namely, the rich and the wealthy; and that it will not balance the budget, and is certain to cause a deficit of over $500,000,000. He expressed the opinion that if the bill is enacted into law it will be bound to create still greater and more dangerous inflation and to avoid that he urges the adoption of the motion which will be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to recommit the bill with instructions to amend it to give relief to about 10,000,000 taxpayers in the lower income brackets. The motion will nearly follow the recommendations of President Truman by actually relieving those in the lower income brackets of paying any income taxes and, as has been pointed out, may exempt nearly 10,000,000 taxpayers.

EFFORT TO CONFUSE AND MISLEAD THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

For the purpose of offsetting these facts and truths given to the House by the gentleman from Arkansas, nearly 30 Republican Members have obtained permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD in an effort to confuse and mislead the American people as to the iniquities of the Knutson bill. I therefore urge all those who wish to have the real facts as to the effect of the provisions of the bill to read the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas and I am confident that if they will do so they will come to the conclusion that the Knutson bill is not only unfair, but dishonest. The proof is there that, instead of giving real tax relief to those in the lower income brackets, the bill is mainly in the interest of the well-to-do classes who are afforded greater tax reductions.

Mr. Chairman, it is the claim of a large majority of the Republican membership that business needs relief from high income taxes in order to expand and improve their plants and factories. My answer to that contention is that the people who will mostly be relieved under the Knutson bill are those having incomes above $10,000 and nearly all of them, by raising the prices of their products, have increased their profits far above the income tax they are now paying.

I fully appreciate that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and many Republicans dislike to hear the truth from me. They have taken exception, and I refer especially to the gentleman from Minnesota, to my designating the rule providing for the consideration of the bill as the most vicious gag rule ever brought to the House and sought to show that I brought in a similar rule on the same kind of bill. The gentleman from Minnesota failed to state that I brought in the rule because of a unanimous agreement on the part of the Democratic and Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means for that rule. However, the rule was not on a tax-reduction bill but on a complicated revenue measure, which you forced as a compromise on the then divided Democratic membership. Furthermore, it was at the time that the Republicans joined hands with big business in a ballyhoo campaign that large unemployment was imminent and, in the hope of scaring American labor, claimed that we would have from eight to ten million people unemployed. The record will show I insisted that, in-

stead of their being eight or ten million people unemployed after the war, the demand for labor would continue and employment would exceed even the 57,000,000 persons then employed and would possibly reach to 60,000,000 persons. The demand of the Republicans then was that if unemployment was to be averted an adjustment of taxes on business was necessary and the bill to which the gentleman from Minnesota referred in his remarks on January 29, 1947, was forced through.

RELIEF FOR THOSE WHO NEED IT MOST

Throughout the debate on this bill by Members on the other side all we have heard were pleas for tax reductions for business in order to expand, for improvements, and for venture capital. In the face of the high profits of business in 1946 and 1947, I still contend that if the Republicans aimed to do the right thing by the people they would have brought in a bill that would be fair and afford relief to those that need it most instead of relief to those that need it the least.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, under the program of the Republican Party it will take over 100 years if we have no more depressions or no more wars to discharge the public debt. I wonder if this is going to interest anybody who is living today? Their children, their grandchildren, and their great-grandchildren, and probably generations beyond that—at least to the extent of the great-grandchildren—will be paying off the public debt, $216,000,000,000 of which now existing was necessary to save the independence of our country and the liberties of our people. Every bill through which this $216,000,000,000 debt was incurred was voted for by every Republican Member of the House as well as every Democratic Member of the House during the war. I wonder how our businessmen are going to view that, especially with the security of business and bonds and the deposits in savings banks involved when they know that the Republican Party instead of supporting sound money and sound stabilized economy is taking a journey that is very dangerous. If we hit a depression, a major depression, it will probably be just unfortunate.

The present bill of the Republican Party is bad for two reasons: First, it gives the greatest tax relief to those who need it the least. It means less than $2 a week reduction in taxes for a $3,000 income to an average American family of four. It means $12.50 a week to the average American family of four with a $10,000 income, and it goes up to $2,036 a week for the millionaire. Secondly, the Republican tax bill is bad because the present bill under current income receipts will probably put the country in the red for possibly the year 1949.

Under the proposal made by the Democratic Party, which gives a $200 per capita additional exemption, it will mean 70 percent of the total tax relief would go to people in the low-income-tax brackets, below $5,000 a year income. The proposal would also relieve over 10,000,000 taxpayers from paying any Federal taxes and take them off the Federal income-tax rolls; that in contrast with 300,000 taxpayers under the Republican proposal. On the other hand, the community-property proposal which will be invoked will give the greatest amount of tax benefits to those with a net income of $5,000 or more. To a person with a net income of $100,000 that will mean over $12,000 a year reduction. Ninety-seven and five-tenths percent of the total benefits of that proposal will go to persons who have a net income of over $5,000 a year.

The proposal of the Democratic Party of a $200 exemption will give greater benefit to those in the smaller income brackets. The community property proposal will give a benefit of 97½ percent to those receiving $5,000 a year or more, as I just stated.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third bill that has come from the Republican side. The first bill was a 20-percent across-the-board reduction. What a hypocritical tax bill that was. Then the second bill gave a little bit more relief to those in the lower income group, but was still inequitable. This bill disregards a cardinal rule of taxation that where reductions are made the smaller income group should receive the larger amount.

Last year our Republican friends made permanent certain excise taxes when President Truman had recommended extension for 1 year.

The Republican tax bill is based upon inequality while the Democratic measure is equitable and just.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is quite important to remember before we come to a vote that this bill presented by the Republican side of the House is a tax-reduction bill. It is an honest bill. It does not attempt to kid everybody into promising them a tax reduction, on the one hand, and then in the very same proposal levying a new tax.

The American people have gone through the trials and tribulations of war, of high taxes, and all the troubles we have had during the past 15 years, and they are now justified in expecting that the Members of Congress will deal honestly with them. That is what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is trying to do in the form of this bill. On the contrary, the motion to recommit, we are told, will come from the Democratic side of the House and contains a provision which would pay every taxpayer for himself and his dependents some $40, if he owed that much in taxes. It would then levy a new tax which would take away from the taxpayers the very money that was given them. Our fellow citizen is not going to be kidded in that way. He knows that the motion to recommit is not a tax-reduction bill. If the newspaper information we get is correct, in an effort to sweeten up this proposal so that the people with more money—those who have over $5,000-a-year income and pay an income tax—may get a benefit, it is proposed to give them the community-property provision to equalize the tax burden, whether they live in a community-property State or in a non-community-property State. Those provisions are in the bill now before us offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]—the Republican bill.

Mr. Chairman, think what we would do by giving $40 to the low-income group and also to the wealthy; then, by levying a tax on manufacturers, which will be passed on directly to every consumer in this country, you will take the tax refund directly back from the very same people. But the people who will benefit under the community-property provision are those who will get the large tax reduction measured in dollars. They will not have to pay back that which they get under your bill. No, indeed. You are taking it off the little man, for your small taxpayers, numbering fifty-odd million, far outnumber the six or seven million who will benefit under the community-property provision. Oh, it is not a fair proposal to sell to the American people, and I personally think that what I said the other day is true. You would have done far better to recognize that the Republican proposal is honest. It recognizes a progressive method of tax reduction. It carries out the policy that both parties in this Congress in the Committee on Ways and Means have endeavored to make the basis of our income-tax laws for many, many years. So, to see some leaders of your party—which does not include the former chairman of our great committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]—expect that group to persude the public that this is an honest proposal, is more than I think they will accomplish. The American people want and they deserve tax reduction today. They want fair treatment, and, under the Republican bill, they will get it. Under the Democratic proposal, they will not give fair treatment to the low-income group—and I repeat this with emphasis. The whole income-tax-paying group, promised a reduction, are given a new tax. Certainly the great Democratic Party does not want that to stand as a policy when they promised tax reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Massachusetts was in error when he said that H. R. 1 provided for a 20-percent cut across the board. I have a copy of H. R. 1 here, if he wishes to look at it. He will find that the cuts were 30 percent, 20 percent, 10 percent, and 5 percent. If the gentleman wishes to inform himself, I will be glad to have him take this copy. There is nothing to be gained by making misstatements.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was not the original proposal 20 percent across the board?

Mr. KNUTSON. It was not. We were speaking of H. R. 1.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was not the original proposal the gentleman introduced 20 percent across the board?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. H. R. 1 is the original bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was there not one introduced before that?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. How could there be, unless you called it H. R. zero?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; but the gentleman advocated 20 percent across the board.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, we may say a lot of things that do not eventuate. It just does not add up. It does not add to either the knowledge of the House or to orderly parliamentary procedure to make misstatements that cannot stand up.

I listened to the remarks made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], a valuable member of our committee, and for whom also I have very high regard. He went to some pains to explain to the House that the excess-profits tax, which it is proposed to impose or reimpose in the motion to recommit, is a different excess-profits tax from the one we repealed in 1945 at the request of the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury. The difference, my friends, is between tweedledee and tweedledum. A rose would smell just as sweet by another name. As a matter of cold fact, the motion to recommit will call for the reimposition of the excess-profits tax.

Let us see what some of your great leaders said about the excess-profits tax when the matter of repealing the tax was before Congress in 1945. Secretary Vinson, who was then Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before the Senate committee and made this statement. I wish you would listen. I recommend this particularly to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. Mr. Vinson then said, in advocating the repeal of the tax:

> The over-all impact which this tax is likely to have on business planning as well as business profits constitutes a serious threat to our postwar employment objectives. The testimony of businessmen is that they are unable to take the risk of full peacetime business expansion until this tax has been removed. That testimony comes not only from corporations subject to the excess-profits tax; indeed, it comes primarily from businessmen contemplating organization and expansion in competition with established corporations.

That is what Secretary Vinson said.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the distinguished gentleman will recall that the bill in 1945 as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as passed by the House did not repeal the excess-profits tax. It reduced it but did not repeal it. That was put on in the Senate.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true. In doing so the Senate at least on that occasion, displayed superior wisdom.

Now we are asked to go back to the good old excess-profits tax. Before we repealed the excess-profit tax the administration sent up a bill asking for $300,000,000 to tide over the 8,000,000 unemployed that they said would be unemployed while we were converting from war to peace. We repealed the tax, there was no unemployment, and there was no need for the $300,000,000, so we did not appropriate it. As a matter of fact, we did not even authorize it. So I would say that Secretary Vinson, now Chief Justice, has been fully vindicated by subsequent events. I cannot conceive of this House committing the folly of reimposing that tax, which will do more to discourage incentive, production, and employment than almost anything the Congress can do.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending bill, H. R. 4790, as presently drawn. The present draft of this measure provides for 33⅓ percent of the tax reduction thereunder to 7 percent of the people of the United States. I cannot find any fairness in this proposed legislation. Those benefited most by this bill (the Knutson bill) are officials of large corporations and persons of the high income groups—those who have already been given tax relief when the excess-profts tax was removed in 1946. I want to vote for tax reductions this year. I want to vote for tax relief where it is most needed—for persons in the low-income groups. The question presented in this legislation is of vital interest and importance to the people of our country. Why do we engage in shadow-boxing activities? Why do Members of Congress try to fool the American people? Why do we not be honest—honest with ourselves and honest with the American people—honest with the people we are privileged and honored to represent—honest with our own Government and its responsibilities?

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the Congress failed to pass a tax-cut bill which would have reduced Federal revenues by $4,500,000,000. There were many Members at that time who wanted to vote for a fair and just and honest tax-reduction measure, but the measure that was offered was not of that type. We were forced to take it or reject it, as that was all that was offered—that was all that we were given a chance to vote on—a measure which was not equitable and which provided disproportionate tax relief. So that measure was twice rejected. It was said, at the time, that by next year we would have had an opportunity to study the tax structure more thoroughly—the revenue needs of the Federal Government—and that a year later we would be in a better position to know just what the needs and commitments of our Government would be, taking into consideration a reasonable sum being set aside for payment on the national debt, and that thereafter a proper tax bill could be considered. This year, when many Members hoped we would be given an opportunity to vote for a fair and honest and just tax bill, a measure is brought forth providing for deficit spending, a bill which if enacted into law would call for a cut in Federal revenue of more than $6,500,000,000. Last year the $4,500,000,000 cut was considered too much and this year—an election year—the Republican leadership supports a bill much more extravagant and unreasonable in amount, a bill which calls for the loss of Federal revenue in an amount in excess of $6,500,000,000, a measure which Members on both sides of the aisle, privately and honestly, admit will never become law; and, yet, it is the only bill we are given a chance to vote on. So, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, why do we engage in shadow-boxing activities? Why are we practicing deception? I know that the statements made on this bill by our distinguished colleague and my fellow Tennessean, Congressman JERE COOPER, a ranking member of the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means, are not misrepresentations of fact, they are not false figures but true facts representing the Federal fiscal situation as it exists today. The Knutson bill, H. R. 4790, has been properly labeled "An act to borrow and reduce taxes," because that would be the effect of the bill if enacted into law. This bill would provide for deficit spending during the next fiscal year. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder and other informed officials of the Government have asserted that if this bill is enacted into law a deficit for 1949 of more than $2,000,000,000 would result and that our national debt would be increased by this amount. Do we want to pass such a bill which would result in our Government having to borrow money to provide tax reduction, especially to those who are least in need of tax reduction?

As a new Member, I come fresh from the people and have faith in their collective will and good judgment and say to you that you cannot and are not and will not fool the people of our country with the deception that is here attempted to be practiced. They know—the people know—that adequate revenues are necessary for the operation of our Government—they know that our defense needs and world commitments are greater than at any peacetime in our history—they know, too, that the only time a debt can be paid is when we have the money to make such a payment. They know that the best time for this is when we are prosperous—the American people want and expect these needs and requirements to be met. They expect honest representation. They also would like tax reduction. It has been clearly demonstrated that a reasonable and fair tax cut can safely be made while at the same time taking into consideration the necessary obligations of our Government. This could be done if we would only cease practicing deception—cease shadow boxing and cooperate to the extent to bring forward a fair and equitable bill to accomplish these purposes.

As a new Member, I greatly esteem the Congress of the United States, but have

been disappointed at the actions of its Members in failing to give and take—in failing to get together and cooperating in working out this most important matter of our fiscal policy. This is primarily the responsibility of the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States—the body in which all legislation providing for Federal revenues and appropriations originates.

There have been three measures proposed and there exist three schools of thought on the question of providing tax reduction at the present time:

First. The Knutson bill, H. R. 4790, the measure under consideration, the bill of Republican leadership, which provides a drastic cut-back of more than $6,500,000,000—some experts estimate in excess of $7,000,000,000. It has been clearly demonstrated that this bill goes much too far and cannot—certainly should not—be enacted into law.

Second. The President's proposal, which would grant tax relief at this time only to persons in the low-income groups by providing a shift or adjustment of the tax load and a reimposition of certain excess corporate taxes, thereby resulting in not losing any revenue for the Treasury of the Federal Government during this period of present prosperity. It is conceded that the composition of the Congress being as it is today, the President's proposal cannot be passed.

A third course of action constitutes a middle-of-the-road or compromise proposal, advocated by Congressman DOUGHTON, Democrat of North Carolina, dean of the House of Representatives and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The measure is desired by many who view this matter from a realistic point of view—from the position of what can reasonably and honestly be accomplished. This proposal would provide for tax relief to all groups by cutting in half the extreme provisions of the present bill under consideration. I should be pleased to support a measure which would remove from the tax rolls some 10,000,000 persons in the low income groups. The membership of the House has not been given an opportunity to vote on such a measure. We have been denied this right—the opportunity to vote for a bill which will provide the necessary revenue for essential operation of our Government and which at the same time will permit of tax reduction on a safe and reasonable basis.

No, Mr. Chairman, the membership of the House is given an opportunity to vote only for the Republican measure, this extreme and dishonest measure, the deficit financing bill, a measure which would attempt to appease some low-income taxpayers with a little reduction while giving enormous tax relief to the rich. We are given a chance to vote only for the Wall Street tax-cut bill—a bill to fill the pockets of those who profited most during the war. A measure which if adopted would weaken the solvency of our Government and deny to us the means of providing for our own national defense and security, which today is so vitally important.

Considering these facts, I ask, Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder why a new Member becomes disappointed at the absence of statesmanship evidenced, at times, by Members of the Congress? It is time that the Congress cease practicing this continued deception. It is time to endeavor to solve the problems of responsibility of our Government and at the same time honestly endeavor to provide a fair and equitable tax-relief program—a measure which will also take into consideration the necessity of endeavoring to balance the Federal budget and substantially reduce our war debt while also providing for the national defense, security, and welfare of the people of America.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is exceptionally meritorious in many respects. I refer specifically to:

First. The increase in the exemption for individuals and dependents.

Second. The provision providing for equalization of taxes for those in non-community-property States with those taxpayers who reside in community-property States.

Third. The increased exemptions to the aged—those 65 years of age and over.

Fourth. The increased exemptions to the blind.

In addition to the foregoing, this bill provides for a reduction in rates and in this respect the greatest percentage of benefit is given to those taxpayers whose net incomes are under $5,000. They are the ones who need it most. This group will receive 72 percent of the total cut. In addition it should be pointed out that this bill applies only to individuals and not to corporations.

The bill is thus well balanced. It corrects inequities and provides a small reduction in the unconscionable wartime tax rates. As a tax bill it is good, and so far as the revenue aspects are concerned, I am convinced that if the actions of this House on appropriation bills are upheld in the Senate that we will have sufficient funds remaining to keep the budget balanced and to make a substantial payment on the Federal debt. Of course there is the possibility that the Senate may increase a number of appropriation bills. If they do I am sure they will make their action on the tax bill consistent with their action on appropriations. Their concern for the public welfare is as great as our own, and I feel it is entitled to as much respect. They should be given an opportunity to act on a tax bill. Under the constitutional restriction, the only way that can be done is for us to send them a tax bill. We should do this early so they can give it full consideration. We cannot expect them to rush through a bill hastily at the last of the session. Our own committee has been holding continuous hearings since November. The Senate should have an equal opportunity for full consideration. Only by passing this bill now can that opportunity be afforded to the other body. When they have acted there will be a conference committee, and then the House will again consider the measure.

That is the time to determine if it provides adequate revenue. Our revenue needs will then be clear. I consider it absolutely essential that we keep our budget balanced and provide sufficient funds to make a substantial payment on the national debt. This bill presently conforms to that requirement. I shall support it for that reason and for the other reasons previously given.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable reluctance that I am taking the time of the House to discuss the pending bill, H. R. 4790, entitled "A bill to reduce individual income-tax payments and for other purposes."

I realize that what I say today must be largely repetitious of what has already been said since we opened debate. The bill has been fully explained and ably debated by those favoring and those opposing the legislation. In fact, I have heard so many statistics and figures that I am a bit dazed by figures and am threatened with a bad case of "figuritis."

Before proceeding with discussion of the bill, I would be derelict to my senses of gratitude were I not to express my appreciation to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], for the able, courteous, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of our committee since he first assumed the duties of the chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The bill has an appealing title. I am sure the 52,000,000 Federal taxpayers of the country are anxious for, and feel they are entitled to, some relief from the burdens of the heavy taxes they have been carrying since the outbreak of World War II.

With respect to this important legislation, I desire that my position be made clear to the Congress and the people of the country. Frankness impels me to state that I believe the time has arrived when we can, and should, lighten the heavy burden of Federal taxes. In doing this, however, there are several important factors that we should take into consideration.

First, we must have a sound fiscal policy. By a sound fiscal policy I mean one that will provide adequate revenue for meeting necessary governmental expenditures—mind, now, I say necessary—and at the same time provide for a substantial payment on our huge public debt. I would not support any bill that I did not think would accomplish these objectives.

In my opinion, the pending bill does not meet the requirements that I have stated. No tax bill is preferable, in my opinion, to an unsound tax bill. Consequently, it is with much regret that I find myself, much as I am in favor of some reasonable reduction of taxes, unable to give the bill my support.

We have often heard the remark "too little and too late," but in my opinion it is equally serious to make the other mistake of "too soon and too much." In the first place, I believe the bill is premature and that we have the plow before the

mule. We should have had revision of taxes first, then reduction of taxes, or if not, we should have had them simultaneously or in the same bill. To have a well-balanced tax bill, there should have been some reduction, or removal, of other taxes, along with reduction of individual income taxes.

Certainly excise taxes are equally, or in fact, more burdensome than individual income taxes, many of which bear no relationship whatever to ability to pay, such as the taxes on communications, transportation, women's handbags, baby powder, automobile tires and tubes, electric light bulbs, and many others.

The bill gives no relief whatever from these burdensome taxes which could only be justified under wartime conditions.

Since the other body is not going to act on tax legislation until they have disposed of the European recovery plan, there would have been plenty of time for tax revision in the House. For these reasons I think this bill is too soon. The decision has been made, however, and we must consider the bill that is now before us.

My principal objection to the pending bill, however, is that it is too much. It threatens a balanced budget and possibly deficit spending for fiscal year 1949. Very probably, under this bill, we would be unable to make a substantial payment on the public debt in 1949.

If this bill were to be enacted in its present form, under the Treasury estimates of receipts of $44,500,000,000, there would be a deficit of $2,100,000,000 for 1949, assuming no cut in the President's budget. Even under the greater estimates of receipts by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, of $47,300,000,000, there would be only $500,000,000 to apply on the public debt. In my opinion, the $209,000,000,000 level of personal income estimated by the joint committee staff is too high, and the $200,000,000,000 estimate of the Treasury is too low. If we split the difference between the Treasury and the joint committee staff we would have a deficit under H. R. 4790 of $800,000,000. The effect of H. R. 4790 upon the budget for fiscal year 1949 under the foregoing estimates is summarized as follows:

	Treasury	Joint committee staff	Splitting the difference
Estimated receipts under present law	$44.5	$47.3	$45.9
Expenditures, President's budget	39.7	39.7	39.7
Surplus before tax reduction	4.8	7.6	6.2
Tax reduction under H. R. 4790	6.9	7.1	7.0
Surplus (deficit) under H. R. 4790	−2.1	+.5	−.8
Surplus (deficit) if budget cut $2,000,000,000	−.1	+2.5	+1.2

But the majority paint for us beautiful pictures of vast reductions to be made in the President's budget. However, as Saint Matthew reminds us:

By their fruits ye shall know them.

The only fruit of the budget cutting efforts is the record in the First Session of the Eightieth Congress. The 1948 budget, submitted by the President on January 3, 1947, estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1948 at $37,500,000,000. The House of Representatives insisted upon a cut in the President's estimates of $6,000,000,000, and the Senate upon $4,500,000,000. This difference was never resolved. The performance was far short of the promises. Estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1948 now will exceed the original estimate of the President by approximately $200,000,000. So it appears there will be an increase rather than a reduction in the President's budget.

One might think that this experience would be a lesson to men of ordinary prudence in fiscal matters. The majority, however, resolve all doubts in their favor in estimating revenue receipts and budgetary expenditures. They ignore the Biblical admonition:

Which of you intending to build a tower sitteth not down first and counteth the cost, whether he has sufficient to finish it.

So, I say there is an alternative to the two extremes—to the excessive tax reduction proposed by H. R. 4790 on the one hand, and to the insistence by the President on the other that there shall be no loss in revenue at this time. I believe that there is room for a moderate safe, sane tax-reduction law.

The bill contains two good provisions, one for the eliminating the community-property discrimination, and the other an increase in exemptions to help the low-income taxpayer. I would not support any bill that did not contain these two provisions.

If H. R. 4790 is sent to the White House in its present form, it will certainly be vetoed, and the veto, in my opinion, will be sustained unless the picture as to revenue receipts and expenditures changes, and as a result we would have no tax relief whatever.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sure my good friend has no assurance from the White House that his bill would be signed. Everything indicates that the President does not want tax reduction. In fact, he has said so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will leave that for the President and the gentleman from Minnesota to discuss. It would take the faith of an Abraham to believe that this bill, in its present form, or the motion to recommit, which I understand will be made, could possibly become law.

My principal and greatest opposition to the pending bill, however, is largely one of degree rather than of formula. The bill simply loses too much money. If the percentage reductions of 10, 20, 30, as contained in the bill, were reduced to 5, 10, 15, as I proposed in the committee, and were to be combined with income-splitting to solve the community-property discrimination, and an increase in exemptions of $100 per capita, or more, to relieve principally the low-income tax group, thereby removing 5,000,000 taxpayers from the tax rolls and benefiting all individual income taxpayers, we would have a bill that would lose no more than four to four and one-quarter billion dollars. Such a bill, in the absence of any cut in the President's budget, would permit a payment on the debt in fiscal year 1949 of one and one-half billion dollars as a minimum.

In my judgment such a bill would become law with or without the President's sanction. If only a moderate cut of $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 is made in the President's budget, which I think can reasonably be done, if we will uphold the hand of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to cut expenditures to a reasonable minimum level, it is safe to say that under my proposal we could make a substantial payment on the public debt of from $2,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000.

That is my opinion. If we send the President a reasonable bill, one under which we can reasonably assume that we will be able to balance the budget and make a reasonable, sizable, substantial payment on the public debt, and if the President should veto that bill, his veto would be overridden and the action of the House sustained, and the public would get tax relief.

And at this point I pay my respects to the able and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who is such an ardent apostle and crusader for economy in Government. I would take off my hat to him if I had one on.

Those favoring this bill and those who believe there should be no reduction in the amount of revenue at the present time represent two extremes. My experience in life has been that safety does not abide in extremes. If we enact a reasonable tax-reduction law, it will have a stimulating effect on business, be an incentive to expansion of industry, have a tendency to increase our revenues, and help remove the temptations to evade taxes.

There is such a thing as having taxes so high as to reach the point of diminishing returns, and many people feel we have reached that point already.

If we do not make a sizable payment on the public debt now—when the national income is at its peak—can we ever expect to begin debt retirement? The Congress must not break faith with the 85,000,000 bondholders, who in the hour of their country's greatest need sacrificed and saved in order to finance the most expensive war in all history.

On the other hand, if we do not give some tax relief now, at the time of greatest prosperity in our history—with revenues at record levels under present taxes producing a surplus—when can the extremely heavily burdened taxpayers hope for any relief? Surely they are now entitled to a little smoother road and a little lighter load.

While we are providing so liberally for so many purposes, both domestic and foreign—for foreign relief and recovery, aid to agriculture, veterans, reclamation, aid to the dependent and the blind, and many other worthy causes, but some possibly not so worthy, why would it not be an act of both wisdom and justice to give the heavily burdened taxpayers a little break and encouragement, for they

are the ones to whom we must look to finance these heavy expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to find myself in disagreement with a number of my colleagues with respect to the motion to recommit. It is always painful to me to disagree with those with whom I usually labor. However, in my opinion, the motion to recommit is equally as objectionable and unsound as the bill under consideration.

I hold no brief for corporations, but I want corporations to have the same consideration at the hands of our Government as any other taxpayer. They are entitled to that consideration—no less and no more.

In my opinion, a tax revision affecting 140,000,000 people and billions of dollars in revenue should have some consideration by a committee. You can always reduce taxes without giving those affected a hearing, but when you come to increasing taxes, when you impose a new tax upon 22,000 corporations out of some 360,000, I submit that it is unfair, unsafe, and unreasonable to do this without giving them an opportunity to be heard.

An excess-profits tax is a war measure. We had an excess-profits tax during World War II. At the same time, we had price controls. In my judgment, the only way you can successfully have an excess-profits tax is to have price control at the same time. We have a seller's market today, not a buyer's market. It takes no superior judgment to realize that those corporations are not going to pay this increased tax. They could pass the tax on to the consumer in the form of higher prices, or they could pass it back to labor in the form of reduced wages, or they could do both. They are in position to take care of themselves.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing about this proposed excess-profits tax and that is its lack of uniformity. It is not like the excess-profits tax we had during the war. It picks out 22,000 corporations, and imposes an additional heavy tax. Who are the 22,000 corporations? They are not the old corporations with the large invested capital and the large base period earnings. Not those at all. They are chiefly the new corporations formed during the war and since. This will result in unjust discrimination and in unfair competition. You are taxing one class of business and leaving another free of taxation. As a consequence, Mr. Chairman, the excess-profits tax in time of peace, in my judgment, is not defensible. This position has been the unanimous view of every Secretary of the Treasury but one over the last 25 years, including such eminent men as ex-Senator Carter Glass and former Secretary of the Treasury, now Chief Justice of the United States, Fred M. Vinson.

In 1945 the tax was repealed at the urgent request of the administration and the Secretary of the Treasury. At that time we were advised that repeal of the excess-profits tax would be an incentive to business and a stimulation to the reconversion and expansion of industry.

Now that the war has been over for two and one-half years, with our present revenue laws producing a substantial surplus, there is no justification for saddling a load of $3,250,000,000 on a limited number of taxpayers.

In my judgment the reimposition of the excess-profits tax is a chimerical scheme, and does not represent the views of the Committee on Ways and Means. And so far as I know, is not supported by any reputable economist. It is not a matter that can be safely prepared by six or seven men meeting for a little more than an hour, as in the case of this motion to recommit.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the proposal with reference to this excess-profits tax was never considered or studied by the committee and that there were never any hearings held, and no one affected ever had an opportunity to come before the committee on this matter.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That certainly is true.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman will agree with me that the so-called Dingell bill was before the committee during the consideration of the Knutson bill, and witnesses were heard on it in committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Does the gentleman mean the Dingell bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why, that is nothing like it at all.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think I can give a demonstration.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The Dingell bill expressed the views of the President, and that made no provision whatever for removing discrimination as between the community and the noncommunity property States. It made no provision for raising exemptions. It made no provision for increasing exemptions for the blind; not at all. I am surprised at my good friend, the distinguished minority leader, that he would say the bills were similar, because I know they are not similar, and I stake my reputation on it that the Dingell bill is not the same as the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. What the gentleman has been talking about is the proposed motion to recommit, bringing in for the first time the excess-profits tax on 22,000 corporations. That is what the gentleman is talking about. Those corporations were formed during the war or since the war; is that not correct?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION. So this proposition would not include the United States Steel or Standard Oil?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I think not.

Mr. ROBSION. Or any of these great corporations?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is my understanding.

I know and my good friends know that they never expect this motion to recommit to become law. Neither do I really think that those who bring in the committee bill are very firm in their conviction that it will become a law.

It will not be necessary to vote for this bill in order to get tax-relief legislation, because the tax bill will finally be written in the other body and in conference. It has been stated that the other body is not going to act upon tax legislation until it has disposed of the European-recovery program.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course my good friend from North Carolina recognizes the fact that in order to get this bill to the Senate and to conference it will first have to pass the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Certainly.

I want to see some tax reduction. I am not engaged, and I do not charge that anybody else is engaged, in political activity in connection with this matter, but I sincerely want to see this Congress send the President a reasonable and practical tax-reduction bill. Then, should the President veto such bill, which I am inclined to hope he will not, he will do it on his own responsibility. I do not speak for the President. We all know that the responsibility for initiating and imposing tax legislation is reposed by the Constitution in the Congress, not in the Executive. After the Congress has acted, then the President may approve or disapprove the bill. In so doing, he must accept responsibility.

While I am no prophet, I make the prediction for what it is worth that neither the motion to recommit nor anything similar to it, will be contained in the tax bill as finally passed by Congress.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, in 1945, the Congress passed a tax-reduction bill. It was an excellent, well-balanced tax reduction bill. It gave $6,000,000,000 tax relief. It was well spread and it cut some 10,000,000 people in the low brackets off the tax rolls. It gave to business corporations the major part of the relief, a little over $3,250,000,000. That tax-reduction bill was sponsored by and was tailored by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who, in my opinion, is one of the greatest living Americans today. He is the greatest Roman of us all. He has well earned the title "The Grand Old Man of the House."

What did that tax-reduction bill in 1945 do which the Congress passed, and which the President signed in the face of

a $20,000,000,000 deficit from the Treasury? This is what it did. First, it gave a shot in the arm to business. It enabled business to plow back into an expansion program some three to four billion dollars, which meant a tremendous business expansion, almost a boom. Second, it increased the national production index by 15 points. Third, it provided 5,300,000 new jobs in America in this expansion program. That, my friends, meant that we had arrived at the goal that F. D. R. had set for 1950, 2 years before the time set. What else did it do? The fourth thing that it did, and you will hardly believe it, but it is true, is that it increased revenues taken in by the Treasury. In this year there will be $40,000,000 more taken in by the Treasury than was taken in in 1945, the all time peak of Treasury receipts. Next year it is estimated that the Treasury will receive a billion dollars more than it received in 1945 when they received $46,500,000,000, and next year it will be $47,300,000,000. That 1945 tax reduction bill was sound, and the results show it. We repealed the excess-profit taxes at that time and gave industry the necessary shot in the arm to expand. The motion to recommit proposes to reverse that trend and to travel in the opposite direction which will mean a reduction in the number of jobs that will be available. That is exactly what such a reversal in the trend will mean, because it will be a handicap to business in this expansion program. There is no getting out of that. Taxes and jobs are Siamese twins, and they cannot be separated. Whenever you have high taxes you always have a contracting national economy and fewer jobs. When you lower taxes you always have an expanding national economy and more jobs.

I ask my colleagues whether you want to follow the lead of sound taxation, the lead set by the grand old gentleman of your party and of the Nation, or whether you want to reverse the trend that he established in 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the question I want to discuss today is "Can Federal Expenditures Be Reduced?" Do we need and can we have Federal tax reduction? Before I proceed I want first to give the sources of my information.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

In 1945 I was a member of the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. At that time I offered an amendment in committee to the Labor Department appropriation bill earmarking $586,000 for an up-to-date study of the city worker's family budget. This was a study of what a typical city worker's family budget ought to be and what he could live on in 34 of the largest cities of the United States. The family consisted of a father, mother, a child 13, and a child 8. After 2 years of work the study authorized in 1945 was completed and the United States Department of Labor issued their report in December 1947. On December 22, 1947, the Research Department of the United States Treasury issued another interesting report. This was a study of the low-income group, the tax burden of that group and particularly a study of the personal exemptions of the low-income group in all fields. I am basing my conclusions here today primarily on these two reports, which I consider the finest that have been made for some time in this particular field.

NEED OF TAX RELIEF

Everyone wants tax reduction. The need in my judgment is greatest for the low-income group. It is this group which has suffered most. They have been squeezed between rising tax rates and reduced tax exemptions on the one side and increased living costs on the other.

I use the phrase "low-income group" because it includes all people in this group. The wage earner—organized or unorganized, the farmer, the school teacher, the white-collared worker, in fact every person is included who requires all of his income to make a decent living under our American standards. I take the position that an old couple who are depending for a living upon retirement pay or upon a return on life savings invested in stocks or bonds can be just as hungry if the retirement pay or return on their investment is inadequate to buy decent food, clothing, and housing as though they were standing in a bread line.

I want to discuss first the question of tax exemptions.

TAX EXEMPTIONS

In 1939 a single person had a tax exemption of $1,000. In 1944 this tax exemption was reduced by an act of Congress 50 percent, from $1,000 to $500. According to the reports and study referred to above by the Department of Labor and the United States Treasury research department, there was an increase of 64.8 percent in the cost of living from 1939 to September 1947. Three hundred and three dollars bought the same living in 1939 when a single person's tax exemption was $1,000 that the present exemption of $500 buys today. While the tax exemption was reduced 50 percent, living costs went up 64.8 percent. In 1939 a married couple had a tax exemption of $2,500. In 1944 that tax exemption was reduced by an act of Congress to 40 percent of the 1939 exemption or to $1,000. Again, according to the Labor Department and Treasury studies, $606 bought the same living cost in 1939 when that couple had a tax exemption of $2,500 that the reduced tax exemption of $1,000 bought in 1947. This couple was reduced in exemption from $2,500 to $1,000 or to 40 percent of the exemption they had in 1939, at the same time living costs went up 64.8 percent. While wages are high in terms of dollars, they are low in terms of purchasing power. While the farmer's product is high in terms of dollars, his purchasing power is low in terms of the same dollar. Three-dollar wheat in September 1947 was worth $1.82 in 1939 purchasing power.

The city worker's budget referred to above says it requires approximately $3,000 in addition to taxes and other similar items for a typical family of four to live in the city of Detroit. A $3,000 annual income seems large for a worker. However, when we consider the matter in the light of a 64.8 percent increase in living costs, we find that $1,800 bought the same living costs in 1939 that the $3,000 buys today. These people in the low-income group, whether on the farm, in the city, or wherever they may be, regardless as to where their income is derived from, are squeezed between the increasd taxes and the increased living cost until millions of them find it impossible to make a decent living—all this during the greatest era of so-called prosperity in the history of the world. The decrease in tax exemption plus the increase in living costs virtually wiped out what tax exemption they had. The increased number of dollars they are receiving do not bring increased food, just increased taxes. Let us take a man and wife with an income of $1,200. According to the tax tables they pay $38 in income taxes and are exempt $1,000. Six hundred and six dollars bought the same living cost in 1939 that $1,000 buys today. They could not live on $606 in 1939, and they cannot live on $1,000 or $1,200 today, and the tax money you are taking from them is blood money. We are taking the bread and butter out of their mouths and reducing their living standards to an unprecedented low.

HEAD OF FAMILY EXCEPTIONS

Before the war and ever since the 1920's, we had a tax-exemption policy which gave one exemption to the head of a family and one to the single person. We gave an additional exemption to each dependent. For instance, in 1939 the head of a family was given a $2,500 exemption for the household and a $400 exemption for each dependent. The wife was considered a part of the household and included in the head of a family exemption. If the father died the mother retained the head-of-family exemptions because she had the same household expenditures required by the family. Under the present system, the husband and wife are given $500 exemption each with a separate exemption for each child. Should the father die, the mother loses his exemption despite the fact that she not only must continue the same household expenses, but must both take care of and earn money to support the household. Each New Year's day Washington newspapers publish the name of the first child born after the passing of the old year. They reported that a child was born 1 minute after 12 o'clock New Year's Day. Had that child been born 1 minute before midnight, December 31, 1947, instead of 1 minute after midnight on the morning of January 1, that child, 1 minute old, would have been given the same 1947 tax exemption that the widowed mother would receive whose husband has passed away and left her with the responsibility of supporting the family and the household. That is how

ridiculous the present tax-exemption laws are. This is one of the principle differences between the present Knutson bill and the Engel bill I introduced.

MR. TRUMAN'S TAX POLICY

Mr. Truman in his recent message came out proposing a tax credit of $40 to every taxpayer. Forty dollars of course would help some. He contends that this would make it unnecessary for 10,500,000 people to pay taxes who are now paying taxes. The difference between Mr. Truman's plan and mine and the present Knutson bill is this: I want to increase their exemption; I want to say to these taxpayers, individually and collectively in this low-income group: "You do not have to pay any more taxes; you do not have to make any more returns; we will take you off the tax roll and you can forget all about taxes until your income is greater." I do not want to employ hundreds of Treasury workers to process these 10,500,000 returns and I want to reduce the workers in the Treasury Department by the number required for that purpose. What does Mr. Truman propose? Mr. Truman is going to require these 10,500,000 people to make their regular tax returns and pay some lawyer or someone to help them make out those returns as many of them cannot make them out alone. That tax return will say, "You owe the Government $40." Then Mr. Truman is going to try to make them believe he is giving them $40 by giving them a tax credit. The report will then go down to the Treasury Department, hundreds of Treasury employees will draw their salaries for processing these 10,500,000 returns and for writing these people that after all they do not have to pay any taxes. The Government is not giving the taxpayer anything; the taxpayer is giving to the Government. Let us get that straight. Mr. Truman and the Government are not giving this little taxpayer anything. He should not pay taxes in the first place. Here is a good chance to reduce some of the thousands of employees we have in the Treasury Department.

CAN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES BE REDUCED?

Regardless as to whether we have tax reduction, waste and extravagance must be reduced. The more successful we are in reducing governmental expenditures and waste, the greater will be the tax relief we can give to all taxpayers and particularly to the taxpayer in the low-income group.

I believe that Government expenditures can be reduced materially. This is my twelfth year as a member of the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee and the second year as its chairman. I want to discuss the question from the War Department expenditure point of view. What applies to the War Department applies to the Navy and other departments in varying degrees.

WAR DEPARTMENT

In order to reduce taxes we have to reduce expenditures. You will recall a year ago when the budget was published the War Department's budget for the present fiscal year of 1948 amounted to approximately seven and one-half billion dollars for all purposes and the Navy Department's budget was $3,541,000,000. The War Department announced that this was the irreducible minimum; that we could not take a dollar off that budget. The Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy so testified. They brought out the big guns, General Eisenhower, Forrestal, Patterson, and others, and began propagandizing the country. You may recall at that time I made the statement that the War Department would have available for expenditure for the present fiscal year not seven and one-half billion dollars, but $10,038,000,000; that the Navy would have available not three and one-half billion dollars, but $6,600,000,000. That, combined, we would have not $11,000,000,000 available for expenditure on national defense but over $16,000,000,000. You will recall that I made the statement that if Secretary of War Patterson and Chief of Staff Eisenhower could not cut that $10,000,000,000 they had available for expenditure for the War Department by one and one-half billion, they better get out and give somebody else a chance. I stated further that if Secretary of the Navy Forrestal and Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Nimitz could not cut at least three-fourths of a billion from the $6,600,000,000 the Navy had available for expenditure, they ought to get out and let somebody else try.

Now let us see what happened. I am chairman of the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee. We handle all War Department appropriation bills. We had four men on the War Department work from February to April 1947. We had some of the best accountants in America who were following our instructions. The War Department admitted that it had $5,700,000,000 in 1946 and prior years' funds that they had not even been able to obligate. $5,700,000,000 is $100,000,000 more than the Knutson tax reduction bill now before the House calls for. The budget office of the War Department testified that the President's Budget Bureau estimated that of the $5,700,000,000, $3,000,000,000 would be obligated. According to this testimony we could rescind and kick back into the Treasury $2,700,000,000. General Richards, budget officer of the War Department, himself estimated that they would obligate $3,700,000,000 in which case we could kick back into the Treasury $2,000,000,000. We were finally able to rescind and turn back into the Treasury $1,100,000,000. While these moneys had not been actually spent, the efforts that were made to keep us from rescinding these old appropriations were the best evidence that they would be spent if not rescinded. Let me give you some idea of what we were up against on that committee.

Each branch of the service in the War Department, that is, the Ordnance, Engineers, Quartermaster and others, has a budget officer. Some of these budget officers are civilians and some are Army officers. Then we have Gen. George Richards in the Army who is over the whole group and whose orders they follow. I had each of these budget officers in my office alone and went over their statements. I did this to get them away from the influence of General Richards. Here is what happened. I had the budget officer of the Ordnance Department of the Army before me. His books showed he had $566,000,000 of 1946 and prior years' funds which were not obligated. At 11 o'clock in the morning he told me he was not going to obligate and that I could rescind that $566,000,000. At 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the same day, after reporting back to General Richards, he called me back and said that he was mistaken, that General Richards had transferred $344,000,000 of these funds. Here we had one Army officer transferring one-third of a billion dollars of taxpayers' money to some other agency for expenditures which had not been justified before any congressional committee and he did not even take the trouble to inform the agency from which it was transferred that he had done so, and then they told us the budget was irreducible.

The taxpayers have not a chance with a budget officer like General Richards. That is why the Army promoted him. Let me give you another instance.

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

The transportation department of the Army had a $400,000,000 budget. I had them before me. After talking to them for 1½ hours, I couldn't get a thing out of them. They just would not talk. These were Army officers, not civilians. They admitted that every time they took a classified employee off the pay roll under the Byrd law, they put the same man back unclassified outside of the Byrd law, and gave that as a reason why they could not cut under the Byrd law. For instance, they took a chauffeur off who was a classified employee and put the same man back on as a truck driver who was not classified. I finally got disgusted. I told them I knew that their budget could be cut, that to make sure we cut enough I was going to recommend a cut of 25 percent or $100,000,000. That if the cut was too deep they could come back to the Deficiency Subcommittee of which I am also a member and they would have to talk to get it back. I told them the interview was finished and they could leave. They sat there for some time refusing to leave. They wanted to discuss it some more. I finally turned to them and said, "Just what would you say if we cut you 10 percent or $40,000,000?" The ranking officer turned to me and said, "Mr. ENGEL, if you cut us $40,000,000 or 10 percent, you will not hear a squawk out of us; any of them can take a 10 percent cut." Here we had the budget officer of a department admitting that the War Department budget was padded at least 10 percent. The man who was responsible for the padding was Major General Richards, now comptroller of the Army and who will undoubtedly be promoted to the rank of lieutenant general. These officers were acting on instructions of Gen. George Richards.

PERSONNEL

The original so-called irreducible budget was based upon officer personnel far in excess of the number and rank required, and of civilian personnel far in excess of the number required. When

the bill left the House we cut off over 17,000 officers and 74,000 civilian employees. The other body as usual put them all back on again. But when we came out of conference we cut off approximately 15,000 officers and more than 58,000 civilian employees, and yet General Eisenhower, Patterson, Forrestal, and that group came out before the public and said the budget was irreducible.

ARMY OFFICERS

When the justifications came justifying the amount of this so-called irreducible budget, we asked for and received a break-down of the number of officers the Army asked for in each grade. Were General Eisenhower's and Secretary of War Patterson's faces red when they had to admit that this so-called irreducible budget contained money to pay five captains, five majors, three lieutenant colonels, one and one-half colonels for every second lieutenant they had in the Army outside the Air Force. Excluding the Air Corps, which has about 50 percent of the officers, the Army asked for the following:

Four thousand and twenty-three second lieutenants.

Six thousand seven hundred and nineteen first lieutenants.

Twenty-one thousand one hundred and seventy-seven captains.

Twenty thousand seven hundred and six majors.

Twelve thousand six hundred and thirty-seven lieutenant colonels.

Six thousand and two colonels.

They had 16 more major generals than they had brigadier generals. They had so much stardust in the budget that it looked like the Milky Way. They asked for 197 major generals, 181 brigadier generals, 26 lieutenant generals, 6 four-star generals, and 2 five-star generals for less than 600,000 men in the Army, excluding the Air Forces, and yet the Secretary of War and Chief of Staff told the Nation that this was an irreducible budget. During all this time that old couple with a $1,200 annual income was paying $38 a year bread and butter money in taxes which the Army was throwing down a military rat hole.

Of course governmental expenditures can be cut. Of course national defense expenditures can be cut. I want national defense as much as any man in America. I believe, however, that the taxpayers of America have a right to demand a dollar's worth of national defense for every dollar spent. We can have reduction in Government expenditures and in Army expenditures. We can have the resulting tax reduction if we can stop the Army and other agencies from throwing money down a military or bureaucratic rat hole.

1949 NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET

I do not know as yet just what can be done in the way of cutting the 1949 budget. The budget figures seem to indicate substantial cuts can be made.

To keep a clear picture before the public on national-defense expenditures, I am making the following statement taken from the 1949 budget:

It will be seen that while the total 1949 appropriation requested for all military functions of national defense is $11,420,383,250, there will actually be $14,544,333,087 available for expenditure for national defense during 1949.

If we add the Army's civil functions budget requests including Government relief in occupied areas and the Panama Canal estimates, there will actually be available for expenditure for all national defense and military purposes during 1949 the enormous sum of $17,485,532,187.

Following is the complete picture in table form:

	Appropriation for 1949	Total estimated expenditures available for 1949
Office of Secretary for National Defense	$6,395,000	$6,565,000
Department of Air Force [1]	1,169,426,000	1,168,926,000
Department of Army, military	4,683,834,000	7,277,440,068
Department of Navy, including supplementals	3,574,427,700	6,091,402,019
Total military	9,434,082,700	14,544,333,087
War civil functions	1,962,115,750	2,906,961,154
Panama Canal	24,184,800	34,237,946
Grand total	11,420,383,250	17,485,532,187

[1] This amount covers only the money that will be appropriated directly to the Department of the Air Force. Pay, clothing, and rations of the Air Corps will be contained as usual in Finance and Quartermaster appropriation of the Army. In 1948 the Air Corps received 56 percent of total Army appropriations.

THE KNUTSON BILL

I have taken the position that the only way the low-income group can get real tax relief is to increase tax exemptions while we are decreasing tax rates; that the tax cut should be a two-way cut, (a) increase of exemptions and (b) decrease in rates. While the present Knutson bill does not go as far as I would like, it does recognize and apply tax reduction by (a) increasing exemption and (b) decreasing rates. I introduced a bill recently which I hoped might be considered. My bill restores a modified "head of family" tax-exemption clause. It does not go as far as I wanted to go. It is in effect a modified Knutson bill which I thought might be a fair compromise. I am including a statement at the conclusion of these remarks showing the difference between the Engel and the Knutson bills. We cannot all have our way in proposed legislation. The present Knutson bill goes much further my way than I expected it would. I shall support it. Bills that die in committee do not give tax relief.

COMPARISON BETWEEN H. R. 4790 (THE KNUTSON BILL) AND H. R. 5172 (THE ENGEL BILL)

While H. R. 5172, the tax bill I introduced, does not represent my views in their entirety, the changes my bill makes in the committee tax bill are not so drastic but what the committee, either in this or the other body, might reasonably accept them. What I want primarily is to get the maximum tax relief for the low-income group that is possible at this time.

The Engel bill is in effect the Knutson bill with the following important changes: First, an increase in the tax exemption of a single person to $750 and of a married couple to $1,500, the exemption for dependents, in general, to remain at $500; second, the insertion of a modified head-of-a-family provision which, after the death of one spouse, would give the remaining spouse a $750 exemption and which would give $750 to the first dependent where the husband or wife passes away leaving the burden of supporting the family on the other spouse. This new head-of-a-family provision is easier to enforce than the head-of-family provision contained in the old prewar law; third, the elimination of the split income and estate tax provision.

With respect to my first suggested amendment, an addition was made to section 25 (b) (1) (A) of the code, as amended by section 201 of H. R. 4790, and a new subsection 25 (b) (D) (ii) was inserted. The former addition would grant a husband an exemption for his spouse where she dies during the year, under certain conditions. The latter addition, with respect to dependents, would grant an exemption of $250, additional to the usual exemption, for the first dependent of an unmarried person. In order to relate the exemption changes which I have outlined to the optional tax table (section 400 of the code) and to the withholding provisions (subchapter D of chapter 9 of the Code), it is contemplated that the tables and the calculations under the sections will involve units of $250. In this way a $500 dependency exemption will entitled a taxpayer to two such units, an additional dependency exemption will entitle him to a third, and the usual individual exemption will entitle him three such units. You will also note that sections 301 (a) and 402 of the draft involve a simple substitute for a recalculation of the tables inasmuch as they could not have been prepared in the time available. This advice has been used on other occasions.

The raising of the exemptions under my second suggested amendment was accomplished by changing the figures in the Knutson bill. I am informed that my bill as drafted will reduce revenues by approximately the same amount as the Knutson bill.

The elimination of the split-income and estate-tax provisions under my third suggested amendment, was primarily accomplished by omitting title III of H. R. 4790, the new Knutson bill, husband and wife, parts 1 and 2. In view of the situation which exists in the community property States, I certainly am not opposed to the Knutson bill split-income-tax provision. I do feel strongly, however, that in view of the tremendous increase in living costs the reduction of taxes in the low-income group should come first before we lighten the tax burden on the higher income individuals. My opposition is merely one of emphasis. I think it is primarily important, in terms of justice and widespread purchasing power to do a fully adequate job of tax relief for the low-income group first. The split-income-tax provision should be secondary and should be included only if and when real relief in terms of dollars, not percentages, is granted the low-income group.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in considering the present tax legislation—the Knutson bill—several considerations pass through my mind. I intend to support the bill, but with reservations and some misgivings.

This bill makes drastic cuts in income taxes. I believe that there should be some cuts in income taxes. This bill follows the correct principle of giving those with low incomes the biggest proportionate cuts. It also gives cuts to those who will gain and have more capital to invest in new ventures, which is what makes employment and increases production.

But we cannot forget that we have a stupendous national debt. We must start paying it off, or those who fought the war will carry an undue proportion of the financial load due to the war, despite the fact that they are the ones who sacrificed greatly to win the war. When we have big national income, that is the time to tax and get the surplus needed to reduce the debt.

Also, to move in the direction of world peace, we must be involved in relief and rehabilitation in various parts of the world. That is a gamble that I firmly believe we must take to move toward a peaceful world.

For this reason, I was hoping the cuts this year would be smaller. I am hoping that the Senate will modify the bill so my general ideas will be embodied in it. It is a pleasure to vote for less taxes for our people, but we cannot overlook the fact that there may be other benefits of much more importance to our people and their children than cutting taxes. The balance is a situation where we cut but still leave room for the long-range program of bringing peace and keeping a balanced budget.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have been in this body for a long time. I have had an opportunity to study, to observe the sincerity of that grand old man, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I think today you are all agreed that he is fearless, that he is courageous, that he is able, that he is a patriot when faced with a situation such as we are confronted with here today.

We all want this country to go forward. We do not care what political program we follow, so long as it is the right program and one that will tend to build up this Republic and enable it to meet its obligations, stimulate business, give the present generation of young people an opportunity, if they are willing to accept it. This bill will do just that. I will say, frankly, it does not go quite as far as I would go, but I am delighted to support it as a constructive and sane tax measure.

It is impossible for me to understand the attitude of the President of the United States. In the first place, I cannot conceive of any man who has the capacity to serve as the Executive of this great Nation coming in here with the type of tax bill which he proposed, known as the Dingell bill. Any child in school could see that that bill was purely a political bill and nothing else. It was a plea to buy votes at $40 each. The Democratic side has repudiated it and I congratulate them on the fact that they have repudiated it. They did not even mention it in their minority report. But one point that has been emphasized by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is the fact that his Democratic colleagues in their motion to recommit are trying to turn now and go back; not to create pay rolls, but to destroy pay rolls. There has been some evidence taken. The Senate has caused a very interesting pamphlet to be published. They have gone into this question of excess profits, and they have called in the best experts in this country to elucidate the problem. I want to read what some of those arguments are. Here is one:

"The excess-profits tax is an emergency measure related to war expenditures and war profits, is completely unsound as a permanent feature of the national tax structure, and, in peacetime, would act as a major deterrent to investment of capital in productive enterprise. * * * Elimination of the excess-profits tax would once more make feasible business growth through reasonable accumulation of earnings, particularly in the case of small businesses." (American Institute of Accountants tax plan, pp. 3–4.)

Again it is said:

"The arguments against a peacetime excess-profits tax—in our judgment—far outweigh the reasons advanced in support of the view that this form of taxation should be continued permanently. * * * such a tax would tend to throttle new enterprise and impede investment. It would affect various classes of business unequally. The mature and established firm in a relatively riskless industry that consistently earns profits about equal to the rate at which the tax becomes applicable would be least affected. Such a situation could not be reconciled with the requirements of an expansionist tax policy which favors the small, the growing, and the risky enterprise rather than the large, the mature, and the relatively riskless business." (Kimmel tax plan, p. 11.)

One further point is especially emphasized:

"The leading argument against the excess-profits tax is that monopoly profits cannot be distinguished from the rewards due to superior efficiency and extraordinary risk taking. A tax on the latter type of profits is particularly discouraging to enterprise. The public has the choice between (a) recapturing some monopoly profits while penalizing efficient management and risk taking, and (b) levying no special tax on monopoly profits but neither on efficiency and risk-taking rewards. A further factor to be weighed in the decision is that, in the absence of price controls, we cannot be certain that the monopolist will absorb the excess-profits tax. An excess-profits tax is, in no sense, a regulatory and preventive measure like public-utility rate control or renegotiation of contracts. Moreover, monopoly profits can be taxed to individuals under the personal income tax as well as to companies under a business tax.

"The conclusion is that the excess-profits tax should be repealed at the close of the war, the repeal to become effective when extraordinary war-caused profits have ceased to exist (perhaps a year after the war ends)." (Harold M. Groves, Postwar Federal Taxation, NTA proceedings 1944, p. 201.)

Many other persons and groups have urged repeal. Some of them are cited in the accompanying note below.

(American Institute of Accountants tax plan, pp. 3–4; Association of American Roads tax plan, pp. 13–14; CED tax plan, pp., 20, 24; Colmer committee report, p. 41; Groves tax plan, pp. 50–57; Kimmel tax plan, p. 11; Nelson tax plan, pp. 5, 14; Rumi and Sonne tax plan, p. 10; Twin Cities tax plan, p. 23. See also George E. Barnes, A Plan To Simplify Corporation Taxes and A Solution of Double Taxation of Corporate Earnings, the Exchange, September 1944, p. 2; Alvin H. Hansen and Harvey Perloff, State and Local Finance in the National Economy, p. 256; Eustace Seligman, A Postwar Program for Taxation of Corporations and Stockholders, Commercial and Financial Chronicle, March 2, 1944, p. 908.)

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize the point that it is the natural and commendable instinct of a normal young man to enter into business for himself. He wants to provide for his own future security and that of his family.

What does he face?

He is confronted with a tax law that destroys incentive.

He finds a confiscatory tax bill that prevents savings to build up risk or venture capital.

He meets with a tax law in which rates are so high that he cannot make the hurdle as against well-established monopolistic enterprise.

Income and estate tax rates, at present levels, make it virtually impossible for a young man starting at scratch to accumulate any competency for his old age and that of his family after he is gone.

Because of the character of the taxes imposed during war and continued in peacetime, the young man starting in business faces an almost insurmountable task.

Does any person who is interested in the future of this Republic and its free-enterprise system dispute the fact that there must be a steady flow of new capital, new pay rolls into the blood stream of the Nation?

Why play politics with legislation vital to the future welfare of our people?

The present wartime taxes are striking at the very foundations of individual initiative.

James Madison pointed out the philosophy of our free-enterprise system when he said:

The economic foundation of the American political system is the protection of the differing and unequal capacity of men to acquire and use property.

The war taxes are striking at those men of capacity for developing pay rolls by means of risk capital, who are being discouraged in their effort to acquire and use capital.

Under the proposal of the Truman administration the very men who are capable of creating pay rolls, high wages, and the production necessary to defeat inflation, are prevented from doing these desirable things, but more than that there can be nothing to provide security for them and their families in their old age.

Here is what these men of capacity face. Take these examples:

Here are three married men—each with two children—residing in New York. The first earns $10,000 a year; spends $7,750 for living expenses; pays $1,825 in Federal and State income taxes; and saves $425 per annum. The second receives $15,000 a year; spends $10,200 for

his family's living; pays $3,585 in income taxes; puts aside $1,215 per annum. The third enjoys earnings of $20,000; spends $11,950 for living expenses; pays $5,745 in income taxes; and saves $2,305 per annum. Living costs in each case have been carefully estimated item by item.

If the $10,000 man invests his entire annual savings of $425 regularly every year with compound interest at 2½ percent, it will take him 36 years to accumulate enough to leave his family a net estate of $20,000—after paying modest funeral and legal expenses and the New York estate tax of approximately $200. If the $15,000 man invested all his yearly savings with compound interest at 2½ percent, he would have to work 34 years to provide a net estate of a little over $50,000 for his widow; the $20,000 man, 37 years to leave approximately $10,000 to his dependents. Note, too, that all three of these men, if they died at 65, would have had to reach their maximum earning levels at the comparatively early ages of 29, 31, and 28 years respectively—a situation which would be the exception rather than the rule. No provision for life insurance was made in any of these cases so that all would remain on the same comparative basis. Invested at 3 percent, the first man's widow would receive the munificent annual income of $600; the second's, $1,500; the third's, $3,000—all subject to income-tax rates at prevailing rates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to know that when the roll is called on this bill it will receive a very large vote. It is a bill that the country ought to have. It is a bill that will do a great amount of good.

A great many individuals have raised questions about the size of any tax reduction that might be undertaken at this time. It must be borne in mind, however, that this bill is a tax-reduction bill for all the American people. We have 50,000,000 income-tax payers in the United States. We are currently gathering in taxes amounting to around forty or forty-seven billion dollars. This bill is worked out so it gives a just and equitable reduction to all categories of taxpayers within the United States.

I am sure everyone agrees with the principle that exemptions ought to be raised somewhat and that those in the lower-income brackets ought to get a considerable reduction; in fact, the largest reduction. There are some people who would stop there. If they did, they would deny tax reduction not only to millions of American people but they would destroy all the gains that tax reduction brings. There are others who say, "Yes; let us take care of the lower brackets and provide the splitting of income for tax purposes and let us stop there, thus making the reduction less." What are you going to do about the people who are already in a community-property State? They are expecting some tax reduction.

How about the single individuals who are not heads of families, a widow or a widower with no one with whom they can split their income? Are those people entitled to tax reduction? Certainly they are. Every individual is entitled to tax reduction.

We have brought about some added tax relief for the aged of the country. This will not amount to a great deal; but, added to the other things, it means we have to have a bill that does substantially what the Knutson bill does.

Let us consider the old folks for a little bit. Here is someone who gets a retirement check which is tax-free. Across the street there is someone who gets a retirement check on which he must pay a tax. Over on the other corner is someone who cannot retire at 65, but who must work to eat and pay an extra tax because somebody else's retirement check is tax-free. The Knutson bill says that everyone who has reached the age of 65 shall have an additional exemption because of his age. That is sound, that is fair, and the people back home would like to have you adopt the provision and make it the law of the land.

The bill before you has been carefully worked out. It is not simple and easy to reduce the amount of the Knutson bill, because if you once start reducing it you will destroy it; you will take the benefits of tax reduction away from some particular group. All are entitled to consideration. Certainly the poor of the country need what the Knutson bill offers; certainly those in position to provide capital need tax reduction, and if you go that far how can you deny a tax reduction to that great group of middle-class American people who are neither rich nor poor, but who make up America, the people who make up the communities that you and I represent?

I fear that the tax scheme worked out in the motion to recommit will not treat the people back home, the middle-class people, the aged, the heads of families who have no one with whom to split their income, as you would like to have them treated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending measure—Knutson tax reduction bill—for the reasons that were so well stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] when he said that "it is a constructive, sane tax bill."

A careful examination of the provisions of the bill will justify this statement. No attempt has been made to make this bill a political measure.

The plan offered by the President to make a straight $40 cut across the board was open to the charge that it was political and without regard to the fundamental principles upon which a tax bill should be based.

The President's bill was even discarded by the members of his party who serve upon the Ways and Means Committee in not being even mentioned in the minority report. Nothing could more clearly indicate the insufficiency of his plan; and the vote upon this bill when taken today will demonstrate that many serious-minded Democrats have given their support to the Republican measure now before us for consideration.

To draw a tax revenue bill is no easy matter. No bill can be drawn to suit everybody. In fact, there are provisions even in this bill that I think might properly be changed, but taking an over-all view of the whole complicated matter I think the present bill can well be termed "a constructive, sane tax bill," and therefore I give it my support.

This bill, H. R. 4790, provides tax reduction and relief for millions of our people. The present high rate of Federal taxes is a product of wartime conditions. The war has now been over for nearly 3 years. It is time that our people, who have carried the burden of these war taxes so long, should be relieved. The continuance of such high taxes is not only a burden to the individual citizen but is also an obstruction to business and delays that full production that is so necessary if we are to overcome the present inflationary forces and the high cost of living.

Some relief from the present high cost of living is provided by an increase in exemptions under the individual income tax. This relief will be particularly among taxpayers in the low-income class. Such taxpayers also receive preferential treatment in the percentage tax reductions made by this bill. Additional relief in the form of greater exemptions is given to persons 65 years of age and over, and also to the blind.

This bill also equalizes the tax burdens of married couples. It places all married couples, regardless of the State in which they reside, on the same basis as those who have lived in so-called community-property States and who have thereby enjoyed a pronounced preference. It also corrects existing inequalities under the estate and gift taxes, as well as individual income tax.

The changes in the rates and exemptions of the individual income tax under this bill are effective January 1, 1948. The changes in the estate and gift taxes become law on the date of enactment of this bill.

A brief description of the changes provided in the bill is as follows:

First. Personal and dependency exemptions are increased from $500 to $600 per person.

Second. Tax reductions ranging from 30 percent to 10 percent according to the size of the income are provided for all taxpayers. The distribution of these tax reductions is as follows:

(a) Persons with net incomes of $1,000 or less after exemptions receive a 30-percent reduction in their tax.

(b) Persons with net incomes of $1,000 to about $1,400 after exemptions receive a reduction of from 30 percent to 20 percent in their tax.

(c) Persons with net incomes of from about $1,400 to $4,000 after exemptions receive a reduction of 20 percent in their tax.

(d) Persons with net incomes in excess of $4,000 after exemptions receive a reduction of 20 percent on the tax imposed on their first $4,000 of net income after exemptions, and 10 percent on the tax

imposed on any remaining net income after exemptions.

Third. Husbands and wives are permitted to split their income for tax purposes.

Fourth. An additional exemption is granted to taxpayers who are 65 or over. If both husband and wife have attained the age of 65, the $600 exemption is granted to each spouse.

Fifth. An additional $600 exemption is granted to taxpayers who are blind. If both husband and wife are blind, the $600 exemption is granted to each spouse. A blind person 65 or over may claim this exemption in addition to that based on age.

It is said that this bill will reduce the amount received into the Treasury from Federal taxes by over $6,000,000,000. That is probably true. Fortunately, our country is now at the highest peak of national income that it has ever reached. This situation makes it possible to give tax reduction to our citizens, and at the same time have a sufficient surplus to make substantial payments on our national debt. This highly satisfactory state of our fiscal affairs is due in no small measure to the vast reduction in governmental expenses that has come under Republican control during the past year. Thus we are enabled at this time to reduce taxes and at the same time pay off a substantial part of our national debt. It is a record of which every citizen may be proud. It shows that under wise management of our national affairs that even the humblest citizen gains some benefit.

I will close as I commenced, this bill is a constructive, sane tax bill. My vote will be cast for it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, when the tax-reduction bill was before us in 1947 I supported it because I believed that people in the lower- and moderate-income brackets, now 2 years after the war, must have some tax relief from the wartime tax structure to help them meet the high cost of living—up over 60 percent over 1939. The cost of living has risen materially since then—the spring of 1947—until today food costs for example are up over twice what they were in 1939.

I do not like certain of the features of the bill before us, and I have profound reservations about the aggregate amount by which we can cut our revenue for tax reduction purposes, but the bill before us will get the legislative process going. The need of my constituents for some kind of help to meet the high living costs is so great that I feel as their representative that I must vote for this bill with its imperfections rather than to afford them no help at all at this time.

When the legislative process is complete, I believe it is capable of allowing for a reasonable readjustment of personal income taxes, and adequate revenue for substantial debt reduction and for support of the European recovery program, both of which I consider essential to the future of the country.

I have again surveyed the opinion of the rank-and-file citizens in the various parts of my district as I did on the occasion of the previous tax bill, and consider that this is what they want me to do by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, thoughtful men agree that the dangers threatening this country from within are greater than any that threatened us from without.

There is general agreement among thinking men that before we can consider any major expenditures for Europe we must first master the domestic crisis caused by an alarming inflation, coupled with the debt of unprecedented proportions, and a Federal Government the size and cost of which is out of all reason. It has become a Government by professional wasters. This combination creates a situation too grave to exaggerate, yet with determination and intelligent direction it can be successfully dealt with.

However, it is apparent that those now in authority have no understanding of these problems, and it follows that they have no solution. Certainly the President in his address on the state of the Union gave the American people no basis for hoping that he recognized the danger of the situation. His tax and other proposals, if carried to their ultimate conclusion, would lend impetus to the dangerous inflationary spiral and insure continued rise in prices and continued scarcity of commodities.

It is well for us to remember that our American political philosophy after 175 years is still the new, liberal, and revolutionary philosophy in the world today. On its record, it is the best political organization that has ever been developed to promote the well-being of all the people. It recognizes the rights of the individual and is based on promoting the initiative of the millions and not the dictatorship of the few. Under it our country has made great progress in developing social and economic values and in what our forefathers called the pursuit of happiness.

Today that system is threatened from within, not from without. We will not be deceived by being told that the big bogeyman is over the horizon. It is imperative that our domestic crisis be mastered now.

This tax bill is the first step on the road back to a sane fiscal policy. It is an honest and equitable tax-reduction program.

All of us know that there is no tax reduction or tax relief unless the whole Federal tax income is reduced. That is just simple arithmetic and is understandable by any high-school student.

The best recommendation for this tax bill is that the opposition, after 2 months of sleepless nights, have been unable to improve it and their attack and criticism has been anything but impressive.

The budgetary requirements of the Federal Government are the primary factor in the consideration of tax matters, but today we are confronted with a shocking and dangerous situation. In addition to our own budgetary requirements, there is a group in this House maintaining that we should also take into consideration the budgetary requirements of 16 European nations and levy taxes on the American people accordingly. This undertaking is without parallel in all history.

The opposition speaks of additional corporate taxes. There has been no justifiable evidence presented in support of this proposal. They speak of exorbitant profits, yet no Government witness before the committee could point to one single industry that was enjoying exorbitant profits. Certainly there is some profiteering. No industrial nation such as ours could scarcely be without it, yet it is recognized that it is not a major factor in high prices. They recommend that additional taxes be placed on some 22,000 corporations; those with income in excess of $50,000, relieving some 300,000 corporations with income less than $50,000. This in effect is saying the big corporations are profiteers and the smaller corporations do not indulge themselves in exorbitant profits. This arbitrary division is within itself the height of stupidity. Their proposals of additional taxes on corporations ignore the large volume of business done in an inflationary period and the fact that profits have not changed materially in ratio when related to the national income. It omits mentioning that the profit dollar is taxed twice and that the purchasing power of the profit dollar has shrunk by 51 percent while the worker's dollar has diminished 39 percent.

It ignores, moreover, the fact that profit margins or percent per dollar of sales have not varied materially from prewar averages. It overlooks entirely the fact that the book value of capital in terms of the cost of plant or buildings or equipment is low and that any use of "net worth" when applied to 1939 figures will necessarily be wrong today. For the "book value" of capital is not a true picture on which to make measurements of profit.

A locomotive still running today was bought at about $50,000 in prewar days. A new one costs about $150,000. A plant unit to produce an ingot of steel is on the books at a depreciated level of about $50 whereas a new unit would cost close to $200 today.

Plant is wearing out. Machinery must be replaced at present-day costs—not "book value" costs. Where is the capital coming from to replace what is worn out?

After eliminating the inventory profits, which are temporary, and the benefits due to carry-back provisions in the tax laws, corporate profits in 1946 were lower than in 1945. This is the statement recently made by the economic staff of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in response to inquiries from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

This bill relieves 7,000,000 persons from any direct Federal taxes. Seventy-one percent of the $6,500,000,000 goes to the men and women in the lower-income bracket. It is a bill to relieve all the people. This bill will give new hope to the American people and confidence to American business. A demoralized and

bankrupt America can make no contribution to a suffering world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF.]

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, it has not been possible for me to be present prior to this time during the debate on the Knutson tax-reduction bill now before us. It was my privilege to sit as a member of the Ways and Means Committee during the hearings on the measure. My vote on reporting the bill to the House was cast in favor of such action. The proposal represents the best judgment of a majority of the committee having had the same under consideration for many weeks.

I take this opportunity to state that I shall vote against the motion to recommit the bill and in favor of the measure on final passage. I am in complete harmony with the others members of the committee who voted to report the bill, and in my opinion the House will approve the judgment of the committee overwhelmingly.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the tax cut of $6,300,000,000 contemplated by the bill now before the House will not hinder in the least the present program of reducing our $256,000,000,000 public debt by an average of $5,000,000,000 each fiscal year.

We have, during the past few weeks, heard many assertions to the effect that our towering public debt prohibits an over-all tax reduction at this time. Such assertions fly in the face of the plain implications of the present redemption schedule of our national debt. The assertions, moreover, tend to be quite vague in phrasing—they exhort us to reduce the debt by keeping taxes at their present level, but they do not tell us what part of the debt is to be paid, or when the payment is to be made.

All of these pleas to keep taxes at their present level to retire our public debt tend to obscure one important fact; namely, an examination of the redemption schedule of our national debt discloses that 1948 is the best year out of the next 10 in which to reduce taxes.

Seen in this perspective, the current outcry against cutting taxes, lest the cut end debt reduction, is just another aspect of the unceasing and resourceful effort to "tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect" at the expense of the American people.

For the redemption schedule of our public debt is such that a slash in taxes, coupled with a deflation of the hot air which balloons the projected 1949 budget to $39,700,000,000, can produce by June 30, 1949, a cut to the public debt of $247,000,000,000, without relying on wartime tax rates and reckless, inflationary spending.

The same situation will prevail during the 1949 fiscal year, but with different causes. Barring the drastic expedient of merely printing the money as required—and I am sure that not even our confirmed "scientific spenders" want this to happen—the Treasury will have to exchange new securities for the debt which matures during fiscal 1949, because it will simply not have enough money to do otherwise. For example, between September 15 and October 1, 1948, $11,000,000,000 matures in bonds, notes, and certificates. In the best of circumstances this sum cannot be redeemed in full because there could hardly be a surplus exceeding $1,000,000,000, or even half that sum, before December. Until we have administrators who profess, at least, a nodding acquaintance with the idea of a budget which balances at $30,000,000,000, we shall have to defer most of our debt reduction until the second half of the fiscal year, when about three-fifths of the total revenues are gathered. But during this period of fiscal 1949, the only marketable maturities are in short-term notes, certificates, and Treasury bills. Any reductions which result solely from refunding these issues—and I believe they will have to be refunded—will be completely offset by an unavoidable increase resulting from the sale of savings bonds and special issues.

As a matter of fact, the Treasury can, during the coming fiscal year, employ a prospective surplus to best advantage only if it calls for redemption of $1,600,000,000 in 2-percent bonds which are not otherwise payable until fiscal 1951. This amount is about one-third of the surplus in prospect if we pass this tax bill and hold Government spending to the entirely reasonable figure of $36,000,000,000 to assure reduction of the public debt to $247,000,000,000 by June 30, 1949. But it happens to be the administration's only justification for denying a tax cut at this time.

By the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder before the House Ways and Means Committee, the present tax bill, if it becomes law, will still leave a surplus of $6,000,000,000 for the 1948 fiscal year, of which $1,500,000,000 has already materialized and been used to reduce the public debt. If we add to the remaining surplus of $4,500,000,000 the extra $1,800,000,000 which the Treasury expects to secure before June 30 from the sale of savings bonds to individuals and special issues of Government agencies, and the $1,000,000,000 available from the present Treasury cash balance, we will have $7,300,000,000 on hand before June 30 with which to slash the marketable debt in the hands of the public.

What will happen to all this money?

Most of it, or $5,400,000,000, ought to redeem the three marketable bond issues which can be paid off on March 15 and June 15 of this year.

About $1,250,000,000 may be paid on the 1-year, low-interest certificates of indebtedness which mature in February, March, April, and June.

A small amount may be paid to reduce the $15,000,000,000 now outstanding in Treasury bills; but since nearly all of these 90-day securities are now owned by the Federal Reserve System, which returns as taxes nine-tenths of the interest paid to it by the Treasury, a substantial reduction of this type of debt would cost more than it is worth.

All told, the debt this fiscal year could be reduced to $252,000,000,000 after the current tax bill becomes law. In his budget message President Truman projected a reduction to $251,000,000,000. The difference, I contend, is so slight as to compel a tax slash at this time.

At best, it is a picayune justification. At worst, it is an artful dodge. It is a dodge which obscures the fact that the coming fiscal year offers the lowest bond-redemption totals possible before 1956. Tax reduction in 1948 is challenged by only $2,000,000,000 worth of marketable bonds which can be paid off during the 1949 fiscal year. During the 1950 fiscal year, tax reduction will be challenged by $7,600,000,000 in redeemable, marketable bonds. The total of such bonds during the 1951 fiscal year is $10,400,000,000. For fiscal 1952, the total is $18,700,000,000; and for fiscal 1953, $9,400,000,000. The possible redemptions of $681,000,000 in fiscal 1954 and $2,611,000,000 in fiscal 1955 will be complicated by the maturing of many billions of dollars' worth of war-bought savings bonds. Not until fiscal 1956, with only $1,449,000,000 in long-term marketable bonds then eligible for redemption, will there be as favorable an opportunity for tax reduction as we have at this moment.

This, then, is the blunt truth: If we fail to cut taxes now, the structure and demands of our public debt may force Americans to wait a decade for tax relief.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the pending bill at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Knutson tax-reduction bill, and shall vote against it. My decision has been reached after careful consideration of the bill and its effects upon our economy. I know that tax reduction is a thing to be desired when it can be had without danger to our economy and national welfare. But desirable as is tax reduction, it is my opinion that tax revision should precede a blind tax reduction as provided in the Knutson bill.

There are many inequities in our tax structure and there are many excise taxes that are burdensome to those of our people who are least able to bear the burden. I refer to the excise taxes on leather goods, telephone and telegraph messages, cosmetics, and upon the transportation of persons and goods. The war rates on these and other items and classifications are still in existence. To me it seems incontrovertible that these wartime rates at least should be removed before there is any reduction in the income tax. And should not the double taxation imposed by taxing the income of corporations and the dividends when distributed to the stockholder be removed before there is a general reduction in income taxes? If the Knutson bill is passed it will reduce the Government's income to such a point that the reductions inherent in tax revision will

not be possible. For this reason alone, I would oppose the Knutson bill, if for no other.

But there are more compelling reasons than this for my opposition. In the first place, it will reduce the Government's income by some $7,000,000,000. This will wipe out the expected surplus of revenue over expenditures for the next fiscal year, and put us in the red. What will those who come after us think of us if we do this foolish thing, and leave nothing to apply upon our huge national debt? As we found in our efforts to reduce the budget last year, it is impossible to make any substantial reduction in our budget so long as the threat of Russian aggression hangs over us, and so long as it is necessary for us to spend large sums in Europe and Asia for our own protection, and still larger sums to maintain our armed strength in the face of the many threats to our very existence as a free people.

To vote for the Knutson bill or any sizable tax cut is unthinkable until we know what our expenditures and incomes will be for the coming fiscal year. I believe it cannot be successfully maintained that there ought to be a tax cut instead of the application of all our surplus funds on the national debt. It hangs like the sword of Damocles over our economy and the stability of our fiscal system. It must be reduced, and there is but one way to reduce it, and that is to apply the surplus of the Federal revenue over our expenditures each year until it is greatly reduced.

In the next place, the tax reduction proposed by the Knutson bill is most inflationary. Its proponents have gone so far as to say that it will help to curb inflation. Those who make this statement are either careless of the truth or are badly misled by the powerful forces who are selfishly demanding this tax cut. No recognized economist has made any such statement about the effects of this huge tax cut. On the contrary, the conservative United States News, edited by David Lawrence, has stated repeatedly that the Knutson bill would add much to the flames of inflation which are sweeping our economy toward the destruction of a depression. That grand old man, Bernard Baruch, has warned us that there should be no tax cuts for 2 years, and that all our surplus revenue should be used to reduce the national debt, especially by using it to retire short-term loans held by the banks, thus reducing the basis for credit. A sound economy demands the reduction of the short-term loans held by the banks, and a regular and sizable yearly cut in the over-all debt.

Last, but not least, I am opposed to the Knutson bill, because it does not give sufficient tax relief to the very people who need it most—the people of the low-income group. Actually we are taxing some of our citizens—unmarried persons—who are making less than $50 a month. They are the people who ought to get the most benefits from any tax reduction that we can afford.

For all these reasons I shall vote against the Knutson bill and shall vote to send it back to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to bring in a bill that will provide for the raising of the exemption from $500 to $700; that will provide the extension of the privilege of dividing income between husband and wife now given in the community-property States to the married people of all our States. I will vote for this tax reduction for these two classes of individuals only because the instructions to the committee will include also the imposition of an excess-profits tax to make up for the loss of revenue entailed by the other provisions of the motion.

I know the sound proposals of the motion to recommit will be voted down, and the Knutson bill will be passed. It is discouraging to see the party in power bow to the wishes of the people with large incomes, who are selfishly or ignorantly demanding this large tax cut which endangers the fiscal soundness of our economy. It is tragic that we do not have the courage, even in a Presidential election year, to discipline ourselves as recommended by Mr. Baruch and others so as to prevent the impending catastrophe of depression and unemployment that will come inevitably unless we check the deadly spiral of inflation that has us in its grip.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I came to the present session of Congress thoroughly committed to, and in favor of, reduction of income tax. My people want it, and I want it myself. I am willing to go to any reasonable lengths to accomplish it. Letters from my constituents indicate very clearly that they expect me to support some form of income-tax reduction.

A very few have suggested that taxes should be reduced even without regard to the national debt. For the most part, however, those who have advised me have stressed their concern over the national debt and have in effect taken it for granted that I would protect their interests and the interests of every holder of Government securities.

I have listened to the argument, over the several days of debate, on the Knutson bill. I am convinced that it is not a sincerely drawn measure and that the Republican majority knows perfectly well that it can never become a law. I cannot believe that the conservative men on the other side of the House would, under any conditions, endanger the national credit and take such an unsound step as that which was so ably characterized by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] as "borrowing money to reduce taxes."

I shall vote against the measure although presumably it is going to pass the House. I hope that the Senate will modify it along lines of good government and good business, and that when it returns to our body for final action it will be in such shape that I can vote for it without apology.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote to recommit this tax bill to the Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report out a more equitable bill.

I wish it were possible to submit amendments to the present bill that we have under consideration; however, I know that under the rule we are not permitted to do so. I appreciate the fact that a tax bill is highly technical and that it requires a lot of effort and time in perfecting it and that, ordinarily, it would be a mistake to attempt to write such a bill on the floor. Therefore, I do not criticize the Rules Committee for disallowing amendments as it is following the precedent that we Democrats have used for many years. The Republicans say for us to take this bill or leave it.

Last year I voted on two occasions against the Republican-sponsored tax bill and also voted to uphold the President's veto which, as you will recall, was upheld by the House. However, the present bill gives additional relief to married couples and to low-income groups.

Personally, I feel that the bill should not be brought up at this time, but that we should have sufficient time in which to ascertain if the budget is to be reduced and in what amount.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has a large voice in the cutting of the budget, states that it will be cut in an amount sufficient to justify the present tax bill. While I am sure that he is sincere in his statement, we must recall that this was not done last year. Be that as it may, the time has arrived for a reduction in taxes. I do not believe that many Members would today stand upon this floor and argue that there should not be some reduction.

I have long felt that the present law allowing community family income splitting was neither fair nor just. Married couples in about 12 community-property States may equally divide their total community income regardless of whether such income is property or earned income. Married couples in non-community-property States with earned income cannot split such income resulting in greatly increased income taxes when compared with married couples in community-property States. I am surprised that some of our colleagues from the community-property States argue that the benefits that they enjoy should not, by Federal legislation, be extended to cover all other States. The answer is given that States like Alabama should themselves change the law. However, a citizen of my State should not be penalized by his Federal Government simply because his State fails to pass such legislation. Several bills have been introduced allowing citizens of non-community-property States the same privileges as those enjoyed by the community-property States. However, we all know that the present leadership is not going to allow these bills to be favorably reported by the Ways and Means Committee. Therefore, we might as well be realistic. If the motion to recommit this bill is defeated, the only way by which we will be able to rectify this tragic mistake will be to vote for the bill upon final passage. While this provision of the bill will give little relief to the low-income groups, they must be given proportionate tax cuts by increasing their exemption. The taxpayers of my State are entitled to the same justice, under the law, and in order to get this justice, I am willing to vote for this bill if it become necessary and send it on to the Senate for action.

It is a foregone conclusion that the Senate is not going to take up this bill any time within the immediate future. They are going to wait and see what amount we will be able to cut in the budget. I firmly believe that when this bill gets to the Senate that it will be modified and that we will again be given an opportunity to vote upon it.

The theory has been advanced by some that taxes should not be reduced at this time because it would be inflationary. Even if this be true, I cannot subscribe to such a philosophy. Taxes should be levied for the purposes of revenue only. The people are carrying a heavy load of taxation. Other means should be found for the combating of inflation. People in the low-income groups are finding it hard to buy the necessities of life. They should and must be given some relief. We have several bills increasing salaries of Government workers and salaries and wages of workers in some industries have been raised. These are justified. However, there are thousands of people who have received no salary raise and doubtless will not do so. Their lot is a hard one. It is difficult for them to raise the money to pay income taxes. The only way to give them a raise in pay is to pass a tax bill. I am pleased that a motion to recommit will be offered by the Democrats. This substitute tax program will give the sum of $200 additional exemption for each taxpayer, raising the present exemption from $500 to $700.

Individual exemptions should be raised. The present bill we have before us does this and the motion to recommit will also raise the individual exemptions.

We must not do anything that would threaten the solvency of our Government. There must be something left to pay on the debt. No one knows what the future holds. We must admit that the budget will necessarily have to be reduced to warrant the present tax bill. There are certain set expenditures which cannot be cut very much. Our national defense must be maintained and this necessarily means a large outlay of money. The disabled veterans of all wars must be properly cared for and we have commitments for education and training which must be carried out. The interest upon the public debt must be paid. We have experienced the most expensive war in history and we cannot look to posterity to pay for all of this expense.

I would like to see something in between the present bill and the substitute, something on the order of the suggestion made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who is the ranking minority member and former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I believe that we could reduce taxes by three to four billion dollars. Other countries have since the war reduced income taxes, among them being England and Canada. Even some of the countries that come under the Marshall plan have reduced them.

There are many objections that I could raise to the bill that we have under consideration. However, it is here and something must be done with it. Not being willing to go all out for the present bill and seeing the necessity for some relief, I am supporting the Democratic recommittal motion and if it should fail of adoption, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important bills we will consider in the Eightieth Congress is this tax bill, H. R. 4790, because it affects the welfare of every American citizen. The Government has no way to carry forward its activities except through the medium of taxation. We have long been taught that the power to tax is the power to destroy. We also know that the power to spend is the power to destroy.

We have the largest tax burden in all of our peacetime history. In fact, we are still laboring under the high war taxes which were imposed when this Nation was in the throes of a world war, and we had to take heroic means to beat back the attacks upon us and upon our civilization. Crushing taxes, as well as all other emergency measures under such circumstances, are justified, but now that the war is over and it is 2½ years behind us, and we are in a peacetime regime, there is no sound reason why this wartime tax load should not be reduced with the major reductions on the low-income taxpayers. We all know that the more money the bureaucratic spenders have available, the more they will waste and dissipate.

I propose to support this bill, H. R. 4790. Under it all of the 55,000,000 taxpayers will receive a reduction; about 7,400,000 removed from individual income tax entirely. Of the total reduction, about 72 percent will go to taxpayers with incomes under $5,000, and only 28 percent to taxpayers with incomes over $5,000. Low-income taxpayers will receive a 30-percent cut and the big payers only 10 percent, graduated down to 20 percent in the middle brackets. Each taxpayer will receive an additional $100 exemption for himself and each dependent. Blind taxpayers will receive further benefits, and it is estimated 77,560 blind persons in Oregon, my State, will be relieved from any income-tax payment. Aged persons over 65 will also receive an additional $500 exemption.

Tax legislation must originate in the House. It is necessary for the House to get this legislation to the Senate without delay for its consideration. When the bill comes back to the House, we will be able, at that time, to adjust errors and lower the total reduction, if found necessary after the budget is agreed upon.

We all want to balance the budget and keep our financial structure sound, to care for our aged, to provide for veterans' needs, to service the national debt, including a substantial annual payment for its reduction, and to fulfill our just obligations in giving aid to our neighbor nations overseas, crushed by the war.

No one can say that we have not fulfilled our duty on foreign aid thus far. We have expended overseas, since the war ended, over $24,000,000,000 for civilian aid. Reports that come to us here in the Congress from our committees and representatives who have canvassed postwar conditions in foreign countries, are to the effect that many of our American tax dollars have been flagrantly dissipated, and poured down "rat holes" with little or no actual aid or relief to the stricken peoples on the lower-income levels or destitute who are in dire need of immediate help to prevent starvation. Our foreign-aid program has been shamefully administered and much of the money provided for this program has gone to corrupt politicians, designing civilians and military officials, and others who want to profit from the largess of America without themselves making any contribution by their own self-help to the welfare of their fellow citizens. Whatever we do in the way of relief for the war-stricken nations should be to help them to help themselves, and must be hedged about by administrative controls that will make certain that every dollar expended will bring a full dollar's worth of value in relief and rehabilitation to the needy recipients of the gifts from our own people. In giving aid, we must not undermine our own financial structure.

America alone cannot save the world. We are a nation of 140,000,000 persons. The world's population is around 2,250,000,000. We are about one-sixteenth of all mankind. We produce about one-eighth of the world's food supply. Europe has some 350,000,000 persons. There are about 275,000,000 in the 16 countries and that part of Germany included in the European Recovery Plan. The Chinese and others also want to share in our bounty. Some contend Uncle Sam can do the job alone. We are facing this great undertaking, the Marshall plan, with the widespread assumption at home and abroad the job can be done with Uncle Sam footing most of the bills.

WHY NOT A MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE AGED OF AMERICA?

Mr. Chairman, in connection with this tax bill, H. R. 4790, which has for its purpose the lessening of the tax load upon the American taxpayer, it is appropriate to call attention to another obligation of our country which must be financed by taxes. I refer to the inexcusable failure of the Congress to make adequate provision for the aged of America. I pose the question, "Why not a Marshall plan for the aged of America?" While we are considering tax measures and the Marshall plan for Europe, is it not time to adopt a Marshall plan for the old folks of this Nation? The proposal of the Administration is to spend some $17,000,000,000 in aid to European countries under the Marshall plan in the next 4 or 5 years, with an allocation of $6,800,000,000 for the ensuing 15 months. This is in addition to the twenty-four billions that have already been expended for European aid since the war ended. I call attention to the fact that much of this huge expenditure will be made available for the needy of the European countries, including the aged. I maintain it is a decent thing to do, while we are expending such huge sums for foreign aid, to have a Marshall plan for our own old folks in America and give them some help in their distress. The Congress for years has been considering legislation for security for its elderly citizens. Throughout my legislative service here, covering some 9 years, I have urged that the Congress adopt a Federal

old-age program which will do justice to the old folks of America.

On the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, I introduced H. R. 16, which is a bill providing benefits to the aged and the totally disabled. This bill does not provide any fixed monthly annuity for the recipients, but it does provide for a tax and the total amount raised thereby will be prorated monthly among those entitled to take under the bill. The experts of the Congress on fiscal affairs and tax legislation should determine the tax formula necessary so that the bill, when enacted, shall provide an adequate annuity to maintain these old folks in decency and health. It would lie within the province of the Congress to change the tax from time to time as conditions warranted. This bill has been gathering dust in the pigeon holes of the Ways and Means Committee. Before we adjourned at the special session, I urged that every Member of the House interested in the welfare of our old folks, sign a discharge petition which I placed on the Clerk's desk. The Christmas season was then approaching and it seemed appropriate as an evidence of good will and sincere interest in the welfare of these old folks that we sign this petition and bring this bill on the floor for consideration. One hundred and forty Members have signed the petition. When two hundred and eighteen Members sign, the bill will come to the floor under an open rule and will be subject to any germane amendment, and the House will be able to work its will and to adopt any amendments it desires in order to make the bill acceptable to the majority of our Members. The exact terminology and provisions of this bill are not the important consideration, but it is important to enact some legislation making adequate provision for our old folks, with an assurance that they will have an ample monthly income during their old age to permit them to secure the necessary medical care, food, clothing, and shelter to protect them from want, hunger, and cold.

The existing social-security law for the aged is an ineffective gesture. Under it, as shown by the reports from the Social Security Agency, the payments the aged are receiving for old-age assistance through the States of the Union, average from $16.92 a month in the lowest State, to $64.95 in the highest, as shown for the month of November 1947, with a national average of $36.91. Truly, such allowances to cover food, clothing, medical care and shelter, represent a starvation program. As was recently pointed out by the Administrator, in some areas contributions by the State and Federal Governments are not enough to enable people to maintain an adequate diet and they are literally suffering slow starvation.

The United States Public Health Service recently reported the results of a long-range survey which shows that about 35 persons per 1,000 have some chronic illness or major physical disability. A gradual increase takes place to a rate of about 100 cases per 1,000 at 45. From this point on the curve goes up very rapidly. There are nearly 250 chronically ill per 1,000 at 60. In the next 10 years the rate goes up to 400 per 1,000. At 80 more than half of the group needs the regular care of a physician, and at 90 the rate is more than 900 per 1,000.

The critical problem facing our old folks in their endeavor to maintain a bare existence is tragically intensified by the high cost of food and other necessities of life in this inflationary period in which we find ourselves. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has recently announced that the cost of food bought by the average American family increased 25 percent in 1947 over 1946. Dorothy Bovee, Red Cross nutritionist, reports that the cost of a minimum adequate diet for a family of two in the Washington area at this time, is at least $11.60 weekly, and she lists the items which make up this minimum diet for two adult persons for 1 week, as follows:

Food and amount:	Cost
Whole milk, 7 quarts	$1.47
White potatoes, 10 pounds	.46
Peanut butter, 4 ounces	.09
Baked beans, 14-ounce can	.15
Oranges, 6 medium-sized	.12
Tomatoes, 1 No. 2 can	.16
Tomato juice, 1 No. 2 can	.10
Cabbage, 1-pound head	.06
Spinach or kale, 1 pound	.25
Corn, 1 No. 1 can	.17
Green pepper, 1	.03
Carrots, 2 bunches	.17
Lettuce, 1 head	.13
Celery, 1 stalk	.19
Onions, 1 pound	.12
Banana, 1	.07
Apples, 2 pounds	.19
Pears, 2 pounds	.20
Applesauce, 1 can	.14
Raisins, ½ pound	.10
Prunes, 1 pound	.19
Eggs, 1½ dozen	.93
Cottage cheese, 1 pound	.23
American cream cheese, ¼ pound	.15
Hamburger, 1 pound	.43
Beef liver, ½ pound	.30
Fresh lean pork, ½ pound	.26
Pork butts, ¼ pound	.17
Scrapple	.24
Dried beef, ¼ pound	.33
Fish, 1 pound	.29
Beef stew meat, ½ pound	.22
Bread, 7 loaves	.98
Rice, 1 pound	.22
Rolled oats, ½ pound	.07
Farina, ½ pound	.10
Flour, ¼ pound	.03
Macaroni, 4 ounces	.06
Margarine, 1 pound	.45
Lard, ½ pound	.15
Salad dressing, 1 jar	.23
Sugar, 2 pounds	.18
Cookies, 1 box	.18
Jelly or apple butter, ¾ pound	.25
Coffee, 1 pound	.49
Total	11.60

We all know old-age annuitants with their meager income would not be able to buy this diet, but would be limited to the essential staples only, eliminating the fresh fruit, canned goods, and fancy items. For them it would be a luxury diet.

In contrast to the foregoing minimum fare which old-age annuitants are unable to buy with their limited allotments, is the menu of a dinner recently given in the Statler Hotel here in Washington to 100 guests by Mr. Charles Luckman, who headed the President's meatless-eggless-days program. Here is the menu: Shrimp cocktail, fried oysters, crabs, shrimp and lobster gumbo, curried chicken, roast turkey, baked ham, roast beef, string beans au gratin, fried apple rings, pickled walnuts, celery, olives, rye rolls, assorted finger rolls, ice cream, and coffee. Mr. Luckman's job was to conserve food for hungry Americans.

Mr. Chairman, how can an old person who must maintain himself on old-age assistance, according to the plan provided in the present social security setup, meet his expenses, not only for food but for all other necessities, on an average monthly payment of $36.91? Is there any valid reason why this Eightieth Congress should not give the right-of-way and green light to legislation for old-age assistance while we are opening the Treasury doors wide for European relief?

We have been concerned in the Congress about the rising cost of living, the inflation spiral, and the added burden placed upon the millions of our workers and the low-income groups who must pay these increased prices for food, clothing, and shelter. Cognizant of these difficulties, the Congress has increased substantially the income of some groups of our citizens, but it has given the old people no consideration. Their meager monthly average of $36.91 remains the same, while the simple fare they must provide to keep body and soul together has risen in price by leaps and bounds. Many annuitants receive much less than the average $36.91. The miserable pittance they were receiving was wholly insufficient to care for their modest needs before the advent of high living costs.

According to statistics I received some time before the war with respect to the annuitants under the insurance provision of the Social Security Act, 252,000 past 65 years of age received an average of $23 a month; 74,000 wives of these pensioners 65 or over received an average of $12.25 a month; widows over 65, totaling 25,000, received only $20.16 a month; 28,000 parents received $13 a month; widows under 65, of whom there were 55,000, received $19.50 a month; and 159,000 children under 18 received $12.21. Of all persons 60 years of age or over, four-fifths received less than a minimum for decency and health. Before our entry into the war, it was estimated that of the persons 60 years of age and over in the United States, 54.9 percent were supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies or were dependent on children, relatives, or friends for their subsistence and care. A considerable proportion of the remainder received part or all of their support from various pension systems—Federal, State, and municipal, industrial or private.

At the beginning of the year 1946, nearly half of all civilian jobs were excluded from coverage under the Social Security program, and nearly 2 in 5 of all persons employed were neither fully nor currently insured. At best the social-security law we now have is a haphazard program which, in effect, is largely financed by the public generally, but the benefits of which are shared in

by only a few selected groups. It encourages inflation by collecting a huge fund currently used for deficit spending. These difficulties would be overcome by the adoption of H. R. 16, which would cover all citizens falling within its provisions, and the obligations and benefits of the program would likewise be shared by all. It would be all-inclusive in its provisions and therefore would obviate the necessity of continuing many social-security laws now in existence and would, for the first time, set up in our country a Federal old-age-security program which would insure all of our elderly citizens 60 years of age or over against the hazards of old age. It would build up no reservoir for deficit spending, but the moneys collected would go back into the channels of trade each month, providing local markets for American production and buying power for aged citizens.

On December 31, 1947, there had been paid into the Social Security fund approximately $10,524,681,961.55, and only $1,772,431,249.69 paid out to beneficiaries; the balance was spent by the Government for general governmental purposes.

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress are engaged in a great adventure in human welfare. We are charged with the responsibility of planning and building for 140,000,000 Americans a social, economic and cultural structure which will assure their welfare. If we omit from our plans the care and protection of the millions of aged citizens who are in want, we will build in vain. We will build a tower of Babel. We must not reject the guiding hand of Providence in our plans; we need spiritual understanding as well as political wisdom. As Benjamin Franklin said to the Constitutional Convention when the great charter of our liberties was drafted:

> We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it," I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests, our project will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages. And, what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, conquest.

Daniel Webster, one of our eminent predecessors, said:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

We should not be unmindful of the fact that these senior citizens were the workers of yesterday. They helped build our cities, our roads, our industries and helped to clear our lands. They were the trail blazers, the pioneers. They built for us. Now that they are old, we cannot pass them by. They do not seek our charity. They only ask simple justice—a modest share in the fruits of American industry, to the production of which their labors in the past have contributed.

Let us prove to the whole world that these aged American citizens are entitled to and shall have vouchsafed to them by their country, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Let us prove that humanity is still on the march here in America by enacting an old-age-annuity plan that will provide for our old people an annuity sufficient to maintain them in decency and health.

I most sincerely urge you, my colleagues, to join us in petition No. 7 to bring the old-age-security legislation on the floor of this House at an early date, so that it may be enacted into law before this Congress ends, thereby putting America on record as willing to provide reasonable old-age security for our own elderly citizens while we are spending billions overseas for similar purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House reported out H. R. 4790 in order to save face by reason of a wild promise made to the American people in the last congressional campaign that the Republican Party would slash Federal taxes by billions of dollars. One year ago this month the Republican leadership of the House promised to reduce the cost of Government by $6,000,000,000. At the same time the other body was more conservative and promised the people that the cost of Government would only be reduced $4,500,000,000. The House Democratic leadership, at that time, stated that it was a rash promise merely to mislead the public into believing that they were carrying out their campaign promise to reduce the cost of government. When the first session of the Eightieth Congress adjourned in December, the facts revealed that the Republican leadership misled the American people on its reduction of the cost-of-government figure by over $5,500,000,000. The so-called Knutson tax bill, if passed in its present form, simply means that the Government will be compelled to borrow money to reduce taxes. The Members of this House almost unanimously voted for the billions of dollars that were spent to win the greatest war in all history. We have a debt of $257,000,000,000. We now have the greatest income in our history. The taxpayer in the higher brackets was never more prosperous than now. If we could eliminate the high cost of living, we could say the same for the group in the lower brackets. Now is the time to pay a substantial sum upon our war debt and not pass it on to the future and compel the veterans of World War II who fought the war to also assume the double burden of paying for the war. The sponsors of this tax bill are making misleading statements and double-talk about cutting President Truman's budget in order to save sufficient money to pay on our national debt. They failed to remind the Members that the President already reduced the budget which the various departments originally submitted by over $7,000,000,000. I have heard Members on the majority side compare the high governmental expenditures today with 10 years ago. These comparisons are misleading, and to the average citizen are startling if he is not acquainted with the real facts. The average citizen does not know that in the President's budget five items account for 79 percent of the budget.

One of the greatest speeches made on the floor of this House was delivered last Thursday by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] the second ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Cooper, in that speech, set out some factual figures which I am again going to call to the attention of the House. In breaking down the five items which take up 79 percent of the budget, we have the following:

The first item of the five is national defense. In the fiscal year 1948, the budget provided $10,746,000,000. In 1949, the figure is $11,026,000,000. Ten years ago in 1939 it was $1,074,000,000.

The next item is international affairs. That includes the United Nations, the Marshall plan and programs of that type.

In 1948 the budget provided $5,533,000,000 for this item. In 1949 it provided $7,009,000,000. Ten years ago in 1939, that item was $19,000,000.

The third of the five items is veterans affairs. In 1948 the budget provided $6,632,000,000. In 1949 the budget provides $6,102,000,000. In 1939 it was $559,000,000, substantially half a billion dollars 10 years ago, and now it is more than $6,000,000,000.

The fourth item is interest. In the 1948 fiscal year this item was $5,200,000,000. In 1949, it is $5,250,000,000. Ten years ago, in 1939, it was $941,000,000.

The last of these five items is tax refunds. In 1948 it was $2,049,000,000. In 1949 it is $1,990,000,000. Ten years ago in 1939 it was $68,000,000.

Those five items cover substantially four-fifths of the budget for the next fiscal year 1949. I submit to you, as a practical proposition, how are you going to substantially reduce any one of those five items?

I have not heard any of the respective Members on the majority side advocate any reduction in appropriations for national defense, veterans affairs or interest on the national debt or tax refund. If they insist on a substantial reduction on the international affairs item in the budget, it will necessarily mean an increase in our national defense items. Eliminating these five items, this reduction of six billion must come out of the remaining 21 percent of the President's budget. If the Republican leadership of this House follows their pattern of last year, they will not cut very much from this 21 percent, because in so doing they will encroach upon the veterans' hospital program, flood control, reclamation, aid to State governments, road building and other necessary improvement projects which the people of the various sections of the country will insist on. An example of the House leadership's action on just one item in the last session will convince the American people that they are merely talking for votes. I will mention briefly this example:

Last year, in their frantic effort to reduce the President's budget, they cut his request of $29,000,000 for reclamation

by almost one-half. When Congress adjourned in July, so much protest came from the communities back home that when they returned during the special session, the House leadership not only reinstated the reclamation reduction, but raised the President's original request from $29,000,000 to over $31,000,000. Possibly the Republican leadership is planning on repeating this legislative trickery in 1948 so that the voters next November will not know the true facts on tax and cost of Government reduction.

I am in favor of every possible reduction of taxes if it can be given to the group in the brackets which need it most. I am in favor of the tax-reduction bill submitted by the gentleman from Texas, Minority Leader RAYBURN, which will be offered at the close of this debate. That bill will raise the exemption from five hundred to seven hundred dollars and give 10,000,000 of the low-bracket taxpayers throughout the country a concession so that it will ease the burdensome high cost of living. Mr. RAYBURN's proposal will retain the community-property exemption. It also provides a partial restoration of the excess-profits tax which was repealed 2 years ago when everybody feared we were going to have six to eight million unemployed in the United States. When President Truman, in his state of the Union message, stated that corporate profits increased in 1946—1 year—from $12,000,000,000 to $17,000,000,000, I firmly think that some of these fantastic profits can be applied on our national debt.

I propose to vote for the motion to recommit so that we can get a real tax-reduction bill for the people least able to pay, and if that is defeated, I will vote against the so-called Knutson tax-reduction legislation which will be a windfall for the persons in the high brackets.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I believe that for the past 2 years, since the end of the war, the American taxpayer has been expecting and should have some tax relief. I supported the tax measure in the last session of Congress and expect to support a tax measure this session. In the first session of the Eightieth Congress the Republican Party brought out a tax bill before a single appropriation measure had been before us. At this session they are following the same procedure as they did last year. Not a single appropriation measure has been passed by the House this session. Today this bill, in my opinion, is premature. In the first session of the Eightieth Congress I voted against the tax proposal when it was first brought out and today I am opposed to this tax measure for the same reason—that is because it is being brought out before any appropriations are made. The tax bill of the first session of the Eightieth Congress went to the Senate after we had passed the majority of appropriation bills and we knew at that time what our income was and also what our expenditures were going to be. When it came back to the House I supported that measure and after the President had vetoed it I voted to override the President's veto. The income for the fiscal year 1947–48 is running at an estimated $47,000,000,000 or more. I do not believe that the majority party expects or even thinks that this measure before us today will be adopted. I want my Government to remain in a sound position and do not desire to see the dollar value further reduced. I also want to support a tax bill that will provide for a reasonable amount to be applied on our national debt. For a long time I have been in favor of the community-property tax provision. I also desire to support a tax bill that will give some relief to the low-income groups and I would like to support a tax bill that will give the people a reduction in taxes of around $4,500,000,000. I believe that the American taxpayers are expecting that much of us and I believe that we can accomplish that amount of tax reduction and remain in a sound position. I am hopeful that the Senate will do a better job on the tax measure than was done on the bill facing us today. The foreign situation today is still serious, in my opinion, and certainly no sound-thinking American desires or wants to jeopardize our national defense. We must stay in a strong position if we expect to remain a free people. When we balanced the budget for the fiscal year 1946–47 we placed ourselves in a much sounder position. I do not believe in deficit spending. I am fearful that this measure before us today will jeopardize a balanced budget before we have determined our expenditures for the fiscal year 1948–49.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, within a few hours this House will in all probability approve a tax bill reducing taxes by several billion dollars. How much better it would be to continue the present tax rate and appropriate several billions to attack the ills that beset mankind.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Eightieth Congress within reach of my voice and loved ones of their families are destined to die of the searing ravages of tortuous cancer. Heart disease, infantile paralysis, diabetes, and other killing and crippling diseases will also take their toll. What a fine opportunity this would be for the Nation that spent over $200,000,000,000 to maim and kill during the war, and $2,000,000,000 for the atomic bomb alone, to say, "Now we shall dedicate ourselves to saving life. We shall forego tax reductions and create the greatest scientific and research group the world has ever known to seek out and eradicate the maladies that have brought hideous and painful death to our fellow men and crippled and killed our children."

Mr. Chairman, I know that if Members of Congress are willing to pass up the substantial savings they would enjoy under this tax bill, those in the lower-income brackets, who suffer most from disease and pestilence, would gladly spurn the few paltry dollars they would receive. They would have the satisfaction of knowing that those in the extreme high brackets would also be making a substantial contribution to the eradication of the greatest curses visited on mankind.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, there is very little I can do in 13 minutes except to express briefly my opinion of the pending legislation and give you in a brief way my conception of some of the things that should be done at this time in the way of rearrangement or reduction of taxes.

I quite agree with the statement made the other day by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], after discussing the provisions of this bill and laying down figures that no one has denied, that this bill should be entitled "A bill to reduce taxes and borrow money," because that is what we shall be compelled to do if this bill becomes law, for the bill, if it means anything, means that the Government of the United States will be in the red. The most optimistic figures of those who are supporting this bill are that we shall have a surplus of $500,000,000. Of course, they express the optimistic hope that the President's budget will be reduced two or three billion dollars. A majority of the House around this time last year made the case that they were going to reduce the President's budget by $6,000,000,000. The other body in their enthusiasm said $4,500,000,000. We know the result. The actual result was a reduction of a little more than one-twelfth of that amount.

It has always been my idea that the prudent man should pay his debts when he has the money. We owe in the neighborhood of $256,500,000,000. These gentlemen with the $500,000,000 surplus propound the sound doctrine that they want a balanced budget and to pay a reasonable sum on the public debt. If we do not pay a reasonable amount—I would rather say a large amount—on the debt in 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, something might come along to check the economy of this country until our income would not justify and we could not support the other functions of Government and pay one dime on our national debt, as was so well stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

I had inserted in the RECORD the other day a statement prepared by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] that shows that after the last war bonds went to 80 cents on the dollar. Our national debt at that time was $26,000,000,000, what we had spent in the war and loaned our allies. Of course, that did not break all the banks and all the insurance companies, because they were not holding too much of this amount, but what would be the condition of the commercial banks of the United States under present conditions? The Federal Reserve banks hold $22,000,000,000 of these bonds. The commercial banks hold $69,000,000,000 of them. Do you think they could lose 20 cents on the dollar or 10 cents on the dollar and be solvent banks?

Do you think the insurance companies owning more than $20,000,000,000 of these bonds could be sound and yet lose 20 cents on the dollar? I know this, and I repeat it, that if something disturbs our economy and we do not have this great national income to pay taxes upon this tremendous debt of $250,000,000,000 is going to press down on your dollar and mine, and is going to squeeze the

value out of that dollar and it will be worth less than it is now.

Further than that, I think this is a cruel thing for this committee to put up to you gentlemen on the Republican side of the House, because they know that no bill that even looks like this will ever come out of the committee on conference. Yet they set their rates to provide for a reduction of $5,600,000,000 and it turned out to be $6,500,000,000, and they say that we are going to hang on to those rates. We are going to give this pap to the American people believing that they will swallow it and like it.

Somebody said they want tax reduction. In the motion to recommit, I propose a tax reduction and propose to remove from the payment of income taxes more than 10,000,000 American citizens. That applies to everybody. That will relieve nearly 10,000,000 people. I propose to raise the exemption from $500 to $700. That will affect all of us. They say that is not enough for the high-income fellow. I want to point out that in the motion to recommit which I shall offer and which is in your bill, 97½ percent of the $800,000,000 involved in the community-property provision goes to people with net incomes of more than $5,000 per annum.

Then there is this scare about the excess-profits tax. I disagree with my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, when he says that that provision was not considered. It was before the committee in the bill presented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] all during the hearings.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I referred to the bill itself and not just to that part of it dealing with excess profits. You say the bill was considered. I submit it was not considered. I was not referring to just that part of it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Not all of it, but two-thirds of it was, for the simple reason that the $40 per person added up amounts to about $3,200,000,000. The motion that I shall offer to raise the exemption from $500 to $700 is practically the same figure, so that bill relieved the small income-tax payer and took him out of the taxpaying bracket. This motion to recommit does the same thing. Further, is the motion that I shall make cruel to the corporations of the country? I do not think so. Every corporation in the country is given a $50,000 exemption. That takes out of the excess-profits tax more than 300,000 corporations. In other words, it leaves only 22,000 corporations that will be compelled to pay excess-profits taxes. They get their $50,000 exemption and then they get what is tantamount to 33⅓ percent reduction in what their excess-profits tax was during the wartime. So I do not think that is going to be so cruel, when I know that the President's budget will be cut very little; when I know that we are going to need money from some source to make up for that which we are going to lose by these exemptions, if we are going to pay one dollar on the national debt. And no more calamitous thing could come to this country of yours and mine in the years that lie immediately before us if we do not make a substantial reduction in that national debt.

Our friends on the Republican side have always boasted they were sound money people. This money is not going to be sound. This dollar is not going to be worth 100 cents with this tremendous and staggering charge made against it. I want a sound dollar. I want a dollar that will buy as nearly 100 cents' worth of material as possible. I know that unless we make these payments that will not come true.

This bill ought to be sent back to the committee, and not in a hurry but in sound reason and on information they should bring in a bill that will reduce the taxes of those least able to pay, and make that up from those most able to pay. I have always been a disciple of this doctrine, that the way to make the country prosperous is to make the man at the base prosperous so that he would have buying power. That prosperity would go all the way up. It has been the theory of some people in this country for 75, yea, 100 years, that the way to make the country prosperous was to make the rich very rich, and that would trickle down to the common, ordinary man. It will not do it.

This motion to recommit ought to be adopted, because it has in it the safety of the finances of this Government.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the record may contain an explanation of the motion to recommit I insert the following statement and tables at this point in the RECORD:

The motion to recommit, offered under the rule, is the only opportunity of the minority affirmatively to record their views on the kind of tax bill most desirable at this time. The motion will provide for striking out everything in H. R. 4790 after the enacting clause, and inserting four principal provisions:

First. A $200 per capita increase in personal exemptions;

Second. A modified excess-profits tax on corporations;

Third. Income splitting between husband and wife; and

Fourth. Estate splitting between husband and wife.

First, personal exemptions are increased from $500 to $700, which would remove nearly 10,000,000 of the neediest taxpayers from the rolls. The remaining 42,000,000 taxpayers will benefit in proportion to the maximum tax rate now paid by them.

There seems to be no doubt in the mind of anyone that present exemptions are too low. The $500 per capita exemption was fixed by Congress in 1944, and under it individual income-tax payers have increased from 4,000,000 in 1939 to the present 52,000,000. Since 1944, however, over-all consumer prices have increased 31 percent, and food prices by nearly 50 percent. If the 1939 personal exemption were to be allowed to the average American family of four, the equivalent under today's prices would be nearly $5,500. Actually, the exemption of a family of four is $2,000. The $200 increase in exemptions therefore, is in accord with the views expressed by the President on several occasions that the millions of taxpayers with low incomes should have high priority for relief from their wartime tax burdens. Eighty-nine percent of the relief granted by this proposal would go to taxpayers with net incomes of less than $5,000.

Second, to offset the $3,250,000,000 lost from increasing personal exemptions, a moderate excess-profits tax would be imposed upon the 22,000 out of some 360,000 taxpaying corporations with the largest excess profits. The wartime excess-profits tax would be modified by increasing the wartime credits by 35 percent. In other words, a corporation would now be allowed to earn 35 percent more than during the war before being subjected to an excess-profits tax. Small corporations would be excused by a specific exemption of $50,000, and the rate of tax on excess profits would be 75 percent, instead of 85 percent.

Accordingly, a most generous yardstick would be provided for determining whether profits are excessive. With corporate profits after taxes at a level 67 percent above the peak war year, 1943, the imposition of an excess-profits tax is an equitable way of granting some tax relief to those low-income people who are hardest pressed by the inflationary prices out of which the excessive profits are being earned.

Third, married couples, in whatever State they may reside, would be placed on an equal basis by being permitted to divide their income for tax purposes. It should not be necessary to change local property laws of long standing to obtain uniformity in Federal taxation. Yet several States recently have taken such steps, and others will do so if Congress does not act.

Despite the $800,000,000 loss in revenue, and the fact that 97.5 percent of the relief goes to taxpayers above $5,000, the elimination of this inequity should no longer be postponed.

Fourth, essentially the same principle would be applied to estate and gift taxes.

In contrast with H. R. 4790, the proposed amendment would maintain the revenue-producing capacity of the tax system at less than a billion dollars below present levels. This is basic, if we are to have a sound fiscal policy adequate to meet with safety and confidence our responsibilities, in the family of nations. Those who would recklessly cut taxes at the risk of deficit spending may, indeed, be endangering their country to enemies, both foreign and domestic, against whom they have sworn to protect and defend.

Tax relief for those whose need is greatest there should be. But this can be provided without a 6 to 7 billion dollar cut in revenues. The motion to recommit actually would give a greater tax reduction for the average American family of four earning up to $4,150 than does H. R. 4790 in its present form.

In the interest both of the financial integrity of this great Nation, and of equity in the tax system, H. R. 4790 should be recommitted, as I shall propose at the proper time.

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of amounts and effective rates of individual income tax under present law [1] and under proposal to increase the per capita exemption to $700 and to adopt income splitting*

SINGLE PERSON [2]—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amounts of tax		Effective rates		Decrease in amounts of tax compared with present law	Decrease in effective rates compared with present law	Tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability	Tax decrease as a percentage of net income after present tax liability
	Present law	Proposal	Present law	Proposal				
			Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$600	19	----------	3.2	----------	$19	3.2	100.0	3.3
$800	57	$19	7.1	2.4	38	4.8	66.7	5.1
$1,000	95	57	9.5	5.7	38	3.8	40.0	4.2
$1,200	133	95	11.1	7.9	38	3.2	28.6	3.6
$1,500	190	152	12.7	10.1	38	2.5	20.0	2.9
$2,000	285	247	14.3	12.4	38	1.9	13.3	2.2
$2,500	380	342	15.2	13.7	38	1.5	10.0	1.8
$3,000	485	443	16.2	14.8	42	1.4	8.6	1.7
$4,000	694	652	17.3	16.3	42	1.1	6.0	1.3
$5,000	922	872	18.4	17.4	49	1.0	5.4	1.2
$6,000	1,169	1,119	19.5	18.7	49	.8	4.2	1.0
$8,000	1,720	1,663	21.5	20.8	57	.7	3.3	.9
$10,000	2,347	2,282	23.5	22.8	65	.7	2.8	.8
$15,000	4,270	4,181	28.5	27.9	89	.6	2.1	.8
$20,000	6,645	6,545	33.2	32.7	100	.5	1.5	.7
$25,000	9,362	9,250	37.5	37.0	112	.5	1.2	.7
$50,000	25,137	25,000	50.3	50.0	137	.3	.5	.5
$75,000	43,477	43,323	58.0	57.8	154	.2	.4	.5
$100,000	63,541	63,375	63.5	63.4	165	.2	.3	.5
$250,000	191,772	191,599	76.7	76.6	173	.1	.1	.3
$350,000	278,222	278,049	79.5	79.4	173	[4]	.1	.2
$500,000	407,897	407,724	81.6	81.5	173	[4]	[4]	.2
$750,000	624,022	623,849	83.2	83.2	173	[4]	[4]	.1
$1,000,000	840,147	839,974	84.0	84.0	173	[4]	[4]	.1
$5,000,000	[3] 4,275,000	[3] 4,275,000	85.5	85.5	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] Single persons would obtain no benefit under the income-splitting provision.
[3] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[4] Less than 0.05 percent.

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of amounts and effective rates of individual income tax under present law [1] and under proposal to increase the per capita exemption to $700 and to adopt income splitting*

MARRIED PERSON [2]—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amounts of tax		Effective rates		Decrease in amounts of tax compared with present law	Decrease in effective rates compared with present law	Tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability	Tax decrease as a percentage of net income after present tax liability
	Present law	Proposal	Present law	Proposal				
			Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,400	$76	0	5.4	0	$76	5.4	100.0	5.7
$1,500	95	$19	6.3	1.3	76	5.1	80.0	5.4
$2,000	190	114	9.5	5.7	76	3.8	40.0	4.2
$2,500	285	209	11.4	8.4	76	3.0	26.7	3.4
$3,000	380	304	12.7	10.1	76	2.5	20.0	2.9
$4,000	589	494	14.7	12.4	95	2.4	16.1	2.8
$5,000	798	684	16.0	13.7	114	2.3	14.3	2.7
$6,000	1,045	885	17.4	14.8	160	2.7	15.3	3.2
$8,000	1,577	1,303	19.7	16.3	274	3.4	17.3	4.3
$10,000	2,185	1,744	21.9	17.4	441	4.4	20.2	5.6
$15,000	4,047	3,040	27.0	20.3	1,007	6.7	24.9	9.2
$20,000	6,394	4,564	32.0	22.8	1,830	9.2	28.6	13.4
$25,000	9,082	6,316	36.3	25.3	2,766	11.1	30.5	17.4
$50,000	24,795	18,500	49.6	37.0	6,295	12.6	25.4	25.0
$75,000	43,092	33,402	57.5	44.5	9,690	12.9	22.5	30.4
$100,000	63,128	50,000	63.1	50.0	13,127	13.1	20.8	35.6
$250,000	191,340	168,999	76.5	67.6	22,340	8.9	11.7	38.1
$350,000	277,790	254,011	79.4	72.6	23,779	6.8	8.6	32.9
$500,000	407,465	383,198	81.5	76.6	24,267	4.9	6.0	26.2
$750,000	623,590	599,323	83.1	79.9	24,267	3.2	3.9	19.2
$1,000,000	839,715	815,448	84.0	81.5	24,267	2.4	2.9	15.1
$5,000,000	[3] 4,275,000	4,273,448	85.5	85.5	1,552	[4]	[4]	.2

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.
[3] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.
[4] Less than 0.05 percent.

TABLE 3.—*Comparison of amounts and effective rates of individual income tax under present law [1] and under proposal to increase the per capita exemption to $700 and to adopt income splitting*

MARRIED PERSON [2]—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Amounts of tax		Effective rates		Decrease in amounts of tax compared with present law	Decrease in effective rates compared with present law	Tax decrease as a percentage of present tax liability	Tax decrease as a percentage of net income after present tax liability
	Present law	Proposal	Present law	Proposal				
			Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,800	$152	0	5.4	0	$152	5.4	100.0	5.7
$3,000	190	$38	6.3	1.3	152	5.1	80.0	5.4
$4,000	380	228	9.5	5.7	152	3.8	40.0	4.2
$5,000	589	418	11.8	8.4	171	3.4	29.0	3.9
$6,000	798	608	13.3	10.1	190	3.2	23.8	3.7
$8,000	1,292	1,011	16.2	12.6	281	3.5	21.8	4.2
$10,000	1,862	1,429	18.6	14.3	433	4.3	23.3	5.3
$15,000	3,639	2,641	24.3	17.6	998	6.7	27.4	8.8
$20,000	5,890	4,112	29.5	20.6	1,778	8.9	30.2	12.6
$25,000	8,522	5,810	34.1	23.2	2,711	10.8	31.8	16.5
$50,000	24,111	17,716	48.2	35.4	6,395	12.8	26.5	24.7
$75,000	42,323	32,538	56.4	43.4	9,785	13.1	23.1	29.9
$100,000	62,301	49,043	62.3	49.0	13,258	13.3	21.3	35.2
$250,000	190,475	167,816	76.2	67.1	22,659	9.1	11.9	38.1
$350,000	276,925	252,814	79.1	72.2	24,111	6.9	8.7	33.0
$500,000	406,600	381,987	81.3	76.4	24,613	4.9	6.1	26.4
$750,000	622,725	598,112	83.0	79.7	24,613	3.3	4.0	19.3
$1,000,000	838,850	814,237	83.9	81.4	24,613	2.5	2.9	15.3
$5,000,000	[3] 4,275,000	4,272,237	85.5	85.4	2,763	.1	.1	.4

[1] Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1945.
[2] Assumes only 1 spouse has income.
[3] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of amounts of individual income tax under present law and under proposal to increase the per capita exemption to $700 and to adopt income splitting under H. R. 4790 and under H. R. 4968*

SINGLE PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Present law	Tax reduction		
		H. R. 4790	$40 per capita tax credit	$700 exemption and income splitting
$600	$19	$19	$19	$19
$800	57	30	40	38
$1,000	95	42	40	38
$1,200	133	53	40	38
$1,500	190	70	40	38
$2,000	285	72	40	38
$2,500	380	91	40	38
$3,000	485	114	40	42
$4,000	694	155	40	42
$5,000	922	194	40	49
$6,000	1,169	219	40	49
$8,000	1,720	277	40	57
$10,000	2,347	344	40	65
$15,000	4,270	547	40	89
$20,000	6,645	790	40	100
$25,000	9,362	1,066	40	112
$50,000	25,137	2,655	40	137
$75,000	43,477	4,497	40	154
$100,000	63,541	6,508	40	165
$250,000	191,772	19,335	40	173
$350,000	278,222	27,980	40	173
$500,000	407,897	40,947	40	173
$750,000	624,022	62,560	40	173
$1,000,000	840,147	84,172	40	173

TABLE 5.—*Comparison of amounts of individual income tax under present law and under proposal to increase the per capita exemption to $700 and to adopt income splitting under H. R. 4790 and under H. R. 4968*

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Present law	Tax reduction		
		H. R. 4790	$40 per capita tax credit	$700 exemption and income splitting
$1,200	$76	$38	$38	$38
$1,500	95	55	80	76
$2,000	190	84	80	76
$2,500	285	112	80	76
$3,000	380	141	80	76
$4,000	589	163	80	95
$5,000	798	220	80	114
$6,000	1,045	303	80	160
$8,000	1,577	501	80	274
$10,000	2,185	730	80	441
$15,000	4,047	1,419	80	1,007
$20,000	6,394	2,388	80	1,830
$25,000	9,082	3,493	80	2,766
$50,000	24,795	8,203	80	6,295
$75,000	43,092	13,079	80	9,690
$100,000	63,128	18,164	80	13,127
$250,000	191,340	39,248	80	22,340
$350,000	277,790	49,185	80	23,779
$500,000	407,465	62,591	80	24,267
$750,000	623,590	84,203	80	24,267
$1,000,000	839,715	105,816	80	24,267

TABLE 6.—*Comparison of amounts of individual income tax under present law and under proposal to increase the per capita exemption to $700 and to adopt income splitting under H. R. 4790 and under H. R. 4968*

MARRIED PERSON—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Present law	Tax reduction		
		H. R. 4790	$40 per capita tax credit	$700 exemption and income splitting
$2,400	$76	$76	$76	$76
$2,800	152	76	152	152
$3,000	190	110	160	152
$4,000	380	167	160	152

TABLE 6—Continued

MARRIED PERSONS—2 DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Present law	Tax reduction		
		H. R. 4790	$40 per capita tax credit	$700 exemption and income splitting
$5,000	$589	$203	$160	$171
$6,000	798	251	160	190
$8,000	1,292	416	160	281
$10,000	1,862	652	160	433
$15,000	3,639	1,319	160	998
$20,000	5,890	2,233	160	1,778
$25,000	8,522	3,322	160	2,711
$50,000	24,111	8,125	160	6,395
$75,000	42,323	12,976	160	9,785
$100,000	62,301	18,076	160	13,258
$250,000	190,475	39,296	160	22,659
$350,000	276,925	49,244	160	24,111
$500,000	406,600	62,660	160	24,613
$750,000	622,725	84,272	160	24,613
$1,000,000	838,850	105,885	160	24,613

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Speaker of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to my able, distinguished, and good friend, the former Speaker of the House. I want to congratulate him. I think he has done a marvelous job of presentation with little to work with. Naturally, he does not like this bill as reported out of the committee, but I must remind him that the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has graced the head of that committee for so many years the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON, is strongly opposed to his substitute measure.

The minority leader is afraid that this will not permit us to balance the budget and commence what is the necessary job of reducing that heavy tax burden which bears heavily upon the people.

I was very sorry to hear him say that the President's budget of $40,000,000,000 could not be cut. Think of that, Mr. Chairman. That is discouraging to me because if there is one job that the people of this country are looking to this Congress to do it is to cut expenditures. This country cannot continue for many years to pay these wartime taxes. The only way that expenditures can be cut is to do it in the House, and I had hoped that that effort would not be partisan. I hoped it would be essentially a nonpartisan effort; yes, an American effort, to put this country back on a sound and solvent basis. And I am sorry, too, that an effort is being made to inject politics into the discussion of this tax bill. That should not be the case, for the Democrats want tax relief just as much as the Republicans do. When we write a tax bill on the books it affects all people regardless of their politics.

Now, what is the motion to recommit? As the distinguished tax expert from North Carolina has said, this tax bill which is represented in the motion to recommit has actually had 1 hour of study in a little back-room conference. No man has had a chance to go to the great Committee on Ways and Means and tell how this bill represented by the motion to recommit would affect his business or his affairs.

It was only a short time ago that the President said it would be necessary to keep this country on an expanding basis to the end that we might get the greater production which is so essential not only to supply the needs of our own people but also those in the devastated countries abroad. Further than that it is necessary to keep down high prices. He estimated that $50,000,000,000 was needed for that purpose. Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, let me ask where that money is coming from if we increase the taxes of the very people who must provide the capital for expansion of plants. We must have the expansion to take care of the increased production which is the final cure for high costs.

I repeat this is no time for narrow partisanship. This is a measure which interests all of our people.

Some mention was made in the debate to the effect that this motion to recommit would be of greater benefit to the little fellow than the pending bill. What are the facts? The facts are that the motion to recommit will only give 70-percent reduction for the income taxpayers in the group below $5,000, whereas in the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee the reduction to that same group amounts to 71.5 percent. It looks as though the little fellow was well considered by the committee and certainly better than in the motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to the membership of the House that this tax bill represents another and perhaps the final effort this year to give the American people relief from wartime taxes. Reduced taxes are essential to any real effort to reduce high prices and bring down living costs. The facts are that 20 percent of the cost of food and goods is represented by taxes. That is why it is so essential that we reduce taxes. It is because of taxes that living costs bear so heavily upon the workers of the country. They are demanding this relief. The most effective way to give this relief is to cut down their taxes so they may have a larger take-home pay and meet these high prices of today. This is just as effective to them as a pay increase and it will be still better because it will bring lower prices through the stimulation of production.

Few tax-reduction bills have ever come to our American Congress that give greater tax relief to the workers and small-salaried people than the pending bill. Furthermore, the worker and the low-salaried person will materially benefit by the stimulation this tax reduction will give to production by providing an incentive for work and expansion. Increased production means more goods and more food. It will stimulate the fight against scarcity and through a greater quantity and better quality of goods and food bring about a lowering of

prices and a great gain to everybody. Six million people will be removed from the taxpaying list. Those people will not be required to pay a single dollar of the cost of the Government. The aged and the blind, the most needy of our population, are given a preferential reduction. These are the real needy people of our country. They, above everyone else, need relief from taxes. What they will save in this tax bill might give them the chance to have a little more food to sustain life and perhaps a few more of the luxuries that the American people like to enjoy.

The leadership of this House has a definite program. We must cut the cost of government. No country can indefinitely bear a burden of $40,000,000,000 a year for the operation of the Government. We must keep the budget balanced. We have at last balanced it after 15 years and of necessity we must keep it balanced if this country is going forward to even greater heights. I am one of those who believe we are going forward to better days and a finer civilization than we ever enjoyed before. Let us do our part to build for the future.

We must continue to pay annual installments on the national debt because that is essential. We have made a payment this year and we will make a payment in the coming year. These debt payments are essential to our economic plan to maintain the country's solvency and to plan for a brighter and a better tomorrow. We must continue annual reductions on the national debt. These objectives can and will be achieved. They should not be partisan but should be supported by everyone who wants to restore security and sanity in our Government.

The pending tax bill is the initial step in this sound program. It is the initial step in tax reduction which the American people are demanding. I trust that this bill will pass the House by an overwhelming vote that will embrace not the membership of one party but all Members who realize the American people want tax relief and want an opportunity to have a little more take-home pay so that they can better meet these high prices.

I plead in the interest of orderly government, because, as the gentleman from North Carolina so well said, tax bills cannot be written on the floor of the House. They too seriously enter into the life of every business and every individual in this country to pass with 1 hour's consideration. I therefore ask you to vote down the motion to recommit. Pass this bill, send it to the Senate, and before the Eightieth Congress ends we will give the American people what they are demanding; relief from the high, burdensome, wartime taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert:

"(2) In no event shall the combined normal tax and surtax exceed 77 percent of the net income."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 18, strike out the remainder of the line after the word "year" and all of line 19, with the exception of the word "and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 22, strike out the words "and has", all of line 23, and all of line 24 down to the word "and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 14, strike out the word "either."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 15, strike out the words "or an", all of line 16, down to and including the word "blind)" in line 17.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 21, insert the following:

"(C) One additional exemption for himself if, on the basis of facts existing at the beginning of such day, there may reasonably be expected to be allowable an exemption under section 25 (b) (1) (C) (i) (relating to the blind) for the taxable year under Chapter 1 in respect of which amounts deducted and withheld under this subchapter in the calendar year in which such day falls are allowed as a credit."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 6, strike out "(C)" and insert "(D)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 9, strike out "(A) or (B)" and insert "(A), (B), or (C)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 13, strike out "(D)" and insert "(E)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 2, after "(4)" insert "of the Internal Revenue Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further committee amendments?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

Page 18, line 3, strike out "and gift tax."

Page 18, after line 3, insert a new heading to read as follows:

"Subpart 1—Repeal of 1942 Community Property Amendments"

Page 18, line 4, strike out "Estate tax—."

Page 18, line 11, strike out "Estate tax—."

Page 18, line 23, strike out "Estate tax—."

Page 19, after line 4, insert the following:

"Subpart 2—Marital Deduction for Bequests, Etc., to Spouse

"SEC. 361. Marital Deduction

"(a) Section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions in computing net estate in the case of a citizen or resident of the United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(e) Bequests, etc., to surviving spouse:

"'(1) Allowance of marital deduction:

"'(A) In general: An amount equal to the value of any interest in property passing from the decedent to his surviving spouse, but only to the extent that such interest is included in determining the value of the gross estate.

"'(B) Life Estate or Other Terminable Interest: Where, upon the lapse of time, upon the occurrence of an event or contingency, or upon the failure of an event or contingency to occur, such interest passing to the surviving spouse will terminate or fail, no deduction shall be allowed with respect to such interest—

"'(i) if an interest in such property passes or has passed (for less than an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth) from the decedent to any person other than such surviving spouse; and

"'(ii) if by reason of such passing such person (or his heirs or assigns) may possess or enjoy any part of such property after such termination or failure of the interest so passing to the surviving spouse.

"'(C) Interest of spouse conditioned on survival for limited period: For the purposes of subparagraph (B) an interest passing to the surviving spouse shall not be considered as an interest which will terminate or fail upon the death of such spouse if—

"'(i) such death will cause a termination or failure of such interest only if it occurs within a period (not exceeding 6 months) after the decedent's death; and

"'(ii) such spouse in fact does not die before the expiration of such period.

"'(D) Interest of surviving spouse reduced by reason of estate, etc., Taxes: In determining for the purposes of subparagraph (A) the value of any interest in property passing to the surviving spouse there shall be taken into account the effect which a tax imposed by this chapter, or any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax, has upon the net value to the surviving spouse of such interest.

"'(E) Trust with power of appointment in surviving spouse: In the case of an interest in property passing from the decedent to a trust, if the trust will terminate upon the death of the surviving spouse of the decedent, and if under the terms of the trust such spouse is entitled for her life to all the income from the corpus of the trust, payable annually or at more frequent intervals, with the power to appoint by will the entire corpus to her estate, and with no power in herself

or any other person to appoint or invade any part of the corpus during her life—

"'(i) the interest so passing shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), be considered as passing to the surviving spouse, and

"'(ii) no part of the interest so passing shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (i), be considered as passing to any person other than the surviving spouse.'"

This subparagraph shall be applicable only if, under the terms of the trust, such power to appoint by will is exercisable in all events.

"'(F) Limitation on aggregate of deduction: The aggregate amount of the deductions allowed under this paragraph (computed without regard to this subparagraph) shall not exceed 50 percent of the value of the adjusted gross estate, as defined in paragraph (2).

"'(2) Computation of adjusted gross estate:

"'(A) General rule: Except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the adjusted gross estate shall, for the purposes of paragraph (1) (F), be computed by subtracting from the entire value of the gross estate the aggregate amount of the deductions allowed by subsection (b) of this section.

"'(B) Special rule in cases involving community property: If the decedent and his surviving spouse at any time held property as community property under the law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of any foreign country, then the adjusted gross estate shall, for the purposes of paragraph (1) (F), be determined by subtracting from the entire value of the gross estate the sum of:

"'(i) the value of property which is at the time of the death of the decedent held as such community property; and

"'(ii) the value of property transferred by the decedent during his life, if at the time of such transfer the property was held as such community property; and

"'(iii) the amount receivable as insurance under policies upon the life of the decedent to the extent purchased with premiums or other consideration paid out of property held as such community property; and

"'(iv) an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate of the deductions allowed under subsection (b) of this section which the value of the property included in the gross estate, diminished by the amount subtracted under clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of this subparagraph bears to the entire value of the gross estate.

For the purposes of clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), property shall be considered as "held as such community property" if it was at any time acquired by the decedent (by one exchange or by a series of exchanges) in exchange for his interest in property held as such community property. The amount to be subtracted under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) shall not exceed the value of the interest in the property described therein which is included in determining the value of the gross estate.

"'(3) Definition: For the purpose of this subsection an interest in property shall be considered as passing from the decedent to any person if and only if—

"'(A) such interest is bequeathed or devised to such person by the decedent; or

"'(B) such interest is inherited by such person from the decedent; or

"'(C) such interest is the dower or courtesy interest (or statutory interest in lieu thereof) of such person as surviving spouse of the decedent; or

"'(D) such interest has been transferred to such person by the decedent at any time; or

"'(E) such interest was, at the time of the decedent's death, held by such person and the decedent (or by them and any other person) in joint ownership with right of survivorship; or

"'(F) the decedent had a power (either alone or in conjunction with any person) to appoint such interest and if he appoints or has appointed such interest to such person, or if such person takes such interest in default upon the release or nonexercise of such power; or

"'(G) such interest consists of proceeds of insurance upon the life of the decedent.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable only with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this act.

"SEC. 362. Property Previously Taxed

"(a) Section 812 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the deduction for property previously taxed) is hereby amended by adding after the first paragraph a new paragraph to read as follows:

"'The following property shall not, for the purposes of this subsection, be considered as property with respect to which a deduction may be allowed: (A) property received from a prior decedent who died after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1948 and was at the time of such death the decedent's spouse, (B) property received by gift after such date from a donor who at the time of the gift was the decedent's spouse, and (C) property acquired in exchange for property described in clause (A) or (B).'

"(b) Section 812 (c) is further amended by striking out 'subsections (a) and (d)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsections (a), (d), and (e)."

PART III—GIFT TAX

Page 19, line 5, strike out "354. Gift Tax—" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "371."

Page 19, after line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 372. Marital Deduction

"Section 1004 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions in computing net gifts in the case of a citizen or resident of the United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"'(3) Gift to spouse:

"'(A) In general: Where the donor transfers during the calendar year (and after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1948) by gift an interest in property to a donee who at the time of the gift is the donor's spouse—an amount with respect to such interest equal to one-half of its value.

"'(B) Life estate or other terminable interest: Where, upon the lapse of time, upon the occurrence of an event or contingency, or upon the failure of an event or contingency to occur, such interest transferred to the spouse will terminate or fail, no deduction shall be allowed with respect to such interest—

"'(i) if the donor retains in himself, or transfers or has transferred (for less than an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth) to any person other than such donee spouse, an interest in such property, and if by reason of such retention or transfer the donor (or his heirs or assigns) or such person (or his heirs or assigns) may possess or enjoy any part of such property after such termination or failure of the interest transferred to the donee spouse; or

"'(ii) if the donor immediately after the transfer to the donee spouse has a power to appoint an interest in such property which he can exercise (either alone or in conjunction with any person) in such manner that the appointee may possess or enjoy any part of such property after such termination or failure of the interest transferred to the donee spouse. For the purposes of this clause the donor shall be considered as having immediately after the transfer to the donee spouse such power to appoint even though such power cannot be exercised until after the lapse of time, upon the occurrence of an event or contingency, or upon the failure of an event or contingency to occur.

An exercise or release at any time by the donor, either alone or in conjunction with any person, of a power to appoint an interest in property; even though not otherwise a transfer, shall, for the purposes of clause (i) of this subparagraph, be considered as a transfer by him.

"'(C) Joint interests: If the interest is transferred to the donee spouse as sole joint tenant with the donor or as tenant by the entirety, the interest of the donor in the property which exists solely by reason of the possibility that the donor may survive the donee spouse, or that there may occur a severance of the tenancy, shall not be considered for the purposes of subparagraph (B) as an interest retained by the donor in himself.

"'(D) Trust with power of appointment in donee spouse: Where the donor transfers in trust an interest in property, and the trust will terminate upon the death of his spouse, and under the terms of the trust his spouse is entitled for her life to all the income from the corpus of the trust, payable annually or at more frequent intervals, with the power to appoint by will the entire corpus to her estate, and with no power in herself or any other person to appoint or invade any part of the corpus during her life—

"'(i) the interest so transferred in trust shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), be considered as transferred to the donee spouse, and

"'(ii) no part of the interest so transferred in trust shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (i), be considered as retained in the donor or transferred to any person other than the donee spouse.

This subparagraph shall be applicable only if, under the terms of the trust, such power to appoint by will is exercisable in all events.

"'(E) Community property: A deduction otherwise allowable under this paragraph shall be allowed only to the extent the transfer can be shown to represent a gift of property which does not fall within either of the two following classes:

"'(i) Property which is, at the time of the gift, held as community property under the law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of any foreign country; or

"'(ii) Property which, although not so held, was at any time acquired by the donor (by one exchange or by a series of exchanges) in exchange for his interest in property held by him and the donee spouse as community property.'

"SEC. 373. Technical Amendment

"Section 1004 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Extent of deductions: The deductions provided in subsection (a) (2) or (3) or in subsection (b) shall be allowed only to the extent that the gifts therein specified are included in the amount of gifts against which such deductions are applied.'

"SEC. 374. Gift of Husband or Wife to Third Party

"Section 1000 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to imposition of gift tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(f) Gift of husband or wife to third party:

"'(1) Considered as made one-half by each:

"'(A) In general: A gift made after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1948 by one spouse to any person other than his spouse shall, for the purposes of this chapter, be considered as made one-half by him and one-half by his spouse, but only if at the time of the gift each spouse is a

citizen or resident of the United States. For the purposes of this subsection an individual shall be considered as the spouse of another individual only if he is married to such individual at the time of the gift and does not remarry during the remainder of the calendar year.

"'(B) Consent of both spouses: Subparagraph (A) shall be applicable only if both spouses have signified (in accordance with the regulations provided for in paragraph (2)) their consent to the application of subparagraph (A) in the case of all such gifts made during the calendar year by either while married to the other.

"'(2) Time and manner of signifying consent: A consent under this subsection shall be signified at such time and in such manner as is provided under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. The right to consent, and the right to revoke a consent previously signified, with respect to a calendar year, shall not exist on any day if a return for such year of one spouse (required otherwise than by reason of the application of paragraph (1)) filed on such day would be a return not timely filed.

"'(3) Joint and several liability for tax: If the consent required by paragraph (1) (B) is signified with respect to a gift made in any calendar year the liability with respect to the entire tax imposed by this chapter of each spouse for such year shall be joint and several.'

"Page 2, strike out the heading 'Part II—Estate tax and gift tax' and the five following lines in the table of contents, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"'PART II—ESTATE TAX

"'SUBPART 1—REPEAL OF 1942 COMMUNITY PROPERTY AMENDMENTS

"'Sec. 351. Transfers of community property in contemplation of death, etc.
"'Sec. 352. Joint and community interests.
"'Sec. 353. Proceeds of life insurance.

"'SUBPART 2—MARITAL DEDUCTION FOR BEQUESTS, ETC., TO SPOUSE

"'Sec. 361. Marital deduction.
"'Sec. 362. Property previously taxed.

"'PART III—GIFT TAX

"'Sec. 371. Gifts of community property.
"'Sec. 372. Marital deduction.
"'Sec. 373. Technical amendment.
"'Sec. 374. Gift of husband or wife to third party.'"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that under the gag rule the bill was not read and further in view of the fact that no one outside of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means knows anything about these amendments, I ask whether it would not be proper that these amendments which change the bill in many respects should not be explained to the membership so that they can vote intelligently knowing what the amendments are.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that under the rule, proponents of the amendment are entitled to 5 minutes and the opponents to 5 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment is necessary in view of the provision in the bill as reported which repeals the community-property amendments made in 1942 to the estate- and gift-tax law.

The amendment provides rules whereby in many ordinary situations the same estate tax or gift tax will result whether the taxpayer is a resident of a community-property State or of a common-law State. It is not possible to have complete equalization, however, because of the differences in the systems of property law with which we are dealing.

The benefits of the amendment extend not only to residents of the common-law States but also to residents of the community-property States with respect to their separate property (not acquired in exchange for community property).

Under the amendment if a husband in any State gives his separate property to his wife, one-half of the value of the property is deducted and only the balance is subject to the gift tax.

The principle of splitting is also applied to the estate tax. The method under the estate tax, however, is to allow a deduction for all the property in the husband's gross estate passing to the surviving spouse—but with the limitation, that the deduction shall not exceed 50 percent of the husband's gross estate reduced by funeral expenses, debts, and other claims against the estate. Thus, under the amendment, if a husband leaves all his property to his wife a deduction is allowed for one-half of the value of the estate less claims.

The deduction provided under the amendment, in the case of the gift tax, is not allowed for community property (and property acquired in exchange for community property). This is because title to one-half of the community property is already in the wife and under the bill as reported the donor will be taxed on only the one-half of the property as to which he has title. Double benefits from the community property system are similarly prevented in the application of the amendment to the estate tax.

The deductions provided for under the amendment also do not apply to interests in property which are terminable interests, such as life estates. Thus, a deduction will not be allowed under the amendment if the only interest given a spouse is in property in which the husband also gives or has given an interest to someone else who may possess or enjoy the property after the wife. However, if the only interest the husband had in the property is a terminable interest, such as a lease, and he gives his wife his entire interest in the property, then the deduction is permitted. The deduction is also permitted if the husband transfers his entire interest in property by way of gift into a tenancy by the entirety or a joint tenancy with his wife.

The amendment applies the splitting principle to gifts made by a husband or wife to a third party. It treats a gift made by either spouse to a third party as if the gift were made one-half by the husband and one-half by the wife. The husband and wife will have the opportunity to obtain or refuse this treatment each year with respect to gifts made in such year. If the option is effectively exercised, however, the gift-splitting treatment irrevocably applies to all gifts to third parties made in the calendar year for which the option was exercised. If the husband and wife choose to have the gifts to the third parties so treated, then they will be jointly and severally liable for the entire gift tax of each for the calendar year for which they chose this treatment.

The amendment also has a provision applying to the following situation: Under existing law, if a husband gives or bequeaths property to his wife and she dies within 5 years, a deduction is allowed her estate for the property acquired from her husband. The application of the splitting principle makes this deduction no longer necessary and the amendment disallows it.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Of course, it is utterly impossible to take a complicated amendment such as the one before us, which none of us knows anything about except as we have just heard it read and even that not in connection with the reading of the bill and its many provisions, and explain the amendment.

I want to express opposition to it and take this opportunity to point out something about the community-property law that seems to be utterly beyond the grasp of people who live in the common-law States. Perhaps we are as ignorant of your common law, except we lawyers who have had occasion to study it, as you are of our community-property law.

There are slurring remarks in the committee report and repeated suggestions that we of the community-property States have invented some kind of a system to beat taxes. Nothing could be further from the truth. The State of Texas, for example, adopted the community-property system by its first constitution as a Republic, in 1836. We think it is one of the greatest stabilizing influences on our homes that a State can have.

You may not agree, but I will point out that we have no such thing as alimony in Texas. Instead the community property of a divorced couple is divided equally. There is no payment of alimony by a divorced husband to a divorced wife, and therefore no divorce "racket" in my State.

Again in Texas—I am using that as an example because I am so familiar with its system—there is not the slightest inducement offered for a marriage of "convenience." Here you are fixing to put into a bill a standing reward for glamor "gal's" sugar-daddy racket. This is so because in your common-law States the husband and wife may divide the income into two equal parts—thus putting the income into a lower tax bracket even though the husband owns all of it. Consequently, the wealthy man in your States can greatly reduce his income tax by paying a lower rate on half the income he owns. Therefore, a rich, single man in your State can, under the provision of this bill, arrange a marriage of convenience and cheat the American Treasury out of many thousands of dollars with comparatively little risk or expense and he still owns the entire income. This, generally, is the effect of the provision in the original bill which

provides for split-income returns in the common-law States.

But here is what I want to say about the gentleman's amendment. If it means what I think it does, it would deprive the married citizens of my State, and every other community-property State, of half the benefit of the provision which repeals the iniquitous and discriminatory estate-tax law of 1942. The effect of that law is to require a surviving wife to pay an estate tax on her one-half interest which she already owned as well as on the one-half she inherits from the husband. Now the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania contains a number of provisions which, as I understand them, from hearing them read is like the "fine print" in some contracts. They would take away most, if not all, of the benefits the community-property States would obtain by repeal of the act of 1942, and thus perpetuate most of its bad features. Time will not permit me to even point out the specific provisions of the proposed amendment which will have such effect but I affirm that such will be the result.

Why? Because the amendment overlooks or ignores the simple fact that in Texas and other community-property States neither the husband or the wife has any power to dispose of the other spouse's half interest in the community estate by will.

In Texas the wife has the same freedom to will her property to whomsoever she pleases as the husband has. If she dies intestate her one-half of the community property passes to her heirs in accordance with the statute of descendant and distribution, just as the husband's one-half passes to his heirs under similar circumstances. We have considered our community-property law so sacred and the State courts for a hundred years have guarded it so carefully that the husband or wife by contract before marriage or afterward can by no device change the community-property status of the common holdings of the couple. Why is it that the States that have recently adopted the system are in the West? Because they are out there close by the community-property States and have seen the benefit of such a law.

If you people in the other States feel you are discriminated against, you can get the community-property privilege on taxation, if you wish it, just like we got it, by giving your wives a just half interest in the common earnings of the marriage. Texas was settled by pioneer people. Wives joined their husbands in reclaiming the land from the forests and building the cabins that became the homes of American families. In your common-law State the wife has only the dower right in the husband's real estate. She acquires no title to personal property, including income, except such income as she may get out and earn. This law originated in England hundreds of years ago, when wives were denied the right to own property and the husband had the legal right to whip his wife. In the community-property State we feel that the husband and wife are partners—each in his and her own way making an equal contribution toward the family income. We conceive this truth to be self-evident, that a woman who performs her function as the wife in the home justly earns her one-half and we give it to her beyond question. That is the theory of our community-property law. Furthermore, even if our wives did not work at all, they would still be entitled to 50 percent for putting up with us. On second thought, I had better amend that. I am sorry I said it. On that basis some of our wives would be entitled to 90 percent.

Frankly, this amendment is too complicated a matter for us to consider so shortly. If it does what I think it does, it penalizes the people of the 12 community-property States of this Nation because they have seen fit to recognize the just rights of their wives.

I am "agin" it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the request comes too late.

Mr. DINGELL. No; it does not come too late. Let the Chair rule on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman on his feet when he made the request?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, we have always been very liberal in the House about the matter of votes or whether Members were on their feet. We have always been very liberal in the matter of allowing division votes. As far as I am concerned I do not care anything about it.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is any doubt in the minds of the membership the Chair will resolve the doubt in favor of the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 202, noes 37.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOEVEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce the individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 450, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN moves to recommit the bill H. R. 4790 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Tax Adjustment Act of 1948.'

"TITLE I—INCOME TAX ADJUSTMENTS

"SEC. 101. Increase in Personal Exemptions

"Section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits of individuals against net income) is hereby amended by striking out '$500,' wherever appearing therein, and by inserting in lieu thereof '$700', and by striking '$1,000' and by inserting in lieu thereof '$1,200'.

"SEC. 102. Splitting of Income

"Section 12 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to surtax of individuals) is hereby amended by adding after subsection (c) of such section the following new subsection:

"'(d) Tax in case of joint returns: In the case of a joint return of husband and wife under section 51 (b), the combined normal tax and surtax under section 11 and subsection (b) of this section shall be twice the combined normal tax and surtax that would be determined if the net income and the applicable credits against net income provided by section 25 were reduced by one-half.'

"SEC. 103. Standard Deductions

"(a) Increase of standard deduction in case of joint return: Section 23 (aa) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the standard deduction) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(A) Adjusted gross income of $5,000 or more: If the adjusted gross income is $5,000 or more, the standard deduction shall be $500 or an amount equal to 10 percent of the adjusted gross income, whichever is the lesser; except that in the case of a joint return of husband and wife under section 51 (b), the standard deduction shall be $1,000 or an amount equal to 10 percent of the adjusted gross income, whichever is the lesser.'

"(b) Election by husband and wife: Section 23 (aa) (4) of such Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(4) Husband and wife: In the case of husband and wife, the standard deduction shall not be allowed to either if the net income of one of the spouses is determined without regard to the standard deduction.'

"(c) Determination of status: Section 23 (aa) of such Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(6) Determination of status: For the purposes of this subsection—

"'(A) the determination of whether an individual is married shall be made as of the close of his taxable year, unless his spouse dies during his taxable year, in which case such determination shall be made as of the time of such death, and

"'(B) an individual legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance shall not be considered as married.'

"SEC. 104. Joint Return of Husband and Wife

"Section 51 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to joint returns) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Husband and wife:

"'(1) In general: A husband and wife may make a single return jointly. Such a return may be made even though one of the spouses has neither gross income nor deductions. If a joint return is made the tax shall be computed on the aggregate income and the liability with respect to the tax shall be joint and several.

"'(2) Nonresident alien: No joint return may be made if either the husband or wife at any time during the taxable year is a nonresident alien.

"'(3) Different taxable years: No joint return shall be made if the husband and wife have different taxable years; except that if such taxable years begin on the same day and end on different days because of the death of either or of both, then the joint return may be made with respect to the taxable year of each. The above exception shall not apply if the surviving spouse remarries before the close of his taxable year, nor if the taxable year of either spouse is a fractional part of a year under section 47 (a).

"'(4) Joint return after death: In the case of the death of one spouse or both spouses the joint return with respect to the decedent may be made only by his executor or administrator; except that in the case of the death of one spouse the joint return may be made by the surviving spouse with respect to both himself and the decedent if (A) no return for the taxable year has been made by the decedent, (B) no executor or administrator has been appointed, and (C) no executor or administrator is appointed before the last day prescribed by law for filing the return of the surviving spouse. If an executor or administrator of the decedent is appointed after the making of the joint return by the surviving spouse, the executor or administrator may disaffirm such joint return by making, within 1 year after the last day prescribed by law for filing the return of the surviving spouse, a separate return for the taxable year of the decedent with respect to which the joint return was made, in which case the return made by the survivor shall constitute his separate return.

"'(5) Determination of status: For the purposes of this section—

"'(A) the status as husband and wife of two individuals having taxable years beginning on the same day shall be determined—

"'(i) if both have the same taxable year—as of the close of such year; and

"'(ii) if one dies before the close of the taxable year of the other—as of the time of such death; and

"'(B) an individual who is legally separated from his spouse under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance shall not be considered as married.

"'(6) Tax in case of joint return: For determination of combined normal tax and surtax under section 11 and section 12 (b) in case of joint return under this subsection, see section 12 (d). For tax in case of joint return of husband and wife electing to pay the tax under Supplement T, see section 400.'

"SEC. 105. Deduction for Medical Expenses

"Section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deduction of medical, etc., expenses) is hereby amended by striking out the second and third sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The deduction shall not be in excess of $1,250 multiplied by the number of exemptions allowed under section 25 (b) for the taxable year (exclusive of exemptions allowed under section 25 (b) (1) (B) or (C)), with a maximum deduction of $2,500, except that the maximum deduction shall be $5,000 in the case of a joint return of husband and wife under section 51 (b).'

"SEC. 106. Technical Amendments

"(a) Declaration of estimated tax: Section 58 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to requirement of declaration of estimated tax) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Requirement of declaration: Every individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien with respect to whose wages, as defined in section 1621 (a), withholding under subchapter D of chapter 9 is not made applicable) shall, at the time prescribed in subsection (d), make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

"'(1) his gross income from wages (as defined in sec. 1621) can reasonably be expected to exceed the sum of $4,500 plus $700 with respect to each exemption provided in section 25 (b); or

"'(2) his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in sec. 1621) can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and his gross income to be $700 or more.'

"(b) Requirement of returns:

"(1) Individual returns: Section 51 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the requirement of individual returns) is hereby amended by striking out '$500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$700.'

"(2) Fiduciary returns: Section 142 (a) of such code (relating to the requirement of fiduciary returns) is hereby amended by striking out '$500' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$700.'

"(3) Information returns: Section 147 (a) of such code (relating to returns of information) is hereby amended by striking out '$500' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$700.'

"(c) Credit of estate against net income: Section 163 (a) (1) of such code (relating to credits against net income of an estate) is hereby amended by striking out '$500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$700'.

"SEC. 107. Changes in Optional Tax and Withholding Tables

"The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make such changes in the tables in section 400 (optional tax table) and section 1622 (withholding tables) as may be necessary to reflect the reduction in taxes provided for in the preceding provisions of this act.

"SEC. 108. Taxable Years to Which Amendments Applicable

"The amendments made by this title shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947. The amendment made by section 104 shall also be applicable to taxable years of both husband and wife beginning on the same day in 1947 if at least one of such taxable years ends in 1948. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948, see section 301.

"TITLE II—EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

"SEC. 201. Reenactment of Excess-Profits Tax

"(a) Reenactment: Section 122 (a) of the Revenue Act of 1945 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) In general: The provisions of subchapter E of chapter 2 shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945, and ending prior to January 1, 1948. The provisions of part III of such subchapter shall not apply to any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1945.'

"(b) Decrease in rate of tax: Section 710 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Imposition:

"'(1) General rule: There shall be levied, collected, and paid, for each taxable year, upon the adjusted excess profits net income, as defined in subsection (b), of every corporation (except a corporation exempt under section 727) a tax equal to whichever of the following amounts is the lesser:

"'(A) Seventy-five percent of the adjusted excess-profits net income, or

"'(B) An amount which when added to the tax imposed for the taxable year under chapter 1 (other than section 102) equals 70 percent of the corporation surtax net income, computed under section 15 or supplement G, as the case may be, but without regard to the credit provided in section 26 (e) (relating to income subject to the tax imposed by this subchapter), and without regard to 70 percent of the credit provided in section 26 (h) (relating to credit for dividends paid on certain preferred stock).'

"(c) Increase in exemption: Section 710 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(1) Specific exemption: A specific exemption of $50,000;'.

"(d) Increase in excessive-profits credit: Subsections (a) and (b) of section 712 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to allowance of excess-profits credit) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Domestic corporations: In the case of a domestic corporation which was in existence before January 1, 1940, the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount equal to 135 percent of a credit computed under section 713 or section 714, whichever amount results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. In the case of all other domestic corporations the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be 135 percent of an amount computed under section 714.

"'(b) Foreign corporations: In the case of a foreign corporation engaged in trade or business within the United States, the first taxable year of which under this subchapter begins on any date in 1940, which was in existence on the day 48 months prior to such date and which at any time during each of the taxable years in such 48 months was engaged in trade or business within the United States, the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be an amount equal to 135 percent of a credit computed under section 713 or section 714, whichever amount results in the lesser tax under this subchapter for the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. In the case of all other foreign corporations the excess-profits credit for any taxable year shall be 135 percent of an amount computed under section 714.'

"(e) Definition of unused excess-profits credit: Section 710 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by striking out the last two sentences thereof, and by inserting in lieu thereof, the following:

"'For the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1946, there shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1946. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1946 and ending in 1947 shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1947, is of the total number of days in such taxable year. For the purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years ending after December 31, 1947, there shall be no unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year ending before January 1, 1948. The unused excess-profits credit for a taxable year beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948 shall be an amount which is such part of the unused excess-profits credit determined under the preceding provisions of this paragraph as the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1947, is of the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(f) No carry-back to 1946 or 1947: Section 710 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) No carry-back to 1946 or 1947: Purposes of the determination of the taxes imposed by this subchapter for taxable years ending after December 31, 1947, the term

"preceding taxable year" and the term "preceding taxable years," as used in this subsection, do not include any taxable year ending prior to January 1, 1948.'

"(g) Technical amendments: The following sections of the Internal Revenue Code are restored to read as such sections read immediately prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1945, to be effective as so restored, with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1947, as if section 122 (g) of the Revenue Act of 1945 had not been enacted:

"(1) Section 26 (e) (relating to the credit for income subject to the excess-profits tax);

"(2) Section 13 (a) (2) (defining 'normal tax net income');

"(3) Section 15 (a) (defining 'corporation surtax net income');

"(4) Section 26 (b) (relating to the credit for dividends received);

"(5) Section 102 (d) (1) (defining terms for the purpose of the tax imposed by section 102);

"(6) Section 131 (b) (prescribing certain limitations on the foreign tax credit);

"(7) Section 204 (a) (2) (relating to foreign mutual insurance companies other than life or marine).

"(h) Taxable years to which amendments applicable: The amendments made by subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1947. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948, see section 401.

"TITLE III—FISCAL YEAR TAXPAYERS

"SEC. 301. Fiscal Year Taxpayers

"(a) Income taxes: Section 108 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out '(d)' at the beginning of subsection (d) and by inserting in lieu thereof '(e)', and by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"'(d) Taxable years beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948 the tax imposed by sections 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 400 shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(1) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1947, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1948, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year; plus

"'(2) that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to years beginning on January 1, 1948, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1947, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"(b) Excess profits tax: Section 710 (a) (imposing the excess-profits tax) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(8) Taxable years beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948: In the case of a taxable year beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948, the tax shall be an amount equal to that portion of a tentative tax, computed as if the law applicable to taxable years beginning on January 1, 1948, were applicable to such taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year subsequent to December 31, 1947, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.'

"TITLE IV—ESTATE TAX AND GIFT TAX

"SEC. 401. Estate Tax—Transfers of Community Property in Contemplation of Death, Etc.

"Effective with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this act, section 811 (d) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to transfers of community property in contemplation of death, etc.) is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 402. Estate Tax—Joint and Community Interests

"(a) Effective with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this act, section 811 (e) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to inclusion of community property in gross estate of decedent) is hereby repealed.

"(b) Such section 811 (e) is further amended—

"(1) by striking out of the heading of such subsection the words 'and community'; and

"(2) by striking out of paragraph (1) the following: '(1) Joint interests:'

"SEC. 403. Estate Tax—Proceeds of Life Insurance

Effective with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this act, section 811 (g) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to life insurance in the case of decedents in community-property States) is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 404. Marital Deduction

"(a) Section 812 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions in computing net estate in the case of a citizen or resident of the United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(e) Bequests, etc., to surviving spouse:

"'(1) Allowance of marital deduction:

"'(A) In general: An amount equal to the value of any interest in property passing from the decedent to his surviving spouse, but only to the extent that such interest is included in determining the value of the gross estate.

"'(B) Life estate or other terminable interest: Where, upon the lapse of time, upon the occurrence of an event or contingency, or upon the failure of an event or contingency to occur, such interest passing to the surviving spouse will terminate or fail, no deduction shall be allowed with respect to such interest—

"'(i) if an interest in such property passes or has passed (for less than an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth) from the decedent to any person other than such surviving spouse; and

"'(ii) if by reason of such passing such person (or his heirs or assigns) may possess or enjoy any part of such property after such termination or failure of the interest so passing to the surviving spouse.

"'(C) Interest of spouse conditioned on survival for limited period: For the purposes of subparagraph (B) an interest passing to the surviving spouse shall not be considered as an interest which will terminate or fail upon the death of such spouse if—

"'(i) such death will cause a termination or failure of such interest only if it occurs within a period (not exceeding 6 months) after the decedent's death; and

"'(ii) such spouse in fact does not die before the expiration of such period.

"'(D) Interest of surviving spouse reduced by reason of estate, etc., taxes: In determining for the purposes of subparagraph (A) the value of any interest in property passing to the surviving spouse there shall be taken into account the effect which a tax imposed by this chapter, or any estate, succession, legacy, or inheritance tax, has upon the net value to the surviving spouse of such interest.

"'(E) Trust with power of appointment in surviving spouse: In the case of an interest in property passing from the decedent to a trust, if the trust will terminate upon the death of the surviving spouse of the decedent, and if under the terms of the trust such spouse is entitled for her life to all the income from the corpus of the trust, payable annually or at more frequent intervals, with the power to appoint by will the entire corpus to her estate, and with no power in herself or any other person to appoint or invade any part of the corpus during her life—

"'(i) the interest so passing shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), be considered as passing to the surviving spouse, and

"'(ii) no part of the interest so passing shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (i), be considered as passing to any person other than the surviving spouse.

This subparagraph shall be applicable only if, under the terms of the trust, such power to appoint by will is exercisable in all events.

"'(F) Limitation on aggregate of deductions: The aggregate amount of the deductions allowed under this paragraph (computed without regard to this subparagraph) shall not exceed 50 percent of the value of the adjusted gross estate, as defined in paragraph (2).

"'(2) Computation of adjusted gross estate:

"'(A) General rule: Except as provided in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph the adjusted gross estate shall, for the purposes of paragraph (1) (F), be computed by subtracting from the entire value of the gross estate the aggregate amount of the deductions allowed by subsection (b) of this section.

"'(B) Special rule in cases involving community property: If the decedent and his surviving spouse at any time held property as community property under the law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of any foreign country, then the adjusted gross estate shall, for the purposes of paragraph (1) (F), be determined by subtracting from the entire value of the gross estate the sum of:

"'(i) the value of property which is at the time of the death of the decedent held as such community property; and

"'(ii) the value of property transferred by the decedent during his life, if at the time of such transfer the property was held as such community property; and

"'(iii) the amount receivable as insurance under policies upon the life of the decedent to the extent purchased with premiums or other consideration paid out of property held as such community property; and

"'(iv) an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate of the deductions allowed under subsection (b) of this section which the value of the property included in the gross estate, diminished by the amount subtracted under clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of this subparagraph, bears to the entire value of the gross estate.

For the purposes of clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), property shall be considered as "held as such community property" if it was at any time acquired by the decedent (by one exchange or by a series of exchanges) in exchange for his interest in property held as such community property. The amount to be subtracted under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) shall not exceed the value of the interest in the property described therein which is included in determining the value of the gross estate.

"'(Definition: For the purposes of this subsection an interest in property shall be considered as passing from the decedent to any person if and only if—

"'(A) such interest is bequeathed or devised to such person by the decedent; or

"'(B) such interest is inherited by such person from the decedent; or

"'(C) such interest is the dower or curtesy interest (or statutory interest in lieu thereof) of such person as surviving spouse of the decedent; or

"'(D) such interest has been transferred to such person by the decedent at any time; or

"'(E) such interest was, at the time of the decedent's death, held by such person and the

decedent (or by them and any other person) in joint ownership with right of survivorship; or

"'(F) the decedent had a power (either alone or in conjunction with any person) to appoint such interest and if he appoints or has appointed such interest to such person, or if such person takes such interest in default upon the release or nonexercise of such power; or

"'(G) such interest consists of proceeds of insurance upon the life of the decedent.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be applicable only with respect to estates of decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this act.

"SEC. 405. Property Previously Taxed

"(a) Section 812 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the deduction for property previously taxed) is hereby amended by adding after the first paragraph a new paragraph to read as follows:

"'The following property shall not, for the purposes of this subsection, be considered as property with respect to which a deduction may be allowed: (A) property received from a prior decedent who died after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1948 and was at the time of such death the decedent's spouse, (B) property received by gift after such date from a donor who at the time of the gift was the decedent's spouse, and (C) property acquired in exchange for property described in clause (A) or (B).'

"(b) Section 812 (c) is further amended by striking out 'subsections (a) and (d)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsections (a), (d), and (e).'

"SEC. 406. Gift Tax—Gifts of Community Property

"Section 1000 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to gifts of property held as community property) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: 'This subsection shall be applicable only to gifts made after the calendar year 1942 and on or before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1948.'

"SEC. 407. Marital Deduction

"Section 1004 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions in computing net gifts in the case of a citizen or resident of the United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"'(3) Gift to spouse:

"'(A) In general: Where the donor transfers during the calendar year (and after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1948) by gift an interest in property to a donee who at the time of the gift is the donor's spouse—an amount with respect to such interest equal to one-half of its value.

"'(B) Life estate or other terminable interest: Where, upon the lapse of time, upon the occurrence of an event or contingency, or upon the failure of an event or contingency to occur, such interest transferred to the spouse will terminate or fail, no deduction shall be allowed with respect to such interest—

"(i) if the donor retains in himself, or transfers or has transferred (for less than an adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth) to any person other than such donee spouse, an interest in such property, and if by reason of such retention or transfer the donor (or his heirs or assigns) or such person (or his heirs or assigns) may possess or enjoy any part of such property after such termination or failure of the interest transferred to the donee spouse; or

"'(ii) if the donor immediately after the transfer to the donee spouse has a power to appoint an interest in such property which he can exercise (either alone or in conjunction with any person) in such manner that the appointee may possess or enjoy any part of such property after such termination or failure of the interest transferred to the donee spouse. For the purposes of this clause the donor shall be considered as having immediately after the transfer to the donee spouse such power to appoint even though such power cannot be exercised until after the lapse of time, upon the occurrence of an event or contingency, or upon the failure of an event or contingency to occur.

An exercise or release at any time by the donor, either alone or in conjunction with any person, of a power to appoint an interest in property, even though not otherwise a transfer, shall, for the purposes of clause (i) of this subparagraph, be considered as a transfer by him.

"'(C) Joint interests: If the interest is transferred to the donee spouse as sole joint tenant with the donor or as tenant by the entirety, the interest of the donor in the property which exists solely by reason of the possibility that the donor may survive the donee spouse, or that there may occur a severance of the tenancy, shall not be considered for the purposes of subparagraph (B) as an interest retained by the donor in himself.

"'(D) Trust with power of appointment in donee spouse: Where the donor transfers in trust an interest in property, and the trust will terminate upon the death of his spouse, and under the terms of the trust his spouse is entitled for her life to all the income from the corpus of the trust, payable annually or at more frequent intervals, with the power to appoint by will the entire corpus to her estate, and with no power in herself or any other person to appoint or invade any part of the corpus during her life—

"'(i) the interest so transferred in trust shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (A), be considered as transferred to the donee spouse, and

"'(ii) no part of the interest so transferred in trust shall, for the purposes of subparagraph (B) (i), be considered as retained in the donor or transferred to any person other than the donee spouse.

This subparagraph shall be applicable only if, under the terms of the trust, such power to appoint by will is exercisable in all events.

"'(E) Community property: A deduction otherwise allowable under this paragraph shall be allowed only to the extent the transfer can be shown to represent a gift of property which does not fall within either of the two following classes:

"'(i) Property which is, at the time of the gift, held as community property under the law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or of any foreign country; or

"'(ii) Property which, although not so held, was at any time acquired by the donor (by one exchange or by a series of exchanges) in exchange for his interest in property held by him and the donee spouse as community property.'

"SEC. 373. Technical Amendment

"Section 1004 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Extent of deductions: The deductions provided in subsection (a) (2) or (3) or in subsection (b) shall be allowed only to the extent that the gifts therein specified are included in the amount of gifts against which such deductions are applied.'

"SEC. 374. Gift of Husband or Wife to Third Party

"Section 1000 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to imposition of gift tax) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(f) Gift of husband or wife to third party:

"'(1) Considered as made one-half by each:

"'(A) In general: A gift made after the date of the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1948 by one spouse to any person other than his spouse shall, for the purposes of this chapter, be considered as made one-half by him and one-half by his spouse, but only if at the time of the gift each spouse is a citizen or resident of the United States. For the purposes of this subsection an individual shall be considered as the spouse of another individual only if he is married to such individual at the time of the gift and does not remarry during the remainder of the calendar year.

"'(B) Consent of both spouses: Subparagraph (A) shall be applicable only if both spouses have signified (in accordance with the regulations provided for in paragraph (2)) their consent to the application of subparagraph (A) in the case of all such gifts made during the calendar year by either while married to the other.

"'(2) Time and manner of signifying consent: A consent under this subsection shall be signified at such time and in such manner as is provided under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. The right to consent, and the right to revoke a consent previously signified, with respect to a calendar year, shall not exist on any day if a return for such year of one spouse (required otherwise than by reason of the application of paragraph (1)) filed on such day would be a return not timely filed.

"'(3) Joint and several liability for tax: If the consent required by paragraph (1) (B) is signified with respect to a gift made in any calendar year the liability with respect to the entire tax imposed by this chapter of each spouse for such year shall be joint and several.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 258, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—159

Abernethy	Feighan	Lesinski
Albert	Fernandez	Lucas
Allen, La.	Fisher	Ludlow
Andrews, Ala.	Flannagan	Lusk
Bates, Ky.	Fogarty	Lyle
Battle	Folger	Lynch
Beckworth	Forand	McCormack
Bland	Garmatz	McMillan, S. C.
Blatnik	Gary	Madden
Bloom	Gordon	Mahon
Boggs, La.	Gore	Manasco
Bonner	Gorski	Mansfield
Boykin	Gossett	Marcantonio
Brooks	Granger	Miller, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Grant, Ala.	Mills
Bryson	Hardy	Morgan
Buchanan	Harless, Ariz.	Multer
Buckley	Harris	Murdock
Bulwinkle	Hart	Murray, Tenn.
Burleson	Havenner	Norrell
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	Norton
Camp	Hébert	O'Brien
Cannon	Hedrick	O'Toole
Carroll	Heffernan	Pace
Celler	Hendricks	Passman
Chelf	Hobbs	Patman
Clark	Holifield	Peden
Colmer	Huber	Peterson
Cooley	Jackson, Wash.	Pfeifer
Cooper	Jarman	Pickett
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Powell
Cox	Johnson, Tex.	Preston
Crosser	Jones, Ala.	Price, Fla.
Davis, Ga.	Karsten, Mo.	Price, Ill.
Dawson Ill.	Kee	Priest
Deane	Kelley	Rains
Delaney	Kennedy	Rankin
Dingell	Keogh	Rayburn
Domengeaux	King	Regan
Donohue	Kirwan	Richards
Dorn	Klein	Riley
Douglas	Lane	Rogers, Fla.
Eberharter	Lanham	Rooney
Engle, Calif.	Larcade	Sabath
Evins	Lea	Sadowski

Sasscer
Sheppard
Sikes
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Somers
Spence
Stigler
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thompson
Trimble
Vinson
Walter
West
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—258

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Banta
Barden
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bell
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brophy
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Busbey
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chadwick
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Corbett
Cotton
Cravens
Crawford
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Doughton
Durham
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Foote
Fuller
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harness, Ind.
Harrison
Hartley
Harvey
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kerr
Kersten, Wis.
Kilday
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis
Lichtenwalter
Lodge
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mitchell
Morris
Morton
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nicholson
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
Norrell
O'Hara
O'Konski
Owens
Passman
Patterson
Peterson
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Potter
Potts
Poulson
Preston
Price, Fla.
Ramey
Rankin
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Regan
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Tibbott
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Welch
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Youngblood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cole, N. Y.

NOT VOTING 12

Bennett, Mo.
Combs
Coudert
Dirksen
Judd
Kefauver
Kilburn
Monroney
Morrison
Poage
Smith, Maine
Thomas, N. J.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Morrison for, with Mrs. Smith of Maine against.

Mr. Kefauver for, with Mr. Bennett of Missouri against.

Mr. Poage for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have arranged a pair with the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. MONRONEY, who could not be present today. If present he would have voted "yea"; therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 297, nays 120, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—297

Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Almond
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Banta
Barden
Barrett
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Boykin
Bradley
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brophy
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Busbey
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chadwick
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Colmer
Corbett
Cotton
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Utah
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Dondero
Donohue
Dorn
Eaton
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Fletcher
Foote
Fuller
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hariess, Ariz.
Harness, Ind.
Harris
Hart
Hartley
Harvey
Hébert
Hedrick
Hendricks
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenkins, Pa.
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Wash.
Jonkman
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kersten, Wis.
Kilday
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Lane
Larcade
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis
Lichtenwalter
Lodge
Love
Lucas
McConnell
McCowen
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Mack
MacKinnon
Macy
Maloney
Manasco
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mitchell
Morris
Morton
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nicholson
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
Norrell
O'Hara
O'Konski
Owens
Passman
Patterson
Peterson
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Ploeser
Plumley
Potter
Potts
Poulson
Preston
Price, Fla.
Ramey
Rankin
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Regan
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers
Rizley
Robertson
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Thomas, Tex.
Tibbott
Towe
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Welch
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Youngblood

NAYS—120

Albert
Andersen, H. Carl
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bell
Bland
Blatnik
Bloom
Boggs, La.
Bonner
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Burleson
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Cannon
Carroll
Celler
Chapman
Chelf
Clark
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Courtney
Crosser
Dawson, Ill.
Deane
Delaney
Dingell
Doughton
Douglas
Durham
Eberharter
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Granger
Gregory
Hardy
Harrison
Havenner
Hays
Heffernan
Hobbs
Holifield
Huber
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten, Mo.
Kee
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
King
Kirwan
Klein
Lanham
Lesinski
Ludlow
Lusk
Lyle
Lynch
McCormack
Madden
Mahon
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Morgan
Multer
Murdock
Norton
O'Brien
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Peden
Pfeifer
Pickett
Powell
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rains
Rayburn
Richards
Riley
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Sikes
Smathers
Smith, Va.
Somers
Spence
Stigler
Teague
Thompson
Trimble
Walter
West
Worley
Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cole, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—12

Bennett, Mo.
Coudert
Dirksen
Judd
Kefauver
Kilburn
Monroney
Morrison
Poage
Smith, Maine
Thomas, N. J.
Tollefson

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Monroney against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Kefauver.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Poage.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, may I again inquire if the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman from Oklahoma and I have a live pair. He is unable to be present. If present he would have voted "no." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2192) entitled "An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. DONNELL, and Mr. MCGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LOUIS H. DEAVER—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 517)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval H. R. 3111, a bill "for the relief of Louis H. Deaver."

The bill authorizes and directs the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Federal Security Agency to receive the claim of Louis H. Deaver, of Tuthill, S. Dak., who allegedly was permanently disabled as the result of an injury received in August 1921, while employed as postmaster at Cody, Nebr., and authorizes said Bureau to consider and act upon the claim under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, notwithstanding the time limitations contained in said act within which claims thereunder must be filed. The bill further provides that any claim authorized by this measure shall be filed not later than 6 months after the date of enactment and that no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this measure.

It appears that Mr. Deaver was appointed postmaster at Cody, Nebr., on April 12, 1913, when the office was in the fourth class, and that the office was advanced to the third class in 1916, and Mr. Deaver was appointed and reappointed for five consecutive 4-year terms to that third-class office, having served therein until January 30, 1934. It further appears that while Mr. Deaver claims to have sustained an injury in August 1921, in the handling of mail bags, no claim was made with respect thereto, but on January 2, 1936, he wrote to a Member of Congress asking aid in procuring compensation on account of the injuries, and on May 20, 1940, he wrote the Post Office Department asking for financial assistance in the way of a pension or some sort of compensation by reason of the injury he claims to have sustained in August 1921. Mr. Deaver is now approximately 75 years of age.

The proposal contained in this measure is objectionable, first, by reason of the fact that at the time of the alleged injury Mr. Deaver was an "officer" as distinguished from an "employee," and officers of the Federal Government were not at that time, and are not now, entitled to benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1916, as amended. Second, even if Mr. Deaver had been an employee of the Federal Government at the time of the alleged injury, it would be practically impossible to develop evidence at this late date—some 27 years after the alleged injury—as to the circumstances under which the injury occurred, and especially in connection with a hernia injury. Finally, the approval of this measure would be discriminatory since it would extend to Mr. Deaver privileges not available to other officers and employees of the Federal Government, especially in cases where injuries are alleged to have occurred many years ago.

While I feel constrained to withhold my approval of this measure, I would be glad to approve a general measure which would make the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act applicable to the civilian officers of the Federal Government, effective from the date of such enactment, if such civilian officers are injured in the performance of their duties and comply with the time limitations required by the act in the filing of claims thereunder.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread upon the Journal, the bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the message ordered to be printed.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 516)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the state of the Union message on January 7, 1948, I spoke of five great goals toward which we should strive in our constant effort to strengthen our democracy and improve the welfare of our people. The first of these is to secure fully our essential human rights. I am now presenting to the Congress my recommendations for legislation to carry us forward toward that goal.

This Nation was founded by men and women who sought these shores that they might enjoy greater freedom and greater opportunity than they had known before. The founders of the United States proclaimed to the world the American belief that all men are created equal, and that governments are instituted to secure the inalienable rights with which all men are endowed. In the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, they eloquently expressed the aspirations of all mankind for equality and freedom.

These ideals inspired the peoples of other lands, and their practical fulfillment made the United States the hope of the oppressed everywhere. Throughout our history men and women of all colors and creeds, of all races and religions, have come to this country to escape tyranny and discrimination. Millions strong, they have helped build this democratic Nation and have constantly reinforced our devotion to the great ideals of liberty and equality. With those who preceded them, they have helped to fashion and strengthen our American faith—a faith that can be simply stated:

We believe that all men are created equal and that they have the right to equal justice under law.

We believe that all men have the right to freedom of thought and of expression and the right to worship as they please.

We believe that all men are entitled to equal opportunities for jobs, for homes, for good health, and for education.

We believe that all men should have a voice in their Government and that Government should protect, not usurp, the rights of the people.

These are the basic civil rights which are the source and the support of our democracy.

Today, the American people enjoy more freedom and opportunity than ever before. Never in our history has there been better reason to hope for the complete realization of the ideals of liberty and equality.

We shall not, however, finally achieve the ideals for which this Nation was founded so long as any American suffers discrimination as a result of his race, or religion, or color, or the land of origin of his forefathers.

Unfortunately, there still are examples—flagrant examples—of discrimination which are utterly contrary to our ideals. Not all groups of our population are free from the fear of violence. Not all groups are free to live and work where they please or to improve their conditions of life by their own efforts. Not all groups enjoy the full privileges of citizenship and participation in the government under which they live.

We cannot be satisfied until all our people have equal opportunities for jobs, for homes, for education, for health, and for political expression, and until all our people have equal protection under the law.

One year ago I appointed a committee of 15 distinguished Americans and asked them to appraise the condition of our civil rights and to recommend appropriate action by Federal, State, and local governments.

The committee's appraisal has resulted in a frank and revealing report. This report emphasizes that our basic human freedoms are better cared for and more vigilantly defended than ever before. But it also makes clear that there is a serious gap between our ideals and some of our practices. This gap must be closed.

This will take the strong efforts of each of us individually, and all of us acting

together through voluntary organizations and our governments.

The protection of civil rights begins with the mutual respect for the rights of others which all of us should practice in our daily lives. Through organizations in every community—in all parts of the country—we must continue to develop practical, workable arrangements for achieving greater tolerance and brotherhood.

The protection of civil rights is the duty of every government which derives its powers from the consent of the people. This is usually true of local, State, and national governments. There is much that the States can and should do at this time to extend their protection of civil rights. Wherever the law enforcement measures of State and local governments are inadequate to discharge this primary function of government, these measures should be strengthened and improved.

The Federal Government has a clear duty to see that constitutional guaranties of individual liberties and of equal protection under the laws are not denied or abridged anywhere in our Union. That duty is shared by all three branches of the Government, but it can be fulfilled only if the Congress enacts modern, comprehensive civil-rights laws, adequate to the needs of the day, and demonstrating our continuing faith in the free way of life.

I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation at this session directed toward the following specific objectives:

1. Establishing a permanent Commission on Civil Rights, a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, and a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice.
2. Strengthening existing civil-rights statutes.
3. Providing Federal protection against lynching.
4. Protecting more adequately the right to vote.
5. Establishing a Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent unfair discrimination in employment.
6. Prohibiting discriminaton in interstate transportation facilities.
7. Providing home rule and suffrage in Presidential elections for the residents of the District of Columbia.
8. Providing statehood for Hawaii and Alaska and a greater measure of self-government for our island possessions.
9. Equalizing the opportunities for residents of the United States to become naturalized citizens.
10. Settling the evacuation claims of Japanese-Americans.

STRENGTHENING THE GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

As a first step, we must strengthen the organization of the Federal Government in order to enforce civil-rights legislation more adequately and to watch over the state of our traditional liberties.

I recommend that the Congress establish a permanent Commission on Civil Rights reporting to the President. The Commission should continuously review our civil-rights policies and practices, study specific problems, and make recommendations to the President at frequent intervals. It should work with other agencies of the Federal Government, with State and local governments, and with private organizations.

I also suggest that the Congress establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. This committee should make a continuing study of legislative matters relating to civil rights and should consider means of improving respect for and enforcement of those rights.

These two bodies together should keep all of us continuously aware of the condition of civil rights in the United States and keep us alert to opportunities to improve their protection.

To provide for better enforcement of Federal civil rights laws there will be established a Division of Civil Rights in the Department of Justice. I recommend that the Congress provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General to supervise this Division.

STRENGTHENING EXISTING CIVIL-RIGHTS STATUTES

I recommend that the Congress amend and strengthen the existing provisions of Federal law which safeguard the right to vote and the right to safety and security of person and property. These provisions are the basis for our present civil-rights enforcement program.

Section 51 of title 18 of the United States Code, which now gives protection to citizens in the enjoyment of rights secured by the Constitution or Federal laws, needs to be strengthened in two respects. In its present form this section protects persons only if they are citizens, and it affords protection only against conspiracies by two or more persons. This protection should be extended to all inhabitants of the United States, whether or not they are citizens, and should be afforded against infringement by persons acting individually as well as in conspiracy.

Section 52 of title 18 of the United States Code, which now gives general protection to individuals against the deprivation of federally secured rights by public officers, has proved to be inadequate in some cases because of the generality of its language. An enumeration of the principal rights protected under this section is needed to make more definite and certain the protection which the section affords.

FEDERAL PROTECTION AGAINST LYNCHING

A specific Federal measure is needed to deal with the crime of lynching—against which I cannot speak too strongly. It is a principle of our democracy, written into our Constitution, that every person accused of an offense against the law shall have a fair, orderly trial in an impartial court. We have made great progress toward this end, but I regret to say that lynching has not yet finally disappeared from our land. So long as one person walks in fear of lynching, we shall not have achieved equal justice under law. I call upon the Congress to take decisive action against this crime.

PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Under the Constitution, the right of all properly qualified citizens to vote is beyond question. Yet the exercise of this right is still subject to interference. Some individuals are prevented from voting by isolated acts of intimidation. Some whole groups are prevented by outmoded policies prevailing in certain States or communities.

We need stronger statutory protection of the right to vote. I urge the Congress to enact legislation forbidding interference by public officers or private persons with the right of qualified citizens to participate in primary, special, and general elections in which Federal officers are to be chosen. This legislation should extend to elections for State as well as Federal officers insofar as interference with the right to vote results from discriminatory action by public officers based on race, color, or other unreasonable classification.

Requirements for the payment of poll taxes also interfere with the right to vote. There are still seven States which, by their constitutions, place this barrier between their citizens and the ballot box. The American people would welcome voluntary action on the part of these States to remove this barrier. Nevertheless, I believe the Congress should enact measures insuring that the right to vote in elections for Federal officers shall not be contingent upon the payment of taxes.

I wish to make it clear that the enactment of the measures I have recommended will in no sense result in Federal conduct of elections. They are designed to give qualified citizens Federal protection of their right to vote. The actual conduct of elections, as always, will remain the responsibility of State governments.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

We in the United States believe that all men are entitled to equality of opportunity. Racial, religious, and other invidious forms of discrimination deprive the individual of an equal chance to develop and utilize his talents and to enjoy the rewards of his efforts.

Once more I repeat my request that the Congress enact fair employment practice legislation prohibiting discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, or national origin. The legislation should create a Fair Employment Practice Commission with authority to prevent discrimination by employers and labor unions, trade and professional associations, and Government agencies and employment bureaus. The degree of effectiveness which the wartime Fair Employment Practice Committee attained shows that it is possible to equalize job opportunity by Government action and thus to eliminate the influence of prejudice in employment.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

The channels of interstate commerce should be open to all Americans on a basis of complete equality. The Supreme Court has recently declared unconstitutional State laws requiring segregation on

public carriers in interstate travel. Company regulations must not be allowed to replace unconstitutional State laws. I urge the Congress to prohibit discrimination and segregation, in the use of interstate transportation facilities, by both public officers and the employees of private companies.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I am in full accord with the principle of local self-government for residents of the District of Columbia. In addition, I believe that the Constitution should be amended to extend suffrage in Presidential elections to the residents of the District.

The District of Columbia should be a true symbol of American freedom and democracy for our own people, and for the people of the world. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will promptly give the citizens of the District of Columbia their own local, elective government. They themselves can then deal with the inequalities arising from segregation in the schools and other public facilities, and from racial barriers to places of public accommodation which now exist for one-third of the District's population.

The present inequalities in essential services are primarily a problem for the District itself, but they are also of great concern to the whole Nation. Failing local corrective action in the near future, the Congress should enact a model civil-rights law for the Nation's Capital.

OUR TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS

The present political status of our Territories and possessions impairs the enjoyment of civil rights by their residents. I have in the past recommended legislation granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, and organic acts for Guam and American Samoa, including a grant of citizenship to the people of these Pacific islands. I repeat these recommendations.

Furthermore, the residents of the Virgin Islands should be granted an increasing measure of self-government, and the people of Puerto Rico should be allowed to choose their form of government and their ultimate status with respect to the United States.

EQUALITY IN NATURALIZATION

All properly qualified legal residents of the United States should be allowed to become citizens without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. The Congress has recently removed the bars which formerly prevented persons from China, India, and the Philippines from becoming naturalized citizens. I urge the Congress to remove the remaining racial or nationality barriers which stand in the way of citizenship for some residents of our country.

EVACUATION CLAIMS OF THE JAPANESE-AMERICANS

During the last war more than 100,000 Japanese-Americans were evacuated from their homes in the Pacific States solely because of their racial origin. Many of these people suffered property and business losses as a result of this forced evacuation and through no fault of their own. The Congress has before it legislation establishing a procedure by which claims based upon these losses can be promptly considered and settled. I trust that favorable action on this legislation will soon be taken.

The legislation I have recommended for enactment by the Congress at the present session is a minimum program if the Federal Government is to fulfill its obligation of insuring the constitutional guaranties of individual liberties and of equal protection under the law.

Under the authority of existing law, the Executive branch is taking every possible action to improve the enforcement of the civil-rights statutes and to eliminate discrimination in Federal employment, in providing Federal services and facilities, and in the armed forces.

I have already referred to the establishment of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. The Federal Bureau of Investigation will work closely with this new Division in the investigation of Federal civil-rights cases. Specialized training is being given to the Bureau's agents so that they may render more effective service in this difficult field of law enforcement.

It is the settled policy of the United States Government that there shall be no discrimination in Federal employment or in providing Federal services and facilities. Steady progress has been made toward this objective in recent years. I shall shortly issue an Executive order containing a comprehensive restatement of the Federal nondiscrimination policy, together with appropriate measures to insure compliance.

During the recent war and in the years since its close we have made much progress toward equality of opportunity in our armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. I have instructed the Secretary of Defense to take steps to have the remaining instances of discrimination in the armed services eliminated as rapidly as possible. The personnel policies and practices of all the services in this regard will be made consistent.

I have instructed the Secretary of the Army to investigate the status of civil rights in the Panama Canal Zone with a view to eliminating such discrimination as may exist there. If legislation is necessary, I shall make appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

The position of the United States in the world today makes it especially urgent that we adopt these measures to secure for all our people their essential rights.

The peoples of the world are faced with the choice of freedom or enslavement, a choice between a form of government which harnesses the state in the service of the individual and a form of government which chains the individual to the needs of the state.

We in the United States are working in company with other nations who share our desire for enduring world peace and who believe with us that, above all else, men must be free. We are striving to build a world family of nations—a world where men may live under governments of their own choosing and under laws of their own making.

As part of that endeavor, the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations is now engaged in preparing an international bill of human rights by which the nations of the world may bind themselves by international covenant to give effect to basic human rights and fundamental freedoms. We have played a leading role in this undertaking designed to create a world order of law and justice fully protective of the rights and the dignity of the individual.

To be effective in these efforts, we must protect our civil rights so that by providing all our people with the maximum enjoyment of personal freedom and personal opportunity we shall be a stronger nation—stronger in our leadership, stronger in our moral position, stronger in the deeper satisfactions of a united citizenry.

We know that our democracy is not perfect. But we do know that it offers a fuller, freer, happier life to our people than any totalitarian nation has ever offered.

If we wish to inspire the peoples of the world whose freedom is in jeopardy, if we wish to restore hope to those who have already lost their civil liberties, if we wish to fulfill the promise that is ours, we must correct the remaining imperfections in our practice of democracy.

We know the way. We need only the will.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1948.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD] may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD his speech, together with the speech made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] at the Good Roads Association meeting in which he properly extolled the virtues of our present Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to insert an editorial from the Maryland Gazette, the oldest newspaper in the United States, on the tax bill; and also an address delivered by Dr. C. S. Duncan before the annual meeting of the railway treasury officers at Swampscott, Mass., last January.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes after any other special orders today, and to include as a part of my remarks an article from a commercial paper regarding currency, notwithstanding the estimated cost which it may entail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include five different articles on the question of the Marshall plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four separate instances and to include newspaper articles and letters.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by George Weller, foreign correspondent of the Chicago Daily News, and a Pulitzer prize winner, on the subject of the Marshall plan and what it means to Europe and what it means to us. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman is undoubtedly as fully informed about conditions in Europe as any man living. He certainly ought to be able to present his views, and he does present his views in a way that will be helpful to the Members of this House.

I have submitted this to the Public Printer and I find it will cost $260.34. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Southgate Press of Southgate, Calif.

Mr. BUSBEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain excerpts from a program held recently in Oakland, Calif., by the B'nai B'rith Lodge in which they honored General Clark, Dr. Sproul, of the University of California, and California Supreme Court Judge Gibson.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JONES of Washington (at the request of Mr. TOLLEFSON), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. COUDERT, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, for 28 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. TALLE, for the remainder of this week, for the purpose of attending to business in his district.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

RETIREMENT FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS OF OUR ARMED SERVICES—H. R. 2744

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for a short while this afternoon I wish to discuss the matter of retirement for reserve components of our armed services. It is my purpose today to tell you briefly a little bit about a bill which was reported from a subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Services, of which subcommittee I was chairman. I want to emphasize the importance of this bill and the need for its enactment. Also I wish to tell you that we are going to ask the Rules Committee for a rule on this bill. If any of you are interested and will support our application we will greatly appreciate it.

The bill referred to is the bill H. R. 2744 of which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is the author. I might say he is the pioneer in trying to develop the reserves of the Army, Air Force, and the Navy. In the last Congress a bill similar to H. R. 2744 of which he was the author passed the House but unfortunately it was lost in the Senate legislative log jam, at the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress and never received consideration by the Senate itself.

In this Congress we again took up the matter and after very prolonged hearings we recommended the bill which bears the name of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] and the number H. R. 2744.

Very briefly, this is what the bill provides: We are departing from the old plan that we have had in our country for over a century of having Reserves serve without pay, except when on active duty, and are proposing to offer incentives to men who devote their time to reserve service, by offering them retirement pay, based on length of service. The pay will be modest but it will be an incentive we think for men to stay in the Reserves.

Without exception every leading man in the Army of the United States, in the Regular Army and in all the other components of our armed services, believes and states emphatically that in order to win a war we must have Reserves. The First World War showed the importance of the Reserve components. Those of you who were in that war—and I was one—know that over two-thirds of the divisions that fought on the front and won the victory and that made the sacrifices were National Guard and Reserve divisions. I can recount some of the numbers for you. The Thirty-second, the Twenty-seventh, the Twenty-ninth, the Twenty-eighth, the Twenty-sixth, the Thirty-fifth, the Thirty-sixth, the Forty-second, and others that served tremendously well.

Our national policy since the inception of this country has been to have a small professional Army and in times of conflict and stress to suddenly expand that by means of the Reserve system through the National Guard and the Organized Reserves. It is all the more important today that we have a group of Reserves in our Army. In my humble judgment, it is especially important that we have well-trained junior officers who can lead men in the event of conflict. I need not tell you here today that in the event of a conflict we will have no time to prepare; we will have no cushion of distance, we will have no cushion of climate, no cushion of latitude or geography. If a war should break out against us we would have to be partially ready the very first day the war started. We could receive a devastating blow on the first day the war started.

The trouble spots of the world are in the northern part of the hemisphere, from 30 degrees latitude north. From any point in that area we can today go to any other important point and back after dropping bombs. You can, therefore, see how imperative it is that we be at least partially prepared in the event of a sudden conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer another thought for consideration that I think is even more important. Every man I have ever met in the Army, be he enlisted man or officer, has always told me that the purpose of fighting our last two wars was to end the war game, to find some means of collective security that would make the world safe to live in. We fought the first war to end all wars. Some of us believed that slogan was right. Some of us came out of that war firmly convinced that we had played our part to end all wars.

As soon as our sons got old enough to fight we were in another war, a war much more devastating. Let us consider for a moment our bonded debt in the two wars. Our bonded debt in the First World War was roughly $25,000,000,000. We staggered under it and thought it might wreck our economic system. In the war just closed the bonded debt because of the war was finally $269,000,000,000. In other words, in just the short space of a quarter of a century the economic cost of war rose over 10 times. Concurrently with that the capacity for destruction rose in different types of destructive missiles from 10 to 100 times between the First and Second World Wars.

It is my firm conviction that to bring about a peaceful world through collaboration with other countries, to bring about the agreements we must have and the understandings that are so essential to have a world of peace, we must have strength. We can only obtain it through strength, and when I say strength, I mean economic strength, I mean military strength, I mean moral strength. I mean an absolute determination on the part of our people that if trouble comes they will be willing to fight to defend their country. This bill provides one of the steps, in my humble judgment, that will give us the strength in its various phases and activities to bring about the cooperation we have to have in order to achieve world peace.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is making an excellent statement, with which

I thoroughly agree. As the gentleman knows, we have in the United States today a vast reserve army of battle-trained men. Unless we pass this legislation the investment we have made in that training will eventually be lost. These men are forgetting what they learned in time of war. We should do all we can to encourage continued participation on the part of these men who have had 3, 4, and 5 years of actual wartime experience as a part of our great reserve Army which I think we will need for the next few years. I certainly appreciate the fine statement the gentleman is making.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman very much for his statement. It is men like the gentleman that I want to encourage to participate in the Reserve activities of the United States Army. He served with distinction during the past war, and we should use his experience and talents. Seated on the floor of this House are men like the gentleman, as well as many others on the outside, who looked down a barrelhead during this war, who sacrificed from 2 to 5 years of their time that they could have devoted to their profession or vocation. We think this bill enables them to participate and offers them a small incentive for the time and the effort that they will give. I hope and believe that that typifies the sentiment of many men and women who served in this war.

Coming to the bill, it provides roughly as follows: That in order to obtain the benefits of this retirement bill you would have to serve a minimum of 20 years, and in various categories you would have to serve also a minimum of 3 years in some cases and down to one-half year in other cases of active service; in other words, a man who did not serve in either war would have to serve a minimum of 3 years following the Second World War. A man, for instance, who before the last war had served in the Reserve some 10 or 15 years and served a total of 20 years must have 4 years of active service, 1 year of which must be after the close of the last war. Many men in Congress will have complied with that by serving perhaps 4 years in the active service during the recent war, but they would have to serve 1 year following the war; and in a few instances only 6 months.

Our committee is making provision for what we call extended active service, so the men would serve from maybe 15 days perhaps to a high of 90 days to get their active service. How is the computation made to pay these men? Here is the plan: For each year of inactive service, when you are on the Reserve rolls or on the National Guard rolls, you will receive one-half of 1 percent credit. Suppose you serve 18 years. In that way you would acquire what I call 9 percent of credit. Then, if you served 3 years in active service, part of which could be in the World War, you would receive 2½ percent per year for each year of active service. That would be 7½ percent. So, you would get 9 percent for inactive service, 7½ percent for other service, which would make a total of 16½ percent. You would then, when you became 60 years of age, be paid 16½ percent of the pay of the highest rank you satisfactorily held. Most of the men that would serve that length of time in the Army would be at least majors and probably they would go up to colonels, and they would receive longevity pay based on the total number of years in service, both active and inactive; in other words, you would receive a fee or annuity when you were 60 years of age that would last throughout your life that in the general average, considering all the cases that we were able to figure out, would be $1,900. There would be some higher and some lower; in other words, you would receive approximately $150 a month for the rest of your life if you had the active service I indicated in my discussion.

Here is the way that would work: In addition to receiving pay for your active service, this annuity, if you bought it and spent 23 years paying for it, would cost you $406 a year for 23 years. So, the effect of this bill is buying an annuity at Government expense for you which will begin to be paid at the age of 60. To give another illustration, using an enlisted man: If he served 20 years and, say 3 years of which were after the war, a man who was not in the World War, and he attained the position of staff sergeant, he would receive roughly $359 retirement benefits at the age of 60 for the rest of his life; in other words, he would get about $30 a month for that service as an enlisted man, which would mean if he bought an annuity over that length of time it would cost him about $100 a year. This retirement pay would in effect be deferred payment for his service.

The way to look on it is that for every year of service that you get, in addition to your pay you will receive the equivalent of the insurance premium you would have to spend to get that annuity. We believe that would hold a good many men on the list. At the same time we are not unmindful of the fact that many men as they get older get married, they get commitments, they get obligations, they move into different parts of the country, and they cannot carry on this continuous service. So a great many men would drop out on the way up to the 60 years of age or on the way up to the 20 years or more of service which they must have. This means that only a very small fraction of these men would ever obtain this annuity, but it does mean that we would have a great many Reserves on our list of 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, and even 15 years of service, and we would build up a reserve list that would be a hundredfold as big in the aggregate of service of the men as we had at the beginning of the last war, and the need for them is almost a hundredfold what it was at the time the last war broke out.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. REEVES. The problem as to how our Reserve forces may best be handled is a very vexing one. I believe the gentleman has made a keen analysis and an exceedingly clear presentation of the solution offered by the bill to which he has made reference. I congratulate him upon what he has told us today.

I should like to make this point: We are expending some billions of dollars a year at this time for the benefit of veterans simply because they are veterans and need some kind of assistance from the Government. It seems to me we have an opportunity to utilize this vast reservoir of trained manpower, battle-trained in a great many cases, as the nucleus of any fighting force we may be called on to utilize in the next few years.

I might point out in that connection that when World War II came upon us our battle-trained officers and enlisted reservists had not seen service for more than 20 years. As the matter now stands, if we should ever engage in another international conflict in the near future we would be in a position to utilize a big reservoir of men who had been service-trained within a comparatively recent period of time. It seems to me it is particularly important today that we apply a certain amount of the expenditure we are applying to veterans' benefits to preserving in some kind of organized training that great national asset which we will be desperately in need of in the event we become embroiled in another war.

I repeat my congratulations to the gentleman on a splendid presentation of this important bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I appreciate the gentleman's comments tremendously, especially as they come from a veteran of the last war.

May I point out how nominal the cost of this bill will be. On the best estimates we could obtain we found that in 1949, assuming the bill had gone into effect in 1948 or 1947, the annual cost would be $52,000. The reason for that is that there are some officers who served in both wars who would be eligible under this law without any service after the second World War. That amount would gradually climb until in 1957—this was based on the assumption that the law would be passed in 1947—the total cost would be only $1,455,000. The cost, considering what I conceive to be the benefits of this thing, are very, very nominal.

I believe this is the key to one way of getting and holding reserve officers and reserve men in the ranks as well. As I pointed out before, these are the ones that have to win all our wars, if we are to properly interpret past experience.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I served many years with the gentleman on the Committee on Military Affairs as it was then called. I know that when the gentleman goes into a committee room he does so to study a question fully and completely. I do appreciate the good work the gentleman has done, as well as the work of my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], in bringing this legislation to the floor. I hope the Committee on Rules will give you a rule at the earliest possible moment because it is highly essential that we do have these trained men and utilize the skills that they possess, because we never know

what will happen and we want to be ready for any eventuality.

I am heartily in accord with the gentleman's legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman, and am especially grateful to my old associate on the Military Affairs Committee for his fine boost for this bill. I might say that we have the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] who has been a pioneer in this movement also. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], the author of this bill, who has probbaly devoted more time, study, and effort to bring about the passage of a bill of this kind than any other man in the Congress in either House. I take pleasure in yielding to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I join in the complementary remarks about my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is now addressing the House. He has shown great interest in Reserve legislation over a period of years, and especially since the end of the Second World War. He has worked as chairman of the subcommittee handling this retirement legislation and has worked long, arduously, and faithfully. Certainly he is entitled to be recognized as a man who is most interested in the safety and security of our country. I think you have made a splendid statement, sir, and I join with the other gentlemen in congratulating you on the statement you are now making about this bill.

May I say in addition to what you have already said that when this Nation came out of the Second World War, we had the mightiest Army and Navy that the world had ever seen. It was splendidly organized and equipped and certainly magnificently trained. They each did a magnificent job. The country decided to demobilize them as fast as we could. We got them out so fast that at times I felt they were getting in each other's way as they came out of the armed services. Then as they were leaving the service they were given an opportunity to show their interest in the Reserve components of the Army and Navy and Marine Corps by enlisting in the Reserve organization. The Army alone, I am told, obtained over a million voluntary enlistments in its organized Reserves from the enlisted men and officers. When demobilization ended we had available well over 1,000,000 Reservists who had expressed an interest in the Army. Today, through lack of interest and through lack of a program, the number has dwindled greatly. We have not been able to keep up with them. We do not know the addresses of the Reserves who are anxious and willing to serve. We have no substantial program for them. But, more important than that, Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment, is the fact that we do not have a long-range program to offer them to keep them interested over a period of years in the work of the organized Reserves. This bill seeks to remedy that very thing. We have just today passed a bill in the House reducing taxes. I think the present bill could be called an economy measure. I do not know of any measure anywhere, Mr. Speaker, that will give the Government the return in service from men who are trained, and are willing to be trained, for as small a cost as is indicated in this bill. As the gentleman has just said, the first year will cost about $50,000 and at the end of a 10-year period it will cost about $1,500,000. When we make the comparison of expenditures of $11,000,000,000 over all for the Army and Navy and Marine forces, you can see the relative comparison under H. R. 2744.

May I just add to what has been said the fact that we began work on this bill in 1941. It has been built up over a period of years. Every provision of the bill has been weighed most carefully and exactly and has met the test. When the bill came out of the committee presided over by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. JOHNSON], it had the endorsement of all the armed services; it had the endorsement of all patriotic organizations; it had the endorsement of every reserve organization. It came to the floor with the unanimous report of the committee.

A similar bill passed the House of Representatives last year by unanimous consent. It went to the Senate and came within a fraction of passing the Senate. Only the limited time due to the final days of the last session of Congress kept it from passing the Senate. So I say to you today, I know of no legislation which, in my humble opinion, will do as much at so little cost to build up and preserve the organized reserves of our country as will this retirement legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman has made his usual fine contribution. I want to congratulate him on his persistence in pressing this legislation for the last 6 years.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my endorsement of this bill. I think at a time like this when many different things are being discussed, this is very timely. I was one of the pioneers in getting universal military training started in my section of the country, but I think universal military training, for which I will vote, may give the Nation a false security. I am receiving petitions every day from the Women's Auxiliary of the American Legion, from the American Legion, signed by hundreds of people. They seem to think that is the only thing we need in national defense. But I may say that if we had 100,000,000 men armed in the United States, and did not have control of the air, it would not be worth one dime. So I wish to commend the gentleman. I will vote for universal military training. I took a leading part in the fight for the unification bill last year. I fought in executive session for months with some of the leaders of the Army and the Navy in order to get that bill out, but I think one point you mentioned is worth a lot to this Congress. That is what you had to say about north of the 30° latitude. The nearest point from any point in the Soviet Union to any point in North America is over the North Pole, where there are no highways and no sea lanes. The only force that can meet an attack from the north is an air force. Now, think that over for yourselves. I might add this, I am told that the temperature at 30,000 feet over the North Pole is 1° warmer than it is at 30,000 feet at the Equator. It makes no difference to air power whether you are flying over the North Pole or the Equator if you have to travel at 30,000 feet or more altitude.

I wish to commend the gentleman from California for what he had to say about the air force reserves, as well as the other components of the armed services reserve. May I say that in 1937 a Russian Stormovik plane flew from a point in Russia to San Francisco, a distance of between 6,000 and 7,000 miles, nonstop, flying, mind you, 11 years ago. That is still the world's nonstop long-distance flying record. Yet a lot of people say that Russia is too dumb to do this or that. I believe that today they have planes that can fly to San Francisco and back. I may be wrong, but I recall the experts were wrong when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. Before that they told me they could knock the Japs out in 3 weeks. So when they tell me Russia is dumb, I do not agree with them. We need more people on this floor like the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] to bring things like this to the attention of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina who was a member of the Air Forces in this war. I was a humble member of the Air Forces in the First World War.

I think it is fair to state that practically everything that happened in this war in the air was predicted by General Mitchell and others. It was just the unfolding not only of the dreams but of the plans of the Air Forces, especially those who had devoted their entire lives to this branch of our national security organization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This would apply equally to the Navy as well as the Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It would apply to every part of our armed services.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Apply equally to so-called naval air—I think that is the phrase they use now.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Naval air and land air.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I sometimes think that the Navy is very much forgotten today. There seems to be a feeling that airplanes can leave this country, go to Russia and return—a very difficult feat. They certainly are going to need the Navy carriers in order to do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This applies to every branch of the armed services, everything we have.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], a veteran of World War II.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I agree that we must have the finest planes in the world, I agree that we must have the best equipment; but it is my belief also that the strength of this country will be found in the caliber of the men who operate those planes and that equip-

ment. I believe that in many cases in the recent war we had equipment inferior to that of our enemies. We won the war not because of superior equipment but because of the superiority of the American soldier. It was interesting to read in the papers about the big tank battles, but there was not one tank out of a thousand that started out intact that did not have three or four American boys to protect it.

I believe that one of the primary duties of the Department of Air during peacetime is to develop reserves. I believe that up to date they have not developed those reserves. This past summer during my trip to Texas I heard many criticisms concerning our reserve program. I came back to Washington and wrote letters to the 48 different departmental commanders in the United States and asked what the status of the reserves was in their States. About 71 percent of the replies I received said the main thing needed was some legislation and a good program from the Department of the Army and the Air Force. Thirty-eight percent mentioned the bill the gentleman has been discussing here today, the retirement bill. About 71 percent mentioned the inactive-duty-pay bill. I give this just as an example of how the people who defended us in the last war are thinking and I want to compliment the gentleman for taking a leading part in stimulating interest in our reserves.

It is my opinion that this Congress should not lose sight of the fact that the strength of this country will be the men in it and not necessarily the weapons we have. It is the duty of Congress to stimulate reserves and reserve programs. It is my opinion that this bill will do much to that end.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and wish to compliment him. He was a soldier in the last war, and a decorated one as well, who will carry the scars of battle to the end of his days.

The gentleman, in my opinion, has put his finger on an important function of this bill. As the gentleman stated, the man behind the gun, and the man in the tank, and the man who handles the plane is the important part of the picture; manpower and skilled manpower in every single rank is essential to win battles. We hope this bill, if it passes, will have the effect of producing such trained manpower.

I take pleasure in yielding to the gentleman from Florida, who has been very active in this field.

Mr. SIKES. My distinguished friend is taking the lead in a very worthy cause. We have come to know the gentleman from California, ROY JOHNSON, in this House, as one of its hardest workers and most valuable Members. I have had the pleasure of working with the gentleman from California, ROY JOHNSON, very closely in the Military Affairs Committee and later the Committee on the Armed Services on this and many other pieces of legislation. I know something about the work that went into it. More important, I know something about the need for this legislation. There is a place for a strong Reserve and a strong National Guard in this Nation, a very important place. At the moment it is the only thing that we have that provides a backlog of trained men. Every Member of Congress knows that we must have a backlog of trained men to implement our armed forces, make it possible for them to speedily get into action and to do a job after they are in action.

We have not progressed very far in building up a strong National Guard and a strong Reserve. There are paper plans, and those paper plans look good, but the work out in the fields has not gone very far. If an emergency were to occur tomorrow, the Reserve and the Guard would do all they could, but they are not organized and developed to the point that they could do very much.

The passage of this measure is one of the steps that would strengthen the Guard and the Reserve. One of the things it would do is to make for an effective organization that we must have if our security forces are to be what this Nation requires. I sincerely hope we can continue to have the type of fine support that has been evidenced by expressions made on the floor this afternoon so that the will of Congress can be worked toward the passage of H. R. 2744.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. As far as I am concerned, I do not deserve any special credit for work on this bill. It has been mostly a labor of love. But what more important work could we do than to try to find a means of protecting our institutions, our people, and our property? In my humble judgment, this bill will bring that about.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a table showing the benefits and some of the features of this bill in table form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I want to add this to what has been said in reference to the need for this bill. I made a study of the needs of the Reserve components of the armed services several years ago. In fact, I was interested in the ROTC prior to the Second World War. I checked into the situation to see what the chief problem of the Reserve was at that time. I found then the great trouble was in maintaining a continuing interest in the Reserves. I found that each year showed a 10-percent turn-over in the Officers' Reserve prior to the Second World War. In other words, every 10 years the country had a completely brand new organization of reserves.

After we train a man for 2 or 3 years he becomes very valuable as a Reserve officer, but if we lose him, immediately his value is lost to our establishment. The idea of retirement legislation when we first began to work upon it was to develop a means whereby we could obtain competent and adequate reserves. Then after they were obtained and trained to develop means whereby we could retain them over a period of years during their usefulness. Some of us felt that some little inducement such as retirement would be the means of continuing those men in service.

The Reserve components of the armed services are not in good shape at the present time. The reserves of the Army are weak; far below the required strength. We had hearings before our committee only recently and we were given figures to show that the National Guard had only about 240,000 men as against a goal of 660,000 for the National Guard alone.

This is not the only branch of the reserve components that are below required strength. We need legislation to stimulate interest in our reserve components, and after we have stimulated the interest and obtained these men, who are interested in serving their Nation, our problem is to maintain this interest. About 2 years ago I visited a great meeting of reservists in one of our cities. There must have been 1,000 present, and there was a great amount of enthusiasm in that meeting. I went back to this same place this year to a similar meeting. There were a much smaller number present and they seemed to lack enthusiasm. I noticed this lack of the enthusiasm which I found in the first meeting which I attended. It is deeply to be regretted, and I think Congress is certainly to blame, at least somewhat to blame, in not giving these men who want and need legislation at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman has made his usual fine contribution. I want to point out that the evidence by men who know the military and the naval profession was overwhelming to the effect that the efficiency of a man increased much more rapidly in the accumulation of service; in other words, a man who served 3 years was probably worth 10 times as much as a man who served only 1 year, and that is why we are anxious to do something to hold in the service for some longer period these young reserve officers and enlisted men.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Mrs. LUSK. I would like to say that it is my impression that there is a strong feeling among the members of the reserve forces of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force that this legislation is very much needed. I think that those people, perhaps better than the average person, realize the cost of training during the past war and the importance of having that training immediately. In any future need that might arise, their experience and their organization would mean a great deal toward meeting the first line of defense. I think UMT is important; perhaps it is basic to any national-defense program, but this is another component of defense that we cannot overlook.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentlewoman very much for that statement. That very idea was emphasized by, what I call, the civilian soldier in this war who saw the fumbling that we did trying to get ourselves ready to

protect ourselves. I just want to emphasize again in connection with the comments of the lady from New Mexico that in the next war we will not have the time to get ready as we did in past wars. We must have trained men who are ready and will be ready when and if the emergency comes.

In closing, I want to mention again that I think every one of our committee and probably everyone who studied this matter looks upon this not as a war measure but as a peace measure. We are trying to retain our strength so that we can get the understandings and get the agreements that will bring about world peace. That is why we believe that the reservists are the ones who can help us more than anyone else. They are the key to peace, through reserve military strength.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there anything before the gentleman's committee in this legislation or other legislation that would provide some benefits or compensation to members of the National Guard who are injured or killed while training under official training orders?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know what the Federal legislation is, but in my State of California, and I think it is typical of other States, we have included national guardsmen under the workmen's compensation provisions, so if a man is injured—and I know of one very distressing case where a man had his back injured—he receives comparable benefits to what the workman receives who works in industry. Our law gives him the maximum amount of benefits.

Mr. CURTIS. But that is State legislation only.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes. Of course, while a man is in the National Guard he is not in the Federal service, and I think the State has some responsibility as distinguished from the Federal Government. When he is called into active duty I believe there may be some Federal provision, but I am not sure as to the specific provision regarding it.

Mr. CURTIS. I call this situation to the attention of the gentleman. Perhaps in the old days when the National Guard was ground forces only, the State, in return for certain police protection that would come from having such a Guard, should stand the expense of some sort of benefit or protection to the members in that training. We have in the State of Nebraska a very fine air National Guard. It is making a definite contribution not to the defense of the State but to the defense of the Nation. We have had at least one case where a young father was killed while training under the official orders of this air National Guard. It seems to me that that is a responsibility of the Federal Government, that his unit is very definitely a part of the defense of the Republic, and certainly there should be some Federal law on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Perhaps there should be, but of course it is a very minor matter in the total over-all picture of the reserves. I will say to the gentleman that I think the principle he advocates is correct, and I would be glad to join with him or to initiate myself legislation to take care of the situation that he mentions. It is a particularly aggravating situation in the air branch, where accidents are frequent and sometimes very sericus.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have a similar case in my home city, where a young man was injured participating in the activity of the ROTC in a high school. It involves a similar point. I think we have to go into it and give it some attention.

Mr. CURTIS. Does not the gentleman from Louisiana agree that especially in the case of the Air National Guard the increased hazard as well as the very type of training these men are put through inures to the benefit of the Federal Government?

Mr. BROOKS. I agree that the National Guard should come under this program, but it should especially apply to the Reserves.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who participated in this discussion may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and I further ask that I be permitted to include in my remarks a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Nondisability retirement plan

I. SERVICE REQUIREMENT FOR RESERVE COMPONENT RETIREMENT

Aggregate service credited at date of enactment	Total aggregate service required for eligibility	Total active Federal service required	Active Federal service subsequent to date of enactment
None	20 years	3 years	3 years.
Less than 5 years	do	do	2 years.
5 to 10 years	do	4 years	18 months.
10 to 15 years	do	do	1 year.
15 to 20 years	do	do	6 months.
Over 20 years	do	do	None.

II. GRADE IN WHICH RETIRED

Highest grade or rank, permanent or temporary, satisfactorily held during member's period of service.

III. RETIREMENT BENEFITS

A. Retirement pay commences upon attainment of age 60.

B. Pay formula: Two and one-half percent multiplied by years of active Federal service at time of retirement multiplied by active-duty base and longevity pay of grade or rank in which retired, plus one-half of 1 percent multiplied by years of inactive service at time of retirement multiplied by active-duty base and longevity pay of grade or rank in which retired; maximum at 75 percent of active-duty pay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. BROOKS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include statements from two colleges and a statement from the general manager of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority of Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OUR VETS NEED MORE SUBSISTENCE PAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, millions of veterans who washed their hands of war now find that they are up against the toughest enemy of their experience: inflation.

They had planned to return to the peace and securty of civilian life, to resume their education which was interrupted by war, or to learn a trade.

The Congress of the United States, in an effort to compensate for the sacrifices made by these young men and women for whom "nothing was too good," passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, popularly known as the GI bill of rights.

To veterans and civilian alike, the title of this law, in popular speech, had a hopeful, healthy ring, consistent with the best of our traditions. In spite of the best-laid plans, there was a tragic inequality of sacrifice during World War II. Some were called upon to suffer and die, while others fattened on their martyrdom. This bothered the conscience of most Americans who believe in fair play. As early as 1944, the Congress determined to make up for this disparity when the veterans came home. Realizing the financial and psychological difficulties of readjustment to civilian life, the Congress made provisions for the veterans to continue their education or take on-the-job training as a free gift of a grateful Government, clearly expressing the will of the people.

Never before in the history of any nation had such a comprehensive plan to help the returning veterans been formulated. The veterans themselves, oriented to this fact, were hopeful that they could make up in some measure for the years of normal living which they had sacrificed in behalf of all of our people.

On the strength of the Government's promise to help, many of them married and then went to school, reversing the customary order of development. True, there was a housing shortage, which could have been anticipated and provided for during the 1930's, if some people had not been so greedy, but that was second-guessing. There was hope and opportunity for the returning veteran, and he was prepared to put up with the inconveniences of living with the in-laws or starting housekeeping in one room, as long as he could acquire an education or the "know-how" of a trade in the meantime.

Bravely, the young couples faced their double responsibility.

Gradually, however—almost imperceptibly—they discovered that their situation was deteriorating from day to day.

In spite of rigid economies, it was becoming impossible to make both ends meet. And the veterans found that the war was not yet over. The visible enemy was gone but they had another which was pressing against them from every side and against whom they could not fight back.

Many were being forced to the wall by inflation.

Everyone else in the United States, with the exception of the profiteers, had to contend against this unseen foe which was stealing their income and was forcing them back into debt and despair.

There was relief for some. Many workers were able to win pay increases which enabled them to keep their heads above the swelling costs of inflation. Others were going under, and among them were the veterans who had sacrificed once and were being called upon to sacrifice again.

The danger to their morale and to the future of our country because of this neglect is great. The present Congress must make immediate adjustments so that the intent of the GI bill of rights will measure up to the realities of life. It must increase allowances—subsistence allowances—to those veterans who are getting an education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. For no veteran can properly learn a profession or a trade while his very existence is being threatened by economic forces beyond his control.

The Government's solemn obligations to the veterans must be carried out in full and not in part.

The cost of living is rising each month, yet the veteran is held to a fixed level of subsistence payments. From my own knowledge the VA is frequently months behind in payments to these veterans. We all understand the terrific work load of meeting the various needs of 14,000,000 eligible veterans, but this is small comfort to those veterans who do not get enough subsistence allowance in the first place, and then find that the checks are lost, strayed, or stolen.

In hearings held by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the United States House of Representatives nearly a year ago, some startling testimony came to light revealing the plight of veterans in the colleges and universities.

The findings of a survey made by students of the graduate school of business at Stanford University showed that single and married veterans alike need twice as much as they receive through their Government monthly allotment. This was published in Higher Education, semimonthly publication of the United States Office of Education. Single men receiving $65 a month from the Government spend an average of about $120 and a minimum of $90. The average monthly recreational expense is $20; for rent they pay out $10 to $20.

To make up the difference, the survey at Stanford indicated that 85 percent of the single veterans draw on savings. About 30 percent have part-time jobs and some 20 percent are helped by their parents. Minimum cost of living for married veterans with $90 coming from the Government is $140, while the average is $180. Rents average $50, with a low of $40, and recreation amounts to $15.

Extra expenses of married men are made up in most cases by wives who work. Nearly two-thirds of the wives of Stanford veterans work, most of them full time. Among men with children 75 percent draw on savings and 37 percent work part time, since wives must remain at home.

One student, a sophomore in engineering, said that he had to carry fewer hours one semester so that he could work part time to meet the rising cost of living.

"My wife works," he said, "but we still can't make a go of it with high rent and zooming food costs. It takes about twice my allotment to get by each month."

A sophomore in the arts and sciences, also married, said that rent and food costs run his bill up to at least twice what the Government pays him, even with his pension added.

"My wife works, and I work part time," he said, "but our average expenses run about $185 monthly."

It seems that the university living costs for married men are about the same as those at Stanford. One married veteran, a junior in engineering, said, "We are expecting a baby, so my wife can't work. I work part time to meet high rent and food costs, since my $90 a month isn't adequate. If expenses go higher than that, I draw on my savings. With this baby coming, it's going to be tough on us."

Even earlier than this, on December 14, 1946, W. J. Bender, counselor for veterans at Harvard University, wrote to the editor of the Army Times:

Our experience is that almost no students under Public Law 346 can get by at Harvard on the Government subsistence payments alone. Students without dependents, however, can come close enough to it that their situation is not serious. Veterans with dependents are in a hopeless situation unless they have considerable savings, help from outside sources, scholarship aid, or the wife has a job. If there are children, it is, of course, difficult for the wife to earn.

If any increases in subsistence payments are to be made, I feel strongly that they should be made first to veterans with dependents and that the amount should vary with the number of dependents. This is in answer to your letter of December 5, addressed to President Conant.

From Columbia University, December 16, 1946:

However, the financial strain on veteran students appears to be increasing and a thorough congressional reconsideration of the whole level of subsistence payments is urgent and inevitable.

North, south, east, west—all over the Nation, colleges report that veteran students are hampered in their work by meager subsistence allowances which are falling far behind the rising cost of living.

And what about those veterans who are taking on-the-job-training? Their subsistence allowances are the same, plus a ceiling on wages they may receive from the employers who are training them in skills or trades. A graphic description of the situation is contained in the tabulation of on-the-job-trainees, by States, made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, together with the recommendations of the V. F. W. State departments.

Confining ourselves to New England, here are the facts:

State	Those taking on-the-job training as of Dec. 31, 1946	Estimates of trainees affected on basis of 70 percent	Veterans of Foreign Wars department opinion as regards ceiling
Connecticut	8,777	6,144	Veterans are leaving training situations to seek more income; propose $250 single, $325 with dependents.
Maine	7,604	5,323	$175 single, $250 with dependents.
Massachusetts	25,599	17,919	Lack of incentive as result of Public Law 679 resulted in marked withdrawal of veterans from program: $250-$325.
New Hampshire	3,795	2,657	No report submitted.
Rhode Island	5,166	3,616	Cost-of-living ceilings imposed by Public Law 676 are too low: $200-$225.
Vermont	3,074	2,152	Wage ceiling discourages veteran from bettering himself; should no count earnings of worker outside program: $175-200.

You will note that I have given you some indication of the testimony submitted by the Veterans' Committee of the House of Representatives regarding the predicament of veterans seeking an education or on-the-job training as of 1 year ago.

The situation for them was difficult enough at that time.

What is it today?

The cost of food alone has gone up more than 20 percent during the past year, and the cost of all items has increased 15 percent.

The net result is that the buying power of the veteran's allotment, scant as it was, has been further reduced by 15 percent. Unless compensatory relief is forthcoming, and soon, many veterans will have to give up their ambitions and join the scramble for quick dollars to their own long-range disadvantage and that of the Nation.

The present Congress is considering several bills to make up for these deficiencies. In particular, H. R. 4212 would raise the subsistence allowance to $75 a month if without a dependent or dependents, to $105 a month with one dependent, or $120 per month if he has more than one dependent. H. R. 246 would raise ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job up to $250 a month for a veteran without a dependent, $325 per month for a veteran with one dependent, and $350 for a veteran with two or more dependents.

We have made a promise to our veterans.

It is our duty to carry out our obligation without short-changing them.

This calls for swift enactment of the two bills to raise subsistence allowances for students and trainees in justice to them and in realistic fulfillment of our commitments under the GI bill of rights.

This we will do.

(Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a certain table.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I am about to make and include therein certain quotations and excerpts; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to read two paragraphs from an editorial appearing in the Springfield Daily News, of Springfield, Mass., on Saturday evening. It is entitled "The Oil Fiasco."

The fuel-oil and kerosene shortage which has come in the middle of one of the most severe winters southern New England has experienced in a number of years is a disagreeable commentary on the failure of an industry to meet requirements it had every reason to anticipate.

The editorial concludes with this paragraph:

Like the petroleum industry, the Government has also failed the public and has added to domestic problems by authorizing excessive shipments of oil abroad. This latter policy is checked as of today under an order of the United States Department of Commerce drastically curtailing oil exports to Europe. That order is long overdue, but the fact that it was made at this late date is strong evidence that the oil situation in many parts of America is more grave than most people have been allowed to know heretofore.

I referred to that order last Friday afternoon when I received it. I find I was in error in one respect. I was advised that shipments of oil in the quota program to Japan and Ryukyus had been reduced from 1,600,000 barrels to 1,000,000 barrels. As a matter of fact, I understand now that the quota has been reduced from 1,600,000 barrels to 100,000 barrels, a reduction of 1,500,000 barrels.

As suggested in the editorial to which I have just referred, the action of the Department of Commerce, belated though it was, was clear recognition of the serious shortage which exists in this country, was recognition of the merits of the repeated recommendations which have been made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and destroys completely the contentions made be representatives of the Government to that committee and to other committees here in Congress that we could not reduce this export program without jeopardizing the industrial productivity of these nations which are, after all, our friends.

Let me illustrate these untenable contentions by quoting from testimony before that committee:

On Tuesday, January 27, during the course of his testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Hon. William C. Foster, Under Secretary of the Department of Commerce made a very significant statement, in response to a question of the chairman, as to the attitude as of that moment of the Department of Commerce.

The chairman asked:

Even though the picture may have been taken in the spring, it develops that the program that was then carried out by the Department of Commerce has resulted in the unfortunate situation that we have today facing us. So that whether the oil was shipped recently, or whether it was shipped before, the net result is that oil went out of this country that could have been used at the present time to advantage. And that brings me to this question:

When these allotments were made for foreign countries during this past year, 1947, was it contemplated by the Department of Commerce that there would be this shortage in our domestic use at the present time?

In other words, was the oil shipped out with full knowledge that there would be this shortage? And if so, why?

Mr. Foster replied:

Mr. Chairman, during the spring of 1947, the industry and most experts were of the opinion that there was plenty of oil. As the spring developed it became obvious that there was an increasing shortage of petroleum products. Due to that fact, on June 30, 1947, we again controlled the shipment of petroleum products for export. Up to that time there had been considerable question.

The shortage has progressively worsened, I think, well beyond the best judgment of the experts in the industry and in Government. We have been faced with a winter much more severe than we have had for many years. Due to that combination of factors, due to shortages of transportation, we are now faced with the situation which you point out.

However, it does seem to me that there are degrees of need, and certainly there is great need in other countries as well as in our own. You must recognize that the only control we have, Mr. Chairman, is to control the amount of material that leaves this country. We have no power to direct it to the particular urgent emergent conditions here. If we keep more petroleum here—and we are doing that; we have reduced the amount progressively ever since the shortage became apparent—if we keep it here it may go to the points of greatest need or it may not. We would have no control over that.

I do think we have a moral responsibility to the other nations who depend upon us for this material. I think we have a responsibility that goes back over many years. If we are to carry out the moral responsibility and the thing which has given this Nation its strength with the other freedom-loving countries I think we must continue to carry out that moral responsibility.

If we were today to shut off a small proportion of our total petroleum production it would mean the difference between complete collapse in some of those countries as contrasted with a very modest addition to our supplies in this country.

I am sure that this committee will give consideration to that point.

Compare that sort of a position with the action of that Department 3 days later in reducing exports in the first quarter by 2,200,000 barrels of petroleum products. The contentions demonstrate their own inherent unsoundness when the amount allocated for Japan and the Ryukyus was slashed from 1,600,000 barrels to 100,000 barrels—a cut of 1,500,000 barrels—a 94 percent reduction. If that can be done in that instance, who prepared the original allotment? If that sort of savings can be made in that area, what possible argument can be advanced justifying the relatively insignificant and totally inadequate cut to other countries?

Last Saturday I spent some time in the Department of Commerce and the Department of State in an endeavor to find out how this further reduction has been accomplished. I understood at that time that cables had been sent to the foreign countries, but I was not able to see copies of the cables at the time. This morning I asked the Office of International Trade to send me copies of their cables which I understood had been sent last week. A matter of 15 or 20 minutes ago I received a report that the cables had actually not been sent, that they are actually in the process of preparation and will be sent sometime this week, probably not earlier than Thursday. However that may be, it is particularly pertinent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this afternoon in a special meeting passed another resolution in which it recited every step it has taken successively from December 19 throughout the month of January resulting in a partial recognition of the validity of its recommendation on January 20 that there should be an immediate cessation of the exportation of all petroleum products until it can be determined whether they are at the expense of our national economy or our national security. The last four paragraphs are particularly pertinent. Under leave previously granted me I shall insert the entire resolution in the RECORD, but at the present time I wish to read this portion:

Whereas on January 30 the Department of Commerce issued another bulletin announcing the further revision and stating that this was done "in view of the serious shortage of fuel oil in certain areas of the United States"; and

Whereas this most recent revision does not result in the saving of heating and industrial oils necessary to alleviate the serious shortages in certain areas of the United States; and

Whereas during this week end conditions in certain areas of the United States have become even more acute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee insists that the Department of Commerce shall immediately consult with all countries to which allocations of petroleum and petroleum products were made on January 16, with a view to arranging without further delay a reduction in the quotas for the months of February and March of kerosene, gas oil, and distillate fuel oil, and residual fuel oil to at least 50 percent of the amount listed in the tabulation of January 16, 1948—

This following for the reason that, much to our astonishment, certain high officials in the Government who have testified before our committee indicated that previous recommendations had not reached up to their level. This sentence I call your attention to particularly—

and that certified copies of this resolution be delivered this date to the office of the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Commerce, to the Director of the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, and to the Chairman of the Board of Review.

I certainly trust, with those certified copies having been sent to the various offices in the executive departments who are responsible for the welfare, the comfort, and the safety of the people of this country, as well as for the possible prejudice any such program might bring to the comfort and welfare of people of other countries, that we will not have a repetition of any witness appearing before us and saying he has not been forewarned of what a committee of this House unanimously recommends be done on the part of the executive department.

In conclusion, I want to refer to certain astonishing figures. May I say, in connection with House Joint Resolution 312, which I introduced last week, dealing with the proposition of the historical use of our exports to other countries, that I acted on the assumption a 5-year period would be a fair period for prewar judgment. However, it was suggested to me Saturday, and I think rightly, that the years 1939 and 1940 should not be used because, since the invasion into Poland had begun and the European war was on, naturally conditions were abnormal. Consequently, I shall either introduce a new resolution using the period from 1934 to 1938, inclusive, or I shall ask the committee to consider an amendment providing for a substitution of those 5 years.

Using the official statistics of the Department of Commerce on Sunday, I analyzed the exports of certain kinds of fuel and industrial oils to the various countries on a historical basis, using that 5-year period. I think you may be interested in a few of the figures. I have not had a chance to verify all of them, but as soon as I do, I shall place them in the RECORD.

To Australia, under the program undertaken, assuming we would send four times as much fuel oil as was designated for the first quarter, and the Department testified that was at least a minimum of what we might anticipate, we would send 400,000 gallons of gas oil and distillate oil to Australia in the calendar year 1948. As a matter of fact, in the 5 years 1934 to 1938, inclusive, we sent only 119,152 gallons of that particular kind of petroleum product. In the case of the residuals we would send, if this program is not checked and revised immediately, 100,000 gallons of the residual oil. During this same 5 years we sent to Australia a total of only 31,416 gallons of that type of oil. In those two fields alone we would be sending 500,000 gallons of those two types of oil against a record of 5 years' experience in that period when we sent a total of only 150,568 gallons.

That points up some of the weaknesses on the part of the program which has been undertaken down town here.

To Belgium we would send residual oil under the program 400,000 gallons of that much-needed type of fuel oil. We only exported to that country in the years 1934 to 1938, 34,918 gallons against a proposed export of 400,000 gallons. I may add that in the years 1936 and 1938 we sent nothing of this kind over there to Belgium.

This is not of the same character, but at least it is indicative of the type of thing that is being done. It is proposed under program to send 1,200,000 gallons of gas oil and distillate fuel oil to France in the calendar year 1948. In the 5 years to which I have referred we sent only 1,469,784 gallons of that type of oil.

In other words, we would send, if we approve this program and it goes on unchecked, 269,784 gallons less than we sent in the entire 5-year period to which I have referred.

Now, there is another analysis which obviously should be made, and I know those of you who are interested in this problem expect me to make it and I promise that I will. Although it is clear that we are setting up a program or have set up a program which, if carried through, would produce those very amazing contradictory and absolutely unjustifiable results on any explanation which has been given to us yet, nevertheless my suggestion obviously is that we should average the exports and consequently take the figures I have given you and divide them by five. We can do that with the other countries which I have not mentioned. I hope to have that done sometime tomorrow and will insert it in the RECORD.

Earlier in my statement I read excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the Springfield Daily News of January 31, and I also read certain paragraphs from a resolution adopted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. For the convenience of those interested in the matter and under permission previously given me, I set forth both in full at this point:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News of January 31, 1948]

THE OIL FIASCO

The fuel oil and kerosene shortage, which has come in the middle of one of the most severe winters southern New England has experienced in a number of years, is a disagreeable commentary on the failure of an industry to meet requirements it had every reason to anticipate.

Several factors have been emphasized repeatedly to explain the fuel oil and kerosene shortages by the petroleum industry. Among them is the explanation that oil consumption has undergone a tremendous increase in the postwar period. Obviously, the petroleum industry should have anticipated that increase. The industry knew that oil burner installations began to multiply by the thousands after the war ended. The industry knew that replacement of steam engines on the railroads with Diesels would require many millions of gallons of oil. The industry knew that greater use of oil by manufacturing plants would join in causing demands to accelerate. The petroleum industry encouraged every development, which would increase the use of oil at the same time.

Now the public is told in the midst of a shortage that the facilities of the petroleum industry have been unable to keep pace with demands for oil. The public is assured that the petroleum industry is expanding its refineries and processing equipment so that one day, perhaps 2 or 3 years hence, it will be in a position to supply everyone with oil.

Not a very pleasant outlook for those people and businessmen who have committed themselves and their finances to the use of oil, certainly.

When John L. Lewis was pushing up the price of coal by enforcing wage demands for the miners under the threat of strikes, which would have paralyzed the Nation, many turned to oil for security. The Daily News editorially encouraged this trend, little realizing that in the space of a year or two the petroleum industry would leave many oil users in much the same position if they had stuck to coal and Lewis had gone ahead with his strikes. The Daily News was not forewarned of the situation that has arisen now. If it anticipated a crisis in the future, the petroleum industry let no inkling of it fall where the oil situation could be brought into the propert perspective for the benefit of the public at large.

It is too late, of course, to do much about the situation now. Like the Pied Piper of Hamelin, the petroleum industry has lured many citizens down a road along which they must struggle as best they can, by maintaining an unwarranted attitude of complacency until the crisis virtually had arrived in many sections of the country.

Like the petroleum industry, the Government also has failed the public and has added to domestic problems by authorizing excessive shipments of oil abroad. This latter policy is checked, as of today, under an order of the United States Department of Commerce, drastically curtailing oil exports to Europe. That order is long overdue. The fact that it is made at this late date is strong evidence that the oil situation in many parts of America is more grave than most people have been allowed to know heretofore.

Whereas this committee, by committee resolution, recommended on December 19, 1947, that the export-control authority granted by section 6 of Public Law 703, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, should be exercised to place such prohibitions or curtailments on the exportation of fuel oil and other petroleum products for such period of time, as may be necessary to alleviate such shortages; and

Whereas it also recommended that the President and the departments and agencies of the Government should take all other possible and appropriate action to utilize such powers as they now possess to aid in alleviating such shortages; and

Whereas on January 2, 1948, the Department of Commerce issued a bulletin referring to the fuel-oil difficulties in this country and advising that Canada had agreed to reduce exports from the United States of certain types of heating oil by 50 percent in the month of January, and stating in part, "This quota continues the policy of restricting exports of major petroleum products to the maximum extent possible until the current domestic shortages are alleviated; and

Whereas on January 16, 1948, the Department of Commerce issued another bulletin giving the tabulation of the export of petroleum products which would be allocated for shipment to all countries but Canada in the first 3 months of this year; and

Whereas on January 26, the House committee further recommended "The immediate cessation of the exportation of all petroleum products until it can be determined whether they are at the expense of our national economy or national security," and "The deferment of making any foreign commitment involving the supply of petroleum products until a complete review has been made of the entire petroleum problem to determine to

what extent such commitments can be made without injury to our national economy or security"; and

Whereas on January 30, the Department of Commerce issued another bulletin announcing the further revision and stating that this was done "in view of the serious shortage of fuel oil in certain areas of the United States"; and

Whereas this most recent revision does not result in the saving of heating and industrial oils necessary to alleviate the serious shortages in certain areas of the United States; and

Whereas during this week end conditions in certain areas of the United States have become even more acute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee insists that the Department of Commerce shall immediately consult with all countries to which allocations of petroleum and petroleum products were made on January 16, with a view to arranging without further delay a reduction in the quotas for the months of February and March of kerosene, gas oil, and distillate fuel oil, and residual fuel oil to at least 50 percent of the amount listed in the tabulation of January 16, 1948, and that certified copies of this resolution be delivered this date to the office of the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Commerce, and to the Director of the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, and to the chairman of the Board of Review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

REISSUANCE OF UNITED STATES CURRENCY

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include a resolution and an article.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, you may remember that last summer I asked the Treasury Department to change the color of the money and have different colors instead of greenbacks. I have not been successful in getting the Treasury to act, and I have introduced a joint resolution which provides for the calling in by the Secretary of the Treasury of all outstanding paper and note United States currency in all amounts, and for the reissuance of new paper and note currency in place thereof in new and different colors for each denomination. That is only part of the bill, which I will insert at this point:

Joint resolution to provide for the calling in by the Secretary of the Treasury of all outstanding paper and note United States currency in all amounts, and for the reissuance of new paper and note currency in place thereof in new and different colors for each denomination

Whereas many benefits will be derived from the issuance of new United States paper and note currency in place of the present currency: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States is authorized and directed to call in all outstanding paper and note United States currency in all amounts, and to issue new paper and note currency in place thereof in new and different colors for each denomination.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 27, 1947, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle carries a reprint from an article by James J. Quinn, investment counsel, entitled "New Money for Old—Hot or Cold?" It states:

[From the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of November 27, 1947]

NEW MONEY FOR OLD—HOT OR COLD?

(By James J. Quinn, investment counsel)

(Investment counsel strongly favors Representative ROGERS' proposal for recall and alteration of currency's color scheme. Asserts this would be temporarily inflationary, but ultimately very deflationary. Suggests four to ten billion dollars of "hot" money of tax evaders might be recovered as incidental result—enough to launch Marshall plan and reduce taxes.)

THE COMING CURRENCY CHANGE—A RECOLORING OR A RECALL?

The proposal of Massachusetts Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS to replace our green and black paper currency with a separate color for each denomination may have more to it than meets the eye. At first blush, the sole virtue of the idea would seem to be the greater ease of distinguishing between the various bills. Without imputing to Mrs. ROGERS' suggestion any other motivation, it is still true that the replacement of the old with new paper currency at this time carries with it implications of vast importance to many phases of our economic life—not the least of which are the relatively recently developed habits of conducting personal and commercial business transactions and keeping liquid savings in cash amounts of staggering proportions. Before examining the various possibilities, however, it may be helpful, perspectivewise, in gaining an appreciation of the scope and nature of the task that such an alteration in our currency would involve, if the events leading up to the last major change in United States folding money are reviewed.

The 1929 currency alteration

From 1861 until the late 1920's, the size of United States paper currency remained the same ($7\frac{7}{16}$" by $3\frac{1}{8}$"). During that period, the economic development of the country was accompanied by various efforts to tie our money (a) to silver, (b) to gold, (c) to a combination of both, (d) to national bank deposits, and (e) to Treasury bond issues—among many other bases. The resultant hodgepodge currency of the 1920's was a natural outcome of the past haphazard approach to the problem of printing and engraving United States paper currency. While the size did not change during the 60-year period, its appearance, especially as regards colors and portraits used, ran the gamut of the entire spectrum on the one hand, and included, on the other, a wide variety of national and local heroes immortalized in print. At one time there were five separate designs for the $5 bill—the type of variety in design that is an open invitation to counterfeiters, who gave the Secret Service many a busy day. Uniformity, however, was not the only reason for the proposed change. There were others.

First of all, the new size ($6\frac{5}{16}$" by $2\frac{11}{16}$") was more convenient to handle. The Philippines had been using the smaller size for years and had lauded its superiority. Since the new series bill could fit into pocketbooks without folding, the freedom from creasing, necessary with the old series, lengthened its life appreciably. The smaller, more uniform, but simpler designs, with their fine engraving, were considerably harder to counterfeit. Additionally, substantial economies in the cost of paper, ink, printing, and especially storing, were important factors. But more decisive than any of these was the 50-percent increase that the change automatically effected in the plant capacity of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The Bureau's building, erected in 1914, had not been designed to cope with the swelling currency demands (jumped 76 percent from 1917–26) of post World War I's booming economy. Without the change in size of the bills, a new building extension and a larger printing plant would have been unavoidable.

How the change was put through

The change-over presented the Treasury with the enormous problems of manufacturing, printing, scheduling, and public education. The latter was one of the gravest that Treasury officials had to cope with. A wide variety of difficulties cropped up that had not been anticipated. They ranged all the way from universal public dismay (especially on the part of the banking fraternity) at the prospect of having to transact business with two sizes of currency during the transition period, to derisive remarks about "the new cigar store coupons." Redesigning the various denominations and printing the 900,000,000 separate pieces was a huge task in itself. Nevertheless it was completed well ahead of original expectations. It was the scheduling of the distribution that brought on most of the headaches.

At first, only the $1 bills were to be issued and those only over an estimated 12-month period. The others were to follow in appropriate order. So well, however, had the designing and printing progressed (including doing an additional last-minute job of an unscheduled redesigning and issuing of new national bank notes, which constituted 15 percent of all of the currency outstanding), that a general rather than an individual distribution date was decided upon, and even advanced by many months. On July 10, 1929, issuance of the new-sized current in $1 to $20 bills was begun. The larger denominations were issued later. No attempt was made to replace at one swoop the entire amount of old-series bills. Instead the normal procedure or retiring such old-series bills as came into the banks during everyday transactions was followed. The 4- to 6-month period estimated for the transition period when both old series and new series would be outstanding was, as it turned out, about right for all practical purposes. At any rate, except for odd stragglers, the outside limit for the complete change-over would hardly have exceeded a year since the number of pieces of the new series, about 900,000,000, was approximately equivalent to 1 year's normal retirements.

Legal aspects

In view of the ease with which the legal aspects of the 1929 currency change were handled—no legislation was necessary—the reported proposals by Representative ROGERS to prepare and submit a bill to Congress on what is essentially the same matter is puzzling. Secretary of the Treasury A. W. Mellon merely directed his Assistant Secretary to look into the matter of reducing the paper currency's size and submit recommendations. According to a press release at the time (1927), "Mr. A. W. Mellon announced that he has approved the recommendations submitted by Assistant Secretary Dewey for a reduction in the size of the paper currency ($7\frac{7}{16}$" by $3\frac{1}{8}$" to $6\frac{5}{16}$" by $2\frac{11}{16}$")." That was all there was to it. Secretary Mellon was on firm legal grounds.[1] No change in the Secretary of the Treasury's powers over the currency has occurred in the interim. It would seem, then, that the pres-

[1] His powers over the currency's physical composition were complete and rested upon certain statutes: viz, national notes—section 104 of title 12 of U. S. Code: "Such notes * * * shall be in such form as the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct." Other U. S. currency is covered by sec. 40, title 31, U. S. Code, Money and Finance: "U. S. notes * * * shall be in such form as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem best." (Also see R. S. 3571, U. S. Laws and Statutes.)

ent Secretary's powers to effect the change proposed by Representative ROGERS in the color scheme of our currency are already ample. Mrs. ROGERS' proposal for special legislation to accomplish the revision is, in view of the foregoing, somewhat mystifying. It is in this apparent anomaly that the more searching implications for the entire economy of a currency recall at this time exist.

The implications of a currency recall

Unlike the 1929 recall, the proposed currency modification, if adopted, will have been preceded by over 12 years of steady annual increases in the amount of money in circulation (see table). From 1920 to 1930, money in circulation (MIC) actually declined irregularly, a period of the greatest peacetime boom in the country's history, not surpassed until post-World War II. Some of the reasons for the fantastic increase in MIC since 1936, especially that from 1941–45, are patent, others are abstruse, and still others downright suspect. The accompanying table I attempts to discover whether there is any correlation between the expansion of MIC and the changes that have occurred since 1920 (that is, where available statistics permit) in the various phases of the economy.

Although all of the gold now in the United States is not specifically pledged behind the currency, column 1 reveals that the actual yellow metal backing for the dollar has weakened drastically since 1940, and except for 1946, has not been so poorly supported in that respect since 1921, coincidentally the last comparable postwar year. Nevertheless, the ups and downs in the United States gold stocks are not especially indicative of MIC causation. In reality they reflect the flight to the dollar that began with the devaluation in 1934 and accelerated rapidly with the gathering of war clouds in the late 1930's.

Columns 2 and 3 are purposely juxtaposed. They show clearly that while MIC per capita has, since 1936, jumped 304 percent, MIC per dollar of wages and salaries gained only 166 percent—slightly more than half. Obviously we shall have to look elsewhere than to the serviceman and the laboring man for the explanation.

Column 4 contains the first, and as will be developed later, the closest correlative in the entire table. Liquid assets per dollar of MIC retain their identity with MIC because of the war-inspired practice (prewar, postwar, and during war) of transacting both business and personal affairs on a cash basis in ever-increasing amounts—especially as the price level mounted and the workings of OPA grew to be most onerous with war's end. This is clearly shown by column 5 where the amount of MIC in relation to bank debits doubled since 1939 and quadrupled since 1929. Currency in the hands of the public constitutes by far the greatest amount of MIC, as column 6 illustrates: Right now, 92 percent is publicly held, as against 75 percent in 1929, 85 percent in 1939.

It has been argued that the vastly greater rate of consumer expenditures since 1936 justifies unprecedented expansion of MIC. Columns 7–10 do not support this view—the reverse being true if anything. Total consumer expenditures in 1947 (column 7), for some reason apparently required 80 percent more cash than in 1936, a year of considerably less personal credit expansion and generally weaker personal credit position. Broken down, it would seem that purchasers of durables need 44 percent more cash, nondurables 58 percent, and services 138 percent. In view of the 62 percent increase in consumer credits since 1936 (128 percent since 1944, the war's low point), our quest for the solution of the MIC riddle may be finding a large part of its answers in the nature and scope of business practice surrounding personal expenditures.

TABLE I.—*United States currency relationships*

Year	Money in circulation (billions)	Gold stocks per dollar (1)	Money in circulation per capita (2)	Wages and salaries, per dollar (3)	Liquid assets total, per dollar (4)	Bank durables, commercial banks (5)	Currency outside banks, per dollar (6)	Per dollar personal consumption expenditures			
								Total (7)	Durables (8)	Nondurables (9)	Services (10)
1947	$28.29	$0.74	$198	$0.23	$0.12	$0.02	$1.08	$0.18	$1.41	$0.30	$0.64
1946	28.25	.73	200	.25	.13	.02	1.06	.20	1.89	.32	.68
1945	26.75	.75	191	.23	.12	.02	1.01	.22	3.33	.35	.70
1944	22.50	.91	163	.19	.12	.02	.96	.22	3.32	.34	.62
1943	17.42	1.26	128	.16	.12	.02	.92	.17	2.68	.28	.51
1942	12.38	1.84	92	.15	.11	.02	.89	.14	1.82	.23	.40
1941	9.61	2.36	72	.16	.12	.01	.96	.12	.98	.22	.34
1940	7.85	2.80	59	.16	.11	.01	1.07	.11	1.00	.21	.30
1939	7.05	2.50	54	.15	.11	.01	1.10	.10	1.05	.20	.28
1938	6.46	2.25	50	.15	----------	.01	1.12	.10	1.12	.19	.26
1937	6.45	1.97	50	.14	----------	.01	1.15	.10	.92	.18	.26
1936	6.24	1.78	49	.15	----------	.01	----------	.10	.98	.19	.27
1935	5.57	1.81	44	.15	----------	.01	----------	.10	1.08	.19	.26
1934	5.37	1.54	43	.16	----------	.01	----------	.10	1.25	.20	.26
1933	5.43	.74	43	.19	----------	.01	1.14	.12	1.55	.24	.26
1932	5.41	.78	43	.18	----------	.01	----------	.11	1.47	.24	.24
1931	4.54	.92	37	.12	----------	.01	----------	.07	.82	.16	.17
1930	4.24	1.01	34	.09	----------	.005	----------	.06	.58	.12	.14
1929	4.46	.90	37	.09	----------	.005	1.25	.06	.47	.12	.14
1928	4.51	.85	38	----------	----------	.005	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1927	4.56	.90	39	----------	----------	.005	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1926	4.60	.91	39	----------	----------	.005	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1925	4.52	.91	39	----------	----------	.01	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1924	4.56	.92	40	----------	----------	.01	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1923	4.54	.87	40	----------	----------	.01	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1922	4.18	.87	38	----------	----------	.01	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1921	4.62	.73	43	----------	----------	.01	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1920	5.18	.51	48	----------	----------	.01	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

NOTES.—(1) MIC excludes 1920–33 $287,000,000 withdrawn from circulation in 1934. (2) All 1947 figures estimated. (3) All amounts computed by dividing columnar figures (1–10) into money in circulation.

The anatomy of United States money in circulation

The above table suggests that not even in the course of studying usual economic pursuits will the answer to the question regarding the phenomenal rise in money in circulation during the past 12 years be found. It almost seems to hint that the explanation may not be an economic one at all. That is, such would be the case were it not for the peculiar correlation of the growth of money in circulation with that of liquid assets; the end of our quest will probably be found in an examination of the nature and motivation behind the extraordinary accumulation of liquid asset savings that has occurred, particularly during the war. No doubt the equally phenomenal rise in factory pay rolls during wartime expansion, and in servicemen's pay, were among the prime causes behind the initial issuance of the currency out of the banks; but the question still remains, why, once these funds were expended, they did not find their way back into the banks as deposits in the usual manner.

That war workers' wages and servicemen's pay were not the only causative factors behind the initial withdrawals of currency is demonstrable. The number of factory workers hit the wartime peak in 1943 (14,560,000); in no year since has that figure been exceeded. In August 1947 it was about 15 percent below (12,565,000). Factory pay rolls, for all the intervening wage hikes, are still about 10 percent below 1943's. The armed forces averaged 11,300,000 in 1944, the peak year, increasing from January's 10,300,000 to December's 11,800,000, about 15 percent. It is now down to 1,400,000. Further, Series E war bond sales averaged over 33 percent of annual average factory pay rolls in 1943 and 1944. Moreover, most overseas personnel (about 40 percent of the total in 1944) were paid in foreign currencies. The writer can personally attest to this, having disbursed naval funds in Brazil as a supply officer. All payments were in Brazilian cruzeiros. No incoming personnel could bring in more than $50 for any reason, and that had to be exchanged immediately for native currency. Thus, despite a stabilized factory wage and armed forces pay situation, 1944 saw MIC increased from $20,400,000,000 to $25,300,000,000, over 26 percent (well in excess of the entire amount of MIC in 1929). With large amounts of workers' and servicemen's pay going into war bonds, these figures would suggest that the astounding expansion in wartime MIC and the continuance of its rise into the postwar period has been in major part due to an obvious preference, newly developed on the part of civilians, for transacting personal and business affairs in cash.

Tax evasion and black marketeering

The two obvious motives for conducting a sizable business chiefly on a cash basis have been tax evasion and black-market operations. There has been a third, the financing of enemy intelligence and propaganda activities within and without the United States; this latter is admittedly of minor importance, however, in relation to the first two. The extent of tax evasion and black marketeering, nevertheless, in terms of dollars and cents is almost impossible to delineate accurately. Some idea, though, of their scope may be derived from table II below showing the changes that have occurred in outstanding amounts of the various currency denominations, with the emphasis on the unprecedented growth in large bills ($50–$500 notably), suggesting eloquently the probable nature of their function.

By indexing the individual denominations, using 1936 as 100, the table reflects the effect upon United States currency of (a) the flight to the dollar; (b) individual uncertainty about the security of banks, especially after the 1933 experience; (c) fears of inflation and soft money (this explains the notably greater increase in coin over the $1–$5 bills); (d) the rise in the commodity price level; (e) the impact of war. As is plainly evident, the most striking increases occurred in those denominations least used in ordinary consumer business transactions, the $10–$100 bills. Such ordinary transactions would justify an increase of about 60 percent in the $1–$5 categories in view of the rise in the consumer's price index. The additional 40-percent to 80-percent jump actually experienced may represent a combination of the effects of the notorious "stoopies" market, and incidental saving (that is, hoarding).

Considering, however, the relative rarity of the $50 and $100 notes for business purposes,

the continued growth in their rate of issuance in the postwar period, as against the stabilizing to decline in the others, suggests that they are being used as a repository for savings, or as temporary storage for capital, rather than as a medium of exchange. Because of the ease in handling and storing fewer bills, the larger denominations, $500, $1,000, and $10,000, would appear to be superior for this purpose. Oddly, nevertheless, a curious reversal occurred in the burgeoning popularity of these large bills, coincident with the issuance by the United States Treasury Department through the Federal Reserve System in May 1945, of an order directing all financial institutions to make a full report of any exchange of currency involving sums of cash in excess of $1,000 in bills of $50 and above, or any denominations if the sum exceeded $10,000. Accompanying a later revision of the report form, on October 24, 1945, the Treasury advised the Federal Reserve as follows: "The end of hostilities has, unfortunately, not put an end to tax evasions, nor lessened the need for tax enforcement. Accordingly this Department is continuing to give the fullest attention to the reporting and other phases of its tax-enforcement program."

It would seem, then, that the five- and six-fold increase in those bills ($20, $50, and $100) that are free from official surveillance and therefore most suitable for saving as against trading, strongly intimates an unwillingness on the part of many owners to submit their cash accumulations to the routine scrutiny of bank officials by depositing them—for reasons that can only be guessed at. Among those reasons are, as mentioned, income-tax evasion and/or black-market operations—they usually go hand in hand.

TABLE II.—*United States money in circulation, by denomination*

[1936=100]

Year	Total circulation	Coin	$1	$2	$5	$10	$20	$50	$100	$500	$1,000	$5,000	$10,000
1947	442	264	201	180	227	401	610	637	730	319	296	71	67
1946	442	263	206	191	239	417	621	625	675	324	296	114	144
1945	435	246	207	208	254	432	615	581	599	337	304	100	133
1944	387	223	198	232	238	383	482	501	587	412	373	143	133
1943	312	197	182	200	217	332	381	371	412	302	283	129	122
1942	235	171	161	157	186	259	273	255	271	213	221	129	139
1941	170	145	139	126	150	175	170	182	202	193	209	342	256
1940	134	125	122	111	125	129	120	135	157	168	198	428	333
1939	116	114	112	103	112	114	105	115	130	142	160	286	178
1938	104	106	105	97	104	103	99	102	109	118	123	242	178
1937	100	104	101	91	100	100	98	97	100	103	108	86	67
1936	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1935	90	92	92	94	90	88	91	90	89	91	90	100	89
1934	85	87	85	91	85	82	88	84	81	83	81	71	39
1933	84	86	80	94	79	79	89	91	87	93	89	114	55
Percent change, 1936–47	+342	+164	+101	+80	+127	+301	+510	+537	+630	+219	+196	−29	−33
Millions of pieces:	*Total*												
1947	2,627	------	1,000	31	411	623	457	51	52	.86	.81	------	-------
1936	944	------	449	17	181	156	75	8	7	.27	.27	------	-------

NOTE.—1947 is as of Aug. 31.

Should Representative ROGERS' recoloring proposal be adopted, in effect a currency recall will result. In the process, all those deposits for the new-colored money of the old-colored cash, not susceptible to full explanation to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, are liable to confiscation; their owners, more importantly, are liable to criminal prosecution for tax evasion (tax avoidance is only liable to a penalty fine). Mr. Henry Lustig and associates, once of Longchamps fame, like Al Capone, have become fully acquainted with the workings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue when tax evasion is an issue. Our peculiar Federal income-tax law does not concern itself with the sources of taxable income (Lucky Luciano, the white slaver, was always careful to pay his income taxes). Black marketeers have little to fear as such. It is only if they have been so careless as to overlook the necessity of full disclosure on Form 1040 that they would run into difficulties with an aroused Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Black marketeering, it is generally known, occurred in numerous forms of business and agriculture at about every stratum of income. The usage of large-denomination bills was necessary in such transactions to insure expeditious movement, while maintaining the required confidential atmosphere with the small physical size of the bundle. The old tin box and the bulging black suitcase went out of style with the torrid twenties. Further, in this connection, an undetermined number of refugees, who had converted their foreign funds into United States currency and who habitually had all their liquid resources with them, descended upon our shores in the late 1930's and early 1940's. The habits these individuals had developed in Europe, of necessity, due to the Fascist harrying, of doing business for cash only, had become too ingrown to cast off easily. Carrying large amounts of currency on one's person could only be accomplished comfortably with the larger bills. Undoubtedly, this group's monetary practices augmented the MIC out of all proportion to its numbers.

Rather than face the almost dead certainty of confiscation and criminal prosecution, tax-evader holders of an undetermined amount of the MIC would not attempt to exchange their currency for the new-colored money. As the Government could set a deadline, by which time all old-colored currency must be exchanged, the Treasury would come into "windfall" taxes of vast proportions. (The banks would simply credit the Government with the amount of unexchanged currency as of the deadline date.) The exact figure which this sum would reach, though, is not easily ascertainable. If the view is taken that a large part of the extraordinary concentration of currency savings in the higher denominations cannot, generally speaking, stand the light of day, then the Government, it can be seen, would benefit by an indirect payment of what might be considered a huge backlog of uncollected taxes. This amount, were the relationship of the larger denominations reverted to the 1940 status and personal expenditures financed in the same proportion, could range between $4,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000.

Looked at another way, the nonbusiness denominations ($50-$10,000), that is, those not used regularly as a medium of exchange, constitute over 30 percent of the MIC. In addition, it is extremely doubtful that all of the lower denominations outstanding are actually required in normal business transactions. Were a return made to the 1936–40 relationship of financing personal consumption expenditures with about 10 cents per dollar of money in circulation (see table I) instead of the present 18 cents, a 45-percent reduction in the MIC would be in order. This would imply a return of most of the largest denominations and some of the smaller to bring the MIC down to about $16,000,000,000, that is, a reduction of $12,000,000,000. Parenthetically, it should be appreciated also that a decrease in the present unprecedented rate of personal expenditures would further lessen the need for even a $16,000,000,000 total of MIC. Any such contraction in the MIC would, it is submitted, have a shock value for the economy not now susceptible to full evaluation. The remainder of this article will be devoted to exploring the possible impact a currency recoloration or recall would have on certain segments of United States life.

Effects of a currency recall

A currency recall would not actually have to occur to set off reverberations that would register in most parts of the economy immediately. The mere threat of such a change in the amount of the money in circulation would touch off so many anticipatory moves of a far-reaching nature, by both actual and potential owners of outstanding currency, that most phases of the Nation's life would be markedly affected. Few citizens' daily lives would be quite the same for some months afterwards, once the currency change proposal evidenced a convincing chance of going through.

Financial repercussions

In reality, money in circulation is undeposited bank deposits. Conceivably, all transactions whether business or personal, could be financed by check. Experience, nevertheless, has demonstrated the feasibility of restricting the payment for certain business, personal expenditures, and purchases to cash. That most of the currency now outstanding is not necessary for such purposes, at least when they are bona fide, has already been discussed. A return to banks as deposits of the excess currency, estimated in round figures at about $12,000,000,000, could profoundly alter the present money supply situation. Instead of banks having excess reserves of about $1,000,000,000, the figure would be $13,000,000,000, permitting a credit base expansion of about $65,000,000,000, three times the present amount of all loans outstanding in the Federal Reserve System.

As the Federal Reserve has already recorded its desire to curb inflationary forces through contracting credit, this development would be a major set-back. In order to sop up the additional excess reserves, reserve requirements would have to be increased to 31 percent. They are now 20 percent in central reserve cities; at their highest, 1937 and 1942, they never exceeded 26 percent, the statutory limit. Since reserve requirements could not, if increased, exceed 26 percent, excess reserves would, with the currency recall, be over $4,000,000,000, and that has important implications for the securities markets.

Such an amount of excess reserves would be almost totally investable, and would find its way mostly into the United States Government bond market. The resultant effect on Treasury bond prices would probably carry them toward record high ground. In the purest sense of the word, that would be "monetizing" the debt with a vengeance. The technical position of treasuries, incidentally, would be further strengthened by any debt reduction which application of the windfall taxes, supra, would effect. The municipal bond market would similarly be affected, perhaps more so if no reduction in personal and corporate income-tax rates has occurred beforehand.

Stocks and commodities would benefit pricewise initially. Such of the old colored money as is "hot" would rapidly be sold at discounts to those willing to assume the risks. Much of such currency would in small amounts find its way into the markets. The greatest of all markets, however, would be

the black market in the currency itself. Now a settled part of the postwar economic life of most of the world, black markets in currency would soon be well established in the United States—at least until the deadline date. As its life would be short, no necessity for setting up special controls would apparently exist, so its activities would probably justify the description of being "rampant," to put it mildly.

The banks' problem in handling the mechanics in exchanging the new for the old currency would be manifold. Whereas in the 1929 currency face-lifting, 900,000,000 pieces were involved in the Rogers recoloration project, over 2,600,000,000 pieces would have to be processed. There would be the usual transition period when both currencies would be outstanding, with its implications of confusion and extra clerical outlays. Combined with the probability of a deadline on completing the substitution, the foregoing would infer a measure of out-of-pocket expense by banks. Alert bank management would, however, take full advantage of the opportunity to add a previously untapped source of new deposits and new business with an unplumbed potential.

Economic repercussions

The onset of a major black market in United States currency, either in anticipation or during the actual processing of the Rogers proposal, would be an inflationary force of the first magnitude. The only course open to those holders who may not, for one reason or another, exchange their old currency for the new, would be to swap it for anything tangible—houses, cars, jewels, stocks, commodities, what have you. There would be no way of effectively curbing these activities. In an already tight market for durables these operations would of necessity be disruptive. On the other hand, removal of any such sum as $12,000,000,000 from the public's hands, which the actual exchange would probably effect, would be somewhat deflationary, since the new holders, the banks, would funnel such of it as the Federal Reserve left investable, but not loanable, into fixed interest securities directly.

After World War I's postwar boom burst, MIC dropped 18 percent in 2 years from 1920–22. While a similar contraction following the current boom would be material, it would still leave about $8,000,000,000 more than is needed as a medium of exchange. In this connection, it is interesting to note that were the rate of increase in MIC for World War II to be equal to that of World War I, the amount of MIC now would be about $15,000,000,000 in excess. In view of the similarity in the extent of the rise in the wholesale price level, this is an illuminating contrast, the explanation for which may possibly lie to some extent in the eye-opening difference in income-tax rates—lowest and highest in World War I ranged from 1 percent to 65 percent; in World War II, 20 percent to 91 percent.

The more profound economic intimations in the Rogers currency proposal would flow from the politico-diplomatic steps which the Federal Government could take, especially as regards tax reduction and financing the Marshall plan.

The politico-diplomatic repercussions

Outside of the risk of possibly stepping on the toes of some party officials, both high and low, there should be no politico-diplomatic reasons why both Republicans and Democrats would not welcome such a currency plan as Representative ROGERS proposes, with open arms. On the contrary, it opens up possibilities which in a Presidential election year, could not be more promising. First of all, few politicians would miss the chance of engaging in a Nation-wide witch-hunt for the rascals in a key election year. It is such a worthy cause, like being "agin sin." Second, and vastly more important, a currency recall may provide the perfect answer to the politician's $64 question regarding the Marshall plan—who is going to pay for it? As estimated above, the take in "hot money" could approximate $4,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. Such a sum would, in the upper range, not only finance the heavy first year of the Marshall plan, but much of the second. This would clear the way for the politician to put his best foot forward in a Presidential year—by cutting taxes.

At the same time, the diplomatic front would be strengthened. Not only would the success of the Marshall plan in some tangible form be assured; certain other frictional aspects of our relations with foreign countries would be eased. One of these is the surging black markets [2] in various currencies with United States money usually the base. Recall of the currency would put an end to many such markets for an indefinite period. Operations of the International Monetary Fund would, as a result, benefit greatly.

From a governmental administrative point of view, Representative ROGERS' currency recoloration could be the inaugural for a periodical refurbishing of United States money, say, every 5 or 10 years. Not only would this confound counterfeiters, it would also serve to thwart any concerted efforts to use United States currency as other than a medium of exchange. Further, on a piece basis, the entire currency is normally turned over (that is, renewed) about once a year anyway. Therefore, the element of cost would be of minor consequence.

Prospects and summary

Undoubtedly there is a good chance of Representative ROGERS' proposal going through, if not in 1948, perhaps in 1949. It has all the best arguments on its side. Nevertheless, it would run into strong opposition from many quarters, whose arguments would not be too easy to rebut. They run as follows:

1. A recall of the currency would be disruptive to the economy in a critical, i. e., a Presidential, year.

2. A probable increase in the banking structure's credit base has harmful implications, especially with outstanding loans now at or just below the all-time highs.

3. There is no assurance that the amount of "windfall" taxes, to which the Government may fall heir, would anywhere nearly approximate the sums postulated above (viz, $4–$10 billion). Therefore, the alleged benefits are of doubtful eventuality.

On the other hand, the opposition would probably find it even more difficult to cope with the arguments of the pros. They follow:

1. A new color scheme for the currency would undeniably facilitate the handling and counting of bills and thereby accelerate bank business transactions.

2. The country does not need any more than $16,000,000,000 of currency in circulation, if that much. The recoloration could serve as a recall which would probably reduce MIC to that figure, as the owners would doubtless leave the difference in banks as deposits.

3. Recoloration at this time could be the inaugural of a periodical currency recall which would formally fix control over the end use of United States money as an exchange medium, in the hands of the individual designated by law, the Secretary of the Treasury.

4. Tax evasion would be restricted to other than currency media.

5. The Federal debt and income taxes could be reduced in 1948 by applying such of the windfall taxes, which the tax evaders provided by failure to exchange their old currency holdings for the new.

6. The Marshall plan financing may, as an alternative to or in conjunction with No. 5, be based in part upon employment of the same windfall tax income.

7. The inflation potential in the present amount of MIC, long a bugaboo of private and Government economists, will have been largely eliminated, as over 40 percent of the MIC would have been more or less immobilized.

8. As no changes in the designs of the currency are in prospect, the mechanics of the job are much simpler than those of 1929 when, in effect, the entire currency was completely revamped. The major difficulties, printing time and color processing, are technological and probably could be easily overcome. The problem of assigning colors could be simplified by making the rarely used $50–$10,000, notes the same color and reserving four standard shades for the bills most often used—the $1–$20 denominations. The $2 bill, race-track money, has long outlived its usefulness and should be eliminated from the currency. The Rogers recoloration proposal would offer a good opportunity to do it while accomplishing more essential objectives.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to my mind now that without a great deal of agitation the Treasury Department does not intend to act on this extremely important matter of changing the color of our paper currency, which would involve the recall of millions and millions of dollars and would be of untold value to the United States.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on January 30, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818.

H. R. 3153. An act to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

H. R. 3322. An act to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands or nations.

H. R. 3326. An act to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3645. An act relating to the exchange of certain private and Federal properties within Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa., and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the

[2] Since finishing this article, a noteworthy development regarding British currency has taken place. In England, the alleged black marketeering in sterling has become so rampant as to lead the Government to consider a recall of the entire British currency and an issuance of new notes. Sir Stafford Cripps, the Chancelor of the Exchequer, revealed on November 18. In order to achieve maximum effectiveness in squelching marketeering in sterling, Cripps stated that such "a currency cancellation would come without warning." Since it is a foregoing conclusion that United States currency is being used for a base for marketeering in sterling, a recall of American money probably would accomplish the Chancelor's objectives without necessitating a British currency cancellation.

House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1273. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the progress report for the fourth quarter of 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1274. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, as required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1275. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1276. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1277. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of a report of real and personal property leased by the Department of the Navy under the authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1278. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of New York: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 5216. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall take office as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as General Manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 5238. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 5239. A bill to promote recovery programs abroad, to strengthen the national defense, to discourage illegal and gray-market operations, to aid in stabilizing the currency of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5240. A bill to authorize the withdrawal of public notices in the Yuma reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 5241. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 5242. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to compensation of postal employees, so as to provide for giving appropriate credit for periods of past service in the making of assignments to salary grades; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TWYMAN:

H. R. 5243. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5244. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 5245. A bill to advance the effective date of within-grade salary advancements of officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1923 and of grade-to-grade promotions of officers and employees in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 5246. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961; 16 U. S. C. 513), to relieve the Secretary of the Army from serving as a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 5247. A bill for the relief of Amite County, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 5248. A bill to declare the national policy regarding the test for determining invention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 5249. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 5250. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation as a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt of the Maltese Cross Ranch, Billings County, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ROSS (by request):

H. R. 5251. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 5252. A bill to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to provide for the calling in by the Secretary of the Treasury of all outstanding paper and note United States currency in all amounts, and for the reissuance of new paper and note currency in place thereof in new and different colors for each denomination; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution to place temporary restrictions on the exportation of certain petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 4 and 5 of the hearings relative to revenue revisions, 1947–48, held before the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings relative to reduction of individual income taxes held before the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. Con Res. 144. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to have printed additional copies of a special subcommittee report and appendix on the United States Information Service in Europe; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution to request the French Government for repatriation of Horst Kupski, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 451. Resolution to create a special committee to investigate the oil-supply situation as it affects the eastern seaboard; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to have included in the forthcoming river and harbor bill the project of dredging Bullocks Cove in the town of East Providence; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5253. A bill to place Emanuel H. Waldecker upon the appropriate register of eligibles for appointment in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5254. A bill authorizing the issuance to Mountain States Development Co. and Crescent Eagle Oil Co. of patents for certain placer-mining claims located in Grand County, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 5255. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Michael Kroskof-Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5256. A bill for the relief of Elza Friedrych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 5257. A bill for the relief of Allan A. Bryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 5258. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Chagra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1276. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N. Y., in strong opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway proposal, and urging all organizations, public, semipublic, and private, in the Niagara frontier to create a united force to the end that all opposition possible may be brought against this unsound and undesirable project; to the Committee on Public Works.

1277. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. Anna Haberkorn, Osage, Iowa, and others, in re S. 265, the Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1278. Also, petition of Mrs. Ralph S. Moore and others, in re S. 265, the Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1279. Also, petition of Mrs. Wm. E. Sasse, Waterloo, Iowa, and others, in re S. 265, the Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1280. By Mr. JENISON: Petition of the American Legion, Donovan, Ill., signed by 34 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1281. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 28 residents of Tippecanoe, Ohio, in support of the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1282. Also, petition of 36 residents of Steubenville, Ohio, and vicinity, urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1283. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petitions of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., requesting enactment of universal military training legislation, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1284. Also, petition of residents of Indianapolis, Ind., urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1285. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Rev. Clarence F. Hammen, Elgin, Ill., containing the signatures of 25 residents of Elgin, protesting the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1286. By the SPEAKER: Petition of legislative department, Board of Aldermen of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting a temporary easement granted to the Mystic Bridge Authority for the purpose of making a preliminary survey for the proposed bridge between Chelsea and Charlestown; to the Committee on Public Works.

1287. Also, petition of John P. Hamilton, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1288. Also, petition of J. A. Justice, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1289. Also, petition of J. T. Lawlor, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1290. Also, petition of Mrs. Hattie Erdman, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1291. Also, petition of the Missouri River States Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the development of the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1292. Also, petition of the Engineering Association of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing immediate action to enable Hawaii to be admitted as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1293. Also, petition of Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the granting of a rule to bring the universal-training bill to the floor of the House for action; to the Committee on Rules.

1294. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mrs. Martha E. Meinhardt and sundry citizens of Massachusetts, advocating enactment of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian.

Rev. James D. Bryden, assistant minister, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, the source of our very life, help us, Thy children, in our need and give Thy guidance to this body, the Senate of the United States, assembled this day. We do believe not only that Thou art omnipotent, but that Thou art near, and not only that Thou art almighty, but that our best concerns are Thine also. Help now those who labor here for the good of our people to depend on Thee, knowing that they need not carry their burdens alone. May they have not only strength for their bare duties, but strength also for responsibility which lies far beyond all assigned duty. Having insight to see the final importance of trivial matters, may they be delivered from the tyranny of small concerns and have joy in their work. Bless through them the people of the United States; may Thy will be done and Thy kingdom come. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 2, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 2, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker; and

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to change the date for filing the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1826) making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to hold hearings during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to hold hearings during the sessions of the Senate today and for the rest of this week.

Mr. LANGER asked and obtained consent that the Senate members of the conference committee considering the retirement bill be excused for the remainder of the session today.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] be granted leave of absence from the Senate for a period of 2 weeks for the purpose of holding hearings on behalf of the National Resources Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate until February 16.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

QUARTERLY REPORT UNDER SECOND DECONTROL ACT OF 1947

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second quarterly report under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON LEASE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of real and personal property leased by that Department, for the period August 5 through December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL MOTOR BARGE TO CITY OF BLAINE, WASH.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the city of Blaine, Wash., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a motor barge for use by that city in rescue and disaster work; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by

the West Hudson Bar Association at Newark, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation providing equal taxation in community-property and non-community-property States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Donat and Laura Laroche; with an amendment (Rept. No. 859);

S. 129. A bill for the relief of Anastasios P. Ionnetos; without amendment (Rept. No. 857);

S. 511. A bill for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea; without amendment (Rept. No. 858);

S. 936. A bill for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 879);

S. 981. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom; without amendment (Rept. No. 880);

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Gerardo de Amusategui and Ramon de Amusategui; with an amendment (Rept. No. 860);

S. 1706. A bill to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 881);

H. R. 422. A bill for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi; without amendment (Rept. No. 861);

H. R. 648. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue; without amendment (Rept. No. 862);

H. R. 650. A bill for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell; without amendment (Rept. No. 863);

H. R. 928. A bill for the relief of Riyoko Patell; without amendment (Rept. No. 864);

H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch; without amendment (Rept. No. 865);

H. R. 1408. A bill for the relief of August W. Dietz; without amendment (Rept. No. 866);

H. R. 1650. A bill for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz; without amendment (Rept. No. 867);

H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 882);

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Daisy Park Farrow; without amendment (Rept. No. 868);

H. R. 3088. A bill for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 869);

H. R. 3168. A bill for the relief of Antone G. Pina; without amendment (Rept. No. 870); and

H. R. 3778. A bill to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25); without amendment (Rept. No. 871).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 134. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190); without amendment (Rept. No. 872);

S. 1583. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines; without amendment (Rept. No. 873);

S. 1782. A bill to provide for selection of superintendents of national cemeteries from meritorious and trustworthy male members of the armed forces who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service; with amendments (Rept. No. 874);

H. R. 3503. A bill to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 875); and

H. R. 4115. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 876).

By Mr. DWORSHAK, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1037. A bill to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho; with amendments (Rept. No. 877).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1990. A bill to provide a means for the orderly continuation and completion of the Deer Creek and aqueduct divisions of the Provo River project, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 878).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 2122. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2123. A bill to exempt certain officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force from the provisions of statutes requiring retirement by reason of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 2124. A bill to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act, as amended, so as to permit American citizens and charitable, religious, and other nonprofit organizations to make donations for use in the repair of war damage in any area of Germany occupied by or under the control of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND) introduced Senate bill 2125, to provide allowances for dependents of veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the payment of an allowance to the dependents of service-connected disabled veterans. While the Congress has been most liberal in the treatment accorded to servicemen and veterans generally, there are certain inequalities in the laws insofar as the service-connected disabled and his dependents are concerned. I know it is not the intention of the Congress to allow such a condition to continue to exist.

The title of our bill explains its purpose. It would provide an allowance to the dependents of service-connected disabled veterans, based upon the degree of disability and upon the number of dependents. The theory of dependency allowances has been established by the Federal Government. During World War II the Congress, upon the recommendations of its then Military Affairs Committees, enacted the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942. Under this law provision was made for the families of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Our social-security laws take into consideration the minor children of a deceased social-security-covered employee. Presently, however, no distinction is made in veterans' laws as to payments to the service-connected disabled veteran, whether he is single or has one or more dependents.

From all directions we hear more and more concerning the increasing cost of living. Under such rapidly advancing living costs, we may well visualize the manner in which an unemployable, totally and permanently disabled veteran, and his family, must live. His income from the Veterans' Administration is $138 monthly. The 70-percent service-connected disabled veteran, and his family, receive $96.60 monthly from the Federal Government. Assuredly, these persons are not living extravagantly.

It is true that the service-connected disabled veterans with lesser degrees of disability are able to supplement their disability compensation awards through regular, though in some instances limited, employment. A survey was conducted during the last 3 months by the Disabled American Veterans. This revealed that only 10 percent of the service-connected veterans, disabled to the extent of 60 percent or more, are able to follow full-time employment. Excepting the very few instances where there is private income, these veterans are compelled to exist upon the charity of their relatives. I feel certain the Congress does not want such a condition to continue.

Another Nation-wide survey, made for a different purpose, but which has a bearing upon veterans' living costs, was recently completed by the American Council on Education, and financed by the Disabled American Veterans. It was conducted to investigate the cost of living of a scientifically selected and representative cross-section of veterans attending colleges and universities throughout continental United States. These veterans included both the able-bodied and the disabled. To determine how much of a differential exists between the monthly subsistence payments and actual living expenses, each veteran was asked to make a careful estimate of his average total monthly expenses while attending school. The results indicate that the average monthly expenses of single veterans in college is $106.13, while the average for married veteran college students is $175.38. This means that single students spent $106.13 monthly, but received only $65, a deficit of $41.13. Married students spent $175.38, but received only $90 from the Veterans' Administration, a deficit of $85.38. This data furnishes a clear picture as to the deplorable plight of the totally disabled veteran, physically unable to attend school.

Let me give you one example—not by any means an isolated case—as to how World War II veterans are affected. A

master sergeant, married, with two children, was being hospitalized at Walter Reed Hospital. With his allotments and combat infantry pay, he received $269 per month. He had been in the Japanese Death March, and is suffering from recurrent draining osteomyelitis. It was the hospital authorities' opinion that this veteran should be discharged to a Veterans' Administration hospital where he could receive the same medical treatment as he is receiving at Walter Reed General Hospital. After such a transfer, this veteran must be rated by the Veterans' Administration, but the maximum rating that could be awarded would be "totally disabled," and his award would be $138 monthly, or $131 less per month than he received before his effective discharge. Because of the nature of his disability he would be unable to work. The Members of the Senate are fully aware of the tremendous increase in the cost of living index in recent months; until now it is estimated that a family of four must have an income of about $3,400 a year in order to live. This is more than double the compensation received by a totally and permanently disabled veteran.

Only modest rates are provided in the bill which my colleague and I are introducing. These would provide that if and while a veteran is totally disabled and has a wife, an allowance of $30 monthly shall be granted; for a wife and one child, $50; for a wife and two children, $65, plus $15 for each additional child. These amounts would be pro rated for the partially disabled in the same ratio which the degree of the veterans' service-connected disability bears to total disability.

It is our hope that the Senate Finance Committee will hold early hearings upon this legislative proposal so that it may give consideration to the granting of some relief to a most deserving segment of our own population.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2125) to provide allowances for dependents of veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person entitled, under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration, to compensation at wartime rates for disability incurred in or aggravated by active service in either World War I or World War II as defined in Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

(a) has a wife but no child living, $30;

(b) has a wife and one child living, $50;

(c) has a wife and two children living, $65 plus $15 for each additional child;

(d) has no wife but one child living, $20;

(e) has no wife but two children living, $35 and $15 for each additional child;

(f) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $25 for each parent so dependent.

(2) If and while rated partially disabled, in an amount having same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to the total disability.

SEC. 2. No person shall receive additional compensation for dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration during the same period that any additional compensation, as provided by this act, is paid.

SEC. 3. The administrative, definitive, and penal provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations thereunder, as amended, shall be for application under this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUCK submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank-holding companies, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF BANK PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4790) reducing individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORITY OF MARITIME COMMISSION TO SELL, CHARTER, AND OPERATE VESSELS—AMENDMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, under the provisions of Senate Resolution 137, which was agreed to in the closing days of the last session of the present Congress, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, was directed to make a complete and full investigation of our entire immigration system. This resolution providing that with respect to findings and recommendations on the subject of displaced persons a separate report should be made on or before January 10, 1948.

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 137 a special subcommittee was appointed consisting of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], chairman, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH]. The subcommittee has devoted a great deal of time in study and deliberation on the subjects involved in the resolution and the matter has only today been submitted by the subcommittee to the full Committee on the Judiciary.

The original resolution provided, as I have indicated, that the report on the subject of displaced persons should be made on or before January 10, 1948. On December 18, 1947, pursuant to Senate Resolution 178, this date was extended to February 10, 1948. It was the unanimous conclusion of the members present at a meeting this morning of the full Committee on the Judiciary that a further extension of time to March 1, 1948, should be made. I remained at the meeting until 20 minutes of 12, until I could get a quorum. The quorum then instructed me to request the Senate to relieve the committee of its responsibility of reporting on the 10th of February, and asked that the date be extended to the 1st of March.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and request its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution to effectuate the purpose I have stated. It will be impossible to get a quorum in the Judiciary Committee for some little time now. We had with us the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who was one of the advisers; and he, too, agreed that the step proposed by the resolution is an appropriate one to take.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether the chairman of the committee has discussed this matter with the Senators who were so eager to have the report made on January 10 originally. I refer to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and, I think, several other Senators.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; the Senator from New Jersey was at the meeting this morning.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And they were agreeable to the proposed step; were they?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; that was the purpose the Senator from New Jersey had in coming to the committee meeting, for he is not a member of the committee.

As I have said, the report cannot be made before March 1. The purpose is to relieve the committee of a mandate which cannot be carried out because sufficient members of the committee will not be present to give final consideration to the matter between now and February 10.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] will bear me out as to that.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I absolutely agree that it will be impossible to obtain the attendance at the committee meetings of the necessary members of the committee in order to do this by February 10.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me ask the Senator if it is his definite opinion that a report will be rendered by March 1?

Mr. DONNELL. The staff of the subcommittee has prepared a very extended typewritten statement of facts, in addition to which the subcommittee caused to be prepared, and has handed to the full committee, a confidential committee draft of a proposed bill. My judgment is that it will be possible to submit the

report and the bill to the Senate by March 1, if the Judiciary Committee approves them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know that the Senator took the trip abroad last autumn to personally investigate conditions there.

Mr. DONNELL. I did.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator knows that many persons in our country are most anxious that a report be rendered on this subject and some decision reached promptly by the Congress.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; I am aware of that; and I am anxious to have the committee make a prompt report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to share what I think are the clear implications of the comments of the Senator from Massachusetts. Also, Mr. President, when my good friend the Senator from Misscuri [Mr. DONNELL] says it is his opinion that in all probability the report will be prepared by March 1, and that every effort will be made to have such a report prepared, I wish to state that I think it is of the utmost importance that we have some action taken on this matter by March 1, because it has been more than a year, now, since by way of a special assignment I visited a large number of these camps and made a report to the then Secretary of War in regard to my observations. I wish to repeat what I have said before, namely, that we shall never win this peace on the basis of at least one of the objectives for which we fought in the war—in short, to put an end to the persecution of minority groups in the world—until we settle properly the displaced-persons problem; and it will never be settled properly, Mr. President, by keeping those persons in what amount to—I do not care what phrase one may use to sugar-coat it—concentration camps, because that is what they are. Those camps are festering sores in Europe today, and in my judgment they are threatening the political health of the world.

So I think the time has come when the Congress of the United States has either to fish or cut bait on this issue. The people of this country are entitled to know what our final course of action will be.

I say that in the name of everything that is right and just, there is only one thing we can do, and that is to see to it that those people, who have been the victims, and still are the victims—although hostilities have long since ceased—of persecution by totalitarian states, are distributed around the globe in equitable fashion so that they and their offspring can lead decent lives, lives of self-production, lives which will offer them some hope of peace for their offspring.

I recognize that the Judiciary Committee has been heavily pressed with other duties; but I do not wish to see June 1 or June 10 arrive with the displaced-persons problem still pending on the calendar of the Senate of the United States. I think March 1 should be set down as the last possible date by which we shall hear from the Judiciary Committee on this matter, because I think it is a matter that should be disposed of and must be disposed of at this session of Congress.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to make it plain that this subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, of which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] happens to be a member, and of which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] also are members, has held hour-after-hour sessions on this matter. I myself attended either one or two of their meetings. I wish to compliment each and every one of them. That subcommittee is made up of individuals, men with diametrically opposite views as to the amount of responsibility this country owes and can absorb. Apparently they have now arrived at some kind of compromise. It is not yet available for publication; it was given to us in executive session. Just today, for the first time, it was brought to the committee—at 20 minutes of 12; and, of course, we had to be in the Senate Chamber at 12 o'clock. It was the censensus of every member of the full committee who was present that this extension of time was necessary and should be granted. That is the point I make, and that is why I make the request, for it was obviously humanly impossible for the subcommittee to have an opportunity to meet with the full committee on this matter. We tried to arrange a meeting for Thursday, but were unable to arrange to have sufficient members of the committee present at that time. We then tried to arrange a meeting for next week, but that also was impossible. On the other hand, it will be possible for the meeting to be held the week after that. At that time we hope to have the entire committee devote an hour to this matter.

As the Senator from Missouri has said, we hope then to be able to report to the floor of the Senate something that is the result of hours and days and weeks and months of labor. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, this problem is one of the tremendous problems facing the United States. However, when the Senator from Oregon said, in effect, that we must see to it that these displaced persons are taken care of all over the world, that poses the issue. Certainly we have no jurisdiction anywhere except in the United States. So that point poses the issue.

Mr. President, I now move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I would not want the Senate to be under the impression that the subcommittee was unanimous as to the report presented to the full committee this morning. I may say that there are two members of our subcommittee who are not in agreement, certainly, as to much of the bill that was presented. The bill as presented meets, as I understand, with the concurrence of three members of the subcommittee. I simply wish to make this statement in view of the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin has referred to an "apparent compromise" which he says he understands has been entered into. I make this statement in order that there may be no misunderstanding in his mind or in the mind of any other Senator as to the unanimity or absence of unanimity as to the bill.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be read at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 193) was read, as follows:

Resolved, that Senate Resolution 137 of the Eightieth Congress, first session, relating to an investigation of the immigration system, as amended by Senate Resolution 178 of the Eightieth Congress, first session, is amended by striking out the word and figures "February 10, 1948," on page 2, section 2, line 12, and inserting in lieu thereof the following words and figures: "March 1, 1948."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement at this point. I do not recall whether the Senator from Wisconsin mentioned the fact that in the subcommittee we have had the help of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who now is on his feet, doubtless in connection with some other matter. But I think it would not be proper to overlook the fact that we have received not only the help of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], but likewise the highly efficient suggestions and help of our good friend the senior Senator from Virginia.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to Federal personnel, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH NOVEMBER 1947

(The following report is compiled from signed, official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives, by agency, the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the total Federal personnel for December decreased 6,592 from the November total of 1,999,863 to the December total of 1,993,271. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment, there was a decrease of 4,738 from the November total of 1,168,776 to the December total of 1,164,038.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed a decrease of 1,854 from the November total of 831,087 to the December total of 829,233.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 2,555 from its November total of 380,184 to the December total of 377,629. Inside continental United States the Army

decreased its civilian personnel 2,131, while outside continental United States personnel decreased 424.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 49 civilian employees from the November figure of 339,219 to the December figure of 339,268.

The Department of the Air Force increased employment 471 from its November total of 111,229 to the December total of 111,700.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal personnel within the United States decreased 6,439 from the November total of 1,777,918 to the December total of 1,771,479. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside the United States decreased 4,666 from the November figure of 1,115,400 to the December figure of 1,110,734.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for December is 660,745—a decrease of 1,773 under the November figure of 662,518.

Department of the Army personnel within the United States decreased 2,131 from the November figure of 255,142 to the December total of 253,011.

Navy Department within the United States decreased its civilian employment 294, from the November figure of 295,692 to the December figure of 295,398.

The Air Forces increased civilian personnel within the United States by 471 from the November figure of 111,229 to the December figure of 111,700.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 153 from the November total of 221,945 to the December total of 221,792. (See table II.)

A reduction of 72 was reported in overseas personel by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment.

Total overseas employment for the National Military Establishment for December is 168,488, a decrease of 81 under the November figure.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 424 civilian overseas employees, from the November figure of 125,042 to the December figure of 124,618.

The Department of the Navy increased its overseas employment 343, from the November figure of 43,527 to the December figure of 43,870.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

Total industrial employment during the month of December decreased 3,078 from the November total of 549,992 to the December total of 546,851. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies, exclusive of the National Defense Establishment, decreased 937, from the November figure of 21,218 to the December figure of 20,281.

The National Defense Establishment effected a net decrease in industrial employment of 2,141, from the November figure of 528,711 to the December figure of 526,570.

The Department of the Army decreased its industrial employment 2,389; 1,826 of this decrease was within the United States, and 527 was effected outside continental United States.

The Department of the Navy increased its industrial employment 248, from the November figure of 236,481 to the December figure of 236,729.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1947, and comparison with November 1947*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	70,683	68,756	−1,927
Commerce	34,125	34,432	+307
Interior	42,390	41,543	−847
Justice	24,844	24,872	+28
Labor	4,409	4,499	+90
Post Office	462,042	463,741	+1,699
State	7,256	7,415	+159
Treasury	84,706	84,488	−218
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	41	41	
Office of Scientific Research and Development	48	14	−34
Office of Selective Service Records	640	653	+13
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	59	61	+2
National Security Council [1]	4	8	+4
National Security Resources Board	51	65	+14
Office of Government Reports	19	19	
Office of Housing Expediter	4,774	4,644	−130
Philippine Alien Property Administrator	3	2	−1
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,660	4,760	+100
War Assets Administration	31,947	29,874	−2,073
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	
Bureau of the Budget	599	602	+3
Civil Aeronautics Board	558	563	+5
Civil Service Commission	3,663	3,742	+79
Export-Import Bank of Washington	114	111	−3
Federal Communications Commission	1,267	1,286	+19
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,170	1,156	−14
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	360	373	+13
Federal Power Commission	780	781	+1
Federal Security Agency	31,055	[2] 31,086	+31
Federal Trade Commission	559	562	+3
Federal Works Agency	22,743	22,542	−201
General Accounting Office	9,520	9,448	−72
Government Printing Office	7,578	7,544	−34
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,294	12,047	−247
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,265	2,257	−8
Maritime Commission	6,767	6,716	−51
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,048	6,076	+28
National Archives	326	328	+2
National Capital Housing Authority	287	286	−1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	24	+3
National Gallery of Art	318	311	−7
National Labor Relations Board	786	878	+92
National Mediation Board	102	103	+1
Panama Canal	549	541	−8
Railroad Retirement Board	2,811	2,783	−28
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6,520	6,213	−307
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,180	1,180	
Smithsonian Institution	516	513	−3
Tariff Commission	224	222	−2
Tax Court of the United States	124	124	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,514	14,222	−292
Veterans' Administration	207,078	206,224	−854
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,115,400	1,110,734	−7,362 +2,696
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−4,666
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	455	636	+181
Department of the Army	255,142	253,011	−2,131
Department of the Navy	295,692	295,398	−294
Department of the Air Forces	111,229	111,700	+471
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,777,918	1,771,479	−9,787 +3,348
Net decrease, including the National Military Establishment			−6,439

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[2] Exclusive of 1,123 employees of Howard University and 100 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf who have not been reported previously. They are excluded pending decision of the Bureau of the Budget on their status.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1947, and comparison with November 1947*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,816	1,904	+88
Commerce	2,649	2,604	−45
Interior	4,800	4,652	−148
Justice	406	411	+5
Labor	78	78	
Post Office	1,540	1,531	−9
State	13,511	13,426	−85
Treasury	594	591	−3
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Selective Service Records	19	14	−5
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Office of Housing Expediter	28	28	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	167	168	+1
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
War Assets Administration	509	464	−45
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	96	98	+2
Civil Aeronautics Board	15	16	+1
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	26	36	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1947, and comparison with November 1947*—Con.

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Federal Security Agency	1,336	1,380	+44
Federal Works Agency	300	303	+3
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42	39	−3
Maritime Commission	146	145	−1
National Labor Relations Board	2	2	
Panama Canal	23,577	23,722	+145
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	99	57	−42
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	
Veterans' Administration	1,591	1,616	+25
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	53,376	53,304	−386 +314
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−72
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	125,042	124,618	−424
Department of the Navy	43,527	43,870	+343
Total, including National Military Establishment	221,945	221,792	−810 +657
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−153

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1947, and comparison with November 1947*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	72,499	70,660	−1,839
Commerce	36,774	37,036	+262
Interior	47,190	46,195	−995
Justice	25,250	25,283	+33
Labor	4,487	4,577	+90
Post Office	463,582	465,272	+1,690
State	20,767	20,841	+74
Treasury	85,300	85,079	−221
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	41	41	
Office of Scientific Research and Development	48	14	−34
Office of Selective Service Records	659	667	+8
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	59	61	+2
National Security Council [1]	4	8	+4
National Security Resources Board	51	65	+14
Office of Government Reports	19	19	
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,802	4,672	−130
Philippine Alien Property Administrator	170	170	
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,663	4,763	+100
War Assets Administration	32,456	30,338	−2,118
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	99	101	+2
Bureau of the Budget	599	602	+3
Civil Aeronautics Board	573	579	+6
Civil Service Commission	3,668	3,747	+79
Export-Import Bank of Washington	116	113	−3
Federal Communications Commission	1,303	1,322	+19
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,173	1,159	−14
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	360	373	+13
Federal Power Commission	780	781	+1
Federal Security Agency	32,391	[2] 32,466	+75
Federal Trade Commission	559	562	+3
Federal Works Agency	23,043	22,845	−198
General Accounting Office	9,520	9,448	−72
Government Printing Office	7,578	7,544	−34
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,336	12,086	−250
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,265	2,257	−8
Maritime Commission	6,913	6,861	−52
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,048	6,076	+28
National Archives	326	328	+2
National Capital Housing Authority	287	286	−1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	24	+3
National Gallery of Art	318	311	−7
National Labor Relations Board	788	880	+92
National Mediation Board	102	103	+1
Panama Canal	24,126	24,263	+137
Railroad Retirement Board	2,811	2,783	−28
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	6,619	6,270	−349
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,180	1,180	
Smithsonian Institution	522	519	−3
Tariff Commission	224	222	−2
Tax Court of the United States	124	124	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,514	14,222	−292
Veterans' Administration	208,669	207,840	−829
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,168,776	1,164,038	+2,741 −7,479
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−4,738
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of Secretary of Defense	455	636	+181
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	255,142	253,011	−2,131
Outside continental United States	125,042	124,618	−424
Department of the Navy	339,219	339,268	+49
Department of the Air Forces	111,229	111,700	+471
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,999,863	1,993,271	+3,442 −10,034
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−6,592

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[2] Exclusive of 1,123 employees of Howard University and 100 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf who have not been reported previously. They are excluded pending decision of the Bureau of the Budget on their status.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executives agencies during December 1947, and comparison with November 1947*

Department or agency	November	December	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,087	1,135	+48
Interior	6,033	5,233	−800
State	343	342	−1
Treasury	3,628	3,646	+18
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Atomic Energy Commission	286	281	−5
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Housing and Home Finance Agency	3	3	
Panama Canal	2,114	2,138	+24
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,724	7,503	−221
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	21,218	20,281	−1,027 +90
Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment			−937
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	197,221	195,359	−1,862
Outside continental United States	95,009	94,482	−527
Department of the Navy	236,481	236,729	+248
Total, including National Military Establishment	549,929	546,851	−3,416 +338
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−3,078

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, SUMMARIZING MID-FISCAL-YEAR GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL SITUATION AND MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE COMMITTEE'S PERSONNEL REPORT ON FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT IN DECEMBER

Reduction of Federal personnel in the Executive agencies during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year was negligible.

Action with respect to personal service funds by the House Appropriations Committee on the independent offices appropriation bill—the first to be reported in this session of Congress—was equally disappointing.

Increase—not decrease—in Federal personnel is to be expected in the remainder of the year on the basis of present prospects.

There is ample experience in proof of the statement that economy and efficiency in government decrease in proportion to excessive personnel. If neither the Executive nor Congress will do anything effective about the situation, who will? Here are the facts:

WILL-O'-THE-WISP REDUCTIONS

On the basis of reports to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by executive agencies (exclusive of the White House and Central Intelligence Agency) their personnel in December totaled 1,993,271—a net reduction of 81,562

Footnotes at end of table.

for the first 6 months of the current fiscal year. But midyear analysis reveals:

Nearly 25 percent, or 19,891, of the reduction was largely seasonal in Agriculture and Interior Departments. Most of this personnel will be back with appropriate weather.

More than 50 percent, or 43,624, of the reduction was in jobs which simply ran out, with no possible justification for continuation—but even some of this is expected to be temporary. In this category there were 32,610 Army and Navy industrial employees overseas. Most of them were native laborers, and many of them were necessarily discharged with the withdrawal from Italy. There is reason to expect increases in such employment in other areas. The other 11,014 in this group were in emergency war agencies and the War Assets Administration which are in belated liquidation.

The remaining 18,046, or less than 1 percent of the total employment, may possibly be attributed to retrenchment of a sort. But even this figure is highly conservative because 10,032 of it is in Veterans' Administration reduction which is regarded as temporary and may be recovered before the year is out. Another 1,352 is a reduction in RFC which was still liquidating war activities.

Actually there were net increases during the first half of the year in nearly half of the agencies.

CONGRESS ALLOWS IT THAT WAY

The situation to date in the current year is running about as Congress provided for it. By the records of the agencies, 29 of 54 agencies requested and received funds for employment of more people during the current fiscal year than they had last year. In fact, 2 agencies which asked for less money for this year than they had last year received more.

Too frequently Congress is satisfied with itself when it whittles down the Executive's budget requests, but actually allows increases over the previous year. This is the case with the independent offices bill reported to the House last week.

This bill carries appropriations from which a score of agencies will start spending July 1. As reported, the bill would provide increased personal-service funds for more than half of them as compared with money for this year. While some of this increase will go for promotions and raises, it is reliably estimated that the aggregate employment will not be reduced, but, to the contrary, it probably would be increased under the bill as it stands.

Employment in these agencies totals more than 50,000. A token reduction would be at least 10 percent under the current year. None of these agencies is involved with the European emergency, except the Executive offices and the General Accounting Office, and the latter was cut at its own request. In addition to these two, only NACA has to do with national defense. No one would disturb the mission of the Battle Monuments Commission, but the Congress would be perfectly safe in assuming that as a whole the personnel of this group of agencies could be cut 10 percent without impairment of the efficiency in any way.

EMERGENCY HANG-OVERS

On the basis of the President's requests, the budget for fiscal year 1949 would provide for employment of 2,010,000 who would be paid more than $6,000,000,000. If we are to obligate this much or more for foreign subsidies during the next 18 months, people will be required. If we are going to stay even within the budget employment estimate, personal-service funds in some of the appropriation bills must be cut more sharply than they have been to date in the independent offices bill.

Such reductions are obviously indicated in view of the fact that, exclusive of national defense agencies—Army, Navy, and Air Force—civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government, as reported to the Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, has increased by 60,220 over peak wartime employment of June 1945.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE IN EUROPE" (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 855)

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution and I request its immediate consideration. A few days ago, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which went abroad to study the Voice of America program, I made a report. I find that the detailed appendix runs slightly over the ordinary length, and a routine resolution, I am advised by the Joint Committee on Printing, will be needed to have the printing of the appendix authorized. I have taken the matter up with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and he has approved the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 194) was read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 855, part 2, current session, submitted pursuant to Senate Resolution 161, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to make an investigation of the effects of certain State Department activities, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations and 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the Printing Committee has approved the resolution providing for additional copies, and that there is no objection made to it whatever.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. No objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'DANIEL

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of the calling of the special session of Congress, issued by him at Fort Worth, Tex., on November 10, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORKER AND THE MARSHALL PLAN—ADDRESS BY JOHN T. KMETZ

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Worker and the Marshall Plan," delivered by Mr. John T. Kmetz, Assistant Secretary of Labor, at a dinner meeting of the Wanamaker Post of the American Legion, in Philadelphia, December 2, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE EXPECT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY FRANK W. ABRAMS

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject What the American People Expect of Business and Industry, delivered by Frank W. Abrams, chairman of the board of directors of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, before the graduating class of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y., January 24, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESENTATION TO SENATOR BALDWIN OF UNITED STATES JEWISH WAR VETERANS' AWARD OF MERIT

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the proceedings in connection with the award to Senator BALDWIN by members of the United States Jewish War Veterans' award of merit, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN APPROPRIATE GOP SLOGAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE ANNISTON STAR

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Appropriate GOP Slogan," from the Anniston (Ala.) Star of January 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Waterway Fight On," from the Plain Speaker (Hazleton, Pa.) of January 27, 1948, and an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 29, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT—EDITORIAL FROM THE RUTLAND HERALD

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Project," from the Rutland (Vt.) Herald of February 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAN WE AFFORD A DECENT WORLD?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Can We Afford a Decent World?" written for the 1947 Labor Day edition of the Trade Union Courier, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Must Decentralize," written by him and published in the magazine the Reserve Officer for February 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF INDIA AND PALESTINE PROBLEMS ON THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE BY LOWELL MELLETT

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "India and Palestine Have Put Our Faith in United Nations to Test," written by Lowell Mellett and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BARKLEY. I reluctantly yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Morse
Baldwin	Green	Murray
Ball	Gurney	Myers
Barkley	Hatch	O'Conor
Brewster	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hayden	Overton
Bridges	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo
Bushfield	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taylor
Connally	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	Lucas	Thye
Cordon	McCarthy	Tobey
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McFarland	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Wilson
Fulbright	Moore	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the National Resources Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the time of the Senate very long, and therefore I hope that I may be permitted to conclude what I have to say on the pending matter without interruption, though I do not foreclose interruption. I am merely expressing a prayerful hope.

Mr. President, I do not rise to occupy the time of the Senate at this time in the hope that I may add anything very material or very new to what has been said about the St. Lawrence seaway project from time immemorial. It is one which has been pending not merely since the introduction of the particular joint resolution now under consideration, but negotiations regarding it have been pending for many years between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, and have occupied the attention of the Congress on many occasions. The project has been before the Congress by way of joint resolution ratifying an agreement made between the United States and Canada through the President. It has been before the Senate in the form of a treaty. It has been before innumerable joint commissions set up by the United States in conjunction with the Dominion of Canada, all of whom have endorsed the project of a seaway in the St. Lawrence River.

I rise in support of this international seaway, and I shall undertake very briefly to give my reasons for that support.

In the first place, I think it would be economically wise and advantageous to have such an international waterway along the St. Lawrence route, first, because it would shorten the distance between a great commercial and industrial section of the United States and the markets of Europe, and, by the same token, of course, would bring ocean transportation, or the possibility of ocean transportation, to the great Middle West, which we have frequently referred to as the granary of the American Republic, and which is more and more becoming the industrial center of the American Republic.

I can visualize a day when it will be the industrial center of the United States, because, as our population increases and gradually moves out toward the West, it will find in the future, as it has found already, that in the great Mississippi and Ohio Valleys, and in the valleys of all their tributaries, there will be focused that industrial activity which will not only make it one of the great industrial centers of the United States, but it will require, in my judgment, additional transportation facilities in order that that industry may find its way to the markets of the world.

I am one who believes, Mr. President, that the day of railroad building in the United States is over. The great railroad pioneers who bridged our streams and tunneled our mountains and linked our country with hoops of steel in the form of railroad rails and cross ties, have done their work, and they did it well. But there is no longer any field within the continental United States for the old-fashioned railroad development with which we are so familiar. The problem of railroads now is to improve their facilities where they are by whatever device or mechanism may be possible, to expand their capacity without expanding their territory, in order that they may meet the demands of commerce in a growing, prosperous Nation which more and more will increase its production both of industry and agriculture in order to supply not only our own demands and the needs of an increasing population, but in the new world situation in which we have automatically become the leader, may supply the demands of mankind for the things which we can produce and will continue to produce for a long time in greater quantities than is true of any other country in the world.

I recognize that many of the railroads are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway on the theory, of course, that it will bring about greater competition with railroad transportation and lessen their opportunity to serve the American people. I was not a Member of the Congress at the time the legislation was enacted which authorized the Panama Canal, but I recall very vividly that the same type of opposition now registered by our transcontinental railroad systems against the St. Lawrence seaway was registered against the construction of the Panama Canal, on the theory that it would interfere with their ability and their opportunity to carry trade across the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.

Likewise they have historically opposed the improvement of our waterways. They have opposed the improvement of our navigable streams on the theory of competition with them, of course, which is a perfectly legitimate attitude. I am not criticizing them for looking after their own interests. I am not criticizing them for opposing the utilization of a God-given means of transportation because it competes with them. But they did oppose our Nation-wide program of waterway improvements, and I have in mind particularly the Ohio River, with respect to which Congress in the early part of this century passed a law obligating itself to provide a 9-foot stage of water the year around from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Cairo, Ill. That waterway improvement was finally completed by the Congress, through the Corps of Engineers, in spite of this opposition.

The Panama Canal was constructed, Mr. President, in spite of the opposition of those who felt that it might afford a means of competition with them, but, instead of injuring the railroads, as it was predicted, it has not only not injured them, but, in one sense of the word, has been of benefit to them. There may have been some diversion of traffic from one road to another, but, on the whole, taking the railroads of the United States as a single unit of transportation, no injury has been created by the construction of the Panama Canal. The point is that they all opposed it, just as they oppose this project. In spite of that opposition, Congress authorized it, and it was dug and is now in operation. Also, in spite of such opposition, our rivers have been improved for navigation and commerce.

Mr. President, I feel about the means of transportation on our great waterways just as I feel about the preservation and improvement of our soil fertility as our population increases. It is now more than 140,000,000. It is predicted that by 1960 it will be 160,000,000, and that by 1980 it will be approximately 190,000,000. We know, as a matter of common sense, that with such an increase in our population every acre of land in the United States will be required to support more people each year than it did before. There is no escape from that logic. Also, every possible means of transportation available to the United States and her people will be required to haul more freight, to be more efficient and more serviceable each year than it was the year before, if our economy and industrial and agricultural prosperity are to

continue, with the facility for carrying all that we produce wherever it may be needed throughout the world.

So I cannot accept the argument—it has not been advanced on the floor of the Senate, but has been advanced in letters, resolutions, and other forms of expression which we have received from time to time in opposition to this project—that it would afford competition to other means of transportation and, therefore, be injurious to them.

I support this program, Mr. President, because I believe that it will be economically to the advantage of and in the interest of the welfare of the United States. A while ago I stated that it would afford a shorter route, not merely along the line of the St. Lawrence seaway, not merely for the benefit of the contiguous territory, but for the benefit of the entire United States west of the Allegheny Mountains, and in many sections east of the Allegheny Mountains, for the transportation of products to the markets of the world.

I believe that when this seaway shall have been completed freight rates, outgoing and incoming, between the United States and other markets, especially across the Atlantic to Europe, will be reduced by a very substantial margin. According to the estimate of economists and engineers, as set out in the report of the committee, the freight rate from Milwaukee or Chicago through this seaway and across the Atlantic will be less per ton than the rates now charged between the city of Baltimore and the city of Chicago. That will be important some day, because ultimately our own supply of raw materials, especially the ores from which we manufacture steel and other things in this country, will be exhausted, and we shall be required to import them into the United States from other countries. It is a matter of great importance to our agricultural producers who have to buy farm machinery made of steel, to our petroleum industry, which must buy steel, and to industries of the United States which must use steel in the mechanization of their plants and in the machinery and tools with which they work. It will be important, when the time comes when we shall have to import those ores instead of producing them in our own country, to have an international seaway by which ships may come up the St. Lawrence River and into the inland ports on the Great Lakes. I believe that the people of those great sections of our country are entitled to that sort of transportation facility.

I am not in a position to say that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway may not temporarily divert some freight from some seaport. It may affect, in a way, the city of New Orleans; and I can very well understand the attitude of our good friends from the State of Louisiana. It might affect for a time the port of Baltimore; and I can therefore understand the attitude of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. It may affect the port of New York and the port of Boston for a time; and therefore I can understand the attitude of Senators coming from those sections.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me that in the consideration of a great project like this, just as in the consideration of the Panama Canal and the improvement of our rivers, we must look upon this enterprise as a national project and not a local project. We must take an over-all view of its advantages as a whole, and not merely the effect it may have upon some particular locality from a geographical standpoint. That is the basis of my support of this measure. I am trying to look at this question from the standpoint of the welfare of the country. It may well be that the construction of this seaway might affect transportation in the Ohio Valley. It may well be that for a temporary period the construction of this seaway might affect river traffic on the Ohio or the Mississippi, although I do not believe it will substantially do so. Even so, I am not looking at it from the standpoint of a county, but from the standpoint of the American people, not tomorrow or next year, but for all the time during which this seaway will be operating and will be needed by the people of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator may recall that about 20 years ago 23 States of the Union supported the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. As I recall, most of them appropriated funds to further the construction of the seaway. Speaking of the Ohio Valley, among those 23 States was the State of Ohio, which obviously would benefit greatly from the project, so far as the northern half of the State is concerned. The Senator's own State of Kentucky and the State of West Virginia also joined the group of States which were attempting to secure approval of the development of the St. Lawrence River. I think the reason is very obvious. It would facilitate the movement of millions of tons of coal from northern Ohio shipping points to Canada and other parts of the world.

But it is quite noticeable that when it was proposed to develop the St. Lawrence River and to construct a dam to produce power at low cost for the benefit of all the people, certain interests in these States were able to swing support away from the St. Lawrence project. In other words, so long as the private power companies could control the development, the coal interests favored the St. Lawrence seaway, but evidently from the way in which they are now acting, the coal companies think they would be injured if the St. Lawrence River were developed for the benefit of all the people.

I simply call that historical fact to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky and of the Senate, namely, that at one time the coal-producing States backed the St. Lawrence seaway. Its construction certainly would result in the shipment and use of more coal. But when the special interests found that private power companies could not grab all the power benefit, they seemed to withdraw their support.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall that Kentucky and West Virginia were among the 23 States which endorsed this project many years ago. I should not be willing to state, or even to believe, that the failure of my own State to pursue during the interim period the appropriation for the purposes originally intended was due to any power interests within the State. Sometimes things happen, and support is not continued for various reasons. This project has been discussed for a long time, and it would not be strange if a State had started out to assist other States in bringing about a situation in which the project might be constructed and, finally, merely through inactivity or immediate lack of interest, withdrew its financial assistance. I can say, I am sure, that it was not any power influence or any power possibility that induced the State of Kentucky to withhold its appropriation.

There is no State in the Union which has been more enthusiastic and more unanimous in its support of the improvement in the Tennessee Valley than has the State of Kentucky. Outside of the State of Tennessee, and probably one or two other States, I do not know of any State that would benefit more by that great development than would the State of Kentucky.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not want the Senator to think that I was applying my statement to all the people in the State of Kentucky. So long as it appeared that private interests would get the power which was developed they were in favor of it, but there were certain groups who withdrew their support, and evidently coal operators were among them, when they found that if power should be developed it would be developed as public power, for the benefit of the people.

The same statement applies to New England. Twenty-two years ago the Associated Industries of New England appointed a committee of five men from each State, I think it was, to study the St. Lawrence River seaway and to make recommendations. This committee of 30 was headed by Mr. Charles Gow, of Boston, one of our finest New England citizens, who is still strong for the seaway. The Associated Industries of the six New England States unanimously approved construction of the St. Lawrence seaway at that time, but, again, when it was found that private interests could not develop power for themselves, but that it was to be public power, they withdrew their support.

I mentioned the names of the members of the committee in a public speech which I delivered in Boston a couple of years ago, and I received a letter from the president of one of the larger power companies in New England naming an electric light company of which Mr. Sam Ferguson was the president. He was a member of the associated industries committee which had enthusiastically endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway. He took exception to my mentioning his name as one of the supporters at that time, saying that he had since changed his mind. Then he added that if we, the supporters, would say to the power companies that they could have 100 percent of the power generated by the St. Lawrence River project to distribute themselves, and would give none of it

to municipal plants or to the REA cooperatives, except that which they might buy through the private companies, they would get behind the St. Lawrence seaway and again support it; but that so long as the power was to be developed as public power, and so long as any of it was to be sold to the municipal systems or to the REA, they wanted to be regarded as opposed to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's contribution to the subject. Undoubtedly some of those who were at the beginning enthusiastically in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway as a means of navigation, when they discovered that the improvement might be used for the generation of power, found their enthusiasm dwindling and their opposition mounting. What I wanted to do was to disabuse the Senator's mind of the belief that the mere fact that Kentucky had not continued over the years to contribute to the fund originated by the 23 States was no indication of power company influence.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator is making a very valuable contribution. I know as well as does anyone else that it is not the effect upon the coal mines and the effect upon transportation that is responsible for the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway. This fight is between the power interests and the people of the United States. The reason for that is that the people of New York and New England today pay approximately $400,000,000 a year more for electric energy than they would have to pay at TVA rates. That is the real reason for the opposition, in my opinion. Various fronts are put forward. Recently some of the electric power companies have come out into the open, but in general they have kept in the background, using the railroad and other interests as a front. They have interlocking directorates. But the real reason is that there is a $400,000,000 overcharge for power that the Northeastern States have to pay every year.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

I referred a moment ago to the opposition to the construction of the Panama Canal. As I recall, without having looked at the figures recently, that Canal cost somewhere in the neighborhood of five hundred or six hundred million dollars. I dare say, Mr. President, that there is not a Member of the Senate, and I dare say there is not an American citizen, who would today be willing to exchange the Panama Canal for the $500,000,000 it cost to construct it. There is not a man or woman in America who would be willing to close up that Canal and put that $500,000,000 back into the Treasury of the United States.

I was called on yesterday by the head of a great industrial organization located in Pittsburgh, Pa., who operates four or five plants producing a technical commodity. He has been in the Tennessee Valley with a view of locating a plant in that valley. I have never seen any advocate of the Tennessee Valley project and the Tennessee Valley improvement who was as enthusiastic as was this man about the possibility of that great valley, which includes, of course, all the tributaries of the Tennessee River, in the development of the industrial and economic life of the people who are beneficiaries of that great improvement, and he is now looking for, and I might say has selected, a site upon which to erect a plant which will give employment to many persons and will bring additional prosperity to those who are using for industrial development and for home consumption the power and the facilities created by the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I was very much surprised the other day—and agreeably so—to note some very interesting additional particulars in regard to the TVA. We remember that one of the objections which was made to building the TVA was that it would deprive the coal barons of their market for coal. But now the facts are that although the TVA has developed the entire section in that part of the country and has added wealth to the Nation and has displaced what were coal-burning electric-generating plants, the demand in that valley for coal now is more than ever before. So we see that the economic health of that part of the country has been vastly improved as a result of the power coming from the generating plants of the TVA.

To my mind, that is just another answer to the argument which we had to meet several years ago when John Lewis argued that the St. Lawrence waterway would mean that foreign coal would be imported into the United States. The fact is that we have been shipping abroad this year more than 40,000,000 tons of coal. Foreign coal has never come into the Atlantic coast ports except in a small trickle, so that argument has proved to be without foundation.

I am happy to corroborate what the Senator from Kentucky has said with regard to the TVA. It is one of the contributions that far-sighted Americans have made to a section of our Nation that needed it. I say to the Senate that the Nation also needs the development which will come from the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. President, I shall close in just a moment, but I wish to say now that the United States has built up all of the section around the St. Lawrence seaway except for the short distance of approximately 100 miles. We have built seven of the canals. The United States Government has appropriated money for the preparation of plans, and the plans now are made. Congress has voted that money. The only thing left is to build a short connecting link.

Let me point out that, up to 1944, 184,000,000 tons of cargo went in and out of the one port of Montreal annually. Think of that, Mr. President—184,000,000 tons. Yet the opposition contends that we shall not even have 20,000,000 tons as a result of the St. Lawrence seaway. They admit there will be approximately 15,000,000 tons, but they say we shall not have 20,000,000 tons going through the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. President, the unfinished length remaining is the bottleneck; and as I have said, there were 184,000,000 tons of traffic in 1944 in that one Canadian city.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution from the Senator from Wisconsin, which leads me to a very brief comment upon the question of power. I have no fear that the construction of this seaway will flood the United States with coal from abroad. Today the whole continent of Europe is straining every nerve to get coal for its own demands—to increase the facilities of its own mines, to modernize and mechanize them, in order that they may meet the demands of the people of Europe. As the Senator has said, we have been shipping coal across the Atlantic to Europe during this emergency. It has been costing the people of France and the people of Italy $24 a ton for soft coal, shipped across the Atlantic Ocean, to keep those people from freezing and to enable them to begin to start some of their industries for which they do not have sufficient coal nearby.

Of course, it is hoped that the coal industry of Europe, and especially of the Ruhr, may be developed and expanded so that it may meet the demands for coal in Europe, because there is no particular economic value to us in undertaking to ship coal all the way across the Atlantic Ocean to Europe, if they can produce coal closer at home cheaper, not only in order that they may furnish coal for their own domestic-consumption purposes, but also so that they may get their industries back on their feet and proceeding under their own steam.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The Northeast section of the United States, as well as the Middle West section of this country, right now is shivering because of a lack of heat units, whether developed from coal or from oil. It is very well established that if we had the electric generating power that is ready to be developed at the St. Lawrence, thus providing 2,200,000,000 horsepower, there would be available a great deal more oil and coal with which to keep the people of New England and New York and Maryland warm. The figures show, beyond any question of doubt, that the Northeast section of our country is hungry for electricity; it is in need of it. The figures further show that, just as in the case of the TVA section, if the needed electrical energy were now available to the northeast section of the United States, it would result in building up industries, improving the economic health, increasing the economic bloodstream of that section.

To my mind, unless some of our folks from the East remove their blinders, they will be hearing rather definitely from their people pretty soon—as they would know if they looked at the polls—that the people of the Northeast, including Boston, Maine, and other sections, want this development.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we are depleting our natural resources in this country; there is no question at all about

it. Men may disagree as to how long the coal in the United States will last or how long we shall have an ample supply of oil in the United States; but we know that regardless of the number of years during which we may have ample supplies of those resources, we are depleting them year by year, and the time will come when we shall not have an adequate supply of coal or petroleum for purposes of generating steam with which to carry on industry in the United States. Already the Secretary of the Interior has recommended to Congress the expenditure of $9,000,000,000 for the development of a process by which fuel oils may be extracted from the earth. If the Secretary of the Interior, who, I am able to say, has no political motive in mind so far as he is concerned, feels that the supply of petroleum is so rapidly reaching a state of depletion that he has asked the Congress to appropriate out of the Treasury of the United States, over a period of time, $9,000,000,000 in order that we may develop a substitute for what we are now getting out of the ground, certainly it is worthy of the attention of the Members of the United States Congress. Mr. President, since we are depleting our petroleum supplies so rapidly and since we are depleting our coal supplies so rapidly, and since the time will come when we shall not be able to develop from those two natural resources any power for industry, where shall we then get our power except from the development of our waterways and the power which ensues from their development? I have always believed and I now believe that our great rivers which flow throughout the United States—and, as a matter of fact, the great rivers throughout the world—are just as much a natural resource as are coal and oil, just as much a natural resource as is the fertility of our soil. Everyone knows that neither private industry nor private initiative can develop these rivers. They could not develop the Tennessee Valley. They might have built a dam at one place or another in order to create some power for a local community, but they could not have developed the great power which now lies within the grasp of the people of the Tennessee Valley. It was utterly impossible for them to do so. They could not have developed the great Columbia Basin. Private industry could not have developed any of these great power resources. Therefore, the Government of the United States has stepped in to develop these rivers and these power plants, not in order that the Government might go into business, not in order that private industry might be stifled, but in order that these great natural resources might be made available to the people through the only method by which they could be made available, namely, through the interference of the Government of the United States, and in their protection.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the extremely critical shortage of power which exists in the Northeast today, and I should like to give him two or three examples.

Only a few weeks ago one REA cooperative in my State was given 24 hours to get their power somewhere else. They had been supplied by the Green Mountain Power Co., which is a subsidiary of the New England Electric Association. They had two or three old Diesels, which were adequate to supply their membership when they had only 500 members. They have 1,900 members today. Nineteen hundred farmers were given 24 hours' notice to get off the private power interest's line. They got some portable Diesels, they borrowed some oil from the Navy, and they are managing to get by, producing very high costing power today. That is one example of what is happening, and that has been going on in northern New England and in northern New York, and getting steadily worse, now, for months.

I will read some of the headlines. Here is one from a local paper, the Rutland Herald, of January 7:

Public Service Commission issues report forecasting continued power shortage. Chase says northern section of Vermont faces deficiency of 37,400 kilowatt-hours this week; urges cooperation of consumers in curtailing use of electricity.

Here is a headline from the St. Albans Messenger of January 7:

Situation on power unchanged. Public light seeks end of Newport contract.

Here is one from the Newport Express of January 7:

Newport area power crisis still unsolved. Some aid expected tomorrow from Canada, but outlook remains gloomy.

Another, from the Montpelier Evening Argus, of January 5:

Temporary improvements noted in power shortage in northern Vermont today.

There was a rain that helped out a little.

Another, from the Newport Express of December 31:

Industries closed in face of power crisis. Northern Vermont towns blacked out last night.

That is almost within a stone's throw of the proposed St. Lawrence Dam.

From the Montpelier Evening Argus:

Power shortage threatening Vermont.

I have here a report of the Vermont Unemployment Commission, saying that payments of unemployment compensation increased during the month of October, because men had to be laid off while plants were shut down. There are small plants across the country that have to shut down during the day and can run only at night. Others, of course, shut down during the night and can only run in daytime. Our papers have been full of reports of that kind.

I have received many telegrams, one yesterday coming from Massena, N. Y., the site of the proposed 2,200,000 horsepower development on the St. Lawrence River.

It reads as follows:

MASSENA, N. Y., *January 29, 1948.*

Hon. GEORGE AIKEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Employment is dropping steadily and metal orders are delayed in filling because of a power shortage in Massena, N. Y., today. Ninety-four men have been laid off at the Aluminum Co. of America plant this week. Power supply present operations at this aluminum plant is largely imported from Canada. One pot line that reduces alumina to aluminum by an electrolytic process was shut down Monday, January 26, for lack of power. The power that would be available by harnessing the St. Lawrence River for producing electric power is desperately needed in this entire area. The United States Senate must approve the St. Lawrence project in its entirety.

ALUMINUM WORKERS UNION 19256,
J. J. CALLAHAN, *Secretary.*

I have here a release by Walter P. Reuther, international president of the UAW-CIO, again calling attention to the desperate shortage of power in the United States.

Why talk about preparedness and then fight to prevent the means of successfully waging war in the event it should come?

Here is a telegram from the Standard Shade Roller Corp., of Ogdensburg, N. Y., another town near the dam site:

Lack of power forced this plant employing 318 to close October 31 and November 1, 1947, despite urgent need for full production.

Here is a telegram from the Farmers' Union of Syracuse, N. Y.:

St. Lawrence power very necessary to north country dairy farmers as we have had many complaints of power shortages especially in early evening, when power was insufficient to operate electric milking machines.

In one county in my State the power was thrown off at 8 o'clock. The milking machines just could not operate while the current was off. I have had complaints from men that they could not get power enough to run their potato graders.

Here is another telegram from the Diamond Watch Co. in upper New York State, saying that they had to shut down their plant.

The people of Vermont are trying desperately, in the face of these obstacles, to keep on doing business. One establishment there, which produces about 1,000,000 pounds of copper a month, is throwing away 150 tons of pure iron a day because they cannot get power—and pure iron is as valuable as steel. I just cannot understand the attitude of our neighbors who want us to continue in that condition without being able to operate our industries in northern New England, particularly Vermont, but who still insist on taking the very narrow local view that it might injure the port of Boston or might force the power companies to reduce their rates, and urge other arguments like that. As a matter of fact, the port of Boston does not have so much export business today. To hear the opponents talk, one would think Boston exported 400,000,000 tons a year. The exports have dropped to about 400,000 tons. It was all diverted from the port of Boston long ago. It was diverted first to the port of New York. New York had 2,000,000 tons of grain a year to export. Now the railroads who manipulate things and who pull the wires, turning the freight and the traffic wherever they desire, have diverted most of the grain from the port of New York to the ports of Philadelphia and Baltimore.

Nobody knows where it will show up next, but when one talks about hitting

the export trade of the port of Boston, I just call attention to the fact that the port of Boston does not have much export trade. There are at least four cities on the Great Lakes which have a larger export trade today than the port of Boston. So I call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky and of the Senate to the desperate condition of the people who live in the northeast part of the country.

It is not a case of getting somebody else's business, it is a case of maintaining what we have. If the St. Lawrence project were approved by the Congress, probably half a dozen small industries would be moved from Massachusetts or possibly from Connecticut up to Vermont and New Hampshire. That would not be a drop in the bucket compared with the increased business which those States would receive by reason of being part of an infinitely stronger nation and a stronger economy than we have now. I do wish the opponents would look at the problem from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole, the way it affects the security of the Nation as a whole, and the way it will affect the economy of the Nation as a whole. There are 48 States in our Union, and the welfare of every one of them is vital to the welfare of the other 47. Let us look at the issue from that standpoint.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont. The story that he has repeated here through telegrams and letters can be repeated in many sections of the United States at this time, showing the results flowing from a lack of power. I have received telegrams from communities within my State and from communities within Indiana, complaining that because the Federal Power Commission had seen fit or had been compelled to shut off a supply of natural gas due to a shortage in the country, not only many industries and schools were compelled to go without fuel for heat, but many homes were likewise deprived of fuel for heat, because of a shortage of natural gas. We must look forward, it seems to me, to the day when there may be a shortage of all sorts of heating fuels and industrial fuels, and the only substitute for them I know anything about is power. It will never be developed for the benefit of all the people of the United States by little piecemeal developments here and there, by the building of a little dam over a creek or a very small river, for some particularly local purpose. It must be done on a broad scale. It might as well be said that every community ought to protect itself against floods. That was tried long ago. It failed, and finally Congress declared by legislative enactment, with all the solemnity that goes with such action, that flood control is a national obligation. Necessary appropriations are now made year by year to protect cities and towns and communities and farm lands from the devastating floods of great rivers, because it cannot be done by private enterprise. That is utterly impossible. It must be done by the only agency the American people have for such a development. That is the Government of the United States.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I hold in my hand, Mr. President, what we may call a map, gotten out by the Power Authority of the State of New York. I think it is one of the most illuminating things that can be brought to the attention of the Senate. I want every Senator to look at it. What the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has said is very true, that what we have to do is to develop those natural resources that are ours.

Now, I call attention to the map, and I ask the Senator from Kentucky to look at it.

I call attention to a map which I hold in my hand on which are shown Federal projects completed or authorized all over the United States, except in the area in question. I point to the two projects which would be built if the joint resolution were passed. There are shown on the map in all 46 Federal projects all over the United States. Yet some Senators do not want to help the great area now under consideration.

The two black rings I point to are at Niagara Falls and on the St. Lawrence. They are the two projects which are contemplated to be built under the pending legislation. In all there are 46 Federal projects shown on the map, covering practically all the area of this country. Now when we ask that Congress authorize, not appropriate, money for, the project in question we hear certain persons say "No." Then we hear men of good judgment and long experience, such as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who has served his country so well in the House and in the Senate, pleading that we look after our own. Yet, either because of provincialism or for some other cause, there is opposition to the project. One Senator who occupied the chair not so long ago told me that yesterday he was contacted six times to oppose the project. Because of such opposition are we going to lose the higher view?

Mr. President, I propose to pin the map up on the wall in the rear of the Senate Chamber, so Senators can see it. The only section of the country which has not received its share of Federal projects is the section we are asking to have developed now, the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence section. We are not asking that Congress give any money, but that money be loaned for the project. The minute we ask for a loan every possible impediment is thrown in our way, every possible false suggestion is thrown out that the project will not work, that it will not pay, that it is not practicable. It is charged that the St. Lawrence freezes over 4 months and 10 days in the year. Yet, as I stated a few moments ago, Montreal is the second largest port in America from the standpoint of volume. Through that port went 184,000,000 tons of traffic in the season of 1944.

So I ask Senators again to look at the map I hold in my hand, which was prepared by the Power Authority of New York, and ask themselves if it is not fair that this section be given a fair shake also.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is that not susceptible of being printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. I wish it were.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, is it not?

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will ask that it be printed in the RECORD——

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the map referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not propose to object, I should like to ask that there be printed alongside it a map also indicating the industrial development of the alleged provincial area. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will be kind enough to withdraw his statement respecting provincialism of an area which I think it will be found possesses 75 percent of the industrial development of the country, not as a result of Federal grants, but as the result of the enterprise, the ingenuity, and the diligence of the people who developed it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the printing of the map in the RECORD will require the consent of the Joint Committee on Printing before the order can be entered.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of that statement, I withdraw the request that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I do not mean to say that the area referred to by the Senator from Maine is provincial. I mean to say that some of those who represent the area are provincial in their approach to the problem we are considering. That was the intent of my remark. In view of the fact that the Senator has spoken about the industrial area of the East, I want to say that what many who represent the East are asking for now is more and more centralization of the industrial area in the East, in the atomic age, when industry ought to be decentralized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Maine and the people of Maine, and of New England, upon their industrial development.

Mr. WILEY. So do I.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been all through New England, and I am glad New England has had such development. But if they have been able to develop their industry without the St. Lawrence River improvement, how much more would they have been able to accomplish had the St. Lawrence River improvement been in existence.

Mr. BREWSTER. Perhaps the people of Maine are a little suspicious of Greeks bearing gifts.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt if they are suspicious of all Greeks bearing gifts. That will call for a definition of who the Greeks who are bearing gifts are in this particular instance.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. We do not want Greeks withholding from us that which is our inheritance.

There has been talk about building up the East into a great industrial center. I want to say to those representing

the East that it was the iron ore from the Middle West that made it possible. It was the iron ore that made it possible for the great skyscrapers to be erected. It was the iron ore which made it possible for the development of all of the great industries the East now has. Now that the East has taken that ore from us to the tune of 2,000,000,000 tons, we ask them to give us a break, to open up the arteries of traffic so that America can have a fifth coast line. There are some rapids in the St. Lawrence which stop the natural flow of the traffic through the river, although 184,000,000 tons of traffic pass through the port of Montreal in 1 year. But now some say, "No, we are a little afraid of doing what is proposed by the joint resolution, because it might hurt us."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I listened to the Senator from Maine, and I heard him say something about 75 percent of the industrial development being in New England.

Mr. BREWSTER. No; I said in the Northeast.

Mr. AIKEN. In the Northeast?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to call attention to the fact that the industrial activity in the Northeast has been steadily dropping in relative importance now for the last 30 years, and has been spreading out over other parts of the country. It does not mean that the total volume of the production in the Northeast has dropped, but the relative importance of the Northeast in the national economic picture has dropped.

I am supporting the St. Lawrence seaway for the same reason that I would support it if it were in the State of Utah or in Montana or Arkansas, or wherever it might be. The reason is that we have become a Nation of very short distances. It requires only a few hours to go across the continent. The welfare of one section of the country is inextricably interlocked with the welfare of every other section. When we get into emergencies, as we did at the beginning of the last war, it requires the agricultural resources and the industrial resources of every part of the country to carry us through. When the late war began the War Production Board got out a map showing where it would be possible to expand industry to meet the war needs. This map showed where power was available for expansion of industry. Of course, we expanded industry in all areas, because our plants were not working to capacity, and we did use existing plants' capacity wherever they happened to be. But there were shortages of power for expansion of industry in a radius not many miles away from Buffalo and Niagara Falls. Western New York suffered the greatest shortage of power. The areas which suffered the next greatest shortage of power were the rest of New York State, and New England, and I believe a small area in southern Illinois across the river from St. Louis, and also in southern Indiana. The areas nearest the St. Lawrence River and Niagara Falls were the shortest of power for the expansion of industry, and all through New England very few new plants were built—almost none at all. There were a few which were renovated, some which were expanded a little, but there were no new plants erected in New England, and hardly any in the Northeast at the close of the war. It was necessary to go elsewhere to secure low-cost war plants.

Mr. President, I expect this has been told to the Senate many times before. The Government constructed three aluminum plants, one at Massena, one on Long Island, and one in northern New Jersey, at a cost of between $70,000,000 and $80,000,000. Attempts were made to produce power in New York City from steam and send it to those plants, but it was found to be unworkable. Those plants were closed. One hundred million dollars was spent on the plant of the Aluminum Corp. of America, on the Saguenay River in Canada, which was acquired, I believe, from the Duke power interests, which still own a part of it. We spent $100,000,000 to develop that plant for them up there. Here was 2,200,000 horsepower going to waste at this single site on the St. Lawrence. Seven hundred horsepower was going to waste on the American side of the Niagara Falls. There was inability to expand industry in that area as it should have been expanded.

It was not very long ago that I received a copy of a letter from one of the Niagara chemical concerns advising me that they would have to cut their use of power 50 percent because it was not available for them.

I could read many headlines and articles dealing with shortage of power. I have here the Montpelier Evening Argus of December 31, 1947. The headline is as follows:

Power shortage threatening Vermont. Low water likely to paralyze four counties.

The article continues:

A power shortage, created by low water, threatened today to paralyze industries employing thousands of persons in four northern Vermont counties.

Here is an advertisement by a power company in the Newport (Vt.) Express, calling upon their customers to cut down their use of electricity as much as possible because of the shortage of power. They asked the people not to use colored lights for the children's Christmas trees this year in Vermont because there was not power enough. How can our colleagues from any of the Rocky Mountain States oppose the development of power to operate our plants and at the same time come before the Congress and ask for money to develop their regions? I am for developing their regions; but I do not think anyone from any part of the United States has any right to adopt the selfish attitude of opposing giving us living conditions for our farms, homes, and industries in the Northeast, and at the same time expect us to go all-out in supporting whatever they want for expansion in their own communities. I feel that I can say this because I have never voted against the development of natural resources in any State in the Union where it was economically feasible. I ask those from other sections to do for their country what they would be doing for themselves and for their country by developing resources in their own communities.

Mr. BARKLEY. A while ago the Senator read a message from Messina, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I am not mistaken, the plant at Messina was compelled to close because of lack of power.

Mr. AIKEN. It was.

Mr. BARKLEY. And is now idle.

Mr. AIKEN. It was idle. An earlier telegram which I read showed that last week 94 men had been laid off because of power shortage at Messina.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps the Senator answered this question when I was not in the Chamber. As one who has been termed a provincial because of my opposition to the seaway, I should like to say to the Senator that I am in favor of the power project. I believe that the power project should be built. During the last half-hour of discussion I have heard nothing except the power end of this project. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky if he has considered and if he would favor the building of the project as a power project alone, until we know more about the practicability of the seaway under modern conditions than we know now.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I wish to be frank with the Senator. I am for the entire seaway and power project. I do not believe it is advisable to handle this project piecemeal and build a power plant somewhere on the St. Lawrence River. Private enterprise, which must act upon the profit motive, would not feel that there would be a sufficient return on the investment to justify developing the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did not mean to say that it should be built privately. It should be similar to a TVA project. Of course, the separation of the power project from the rest of the undertaking would eliminate a very substantial expense. While no figure is given, I think it would cut the expense to less than half.

Mr. BARKLEY. The building of a power plant at some point on the St. Lawrence River, even by the Government, would be cheaper than the building of the entire project; but it would be only one segment of the entire program, which I think should be carried forward as a whole.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. In connection with the question raised regarding Messina, it is my understanding that the Messina aluminum plant is still in operation, and is in fact producing a great deal of aluminum from time to time, but is not able to produce anything like what would be possible if the power development were available. In that connection I shall have more to say on this subject tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion. I do not claim to have any familiarity with the situation at Messina. I do not know how many plants are there which could operate on a more extensive basis if they had the power. Evidently they do not have the power to operate at full capacity. If there are any that are shut down—and I was told that there was one that was idle because of lack of power—that is an additional factor.

Mr. IVES. Alumirum is still being produced there.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from New York refers to the original aluminum plant.

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. And not the new one which was built by the Government during the war.

I was interested to hear the Senator from Massachusetts say that he would favor a TVA for the St. Lawrence River. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that he would favor a TVA for the St. Lawrence River area?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I used the expression "TVA" as a symbol to indicate a public-power project. I would be in favor of a public authority, provided the Federal Government kept control of it, so that all areas which could be served by it would be fairly and equally treated.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask if the Senator from Massachusetts would favor the development of public power for the Connecticut River, which is close to home? The Senator must know that the city of Holyoke is running out of power.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am on record in favor of the policy of considering that question and looking into it to see how it would affect conditions up there, and whether such a project would be feasible and practicable.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question that it would force the New England power companies to reduce their rates, and provide more power for people who need it. I was hoping that the Senator from Massachusetts would be as ardent in favoring development of public power for Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire as he is for New York and other areas.

The point raised by the Senator from Massachusetts is a part of the old tactics which have been used against the seaway for almost a generation—the policy of divide and conquer. Some will say, "We are for the power, but not the navigation." Others will say "We are for the navigation, but not the power." The New York financial interests, which control both the railroads and the power companies, are saying, "We are for the Missouri Valley system. We must have that first. If we appropriate money for the St. Lawrence, there wil be no money for reclamation in the West, and for the Missouri Valley." Those who are saying that are just as dead set against the development of the Missouri Valley as they are against the development of the St. Lawrence River; but they are adopting these divide-and-conquer tactics. I hope that no one will be misled by the Senator from Massachusetts repeating the arguments which the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have been feeding the public and the Congress for years.

Let me read from a letter which I have received from the president of the Hartford Electric Light Co., 266 Pearl Street, Hartford, Conn. The letter is dated December 11, 1945. In reference to the St. Lawrence development, the writer said:

> Even today I would favor it if the enabling legislation required that all power developed is to be sold at the bus to private distributing companies under the proviso that all savings effected by the purchase and resale of federally generated power shall be passed on to the ultimate consumer as directed and regulated by the appropriate regulatory authority.
>
> S. FERGUSON,
> *President.*

Mr. Ferguson, who operates perhaps the best electric system in New England, came to see me about this subject, and intimated that the power companies would support the development of the St. Lawrence if they could be assured of 100 percent of the power, and that the REA and the municipal systems in northern New York and New England would get none of it except what they bought through the private system.

I have always felt that Mr. Ferguson was sent here by the New England power group to size up the situation and see what could be done toward making a trade. But no trade was made on my part, because in my judgment the power from the seaway and any additional power at Niagara should be developed for the benefit of all the people, and not for the particular benefit of half a dozen or more men who hold the reins of our economy in their hands and can turn it this way or that way according to their own personal or collective whims.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont and other Senators for their contributions by way of interruptions. I wish now to proceed and bring my remarks to a close. I have already extended them far beyond my original intention.

Natural gas is a natural resource of this country. Coal is a natural resource. Petroleum is a natural resource. It so happens that the profit motive has been sufficiently strong to induce men to develop these natural resources by the investment of private capital in the hope that profits would flow from the investment; and, by and large, their investment has been justified. But none of these things are any more natural resources than are the rivers of the United States. They are just as much a natural resource as are any of the commodities which lie under the ground. The rivers which flow by and through our States are natural resources.

It so happens that the profit motive cannot be sufficiently justified to induce the investment of large sums of money in the development of these great waterways. It cannot be done by any agency except the Government of the United States. The question which we are called upon to decide is whether the people of the country are to be deprived of the use of the natural resource of which I am speaking merely because it involves a governmental expenditure which is indispensable to the development, and, in a particular case, because it involves an agreement between the United States and the Dominion of Canada.

Objection has been made to the pending joint resolution because it is not a treaty, but is a mere agreement. I shall not go into the long history of executive agreements. Any Senator who has an open mind and is willing to be guided by the history of executive agreements will find that almost from the very beginning of our history executive agreements were entered into between this country and other countries.

On yesterday I referred to the waters of the lower Colorado River and said there had been an executive agreement between the United States and Mexico involving the use of some of the waters of that river. I was quite peremptorily challenged on the ground that that was a treaty. The most recent act was in the form of a treaty, but back in 1909, before any of us here were Members of the Congress of the United States, there was an agreement between the United States and Mexico involving the distribution and control of the waters of the lower Colorado River.

There have been innumerable agreements that were not treaties. Sometimes they were made as the result of an act of Congress authorizing the President to make an agreement and thereby in advance ratifying the agreement which he might make, such as the trade agreements which have been in existence for some time. They are not treaties. Congress authorized the President to make those agreements. They were not brought back here to be passed on by the Senate by a two-thirds vote, or even by a majority vote, because consent had been given in advance.

In other cases agreements have been made and submitted to the Congress for ratification of both Houses. There is a certain field within which we permit agreements between this country and another nation to be made by executive agreement or by treaty. The Executive has very wide discretion in determining what shall be done within that field.

In this particular case numerous commissions have been appointed by the two Governments to investigate the St. Lawrence waterway. Every one of them has recommended the project. One of them was presided over, I believe, by former President Hoover. If I am mistaken about that I will stand corrected, but I know Mr. Hoover was appointed as chairman of an American group which recommended this seaway.

Every bridge which has been constructed across the St. Lawrence River has been constructed in accordance with an agreement, and not under a treaty. We have passed bills authorizing the construction of bridges across the St. Lawrence River with a proviso that the law should be effective and the bridge should be constructed if and when the Government of Canada likewise approved its construction. A treaty was not necessary. That was a case in which Congress itself initiated the matter by passing a law giving consent for the construction of a bridge, with a provision that it should not take effect un-

less and until the Canadian Government approved it. I think that in nearly all cases the Canadian Government has approved, and I have no doubt that in every case there were informal negotiations between the two Governments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator understands, does he not, that those bridges were constructed and other works undertaken under the provisions of the treaty of 1909?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that is correct. But what I want to call to the Senator's attention is that yesterday we heard the opposition refer repeatedly to the sanctity, the dignity, and the morality of international agreements. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that when the private power interests were constructing a dam across the St. Johns River between the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick, we did not hear a word about the sanctity, the dignity, and the morality of an action of that kind. The opposition never raised their voice against the construction of dams across international waters until it was proposed to construct a dam across the St. Lawrence River for the benefit of all the people.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, just a word regarding the matter of agreements. I have no doubt, so far as my studies have gone, that this is a legitimate exercise of the power of the President of the United States to enter into an executive agreement. The mere fact that it involves a little different situation from that which was involved in the agreement between the United States and Mexico with reference to the Colorado River does not vitiate the right of the President to enter into such an agreement. The mere fact that it involves an international waterway which can only be improved by agreement between the two nations does not vitiate the right of the President to enter into an agreement.

I listened all day yesterday to vociferous and vehement opposition because this is an agreement rather than a treaty. But the record shows that when the matter was here in the form of a treaty in 1934 the Senators who now object because it is an agreement voted against it at that time because it was a treaty. They are now opposed to the joint resolution because it involves an agreement.

In what form could we bring it into the Senate to induce its opponents to support it? Now that they oppose it because it is an agreement instead of a treaty, how can they square their present opposition with their opposition in 1934 when a treaty was involved and was submitted to the Senate and defeated on a vote of 49 to 47? It received a majority vote, but not a two-thirds vote.

The fact that it was defeated as a treaty in no way forecloses the right of the President or of Congress to present it, because the President has a wide discretion within that field in the exercise of his power to make an agreement under his Presidential powers. We have the power, in requiring agreements among the States and with foreign nations, to bring it here as an agreement. We have the same power to do it by an agreement or by an act of Congress that we have to provide for the navigation of our inland waterways. Every bridge which has ever been built across a navigable stream in the United States was built under the commerce clause of the Constitution. Every dam which has been built, every improvement made on our navigable streams to deepen them and make them available all the year round for traffic and commerce, has been built and made under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States. Obviously we cannot do that with respect to an international waterway by any unilateral action of our own. We cannot pass an act of Congress to improve the St. Lawrence River. We must have an agreement with Canada in order to do that. That agreement has been made under the authority which I think has been confirmed over and over for more than a century on the part of the Supreme Court, not the Supreme Court referred to yesterday in contemptuous terms, which might decide anything now because of its composition, which I did not think was a very happy allusion to that Court. Long before the present personnel became members of the Supreme Court it had acted for more than a century and had sanctioned agreements of this kind made by Presidents of the United States.

So, Mr. President, I support this resolution and this project because I think we have the power to do it in the exercise of control and regulation of commerce with a foreign country—in this case Canada. I support it because I believe it is economically necessary. It is an investment and not a grab; it is an investment of money which will be returned to the United States. It is and must be an investment out of the Treasury, because there is no corporation and no combination of corporations and individuals in the United States that can improve the St. Lawrence River by private funds. The only way it will ever be improved is by the Government of the United States with the Government of Canada, both nations sharing the responsibility and the obligation.

I support the resolution, Mr. President, because not only will it provide for a great waterway, which we need, but it will be a source of great power which we may need even sooner than we may need the waterway. I support it because I think it is in the interest of national defense. I know the project will be constructed some day. I have no more doubt about the fact that some day the St. Lawrence waterway will be constructed than I have that we have already built the Panama Canal and improved many of the rivers of the United States. The Senate of the United States may delay the project, but it cannot ultimately defeat it.

I hope the joint resolution will be agreed to by the Senate and by the House, and that it will be approved in the form in which it has been submitted, so that these two great nations may make use of this great national resource between them. I hope that construction of the work will be begun so that we may have the project available for our people at the earliest possible date.

I regret that I have been impelled to consume more time than I had intended. The interruptions have been helpful to me, and, I hope, to the Senate, and I thank the Members of the Senate for allowing me to intrude upon their patience so long.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway project. I am opposed to this fantastic idea of spending around a billion dollars of the overburdened taxpayers' money to build another transportation system partly on foreign soil. The stench of two similar squander-maniacal projects has not yet assumed an attar-of-roses odor. I refer to the scandalous Alcan Highway and the Pan-American Highway. Of these three brain blisters, this St. Lawrence waterway is the worst.

In the first place, I have heard of no lack of transportation facilities for getting everything that is loose in this Nation shipped out and given away to foreign lands. Everything seems to be moving out rapidly enough. Our present transportation systems appear to have been adequate enough to ship out of the country more of our foodstuffs than we can safely spare, thus causing prices of food products to our American consumers to soar to unprecedented heights. So, why squander more millions to build more unnecessary transportation systems?

In the second place, if we just must squander or get rid of these hundreds of millions of dollars, which some people apparently think are burning holes in the pockets of Uncle Sam's $260,000,000,000 "deficit pants," then why not dredge out some rivers in our own country, which empty into the ocean along our own coast line? Inasmuch as we are generously blessed with 3,561 miles of seacoast on the Atlantic side of our Nation, 1,872 miles on the Pacific side, and 2,908 miles on the Gulf coast, it appears to me that we have enough seacoast of our own so that we need not spend hundreds of millions of dollars to provide facilities to use the seacoast of some foreign nation for our exports and imports.

I realize that under this strange bipartisan-New Deal arrangement, it seems out of order for any public servant not under its spell, to suggest doing something beneficial for the people of our own Nation; but assuming it is still permissible, I suggest that instead of fixing up export facilities on foreign soil or which are subject to control by foreign nations, we could better improve the transportation system for handling domestic shipments within our own borders, so as to prevent the fuel shortages which are causing so much suffering and discomfort to a very large segment of our own people at this very moment.

If the railroads were not cuffed and cussed, regimented and abused, and scared so much by this gang of scheming totalitarian-minded New Deal bureaucrats, they might feel safe to risk more capital to buy additional tank cars to transport fuel oil from the oil fields to the homes and factories in our own Nation.

The same thing applies to the transportation of wheat from the railroad sidings to the consuming centers. Millions of bushels of wheat had to be piled on the ground in the open weather where much of it spoiled or wasted simply because the railroads did not have enough boxcars to handle this most important food commodity during the wheat harvesting season.

Also, our public highways are now so worn out, outmoded, obsolete, and cluttered up that it is extremely dangerous for our American citizens to use them. Our entire Nation-wide highway system needs to be rebuilt for use by our own citizens—the taxpaying public. Also, if one wants to do something really beneficial to transportation, Mr. President, let him start at the receiving end of the transportation line. Let him go back to the farms and ranches and see how the producers of food for this Nation have to drive through muddy or sandy cow-trail roads and ford creeks and rivers to get their produce from farm to market. That is where transportation money should be spent, on farm-to-market roads, instead of being squandered for a spillway from the top of our Nation to some other Nation's seaport that is frozen up 5 months in the year.

There have been tomes of statistics recited on the Senate floor. Much argument and debate has poured forth. It has all been very interesting. I am not criticizing the views expressed. I am condemning the whole idea.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I should like the indulgence of the Senate to offer some considerations in respect to the pending legislation, the joint resolution approving the St. Lawrence seaway.

Confronted by serious world problems, affecting every phase of the lives of our people, we may well ask, "Is this the time for such a project as the proposed St. Lawrence seaway?"

At a time when our people are woefully short of housing, when transportation systems and industries are experiencing difficulty in replacing their warworn equipment and when hospitals cannot be built, and much-needed harbor improvements, reclamation and flood-control projects cannot be undertaken because of the shortage of critical materials and manpower; at a time when we are being asked, and are planning to give freely of our substance to the rehabilitation of Europe, which will place an even greater strain on our scarce materials—at this time when inflation is lapping at the national structure—we are asked to add further to the scarcity of materials and to the inflationary pressures by embarking upon this project.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Maryland. He understands, does he not, that the resolution is nothing but an authorization?

Mr. O'CONOR. I so understand.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator also understands, does he not, that it authorizes the President to enter into arrangements in reference to tolls, and so forth? I am sure the Senator must understand that not one cent can be spent on the project until an appropriation has been made.

Mr. O'CONOR. I so understand, but I am equally clear in my understanding, I will say to my friend from Wisconsin, that with favorable action by this body at this time, it will of course be a definite expression of the desire, and by way of instruction, as it were, that the project should proceed. I hope to develop this in the statement which I am about to make.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wanted to ask a question in that connection. I think that a study of the undisputed facts shows that about three or three and one-half billion dollars is authorized for projects, but it is not an appropriation. This is my point. In view of the dire prophecies that have been made by many economists and others, that eventually the bubble, as they call it, will burst, I am asking the Senator if it would not be wisdom on our part to build up a group of projects that would not be classified as WPA projects, and to have them ready to meet the impact of the bursting of any bubble. Would not that be the part of wisdom?

Mr. O'CONOR. I will say in answer to the Senator that I think it would be unwise to give approval now to a dubious project like this, merely to anticipate some wholly unforeseeable future emergency. If the Senator will bear with me throughout the presentation of that statement, I hope to convince him that now is not the appropriate time to embark upon this as a long-range proposition.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I want to express this thought: The Senator argues that this is not the time. Time for what? Does he mean it is not time for the authorization, or does he mean it is not time for construction?

Mr. O'CONOR. I will say in answer to the Senator that I do not think it is the time to give approval, which approval will be construed as an authorization to proceed forthwith.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator. I think he has made himself clear.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, this project has been reappearing before this body for several decades, but I doubt that ever before its appearance has been so ill-timed.

There is no one who knows the future of Europe. The United States is trying mightily to hold it together, body and soul, or rather the western half of it. But certainly no one can predict with any confidence what the future state of trade between those countries and the United States will be. This is also true of trade with the Orient.

One thing is known. World trade, insofar as this country is concerned, has been deteriorating for many years. It is not necessary to debate the reason for the deterioration. Regardless of the reason, it has been a one-way affair, which our economists generally agree is an impossible situation.

America did a land-office, one-way, foreign trade during the war. It is doing a land-office, one-way foreign trade now. Manifestly, this cannot continue. It is a subsidized trade, borne by the American taxpayers.

I am only seeking to point out, Mr. President, the complete uncertainty of future world trade.

Yet our people are being asked here to set up another transportation system to handle this trade. What trade? To and from what countries?

Is there anyone who can say if and when vessels will again move freely between the ports of this country and those of Europe and Asia, bearing to them our surplus goods and bringing to us their exports? Do the proponents of this measure expect an early lifting of the iron curtain? Is not the practice of block bargaining which Hitler intimated still the trend?

Advocates of this project may visualize oceangoing vessels leaving the harbor of Leningrad, of Helsinki, the harbors of the Scandinavian ports, of Bremen and Hamburg, the British ports, Le Havre, of the Far, Near, and Middle East, laden with cargoes for the people of the central United States and Middle West, moving slowly up the St. Lawrence, through a system of locks and canals and eventually reaching the ports of the Great Lakes. In turn, they visualize the sending back to these countries over the same laborious route, of their surplus of grain and other products of their soil and industry.

A great navigational accomplishment will have been achieved here, Mr. President, the accomplishment of bypassing the eastern ports. A navigational accomplishment that should dwarf Magellan's circumnavigation of the globe.

I cannot see that it would have been a vital accomplishment back in the time of normal world trade. Certainly it would not be a vital accomplishment now when the only so-called world trade is that which the Middle West and the rest of Americans are paying for.

One could say in passing that, even if the project were now completed, its proposed 27-foot depth would not accommodate the vessels which the project's proponents seek. But aside from that, and without again bringing up a question which has been so thoroughly thrashed out in this body, it can be pointed out that the inescapable trend now, in ocean commerce, as elsewhere, is toward speed and increased size, not toward canals and locks.

For example, our steamship lines are worried about the competition of steadily developing transoceanic airways and insisting they cannot survive unless they are permitted to operate airways in connection with their water-borne carriers. But more to the point is the fact that in the matter of the water-borne carriers the trend is toward larger and more economically operated vessels.

Our present Liberty ships could not use a 27-foot depth which permits vessels of a 24-foot draft. They have a mean draft of 28 feet and possibly 32 feet when under way and loaded.

Last November the President's advisory committee on the merchant marine told of the trend toward bigger ships. It recommended a 4-year plan of construction of passenger vessels drawing 32 to 35 feet. More important to the subject we are considering, this committee recommended that the first tankers built under this program should draw 32 feet and the first cargo vessels 29½ feet. Manifestly none of these vessels could use a 27-foot channel which is proposed for the St. Lawrence waterway.

We are concerned now with the area east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio. With the growth of the country, a great transportation system has developed by which goods destined for foreign ports move by rail and highway down to the seaboard, there to be loaded in oceangoing vessels. Conversely, our imports come to our ports and thence are carried to the interior by rail and highway.

This is not a set-up that was created by one massive blueprint. It developed step by step over a period of time. It was a natural development, perfected by the energies and talents of our people. Communities, large and small, have grown up. A definite way of living has been evolved.

In this area the railroads employ 560,000 workers; the coal industry 325,000. American ships in Atlantic and Gulf trade employ 42,000.

To these are added 55,000 longshoremen who work in this area. Related groups, such as truckers, stevedores, warehousers, brokers, pilots, tugmen, and their families bring the total involved up to not less than 4,000,000 persons on the Atlantic seaboard and Gulf areas directly dependent for their livelihood on the successful operation of the railroads, steamship lines, and coal mines.

The direct effect upon this number of people, if the seaway were built and if it should accomplish what its proponents claim it will accomplish, cannot be estimated, but the fact remains that with the industries certain to be adversely affected, lowered incomes, unemployment, part-time work, and loss of taxes to communities would be bound to follow.

What possible justification is there to enter upon such a gigantic experiment, involving so much loss and offering so little positive assurance of proven benefit?

Much has been heard lately from officials well versed in Government financing of the vital necessity of reducing the huge burden of debt which now oppresses American business and individuals alike. It is generally agreed that a national debt of $250,000,000,000 is dangerous in the extreme, and would prove a veritable millstone around our national neck in the event of a future war emergency of anything like the character of World War II. And more and more each day we hear warnings that just such an emergency is possible.

Along with the demand for debt reduction, and, indeed, as a necessary part of any efforts along this line, is the urgent need for national economy. By this is not meant the type of economy that would forego all projects except those in which we personally are interested, but an economy that will impartially study every proposal for the expenditure of governmental funds, and approve or reject such a proposal strictly on the basis of its vital need and its benefits to the country generally.

Inasmuch as it now seems clear, even from the very inadequate financial details available, that the completion of such a project would entail over-all expenditures that might well exceed a billion dollars, it would seem that there is quite a definite relation between any such proposed expenditure and our admitted need for reducing rather than increasing our national obligations.

Only a few years ago, when Liberty loans and later Victory loans of huge magnitude were required to finance the conduct of the war, our people gave their support in the very well-defined belief that such tremendous national budgets as were the rule during those years, were extraordinary expenditures of which there would be no recurrence once the war was ended.

Many persons interested in governmental spending urge that before giving approval to the projected expenditure of a possible billion dollars for any new venture, we should seriously consider the effect upon what we know to be the proper national financial policy. They believe we should refuse to approve any such project unless it can be clearly and indisputably shown that it is first of all urgent, and, secondly, that it will be beneficial to the great mass of people in our country and not entail losses out of proportion to the benefits derived.

Certainly, if we use the yardstick of urgency in considering the St. Lawrence seaway project, a study of the record will show that it is no more urgent now than it was when the idea was first envisioned decades ago. America and the midwestern section of our country have both gotten along wonderfully throughout the year without a 27-foot channel from the Great Lakes to the ocean. And, in times of war and peace, there has been no particular belief generally that America was failing to do its duty by the people of that area in not providing a passage to the sea for heavier vessels.

If we take the second necessary consideration, that of general benefit to the people of the United States, we find as wide a divergence of opinion, with as many tortuous channels and dangerous rapids, as the St. Lawrence seaway, if ever completed, would provide.

Against the claimed benefits for the people of the Great Lakes section, we can balance much more definite damage to the already established transportation and port facilities of the Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf. The interested Government agencies do not agree upon a definite figure of the expected tonnage. The Department of Commerce has expressed the belief that with a 27-foot channel it will be possible to transport 16,000,000 tons of cargo. Of this, the claim is made that approximately 10,000,000 tons would be additional to that now using the various canals existing along the waterway.

By additional tonnage, they mean merely additional to the St. Lawrence. They do not emphasize that most of this 10,000,000 tons of freight will be taken away from the already established ports of Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Buffalo, New Orleans, and Norfolk.

They fail to mention what such a decrease in tonnage would do to these well-established ports, with their hundreds of millions of dollars worth of port facilities, their thousands of port workers. And they overlook, as well, the other millions of dollars that would be required to make the lake ports usable for vessels requiring a 27-foot channel.

We are not informed how much of this 10,000,000 additional tons of cargo would be taken from the carriers which now serve that area, during the 7 months or less when the waterway would be free of ice for passage of vessels. Nor are we advised how these carriers, deprived of that huge amount of traffic 7 months during the year, could have available the necessary stand-by facilities to care for the full traffic of that region when ice closes the waterway to the sea.

I do not approach this question from a sectional point of view. In the determination of this all-important subject it would be unfortunate if the decision turns on the special interests of a particular area or section of our country, but that is not to say that grave losses to individual localities, when considered together, would not in the aggregate constitute a calamitous loss to the country as a whole.

The adverse effect upon the port of Baltimore with its millions of dollars of capital investment in port facilities, in which the Federal Government is vitally interested as a contributor, and also with its 15,000 port workers, plus the adverse effect upon the ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Norfolk, New Orleans, and of many others, when considered all together represent a distinct and irreparable loss to the economy of the country as a whole.

Baltimore's value to the Nation as a clearance point for millions of tons of imports and exports each year has been established. During the war a large portion of overseas shipments passed through our port's facilities. Since the war, volume has increased until during a portion of the past year Baltimore led the Nation's ports in imports and was among the very top ports of the country in combined water tonnage handled.

Not only would Baltimore suffer, but the same thing would happen to every port of any consequence along the Atlantic seaboard. To a great extent, therefore, the additional traffic handled on the St. Lawrence seaway would not be additional traffic at all, but merely tonnage transferred from some other port, to be carried at a great expense far up the Atlantic seaboard and down the winding 1,800 mile stretch of river and lake until it arrived at its destination.

If the St. Lawrence project were of real benefit, one would suppose that the shipping interests of the country would be the first to acclaim it. Have they done so? The record does not show this to be the case. The large lines serving Baltimore, almost without exception, have expressed themselves as being uninterested in using the proposed facilities.

Among others, the following have expressed themselves, in some cases vigorously, to the effect that they would not be interested in sending their vessels into the St. Lawrence seaway: Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.; United States Lines Co.; Alcoa Steamship Co., Inc.; Grace Line, Inc.; Calmar Steamship Corp.; American South African Line, Inc.; United Fruit Co.; Stockard Steamship Corp.; Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc. Their unanimous opposition hardly indicates that the seaway offers any great advantage to shippers, or indeed that the seaway can attract anything like the volume of tonnage which its proponents claim for it.

It is impossible to determine the feasibility of this project without more definite and authoritative information as to the extent of tonnage to be transported and the rates of charges or tolls to be levied. The only limitation is the provision that in no event is the toll charge to exceed the equivalent of $1.25 per ton of laden cargo.

The question of division of tolls among the governments is, of course, a determinative one. Until some decision, even a tentative one, is reached on this question, no final conclusion can be reached that the project would be self-liquidating. Apropos of this, it is necessary to state that the data thus far presented by the Department of Commerce, the United States Army Engineers, and by others is not convincing that a sufficient amount of cargo would be transported to make this project self-liquidating.

In this connection, already suggestions have been advanced that, inasmuch as the proposed 27-foot channel would not permit heavily laden Victory or Liberty ships to use the facility, the channel depth might be increased to 30 feet. Engineering authorities have been quoted as warning that a 30-foot depth was the least that should be planned. They further declare that to keep the initial construction on a 27-foot channel basis and later to attempt to deepen it, would entail an exorbitant outlay.

Furthermore, we cannot ignore the consideration that the subject matter involved in this issue is one which should be covered by treaty rather than by agreement between the two countries. Persuasive arguments presented on this point here on the Senate floor should certainly be considered by every Senator. If the question is surrounded by such doubts as to warrant such forceful argument as has been made, might it not be a question with which to be concerned as to whether we would be involved in litigation for the next decade if the project were to be authorized by such a questionable method as under the form of agreement rather than by treaty?

Because one of the ever-present arguments in any proposal for favorable action has to do with the matter of national defense, and the proponents of the seaway stress its value to our country during an emergency, attention must also be given to this angle of the situation.

In the first place, the greatest portion of the seaway would be within the borders of another nation—an extremely friendly nation, we cheerfully admit—but the seaway would still be outside the borders of the United States and, as such, beyond our control even though the United States would have expended the major portion of the funds required for its construction.

As to the claim that it would open up a vital, protected area for war industries, particularly shipbuilding, during an emergency, it is well known, and it is admitted in every discussion of air power that in this age of long-range bombers and transpolar flights the Great Lakes area would be more accessible to an aggressor than would the now established Atlantic ports. If a war were to be waged only in the summertime, there would be a certain advantage, possibly, in the seaway. During the winter months, however, its value from a defense standpoint would be highly questionable, because everything would be ice-bound, and any ships constructed would have to wait until the arrival of warm weather before they could be launched and dispatched to their destination.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very pleased to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Senator speaks of navigation being stopped in the wintertime. Practically all the iron ore brought into the blast furnaces comes by way of the Great Lakes from the Mesabi range. We have a winter season now, and we have had it in the past. We shall probably have a winter season in the future.

Mr. O'CONOR. I well understand the force of the observation made by my friend from Minnesota; but I suggest that if there were any appreciable increase, such as is claimed by the proponents of this measure, the extent of the increase would, of course, add to the uncertainty of transportation when ice conditions in the St. Lawrence would make transportation impossible.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say, first, that I appreciate the very complete character of the Senator's speech. I think it is a very real contribution to the subject.

I should like to ask him whether it is not true that when we look at the project from the standpoint of national defense, leaving out the economic factor, it is essential that any kind of national defense installation shall be usable throughout the year. While it is undoubtedly true, as the Senator from Minnesota says, that the freezing of this waterway for 5 months in the year is not a vital consideration from an economic standpoint, because industry can stock pile, yet it is a very decisive factor when we examine this project as a factor in our national defense.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am obliged to the Senator from Massachusetts for his observation. The basis upon which I was attempting to make this point was related to the national defense aspect of the situation; and considering it from that viewpoint, I feel that that is certainly a very questionable undertaking.

Another point that deserves real consideration is raised by a Canadian writer who, after a study of the entire proposal, expresses the conviction that the havoc that could be created by bombing of the locks would be so great that this portion of the seaway would be a priority project of any aggressor. Among other things, he said, destruction of the locks would release such a flood of water that it would surely destroy a third of the city of Montreal. None is heard to deny that one or two well-placed bombs could destroy the locks and render the seaway unusable over an extended period, without any agents of a country inimical to the United States ever setting foot on United States territory.

The power angle of the project should not serve to gain approval by itself for the entire project. It appears to be the tail that is wagging the dog. The dams required for the power projects envisioned would be extremely costly, and absolutely uneconomical, if their cost had to be assigned to the power-development feature alone.

All in all, the whole St. Lawrence seaway project seems to be one that does not stand up under close inspection. A check of the previous hearings shows clearly that the Chief of Army Engineers was indeed reluctant to declare that the project could be self-liquidating and admitted that his data was not only old, but incomplete.

In these days of extensive financing, a billion dollars is not unheard of by the American public. If we are ever to get back to the kind of sensible economy that permitted the United States to grow strong and to retain its world leadership, we shall have to get back to a policy under which a billion-dollar project will be scrutinized 10 times as closely as a $100,000,000 project, and 1,000 times more closely than a million-dollar project. In other words, we shall have to begin once again to consider a billion dollars a great amount of money, and we owe it to our citizens to get in such a frame of mind right away.

If America is to fulfill its responsibilities to the needy nations of the world without imposing an insupportable burden upon our national economy, it is requisite that only essential expenditures be given approval at this critical period.

Conservation of our financial and physical resources is a must. In the other direction lie uncontrolled inflation and possible chaos. The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project is no more essential than other desirable reclamation and other public projects. It can be deferred without any provable serious detriment to sectional or national interests—certainly until such time, as the able Senator from Massachusetts pointed out several days ago, a more intensive survey as to the actual economic factors has been conducted. It cannot be approved without danger of serious further upset to our national economic balance. The Congress would be flying in the face of sound business practices to add this huge expense to a budget which already is dangerously high. I believe the interests of America as a whole require the defeat of this resolution, and I shall so vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I had not intended to undertake a discussion of this measure because of pressure of other duties which have prevented me from giving it the necessary study and doing the necessary research to substantiate with facts the conclusions which I have reached with respect to it. However, I feel that on issues of this magnitude and importance one ought to make his position clear. I am taking this occasion simply to record my views and to state why I cannot support this measure.

In the first place, assuming that the project is economically justified, and assuming that it is to our advantage and in our interest as a nation to incur this enormous expense, and assuming further that the benefits which would flow from it, either as a project for national defense or as a project affecting the economics of our Nation, would greatly improve and enhance our position, it is of such far-reaching magnitude that it involves, in a measure, our national sovereignty. Likewise it involves an obligation with respect to the sovereignty, in part, of our neighboring country.

A great deal has been said with regard to whether this document is in fact a treaty or an executive agreement; and much effort has been made in debate to sustain the position that even though it properly should be a treaty and not an executive agreement, the objectives can be accomplished in this way.

Let us grant that is true, Mr. President, for the sake of discussion at the moment. Assuming it can be done this way is the only thing with which we are concerned as Senators of the United States, the fact that it can be done legally in this way? Are we not a little more concerned than that? Should it be done this way? That should give us primary concern. The very fact that a thing can be done by subterfuge, however worthy it may be, does not justify resorting to that course of procedure. If it were not for the fact that the proponents—and I include the State Department and the administration—are of the opinion that the merits of this proposal do not carry with them the persuasion to influence a two-thirds majority vote of the Senate, there would have been written the title of "Treaty" instead of "Executive Agreement." This is a subterfuge. It is a device to circumvent the very fundamental law of the land. Even if it can be done legally, as the guardians of our liberty and of our fundamental law, I say the Senate should not permit it to be done by this procedure.

There is a great tendency by some in America to break down the Constitution and to distort it, to read into it interpretations which the founding fathers never even conceived or imagined. That is a process and practice, slow though it may be, which will ultimately destroy the Constitution of the United States. Where there is doubt—and certainly the course which this debate has taken does indicate great doubt among the best legal minds—where there is doubt, what is our responsibility? How should that doubt be resolved? It should be resolved in accordance with the plain letter and intent of the Constitution as written and adopted.

At the very inception of this undertaking a treaty was proposed and submitted for congressional approval. It was written first as a treaty. What caused the change? Who changed their minds, and why? Back of it, Mr. President, is political expediency. That is why today the words "executive agreement" have been substituted for the word "treaty." Let me suggest this to the Senate. If by that device the State Department and the present administration, or any other administration, can evade the plain mandate of the Constitution of the United States with respect to an international agreement and covenant of this magnitude and of this duration, which involves a part of the sovereignty of the two nations involved—if by this process it can be done, and the Senate, by a majority vote, should accept this procedure, then we shall have nullified for all time to come that provision of the Constitution requiring treaties to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Can the Senate possibly conceive of any other agreement respecting the national boundary between these two neighboring countries? Can the Senate possibly conceive of any other agreement that can ever be made which will be of any more importance than this one unless it should be a treaty of peace following war between the two countries? I cannot conceive that in the future there will ever be any reason, necessity, or opportunity for any more important agreement to be made between two countries than is this one. If we now are willing to take a device, however legal it may be, to circumvent the Constitution, and to do it by executive agreement, we are simply, in my humble judgment, failing in our duties and responsibilities to say to the State Department, the administration, and the proponents of this measure that we shall not encroach upon or sacrifice the fundamental law of this land for the sake of political expediency and the gaining of a desirable momentary objective.

If this project has in it genuine merit which will justify this country in assuming the obligation involved with respect to expenditures which will be required in order to do this work, if it can be justified on that basis, Mr. President, it can certainly receive a two-thirds vote of the Senate. The only reason it is presented in the form of an executive agreement, Mr. President, is to evade the plain mandates of the Constitution. With small measures pertaining to our own internal affairs and domestic economy we might sometimes be a little careless, and we are. In the pressure of duties we do not always weigh as carefully as we should, perhaps, the constitutional requirements. But in a matter of this magnitude it is dangerous for us to ignore them. Some may be complaisant about these dangers, these encroachments, these circumventions of the basic law of the land, but once we find a device to get around one plain mandate, the ingenuity of others will be employed to find another device to circumvent another section, article, and clause of the Constitution. It will become a habit—an established procedure, and that provision of the Constitution will be nullified.

We have it in our power in the United States Senate to vote an end to that practice. Once we turn down proposals of this kind and require the Constitution to be followed we shall have little trouble with respect to maintaining its dignity and preserving its integrity. We shall not have a lot of loose legislation. The practice of endeavoring to circumvent the Constitution will be discouraged. We also have it within our power to be careless and complaisant and let these dangers grow and increase, but I am unwilling, Mr. President, to be a party to that course or to sanction it by my vote.

Therefore I cannot vote for this resolution. If it were submitted as a treaty I could give more favorable consideration to it. It has been urged that this project is a great defense project necessary to our national security. I am not an expert on national security. I can well understand that the increase in production of hydroelectric energy and the development of our waterways, the implementing of our present navigation systems, and all those things go, it is true, to build a stronger nation. As a general proposition, Mr. President, I certainly favor the development of our waterways and our resources to their fullest potential, so as to convert them to the greatest service to humanity. This project may be economically justified. There is some doubt about it, but as a national defense project, Mr. President, except for the additional power which will be generated, I have serious doubt about it. I think we have only to read the statement of General Bradley, which is found on page 3 of the minority report, to be convinced—and it does not require military genius in order to understand it—that this seaway constructed with locks and dams as provided would simply present an exposed target on our border and in the neighboring country of Canada.

Mr. President, any military man of competent judgment and experience, and certainly those who participated in the last war or those who have seen the destruction which is wrought by one well-placed bomb, knows that it would take only one properly placed bomb at any time to put the whole project out of commission for the duration of a war. It is said that the proposed project could be defended, but General Bradley says it could not be.

Mr. President, what would be required to protect it as a national defense facility? How many airfields would have to be built around it, and how many men, airplanes, and other facilities would be required? Such items would amount to a great total expense. In the end, would the increased shipping and power be a net gain? Would they prove to be an asset or a liability in the event of war? I say, Mr. President, that on the basis of the evidence presented in the hearings and on the basis of the other information available, there is just as much to indicate that it would prove to be a liability as there is to substantiate the contention that it would be an asset, in time of war.

Whether this proposed project can be economically justified in regard to our domestic economy may be the subject of honest differences of opinion. As to the power project, Mr. President, I am convinced that enormous benefits would flow from it. Frankly, I should like to see it constructed for that reason. I should like to see both our Nation and our neighbor country of Canada utilize the great potentialities from the development of hydroelectric power. But I do not believe the claimed navigation benefits are at all substantiated by the testimony I have read in the hearings.

Mr. President, there has been some criticism here from those who say, "You believe in the power project, but you do not believe in the navigation project." I do not say I do not believe in the navigation project. Probably it, too, can be developed. But I believe it to be the inescapable, an irrefutable conclusion, based on the testimony developed at the hearings, that if this project is to be developed, there will have to be a far more extensive development than that which is provided for in the present proposal. Otherwise only half the benefits possible from this project will be made available, and the remainder will be destroyed or lost. If we are going to construct this project, let us do a thorough job of it. I know that some of our resources have been more or less wasted by reason of the lack of proper and adequate planning, construction, and improvement so as to develop the maximum benefits that might be made available.

Mr. President, as I have said, I had not planned a prepared speech. But I come now to another feature of the project which attracts my attention. Just how much effect the development of this waterway might have on the other economy of the Nation, I cannot say; but we know it would have a terrific impact on the finances of our Government. I know it may be said that a few hundred million dollars is not very much money; but before we get through with this proposed project we will have spent a billion and a half dollars. Suppose the seaway and the power plants are built, at the estimated cost, plus the increased cost which has accrued since the estimates were made. If we are to protect such an investment, it will be necessary to build air bases on both sides of the project, in our country and in Canada. Such bases and further developments will be required if the project is to be adequately defended in time of war. So before we are through with the project, the initial investment will, in my humble judgment, be a billion and a half dollars, at the very minimum.

Let me point out that I do not wish to see this project retarded, insofar as any part of it can be economically justified; but today we have on the statute books authorizations for some $6,000,000,000 worth of inland-waterway projects. If the proposed St. Lawrence project is authorized as a national-defense project, at this tremendous cost, and if as we go along with the program a recession comes and Federal revenues fall off and we have to curtail expenditures, where will the cuts be made? I can tell you where they will be made, Mr. President. They will be made on the inland waterways of this country. This St. Lawrence project, having been authorized, if it is, will have been authorized as a national-defense project; and then it will be argued and insisted upon that inasmuch as it is authorized as a national-defense project, we cannot afford to delay its construction. That would mean that it would be constructed at such a period, in all probability at the expense of the inland waterway improvements which already have been authorized, and many of which are well planned and ready for construction. The sum total and benefit of those projects, Mr. President, as a matter of implementation of national defense and enhancement of our domestic economy, will far exceed all the claimed benefits which can possibly flow from the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. President, my present reason, however, for opposing the St. Lawrence seaway is based on another objection. I should like to see these other phases of the St. Lawrence project given further study; and certainly if it is to be constructed, I should like to see the plans modified to such an extent as to provide for the maximum development and benefit from it. Such a development would cost more, of course; but whenever we do such a job, it should be well and completely done. But, Mr. President, I am unwilling to cast my vote for and give my sanction to the practice that is present in this instance, namely, the writing of the words "executive agreement" in place of the word "treaty," in a case which does involve a treaty, which is known to call for a treaty, which was conceived of as a treaty, and which was attempted to be executed as a treaty, although when it was found that it did not have the merit and the appeal and the persuasive force to muster support of two-thirds of the Members of this body, the device of an executive agreement was resorted to. I repeat, Mr. President, that even though such a step can be taken, that is not sufficient for me. Even though the proposed step might be termed legal by the present Supreme Court, that is not the controlling factor. The real issue with all of us should be whether this proposed step should be taken by means of subterfuge, for political expediency, and by circumventing the plain mandate of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there be printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Arkansas Democrat of January 28, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The proposed St. Lawrence seaway is up in Congress again. It would provide a channel 27 feet deep at the shallowest, from the Atlantic Ocean through the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes to Duluth, Minn., at the western tip of Lake Superior—a third of the way across the continent.

The estimated cost is about $675,000,000, of which $330,000,000 would be paid by the United States Government, $184,000,000 by Canada, and $161,000,000 by the State of New York.

No doubt there would be large benefits—to the northeastern part of this country and to Canada: cheaper shipping and a lot of electric power. But disadvantages are also pointed out, and they must have weight, or the project wouldn't still be hanging fire after a half century of agitation for it.

From our point of view down here it seems doubtful wisdom to provide for concentrating more industry and people in the already congested Northeast. It doesn't look sound as a factor in the Nation's defense.

The Nation will be stronger in every way, for peace or war, if it is more uniformly developed. And a project that would contribute much to this is the plan for the Arkansas River. Our Congressmen should urge attention to it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened to the argument of the Senator from Arkansas, and I want to say that, coming from the State of Wisconsin, I have always been proud of the fact that the Spooner Act, which brought into being the Panama Canal, was fathered by a predecessor of mine from Wisconsin. The Panama Canal did not help the Middle West, but it was a boon to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, and the west coast. In fact, the Middle West was placed at a competitive disadvantage, but the Senator from Wisconsin fathered the act in the national interest. I am proud of what it did for the national interest. I am glad we have today men who are not concerned simply about their States.

It was Justice Holmes who said that the Constitution is a living, growing, and pulsating organism. It was Patrick Henry who said, "Give me liberty or give me death," and then when it became a question of whether we should have a Constitution, he said, "No." He had not grown with the times. But men like Marshall, Washington, and Madison saw the need of national unity and national effort.

This is the first time the cat is out of the bag, and that men from the East have joined with the inland waterways boys claiming the seaway will injure their highways on the rivers, if it is completed.

I give the opponents this one word: If this matter becomes an issue, since we of Wisconsin have stood and will stand by the development of the Missouri and the Arkansas, we would like to see a little reciprocity of fair and open-minded consideration on the merits of the seaway resolution. We expect it to be realized that if there is to be an 8-foot, a 9-foot, or a 7-foot channel on a river, as happened in the case of the Mississippi, then it would be well from a national standpoint, and on its own merits, to have a 27-foot channel for just 100 miles on the St. Lawrence.

A little reciprocity of fair and open-minded consideration from each of us on the merits of measures of this character, regardless of their geographic origin, will of course properly benefit many sections, and in so doing will promote the general welfare. Without that kind of open-minded consideration, any appropriation bill relating in any way to any geographic area would face fights till hell freezes over—undesirable sectional fights, which none of us want.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. JENNER obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the distinguished Senator from Indiana is about to deliver an address on the so-called European recovery plan. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Morse
Baldwin	Green	Murray
Ball	Gurney	Myers
Barkley	Hatch	O'Conor
Brewster	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hayden	Overton
Bridges	Hill	Reed
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Jenner	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo	Saltonstall
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kem	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Taylor
Connally	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	Lucas	Thye
Cordon	McCarthy	Tobey
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McFarland	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Wilson
Fulbright	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, anyone acquainted with the realities of present-day Europe, its grinding pressures, its hunger, its spiritual starvation, must feel that wherever relief from this vast ugliness and injustice may be looked for—there we must make due search. This search must be made in full awareness that our Nation abroad is confronted with a new and sinister power bent upon an implacable mission of world domination.

We are not at peace. At best we enjoy but an uneasy armistice. At home we are already at grips with the evils of monetary inflation and propaganda appeals for the controls of state socialism.

It is in this spirit of humanity and humility and yet with these foreboding facts squarely before us that we must study to comprehend the veiled generalities of the so-called Marshall plan.

The United States Senate has never failed to show unmistakable sympathy for the peoples and the nations who need and have earned that sympathy. No upright person will ask or expect the United States Senate to be a "sucker" for nations which have not earned the right to our sympathy. The Senate will fail in the discharge of its responsibility if it fails to go beyond mere emotionalism and inquire fully and fearlessly into the underlying facts and into the nature and causes of the problems with which we are attempting to deal.

Indeed the decisive considerations must be the facts rather than any so-called general principles regarding the charitable obligations of this Nation in the matter of care and protection for other nations. A glance at the world deterioration of the past 12 months will reveal the all-encompassing reasons for a national policy of greatest care and most balanced judgment.

Scarcely a year ago America was still talking about one world. Less than 3 months ago the last conference of foreign ministers collapsed like a punctured balloon and notified the world that American diplomacy, under Mr. Truman, is little more than a system for announcing public disagreements publicly arrived at.

The past year has clearly revealed the frightfully precarious margin of time within which we can hope for exclusive custody of the power to destroy all civilization. It also disclosed in its ominous sunset the forbidding outline of the tens of millions who would exult to destroy us. There can be no denying a crisis in our national life and a crisis in world affairs.

There can be no denying our duty to determine the exact stuff of which this crisis is made. Just as in the crisis of President Lincoln's time, so in the crisis of our time, pernicious abstractions are everywhere being urged upon us. Among the most insidious of these, in my judgment, is the doctrine that the United States has a positive duty to give huge sums of money to European nations if it is to save the world from communism and chaos. This is said to be a calculated risk. It is clearly that dubious sort of risk for the success of which no one is yet willing to pledge his honor or give the least assurance that it is more than a gambler's chance. Taking gamblers' chances with our Nation's future was a recognized New Deal procedure. My mail indicates that America is now awake to the peril implicit in this procedure—and wants no more of it.

Indeed, under clear-eyed scrutiny, this calculated-risk business is credible only as a lively fiction intended to obscure the suffering that inevitably will follow for the American taxpayer. I know that many thoughtful Members of this Congress regard it as little better than a strange frolic of generous impulse, which might well imperil and disrupt our entire national structure.

It is obvious that the protection of our national integrity rests far less on the acceptance of formulas, in which agreement may be all too easy, than upon a correct appraisal of the actual purposes and the actual effects of our proposed conduct when applied to the facts of life in Europe.

It is the constitutional function of the Senate to guard the Nation's welfare in matters of foreign policy. It will be a crime against the people if we indulge in pernicious abstractions while resolutely shutting our eyes to the social, political, and economic facts of the present-day Europe.

In this connection, we should remember that there is nothing inevitable in history except as the acts of men make it so—and that unless we move with promptness and vigor to protect the strength of our own land, we shall shortly have precious little with which to help anyone anywhere in the world.

It seems to be a universal assumption that if the European crisis deepens or if European shortages continue, then Europe will turn in desperation to communism.

Apparently it has never occurred to anyone that Europe's crisis, if left to those responsible for it, could well lead to a demand, not for communism, but for a return to economic freedom. Indeed, there are already some signs of this. Italy has recently found it expedient to restore relative freedom in foreign exchange. France has found it necessary to drop some of its more important controls, and, only a few days ago, marked the franc down sharply toward its true worth.

Mr. Truman has been warning us about the dangers of providing "only half-hearted and halfway help." He has ignored the dangers of half-hearted and halfway self-support in Europe. Unless Mr. Truman is actually and secretly opposed to the American free-enterprise system, I doubt that he will deny the tremendous risk that funds supplied by the Marshall plan could make the situation in Europe sufficiently easy, for the time being at least, that they would serve in fact to delay or prevent a return in Europe of free markets and free enterprise upon which the economic health of the whole world is grounded.

I am not one of those who would discount the European problems that are a direct result of war damage. It is true, nevertheless, that in the whole of Socialist and neo-Communist Europe, production has been so disorganized and reduced by economic prohibitions and by the requirements of a special license for almost every economic act that the world-respected London economist has felt impelled to warn us that—

> What is planned is actually a series of bottlenecks.

With many others I believe that the most damaging single circumstance in the whole effort toward European recovery resides in the socialist economic controls that systematically suffocate its own capital production and investment. Former Premier Daladier of France recently declared in debate that inflation cannot be overcome in France as long as a managed economy prevails. There are many evidences in Britain that public faith in a managed economy is dying. Certainly, we are simple-minded and stupid if we embark on a program that amounts to nothing more than paying for French and Italian strikes.

While the typical European national budget is wretchedly unbalanced, it is still true that massive sums are being spent on armaments, on increasing pensions and family allowances, on nationalized industries operating under huge deficits, on food subsidies, and other forms of social security, while those governments blame their consequent economic distress on speculators and hoarders.

Indeed, both in Europe and America the whole subject of inflation requires the kind of clear intelligence which the London Economist gives us again when it pointed out recently that—

> Rising prices and inflation are associated together like scarlet fever and rising temperatures—but, so far from being the same thing, one is the cure for the other.
>
> Inflation is an excess of demand over supply and one way in which the two can be brought into balance is by such a rise in prices that the available supply satisfies the demand. * * * Nobody in his senses would advocate an indefinite rise in prices as an end in itself.
>
> But it does bring the inflation to an end whereas holding all prices down merely guarantees that it * * * shall go on forever.

There is nothing new in all this.

More than 100 years ago that eminent economist John Stuart Mill wrote:

> It is not so much the general or average price of food, as its occasional high price in times of emergency, which governments have studied to reduce.
>
> In some cases * * * the compulsory regulation was attempted by the ruling powers to counteract the necessary consequences of their own acts; to scatter an indefinite abundance of the circulating medium with one hand and keep down prices with the other, a thing manifestly impossible under any regime, except one of unmitigated terror.

The confusion of today is well illustrated by the statements of two eminent gentlemen who have posed as possessing some authority on this subject, the President of the United States and Mr. Chester Bowles.

On February 14, 1946, President Truman said:

> Production is our salvation—production will do away with the necessity for Government controls.

In October of 1947, in a radio address, Mr. Truman asserted:

> We are producing more goods for civilian use than ever before in history.

Testifying before a committee of this Congress on February 18, 1946, that noisy expert on price controls, Mr. Chester Bowles, said that "production is the only answer to inflation."

Since we are now turning out more than 50 percent of the world's known industrial production as against 30 percent before the war, it is perfect nonsense to suggest that a lack of production has brought the current palsy of inflation upon us.

In 1947 we produced in goods and services more than $230,000,000,000 worth, or more than 13 percent above the record peacetime year of 1946.

This achievement, moreover, cannot be charged to a rise in prices for the items turned out were 23 percent in excess of the astounding total of 1946—Time, page 75, January 12, 1948.

A clear examination of the contradictions and the fear that constitute the core of Mr. Truman's ever-shifting policy serves but to emphasize that our crisis is a crisis in leadership rather than a crisis in economics or diplomacy.

Amidst all the claims and counterclaims of the Truman administration the astounding fact remains that the Nations of Europe have turned to the United States, the last free market in the world, to make up their own deficiencies exactly when Mr. Truman has been asking us to reestablish at home the collectivist system of rationing, allocations, licensing, wage controls and price controls that have in their very nature created the present European crisis.

With gold and dollars now held by the outside world having reached the unprecedented total of twenty billions and with the United States having contributed in cash and goods during the past 2 years an estimated seventeen billions additional, we justly stand in amazement at the rising chorus of complaints over Europe's ever-growing dollar shortage.

How can there be a dollar shortage, and who is responsible?

The simple truth is that nearly every currency in the world is deliberately overpriced in relation to the dollar.

This is true because nearly every country in the world wants to buy at the lowest possible price in the American market.

Our foreign friends are trying to do this by keeping their official currency exchange rates high and making it a crime to buy or sell their currencies below the official rates.

The responsibility falls squarely upon the shoulders of these governments.

It is exactly this policy of overvaluation coupled with socialistic government controls that encourages the Europeans to increase their buying from us while discouraging our purchases from them.

The balance of international trade can never be restored under any such system.

Marshall plan or no Marshall plan, this problem will never be solved until all nations are willing to accept the verdict of the open market as to what their currencies are really worth.

France's recent devaluation is simply a courageous and clear-headed recognition of the fact that she must earn more dollars and pay her own way, rather than rely on the charity of America or any other nation.

In trying to measure these problems, we must never forget that if we send food or money to European nations which maintain enormous standing armies, defaulting state-owned industries, and immense pension and family allowances for nonproductive workers, we may be solving their immediate food problems only by making it possible for them to take their most productive youth away from the farm and the factory in order to keep them in military service.

Under the proposed Marshall plan, the money we lend or give to relieve a foreign nation from providing for any of the needs of its own people can be used for any purpose that nation may choose, including the increased publication of anticapitalist propaganda.

The conclusion is inescapable that gifts which serve only to prolong the paralysis of European production and European self-help are worse than thrown away.

In November of last year, Mr. Truman asserted that—

> An attempt has been made to place the blame (for higher prices) on our foreign aid program, but this has not been borne out by the facts.

As to our domestic inflation, Mr. Truman may be quite correct.

Our inflation is the direct result of his own policy of high wages and continuously expanding bank loans.

In truth, Mr. Truman's administration seems to be "all apoplexy at the center and apathy at the extremities."

It seems to be Mr. Truman's thesis that the international crisis can only be solved if we buy off the dangers of communism by giving large cash donations from the American taxpayer's pocket to already shaky European governments most of whom are, in fact, only a degree or two removed in color from the menace from which we are supposed to be protecting them.

The giddiness of this reasoning becomes apparent with our first glance at the facts.

In the December 22 issue of one of our leading national publications—Newsweek—we find the following dispatch:

> As a result of the Communist-inspired strikes, economic advisers have told the State Department that France now faces a production deficit of around $800,000,000 not contemplated at the time stopgap aid figures were prepared.
>
> This more than offsets the $328,000,000 contained in the interim-aid bill calculated to tide France through the winter crisis up to March 31.

In other words, the Communist-inspired strikes in France cost in production $800,000,000, when we as representatives of American taxpayers were hurriedly called back into special session to rush money over to France to tide them over to March 31.

To be sure, the Communist-inspired strikes in France and Italy and elsewhere can quickly cancel out the value of our aid.

Our aid can never hope to cancel out the evil effects of those strikes.

If European governments lack the unity and the purpose to prevent these ruinous disruptions of output, then it is manifestly impossible for us to save Europe.

Europe has 350,000,000 people to feed and nobody suggests that as a nation we have more than a narrow margin, of less than 5 percent, to spare from what we produce, to feed and clothe our own 140,000,000 people.

It is an elementary fact that aid to European governments will be futile unless they change their own economic policies—Marshall plan or no Marshall plan. In support of this conclusion, I offer the words of the most distinguished British economist of our era:

> The United States is disinclined to entangle herself further (after recent experiences) in the affairs of Europe. * * * There is no guaranty that Europe will put financial assistance to proper use, or that she will not squander it and be in just as bad a case in 2 or 3 years hence as she is now * * * in short, America would have postponed her own capital development and raised her own cost of living in order that Europe might continue for another year or two the practices, the policy and the men of the past 9 months. * * *
>
> If I had influence at the United States Treasury, I would not lend a penny to a single one of the governments of Europe.

These are not the cracked and hollow words of some current American isolationist. They are the ringing denunciation of John Maynard Keynes, uttered in 1919, when European economy was immeasurably healthier than it is today. They constitute an amazing prophecy and a stinging rebuke to the President, who goes blithely forward with a huge program of foreign aid, piled on top of the swollen buying power of our own domestic market, a swollen buying power which has been created almost entirely by the vast increase in money and bank credit brought on by his own fiscal policies.

Does Mr. Truman think the American people will fail to perceive the dangerous insincerity implicit in the efforts of his administration to protect us from the evil consequences of his own deliberate policy of easy money, high wages, and massive foreign loans—just because he asks for more powers against speculators, producers, and profiteers?

Mr. President, recently, Mr. Truman told us he wanted legislation permitting him to impose price ceilings. Now he blames us for not giving it to him. Yet we all know, as the most elementary lesson of the last war, that mere price controls fail to solve anything.

We all know that if prices are held below the point where supply and demand meet on natural ground, then a few people, like Mr. Edwin Pauley, will soon buy up the entire available supply—and thus require iron-fisted rationing.

In truth, rationing is the inevitable and absolute corollary of price controls.

In truth, too, Mr. Truman wants us to accept for America—in this hour of our supposed victory—the wartime controls of a police state—so that he can more easily pursue a foreign-aid policy of the very sort that Lord Keynes so roundly and wisely denounced a generation ago.

It is pure nonsense to suppose that if we throw in enough money or goods to raise the standard of living in western Europe, the nations of that area will automatically withdraw from state socialism and communism, and will follow their supposedly natural bent toward free enterprise.

It is at least a startling coincidence, if not a calculated and deliberate phenomenon, that only a few weeks ago the pinko-Socialist Labor Party in Britain was materially aided by the very fact of Mr. Truman's appeal for the reestablishment of price controls here in America.

The New York Times reported from England that Mr. Truman's appeal had become a major factor in the Gravesend by-election, in which labor conducted its Socialist campaign under the slogan:

Do you stand with Attlee and Truman on the controls issue, or with Churchill and the price racketeers?

Mr. President, the question of utmost gravity to many of us is not whether Europe wants to return to the ways of freedom, but whether Mr. Truman may not be seeking to press our Nation inexorably down the path of state socialism.

Under the massive cloud of doubt that now envelops him, I sorely question whether Mr. Truman can lift either our foreign or our domestic policies above the level of dread suspicion and mounting alarm.

As one student of affairs and as a soldier who served in the European theater in the recent war, I long since have reached the conclusion that the nations of Europe are not in danger of communism today because they have run into a chain of economic crises. They have run into a chain of economic crises because they have succumbed to the illusions of a dictated economy, socialistic controls, and deliberate monetary inflation—those three things. Taken together, these have destroyed the mechanism of free enterprise and its irreplaceable incentives to self-respect and self-support.

It is precisely because Europe is in such economic distress that she needs free enterprise—and needs it right now—and not, as Cripps says, in effect, "On with the socialistic program, although we run up a billion-dollar deficit next year, even with the aid we are supposed to get."

If the United States tries to bolster the whole western world with dollars, it is quite conceivable that we may contribute to the world's future nothing better than a corresponding paralysis of local responsibility everywhere else.

Every statesman in history, sooner or later, has had to learn that patriotism and unselfishness have been invoked repeatedly for causes far below the level of the common good.

Every Member of this Congress knows, moreover, that there must be some limit to our prodigalities if the bitter seeds of discontent are not to be planted deep in our already painful self-inflicted wounds.

Mr. President, the desires of President Truman and Secretary Marshall seem to be as nebulous as the very Marshall plan itself. As late as January 29, only 4 or 5 days ago, President Truman told his news conference he wanted "all or nothing." Secretary Marshall said earlier to the Congress, "take it or leave it." And, as I have said, Mr. Truman said, only a few days ago, that he wanted "all or nothing." Yet, while insisting on authorization for the full 4¼ year program, he, at the same time, voiced arguments for the $6,800,000,000 cost of the European recovery plan for the first 15 months. But now they are talking about cutting it down to 12—in other words, to make it more palatable, so we can swallow it more easily.

Could it be that this is somewhat of a hasty and ill-conceived retreat from Mr. Truman's original demand of $17,000,000,000? Must we accept this as his own acknowledgment of the new unrest and the rising public temper toward these problems?

Mr. President, having watched with careful anxiety the mounting anger in masses of men and women as Mr. Truman's domestic price policy and his prodigal foreign policy have heaped burden upon burden on their aching backs, I have become increasingly certain that the quality of our future civilization will never measure our hopes if it is to depend on some happy accident of maudlin generosity.

We must do far better than to create on a world-wide basis another "boondoggling PWA."

You may well ask what I have to suggest—what may be in fact an available and sensible alternative.

I have the following suggestions to make:

First. Since the United Nations is the world's last hope for widespread and long-continued peace, I would ask America to take the lead in putting real teeth into its procedures so as to make it work—at whatever cost—with or without the cooperation of Russia—for if Russia will not cooperate then the unity of the rest of the civilized world is still the last and best hope for peace which humanity can find anywhere in this troubled world.

Second. I would defend free enterprise without apology, recognizing that from its deep well-springs of imaginative enterprise and human incentive have flowed the whole magnificent achievement of our people.

Third. I would resolutely oppose the doctrine of the welfare state both at home and abroad and would therefore extend loans or grants only on terms and under conditions that make the solvency of the borrower certain and the repayment of a fair and equitable consideration to the United States an equal certainty.

Fourth. I would tell the American people the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

If our purpose is honestly and actually to prevent Communist expansion I would explain to them that the present administration and its predecessor are totally responsible for the Communist domination in all that vast land mass from Berlin, across Europe and Asia, to the very waters of Alaska.

I would tell the American people what the deals were that made this possible—at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

I would tell them by what right they may now expect a better result from the same hands that thus far have produced only diplomatic chaos.

If Russia is our enemy, I would explain to the American people why American engineers are now, at this very minute, working in Russia with the knowledge and acquiescence of our State Department, to restore Russia's mightiest military potential, her bombed and broken power dams and hydroelectric plants.

Fifth. I would demand that the international monetary fund cancel the requirement that member nations maintain controlled exchange rates, or withdraw from the fund altogether.

Sixth. I would recognize that the business of lending money is a specialized business and that international lending is doubly perilous for the uninitiated.

I would place this entire project, therefore, in experienced hands, where the customary safeguards to our money and property will be assured.

Seventh. I would open our private financial markets to foreign loans, under proper safeguards for the protection of the ultimate investor.

Eighth. I would recognize and accept the challenge of communism in the fullest realization that appeasement of Stalin will be no less calamitous than was the appeasement of Hitler and Hirohito.

Ninth. Last, I would recognize, above all things, the devious Oriental mind that guides Stalin to oppose the Marshall plan on the carefully calculated assumption that his opposition will insure its passage.

He certainly wants it to become a law, for only thus can he continue the collossal game of "Put and take" in which we "put" and he "takes."

For it is the simple truth that while we have been giving aid to the extent of seventeen billions, in Europe, Russia has been taking in reparations twelve billions out of Europe. (U. S. News-World Report, January 30, 1948, p. 19.)

Only so long as we continue to "put" can he continue to "take."

Marshal Stalin knows better than anyone now living that his sole hope for world domination lies in the success of his secret purpose to have America spend herself into bankruptcy.

With these guiding principles in mind I shall gladly join in the effort to achieve a world of order and stability in which the American people will not be asked to respond to economic superstition or serve the will of any demagogue.

Proceeding in this spirit, I believe there is a genuine opportunity for us to lift from our generation the sense of desperation and terror which, for so long a time, the enemies of liberty have been permitted to encourage without challenge.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Indiana has delivered a very interesting and comprehensive address, which it was expected he would do. Unfortunately, the proposals he makes are not before us. The Marshall plan is before us. I just wanted to inquire whether the Senator is for or against the Marshall plan.

Mr. JENNER. In its present form I am unalterably opposed to it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator could be induced to support the plan, though, if a few modifications here and there were made?

Mr. JENNER. It seems to be the trick now to "induce." We start off with a 4-year program to spend $17,000,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not ask that.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator propounded a question, and I am trying to answer him. Did we not cut it then to $6,800,000,000? Now we are talking about shortening the period from 15 months to 12 months, and of reducing the amount to $4,500,000,000. I say, tell the people the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the reason why I am interrogating the Senator.

Mr. JENNER. I am answering.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suppose the Senator is going to tell me the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. What can be done now to make the plan acceptable to the Senator?

Mr. JENNER. I will say to the Senator that I have tried in my remarks today to explain my position on what I think should be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I am not trying to heckle him. I am just trying to find out what his attitude is going to be, because if his attitude is adamant——

Mr. JENNER. It is not adamant. I just want to protect my country.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator proposes about eight different things that he would do.

Mr. JENNER. Nine.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator require that all those nine things be done before he could agree to the Marshall plan?

Mr. JENNER. I realize that in legislative bodies there must be compromise, but I do not want to compromise away my country.

Mr. CONNALLY. So at present we cannot count on the Senator?

Mr. JENNER. It is too weak.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

CENSORSHIP

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish briefly to call to the attention of the Senate a matter which I think should be of some concern to the Members of Congress and also to the country. Not very long ago we had up for consideration on the floor of the Senate the so-called Smith-Mundt bill, which I was pleased to support. Having been in Europe last October I saw the need for the Voice of America program. Also I saw how in some of the countries of Europe the Soviet Government, through its information service, was running circles around us. I think the enactment of that bill was a constructive step for us to take.

However, I think it is doubly important, along with the Smith-Mundt bill, in which we bring to the attention of the world the facts as to what is going on, and try to lift at least the corner of the iron curtain, that we in the United States not permit an iron curtain of any type or character to exist either between the Government and the people of the United States, or between any of our occupied areas and our home country.

I call to the attention of the Senate a series of articles and telegrams, which I shall later put into the RECORD. To give some continuity to the situation I first wish to read an article by Mr. Keyes Beech, of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, written under a Tokyo date line on January 26. It reads as follows:

ARMY CENSORS IRK NEWSMEN

(By Keyes Beech)

TOKYO, Japan, January 26.—"That's classified" remains the stock reply correspondents here get when they want to know anything the supreme command for the Allied powers doesn't want them to know.

Apparently SCAP still operates today—28 months after the occupation of Japan—on the military principle that the American people are entitled to know only what the military wants them to.

At any rate, though no longer subject to court martial as in the early days of occupation for indiscreet reporting, correspondents cannot get any facts considered unfavorable to General MacArthur on his occupation.

JAPANESE WARNED

With few exceptions, section chiefs simply refuse to discuss matters they don't want printed, and their subordinates talk with correspondents at risk of their jobs. Furthermore, Japanese officials have been warned by SCAP against giving out any information without its approval.

News items which have gotten "classified" treatment recently include the question of how the Army is making up the $80,000,000 lost earlier in the occupation on illegal yen-dollar transactions.

A recent report by a Government section investigator criticizing the extravagance of Emperor Hirohito's travels was also pigeonholed.

The matter of how much of Japan's products, classified as war material, has been returned to the Japanese Government is on the shush list.

PRESSURE EXERTED

Last week MacArthur's headquarters indicated that it was prepared to give this unofficial censorship teeth by restricting travel by correspondents based in Japan but assigned to cover all of the Far East.

A correspondent ordered to temporary duty outside the command area must leave without assurance that he will be permitted to return, and instead must reapply for formal accreditation through Army channels.

Under the housing ruling families of correspondents temporarily assigned outside the command area will forfeit the right to housing and, therefore, will be compelled to return to their home countries.

Correspondents and their families are dependent upon the Army for all necessities, including food and housing.

The headquarters' intimation was thus almost unanimously regarded by the 60 newsmen affected as an implied warning that life would get more difficult unless they accept hereafter what the brass hats consider pertinent news.

Based presumably on that article out of Japan, and some inquiries by the American press in this country, the Department of the Army sent an inquiry to General MacArthur, under date of January 26. Since it is a classified document I shall not read it in toto, but merely paraphrase it.

The public relations section said they had received certain complaints regarding what appeared to be a change of policy; that they were not familiar with any new policy having originated from the Department of the Army, and would SCAP please advise them what it was all about.

Under date of January 27, SCAP replied in a message signed by General MacArthur to the Department of the Army. This document is an incoming clear message, and so that Senators may be familiar with it I ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1948.

From: CINCFE, Tokyo, Japan, signed MacArthur.

To: Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., for CSPID:

Reurad WAR 94717, correspondents accredited to this theater are allowed full latitude of coverage within its various sectors, such as Japan, Korea, Philippines, Marianas, and Ryukyus. When they leave the theater to go to other areas for assignment thereto, such as Siam, Indochina, Malaya, the Dutch Indies, India, or other foreign countries,

their accreditation here is closed. To reenter the theater they must make reapplication through normal channels for reaccreditation. This follows the principle of the policy enunciated by the War Department that correspondents accredited here and returning temporarily to the United States must be reaccredited before return. This policy is completely sound as the theater cannot assume the implied responsibility for their activities in foreign areas where it exercises no jurisdiction of correspondents whose official standing is based upon accreditation to this command. Nor should the United States permit such correspondents to enter foreign areas without special consideration of each case and proper clearance for formal accreditation by the nation involved. It would also be improper for this headquarters to issue orders authorizing travel by correspondents in areas outside his command, except for travel between home offices and this theater.

Homes and billets are assigned to correspondents here on exactly the same basis as to the military and civilian members of the occupation. They were commandeered from the Japanese and assigned by proper roster arrangements. All housing available for this purpose has been exhausted. When a correspondent leaves the area, just as when a member of the occupation leaves, the home which had been assigned him becomes available for other distribution. If the correspondent is reaccredited he is again assigned a residence in accordance with the general rules. Accommodations are entirely inadequate to care for the dependents of present members of the occupation, there being a backlog of many hundreds still waiting in the United States. To establish a different rule for correspondents would grant privileges denied all other personnel and would result in the barring from the theater of a corresponding number of families now waiting in the United States for available quarters here. It is patent for the above and many other reasons that Japan is unsuitable for use as a press base for all of Oriental Asia. The United States alone is competent to serve as such a base for American correspondents. There is no justification whatsoever for any complaint in this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now I call to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, under date of January 31, 1948. This article is also dated Tokyo, January 30, and is as follows:

CORRESPONDENTS DISPUTE MAC ARTHUR ON TRAVEL BAN

TOKYO, January 30.—The executive committee of the Tokyo Correspondents' Club took issue today with Gen. Douglas MacArthur on his statement to an American radio network that it was "sadly misinformed" about travel restrictions on newspapermen.

The committee said Bill Costello, of CBS, and Alpheus W. Jessup, of McGraw-Hill Publications, again were told yesterday they must give up their homes and move their families out of General MacArthur's Far East Command if they make reporting trips to southeast Asia, as instructed by their home offices.

Reporting to the club's 61 members, the executive committee explained that the Columbia Broadcasting System had radioed Mr. Costello it received a message from General MacArthur that it was "sadly misinformed" when it sent the supreme commander a protest.

The CBS protest said in part: "We are advised that travel order of October 21, 1947, permitting correspondents to travel outside of Japan without losing accreditation or billets, has been rescinded. Currently we are informed that if correspondents wish travel orders and receive them, they automatically give up living quarters and upon returning must apply for reentry into Japan."

The restrictions were repeated to the two correspondents by Frayne Baker, General MacArthur's public-information director.

Then in Time magazine, under date of January 22, is an article headed "Censorship in Tokyo?" I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENSORSHIP IN TOKYO?

The working press has never known quite where it stood with Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Zealous public relations officers, by fending off reporters in his Far East Command, have kept the press from finding out. At his rare press conferences MacArthur has talked freely; between times, his public relations officers have acted on the theory that no news but good news should be written about MacArthur.

Last week the Tokyo Headquarters Press Corps was angered and surprised by a new shift in policy. First sign of a change came when the London Daily Herald's Hugh Hessell Tiltman, who had criticized some occupation policies, applied for round-trip orders to Malaya and the East Indies. He was told that if he left the area of the Far East Command he would lose his credentials and his family its quarters. He left anyway. Hitherto correspondents had been allowed to leave the theater on reportorial assignments and reenter without trouble.

Like Tiltman, William Costello of CBS had sent critical reports on General MacArthur. Costello, who planned a trip to Java, got the same notice as Tiltman. McGraw-Hill's Alpheus Jessup wanted to visit Malaya and Burma. Ex-Gen. Frayne Baker, MacArthur's public relations officer, ruled Jessup would have to take his wife, who is expecting a child in a month, with him.

When a correspondents' committee asked who was cracking down on whom and why, Baker said: "Every time [you] have pressed for a clarification of policy, the policy has grown tighter." To correspondents, the latest turn of the screw seemed to mean that the squeeze was on correspondents to write only good news about MacArthur.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, coming to the office yesterday morning I tuned in on the CBS broadcast, the round-the-world news broadcast, which comes on between 8 and 8:15, I believe, every morning. At that time, speaking directly from Tokyo, was a broadcast by Mr. Costello. I immediately got in touch with the CBS organization and asked them to send me the script. I have the text of it, and I wish to read it at this point:

Tokyo correspondents who are assigned to cover the whole Far East learned positively today that General MacArthur considers them unwelcome in Japan. From an unofficial source newsmen obtained copies of a press policy statement cabled to the War Department in Washington by MacArthur last Tuesday.

I might interpose at this point to say that that I believe is the SCAP message which I previously asked to place in the RECORD. I continue to read:

In it MacArthur says categorically: "Japan is unsuitable for use as a press base for all of oriental Asia." He maintains he cannot assume responsibility for correspondents traveling in other parts of the Far East, although no reporter has ever asked for more than permission to reenter Japan after trips elsewhere. He also argues there is a housing shortage which makes it impossible for newsmen to keep their families in Tokyo while away on trips. The fact is, as reporters discovered this afternoon, there will be 12,350 allied housing units here by spring, and reporters occupy 19 of them. But the most disturbing sentence in MacArthur's entire official statement is that the United States should not permit correspondents to enter foreign areas without special consideration of each case. Correspondents wonder what he means by "special consideration." Does he want the United States Government to screen the people hired by editors and publishers. Does he want to censor the American press by dictating hiring and firing policies.

Secretary of National Defense Forrestal is now planning a conference at which he will ask editors and publishers to establish a voluntary code of censorship on matters of military security. MacArthur's policy suggests he wants a bureaucratic censorship which would be imposed, rather than voluntarily assumed.

Just recently I was informed that Newsweek's correspondent in Japan, Mr. Compton Pakenham, who had come back to the United States, had reapplied for admission into Japan. This was denied him by the public-relations officer of SCAP. I understand that the management of Newsweek Magazine then made a direct appeal to General MacArthur, and received word that the matter had personally been turned down by the commander in Japan. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed a statement which I understand will be published in Newsweek Magazine, relative to this incident.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last August the chief of Newsweek's Tokyo bureau, Compton Pakenham, came to the United States on leave of absence. Last December, Newsweek made the routine application for his reaccreditation in preparation for his return. The Army Department told Malcolm Muir, publisher of Newsweek, that the request for reaccreditation had been personally denied by General MacArthur.

Mr. Muir thereupon informed the Army Department that although "technically, a theater commander has the right to refuse admittance to any correspondent for any reason or no reason at all * * * the war has now been over for more than 2 years" and "no correspondent has been refused admission to a theater since the end of the war" under similar circumstances. Mr. Muir went on to state that in Newsweek's opinion "an important principle of freedom of the press is involved."

During the past year Newsweek has published a number of stories reporting criticism of certain phases of the occupation of Japan. The first of these in the issue of February 10, 1947, dealt with the purge of Japanese businessmen. General MacArthur issued a statement expressing strong disagreement with the conclusions reported in the story. It was also understood that some of MacArthur's commanders greatly resented not only the criticism as reported but also the fact of its publication.

In April 1947 Harry Kern, Newsweek's foreign editor, went to Japan to make a special report on the occupation. While there he talked to General MacArthur. In view of the General's statement on the Newsweek story Kern raised the question of such reports of criticism. The General informed him: "I love criticism."

At no time during this long interview did the General in any way complain against Newsweek's Tokyo bureau chief. It seemed

a fair assumption that General MacArthur would have availed himself of this opportunity to mention any charges against Pakenham serious enough to warrant his exclusion from the theater a few months later.

In its December 16 letter announcing Pakenham's exclusion the Army made no definite charges against him. It merely intimated that MacArthur had excluded Pakenhame because: (1) he was a British subject; (2) he had shown a marked antipathy toward American occupation policy; (3) he had associated with feudalistic and reactionary Japanese.

The facts on which these reasons were based seemed to be:

1. As an officer in the Coldstream Guards, who served with distinction on the Western Front from 1914 to 1918 and won the Military Cross, Pakenham felt he should maintain his British status even though he has lived in the United States since 1921. He was sent to Japan by Newsweek because he had spent much of his early life in that country and possessed a rare knowledge of the language and people.

2. Under instructions from Newsweek Pakenham had gathered material for this magazine's stories covering every phase of occupation policies. These policies have recently been the subject of severe censure on the floor of the United States Senate and may soon be investigated by the Appropriations Committee.

3. Pakenham was under instructions to report what all Japanese, including reactionaries, were thinking. Lack of this knowledge was a contributing factor in unpreparedness at Pearl Harbor.

In view of the above facts, Mr. Muir therefore asked the Army to refer the matter to higher authorities. On January 21 Newsweek was informed by Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall that the question had been taken up personally with General MacArthur and that he had again reported that Pakenham was entirely unacceptable to him. Mr. Muir thereupon sent the following cable to General MacArthur:

"Knowing your interest in the freedom of the press, I cannot believe that you have made an irrevocable decision, and so I ask you to look further into the facts. Pakenham has my full support and that of the responsible editors of Newsweek, who consider him a thoroghly competent correspondent with exceptional qualifications to serve in Japan. Pakenham has faithfully carried out the instructions of his editors here, and we are unaware of any bias or inaccuracy in his reporting. We've been informed of no charges against Pakenham's personal conduct in your theater. If such charges have influenced the decision of your headquarters, I feel in fairness to all concerned this information should be given us at your earliest possible convenience for appropriate action.

"Both in our domestic edition and the edition published in Tokyo we feel we are doing a sincere job in the interest of public enlightenment. I am sure you'll understand that we cannot help but feel that the exclusion of Pakenham as our selected representative is a serious blow to freedom of the press."

General MacArthur's only reply was: "I am sorry to have to disagree with you in reference to the Pakenham case." On February 2 Mr. Muir sent this final cable to MacArthur:

"We naturally recognize your authority to declare any correspondent unsuitable to you. Nevertheless we do feel this refusal to accredit Pakenham is a very grave infringement on rights of the press, particularly as you haven't thought it suitable to provide us with the reason for this expulsion. Under the circumstances we are forced to conclude your decision is motivated by the fact that articles published in Newsweek reported criticisms which had been made of some policies adopted by your command."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, Mr. President, in order that the other side of the picture may be clearly given, I will say that I have today received a copy of the cablegram sent to the publisher of Newsweek magazine, Mr. Malcolm Muir, and signed "Gen. Douglas MacArthur, GHQ, Far East Commission," in Tokyo. I make the request that the telegram be published in the RECORD so the Senate may be advised of the entire situation.

There being no objection, the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With reference to your message of February 2, I have no slightest objection to anything you publicize concerning the Pakenham matter provided the true facts rather than a distorted version are carried. There is no, repeat no, basis whatsoever for your suggestion that freedom of the press is in any way involved, or that the critical editorial policies of Newsweek have a bearing upon the matter. To the contrary, such editorial criticisms which Newsweek has expressed with reference certain policies being implemented here based upon directives received from the United States Government and the Far Eastern Commission have never been attributed to Pakenham's reporting. As to the suggestion that freedom of the press is in any way infringed, I doubt that the allied press enjoys anywhere in the world greater freedom in the gathering and dissemination of the news than it does here in Tokyo. Your own Bureau would undoubtedly be among the first to bear this out. The danger with respect to the return of Pakenham, during this critical period, lies in the disturbing influence he is believed to exercise among Japanese malcontent and the jeopardy this causes to the objectives and security of the occupation and the interests of the United States. Your statement that no, repeat no, reasons for Pakenham's exclusion have been furnished you is not, repeat not, understood in view of the recent letter to you from the Department of the Army in Washington, which summarized the matter as follows: "In his recent residence in Japan he, Pakenham, has shown a marked antipathy toward American policy and American personnel in the occupation zone. This is undoubtedly due to his long residence and prewar affiliations in Japan which have led him to associate, personally, with reactionary Japanese of deep-rooted futilistic and militaristic tendencies in their resistance to the objectives of the Allied occupation. This, as SCAP points out, makes his return undesirable as such return would not be in the best interests of either the occupation forces or of your publication. I feel compelled to support SCAP's position in this matter. I suggest your office assign another competent correspondent to proceed to Japan. We shall do everything in our province to expedite his clearance and to make suitable arrangements in order that we can evidence our desire that the pleasant and cooperative relationship we have enjoyed in the past, can continue in the future." This is the basis for Pakenham's exclusion and the position with respect to his replacement in which I fully concur. If you do decide to publicize your version of the matter, I trust that in the same issue you will include this message unabridged.

Gen. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
GHQ, Far East Commission, CINCFE, Tokyo.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that I think all of us in the Congress of the United States, and certainly all of us who served in the armed services during the war, recognize that during a war it is necessary, in the interests of national security, to withhold certain information from the American people. I can say, I believe without fear of contradiction, that during the whole wartime period when we had the so-called voluntary censorship of the American press, newspapers did not violate the confidence that was reposed in them. In many instances they had access to information and had in their possession information which from a pure news point of view would have made good news stories. Yet, in compliance with the desires of their Government and in the interest of national security, they did not violate the confidence reposed in them.

I think that newsmen today recognize full well that in the field of, let us say, atomic power, there are certain secrets which obviously cannot be and should not be discussed in public or in the public print. I am sure there would be no violation of that type of security at this time.

We also have legitimate need for censorship in the development of new weapons, such as guided missiles, and I am sure that there would be no violation of that type of a voluntary censorship in peacetime.

I am frank to admit that there are certain other phases, perhaps in the delicate negotiation of a treaty, where it would be harmful for information regarding the negotiations to be disclosed. But I want to say, Mr. President, that I think the executive departments of this Government have all too often used a security classification, not for the protection of national security as such, but merely to keep from being bothered by either the Members of Congress or by the American press. They have put a cloak of security around their activities which they have no legitimate right to place around them. I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States take steps to see to it that the executive departments do not hide behind a security cloak of that nature when in fact no national security itself is involved.

As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, Mr. President, certainly we should not tolerate any iron curtain between an occupied area where the American flag flies and this home country. We should not place any type of iron curtain between the Government departments and the people of the United States. There may be additional facts which I have not yet been able to bring out, relative to the situation in Japan. It may be, as General MacArthur points out, that there are certain restrictions in regard to housing, and that if he permitted a concession to the correspondents it would tend to discriminate against American military or civilian personnel in Japan. It may be that he does not want to put the correspondents in what he might term a privileged class. However, let me say that, contrary to the views expressed by SCAP, Japan is an ideal place for American news services, American magazines, and American newspapers, to base their correspondents and have them go out from that country to cover the rest of the Far East. I think it is essential that the

American people become fully informed as to what is happening in the Far East—in Japan, China, Burma, the Philippines, Indochina, Siam, and the rest of the Far East.

I believe that the American people—and I dare say even the Congress of the United States—in many instances receive more accurate information from the newspaper and radio foreign correspondents as to what is going on overseas than they receive from their own State Department or from the other Government departments. For that reason I think the Congress itself should have a very vital interest in seeing to it that there is not, directly or implied, any type of censorship upon American correspondents serving in any area of the world. Some might say that there has been no charge of censorship as such. I agree that that is true at the present time. But when a correspondent knows that if he leaves Japan he cannot get back into that country without again going through the whole process of being accredited, it may have at least a tendency to make him not quite as free in reporting as he otherwise might feel that he should be. For that reason, Mr. President, I have felt that this matter was of such vital importance that I should bring this information to the attention of the Senate.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the convening of the Senate tomorrow I be recognized by the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Illinois concluded?

Mr. LUCAS. I have finished.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it appears that the work of the Senate has been concluded for the afternoon. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator makes the motion to recess, I should like to express once more for the RECORD my hope that it will be possible to proceed with the St. Lawrence seaway with some dispatch. I think we shall be making an exhibition of ourselves before the country if we do not vote this thing up or down very soon. It will appear that we are pettifogging, dawdling, and delaying.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Assuming that the debate has been concluded on a subject which is under discussion, and there is no agreement to vote, would a motion to lay on the table be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion would be in order for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. That would bring to a close the debate which apparently had already been finished. Is that the answer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the senior Senator from Nebraska again state his inquiry?

Mr. BUTLER. As I understand, a motion to lay on the table would bring the debate to a close.

Mr. WHERRY. In the absence of a unanimous consent agreement to vote on a certain day. That was the Senator's question, was it not?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. After the debate on a subject matter has apparently been concluded, and in the absence of a unanimous-consent agreement, the senior Senator from Nebraska is asking if a motion to lay on the table is in order. That is as I understand his inquiry.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that if the motion is made and agreed to, it disposes of the pending measure.

Mr. WHERRY. If a motion to lay on the table is made and agreed to, it does dispose of the pending measure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the senior Senator from Nebraska, in connection with what he has said, that I have in mind making some remarks tomorrow on the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. I assure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that it is not my intention to make a motion to shut off debate, so long as there is a purpose on the part of Senators to debate the measure.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Let me repeat what I said yesterday. I know of only two Senators who desire to be heard in opposition to the seaway project. One is the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the other is the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. It is planned that they will seek recognition tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not know whether there is a move on foot to cut off debate on the St. Lawrence seaway. Am I to understand that that is the purpose of the suggested motion?

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. LODGE. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The inquiry was addressed to the Chair as to whether or not a motion to lay on the table could be considered. The Chair ruled that it could be considered, and that if it were agreed to it would dispose of the measure.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course. That is one of the first rules in the book, as I understand parliamentary law. However, a Senator would not ask that kind of a question unless there were some reason behind it. I wonder what the reason is. May I inquire from the senior Senator from Nebraska what the reason is? Is it planned to cut off debate on the seaway project?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I certainly would not be a party to any plan to limit debate on the St. Lawrence seaway or any other question before the Senate. However, I am rather anxious to have a vote on the measure when the debate apparently has been concluded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if anything of the sort is contemplated, I think Senators should be very frank about it so that all Senators may know what lies ahead. It is my understanding that a number of Senators have already left the city, relying upon what is called a gentleman's agreement, to the effect that a unanimous-consent agreement is to be entered into in respect to a vote later in the month. As I understand, the reason for the postponement is that the absence of Senators makes it impossible to obtain a quorum until the Lincoln anniversary circuit is finished and until the subsequent week of Democratic speeches is concluded.

If there is any lurking concept of a motion to lay on the table, I think in simple, fundamental, elementary fairness the plan should be known in advance so that Senators may guide themselves accordingly. I make no plea, one way or the other, in respect to a time to vote, but I do assert that Senators have a right either to rely upon the information which has been given them or to be notified that they had better return to Washington.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation relative to the situation in which we now find ourselves. I announced yesterday at the close of the session that there had been much talk on the floor of the Senate about arranging a unanimous-consent agreement. I stated then that I thought it was a mistake to try to arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement on the floor of the Senate; that none had been made; that the program for the Senate would be to meet on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday; and that unless a unanimous-consent agreement had been entered into by the time of the conclusion of business on Thursday, or late in the afternoon, we would announce the program for the remainder of the week, and for the next week. That is as far as anything that I know of has been said or done officially, which meets with the approval of the Senate, relative to the procedure in the disposition of the proposed legislation.

I think I am in duty bound to say at this point that it is my understanding that the proponents and opponents of the pending measure have concluded what I understand to be a unanimous-consent agreement, to which they have subscribed, and which is to be proposed to the Senate, according to the announcement which I made yesterday, when the proper time arrives. The debate has continued yesterday and today, and will continue tomorrow. I feel that Senators should remain in attendance until a unanimous-consent agreement is made

or until we have a vote on the pending measure, or agree to set it aside and take up something else.

I believe that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, who is a past-master at orderly procedure, will agree with me. However, I feel that I should state that the proponents and opponents have come to an agreement, but that does not mean that some Senator may not object to it.

The unanimous-consent agreement has not been proposed, and I feel that it should not be proposed until sufficient time has been given to conclude the speeches and the debate upon the pending measure. Already announcements have been made of those who expect to take part in the debate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr LUCAS. If I correctly understand the Senator, in the event of a motion being made to lay on the table before the debate has been concluded, we can rely on the Senator from Nebraska to help us to defeat that motion, can we not?

Mr. WHERRY. I would not say that I would help to defeat it, but as acting majority leader I would present the unanimous-consent request for the Senate to consider, and if it could not be worked out on that basis we would do the next best thing as to how and when to terminate the debate.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator misunderstood me. Regardless of anything we may do in the way of a unanimous-consent agreement, it would not prevent some Senator from making a motion to lay on the table, would it?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. LUCAS. What I am asking the Senator is, if a motion of that kind be presented, will he help us to defeat the motion?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not subscribe my aid in defeating the motion. The senior Senator from Nebraska has a right to make the motion tonight, but I think I am in duty bound to say that this agreement has been entered into, and if any promises or commitments have been made to Senators who have left, that should be borne in mind. I think we should protect the rights of all Senators. If such a motion is made I certainly shall ask unanimous consent to submit a unanimous-consent request and ask that it be adopted, in view of the fact that I feel that because of the discussion which has been engaged in relative to voting on the twenty-third, the Senate should subscribe to such unanimous-consent agreement. But that does not prevent someone from objecting to it. If that be done, any motion will be in order to do anything with the proposed legislation.

I am sure that the senior Senator from Nebraska had no thought of any sharp practice. I do not know what was in his mind. My feeling is that he felt, as I do, that possibly, since the matter has been debated, if we cannot work out some agreement we should dispose of the matter in some way. Inasmuch as there has been talk about Lincoln Day, Jefferson Day, and Jackson Day, and speeches here and there, I feel we should try to work out a unanimous-consent agreement when the time comes, because Senators have left under the impression that that would be done. But I think that is not the proper way to legislate. If I had known when I was on the steering committee that this measure was to be brought up and debated for 2 weeks and then set aside until February 23, I would have done my level best to bring up some other measure for the consideration of the Senate. We should debate the pending resolution and vote it either up or down. Of course, with the statements and the propositions which have been made on the floor and off the floor, even though the Senate has not adopted a unanimous-consent agreement, I feel the Senate should abide by such an agreement, if possible, and vote on the day agreed upon.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course I had no thought of suggesting any sharp practice on the part of the senior Senator from Nebraska in his discussion of a motion to lay on the table. I was simply raising a collateral question of fair play. I think the junior Senator from Nebraska has described the parliamentary situation accurately. It was my understanding that those in charge of the proposed legislation, of whom I am not one—and I am merely speaking by proxy in the absence of the rest of the Senators—had worked out an agreement. Whether it is a sound one or not is beside the point. But I understood that an agreement had been worked out for a definite program to vote, I think, on the 23d of February. It was also my understanding that the unanimous-consent agreement was being withheld deliberately and substantially at the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska, in order to see whether the debate would exhaust itself in the course of the balance of the week.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of several Senators who have left the city. Perhaps they should not have gone. Again we face a condition and not a theory. They have gone, relying on what they considered to be an unofficial agreement in respect to the ultimate program. All I am saying is that if the able senior Senator from Nebraska, who has a complete right to make a motion to lay upon the table now, tomorrow, or at any other time, proposes to do so, in fairness to his colleagues he should announce that purpose substantially in advance so that those who might desire to be registered upon that roll call might have an opportunity to return to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. It is certainly not the intention of the senior Senator from Nebraska to resort to anything in the nature of an unfair practice. I would not be a party to anything of that sort. But to me it does seem very unusual to debate a measure for 2 weeks and then postpone voting on it for 3 weeks because a few Senators may be absent. There will undoubtedly be a few Senators absent on each side of the question on February 25 or February 26 when the matter is intended to be brought up for a vote. I think it is a very unusual proceeding to debate for 2 weeks and then to postpone a vote on the matter for 3 weeks. I think the proper thing to do is to vote when the debate is concluded. I do not at this time intend to make any such motion, but I am not sure what may happen when the debate is concluded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one further word?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The senior Senator from Nebraska says it is a very unusual procedure to arrange a postponed voting timetable such as that contemplated in the so-called unanimous-consent agreement which has been unofficially approved by those who are in charge of the proposed legislation. I agree with him. I am not arguing the validity of the arrangement which has been made, if it has been made, but I suggest to my able friend that it is a far more unusual procedure to undertake to dispose of a major piece of legislation by a motion to lay on the table. I doubt whether my able friend can find a precedent in the United States Senate for that sort of procedure within the last 20 years. It is for that reason I am saying, without challenging the Senator's right—I think he is completely within his right, and I do not think he has violated any obligation to his colleagues—that if he contemplates that sort of action within this present week I think he ought to so announce in advance, so that Senators can return to be present and vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I understand the senior Senator from Nebraska has already stated that he does not intend to make such a motion, at least until the debate is completely exhausted. I have a feeling that we shall still be debating this question at least up until Thursday. Prior to that time, possibly tomorrow night, when we can see how the debate is progressing, the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into by the proponents and opponents of the measure will be presented to the Senate. Many observations have been made as to who agreed to this and who agreed to that. The senior Senator from Nebraska spoke my sentiments when he said that when we have debated a bill for 2 weeks the final vote should not be delayed for 3 weeks. I think it is an unusual procedure, and I think it should not be indulged in in the United States Senate.

I state again that each evening I call attention to the fact that a unanimous-consent agreement has not been presented. If a Senator has left, he has left certainly with the full knowledge that he has not yet entered into a unanimous-consent agreement. In keeping with the observations which have been made, and apparently with the understandings which have been assumed, and certainly in keeping with the statement by the distinguished Senator from Michigan that Senators have left the city with the understanding that a unani-

mous-consent agreement would be entered into, or at least that there was a mutual agreement between the proponents and the opponents of the legislation, I felt it was only fair, in advance of the termination of the debate, to state that a unanimous-consent agreement had been entered into. The Senator has my assurance—I am speaking to the senior Senator from Michigan in reply to his observation—that certainly not later than Thursday night, or possibly tomorrow night, if the debate looks as though it were drawing to a conclusion at that time, the unanimous-consent request will be presented. Not only have the proponents and opponents agreed on the terms, but other Senators have given their assent to this unanimous-consent agreement. Therefore, I think everything has been done that can be done to accommodate all those Senators who are depending upon the mutual agreement between the proponents and opponents of the measure.

I want to say just a final word. I leave it to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, to my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, and I certainly leave it to the distinguished minority leader who has been the majority leader for many years, if it is not the correct procedure that when debate has been concluded on a major piece of legislation, such as is the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution, it should be voted on as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The statement of the Senator is true. The rule here from time immemorial has been that when debate has been exhausted on a measure, the Senate has voted. But this has been a peculiar situation growing out of advance information, days ago or even weeks ago, that no business of a serious nature would be transacted for a week, in order that Senators who might wish to leave over Lincoln's Birthday might be free to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So, based upon that suggestion, this arrangement was worked out and came to a definite gentlemen's understanding all around, with some reciprocal considerations which might attach to us a little later, or from time to time.

If there were any urgent legislation pending or ready for consideration, with which this arrangement would interfere, that would present another problem. But there is not. There is nothing urgent on the calendar.

If this motion were made tomorrow and were carried, nothing of importance would be done next week or perhaps the week after that.

Thus, no legislative time will be lost by the arrangement to which the Senator has referred; and, although not yet presented, it has been entertained informally and agreed to informally, so that Senators might have something to count on and might know what will be done in the meantime.

So, Mr. President, in any event I think nothing of great consequence would be done here during the next 2 weeks. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator when the vote on this measure will be taken, if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. WHERRY. I might just as well state the terms of the agreement now, if that is acceptable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say, to answer the question, that I think it will be the 25th of February.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the 25th, the fourth week in February.

Mr. President, I do not mind giving the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement at this time. However, my feeling has been that if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, as the Senator from Illinois well knows and as the distinguished minority leader well knows, this debate will stop. That has been the usual procedure. Then, as the Senator has said, if we were to take up legislation which should be brought before the Senate, many Senators would have left the city.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course the agreement contemplates that the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution would still be the unfinished business during that entire period.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and any Senator could address himself to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It could be set aside by unanimous-consent for the transaction of other business, if the Senate saw fit to do so. Certainly it is not contemplated that we would debate this question steadily until the 25th of February.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no. I understand that if the Senate decided to enter into the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate would vote on the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution and all amendments thereto on the 25th of February. There are some conditions relative to that, which would have to be agreed to, of course. However, that is not the point.

Mr. President, I think I have been guilty of helping initiate unanimous-consent agreements about as much as any other Member of the Senate has, if the word "guilty" should be used in that connection. I think there are times when the sooner a vote can be obtained on a measure the better, and I believe there are times when such agreements help the work of the Senate. I agree that often such agreements help everyone. It simply seemed to me that it would be a long time between the time when debate on this measure would be discontinued and the time when the vote on it would be taken.

Personally, I think the proposed procedure is not the best one. I hope we do not have to act in that way on every piece of legislation.

However, in view of the apparent gentleman's agreement which has been entered into—and I think there is no misunderstanding about that; all of us have agreed to ease the work next week and the following week—I think it is only fair that the unanimous-consent agreement be presented. In view of the fact that now the terms have been more or less discussed and also the date has been discussed, I think the forthright thing to do would be to present the proposed agreement possibly late tomorrow evening; and if it can be entered into, then I would ask that the pending legislation be laid aside.

If that is done, I should like to state now at that time I believe three or four measures on the calendar should be brought before the Senate for consideration, if the Senate so agrees. One of them is Calendar No. 902, Senate Joint Resolution 173, a joint resolution to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes. I think that measure should be brought up possibly Thursday, if we can do so.

Also, during the recent call of the calendar when the able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] asked that Calendar No. 696, Senate bill 1356, a bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans be considered, and also two similar bills which follow it almost immediately on the calendar, it was stated at that time that when action on the St. Lawrence seaway legislation was concluded, the Senator from Connecticut would ask unanimous consent or would move that the Senate take up those three bills. I think possibly they should be considered following consideration of the Maritime Commission joint resolution.

Then there is the legislative budget, which may be here before we take a recess on Thursday or Friday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has discussed three bills on the calendar which he says will be taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I have said that might be done.

Mr. LUCAS. And the Senator has said that, instead, a motion to take up those bills might be made.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask this question: While the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution is pending before the Senate, can any other business be taken up, other than by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it would be in order to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to propound a further parliamentary inquiry in that connection. Of course it is in order, is it not, during the pendency of any unfinished business to move to have the Senate take up some other business; but if such motion is carried it displaces the unfinished business, and it cannot be resumed except by another motion. Is not that correct?

So while it would be in order in the interim to move to have the Senate take up some other measure, if such motion were made and carried, that measure would displace the unfinished business

and would also displace any agreement made in regard thereto.

So, it seems to me, the only way to avoid that situation would be to proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, possibly I misspoke myself. I meant to say that the junior Senator from Connecticut said he would move to have the Senate take up those bills after action on the St. Lawrence seaway legislation had been concluded. I did not mean that he was going to do what the Senator has suggested. I meant to say that anything done by unanimous consent would only temporarily displace the unfinished business, the legislation now at hand, until action on it is concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that if a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the unfinished business were agreed to, and if later a unanimous-consent agreement as to the time to vote on another measure were agreed to, that would displace the business now before the Senate, until it was subsequently resumed, either by motion or by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

So if a motion to have the Senate consider other business were carried, that would automatically displace the present unfinished business. But if a unanimous-consent agreement of the sort described is presented and agreed to, when action on the subject of that agreement is concluded, the Senate will automatically resume consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, it is my purpose to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Would the unanimous-consent agreement to have consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution go over until the 25th of February include the joint resolution and all amendments thereto, or would the amendments be taken up prior to that time?

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is a pertinent question, so I shall read the agreement. Here is the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into between the proponents, or the Senator in charge of the pending joint resolution, and the opponents—in other words, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]:

Ordered, by unanimous consent,

That on the calendar day of Wednesday, February 25, 1948, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon:

(1) Any amendment that may be pending—

That would include the Senator's——

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

(2) Any amendment that may be proposed, subject to the provisions hereinafter named, following which the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution shall be considered as ordered.

(3) The final passage of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Ordered further, That after the adoption of this order, no amendment—

I ask all Senators please to give their attention to this, and I repeat a little of it—

Ordered further, That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane or relevant to the said joint resolution shall be received—

That is to say, after this unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into, but not before—

and that no amendment shall be received to said joint resolution which has not on or before said date of February 23, 1948, been submitted as an amendment intended to be proposed thereto, and ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The suggestion means, then, that if I can get the floor before the agreement is proposed, and get my amendment in, it will be taken care of?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. But if the agreement is made before I get my amendment in, by any chance, will it be too late for my amendment to be considered?

Mr. WHERRY. No; the Senator will still be protected. He may offer his amendment any time up until the date stated, February 23, 1948.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I correct in that statement, I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator is correct. Let me say that my position all along has been that the debate should not be unduly prolonged. When the debate was begun, the Senator from Wisconsin asked me to please agree with him not to drag it out, and I said I would agree not to drag it out. I call every Senator present to witness that I have not been one who has been trying to drag it out. I should be glad to vote on the joint resolution this week, Mr. President, or as soon as possible.

When it became apparent that the Senator was unwilling to have a vote this week, then of course I agreed to that, because it was the next best thing, and that has been the spirit in which I agreed. I think that there is much to be said for the contention that to put the whole matter off until February 25, and to spend 33 days on it when we have the Marshall plan and tax reduction and many other important issues confronting us, is distinctly out of line, and will be so viewed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, so there will be no misapprehension or misunderstanding about the provisions of the agreement, I interpret it to mean that all amendments which have been submitted or will be submitted will be voted upon not later than February 23, which is Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator is wrong in that statement. They must be offered by the 23d, but they can be voted on between the 23d and the time of the final vote on the joint resolution, on the 25th.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I accept the correction.

Mr. LODGE. But after the 23d no new amendment can be offered?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. LODGE. That is to protect every Member of the Senate, so that he will not have an amendment confronting him which he has never seen before.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I may say this is the first time I have seen the proposed agreement. After February 23 no amendments can be offered, and the Senate will vote on the final passage of the joint resolution on February 25 at 4 o'clock p. m. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we have now covered the matter rather thoroughly, and I hope there is no misunderstanding.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii;

John E. Parks, of Hawaii, to be third judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii;

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be circuit judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii;

Percy C. Fountain, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama, vice Albert J. Tully;

William W. Hart, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois;

Howard L. Doyle, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois;

Felipe Sanchez y Baca, of New Mexico, to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico;

Gerald K. Nellis, of New York, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York;

Theodore B. Werner, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the District of South Dakota; and

Leland Stanford Finney, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia, vice John White Stuart.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Harry L. Smith, of Illinois, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul,

and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Raymond G. Leddy, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Philip Axelrod, of Delaware.
Douglass K. Ballentine, of Texas.
Joseph V. Brès, of Louisiana.
Philip H. Chadbourn, Jr., of California.
Philip M. Dale, Jr., of New York.
Frank J. Devine, of New York.
Isidore Friedman, of New York.
Howard C. Goldsmith, of California.
Charles M. Hanson, Jr., of New York.
Miss Dorothy M. Jester, of California.
Alexander R. Kepler, of Ohio.
Frank E. Maestrone, of Connecticut.
Philip W. Manhard, of California.
Charles E. Paine, of California.
Chris G. Petrow, of Massachusetts.
Robert M. Phillips, of California.
Dwight E. Scarbrough, of Minnesota.
Lawrence W. Shenfield, of New York.
Wallace A. Sprague, of New Jersey.
Godfrey Harvey Summ, of New York.
John Patrick Walsh, of Illinois.
Milton C. Walstrom, of Hawaii.
William A. Wiedersheim, 3d, of Pennsylvania.
John W. Williams, of North Carolina.
Chalmers B. Wood, of the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. James M. Proctor, elevated.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Saviour of the world, by whose earthly life the ways of God are revealed, we would bare our hearts to the wondrous truth Thou dost impart. Forgive us the tasks we have neglected—the common duty and the commands of conscience. Inspire us with a larger claim that we may breathe the world-thought, feel its dire need, and thus become channels of broad understanding. Do Thou further us with Thy continued help, that unworthiness may be overcome and deliverance come to the scattered families of this sorry world. Thou who art sufficient for all things, enjoin us to pour courage and strength into the lives of the weak and helpless, and thus link ourselves with the kingdom of God upon earth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1634. An act to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto; and

H. R. 1826. An act making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap; and

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments;

S. 1195. An act to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations;

S. 1454. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes;

S. 1478. An act to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the Department of the Army to the Interior Department;

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (48 Stat. 387), and for other purposes;

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 1528. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury to accept and use gifts, devises, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of the Treasury, respectively, and for other purposes;

S. 1605. An act to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; and

S. J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1948.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today for the Speaker to recognize Members to move to suspend the rules and pass certain bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, of course, I shall not object, but I reserve the right to object so that the gentleman from Indiana may advise us if there is any bill that he has in mind in making his request, so that we on this side may be informed.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. The two bills that are proposed to be called up under suspension of the rules are the so-called subsistence bill for veterans in colleges and the on-the-job training bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Indiana limit his request to these two bills?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the request is a general one, but those are the two bills particularly for which the request is being made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he will not recognize Members to move to suspend the rules on other than the two bills mentioned.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a news letter by Samuel Pettengill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

ARMY RECRUITMENT PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word from some of my constituents complaining about the fact that the Army and the Army Air Force are using the Fred Waring program as a means of advertising their recruitment program.

I have just two comments to make on that. One is that we all know the Fred Waring program is not bought for peanuts. The other is that the program is being broadcast in my district at 9 o'clock in the morning. I do not know what the Army Air Force is doing trying to recruit the housewives of this country, because they are the only ones I can imagine who would be listening at that

time. It would seem to me that any legitimate prospect for recruitment would either be in school or at work at that time in the morning.

I have written a letter to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House asking him to look into that situation, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be included in these remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1948.

Mr. W. G. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: It has come to my attention that the Fred Waring program is being used as a radio medium in support of the Army's recruiting program.

While the objective is legitimate, I seriously question the advisability of using an expensive program of this kind, which is broadcast in my district at 9 o'clock in the morning. It seems to me that any legitimate recruitment prospect would either be in school or at work at that time.

I believe this question is one that might well be inquired into by your committee and I am therefore calling it to your attention.

I would be personally interested in being informed as to just what kind of a contract the Army has entered into with Fred Waring.

With personal regards to you, I am

Very sincerely yours,

GLENN R. DAVIS,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an extract from the Navy League Bulletin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT PAY OF ARMY OFFICERS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee considers the Army budget, we are always told that this is an irreducible budget. I have before me an excerpt from the Navy League Bulletin for January 1948, which reads, in part, as follows:

Data collected for the Secretary of Defense reveals that 84.7 percent of the Army officers holding the rank of major and above, who were discharged since 1940, will receive disability pensions, whereas only 63.4 percent of Navy officers of comparable rank will receive the same.

I am today placing the complete quotation, which is short, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials and letters.

TAX-REDUCTION LEGISLATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, by an overwhelming vote this House has sent to the other body a bill that carries tax relief for all the American people.

The other body has a choice of alternatives: One is to cut the President's budget, the other to alter the proposal we passed yesterday to the point where any tax relief for the American people is negligible. The choice is theirs.

ORDERLY REDUCTION OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, now that this House has acted with such overwhelming unanimity on the subject of tax reduction, it seems to me to be exceedingly appropriate that we should act with equal decisiveness on the subject of reducing the tremendous national debt. I have just introduced a bill, H. R. 5229, designed to provide for orderly and regular payments on the national debt of nearly two hundred and sixty billion dollars. While we are reducing taxes, we ought to be providing at the same time for reduction of the national debt.

At the close of World War I we had what seemed to be a staggering Federal debt. During the Republican administrations in the 1920's we adopted and carried out a program of making regular annual payments on our national obligations. That program, if continued, would have completely paid off the national debt before the start of World War II, but the New Deal came along and we have been going steadily deeper in the hole ever since.

The bill which I have introduced would compel the Federal Government to reduce the principal of the national debt by at least $1,500,000,000 every year. This amount would be earmarked and set up in the budget every year for debt reduction—in both good years and bad years, through prosperous times and hard times. We must pay off part of the principal just as regularly as we pay the interest, and the interest on the national debt is always included as an item in the Federal budget. I want principal payments budgeted on exactly the same basis.

My bill provides that the Treasury shall pay every year on the national debt an amount not less than 10 percent of all personal income taxes collected, or $1,500,000,000, whichever is the larger. In prosperous times 10 percent of all personal income taxes will very probably exceed $1,500,000,000. Even if this is not the case, under my bill we will still pay off $1,500,000,000 of our debt.

This does not mean that we should not pay off more than this annual minimum amount when we can. It will be up to Congress and the administration each year to set aside additional money for debt reduction. But certainly we cannot continue to handle the national debt on the present hit-or-miss basis. It is simply poor business. I think all of our people will be better satisfied and much less uneasy about the situation if they know that the Federal Government is paying its debts in a regular and businesslike way, even if it takes a long time.

Of course, everybody owes part of the national debt and everybody will have to pay a part of it. We all know that the theory that we owe it to ourselves is double talk, pure and simple. Paying it off will be a long, hard job for everybody.

The average taxpayer would like to feel that part of every dollar he pays will be used directly to reduce the national debt. This bill gives him that assurance. It provides that every income taxpayer, in making out his tax return, shall himself set aside and earmark for debt reduction 10 percent of the total amount of the tax he pays. The bill requires that each income-tax return form shall identify this 10-percent item with the following explanatory words, in boldface type: "This is the minimum amount which you are paying this year to reduce the national debt."

All of us will be able to pay our taxes more cheerfully if we know that a substantial part is to be used to help get the Federal Government out of the red and will not be turned over to some Government bureau to squander.

This country will never be genuinely prosperous until it pays off its back bills—two-hundred and sixty thousand million dollars of them. We ought to face the job squarely and go to work on it. I think my bill provides for a sensible beginning and intend to ask the Ways and Means Committee to act on it immediately.

DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the Department of Justice that America's No. 1 enemy, the German Communist, Gerhart Eisler, has been arrested and confined on Ellis Island. That is one down and several hundred more to go, of these aliens who are flocking into our country, Communists, Fascists, and Nazis, making a lot of money among the American people for the destruction of the American people.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman said it is one down and several hundred to go. He means several hundred thousand to go.

PER CAPITA FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE FIFTEENTH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA AS GIFTS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by inserting therein a table in reference to the six counties of my district, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has gone far enough in obligating the people of my district for Federal gratuities—gifts against their permission or will. I just want to show the Members what they have done.

Since the 1st of July 1945 up to June 30, 1947, you have obligated the people of my district for $44,827,707.06—this money to be given away to foreigners. Before the New Deal era such a thing was unheard of. Now you are talking about the Marshall plan, and you want to obligate the people of my district further for $34,956,000 more. That is their share of the seventeen billion in the Marshall plan.

I object to that.

This is $80,169,000 that you are taking from the people of my district to give away.

If I were to get behind the Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, the Lions Club, and other clubs and fraternal organizations in the district and urge them to go out and collect money to give away to foreigners, I will bet a dollar they would not get any $80,000,000 as gifts to pay this bill. I am on committees raising much money, and it is not $80,000,000.

The sad part of it is that you are doing the same thing to your own districts. It is not right. It is not just. It is not the honorable thing to do, and I object to it. I want you to stop it. Read the report that I shall insert in my remarks at this point and just see how far you can go in your own districts. I give my counties, their population in 1940, the obligations for gifts, and what you propose in the Marshall plan.

County	1940 population	Foreign aid July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, peacetime assistance	Foreign aid proposed by Truman-Marshall plan now pending	Total foreign aid provided and proposed
Cameron	6,852	$1,254,121.56	$988,743.60	$2,242,865.16
Clinton	34,557	6,324,967.71	4,986,575.10	11,311,542.81
Lycoming	93,633	17,137,647.99	13,511,241.90	30,648,889.89
McKean	56,673	10,372,859.19	8,177,913.90	18,550,773.09
Potter	18,201	3,331,329.03	2,626,404.30	5,957,733.33
Tioga	35,004	6,406,782.12	5,051,077.20	11,457,859.32
Total	244,930	44,827,707.60	35,341,956.00	80,169,663.60

This does not include anything but gifts since July 1, 1945, to foreign countries, gratuities if you please. Besides this, think of our national debt. Think of our annual expenditures, think of their local and State taxes. The power to tax is the power to destroy. The tax-take of America—Federal, State, and local taxes are around $56,000,000,000 annually or 30 percent of the estimated national income for 1947.

Before World War II, State and local taxes collected twice as much as Federal taxes. Today in the third year of peace our Federal tax is four times as high as local and State taxes for 1947 or about $40,000,000,000. Is not that a travesty on justice or to our people? That shows what this administration is doing to your people at home—I want it stopped and I will stop it with my vote if I can. Stop giving America away. Stop this increasing my peoples' debt. Stop wrecking our country. This Marshall plan is a wasteful, extravagant proposal. Why give Britain $5,348,000,000 more? We gave them $4,400,000,000 to do the job—all it did was socialize them.

Why give Holland $2,436,000,000?

Why give Denmark $582,000,000?

Why give Ireland $497,000,000?

Why give Iceland $38,000,000?

Why give Norway $234,000,000?

Why give Portugal $150,000,000?

Why give Sweden and Switzerland $700,000,000?

Why give our enemies Germany, Italy, and Austria $7,000,000,000? This does not include China and other countries. Stop giving us away. Stop giving my district away—I object to it.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to challenge any statement made by my President, but I would be a miserable slave to fear if I did not take exception to the recommendations made in his message of February 2.

When I read this message I wonder if, after all, Henry Wallace is such a bad man.

The President attacks the people of that section of the country whose support he must have if he is to hope to be reelected. The whole thing sickens me.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's message, delivered to the House on yesterday, with respect to the State of the Union, is an interesting document.

In so many words, it gives Presidential backing and approval to the recent report issued by the Committee on Civil Rights, on which committee the South had no representation to amount to anything—save left-winger Frank Graham, of North Carolina, who saw to it that his State got a pat on the back, and that the rest of the South was held up to ridicule, hatred, and contempt to the Nation.

It is deplorably unfortunate that President Truman is always a conscious party to any concoction which brands the southern white people as inhuman, and devoid of any respect for law and order. It is getting increasingly unbearable to my people that the so-called Democrats now carrying the label of the party which we founded and whose life we kept alive in the darkest hours of our party's political adversity, feel so sure of our complacency that they can continue to use us as the Nation's whipping boy.

The Democratic Party started on a one-way road to destruction at the time Eleanor Roosevelt got free tenancy in the White House.

President Truman's masterpiece is significantly quiet on one of the most brazen attempts to subjugate one of our most sacred institutions, the wholesale stealing of votes in Kansas City, and the deprivation of the sacred right of citizens to cast their votes and have them counted.

President Truman's masterpiece is significantly quiet on the recent mass slaughter of citizens of Chicago by machine-gun-toting gangsters.

President Truman's masterpiece fails to make mention of the murder in cold blood in New York City of one Scottorigio, on election day. Evidently, murder in the big cities is less important than one or two lynchings in the vast part of our Nation known as the Southland.

President Truman's masterpiece does not tell the Nation that there are more unnoticed murders in New York or Chicago in 1 year than there are alleged lynchings in the rest of the Nation combined.

President Truman's committee, who compiled the report of 178 pages, did not call the Nation's attention to the difficult task the South has had over the years of stamping out lynching, and how courageously the southern law-enforcement officers have been combating this thing with encouraging success.

It being the political season of the year, I imagine that in order to attract the Negro vote of the North, it is appropriate for political concoctions in the nature of the President's request to be the order of the day. It also appears that the ideal to which many emancipators point their sights in this Nation is to bring forth a mongrel American.

It is a sad commentary to me that the right to live as we please in the privacy of our homes, and in our work, now becomes a mortal political sin. It is a sad commentary to me that President Truman will be a conscious party to that group of Americans who apologize for the pigment of their skin. The only Americans who have no spokesman in this Nation are the white people. It has

gotten to the sad sight of 13,000,000 tails wagging 130,000,000 dogs.

The solid South one of these days is going to rise up and surprise some of the solid-headed leaders who think that the South is still in the bag.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, time and time again I have said on this floor that Harry Truman never had a better friend in this House than I have been, but that message of yesterday was the most discouraging thing I have ever heard read.

Why should we go to Europe and spend $17,000,000,000 under the so-called Marshall plan, allegedly fighting communism, which means $6,000,000 for the overburdened taxpayers of every individual county I represent? Why should we go to that extent and then have a President of the United States under some pressure we cannot understand come in with that message and try to ram the platform of the Communist Party down the throats of the people of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, there is one way we can take care of ourselves. We can elect independent electors throughout the South; and it is about time we do that throughout the country; then let those electors decide who shall be President. When we do that, we will put a stop to these smearing Communists who creep into every bureau and every commission that is appointed and attempt to undermine and destroy everything our people have fought for and everything we hold dear.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am a lifelong Democrat, a descendant of Democrats, representing the most Democratic State in the Union, and I also rise to protest this thing that the President is doing to the South.

If it were not for southern Democrats, Henry Wallace would be in the White House today instead of Harry Truman. Southern Democrats have always been the best friends that President Truman or the Democratic Party ever had. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a mighty poor way for him to evince his gratitude.

I cannot of course in the brief space of a minute go into detail in discussing this latest attack on constitutional government and Jeffersonian Democracy.

But I will say in all sincerity that I had rather see the Democratic Party go down in honorable defeat standing on the time-honored principles of Thomas Jefferson than to see it win an empty victory by stabbing its best friends in the back.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I endorse and subscribe to all that has been said by my colleagues who have preceded me.

Mr. Speaker, on January 12, I introduced a discharge petition for the so-called universal military training bill, and thereafter I found that I had been improperly advised on the number of the bill as well as the procedure. Therefore, on January 21, I introduced House Resolution 445 directing the House Rules Committee to report out H. R. 4278, under the rules of the House, which bill is the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee of the House, and upon which the Rules Committee had taken no action.

Under my House Resolution 445, and under the rules of the House, seven legislative days are required to give the Rules Committee time to consider the reporting the bill to the House for consideration, and failing to do so at the expiration of the seven legislative days, it is then in order under my resolution, and under the rules of the House that a discharge petition may then be directed against the Rules Committee which will require the consideration of H. R. 4278 upon the signing of the said discharge petition by 218 Members of the House.

Therefore, since the required number of legislative days have expired, and in view of the fact that the Rules Committee have failed to take any action on H. R. 4278, by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE], under the rules of the House I am today filing discharge petition No. 13 on the desk of the Clerk, and I ask that all Members who desire to sign the discharge petition do so at the earliest possible moment, otherwise, if the required number of signatures is not obtained at an early date, it may not be possible to have the bill considered and acted upon by the House and Senate before adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this bill for universal military training is, in my opinion, the first step in any program for the protection and preservation of our country, and further, recent events, in my opinion, make it necessary that this legislation be enacted without further delay.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues I am saddened and disheartened by the President's message of yesterday. But I do not blame the President so much. It is a system to which he has succumbed. If a Republican, or some other Democrat, were in the White House he would probably send up a similar message. It is a form of political expediency or hypocrisy induced by the electoral-college system of choosing Presidents.

Under the archaic undemocratic system of electing Presidents we have, as a matter of fact, turned over the national politics of the country to two major cities—New York and Chicago. Both parties get down on their bellies and crawl in the dirt and kiss the feet of the organized minorities in the big pivotal States. The only way we are going to be absolved from this ignominious procedure is to abolish the archaic system under which we elect Presidents. The solid South has been used as a whipping boy by both parties. We are kicked around by the Democratic National Committee and also by our friends, the Republicans. It is a matter of political expediency. The best folks in the country, the real Democrats, have no actual voice in the election of a Chief Executive; so, blame the system rather than Mr. Truman, who has succumbed to it. Let us change this system. Let us remove the shackles that now bind both major parties, and let the President be elected by a democratic process. The present system accentuates, encourages, and aggravates religious, racial, and economic blocs to the detriment of our whole country.

Our Judiciary Committee has finished hearings on resolutions to abolish the electoral college and electors and to divide the electoral vote of each State in the exact ratio with the popular vote. The Congress should immediately pass such resolution. Then and then only will Presidents stop appealing to the minorities and quit appealing to their passions and prejudices for the sake of votes.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the President's message of yesterday was most unfortunate. As has been pointed out by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] much of it comes from our system of electing Presidents in which both parties set out to get votes of the racial minorities in the so-called pivotal States, apparently losing sight of all else, in order to obtain the electoral votes of those States.

A short time ago the Governor of my State, a great Governor of a great State, an outstanding lawyer and citizen, a temperate man, in his inaugural message to the State legislature served notice on the leaders of the National Democratic Party that in view of their efforts to pass measures aimed at the South they had better stop, look, and listen, if they hoped to have the unqualified support of the South. This we have been urging for some time, to no avail. Party leaders will not learn.

The President's message yesterday shows that these party leaders have neither stopped, looked, nor listened.

Mr. Speaker, the President's action yesterday is deplored. I believe his advisers have led him to make a serious mistake. There can be no question that such message comes as a result of the charges of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Communist Party, and various radical agitators, leveled against us in the South.

This message presumes that such charges are well founded, it takes for granted that Negroes are mistreated in the South. Such is not the truth.

For almost 9 years before coming here I was a district attorney in Mississippi. During that whole time, and since, I know that every official with whom I came in contact was wholly fair to the Negro; in fact, they not only protected him in his civil rights but if they erred it was in his favor. In practically every case where a Negro was charged with crime which came before me several good white citizens were there begging the officers to be lenient with him. In those few cases where, due to their atrocity, some few people might have liked to take the law in their hands, in all cases the defendant was protected by the sheriffs, the deputies, the court, and the people. Such is the general situation throughout the South where, according to the Tuskegee report, during 1947 there was only 1 lynching and 31 were prevented.

If the antilynch bill is passed so that an officer is personally responsible if something happens to the prisoner, it will not improve the present situation but will tend to cause officers to be less diligent in their efforts to go in and arrest the person believed to be guilty and protect him, because if the officer takes such person into custody, and his prisoner is taken from him, then the penalty applies.

No, Mr. Speaker, the President says his recommendations follow that of his committee which he appointed. The recommendations are the same but the President knew or should have known what his committee would bring in, for 8 of the 15 members of that committee are members of racial minorities in this country, and of the other 7, several are well known for their charges against the South. That kind of group started out to do just what the President has lent his aid to doing.

We have had a taste of having the Department of Justice send representatives into our State. We have learned what they will do, for on at least two occasions they went into my State, paid no attention whatever to the statements of the State officials, who are just as conscientious in the discharge of their duties as any Federal officer who ever lived, but accepted the false and untrue statements of racial minority radicals.

The tragedy of the situation is that both the Democratic and Republican Parties are trying to get the Negro and other racial minorities to support them in the November election. In their efforts to obtain that support they recommend the passage of the FEPC, whereby folks in Washington will tell every businessman in the country who he must employ. They recommend the passage of the antilynch bill, which would not improve the present situation, the repeal of the poll tax—in my State $2 each year, which all, white and black, must pay whether or not they vote, the money from which goes to the support of public schools for white and Negro. All would have been held unconstitutional by any Supreme Court which preceded the present Court.

Mr. Speaker, Negroes are protected in their rights, civil and otherwise, to a greater extent in the South than in any section of which I know and I have been over the United States. We understand them and their failings, and in fact they are not held as strictly accountable as are the white citizens.

No; what is desired by the Communist Party, who recommends these things, is unrest and trouble; that would certainly follow the passage of these measures.

What the various Negro organizations want is amalgamation of the races, they want to break down segregation; they do not want equal treatment but want social intermingling—which they believe would follow the passage of such measures.

What the Democratic Party and Republican Party, too, I might say, want is the votes of Negroes and other racial minority groups in Chicago and New York and other cities in the so-called pivotal States and thereby hope to win the next election.

To the Democratic leaders I say Governor Wright was right when he said they had best stop, look, and listen. He had reference to politics. I say both parties, Democratic and Republican, had best stop, look, and listen, or they are going to wreck this Nation by directing their platforms toward obtaining the Negro vote in the northern cities even if it calls for destroying State laws, State courts, and even State government.

They should leave such platforms to Henry Wallace and the Communist Party and devote themselves to the great majority of American citizens who, through State and local governments, are giving much better service and protection to all their people than would the Federal Government, operating thousands of miles away, who might at any time destroy the laws, the customs, take away the rights of the people of one section in order to obtain the votes of other more populous areas, such Federal Government being controlled by a Congress and an executive department, only a few members of which would either understand or know the local problems. To both the Democratic and Republican Parties I say you are on the road to an all-powerful state. Once you destroy State laws and State government you have taken away the greatest protection the American citizen has in his civil rights and in all others. Today more and more southern Democrats are seeking ways and means of correcting the present intolerable situation which threatens not only the South but also our great Nation. The President's message will tend to speed up that hunt for a way to save the South and the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an editorial and in the other a statement.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an article and in the other an editorial.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include resolutions adopted by an American Legion post.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I think my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] has a good plan, that the people of this country should do something to take the elections of Presidents of the United States out of the hands of minorities and give them back to the people of this country where they belong. Gentlemen of the House, I may be wrong, but I think that the civil rights of the people in China and in Europe, as well as the rest of the people all over the world, who are being threatened by communism, should be the No. 1 objective of any administration sitting in the White House of this country today. Soil conservation and forestry and hydroelectric power, lowering the Social Security Act from 65 to 62 years, and things of that nature, should come first in this country, and not the kind of stuff that was brought before this House on yesterday. For all we know, the atomic bomb might fall some night on some of the cities of this country. I thought about that last night. I have seen bombs fall in Europe, and I know what I am talking about. We should do first things first in this country and not try to out-Wallace Henry A. Wallace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McGARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial regarding the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make later today and include certain tables and correspondence.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a newspaper article and other material.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

REDUCTION OF POSTAL RATES ON RELIEF SHIPMENTS OVERSEAS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to answer an attack which has been made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs consisting of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the gentlemen from New York [Messrs. JAVITS and PFEIFER] upon the measures which have been introduced by a number of Members to reduce or eliminate the postage on shipments overseas of relief supplies—food, clothing, medical supplies, and necessaries.

I happen to be the author of H. R. 4616, introduced on December 2, 1947, to reduce such charges by one-half. A number of my colleagues have introduced other measures to the same general effect. In addition, there are large numbers from this body and the other body who have voiced their vigorous support of such legislation as embodying the most desirable form of foreign aid in the finest American tradition.

The report of this Subcommittee of Foreign Affairs, which has been made a House document, presents a labored argument to attempt to show that it is actually less expensive for the Government to buy relief supplies and pay the entire cost of shipping them than it is to grant a subsidy of a part of the cost of shipment to be charged to any European recovery program. They say that, given a certain number of dollars, the Government can make them go farther by buying food and paying all of the cost of sending it overseas than they can by paying simply the cost or a part of the cost of shipment of the item.

In the first place, this argument seems to me patently unsound arithmetic. How one can seriously argue that the Government saves money by buying a bag of sugar or a suit of clothes and paying the entire cost of shipping it, rather than by allowing one of my constituents to send it out of his own generosity and simply defraying a part of his postage costs is beyond my power to comprehend.

But this subcommittee says it should all be channeled through the Government. We ought not, they say, to encourage our people to help their relatives and friends overseas, to whom they have family or racial ties. It should all be done, they claim, by the scientifically cold and calculating hand of bureaucracy rather than out of the genuine warmth and affection of personalized generosity. To that viewpoint, I cannot subscribe.

Conceding the necessity of some governmental program of foreign aid, I feel certain from personal experiences related to me by my people that the thrill experienced by a family in Germany, Italy, Poland, or England in receiving a parcel from John or Mary Smith postmarked U. S. A. is incomparably greater than his experience in having those same relief supplies doled out by some governmental agency. Moreover, we should not lose sight of the value of such a gift to the giver, always more richly blessed than the receiver.

The people in my district, and I know the same holds true throughout the country, generous as they have been, want to do more, but when it costs over $3 to send a package abroad they are naturally restricted in the extent to which they are able to share with their less fortunate brothers and sisters across the seas. It is regrettable, indeed, that this subcommittee has seen fit to take a step which, if accepted by this Congress, will reverse rather than accelerate the trend toward voluntary assistance by our own people in the finest American tradition.

I have spoken out on this subject at this time in order to urge that the full Committee on Foreign Affairs may not follow the recommendation made by this subcommittee. Furthermore, it is submitted, with due deference, that this subcommittee has presumed to exercise jurisdiction over a matter which is entirely outside the scope of its legitimate activities and which has already properly been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Upon the chairman and members of this committee I urge that an early hearing may be granted on my bill, H. R. 4616, and the other measures seeking similar relief which are sponsored by my colleagues.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H. R. 5052 and House Joint Resolution 296.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on the shipping of farm equipment to foreign countries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, the oil situation in western Massachusetts is becoming more serious day by day. According to a recent telegram I received from an independent dealer, it is possible that 1,500 families in one city may be out of oil and without opportunity to secure oil unless something drastic is done shortly. Director Max W. Ball of the Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior prophesied that the fuel shortage which we are encountering this year may extend over the next 4 or 5 years. The only proposal that has come out of the Department of the Interior to take care of this situation is a proposal to spend $9,000,000,000 in order to make oil out of shale and coal. Everyone knows that that would take a period of years and is no remedy for the situation which actually faces this department as the oil industry is now run. It would appear that 17 major oil companies in the course of the next 3 or 4 years are going to be in the position of putting every independent oil dealer, distributor, and retailer out of business unless Congress does something shortly in order to remedy a situation which is slowly but surely becoming worse. I am advised that one or more independent dealers in my district are unable to secure fuel oil for their customers but a major oil company is prepared to deliver fuel oil to the independent dealer's customers directly. This, in my opinion, is a gross violation of the recommendation of representatives of the oil industry that a pool of fuel oil should be placed at the disposal of a State fuel coordinator to aid independent dealers in supplying their customers. There are nine investigations of the oil situation now under way by Congress. I trust at least one of them will provide an answer to such a situation as this independent dealer faces.

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1948, I introduced H. R. 4928, a bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, so as to authorize, belatedly, the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver strategic or critical minerals and metals during the war. The amendment is based upon the repeatedly acknowledged obligation of the American people to provide fair compensation for all who contributed materials, services, or facilities for the prosecution of World War II and is, in substance, a reenactment of similar remedial legislation adopted by the Congress after World War I, expanded to include the minerals and metals designated by the Army and Navy Munitions Board as strategic or critical. The amendment serves to rationalize the payment of fair

compensation so that the war contractor who supplied critical minerals and metals is treated the same as any other supplier of materials, services, or facilities used in the prosecution of the war, and to correct presently existing discriminatory practices resulting from technically inconsistent or conflicting provisions of the act itself, whereby the claim of one producer is allowed and that of another is denied.

Commencing with the war-induced emergency, the President of the United States, the Congress, and hundreds of officers and representatives of wartime Government agencies repeatedly importuned the members of the mining fraternity, especially those who owned or operated marginal properties, to accelerate exploration, development, and production so that critical minerals and metals used in the manufacture of implements of war might be in maximum supply.

Pursuant to policies formulated by the War Production Board, the Metals Reserve Company, organized in June 1940 to act as a Government purchasing agent, created a special market for critical minerals and metals, and by press, by radio, and by personal appeal, sought to stimulate production by offering all sorts by inducements, such as loans, subsidies, and decentralized special services.

The miners' good-faith response to the Government's intense drive for increased production we cannot gainsay. Many of these loyal producers, especially from among those of small means, failed to recover the actual cost of their patriotic endeavor, due to natural hazards common to mining and over which the miner had no control.

That Congress intended to pay fair compensation to the wartime producer of critical minerals and metals is evidenced by the words of the Honorable James G. Scrugham, former Senator from Nevada, when he said to a group of miners on August 7, 1944, at Phoenix, Ariz., shortly after the adoption of the Contract Settlement Act:

> The Congress has included in the recently passed Contract Settlement Act authority for the Office of Contract Settlement to deal with quasi and informal contracts and make settlements therefor. It was the intent of the Congress under this act to give the agencies and the Office of Contract Settlement such authority that a war minerals relief bill would not be necessary. What the results will be depends upon the administration of the act as set up in the Office of Contract Settlement.
>
> There is no reason, ladies and gentlemen, why you of the mining industry and of other industries who did not wait or quibble about contracts before doing their best for the war effort should not be compensated. I know that I did not intend, and I now know that neither the Senate nor the House intended that we should have to wait 10, 15, or 20 years under some new war minerals relief act before those who may have some unrecovered wartime investment at the end of hostilities should be compensated therefor. This was the case after the last world war.

Unfortunately, history is repeated. Three and a half years after the passage of the Contract Settlement Act, the record reveals that the miner has been treated with a disregard equal to, or perhaps greater than, that displayed following World War I. Some producers whose claims for fair compensation have been successively denied by the contracting agencies and the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement, are now prosecuting an action de novo in various district courts of the United States, ranging from South Carolina to Montana, in a prolonged but determined effort to recover fair compensation. The record further shows that, in one instance where two producers furnished manganese ore to the same stock pile simultaneously under parallel conditions, the unrecovered costs of one have been paid, and a like claim of the other rejected. Just recently, I discovered that one of my own constituents, whose contract for the delivery of a specified number of tons of ore was terminated as the result of circumstances or natural causes impossible of apprehension or control, is precluded from recovering fair compensation on account of an irreconcilable conflict in the provisions of the Contract Settlement Act itself, thus defeating its very intent.

The afore-mentioned record of confusion and frustration is sufficient to convince me that we must act promptly to eliminate the discrimination which, by our own slothfulness, we have too long allowed to prevail between classes of war contractors and between members of the same class. It is obvious to me that the act, which is based upon the fundamental principle that war contractors shall be paid speedily the fair compensation due them for the termination of their war contracts, must be amended if we are to keep faith with the wartime producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals. To that end, I have introduced H. R. 4928, and earnestly seek its speedy adoption.

We can ill afford, at this critcal period in our Nation's existence, to consciously permit depletion in the resources of those upon whom we must depend for our supply of critcal minerals and metals. I say, and I think we will all agree, that we may again need their wholehearted and unreserved aid and assistance. What response do we have a right to expect in the face of the shabby treatment which I have just called to your attention.

In endeavoring to decide whether we should spend billions of dollars in an attempt to prove to the disillusioned people of western Europe the superiority of our democratic processes and so-called way of life and induce them to make it their first choice, I find many fellow Members of Congress suggesting that we insist on acquiring, from those European countries, as part consideration for our bounty, readily available supplies of critical minerals and metals, to be here stock-piled for possible future emergency. Before we do that, before we send billions abroad, I respectfully suggest and urge that we pay our duly acknowledged debt, at best but a few millions, to our own loyal and proven producers of these necessary materials. With me they come first.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PARCEL-POST SHIPMENTS ABROAD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] has called attention to a report on the question of voluntary foreign aid affecting parcel-post shipments. I am very happy to straighten that point out for the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], as well as for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], and perhaps other Members who have introduced similar bills. The only thing we intended to say in our report is that on a purely financial basis, the idea of taking money out of funds appropriated for foreign relief for the purpose of compensating for free parcel post did not pay in dollars and cents. Now, the question of policy or the question of humanitarianism or the question of whether we should encourage in an affirmative way the sending of these parcels, because it is a good thing like the Voice of America program or a similar policy approach, is not at all dealt with and is entirely within the realm of discretion. All we do is analyze the purely financial aspects of the operation. I hope that will clarify the matter for my colleagues. I would feel perfectly free myself to vote for a suitable bill on this subject. Our report is not intended to be and is not an obstruction on the road for the consideration of these bills entirely on their merits.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I echo the sentiments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] on the legislation which has been introduced to reduce or eliminate the postage on shipments of gift packages sent abroad. As I understand it, the study which was made by the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held no hearings on the question. Therefore the special subcommittee's opposition represents no more than their own viewpoint. I do not think it is the prerogative of a special subcommittee of one House committee to labor the points of legislation presently pending before another committee, in this case the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think if the views of the special subcommittee are carried out it is going to discourage this very urgent, immediate, humane, and charitable aid of sending gifts of food to deserving people abroad. We know that no donee abroad gets the food unless the donor here knows that he is deserving of it. We know also that this private

aid eases tremendously the public burden to give succor to deserving souls abroad. I trust that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will rely on its own study.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BREHM addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REDUCED PARCEL-POST RATES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to lend my wholehearted support to the proposition of reducing the postal rates to foreign countries so that private individuals may be more encouraged to send their contributions to foreign countries where there is great need.

There is one aspect of this program, a bill for which I have also introduced, that has not been sufficiently stressed, in my opinion. It is this, that by reducing the postal rates we thereby encourage private individuals to send aid to those countries where there is great need and we are thereby engaging the interest of a much larger number of our citizens in aiding Europe and in the fight against communism. The rank-and-file citizen of the United States is by this measure encouraged to send aid and he thereby personally participates in the aid program. This is not just a Government program to aid the people of these foreign countries. This is a program in which the rank-and-file citizens of the United States have a vital interest, and by reducing the postage rates we are thereby engaging their direct interest. The loss sustained in postal revenue is gained tenfold in the private contributions thus increased. Hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of private citizens will be encouraged to send aid and thereby participate in the ERP. The more private contributions, the less burden on the Government. Private contributions create a closer bond between citizens of the United States and the needy in foreign lands. There is less of the political and more of the human in this kind of aid. There is something much more heart warming in a gift from an individual, as contrasted with a gift from a government. I heartily support this measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

THE LATE ORVILLE WRIGHT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include as a part of my remarks an editorial from the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., The Dream Still Flies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last there passed away one of America's great pioneers, the last of the Wright brothers, Orville Wright. During the 3 years he spent on the coast of North Carolina he endeared himself to the people of my State—and particularly those living in Dare County. There he made lifelong friends. Also, this is true of Wilbur Wright, who passed on years ago.

On the same day that Mr. Wright passed away there entered the hospital at Norfolk, Va., Capt. John T. Daniels. He passed away the succeeding day. Thus closed the active life of the men who participated in the first flight to conquer the air. All have gone on to their reward. At Kitty Hawk stands the Wright Memorial, which commemorates the first flight of an airplane and forevermore will inspire the youth of the world.

DIES AT NORFOLK

NORFOLK, VA., February 1.—Capt. John T. Daniels, 74, of Manteo, N. C., who assisted the Wright brothers in the first successful airplane flight at Kill Devil Hill 44 years ago, died last night in a local hospital.

Daniels was brought to the hospital suffering from a heart ailment Friday shortly before the death of Orville Wright at Dayton, Ohio.

It was Daniels who held down one of the wings of the Wright plane on December 17, 1903, until the proper time for the craft to be freed for flight. He was the last survivor of three coast guardsmen who assisted in the historic take-off.

Daniels retired from the Coast Guard in 1918 due to disability. Subsequently he was the master of several inland waterway vessels. He was a cousin of the late Josephus Daniels, former Navy Secretary and Raleigh publisher who died recently.

THE DREAM STILL FLIES

When Capt. John T. Daniels of Manteo died a few hours after the death of Orville Wright, the last of those young men who participated in man's first flight was gone and aviation became not an invention of our time but of our past. The little moments of uncertain flying above the Carolina dunes seemed very remote as these two old gentlemen died. And in an age which counts aviation as a principal part of power, it is difficult to remember that even as young men, both of them, the Carolina coast guardsman and the Ohio mechanic, were the gentlest sort of human beings. What they launched was a long desired part of man's hope, and both of them as they grew older were appalled by the deadly results which followed the fulfillment of that dream.

The world knew Orville Wright much better than it did Capt. John T. Daniels. It knew him as a very retiring inventor, almost forgotten as he grew older among the roar of the militant voices of those who seized upon aviation as the most deadly weapon man has yet contrived. Orville Wright himself spoke in dismay of the awful use made of the invention he and his brother had created.

In a remarkable way Captain Daniels was a man of the same sort of gentle and reticent spirit. He was a strong, brave man who gave his life to saving the lives of the shipwrecked in the seas above Hatteras. At that first flight, of course, he represented not the inventive genius of man but the spirit of the ordinary American of good will, ready in courage to take the adventurous chance. In such a way both Orville Wright and Captain Daniels symbolized the decent expectant world in which men escaped the bonds of old earth—and somehow felt in the process that man could rise above the past as well as the earth.

There is more than an ordinary element of tragedy in the death of these two men—and also in the lives of those of us who remain—in the fact that the principal note at the time of their passing should be sounded by military men. The thanks they gave was that from that first flight "America will be empowered to maintain world peace." Orville Wright and John T. Daniels were as patriotic as any Americans of their time. It is to be doubted, however, that either dreamed of aviation as an American weapon for an American maintained peace.

Across the 44 years of flight before they died, they heard men speak of the possibilities that aviation might pull the hearts of men together in a smaller, better world. Indeed, the development of aviation coincided with the development of plans by which men and nations working together might secure peace and order for all, not by a weapon in the hands of one nation but by rising intelligence and decency among all nations.

Sometimes today such plans for a world rising above the ruins of the endless varieties of peace by power in the past may sometimes seem as fragile and as awkward as that kite crate which flew so uncertainly across the Carolina dunes in 1903. The League of Nations did not rise. The United Nations falters. The soldiers still are those who talk as the possessors of the best creativeness and courage of man. But the world needs desperately to remember at the death of these two old gentlemen who were such gallant young men that man still looks up in hope, in genius, in courage and in faith. He will not be forever bound to a bloody earth nor always permit primitive distortion of his soaring dream.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

CAFFEY ROBERTSON-SMITH, INC.

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar (H. R. 350) for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds available for carrying out the provisions of section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, as amended, the sum of $9,448.86, to Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn., in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for payments for the exportation of certain quantities of cotton at the rates in effect at the time of the sales thereof for export, notices of such sales having been given prior to December 6, 1939, but the payments therefor having been withheld for the reason that the said Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc., did not promptly file a bond supporting the agreement of compliance, dated August 1, 1939, which it entered into in connection with the cotton and cotton products export program of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwith-

standing. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF E. W. EATON COAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2697) for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,103.24, to E. W. Eaton Coal Co., of Belfast, Maine, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation cost in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after April 1, 1944, to December 31, 1944, in and around New York Harbor area and in New England, which period was not included in the regulations of the Office of Price Administration on bituminous coal from district No. 3 in northern West Virginia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out all of line 2 and the words "of Price Administration" in line 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES E. CROOK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2268) for the relief of Charles E. Crook.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to credit the account of Charles E. Crook, postmaster, of Vicksburg, Miss., in the sum of $677.30, and that B. L. Fielder, assistant postmaster, of Vicksburg, Miss., is hereby relieved from any liability to refund or to pay to the United States said sum of $677.30, such sum being the amount of increased salary paid to the assistant postmaster from December 1, 1942, to January 31, 1946, and disallowed by the General Accounting Office due to misunderstanding, by the Vicksburg postmaster, of section 9, paragraph Z, of Public Law 134, of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "to a mistake of facts upon the part of the postmaster, Vicksburg, Miss., and the Post Office Department in applying section 92 of title 39, United States Code, and section 9 (z) of Public Law 134 of the Seventy-ninth Congress (title 39 U. S. C., 1940 ed., sec. 859 (z)).

"SEC. 2. The Postmaster General is authorized to pay to B. L. Fielder from the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1947 for the service involved such sum as he may have repaid as a result of the condition set forth in section 1 of this act and the Comptroller General shall allow the same."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$677.30" and insert "$699.15."

Page 1, line 8 strike out "$677.30" and insert in lieu thereof "$699.15."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "January 31" and insert in lieu thereof "August 12."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. EDWARD H. ISENHART

The Clerk called the bill (S. 664) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart, of Kemmerer, Wyo., the sum of $662.82, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for the sums of $475.20, representing the 6 months' death gratuity, and $187.62, representing arrears of pay, which would be payable to them in the case of their foster son, Harold Emmett Isenhart (service No. [redacted]), late a seaman first class, United States Naval Reserve, except for the fact that they were not his natural parents: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PETER BEDNAR ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1022) for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Ruth Eva Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to dismiss the deportation proceedings now pending against Peter Bednar, and that he shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States, notwithstanding the fact that he arrived without proper immigration documentation. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Rumanian quota of the first year that the same Rumanian quota is available.

The Attorney General is further authorized to record lawful admission for permanent residence into the United States of Francisca Bednar, Ruth Eva Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar as of the date of their last entry into the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the words "United States", add "on May 26, 1942."

Page 2, line 7, strike out the name "Ruth Eva Bednar."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIE RUTH CHAPMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1411) for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Willie Ruth Chapman, of Ethridge, Tenn., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by her as a result of an accident which occurred on December 2, 1944, in Lawrenceburg, Tenn., when the automobile driven by her was struck by a United States Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD L. BARRERAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 380) for the relief of Edward L. Barreras.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward L. Barreras, Canoga Park, Calif., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edward L. Barreras against the United States on account of personal injuries received by him on March 3, 1944, as a result of a collision between the car in which he was riding and a United States Army vehicle at the intersection of Manchester and Avalon Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services

rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,100."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ESSIE N. FANNIN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 697) for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, of Moneta, Va., the sum of $15,000; Miss Helen Hicks, of Moneta, Va., the sum of $10,000; Miss Marie Hicks, of Moneta, Va., the sum of $5,000; Miss Frances Fannin, of Moneta, Va., the sum of $5,000; William O. Thompson, of Moneta, Va., the sum of $1,000; and Mrs. W. D. Thompson, of Moneta, Va., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained, hospital and medical expenses, and loss of earnings incurred by each of the above-named persons, as a result of an accident involving a vehicle operated by the Civilian Conservation Corps, War Department, on route 122, near Moneta, Va., on November 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,430.30."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,533.96."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,573."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,116.25."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$226.10."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$211.35."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVE HOUGARDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of Dave Hougardy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dave Hougardy, Renton, Wash., the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages arising out of the death by drowning of Teddy Hougardy, 8-year-old son of the said Dave Hougardy, on August 5, 1938, when he fell from an unprotected foot log built by employees of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture in the Dalles campground of the Snoqualmie National Forest, Washington: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HASSLER-PONDER TOY MANUFACTURING CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2914) for the relief of the Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc., of Birmingham, Ala., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc., by a fire which destroyed its plant and equipment on November 16, 1938, while being occupied and used by the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISSISSIPPI CENTRAL RAILROAD CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3089) for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,750, to the Mississippi Central Railroad Co., of Hattiesburg, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for the death of C. L. Hensarling, sustained as a result of an accident at Camp Shelby, Miss., on June 2, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEBANON WOOLEN MILLS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3425) for the relief of Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc., of Lebanon, Tenn., the sum of $9,292.99, in full satisfaction of all claims of such company against the United States for remission of liquidated damages assessed against such company under the provisions of a contract with the United States, acting by the War Department, Quartermaster Corps, of date August 12, 1935, with execution completed on September 26, 1935, and the executed copy sent to the contractor on October 1, 1935, for manufacture and delivery of a quantity of blankets to the War Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARY H. OVERALL AND THOMAS I. BAKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3427) for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mary H. Overall, Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $1,500, and to Thomas I. Baker, Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sum of $1,500 to the said Mrs. Mary H. Overall shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Mary H. Overall against the United States arising out of the loss of a barn and its contents as a result of fire caused by military personnel during Army maneuvers in Tennessee in 1944. The payment of such sum of $1,500 to the said Thomas I. Baker shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Thomas I. Baker against the United States for the loss of a Fordson tractor which was in such barn at the time of the fire and damaged beyond repair: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney

on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,280."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,280."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN OSGOOD COGAN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1929) for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel John Cogan, as of May 2, 1945, the date they were admitted temporarily to the United States. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the Philippine quota of the first year that the Philippine quota is available and one number from the quota for India of the first year the said Indian quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "John" and insert "Joan."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE CABRAL LORENZO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Jose Cabral Lorenzo, as of April 29, 1937, the date on which he was temporarily admitted to the United States, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than the second class of section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875, U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (a)).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 1, insert "Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the Spanish quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLIVE IRENE MILLOGLAV

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3968) for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States, for permanent residence and relating to admission at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which exclude from admission into the United States persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony, or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, shall not hereafter be held to apply to Olive Irene Milloglav, who is the wife of George E. Milloglav, an American citizen and veteran of World War II, on account of an offense alleged to have been committed abroad while she was about 18 years of age during her legal infancy and prior to her marriage in Australia to George E. Milloglav. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to Olive Irene Milloglav under this act upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Olive Irene Milloglav, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4443) for the relief of Jacob Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Jacob Cohen, San Francisco, Calif., a Rumanian national who entered the United States in September 1946, for a temporary stay (and whose son, Kurt Cohen, a naturalized citizen of the United States, died in France on February 6, 1945, as a result of wounds received in action while a member of the military forces of the United States) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, as of September 1, 1946. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Rumanian quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EZRA BUTLER EDDY, JR., AND WIFE, MARIE CLAIRE LORD EDDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1915) for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and his wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy, as of February 3, 1945, the date upon which they were admitted temporarily to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB A. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 332) for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jacob A. Johnson, of Kodiak, Alaska, the sum of $26,669, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for the loss of 235 fox pups in the year 1941, for the loss of 230 fox pups in the year 1942, for the loss of 77 fox pups in the year 1943, and for the loss of 84 fox pups in the year 1944, caused by the flight of United States Army and Navy airplanes over his fox farm located on Crooked Island approximately 2 miles from the city of Kodiak, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 7 to 10, inclusive, and, on page 2, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert the following: "$15,103.94, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses heretofore sustained, or which may hereafter be sustained, by the said Jacob A. Johnson, on account of damages heretofore caused, or which may hereafter be caused, to his fox farm, located on Crooked Island, Alaska, by military, naval, and air force activity in that area."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. C. HEDRICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1733) for the relief of G. C. Hedrick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $318.22, to G. C. Hedrick, of Beckley, W. Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States, for property damage sustained as the result of a fire caused by a patient, Donald Benjamin Nichols, from the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Roanoke, Va., on March 21, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANNON VALLEY MILLING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1780) for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Cannon Valley Milling Co., Cannon Falls, Minn., the sum of $2,543.26. Such sum represents the amount paid by such company to the United States in settlement of a claim against such company made by the Office of Price Administration on account of certain sales by such company of mill feed at prices in excess of those permitted by Revised Maximum Price Regulation 173. Each such overcharge resulted solely from the fact that a shipment of mill feed was made by such company under a bill of lading taken in the name of such company, so that title remained in such company until the feed reached its point of destination, and, therefore, under the language of such regulation the selling price had to be computed on the basis of the sale taking place at such point. Such regulation was amended, effective January 29, 1945, to permit the use of such bill of lading without the necessity of computing the selling price on such basis. Following the promulgation of such amendment to Revised Maximum Price Regulation 173, suits against other feed mills for similar violations of such regulation were dismissed by the Office of Price Administration without payment of any settlement, thus leaving the said Cannon Valley Milling Co. in the position of being the only feed mill to suffer a penalty for such violations.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARTHA W. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2136) for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOSEPH DESOUZA, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2433) for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr., of 630 Enloe Street, El Monte, Calif., formerly of Honolulu, T. H., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, and medical and hospital expenses incident thereto, sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army airplane on Billingham Boulevard, Honolulu, T. H., on June 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "Billingham" and insert "Dillingham."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEN GRUNSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4400) for the relief of Ben Grunstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the account of Ben Grunstein, Hudson County, N. J., in the sum of $1,500, such sum being the balance of a judgment on a forfeited bail bond of Ruben Finn, on which Ben Grunstein was surety, which judgment in the sum of $2,500 was entered against the said Ben Grunstein in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, as of record December 6, 1940, and on which judgment the sum of $1,000 has already been paid to the United States. The said Ruben Finn was subsequently located and arrested in Houston, Tex., in January 1942, removed to the southern district of Indiana, where he pleaded guilty and was sentenced to a term of imprisonment for 3 years.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5 down to and including the word "of" in line 6, and insert "That there is hereby remitted the unpaid balance of $1,500 upon."

Page 2, line 3, after the words "United States", insert "and the United States Attorney is authorized and directed to enter satisfaction of the judgment."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

FILLING VACANCY IN OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1436) to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. CHENOWETH, and Mr. ROCKWELL objected.

ESTABLISHING A FISH HATCHERY AT ROGERS CITY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 210) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. KEAN, Mr. RICH, and Mr. BONNER objected.

ESTABLISHING A FISH HATCHERY AT ST. IGNACE, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 214) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. BARDEN, and Mr. DEANE objected.

FISH HATCHERY, CHARLEVOIX, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 215) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. DEANE, and Mr. BONNER objected.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3106) to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil, shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190).

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BRAINERD WAR DEAD NATIONAL MEMORIAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3614) to provide for the establishment of the Brainerd War Dead National Memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. RICH, and Mr. BUCK objected.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1005) to amend the Act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio withhold his objection for a moment? I should like to know why he objects.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman asks why I object. Because it is a waste of money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are required.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1, the act of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 425; 22 U. S. C. 276), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"An appropriation of $30,000 annually is hereby authorized, $15,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2273) to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been requested on this bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1710) to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH, Mr. KEAN, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, and Mr. CHENOWETH objected.

PARKER RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4108) to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. DEANE, Mr. CHADWICK, and Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., objected.

RETIREMENT OF REGULAR ARMY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2744) to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, for the equalization of retirement benefits for members of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule has been requested on this bill. Therefore, I object.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PUBLIC AIRPORT IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been requested on this bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AIRPORT FOR CITY OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3509) to authorize the construction of a class IV airport for the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and a public highway or bridge from the city of Fairbanks to the location of the airport.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. A rule has been requested on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TORNEY HOSPITAL, PALM SPRINGS, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next business, House Concurrent Resolution 57 regarding disposal of Torney Hospital property in Palm Springs, Riverside County, Calif.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3924) to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we ought to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio has asked for an explanation of the bill. The bill is rather technical. It is designed to amend the Public Health Service Act to bring it into conformity with the promotion and classification bill which was passed with respect to the Army in the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

The gentleman will perhaps recall that we had a very lengthy debate on that bill to set up the classifications in the Army and the number of officers and grades and so forth. From the very beginning the Public Health Service has conformed with respect to its classifications with the classifications in the medical service of the Army. That is what this bill is designed to do.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The bill deals with nothing except classifications?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is correct, generally speaking. There is a provision that the Public Health Service can put certain people in schools for further training. That is a very minor matter.

I am informed by the Service that they estimate the cost the first year will be $275,000 and following that the cost will be $75,000 per year. I might say that this bill is a bill of the Public Health Service and if passed I shall ask unanimous consent that a Senate bill which was passed yesterday be substituted for the House bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was the Senate bill debated?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes; I understand it was. I was not present, but I am so informed.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that this matter is of sufficient importance to consider it on another calendar?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman asks my opinion on that. I feel it has been given very thorough study by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is a good bill and really should not take the time of the entire House because it is noncontroversial.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to point out what the gentleman has already said that the bill has been extremely carefully considered already and has had the closest attention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to get a copy of this bill because it was called to my attention this morning. In the absence of a copy of it, I

ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I have been trying to get it for 20 minutes and I cannot get one.

Mr. DOLLIVER. May I ask the gentleman to withhold his request. Our committee tried to get this bill before the House last summer but due to the exigencies of time, it was impossible to do so. Surely the gentleman has some confidence in the committee that considered this bill.

I assure the gentleman from Minnesota that it is not controversial in nature and ought to be passed for the benefit of this very important service of our Government. Of course, we cannot control the gentleman. I recognize that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, much as I regret to be in divergence with my esteemed colleague, I have to ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

RATING FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED ARRESTED TUBERCULOSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4243) to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis.

Mr. KEAN, Mr. CHENOWETH, and Mr. ROCKWELL objected.

DEATH-PENSION BENEFITS TO WIDOWS AND CHILDREN OF VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4242) to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. For the same reason, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CHENOWETH and Mr. ROCKWELL objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT, 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4309) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights) pertaining to "loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property," so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to state that this bill is identical, practically word for word, with present law. We now have a law making farm loans to veterans, administered by the Farm Loan Administration. A reading of the bill shows that this bill was taken almost identically from present law. All it does is to set up a similar program under the Farm Credit Administration. We would therefore be faced with two identical laws, doing identically the same thing, one under the Farm Loan Administration and the other under the Farm Credit Administration.

Not only that, but it involves many millions of dollars. Therefore, I object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the next bill.

Mr. PACE. I wanted the bill stricken from the calendar, Mr. Speaker. I objected to its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The bill cannot be stricken from the calendar until 2 weeks from today when three objections are required. It will be called again in 2 weeks; and then, if there are three objections, it will be stricken from the calendar.

The Clerk will call the next bill.

AUTHORITY TO SEND MILITARY AND NAVAL MISSIONS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2313) to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763), providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] had spoken to the gentleman and that he had agreed to an amendment which we will offer as a committee amendment to this bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, there is some misunderstanding about that. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] asked me if I had objection to it upon the ground that it might permit combatant forces, and I said, "Yes; that is an objection to it"; and he said they expected to amend it. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The committee amendment is on the desk. Will the gentleman withhold his request until he hears the amendment?

Mr. FOLGER. I would not want to pass upon that amendment right now.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I trust the gentleman from North Carolina will not press his request that it be passed over. When this bill was first presented to our Committee on Armed Services, I was strongly inclined to oppose it, but after further hearings and more mature deliberation, the bill was unanimously reported by our committee. Especially since I have had the privilege of visiting our military and naval missions in some of the foreign countries, I am convinced that this legislation is quite necessary at this time to protect our interests.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4143) to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the author of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 275, to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a rule has been requested on this bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

RESERVED MINERAL INTERESTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4856) to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States, as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no mineral interests reserved to the United States which are required to be liquidated under the terms of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 shall be sold by the Secretary of Agriculture or transferred by him to appropriate agencies of the United States for disposition as surplus property of the United States until hereafter authorized by law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PURCHASE OF POST-OFFICE SITE AT OMAHA, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4836) to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in Omaha, Nebr., for the purpose of erecting thereon a building for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Omaha.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION OF SITE FOR NEW FEDERAL BUILDING IN HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3506) to provide for the acquisition of a site for a new Federal building in Huntington, W. Va., adjoining existing Federal buildings there, as an economy measure, before land values have increased as a result of improvements.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a plot of land 200 feet long and 90 feet wide, together with all improvements thereon, situated at the southeast corner of Fifth Avenue and Eighth Street, in the city of Huntington, W. Va., for use as a site for the erection of a new Federal building. Such plot of land is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point where the south line of Fifth Avenue intersects with the east line of Eighth Street; thence along the line of Eighth Street 200 feet to an alley; thence in an easterly direction and with the north line of said alley to a point; thence in a northerly direction and parallel with the line of Eighth Street 200 feet to a point in the south line of Fifth Avenue; thence in a westerly direction and with the south line of Fifth Avenue 90 feet to the place of beginning.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "land", insert the word "approximately."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "and", insert the word "approximately."

Page 2, line 6, after the word "Street", insert the word "approximately."

Page 2, line 9, after the word "Street", insert the word "approximately."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "Avenue", insert the word "approximately."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW POSTAL BUILDING IN PORTLAND, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4967) to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building and for remodeling of the existing main post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site in Portland, Oreg., and to prepare or cause to be prepared plans and specifications for a new building to be located on such site and for the remodeling of the existing main post office all to provide additional postal facilities in said city. The cost of such plans and specifications and the acquisition of the site shall not exceed $300,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF THE FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4505) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1796) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to repair, equip, and restore the frigate *Constellation,* as far as may be practicable, to her original condition, but not for active service, and to accept and use any donations or contributions which may be offered for the aforesaid purpose. All costs of repairing, equipping, and restoring such frigate, other than the pay and allowances of naval officers and enlisted men engaged in such work, shall be defrayed from a fund consisting of such donations or contributions and the net proceeds of the sales made pursuant to section 2 of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby further authorized to give or to sell, under such regulations as he may prescribe, such parts or pieces, including rigging, of the frigate *Constellation,* as are suitable for use as relics, souvenirs, or mementos, and which cannot profitably or advantageously be used in restoring this vessel to original condition, to clubs, associations, or individuals making donations or contributions for the restoration of the frigate *Constellation.* The cost of converting the aforesaid material into relics, souvenirs, or mementos shall be charged against, and the proceeds of such sales shall be added to, the fund created by authority of this act.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the House bill as follows: "That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to repair, equip, and restore the frigate *Constellation,* as far as may be practicable, to her original condition, but not for active service, and to accept and use any donations or contributions which may be offered for the aforesaid purpose.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby further authorized to give or to sell, under such regulations as he may prescribe, such parts or pieces, including rigging, of the frigate *Constellation,* as are suitable for use as relics, souvenirs, or mementos, and which cannot profitably or advantageously be used in restoring this vessel to original condition, to clubs, associations, or individuals making donations or contributions for the restoration of the frigate *Constellation.* The cost of converting the aforesaid material into relics, souvenirs, or mementos shall be charged against, and the proceeds of such sales shall be added to, the fund created by authority of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4505) was laid on the table.

EXTENDING PERIOD OF VALIDITY OF THE ACT TO FACILITATE THE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCÉS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4838) to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I conferred with the author of this bill and there is a serious question with respect to the admission of German fiancées who are now being admitted on a permanent visa, so there is no check as to whether they are actually married.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is very necessary to the welfare of ex-GI's. Their fiancées are being taken to Ellis Island when they come in and I do not think the gentleman should take it out on the GI's.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I investigated this matter in Germany. There is a section in the bill now which says that the visas shall be issued for 90 days in the event that the quota of the particular country from which the fiancée comes is oversubscribed; therefore, when the girl comes here and does not marry she may be sent back after 90 days. That does not apply where the quota is not oversubscribed. The German quota is not oversubscribed. As I stated, I investigated this personally. Quite a few hundred visas have been issued to German girls, but they are permanent visas. They have come over here. There is no check-up as to whether or not they have actually married and the thing has become subject to much abuse. The only thing that is needed is to amend the bill to strike out that particular provision which brings about this condition. It will not affect the matter that the gentleman wants to accomplish and what I want to accomplish; that is, the admission of these fiancées only for purposes of marriage to Americans.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that what he has pointed out may be cured administratively.

Mr. JAVITS. I have taken it up with the State Department and I am advised it cannot be cured administratively. It is right in the law.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. These girls to whom you refer come in under a quota which has not been exhausted. That is a matter for the American consul to administer. As to those other girls who come in here as fiancées of GI's and do not marry the GI's, they are sent right back. What is happening now to bona fide fiancées of ex-servicemen? They are being taken to Ellis Island and detained there. They are released only on bond.

These are fiancées of GI's, the men who served over there and who met these girls over there. Therefore, I do not think that the gentleman should hold up the passage of this bill especially when he has an opportunity to offer an amendment to correct the situation to which he objects. If consideration of the bill is not objected to, the gentleman can offer an amendment to cure the situation he describes. Otherwise, by objecting he is doing a tremendous injury to these ex-servicemen.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman will do a great injury if this bill is passed in this form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill being passed over.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BASIC AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE WEATHER BUREAU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4426) to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That appropriations now or hereafter provided for the Weather Bureau shall be available for (a) furnishing food and shelter, without repayment therefor, to employees of the Government assigned to Arctic stations; (b) equipment and maintenance of meteorological offices and stations, and maintenance and operation of meteorological facilities outside the United States by contract or otherwise; (c) repairing, altering, and improving of buildings occupied by the Bureau, and care and preservation of grounds, including the construction of necessary outbuildings and sidewalks on public streets abutting Weather Bureau grounds; and (d) arranging for communication services at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce by agreement with the companies performing the services when determined to be advantageous to the Government.

SEC. 2. When so specified in appropriation acts, the Weather Bureau is authorized to (a) make contribution of the United States share of the cost of the Office of the Secretariat of the International Meteorological Committee; and (b) maintain a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications: *Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau which could be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said Bureau.

SEC. 3. The Weather Bureau is hereby authorized to (a) grant extra compensation to employees of other Government agencies for taking and transmitting meteorological observations, and (b) appoint employees for the conduct of meteorological investigations in the Arctic region without regard to the civil-service and classification laws and titles II and III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, both at base rates which shall not exceed such maximum rates as may be specified from time to time in the appropriation concerned.

SEC. 4. Subject to approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and without charge to the Weather Bureau, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to transfer to the Weather Bureau (a) equipment and supplies for upper air soundings, and (b) equipment and supplies which are surplus to the needs of the War or Navy Department and necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic weather stations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "and", and in line 6 before the period insert the following: "; and (e) purchasing tabulating cards and continuous form tabulating paper."

Page 2, line 8, strike out the following: "(a) make contribution of the United States share of the cost of the Office of the Secretariat of the International Meteorological Committee; and (b)."

Page 3, line 5, strike out "war" and insert in lieu thereof "the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force."

Page 3, line 6, strike out "(a) equipment and supplies for upper air soundings, and (b)."

Page 3, line 8, strike out "the War or Navy Department" and insert in lieu thereof "their respective Departments.".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEFFERSONVILLE FLOOD-CONTROL DISTRICT, INDIANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2000) for the relief of Jeffersonville Flood-Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon written notice from the Secretary of the Navy that the Jeffersonville Flood-Control District has complied with the provisions of section 2 of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jeffersonville Flood-Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation, the sum of $53,099.56. Such sum represents the cost of acquiring an alternate right-of-way for the construction of flood-protection works, the original right-of-way acquired by such district having been taken by the United States for the use of the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Navy having imposed restrictions making it impossible to construct flood-protection works upon a right-of-way which, pursuant to a stipulation, the Department of the Navy agreed to convey to such district as compensation for the right-of-way taken by the United States. The payment of such sum to such district shall be in full settlement of all claims of such district against the United States on account of complying with the provisions of section 2 of this act and on account of the taking of such original right-of-way by the United States in proceedings in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, New Albany Division, entitled "United States of America against 27.02 acres of land, in Jeffersonville, Clark County, Ind., Howard Shipyards & Dock Co. et al., Civil No. 80," and entitled "United States of America against 15.77 acres of land, more or less, in Jeffersonville, Clark County, Ind., Dollie Hoffman et al., Civil No. 92."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy shall give written notice to the Secretary of the Treasury that the Jeffersonville Flood-Control District has complied with the provisions of this section whenever such district has, in such manner as is satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy, conveyed to the United States all right, title, and interest which it may have in and to the naval property in Jeffersonville, Clark County, Ind., particularly described in a proposed grant of easement signed on the 13th day of August 1943, by which the United States proposed to grant and convey to Jeffersonville Flood-Control Commission, Jeffersonville, Ind., its successors and assigns, a perpetual easement to construct, operate, and maintain, a flood-protective system on the two sections of naval property described in such proposed grant of easement.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BACK COPIES OF UNITED STATES PATENTS TO PUBLIC LIBRARIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3366) to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4934 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), be amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph 9 to a colon and adding the following: *"Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Patents may supply such copies for $50 per annum to any public library that has failed to pay such amount for any one or more years on the payment of such fee for said year or years."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "library", insert "approved by the Commissioner."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND IMMIGRATION LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1878) to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. FELLOWS. As the law stands today, as soon as anybody passes the consular agent overseas, he comes in permanently. This gives the Attorney General the right to check up on the application and things that come up after that.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Does the Attorney General have to make any ac-

counting or any public explanation of his reasons for refusing?

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, the Attorney General has a record, but this gives the Attorney General a chance to check on the actions overseas by the consul or the consular agent who have passed this man in the first instance. As it stands now, if he is passed by them, no matter what the situation was, he is in here permanently, and the Department of Justice has nothing to say about it.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman is satisfied then that this act has no effect such as to give the Justice Department any superpowers or opportunity to abuse his present powers.

Mr. FELLOWS. No; except if he finds something has been overlooked, or if he finds that this man is not the man who should come in, he still has the power to say no. As it stands today, he has to sit by and let him come in.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS], does this bill require the Attorney General to give his reasons for the exclusion?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not have a copy of the bill before me.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The bill proposes to amend the act by adding to the subparagraph which says "aliens who are anarchists" these words: "or persons who the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States."

As for me, I think it is much better to prevent these people coming in than to let them in and have the Attorney General try to get them out, like Harry Bridges.

Mr. KLEIN. That is true, but I would like to repeat my question: Does the gentleman know whether administratively the Attorney General must give his reasons for excluding these people from entering the country?

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not think he needs to give his reasons.

Mr. KLEIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended, is further amended by inserting the following clause before the clause, "anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate the assassination of public officials or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property;": "persons who the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That section 1 (a) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 1012; 41 Stat. 1008–9; 54 Stat. 673; 8 U. S. C., 137), is further amended by inserting the following clause immediately after the clause 'Aliens who are anarchists;': 'or persons who the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossd and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUESTING INFORMATION FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 385) requesting information from the Secretary of the Interior concerning fuel oil, gasoline, petroleum products, and coal, and what steps the Government should take to make the proper and necessary supply available.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMERCE DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4427) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That appropriations now or hereafter provided for the Department of Commerce shall be available for—

(a) furnishing to employees of the Department of Commerce and other Federal agencies (including military and naval personnel), and their dependents, in Alaska and other points outside continental United States, free emergency medical services by contract or otherwise and free emergency medical supplies, where in the judgment of the Secretary furnishing of such supplies and services is necessary;

(b) purchasing, transporting, storing, and distributing food and other subsistence supplies for resale to employees of the Department of Commerce and other Federal agencies (including military and naval personnel), and their dependents, in Alaska and other points outside the continental United States at a reasonable value as determined by the Secretary of Commerce, the proceeds from such resales to be credited to the appropriation from which the expenditure was made: *Provided*, That a report of such transactions shall be made to Congress annually showing the total expenditures made for such supplies and the total proceeds from such resales;

(c) establishment, maintenance, and operation of messing facilities, in Alaska and other points outside the continental United States where suitable family facilities are not available, such service to be furnished to employees of the Department of Commerce and other Federal agencies (including military and naval personnel), and their dependents, in accordance with regulations established by the Secretary of Commerce, and at a reasonable value determined in accordance therewith, the proceeds from the furnishing of such services to be credited to the appropriation from which the expenditures are made: *Provided*, That a report of such transactions shall be made to Congress annually showing the total expenditures made for such services and the total proceeds therefrom;

(d) reimbursement, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, of officers and employees in or under the Department of Commerce, for food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies furnished by them for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities;

(e) providing motion-picture equipment and film for recreation of crews of vessels, for recreation of employees in remote localities where such facilities are not available, and for training purposes;

(f) erecting, altering, repairing, equipping, furnishing, and maintaining, such living and working quarters and other public improvements as may be necessary to carry out its authorized work at remote localities not on foreign soil where such living and working accommodations are not otherwise available: *Provided*, That the National Bureau of Standards is hereby authorized to perform the functions listed in this subsection without regard to the limitation concerning foreign soil when establishing and maintaining ionosphere observation stations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "now or hereafter provided for the Department of Commerce shall be available for—" and insert "are hereby authorized for the following activities of the Department of Commerce."

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "military and naval personnel" and insert "Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel where Army, Navy, or Air Force facilities or supplies are not available and upon request of the service concerned."

Page 1, line 8, after "outside", insert "the."

Page 2, line 3, after "(b)", insert "when deemed necessary by the Secretary of Commerce."

Page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike out "military and naval personnel" and insert "Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel where Army, Navy, or Air Force facilities or supplies are not available and upon request of the service concerned."

Page 2, line 16, after "(c)", insert "when deemed necessary by the Secretary of Commerce."

Page 2, line 17, after "facilities", insert ", by contract or otherwise."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "military and naval personnel" and insert "Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel where Army, Navy, or Air Force facilities are not available and upon request of the service concerned."

Page 3, line 9, after "them", insert "in emergencies."

Page 3, line 12, after "vessels" and before the comma, insert "of the Coast and Geodetic Survey."

Page 3, line 16, after "maintaining", insert ", by contract or otherwise."

Page 3, line 17, strike out "other public improvements" and insert "facilities."

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out "not on foreign soil"; and strike out beginning with the colon in line 20 down through "stations", in line 25.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION OF ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCÉS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Consent Calendar No. 392, the bill (H. R. 4838) to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority conferred upon the Secretary of State and the Attorney General under the provisions of the act approved June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 339), shall be extended to June 30, 1948, midnight.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "June 30" and insert "December 31."

Line 7, insert the following: "Sec. 2. This Act shall be regarded as having become effective from and after December 31, 1947."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 1, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. That subsection (b) of section 1 of the act approved June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 339) is hereby repealed."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that an amendment to repeal a provision of permanent law is not in order unless the provision of the law is stated. It is a violation of the Ramseyer rule and of all the other rules of the House I know anything about. We are supposed to know what we are repealing when we vote on anything. Therefore, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi is not good, because the Ramseyer rule does not apply to amendments offered on the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the further point of order that it is out of order to offer an amendment to repeal a section of law without including that section of law to let the House know what it is we are trying to repeal, and I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Mississippi on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. If I am wrong, then we might repeal any law in the statute books without the Congress even knowing what they are voting on. I do not know what we are being asked to vote on, and I daresay that 99 percent of the membership of the House do not know. I submit this is going far afield from what I understand the rules of the House to be, to permit a Member to offer an amendment repealing a provision of law which now exists on the statute books without including the provisions of that law in his amendment.

The SPEAKER. The amendment is in order provided it is germane to the subject matter under consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, Mr. Speaker, but a Member has no right to offer an amendment unless he states the provision of law that he is trying to repeal. If such procedure is followed, we will have the entire House voting on the repeal of a provision after 5 minutes debate on each side when 99 percent of the membership do not know what it contains. If we are to establish that precedent, Mr. Speaker, then from this time on, in this way, we might repeal any law on the statute books without any discussion and without the provision being read, and without the membership of the House knowing what they are voting on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair reminds the gentleman from Mississippi that a Member is entirely within his rights in offering an amendment as long as his amendment is germane. Of course, such an amendment would not be germane if it repealed a provision of law which was not being considered in the pending bill. As long as the amendment is germane the Chair holds that it is in order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not question the germaneness of the amendment provided it contains the provision of law which it attempts to repeal; but for a Member to rise and offer an amendment repealing a certain section of the law without including it in the amendment and without letting the House know what it is, I submit is certainly poor policy, and in my opinion, is subject to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that the amendment is not subject to the point of order on the grounds that the gentleman from Mississippi has advanced.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to have the section read which the gentleman proposes to repeal? I would like to have it read, because I note that he is proposing to repeal a certain section of law which I understand has been in full force and effect since 1929.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman from New York has the floor and he can read it in his own time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the section which is proposed to be deleted from this act which it is proposed to extend, which as we all know is an act to permit fiancées to come into the United States free of any quota restrictions if they have actually been engaged to a member of the armed forces and are coming here for the purpose of marriage, is one of the provisos which conditions the use of this whole statute. Those provisos are three, and the particular one which I am proposing by my amendment to delete, which incidentally has been consented to by the author of the bill, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] and by the gentleman with whom I had the discussion when the bill was up on the Consent Calendar, reads as follows:

The nonpreference portion of that quota to which the alien would be chargeable is exhausted at the time the alien applies for a visa.

What that means is that under the provisions of this particular statute heretofore when the fiancée applied for a visa, she got the temporary 90-day visa provided for in the act only if the regular quota of the country of which she was a national had actually become oversubscribed. Where that quota was not oversubscribed, therefore, the Department of State said that it must give her a visa under the regular quota of that country because it had not been oversubscribed. What happened in the case of girls who were German nationals was that these fiancées were preferred above other German nationals, and above nationals of countries which were our allies, not our enemies, and who could not get regular visas but came over to this country under a 90-day temporary basis and could be sent back if they did not marry. The German fiancées, however, went into the mainstream of American life and remained permanent residents here whether or not they married. Hence the statute was being abused. When I consulted with consul after consul in Germany, it was clear that the statute was subject to abuse and that frauleins could just make these arrangements for the purpose of coming into the United States without any intention whatever of marrying when they got here. By my amendment, with the proviso out, the State Department advised me that they would give only a 90-day visa to all fiancées regardless of what country they are nationals of and whether or not the quota of that country is open or is actually oversubscribed. The whole purpose of my amendment is simply to avoid the misuse of this law for purposes for which it was never intended.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman of course probably did not go so far in his investigation to know that any German, whether he or she is engaged to be married or not, if she can get out of Germany and go to Zurich or London or Paris where there is an American consul, he or she can get a visa and come in under the German quota whether she marries or not.

Mr. JAVITS. The fact is that I recollect, in our Munich consulate an important part of all visas granted were these to German fiancées. I was told that regular visas were being granted to these German fiancées and that others who were to get visas were being held up because the work of the consulate was so taken up with granting these general visas to these German girls.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. All that will happen, if your amendment is agreed to, is that

the German girl will simply leave the country and go across the Swiss border to Zurich or Chaux des Fonds, or any one of a half dozen other places. It is a simple matter to cross the Swiss border and at any of the Swiss cities where resides an American consul she can get her visa and come here. So your amendment will be thoroughly aborted.

Mr. JAVITS. The military authorities are not permitting such departures, I believe, besides that argument is begging the question. In the case of fiancées, the 90-day limitation will protect us against the fact that when a person gets a visa it will be used for that purpose only. I see no objection to the amendment. Even if what the gentleman says is true, there will be no change in the situation, but if what the gentleman says is not true, at least the situation will be changed for the better.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

For the first time since this legislation has been under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary, I have heard there was an investigation made that we know nothing about. It seems to me that our committee inquired as carefully into this proposed legislation as the facts justified, and we unanimously reached the conclusion that the benefits heretofore extended to the fiancées of GI's should be considered in order to relieve some of the serious cases in ports of entry in this country. The amendment that was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is an ill-disguised attempt to extend the German quota, and nothing else, because these people who are able to come to the United States from Germany can come in under the quota. Whether or not the fact that they are brides or fiancées of American servicemen and are interfering with the speedy processing of other cases, I think is entirely immaterial. Of course our Consular Service is very busy, but what difference does that make? These Germans who want to come to the United States can come in right now, because the quota is not oversubscribed.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. Is it not true, just as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] stated, that this is not accomplishing a single thing? It does not close the borders. It does not control anything. It is really an administrative matter if it is anything at all, and the matter will not help either the fiancée or the man who is going to marry her. It does not change the number that will come in. It does not control it in any shape, sense, or manner.

Mr. WALTER. That is exactly the situation, and I think it would be very unfortunate if we would repeal an old statute with just 10 minutes' debate, and on a matter that is as important as this is. I see no reason for it. Nothing can be accomplished. I do not care if the gentleman was in embassies in many German cities. I do not think he has offered anything by his amendment that would justify our taking the very drastic step that he is urging us to take.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that these fiancées will get their visas under my amendment, and the only thing I seek to accomplish is that they shall get these temporary visas so that the visa is conditioned upon their actually being married when they get here. In other words, that good faith is being carried out; not whether the fiancées shall come in at all. I do not see how this can possibly be said to extend the German quota; on the contrary I am trying to protect us against its being improperly extended.

I am for the bill, I do not object to it; I would not object to it but for this point. All that happens under my amendment is that we are positive that these German fiancées, like French, Italian, or any other fiancées, get only the 90-day temporary visa and not a permanent visa so they cannot become permanent residents here unless they marry here as arranged.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know whether that has happened but the attention of the Judiciary Committee has not been called to a single case, if it has. I do not believe that what the gentleman proposes will accomplish anything.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is of course a most unusual situation for the House to find itself in on Consent Calendar day, a day on which we know from experience that amendments are usually perfecting in nature and have been well thought out and taken up with the members of the committee having jurisdiction of the legislation and with the objectors' committee. It is most unusual when we find ourselves in the situation where an amendment is offered the significance of which, or what it will accomplish, seemingly is not known by any member except the gentleman from New York himself who has offered it. I have no doubt but what everything the gentleman from New York says is correct, but I do not know; the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary who reported out the bill does not know. Another distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary in whom we all have confidence has taken the floor and said he does not know.

When this bill was called originally it was objected to. By unanimous consent the House agreed to return to the bill for consideration and it is now before us. The gentleman from New York is perfectly within his rights in offering the amendment. On the other hand, we are perfectly within our rights in this uncertain situation in saying without any disparagement whatever of the gentleman from New York that we cannot agree with him.

Inasmuch as the bill must go to the other body of Congress and the Members of the other body will have the benefit of what little has been said on this amendment, it seems to me that with the Judiciary Committee opposing it—am I right?

Mr. FELLOWS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the gentleman from Pennsylvania opposing it, and all the committee members on the floor now opposing it, it seems to me we would exercise wise judgment and it would be no reflection upon the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] if we voted the amendment down and allowed the Members of the other branch of Congress to consider the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at the expiration of the statement by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, without regard to the merits involved, I can think of nothing more ridiculous than for the Congress of the United States to adopt an amendment under this motion the meaning of which no one can tell by looking at it, and without having had read to us a word of the permanent law it attempts to repeal. If we are going into that kind of ridiculous procedure we might as well close the book of rules and fold up.

I submit, therefore, that the best thing the House can do is to vote this amendment down by about 99 to 1—that is the percentage of us who do not know what it covers.

Mr. FORAND. I hope the gentleman does not mean to vote the bill down.

Mr. RANKIN. No; I mean this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some letters.

TO RAISE THE CEILINGS AND ALLOWANCES PAYABLE TO VETERANS UNDERGOING TRAINING ON THE JOB

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1393) to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes, with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a)

as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in a calendar year. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor whether performed as part of their apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business, or other establishments, or otherwise, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependence allowances, as may be determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $250 per month for a veteran without a dependent, or $325 per month for a veteran with one dependent, or $350 for a veteran with two or more dependents: *Provided further*, That only so much of the compensation as is derived from productive labor based on the standard workweek for the particular trade or industry, exclusive of overtime, shall be considered in computing the rate of allowances payable under this paragraph."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) 2 e of paragraph 11 of part VIII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"e. The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than 3 months and not more than 4 years of full-time training."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second and ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, what is the number of the bill we are now considering?

The SPEAKER. Senate 1393, as amended. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Kearney bill was reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unanimously early in the last session of the Congress and it is a pleasure to the committee that the bill is now coming up for action. I hope it will pass unanimously. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], the ranking Republican member of our committee, deserves a great deal of credit for the valiant work he has done in this matter. I therefore yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion by the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to amend S. 1393 by substituting certain provisions of H. R. 246, a bill to accomplish a similar purpose and which was reported favorably by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 24, 1947, after several weeks of hearings and testimony.

The amendment is desirable and should be accepted because it offers a more realistic approach to the problem and is in accordance with the needs as determined by exhaustive studies which have been made by Members of Congress, veteran organizations, and student associations.

The history of ceilings affecting veterans taking on-the-job training and the efforts to revise those ceilings is familiar to all Members of the Congress. There is no question in my mind and I doubt if there is any question in the minds of my colleagues that the existing ceilings as imposed by Public Law 679, Seventy-ninth Congress, are too low and should be revised upward.

The primary purpose of on-the-job training as established in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, was to provide our returning veterans with an opportunity to obtain the most direct and best training available so as to equip them for suitable employment and to become useful and productive citizens. The legislation was designed to permit veterans to acquire a particular skill, through training, and at the same time enable said veteran to support himself and, in many instances a family, while receiving training. The fact that most of our returning veterans would, because of their military service, be in an age group older than those who ordinarily enter apprentice training, with the low rates of pay, was taken into consideration and monetary allowances to augment earnings while in training were provided.

The payment of a subsistence allowance during the period of training was designed to aid the veteran to carry on with his current obligations until such time as his skill reached the place where he would be capable of producing enough work to permit the employer to consider him as a qualified employee and pay him the wages of an experienced and fully trained employee. I believe every Member of this House will agree that the program as intended was fair and reasonable and in accordance with our Nation's historic policy in dealing with our veterans.

It was unfortunate, and to be regretted, that in the operation of the on-the-job training program certain weaknesses and abuses were permitted to creep in and led to a general demand for correction. Inadequate supervision on the part of some States, lack of knowledge on the part of employers as to what was expected of them, and an insufficient number of training officers in the Veterans' Administration to investigate and correct the abuses hastened the need for something to be done. In the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress, at the request of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Congress hurriedly and with too little consideration enacted legislation to impose ceilings which became Public Law 679.

This law placed a ceiling on the combined wages and subsistence affecting veterans receiving on-the-job training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Under Public Law 679, veterans without dependents come under a ceiling of $175 per month while those with one or more dependents come under a ceiling of $200 per month. There is much misunderstanding over the application of ceilings. There are some who believe that under Public Law 679 a veteran with no dependents may not earn more than $175 per month and those with dependents may not earn more than $200 per month. There are others who have the impression that if a single veteran receives more than $175 per month he may continue to receive subsistence allowances but reduced in an amount equal to wages received in excess of $175 and that the same principle applies to the married veteran under the $200 ceiling. Neither is correct.

The facts are a veteran is not limited in the amount of wages which the employer may pay him per month. The ceilings as provided under Public Law 679 establish maximum monthly rates of pay beyond which the Government will not add subsistence allowances. For example, under existing law if a veteran without dependents taking on-the-job training receives $150 per month from his employer the Government will allow him $25 per month in subsistence allowances, which makes a total of $175 per month, or the ceiling imposed by law. If the same veteran's earnings from his employer reaches or exceeds $175 per month the ceiling has been reached and the Government will no longer grant subsistence allowances. The same principle applies to a married veteran who comes under a ceiling of $200 per month.

Experience, since the enactment of Public Law 679 in August 1946, conclusively proves that the ceilings imposed at that time were ill-considered and entirely too low. It is the purpose of the legislation pending before the House to revise those ceilings upward, and it is the purpose of the amendment offered to increase the ceilings beyond those which were approved by the Senate in Senate bill 1393. Without the amendment as proposed by the chairman of the House Veterans' Committee a single veteran would be denied subsistence allowances after his wages reach $200 per month, while a veteran with one or more dependents would be denied subsistence allowances after his wages had reached $250 per month. I believe, and I hope the other Members of the House will agree with me, that ceilings of $200 for single veterans and $250 for married veterans are still too low and should be increased to the amounts which have been proposed in the amendment, namely, $250 for a veteran without dependents, $325 for a veteran with one dependent, and $350 for a veteran with more than one dependent.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I believe the testimony shows that the cost of living for the veterans has increased 29.2 percent since that time.

Mr. KEARNEY. I was coming to that statement.

The latter figures are more realistic in accordance with today's cost of living

and take into consideration the extra needs of veterans who have more than one dependent.

Under the proposed amendment, which I urge the House to accept, a veteran with no dependents would be permitted to earn up to $250 per month before being denied any assistance from the Government, while the veteran with one dependent would be permitted to earn up to $325 per month before being denied any allowances, and a veteran with more than one dependent would be able to receive in wages up to $350 per month before being shut off entirely from subsistence allowances.

A recent survey on the cost of living in 34 typical American cities by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that an income in excess of $3,600 per annum is necessary to support a family of four under the minimum American standard of living. This estimated income does not take into consideration any savings. Thus you will note that the ceilings proposed in the amendment are not out of line with the income estimate made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Let us examine the effect of the present ceilings as imposed under Public Law 679 with respect to the encouragement offered our veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and the future of our national economy. Thousands upon thousands of veterans accepted in good faith the opportunity offered under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and took up on-the-job training in the belief that the wages they received while in training, plus the subsistence allowances provided by the Government, would permit them to acquire a useful skill and at the same time to meet the obligations required of adult citizens with family responsibilities. Plans were made and economic obligations incurred which would permit them to undergo training at the customary apprentice wages and yet not be forced to exist entirely upon the wages paid by the employer. Like a bolt out of the blue came Public Law 679 with its ceilings of $175 and $200 per month. The immediate effect was obvious and protests began to reach the Congress and the veteran organizations. Those protests have continued to swell in volume but in the absence of congressional action thousands upon thousands of these veteran trainees have been forced to abandon their training and seek full-time employment, thereby denying themselves the acquisition of a special skill which would enable them to earn a larger income in the future. Other thousands have sacrificed their meager savings and possessions and in many cases the savings of their parents in order to continue their training under the ceilings.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How long is this program of on-the-job training going to run?

Mr. KEARNEY. The veteran must initiate his course not later than 4 years after either the date of his discharge or the termination of the present war, whichever is the later and further no such training shall be afforded beyond 9 years after the termination of the present war.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. For how many more years will it run?

Mr. KEARNEY. From 1944 on through the 9-year period.

Statistics prepared by the Veterans' Administration vividly portray the disaster which has struck at the hopes and the futures of thousands of these veterans. It is significant to note a comparison of the increase and decrease of veteran trainees between those taking training under Public Law 16 and Public Law 346. Trainees under Public Law 16 were not affected by the ceilings imposed under Public Law 679. Records reveal that up until the effect of the ceilings' law became evident there was a steady proportionate increase in the number of veterans taking training under both laws. Thereafter the number taking training under Public Law 346 sharply declined while those under Public Law 16 maintained the average increase.

The records stand as mute evidence of the damage done by the low ceilings imposed under Public Law 679. Instead of a continuing increase in the number of veterans who would acquire a useful and productive skill under the training program, a decrease set in which resulted in a net loss of approximately 90,000 trainees between the end of 1946 and the end of 1947. As of December 31, 1946 some 629,157 veterans were taking training under Public Law 346, but on December 31, 1947, the number had declined to some 513,000. During the same period trainees under Public Law 16 increased from 83,642 to 108,706.

Consequently, surveys made by Members of Congress and veteran organizations clearly reveal that the reduction in the number of veterans taking training between December 1946 and December 1947 under Public Law 346 can be placed squarely at the door of Public Law 679, not to mention other thousands of veterans who would have engaged in training had it not been for the unreasonably low ceilings.

Every major veteran organization has demanded either an outright repeal of Public Law 679, or a substantial upward revision of the ceilings. After weeks of consideration and listening to testimony from every angle of the problem, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs reached the conclusion that while some ceilings should be retained they should be liberalized above existing ceilings. Consequently the committee revised and unanimously reported H. R. 246 as the bill which they felt would be equitable and realistic for veteran trainees but which would prevent a recurrence of the abuses which conceived the hasty and illy considered Public Law 679.

The suggestion has recently been made that certain types of training programs are useless and should be discontinued. I am not attempting to condone or defend loose administration in approving questionable training programs. I am concerned with the welfare of hundreds of thousands of veterans and the future of my country, and I sincerely believe this Congress and the President should correct an injustice which was done our veterans in the Seventy-ninth Congress through Public Law 679.

I am, therefore, appealing to my colleagues in the House of Representatives to correct the injustice and resolve this question by supporting the amendment to S. 1393 which was offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and chairman of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TABER. How many veterans are involved in this training?

Mr. KEARNEY. The latest figure that I have been able to get from the Veterans' Administration, which is as of December 31, 1947, is that possibly 513,000 veterans are involved.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that it is necessary to take any time discussing this matter further.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman would be able to inform the House as to how much additional funds this would require.

Mr. RANKIN. I could not give the entire amount, because I doubt if that can be given at this time. It will vary from time to time. In the first place, the number of students that are taking this training varies from time to time. I do not know whether that exact figure has been given to the committee. Probably the lady from Massachusetts, chairman of the committee, can give you the answer.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Last year it was estimated this bill would cost $149,000,000, but many, many fewer people are taking on-the-job training at this time, so I think the cost would be very much less than that. It is not a continuing cost. It will not be for very long.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. That figure of $149,000,000 was of June 30, 1947. In talking with the Veterans' Administration the other day, they say that of necessity they had to revise their figures downward; but they can give us no approximate cost, due to the fact that over 90,000 veterans have left this training because they could not afford to carry on.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this on-the-job training and these educational advantages by legislation passed in 1944 have been of great assistance to the servicemen, not only the ones who want to complete their education but for those who are taking on-the-job training. I insisted on the on-the-job training at the time. That was my provision, because for a hundred years we have been educating our children, sending them to college and teaching them how to make a living without working, and have overlooked the man who has to do the work. So I insisted on this on-the-job training. From my viewpoint it is having a splendid effect.

There was a splendid ordnance plant at Prairie in the district I have the honor to represent. It contained some splendid buildings and machine shops. They

wanted to tear down those buildings and scatter the machinery about the country. Instead of that, I got it transformed into a training school and today seven or eight hundred servicemen are there taking training, preparing themselves for the kind of work they are going to do through life.

Now, they talk about $140,000,000. When you get below billions, you are getting back to the United States. When you talk about billions you are getting out of the United States. You are talking about something for somebody else. But these are men who fought the battles of this Nation in time of war and who are to sustain our institutions in time of peace. I am not only for helping them to continue their education and training, but I am also for compensating the ones who came back and went to work and did not ask for anything.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Under the present law the States approve certain projects for on-the-job training?

Mr. RANKIN. That is true.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the Veterans' Administration have any control over that on-the-job training?

Mr. RANKIN. This law does not change that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The reason I asked, there has come to my attention recently that in the State of Pennsylvania there are several barber schools that have been set up; sort of fly-by-night schools, that are taking in a great many veterans. They are not getting any training that will do them any good, yet they are making a racket out of the training of these veterans that apparently will not do them much good after they are through. I am wondering if there is any supervision of that type of work among the States and other special groups that might want to set up that type of training.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that a witness from his State testified before our subcommittee the other day. That matter is regulated, of course, by the department of education of each of the States. Unfortunately the effort of the education department in some States has not been so good, but that matter has been corrected by the Veterans' Administration. We are holding hearings at this time. I might add for the benefit of the gentleman from Nebraska that less than 3 percent of all these training institutions in the United States of America have been bad; 97 percent have been good.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As the gentleman knows, I have always been in favor of on-the-job training, but I have viewed with some alarm the sort of upsurge of these fly-by-night schools which claim to give training to the veterans, but which training is worthless to them. I want to see them get something substantial for their effort and expenditure.

Mr. RAMEY. I can assure the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that the situation is being corrected. Our committee is grateful to the gentleman for having that witness appear before us the other day.

Mr. RANKIN. Much of the criticism of the law passed during the last Congress came about as a result of the very condition of which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] complains.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I wish to compliment the committee for bringing the bill out. My only regret is that it was not brought out sooner. I have had many letters and telegrams, and I know other Members have, from veterans in my own district. Many of them are having difficulty in staying in school; as a matter of fact, some have had to leave because the amounts they were receiving were insufficient. I believe we are on solid ground in endeavoring to keep these men who are veterans in school, particularly those who have been separated by several years of service from an opportunity to carry forward their education.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Oregon that this continued inflation of the currency through the Federal Reserve System is causing a rise in prices that has diminished the purchasing power of the amount originally allotted to these veterans. That is the justification for this increase in the allowance.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand, the next bill to come up will increase the allowance itself. I have received a great many letters from veterans asking about increasing the allowance. We made a definite mistake in not passing that bill last year because those men and women receiving this training are not rich and they are demanding this allowance.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I presume there is very little or no opposition to this measure. Therefore I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK].

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad we are, at last, having an opportunity to consider this bill. Our committee just a year ago gave unanimous approval to the provisions included in the bill, but due to the inflationary condition of living costs at this time, I think it is just as necessary today to consider the amendments to the bill as it was a year ago to take up the original bill.

Young men engaged in on-the-job training have been caught in a squeeze between the employer on the one hand and the limitation of subsistence on the other. As a consequence, I think the subsistence has paid the price and these men have worked at lower wage rates than they would have worked if they had been allowed to earn a normal wage rate for the kind of work done.

I do not believe it is necessary to go into a detailed discussion because I think we all understand that the Government has an obligation to help these men readjust themselves to this training program. I hope you will approve the amendment.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. In all of our hearings I believe you will find there have been none of the so-called or what has been published as racket situations in existence. Better than 90 percent of these training situations have been sincere, and most of the State boards of education have cooperated.

Mrs. LUSK. Yes; I appreciate that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is long overdue and I shall give it my full support.

This measure, which raises the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, was introduced in the House on January 3, 1947, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY], and was promptly favorably considered by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I was a member.

Representatives of all veterans' organizations appeared before our committee in support of the legislation, and after careful examination of all the evidence offered in support of the bill it was the unanimous decision of our group that this was worthy of immediate and favorable action on the part of the Congress. It was accordingly favorably reported to the House on February 26, 1947.

I am sorry that somewhere along the line it landed in a pigeonhole and it required much effort on the part of those of us who recognize the importance of this legislation to so many veterans to bring it before the House for final action this afternoon.

The on-the-job-training program has meant much to thousands of veterans. It has given them the start they needed in civilian life to learn a trade through which they can earn their livelihood in years to come. It has been a very successful program—well received, not only on the part of the veteran but also on the part of the various industries and business establishments which have cooperated so well in making it work.

I am very happy, therefore, to see the House taking this action this afternoon and I am confident there will be very, very few votes against suspending the rules and passing this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the provisions of the two bills which will be presented today. The great reduction in purchasing power of the veterans' allowance makes it necessary, in order to obtain a decent standard of living, that they have a raise in their wage ceilings. The present bill will cover this point adequately. The second bill will raise the subsistence allowance from $90 per month for a married veteran to $105 per month, with an additional $15 per month for each dependent.

The raises provided for in this bill will not compensate for the loss in purchasing power of the original allowance. It is a corrective step, and I will vote for these two bills as the best solution offered us for legislative action.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been before our committee for some time. The committee has worked long and very hard on it and we think this is a fair bill. The law which was passed placing a ceiling on earnings was a mistake. That bill went through the Congress at the end of a session in a hurry. Probably not sufficient consideration was given to it at that time. I did not give it my approval.

This bill we are considering today is an attempt to rectify and correct the mistake which was made then, and I hope there will not be a single voice raised against it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, it has taken us a long, long time to get this measure before the House and I am truly delighted that we finally have an opportunity to correct a serious mistake made on the closing day of the 1946 session of the Congress.

On that day the present limits of $175 per month for a veteran without a dependent and $200 for a veteran with a dependent or dependents was fixed as the maximum earnings a veteran could enjoy under the on-the-job-training program in order to receive a subsistence allowance. Such limitation was ill-advised and improper.

On the first day of the next session of Congress, that is, on January 3, 1947, I introduced a bill, H. R. 133, to raise the limits to $250 per month for a veteran without a dependent and $350 for a veteran with a dependent or dependents.

That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs realized the injustice of the 1946 act is evidenced by the fact that they opened hearings on this question on January 28, 1947. I was invited to appear before the committee and did so on February 20, 1947, in support of my bill, which reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $250 per month for a veteran without a dependent or $350 per month if he has a dependent or dependents."

On February 26, 1947, the committee reported out H. R. 246, by the gentleman from New York, General KEARNEY, a member of the committee. It will be observed that the only difference between my bill and the bill reported by the committee is that the committee bill provides $325 per month limit for the veterans with only one dependent. Both bills provide $350 per month for veterans with more than one dependent.

Since the bill was reported out in February 1947, many of us have been laboring to get the bill called up for consideration. We have had many disappointments but finally it is before us and I hope it will receive the support and vote of every Member of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I favor this legislation, and I also favor suspension of the rules, in accordance with the motion of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, so that it can be taken up and passed today.

I have never seen any justification for imposing a ceiling or limitation of $200 a month on veterans who are taking on-the-job training. It has worked hardship on many veterans and their families. I feel that this ceiling has not resulted in any saving to the Government. The amount of the Government contribution has remained the same, because the employer who paid the veteran $110 per month is not going to increase that salary when he knows that for every dollar he adds to the veteran's salary, the Government is going to cut its contribution a dollar. For instance, where a veteran was receiving $250 a month salary while taking on-the-job training, the Government paid $90 of this, if the veteran had a family, and the employer paid $160. When this ceiling or limit of $200 was imposed, it meant that for every dollar the employer paid in excess of $110 per month, the Government cut off $1 of its portion. Under this arrangement the only way the veteran trainee can receive $250 per month is for the employer to pay every dollar of it.

A veteran with a family is hard put in this time of high prices to make ends meet on $200 a month. Many veterans would like to buy homes on monthly payment plans; they cannot do it with a salary limit of $200 a month. Many employers would gladly pay more than $110 a month if the increase goes to the veteran and not to the Government. Let us increase this ceiling so the employers can increase their payments to on-the-job trainees.

And while we are at it, let us also suspend the rules and increase the amount of subsistence payments to veterans who are attending college. Every month hundreds of veterans are leaving college because they cannot exist on the subsistence allowances they are now getting.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I arise to support the motion of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 246 to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes.

I was present and helped to pass the original bill granting subsistence allowances to veterans of World War II who were taking on-the-job training. At that time the Veterans' Affairs Committee recommended subsistence allowances of $65 per month if the veteran had no dependent or dependents and $90 per month if the veteran had a dependent or dependents.

Since the passage of the original act the cost of living has increased almost 30 percent and it has been pointed out by those who had control and direction of this great program that the subsistence allowance was too low, and an increase has been urged by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veterans' organizations, as well as those who have made a very careful study of this problem. The Members of the House, of course, will understand that these veterans take employment in learning the various trades and, of course, they are not fully trained and skilled in the work they have chosen and for which they are given additional training, and cannot receive such wages that are usually paid to those who are fully trained and skilled, and these benefits are added to the wages that they receive and bring their pay up to the standard. This will continue until they do become thoroughly skilled and trained. If they are persons without dependents their total pay and subsistence cannot exceed $250. If the veteran has dependents these cannot exceed $350.

We are informed there are now approximately 150,000 young men and young women of World War II taking this training, and the over-all picture is they are making the most of their opportunities. When this program is finished it will turn into productive activity a real army of well-trained young men and young women who can and will be very useful to themselves and to their families and to our country. We are also informed that the majority of these trainees have families and they must meet the problem of the high cost of living. It will mean a great deal to our country in peacetime, and perhaps more in war, to have these veterans trained as skilled machinists, mechanics, engineers, and in every field of activity of this Nation, and many of them are being trained in agriculture and its various branches.

These veterans were taken from their homes, their families, and from opportunities for training to enter the service of our country in the greatest war of all times. They served our Nation courageously and patriotically, and the people of this great Nation, in this measure, expresses to them, in a measure, their debt of gratitude.

After World War I, I was a member of the committee in the House that passed an act to give subsistence benefits to disabled veterans to give them vocational training as well as educational training. It was a real pleasure to me then, in the early twenties, to express our gratitude to the veterans of World War I, and we now have the signal pleasure of aiding along the same lines veterans of World War II, inasmuch as we gave sixty billions to other nations during the present war, and we have given to them more than twenty-four billions since the shooting war stopped, and it is proposed to give to other countries additional billions. I am very glad, indeed, to have an opportunity to do something for our own veterans in this bill and in a bill that is coming up this afternoon—H. R. 4212, by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr.

MEADE], a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House—to increase the subsistence benefits to veterans of World War II in taking educational and other training in schools, colleges, and universities in this country, and I intend to speak and vote for that bill. It, too, offers splendid opportunities to nearly 2,000,000 young men and young women who served our country, and they are taking full advantage of these opportunities, according to all reports. This will prove a blessing to them and promote the general welfare of our country. I am expressing the hope that the bill before us, H. R. 246, will be passed without a dissenting vote.

I commend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for bringing this bill out and giving us an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for bringing this bill up for consideration at this time.

This bill amends the present law and S. 1393 by substituting certain provisions of House bill 246, which bill was reported favorably by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This bill and the proposed amendment provide that the veteran with no dependents would be permitted to earn up to $250 per month before being denied any assistance from the Government; while the veteran with one dependent would be permitted to earn up to $325 per month before being denied any allowances; and the veteran with more than one dependent would be able to receive in wages up to $350 per month before being prohibited entirely from receiving subsistence allowances.

Inasmuch as it may be impossible for me to secure sufficient time to speak on S. 1394, which bill will be taken up by the House immediately following disposal of this bill, and which bill provides for increased subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, I will also discuss this bill within the time allowed me.

At the time provisions were enacted allowing on-the-job training and subsistence allowances to veterans attending school, it was realized that Congress could not by the mere payment of money reimburse one for their service in time of war. However, it was an honest effort by Congress to place the young men and women of this country, who had responded to the call of their Nation, insofar as could be done in the position that they would have occupied had it not been for the war.

Some months ago there was a great deal of criticism about the on-the-job training program. It seems that investigations by the Veterans' Administration had brought out many cases where the program was being abused. I do not doubt but that many such cases did exist. However, that was not the fault of the program, but in its administration.

Last fall, during the recess of Congress, I took the opportunity to make an investigation and study of this matter. I visited some of the night classes being conducted and talked with many of the veterans attending these classes and also visited with them while they were on the job. I found that by far the rank and file of these veterans were doing good work and that they were appreciative of this opportunity being given by their Government for them to undergo this training. I also learned that in many cases where the training was being abused that corrections were being made. After all, the individual trainee should not be penalized for something beyond his control. Where cases of abuse exist they should be rooted out and properly dealt with.

I also took the opportunity to visit some of the schools and colleges where institutional training is being given to our veterans. I talked with many of the veterans, both single and married, undergoing this training, and I was firmly convinced that, on the whole, this program is working satisfactorily.

It has been charged that some of the veterans were taking this training only in order to draw their subsistence. There might be a few isolated cases of this nature, however, on the whole I challenge this statement because I found the veterans to be doing hard and conscientious work. The majority of them are attending schools that are overcrowded and living under conditions which are all but satisfactory. Many of them are living in overcrowded quarters, in trailers, and in other places which are not conducive to good living. I do not think that anyone would put up with the conditions under which many of these fellows are having to live unless they were seriously interested in securing an education.

While I found that many of the single veterans were making a sacrifice to attend school, their sacrifices could not be compared with those of married veterans and, especially with those who have children. The passage of this bill will not correct many of these conditions because there are simply not enough houses in which to live. However, we all know that the subsistence allowance now being received is much too small. I have received several letters from veterans pursuing this training. Some months ago I received one from a young man in my district which is typical. This was from a single veteran and he wrote in part as follows:

> I am greatly in favor of seeing the married veterans get a raise in allotment. I have very close friends here in school who are married veterans and I can speak authoritatively when I say they deserve it. I know you are doing all you can to help these boys and their wives and, I might add, their children. Believe me, they are having a heck of a time making ends meet with their small allotment. One friend of mine works across the street at a drug store trying to provide for his wife and three children. His grades are good, but you can imagine the strain on him and to make an A or B here is many times as hard as before the war. With eight to ten thousands students enrolled, I am sure you understand that a loafer cannot stay in school long. There are many others in this boy's position and that is my reason for writing you. I know firsthand how badly these boys need more financial aid.
>
> Now for the single veterans—yes; we would all like to have a raise in our allotment. If I denied that fact you and I would both know I am not telling the truth. But I feel free to speak for the majority of single veterans when I say that if our howl to get a raise also would lessen the chances of the married veterans getting a raise, then we won't let out a peep. It seems to me that a little foresight should see that if this could be done separately, the results might prove more fruitful. But let the married veterans have the first nip.
>
> Single veterans, as well as the married veterans, find jobs to help out. However, there are not really enough jobs to go around here and I might add, more time is needed for study here than before the war. Those in premed, engineering, accounting, etc., are spending much time by the lamp. Of course, I have financial help from home, but for those who are not so lucky, let me brief you on some expenditures:
>
> My house bill last month was over $60. This does not include laundry, dry cleaning, insurance, cigarettes, haircuts, church offerings, an occasional movie, etc. Those who do not have help from home have to stretch that $65 with a job, but this keeps him from his books.

The high grades being made by the veteran is an answer to those who oppose this program. The bill provides that the present minimum of $65 for single veterans is increased to $75; $105 per month if he has one dependent, or $120 per month if he has more than one dependent. I believe that it is a wise provision to increase the extra amount of $15 for those who have more than one dependent. I trust that the passage of this bill will make it possible for many who were going to have to drop out of school to now complete their education.

Some may question the cost of this increased allowance for on-the-job training and subsistence allowance to those pursuing institutional training. It is true that it will cost more money; however, this cannot be charged to the veterans. In wartime they had a job to do and they did it well. Since the original bill was enacted, living costs have steadily mounted. Some groups in our Nation have been compensated either in whole, or in part, by increased wages for this increased cost of living. Not so with the veteran who is undergoing training. He must accept what is allowed him by Congress. I have no fear but that this bill will be passed and signed by the President. It is fair and just.

In discussing the problems of veterans undergoing training under the GI bill of rights, we must not lose sight of the fact that there are many other benefits which Congress has enacted for the veterans. I recently read a statement to the effect that 45 percent of our veterans, who are entitled to such benefits, are not claiming them. The supposition was advanced that they were not properly informed concerning such laws. In an effort to rectify this condition, I believe that we should do everything that we possibly can to inform our veterans of their rights. These men were taken out of their homes and schools and businesses and sent away, many to foreign lands, to fight for this Nation, and fight they did—gloriously and successfully. Believing now, just as I did when I voted for this legislation, that our veterans gloriously earned the

benefits provided for them under the law, I am listing here most of those benefits in the hope that additional publicity will be given this whole matter to the end that our veterans and the widows and dependents of veterans may obtain the rights and benefits which are theirs under the law:

LIST OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

Eligibility for compensation for disability of both World War I and II: The veteran must have completed 90 days' active duty, with a discharge other than dishonorable, or discharged for disability. Compensation is payable for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by service. Compensation for a non-service-connected disability must be permanent and total in nature. The Veterans' Administration does not forbid any veteran from filing a claim if he feels the claim is justified.

Entitlement to VA hospitalization is available to (1) veterans needing hospitalization for service-connected disability; (2) veterans needing hospitalization for a non-service-connected disability; (3) any veteran needing emergency hospitalization; and (4) peacetime veterans eligible with a service-connected disability. Wives, children, and dependents are not eligible for VA hospitalization.

Out-patient treatment is available to those veterans with a service-connected disability for treatment of the disability by a VA authorized doctor or dentist.

Prosthetic appliances such as limbs, eyes, hearing aids, oral aids, and cars are available to disabled veterans.

National service life insurance is available to veterans who served after September 16, 1940, and carried or applied for NSLI during their service. The maximum amount that can be carried is $10,000.

College and/or high-school education and training is authorized up to 4 years under Public Law 16 and Public 346, as amended. Those veterans training under Public, 16, are limited to 4 years unless it is determined more time is needed for their rehabilitation.

The VA will guarantee up to $4,000 or not more than 50 percent of a home loan, farm loan, or $2,000 or not greater than 50 percent of a business loan. The VA does not loan the money to the veteran. It is the responsibility of the veteran to find a lending institution who will grant him the loan.

Unremarried widows and minor children are eligible for a pension if the veteran died of a service-connected death. Parents must prove dependency before becoming eligible. Unremarried widows and minor children of World War I veterans are eligible for pension if the veteran's death was not due to service. Unremarried widows and minor children of World War II veterans are eligible only if veteran had a service-connected disability. Income limitations are a big factor in these pensions—annual income for a widow with no dependents cannot exceed $1,000; widows with dependents, annual income cannot exceed $2,500 to be eligible for pension.

Burial allowance of $150 is provided for the burial of a veteran and may be claimed any time within 2 years after burial. An American flag to drape the casket is authorized. Application for flag should be made to the nearest VA regional office or post office. Headstone or grave marker is available for any and all veterans' graves, except to those holding a dishonorable discharge.

The service officer of any of our veterans' organizations, the county service commissioner, the State service commissioner, and the nearest Veterans' Administration service officer will be glad to furnish further and more detailed information regarding the above, or any other benefits which are available.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation which I consider long overdue. In fact, there never should have been such a low minimum set. Regardless of the intention of the legislation it tended to penalize many of our returned veterans who were aggressive and who had the initiative to press for promotion. Of course, this legislation has been abused in some cases, but the abuses should have been corrected instead of imposing such a low minimum on the veterans.

I am sure there is no opposition to this legislation and I wish to commend the committee for giving us the opportunity to vote on it—even at this late date.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago I introduced H. R. 772, to remove the monthly maximum placed on the income of veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowance for education. I am glad Congress is considering this legislation today. Our veterans and their dependents badly need this raise. That which is fair and just will be done when we pass the legislation today.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in this session I am presented an opportunity to support the veterans of World War II who are taking advantage of the on-the-job training privileges under the GI bill of rights. It is unusual and refreshing to have the privilege of supporting legislation for American citizens since we have been occupied for months with the problems of foreign nations.

While this legislation affects all World War II veterans receiving on-the-job benefits I am principally concerned with several hundred apprentice employees in the Altoona shops of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., in Altoona, Pa., as well as the hundreds of other World War II veterans in my congressional district employed in various industries.

When I appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in behalf of the legislation now under consideration I read the following letter from Mr. Richard M. Bell, president of the Apprentice Club of the Altoona Works and Middle Division of the Pennsylvania Railroad:

ALTOONA, PA., *January 2, 1947.*

The Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The unanimous vote of the 200 members of the Apprentice Club of the Altoona Works and Middle Division of the Pennsylvania Railroad was to send you the objections of the members of the club to Public Law No. 679, passed August 8, 1946, by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Section 3 of Law 679 provided that a veteran under the program of on-the-job training could not, if he is single, receive any benefits of the act if he earns $175 or more per month; if married, $200 per month. Section 3 also provided that a full-time training period was limited to not more than 2 years.

At the regular meeting of the Apprentice Club of the Altoona Works and Middle Division, held in the Altoona YMCA, on December 6, the following objections were stated:

1. The limit set on wages cuts the initiative of veterans, and retards their ability to compete with the efforts of others. The stimulation of competition is of benefit to both employers and employees; to limit the individual in industry, diligence, and initiative is un-American.

2. The limit on wages makes it impossible for a veteran and his family to live up to the demands of the higher standard of living and its increased costs.

3. The limit set on the training period to not more than 2 years is unfair to both the veteran and the employer; it prevents a veteran from serving an apprenticeship for a vocation which requires more than a 2-year training period.

4. The enactment is not on a par in merit with the legislation which concerns the veterans. It was discussed and passed hastily at the close of the congressional session.

We solicit your vote and aid for the amendment of Public Law 679.

Respectfully,

RICHARD M. BELL, *President.*

President Bell's letter indicates strong concern regarding ceiling on earnings and the limitation of 2 years as the period of training. My reasons for supporting this bill are that the legislation raises the ceilings on earnings and extends the period of training to 4 years. The extension of the period of training benefits a railroad apprentice since a railroad apprenticeship is for a 4-year period. I want to commend the gentleman from New York, Representative KEARNEY, for his sponsorship of this legislation and the various veterans' organizations that joined with him in emphasizing the merits of this legislation.

News of the passage of this legislation by the Congress of the United States will bring unbounded joy to many a veteran and his family who are striving to exist in the face of the present high cost of living.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported this legislation and I am very pleased to see that it is now up for consideration by the House. However, I must state that this bill and the one for ex-GI students are long over due. Further, in view of the increasing cost of living, both bills are inadequate. I shall vote for these bills, and shall join others in the fight to obtain increased payments commensurate with living costs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the pending bill, and that all Members who care to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AN AMERICAN STANDARD OF LIVING FOR GI TRAINEES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief, for it seems to me that there is only

one logical and proper course open to us on this measure, and that is to pass the House bill.

In the time of national need we took these young men from their schools, their shops, their offices. We took them away from their normal expectation of getting a job and starting a family.

We taught them to kill and be killed.

We promised them that if they would risk their lives—and there are 600,000 who not only risked but gave their lives—in defense of our country, we would try to make up to them for the hell we sent them to.

They came back, ready to continue to serve their country in peace as in war; and, in accordance with the promises we made them, the young men who will benefit by this bill sought the kind of jobs where they would learn a trade or a vocation on the job.

These are grown men. Many of them had young families when they left; others acquired families during or after the war. Whether as wives or as sweethearts, their women served no less than the men.

A grateful country undertook to pay these men the difference between the cost of living and the wages they could earn while learning. In good faith, they enrolled in the program.

Meanwhile, the value of money was cut in half.

The 1948 dollar will buy only 50 cents' worth of food even by 1945 standards. These are the men who served our country in her mortal need; and it seems to me the simplest kind of justice that we should now serve them in their need by passing this bill and raising the payments to the on-the-job trainees to a figure which will actually enable them to live according to American standards.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as being in full support of H. R. 246—a bill to raise income limitations for on-the-job training from $175 to $250 per month for single veterans; and from $200 to $325 per month for married veterans, with an additional $25 in income allowed for married veterans with children.

In my opinion, this measure is necessary to remove certain inequities in the operation of the apprenticeship and on-the-job training program. Apprenticeship wages in industry are set according to standards agreed upon by management and labor through collective-bargaining arrangements. In many instances, however, apprenticeship wage levels are higher than the $175 and $200 per month wage ceilings established by the GI bill.

What happens under such circumstances? When apprenticeship wages are above the level set by the GI bill, the veteran is penalized by having his wages reduced to the ceiling level. There are some 600,000 veterans now taking on-the-job training in industry, and about 40 percent of them have had their wages cut as a result of the present law. This is most unfair to the veteran apprentice, and many of them have withdrawn from the program to seek employment in other industries.

The present income ceilings are also unfair to the nonveterans because they tend to depress wage levels in industry. With wage ceilings established by law for the veteran apprentice; the tendency has been for employers to reduce all apprenticeship wages to the levels established by the GI bill. This has had the effect of driving nonveterans from the field.

This measure, which will substantially increase the income levels for apprenticeship training, will remedy the situation which causes veterans to lose part of their wages, and at the same time will help stabilize apprenticeship wages in industry.

I also want to make special mention of that provision of the bill which extends the time limit for on-the-job training from 2 to 4 years, in line with the original provisions of the GI bill. A number of veterans from my district now enrolled for on-the-job farm training have called my attention to the injustice done them by the enactment of the 2-year limitation. These veterans had made commitments for purchase or rental of farms and farm machinery with the expectation that the program would last 4 years. The effect of the 2-year amendment was, therefore, a source of difficulty and in many cases real hardship to many GI's. This change in the law in favor of the 4-year time limit is most desirable, and it has my complete approval.

In conclusion, let me again state that I am wholeheartedly in support of this measure, and urge the House to act favorably on it.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation similar to the bill under consideration at the present time. As a veteran of World War II, I am in deep sympathy with the problems of readjustment which are being faced by my comrades at this time. I have supported this measure with the realization that we must do everything possible for those who gave so much for our great Nation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the two bills we are considering today are of great importance to veterans and their families. H. R. 246 raises the ceiling on wages and allowances to veterans undergoing training on the job. As the law now stands, a veteran may receive subsistence allowance only when he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training. He may earn as much as he can. But when the trainee with no dependents earns $175 or more per month, the Government ceases to contribute subsistence allowance. The same is true when a veteran with dependents earns $200 or more per month.

Where the veteran's earnings are less than the foregoing amounts, the Federal Government will pay him subsistence allowance but not to exceed $65 a month if he has no dependent or $90 a month if he has a dependent or dependents.

This bill would change the existing law to increase the amounts from $175 to $250 per month for a veteran without a dependent, from $200 to $325 per month for a veteran with one dependent, and from $200 to $350 per month for a veteran with two or more dependents. The bill would further enact into law that the standard workweek for the particular trade, exclusive of overtime, shall be considered in computing the rate of allowance.

Section 2 of the bill would amend paragraph 11 (b) 2e to increase the allowable period of training for on-the-job training not apprenticeable in character from 2 years to 4 years.

H. R. 4214 provides for an increase in subsistence allowances to veterans who are in school under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The bill increases the allowance from $65 a month to $75 for a veteran without dependents and from $90 per month for a veteran with dependents to $105 per month if he has one dependent and to $120 per month for a veteran with more than one dependent.

These two bills provide substantially the same benefits as contained in H. R. 4828 which I filed in December. The allowance in H. R. 4828 is a little more generous.

The passage of the bills is fully justified. The existing ceilings are considered so restrictive as to cause a number of veterans to refrain from entering on courses of education and on-the-job training. Some who have started a course in education or who have taken on-the-job training assignment have been forced to discontinue such courses because of the insufficiency of the allowance they have received.

All of us have been told by veterans of their inability to subsist on the small allowance made at this time. The rising cost of living justifies even a higher increase than the one granted. I am glad though that Congress is giving some measure of relief at this time.

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I desire to say that I am very much in favor of H. R. 246, to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes. This bill is of great importance to the veterans at this time.

I intend to vote for the bill and urge its immediate passage.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I think that all of you well know that the original bill providing an on-the-job-training program for our veterans was hastily passed in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress and the bill we are presently considering is designed to repair some of the admitted deficiencies of the present legislation.

It has been tried since that time, and it has been found to be, as I think the hearings before the Veterans' Affairs Committee will show conclusively, wanting.

The bill we are now considering provides a plan which will prevent the abuses that developed under the old system and at the same time will extend a greater measure of justice to all veterans.

There has been a change in the cost of living since the action was taken before and I think more veterans ought to be brought into this program and I believe more veterans will be brought into the program under this bill.

Although it perhaps should go a lot further than it does, it provides a more equitable adjustment in the present on-the-job-training program; I submit that it is deserved legislation, decidedly in the interest of the veteran and of the public welfare, and I urge my colleagues to vote favorably upon it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill would raise the ceilings on subsistence payments in on-the-job training programs and would increase the subsistence payments for veterans pursuing institutional training.

In order to keep the record straight, may I say I talked to nearly all of the members of the Rules Committee in reference to this bill, and everyone with whom I have spoken is in favor of this legislation. They favor this method of legislating under suspension of the rules, because the members of the Committee on Rules that I talked to feel that this will insure the quickest method of dealing with this extremely important legislation. It is their feeling and my feeling that if this legislation were not brought up under suspension of the rules it would make for less rapid consideration, and there would also be the possibility of emasculation, which we want to avert, because that would defeat the very purpose of this bill.

So, again, I want to say that the Committee on Rules is in agreement. The committee did not object to considering it under suspension of the rules, and I hope that these bills will be passed unanimously. As we know, the Senate last year passed these without a record vote. The Committee on Rules, I am sure, would have acted sooner on this legislation but for the fact that the committee must consider the over-all picture for veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and Training, who did a tremendous amount of work on this on-the-job training program.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that before hearings on this program by the subcommittee were begun, invitations were sent out to employers and employees as well as to the veterans throughout the land. Despite the fact that there was some resistance to it at first—reports of use of program as a racket—there was found to be irregularity in less than 3 percent of cases. In the program throughout the United States each State had a separate educational system, but in spite of this fact there were very few instances where the opportunity was given to a subterfuge. I trust that this legislation will pass unanimously.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say, in response to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, had to say, that this policy of passing veterans' legislation under suspension of the rules was adopted when Royal Johnson was chairman of the committee 24 years ago.

We found that that policy worked remarkably well, and during the time I was chairman of the committee I followed it as best I could. I think it is a wise policy now when the administration and the committee can agree on legislation to pass it under suspension of the rules in order not to have it destroyed by unreasonable amendments offered from the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one remark and that is this: There is nothing too good for our veterans. I favor this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I thought the gentleman from Florida would be for us.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. How can you give this country away to foreign countries and then think you are going to be able to take care of the veterans? If you pass the Marshall plan and give away $17,000,000,000 besides the $22,000,000,000 we have already given away, and then think you are going to take care of the veterans, I tell you you are only fooling the veterans. The thing for us to do is stop squandering money and take care of the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Let not the gentleman from Pennsylvania shake his gory locks at me. I am not responsible for that situation. He should talk to the leaders on his own side of the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee which reported this bill out favorably, I am very, very much in favor of its passage, because I believe it will allow those men who have so well served their country to become better economic assets for themselves, for their families, and for their Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I do not believe there is serious opposition to this bill, I shall not burden the House with further remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am supporting H. R. 246, a bill to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job. This bill would change the existing law to increase the amounts from $175 to $250 per month for a veteran without a dependent, from $200 to $325 per month for a veteran with one dependent, and from $200 to $350 per month for a veteran with two or more dependents. The bill would further enact into law that the standard workweek for the particular trade, exclusive of overtime, shall be considered in computing the rate of allowance. The original law would be amended to require a period of training of not less than 3 months and not more than 4 years of full-time training.

Extensive hearings were held, and representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of World War II, the Regular Veterans' Association, Members of Congress, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs expressed their views on the subject.

Experience has proved that existing ceilings are considered so restricted as to cause a great number of veterans to refrain from entering upon a course of education, or on-the-job training, or to discontinue such courses altogether. It is believed that the bill before us will tend to encourage beneficiaries to engage in self-help and self-development and will encourage initiative. The increased ceilings will permit the veteran training under this program to earn additional money, which will partially help to tide him over so as to meet the high cost of living.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the bills we pass here today which provide increases for veterans' allowances and compensation embody the proposals I made at the beginning of this Congress, over a year ago.

At that time, I introduced H. R. 866, a bill entitled to increase the monthly maximum allowed to veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education.

I went a bit farther, perhaps, than do the provisions we are discussing. I asked for a doubling of the existing allowances for education and on-the-job training.

Everybody knows veterans have been crying for these increases for over 2 years. In my opinion, action is long overdue, and I think our leadership is wise indeed to allow the passage of these remedial measures now.

In fixing ceilings on earning capacity to on-the-job trainees, a stop was put to abusing privileges originally given to veterans in the GI bill. There were many violations of good judgment and ethics, even, which forced the Veterans' Administration to advocate a limit.

For instance, it came to my notice that colonels were maneuvering to understudy generals and consequently receiving near equivalents to the latters' salaries.

In these instances no one will argue against the wisdom of placing limits upon earning capacity. But too many toes have been stepped on. The ceilings are too low. Therefore a readjustment such as we are proposing here is by all means reasonable.

From now on the average veteran taking on-the-job training will be able to meet more easily the high cost of living. His preparation for a better job will not be impeded. Employers of such veterans will likewise benefit, because such training will remain attractive.

From the standpoint of education under the GI bill, students who are veterans have found it well nigh impossible to live on subsistence allowances. I remember talking to a group of veterans attending one of the several colleges in my district a few months ago.

One and all of these young veterans had the burning desire to regain their

lost years by taking advantage of the higher learning offered them. But, tragically enough, they were up against rising food costs and other mounting expenses. They asked me when Congress would wake up to their dire circumstances and give them a helping hand. They said frankly many of them would find it necessary to leave school unless we come to their rescue.

As one who proposed universal college education of the GI several months prior to its inclusion in the original GI bill, I am anxious to see veterans opportunities in the field of higher learning increased, not decreased. Perhaps there are some who mockingly refer to this as a noble experiment. But the experiment is working and working well.

I believe the time will come when government will assume the responsibility of opening the avenue to college and university training for all our citizens just as today it guarantees our children primary and secondary education.

Certainly, a poor boy or girl who meets the scholastic qualifications of a university ought to have the same chance of improving the mind a person who is more fortunate financially has.

At any rate, the GI bill has opened a burning question, puts it on a working basis, and proves that all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, can be treated equally when it comes to opportunity to go to college.

Therefore, lest this educational feature of the GI bill be scuttled and countless veterans be compelled to leave important studies they are now pursuing, I strongly urge the House to vote these increases of subsistence allowances to veterans immediately.

I likewise recommend that we improve the on-the-job training program by raising the ceilings, now too low, so that the private initiative of each veteran manifests itself more forcefully.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 373, nays 5, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—373

Abernethy	Blatnik	Chadwick
Albert	Boggs, Del.	Chapman
Allen, Calif.	Boggs, La.	Chelf
Allen, Ill.	Bolton	Chenoweth
Allen, La.	Bonner	Church
Almond	Boykin	Clark
Andersen, H. Carl	Bradley	Clason
	Bramblett	Clevenger
Anderson, Calif.	Brehm	Clippinger
Andresen, August H.	Brooks	Coffin
	Brophy	Cole, Kans.
Andrews, Ala.	Brown, Ga.	Cole, Mo.
Andrews, N. Y.	Brown, Ohio	Colmer
Angell	Bryson	Combs
Arends	Buchanan	Cooley
Arnold	Buck	Cooper
Auchincloss	Buffett	Corbett
Banta	Burke	Cotton
Barden	Burleson	Courtney
Bates, Ky.	Busbey	Cox
Bates, Mass.	Butler	Cravens
Battle	Byrnes, Wis.	Crawford
Beall	Canfield	Crosser
Beckworth	Cannon	Crow
Bell	Carroll	Curtis
Bennett, Mich.	Carson	Dague
Bishop	Case, N. J.	Davis, Ga.
Blackney	Case, S. Dak.	Davis, Tenn.
Bland	Celler	Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.	Jensen	Philbin
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Calif.	Phillips, Calif.
Deane	Johnson, Ill.	Phillips, Tenn.
Delaney	Johnson, Ind.	Pickett
Devitt	Johnson, Tex.	Ploeser
D'Ewart	Jones, Ala.	Plumley
Dingell	Jones, N. C.	Potter
Dolliver	Jonkman	Potts
Domengeaux	Judd	Poulson
Dondero	Karsten, Mo.	Preston
Donohue	Kearney	Price, Fla.
Dorn	Kearns	Price, Ill.
Douglas	Keating	Priest
Durham	Kee	Rains
Eaton	Keefe	Ramey
Eberharter	Kefauver	Rankin
Elliott	Kelley	Rayburn
Elis	Kennedy	Redden
Ellsworth	Keogh	Reed, Ill.
Elsaesser	Kerr	Rees
Elston	Kersten, Wis.	Reeves
Engel, Mich.	Kilday	Regan
Engle, Calif.	King	Rich
Evins	Klein	Richards
Fallon	Kunkel	Riehlman
Feighan	Landis	Riley
Fellows	Lane	Rivers
Fenton	Lanham	Rizley
Fernandez	Larcade	Robertson
Fisher	Latham	Robsion
Flannagan	Lea	Rockwell
Fletcher	LeCompte	Rogers, Fla.
Fogarty	LeFevre	Rogers, Mass.
Folger	Lemke	Rohrbough
Foote	Lesinski	Rooney
Forand	Lewis	Ross
Fuller	Lichtenwalter	Russell
Gallagher	Lodge	Sabath
Gamble	Love	Sadlak
Garmatz	Ludlow	Sadowski
Gary	Lusk	St. George
Gathings	Lyle	Sanborn
Gavin	Lynch	Sarbacher
Gearhart	McConnell	Sasscer
Gillette	McCormack	Schwabe, Mo.
Gillie	McCowen	Schwabe, Okla.
Goff	McCulloch	Scott, Hardie
Goodwin	McDonough	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Gordon	McDowell	
Gore	McGarvey	Scrivner
Gorski	McGregor	Shafer
Gossett	McMillan, S. C.	Sheppard
Graham	McMillen, Ill.	Short
Granger	MacKinnon	Sikes
Grant, Ala.	Macy	Simpson, Ill.
Grant, Ind.	Madden	Smathers
Gregory	Mahon	Smith, Kans.
Griffiths	Maloney	Smith, Va.
Gwynne, Iowa	Manasco	Smith, Wis.
Hagen	Mansfield	Snyder
Hale	Marcantonio	Somers
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mathews	Spence
	Meade, Ky.	Stanley
Hall, Leonard W.	Meade, Md.	Stefan
	Merrow	Stevenson
Halleck	Meyer	Stigler
Hand	Michener	Stockman
Hardy	Miller, Calif.	Stratton
Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Md.	Sundstrom
Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.	Taylor
Harris	Mills	Teague
Harrison	Mitchell	Thomas, Tex.
Hart	Monroney	Thompson
Harvey	Morris	Tibbott
Havenner	Morton	Tollefson
Hébert	Muhlenberg	Towe
Heffernan	Multer	Trimble
Hendricks	Mundt	Twyman
Herter	Murdock	Vail
Heselton	Murray, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Hess	Murray, Wis.	Vinson
Hill	Nicholson	Vorys
Hinshaw	Nixon	Vursell
Hobbs	Nodar	Walter
Hoeven	Norblad	Weichel
Holifield	Norrell	Welch
Holmes	O'Brien	Wheeler
Horan	O'Hara	Wigglesworth
Huber	O'Konski	Williams
Hull	O'Toole	Wilson, Ind.
Jackson, Calif.	Pace	Wilson, Tex.
Jackson, Wash.	Passman	Winstead
Jarman	Patman	Wolcott
Javits	Patterson	Wolverton
Jenison	Peden	Wood
Jenkins, Pa.	Peterson	Woodruff
Jennings	Pfeifer	Worley

NAYS—5

Kean	Reed, N. Y.	Taber
Miller, Conn.	Seely-Brown	

NOT VOTING—52

Bakewell	Bennett, Mo.	Bulwinkle
Barrett	Bloom	Byrne, N. Y.
Bender	Buckley	Camp
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Powell
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Wash.	Scoblick
Coudert	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kirwan	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Doughton	Lucas	Talle
Fulton	McMahon	Thomas, N. J.
Gross	Mack	Wadsworth
Gwinn, N. Y.	Martin, Iowa	West
Hartley	Mason	Whitten
Hays	Morgan	Whittington
Hedrick	Morrison	Youngblood
Hoffman	Norton	Zimmerman
Hope	Owens	
Jenkins, Ohio	Poage	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Hedrick.

Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.

Mr. Bender with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Lucas.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Byrne of New York.

Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Camp.

Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Doughton.

Mr. Gross with Mr. Bloom.

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Poage.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Owens with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Talle with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Hays.

Mr. Youngblood with Mr. West.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Whittington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "To raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file minority views on House Joint Resolution 296.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he expects to make later today a newspaper article.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts.

SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE TO VETERANS PURSUING CERTAIN COURSES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1394) to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, as precedes the proviso, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in a calendar year: Except, That while enrolled in and pursuing a course of full-time institutional training under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month if he has one dependent, or $120 per month if he has more than one dependent, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in a calendar year. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor whether performed as part of his apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business or other establishments, or otherwise, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances as may be determined by the Administration."

SEC. 2. So much of paragraph 3 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, as precedes the first proviso, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for 2 months after his employability is determined, each veteran pursuing a course under this part, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month if he has a dependent or dependents: Except, That each veteran pursuing a full-time institutional course under this part shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $75 per month if without a dependent or dependents, or $105 per month if he has one dependent, or $120 per month if he has more than one dependent:".

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, and ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement before yielding to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE], the author of the Meade bill, to explain why the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has asked to have the Senate bill considered rather than the Meade bill, which is exactly the same as the Senate bill.

May I state that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE], the author of the bill, has made a most exhaustive study of institutional training for the GI's. I wish the House could pass his bill, although the bill that is being considered now is really his bill. Paying his own expenses, he traveled for a long time visiting various institutions and talking with GI's. He deserves the greatest commendation for his work as a member of the Subcommittee on Education, Training, and Rehabilitation. In fact, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has nothing but the highest praise for Members on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation in securing the passage of legislation for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE].

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, to me this is a great day. When the GI bill of rights was passed, I was serving in the Pacific. I was a college graduate. I was serving with a number of young men who had not had an opportunity to complete their education due to the fact that the great majority of them had volunteered their services to their country. The war in which they were then serving was a long war. During the time that many were in service, for 3, 4, and 5 years, they grew out from under the apron strings of their mothers and the purse strings of their fathers. They were on the pay roll of the Government. Most of them became independent and reached the age of legal manhood during that period. Many married and had children and practically all of them had had their education interrupted by their war service. I wondered at the time what effect the disruption of the education of the young people of this country would have on the future of this country.

When the GI bill of rights was passed I was highly gratified because of the provision for a subsistence allowance to compensate for the expenses of living in the amount of $50 for single veterans and $75 for married veterans. Subsequent to the original passage of that legislation the Congress increased that amount because of the rising cost of living to the present amount of $65 for single veterans and $90 for married veterans. The cost of living, as we all so well recognize, has continued to rise and was called to my attention as a member of the subcommittee, the so-called Ramey Subcommittee on Education and Training of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of that subcommittee, I want at this time to pay unusual praise to the gentleman from Kentucky and to say that at his own expense he covered the whole State of Kentucky, a State that was neither east nor west nor north nor south. He covered the colleges where the wealthy attended, and covered those like Berea College, where the students work their way through. I believe that your survey discovered that the increase in the cost of living for the veteran was 29.3 percent. Was that not correct?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. That is correct.

Mr. RAMEY. And you found, furthermore, that the veterans led their classes and I believe as a result of your painstaking efforts in visiting these colleges you have records of the high five and the low five in standing in the classes? Is that not correct?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I congratulate the gentleman on this bill. There are five outstanding colleges in my district. I have talked with hundreds of men and girls who go to these colleges and who get the GI bill of rights allowance. They just cannot live on the allowances they get and pursue their studies. This is an enormous boon to them and is really a most constructive piece of legislation and a public service. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman very much. May I say to the gentleman from New York that I appreciate his continued interest in this and his interest in student veterans pursuing their education under the GI bill of rights.

When visiting these colleges, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] has pointed out, I found that married veterans were encountering more sacrifices, regardless of the subsistence allowance being allowed, especially those with children. Of course, the more mouths to feed the more difficult it was to try to make ends meet. Survey after survey has been made, not only by me, but by other individuals and various veterans' organizations. All of them show that the subsistence allowance is too meager to enable those who have been deprived of their education to be able to complete it.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. DEVITT. What did the gentleman find with reference to the single veterans? How are they getting along?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Of course, the single veteran does not have the responsibility of a family. His plight is not as bad as the married veteran or the married veteran with children. However, the most recent survey on that shows that the single veteran is short $42.12 each and every month. Of course, even this bill will not compensate for that amount.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Kentucky had another bill covering somewhat the same conditions. He would like to have had that bill passed because that provided a higher amount for men with dependents. We have called up this bill because this bill has passed the Senate, and as soon as it passes the House it will be on its way to the White House, and perhaps this money can be provided for the next semester. The gentleman is very unselfish in allowing this bill to be called up.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I appreciate that from the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. I wish to commend my colleague from Kentucky for his good work in bringing out this bill, and for what he has done in bringing these facts before the Congress. There is a college in my town in which there are many veterans. They all seem to be very earnest young men and are doing a fine job. I know from my talks with them that this legislation is very necessary.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I appreciate the observation of the gentleman from Kentucky. I might say at that point that the student veterans all over the country are making by far the greatest record that has ever been made by any group ever to attend our institutions. Every college president, professor, or dean of an institution will say that this is the greatest boon to higher education this country has ever experienced.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. There has been some question raised, in light of the language used in the report on this bill, as to whether or not student veterans in institutional on-the-farm training programs would be included. Would the gentleman give me the benefit of his views as author of the bill, as to whether or not it was his intention and whether or not it was his understanding as to the intention of the committee, that these men enrolled in institutional on-the-farm training should be included.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. As author of this bill, it was my intention to include the on-the-farm training trainees as a part of this increased subsistence allowance. I might say it was the intention of the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] is also a member, to include the on-the-farm trainees. As far as I am concerned, if this statement will have any bearing, it should be made definite now, once and for all, that the on-the-farm trainees are included in this bill.

Mr. WHEELER. It was my feeling, in light of Public Law 377, enacted last summer, that the question was solved, but in view of some of the statements made in this report, I just wanted that clarifying statement from the author of the bill.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. There should be no misunderstanding about it now.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to commend the gentleman for his fine work in connection with this matter. I want to say that we made a mistake in not bringing it up earlier. I feel it should have been brought up before we adjourned in the special session. In my own district there are hundreds of veterans, as I assume there are in other districts, who have found insufficient the present allotment in order to permit them to maintain their courses. Some of them have actually left school because they could not get by on the amount we are allowing.

I think on account of the increased cost of maintenance that faces these veterans, if for no other reason, we should pass the legislation. Certainly it is very meritorious.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr ALLEN of Louisiana. Just a moment ago the gentleman stated it was the intention of the subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Kentucky was chairman, to include on-the-farm trainees in this bill. Could not the gentleman also say that it was the intention of the entire Veterans' Committee to include on-the-farm trainees in this bill?

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. If it were not said then I think it should have been and I will say it now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as one who was on the Veterans' Affairs Committee when the original GI bill was under consideration and as one who worked on that bill for about 6 months, I was most interested in title II on education. I still think it is the best part of the bill. Millions of young men and women have taken advantage of the educational features of that bill and we have by that act been able to give these young men who came back from the war and whose education was interrupted, the greatest opportunity of life.

After the bill began to work we soon found, however, that a great many veterans could not continue in school on the subsistence allowance provided in the original bill. Soon thereafter I introduced a bill increasing the subsistence allowance from $50 to $75 for single men and from $75 to $100 for those having dependents. We were not able to get that much but in conference the conferees agreed on $65 and $90, and that is the amount the veterans are now receiving.

We have found by actual experience and by actual contact with thousands of veterans over the country that with increasing prices it has been almost impossible for many of them to stay in school; so the very objective which we had in the original GI bill of giving these veterans a greater chance in life is being defeated. We have found that many young men who were taking full-time college work were not able to get out and do other things to earn a little additional money to supplement the amount we gave them and which they needed to be able to stay in college. So, Mr. Speaker, the lack of action, the inaction on this matter, has been the cause, I am afraid, of some veterans having to withdraw from college and having to get out in life and abandon their chance and their hope of getting an education.

Long ago, early in this Congress, many of us, both on the committee and other Members, presented bills further to increase the subsistence allowance. I have presented my bill and constantly pushed for favorable action.

We bring to you today this bill which increases the amounts the veterans receive. It is similar to the bill which the committee voted out. In the case of those getting $65 it is increased to $75; in the case of those now getting $90 it is increased to $105. We have also adopted in this bill a principle which I think is sound, very sound, of giving some special consideration to men trying to go to school who have a wife and children. I think it was back in the Seventy-ninth Congress that I introduced a bill giving this special consideration to married couples having children. So we have included in this bill an extra amount of $15 for those who have dependents. I think that is a very wise provision. Frankly speaking, a great many of these men having been in the Army several years, they are getting along in life and when they got out and got married they wanted to start families, which was the proper thing for them to do. However, the rearing of families has resulted in some of them not being able to go to school, therefore it is right and proper for the Congress to take cognizance of that fact and give recognition to these men by paying something more to them.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how anyone could oppose this bill. To my mind it is one of the most meritorious pieces of legislation that has come before the House or will come before the House during the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I hope when the roll is called, and I trust there will be a roll call, that there will not be a dissenting vote. I want the veterans to know that we are interested in their going to school and continuing their work with a new heart, a new hope, as they will be better able to feed and care for their families while they are going to school.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. What is the estimated cost of this particular bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I understand the cost of this bill for 1948 will be about $207,000,000, but it is money well spent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to visit some of the schools where these men are taking this training and I have

never seen a more alert, more enthusiastic group of young men in my life. As the gentleman from Louisiana said, I doubt that there will be any opposition at all to this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and at this point yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to give this bill my support, and I am particularly pleased to have the assurance from the author of the bill that it was his intention in drafting the bill and the intention of the committee in reporting the bill that this increase in the subsistence allowance will be for the benefit of those veterans now receiving an education under the institutional on-the-farm training as well as those veterans attending the established educational institutions.

I have listened with interest to the report of the survey made by the committee and certainly it demonstrates the urgent need for increasing this subsistence allowance. I made some individual investigation on this question and reached the same conclusion. In fact, anyone acquainted with the enormous increase in the cost of living since this program was originally set up in 1944 realizes that the present allowance is not adequate to meet the veterans' bare necessities of life.

It has taken us a long time to get this bill on the floor for consideration. This legislation is long past due and I sincerely hope it will have the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago the House passed a bill raising the income ceiling for on-the-job trainees. This was a worthy bill, and I am glad to have had the privilege of supporting it.

We have before us now another worthy measure which will raise the subsistence pay for veterans pursuing their education under the GI bill. I regret that the Republican leadership, which by virtue of its majority in the House controls the legislative program, has not brought it before us sooner. It is long overdue. The Senate passed such a bill before the Congress recessed last July, and there was no reason why the House could not have taken similar action had the majority party seen fit to bring the bill to the floor for a vote. By special call we returned here in November, and at that time it could have been considered. Nevertheless, I am grateful for the privilege afforded the House to consider the measure even though it comes at a late date.

I was a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation which reported out the original GI bill. I believe that was back in 1944. The subsistence allowances then fixed in the bill were reasonable. But since that date there has been a continuous upward trend in the cost of living, which necessitates increases in subsistence allowances. Scores of veterans in the colleges of my State have written me in support of the bill. They are struggling to remain in college under the present high cost of living. It is my opinion that the educational benefits offered in the GI bill constitute the best part of the bill. Scholastically, student veterans are leading their classes. The benefits afforded have been a boon to education, and the country stands to reap great dividends from the educational advantages offered to and accepted by thousands of worthy veterans.

The bill has the endorsements of all of the veterans' organizations and of the general public. I trust that it will pass the House unanimously.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that in answer to the question I just asked of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], the approximate cost involved in this bill will be in the neighborhood of some $217,144,000. May I say that is a relatively small amount of money considering the billions of dollars that this Congress will be called upon to appropriate for the relief of Europe. I think our ex-GI's are entitled to this consideration. They fought to release the Old World from bondage and in our haste to further aid Europe in her desperate condition we do not want to overlook or slight those who were greatly responsible for her freedom. There is no argument but that both our GI's and Europe need immediate help. Let us give it to them, but let us also remember—"Charity begins at home." Give succor to the friendless, the homeless, the hungry—all of our good neighbors who are in distress; yes—but like the prudent man of his household—if a choice must come in due time by reason of financial complications or adversity—let us care for those members of our family residing under our own roof, first.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this bill and shall vote for it so as to increase the student GI's subsistence allowance while at college.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in giving my wholehearted support to this legislation to increase subsistence allowances for veterans now taking advantage of the educational program under the GI bill of rights.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I worked for approval of this legislation and I was proud of the support which the members of that committee under the chairmanship of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] gave to the program.

Had the recommendations of our committee been followed this legislation would have been approved by Congress almost a year ago and many more veterans would have been benefited by its provisions. It has taken an election year to smoke it out of the Rules Committee pigeonhole. Notwithstanding, I compliment the Rules Committee for giving its belated blessing to this important measure through the statement made earlier in the afternoon by the committee chairman.

Many veterans were forced to drop out of college because of failure to act more expeditiously on this bill. Our action in suspending the rules and passing the legislation this afternoon, will, I hope, make it possible for many hundred young men and women participating in the program to continue on and complete their education. Without the increased subsistence allowance which this bill provides I am certain a very large number of veterans would have had to follow the course forced upon the many hundreds of their comrades who last year were unable to carry on.

So, I say, it is better late than never and if the shadow of a coming election has accomplished this good thing for the veterans I am thankful—but I would have been much better pleased had this Congress considered the bill on its merit a year ago and held out its helping hand to so many who at that time were struggling against heavy odds to continue their education.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I called the attention of the Members of Congress to the dire need of immediate action for legislation to give veterans an increased subsistence allowance so as to enable them to complete their education.

The Veterans' Committee of the House is to be congratulated on their work in holding hearings on this legislation and also on H. R. 246, which is substituted for Senate bill 1393 which provides ceiling provisions on job training. That bill, as well as House bill 4212, which is substituted for the identical Senate bill 1394, should receive the overwhelming support of the Members of the House.

During the past several months, especially when I was home during the Christmas holidays, I received numerous complaints from veterans and their wives regarding the struggle which they were enduring to successfully take advantage of the insufficient allocations under the GI bill of rights.

The cost of living was exceedingly high in June 1946, when price control was discontinued, but since that date, the cost of living has gone up 23 percent on the average, and for some food items and other necessities of life, it has more than doubled.

These two pieces of legislation will bring the veteran far-overdue aid to enable him to take advantage of his educational opportunities to which he is so justly entitled.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, after too long a delay, I am delighted that the House is today suspending the rules and is considering two bills which are of vital interest to our veterans.

The original intent of the Congress in putting a ceiling upon the sums that

veterans could earn while receiving benefits under the veterans' laws was good. I believe that the purposes for this ceiling or restriction on incomes for veterans have been accomplished. If there were those who would take advantage of the liberal provisions of law, they have been weeded out. I know of veterans who are willing and able to earn far more than the sum proposed in the pending bill. Veterans, generally, would rather earn all of their income than to have any portion thereof given to them by the Government.

The modest sum to which the amendment raises the amount which a veteran may earn and receive from the Government certainly is not excessive. I am glad to find that Members of the House, generally, are in accord with the views I herein express and I am happy to know that the bill evidently will pass by a handsome majority.

The second bill which we are considering today, allowing increases in subsistence money to veterans, both single and married, is certainly in order. I am sure that Members of the House are personally acquainted with veterans, as I am, who are making great sacrifice to carry on their studies. The cost of living, not luxuries but mere necessities, is very high. Veterans are living on a very narrow margin. Many of the wives and children of these veterans are not receiving necessities to which they are entitled, to say nothing of luxuries, because of the zeal and determination of veterans to pursue their studies.

One of the most amazing revelations I have discovered is that the reports I receive from school and college officials in my district show that veterans are taking nearly all of the scholastic honors. Normally, the youngsters from 18 to 22 would be making the highest grades. Not so now. These veterans who have, many of them, been in actual combat now fully realize the great need for an education. Most of the higher grades come to veterans and in a great many instances, to married veterans with children. Many a youngster goes off to school in the morning along with his dad. It will be a great heritage to remember that veterans and sons or daughters left their humble places of abode in the early morning to pursue their studies.

There can be no criticism in the passage of either of these bills.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this legislation, which our veterans have needed for some time, as will be seen by my statement under extension of remarks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DEVITT].

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I have grave doubts as to the wisdom of enacting this bill in its present form. It is regrettable that this bill did not come up on a regular rule so as to permit of offering of amendments. I favor increasing the subsistence allowance for married veterans taking full-time institutional training. I do not believe that an increase should be given to single veterans, and I have doubts as to either the necessity or wisdom of giving it to married veterans without children.

The president of the University of Minnesota sent me the results of a survey conducted at that institution last year. It reflected the fact that married veterans with children just could not exist on the present allowance, but that single veterans were breaking even. It appears to me that married veterans without children are free to work part time, and their spouses normally have the same opportunity.

Yesterday this House passed a bill providing for a cut in taxes of about six and a half billion dollars. This Congress has its sights set on reducing the budget in order to accommodate such a huge tax cut. Our action today belies our expressed intention and conduct of yesterday.

My good friend from Florida, the Honorable DWIGHT ROGERS, has just said "there is nothing too good for our veterans." With that statement I agree, but the fact remains that we just do not have enough in our Treasury to compensate the veteran for all he has done for us. We must make our partial payment to him on a wise and deserving basis. The veterans taking institutional training constitute only a small percentage of the 15,000,000 veterans of the late war. How is this Government going to compensate the some eleven and a half million veterans who have not accepted any educational or other benefits under the present law? Should not some comparable recompense flow to them?

I counsel that we exercise our best judgment in parceling out such as we can afford for the veterans in the interest of equality of treatment.

This Congress can never give enough to the combat-disabled veteran or to the widows and children of our war dead. It is to these classes that we owe the most. Why do we not increase the disability allowances of the some two and a quarter million disabled veterans of the late war? Are they not more deserving than the able-bodied veterans taking advantage of the educational benefits of the present laws without having suffered any disability incident to the war? In my judgment they are. The money you are authorizing to be appropriated today for single veterans and married veterans without children should, with greater justice and equality, go to the disabled veteran.

Within a few short years we veterans and the members of our families will constitute almost half the total population of this country. We are so numerous that we have almost lost our identity as a group. In my judgment, this is as it should be. We are citizens first and veterans second, and in considering the enactment of laws for the benefit of veterans, this thought should be uppermost in our minds.

I shall vote for this legislation because it increases the subsistence allowance of married veterans with children. They are deserving. It is not possible under the parliamentary procedure now prevailing to offer an amendment to alter this bill so as to limit the provisions to that class of veterans.

I hope that in the consideration of future veterans' legislation we will be governed by principles of equality and justice for all classes of veterans and be guided by the tenet that we veterans are citizens first and veterans second.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am whole-heartedly in favor of this legislation. I feel that a great number of our young veterans have taken advantage of this part of the GI bill of rights to further their education. I have had an opportunity to visit many of our junior colleges and State institutions and, after making a careful check, have learned that in all cases these veterans have returned to school in all seriousness and are making the most of their opportunities.

With inflation and the cost of living as it is today, many of these veterans would not be able to continue in school without this increase. Certainly, with the billions of dollars being spent at home and abroad, this small increase should be granted to our own veterans to whom the future of this country must look. We all agree that through proper education of our people we can hope for a greater America.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], one of the authors of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 246, a bill to raise ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and H. R. 4212, providing increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, deserves the support and vote of every Member of the House of Representatives.

For 27 years I have been intensely interested in all legislation pertaining to veterans, particularly the disabled, and I feel that the increases provided for in these two bills are indeed very, very small when considering the cost of living has gone up over 65 percent. If this Congress can vote billions and billions of dollars to perpetuate socialistic governments in power in Europe, it would be a shameful day in the history of this country if we did not vote this small increase which means so much to veterans in America.

The Seventy-ninth Congress, of which I was not a Member, hastily passed legislation to which a rider was attached restricting the earnings of our veterans. During my visits with veterans throughout the district I have discovered that legal interpretations made by the Veterans' Administration, particularly on the overtime phase, have caused discrimination and brought complaints from both the GI's and their employers against the Government fumble of the job-training program. Veterans entered into contracts with employers and assumed obligations for homes with the promise that their income would be maintained at a substantial level. Then

they found themselves without sufficient income to meet their obligations.

Their initiative was stifled. It would be far more sensible to trim down the tremendous number of Federal employees and duplication of effort in the agencies rather than break our promises to honest GI's and honest employers.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the members of the Veterans' Committee who worked on the original GI bill of rights and I support this legislation 100 percent.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill, and that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of these bills, H. R. 4212 and S. 1394, to increase subsistence allowance rates for World War II veterans pursuing full time institutional training.

Under existing circumstances there would seem to be no substantial objection to this bill except on the matter of cost, which is estimated to be $217,144,000 for the coming year. After that the cost should greatly decrease each year and should become almost negligible in about 4 years.

Prices of everything have risen considerably since the original rates were fixed, so that veterans who took advantage of the privileges extended them by the Congress, now find themselves in a much more difficult position than they had anticipated. Of course, Congress did not guarantee every veteran who wanted it, a college education wholly free of cost to himself, but gave him a substantial aid in obtaining that education, provided he augmented his income by his own efforts.

There are many thousands of independent and self-reliant veterans who have not complained about the situation which has since arisen, but have been thankful for the help they have received, even though they are much more handicapped now than they anticipated when they undertook their courses.

Having been induced to make this undertaking, and conditions having changed as I have pointed out, these veterans are entitled to the consideration proposed to be given them by the pending legislation, and since I further believe that a large number of them will be better citizens and able to contribute more to the Nation at large, it appears to me the money is well invested.

Furthermore, veterans deserve this consideration, as they are certainly in a different category from all other citizens in this respect.

There are many places for the Government of the United States to economize instead of at the expense of those citizens whose heroic efforts in large measure preserved the existence of that very Government.

THEY CAME BACK MEN

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have already expressed my views in favor of the bill to increase to an American living standard the allowance to the former servicemen enrolled in the on-the-job training program, which we just passed.

The same arguments apply to the measure now pending before us, which will increase the allowance to veteran students enrolled in colleges and universities under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Naturally, I support and will vote for this bill.

Time is of the essence; the new terms are opening this month in most colleges and universities, and without some increase thousands will have to drop out.

My only criticism is that the increases provided in this bill are not enough to enable a man to support himself and his dependents.

Mr. Speaker, when our country was imperiled by the Nazi aggressor we took these young men out of the classrooms. With brief training, we sent them into battle. They went to war beardless boys; they returned to peace as grown men. They acquired wives and inevitably babies.

These men were good soldiers, and their wives are good soldiers; otherwise they would never have stuck out the grueling life of a veteran student, living in barracks, in trailers, in kitchenette apartments, or made-over houses, destitute of modern conveniences, and subsisting on an allowance which, at present inflated prices, will not buy sufficient food, let alone clothes; which has no room for doctor bills or special baby diets or a permanent wave.

The increases we are offering them today, if not insulting, at least are not comforting; they merely assure these million or so young men that if they—and their wives and children—are willing to continue to struggle along on a pittance for the sake of a degree they can do so. This bill will provide no luxuries, Mr. Speaker, I assure you. If prices continue to rise, it will not buy all the necessities.

Nevertheless, because of the urgency, I shall vote for passage, while expressing the devout hope that the majority leadership will entertain new legislation further increasing the allowances in the near future.

GI SUBSISTENCE INCREASE VITAL

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am giving full support to H. R. 4212, which would increase subsistence payments for veterans attending school under the GI bill of rights. This measure is long overdue and is absolutely necessary to offset the present cost of living and to carry out the will of Congress.

Congress enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment and Education Act of 1944 to guarantee education to all veterans who wish to attend school, and several million have taken advantage of this chance to improve themselves by attending college. Today, however, the whole education program is being jeopardized by the ever-rising cost of living.

Few except the veterans themselves seem to realize that at the present time single veterans receive only $65 per month, and married veterans, regardless of the number of their dependents, only $90 monthly. Since these payments were fixed, the cost of living has increased about 35 percent, and it is clear that few veterans are able to stay in school on these amounts without outside financial help.

The present bill is not overgenerous. The veteran without dependents will receive only $75. The married veteran receives an additional $15 or $105 monthly, and if he has two or more dependents, this will be upped to $120.

Let me mention a few facts and figures to demonstrate how serious the situation is regarding GI education, and how the whole purpose of the program has been threatened by inflation. According to recent studies the average monthly living expenses for single veterans attending college amount to $121. Married veterans can get by on $198.

These figures speak for themselves. Present subsistence checks are completely inadequate, and the increase we are considering here today, while long overdue, will not solve the problem. The truth is, we have not kept faith with the veteran by striking at the real cause of his difficulties and enacting a wise inflation-control program, a sound housing program, and a program to provide needed medical care.

In the meantime, and while this bill has been pending in committee, some half a million veterans have been forced to leave school, and it is estimated that at least half of these have left for financial reasons. I propose that passage of this needed legislation be but the first step in a real program to keep our wartime promises to the veteran and to his fellow citizens.

Mr. SARBACHER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am extremely pleased that the House of Representatives will consider and, I am sure, pass this much needed veterans' legislation. Both the on-the-job training and the increase of GI subsistence bills are not only timely but vital at this time.

Although the President, in his recent message to Congress, stated his opposition to this legislation, I do hope a reconsideration will be made, allowing this to become law as soon as possible. With a relief program to almost the whole world, it is amazing that there should be any possibility of a Presidential veto on legislation for the men who gave so much to the very preservation of this country; it would, indeed, be a sad, ironical twist.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 4212, which is identical with S. 1394, which was passed by the Senate during the first session of the Eightieth Congress. It has been recognized for many months that increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is necessary. A number of factors has created a situation that merits an increase in subsistence to young men and women attending schools and colleges under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. High rents, high taxes, and the general high cost of living, which applies to clothing, food, and shelter, makes it necessary for an increase in subsistence. The House bill, H. R. 4212,

and the Senate bill 1394 provide an allowance of $75 per month without a dependent or $105 per month with one dependent, or $120 per month with more than one dependent.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House has conducted extensive hearings on the above measure. Many educators, including public-school men, presidents of colleges and universities, as well as instructors and students, testified before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member. The committee made a thorough study of the whole problem, and recommended this bill after careful consideration. The legislation under consideration has the support of the veterans' organizations of this country.

The records show that veterans who are receiving training under this program are sincere, conscientious, and efficient in their studies as evidenced by the fact that they rank in the upper high percentage with reference to grades in our schools and colleges. It is estimated that more than 2,000,000 fine young men and women are availing themselves of the benefits and opportunities offered under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which sets up an educational program. It is remarkable how well schools, colleges, and universities have responded to the needs of these ex-service men and women, and have expanded their facilities to accommodate students for enrollment. This bill recognizes the truth that many veterans served for long periods of time, ranging from 3 to 5 years, and that their education was interrupted. The present bill acknowledges that the American family is the foundation of our Republic, and therefore, gives additional encouragement and aid for the support of dependent children. The present increase will be a great boost to public education, and make it possible for both single and married veterans to remain in school and finish their education.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I look upon this type of legislation as a duty which the Congress owes to the men who served in the armed forces, who, by reason of having been called into the service a..d required to remain for various periods of time, some of them for 5 or 6 years, were deprived of an education. I think it is unfortunate that we are not giving them sufficient to enable them to receive an education without having to look about for a part-time job in order that they may thereby earn money to supplement the allowance which the Government gives them for that purpose. I think it is very unfortunate, because these boys gave unstintingly of their time and services to their Government during the worst war this country or any other country has ever experienced.

From the standpoint of emotional feeling, the men who made that sacrifice ought to be given full consideration. We should see to it that their needs are met and their opportunities restored to as great an extent as possible.

From the practical, economic side, these men become far better citizens when they are given a full education. They make a greater contribution to their Government. Economically, the investment is wise.

Also, the Government owes them a debt of gratitude. It owes it; it is not a matter of making a contribution; it is not a matter of making a gift to a man who answered the call of his country in time of war. He ought to be given sufficient money to enable him to acquire an education. The Government took away from him his opportunity to obtain an education, because it kept him in the armed forces—perhaps a part of the time overseas—during the very period of life when he would otherwise have been in school.

I am told by many educators that the best students in the schools today are those who have returned from 3 or 4 years' service in the armed forces and are taking advantage of the GI bill of rights, under which they are undertaking to complete their education.

They know that the period of youth, in which they must acquire an education, is now upon them and is rapidly slipping away, and they are eagerly seizing upon the opportunity to go to school and receive the education of which the war deprived them. They are the best students in the universities of our land.

If we have money to scatter like seed in the wind in Europe and elsewhere in the world, why can we not also at least give freely to our own men who fought under our flag for their country during a time when they were much needed? Why require them to seek part-time employment and become part-time workers and part-time students? They were not part-time soldiers while the war was being fought.

I urge my fellow Members to vote favorably on this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, several Members have asked about the estimated cost of this bill. I think even the Veterans' Administration estimate is high. The outside total would be $217,144,000, a lower estimate than the House membership realizes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ross].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on July 23 of last year reported favorably H. R. 4212, a measure comparable to the Senate bill we now have under discussion. The committee approved this measure to carry out what it felt was the intent of the Congress when it enacted the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. It reported this bill favorably only after extensive hearings by the Veterans' Subcommittee on Education and Training, of which I am a member.

Mr. Speaker, we had before our subcommittee college registrars and deans and student veterans from all over the United States. Representatives from every veterans' organization appeared before the subcommittee. We had submitted for our consideration tables showing the rising cost of living. We also had submitted to us figures showing the great number of veterans who found it necessary to drop out of school because of the inadequacy of the subsistence allowance they were receiving. After weeks of studying this question the subcommittee reported this measure unanimously. Every veterans' organization has recommended its passage.

The cost of living has risen constantly since last July. In order to help these student veterans complete their education, it is imperative that we provide additional subsistence allowance. I hope this bill will pass the House unanimously.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico [Mrs. LUSK].

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago we heard our colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE] open the discussion of this bill by stressing the sincerity and the fine ability of the veterans who are training under this program. I should like to go further and say that just before the holidays I had a number of calls from young men who were considering whether or not they would be able to continue their education, in view of the fact that they expected this bill to be considered in time to help them with their expenses through the second semester of this year. Of course, I did not have any definite information at the time, but in talking with those men I was very much impressed with their anxiety over whether or not they would be able to continue their college work to graduation. I am glad to say that with the action we anticipate here today those men will be able to graduate and will be able to go out into the different professions and fields of activity they have planned for themselves, and I am sure the entire country will join with us in real appreciation of the fair consideration this body is giving student veterans today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, a great many hearings were had on this bill before the subcommittee of which I had the honor to be chairman. Every dean, and every president, as well as all veteran students, were invited to be present. Most of the colleges sent teachers and students. Day after day of testimony was had. Thank God the Rules Committee has released this bill to the floor, which we have urged since the hearings. I hope all have read the hearings.

A grateful Nation today is making sure that each veteran, married or single, is equipped for life.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, the President in his state of the Nation message told Congress that he thought everything had been done for the veteran which ought to be done. The House will today have an opportunity to voice its dissent, in which I shall join.

I have often said that a benefit conferred on a veteran is not actually a benefit unless the veteran can avail himself of it. In many cases he could not.

We shall have two opportunities today to show our gratitude to those who lost so many years of their lives in the preservation of ours. We shall vote to extend the provisions of the on-the-job training and veterans' subsistence programs. I shall vote for them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of H. R. 4212, which provides for increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

I wish to commend my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE], who is a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, for having introduced this meritorious legislation and also commend that committee for having given this bill favorable consideration and for having brought it to the House and thereby affording myself and other Members an opportunity to urge its passage and to vote for it.

Approximately 2,000,000 veterans of World War II—young men and young women—are attending schools, colleges, and universities of our country and are pursuing courses of study that they and their advisers have suggested to them. A majority of these young men and women had their education arrested in order to enter the service in defense of our country. I was present and helped to pass the original law which fixed the subsistence allowance of single veterans at $65 a month who did not have a dependent or dependents, and fixed the allowance at $90 a month for those who had a dependent or dependents. Since that law was passed, the cost of room, board, and so forth, has increased nearly 30 percent and many of the school authorities throughout the country, the veterans' organizations, and the veterans themselves pointed out that a great many of these young men and women who had entered upon their courses of study could not continue in school without additional allowance. In fact, hundreds and hundreds of them were forced to leave their school because the amount provided did not cover their actual and necessary subsistence requirements, and these various groups, including the veterans' organizations—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and others—have insisted that this should be increased to $75 a month for the veterans without dependents and to $105 a month to the veteran who has one dependent and $120 a month for the veteran who has more than one dependent.

I have personally talked to scores and scores of veterans who are attending high schools and colleges in my own district, and I am thoroughly convinced that this increase is necessary and therefore I am happy to have the opportunity today to urge the passage of this bill and to vote for it. Many of us have been urging for several months that this bill be brought up and be adopted. Section III of the bill also provides that veterans may receive subsistence for 2 months after his employability is determined. That, I am sure, is to bridge him over from the time he has finished his course until he can secure employment.

I have been greatly and most favorably impressed with the character of these young men and women and their very great desire to make the most of the opportunities that have been extended to them. It is one of the greatest programs ever put on by the United States Government in the aid of education. It will result in great benefit to the veterans themselves and to our country as a whole. A bloody and terrible war came on without any fault of these young people. Their educational training was rudely interrupted by this war. They left their homes, their families, their friends and contributed their full share in winning the bloodiest and greatest war in all history. This great Republic owes to them a debt of gratitude which cannot be fully repaid by this or any other act of Congress. My only regret is that this measure was not passed last fall or during the regular session of Congress, but other matters of national and world-wide concern prevented earlier action.

These young men and young women—veterans of World War II—also receive their tuition and books. I know that they will continue to make the most of these opportunities and that these will prove a great blessing to them and they will enrich in service this great Nation.

There will be some who will complain of our action but let us not forget that we gave to other countries free during the war nearly $60,000,000,000 and since the war, our country has contributed more than $24,000,000,000. Our first duty is to be of service to the people of our own country and especially to its defenders and their dependents and we should not at any time become overgenerous with the peoples of other countries and neglect our own.

It was a pleasure to me to have the opportunity to rise and support H. R. 246 to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances of World War II veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes. I was happy to support that bill and to observe that the House passed it by an almost unanimous vote.

I sincerely trust the bill before us—H. R. 4212—will receive the unanimous vote of the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 372, nays 6, answered "present" 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—372

Abernethy	Bennett, Mich.	Canfield
Albert	Bishop	Cannon
Allen, Calif.	Blackney	Carroll
Allen, Ill.	Bland	Carson
Allen, La.	Blatnik	Case, N. J.
Almond	Boggs, Del.	Case, S. Dak.
Andersen, H. Carl	Boggs, La.	Celler
Anderson, Calif.	Bolton	Chapman
Andresen, August H.	Bonner	Chelf
Andrews, Ala.	Boykin	Chenoweth
Andrews, N. Y.	Bradley	Church
Angell	Bramblett	Clark
Arends	Brehm	Clason
Arnold	Brooks	Clevenger
Auchincloss	Brophy	Clippinger
Banta	Brown, Ga.	Coffin
Barden	Brown, Ohio	Cole, Kans.
Barrett	Bryson	Cole, Mo.
Bates, Ky.	Buchanan	Colmer
Bates, Mass.	Buck	Combs
Battle	Buffett	Cooley
Beall	Burke	Cooper
Beckworth	Burleson	Corbett
Bell	Busbey	Cotton
	Butler	Courtney
	Byrne, N. Y.	Cox
	Cravens	Jenison
	Crawford	Jenkins, Pa.
	Crosser	Jennings
	Crow	Jensen
	Curtis	Johnson, Calif.
	Dague	Johnson, Ill.
	Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Ind.
	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Tex.
	Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.
	Dawson, Utah	Jones, N. C.
	Deane	Jonkman
	Delaney	Judd
	Devitt	Karsten, Mo.
	D'Ewart	Kearney
	Dingell	Kearns
	Dirksen	Keating
	Dolliver	Kee
	Domengeaux	Keefe
	Dondero	Kefauver
	Donohue	Kelley
	Dorn	Kennedy
	Doughton	Keogh
	Douglas	Kerr
	Durham	Kersten, Wis.
	Eberharter	Kilday
	Elliott	King
	Ellis	Kirwan
	Ellsworth	Klein
	Elsaesser	Kunkel
	Elston	Landis
	Engel, Mich.	Lane
	Engle, Calif.	Lanham
	Evins	Larcade
	Feighan	Latham
	Fellows	Lea
	Fenton	LeCompte
	Fisher	LeFevre
	Flannagan	Lemke
	Fletcher	Lesinski
	Fogarty	Lewis
	Folger	Lichtenwalter
	Foote	Lodge
	Forand	Love
	Fuller	Ludlow
	Gallagher	Lusk
	Gamble	Lyle
	Garmatz	Lynch
	Gary	McConnell
	Gathings	McCormack
	Gavin	McCowen
	Gearhart	McCulloch
	Gillette	McDonough
	Gillie	McDowell
	Goff	McGarvey
	Goodwin	McGregor
	Gordon	McMillan, S. C.
	Gore	McMillen, Ill.
	Gorski	MacKinnon
	Gossett	Macy
	Graham	Madden
	Granger	Mahon
	Grant, Ala.	Maloney
	Grant, Ind.	Manasco
	Gregory	Mansfield
	Griffiths	Marcantonio
	Gwynne, Iowa	Mathews
	Hagen	Meade, Ky.
	Hale	Meade, Md.
	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Merrow
	Hall, Leonard W.	Meyer
	Halleck	Michener
	Hand	Miller, Calif.
	Hardy	Miller, Md.
	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Nebr.
	Harris	Mills
	Harrison	Mitchell
	Hart	Monroney
	Harvey	Morris
	Havenner	Morton
	Hébert	Muhlenberg
	Hendricks	Multer
	Herter	Mundt
	Heselton	Murdock
	Hess	Murray, Tenn.
	Hill	Murray, Wis.
	Hinshaw	Nicholson
	Hobbs	Nixon
	Hoeven	Nodar
	Hoffman	Norblad
	Holifield	Norrell
	Holmes	Norton
	Horan	O'Brien
	Huber	O'Hara
	Hull	O'Konski
	Jackson, Calif.	O'Toole
	Jackson, Wash.	Pace
	Jarman	Passman
	Javits	Patman
		Patterson
		Peden
		Peterson
		Philbin
		Phillips, Calif.
		Phillips, Tenn.
		Pickett
		Ploeser
		Potter
		Potts
		Poulson
		Preston
		Price, Fla.
		Price, Ill.
		Priest
		Rains
		Ramey
		Rankin
		Rayburn
		Redden
		Reed, Ill.
		Rees
		Reeves
		Regan
		Rich
		Richards
		Riehlman
		Riley
		Rivers
		Rizley
		Robertson
		Robsion
		Rockwell
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rohrbough
		Rooney
		Ross
		Russell
		Sadlak
		Sadowski
		St. George
		Sanborn
		Sarbacher
		Sasscer
		Schwabe, Mo.
		Schwabe, Okla.
		Scott, Hardie
		Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
		Scrivner
		Shafer
		Sheppard
		Short
		Sikes
		Simpson, Ill.
		Smathers
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Va.
		Smith, Wis.
		Snyder
		Somers
		Spence
		Stanley
		Stefan
		Stevenson
		Stigler
		Stockman
		Stratton
		Sundstrom
		Taylor
		Thomas, Tex.
		Thompson
		Tibbott
		Tollefson
		Towe
		Trimble
		Twyman
		Van Zandt
		Vinson
		Vorys
		Vursell
		Wadsworth
		Walter
		Weichel
		Welch
		Wheeler
		Whitten
		Whittington
		Wigglesworth
		Williams
		Wilson, Ind.
		Wilson, Tex.
		Winstead
		Wolcott
		Wolverton
		Wood
		Woodruff
		Worley
		Youngblood
		Zimmerman

NAYS—6

Eaton	Miller, Conn.	Seely-Brown
Kean	Reed, N. Y.	Taber

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Teague

NOT VOTING—51

Bakewell	Gross	Mason
Bender	Gwinn, N. Y.	Morgan
Bennett, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Morrison
Bloom	Hartley	Owens
Buckley	Hays	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Hedrick	Plumley
Byrnes, Wis.	Heffernan	Poage
Camp	Hope	Powell
Chadwick	Jenkins, Ohio	Sabath
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Scoblick
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Wash.	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Kilburn	Smith, Maine
Cunningham	Knutson	Smith, Ohio
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Talle
Fallon	McMahon	Thomas, N. J.
Fernandez	Mack	Vail
Fulton	Martin, Iowa	West

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Hedrick.
Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Bender with Mr. West.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Chadwick with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Hope with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Bloom.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Poage.
Mr. Talle with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I was present during all the debate on the bill just passed and during part of the roll call, but unfortunately was called from the floor during the roll call and missed the opportunity to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the bill.

REGULATING BUSINESS OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 146) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 1634) to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia", and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto, is authorized and directed to make the following corrections in the House engrossed bill:

Page 8, line 3, after "one" insert the following: "per centum."

Page 13, line 20, strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "5b."

Page 13, line 20, strike out "in" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "In."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, due to unfortunate circumstances, it was impossible for me to be present to vote on the passage of the bill just passed. I ask unanimous consent that I may be recorded as having voted in favor of the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, that has never been done in the House. A Member can rise and say how he would have voted, but we cannot start the practice of what the gentleman seeks to do. It is not that I want to deprive the gentleman of anything, but I must object to the request.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Then, Mr. Speaker, may I state that although I should have liked to be recorded as being in favor of the bill, the rules of the House prevent me doing so, so I repeat that, due to unfortunate circumstances, it was impossible for me to be present while the vote was being taken on the passage of the bill; and had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS MESSAGE

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that our President has seen fit to send down such a message as he did on yesterday. It follows the recommendation of his so-called Civil Rights Committee, a committee the majority of which are members of racial minority groups and most of the others of known radical views. Such program would destroy the laws of the Southern States. The entire message is built on the premise that we mistreat Negroes in the South and that the civil rights of the Negroes are not protected. This I deny. We understand the Negro. If anything, southern officers are more lenient on the Negro who violates the law.

The President in this message advocates the passage of an antilynching bill. No one is any more opposed to lynching than I am. However, lynching has never been as prevalent in the South as gangster killings in the North and no one advocates making gangster killings a Federal offense. Oh, no, there they are willing to leave such prosecutions in the hands of the State.

There is no question but what lynchings are no longer, you might say, in the South. I quote from the Meridian Star, of Meridian, Miss.:

> To the great credit of the South, lynchings declined from six in 1946 to one in 1947, according to the annual report by the Tuskegee Institute (a Negro institution). * * * If the happier trend of 1947 is projected into the current year the United States will have no lynching in 1948. One other encouraging factor in the report is the prevention of lynchings in 31 different cases.

Thus we see that there is no serious need to make such crime a Federal offense in order to break it up. In fact if the antilynching bills now pending are passed they might well be termed the lynching bills because they would have tended to encourage lynching in the 31 cases which the Tuskegee Institute reports were prevented. For if an officer is to be personally responsible if a prisoner is taken from him and lynched it might in some cases tend to make him a little slower to arrest and protect the defendant in those crimes so atrocious as to make a few want to take the law in their own hands. Certainly such bills would not improve a situation where there was only 1 lynching and 31 prevented by the State officers.

We must come to the conclusion that the President's advisers are not trying to prevent crime but are in reality trying to obtain the support of the Negro vote in the Northern States, and if they can get those votes by passing an antilynching bill apparently they would say, What of it, if a few more Negroes lose their lives?

What makes the matter more serious, Mr. Speaker, is that the Republican Party is trying to outdo the President in urging the passing of such legislation in an effort to get the same Negro vote in the North. Both parties seem to lose sight of the great body of American citizens who believe in States' rights, who in their State courts and in the State legislatures are busy taking care of the rights of all their citizens much better than could possibly be done by the Federal Government from Washington.

Take the FEPC, does anyone believe that either party would sponsor such an un-American bill as this under the terms of which every businessman in the United States would be told from Washington who to employ and who to fire, if it were not for their desire to obtain the votes of the radical groups who sponsor such measure including the Communists?

In the past the Republican Party has sponsored such legislation as is recommended by the President, and true, they were sponsored by certain Democrats but always heretofore they have stopped just short of losing the support of the Southern States. Now it appears that they go further than ever before. President Roosevelt never went so far.

A short time ago Governor Wright of Mississippi, a fine Governor, one not given to intemperate speech making, in

addressing the State legislature, called attention to the seriousness of the situation. He knew that conditions were good in our State and that all citizens were protected in the State courts and our conditions compared favorably with conditions in any State in the Union. He stated then that if certain Democrats did not quit trying to needlessly attack the South, her State laws and institutions under which the people of two races had lived peaceably for generations that it would probably become necessary for the Democrats to take action to break away from those who attack us for support in other areas.

Such a course is not easy for a southern Democrat, whose father before him was a Democrat. The question arises, Where can the southern Democrats go? That is a serious question. Just now I do not know the answer, but more and more Democrats of the South are seeking some way to divorce themselves from those who call themselves Democrats but who in no way reflect the principles of Jefferson, and who are willing, it seems, to destroy the laws of the Southern States, end segregation, and make of the people of this Nation a mongrel race.

It seems to me that the leadership of the major parties, both Democrat and Republican, in this country could devote themselves to constructive legislation and thereby appeal for support and votes instead of stooping so low as to sponsor the FEPC, the antilynching bill, and the anti-poll-tax bill, all lifted from the program of the Communist Party, in their effort to secure the votes of the radical minorities in this Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently absent during roll call No. 10. If I had been here, I would have voted "aye."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate continue throughout today and not to exceed 2 hours tomorrow, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] will have charge of the time for the minority on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5214, with Mr. LEONARD W. HALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the independent offices appropriation bill is the first appropriation bill under the Presidential budget calling for the expenditure of $39,700,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949—the largest peacetime budget in history—recommended to the Congress in spite of mounting prices, the threat of devastating inflation, and the administration's lip service to retrenchment and economy.

This is the first part of the independent offices appropriation bill, dealing with some 30 agencies or items and with a billion dollars' worth of estimates. It will be followed later by part 2, dealing with three agencies, namely: Atomic Energy Commission, Maritime Commission, and Veterans' Administration, with estimates calling for the expenditure of about $6,000,000,000.

Of the $1,000,000,000 estimates, only about $265,000,000 are open to reduction. As is indicated on page 2 of its committee report, the Congress has no control over the balance which comprises more or less fixed estimates.

Of the $265,000,000, your committee recommends a reduction to the extent of $56,000,000, or approximately 21 percent. In addition, it recommends rescissions to the extent of $3,000,000, giving an overall total reduction of $59,000,000.

It is true that the bill carries $196,000,000 more than was appropriated for the current fiscal year for the same activities. Attention is called to the fact, however, that of this total increase, over $195,000,000 is in respect to a single item for postwar highway projects, over which your committee has no control.

Details of the action recommended will be found in the committee report. The report is practically unanimous. It is unanimous with the possible exception of one item, and I want to express my appreciation to the minority members of the subcommittee in charge of this bill for their help and cooperation in its preparation. It has been a pleasure to work with them.

As a matter of policy, your committee has attempted to hold requests, wherever possible, to or below current levels, to postpone requests for new functions, and to allow increases only where they are obviously justified. This policy seems imperative in view of inflationary conditions at home and of the tremendous demands both at home and abroad.

It will be noted that no agency estimate submitted to your committee by the Bureau of the Budget, with the approval of the President, reflects a decrease over the current fiscal year except that for the General Accounting Office. As a matter of fact, almost every item reflects an increase.

THE WHITE HOUSE

The White House, Mr. Chairman, is no exception to this rule. For the White House Office, there is requested over $969,000 compared with something over $952,000 in the current fiscal year, and with about $302,000 in the spending days of 1944.

For the Executive Mansion and grounds there is requested over $230,000 compared with some $202,000 in the current year—the largest request ever made in this connection—including provision for additional personnel eliminated from the rolls of the Federal Works Agency as the result of reduced appropriations for that agency.

In addition, through the so-called emergency fund for the President, there is requested some $226,000 for additional personnel for Mr. Steelman, Mr. Clifford, and for liaison work with the advertising and motion-picture industries of the country.

There is no indication here of a desire for economy in governmental spending. On the contrary, the example is set by the White House for all agencies to request increased appropriations in spite of the condition confronting the Nation at this time.

There are three agencies, Mr. Chairman, in this bill whose activities pretty much affect the entire Government.

Their testimony is of especial interest. I refer to the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the General Accounting Office.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

The testimony of this agency, Mr. Chairman, reflects a direct national debt of over $256,800,000,000, together with contingent liabilities and other obligations of about $163,500,000,000, or a grand total debt and contingent liabilities of over $420,300,000,000, or roughly, $3,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert in the RECORD at this point a table summarizing this indebtedness.

The public debt and contingent liabilities

[Source: Bureau of the Budget]

Direct public debt	$256,899,844,854.11
Contingent liabilities	26,936,089,014.24
Unliquidated obligations	13,787,000,000.00
Guaranteed loans	6,473,673,957.18
Insurance in force	116,273,397,804.00
Total	420,370,005,629.53

This testimony also indicates estimates of personnel on the Federal pay rolls on July 1, 1948, within continental United States, of 1,750,000; outside the United

States 242,896; and as of July 1, 1949, inside the United States 1,750,000 and outside the United States 243,742.

In other words, looking ahead to the end of fiscal year 1949, the Bureau of the Budget sees an actual increase of about 1,000 outside the United States and no decrease whatsoever inside the United States. This is in striking contrast with representations made by the Administration through its vast propaganda machine.

Moreover, the estimate within the Nation is based upon the assumption that no part of the new legislation called for by the President requiring $5,700,000,000 of expenditure will, in fact, be enacted into law. If any part of that program is put into effect, obviously the personnel within the country will increase correspondingly.

The total on the rolls as of July 1, 1949, of approximately 2,000,000 compares with the total of some 719,000 at June 30, 1935, and 920,000 at June 30, 1939.

There appears, Mr. Chairman, to be no adequate standardization by the Bureau of the Budget in such fields as budget work, accounting, personnel work, publicity, the ratio of highly paid to low-paid personnel, and other matters common to all agencies. Let us take one example. Let us consider the number of employees engaged in personnel work.

In 1938 the total number of such employees was 4,197; in 1948 it amounted to 25,191, or an increase of over 600 percent. The ratio of persons engaged in that work to the total number of personnel on the Federal pay rolls varies from a maximum of 1 to 18 to a minimum of 1 to 121, an average of about 1 to every 85 persons on the pay rolls.

Inquiries of leading business organizations of this country, such as railroads, steel companies, manufacturing and business machine establishments, reflect a ratio of a maximum of 1 to 200 and a minimum of 1 to 3,500 employees.

In July, last year, your committee requested the Bureau of the Budget to make a survey and report on this matter with a view of standardizing and reducing the number of persons engaged in personnel work. Four months later, in November, the Budget Bureau reported that it would take four people a year to obtain the necessary information on which to base any recommendations. In other words, the Bureau of the Budget, by its own confession, has been authorizing these tremendous increases in this field of work year after year without adequate information on which to base intelligent action.

It is believed that this is but one example of a similar lack of proper information on the part of this agency.

The Bureau of the Budget is apparently adopting the practice of attempting to interpret the will of the Congress for the agencies of Government to the extent of controlling the expenditure of appropriations according to its own ideas.

In one recent instance an interpretation contrary to that of the agency resulted in largely disturbing the shipping and ship-building industry of the country. The interpretation of the Bureau of the Budget was wholly without justification, and was made without consulting either the Senate or House Committee which wrote the legislation involved.

It is because of this interpretation that the committee has inserted the language on page 2 of the report under the heading, "United States Maritime Commission."

It is to my mind extremely doubtful if the Bureau of the Budget has any authority in the field of statutory interpretation. That would seem to be a matter primarily for the General Accounting Office. If, however, the jurisdiction exists, surely it is not too much to ask that the appropriate committees of Congress be contacted before interpretations are made which are clearly contrary to the will of the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has also apparently developed the practice of instructing agencies to include in appropriations for any current year supplemental or deficiency requests, even where those requests have never been submitted to the Congress.

In one recent instance the Civil Service Commission was instructed to include a supplemental request of $2,500,000 which it appears may never be submitted for consideration by the Congress. It was included for purposes of comparison between 1948 and 1949 appropriations requests.

Obviously a practice of this kind presents an entirely false picture of the facts. It must be discontinued.

It would further appear, Mr. Chairman, that the Bureau of the Budget has been guilty of recommending transfers or expenditures for purposes which are unauthorized by substantive law.

Recently, a transfer of $500,000 was recommended from funds appropriated for relief in European devastated areas, to defray the expenses of the so-called Luckman food committee. The only excuse given was that both agencies were dealing with food.

There seems to be a growing tendency to apply appropriated funds to purposes never contemplated or authorized by the Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has failed in eight instances to supply detailed information requested for inclusion in these hearings. It would seem that much of this requested material should have been readily available if this agency were concentrating on the duties for which it is primarily responsible.

The fundamental difficulty with the Bureau of the Budget today, in my judgment, is that it serves as a mouthpiece and adviser to the President, and not as an independent agency serving the President and the Congress alike in the effort to attain economy. A radical change is required, if efficient government at a minimum cost is to be assured, and annual raids on the taxpayers' money halted.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Should it not also be said that in several instances in this subcommittee and also in another subcommittee on which I serve, the Bureau of the Budget has taken upon itself to determine where reductions shall be applied and to make reductions in respect to items which involve a matter of policy that should be decided by the Congress, not proportionate reductions or ordinary reductions such as have been made in previous years, but such marked changes in the requests of the departments that in effect the Bureau of the Budget has supplanted the Congress itself in connection with policy decision.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is clear, I think, that the Bureau has been reaching out beyond the functions that it was originally set up to exercise.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, a fundamental change in the operations of the Civil Service Commission would also seem to be called for, if a competent service on a merit basis is to be restored. Numerous complaints have been received as to the operations of this Commission. I have personally been told on various occasions, both by officials within the Government, and by others, that, in their opinion, present operations are destroying, rather than maintaining, the merit system.

Particularly disastrous to efficient and economical government is the widely held belief that rating and pay are largely dependent upon the number of personnel under the supervision of any individual. The emphasis should be exactly the reverse. The man who can do an efficient job with the fewest assistants should win the promotion. This, of course, is not in keeping with bureaucratic operations.

During the hearings, representatives of two agencies told your committee that they were handicapped in the operations of their agencies to the extent of 15 to 20 percent of efficiency by the complex rules, regulations, and red tape of the Civil Service Commission.

When asked how he could get rid of an inefficient employee, one official replied, and I quote: "By having a hearing and then being proved wrong myself and then he"—the employee—"stays on in defiance of me."

Another official added, "If you discharge a man for misconduct, his superiors, who recommend such action, are likely to be put immediately on the defensive with countercharges."

The Civil Service Commission states that anyone except a veteran may be discharged after an opportunity to reply in writing, and that his only recourse is to appeal to the Commission for reinstatement for appointment, not in the same but in some other agency.

The Commission also states that the State Department, under special legislation, can discharge anyone, anywhere, at any time, with or without cause.

Experience does not seem to square with these statements.

The Commission, Mr. Chairman, requested a very large increase in appropriations for the loyalty program, under Executive order of March 27, 1947.

This committee, of course, desires to see the necessary loyalty work completed at the earliest possible moment.

On the other hand, the procedure called for appears to be so involved and

complicated as to be likely to defeat the very purpose of the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The procedure involves investigation by the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; it involves action by agency boards; it involves possible appeals to agency heads or to regional loyalty boards; it involves possible appeals to the Loyalty Review Board; it involves counsel and witnesses for the accused, all along the line.

It appears that months, even years, may be involved in ridding the service of a given individual, who may perhaps remain on the pay roll of the Government throughout the entire proceedings.

The fact that over $17,000,000 is suggested as necessary in 2 years for the elimination of disloyal persons from the Federal pay roll is, of course, eloquent testimony on the part of the Civil Service Commission of a dismal failure to do the job that should have been done in the years which have passed.

Commissioner Flemming very frankly admits that, if the work had been done during those years when some of us were demanding that the personnel of the OWI and other agencies be investigated and cleared or removed from office, the money now requested for the loyalty program would not be needed at this time.

The record discloses 1,126 vacancies as compared with the number of positions now authorized for the Commission. The committee believes that this authorized personnel, in adidtion to 586 persons now engaged on the loyalty program is sufficient for the time being for the work in prospect, particularly in view of the present authority vested in Government agencies to discharge personnel, and of the fact that the Commission has delegated 50 percent of its work in the field of examinations, qualifications, and appointments, and that it has a reserve to its credit at the moment of about $29,000.

The record indicates that 1,319 persons have been rated ineligible with the question of loyalty involved in the fiscal years 1940 to 1947, and that there are in the so-called bar files of the Commission today, 7,806 cases, and in the Commission's so-called flag files 93,206 cases.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The General Accounting Office, Mr. Chairman, which takes a voluntary reduction for the second consecutive year, is the agent of the Congress. As such, its transactions are of special interest.

The testimony discloses during fiscal year 1947 exceptions taken to expenditures to the extent of $548,000,000; reports of waste and extravagance to the number of 30; and reports of failure to protect the Government interest to the number of 366.

The testimony also refers to shortcomings of various agencies, including Federal Works Administration, Maritime Commission, and War Assets Administration.

Particularly amazing is the testimony in reference to the Maritime Commission. It shows four cases involving losses to the United States of many millions of dollars.

It shows that the accounting system which the General Accounting Office has sought to have installed since 1937 has not as yet been installed.

"Ten years of frustration," says the Comptroller General, "in our dealings with the Commission in this and many other matters have just about exhausted our patience."

It shows, in the field of just compensation cases, letters addressed by the Comptroller General to the Maritime Commission dated August 29 and October 13, 1947, with no reply whatsoever to the date of the testimony (December 11, 1947), and, on the contrary, a resolution apparently adopted by a 3–2 vote of the Maritime Commission, defying the rulings of the Comptroller General.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point the letters addressed by the Comptroller General to the Maritime Commission:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 29, 1947.

CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL SMITH: Reference is made to the provision in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 299, approved July 31, 1947, involving the future payment of certain obligations against War Shipping Administration funds. Said provision reads as follows:

"The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to withdraw from the accounts of the United States Maritime Commission 15 days after the date of enactment hereof the unexpended balance of the War Shipping Administration funds received by the United States Maritime Commission pursuant to section 202 of the Naval Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 501), and to carry such unexpended balance to the surplus fund to be covered into the Treasury, and 'there is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such amount as may be necessary (not to exceed $200,000,000) to liquidate such obligations as may be found by the General Accounting Office as having been properly incurred against such funds prior to January 1, 1947:' *Provided*, That the appropriation herein for liquidation of obligations shall be available only until March 31, 1948: *Provided further*, That moneys received by agent operators of the Maritime Commission on account of operations prior to September 1, 1946, under the War Shipping Administration revolving fund may be applied against necessary expenses of such agent operators in connection with liquidation of obligations incurred under such fund prior to January 1, 1947: *Provided further*, That hereafter all moneys accruing to the Maritime Commission from operations under the War Shipping Administration revolving fund prior to September 1, 1946 (including moneys received from agent operators after deduction of necessary expenses of such agent operators), shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts." [Single quotations supplied.]

The purpose of this letter is to advise you of the views of this office with respect to the function which the Congress intended would be performed by the General Accounting Office under said provision and to outline briefly the procedure by which such function will be carried out. In this connection, I am informed that a conference already has been held, attended by representatives of the Maritime Commission, the Treasury Department, and the General Accounting Office, at which the details of the procedure to be followed have been tentatively agreed upon.

I do not regard the provision as requiring that the General Accounting Office examine into the merits of each item submitted for payment. That is to say, the language is not construed as making it mandatory for each item to receive a preaudit approval before payment can properly be made by the Treasury Department. Rather, the examination to be made will be confined to ascertaining (1) that under the facts and supporting documents the proposed payment is in satisfaction of an obligation actually incurred against War Shipping Administration funds prior to January 1, 1947, and (2) that, on its face, the item is of the general nature and type chargeable to such funds. And, of course, it will be essential to such an examination and determination that there be made available by proper personnel of the Maritime Commission data and supporting documents sufficient to establish the propriety of each expenditure to the extent indicated above.

Thus, the finding of the General Accounting Office in advance of payment that an item constitutes an obligation "properly incurred" against War Shipping Administration funds prior to January 1, 1947, should in no sense be construed as a final and complete approbation of the expenditure. All payments will continue to be the subject of a postaudit as heretofore. In other words, the function imposed upon the General Accounting Office by said provision of law is to be considered as in addition to and entirely independent of the functions and duties imposed by previously existing legislation.

It is my understanding that the supporting documents for most of the payments to be made are located in Washington, New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco. In order to expedite the handling of such payments I have approved the recommendation that certain personnel of the Audit Division, General Accounting Office, stationed in the cities named above be designated to perform the function involved. Where, after examination along the lines indicated, an item is found to represent an obligation properly incurred against the funds in question prior to January 1, 1947, the voucher proposing payment will be stamped as follows:

"Approved to the extent required by Public Law 299, Eightieth Congress, approved July 31, 1947.

"COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.
"By —— ——."

The auditor marking the examination will affix his signature and the date, and the voucher will then be forwarded to the chief disbursing officer, if in Washington, or to the regional disbursing officer, if in the field.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WARREN. I shall now read my letter of October 13, 1947.

"MY DEAR ADMIRAL SMITH: Under date of August 29, 1947, I addressed a letter to you setting forth my views as to what function the Congress intended the General Accounting Office to perform under the provision in Public Law 299, approved July 31, 1947, involving the future payment of certain obligations against War Shipping Administration funds. That provision, as you know, appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury not in excess of $200,000,000 for the payment of such War Shipping Administration obligations "as may be found by the General Accounting Office as having been properly incurred against such funds prior to January 1, 1947." In my said letter of August 29, 1947, I stated that, in my opinion, said provision did not contemplate that the General Accounting Office would inquire into the merits of each item submitted for payment but that

it required this Office to do two things: First, determine and find that the payment was in satisfaction of an obligation actually incurred against War Shipping Administration funds prior to January 1, 1947, and, second, determine and find that the item was of the general nature and type chargeable to such funds.

"Insofar as concerns items generally proposed to be paid from such funds, I still adhere to the views expressed in that letter, and the approval of such items by the General Accounting Office prior to payment will be along the lines indicated. However, in view of the action recently taken by the Commission with respect to just compensation payments, which I shall refer to more specifically below, I deem it my duty as Comptroller General of the United States to take steps to insure that public funds will not be expended in violation of applicable provisions of law.

"There have been forwarded to this Office copies of memoranda prepared by various officials of the Maritime Commission on the subject of just compensation for requisitioned vessels, particularly with respect to the enhancement prohibition in section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. It appears that the Commission has had under consideration during the past few months the question of whether, as a matter of policy in the determination of just compensation, it would follow the formulas set by the War Shipping Administration, which were based on rules laid down by the Advisory Board on Just Compensation, or whether it would follow the applicable decisions of this Office. My examination of these memorandums and papers leads me to believe that rates and valuations fixed in accordance with the formulas contained in WSA General Order 37 may be substantially in excess of the amounts properly payable if due regard were given to the decision of November 28, 1942 (22 Comp. Gen. 497).

"I have been advised that on July 24, 1947, the Maritime Commission adopted a resolution reaffirming the policies followed by the War Shipping Administration in fixing just compensation. As I read that resolution, the Commission has put itself on record as having decided to make just-compensation payments in clear and recognized violation of the law as construed by the accounting officers of the Government. Under such circumstances, I have no alternative but to use every power at my command to prevent payments being made in open defiance of the law.

"Were support for my position in this matter necessary, I have only to invite your attention to the following language in the report of the House Committee on Appropriations in connection with the act making funds available for just-compensation payments:

"'* * * One of the most serious phases of the matter is the settlement of the so-called just-compensation cases involving settlement for ships requisitioned by the Government under section 902a of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. The Comptroller General rendered a decision interpreting certain phases of this section early in the war, but the Commission so far has failed to consummate the settlement. These payments bear interest from the date of requisition of a vessel until the date of settlement, and it is the committee's desire that these claims be processed with all practicable speed and with due regard to the decision of the Comptroller General. * * *'

"Accordingly, I am constrained to insist that all vouchers representing payments of just compensation must contain a certification to the effect that the amount to be paid is consistent with the principles of applicable decisions of this Office. Moreover, I am instructing the Audit Division of the General Accounting Office that, with respect to this class of payments only, a full and complete audit should be made prior to approval of the vouchers."

Now, I might say that on data furnished the General Accounting Office by two of the five members of the Maritime Commission the vote of the Commission was three to two not to follow the decision of the Office. I am informed that vote was taken on the very day this committee issued its report on the appropriation bill, from which I have just read, and I am not advised of any later action by the Commission to reverse the vote.

(The Comptroller General.)

A few comments, Mr. Chairman, on other agencies dealt with in the bill:

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT

Before the war there were no such funds. During and since the war funds have been made available on a decreasing basis.

For the current year the amount provided was $500,000. The request for fiscal year 1949 is $1,000,000. Your committee has allowed $700,000, an increase of $200,000 over the current fiscal year.

These funds have always been, and are intended to be used for real emergencies affecting the national interest or security. Nevertheless, year after year your committee has been forced to criticize the use and application of these funds as contrary to the will of the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the application of the funds for the fiscal year 1948. With one or two exceptions, no item included can be fairly classified as an emergency item. Almost every item included could and should have been submitted to the Congress for approval.

There is no reason why under the guise of emergency funds the President should set aside a sizable back-room kitty.

Allocations from the emergency fund for the President, 1948, as of Jan. 14, 1948

Appropriated in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948	$500,000
Allocations:	
Executive Office of the President:	
President's Amnesty Board	40,000
President's Committee on Civil Rights	50,000
President's Commission on Higher Education	64,000
Advisory Commission on the Merchant Marine	8,700
Office of Coordinator of Emergency Export Program and Secretary of the Cabinet Committee on World Food Programs	45,000
Additional staff of the White House	103,528
	311,228
Department of Commerce:	
For Special Committee on Foreign Aid	41,850
Department of the Interior:	
For international scientific conference on the conservation and utilization of natural resources	10,000
Department of Justice:	
For President's Amnesty Board	11,000
Department of the Army:	
For rehabilitation of hurricane damage on Mississippi Gulf coast	50,000
Total allocations as of Jan. 14, 1948	424,078
Balance available for future allocation	75,922

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The testimony of this agency was lamentably weak. There was strong sentiment in the committee for the complete elimination of all funds for the agency.

It is admittedly not a fact-finding agency. It merely uses the findings of other agencies which, it would seem, could be made available directly to the President or the Congress by the originating agencies.

There is little evidence of any important results from its work of interpretation, and it takes the position that its views and recommendations are confidential except as to the President, unless released by him.

In respect to its report on foreign aid, which was publicly released, it would appear that it made no specific recommendations as to inflation, as to employment of idle plants, or as to specific commodities such as steel, fertilizer, and grain substitutes.

Asked to provide a break-down in terms of commodities, showing estimated availability, and estimated demands against that availability in terms of domestic consumption, normal exports, requirements for existing foreign-aid programs, and requirements for pending programs, the agency replied that it would be impossible for it to supply the desired information.

Its recommendation to the President would appear to have been in general terms only and to the effect that what is requested can be done as we did more in the war years, provided our domestic consumption is sufficiently controlled.

Continued operation on a reduced basis is recommended only in the light of present conditions, and the fact that the agency is new.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The testimony of the Federal Communications Commission gives little indication of fundamental improvement in the operations of this agency.

Transfers of stations, with Commission approval, for considerations far in excess of cost or replacement value continue.

Action or inaction in respect to assignment of frequencies, including the so-called Bulova stations, the New York News case, the Cur-Nan Co. case, and certain stations in Kentucky, suggests continuance of operation on the basis of political favoritism.

The testimony of Commissioner Durr in respect to his altercation with the FBI, including his statement as to Communist ownership of stations, in which he apparently regards Communist applicants in much the same light as Catholic, Protestant or Jewish applicants; and in which he indicates that he does not know that Communists advocate the overthrow of this Government, is startling.

Fear of the Commission by radio licensees still is manifest.

Mr. Chairman, freedom of the air, to the end that the people may have both sides of important questions, fully and fairly presented, is imperative to our form of government. It is vital that the FCC operate as an impartial quasi-judicial agency rather than as the political puppet of any administration that happens to be in the White House.

I do not know what has become of the resolution to investigate this agency which was filed during the last session. If the Committee on Foreign and Interstate Commerce is not in a position to conduct an investigation, it should be conducted without further delay by a select committee.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Federal Trade Commission requests an increase of $1,000,000, or 33⅓ percent more than it has for 1948.

The committee recommends an increase of $58,000 for in-grade promotions and $348,000 for antimonopoly work, disallowing all other items, including proposed funds for work in insurance, work on additional joint financial reports, and work on administered price matters.

This, with certain transfers, will make available for antimonopoly work $1,364,181. If properly applied, this should be helpful to the consuming public.

The committee feels that the over-all amount allowed should be ample, particularly in the light of the fact that there are 65 vacancies compared with authorized positions, and that several divisions appear to be overstaffed, in the light of the work load during the past 2 years.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

The record indicates that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made no accounting to Federal Works Agency for securities of the Public Works Administration sold by the RFC, many at handsome prices. A request for a statement showing the total amount of securities sold, the amounts realized, and the disposition of the proceeds resulted in the first instance in a response from the RFC to the effect that it would cost $20,000 to produce the desired information.

This is almost unbelievable. I understand the RFC has now agreed to furnish the desired information.

Let me call your attention to the enormous cost of operating Federal buildings. For the maintenance and operation of the Department of Agriculture's South Building there is requested for the fiscal year 1949, $1,028,990; the figure for the Pentagon Building is $4,039,470.

The largest uncontrollable item in the bill, Mr. Chairman, is for postwar highways and the elimination of grade crossings, $459,588,854—more than one-half of the total carried in the bill.

Under present law, the Commissioner of Public Roads and the President provide the funds for this purpose. Contracts with the States are approved in advance and become binding commitments. Congress is completely without control over funds required for construction, as well as over the administrative expenses of the agency.

I appreciate that road construction is popular. It is possible the Congress might approve, in full, the request carried in this bill. In principle, however, I submit that it is absolutely unsound for the Congress to be deprived of control over these appropriations from year to year, particularly under the conditions confronting America today.

Attention is invited in this connection to the enormous cost of road construction. The record indicates that primary roads have cost $42,900 per mile average, with a maximum of $309,400 per mile; and that secondary roads have cost an average of $15,900 per mile, with a maximum of $106,700 per mile.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the record a table showing those costs:

AVERAGE COSTS PER MILE FOR RURAL ROAD PROJECTS APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION TO OCTOBER 1, 1947, FINANCED FROM POSTWAR FEDERAL-AID FUNDS

Construction costs for approved projects financed from postwar funds average $42,900 per mile for primary rural roads and $13,900 per mile for secondary rural roads, exclusive of costs for bridges. These average costs per mile include both Federal funds and State matching funds.

Per-mile construction costs do not represent entire costs for finished roads in cases where only a portion of the construction is completed under the current projects, such as grading projects preliminary to subsequent surfacing projects or current surfacing projects for which the grading work was completed under previous projects. Character and density of traffic influence type and width of surface and foundation construction and width of grade, and hence occasion differences in per-mile construction costs. Topographic conditions and geographic location also account for variations in per-mile construction costs.

Average per-mile construction costs for primary and secondary rural roads approved for construction utilizing postwar funds are shown for each State in the following tabulation:

Average cost per mile for rural road projects approved for construction to Oct. 1, 1947, financed from postwar Federal-aid funds

State	Primary roads		Secondary roads	
	Miles	Average cost per mile	Miles	Average cost per mile
Alabama	170.8	$44,700	556.6	$18,200
Arizona	104.5	61,300	228.7	22,300
Arkansas	289.6	30,400	504.5	16,800
California	276.5	114,500	299.2	31,700
Colorado	145.0	53,900	193.6	24,600
Connecticut	27.2	147,300	10.6	106,700
Delaware	28.4	42,300	8.7	31,100
Florida	123.8	39,900	170.5	29,300
Georgia	326.4	31,500	363.9	16,700
Idaho	102.5	54,100	234.9	14,400
Illinois	309.5	44,200	326.0	23,900
Indiana	87.9	127,500	121.2	61,800
Iowa	261.1	34,600	1,159.1	6,800
Kansas	670.3	21,800	1,643.9	4,200
Kentucky	199.4	49,600	528.0	16,800
Louisiana	32.7	58,800	56.3	38,300
Maine	36.8	61,500	48.4	39,000
Maryland	41.8	105,200	78.9	29,300
Massachusetts	12.3	117,300		
Michigan	313.5	49,300	375.6	18,800
Minnesota	754.3	24,000	1,434.4	9,400
Mississippi	274.9	29,300	472.9	16,800
Missouri	257.8	47,900	656.6	8,800
Montana	173.4	26,900	238.1	16,800
Nebraska	611.6	19,400	398.6	10,300
Nevada	121.3	41,700	243.8	13,700
New Hampshire	10.9	158,900	10.8	69,500
New Jersey	5.4	309,400	5.3	60,300
New Mexico	196.5	28,000	103.7	16,800
New York	217.7	131,700	15.1	53,300
North Carolina	280.1	36,600	570.2	19,100
North Dakota	299.5	20,000	342.0	3,300
Ohio	72.9	179,500	165.2	31,000
Oklahoma	232.5	30,500	957.8	5,500
Oregon	265.2	39,400	325.2	25,100
Pennsylvania	147.2	203,300	134.1	85,500
South Carolina	209.2	18,900	550.4	16,100
South Dakota	480.2	14,600	285.5	5,400
Tennessee	153.9	49,600	396.4	16,400
Texas	948.0	29,300	3,458.7	9,500
Utah	109.5	37,600	206.0	13,800
Vermont	33.5	71,800	37.9	44,600
Virginia	86.9	106,700	387.6	14,600
Washington	186.2	46,700	286.3	18,400
West Virginia	42.1	90,100	82.2	45,800
Wisconsin	236.8	39,200	426.5	12,500
Wyoming	194.8	31,200	242.1	15,700
Total	10,262.3	42,900	19,442.0	13,900

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

An attempt to locate the responsibility for the recent disposal of the Big Inch and Little Inch pipe lines as surplus property, from Federal Power Commission, in the light of newspaper allegations that large promoters' profits had been realized, with governmental cooperation, resulted in the usual alleged division of responsibility between agencies—this time between War Assets Administration, Federal Power Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission. War Assets Administration apparently made the sale of the pipe lines, Federal Power Commission issued essential certificates of public convenience and necessity, and Securities and Exchange Commission gave tacit approval of the financial scheme.

Correspondence between Federal Power Commission and Securities and Exchange Commission indicates clearly that both agencies possessed the facts in the case.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD at this point the correspondence in question, which speaks for itself:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 20, 1947.

Mr. LEON M. FUQUAY,
Secretary, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FUQUAY: Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. proposes to file a registration statement with this Commission with respect to the public offering of preferred and common stock, within the next few days. At our suggestion they are sending you three preliminary copies of the proposed registration statement. In view of the fact that the company is under the jurisdiction of your Commission, it will be appreciated if you will have the statement reviewed by member of your staff and afford us the benefit of your comments. As you know, this Commission is particularly interested in the accuracy of facts stated in the prospectus, as well as the possible omission of any facts which should be disclosed in connection with an offering of securities to the public.

Since the time schedule of this office is prescribed by statute, it would be appreciated if you could forward your comments at an early date.

Very truly yours,

HARRY HELLER,
Assistant Director,
Corporation Finance Division.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Philadelphia, Pa., October 31, 1947.

Mr. CHARLES SMITH,
Chief of Bureau of Accounts,
Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I am enclosing herewith a copy of Amendment No. 1 to the registration statement of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. which was filed on October 31, 1947.

Particular reference is made to the revised material under the caption "Estimated revenues and expenses" on page 10 and the relocation in the prospectus of the information regarding the organization and promotion of the registrant to page 4.

The registrant has requested acceleration of the effective date of the registration statement to November 12, 1947, and accordingly we must complete our examination during the week. I would appreciate it if you could review the enclosed amendment and give me any comments you may have with respect thereto. I will telephone you on our

Washington line on Monday afternoon, November 3, 1947.

Very truly yours,

HARRY HELLER,
Assistant Director,
Corporation Finance Division.

NOVEMBER 4, 1947.

Hon. JAMES J. CAFFREY,
Chairman, Securities and
Exchange Commission,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Commission is in receipt of a letter dated October 20, 1947, from Mr. Harry Heller, Assistant Director of your Corporation Finance Division, requesting a review of a draft of registration statement filed with your Commission by Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. In addition, the Commission has been furnished copies of the actual registration statement filed under date of October 24 and amendment No. 1 thereto.

The registration statement has been examined and, except for the fact that details as to equity financing were not submitted on the record before this Commission, the representations contained therein are in accord generally with the testimony presented to this Commission in the course of hearings on the company's application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity.

As stated in the registration statement, the Federal Power Commission, on October 11, 1947, issued a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act to Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. The certificate becomes effective upon acquisition by the corporation from War Assets Administration of what are familiarly known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe-line facilities.

From the detailed financial information contained in the registration statement, it appears that the original stockholders, who had purchased 150,000 shares for an initial investment of $150,000, will reclassify their 150,000 shares of $1 par stock into 1,200,000 shares without par value. It is noted that the resulting 1,200,000 shares will have, share for share, the same voting power, book value, and claim upon earnings as the 3,400,000 shares, more or less, which it is proposed to sell to the public at a maximum price of $12.

It should be noted that the Federal Power Commission has no jurisdiction over securities of natural-gas companies. The Commission, therefore, has not approved the issuance of any securities by Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. The main inquiry in certificate proceedings as to financial matters goes to the feasibility of the financial plan; that is, the ability of the applicant to raise the necessary funds at reasonable cost.

We wish to make this clear, because the Commission, in its opinion No. 157, relating to the issuance of the certificate of public convenience and necessity, stated that the company's financial plan as testified to in the record is adequate and reasonable. As the opinion shows, this statement applies only to the feasibility of raising money by the issuance of bonds and stock in the total amounts set forth on the record and not to the details of equity financing. As a matter of fact, financial witnesses for the company, during the hearing late in August, stated that they were not able to supply details as to equity financing and that such details had not been formulated and could not be decided upon so far in advance of the actual financing.

We would further call attention to the statement on page 10 of amendment No. 1 to the registration statement that the company anticipates earning approximately $1,500,000 more than the 6 percent usually allowed by this Commission in gas-rate cases. Members of our staff have checked the estimate of earnings and have found it substantially correct on the basis of the negotiated rates in the company's sales contracts. It should be emphasized, however, that such rates are subject to review and regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

This Commission trusts that these comments will be of assistance to you.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

NELSON LEE SMITH,
Chairman.

(Copies to Mr. John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President, the White House; Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn, War Assets Administration; Mr. R. H. Hargrove, president of the Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.; Mr. J. Ross Gamble, 719 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.)

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Philadelphia, Pa., November 10, 1947.

Mr. NELSON LEE SMITH, Jr.
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 4, 1947, in connection with the registration statement of Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.

I wish to thank you for having your staff review the registration statement and for sending your comments in connection therewith.

Sincerely your.,

JAMES J. CAFFREY,
Chairman.

It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, to develop all points of importance in hearings covering so many diversified governmental operations and functions in the time available. The details of committee recommendations are covered in the report and the appended tables. Unless there are further questions, I will reserve further discussion for others under general debate and under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a comment on the appropriation for the Federal Works Agency?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. As the gentleman knows, he has cooperated with me in an attempt to quickly analyze some figures sent up from the Federal Works Agency yesterday at the chairman's request, having to do with a report made under date of December 30, 1947. It is my understanding the report is from the Public Buildings Administration to the Federal Works Agency. I called the chairman's attention and the attention of the staff to the fact that within recent days Mr. Steelman has sent a report to me in behalf of a New England delegation subcommittee, which was charged with the responsibility of working out certain developments along conservation lines. That letter, with the accompanying letter from General Fleming, is as follows:

JANUARY 29, 1948.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HESELTON: This is in further reference to our past correspondence regarding the possible conversion from oil to coal in Government buildings.

Enclosed herewith is a copy of the report of January 27, 1948, on this subject from General Fleming, Federal Works Administrator.

It would appear from this report that there are some Government buildings in which conversion from oil to coal could be made at an early date and with relatively small expense; and General Fleming has been asked to arrange with the several departments and agencies concerned, for corrective action in this respect where such action is feasible and will produce results during the present heating season.

As you doubtless know, the President's order of January 17, 1948, for conservation of fuel oil, gasoline, and gas (copy attached) contains the following paragraph with respect to future installations of fuel oil or gas-burning equipment:

"4. No equipment shall be installed for burning fuel oil or gas or liquefied petroleum gas, and no permanent building or establishment shall be converted to these fuels, without the prior approval of the Bureau of Mines, except where firm commitments for such installations or conversions have already been made."

Sincerely,

JOHN R. STEELMAN.

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, January 27, 1948.

Hon. JOHN R. STEELMAN,
Assistant to the President,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. STEELMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of December 19 requesting that an investigation be made as to the practicability of converting Government buildings from the use of oil to the use of coal. As you were advised, a meeting was held in this office on December 30 and those present were requested to have final data in our hands by January 2 on which to base a complete report to you.

We have now received a mass of information from the majority of those who were present at the meeting, included in which are figures to show the buildings which cannot be changed over for various reasons, as well as those which are susceptible of being changed and under what conditions. Briefly the information developed consists of the following:

1. Before the date of our meeting, some of the agencies had already issued to their field offices instructions to suspend any further conversions from coal to oil.

2. The Justice Department reported the partial conversion of one plant using 400,000 gallons of fuel oil per year to the use of coal; Public Health Service reported the recent conversion of one small plant burning 15,000 gallons of oil per year to the use of other fuel; and Public Buildings Administration reported the partial cancellation of a contract which had been entered into for converting a building to the use of oil. The contract had been partially completed and would have produced a plant which would burn 370,000 gallons per year.

3. The agencies reporting that conversion from oil to coal is practicable stated that to accomplish this would require the expenditure of a substantial sum, which funds had not been included in the budget estimates and that it would therefore be necessary for them to obtain the additional funds before proceeding with the work. They also reported that the oil-burning plants that are now in operation are in many cases automatically controlled. If converted to the use of coal, it would be necessary to employ firemen to operate them, requiring the necessity of additional funds. I am enclosing two of the reports that were received as samples so that you may see the care that was exercised by the agencies in gathering the desired information. It will be noted that the Department of Agriculture report shows a possible saving of 888,690 gallons of oil per year but that the cost of making the necessary changes would amount to $129,539 and that there would be an increase in operating costs of $70,065 per year. An analysis of the report of the Public Buildings Administration shows that it is considered practicable to convert 35 of the buildings but that this work would cost $414,220. This figure does not include the

cost of any additional employees who might be required as firemen.

4. Apparently the situation existing in the Navy Department, which was reported in our letter of January 16, is the only one reflecting a major saving at this time. They can immediately begin the use of coal in certain of their plants previously operated by oil and thereby save at the rate of 1,420,000 barrels of oil per year.

Since the Executive order calling for conservation of fuel oil was issued January 17, 1948, which covers all phases of conservation and also regulates the installation of additional oil-burning equipment, it is doubtful if much more can be done in the interest of saving oil at the present time. It would seem that since the agencies are now acquainted with the existing situation and know that the prospects for the next few years are but little brighter, they will cooperate in every way possible, including the conversion of equipment where practicable, in order to ease the effects of the present fuel-oil shortage.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Returning to the analysis which I have attempted to make hurriedly this afternoon, these figures deal only with buildings, as I understand it, operated by the Public Buildings Administration. They do not deal with a vast amount of buildings and building space that is leased, such as the chairman of the subcommittee and I know about—more than one entire building last year used by the Veterans' Administration in Boston. They certainly do not deal with the Navy buildings at Norfolk and the Naval Station at Norfolk, or the Naval Air Station, or the Boston Naval Shipyard Annex—where conversion from fuel oil to what is known as pulverized bituminous, which will result in a saving of 1,420,000 barrels of that much-needed type of fuel oil, has been promised by the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. I want to bring out this point now. My analysis shows that there are 22 buildings being operated, as reported, in the District of Columbia and adjacent areas. If my mathematics is correct, we have in this report buildings amounting to 60 outside the District. That makes 82 buildings involved in this appropriation bill. In many instances, the report is that the conversion is not feasible. In other words, the report is startling. The total over-all expenditure that is estimated if they would convert from heat by fuel oil and heat by natural gas back to heat by coal, would be $414,220. That is verified by the staff of the committee.

I do not know whether the committee would accept an amendment authorizing the additional amount of $414,220. I would be the last person to advocate the addition of a single dollar for the purpose of any unnecessary expenditure. I am one who believes that we must confine ourselves to absolute necessities if we are going to bring down the cost of living, which is vitally affected by the amount of funds taken from the American taxpayers to operate the Federal Government. Yet, I may still submit such an amendment to the committee, in the hope it will consider it favorably as a capital expenditure. I have in mind the testimony of such qualified witnesses as Secretary Forrestal, Secretary Krug, Director Max Ball, and many others, indicating their convictions that this is not a temporary shortage but one which will be with us at least for 5 years. If their dire predictions are accurate, then we shall have expended for a period of 5 years an annual sum of $82,844, even though we do have to invest it now in one lump sum in order to force these Government agencies to take the lead in conservation of this much-needed fuel oil. I call your attention to the fact that the tabulation shows a total savings could be made annually of 6,668,155 gallons of fuel oil. Even allowing for the fact that some of these conversions cannot be completed for a period of from 4 to 6 months, and one apparently not for 300 days, most of them can be rapidly completed and many of them at a nominal sum. The saving in 5 years would amount to 33,440,775 gallons. Let us be conservative about it and say that we could only save from between 25 and 30 million gallons in this 5-year period. Would it not be worth the expenditure of $82,844 annually on that basis alone?

In this connection, let me read a telegram to one of my colleagues from Detroit:

Detroit Housing Commission down to 14 days' supply of fuel oil for 250 veterans' families living in veterans' housing project; 30,000 gallons would carry us through until April. All local suppliers refuse us.

What do those veterans think about burning up 6,668,155 gallons yearly, when 30,000 gallons would carry them through until April? I do not find any building in Michigan listed, but let us get oil to this group of veterans rather than, for instance, the Sloan Building on Twelfth Street, where 58,000 gallons will be used this year, or the Arlington Building at 705 Columbia Pike, where 34,000 gallons will be burned this year. At least, if the 14 days' cancellation privilege was exercised, from either of these sources more than enough fuel oil would be saved to supply these veterans' needs, and my guess is that they would be glad to pay for the hire of sufficient trucks to come on here to take the oil and put it in their storage tanks.

There is another reason I urge you to consider. It is our understanding that the oil industry is now reverting to the wartime, uneconomic practice of running the solid fuel tankcar trains from Texas to New England. I do not have the figures at the moment, but I hope to have them by tomorrow. It is my impression that the cost of this sort of an operation, instead of tanker carriage, practically doubles the price of oil. During the war the Government paid that bill. Now the industry must absorb it, or they must pass it on to the consumer and, judging from the reports of increasing prices, I am confident they are passing it on to the consumer. Which is better, that we should spend $414,220 of the taxpayers' money to save 6,668,155 gallons of oil, or that we should load him with the necessity of paying certainly that extra amount on his bills for fuel oil and kerosene?

A third point might be stressed. If this is done we shall have these savings indefinitely into the future until the time comes when we hope we may be able to develop synthetics or new fields to the point where we again have a surplus.

It seems to me that even those who are understandably interested in the sale of oil and natural gas should join with us in this limitation for the fiscal year of 1949, even though they cannot see their way clear in voting the extra appropriation. Certainly there is an immediate market for every gill of fuel oil and kerosene now being produced in this country and every cubic foot of natural gas being offered. I do not think anyone would care to assert that in either of these fields, before July 1, 1949, we will have a surplus.

I have broken that down again. I have not worked out the consumption in gallons. There are four buildings in this group where the conversion would run from $15 to $100; a total of $165.

The second group that I worked out ran from $100 to $1,000. There are seven of them. Five are under $1,000 and none over $500. The period of time required would be from 15 to 120 days. That is $3,550.

May I remark that the New England subcommittee raised this question in December. More than 30 days have elapsed, so that most of these conversions that could have been undertaken at that time would have been completed now, and the fuel oil would have been saved.

There is another group of $1,001 to $5,000. It would take from 40 to 180 days to complete the conversion. The total amount is $26,408.

Another group from $5,000 to $25,000, only one of them being over $18,000. It would take 60 to 180 days and would cost $59,000.

There is one which would take 120 days and cost $26,500. Another would take 300 days and cost $90,000. Another would take 120 days and cost $125,000.

I raise this question at this time but I shall put in the entire tabulation under permission which I shall ask when we get back in the House because I think this is going to throw a lot of light on a motion I expect to offer tomorrow, which I have submitted to the Chairman and which addresses itself to one phase of this problem. The motion would be a restriction. It would be at page 29 of the bill, line 25, a new paragraph to read as follows:

No part of the foregoing appropriations to the Federal Works Agency shall be used for the purpose of converting any existing coal-heating units to oil or natural gas.

I have added natural gas because of the fact that in Detroit, in parts of New England, New York, and even here in the District of Columbia the supply of natural gas is not sufficient, although it is not a matter of direct and immediate interest to us in New England for, so far as I know, we have very little, if any, natural gas there; consequently I understand that in these other areas they have to manufacture additional gas from

this limited supply of fuel oil and they are putting on the individual consumer the prime burden of carrying out this conservation program.

Natural gas in any federally owned or rented buildings in or outside the District of Columbia.

I have put in rented buildings because it is only fair to anticipate that the landlords of those buildings who are getting big rentals, paid on the dot, should be willing to go along in this program of conservation.

One final comment and then I will not trespass further on the gentleman's time. I want to call the Committee's attention to one particular problem posed by this report. The report indicates buildings currently being converted to oil under contract. This will be interesting, I believe, to the membership of the House. One of these buildings is the Sloan Building, located at 711 Twelfth Street NW., stated to be under the veterans' group. It will consume 58,000 gallons of oil every year. I find a notation here that it would be possible to convert in 14 days for $1,500. I do not know what that means, unless it is that they have the legal right to cancel the order for oil equipment on 14 days' notice. Here they have protected themselves and us and we can stop this conversion right here in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. I appreciate the gentleman's consideration very much.

Another one is in Suitland, Md. The answer is:

"Yes; 180 days."

That covers film-storage vaults 1, 2, and 3 at Suitland.

Next, the Marine Hospital at Boston. They say they could convert; that it would take 120 days.

The next one is at Arlington, Va., 705 Columbia Pike. They will use 34,000 gallons of oil a year. Here again they can cancel the contract for oil equipment on 14 days' notice. In other words, if they exercise that right today, then in 2 weeks' time we would have canceled that equipment and saved 34,000 gallons a year. If they had exercised that right shortly after December 13, none of this precious fluid would have been burned in January. That use is at the rate of 2,833 gallons a month.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to illustrate the picture a little more clearly when I revise and extend my remarks, but I do not want this moment to go by without expressing my deep conviction that if the Federal Government is asking individuals, is asking State, county, and local governments to conserve, the Federal Government itself has the responsibility in the first instance to convert wherever it can, just as the Navy has done; and the Navy is the only department which thus far has made an effective effort to do anything.

I thank the gentleman.

The tabulation to which I referred is on the stationery of the Federal Works Agency, dated December 30, 1947.

Survey relative to use of fuel oil—Public Buildings Administration

Cities where fuel oil is used	Purpose for which fuel oil is used	Name of building, reservation, housing project, etc.	Number of plants using fuel oil	Approximate number of gallons of oil consumed per year	Is conversion to natural gas or coal feasible—time required for conversion	Estimated cost of conversion
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
District of Columbia:						
Pennsylvania Ave. group	Space heating	1624 H St. NW., 1626 K St. NW. (O)	1	14,000	Yes—5 days	$100
Do	Water heating	Normandy (L)	1	2,700	Yes—15 days	1,000
Do	Space heating	1626 K St. NW., Normandy (L)	1	26,000		
Do	do	1818 H St. NW. (L)	1	62,000	No	
State group	do	415 22d St. NW., Briggs School (O)	1	8,800	do	
Do	do	515 22d St. NW. (L)	1	2,200	No—Building has 1 oil and 1 coal boiler. Oil used in emergency only.	
Agriculture group	do	426–430 12th St. SW. (L)	1	600	No	
A–B–C group	do	57 L St. SE. (L)	1	12,000	do	
Do	do	1430 South Capitol St., Harbor Garage (L)	1	2,900	do	
Mall group	do	9th and N Sts. SW. (O)	1	15,500	do	
Do	do	301 Independence Ave. (O)	1	6,800	Yes—5 days	50
Dupont Circle group	do	Japanese Embassy (O)	1	21,000	No	
Do	do	Longfellow, 1201 Connecticut Ave. (L)	1	5,000	No—Building has 1 oil and 1 coal boiler. Oil used in emergency only.	
Do	do	1415 22d St. NW. (L)	1	9,200	No	
Do	do	1620 M St. NW. (L)	1	25,000	do	
Do	do	1737 L St. NW. (L)	1	10,500	do	
Armory group	do	300 I St. NW. (L)	1	25,000	do	
Do	do	1735 15th St. NE. (L)	1	21,000	do	
Civil Service group	do	1331–41 U St. NW. (L)	1	35,500	do	
Do	do	1840 14th St. NW. (L)	1	27,000	do	
Veterans' group	do	F. L. A., 811 Vermont Ave. (O)	1	33,000	No—Building has 1 oil and 1 coal boiler. Oil used only in emergency.	
Do [1]	do	Sloan, 711 12th St. NW. (O)	1	58,000	Yes—14 days to cancel contract for oil equipment.	1,500
Subtotal				421,700		
Florida:						
Arcadia	Space heating	Post office (O)	1	1,000	45 days	250
Bradenton	do	do	1	1,250	5 days	80
Clearwater	do	do	1	2,700	45 days	250
Daytona Beach	do	do	1	5,000	Yes—40 days	1,008
Fort Lauderdale	do	do	1	250	No	
Fort Myers	do	do	1	1,300	do	
Fort Pierce	do	do	1	1,300	do	
Key West	Water heating only	do	1	250	do	
Lake Wales	Space heating	do	1	420	do	
Lake Worth	do	do	1	400	do	
Miami (main office)	do	do	1	6,300	do	
Miami (Miami Beach branch).	do	do	1	800	Yes—3 days	75
Orlando	do	do	1	6,000	Yes—1 day	15
Palm Beach	do	do	1	500	No	
St. Petersburg	do	do	1	2,700	do	
Sarasota	do	do	1	1,300	do	
Sebring	do	do	1	500	No	
West Palm Beach	do	do	1	630	Yes—30 days	250
Tampa	do	Appraisers stores (O)	1	2,000	Yes—70 days	500
Port Everglades	do	United States customhouse (O)	1	325	No	
Subtotal				34,925		
Georgia: Savannah	Space heating	PHS Hospital (Oatland Island) (O)	1	40,000	Yes—180 days	5,000
Illinois: Aurora	do	Cotton mill mart (L)	1	100,000	No	

[1] Indicates buildings currently being converted to oil under contract.

Survey relative to use of fuel oil—Public Buildings Administration—Continued

Cities where fuel oil is used	Purpose for which fuel oil is used	Name of building, reservation, housing project, etc.	Number of plants using fuel oil	Approximate number of gallons of oil consumed per year	Is conversion to natural gas or coal feasible—time required for conversion	Estimated cost of conversion
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Louisiana:						
Houma	Space heating	Post office (O)	1	2,300	No	
Carville	Space heating, water	Marine hospital (O)	1	1,500,000	Yes—300 days	$90,000
Subtotal				1,502,300		
Maine:						
Portland	Water heating, space heating.	Post office (old) (O)	1	22,000	Yes—75 days	6,000
Hartford	Space heating	112 Main St. (L.)	1	3,000	No	
Subtotal				25,000		
Maryland:						
Baltimore	Space heating	Parcel post (O)	1	48,000	No	
Do	do	Federal Office Bldg. (old) (O)	1	284,000	Yes—60 days	9,000
Do	do	Marine hospital (O)	1	550,000	Yes—180 days	18,000
Do	do	Quarantine section (O)	5	65,000	Yes—60 days	3,000
Bethesda	do	National Institute of Health Laboratory and Officers Quarters (O).	8			
Do	do	National Institute of Health, main building (O).	1	1,000,000	Yes—120 days	15,000
Do	do	National Cancer Institute (O)	1			
Do	do	T–6, temporary office building (O)	1			
Suitland [1]	do	Film-storage vaults 1, 2, 3 (O)	3	4,000	Yes—180 days	4,500
Do	do	Hydrographic office annex (O)	1	2,700	No—Building secured. No heat supplied. To be leased as private residence.	
Subtotal				1,953,700		
Massachusetts:						
Boston [1]	Space heating, water heating, sterilizing.	Marine hospital (O)	1	370,000	Yes—120 days	26,500
Vineyard Haven	do	do	1	18,700	Yes—90 days	1,600
Subtotal				388,700		
Missouri:						
Kansas City	Space heating, water heating.	Office building (L)	1	35,000	No	
Kirkwood	Space heating, water heating, sterilizing.	Marine hospital (O)	1	220,000	Yes—180 days	11,000
Subtotal				255,000		
New Jersey:						
Newark	Space heating	37 Fulton St. (L)	1	50,000	No	
Do	do	581 Broad St. (L)	1	40,000	do	
Trenton	do	Post office (old) (O)	1	60,000	Yes—70 days	1,500
Union City	do	32–11 Hudson St. (L)	1	75,000	No	
Subtotal				225,000		
New Mexico:						
Fort Stanton	Diesel generators	Marine hospital (O)	1	40,000	No—for Diesel	
	Water	Residences	5	2,500	Yes—120 days	3,800
	Space heating	do	7	14,000		
Roswell	Space heating	Post office (O)	1	16,000	Yes—90 days	350
Subtotal				72,500		
New York:						
New York City	Space heating	88–11 Roosevelt Ave. (Corona) (L)	1	40,000	No	
Do	do	70 Columbus Ave. (L)	1	40,000	do	
Staten Island	do	Marine hospital (O)	1	938,000	Yes—200 days	80,000
Do	do	Rosebank, quarantine station (O)	7	70,000	Yes—120 days	5,000
Subtotal				1,088,000		
Pennsylvania: Upper Darby	Space heating	17 Brief Ave. (L)	1	70,000	No	
South Carolina:						
Charleston	Diesel generator	Quarantine station (O)	1	900	No	
Do	Space heating water heating.	M. O. C. residence (O)	3	6,480	Yes—40 days	300
		Attendants' barracks (O)	4	750	Yes—40 days	100
		Detention hospital (O)				
Subtotal				8,130		
Texas:						
Galveston	Space heating	Quarantine station (O)	1	18,000	No	
Georgetown	do	Post Office (O)	1	4,200	Yes—120 days	1,000
Sabine Pass	do	Quarantine station (O)	1	5,000	No	
Subtotal				27,200		
Virginia:						
Arlington	Heating	Pentagon sewage-disposal plant (O)	1	2,000	No	
Do	Space heating	Federal Office Bldg. No. 2 (O)	1	420,000	Yes—120 days	125,000
Do [1]	do	705 Columbia Pike (O)	1	34,000	Now burning coal, 14 days cancel contract for oil equipment	1,500
Subtotal				456,000		

[1] Indicates buildings currently being converted to oil under contract.

The foregoing list includes (1) buildings which Public Buildings Administration operates and for which it purchases fuel oil; (2) Government-owned post offices for which fuel oil is purchased by Post Office Department; (3) Government-owned National Institute of Health buildings for which fuel oil is purchased by National Institute of Health. Buildings in (2) and (3) are listed, as the maintenance is under control of Public Buildings Administration and any conversion from fuel oil to other fuel will be done by Public Buildings Administration. Total gallons per year for Government-owned buildings, 5,950,555; total gallons per year for Government leased buildings (Government buys oil), 717,600; total gallons per year for all Government buildings, 6,668,155.

The tabulation with reference to the possible conversions of the Navy is as follows:

Possible conversions in the Navy Department

Field activity	Annual consumption, bunker C fuel oil	Equivalent consumption, bituminous coal
	Barrels	*Tons*
Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va.	590,000	135,000
Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.	610,000	140,000
Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.	210,000	48,000
Boston Naval Shipyard Annex, South Boston, Mass.	10,000	2,300
Total	1,420,000	325,300

No estimate has been submitted as to the attendant costs if conversion from fuel oil to coal are effected.

No estimate as to the time of conversion has been submitted, since such conversion is dependent upon adequate supplies of coal.

The letter from Under Secretary of the Navy, W. John Kenney, to General Fleming, dated January 9, 1948, is as follows:

Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Administrator, Federal Works Agency.

MY DEAR GENERAL FLEMING: The Navy Department was represented at the conference held December 30, 1947, in the Federal Works Agency on the subject of converting from fuel oil to coal in Government buildings, both in Washington and in the field. All agencies represented at the conference were requested to conduct surveys and to submit reports to the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency of reductions in fuel-oil consumption possible within available appropriations.

The information required for the report desired is available in the Navy Department obviating the necessity of conducting a survey of field activities. The Navy Department has taken positive steps as a routine procedure to conserve all utilities, including fuel oil, directly and indirectly. Reports received from the field indicate the fuel-conservation program is being administered effectively through special attention to temperature control and avoiding wasteful practices. It is believed this program has no effect on the present fuel-oil situation, since the conservation of all utilities is the continuing objective of the Department as a matter of economy without regard to availability of fuel.

A substantial reduction in the present rate of fuel-oil consumption can be made by the Navy Department at certain shore establishments presently equipped to burn either fuel oil or pulverized coal. The activities and the estimated quantities of coal and fuel oil involved in this category are listed below:

Field activity	Annual consumption, bunker C fuel oil	Equivalent consumption, bituminous coal
	Barrels	*Tons*
Norfolk naval shipyard, Portsmouth, Va.	590,000	135,000
Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.	610,000	140,000
Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.	210,000	48,000
Boston Naval Shipyard Annex, South Boston, Mass.	10,000	2,300
	1,420,000	325,300

The change can be accomplished as soon as adequate coal supplies are provided, and should result in a substantial reduction in fuel-oil consumption during the current heating season.

Further reduction in the consumption of fuel oil in succeeding years would result if certain facilities presently equipped to burn only fuel oil were equipped to burn also pulverized coal or gas. Funds are not presently available for projects in this category.

Sincerely yours,

W. JOHN KENNEY,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts intends to offer an amendment placing a limitation on funds for this agency so that they shall not be used for conversion from coal to oil. I want to give that amendment further study and to take it up with the other members of the committee; but offhand I am inclined to be sympathetic to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to take this opportunity of thanking the chairman of our subcommittee for the consideration shown the minority members of the committee. It was a pleasure to work with the members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. I do not know of any harder-working Member of Congress than my esteemed friend and distinguished colleague who is chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

I did not particularly like what he had to say about the Budget Bureau, however, because I am of the opinion that the Bureau of the Budget has done, in connection with this bill, a good job as well as with all other agencies where I have had the opportunity to examine their work. In support of that statement I would like to submit the figures shown in this bill.

The Bureau of the Budget requested for the 27 agencies represented in the bill for the fiscal year 1949 a total of $1,047,798,864. The committee allowed $991,583,551, reducing the budget request $56,215,313, which is roughly about 6 percent. So I say that I think the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Webb, and his able assistant, Mr. Lawton, have done a good job in connection with the requests submitted for the 27 agencies represented in this bill.

I think this is the first time that the independent offices bill has been broken into two sections, so to speak. The subcommittee of the independent offices handles appropriations for 31 independent agencies. Represented in this bill are appropriations for 27 independent agencies. I think it is a good plan for the committee to break this bill in two. Later we will hold hearings on four other independent agencies, which are the big independent agencies, namely, the Veterans' Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Maritime Commission, and the War Assets Administration.

This bill comes before the Committee almost unanimously. The only item that was not in agreement had to do with the emergency fund for the President. In fiscal 1948 we appropriated $500,000 for that fund. The budget request for this year was for $1,000,000. The bill provides for $700,000 which is an increase of $200,000 over the 1948 appropriation. Those of us of the minority on this committee took the position that certainly the President of these United States has a right to say how much he needs for an emergency fund, and we think that the dignity of his office requires that the Congress grant that amount. With few exceptions most every State in the Union provides an emergency fund for the Governor. It is not for us to say as Members of Congress what the President's needs are. If he requests any amount that is within the bounds of reason, then we think the Congress should go along with him. That money is appropriated for the purpose of enabling the President to use in case of an emergency, and it is for him to say what that emergency is and whether or not emergency funds should be spent. If we lack faith in his judgment to use that money judiciously, then we should not allow him one dollar. Certainly I think that the facts bear out that the President will use this money discreetly and in situations where in his judgment he deems an emergency to exist.

I like to call attention to the fact, Mr. Chairman, that in this bill every dollar requested by Mr. MacDonald, the Public Roads Administrator, has been granted for the purpose of postwar highway construction. The amount contained in the bill for that purpose is $452,288,854. As you will recall, in 1944, the Congress passed the Highway Act providing for a postwar program of road construction to be undertaken. In that bill there was an authorization for the Federal Government to spend $1,500,000,000, which was to be matched by the States, during a 3-year period. That authorization was for $500,000,000 for each of the postwar years, for 3 years.

The testimony before us was that the 1944 highway construction bill went into effect and operations were begun under that bill on October 5, 1945. That was the fiscal year 1946. Congress passed a resolution starting the work under the 1944 highway bill. So we have had since that time the fiscal year 1946, the fiscal year 1947, and the fiscal year 1948, and at present we are dealing with the fiscal year 1949—4 years.

Some criticism will be found in the RECORD there as to the charge that Mr. MacDonald has been too reckless in the expenditure of this money. I cite you the fact that when this appropriation for fiscal 1949 of $452,288,854 is added to the appropriations that have been made for the past four fiscal years, the total amount expended by the Public Roads Administration will be found to be slightly over $800,000,000, as against the authorization of $1,500,000,000 for the first three postwar years.

I should like to say a word about the attitude of this committee with reference to the loyalty investigation on the part of the Civil Service Commission. It is the desire of this committee that the work in that regard be carried on with expedition by the Civil Service Commission. We did not grant all requested in the budget by the Civil Service Commission, but we do feel that with the funds appropriated in this bill, in addition to

the unexpended funds held by the Commission, there will be ample funds to do that job.

Now a word about the Federal Trade Commission. You will notice there has been an over-all increase in the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission of $384,000 for antimonopoly work and $58,000 for in-grade promotions. Evidence was submitted before our committee to the effect that with this money earmarked, so to speak, for antimonopoly work, the Federal Trade Commission would be in position to make an investigation and bring about prosecutions for monopolistic practices which we feel have made their share of contribution to the high cost of living. The testimony came to us not only from members of the Federal Trade Commission, but members of the small-business associations in this country.

I want to say a word about the General Accounting Office under the Comptroller General, Hon. Lindsay Warren, a former Member of the House. I think this is the third consecutive year that he has come before our committee voluntarily requesting a decrease in his funds. I do not think there is any finer, harder-working officer in the Government than Lindsay Warren. The committee granted his request with very few questions being asked.

In closing, may I say that with one exception, namely, the President's Emergency Fund, this bill comes to you almost unanimously. The bill provides for appropriations for 27 independent agencies. In 1948, the appropriations for these 27 agencies amounted to $1,188,270,525. The total amount appropriated for these 27 agencies was $794,896,577. The budget estimates for 1949 were $1,047,798,864. Recommended in this bill for the 27 agencies is $991,583,551, showing an increase over the 1948 appropriations of $196,686,974, a reduction from the budget request of $56,215,313, or approximately 6 percent.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion in the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] wished to insert in his remarks certain tables. I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to make whatever insertion he desires.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me today be canceled and transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the American Journal of Public Health.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Lowell Mellett.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania, for February 4, 5, and 6, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized

OLEO

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time to discuss the oleo propaganda that is becoming so vociferous here on the floor, as well as elsewhere.

To begin with I wish to discuss this oleo subject in keeping with nutritional facts, scientific facts, and economic facts, and in the light of what is for the best interest of the people of America as a whole.

You may say that I am a prejudiced witness coming from a State that produces one-eighth of the milk of the Nation. Yes, a State that produces twice as much milk as any State in the Union except one. Yes, one out of every hundred cows in America can be found in the district I have the honor to represent. Surely 80 to 90 percent of the farm income in Wisconsin comes from the sales of livestock and livestock products. Surely I have a livestock and dairy district. Assuredly, I try to look after the interests of the farmers and all groups in my district the same as I know you do. This abundance of milk production does not alter scientific or nutritional facts.

I wish to keep this discussion on a high plane. I hope you will allow me to do so. Let us consider an approach on which there should not be any disagreement.

First. If one takes 100 pounds of milk and drinks the milk, certain food and nutritional values are derived.

Second. If one takes this 100 pounds of milk and converts it into 5 pounds of butter and 8 pounds of powdered skim milk, an equal amount of food and nutritional values are derived.

Third. If one converts the 100 pounds of milk into 10 pounds of cheese and recovers the byproduct, the same amount of food and nutritional values are obtained.

Fourth. If the 100 pounds of milk is converted into evaporated milk, once again we find that the nutritional value and the food value of the original 100 pounds of fluid milk is obtained.

Fifth. If one converts the 100 pounds of milk into powdered whole milk, all the nutritive values of the original milk are obtained. Incidentally some cream is powdered for fancy candies but this is of small volume.

Before the war a very large percentage of the milk produced in the Nation was made into butter. It was the end product. Some 42 out of every 100 pounds of milk produced in the United States were made into butter, 29 pounds were sold as fluid milk and cream, 5 to 6 percent made into cheese, 5 to 6 percent made into evaporated milk and 5 to 6 percent made into ice cream and fountain use, and the remainder fed to calves and used on farms.

During and since the war a new relationship in regard to milk uses have been effectuated.

Butter production has been reduced from an annual production in 1940 of 1,800,000,000 pounds of creamery butter and 400,000,000 pounds of farm butter or a total of 2,200,000,000 pounds of butter to an estimated 1,300,000,000 pounds of creamery butter and an estimated 300,000,000 pounds of farm butter or a total of 1,600,000,000 pounds in 1947.

Oleo production increased from 343,000,000 pounds in 1940 to 738,000,000 pounds in 1947.

Dried whole milk production increased from 29,000,000 pounds in 1940 to 217,000,000 pounds in 1945, 188,000,000 in 1946, and an estimate of 160,000,000 pounds in 1947.

American cheese increased from 603,000,000 in 1940 to 956,000,000 pounds in 1947.

Evaporated milk increased from 2,464,000,000 pounds in 1940 to a high of 3,777,000,000 pounds in 1945 and 3,162,000,000 pounds in 1947.

It is, therefore, evident that there has been a great diversion of milk from butter to these other manufactured dairy products, and also, an increase in cream and milk consumption. If it takes 20 pounds of milk to produce a pound of butter, the 20 times 1,600,000,000 pounds of butter produced in 1947 would indicate that about 32,000,000,000 pounds of milk was used in the manufacture of butter in 1947. This, then, would also indicate that 26 percent of the milk produced in the United States in 1947 found its final home as butter.

The total milk production in the United States has been over a billion pounds ever since 1930. In 1940 it was 110,000,000,000 pounds and in 1947 it was 120,000,000,000 pounds.

While there has been an increase in total milk production, it has not been large, and never 10 percent more any one

year. Neither was 1947 production of milk 10 percent above the 1946 production. The use of milk in 1947 for creamery and farm butter has evidently then been from 25 to 30 pounds out of total milk production instead of the 42 pounds previous to the war. The milk formerly used in larger quantities for butter has found a new home in increased production in evaporated milk, cheese, bottled milk and cream and in dried whole milk as stated above.

The complaint is made that butter prices have gone out of bounds. But have they gone up in relation to other foods?

Please ask yourselves a few questions:

First. Do you wish to ruin the dairy industry?

Second. Can you name any dairy product where the consumer can purchase a pound of butterfat as cheaply as in a pound of butter?

Third. If you cannot answer this question affirmatively, how are you justified in complaining on the price angle so long as it is the cheapest form in which butterfat can be purchased?

Fourth. How much are you paying for a pound of butterfat up in New York when you pay 23 cents a quart for milk? Did you ever figure that one out? If you did you would be a little reticent to be complaining about the price of butterfat in butter in comparison.

Fifth. Who has the power and the authority to really fix the price of butter?

Sixth. Why has not the support price on milk been announced?

Seventh. Why is the support price of dried skim milk only 9 and 10 cents per pound?

There are two views in connection with this price angle that are worthy of discussion at this time.

First. Was it not the United States Department of Agriculture that placed the 9-cent support on roller dried skim milk and a 10-cents-a-pound floor on the processed skim milk? Did not this floor yield the farmer only 25 cents a hundred pounds for the skim milk? Even the OPA has a 14½-cents-a-pound ceiling on sprayed process skim milk. Why was not the support price for the skim milk in keeping with the spirit of the Steagall amendment, and in relation to food value in comparison to the butterfat content of the milk? If the powdered skim had a support price in keeping with its food value with its 35.6 percent digestible protein, would not the price of butter have been less all these months, and would it not be considerably less right at this hour? One trouble in the butter business is that people for 10 years had this product for much less than it cost to produce it. In 1940, the eighth year of the more abundant life, it was only 28 cents a pound on 92-score grade A butter in Chicago. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, cottonseed oil was 5.26 cents a pound in 1940 and is more than five times that at the present time, while the price of butter was only 70.6 cents a pound in Chicago in 1947.

Of course, if we are going to be led off into a discussion of prices and what has taken place since last August, this administration must surely assume its share of responsibility. They have the power, the authority, and the money, and have had. If the price of a vegetable oil has increased from 18½ cents in August to 26.6 cents in November and to 29 cents on the 16th of January 1948, is there anything surprising that the wholesale price of butter should advance from 74.8 cents a pound to 82.6 cents a pound during the week ending January 23, 1948? If vegetable oil has increased in price 50 percent, why all this complaining of an increase of a little over 10 percent in butter?

Prices of butter, soybeans, and cottonseed oil at specified markets

Calendar year	Butter, Chicago, grade A (92-score) per pound	Cottonseed oil, crude, in tanks f. o. b. Southeastern mills	Crop year, October to September	Soybeans for crushing, Chicago, per bushel of 60 pounds
	Cents	*Cents per pound*		
1940	28.7	5.27	1939-40	$0.96
1941	33.8	9.48	1940-41	1.06
1942	39.5	12.70	1941-42	1.68
1943	44.0	12.75	1942-43	1.72
1944	41.5	12.75	1943-44	1.90
1945	42.3	12.75	1944-45	2.20
1946	61.9	15.80	1945-46	2.13
1947	70.6	25.92	1946-47	3.04
1947 by months:				
January	66.2	28.80		3.21
February	69.0	32.75		
March	69.0	36.00		
April	61.1	31.75		
May	60.4	23.60		
June	63.0	21.88		
July	68.0	22.19		3.34
August	74.8	18.50		3.11
September	79.2	20.62		2.92
October	70.1	21.40		3.39
November	79.9	26.62		3.66
December	86.3	26.94		3.93
Weekly average ending—				
Jan. 2	87.2	28.0		4.06
Jan. 9	82.7	29.0		4.24
Jan. 16	84.1	29.0		4.34
Jan. 23	82.6			

Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Division of Dairy Statistics.

This might be a good time to ask who put the 165 percent of parity under flaxseed last year, which reflects 25 to 30 cents a pound under this vegetable oil? This cannot be put on the doorstep of the National Manufacturers' Association because this was done long after the OPA was dead and buried. What influence do you think a 25- to 30-cent floor on linseed oil has had on the price of not only other grains, but also the price of other vegetable oils? Do you care to contend that this act stabilized prices, or are you willing to admit that they increased prices? While Mr. Parron might have shown that we could produce all the linseed oil we need in this country, just exactly how much do you think this demonstration has cost the consumers of America.

Now let us take a few minutes and discuss this oleomargarine. How is oleo manufactured? Is it not composed of 15.6 percent of the cheapest form of dairy products? At least that is what the Oleomargarine Institute states. They are the ones that incorporate the skim milk into it when it is manufactured. Why is there anything surprising about it having the odor and taste of butter? The question that I would like to have every oleo lover answer is, How are you going to make this product if you do not have dairy products in order to manufacture it?

This leads up to the next product, and that is filled milk. It is the same as oleo, except that the proportions of vegetable oil and dairy products are different. This particular product is known as Milnot. This is oleo's girl friend. It is made by taking evaporated skim milk, and squirting in some cottonseed oil, and selling it as a substitute for evaporated milk made out of normal cows' milk. Do you support this product? If you subscribe to the oleo thesis you do not have to change your thinking much to be an advocate of this ersatz product. Of course, the question arises, how will you get the skim milk after the dairy cows are hanging in the coolers of the packing plants? However, this does not seem to worry some people.

Now it happens to be against the Federal law to ship filled milk interstate. It is pretty difficult for anyone to take the position and glibly say "I am for oleo" and not say "I am for his girl friend, Miss Milnot" at the same time. If the oleo group have their way, you can be sure that the next step will be to repeal the Federal law and allow this filled milk to be shipped interstate and sold in place of evaporated milk. There is a question involved, much larger than just a discussion of ¼-cent a pound tax on oleomargarine. It might interest you to know that there is a greater Federal tax on milk going to butter factories and that there is a higher Federal tax on butter per pound than on oleo before the milk ever gets to the factory. The purpose of Federal legislation in connection with oleomargarine could not be stated any plainer than was stated by Mr. Fred Brenchman, who for many years has been the Washington reporter of the National Grange. He has an article in the December issue of the National Grange Monthly and I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD.

[From the National Grange Monthly]

OLEO LAWS ARE NECESSARY

(A handful of manufacturers seeks relaxing of oleomargarine controls—but let the public not be fooled by their promise of lower prices.)

(By Fred Brenckman, Washington correspondent for the National Grange Monthly)

The prevailing Nation-wide unrest about the high cost of all sorts of commodities, including butter, has furnished the manufacturers of oleomargarine with a plausible pretext in launching a new and intensified campaign for the repeal of all Federal taxes on their product.

The argument used by the manufacturers of oleomargarine, of whom there are only about two dozen in the whole United States, is that if Federal taxes were repealed it would be possible to reduce the price of this "healthful and nutritious" article of diet, thus relieving the strain on the budget of families in the low-income brackets throughout the country. This argument, of course, is supported by the dealers in the product, together with many consumers who have not taken the trouble to familiarize themselves with the facts in the case.

FUNDS FOR ENFORCEMENT

It should be clearly kept in mind that Federal taxes on oleomargarine are not levied for the primary purpose of raising revenue in

the common sense of the term, but to provide funds for administering the oleomargarine laws and to prevent fraud and deception in the manufacture and sale of the product. These laws have a twofold purpose: They protect the dairy industry against unfair competition on the part of a low-cost imitation product, and they protect the consuming public as well.

The experience of three-quarters of a century has furnished overwhelming evidence that the oleomargarine industry is one that requires proper supervision and regulation if the interests of the public are to be safeguarded. This being true, it is only fair and just that those who are engaged in the industry should pay the taxes necessary to raise the revenue required for proper supervision and inspection.

Assuming that there is not a single manufacturer of oleomargarine who is dishonest, the fact remains that when the product finds its way into the channels of trade and distribution, it falls into the hands of all kinds of people, many of whom are thoroughly unscrupulous and who are willing to take all kinds of risks for the sake of ill-gotten gain. That has been true in the past, and it is just as true today.

In the combined annual reports of the Federal Food and Drug Administration for the period from July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1943, the following occurs:

OLEOMARGARINE "MOONSHINERS"

"One of the most flagrant cases of spurious butter encountered concerned an individual known to have made at least $15,000 in the 10-month period prior to fat rationing through buying oleomargarine at 16 to 22 cents a pound, coloring it, wrapping it in quarter-pound sticks, and selling it as country butter at 45 cents a pound to small retailers, who sold it at 60 to 65 cents a pound.

"These operations entirely local in scope, resulted in actions by both the State where the fraudulent butter was packaged and marketed and the United States Treasury Department, which charged evasion of the oleomargarine tax regulations." That case occurred in Louisiana.

Up in Massachusetts, some years ago, an oleomargarine moonshiner, who had served a term in Federal prison, flooded Boston and a large part of New England with 375,000 pounds of oleomargarine, which was sold as butter. He sometimes colored 10,000 pounds of oleomargarine in semblance of butter in a single day. But the Federal agents finally caught up with him in California, where he was tried and sentenced to Federal prison for a term of 2 years.

Within recent years, the Baltimore Sun, one of the most reputable newspapers in the country, reported that 50 agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue raided 30 homes and places of business in the Baltimore area. In one man's cellar they found 4,442 pounds of colored oleomargarine and 10,000 pounds of white oleomargarine. They also found coloring matter and equipment for coloring. For a period of 2 years the guilty individual who did business in this cellar had sold oleomargarine as butter, victimizing small restaurants, groceries, and housewives.

Abandoned barns and even caves in the woods have sometimes been used by oleomargarine moonshiners in conducting their illicit business.

This recital is not intended as a reflection on the honesty and integrity of reputable manufacturers and dealers, who constitute the big majority.

LAWS NOT OBSOLETE

It does prove, however, that our oleomargarine laws are by no means obsolete, as is often claimed by those who regard them as a hindrance in accumulating unearned profits. These laws are needed just as much today as they were in the beginning, because human nature is the same now as it was 50 or 75 years ago. If the oleomargarine moonshiners are willing to take such risks under our present laws as those which have here been briefly sketched at random, we may well ask what conditions would be like if these laws were repealed.

Surely, both the dairy industry and the consumer are entitled to protection against such lawless and reckless characters. Further than that, the oleomargarine industry itself would suffer if the laws in this connection were repealed. Such action would speedily be followed by fraud and deception on a colossal scale, and the industry would fall into disrepute in a very short time. This would be followed by an irresistible demand for the reenactment of the very laws which had unwisely been repealed.

SUMMARIZING THE FACTS

In summarizing what would happen if Federal taxation and State restrictions against the sale of yellow oleomargarine were removed, Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, well says:

1. Consumers would have no adequate protection against deception and misrepresentation. They would have no adequate way of knowing what they get when they ask for butter.

2. No control would be left to the Federal Government over intrastate production and sale of oleomargarine, because the Federal Pure Food and Drugs Act does not apply to its intrastate production and sale.

3. Profits of the two-dozen-odd oleomargarine manufacturers would swell and overflow their coffers. Repeal of Federal taxation and State prohibitions on colored oleomargarine would see the disappearance of white oleomargarine, which serves as an important price governor on the colored product. As the white product would disappear, prices of colored oleomargarine would gradually be increased in each State, and each price increase would be almost entirely profit. On the basis of a billion pounds national production, and only a 5 cents a pound rise in price, this small group of manufacturers would be able to annually divide among themselves a $50,000,000 profit.

4. With no Federal control over the interstate production and sale of colored oleomargarine, butter prices would be depressed, because of the yellow oleo competition. While temporarily lower prices for butter might appeal to consumers, the eventual result would be the slaughter of from 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 dairy cows. In addition to forcing thousands of dairymen out of business, it would mean a scarcity of milk solids, and less, rather than more, dairy products for consumers.

A firm grasp of the facts involved in this situation is all that is needed to disclose the specious reasoning that underlies the campaign of propaganda conducted by the oleomargarine interests for the repeal of existing legislation on this important subject.

One paragraph in this article which I wish to particularly call to your attention is:

The experience of three-quarters of a century has furnished overwhelming evidence that the oleomargarine industry is one that requires proper supervision and regulation if the interests of the public are to be safeguarded. This being true, it is only fair and just that those who are engaged in the industry should pay the taxes necessary to raise the revenue required for proper supervision and inspection.

Did you ever ship a load of potatoes interstate? Who paid for the inspection? The point I wish to make at this time is, just because some individual might sell milk as fluid milk or the milk happens to go to an evaporated milk factory or happens to be made into cheese or into powdered whole milk, he does not want to assume that he does not have any interest as to where oleo displaces butter. As I have said before, there is a much bigger question so far as American agriculture is involved here today than just as a matter of whether or not someone is to pay one-fourth of a cent a pound tax in the manufacture of oleo. The big question is, do you want to help ruin the dairy industry of this country and to deprive the American people of an opportunity of obtaining one of the greatest protective foods that has ever been discovered by the scientists of our country.

At this point in the record I wish to call your attention to the fact that there is a greater increase in the demand for skim milk as a byproduct from the manufacture of butter. This is indicated by the fact that the annual production of powdered skim milk before the war of 200,000,000 pounds has been increased threefold and is now over 600,000,000 pounds a year. Also at this point I wish to include a short table showing the increase in the production in the condensed sweetened skim milk and the bulk condensed skim milk.

Condensed-milk production—United States

[Million pounds]

Year	Sweetened condensed skim milk	Bulk condensed skim milk
1936–40 average	159	222
1941	174	327
1942	226	318
1943	307	326
1944	375	364
1945	520	454
1946	815	486
1947 [1]	555	400

[1] Estimated.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

You will note as you read the table that the 5-year average from 1936 to 1940 was 159,000,000 pounds of sweetened skim milk made in our country and that this has gradually increased up to 1946 when 815,000,000 pounds were made, and in 1947 an estimate of 555,000,000 pounds. I am not going to take your time to enumerate the many ways in which this splendid product is used in candy making, ice cream manufacture, and such. You might be interested in knowing that in 1946 when we still had the OPA that the reason why this product had such a tremendous increase in production was that it was one of the ways to buy sugar.

In addition I wish to call your attention to the increased production and diversion of bulk condensed skim milk. The 5-year average from 1936 to 1940 was 122,000,000 pounds; 1945, 1946, and 1947 show that the production of this good product has doubled in production. This product has many uses, and there is no doubt but that in many places this unsweetened bulk condensed milk has been used by reconstituting it with frozen cream and selling it in the form of bottled milk. The point I wish to make at this time is that if there is not going to be a satisfactory home for the butterfat in the form of butter, how are you going to obtain the skim milk and its

products? Innumerable markets have been found for these skim-milk products which also include cottage cheese with over 19 percent digestible protein.

There is enough happening to the dairy industry today without starting all this talk about oleomargarine and in complaining about a ¼-cent-a-pound tax. If some of these oleo people would go into some cities and start a milk business they would find that they had a tax to pay before they could get started in the business.

My contention, Mr. Speaker, is that although I have followed all the experiments that are supposed to prove the wonders of oleomargarine, there are not any of them that have ever proven too much. What makes these experiments appear worthless is the fact that as everyone knows the oleomargarine contains enough dairy products to make the rats show somewhere near the same response to oleo feeding that they do to butter feeding. Why is not an experiment made that is not in part a dairy product and see how the experiment ends up? I wish that some of these pseudo-scientists would make that experiment, and then see what story they would have to tell.

Mr. Speaker, my contention is that the United States of America is a full milk country. That the dairy cow is a most efficient producer of human food on the face of this earth. In support of this contention, I ask unanimous consent at this point in the RECORD to include a short table from page 44, table 36 of Feed Consumption by Livestock, Circular No. 670, United States Department of Agriculture:

	Unit	Feed converted into human food by—						
		Hogs	Milk cows	Beef cattle	Sheep and lambs	Poultry		
						Laying flocks	Chickens raised	Turkeys raised
Human food produced by 10 feed units of all feed, except pasture:								
Calories	Calorie	3,629	4,627	837	1,880	1,260	958	1,522
Protein	Pound	0.14	0.52	0.121	0.21	0.23	0.22	0.26
Calorie plus protein index.		1.16	2.54	.56	1.04	.99	.92	1.14

This table proves that the dairy cow when provided a given amount of feed will produce twice as much human food as any other farm animal, and four times as much as some farm animals. I do not subscribe to a system of life, nor to a system of agriculture based on the thesis of cream for the few and skim milk to the many. If the dairy cow is, and I have just proven that she is, the most efficient livestock producing animal in the world, I ask any fair-minded man why try to tear her down in her efforts to feed the people of this Nation?

I have here today a plastic cow. As you will notice she is about a foot high and 2 feet long. Her name is Rebecca. I keep her in my office so that I will never forgot the great benefits she represents in furnishing food for the human race. I also realize that she is a symbol, and in fact, she is "the foster mother of the human race." I do not have the time to enumerate all the products that are made from the products of this great animal. I do, however, at this point ask unanimous consent to include some milk facts obtained from the Milk Industry Foundation's 1947–48 edition.

[From Milk Facts, 1947–48 edition]

VALUE OF MILK IN THE DIET

Federal Security Agency, United States Public Health Service: "Of all the factors of man's environment, none is more important to his welfare than food. Of all foods, none is more important than milk."

United States Department of Agriculture: "Milk does more for the body than any other food. It provides high-quality protein, calcium, and vitamins A and G cheaply."

Dr. Charles H. Mayo, late distinguished surgeon, Mayo Clinic: "Every person, young or old, should drink milk. Milk contains a large variety of nutritional constituents and, considering its cost per pound, more food for the money than any other food material available."

Dr. H. C. Sherman, professor of chemistry, Columbia University: "Increasing the proportion of milk in the diet should add to the length of life."

Dr. E. V. McCollum, professor of biochemistry, Johns Hopkins University: "The people who have achieved, who have become large, strong, vigorous people, who have reduced their infant mortality, who have the best trades in the world, who have an appreciation of art, literature, and music, who are progressive in science and in every activity of the human intellect, are the people who have used liberal amounts of milk and its products."

GENERAL INFORMATION

Historical food

Milk is one of the oldest known foods. Records exist of cows being milked in 9000 B. C. The Bible contains many references to milk, one of the best remembered from Exodus 3: 8—"milk and honey." Sanskrit writings 6,000 years old tell how milk is one of the most essential of all foods. Hippocrates recommended milk as a medicine five centuries before Christ. In Ur of the Chaldees a frieze depicts a dairy scene in 3500 B. C. showing milk containers and strainers.

First United States cows

The Pilgrims made the mistake of not bringing cows and lack of milk was said to have had a bearing on the high death rate, particularly of children. Cows were required to be brought on later ships.

When the frontier moved westward, the covered wagons were accompanied by cows.

River of milk

Enough milk is produced annually in America to fill a river 3,000 miles long, 40 feet wide, and 3 feet deep. If all of the milk produced in the United States in 1946 had been put in quart bottles side by side, the bottles would extend almost 140 times around the earth.

Nutritive value

A quart of milk—four glasses—supplies approximately these percentages of the daily nutritive requirements of an average man: Calcium, 100 percent plus; riboflavin (vitamin G), 82 percent; phosphorus, 67 percent; protein, 49 percent; vitamin A, 30 percent; thiamin (vitamin B_1), 22 percent; calories, 22 percent; vitamin C, 19 percent; niacin, 6 percent; iron, 3 percent.

Economy of milk

There is no waste in milk as every drop can be used and the cost is very low in proportion to food value. Milk is one of the best food investments at any price. Families on low-cost diets need a generous allowance of milk as diets are limited in variety and lack vital essentials. Milk can make up that deficit at low cost.

Government nutritionists say that in terms of money value from one-fifth to one-third of the allowance for food should be spent for milk and its products. Dr. Henry C. Sherman, Columbia University, recommends that regardless of the amount expended for food, as much should be spent for milk and dairy products as for meat, poultry, and fish.

Pasteurization

A process named for Louis Pasteur, scientist, by which every particle of milk is heated to not lower than 143° F. for not less than 30 minutes and promptly cooled to 50° F. or lower to destroy any harmful bacteria that may be present without affecting flavor and food value. Another method raises the temperature of milk quickly to at least 160° F. for not less than 15 seconds, followed by rapid cooling.

The first compulsory pasteurization law was enacted in 1908 in Chicago. All milk for our armed forces and 88 percent of the fluid milk supply in United States cities of over 10,000 population is pasteurized. The United States Public Health Service says: "The public health value of pasteurization is unanimously agreed upon by health officials. Pasteurization is the only measure known which if properly applied to all milk will prevent all milk-borne disease."

Grading

Milk is often graded A, B, etc., according to local regulations based on conditions under which it is produced and handled from the standpoint of bacteria count, quality, cleanliness, etc.

Certified milk

A milk produced under standards of the American Association of Medical Milk Commissions.

Homogenized milk

Milk in which butterfat has been mechanically broken up and dispersed evenly throughout the milk. There is no cream line as the fat globules are held in suspension producing a uniform flavor and softer curd.

Vitamin D milk

Milk that is fortified with vitamin D, the vitamin with the special property of preventing rickets. Vitamin D is added by any one of three methods—exposure of milk to ultraviolet light, adding a vitamin D concentrate, or feeding cows irradiated yeast.

Conversions

One quart of milk weighs 2.15 pounds. To make a pound of butter 9.77 quarts of milk are required, 4.65 quarts for a pound of cheese. One quart of milk is required for a pound of evaporated milk, 3.72 quarts for a pound of whole milk powder.

Milk equivalent

Figures on utilization of milk are generally in terms of the equivalent of milk containing

3.5 percent butterfat. Where cream is included, the figures also have been converted to milk of 3.5 percent butterfat content; i. e. to include 1 quart of cream of 19 percent butterfat content in a tabulation of milk figures, the cream must be converted mathematically to the equivalent of milk of 3.5 percent butterfat content.

Milk in industry

In more and more industries milk is being used to improve employees' health and counteract fatigue. Reductions in accidents with an improvement in safety, less absenteeism due to illness, increased production during hours of fatigue low points, are reported where milk is being served between meals or added to diets.

Industrial uses

Milk is used in a wide variety of industrial products such as plastics, textiles, paper coating, paint, glue, films, pharmaceuticals, insulation, fertilizer, insecticides, penicillin, plaster, dyes, animal feed, preservatives, explosives, electroplates.

Workers

Estimated workers employed in processing and delivering dairy products total 250,000.

Motortruck transport

More motor vehicles are used in the distribution of milk than any other commodity. There are approximately 190,000 trucks used in delivering milk and dairy products from farms to plants and from plants to consumers.

A statement in this report by Dr. E. V. McCollum, professor of biochemistry at Johns Hopkins University, to which I would like to call your attention is as follows:

The people who have achieved, who have become large, strong, vigorous people, who have reduced their infant mortality, who have the best trades in the world, who have an appreciation of art, literature, and music, who are progressive in science and in every activity of the human intellect, are the people who have used liberal amounts of milk and its products.

I had the privilege of being a student at the University of Wisconsin when Dr. McCollum was doing his pioneering work in vitamins. I remember at that time they did not call them vitamins. What is now known as vitamin A was then known as fat soluble A. I am sure that everyone of you are acquainted with the world-wide fame that has been accorded this great chemist. Dr. McCollum; Dr. E. H. Farrington, uncle of our distinguished colleague from Hawaii; Dr. E. B. Hart; Dr. Babcock; and ex-Governor Hooad, of Wisconsin, have done more to prove to the people of this world that milk is the greatest single food ever known to man than any other living Americans.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Another angle of this dairy industry must be viewed in the light of conservation of the soil of our Nation. Livestock farming, as you know, is the system of farming that is conductive to soil conservation. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a short article from the February 1948 Farm Journal, page 85, by Ray Anderson, in which he calls attention to the fact that a State that has mostly livestock farming raises what they feed and feed what they raise, maintain the fertility of their soil and the tilth of their soil.

The article is as follows:

[From the Farm Journal of February 1948]

RAY'S RAMBLINGS

(By Ray Anderson)

I heard a Wisconsin man kid an Illinoisan yesterday because the corn crop in Wisconsin was higher in average yield and better in quality than Illinois grew in 1947.

And I heard the Illinois man retort that "if we grew corn only in the hollers we could have had high yields, too."

It was a fair come-back, but not strictly accurate. Wisconsin had a better average corn crop in 1947 than Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, or Ohio, simply because most of the corn in Wisconsin goes on sod ground. Last season was one that demonstrated clearly that corn on soil of good tilth, like after alfalfa or sweetclover, does a whole lot better. And last season also made clear the important fact that commercial fertilizers, or the best of hybrid seed, will not by themselves produce a good crop. It takes active living soil besides.

And Wisconsin has soil of that sort, made that way by deep-rooted legumes. Oh, sure, so does Illinois, and Iowa, and other Corn Belt States, but look at the record and you will find that Illinois grows 16 acres of corn to 1 acre of alfalfa or sweetclover. The ratio is about the same in Iowa, not quite as wide in Indiana and Ohio, but in Wisconsin the ratio is 2.9 acres of corn to 1 acre of alfalfa and sweetclover. (Dr. G. N. Hoffer of La Fayette, Ind., put me on to that one.)

In this connection I include an article from the Country Gentleman of February 1948, entitled "The Best Risk in Agriculture":

THE BEST RISK IN AGRICULTURE

This country is facing a really serious livestock situation. Cattle numbers have undergone another sharp reduction, a spring-pig crop below last year's total has been forecast, and sheep are close to the lowest point since the 1860's.

All of this decrease in the sources of supply comes at a time when the demand for meat is the highest on record. With the Nation's population 12,000,000 larger than in 1940 and increasing at a rate of over 2,000,000 a year, there is a market for much more instead of less livestock production. Moreover, our agricultural system, with its large outlay of grass, hay, roughage, and feed grains, requires an extensive livestock production if it is to remain sound and prosperous.

These facts give a gravity to the situation and raise the question of when and how the downward trend in livestock can be reversed. That it must be reversed, if the national welfare is to be served, is plain.

For various reasons, particularly the use of grass and forage that would otherwise not be utilized and the growing food preference of consumers, cattle are the most important factor in the case. For 3 years slaughter and normal losses have exceeded the annual calf crops. The heavy movement of cattle to market in 1946 and 1947 drew heavily on the reserves of replacement and future marketing for it included more cows and calves than usual. This excludes any hope of an early expansion in beef cattle. In fact, Charles A. Burmeister, of the United States Department of Agriculture, and regarded by many as the ablest analyst of the livestock industry, figures 1951 as the nearest date to look for an increase in cattle numbers.

The main influence in this downward trend in the cattle cycle is different from those of the past, which were usually low prices, bad times, or drought on the range. Cattlemen this time are marketing their herds more closely because of high prices and the uncertainty of how long these prices will last. So long as this is the chief consideration the downward trend will continue. It can be reversed only when stockmen feel enough confidence in the future to start holding back breeding stock and marketing fewer animals than the number of calves raised. This will mean less meat on the market temporarily, but it will be to the consumers' long-time advantage—a fact of which they should be fully informed.

Stockmen should be able to find good reasons for this confidence in the future. With higher average incomes people have demonstrated that they want more meat in their diet. While pork has been called "the poor man's meat," a preference for beef has been indicated ever since the war boosted wages. Not even last year's heavy marketings satisfied the demand. To supply consumers with as much beef and veal as in 1947 and maintain the cattle inventory, observers say it would be necessary to increase cattle numbers to well over 90,000,000 head. They are now down to about 76,000,000 head.

Full utilization of our pasture, hay, and roughage resources, as well as good land use, warrants an increase in cattle production. Since the First World War the number of horses and mules has gone down about 17,000,000. In terms of hay and pasture required this is equivalent to about 20,000,000 cattle and calves. Most of this slack has been taken up by them. But a further reduction in work stock is anticipated and a decline of 18,000,000 head of sheep since 1942 is equal to the grazing requirements for another 2,000,000 head of cattle. A national land policy, certain within the next decade and furthering the use of land for grass and legume crops, will increase the grazing and forage facilities available for cattle. The prospects of outside competition are less than formerly. Since early in the war, Canada has imposed a virtual embargo on exports of beef cattle to this country in order to meet its commitments to Great Britain and to protect its own economy. The presence of the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico will hold down, if not cut off entirely, all imports from that country. Our livestock growers have the market to themselves.

There is another point that should cause cattle producers to think hard. A meat supply, below consumer demands and high priced, is likely to cause public resentment and to make meat a political target. It provides a handy argument for those who want price controls, rationing, and other Government interference. That these would obstruct rather than encourage an increase in livestock production is beside the point. Their threat is real.

But the opportunity is likewise real. The facts of the situation—our increasing population, the demand for meat, higher labor income, the lack of import competition, the sound financial condition of the range—all add up to one of the most favorable prospects cattle raisers ever had. In fact, livestock generally looks like the No. 1 best risk in agriculture.

Inauguration of grass farming, which goes along with livestock production, is a conservation practice that most assuredly will be evident and benefit the present as well as the future generation.

In the State of Wisconsin we have 626 dairy products cooperatives and 1 of these marketing cooperatives has a membership of 13,000. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point a list by States of the co-ops of the Nation.

1944–45

Total farmers' marketing and purchasing associations, by States

	Associations listed	Estimated membership	Estimated business
			In thousands of dollars
Minnesota	1,362	420,000	461,980
Wisconsin	1,030	272,800	273,660
Iowa	739	298,730	309,900
Illinois	614	411,780	416,870
North Dakota	583	127,500	160,680
Texas	482	147,750	201,160
California	467	100,790	627,520
Nebraska	451	150,880	162,120
New York	372	170,520	329,480
Kansas	358	85,790	165,870
Missouri	321	247,900	217,560
South Dakota	299	103,540	83,240
Ohio	295	200,350	249,840
Michigan	255	135,600	161,450
Washington	208	91,990	193,010
Montana	198	37,400	53,410
Oklahoma	192	101,860	100,660
Indiana	190	192,150	182,050
Pennsylvania	184	90,750	117,030
Oregon	150	56,600	100,260
Virginia	122	186,220	127,980
Idaho	114	67,200	60,600
Colorado	112	48,000	59,370
Mississippi	97	40,710	67,340
Florida	86	5,640	117,400
Alabama	71	48,890	12,590
Utah	66	31,090	57,390
Louisiana	64	17,300	40,710
Maryland	59	34,710	22,930
New Jersey	56	29,650	48,220
Tennessee	54	93,150	30,570
North Carolina	49	72,710	32,120
Kentucky	48	98,050	34,010
Arkansas	48	6,120	14,720
West Virginia	48	22,860	4,520
Georgia	43	75,970	101,160
Massachusetts	40	91,270	109,380
Maine	37	8,360	17,510
Connecticut	34	9,120	21,300
Vermont	34	9,600	22,970
Wyoming	27	11,050	12,120
South Carolina	22	10,470	7,020
New Mexico	19	4,440	6,750
Arizona	14	23,210	10,980
New Hampshire	14	6,270	17,340
Delaware	11	5,080	2,480
Nevada	7	370	420
Rhode Island	3	1,410	2,350
District of Columbia	1	1,400	15,000
Total, United States	10,150	4,505,000	5,645,000

Source: Statistics of Farmers' Marketing and Purchasing Cooperatives, by the Farm Credit Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture (Report 108).

At this point I wish to call your attention to excerpts of an article by Mr. Charles D. Hysong, of Cambridge, Mass.:

[From the New York Times]

CONSUMPTION OF MEAT—EFFECT OF TEMPORARY REDUCTION ON FOOD PRICES POINTED OUT

(The writer of the following letter is an instructor in the Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The current focusing of attention on meat prices as an avenue of approach to the solution of inflation is both logical and within the realm of possibility. However, both the nature and the effectiveness of the solution that may eventually be reached depends not only on the definition of the problem, but also on a thorough awareness of how and why meat occupies a key position.

It is generally recognized that meat is the balance wheel in our use of grain. High meat prices siphon off grains that might be used as human food as well as grain for industrial uses and the production of other livestock products such as milk and eggs. The higher meat prices are, the higher the other uses must bid to secure the necessary grain to maintain production. Obviously, if grain were in adequate supply, there would be no such pyramiding to inflate the price of meat. However, grain supplies today are short of demand, and future outlook does not promise a quick easing of this situation. A further complication is the relatively short supply of meat.

Nutritionists have pointed out that the direct consumption of grain by human beings is the most efficient use of a short supply, and that grain converted into meat is one of the least efficient. The simple solution might, then, seem to be to reduce the amount of meat consumed. Such a course, unfortunately, does not recognize the fact that meat and livestock in general are part of a general pattern of use of our agricultural resources.

UTILIZING TOTAL RESOURCES

One of these resources is grass, a crop of comparable importance to grain. Cattle, and to a lesser extent hogs, are our only means of converting this grass into human food. Furthermore livestock can convert this grass efficiently only if optimum amounts of grain are fed at the same time. In other words, the net gain or loss from producing livestock must be calculated in terms of the total resource utilization rather than the simple comparison of conversion of calories from grain into human food. Of lesser, but not insignificant importance, is the production of hides, medicinal products, fertilizer and other byproducts made possible by livestock. And finally there is the question of soil fertility. The drain on our soil resources by grain is considerably greater than the net loss from the raising of livestock.

This is not to say that there should be no shifting in livestock production. There is, for instance, a considerable difference in the efficiency of various types of livestock in producing human food, with the dairy cow and the hog near the top of the list and beef at the bottom. On the other hand, without the beef herds the grasslands of the Western Plains would not be converted into human food. This suggests that the problem is not simply one of cutting meat consumption but rather one of changing the consumption pattern to maintain the highest net return from our agricultural resources. In the last analysis this becomes a problem for the livestock raiser and Government agricultural policy.

It is a patent oversimplification, however, to conceive of the problem of meat prices and inflation as beginning and ending with the cow, the hog, and the hen. Of equal weight is the question of consumer income and expenditure. The solution to the meat and the related inflation problem demands that the solution be integrated on all levels from the producer to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, my contention is: First, that this is a poor time to be adding any burdens to the dairy farmers of this Nation. December of 1947 showed the smallest milk production since 1940, and you must remember that we have had an increase in United States population of 11,000,000 in numbers. Second, I also contend, and I do not think anyone will dispute this statement as fact, that as soon as the fever gets out of some of these price situations, that there will be a gradual decrease in the amount of oleomargarine manufactured, and that they are becoming particularly vociferous at this time due to a temporary situation. If you would look up the production last spring when the price of milk went down, in many sections of the United States the milk returns were only $2.70 to $2.80 a hundred pounds to the producer, or 30 cents a hundred pounds below the legal lawful price, and the production of oleomargarine dropped from 41,000,000 pounds in May 1946 to 37,000,000 in 1947. For all the propaganda that we hear about this oleomargarine, remember that the American people in 1947 consumed twice as much butter as oleo. When people really obtain the facts about dried skim, butter prices will be lower.

Third, I again ask if you believe in oleo, do you believe in filled cheese and filled milk? I had not intended to bring up another angle of this price situation, but there are so many people talking about the housewife that I feel I should spend a few minutes on this angle. She can save herself some money and provide herself with a most acceptable dairy product. As I said before, I believe that this is a whole-fluid-milk country, and I think that in the school-lunch program whole milk should be used instead of skim milk, although I realize and do appreciate the fact that it is very fortunate that even the skim milk can be used in the school-lunch program. The product that I want to call to your attention is dried whole milk. This particular sample comes from the Badger Cooperative, which is a rather strong dairy cooperative and one of the largest of the 626 dairy cooperatives in the State of Wisconsin. In a letter of transmittal Mr. George Rupple, president and general manager of the Consolidated Badger Cooperative, states as follows:

We are forwarding to you today four 1-pound cans of dry, whole-milk powder, gas paced, and each can will make a gallon of milk, or in other words, it takes approximately 4 ounces of this product with enough water added to make 1 quart of milk. But I must say that care should be taken in making this mixture. It should be mixed and held in the ice box at least 12 hours before used, and be sure to mix only with cold water. Serve only when it is very cold, do not let it warm up.

I will attempt to give you a few figures as to the cost of this product which could be very misleading if not properly presented, because the costs that I will give you are what we could sell it for in the respective size package, but jobbers' and retailers' profits would have to be added which I will leave to you, but later in this letter I will indicate the approximate price it is now being sold at off the grocery shelf, which I think is a little out of line, too high.

At the present price of milk which is approximately $4.25 per hundred delivered at our plant for 3.5-percent milk, 1-pound tin of this product would cost, f. o. b. our plant, about 55 cents. If the milk was $3 per hundred, the same product and package would cost about 44 cents. Now to this you must add retail and wholesale profits, which I am going to suggest as 10 to 15 cents per pound, because today throughout the grocery stores in this country, our competitors are selling a 1-pound can all the way from 60 to 75 cents a pound.

This same product packed in 200-pound barrels delivered Washington, D. C., today sells for approximately 46 cents a pound and if milk was selling for $3 a hundred, delivered plant for 3.5-percent milk, the price for the same size barrel would be 35½ cents per pound, delivered, Washington, D. C.

We are shipping to you under separate cover four 1-pound cans without a label. We are leaving the label off intentionally so that there is no chance of you being accused of advertising. If you need additional samples let us know. I hope that this information will be helpful to you.

Now let us stop and analyze this situation for our New York friends who do not like to pay 23 cents a quart for milk in New York City. Some of our New York

milk producers of fluid milk appear to give aid and comfort to our enemies so far as oleo is concerned. It will be well to spend a few minutes in discussing where a housewife can really make a saving so far as dairy products are concerned. This product can be purchased for 60 cents a pound, so milk can be made at 15 cents a quart. A housewife can save between $25 and $30 a year on every quart of milk she buys. I just mention this so that some of the fluid milk producers will not get so anxious to get lined up with the oleomargarine crowd. You cannot get any of the scientists to make any derogatory remarks about this dried whole-milk product. It is a very high quality product. To begin with, it is pasteurized before it is dried. It has been in use for over a quarter of a century, and although only twenty-five to thirty million pounds were produced before the war, during the war it had a production of around 200,000,000 pounds a year, which is an indication of a new field for dairy products. Remember when you are buying this product you are not buying a substitute for milk, you are buying milk itself, and when you are buying oleomargarine you are not buying a substitute for butter, you are buying something in place of butter that is used no doubt because it has enough dairy products in it to make it usable. To keep this discussion on a scientific basis, it may be well to call your attention to the fact that you can make the same product as oleo out of coal. That is, another form of vegetable oil.

In conclusion allow me to say that if you want some vitamin A there is nothing to stop you from going to the corner drug store and buy them, and if you eat oleo long enough you may need all the vitamins, so that you may need to purchase the one-a-day brand.

At this point I ask to include a letter to Dr. Thomas Parran, of the United States Health Service, and his answer thereto:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1945.

Dr. THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. PARRAN: In reading various newspaper articles all during the war I noted in many instances the stress placed on foods with a high vitamin A content as part of a pilot's diet.

Pilots have told me that they have always had plenty of butter and that they used it freely.

I have never heard mentioned in my conversations with pilots nor have I read in the newspaper articles any reference to the consumption of oleomargarine.

Would you be kind enough to give me the information as to whether oleomargarine was prescribed as part of the diet for pilots at any time during the war.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, September 28, 1945.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Your letter of September 26, concerning the use of oleomargarine by pilots, has been received.

I am informed by the Surgeon General's Office of the Army that oleomargarine was not prescribed as part of the diet for pilots at any time during the war.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General.

There are two facts that are very apparent. One is that the more the people talk about rationing meat the less meat the people are liable to obtain, and second, the more we hear about this oleo business the less milk will be produced in the United States and the less dairy products the people of this Nation will be able to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to include a memorandum from Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, in which he calls my attention to certain inaccuracies made in the comments by my distinguished colleague and friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. I call your attention to the last sentence, which reads as follows:

Oleomargarine never used more than 18.8 percent of the soybean oil supply in any year and in the first 9 months of 1947 used only 15.8 percent of the total quantities of soybean oil disposed of in that period.

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1948.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REID: Here is a memo concerning certain errors in the talk by Representative POAGE which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In some way the memo got lost on my desk or I would have sent it to you earlier.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Holman.
From: L. F. Herrmann.
Date: January 20, 1948.
Subject: Comment on W. R. POAGE address on oleomargarine.

This speech by Mr. POAGE contains a number of errors of statistics and logic. I have a number of comments to make on these, referring to the page numbers in the mimeograph copy of the address at which the various points appear.

On page 19 appears this statement which contains several statistical errors: "To achieve this health goal, 657 pounds of milk or its equivalent per capita are required compared to the estimated 1947 supply of 430 pounds (of which 403 pounds is fluid milk or cream). To fill the gap of 227 pounds per capita, approximately 5,820,000 additional dairy cows would be needed at the 1946 high rate of production per cow."

The first error is that the 1947 supply of milk or its equivalent is 578 pounds rather than 430 pounds. In the October-December National Food Situation published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, it is estimated that total milk for human consumption was 811 pounds per capita. This figure includes the milk equivalent of butter, which is not a product to be compared with the "657 pounds of milk or its equivalent." The milk equivalent of butter included in the 911 pounds amounts to 233 pounds, leaving a balance of 578 pounds to be compared with the 657 rather than 430. Thus the gap is only 79 pounds per capita instead of 227 pounds per capita. Seventy-nine pounds per capita for 143,200,000 people in the civilian population amounts to 11,300,000,000 pounds of milk. The 1946 rate of production per cow is 4,891 pounds per cow indicating 2,320,000 cows instead of 5,800,000 cows. It is probable that the latter figure still would achieve substantially the same effect that Mr. POAGE attempted to accomplish with his erroneous statistics. The detectable error, however, sheds a modicum of doubt upon other statements which are not so readily verifiable.

Farther down on page 19, Mr. POAGE makes the following statement: "The average price paid for milk sold as fluid milk or cream during the 10-year period 1936–46 was about 74 cents per pound; for butterfat, about 37 cents per pound. The prices paid for milk for use in ice cream, cheese, and other products fell between the two levels." This statement is accurate, but it is followed by another statement which is erroneous: "In other words it was twice as profitable during this period for the dairy farmers to sell this milk for whole milk as it was for him to divert it to butter manufacture." This is erroneous because the dairy farmer selling whole milk has higher expenses than the dairy farmer selling butterfat in the form of separated cream. The dairy farmer selling whole milk must pay a greater hauling charge per pound of butterfat sold. He must also meet more exacting requirements as to equipment, materials, and methods used in the production of his product. The farmer selling farm-separated cream retains his skim milk on the farm where it is used as an extremely valuable protein supplement in the ration of his hogs and poultry.

On page 20, it is possible to admit that the percentage of the Nation's milk production going into butter production has dwindled without admitting the unwarranted inference that a further decline in the quantity of butter which consumers stand ready to take at a given price would be of no significance to dairymen. What has hurt dairymen is that consumers are willing to pay only about two-thirds of an industrial worker's hourly wage for a pound of butter and buy only 11 pounds of butter per capita per year currently while in the 1920's consumers would pay a full hour's wage and buy 16 to 18 pounds per capita.

The statement on page 21 that the feeding of skim milk to animals was a loss both to consumers and dairymen is erroneous. The feeding of skim milk to livestock is definitely an economic practice under certain conditions. Small dairy herds and herds at a distance from plants able to receive whole milk could not have had their dairy herds at all if the productive use of skim milk in livestock feeding were not possible. As a result of salvaging their skim milk in this way there were more active dairymen at the outset of the war than would otherwise have been the case, which made possible the vast expansion of supplies of whole milk for human consumption which occurred with the onset of World War II.

The paragraphs comparing farm receipts from sale of soybeans and dairy products on page 24 contain a number of errors. In the first instance the speech refers to "Cash receipts for soybeans produced in 1946." The source of these statistics is the Farm Income Situation for May 1947, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the exact data taken by Mr. POAGE are the cash receipts for soybeans sold in 1946. It includes the value of that part of the 1945 crop which was sold in 1946 and of that part of the 1946 crop which was marketed before the end of the year. The same error in terminology is made at other places in this part of the speech.

A more serious error occurs in the paragraph citing the statistics for Illinois. This paragraph gives the cash receipts from dairy products in 1946 as $146,022,000. Mr. POAGE

has committed the error of citing the 1945 figure for receipts from dairy products. The correct 1946 figure is $175,726,000, plus dairy-production payments of $19,192,000, or a total of $194,918,000. Mr. POAGE said the value of the soybean crop was $37,000,000 greater than the value of dairy products, but the corrected statistics show that the value of the soybean crop was $12,000,000 less than the value of dairy products in 1946.

On page 25 it is stated that 1 pound of soybean meal will replace from 3 to 4 pounds of corn in the livestock ration. That is true only when the comparative protein content of soybean meal and corn are considered. Corn, however, is not fed primarily for its protein content. As a source of total digestible nutrients or calories, corn and soybean meal are equivalent, pound for pound.

On the same page, page 25, Mr. POAGE makes the categorical statement that there must be a profitable market for the oil which is crushed out of soybeans in order to get the soybean meal to chickens and cattle economically. This is not true. Soybeans can be fed directly to livestock freshly ground or mixed with other grains in a balanced ration. Prof. J. B. Fitch, head of the department of dairy husbandry at the University of Minnesota, says: "Ground soybeans are practically equal to linseed meal as a source of protein for dairy cows. Because of their high fat content they may cause a slight increase in the butterfat in milk. Soybeans are very palatable."

While it is true that the dairy industry pays more to the soybean grower for the soybeans and soybean meal which it buys and uses as feed than the soybean grower realizes from oil used in oleomargarine, it is not true that soybean meal is the only form for which the dairy industry can or must make use of the valuable protein supply found in the soybean. Department of Agriculture statistics show that oleomargarine is a minor use for soybean oil. Oleomargarine never used more than 18.8 percent of the soybean-oil supply in any year, and in the first 9 months of 1947 used only 15.8 percent of the total quantities of soybean oil disposed of in that period.

I maintain that the United States is a whole-milk country.

The following is a telephoned list of the amounts of skim milk used in various States through the school-lunch program:

States for which dried skim milk was purchased under school-lunch program

	Number of pounds purchased
Alabama	280,017
Arizona	54,000
Arkansas	324,000
California	583,200
Colorado	54,000
Florida	54,000
Georgia	216,000
Idaho	54,000
Illinois	54,000
Iowa	54,000
Kansas	108,000
Kentucky	140,103
Louisiana	378,000
Maryland	54,000
Massachusetts	108,000
Michigan	162,000
Minnesota	216,000
Mississippi	162,000
Montana	14,935
Nevada	10,800
New Hampshire	27,000
New Mexico	21,600
North Carolina	175,500
Ohio	756,000
Oklahoma	356,400
Oregon	76,815
Rhode Island	27,000
Tennessee	119,880
Texas	648,000
Utah	54,000
Virginia	121,500
Washington	162,000
West Virginia	162,000
Wyoming	16,200
Hawaii	156,900
Puerto Rico	207,100

Dried skim milk purchased only for milk deficit areas, used mostly for cooking purposes in Northern States, reconstituted and used for fluid milk in Southern and Southeastern States:

Total amount purchase, 7,358,000 pounds.

Price, f. o. b. manufacturing plant, 16 cents per pound.

Source: United States Department of Agriculture.

The question always is, How is one to make oleo without milk? Another question is, How is one to obtain milk and skim milk for the school-lunch program when and if oleo was to displace butter?

If the dairy cow is the foster mother of the human race and is the most efficient farm animal in the production of human food should we not be able to furnish natural milk in our Federal school-lunch program?

Will we soon see the vegetable-oil interests advocating oil from trees to displace the other vegetable oils? The following article is from the Washington Sunday Star:

BIG FLORIDA REFINERY TO EXTRACT VEGETABLE FATS FROM WOOD

NEW YORK, January 31.—Construction is under way on a $1,700,000 refining plant at Panama City, Fla., for production of industrial vegetable fats from wood, John H. Hinman, president of International Paper Co., disclosed today.

The plant is being constructed by Arizona Chemical Corp., owned jointly by International Paper and American Cyanamid Co.

In addressing a dinner celebrating his company's fiftieth anniversary, Mr. Hinman said:

"It is also quite possible that in the future such edible fats as are used in cooking and frying can be produced from United States forests for use in United States homes as a result of the progress we are making in developing the separation process for 'tall oil.'

"While the production of such foodstuffs is now technically feasible, it is not yet known whether it would be economically efficient."

"Tall oil" is the term applied to the product which is derived from the liquor that remains after wood is cooked. The new plant will separate the "tall oil" into its component parts, vegetable fats and rosins.

Mr. Hinman said the plant is scheduled to go into production in about 1 year. It will have an annual maximum capacity to process around 22,000 tons of crude "tall oil."

When combined with reagents, the company said, "tall oil" performs the same functions as many other oils such as linseed in the manufacture of paints and varnishes. It is also widely used in making disinfectants; many types of soaps and emulsifiers; in metal processing; in cutting and lubricating oils, core oils, textile-processing oils, and other industrial products.

The following article is from the New York Times of Sunday, December 7:

FOOD EXPORTS SHOW 46 PERCENT SEPTEMBER RISE

WASHINGTON, December 6.—United States exported 46 percent more foodstuffs in September than in the same month last year, the Commerce Department reported today.

The total was $175,224,000, an increase of $54,911,000 over the figure a year ago. September exports also exceeded August's by $1,258,000 but were $7,463,000 below July.

Government officials said that much of the increase resulted from higher prices.

The department reported that the United States imported more foodstuffs during the first 9 months of this year. It said imports totaled $1,200,842,000, a 26 percent increase over the same period a year ago.

During September, it said, there were substantial increases in the purchases of canned beef, sardines and tomatoes, preserved pineapples, cane sugar, coffee, whisky, black pepper, and some varieties of molasses.

Major increases in exports for September were in beef and veal, lard, dairy products, canned salmon and sardines, grains, wheat flour, feeds, white potatoes, canned fruits and vegetables and sirups.

THE DAIRY SITUATION AND OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. Speaker, there are at least four different angles to this oleo question that should be discussed. First, we should discuss it from the basis of the quarter-of-a-cent tax and the 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine. Second, we should discuss it in relation to the cost of living. Third, we should discuss it in relationship to the soil fertility of this Nation. Fourth, we should discuss it in regard to the future effect on American industry and the general health and general welfare of the people of the United States.

I might say to start with that this old argument as to whether vegetable oil is equal to animal fat has been going on for a long, long time. I have reached the time in life when I know that I do not have all the answers and I do not try to give anyone the impression that I have all the answers. As an indication of what has happened in relation to the vegetable oils, as far as oleo is concerned, I might say that the old fight used to be on cottonseed oil. Recently they have enlisted the services of the soybean people. Of course, the soybean acreage has increased very materially during the war, and the price has increased from less than a dollar a bushel to something over $4 a bushel, and I presume they are justified in hoping it will be $4 a bushel from here on out.

I hold in my hand an article from the Sunday Star that shows that this is not the only source of vegetable oil. This article goes on to tell about a plant that is going to be built in Panama City, Fla., that will cost something over $1,700,000. It is being put up by a paper company, and they expect to take the "tall oil" and take the resin out of it and then make vegetable oil out of the rest of the product. I presume then they will have a substitute for oleomargarine, because it will be the same thing as any other vegetable oil. I have included this article in my prepared remarks.

It was demonstrated years and years ago that even from coal you could make the same thing you have in oleomargarine. Whether or not this is good procedure to follow brings up another question. I might digress enough to say I realize that with the war profits the oleo people can stimulate a great advertising program. I realize all those things, but I feel that the scientific facts, that the nutritional facts, that the economic facts

justify my belief that I have righteous cause in presenting the other side of the oleo picture. The time is going to come when we will have to choose which road we want to follow.

The first point is that not one of the many Members who have been throwing oleomargarine bills into the hopper will seriously contend that people would even eat it at all if it did not have dairy products in it. The amount is 15.6 percent of the cheapest form of dairy product. Is it at all surprising that even if you put 15.6 percent—and incidentally, as I said, the cheapest dairy products—into oleomargarine it still tastes and smells like oleomargarine? I do not see anything very surprising about that, but I would just like to have them served once some oleo that did not have some dairy product in it. The point is they must have a dairy product to make oleo.

Here I hold in my hand a replica and reproduction of the foster-mother of the human race. This cow's name happens to be Rebecca. She is not as well advertised as Elsie, but she stands for the same thing. This happens to be a plaster-of-paris cow and she is surely a good cow. She has the outlines. Whoever made this cow sure knew something about the dairy business, as you can see. Notice the milk veins, the dairy form, the shape of her udder. She is a regular dairy cow and she has just the right number of faucets. The faucets are correctly placed.

I want to put in the RECORD the fact that the cow is an animal that is the most efficient producer of human food that ever has been found in this whole world. No one can dispute that statement. This dairy cow will produce four times as much human food as some farm animals, and will produce twice as much human food as any farm animal.

As a thesis, right or wrong, as a thesis I believe this is a full-milk country. I do not believe in cream for the few and skim milk for the many. We do not want one group to have skim milk and want a few of the fat cats to have the cream off the top of the bottle. I will not take time to name the States—but I include the list in my prepared remarks—we find that in our own school-lunch program we use skim milk instead of natural whole milk.

The United States of America is a full-milk country, and children participating in the school-lunch program should have whole milk. These children are entitled to the nutritiousness of whole milk produced by the most efficient producer of any animal on the farm.

As a matter of fact, this dairy cow comes the nearest to perpetual motion this world has ever seen. Here is this cow weighing around a thousand pounds. She will give 10 times her weight in milk every year. This milk will produce a thousand pounds of cheese and that cheese has twice the human food value as does the carcass of the animal itself. And yet we have those amongst us who would destroy the dairy cow. I repeat once more, I realize the forces that are in this oleo-promotion business. I realize that they try to make these soybean people believe that they are going to have a future home for the soybean oil; but according to Mr. Charles Holman, of the Milk Producers' Association—as you will find in my prepared address—only 15 to 18 percent of the soybean oil produced in the United States finds its way into oleo.

As I have shown in the body of the chart I am giving you today, last spring when the price of dairy products went down, what happened to the production of oleomargarine? It dropped below the 1946 price. That was temporary.

Now, it is said that the price of milk and the price of butter are too high. I would like to ask anybody who is up here propounding that thesis if he wants to destroy the dairy industry of this country. I will ask anybody on either side of the aisle to name me one dairy product where he can buy a pound of butterfat as cheaply as he can a pound of butter. I know he cannot answer the question.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman spoke about 18 percent of the soybean crop going into oleo. What percentage of the milk crop goes into butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will be glad to discuss that with my distinguished friend. May I correct the RECORD and say that the gentleman from Wisconsin said that Mr. Charles Holman stated from 15 to 18 percent of the soybean oil went into oleomargarine.

Before the war 42 pounds out of 100 pounds of milk went into butter. That was the end product. I would not accuse anyone during the war of having any oleo interest in mind, but I do know we had to send Russia a hundred million pounds of butter while we had to stimulate the use of oleomargarine in this country, and I know that the going has been tough so far as butter is concerned.

May I say right here that the State I represent is not one of the large butter-producing areas of the country. About one-third of the butter of the United States is made in Iowa and Minnesota. A large part of the milk in my State goes into these other manufactured dairy products. But this oleomargarine business is just a beginning. It is getting the camel's head under the tent, because if it is a good thing to substitute vegetable oil for an animal fat in butter it is also going to be a good thing to have filled milk, and it is going to be O. K. to have filled cheese as well.

During the war the uses of milk switched around. Part of it made sense. Surely we had an increase in the diversion of milk, not much of an increase in milk production. I do not know how the dairy farmers kept up the dairy production the way they did. We did not have very much of an increase in milk production. Of course, Mr. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, says we are producing a third more than we did before the war. He must mean a long time before the war, because we only increased the production of milk in the years 1940 to 1947 from 110,000,000,000 pounds up to 120,000,000,000 pounds, which is less than 10 percent. Now there has been a realinement, and you can figure it out for yourself. Our creamery production last year was 1,300,000,000 pounds. Farm butter is estimated around 300,000,000 pounds. That is a total of 1,600,000,000 pounds. If it takes 20 pounds of milk to make a pound of butter, that means 32,000,000,000 pounds of milk this year found its way into butter. In other words, instead of having 42 percent going into butter as before the war, evidently we only have between 25 and 30 percent at the present time, of the milk going into butter. In other words, it has been funneled off into these other dairy products. What is going to happen to this end product? Cheese production has nearly doubled. There have been times that the evaporated milk business gave indications of having a 50-percent increase. What is going to happen when they quit exporting evaporated milk products and that settles back and is absorbed by the domestic market? So long as meat is high, cheese will be in demand, surely. Why? Because a pound of cheese is supposed to be the poor man's meat. Cheese has a content of 23-percent protein and your best meat will not have over 18-percent protein content. The answer to the gentleman from New York then is that butter accounted for 42 pounds out of every 100 pounds of milk and now accounts for 25 to 30; and if the oleo crowd has its way it will be zero.

There are two things involved in the price situation. Here is No. 1. Of course, butter is like any other commodity that has swept up from August on. But, who swept it up? Who swept the agricultural price up from August until now? Who did that? Was that done by the National Manufacturers Association? The OPA was dead and buried. Over in Geneva last summer—and if this is not correct, Under Secretary of Agriculture Dodd can correct the RECORD or he can have me correct it, but Mr. Dodd tried to show what would happen if they tried to furnish all the grain that those European countries wanted. Now, I personally heard him make a speech to that effect. He told them what they would have to do in order not to disturb our own economy was to use these agricultural products that we did have in surplus, and which we could furnish to the hungry people of those countries, and in the long run we could do a much better job for them than we could if there was too much emphasis put on this grain. What happened here at home? Why, the price of this grain was just pushed up. Practically $1 was added to a bushel of wheat. You can feed 50 percent more hungry people with $2 wheat than you can with $3 wheat. What was the result? The result was that this is the only time in the history of this country that 100 pounds of milk will not buy 100 pounds of feed. Then you say that dairy products are too high. I cannot go along with that, because it is a man-made institution, and I know if we had followed the program laid down by Mr. Dodd, we would not have had the present prices. The consumer, the farmer, and the taxpayer would have benefited. The same proposal was endorsed by Sir John Orr, the head of FAO. That seemed to be the attitude he took.

There was no reason in the world for the price to go up, because last spring the fever was pretty well out of many food products. In August, even, cottonseed oil was only 18–19 cents a pound and soybean oil was around 15 or 16 cents a pound. Who added about 50 percent? Yet, we added less than 10 percent to the price of butter during the same time. Then, we have to start hearing the sob story about having to have this oleo. Now, if that thesis is right, and if any of these oleomargarine people are right, and if vegetable oil is equivalent to the animal fat in a pound of butter, by the same token you must come out and say that you believe in this product known as filled milk. Now, the reason I say that is because the formula would be the same. It is a vegetable oil and a dairy product; it has more dairy product in it than has the oleo. Of course, it probably makes it that much better, but remember this can of the product that cannot be shipped interstate. It is against the law to ship from one State to another, and yet if the oleomargarine crowd is able to carry through what they are operating on at the present time—you do not need to worry; they will be in here rapping on your doors and telling the same stories, and they will be preaching to the housewives—that she should be buying filled milk. Mr. Oleo Lover, do you advocate filled milk? If not, why not? Skimmed milk with some vegetable oil squirted into it, selling it to the people in place of evaporated natural milk. So, do not think that the evaporated milk people, or the man whose milk goes to the evaporated milk factories, does not have an interest in what this oleomargarine crowd is up to, because it means that they are going to be faced with this same kind of competition. We are going to take off the cream and feed it to the fat cats and let the rest of the people eat the doctored-up products. Maybe vegetable oils are good foods and maybe soybean oil is good, but if they use it sufficiently they may get slant eyes like the orientals who have been using it for so many generations.

Here is a letter that I wrote to Dr. Parran of the Public Health Service in 1945 in which I asked him about oleo, if they fed it to the fliers during the war. I received his answer saying, No, they did not feed any oleo to those boys who were flying our planes. They wanted them to get butter, and they gave it to them, too. I placed these letters in my prepared address. Remember, I repeat, if a vegetable oil is just as good in a pound of butter—as butterfat and I do not say that it is, but if it is just as good, is filled milk with a vegetable oil displacing butterfat equal to the evaporated natural milk?

I do not pay much attention to all the propaganda from the crowd. I have listened to that all my life. I did not just pick up the gems during this session. The point always is, if vegetable oils are so good, why do they have to use dairy products to make them desirable to eat? Now one more: If the vegetable oils are desirable to replace butterfat in butter and in filled milk, why is it not desirable to make filled cheese? That will be the next step. You know that natural cheese is one of the greatest products that man ever did make.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman mentioned the fact that oleomargarine was not used in the armed forces. Of course, the appropriation bills carry a prohibition against such use.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sorry I have to correct my distinguished friend so often. I said in the Air Forces.

Mr. BUCK. That is an armed force.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But there was some oleo used in some camps in the Army. There was not evidently anything in the law that prohibited the War Department from using oleo in some camps. I think we used a relatively small amount, however, in the camps, according to the War Department. In the Air Forces they have to have vitamin A. You just try getting along a while without using vitamin A and see whether or not you can read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without a pair of glasses. The relationship of vitamin A to people's eyesight has been demonstrated so many times that I will not repeat it here. Maybe it is just as good if you go out and catch a shark or some other fish and take that liver and squirt that in. I do not know. I would not want to get into that argument at this particular time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I commend the gentleman on the very scientific approach he is taking to this issue. The gentleman may already have said it, but he knows full well that since 1941 certain policy makers in the administration have done everything they could to put butter production out of business. In fact, I thought many times that many of them were stockholders in the 22 companies that make oleomargarine.

The gentleman has commented on the use of vegetable oil in filled milk. It seems to me a member of the Cabinet the other day, the Secretary of Commerce, said that as far as oleo was concerned it was just as good or better than butter, and he and his family were eating it. I do not suppose he can afford anything more, so he has to go to oleo, which is about half the price of butter.

If they can use vegetable oil—and I am not depreciating the food value of vegetable oil—in perfecting these synthetic foods to make them look and taste like dairy products, they might just as well feed the people vegetable oil directly and get away from the deception that is being practiced by using them in oleomargarine and in filled milk and in these other commodities. I should like to hear the gentleman's comment on that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That has been the history of the whole oleo business. It has been sired by deceit and mothered by deception. They started out that way and that is what got them into the legislation troubles they have today. Do you know what happened within the last 4 or 5 years? They came before the Committee on Agriculture and said they had to change the oleo law. Butter was 46 cents a pound, but they had to have oleo. Do you know that Ole committed so many sins when he was young that they are trying to change his name? They want you to call him "Margie" now. They even want to change his sex.

They want you to call it margarine now, and they think that you will forget all the sins that Ole committed when he was younger. Then 3 or 4 years ago when they had the bill up they claimed that it had 9,000 international units of vitamin A, and that that was more than butter had. Then you know they had some fellow over here in the research laboratory at Beltsville go into the thing. I will say that there never has been the amount of profit in the dairy industry to carry on a lot of propaganda like the oleo crowd carries on. They decided that maybe they had better look the thing up and find out how much vitamin A was in butter. What do you think they found? They found that butter had from 15,000 to 25,000 to 27,000 international units of vitamin A. Then what did the oleo crowd do? They came around and squirted 15,000 more units in it and now they say they have just as much vitamin A as they have in butter. Most of the butter is made in the summer months at a time when you have the highest natural vitamin count in your butter. So if someone else discovers something else in butter then they will have to come along and inject something else in that oleo and try to fool the people. That has been the trouble all the way through. They want to fool the American people and they are willing to line up with anybody to do it. That has been their performance ever since they started out in the business because the profits that go along with that business sure justify their doing it. Twenty-nine cents worth of oil, add 20 percent skim milk, salt, and so forth, and sell it for 40 to 50 cents a pound is a pretty good business, especially so if they can get to sell it as butter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish the gentleman would correct me if I am in error, but as I understand it, oleomargarine can be colored any color under the sun except yellow which is the color of butter without paying that 10-cent tax. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then why is it that they insist on taking the historic color of butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The reason is that that is part of their deceit and deception. They want to make it look like butter to deceive the people. They want to make it smell like butter and taste like butter.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. How many months of the year is coloring matter put in butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That depends on the manufacture of the butter. Some butter is not colored at all. Personally I do not care about having any color in it.

Mr. BUCK. Then when it goes in it is deceit and deception?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No not necessarily. Some markets want it that way.

Mr. BUCK. Why is it deceit and deception in margarine and not in butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is a good question. When you put it in butter, you are still selling butter, but when you put it in oleo, you are putting it there so that you can sell oleomargarine as butter. There is the difference between the two situations. In one case you are putting it into butter and in the other you are putting it into something that you want to sell as if it were butter.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman did not answer my question. How many months out of the year does coloring matter go into butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In some butter it is not used at all during any months of the year.

Mr. BUCK. How many months of the year does it go into some butter? The gentleman is an expert.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I did not say I am an expert. I am just an expert in what the oleo people are up to and I am not an expert on these other matters.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman is an admitted expert on dairy products, and that is the reason I am asking him.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What is the specific question that the gentleman is asking now?

Mr. BUCK. What is the maximum number of months in which coloring matter goes into butter in some areas of the country?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have not been in the creameries all over the country, but I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, which used to be the leading butter State, and then also will yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois, who formerly was the president of the Illinois Dairy Industries Association, if you please.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That depends on the part of the country where they get the green grass to put the color in. It seems to me that they also put salt in butter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, and they put it in oleo, too.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They also put it in oleo. I suppose we probably should take the salt out. If the oleo industry would stop being synthetic about their oleo, I am sure that there would not be any difficulty with the dairy industry. The trouble is they are trying to make a synthetic product look and appear and taste like butter in order to deceive the people.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They want to get a lot of fellows to be their mouthpieces and be the sponsors for the oleo crowd. If they want to do it, it is all right with me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I would like to elaborate on the question asked by the gentleman from New York on how many months they color butter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. You have made millions of pounds of butter in your day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Yes, I have made lots of it, many millions of pounds.

During certain periods of the month, the farmer does not put any in. That is with reference to home-made butter. But we are referring to creameries now and butter that goes into the commercial trade. In some of them in particular areas where they get a certain brand of butter where the cows are fed silage they get the natural color through the silage and they do not need any the year around. There are others who standardize with certain brands. In the winter, for perhaps 3 months, they will add a little coloring. It is never overcolored, but just enough to standardize it the year round. There are only a few who do it. But it does not add anything.

Now, I wish to add, I wonder how many know that right after World War I, when the German hordes overran Belgium, there was an epidemic of eye trouble with all the children, and after certain research they found they had not been getting the butter they had formerly got, and milk, which contained certain vitamins. We exported into Belgium, and rationed among the children, a certain amount of butter, and in a short time their eye-trouble epidemic passed away and they came back to normal condition.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman was formerly president of the Illinois Dairymen's Association, and he is one of the best-informed men in the manufactured dairy products business.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. I have waited for 30 minutes to pay a tribute to you. I am not a farmer. You have convinced me of many things and you may convince me that you are right on this, although at the present time it will take some convincing. I have told you that before. On the other hand, on many things you have said I find it very useful to explain that you are one of the greatest authorities on agriculture in this country. My farmers believe what you say. I hope you will not give up with just your plea to take care of this situation, but will address yourself to some other matters in the near future. In fact, my own farmers insist that you come to my State and address them on agricultural and food questions.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Then, I will address myself to some of them right now. I will tell them how you can take 10 cents a pound off the price of butter tomorrow, if this administration wants to take it off. Last spring they put a support price under skimmed milk. The most important part of the farming industry, milk, does not have an announced support price. Think that one over. The United States Department of Agriculture came in with a 9- and 10-cent support price for skimmed milk; 9 cents for the roller and 10 cents for the spray. Do you know what that would yield to the average farmer in Minnesota? That would give him around 20 or 25 cents per hundred for his milk. With hogs at the price they are, it is surely worth more to be feeding milk to his pigs. But that is the kind of support we get from the present Department of Agriculture so far as dairying is concerned. I do not want anyone blaming me because they have to pay too much for what they eat. When they put that floor under skimmed milk, they were putting it away below its food value. The result of it has been that possibly you could have saved the housewives millions and millions of dollars on their butter bill. You can do it tomorrow, if you want to, because all you have got to do is to put a support floor under skimmed milk somewhere near in keeping with the purposes of the Steagall amendment. Skimmed milk that was bought for the school-lunch program was bought at 16 cents a pound. Just imagine. Sixteen cents a pound. Four cents per quart. That is all that this administration seems to think it is worth. There is nothing in the world to stop them tomorrow from putting a 20- or 25-cent floor under dried skim any time they want to. Every time you put 1 cent on the floor on skimmed milk you take 2 cents off the price of butter. So if tomorrow they will announce 5 cents more on skimmed milk, it will take 10 cents off the price of butter the next day. Of course, this way the oleo manufacturer putting 15.6 percent skimmed milk in oleo will have to pay a little more for his skim milk.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman will recall that shortly after the war commenced they placed a ceiling on butterfat of 54 cents, at least in the greater part of my district in Minnesota. In addition, there was the subsidy of 17 cents a pound going to the butter producer, making a total of 71 cents a pound in my area. The OPA did not take into consideration what it cost the farmers of that area to produce butterfat, and as a consequence within a few years' time between 30 and 40 percent of the dairy herds of that particular area disappeared; they were slaughtered.

So there we see how the shortsightedness of the administration is putting out of business a great number of dairymen. Had the administration used a little common sense at that time, as I pleaded with them in September of 1943, they would have permitted that price to go up to the point which would have guaranteed at least that these herds stayed in production. They listened to OPA, however, rather than to the dairymen of the Nation and slowly but surely crushed out the big bulk of the dairy herds through that great midwestern region, and today we are suffering because of their mistakes.

If these oleo people achieve their ends I predict a still greater calamity and can foresee the time in the not too distant future when we will not have any milk

whatsoever for the children of this country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What the gentleman has said, I think, is correct for this reason: Where are we today? In December of 1947 we produced less milk than we did in December of 1940. Do you realize we are down a million milch cows in number already? We killed off 9,000,000 head of cattle and 20,000,000 sheep. We have cut our sheep by 35 percent. The whole livestock industry is in jeopardy. We have about 40 percent less hogs in the United States on January 1, 1948, than we had January 1, 1943. I wish I were able to have that statement placed in the RECORD in big black headlines and repeated several times. Then I would like somebody to come to me a year from now, 6 months from now, or any time and tell me that statement is not correct. The fact is the more you holler about oleo the less milk will be provided for the babies of America.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is a fact that all of this talk about meat rationing is beginning to have its effect upon production. That is the news that is coming to me in the mail from my congressional district. I just wish these bureaucrats and others who talk about proposed meat rationing would keep their mouths shut. Then they would really be doing something to assure a future supply of meat for the Nation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. A chap told me this yesterday, he said: "I had a chance to get $280 apiece for 10 cows. With all this talk about oleo and what they may be doing I did not know what it might do to the dairy business and I thought it would be better to take $2,800 now." These cows, of course, went to the fluid-milk area where they have specialized production, but it shows the fear and uncertainty that is creeping into the dairy business.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman made a rather startling statement when he spoke about the reduction of the dairy herds. Is that general throughout the Nation or is it confined to certain areas?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; that is for the United States as a whole. The milk cow population is on the way down. I do not know what it is going to be now after we had Mr. Luckman's reign. The trouble is a lot of these fellows making the rules and regulations do not know anything about the business at all. Taking my own State as an example, apparently they do not realize that in many parts of my State only half the land of the farm could ever be put into grain anyway. What are you going to do with the other half of the farm?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, the greatest butter-producing State in this Nation at the present time, a State that has many outstanding attributes, a State that so far as area is concerned is the most productive area in the world.

Mr. JENSEN. Before I ask the gentleman a question I wish to say that I am sorry that all the people of the United States, both the city folks and all the farmers in every section do not have the privilege of listening to the gentleman from Wisconsin explain and point out the things which he always points out which are very valuable, facts and figures proving his point, that is, that the dairy industry is one of the most necessary and most important industries in America.

I appreciate the fact that the gentleman spends many hours, many days, even years, making a study of this question. May I say also in response to what the gentleman from Minnesota has just said that I have been getting letters from farmers and even from the secretary of agriculture of the State of Iowa asking, "Can you not do something to stop this noise and this talk about the return of meat rationing?" He states, "It has the farmers out here in a quandary. They do not know what to do. They are going to reduce their herds. It is having a terribly bad effect."

On top of that a lot of folks are filling their deep-freezers, they are starting to hoard meat, and, of course, they are bringing on a shortage of meat due to the fact that somebody is making a noise about something they do not know anything about.

I only wish the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] were running this whole food program along with such men as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], and also the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON], including the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and a few more I could name. We would not have all of this tommyrot and monkey business that is going on and we would get production. We would not have a lot of folks jumping on to the finest product in the world—good, pure butter.

May I ask the gentleman a question: Is it not a fact that where you find a good dairy section in this United States and any place in the world for that matter you find good healthy people and good productive land?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of course, the answer to that is obvious. The gentleman has said a lot of good things about the gentleman from Wisconsin. I put an article from the Farm Journal in my prepared speech showing that last year Wisconsin produced more corn per acre than did Illinois or Iowa. I dislike to have that in there now after all those good things the gentleman said about me. But it is in there. The article went on to say that the reason why is because in Wisconsin they do not raise much corn in comparison with the amount of alfalfa and clover that is raised. In Illinois and Iowa they raise many times as many acres of corn for every acre of alfalfa.

However, I do not want to be like some Presidential candidates, so we will straighten that out now. I will accept and will be glad to. We will not keep anyone in suspense on that. And I am sure if you get the others interested we might do a good job. At least we would be from a part of the country that produces food. That would be some advantage.

Mr. JENSEN. We are learning fast out in Iowa and we will come through, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I could discuss this oleo business, as I said, from a lot of different angles. There are also a lot of angles in connection with the dairy industry. You know, we get into trouble with the housewife, and I do not want to be in bad with the housewife. I do not want to be in trouble with the housewife. I do not get mixed up in any arguments with the ladies. But I just want to fix up a new approach for the housewife consumers of this country.

They have been told how much they are going to save on oleo. On 15 pounds consumption it would be between $1.50 to $1.75 per capita. They are paying twenty-some cents a quart for milk up there, and they pay twice as much for a pound of butterfat in the milk as they do in a pound of butter, and yet they are trying to get their Congressmen to do something about the butter. I want to say something to the good housekeepers up there in New York and I will address myself briefly to them. Here is a glass of milk. This is not any substitute. This is the milk itself. This happens to be made by one of the outstanding milk cooperatives that you have heard about out in Wisconsin. It is known as the Badger Consolidated. All they do is to take the water out of the milk so that they do not have to pay the freight on it, and then the consumer reconstitutes it. You can get all the milk up there you want for about 15 cents a quart. The people of New York will not be misled by that suggested saving of $1 or $2 on their oleo. They can save $25 to $30 yearly per quart on their milk bill every year. If you are really interested in doing something to save her money, here is your opportunity. It was not generally used before the war; they kept it for Red Cross work and so on. Twenty-five or thirty million pounds a year was all that was produced. Now, there is not an agricultural product scattered all over the world as much as dried whole milk is. We in the United States are producing now about 200,000,000 pounds a year. So, to the housewives may I say while the oleo promoters are trying to save you $1.50 to $1.75 a year on a substitute product, I will save you $25 to $30 a year on every quart of milk you buy. To save money just forget the ersatz butter. I want you to have the real butter. I do not advocate a substitute for milk. This is the milk itself.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. I want to say "amen" to everything that has been said about meat rationing, and when I say that I think I am speaking in the interest of the consumer. I hope the gentleman in his very able dissertation will show how the tax on oleomargarine affects the dairy industry. It is only the tax on oleomar-

garine that we are seeking to have removed.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All right. I am glad the gentleman brought that one up, because that is a good one. Are there any members of the Committee on Ways and Means here? You remember there is the 3-cent transportation tax; in other words, when you take your milk to the creamery—and over 90 percent in my State goes to the factory as milk—just get this and figure out the 3 cents. Pretty near 90 percent of it is water. One hundred pounds of 3½% fat milk will yield a little over 4 pounds of butter; in other words, that is nearly three-fourths of a cent a pound tax that Uncle Sam takes off of this butter before the milk ever gets to the creamery. Well, now the oleo people are worrying about a little one-fourth of a cent tax that they pay on their product. Before the milk ever gets to the creamery the butter farmer pays between one-half and three-fourths of a cent per pound transportation tax.

Now No. 2, and this is a good one. They are not satisfied, you know. This administration is pretty hungry for money. The fur business they call a luxury, and they have a big tax on it amounting to 20 percent. Some people wanted to lower the tariff and they did and brought in foreign wool. Then turn around and what do you suppose they do? If you live up there where it is 10, 20, and 30 below zero, a fur coat is not a luxury, and if you are wearing it, a Mouton coat, which is nothing but sheepskin with a little wool pulled off, sheared off, then you have to pay 20-percent tax in order to get the privilege of wearing a sheepskin coat. When you get into that tax business there it will take more than the time allotted me today to discuss the relationship of the tax on oleomargarine and the tax on milk, tax on butterfat, and tax on sheepskin coats.

Mr. BUCK. But that is the question on which the bill is submitted, the 10-cent tax.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The tax on oleomargarine may deceive a lot of people in America.

Mr. BUCK. But my question is, How does that tax on oleomargarine affect the welfare of the dairy industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. How does it affect it? Well, they have not taken it off yet. I cannot answer it before I hear the question.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The dairy industry is not for keeping the tax on oleomargarine because it will be a direct benefit to butter, but the tax was put on originally to provide for an inspection service to prevent inferior products going into oleomargarine, a condition which could still exist. As the gentleman has so ably pointed out, the tax is a minimum tax; it amounts to nothing and does not compare with many other taxes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want this to appear in the RECORD.

First. Oleo farming means less fertility in the soil. I guess they will not argue about that, because oleo products are soil-depleting crops.

Second. Oleo farming means a smaller meat supply. That is another one they have forgotten. Forty percent of the beef and veal of this country comes from the dairy industry, do not forget that.

Third. Oleo farming will provide fewer hides for our leather industries. That is another thing they do not stop to think about, but they will when they get all these cows killed off.

Fourth. Oleo farming will provide less pharmaceutical supplies for the Nation.

Butter farming means—

First. An increase in soil fertility. No one can argue that.

Second. Butter farming means adequate supplies of milk and milk products and the products that are so necessary for human foods and industry. The average person has no concept how these by-products of butter making are used in ice cream, candy, and other commercial uses. As a matter of fact, you can make cloth out of it if you want to.

Third. Butter farming means a rounded-out agricultural program.

Fourth. Butter farming means the United States can continue to be the greatest agricultural food-producing Nation in the world.

Fifth. Butter farming means bigger and better babies. Do not forget that. Be sure to have that thought along with you if you are interested in the future generations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. One thing that has always troubled me about the argument of those who take the same position as the gentleman has been how anyone could be deceived by colored oleomargarine if the package said "oleomargarine" on it. They would have to sell it under that name, would they not? They could not sell it under the name of "butter," could they?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota to answer that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I inform the gentleman that there are innumerable cases where the people who have sold this oleomargarine colored to look like butter have sold it as country butter. They put it into jars, and do not follow the law. They deceive the people.

Mr. KEATING. Do we not have a Federal Trade Commission to prevent that very thing?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We not only have a Federal Trade Commission but we have a Department of Justice as well to handle these things. They are picking up a few cases. They found some down in New Orleans a little while ago where the people were selling colored oleo as country butter. Of course, one thing this tax does is stop that deception, although it is difficult to stop it.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman would not contend that was a common practice or a general practice? The mere fact that we have a few chiselers or crooks does not mean that that is a common practice.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There will be plenty of them if they permit oleo to be colored to look like butter. You will find that a good many of them, not only in restaurants but in retail stores, will go into the practice of selling colored oleo as butter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. And mixing it with butter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want to give this to one of my colleagues to see what he thinks of this reconstituted milk.

Mr. KEATING. To whom is the gentleman giving the milk?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am giving it to the former president of the Illinois Dairyman's Association. This is milk that has the same content of butterfat as it had before they ever took the water out of it. No scientist or nutritionist can say one word against this product. So if you are interested in the consumer, there is a chance to get in with the housewives and save the housewife $25 or $30 a year and live happily ever afterward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I will say it is mighty good, delicious, and of high quality.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does that have 3½-percent butterfat, the same as it had before the water was taken out of it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; or more.

On the board here is an official chart from the Department of Commerce. Here is a thing that people do not realize. They have heard us talk about feeding the world. Then they wonder about the high cost of living. Here we are on volume, not on dollars. All during this period from a little after 1925 on we were not agriculturally self-sufficient. Then all at once we blossom out and tell the world that we are going to feed them. People do not realize that all during these years—here is about the time when Henry was killing the pigs—we imported the most we had ever imported. By the time we got into the war the whole domestic agricultural program had bogged down. In August 1939 we had 54-cent-plus wheat, we had 8-cent-plus cotton, we had 5-cent-plus hogs. The whole New Deal program had blown up, until we got into the war. Here we were importing the most agricultural products we ever had in the history of the country, and our exports had gone down so that they were only a small percentage of our total imports.

Now the war came along and we have been trying to see-saw in between. Still, up to this time the exports were more than the imports so far as agricultural products are concerned. But here we are again with more agricultural products imported than exported. Now I am not saying that you should take my statement for that. I am only showing you a chart made up by the Department of Commerce and other material from the Department of Agriculture itself.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does that include the exports of 600,000,000

pounds of grain that were exported last year?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, that will show up on this chart.

Now this other chart is confined to food products alone. During the war years it was hard to keep too good a record because the United States bought millions of pounds of food in other lands which do not show because they never came into this country so they do not show up as imports. But here are the exports. Here we are as shown in the article that I have here from the New York Times that as of September of this year over a year ago our exports jumped up in cash value 46 percent. Then you wonder who caused the high cost of living. Then they want to talk about the National Manufacturers Association and about the OPA, and they want to talk about rationing meat and talk about trying to do something about this oleo business. Here are the same groups. They are all hot and bothered and want to do this and yet they are the same ones who complain about the price of food being high.

Once more I say that this is from the Department of Commerce, and these figures are not mine. This chart tells the story so far as beef and pork is concerned. Here is something that is a little bit startling, I think. During the prewar period of 1937 and 1941 the red lines show the imports. We were on an import basis for beef and pork for 4 years out of the 5 before the war. Then all at once, from 1942 to 1947, you see what happens. The black lines are the exports. The red ones are the imports. Then you wonder why that happened. Then you wonder what we did and what is going to happen. Remember that except for a small period during World War I we were not self-sufficient so far as beef was concerned. Then all at once we do this. How did it happen? We did it by killing off 9,000,000 head of cattle. We did it by reducing our sheep numbers 35 percent. We did it by reason of the fact that on January 1, 1948, we had practically 40 percent less hogs in this country than we did 5 years previously in 1943. That is what is happening to the livestock industry in this country. Yet they talk about meat rationing and they talk about the oleo business. There is the answer to that story.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the purpose of this tax, in the gentleman's opinion, in order to protect the dairy industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is the general idea, I would think.

Mr. KEATING. Is there any other tax which is imposed by the Federal Government to protect a competing industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Not being a lawyer, I would refer that to the distinguished gentleman from New York. The laws says that eggs have a support price of 58 cents per dozen and they are selling in the Midwest for 35 cents to 38 cents per dozen.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman is an expert on taxes and cows and dairy industry and babies and many other subjects. I admire the ability of the gentleman tremendously. He is one of the ablest men of the House. But I would like to know if the gentleman can tell me whether there is any precedent for this type of legislation by the Federal Government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am like Leon Henderson, who came before our committee once. He had 15 men with him to help answer the questions. So I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman shows the confusion which is in the minds of the oleo supporters, because he said, "Is there any tax put on to protect any competing industry?" It was not put on to protect a competing industry but to protect the consumer.

Mr. KEATING. I do not understand. I am simply asking for information. I am not an oleo guy, or a butter guy, or a baby buy, or anything else. What I want is facts. I do not understand how this protects the public in any way, because you have got to show what you are selling or you are breaking the law.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If you are eating in a restaurant, I suppose they will bring you the carton and say, "Now, this is oleo. Here is the carton."

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. The tax was put on largely as a means of revenue for enforcing the pure-food laws. In the early days of oleo, it was largely made from fat instead of from soybeans, which we did not know anything about. Then came coconut oil, which preceded it. But we are going back to the coconut oil again. It was put on to protect the animal fats, which came out of packing houses, which were none too good, so we had some inspection so that they would get fats from healthy animals, and so on. We know that a large part of the coconut oil went into oleomargarine until recently. Now we are getting soybeans, but speaking about any other comparable tax, will the gentleman name one other food product that is so definitely an imitation as oleo is of butter?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I object. We have been waiting patiently for a long time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order previously granted, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the justifications for this proposed legislation are all based upon assumptions, which I hope will prove to be correct, but let us not repeat the error of a year ago.

Actual surplus for the fiscal year 1947 was $754,000,000. Estimated revenue loss from H. R. 1, which passed the House on March 27, 1947, and against which I voted, would have been $3,840,000,000 had it been enacted into law. This is in accordance with Mr. KNUTSON'S statement on that bill. This bill was retroactive to January 1, 1947. Had it passed, there would have been a $750,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year 1947 instead of there actually being $754,000,000 in the black, as the facts show today.

The money was not in the bank for that proposed cut in taxes a year ago. I want to be certain this year that the arguments for the present tax reductions are assumptions which will be verified by facts. Last year those assumptions were incorrect.

Our income for 1948 is assumed; our expenditures for fiscal 1948 are a guess; nobody can foretell the action of Congress on the Marshall plan; and we will not know until May or June what the appropriations situation will actually be. Why not wait until then for a reduction in taxes?

It is assumed that the national income for the 12-month period between July 1, 1948 and June 30, 1949 will be 200 billions. If a moderate recession sets in, that figure could easily be reduced by $10,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000.

It is assumed that Congress will cut the President's estimate of $39,700,000,000 expenditures down by $3,000,000,000. If the opposition of the Democrats to any savings in Government continues as it has in the past, this figure is also just pure assumption. The Senate has already announced they will not take any action on the tax bill until they know more about the size of the cuts in the pending appropriation bills.

As Mr. TABER has said "A $3,000,000,000 cut in appropriations is entirely possible if the Congress does stand up and make the cuts it should." Our first appropriation bill of this session, however, does not show encouraging reductions.

I hope that it will be possible for me to support the compromise bill when it reaches us later in the session after action by the Senate. Today I cannot justify in my own mind a vote for this $6,500,000,000 cut. Conditions, however, proven by facts, may 3 months from now be such that we can be sure our national debt can be reduced by at least three billion and still leave room for a substantial tax reduction this year. I sincerely hope so.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] for any questions he may have to propound or any answers he may have to give on the subject previously under discussion.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I am sure the people in New York should profit by this.

I want to show one more thing of what we are doing in regard to consumer prices and who is to blame for it. Of course, we want the Marshall plan. We want a billion dollars in it for tobacco. I do not know whether they want that in there so they can smoke the Communists out or so they can make insecticide to kill the Communist bug. But we are talking about food all the time and here is a table that shows the exports of tobacco for 1946. Of course,

incidentally, they could not give away as much as they exported during the Republican administration and received cash for it. They could not give it away that fast. But since 1940 we have jumped up from 9 pounds per capita production in the United States to 15 pounds. To show you how ridiculous is the approach to this food program, do you know that on the statute books a law, put on there by this administration, says you cannot even ship tobacco seed over there? You would think they would let them grow their own tobacco so that we would not have to send them a billion dollars' worth of tobacco under the Marshall plan, or any other plan. I do not like to mention this, but I cannot help from showing how ridiculous our food program is. Here we have a law on our books saying that you cannot ship a handful of tobacco seed. This was the most vicious trade barrier ever put on a statute book in this country. This was put in effect when Mr. Cordell Hull was Secretary of State, from the great tobacco State of Tennessee, and when Mr. Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture.

That was a part of the good-neighbor policy, part of the more abundant life, I guess. Think of it, they would not allow people of other countries even to have tobacco seed. I claim that was the worst trade barrier ever erected in the history of this country. It is coming home now to roost when we are now asked to give them a billion dollars' worth of tobacco instead of letting them have a little seed to raise their own tobacco and letting our farmers raise something here for the people to eat. We should be raising food for our people to eat and not be using fertilizer, manpower, and acres to produce a crop we have to give away. Dried skim has 35.6 percent of the best animal protein to be found and it has been purchased at 16 cents per pound or 4 cents per quart. Compare this with 42-cents-per-pound tobacco that will not feed the hungry in any country.

In conclusion, I might call your attention to what is happening to sheep. All the ewes have gone to the blue heaven or to the ewe heaven, I do not know which, because the sheep population has been reduced 35 percent. If we keep on with this policy you will have to take your grandchildren down to the zoo, because that is the only place where you will find a sheep, there will not be any found on the farms of the United States.

So I repeat, keep on pleading for meat rationing and see the meat supply dwindle. Keep on promoting the oleo propaganda and see the babies of America receive less milk. Keep on pulling the economic rug out from under the livestock industry and pour billions into a soil depleting program and you and your children and your children's children will pay the consequences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have come to a miserable impasse in Palestine. Because of Great Britain's curious "neutrality," by which Arabs who attack Jews in a fight against the United Nations' decision, and Jews who defend their lives are both treated alike; because of our own shameful silence at a time when our voice should be raised in protest, blood is being shed that need not be shed, and violence is gaining acceptance among millions as the only solution for international problems.

I do not blame Great Britain alone. I do not excuse our Government. Our sins are sins of omission as well as sins of commission, and one can be as reprehensible as the other. We blew hot in the UN a few weeks ago; we blow cold now. Men and women everywhere are confused. What goes on here? Why is the situation in Palestine allowed to go from bad to worse until it has reached its present abysmal point—a point at which a man is not safe on the streets of the Holy City of Jerusalem?

Why are governments of small Levantine member nations of the United Nations, why are gangster-politicians of such unsavory repute as the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, Hitler's aide during the war, allowed to threaten, bribe, and kill as though this were not the twentieth century but the Middle Ages, and rule by brigand and not by civilized tribunal were the order of government? As though the United Nations itself did not exist?

I say that once again we see what happens when a great power like the United States allows herself to be hamstrung by internal intrigue. I say that the State Department is again thwarting the will not only of the Executive but of the people. I accuse such men as Loy Henderson, enthusiastic but misguided chief of the Middle East office of the State Department, of intriguing behind the scenes to void decisions made on higher levels. Only the other day I was told that the State Department has now virtually locked itself in an ivory tower of its own, and that letters and telegrams sent by men and women, and other indications of the popular will, never reach Secretary Marshall. I do not say he must read these himself, but certainly he should be kept cognizant of what the people feel and how they are reacting to administration policies abroad. If this story is true, something is rotten, and it is not in Denmark.

Why do we allow the Hendersons to talk us into a course of action which has resulted in our losing the respect of both Arabs and Jews? There are people here in Washington who for months have been trying to prevent our Government from backing the United Nations plan. Months ago they warned us that if we supported partition the Arabs would turn to the Soviets.

We supported partition.

Have the Arabs turned to the Soviets?

When that proved unfounded we were warned that the Arabs would cancel their oil concessions, and our stake in the Middle East oil reserves would be endangered if we continued our support of partition.

The United States not only supported partition thereafter; it led the entire United Nations in urging other countries to support it. Partition was voted, 33 to 3. Only 3 non-Moslem nations voted against partition—Cuba, Greece, and India.

Have the Arabs canceled their oil concessions? Quite the opposite. King Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, is now on record as denouncing all such talk as "hot wind." And no one who knows the Middle East is likely to think the Arabs would kill the goose which lays the golden egg. The Arabs know well enough that if war comes the western powers are too distant from the oil fields to hold them.

Far better, say the Arabs, to sell their oil now and get money for it than to find themselves forced to yield it to the Soviet in the future for nothing.

Now new bogies are raised by the British abetted by those in the State Department who wish to see themselves as the real rulers of this country despite the wishes of the vast majority of Americans, as repeatedly manifested on the Palestine issue. Now the cry is that Palestine will fall into the arms of Russia. Remember zionism has always been a crime in Russia. Actually in Jewish Palestine we have a growing economy; we have none of the despair and shabby economic helplessness upon which Russia can feed. The DP's seeking to go to Palestine are fleeing from Communist-dominated lands. They want no part of communism. This Red bogey is just a cruel fake to alienate sentiment for the Jewish state.

These State Department experts have now dropped the suggestion that we shall be embroiled in a war if we carry out what we are covenanted to carry out—the UN decision on Palestine.

War? What war? Who will declare war upon us because of Palestine? Egypt? Saudi Arabia? Lebanon? Great Britain?

Absurdities multiplied by absurdities!

What is needed now is a clear, cold wind to ventilate this problem not the "hot wind" so aptly described by Ibn Saud.

It is time to ask ourselves, what is going on here? Do we have to deal with a group of officials moved only by public interest, or do private interests like oil companies and personal likes and dislikes, however sincerely held, enter into the picture?

I think it is high time for the President and his Cabinet to investigate this matter most thoroughly lest, for the best of motives but misled as to the facts of the situation, they sacrifice the integrity of the American Government.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in the Herald Tribune of Sunday, February 1, 1948.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, permit me to commend my distinguished colleague

from New York for the position that he has so consistently taken on this great problem of the day. He has been a great leader in this movement and I certainly know that those of us who are acquainted with the activity that he has evidenced on behalf of the new State of Palestine will join with him in attempting to reach a satisfactory solution of the pressing problem. Just as our colleague is such a leader he knows that I have been implemented by the counsel and the advice of distinguished and outstanding members of our community in Brooklyn, among whom I might mention several with whom I know our colleague is fully familiar: The Honorable Nathan W. Math, former assistant district attorney of Kings County and presently a distinguished member of the State committee in our great State; County Clerk Francis J. Sinnott, of Kings County, which is Brooklyn, and the Honorable John R. Starkey, a distinguished resident of my colleague's and my neighborhood. These men join, I am sure, in hoping that our colleague will receive the aid and encouragement which he should have in attempting, as I say, to reach a satisfactory solution of this problem.

I see that the United Nations Palestine Commission unanimously decided last Friday to help arrange for the formation of a Jewish militia in Palestine. This, in my opinion, brings up once more the need for Jewish defense forces in Palestine to be given immediate access to American arms and equipment in order that they may defend and perpetuate a decision taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations to partition Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states. Our stand on Palestine should be guided by the United Nations, not by the British, who in this case are engaged, as has been pointed out, in a sordid war and a grudge fight against the Jews. Although it is to our country's credit that it acted positively and decisively in the meeting halls of the United Nations during the period when the partition plan for Palestine was still a matter of debate, the history of our country's activities since November 29—the date that the partition plan was approved—has not been consistent at all with its earlier spirit.

I feel that our Government has evaded its responsibilities. As soon as civil strife broke out in the Holy Land, our Government's attitude became one of seeming indifference. The fact that Palestine had become the target of separate invasions from Syria and Lebanon—two countries which are members of the United Nations—did not apparently cause grave concern to our policy makers.

Our Government chose rather to look the other way. Did we not look the other way when Japan marched into China, when Italy marched into Ethiopia, when Germany marched into Czechoslovakia? It was not wise policy. It only encouraged potential aggressors to bigger and better aggressions.

But again our Government looks the other way. It does not deem it necessary, for example, to raise the question in the Security Council that these separate forays against a neighboring country might constitute an act of aggression. Nor does it choose to consider that these attacks from the outside—and the thousands of individual cases of Arab violence within the country—were directed not only against the Jews of Palestine, but were being launched against the United Nations itself.

It must be remembered that the decision to partition the Holy Land was not a Jewish settlement to the thorny problem of Palestine. It was the judgment of the world's highest tribunal. And in defending themselves against attack, the heroic Jews in Palestine are acting as the only force in the world which is attempting to implement the decision of the United Nations.

I believe that when the United States refused to initiate any action when the first act of aggression against Palestine was committed, our Government not only faltered in its duty as a member of the United Nations, but was running counter to the established traditions of liberty and justice which are the keystones of our country. Our answer to Arab aggression should have been immediate and decisive. Our reply should have been in the form of an immediate announcement that America's arms and materials would be made available to the Jewish militia in Palestine so that sanctity of the UN decision could be upheld. This decisive action would have been in the true American tradition. This policy would have been within the spirit of the decision of the United Nations. It would be moving along the road to solving this difficult problem.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman. He has been of great aid in this endeavor to carry out the aims and aspirations of the Jews in Palestine. He has mentioned some very eminent Brooklynites, and it is very encouraging indeed to have their support as well as the support of the eminent gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the serious situation that exists in Palestine today, and to urge the Government of the United States to take immediate and effective action to cope with this emergency. The problem of Palestine, and the relationships between the Jewish population and the Government of Great Britain, has long been a "festering sore" on the international body politic, and one which demands solution in the interests of world peace.

I have long been concerned with this problem, and have been in sympathy with the Hebrew nation's struggle for freedom and self-government which has awakened the conscience of the civilized world. On July 25, 1947, I felt compelled to address the House, and protest against the mistreatment of the 4,500 Hebrew repatriates aboard the steamship, *Exodus*, and the practices of the British military government in Palestine. I believed then, as I do today, that the United States has a moral obligation to help guarantee the safety of these people.

I was happy when the General Assembly of the United Nations voted on November 29, 1947, to create a separate Jewish state in Palestine. This action was hailed by all men of good faith as a step which was long overdue. It seemed that at long-last the dream of the Hebrew nation for political recogniton was about to be realized—the Jewish DP's in Europe were filled with new hope by the promise of a new home in Palestine.

But the hope and enthusiasm resulting from the UN decision was short-lived. Since that time we have witnessed a series of events which threaten the goal of a free Palestine. Open warfare and aggression has taken place with armed bands of Arabs openly terrorizing, killing, and committing atrocities against the unarmed Jewish population. Furthermore, this Arab revolt with its reign of terror is taking place with the encouragement of the British military government.

The most significant example of British defiance of the United Nations' decision was her failure to observe the February 1 deadline. On Sunday, February 1, according to the decision of the United Nations, ships were supposed to disembark Hebrew displaced persons in the free port of Tel Aviv. At that time the British were also supposed to evacuate this port.

February 1 was the date set by the UN to start the return to Palestine of men, women, and children who have been waiting in concentration camps—some for 10 years—for the chance to return to the promised land. All of these DP's have been behind barbed wire in Europe and Cyprus since "liberation."

Today is February 3, and the British are still in Tel Aviv, and the DP's are still behind barbed wire. The British have given as their excuse the fighting that now rages in Palestine. They point to the fact that over 1,000 persons have been killed and that almost 5,000 have been wounded in recent weeks.

It comes with ill grace from the British to justify the flouting of the United Nations' decision on one hand, when they are busily provoking the bloodshed on the other. Not only have the 100,000 British troops in Palestine stood idly by during the violence, but they have been disarming the Jews while openly assisting the Arab aggressors. To refuse repatriation at this time is to grant a bonus to violence. In other words, the "spontaneous Arab uprising" is paying off. That is what the Mufti wanted—the complete stoppage of repatriation.

The lesson is simple. The British hope that by continuing the violence in Palestine, repatriation will never resume. Continue the violence and the United Nations decisions will be washed away in blood. This is operation chaos, conceived by the British Foreign Office, designed to defeat the United Nations plan to create the Hebrew state.

We cannot let this go unnoticed and unchallenged. As a member of the United Nations, the United States cannot remain passive. We have a legal and a moral obligation to take the lead in backing up this major decision of the United Nations. In my opinion, the United States should take the following three steps:

First. Lift the arms embargo which was imposed by our State Department on December 5, which leaves the Hebrew people defenseless against the armed Arab aggressors. In this emergency we should permit the people of Palestine to buy arms for self-defense.

Second. Our Government should insist that repatriation of Jewish DP's to Palestine be accelerated, and we should provide the transportation facilities for this purpose.

And third, the United States delegation to the Security Council of the United Nations insists that steps be taken to halt the aggression against Palestine, and to implement its decision.

Mr. Speaker, let us act now, before it is too late. Unless immediate and decisive action is taken on the part of the United States, all hopes for a free Palestine may be lost. We cannot afford to become an accomplice to such a betrayal.

THE EMBARGO MUST BE LIFTED

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I might say to my colleague from New York that I am happy to join with him and those of our colleagues who are here in raising our voices in support of this great problem which is facing the world, and I want to commend those of our colleagues who remained here to this late hour.

I think the gentleman will agree with me that this is not a Jewish problem alone by any means. This problem is not limited or confined to any religious group or to any specific geographic location. For that reason I am particularly happy that those colleagues of ours who have spoken on this issue and who will follow me feel as I do that the time has come when we must raise our voices, not only in this body and in the other body, but throughout the world so that the people can appreciate and realize that this is not our problem alone; it is the problem of the entire Nation and of the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Government has great responsibilities in a world which includes death, suffering, hunger, and despair.

We cannot, we must not, we dare not close our eyes to international problems when the lives and welfare of human beings are at stake.

This Government earned and received the acclaim of the civilized world by taking the lead in the United Nations Assembly to bring about a favorable vote last November on partition of Palestine.

Since that time, however, the British foreign office and the Middle East division of our own State Department have climbed back in the saddle, and by our actions, if not by our words, that bold beginning is being disavowed.

On Palestine, the American Government is suffering from a severe form of split personality.

PROMISES MUST BE FULFILLED

On one side are the warm-hearted, humanitarian and adult impulses of the President and of most Americans, determined that the promises made to world Jewry during and after World War I shall be fulfilled and that a Jewish state in the Jewish homeland shall be created.

On the other side are the cold-blooded diplomats and international oil barons, equally determined that the sacred obligations of international treaties shall not be permitted to interfere with profits.

They are plotting and planning, using Arab feudalism and Pan-Arabian nationalism, Russophobia, and the bitter Moslem religious fanaticism as convenient pawns in their games of war, intrigue, and money.

We must reject utterly that cold-blooded and cruel attitude toward the real and human problems of Palestine.

Take away the international greed for the oil of Araby and the Jews and the Arabs will quickly settle their few differences and live side by side in peace and prosperity.

If the British will not live up to their own treaty obligations and to their obligations to uphold majority decisions of the United Nations, then we must not only permit but help the Jews of Palestine to gain the necessary weapons for their own self-preservation.

The British Government has flatly refused to allow the Jewish militia to arm itself.

BRITISH PREDICT CALAMITIES

The British have refused to give to the Jewish militia the status of a legal and recognized police force, although the British armed forces in Palestine have demonstrated that they are unwilling to preserve order and to protect the lives and property of Jews and Arabs against violence and destruction and murder.

The British have refused to get out of Palestine until next May 15; they have refused to allow the United Nations Palestine Commission to enter Palestine until May 1; and they have flatly warned the members of the commission that they are in danger of attack or even death from the Arabs. They have warned the UN commission that violence will increase with the end of the mandate and that the United Nations will mean nothing to the Arabs.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, if the British thus incite the Arabs to greater violence, express their approval in advance, and refuse to allow the Jews to prepare for national defense when the new Palestinian Government must assume its responsibilities, the Arabs will do what the British predict. That is like saying, in advance, that they wish these calamities to occur.

In support of this outworn policy of British imperialism, the United States Government has arbitrarily imposed a rigid embargo on the shipment of arms and military and police supplies to Palestine.

THE WARNING IS CLEAR

I do not doubt for a moment the legal right of Loy Henderson and his Middle Eastern Division of the State Department to deprive the Jews in Palestine of all possibility of arming themselves against the thugs and brigands who compose the mercenary Arab forces of the Mufti.

I do doubt the moral and ethical right of Mr. Henderson to reverse the enlightened and noble policies of the President and of the Secretary of State, to hinder and sabotage and frustrate the execution of those policies, and to connive with the worst elements in the British Government and the international oil cartels to stultify the United Nations Commission on Palestine.

The warning is clear.

We must either carry out the obligations we have assumed like a mature Nation, with the dignity and consistency demanded by our unlimited strength and power, or we must be prepared to retreat from every part of the world in ignominious defeat and shame.

The embargo must be lifted; the British must be forced to accept in full the decision of the United Nations, and to actively cooperate in bringing that decision to full force and effect; and the Jewish militia forces must be legalized and armed to enable the Jewish state to stand alone, when the time comes, against all the forces of evil.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to join with my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in expressing despair and a feeling of shock at the state of affairs in Palestine. On behalf of the Pittsburgh Zionist Emergency Council held in January of this year a communication was addressed to me by Dr. Alex Lowenthal, chairman of the Pittsburgh Zionist Emergency Council.

Since November 29, 1947, the situation in Palestine has deteriorated continuously. This deterioration has been due mainly to the noncooperation and obstruction of the British Government to the UN decision. Also the policy of the United States has been encouraging to both the Arabs in Palestine and the Arab states surrounding Palestine to violate and disobey the UN decision. These actions have been: First, an embargo on the shipment of arms to Palestine; second, the failure to warn Arab states about the consequences of their interference in Palestine; third, statements by high officials of our Government questioning the soundness of American policy in advocating participation; fourth, failure to take any action within the UN toward the establishment of an international police force; and, fifth, permitting a general atmosphere of alarm which may have disastrous effects on American public opinion, which, in turn, may undermine the entire structure and effectiveness of the UN.

The Jews of America are shocked by this reversal of attitude. And so is every right-thinking American who wants to see the decision of the UN carried out in its true light.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

In conclusion, I want to point out two very marked derelictions of the British Government in connection with instructions laid down by the United Nations decision on Palestine.

In part 1, subdivision (a) we find this significant language:

The mandatory power shall use its best endeavors to insure that an area situated in the territory of the Jewish state including

a seaport and hinterland adequate to provide facilities for a substantial immigration, shall be evacuated at the earliest possible date and in any event not later than the 1st of February 1948.

The 1st of February has come and gone. The purpose of that language was instructions to the mandatory power to allow the Jews to use a seaport, either Tel Aviv or Haifa, for purposes of immigration and for the entry of supplies necessary to sustain life and for military material. February 1 has come and gone and the British refuse to set aside or set up that seaport for the use of the Jews as indicated.

Secondly, I draw your attention to this significant language in part 8 of the decisions of the United Nations on partition:

The Provisional Council of Government of each state shall, within the shortest time possible, recruit an armed militia from the residents of that state sufficient in number to maintain internal order and to prevent frontier clashes. This armed militia in each state shall for operational purposes be under the command of Jewish or Arab officers resident in that state, but general political and military control, including the choice of the militia's high command shall be exercised by the commission.

That language specifically provides for the setting up by the Arabs in their state of their own militia and by the Jews in their state of their militia, but Great Britain refuses point blank to allow the Jews to set up their militia. They have what is known as the Haganah, which means "defense," which is a militia in a way, but these members of the Haganah, if they seek to patrol the roads or defend the lives of their own people or to defend the decision of the United Nations against raiding marauders, are disarmed by the British and jailed as malefactors, despite this very significant language I have just read to you.

Over and beyond that, how can you have a militia if arms are denied you?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Were the British a party to the instrument from which you have quoted?

Mr. CELLER. The British are members of the United Nations and are sworn, with the other members to uphold the decisions of the United Nations.

Mr. KEATING. What excuse or reason do they give for being unwilling to open a port or to allow the arming of the militia?

Mr. CELLER. They say that as long as they are in Palestine as the mandatory power it is incumbent upon them to maintain law and order and they do not want the authority to be divided. But they do not maintain law and order. Their position is insincere and perfidious. I would say if they did maintain law and order, pending the transition period, there might not be need for a militia, but insofar as they have refused to maintain that law and order, they assume a dog-in-the-manger attitude: "We will not risk the lives of our British soldiers and we will not let you either maintain law and order." The Jews can take care of their own. There are about 70,000 of that Haganah. They can very well take care of themselves. If there were no outside assistance given to the Arabs, as, for example, from Syria, Lebanon, and the neighboring states, and if they were plenifully supplied with arms. We placed an embargo on arms. Of what avail is that embargo on arms if Britain places no embargo on arms? Great Britain has just completed a military pact with Iraq, under which tanks, planes, and military vehicles have been sent to Iraq. Only a child would say that that military matériel does not find its way or is not routed into Palestine.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. The gentleman stated that Britain has placed no embargo on arms. What the gentleman meant was that Great Britain has placed no embargo on the shipment of arms to the Arabs. You do not imply that Great Britain is helping arm the Haganah?

Mr. CELLER. No; indeed not. But I am saying there can be no efficacious embargoing of arms just by the United States if the supporting nations like Iraq, Iran, Trans-Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt, who opposed partition, can get a plentiful supply of arms, and they, in turn, can route their arms into Palestine. So our embargo on arms is a nullity as far as trying to keep arms from the Arabs is concerned. It weighs the scale deliberately in favor of the Arabs and against the Jews.

Mr. KEATING. So that the effect of our embargoing arms is to help the arming of the Arabs but prevents the arming of the Jews. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman states it perfectly and very eloquently.

Mr. KEATING. Are arms available to the Jews from other countries?

Mr. CELLER. No; because the Jews are not a sovereign state. The Jewish agency is not a sovereign nation and is in no position to purchase arms. Whatever arms they have they have made themselves or have secured surreptitiously.

The Arab nations, however, are sovereign nations and they can purchase. For example, the embargo that we placed on arms does not cover some of the Moslem nations that voted against partition. It originally did not cover Yemen until I drew attention to the fact and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] drew attention to the fact. Then they suddenly included Yemen. We know, though, that whatever arms were sent to Yemen will find their way eventually into Palestine.

The embargo presently does not include Pakistan. It does not include Turkey, and we know again that arms sent to those Moslem countries will eventually find their way into Palestine.

If we try to be neutral, if we say we are neutral and therefore place an embargo on arms we are doing the very opposite of neutrality.

And then, may I ask this? Who said we were neutral? We were not neutral when we voted for partition. We were not neutral when we led the fight for partition. That was not neutrality. We took a definite stand. We must, therefore, be logical and do everything in our power to uphold the position we took at the United Nations.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest and concern to the speeches made here on the unhappy subject of Palestine. My concern springs from several reasons. In the first place, I do not like to see organized violence or aggression anywhere in the world. History should have taught us that aggression, unless checked immediately, has a habit of spreading.

I am further concerned with the particular subject of Palestine because it is a subject on which the Congress of the United States, the two great political parties, and American public opinion are very clearly on record as favoring a Jewish state and large-scale Jewish immigration.

Finally, I am clearly concerned over the fact that the executive branch of our Government, after having exercised its influence in accordance with the wishes of the American people, and after having contributed to the wise solution of the Palestine question by the United Nations, is now wavering.

I do not like, generally speaking, for Congress to give advice to the Executive in a sphere which is normally an Executive responsibility. Palestine is a matter of foreign policy, and under our system, an Executive responsibility. But it is incumbent on us to remember that in the conduct of American foreign policy we must always be inspired by certain principles and rules.

We must always be certain that the integrity of our Government can never be questioned. We must always be certain that we are keeping faith with the United Nations, not only in the letter but also in the spirit. And we must always be certain that, as befits our democratic and popular form of government, American foreign policy is responsive to the wishes of the American people and of its representatives in Congress.

Are we certain that in the matter of Palestine we are following each and every one of these fundamental principles? As Members of Congress we must be most careful and vigilant.

I see there is a lot of speculation in the newspapers as to who is responsible for the questions now the subject of so much discussion—whether it is the President, a Secretary of one of our major governmental departments, or this or that official. I do not know the answer, and perhaps it doesn't matter very much. Under our Constitution the President heads the executive branch of our Government. If any subordinate official pursues a policy contrary to the President's instructions, it is up to the Presi-

dent to compel a sharp about-face. If the President permits the continuance of a variation in policy, it becomes his policy. The Congress of the United States is not concerned with individual officials. It is concerned with general policy. As to that, I join those who spoke before me in expressing the hope of an immediate and enlightened correction of those activities, or lack of activites, which are causing so much concern.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. McMAHON (at the request of Mr. LATHAM), indefinitely, on account of official business;

To Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania, for February 4, 5, and 6, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1195. An act to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1478. An act to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the Department of the Army to the Interior Department; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (48 Stat. 387), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1520. An act to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1528. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury to accept and use gifts, devises, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of the Treasury, respectively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1605. An act to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $12,000,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 172. Joint Resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1826. An act making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 4, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1279. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1280. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfer to the city of Blaine, Wash., a motor barge or a craft of similar type; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1281. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Second Quarterly Report, required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1282. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $2,212,000 for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office (H. Doc. No. 519); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1283. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $700,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 520); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1284. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $5,545,500 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 521); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1285. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $86,627,228 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 522); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 522. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1133. An act providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1507. An act authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel addition to the town of Polson, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2159. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare plans and estimates for a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3603. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3628. A bill to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3685. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3936. A bill to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4023. A bill to authorize the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4027. A bill to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4461. A bill approving the performance in the field of certain functions relating to the public lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4462. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming; with amendments (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4515. A bill to provide for selection of superintendents of national cemeteries from meritorious and trustworthy male members of the armed forces who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4823. A bill to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4980. A bill relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4513. A bill to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 61. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Park River dam and reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 150. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Monument, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 296. Joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; with amendments (Rept. No. 1319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5052. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 310. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Jonah Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 311. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Ghost Bear, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 312. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Kills the Enemy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 313. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Calvin W. Clincher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 402. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 499. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Bessie Two Elk-Poor Bear; without amendment (Rept. No. 1315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 500. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 542. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Ella White Bull; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4118. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 5259. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to permit certain payments to be made to the estates of former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5260. A bill to ratify the administrative promotions of employees on military furlough from the field postal service, in certain cases, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5261. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5262. A bill to authorize the sale of Indian lands acquired under the act of June 18, 1934 and under the act of June 26, 1926; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5263. A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of certain real property quitclaim deeds to the minerals in or under such property; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5264. A bill to provide for the commitment, detention, and treatment of criminal sexual psychopaths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 5265. A bill to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 5266. A bill to amend section 3 of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 5267. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 5268. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution to place temporary restrictions on the exportation of certain petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. Res. 452. Resolution to request the Secretary of Agriculture to take action to prevent damage to valuable crops as a result of the use of the weed killer known as 2,4–D; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 5269. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Hondros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5270. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5271. A bill for the relief of Dolan Calcutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1295. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 22 residents of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, urging the passage of Senate Bill 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1296. By Mr. Dondero: Petition of citizens of the Seventeenth Congressional District of Michigan, urging favorable consideration of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1297. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Logansport, Ind., in support of H. R. 2716; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1298. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 30 residents of East Liverpool, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting the enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1299. Also, petition of 21 residents of Barnesville and Quaker City, Ohio, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1300. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of 23 residents of Greensboro, two of Ridgely, and one resident of Denton, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1301. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of citizens of the towns of Guilford and Madison, Conn., for favorable action on the European recovery program, popularly known as the Marshall plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1302. Also, petition of members of the American Legion Auxiliary, and others, of Moodus and Meriden, Conn., in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James D. Bryden, assistant minister, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, we invoke Thy blessing upon the Senate of the United States and pray for the Senators who are met and will meet here this day. As they seek solutions to the complex and perplexing problems of our time, give them breadth of vision to see the good of all the people, and grant unto each one personal resources sufficient for the day.

We confess that we do often forget Thee, but we know that Thou dost not forget us. Thou hast girded us with strength when we have thought the strength to be our own. Continue this mercy toward us, and foster within us humble and thankful hearts. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMFORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY P. CAIN, a Senator from the State of Washington, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CAIN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 3, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart;

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union";

S. 1394. An act to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman.

The message also further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1796) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 332. An act for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson;

H. R. 350. An act for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.;

H. R. 380. An act for the relief of Edward L. Barreras;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson;

H. R. 1022. An act for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 1878. An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter Isabel Joan Cogan;

H. R. 2000. An act for the relief of Jeffersonville Flood Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation;

H. R. 2214. An act for the relief of Dave Hougardy;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo;

H. R. 2433. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.;

H. R. 2697. An act for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.;

H. R. 2914. An act for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3089. An act for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.;

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3425. An act for the relief of the Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc.;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3506. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site for a new Federal building in Huntington, W. Va., adjoining existing Federal buildings there, as an economy measure, before land values have increased as a result of improvements;

H. R. 3968. An act for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav;

H. R. 4400. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein;

H. R. 4426. An act to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4427. An act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4443. An act for the relief of Jacob Cohen;

H. R. 4836. An act to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.;

H. R. 4838. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4967. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building and for remodeling of the existing main post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HAROLD M. STEPHENS TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 18, 1948, at 10:15 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Harold M. Stephens, of Utah, to be Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. D. Lawrence Groner, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES M. PROCTOR TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 18, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of James M. Proctor, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Harold M. Stephens, elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD ALLEN TAMM TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in

accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 18, 1948, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. James M. Proctor, elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], chairman; the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]; and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. LANGER asked and obtained consent that members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dealing with REA, be excused from attendance on the Senate for the remainder of the afternoon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MOORE asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the Senate for the remainder of this afternoon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventeenth and last report of the Attorney General, covering the period from October 1, 1947, through January 25, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BUREAU OF MINES ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory to be constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board of Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from Mathilda D. Miller, national chairman, Commission on Law and Social Action, Women's Division, American Jewish Congress, and Anna Center Schneiderman, national chairman, Committee on Education, Women's Division, American Jewish Congress, relating to the furnishing of arms to the Jewish people in Palestine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway which was adopted on October 15, 1947, by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I am strong for the St. Lawrence seaway, as are the farmers in my part of the country, and I am pleased to cooperate every way I can with the program.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Be it resolved, That we consider the St. Lawrence seaway project to be one of the resources which should be immediately developed; that authorization for immediate construction of this project is desirable, and we hereby reaffirm our resolution (asking for its immediate development) adopted at the last annual meeting of this association, at Buffalo, N. Y., March 6, 1946.

"Whereas there is a serious and growing power shortage throughout the United States; and

"Whereas all possible new generating capacity is needed whether provided by the commercial power companies or by the Federal Government, State agencies, municipalities, or cooperatives; and

"Whereas the rural electrification program throughout the United States is being slowed down and even threatened by lack of adequate wholesale power; and

"Whereas it is in the public interest to harness the Nation's potential hydropower and make that power available through transmission lines directly to distribution agencies including electric cooperatives: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be urged to expand, as rapidly as possible, the program for the production of power generally, and particularly projects in our region on the St. Lawrence River, the Roanoke River, Savannah River, and other multiple-purpose projects recommended by the Corps of Engineers."

CERTIFICATION

I, Avery C. Moore, secretary-treasurer of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, hereby certify that the above resolutions were adopted unanimously, the first by the rural electric systems of the United States in session at Spokane, Wash., April 24, 1947, and the second by the rural electric systems of region I (the Atlantic seaboard States—Maine to North Carolina, inclusive) in session at Albany, N. Y., October 15, 1947.

[SEAL] AVERY C. MOORE,
Secretary-Treasurer, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
JANUARY 21, 1948.

DEATH OF MOHANDAS K. GANDHI

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Ambassador Warren R. Austin, United States representative at the seat of the United Nations, before the Security Council, upon the death of Mohandas K. Gandhi.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the assassination of Mohandas K. Gandhi, who for more than a generation has valiantly blazed a trail toward the goal of a nonviolent world, comes as a deep blow to me, and, I am sure, to the people of the United States and peoples everywhere.

It is fitting that we should sit here charged with the grave responsibility of maintaining peace among nations and pay tribute to this great Indian leader, who, over the years, has done so much to bring home to his fellow countrymen the moral and spiritual lessons which are essential for the achievement of world peace and brotherhood. It is indeed tragic that his death has come at a time of tension and crisis when these qualities of restraint and moderation which so characterized the man are desperately needed.

Gandhi fell a martyr to the great cause of cooperation among all nations and communities, and although we shall, together with all peace-loving peoples, mourn his loss, we earnestly hope that his martyrdom will inspire the peoples of the United Nations to press forward with even greater determination to achieve those ideals for which he stood.

I express to the distinguished representative of India and his Government and his people the profound sympathy of the mission of the United States to the United Nations.

SCHOOLS AND THE RACIAL QUESTION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have seen in recent weeks many highly emotional and ill-considered statements in the press about racial matters in our schools. On January 30 the Arkansas Gazette carried a statement by the chairman of the board of the University of Arkansas, Mr. Herbert L. Thomas, dealing with this subject, which I believe is one of the most sensible pronouncements I have seen. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD, for the benefit of all those who are interested in the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. THOMAS' STATEMENT

Personally, I feel that an attempt to force admittance into the University of Arkansas by a Negro in undergraduate work is an error of judgment. The race is making economic and educational progress in Arkansas, and there is a large portion of our citizens who are strongly backing an educational program that is fast leading to accredited schools.

Economic and educational opportunities should be a logical goal of any member of any race. Segregation is a more involved and complex problem, and neither North, South, East, nor West can truthfully say that nonsegregation by all races is practiced by them. The immigration quota which is so strongly supported by the East and the West is nothing more than one form of national segregation and prejudice. I do not believe the solution of problems comes from sectional name-calling, but I call attention to the immigration question as one of many discriminations merely that we not be isolated in the judgments of peoples as the only section with unsolved prejudices. Many many more could be cited.

I even believe if a court demands correction of social, economic, and racial discrimination, it could and should give a reasonable time to make adjustments. The precedent for this lies in the ruling on the discriminatory freight rate case which gave time for a gradual adjustment. The recent ruling on fire insurance rate making is another example of extension of time for making reasonable adjustment.

This problem that is an accumulated problem of many years needs the enlightened help of the best thinkers of our time. And if this is sympathetically given, sound objectives can be reached reasonably soon.

It is barely possible that with the Negro race reaching a satisfactory economic and

education standard that they themselves would want segregation. It is possible that if they reach these high standards that the white race would not insist upon segregation but when rapid progress is being made on the question of Negro education, it seems a mistake to inject the question of segregation at this time.

It is the responsibility of the people of the State to decide whether they wish to furnish adequate educational facilities with or without segregation. It seems to be the responsibility of the court to allow adequate or not to allow adequate time to accomplish this purpose.

With the Negro college in Pine Bluff furnishing courses in business education, and with the facilities for undergraduate work at the university to capacity, I feel that any Negro student applying for undergraduate work will be rejected and any qualified Negro applying for graduate work will be accepted. This question of course will be discussed at our coming board meeting and from official policy adopted and announced publicly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that following the statement I have just inserted in the RECORD there may be printed an editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of Saturday, January 31, 1948, entitled "The University's Wise Decision."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY'S WISE DECISION

The involved issue of admitting Negroes to Arkansas' institutions of higher education has now been raised, and faced squarely by officials of the University of Arkansas. Without impairment of the State's existing social pattern, the university is moving to provide Arkansas Negroes with adequate instruction in fields of graduate study not available to them in other State institutions. At the same time it is insisting that the undergraduate schools remain segregated.

It was an issue that could no longer be avoided. Like the other Southern States, Arkansas has not provided its Negro students with the separate but equal educational facilities required by decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Experience in Missouri, Texas, and now Oklahoma has left no doubt as to the Court's decision if a test case involving the university were brought. The choice was between providing a Negro graduate school at prohibitive cost or giving qualified Negro graduate students access to existing facilities at Fayetteville.

In taking this inevitable step before a court decision forced precipitate action, Arkansas has gained time to make the difficult adjustments it involves. More than that, the university and State officials who supported this action have given concrete evidence of Arkansas' willingness to provide an adequate education for every Negro citizen who can qualify for it, recognizing, as Board Chairman Herbert Thomas said, that "economic and educational opportunities should be the logical goal of any member of any race." The practical result already may be seen in the decision of Wiley A. Branton, the Negro who had applied for admission to the undergraduate school at the university, to withdraw his application and accept admission to the Negro college at Pine Bluff if adequate courses are provided there.

Mr. Thomas, President Lewis Webster Jones, and the other officials concerned have taken the bold and forthright stand demanded by the logic of a situation that was not of their choosing. Their action reflects great credit upon Arkansas. They deserve, and we are confident they will have, the support of all our citizens.

THE PACIFIC FISHERIES CONFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for a long time the fisheries industries on both the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts have been concerned with the mechanics of handling fisheries matters in the State Department, and have urged a raising of the policy level for the benefit of those interested in fisheries. That culminated in several conferences at which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and I conferred with the State Department. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very fine analysis in regard to those conferences with State Department officials.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PACIFIC FISHERIES CONFERENCE

The Pacific Fisheries Conference is an organization composed of representatives of management and labor drawn from the entire industry, and speaking for all segments of the fishing operation from the initial activity of the taking of the fish, through to the final processes of marketing and distribution. The operations of the various units of this group are centered along the Pacific coast of the United States including Alaska. In this matter they are speaking in behalf, not only of their own interests, but in the interest of other extensive fisheries of this Nation which operate off the Atlantic coast, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes, and in a spirit of deep concern for the general welfare of our Nation.

FISH—A VALUABLE COMMODITY; FISHERY—AN ESSENTIAL RIGHT

Since time dating back beyond the written history of mankind, the peoples of the world who have had access to the food supplies of the sea have relied upon fish as a major and in many cases a principal factor in their subsistence. A nutritious and well-balanced food supply is a determining factor in human existence. Protein foods are a necessity in any scheme of diet and the fish of the sea offer these protein elements in a combination well adapted for human sustenance. The seas offer an opportunity for the harvesting of a vast food crop which does not need to be replanted, fertilized, or cultivated, a food crop which not only contains the essential proteins but equally important vitamins, minerals, oils, and acids.

The seas are bounteous. Dr. R. A. Gortner, Jr., an expert on protein foods for the National Research Council, states that man-hours spent in fishing produce from 4 to 10 times as many pounds of food as those spent by a farmer in raising hogs which are considered the most efficient of all farm animals in the making of meat. Dr. Kahn, Chief Statistician of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, reports that the average farmer produces annually 34,500 pounds of food while the efforts of each fisherman yields 47,000 pounds. It should be noted in this connection that the fisherman's production is principally the essential type of protein food containing oils of the high caloric value while much of the farmer's production includes the starchy type of foods which are more available and susceptible to production in all areas.

Today there exists in the world a definite and growing shortage of protein foods. Fishery products constitute the most readily available supply to remedy this shortage. The production of other protein foods such as meat, eggs, dairy products, depend also upon a plentiful supply of other foods. Cattle, sheep, hogs, and poultry must be fed so this supply of protein foods will fluctuate with the available supply of the grains and starches. Fish food, on the other hand, develops through the absorption of the inexhaustible supply of organisms which abound the oceans, and man does not need to take from one element of his subsistence to create another.

With the pressure of increasing populations demanding an ever greater increase in food production, it is certain the race to participate in this harvest from the oceans of the world will increase its tempo and the competition to control these supplies will become more keen.

It is at this point that consideration of the fishery must change from the aspect of commodity to that of a right, for fish are not a commodity until they have been taken.

Certain areas of the seas of the world have been discovered to be more productive than others. These areas from the time of discovery have often been focal points of bitterness and strife in the past, and indeed, well up into modern times. The Japanese-Russian incidents in Kamchatka which involved sinkings and bloodshed, the Japanese invasion of Bristol Bay in 1938 which might have been the match to set off World War II had the issue not been handled firmly and with dispatch, the many minor incidents relative to the North Atlantic fishery, and a constantly increasing series of difficulties encountered in the operation of American fishing boats off the coasts of Mexico, the Central American nations, and the west coast of South America, all indicate that the problem of the "right of fisheries" cannot only become acute and a threat to world peace, but that there is a growing tension because of the lack of any set and established principles of international law regarding the control and administration of such rights as may be claimed on the high seas.

This tension is certain to become heightened as nations recovering from the effect of war begin to expand their fishing activities. The advances in knowledge gained through war operations will hurry this expansion. In other times fishing operations, except those of a few specialized types, were more or less confined to within reasonable distances of the home ports of fishing fleets. Today fishing craft have equipment and fuel capacity to travel thousands of miles and to refrigerate their catch for preservation during long trips This ability to reach out to vast distances will be further increased as the principle of operation with mother ships, large freezer or cannery units, which can accompany the fishing boats, carrying necessary supplies and fuel, and offering an opportunity for disposal of their catches without long round trips between port and the fishing grounds.

Japan, prior to the war, was the greatest fishery nation of the world through early development of this type of operation. Russia today owns a large fleet of refrigerator and cannery mother ships obtained from this country during the war, a fishing asset, by the way, that we do not possess ourselves. Our own fishing interests are seeking to remedy this condition. The initial units of a fleet which can range the entire Pacific are now being readied for service. Norway and other maritime nations are planning similar ventures, and Japan is driving hard to obtain permission to resume her former methods of fishery.

Under these circumstances it is evident that "rights of fishery" can no longer be safeguarded by the limitations of distance. The fisherman of any nation can reach and operate on any fishery that is sufficiently productive to make the venture economically sound.

The international character of the ocean fisheries and the international complications that may well arise from their exploitation is well indicated in the proclamation of September 28, 1945, by the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of United States. This proclamation, which asserts the rights of the United States to the natural resources of the continental shelf contiguous to the coasts of this Nation and its territories, sets forth certain principles for the conservation and regulation of the fisheries in these areas. They may be expressed in brief as follows:

1. Fisheries, which have been developed by nationals of the United States alone, or which may hereafter be so developed and maintained shall be fully regulated and controlled by the United States.

2. In areas where the nationals of other countries have developed or shall develop such fisheries, zones and regulations may be established by joint agreement between the United States and other states.

3. The United States will recognize the rights of other countries to establish conservation zones off their own coasts where the interests of nationals of the United States are recognized in the same manner in which we recognize the rights of other nationals.

Here is a statement of policy which recognizes the international character of these fishery rights and which clearly anticipates that international complications will arise in the exploitation of these rights.

Unfortunately this proclamation has never been implemented. Other nations of the Western Hemisphere have seized upon the principles embodied in this proclamation and not only implemented but extended them.

The result has been that the operation of American fishing vessels has often been obstructed, and the operators themselves subjected to delays, bans, and difficulties, which could well be cleared up by aggressive action on the part of our Government toward implementing its own fishery policies, and, toward definite correlation of these policies through treaties and agreements with such other nations. Until such action is taken we cannot expect the proper development of the fishery of this Nation nor the certainty that this Nation will retain its rightful share of the high-seas food resources.

OUR FISHING INDUSTRY

This problem should not be considered from the standpoint of the fishing industry and the fortunes of those engaged in it, alone.

We have previously discussed at some length the value of the fishery resources as an adjunct to the national diet. The importance of the possession of the right to take an equitable share of this world food supply, and the facilities, in trained manpower and material, to so capture it, were never more emphasized than during the recent war. Then the Nation's fishing industry was called upon, despite a shortage of manpower and the requisitioning of much of its operating material to expand its production. While other combatants suffered from food shortages and an inadequate diet the people of this Nation never suffered from a lack of a balanced and energy-building food supply. The contributions of our fishing industry did much to maintain this condition during the entire war period.

In addition to this contribution the industry gave thousands of trained seafarers and boat operators to our naval forces, and the fishing fleet itself contributed units of extreme value in the operations of picketing convoy, and supply of advanced stations of the Army and Navy.

It is no secret that high Navy officials are of the opinion, today, that if the extensive fishing operations in the vicinity of the Hawaiian Islands had been carried on by our own nationals instead of the Japanese, the disaster of Pearl Harbor might have been avoided. The fishing fleets of the postwar era include large, fast units with extended cruising ranges and in many instances are equipped with radar and other devices that would render their use as eyes of great importance to those charged with conduct of military operations.

If we are to maintain and expand this industry which provides the Nation with a vital food supply and which can become an effective military arm in case of war it is evidently necessary that our Government must take such steps as may assure and safeguard the rights of our nationals engaged in its operation so that they may survive in competition with the fishery industries of other nations.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the preceding statements the fishing industry urges that this Government take immediate steps toward the activation of the Presidential proclamation of 1945, herein cited, and toward the consummation of treaties, agreements, and/or pacts with other nations claiming rights of fisheries, to the end that the rights of United States citizens engaged in the fishing industry will be clearly safeguarded and defined, and, in order that fishing areas developed and discovered by our nationals be protected and regulated, and the food resource involved conserved, we urge that a strong stand be taken to assure our citizens engaged in this industry equal rights with those of any other nation in fishing operations on high seas.

The industry feels that such steps can be taken, only through the assignment of the duties and responsibilities involved in the handling of these problems to an Assistant Secretary of State who shall be primarily responsible for fishery matters, and whose functions in regard to these responsibilities shall represent the principal part of his duties within the Department. Such an official should be supported by an adequate staff including men with a personal knowledge of the fishery problems. Pressure is developing from many sources at the present time for the promulgation of treaties and agreements which involve fishery problems. The treaty with Japan is a current and very serious problem and fishery factors are vitally involved. The Russian situation in the Pacific is as yet unclarified, and may, at any time, become acute for the great salmon resources of the two countries lie side by side. Problems are arising daily as fishing operations are extended in the North and South Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico, and in the North Atlantic. The industry sincerely believes that action, such as suggested above, must be taken now if the interests of this country are to be safeguarded.

In conclusion, we respectfully ask that such an assignment of fishery matters be made within the Department to the end that the Department official charged with this grave responsibility can meet on an equal level with the high-ranking officials, many of ministerial rank, who have been given such assignments by other governments, who have already realized the importance of this problem.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1801. A bill to authorize attendance of civilians at schools conducted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and Joint-Service schools, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 883).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 2126. A bill to provide a coordinated anti-inflation program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2127. A bill relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 2128. A bill for the relief of Vaso B. Benderach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2129. A bill for the relief of Dr. Margaret Hie Ding Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2130. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay a bounty for the destruction of crows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to a Senate bill to be reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency providing for the extension of rent control, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

THE PLACE OF THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD AFFAIRS—ADDRESS BY H. R. CULLEN

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Place of the United States in World Affairs," by H. R. Cullen, in Houston, Tex., January 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMBARGO ON SHIPMENT OF ARMS TO PALESTINE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Secretary Marshall on January 16, 1948, and a reply to him from the State Department, dated January 26, 1948, dealing with the subject of the embargo of arms to Palestine, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S OBLIGATIONS IN THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject, America's Obligations to the United Nations as a Result of the Action Taken in Regard to the Partition of Palestine, prepared by him, and printed in the New York Post on January 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPIRITUAL SURGERY—ADDRESS BY DR. PETER MARSHALL, CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Altered Ideas Needed, Says Dr. Marshall," published in the Richmond News Leader of February 3, 1948, being an outline of an address by Dr. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, at Richmond, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 332. An act for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson;

H. R. 350. An act for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.;

H. R. 380. An act for the relief of Edward L. Barreras;

H. R. 697. An act for the relief of Mrs. Essie N. Fannin, Miss Helen Hicks, Miss Marie Hicks, Miss Frances Fannin, William O. Thompson, and Mrs. W. D. Thompson;

H. R. 1022. An act for the relief of Peter Bednar, Francisca Bednar, Peter Walter Bednar, and William Joseph Bednar;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 1878. An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States;

H. R. 1915. An act for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Edwin Osgood Cogan, his wife, Helen Olga Cogan, and his daughter, Isabel Joan Cogan;

H. R. 2000. An act for the relief of Jeffersonville Flood Control District, Jeffersonville, Ind., a municipal corporation;

H. R. 2214. An act for the relief of Dave Hougardy;

H. R. 2268. An act for the relief of Charles E. Crook and B. L. Fielder;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo;

H. R. 2433. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.;

H. R. 2697. An act for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.;

H. R. 2914. An act for the relief of Hasslet-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.;

H. R. 3089. An act for the relief of Mississippi Central Railroad Co.;

H. R. 3366. An act to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 78), as amended, to permit public libraries of the United States to acquire back copies of United States letters patent, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3425. An act for the relief of the Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc.;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3968. An act for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav;

H. R. 4400. An act for the relief of Ben Grunstein;

H. R. 4443. An act for the relief of Jacob Cohen; and

H. R. 4838. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3506. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site for a new Federal building in Huntington, W. Va., adjoining existing Federal buildings there, as an economy measure, before land values have increased as a result of improvements;

H. R. 4836. An act to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.; and

H. R. 4967. An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building and for remodeling of the existing main post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4426. An act to provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4427. An act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRESERVATION OF THE FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION"

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1796) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to repair, equip, and restore the frigate *Constellation*, as far as may be practicable, to her original condition, but not for active service, and to accept and use any donations or contributions which may be offered for the aforesaid purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby further authorized to give or to sell, under such regulations as he may prescribe, such parts or pieces, including rigging of the frigate *Constellation*, as are suitable for use as relics, souvenirs, or mementos, and which cannot profitably or advantageously be used in restoring this vessel to original condition, to clubs, associations, or individuals making donations or contributions for the restoration of the frigate *Constellation*. The cost of converting the aforesaid material into relics, souvenirs, or mementos shall be charged against, and the proceeds of such sales shall be added to, the fund created by authority of this act.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMPENSATION TO VETERANS TRAINING ON THE JOB

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"6. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $65 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $90 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding 30 days in a calendar year. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor whether performed as part of their apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business, or other establishments, or otherwise, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependence allowances, as may be determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of such allowance plus the compensation received exceed $250 per month for a veteran without a dependent, or $325 per month for a veteran with one dependent, or $350 for a veteran with two or more dependents: *Provided further*, That only so much of the compensation as is derived from productive labor based on the standard workweek for the particular trade or industry, exclusive of overtime, shall be considered in computing the rate of allowances payable under this paragraph."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) 2 e of paragraph 11 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) is hereby amended, to read as follows:

"e. The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than 3 months and not more than 4 years of full-time training."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. TAFT, Mr. BALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered by the Senate last evening, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Thursday, January 29, the Washington Post carried an Associated Press article under the date line of Durham, N. H. The caption of the item is "Stassen needles Dewey on debate." The article reads:

Harold E. Stassen today announced he is ready to debate with Gov. Thomas E. Dewey on foreign and domestic issues in their campaign for the Republican Presidential nomination anywhere, anytime in the United States.

Stassen's assertion came at a press conference during his tour of New Hampshire campaigning for delegates in the State's first-in-the-Nation primary on March 9.

Asked whether his comment could be considered a challenge to Dewey, Stassen replied:

"I would accept an impartial invitation."

Earlier Stassen had called on Dewey to come out in the open on issues and told a luncheon of Exeter, N. H., businessmen:

"If he remains silent on the issues, that in itself is an issue."

Mr. President, this headline is nothing unusual for Mr. Stassen. He seems to be challenging practically everyone these days, including my distinguished friend,

the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. But had Mr. Stassen taken a look at the record he would have known that Mr. Dewey has stated his position on a good many issues. In fact, as the Republican candidate for President in 1944, Mr. Dewey made speeches in every section of the country, and placed the issues of that campaign before the people for decision.

When I saw the statement I have just read, I vividly recalled what Governor Dewey said in his acceptance speech in Chicago in 1944, not only on what was one of the most important issues of the campaign, but also as to what might happen in the postwar rehabilitation era.

In view of the fact that Candidate Stassen says that Dewey's silence itself may be an issue in the coming campaign, I think I should inform the former Governor of Minnesota, now one of the Republican candidates for President, what Mr. Dewey said in his acceptance speech about the unemployment problem following the war. This can be found in the book entitled "Republican National Convention of 1944," on page 239. Among many statements Mr. Dewey made in his memorable acceptance speech was the following:

> The present administration has never solved the fundamental problem of jobs and opportunity. It never can solve this problem. It has never even understood what makes a job. It has never been for full production. It has lived in chattering fear of abundance. It has specialized in curtailment and restriction. It has been consistently hostile to and abusive of American business and American industry, although it is in business and industry that most of us make our living. [Applause.]
>
> In all the record of the past 11 years is there anything that suggests the present administration can bring about high-level employment after this war? [Applause and cries of "No," "Certainly not."] Is there any reason to believe that those who have so signally failed in the past can succeed in the future? [Applause and cries of "No," "No."] The problem of jobs will not be easily solved; but it will never be solved at all unless we get a new, progressive administration in Washington—and that means a Republican administration. [Applause and cries of "You bet it does."]

Well, we all know that this prophecy of the Governor of New York, then candidate for President, has utterly failed of fulfillment. Employment is at an all-time high, and profits for business are also at an all-time high.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. The Senator is now commenting on something in which I am intensely interested, and I wish to point out a few facts to him.

In the first place, I do not think the Governor of the State of New York, in making the statement just quoted, was alone in entertaining the ideas he expressed. Estimates and figures coming out of Washington at that time, in fact, statements from Washington for several years prior to that time, and even afterward, anticipated that in all probability there would be six or seven million unemployed after the war. As a result of that, serious mistakes were made here in the present administration. Had those mistakes not been made we probably would be in a great deal better position today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not yielding to the Senator for a speech.

Mr. IVES. No; I merely wish to ask a question. Does the Senator maintain that the question of unemployment, which had not been solved when the United States entered World War II, is now solved? The Senator will recall that there were still over 10,000,000 unemployed at that time. The problem had not been solved when we started our war effort in connection with World War II.

Mr. LUCAS. I would reply to my able friend by reiterating what the great governor of New York said. In 1944 we were at war. At that particular time every man in this country who wanted to work was employed. The governor at that time was talking about what was going to happen after the war. His judgment was not good.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment. The Senator interrogated me on this; allow me to answer. The governor made the prophecy in his speech that following the war the administration would not be able to solve the problem of unemployment. All I am doing is calling the attention of candidate Stassen to that erroneous prophecy in this particular speech made by Governor Dewey back in 1944. Stassen says that Dewey is silent on issues. I maintain that he is not, and I am going to quote, just a little later, from something else the governor recently said about the farm program, which is tremendously interesting to me, and, I think, to the country. All I am doing is defending Dewey here against the charge of Stassen, who says that Dewey is silent on issues. I contend that he is not. I doubt that the junior Senator from New York wants to take a different position; I know he is a good friend of the governor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator deny that that attitude with respect to possible or likely unemployment following World War II was not shared by everyone?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. IVES. I know very few people in this country who had any other idea than that, prior to the close of the war.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator in that. As a member of the Finance Committee I sat in on the hearings when we had the unemployment-compensation bill before us. Not only the New Dealers, as they are called, but everyone else who came before the committee, including Republicans and experts who represented the big interests of the country, made predictions of that kind.

But that is not the point at all. In other words, the governor said in this speech that only the Republican administration could find jobs for people; that they were the only ones who understood what a job meant. All I am doing is calling attention to the fact that today at this moment, notwithstanding the prophecy made by the distinguished governor from New York, more people are employed than were employed at any other time in history. Those businesses and industries which the so-called New Deal crucified all these years today are making the largest profits received in the history of peacetime operations; in fact, their profits are larger than they were during the war.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. I merely want to ask if the Senator construes this situation to be the result of the present administration's or the New Dealers' policy?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to be drawn into a discussion of another subject.

Mr. IVES. I am just trying to pin this thing down, if I may.

Mr. LUCAS. I am pinning it down on what Mr. Dewey said in 1944, and all I am doing is calling the attention of Mr. Stassen to the speech the Governor of New York made on the question of unemployment. That is all the Senator from Illinois is trying to do. Apparently candidate Stassen does not know what Dewey has said in the past. I want him to become informed about this.

Mr. IVES. The Senator does not claim, does he, that the present administration is responsible for current employment?

Mr. LUCAS. Well, who is responsible if this administration is not?

Mr. IVES. Is the Senator asking me?

Mr. LUCAS. If 10,000,000 people were now unemployed, would not the Senator from New York be quoting Dewey's speech today on the floor of the United States Senate, instead of the Senator from Illinois quoting it, and would the Senator from New York be saying, "Who was responsible for the lack of jobs? What did Dewey tell you in 1944 in his acceptance speech?" On the other hand, if the Republicans were now in power, having been successful in 1944, and their candidate Dewey were in the White House, and all these people were employed, as they are today, does the Senator not think the Republican Party would be taking credit for it, as a result of what Dewey said in this speech, or does he?

Mr. IVES. Is the Senator asking me?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I am asking the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois wants me to make the speech and yields to me, that will be all

right; I shall be pleased to discuss the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can answer that question "Yes" or "No."

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York desires to point out, in the first place, that he absolutely denies the present administration is responsible for present economic conditions, insofar as employment is concerned. In all probability, any administration under present conditions could not be held to be responsible in that way. I think that answers the question the Senator has raised.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad the Senator takes issue with his mentor, Mr. Dewey.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment; I am not yielding. When the Senator says that no administration would be responsible for jobs he takes issue with the statement that was made by Dewey in his 1944 speech, because at that time Mr. Dewey, in that acceptance speech, said, in substance, that only the Republican Party, only the Republicans in power, have the courage and the foresight and the vision to find jobs for 60,000,000 people in this country. Now, the Senator from New York says that no administration could accept any praise or glory for full employment. I am very glad that he is so frank in challenging the Governor of New York, who was then the candidate for President.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. IVES. I merely want to point out that I am in no way taking issue with the Governor of New York on this question. I merely want to point out, Mr. President, that this job situation, as I have already stated, is due to current conditions, conditions following the war, over which no one has had any control or could have had any control; that the condition in which we find ourselves at the present time, the pitiful state in which we find ourselves, is due largely to the present administration's policy. The situation as to high prices, costs, everything generally, is due to that kind of policy. And I want to point out further——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not yielding for a speech.

Mr. IVES. I am not making a speech.

Mr. LUCAS. Well, not much.

Mr. IVES. Well, just a little one. [Laughter.] I wish to point out further that if this situation continues, much worse conditions than were facing the Governor of the State of New York in 1944 will be on us in this country. Furthermore, and finally, if the Senator wishes to close this discussion, I want to point out that if we are going to avoid such an eventuality, we shall have to have a change in administration and put the Republicans in, no matter who the Republican President may be.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for those kind remarks. The able junior Senator from New York today makes the same speech which Dewey made in 1944; namely, that there must be a change of administration in order to have the kind of administration that is needed in Washington. In other words, they say everything is all right, but the Republicans could do it better. Mr. President, I do not know how many more men can be put to work. It is impossible now to find men for all the jobs that are beckoning. But there is one thing certain, the Senator from New York will not deny that Mr. Dewey made this speech from which I quoted, to be found in this book I hold in my hand.

A few days ago I picked up the Washington Star, and under the date line of Albany, N. Y., found another Associated Press article, dealing with Governor Dewey and his philosophy on farm legislation.

The caption is "Dewey tells the farmers to stop expansion as recession protection."

Mr. President, it is apparent to me that Candidate Stassen did not read what Candidate Dewey was telling the farmers in New York on January 22. Candidate Dewey made a very interesting and thought-provoking statement on the farm issue, and I want to talk about it just a little, and call the attention of the Senate, especially the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate, to how Governor Dewey feels about agriculture.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senator gave the date of the speech as January 22. Is that January 22 of the present year?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; January 22 of this year. The Governor was speaking to an agricultural group in New York, as he proposed some very startling plans for agriculture in his State. I thought it worth while to bring the speech to the attention of the Senate and the country.

According to the news accounts, Governor Dewey began his speech by advising the farmer that his best protection against a possible recession is to pay his debts. That is wonderfully sound advice. That advice is good not only for the farmer but it is good for everyone. I am delighted that the Governor has taken such a strong position against being in debt; that he so boldly affirms his conviction that being in debt is a bad thing. I am glad to be able to agree with him wholeheartedly on this burning issue.

As I understand from the records, the farmers have paid off more mortgages and more of their debts in the last 8 years, under Democratic administrations, than at any other time in all their history. They are better off today as a result of the policies followed by the Democratic administration than at any time in their agricultural career. They have today more cash in the banks, greater credit, more of everything, as a result of an agricultural program proposed, enacted, and administered by a Democratic administration.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with what the Senator from Illinois has said. As I understand from Governor Dewey's remarks, as quoted by the Senator from Illinois, the farmer is headed for a depression.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think he said that.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the meaning of his remarks, is it not—that the farmer is heading for a depression and had better prepare for that depression? Is it not evident that Governor Dewey thought that a Republican might be elected President of the United States, and therefore the farmer had better prepare for a depression?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Mississippi has a point there. In the article Governor Dewey is quoted as having said that, if economic conditions should dictate large Government subsidies, "it seems to be much more logical to subsidize a continued high consumption of full agricultural production rather than pay for crop curtailments."

The Governor is completely right. In that statement he agrees with the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the United States, and the Democratic Party.

Governor Dewey would have us stimulate consumption of farm products. Somehow that strikes a familiar note, too. I seem to recollect that the Secretary of Agriculture has told committees of Congress again and again that we need a floor under the consumption of farm products. I seem to recollect that we have a school-lunch program and that the Senate, particularly the Democratic Members of the Senate, had to work very hard last year to keep appropriations for the school-lunch program from being cut. I seem to recollect that away back in the thirties we had a food stamp plan and direct distribution of surplus farm products to low-income groups. The Republican House of Representatives apparently does not share Governor Dewey's concern over high consumption of agricultural commodities. We all know that they cut the President's budget request of $75,000,000, for the school-lunch program last year to $45,000,000, and it took the Senate of the United States to restore the amount.

Governor Dewey went on to say that "people need to eat, even if they are in a depression."

Now here is a statement which I do not think anybody has the courage to challenge, not even the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. It has never been proved that people get less hungry as their income shrinks. Everyone knows from the statistics of the Bureau of Labor that the people of the United States under this administration are eating better today per capita than at any time in all the history of the country, and that we now have the highest per capita consumption of food of any nation in all the history of time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. And yet the able Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] said——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. That in order to have them eat more you are going to have to change administrations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield. Does the Senator desire to interrogate me?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield to my good friend the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator then feel that there is any need for price controls in this country?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to go into the question of price controls, but I will say to the Senator——

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. The Senator asked me a question, did he not?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I am absolutely for the 10-point program of the President.

Mr. WHERRY. That includes the price-control program.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I answer the Senator?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I appreciate it. Upon the one hand we have the highest living standards that have ever been known in the United States of America, its people are eating more food, are eating more meat, are eating more of all food products. Yet now the Senator is in favor of price controls.

Mr. LUCAS. Only an inflationary whirlwind could make the Senator from Nebraska look in the direction of controls. I know his position.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment.

Mr. WHERRY. The question is what the Senator from Illinois thinks about it, not what I think about it.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that my good friend does not observe the rules of the Senate. He is the acting majority leader, yet he keeps interrupting me without securing permission. He is setting an extremely bad example for his colleagues on the other side of the aisle. There are many new Senators on that side of the aisle, many who are not as old in service as the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator should not do such a thing.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Not now.

Mr. WHERRY. Not now?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. Not at this time.

Now I come to the most astonishing statement of all, which I think deserves the most careful attention. This is contained in the AP news dispatch. Candidate Dewey said that "the New Deal policy to meet a collapse is to collapse the farmer." In other words, Dewey wants to leave the impression with the American people that if the Democrats are continued in power the program which has been adopted by a Democratic administration starting back in 1933 will collapse the American farmer. This is completely inconsistent with his other statements.

No, Mr. President, it was not the Democrats who collapsed the American farmer. I need not go far into past history to bring to the attention of everyone in America who it was that collapsed the American farmer back in 1931 and 1932. The American farmer knows who saved him back in 1933 when Franklin D. Roosevelt came into power. The individual who collapsed the American farmer is the same individual who is attempting to collapse the Marshall plan—Herbert Hoover. If it was the New Deal that collapsed the farmer, I submit that it was the most inspired and humanitarian collapse that ever happened to any group of people in this country. Frankly, I do not know how the farmers of New York have made out under the New Deal farm policy, but I have some familiarity with the "collapsed" condition of the Illinois farmer. In spite of his collapsed condition he seems to be doing pretty well for himself and his family. Governor Dewey finds himself in the administration camp completely when he says that production controls should be used by the Government only as a last resort. He is dead right about that. He agrees with the policy of the Democratic Party. Production controls should be adopted only when there is no market anywhere, only when there is no alternative. The Roosevelt recovery program brought bigger markets. Then the war demanded bigger production. That is why there have been no agricultural production controls for the past 6 years on any commodity except tobacco.

The Governor of New York also came out completely for the preservation of the family farm. Somehow it has been my impression that all our agricultural programs since 1933 have been developed with that goal in mind. Again we must give the Governor good marks upon that question.

All this advice to the farmer makes me wonder where the Governor has been for the past several years in his thinking on the farm program. After all, Albany is not so far from Washington. But perhaps we should give up speculating about this subject and welcome the Governor into the fold of those who support the Democratic farm program. He is for it 100 percent on every phase of it he has discussed, and we are glad to have his help in the fight to keep that program going.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I ask the Senator from Illinois if he is aware that Governor Dewey is himself a farmer. He has a very large farm in Dutchess County, in the State of New York, with approximately 100 head of cattle.

Mr. LUCAS. I have heard about that horny-handed son of the soil.

Mr. IVES. He is doing all right at it, too. He knows what he is talking about when he speaks about farming.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad to know that; and the Senator has made a very valuable contribution to the debate. It is apparent that if the Governor is a successful farmer in New York, he has been taking advantage of the New Deal farm program, and I can understand that, as a result of the planks which he has laid down in the memorable speech which he made before the farmers of New York a few days ago.

I suggest that Governor Dewey join us in our battle against our friends on the other side of the Capitol to keep the farm programs intact. They suffered a staggering blow last year at the hands of the House Committee on Appropriations, which tried to cut the school-lunch program, sell the soil-conservation program down the river, abolish the AAA, and cripple the rural-electrification program. It was only the valiant efforts of Democratic Members and some Republican Members in the Senate who were sympathetic toward this farm program that saved it from a terrific defeat last year. The battle is about to begin again, and I am very glad to know that Governor Dewey is with us on the farm program. I hope Harold Stassen finds out about it too.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator for Governor Dewey or Governor Stassen?

Mr. LUCAS. I am for Senator WHERRY. [Laughter.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Quebec Chronicle-Telegraph which describes a meeting of Great Lakes shipping operators of both Canada and the United States which concluded in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway plan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LAKES SHIPPING OPERATORS BELIEVE SEAWAY PLAN IS UNSOUND

SEIGNIORY CLUB, QUEBEC, January 23.—Great Lakes shipping operators of both Canada and the United States yesterday denounced the $700,000,000 proposed St. Lawrence seaway plan as "distinctly unsound" economically and for marine navigation.

The operators of the two countries, with their shipmasters, met here in the plush and rustic surroundings of the log chateau of the Seigniory Club. For 2 hours they held open panel discussion on the projected seaway; and at its close, George R. Donovan, of Toronto, chairman of the meeting, declared "the whole thing is unsound."

The occasion was the annual joint meeting of the United States Lake Carriers Association and the Dominion Marine Association of Canada. Ship masters said during the discussion they would have great difficulty operating their flat-bottomed lake vessels in the cross-currents of the St. Lawrence River. They said also that oceangoing freighters would have equal difficulties navigating their vessels on the Great Lakes.

ONE BILLION

The seaway project, with costs officially estimated at $700,000,000 but which might run as high as $1,000,000,000 in the view of delegates, is to be given further congressional study in Washington shortly.

L. C. Sabin, of Cleveland, an official of the United States association, estimated the cost of carrying the operating expenses and the initial investment over a 100-year period at 5.5 percent. Donovan, secretary of the Canadian association, said he hesitated to agree to such a financial burden without a clear indication of what future traffic over the route might be.

Sabin estimated maximum traffic at 25,000,000 tons, and Donovan said peak traffic during the war years was 9,000,000 tons. To meet the great cost of the project, present lake freight rates of approximately $1.25 per ton would have to be considerably increased, resulting in increases in rail and truck rates, Donovan said.

"The whole thing is unsound," he said. "We should have a new survey to find out what our ultimate cost will be, and to determine what future traffic might be.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, first I should like to compliment the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], for doing what I think is an outstanding job of documenting and bringing before the Senate an intelligible and detailed picture of the pending measure.

Mr. President, there are a great many excellent reasons both in favor of and against the St. Lawrence seaway. We have heard practically all of them up to this time. However, there is one overpowering reason for building the seaway. It alone should far outweigh all the objections put together. That reason is national security.

Though the factors are complex they boil down to one thing; we live or die as a nation depending on our ability to produce—for peace or for war.

To produce for peace or war we must have raw materials, and we must be able to move them efficiently and cheaply and surely to the spots where they can be utilized. The greatest and most indispensable of the raw materials is iron ore. We cannot prosper in peace or succeed in war without vast quantities of steel. We cannot build houses without nails or autos without steel sheets—two of our biggest headaches in these days of peace. Of course, we cannot fight a war without steel—great quantities of it, as we know from recent experience. Our national security, economic and military, is tied to our supply of iron ore.

It may be said that we have hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of tons of iron ore in the ranges of the Lake Superior region. Have we? Let us see. Anyone who thinks so is in for a rude shock, because of the real significance of the situation as it is fast developing.

We now take around 85,000,000 net tons of ore out of Lake Superior yearly, about 85 percent of all the iron ore used in our furnaces. It is too well known to repeat here that the quantity of pig iron and of steel ingots now being produced is inadequate to meet the demands of home industry for steel, not to mention the insistent demands of export trade.

At the present rate of ore consumption, the reported reserves of high-grade ores in the open pit and deep mines of Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, will last only from 10 to 20 years. The best estimates available are not reassuring. One company, United States Steel, owns or controls more than 50 percent of the reserves in the Mesabi Range. Other steel producers who depend on Lake Superior ore may begin to feel the pinch in a very few years; some apparently are feeling it now.

A shortage of iron ore at this time—or at any time—is an unthinkable condition in this country. Even if our reserves of high-grade ore should be good for 20 or 30 years, two or three times some of the present conservative estimates, we would still be in a very bad way.

It is a serious understatement to say that our national security is threatened by the iron ore supply situation; it is gravely threatened, and it is vitally necessary for us in Congress to look beyond the ends of our noses and take such steps as will assure the safety of our country. We simply cannot afford to look at this matter from any point of view other than that of the needs of the country as a whole. Neither can we delay in taking whatever action may be necessary to protect the country. What can we do? Mr. President, we have the best answer right here in Senate Joint Resolution 111. If this resolution is adopted it would mean that the world reserves of high-grade iron ores would be available for our steel mills at their present locations. The ores from Labrador, for example, said to be as rich as or richer than our own best ores, could be transported on the St. Lawrence waterway to the same lake ports that now depend on Mesabi ore, a rapidly vanishing source of supply.

If we do not do this we may have to move our steel mills to the Atlantic seaboard to utilize foreign ores, or face a very sizable increase in the cost of steel.

Of course, there are other alternatives. There are said to be vast reserves of low-grade iron ore in the Lake Superior region. This is unquestionably true. They can be concentrated to an iron content that the furnaces can use and that existing lake transport can carry. But that solution is not as simple as it sounds. In the first place, the bulk of the low-grade Superior ores are of an exceedingly hard rock called taconite. That ore cannot be mined by the low-cost power-shovel method used to extract the high-grade ores; it must be blasted out. Since less than one-third of the rock is iron, the whole mass must be concentrated through elaborate and costly processing, which is called by the experts beneficiation, until the product shipped to the furnaces contains almost two-thirds pure iron. It takes nearly three tons of taconite to make a ton of shipping ore. It must be obvious that the ore is going to cost more than the direct-shipping ores now scooped out of the pits by power shovels, loaded directly into cars, and then dumped into boats.

But that is not all. Vast plants and corresponding expenditures will be necessary for the beneficiation of the taconite, and none have yet been built, except on a laboratory scale, so no one is yet sure that the processes are commercially practicable. The first large plant is one now being built by Oglebay Norton & Co., which is to have an initial capacity of 2,500,000 tons yearly. It may be ready 5 years from now. The estimated cost of the plant is $42,500,000, $15 per ton of yearly output.

If we have to replace by taconite all of the Lake Superior direct shipping and easily treated ores, as it seems we must do some day, the investment in treating plants will be staggering. We consumed nearly 97,000,000 net tons of Lake Superior ore in 1943, the peak of war production, and in 1947 more than 86,000,000 net tons were shipped down the Lakes. According to reports, we may run short of ore before the Great Lakes open this spring.

It looks as though we may need a yearly output of at least 90,000,000 tons of taconite concentrates some day if we continue to depend on Great Lakes ore. The plants to beneficiate 90,000,000 tons would cost around $1,400,000,000 and, of course, the operating costs would be high, so our steel costs will go up, adding that much to the cost of living.

The present investment in iron and steel producing facilities is probably around $4,700,000,000. To utilize taconite ore reserves it appears that the industry would have to add 30 percent to its investment without adding a ton to plant capacity, which now appears to be inadequate to meet the demand for steel and iron.

It is no wonder that those well informed on the situation, be they hardheaded practical men of affairs such as C. M. White, president of Republic Steel Corp., and Cyrus S. Eaton, a director of Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co., and chairman of the board of Portsmouth Steel Corp. and Steel Rock Iron Mines, Ltd., or economists such as Marvin Barloon, professor of business and economics at Western Reserve in Cleveland, in the heart of the valley of steel, are alarmed at the iron-ore situation.

Mr. President, instead of quoting from them I ask unanimous consent that the quotations from both Mr. White and Mr. Eaton be made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. White said in an address delivered before the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, March 17, 1947, that—

"FUTURE OF OUR STEEL PLANTS

"The prosperity of the United States is based upon a plentiful supply of high-grade, cheap furnace feed, convenient to ample reserves of coking coal and both near markets for the finished product—steel.

"When any one of these three factors gets out of balance, our economy will suffer. It is because of this fact that the iron-ore situation in the Lake Superior region is of paramount importance not only to the great industrial centers in the lower Lakes region, but to the Nation and to the world as a whole.

"Should the ore production of the Lake Superior region be seriously decreased, and if abundant ores from elsewhere were not made available in the lower Lakes area, it would mean that much of our steel industry eventually would be forced to migrate to the eastern seaboard—and perhaps to the Gulf to utilize sea-borne imported ores. There would be nothing to attract any appreciable percentages of the steel industry westward from the Lakes. Such a migration to the seaboard would effect vast changes, of far-reaching consequences, not only in what we now regard as the 'industrial heart of America' but in the entire Nation and its economy. There is, of course, the possibility that the recent discoveries in the Labrador Peninsula ultimately may reveal very large reserves which might provide ore for the Lakes furnaces as well as to the eastern seaboard. But regardless of that possibility, within relatively few years, the Lake-based steel industry must begin to equip itself with plants capable of concentrating low-grade ores—either in the Lake Superior or the eastern district, or in both districts—into material usable in its furnaces. Otherwise it must resign itself to a declining steel production when the Lake ore supply begins to be insufficient and elect to watch its present plants gradually become of secondary importance as they yield to expansion of plants elsewhere in this country.

"Whether the decline in production from commercial reserves becomes material in 5 or 10 years, or not until later, the period is too short to permit a passive course."

Cyrus S. Eaton is quoted in the Iron Age, January 1, 1947, as saying:

"Most steel-company management is reluctant to admit it, but steel capacity must be increased. The crying need is not for more finishing facilities, but for additional blast furnaces, to produce pig iron both for open-hearth and foundry use. When the necessity for more pig iron is, as it will have to be, finally conceded, a sharp and not presently contemplated shortage of iron ore will promptly rear its ugly head.

"I say 'ugly' because it takes time to bring now open-pit iron-ore mines into production; it takes still more time for underground mines, and nobody knows how long (not to mention how much money) it will take to arrive at satisfactory methods of beneficiating taconites and jaspers.

"Moreover, you cannot open mines if you do not have ore. Two or three steel companies are well-heeled with fairly high-grade reserves, but the other blast-furnace operators of the United States and Canada, in steel companies and outside, are shockingly short of good and readily accessible iron ore. In fact, some companies whose annual consumption is high do not have more than a hatful of iron ore. There is no use counting on ore geographically so remote as not to be available this generation. Beneficiation of taconites and jaspers, with whatever speed it comes, is also a long way off.

"Blast-furnace operators had therefore better begin taking their future supplies of iron ore with the utmost seriousness. Just because they have always been able to buy all the ore they wanted they cannot afford to assume that this will continue to be the case forever. If they do they are destined for a rude awakening."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Marvin Barloon, in Harpers, August 1947, was even more pessimistic. His article is well worth reading and pondering. He feels that steel from taconite will add nearly $5 per family per year to the cost of our steel, and that sooner or later our steel industry must pick up, bag and baggage, and move to the Atlantic and Gulf coasts in what he calls The Great Retreat and thenceforward use foreign ores.

Do all of us fully realize what this means? Over 70 percent of the capacity of the blast furnaces and steel mills of the Nation is located in the area between Pittsburgh and Chicago. These plants are almost wholly dependent on Lake Superior ore. The plants that finish and use the steel and iron are also preponderantly located in that area.

Certainly we cannot believe that a shift in the location of 70 percent of the producing capacity of the steel industry can be made without almost cataclysmic effects on our economy. Yet Mr. Barloon and the other economists are not alone in their fear. Mr. White and Mr. Eaton, the hard-headed, practical businessmen, warn us of this eventuality in serious and measured tones.

The steel producers and even some of the railroad men—and I emphasize particularly that this is the position of some of the railroad men—will admit that unless we enact the St. Lawrence seaway legislation and place the seaway in operation there will be ghost steel towns throughout the Middle West.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I prefer to finish my statement; and then I shall be glad to yield for any and all questions which Senators may wish to ask me.

Mr. President, is there any way out except by the costly and uncertain development of taconite beneficiation or the extremely costly moving of the industry to the seaboard where it could use foreign ores?

Yes; there is obviously one really good solution of the problem. It lies in the approval of Senate Joint Resolution 111, which now is before us, and the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Labrador, we are told, has all the iron ore we shall need for many, many generations. Apparently there is no question about that. It can be utilized either by moving some $3,000,000,000 worth of iron-making and steel-making capacity to the seaboard, thus upsetting the economy of Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and heaven only knows how many other States that are geared to steel supply from the Pittsburgh-Great Lakes area, or by moving the iron ore to the present producing centers. There is just one way to move that Labrador ore at costs comparable with those now prevailing from the Lake Superior area. It is through the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. So we have two possible choices: Either move our present $3,000,000,000 steel-making industry from the Middle West to the east coast or else complete the St. Lawrence seaway. I think the question provides its own answer.

Labrador is, of course, not the sole possible source of supply of foreign ores. Brazil, the Orinoco Basin of Venezuela, and other parts of the world are potential sources of supply of high-grade iron ores. Labrador, however, now appears to be the best bet from all points of view—richness, quantity, cost, and security of shipment in times of war.

Undoubtedly, Mr. President, the experiments and developments now under way to process taconite should go forward. That is the last ace in the hole from the standpoint of security; but we cannot depend on that alone, for the taconite does not appear to provide the answer to our need for an adequate supply of low-cost iron ore for competitive operations or for the normal functioning of our peacetime economy.

What I have said constitutes the vital and, I believe, unassailable reason for proceeding at once with the authorization for and the development of the St. Lawrence waterway.

Other factors also are almost, if not quite, on a par with the basic reason for the development. The principal one is national security.

Let us take cost, for example: The St. Lawrence waterway is estimated to cost around $700,000,000, but this project will be self-liquidating. Replacement of present iron ores by taconite may cost twice that amount, and conservative estimates seem to indicate that cost to be $1,225,000,000, or nearly twice the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway. That would be the initial capital outlay, and it would lay a fixed charge, for interest and depreciation alone, of millions of dollars yearly on the buyers of iron and steel, not to mention the operating costs for processing the ore. The operating costs alone probably would be greater than the differential between moving Labrador ore to Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, and Chicago, and present costs for moving ore from the head of the Lakes to those steel-making cities.

Let us suppose—a horrible supposition—that the steel plants were to move to the Atlantic seaboard, leaving behind the ghost towns of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and the like. What would it cost to move the necessary coal and coke to the seaboard? How many thousands of coal cars, double-track lines, and so forth, would have to be constructed? Our present difficulties in obtaining cars would sound like a paradise in transportation, in comparison.

Another factor in favor of the St. Lawrence development is the large amount

of electrical energy which would be developed from the inexhaustible source of falling water, thus prolonging the life of our reserve supplies of fuel. I refer particularly to oil. Certainly we need more electric power capacity now, not 5, 10, or 15 years from now; and the St. Lawrence seaway constitutes the best and most desirable means of obtaining additional power.

Mr. President, why should anyone oppose the development of the St. Lawrence seaway? I am frank to say that equally intelligent and equally honest men take different sides on this question. The principal argument seems to be that it would affect the prosperity of Atlantic ports, through the diversion of grain shipments. However, if we check on the available statistics, I believe we find that practically no port ever made much through transfers of bulk cargoes, such as wheat, corn, cotton, and so forth.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator to permit me to continue for 1 minute longer, and then I shall yield for any questions Senators may wish to ask.

Mr. President, I have just said that it is my opinion that practically no port has ever made very much money through the transfers of bulk cargoes, such as wheat, corn, cotton, and so forth. In my opinion that is what we find when we check up on what has happened over the past 30 years in ports which have been outstanding in such movements, but which did not have other great and better sources of income.

Some persons say, perhaps under their breath, that completion of the St. Lawrence seaway would adversely affect the railroads. What railroads would thus be affected, Mr. President? And would completion of the St. Lawrence seaway really hurt them? Certainly it would not, if the lessons to be gained from history offer any criteria. The prosperity of the Northeastern States would be greatly increased by the waterway, and the rail lines would be one of the principal beneficiaries of this great development, which would add so much to the prosperity of the entire Northwest and Middle West.

Other persons say, again under their breath, that completion of the St. Lawrence seaway will hurt the electric-utility companies. However, Mr. President, they can scarcely take the business now offered to them, or adequately serve those on their lines, without making important capital additions. An important present national bottleneck is our power supply. The 1947 peak load was handled, according to the industry's own statements, through the goodness of industries in curtailing their demands at peak-load hours during December. That does not sound like much excess capacity to sell to new or growing industries.

Mr. President, the valid arguments against the St. Lawrence seaway are few, if any; and in any case they are local, and are far outweighed by the benefits it would bring to the country as a whole. It would add immeasurably to our national security, and certainly that is the best reason of all for the prompt enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 111, and for speed in carrying out the project.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield now to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I make the point that the record thus far indisputably shows that the depth of harbors in the Great Lakes is very shallow in comparison with harbors on the Atlantic seaboard and other coastal areas. There is only one harbor on the Great Lakes that has a depth equal to 27 feet, and it is a private harbor at Gary, Ind. For instance, in the Senator's own State, the city of Milwaukee has a harbor with a depth of 21 feet, Ashland, a harbor with a depth of 25 feet. They have an average depth of about 23 feet. The argument is made that the 27-foot channel which is to be constructed down the St. Lawrence will permit the movement of vessels with a draft of 24 feet. A vessel with a draft of 24 feet requires a depth of 27 feet. The question I wanted to ask the able Senator was, How are the ports on the Great Lakes, with their shallow harbors, to have the advantage of entry of the ships of deeper draft which are supposed to pass up the St. Lawrence River?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to answer the question. I will say for the benefit of the Senator from Louisiana that I think that point was covered very thoroughly by the senior Senator from Wisconsin in his extended debate. He pointed out at that time that the Army engineers had estimated that those harbors could be repaired and made accessible to boats using the 27-foot channel, by a total expenditure of $14,000,000. Just so that we may have this clear in the RECORD, that would take care of the harbors in Duluth, Superior, Milwaukee, Chicago, Muskegon, Bay City, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, and Oswego. I should like to point out to the Senator, in connection with that—and I wonder if he has given this a great deal of thought—that practically all our steel industry in the Middle West, or at least about 85 percent of it, is located between Chicago and Pittsburgh, and is supplied by the lake ore. Those ores are being rapidly exhausted, and unless some way can be found of getting richer ores to the steel mills, there will be nothing but ghost towns throughout the Middle West.

I frankly cannot conceive how that will help the railroads or anyone else. I think that the large rail lines which are spending so much time and energy fighting the St. Lawrence seaway are not looking at this matter from the long-range standpoint. They simply are not looking beyond their noses. If they were, they would realize that if the Middle West is robbed of this industry, which is bound to happen unless the rich ore is made available, ultimately it will mean the bankruptcy of the railroads; it will not be to their benefit.

Mr. OVERTON. Assuming that the cost of deepening the harbors, as shown by the list I inserted in the RECORD the other day, would not exceed $15,000,000, who is to contribute the $15,000,000?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me point out to the Senator that without any deepening of the harbors, and as they are today, there was shipped a total gross tonnage of 314,000,000 tons. If Labrador ore is made available by the opening up of the St. Lawrence seaway, and without one penny being spent on the harbors, certainly the tonnage can be increased above 314,000,000 tons.

Mr. OVERTON. What need is there of deepening the St. Lawrence channel, unless it be to increase the commerce on the Great Lakes?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me be certain that the Senator understands me. As I pointed out, in the last year those harbors accommodated 314,000,000 tons of ore. Someday that ore may not be available. Someday that 314,000,000 tons of ore must be obtained from another source. That may be within 10, 15, or 20 years. If those harbors are able to accommodate 314,000,000 tons of lake traffic today, they certainly can accommodate 314,000,000 tons of traffic coming through the St. Lawrence waterway. Am I right about that?

Mr. OVERTON. On the other hand, the American merchant marine takes the position that they cannot use the 27-foot channel, so the American merchant marine is not sending any vessels into the Great Lakes, according to the uncontradicted statements of owners of ships operating under the American flag, which statements are to be found in the record. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me at this point correct a statement I made. I said that 314,000,000 tons of ore was shipped into the Great Lakes ports. It is 314,000,000 tons of total shipping. The ore, I believe, runs somewhat over 100,000,000 tons.

Mr. OVERTON. How about American ships using the 27-foot channel? There have been published in the RECORD letters from 31 of the owners of ships under the American flag, in which they state they will not use the 27-foot channel. What vessels would use it?

Mr. McCARTHY. I frankly do not have any idea at this time which companies feel they will not use the channel, and which ones feel that they will use it. All we know is, the channel will be available, and it is only logical and sensible to assume that if the channel is available, the ore is needed, and therefore the channel will be used. Certainly it is impossible to foresee what any particular company will do.

Mr. OVERTON. It cannot be used by any of them, because all have vessels of deeper draft than 24 feet; therefore it cannot be used. As the situation now stands, advantage cannot be taken of the 27-foot channel in the Great Lakes, on account of the shallowness of the harbors. That will have to be corrected in some way. American bottoms cannot be used on the channel, because it will not be deep enough. It presents a very difficult problem. It looks to me what is to

be spent would be a useless expenditure of public funds.

Mr. McCARTHY. If I may answer the Senator's first question, I believe the Senator does not have in mind clearly all the facts, including the latest figures. I have before me figures compiled by the Research Division of the United States Maritime Commission, dated January 29, 1948. These figures are to the effect that of a total of 4,500 freighters, 47.9 percent have a 25-foot draft or less; of combination passenger and freight vessels, 63.6 percent have a draft of 25 feet or less; tankers, 22 percent, and so forth. So there are great numbers of freighters and tankers having a draft of less than 27 feet.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think this is an appropriate time to point out for the RECORD that the cost of deepening all the major harbors on the Great Lakes would be only a fraction of the cost of providing a deep-sea channel to the port of New Orleans, which the Senator from Louisiana has so earnestly advocated. If I remember correctly, the cost would be $14,000,000, for all the harbors on the Great Lakes, against something like $150,000,000 for deepening the channel to the one port in which the Senator from Louisiana is so very much interested.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I think he makes an excellent point.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I am sure the able Senator from Wisconsin will agree with me that one of the major issues before the Congress now is that of rising costs of living. I wish at this time to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his work on this problem during the recess, at which time he held Nation-wide hearings in connection with the greatly increased costs of building construction. I find in connection with foods that oftentimes, especially now, poultry is selling for about double the price in Washington that the farmer receives in my State. That is true of eggs, poultry, and of other farm commodities.

The cost of shipping wheat at the present time ranges from 30 cents to 40 cents per bushel. That is a tremendous cost when we realize that sometimes wheat has sold for less than 30 cents a bushel on the farm. It should be of major concern to the consumers of the Nation to lower the spread in price between the producers and the consumers.

My understanding, from the figures I have obtained from the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Commission, is that the St. Lawrence seaway would reduce the cost of shipping wheat from my State, which incidentally is the second largest wheat-producing State, to the east coast for export or use in the Eastern States by about 6 cents a bushel. If my State exported 25,000,000 bushels of our crop this year of 169,000,000 bushels, that would be a saving to the consumers and farmers of North Dakota of approximately one and one-half million dollars. I believe that one of the problems of the United States, the lowering of the cost of living, can only be solved by lowering the cost of distribution between the producers and the consumers. This is one way in which it can be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I certainly wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from North Dakota. I think if we would only give this matter a little more thought we would realize that the proposed seaway would not merely be of tremendous benefit to the Middle West, but that if we can create a greater degree of prosperity in the Middle West that will be of untold benefit to the country as a whole.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I desire to compliment my colleague from Wisconsin on the very fine and convincing statement he has made. I desire to comment simply on two matters. I want to add to what the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has said. There is in the RECORD a statement that Canada, herself, will consume not over 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, and that in one season she exported out of Montreal 184,000,000 bushels. The greatest grain expert in the world, Mr. Barnes, of Duluth, whose energy and foresight are acknowledged in the Middle West and in New York, has stated that with the condition the world is in it would not be out of the question for Canada to raise one-half billion bushels of wheat, and to export 400,000,000 bushels. We are planning on exporting one-half billion bushels of wheat this year.

If Canada were to export 400,000,000 bushels, and save on transportation 6 cents a bushel, it can be seen what a saving there would be to the Canadian farmer. But more than that. We can see a further reason for building the canal. Right now the wheat that comes down the Lakes, when it arrives at the entry into the St. Lawrence goes into the little 9-foot or 14-foot canal. It must be unloaded into canal boats. That is extremely expensive. Then when it gets to Montreal it must be unloaded again. I ask how much better would it not be if the St. Lawrence seaway were in existence, so that there could be a saving of 6 cents a bushel on 400,000,000 bushels exported by Canada? That would make a great deal of difference to Canada and to the Canadian farmer.

But more than that, Mr. President, there is the question of tolls. A considerable amount of money would come in by way of tolls. As was brought out by my distinguished colleague, all the ports on our lakes can handle a total of 314,000,000 tons. Think of that, Mr. President! It is three-quarters of the tonnage handled on the Pacific coast, the Atlantic coast, and the Gulf coast put together. Think of the potentialities of the picture.

I wish to comment on one other matter which my distinguished colleague has brought out. Repeated charges have been made on the floor to the effect that an insufficient percentage of the shipping of the United States and of the world could utilize the St. Lawrence seaway, if it were built. The figure 9 percent has been used as the total amount of United States shipping that could use the seaway. Any lawyer knows he must get the facts before he can arrive at his conclusions. I am going to give facts which will astonish Members of the Senate, and will totally contradict the statement respecting the 9-percent figure. Such a figure is, of course, absurd and is not confirmed in any way, shape, or form by the United States Maritime Commission.

I might ask the opponents of the seaway just how it could be that if only such a small percentage of United States shipping could use the seaway, the project as a whole would be endorsed by the greatest authorities in the United States, including every past American President since the birth of the project, including the Corps of Engineers, the Maritime Commission itself, the Department of Commerce, and so forth.

I might also point out once again this amazing contradiction: On the one hand, opponents of the seaway base their argument on the fact that the seaway could not possibly be used by any large amount of shipping; on the other hand, they base their argument on the fact that so much shipping will go through the seaway, that traffic will be diverted from existing ports. This contradiction speaks for itself.

However, there is an even more direct answer to the charges which I have cited.

My colleague the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has introduced into the RECORD, as have I, testimony from the Maritime Commission as presented in 1946, confirming that a large amount of shipping could use the seaway.

However, in order that we might have the most up-to-date statistics on this subject, I asked the Maritime Commission to prepare totally new data. Its Research Division compiled, as of January 29, 1948, a report on the number of United States flag and world merchant ships that could use the seaway project. This report shows, for example, that 73 percent of the United States flag fleet total are vessels of 27-foot draft or less and could, therefore, use the seaway. One hundred percent of United States flag Libertys and 100 percent of United States flag Victorys are included in this category. Sixty-two percent of our combination passenger and freight ships and 65 percent of United States freighters, excluding Libertys and Victorys, could use the seaway.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts in a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table submitted to me on

January 29 by Chairman W. W. Smith, of the United States Maritime Commission, citing these shipping figures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States flag and world seagoing merchant fleet as of June 30, 1947, vessels of 1,000 gross tons each and over with maximum loaded draft of 27 feet or less including United States flag Liberty and Victory vessels with drafts of 27 feet 9½ inches and 28 feet 6¾ inches, respectively

Vessel type	Grand total, all vessels		Vessels of 27-foot draft or less, and United States flag Libertys and Victorys			
			Vessels		Gross tons	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Percent of grand total	Tons	Percent of grand total
		Millions			*Millions*	
World fleet, total	12,370	70.42	9,587	77.5	45.09	64.0
Freighters (excluding United States Libertys and Victorys)	7,314	33.22	5,921	81.0	22.56	67.9
United States flag Libertys	1,714	12.31	1,714	100.0	12.31	100.0
United States flag Victorys	358	2.73	358	100.0	2.73	100.0
Combination passenger and freight	1,015	7.13	786	77.4	3.57	50.1
Tankers	1,969	15.03	808	41.0	3.92	26.1
United States-flag fleet, total [1]	4,202	30.90	3,072	73.1	20.50	66.3
Freighters (excluding United States Libertys and Victorys)	1,221	7.60	799	65.4	4.34	57.1
United States flag Libertys	1,714	12.31	1,714	100.0	12.31	100.1
United States flag Victorys	358	2.73	358	100.0	2.73	100.1
Combination passenger and freight	108	1.11	67	62.0	.54	48.6
Tankers	801	7.15	134	16.7	.58	8.1

[1] Includes 272 USMC-owned vessels aggregating 1,809,000 gross tons transferred to foreign flags under lend-lease or other agreements and remaining under foreign registries as of June 30, 1947, by subsequent arrangement.

Source: U. S. Maritime Commission, Research Division.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in answer to the interpolation by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I am going to tell him that I have three exhibits which are of tremendous significance. They were referred to by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Let me finish the sentence, and then I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at this time I shall yield the floor. I have an appointment, and I am obliged to leave the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that another table dealing with the United States flag and world seagoing merchant fleets as of June 30, 1947, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States flag and world seagoing merchant fleet as of June 30, 1947, vessels of 1,000 gross tons each and over with maximum loaded draft of 25 feet or less

Vessel type	Grand total, all vessels		Vessels of 25-foot draft or less			
			Vessels		Gross tons	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Percent of grand total	Tons	Percent of grand total
		Millions			*Millions*	
World fleet, total	12,370	70.42	5,579	45.1	16.97	24.1
Freighters	9,386	48.26	4,500	47.9	13.33	27.6
Combination passenger and freight	1,015	7.13	646	63.6	2.34	32.8
Tankers	1,969	15.03	433	22.0	1.30	8.6
United States flag fleet, total [1]	4,202	30.90	637	15.2	2.95	9.5
Freighters	3,293	22.64	518	15.7	2.47	10.9
Combination passenger and freight	108	1.11	42	38.9	.28	25.2
Tankers	801	7.15	77	9.6	.20	2.8

[1] Includes 272 USMC-owned vessels aggregating 1,809,000 gross tons transferred to foreign flags under lend-lease or other agreements and remaining under foreign registries as of June 30, 1947, by subsequent arrangement.

Source: U. S. Maritime Commission, Research Division.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has the floor. Will he yield to me so I may ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether the figures he cites are cited on the basis that the ships would be fully loaded?

Mr. WILEY. No; they are not.

Mr. LODGE. There you are. That completely knocks the bottom out of all those figures.

Mr. WILEY. Of course the distinguished Senator has the faculty of not waiting until someone answers his question. If he will listen with his fine mind, which I am sure is not always perverted, I am sure that he will see that he is totally wrong. Now get this. The United States flag and world seagoing merchant shipping as of June 30, 1947, vessels of 1,000 gross tons each and over with a maximum loaded draft of 25 feet or less—I am reading from the second table I placed in the RECORD—amounts to a grand total of 12,370 vessels. There are 9,386 freighters. There are 1,015 combination passenger and freight vessels. There are 1,968 tankers. There is a United States flag fleet total of 4,209. The total of the world fleet is 12,370.

The percentages of the grand total of the world fleet are as follows: Freighters, 47.9 percent. Combination passenger and freight vessels, 63.6 percent. Tankers, 22 percent. The United States flag fleet represents 15.2 percent of the total world fleet.

In respect to the particular exhibits to which the Senator refers, and which I have put into the RECORD, and which contain the Liberty and Victory ships, the figures are amazing, and I am sure that if the Senator will study the figures he will have to take back his suggestion that only 9 percent of the total world fleet could be utilized in this canal if it were built.

Mr. LODGE. I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has the floor, and I will not take any more of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY in the chair). The present occupant of the chair understands the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has the floor.

Mr. LODGE. It was my understanding that the Senator from New York had the floor.

Mr. WILEY. I understand that there was a "gentlemen's agreement" to the effect that the Senator from New York was to follow the junior Senator from Wisconsin, and I am speaking now simply to get into the RECORD a few items which I think will clarify and make more plain the position which both the Senators from Wisconsin have taken on the matter. I am not going to speak further except at this time to ask also that there be printed in the RECORD a further table which shows the total amount of tonnage the cities on the Great Lakes have handled in the so-called inadequate harbors which have been so powerfully stressed.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1946 calendar-year tonnage

Harbor:	
Duluth-Superior	54,285,000
Milwaukee	7,900,000
Chicago	18,925,000
Muskegon	2,360,000
Bay City	2,515,000
Detroit	15,754,000
Toledo	30,051,000
Cleveland	16,539,000
Buffalo	16,150,000
Oswego	1,914,000
Total	166,393,000
Total gross tonnage for Great Lakes	314,510,000
Percentage of cited harbor tonnage to gross total	53

Mr. IVES obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY in the chair). Does the Senator

from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Of course it is true that the number of ships that could use the proposed seaway, not fully loaded, is very large. But it seems to me that when we are contemplating a project which is to extend for generations, we ought to build it right to begin with.

I think it is also admitted that the harbors in the Great Lakes are not deep enough. I have not heard that statement contradicted by anyone. They will have to be deepened. That, of course, will be done, in part at least, at the expense of the Federal Government, because that is what has happened in the case of all other harbors. To be frank, that cost ought to be considered when we are figuring the operating cost which must be liquidated by tolls.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am surprised at the position taken by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts. His distinguished harbor of Boston, famous in history and song, never paid the Government a cent for all the millions which have been spent on that harbor. New York and Baltimore have never paid the Government a cent for the money which has been spent on those harbors. That shows how utterly unfair the whole picture is.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I do not in the least begrudge the harbors in the Middle West the receipt of Federal funds. In fact, I believe that if this seaway should be built and the ships should begin to use it, the harbors will have to be deepened, and I think it is only fair to treat the middle western Great Lakes harbors exactly as we have treated the others. I am not begrudging the expenditure of a nickel. What I said was that the cost of deepening those harbors ought, in all honesty and frankness, to be calculated as one of the costs of the project which will have to be liquidated by tolls. I do not begrudge the expenditure of Federal funds on those harbors.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York further yield?

Mr. IVES. I will yield so that this question may be cleared up.

Mr. WILEY. I invite attention to the fact that up to date in the great harbor of New York the Federal Government has spent $142,000,000 plus. In Boston it has spent $18,000,000 plus. The figures show that the other harbors can be deepened to make them effective for shipping at a total cost of $14,000,000. We are not asking the Federal Government to pay for it. We have evidence from the distinguished former mayor of Milwaukee that those cities will be willing to make improvements in those harbors if they can only get their birthright.

I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if the atmosphere is sufficiently clear, the junior Senator from New York would like to proceed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York is perfectly content with the present audience.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator appreciates the quality of it?

Mr. IVES. That is definitely understood.

At the outset of these remarks I request that I be allowed to complete the statement which I have prepared before questions are asked. The statement is closely knit, and any interruption would be rather harmful to the presentation. Therefore, I shall decline to yield until I shall have finished, at which time I shall be perfectly willing to yield and answer whatever questions I am able to answer.

My remarks on the question of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will be as brief as I can make them. Both proponents and opponents in this debate have covered the subject matter so thoroughly that there is little that I may say which can contribute to this discussion.

There are, however, a number of phases of this question which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate. It is to these matters that I shall largely confine my remarks.

As is generally known, I am opposed to this seaway proposal. I have always been opposed to it. As is also generally known, my warm personal friend and close associate in government over the years, the distinguished Governor of the State of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, strongly favors it. He has always favored it.

This is one of the very few matters on which Governor Dewey and I are not in agreement. From time to time in past years he and I have discussed and debated this question. Neither of us has changed his attitude or position.

Naturally, I regret extremely that this difference of opinion exists between us. I have tried my utmost to persuade myself that this proposal for a so-called seaway is sound and that it would prove beneficial to the country as a whole. But the more I have looked into this matter and the more I have studied it, the more I have become convinced that I should continue to oppose it. Were I to follow any other course, I should not be honest with myself.

The proponents of this scheme have been most ingenious in the presentation of their case. To most of the objections raised against it they have offered some kind of seemingly plausible answer.

When the weaknesses in these answers are pointed out, other answers are forthcoming, and offtimes these other answers are taken from the realm of utter speculation and imagination.

For example, when it is pointed out that, because of the necessarily low tolls to be charged and the limited amount of additional tonnage—based on previous estimates—which is likely to use this so-called seaway, it can never be anywhere nearly self-supporting, we are told that the earlier estimates of 25,000,000 tons were wrong and that new estimates of 52,000,000 tons or more are the ones we should now consider. Never mind that these additional 27,000,000 tons are pulled like rabbits out of a hat.

When it is pointed out that anywhere from 10,000,000 tons to 36,000,000 tons of this traffic, depending upon which estimate one uses, would result largely from the diversion of tonnage now being carried by other means of transportation, we are told that this would not be the case at all because most of the tonnage to be carried on the so-called seaway would be entirely new tonnage.

When we inquire as to the nature of this new tonnage, we are informed that it would consist in large part of iron ore from the now undeveloped sources in Labrador and that this new ore will be required as a substitute for that now being taken from the Mesabi Range, which is alleged to be near the point of exhaustion.

When it is pointed out that the Mesabi Range may not be anywhere nearly so near the point of exhaustion as some would have us believe, that there is also an abundance of taconite in the Great Lakes region, as has been pointed out today, that most of the major steel companies do not favor the use of the Labrador ore, preferring, if need should ever arise, to use taconite instead, and that from a defense standpoint for the steel industry in the United States to become dependent upon foreign sources for ore would be highly imprudent, we are nevertheless told that, regardless of these circumstances, Labrador ore is the ore which must be used. In passing I note that this is a typical instance in which the proponents of the so-called seaway appear to claim to know more about what is good for the steel industry and for other groups in this country than those groups know themselves.

When it is pointed out that most of the tonnage to pass over the so-called seaway, on which tolls would be paid, would actually constitute a diversion of tonnage from our great seaports on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, we are accused of sectionalism in our attitude.

When it is pointed that the greater portion of this additional tonnage on the so-called seaway would be diverted from some of the great railroad systems of this country and that the closing of this so-called seaway during 4 or 5 months of the year because of its ice-bound condition would place an impossible burden upon these railroad systems at a time of year when they would be least able to carry it, we are informed that the railroad systems in the United States are antiquated and that in any case the so-called seaway would help the railroads rather than injure them. Right here I am constrained to remark upon the extravagant position thus taken by the proponents of the so-called seaway, for if proof were needed to show that the railroads are still the chief and, by all means, the most dependable medium for transportation in the United States, the record of our American railroads during the war and their great contribution to the war effort offer irrefutable testimony.

Surely our American railroads have demonstrated beyond question that they possess a value to our economy, incom-

parably greater than that which can ever be attached to any ice-bound seaway or to any combination of ice-bound seaways.

When it is pointed out that this proposed so-called seaway would be too shallow to accommodate more than a very small fraction of present-day oceangoing vessels, we are told that oceangoing vessels with a shallower draft are now in the process of construction and that these would be able to navigate the so-called seaway and that, in any event, present oceangoing vessels could easily transship at Montreal.

When it is pointed out that, upon being questioned with respect to the value to themselves of this so-called seaway, 30 out of 32 leading steamship lines in this country indicated they would not use it if it were available, we are told that ships of other shipping interests might find it advantageous. It would appear, therefore that the chief shipping beneficiaries of this project would be the small tramp ships of foreign nations manned by foreign crews.

When it is pointed out that this so-called agreement is, in effect, a treaty and that its terms and purpose and the conditions surrounding it are those traditionally peculiar to treaties and that by construing it to be an agreement the Senate is abdicating from the performance of one of its chief constitutional obligations and responsibilities, we are informed that the resolution before us has been so drafted as to remove this question of dubious constitutionality and that, in any case, the need for the so-called seaway project is sufficiently great to justify the Senate in bypassing one of its basic constitutional functions.

When it is pointed out that a period of high costs and shortages in materials and labor is no time for undertaking a project of so vast a nature, it is suggested to us that there is apt to be some delay before the project can be gotten under way and that by that time conditions may be decidedly changed. In the next breath we are informed that "speed is of the essence" in getting this project under way, and that delay is unpardonable.

When it is pointed out that, from the standpoint of national defense, this proposed so-called seaway cannot be defended and offers more in the way of a liability than can ever be realized from any asset value it may contain, then we are told that the Secretary of War has stated that, while it might be helpful, it is not vital to national defense.

When these and other objections to this proposal have been raised, always we are told that our facts are wrong or our figures are wrong or our reasoning is wrong and always we receive some kind of seemingly plausible explanation aimed to offset the objections. I have to admit that it is a bit difficult to keep up with the proponents of this proposition in the matter of figures, for with each new obstacle confronting them, there seems to be at hand a new set of figures or estimates calculated to meet and overcome it.

Finally, however, we are given to understand that one of the most valuable features of this proposed undertaking would be the development of hydroelectric power which its construction would entail.

On this point I cannot disagree with the proponents. That is where we get together. I feel strongly, in fact, that development of the power resources of the St. Lawrence River would be a most worth-while undertaking.

I feel equally strong, however, that construction of this St. Lawrence so-called seaway project for the sole purpose of the development of the St. Lawrence power resources would be an inexcusable waste of money. I see no point whatever in spending a billion dollars or more on a very questionable waterway project when all that we would be sure of getting out of it would be a half-billion-dollar power development—especially when it is possible to develop the power separately.

For years I have been led to believe that without the so-called seaway itself no power project can be undertaken. I am convinced now that it is not only possible to undertake the hydroelectric development separately, but that such a course is the only one practicable insofar as the St. Lawrence River is concerned. In fact, it would seem to me that a treaty between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, which would authorize the State of New York and the Province of Ontario to develop the St. Lawrence power by joint agreement and as a joint project, should be wholly feasible. I understand that the Province of Ontario has just about reached the end of possible power development within its own borders. Surely New York State can use all the power which it could obtain as its share from such a project.

In this connection it is worthy of note that New York's half of the primary power which would be developed by the project, which the pending resolution would authorize, would constitute approximately 10 percent of present power requirements in that State alone. Furthermore, this power would be just about enough to supply the additional load which will develop in New York State in the next 2 years if the present rate of load growth is continued.

Some may doubt the willingness or capacity of New York State alone to engage in so large an undertaking. An analysis of the proposal contained in the resolution which is now before us, however, will show that insofar as New York State's taxpayers are concerned, the burden on them is likely to be as heavy one way as the other. It should be remembered that New York's share of the cost of the project now before us is $161,000,000. Increased costs since the $161,000,000 estimate was made, moreover, would very likely bring New York's cost to well over $175,000,000. Add to this item the approximate 22 percent of the Federal tax load which New York State taxpayers carry and one can easily perceive the very large proportion of the cost of this St. Lawrence so-called seaway project, which would be borne by New York State taxpayers under the terms of the pending resolution. I doubt very much that the cost to New York's taxpayers would be more—indeed, it might be less—if the power development were undertaken jointly by the Province of Ontario and that State.

While I am on this subject of power development I would bring to the attention of the Senate that, with an expenditure of about $55,000,000 for plant and only slight additions to existing transmission and distribution systems, there can now be made available on the American side at Niagara Falls 450,000 horsepower which can be produced even more cheaply than can the power which would be obtained through the development on the St. Lawrence River. By like process, about the same amount of power can be developed on the Canadian side of the Falls. This possibility can be realized by making permanent through treaty amendment a temporary wartime agreement for the diversion of water on each side of the international boundary at Niagara Falls.

Some Senators may remember that a number of years ago the Senate agreed to this arrangement, effected by an exchange of notes permitting this diversion for the duration of the emergency which still continues officially. It occurs to me that this treaty amendment should be made and ratified as soon as possible, in order that this extremely cheap power, right at our back door, can be used and made permanently available.

As to the St. Lawrence so-called seaway project itself, however, it seems to me that any promise of good or of benefit which it may hold is far more than offset by the equally implied promise of loss and damage which its establishment would bring to our American economy as a whole. In condemning this project, I have tried to take from the proposal before us the one desirable feature which it contains, and I have endeavored to show how that feature can be utilized to greatest advantage.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New York is somewhat concerned over what he calls the mystical figures in regard to shipping. I am also a little concerned over the statement that the American part of the St. Lawrence power development would amount to approximately 10 percent of the total power used in New York. Can the Senator give us the figures as to the total amount of power which is used in New York State, and also as to the amount that would be developed by half the power facilities of the St. Lawrence River?

Mr. IVES. It is my recollection—and I will have the figures in a moment, I will say to the Senator from Vermont—that there is approximately 7,750,000 horsepower used daily in New York State.

Mr. AIKEN. How much?

Mr. IVES. Seven million and seven hundred fifty thousand horsepower daily.

Mr. AIKEN. I am asking about the kilowatt-hours, annually.

Mr. IVES. Is the Senator talking about kilowatts or kilowatt-hours?

Mr. AIKEN. Kilowatt-hours. The Senator referred to the amount of power which could be developed and the amount

of power used annually within the State of New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator understood my statement, did he not, that the primary power itself to be developed by one-half the power facilities of the St. Lawrence River, which constitutes 764,000 horsepower, is the 10-percent item to which I am referring? I wish to make sure we are agreed on that.

Mr. AIKEN. I am asking for the amount of power used within the State of New York.

Mr. IVES. Approximately 7,750 000 horsepower daily.

Mr. AIKEN. But that is not the amount used in a year.

Mr. IVES. It is only necessary to multiply that figure by 365, the number of days in the year.

Mr. AIKEN. I have the official figures here.

Mr. IVES. What does the Senator from Vermont have?

Mr. AIKEN. They are from the Federal Power Commission. They show that New York State used, in 1946, 17,986,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Mr. IVES. That would be approximately correct, I should think.

Mr. AIKEN. The output of one-half of the St. Lawrence seaway development is estimated, I think, at 6,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Mr. IVES. That is not the firm power, the primary power. That includes the use of secondary power.

Mr. AIKEN. I am speaking of the total used.

Mr. IVES. But that includes both primary and secondary power.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. But the secondary power is also used.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Senator understands that the power from the St. Lawrence seaway development would be 70 percent firm power. That is the firmest power in the world, for the St. Lawrence River has the most constant flow of any river in the world.

Mr. IVES. It has; that is correct. It has one of the most constant flows.

Mr. AIKEN. It is the most valuable.

Mr. IVES. Yet I point out to the Senator that there is a variation of approximately 10 feet or more from the high level to the low level during the year, and that variation in itself causes this variation between the estimated 1,098,000 horsepower—I wish to point this out particularly—which would be the American share, the New York State share——

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. And the 764,000 horsepower, which is the primary load. The rest of it has to be picked up by steam.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct, and, of course, that steam-power equipment would be idle part of the year, whereas the water power which would be developed at the St. Lawrence would be constant power.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator from Vermont understand in that connection that the measure now before us carries with it a provision for the establishment of steam plants, too?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. It is inevitable that if the St Lawrence project power were developed and sold at the price at which it should be sold, we would require an even greater capacity of stand-by steam power than we have today.

Mr. IVES. I am glad to have the Senator from Vermont point that out, because that has been my understanding, too.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. IVES. But the fact remains that there is nothing in the joint resolution now before us, insofar as the contemplated financing is concerned, which covers the item of stand-by steam power or even transmission.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. That would necessarily follow, and would come under the jurisdiction of the power authority of the State of New York or the private-power interests, who would feel called upon to develop more stand-by power.

Mr. IVES. That would depend upon the procedure followed in the State of New York as to the disposition of the power at the source.

Mr. AIKEN. And the cost of it.

Mr. IVES. Yes. If New York State itself were to have to set up transmission lines and establish steam plants, the cost of those projects probably would run into half a billion dollars of additional outlay, or something in that vicinity.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I think it would.

Mr. IVES. Undoubtedly it would. But that is not contemplated in the cost figures presented to us now. Undoubtedly there are some steam plants where this power would be used.

Mr. AIKEN. And it is almost impossible to establish steam plants fast enough, these days, to keep up with the demand.

Mr. IVES. That is correct.

Therefore, we harp back to this 764,000-horsepower figure, which is the primary load.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Of course, the greatest aggregation of steam plants in the world is located in New York City today.

Mr. IVES. Yes; I suppose that is so. In fact, I understand there is one plant there which alone develops more power than can be developed from the American share of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would develop about the same amount.

Mr. IVES. I understand that the New York City plant develops slightly more.

Mr. AIKEN. It is 700,000 or 800,000 horsepower.

Mr. IVES. Again I am talking about the firm load, the primary load.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wish to point out, lest there be any mistake, that the production capacity on the American side would be about 6,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually; and the total amount used in New York is approximately 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

Mr. IVES. I would remind the Senator from Vermont that on the basis of primary power, half the St. Lawrence power would come to approximately 10 percent of the total amount now used in New York State.

Mr. AIKEN. Also the Senator states that probably by the time they get through with all the fixings, it no doubt would cost New York $175,000,000 for her half of the plant. Can the Senator estimate what the cost would be if that amount of power were not developed in connection with the navigation features?

Mr. IVES. Yes. Taken by itself, it obviously would be substantially more than it would be in connection with the seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. It might run to as much as $100,000,000 or more.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we agree as to that.

Mr. IVES. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Vermont and I are in disagreement as to this aspect of the matter.

However, I would point out in that connection the following: Suppose that were the case. The State of New York has to pay $161,000,000, according to the figure given here, which, in view of the increased costs which have since occurred, would be a little more than $175,000,000. So, if we consider the burden on the taxpayers, we would be paying anywhere from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000 more, taking the over-all seaway project now under consideration as being the project to which New York State taxpayers would contribute on the basis of 22 cents out of every tax dollar. So when we get all through, I do not think it makes much difference insofar as New York taxpayers are concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; New York taxpayers would be paying more, if we regard New York State as solely concerned in this connection. But if we regard all the 48 States and if we credit this project with the value which those 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 people would thus receive from the strengthening of the national security and economy, considerable credit would be coming back to them in that way.

Mr. IVES. I am perfectly willing to take any credit the Senator from Vermont desires to give to New York State, but that credit applies either way, whether New York does it alone or by means of this other process.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wonder whether the Senator would object to my reading at this time a brief statement by the distinguished Governor of his State on this subject.

Mr. IVES. No; I think that would be quite appropriate.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to compliment the Senator from New York on his very able speech and very able presentation, and also on its political effect.

I read now from a statement by Governor Dewey:

> For years I have advocated the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. During the past decade the means have been found and billions in Federal funds have been appropriated, to develop great rivers in other sections of the country, for power, navigation, flood control, irrigation, and like purposes. The incomparable resources of the St. Lawrence River should no longer be wasted. If the Federal administration is unable or unwilling to proceed, then the State of New York itself should

undertake to complete the project on a self-liquidating basis in cooperation with the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario.

* * * * *

For the last 5 years I have advocated every constructive movement to make possible this great St. Lawrence development. * * * I am confident you will agree that the accord should not be omitted from any bill to be introduced, and earnestly trust that I may count upon your support in this matter of such vital interest to the people of New York State.

That was a telegram sent to President Truman.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I would point out one thing in the Governor's statement, that is, that he is advocating construction of the project on a self-liquidating basis. I think that should be emphasized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield further to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to call attention to the testimony of General Robins, of the Corps of Engineers, as follows:

Mr. BEITER. Have you ever figured the seaway project without the power project?

General ROBINS. No, sir; I have never looked at it as anything but a multiple-purpose project, because I think it would be a crime to look at it in any other way.

Mr. BEITER. What do you mean, "to look at it in any other way"?

General ROBINS. You have two resources there to be developed—navigation and power—and it would be a crime to build the project for either one or the other, because you would be wasting money.

Mr. BEITER. Well, don't you think it would be advisable to construct just the power plant in that area?

General ROBINS. No, sir; because power would cost more to build alone than if it were built in combination with navigation, the same as would obtain if you built for navigation alone. Those two purposes help each other.

I understand the distinguished junior Senator from New York does not agree with that conclusion.

Mr. IVES. I do not agree with the premise. I do not agree on the seaway.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator does not agree with the senior Senator from New York on that, either, does he?

Mr. IVES. I have not talked with the senior Senator from New York about it. I do not know anything about how the senior Senator from New York stands on the subject. It has been reported that he is in favor of it, but I do not personally know that.

Mr. WILEY. I wonder if the Senator has anything to say in relation to whether or not Canada would agree, assuming it were an agreement or a treaty.

Mr. IVES. I am not talking about treaties. I am not in favor of this agreement now before this body.

Mr. WILEY. Would the Senator favor a separate power treaty?

Mr. IVES. On everything as fundamental as this, never mind how technical we want to be from the legalistic aspect and how legally right it may be to do it by agreement, fundamentally and basically, a thing of this kind should be done by treaty. I am proposing a treaty here.

Mr. WILEY. I understand the Senator is very clear on that, and of course I must say to him that I cannot agree with that conclusion, and I expect to have something to say about that later in the debate. Of course, I should be too timid, perhaps, than to attempt to reply to some of the distinguished Senators on that subject, but I do not care to go into that now. My question was whether or not the Senator thought that Canada would agree to a separate power project. Has the Senator any information on that subject?

Mr. IVES. I do not know anything about it at all, I would reply, but I would point out in that connection that the Canadians were very glad to agree to it, so far as the utilization of the facilities of Niagara Falls was concerned. I think that might afford some idea as to the attitude that may be expected from the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator stated, I believe, that he understood that under a dual construction plan, as outlined here, costs have been apportioned, some to navigation, some to power. I believe the Senator has stated that if he could have his way he would provide that all the cost would have to be apportioned to the power project, if the power project were put through without the navigation project.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would point out that it would not be on the same basis, because there would be no requirement for the locks, the same need for construction which the seaway entails. What would be required would be a dam and the docks, and the removal of the several communities in the vicinity, in order to permit the damming process. I did not say the "damned" process. I have reference to damming.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator acquainted with the following statement from a great New Yorker? I quote:

I am from the greatest port in the whole world. I have confidence in my port. I am not afraid of it at all. At one time New York City, or the Port of New York, was the port of the Atlantic. Since that time other ports have developed, and properly so. At one time all the cotton came to New York. Now it goes to Gulf ports. If it can be done more economically, every advantage must be taken.

We have facilities in New York City that other ports do not enjoy. I will say this to my friends in the shipping business in New York City: It is not the St. Lawrence seaway that I fear; it is the Interstate Commerce Commission that I fear.

Further quoting:

I can assure you gentlemen that we will have no trouble with Canada at all. They will cooperate 100 percent. I have been the chairman of the American section of the Dominion Joint Board of Defense with Canada since 1940. We worked harmoniously. They are most cooperative.

Then, commenting on a position like that of the Senator's, this gentleman said:

They cannot be right in both approaches. I say it is going to be a practicable waterway and compete, or it is a no-good waterway and will not compete. I am willing to take either side of that. If it is a better waterway and if exports from the United States can be shipped more cheaply to other ports in the world we are living in, it deserves getting approval.

That was said, as the Senator undoubtedly will recall, by the late Mayor LaGuardia. Does the Senator recall the testimony?

Mr. IVES. I not only recall the testimony, I read it previously. I want to say that I do not feel at liberty to speak regarding the late mayor as I would speak if he were still living, and I think we will let it go at that. However, I would point out that there have been over the years a number of things on which the late mayor of the city of New York and I did not agree. This happens to be one of them. At the same time I would point out that the present mayor of the city of New York is very much and strongly opposed to this seaway project. The reason I have not presented his position in any way, shape, or manner is because I have been trying to keep this thing on a national level; never minding what New York's local interests are in this matter. Presumably and for the sake of the debate let us accept the idea that New York stands to gain as much as it would lose as a State, and I think it is fair to leave it on that basis. I have been trying to look at the seaway proposition from a national aspect and keep out of any provincialism, any localism, or any sectionalism, or anything else of the kind.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator will admit, will he not, that in 1931 the Legislature of New York went on record as favoring the development of both navigation and power in the St. Lawrence River, and that some provincials in New York ever since have tried to get that legislative resolution repealed?

Mr. IVES. May I point out that the Legislature of the State of New York in 1931 undoubtedly did not go on record in favor of this seaway?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator emphasizes "this," does he, or does he mean the seaway?

Mr. IVES. This proposed seaway, here.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator quibbling?

Mr. IVES. I happened to be a member of the Legislature of the State of New York at that time. I have always been opposed to this matter, as I said in my earlier remarks. I do not think the Senator will find any record wherein the State of New York's Legislature has been placed on record, in the 1930's, as favoring the seaway.

Mr. WILEY. I have in front of me a note——

Mr. IVES. The Senator may. He will find something about power development there, surely.

Mr. WILEY. I have in front of me a note, and I shall be glad to check on it.

Mr. IVES. That is all right. I just want to make that clear. I know now what I am talking about, definitely, in connection with the Legislature of the State of New York, and the Senator will find something there on power development, surely; not only that, but the legislature in the last number of years has

taken action, positive, definite, affirmative action, to enable the State to enter into the power-development proposition.

Mr. WILEY. My question was whether or not the State Legislature of New York in 1931 went on record in favor of the development of both navigation and power in the St. Lawrence River. The Senator's answer was "No," was it not?

Mr. IVES. My answer is that to the best of my recollection the Legislature of the State of New York in 1931 did not go on record in favor of any seaway. The Senator knows, as well as I, the wording in memorials and resolutions adopted by some of the State legislatures. I do not know how that resolution read, unless he happens to have a copy of it there. I do not think there is any way of deciding that question definitely between us. It is very technical, but I am sure that the legislature did not favor any seaway.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator acquainted with the fact that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the Textile Workers, with a total of over 1,000,000 members in the city of New York, have registered approval of the seaway and the power project?

Mr. IVES. Now, once again, the Senator is bringing in the local angle, and if I were to do that, I could point out that the New York State Federation of Labor, I understand, and all of its subordinate units, is on record as opposed to the seaway, as are also the railroad brotherhoods, all of them, in the State of New York. I am trying to keep these things out. They have no place in the debate.

Mr. WILEY. In other words, the Senator contends that the opinion of the common citizens of America has no weight, that the right of petition or the right of expression has been eradicated by the United States Senate?

Mr. IVES. I made no such statement as that at all.

Mr. WILEY. I did not think the Senator did.

Mr. IVES. I am very sorry that the Senator has so construed my remarks. What I am referring to in my statement is the position of a State or any small group of States, in connection with a project affecting the whole United States.

The Senator spoke about the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of New York. I spoke about the State Federation of Labor of New York. Let me point out that those are State of New York organizations. To be sure, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers extends beyond the limits of New York, but most of the members of the organization are in New York. I am trying to keep local interests out of the discussion. That is what I was referring to, and not that the rank and file of citizens should not be permitted the right of petition. Of course, they should under all circumstances.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York will state to the Chair that there has been a constant implied yielding back and forth during the colloquy, and if the Chair will accept the apology of the Senator from New York, I would suggest that we be allowed to pursue the course we have been presently pursuing.

Mr. WILEY. On that subject I wish to say that the other day I heard a ruling made in the Senate to the effect that every time a conversation was going on between the Senator who had the floor and other Senators back and forth that a Senator who wished to interrupt the Senator who had the floor should address the Chair. I agree that that is the rule. But the rule is observed more in the breach than in the observance, as I have observed during the 9 years it has been my privilege to be a Member of the Senate. During that time I have found it to be the common practice when two Senators are seeking to obtain light on a subject, that they proceed in the manner that the Senator from New York and the Senator from Wisconsin have just done.

Mr. IVES. I take it, Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin feels that the discussion might be short-circuited by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is not looking out for his authority, but is wholly concerned with seeing that decorum shall be preserved, and that there shall be no interruption of a Senator while he is concluding his remarks. If debate were carried on in that manner, it would be objectionable.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the Chair's ruling is absolutely sound, and I would stand by that ruling at any time. I would suggest now that from this point on the Senator from Wisconsin and the junior Senator from New York address the Chair properly.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I agree. There is harmony once more on the floor. The distinguished Senator from New York has laid down the rule which both of us have been guilty of violating. We will now try to keep from doing so in the future.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is not trying to lay down a rule. He has simply pointed out a rule which already exists.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, did not the Senator from New York just violate it?

Mr. IVES. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York addressed the Chair. Does the Senator from Wisconsin now ask the Senator from New York to yield?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is pleased to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York yields to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I want to ask the distinguished Senator whether the State Power Authority of New York supports the St. Lawrence seaway project and the power construction?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if the Senator has completed his question, I will say that so far as I am aware the State power authority is in favor of the seaway and the power construction.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask at this time——

Mr. IVES. I do not happen to agree with the State power authority on this question.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask at this time that there may be printed in the RECORD——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is pleased to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Wisconsin properly to insert something into the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am distinctly happy to insert in the RECORD an excerpt from the New York Times of date January 21, 1948. I want to say, Mr. President, that I am extremely grateful to the Senator from New York for permitting me to make the request.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE POWER UNIT SUPPORTS SEAWAY—REPORT OF AUTHORITY STRESSES SHORTAGES, RISING FUEL COSTS, NEED FOR MORE PRODUCTION

ALBANY, January 21.—Electrical power shortages, the rising costs of fuel and transportation, and the need for more industrial and farm production were cited today by the State power authority as reasons why the St. Lawrence seaway project should be undertaken immediately. The authority's annual report to Governor Dewey and the legislature was a signal for a fresh outbreak of controversy over the proposal.

Assemblyman Wilson C. Van Duzer, Republican, of Orange County, immediately sponsored a bill to abolish the authority. Assemblyman Gerald F. Sullivan, Republican, of Erie, proposed a legislative inquiry into the authority's expenditure of its $150,000 annual appropriation.

As in other years the authority urged in its report, a 216-page document complete with maps, photographs, and charts, that the necessary construction of the seaway be undertaken at once and pressed to early completion.

A measure to accomplish this end is scheduled to be taken up in the United States Senate next week. It has been announced here that Senator IRVING M. IVES, of New York, will lead the fight against it although Governor Dewey is on record in favor of it.

Arguing that the seaway was urgently needed, the power authority's report said:

"At the beginning of 1948 the immense value to New York State and the Nation of the resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system has been brought into bold relief by:

"Power shortages in the project area itself, including parts of New York State and the Province of Ontario.

"Rising costs for fuel and transportation.

"Expanding demands for more production to help meet domestic and overseas requirements for food and manufactures.

"Renewed emphasis on the importance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence resources to the security of the Western Hemisphere."

Under the terms of pending Federal legislation, the project would open all of the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes to deep-draft shipping and provide for production of 2,200,000 horsepower (12,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours) of hydroelectric energy in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River.

The cost has been estimated at $513,884,000, of which New York would pay $100,000,000 and get in return half of the electrical energy developed.

In support of its statement that more power is needed, the authority stressed the electric brown-out last fall in the up-State area.

The report was signed by Francis B. Wilby, chairman of the authority and George S. Reed, Fred J. Freestone, Gerald V. Cruise, and Samuel J. Joseph, trustees. Mr. Joseph resigned near the end of the year to accept an interim appointment as Bronx County judge. Jacob Grumet, formerly an assistant district attorney under Governor Dewey, succeeded him.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York further yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator from New York acquainted with the fact that every President of the United States from President Harding down to the present time, including President Truman, has heartily endorsed the seaway and the power project?

Mr. IVES. The Senator is so aware.

Mr. WILEY. Is the Senator also aware that every distinguished Secretary of State under those Presidents, including the great statesman, Mr. Stimson, of New York, Secretary Hughes, and Secretary Hull, have endorsed the seaway and the power project?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York was not so aware, but is glad to be so informed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York yields.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to say at this time that the International Garment Workers of New York, with a membership of over 200,000, have endorsed the project.

The record shows, as already indicated, Mr. President, that in the United States, according to polls which have been taken, some 57 percent of the people have indicated their endorsement of the project.

I will not pursue this course of questions further, but I assure the Senate that the fine argument which has been made by the distinguished Senator from New York will not go unanswered. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Senator from New York now yields the floor, with appreciation, to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of my colleagues to listen to me while I speak in opposition to the pending joint resolution. I want to say at the outset that I do not have any brand-new arguments to offer, but I simply propose to comment on or add emphasis to some of the arguments previously made.

As has been stated on several occasions, this proposal has been before the Congress for many years. It would seem to me that the proponents of the measure are gluttons for punishment, because they have been defeated every time they have brought the matter before Congress. I predict that failure again awaits them. Only a few years ago when the proposal was presented, one of the new arguments advanced was that it would relieve unemployment. The old arguments that it would be of great benefit to this country and to Canada, and so on, were of course stressed in no uncertain terms. Upon those issues the Senate promptly voted down the joint resolution.

Since 1941, when the proposal was last defeated by the Senate, the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have added two additional arguments, first, the one pertaining to national defense, and the other that the project will be self-liquidating by the imposition of tolls. To my way of thinking those two arguments may be placed in the category of superbaloney. I believe that my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has adequately taken care of the argument that the project should be built because it will assist materially in national defense. A reading of the record will demonstrate that virtually every witness who testified for the proposal stated that the building of the project will be helpful, but certainly that it was not vital to our defense in case of war.

I believe that the arguments so far adduced will show that it will be of little or no service in case of another war. I am sure that all will agree that very few if any war plants would be built along a highway if it were open for only 60 percent of the time, or 7 out of 12 months in the year.

The argument of self-liquidation, to my way of thinking, has no basis. We have had experience with the Panama Canal, and I propose to demonstrate to the Senate in only a few minutes how we have fared with that project by way of self-liquidation.

The argument of self-liquidation has, I believe, had the effect of gaining a few votes. The proponents of this measure, in their zeal to carry it through, have been adding a little more honey every time the subject comes before the Senate, with a view of attracting more bees; but I believe that in this instance the answer to these two arguments has been such as to make it appear that the only thing they have added to the hive is honeycomb.

The matter of self-liquidation by the imposition of tolls is not provided for in the pending measure. It is something that we must look for in the future. There is nothing definite except that Canada has agreed in principle to the imposition of tolls. The tolls are to be placed, not on cargo that will go through the entire system, but only on cargo that is transported on that part of the St. Lawrence River from the point where it begins in Ontario Lake to the ocean. So far as all other freight is concerned, that is, that transported in the five Great Lakes and their connections, it shall be toll-free.

I am wondering what the shippers of Montreal will have to say when a proposal comes before the Canadian Parliament to place tolls on all of their shipments which are now toll-free. As Senators know, there is today a channel beginning at the port of Montreal which is deep enough to carry all the freight that is now available for Montreal to the ocean. Will the shippers in that section stand idly by and permit themselves to be taxed to pay for a canal from Montreal to the west? I contend that the proponents of this measure, if they are in earnest about the self-liquidating feature of the proposal, should insist that the terms and conditions under which tolls are to be imposed should be incorporated in the resolution. They should make certain that the people of this country have a vested right in that respect, and not a mere promise that tolls will be imposed for the purpose of self-liquidation. Instead they are depending on agreements to be made in the future, which, as has been shown, can be changed almost at the whim of the Congress.

What about the division of the tolls? Has that been decided upon? The report shows that we are to pay almost two-thirds, and perhaps more, of the cost of this project. How will the tolls be divided? Will they be divided half and half? Will Canada get more than we will? I believe that it is essential that the resolution contain the terms and conditions under which the so-called self-liquidating feature can be accomplished.

Mr. President, what would be the use of even doing that? Why try to fool the people by attempting to make them believe that the project is self-liquidating? We built the Panama Canal in 1903, as I recall. In 1912 the Congress imposed tolls for the passage of freight through the Canal, on the assumption that the tolls charged would liquidate the debt incurred in the building of the Canal. It was argued that the tolls sought to be imposed would give us back every dollar that we invested. But what does the record show? Let me read from it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have the record of the hearings before me. Secretary of State Marshall declared on May 28, 1947, during his testimony before the subcommittee, that there were four advantages to the St. Lawrence project, from the point of view of national defense.

First, provision for the construction and repair of ocean-going vessels in the relatively secure area of the Great Lakes.

Second, the establishment of a vital new line of communication in the heart of the continent. He named several other items, including the importance of electrical development, which the project itself would provide. In view of that feature alone, from the standpoint of national defense and what we need in electrical current, I say that the project would be warranted by that fact alone.

Mr. ELLENDER. In making my statement a moment ago I did not mean to entirely disregard the fact that some benefit would follow in case of war. But it is not vital. I would rather spend that sum to greater advantage in our own country. Why could we not make the Gulf of Mexico our own lake for such purposes as proposed by General Marshall?

Let us consider the two or three arguments advanced by General Marshall. First, he stated that the project would afford a safe place to repair vessels. But let us not forget that this channel would be ice-bound 4 or 5 months during the year. Probably at a time when repairs were most urgent.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further very brief statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In spite of the ice-bound condition to which the Senator refers, we transported the vast majority of all the iron ore that went into the steel production of this great Nation during the war years, and we transported it down that chain of lakes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Iron ore can be stock-piled. It can be piled mountain-high when necessary; but that is not true of ordinary freight. It is not true in respect to ship repairs. Does the Senator suggest stock-piling finished products on the banks of the St. Lawrence in great warehouses, and letting the freight stay there for 4 or 5 months until the ice thaws? Has the Senator any idea of the costs that such a plan would necessitate? Has he any idea of losses by way of deterioration?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to permit another interruption?

Mr. ELLENDER. Surely.

Mr. THYE. The harvest of the great Northwest takes place in July and August. When that harvest is under way the grain movement is out across the continent. We have not had railroad facilities which permitted sufficiently rapid movement of the grain from the Northwest. If we could cut the transportation cost to the head of the Lakes, the great grain terminals there could receive the grain, and from August through December that grain would find its way to the ocean. In that way the seaway would not only supplement and assist the railroad facilities, but would move the grain at a minimum of expense as compared with railroad transportation.

Mr. ELLENDER. What the Senator is now discussing was due more or less to the stress of war. It is true that our railroads were overtaxed and grain movement was rather slow. However, do not forget that it will still require railroad cars to move the grains to water transportation. On the other hand, the Senator well knows that our annual wheat production in years prior to the war was between 700,000,000 and 800,000,000 bushels. We consume about 750,000,000 bushels. But during the war we increased production to as much as 1,200,000,000 bushels. The condition to which the Senator now refers, may apply to the present; but if Canada continues its large wheat production, and Russia and other countries get back into production, I do not believe that this country will be producing 1,200,000,000 bushels of wheat, as it did during the war. Therefore, I doubt that the situation to which the Senator now refers will prevail very much longer.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There is no other Senator of whom I think any more than I think of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is very kind; and I can return the compliment.

Mr. THYE. I do not wish to enter into an argument other than on a specific question related to the St. Lawrence seaway. If we are not transporting wheat, we shall be transporting some other food supplies just as vital to our economy as is wheat. I shall continue to live in the Northwest. I like Minnesota as well as the Senator likes Louisiana, and I shall never move out of the Northwest. If my neighbors are not producing wheat, they will be producing something else needed in the economy of this great Nation, and we shall need transportation facilities. The St. Lawrence seaway will furnish such facilities, whether it be for wheat or other products. However, I believe that we shall be producing wheat just as long as Russia and the other countries of the world produce it. For that reason I think the St. Lawrence seaway is an essential project from the standpoint of moving food commodities. But I think the project in itself is far beyond even the one question of transportation or of the frozen condition during 4½ months of the year, thereby affecting the facilities of shipping by way of the chain of lakes. We need the project in the growth of this great Nation. We cannot in the future enjoy the growth which this Nation has had in the past 10 years without developing the industrial East and the industrial Midwest. That requires electric current. There is a potential generating possibility on the St. Lawrence River which is greater than on any other body of water in all the world, and we can generate that current more cheaply than in any other hydroelectric plant that is today known or contemplated. If we have that generating capacity, we might as well add to it the shipping facilities that the seaway would afford, and thereby we shall strengthen the whole Nation. From it Louisiana will benefit, as will also Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, or any other State in the Midwest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I recall the figure about which the distinguished Senator has been speaking, but I believe that we can handle the problem within our own country and with facilities that are our own. If we spend within our own country the amount of money which we are now being asked to spend in Canada it will add to the security of the investment and, I am sure, will take care of the additional production about which the distinguished Senator has been speaking.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to continue for a few moments on the matter of tolls to which I was addressing myself before I was interrupted. I want to say to my distinguished colleagues that I invite questions at any time, but I should like further to develop the toll vote-getting proposal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield for a question; yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I have listened to the Senator's remarks regarding the proposed investment. Of course, the Senator understands that most of the investment will be within the borders of the United States, does he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not be spent within the borders of the United States, it will be mostly spent at the border.

Mr. AIKEN. Most of this investment is to be within our borders. All of the main dam and all of the locks and canals which are proposed will be within the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Now, Senator, I know you are in error. Look at the map on the wall. Only Lake Michigan is wholly in the United States. Most of the project will be built on the boundary between us and Canada, or, may I say, so close to Canadian territory that we might as well call it so.

We cannot charge tolls to repay the expenditure as to all freight transported in the five Great Lakes. The toll charges are to be relegated to such freight as shall pass through the St. Lawrence River itself, from where it leaves Lake Ontario and continues on to the ocean.

Mr. AIKEN. But what I wished to call the Senator's attention to was the fact that because we did not have power available in this country it was necessary for us to invest $100,000,000 in the expansion and construction of an aluminum plant, which was entirely within Canada, and in the event of war we would still be depending upon Canadian power and Canadian aluminum to carry on such a war. Furthermore, we have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the Alcan Highway and the Canol project in Canada.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I would not at all oppose the establishment of a power plant. I would help to the extent of my ability to make such a plan come into being. But I say that the expenditure of this vast amount of money to develop the St. Lawrence seaway is not necessary to procure the power to which the Senator refers at this time. Power development is the only part of this entire project which may be self-liquidating. As I pointed out a moment ago, I heard the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan state that one of the features of this proposal that has won him over was the fact that it was self-liquidating. Yet there is not a single sentence in the pending resolution which states what the tolls shall be and how they shall be divided or whether under the limitation as to charges to be imposed, a sufficient sum will be realized to make the project self-liquidating. They had to gaze into the crystal ball, so to speak, to find the additional tonnage that will be necessary to pass through this seaway and make available a sufficient sum of money to pay for the operation and the retirement of the money expended. The record shows that the St. Lawrence River, at present, takes care of approximately 9,000,000 tons of freight. The estimate of new tonnage first presented to the Senate indicated a total of 16,000,000, which added to the present tonnage made a total of 25,000,000 tons. The crystal gazers raised the ante to 52,000,000 tons for no other purpose than to try to justify the proposition that it was possible to build this project on a self-liquidating basis.

Let us see what has happened to the Panama Canal's self-liquidating proposal. I have before me the Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the year 1946, and on page 114

there appears a table, No. 21, which shows the revenues, expenses, and computed surplus from the year 1914 to the year 1946, together with the net appropriation expenses, net revenues, capital interest at 3 percent, and computed surplus for the same years. What does that table show? It shows that in that period of time there is a deficit of $124,282,234.32. Does that spell self-liquidation?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what this written report shows.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In just a minute. As I recall, the Panama Canal cost our Government in excess of $700,000,000. That is about equal to the estimate of the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway. The Panama Canal is open not only 7 months in the year; it is open the entire year. It is a canal which connects two great oceans. Yet, it is not self-liquidating. I ask how, in the name of common sense, can it be argued here that a project which is now estimated to cost $700,000,000 and which, in my estimation, will cost in excess of a billion dollars before completion, can be self-liquidating? How some of the proponents can be drawn into supporting this measure on that basis is simply beyond my comprehension. I fear they are being hoodwinked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the table to which I have referred, on page 114 of the report mentioned, as well as the statement appearing on page 115 of the Annual Report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 21.—*Revenues, expenses, and computed surplus*

Fiscal year	Tolls	Civil revenues	Business profits	Total revenues	Net appropriation expenses [1]	Net revenues	Capital interest 3 percent [2]	Computed surplus [3]
1914–20	$33, 303, 581. 67	$1, 206, 579. 86	$536, 068. 34	$35, 046, 259. 87	$36, 657, 766. 89	($1, 611, 507. 02)		($1, 611, 507. 02)
1921	11, 261, 919. 31	213, 986. 19	564, 211. 20	12, 040, 116. 70	9, 578, 300. 14	2, 461, 816. 56	$14, 674, 964. 74	(12, 213, 148. 18)
1922	11, 193, 383. 47	192, 208. 85	323, 259. 16	11, 708, 851. 48	8, 469, 017. 63	3, 239, 833. 85	15, 253, 780. 02	(12, 013, 946. 17)
1923	17, 507, 630. 52	184, 213. 54	1, 140, 642. 50	18, 832, 486. 56	8, 240, 777. 56	10, 591, 709. 00	15, 202, 430. 18	(4, 610, 721. 18)
1924	24, 289, 603. 16	392, 250. 73	901, 624. 12	25, 583, 478. 01	8, 923, 905. 39	16, 659, 572. 62	15, 150, 900. 33	1, 508, 672. 29
1925	21, 374, 664. 12	207, 954. 04	765, 916. 85	22, 348, 535. 01	8, 666, 693. 44	13, 681, 841. 57	15, 099, 730. 49	(1, 417, 888. 92)
1926	22, 927, 456. 03	217, 680. 50	841, 310. 29	23, 986, 446. 82	8, 543, 468. 47	15, 442, 978. 35	15, 085, 580. 64	357, 397. 71
1927	24, 217, 185. 32	391, 623. 50	876, 536. 80	25, 485, 345. 62	9, 547, 715. 02	15, 937, 630. 60	15, 068, 580. 79	869, 049. 81
1928	26, 943, 513. 11	232, 532. 57	736, 719. 43	27, 912, 765. 11	9, 501, 200. 82	18, 411, 564. 29	15, 035, 029. 29	3, 376, 535. 00
1929	27, 123, 534. 33	243, 391. 39	737, 850. 26	28, 104, 775. 98	10, 187, 150. 71	17, 917, 625. 27	15, 013, 374. 55	2, 904, 250. 72
1930	27, 077, 117. 36	349, 255. 35	760, 971. 66	28, 187, 344. 37	9, 893, 920. 93	18, 293, 423. 44	14, 987, 527. 89	3, 305, 895. 55
1931	24, 644, 550. 39	346, 030. 35	562, 764. 17	25, 553, 344. 91	10, 693, 353. 53	14, 859, 991. 38	14, 986, 578. 04	(126, 586. 66)
1932	20, 706, 568. 49	327, 444. 23	557, 095. 44	21, 591, 108. 16	10, 239, 211. 84	11, 351, 896. 32	14, 943, 807. 66	(3, 591, 911. 34)
1933	19, 621, 158. 61	310, 014. 16	1, 135, 708. 62	21, 066, 881. 39	9, 555, 672. 02	11, 511, 209. 37	14, 907, 732. 16	(3, 396, 522. 79)
1934	24, 065, 065. 16	96, 666. 67	1, 366, 755. 12	25, 528, 486. 95	7, 931, 383. 77	17, 597, 103. 18	15, 039, 203. 81	2, 557, 899. 37
1935	23, 338, 977. 90	81, 957. 68	1, 021, 216. 61	24, 442, 152. 19	9, 481, 429. 57	14, 960, 722. 62	15, 124, 193. 39	(163, 470. 77)
1936	23, 506, 806. 46	119, 915. 21	920, 185. 23	24, 546, 906. 90	9, 675, 067. 13	14, 871, 839. 77	15, 159, 597. 04	(287, 757. 27)
1937	23, 147, 433. 54	98, 775. 74	917, 360. 14	24, 163, 569. 42	10, 289, 624. 05	13, 873, 945. 37	15, 205, 397. 30	(1, 331, 451. 93)
1938	23, 215, 192. 39	90, 335. 19	824, 612. 60	24, 130, 140. 18	9, 575, 624. 32	14, 554, 515. 86	15, 229, 992. 24	(675, 476. 38)
1939	23, 699, 413. 82	106, 929. 55	681, 272. 48	24, 487, 615. 85	10, 145, 272. 18	14, 342, 343. 67	15, 250, 404. 68	(908, 061. 01)
1940	21, 177, 243. 04	118, 480. 75	1, 033, 886. 06	22, 329, 609. 85	10, 041, 950. 30	12, 287, 659. 55	15, 243, 237. 66	(2, 955, 578. 11)
1941	18, 190, 379. 36	275, 775. 08	1, 008, 741. 70	19, 474, 896. 14	9, 614, 117. 60	9, 860, 778. 54	15, 275, 108. 42	(5, 414, 329. 88)
1942	9, 772, 112. 42	[4] 219, 425. 29	734, 465. 84	10, 726, 003. 55	9, 406, 901. 79	1, 319, 101. 76	15, 301, 998. 50	(13, 982, 896. 74)
1943	7, 368, 680. 74	[5] 54, 943. 70	1, 492, 542. 70	8, 916, 167. 14	11, 268, 564. 39	(2, 352, 397. 25)	15, 432, 220. 92	(17, 784, 618. 17)
1944	5, 473, 846. 30	239, 393. 31	1, 553, 294. 06	7, 266, 533. 67	12, 634, 164. 42	(5, 367, 630. 75)	15, 483, 605. 43	(20, 851, 236. 18)
1945	7, 222, 656. 14	238, 715. 40	1, 469, 183. 52	8, 930, 555. 06	13, 905, 470. 81	(4, 974, 915. 75)	15, 475, 539. 95	(20, 450, 455. 70)
1946	14, 791, 807. 14	267, 684. 60	[6] 207, 608. 91	[6] 15, 267, 100. 65	15, 214, 130. 16	[6] 52, 970. 49	15, 427, 340. 86	[6] (15, 374, 370. 37)
Total	537, 161, 480. 30	6, 824, 163. 43	23, 671, 833. 81	567, 657, 477. 54	297, 881, 854. 88	269, 775, 622. 66	394, 057, 856. 98	(124, 282, 234. 32)

[1] Includes adjustment of $15,027.41 in postal surplus.
[2] Includes adjustment of $44,099.80 in postal surplus.
[3] After deduction of Canal earnings repaid to appropriations.
[4] Interest prior to July 12, 1920, is included in capital investment account.
[5] Parentheses denote deficits.
[6] Actual business profits of $876,835.29 have been adjusted by $669,226.38 for write-off of reimbursable capital expenditures, public works, Republic of Panama.

The above table summarizes by classes the revenues received by the Panama Canal by fiscal years from 1921 and shows the net results from operations after deducting therefrom the net current expenses chargeable to appropriations and the current interest charge on the capital investment. The interest rate of 3 percent has been used in making computations a great many years. The use of this rate received the approval of two organizations which investigated Panama Canal matters and was formally adopted when the present accountng system was established in 1932. It has been considered a fair and reasonable rate, as the Government at various times has paid much higher rates for the use of money.

Interest chargeable to operations is not included on the balance sheet and no interest charge against the Canal is actually made by the United States Treasury.

Total revenues on the foregoing statement represent receipts which must be covered into the United States Treasury and relinquished from control of the Panama Canal. Earnings repayable to Canal appropriations, and reexpendable by the Canal, are deducted from gross operating expenditures, in order to present a comparison of funds covered into the Treasury with funds chargeable to operating account, exclusive of capital additions.

The absence of tax charges is compensated for by the inclusion in Canal-operating accounts of the direct costs of civil government, health, and welfare activities. Neither capital nor operating expenses of the Panama Canal include the cost of the military and naval establishments on the Isthmus; however, all important exchanges of services with those interests are covered by cash settlements, or reciprocal allowances.

By including in the accounts all revenues properly applicable to Canal activities and by charging against the total revenue the net appropriation expenses, including charges for depreciation and interest at 3 percent on the capital invested but excluding any charge to amortize the investment, there has accumulated as of June 30, 1946, as shown by the above table, a deficit of $124,282,234.32.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator, but I shall not press my question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not like to say this, but I do believe that the proponents of this resolution have simply lost their sense of better judgment in their zeal to put this burden on the taxpayers of our country. To my way of thinking, it is "smelly" in at least one respect.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. Mr. President, as I shall demonstrate by the majority report, the proponents have gone so far that they are willing to sell the rights of American people down the St. Lawrence River to make the project possible. What do I mean when I say that?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. When the Senator states that the entire project will be so costly and so beclouded that it is even "smelly," how does he answer Lieutenant General Wheeler and how does he justify his statement in that regard?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when I said this proposal was "smelly" in at least one respect, I did not have any reference to the cost of the project. What I have in mind is the manner in which the proponents of the measure have been willing to trample on the Constitution itself in order to place this proposed resolution on the statute books and thereby make the St. Lawrence waterway a reality.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. How does the Senator answer General Wheeler?

Mr. ELLENDER. Regarding the cost?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not now discussing the cost. In that connection, however, let me say to the Senator that I have studied the estimates made. Almost every project of any consequence built by the United States, including the

Panama Canal, has cost much more than the estimates. The engineers in charge, have, from time to time, been compelled to raise their sights as to costs. The Senator is well aware of that. I desire to say that when I used the word "smelly" a moment ago, I had reference to the scheme resorted to by the proponents of this measure in order to bypass the Constitution. I should like to discuss that point for a moment.

Mr. President, every Member of the Senate knows, or at least should know, that it is absolutely inexcusable for us not to guarantee perpetual rights of navigation to every citizen of the United States and to hope that the same rights may be accorded to every Canadian. Such a provision is essential. Perpetual navigation rights should not be left in the realm of probability, but they should be indelibly written into the measure now before us. They should be made perpetual. They should be vested in every citizen of the countries involved.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? If he will, I wish to say——

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask the Senator from Minnesota to wait a moment, please.

Mr. President, I have seen from the air the large farm owned by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, which is located in his native State. Suppose he desired to drain his farm into a river 2 or 3 miles away, and suppose that in order to reach that river he had to dig a canal through several adjoining farms belonging to his neighbors. Would the distinguished Senator undertake to cut that canal to the river before he obtained a right-of-way and established the terms and conditions under which he could use the canal? I am sure he would not be so foolish. I give him credit for having some sense.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In the first place, in the case of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway the trench is all dug, with the exception of several small, narrow necks of land through which we have yet to build canals. But if the Senator desires to give an illustration, then I should like to say that when we were confronted with the danger of having our coastal cities bombed during the war, we found it expedient and wise to build our armament and other defense plants in the interior parts of our country; and in doing that, the best land, wherever land was needed, was used. Such land was taken for that purpose in various of the interior portions of the United States, in order to have those armament plants removed from the danger of bombing.

Mr. ELLENDER. With all due respect, I believe that my good friend has missed my point. But in answer to what he has just stated, of course, the Government has a right to do all of that in time of war. In time of war the Government can take a man's home; his farm; it can force men to go to war and leave their loved ones; and so on.

But all that is far removed from the argument which I have made in this instance, and as to which I propose to show from the report itself that one of the most vital provisions which should be included in this agreement is left dangling for future agreement between the United States and Canada. I refer to a provision for perpetual navigation rights to all of the people of the United States and to those of Canada.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to place a notice in the RECORD?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the argument I am advancing will lose its significance if I continue to yield and thereby make its presentation piecemeal. What is it that the distinguished Senator wishes to insert in the RECORD?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. To no one. I prefer to continue.

Mr. President, as I have just stated, the most vital provision of any measure for the building of a project, such as the one in contemplation, is a section guaranteeing to the people of the United States and to the people of Canada perpetual rights of navigation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I refuse to yield for the moment.

Let me call to the attention of Senators that such a provision for perpetual rights of navigation was considered so vital that it has been included in every measure on this subject which previously has been presented to the Senate for consideration. It was included in the last resolution on this subject, which was before the Congress in 1941 under article VII. Article VII is summarized as follows on page 6 of the majority report on the pending measure:

> Article VII extended perpetual navigation rights to the two countries in boundary waters and connecting channels and canals where those navigation rights are now terminable with the life of existing treaties.

Now let me read article VII in full as it appeared in the Canadian-American agreement of March 19, 1941. I read:

> ARTICLE VII
>
> The High Contracting Parties agree that the rights of navigation accorded under the provisions of existing treaties between the United States of America and His Majesty shall be maintained notwithstanding the provisions for termination contained in any of such treaties, and declare that these treaties confer upon the citizens or subjects and upon the ships, vessels, and boats of each High Contracting Party, rights of navigation in the St. Lawrence River, and the Great Lakes system, including the canals now existing or which may hereafter be constructed.

That article was the one we were called upon to ratify in 1941.

Mr. President, I consider that provision to be essential. It is necessary. It gives to both countries a vested right to perpetual navigation in the proposed seaway. Yet, what do the proponents of this project do in their zeal to try to have the pending resolution enacted by the Congress? Mr. President, they eliminate it from the resolution. And why, may I ask, that article VII was eliminated? The answer, in order to bypass the requirement of the Constitution, providing for the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate. Listen to this, Senators. I read from the majority report, at page 6:

> Article VII and IX were eliminated to meet the view that they required the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, because they were considered to be matters properly dealt with by means of treaties.

Senators, that is not my language, but it is that contained in the majority report filed in connection with the pending measure.

Smelly, I should say so. It stinks.

Mr. President, how can we obtain such perpetual rights of navigation, which are so essential, unless we conform to what the proponents of this measure say is necessary, namely, to proceed by way of treaty?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with all due respect, I think the Senator from Minnesota should know that I will not yield just now until I say I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I believe it to be necessary and essential for this Congress to include in the pending measure a binding agreement by which it will be made certain and crystal clear that the people of Canada and the people of the United States will have perpetual rights of navigation in the so-called St. Lawrence seaway. I say that based on the views of the majority; for they themselves thought that was necessary; but in order to have the measure passed by the Congress, they now have said in effect, "We are willing to brush that aside temporarily, and let it be agreed to in the future between Canada and the United States."

With apologies I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not recognize the danger because of the absence of a treaty, to which the Senator has referred. I do not recognize such a danger for the reason that the situation relative to the St. Lawrence seaway is not identical to that relative to the Panama Canal. In the case of the Panama Canal we were dealing with a country through which the Canal was to go, whereas in the present case we are dealing with a boundary river in which we have an interest and in which the other country, Canada, also has an interest. In the present case the major canal installations are to be made on our own soil. So we cannot properly foresee that the other country will forbid navigation on its one-half, when we own the other one-half. That situation is in no sense the situation in regard to the Panama Canal Zone.

So again I must differ with the Senator from Louisiana on the question of the importance of having a treaty with Canada before we proceed to develop the project or attempt to make the plans for its development, because the actual situation is that we own half of the river and we own all the land on which the major locks and dams are to be installed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but in order to reach the ocean, so as to make navigation feasible, it will be necessary for our ships to pass through Canada itself. Aside from the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence borders our country for about 120 miles. The rest of its great length is entirely in Canada. Since the Senator has injected the Panama Canal, let me ask this question of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota: Suppose the Panama Canal had not been built, would the Senator agree to have the United States go to the extent of building that canal, installing the locks, and so forth, and then after the canal and the locks were built, deal with Panama as to the terms and conditions under which the United States could hold the necessary property and operate the canal?

Mr. THYE. That is what the Senator has been complaining of.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, Mr. President; the Senator has again missed the point. I am not complaining about anything, except as to the method of approach in the instant case. I am simply pointing out that I do not believe that the Senator would agree to build a Panama Canal, unless a solemn treaty was first entered into with the Republic of Panama.

We obtained possession of the property necessary to build the Canal from Panama by way of a treaty. We obtained a vested right in a strip of land running through Panama 10 miles wide from ocean to ocean. We got that authority before a spadeful of dirt or rock was removed from the canal site. In the case of the St. Lawrence seaway it has always come before the Senate by way of treaty except as to the resolution now before us. We first had our rights to perpetual navigation guaranteed, but now, as I pointed out, there is no such a guaranty respecting perpetual navigation. Under the pending resolution, we authorize the project, we agree to put up the money, the project may well be started, nay, it may be completed before the rights of navigation are dealt with finally. I say with all the force that is in me that the American people should have a vested right to perpetual navigation or the use of the St. Lawrence River in perpetuity, and it ought to be done before we spend a red sou on it. That right should be vested at the same time that the project is being authorized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator not know that we have had a treaty since, I think, the year 1879, with Canada?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes; we have had many treaties with our good neighbor, Canada.

Mr. AIKEN. I refer to a treaty of navigation with Canada. And does the Senator not know that today we have to traverse Canadian waters every time an American ship puts in at Montreal?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator not know also that Canada can start charging us tolls on the Welland Canal, in a manner that will affect our Great Lakes shipping tomorrow?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. But we likewise accord similar rights to Canada in the Great Lakes region.

Mr. AIKEN. Canada has never done that.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; but I will say to the Senator all that is under treaty. We have a vested right in that, but we do not have in this instance.

Mr. AIKEN. The development of the St. Lawrence River was authorized specifically in the treaty of 1909.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why this effort, may I ask? Why pass any sort of resolution if the authority to build exists?

Mr. AIKEN. Certain private and public interests have constructed dams, bridges, and channels, and have diverted water, and have developed tunnels, under that same treaty, but the validity of constructing these works under the 1909 treaty is questioned only when it is proposed to build a dam which will be owned by the public and operated for the public. So long as private interests wanted to operate under the provisions of that treaty, it was perfectly all right, but when you talk of developing power for the public, then the opponents raise their hands in horror and talk about dignity and sanctity and morality.

Mr. ELLENDER. Such a condition does not guide my action. I should like to see the power developed there, and I sincerely believe that it can be done without developing the transportation facilities now under discussion.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not the real reason that the Senator does not want the navigation developed because he wants to turn as much navigation as he can down the Mississippi, through the port of New Orleans?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; that is not the reason, but the Senator could likewise be accused of wanting to get power for Vermont. I am not that narrow in my views, and the Senator should know that of me by now.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to get power everywhere.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have kept clear of sectionalism.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly we want power in Vermont.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want to say to the Senator that my concern is prompted by the fact that within the past several years we have been too liberal with our God-given natural resources and cash for the benefit of foreign nations. The Senator knows that.

Mr. AIKEN. We have been too liberal with some parts of our own country.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a great deal of development that could be undertaken within our boundaries. We have had tremendous floods in Iowa and other of our Central States, and we have had tremendous floods in other sections of the country, but when we go to the Treasury with open hands and ask a little money to repair the damage or to protect ourselves from the ravages of recurring floods, we are told that the cost is too great and our national debt is too big, that we are spending it here and there, and do not have any money to spend for remedial measures.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Louisiana think it was right that during the war years his own community, through the efforts of his distinguished colleague, who was chairman of the subcommittee on flood control, I believe, of the Committee on Commerce, received appropriations of $19,000,000? Let me quote from one of the Senator's colleague's election speeches, as reported in the Alexandria Daily Town Talk, Alexandria, La., Wednesday, August 9, 1944:

> OVERTON said that Congress had appropriated $19,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944, and $26,000,000 for fiscal 1945 for flood-control work on the lower Mississippi Valley, but that only a token payment of $100 has been allotted for all flood-control work outside of the Mississippi Valley.

Does the Senator think it was fair to get $45,000,000 for his own community, and cut off all the rest of the country with only a $100 token appropriation, at a time when we were at war, when boys were dying in blazing oil in the Caribbean, and when the whole country was making sacrifices?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator should know that the amount referred to took care of river work from Cairo, Ill., down to the mouth of the Mississippi River. I am sure the Senator is aware that all the waters of the States that border on the Mississippi, as well as all the waters from the tributaries of that great river, pass our doors, and it is necessary that Louisiana, as well as many other Southern States, be afforded some kind of protection. There is no doubt about the constant menace of flood, and I say that what has been spent is but a pittance compared with what should be spent in order to protect us from the floods coming down on us from the north.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the money used for flood control is well spent, but every time we come to the Congress and ask for money to take care of those situations we have always been told that the national debt is too big; that we have to spend it here or have to spend it over yonder; that Europe needs it; that England needs it. We are told, in effect, "We cannot take care of you here at home." I want to try to reduce some of our foreign expenditures, if I can. I want to be more liberal with our own projects in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. That argument holds good as to New England, as well as to the Mississippi River Basin.

Mr. ELLENDER. Speaking about sectionalism, yes, I am sectional—I am for the United States. I would like to see a little more money spent here to benefit our own people, rather than sending too much of it abroad. I repeat, the Senator is well acquainted with what took place in the tremendous flood in Iowa, Illinois, and various other States in the central part of our country in recent months. Does the Senator not feel that it is high time for this Congress adequately to take care of the flood-control problem of this country?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator mentioned the disaster in Iowa, but he understands that both Senators from Iowa are sponsors of a bill to develop the St. Lawrence, I suppose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, I suppose there are in this body quite a few misguided Senators. I do not doubt that.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to say that I intended to speak for only about 15 or 20 minutes. I have been on my feet for almost 2 hours.

Mr. WILEY. I will not take long.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in relation to the matter of perpetual rights, it seems to me that the Senator was right in the spirit of his contention; but he failed to present the matter clearly, and I think anyone reading the RECORD would possibly get a wrong understanding. I want to say to the Senator that previously one of the great arguments that was made in this matter, that the matter should be handled by a treaty instead of a resolution approving an executive agreement was based on the fact that it involved at that time the very thing for which he now argues, a perpetual right. But if the Senator will turn to the joint resolution he is asked to pass upon, which is now before the Senate, he will see that in section 2 the President is instructed to negotiate with Canada a treaty or treaties with reference to perpetual navigation rights on the Great Lakes. There is an instruction of the House and the Senate to the President to do that very thing, and to bring back a treaty.

When the Senator says that the money provided will be spent before that has taken place, of course, that statement is subject to correction. The resolution does not appropriate a cent. What the resolution does is to start the machinery for the negotiation of a treaty for the perpetual rights, whereby the President will enter into an agreement with Canada in relation to tolls, and other matters. Money has already been spent on the project in the sense that engineering plans have been made. That money has been appropriated. But until the Senate and House appropriate the money for the project itself, the project can never really be gotten under way. So I want to make clear that while the Senator is right that the matter of perpetual right must be dealt with by treaty, the joint resolution instructs the President to undertake to negotiate such a treaty for that very purpose, and to bring it back to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad the Senator admits that the right to perpetual navigation should be restored by treaty.

I am contending that the right to perpetual navigation, under the terms of the resolution, is left for the future, whereas it should be fixed now. A mere authority to make a treaty is not sufficient. We are asked to authorize the project. We may spend much money toward building the canal, and yet the right to perpetual navigation may be deferred indefinitely. Does the Senator think it is good business for us to build the canal and then let the President go to Canada to see Mr. Mackenzie King, if he is still there, and say, "Now, we are about through building the seaway we would like to have perpetual navigation rights." Why do we not do it now? Why is it not necessary that it be done now? Why is it not the sensible thing to do, to obtain perpetual navigation right at this time, before we undertake to spend another dime on the project. I should like the Senator to answer that question for me. Why does he not insist on the inclusion of article 7 of the Canadian-American agreement entered into in March 1941? That article, as I previously pointed out, provided for perpetual navigation. Oh, what is the use to argue? As I pointed out a while ago, the Senator consented to the elimination of article 7 to meet the view that it required the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, because said article was considered to be a matter properly dealt with by means of treaty. What assurance has the Senator that this body is going to ratify a treaty later?

Mr. WILEY. I do not have any assurance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator does not have assurance.

Mr. WILEY. No one else has that assurance.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the Senator does not have any assurance as to what Canada is going to do. Yet the Senator is willing to authorize the expenditure of millions upon millions of dollars for the purpose of navigation, and he is not willing in advance to guarantee to the American people and to the Canadian people a perpetual right of navigation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I decline to yield further. I should like to conclude. If the Senator desires to answer my arguments, he may proceed in his own time.

Mr. President, what I have to say now has been more or less touched upon by me in answer to a few questions propounded during the course of the debate. I do not mean to practice, here on the floor of the Senate, sectionalism respecting the expenditure of public funds. I have telegrams that I propose to read in a moment from various ports located throughout the country, that are opposing the proposal, because they think it will be harmful.

For several years past, as I said a moment ago, we have often been told that funds could not be provided for the development of necessary projects within our own boundary, projects to protect our own people from floods and other disasters, because of the enormous debt that hangs over our heads. Why, there are those who are willing to put us into debt further and make it less possible for these vital projects to which I referred a while ago to be built in our own country. We have had a number of projects that were deemed necessary, the total cost of which to date is in excess of $3,500,000,000. Many of these projects have been approved years ago, but they have been subjected to continual delays, because we were told that the Treasury is empty, our national debt is enormous, and we cannot do it today. Notwithstanding that, the proponents of this measure are willing to put an extra pile on the debt we now owe, and make it less possible, as I have just indicated, for us to complete many of the projects that are essential to our own economy and which have been approved by those in authority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] said on the floor of the Senate yesterday that Congress had authorized inland construction amounting to more than $6,000,000,000; that that was the amount which the Congress had already authorized.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his contribution. I was under the impression the amount was about $3,500,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was also, but the senior Senator from Arkansas said it was more than $6,000,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to have that information placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I maintain that we ought to protect our own interests. It has been stated on the floor of the Senate by quite a few Senators that the majority of the vessels which are now owned by the United States will not be able to use the canal because it will not be deep enough; that it is going to be used by many small foreign vessels, tramp vessels, which carry freight here and there, which represent little investment, all of which will mean the taking away from our own people of some of the freight which should be carried by transportation means owned by our own citizens.

Just stop and think of the loss which would result to the railroads of the United States from the construction of the canal. There are many persons scattered throughout the United States who today own large amounts of railroad stocks and bonds. These investments will be impaired by the diversion of a considerable amount of the freight which would otherwise be carried over the railroads.

While the seaway is open to traffic for 7 months in the year there may be little for some railroads to carry, but while it is closed by ice, shippers are going to resort to the railroad systems to bring their goods to the ports. Think of what an impact that will be on some of our railroads.

Mr. President, that argument may be called an argument based upon sectionalism, but I do not think it is. I am arguing for the investors in our railroad systems, and for the people in our own country who have subscribed to the building of our immense water transportation systems.

Mr. President, I have a few telegrams which I propose to read into the RECORD in substantiation of what I have been speaking of as to the effect the project will have on the investments in many of the cities of our country. I read a telegram from New York under date of February 2, addressed to me, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 2, 1948.*
Senator A. J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building:

Proposed St. Lawrence seaway would divert 3,000,000 tons annually from New York harbor and seriously affect livelihood of 200,000

people dependent on port commerce and jeopardize investment of $1,000,000,000 in New York port facilities. The seaway would cripple the development of our merchant marine as United States flag vessels would not use it and would constitute important target difficult to defend in case of war instead of aid to defense of United States.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Secretary, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.

I now read a telegram from Boston, also dated February 2, addressed to me, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *February 2, 1948.*
Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Room 245, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Port of Boston Authority strongly opposes St. Lawrence seaway proposal. Proposed seaway would inevitably divert substantial traffic from the existing Atlantic and Gulf ports on the strength of which this Nation depends. Investment in port facilities at port of Boston aggregating in excess of $100,000,000 is threatened by this costly part-time, wasteful, and diversionary proposal.

J. A. CROTHERS,
Director, Port of Boston Authority, Commonwealth Pier 5, Boston.

I read a telegram from my own State of Louisiana, from New Orleans:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *February 3, 1948.*
Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate:

This board desires that you register in Congress on our behalf our unqualified opposition to the passage of any legislation approving the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. This board, as an agency of the State of Louisiana, in its operations of the port of New Orleans has issued bonds and has paid out of its own funds other than from bonds a total of $58,867,542 for the construction of wharves, sheds, buildings, machinery, canal construction, and acquisition of real estate. At the present time we consider this investment is valued at $117,735,094. It would be impossible to calculate in dollar value the harm to this port that would result from the St. Lawrence seaway, because of the loss of tonnage and diversion of traffic. Such a loss while incalculable would reach a staggering proportion when it is considered that an all-weather port like New Orleans would be so adversely affected in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway, which, at best, cannot support traffic more than 6 months out of the year. The conclusion should be inescapable to any fair-minded group that such a waterway is not in the interests of the people of the country as a whole, but in favor of a small section of the country.

E. O. JEWELL,
General Manager.

I read another telegram from Louisiana, sent from Lake Charles, as follows:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *February 3, 1948.*
Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Washington, D. C.:

The Gulf Ports Association instructed me as its president to protest against passage of Senate Joint Resolution 111 or any other plan making use of Federal money for construction of St. Lawrence seaway. Written protests giving detailed and cogent reasons to back up the protest will be forwarded each United States Senator in tomorrow's mail. Texas Ports Association also filing like protest.

ALVA P. FRITH,
President, Gulf Ports.

To this telegram is attached a succinct statement signed by Mr. Alva P. Frith, president of the Gulf Ports Association, which gives a summary of reasons why the Senate should not adopt the pending proposal. I ask that this statement be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GULF PORTS ASSOCIATION,
Lake Charles, La., February 2, 1948.

To the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The members of the Gulf Ports Association are disturbed about the injury to their ports, should Senate Joint Resolution 111 pass. I am instructed to place the association's views before you, and request that you do all possible to defeat Senate Joint Resolution 111, House Joint Resolution 192, House Joint Resolution 194, or any other plan for construction of St. Lawrence seaway that calls for use of Federal money.

There are many reasons why St. Lawrence seaway should not be constructed, but, wishing to be as brief as possible, I quote what the Gulf Ports Association membership consider the most important:

1. The proposed agreement is assertion of executive authority which, if permitted, will have far-reaching and injurious effect in many ways.

2. The tremendous cost and failure to produce the tonnage and service claimed by proponents will result in a reaction of public opinion that will be unfavorable to all future worth-while projects in other sections of the country.

3. When completed, the seaway would be tortuous, fog-ridden, and hazardous.

4. The seaway would be more vulnerable to air attack than any waterway in the United States.

5. Twenty-seven-foot depth is unsuitable for most United States vessels.

6. It would mostly be used by foreign-flag small vessels which would take tonnage now moving through Atlantic and Gulf ports. That would be detrimental to United States merchant marine, railroads, inland water carriers, and ports.

7. It would affect car-equipment situation by taking traffic from rail carriers during open season, but compelling them to handle during winter months.

8. Construction will hardly begin before proponents will be demanding a 35-foot channel. Numerous Great Lake ports will request improved harbor facilities.

9. The tremendous cost for a part-year seaway is unsound from every economic and transportation standpoint.

10. It would be unfair to transportation lines, without which the United States would have been defeated in World War II. Its construction would violate the principles enunciated by Congress in the national transportation policy.

11. The money spent to construct an expensive link to an icebound locality could be put to far better use in improving United States time-tested ports. Ports that proved their worth in peace and in the crucible of World War II.

Thanks for your kind consideration.
Respectfully submitted.

GULF PORTS ASSOCIATION,
By ALVA P. FRITH, *President.*

Mr. ELLENDER. I have another telegram, dated February 2, from Baltimore. It reads as follows:

BALTIMORE, MD., *February 2, 1948.*
Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building:

The city and port of Baltimore oppose the St. Lawrence seaway project as an unwise and improper national undertaking. Investment of some $200,000,000 in marine facilities by private and public interests here would be menaced, such facilities having been established to serve large sections of the country. Baltimore, like other major harbors, regards its port as a national service gateway and feels that the St. Lawrence proposal would impair its functions and hence be contrary to the best interests of the country as a whole.

G. H. POUDER,
Executive Vice President, Baltimore Association of Commerce.

Here is another from Buffalo, which I will read:

BUFFALO, N. Y., *February 4, 1948.*
Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Chamber:

The city of Buffalo reasserts its continued unqualified opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The port of Buffalo is the hub in the interchange of lake, canal, and rail traffic and its industry would be destroyed and employment greatly affected. This telegram is forwarded pursuant to unanimous resolution of the common council.

Dr. JOSEPH J. TRONOLONE,
City Clerk.

If that is your conception of sectionalism, I am for it.

Mr. President, I did not intend to speak as long as I did on this all-important subject. All the arguments pro and con have been covered time and time again. It is my honest belief that this proposal is unsound and impracticable and violative of our constitutional obligations. It is a waste of public funds and will do harm rather than good to our economy.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement. Now that the junior Senator from Louisiana has concluded his speech, that marks the last speech that I know anything about on the part of Senators who are opposed to the project. All Senators who have told me that they desire to speak in opposition to the project have now done so, and so far as we are concerned we are ready to proceed to a vote. I wished to make that announcement so that Members of the Senate, ladies and gentlemen of the press, and the public would realize that so far as the opponents are concerned they are ready to proceed to a vote.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was not present yesterday afternoon when there was a slight altercation on the floor. When we started this debate, instead of pursuing the debate day after day, the Senate met on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and then went over until the following Monday. As a result, we are now in a jam. I am not ready to proceed to a vote, and I will tell the Senate why.

Two days ago the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] gave me a list of 12 or 13 Senators who would like to speak, and I gave him my list of 12 or 13 Senators. I shall ask my secretary to obtain a copy of both lists, and shall read them into the RECORD.

There was every indication that the debate would continue not only through this week, but into next week. Then I was informed that, under the general understanding in years past, during the week of February 12 there would be no voting. With that understanding in mind, I tried to obtain an agreement with the opposition to vote the following week.

I was unable to obtain such an understanding. However, we did obtain a firm understanding with the Senators from Massachusetts, who were leading the opposition, that there would be a vote on the 25th.

Mr. President, I owe an obligation to absent Senators and to Senators who will be absent in the near future. Many Senators are now absent. When they came to me they were informed of the situation. Some of them were Senators who expected to vote with the opposition.

So, putting on a "stunt" and declaring that "We are now ready to vote" does not appeal to me, when there was an agreement between us, and other Senators were informed of it.

Mr. President, I believe that all Senators understand the situation. It seems to me like stage play to say, "We are now ready to vote." I could not feel that I was keeping faith with my fellow Senators if I were to say that I was ready to vote.

Furthermore, there are distinguished Senators, including both Democrats and Republicans, yet to speak on this subject. We shall proceed with the debate. I was informed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that at 4:30 o'clock he would present a unanimous-consent agreement, and that after that we would know just what the situation was.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I now state that I have before me the list of Senators who intended to speak against the pending measure. The list includes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I turned over to the Senator from Massachusetts my list, containing the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin, who were to speak. Those are the facts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Has not the senior Senator from Wisconsin spoken?

Mr. WILEY. I trust that the Senator knows the answer to that question. However, the Senator from Wisconsin has not exhausted his capacity. There are plenty of amendments on which to speak. I can speak twice on the joint resolution and twice on any amendment. I do not think the Senator would object to my speaking.

Mr. LODGE. I do not doubt the Senator's capacity to speak at length and with eloquence on almost any topic.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the addresses of those on the list which the Senator has read, of Senators who were opposed to the pending measure and who desired to speak, have been completed, with the exception of that of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who told me that he did not care to speak. We have completed our arguments.

The list which the Senator from Wisconsin has read, of Senators who are in favor of the pending measure, is of approximately the same length as our list. Of course, the Senator from Wisconsin knows very well that if there were a real will to do so, it would not be difficult to conclude the addresses of those on that list today and tomorrow. It would not be any problem at all if there were a desire to do so.

Of course I agreed to vote on the 25th; but there is nothing inconsistent between my agreeing to vote on the 25th and my saying that I would rather vote today. The two are not inconsistent at all. There is no stage play or "stunt" about my announcement. I simply wished to announce, for the information of Senators and of the public, that the opponents of the pending measure had completed their presentation. I was not trying to indulge in any stage play. The Senator must be imagining such things because of some plan which he has. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad that we have a thorough understanding that the 25th was agreed upon between us as the date upon which to vote. The only thing that remains to be carried through is the presentation to the Senate of the unanimous-consent request. With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to make a statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have not yielded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I inquire what the parliamentary situation is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has the floor. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know what became of the agreement. Has it been presented?

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to present it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall not consume as long in what I am about to say as will Senators who are asking me to yield.

No doubt it would be a very delightful arrangement to the opposition, having presented their case, to take a vote now before the proponents have an opportunity to present their case.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has made a preliminary statement. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] has spoken; and perhaps one or two other brief speeches have been made by the proponents. But as yet I have been unable to obtain recognition even to speak once in behalf of the seaway. All I have said has been on borrowed time, usually in the form of questions of Senators who have had the floor. I wish to speak in support of this great development, and to set forth the reasons why we cannot afford to delay longer in securing approval of its construction.

I do not approve of any arrangement whereby a vote shall be taken as soon as the opposition has presented its case; and I do not approve of any move which may be made to obtain a vote on the measure after many of the proponents have left the city. As I understand, nearly 20 Senators have already left the city, after it was understood that February 25 was selected as a tentative date for taking a vote.

If such an agreement is not concurred in, but the opposition insists on taking advantage of the situation, I shall have to insist on the regular order of business for the next week, and suggest the absence of a quorum at every meeting of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I expect to be present all the time, anyway, so that it is immaterial to me whether the Senator from Vermont insists on the regular order. That does not bother me very much.

Mr. AIKEN. It does not bother me, either. I shall be here also.

Mr. LODGE. Let us be clear about the situation. I believe that more Senators who are opposed to this project are absent than are those who are in favor of it. We all know that no matter when we have a vote in the Senate there will be some Senators absent. I am simply trying to expedite the business of the Senate, and to make it clear to the country that in these days, when there are crises and so many loose bundles of dynamite all over the world, we are attending to business and not spending too many days on this proposition.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senate will permit me at this time, I should like to say that it seems to me the solution of our problem is to find out whether the Senate can now enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote according to the agreement entered into between the proponents and opponents of the joint resolution. I think I am safe in making that statement now. We have had continuous debate upon the resolution for nearly 2 weeks. In view of the observations and representations which have been made by various Senators, I think it would be well to ascertain whether we can enter into a unanimous-consent agreement. I think the sooner we can do that the better off we shall be. If we cannot enter into such agreement, we will do something else, but

I think we should at least try. So, Mr. President, if it be in order, I should like to suggest that I am about to propose a unanimous-consent agreement; and in order to comply with the rules, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Overton
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kem	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McKellar	Tydings
Dworshak	McMahon	Umstead
Eastland	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Flanders	Millikin	Wiley
Fulbright	Moore	Williams
George	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	
Hatch	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the National Resources Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, prior to the quorum call, I announced that I felt the time had arrived when we should clarify the question as to whether it would be possible to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement. I said then that after the quorum call, which is required by the rule, we would take up the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which has been agreed to by the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure.

I now ask that the proposed agreement be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Friday, February 27, 1948, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon (1) any amendment that may be pending; (2) upon any amendment that may be proposed, subject to the provision hereinafter named, following which the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution shall be considered as ordered; and (3) upon the final passage of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Ordered further, That after the adoption of this order, no amendment that is not germane or relevant to the said joint resolution shall be received; and that no amendment shall be received to said joint resolution which has not on or before February 23, 1948, been submitted as an amendment intended to be proposed thereto and ordered to lie on the table and be printed: *Provided,* That a motion to recommit the said joint resolution shall only be in order on February 23, but a vote thereon shall not be had prior to February 27, 1948.

Ordered further, That on said calendar day of February 27, the time intervening between 12 o'clock and 4 o'clock p. m. shall be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of said joint resolution, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am pleased to inform the Chair that I find myself in complete agreement with the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I say that as one who ordinarily objects to unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate in any way. However, I think it is perfectly clear that in this instance ample time for full debate has been offered the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure. The agreement itself provides for a further extension of time, so as to make available to any Senator an opportunity between now and the date stated in the agreement to make any speech he wishes to make on any side of the issue; and certainly the agreement also safeguards another matter in which the junior Senator from Oregon is always interested, namely, the question of providing ample time for the people of the country to make their views and their wishes known on any measure pending before the Senate.

Because this proposed agreement, in my opinion, provides all those safeguards, I am very happy to join in it, and not to make the objection which usually it is my policy to make in regard to proposed unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I wish to know whether, under the terms of the proposed agreement, amendments to the pending joint resolution which are not germane to it would be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that in the event the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, no amendment not germane will be in order.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not do so—let me state that I have agreed as to the proposed date with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I wish the date were set much earlier; I should like to see a vote taken today or tomorrow, for I think the issues have been very thoroughly set forth. I think it is most unusual to keep a measure dragging along in the way proposed in the present case; but, of course, it is better to have a vote taken on the 27th of February than never to have any vote at all. So I am glad to give my concurrence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been informed by the Senator from Utah that he would like to present his argument tomorrow morning. I feel that the hour has arrived, unless there is other business to come before the Senate, when the Senate should take a recess until noon tomorrow.

ANTIDISCRIMINATION LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a telegram which I have received from Mr. R. R. Church in connection with the Ives-Fulton antidiscrimination bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1948.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

From the standpoint of winning and holding the confidence of the colored electorate and other minority groups, including Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish organizations, it is imperative that the Ives-Fulton bill, S. 984, against racial and religious discrimination in employment, be made the No. 1 must at this session of the Congress. The antilynch and the anti-poll-tax bills are desired by colored people and should be passed; however, neither directly affects millions of colored voters, in doubtful Northern States and districts where they vote. Let me repeat, in doubtful Northern States. On the other hand, the Ives-Fulton bill means something definite for every one of them. It means fair job opportunity, promotion opportunity, wiping

out wage discrimination, wiping out discrimination in labor unions. It means better housing, food for the table, shoes for the baby; in other words, it is the practical payoff on Republican promises. Here is another important angle. The other two bills, while most desirable and should be enacted, have been promoted by groups including Communist-infiltrated organizations. The Ives-Fulton bill against discrimination has been backed by non-Communist and anti-Communist groups, and they have argued that the Ives-Fulton bill is the insurance against communism. Now, if either of the other two bills are moved by the Republican majority, and the Ives-Fulton bill is not, all minority groups are going to say that the Communist Party pays off better than non-Communist organizations and that the Republican Party pays more attention to the Communist-backed operations than to others. This is being said already. The issue of fair employment is a human one which involves economic, social, and moral justice for more than 20,000,000 members of minority groups. It has the active support of labor, religious, racial, civic, and welfare groups representing a majority of the American people, and will do more to insure the return of the colored electorate to our party than any other legislation before the Congress and should be made the test ahead of the showdown on the suggested change in the Senate rule. As a lifelong Republican and chairman of the only national colored Republican organization in America, with membership in 38 States and the District of Columbia, let me urge and implore you, as a member of the Republican policy committee of the Senate, to make the Ives-Fulton bill first on your program for minorities, not only because it was promised in our national platform but also and more particularly for the good of our great country and our party.

R. R. CHURCH.

CONDITIONS IN PALESTINE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate briefly on a situation which is alarming the American people and the whole world.

The 2 months since the partition plan for Palestine was adjudicated by the General Assembly of the United Nations have seen a tragic story unfold itself in the Holy Land. Chaos, confusion, and anarchy reign now in Palestine. This is unfortunate not only because of the nature of the disorders, but because the progress initially made toward solving the problem of Palestine's future has bogged down and is in danger of complete break-down.

In accepting the responsibility to adjudge the Palestine question, the United Nations grasped this thorny problem squarely and with determination. By its courage and decisiveness it accomplished the seemingly impossible. It resolved once and for all what 19 previous investigatory and international bodies were unable to do. It laid the ground work for the final settlement of the Palestine problem. By its approval of a compromise plan to partition the Holy Land into separate Jewish and Arab states with economic union, it took the problem of Palestine out of the arena of power politics and sent it well on the road toward a final and lasting solution.

It is sad to note, however, that what was begun in such a splendid manner is now in imminent peril. Although the Arab forays from Syria, Lebanon, and Transjordan constitute undeniable acts of aggression, the matter was never introduced in the Security Council of the United Nations. And although these acts of violence were directed against a decision of the United Nations Assembly itself, there is still no reaction from that international body. I am afraid there has been a dereliction of duty.

An equal party to this dereliction has been our own Government. Though we are a leading member of the United Nations, quick to uphold the Charter and to castigate aggression in every other case, not a squeak did we raise in the present case. And though we are deeply committed to the partition plan for Palestine—by virtue of the strong position we assumed in its behalf at the General Assembly of the United Nations—our only recent acts directed toward Palestine have been in the direction of hindering rather than implementing this United Nations-approved plan. Our Government has placed embargoes in front of the Jews of Palestine who are fighting desperately to defend their lives and uphold the decision of the United Nations. Our State Department has issued a directive to the effect that American Jewish volunteers who desire to aid their brothers in the Holy Land would be penalized by possible forfeiture of their American citizenship.

These unfriendly demonstrations by our Government are neither consistent with American traditions, nor are they in harmony with our official policies with reference to Palestine.

If American Jewish boys want to help in the fight for Jewish survival in Palestine, why should State Department bars be put in their way? What neutrality can they be accused of violating? The present struggle in the Holy Land is not a private fight. It is a conflict between those who are for the United Nations and those who are against it.

And if the United States of America is not formally involved, and if the United Nations has not yet taken proper action, there is certainly nothing but admiration which we should show for those brave American boys of Jewish parentage who throw themselves into the fight as private individuals. It has been done before. We all recall how great numbers of American private citizens, with the moral encouragement of the American people, volunteered without any threats of forfeiture of citizenship, in the defense of Finland, of England, and of France at a time when our country was neutral. I, for one, want to salute these boys. By acting as they do, they show that they have indeed absorbed the lesson of red-blooded Americanism. But as for the odd attitude of the State Department—a mixture of unbecoming timidity toward the Arabs and thinly disguised disapproval toward the Jews—I do not understand it and I do not like it. Our domestic law does not require it. International law does not call for it. The international situation, difficult as it is, does not demand it. Our dignity and integrity suffer from it.

Mr. President, we were a great and influential party to the partition of Palestine. It does not behoove us to now put any impediments in the way of its full and expeditious implementation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from Montana feel satisfied, in his own mind at least, that if it had not been for the position taken by the United States, possibly the decision of the UN would have been different?

Mr. MURRAY. That I think is a correct conclusion to draw from the facts. I think we were very strongly instrumental in the decision taken, and we should uphold that decision.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination and withdrawing a nomination were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 146) authorizing the Clerk of the House, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 1634) to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto, to make certain corrections.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart;

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union";

S. 1394. An act to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Rear Adm. Edwin D. Foster, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years; and withdrawing the nomination of Miss Jane E. Steuart to be postmaster at Irvine, Pa., which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any reports of committees? If not, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

HAWAII

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be second judge, first circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John E. Parks, of Hawaii, to be third judge, first circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be circuit judge, second circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Percy C. Fountain to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William W. Hart to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Howard L. Doyle to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 4 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Edwin D. Foster, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

HAWAII

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Albert M. Cristy, to be second judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

John E. Parks, to be third judge, First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

Cable A. Wirtz, to be circuit judge, Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Percy C. Fountain, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama.

William W. Hart, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

Howard L. Doyle, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Felipe Sanchez y Baca, to be United States marshal for the district of New Mexico.

Gerald K. Nellis, to be United States marshal for the northern district of New York.

Theodore B. Werner, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota.

Leland Stanford Finney, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 4 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

POSTMASTER

Miss Jane E. Steuart, to be postmaster at Irvine, in the State of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father E. Carl Lyon, of the Shrine of the Most Blessed Sacrament, Chevy Chase, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

That the will of God be done.

In the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Almighty and Eternal God, grant to us Your grace, that it may be with us and work with us and remain with us to the very end. Grant that we may always desire and will that which is most acceptable and pleasing to You. Let Your will be ours. Let our will always follow Yours and agree perfectly with it. In our deliberations regarding laws that affect both men and country, may the light of Thy holy will serve as our guide, so that all the laws framed for our rule and government may tend to the preservation of peace and the promotion of national happiness. If what we do be pleasing to You, then so be it. If it be to Your honor, then be it done in Your name. If it be expedient and profitable for us and our fellow men, then grant that we may use it for Thy greater glory. May our resolution be—not our will, but Thine be done, O Lord.

In the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Air Force.
3. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
6. National Archives.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1796) entitled "An act to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1393) entitled "An act to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TAFT, Mr. BALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. HILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address given by the distinguished Speaker of the House to the conference of small-business organizations meeting in Washington.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, former Gov. Harold Stassen has performed a worth-while service in calling the attention of the people and the Congress to the fact that there is the possibility that someone in the executive department with inside information may have been making a profit for himself through the use of that information. I think that was well worth while. He aroused my curiosity when he got on that question of the source of the income of certain gentlemen. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Stassen, to tell the people and the Congress who is financing his campaign for the Presidency, which is costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. Just who, Mr. Stassen, is paying the freight?

This is no reflection on you or on them, but who puts up the "dough"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may hold hearings this afternoon during general debate on the pending legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today a progress report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the current fuel situation. This report is in accord with the commitment the committee made to the House last week at the time a preliminary report was filed, that a prompt further report would be made on just what action had been taken by the various departments and agencies along the lines of the nine-point program adopted by the committee last December to meet the present fuel-oil situation.

The committee is gratified with the expeditious action thus far taken as reported to it by these agencies. The committee finds, however, from such reports that 11 additional specific matters should be studied promptly and appropriate action taken. Briefly, these recommendations relate to:

First. Immediate investigation of national and local increases in fuel-oil prices.

For some time the committee has been alarmed over the prospect that petroleum prices might be increased exorbitantly in the face of impending and actual shortages. Within the past few weeks complaints from many consumers show this very thing has happened. A study of the subject should reveal the facts. Steps should then be taken to protect unwarranted Nation-wide price increases by the industry and overreaching on the part of individual companies and dealers in shortage areas.

Second. Close attention to the possible use by the major oil companies of present and future oil shortages to undermine the competitive position of independent refiners and dealers.

The committee has heard that major oil companies sometimes are refusing to sell crude to independent refiners except under so-called processing contracts, which obligate the independent to sell back the more desirable products to the supplying company. Sometimes, it is also reported, dealers and consumers have been unable to obtain fuel oil from the customary independent refinery suppliers only to have it offered to them by major company outlets. The Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General must exercise continuing care that any voluntary agreements entered into under the present emergency do not inadvertently undermine the independents.

Third. Immediate call by the Secretary of the Interior for a report by the industry of the industry's program to meet the shortages of gasoline for agricultural and other uses which the Department states will occur this spring and summer.

Fourth. Immediate consideration by appropriate governmental authorities as to whether steel should not be allocated for expanded petroleum production, refining, and distribution facilities rather than for petroleum-consuming equipment.

Fifth. An immediate survey by the Maritime Commission of the adequacy of the tanker fleet to meet the next and ensuing years' petroleum transportation requirements with particular regard to additional tanker construction necessary in case existing and proposed Middle East pipe lines cannot be operated.

Sixth. Prompt reorganization by the Department of Commerce of its entire export-control procedures over petroleum and its products.

The committee is gratified by the action thus far taken on its December program by the departments and agencies concerned, namely, substantial reduction in exports; reduction in military take; release of Navy tankers through its repair of others; additional tankers in the east-coast trade; coordination with State fuel administrators; establishment of voluntary industry allocation program calling for maximization of crude-oil runs, adjustment of refinery yields to provide maximum fuel oils at the expense of gasoline, and equitable distribution among customers of available supplies of fuel oil; Federal conservation of fuel oil; and more efficient utilization of railroad tank cars.

I wish to reiterate the committee's belief that the problem essentially is that there is a basic shortage of crude oil to meet the Nation's tremendously increasing demand. Immediate action should be taken on the resolution which I have introduced to establish a joint congressional committee to go into the entire fuel picture and formulate a national fuel policy, treating with both these emergency situations and the long-range problem.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Can the gentleman explain what effect the transfer of the B'g and Little Inch facilities to the use of gas had on this oil shortage?

Mr. WOLVERTON. In the time allotted to me it would be impossible to give a full statement with reference to that. I will assure the gentleman, however, that it is the intention of the committee to give full consideration to the whole subject of natural gas as a source of fuel, as well as to all the elements that enter into the problem, including the subject of transportation by pipe line or otherwise.

THE LATE HONORABLE B. G. LOWREY

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and that other of my colleagues who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, during the fall recess of the Congress, my State and the Nation lost one of its finest public servants, Hon. B. G. Lowrey, formerly Representative from the district which I now have the honor to represent. Mr. Lowrey died at Lewisburg, in De Soto County, on September 2. Mr. Lowrey represented the Second District of Mississippi for 8 years. During that period of service his work was outstanding in the Congress, and his contributions to the Nation and to the national welfare will be with us for a long time.

Mr. Lowrey was a splendid southern gentleman, possessed of a ready wit. His southern stories, his excellent character, and his kindness and understanding caused him to be a true representative of our section, one that reflected credit on the State from which he came and to the ideals which he held.

His work in the Congress was outstanding, but perhaps the service he held most dear was his connection through the years with one of the outstanding colleges of Mississippi, the Baptist college at Blue Mountain, Miss. This school was founded many years ago for young women and its influence and that of the Lowrey family on the young women who attended this institution have made a finer Mississippi and a finer Nation.

Mr. Lowrey was born May 25, 1862, at Kossuth, Miss., the eighth of 11 children born to Rev. Mark Perrin Lowrey and Sarah Holmes Lowrey. He was educated at Blue Mountain Male Academy, Mississippi College, and Tulane University.

He was largely instrumental in establishing Baptist Memorial Hospital, Memphis, Tenn., and served as president of Blue Mountain College and the Amarillo Military Academy, Amarillo, Tex. He

was founder and first president of the board of trustees of Mississippi Heights Academy at Blue Mountain. He was also coauthor of a book titled "Mississippi" which was adopted by the department of education for use in various schools.

Hon. Bill G. Lowrey lived to the ripe age of 85 years, having a life span that comes to few men. Be it said of him that he made the most of his life, and each and every year was spent in Christian living and application of his talents and ability for the improvement of the people of his country. He leaves for all a shining example of Christian leadership. His 13 years as president of Blue Mountain College fit well into the glorious history of that institution. The splendid work that he did there has been carried on by members of his family.

Though we are never ready to lose a man of Dr. Lowrey's capacity, we can in such loss realize that his life was a life of service, and the world is better by reason of his having lived.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly subscribe to everything the gentleman has said about Dr. B. G. Lowrey. I served with him in this House for 8 years. He was one of the finest Christian gentlemen I have ever known.

With the milestones along the highway of life becoming monuments to departed friends, we are prone to look back over those golden years, and appreciate more fully what we gained by our association with such men as B. G. Lowrey.

I am reminded of Thomas Moore's golden lines when he said:

Let Fate do her worst; there are relics of joy,
Bright dreams of the past, which she cannot destroy,
Which come in the night-time of sorrow and care
And bring back the features that joy used to wear.

Long, long be my heart with such memories filled!
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled,
You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang 'round it still.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I want to join with the gentleman in mourning the death of this distinguished Mississippian. It was not my privilege to know Dr. Lowrey so well personally, but I did know him well by reputation. He came from one of the outstanding and most cultured families of our State. The family has contributed much to the spiritual, economic, and political life not only of Mississippi but of the entire country. Dr. Lowrey rendered a valuable service in the Congress. After his retirement he rendered a valuable service as clerk of our Federal court. He lived a useful life which we would do well to emulate. I regret very much to learn of his passing.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, former Representative B. G. Lowrey, of Mississippi, was born on May 25, 1862, and passed away after a lingering illness, while Congress was in recess on September 2, 1947.

After attending the public schools and Blue Mountain Academy, Blue Mountain, Miss., he was graduated from Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss., in 1887. He was for many years in each position, professor of English, vice president and president of Blue Mountain College, one of the leading female colleges of Mississippi. He also served as president of the Amarillo Military Academy, Amarillo, Tex., for some 5 years. He was prominent in educational and Christian activities in Mississippi and the South for two generations.

He was elected to the Sixty-seventh Congress and reelected to the Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, and Seventieth Congresses, and thus served from March 4, 1921, to March 3, 1929.

Former Representative Lowrey sprang from one of the most prominent families of Mississippi. His father was a well-known educator and a leading Baptist minister. He held many positions of trust in the denomination. He was a brave soldier and a most efficient officer in the Confederate Army. At the conclusion of hostilities he was brigadier general.

The Lowrey family are best known in Mississippi as educators. Representative Lowrey's brother, W. T. Lowrey, was a great teacher as well as an eminent minister. His sister was known as Mother Berry and was a teacher in Blue Mountain College for more than a half century. No woman in all the history of the State was ever more beloved or more highly esteemed.

My relations with B. G. Lowrey and with the Lowrey family were always cordial. We were all Baptists. We were both graduates of Mississippi College at Clinton, Miss. We were associated in denominational and educational work for many years.

Representative Lowrey had been a Member of Congress 4 years when I was elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress. He was industrious and faithful in the discharge of his congressional duties. No man was held in higher esteem by his colleagues. He was preeminently a Christian statesman.

He became clerk of the United States District Court in Missisippi after he retired from Congress. For some years his health had not been good. His death was not unexpected. He was gathered unto his fathers, full of years and honors, in his eighty-sixth year.

I gladly pay tribute to the high character and to the splendid service of my friend and former colleague, the late lamented B. G. Lowrey, of Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, although I did not have the privilege of being intimately associated with Dr. B. G. Lowrey, as were some of my colleagues, he is well known to all Mississippians by reputation. He was a former Member of this House, the son of the founder of Blue Mountain College, the third president of that great institution, and at one time president of the Southern Baptist Convention.

Dr. Lowrey was a member of one of the most prominent families in Mississippi and was himself a great leader in both educational and religious activities.

Dr. Lowrey was elected Congressman from the Second District of Mississippi in 1920 and was reelected to this office three times. He later served as clerk of the United States District Court of the Northern District of Mississippi.

Few men have ever rendered a greater service to the people of our State, nor been more beloved than was Dr. Lowrey.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Evangelist, of Albany, N. Y., regarding universal military training.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter from a constituent on American relief for Poland and in the other an editorial from the Lynn Item.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier of Wednesday, January 28, entitled "Russia's Secret Pacts."

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oregon Journal.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD and Mr. TEAGUE asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, with the forthcoming November elections eagerly eyed, leaders of the two major parties find themselves bartering for minority votes. By November both parties will have quite forgotten the rights and privileges of the great majority of the American people who do not, for the purpose of special privilege, affiliate themselves with so-called minorities. Party platforms will as usual be filled with glowing promises and lures for the minority vote.

The President came forth with a strong bid in his message of February 2. This message in effect offers to trade the South, which constitutes the front line of the Democratic Party, for minority support, particularly the Negro vote.

Southerners who have long been loyal to the Democratic Party will not permit themselves to become an object of barter for the support of radical minorities. We are not going to take this threat to our heritage lying down. And the policy makers in the Democratic Party, whomever they may be, might as well take note of this fact.

I have suggested in a telegram to the Governor of my State that there be a show-down on the question with leaders of the Democratic Party. My colleague, Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, endorsed the proposal in a similar message. The messages are as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1948.

Hon. FIELDING WRIGHT,
Governor, Jackson, Miss.:

If there is any doubt in the minds of the southern people that the present leaders of the Democratic Party are hell-bent on bartering or destroying us, our southern institutions, and traditions for the support of radical Negro minorities, then they need only examine the message which the President sent to the Congress yesterday recommending among other things immediate enactment of the FEPC, anti-poll-tax, and antilynching bills and breaking down of segregation of the races. The Republicans don't give a hoot about us, and, from the accumulation of insults over the years, summarized and restated in yesterday's message, it is apparent that our Democratic leaders care less. The situation today is more serious than ever before. My heritage means more to me than just a possession. Like you, I feel it my duty to exercise every ounce of my being in perpetuating same. I don't intend to take these insults lying down. The time has arrived for concerted action and for all true southerners to stand up and be counted. Therefore I urge that southern governors request an immediate audience and conference with party leaders in Washington for a showdown, and I for one will be most happy to accompany them and participate in the meeting. You led the way in your momentous and timely inaugural message. More power to you.

THOS. G. ABERNETHY,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 3, 1948.

GOV. FIELDING L. WRIGHT,
Jackson, Miss.:

I join TOM ABERNETHY in asking you to call immediate conference of southern governors in Washington with party leaders for show-down with Democratic Party. The President's civil-rights message and recommendations for Negro and antisouthern legislation evidence his utter disregard of and contempt for principles of Jeffersonian democracy. He has placed the South on the altar of cheap politics and it is time for concerted positive southern action if our institutions are to survive. We can look to the Republicans for no help, so it is up to us alone. Your courageous leadership in advocating necessary action designates you as natural and logical leader in the fight. I had rather see the Democratic Party go down in honorable defeat standing on the principles of Jefferson than to win an empty victory by stabbing its best friends in the back. We must face the issue by putting truth and principle above partisanship and fight to the last ditch for the preservation of our heritage.

JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I for one propose to see this through to a finish. We shall determine whether the Democratic leaders propose to let the tail wag the dog.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter on the St. Lawrence seaway.

FUEL-OIL SHORTAGE IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the progress they have made to relieve the fuel-oil shortage here in the United States. But I wonder if they have gone far enough. I think it is time the House took drastic action to relieve the situation, which has become critical in some sections of the country.

The people of New York City, literally thousands of them, as well as thousands of other residents in the northeastern part of the United States, are suffering untold hardships because they do not have heat. I understand the police commissioner of New York City, Mr. Arthur Wallander, is in Washington today to plead with the Navy to release enough fuel oil to relieve the critical situation in New York City. I certainly hope he is successful, but frankly I do not know why it should be necessary for him to come to Washington.

About 10 days ago when it appeared there might be a shortage of oil here in Washington, the Navy immediately released oil which was received a few days later. If the Navy can provide oil to keep the bureaucrats in Washington warm, I certainly do not know why they cannot release enough oil to help the residents of New York City.

I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will bring a resolution to the House within the next few days which will direct that an embargo be placed upon the shipment of fuel oil to foreign countries, and I hope when the committee does the House will take immediate action on it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Brighton Blade, of Colorado, on veterans training from the thirteenth area, including Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

THE WINTER CARNIVAL IN ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I hope that before the Eightieth Congress adjourns we provide for home rule for the District of Columbia; but before setting these Washingtonians adrift, we should provide for them an adequate appropriation for the purchase of snow-removal equipment.

If you Members experienced the same difficulty as I did this morning in attempting to get to work through a slushy blanket of snow, you will agree with me that the District of Columbia is inadequately prepared to cope with snow. I was an hour and a half late in getting to my office on account of it.

Now, out in Minnesota we know how to take care of snow. In fact, we convert it from a deterrent to ready transportation to a source of frivolity and fun. In the city of St. Paul this week we are having our annual mammoth winter carnival. This is the outstanding winter carnival event of the Nation. Our citizens turn out by the thousands and engage in ice skating, ice fishing, skiing, and tobogganning. We all dress in snow suits and carnival uniforms and parade by the thousands with bands and hundreds of gaily colored floats through the streets of St. Paul. The event is characterized by fireworks and pageantry. All of this is accomplished in a community noted for its snow. Even the little children engage in snow modeling contests.

Now, by no stretch of the imagination am I attempting to advertise the city of St. Paul or its wonderful winter carnival; but what I am trying to say is that the District of Columbia needs adequate snow-removal equipment, and if it does not get it, traffic is going to be paralyzed in this community every winter like it is today.

If you get tired of trudging through the unswept streets of Washington, I urge that you come to St. Paul, Minn., the winter capital of the Nation "where good business combines with good living."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts from a magazine.

THE OIL SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, referring to the testimonial to the great State of Minnesota, in which I wish to join, I want to say that we know how to take care of the snow in New England if you would only give us a bit of fuel so that we can operate the machines to plow, and remove it. We are hoping and praying that we will not get any colder weather. I am going to appeal to the good folks from the South, to the gentleman from Texas, the former Speaker of the House who I hope will exercise his great influence with his delegation. I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] considers this matter a very serious one. I hope to be able to prevail upon the committee to accept an amendment which

is a short one and can be found on page 1015 of the RECORD. I will not bore you by asking you to read all the remarks I made yesterday, but I hope you will help us in this instance. The Governor of Massachusetts wired me this morning as to the number of barrels we need to get along until March. The people of Michigan tell you what they need for their homes and industries. I am afraid that I imposed upon the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] in trespassing on his time. Today I want to try to get just 10 minutes in behalf of the people of New England to beg you folks to help us out in this instance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Daily Item.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, those who are prone to brush off the remarks of the southern Democrats yesterday as being mere idle talk are in for a rude awakening. It should be apparent to the leadership of both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party that we mean exactly what we say; that we are not going to stand idly by and watch the South be mongrelized. We are not going to stand by and see an amalgamation of the races come about in the South without a last-ditch fight. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the spring of 1948 is the best time that I know for having our first-class wholesale spring housecleaning in the Democratic Party.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS OIL TANKERS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the remarks of my colleagues from the Northern States with respect to the fuel shortage. I am one of those who protested against the disposing by this Government of surplus tankers to foreign governments when the oil companies in my district and State and Texas were making every possible effort to buy those tankers in order to transport oil to New England and the Eastern States. However, we were unsuccessful. The 90 or more surplus tankers left over from the war were allocated to foreign countries. As a result of that, the east coast and the New England States and other portions of our country which are greatly in need of oil, have been deprived of oil by this action.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I understand that under the Marshall plan we are to give away 500 more ships to foreign countries.

Mr. LARCADE. They will never give them away with my vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

THE SITUATION IN MANCHURIA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to an article on the front page of Monday's Washington Daily News, which I hope all the members will read if they have not. It was written by one of the most farsighted patriots, one of the most courageous soldiers, one of the ablest air strategists America has had, Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault. He first demonstrated his vision and courage when he fought for air power alongside Gen. Billy Mitchell against all the inertia and the opposition of the usual unimaginative brass-hat psychology of peacetime. He crusaded more than 25 years ago to bring to the attention of our armed forces and the country the decisive role air power, or lack of it, was destined to play; and he was crucified for his vision. He did it again in the years before World War II, when he saw what was developing in the Far East and tried to warn us against the disaster impending as a result of our helping Japan destroy China. He backed up his convictions by going as a private citizen to China, and by enlisting others to go to build an air force there which wrote a veritable saga of heroism and effectiveness. He sees just as clearly what is now happening in the Far East as a result of our incredibly short-sighted policies there since VJ-day. What is more, he is again warning us to wake up before it is tragically too little and too late. He analyzes clearly the strength as well as the weaknesses of our strategic position in Asia. If our Government will act vigorously and promptly along the lines indicated, there is still a good chance we can salvage something out of the brilliant military victories won so recently at such awful cost, and can prevent war later with Russia.

The article is as follows:

UNITED STATES CAN STAMP OUT THE THREAT OF WAR

(By Maj. Gen. C. L. Chennault, retired)

(When the first of Staff Writer Clyde Farnsworth's Mukden dispatches on the Battle of Manchuria was received last week, the Scripps-Howard newspapers, by cable to Shanghai, invited Gen. Claire L. Chennault to give his size-up of that conflict and of the American diplomatic and strategic interests involved. General Chennault, now head of the Chinese Relief Administration Air Transport Service, made his great reputation in China in his spectacular leadership of the famous Flying Tigers, a group of volunteer American airmen who were fighting the Japanese over China long before Pearl Harbor.)

SHANGHAI, February 2.—The time fuse of World War III is burning now in Manchuria.

The United States owes it to China and to herself to stamp out this evil threat if possible. I believe it is possible.

If the United States does not help China and herself in this way, we shall have facilitated—nay, assured—triumph in Manchuria of Russian-inspired, Russian-armed, Russian-manipulated rebellion within and against a nation friendly to us. We shall have abandoned the initiative we now possess for keeping what remains of world peace.

Something must be done because the only conceivable strategic motivation for this cat's-paw game, which Russia is playing in Manchuria, is to insure her eastern flank for freedom of action in the west—that is, Europe.

Russia will not take the big plunge in the west until she is secure in the east. That security is what she is seeking now—at China's expense.

Much of the dreaded pattern of Japan's first move for conquest of Asia is being repeated now in Manchuria. World War II dated from, and in great measure stemmed from, Japan's unchecked aggression there beginning in 1931.

While Russia's present maneuvers are perforce not as open as were Japan's, they are nonetheless clear in their implications. The aggressive motivation is essentially the same, and if unchecked will bring the same result.

Through creation of a Soviet sphere of influence, for which the United States was the careless or unwitting sponsor at Yalta, the Soviet Union intends not only to supplant Japan in Manchuria and Korea. It also seeks to enlarge that sphere into domination of Chinese borderlands from the Yellow Sea to the innermost recesses of Asia—a sweep of more than 2,000 miles.

Manchuria, with Korea, is the eastern anchor of that vast belt of strategic territory which Russia must control in Asia before she can act with a free hand in Europe, with her eastern flank secure from retaliatory assault.

To prevent consolidation of that eastern bulwark of communism is the cheapest and easiest insurance we can have against World War III.

Russia will not dare attack in the west until she is reasonably assured that her industrial regions and vital communications east of the Urals are secure from assault by air from bases within effective range—bases within northern and northwestern borderlands of China.

That is the broad strategic frame within which the present conflict in China, especially in Manchuria, bulks so large. But this strategic position is only the primary Russian objective. Manchuria is a rich prize in natural resources. It is so rich that China cannot achieve full stature as a nation without Manchuria, which even Russia recognizes—on paper—as under Chinese sovereignty.

A communized Manchuria probably would entail eventual disappearance of China, as well as other Asiatic countries, from the community of free nations. Communism cannot stand still for long and survive. It will not stop at international frontiers unless it is opposed.

We cannot afford, therefore, to let Manchuria go under unless we are prepared to surrender the world, ourselves included, to totalitarian authority.

If Manchuria is to be saved and the present deadly train of events averted, the United States must act decisively. That means soon. We can still act within the latitude of unwarlike cooperation with our former ally, whose sovereignty is recognized not only by the United States but also, ostensibly, by Russia.

If our cooperation with China is to be construed by Russia as war provocation we may be sadly assured thereby that Russia's inclination toward war was inexorable in any event. Actually, however, there is every reason to believe that firm aid to the Chinese Government would serve as a warning that the United States is fully committed to the support of China against communism, and that communism will not be permitted to encircle China with its iron curtain.

As urgently required as it is, American intervention on China's invitation in Manchuria need not be of a combatant nature. China does not need American soldiers or airmen directly in combat against Communist rebellion. China already has resources of manpower needed for victory.

Her only shortcoming—and this is a very great one—lies in her inability to train, arm, and supply that manpower, and bring it to bear to best advantage upon the inferior numbers of armed rebels. She has failed in this in the past for a variety of causes, for which the United States is not entirely blameless.

The most important of these causes was American capitulation to Russia at the Yalta Conference. There, in the mistaken belief that Soviet intervention was necessary for the defeat of Japan, the United States virtually invited the Soviet Union to move into the Japanese sphere on the Asiatic continent. Russia was invited to invade Manchuria.

This invitation was extended on advice of our military experts who could not foresee the inevitable collapse of Japan 90 days before it actually happened. Some of these experts are still directing our China policy today, and are just as blind to the actual situation and its dangerous implications as they were to Japan's true situation in May 1945.

Russia used her invasion of Manchuria to lay the foundations of a Communist regime where no Communists had been before. During the period when the United States, still misguided, futilely sought to enforce a coalition between the Chinese Government and Chinese Communists, the Reds massed in Manchuria and were armed by Russia with weapons surrendered by the Japanese Kwantung Army.

Russia's manipulation of the Chinese Communists, and her strategic motivation, requires no further proof than this. Without loss of a single soldier she would thus attain the vital objective of securing her continental eastern flank.

By her action in Manchuria, Russia tipped the scales against China in such a way as to prevent reassertion of Chinese sovereignty there. Russia put that sovereignty to the test of bitter civil war—Chinese against Chinese.

Already disorganized and weakened by 8 years of war and 6 years of almost untested Japanese aggression prior to that, China needed and deserved American assistance from the very outset for recovery of Manchuria after Japan's defeat.

This was not forthcoming. On the contrary China was obstructed by the United States through one-sided enforcement of a 1-year truce, sadly calculated to bring about coalition between a constituted government and rebels against it.

The Communist used this heaven-sent—or was it made in America—respite to organize and train tens of thousands of new troops in Manchuria. During that period, when conceivably China might have overpowered communism there, the United States was withholding arms from China lest our "peace negotiations" be embarrassed.

Thus, it seems to me, our obligation to help China now is clear. Morally, it is something we ought to do. It is something which we, in realistic appreciation of the danger to our world, must do. There should be no difficulty in making these decisions. There remains only the question of what we can do.

Time is short and the need is great. But it is neither too late nor too great a task for American ingenuity to perform.

China's most crying need in Manchuria, the principal zone of decision, is for American military advice and such direction as she can accept without sacrifice of national sovereignty. Concurrently with this advice and direction, which must be rendered on an emergency basis, the United States must set in motion vast replenishment of Chinese arms and military supplies.

We must strike a proportion between land power and air power in China so that the latter, the only weapon missing from the Communist arsenal now, may be exploited properly and to full measure for swift victory.

No emergency measure within our power could serve China more than assignment, at China's invitation, of such a man as General Wedemeyer to a position such as he held in 1945 under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. For prosecution of aerial warfare the United States should furnish, again at China's invitation, the best available American tactician.

Both of these men should be supported with increments of hand-picked specialists and technicians sufficient in number so that this partnership of advice and direction would be carried down as far as company organizations in the Chinese Army and flight organizations of the Chinese Air Force.

If this can be done quickly, I believe it will assure victory in Manchuria. Victory in Manchuria will assure victory in China, and consolidation and recovery of a great nation which could be the eastern bastion of the only kind of world we want to live in.

ANTILYNCHING BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, certain individuals of racial minorities are leading their people into trouble the like of which they have never known.

I particularly refer to this fellow Walter White, who calls himself a Negro, who is secretary of the so-called National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, and to this man Spingarn, a New York Jew, who is president of that association.

They do not represent the better element of the Negroes and they do not represent the better element of the Jews of this country. They are demanding the passage of the so-called antilynching bill. I have a right to talk about this, because they are denouncing me as a demagogue, just as Pravda, the Communist mouthpiece in Moscow, Russia, denounced me as a dangerous American dictator.

Twenty-six years ago at this time we were fighting a similar bill on this floor. When that Congress opened the Republicans had a majority of 169, but when they got through with that ridiculous performance the American people were so utterly disgusted that at the next election, to our surprise, they elected only 220 Republicans, 205 Democrats, and about 8 or 10 who did not belong to any party.

The American people are not in favor of this kind of stuff. This same gang that calls themselves the Association for the Advancement of Colored People are out fighting this Negro veterans' hospital in Virginia that the Booker Washington Negroes are pleading for, and which I helped to get through this House, and which we are working now to try to get through the Senate.

These men are doing the Negroes more harm than good; and I say to you members of other minority races who join with them in this movement that you are bringing down upon your heads condemnation that you will not live down in a century.

UNFAIR BRITISH COMPETITION WITH AMERICAN MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, when I voted against the British loan during the last Congress, I believed at that time that Great Britain would use American dollars to fight American industry.

My belief has been confirmed. Great Britain is now using every facility to boycott American motion pictures and has launched an all-out campaign to capture the world market.

American industry has never objected to fair and open competition. Great Britain imposes a 75-percent tax on American films and at the same time they are asking full privileges for showing their films in the United States.

We passed the Voice of America bill to tell our story overseas and to include the use of films. The British have hurt us in Britain and plan to hurt us in other parts of the world. They would receive about five billions of Marshall plan money which will further aid their motion-picture industry.

Arthur Rank admitted in the London Times that British films will be strong enough, thanks to the 75-percent tax, to go out and compete with Hollywood in the world market. Yet the American Government does nothing to help its picture industry which it needs in the State Department's world-wide information program.

In the face of this British situation, we should help our industry domestically by reducing the 20-percent admission tax and abroad by aiding it to get some of its frozen money.

The following editorial by Arthur Unger, editor of the Daily Variety, of Hollywood, expresses the views of the motion-picture producers:

WAKE UP, UNCLE SAM

It's a fact. Great Britain wants no part of Hollywood or its pictures.

That so-called 75 percent tax that the British labor government has put on American films is strictly a subterfuge. The British at one time controlled the sea and the world market, and is out to do it again via its screening output. They don't care whether we comply with their tax conditions or not.

Britain wants to build a world market for its films. Its producers told the labor government they could take care of the needs of home consumption, as well as turn out a product that would reach the world entertainment market and at the same time act as a missionary factor for British commerce.

That fact is best accentuated by an article which J. Arthur Rank wrote for the last Sunday's London Times, and from which quotes are reproduced elsewhere in this paper.

We do not know whether Rank was one of the producers who told the Cripps government to forget about American films, so dollars could be kept at home and be garnered in addition from a world market. But we do believe that Rank has the same thoughts as other British producers, who stated they could make enough pictures to take care of the needs of the English cinema.

The British tax came right on the heels of Rank's visit to the United States to get the American distributors and exhibs to give him guaranteed playing time for his films in this country amounting to around $12,000,000 a year. Rank professed chagrin at the time the tax was imposed on our product in England. He said he knew nothing in advance of his country's proposed tax. Maybe he didn't and maybe he did.

But one way or another, Mr. Rank has fallen in line with the labor government. He's out to capture a world market with his product. He's going to show the British way of life, customs, etc., on the screen, so that its general commerce can regain its hold on the world market to compete with us and surpass us.

In the London Sunday Times article he is not reluctant at all in stating that "Britain shall not for some time yet be living easily. There will be a sense of purpose in our work; and this I believe will be reflected in our films" and "Not so long ago the British industry was largely controlled by American influences. Most people were agreed that this economic and cultural domination was both unhealthy and unnecessary, but very little was done about it. We could have at one time been out of business or been made into a small and very inadequate branch of Hollywood. Neither of those eventualities is likely to happen now."

Yes, we think that Mr. Rank was hep all the time he was in this country, as to what the labor government planned to do with respect to isolating American films from the English market. Rank was trying to kill two birds with one stone. He had nothing to lose in getting assurance his product would get playing time in this country. He also had everything to gain by the move of his Government toward its desire to make British films supreme in a world market. Rank is no chump. He is an out and out businessman. He has an avalanche of coin invested in films, and is determined to get it out. As the leading English producer, he has most at stake, so falls in very easily and handily to help carry out the precepts of the labor government to "Freeze American films out of the British market."

On the other hand, Rank points out that he has many interests outside of the British Isles. Partnership arrangements, such as 110 theaters in Australia; 143 in New Zealand; 52 in Ceylon, 12 in Holland. Also his product reaches 400 houses in South Africa. He has his Odeon circuit in Canada with 107 theaters as well as interests in the West Indies, parnerships in Egypt, and around a 25-percent interest in Universal Pictures. He is well fortified in connections and partnerships. They won't hurt his endeavors toward circulating his films.

He also points out that though British pictures have restricted earnings in America, "our films are becoming an increasingly valuable export, bringing in much-needed foreign currency. More than that, they can give a tremendous boost to other British exports; for a nation's goods are 'in the windows' whenever and wherever her films are shown."

Rank has tipped the whole set-up off, when he talks about helping export. That the British Government wants.

The United States Government has had the same outlets the British are seeking, via its film production. Films helped United States gain a lot of exports, and also propagandized the introduction of new American commodities. But the United States Government and its Commerce and State Departments never took cognizance of this fact. They permitted the American film industry to be battered and kicked around by everyone and anyone. It's high time that this ceases, that our Government gives respect to the film industry and starts protecting it. It should take a firm stand in negotiation of treaties with foreign countries, to protect our film business. It should fight all unfair embargoes on it.

This Government now controls the coin of the world, it's in a position to act. It can and must do so quickly. By acting now, it will protect all other American industry as well as films. Our picture chieftains must not be timid in asking for that action. They must be determined and aggressive in their efforts. American films are not made solely for home consumption. Neither is any other product. They all have a world-wide market and demand. Under no circumstances should we permit Britain to grab our world dominance from under our noses by using American taxpayers' coin to do it.

A. U.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I just made and to include therein the speech I made against the so-called antilynching bill in the Sixty-seventh Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a sonnet by Glenn Levin Swigett, and in the other to include the testimony of L. Douglas Meredith before the Joint Committee on Housing.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 447) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to continue its investigation on matters coming within jurisdiction of the committee (Rept. No. 1322), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That effective from December 19, 1947, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 141 of the Eightieth Congress, and for such purposes shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such House Resolution 141. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF DEMONSTRATION PLANTS TO PRODUCE SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 453, Rept. No. 1323), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF REPORTS OF SPECIAL TAX STUDY COMMITTEE TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 359, a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the reports of the Special Tax Study Committee to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, dated November 4, 1947, be printed as a House document; and that 3,000 additional copies shall be printed, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 2,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after the word "document", insert "and that there be included therewith a supplemental statement prepared by Matthew Woll."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 421 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation and study of reorganization and home rule for the District of Columbia pursuant to House Resolution 195

of the Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of the amount authorized by House Resolution 228 of the Eightieth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 405, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee authorized by House Resolution 18 of the Eightieth Congress, not to exceed an additional $85,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "$85,000" and insert "$70,000."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. What I would like to ascertain is what committee this involves?

Mr. LECOMPTE. This is the Committee on Small Business, formerly known as the Patman committee, now known as the Ploeser committee.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman think any of this money or more of the money we vote for this committee is going to be used to fight cooperatives as has been narrated around here that much of the money has been used for in the past?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that I feel that the study of cooperatives is within the province of the Ways and Means Committee. However, I am not authorized to speak for the members of the Small Business Committee. I understand that they have completed their studies along that line. I see present the chairman of that committee. He could probably answer that question.

Mr. RAYBURN. Many of us are going to look into this question between now and the next time this committee comes up for money, and if they are conducting the same kind of operation that they have in the past, which we feel is punishing the cooperatives, we are going to resist further appropriations.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it would be well for the gentleman from Texas to refer to the records of the committee, and then he would not say that this committee devoted any of its money to fighting cooperatives. The records are very clear that we were making a study, a fair study. That study is nearing completion. By the statement of the ranking Member of the committee, those committee hearings that were held were very fair. No one was attacked except the chairman, and he, by political propagandists. Now, you can either attach your remarks to the facts in the case or you can attach your remarks to the political propaganda of the case. The facts in the record are very clear, and they are available to the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5214, with Mr. LEONARD W. HALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House of Tuesday, February 3, the debate on the bill was extended not to exceed 2 hours today, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee upon the work that it has done on this bill. Of the items totaling about $256,000,000 upon which cuts might be made they were able to cut $56,000,000, or a little over 20 percent. This includes all of the items that relate to personnel, traveling expenses, and ordinary operations that the bill contains. It is a good start toward keeping the Federal Budget in line, and toward taking the bloat out of the budget.

There is one situation that has developed in one of the agencies that I think merits attention, and merits consideration by the Congress. Since the consideration of this bill was begun, Wayne Coy has been appointed Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Coy started the major part of his political career as the chairman of the Two Percent Club in Indiana, under the administration of Paul McNutt. He followed it up with operations of the WPA and the Federal Security Agency, and other activities of the Government. He succeeds three successive chairmen, Mr. James Lawrence Fly, Mr. Paul Porter, and Mr. Charles Denny, every one of whom has retired from the Federal Communications Commission to enter the practice of law in Washington, appearing largely before this Commission, with which they are supposed to have great influence. Mr. Coy starts out with a record which would make one expect him to follow the lead of those three chairmen and retire after a little to set up a lucrative practice before the Federal Communications Commission. I would hope that that example might be a warning to him and that he might approach the duties of that position by making up his mind to make a record for efficiency and competency and not for building up a great big cumbersome, bloated organization, and not aim to retire to practice before the Commission of which he is a member.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we Members of the minority of your committee would like to thank and congratulate the Members of the majority for their industry, and particularly their courtesy and their fairness to the Members of the minority in writing this bill.

Frankly, I do not think there is a finer chairman in either body than our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has certainly performed wheel-horse work in the writing of this bill. Also, I must say that our friend the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON], with his business background and experience, has contributed a lot of good common horsesense to the deliberations of the committee. Our friend from New York [Mr. COUDERT], with his fine legal mind, has kept us out of trouble, too.

May I point out that although this bill carries appropriations for some 30 agencies, known as independent agencies, that is really the small part of this bill. It carries a total of appropriations in the neighborhood of $990,000,000, yet this same bill last year carried in the neighborhood of $790,000,000, an increase of $200,000,000 for fiscal 1949 over fiscal 1948. This increase of $200,000,000 comes about largely from the increase in appropriations for only one agency, that is, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Federal Works Agency. It has an increase of $200,000,000 this year over last year and I doubt if there are very many Members of this body or the other body who would want to curtail the carrying into effect of the act of Congress by denying the Public Roads Administration these

funds. But as I said a while ago even though this bill carries funds for 30 agencies, the big money involved in the independent offices is not in this bill, namely the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, the War Assets Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Maritime Commission. Why those agencies are not in this bill is not exactly clear to me. I do not think it amounts to a hill of beans whether the bill is split in two parts or not, but frankly this is the first time a bill has ever been handled in this way so far as I know at least as long as I have been a Member of this body. But I understand through our chairman that he intends to conduct hearings at a later date for those agencies and bring in a bill covering their appropriations. When we do that you will find that you will have another bill for the independent agencies totaling in the neighborhood of $7,000,000,000 over and above the $990,000,000 involved in this bill.

I would like to say something about the independent agencies of the Government which this bill covers. These agencies are just exactly what the term indicates, that is, most of them—independent agencies made up of bipartisan boards, Republicans and Democrats alike. It requires a majority vote of those agencies before any of their rules and regulations and orders can be binding. They do not have to have White House approval, regardless of who is in the White House, a Democrat or a Republican. They are independent agencies. Frankly, I think some of the finest men in Government service today are serving on some of these independent agencies. In the revision of my remarks I would like to comment on some of these men, but I would like to mention now Chairman Smith, of the Federal Power Commission. He is certainly an outstanding man and is performing a great service. I understand Chairman Smith is a Republican. Then there is our own Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General. Certainly he and his splendid organization are doing a fine job in taking care of the taxpayers' money and in supplying information to Congress. Incidentally, General Warren's crowd this year came in voluntarily with a reduction in their budget for 1949 as compared to 1948. That is one of the few agencies that did so. I think Mr. Coy, who has recently been confirmed by the other body as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, is a fine man. He made a good impression on me, and I think on most of the members of the committee.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is the gentleman referring to the present Chairman or to his immediate predecessor?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I am referring to Mr. Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Then there is Mr. Flemming, of the Civil Service Commission. While he is not Chairman, I think he is a hard worker and is doing a fine job, and the best witness I know. Incidentally, I think Mr. Flemming is a Republican.

Then there is Mr. MacDonald, General Fleming, and Mr. Bert Reynolds, of the Federal Works Agency. I do not think there are any finer men in Government service than those men. Certainly they are doing a grand job.

Much has been said about the Bureau of the Budget. Frankly, I do not know of any finer public servant than Mr. Webb, Chairman of the Budget, and Mr. Lawton, his assistant. Those men are doing a big job; and they are holding those jobs by virtue of the fact that the Congress created those jobs.

It has been said the Bureau of the Budget helps formulate congressional policy. I think that is a rather weak statement. I doubt if there is anything to back that up. After all, they are doing their work. Part of that work is to strengthen Federal agencies, to analyze appropriations, and to bring better order and business management to the departments. I think they are doing a very good job of it.

Certainly, mention should be made that in this budget of approximately $8,000,000,000 for independent offices, the Budget alone trimmed $2,200,000,000 from the estimates of the agencies. So it does not look like they are sleeping on the job. Certainly it should be pointed out that if this Congress does not like what the Budget Bureau is doing in the way of its recommendations, this Congress has the authority to overturn them. In other words, their recommendations certainly are not binding on your committee or on the House. That is fundamental.

As I said previously, the committee works well and in peace and harmony. The Republican majority were certainly nice to the minority. By and large, I think the bill is a good one. There are some points that we could not all agree on. That is human nature. Of course, the majority has the votes to do as it wishes. One of the rough spots in this bill is the President's emergency fund. The majority cut from those funds $300,000. Frankly, I think that is partisan politics, and I want my remarks to be made on that basis. Frankly, I think the office of the President of the United States is entitled to more consideration than was given by our Republican friends. I do not have the slightest doubt that, had a Republican been today where Harry Truman is, that Republican President could have asked for a million dollars and he would have gotten every dime of it. As far as I am concerned, I would have been one of the first to have given it to him. I want to point out that we are inviting some trouble, in a small way, over this item. Every man in this House must realize that when the House appropriates funds for its own housekeeping purposes, the President of the United States has to approve of those funds. Without attempting to read his mind, at some time he may disagree with what we spend for our own housekeeping purposes. In keeping with comity and peace and harmony between the various branches of government, he always approves what we do for our own housekeeping jobs. Look at the other body. Does the House ever attempt to tell the other body what funds they should appropriate for their own housekeeping jobs? Why, of course not. We approve them as a matter of course in order to keep peace and harmony like it should be done, and I hope that when this bill gets to the other side those funds will be restored.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman has shown much interest in the past and also this year in connection with the appropriations for the agencies contained in this bill, one in particular, the National Advisory Committee for Aviation. I wish the gentleman would say something about the provisions in this bill with reference to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I will be delighted to, in response to the request of the ranking Democratic member of the committee.

The National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics certainly is the backbone of scientific investigation and improvements of the aeronautical industry of the United States. That goes for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and private industry. Speaking in terms of dollars and cents, if my memory serves me correctly, we gave these people about $2,500,000 increase this year over 1948, bringing the amount for personnel to about $33,000,000 all told. I think we increased their scientific funds for construction and equipment from about $2,500,000 to $10,000,000.

As time goes along I believe this agency will gradually reach the point where they will require between forty and forty-five millions a year. Of all the money carefully spent in this bill, I do not think there is a more economical dime than this money for aeronautics. We certainly can spend from five to fifty millions a year to improve all elements of air navigation, especially when we remember that we are spending some two to three billions a year on aeronautics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices has given a most comprehensive analysis of the bill that is now before the committee. One cannot serve on this important subcommittee and watch the operations of the distinguished chairman without an ever-increasing admiration for his understanding of the problem and his detailed application of general principles to the hearings. It is truly an inspiration to serve under him.

The committee is handsomely fortified by a very able staff. I feel conspicuously indebted to Mr. Bill Duvall and his assistant, Mr. Bert Skinnard. They are always available and in possession of the vital and important facts that are needed for the consideration of this legislation.

It is a pleasure to serve with the members of the minority, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. It is surprising how these intricate problems are handled day by day without the

slightest appearance of partisanship from one side or the other. I salute these gentlemen for their great contribution to this important piece of work.

The work required in the preparation of this bill extends over a long period of time. The hearings are detailed. There are many agencies, each working in its own specific direction. The chairman has told you that this year there will be two independent offices appropriation bills. Four of the major agencies are not included in this bill.

The chairman has told you of the sum total of the original budget estimates for the fiscal year of 1949, and has likewise told you of the recommendations of this committee. The committee recommends a reduction of $56,215,313 in the bill of $1,047,798,864. To this has been added rescissions of $3,092,758, reflecting a total savings of $59,308,071. In the face of these reductions, the bill is in excess of the 1948 appropriation by $196,686,974.

This increase is due almost entirely to the increase in funds required during the last year for highway construction and related work. You will recognize that the committee has little control over such an item as this. Many of the appropriations appearing in the independent offices appropriation bill are of a permanent nature. Most of them have been established by acts of Congress and it leaves little ground on which the committee can make reductions so much needed 3 years after the war.

I should also like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the committee gets little support in making reductions from the various agencies, with one or two exceptions. All more or less seem to accept the fact that there is no bottom to the barrel, and that each year they have a right to expect to go on and on to larger proportions. They are the victims of habit explained in a statement made many years ago, which goes something like this: Habit is a cable, we weave a thread of it each day; and at last it becomes so strong we cannot break it.

As we labor with these problems, trying to fulfill our responsibility to the taxpayers of the Nation, we get little help from the heads of the agencies, and we get a great deal of propaganda from the administration itself. The thought really prevails in the minds of many employees of these agencies that they have a divine right to their jobs. The right of the taxpayer is given little consideration.

Generally speaking, I believe it is the idea of the committee that we should go back as rapidly as possible toward prewar figures. This is quite impossible in many instances because the Congress itself must now accept the responsibility for the legislation on ingrade promotions, various phases of the civil-service legislation, and many other things. Should the time ever come that the taxpayers of the Nation could speak in unison the Congress would come to recognize that we have but one road to follow if we are to reduce the Nation's expenditures. That road means that we must of necessity begin to lop off many Government functions which have been thrust upon us in the last 15 years and which prior to that time never even existed in the minds of men.

Even if one agrees that the old agencies which have existed for many years must of necessity be kept in good shape and allowed to grow in the service of the country, there are many other things that have been added by executive order and otherwise that could well be abandoned in the interest of the taxpayer.

We have committed ourselves to certain things. It would be difficult indeed to reduce the amount required for the Philippine War Damage Commission. That is in fact an expense growing out of the war. The committee allowed this year substantially all of the funds requested by the Federal Trade Commission for the purpose of antimonopoly prosecution. Yet in other operations of this agency we made substantial reductions.

The Comptroller General of the United States, Lindsay C. Warren, comes before the subcommittee with his budget pared by his own hand. His is one of the few agencies that seems to fully understand the taxpayers' demands, and he is doing everything in his power within his own agency and through his important position over the other agencies to meet these demands. For this, he is entitled to great credit.

I have previously pointed out that the committee is constantly confronted by legislation that has been passed by the Congress providing for in-grade promotions. These are automatic and must be allowed in conformance with the basic act.

Speaking briefly on the agency known as the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, their budget request was $3,400,000 to initiate action in connection with the redevelopment program provided for under Public Law 592 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. On this particular question, the committee held extensive hearings and as a result of these comprehensive hearings, the committee has concluded that funds for this project should not be allowed at the present time. It is the understanding of the committee that the plans are now merely being made for redevelopment of Barry Farms and Marshall Heights areas.

Inasmuch as no plan has been completed by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which is the agency by law delegated to draft the comprehensive plan, the committee has felt that until it can give a complete study of the plan and be truly advised as to its desirability, no funds should now be made available. The committee has doubt as to the desirability of redevelopment in the areas under consideration at this time for the very good reasons that many modern homes are now in existence in these areas to be redeveloped and the cost of construction under present housing conditions is extremely high.

On the question of an appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission, the committee has provided $60,000 in excess of the 1948 appropriation, and $240,000 less than the budget estimates. We therefore find we have provided funds on substantially the same basis as the current fiscal year, the increase of $60,000 providing approximately two-thirds of the amount requested for within-grade promotions. No provision was made for increased activity of this agency. Generally speaking, the committee feels that with the experience gained this far in the postwar period in the processing of applications and licenses of all types, the commission should normally have within itself an increased efficiency to extend to a point where a larger number of applications can be handled.

In this bill the committee has recommended $1,000,000 less for the Public Roads Administration than the budget estimate, and $195,588,854 more than the 1948 appropriation for the continuation of construction of postwar highways and the elimination of grade crossings, $7,300,000 being provided for the latter item. The funds provided are to meet the Federal Government's share in this undertaking and are the amounts which it is estimated will be required during the fiscal year 1949 to meet contracts for road construction submitted by State highway departments and approved by the Federal Works Administration. As of December 1, 1947, programs of projects had been submitted by the State highway departments for a total estimated cost of $1,931,981,000 for which the Federal share is $976,877,000.

We must be mindful of the fact that, during the period of the war, roads in all sections of the Nation suffered for lack of repairs and general construction. Roads touch every part of every State in the Union. We are finding that many parts of the national highway system are obsolete. The 18-foot steel-and-concrete slabs that were laid some years ago have proven to be totally inadequate for the modern transportation demands made upon them, and in many instances, especially in heavily populated areas, new roads must be built or the old roads must be widened. It is for these reasons that the committee has allowed this additional amount above the 1948 appropriation.

Perhaps no more technical question confronts the committee than that contained in the presentation of the justification by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. All of us recognize that it is through this agency that the program for development of aeronautics and guided missiles is accomplished. The work of this agency is directed toward the over-all objective of directing and applying the new scientific knowledge essential to assure American leadership in aeronautics. I am sure that the Members of this House are resolute in the determination that America possess leadership in aeronautics. Therefore, little reduction was made in this important agency. While they asked for 42 additional salaries to be paid to employees in the District, this was reduced by the committee to 21. Otherwise, their authorization was left intact. I urge the Members to read carefully page 13 of the report dealing with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The committee presents this Independent Offices appropriation bill for 1949 to the Congress with the deep conviction that it has considered well every aspect presented by the different agencies represented in this bill. It is a long,

comprehensive, and tedious task. It is reasonable to assume that there will be some who challenge some phases of our work. I can assure you that we present it to you, resolute in the belief that it is a good bill and will serve the purposes of these agencies and the welfare of the Nation for the next fiscal year.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, first I want to express my appreciation for the courtesy of both the majority and minority. I imposed on the majority by using a substantial portion of the chairman's time yesterday afternoon, and now the minority has been good enough to recognize that I may have something further to contribute.

If I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], may I say that the committee staff furnished me within a few minutes the report they obtained from the Federal Works Agency this morning. It has in it about the most sickening piece of news that could be sent to the people of New England. There is listed in the tabulation on page 1016 of the RECORD of yesterday the Boston Marine Hospital. That is the next to the last item. It shows that it would require 120 days to reconvert now back to coal; that it would cost $26,500; and that they will use, in that shortage area where we need this oil, 370,000 gallons of oil in the calendar year, over 1,000 gallons each day.

The Boston Marine Hospital reconversion was completed in December of last year, right in the midst of the toughest winter we have had in years. They went right ahead in the face of all the recommendations made by the New England delegation, Democrats and Republicans alike, under the leadership of the Speaker and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] was a member of our subcommittee.

Along in December we heard testimony from the gentleman who buys the oil for the Federal Government. I will have it here this afternoon and read it into the RECORD. He told us that there had been these reconversions and that they were going ahead with them. I said in substance, "Isn't it only fair to ask those people, if they have those grates to help us out, and set an example?" He said, in substance, "By all means." The subcommittee wired the President the next morning. That was back on December 13. Somebody must have known the Boston Marine Hospital was being reconverted but it was not stopped.

I have the items of reconversion and the dates of reconversion right here in the District. I would assume you would agree with me that in view of what has been happening in the District here, if we use the words "shortage area," as is suggested, the District of Columbia is a shortage area, as are North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey, the whole Northeast, Illinois, and clear into Minnesota. We are all short this year.

Prominent and informed witnesses, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, Max Ball, and others, have told us that we are not facing this problem for just this year, but that we are going to continue to face it for 5 years at least. On that basis, and on the basis of national security every drop, every gallon, we can save we must save. This limitation I am suggesting is simply to say to the Federal Works Agency positively, "Thus far you have gone. Do not go one step further. Do not spend a single dollar out of this appropriation to convert to oil." My responsibility is oil. There are other Members here who have 200,000 people out of work. There are 15,000 out of work in the Pittsburgh area. Those gentlemen will speak to you about the question of whether you should include natural gas. But go along at least with us on the oil. I will place in the RECORD later the telegram and interpretation of the telegram from the Governor of Massachusetts which I already told you about. I was incorrect in using 52 as the multiple there. It should be 42. In the 20 to 25 days up there in that area, we have had temperatures of 27, 37, and 47 degrees below zero. That is pretty tough. Some of those people are sick. There are young children and there are old people. Some of our industries are forced to close down. Our situation does not get Nation-wide attention such as the Detroit area when 200,000 people are out of work. I know our colleagues from Pennsylvania will agree that the welfare of the whole area there is in jeopardy unless we can convince you here that you should join hands with us this afternoon and say to the responsible Federal agencies, "You have gone far enough, and we say to you stop right here."

Here is the Washington story: 301 Independence Avenue, date of conversion, September 1946; 1626 K Street, date of conversion—all of this is coal to oil—September 1946; 1624 H Street, October 1946. That was when we all had knowledge that we might be faced with this threat of the coming shortage. Our committee had hearings beginning in July, and again in December. Now we learn that even then someone was actually going ahead and permitting conversions. Briggs School, October 1946; 1757 L Street, September 1946. Here is another significant thing. I call your attention to the Arlington, Va., project at 705 Columbia Pike. The contract has been stopped. There is a 14-day escape clause in there, and the contractor is trying to find out how they can exercise it. But listen to this: "It is proposed to start work again on April 1." Seven Hundred and Eleven Twelfth Street, contract stopped, proposed to start work again after April 1.

I ask you to help us call a halt to this and let us tell them about this if they do not know yet that we are cold and in trouble in parts of this country. We have been trying to tell them that, and I beg you whose constituents are in comfort, and we are glad they are, to try to help us out this afternoon. If you do not like my amendment, I will change it any way you want. I have taken out the natural gas. I will call them shortage areas or anything else you want. I am sure our colleagues from Michigan and Pennsylvania will not agree with me as to this. But we have a different problem in New England. Will you not help us out until April 1?

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. In Illinois we have prohibited any gas installations since July 1, 1946, because of the shortage of pipe.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] to close debate.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in general debate for two reasons. The first is to pay my respects to the chairman of our subcommittee, and to the other members of the committee. It has been a matter of personal pleasure to me to serve on a committee about whose work I knew very little at the time I was assigned to it by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. In the interim I have come to realize that this is one of the more difficult subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and if it were not for the genuine ability of our chairman and the respect with which he is held generally in the House, it would be even more difficult. There is a feeling of regard, and of cooperation among all of us, on this subcommittee, which has manifested itself in the finished bill as it comes to the floor. As you already know by this time from other comments, this subcommittee has before it the budgets of 31 agencies of the Government, with varying functions; budgets of various size, and very great complications in some of the agencies. The bill before you represents the budgets of 27 of those 31 agencies.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] spoke of the fact that four of the agencies had been delayed in the consideration of their budgets. That is a very easily understood situation. It meant that either the committee would have been compelled to hold the results of its immediate work—for the committee started work early in December and has now finished 27 of the agencies—it would have been compelled to hold those 27 budgets until April or May and then present them at the same time it presented the remaining four. The four remaining agencies include the Veterans' Administration, which has a tremendous problem and a new Administrator. It is only fair to him to give him time to find out something about his job and what he himself wants to do with his own budget before asking him to come before a committee of the Congress and present and defend that budget.

In the same way the Atomic Energy Commission has a problem which I do not need tell the Members of this House is one of tremendous importance. The longer time it has to prepare its budget and prepare its program, in the present domestic and international situation, the more we will know and the Commission will know what it wants.

The War Assets Administration is an agency which is rumored to be in the

process of changing form, and it is right that it should be allowed as much time as possible, so that it may know what its situation is.

Finally, the Maritime Commission, I say in kindness to the Maritime Commission, is in a state of confusion. It may have a chance to work itself out by the time the subcommittee comes in with the rest of the budget for this year.

It has not been an easy budget to handle, not only because of the complexity of the agencies but because, as the chairman said yesterday, while many of the agencies and their administrative heads have given lip service to economy there has been no evidence of any further interest in that subject in the budget requests. Of the 31 agencies only 4 presented budgets which on their face showed decreases in the budgets of the year before. The General Accounting Office offered an honest reduction in its budget. It was less than last year, maintaining not only the functions of the present fiscal year but whatever additional work might come with the passing year.

The Tax Court, which has roughly $750,000, presented exactly the same budget, dollar for dollar. Therefore, it may be credited with a reduction, because it has obviously assumed in-grade promotions in their own budget.

The Veterans' Administration, in its first budget, which is not now under consideration, presented a request which seemed to be less, but upon analysis showed that the personnel was increased, and very largely the potential elements of the budget, which produce rising costs year after year, had been increased, and only large and finishing items had been removed from the budgets, to show a reduction.

That same thing applies in a slightly different way to the Maritime Commission. My own feeling was, after the first year of service on this committee, that last year, for the fiscal year 1948, the committee had made one of the most thorough analyses possible under the limited conditions under which we were compelled to work. Last year we brought to the floor a budget cut of $1,411,000,000. It is not to be expected that we can in any way duplicate that feat this year. I recognize that the figure is subject to challenge. The distinguished gentleman from Texas, the minority leader [Mr. RAYBURN] said yesterday that the general budget had been reduced something less than a million dollars. My own feeling, as I have said previously on the floor, has always been that the taxpayer does not care very much about the technicalities, whether it was an actual reduction made by a committee in a budget figure, or whether it was a rescission of previously voted funds, or whether it was an amount taken out of the budget, so to speak, by the agency itself after the agency saw the determination of the Congress to reduce expenditures. Instances have arisen where agencies, when the auditors of the committee have looked over their accounts, have said: "Look, here you have a lot of money in this budget justification that you are not going to use or spend this year;" whereupon the agency would come to the Appropriations Committee and say: "We would like to take some money out of our budget request." It seems to me it makes very little difference to the American taxpayer what the technicalities are. The savings are reflected in the taxpayers' pocketbooks.

So last year this particular subcommittee made a recommendation of a $1,411,000,000 reduction in this budget. This year it makes a recommendation of $59,308,071; putting on the budget an additional $196,636,974, which is less than one item alone discussed at length by the able gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON]. This is the item providing the matching fund for road improvements which amounts to something over $200,000,000 in itself. I feel, therefore, that the increase is a justifiable increase, but it should give rise to some thought on the part of Congress concerning these items over which the Congress has lost control. I do not believe the Congress would have wanted to reduce that particular item, but I am saying that Congress, little by little, has given out of its own hands control of certain items, even the little item which has amused you in the papers recently when the President of the United States decided to build a porch in the rear of the White House. The funds apparently are coming from previously voted money for general repairs and improvements to the White House, over which Congress lost control when it voted the money with a provision that it should be allowed to stand until spent. I, myself, think it is a subject in which the Congress might interest itself.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The total carried in this bill calls for an increase in appropriations of roundly $197,000,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman may have heard me say that there was also in the budget $204,577,708, over which the Appropriations Committee had no control, simply the requirement that the money be appropriated.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is speaking about the roads fund.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is merely an authorization; is not that correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No; it is in the budget; that is a budget item.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is statutory?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, there is an item in the bill, and the only item in the bill, on which there was any lack of complete agreement in the committee itself. I may say at this point that we worked in most complete cooperation from beginning to end. I refer to the item which has to do with the emergency fund of the President of the United States. I think it may be said here without revealing any confidential discussions of the committee that some of the members of the majority of the committee were fully in accord with certain of the arguments of the minority, and some of the arguments of the majority were agreed to in part by some of the minority members. In other words, it was not a complete disagreement.

This is the situation: The President last year asked for an emergency fund of $500,000—a half million dollars. The emergency fund of the President is supposed to cover two classes of items: Those items which arise when the Congress is not in session which must be met before the Congress comes back in session, and which, therefore, can be properly taken from a fund of that kind. Those are the emergencies of government, and are met in this way. The fund is also intended to cover those items which should be worked out before great publicity is given to them and which are also emergency in character.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. May I refer to the items here?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am about to read the items. I am about to do just what the distinguished gentleman from Kansas wants me to do. That is to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether you consider these to be emergencies:

From the emergency fund last year there was spent for the President's staff and personnel in the White House a total of $103,538 from this emergency fund. That is for the ordinary operating staff of the President's office.

There was spent for the President's Amnesty Board, $40,000; for the President's Committee on Civil Rights, $50,000; for the President's Commission on Higher Education, $64,000; for an Advisory Commission on the Merchant Marine, $8,700; for the Office of the Coordinator of Emergency Program and Secretary of the Cabinet Committee on the World Food Program, $45,000.

The President also drew upon many of the other departmental budgets, in my opinion sometimes without the department head having authority to use these funds for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the total which the President spent last year was $425,000, including these items I have read, and which I question as being emergency items.

This year the President's budget officer asked the subcommittee for a million dollars in emergency funds. The majority side of the subcommittee thought that since the President had not spent all of last year's appropriation, and had spent the greater part of that for items which were not emergency items, the President of the United States could set an example of economy to the Congress and get along with the same amount of money which he had in last year's fund. The subcommittee finally raised the amount to $700,000.

Now I come to a point which has not been talked about before but which, to

me, as an individual, is part of the present discussion. If you will turn to pages 436 and 437 of the hearings you will see the committee's interrogation of the members of the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council of Economic Advisers represents all that was left of the political idea of a full employment act after the storm had passed and the Congress picked up the pieces. It represents the brush which is given to the hunter after the fox hunt is over.

The Council received $350,000 in the fiscal year. It came up this year and said, "We would like to have $400,000 for the coming fiscal year." So the members of the subcommittee asked certain questions. Among those questions were ones like these, asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]:

Now, if you do not touch the inflationary consequences and how to deal with them, and if the Harriman committee does not touch the inflationary consequences and how to deal with them, who does?

Mr. Nourse, the chairman of the committee, said:

We did not deal with them in our report.

In other words, the Council did not deal with the inflationary consequences of present conditions in the United States, in advising the President. The answer is impossible. So I inquired, to quote freely: "What did you say about fertilizer, which is a very important subject in the rural areas? Did you say that we had three idle fertilizer plants and if we shipped fertilizer abroad we should, at least, produce all we could?"

Mr. Nourse said, also in free quotation, "No; we did not mention that to the President except to tell him that if we shipped fertilizer abroad then we would have to reduce the amount used in the United States."

Now, I suggest that a telephone call at a cost of considerably less than $400,000 to any agricultural commissioner or Secretary in the United States would not only have brought that information, but it would have brought some practical suggestions.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. On that subject matter of fertilizer, is the gentleman familiar with the fact that we have imported fertilizer from Germany during the past year or two?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am very familiar with it, but I do not think the members of the Council of Economic Advisers is familiar with it.

Mr. REES. I am wondering whether they are or not; at least, they have not made a report on it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I will not read you all of this interrogation, but I think it would interest you to read it. In the matter of steel, a question something like this was asked:

"What did you say to the President about steel, which is the basic commodity in industry in the United States? Did you say to the President that there appears to be a strong suspicion that the steel industry is not working to its fullest capacity?" And they said, "Oh, no; we did not mention that, because that would be administrative, and we do not enter the administrative field. We just said that if we used the amount of steel which is being asked for foreign exports, we would not have as much steel to use in the United States as we would otherwise have."

Now, if anybody wanted that information and could not have gotten it by one telephone call to Pittsburgh, I think certainly that somehow or other we could have gotten it for less than $400,000. So I, coming from the western part of the United States, where we are extremely anxious to have comparable food products used to provide a balanced nutritional diet, instead of buying the most expensive grains we have, and thus raising the inflationary spiral, asked:

"What did you say about the substitution of foods?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The Chairman of the Council said that was not mentioned, that it also was administrative.

My feeling is that this is related to the President's emergency fund. Last year we had the Office of Government Reports, a luxury which the committee felt had not justified itself before the subcommittee. If the administration proponents wish a luxury like that it should be paid for out of the President's fund, and I felt if we were to have, for $400,000, a luxury to provide information which anybody could get by subscribing to Kiplingers or to Prentice-Hall or to Dun's Review or any one of a half dozen reports, and certainly needing only a staff representative to coordinate the information, why, that should be a matter of decision with the President, and charged to his so-called emergency fund also. Therefore, if you will add together the amounts given to the President, $700,000, for his emergency fund, and the amount given to the Council of Economic Advisers, $300,000, you will see that that represents $1,000,000.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Does the gentleman believe this Council of Economic Advisers really serves a genuine and needful purpose, after having taken this testimony?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am quite sure the majority of the subcommittee felt that it had probably justified itself less well than almost any one of the 27 agencies.

Mr. VURSELL. My observation is that if we are trying to save any money in the interest of the taxpayers, the subcommittee ought to cut further or wipe out entirely agencies like that, whose principal function is to keep some luminaries on the pay roll.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Let me give you this little illustration: About 20 years ago H. G. Wells wrote a book called The First Men on the Moon. When these men got to the moon they discovered that everything was so well organized there, just as it is in Washington, that everybody was being trained from birth for a specific occupation in life. Those who were going to turn a crank in an industry were developed entirely in the right arm and nowhere else in the body. Those who were going to do the thinking for the great lunar system developed only the minds. The grand lunar, who was the head of all the moon population, had an enormous head, which he used with such great internal friction that it was necessary to spray his head constantly with cooling vapors and soothing oils.

After listening to the Council of Economic Advisers, I believe the subcommittee felt that perhaps its members should go back to their ivory tower and have their heads sprayed with soothing oils and cooling vapors.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman has reference to the President's council of soothsayers?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. If the gentleman cares to look upon them as such; I saw no evidence of a crystal ball in the committee hearings.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

For expenses necessary to provide additional assistance to the President and to enable him, through such agents or agencies of the Government as he shall designate, to provide for emergencies affecting the national interest or security, without regard to such provisions of law regulating the expenditure of Government funds or the employment of persons in the Government service as he shall specify, $700,000, of which $100,000 may, when authorized by the President, be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the expending agency as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided*, That no part of such fund shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the Eightieth Congress or the First Session of the Eighty-first Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 3, line 9, strike out "$700,000" and insert "$500,000."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to reduce the item described as the emergency fund for the President, $200,000. This will still give the President $500,000, which is the amount that was allowed by this Congress last year. Your attention has already been called to the fact that the President asked for $1,000,000 free fund. Apparently a compromise was reached by the Committee at $700,000.

The item is described as an emergency fund. I do not believe that in the last 50 years an emergency fund was allowed to any President, with the exception of the last two. Anyway, it seems to me

$500,000 is enough. Can it be said that the emergency is greater now than it was a year ago? There is nothing in the hearings to sustain that view.

Let us examine briefly how the money was spent, and I leave it to your judgment whether the items, or at least most of them, can be described as emergency items. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] called attention to them. One item is for $40,000 paid to a committee to prepare a report on civil rights. Is that an emergency? Another one is an expenditure of about $50,000 for a President's Commission on Higher Education. Is that an emergency? Another one is for a similar amount, or more, for the Advisory Commission on Merchant Marine. Do you regard those as emergency items? Certainly you cannot—not even by the stretch of your imagination. I think if you will examine these items you will find that out of the $420,000 spent last year, two-thirds of it cannot be described as emergency.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I know this is a comparatively small item, but there is a principle involved. This Congress has in recent years been too free all the way along the line with lump-sum appropriations. You are doing that today. The President said himself we should be economy-minded and yet he asks for a million dollars to be used as a free fund so that he can appoint commissions and organizations of various kinds that have nothing to do with emergency.

What I am trying to say is this. If he is in need of money for these items or any other items for emergency or otherwise, they ought to be authorized by the Congress and there is nothing in the hearings to indicate that any of this money will be spent for emergency purposes. The least the administration should do is to tell us what you are going to spend the $700,000 for. You have not done it and I ask you now to tell me the purpose for which this money is to be used.

I want the President to have all the money he needs for taking care of the management of his Executive offices, but that is taken care of in another item of this bill. Again, I say if there is an emergency for which this money is to be used, why not tell us about it and why not let us know the purpose for which it is to be spent.

I ask you again whether any Member on the floor of the House thinks that the $50,000 spent for the report of the Committee on Civil Rights was an emergency or the money spent by a Commission on Higher Education, appointed by the President, is an emergency, or the thousands of dollars spent on an Advisory Commission on Merchant Marine is an emergency item.

I say again, if the expenditures of such items are needed, certainly Congress should have the right of authorizing the expenditure of such funds. I think this is the responsibility of Congress.

So there will be no misunderstanding, this item is in addition to funds in this bill to pay all expenses for the President's salary and salaries of all the people he wants to employ for the White House and Executive Offices. Here they are right in your own bill amounting to more than a million dollars. You have them in only three items. President's salary, $75,000; salaries and expenses for the White House Office, $969,612; then you have $330,700 to be used to maintain the Executive Offices and Grounds.

The so-called emergency fund is a free fund and not used for so-called housekeeping purposes. Again I am only asking that we save a part of it and put the fund where it was last year. If more is needed, Congress can look it over and authorize it. After all, it is the money of the taxpayers that is being spent in these bills. It ought to be accounted for.

There are a number of items in this bill that should be reduced. I hesitate to vote against the entire bill, because I realize there are a number of important items in it that are necessary.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, before the Chairman puts the question on the amendment, I wonder if any member of the majority on the committee is going to defend the bill. I cannot pretend to know too much about it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If it were possible to say that I am rising in opposition to the amendment without prejudice to it, I would say that now. The situation is simply this. I have expressed myself regarding the President's emergency fund. I agree with much that the gentleman from Kansas says so eloquently, that the President should have asked for less money. It was agreed in the committee that the figure should be set at $700,000. I do not mean by any compromise agreement; I mean by discussion, and a feeling in the committee that the President had a right to ask for the amount of money that he needed. There was a feeling that we did not want to inquire too closely into the requests of the Executive, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] yesterday stated. Consequently, while I feel that economy would be served and we would save $200,000 if this amendment were carried, I also feel it is well to let the relationship stand which exists between the several agencies of Government. Speaking for myself, and without consultation with the other members of the subcommittee, I feel we should leave the bill stand as it was reported by the subcommittee, on the two items which total the amount requested from the White House. This represents, at that, a saving of $400,000. Therefore, I will vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, for whom I have the highest regard.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. REES. As I take it, the gentleman feels he is obligated to stand by the committee's agreement, but he is not justifying the $700,000 or $1,000,000 that is to be handed over to the President to carry on as an emergency fund. What I am trying to do is to reduce the item to $500,000. Even this has not been justified. The remarks of the gentleman himself have shown that funds heretofore allowed have not been used for emergency purposes. All we are saying is, "If you want to spend money for economic councils or advisory boards or civil rights reports, or things like that, that cost thousands of dollars, let it be justified before the House." That is all there is to it. We are not taking any money from him if it is justified. But just to turn over $700,000 for this thing is all wrong. After all, it is the taxpayers' money that is being spent. I can understand the gentleman's position as a member of the committee, but I think his speech a few minutes ago justifies my position in this matter.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Curiously, there is no agreement, in that sense, in the committee regarding this item; in the sense of a compromise in the committee, which either compels or suggests to me to defend this item. I am defending it because of a condition in government, which I believe the Members of this House will defend as a condition, even though they may not agree with the figure in the budget which comes out of that condition. That is, that this House asks for its funds; the other body asks for its funds; the executive agency of the Government asks for its funds. While I may be in disagreement with what the other body sometimes asks, in its own fund, I have never chosen to oppose those funds upon the floor of this House, or in committee. When the committee reported out this bill, it reported out a figure which it believed was satisfactory, in considering the entire picture.

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. REES. It seems to me we are in a rather peculiar position if the House cannot question the funds of any department of government. I do not see any justification for that. I think that is our responsibility. It is our responsibility to appropriate these funds, and every Member has a right to question not only the members of the committee but any Member of the House. That is what I am trying to do now. I do not think there is anything so sacred about it that we cannot question it. The hearings do not justify this $700,000 at all, except as one member from the Budget Bureau or someone down there said, "We ought to have a million dollars." Then, according to your hearings, the committee agreed on $700,000. There is no justification in the hearings on the report for this amount. Let someone point them out for me. They are not there.

Something has been said about need of part of these funds for so-called housekeeping purposes and increased salaries. Let's keep the record straight on that. This bill already provides amply for more than a million dollars for those things in a separate item. Here they are $75,000 salary; $969,612 salaries and expenses of White House Office; and $230,700 to maintain the Executive Mansion and grounds.

This item of $700,000 is a sort of free fund in addition to other funds and described as an emergency fund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will vote down this amendment. With few exceptions, there is no State in this Union that does not allow the Governor of that State an emergency fund. That is allowed on the assumption that the chief executive will expend it judiciously. Certainly, we recognize the need for an emergency fund. If we appropriate one dollar for that fund, we should have faith in the ability of the executive to spend that money judiciously.

There is not any evidence before this Committee and there was no evidence before our subcommittee that the emergency funds spent last year were spent recklessly. I think it is beyond our prerogative to be questioning the emergency fund of the Chief Executive of these United States. He passes on every statement of expense that is allowed to this House of Representatives and to the Senate.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. REES. The President's original request was that he be allowed to spend $1,000,000, not $700,000.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. But the committee, after hearings, agreed to $700,000.

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman insist that the expenditure of money for the President's Committee on Civil Rights is an emergency item? Does the gentleman insist that the President's Commission on Education is an emergency item?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. No; but he should be given discretion.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman contend that the President's Committee on Merchant Marine is an emergency item? Or the Committee on Civil Rights?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Certainly not.

Mr. REES. What I am saying is that these things should be sent to us in regular order; let them be authorized by the Congress. They certainly do not fall into the classification of emergencies. Of course, under this legislation he can spend it as he pleases.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I say it is well within his rights to spend that money for emergency purposes.

The question before this House is whether or not we are going to allow the President what I think is a modest sum—less than he requested—for emergency purposes; and I say that this bill comes from our committee almost unanimously agreeing that $700,000 is a reasonable amount to allow the President for his emergency fund, $300,000 less than he requested.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. REES. I call attention to the fact that $500,000 was the amount allowed last year, $424,000 was spent of which less than one-third was for emergency items. All in the world I am doing is asking this Committee to support an amendment that will allow a similar amount that was appropriated for this purpose last year. That is all there is to it. We ask for a reduction in that item to put it where it was last year, that is because it seems to me there is no greater emergency now than there was a year ago, when $420,000 was spent. All of it should be justified, but I am trying to effect a compromise. Anyway, the hearings do not justify it. The gentleman has not suggested any explanation of how the President is going to spend this $1,000,000 he wanted, or any part of it. What is it to be spent for? Can you tell me?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. In order that tne record may be kept absolutely straight at this point, last year there was about $105,000,000 of emergency funds used for salaries at the White House. This year salaries, plus a publicity item, radio, and so forth, come to about $245,000. The remainder of the $1,000,000 requested would be used for the President's housekeeping under emergency times.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. I hope the gentleman will be a little more liberal. I hope he will allow, say, 7 minutes. I would like to use a couple of minutes myself.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to use 5 minutes. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], who said he wants to cut this fund back to what it was last year, $500,000, that the President has the same reason for asking $1,000,000 this year that he had for asking for $500,000 last year.

Let me remind the gentleman that the President has never questioned any item we have sent up for the House of Representatives or the Senate; he has always approved them. I do not say that he could not object to them or that we cannot object to what the White House sends up, but he never does.

I wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas that last year we did not cut this item. He requested $500,000 and we gave him $500,000. This year he has asked for $1,000,000 and the committee has already agreed to cut it by $300,000. I think that is sufficient. I think that is a larger cut than given to any other item in the bill. I think the average cut was about 6 percent throughout the bill.

Last year when we had this bill on the floor of the House, my side of the House offered amendments they felt were important, particularly in regard to appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. I stood on this floor and fought those amendments in support of my chairman.

Mr. Chairman, after my chairman and the members of the committee have agreed that $700,000 is the amount of money that the President should have, this committee ought to accept the word of that committee. I believe this committee knows better what we should do than the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], who is not a member of the committee. I therefore request that the members of the committee here sustain the Subcommittee on Appropriations in its action just as I requested that the Democrats sustain that committee last year.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I do not question the gentleman's great ability in handling legislation before the House as a member of the committee, but to carry his proposal to finality I am wondering whether only members of the committee that report bills are the only ones to offer amendments?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I did not take any position of that sort, but I say that in this case the committee has considered the matter very thoroughly. We decided that $700,000 is the proper amount. As I stated, I believe we have more information on the subject than the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. That is what I said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have been here a long time. The 4th of March next will be 35 years. During that time I have served 12 years under Republican Presidents, and I know that my conscience is clear that I did not deal with any of those Republican Presidents in a small way. I voted to give to them enough funds to run their office, and I would feel pretty badly today if I looked back and felt that I failed to do that.

I remember that we were talking to President Roosevelt one time about some funds he wanted with which to run his office. It was a modest sum. He said, "I sign many bills which give you help to run your office up on the Hill, and I never question them."

The President has asked for a modest sum. As a matter of fact, I think the million dollars originally requested was a modest sum. Certainly $700,000 is not too much. Just because somebody with some name or of some party happens to be President of the United States at the moment that I am passing upon questions like this is not going to influence my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, in looking over the disposition of the $424,000 used last year by the President, I see several items that aggregate considerable money. For example, there is one for a special committee on foreign aid, $41,850. I wonder if we are going to have to spend $41,850 this year through the Department of Commerce to make a special committee report on foreign aid in light of the Marshall plan and all the other hundreds of millions of dollars which are being included in some of the foreign-aid items called for by the President.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as I know, the Presidents previously alluded to by the distinguished gentleman from Texas did not in their days have these big special emergency funds available to them. In those days we did not have so many emergencies, I will admit. May I say in all kindness to the members of the Appropriations Committee that the cut in the budget last year did not satisfy me at all. I think we did a lot of excess talking to the country and failed to perform.

I do not know what the budget is going to be cut this year, but so far as I am concerned I shall vote for this reduction of $200,000 to put the item back where it was last year, which was about $76,000 in excess of what was actually expended under the emergencies then existing; and all in the hope that the President of the United States can under the excruciating conditions which exist today, get by with a half-million dollars. I venture to say that if that is all the two Houses of Congress will permit him to have that he will hold the expenditures down to $500,000, and I think beginning with this first appropriation bill that the Members on the Republican side of the House might just as well begin to cut if we are going to carry out the pledges that have been made by our leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—ayes 39, noes, 49.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. REES and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 59, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; health-service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 921); contract stenographic reporting services; newspapers not to exceed $500; and not to exceed $9,000 for deposit in the Treasury for penalty mail (39 U. S. C. 321d); $3,431,510, of which not less than $228,695 shall be available for the enforcement of the Wool Products Labeling Act: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein for the Federal Trade Commission shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 14, line 21, after the semicolon strike out "$3,431,510" and insert "$3,361,510."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered as a committee amendment for the purpose of clarifying the present situation.

It was the intention of the committee in making the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission to eliminate for the time being all money for work in the insurance field, because in the event the present law should be extended beyond June 30, as it already has been extended on at least one occasion, the money would not be necessary.

The testimony of the agency was far from clear. It appears, however, that it considers under the action taken by the committee that it still has $70,000 which might be used for this work.

It seems best, therefore, to reduce the amount by $70,000 and allow the matter to be straightened out in the other body.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Funds available to the Public Buildings Administration for construction shall be available for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $35 per diem (unless a higher rate, not exceeding $50, shall be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget).

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HESELTON: On page 21, following line 22, add a new paragraph as follows:

"No part of the foregoing appropriations to the Federal Works Agency shall be used for the purpose of converting any existing coal-heating units to oil in any federally owned or rented buildings in or outside the District of Columbia when there is a fuel-oil shortage."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes, this being the last time that I intend to speak today during debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, some of you were here yesterday and some of you were here this morning when I addressed myself to this question, but there are others who have not learned what the developments are as of this time. Yesterday afternoon, at page 1015 in the third column of the RECORD, I indicated the form of an amendment I proposed to offer, a limitation on the use of these funds appropriated for operating buildings. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has indicated to me that if I would take out natural gas, he would not be disposed to oppose the amendment. I confess that I have no business on the floor here as a Representative of a New England State advocating the inclusion of natural gas because we do not get any. I will have to leave that fight to you people in the natural-gas areas. He also indicated he would prefer that I should add the words "in areas where there is a fuel-oil shortage." I have done so with some reluctance, because I realize that creates a question of interpretation. I suppose today the District of Columbia could be considered in a fuel-oil-shortage area; possibly Virginia; perhaps North Carolina, and even Tennessee. Even the State of Texas, I understand, is having trouble today in some areas. But we certainly are having our troubles in New England and the Northeast. So I am going to confine my efforts this afternoon to prevailing upon you to help us out.

You will find a table at page 1016 of the RECORD which was furnished to the President at the request of Mr. Flemming, with which I will deal in a moment. But let us get back to this fight of December 12 before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A gentleman by the name of Mr. William E. Gannon, purchasing agent, Bureau of Federal Supply, was testifying, and he said in part, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]:

How wide a scope of articles did these bids call for?

Mr. GANNON. It was solely fuel oil and kerosene and Diesel oil.

Mr. O'HARA. Used for heating in the buildings of the various departments of the Government that you have outlined?

Mr. GANNON. Yes, sir.

Later I inquired:

Do you have any jurisdiction over the use made of fuel oil in the Federal buildings?

Mr. GANNON. No, sir.

Mr. HESELTON. You are confined simply to the matter of purchase?

Mr. GANNON. That is right.

Then this very significant point which I would like you to listen to carefully, I said:

I understand that Mr. Lewis testified earlier this week that it is possible to reconvert to coal in the New England area, and the coal industry could supply all of the demands there if it was possible to convert. Are you familiar with the possibility of converting the Federal buildings in that area as a step toward helping the situation?

Mr. GANNON. I could not say that I am reliably informed but I have heard rumors that there have been certain conversions to oil and I do not know why.

Mr. HESELTON. Conversions to oil?

Mr. GANNON. Within the last year, and I do not know why they could not reconvert.

Mr. HESELTON. Would that not be worth while exploring? Would it provide some real aid in the near future as well as for long-range conservation? As long as you are having difficulty buying it, if you can reconvert to coal, it would save oil in considerable amount.

Mr. GANNON. I think not only the Government but all citizens should be urged, if not forced, to reconvert where they can.

Mr. HESELTON. While I agree now it is an emergency problem, I still think that the Government has the prime responsibility and should set the example.

Mr. GANNON. There is no question about it.

That was December 12. What is the record? This table shows there have been some reconversions in recent months. It does not tell you, however, in the table when these reconversions took place.

Earlier today I received from one of the staff of the Appropriations Committee, who has been kind enough to follow this, a startling statement, one that will make bad reading in the New England papers tonight if it is printed:

The Marine Hospital in Boston, Mass., was reconverted from coal to oil in December.

I do not know what date, but it was in December 1947. The table shows that that particular hospital uses 370,000 gallons of this desperately needed fuel oil right in the heart of some of the worst temperature conditions in New England. That is for foresight. That is not the type of thing you and I expect to be used by responsible experts.

Now, as to the District of Columbia: We have five locations here, and they are interesting, although not quite so vivid as that; 301 Independence Avenue was converted in September 1946; 1626 K Street was converted in September 1946; 1624 H Street was converted in October 1946; Briggs School was converted in October 1946; 1757 L Street was converted in September 1946.

You will find that tabulation on page 1016 of the RECORD. You can estimate how many gallons of fuel oil was burned during that time.

Now, this is the prime reason why I am asking you to place this limitation in. At Arlington, Va., 705 Columbia Pike, the contract has been stopped. There is a 14-day emergency clause, an escape clause, as I interpret it. The contract has been stopped, but only temporarily, for they say it is their purpose to start the work again after April 1.

Mr. Chairman, every person who has been competent to testify before any committee from Secretary Forrestal right straight down through the industry has told us that this is not a problem for this month or this winter, that it is a long-range problem, that it is a 5-year problem at least, that it is a national-security problem. Members of this House from New York, New Jersey, and New England will tell you that it is also a welfare problem with our people. We are dealing with people who are sick, with people who are elderly, we are dealing with young children, with hospitals, schools, churches, and industries.

Our colleagues from Michigan and Pennsylvania will tell you why they want natural gas included in the amendment. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] will take the floor and read an emergency telegram setting forth conditions in the city of Northampton. What I am trying to tell you is that we are up against an emergency, a real one.

Here is another one: Washington, D. C., 711 Twelfth Street, NW. Contract stopped. Proposed to start work again after April 1.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not want to interrupt the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but as he knows, last evening I expressed myself as sympathetic with the amendment. I have had an opportunity to talk with other members of the subcommittee. I am glad to state that I am authorized to say that as far as the committee is concerned it is prepared to accept the proposed amendment.

Mr. HESELTON. I was told by my father once that it is a wise man who knows when to stop talking when the court is with him. I have always valued that good counsel.

I am through.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COFFIN to the Heselton amendment: Insert after the word "oil" the words "or natural gas."

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, my heart bleeds with sympathy with the gentleman from Massachusetts whose constituents are freezing to death because of the lack of fuel oil. I come from an area where every other person is already a human icicle because of the lack of fuel oil. But worse than that we have 200,000 people out of work because of lack of gas. I think, therefore, if we are sensible we will include gas as well as fuel oil in this restriction against conversion; and I therefore ask you to support, for the sake of the dear people of Detroit, this restriction of conversion to gas as well as to fuel oil, which is covered by my amendment.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in favor of this amendment because I believe the shortage of fuel oil throughout the country is such that public officials should cooperate in every way possible in an effort to relieve the situation. This amendment and the amendment to the amendment both are offered for the purpose of giving further relief.

In order that the House may know the situation as it prevails in Massachusetts today I would state that this noon I spoke with Mayor Edwin Olander, of Northampton, Mass. The information he gave me was of such nature that I sent a telegram to the President of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey this afternoon. I would like to read you the telegram:

M. J. RATHBONE,
President, Esso Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, New York, N. Y.

Mayor Olander, of Northampton, Mass., informs me that board of health has declared state of emergency in Northampton. Mayor has impounded all No. 1 and No. 2 fuel oil. Public amusement places, bowling alleys, and theaters closing down, stores cut to 60-degree heat and church services limited. Officials have handled up to 100 calls in 1 day from persons out of fuel oil. Yesterday, 200 calls from persons out of oil or to be out of it by next morning.

Can you arrange for pool of fuel oil to be available to relieve desperate fuel-oil situation Northampton immediately?

Some time ago when another serious situation was developing in regard to the shipment of emergency fuel-oil supplies to independent dealers and for customers who could not get it from the regular suppliers to whom they had gone previously, Mr. Rathbone helped considerably. His company has assisted considerably in attempting to alleviate the situation by distilling a larger percentage of fuel oil from each barrel of crude oil than had been the intention of the company. This increase amounted to about 10 percent, or over 2,400,000 gallons daily for his company alone. I am hopeful that President Rathbone will be able to step into this picture and, knowing the facts and the inability of the oil companies up there to meet the situation which has developed, will be able to do something at once.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I heard a long-distance call from Maine last night, from a community where the temperature was 25 below zero. This is not a local Massachusetts matter. It is a New England matter, it is a matter involving the whole northern part of the country. I am strongly in favor of the pending amendment. I was very shocked to learn that the Navy felt it must keep its oil supply by converting a Marine hospital from coal to oil. This is an incredible situation. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that if my bill to embargo oil were enacted into law it would have a very salutary effect upon the oil producers in the matter of getting the oil out to the people who need it. I think it is the one solution to the whole matter.

Mr. CLASON. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. May I point out that in Springfield the temperature has been 26 below zero, at Hampden 30 below, and at Deerfield, in Congressman HESELTON'S district, 37 below. When the situation is like that, everybody ought to step in and help.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In common with the gentleman from Massachusetts, I have received similar telephone calls. I received one early this morning. I have also received a number of telegrams calling attention to the fact that the suppliers are running out of oil completely. One in particular, the State Fuel Co., of East Boston, is entirely out of oil this morning.

In addition to what the gentleman has already said, may I state that I am given to understand that the president of the New Jersey Standard has already been in telephone conversation with the Boston representative of his concern and it is my further understanding if there is any oil available belonging to that company in the Boston area he is going to do all he can to see that it is distributed where it is needed most. I need not say that we are deeply appreciative of this

cooperation. It is a very unfortunate situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. I have the greatest sympathy for the people in areas that use fuel oil when they are striving so hard to alleviate the shortage. There has been information that certain Government buildings in certain shortage areas are being converted from coal to fuel oil. For this reason I think the pending amendment is justified. However, I should like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that I question the advisability of including natural gas. Our Committe on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been holding extensive hearings on this matter for some time and we have not had any information that there have been any conversions or purported conversions from coal to natural gas.

The pending amendment applies to conversions in Federal buildings. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan if he has any information that the Federal Government either with respect to its own buildings or rented buildings intends to convert from coal to natural gas?

Mr. COFFIN. There have been several projects. I cannot give you the exact number, but the scarcity of fuel oil is going to tend in that direction more and more.

Mr. HARRIS. I regret, of course, the general situation regarding fuel oil. But in certain areas I want to call your attention to the fact that we have buildings that are using butane and other products developed from natural gas and petroleum. Butane is becoming an extremely short product in these areas, and if we do find some Federal buildings where they are running short of butane and cannot, of course, get any more fuel in an area where there is available plenty of natural gas, a prohibition of this kind would require the Federal Government to go into the coal areas and transport coal down into that part of the country. It would cause a tremendous liability and increase the burden, in my opinion, if a condition like that were to develop. I am greatly in sympathy with the gentleman's proposal, and if it would relieve the situation any at all in his area I would certainly be in favor of it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I appreciate very much the attitude that the gentleman has taken, and I also appreciate the attitude taken by the other Members in this body. But I will be frank with you that I must support the gentleman's amendment. I do it for this purpose. It is my understanding that right here in the District we are burning fuel oil in order to make up the shortages of natural gas. I said yesterday, and I say again, that this is a long-range problem. We cannot overlook the fact that 200,000 people are out of work in Michigan and 15,000 people are out of work in the Pittsburgh area, and for every cubic foot of natural gas that you send up to us we will pay premium prices for.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has been very diligent in this matter, and I certainly am anxious to help out in any way I possibly can, but if the gentleman can tell this Committee or the Congress one instance of where the Federal Government proposes to convert from coal to natural gas, then certainly I would be more in sympathy with the proposal.

Mr. HESELTON. Would the gentleman be willing to say that if we can develop that before the other body he will join with us?

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly will. If it will help alleviate the unemployment situation and the critical condition in the distressed areas, I would be glad to join in any program that would help out.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. At this point it might be well to inform my colleagues from Michigan that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning has agreed to hold hearings on the shortage of natural gas. A complete investigation will be made of that situation by the committee, and a report should be had in about 2 weeks from now.

Mr. HARRIS. I merely call this to the attention of the committee that I doubt very seriously the wisdom in having natural gas included at this time, because we might find ourselves running into more trouble. I do not believe, from information I have, that it would help any at all to include natural gas in this amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am rather glad that some of the Members of Congress are hearing from their constituents at home. It seems as though the lack of fuel oil had to happen before they could become properly interested, in the broad sense of the word.

Referring to what the gentleman from Nebraska just said, I had occasion the other day to look into the breakdown of how much petroleum products is to be shipped to Europe for the first 15 months under the Marshall plan. If we do not have this oil available, we are to buy it from South America. It amounts to $651,900,000 worth of precious petroleum products, that we are short of in this country.

There are 300,000 people out of work and hundreds of thousands of people inconvenienced as a result of the shortage of heating, in addition to the hospitals, and so forth. I also notice that $328,000,000 worth of coal is to be shipped out in the first 15 months under the proposed Marshall plan.

It is a long-range problem that is confronting the people of the United States at the present time. We are using 20 percent more petroleum products than we did in 1945, and our population is increasing. Yet this Congress is about to take the responsibility of sharing our petroleum products and our coal and our steel and everything else, to shore up the economies of the entire world.

I hope that out of the investigation the Interstate and Foreign Commerce is now making we can put a complete embargo on the shipment of petroleum products, and I hope we can write this amendment into the bill and stop the Government from converting from coal to gas and petroleum. Of course, they have been converting and they will keep converting unless they are stopped by law, because that is a chance to award contracts and spend more money, and this administration is never happier than when it has everybody spending money, whether it is conversion to this or conversion to that.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting both the amendment to the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of, and shall support, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. COFFIN]. I think both gentleman are doing their constituents, their districts, and their Nation a service in offering these amendments.

May I call your attention to the resolution which has been brought out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has for its purpose a definite embargo on the export of petroleum products for a period of time which I think is 30 days.

Let me say to you once more, as I have on previous occasions, that the House Committee on Merchant Marine considered this problem last June and July and brought out at that time, when the weather was warm, a bill forbidding the export of petroleum products, unless the Secretary of Commerce O. K.'d those exports as being not against the national interest of this country. This thing has been delayed entirely too long. The House passed that bill, incidentally, and I sought to incorporate the same provisions in legislation pending before the House when we considered the $600,000,000 foreign-relief bill. My amendment lost in the Committee of the Whole by seven votes. So that it has been delayed ever since last June. It is time that we took very drastic action on this situation.

While I have this brief time, let me make this one remark. I doubt if there is anyone in the Congress, or if there is anyone in the Nation who has rendered more valuable service on this particular problem than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], who has spent hours, days, and weeks working on this

program in his committee and on the floor of the House. I hope the Committee supports his amendment.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POTTS. The gentleman will recall that when the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries was studying this situation last June, there were at that time three ships loading on the Pacific coast bound for Russia, one of which was the *Tagenrod*, which had 11,000 barrels of kerosene which is the fuel used by the veterans in the Quonset huts in my district. Those veterans have been very cold this winter.

Mr. HAND. If the gentleman will permit me, the same situation happened in the port of Philadelphia within the last week.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of my constituents throughout the State of Connecticut, I wholeheartedly endorse the proposal by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] to prevent further conversion of coal-burning to oil-using equipment in order that we might save every drop of fuel and distribute it to the fullest advantage in the critical situation that has arisen in the matter of fuel shortage.

I join with my colleagues in their respect and commendation to the proponent of this amendment, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] for his indefatigable efforts in endeavoring to bring about an alleviation of a hardship that is particularly growing in the northeastern area because of the continuance of subzero weather and unusually heavy snowfalls that add to the unhealthy discomforts.

This proposition is the beginning of long-range planning and is a measure which is a follow-up of the requests made to the administration urging the discontinuance of converting heating units to the use of oil instead of other fuels. Of course, direct relief by the shipment of the necessary fuels to our affected areas is the surest way for dealing with the case, but at the same time, every other avenue of bringing relief must be investigated and compelled to act for the good and welfare and overcoming a problem which is causing greater concern today and must be continually dealt with in the days before us.

I hope the Committee will accept this meritorious amendment and the Members will join unanimously in its addition to the bill before us.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I want to echo what has been said with regard to the activities of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. I have observed his work in committee as well as on the floor on this extremely important matter. The people of my section of the country are as cold or perhaps nearly as cold as the people of Massachusetts and New England generally. I do believe if it had not been for the excellent work of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], a great deal that has already been accomplished would not have been accomplished. We are all very much indebted to him for his fine work.

Mr. SADLAK. I am unqualifiedly in agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to echo the sentiments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in expressing the gratitude of everyone in my section of the country to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], and to say that I am very happy to support his amendment.

Certainly with all the suffering now being encountered from lack of fuel oil, particularly in the New England and Mid-Atlantic States, and with the city councils and administrative officers of all our municipalities so much exercised over this serious problem, it is unthinkable that we should not call a halt on the conversion at this time of federally controlled buildings to oil heat. It shocks our conscience to hear of such callous disregard of the people's welfare or downright mismanagement such as the gentleman from Massachusetts has referred to in the conversion just this last December of a large veterans' hospital in Massachusetts. The oil consumed in this huge installation in 1 week would no doubt heat a good many homes for the entire winter season.

The Federal Government, instead of trying to corner the fuel oil for its own buildings, should set an example for the rest of the country in conserving this vital commodity. Since those having in charge the administration of public buildings either through misdirected action or thoughtless inaction are either doing the wrong thing or nothing at all, it devolves upon us, it seems to me, to put a stop to it insofar as we can by the enactment of this amendment at this time.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to know the gentleman's position on this important matter. I agree with him wholeheartedly in the compliments that he has paid to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. No one could work more earnestly or more effectively in trying to find a solution to this critical problem than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]. He deserves our sincere commendation. Our situation in New England, as the gentleman well knows, is desperate and highly critical. While we appreciate the help that has been rendered to us by Members of this body and the Government, we hope that we will be able to go ahead with this and other pending measures on the oil-shortage problem and thus get some real relief on this matter during the rest of the winter so that our people may be spared the rigors and hardships that they have suffered and are now facing in even greater degree. I urge the House to support this amendment and all other emergency measures to relieve our people.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON], because I share the conviction, based on expert testimony, that our present desperate oil shortage is not a temporary one, but may well continue throughout the next several years to come. With the universal exhortations, by all authorities, to businesses and householders to reduce fuel consumption, it is most appropriate that our Government and its agencies should cooperate in the program of conservation.

When the Federal Government is requesting individuals, as well as State, county, and local governments to conserve, then it surely has the responsibility of leading the way by good example.

The Executive order, issued last month, calling for conservation of fuel oil, and the regulation of the installation of additional oil-burning equipment makes it clear that the Government is well acquainted with the existing situation, and the fact that the prospects for the next few years are not bright; they should, then, do everything possible in order to ease the effects of the present fuel-oil shortage.

I know there is no need for me to make an extended recitation of the existing hardships in so many sections of our country. We in New England are going through the worst winter within memory and experiencing almost daily subzero temperatures.

The people of my district and State fully realize the emergency confronting them; by personal and individual sacrifice, they are doing everything possible to help in this crisis by cutting down their consumption. It would seem that they, and all our taxpayers, have the right to expect Federal agencies to assist them in meeting this problem.

The purpose of this amendment is just that, and I urge its favorable adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I had a letter from a friend originally from my home city who has settled in Alaska and has been living there for the last few months. He tells me that the average temperature in Alaska, mind you, has been 28 degrees above zero. I leave it to the Representatives from New England and from upState New York who have already spoken to testify and vouch for my statement that our average temperature during the past month has been about 10 degrees below zero. It is a serious situation for the areas of the United States whose people are exposed to that cold.

We are about to commit ourselves to a world-wide program of help. I dare say there is contemplated in the Marshall plan the shipment of a great many tons of coal, countless gallons of fuel oil, and all other methods of heating to the

various countries across the seas. Certainly, if the exigencies and emergencies are so serious that people have to reduce fuel consumption in everybody's home, it is going to be that much more critical when the Marshall plan or any other program of international assistance is put into effect. So, for one, I want to subscribe wholeheartedly to this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, because if anybody should set an example it is certainly the departments of Government and the public servants who are housed in the various buildings that are going to be heated. It dovetails exactly with a proposal which I made some weeks ago, which will bring about cooperation between industry and all agencies of Government that have to do with the saving of fuel oil, coal, and fuel in general. It is similar to the objective I have in mind to see that the users of fuel oil and coal are given priority in the home, where families and loved ones must be kept warm. I think every effort should be made to keep up the high standard of living in America so that our people can be kept warm. Behind the iron curtain, in those countries where darkness and despair are evident today, people huddle together in their below-zero dwellings. Government commissars haye priority over everybody else to get fuel of all kinds. They take a ton of coal or a load of wood and use it for themselves, but the rank and file of the people in those unfortunate countries are pushed around and they spend their time shivering and freezing in the cold.

Therefore, I think this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Access roads: During the fiscal year 1949, not to exceed $70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon completion of access road projects authorized to be constructed under the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by the act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106), shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges under the jurisdiction of the Public Roads Administration on Government-owned land in Arlington County, Va.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to interrogate the committee with reference to this appropriation for Federal aid to roads.

In 1944 we passed a law under which $500,000,000 a year was authorized each year for 3 years for Federal aid to roads. I was instrumental in having written into that act the earmarking of $150,000,000 of the $500,000,000 for farm-to-market roads.

I wish to inquire if there has been a break-down in this bill showing what percentage of the $452,000,000 is to be devoted to farm-to-market roads? The original act, of course, earmarked 30 percent of the $500,000,000 for farm-to-market roads and I am wondering if there has been any break-down of this item so we can know what percentage of this amount is to be used for farm-to-market roads.

In the State of Texas the federally aided highways are in mighty good shape, but our farmers are in the mud.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that I doubt if a break-down such as that he has in mind has been furnished to the committee. There is a break-down on page 716 of the hearings but I doubt if that covers the particular matter in which the gentleman is interested.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. It is our understanding that when the Congress passed the good roads bill, let us call it, then and there the Federal Government became liable by virtue of the act itself for the Federal part of this fund for the very specific purposes enumerated in the bill. Therefore the $150,000,000 in which the former Speaker is interested is included in the $452,000,000 for this year.

It is our further understanding that the 3-year program will not be carried out in 3 years but will be carried out in perhaps 4 or 4½ years for the simple reason that during the first year and a half labor was scarce and building materials were scarce, and at the request of the committee—and certainly the Public Roads Administration concurred—they did not operate that program through the period of scarcity; but it will be carried out to the very letter of the act, and the farm-to-market roads will be constructed to the full extent intended under that act.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say with respect to authorizations that the Federal Highway Act of 1944 provided, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has stated, authorizations for 3 years, but the third year was extended an additional year by act of Congress during the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

In answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] I may say that while the committee apparently is unable to furnish the information asked by him, it strikes me as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] that under this appropriation of $452,288,854 for carrying out the provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 the amount will be spent on Federal-aid highways, farm-to-market roads, urban highways in the percentage as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]; to wit, that 30 percent of it shall be spent for farm-to-market roads, or secondary roads. The act fixes the relative amount or percentages in the same section for the 3 classes or types of roads.

Mr. RAYBURN. If that is the understanding of the committee, that out of this $452,000,000 appropriated for 1949, 30 percent is going to be spent for farm-to-market roads, it is perfectly satisfactory to me. I just do not want the House to appropriate as big a sum as this, which is getting up pretty close to the limit of the authorization and then have some of our people who want farm-to-market roads cut to below 30 percent of that amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the members of the Appropriations Committee upon their support of the public roads program. The bill contains $459,588,000, which is almost $200,000,000 more than the 1948 appropriation. It is only $1,000,000 less than the amount authorized by the Budget Bureau. This $1,000,000 reduction is a result of deferring the construction of a testing and research laboratory at Langley, Va. Due to the cost of construction, this laboratory will be built at a later date.

The Federal-aid highway program is of tremendous importance. During the war all highways were heavily used and because of the lack of equipment many of them got in a bad state of repair. The record shows that there is a great increase in highway use in the postwar period. According to the statement of Mr. McDonald, in 1941 we had about 330,000,000,000 vehicle miles and in 1947, 375,000,000,000. This was an increase of more than 12 percent. The major increase seems to be in the use of trucks and busses, the increase from 1941 to 1947 being more than 33 percent.

The interest and cooperation of the local road officials in the secondary-road program has been gratifying. The counties are contributing about 15 percent of the funds required to match secondary-aid funds, and frequently they furnish rights-of-way. I think Congress took an enlightened step in authorizing funds for a Federal-aid system in urban areas in 1944. I am glad that the program for urban areas and also for secondary funds is being continued. The table on page 11 of the report shows the program of projects that have been submitted by the State highway departments. As of December 1, 1947, the total cost of projects submitted for Federal-aid primary funds was in excess of $900,000,000; for Federal-aid secondary funds was in excess of $600,000,000; and for Federal-aid urban was in excess of $400,000,000.

In Tennessee, a highway program of more than $35,000,000 had been submitted as of December 1, 1947. A program of more than $14,000,000 is under construction. Page 717 of the hearings show that projects costing almost $7,500,000 have already been completed. The people demand, and are entitled to, a good system of roads. This includes urban and farm-to-market roads, secondary roads, as well as primary Federal roads. All parts of the system are necessary if we are to have a real road program. I am glad that the Appropriations Committee of the House has accepted the recommendation of the Public Roads Administrator, and I hope that it

will be approved by the Congress as recommended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Penalty mail costs: For deposit in the Treasury for penalty mail of the Interstate Commerce Commission (39 U. S. C. 321d), $35,000.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 31, following line 4, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

"Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay in advance to the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin the Federal contribution toward the expenses of the Commission during the fiscal year 1949 in the administration of its business in the conservancy district established pursuant to the act of July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 748) $5,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created by Public Resolution 74, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 31, 1937. The Congress authorized the States of Maryand, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact providing for the creation of a conservancy district to consist of the entire drainage area of the Potomac River, said district to be organized and maintain for the purpose of regulating, controlling, preventing, or otherwise rendering unobjectionable and harmless the pollution of the waters of said Potomac River Basin by sewage and industrial and other wastes.

On July 11, 1940, the President approved Senate Joint Resolution 222—Public Resolution 93, Seventy-sixth Congress—granting the consent of Congress to these States to enter into a compact for the creation of a Potomac Valley Conservancy District and the establishment of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. The compact, which is fully set forth in the joint resolution, provides that it will become effective when ratified by a majority of the five signatory bodies and approved by Congress. The compact became effective when ratified by a majority of the five signatory bodies and approved by Congress. The compact became operative May 10, 1941, when three of the five signatory bodies had approved same. Since that time all of the other signatory bodies have approved the compact and are actively participating in the affairs of the Commission.

By law the Federal Government is a member of and participates in the affairs of the Commission through the medium of its three representatives appointed by the President of the United States. One is appointed from the United States Public Health Service, one from the War Department, and the third is a scientist representing the public at large. In actions of the Commission they have the same authority as the members appointed by the several States.

The compact provides that the Interstate Commission in its administration of the business of the conservancy district shall be financed through appropriations from the United States and the signatory bodies in pro rata amounts based on area and population as shall be determined from time to time by the Commission. To date, however, the Federal Government has not paid any pro rata share of the expense of the Commission.

The present expenses of the Commission are distributed among the States as follows: Pennsylvania, $1,800; West Virginia, $2,700; Virginia, $3,600; Maryland, $4,500; and the District of Columbia, $5,400. The Commission requested a Federal contribution of $10,800 for the 1949 fiscal year. That amount was reduced by the Budget Bureau to $9,000. The item was stricken entirely from the bill by the subcommittee. I am merely asking that the item be restored and that the Federal Government contribute $5,000 to this Commission during the next year.

I have several letters from members of the Commission, one of whom is the director of the Virginia State Planning Board. He tells me that additional funds are needed by the Commission. I also have a letter from a member of the House of Delegates of Virginia, who is a member of the Commission.

I therefore hope that this body will see fit to restore the item of $5,000 to the bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very small amount of money involved in the proposal before the Committee, and it is very hard to oppose the eloquence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] on a matter of this kind.

I just want to point out that the committee was not impressed by the importance of this organization from its testimony. It seems to be devoting itself largely to educational work in the field in which it operates. Furthermore, the committee was not impressed by the proposal before it at that time that the Federal Government should put up $9,000 out of the $27,000 total, in addition to the $5,400 which the District of Columbia is contributing. Therefore the item was eliminated from the bill.

As far as I am concerned, I am content to have the House vote upon the matter as it sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 207. Except as otherwise provided by law, any appropriations or funds available to the executive departments, independent establishments, and corporations for the payment of salaries and compensation to persons employed outside the continental United States or in Alaska shall be available for the payment of such salaries and compensation only in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President at rates of pay equal to those paid for the same or similar services of persons employed by the Government in continental United States, plus not to exceed 25 percent: *Provided*, That no such salary or compensation shall exceed the maximum provided by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the point where the postwar highway appropriation was under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have sought this time for the purpose of clarifying the application of section 207, which provides the authority of the various branches of the Federal Government as to the payment of the 25 percent differential.

In the Territory of Hawaii there are between 20,000 and 30,000 civilians in the employ of the Federal Government. All of those civilians receive a 25 percent differential in pay except the employees in the postal service. For a period of almost 5 years attempts have been made by the postal employees through the Post Office Department and through the representative of the Territory in Congress to obtain for the postal employees this 25 percent differential in pay. The Post Office Department has taken the position that the money could not be paid without specific authority in the law.

On February 12, 1947, I introduced a bill to provide specific authority for the payment of this differential. The Department in a report on April 22, 1947, opposed the enactment of this bill, and then in a second report on August 27, 1947, asked that action on the bill be held in abeyance until an investigation was held.

It is manifestly unfair that the 500 to 600 persons employed in the postal service should receive 25 percent less than the employees in the other services of the Federal Government. I hope, therefore, that under the provisions of this bill the Post Office Department will have the authority to pay that differential. May I ask the chairman of the committee to inform me if this is a correct statement of the case?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. My understanding is that all those on foreign service are brought under this provision except where otherwise provided by law. Therefore, the personnel to whom the gentleman refers would be eligible for the increase in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Then I am correct in understanding that if this section is enacted into law the Post Office Department will have adequate authority to pay the Federal employees in the Territory of Hawaii the 25 percent differential in pay?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not know whether they have the funds, but they would have adequate authority and presumably would ask for funds under that authority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Do I understand from the chairman of this subcommittee that there is authority to pay the postal employees in Hawaii more money and that the same thing might

apply to Alaska and Puerto Rico and other Territories?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This applies to all foreign service personnel.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand, but are not the personnel in the foreign service in the Territories treated just as the employees in the States are in all other legislation? Under this bill, why should the postal service be paid more? Is that not the situation in our Territories? The Territories under our control are entirely different from the situation that obtains in foreign countries which are not under the control of the United States. I think that would be discrimination if postal employees in Hawaii or Alaska and other Territories were paid more than is paid to postal employees in the States. I cannot understand it. I do not see why that discrimination should exist or what authority under the law the Post Office Department may have to pay them more money.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The postal employees of Alaska do receive this 25 percent differential. There is a long history behind the payment of that 25 percent. It arose out of the conditions that developed during the war. I do not have the time to outline that now, but it came about through the necessity of moving a great many people to those areas for the purpose of prosecuting the war and also because of the high cost of living in those areas.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a most unfortunate time to advance the proposition that because it was necessary to win the war, a Territory of the United States should pay its postal employees 25 percent more than employees are paid in the States.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am not making that contention at all. I am merely asking that the postal employees be treated on exactly the same basis as are all other Federal employees in the Territory of Hawaii. The Congress of the United States decided what the other employees should be paid. We did not make that decision in Hawaii. You made that decision here, and I am only asking that these people be placed on the same basis. I want to thank the chairman of the committee and the committee for putting this provision in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Hawaii has expired. The pro forma amendments are withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 10, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—339

Abernethy	Case, N. J.	Flannagan
Albert	Case, S. Dak.	Fletcher
Allen, Calif.	Chadwick	Fogarty
Allen, La.	Chelf	Folger
Almond	Chenoweth	Foote
Andersen, H. Carl	Clason	Forand
Anderson, Calif.	Clevenger	Gamble
Andresen, August H.	Clippinger	Garmatz
Andrews, Ala.	Coffin	Gary
Andrews, N. Y.	Cole, Kans.	Gathings
Angell	Cole, Mo.	Gavin
Arends	Colmer	Gearhart
Arnold	Combs	Gillie
Auchincloss	Cooley	Goff
Banta	Cooper	Goodwin
Barden	Corbett	Gordon
Barrett	Cotton	Gore
Bates, Ky.	Courtney	Gorski
Bates, Mass.	Cox	Gossett
Battle	Cravens	Graham
Beall	Crosser	Grant, Ala.
Beckworth	Cunningham	Grant, Ind.
Bell	Curtis	Gregory
Bender	Dague	Griffiths
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Ga.	Gwynne, Iowa
Bishop	Davis, Wis.	Hagen
Blackney	Dawson, Utah	Hale
Blatnik	Deane	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Boggs, Del.	Delaney	Hall, Leonard W.
Boggs, La.	Devitt	Hardy
Bolton	D'Ewart	Harless, Ariz.
Bonner	Dolliver	Harness, Ind.
Boykin	Domengeaux	Harris
Bradley	Dondero	Harvey
Bramblett	Donohue	Havenner
Brehm	Dorn	Hébert
Brooks	Doughton	Hendricks
Brophy	Douglas	Heselton
Brown, Ga.	Durham	Hess
Brown, Ohio	Eaton	Hill
Bryson	Eberharter	Hinshaw
Buchanan	Elliott	Hobbs
Bulwinkle	Ellis	Hoeven
Burke	Elsaesser	Hoffman
Burleson	Elston	Holifield
Busbey	Engel, Mich.	Holmes
Butler	Engle, Calif.	Horan
Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan	Huber
Canfield	Fellows	Hull
Cannon	Fenton	Jackson, Calif.
Carroll	Fernandez	Jackson, Wash.
Carson	Fisher	Jarman
Case, S. Dak.	Flood	Javits
Chadwick	Fogarty	Jenison
Chelf	Folger	Jennings
Chenoweth	Foote	Jensen
Clason	Forand	Johnson, Calif.
Clevenger	Gamble	Johnson, Ill.
Clippinger	Garmatz	Johnson, Ind.
Coffin	Gary	Johnson, Tex.
Cole, Kans.	Gathings	Jones, Ala.
Cole, Mo.	Gavin	Jones, N. C.
Colmer	Gearhart	Jonkman
Combs	Gillie	Judd
Cooley	Goff	Karsten, Mo.
Cooper	Goodwin	Kearney
Corbett	Gordon	Kearns
Cotton	Gore	Keating
Courtney	Gorski	Kefauver
Cox	Gossett	Kelley
Cravens	Graham	Kerr
Crosser	Grant, Ala.	Kersten, Wis.
Crow	Grant, Ind.	Kilburn
Cunningham	Gregory	Kilday
Curtis	Griffiths	King
Dague	Gwynne, Iowa	Kirwan
Davis, Ga.	Hagen	Kunkel
Davis, Wis.	Hale	Landis
Dawson, Utah	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lane
Deane	Hall, Leonard W.	Lanham
Delaney	Hardy	Larcade
Devitt	Harless, Ariz.	Latham
D'Ewart	Harness, Ind.	Lea
Dolliver	Harris	LeCompte
Domengeaux	Harvey	LeFevre
Dondero	Havenner	Lemke
Donohue	Hébert	Lesinski
Dorn	Hendricks	Lichtenwalter
Doughton	Heselton	Lodge
Douglas	Hess	Love
Durham	Hill	Lusk
Eaton	Hinshaw	Lyle
Eberharter	Hobbs	McConnell
Elliott	Hoeven	McCormack
Ellis	Hoffman	McCowen
Elsaesser	Holifield	McCulloch
Elston	Holmes	McDonough
Engel, Mich.	Horan	McGregor
Engle, Calif.	Huber	McMahon
Feighan	Hull	McMillan, S. C.
Fellows	Jackson, Calif.	McMillen, Ill.
Fenton	Jackson, Wash.	MacKinnon
Fernandez	Jarman	Mack
Fisher	Javits	Macy
Flannagan	Jenison	Madden
Flood	Jennings	Mahon
Fletcher	Jensen	Maloney
Fogarty	Johnson, Calif.	Manasco
Folger	Johnson, Ill.	Mansfield
Foote	Johnson, Ind.	Marcantonio
Forand	Johnson, Tex.	Mathews
Gamble	Jones, Ala.	Meade, Ky.
Garmatz	Jones, N. C.	Meade, Md.
Gary	Jonkman	Merrow
Gathings	Judd	Meyer
Gavin	Karsten, Mo.	Michener
Gearhart	Kearney	Miller, Calif.
Gillie	Kearns	Miller, Conn.
Goff	Keating	Miller, Md.
Goodwin	Kefauver	Mitchell
Gordon	Kelley	Mills
Gore	Kerr	Mitchell
Gorski	Kersten, Wis.	Monroney
Gossett	Kilburn	Morris
Graham	Kilday	Morton
Grant, Ala.	King	Muhlenberg
Grant, Ind.	Kirwan	Mundt
Gregory	Kunkel	Murdock
Griffiths	Landis	Murray, Tenn.
Gwynne, Iowa	Lane	Murray, Wis.
Hagen	Lanham	Nicholson
Hale	Larcade	Nixon
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Latham	Nodar
Hall, Leonard W.	Lea	Norblad
Hardy	LeCompte	Norrell
Harless, Ariz.	LeFevre	O'Hara
Harness, Ind.	Lemke	O'Konski
Harris	Lesinski	O'Toole
Harvey	Lichtenwalter	Pace
Havenner	Lodge	Passman
Hébert	Love	Patman
Hendricks	Lusk	Patterson
Heselton	Lyle	Peden
Hess	McConnell	Peterson
Hill	McCormack	Philbin
Hinshaw	McCowen	Phillips, Calif.
Hobbs	McCulloch	Phillips, Tenn.
Hoeven	McDonough	Pickett
Hoffman	McGregor	Plumley
Holifield	McMahon	Poage
Holmes	McMillan, S. C.	Potter
Horan	McMillen, Ill.	Potts
Huber	MacKinnon	Poulson
Hull	Mack	Powell
Jackson, Calif.	Macy	Preston
Jackson, Wash.	Madden	Price, Fla.
Jarman	Mahon	Price, Ill.
Javits	Maloney	Priest
Jenison	Manasco	Rains
Jennings	Mansfield	Ramey
Jensen	Marcantonio	Rankin
Johnson, Calif.	Mathews	Rayburn
Johnson, Ill.	Meade, Ky.	Reed, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.	Meade, Md.	Reed, N. Y.
Johnson, Tex.	Merrow	Rees
Jones, Ala.	Meyer	Regan
Jones, N. C.	Michener	Rich
Jonkman	Miller, Calif.	Richards
Judd	Miller, Conn.	Riehlman
Karsten, Mo.	Miller, Md.	Riley
Kearney	Mitchell	Rivers
Kearns	Mills	Robertson
Keating	Mitchell	Robsion
Kefauver	Monroney	Rockwell
Kelley	Morris	Rogers, Fla.
Kerr	Morton	Rogers, Mass.
Kersten, Wis.	Muhlenberg	Rohrbough
Kilburn	Mundt	Ross
Kilday	Murdock	Russell
King	Murray, Tenn.	Sabath
Kirwan	Murray, Wis.	Sadlak
Kunkel	Nicholson	Sadowski
Landis	Nixon	St. George
Lane	Nodar	Sanborn
Lanham	Norblad	Sarbacher
Larcade	Norrell	Sasscer
Latham	O'Hara	Scott, Hardie
Lea	O'Konski	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
LeCompte	O'Toole	Scrivner
LeFevre	Pace	Seely-Brown
Lemke	Passman	Shafer
Lesinski	Patman	Sheppard
Lichtenwalter	Patterson	Short
Lodge	Peden	Simpson, Ill.
Love	Peterson	Smathers
Lusk	Philbin	Snyder
Lyle	Phillips, Calif.	Somers
McConnell	Phillips, Tenn.	Spence
McCormack	Pickett	Stanley
McCowen	Plumley	Stefan
McCulloch	Poage	Stevenson
McDonough	Potter	Stigler
McGregor	Potts	Stockman
McMahon	Poulson	Stratton
McMillan, S. C.	Powell	Sundstrom
McMillen, Ill.	Preston	Taber
MacKinnon	Price, Fla.	Taylor
Mack	Price, Ill.	Teague
Macy	Priest	Thomas, Tex.
Madden	Rains	Thompson
Mahon	Ramey	Tibbott
Maloney	Rankin	Tollefson
Manasco	Rayburn	Trimble
Mansfield	Reed, Ill.	Twyman
Marcantonio	Reed, N. Y.	Vail
Mathews	Rees	Van Zandt
Meade, Ky.	Regan	Vinson
Meade, Md.	Rich	Vorys
	Richards	Vursell
	Riehlman	Weichel
	Riley	Welch
	Rivers	Wheeler
	Robertson	Whitten
	Robsion	Whittington
	Rockwell	Wigglesworth
	Rogers, Fla.	Williams
	Rogers, Mass.	Wilson, Ind.
	Rohrbough	Winstead
	Ross	Wolcott
	Russell	Wolverton
	Sabath	Wood
	Sadlak	Woodruff
	Sadowski	Worley
	St. George	Youngblood
	Sanborn	Zimmerman
	Sarbacher	
	Sasscer	
	Scott, Hardie	
	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	
	Scrivner	
	Seely-Brown	
	Shafer	
	Sheppard	
	Short	
	Simpson, Ill.	
	Smathers	
	Snyder	
	Somers	
	Spence	
	Stanley	
	Stefan	
	Stevenson	
	Stigler	
	Stockman	
	Stratton	
	Sundstrom	
	Taber	
	Taylor	
	Teague	
	Thomas, Tex.	
	Thompson	
	Tibbott	
	Tollefson	
	Trimble	
	Twyman	
	Vail	
	Van Zandt	
	Vinson	
	Vorys	
	Vursell	
	Weichel	
	Welch	
	Wheeler	
	Whitten	
	Whittington	
	Wigglesworth	
	Williams	
	Wilson, Ind.	
	Winstead	
	Wolcott	
	Wolverton	
	Wood	
	Woodruff	
	Worley	
	Youngblood	
	Zimmerman	

NAYS—10

Buck	Hand	Smith, Ohio
Buffett	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Church	Schwabe, Mo.	
Crawford	Schwabe, Okla.	

NOT VOTING—81

Allen, Ill.	Gross	Martin, Iowa
Bakewell	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mason
Bennett, Mo.	Halleck	Morgan
Bland	Harrison	Morrison
Bloom	Hart	Multer
Buckley	Hartley	Norton
Byrne, N. Y.	Hays	O'Brien
Camp	Hedrick	Owens
Carson	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Celler	Herter	Ploeser
Chapman	Hope	Redden
Chiperfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Reeves
Clark	Jenkins, Pa.	Rizley
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney
Coudert	Jones, Wash.	Scoblick
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Sikes
Dawson, Ill.	Keefe	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	Kennedy	Smith, Kans.
Dirksen	Keogh	Smith, Maine
Ellsworth	Klein	Smith, Va.
Evins	Knutson	Talle
Fallon	Lewis	Thomas, N. J.
Fuller	Lucas	Towe
Fulton	Ludlow	Wadsworth
Gallagher	Lynch	Walter
Gillette	McDowell	West
Granger	McGarvey	Wilson, Tex.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Halleck with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Towe with Mr. Klein.

Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Hedrick.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Rooney.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Hays.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Talle with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Multer.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Carson with Mr. Walter.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Owens with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Ludlow.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Redden.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Lewis with Mr. West.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. Hope with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Reeves with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Rizley with Mr. Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Keefe with Mr. Bloom.

Mr. CHURCH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MILLS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATING BUSINESS OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in passing House Concurrent Resolution 146, a typographical error was made. I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings of the House by which the concurrent resolution was passed in order to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 146, and I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 1634) to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia", and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto, is authorized and directed to make the following corrections in the House engrossed bill:

Page 8, line 3, after "one" insert the following: "per centum."

Page 13, line 20, strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "5b."

Page 13, line 20, strike out "in" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "In."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: On page 1 of the engrossed resolution, strike out lines 11 and 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO RAISE THE CEILINGS AND ALLOWANCES PAYABLE TO VETERANS UNDERGOING TRAINING ON THE JOB

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1393) to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the Joint Maritime Committee.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a message he sent to Governor Davis, of Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIAMS (at the request of Mr. PASSMAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. CHELF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by inserting a letter from Dr. Boris Klasons, recently an inmate of a displaced-persons camp.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a news item from the Railway Trainman.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from a newspaper.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the business of the day and other special orders entered for that date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. REEVES, for 1 week, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] is recognized for 45 minutes.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE AND FARM-MACHINERY EXPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, agriculture forms the basis of our prosperity. A prosperous, successful, and forward-looking program for our agricultural activities is a basic essential if the United States is to meet its opportunities and possibilities during the postwar period. Should we permit our agriculture to shrink, develop anemia, or any portion of it shrivel on the vine, the immediate effect on world peace and prosperity could and would be apparent. Therefore, any program or part of a program developed by the many departments of our Federal Government that hampers, hinders, or completely destroys segments of our agricultural production is definitely injurious, not only to agriculture but to our entire economic life.

Throughout the war our agricultural production increased about 30 percent and at the same time farmers could not secure sufficient farm labor nor were they able to purchase new machinery or even keep the old machinery in proper repair. This increased production was brought about by the pressure of the war and the fact that farm family after farm family had relatives, sons, and daughters in the service and the entire family was willing and anxious to produce to the limit. Long hours, hard work, was the usual procedure. Many farmers who had retired returned to the field to carry on the work of the sons who were on the battlefield. The war has been over nearly 2½ years, farm production is still high, but the pressure of the war is removed and farm people cannot be expected to continue the long and dreary hours of hard work that was necessary during the war years.

It certainly is discouraging for our farmers to learn that much farm equipment, new and modern, has been sent to foreign countries; yes, even to our former enemies. Many of them feel it is about time we carefully examine just how this export of farm equipment is affecting American agriculture.

As part of my remarks I want to read a careful analysis of farm exports made by one of the largest retail farm-equipment associations in the United States. Let me tell you something about the organization that made this analysis.

The National Retail Farm Equipment Association was organized in 1900.

There are 35 State and regional affiliated organizations that embrace the entire United States. The membership January 31, 1948, was 17,146. That is more than 85 percent of all of the retail implement dealers in the United States. They are located in some 3,000 out of the 3,069 counties. All of them are in rural areas where it is convenient for the farmer to secure his machinery, repair parts, and service.

The local implement dealers contributed greatly to the production of food supplies throughout the war by keeping the farmers' old equipment in operating condition. They did this through making repair parts when they were not available through the factory. They operated in their jobs over long hours and under most adverse conditions; such as shortages of manpower and factory-built parts. And it would not have been possible for the farmers of America to have continued to produce increased supplies of foods, fats, and fiber each year since 1940 if it had not been for the service rendered by the local implement dealers.

There has been throughout the war and continues even until today an acute shortage of power farm equipment. Tractors, combines, balers, and other principal labor-saving farm machines are needed on the farms to replace the manpower that has been lost and to make possible continued high production of food supplies. During the war the farmers were compelled to operate their equipment over much longer periods than usual. Many of their machines need replacement and many additional farmers are aware of the crop-producing quality of power equipment and they wish to complete their mechanization program. The shortages of raw materials and labor disputes in the factories during 1947 seriously affected the output, and there is not a single dealer or company that does not have long lists of farmers who are in need of modern power farm equipment.

Unquestionably there were many acres that were not cropped in 1947 following the floods in the central part of the country and Midwest due to the lack of machinery needed to prepare the soil, plant, cultivate, and harvest the crops. Agricultural leaders in many other areas have reported that an adequate supply of machinery would enable them to put a much greater acreage into production this year. That is particularly true of the feed crops; such as grains, wheat, corn, and oats.

According to the Department of Commerce statistics, 1946 exports of farm machinery to the 16 European-recovery-program nations was less than $30,000,000. A commodity report on the European-recovery program recently issued by the Department of Commerce shows that these same 16 nations are asking for more than $300,000,000 of farm machinery from the United States for this next year. The report further states that it appears that $160,000,000 of farm machinery can be supplied to them without serious impact on American agriculture. Note that this figure of $160,000,000 which the Department of Commerce indicates can be supplied is more than five times the export rate of machinery in 1946.

Let me now read the article taken from Farm Equipment Retailing, a magazine published by the executive secretary of the National Retail Farm Equipment Association, Paul M. Mulliken, St. Louis, Mo. I quote:

ANALYZING FARM-EQUIPMENT EXPORTS

There is a general impression in this country (except among farmers and implement men) that there has been little or no farm equipment exported to the 16 countries to be considered under the provisions of the Marshall plan, and yet, the export figures compiled by the United States Department of Commerce show tremendous increases in the amount of equipment sent to these countries in 1946 and the first 5 months of 1947; no doubt due to large shipments under UNRRA.

To illustrate, by far the greatest export increases went to Russia and Russian-dominated countries—Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia—although other countries, France included, received substantial increases.

When Poland was free—and spending her own dollars—back in 1938—she imported only $32,000 worth of farm machinery and implements from this country. But in 1946 United States manufacturers, under UNRRA, were obliged to ship $2,291,000 of farm equipment, a percentage increase of 7,060 percent over 1938. And for the first 5 months of 1947, until controls were removed from exports, Poland received $3,000,000 in farm equipment from the United States or a percentage increase over-all of 1938 of 9,275 percent.

Czechoslovakia managed to get along on $110,000 worth of United States farm machinery production in 1938 but required $1,329,000 worth in 1946, a percentage increase over 1938 of 1,108.2 percent and in the first 5 months of last year received $1,133,000 worth, a percentage increase over 1938 totals of 930 percent.

Yugoslavia did with a mere $24,000 worth of United States farm equipment in 1938 but received $2,183,000 worth in 1946, 9,000 percent more than 1938. In the first 5 months of last year Yugoslavia had received farm equipment from the United States valued at $991,000, an increase of 4,029.2 percent over 1938.

Russia, whose tractor plants were reported destroyed during the war, needed $147,000 worth of equipment in 1938 but received $1,618,000 worth in 1946, a percentage increase over 1938 of 1,000.1 percent In the first 5 months of 1947 Russia received $2,324.000 worth of equipment or an increase of 1,487.7 percent over 1938.

The United Kingdom during 1938 purchased $3,496,000 worth of farm equipment from the United States and in 1946 this was increased to only $3,972,000 or 8.5 percent more equipment. For the first 5 months of 1947, slightly more, $3,967,000 worth, was purchased which amounted to 13.5 percent more than 1938. Unlike western European countries, Great Britain seems to have been able to manufacture much of its own equipment.

France received $1,386,000 worth of farm equipment in 1938, $11,754,000 worth in 1946 for an increase of 748.05 percent. In the first 5 months of 1947 France received equipment valued at $8,522,000 or a percentage increase over 1932 of 514.8 percent. France is one of the 16 nations under the Marshall plan set to receive a large amount of aid.

North American countries during the first 5 months of last year received a 124.8-percent increase in United States farm equipment over the amount they received in 1938; South American countries received approximately the same amount as in 1938; African countries received an increase of 27.3 percent, European countries 155.1 percent more, Asia and Oceania countries an increase of 7 percent.

Figures are not available from the Bureau of Census on exports made after May 1947, when controls were lifted, but these were probably much less after the expiration of the UNRRA program.

For comparative purposes the year 1938 was chosen (1) because it was the last year when world-wide peace reigned, and (2) farm-equipment exports from this country were greater in 1938 than they had been in a score of years.

Since almost 100 percent of all farm equipment exported since 1945 to the above-mentioned countries should be presumed to be in operative condition, it is obvious that farm equipment export needs called for by the Marshall plan should take into consideration the existence in these countries of this huge amount of equipment.

There is a question in the minds of many farm-equipment men as to how and on what basis the needs of ERP were determined. For instance, there is considerable variance in United States export statistics relating to farm equipment—even in the same Government bureaus and departments.

The Bureau of Census, United States Department of Commerce, reports farm-equipment exports of $69,578,000 in 1944, while the United States Statistical Abstract, published by the same United States Department of Commerce, reports (p. 901, 1946 edition) that exports of tractors and agricultural implements in 1944 amounted to $166,608,000, a difference of $97,030,000. It may be assumed that the larger figure includes shipments under UNRRA and possibly crawler-type tractors.

In another example the United States Bureau of Census reports exports of tractors and agricultural implements in 1946 of $85,142,000. However, the Bureau of Foreign Commerce and Navigation, in the same United States Department of Commerce, reports that exports for the calendar year 1946 amounted to $157,559,000, another difference of $72,417,000. In this case also the larger figures include shipments to Canada as well as shipments under UNRRA.

Some of these differences may be explainable by the fact that the Bureau of Census figures are not based on shippers' export declarations at point of export but rather upon reports received from manufacturing companies. "Therefore," states the Bureau of Census, "the statistics are limited in their reliability by the extent to which the manufacturer knows that the farm equipment shipped from his plant will be actually exported."

On the other hand, the export figures of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce and Navigation are based on actual shipping declarations (f. a. s.) and include UNRRA shipments for the periods mentioned.

A more specific analysis of these statistics will certainly be helpful in the consideration of the Marshall plan. The western European small-acreage farmer who never needed, wanted, nor expected complete mechanization of his few acres should not be provided United States equipment now at the expense of American farmers whose 1948 average goals set by the United States Department of Agriculture are substantially higher than 1947.

Last September, in traveling over many farming areas in nine countries of western Europe, I noted particularly the need for small hand tool farm equipment and horse-drawn implements.

I quote from a statement made by Paul M. Mulliken, executive secretary of the National Retail Farm Equipment Association, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

No group is more aware of the value of farm mechanization to the agriculture of a nation

than the farm equipment dealer members of our organization who do business exclusively with farmers. We also recognize fully the need for farm machinery in western Europe. However, we believe that farming conditions in western Europe vary greatly from those prevailing in the United States due largely to the size of the individual farms.

For example, in France the average farm consists of only 24 acres, while in Texas, which has relatively the same total area, the average size of farm is 329 acres. In the Netherlands 90 percent of all farms are under 50 acres in size and 50 percent of them are less than 10 acres.

Sweden has a total of 420,000 farms but 120,000 of them consist of less than 5 acres; 270,000 have between 5 and 50 acres. Thus, 93 percent of the total of the farms in Sweden are smaller than 50 acres in size.

In the whole of the United Kingdom the average amount of all cropland per farm is less than 35 acres.

Only one-fifth of the area of Greece is under cultivation. The 6,000,000 acres of farm land are split up into nearly 1,000,000 farms with less than 7 acres on the average. Only 13 percent of all farms consisted of more than 12½ acres.

In Italy only one-tenth of the land is arable. The average size of Italian farms is less than 16 acres. In 1939 there were 8,756,858 persons engaged in agriculture. It is rather obvious that with less than 2 acres of farm land per person engaged in farming there is not much need for power farm equipment.

It should be most readily apparent that modern power farm equipment such as is currently being built by our factories would be neither practical nor feasible on farms comprising 5, 24, or even 35 acres where the individual fields would be still smaller. The knowledge of farmers' needs possessed by the farm equipment retailers of the United States convinces us that exporting huge quantities of tractors, combines, pick-up balers, and other power farm equipment to Europe is unsound. Even if ample supplies of fuel were available, there would be a shortage of trained operators, skilled mechanics, and adequate service facilities.

As executive secretary of the National Retail Farm Equipment Association, I am here to offer the assistance of our membership to the agency that the Congress may designate to administer the European recovery program. We believe that there is a way whereby the greater part of the farm machinery needs of European farmers can be met without materially diminishing the supply of new power equipment for our own American farmers. We know that there are sizable quantities of good usable—but not needed—items of horse-drawn machines to be found on the farms of the Nation. Much of this equipment is reasonably new. It was retained by the farmer as stand-by equipment when he mechanized his farming operations.

In order that we might be certain of our facts, we made a small-scale survey in December. Letters were written to some 250 representative dealers in 45 States. Replies were received from 213 dealers coming from 44 States. We asked dealers to advise us (1) if there was any usable machinery on the farms in their trade territories; (2) if farmers would dispose of it at a fair price; and (3) if the dealers would be willing to cooperate in collecting it, reconditioning it, and make it available for export. From the replies received, we are convinced that there are ample quantities of most horse-drawn machines, although the supply is not uniformly distributed over the country. Many dealers report that they have discussed this proposal with their farmer customers and invariably the farmers are most enthusiastic.

We propose to use the manpower and facilities of our 17,000 dealer members throughout the Nation to comb the farms for usable horse-drawn equipment, bring it in to the dealers' repair shops, thoroughly recondition it and make it available for shipment abroad. This is as far as we could proceed since retailers do not have the knowledge or facilities needed to engage in export work.

It is much easier to ship tractors, combines, pick-up balers, and other power equipment in bulk than to provide the horse-drawn and hand-tool equipment that these people in western Europe are in the habit of using. It is high time we developed some common sense in preparing our export program to foreign countries.

In closing, it seems to me it is about time that we reexamine and carefully analyze what has been going on in the exporting of farm machinery, and that we carefully consider what is being contemplated under the Marshall plan by way of shipping farm power equipment. What we need to ship to those countries is farm hand tools and horse-drawn equipment.

In traveling over nine countries in western Europe we could count the tractors we saw almost on the fingers of our right hand, but we saw hundreds of horses and bulls at work in the fields of those nine countries. If we are going to help those countries, the thing we should do is analyze carefully what they need and send them the equipment for the bulls to pull, and we will get a lot further than we will sending them power farm equipment that no one knows anything about, and which will be standing in the corner for lack of repairs and proper service equipment and men trained to handle it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman visited 11 countries in Europe last fall and made a very careful study of the needs of agriculture. The gentleman will recollect that when he visited Italy he found that they had a tremendous surplus of labor. If we send a great deal of mechanized farm equipment to Italy, we will aggravate that surplus labor situation.

Mr. HILL. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Probably we can get 200,000 or 300,000 of those Italians to come over to the United States to help in the sugar-beet fields and elsewhere, to do some of the stoop labor over here. We also ran into people over there who wanted to come to the United States from areas in Germany. The gentleman will remember that. I will not comment on that, but we certainly need certain types of farm labor in this country that we cannot produce from our own citizens.

I feel that the gentleman has made an excellent contribution to the study of the need for farm machinery on the part of American farmers and also of what we should ship abroad. The gentleman knows that we would probably have to send trained experts over there, for a good many people in those countries could not use mechanized farm equipment if we sent it to them. The farms are not big enough. What they need over there is moisture to make the crops grow and then tools they can handle, to do the customary thing in the way they have done for a good many years.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I say that all over Europe we could not help but notice the shortage of hand tools. They positively do not have them. Further, no one can fail to see all over Europe the thousands and thousands of tons of steel, twisted and lying in the buildings, with no one attempting to do anything about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman also knows that people that talked to us about getting hand tools and parts for farm machinery said they had been getting them in Germany, but now the factories in Germany where they made the parts for farm machinery are being torn down. The gentleman knows that probably the parts situation is more critical than furnishing them with mechanized equipment.

Mr. HILL. That is especially true of tractors. We found tractor after tractor that had been sold in France from Germany standing in the fields with no repairs, and with no repairs possible because there were no plants to make the parts for the tractors.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I commend the gentleman on his remarks on a very vital subject. I happen to be in the ranching business myself. During these days of shortage of labor we have need more and more for tractors and other machinery. My personal experience has been that 18 months ago we ordered an additional tractor for our ranch, and it finally was delivered just a few days ago. This delay caused the loss of a great deal of the crop. I am interested to know where these tractors have been going. I think it has been brought out here very clearly that the need abroad is for small tools, as the gentleman from Colorado has just stated. In this country we certainly need the big mechanized equipment to overcome the lack of labor on our farms and ranches today.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. PEDEN. May I compliment the gentleman on calling the attention of the House to a subject which is very vital. I represent a strictly agricultural district. Only today I had three letters upon this subject, pleading for Congress to do something to provide equipment with which to farm. This is a critical problem. I think this Congress owes a duty to the American farmer, who has done so much to provide the food that is needed to be shipped abroad, to try to give him some relief.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIEHLMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain tables and editorials.)

THE FUEL OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for imposing on the House further today. I deeply appreciate the generous acceptance of the suggestion I made and the support that was given to it. I cannot tell my friends from Massachusetts who are here today how much I know their fine cooperation means to the people of my district, as well as of New England generally. I want to read first a portion of an editorial from the Boston Post of Monday, which really reflects, I think, the growing uneasiness and unhappiness of the people in Massachusetts as to the way this thing is developing. It is headed "We want oil":

WE WANT OIL

The prospect of bleak, heatless days in weeks to come because of a shortage of oil is scarcely made more encouraging by the sudden self-righteousness of those who are supposed to be planning means of providing New England with the oil that it needs.

As in the case of all shortages caused by bungling and inefficient planning, it is the public which must serve as whipping-boy. Those who are supposed to plan ways and means of getting oil and distributing it fairly now raise the cry that the consumers are not cooperating, that they are not shoveling paths to the oil-intake pipes, and that deliveries are delayed, and the work of the oil men is made more difficult.

The assertion can be disposed of in a very few words. The failure to plow out side streets in the way that they should be plowed out is the chief factor in delivery delays. The real reason for the shortage is that not enough oil is being shipped to New England, and what is being shipped is sold at scandalously high prices completely out of line with what people in Europe are paying for American oil.

The export of fuel oil from the United States is averaging 12,000,000 barrels a month, and during the first 9 months of 1947, when the oil industry first began to issue warnings of a fuel oil shortage in the Northeastern States, almost $1,000,000 worth of oil was shipped to our dear friends, the Soviet Union.

That is pretty bitter language, but I think it can be demonstrated that it is an accurate opinion.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. Will the gentleman repeat the figures on the shipment of oil to the Soviet Union?

Mr. HESELTON. The Post gives the figure as $3,000,000. I am confused; you are confused, and I think everybody else is confused because reference is made one day to tons, the next day to barrels, and the next day to dollars. I wish they would use one single standard that we all could understand. I am going to keep on trying to make them do that.

The editorial reads further as follows:

Moreover, tankers used in hauling this oil abroad, to be sold at prices cheaper than those we now pay for oil, are vitally needed to bring oil to the Northeast.

These are not newly discovered facts. Indeed, the same facts were called to the attention of the executive branch of our Federal Government, and Secretary of Commerce Averill Harriman testified before a congressional committee last November that he could regulate the export or stop the export of oil to foreign countries.

Secretary Harriman was asked if he could divert this export oil to the area of this country now suffering from a fuel-oil shortage, and his assistant, a Mr. Blaisdell, testified that he could accomplish this diversion in 15 minutes.

But it is simpler for those who are dealing with the oil shortage on an executive level to lambaste the poor public and blame it for the oil shortage.

That is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and you will find it there in the issue of December 19, when the gentleman from Michigan took the floor. I referred, at page 11747, to the record of the hearings before a congressional committee and the examination of Mr. Harriman by the chairman of the committee on November 26. Secretary Harriman was asked if he could divert these exports of oil to areas now suffering from a fuel-oil shortage. His assistant, Mr. Blaisdell testified on December 19 that he could accomplish this diversion in 15 minutes. That is the testimony of Mr. Blaisdell before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

We have heard many remarks by some of our friends from the Midwest about an alleged inconsistency on the part of some of us in the Northeast in being willing to support a decent European-aid program, because we say it is advisable first, for humanitarian reasons; second, because of our own self-interest; and third, because we want this country to remain strong in this world. But let us see what the Post says:

If the growing opposition to the European-recovery plan surprises the administration or the proponents of the plan, they have merely to contemplate the natural resentment that people of the Northeast feel when they see their taxes going to finance huge oil shipments to Europe at a cost far lower than they can buy it themselves.

The New England States are not asking for charity. They seek the means of keeping themselves from freezing in one of the worst winters on record.

In a time when distribution systems are as far advanced as they are today it is shameful that New Englanders must follow the progress of a single tanker loaded with fuel oil toward port as if it were a treasure ship bearing a long-awaited fortune.

So much for that. That is accurate.

Governor Bradford wired yesterday as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *February 3, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

If we had 514,000 barrels of kerosene and 610,000 barrels of No. 2 to the end of March in addition to what suppliers say they expect we would have sufficient to take care of all means. For first 10 days of February we have 76 percent of kerosene demand and 80 percent of No. 2.

ROBERT F. BRADFORD.

That is of great interest to my friend, the minority whip, because his continued cooperation and sound counsel have meant so much to the rest of us in struggling for a solution of this problem.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, sent some wires last night to some big oil companies trying to get some kerosene. I received a reply from one company that we took a gamble on and I suppose Senator SALTONSTALL has too, and Governor Bradford, who by the way I wish had kept the fuel coordinator in existence instead of letting him go in the latter part of last year. You know the story on that. You know what happened in Massachusetts on the State level. We just stand it so long. In any event, I got a telegram back and we got 450,000 gallons of grade No. 2, and we are still fighting for more. There is a situation up there that must be corrected. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will keep it on a nonpartisan level, because there is no politics involved in this and there should not be.

Mr. HESELTON. There are not. I said to the House the other day that a Democrat gets just as cold as a Republican up our way. As far as I am concerned, the Democrats in my district are of just as much importance to me as I know the Republicans in your district are to you. You are going to fight for the Republicans in your district and I am going to fight for the Democrats in my district. If we make any mistakes, we are big enough to admit it. If they make some mistakes downtown, I am going to challenge them and ask them to explain, because we ought to learn from past mistakes.

Today, when the House acted as it did, I think the House is to be congratulated, and so are you, and so is the respected former Speaker of this House who lent his great influence to that effort.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are all working together, the whole New England delegation.

Mr. HESELTON. Right.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a lot involved in this. There is congressional action in disposing of the tankers——

Mr. HESELTON. Now, I do not yield any further on that point. Let me say to you that you should read the minutes of the Maritime Commission if you want to be enlightened on the responsibility of Congress for the disposition of the tankers. That decision was taken downtown on December 17, if I recall correctly. I will change that date if I am in error. But it was taken right in the midst of the hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, while they knew we needed these tankers. I do not care who they are. I do not know and I am not interested in their political views. I am simply saying that you and I need the tankers to take fuel up to our constituents in the Northeast, and I know you will help me to try to get them.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I hope you will help me.

Mr. HESELTON. I will do anything I can.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us work together.

Mr. HESELTON. Right. I want the Members of the House to hear the testimony of Commissioner McKeough and the table as to the sale at this time. The printed report is not yet available, I understand, but the effort to hold these tankers in east coast service for at least 2 months is of great importance.

Mr. HESELTON. Have you any time you would like to adjourn?

I would like to get a little clearer your testimony in answer to the chairman's questions this morning.

As I understand it, there was a Cabinet request or suggestion or directive somewhere along the middle of June for the consideration and sale of 100 oceangoing tankers to foreign purchasers; am I right about that?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. There was then formed a committee which went into consultation, presumably with representatives of these governments that you have listed, who now have title to the 83 tankers.

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. As a result of that, some allocations were made.

Were any contracts made with those people at that time?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Well, Mr. Congressman, the contracts were probably a matter of the results of it, because it was, first, the action to sell and, second, the contract negotiations with reference to the number and other features, and then actually the contracts.

Now, the dates of the signing of the contracts is a matter that the chairman asked for, and which we have agreed to find from our records and furnish.

Mr. HESELTON. I want to get your procedure clear. Let us take it actually as to these without specifying anyone.

The Commission, after having gone over the request which was allocated or assigned or indicated in some manner, formally, to these foreign representatives—that they were to have title to these tankers after all negotiations were concluded?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. Was that by formal vote of the Commission, or was it by a memorandum issued to them, or was it by the signing of a contract, or what is your procedure at that stage?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. The procedure at that stage, Mr. Congressman, is that the Commission by its action normally gives formal consummation of the arrangement.

Mr. HESELTON. By a formal vote?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. A written vote?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Not written except as it is recorded in a written manner in the minutes.

Mr. HESELTON. In the minutes of the Commission as of a certain date?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. So that as to these 83 tankers, am I to understand there is a record, an official record from the minutes, showing on what date the Commission approved the sale of these tankers?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Well, I do not know. I do not know whether the minutes so record that in detail. I think the minutes are quite illuminating as to the actions taken with a view to making the requirement for the staff to make.

Mr. HESELTON. Let us go a little step further.

There is some other step to be taken before delivery is consummated?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. What other step has to be taken by the Commission in order to get the actual title and physical possession of these tankers into the hands of the purchasers?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. You mean from the time the Commission makes its approval of the proposed sale?

Mr. HESELTON. I am assuming that the minutes you speak of is the official thing that is done by the Commission indicating its approval, and then assume that there has to be some other step taken by the Commission in order actually to vest title and physical possession in the purchaser; am I right about that?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I would not say that you were, but I think I would have to yield to Mr. Pimper, who is in the sales section, to give you the technical mechanism of the move.

Mr. PIMPER. I assume that your question is, after the Commission has formally approved the sale of these tankers to anyone, they then empower the staff to do the necessary details for the transfer of the title to the vessel.

It would be the formation of a contract, and the signing of the contract, and the preparation of the bill of sale and mortgages, if necessary, and inventories taken, and so on.

Mr. HESELTON. May I interrupt?

There is a bill of sale prepared?

Mr. PIMPER. That is right.

Mr. HESELTON. And executed in behalf of the Commission by the staff?

Mr. PIMPER. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. Were those bills of sale, or any of them, executed last Friday?

Mr. PIMPER. Some of them may have been.

Mr. HESELTON. Have you any recollection of how many of them were?

Mr. PIMPER. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. HESELTON. Would it be more than 10?

Mr. PIMPER. I would doubt if there were 10 executed on that day.

Mr. HESELTON. When was the Attorney General's opinion filed with the Commission?

The CHAIRMAN. I think it was addressed to the President and referred to the Commission.

Mr. HESELTON. When did it come to the Commission's knowledge?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I believe Wednesday or Thursday, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. HESELTON. That is last week?

Mr. PIMPER. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. When you speak of this action taken by the Commission which completely disposed of the balance of the 83 tankers, you are speaking of some staff detail work that was completed on Friday; is that right?

Mr. PIMPER. Some of them were completed on Friday; yes, sir.

Mr. HESELTON. You have available and can furnish to this committee the exact information as to what was done last week, so far as the Commission is concerned?

Mr. PIMPER. I think it can be furnished.

Mr. HESELTON. And you can also furnish for us information of the same nature from November up to last Friday; can you not?

Mr. PIMPER. Yes.

(See status table previously inserted.)

Mr. HESELTON. Now, may I address my question to you, sir?

I believe that you said the Commission became aware of this domestic crisis in November; is that right?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I think that I said the American purchasers, Mr. Congressman, began to show a marked interest in the possibility of buying these tankers, beginning in October; I do not believe I said November.

Mr. HESELTON. When was the Commission aware of the crisis so far as these shortage areas were concerned?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I don't recall the date that anyone in the way of a governor or a Member of the Congress ever wrote and told me about a very acute threatened shortage of oil in New England, until very recently; I would say the last 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. HESELTON. Do you want to leave it that the Commission was not aware of a situation developing in New England until the last 2 or 3 weeks?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I would assume so; 3 or 4 weeks, I said.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you yield for a moment?

Do I assume from the answer that you made to Mr. HESELTON's question that you had not received any communication from a Member of Congress, that the Maritime Commission or any of these other commissioners depend on Congress to bring a situation such as this to their attention; is that correct?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I said, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Do they not ever find out anything on their own?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I said 3 or 4 weeks; that may well be 5 or 6 weeks. I would not want to be held to 3 or 4. Time runs pretty fast, and it may have been 5 or 6 weeks.

Mr. HESELTON. Let us take it as 5 or 6 weeks.

For a month and a half the Commission has been increasingly aware of this situation?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I would say so.

Mr. HESELTON. Immediately upon the filing of this opinion by the Attorney General, the Commission weighed, I assume, the importance of a recommendation made last June in terms of the then existing situation, against the critical situation developing in a portion of this country; is that right?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. You mean with relation to consummating the sales to foreign nations?

Mr. HESELTON. Yes.

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I would say so.

Mr. HESELTON. You discussed it as a commissioner, as to whether you would proceed one way or the other; whether you would consummate the sales, or complete the sales and delivery of any portion of this 83 tankers, or whether you might make another decision for the benefit of people in this country who are in critical condition as far as their fuel is concerned, and so far as their industrial activities are concerned, and you came to the conclusion that you would disregard interests of the people who were affected in this country; is that right?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. No; I would not say that is right, Mr. Congressman. I don't think that tells the whole background and the whole story that resulted in the action of the Commission.

Mr. HESELTON. Will you tell me what the Commission did in the sense of what factors they weighed and how they came to this conclusion you told us about this morning?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I will be very happy to tell you, sir. I may have to burden you with some repetition, but I will be happy to tell you from my standpoint what we did.

In June of this year we were asked to allocate 100 tankers for foreign sales, and it came from the level of this Government known as the Cabinet.

I would assume, if I were respecting the position of a Cabinet level, that such a request was worthy of very serious consideration, and, if possible, an accommodation to that request.

The Commission so decided, and in the interim conditions were changed.

Mr. HESELTON. What changed it?

Commissioner McKEOUGH. I cannot answer that. I do not pose here as one who knows all that took place in the way of change.

The only thing that I am familiar with, sir, is that the American operator, up until approximately the 1st of October, and maybe a week or 10 days on either side of it, had shown no interest at all in the buying of tankers, and that Commission that I happen to be a member of, under law, is required to sell tankers.

Another very respected committee of this Congress known as the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, as I recall, back in late April and early May of this year urged this Commission to do everything it could to sell tankers and if the Americans would not buy them, sell them on the foreign market.

Mr. HESELTON. Referring to the Ship Sales Act, is there anything in that act that would prohibit the Commission taking cognizance of a critical emergency condition in this country and on its own initiative doing exactly the same sort of thing that you very commendably did do with reference to the 50 tankers, and making an effort then to charter any remaining portion of these tankers during this one season in order to take care of this critical situation; what about that?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. None; except that we would have that control if we refuse to complete the sale, of having contributed to the fleet for American use beginning November 1, in our control, to the degree that we may have failed to sell 20 or 30 of the 83 that were ultimately sold.

What that is, Mr. Congressman, I don't know at the moment. But let us assume that we stopped and made no further endeavor in the way of deliveries on contractual commitments in the fulfillment of that obligation; that we assumed that we had taken on when we had conducted these negotiations with these various representatives of the governments involved.

Let us assume that it was 20 or 25 tankers. I presume that your point is that then, knowing in November or December that that shortage was here, that we should have stopped that sale and kept them for American use.

Mr. HESELTON. That is exactly the point.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. Now, I would like to address myself to that phase: I believe that I stated when I testified earlier that if we had sold all of the 83 to the Americans, no guaranty would have come to New England or to the west coast or the Gulf or to my section of the country in Chicago that another pint of oil would have been put into those tankers under the Americans' control.

Mr. HESELTON. You could charter them; could not you have done that?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. No; we had to sell them American, that is just the point. We are compelled to sell them American. We have no choice under law.

Mr. HESELTON. You mean to say that if you had been able to devise a means of withholding the consummation of these sales foreign, until, let us say, next May or June, in terms of the situation you knew existed here in this country today, that you could not then under the law charter those that you were able to hold out from completion for service here?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. No.

Mr. HESELTON. Why not?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. Because you could not keep them; because under the law we are compelled to sell them.

Mr. HESELTON. When?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. When an American meets the requirements of the law, you shall sell, it says; that is the law.

Mr. HESELTON. How many applications have you on hand today from Americans for those ships?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. I believe we have a total of one-hundred-and-fifty-some-odd. We had 177 ships applied for.

Mr. HESELTON. For the balance of these ships or whatever they are?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. Americans did want to buy them; did they not?

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. Yes; but they did not start to want them until about the 1st of October or thereabout, and these commitments were made on our part in good faith.

Mr. HESELTON. I am not challenging your good faith; I am challenging the judgment exercised.

Commissioner MCKEOUGH. That is anybody's privilege; to question the judgment of anyone.

Mr. HESELTON. I think it is our responsibility.

Sale of 83 tankers to noncitizens as of Dec. 17, 1947

Country, applicant, and steamship	Date contract signed by Commission	Date of title transfer	Date of delivery of bill of sale [1]
UNITED KINGDOM (31)			
Anglo-Saxon Petroleum Co., Ltd.:			
Silver Creek	Sept. 2, 1947	Sept. 12, 1947	Sept. 12, 1947
Council Crest	do	Dec. 16, 1947	Dec. 16, 1947
Modoc Point	do	Oct. 21, 1947	Oct. 22, 1947
White Sands	do	Sept. 3, 1947	Sept. 3, 1947
Stones River	do	Oct. 24, 1947	Oct. 24, 1947
Bryce Canyon	do	Sept. 24, 1947	Sept. 24, 1947
Capitol Reef	do	Oct. 13, 1947	Oct. 14, 1947
Laurel Hill	do	Sept. 26, 1947	Sept. 29, 1947
Horseshoe	do	Aug. 27, 1947	Aug. 27, 1947
Fort Raleigh	do	Oct. 24, 1947	Oct. 24, 1947
Swan Island	do	Sept. 18, 1947	Sept. 19, 1947
Bandelier	do	Sept. 3, 1947	Sept. 3, 1947
Chaco Canyon	do	Oct. 21, 1947	Oct. 22, 1947
Fort Matanzas	do	Dec. 15, 1947	Dec. 15, 1947
Tuolumne Meadows	do	Sept. 23, 1947	Sept. 24, 1947
Stanhope Steamship Co.:			
Fort Chesnell	Sept. 10, 1947	Oct. 3, 1947	Oct. 3, 1947
Fort Jupiter	do	Dec. 17, 1947	Dec. 17, 1947
British Tanker Co., Ltd.:			
Beecher Island	do	Nov. 4, 1947	Nov. 4, 1947
Chisholm Trail	do	Sept. 23, 1947	Sept. 25, 1947
Fort Frederica	do	Oct. 6, 1947	Oct. 8, 1947
El Morro	do	Nov. 3, 1947	Nov. 4, 1947
Mesa Verde	do	Oct. 22, 1947	Oct. 24, 1947
Smoky Hill	do	Dec. 7, 1947	Dec. 8, 1947
The Baltic Trading Co., Ltd.: *Chatterton Hill*	Sept. 9, 1947	Oct. 22, 1947	Oct. 22, 1947
British Oil Shipping Co.: *Fort Winnebago*	Sept. 2, 1947	Sept. 3, 1947	Sept. 3, 1947
Northern Petroleum Tank Steamship Co.:			
Hovenweep	Sept. 11, 1947	Oct. 17, 1947	Oct. 21, 1947
Verendrye	do	Oct. 22, 1947	Oct. 22, 1947
Anthony Radcliffe Steamship Co. et al.:			
Rye Cove	Sept. 12, 1947	Dec. 4, 1947	Dec. 5, 1947
Cleveland Petroleum Co.: *Forbes Road*	Sept. 24, 1947	Oct. 20, 1947	Oct. 21, 1947
Esso Transportation Co.: *Halls of Montezuma*	Oct. 10, 1947	Oct. 27, 1947	Oct. 27, 1947
Moller Line Ltd.: *Orchard Knob*	Sept. 9, 1947	Nov. 7, 1947	Nov. 12, 1947
CANADIAN (4)			
Acadia Overseas Freighters: *Fort Donelson*	Nov. 5, 1947		
Deep Sea Tankers, Ltd.:			
Paloma Hills	do		
Pinnacles	do	Dec. 12, 1947	Dec. 12, 1947
Rincon Hills	do		
REPUBLIC OF TURKEY (1)			
Fort McHenry	Oct. 28, 1947		
REPUBLIC OF FRANCE (11)			
Grand Teton	Oct. 31, 1947	Dec. 12, 1947	
Coulee Dam	do	do	
Ochoco	do	do	
Donner Lake	do	do	
Table Rock	do	do	
Ranier	do		
Fort Wood	do		
Scott's Bluff	do		
The Dalles	do		
Trailblazer	do		
Montezuma Castle	do		
KINGDOM OF THE NETHERLANDS (4)			
Inglewood Hills	Nov. 3, 1947		
Wheeler Hills	do		
Coyote Hills	do		
Sante Fe Hills	do		
GOVERNMENT OF ITALY (16)			
Quebec	Dec. 11, 1947		
Broad River	do		
Crater Lake	do		
Fort Erie	do		
Autosee	do		
Schenectady	do		
Rosebud	do	Dec. 17, 1947	Dec. 17, 1947
Shiloh	do		
Ball's Bluff	do		
Manassas	do		
Corvallis	do		
Plattsburg	do		
York	do		
Pulpit Rock	do	Dec. 17, 1947	Do.
Tule Canyon	do	do	Do.
Corinth	do		
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (2)			
The Southern Steamships Proprietary Co., Ltd.: *Egg Harbor*	do		
Alpha South African Steamship Co.: *Hadley*	do	Dec. 16, 1947	Dec. 16, 1947
GREECE (7)			
Cephalonian Maritime Co., Ltd.: *Grande Ronde*	do		
Dimitrios G. Gratsos et al.: *Elk Hills*	do		
Nicolas G. Nicolaou: *W. L. R. Emmet*	do		
Stratis G. Andreadis: *Fort Niagara*	do		

[1] The difference, if any, in time between title-transfer date and bill-of-sale delivery applies to certain British tankers delivered abroad as a result of a special agreement resulting in the British purchaser assuming full liability and responsibility from the date of acceptance, and also resulting in the cessation of depreciation and maintenance cost to the Maritime Commission.

Sale of 83 tankers to noncitizens as of Dec. 17, 1947—Continued

Country, applicant, and steamship	Date contract signed by Commission	Date of title transfer	Date of delivery of bill of sale
GREECE—continued			
Nicholas Peter Goulandris et al.: *Tumacacori*	Dec. 11, 1947		
Markos P. Nomikos: *Klamath Falls*	do		
Demetrios John Chandris: *White Oak*	do		
NORWAY (6)			
Victor Jensen's Roderi A/S: *Santa Maria Hills*			
A/S D/S Hidlofjord: *Elwood Hills*			
O. Braa-Johannosen & Thv. Klaveness (A/S Braastank): *Belridge Hills*			
NORWAY—continued			
Carl Olsens Tankrederi A/S: *Fallen Timbers*			
Hvalfangstselskapet Blaahval A/S: *Lundys Lane*			
Westfal-Larsen & Co. A/S: *Mechanicsville*			
PERU (1)			
Corporacion Peruana de Vapores: *La Brea Hills*			

You will note the delivery dates of the bills of sale for the *Council Crest, Fort Matanzas, Fort Jupiter, Rosebud, Pulpit Rock, Tule Canyon,* and *Hadley.*

You will note the fact that no indication of such deliveries as to 1947. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is making further inquiries as to how far its recommendations have been followed.

Mr. McCORMACK. But keep politics out of it, because you know that on the State level the fuel coordinator was let go the early part of last year, when a fuel coordinator in our State was vitally important. There was an emergency fuel coordinator put in right when the winter was on top of us.

Mr. HESELTON. My friend knows he is not responsible for what is done in the State, and I am not either.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, as long as you stick on a nonpartisan level.

Mr. HESELTON. That is true, and that is where I want to stick, because you are a valuable asset. So are the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. LANE, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mr. KENNEDY] and the gentlemen from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND and Mr. FOGARTY]. They have been helping to bring this about and each is entitled to thanks and praise for the united efforts. I thank you for your assistance which means a great deal to us all and for your contribution.

Now, let me carry on a little further. The Governor said:

> If we had 514,000 barrels of kerosene and 610,000 barrels of No. 2 to the end of March in addition to what suppliers say they expect, we would have sufficient to take care of all means. For the first 10 days of February we have 76 percent of kerosene demand and 80 percent of No. 2.

This afternoon I received from the Department of Commerce their proposed revised figures for the first quarter. We took the first step today. We are going to take more steps, in my opinion, if I understand the temper of this House and the earnestness and sincerity of my friends on both sides.

That table will be in the RECORD tomorrow morning. It will show you where the reductions are as I have computed them. That is not enough. I have a bill before our committee insisting that they revise that down to at least 50 percent. Canada went down 50 percent. Surely, Canada is just as cold as a good many other parts of this world where we are shipping kerosene. They cut out 5,000 tons from Denmark, 5,000 to our friends in Ireland. They reduced 110,000 by 25,000 to China; they reduced Australia from 70,000, down to 20,000. United Kingdom, 130,000, down to 50,000. In other words, we found that through the united efforts of the New England delegation and the persistent efforts of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the constant pressure we have been putting on them, we got 300,000 barrels of kerosene—and they only need 514,000 to get them out of the mess. So that is another step in the right direction. Look at the headings "Gas oil" and "Residual oil" and I think you will be encouraged and our people at home will be encouraged. But we are not through. It is not enough yet.

Let me call attention to one other thing. I am not satisfied with what we did here this afternoon. I am not satisfied that any of you are satisfied. I do not think they should have gone ahead and converted that marine hospital in Boston in the face of all this; I do not think it was good judgment, and I think we acted very properly in supporting the amendment. I am going over with this problem to the other body and I hope we can join in trying to prevail upon them to appropriate enough funds so that we can get the Federal Government out of the oil-heating business. The Federal Government should be leading, not following. I think we can all agree on that. They should not be heating with oil down here. Here is the Navy Annex. A witness before my committee recently testified it is so hot there that he has to open the windows.

For the record I quote the following from a history of the Petroleum Administration for War, page 109:

> During the first upsurge of overland shipments in the fall of 1941, PAW suggested and obtained antitrust protection for a pool of the east-coast companies which would voluntarily distribute the burden of the excess transportation costs among all the companies in proportion to their normal sales volume. The oil companies formed this pool with only a promise from PAW to plead their case before the OPA, and for many months it was a deficit pool only. OPA finally made its first meager price increase on January 21, 1942. At that date the pool showed a deficit of many million dollars, and reached a peak of $38,446,800 by June 1942.

My argument is going to be this. It will cost us, according to estimates we have here, to convert to coal—as the Navy has done so splendidly—in all of these 80 or 90 Government-owned or leased buildings, $441,000. I say that is a capital investment. I think it is a justifiable expense but the cost can be allocated over the entire period of these 5 years since they tell us there will be at least 5 years of shortages. It is also a matter of national security. That is over $38,000,000 absorbed by the oil industry because the Federal Government would not pay. Now, today, we all know who is paying for this. It is the consumer, and that is one of the reasons why these companies come down here and testify before us that they have to increase their price by another 50 cents a barrel to take care of their exceedingly uneconomic transportation costs from Texas clear up into New England. I think we are going to find a lot of things that need to be checked and I have high hope that with the continued splendid cooperation, and it has been a nonpartisan cooperation of the New England delegation, and with the sympathetic understanding of our friends from the other parts of this Nation, we are going to help our people get out of this crisis this winter; but I do not want to have to go through this next winter if I am back, as you will be, or the following winter or the winter following that. Let us do this job once and for all while we are at it. I hope the gentlemen will try to arrange to go with me. Let us all go together.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. I want wholeheartedly to commend the gentleman for his energetic efforts in this matter, but that brings up another question, that is, whether it is advisable for private individuals to convert from oil to coal. I wonder if the gentleman can give me any assurances that when this step is taken we will not suffer from coal shortages.

Mr. HESELTON. That is a good question, and I think a just one. The only thing that I would recommend in the case of an individual wanting to convert to coal is for him to get in touch with his dealer and see if he can guarantee uninterrupted coal deliveries. If he can, I would say convert.

You heard the story of the emergency situation in Northampton from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]. All I can do is to ask those of

you interested to join me in presenting this matter to the other body.

At this point I wish to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], former Speaker of the House, for helping us out. We deeply appreciate his understanding, that of his colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], and of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS]. We appreciate the help all of you gave us in this first step. We are sure you will continue to listen sympathetically to any suggestion which you feel is constructive. When you suffer from disasters, such as tornadoes, floods, or explosion, I think you have found a quick and unquestioning response from the Northeast when you called for assistance. Our neighbors, our constituents in the Northeast, need your help now. And we are confident of your response. It is a weighing of the resources we have to judge. Our own committee has recommended unanimously making a prompt study of this whole long-range problem by a joint committee, and I have yet to see a single editorial against it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, that is my plea. You may be sure we will do the best we can. I have been told that the bituminous stocks in New England are adequate. It is true, of course, that they may not be able to get the kind of coal they want. You might have to burn something different than you would like to burn.

Mr. PHILBIN. But the supply may not be adequate if we convert too many of these oil-burning units. There is another question I would like to ask at this point. Could the gentleman give the House any enlightenment as to the status of the oil and petroleum embargo bill that he introduced and which I understand is now pending in committee? May we expect that to be considered by the House very shortly?

Mr. HESELTON. Hearings are scheduled to begin tomorrow. I believe witnesses are listed for tomorrow and Friday. I may say very frankly to the gentleman that there is a growing sentiment among a lot of our colleagues to advocate full embargoes on petroleum and petroleum shipments. I do not altogether share this point of view because I think it might be very dangerous. I am not an expert in this thing. I think though we might upset our present intricate trade arrangements in other fields. However, I would like to see an embargo imposed at once until we can find out what the situation is, an embargo of 15, 20, 25, or 30 days. My bill does not provide for that. I have two alternatives. My second bill advocates that we cut down 50 percent to key into the Canadian export program and the exports of countries that have been dependent upon us. But to any country that cannot show that we have exported to them from 1934 to 1938 we are justified in saying "We are sorry, but we cannot send more over to you just now."

Mr. PHILBIN. Could the gentleman give us any idea when we may expect this legislation to reach the floor of the House for action?

Mr. HESELTON. I cannot. As far as I am concerned, I shall urge quick action. I hope we can get to it next week, but I do not know. I think that is a question that should be addressed to the chairman and ranking members of the committee.

Mr. PHILBIN. May I make a further inquiry of the gentleman? Do I understand that the gentleman's position is he advocates an immediate and total embargo pending a determination of these questions as to whether or not we can provide enough oil for our own people?

Mr. HESELTON. That is the unanimous recommendation of the committee, as you will find in the RECORD. It is a drastic thing, but we are trying to meet a drastic condition.

Mr. PHILBIN. I am glad to have that information.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I would be a little remiss if I did not compliment the Member from Massachusetts for the very excellent work he has been doing in respect to the petroleum situation. May I further say that in all my years of experience here I have never seen both sides of the aisle so completely represented in joint action as in reference to this very important matter that is affecting the welfare of the people of our part of the country. I know the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] have been working hand in hand, and the entire New England delegation has been working as a unit in respect to this matter. There has been no partisanship involved. We are trying to do what we can for the common good of our part of the country irrespective of party lines, because this is not a party issue. This is a matter that is of importance to all the people we represent here in Congress. All these men are doing an excellent work.

Mr. HESELTON. I agree with the gentleman and I think we owe a debt of gratitude to all of the gentlemen who have taken the lead in this matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is the thing I want to see maintained. I sat here very comfortably until the gentleman mentioned my name, and I wondered why the gentleman picked on me especially. Naturally under those circumstances, I respond as gently as I can.

Mr. HESELTON. The reason I picked on the gentleman is because I am very fond of him, and always like to have him help me in my struggles. He will recall that in my first year here, he tried to help me in a motion I thought would be fairer to the farmers of New England. That is characteristic of him.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is mutual, I assure the gentleman. I want to amplify what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] stated and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] stated. During the war we had our trying problems and we always worked together.

Mr. HESELTON. The gentleman would not want me to give a secret away, would he, how he worked so effectively with some one during the war?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is over with now. But, my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], of the Committee on Naval Affairs, cooperated with me when we got some tankers up to Boston in the middle of the winter one time when it was 20 degrees below zero; at a time when the German U-boats were sinking our tankers and our ships, but particularly our tankers, and the Navy cooperated very effectively. There has always been cooperation. The New England delegation has always cooperated on this and on any other situation that called for attention in our section of the country.

Mr. HESELTON. And if I have a situation in my part of the State and you have a situation in your part of the State, we always cooperate.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I would cooperate in every way possible and, again, we want to keep that close cooperation intact.

Mr. HESELTON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Let me ask the gentleman one further question. Has the gentleman any views as to whether or not the situation existing is such, at least so far as those tankers that were owned by the Government are concerned, and disposed of, that there should be power in an emergency some place, in some Federal agency, to direct the American companies to use those tankers to meet the emergency, whether in New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, or any other section of the country?

Mr. HESELTON. I have a definite personal opinion. The gentleman may not know it, but the chairman of my committee filed a bill to extend the power of the Maritime Commission to do just that. I think it is an excellent idea. I think we have to meet this situation. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has demanded that the Maritime Commission do just exactly that, and they have undertaken to do it, and to some extent they have been successful. We propose to carry that fight right straight along.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I might also say that the observation of the gentleman about next winter and the winter after, looking ahead, is a very sound one, because while we have to meet the immediate situation as best we can, we have

to realize that this is probably a condition that will continue from 3 to 5 years, and we should do our planning now.

Mr. HESELTON. Right.

Mr. McCORMACK. And judging by our experience now, it will be very beneficial in minimizing the impact next winter and the next three or four winters to come.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution, and also my colleagues from all New England.

Revised first quarter, 1948, country quotas of petroleum products

[In barrels]

	Aviation gas (5016.00)	Motor gas (5017.00)	Kerosene (5027.00)	Gas oil and distillate fuel oil (5030.00)	Residual fuel oil (5031.00)
Argentina		220,000			
Australia	20,000	300,000	50,000	100,000	25,000
Belgium		175,000	8,000	175,000	70,000
Brazil		80,000			
British Honduras	2,000	5,000	2,000	3,000	
China	60,000	350,000	85,000	100,000	
Costa Rica	2,400	30,000	3,500	10,000	20,000
Cuba	25,000	200,000			200,000
Denmark		70,000		120,000	60,000
El Salvador		25,000	1,500	3,500	40,000
Eire	15,000				
France	120,000			300,000	
Guatemala	5,000	8,000	2,000		55,000
Italy	30,000				
Mexico	80,000	350,000		75,000	250,000
New Zealand	10,000	140,000	20,000	35,000	
Norway		10,000	7,000		
Panama Republic	100	40,000	7,000		25,000
Paraguay	1,500				
Philippines	20,000	280,000	60,000	135,000	
Portugal	20,000	50,000	30,000	10,000	19,000
Sweden		225,000	50,000	250,000	60,000
United Kingdom	120,000	1,400,000	80,000	1,000,000	
Netherlands				60,000	
Iceland	35,000	30,000			
British West Africa	5,000	70,000	25,000	20,000	10,000
Switzerland		30,000	10,000	50,000	
French West Africa	10,000	60,000	10,000		15,000
Subtotal	581,000	4,148,000	451,000	2,446,500	849,000
Reserve	119,000	402,000	149,000	353,500	151,000
Total	700,000	4,550,000	600,000	2,800,000	1,000,000
Total cut		700,000	300,000	400,000	800,000

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the continuing critical housing shortage throughout the United States is the basic reason for continuing rent control. Among the many factors which have contributed to the housing shortage are three: First, the lack of normal residential construction during the war years; second, the increase in the number of marriages and new families; and, third, the great shifts in population from rural areas to urban centers. The Bureau of the Census reports that for all nonfarm dwelling units in the United States the vacancy rate in 1947 for habitable dwelling units offered for rent was only one-half of 1 percent. A further indication of the shortage may be found in the number of families who are living doubled up with other families. According to the Bureau of the Census, about 2,764,000 married couples, or 8.3 percent of all married couples in private households, were living doubled up in April 1947. This represents an increase of about 50 percent over the corresponding number of 1,864,000 who were living doubled up in 1940.

The House Banking Committee opened hearings on rent control yesterday and heard the Housing Expediter, Mr. Woods, and today we heard representatives of the veterans' groups.

There are many bills before our committee, but I should like to comment briefly on H. R. 4728, which contain essentially the Housing Expediter's recommendations.

H. R. 4728 amends the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 and would be known as the Housing and Rent Extension Act of 1948. Essentially, it would continue the programs of rent control, limitations on construction for amusement or recreational purposes, and veterans' preference until March 1, 1950, and would continue the Office of the Housing Expediter to that date for the purpose of administering them. In addition, it clarifies the purposes of the Housing and Rent Act by adding a declaration of purposes, sets the rent agreed upon under the present 15-percent lease provision as the maximum rent for the effective period of the lease but deletes the provisions removing housing accommodations so leased from rent control, gives the Housing Expediter the right to sue for overcharges if the tenant does not, strengthens the enforcement and eviction provisions by providing for criminal sanctions for willful violations of the act and by authorizing the Housing Expediter to conduct investigations and hearings.

Under the present rent act, units on which landlord and tenant sign a voluntary lease for not more than 15 percent above the maximum rent which carry over until at least January 1, 1949, are decontrolled as of December 31, 1947. This means that should any tenant violate an obligation of his tenancy or otherwise terminate his lease, the unit is thereafter free from control. It is fairly evident that there would be tremendous pressure to void these leases so as to remove these units from all controls. This bill would amend the present act to continue to hold these units under rent control but to honor the 15-percent rent increase for as long as the lease exists.

This bill continues the local advisory boards with all the powers they now have to recommend to the Housing Expediter actions on decontrol, the adequacy of the general rent level, operations of the local rent office and individual hardship cases. It would continue to allow the Housing Expediter to exercise his judgment as to whether a local board recommendation has been properly substantiated and is in accordance with the provisions of the act.

This bill strengthens the enforcement provisions so as to give the Housing Expediter the right of treble-damage action against willful and flagrant violators and also to permit the Housing Expediter to refer to the Attorney General willful and flagrant violators for criminal action. This is a necessary amendment because the present provision of the act giving the tenant the right of treble damage has failed to cure violations. It is not working because tenants are more afraid of losing the roof over their heads than they are desirous of obtaining monetary damages. Experience shows that generally law-abiding landlords who always obey the law are still obeying but that the old violators are boldly overcharging and accepting bonuses and side payments. When they are caught, they simply make restitution and unless an injunction is obtained proceed to commit the same violations all over again.

The following data will be of interest in connection with rent control:

As of June 30, 1947, there were 17,004,325 registration statements of rental housing units on file in area rent offices. This figure is the total number of registrations filed by landlords in areas under rent control on June 30, 1946, and includes all housing units rented at any time during the period of rent control.

It is estimated that there were 15,700,000 housing units actually being rented on June 30, 1947. This estimate was calculated by deducting from the total number of registrations the 937,675 rented units for which certificates of eviction were issued for purchaser occupancy in the files. It should be noted that the estimate of 15,700,000 units being rented on June 30, 1947, includes certain sublet housing units which are excluded from rental housing estimates by the Bureau of the Census.

It is estimated that, as of December 1, 1947, there were 63,000 newly constructed housing units, 24,000 converted units, and 10,000 units not rented between February 1, 1945, and January 31, 1947, which were decontrolled by the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

From July 1, 1947, to January 2, 1948, the Housing Expediter issued 19 decontrol orders affecting an estimated 30,780 housing rental units. Of the 19 decontrol orders issued, 14 were taken upon recommendation of local rent advisory boards and 5 were taken by the Expediter upon his own initiative.

As of January 2, 1948, there were 1,634,855 copies of leases, providing for

rent increases up to 15 percent, on file in area rent offices. The housing units covered by these leases were decontrolled January 1, 1948. No tabulation has been kept of the amount of rent increase stipulated in these leases but area rent directors have indicated that the vast majority provided for the full 15-percent increase permitted under the act.

It is estimated that 1,250,000 rental units in hotels, motor courts, and tourist homes were automatically decontrolled by the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. This estimate is based on monthly reports from area-rent offices, estimates of the American Automobile Association and the Census of Business. The Census of Business for 1939 indicated that there were almost 1,500,000 hotel rooms in the United States. (No deduction was made from this figure for hotel rooms in areas not under rent control since it was assumed that such a deduction would be offset by the increase in hotel rooms since 1939.) Prior to July 1, 1947, applications for decontrol of transient rooms in hotels were filed with area-rent officers for almost 500,000 rooms. Of the 1,000,000 hotel rooms remaining under control on June 30, 1947, it is estimated that 700,000 became eligible for decontrol under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. The American Automobile Association estimates that there are 550,000 units in motor courts and tourist camps. It is estimated that 450,000 units are in controlled areas and were decontrolled under the Housing and Rent Act. The American Automobile Association also estimated that prior to the war there were about 50,000 tourist homes with an average of four units each and that the number today is approximately the same. It is estimated that about half of the 200,000 rooms in tourist homes became eligible for decontrol under the new act. It is thus estimated that there were 700,000 units decontrolled in hotels, 450,000 units in motor courts, and 100,000 units in tourist homes.

It is estimated that there were 2,215,000 rooming-house units under rent control as of July 1, 1947. This figure was estimated by subtracting the number of units decontrolled in hotels, motor courts, and tourist homes from the number of units subject to the hotel- and rooming-house regulation on June 30, 1947.

As of January 2, 1948, 667 local rent-advisory boards have been appointed in 553 areas. Of this number 37 have recommended decontrol actions, 14 of which were approved, 13 rejected for lack of substantiating evidence, and 10 were pending final action. As of the same date, 36 boards have recommended general rent increases, 2 of which were approved, 4 rejected for lack of substantiating evidence and 30 were pending final action. None of the recommendations were more than 30 days old.

In addition to specific recommendations for decontrol and general rent increases, the local rent advisory boards have submitted many suggestions and recommendations which have been very helpful in improving operations generally in the local area rent offices. As of the end of December, 241 of the 667 rent advisory boards appointed had also accepted 3,426 individual hardship cases for review.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman state what the average increase in residential rents was from the time we put on an effective rent-control law? As I remember, from the latter part of 1942 until the law was virtually repealed on June 30, 1947, the average increase was 1.1 percent.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You are substantially correct. I was going to say much less than 2 percent.

Mr. McCORMACK. My recollection is that it is 1.1 percent. It is my recollection also in a survey of thirty-odd cities made by the Department of Labor under the present law that during July, August, September, and October, 4 months, it was found that the average increase was 5.2 percent. In other words, in that period of 4 months, residential rents increased nearly five times as much as they did for approximately 4½ years prior to June 30, 1947.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is substantially correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. My investigation also shows that about 1,600,000 leases were made under the 15-percent provision.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is about 10 percent of the total number.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; about 10 percent. About 16,000,000 families in America are involved.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. However, there is a large percentage of violations where there is no lease and where there are increases above the ceiling which cannot be ascertained because the tenants are afraid to make a complaint. Is that not the situation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is exactly the situation. That was testified to yesterday and again this morning by the Housing Expediter.

Mr. McCORMACK. What happened when the majority of the Congress and the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I opposed it last year was that this legislation resulted in an invitation practically to go ahead and make increases without regard to the tenants because the tenants were afraid to make reports to the Housing Expediter or the regional offices.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The tenants were afraid to complain. They wanted a roof over their heads.

Mr. McCORMACK. One case was called to my attention where a man was paying $60 a month rent according to his check, but he had to pay $40 cash in addition.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Many cases like that have been reported.

Mr. McCORMACK. That situation is growing, as I understand it. The Housing Expediter had the power to control during the war because the Housing Expediter or the representative in the regional office could go into court and collect treble damages.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. That authority has been taken away.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is right. It has been taken away.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now the only thing that remains is that the tenant can go into court and sue and get three times the damages but the tenants are not suing. Is that not correct?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is exactly right, because the tenants are too fearful of the consequences.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, when the dignity and strength of the Federal Government was involved and a Federal official could go in and sue, then the law was respected.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We had effective rent control then.

Mr. McCORMACK. Furthermore whenever there was a vacancy the landlord had to make a report to the rent control office or the Housing Expediter's office. Is that not correct?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not have to be done now, does it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is true; they do not have to make a report now.

Mr. McCORMACK. So last year we took away the real power to effectively control rents and the conditions throughout the country at the present time are terrible and growing worse and worse. Is that not right?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We have a skeleton compliance force now; that is about all.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition the appropriations were reduced last year for this fiscal year for the Housing Expediter and the regional offices to even carry out the very slight powers that were generously permitted to remain in the act which was passed by a majority of this body last year, is that not correct?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Up in New England I remember they had to reduce the regional offices from about 170 to 69. On the one hand they took away the power to enforce and on the other they reduced appropriations, so that they could not employ enough help to carry out with any degree of effectiveness the slight powers that remained in the present law, is that not correct?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; and the same is true with regard to the construction limitation regulation pertaining to recreational and amusement construction. The Housing Expediter specifically stated that he had merely a compliance force of about 40 and that he needed a minimum of about 300 if he was going to be able to make the compliance provisions effective, and that he recommended that either they take this provision out of the law or give him the necessary compliance officers to enforce the CLR regulation.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition the law passed last year wiped away any controls over nonessential construction, which interfered with the building of homes; is that not correct?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only thing they left under control was bowling alleys and recreational buildings such as that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. With the beforementioned weaknesses.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is an authority on this and has devoted his attention to this type of legislation. What is the gentleman's opinion as to the law that was passed last year in regard to protection of the tenants in this emergency?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I opposed the law last year, as did my colleague, on the basis that the law as set up had a skeleton framework for effectively carrying out the provisions of the act as written. In addition to that, it had the weapon of a so-called voluntary blackjack provision, which I opposed vehemently and which by experience has proven that it has been ineffective and has not worked, because less than 10 percent have entered into such lease agreements. However, in reenacting this law, I believe that those people should be protected for the period of any extension, if there is to be an extension.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly, because they are decontrolled now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. The only protection they have is their lease until the end of the year, but if they move out for any reason——

Mr. BUCHANAN. That property is decontrolled.

Mr. McCORMACK. Or, if any conditions are imposed where the tenant cannot tolerate them, then they move out and there is complete decontrol.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the rent-control law should be extended and some teeth put into it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We should augment it and strengthen it by making these weak provisions strong and effectively workable. Unless we do that we are going to have a continuous degrading of the act and complete refusal to comply with the provisions. So rather than have a weak, ineffective law, as we do have now, let us write into the extension of the rent-control law provisions which will be effective and will give the Housing Expediter the necessary legal implements to enforce compliance, or else let us not have any further extension at all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NEW POST OFFICE SITES NEEDED FOR LAWRENCE, MASS., AND NORTH ANDOVER, MASS.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the small and cramped quarters of the post offices at Lawrence, Mass., and at North Andover, Mass., do not permit these essential agencies to give prompt and convenient service to the citizens and the business interests of these areas.

In both cases, a steadily increasing volume of mail has led to demands for more space in order to handle the greater work load.

This is reflected in the results of a recent survey made by the Post Office Department which recommends a sizable addition to the number of employees in this postal district. Clearly, more workers need more space.

With this in mind, I ask for favorable consideration of a bill which I am introducing today "to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," so amended as "to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings, and for other purposes."

There is a need for extra facilities at Lawrence and North Andover, Mass., now. There will be a greater need later. Even if we cannot secure the new buildings at once, we can lay the ground work for the future. By anticipating, we can be ready.

The Lawrence post office is 44 years old. It was built to accommodate the needs of a community that is much larger than it was in 1904. Apart from the population factor, the functions of the post-office building has added to the strain.

During the 1930's, when there was a huge Federal building program in operation designed to take up the work slack in our depressed economy, Lawrence was bypassed.

To the west of us, the city of Lowell got a brand-new post office and Federal building. To the east, in the city of Haverhill, another was built. To the south, in Lynn, a large and beautiful structure was erected.

But in Lawrence, only a small annex was attached to a post office that was fast becoming obsolete.

Apart from the expanding needs of the post-office department, this building is not large enough to house other Federal agencies. The Veterans' Administration is forced to rent space in a private building, at considerable extra cost to the Government, to serve the veterans in this section.

The Government is also suffering from the acute housing shortage with consequent impairment of service.

The Navy recruiters at the Lawrence Post Office are crowded into a 6 by 8 room. The Army recruiter has a chair and a table in the corridor. The marine recruiter stands up.

When the rent-control representative comes to this city, he has to borrow the civil-service examination room. The Department of Justice—Immigration Service—does likewise. When an examination is on, they have to borrow a corner in some other office, where the troubles of individual citizens are aired to everyone's embarrassment.

In this city with an area of 3 miles by 2 miles and a population of 84,000, it is necessary for the post office to hire quarters for a substation in a more central location to provide for the overflow of postal business and in order to service the industries and the merchants of this community.

As far back as August 12, 1946, a field investigation conducted by the Federal Works Agency of the Public Buildings Administration revealed that:

> While existing postal facilities are adequate for the time being, there appears to be a future requirement of approximately 6,000 square feet of additional office space for nonpostal agencies of the Government located at Lawrence.

On August 14, 1946, the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General reported that:

> The inspector states further, that there has been considerable criticism of the inadequate facilities at city hall station, and some comment that the main post office should be located near the center of business.

Still earlier, on October 3, 1945, under a program submitted to Congress by Federal Works Administrator Philip B. Fleming and Postmaster General Robert Hannegan, authorizing Federal building construction throughout the country, funds were earmarked in the amount of $95,000 for the North Andover branch of the Lawrence postal district.

The Lawrence post office is located north of the Merrimack River and the railroad station is south of it. This causes loss of time and extra wear and tear on vehicles engaged in collecting and delivering mail to the trains.

Furthermore, because of insufficient space in the Lawrence post office, all parcel-post packages have to be taken to the second floor for sorting and then taken down again to the main floor, resulting in extra effort, which costs the Government more in the long run.

Lawrence is the halfway point on the main artery leading from Boston, Mass., to Manchester, N. H. Ten miles to the west, on the Merrimack River, is the city of Lowell. Eight miles to the east, also on the Merrimack, is the city of Haverhill. Lawrence is, therefore, the communications hub for northeastern Massachusetts, and should properly be the center for all district offices of the Federal Government in this area. Due to lack of foresight in providing a large and adequate post office and Federal building at Lawrence, the cities and towns of the Merrimack Valley have been unable to enjoy the convenient service of the many agencies operating under the Federal Government.

The bill I propose will amend the act approved May 25, 1926, to provide for the acquisition of sites and preparations of plans for such Federal public buildings as may be deemed necessary by the Public Buildings Commissioner under the supervision of the Federal Works Administrator, with the concurrence of the Postmaster General where his Department is involved.

The Public Buildings Commissioner, under the above-mentioned supervision, is authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise lands or interest in lands or sites or additions to sites for Federal public building projects previously authorized and for such new projects as may be deemed necessary by the Public Buildings Commissioner, and to cause to be prepared plans, drawings, and specifications for such projects.

The total estimated cost of the sites and plans for the project to be selected under the provisions of this act shall not exceed in the aggregate $25,000,000. Selection of new projects for the foregoing purposes shall be made by the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster

General from the list contained in their revised report.

In making such selections, they shall endeavor to distribute the selected projects equitably throughout the United States upon the basis of the relative need for the projects and the comparative costs of providing suitable accommodations in leased space.

The need for a new post office and Federal building at both Lawrence and North Andover, Mass., was evident even before the war, but has been put off for 8 years due to wartime and postwar emergencies.

There can be no further delay in meeting these needs without interfering with the efficient operations of the various Federal services in northeastern Massachusetts.

It is my considered opinion that this bill should become law, so that we may be able to give improved service to the individuals and to the business establishments of those areas such as Lawrence and North Andover which are in need of larger accommodations.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart;

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union";

S. 1394. An act to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1286. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on the economy of Hawaii in 1947, with special reference to wages, working conditions, and industrial relations; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1287. A letter from the Secretary, United State Department of Justice, transmitting the Annual Report of the Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1288. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines anthracite research laboratory to be constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1289. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the seventeenth and last report of the Attorney General, covering the period from October 1, 1947, through January 25, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on fuel investigation, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 447. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to continue its investigation on matters coming within jurisdiction of the committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 453. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2161, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190); without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 359. Resolution authorizing the printing as a document the reports of the Special Tax Study Committee to the Committee on Ways and Means, dated November 4, 1947, and providing for additional copies thereof; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 421. Resolution providing additional funds for the conduct of the investigation and study of reorganization and home rule for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 405. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 18; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1326). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1961. An act to amend the act of December 3, 1945, so as to extend the exemption of Navy or Coast Guard vessels of special construction from the requirements as to the number, position, range, or arc of visibility of lights, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4721. A bill to remove the statutory limit of appropriation expenditures for repairs or changes to a vessel of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1392. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Jesse A. Lott; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2013. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian; without amendment (Rept. No. 1332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2633. A bill for the relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2806. A bill for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard; without amendment (Rept. No. 1335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of J. L. Hitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4541. A bill for the relief of Jesse F. Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of John Halstadt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4569. A bill for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4570. A bill for the relief of Howard A. Yeager; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4593. A bill for the relief of Abraham Spevak; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4672. A bill for the relief of John Cameron Henry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 5272. A bill relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 5273. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 5274. A bill to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act with respect to the definition of the term "labor dispute"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 5275. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5276. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5277. A bill to repeal the act of June 5, 1940, entitled "An act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CROW:

H. R. 5278. A bill to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5279. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 5280. A bill to amend section 106 of the act of October 31, 1945, so as to eliminate the segregation of races at the Washington National Airport; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 5281. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5282. A bill to increase the pensions of widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II and to liberalize certain of the eligibility requirements for such pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 5283. A bill to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5284. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 5285 A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 5286. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 5287. A bill to amend section 58d of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 5288. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. J. Res. 318. Joint resolution to prohibit the Civil Aeronautics Board from rendering any decisions until the existing vacancies on the Board are filled; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 454. Resolution to investigate whether the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended, and regulations promulgated thereunder have been violated; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 455. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations to be continued under the authority of H. Res. 447, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. Res. 456. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report entitled "The Economy of Hawaii in 1947"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 457. Resolution to investigate shortages of natural gas, fuel oil, and other petroleum products in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 5289. A bill for the relief of Miroslav (Fred) Schiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5290. A bill for the relief of Ewa K. Sudol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 5291. A bill for the relief of Harry Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1303. By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of Post No. 4352, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Ketchikan, Alaska; American Legion Auxiliary, Ketchikan, Alaska, Ketchikan Union, No. 3; Ketchikan, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce; Business and Professional Women's Club, Ketchikan, Alaska; Post No. 4352, Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary, Ketchikan, Alaska; Women of Moose, Ketchikan, Alaska; American Legion Post, No. 3, Ketchikan, Alaska; American Legion Auxiliary, Anchorage, Alaska; American Legion Auxiliary, Sitka, Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1304. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Frederic E. Holmes and 30 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, in support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1305. Also, petition of Frederick Laffey and 96 other citizens of Cincinnati and Madeira, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1306. Also, petition of Gilbert Holocher and 44 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of S. 1849, a bill to increase the compensation of postal employees $1,000 a year, and H. R. 2985, a bill to grant postal employees appointed subsequent to armed service in World War II credit for time spent in the armed forces for purposes of determining their salary grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1307. Also, petition of Verner G. Rowe and 33 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1308. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of Louis J. Duewel and 65 others, of Tabor, Iowa, for complete abolition of liquor traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1309. By Mr. JENISON: Petition signed by 216 residents of Edgar County, Ill., submitted by John G. Keller, national defense chairman, the American Legion, Paris Post, No. 211, Paris, Ill., petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1310. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning Congress that the construction limitation regulations of the Federal Office of Housing Expediter be amended to permit immediate construction of adequate facilities for physical culture to diminish the juvenile problem; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We confess, O Lord, that we think too much of ourselves, for ourselves, and about ourselves.

If our Lord had thought about Himself, we would not now be bowed in prayer, nor have the liberty in which and for which to pray.

If the great men whom we honor for their part in building our Nation had thought about themselves, we would have no free Republic today. Help us to see, O Lord, that "I" is in the middle of sin, and let no man among us think more highly of himself than he ought to think, to the end that we may be used of Thee in Thy service for the good of all mankind.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 4, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. RANKIN, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive

bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Allocation of Grains of the Committee on Banking and Currency to hold a hearing today during the session of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

Mr. CAIN asked and obtained consent for the Subcommittee on Rents and Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency to hold a hearing this afternoon.

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained consent for the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to meet during this afternoon's session of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND (on behalf of Mr. MOORE) asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to meet during the session of the Senate.

REPORT OF OPERATIONS UNDER BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth annual report of operations under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—RESOLUTIONS OF SENATE OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the State Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to enact a sound and effective European recovery program.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact a sound and effective European recovery program

Whereas there is great need of aid by the United States to certain countries of Europe in order to protect the inhabitants of such countries from privation and starvation to assist them in their own efforts to restore their shattered economies and to prevent the spread of communism and to preserve the democratic form of life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts hereby respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact as speedily as may be consonant with careful consideration a sound and effective European recovery program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted January 29, 1948.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

[SEAL] T. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, at its recent annual meeting the New York State Bar Association adopted a resolution pertaining to the European recovery program. The resolution has a distinct bearing on a question now before the Congress, and for that reason I feel it should appear in the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and request that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The New York State Bar Association recommends that Congress enact legislation in furtherance of the program for European recovery set forth in section 2 (b) of the draft bill that accompanied the President's message of December 19, 1947, to the Congress on this subject."

CERTIFICATE

I, Chester Wood, secretary of the New York State Bar Association, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the original resolution which was duly adopted by the association on the recommendation of its committee on international law, William Roy Vallance, chairman, at a regular session of the association held during its annual meeting on January 23, 1948, at the house of the association of the bar of the city of New York.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said association, this 30th day of January 1948.

[SEAL] CHESTER WOOD,
Secretary.

NOTE.—The section 2 (b) referred to in the resolution was quoted in the printed report of the committee of the association, as follows:

"Section 2 (b) Purposes of act.—It is the purpose of this act to effectuate the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of abnormal outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this act, by

"(1) Promoting industrial and agricultural production in the participating countries;

"(2) Furthering the restoration or maintenance of the soundness of European currencies, budgets, and finances;

"(3) Facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade."

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. KNOWLAND (for Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming), and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK, be assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY (for Mr. WILSON), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1795. A bill to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174); without amendment (Rept. No. 884).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 4, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart;

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union";

S. 1394. An act to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Sundry appointments and promotions in the United States Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WILEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 2131, for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury claim board, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2132. A bill to authorize the participation of States in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service; to establish a National Park Land Commission and provide for the acquisition of lands within areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 2133. A bill transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserves Nos. 2 and 3, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2134. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the postwar construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2135. A bill to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit private sales of permanent

war housing to local communities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2136. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, who have dependents, to occupy on a rental basis and without loss of rental allowances temporary housing facilities under the jurisdiction of any such service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, by request of the Treasury Department, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide relief for certain officers and employees of that Department for losses sustained as a result of war conditions, and I request that the text of a letter which I received from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, describing the bill and the reasons for it, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2131) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury Claim Board, introduced by Mr. WILEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JANUARY 26, 1948.

The PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "For the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury Claim Board."

The proposed bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay sums totaling not to exceed $19,259.80 to 25 persons employed by the Treasury Department. During the war these employees were stationed in foreign countries and engaged in the performance of official duties. The employees sustained losses of property due to bombing, fires, looting, damage or pilferage while in transit, and other reasons.

The Treasury Department had no authority to settle these losses, and with the view of submitting relief legislation to the Congress, a Treasury Claim Board was established to consider and process the claims presented by the employees for such losses. The Department has received claims from 25 employees, aggregating $28,845.12, of which amount, after careful consideration of the merits of each claim by the Claim Board, $19,259.80 is recommended for approval by the Congress. There is attached a memorandum setting forth in detail a summary of the basis of the claims involved, indicating in each case the amount claimed, the amount disallowed, and the amount recommended for approval by the Department.

The Congress has on two previous occasions enacted legislation providing for the relief, under similar circumstances, of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, namely, Private Law 145 (78th Cong.) and Private Law 13 (79th Cong.). Also there is pending in this Congress H. R. 3726, a bill for a similar purpose for Foreign Service employees, which was passed by the Senate on July 24, 1947.

This Department is of the opinion that these claims of officers and employees of the Treasury Department have merit, and it is strongly recommended that the proposed legislation be enacted.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate, and it is earnestly recommended that it be given prompt consideration. A draft of the proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

A. L. M. WIGGINS,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5214) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to announce to the Senate that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations this morning concluded its hearings on the European recovery program. It is very essential that additional printed copies of the hearings be made immediately available, and if there is no objection, and without displacing the business pending before the Senate, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair asks unanimous consent to report an original resolution, and requests its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 195) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Foreign Relations on the European recovery program be printed for the use of said committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC

Mr. CORDON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 196), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed make a study and investigation of such matters as it may deem appropriate relating to the islands, groups of islands, or other areas included within the trust territory of the Pacific, or relating to other islands, groups of islands, or areas of the Pacific which are possessions of, or subject to the authority of, the United States, including study and and investigation of—

(a) the peoples, customs, laws, economies, resources, and governments of such areas;

(b) the interrelation, and the natural or appropriate integration, of such areas;

(c) measures designed to advance the security and well-being of the peoples and economies of such areas; and

(d) such other matters relating to such areas as the committee may deem appropriate.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study, recommending such organic and other legislation as may be necessary to provide for the civil government of such areas, and to assure to the peoples of such areas justice, peace, and tranquility, a voice in their civic affairs and government, the development of their economies and the protection of their civil rights, all with due regard to the established customs of such peoples. For the purposes of the studies and investigations authorized and directed by this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ such consultants, specialists, clerks, and other assistants, to travel, and authorize its assistants to travel, and to utilize such transportation, housing, and other facilities which the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Air Force may make available, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the purpose of making a study and investigation of any matter referred to such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of the address delivered by him at the Lincoln Day banquet, at Knights of Columbus Hall, Detroit, Mich., February 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETERANS IN COLLEGE TRAINING—RELEASES BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD five releases on the subject of veterans in college training, by the American Council on Education, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—ARTICLE BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Taft-Hartley Act: What It Does Do, What It Does Not Do," by Senator TAFT, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAGNER MADE IN CONNECTION WITH BROADCASTS ON HOUSING

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Senator WAGNER dealing with a series of broadcasts on the housing problem as well as a broadcast on the subject from Station WNBC, New York City, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY'S CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address

on the subject The Republican Party's Contribution to Peace, by Alf M. Landon, before the Republican Club at Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans., February 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARD TO POSTMASTER ALBERT GOLDMAN, OF NEW YORK, BY THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a citation presented to Albert Goldman, postmaster of the city of New York, by General Theodorus Bailey Post, No. 104, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARD TO ROBERT I. QUEEN BY DELTA SIGMA LAMBDA FRATERNITY

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article describing honor paid Robert I. Queen, past county commander of the Bronx County Disabled American Veterans, by the Delta Sigma Lambda Fraternity, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILLAMETTE VALLEY PROJECT—RESOLUTION OF THE PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution on the subject of the Willamette Valley project, adopted by the board of directors of the Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—EDITORIAL BY MARK M. SHAW

[Mr. KNOWLAND, on behalf of Mr. WHERRY, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Shaw Plan," by Mark M. Shaw, from the Greater Nebraskan, which appears in the Appendix.]

F. S. SHATTUCK RIPS MILITARY TRAINING PLAN—NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "E. S. Shattuck Rips Military Training Plan," published in the Los Angeles Daily News of January 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CELEBRATION OF FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM OF CUBA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last Friday a report from a committee appointed from the House of Representatives and the Senate to recommend a celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the freedom of Cuba was brought up, and at that time I asked unanimous consent for the consideration of three concurrent resolutions. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] objected to the consideration of the resolutions at that time, but he has now withdrawn his objection, and owing to the fact that part of the celebration will start a week from the coming Sunday, it is necessary for the Congress to act if we are to carry out the plan, and I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 39 be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unfortunately, the concurrent resolution is in the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee would have to be discharged before the Senate could proceed to consider the concurrent resolution, although of course that could be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have taken the matter up with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is that satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the procedure is not satisfactory, but in this particular instance we will agree to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain, resulting in the liberation of Cuba, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, on Monday, April 19, 1948.

That the joint committee created by House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, is empowered to make suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises for the joint session of Congress herein authorized.

That invitations to attend the exercises be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps (through the Secretary of State), the General of the Armies, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and such other persons as the joint committee shall deem proper.

That the President of the United States is hereby invited to address the American people at the joint session of the Congress in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I make the same request respecting Senate Concurrent Resolution 40.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution, and under the same understanding existing as to the concurrent resolution just agreed to, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, and by unanimous consent it will be considered at this time.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is amended by striking out the last sentence of section 2 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The committee shall cease to exist upon the expiration of 30 days after April 19, 1948."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask for the same action with regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 41.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks for the consideration, under similar circumstances, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is amended by adding at the end of section 3 thereof the following: "The funds made available under this concurrent resolution shall be available for paying the expenses of a delegation to attend the ceremonies that will be held in Habana, Cuba, on Sunday, February 15, 1948, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine*, to be composed of two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, and two representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans, consisting of the commander in chief and one other member of that organization, together with the expenses of any of the employees of the committee whose services are required in connection with this ceremony."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentarian suggests that this concurrent resolution should go to the Committee on Rules and Administration, inasmuch as it deals with the contingent fund.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the matter has already been taken up with the chairman of that committee and it is agreeable to the Committee on Rules and Administration that the Senate give immediate consideration to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the matter presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. MARTIN. It was.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the chairman of the committee notify the distinguished Senator that the Committee on Rules and Administration was favorable to the resolution?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether or not the Senator from Illinois polled the committee?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall not object, if the matter has been approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would very much dislike to have this considered as any sort of precedent, because it is not the proper procedure when the contingent fund of the Senate is involved.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania refer the matter to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and have the committee polled.

Mr. MARTIN. I shall do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Undoubtedly the Senator from Pennsylvania can proceed with the subject later in the day.

Mr. MARTIN. Very well.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, early today the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] requested consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, relative to the expenses of a delegation to attend the ceremonies in Habana, Cuba, in con-

nection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine*. However, at the request of the President pro tempore and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I wish to point out to the Members of the Senate that the concurrent resolution does not call for any additional appropriation. It merely provides that the funds which are already available shall be made available for the use of sending of the American delegation to Habana, to consist of two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans.

From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I now ask unanimous consent to report the concurrent resolution favorably, without amendment, and request its consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

REGULATION OF BUSINESS OF LIFE INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT—CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 146, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 1634) to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia", and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto, is authorized and directed to make the following corrections in the House engrossed bill:

Page 13, line 20, strike out "5" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "5b."

Page 13, line 20, strike out "in" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "In."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked what the program for today will be. I desire to say to the Senate that several Senators will deliver speeches on the St. Lawrence seaway project today. The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and possibly one or two other Senators will speak on the subject. If the speeches themselves or the colloquies in connection with them run late into the afternoon, too late for the Senate to take up other business, it will then, I believe, be the intention to recess until Monday, unless something comes up at the end of the session that should demand attention tomorrow.

I might also add that in the event the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway is concluded today, and there is ample time for consideration of other legislation, it is the intention that the Senate be asked to consider several bills now on the calendar. It is not the intention to bring up legislation respecting which there is controversy. One measure is Senate Joint Resolution 173, Calendar No. 902, to be found on page 9 of the calendar. That is a joint resolution to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes. My understanding is that the authority will expire the latter part of February, and that there should be consideration had by the Senate, as soon as convenient, with respect to whether the authority should be continued.

Request has been made for immediate consideration of Senate bill 1004, Calendar No. 897, if possible at the conclusion of the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway today. The bill was introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. Senators will find from a reading of the title of the bill that it explains fully the subject matter dealt with by the bill.

Members of the Senate will remember that when the legislative calendar was called last Monday the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] stated that as soon as the legislation dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway had been acted upon—and it will not be concluded for some time, but is now the business pending before the Senate—or at the first opportunity, he would ask unanimous consent, or move, as I recall his words, and I might be mistaken as to which words he used, to bring up for consideration Senate bill 1557, Calendar No. 702, and, I think, Senate bill 1375, Calendar No. 704. Senators will find the last two bills on page 8 of the calendar.

Request will also be made for consideration of Senate bill 1356, Calendar No. 696, the last bill on page 7 of the calendar, which is legislation similar to that contained in the other two bills to which I referred. No doubt if one of these bills is brought up for consideration request will be made that all three be considered.

Mr. President, in view of the gentleman's agreement respecting what shall be done next week, I think that before any Senators leave the city attention should be called to two other very important pieces of legislation. One deals with rent control, on which action must be taken by February 18, which is a week from Wednesday. If there is any objection to consideration of that measure, I wish the Senator or Senators who have objection would take the matter up with the chairman of the policy committee and see if the objections can be ironed out.

There is another measure, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], dealing with the budget, which may possibly be ready for consideration next week.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that measure certainly will have to be taken up not later than immediately at the beginning of week after next, 16th or the 17th of February.

Mr. WHERRY. That, Mr. President, is about the legislative program. The two latter pieces of legislation might involve debate. Objections may be raised. If there should be objections and they cannot be ironed out, I think we should stand by the "gentleman's agreement" which has been entered into. But, as to the other matters to which I have referred, which are on the calendar, I am quite sure they will meet with the approval of all Members of the Senate and can be given early consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand from the remarks made by the acting majority leader that any one of these bills which are now on the calendar to which he has referred may be taken up this afternoon?

Mr. WHERRY. That was the announcement, yes, in the event the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway shall be concluded in time for such action to be taken at today's session.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has presented what seems to me to be a rather ambitious program.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that it is our intention to ask unanimous consent for consideration of the measures I mentioned. It is the intention to try to have some legislation considered on which all Members of the Senate can agree.

Mr. LUCAS. I know nothing about Senate Joint Resolution 173, Calendar No. 902, or Senate bill 1004, Calendar No. 897. I imagine there may be some objection to the latter bill.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is any objection, very well. It was the intention to have the Senate consider some piece or pieces of legislation which are available for consideration and to which there would be no objection.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is very anxious that Senate Joint Resolution 173, Calendar No. 902, be taken up for consideration as quickly as possible. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that inasmuch as the speeches which will be made on the St. Lawrence seaway will occupy considerable time today, if he will take the matter up with the Senator from Washington, or any other Senator, and if he finds that there is objection to the joint resolution he can make it known. If not, I think that possibly consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 173 should be proceeded with today, if possible.

Mr. LUCAS. I was wondering whether the absence of a quorum would not be in order before action is taken on any piece of legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. That will have to be done. If unanimous consent is made to take up any measure it will be necessary that the absence of a quorum be suggested.

Mr. LUCAS. Before any of these bills are taken up.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, I think so.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say frankly that I know nothing about any of the measures referred to. I imagine members of committees which considered the measures would want to be present when they were taken up for consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I simply stated the contemplated procedure with the idea that it would be for the benefit and

information of the Senate. As I stated before, in the event the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway continues until a late hour, then a recess will be taken, but I thought that in view of the fact that consideration of certain pieces of legislation had been suggested by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, attempt would be made to have them brought up for consideration, if there were no objection, and if there would be time today to do so.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1796) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANDREWS of New York, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. VINSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I know from the discussion which has preceded that the question before us leads to the type of argument which makes it not out of place for me to start with a subject which does not deal with the St. Lawrence waterway. When I say that, I am sure that it is rather consistent with what has occurred during the past half hour in the Senate.

I am certain about one thing, Mr. President, the Marshall plan entered into the discussion long after the St. Lawrence waterway project was before us. The Marshall plan has been brought into the argument in this way: It is said that at a time when we are planning to spend so much money for the relief and stability of Europe, it would be improper to spend money for the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. President, I am one of those who did not take exception to the President's message in which he united the idea of interim relief and the idea of price stabilization. We cannot stabilize conditions in Europe if we allow further instability in our own country. All these questions are closely related; and because they are closely related I believe that it would be wise for me to say a word or two about the bill which I introduced yesterday on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself in an attempt to bring out a plan which might help in the price situation.

It should also be said, if one is to attempt to appreciate the philosophy of the bill, that I was one of those who in the beginning of our attempt at controls stood wholeheartedly on the theory that there should be entire control and not piecemeal control. I shall not criticize what was done. I realize that what was done was done after due deliberation and careful consideration of an overall control plan. However, I feel that in fairness to the authors of the bill I should say that I was one of those who wanted wholehearted control of our economy in order to attempt to keep prices, and all that goes with prices, before our country as a single problem.

Yesterday I introduced Senate bill 2126, a bill to provide for a coordinated anti-inflation program. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] joined in the presentation of this bill. I have introduced the bill because I feel that none of the bills now before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee meets the need of the day.

Prices are rising steadily. The consumers' price index of the Department of Labor, which measures the cost of living, increased on the average of 1 percent a month during the last 3 months of 1947. There is every indication that this consumers' price index will continue to increase about this rate in the coming months of this year.

But rising prices are not our only problem. In order effectively to carry out our commitments in the European recovery program with the least possible effect upon our domestic economy, it is necessary that basic products and commodities be channeled into their proper and most worth-while uses.

After examining and giving consideration to the bills now before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I decided that not one met the need existing today to stop inflation. Therefore, I have introduced Senate bill 2126, which:

First. Freezes prices as of January 5, 1948, and provides for the elimination from this price freeze of all those commodities not basically affecting the cost of living and industrial and agricultural production.

Second. Provides for authority to be granted to permit the allocation and rationing of basic commodities which affect the cost of living or industrial or agricultural production.

Third. Provides for controls over bank credits.

I have incorporated into the bill the proposal made to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee by Marriner C. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, suggesting that the Federal Reserve Board be permitted to require commercial banks to establish special reserves, thus limiting the amount of demand and time deposits which those banks can use as collateral for extending commercial loans.

Fourth. Provides for the creation of an economic stabilization coordinator. If we are to have an effective anti-inflation program, it is essential that authority be granted to the President to create an administrator who will coordinate the many Government agencies that will be responsible for carrying out the various phases of such a program.

Fifth. Provides for adequate enforcement machinery. This is necessary if we are properly to administer and make effective the provisions of the bill.

Sixth. In addition I suggest that the powers and authority under this act extend for at least a 2-year period, to March 31, 1950, with authority to terminate at a sooner date if deemed advisable. This provision will prevent hoarding and withholding from the market in anticipation of quick elimination of price ceilings.

In introducing this bill I have attempted to put into one package a well-coordinated and effective anti-inflation program. I have accepted the principle of price freezes as proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I have further written into this single bill the allocation and rationing authority contained in the bill introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] on behalf of the Department of Commerce. I have further included the idea contained in the bill of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to establish an economic stabilization coordinator. I have also incorporated the kind of enforcement procedures contained in a bill introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]. In addition, as I have heretofore mentioned, I have accepted the recommendations of Marriner C. Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board on the problem of bank credits.

I have attempted to coordinate the best parts of the various provisions of the bills now before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee into a single, coordinated, effective anti-inflation program.

At the hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning there was a witness who bore testimony to the need for this program. The President pro tempore commended him for his statement, and for his great contribution to the hearing.

Mr. President, the contribution consisted primarily in the fact that the witness pointed out that the program was to be all-embracing, taking into consideration all the economic characteristics which prevail throughout our entire economy.

I repeat, we cannot bring stability anywhere else if we do not have it here. There is no use in our planning for stability in the world if we cannot provide stability for ourselves. Mr. President, that brings me to the point I wish to make above all other points in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway. It is not a local proposition; it is not a proposition which deals primarily with the setting up of a seaway to compete with our railways; it is not a proposition which has to do with the Northeast. It is a proposition which deals with the entire economy of the United States of America; and it is a proposition which has been reviewed time and time again and has been under discussion by the American people since the logic of the waterway first became apparent to them.

The St. Lawrence River is a boundary in some parts of our country. It was necessary to enter into treaties regarding treatment of the river in other parts. In some parts of the country it is really a national river, just as portions of the Great Lakes are wholly national. There-

fore the problem is bigger than the American national Government; it is bigger than the American National Government and the Canadian Government. It is so big, as the Panama Canal was so big, that in time it may not only prove itself a great relief to a crowded economy, both here and in Canada, but may be a shaper of commercial and economic habits, fitting into the whole relief scheme.

We have done much in the history of our country in the last 150 years, and have ratified all we have done, to bring about unity of the Americas for the purpose of defense, of understanding, of dealing with one another as we hoped from the very beginning other Republics in this hemisphere would deal with one another for the purpose of complementing and helping the cause of peace, for the purpose of saying to one part of the world which has a philosophy of life which is inconsistent with that of America and upon which it was founded, that it may come so far and no farther.

The origin of the theory which primarily brought into being the hemispheric defense idea is bigger than just an act. It is a world-wide theory which has been applied in other parts of the world. We speak of a Monroe Doctrine for this country or for some other part of the world. It is spoken of rather glibly throughout the land. There has always been, Mr. President, one part of the Western Hemisphere which has never seen eye to eye with this Nation in regard to pan-American union and in regard to hemispheric defense.

For the purpose of argument in connection with the pending joint resolution, it has been said by many Senators that the resolution is hardly in order; that we should have a treaty before us. I am very sure that the Pan American Union, which has grown into such a great institution and which has crystallized into what is probably the biggest idea in the Western Hemisphere, was not established by treaty but by an agreement. I may be wrong in that statement, because it has been a long time since I read the origin of the Pan American Union. I think, however, it was set up by agreement.

Mr. President, Canada, because of its connections east and west, has always been outside of the thinking and the philosophy of the Pan American Union, but not outside of its ideals. Canada knows, as we know, that our defense is intermingled; that one country cannot remain free and the other captive in time of war. Canada knows, and we know, that our economies are almost interchangeable. Those persons from my part of the country who went into Canada and settled there thought, until the beginning of the First World War, that they were probably not even changing their citizenship. They came and went with complete happiness, thinking American principles, thinking American ideals; and the American flag was as much displayed as was the British flag. That is one of the great evidences that such a situation should be continued. Every bond of friendship which can be thought of, every ideal, and every institution which can make the two countries more of a unit is statesmanlike forethought on the part of the two nations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to congratulate the Senator upon the type of address he is making. I want to say, candidly, that from time to time I have been opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway treaty or the seaway agreement, but in view of the conditions in the world as they exist at this time, and in view of the fact that through former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, and others who have followed, much has been done toward a good-neighbor policy in the way of setting up a hemispheric solidarity as a matter of sound, adequate national defense, I can think of nothing at this particular time, insofar as this country and Canada are concerned, which could do more to cement the ties of friendship and once again move in the direction of hemispheric solidarity than now to begin construction of the seaway between this country and Canada.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I appreciate what he has said. It seems to me what he has said can be extended a little bit further than to the Americas. The good-neighbor policy was not intended to work only north and south; it was also intended to work east and west.

I repeat what I said in the beginning, that if we can not keep stability in our own country there is no use talking about establishing it somewhere else. Practically every witness who has appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee on the European recovery plan has pointed out the need of European unity, and we have accepted their logic. Practically every Senator who has considered the problem has realized that economic unity is of the greatest importance. I do not mean entire political unity. It is difficult to draw a line. There should be unity in thought, unity in the desire to succeed in a unified way. The American people say to 16 European countries which have ideals and civilizations much like our own, "Unite so that you may attain your objective." Then in the same breath we refuse, because we say we have not the genius or ability, to go into a partnership with the Dominion of Canada, right on our own border, in regard to a proposition on which we have been in partnership since 1794.

Mr. President, that is the logic of the situation, and it is the basic idea which I think underlines all we are trying to do.

Toward the end of the session yesterday one Member of the Senate objected to the measure now before us on the theory that it leaves the question of the use of all the St. Lawrence waterways perpetually dangling. I think the word "dangling" was the one he used. Mr. President, it would be hard indeed to leave dangling any question that comes before us, especially in view of what has gone before. How can we think that in acting here on a given measure we act in a great vacuum, that nothing has gone before and nothing will come after, but that we are creating something absolutely new? Such a notion is the sort of thing I could never understand in people any time, when I read their history.

When we adopted the Constitution of the United States we did not do something in a vacuum. Mr. President, all we have to do is look at the seal of the United States as it appears on one of our dollar bills, and there we see the words showing that the founding fathers asked the blessings of God upon their beginning in the establishment of a new order in the world. It is worth pointing out that when one of the great Chief Justices of the United States handed down a decision, which was perfectly logical and fitted in with the scheme and patriotism of the founding fathers—a decision based on the theory that a new order had been established and that therefore they did not have to consider the past—the people of the United States rose up and adopted a constitutional amendment calling attention to the fact that all that had gone before belonged to them in this new order, and that nothing was set up in a vacuum, that nothing was started without regard to what had previously happened, but that there was antecedent for what they did. So, Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States was a document of delegated powers by which the people of the United States said where the powers were to be placed.

I make that point to show that we are not acting in a vacuum in connection with this matter and are not doing something new, but are doing something in the course of the evolution of a great idea, and also to show that the influence of what has gone before remains upon us.

In addition, I should like to point out the striking difference between the Constitution of the United States and the constitution which governs the people of Canada. Under our Constitution, the people of the United States reserve to the States all the powers that are not granted to the Federal Government; but the states in the Canadian union allow that union, and not the individual provinces, to have the reserved powers. In this proposition we are dealing with a union, Mr. President.

Yesterday it was pointed out, Mr. President, that the idea in regard to perpetual use of the waterway was left dangling because the pending measure provides for future negotiations and future treaties in regard to certain phases of the matter. It is necessary in the RECORD to call attention to the fact that we began thinking about the joint use, if not the joint control, of these waterways as early as 1794. In 1794 our country ratified a treaty dealing with the navigation on that waterway. I shall read part of that treaty to show that all that should have been done has been done to make way for the future negotiations which should be carried on in an orderly way, consistent with what has been done in the past. Article III of the treaty of 1794 reads as follows:

ARTICLE III. It is agreed that it shall at all times be free to His Majesty's subjects, and to

the citizens of the United States, and also to the Indians dwelling on either side of the said boundary line—

That refers to the part of the St. Lawrence which is the boundary line between the United States and Canada—

freely to pass and repass by land or inland navigation, into the respective territories and countries of the two parties, on the Continent of America (the country within the limits of the Hudson's Bay Co. only excepted), and to navigate all the lakes, rivers, and waters thereof, and freely to carry on trade and commerce with each other.

Article XIV reads as follows:

ARTICLE XIV. There shall be between all the dominions of His Majesty in Europe and the territories of the United States a reciprocal and perfect liberty of commerce and navigation. The people and inhabitants of the two countries, respectively, shall have liberty freely and securely, and without hindrance and molestation, to come with their ships and cargoes to the lands, countries, cities, ports, places, and rivers within the dominions and territories aforesaid, to enter into the same, to resort there, and to remain and reside there without any limitation of time. Also to hire and possess houses and warehouses for the purposes of their commerce, and generally the merchants and traders on each side shall enjoy the most complete protection and security for their commerce; but subject always as to what respects this article to the laws and statutes of the two countries respectively.

Mr. President, that very broad usage has continued.

In the Reciprocal Treaty of 1854 the same ideas were stated, and by that treaty those practices were continued.

The Treaty of Washington, in 1871, provides an expanding notion.

When we come down to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Great Britain, we find expressed in it the same ideas, but expanded still further, and leaving the peoples and citizens of both countries free to use the boundary waters in the way in which they wish to use them, either by national use or cooperative use. At any rate, the idea still persists.

Then we find that, still later, in the debate in the Senate on the Canadian Reciprocity Act of 1911, it was stated by one of the Senators from Michigan that—

It is well known that one of the objects of the treaty of 1854 was the improvement of the St. Lawrence River.

That statement was made only 37 years ago, but it is a pronouncement showing us that all that is being done, and all that has been done, and all that it is contemplated to do is thoroughly consistent with what has been the will of the United States and the will of Canada for at least 40 years.

Mr. President, there is considerable legal authority in support of the view expressed by Assistant Secretary Adee. Thus, in the case of Canada Malting Company against Patterson Steamships, the court stated:

On this motion for rehearing proctors for respondent point out that by treaty relations between Great Britain and the United States the boundary waters of the Great Lakes, meaning thereby the entire body of water comprising lakes, rivers, and waterways separating the two countries, with respect to navigation have become international waterways and equally free to citizens of Canada and citizens of the United States. (See Root-Bryce Treaty of 1909, and President's proclamation of May 13, 1910 (36 Stat. 2448), Moore's Digest of International Law, vol. I, p. 674.)

In view of this treaty, there exists, it seems to me, additional reason for declining jurisdiction and relegating the parties to pursue their remedies and rights in the country of which they are citizens and subjects, in the place where the contract of carriage was made and performed, and further, where the witnesses reside.

That is from a decision of the court, which seems to have a direct bearing on what I have to say.

Similarly, in the act approved February 8, 1895, regulating navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting tributary waters, the Congress specifically stated that "the following rules for preventing collisions shall be followed in the navigation of all public and private vessels of the United States upon the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal."

These treaties, then, have vested in the United States reciprocal rights to navigation in boundary waters and in those waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system which are wholly located in Canadian territory. The only question that remains, therefore, is the method of further developing the usefulness of these rights through reciprocal improvements. For this purpose the parties agreed upon such a method in the 1909 treaty whereby special agreements may be entered into to improve the navigation of the system on the basis of reciprocal legislation.

Mr. President, there remains but one question that bothers those who are opposed to the pending measure. The various treaties and agreements, and the practice followed as a result of the treaties and agreements, are applicable to citizens of both the United States and Canada. Mutual rights are guaranteed to the citizens of each country. Someone will say it is contemplated there may be some sort of publicly owned utility based on the waterway, and that therefore the treaty provisions will not hold.

Mr. President, in a world like ours, in which the tendency the world over has been toward more and more national functioning and State functioning in what have been considered purely private affairs, to assume that all past understandings and treaties would not be brought into consideration when the time for a special agreement came is unwarranted. I think that the question of control of the St. Lawrence waterway, and of all that is done under the great system which is projected, has not been left dangling. I think there is much understanding and background, and that much that has preceded it should control the actions of negotiators to the end that the spirit which has been followed in the past may prevail in the future. That is all that is asked.

It is pointed out by some that they fear this spirit in the future. It is pointed out by some that because of the building of this great waterway some element of the American economy which is prosperous today may cease to be prosperous. That is the chance everyone takes in a changing world. I doubt very much whether, in an automotive age, anything can be done for the person who has, for example, spent all his business lifetime in making buggy whips, and yet adjustments are made by business quite as much as by individuals. Business corporations learn how to operate automobiles, just as the individual does who has been accustomed to riding and driving horses. The buggy-whip age may have gone, as far as industry is concerned, but those who took part in it have changed. I have noted in the history of the country that practically every new thing contributes to prosperity everywhere, and while the St. Lawrence waterway is not a new thing, it will relieve some of the extreme pressures from which the economy of the northeastern part of the United States is now suffering. Think of it, Mr. President, at a time like this, right here in Washington, there are people who are cold because the fuel they need for heating cannot be brought to them in abundance. Think of it, Mr. President, that in the northeastern part of the United States, particularly in the great centers of population, suggestions are being made of putting a complete embargo on the exportation of oil, because it is said the people are cold and do not have enough oil and coal. Think of it, Mr. President, that our railways are overextended; think how busy they are, how much they are doing; and yet people fear the effect of the St. Lawrence seaway on transportation.

Mr. President, in this country the things that are needed more than anything else are more transportation and more power. The St. Lawrence waterway will provide more transportation facilities and more power. We, in America, should realize what is going on in the world. We should realize the need for new trade routes, when we consider what our handicaps were during the last war because of our inability wholly and completely to fulfill all the necessities attendant upon the war, largely due to our transportation system, great as was its contribution to the war effort.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs during much of the war, dealing with this question from day to day, I know, and no one can tell me differently, what the worry of our country in the great defense effort rested upon. It was the inability of our country's transportation system and of our economic system to meet all the demands. We are not fearful. It will be discovered that every new use creates new demands. More power in the northeastern part of the United States will benefit the whole of the United States. More transportation facilities in the northeastern part of the United States will benefit all. The dream we all cherish for our country is that every national resource will be put into shape so that it can contribute its utmost to the economy and welfare of the American people, and incidentally, by so doing, that it will contribute to the economy and welfare of the whole world.

The railways in the United States were not built with their strategic value in mind. They began operating before railways were used in war, and the first war in which they were used was the War Between the States. European governments, in building their great railroad systems, built them on a strategic basis.

Mr. President, we may be going far afield, but I think it is necessary to go far afield in order to show to the whole Nation its need for and dependence upon the proposed waterway for defense purposes, as General Marshall has pointed out, if for nothing else.

I mentioned the fact that our railroads were not built on a strategic basis. Four of the great East and West trunk lines of the United States—as everyone who has ever read a timetable knows—run on tracks of two systems for many miles. There will be found the weakest links in those four trunk lines. There will be found the greatest cause for worry, because four great systems can be put out of service by a single bombing raid. Such a railroad system, Mr. President, is not a strategically wise railroad system. I am not attacking the railroads. The economy of my State, like the economy of the States of most Senators present—of practically every Senator who is present at the moment—grew up around a railroad.

Speaking of railways, Mr. President, I wish to say that in the midst of a great war, when the country was loaded with debt, at a time when nearly everyone said, "Railroads cannot be built because of the debts owing by the country," we had a great statesman in the White House, a man by the name of Abraham Lincoln, and despite the great debts, despite the war, despite every obstacle, he started the country on the program of building the great East and West railway.

Mr. President, something was said the other day about the pending measure being unconstitutional. I have said something about Abraham Lincoln and his statesmanship. When he considered the great, drastic, experimental, wealth- and labor-consuming, highly costly program, and realized the great need for the building of our railroads, he set that great need above the risk of the program, and signed the act which gave us our great East-West railway system.

But Lincoln gave more evidence of greatness than that. During President Buchanan's administration, which preceded that of Abraham Lincoln, there was passed by the Congress of the United States the Land Grant College Act. Since the question of constitutionality with respect to the pending measure has been brought up, I wish to point out that James Buchanan vetoed the Land Grant College Act because he said there was not a provision in the Constitution giving the Federal Government the right to do anything for education. But, Mr. President, when a great statesman came into power, when a great statesman sat in the White House, at a time when the Nation was loaded with debt, surrounded as he was by overwhelming problems, bent down by worry, faced by uncertainties, he yet knew the great fundamentals upon which the Government rested, and brought into existence the greatest educational act ever conceived by man. It was considered to be unconstitutional by one President, but was considered to be necessary by the other.

Mr. President, in spite of all the arguments that can be made about the Constitution being strictly an instrument of delegated power, it was never set up to stop the progress and the onward march of the American people in achieving their economic and their political objectives. It was set up to be a guide for them in attaining those ends. And that is what it is.

The St. Lawrence waterway program is as much necessary in the proper evolution and the proper growth and development of our country as were the other great programs I have mentioned. If we should follow through the ideas of Buchanan and turn our backs on the ideas of Lincoln, we would of course, retard the growth and development of the American people who conceived the idea of the development of the St. Lawrence 100 years ago, although an actual navigation treaty was entered into 150 years ago.

Mr. President, we all know that we are not going to permit to go to waste the great natural resources, the energy, the power, and the facilities which this system would give us, and leave them unused up to their maximum.

Mr. President, we see a wonderful picture when we realize that already in our country we have brought into existence the Columbia River project; already we have brought into existence the Colorado River project; so the Northwest and the Southwest have power. The Southeast has the TVA development. It also has power therefrom. The Northeast, which needs power even more, because of the greatness of its industrial life, is not going to be deprived of power forever. The American people will say "No" to a stand of that sort, because the American people are a unit when it comes to thinking through our defense and our whole economic life, when considered as one.

Mr. President, I wonder what we would have done in the wartimes were it not for the fact that we had the power which was provided in the Northwest, in the Southwest, and in the southeastern part of our United States. That power not only gave us the atomic bomb but it gave us all the other implements of war and other things we needed.

Mr. President, I heard a Senator tell us the other day that he was against the St. Lawrence seaway project because it could not be defended in time of war; that part of the project was wholly in Canadian territory, and therefore it could not be defended. If the world's war morals remain at the level they reached when we decided to use the atomic bomb, then I say it would be a waste of even an insignificant bomb to try to hit that part of the St. Lawrence seaway which is going through Canadian territory.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wanted to interpolate that I heard that argument used, and it is going to be used again on the floor of the Senate. To me it is almost puerile. If I might use a stronger adjective, I would say it is almost asinine, and I know, or I hope, Senators will know what I mean by that.

I wish to point out that if we are going to have a religion of fear in our hearts in looking toward this great development of the St. Lawrence seaway, we ought to be thoroughly ashamed of ourselves. When the contention is made that we should not build the canal because of the danger of its destruction by an atomic bomb, if one should fall upon it with all its hellish fury, and destroy its usefulness—when that contention is made I raise my eyebrows.

I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Utah that if I were a foreign enemy I would direct my attack first at the Panama Canal, and endeavor to wreck it. I would then send an airplane over Washington and drop an atomic bomb on this Congress of men more or less brilliant, and put it out of business. If I were an enemy of this country, there are many points I would attack before I would attack the St. Lawrence seaway. The worry that has been expressed respecting the vulnerability to attack of the St. Lawrence Canal is the expression of a religion of fear.

Almighty God has placed on the face of the earth great bodies of water which men, through the great scientific ingenuity possessed by them, can harness up to improve and benefit mankind by providing better transportation and cheaper power. When men stand up in the Senate and say that such improvements should not be made because of the possibility that they may be destroyed by an enemy, I am ashamed of such an expression of religion of fear.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question in connection with the assumption that Washington may possibly be the object of an atomic-bomb attack. If we are to assume that Congress will vote against the St. Lawrence seaway, and other projects which are designed to strengthen the American economy and industry, does the Senator still think that the Congress would have the same importance as an objective for an enemy attack?

Mr. TOBEY. If the Congress were to vote against the St. Lawrence project, I think it would mark Congress as being a little below par.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from New Hampshire may have in mind that while the Senator from Utah has the floor, with the small representation of the membership of the Senate present to hear the discussion, it might not do any great harm if an atomic bomb were to descend upon us, for only a few others than the Senator from Utah would be the target.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the companionship of the Senator from Utah in this great objective. I have heard the St. Lawrence seaway project maligned from one end of the country to the other. I have heard the project attacked by those who are moved by provincialism, by those whose views may be said to be nothing other than archaic. More than that, the railroads of New England, instead of crying out concerning the project "Unclean, unclean," and using every possible means to hamstring the project, ought to sing a Te Deum and get behind it, because in 10 years after completion of the project they would be doing more business than

they did before the Canal was completed. The people of my State, Vermont, and other States would have their power rates cut in two—pro bono publico all along the line. I am for it.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont.

Let me add one further sentence. If the morals of war sink to the level where we left them when the last war was over, it will be a waste of power to try to find the waterway. No general would sanction it when Chicago is within another half-hour's flight, and when the great city of New York is on the way, if they come from the east. If they come over the Pole, which they likely will do, then, of course, they will be in the economic center of the United States; and surely one little passageway would not be an objective when the entire economy could be petrified and thrown out of gear.

Wherever and whenever the enemy comes, if we are to fight a war on the basis of total destruction of everything, if we are to fight a war with biological effects, if we are to forget all the morals which mankind has tried to develop to take care of men even in wartime and cause them to think in terms of greater values—if we are to lose all those things, Mr. President, there is no use of assuming that one canal is going to be an objective when with a bomb so much greater damage can be done.

If our war ethics were as they have been at a time in the past, when noncombatants, women, children, people in hospitals, private property, and all those things were respected, then a canal running through Canadian waters would be a logical and sensible military objective. But since those things have gone, we may rest assured that the objectives will be where more deadly consequences lie, and no one will be satisfied with taking a chance on dropping a bomb into the mud.

Mr. President, I do not believe that more need be said on the defense angle. Both the St. Lawrence waterway and the development of power on the St. Lawrence will improve our economic life; and that which betters our economic life and improves the facilities whereby we produce for war contributes to our ability to take care of ourselves in war, and also contributes to our ability to make our country fair and provide for the general welfare in peace. It is that about which I would rather think, and which I would rather discuss, than the war aspects; but if the war aspects must be discussed—and they have been discussed—it is necessary to bring these factors into the picture.

There is one further point which has emerged from the debate, and which I think should be answered. We find it in the minority report. I read two paragraphs to give me a text:

> Let it be set down at the outset that we vigorously reemphasize that part of Senator WHITE'S report—
>
> Referring to a minority report against the waterway when it was previously before us—
>
> which establishes in detailed manner the fact that a project calling for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, which it will take from 4 to 6 years to complete; which involves long-term obligations by both countries; which gives to each Government sovereign rights in the other country, is by every test a treaty and not an agreement and always, heretofore, the President and the Senate have held this view.
>
> Senator WHITE calls attention to the growing resort in late years of the State Department to agreements so-called in the stead of treaties to be ratified by the Senate and points out that the present resolution is an effort to accomplish by indirection what the Senate has twice refused to sanction, first by refusing consent to the proposal in treaty form and later by rejection of an amendment to a river-and-harbor bill.

Mr. President, if there has been indirection, if there is anyone in the State Department who has an idea that he is fooling anyone in America by suggesting that this be done by resolution instead of by treaty, that is something out of someone's imagination.

I think I have attempted as much as any other Member of the Senate since I came here to say that so long as the provision remains in the Constitution with regard to treaties, the Senate has the last word with respect to treaties. I think it should also have a first word now and then.

There was a time in the past when there was better cooperation between the Senate and some of the departments than there is today; but that is not the question here. The idea was put forth undoubtedly because it was thought to be a good argument against the waterway. It is not a good argument.

It has been stated by some of the opponents that this resolution is unconstitutional because the subject should have come before us in the form of a treaty. Perhaps it should. It has come before us in the form of a treaty in times past. Probably it could be put in a treaty; but it was not put in a treaty, and the fact that it was not put in a treaty does not make it unconstitutional.

There is a provision in the Constitution of the United States which gives the President the power, with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, to enter into treaties with foreign governments. But, Mr. President, it would be an innocent schoolboy indeed who would say that all those things which refer to relations with other nations must be carried on by the treaty method. No, Mr. President. The right to make treaties did not foreclose all the other ways of carrying on relations with foreign governments. The Constitution provided a simple way, at a time when the founding fathers dreamed of what might be called a council of state. The key to what has taken place is not in the fact that resolutions have been developed and our foreign relations have been carried on as a result of resolutions, statutes, and laws quite as much as by means of treaties. The thing which has made the treaty system not work in our country has been the interpretation of the advice-and-consent provision in the Constitution. Almost since Washington's time there has not been resort to the advice feature in regard to negotiating treaties.

The term "advice and consent" is used in regard to appointments. Everyone knows that we reached the point where one of our Presidents, in defending one of his appointments which the Senate did not see fit to accept, laid down the proposition that the power of nomination remained wholly in the hands of the Executive. That was answered; and I am sure that the textbooks did not allow the law as stated by that President to remain a guide for our country. I am sure that when the time comes we shall go back to the real meaning of "advice and consent," and that we shall not consider it as it is now considered, and as the text writers have considered it, as one act and not two acts. It is extremely interesting to read, in one of the latest books by one of our secretaries of State, that he actually talks about a treaty receiving the "consent" of the Senate. There is not a word about advice. That tendency has gone on, and it is going on. It was because that tendency had gone so far that when we reorganized the Congress of the United States we did something about it. But so far as I know, the other branch of the Government has done nothing about it.

We all know that when the Senate was established it was, with reference to foreign relations, to be a council of state to advise with the President in the matter of who serve the people in their Government. We all know that our first President did not get along very well when he sought advice, and that therefore he did not return for any more. The next President followed suit, which course continued down through our history, until we have reached the point where consent is probably the only thing that is asked of the Senate. The Executive sends up to us the names of persons to serve in the Government. He asks for our consent, but he does not ask our advice. He sends up treaties with which the Congress has had nothing to do. Knowing that situation, and taking a hint from the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], knowing that he was on the committee for the reorganization of Congress and sat with me through all the reorganization hearings, I think there is probably something bigger in what the Senator from Maine said. I read something bigger in it, because in the reorganization of Congress we provided again that the President of the United States should never be left without the kind of advice he should have when great questions faced him. We provided for a policy committee to be made up of Democrats and a policy committe to be made of Republicans. That provision exists in law, so that at any time the President of the United States wishes to have a council of state he will have one which is recognized by both of the parties in the Senate of the United States. He has not used it; no. The old habits continue, despite the action of Congress in attempting to change those habits. The President will use it some day—perhaps not the present President, and perhaps not the next President; but the time will come when we must get rid of the archaic way of acting in compartments and trying to force the will of one compartment on another. That

is no way to run the Government. The theory of the separation of power was never conceived of in that way.

I should like to repeat what I have probably said thousands of times when I have talked about the American Government. There is only one Government of the United States, not three. Sometimes Congress speaks for that Government; sometimes someone behind a desk speaks for it; once in a while the Supreme Court speaks for it; now and then the President speaks for the Government. But the theory was that there should be coordination of ideas and ideals, and that the Government of the United States was not made up simply of the Congress or the President or the Judiciary, but that the three together made one government. Those three branches together have made this country what it is.

Of course, we can find some decision somewhere that a council of state was never contemplated; that we do not want such a thing. We can get anything we want out of this Government by law if we seek far enough. But that is not the way in which our Government actually functions.

Perhaps this resolution should have come to us in the form of a treaty. Probably it would have been better as a treaty. But the fact that it did not come to us in that way does not make that which occurred unconstitutional.

I repeat, the fact that there is provision for the President to make treaties, with the advice and consent of the Senate, two-thirds of the Senate concurring, and so forth, does not mean that all matters relating to our foreign relations shall be handled by the treaty technique. To change the grant given in the Constitution of the United States by that sort of interpretation would bring nothing but chaos and disorder. It would put us into the greatest confusion that could come to us. No, Mr. President, probably the way the pending matter is being handled is not the best way, perhaps it is not the right way, perhaps it is the unwise way, but it is not an unconstitutional way.

I have already pointed out a number of great institutions dealing with foreign relations which have been established as the result of congressional action rather than by treaty action. I could cite a course of them running through our history.

I am sorry, Mr. President, when any Senator argues on the floor on a narrow line. I am also sorry when any Senator argues against a great national project which everyone realizes is necessary or may become necessary at any time. Arguments have been made against it on the score of expediency, or, as someone has said, sectionalism. There cannot be a sectionalist from the State from which I come, because the interests of Utah are so closely intertwined with the interests of every other part of the United States that our economy would fall, our history would fall, our country would fall, and all we strive for and all that we pray for would fall if we were sectionalists. We cannot deal with these great national questions on the basis of a State interest or a regional interest. It is the national interest of which we are thinking and for which we want to strive.

Speaking about the great habit-forming policies which affect our commerce, and, therefore, affect our whole life, let me ask the Senators who are present how many of them, if I may state it that way, would be proud to stand up and say, "I voted against Boulder Dam"? How many of them would be happy to be so listed? How many of them would point out to their grandchildren that "I voted against Boulder Dam"? or "I voted against the Panama Canal"?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think I can answer that question. I think the same number would be proud to get up and say today, "I voted against the Panama Canal," as would be proud to say 20 years from now, "I voted against the St. Lawrence seaway."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator has given a good answer. But let me say to the Senator from Vermont that it would be an interesting thing if he would get out the speeches against Boulder Dam, against the Columbia River project, against the Panama Canal, against the building of railways, and against the road program. Think of it. The public road program had to go to the Supreme Court of the United States. Why? Because someone from some small State in which there was a big population said, "We will not help build roads through Utah and into California." They conceived of the road program of the United States as being something which was done for the villages in which they lived, and they did not see any sense in constructing roads throughout our country.

Read the debates. They make most interesting reading. The one thing that is fine in connection with the subject, Mr. President, is that as time goes on people change their minds and the old notions prevail for only a little while.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. While the Senator was discussing this point I was reminded that sometime ago I had occasion to read the history of the Pure Food and Drug Act. I found that the right of a citizen to buy poisoned food and medicine was proclaimed as a constitutional right on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Let us go even further, Mr. President. I am not a Son of the American Revolution. My parents came to this country, but they were Americans long before they left the old country. I read such things as Bryce's American Commonwealth before I was old enough to read such a book, because that is the sort of reading matter my parents had. When I became a candidate for a Ph. D. degree, I had been away from school for many years and had been active in various parts of the world. I faced a committee of 13 professors, one of whom asked me the question, "Do you know any books about the Government of the United States?" I was scared to answer the question. I hemmed and hawed, and said, "Well, I have been away from the university. I do not know much if anything about books." Then one professor thought he would save me by saying, "Why do you not mention Bryce's American Commonwealth?" I said, "I had better answer you truthfully. I was frightened, because I read it back in the 1890's, and that was quite a while ago. I was just scared to bring up an old book like that." He said, "Well, one as good has not been written since, so it is all right."

Then he wanted to know how it happened that I had read the book back in the nineties, and how it happened that out in my part of the country anyone happened to have such a book at that time. You see, Mr. President, he was a little sectional, and he could scarcely understand how anyone except an easterner would read the new and important books—although as a matter of fact he originally came from Canada.

But, Mr. President, when we study the history of our country and read its Constitution and understand it and see what it has done for the world and realize that anywhere in the world today there is not a constitution that is not fashioned in some way or other on it, and that the Constitution of the United States has become the mother of them all, then we realize that we are dealing with an institution that has meant much to mankind and will mean much more to mankind in the future.

Let me point out at this time that if I had lived in the days of the ratification of the Constitution, I would have hated, in talking to my grandchildren, to say, "Children, I stood with Patrick Henry; I thought the Constitution went too far. I stood with Luther Martin; I thought the Constitution went too far. I was against it"—just as all the bright, unseeing people who are thinking in terms of expediency are against it.

Mr. President, after having gone through so much in the last several generations, cannot we project ourselves? Do not the First World War and the Second World War and what took place between them and what is now occurring in the world give us the right to have hope and vision for the future? Let us never do anything that will stand in the way of keeping and making America strong, because the answer to the question whether the whole world will sink or swim now depends on the strength of America. And, Mr. President, the St. Lawrence waterway will certainly play an important part in making America strong.

So many good reasons can be advanced as justifications for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project that it is difficult to determine which should receive the most emphasis.

However, in the present world situation there are a few which I believe to be of primary importance, and which should receive precedence in our consideration over the other reasons, however reasonable and strong they may be. Bearing in mind the tense, almost chaotic state of mind of the world, its uncertainties, and the lack of confidence

among nations in themselves and other countries, the building of the seaway assumes great significance. In the first place, it would offer concrete evidence of good will between the United States and Canada if they embarked immediately on a large-scale cooperative endeavor such as this project. In the second place, the need for every valid measure of self-defense and national preparedness is only too apparent. And finally, there is equal need to provide for the future.

The negotiation of this agreement for the cooperative construction of the seaway and power project would at once constitute an outstanding concrete example, for the world to see, of that of which there is so little in this day and age, namely, the desire of two adjoining nations to get along together. It would demonstrate their willingness to work together on one common cause for the common good, and their willingness to commit themselves to long-term cooperation. This project involves a certain amount of construction by the United States within the territory of Canada. In many quarters this would be viewed with great alarm as an invasion of the sovereignty of a nation. In this instance it simply means that the United States is willing to bear its share of the costs of one great project which will benefit each country equally, and that Canada has perfect confidence in our motives.

Let us show the world that here at least are two countries who trust each other, who in a healthy spirit of give-and-take are willing to join hands in constructing a magnificent seaway which not only will open up the great midlands of the two countries to the opportunities of water-borne foreign commerce, but also will be of untold benefit to the world.

Western Europe is densely populated and highly industrialized. It is now, and probably will be to an increasing degree in the future, dependent upon the Western Hemisphere to a large extent for its foodstuffs. In prewar years much of its food was obtained from eastern Europe, but now that source is closed to them and probably will remain closed. In the years to come, the United States and Canada will be called upon to supply the western European democracies with foodstuffs, mostly grain. Here in North America is to be found the most efficient, stable agricultural area of the world, producing a recurring surplus of food. This is due to the constant search for better varieties of food and to our efficient methods of culture and harvesting. There is lacking one thing to make available the fruits of this great endeavor—a cheap means of transporting the foodstuffs to where they are so desperately needed, where every dollar must be weighed so carefully and must be spent to accomplish the most good. Every dollar spent for food from the meager resources of the western European nations is spent at the expense of reconstruction and rehabilitation, setting back the day when those nations can stand on their own two feet. Let us provide the missing link between the producers and the consumers by constructing the St. Lawrence seaway. We shall thus provide the cheapest means of transportation known. We shall permit a greater effort to be devoted to reconstruction and rehabilitation. We shall speed the day when those nations can again assume their rightful place in the economic structure of the world.

Not only would the construction of the seaway help Europe, but the possibility of a steady market both for the agricultural products and the industrial products of the Midwest, would be tremendous. The area which would be most directly affected by the seaway has a population of 40,000,000 in the United States alone, and it produces one-half of all the wealth of the Nation, both agricultural and industrial. A steady market for agricultural products will add to the purchasing power of our farm population. This purchasing power, in turn, will create demands for the products of our own and other nations' industries. Such a situation could mean only one thing, prosperity, not alone for ourselves, but for other nations as well. The seaway will be open to the ships of all nations.

The presence of ships from other lands in the heart of our country, with the resultant interchange of commodities, to the advantage of both the buyer and the seller, will in itself contribute to international understanding and good will.

The fear of some of the port cities outside the Lakes area that they will suffer harm by loss of trade to the new seaway is not borne out by the substance of the testimony at the lengthy hearings held in the past on the subject.

From the evidence presented it appears that New York might lose some foreign traffic, but in its place it will gain sufficient traffic to and from lake and St. Lawrence River points to more than offset any loss in foreign trade. Boston will be the nearest of the great North Atlantic ports to the St. Lawrence River route. It can utilize the route to enable its own products and those of its hinterland to reach the great midwestern market, and by means of the same cheap transportation route it can obtain some of the raw materials needed for its industries. On the whole, Boston stands to gain from the construction of the seaway. The mere presence of an alternative means of reaching inland points might tend to reduce rail freight rates, which now are disadvantageous to Boston. Above all, the presence of a great block of hydroelectric power, such as is contemplated in the St. Lawrence project, in the northeast area, hitherto a power-deficit area, will help the industries of that section. New York, Boston, and other North Atlantic ports will then be used for its exports. A correlative saving to New England would appear in the cost of such products of the Middle West as dairy products, hay and feed grains, and automobiles. Savings of up to half of the present rail charges will be possible.

Construction of the waterway will aid Canada to develop her resources in unsettled land contiguous to the river.

This project constitutes only a final step in a logical procession of development. Below Montreal the St. Lawrence has already been improved by Canada to a minimum depth of 32 feet to the ocean. Above Ogdensburg the St. Lawrence and the connecting channels of the Great Lakes have been improved to a minimum depth of 21 feet. Canada has completed the Fourth Welland Canal, connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, with a channel bypassing Niagara Falls. While the 1941 agreement was pending, the United States completed the MacArthur lock—800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet deep over the sills—at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., on the St. Mary's River, at the connection between Lakes Huron and Superior.

The Great Lakes themselves have ample, natural depth for ships of any type. When connecting rivers and channels of the Great Lakes system are improved, under the present plans, to a ruling depth of at least 27 feet, the entire system will accommodate all types of vessels loaded to a draft of about 25 feet in salt water. The project is not designed to accommodate the largest passenger liners or huge battleships such as now use some of our existing ocean ports.

Mr. President, both the United States and Canada stand to gain equally by the development of this cooperative endeavor.

The impelling reason, Mr. President, for the construction of this waterway is its value for the national defense, and I wish to emphasize this point in particular. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, through the Secretary of War, on February 16, 1946, expressed the opinion that construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is important to the national security.

In that letter they stated that in the event of war or other national emergency the project would provide shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, located in a relatively secure area, capable of expansion and of conversion for handling deep-sea vessels, of use as supplemental coastal shipyards. It would also be valuable as an additional line of communication, navigable by ocean shipping, which could, by diversion of some cargo for overseas destinations, ease the strain during wartime on rail transportation and the port facilities of the east and Gulf coasts. This seaway could also serve as a reserve route to be used in the event of interruption of other routes by enemy action. It would provide a large source of cheap, dependable power, which could be generated without the use of crowded rail or highway-transportation facilities. This power would be available in an area which had a power deficit during the past war.

In recent hearings on the subject Secretary of State Marshall confirmed the statements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and added another and highly important asset affecting the war potential of the Nation to be gained as a result of the construction of the project. This is the over-all increase in industrial power of both Canada and the United States. They have agreed to continue joint efforts for the security of North America, which was announced on February 12, 1947, as being the official policy of the two Nations, implemented by the Permanent Joint Board of Defense.

Secretary of State Marshall said that the strength of the United States lies in its natural resources as we have developed them. It is the development of this power that has enabled us to defend ourselves successfully. Here, now, is another potential source of cheap, dependable electrical energy, and a low-cost means of transportation which can increase our productive capacity. Any means of increasing this capacity increases our ability to defend ourselves and should be attained at once.

Fortunately, we have here a magnificent project which can accomplish a great deal for the economies of two great countries and, at the same time, a very definite strengthening of the power of defense.

It is fundamental that in the Western Hemisphere there be unity and strength. Construction of the St. Lawrence seaway will have a very helpful influence in that direction.

We cannot overestimate the dangers arising out of a repetition of the tremendous crisis in transportation and power during the last war. At the same time, it should be noted that there are now occasional shortages of both, even in peacetime. In wartime or in periods of national emergency, every possible means of transportation and source of power would be utilized to the utmost. The facilities of transportation and sources of power which in ordinary times might even be called surplus are soon exhausted by the demands of war, and the cry is for more. We should in times of peace provide resources of immediate value which would also have a crucial value in wartime.

All the great leaders in the past war stated their belief that the St. Lawrence seaway has a distinct military advantage. Had it then been in existence, it would have been of immeasurable assistance, according to Nimitz, Eisenhower, Arnold, Eaker, and Leahy.

There is in existence at the present time a condition of power stringency which may actually become a shortage or deficit should any sudden strain be put on our power industry. Any national emergency now would call for rationing of electricity, and it might even result in a break-down of our industry. Additional electrical energy is needed now and more will have to be produced in the future as our population and industrial needs grow. There has seldom been such a thing as a power surplus. Electrical energy, when made available, is soon utilized. That has always been our experience in the past, and certainly as our industrial processes become more complex we will ever need more and more sources of power. This project is urgently needed now, as a result of a known situation.

Experience of the last war has shown that it is impossible to forecast the needs for power. During the peak of demand for power in 1944 the major electric utilities of the Nation were using nearly ten times the amount used in the last year of World War I. Much of our defense industry is dependent upon large amounts of power. It took 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power during the past war to create a single battleship, and 450,000 kilowatt-hours to produce one B–17, a plane which is already obsolete. Between 1938 and 1944 the utility generating capacity increased about 60 percent, but it was only because of what had hitherto been considered surplus power, available at federally constructed dams in the Tennessee, Columbia, and Colorado River Basins, that the challenge was met. Production of aluminum and magnesium, important metals in any defense program, require vast amounts of electricity, as does atomic research. It was mainly because of the so-called surplus power available on the Tennessee River and the Bonneville development that the Nation was able to carry on the tremendous work at Oak Ridge and Hanford resulting in the development of the atomic bomb.

Some have contended that the power plants on the St. Lawrence would be extremely vulnerable to air attack, presenting an inviting target. But the great concentration of steam-generating plants in the metropolitan New York area with a combined capacity of over 2,000,000 kilowatts are equally vulnerable. As well say that New York City should not build its power plants as to say that the St. Lawrence plant should not, because of vulnerability to attack. The St. Lawrence plant will be much easier to defend from attack by aerial bombs or directed missiles than would New York City. The United States now commands the approaches to the St. Lawrence from military, naval, and air bases acquired from Canada and constructed by the United States during the war.

We must also observe the fact that the power to be generated at the International Rapids will be available the year round because of its design. An ice cover is formed very early but water supply for turning the turbines will be drawn off underneath this cover. This freezing weather will not be a factor so far as the power program is concerned.

In evaluating projects of this type it is well to consider the long-range future needs of the Nation and the benefits that might be expected.

One very important possible development is the effect on the great iron and steel industry of the Middle West.

The vast deposits of high-grade iron ore of the Lake Superior region, long depended upon by that great industry, are now being exhausted of their best grades. The general feeling is that there is only about a 15-year supply left at the present rate of utilization of these ores. Somewhere, somehow, something must be found to take their place. Several possibilities are open, all of them requiring more or less readjustment.

There is the possibility of utilizing the other lower-grade ores of which there are huge quantities. This can be done only by an expensive and complicated process, on the research and improvement of which our steel industry is spending millions. There is the possibility of utilizing high-grade iron ores from other countries. This can be done by any one of several methods. One method is to transfer the iron ore from the ports where it is received by rail to the present site of the industry. This, however, would increase the total cost of production to such an extent that the industry might seriously consider moving the entire plant to the seaboard, truly a tremendous step. Its importance can hardly be estimated. The repercussions throughout the industrial structure of the entire Nation would be hard to calculate. The loss of such a large and important industry to the Middle West would be disastrous.

There remains a comparatively simple, relatively less costly remedy for this approaching dilemma in which an industry absolutely vital to the Nation in peace as well as in wartime will soon find itself. That solution is to build the St. Lawrence seaway. Through this waterway can be brought the high-grade ores of the Quebec-Labrador, Brazilian, and other fields. Private enterprise could soon adapt the present very efficient ore carriers to the open sea, and the iron and steel industry of the Midwest can be kept there. Its raw material, iron ore, can be secured at little higher cost than it is now. Construction of this seaway might well mean the salvation of iron and steel industry in the Midwest, and such a result should be almost sufficient reason alone for undertaking the project.

The impact of the power development on the northeastern part of the Nation is also worth considering seriously.

Through the International Rapids at the boundary of New York and Ontario passes the entire flow of the five Great Lakes. A great reservoir is formed insuring a minimum year-round flow of 230,000 cubic feet per second, available for power. This is enough water to provide generating capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower, or 1,640,000 kilowatts, and it would be second to the Grand Coulee project in magnitude. The United States share, one-half of this, would be exceeded only by Grand Coulee and Hoover Dams.

The water from these inland seas can be used without the necessity of building great dams and providing tremendous reservoirs to impound the water, nor would it be necessary to buy large amounts of land that might be flooded. Nature has provided the reservoir stabilizing the flow and we have a remarkably constant and economical source of power.

The Northeast has been losing population in recent years. Industry has moved away mostly because of the lack of cheap power. Make a large block of cheap power available to this power-deficient area and the trend can be checked, prosperity can return to an area where great labor skills and technological know-how await only a chance to be put to work. Give them a chance to regain their old prosperity by making cheap power available. This is not a project for one section of the country alone. Old industries revived, new industries begun, more products shipped from the great ports of the Northeast, more commodities imported, including raw materials for its industry—all can be set into motion by providing it with the largest single block of hydroelectric power available in the entire area.

Lack of developed hydroelectric power in the Northeast has unquestionably limited industrial expansion in northern New York and nearby areas while 4,000,000 domestic, rural, and small commercial customers for electric energy continue to pay relatively high rates.

The area for which the St. Lawrence power project will provide, including New York and New England, with the exception of Maine, has lagged behind the rest of the Nation in providing new sources of electrical power. In fact, it was necessary during the last war for the War Production Board to impose a ceiling on expansion of war production in the area because of the limited amounts of power available. Two great metallurgical plants, one at Massena on the St. Lawrence and one at Niagara Falls, were forced at rely on importation of steam-generated electricity from New York City, and any additional amounts which could be obtained by importation from Canadian sources and by temporary diversion of Niagara water through existing power turbines. This was a definite handicap to the war effort. We must prevent such a thing happening again. Ontario itself is short of power and we cannot depend on that source.

A competent study by the Federal Power Commission of the needs of the area for electricity has indicated that the entire St. Lawrence output could be absorbed in a very short time. Encroachment on normal reserves, delay in the retirement of old, inefficient generating units, and the development of new industrial demands in anticipation of the availability of St. Lawrence power might well result in absorption of power from this project within a year or so after it becomes available.

Many believe that benefits from this waterway would be as great as those derived from the Panama Canal. It would help a region placed at a disadvantage by the latter which puts eastern industry at an advantage in western markets by making available cheap water transportation from Atlantic to Pacific ports, and vice versa. This would relieve midlands industry now dependent upon relatively high-cost rail transport to reach the great markets of the eastern and western seaboards.

Prospective increases in freight traffic in the United States over the next 15 years will be such as to make the St. Lawrence seaway an absolute necessity in handling our ocean-bound traffic, according to a survey by the Department of Commerce in 1941.

The same survey states that many or all of the ports which claim to be in danger of ill effects from construction of the project will gain new traffic as the result not only of the normal growth of the United States but of the industrial expansion that will be stimulated through this project.

There are many other reasons for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. Every survey made, irrespective of cost estimates, has been favorable to the project. The case has been proved, the plans are ready, and the work should proceed. It is engineeringly feasible and economically justified.

Nature has provided a 90-percent complete waterway. Only 10 percent more needs to be constructed or improved. Canada has completed substantial improvements costing more than $133,000,000; the United States has already invested $32,000,000. Canada is prepared to join us in completion of the project. We should work with her to finish the job.

It is hardly possible for private industry to carry out the project because of the international complications involved. If it is to be done, it must be done by the two Governments.

The project will make available a cheap transportation facility for a vast area of the Middle West which has suffered for a long period from a disadvantageous position in the markets of the world due to high transportation costs. Savings of up to one-half of transportation costs have been estimated for many commodities. Its construction will aid greater industrialization of some sections of the Middle West which are now largely or completely agricultural, reducing dependence upon the vagaries of the international agricultural markets. Even so, the availability of a cheaper means of transportation will tend to be a stabilizing factor for the agriculture of the Middle West.

The low-cost transportation will make available in the Lakes region new and needed raw materials on which to base new industries. New commodities will reach this great market by the same route, at prices which up to now may have prevented their shipment.

The period of time during which the seaway will be entirely ice-free coincides with high-peak demand upon all transportation facilities. Thus it will tend to relieve some of the pressure on them which at times has almost caused a break-down, and at many other times has caused a car shortage on the Nation's railroads. This period covers the time during which the grain crops normally move to market. This grain movement year after year causes the recurring car shortages about which so much is said but so little actually ever done. Would not the construction of this waterway help the railroads rather than hurt them? Even use of the seaway's capacity to the extent of 25,000,000 tons annually would equal only about 4 percent of the railroads' total traffic.

Many have wondered about the possible effect of the construction of the seaway on the coal industry. However, if the experiences of the past are any criteria the coal industry will benefit as much as any other. This has been the experience in the Tennessee Valley region where it was believed that the coal industry would suffer greatly. However, the consumption of coal throughout that area has greatly increased since the inception of the TVA power program. The seaports of the Atlantic seaboard are even now open, as they have been for years, to possible competition from the so-called cheap foreign coals. Has anyone seen much foreign coal there to compete with our American coal? No, on the contrary, several of our great Atlantic ports are highly dependent upon the export of American coal for their prosperity.

New industries and expansion of older industries made possible by the seaway will, on the other hand, increase the demand for coal. Coal is one of the essential raw materials on which a large portion of our industry is based. Cheaper transportation facilities encourage the growth of industry which in turn creates a greater demand for coal. The logic is inescapable.

While New York, Boston, and Buffalo might at first suffer some loss of traffic—the latter particularly some of its terminal grain business—it must not be forgotten that between 80 and 90 percent of the interchange of commodities between the East and West is for domestic consumption and not for exports and imports, upon which the ports depend for their well being. In the long run the increased prosperity of another section of our great country made possible by this project cannot but help to increase the prosperity of our ports. Some certain commodities will still not use the seaway because of the time element. Whatever increases the prosperity of such a large area as the 16 States of the Middle West will increase the prosperity of the whole Nation.

While it is not now a question of primary importance, at some time in the fairly near future the need for more jobs may be of vital importance. During the construction period of from 4 to 8 years many thousands of man-days of labor will be utilized, not only at the site, but in industries throughout the Nation. This stimulation to employment will not, when construction is completed, silently fold up and steal away. It will have a lasting effect especially in the region where construction is located. This alone will far outweigh the cost of the entire project.

There has been some feeling that shipping will not use the seaway. It has been stated by one old in the ways of seafaring that where there is a dollar's worth of trade to be had some boat will go get it. The present shallow 14-foot canal is being used at near capacity now, and profitably. Wood pulp is reaching the farthest west of the lake ports from overseas. It hardly seems conceivable that these ships would engage in an unprofitable business. The present canal has 22 locks, while the projected deeper one would have only 8 locks over the same distance. This would make navigation simpler. Montreal has an average of 4 days of fog a year, while New York has an average of 44. This latter does not seem to prevent shipping from using New York as a port. The route will have the added advantage of enabling shipping to reach Europe from America with a thousand miles less of open water than is the case from the Atlantic ports.

There is no need to fear that cheaply operated foreign vessels will steal away our very profitable trade between ports on the Great Lakes. That is prohibited by the law which restricts coastwise trade to American vessels.

The entire project can be built at little or no cost to the taxpayer in the long

run. Through the medium of a system of tolls on the volume of traffic which testimony at the lengthy hearings on the project would lead us to expect would use the navigation facilities, it would be self-liquidating. Proceeds from a small toll charge, not to exceed $1.25 per ton, would return sufficient funds to pay operation and maintenance costs, as well as to provide for amortization at a reasonable rate of interest. The power phase of the project has been spoken for by the State of New York which will recompense the Federal Government for the cost of the works primarily for power, as well as one-fourth of the costs of those works common to navigation and power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "St. Lawrence River" and insert in lieu thereof "Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Jenner	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Langer	Taylor
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McClellan	Thye
Cooper	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McGrath	Tydings
Donnell	McKellar	Umstead
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Martin	Wherry
Ecton	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Williams
Flanders	Moore	Wilson
Fulbright	Morse	Young
George	Murray	
Green	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the National Resources Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, probably no Senator has a greater interest in the debate which is now going on than has the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. Unfortunately it is impossible for the Senator from New York to be present. He is very anxious that his views be made known to the Senate, and has prepared a statement which he has asked me to read in his behalf and in his stead. I shall now read the statement prepared by the Senator from New York. The views which he expresses, I might say, are also my own views, but at this time, as I read this statement, it will be the statement of the Senator from New York.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT (S. J. RES. 111)

The people of the State of New York have long recognized that they possess a priceless asset in the resources of the St. Lawrence River and that these resources should be fully developed to serve the public good.

As a member of the Legislature of the State of New York and throughout my service in the United States Senate, I have fought for 40 years against the alienation of St. Lawrence power, and the undeveloped power on the Niagara as well, to private interests which have always been eager to get control over these resources for private gain.

Thanks to policies established under the administrations of Gov. Alfred E. Smith, Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, these great water powers were preserved under public control and are now available for public development and use for the general benefit of millions of residential, commercial, and rural customers for electric service within transmission distance of the power sites.

I was not prepared in 1934 when a plan for developing the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway was presented to the Senate, to support the initiation of the project largely because of the existence of great surpluses of transportation and power facilities then prevailing. By 1941, however, the requirements of this country for more power and transportation facilities had expanded to a point at which it became evident that the development of the St. Lawrence for the dual purposes of power and navigation was urgently and imperatively needed. Accordingly, President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull negotiated with Canada the agreement of March 19, 1941, to complete the development, and to this agreement I have given my consistent support.

I voted for approval of the agreement and for authorization of the project in the Senate December 12, 1944, and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations June 13, 1946, and July 18, 1947. On October 2, 1945, I joined as a cosponsor with Senator BARKLEY, Senator VANDENBERG, Senator AIKEN, and others of a joint resolution to give effect to the United States-Canadian Agreement and to provide for construction of the project.

Long and careful study of the project as presented at public hearings before the committee and on the Senate floor has convinced me that the full development of the St. Lawrence River will be of incalculable value to the people of the entire State of New York, of the United States, and of the Dominion of Canada.

I am aware that fears have been expressed that further improvement of the St. Lawrence River, existing canals and locks of which are now used to capacity to carry a large commerce, might in some way adversely affect ports on the Atlantic and Gulf and other transportation facilities. Exhaustive investigation and extensive hearings have shown that these fears rest on no substantial foundations. The project has, in fact, been recommended as beneficial to existing ports and to the railroads in creating new traffic and a net gain in tonnage available to New York, Boston, Buffalo, and other great shipping centers, by the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Commerce, the United States Maritime Commission, and by the Committee on Foreign Relations in its reports June 13, 1946, and January 7, 1948. The overwhelming weight of the evidence before the committee fully supports these conclusions.

Because of the natural advantages which have made it the greatest port in the world, because of the immense population and productivity of the immediate area which account for the great bulk of the tonnage annually handled by the port, I have no fears for the future of the Port of New York. I would not support any measure which would harm the city of New York. On the other hand, I do not consider inimical to New York, and would not obstruct, the development of the great ports on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, or on the Great Lakes, which do business with New York to their mutual benefit and share in the commerce of the Nation as a whole.

The direct benefits of the power development on the St. Lawrence River are so great that they stand virtually unchallenged on the record. Here on the New York-Ontario frontier is 2,200,000 horsepower of potential hydroelectric energy running to waste in the greatest market for power and electricity in the world.

During World War II it was necessary to restrict expansion of plants in New York State manufacturing essential war materials because of the lack of developed low-cost power in up-State areas. In 1947 a serious shortage developed in the area between Buffalo and Albany, resulting in October in curtailment of power use and interruptions in production in more than 90 industrial plants in the State.

The use of electricity in New York State, as in the United States, has steadily expanded in recent years until, in 1947, it rose above the peak established in World War II. The development of St. Lawrence power is imperatively necessary if the homes, farms, and industries of the area are to share in the benefits of increased electrification, greater use of electric appliances, and improved standards of living enjoyed in other areas where hydroelectric energy has been made available at low cost.

The development of the St. Lawrence will help to provide low-cost energy to meet a part of the growth in these demands—a growth which cannot otherwise be met except by increased consumption of oil, coal, and other exhaustible resources, at costs to the consumers far above the cost of hydroelectric energy, and with recurring shortages of oil and other fuels in the Northeast.

The fact that the St. Lawrence development is needed by and will benefit the neighboring Dominion of Canada, as well as the United States, emphasizes its value. These two great democracies have fought two world wars as allies since the project to complete the development of their greatest resource on the common frontier was first proposed.

America has grown great by developing its matchless resources. The Erie Canal, built by New York State, the Panama Canal, the TVA, and other great multiple-purpose projects throughout the country have contributed to the welfare of the whole Nation. The St. Lawrence development is in this tradition and in the American spirit of courageous enterprise, which we need today as never before.

In the light of our problems in the post-war world, and in view of the demonstrated need for the facilities to be provided by the

St. Lawrence development, I shall continue to support pending legislation to approve the United States-Canadian agreement and the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) to authorize construction of the project.

Mr. President, I am glad to have the privilege of submitting to the Senate the views of the Senator from New York as he has thus expressed them.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I hope that during the period before the St. Lawrence seaway vote is finally taken, of February 27, my colleagues will become informed as to public opinion in their States and areas. I firmly believe that even men who are strongly committed to oppose the seaway will find that opinion in their areas supports this seaway.

I make this statement on the basis of all of the public-opinion polls which have been taken, which sustain my belief that the people of America are wholeheartedly behind the St. Lawrence seaway. Many of my colleagues will be returning to their home States during the next 2 weeks and to other States to make public statements. I trust that they will seek the reactions of their constituents and of as many American citizens as they can contact during this period. I believe that they will find that America believes, on the whole, that to oppose the St. Lawrence seaway is as illogical and unworthy as was opposition to the Suez Canal a half a century ago.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. No. I have not concluded my statement.

I appeal to my colleagues to listen to the voice of enlightened American citizens, looking forward to the needs of our expanding Nation, rather than to the fearists, the few selfish men who fear, although there is really no justification for their fear, that their narrow interests will be hurt by the St. Lawrence seaway.

There is widespread talk to the effect that the St. Lawrence seaway is already defeated on the basis of preliminary tallies which have been taken informally. I say that such talk is not only completely unjustified, but is absolutely unsound and untrue. The opponents of the seaway are trying to spread defeatism and pessimism among the seaway supporters. On the contrary, I am still confident that if my colleagues will approach this problem open-minded, if they will consider the national interests as against petty sectional interests, if they will listen to the voice of American public opinion rather than the voice of a few selfish interests, they will enable the seaway bill to be passed by the Senate.

Now I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin tell me what statement it is that he is reading?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly. It is a statement I have prepared.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator not think he ought to point out to the Senate that there is a difference between the Suez Canal and the St. Lawrence seaway, in that the Suez Canal is never frozen up?

Mr. WILEY. I think that has been discussed. I am just making an appeal now to the group who are going home this coming week to discuss the principles of Lincoln, and who are going to preach the patriotism that has made America great. They are going to talk about the unity Lincoln advocated. When a suggestion was made to "let the South go," Lincoln replied, "No; we are one Nation." Senators will be orating about the unity that Webster, a gentleman from the Senator's own State, exemplified when he said that we were one Nation, one and invincible, and that we want no East or West or North or South, that we were builders of a great Nation. We have our eye on the future, not on the past. That is why I make this appeal.

That is my statement. I could carry on in the same vein for hours, because I am sold on the merits of this great nation-building project.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. LODGE. I am sure the Senator could carry on for hours, and I know that I would enjoy listening to every word that he said.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is kind.

Mr. LODGE. Not at all; I really mean it. I never tire of listening to the Senator from Wisconsin, because he comes forward with statements which are certainly very, very startling. But I do regret, I want to say again, as I have said it before, that in this statement, as in so many others, the Senator undertakes to accuse the opponents of the St. Lawrence project of selfish motives. I have never impugned the motives of the Senator from Wisconsin in this matter. I have always assumed that he was motivated by the loftiest patriotism. I have taken great care never by any kind of insinuation or implication or innuendo to make any argument that was not a national argument; and I am not going to change now. I am not going to impugn his motives now, but I do want to express regret that every time the Senator from Wisconsin rises to talk about the pending measure he seems to be so barren of real arguments that he finds it necessary to impugn the motives of the opposition.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I wish to reply to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 15 seconds? I wish to ask that permission be given for the Committee on the Allocation of Grain to hold hearings this afternoon.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I realize that one of the motives that Abraham Lincoln——

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is the Senator from Wisconsin. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Chair. I wish to inform the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and his colleagues that the Senator from Wisconsin is in his place and is in a good situation.

I desire to say, in reply to the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, that Lincoln always said that when a man indulged in impugning the motives of others, it indicated he had a poor case of his own. Yet, Mr. President, I also remember that the Good Book suggests that he who does not look after his own is unworthy. I am not impugning the motives of the Senator from Massachusetts. I am simply saying that he has too narrow a view, that he is provincial in his outlook, that he can see only the railroads and the Port of Boston. I am saying that this Nation is made up of 48 States. I am saying that when we have built the ports on the Atlantic and have spent hundreds of millions to build the ports on the Gulf and on the Pacific, we are entitled to have seven more locks built—we already have built eight—in a stretch of some 90 to 95 miles, which will give to America a fourth seacoast. That is all there is to it. So, when I suggested that when Senators return to their homes they consult their constituents, I am sure it was again a little element of fear in the Senator's bosom that he might find that his folks were leading the band wagon instead of his doing so that caused him to take exception to my remarks. I intended nothing personal. I love the Senator, I assure him, in spite of his shortcomings on the pending measure. He is always a gentleman, and I trust I shall always be one, but I can never refuse to bring to light a provincial or sectional view that impedes the general progress of the Nation, and that is my only purpose at this time.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Star of January 27, 1948, in relation to the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY WAIT

[From the Indianapolis Star of January 27, 1948]

Renewed proposals for spending hundreds of millions of public funds on the proposed St. Lawrence River seaway strikes a sour note at this time. The President has sent to Congress a record-breaking peacetime budget of $39,669,000,000. Members, in both parties, are earnestly studying items that could and should be cut.

No advocate of the St. Lawrence seaway is contending that it is an emergency project that cannot wait. Regardless of the advantages or lack of usefulness that may be urged concerning that proposal, it is not a must item. The taxpayers should not be assessed to finance any such undertaking as the St. Lawrence project. That proposal at least should be on the backlog of improvements to be taken up in seasons of business recession. There is bound to come times of unemployment. Federal funds could be used advantageously to take up the slack in such periods. Labor is scarce. The government should not be needlessly in competition with those seeking men and materials for housing and the other greatly needed construction.

It will be time enough to talk about that St. Lawrence improvement when we have labor and money to spare.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the arguments advanced by the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway is that the seaway would further cause bottleneck of railroad transportation, because it would complicate railroad transportation in the winter months, when the seaway would be closed up because of ice and when the railroads would already be jammed with traffic. That argument is effectively disproved on the basis of facts which I have just secured from the Department of Commerce. At my request, the Department submitted to me an analysis of railroad-car loadings. This analysis was based upon information supplied by the Association of American Railroads, and I ask unanimous consent that the tables be reproduced at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As my colleagues know, I have sought consistently to keep insertions in the RECORD at a minimum, including only necessary materials. However, I do believe that these tables of car loadings are of outstanding importance not only to this St. Lawrence seaway project discussion, but to our consideration of the entire subject of railway transportation, which is uppermost in everyone's minds.

Now, what do these tables show? A brief inspection, even by a layman, shows that peak loadings occur for all commodities normally during the months ranging from August to November, inclusive. Thus, the position that we have taken that the St. Lawrence seaway, rather than complicate railroad traffic during the winter months, would actually serve to ease railroad traffic on the basis of all-year transportation is sustained in view of the fact that the peak of railroad traffic is during the late summer and fall months, at the very time that the seaway would be operating at maximum capacity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total cars of revenue freight loaded, by months, 1937–47 [1]

TOTAL, ALL COMMODITIES

Month	1947	1946	1945	1944	1943	1942	1941	1940	1939	1938	1937
January	3,168,397	2,883,863	3,003,655	3,158,700	2,910,638	3,181,945	2,840,238	2,557,735	2,288,730	2,256,717	2,714,449
February	3,179,198	2,866,876	3,052,487	3,154,116	3,055,725	3,122,942	2,866,565	2,488,879	2,282,866	2,155,536	2,763,457
March	4,170,420	3,982,240	4,022,088	3,916,037	3,845,547	4,003,819	3,749,413	3,123,916	2,976,655	2,746,428	3,707,395
April	3,232,947	2,604,049	3,377,335	3,275,846	3,152,879	3,380,869	2,904,527	2,495,212	2,225,188	2,126,471	2,991,677
May	4,376,122	3,242,821	*4,294,351	4,252,314	4,030,804	4,166,326	4,218,701	3,351,840	2,926,408	2,688,439	3,787,619
June	3,543,476	3,436,013	3,528,630	3,528,188	3,335,784	3,284,706	3,397,476	2,896,953	2,563,953	2,257,041	3,075,578
July	3,275,827	3,406,866	3,379,284	3,459,830	3,455,328	3,431,395	3,555,098	2,822,450	2,532,236	2,272,941	2,991,903
August	*4,559,767	*4,478,425	4,100,512	*4,473,872	*4,455,769	*4,375,865	*4,379,141	3,717,933	3,387,672	3,040,100	*3,902,129
September	3,600,436	3,517,219	3,255,757	3,527,162	3,555,391	3,522,709	3,660,315	3,135,122	3,102,236	2,595,482	3,211,743
October	3,808,271	3,680,634	3,151,185	3,598,245	3,607,851	3,604,323	3,635,111	3,269,476	3,355,701	2,842,632	3,156,533
November	4,424,254	4,220,285	4,011,044	4,172,739	4,167,563	3,996,315	4,256,413	*3,780,423	*3,708,292	*3,176,671	3,235,705
December	3,164,234	3,021,987	2,741,792	2,891,246	2,866,672	2,699,888	2,889,129	2,717,915	2,561,561	2,298,620	2,132,276
Total	44,503,349	41,341,278	41,918,120	43,408,295	42,439,951	42,771,102	42,352,127	36,357,854	33,911,498	30,457,078	37,670,464
First quarter	10,518,015	9,732,979	10,078,230	10,228,853	9,811,910	10,308,706	9,456,216	8,170,530	7,548,251	7,158,681	9,185,301
Second quarter	11,152,545	9,282,883	*11,200,316	11,056,348	10,519,467	10,831,901	10,520,704	8,744,005	7,715,549	7,071,951	9,854,874
Third quarter	*11,436,030	*11,402,510	10,735,553	*11,460,864	*11,466,488	*11,329,969	*11,594,554	9,675,505	9,022,144	7,908,523	*10,105,775
Fourth quarter	11,396,759	10,922,906	9,904,021	10,662,230	10,642,086	10,300,526	10,780,653	*9,767,814	*9,625,554	*8,317,923	8,524,514

GRAIN AND GRAIN PRODUCTS

January	215,545	207,184	176,033	226,844	196,906	176,409	126,995	117,396	128,612	149,772	120,463
February	201,642	208,805	166,607	207,891	202,504	153,500	119,318	123,374	115,811	126,628	114,609
March	264,779	236,531	218,402	223,333	230,484	181,226	172,947	163,429	157,296	164,389	145,158
April	190,935	140,365	200,124	152,947	176,359	141,906	134,825	131,403	127,119	128,097	113,543
May	212,680	192,922	257,121	197,231	213,565	173,262	185,858	152,826	166,761	156,611	128,660
June	200,393	182,422	225,190	201,157	211,263	160,038	187,432	137,051	171,569	159,690	150,491
July	274,920	228,146	256,979	236,787	234,705	195,063	*225,512	203,288	200,028	223,389	198,120
August	*317,381	*255,114	*314,065	250,607	*279,941	*227,862	214,302	*207,063	*210,327	*232,582	*210,202
September	209,922	190,530	220,572	193,593	208,602	194,482	170,705	160,083	178,409	147,571	139,799
October	215,872	199,698	223,074	207,890	238,943	196,521	145,052	153,825	164,785	179,096	151,379
November	245,367	248,057	281,881	*251,424	270,653	212,475	200,507	166,418	186,343	172,504	190,979
December	177,406	207,269	193,920	171,029	184,383	172,278	144,371	118,437	133,004	126,989	125,563
Total	2,726,842	2,497,043	2,733,968	2,520,733	2,648,308	2,185,022	2,027,824	1,834,593	1,940,064	1,967,318	1,788,966
First quarter	681,966	652,520	561,042	658,068	629,894	511,135	419,260	404,199	401,719	440,789	380,230
Second quarter	604,008	515,709	682,435	551,335	601,187	475,206	508,115	421,280	465,449	444,398	392,694
Third quarter	*802,223	*673,790	*791,616	*680,987	*723,248	*617,407	*610,519	*576,434	*588,764	*603,542	*548,121
Fourth quarter	638,645	655,024	698,875	630,343	693,979	581,274	489,930	438,680	484,132	478,589	467,921

LIVESTOCK

January	67,966	65,061	63,290	65,732	54,875	53,622	46,945	50,311	52,774	58,323	56,354
February	48,639	72,878	54,405	60,958	50,711	42,021	41,178	43,305	42,126	45,118	44,953
March	67,203	78,851	71,787	72,857	65,470	54,787	52,152	53,128	53,120	54,742	56,288
April	54,379	71,561	61,984	60,054	59,788	51,588	47,665	44,801	50,429	47,247	54,182
May	66,157	72,658	74,552	72,817	69,154	60,788	54,795	57,464	58,946	62,006	63,182
June	49,298	53,805	55,981	56,571	47,367	42,355	36,536	41,961	39,904	41,830	44,768
July	46,088	73,971	52,222	54,746	53,127	42,344	39,386	40,553	44,427	44,436	41,194
August	62,037	79,775	76,479	80,831	79,448	72,868	58,009	62,360	62,036	63,714	71,617
September	74,103	63,458	81,554	82,835	84,616	76,200	65,321	69,364	75,838	65,109	75,158
October	91,069	112,240	105,394	103,893	104,035	*96,178	*83,230	*86,183	*84,193	84,580	*84,137
November	*92,884	*117,460	*125,266	*115,776	*110,692	96,028	76,986	85,815	80,696	*85,721	81,057
December	50,459	63,201	70,611	65,075	58,494	56,401	49,107	50,037	49,757	50,094	48,711
Total	770,282	924,919	893,525	892,145	837,777	745,180	651,310	685,282	694,246	702,920	721,601
First quarter	183,808	216,790	189,482	199,547	171,056	150,430	140,275	146,744	148,020	158,183	157,595
Second quarter	169,834	198,024	192,517	189,442	176,309	154,731	138,996	144,226	149,279	151,083	162,132
Third quarter	182,228	217,204	210,255	218,412	217,191	*191,412	162,716	172,277	182,301	173,259	187,969
Fourth quarter	*234,412	*292,901	*301,271	*284,744	*273,221	248,607	*209,323	*222,035	*214,646	*220,395	*213,905

[1] 1947 will be revised with weekly reports of 1948 (A. A. R. footnote).

NOTE.—"*" designates peak loadings.

Total cars of revenue freight loaded, by months, 1937–47 [1]—Continued

FOREST PRODUCTS

Month	1947	1946	1945	1944	1943	1942	1941	1940	1939	1938	1937
January	167,221	127,620	149,982	163,262	145,829	175,274	154,752	114,696	103,572	102,175	122,814
February	194,988	145,924	159,579	173,984	159,953	184,970	155,274	121,315	98,960	105,215	139,088
March	*249,776	208,061	206,772	217,236	205,543	232,518	195,422	159,986	131,752	132,303	188,590
April	183,224	176,751	163,984	175,430	171,001	198,231	163,283	128,628	112,582	98,637	145,677
May	233,323	200,806	*217,935	220,683	218,724	247,875	204,991	166,273	147,904	129,375	197,938
June	188,406	192,551	184,282	193,600	178,787	196,047	169,649	138,726	124,041	107,054	159,659
July	178,057	181,108	165,317	185,613	179,345	214,124	186,104	126,427	118,414	103,930	158,890
August	247,668	*253,825	217,842	*250,222	*240,223	*266,783	*237,336	185,788	159,712	*149,609	*198,753
September	190,774	197,043	159,250	174,369	177,043	195,907	185,966	156,785	137,988	121,913	150,719
October	191,276	191,690	141,645	173,189	178,285	194,669	181,538	166,841	152,112	126,850	137,942
November	221,947	222,218	162,121	201,760	220,541	202,750	210,833	*193,089	*176,748	138,059	139,247
December	168,044	165,649	110,283	142,102	153,633	136,083	144,692	141,096	120,551	102,749	88,715
Total	2,414,704	2,263,246	2,038,992	2,271,450	2,228,907	2,445,231	2,189,840	1,799,650	1,584,336	1,417,869	1,828,032
First quarter	611,985	481,605	516,333	554,482	511,325	592,762	505,448	395,997	334,284	339,693	450,492
Second quarter	604,953	570,108	*566,201	589,713	568,512	642,153	537,923	433,627	384,527	335,066	503,274
Third quarter	*616,499	*631,976	542,409	*610,204	*596,611	*676,814	*609,406	469,000	416,114	*375,452	*508,362
Fourth quarter	581,267	579,557	414,049	517,051	552,459	533,502	537,063	*501,026	*449,411	367,658	365,904

MERCHANDISE L. C. L.

January	445,250	447,987	384,062	402,585	345,344	587,814	595,644	553,673	560,909	571,096	631,778
February	461,483	471,255	395,572	404,792	369,626	596,789	605,018	571,125	576,765	576,752	640,947
March	*619,700	619,343	536,533	530,880	490,106	*723,892	*800,918	741,356	769,270	*760,138	*856,971
April	504,863	515,317	451,765	427,716	393,944	498,175	648,350	594,854	617,354	599,410	688,528
May	592,682	575,261	539,507	519,949	480,892	476,500	790,679	727,215	744,938	726,924	834,549
June	464,232	510,385	429,836	419,822	395,943	362,884	617,273	594,827	610,923	586,710	674,108
July	429,010	469,623	405,690	399,059	383,436	353,224	620,561	569,328	582,953	562,731	638,496
August	576,973	609,636	512,384	*537,335	505,274	448,888	766,789	*754,667	*772,184	753,241	843,883
September	467,253	476,119	419,196	425,558	399,742	349,464	641,045	605,256	622,950	602,829	667,638
October	490,821	517,354	455,409	435,911	419,555	368,143	638,752	635,804	640,368	639,952	681,953
November	588,090	*640,812	*571,785	330,760	*520,340	445,091	765,430	752,047	766,086	746,654	778,339
December	432,190	472,203	426,770	393,561	375,518	325,928	549,056	578,237	566,235	555,410	530,678
Total	6,072,547	6,325,295	5,528,509	5,427,928	5,079,720	5,536,792	8,039,515	7,679,389	7,830,935	7,681,847	8,465,868
First quarter	1,526,433	1,538,585	1,316,167	1,338,257	1,205,076	1,908,495	2,001,580	1,866,154	1,906,944	1,907,986	2,129,696
Second quarter	*1,561,777	1,600,963	1,421,108	*1,367,487	1,270,779	1,337,559	*2,056,302	1,916,896	1,973,215	1,913,044	*2,197,185
Third quarter	1,473,236	1,555,378	1,337,270	1,361,952	1,288,452	1,151,576	2,028,395	1,930,251	*1,978,087	1,918,801	2,148,017
Fourth quarter	1,511,101	*1,630,369	*1,453,964	1,360,232	*1,315,413	1,139,162	1,953,238	*1,966,088	1,972,689	*1,942,016	1,990,970

MISCELLANEOUS

January	1,408,953	1,274,298	1,468,763	1,452,963	1,392,658	1,420,080	1,205,198	987,212	878,326	823,007	1,067,586
February	1,429,648	1,170,978	1,500,231	1,466,363	1,453,264	1,407,416	1,224,878	972,698	870,434	809,181	1,106,403
March	1,910,227	1,786,251	*1,995,678	1,882,458	1,834,937	1,854,044	1,670,533	1,282,202	1,223,781	1,120,317	1,556,831
April	1,535,769	1,491,500	1,602,080	1,526,143	1,519,303	1,509,594	1,400,248	1,060,937	1,004,058	871,662	1,289,819
May	1,909,273	1,643,222	1,993,714	1,896,107	1,895,359	1,880,622	1,795,451	1,366,586	1,246,486	1,085,622	*1,573,606
June	1,555,266	1,481,638	1,584,678	1,558,130	1,544,939	1,497,915	1,454,736	1,188,581	1,030,264	903,171	1,252,395
July	1,461,053	1,444,520	1,506,702	1,536,743	1,498,840	1,555,705	1,461,596	1,092,330	981,231	878,709	1,180,667
August	1,992,197	1,937,699	1,776,245	*2,005,728	1,950,041	*2,026,537	1,832,937	1,449,617	1,317,488	1,194,043	1,550,945
September	1,592,053	1,522,542	1,380,871	1,608,298	1,576,244	1,658,651	1,586,221	1,258,439	1,236,831	1,043,094	1,284,531
October	1,728,197	1,598,886	1,437,470	1,654,244	1,621,907	1,729,458	1,606,883	1,400,035	1,356,853	1,141,148	1,262,620
November	*2,029,713	*1,976,049	1,776,178	1,982,532	*1,951,186	1,901,707	*1,906,984	*1,613,868	*1,528,462	*1,272,365	1,276,026
December	1,495,211	1,416,560	1,235,265	1,437,538	1,332,266	1,313,196	1,330,091	1,169,707	1,076,461	883,462	772,181
Total	20,047,562	18,744,143	19,257,875	20,007,247	19,570,944	19,754,925	18,475,756	14,842,212	13,750,675	12,025,781	15,173,610
First quarter	4,748,828	4,231,527	4,964,672	4,801,784	4,680,859	4,681,540	4,100,609	3,242,112	2,972,541	2,752,505	3,730,820
Second quarter	5,000,310	4,616,360	*5,180,472	4,980,380	4,959,601	4,888,131	4,650,435	3,616,104	3,280,808	2,860,455	*4,115,820
Third quarter	5,045,303	4,904,761	4,663,818	*5,150,769	*5,025,125	*5,240,893	*4,880,754	3,800,386	3,535,550	3,115,846	4,016,143
Fourth quarter	*5,253,121	*4,991,495	4,448,913	5,074,314	4,905,359	4,944,361	4,843,958	*4,183,610	*3,961,776	*3,296,975	3,310,827

COAL

January	759,180	683,960	660,643	728,205	656,830	658,683	606,044	646,930	500,998	497,492	626,373
February	736,021	740,072	671,208	724,241	704,570	628,938	613,446	574,533	514,624	441,561	626,813
March	917,092	*937,719	828,484	842,924	863,838	757,671	716,362	627,054	564,466	454,473	*788,931
April	546,873	126,134	613,454	678,263	643,094	666,439	197,222	445,563	242,057	330,973	480,017
May	921,742	388,821	760,842	873,898	699,071	823,947	734,372	584,736	376,576	430,494	573,541
June	707,772	724,879	694,598	710,028	561,161	617,846	584,485	488,113	394,372	345,241	456,267
July	494,633	668,135	635,319	657,936	696,901	650,449	650,438	474,021	413,551	353,036	430,321
August	885,864	925,266	783,337	*878,713	*882,691	*825,314	*824,401	657,104	586,905	498,700	607,682
September	712,788	743,036	662,291	684,568	708,344	662,897	672,257	561,610	588,632	482,978	584,171
October	757,836	754,614	504,759	694,221	674,164	668,267	666,855	505,122	658,386	534,953	625,588
November	*934,244	712,048	*867,451	832,111	766,109	810,918	777,836	*694,545	*717,336	*652,187	663,083
December	714,171	599,337	613,822	584,410	650,263	585,061	562,597	560,283	524,617	518,651	514,151
Total	9,088,216	8,004,021	8,296,208	8,889,518	8,507,036	8,356,430	7,606,315	6,819,614	6,082,520	5,540,739	6,976,938
First quarter	2,412,293	*2,361,751	*2,160,335	*2,295,370	2,225,238	2,045,292	1,935,852	1,848,517	1,580,088	1,393,526	*2,042,117
Second quarter	2,176,387	1,239,834	2,068,894	2,262,189	1,903,326	2,108,232	1,516,079	1,518,412	1,013,005	1,106,708	1,509,825
Third quarter	2,093,285	2,336,437	2,080,947	2,221,217	*2,287,936	*2,138,660	*2,147,096	1,692,735	1,589,088	1,334,714	1,622,174
Fourth quarter	*2,406,251	2,065,999	1,986,032	2,110,742	2,090,536	2,064,246	2,007,288	*1,759,950	*1,900,339	*1,705,791	1,802,822

[1] 1947 will be revised with weekly reports of 1948 (A. A. R. footnote).

NOTE.—"*" designates peak loadings.

Total cars of revenue freight loaded, by months, 1937–47 [1]—Continued

COKE

Month	1947	1946	1945	1944	1943	1942	1941	1940	1939	1938	1937
January	56,330	43,314	56,294	61,735	61,007	57,904	54,661	49,782	30,091	26,495	47,440
February	57,713	32,401	59,180	60,608	59,993	57,098	56,920	42,999	29,828	22,520	48,324
March	72,509	65,764	*76,324	*74,004	*74,607	69,255	66,246	45,116	34,847	23,817	*57,909
April	52,724	29,898	55,605	58,957	57,791	55,768	37,982	30,053	22,970	16,085	41,613
May	71,559	24,168	74,964	73,895	68,528	70,153	*66,339	41,942	24,375	20,637	50,163
June	54,446	44,582	55,643	59,720	51,819	54,958	53,384	41,623	23,161	16,290	39,665
July	48,617	52,302	57,087	57,430	54,723	55,447	53,276	41,475	24,172	16,897	40,701
August	70,248	*69,886	63,769	70,369	72,821	69,735	65,464	53,778	34,815	23,343	48,759
September	54,069	55,208	46,643	55,081	58,989	56,029	53,250	43,784	36,987	23,287	41,049
October	59,575	57,204	33,787	56,524	60,562	57,082	52,064	46,990	46,224	24,128	35,374
November	73,900	*63,908	63,250	69,088	71,661	*70,901	64,448	*60,900	*58,579	*34,412	34,088
December	60,329	48,255	52,161	53,274	59,186	57,447	54,807	50,244	47,637	26,728	22,732
Total	732,019	586,890	694,707	750,685	751,687	731,777	678,841	548,686	413,686	274,639	507,817
First quarter	186,552	141,479	*191,798	*196,347	*195,607	184,257	*177,827	137,897	94,766	72,832	*153,673
Second quarter	178,729	98,648	186,212	192,572	178,138	180,879	157,805	113,618	70,506	53,012	131,441
Third quarter	172,934	*177,396	167,499	182,880	186,533	181,211	171,990	139,037	95,974	63,527	130,509
Fourth quarter	193,804	*169,367	149,198	178,886	191,409	*185,430	171,319	*158,134	*152,440	*85,268	92,194

ORE

January	47,952	34,439	44,588	57,374	57,189	52,159	49,999	37,735	33,448	28,357	41,641
February	49,064	24,563	45,705	55,279	55,104	52,210	50,533	39,530	34,318	28,561	42,320
March	69,134	49,720	88,108	72,345	80,562	130,426	74,833	51,645	42,123	36,249	56,717
April	164,180	52,523	228,339	196,336	131,599	259,168	274,952	58,973	48,619	34,360	178,298
May	368,704	144,963	*375,716	397,734	385,511	433,179	*386,216	254,798	160,422	76,770	365,980
June	323,663	245,751	298,422	329,160	344,505	352,663	293,981	266,071	169,719	97,055	298,225
July	343,349	289,061	299,968	331,516	354,251	365,039	318,225	275,028	167,460	89,813	305,514
August	*407,399	*347,224	356,391	*400,067	*445,330	*437,878	379,903	*347,556	244,205	*124,868	*370,288
September	299,474	269,283	285,380	302,860	341,811	329,079	285,550	278,801	224,601	108,701	268,678
October	273,625	248,948	249,647	272,373	310,400	294,005	260,737	274,676	*252,780	111,925	177,540
November	238,109	249,733	163,112	189,288	256,381	256,445	253,389	213,741	194,042	74,769	72,886
December	66,424	49,513	38,960	44,257	52,929	53,494	54,408	49,874	43,299	34,537	29,545
Total	2,651,177	1,995,721	2,474,336	2,648,589	2,815,572	3,015,745	2,682,726	2,148,428	1,615,036	845,965	2,207,632
First quarter	166,150	108,722	178,401	184,998	192,855	234,795	175,365	128,910	109,889	93,167	140,678
Second quarter	856,547	443,237	902,477	923,230	861,615	1,045,010	955,149	579,842	378,760	208,185	842,503
Third quarter	*1,050,322	*905,568	*941,739	*1,034,443	*1,141,392	*1,131,996	*983,678	*901,385	*636,266	*323,382	*944,480
Fourth quarter	578,158	538,194	451,719	505,918	619,710	603,994	568,534	538,291	490,121	221,231	279,971

[1] 1947 will be revised with weekly reports of 1948 (A. A. R. footnote).

NOTE.—"*" designates peak loadings.
Source: Cars of Revenue Freight Loaded, 1947–28. CS54–B. Association of American Railroads, Jan. 7, 1948. Original data gives weekly break-down.

TRIBUTE TO JULIUS H. BARNES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have referred previously to some of the great men in business and in government who have contributed virtually their entire lifetimes to the advancement of the St. Lawrence seaway project. Their selfless endeavor is an inspiring story of American patriotism. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement, which I have prepared on the subject of one of these men, a world-renowned shipping authority and builder, to whom I have already referred, Mr. Julius Barnes, a great pioneer on behalf of the seaway project.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO MR. JULIUS H. BARNES

The ranks of the great pioneers for the St. Lawrence waterway are filled with some of the greatest names in recent American history—statesmen of public affairs and businessmen of farsighted vision. One such businessman is Mr. Julius H. Barnes, of Duluth, president of the National St. Lawrence Association, which has spearheaded efforts for the completion of this indispensable project. The record of this indefatigable leader speaks for itself. Mr. Barnes was president of the United States Food Administration Grain Corporation from 1917 to 1919. He was United States Wheat Director from 1919 to 1920. He was president of the United States Chamber of Commerce from 1922 to 1924, and chairman of the board of directors of the United States Chamber of Commerce from 1929 to 1931.

Mr. Barnes is a successful businessman who represents the very best and the very finest in the American free-enterprise system. Recently, he added to the long series of outstanding presentations which he has made on the seaway by preparation of a very interesting 71-page booklet entitled "Vast Peoples Are Stirring—Which Way—Americanism or Communism?" I wish that every one of my colleagues could read this booklet and grasp its vital message—the need for the St. Lawrence seaway to preserve American preeminence in world affairs and to counteract Russia's aggressive steps for industrial, political, and commercial expansion.

It is absolutely inevitable that the St. Lawrence waterway will one day soon be enacted. The forces of progress in our land are irresistible and this great project to which Mr. Julius H. Barnes has contributed of his efforts and his genius so long, so nobly, and so selflessly will, I trust, in the not-too-distant future reach fruition.

The Midwest and all America may well be proud of this great man whose efforts over the years have not been in vain, but will bear increasing fruit in the years and the decades and the generations to come.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA AND THE WORLD OF TOMORROW

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, this year one of the great organizations of our country is observing its thirty-eighth anniversary. Boy Scout Week is being observed over the entire Nation the week of February 6 to 12. Since 1910, when it was first founded, over 14,500,000 persons have been members, and a great many of them say their membership has profoundly affected all of their lives. This is the Boy Scouts of America which is, of course, well-known to all Senators by reputation, and in many cases I know, by their personal association.

The Scout idea is becoming increasingly important throughout the world, and in my judgment may well become an important factor in promising international good will. Throughout the world, there are over 4,400,000 Boy Scouts organized in 42 countries. They all have the same code and follow more or less the same program, an important feature of which is that a Scout is friendly and a brother to every other Scout. They certainly carry this out in a practical way.

Last summer some 32,000 of them camped together in France for 2 weeks. This was called the Scout Jamboree of Peace and was the sixth such gathering to be held. They plan to hold another in 4 years. Think what it means to bring these boys from practically every civilized country on earth—except the dictator countries—to take part in adventure with mutual good will and understanding of this sort.

Of course, the Boy Scouts of America are helping their brother Scouts abroad in more practical ways, too. They have a world friendship fund to which the Scouts themselves contribute, and the proceeds of which are used for Scouts abroad who need it. They take up collections of used uniforms, camping equipment, Scout books, and all sorts of things which will help revive Scouting in war-torn countries.

Altogether this is a demonstration of international good will which is interesting to watch. All these boys got along wonderfully together in their camp last summer, with no friction, no misunderstanding, just friendly good will, and the promise of more friendship to come. If we are going to have a peaceful world in the future, probably one important

thing is to begin educating the citizens of the future throughout the world right now. The Boy Scouts of America is one American agency that is doing its part. I hope that the American people will continue to give them support and leadership.

COMMUNIST CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the President of the United States has recently recommended the passage of certain measures contained in a report made to him by what is known as his Civil Rights Committee. I want to take time to state that the communistic philosophy contained in the President's recommendations originated in Moscow, and explain how the orders of Joe Stalin trickled down through his stooges right into our White House.

The President's Civil Rights Committee had its being and was nurtured into life as the warped and twisted offspring of the Communist Civil Rights Congress which met in Detroit in April of 1946, presumably to organize an offensive against the rising fascist aggression in the United States. Insofar as I have been able to learn the rising fascists about which the Civil Rights Congress was so concerned were southern Members of Congress; old-fashioned American businessmen who still believe in the competitive system of trade; the members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; any American who does not believe in the new type alien social order, in fact, all the people whom the Communist and his fellow travelers do not like and who oppose communism.

The important and very, very dangerous thing about the Civil Rights Congress that had its inception in Detroit in April 1946 is the absolute fact that this Civil Rights Congress was formed by Communist-front organizations with histories that link them right back to Moscow in a straight unbroken line. Its stated and published aim, as proclaimed at the time of its origin, has been a program to strike chaos and disunity with all its attendant evils into the American scene of life. They strive with all their might to foster hatred between races in this country, not from any sincere interest they might have in the betterment of our minorities in America, but to exploit them, thereby creating confusion, and more hatred and confusion. For it is only in this manner that the Communist Party in America and its parent organization—the Politburo of Russia—can ever hope to achieve victory in America. Too many times has the Communist International laid out its pattern of evil for all to see and judge accordingly; therefore, we should know by now, after seeing the rape of most of Europe, what the Communist pattern is. It is internal strife and the greatest weapon of all is class and racial hatred.

We have unearthed too many documents recently on which the New Deal dynasty could not quite keep the lid clamped down, not to be absolutely certain that Stalin wants world domination and that he recognizes the fact that America is the only large stumbling-block in his path toward his Communist world-dream. The pattern is there for all to see. One of the first drastic steps was the organization in Detroit in 1946 of the Civil Rights Congress.

I intend to show, with references that will withstand any battering by the fellow-travelers, Reds, and Pinks in this country, that the fountainhead of both the Civil Rights Congress and the President's Committee on Civil Rights is the Communist International in Soviet Russia; that their declared aims and purposes are identical; that the same people and organizations were instrumental in forming both civil rights committees. Representatives from the same Communist-front organizations served both on the Civil Rights Congress and the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

The history begins in Russia, right after the Russian revolution in 1917, when the Communist International was formed with its underlying purpose to undermine and overthrow all governments of the world. The International formed the International Red Aid in 1922, which was part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communists all over the world. It had different names in different countries, but its purpose was the same everywhere. In the United States it was known as the International Labor Defense, and has been under investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since 1938. In 1939, Benjamin Gitlow, one of the original founders of the International Labor Defense, testified under oath:

> International Labor Defense is not a national organization, but an international organization * * * it is the legal defense organization of the Communist Party and the Communist International in this country and serves as a highly political and propagandist Communist organization.

When the Civil Rights Congress was formed in Detroit in April 1946, it was simply a merger of the International Labor Defense and the notorious Communist-front organization known as the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. This National Federation was cited as communistic so many times by the Committee on Un-American Activities and other investigating groups that it lost its usefulness to the Communist Party and they decided to merge its identity with a new "front." So we find the Communist clan flocking to a new organization and under a clarion call that assured all and sundry that "an enemy offensive is now being waged against all the common people of the United States—labor, Negroes, Jewish people, the foreign-born, progressives, and others in a relentless drive to establish fascism in this country."

That, Mr. President, was the proclamation of the Communists, who assembled the Civil Rights Congress.

There can be no doubt but that the standard of living of the average Negro, Jew, foreign-born citizen, or any other person in the United States is far higher than that of the average Soviet worker under the Communist dictatorship of Joe Stalin. That much news does trickle out from behind his iron curtain occasionally. Another proof is the bitter fight which these red-hot Communists put up when an attempt is made by our Government to bar them from this country—or worse still, to send them back to Russia. That calls for the Army, the Navy, and the Marines.

In order to impress more vividly the similarity of the object of this call to organize the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit in April 1946 and the much publicized recommendations of the President's Committee on Civil Rights on October 29, 1947, I am inserting a photostatic record of this urgent summons to a Congress on Civil Rights on April 27 and 28, 1946. It is also well to bear in mind that the President's Committee on Civil Rights was formed in December of 1946, a few months following the Civil Rights Congress in April.

The draft call issued by the Congress on Civil Rights, which I said I would insert in the RECORD, reads as follows:

DRAFT CALL—URGENT SUMMONS TO A CONGRESS ON CIVIL RIGHTS IN DETROIT, APRIL 27 AND 28, 1946, TO ORGANIZE AN OFFENSIVE AGAINST RISING FASCIST AGGRESSION IN THE UNITED STATES

Today's drive to subvert our democratic liberties is well organized, well heeled, insidious. It presents an emergency that emergency measures alone can meet.

The great war against fascism is won, but the victory is far from secure. Only a coalition of all the forces of the people, through united action, can prevent its destruction.

Here's what is happening in the United States:

Reactionary forces, based on war-rich monopolies, die-hard union breakers, red-baiters, and race-haters, command the largest surviving fifth column in the world. They are turning the weapons and methods of fascism against the American people. They are prepared to destroy our democracy, even to the establishment of outright fascism.

Their program consists of smashing unions through strike provocation, injunctions, and legislation like the Case bill that would wipe out labor gains of a quarter of a century; spreading discrimination and hatred against minorities through violence against Negro civilians and veterans, particularly in the South, anti-Semitism, and destruction of FEPC; maintaining the poll-tax system to disfranchise 10,000,000 Negro and white Americans; sapping the strength of labor and other organizations by using Hitler's prime weapon of red-baiting, especially through revival of the Dies committee under RANKIN.

This reactionary program has met the growing organized resistance of the labor movement and other groups and individuals who believe firmly in democratic liberties.

The popular response to such campaigns as FEPC and poll-tax repeal shows that the people will organize. Veterans are fighting discrimination and challenging the pro-Fascist press. Committees everywhere have sprung up to defend victims of police and lynch violence; the renewed activity of such Fascist spokesmen as Gerald L. K. Smith has brought widespread, fighting protests.

Labor has sharply stiffened the defense of its civil rights, and people in all walks of life are rallying with enthusiasm to labor's defense.

Now more than ever the united action of the democratic forces is needed to enable each organization and individual to exert maximum effectiveness in the realization of a common program. The elaboration of a campaign or series of campaigns, coordinated in detail and Nation-wide in scope, is therefore essential to meet the challenges that today confront us all:

To safeguard and extend all democratic rights, especially the rights of labor, and of racial, political, religious and national minorities;

To combat all forms of discrimination against these groups;

To defend and aid victims of the fight for these rights;

To fight against domestic fascism and all its forms, Jim Crow, anti-Semitism, Red-baiting, discrimination against the foreign-born.

To these ends, we call upon civil rights, labor, religious, interracial and other organizations and individuals to attend a Congress on Civil Rights in Detroit on April 27 and 28, 1946, to formulate and agree upon a national program to defeat the offensive of reactionary and Fascist forces, and to consider all steps required to assure the maximum unification of effort to advance that program.

Mr. President, I have just finished reading the draft call issued by the Congress on Civil Rights for their meeting in Detroit on April 27 and 28, 1946. It will be noticed how nearly that call corresponds to the recommendations recently made by the President of the United States.

Now, so that all may know just how similar the Communist program is and this program handed to the Congress by President Truman, I quote from Mr. Truman's recommendations to the Congress as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of February 2, 1948, on page 928:

1. Establishing a permanent Commission on Civil Rights, a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, and a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice.

2. Strengthening existing civil-rights statutes.

3. Providing Federal protection against lynching.

4. Protecting more adequately the right to vote.

5. Establishing a Fair Employment Practice Commission to prevent unfair discrimination in employment.

6. Prohibiting discrimination in interstate transportation facilities.

7. Providing home rule and suffrage in Presidential elections for the residents of the District of Columbia.

8. Providing statehood for Hawaii and Alaska and a greater measure of self-government for our island possessions.

9. Equalizing the opportunities for residents of the United States to become naturalized citizens.

10. Settling the evacuation claims of Japanese-Americans.

The line of thought and ideology are practically the same, and the reason for this similarity is not a coincidence. The truth is that the same presiding genius guided both groups.

Communists and fellow travelers from each of the 48 States were on hand as delegates to the Detroit meeting of the Civil Rights Congress. They represented practically every known Communist-front organization. From the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities we find that 43 persons who attended the Civil Rights Congress are also affiliated with the American Peace Mobilization. This organization was cited as subversive by Attorney General Clark on December 5, 1947. Some of the better-known names belonging to both organizations follow: Lewis Merrill, president, United Office and Professional Workers; Meyer Adelman, district director, United Steel Workers, Milwaukee; Philip M. Connelly, secretary, Los Angeles CIO Council; Councilman Eugene P. Connolly, New York City; Joseph Curran, president, National Maritime Union; former Representative Hugh De Lacy, Washington, D. C.; Donald Henderson, president, Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers, writer for Communist press; Langston Hughes, Negro poet and writer, author of many atheistic poems, including Good-bye Christ; Rev. Jack R. McMichael, secretary, Methodist Federation for Social Service, recently denounced by Methodist ministers; Dr. Max Yergan, president, National Negro Congress; Paul Robeson, Negro singer and member of many Communist-front organizations; and Dr. Harry F. Ward, leader in the socialist church movement, Federal Council of Churches of Christ, also member of many Communist-front organizations.

Also from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities comes a list of 83 individuals who aided the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit and were members of the notorious National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. In part, they are as follows: Louis Adamic, one-time protégé of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; James Egert Allen, president, New York State Conference, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mary McLeod Bethune, president, National Council of Negro Women; Elmer A. Benson, chairman, executive council, National Citizens PAC; Joseph R. Brodsky, attorney for the International Labor Defense, and attorney for the Communist Party in 1936–40, 1942, 1946, and 1947; former Representative Hugh De Lacy, sponsor of Civil Rights Congress, "beloved and cherished by the Communist Party" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol 91, part 9, page 11696); Stephen H. Fritchman, former editor, Christian Register, member of many Communist fronts, including North American Spanish-Aid Committee, Win-the-Peace Conference, sponsor of no less than 22 pro-Soviet organizations; and Lee Pressman, general counsel, CIO, who is in disagreement with his boss, Phil Murray, because of Pressman's affinity for the Red line.

The Civil Rights Congress has received the support of and has cooperated with numerous Communist fronts, of which the following are typical: American Labor Party; American Youth for Democracy; United Negro and Allied Veterans of America; International Workers Order, Lodge 572; American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; and Council on African Affairs.

Key individuals who whipped into shape the Detroit Conference of the Civil Rights Congress are affiliated with all the better known Communist-front organizations, such as Michigan Civil Rights Federation; American Peace Mobilization; American League for Peace and Democracy; American Youth Congress; American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; League of American Writers; National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee; Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship; National Negro Congress; Jewish People's Committee; American Student Union; League of Women Shoppers.

The above organizations were listed as Communist-fronts by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its report on Civil Rights Congress as a Communist-front organization on September 2, 1947, House Report No. 1115.

A delegation from my own home State of Texas attended this Civil Rights Congress in Detroit. Twelve people, 9 of whom were Negroes, from Houston paid their own fares to this conference to get help for their campaign in Texas. I have no record of what support they got, other than moral; but it is most probable that any donations raised were handled by the smart men who engineered the affair, and the Texas Civil Rights Congress repaired to Houston with advice only. This advice was probably flowered into full bloom on April 27, 1947, when the Daily Worker, Communist road-guide, said that "prominent Texans have petitioned the Texas Legislature against the passage of legislation which they charge would suppress ideas and political principles." They referred to a number of bills aimed at the suppression of the Communist Party. The Civil Rights Congress of Texas then proceeded to list 100 signers for all parts of Texas. Included were:

Educators: Prof. Clarence E. Ayers; Dr. Wendell C. Gordon; Mrs. J. H. Clauser; Dr. Clarence A. Wiley; Prof. Ernest A. Patterson; Dr. Harry E. Moore; Prof. E. E. Hale; Prof. N. Peach; Prof. J. H. Morton; Prof. Howard D. Asbury.

Ministers: Rev. Blake Smith; Rev. Fred E. Cole; Rev. L. N. Hawke; Rev. W. H. Holland; Rev. William C. Crawford.

Labor leaders: Ray Davidson, M. M. McKnight, Carl Garcia, Garland Butler, Arthur Leibson, R. J. Owen, Ed Dawley, C. A. Sanders, Ceferino Anchiando, Juan R. Benevidez.

Business, professional, and civic leaders: W. M. McMillan, Kenneth Lampkin, Regina Boyd, Mrs. U. V. Christian, Joe B. Dibrell, A. Maceo Smith, Jack Summerfield, Clare Ruggles, J. J. Jones, R. D. Dickson, Arthur Ruskin, A. A. Ormsby, C. D. Leake, Chester Frazier, Arthur DeWitty, Mrs. J. E. Craft, R. H. Duncan, and Mrs. L. M. Mitchell.

Students and veteran leaders: Melvin Webber, Stuart Chamberlin, Richard Sterba, Mr. and Mrs. Curry Gilmore, Mac E. Wallace, Louis Watel, Monroe Cohen, and Nicholas Seidita.

The references above are from the report on the Civil Rights Congress as a Communist-front organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

All of the foregoing brings us up to the President's Committee on Civil Rights. When he appointed his 15-man commission to look into things where racial and religious intolerance were threatening the very things we had just fought for, by some strange coincidence he managed to include at least six whose ideology runs parallel with that of the master minds who organized the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit in 1946. From the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I have before me the carefully recorded activities of these six

members of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. Who can say what motive is behind their cooperation on the President's committee? Why did they serve on the committee? Do we dare trust men who have belonged and do belong to organizations which have been found by a duly qualified congressional committee to be subversive? Have they had a change of heart and are really putting our country—America—ahead of any other in their planning? Or are they still—under the name of "liberals"—trying to tear down our Constitution, and substitute a socialized form of government patterned after that master of socialization, Soviet Russia. The Communist-front organizations to which they belonged had only one thing in mind, and that was to destroy our American form of government. Our various investigations have proved that very clearly. Is it not the duty of every American to seek out the facts and present them to the people, especially as the President's committee is merely an echo of the aims and recommended legislation published by the Civil Rights Congress in April 1946? Can we trust the motive behind this piece of business?

The members of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights were: Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, presiding bishop of the Protestant Church; Channing H. Tobias, New York City; Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn, of New York City; Francis P. Matthews, of Omaha, Nebr.; Morris L. Ernst, of New York City; John S. Dickey, president of Dartmouth College; James B. Carey, secretary of the CIO; Mrs. Sadie T. Alexander, of Philadelphia; C. E. Wilson, chairman, president of General Electric Corp.; Rev. Francis J. Haas, bishop of Grand Rapids; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, of Atlanta, Ga.; Boris Shishkin, Alexandria, Va.; Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina; Charles Luckman, of the Lever Bros. Co.; and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

The CIO News of November 10, 1947, states that Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey, of the CIO, received from President Truman a letter thanking him for his part in preparing the report of the Committee on Civil Rights. Let us hope that James B. Carey's conversion, while fairly recent, has been thorough, for James B. Carey's affiliations and connections with Communist-front organizations go back to 1936. He has been a speaker for the Jewish People's Committee, an organization cited in 1944 by the Committee on Un-American Activities. That organization also had representatives at the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit, whether they attended officially or not. He has been a delegate to the World Youth Congress, most of whose sponsors were fellow travelers, and which also was represented at the Civil Rights Congress. He was a speaker for the American Student Union at their fourth convention in 1939, an organization cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities several times, which also had its members in attendance at the Detroit Civil Rights Congress. He was an honorary pallbearer at the funeral of Communist Tom Mooney in San Francisco in 1942. He is the signer of a petition to discontinue the Dies committee, originated in a letter by the Communist-front American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom in 1940. He spoke before the Washington Committee for Democratic Action in 1940. This organization was recently cited by Attorney General Clark. He has written for The Champion, Fight, and other publications cited as subversive. In 1940 Carey was a member of the National Council for American Peace Mobilization, the organization which furnished 43 of its members at the formation of the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit in 1946. Of course, at the present time James B. Carey seems to be putting up a real fight to clear the CIO of Communists. But with his background of affiliation with many dangerous Communist-front organizations, many of which were well represented at the Detroit Civil Rights Congress, one may still very well wonder if his conversion and about-face has been sincere and complete.

Morris L. Ernst, another of the President's Committee of Fifteen, has also been affiliated with organizations which have been cited as subversive and which were also represented at the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit. He has been a speaker for the League of American Writers and the American Youth Congress, and very active in the National Lawyers Guild. These organizations have all been cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities. He was connected with the medical bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. He was a member of the Milk Consumers Protective Association, the League for Mutual Aid, and the Consumer-Farmer Milk Cooperative, Inc., all of which have been cited as subversive. At least three of these organizations were in attendance at the Detroit Civil Rights Congress.

Boris Shishkin, economist for the American Federation of Labor and 1 of the 15 on President Truman's committee, was at one time a member of the Washington Book Shop. He is well represented in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities in this respect, and it should be remembered that the Washington Book Shop Association was very recently cited by Attorney General Tom Clark as subversive. Mr. Shishkin is one of the voluble speakers for the doctrines set forth in President Truman's Civil Rights Committee before organizations such as the Michigan Committee on Civil Rights, formerly the Michigan Council for Fair Employment Legislation.

Channing Tobias, of New York City, also on the President's Committee for Civil Rights, was recently classified by Mr. J. B. Matthews in a speech before the American Legion seminar as a confirmed fellow traveler. Mr. Tobias seems to have earned that distinction by way of association. He was an endorser of the American League for Peace and Democracy at its New York City conference in 1939. He has been affiliated with the National Committee To Win the Peace and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and was a member of Council on African Affairs. These organizations have all been investigated and cited as subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and many of the same organizations were well represented at the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit in 1946.

Dr. Frank Porter Graham, also on the President's Committee, is not considered a Communist. He is, however, to quote a report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which the Committee on Un-American Activities caused to be printed in June 1947, "one of those liberals who show a predilection for affiliation with various Communist-inspired front organizations." Dr. Graham's record and connections with Communist fronts is a long one. He urged freedom for Earl Browder, the Communist, and served as sponsor at a dinner held to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red army. He has been associated with the communistic International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party, the American League for Peace and Democracy, the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, the China Aid Council, and other Communist fronts. The insidious thing is not in his belonging to and affiliating himself with these numerous fronts, which vary from a slightly pinkish tint to out-and-out red, and the International Labor Defense, which is an actual branch of the Communist Party, but the fact that many of these organizations with which Dr. Graham connects himself are also the front organizations whose members were featured strongly at the formation of the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit. The connection cannot be overlooked when it comes to weighing the doctrines enunciated by the President's committee, and it should be taken into consideration.

The Right Reverend Henry Knox Sherrill is a presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church. He is a member of the Massachusetts Committee on Racial and Religious Understanding, and on his record as such he was probably asked to serve on President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights. However, the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities also show another picture of Dr. Sherrill's life, wherein he affiliated himself with organizations cited as subversive. In 1943 he sponsored the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Members of this organization were also very active in the formation of the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit. And the report on the Civil Rights Congress made by the Committee on Un-American Activities cites the organization as a "Communist front." Dr. Sherrill at various other times has been a sponsor for the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, once as late as March 13, 1946. It will be remembered that the Civil Rights Congress met a month later, in April 1946. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship had many of its representatives at the Civil Rights Congress, to express their views and doctrines. And the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship is one of the most subversive and un-American organizations on rec-

ord. It was even included by Attorney General Tom Clark when he made his report on subversive organizations in December 1947.

There, Mr. President, are the names of six members of President Truman's committee, each and every one of them with a record of service with Communist-front organizations. Yes, there were citizens on Mr. Truman's committee who do not bear the taint of communistic affiliation. They were put there to supply the window-dressing for the main show. They were put on the committee to lend an air of stability and conservatism to its acts, but Mr. Truman has reckoned badly with the knowledge of the American people, for the people are coming awake to the wiles of the Communist leadership which has crept into New Deal activities. Here we see Mr. Truman making a bold bid for the radical vote. He is out-Wallacing Wallace. He is hurling a boomerang that may come back to clip his own ears. I do not believe he can sell this bill of goods, even though it is wrapped in the habiliments of the Democratic Party. The program is an insult to the American people, regardless of race, creed, or color. It promotes class consciousness and inspires hates and racial prejudices. It is un-American, unconstitutional, and undemocratic. It is a stench in the nostrils of honest, self-respecting people, an abomination in the eyes of the Lord.

Here again we find the Communist radio blabbers in Russia running true to form. Anytime Joe Stalin wants to put something over on Uncle Sam, he first throws out the bait, and when he has his fish hooked, he starts propaganda in reverse. Joe and his politburo know if you want to put over anything communistic on Uncle Sam, the way to do it is to oppose that thing. His gang started the civil-rights program, and came in on the finish. Now comes the technique to get Congress to adopt the child of the Kremlin. As soon as Truman sends it to the Congress, Joe orders his radio stooges to denounce the program. They say it is an attempt by Truman to steal the liberals from Wallace and that the Kremlin is against it. But here in the United States we find the American Communists supporting the program and at the same time endorsing the candidacy of Henry Wallace. If Joe Stalin were to endorse the Truman civil-rights program, he knows that it would melt faster than a snowball cast into the burning fires of hell.

And, now, Mr. President, as a climax, we find the Communists gathering in Washington to lobby for the Truman program. We get this fresh from the hyena's mouth, the Daily Worker of February 4, page 3:

CRC ASKS TO MEET TRUMAN ON 10-POINT PLAN

The Civil Rights Congress yesterday asked for an interview with President Truman on Friday—

That is, tomorrow—

to discuss his recently issued 10-point civil-rights program. In a wire to the Chief Executive, Joseph Cadden, executive director, expressed support for the President's program but regretted that the message was long overdue.

"We regret also," said Cadden, "that the President waited until an election year for a move to enact such vital legislation. Every legislative proposal you submit in this message must run the gantlet of the white supremacists in Congress. If your message is to be more than a mere campaign document, we expect you, as a leader of the Democratic Party, to permit your party to invoke cloture in the Senate and thus defeat the inevitable attempt at a filibuster by Southern Democrats."

The Civil Rights Congress will have more than 100 persons in Washington on Friday—

That is, tomorrow—

from its various chapters to appear before the House Judiciary Committee considering the antilynching bill.

We hardly need to wonder that the Daily Worker and the Communist Party in the United States are working, and working hard, to see that the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights goes through. The Communists center their attacks mostly on the southern Democrats because of the legislation in many Southern States on race segregation and, therefore, they make the Negro race the tragic pawn in the Communist movement to disrupt the country. The South today is going ahead soundly and steadily working for better educational and economic advantages for its millions of Negroes. The South was left helpless with this great problem at the end of the War Between the States, and she has made great strides to solve the problem in the only way possible. And that way is certainly not the way the President and his 15-man Committee on Civil Rights has outlined. The President's way is the way the Communists are hoping for and fighting for. It fits their purposes perfectly and we should weigh all the evidence at hand thoroughly before we accept the President's recommendations at all.

There is no problem affecting the lives of the white and black men in the South which the intelligent people of the two races are not working out satisfactorily. Decent whites and decent blacks respect each other. They work together and fraternize upon a basis of respect for the individual, each as he deserves, but they worship separately, live separately, attend different schools. Almost every known faith has its separate schools here in America. That is possible under the Constitution, for the Constitution enables men of any and all creeds, races, and colors to choose their associates, their religion, their schools, and their elective political officials. The Truman program proposes to throw all this in reverse. That is why, Mr. President, the Truman program is un-American and must be defeated.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois wish to make a statement?

Mr. LUCAS. No. As I understand, the Senator from Nebraska wishes to have a bill considered at this time by unanimous consent. I have conferred with the Senator from Nebraska about it, and also have discussed the measure with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. As I understand, there is no objection to the bill by any member of the committee from which it was reported.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to say, Mr. President, that the bill in question was reported unanimously from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is Senate bill 134.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have no objection to a motion being made at this time that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the bill be considered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 134, Calendar 916.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a moment. Reserving the right to object, I should like to look at the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if it is proposed that the Senate consider other bills in addition to Senate bill 134, I suggest that perhaps there should be a quorum call before any such action is taken.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bricker	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Jenner	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Langer	Taylor
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McClellan	Thye
Cooper	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McGrath	Tydings
Donnell	McKellar	Umstead
Downey	McMahon	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Magnuson	Watkins
Eastland	Martin	Wherry
Ecton	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Williams
Flanders	Moore	Wilson
Fulbright	Morse	Young
George	Murray	
Green	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 134, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 134) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, are we to have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall explain the bill very briefly, and then I shall yield to one or two other Senators who wish to make statements in connection with what I consider to be a very important piece of legislation.

During the past 2 years we have experienced an amazingly rapid increase in our requirements for petroleum products. In contrast, we have had no corresponding increase in petroleum resources or productive facilities. The result has been spot shortages in various parts of the country and increased dependence on foreign sources.

The long-term prospect with regard to our petroleum supplies is even more serious than the temporary shortages. No doubt these shortages will be cured if all goes well and if we remain at peace. However, the only cure in immediate prospect is through increased imports. Furthermore, if we should suddenly find ourselves at war, Secretary Forrestal tells us we would immediately be faced with a shortage of 2,000,000 barrels a day needed for all-out military operations. Although we shall certainly find some additional supplies of oil in this country, there seems to be no real prospect that they will be sufficient to fill the evergrowing demand. In other words, if petroleum were to be our only source of liquid fuel, we would come to be more and more dependent on foreign sources. Officials of the State Department and the Army-Navy Petroleum Board have expressed the opinion that by 1965, half of this country's oil requirements will have to be imported.

The Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944 was designed to meet this situation by proceeding as rapidly as possible with research and development of potential sources of liquid fuels from coal and oil shale. Under this bill, a number of programs to conduct the basic research and to perform pilot-plant and demonstration operations were to be started.

Two oil-shale mines and a demonstration plant for the production of shale oil were placed in operation near Rifle, Colo., early in 1947. A demonstration plant for production of gasoline by the hydrogenation of coal is being developed at Louisiana, Mo. Laboratory facilities for the development and improvement of the synthetic liquid-fuel process have been established at Pittsburgh, Pa.; Morgantown, W. Va.; and Laramie, Wyo. The Bureau of Mines is ready now to contract for the construction of a Fischer-Tropsch demonstration plant, but this will not be possible until new legislation is enacted. Laboratory work by the Department of Agriculture at Peoria, Ill., is also covered by this legislation, looking toward a utilization of agricultural products as a source of industrial alcohol.

The bill simply extends the program for 3 more years and increases the total authorized appropriation for the entire program from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000.

The principal effect of the bill will be to permit the program to go forward as originally planned. Very few new features are contemplated.

Progress has been slower than anticipated for several reasons. First, the Synthetic Liquid Fuel Act was passed in 1944 at the height of the war, and it was therefore not possible to get under way with some of the construction for some little time. Second, the program was seriously delayed during much of 1946 by a succession of disastrous strikes. Third, the Missouri Ordnance Works, which was to have been used under this program, was taken over by the War Department for fertilizer manufacture in 1946.

A large part of the increased authorization is necessary to take care of the higher level of costs due to the rise in the price level and salary scale since 1944.

In addition, certain new features have been added, based on experience to date, and on some of the developments of European research that have become available to us since the end of the war. New processes are being worked out for test and demonstration at the facilities at Pittsburgh, Pa., and Louisiana, Mo.

In my opinion, one of the most important aspects of this program lies in the development of efficient processes for the use of surplus agricultural products in the manufacture of industrial alcohol and other products. I mentioned the work that was being done at Peoria, Ill., in connection with this problem. It is my feeling that within a very few years we may again be faced with the necessity for disposing of agricultural surpluses in some way. If this research program is pushed aggressively and if we give adequate encouragement to those interested in this problem, I have hopes that we may meet a part of our shortage of liquid fuels and petroleum products through conversion of surplus agricultural crops into alcohol.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has referred to the research which is being carried on. Will the Senator tell me what is being done with the plant at Omaha?

Mr. BUTLER. The plant at Omaha is under private operation. It is being operated, and is contributing to the needs of the times, but it is not in any way connected with the Government. It is not Government operated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It still belongs to the Government, and could be available for the purposes of the fuel program if we chose to extend the program to it, could it not?

Mr. BUTLER. I doubt that there is any provision in the bill which in any way affects the operation of the plant at Omaha.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reference to agricultural production would seem to be broad enough to include such a plant if the Government chose so to use it, would it not?

Mr. BUTLER. I say very frankly to the Senator that I see no reason at the moment why this piece of legislation could not be made adaptable to the situation which the Senator mentions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to know on what scale the plant at Peoria is operating. I am not familiar with that operation.

Mr. BUTLER. The plant at Peoria is one of several experimental plants placed in operation under a previous law. There is one in New Orleans, one in the West at San Francisco, I believe, one in Philadelphia, all having to do with agricultural research. The fourth is at Peoria. The amount of the work being done on this phase of it is only incidental to the total over-all program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator satisfied that that stage of the program will be adequately taken care of under this bill?

Mr. BUTLER. I certainly hope so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator satisfied that it will be? I hope so, too, but I do not know anything about it.

Mr. BUTLER. I should not like to try to predict today exactly what the managers of it may do, but I know what I would like to have them do.

Mr. President, I have only a word or two more to say in this connection.

This bill is urgently recommended by the Department of the Interior, which points out that it must be passed soon in order to permit the Bureau of Mines promptly to contract for additional construction. The importance of some such legislation has also been emphasized by the Secretary of Defense. The petroleum industry and the special petroleum committees of both the Senate and the House have recognized the need for this work. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously reported the bill on Monday of this week.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska in relation to the bill and the need for such legislation. The plant in Colorado has been making a fine contribution. It is located in the very heart of the oil-shale fields in the Rocky Mountain States, and also in the coal fields. In Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah, there are immense deposits of oil shale, mostly on the surface, where it can be mined by open-cut mining. Many of the counties in those States are underlaid with coal. To the people in the intermountain West it is of great importance, and to the people of the United States and of the world it is of still greater importance, that these great reserves of oil to be produced from coal and shale should be brought to a point where it can be used in the years ahead.

I am glad to associate myself with the statement made by the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator from Utah for his splendid statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I am very willing to yield the floor to the Senator from Wyoming, who I know should speak at some length on this very important measure. He was the author, I believe, of the original legislative proposal, and is the author of the amendment which is under consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that there is now pending in the House of Representatives a companion bill to Senate bill 134. It was unanimously recommended by the House Committee on Public Lands, just as this bill was unanimously recommended by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For the sake of strict accuracy, I should like to say that because of a personal interest of mine which could be helped or hurt by the pending legislation I did not vote in connection with the committee's action on the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator interrupted to point that out, because I am aware that he made the same statement in the committee. What I meant to say was that the bill was reported without objection.

I was about to say that I am happy to be able to advise the Senate that the Rules Committee of the House has today granted a special rule for the early consideration of the House bill. I was delayed in coming to the Senate during the quorum call because I had been requested by Mr. Bulkley Griffin, a correspondent of numerous newspapers in New England, to make a radio broadcast with him regarding the synthetic-fuel program. These two things indicate the widespread interest of the country in the development of synthetic fuels.

As the Senator from Nebraska has well said, researches in connection with the program began several years ago. Hearings were conducted by what was then the Senate Committee on Public Lands, in conjunction with the House Committee on Mines and Mining, in Washington, in Pittsburgh, in Utah, and in Wyoming. The testimony which was developed showed a general agreement upon the part of all experts in and out of private industry that the Bureau of Mines should be authorized to construct and operate demonstration plants, the purpose of which is to show that synthetic fuels can be made commercially from these great resources covered by the bill.

When the original bill was under consideration in the committees and on the floor, it was modified so as to include agricultural products, and the appropriations which are here authorized are available and may be made available for the Department of Agriculture to conduct its experiments for the manufacture of synthetic fuel from forestry products and any other agricultural products.

The significance of the measure I think can readily be recognized when it is pointed out that the United States, which has long been the world's greatest producer of petroleum, has petroleum reserves of approximately 22,000,000,000 or 23,000,000,000 barrels of oil; but discoveries in the Middle East, particularly in Saudi Arabia, and discoveries in Latin America would indicate that the center of gravity, so to speak, for the production of petroleum has passed from the United States to foreign countries. In Saudi Arabia it is estimated that the reserves of petroleum amount to at least 50,000,000,000 barrels. The Senator from Nebraska in his statement with respect to this bill pointed out that the oil shale deposits in Colorado alone are now estimated as capable of producing not less than 200,000,000,000 barrels of oil. That is four times the estimated reserve of Saudi Arabia in petroleum. But if we take into consideration the oil shale deposits of Utah and of Wyoming, in addition, the reserves on these three public-land States are not less than 300,000,000,000 barrels.

There are also reserves of oil shale in Montana, Nevada, and the Eastern States. I understand that it is estimated that in Pennsylvania the deposits of shale are sufficient to produce approximately from 13,000,000,000 to 20,000,000,000 barrels of oil—oil from shale. West Virginia has supplies of oil shale, and so does Ohio, and so do a score of other States.

But, Mr. President, we are not confined to the use of oil shale. The coal resources of the United States, which are almost beyond imagination, are capable of producing unlimited supplies of synthetic fuel. I need not remind the Senate that Hitler fueled his war machine with synthetic fuel manufactured from coal. The deposits of coal in the United States are estimated as being sufficient, at the present rate of consumption, to supply the United States for at least 2,500 years.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. In regard to synthetic fuel, I wonder whether the Senator is aware that before VE-day the German war machine was all set up to power its equipment with synthetic fuel in the form of alcohol in certain mixtures. The Germans were not completely ready in that respect; but the chief of air said that, if they had been given 5 months more, they would have been able to prolong the war 5 years by the use of alcohol as a synthetic fuel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. That is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. President, the United States has reserves of natural resources sufficient to make it completely independent, in my judgment, of any foreign source of supply.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The remarks of the Senator from West Virginia in regard to the development of alcohol in Germany give me an opportunity to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question in regard to this bill. I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that during the war a pilot plant for the manufacture of wood alcohol out of wood waste was started at Springfield, Oreg. As the Senator knows, there are great quantities of wood waste in my State. In fact, one of the great problems of the lumber industry is to develop methods for making use of the present waste in the lumber industry—the sawdust and all the parts of the trees that are not suitable for lumber and do not go into lumber.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that during the progress of the hearings on this subject, we were told that it was actually possible to make an appropriate feed for livestock out of wood waste.

Mr. MORSE. That has been alleged. I have not yet fed any of it in any of my livestock production.

The question I wish to raise is whether under this bill the Department of Agriculture could, if it decided to do so, take over that alcohol plant, under the funds provided for in the bill, and continue with its development, to the end of trying to determine whether an economic program for the manufacture of alcohol could be developed out of wood waste.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be altogether within the terms of the bill. I point out to the Senator from Oregon that the hydrogenation experiments of the United States Bureau of Mines, which now are about to take place at Louisiana, Mo., are in a war plant which was constructed for the purpose of making ammonia, and was turned over to the Bureau of Mines by the War Department, for purposes of hydrogenation. Therefore there is no reason why a plant such as the one in Oregon which the Senator has described should not be turned over to the Department of Agriculture for its share of these experiments. The basic law, which by this bill is extended for 3 years, and the authorized appropriation, which is increased by $30,000,000, specifically provide that all work on agricultural and forestry products shall be carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his answer to my question.

I wish to say now, if the Senator will permit me to say a sentence or two more, that when one considers the great amount of the taxpayers money that has gone into the wood-alcohol plant at Springfield, Oreg., I think inquiry should be made by the Department of Agriculture, if this bill is passed, as to the possibility of continuing the operation of the plant under Government operation, at least for the time being. At the present time the plant has been turned over to the Surplus Property Administration; and as the Senator well knows, when it is disposed of or dismantled through the Surplus Property Administration, that will be done at tremendous loss to the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator or with anyone else to make sure that that plant and all other plants are used in the best interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senator familiar with the program which recently was

suggested by Secretary of the Interior Krug?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Does that dovetail in with the program the Senator is discussing in respect to his own bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Completely. The Secretary of the Interior has approved this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I read only part of what the Secretary of the Interior had to say; but it seemed to me that he laid great stress on synthetic fuel made in the way the Senator has described.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to be able to tell the Senator that there appears to be complete unanimity between the industry and the experts in the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior that this program should be carried out.

I should point out that at this moment there are cooperative agreements between the United States Bureau of Mines and the Standard Oil Development Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and between the United States Bureau of Mines and the Union Oil Co. of California, and between the United States Bureau of Mines and the Standard Oil Co. of California, and between the United States Bureau of Mines and the Sinclair Refining Co. These cooperative agreements are for the following purposes: That between the Standard Oil Development Co. and the Bureau of Mines is for the purpose of drafting cost estimates for the construction of a coal hydrogenation plant sufficient to produce 30,000 barrels of oil a day from coal. The Standard Oil Development Co. is also conducting cooperative experiments on the refining of crude oil made from shale. The Standard Oil Co. of California and the Sinclair Co. are similarly conducting joint experiments on refining; and the Union Oil Co. is conducting experiments with the Bureau of Mines on the pumpability through pipe lines of crude petroleum made from shale.

So we have a program, through unanimous action by industry and Government, to produce a result which is very greatly indeed in the public interest.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think perhaps it might be emphasized to advantage that this is not something that is in the field of fantasy, but that the production of petroleum products from coal has been carried on a long time, notably in Germany; and that the production of petroleum products from oil shale has been carried on for a long time in a number of countries, including Scotland, on a commercial scale, and in Estonia, Lithuania, Manchukuo, Sweden, and also in Tasmania, the basic chemical and physical facts are well known in both fields.

Our problem in this country is to bring out the known facts, and others to be developed by experimentation, and develop processes which will result in products which can be brought into competition with existing petroleum products.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right, as the primary objective of the bill is to enable the United States Bureau of Mines to demonstrate the commercial possibilities of making the synthetic fuel at a cost which will enable it to compete with gasoline and fuel oil made from petroleum.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for another observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In further response to the inquiry from the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] I do not believe it can be said that this plan is a necessary forerunner of the full-scale Krug plan, but this plan will, it is hoped, develop those scientific and procedural facts out of which private industry could go ahead or Government industry could go ahead according to future decisions. The basic work, it seems to me, is very essential. If the Senator will permit, I would like to say that in the field of oil shale, away back in the 1920's Senator Phipps, of Colorado, sponsored a bill in the Senate calling for a demonstration plant, which was erected at Rulison, Colo., which is close to the site of the present plant.

In that connection, if I may make a personal reference, the then president of the Colorado School of Mines and I brought to Washington a small demonstration apparatus and erected it in one of the committee rooms here, and made oil out of oil shale. We had a very interested group of Senators and Representatives from States where there is oil shale. As the Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, I suppose there are 2 dozen such States, extending pretty well over the country.

Mr. President, as I stated before, I have a personal interest which might be helped or hurt by the proposed legislation, and as I did when the original bill was up before, I shall refrain from voting.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Our attention has of course been increasingly directed to the problem of petroleum, particularly among those of our States that do not have these reserves. We have been getting a rather liberal education on these shortages in recent weeks. In that connection, from high authority in the Government, attention has been turned to the very great oil reserves of the Middle East. The result of their development, to which I know the Senator from Wyoming has directed considerable attention, has been the estimate that there are perhaps 100,000,000,000 barrels of oil out there in the Middle East. Do I understand that the Senator from Wyoming believes, from the studies thus far, that there could be made available ample supplies of petroleum in this country from these other sources on a sound economic basis?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no personal doubt about it at all, I will say to the Senator. The Senator may recall that in the last Congress I introduced a bill to amend the Oil and Gas Lease Act so as to stimulate research for petroleum in the public-land States. That bill was enacted. It has become a law and has resulted in a very great stimulation of the search for petroleum. Many new discoveries have been brought in; not sufficient as yet, I am sorry to say, to make any tremendous addition to our reserves, but enough to indicate that we have not as yet thoroughly explored all our possibilities for petroleum. But due to the fact that in the United States exploration has been carried on over a period of fifty years, at a much more rapid rate than anywhere else in the world, there is no doubt that we are coming to the end of the road so far as new discoveries of petroleum here in the United States are concerned. But we are only beginning, so far as oil shale, coal, and agricultural products are concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator will yield further, does he feel that there is justification for the fear recently expressed that as long as petroleum continues to be a vital factor in modern economic life, we might arrive at a point where the reserves of the Middle East would be an absolutely essential factor in our functioning in war or peace?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not shared that opinion. I know that it has been expressed. I feel that our resources here are sufficient to make the United States self-sufficient so far as liquid fuel is concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. What does the Senator envision as to the time involved in this development, as to how soon we might arrive at the happy day when on some economic basis the production of petroleum from shale or coal or fuel from grains would be possible?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There would be a difference, according to the emergency. In time of peace it probably would take a longer period. If we were required to prepare for war, for example, then of course we would expend the necessary sums to build the necessary plants, but the evidence which is before the committee is, in my opinion, sufficient to indicate that the degree of cooperation between industry and Government now has been developed to such an extent that within a few years we can depend upon an ample source of supply for synthetic fuel.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I appreciate the importance of the original legislation, and I fully appreciate what is intended to be done by the proposed measure we are now discussing. But has the Senator from Wyoming any information as to the program of the Department of the Interior under which it proposes to proceed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; that has been discussed in the original hearings and in the reports, and in connection with the work that has been done to date. We have these various plants, the one at Rifle, for oil shale; the one at Louisiana, Mo., for coal. If this measure is passed, I am sure the Department will have suggestions for some other plants.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, the Senator knows that in the West, especially throughout the Rocky Mountain area, there are tremendous coal fields. In my State we have millions and millions of acres of coal. I was just wondering whether it is the opinion of the Senator that if the legislation goes through and the extra money is voted, all those areas will be treated alike, and some particular area not be picked out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think without any doubt that all areas will be treated alike, but the degree of cooperation which is going on indicates to me clearly that private industry is now moving into the field and may be expected to do some of the work very shortly. I am advised, Mr. President, that certain of the oil companies are already buying coal lands for the purpose of getting ready, but I have not had the time to get specific information on that point.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think it is very laudable on the part of the oil companies to cooperate in this wonderful endeavor. But, continuing with what I had in mind when I interrupted the Senator, my State is extremely exercised about the matter. I noticed an article in the paper today containing a statement given by the Interior Department to the press, designating certain States in which the work is to be done. New Mexico was not in the list. I was just desirous of ascertaining whether under the general law we in New Mexico could utilize our coal lands for this laudable idea, in view of the need for more fuel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The coal mines in New Mexico can be used and, I think, ought to be used.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Colorado wanted to ask a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I just wish to suggest, in response to an observation made by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], that it is not a question of providing, overnight, any substitute for our liquid oil supplies. They, of course, being a wasting asset, will decrease as time goes on, and our problem therefore is to supply an increasing supplemental synthetic supply. If we could envision an overnight stoppage of our liquid supplies, something which is not going to happen, we could not hope to replace those supplies within a short period of time with synthetic substitutes. That will be a lengthy process, and it should be developed, I suggest, in a constantly expanding way against that long-distant day, I hope, when our liquid supplies are gone. This merely emphasizes, I suggest, the importance of making a start and getting the techniques well understood.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in my response to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] I had in mind that ultimate objective of the legislation and of the program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The inquiry propounded by the able Senator from Colorado is the same as that I was about to make, and has to do with the question raised by the Senator from Maine who inquired respecting the time element involved. We all know that there is a serious diversion of opinion respecting the oil reserves of the world. We know that a tremendous effort is being made for continuation of the control of the oil of the Middle East. The statement is frequently heard that whoever finally controls the oil in the Middle East will probably control Europe and Asia. In view of the fact that we do have a short supply, and that sooner or later we are going to run out of a liquid supply of fuel, the time element does seem to me to be very important. It is important to know how soon we may be able to get into sufficient production of synthetic fuel from shale and coal and other commodities to the end that at no time would we be caught in short supply of this vital material.

We all know that one of the causes for Hitler's downfall at an earlier period than it might have been was the fact that he ran out of some of the lubricating oil and other petroleum products that were so vital and necessary to the operation of his machine. Any future world conflict will be based, of course, in a great measure upon the quantity of oil any nation can produce.

I wish to state candidly that I knew very little about the program involved, but I want to commend both Senators and the committee for producing this constructive measure. It is my sincere hope that the Congress in the future will take hold of the program, not in a niggardly way, and go along with a further program something like that which was recently recommended by Secretary of the Interior Krug. I do not think we are going to be able to depend upon private industry to do the kind of job that ought to be done. Certainly this oil problem is in the public interest and the interest of national defense. I am glad to see the two able Senators promoting a measure of this character because of its tremendous importance to the future of our Nation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Illinois for that comment. It is precisely because I have believed for many years that the United States should concentrate upon the development of its natural resources that I introduced the previous bill, to which I alluded, to amend the Oil and Gas Leasing Act. That bill was enacted into law, and has resulted in finding for us new reserves of oil. The pending bill will find us new reserves of synthetic fuel from oil shale. We know that we can obtain oil from coal, and we should be stepping along as rapidly as possible so that our supplies will not be exhausted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I commend the Senator from Wyoming for pressing this matter and for the results he is getting, but I hope he will go a little beyond providing appropriations. I hope that something may be done by the Congress to expedite action in this research. There is no question it has been lagging. It should not be lagging. I am sure the Congress will provide whatever funds are necessary. I do not know about the $9,000,000,000. I think that amount of money can probably be provided by private enterprise. But I have no doubt that Congress will take care of the research part of the program. Putting up the money is only part of the program. We must go beyond that, and we must see that those who are entrusted with the program get the lead out of their pants and really move forward in this great enterprise which the Congress is undertaking.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Colorado. It is only fair to the Bureau of Mines to say that they have been diligently at work upon this program. One of their experts, Dr. Schroeder, immediately after VE-day made a special trip to Germany and examined all the German plants and brought home some of their blueprints to use in this program.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I compliment all the Senators who have spoken on this subject, especially when they have emphasized the point that America should stop wasting her national resources. Where there is wealth to be gotten for Americans, we should get it. I like the thought which was so ably expressed by the distinguished Senator that here we have a reserve of liquid coal that will make us competent to meet any challenge that may arise in the future. The main problem is to get under way and to meet the fears which have arisen. We have had fears suggested that the oil industry might be injured, and we know now that because of those fears the American people have been injured. In my own State people are freezing. They do not have the fuel they need. In other words, because of those fears, we have not provided for our people as we should have provided.

Mr. President, as I have many times before said, there is another resource of which we should avail ourselves. There are 2,200,000 horsepower going to waste on the St. Lawrence. There is opportunity to provide for transporting the fuel back and forth to 50,000,000 people.

I especially wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Utah, who today so dramatically and eloquently set forth the needs of the Nation, and who so clearly called to our attention that we were all one people.

I join with my colleagues, Mr. President, some of whom have been in opposition to the St. Lawrence development, in the development of the program now under consideration because I am in favor of all things which are for the general welfare.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. It is always a pleasure to agree with the Senator from Wisconsin whenever I can do so, and this is certainly one occasion when I can do so with the greatest enthusiasm. I feel that the

extraction of synthetic oil is of great benefit to the country as a whole. It is a project which has real intelligence and practicality behind it, and is definitely in the national interest. I am happy to give it my support.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I will not take any further time of the Senate beyond asking unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of the report of the Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources in Relation to National Welfare, which I had the honor to file with the Senate on January 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES IN RELATION TO THE NATIONAL WELFARE

INTRODUCTION

Until science succeeds in harnessing atomic energy to the everyday machines of the modern world, petroleum will continue to be the most essential fuel of industry both in peace and in war. The discovery, development, and utilization of petroleum in modern times was one of the principal factors which prior to World War II had made the United States the greatest industrial nation. It is also indisputable that during this war the intensive production of United States petroleum, at a rate in excess of that indicated by scientific principles for maximum efficient recovery, was one of the chief factors of military victory. Therefore, it is not too much to say that the evolution of modern industrial civilization and its preservation from Nazi totalitarianism may be attributed in very large measure to petroleum, to the American oil industry, and to the teamwork between the industry and the Government. But more than that, it is now clear that no nation which lacks a sure supply of liquid fuel can hope to maintain a position of leadership among the peoples of the world. It follows that if the United States is to hold the place it now occupies on the world stage as an effective leader in elevating the standard of living for people, it must develop a national petroleum policy which will make certain that we shall not become dependent upon any other country for our supply of liquid fuel.

This basic fact was recognized by the United States Senate when on March 13, 1944, in creating this special committee of 11 Senators, it declared that "adequate petroleum reserves are essential to our national security and economic welfare."[1] The committee was instructed "to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to petroleum resources, and the production and consumption of petroleum and petroleum products, both within and outside the United States, in their relation to our national welfare and security," and to "report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for the formulation of a national petroleum policy."[2]

On April 6, 1945, the Intermediate Report[3] of the committee was submitted to the Senate, recording the principal activities of the committee up to the date of the death of Senator Francis Maloney, the former chairman, on January 16, 1945.

Prior to the date of the intermediate report the attention of the committee was largely directed (a) to the wartime proposal that the Government of the United States construct, own, and maintain a pipe-line system across the Arabian Peninsula designed to make Persian Gulf oil available to the United Nations in the Mediterranean theater, and (b) to the question whether the Anglo-American oil agreement should be an executive agreement or a treaty subject to approval by the Senate under the treaty-making power of the Constitution.

Obviously, the project to build and own a trans-Arabian petroleum pipe line, if carried out, would have taken the people of the United States through their Government into the active development abroad of the natural resources of foreign countries, thus effecting a revolutionary change in national policy. It would have made the Government an owner in an area over which it had no political jurisdiction, thus breaking down, beyond the geographical frontier of the United States, the line of demarcation between the industrial and economic function of the people as individual private citizens, and the political function of the Government as the agent of all the people. Suffice it to say that the executive hearings held by this committee, under the wise and extremely capable leadership of the late Senator Francis Maloney, and the advice given by him, as spokesman for the committee, to President Roosevelt resulted in the abandonment of the project.

As to the constitutional status of the Anglo-American oil agreement, the committee succeeded in having it submitted to the Senate as a treaty, despite the fact that it was originally designed by its authors to take effect between the United States and the United Kingdom merely as an executive agreement. In view of the far-reaching implications and the important subject matter of the agreement, the committee believed that there was no question but that it constituted a treaty and ought to be handled as such according to the Constitution. The committee had observed with alarm the increasing inroads made upon the treaty-making power in recent years through the device of the executive agreement. The committee therefore decided that it would be contrary to public policy and to constitutional limitations if this important international covenant were permitted to escape the scrutiny of the Senate. Again, the executive hearings by this committee (on which sat the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations) and the conferences between Senator Maloney and the highest executive officers of the Government, including the President, resulted in the agreement being transmitted on August 24, 1944, to the Senate as a treaty. Subsequently, on January 10, 1945, President Roosevelt withdrew the treaty for renegotiation with the United Kingdom. On November 1, 1945, the revised treaty was resubmitted by President Truman to the Senate, where it is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Upon completing the activities referred to in the intermediate report aforesaid, the committee next addressed its attention to the underlying problem of the formulation of a national petroleum policy. In order that there would be made available to the Congress and to the public a complete exposition of the basic facts involved, without which no competent judgment could be rendered, the committee conducted public hearings in Washington, D. C., as follows:

1. Foreign Contracts Act. (S. 11.) Joint hearing with a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. (May 17, 18, 21, and 22, 1945.)

2. New Sources of Petroleum in the United States. (June 19, 20, 21, 22, and 25, 1945.)

3. American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries. (June 27 and 28, 1945.)

4. Petroleum Requirements — Postwar. (October 3 and 4, 1945.)

5. War Emergency Pipe-Line Systems and Other Petroleum Facilities. Joint hearing with Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs. (November 15, 16, and 17, 1945.)

6. Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War. (November 28, 29, and 30, 1945.)

7. The Independent Petroleum Co. (March 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, and 28, 1946.)

8. The Oil and Gas Division of the Department of the Interior. (June 17, 1946.)

At each of the above hearings, with the exception of the last, the committee had the benefit of thorough factual presentations by representative groups selected by the petroleum industry. The statistics, charts, historical data, and elaborate descriptive material, thus assembled with painstaking care, together with their logical presentation at the hearings, have been of great aid to the committee in arriving at its conclusions. Likewise, the committee has benefited from the valuable testimony of numerous witnesses from governmental agencies charged with duties relating to certain phases of petroleum activity, and from interested members of the public—to all of whom the committee expresses its gratitude. Indeed, too much credit cannot be given to the representatives of industry and of Government for the thoroughness and the frankness with which they prepared and presented their evidence. The demand which the committee has had for the printed volumes of the hearings bears witness to the value of the material that was gathered.[4]

FACTUAL SUMMARY

The most pertinent facts developed at these hearings may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Although the demand in the United States for petroleum and petroleum products is greater now than it ever has been, and although the demand gives every indication of continuing to increase,[5] this country is no longer the world's greatest reservoir of oil. More than 63 percent of all petroleum produced in the world between 1859 and 1941 was drawn from deposits within the boundaries of the continental United States.[6] It was United States oil that made this country the industrial leader of the world. It was United States oil primarily that fueled the armies, the fleets, and the air squadrons of the United Nations in the war against Germany, Italy, and Japan. Today, however, less than one-third of the proved oil reserves of the world are located in continental United States.[7]

2. Discoveries of new fields in the United States during the past 10 years have been decreasing in size and importance, while the opposite is true of discoveries made abroad.[8]

---

[1] S. Res. 253, 78th Cong., 2d sess., agreed to March 13, 1944; continued until the end of the 79th Cong., by S. Res. 36, 79th Cong., 1st sess., agreed to January 29, 1945.

[2] Idem.

[3] S. Rept. No. 179, 79th Cong., 1st sess.

[4] Thus far, more than 21,000 copies of the various hearings have been distributed, of which more than half have been distributed by the Government Printing Office through sales in excess of 7,800 copies and through shipments to libraries, etc.

[5] Postwar Demand for Oil Products, World Petroleum, September 1946, pp. 60, 63. See also address by Serge B. Jurenev, of the Continental Oil Co., reported in the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 9, 1947. See also National Petroleum News, Dec. 25, 1946, pp. 24–27.

[6] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 354–357. The Petroleum Almanac (National Industrial Conference Board), 1946, pp. 293–298.

[7] The Petroleum Almanac, op. cit., p. 42. Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 199–201. In the Middle East alone, the proved reserves greatly exceed those of the United States. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

[8] Hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, pp. 275–280; Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, pp. 6–7, 68 ff., 85, 217; the Independent Petroleum Company, pp. 216, 249, 262; American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 5–7, 66 ff., 422.

The average new field discovered at the present day in the United States scarcely exceeds 2,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil, while the 300 fields discovered abroad during the 20 years prior to 1943 have an average ultimate yield of about 100,000,000 barrels each.[9]

3. In the United States one wildcat well has been drilled for every 12 square miles of prospective area, but in foreign countries only one wildcat has been drilled for every 480 square miles; and the best evidence available at the moment would indicate that the land area of Russia is a greater potential source of petroleum than continental United States.[10]

4. New sources of petroleum in the United States might be obtained, but to what extent no one can say with any degree of certainty, in the following ways:

(a) New exploratory drilling on the public domain and elsewhere;

(b) Deeper drilling, as a result of improved technology, to horizons hitherto untested;

(c) Stimulated production from old fields by improved methods of secondary recovery and by payment of governmental subsidies; [11]

(d) Exploration of the Continental Shelf; [12]

(e) Manufacture of gasoline and other products from natural gas; and

(f) Extraction of petroleum from oil shale, and manufacture of synthetic liquid fuel from coal as well as from agricultural commodities.

5. The discovery, production, refining, and distribution of petroleum and its products are operations too complex and costly to be feasible for individual enterprise, but may be conducted efficiently and profitably only by corporate organizations.

6. American groups, organized in the corporate form, have not only achieved a high degree of efficiency in the United States but have carried the industry to almost every quarter of the globe.

7. The development of the industry has been marked by the appearance of integration and concentration.[13]

8. During the year 1944, 83.51 percent of all crude oil run to stills in the United States was handled by 21 major companies. The remaining 16.49 percent was refined by approximately 234 independent companies.[14] In the same year, 61.3 percent of the gross domestic production of crude oil was produced by 21 major companies.[15] In the case of American oil companies with investments abroad, from 93 to 95 percent of the total investment is held by 22 companies and their subsidiaries and affiliates.[16]

9. American oil interests own or have a share of production or of proved crude-oil reserves in 20 foreign countries in both hemispheres.[17] American petroleum investment abroad increased at the rate of $100,000,000 per annum during the 20-year period beginning with 1920.[18] The American share of foreign proved reserves (excluding Russia) has grown from 22.7 percent of the estimated 9,175,000,000 barrels in 1928 to 46.3 percent of the estimated 37,554,000,000 barrels in 1945.[19] The American share of foreign proved reserves in the Western Hemisphere is 65.2 percent of the total foreign reserves in this hemisphere.[20]

10. The risks and financial costs involved in foreign operations are of such magnitude that only the larger companies can assume the hazards, and even these companies find the difficulties so great that they customarily operate through hundreds of subsidiaries and by means of joint ventures among themselves and with foreign corporations so as to distribute the risk.[21]

11. American oil companies, managed independently of the Government of the United States, are associated in some joint ventures with foreign oil companies that are controlled by foreign governments.[22]

12. Foreign concessions in which these investments are made involve operations of such magnitude, often affecting vast areas and large segments of native populations in the stage of agricultural or nomadic civilization, that the companies must engage in activities which are normally considered the function of government, charity, or industries of other types.[23]

13. The very size of many foreign concessions, covering areas sometimes greater than most States of the American Union, and affecting the economic welfare of all inhabitants of the regions where located, necessitates complicated negotiations between the companies and the foreign governments concerned. The resulting contracts have, therefore, an intimate relationship both with the economy and the politics of foreign countries.

14. The economic impact of the production and distribution of petroleum upon the people of all nations of the world is so great that not infrequently a strong movement develops toward nationalization of petroleum resources in those countries where oil deposits are found, and toward establishment of state oil-trade monopolies in other countries that are on an import basis.

15. There are vast areas of the globe which apparently are without petroleum deposits. Most of Africa and Australia offer little prospect to the driller. China, Japan, eastern Siberia, a large part of Russia in Europe, the Scandinavian peninsula, France, Spain, Italy, and the British Isles are virtually without local sources of oil supply. Except for the United States, which with approximately 20 percent of the world's potential oil-producing area has furnished more than 63 percent of the world's oil requirements, the more industrialized and populous countries must look beyond their own borders for the petroleum they require. Russia, however, which cherishes among its dominant aspirations the achievement of industrial leadership, possesses in the Ob basin of western Siberia a vast extent of potentially rich oil land, and also has control of important sources of supply in the Caucasus and in

---

[9] Testimony of James Terry Duce before subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys on S. 1243, 78th Cong., 1st sess., August 3, 1943, Synthetic Liquid Fuels, p. 63.

[10] Hearings, Foreign Contracts Act, pp. 129–131.

[11] By listing the payment of subsidies as a method of obtaining additional oil, the committee is not to be understood as taking a position either advocating or opposing a subsidy program.

[12] The Continental Shelf is sometimes defined as the submarine extension of the land mass of the coast to a depth of 100 fathoms.

[13] By "integration" is meant the consolidation under the same corporate management of the principal branches of the industry, namely, production, refining, transportation, and marketing. By "concentration" is meant the acquisition by a comparatively few companies of control over a substantial portion of the industry. Integration and concentration of control are the characteristics according to which, by common usage in the business, corporations are roughly designated as "majors" or "independents."

[14] Hearings, The Independent Petroleum Co., pp. 188–189.

[15] Ibid., p. 53. This corresponds roughly with the proportion of the proved reserves owned by the major companies. See statement prepared for the Temporary National Economic Committee by William S. Farish, president, Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), printed in hearings before the said committee (October 23, 1939), pt. 17, Petroleum Industry, sec. IV, pp. 9933–9935.

[16] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, p. 182. Two of these companies (James B. Berry Sons' Co. and Tide Water Associated Oil Co.) have no investment in foreign exploration or production, but confine their investment abroad to other branches—to marketing in the case of the former of the two companies, and to refining and marketing in the case of the latter company.

[17] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, p. 57. American oil interests are known to be directly or indirectly engaged in exploration in at least 11 foreign countries or areas in which there has not yet been developed commercial production or proved reserves. Ibid., p. 57.

[18] At the end of 1919 the total assets employed abroad were $399,000,000, and at the end of 1939 they were nearly $2,500,000,000—a growth of 526 percent. Ibid., pp. 157–161.

[19] Ibid., pp. 199–201.

[20] Ibid., p. 200. It should be noted that even in the Western Hemisphere there are vast stretches of untested territory, especially in South America, where the surface geology has been thoroughly studied in only a few countries, and where geophysical methods of exploration have not been applied on a large scale even in all of these. (See Oil Resources of South America, World Petroleum, December 1946, pp. 54–57.)

[21] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, p. 182. For example, the Iraq Petroleum Co. is owned by British, Dutch, and French interests, together with the Standard Oil Co. (N. J.) and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. The Arabian American Oil Co., which holds the well-known concession in Saudi Arabia, is presently a joint venture of the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. Recently it has been reported that negotiations are in progress looking to a further spreading of risk by the Arabian American Oil Co. through acquisition of substantial blocks of its stock by the Standard Oil Co. (N. J.) and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. The consummation of this realinement of ownership would appear to assume the termination of the famous "red line agreement" whereby the companies associated in the Turkish Petroleum Co. (Iraq Petroleum Co.) undertook not to engage in activity in former Ottoman territory beyond the borders of Mesopotamia (Iraq) except through the medium of the Turkish Petroleum Co. (See Diplomatic Production of American Petroleum Interests in Mesopotamia, Netherlands East Indies, and Mexico, p. 21. S. Doc. No. 43, 79th Cong., 1st sess., prepared by the chief counsel of the committee.)

[22] For instance, the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., which is controlled through stock ownership by the British Government, owns a 23.75 percent interest in Iraq Petroleum Co. in which two American companies, the Standard Oil Co. (N. J.) and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., own an equivalent percentage. Another example is the equal division of control of the Kuwait Oil Co. between the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. and the Gulf Oil Corp. Not the least of the advantages possessed by the privately owned company is its ability to enter a foreign country which might bar the door to operations therein by a company controlled by a foreign government. The vice president of the Arabian American Oil Co. has stated that King Ibn Saud remarked "that he was glad to make an agreement with a company which would not involve itself in the complicated politics of the Middle East but would carry out its commercial mission of exploring for and developing oil fields." (James Terry Duce, Aramco Concession, The Texaco Star, Saudi Arabian Number, 1946, pp. 16–18, at p. 17.)

[23] Thus, the companies often dredge channels, build roads, schools, light and power plants, hospitals, etc. (Infra, pp. 39–40.) Sometimes these activities are carried on by the companies in conjunction with foreign public authorities, and sometimes independently. (Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 61–65, 271–289.)

eastern European territory which is presently in the Soviet zone of influence as a result of World War II.[24]

16. American oil companies operating abroad have furnished a large proportion of Europe's needs from their Latin-American concessions,[25] and are now preparing to furnish an even larger proportion from their concessions and through their distributing facilities in the Near and Middle East.[26]

The mere recitation of the above facts makes it immediately obvious that the story of oil now unfolding on the international horizon is a political and economic drama of the first magnitude. It is a drama of peace and war and progress that may affect the future of civilization even more profoundly than it has the past.

The formulation of a national oil policy raises questions both domestic and international—questions as to production and consumption at home and abroad; questions of the relationship between the "independents" and the "majors," among the majors themselves, and between the majors and foreign governments; questions of cartelization and imperialism; questions of the relationship between American operators and the Government of the United States; and finally, questions of international understanding among the peoples of the world, so that petroleum, instead of being a possible source of conflicting ambitions among rival powers, may become a means of raising the standard of living of people everywhere and of promoting the dissemination throughout the world of the principles of human liberty.

THE NECESSITY FOR PETROLEUM

It is appropriate here to repeat that in time of peace a nation, to maintain a first-class rating in the trade and commerce of the modern world, must have access to an abundant supply of oil because mechanized industry and transportation depend upon it. Oil is also of basic importance for purposes other than the provision of energy. Petroleum lubricates the fleets, airplanes, and machines of the world. It is a raw material in the whole field of chemicals. It is used in the manufacture of pharmaceutical products, paints, solvents, plastics, and synthetic rubber. It is used as fuel for domestic comfort and for heating generally, on an ever-growing scale.

Furthermore, in time of war, as twice demonstrated on a large scale in the present century, a nation, to remain a first-class power, must have petroleum resources immediately and continuously available in virtually unlimited volume. Oil is the sine qua non of military victory.

Although future developments of atomic research may eventually result in supplanting some or many of the peacetime applications of petroleum, an industrialized nation cannot in the immediate nor perhaps in the distant future dispense with oil both for fuel and lubricating use. Moreover, despite the prospect that the military application of atomic fission may render future war briefer and still more catastrophic, a nation in relying solely on the atomic bomb, either for offense or defense, would court disaster.[27] If the use of atomic bombs by one or by both belligerents did not terminate the struggle, the supply of oil might again prove the decisive factor.

Therefore, as a basis for a sound national petroleum policy, the extent and location of our proved oil reserves, their productive capacity, and our domestic requirements must be considered.

PROVED RESERVES

However sanguine may be the hopes of geologists derived from historical trends of discovery, or however likely may be the presence of petroleum in untested areas,[28] it would be unwise to rest conclusions for present purposes upon any premise other than "proved" reserves as that adjective is understood by the American oil industry.[29] If present estimates of future productive possibilities are later demonstrated to have been conservative, our national oil policy could be readily adapted to the happy plenitude of supply. If the future proves less roseate, our policy will have run concurrently with the facts and the Nation's security will not have been adventured.

1. Proved reserves within continental United States: The latest (December 31, 1945) estimate by the American Petroleum Institute is 20,826,813,000 barrels of crude oil recoverable under existing operating conditions.[30] Although since 1936 the total estimated reserves have shown an annual increase (with the exception of 1943),[31] this has been owing chiefly to extensions to existing fields and revisions of former estimates, the reserves of new pools discovered each year having of late been far below annual production.[32] Of course, this trend may be reversed by the discovery of one or more great pools, but it is noteworthy that despite greater exploratory effort, increased and deeper drilling, and improved technology, the estimates of reserves found in new fields in 1945 are still less than the annual civilian consumption.[33] Some American authorities, however, are more optimistic in their estimates of the quantity of oil which may be discovered in the United States. They assert that this country should ultimately yield at least 100,000,000,000 barrels of oil, including the 44,000,000,000 barrels already discovered.[34]

2. American interest in foreign crude reserves: Although data comparable in accuracy to estimates of United States domestic reserves do not exist in respect of foreign areas, the total proved reserves outside the United States have been estimated at 43,319,000,000 barrels, of which about 40.1 percent, or 17,371,000,000 barrels, represents our posi-

[24] Hearings, Foreign Contracts Act, pp. 124 ff.; Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, pp. 120–121.

[25] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, p. 213.

[26] It was announced last month that the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. had concluded "in principle" an agreement for the purchase of substantial quantities of crude from the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. during a 20-year period. The agreement also involves the possibility of constructing a pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. This contract, together with the acquisition of an interest by these two American companies in the Arabian American Oil Co. (supra, p. 11 n.), indicates a belief that Europe and the western Mediterranean area will constitute a great future market for petroleum products. (The Wall Street Journal, December 27, 1946.)

[27] Frederick S. Dunn et al., The Absolute Weapon: Atomic Power and World Order, pp. 21–107. (Bernard Brodie, Ed.; Institute of International Studies, Yale University. New York, 1946.)

[28] Much has been published recently as to potential oil reserves underlying the Continental Shelf. Although it is virtually certain that petroleum is present in the Continental Shelf off some parts of the coast, its recovery by known technical methods would involve prohibitive costs. The greatest underwater depth at which drilling has been thus far successful is about 15 fathoms, and this has been not in the open sea such as the Gulf of Mexico but in the protected waters of Lake Maracaibo in Venezuela. To be sure, research in the technique of underwater drilling should continue vigorously in the hope that recovery of oil in the Continental Shelf may become commercially possible. However, at the present time the United States should not base its petroleum policy upon the expectation that the development of such resources is imminent.

[29] The American Petroleum Institute's committee on petroleum reserves, under the chairmanship of the late J. Edgar Pew, in a report dated February 16, 1945, defined "proved" reserves in the following language: "Proved reserves are both drilled and undrilled. The proved drilled reserves, in any pool, include the oil estimated to be recoverable by the production systems now in operation (whether primary or secondary) and from the area actually drilled up on the spacing pattern in vogue in that pool. The proved undrilled reserves, in any pool, include reserves under undrilled spacing units which are so close, and so related, to the drilled units that there is every reasonable probability that they will produce when drilled." (Report printed in hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, pp. 38 et seq.) It is worthy of note that Soviet geologists take into account, in addition to reserves deemed "proved" under American standards, "supposed" reserves—estimated "on the basis of the geological structure of the field and of the region," and "possible" reserves—believed "possible for various geological reasons." According to Prof. Ivan M. Gubkin, prominent Russian expert, the assessment of "supposed" reserves is necessary for the planning of future oil production, that of "possible" reserves for "long-term general orientation." (Solomon M. Schwarz, How Much Oil Has Russia? Foreign Affairs, July 1946, vol. 24, pp. 736–741.)

[30] The Petroleum Almanac, op. cit., p. 42. Of course, more oil may become available by secondary recovery methods from fields where such methods have not yet been applied, and from extensions to existing pools, revisions of previous estimates, new discoveries, and improved technology.

[31] Hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, p. 40.

[32] This is true for the past 5 years whether one considers the token figures used by the American Petroleum Institute for new pools or the higher estimates therefor given by Mr. E. DeGolyer. (See testimony at hearing, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, pp. 275–280.) It is of interest to note that discoveries aggregating from 80,000,000 to 100,000,000 barrels have been made on the public domain since the O'Mahoney Act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1080), and that exploration has been notably stimulated by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 696), amending the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (41 Stat. 437).

[33] Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, pp. 84–85. It has been recently asserted that in the last 5 years the oil producer's effort has increased 41 percent, the results have shown a decrease of 58 percent, and his costs have meanwhile increased 256 percent. (H. J. Struth, Cost of Discovering New Petroleum Reserves Continued to Increase in 1945, The Petroleum Engineer, February 1946, vol. 17, pp. 51–58; see also James V. Brown, The Trends in Costs of Replacing Petroleum Reserves, the Independent Petroleum Association of America Monthly, March 1946, vol. XVI, pp. 17–26.)

[34] Wallace E. Pratt, Oil in the Earth, p. 68. (University of Kansas Press, 1943.) William R. Boyd, Jr., president of the American Petroleum Institute, also finds no reason to be unduly disturbed at the status of the reserves. "The view," he says, "that crude discoveries of importance are on the decline in this country has, in my opinion, little basis in fact." (Dallas News, December 15, 1946.)

tion as of January 1, 1945.[35] Of these reserves, about 5,596,000,000 barrels are located in the Caribbean region (Venezuela, Colombia, and Trinidad); about 11,136,000,000 in the Near and Middle East; and the remaining 639,000,000 are distributed in Oceania, Europe, and the Western Hemisphere outside the Caribbean.[36]

PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

1. Fields within continental United States: Crude-oil production for the year 1929 reached a peak slightly in excess of 1,000,000,000 barrels.[37] This total was not attained again until 1936.[38] In 1940 the annual production was about 1,350,000,000 barrels.[39] During the war the total rose in 1945 to a figure in the neighborhood of 1,711,000,000 barrels.[40] At the time of the formal entrance of the United States into the war in 1941, this country had an efficient productive capacity of approximately 4,650,000 barrels daily.[41] The maximum efficient rate of production began to be exceeded in mid-1944; by mid-1945 the maximum efficient capacity was being exceeded by approximately 300,000 barrels per day.[42] During the war the proved reserves within the United States were produced at the average rate of nearly 7½ percent per year.[43] In 1946 the production is reported by the Bureau of Mines to have exceeded 1,730,000,000 barrels. The Bureau estimates a total production of 1,746,000,000 barrels for the current year.[44]

2. Foreign fields owned by or under concession to United States nationals: In 1939 the American share in foreign production totaled approximately 554,000 barrels daily, about 441,000 barrels thereof being produced in the Western Hemisphere, principally in the Caribbean area.[45] It is to be anticipated, however, that a rapidly increasing American production will flow from the extensive reserves in the Middle East.

During the recent war the known foreign reserves, American and other, on the average were drawn upon at the approximate rate of 2 percent per year.[46] In August 1945, total foreign crude production (excluding Axis and Russian areas) attained a peak of 1,900,000 barrels daily.[47]

DOMESTIC PETROLEUM REQUIREMENTS

In 1938, the last normal prewar year, domestic requirements, civilian and military, were 3,115,000 barrels per day; only 3 years later the 1941 domestic requirements were approximately 4,070,000 barrels daily.[48] During the war, even with civilian rationing, production from reserves within the United States was increased to a peak of 4,690,000 barrels per day for the month of July 1945.[49] In 1946 the demand exceeded even the wartime requirements.[50]

Forecasts presented to the committee in October 1945 indicate a domestic demand in 1950 of 4,955,000 barrels per day, gradually rising to 5,735,000 after 1960.[51] However, since these estimates were made, new forecasts indicate a peacetime demand as high as 5,400,000 barrels daily in 1950; 5,650,000 in 1955; and 5,850,000 in 1960.[52] All these forecasts are made on the assumption that the United States will not engage in war during the period.

NATIONAL POLICY IN THE PAST

For some time after the discovery of oil by Drake in 1859 the production and sale of oil were essentially local in scope. No problems immediately arose of a nature to concern the Congress. Under the stimulus of private initiative the industry expanded as the years went by and as the demand for oil increased. During this period, and even in more recent days, it could hardly be claimed that there was a conscious or comprehensive national petroleum policy. To be sure, in the twentieth century the principle of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil Case,[53] applying the Antitrust Act to combinations in undue restraint of interstate trade in petroleum, has been generally accepted. The principle of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920,[54] under which the Federal Government retains ownership of oil lands on the public domain, although leasing them for development and operation by private industry, has likewise been accepted, as has Federal legislation (a) prohibiting interstate shipment of petroleum produced in contravention of State law, and (b) consenting to compacts among the States to prevent wasteful production. Moreover, the Congress, recognizing that production costs were deterring the manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels, recently authorized the Department of the Interior for a limited time to construct and operate demonstration plants for the production of such fuels from coal, oil shale, and agricultural and forestry products.[55] Nor has the Nation been without a foreign-petroleum policy, sometimes more successful than at other times, based upon the principle of the "cpen door."

The following generalizations may perhaps be made in respect of the historical development of the American oil industry:

1. The industry has been owned and operated by private enterprise, with a minimum of regulation by Government, either Federal or State;

2. A competitive system with opportunity for small operators to establish themselves, to prosper, and to expand, has been regarded as the ideal;

3. Integration of the various branches of the business—production, refining, transportation, and marketing—has not been prohibited, with the result that some 21 efficient companies with strong financial resources have become capable of operating throughout the United States and 14 of the same companies also operate in many foreign areas;

4. No impediments have been created by the Federal Government to exploration and production abroad. The "open-door" policy has been recognized in principle, and although foreign development has been for the most part undertaken by the operators on their own initiative and at their own risk, they have, in increasing degree, sought the cooperation of the Department of State;

5. Under the Webb-Pomerene Act,[56] American companies have been permitted to operate freely abroad in accordance with the economic and legal conditions there confronting them, so long as the antitrust laws of this country have not been violated;

6. Foreign companies have been allowed to qualify to do business in the United States, and to lease public lands therein, provided American companies were granted reciprocal privileges;

7. Except in the case of public lands, the conservation and production of petroleum, including natural gas, within the United States have been left to the jurisdiction of the State governments, with supplementary Federal legislation to forbid the interstate shipment of petroleum produced in violation of State law, and to authorize interstate compacts for prevention of waste;

8. Because oil, like other minerals, is a diminishing resource, and because investments incident to exploration involve unique risks with danger of large financial loss, the Congress through income-tax provisions has allowed deductions for depletion and intangible drilling costs; and

9. The development of domestic resources by domestic companies has been regarded as worthy of protection against imported oil.

On the basis of the industrial practices and State and Federal law thus far evolved, the American oil industry has developed a technical know-how that is matchless. Proved reserves which in 1918 were only 6,200,000,000 barrels climbed to 20,826,813,000 barrels in 1945.[57] From a daily average production of crude in 1918—a war year—amounting to 975,000 barrels from 203,000 wells, the daily average rose by 1938 to 3,327,000 barrels from 369,000 wells.[58] At the same time the average price at the service station of a gallon of gasoline declined from 25.1 cents in 1918 to 12.75 cents, excluding tax, in 1940.[59]

Meanwhile the utility of oil for a wide variety of civilian uses became more and more apparent. The internal-combustion engine was improved. Road-building programs covered the continent with a network of good highways. The motor industry developed the mass production of automobiles.

---

[35] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, p. 199. Total proved reserves in the Western Hemisphere (exclusive of the United States) are about 8,885,000,000 barrels. In the Near and Middle East the total proved reserves are estimated conservatively at 26,800,000,000 barrels; in Europe (including Russia) at 6,367,000,000 barrels; and in the Far East at 1,184,000,000 barrels. Ibid., pp. 71, 75, 200.

[36] Ibid., p. 200.

[37] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, p. 15.

[38] Ibid., p. 15.

[39] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, p. 15.

[40] The Petroleum Almanac, op. cit., p. 11.

[41] Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, p. 81.

[42] Ibid., pp. 6, 64–65, 81. This excessive rate of withdrawal, although regarded by scientists as unwise, was permitted in order to meet the demands of war. Our allies in the late war received from us 80 percent of their petroleum. (Eugene Holman, We Will Have Plenty of Oil, the American Magazine, January 1946, pp. 28–29, 99–101, at p. 99.)

[43] Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, pp. 111, 118.

[44] U. S. Bureau of Mines, Monthly Petroleum Forecast, No. MFR 137, Dec. 13, 1946. See also Oil Industry Enters Year of Expanding Activity, World Petroleum, January 1947, pp. 36 ff.

[45] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, p. 193.

[46] Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, pp. 111, 118.

[47] Ibid., p. 118.

[48] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, p. 30.

[49] Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, p. 81.

[50] An all-time high daily crude-oil production was reached for the week ended June 15, 1946, of 4,960,650 barrels. Two weeks later the daily production was only about 3,000 barrels below this record. (American Petroleum Institute reports.) Based on statistics of the Bureau of Mines through last October, the total domestic demand for petroleum products in 1946 averaged 4,812,000 barrels daily.

[51] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, p. 60.

[52] National Petroleum News, December 25, 1946, pp. 24–27.

[53] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States* (221 U. S. 1 (1911)).

[54] 41 Stat. 437.

[55] 58 Stat. 190.

[56] 40 Stat. 516.

[57] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, p. 18. The Petroleum Almanac, op. cit., p. 42.

[58] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, p. 15.

[59] Ibid., pp. 14, 36.

The oil industry met the challenge. Per capita consumption increased from 36 gallons a year in 1900 to 367 gallons a year in 1938.[60] In 1918 the refining capacity was 1,186,000 barrels daily of crude oil against about 5,000,000 barrels at the present time.[61] In 1918 the mileage of trunk and gathering crude-oil pipe lines totaled 55,000 in contrast to the present network of 141,000 miles.[62] The United States tank-ship fleet grew from 145 oceangoing vessels of 2,000 gross tons or over in 1918 to 382 in 1938, and to 907 on September 1, 1945.[63] In 1912 the share of American companies in all foreign crude-oil production was 8.4 percent; in 1938 it was 23.8 percent.[64] On January 1, 1945, the total foreign reserve (proved) of American companies was 17,371,000,000 barrels, or about 40.1 percent of all foreign reserves.[65] In 1938—the last normal year—United States production was 60.6 percent of world production, and during the war years—1941-44—nearly 65 percent of the world's estimated total production was supplied from wells in the United States.[66] With only 6 percent of the world's land surface, the United States, for the last 40 years, has produced annually more than one-half of the world's total supply of crude.[67]

A petroleum program that has yielded these magnificent results would seem to require no radical change. On the other hand, this country may not wisely conclude that the wells will never run dry, nor that the reserves which its explorers have discovered abroad will always be available. Considerations of national security demand everlasting vigilance. In this troubled world, which has not yet learned how to avoid war, the oil policy of this Nation while at peace must, nevertheless, be governed by the inexorable demands of self-preservation.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

If the United States should become engaged in a war waged wholly or partially outside its boundaries, the availability of oil from American reserves near the foreign theater of hostilities would be advantageous. To the extent that the war were waged within or near the continental United States, the reserves within this country would be of paramount importance.

It should not be assumed that all future warfare will occur beyond our boundaries. If invaded we would naturally rely first upon local oil reserves. If production from these were inadequate and if the United States controlled the sea, supplementary oil might be imported. However, it should not be assumed, particularly in the light of our experience with hostile submarines off the Atlantic coast in the last war, that the United States would at all times be in control of the routes between our ports and our petroleum reserve situate abroad. This is not to imply that American petroleum interests abroad should receive only lukewarm diplomatic protection, or that we should not emphasize exploration and development of our concessions in other lands. Quite the contrary should be our policy because those reserves will add to prosperity in time of peace and may under certain conditions of warfare be highly useful. But, in the final analysis, the reserves within our own borders are more likely than not to constitute the citadel of our defense.

It follows that nothing should be done to weaken the productive capacity of domestic reserves, and that every possible step should be taken both to increase these reserves and continuously to develop them to such a degree as would occasion no regret in the event of war.

If the Nation during wartime were called upon to supply all its military and essential civilian requirements from reserves located in the United States, and if the war were conducted on a large scale, the task could not be accomplished from the reserves now known. The presence of proved reserves in excess of 20,000,000,000 barrels does not mean that a mere turn of the valves will yield production in any desired amount. There is a limit at which a given supply can be made available. Thus, it is a physical impossibility, even disregarding maximum efficient rates, to produce say one-fourteenth of the reserve supply annually for 14 years. Many an old well, now giving up but small quantities each day, is expected to produce for 20 years to come. The oil will not flow out of the reservoir rock any sooner. Moreover, the Nation no longer enjoys the comfortable margin between production and productive capacity prevailing in 1941.[68]

To say that imports from the Caribbean area can be utilized in wartime by virtue of our control of the Caribbean is too hazardous a program. Our naval bases and tankers are subject to destruction, to say nothing as to the possibility of attack on the foreign petroleum fields themselves.

The answer is to be found in synthetic production. Synthetic gasoline can be produced from natural gas at costs similar to present costs of producing domestic gasoline from crude petroleum.[69] Oil shale and subbituminous coal and lignites also can be utilized to produce gasoline and other liquid fuels at a cost which research has already reduced from 14 to about 8 cents per gallon above that of producing gasoline from crude.[70] These sources of supply, it is estimated, are capable of meeting all domestic petroleum requirements for many centuries.[71] In view of these facts it is folly to be apprehensive that this Nation is facing a shortage of liquid fuel. But it behooves the Nation as soon as possible to take bold steps in the direction of synthetic production so that such production can become readily geared into the oil economy.

Until such time as synthetic production costs are not in excess of those of production from crude oil, there will be a natural temptation in peacetime to meet domestic deficiencies with imported petroleum. But to the extent that the volume of imports is permitted to grow during such period, the Nation-wide industrial plant necessary for synthetic production will fail to emerge through private investment. This is not to say that the manufacture of synthetic fuel should be fostered by a governmental policy designed to force prices up, thereby rendering such manufacture commercially profitable, but rather that the Bureau of Mines should continue to build and operate demonstration plants, and to conduct research, pursuant to the authority conferred by the act of April 5, 1944,[72] to the end that the transition may be made promptly at the appropriate time.[73]

Prior to the transition, it must ever be borne in mind that crude reserves in the ground, no matter how vast, are useless in an emergency unless they are producible to meet the emergency. It requires skilled manpower, expensive equipment, and a long period of time to drill an oil well. Moreover, daily yields are physically limited in volume. After the oil reaches the surface it must find transportation by pipe line, tanker, barge, tank car, or tank truck, or by

---

[60] Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy under the Petroleum Administration for War, p. 248. In 1938 the annual per capita consumption for the rest of the world was approximately 21 gallons. (Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, p. 406.)

[61] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, pp. 18, 113.

[62] Twentieth Century Petroleum Statistics, p. 34. (Prepared in the office of the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, November 15, 1945.) The latter of the above-named figures includes approximately 14,000 miles of products lines.

[63] The dead-weight tonnage of these vessels in 1918 totaled 1,221,897 tons; in 1938 the total was 4,364,459 tons; and on September 1, 1945, it was 13,379,143 tons. In terms of T2-SE-A1 equivalent, the United States possessed 38.8 percent of the world tank-ship fleet in 1938, and 59.8 percent thereof on September 1, 1945. (Hearings, War Emergency Pipe-Line Systems and Other Petroleum Facilities, p. 280.) As a result of the emergency of the late war, which required capital expenditure beyond even the resources of the oil industry, a huge fleet of Government-owned tankers came into being. On April 1, 1945, the flag of the United States was flying over 54 percent of all world tanker tonnage (d. w. t.) as contrasted with 26 percent on September 1, 1939. (Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, pp. 199-200, 210-211.) The Government of the United States thus became the owner of 74 percent (d. w. t.) of the present United States fleet. (Hearings, War Emergency Pipe-Line Systems and Other Petroleum Facilities, pp. 272, 317.)

[64] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 189, 192.

[65] Supra, p. 19. The British-Dutch position on that date was also about 40 percent. The remaining 20 percent was owned by all other foreign interests, including the government-operated reserves in Argentina, Bolivia, Mexico, and Russia aggregating in those four countries nearly three-fourths of the said 20 percent. (Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 200-201.)

[66] Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, p. 115.

[67] Ibid., p. 115.

[68] "It was fortunate, indeed, that the United States was able to enter the war with a million barrels per day of reserve productive capacity. Probably the most important lesson learned from the war is the need to maintain an adequate reserve productive capacity, and hence the need to keep the petroleum industry in an environment which will permit it to regain and retain the position of readiness in which it entered World War II."—Philip H. Bohart, Director of Production Division, Petroleum Administration for War, in statement before the committee, November 28, 1945. (Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, p. 81.)

[69] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, p. 69. The present gas reserves are of the order of magnitude of two hundred trillion cubic feet. Such reserves may eventually be of even greater importance than our present proved oil reserves. (Hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, pp. 26, 54-58.) With natural gas costing about 4 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, it is claimed that gasoline can be produced therefrom at 5½ cents per gallon. The current cost of producing gasoline from crude is about 5½ cents per gallon. (Letter from R. R. Sayers, Director, Bureau of Mines, to the chairman of the committee, December 6, 1946.)

[70] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, pp. 69-71. Further, it should not be overlooked that the cost of oil production in the United States has been rising, owing to the increased expense for exploration and development. "As far as can be anticipated at present, there is good justification for the belief that oil from shale may soon be produced at a cost that will bring it within competitive range of the petroleum industry."—R. R. Sayers, letter cited supra, note 69.

[71] Hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, pp. 26-27; The Independent Petroleum Co., p. 399.

[72] 58 Stat. 190. (O'Mahoney-Randolph Act.)

[73] Hearings, Petroleum Requirements—Postwar, p. 71.

a combination of these. Then it must be refined, and the various products thereafter distributed. To do these things upon arrival of emergency requires that certain conditions exist during the period prior to the emergency. Thus, laboratories of research must be maintained; geological and engineering expertise must uninterruptedly progress; wildcat drilling must flourish; patient exploration must take place; and an industrial esprit de corps unhampered by governmental or monopolistic encumbrances or restraints must illuminate the whole.

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INTERESTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Too little understood is the place in our modern economy occupied by the American oil companies operating abroad. They have achieved by their initiative a dominant position in foreign commerce, a position which is maintained, upon the one hand, by contracts, concessions, and understandings with various governments and, upon the other hand, by the routine functions of trade in the refining and distribution of their products. These companies have, therefore, an impact both in the political and in the economic spheres.

In the political sphere, they have relations not only with the governments of the countries where petroleum is produced, but with the governments of the countries where petroleum products are sold and where, not infrequently, the object of the foreign government is to establish some form of state monopoly or cartel by which the course of commerce in petroleum will be guided as the government may desire.[74] Then, too, these companies have relations with the Government of the United States, whereby they endeavor to keep the Department of State advised as to their current activities and programs to the end that the same will not be contrary to American foreign policy and that the companies will be in a position to request prompt diplomatic protection when necessary.[75]

In the economic sphere, the foreign operations of American oil companies constitute a major factor in world trade. These operations, moreover, are not a thing apart from the domestic oil industry—indeed, they are closely meshed with it. The companies which engage in foreign operations do so as a part of their over-all activity, either directly or through subsidiaries and affiliates. Hence, the financial position of the companies is strengthened by the profits of world trade, thereby benefiting directly hundreds of thousands of stockholders including over 42,000 banks, 700 insurance companies, and 3,700 charitable or educational institutions.[76]

Practically all oil imported into the United States is produced by American companies, and, of course, a goodly portion of the purchase price eventually finds its way to American stockholders. The United States Treasury also receives large sums in duties and income taxes arising from these foreign operations. The purchase in this country of drilling machines, pipe lines, and refinery equipment for foreign installation involves an annual expenditure of many millions of dollars. Moreover, it is urged frequently that the increased purchasing power of the foreign oil-producing countries, all of which benefit economically from the American pioneer who so often has been the first to tap the underground resources of distant regions, is reflected in increased exports from the United States in response to the stimulated demand for American-made goods.[77]

There is, however, another side of the picture. The American companies which possess the financial resources to enable them to operate abroad and to sit across the bargaining table from monarchs and foreign diplomats are few in number, but they heavily outweigh in the scope of their operations the hundreds of small companies which function independently in the domestic oil industry.[78] These "independent" companies look with considerable apprehension toward the threat of oil imports into the United States by the comparatively few American corporations operating abroad which control a vast productive potential.

In 1938, before the magnitude of the middle eastern oil resources was generally comprehended,[79] South American oil moved into Europe, to a large extent through the instrumentality of American companies, at the rate of 298,000 barrels daily. In addition, 188,000 barrels daily were exported from South America to the United States. At that time Europe imported oil from Iran and Iraq at the rate of only 171,000 barrels daily.[80] Now, in the year 1947 with increasing production in the Middle East, improved facilities for pipe-line transport to the Mediterranean from the Persian Gulf, and more efficient arrangements for European marketing,[81] a problem is posed for the producer in South America and for the producer in the United States. The question is being heard: "Will middle eastern oil displace South American oil in Europe and thereby turn the latter stream toward the United States?"

The Independent Petroleum Association of America, in a brief presented in December 1946 to the Committee for Reciprocity Information (Washington, D. C.), pointed to the increasing flow of petroleum imports which, during the first 9 months of 1946, reached an average of 378,000 barrels daily as compared with an average of 160,000 barrels daily imported by the United States during the 4 years 1936–39. Exports from the United States during the same 9 months of 1946 declined by 35,000 barrels daily from the average during the 4 years 1936–39.

It is not intended in this report to enter upon a discussion of reciprocal trade policies, and these facts in respect of increasing imports and decreasing exports of crude petroleum and its products are cited only to illustrate the impact on the domestic oil industry of the foreign operations of American companies. The facts are that a torrent of foreign oil could be released on our shores and that imports are already rising rapidly and net exports declining. An inundation by low-cost foreign oil could not help but injure the secondary recovery of domestic oil; it would stifle many an independent enterprise which, to exist, must make a profit under the high-cost conditions prevailing in the United States. The danger of this flood is what the independent domestic producer fears.

These facts, on the other hand, must be viewed against the background of the increasing use of petroleum and the slowing-up of important domestic discoveries. Since the turn of the century petroleum has been fast growing in importance as a source of industrial energy. In 1944 petroleum and natural gas furnished to the Nation seven-ninths as much energy as coal, whereas in 1900 they furnished only one-fourteenth as much as coal.[82] Since the termination of the recent hostilities a tremendous peacetime impetus has been given to the utilization of oil as a fuel. The Diesel engine is displacing the steam locomotive on American railroads; the bituminous coal-mining industry is losing a substantial portion of its market to oil; and it is obvious that, unless a national policy to the contrary be adopted, the time might well

[74] Hearings, Foreign Contracts Act, pp. 138–189, 256–258.

[75] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 101, 121. For example, when the celebrated red line agreement affecting the Persian Gulf area was in the making, A. C. Bedford, the chairman of the board of directors of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), called at the Department of State to ascertain the Government's attitude in relation to the progress of the negotiations undertaken privately with British interests for American participation in the development of the Mesopotamian oil fields. The Department took the position that participation by American companies in the Turkish Petroleum Co. would be unobjectionable under the American policy of the "open door," provided that all interested American oil companies had been accorded an opportunity to share in the arrangement, and that no attempt were made to establish a monopoly in favor of the Turkish Petroleum Co., or any other company. However, while Secretary Hughes in his letter of August 22, 1922, to the president of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) made no objection to the proposal that the participants obligate themselves not to be interested in former Ottoman territory beyond the borders of Mesopotamia except through the medium of the Turkish Petroleum Co., he declared that the said proposal would not affect the attitude of the United States Government in the diplomatic protection of American interests in such areas. (Diplomatic Protection of American Petroleum Interests in Mesopotamia, Netherlands East Indies, and Mexico, op. cit., pp. 20–21. See also hearings, Foreign Contracts Act, pp. 158 ff.)

[76] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, p. 290. The Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), and the Texas Co.—the four participants in the projected venture by which Saudi-Arabian oil is to be made available for distribution under a single managerial policy (supra, p. 11 n.) had a total of 470,752 stockholders as of December 31, 1945. (Moody's Manual of Investments, American and Foreign, Industrial Securities, 1946, pp. 1907, 2286, 2522, 2689.) Of course, this total includes numerous duplications, but it still is correct to say that these four companies have a larger number of stockholders in the aggregate than all but a few municipalities in the United States have inhabitants; indeed, a greater number than the population of some of the States of the Union.

[77] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 290–296.

[78] Thus, in respect of refining operations, while there are in the United States approximately 234 "independent" refining companies with 257 plants having a reported capacity, in terms of crude runs to stills, of about 750,000 barrels daily (hearings, The Independent Petroleum Co., pp. 189, 208), there are but five American companies with significant refining investments abroad namely, Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), Standard Oil Co. of California, The Texas Co., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., and Sinclair Oil Corp. (hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 205–208). There are 66 American-owned refineries in foreign countries, operated by 12 companies, with an estimated crude-distilling capacity in excess of 870,000 barrels daily. (Ibid., pp. 201–208.) In 1944, crude runs to stills in the United States by 21 major companies averaged about 3,800,000 barrels daily, which constituted 83½ percent of the runs for the entire United States (hearings, The Independent Petroleum Co., pp. 55, 188–189).

[79] The total new reserves to be discovered in the Persian Gulf area may ultimately exceed 150,000,000,000 barrels. Approximately one-third of the prospective part of this area lies within the Saudi-Arabian concession, owned by the Arabian American Oil Co. (James Terry Duce, Aramco Concession, The Texaco Star, Saudi-Arabian number, 1946, p. 16, citing Joseph E. Pogue's estimate.)

[80] Hearings, Foreign Contracts Act, p. 135, exhibit F.

[81] Supra, pp. 11 n., 13 n.

[82] Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, pp. 241–242, and see Chart No. 36 facing p. 252.

arrive, in view of diminishing discoveries at home, when the domestic petroleum operator would be at a severe disadvantage in competition with the American petroleum operator who was in a position to meet the demand with imported oil. However, the American investment in foreign oil operations could continue to yield a financial return, and at the same time the domestic oil producer remain in business, if the aims of world statesmen were diverted toward the ways of peace and the raising of the standard of living of the people everywhere.

In 1938 the United States and Canada, with less than 7 percent of the world's population, consumed 62 percent of all petroleum that was consumed in the world.[83] The per capita consumption in the United States and Canada for that year was 353 gallons. During the same 12 months the consumption in Australia and New Zealand was 122 gallons; in Russia, 41; in Latin America, 39; in Europe, 31; in Africa, 9; and in Asia, 4 gallons.[84] The great preponderance of consumption in North America is explained principally by the fact that the people of the United States and Canada have a standard of living and an industrial plant which create a far greater demand for petroleum than elsewhere in the world.

It would seem apparent that the danger of a world surplus of petroleum flowing into the United States to destroy the market of the independent oil operator could be readily averted by an increased industrialization in foreign countries and by an improvement of living standards whereby the use of motor vehicles would become more general throughout the world.[85] That such a possibility is not mere fancy is demonstrated by the fact that the gasoline demand in foreign countries during the period 1927–38 showed an average increase of approximately 19,000 barrels per day annually, or 4 percent per year, whereas in the United States the gasoline demand in the same period increased an average of about 24,000 barrels per day, or 2.1 percent per year. It should also be noted that for the same period the demand for all petroleum products abroad, excluding Russia, almost doubled, whereas in the United States the consumption increased about 50 percent.[86]

The prospect of improved living standards abroad is further enhanced by the manifold benefits to foreign countries through the very presence of the American oil investment therein. Likewise the social and educational benefits, resulting from the American investment and the policies of the companies, are manifold. Thus, in 1937, royalties and taxes paid in all foreign countries by American petroleum companies exceeded $687,000,000.[87] Thousands of the nationals of these countries find welcome employment, skilled and unskilled, by the oil companies, and other thousands find employment indirectly as the result of such large-scale operations.[88] Homes, hospitals, schools, highways, port works, power and light plants, telephone and telegraph lines, airports, water wells, facilities for drainage, irrigation, sanitation, etc., have been constructed in many parts of the world where they had been rarities.[89] It is of small moment that some of these improvements were motivated by a policy designed in the long run to profit the companies. The local benefits are no less real because business enterprise is sufficiently enlightened to cultivate good will.

It is obvious that operations in sparsely populated and remote areas, often in swamps, jungles, and deserts, are extremely costly. When, added to such costs, there is taken into consideration the gamble inevitable in all oil exploration, it is apparent that only companies with vast financial resources could undertake such enterprises. For example, a sum in excess of $60,000,000 was expended before the first oil was shipped from the Barco concession in Colombia, 23 years after the original acquisition of the concession by American interests. In Venezuela the Creole Petroleum Corp. spent $42,000,000 between the date of first investment (1920) and the date of first discovery (1928); and before the first oil was commercially marketed 2 years later, the company invested $6,000,000 more.[90]

Political risks also attend foreign oil operations, ranging from governmental competition, compulsory refinery installation, and trade and exchange control on the one hand, to revision or cancellation of contracts and outright expropriation on the other. In this hemisphere, Bolivia and Mexico took the initiative in nationalizing their petroleum deposits and in expropriating foreign oil properties.[91] In Europe, American oil interests which had made substantial investments in Rumania and Austria and had pioneered discoveries in Hungary now find their holdings after the war under control of Russia which previously expropriated American oil properties acquired under the Empire. Oil lands which have been prospected and developed in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrein Island, and throughout the Iraq-Iranian areas are involved in the conflicting politico-economic ambitions of Russia, Britain, France, and the Netherlands, to say nothing of the United States and the inhabitants of Palestine. Across the Indian Ocean in Sumatra the native population is assuming power, and an independence movement has threatened to upset the traditional concepts under which oil concessions were granted and oil interests acquired in the Netherlands East Indies. The new Indonesian government is reexamining these contracts and apparently is demanding at the very least that the Republic be recognized, in lieu of the former Dutch administration, as the successor party to the contracts.

With the labor government in England pursuing a policy of nationalization at home in respect of the coal industry—although abroad striving to maintain the structure of empire—and with the Soviets pursuing a policy of communism, the rising native governments have example enough to cause them to assume that prewar standards of dealing with natural resources require modification.

Thus is posed a thorny question of foreign policy for the United States. A foreign policy, simple enough when it involved chiefly the exercise of the Government's persuasive diplomatic authority for the preservation of economic conditions under which Americans could operate abroad with a minimum of difficulty, becomes complex indeed when it concerns the activities of modern corporate giants, the ambitions of totalitarian states, declining empires, and revolutionary uprisings.

Prior to the war of 1914–18, American diplomatic policy was not different for oil from what it was for any other commodity in world trade. Our policy then was designed primarily to uphold the right of American nationals to export to foreign countries on equal terms with foreign exporters. But after 1918 the American oil companies enthusiastically applied their great technological skill and financial resources in a successful search abroad for new fields to develop, spurred by the vigorous support of the Department of State sustaining the principle of the open door,[92] and by a widespread fear of an impending oil shortage.[93] Now that the few American companies strong enough to operate abroad are dealing with some foreign governments almost as equals, and three-quarters of the world is worshipping at strange economic shrines, we find ourselves in a new chapter. Diplomatic policy now must be directed toward the establishment of a world economy free from the restraints of monopoly, whether practiced by government, by private cartel, or by a union of government and cartel.

An indispensable corollary of American oil activity in foreign countries, whether primarily producing or consuming countries, is the creation of an economic climate wherein world trade can breathe. To the degree that foreign governments, acting with an eye only to immediate economic advantage, impose severe restrictions, American oil operations abroad will suffer. To be sure, in the absence of a treaty to the contrary, a foreign government is at liberty under international law to legislate to the detriment of foreign business, provided the legislation is of general application and does not deprive foreigners of their lawfully acquired property without adequate compensation. However, it is to be earnestly hoped that all governments will take early steps to create a world economy fostering trade among the nations, and that by international agreement and education the markets of the world will be opened to the international merchant in a spirit of welcome for the goods he offers in exchange for the products of the importing country. Assuredly the inspiring growth of world trade from the days of the ancient Phoenicians and through the period of the Crusades to its modern burgeoning in the age of discovery and its rapid development after the industrial revolution ought not shrivel in the twentieth century. It will not shrivel if men recognize that the prosperity of trade is measured by the number of people who may with profit participate in it, and if the nations of the world will keep the door of opportunity open to all.

There can be no doubt that the American companies have achieved the position of leadership they now enjoy not by withdrawing in the face of artificial and discouraging conditions imposed by foreign governments but by adjusting themselves to the laws and practices of the countries where they found

[83] During the same year Europe (exclusive of Russia) consumed only 15 percent; Russia's proportion was 8 percent; Latin America's 6 percent; all Asia used only 5 percent; Australia and New Zealand consumed 1½ percent; and all other countries, the remaining 2½ percent. (Hearings, Wartime Petroleum Policy Under the Petroleum Administration for War, p. 248, and see chart No. 39 facing p. 252.)

[84] Ibid., pp. 248–249, and see chart No. 40 facing p. 252.

[85] For the year 1938 United States registrations totaled 31,568,000 private and commercial cars, or 68 percent of the world total. However, foreign registrations increased markedly in the interwar period. In 1919 foreign registrations were only 14 percent of the world total but they rose to 32 percent for 1938, or, expressed in number of vehicles (excluding motorcycles), the foreign total in 1919 was only 1,287,000 but in 1938 was 14,773,000. Foreign motorcycle registrations far exceed those in the United States, which had only about 110,000 out of a world total of 3,515,000 in 1938, or 3.1 percent. Over 3,000,000 motorcycle registrations were in Europe before the war, and over half of those were in Germany. (Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 405–410.)

[86] Ibid., p. 406.

[87] Ibid., p. 255. About one-third of the total revenue of the Venezuelan Government is contributed by the petroleum industry. American capital constitutes about 62½ percent of the total foreign oil investment in Venezuela. Ibid., p. 265.

[88] Ibid., pp. 254–270.

[89] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 271–289.

[90] Ibid., pp. 226–243.

[91] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 87 ff., 246–249, 311–312.

[92] See Diplomatic Protection of American Petroleum Interests in Mesopotamia, Netherlands East Indies, and Mexico, op. cit., passim.

[93] Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 298 ff.

themselves.[94] Originally an American company would have had nothing to fear from the antitrust laws in entering into many of these foreign arrangements,[95] but beginning with the Sisal case in 1927,[96] it became clear that acts, although performed outside the United States, would violate the antitrust laws if such acts related to and were in direct restraint of trade in the United States. Essentially, however, the Sisal case did not introduce novel doctrine, and American companies still had no cause to hestiate where the agreement did not relate to United States trade.

Of late, however, the question has presented itself to what extent an American company may safely go in complying with foreign regulations or indirect pressures, and still not offend the antitrust laws of the United States. Related to this question is the proper delimitation of the scope of the antitrust laws insofar as world trade is concerned.[97] An American company which ventures its capital abroad is entitled to know with a reasonable degree of certainty whether a prospective course of action is not unlawful under the statutes of the United States, if for no other reason than that a wrong choice may affect the extent of diplomatic protection. By the same token the Government is entitled to know at least in outline the principal programs and prospective foreign commitments of American petroleum companies. Although monopolistic practices may be unpopular and unsound, yet American oil interests abroad, if disqualified from participating in trade under the foreign rules and customs, may easily lose position to alien competitors.[98] This, then, is a dilemma of national petroleum policy which calls for decision.[99]

Size alone does not constitute monopoly. Indeed, bigness is frequently essential in modern industry for the greatest efficiency, and has other advantages of importance to society.[1] The attainment of a dominant position in the business world, acquired through honest effort, is not a violation of the law. It is only the unfair methods of trade, which seek to destroy or exclude competitors by means of intercorporate stockholdings, or by agreements between present or potential competitors, whereby control of commerce among the States or with foreign countries is secured, that are anathema to the people of the United States.[2] But how far shall we go in advancing beyond our borders the principles of the laws against restraint of trade?

It may be doubted whether we can abandon our defense of free competitive enterprise at the water's edge and still expect it to survive even within our own borders. At the same time the Nation can ill afford to hazard the position of our petroleum interests in foreign lands by a unilateral policy which might not yield corresponding benefit.

As one step toward the solution of this difficulty confronting American oil companies abroad, in common with other types of business, the Congress might consider the enactment of legislation requiring, with appropriate safeguards, American companies to register with some agency of the United States Government copies of such foreign contracts as by their terms involve the types of trade restraint defined in the statute.[3]

Any broad solution, however, will have to be undertaken on an international scale by international conference. Difficult though it is proving to be to make progress toward a peaceful society, nevertheless this Nation should press unremittingly and with all the peaceful processes at its command for general acceptance of the principle of fair and friendly trade among the nations of the world. When freedom of opportunity is preserved, free enterprise is preserved. The essential condition of such preservation in foreign oil operations is an international understanding that control of this natural and indispensable resource shall not be used for exploitation of the native peoples in the producing countries, or of the users of oil in the consuming countries.[4] In a world genuinely devoted to peace and genuinely interested in the promotion of international trade and the raising of living standards, Americans doing business abroad will seldom be there confronted with practical situations posing difficult questions of antitrust law.

PUBLIC LANDS

The public-domain lands potentially valuable for oil or gas production are concentrated mainly in California, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, and Wyoming.[5] Although for the past several years the production from the public domain has averaged only a little more than 3 percent of the total production in the United States,[6] the unexplored potential oil areas within the public domain are relatively large, and it is not unreasonable to assume that the percentage of total production derived from the public domain will show an increase in the years to come.[7]

In general, public-domain land is interspersed with patented land and State-owned land, and, in view of this varied ownership in prospective oil or gas areas, the Federal-owned lands must necessarily be explored or developed simultaneously with lands under other ownership, and vice versa. It follows that unduly restrictive laws or regulations governing the lands of either type may preclude the testing of an area, and that to the extent practicable the leasing provisions for Federal lands should conform to those under which State and private lands are leased.

In December 1942 the Congress enacted a law which offered an inducement to the prospector by granting during the national emergency a flat 12½-percent royalty rate for new discoveries on Federal leases bearing a higher royalty rate.[8] The results were gratifying.[9] In August 1946 the Congress took still further steps toward conforming the mineral leasing laws more nearly to the practices in vogue by the States and by private lessors.[10] Among the principles embodied in the new legislation, which is expected to encourage oil exploration and development on the public domain, is the flat 12½-percent royalty rate for future noncompetitive leases and also for existing noncompetitive leases under certain conditions.

---

[94] "The one inescapable fact," testified Laurence B. Levi, executive in charge of foreign operations of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., "is that American companies, if they are to continue to carry on business abroad, must be in a position to meet, in each particular country, the conditions existing there. In other words, an American concern desiring to carry on business in those areas must 'do as the Romans do' or suffer the consequences." (Hearings, Foreign Contracts Act, pp. 165–166.)

[95] See *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.* (213 U. S. 347 (1909)).

[96] *U. S.* v. *Sisal Sales Corp.* (274 U. S. 268 (1927)).

[97] The nebulous compass of the antitrust laws in their application to commerce with foreign nations is well illustrated in a colloquy on May 17, 1945, between former Attorney General Biddle and the committee's counsel. (See Hearings, "Foreign Contracts Act," pp. 20–22, 170–171.)

[98] Monopolies and closed economies are unsound, and we are opposed to them," Mr. Levi told the committee, but then he went on to add: "Nevertheless, the trade agreements in foreign countries regulating their domestic marketing, where conditions may differ from ours, are considered by many governments as meeting the needs of their national economies. There is no doubt several foreign-owned oil companies stand willing and able to take the place of any American company which does not participate in these agreements." (Hearings, "Foreign Contracts Act," p. 164.)

[99] In a thoughtful statement to the committee Alfred Jacobsen, president of the Amerada Petroleum Corp. and chairman of the national oil policy committee of the Petroleum Industry War Council, said: "The solution which the American companies would prefer would be to see such countries persuaded by our State Department to open up their oil markets to free competition." (Hearings, "The Independent Petroleum Co." p. 381.)

[1] Peter F. Drucker, Concept of the Corporation, pp. 209–229. (New York, 1946.)

[2] George W. Wickersham, the Changing Order, p. 141. (New York, 1914.) Perhaps no one has more eloquently expressed the basic meaning of the antitrust laws than President William Howard Taft in a special message to Congress on January 7, 1910, wherein he recommended a national incorporation law. Speaking of the methods of some large business enterprises, he said: "If they attempt by a use of their preponderating capital and by a sale of their goods temporarily at unduly low prices to drive out of business their competitors, or if they attempt, by exclusive contracts with their patrons and threats of nondealing except upon such contracts, or by other methods of a similar character, to use the largeness of their resources and the extent of their output compared with the total output as a means of compelling custom and frightening off competition, then they disclose a purpose to restrain trade and to establish a monopoly and violate the act." (James D. Richardson, editor, A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. XVI, p. 7450. Edition published by Bureau of National Literature, Inc. New York.)

[3] The committee, sitting jointly with a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, held hearings on S. 11 (79th Cong., 1st sess.) embodying a proposal of this type. See hearings, "Foreign Contracts Act." Reference should also be made to the hearing on S. 1476 (78th Cong., 1st sess.), the predecessor of S. 11 aforesaid, by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, on May 23, 1944, at which hearing Ralph W. Gallagher, president, and Orville Harden, vice president, of the Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), testified.

[4] It should be observed that the consumers in certain European countries, for example, are often required to pay extremely high prices for gasoline and other petroleum products because of local duties and taxes. Sometimes such duties and taxes constitute as much as 77 percent and even 84 percent of the retail price. (Hearings, American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, pp. 411–417.)

[5] Hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, p. 454.

[6] Ibid., p. 456. In 1941, when the United States total was 1,400,000,000 barrels, the public-domain production was 46,000,000 barrels; in 1945 the total for the United States was 1,700,000,000 barrels, and the public domain produced 57,000,000. Ibid., pp. 456–457; The Petroleum Almanac, op. cit., pp. 39, 42.

[7] Hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, pp. 457–459.

[8] 56 Stat. 1080.

[9] For the period from January 1, 1943, to July 1, 1946, there were 55 new oil pools and fields, and 11 new gas pools and fields, discovered on public-domain lands. In 1944 there were drilled on the public domain in the five principal oil-producing public-land States a total of 123 wildcat wells, whereas in 1942 the total was 68, and in 1941 was only 58. (Data received by committee from Harold J. Duncan, Chief, Conservation Branch, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior. See also hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, p. 469.)

[10] Hatch-O'Mahoney Act of August 8, 1946.

In addition to the public-domain lands within the United States, the Federal Government also owns extensive areas commonly referred to as acquired lands. The extent of such holdings has never been accurately tabulated, but rough estimates place the total at 150,000,000 acres.[11] These lands are not subject to the mineral leasing laws covering the public-domain lands. Some of the acquired lands have been leased for oil or gas development, but it is clear from evidence presented to the committee that exploration of acquired lands has been retarded (a) by lack of statutory authority to lease, (2) by divided jurisdiction among various departments of government, and (c) by a want of uniformity in policy and leasing procedure.[12] The Senate should give early consideration to the various postwar problems arising from the large amount of recently acquired lands, both as to their disposal and as to their mineral deposits.

In addition to such legislation it is submitted that the Senate consider the advisability of discontinuing certain naval petroleum reserves and of assimilating them to other public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The total estimated recoverable oil from the three naval petroleum reserves, other than Alaska, is only 376,000,000 barrels.[13] It is obvious that the amount of oil producible daily from these modest reserves would constitute but slight assistance in the event of war. As has been demonstrated, the huge supply requisite for war purposes can best be assured by the existence of a strong private industry which is already in full operation when the emergency occurs. Therefore, it is submitted that the naval petroleum reserves of Buena Vista Hills, Teapot Dome, and Elk Hills be discontinued as such, and that they be administered in the future by the Department of the Interior as other public lands. As to the naval reserve in Alaska it is too early to draw conclusions because exploration there has only started.

THE INDEPENDENT COMPANY

At home, as well as abroad, a national oil policy based upon the principle of free enterprise would not only safeguard the position of the independent against restraints of trade, but would recognize the handicaps imposed by inequitable tax laws and the preponderant weight of the financial resources of the integrated majors. Small producers, small refiners, small retailers, all find it difficult to compete with the majors which engage in all three branches and in transportation as well. If the big company desires a certain street corner for the retail sale of gasoline, it can usually get it. Lack of financial resources limits the ability of the independent to withstand pressure as well as competition and, in the case of the producer, tends to induce the sale of proven properties by the wildcatter to the major. The wildcatter must turn over his capital, but the major can hold the property in idleness until a favorable time for production.

The majors are corporations with thousands of stockholders of small average holdings, whereas the independents are frequently the ventures of comparatively few stockholders. Again, the major is less affected by the life expectancy of its managers or stockholders, because its executives are drawn from an ample reservoir of talent, and because its stockholders normally do not exercise executive functions. On the other hand, when the founder of a small independent dies, there is often no one among his heirs to succeed him, and the inheritance tax frequently deals such an enterprise a severe blow. These are considerations which emphasize the necessity of antitrust enforcement, and of revision of the tax laws to remove the apathy toward investment of private capital in independent enterprise.[14]

It may be assumed that none of the major companies would welcome an industrial theater where only large companies occupied the stage. In such a drama government itself would soon become the protagonist. Equally it may be assumed that the small companies would view with grave apprehension the disappearance of the major enterprises. The present ready market at the well afforded by the large companies, their transportation and distribution systems which make possible a wide consumer market, their research programs, and their function in the national defense would be lost or greatly minimized if the growth of enterprise were limited by law.

In brief, it is recognized that a big man is not necessarily a bad man. Nor is a small man necessarily a good man.[15] The primacy of the United States in the oil world prevails in large measure because of the spirit which animates those who have ventured their fortunes, and at times their lives, in the vast foreign enterprises that only the strongest companies can undertake. And in large measure is American primacy owing to the wildcatter in the United States who on a shoestring and a prayer doggedly drills his well, be it dry hole or east Texas. Probably two-thirds of the wildcat wells in this country are drilled by independent producers as distinguished from the 20 or so major companies.[16] Approximately one-sixth of the total crude oil refined here is processed by independent refiners.[17] Hence, it is obvious that the functioning of the independent companies is indispensable to a healthy industry The independent company must be permitted to prosper if for no other reason than to prevent a drift into monopolistic practices with resultant governmental intervention.

TWO ALTERNATIVES

Every American unites in the national commitment to dedicate our country's energies and its will, as well as its hopes and prayers, to the establishment of world peace. International understanding in both commercial and political fields is the aim of our people, but, until that understanding is achieved, the United States must under no circumstances abandon to chance its industrial and military capacity to uphold its ideals.

This Nation now faces two alternatives: Either—

1. To wait with hope the discovery of sufficient petroleum within our boundaries that the military requirements of the future will occasion no concern, and in the meantime to depend upon foreign oil and trust that war will not cut off our imports; Or—

2. To take steps to guarantee a domestic petroleum supply adequate for all eventualities by means of:

(a) Incentives to promote the search for new deposits of petroleum within the boundaries of the United States and in the continental shelf; and

(b) The continuation of the present program looking to the manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels to supplement our domestic crude supply.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NATIONAL PETROLEUM POLICY

All the facts before us impel the choice of the second alternative. Therefore, the first principle of American petroleum policy should be to sustain our domestic supply of petroleum and to maintain the American system of competitive free enterprise at home and abroad. The second principle is to make human freedom the cornerstone of our policy, liberty and opportunity for people without discrimination or restraint, both within and beyond our borders.

To these ends we should:

1. Enact those laws which are most conducive to stimulating additional exploration and development in the United States. Encourage conservation to prevent waste. Promote interstate compacts so that our reserves may be expanded and used in the public interest, but guard against any danger of misusing conservation laws to restrain unduly any operator. Administer the public lands, not primarily as a source of governmental revenue, but for the purpose of stimulating private initiative in discovering and developing oil on the public domain.

2. Utilize the facilities of Government to promote research in the manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels, but without permitting governmental competition with private industry. Enact such legislation as may be necessary and proper to encourage secondary recovery from old fields which otherwise would not be productive.

3. Encourage free competitive enterprise by tax reforms to provide incentives for the risk of private capital in new ventures. Maintain the atmosphere in which competition may survive by enforcement of the antitrust laws. Adhere to the Federal statute prohibiting interstate shipments of petroleum produced in violation of State law. Continue the provisions of the income-tax law permitting deductions for depletion and intangible drilling costs.

4. Require full disclosure to the appropriate agency of Government of the principal terms, conditions, and obligations by which American companies undertake to carry on the petroleum industry abroad.

5. Follow a foreign policy designed to promote full development of the petroleum resources of the whole world for the benefit of all peoples of the world; to secure adequate supplies of petroleum to all peoples; and to discourage artificial restraints and restrictions, both political and private, which deny full opportunity for the people of all lands to participate beneficially in the production and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

ADDITIONAL CONCURRING VIEWS

I concur in the general principles, objectives, and suggested policies set forth in the foregoing report of the Special Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources, with three

[11] Hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, pp. 196–198.

[12] Hearings, New Sources of Petroleum in the United States, pp. 197 ff.

[13] Ibid., p. 260.

[14] Hearings, The Independent Petroleum Co., pp. 193 ff., 368 ff., 403–424. In the course of a valuable statement to the committee by Fayette B. Dow, he pointed out that, "recognition should be given to the fact that what might be considered big business in one industry may be very small business in another. In the oil industry a typical independent refining company may have an investment of $2,000,000 or $4,000,000 or $6,000,000, or more than that, but it would still be a small enterprise, a hazardous and marginal enterprise, compared with its major competitors. Under the present tax law the Federal Government will take 38 percent of net taxable corporate incomes of $50,000 or more regardless of the size of the various enterprises, their need of new capital, or, if estimated in terms of assured continuous earning power, of their ability to pay. So it is suggested that consideration be given to increasing the level of net taxable incomes at which the maximum rate applies and of modifying the rates of taxation on corporate incomes below that level." Ibid., p. 202.

[15] But it is sometimes said, "A good little man is always out of his class when he meets a good big man."

[16] Hearings, The Independent Petroleum Co., p. 33.

[17] Ibid., pp. 188–189.

reservations which I deem it advisable to point out. It is also my desire to emphasize other general observations contained in the report.

The first matter in which I find myself in slight disagreement is the suggestion of the report that the Congress might consider the enactment of legislation requiring American oil companies operating abroad to register with some agency of the United States Government copies of their foreign contracts which, by their terms, involve the types of trade restraint defined in the statute. It is, of course, obvious that American nationals engaged in foreign operations must necessarily comply with the laws of the foreign countries in which they operate. It is likewise obvious that American nationals operating abroad raise questions of diplomatic relations between the United States and such countries. It is, therefore, proper that the basic concession agreements between such governments and American nationals with respect to the scope of operations to be conducted and the obligations assumed by such American nationals and the commitments of the foreign governments affected, should be made known to our Government. This is and has been the prevailing practice for many years. If legislation is necessary in this regard, the Congress should give consideration to the enactment of appropriate statutes. To require disclosures beyond such basic information, might well result in making public competitive trade secrets that would have serious repercussions upon the private enterprise of this Nation and work undue hardships upon the units of private industry.

The application of the antitrust laws to monopolistic practices in interstate commerce has been clearly interpreted by the courts. It is generally agreed that such laws may be employed to protect the freedom of trade in interstate commerce from activities of American citizens or corporations, whether the restraint emanates from a domestic or foreign source. Circumstances abroad, under which international trade is conducted exclusively beyond our borders, are such, however, as to distinguish that character of trade from purely interstate or partly interstate and partly foreign transactions as defined and covered by the antitrust laws. I would hesitate to urge a governmental policy that might destroy that distinction as to application of the antitrust laws.

The second proposal of the report on which I desire to comment is the suggestion for the enactment of legislation as may be necessary and proper to encourage secondary recovery from oil fields which otherwise would not be productive. In general, this objective is heartily approved and I concur in the proposal to the extent that the Federal Government may do so within its constitutional sphere of legislative authority and to the extent that such legislation is equally applicable to the encouragement of recovery of all oil from any source in the United States. The suggestion, however, raises the possibility of subsidy payments to those engaged in the secondary recovery of oil. On principle, it is my opinion that any philosophy of government tending to subsidize uneconomic peacetime operations of any character is unsound and leads to a destruction of the virility of our private enterprise. If private enterprise is to survive in the United States, it must do so by its ability to survive all legitimate competitive hazards. The maintenance of a healthy domestic economy that will result in adequate competitive prices is the best insurance we can have for the continued operation of secondary recovery projects and the preservation of stripper pools.

I raise the third question as a mere matter of clarification. The report suggests that the Federal Government take such steps as may be possible to encourage conservation to prevent waste. I strongly approve this objective. The Federal Government can do much to encourage conservation to prevent waste. The Congress has done so by ratifying the Interstate Oil Compact, the enactment of the Connally Hot Oil Act, and the enactment of more liberal and practical public-land laws. Much has also been accomplished through the United States Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, and other agencies of the Government acting within their proper sphere. It should be made clear, however, that the production of oil and gas is entirely a local matter, wholly within the jurisdiction of the respective States, and that the primary problem of enacting and enforcing conservation measures to prevent waste of these natural resources is exclusively a State matter. The Congress should refrain from any policy that would tend to invade the prerogatives of the States in this purely local field.

The committee report and the policies suggested are indeed a strong argument for the competitive enterprise system which we enjoy in America and which has been the philosophy upon which our private oil industry has succeeded. I, therefore, emphasize that any governmental policy which encourages any department or agency of Government to enter into competition with private enterprise, is contrary to this philosophy. As a corollary it follows that our national oil policy should be to discourage and, if necessary, to prohibit any department or agency of Government from engaging in petroleum activities that directly or indirectly compete with our private industry.

The report properly points out that freedom of markets in international trade and equal access to petroleum supplies for all nations are contributing factors to world peace. In this connection, however, we should not fail to recognize that the United States is the only remaining Nation in the world where the production of petroleum is not a governmental monopoly. With consciousness of this fact it should be made clear that our agreement to these principles does not mean that we open the door to any foreign nation for the exploration of our domestic oil resources in competition with our private industry. Reciprocity in this regard should be limited to the citizens and nationals of foreign countries. Likewise, the United States Government should respect such policy by refraining from engaging in the petroleum business abroad.

E. H. MOORE.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate may act upon the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may consider Senate bill 1557, Calendar No. 702, and Senate bill 1375, Calendar No. 704.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that the Senate has not yet acted on the bill of the Senator from Nebraska, which is now pending. The St. Lawrence seaway legislation was temporarily laid aside so action might be had on the other bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank my distinguished friend from California. I thought we had acted on that bill. It seems to me we have acted and reacted and acted several times.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Unfortunately, the Senate has not as yet passed the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Very well. I will subside until action is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 134) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), is amended by changing the words "five years", in the first sentence, to read "eight years", and by changing the numeral "$30,000,000" in section 6 to read "$60,000,000."

INVESTIGATION INTO ACCOUNTS OF THE OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE, WILMINGTON, DEL.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement on another subject at this time. Recently an investigation has been conducted by my colleagues the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], Representative BOGGS of Delaware, and myself into the accounts of the office of the collector of internal revenue, Wilmington, Del. We have found many discrepancies in the accounts involving the embezzlement of some of the Government funds; and, what is worse, the record indicates that an effort is being made to conceal the true facts of this case from the citizens and taxpayers involved, and at the same time protect certain responsible Government employees from disciplinary action.

In a letter dated today, and signed by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], Representative BOGGS of Delaware, and myself, and addressed to Mr. George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, we have called this situation to his personal attention and insisted that he take immediate steps to clear up this unpleasant situation.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a copy of this letter, dated February 4, 1948, addressed to Mr. George J. Schoeneman and signed by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], Representative BOGGS of Delaware, and myself.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHOENEMAN: During the latter part of December 1947, we discussed with you the fact that the accounts of several hundred taxpayers in Delaware had erroneously been marked delinquent by responsible officials in the Wilmington office and that as of that date, there was evidence that over $30,000 of these funds had been embezzled. Since that time the cashier of the Wilmington office has pleaded guilty to this embezzlement and has been sentenced in the Federal court.

During our discussions last December, we called to your attention the fact that an exceptionally large number of special agents had been assigned to that area to investigate the taxpayers. We are not asking that the taxpayers of our State be exempt from the routine audit by your Bureau, but we do think that it is very unfair that they be subjected to the tactics now being used by your agents and at the same time be denied the knowledge that the reason for this rigid examination is that their accounts have been manipulated and some of their payments embezzled by someone in the collector's office.

Since this situation developed in our State, we have been receiving numerous requests from various taxpayers, asking if their accounts were involved. Many of these taxpayers have been receiving bills for unpaid taxes for which they have receipts. It is our opinion that the most important contribution which can be made at this time to restore the confidence of the Delaware citizens in the Revenue Department is to convince them that this case has been fully exposed; therefore, we are today placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and asking the newspapers in our State to publish a complete list of those taxpayers whose accounts are known to have been tampered with as well as a copy of Mr. McNamee's report of November 13, 1947, addressed to your Department, in which he made the following statement:

"In this connection it is well to note that during the period November 1946, when the collector was first notified by the assistant cashier of an apparent discrepancy in the accounts, the cashier, Mr. Flynn, was left in complete control of his duties by the collector and no satisfactory explanation has been forthcoming from the collector as to why this situation was allowed to exist.

"The efforts of the collector and assistant collector to hide or hush up this affair has been, to my way of thinking, presumptuous, to say the least. The fact that the assistant collector spent several months as a supervisor of accounts and collections prior to his present appointment should have instilled in him a certain esprit de corps which, I am sorry to say, is entirely lacking. He failed to acquaint the supervisors or the Bureau with his knowledge of this irregularity for 6 months after he found it out, during which period the cashier carried on his defalcations. As indicated by the report, a total of $2,939.26 was embezzled during the period November 1946 to May 28, 1947.

"This amount, in my opinion, should be charged to the collector and his assistant, to be paid out of their personal funds."

Further proof that these two officials were making an effort to conceal these discrepancies in their office is borne out by evidence recently obtained by us, which shows that a written memorandum was delivered on November 15, 1946, to the assistant collector, Mr. Ainsworth, outlining certain manipulations by the cashier. We find that a routine audit was made of this agency during the month of December following this written notice, at which time both the collector and the assistant collector failed to call the written memorandum to the attention of the auditors.

An examination of various reports made by the chief investigator for that area discloses that serious criticism has been made on numerous occasions by the investigator, charging that the records and the bookkeeping system of the office in general were in a state of confusion. They also criticized the looseness of the Department's handling of cash items, and even insisted upon a new system being set up.

We have reviewed these critical reports by your own investigators, charging these men with an attempt to conceal and protect the guilty parties in addition to the many charges of inefficiency, and as representatives of the citizens and taxpayers of that State, we feel obligated to call on your department for an explanation as to why the investigation in the Wilmington office has suddenly been called off. In your reply we want you to explain to us not only why these officials were left in charge of the office but also why it was that you designated these same men for a special promotion and an increase in salary.

We realize that the total amount of this embezzlement cannot be established until such time as all of the accounts in that office prior to July 1947 have been audited, and we are wholly in accord with your thought that this audit should be made as soon as possible; but we do think that there are three essential points being overlooked in your effort to clear up this situation:

1. You should immediately suspend every employee in that office involved in any manner, either through participation in the embezzlement or through negligence in reporting the situation which they knew to exist to the proper authorities. This should be done immediately in order to restore in the minds of the taxpayers the confidence which they once had for your office.

2. We think that you should immediately notify each taxpayer in the State whose accounts have been tampered with in any manner, giving to that individual all the details and enlisting his support in assisting your office to obtain a true picture of the facts.

3. We think that a thorough audit should be made of the Wilmington Office, and if necessary to expedite this, we suggest that you utilize the services of some of the special agents now assigned to that area who have been devoting their time to auditing the taxpayers.

The evidence now on file in your office against both the collector and the assistant collector is of a rather serious nature and is something which we feel cannot be overlooked.

Yours sincerely,

C. DOUGLASS BUCK,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
Congressmen.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in order that each taxpayer whose accounts are known to have been manipulated might be properly protected and notified, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a list of their names, with the suggestion that each individual write the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Wilmington, Del., and ask that office for a detailed account of all the manipulations of their funds which have taken place during the past 7 years. It is true that many of these taxpayers' accounts have since been adjusted, but we still feel that they have a right to know all the facts in order that they might check their own records for possible duplications in payments.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lea River Lines, Inc.; Kathryn H. Lewis; George A. and Agnes Passwaters; Samuel McCormick; H. Z. Gabraeil; Edward Eisenhandler; S. Summer Bearman; Gre-Sin Gift Shop; Wilmington Dry Goods Co.; E. Clifton and Martha C. Sutton; George B. and Mary Rochelle; William D. and Natalie B. Bradford; Harold V. and Elizabeth Maull; George B. and Elizabeth Carroll; LaSalle Athletic Club; Wooleyhan Transport Co.; Leroy's; Henry Davis; Alfred E. Bissell; Sarah Lipstein; Philip E. Rust; Nelson J. Forney; William H. Peoples; Howard A. Gifford; Howard Tucker, trading as Chiek's Restaurant; Thomas and Leah C. Davis; John J. Williams; Anthony P. and Rose M. Columbo; F. A. Wardenberg; Hotel Rodney; Charles and Bessie Gauss Ingersoll; Vera A. Lindsay; Hotel Olivere; Kennard-Pyle Co.; Eckerds of Wilmington, Inc.; John M. Emory; Crosby & Hill Co.; National Theater; Reese B. Harrington, trading as Reese Theater; Jessie Hall; Dolles Candyland and Recreation Center; Indian River Lines, Inc.; Bayberry Gift Shop; Landis E. Wilson; Henry P. Scott; Howard R. Collins; Dover Base Ball Association, Inc.; Walter E. Brown; Reed Trucking Co.

Pauline B. Eberhardt; Strand Theater; Hercules Country Club; Shusters, Inc.; White Transfer; Fred Knecht; Delaware-New Jersey Ferry Co.; Frank M. Carpenter; Ball Theater; Harris & Gross, Inc.; Wilmington Country Club; C. E. Major, trading as Major Distributing Co.; Fred D. Nelson, trading as Dragon Run Inn; Mildred Blaska; Joseph Krautter; Grand Voitura of Delaware; Francis and Elizabeth Briggs; Maude A. Davis; Joseph P. and Grace S. Walsh; Harry G. Smith; Mamie E. Bailey; Charles and Emily White; Harry E. Corbett; William M. Nolan; John and Mildred Re, Jr.; Alice Lea Spruance; Harry Unangst; Frank A. Potts; Ellis Sisters, Inc.; Horace W. Jones; Carlisle Fire Co.; Stanley's Men's Shop; Corporation Trust Co.; Alice C. Cooper; Reuben Satterthwaite, Jr.; Albert Bunin; Hervey S. Unangst; John J. Fennessey; Olson's Foods; Charles Lipstein; Leo F. and Frances F. Connell; Albert H. Strotham; Clarke & McDaniel; Loew's Theater & Realty Corp.; John F. and Laura Barlow; Robert E. Bowman, Jr.; Mary E. Taylor; Hugh M. Morris; Joseph J. Moosman.

I. Sophie duPont May; Frank Rosaio, trading as Point Breeze Cafe; Horance W. Jones, trading as Sussex Hotel; Loew's Aldine Theater; Kentucky Bus Lines, Inc.; H. Braunstein, Inc.; Bernice G. Quillen, Louis Cohlend; Walter Grabowski; Sing So Tow; Raymond F. and Mattie J. Murray; Elizabeth McClellan Challenger; Hercules Powder Co.; William B. and Katie M. Sweeny; Ermon W. Taylor; Louis Slomsky; Albert F. and Florence C. Laubacher; Thomas H. Schwamb; Walter T. Hendrickson; Helen Hodgson, J. Daniel Hodgson; Florence H. Brown; Elizabeth K. Holland; B. J. Hoy 5 and 10 Cent Store; Ogden-Howard Clothing Co.; C. F. Millman; Joshua Connor & Son; Seaford Golf and Country Club; Reynolds Reed & Son; Wright Transfer & Supply; Continental Diamond Fiber Co.; Andrew G. Baker; Jas. T. Mullin & Sons, Inc.; John Koczak, trading as Earle Theater; Krueger Brewing Co.; Lerner Shops of Del., Inc.; Holt's, Inc.; Arteisan Metal Products Co., Inc.; Newark Home Builders, Inc.; George W. Helm Co.; Lerner Shops of Ill., Inc.; Famous Maids of Wilmington, Inc.; Black Cat Tea Room, Inc.; Marine Transportation Co.; Delaware Power & Light Co.; Daniel G. Elsen; the Interstate Amiesite Co.; Wilmington Suburban Water Co.; the Dimon Corp.; Union Pharmacy; Sigmunds Beauty Supply; B. Kleitz & Bros. Co.

Reiss Steamship Co.; the Pitcairn Co.; Thun Investment Co.; Dunmovin Corp.; the Dimar Corp.; Deanok, Inc.; Silas Mason Co.; Associated Gas Co.; C. Killoran; Engineers Public Service Co.; E. Clifton and Martha C. Sutton; Samuel McCormick; William D. and Natalie B. Bradford; James T. O'Connor; C. E. King, Jr.; Stanley Rothenhausler; Aver McDade; Norris H. Thomas; Fisranto and Mary Barilo; Charles C. Harris; Jesse and Alice E. Przybyled; Cedar Inn, Inc.; W. D. Cooper & Sons; Shoppers Finance Co., Inc.; Ramondo's Barbor Shop; Blue Hen Theater; Ragain's Pharmacy; National Bank of Smyrna; Philip E. Rust; Frederick E. Pickard; Delmarva Brewing Co.; Milford Ice & Coal Co.; Piedmont Securities Co.; Rosalyn K. Hack; D. C. Healy; Lerner Shops of California; Central Ohio Light & Power Co.; Roger Williams; Henry Harris; Addie L. Herring; Dave Harris & Harry Groll, Inc.; Edith E. Kaiser; Tatnall School; Hahn & Alexander; M. Zutz; Robinson Lumber Co.; Norman F. Harris, Inc.; Joanna Textile Mills; Henry Harris Loan Office; George E. and Ruth Cox; Paul A. Lynch.

Arthur Morris; Emples M. Hiltz; Mayflower Open Kitchen, Inc.; Continental Diamond Fibre Co.; the Smith Meal Co., Inc.; Walter Holleger; Equitable Trust Co.; Compania Embotelladora Coco Cola; Diamond State Beer; Krueger Brewing Co.; Vicmead Hunt Club; Wilmington Trust Co.; S. L. McKee Optical Co.; Joseph T. Montgomery; Cloid Fry; American Republics Corp.; Robert W. Rea; Security Trust Co.; Harry E. Williams; Henry V. P. and Jessie C. Wilson; Anna Kelly; Frank J. Murphy; T. Paruszewski; Thornton Bros.; Andrew J. Baker; William Margolin, trading as Circle Inn; the Arden Club; A. H. Gurvitz; W. E. Valliant Co.; Home Drug Co., Inc.; R.

Miller; E. F. Smith; H. C. Helm; Carolyn's Beauty Shop; Thomas and Lillian S. Cappeau; Herman E. Maxwell; Ernest S. Davis; Thomas H. and Blanche Dunn; Teofil Sikorski; Charles W. and Elsie Burns; Erva M. Moyle; Raymond F. and Mattie J. Murray; W. Carl and Margaret Blackwell; William S. and Eva B. Pultorak; Alexander W. and Myrtle Errickson; John E. Kreggenwinkle; George Pandelakas; Helen M. Wollaston; DuPont Country Club; Diamond Ice & Coal Co.; St. Hedwige Lodge, Local SJRS; Seidel Drug Store; Gould R. Rheuby.

Vicmead Hunt Club; Wilmington Club; Laird, Bissel & Meeds; Edgemoor Iron Works, Inc.; Newark Box Toe Co., Inc.; Butlers, Inc.; West Dover Candy Co.; Silverside Supply Co.; Hattie Kutz; William Shinn & Co., Inc.; Matilda P. Graham; Cuban Atlantic Sugar Co.; Pierce Ellison Petroleum Co.; Gas & Electric Improvement Co.; Hering, Morris, James, & Hitchens; Henry S. Saunders; William Bellack; American Republics Corp.; Carlton B. Owings; Clifford D. Prickett; Anna Y. Prettyman; J. Lee Phillips; Wilmington Pattern & Manufacturing Co.; Gust Ambagis; John Burris; Red Arrow Steamship Co.; Rockport Steamship Co.; Twentieth Century Bowling Center; Hurley-Powel Co.; Style Shop; Artesian Water Co.; I. Garrett Robinson; Diamond State Brewery, Inc.; Clarence C. Ruppert; Thaddeus J. Schelnk; Choy Gum; Beltons Printing Office, Inc.; Robert Chaiken, Inc.; Bruce H. Gordon; Arthurs Apparel Shop, Inc.; Grace-Lloyd Collins; Philip Vaccarini; the Bogota Telephone Co., Ltd.; Benjamin Schreiber; John H. Sweeney, Jr.; Paul A. Mark; Antonio Muller; S. Lentini; Interstate Amiesite Co.; Edel Edes.

Lindy's Delicatessen, Inc.; Robert J. Peoples; Mantle Club; Fred E. Gebhart; John H. Carl; Becker Millinery Corp.; Polly Shop; John A. Carlson; Joseph Berkman; Manain W. Tingle; Jonathon A. Scotton; Albert O. H. Brier; George B. Malone; Samuel and Mary B. Murphy; Bruce F. Slagle; Harry G. and Sue Slagle; Larrimore Andrews; Walter J. Jorison; Arnold L. Brown; Stanley J. and Lucia Pietluch; George M. Hardin; Marion L. Brown; Swanie and Blanche Rossander; George V. Wolsterholme; Loyd L. Warren; DuPont Country Club; Municipal Golf & Tennis Association, Inc.; Harper Signs, Inc.; Edgar A. Lamon; Vincent Rizzo; Capital Theater; Everett Theater; Frank H. Overdeer; Ethel V. Ward; Ann Cox; S. F. Dzielakowski; John Hnatkowski; John McColgan; Catherine Burns; Stanley and Helen Stroycharz; Fisher's; Dr. W. Ralph Staats; Carl A. Doubet, Jr.; Howard P. and Belle Mansfield; James H. Gallagher; Walter R. Archibold; Theodore P. Lynch; Harry Brodsky; Harold Martin; Mr. and Mrs. Philippe E. H. Eichinger.

Roland Conner; Eber C. Brown; Mary Bargielski; John Stachow; Bertha L. Stone; The Gun Wynn Co., Inc.; H. P. Cannon & Son, Inc.; The Gund Co.; Wyndham Realty Corp.; Marjorie Hopkins; George H. Draper, Jr.; Howard and Carolyn A. Greene; Joseph and Mary Wright; Janet C. Bane; Richard Corre Bostwick; James S. Lowe Transfer Co.; Speakman Co.; American Construction Co.; Delaware Realty & Investment Co.; Texaco Development Co.; Henry Janssen Corp.; McCaffrey's Oyster House; Arthur La Mottee; Naomi Hendreckson; B. Kleitz & Bros.; Bernard and George Kleitz; Dominquez Oil Fields; Millsboro Feed Co.; R. D. Morris; Farmer's Bank; Elizabeth V. Quigley; Charles H. Lickle; Beneficial Loan; Sumter Lumber Co., Inc.; Bond Manufacturing Co., Inc.; Tytona Securities Co.; Young Men's Republican Club; Jefferson Food Market; Cargill, Inc.; United Public Service Corp.; David R. and Marian K. Rutter; W. Carroll Coyne; Charles W. Baker, Jr.; Kennard Adams; Rotary Diesel Corp.; Edith duPont Riegel; Stellar Corp.; Temple Theater; Donald E. Repp; The Pennroad Corp.

Wilmer Stradley; Mesrop A. Tarumianz; Joseph Lincoln Gillon; Playhouse; Wilmington Whist Club; Mesrop A. and Sonia Tarumianz; Howard and Carolyn A. Green; Augustus W. Burr; Henry H. Silliman; William C. Appleton; Martha M. Stine; Andrew Godfrey; Benjamin Brown; G. W. Helme; Edmund M. Flaherty; Southerland; Monarch Services, Inc.; J. Rankin Davis; Eberhardt & Co.; Thun Investment Co.; J. P. Cann; Lumber Industries, Inc.; Arctic Roofings, Inc.; Edgehill Investment Co., Inc.; the Investment Co. of America; Natural Gas Investment Co.; Wilcox, Inc.; Gotham Livestock Corp.; Benjamin Schreiber; Mary C. Ridings; George L. Manchester; Arthur G. Logan; St. Georges Trust Co.; John A. Boers, et al.; Charles C. Kurtz & Sons; Ridge Row Corp.; Simon Estate, Inc.; Fred W. and Howard Kurtz; Downs, Hoopes & Co.; Michener Bros. Garage; Georgetown Trust Co.; Auchincloss, Parker & Redpath, Inc.; Samuel Becker; Diamond State Bottling Co.; Ellis Flotation Co., Inc.; Maria L. Matthews; Otto and Nellie Runger; Frederick E. Ston; Francis J. and Greta S. Byrne; T. V. and Rose T. Volk; Albert W. and Elizabeth B. Wilson; William J. Cunningham; W. W. White; Baltimore Trust Co.; William E. Walsh; A. R. Hudson Co.; U. S. F. Powder Co.; Georgetown Motor Co., Inc.; F. H. Simonton, Inc.; James Healy; Edgar Realty Co.; Lindamere Corp.; First National Bank of Seaford; Harry Haskell; Courtland E. Pierson Co.; Mercantile Discount Corp.; Marshall Park, Inc.; Margoline's Shopping Service; New Deal Garage; John's Sandwich Shop; Protective Realty Corp.; Vaughn Properties Co.; Rockport Steamship Co.; Wilmington Auto Sales Co.; Francis A. O'Brien; James M. and Maude M. Satterfield; James M. Satterfield; the Mentholatum Co.; Delaware Realty & Investment Co.; John B. and Marion H. Jessup; Willard A. Speakman, Jr.; Karl M. and Alice S. Currier; Mill Finance Corp.; A. S. Kloss; Leo F. Connell; Ida Crezenzio; Patchell's Men's Shop; Commercial Trust Co.; the Homent Co.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, at this time I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks copies of two letters, both dated November 13, 1947, addressed to Mr. Paul A. Hankins, Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue Bureau, Washington, D. C., and signed by Mr. J. E. McNamee, Supervisor of Accounts and Chief of the Staff of Auditors, who conducted this investigation for the Treasury Department.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *November 13, 1947.*

Mr. PAUL A. HANKINS,
Deputy Commissioner,
Accounts and Collections Unit,
Internal Revenue Bureau,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HANKINS: Transmitted herewith is report of the examination of the Office of Collector of Internal Revenue, Wilmington, Del., for the period July 2, 1940, to June 3, 1947, inclusive.

In this connection it is well to note that during the period November 1946, when the collector was first notified by the assistant cashier of an apparent discrepancy in the accounts, the cashier, Mr. Flynn, was left in complete control of his duties by the collector, and no satisfactory explanation has been forthcoming from the collector as to why this situation was allowed to exist.

The efforts of the collector and assistant collector to hide or hush up this affair has been, to my way of thinking, presumptuous, to say the least. The fact that the assistant collector spent several months as a supervisor of accounts and collections prior to his present appointment should have instilled in him a certain "esprit de corps" which, I am sorry to say, is entirely lacking. He failed to acquaint the supervisors of the bureau with his knowledge of this irregularity for 6 months after he found it out, during which period the cashier carried on his defalcations. As indicated by the report, a total of $2,939.26 was embezzled during the period November 1946 to May 28, 1947.

This amount, in my opinion, should be charged to the collector and his assistant to be paid out of their personal funds.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. MCNAMEE,
Supervisor of Accounts and Collections in Charge.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *November 13, 1947.*

Mr. PAUL A. HANKINS,
Deputy Commissioner,
Accounts and Collections Unit,
Internal Revenue Bureau,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HANKINS: The following is a report of the examination of the Office of Collector of Internal Revenue, Wilmington, Del., for the period July 2, 1940, to June 3, 1947, inclusive.

On May 28, 1947, Mr. Norman Collison, collector of internal revenue, Wilmington, Del., called me and asked if I would come to his office that day. I arrived at the Wilmington office about noon time and was informed by the collector and his assistant, Mr. Ainsworth, that there was an apparent shortage in the snuff stamps in the Wilmington office. I immediately made a count of the internal revenue stamps in the vault, which revealed a shortage in snuff stamps of $8,572.50, which shortage still exists.

The cashier was called in and admitted this shortage. The collector then stated that the cashier was over about $700 in the cash account and that he (the cashier) was prepared to make good this evident shortage of $7,800 and insisted that this was the total amount of the shortage. He further asked if I would accept this arrangement and forget the incident. I replied that my only reaction was to notify the Bureau immediately and ask for the suspension of the cashier. The collector demurred to this, pointing out that Mr. Flynn was married and has two sons. Upon my insistence that the Bureau be notified, the collector asked if he could accompany me to the Bureau. I acquiesced and, because of previous engagements, the trip was put off to June 3, 1947. Later that day I found other discrepancies totaling $22,500. The cashier was called to the collector's office and, when informed of these discrepancies, admitted same and said he could make full restitution if given 4 or 5 days. When asked why he did not admit these discrepancies during our first interview, he replied, "my bosses did not open their mouth, so why should I tell on myself."

Upon our visit to the Bureau on June 3, 1947, Mr. Flynn was suspended immediately.

On June 4, 1947, the supervisors instituted a day-by-day check of the cashier's records from June 3, 1947, back through January 1940, which revealed a gross shortage of $38,018.25. A duplicate credit in the amount of $7,500 to the 1944 estimated income tax account of Robert W. Rea under date of December 29, 1944 (which erroneous credit still stands) and various penalty and interest items totaling $84.27 credited to taxpayers on documents filed on time but journalized as delinquent, reduce the gross shortage to a net of $30,433.98.

The authorized destruction of various records, such as cashier's work sheets and cashier's journals, handicapped the supervisor's investigation as it progressed. The destruction of the various order forms for stamps for 1940 and prior years made it impossible to identify purchasers of documentary and/or stock transfer stamps. Orders for stamps, fermented malt liquor, were reconstructed from brewery records.

On July 2, 1940, orders for documentary stamps and stock transfer stamps in the amount of $1,297.90 were journalized covered by misapplied checks. Since this was the entire balance of the shortage yet to be identified (except one check for $8.44 deposited April 17, 1943) and neither the names of the purchasers of the stamps nor whether the original transactions were by cash or check could be ascertained, and since the comparison of remittance registers and document registers back through January 1940 revealed no discrepancies in which misapplication of funds was apparently involved, it was decided that further efforts to identify the balance of $1,297.90 would be useless.

The defalcations set up a fairly regular pattern as revealed by the schedule of discrepancies in deposits. Documents showing taxes originally paid in cash were journalized under cover of other taxpayers' checks. Sometimes the penciled cash was partially erased. On bills such as forms 17 or 19, an entirely new form was often prepared in pencil with no blue pencil notation and no received stamp. A general laxness in the use of the received stamp in the office, particularly on orders for stamps, contributed to the situation. The documents from which checks had been taken were subsequently put through with still other taxpayers' checks. However, several times taxpayers' checks were used as described above and the document journalized later as a cash transaction. Cash was also used many times to cover the difference between misapplied checks and documents being journalized. On 17 occasions Mr. Flynn used his personal checks for this purpose. These personal checks ranged in amounts from 32 cents to $153.16. These were verified by the records of the Farmers Bank & Trust Co., Wilmington, Del.

A study of received dates, when available, on cash documents, journalized under cover of checks, indicated that unidentified cash deposited in the operations described in the preceding paragraph came from such documents and not from the cashier's personal funds.

Prior to 1946, the only document not journalized for which the check was deposited was a miscellaneous tax return, Form 727, in the amount of $8.91 filed by Walter Holliger. A check for $17.08 was forwarded by mail with forms 727 for May and June 1944. The check was deposited August 11, 1944, but only the Form 727 for June in the amount of $8.17 was abstracted. This discrepancy, as well as several small excess collections which were not credited to taxpayers, apparently resulted from adding kited documents and checks to the document registers and remittance registers respectively without having first balanced the registers.

In six different cases documents were altered to bring the document register into balance with remittance registers, to bring the stamp control into balance with the stamp inventory, or to bring the kited documents into exact agreement with the kited checks. With one exception these were minor alterations. On June 26, 1942, however, the cash order of the Diamond State Brewery Co. for fermented malt-liquor stamps in the amount of $780 was not journalized and a fictitious order for fermented malt-liquor stamps in the amount of $180 was journalized in its stead. In addition, a fictitious order in the amount of $120 was journalized the same day. The two orders were in the same handwriting and neither the taxpayers' records nor bank statements reveal any such payments. The fictitious order of the Diamond State Brewery Co. differs from the taxpayer's copy only in that an order for four 25-barrel stamps at $150 each had been removed. The fictitious order in the name of the Delmarva Brewing Co. is for four 5-barrel stamps at $30 each. Apparently an inventory of fermented malt-liquor stamps revealed an average of four 25-barrel stamps and a shortage of four 5-barrel stamps and this device was utilized to bring the accounts into balance. It also apparently was used to embezzle $480. The Diamond State Brewery Co. was not aware that 5-barrel stamps had been delivered instead of 25-barrel stamps. The records of the Diamond State Brewery Co. indicated that a stamp order in the amount of $780 was paid by cash, on that date, while the Delmarva Brewing Co. had no records of $120 on that date. Inasmuch as all orders of the Delmarva Brewing Co. were paid by check and this order for $120 was covered by cash, it is clearly evident that this order was fictitious.

In addition to checks for $8,572.50, $5,000, $500, and $8.91, mentioned heretofore, the related documents for which were never journalized, checks in the amounts of $15,000 and $7,500 were submitted by John J. Williams to cover 1946 estimated income taxes of himself and his wife, respectively. These checks were deposited June 4, 1946, to cover the 1946 estimated income tax of Anthony P. Columbo and Rose M., in the amount of $2,500, and F. A. Wardenberg in the amount of $20,000. The documents with which Mr. Williams' checks were related have never been journalized.

On May 13, 1947, a check in the amount of $605.20 drawn by the Wilmington Country Club in payment of tax on admissions for April 1947, was deposited to cover orders on documentary stamps that are marked "cash." A duplicate return was filed by the taxpayer at the request of the collector's office and was assessed on the October 1947 Spl. No. 1 list, account No. 53160, and is outstanding.

Six cash payments, the documents for which were never journalized, have been definitely established. More may come to light eventually. Howard A. Gifford holds a cash receipt, Form 1, dated April 9, 1946, in the amount of $185.20 covering the balance of his 1945 income tax. There is no record of this payment in the collector's office. Four taxpayers have submitted affidavits of filing forms 11 with cash payments for various special tax stamps in total value of $159.50. The exact amount of the items claimed appear on the teller's cash sheet of the assistant cashier as payments for stamps and are included in the daily recapitulation of cash tallied as on hand at the close of business May 27, 1947, by the cashier. A comparison of the teller's stamp sheets with Forms 11 and other stamp records, leaves these items unreconciled.

It had not been the custom of the cashier's office to give a receipt for cash payments for stamps which could not be issued immediately. Now, a Form 1 receipt marked "in lieu of stamp to be issued" is given to taxpayers in all such cases.

In the schedule of discrepancies, under the heading, "Net cash," there appears 91 items which represent payments by the cashier from his cash reserves. Seventeen of these items marked "*" are his personal checks; the balance are cash payments. These payments total $10,329.47. It was necessary for the cashier to deposit these amounts to balance the various days' work. It is entirely possible that part of these payments represent cash payments by taxpayers whose returns were destroyed and owing to the volume of unfinished work of checking the unmatched documents received from the Processing Division and the migration of many war workers, it will be impossible to complete this part of the investigation. It is also possible that additional discrepancies will be uncovered when the revenue agents check the 1945 and 1946 income tax returns (Bureau) and make comparison with the credit documents attached to the return with the amount of credit taken by the taxpayer on his return.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. McNAMEE,
Supervisor of Accounts and Collections in Charge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a copy of a letter dated November 7, 1947, addressed to Hon. John J. Morris, Jr., United States district attorney, Wilmington, Del., and signed by Mr. Eugene C. Miller, senior investigator, General Accounting Office; which further explains the method used in juggling these taxpayer accounts.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., November 7, 1947.

Hon. JOHN J. MORRIS, Jr.,
United States District Attorney,
Post Office Building,
Wilmington, Del.,

MY DEAR MR. MORRIS: There is submitted for your consideration the following items resulting from the use of cash received by Maurice A. Flynn, Jr., as cashier in the office of the Collector of Internal Revenue at Wilmington, District of Delaware, and the substitution of checks prior to giving credit to the drawers of said checks.

George W. Helme Co. gave their check for $8,572.50 in purchasing snuff stamps. The check was deposited with the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia on March 21, 1947, without giving credit to the snuff-stamp account and there is no credit as yet given and it has resulted in a shortage in the snuff-stamp account.

The credit of the above remittance was applied as follows:

Delaware-New Jersey Ferry Co.: Form 727 for December 1946	$2,860.26
Frank M. Carpenter: Form 727 for December 1946	73.99
Reese Theater: Form 729 for December 1946	1,125.47
Ball Theater: Form 729 for December 1946	568.78
Harris & Groll, Inc.: Form 729 for December 1946	3,186.01
Shortage in cash deposit for documentary stamps on Mar. 21, 1947	413.27
Shortage in cash deposit for miscellaneous taxes in addition to cash paid by Fred Knecht shown below	324.76
Fred Knecht: Form 728A for February 1946 (paid in cash)	19.96
Total	8,572.50

The document "Order for stamps—Snuff" dated March 20, 1947, factory No. 4, George W. Helme Co., Yorklyn, Del., totaling $8,572.50 was placed in the hands of Thomas Ainsworth, assistant to the Collector of Internal Revenue, in the presence of Hon. Norman Collison, collector, on May 27, 1947, thus indicating a shortage in the snuff-stamp account by Mr. Maurice A. Flynn, Jr., then cashier of the collector's office.

John J. Williams sent two checks to the Collector of Internal Revenue, Wilmington, district of Delaware, in the amounts of $15,000 and $7,500 respectively. The checks were deposited in the Federal Reserve Bank, Philadelphia, on June 4, 1946, but credit has been withheld leaving the accounts due and unpaid and the checks applied to the credit of the following accounts:

Anthony P. Columbo and Rose M., for estimated income tax for 1946 in the amount of $2,500.

F. A. Wardenburg, for estimated income tax for 1946 in the amount of $20,000.

The checks from Anthony P. Columbo and Rose M., and F. A. Wardenburg having been applied to credit the accounts of other persons on March 8, 1946.

Henry Davis paid his estimated income tax for 1946 by a check in the amount of $5,000 which was deposited on March 28, 1946, in the

Wilmington Trust Co., Wilmington, Del. Credit has been withheld leaving the account due and unpaid.

The check was used to credit the account of Alfred E. Bissel for estimated income tax for 1945 in the amount of $5,000, Alfred E. Bissel's check for $5,000 having been deposited on November 9, 1945, and credit applied to accounts of other persons.

EUGENE C. MILLER,
Senior Investigator,
General Accounting Office.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1557, Calendar 702, a bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, and Senate bill 1375, Calendar 704, a bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a controversial question, and in view of the understanding which we have had with respect to taking up measures which are controversial while a number of Senators are out of the city and will be absent for some time, I am constrained to object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I understand that there is an agreement, in which both parties have joined, that no matters of a controversial nature shall be considered during the remainder of this week and next week. I shall not attempt to break that agreement by making a motion that these bills be considered.

I hesitate to make a motion for the further reason that we should dispose of the St. Lawrence waterway measure. However, I should like to have an understanding that when the St. Lawrence waterway is disposed of, we can make these bills the order of business, so that they can be disposed of. They have been on the calendar for a long time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I share the views expressed by the Senator from Connecticut, with this reservation: I hope that no understanding has been entered into that we are not to transact any business of a controversial nature in the United States Senate between now and February 27, because I think there is some legislation which we certainly ought to take care of between now and that date. There are a great many so-called minor bills on the calendar, very important bills, which are unanimously reported from committee. I think we should dispose of them if no Senator wishes to speak on the St. Lawrence waterway.

I think it would be an unfortunate state of affairs, merely because some of our colleagues are to be out of the city between now and February 27, if we were to drag our feet and take a sort of slow-down vacation until February 27.

I serve notice now that so far as House bill 3484, Calendar 365, is concerned, I shall move to take up that bill. It is a bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture. I commented on the bill the other day when the calendar was called. The bill has been unanimously reported from the Armed Services Committee. It involves reaching some decision as to how we are to handle the Remount Service. We cannot go ahead with the so-called emergency grant which we were able to get through in the closing days of the last session.

I, for one, will protest any attempt to reach an understanding that legislation of that type is not to be considered before February 27 merely because some Senators are absent or intend to be absent.

I serve notice now that at the first opportunity after today I shall move to take up House bill 3484.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I was momentarily out of the Chamber. I should like to know whether Calendar No. 696, Senate bill 1356, a bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans, has been called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to know if there is any objection to bringing up that bill at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me suggest to the able Senator from Massachusetts that we try to settle the question which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has raised. He has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1557, Calendar 702, and Senate bill 1375, Calendar 704. I understood that there was objection from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to taking up those bills in the absence of a number of Senators.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator from Illinois also object to the consideration of Calendar 696, Senate bill 1356, providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Massachusetts was not present when I made my statement a moment ago. The two bills referred to by the Senator from Connecticut and the third bill, which was mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts, are controversial measures, and in my judgment they will require considerable discussion and debate. I therefore cannot agree to a unanimous-consent agreement at this time, because a number of Senators who are interested in those bills are out of the city.

Mr. President, I am not responsible for Senators being out of the city. There has been a tentative understanding that while those Senators were absent making speeches in behalf of the Republicans, and while Democratic Senators are absent during the following week, no really controversial matter should be brought before the Senate for decision. I presume that that agreement can be overturned at any time, but I understood that that was the gentlemen's agreement, from all I have listened to in the past few days, and from the statements of the distinguished acting majority leader, Mr. WHERRY, and other Senators with whom I have talked. I have nothing to do with the policy of the Senate at the present time. It is a matter for Senators on the other side of the aisle to decide what they wish to do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is the Senator personally opposed to these bills?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Massachusetts cannot get the Senator from Illinois into a debate about those bills.

Mr. LODGE. I am not trying to debate them. I am merely seeking information.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will not get that information at this time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I express my regret that the Senator sees fit to block these bills. I thought that all the opposition to them had been removed. The bill to which I refer in particular is sponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH]. I had hoped that that might have a little weight with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts regrets that I have blocked these bills. On an occasion of this kind, I have some responsibility on this side of the aisle, as acting minority leader. There are other Senators on this side of the aisle besides the Senator from Illinois, whom he must consider in this connection, or in connection with any other measure with respect to which there is controversy.

All I am saying to the Senator from Massachusetts is that there is a controversy with respect to these bills. Whether or not the Senator from Rhode Island or any other Senator on this side of the aisle happens to be for a certain bill might or might not make any difference to the Senator from Illinois from the personal angle. There are some Republicans who are for the St. Lawrence seaway, but that makes no difference to the Senator from Massachusetts in his opposition to it. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has no influence on the Senator from Massachusetts with respect to such an important measure; yet the Senator from Massachusetts seeks to catechise the Senator from Illinois because he objects to the consideration of a certain bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not seeking to catechise the Senator at all. I am simply asking the question whether or not he is personally against the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will find out in due time whether I am for it or against it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to make my position clear. I made the request which I submitted because some time ago I spoke with the acting majority leader [Mr. WHERRY], who told me that he thought there might be an opportunity at this time to consider these bills. I had no idea that there would be so much controversy about them. Twice they have been called during the call of the calendar, and each time there has been objection. In each instance I explained the bill to the Senator who objected, and afterward the objection was withdrawn.

Mr. President, I am aware of the parliamentary situation. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I do not believe that we ought to drag our feet. However, since there is an indication that these bills may be of a controversial nature and require some debate, I do not wish to interfere with the debate on the St. Lawrence waterway, which is a very important matter, and which has priority, by making a motion the effect of which would be to divert the attention of the Senate to these two bills. They are important bills, but they can be considered after the St. Lawrence waterway measure is disposed of. I merely ask my distinguished friend from Illinois and other Senators who may feel that consideration of those bills ought to be postponed at this time to join with me after the St. Lawrence waterway question is disposed of, when I make the motion that those bills be made the pending business so that they may be disposed of. I wonder if that suggestion meets with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say candidly to my friend that I have nothing to do with the program which will be in operation from now on. It is a matter for the policy committee of the majority as to what they wish to do in connection with these matters. I shall not be in position either to cooperate or not to cooperate with the able Senator. When the proper time comes I shall be glad to give the Senator my decision.

Mr. BALDWIN. My reason for addressing the distinguished Senator from Illinois is that he is the one who is making objection, and I thought he might be in position to give me some assurance, because he is the acting minority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest that we let the matter ride along. That is all we can do until the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution is out of the way.

Mr. BALDWIN. The suggestion has been made, and I serve notice at this time that after the vote on the St. Lawrence seaway is had, I shall make a motion that these bills be considered.

Mr. LODGE. I shall join with the Senator from Connecticut in making that motion.

Mr. BALDWIN. And I shall join with the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while the St. Lawrence seaway project is under debate, these actions can be taken only by unanimous consent. I assume that the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway will soon come to a close. After that, any motion may be made to take up any measure. I assume the floor leader of the majority will move to take up certain bills. He has already suggested taking up on the 17th the budget resolution, and on the 18th the rent-control bill. I think that if the distinguished Senator from Connecticut will apply to the majority leader he will no doubt add to the list the bills in which the Senator is interested.

AUTHORITY OF MARITIME COMMISSION TO DISPOSE OF VESSELS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 902, Senate Joint Resolution 173, dealing with the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. I may state that the urgency in this matter arises from the fact that the present legislation will expire on the 29th of February. So far as I have been able to discover, the resolution has the approval of Senators on each side of the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to object to taking up the joint resolution at this time. When it was called on Monday I asked that it go over because the Waterman Steamship Corp., having its home office in the State of Alabama, had indicated an interest in the resolution, and a desire to offer certain amendments. I asked for time in order to present those amendments. I submitted them on Tuesday, and they are now on the table. Following that, I discussed the matter with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who has been very much interested in the measure. The Senator from Washington had told me that there was merit in the amendments proposed by the Waterman Steamship Corp., but that, unfortunately, it was a matter that should be discussed in committee, that of course it was impossible to take the matter back to the committee for further consideration, but that there would be ample opportunity for the presentation of amendments and discussion of them in the hearings to be held in the House committee.

Because of the urgency of this matter, Mr. President, I shall not press my amendments further, since the Senator from Washington has told me he did not feel it would be possible to accept the amendments here without having had some consideration of them in the committee. I believe there is merit in the amendments, and that very careful consideration ought to be given to the objective sought to be reached. As I understand the situation, it would be the intent of Congress to work out a merchant marine which might become a real and permanent part of the shipping industry, and every encouragement was sought to be given to people to buy ships in order that they might enter into that industry. As it is, a great many people are simply chartering ships and are not making headway as fast as it should be made in the purchase of ships and the setting up of a permanent and regular business. The purpose of the amendments was to lend an incentive for the purchase of ships, rather than have the business carried on merely under a temporary charter arrangement. I wish that the amendments might have been considered, but, due to the urgency of getting the law extended, I shall not insist on my amendments.

I ask, Mr. President, for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement which I requested the Waterman Steamship Corp. to prepare for me in explanation of the amendments, and why they should be incorporated into the legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM WITH REFERENCE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 173, PARTICULARLY WITH REFERENCE TO THE EXTENSION OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION TO CHARTER DRY-CARGO WAR-BUILT VESSELS

The proposed amendents to Senate Joint Resolution 173 may be considered qualifications and/or limitations to the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to charter dry-cargo war-built vessels, so that the resolution will conform more nearly with the spirit and intent of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. The "spirit and intent" of the act was in effect to dispose of Government-owned war-built vessels to American shipping companies in order to reestablish a privately owned and operated American merchant marine. The intent was not to have the Government remain in the shipping business through continuing to charter vessels to operators who did not demonstrate their intent to purchase the ships.

Section 14 of said act stipulates that no contract of sale or charter shall be made thereunder after December 31, 1947; however, the Congress subsequently and generously extended the dead line date until February 29, 1948. The proposal to further extend the Commission's chartering authority until July 1, 1949, is not within the scope of the intent of the Merchant Ship Sales Act and, if the Congress feels that the authority should be extended in view of international conditions, certain limitations and qualifications should be attached thereto in order to bring it more in line with the intent of the act. The amendments suggested propose to meet this problem.

We heartily endorse the proposal outlined in Senate Joint Resolution 173 that would deny the Maritime Commission the authority to charter or sell war-built vessels to any person not a citizen of the United States. It is felt that recent proposals to charter vessels to foreign nations would be extremely detrimental to national interests and to the American merchant marine.

We take no position with reference to section 2 of the joint resolution which would waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws, submitted by the Coast Guard, inasmuch as our interest lies primarily in dry-cargo merchant vessels.

Senate Joint Resolution 173 provides in section 1, subsection (a), that the temporary authority of the Maritime Commission to charter war-built dry cargo vessels shall be extended from March 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949. We suggest that this latter date be changed to May 1, 1949, with the provision that all charters entered into shall terminate not later than 60 days thereafter. Without this 60-day provision, the original intent of the committee, as expressed in Senate Joint Resolution 173, would be partially nullified inasmuch as many vessels on uncompleted voyages could not possibly be returned to the Maritime Commission in less than 60 days. Therefore, the changing of this date to May 1, and the 60-day provision, will permit compliance, in fact, with the intent of Senate Joint Resolution 173, i. e., the limitation of the chartering authority to July 1, 1949.

The second suggested amendment is noted on the attached as subsection (b) of section 1

(of S. J. Res. 173). It provides that, after February 29, 1948 (the deadline set by the last Congress), vessels shall be chartered for operation in the foreign trade only to citizens who actually own and operate American-flag vessels and/or those who have made unqualified commitments on or before that date to purchase dry cargo war-built vessels from the Maritime Commission. It proposes further that the number of vessels which any citizen may charter for operation in said foreign trades shall not exceed the ratio of two chartered vessels for each vessel the charterer actually owns or had made unqualified commitments to purchase.

Since March 8, 1946, all American citizens who seriously intended to acquire modern dry cargo war-built vessels from the Government have been afforded every reasonable opportunity during this 2-year period to demonstrate their alleged sincerity of purpose by assuming the inherent risks by investing their own private funds in the purchase of such vessels as might have been required to enable them to restore their prewar services and such postwar services as they intended to operate. Every inducement was made in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to have these war-built vessels purchased by private industry for the purpose of reestablishing the privately owned merchant marine. Some elements of the industry, recognizing the intent and purpose of the Ship Sales Act, have invested their own funds and have reestablished their prewar American-flag fleet. Other elements of the shipping industry have not felt that it would be necessary to invest their private capital in war-built vessels as long as the Maritime Commission continued to charter the vessels to them without requirements as to the necessity to purchase vessels.

Obviously, therefore, the continuation of this chartering program, without the qualifications and limitations as suggested in these amendments, is a distinct discrimination against those American-flag ship operators who have purchased vessels and have thereby attempted to abide by the word and the intent of the act to reestablish a privately owned and operated American merchant fleet.

The suggested ratio of chartering two vessels for each one owned should actually result in the enlargement of the present American-flag dry-cargo fleet now being operated in the foreign trade of the United States. This fleet presently is made up of roughly 1,650 vessels. Approximately 550 are privately owned, and about 1,100 are chartered Government-owned vessels. Therefore, on the suggested basis of "two for one," the actual number of vessels in operation will not diminish inasmuch as it can very well be assumed that all owners of private fleets will take advantage of these suggested terms.

In addition, however, there can be no question but that many of the shipping companies who have not felt it necessary to purchase vessels will invest the profits they have accumulated through the operation of chartered Government-owned vessels, through the purchase of ships from the Commission. Therefore, this amendment will without doubt assist in the carrying out of the original intent of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 and, at the same time, should actually increase, rather than decrease, the present number of American-flag dry-cargo vessels in operation.

In the domestic shipping trade, i. e., the coastal and intercoastal trade, there are no national or international problems that necessitate the continuation of the operation of Government-owned vessels via charter arrangements with the Maritime Commission. The recent increase of 20 percent in rail rates has made it possible to increase domestic shipping rates to the extent that the reasons stated in the report (No. 856) on Senate Joint Resolution 173 for the continuation of the chartering authority in the coastal and intercoastal trades are not warranted. This rate increase has now placed the domestic shipping industry in a competitive position whereby it can rehabilitate itself by the use of privately owned vessels and without the necessity of confining its operations in such trade to the use of vessels chartered from the Government at nominal or reduced rates.

Under these circumstances, an amendment has been suggested (subsection (c) of section 1) which would extend the authority of the Commission to charter vessels in the domestic trade to not later than 60 days after September 30, 1948.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Waterman Steamship Corp. relating to the same matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.,
Mobile, Ala., February 4, 1948.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: Confirming our conversation of yesterday morning, I am attaching hereto a brief memorandum in support of the two proposed amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 173. Further confirming our conversation, we feel that these suggested amendments, which in fact are limitations to the authority of the Maritime Commission to charter or sell war-built dry-cargo vessels, are vital if the American merchant marine is to be conducted as a private enterprise financed by private capital.

As you no doubt are well aware, the Waterman Steamship Corp. is an Alabama corporation with main offices in Mobile. We now own 55 dry-cargo war-built vessels which we have purchased from the Maritime Commission since the enactment of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, exclusively with our private funds, and in accordance with the terms of the said act. Eleven of these vessels have just recently been purchased from the Maritime Commission and will be part of our active fleet as soon as reconversion work, which we hope will be done in our yards in Mobile, has been completed.

With the addition of these 11 ships, the total dead-weight capacity of the American-flag fleet owned and operated by Waterman in domestic and foreign trades will be approximately 577,000 dead-weight tons. I am confident that Maritime Commission records will indicate that this is the largest privately owned and operated fleet under the American flag.

In addition to these privately owned vessels, we operate under charter arrangement with the Maritime Commission some 67 vessels, making a total fleet of 122 vessels, all with their home port in Mobile.

I bring these facts to your attention only to indicate to you our qualifications to speak in reference to the matters involving the American merchant marine and to indicate to you that the management of Waterman has made a concrete demonstration of their desire to comply with both the letter and the spirit of the Ship Sales Act of 1946.

Due to circumstances beyond our control, which I explained to you, we were unable to study Senate Joint Resolution 173 and to make known our views on this proposed resolution in time for proper consideration of our suggestions by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Therefore, your cooperation and interest in bringing our views to their attention and to the attention of the United States Senate before final action is obtained on Senate Joint Resolution 173, as reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, is deeply appreciated.

Trusting you will call on me if I can be of further service, I am,

Most cordially yours,

MARSHALL F. BANNELL,
Director, Public Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that at this point in the RECORD there be inserted the report of the committee, without the accompanying letters, which I think states clearly the purpose of the proposed legislation, and to which I think there will be no objection.

There being no objection, the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) which continues until July 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels and also continues the present waiver against compliance with certain navigation and vessel-inspection laws, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that it do pass, as amended.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The joint resolution would accomplish three objectives: (1) Extend until July 1, 1949, the temporary authority heretofore granted the Maritime Commission under the act of June 28, 1947 (Public Law 127, 80th Cong.), to continue to sell, charter, and operate vessels; (2) write into law the policy now followed by the Maritime Commission of not selling or chartering vessels to foreigners; (3) extend until July 1, 1949, the authority granted the United States Coast Guard under the act of March 31, 1947 (Public Law 27, 80th Cong.), to waive compliance with vessel-inspection and navigation laws for vessels under American registry. The recommended resolution has the approval of the United States Maritime Commission, the Department of State, the United States Coast Guard, labor organizations directly involved in maritime matters, and the National Federation of American Shipping. However, only the latter organization submitted its views on the committee amendment.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The legislation herewith reported by the committee was formally recommended by the President in a message to Congress on December 2, 1947 (H. Doc. 468, 80th Cong.). Calling attention to the fact that the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, operate, or charter Government-owned vessels built during the war will expire on February 29, 1948, the President declared that—

"It is now clearly apparent that this authority must be continued beyond that date in order to prevent a break-down in vital shipping services."

And concluded with the statement that—

"Our most immediate need, however, is to assure the maintenance of essential shipping services by continuing in effect the present provisions of law which make possible the use of Government-owned ships."

The Department of State, in even more urgent terms, advised this committee in a letter dated January 27, 1948, that the extension was of paramount importance in carrying

out this Government repatriation program and called attention to a report of a special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee recommending that the repatriation program not be allowed to lapse. The State Department also points out that any failure in the International Refugee Organization's basic mission to liquidate the displaced-persons problem would throw a large additional burden of maintenance cost upon United States taxpayers, estimated by the State Department as $130,000,000 annually. The text of the President's message and the State Department's letter are made a part of this report.

While the basic purpose of the resolution here recommended is contained in section 1 (a), which continues authority to carry on ship-operating functions and the sale and charter authority of the Ship Sales Act of 1946, the committee desires to call particular attention to its amendment contained in section 1 (b). The amendment, in specific terms, forbids after March 1, 1948, the sale or charter by the Maritime Commission of any United States war-built vessel to a noncitizen of the United States. The committee desires to point out that the United States Maritime Commission has followed the policy for several months of making no more sales to noncitizens, and it never has, of course, chartered any vessels to noncitizens. The committee believes the Maritime Commission is to be commended for this policy. In adopting the amendment the committee is making explicit in law what is presently implicit in administration and thereby definitely precluding shifts or changes in policy which might vitiate what it conceives to be a sound policy based on the facts available to it.

The committee believes there is no justification for the sale of war-built vessels to noncitizens after March 1, 1948. More than 950 such vessels have been sold to foreign buyers under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946. These sales, coupled with the construction programs of the 16 so-called Marshall-plan nations, including vessels under construction and those for which contracts have been let, will result in merchant-fleet tonnages for these nations substantially in excess of their prewar levels. The merchant fleets of the friendly Allied Nations also will be larger than their prewar levels upon completion of their construction programs. Thus, the further sale to foreigners of American vessels would, in the committee's opinion, result in a competitive disadvantage to American-flag operators.

Data available to the committee would indicate that the total merchant-ship tonnage of the European nations which this country is aiding will in 1951 represent about 8 percent more of the world tonnage on that date than they had in 1938. Moreover, there are authoritative reports that some European nations which buy or would charter American vessels are presently busily engaged in ship-construction programs for the sole purpose of trading such new construction for other commodities necessary to their economies, meanwhile expecting to use the purchased or chartered American vessels to build up their own fleets. In effect, this is a program of using American war-built vessels to trade with nations with which we ourselves do not trade for the mutual advantage of the two participating nations but to the detriment of the United States, whose own merchant-fleet tonnage, both active and reserve might be lowered beyond safe, economic, and national-defense standards.

And while there is no authority in the Merchant Ship Sales Act to charter vessels to noncitizens and the Maritime Commission has not chartered American vessels to foreigners, the committee believes that it is desirable to make affirmatively certain that the law forbids such chartering of American vessels. It has been suggested that chartering will insure American ownership of the vessels and prevent reduction of the American merchant marine below safe limits. The committee, however, is impressed with testimony offered which indicates that chartered vessels are not always returned; for example, this country is still awaiting the return of 95 ships lend-leased to Soviet Russia when she was our ally. Moreover, American experience with chartering foreign demonstrates that the vessels returned are far from being in satisfactory condition. The cost of repairs to put them into operating condition is frequently more than the vessel is worth.

Beyond all this is the basic question of what tonnage should be retained in the American active and reserve fleets from a standpoint of national defense. The importance of a large merchant fleet to render vitally necessary auxiliary and logistical support to our military forces has been sharply demonstrated in two world wars. The report of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine (Keller report) shows that the Navy deems as a minimum requirement a merchant fleet of 11,400,000 tons. The present privately owned American merchant marine is less than this total. This same report declares that when all Government vessels, including those now engaged in transporting relief and recovery cargoes, are returned to the reserve fleet, they will total about 2,000 vessels. Whether this number of vessels, which will have to be drawn upon from time to time to replace casualties and transport essential civilian requirements and strategic materials, is ample for the Nation's defense requirements is yet to be established. But, in the opinion of the committee, this is not the time to gamble with the future, or take a chance that we will not require a large, quickly available merchant fleet.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator would also insert in the RECORD the very brief statement he showed me earlier in the day. I should appreciate it if he would.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement, which I understand is a statement of the Maritime Commission regarding the amendments offered by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and which merely states that while the amendments have merit they raise a controversial point, one on which hearings should be held.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 173, introduced by Senator TOBEY, provides for the extension of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, and the operating authority of the Maritime Commission until July 1, 1949.

The extension of such authorities is deemed essential, whether to July 1, 1949, or to such earlier date as may be deemed appropriate.

The amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Senator SPARKMAN modifies Senate Joint Resolution 173 in several material aspects. Although these proposed modifications are supported by substantial merit, they may be subject to considerable controversy. It is believed, therefore, that they should be considered separately so as not to prejudice the immediate passage of the extension of the authorities provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 173, as introduced.

Separate consideration of the proposed modifications will permit the holding of hearings and the making of unhurried conclusions which the amendments deserve. It will also make possible the opportunity to better correlate the proposals and will result in amendments which will most effectively accomplish the intended purposes to the greatest ultimate benefit of the American-owned and American-operated merchant marine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the first amendment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert on page 1, line 3, after the word "that", the letter "a" in parentheses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, to insert a new subparagraph (b), as follows:

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), no contract of sale under section 6 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 shall be made after March 1, 1948; and nothing contained in this or any other act shall be deemed to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to charter any war-built vessel (as defined in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946) to any person who is not a citizen of the United States (as defined in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946).

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, as I understand, the committee amendment prohibits any more foreign sales after the end of the present month. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. It merely writes into the law the practice which has already been adopted by the Maritime Commission itself. It makes it a matter of statutory policy instead of merely a policy of the Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, the Senator is aware that in the so-called Marshall plan there is a provision for the transfer of approximately 400 vessels. I am not sure of the number, but I believe there is a provision in the plan for the transfer of such vessels. Is the Senator informed as to that?

Mr. TAFT. I am not fully informed, but of course if it were desired to make that prohibition it would supersede the present practice.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator is correct, the Maritime Commission has, as a matter of Commission policy, stopped some months ago foreign sales, at least to any great extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) section 1 of the act entitled "An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948," approved June 28, 1947 (Public Law No. 127, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out the date "March 1, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1949."

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), no contract of sale under section 6 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 shall be made after March 1, 1948; and nothing contained in this or any other act shall be deemed to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to charter any war-built vessel (as defined in the Merchant Ship

Sales Act of 1946) to any person who is not a citizen of the United States (as defined in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946).

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard," approved March 31, 1947 (Public Law No. 27, 80th Cong.), as amended, is amended by striking out the date "April 1, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1949."

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to make a 2-minute statement on the St. Lawrence seaway, if I may.

Mr. President, after full consideration of the issues involved in the St. Lawrence seaway, I have decided to vote against it at this time. So long as this country is involved in the expenditure of billions of dollars for armed forces, more likely to increase than decrease, so long as it is involved in costly aid to other countries to check the growth of communism in the world, so long as we have the tremendous obligations to our veterans of two world wars, I do not think the Federal Government should undertake any large increase in its public-works projects, unless the case in favor of proceeding is clear beyond question. Already the effort to do too many things at one time is causing hardship and inflation.

While I think the power development of the St. Lawrence is important and desirable, the greater part of the expense relates to navigation. The navigation project seems to me of questionable economic value at this time.

I also believe it is of questionable defense value. I believe our steel companies should be forced to develop the low-grade iron ores of Minnesota and not become entirely dependent on iron ore imported from other countries. I find this is the prevalent view also in northern Ohio, where so much of the steel industry is located.

Therefore, I am not willing to vote to authorize the navigation project at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to one or two matters.

Before doing so, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, because I am not sure that I correctly understood the Senator from Ohio, and I should like to have him give me his attention for a moment in regard to a point he made a few moments ago concerning the procedure which has to be followed under the unanimous-consent agreement in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution.

I propound the parliamentary inquiry whether a Member of the Senate has a right to make a motion at any time to have the Senate lay aside the unfinished business, the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution, which is now before the Senate, and take up any other measure on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to take up any other measure is in order at any time.

Mr. MORSE. Then, if I correctly understand the ruling——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand the distinction, a motion is now in order to have the Senate take up any measure; but the effect of the adoption of such a motion would be to do away with the status of the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution as the unfinished business. I suppose that under the unanimous-consent agreement that joint resolution would automatically recur as the business before the Senate on February 27.

However, until we have completed action on the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution, I do not think we should entertain a motion which would remove the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution from the status of the unfinished business.

So the only other recourse is a unanimous-consent agreement to set aside temporarily the unfinished business. It seems to me that a motion to set it aside is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. MORSE. That was my impression. I simply wished to make sure, because as I understood the Senator's previous remarks, it seemed to me they left the impression that such a procedure would not be in order.

I wish to say that until the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution has in fact ended, it would certainly not be out of order, although not cricket, for any Senator to make such a motion. I have no intention of making such a motion; but when I am satisfied that every Senator has said all he wishes to say in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway measure, I intend to press for action on Calendar No. 365, House bill 3484, for reasons which I stated earlier today, for I think all of us understand that the real reason why the date February 27 was fixed under the unanimous-consent agreement, insofar as the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution is concerned, was the fact that all of us knew there would be a considerable amount of absenteeism in the Senate between now and February 27, and both the proponents and the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway wished to be sure of selecting a date when the maximum number of Senators would be in the Chamber when the Senate came to vote on that measure. That is one reason why I went along with the unanimous-consent proposal, quite contrary to my usual custom in regard to such matters, plus the other reasons I stated in the RECORD yesterday—the fact that the agreement gives ample time for all Members of the Senate to debate the issue, and also ample time for the country to be heard from in regard to it.

But I wish to point out this afternoon, Mr. President, that as soon as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is the leader for the proponents, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is the leader for the opponents, can make clear to us that they think debate on the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution has in fact stopped, then I think the Senate should proceed with some of these minor but controversial measures, and should do the business of the Senate which should be done between now and February 27.

That is why at a later time, when I have such a notification from the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Massachusetts, I shall at least urge that some action be taken by the Senate on some minor but nevertheless controversial bills.

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the next thing I wish to comment on in these brief remarks is the speech made earlier this afternoon by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL]. I wish to refer particularly to that part of the speech in which he commented upon a man who I think is one of the greatest of living Americans.

I am sure that those who read the speech of the Senator from Texas may at least infer that Dr. Frank Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, was the subject of criticism in that speech. I do not need to say anything in defense of Dr. Graham; and the remarks I now make, Mr. President, are not in defense of him, but, rather, are in fairness to him, because I think on the same day when the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carries the type of remarks about Dr. Graham that were included in the speech of the Senator from Texas, a statement in support of Dr. Graham's great Americanism should also appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I served with Dr. Graham for 2 years on the National War Labor Board, during the war. He is the personification, let me say, Mr. President, of the idealism of Americanism. I know of no living man who is more Christlike in character than the great president of the University of North Carolina, Dr. Frank Graham. He is the son of a Confederate officer, one of the great sons of the South, a man who I think must be included in any list of the 25 greatest living Americans, a man who is a great inspiration to the youth of the South—not only to the youth of the South, Mr. President, but to the entire South and to the Nation as a whole. He is a man who recognizes the liberalism of the Constitution of the United States, and who fully appreciates the significance of the freedoms of its Bill of Rights, a man who recognizes that we do not answer opposition by trying to drive it underground, a man who has appeared on the platforms of America before all types of organizations in defense of constitutional government.

Mr. President, I hope we have not reached such a point in America that when one accepts an invitation to speak before any organization, he thereby becomes an endorser of the platforms or policies or principles of that organization. The fact that Dr. Graham, as was pointed out this afternoon by the Senator from Texas, has appeared on the programs of some organizations that we know to be leftist organizations, is no reflection upon his Americanism. Mr.

President, as an American liberal I am perfectly willing to appear, at my convenience, before any leftist organization in America and defend the principles of Americanism for which I stand. I have done so on many occasions. I have done so, making perfectly clear my opposition to the principles for which those organizations stand.

Let me say, Mr. President, that in my opinion the way to meet the Communist menace is to keep that menace right out in the open, beard the Communists in their dens, so to speak, go before them and their constituencies and point out to them wherein they stand for principles that cannot be reconciled with the freedoms of our Constitution. Point out to them that the principles for which they stand constitute, in the last analysis, police-state methods, and cannot be reconciled with the individual liberty guaranties of our form of government.

Frank Graham is such a liberal fighter for American principles. I wish to say that the test is not before what audiences a man speaks, but what he says before those audiences. That is the test. I am perfectly willing to let Dr. Graham's record, as set forth in his speeches, speak for itself.

I make these remarks because I think there is a danger that from the remarks made this afternoon by the Senator from Texas about Dr. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, some persons might draw an implication reflecting upon the patriotism of Dr. Graham. I make them with this concluding statement, Mr. President, that it is my honest opinion that a more patriotic American does not live in our country than the distinguished president of the University of North Carolina, Dr. Frank Graham.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I was greatly moved by the statement of the Senator from Oregon. I agree 100 percent with the sentiment he expressed. I do not know the doctor to whom the Senator referred, but I do know that in these fast-moving days the thing to do is not to indulge in personalities, but to argue principles, and not so to act that nefarious forces must go underground, but if we can, argue the merits. As I have said so many times on the floor of the Senate, and as I have said in relation to Europe, we Americans have a good bill of goods to sell. The question is whether we are salesmen. The thing to do is to sell the bill of goods, and the way to counteract or to provide an antidote to communism is to expose its irrationality and lack of common sense and to expose further what communism breeds and what citizens under that form of government get. The way to do that is to show the facts, and to sell our bill of goods. So I join with the Senator in what he so ably said, only wishing that I could get on my feet and express as forcefully, as dynamically, and as clearly as he did, what I think is one of the great needs of the day, that when we disagree with a person's philosophy we present our reasons for our beliefs. It was only four or five hundred years ago that the Catholics and Protestants burned each other at the stake, thinking they were doing God's will. Each group thought they were doing God's will. We in America today know that that is not God's will; it is man's blindness. So today, we must not be so cocksure that we have arrived. America is a growing nation, and that is why we are asking for the St. Lawrence seaway.

BREAKING NEW GROUND, BY GIFFORD PINCHOT—ARTICLE FROM THE INTERNATIONAL WOODWORKER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as part of my remarks, a very excellent review of Gifford Pinchot's book, Breaking New Ground, dealing with one of the great domestic problems of America, namely, the conservation problem. I ask to have the review printed in the body of the RECORD because I wish to associate my views with those expressed in the review.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the International Woodworker of January 21, 1948]

A BOOK TO SHOUT ABOUT

(Breaking New Ground, by Gifford Pinchot)

Here is a book to shout about. It's so worth while anyone's time reading that when you finish the last page you will want to tell the whole world about it.

The book starts with forestry, which itself is a pretty big thing, especially to woodworkers. But Pinchot's story broadens and deepens mightily as it goes along, until it becomes the best book we know on what the whole twentieth century in America is all about.

It is an especially timely book for this crucial political year of 1948, but it will remain timely for many years to come. Here is why:

The twentieth century is the century of American revolt against plutocracy, the century of struggle for the general welfare against the evils of concentrated wealth. Breaking New Ground tells what that fight is all about. It tells the story, not by theorizing, nor from library research, but by actually reporting the first-hand experiences of a man who was in the thick of the first big round of that battle, early in the century. That round, of course, was Theodore Roosevelt's Square Deal, which was to be followed, between reactionary lapses, by Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom, Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, and—well, the people have yet to decide what and when the fourth and succeeding rounds will be. If we give Truman a good Congress to back him up in November, maybe it will be soon.

CONSERVATION IS ANTIMONOPOLY

Pinchot shows how the whole pattern and direction of the twentieth-century struggle in America was set during the Square Deal years. The crux of the whole progressive movement against concentrated wealth, Pinchot points out, is the conservation policy that was formulated and popularized, and partly put into effect, during the administration of "TR."

Pinchot makes it clear that the conservation policy was not and is not the obscure, technical, rather negative thing which some people evidently regard it to be. Instead it is a dynamic policy for the development and use of the world's resources for all the people, against the restrictive, exploitive schemes of monopoly. As such it is the most basic material problem of all.

The "TR" conservation policy laid the foundations and started many of the works of the twentieth century which have done most to provide opportunity to the common man and to raise his standard of living and better his conditions. Those works now include the Nation's great electric-power projects like Bonneville and Grand Coulee, the unified development of river basins, as in the Tennessee Valley, the mighty irrigation projects on the western deserts, rural electrification, the soil-conservation program, and the conservation and wise use of oil, coal, and mineral lands, as well as the fight to conserve and develop the forests for the public welfare against the greed and ignorance of a scheming few.

Pinchot shows clearly how the fight against monopoly is a part of the conservation policy. As he puts it, "the rights of the people to govern themselves shall not be controlled by great monopolies through their power over natural resources." That he presents as one of the three great purposes of the conservation policy. The others are (1) wise use and development; and (2) control of such use in the common interest (p. 506).

CONSERVATION SPLITS REPUBLICAN PARTY

How the fight of special privilege against the conservation policy split the Republican Party from stem to stern (leading to Woodrow Wilson's election in 1912) is part of the story. Since that split the number of progressives left in the Republican Party can very nearly be counted on the fingers of one hand, although Pinchot does not go into that. Except for world conservation policy, Pinchot's story ends right after the bumbling, reactionary President Taft (father of the present Senator) fired Pinchot for continuing to fight for the conservation policy when Taft's friend, Ballinger, as Interior Secretary, was scuttling it.

KEY TO WORLD PEACE

As regards world affairs, Pinchot shows that the conservation policy is the key to peace. And he brings that part of the story down to 1946 and the plans for a world-conservation conference to start the ball rolling. Such a conference, the book says, has been placed on the UN agenda for this year.

Pinchot comments, also, how President after President since TR has "discovered" conservation. But he makes clear that the Presidents who count are those who do something about it, rather than giving mere lip service. By that measure, of course, Franklin Roosevelt counted high. Indeed, Pinchot reports that FDR was the first President since TR who immediately grasped the significance of the conservation policy in relation to world peace. Plans for the coming UN world-conservation conference were started by Pinchot and FDR.

The first part of the book is especially interesting to a forester, but it is good reading and helpful for anyone who wants to understand what the twentieth century is all about. That is because it shows, in rewarding detail, how the conservation policy got its start in the fight for the forests. And it tells much that a woodworker as well as a forester, will be glad to know about forestry.

THE PEOPLE VERSUS PRIVILEGE

The latter part of the book tells what the conservation policy is, and the kind of opposition it met, and has met ever since. This part of the book, except for names and dates, reads just like today's news: On one hand, the same kind of clear, constructive proposals, the same honest courage on the part of men who put the public welfare first; on the other hand, the same kind of demagogery, dishonesty, evasion, and stupidity which has always characterized the spokesmen and stooges of monopoly and special privilege.

Replete with actual quotations from both sides of the controversies of the TR days,

the book does something mighty helpful for the reader: It enables him to see that there is a consistent steady direction to the drive for democratic progress in the twentieth century. If you are on the democratic side of the struggle, you will get from the book not only insight on what to do, but also a warm feeling of kinship and fellowship with some really great souls who pioneered in the same fight that woodworkers and all decent-minded people are waging today.

If you are on the reactionary side, the book should make you feel like a heel, which, of course, is the first step in reforming a reactionary.

So it is a useful and timely book. It's also good, entertaining reading. The action moves along well, except in a few spots. It is livened with many a pungent phrase, for GP was a master phrase maker.

MONOPOLY ON THE LOOSE

The whole book is worth reading, but for those who don't read whole books, at least the concluding section, What It All Means, is a must. Among other things it has pungent, honest things like these to say:

"Monopoly on the loose is a source of many of the economic, political, and social evils which affect the sons of men. Its abolition or regulation is an inseparable part of the conservation policy" (page 507).

"Concentrated wealth attributes to the prosperity and progress of the United States to what it calls free enterprise. To it free enterprise means freedom to take, keep, and control all the resources * * * and charge for them the last possible cent. * * *

"The monopolists must accustom the people to their tyranny by a constant stream of praise for great corporations and of free enterprise according to their own interpretation, as well as discrediting of liberal movements and leaders—all of which is facilitated by their ever-increasing control of the press, the radio, and other news outlets" (page 508).

"It is time for America and the world to move on from a social order in which unregulated profit is the driving force. * * * When it comes, I want it to come by development and not by revolution" (page 509).

ELLERY FOSTER,
Research Director.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we were ready to go forward today. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] was to have carried on. He yielded to other Senators having business to come before the Senate. I do not want the impression to go out that we are trying to delay the consummation of the argument. I have been informed by the acting majority leader that it is proposed to recess until Monday. We would be ready to carry on tomorrow; we shall be ready to carry on on Monday. I do not know what the program for Monday is, whether the St. Lawrence seaway matter has gone over until Wednesday or not. We should like to conclude the arguments on the St. Lawrence waterway, but for reasons that have been stated many, many times, we are in a sort of hiatus, with Lincoln's Birthday coming next week. I do not want it to appear for one moment that we are trying to be dilatory or following any delaying tactics.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 9, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, as we pause in this sacred quietness, hear our supplication for divine help, that we may approach the pattern and similitude of our Redeemer's character. As each day sets its task, steady us with concentration and perseverance and hold us to the conviction that triumph or failure rests with us.

Open the fountain of Thy wisdom that we may be most seriously concerned with the welfare of our Nation, which must rest forever upon the mental, moral, and spiritual nature of our people. Give us humility, without which faith becomes presumption and hope a delusion. As we ponder the tangled problems of today, O keep us out of the easy paths of acquiescence and vouchsafe unto us the profound insight of true statesmen. Make us wise by our mistakes and stronger by every temptation overcome. Thou who art our ruler and our guide, without whom nothing is strong or enduring, hear our prayer and give us peace. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO SIT DURING SESSION TODAY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE WRIGHT BROTHERS

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, citizens the world over in recent days have been paying tribute to the genius of the late Orville Wright, who, through the invention of the airplane with his brother, Wilbur, made the name of Wright one of international fame.

On the North Carolina coast nearly 45 years ago, the Wright brothers negotiated the first successful flight with a heavier-than-air machine. No one, even today, can truly evaluate and estimate the importance of this achievement. Nevertheless, as coinventor of the airplane, Orville Wright did have the opportunity, unlike his brother, to witness and harvest some of the fruits of the combined efforts of their revolutionary development.

The story of the development of modern-day aviation started from a mere toy which was brought home to the Wright brothers by their father, Bishop Martin Wright. Fired by the enthusiasm of this toy helicopter, their imagination and capabilities took on such tangible form that today great distances have largely been nullified. As a result of this inventive skill, we find it necessary to adjust our thinking and actions to meet the resulting changes.

I should like to insert into the RECORD a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Dayton (Ohio) Herald on Saturday, January 31. It takes note not only of his international fame, but also of his value to the community.

ORVILLE WRIGHT

The world knew and honored Orville Wright as the coinventor of the airplane, as the man who with his brother brought to realization the age-old dream of mankind to conquer the air.

But Dayton knew, honored, and loved Orville Wright because he was Orville Wright, because he was the son of his reverend father, and the brother of his equally famed, honored, and beloved brother.

Dayton knew, honored, and loved Orville Wright because he was such a good citizen, all round. Great fame, we are convinced, never rested so lightly upon anyone. He was such a modest man, so unassuming, so friendly.

He has been an institution here in Dayton for so long that it is hard to believe that he is gone, hard to believe that no more shall we see him at public gatherings sitting quietly well out of the limelight. He shunned all personal prominence as if it were positively painful, yet that trait never prevented him from putting his shoulder to the wheel whenever community or country called.

The tale of his achievements is told elsewhere in the Herald. There is no need of reciting it again here. That story in its broader outlines is well known to every Daytonian as, indeed, it is to almost everyone in the civilized world.

It is an inspiring story, a story of the surmounting of difficulties which seemed really unsurmountable, until the Wrights, Wilbur and Orville, came along. No more illuminating commentary can be made on their accomplishment than to point out that, when at last they succeeded and made their machine actually fly, people generally simply wouldn't believe.

The thing was too astounding! Why, here in Dayton, their home, people wouldn't believe. And the Dayton newspapers, this Dayton newspaper is sorry to have to admit, didn't even cover the story—certainly in its wonder and in its consequences one of the greatest stories ever to break.

Orville Wright is no more, but his memory will endure while civilization survives.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at noon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on Thursday following at noon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUHLENBERG and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter in support of the fine record of Dr. S. H. Scott, a resident of his district.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an article.

DOES RUSSIA REALLY OPPOSE MARSHALL PLAN?

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, does Russia really oppose the Marshall plan is a question that is causing much speculation today.

It is refreshing to find a Member of the other body courageous enough to challenge the administration's position that Russia, in her fight on democracy, is opposing the Marshall plan. The facts, I am sure, will sustain the distinguished Senator from Indiana when he says, as quoted in the press:

Reds fight Marshall plan in ruse to aid it. Russia thus can continue to take reparation out of Europe.

And he continues:

Stalin is cagily pretending to oppose the Marshall plan—just to make sure the United States approves it.

And, to quote again, he said:

We are playing the sucker to Stalin's devious oriental mind. This is a colossal game of put and take; Russia can continue to take reparation out of Europe only so long as we continue to put it in.

The Senator is correct.

You will recall, during the debate on the European interim aid bill last December, the communistic strikes were in progress in Italy and in France. As the day of voting in the Congress approached, the strikes developed into riots and general disorder. This was perfect timing on the part of Stalin, and no doubt its effect was reflected in the support the measure received.

Yes, the Senator is correct when he says: "Stalin is aiding in the Marshall plan by opposing it, which he well knows will provide a basis for the desired propaganda."

The objective of the cold war has been evident for weeks. Russia has demanded $10,000,000,000 reparation from Germany, knowing full well that Germany cannot pay one dime. His plan is to receive the reparation in American dollars and the prospects appear to be good, if the administration has its way.

Yes, truly, the communistic bear is feeding on American dollars and is playing Uncle Sam for a sucker.

Another interesting bit of news is that 29 students just in from Europe touring America express surprise at the prevalence of war talk in the United States. Is the administration becoming trigger-happy in its mad fight for European aid?

DON'T QUIT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, as I was coming over here to attend the session of the House today I was asked, "Where are you going to get the money?" I do not want to make America weak by assuming the burdens of the world and I do ask the question, "Where are you going to get the money?" to finance all Europe and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a little poem that was given me this morning entitled "Don't Quit," which I think is rather pertinent at this time. It reads:

DON'T QUIT

When things go wrong, as they sometimes will,
When the road you're trudging seems all uphill,
When funds are low and debts are high,
And you want to smile, but you have to sigh,
When care is pressing you down a bit,
Rest if you must, but don't you quit.
Life is queer with its twists and turns,
As everyone of us sometimes learns,
And many a failure turns about,
When he might have won had he stuck it out;
Don't give up, though the pace seems slow—
You may succeed with another blow.
Often the goal is nearer than
It seems to a faint and faltering man.
Often the struggler has given up
When he might have captured the victor's cup.
And learned too late, when the night slipped down
How close he was to the golden crown.
Success is failure turned inside out—
The silver tint of the clouds of doubt.
And you can never tell how close you are,
It may be near when it seems afar;
So stick to the fight when you're hardest hit—
It's when things seem worst that you mustn't quit.

—*Selected.*

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make America weak by financing the other nations of the world.

Do not give up the ship. Let us not make America weak by trying to remedy the troubles of the peoples of all the world.

Do not quit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each newspaper articles.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered before the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include cryptic endorsements that Lincoln made on the backs of some of the letters he received while President of the United States.

SKILLED STENOGRAPHER AVAILABLE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, skilled stenographers who attend to business and use their heads are rare jewels. Such a young woman is now at work in my office but is surplus solely by reason of the return of a former employee. I will be glad to furnish the full particulars to any Member interested.

SOCIAL-SECURITY COVERAGE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 458, Rept. No. 1343), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 296) to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the joint resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said joint resolution except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the joint resolution at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 459, Rept. No. 1344), which was referred to the

House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 275, to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMEMORATION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VICTORY OVER SPAIN

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 140.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain what this measure is?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Under House Concurrent Resolution 108 there was created a joint congressional committee for the purpose of perfecting arrangements to observe the fiftieth anniversary of the American and Cuban victories in the war with Spain. The joint congressional committee has submitted its report to the Congress, recommending a program of observance, and we now ask that the authority of the committee be continued for a period 30 days after April 19, the date of a joint session of the Congress of the United States to observe the victory over Spain. For the information of the Members of the House I am inserting at this point the report of the Joint Committee on the Observance and Celebration in Cuba of the Fiftieth Anniversary of American and Cuban Victories in the War With Spain, created by House Concurrent Resolution 108:

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE OBSERVANCE AND CELEBRATION IN CUBA OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN AND CUBAN VICTORIES IN THE WAR WITH SPAIN

To the Congress of the United States:

The Joint Committee on the Observance and Celebration in Cuba of the Fiftieth Anniversary of American and Cuban Victories in the War with Spain, created by House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, submits the following report pursuant to section 2 (b) of said resolution:

In the discharge of its duties under House Concurrent Resolution 108, your committee has considered various plans for the observance contemplated by the resolution, and has had the active cooperation of representatives of the Cuban Embassy in Washington. After discussion of all plans your committee has unanimously agreed upon the following recommendations:

(a) In connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor, it is recommended that a delegation be appointed to be composed of two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, and two representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans, consisting of the commander in chief and one other member of that organization to attend the ceremony that will be held in Habana, Cuba, on Sunday, February 15, 1948. This action was approved after it was indicated by a spokesman for the Cuban Embassy that the Cuban Government would formally invite the delegation, through diplomatic channels, within the next few days. Expenses in connection with the visit of the delegation to Cuba are to be paid from the moneys authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 108.

(b) It is recommended that a joint session of the Congress of the United States be called for Monday, April 19, 1948, at which time the President of the United States will address the joint session. The President has already agreed to such action. In Habana, Cuba, on the same date, a joint session of the Cuban Legislature will be held, with the President of Cuba addressing the joint session. National and international broadcasting companies have indicated their willingness to cover these two joint sessions.

(c) While your committee is submitting this report not later than February 2, 1948, as provided in House Concurrent Resolution 108, it is recommended that the committee, together with its authority and authorized moneys, should be continued for a period of 30 days after April 19, 1948.

The necessary resolutions to carry out the foregoing recommendations will be submitted contemporaneously with this report.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is amended by striking out the last sentence of section 2 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The committee shall cease to exist upon the expiration of 30 days after April 19, 1948."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMEMORATION OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VICTORY OVER SPAIN

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 139.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain, resulting in the liberation of Cuba, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, on Monday, April 19, 1948.

That the joint committee created by House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, is empowered to make suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises for the joint session of Congress herein authorized.

That invitations to attend the exercises be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the diplomatic corps (through the Secretary of State), the General of the Armies, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and such other persons as the joint committee shall deem proper.

That the President of the United States is hereby invited to address the American people at the joint session of the Congress in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "the victory over Spain, resulting in."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "victory over Spain" and insert "liberation of Cuba."

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Providing for a joint session of the two Houses on Monday, April 19, 1948, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PALESTINE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a portion of a Kiplinger letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that a portion of the Kiplinger letter of January 31 reads as follows:

PALESTINE

The partition endangers oil. Army and Navy are worried. They fear Arabs may cut pipe lines, or Jews may do it and blame Arabs. So, United States has sent into the Middle East 200 specially trained officers to woo the Arabs, and to try to keep Russia from getting the Arab oil.

By summer, 40,000 United States troops in Palestine; that is the prospect. Also same number of Russian troops, to enforce partition at UN request. Arabs do not like the United States, for this country forced partition through UN.

Palestine will become increasingly a danger spot.

Mr. Speaker, I think that such statements as this in a letter which has as wide a distribution as the Kiplinger letter are inflammatory and absolutely not based upon the facts of the case. They stem either from the standpoint of creating propaganda or from a lack of knowledge of the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 2948) to regulate and control the operation of foreign agencies acting within the United States or its Territories or dependencies was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Bills dealing with the same subject matter have been referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities. I have conferred with the author of H. R. 2948 and with the acting chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and it is agreeable to them that I submit this request. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill, H. R. 2948 be rereferred to the Committee on Un-American Activities, and that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MILK SHORTAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this morning's paper carries a front-page article quoting the Department of Agriculture to the effect that there will be an increasing shortage of milk during the coming year. In fact, it is now stated that the shortage of milk will be more serious than the expected shortage of meat.

The milk we do have can go either into bottles or into butter. Fresh milk in bottles brings a better return to the farmer and brings far more food to consumers than milk which is diverted into butter. The less butter we produce the more fluid milk we will have.

Coffee and cokes make a poor substitute for fresh milk for our babies, but most grown-ups could get along very well with less butter and more margarine. If we sincerely want to make our food supplies go further, if we want our dairy farmers to enjoy a higher income, and if, at the same time, we want to reduce the cost of living, let us hasten to repeal the discriminatory laws against the production of pure, healthful margarine.

BYPRODUCTS OF MILK

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have been listening to this kind of counsel for long years. As I told you the day before yesterday, the more oleo you buy the less milk your babies will have to drink. The reason we are having a reduction in milk products is due to the practices of the present administration. Any time they want to support the byproducts according to the Steagall amendment butter prices will come down.

If the administration will not even announce the support price for milk and will not support the price of dairy byproducts, they must assume the responsibility for prices, whether high or low. The administration has the power, authority, and money to control prices any time it wishes to assume the responsibility of doing something about them. You can take 10 cents off the price of butter tomorrow if this administration will give Steagall support on the byproducts. When the gentleman from Texas or anyone else tells you what is in a hundred pounds of milk, I will just say to you, and ask any scientist to refute it, that there is nothing in a hundred pounds of milk that is not in five pounds of butter and the 8 ounces of dried skimmed milk that is obtained from that hundred pounds of milk.

The more we talk about oleo the less cattle we will have and the less milk we will have. The more oleo we have the less cattle in the United States and less meat will be available to the consumers. We are on the road to lower milk production now. The reign of Luckman will cost the consumers of this Nation millions of dollars.

More oleo, less milk; more oleo, less beef and veal; more oleo, less fertile soil. Remember you cannot make oleo without dairy products.

OLEOMARGARINE VERSUS BUTTER

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the foster mother of the American people neglected to tell you that while he embraces the philosophy of cutting down on the taxes of the people of this Nation, he favors keeping a duty and tribute imposed on the housewives of this Nation.

I want to call to his attention the fact that oleomargarine does not give you tuberculosis; it does not give you brucellosis; it does not give you Bang's disease, or undulant fever, and what not. When you take my cottonseed meal and take it up yonder to your country; when you take my soybean meal up to your country, and take my peanut oil away from my people to sell it back to them in the form of Bang's disease, we are not for it—we are against it. You cannot get away from it. Republican housewives of this Nation eat oleomargarine, too. All the people who consume oleo are not Democrats only; you are going to repeal this tax, whether you like it or not. We are going to make you repeal it. Whether you sign my discharge petition No. 12, you are going to repeal it. You cannot get away from it. You can sit down here for the rest of your lives and shed crocodile tears about the butter industry, but this tax must go. It will disappear before the Eightieth Congress is history.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

OLEOMARGARINE VERSUS BUTTER

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at some of the gentlemen on the Committee on Agriculture who do not know what is the matter with milk. I will tell you frankly, on my desk in my office yesterday there was a letter from some farm folks that I know quite well. They tell us that the farmers all around them are disposing of their dairy cows. they cannot afford to buy this high priced dairy feed and sell their milk at present prices. I might also add to the gentleman from South Carolina, who throws the burden on us for the repeal of the oleo tax, that his party had control of the House up to the 1st of January 1946, if my memory serves me correctly. Why did he not do something about it under the Democratic administration?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield at any time to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Does not the farmer get more for milk that he sells as fluid milk than for milk that he sells in the form of butter?

Mr. HILL. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that he could not make a pound of oleo unless he used milk with it. It is a part of it despite all that he says.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman answer my question?

THE LATE MOHANDAS K. GANDHI

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, immediately upon learning of the death by assassination of Mohandas K. Gandhi, I wrote down my reaction, which I would like to suggest to the House at this time. My judgment is that Gandhi will go down in history as the man of the century. Why? Because of all the public leaders of this day, he was the best and nearest prototype of Christ of any man who has lived on earth ir. this century. He not only committed the Golden Rule to memory, but committed it to life as suggested by the poet. He actually gave his life in behalf of peace. I wish we had more leaders in the world today like the fallen hero of mankind, Gandhi, the little Indian.

THE FUEL OIL SITUATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and all the other representatives of the people who are shivering with cold in that section of the country that I have found the solution of your problem.

You secede from the Union and get in under the Marshall plan. Then, you can get all the fuel you need and will not have to pay for it, nor will you have to pay the taxes to raise the money which the Government would lose on it.

I promise you now that if you decide to take such a step we Confederates will not whip you back into the Union again—at least until the weather warms up.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

NAILING A LIE ON PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] countering to the sly propaganda that appears in the Kiplinger letter wherein Kiplinger says "by summer 40,000 United States troops in Palestine. That is the prospect. Also the same number of Russian troops."

There is no desire by responsible people, Jews or non-Jews, to place United States troops or Russian troops into Palestine. The Jews in Palestine, if properly armed, can take care of their own. They need no outside assistance, if properly supplied with arms. They can adequately handle the situation with arms assured them and if Moslems from neighboring lands are kept out. The United Nations Palestine Commission has recommended an international constabulary. They do not mention Russian troops; they do not mention United States troops. There are plenty of historical precedents for the sending of contingents of volunteers from the smaller nations, and the smaller nations have already indicated their wish and their desire to send contingents of volunteer troops to Palestine to form an international constabulary if that be necessary.

This man, Kiplinger, has no right to grasp will-o'-the-wisp opinions from irresponsible sources. His statement is a sly, mean, and contemptible canard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the other business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders today, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON]?

There was no objection.

THE FUEL OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, speaking individually, that I am deeply grateful for the suggestions that are made, but I am more grateful for the interest that is obviously taken in the difficulties we are having in our section of the country, in the Northeast, by our friends from the Southern States. I tried to express that gratitude in the RECORD yesterday to all of you, particularly to the former Speaker, who used his influence in trying to help us on one phase of this problem.

I am not prepared to accept the suggestion of secession at the moment, but I am afraid some of our people may be prepared to take drastic action if something constructive is not done soon.

I suggested yesterday that whenever and wherever there has been a tragedy in another part of the country the people of the Northeast have been quick to respond. If, as the result of a tornado, an explosion, or a flood, people were without food, clothing, medicine, or shelter, every instinct of the people of the North prompted immediate remedial action. I am sure you will understand why they are becoming a bit more than impatient when, having been without necessary fuel, their health and comfort have been endangered, and their work has been threatened, and it seems to take such a long time to obtain any effective response. Please understand that there is no disposition to blame the people of other sections of the country. We do not need and do not ask for charity. We do ask for better judgment and the exercise of common sense on the part of those having the power to see that the situation is relieved in the Northeast.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The point I was bringing out was that the oil that ought to go to New England was being shipped abroad.

Mr. HESELTON. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that again this morning the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce addressed itself to that very vital problem. As a result of this hearing I am hopeful that a resolution will be brought to the floor.

I want to say also that I am having prepared three additional different kinds of embargo resolutions. There are two pending already, which I submitted for consideration. The other three will set various periods of time, one 15 days, one 30 days, and one 60 days. It is my hope that we can present to the House a considered, reasoned, and a sound method of trying to retain in this country for the period of time which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recommends, sufficient of our domestic fuel to get us over this particular crisis.

You will recall that that committee has expressed repeated concern as to the effect of continued exports of petroleum and petroleum products without the guarantee of the most careful kind of screening and that in its report filed only a week ago, it stated that—

> The existing and threatened situation is now so grave that exports should be stopped completely until it can be determined whether further exports are damaging to the economy of this country.

I have been seriously concerned as to the effectiveness of the procedure under which the requests made for exports are examined. I think the fact that the export allocation to Japan and the Ryukus is reported to have been cut back from 2,470,000 barrels of petroleum products to 100,000 barrels is convincing evidence that the original allocation could not have been based upon anything remotely resembling a careful examination of the request. Rather, it seems to me to be the best possible illustration of the unfortunate fact that in certain responsible quarters the admitted needs of our domestic economy has carried little, if any, weight in arriving at these determinations.

You will note that I have chosen three relatively short periods during which such an embargo would be effective. Personally, I think much can be said for the selection of the 60-day period. While it may be argued that it is too long, I think we must recognize that this will be the most critical period for most of the northern sections of the country and that if we can somehow manage to divert these amounts of heating and fuel oils to those areas, it is just possible that we can avoid more serious consequences. It also seems to me to be self-evident that no one is prepared to tell any of us what the stock piles are in any of these countries. Consequently, I do not see how it can be stated with any assurance by anyone that such an admittedly drastic step, which certainly will help to relieve conditions here, would necessarily make conditions elsewhere any worse than they are within the borders of this country.

Since I understand it is not possible to file the resolutions until Monday and because I want the text before the committee during these hearings, as well as available to all of the Members of the House, I am including the text of the first resolution. The only change in the other two resolutions will be the substitution of the periods—of 30 and 60 days, respectively.

Joint resolution to temporarily prohibit the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products

Whereas there are current and anticipated shortages in the United States of petroleum and petroleum products essential to satisfy fuel needs; and

Whereas while such shortages continue, the health, safety, and welfare of the American people are threatened and industry is severely handicapped in the effort to attain production of commodities necessary (1) to the economic welfare of the United States, and (2) to insure the success of such program as may be adopted for aiding in the economic recovery of Europe; and

Whereas the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House has been conducting a study of this problem, and, in its preliminary report to the House on January 26, 1948, stated that the existing and

threatened situation "is now so grave that exports should be stopped completely until it can be determined whether further exports are damaging to the economy of this country": Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That during the period of 15 days beginning with the day after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and notwithstanding commitments heretofore made, it shall be unlawful to export petroleum or petroleum products from the United States to any foreign country.

SEC. 2. Whoever violates the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 3. As used in this joint resolution the term "United States" includes the Territories and possessions of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two resolutions.

Mr. LODGE (at the request of Mr. JAVITS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including an article.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I received permission to have inserted in the RECORD an address by David E. Lilienthal on the subject of atomic energy. I am advised by the Public Printer that this matter exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $213. I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Marquis Childs.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered in New York City on January 30 by the national commander of the American Legion.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include the proceedings honoring General Marshall, Chief Justice Gibson, and Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul.

FOREIGN-HELD ASSETS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the National Advisory Council, the administration's spokesman on international financial problems, whose president is the Secretary of the Treasury, and whose members include the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce, and the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Export-Import Bank has disclosed to the country that the assets held by foreign nationals in this country amount to $4,300,000,000.

Admittedly, the Council cannot vouchsafe the accuracy of this figure. This disclosure, however, long rumored to be a fact, makes it clear that assets in considerable quantity are now held in this country belonging to nationals of those nations which seek our financial and material assistance.

Insofar as the Council fosters a plan to assist the European nations to locate assets of their nationals in this country, it deserves our endorsement. It is all right so far as it goes. The first step is, as I pointed out during the debate on the interim-aid bill, to insist that the foreign nations request information from this country and that we furnish them the data as to the identity of each of their nationals holding assets in the United States, together with the character, location, and value, if determinable, of such assets.

The Washington Post, an ardent supporter of the European-recovery program, states in an editorial this morning:

> American taxpayers are being asked to make large contributions to European recovery. Consequently, it seems only fair to assist the efforts of foreign governments to obtain control of dollars concealed by their own people in defiance of the laws of their several countries—dollars that can, to a limited extent, relieve the burden imposed on the American people.

Certainly there can be no possible quarrel with this step. It is one which should have been taken long since.

But we must, in my judgment, go further. Negotiations must be entered into between the United States and the governments concerned to establish satisfactory conditions, guaranteeing that these assets either may be held by the United States as security against Export-Import Bank loans or any governmental credits from the United States to such countries, or may be made available as security against loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development under conditions agreed to by our Government. Nothing less than this, Mr. Speaker, will be the discharge of our obligation to the people of our own country, upon whose pay envelopes we must levy a deduction to implement any relief and reconstruction program.

Secretary Snyder and the Council oppose the forced liquidation of these foreign-held assets as a condition to receiving aid on the ground that this would further aggravate the monetary difficulties of the foreign countries and would deprive them of dollars and dollar earnings at the very time when we are being asked to grant dollars and dollar credits to them. There may be some merit to this contention.

It does not, however, answer the argument which I made on the floor of this House on December 11 that these extensive assets of foreign nationals, who seek to benefit under a program of aid from this country, should be pledged as security for our advances. If it becomes necessary over a period of time to liquidate those assets in a systematic fashion and apply the proceeds to the advances we have made, that action need not disrupt the monetary systems of the foreign countries or have any other adverse effect, except upon those foreign nationals who have left their own countries, to which they owe first allegiance, and have brought with them to this country their extensive assets, which should be the first source of aid to their own countries before American taxpayers are called upon to make their contribution.

From the chairman and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in their detailed study of this great problem with its complex ramifications I beseech a sympathetic consideration for the inclusion of protective provisions which will insure that the burden of foreign aid be not shifted from the banks and brokerage accounts of the foreign wealthy to the pocketbooks of the American poor—a result which will surely follow unless some such plan as I have advocated is adopted.

POSTAGE ON FOREIGN RELIEF PACKAGES

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take issue with the report of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs relating to voluntary foreign aid, and to question its conclusion pertaining to Federal subsidies for individual parcel-post packages mailed overseas.

In this report, the subcommittee has asserted that it is actually less expensive for the Government to purchase and transport foreign aid than it would be to subsidize postal rates on relief packages which have been purchased by individual citizens. It is difficult to understand why transportation on private relief is more costly than the purchase price plus transportation costs on Government relief.

On Tuesday of this week, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] answered this criticism of voluntary foreign aid very ably, and I most certainly concur in everything he has said.

Last December 15, 1947, I introduced H. R. 4740, which would substantially reduce the postage for overseas shipment of private relief packages. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], and several other colleagues have introduced bills providing for some such assistance.

It seems to me that it is the responsibility of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to study this question, and render a report, instead of the subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, and I am happy to have learned just a short time ago that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will consider these bills and is holding hearings beginning tomorrow morning, Friday, February 6. I hope that a favorable report on voluntary foreign aid will soon be forthcoming.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

ARMED SERVICES PROCUREMENT ACT OF 1947

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1366) to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That this act may be cited as the 'Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947.'

"SEC. 2. (a) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to all purchases and contracts for supplies or services made by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Coast Guard, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (each being hereinafter called the agency), for the use of any such agency or otherwise, and to be paid for from appropriated funds.

"(b) It is the declared policy of the Congress that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government shall be placed with small business concerns. Whenever it is proposed to make a contract or purchase in excess of $10,000 by negotiation and without advertising, pursuant to the authority of paragraph (7) or (8) of section 2 (c) of this act, suitable advance publicity, as determined by the agency head with due regard to the type of supplies involved and other relevant considerations, shall be given for a period of at least 15 days, wherever practicable, as determined by the agency head.

"(c) All purchases and contracts for supplies and services shall be made by advertising, as provided in section 3, except that such purchases and contracts may be negotiated by the agency head without advertising if—

"(1) determined to be necessary in the public interest during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress;

"(2) the public exigency will not admit of the delay incident to advertising;

"(3) the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $1,000;

"(4) for personal or professional services;

"(5) for any service to be rendered by any university, college, or other educational institution;

"(6) the supplies or services are to be procured and used outside the limits of the United States and its possessions;

"(7) for medicines or medical supplies;

"(8) for supplies purchased for authorized resale;

"(9) for perishable subsistence supplies;

"(10) for supplies or services for which it is impracticable to secure competition;

"(11) the agency head determines that the purchase or contract is for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of supplies for experimentation, development, research, or test: *Provided*, That beginning 6 months after the effective date of this act and at the end of each 6-month period thereafter, there shall be furnished to the Congress a report setting forth the name of each contractor with whom a contract has been entered into pursuant to this subsection (11) since the date of the last such report, the amount of the contract, and, with due consideration given to the national security, a description of the work required to be performed thereunder;

"(12) for supplies or services as to which the agency head determines that the character, ingredients, or components thereof are such that the purchase or contract should not be publicly disclosed;

"(13) for equipment which the agency head determines to be technical equipment, and as to which he determines that the procurement thereof without advertising is necessary in order to assure standardization of equipment and interchangeability of parts and that such standardization and interchangeability is necessary in the public interest;

"(14) for supplies of a technical or specialized nature requiring a substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, as determined by the agency head, when he determines that advertising and competitive bidding may require duplication of investment or preparation already made, or will unduly delay procurement of such supplies;

"(15) for supplies or services as to which the agency head determines that the bid prices after advertising therefor are not reasonable or have not been independently arrived at in open competition: *Provided*, That no negotiated purchase or contract may be entered into under this paragraph after the rejection of all bids received unless (A) notification of the intention to negotiate and reasonable opportunity to negotiate shall have been given by the agency head to each responsible bidder, (B) the negotiated price is lower than the lowest rejected bid price of a responsible bidder, as determined by the agency head, and (C) such negotiated price is the lowest negotiated price offered by any responsible supplier;

"(16) the agency head determines that it is in the interest of the national defense that any plant, mine, or facility or any producer, manufacturer, or other supplier be made or kept available for furnishing supplies or services in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense in maintaining active engineering, research and development, are otherwise subserved: *Provided*, That beginning 6 months after the effective date of this act and at the end of each 6-month period thereafter, there shall be furnished to the Congress a report setting forth the name of each contractor with whom a contract has been entered into pursuant to this subsection (16) since the date of the last such report, the amount of the contract, and, with due consideration given to the national security, a description of the work required to be performed thereunder; or

"(17) otherwise authorized by law.

"(d) If in the opinion of the agency head bids received after advertising evidence any violation of the antitrust laws he shall refer such bids to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

"(e) This section shall not be construed to (A) Authorize the erection, repair, or furnishing of any public building or public improvement, but such authorization shall be required in the same manner as heretofore, or (B) permit any contract for the construction or repair of buildings, roads, sidewalks, sewers, mains, or similar items to be negotiated without advertising as required by section 3, unless such contract is to be performed outside the continental United States or unless negotiation of such contract is authorized by the provisions of paragraph (1), (2), (3), (10), (11), (12), or (15) of subsection (c) of this section.

"SEC. 3. Whenever advertising is required—

"(a) The advertisement for bids shall be a sufficient time previous to the purchase or contract, and specifications and invitations for bids shall permit such full and free competition as is consistent with the procurement of types of supplies and services necessary to meet the requirements of the agency concerned.

"(b) All bids shall be publicly opened at the time and place stated in the advertisement. Award shall be made with reasonable promptness by written notice to that responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered: *Provided*, That all bids may be rejected when the agency head determines that it is in the public interest so to do.

"SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, contracts negotiated pursuant to section 2 (c) may be of any type which in the opinion of the agency head will promote the best interests of the Government. Every contract negotiated pursuant to section 2 (c) shall contain a suitable warranty, as determined by the agency head, by the contractor that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure such contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business, for the breach or violation of which warranty the Government shall have the right to annul such contract without liability or in its discretion to deduct from the contract price or consideration the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

"(b) The cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost system of contracting shall not be used, and in the case of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract the fee shall not exceed 10 percent of the estimated cost of the contract, exclusive of the fee, as determined by the agency head at the time of entering into such contract (except that a fee not in excess of 15 percent of such estimated cost is authorized in any such contract for experimental, developmental, or research work and that a fee inclusive of the contractor's costs and not in excess of 6 percent of the estimated cost, exclusive of fees, as determined by the agency head at the time of entering into the contract, of the project to which such fee is applicable is authorized in contracts for architectural or engineering services relating to any public works or utility project). Neither a cost nor a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract nor an incentive-type contract shall be used unless the agency head determines that such method of contracting is likely to be less costly than other methods or that it is impracticable to secure supplies or services of the kind or quality required without the use of a cost or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or an incentive-type contract. All cost and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts shall provide for advance notification by the contractor to the procuring agency of any subcontract thereunder on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis and of any fixed-price subcontract or purchase order which exceeds in dollar amount either $25,000 or 5 percent of the total estimated cost of the prime contract; and a procuring agency, through any authorized representative thereof, shall have the right to inspect the plants and to audit the books and records of any prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of a cost or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract.

"SEC. 5. (a) The agency head may make advance payments under negotiated contracts heretofore or hereafter executed in any amount not exceeding the contract price

upon such terms as the parties shall agree: *Provided,* That advance payments shall be made only upon adequate security and if the agency head determines that provision for such advance payments is in the public interest or in the interest of the national defense and is necessary and appropriate in order to procure required supplies or services under the contract.

"(b) The terms governing advance payments may include as security provision for, and upon inclusion of such provision there shall thereby be created, a lien in favor of the Government, paramount to all other liens, upon the supplies contracted for, upon the credit balance in any special account in which such payments may be deposited, and upon such of the material and other property acquired for performance of the contract as the parties shall agree.

"SEC. 6. Whenever any contract made on behalf of the Government by the agency head or by officers authorized by him so to do includes a provision for liquidated damages for delay, the Comptroller General, on the recommendation of the agency head, is authorized and empowered to remit the whole or any part of such damages as in his discretion may be just and equitable.

"SEC. 7. (a) The determinations and decisions provided in this act to be made by the agency head may be made with respect to individual purchases and contracts or with respect to classes of purchases or contracts, and shall be final. Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the agency head is authorized to delegate his powers provided by this act, including the making of such determinations and decisions, in his discretion and subject to his direction, to any other officer or officers or officials of the agency.

"(b) The power of the agency head to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraphs (12), (13), (14), (15), and (16) of section 2 (c) and in section 5 (a) shall not be delegable, and the power to make the determinations or decisions specified in paragraph (11) of section 2 (c) shall be delegable only to a chief officer responsible for procurement and only with respect to contracts which will not require the expenditure of more than $25,000.

"(c) Each determination or decision required by paragraphs (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), or (16) of section 2 (c), by section 4 or by section 5 (a) shall be based upon written findings made by the official making sucn determination, which findings shall be final and shall be available within the agency for a period of at least 6 years following the date of the determination. A copy of the findings shall be submitted to the General Accounting Office with the contract.

"(d) In any case where any purchase or contract is negotiated pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (c), except in a case covered by paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), or (6) thereof, the data with respect to the negotiation shall be preserved in the files of the agency for a period of 6 years following final payment on such contract.

"SEC. 8. No purchase or contract shall be exempt from the act of June 30, 1936, as amended (49 Stat. 2036, as amended by the act of June 28, 1940, 54 Stat. 681, and by the act of May 13, 1942, 56 Stat. 277; U. S. C., title 41, secs. 35 to 45) or from the act of March 3, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1494, as amended by the act of August 30, 1935, 49 Stat. 1011, and by the act of June 15, 1940, 54 Stat 399; U. S. C., title 40, secs. 276a to 276a–6), solely by reason of having been entered into pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof without advertising, and the provisions of said acts and of the act of June 19, 1912, as amended (37 Stat. 137, as amended by the act of September 9, 1940, 54 Stat. 884; U. S. C., title 40, secs. 324 and 325a), if otherwise applicable, shall apply to such purchases and contracts.

"SEC. 9. As used herein—

"(a) The term 'agency head' shall mean the Secretary, Under Secretary (if any), or any Assistant Secretary of the Army, of the Navy, or of the Air Force; the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Treasury Department; and the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, respectively.

"(b) The term 'supplies' shall mean all property except land, and shall include, by way of description and without limitation, public works, buildings, facilities, ships, floating equipment, and vessels of every character, type, and description, aircraft, parts, accessories, equipment, machine tools, and alteration or installation thereof.

"SEC. 10. In order to facilitate the procurement of supplies and services by each agency for others and the joint procurement of supplies and services required by such agencies, subject to the limitations contained in section 7 of this act, each agency head may make such assignments and delegations of procurement responsibilities within his agency as he may deem necessary or desirable, and the agency heads or any of them by mutual agreement may make such assignments and delegations of procurement responsibilities from one agency to any other or to officers or civilian employees of any such agency, and may create such joint or combined offices to exercise such procurement responsibilities, as they may deem necessary or desirable. Appropriations available to any such agency shall be available for obligation for procurement as provided for in such appropriations by any other agency through administrative allotments in such amount as may be authorized by the head of the allotting agency without transfer of funds on the books of the Treasury Department. Disbursing officers of the allotting agency may make disbursements chargeable to such allotments upon vouchers certified by officers or civilian employees of the procuring agency.

"SEC. 11. (a) The following acts are hereby repealed:

"Revised Statutes, section 3716 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1202);

"Revised Statutes, section 3717 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 9);

"Revised Statutes, section 3718 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 561);

"Revised Statutes, section 3719 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 562);

"Revised Statutes, section 3720 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 563);

"Revised Statutes, section 3721, as amended (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 569–570);

"Revised Statutes, section 3722 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 572);

"Revised Statutes, section 3723 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 573);

"Revised Statutes, section 3724 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 574);

"Revised Statutes, section 3726 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 577);

"Revised Statutes, section 3727 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 578);

"Revised Statutes, section 3729 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 579);

"Act of June 14, 1878, No. 30 (20 Stat. 253; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 565);

"Act of March 3, 1893 (ch. 212, sec. 1, 27 Stat. 732; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 566);

"Act of March 2, 1907 (ch. 2512, 34 Stat. 1193; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 571);

"Act of March 4, 1913 (ch. 148, 37 Stat. 904; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 575);

"Act of June 30, 1914 (ch. 130, 38 Stat. 398; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 567);

"Act of May 15, 1936 (ch. 400, 49 Stat. 1277; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1199 (a));

"Act of July 13, 1939 (ch. 265, 53 Stat. 1000; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 313);

"(b) The following acts shall not apply to the procurement of supplies or services by the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the United States Coast Guard, Treasury Department, or the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:

"Revised Statutes, section 3709, as amended (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5);

"Revised Statutes, section 3735 (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 13);

"Act of October 10, 1940, ch. 851, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 1109, as amended (U. S. C., title 41, secs. 6 and 6a).

"(c) The following parts of acts are hereby repealed:

"(1) That portion of the act making appropriations for fortifications, approved February 24, 1891 (26 Stat. 769), relating to 'Armament of fortifications', which reads as follows: *'Provided,* That no contract for the expenditure of any portion of the money herein provided, or that may be hereafter provided, for the purchase of steel shall be made until the same shall have been submitted to public competition by the Department by advertisement.'

"(2) Those portions of the Army Appropriation Acts approved March 2, 1901 (ch. 803, 31 Stat. 905; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1201); and June 30, 1902 (32 Stat. 514), relating to 'Quartermaster's Department, Regular Supplies,' which read as follows: *'Provided further,* That hereafter, except in cases of emergency or where it is impracticable to secure competition, the purchase of all supplies for the use of the various departments and posts of the Army and of the branches of the Army service shall only be made after advertisement, and shall be purchased where the same can be purchased the cheapest, quality and cost of transportation and the interests of the Government considered.'

"(3) That portion of the Army Appropriation Act approved June 12, 1906 (ch. 3078, 34 Stat. 258; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1205), relating to 'Ordnance Department', which reads as follows: 'Hereafter the purchase of supplies and the procurement of services for all branches of the Army service may be made in open market, in the manner common among businessmen, when the aggregate of the amount required does not exceed $500; but every such purchase exceeding $100 shall be promptly reported to the Secretary of War for approval, under such regulations as he may prescribe.'

"(4) That portion of the Army Appropriation Act, approved May 11, 1908 (ch. 163, 35 Stat. 125; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1199), relating to 'Ordnance Department,' which reads as follows: 'Whenever proposals are invited for the furnishing of articles of ordnance property, the character of which or the ingredients thereof are of such a nature that the interests of the public service would be injured by publicly divulging them, the Chief of Ordnance is authorized to purchase such articles in such manner as he may deem most economical and efficient.'

"(5) That portion of the War Department Appropriation Act, approved May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1299), relating to 'Arms, uniforms, equipment, and so forth, for field service, National Guard', which reads as follows: *'Provided,* That specifications for motor vehicles, which shall be so drawn as to admit of competition, shall to the extent otherwise practicable conform with the requirements of the National Guard.'

"(d) All other laws and parts of laws to the extent that they are inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of the Navy shall have the same authority with respect to contracts of the Department of the Navy as the Secretary of the Army has with respect to contracts of the Department of the Army under the act of April 10, 1878, as amended (20 Stat. 36, as amended by the act of March 3, 1883, 22 Stat. 487; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 218). The Secretary of the Army and the

Secretary of the Air Force shall have the same authority with respect to emergency purchases of war material abroad as the Secretary of the Navy has with respect to such purchases under the act of June 30, 1914 (38 Stat. 399; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 568).

"SEC. 13. This act shall become effective 90 days after the date of enactment."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the amendments adopted, including both those which the Senate committee adopted last year and those which were added by the Senate on January 12, represent merely changes in language or technical amendments necessary to provide for the inclusion of the Air Force within the provisions of the bill. Only a few of the amendments relate to matters of substance and I will briefly discuss the more important of these as follows:

First. The bill has been extended to include the Coast Guard and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Inclusion of the Coast Guard was recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury and is felt to be logical in view of the fact that that service is faced with the same procurement problems as the Army, Navy, and Air Force; furthermore, it becomes a part of the Navy in wartime and therefore it is desirable to have its equipment interchangeable with that of the Navy. The inclusion of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is desirable in view of the large number of contracts which that agency must enter into covering research and development in the field of aeronautics.

Second. As you recall, the essence of H. R. 1366 is that it permits the services to enter into contracts on the basis of negotiation rather than requiring them to advertise in certain specified cases, namely, in the event of a national emergency, where public disclosure would not be in the public interest, for research and development, and so forth. One more exception has been added to this list which would permit the negotiation of contracts for services to be rendered by any university, college, or other educational institutions. This provision is designed to supplement Public Law 729 of the Seventy-ninth Congress which relates to the payment of tuition, procurement of books, and so forth, for Naval Reserve officers. This exception is believed to be essential in view of the impossibility of entering into such contracts by the method of advertisement and competitive bid.

Third. The Senate has reinstated the provision which would permit agency heads to let contracts be negotiated in any case where he determines that the bid prices after advertising are not reasonable or have not been arrived at in open competition. This provision was contained in the bill as it was originally introduced in the House, but was deleted as the result of objections raised by members of this committee on the ground that it might be susceptible of administrative abuse. The Senate has added to the original language of the House bill certain specific safeguards which are felt to be adequate to insure against the possible abuses which were feared by members of our committee. These safeguards are as follows:

(a) Before any such contract may be awarded by negotiation, advance notification and a reasonable opportunity to negotiate must be given to each responsible bidder.

(b) The negotiated price must be lower than the lowest rejected bid price of a responsible bidder as determined by the agency head.

(c) The negotiated price must be the lowest negotiated price offered by any responsible supplier.

It is believed that the inclusion of this provision to permit the negotiation of contracts in those instances where there is apparent collusion is extremely desirable. Contracts were negotiated repeatedly during the war by various Government agencies under a similar authority contained in the War Powers Acts with great savings to the Government. The Federal Bureau of Supply has furnished a number of significant examples where such savings were effected pursuant to authority of this kind. A few of these examples are cited in the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee to the Senate. It is expected that a provision of this sort in the bill before us now will be most useful in breaking the following practices:

Collusive bidding, follow-the-leader pricing, rotated low bids, identical bids requiring drawing of lots, uniform estimating systems, refusal to classify the Government as other than a retail buyer regardless of the quantity purchased. The Government should have the power to inquire into the reasons why it is not securing competition—to call for facts and figures and to negotiate to eliminate unwarranted charges, excessive reserves for contingencies, unwarranted profits, and so forth.

Fourth. Paralleling the provision which would permit the negotiation of contracts where collusion is suspected, the Senate has added a new section which requires agency heads, in cases where they believe that bids received after advertising evidence any violation of the antitrust laws, to refer these bids to the Attorney General for appropriate action. It is certainly logical that if the agency head is allowed to reject bids and to negotiate contracts he should likewise be required to undertake the responsibility of reporting the circumstances to the appropriate law-enforcement authorities of the Government.

Fifth. The Senate has added to section 4 (b) of the bill, which sets forth the requirements as to the types of contracts which may be entered into under its provisions, a new provision, which will require:

(a) That all cost and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts must contain a provision requiring that the contractor give advance notification to the procuring agency of any subcontract exceeding $25,000, or 5 percent of the total estimated cost of the prime contract.

(b) That the procuring agency shall have the right to inspect the plants and audit the books of any prime or subcontractor under a cost or cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract.

To quote the observation made by Senator BYRD on the floor of the Senate, these provisions are "designed to remedy the situation created by General Meyers in connection with the fraud he perpetrated on the Government."

Sixth. The Senate has amended section 7 (b) by limiting the authority of the agency head to delegate the power to make determinations. Under the bill as it passed the House the authority to make the determinations and decisions required before contracts for research and development can be awarded on the basis of negotiation could be delegated to a chief officer responsible for procurement and his first assistant. The Senate has restricted this provision to permit the delegation only to the chief officer and further limiting such delegations to contracts which will not require the expenditure of more than $25,000.

Seventh. A very important change which should have far-reaching effects in facilitating the efficient procurement of supplies for all of the armed services is contained in section 10 of the bill. Originally this section, as it appeared in the bill when it passed the House, provided merely that the provisions of H. R. 1366 would apply to purchases made by an agency for its own use or otherwise. The intent of the language "or otherwise" was to permit cross procurement and joint procurement. The Senate has expanded this section in such a manner as to spell out in detail effective means by which these objectives may be achieved in actual practice. Section 10 now permits agency heads to enter into mutual agreements whereby, to take a specific example, the Secretary of the Army can assign or delegate the procurement responsibility of his agency to a procurement officer of the Navy charged with the procurement of a particular item which the Army desires to obtain. In such a case the appropriations available to the Army for the purchase of that particular item can be made available for obligation by the Navy procurement officer. This may be accomplished under section 10 by means of administrative allotments between the agencies, in such amounts as may be authorized by the head of the alloting agency, without transfer of funds on the

books of the Treasury Department. In actual practice, in the hypothetical example which we assumed a moment ago, the Army then will requisition of the Navy the item which they desire. The Army's bookkeepers then set up an administrative allotment to the Navy of the necessary funds to cover the purchases in question. There will be no necessity for a transfer of funds between the departments. Payment will be made by an Army disbursing officer who is authorized under this section to make disbursements chargeable to such administrative allotments upon vouchers certified by the Navy procuring officer.

I have discussed all of the important amendments which relate to matters of substance. All of the other amendments adopted by the Senate are purely technical in character. I might say in passing, however, that a number of these technical amendments have resulted in substantially improving the bill. I have in mind particularly a number which were adopted by the Senate after informal consultation with the General Accounting Office as a result of which it was determined that that agency would interpret a number of sections in the bill much more strictly than had been anticipated by the departments or by our committee during its consideration of the bill. Accordingly, corrective amendments were adopted as safeguards against the undesirable results which might follow from a restrictive interpretation of some of the provisions. These amendments have the full approval of the Comptroller General and the General Accounting Office. Thus, for example, in the section which permits the negotiation of contracts for equipment where standardization is necessary, the Senate has rewritten the language to permit the agency head to determine what is or is not such technical equipment. During the hearings before our committee the witnesses cited the purchase of trucks as an example. Informal advice was received from the General Accounting Office that trucks would not be construed to fall within the terms of this authority. The amendment, by permitting the agency head in an appropriate case to determine that trucks do constitute technical equipment of a kind where standardization is necessary, will obviate the possible danger of his being second-guessed by the General Accounting Office. Similarly, in this same provision, the Senate has deleted the requirement that a showing be made that standardization is necessary, because the General Accounting Office advised that under that language a notation would have to be made on each individual voucher to the effect that such a showing had been made. I will not attempt to cite any further examples as it is sufficient to say merely that they all fall within the same category of changes which are highly desirable to avoid restrictive interpretations which indeed were never contemplated by this committee under the language of the bill as it passed the House.

PRESERVATION OF THE FRIGATE "CONSTELLATION"

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1796) to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ANDREWS of New York, COLE of New York, and VINSON.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO CONTINUE ITS INVESTIGATION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 447.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from December 19, 1947, the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 141 of the Eightieth Congress, and for such purposes shall have the same power and authority as that conferred by such House Resolution 141. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House that we will not use all of the time granted on this resolution because it is a very simple measure. House Resolution 447 simply corrects a typographical error which was made in House Resolution 141 wherein the words "present session of Congress" was included instead of the words "present Congress."

House Resolution 141, the original resolution, authorized House Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to conduct investigations on matters coming under the jurisdiction of that committee. The Armed Services Committee has conducted a number of investigations under the original resolution which, of course, expired on December 19, when Congress adjourned sine die. So, House Resolution 447 simply corrects the typographical error which limited the committee's authority to that particular session and continues this investigative power for the duration of this Congress. It is hoped that the resolution will be given the unanimous vote of the House.

INVESTIGATIONS FOR POLITICAL PUBLICITY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that other committees, unlike the Committee on Armed Services, instead of devoting themselves to real investigations for which they were created, should devote their efforts to purely political publicity.

In the first session of this Congress when you appointed a multiplicity of these committees to investigate the war frauds—as you have made the country believe—I stated on this floor that as soon as you started to penetrate into the war frauds and found that 98 percent of all the war profiteers were Republicans, the investigations would cease. With a few exceptions, these investigations have lent themselves to a great deal of publicity, such as the Garssons, who were thrown into bankruptcy; the Howard Hughes fiasco, and the so-called communistic Hollywood probe.

INVESTIGATION OF REAL WAR PROFITEERS SHOULD BE MADE

Although I have urged the investigation of many of the real war profiteers who have made millions out of the war, after a year and a half, as I charged, you have stopped short. But I repeat, the Committee on Armed Services has actually performed its duties, and the time for continuing investigations should be extended.

However, I feel that if the membership of many of these investigating committees had devoted their time to legislation it might not have been necessary for the House to adjourn until Monday—from Monday until Thursday—and from next Thursday until next Monday, because during those 10 days we could have at least acted on some of the legislation urged by the President. I do not know, but the question is in my mind, whether these recesses are for the purpose of preventing the passage of the rent-control bill which will expire in about 3 weeks; namely, on February 29.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO REDUCE COST OF LIVING, EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL, LOW-COST HOUSING FOR VETERANS AND CITIZENS

Today many speeches were made on the floor by many of my colleagues, but unfortunately no one has urged the need of legislation that would bring about the reduction in the high cost of living, or urged action on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill that aims to bring about the construction of low-cost housing for the veterans and thousands of American citizens.

Personally, I feel that it is our duty to the veterans and those in the low-income brackets to attempt to relieve them of the deplorable conditions under which they are obliged to live. Instead of acting upon the President's recommendations to bring about price control and rationing, you, in the last special session, passed a ridiculous bill to reduce the high cost of living by a so-called voluntary action on the part of the various industries and businesses, who are the very ones responsible for the ever-increasing cost of living. But instead of industry doing as it promised and what you claimed it would do to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living, industry continuously increased their

prices, notwithstanding its tremendous profits.

UNFAIR OLEOMARGARINE TAX

Yesterday and today we heard several gentlemen who made speeches for the removal of the tax on margarines, which was forced through by the Republican farm bloc years ago. I have urged the repeal of this tax many times because it is a tax on the poor people who cannot afford to buy high-priced butter. In that connection may I say that not only are the people of lower incomes unable to buy butter, but are unable to buy milk which is 22 cents a quart today, as well as meats and many imitations of cheeses which are 300 to 400 percent higher than formerly.

With respect to these products, not only a real investigation is needed to place the responsibility for the manipulations which have brought about these outrageous prices, but legislation should be forthcoming without delay or procrastination to check any further increases and to bring them down to their legitimate price levels.

SECRET AGREEMENTS AND CONSPIRACIES TO INCREASE PRICES

The National Association of Manufacturers, known as the NAM, with their affiliates and various institutes have continuously through secret agreements conspired to increase the prices of all products.

To prevent the passage of price and rent control and rationing in order to continue their mulcting of the American people they are again trying to mislead and scare the American people that the return of controls and rationing would bring on black marketeering. But, Mr. Speaker, we have no price control now and there is black marketeering to a greater degree than ever before.

GRAY MARKETEERING IN STEEL

As to gray marketeering in steel, today only through the insiders can a few favored manufacturers obtain steel, for which product the small manufacturer, in many instances, is obliged to pay from $200 to $300 per ton. This also applies to lumber, insulation, hardware, and other materials going into home construction. These industrial czars are responsible for the high cost of living and for the delay of constructing lower-priced homes because an honest contractor cannot pay the black-market prices for materials needed for home construction.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the majority do not realize the unfortunate existing conditions, but I hope that these three recesses for 10 days will give the Republican Members an opportunity to familiarize themselves as to the situation and that they will come back and begin to adopt some of the legislation recommended by the President to relieve these deplorable existing conditions and at the same time pass other legislation to arrest dangerous inflation.

Regardless of what I and the members of the minority, who have the interest of the common people at heart, may say or try to do, I am satisfied that no legislation will be enacted to relieve present conditions, and unless you will come to the conclusion that something must be done, you will be done.

In that connection I just received a letter bearing on rent control which expresses the sentiments of the vast majority of the American people, which I insert as part of my remarks.

The letter is as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 3, 1948.*

Subject: Federal rent control.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I believe that Federal rent-control regulations should receive the immediate attention of Congress and I urge that you support the enactment of this legislation at the earliest moment possible.

Without the prompt extension of Federal rent regulations there are millions of people daily becoming more alarmed in the full knowledge that unless regulations are enacted before February 29, 1948, there will be a wave of unjustified and exorbitant rental advances. I do not need to tell you what this will mean to millions in the lower and middle income bracket, who are, at today's general living conditions and costs, barely able to keep their heads above water and there are many, many thousands, who are not, under today's present economic conditions, even able to do this.

May I offer that almost all residential rental property today was constructed, financed, and amortized before the war or during the first years thereof; rental property was, at those times, amortized on a basis of rents in existence at the time and based on from 10 to 15 percent vacancies. We all know that property has been 100 percent occupied—there have been no vacancies, consequently the 10 to 15 percent basis on which the property was amortized, under the lower building and materials costs of that time, makes them at today's rentals, in a great majority of cases very profitable investments for the owners.

May I again urge that you support the speeding and enactment of regulations extending Federal rent controls to at least December 31, 1949.

Respectfully yours,

FRED P. GREEN.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this measure has been approved unanimously by the Committee on Rules. It is simply to correct a typographical error.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for 30 minutes for next Tuesday, but since I am informed that the House will not be in session on that day, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I placed in the RECORD, on page 1097, a tabulation showing the revised export quota for petroleum products for the first quarter of 1948. I have now completed a computation of the differences between that quota and the quota announced in January, which I shall insert at this point in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the House.

Revised first quarter, 1948, country quotas of petroleum products in barrels:

Kerosene

	Announced Jan. 16	Announced Feb. 4	Reduction
Australia	70,000	50,000	20,000
Belgium	8,000	8,000	None
British Honduras	2,000	2,000	None
China	110,000	85,000	25,000
Costa Rica	3,500	3,500	None
Denmark	5,000	0	5,000
El Salvador	1,500	1,500	None
Eire	5,000	0	5,000
Guatemala	2,000	2,000	None
Honduras	2,000	2,000	None
New Zealand	20,000	20,000	None
Norway	7,000	7,000	None
Panama, Republic of	7,000	7,000	None
Philippines	70,000	60,000	10,000
Portugal	40,000	30,000	10,000
Sweden	50,000	50,000	None
United Kingdom	130,000	80,000	50,000
British West Africa	25,000	25,000	None
Switzerland	10,000	10,000	None
French West Africa	10,000	10,000	None
Total	578,000	453,000	125,000
Reserve	322,000	149,000	173,000
Grand total	900,000	602,000	298,000

Result: Reduction in varying percentages in exports to 7 countries; no reduction in exports to 13 countries. Over-all reduction accomplished by drawing from reserve an amount which is 58 percent of total purported reduction of exports.

Gas oil and distillate fuel oil

	Announced Jan. 16	Announced Feb. 4	Reduction
Australia	100,000	100,000	None
Belgium	175,000	175,000	None
British Honduras	3,000	3,000	None
China	100,000	100,000	None
Costa Rica	10,000	10,000	None
Denmark	120,000	120,000	None
El Salvador	3,500	3,500	None
France	300,000	300,000	None
Mexico	100,000	75,000	25,000
New Zealand	35,000	35,000	None
Panama, Republic of	10,000	0	10,000
Philippines	160,000	135,000	25,000
Portugal	10,000	10,000	None
Sweden	250,000	250,000	None
United Kingdom	1,200,000	1,000,000	200,000
Netherlands	60,000	60,000	None
Iceland	40,000	0	40,000
British West Africa	20,000	20,000	None
Switzerland	50,000	50,000	None
Total	2,746,000	2,446,500	300,000
Reserve	453,500	353,500	100,000
Grand total	3,200,000	2,800,000	500,000

Result: Reduction in varying percentages in exports to 5 countries; no reduction in exports to 14 countries. Over-all reduction accomplished by drawing from

reserve item an amount which is 20 percent of total purported reduction of exports.

Residual fuel oil

	Announced Jan. 16	Announced Feb. 4	Reduction
Australia	50,000	25,000	25,000
Belgium	100,000	70,000	30,000
Costa Rica	20,000	20,000	None
Cuba	200,000	200,000	None
Denmark	70,000	60,000	10,000
El Salvador	40,000	40,000	None
Guatemala	55,000	55,000	None
Mexico	400,000	250,000	150,000
New Zealand	70,000	----------	70,000
Panama Republic	25,000	25,000	None
Portugal	19,000	19,000	None
Sweden	100,000	60,000	40,000
United Kingdom	300,000	----------	300,000
British West Africa	10,000	10,000	None
French West Africa	15,000	15,000	None
Total	1,474,000	849,000	625,000
Reserve	326,000	151,000	175,000
Grand total	1,800,000	1,000,000	800,000

Result: Reduction in varying percentages in exports to seven countries; no reduction in exports to eight countries. Over-all reduction accomplished by drawing from reserve item an amount which is 24 percent of total purported reduction of exports.

I submit that several conclusions are clear:

First. This action is not in compliance with the unanimous recommendations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (a) of December 19, 1947, that "the export control authority granted by section 6 of Public Law 703, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, should be exercised to place such prohibitions or curtailments on the exportation of fuel oil and other petroleum products for such period of time as may be necessary to alleviate such shortages," or (b) of January 26, 1948, when the committee recommended "the immediate cessation of the exportation of all petroleum products," stating:

It appears that the situation is now so grave that exports should be stopped completely until it can be determined whether further exports are damaging to the economy of this country.

Second. The announcement of the Department of Commerce of the revision on the afternoon of January 30, 1948, emphasized that it was a reduction of 18.5 percent. In terms of the withdrawal from reserves and the limited number of countries affected, I submit that this is an unfortunate statement. It certainly appears that the effort to reduce exports was a scattered, piecemeal one.

Third. It is difficult, and I find it impossible to reconcile the position of the Department of Commerce through its authorized representatives in a period so short as between Monday and Friday of last week. On Monday Hon. William C. Foster, Under Secretary of Commerce, testified before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in opposition to any form of embargo on the export of petroleum and petroleum products. He said:

The reason I have taken here the attitude that I have is that I am still fearful that the action contemplated is that proposed legislation will lead to more trouble than a solution of the problem.

Yet on Friday afternoon the Department of Commerce announced the revision, which I have analyzed, and you will note several startling facts. First, the export program to Japan and the Ryukyu Islands was cut back from 2,470,000 barrels to 100,000 barrels; second, as to kerosene, exports to China are cut back 25,000 barrels, or 22 percent; to Portugal, 10,000 barrels, or 25 percent; to the United Kingdom, 50,000 barrels, or 38 percent; and to Denmark and Eire, 5,000 barrels, respectively, or 100 percent. Third, as to gas oil and distillate fuel oil, exports to Mexico are cut back 25,000 barrels, or 25 percent; to the Philippines, 25,000 barrels, or 15 percent; to the United Kingdom, 200,000 barrels, or 16 percent; and to Panama and Iceland, 10,000 and 40,000 barrels, respectively, or 100 percent. Fourth, as to residual fuel oil, exports to Australia are cut back 25,000 barrels, or 50 percent; to Belgium, 30,000 barrels, or 30 percent; to Denmark, 10,000 barrels, or 14 percent; Mexico, 150,000 barrels, or 37 percent; Sweden, 40,000 barrels, or 40 percent; and New Zealand and the United Kingdom, 70,000 and 300,000 barrels, respectively, or 100 percent.

What possible result can be drawn from those conclusions but that the argument that we must not restrict these exports in any way is absurd? Surely the allocations which have not been touched should be reviewed immediately. Personally I am forced to the conclusion that the record as to the use of these control powers since the first of the year demonstrates beyond any reasonable doubt that Congress has the grave responsibility of legislating at once in this field. I am convinced that it can and will give proper weight to all the evidence as to possible effects elsewhere against known effects in this country. Someone must act—and before it is too late. I urge that we accept that responsibility now.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to announce the program for next week.

Next Monday is District of Columbia Day. Following the disposition of District of Columbia business, the bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), the so-called Case oil bill, will be considered.

Consent has already been granted for the House to adjourn from Monday to Thursday of next week. On Monday further information will be divulged as to the program for Thursday and Friday of next week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 9, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1290. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Sixth Annual Financial Statement and Report of Operations, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 458. Resolution providing for consideration of House Joint Resolution 296, a joint resolution to maintain the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 459. Resolution providing for consideration of House Joint Resolution 275, a joint resolution to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1344). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1252. An act making certain changes in the organization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1345). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1275. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for medical treatment of persons in the naval service; to repeal section 1586 of the Revised Statutes; and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3344. A bill to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4272. A bill to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4549. A bill to authorize the enactment by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska of a code of laws for Alaska; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5035. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the eighty-second national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26–30, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2803. A bill for the relief of Miriam Barkle; without amendment (Rept. No. 1342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1673. An act to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2948) to regulate and control the operation of foreign agencies acting within the United States or its Territories and dependencies, and the same was referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 5292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to reduce the taxes on yellow oleomargarine made from domestic fats and oils and on dealers in such oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 5293. A bill to change the method of computing Federal grants-in-aid to States for aid to dependent children, to authorize such grants-in-aid for aid to needy relatives who provide homes for such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 5294. A bill to provide free postage for hospitalized members and veterans of the armed forces and to make available for such purpose to certain Government hospitals machines for the impressing and cancellation of postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5295. A bill to provide free postage fo. veterans and members of the armed forces of the United States receiving care or treatment in certain hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 5296. A bill to repeal section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5297. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5298. A bill to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 5299. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to certain employees of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5300. A bill to provide for the conservation and preservation of fish, wildlife, and game on the Menominee Reservation, Wis., including the enforcement and prosecution of violators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 5301. A bill to extend the educational and training benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to certain widows and children of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 460. Resolution to erect a monument to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. Res. 461. Resolution creating a special committee to investigate the election of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a sound and effective European recovery program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5302. A bill for the relief of the estate of R. C. Randolph, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 5303. A bill for the relief of Goettmann Printing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 5304. A bill for the relief of C. Y. Andrews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1311. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing Congress to have included in the forthcoming rivers and harbors bill the project of dredging Bullock's Cove in the town of East Providence; to the Committee on Public Works.

1312. By Mr. BUCK: Petition of United States Marine Hospital Post, No. 1364, American Legion, containing the signatures of 48 residents of Staten Island, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful Father, strengthen our faith, we pray, and save us from discouragement. Let not our hearts fail us when, after a war to set peoples free, there is less freedom in the world than there was before. Setting up standards of right and justice, we have seen them betrayed for money and mocked by selfishness. We have tried to forgive our enemies, we have humbled ourselves before haughty and cruel men, but we have not changed their hearts. Only Thou canst do that. But it takes faith to wait.

So we are tempted to despair of our world. Remind us, O Lord, that Thou hast been facing the same thing in all the world since time began.

But let not our hearts become hard or our spirits bitter. Keep our souls in faith and in hope. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. IVES, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 5, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 5, 1948:

S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.

On February 6, 1948:

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses on Monday, April 19, 1948, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba; and

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution extending the life of the Joint Committee on the Observance and Celebration of the Victory Over Spain.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES asked and obtained consent that Mr. DONNELL be excused from

attendance on sessions of the Senate on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of this week.

Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained consent to be absent from sessions of the Senate from today to February 19.

Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained consent to be absent from sessions of the Senate until Monday next.

Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance upon the Senate for the remainder of this week.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS

A joint letter from the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no reservations from all appropriations of lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects were made during the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the quantity of penalty inscribed material on hand and on order on June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, and the estimated cost of handling for the period July 1 to September 30, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of the Lake Worth Townsend Club, No. 1, Lake Worth, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a uniform national pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Ross C. Patton, Philadelphia, Pa., relating to his patent application No. 230,760, filed September 20, 1938, for which he has been denied compensation in petition to the United State Court of Claims case No. 47661, February 2, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Letters in the nature of petitions from Edward Gorecki, of Cleveland, Ohio, and Mrs. Mary Prichota, of East Chicago, Ind., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 1813, to reduce postage rates on parcels containing food, clothing, or medicines mailed to certain foreign countries so as to include Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"House Concurrent Resolution 22

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi memorializing the Congress of the United States of the grave apprehension and vigorous opposition of the people of this State to the recommendations of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, and urging opposition to any congressional enactment of said recommendations

"Whereas President Harry S. Truman, by Executive order on December 5, 1946, did establish the President's Committee on Civil Rights; and

"Whereas this committee did function and submit its report to the Nation in the form of a public document; and

"Whereas the report did recommend, among other things, the enactment by the Congress of an Antilynching Act, an Anti-Poll-Tax Act, a Fair Employment Practices Act, an act forbidding segregation, and other acts of this same character and devious purpose, which acts are obviously directed against certain geographical sections of the Nation, more particularly the Southern States, and which acts are aimed at nothing less than the subjugation of the sovereignty of the 48 States of this Union in favor of a gigantic and compelling Federal system of appointive boards with powers equal to those of the State or the judiciary; the subjugation of the majority to the demands of various minority groups, and not least among these recommendations, certain ones whose effect would be to deprive the States of their rights with regard to suffrage and election laws, and passing this power to the Federal Government for their dictates; and

"Whereas the recommendations of this committee constitute an assault on the fundamental principles of division of powers between the Federal and State governments; and

"Whereas the recommendations of this committee constitute an attempt by a group of persons not qualified by training or experience to recommend basic changes in a social and economic system arrived at after centuries of adjustments and changes accompanied by progress and enlightenment; and

"Whereas the recommendations of this committee constitute nothing less than an attempt to inflict on the States by Federal legislation a social, economic, and political framework totally in derogation of the sovereignty of States guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized of the grave apprehension with which the people of this State view these proposals, and be further memorialized of the vigorous, indignant, justifiable, and considered condemnation of and opposition to these said recommendations, and that the Congress be urged to defeat any and all of these recommendations; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these joint resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Mississippi delegation in Congress with the request that said delegation continue their steadfast, determined and courageous defense of the traditions, customs, and ideals of the State of Mississippi and the South."

USE OF TOBACCO AS INCENTIVE COMMODITY IN EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, concerning the use of tobacco as an incentive commodity in the European recovery program, which has been addressed to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Members of Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky. I am sending a copy of the resolution to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for its consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering legislation in regard to a European recovery program; and

Whereas certain commodities will be supplied as grants to participating countries in the carrying out of this program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the house of representatives concurring therein), That in connection with the supply of United States tobacco to recipient countries under the European recovery program, it appears that in the interest of all producers several points should be considered.

1. REVENUES

The United States Government derives annually more than $1,200,000,000 in revenue from tobacco. This is almost equal to $1,000 per acre for the amount used in the manufacture of products by domestic manufacturers. It should be noted in this connection that revenue from tobacco is more than double the cost of the tobacco to be shipped to recipient countries under the European recovery program. This does not apply to any other commodities or products to be supplied. Its use in providing revenue in foreign countries should be considered, in connection with the supply of commodities to recipient countries. For example the revenue accruing to the Government of the United Kingdom for the year 1947–48 is estimated at more than $2,000,000,000. In Italy, tobacco supplies about 30 percent of the total revenue received by the Italian Government.

2. INCENTIVES

Testimony before congressional committees has established the value of tobacco as an incentive product to stimulate production on farms, in factories and in the mines and as a factor in improving the morale of the people in countries where tobacco products are in short supply. The European recovery program is designed to encourage and to increase production in European countries and to improve the morale of the population, and for this reason tobacco is included as one of the commodities to be supplied European countries under the recovery program.

3. DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE MARKETS

Since tobacco is to be supplied to participating countries as grants, the tobacco shipped should be such that trade between the United States and recipient countries will be perpetuated. This can best be achieved by its supply to recipient countries through established trade channels.

4. TOBACCO IN SURPLUS SUPPLY IN THE UNITED STATES

Tobacco is in surplus supply in the United States and its shipment, in the amounts

scheduled, will not create a shortage in the domestic market and will therefore have no inflationary effect on our economy. Supplies of tobacco from this country to recipient countries, as a whole, should be on a basis that will remove United States surplus supplies of each type of tobacco. Surplus supplies would include leaf tobacco held by dealers as well as that held by any agency of the Government under a price-support program.

5. ALL AREAS BE GIVEN EQUAL CONSIDERATION

Since funds for aid to participating countries will come from all areas, through taxes, it would appear equitable that, in order to protect the respective producers, all tobacco-producing areas must be given equal consideration. This is especially important to tobacco growers who produce types now in surplus supply.

Equal consideration for each tobacco-producing area could probably be achieved through instruction to the administrator of the European recovery program, in the act or in the conference report, that in the distribution of United States agricultural commodities as grants to participating countries, the amounts of each class or type supplied must, in order to protect respective producers, be in proportion to the United States available supply of each class or type of each commodity; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed by the clerk of the Senate of Kentucky to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and the Honorable George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, and the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Honorable Averill Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, and the Honorable Julius Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and a copy sent to the Honorable Alben W. Barkley, United States Senator from Kentucky, and the Honorable John Sherman Cooper, United States Senator from Kentucky, and the Honorable Noble J. Gregory, the Honorable Thurston Ballard Morton, the Honorable Frank Leslie Chelf, the Honorable Brent Spence, the Honorable Virgil Chapman, the Honorable W. Howes Meade, the Honorable Joe B. Bates, and the Honorable John M. Robsion, Representatives from Kentucky.

ERVINE TURNER,
Chief Clerk, Senate.
LOUIS COX,
President pro tempore,
President of the Senate.
BYRON ROYSTER,
Chief Clerk, House.
HOBART RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House.

Approved:

EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:

MARY LOU HUBBARD,
Assistant Clerk of the Senate.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION BY MILWAUKEE COUNTY (WIS.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Milwaukee County (Wis.) Board of Supervisors, endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is presently pending before Congress Senate Joint Resolution 111 authorizing necessary governmental action to establish the St. Lawrence waterway; and

Whereas, the best interest of the city and county of Milwaukee and the entire State of Wisconsin will be greatly served by the early establishment of this great project: Therefore be it

Resolved by the County Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., this 27th day of January 1948, That the Representatives in Congress from Milwaukee County and the United States Senators from Wisconsin be, and they are hereby, requested to do all in their power to secure the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 111; and be it further

Resolved, That the county clerk is directed to transmit forthwith certified copies of this resolution to the United States Senators from Wisconsin and the Representatives in Congress from Milwaukee.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION BY THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE CIO

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts State CIO, Industrial Union Council, which has been certified to by J. W. Belanger, secretary-treasurer, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE CIO INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

"Whereas we, as rank and file citizens of New England, cannot and will not sit idly by and see the region in which we work and have our homes lose ground economically to other sections of the country; and

"Whereas at one time it was true in large measure that many of New England's industries migrated to other sections of the country where lower wages prevailed, this condition no longer prevails to any extent, and it is now painfully evident that other causes are responsible for the contraction of employment opportunities in this section of the country; and

"Whereas the fact stands out that costs of electric power, both for industrial and domestic use, are higher in New England than anywhere else in the United States; the cost of purchased electric energy per kilowatt-hour was 1.03 for the country as a whole but 1.35 for New England; the cost of power in certain Southern States, which are in direct competition with New England, is roughly about half of what it is here; and

"Whereas all other types of essential fuel are more expensive in New England than elsewhere; the average cost per B. t. u. of fuel used in manufacturing industry in the United States is 15.8 but costs 20.8 cents in New England. These differentials are now proving to be important, and often controlling, factors in causing the relocation or contraction of various types of industrial establishments in this region; and

"Whereas New England must have cheap and adequate transportation, especially with the Midwest, because as a manufacturing region we buy both raw materials and foodstuffs from distant points and then reship finished products; and

"Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway and power project would bring into use the largest single undeveloped block of hydroelectric power in North America, which will yield more power than all the TVA dams put together and at a lower cost than TVA; and

"Whereas the use of the waterway would eliminate bottlenecks and gradually reduce transportation costs in the region; and

"Whereas electricity developed by the St. Lawrence power project could be delivered economically within a 300-mile radius (which means pretty well all of New England), and would save electric consumers in the region somewhere between $110,000,000 and $150,000,000 per year; and

"Whereas expert analysis of the objections which have been raised against the St. Lawrence project prove to be merely selfish or short-sighted special pleadings by the very same vested interests which are mainly responsible for the present deterioration of our region; and

"Whereas fears expressed by some labor unions that the use of the seaway might mean some loss of employment are also found to be without reasonable foundation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That we hereby endorse the St. Lawrence seaway and power project and urge immediate passage by the Congress of the United States Senate Joint Resolution 111, which would enable this long-deferred and urgently needed undertaking to go forward at once; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we publicize this action as widely as possible and that copies of this resolution be sent to all Senators and Congressmen from New England, to the President of the United States, and to all others specially interested or concerned."

The above is a true copy of the resolution passed at the convention of the Massachusetts State CIO Industrial Union Council at the Hotel Statler in Boston, December 13–14, 1947.

[SEAL] J. WILLIAM BELANGER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2038. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section; with an amendment (Rept. No. 886).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE BUDGET (REPT. NO. 887)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] from the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report and minority views, together with a Senate concurrent resolution which was recommended by the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. I presume that goes to the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report and minority views will be received and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1949 will approximate $47,300,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $37,200,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $26,600,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL POLICY AND PROGRAM (REPT. NO. 885)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report on the long-range agricultural policy and program which was prepared by the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, pursuant to Senate Resolution 147. The subcommittee worked many months on the report, it was finally unanimously agreed to, and now I wish to submit it to the Senate. The committee finds itself in a predicament. We find we can get only about 220 copies of the report printed, whereas, up to this morning, the clerk advises me that we have over 3,500 requests for copies. It would be impossible to fill the demand with but 220 copies. I prepared a resolution to authorize the printing of 7,000 additional copies, which I had intended to offer today, in the hope that it could be acted upon this week. We now find that a majority of the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on Rules and Administration are out of town, and it will be impossible for some days to hold a hearing to approve the resolution. In the meantime requests for the report are continuing to pile up almost every minute. I know that it was formerly the custom to ask unanimous consent to have copies printed. We have not done that, at least very often, at this session of the Congress. I should like to have the advice of the majority and minority leaders who are present here today, as to just what to do in this predicament. We shall have more requests every day, I am sure, than the number of copies available under the present circumstances. I should like to ask the advice of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may have immediate consideration by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I submit the resolution, and request that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the difficulty involved. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 197) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That 7,000 additional copies of the report by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on long-range agricultural policy and program be printed for the use of said committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the estimate of cost is about $500. The Chair will assume that it is under $500, which is necessary for the publication through the present action. On that assumption, is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has approved the resolution—the only member of the minority on the Committee on Printing—and I think we can speak for the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] of the majority.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I certainly am not going to raise any objection, now that the resolution has been adopted, but I do say that the precedent is not a very good one to follow. Naturally, I know something about the report that is being filed. It is a very illuminating document on the long-range policy, and the fact that so many are already inquiring for it indicates the tremendous interest in the report. I certainly shall not object to it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am advised that the cost of printing 7,000 copies will be less than $500, so it is within the rule.

METLAKAHTLANS ON ANNETTE ISLANDS, ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present a report, dated May 3, 1947, made to the Secretary of the Interior by a committee previously appointed by him to consider questions concerning the Metlakahtlans on Annette Islands, Alaska, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, with a view to its being printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2137. A bill to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. IVES (for Mr. Baldwin):

S. 2138. A bill for the relief of Magdalena Maria Neznik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2139. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2140. A bill to amend section 8 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to allow certain commissioned warrant officers of the Armed Forces to count other active commissioned service in the computation of service for advancement to certain pay periods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2141. A bill to amend the act approved August 24, 1935, as amended May 23, 1938, entitled "An act to authorize the erection of a suitable memorial to Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals within the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2142. A bill to make the Government-owned alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, available for processing agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2143. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2144. A bill for the relief of Ebbie Kirschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2145. A bill to authorize payment to certain heirs of enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians under act of July 2, 1942 (Public, No. 645, 77th Cong.);

S. 2146. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army and to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond; and

S. 2147. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2148. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of a portion of the Vigo Plant, formerly the Vigo Ordnance Plant, near Terre Haute, Indiana, to supplement the farmlands required for the United States Prison System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2149. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the postwar construction of highways, and for other purposes; and

S. 2150. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the postwar construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2151. A bill to increase the pay of postoffice employees in the unincorporated territory of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 2152. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2153. A bill to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (for himself and Mr. BYRD) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 181, authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry week in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. BYRD):

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to amend section 138 of the Legislation Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to the legislative budget; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PATRICK HENRY WEEK

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a Senate joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week, in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the death of Patrick Henry. The joint resolution is being presented pursuant to a joint Senate resolution of the General Assembly of Virginia. I request that the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD, accompanied by the letter I wrote to the President of the United States on February 3, and his reply of February 5, indicating that if the proposal were effected it should be by congressional action.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that this is not a move to set aside a week to promote the sale or consumption of any product this country produces, nor is it an effort merely to do honor to a distinguished Virginian. The fame of Patrick Henry is secure in the history of America, but the principles for which Patrick Henry stood are not secure. I have been gratified to observe from the press that communities all over our Nation are having what they are calling Christian mission weeks, in which distinguished preachers are coming into the various communities and asking the people to reappraise their conception of God and the part He plays in human destiny. I think that is a fine thing, and it should be followed up by a reappraisal of representative democracy, which rests upon the ethical teachings of the Bible. We have become the most powerful Nation in the world, but the Senate has just heard our chaplain pray "Let not our hearts become hard." The Chaplain recalls, of course, that it is said of Nebuchadnezzar in the Book of Daniel—

But when his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him.

The principles of democracy are now being challenged, and many people in this country do not realize the difference between war, in which we win the right to have freedom, and the necessity of living in peace. All wars must sooner or later end, but peace must be lived, and a peace between nations is no different from peace between individuals. We have free choice between hostility and friendly actions between individuals, and we have it between nations. Our democracy is based upon the principles of friendly action, of neighborly action, of Christian action, and if we are to preserve the greatness which is now ours and the leadership which is awaiting us in a troubled world, we should welcome an opportunity to renew our allegiance to the faith of the fathers, which we can do in no better way than by honoring the memory of the man who was the spark plug of the American Revolution. It was a courageous thing to say in 1775, "Give me liberty or give me death," because at that time it was "touch and go" as to which one the speaker would get.

We got our liberty after 7 years of revolutionary war. We preserved it through the intervening years, but I remind Senators again of the prayer offered in the Senate this morning by the Chaplain, "Let not our hearts become hard."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection the joint resolution and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 181) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia (for himself and Mr. BYRD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week, inviting the people of the United States to observe such week, and particularly the day June 6, 1949, as the one hundred fiftieth anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry, in accordance with their religious faith, with appropriate ceremonies which will serve to recall his great contribution to the cause of our national independence and to the establishment of the liberties of the people of the United States.

The letters presented by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
February 3, 1948.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It gives me pleasure to transmit for your consideration Senate Joint Resolution No. 8 of the General Assembly of Virginia, in which our State legislature petitions you to set aside a week in the month of June 1949, to be known as Patrick Henry Week, to the end that appropriate exercises may be held in recognition of his part in laying the foundations of our national freedom.

Last year I introduced a bill to authorize the minting of a Patrick Henry memorial coin as a means of raising funds for the preservation of his home in Charlotte County. However, the Congress yielded to your request to discontinue the authorization of commemorative coins.

I hope that you will share our view that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; that our future liberty is now being threatened by a totalitarian power and that we can best gird our loins for that conflict by renewing our allegiance to the faith of the founding fathers, among whom in the earliest days of the struggle Patrick Henry was the recognized leader.

Faithfully yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 5, 1948.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The President has asked me to thank you for transmitting to him Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, of the General Assembly of Virginia, requesting that a week in the month of June 1949 be set aside to be known as Patrick Henry Week in recognition of the sesquicentennial of the death of that famous statesman.

May I explain to you that during the last few years the number of requests for the President to designate special days and weeks has increased to a very great extent. Besides this request from you there are at the present time three other requests, each asking that the President by proclamation set aside a particular day or week for general observance. In order to treat all organizations asking for these special proclamations on a basis of exact equality, the President, except in cases of national emergency, follows for the most part a course of limiting his proclamations to those which are authorized by the Congress. Even so, the number of such authorizations, as you know, is very great.

I note that the concluding paragraph of the Senate joint resolution which you forwarded to this office provides for forwarding copies of the resolution to Senators and Members of Congress with the request that they take appropriate action. If the Congress should take this highly appropriate action, I am sure the President would be very happy to comply with any directive thus authorized.

With all good wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

MATTHEW J. CONNELLY,
Secretary to the President.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER (by request) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PRICE OF MILK—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3370) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This request is made with the concurrence of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL AND SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of Senate bill 1807, to provide for the temporary extension of the Export Control Act and title III of the Second War Powers Act, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The request is made after consideration and with the concurrence of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which committee is already holding hearings on the matters contained in the bill. My staff has consulted with the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it is agreeable that that committee take over the hearings on the matter. In fact, such hearings are already being held.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ANASTASIOS P. IONNETOS—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Calendar No. 906, Senate bill 129, for the relief of Anastasios P. Ionnetos, indefinitely postponed. The reason for the request is that it has since been discovered that a bill of similar content has already been received from the House and that bill, of course, will be reported by the committee at its next meeting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

STATE SOVEREIGNTY OVER MINERALS BENEATH WATERS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Minerals Beneath the Waters—State Sovereignty—A Vital Question," delivered by Senator McCARRAN at a luncheon meeting of the Colorado Mining Association, at Denver, Colo., on February 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN FARMER—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the American farmer, prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADVANTAGES OF EXPORT TO THE MIDDLESEX COUNTY MANUFACTURER—ADDRESS BY ALEXANDER S. KELLER

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Alexander S. Keller at the annual meeting of the Middlesex County Manufacturers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM—SERMON BY DR. E. H. PRUDEN

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Hears Praise From Pastor for His Civil Rights Stand," containing the report of a sermon by Dr. E. H. Pruden, pastor, First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE RESOLUTIONS ON AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted at the seventy-seventh annual meeting of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture on January 16, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICES IN AUSTRIA—LETTER FROM JOHN G. ERHARDT

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of United States Information Services in Austria, addressed to Senator SMITH, which appears in the Appendix.]

REDUCED NUMBER OF STRIKES SINCE ENACTMENT OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE ASHEVILLE CITIZEN

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to the reduced number of strikes since the adoption of the Taft-Hartley Act, from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEWISH REFUGEES EN ROUTE TO PALESTINE—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding Jewish refugees attempting to enter Palestine, by I. F. Stone, from the newspaper PM of February 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STAND BY MR. TRUMAN—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Stand by Mr. Truman," by Richard L. Neuberger, published in the Oregon Democrat, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article published in the Chattanooga Times of February 2, 1948, quoting Representative KEFAUVER, which article I ask to be printed in full at the end of my remarks. Before it is inserted in full in the RECORD, I am taking the liberty of quoting several statements therefrom. Mr. KEFAUVER is quoted as saying:

> Charges that the "private electric lobby" has adopted a bill being sponsored by Senator KENNETH D. McKELLAR and one of his opponents in the current senatorial race in Tennessee—Senator TOM STEWART—and will use it to make an "all-out effort to sabotage the Tennessee Valley Authority at this session of the Congress," came last night from Representative ESTES KEFAUVER.

This statement is a willful, deliberate, and apparently malicious falsehood. I am sorry we have a man in Congress from Tennessee who would make such a false statement.

Again Congressman KEFAUVER is quoted as saying:

> The "hostile Public Works Committee" of the Senate, KEFAUVER asserted, "will spearhead the assault" upon the TVA.
>
> "The bill to be used for this purpose," KEFAUVER continued, "is the anti-TVA bill sponsored by Senators McKELLAR and STEWART."

Mr. President, I never sponsored an anti-TVA bill in my life. Both of these statements are absolutely false. Again I say I am sorry we have a man in Congress from Tennessee who would make such a false statement.

And again:

> Those forces unfriendly to TVA hope to gain strength by getting behind the continuing attack of Tennessee's senior Senator.

This is an absolutely false statement. Again I say I am sorry we have a man in Congress from Tennessee who would make such a false statement.

Again:

> The idea is to do away with TVA's right to use its receipts in the operation of its power business. As matters stand, TVA makes a yearly report to the Congress and returns a substantial sum to the Treasury annually.

This statement is false, and again I say I am sorry we have a man in Congress from Tennessee who would make such a false statement.

While Lilienthal was the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and even before, when he was a member of the board of directors, he managed its affairs without regard to the laws of Congress. During the last war and before it the said Lilienthal sneaked up here from time to time and got amendments to the law passed, some of them secretly and without my knowledge, by which amendments the TVA was taken out of the hands of the United States Government, which owns it, and put in the care and keeping and complete dictatorial control of himself first, and then of his successor, Gordon Clapp. The TVA does make some kind of report to the Government, but during this time of high prices the TVA has made money, and it is being used without regard to the Government's ownership. And Congressman KEFAUVER defends this way of managing it.

Here is the way he speaks of the Government's interest in the TVA:

> TVA's accounts are audited by the General Accounting Office and by private firms, and not 1 penny has been misused.

Is it not remarkable how much information and knowledge a man acquires when he serves in Congress a little while and becomes a candidate for United States Senator? KEFAUVER knows no more about how this money has been used than he knows about the duties of Senator or Representative, and certainly his knowledge of the duties of the services in both these places is infinitesimal.

The Treasury Department is doing a valuable work for the Government, but it comes to Congress to get its appropriations. So does the State Department. So does the Department of the Army and the Department of Navy. So does every other department of Government. The TVA is unique in not paying its money over to the Government and not making a request of the Government for money for the next coming year. Why should it be excepted? All the other departments of Government which collect money pay it into the Treasury of the United States and get their money through Congress to run their departments thereafter. Why should the TVA be left out? It was left out because of the slick, secret machinations of a man who has dishonored the honor and tradition of our American way of doing things during all the time he has been in control as the head of the TVA. Of course, I am speaking of Lilienthal.

The Post Office Department collects an enormous sum from the people and pays it all into the Treasury of the United States. Has it been a failure? It has been one of the Federal Government's greatest successes. Why should the TVA be put on a different basis from all the other departments of Government? The truth is, we have the best Government in the world; so why change it?

The all-wise Congressman next says:

> No electric power system could be operated successfully on that basis. The effect would be to take the control of the TVA from the region it serves and make it a political football for the Appropriations Committees in the Congress. This would seriously blight the future value of this great agency. It would mean the end of the economical and efficient operation which it has carried out in the past.

To show how ignorant the Congressman is, I requote:

> The effect would be to take the control of the TVA from the region it serves and make it a political football for the Appropriations Committees in the Congress.

Dr. A. E. Morgan, the first Chairman of the TVA, was a native of Indiana, I believe. Mr. Lilienthal was born in Morton, Ill. Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan came from Canada, and the present Chairman, Mr. Clapp, was born in Wisconsin. I do not see how that "control" can be considered "local control." But the Government owns the TVA, furnished all the money that went into its building, and the Government, which owns it, ought to have something to say about how it should be run.

I first began my fight to build dams on the Tennessee River in 1916, I believe it was. I made a fight for appropriations for building the dam at Muscle Shoals first. It took us several years, but we finally got Muscle Shoals built. Strange to say, all the time I was in the House and a part of the time I was in the Senate, the late Senator Norris was greatly opposed to the building of the dams on

the Tennessee River. Mr. KEFAUVER was 14 or 15 years old at the time, and I suppose he was up here working for the dams, though I must admit to the people of my State that I do not recall seeing him at that time. If he took any part in what was done during all the weary days we spent working for the improvement of the Tennessee Valley I just cannot remember it to save my life. I believe that in his efforts to get into the Senate he is letting his imagination run away with him.

I think possibly the greatest piece of individual work I have done since I have been in the Congress of the United States, now 37 years, was the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the obtention of the money to build the dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. Every dollar of the money has come through the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, except the money for the original Muscle Shoals Dam, and I believe I had a more active part in getting that money than any other Representative or Senator.

There being no objection, the article referred to by Mr. MCKELLAR was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEWART'S STAND ON TVA ATTACKED—KEFAUVER SAYS SENATOR WILL AID MCKELLAR IN EFFORT TO "SABOTAGE" AGENCY

Charges that the "private electric lobby" has adopted a bill being sponsored by Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR and one of his opponents in the current senatorial race in Tennessee—Senator TOM STEWART—and will use it to make an "all-out effort to sabotage the Tennessee Valley Authority at this session of the Congress" came last night from Representative ESTES KEFAUVER.

The senatorial candidate and Third District Congressman stopped over en route from a campaign tour through middle Tennessee to Washington. He will leave for Washington early this morning.

The Kefauver statement last night is the first time he has taken Senator STEWART to task on TVA legislation since they jumped into Tennessee's red-hot senatorial campaign. He charged the junior Senator with supporting legislation sponsored by Senator MCKELLAR that would have been injurious to the Tennessee Valley had not supporters of the Federal agency, of which he is one, headed it off in the House of Representatives.

MAY OPEN BATTLE

The Kefauver statement here last night is a prelude, perhaps, to a bitter fight that probably will develop in the Tennessee senatorial campaign over the TVA.

The "hostile Public Works Committee," of the Senate, KEFAUVER asserted, "will spearhead the assault" upon the TVA.

"The bill to be used for this purpose," KEFAUVER continued, "is the anti-TVA bill sponsored by Senators MCKELLAR and STEWART.

"Those forces unfriendly to TVA hope to gain strength by getting behind the continuing attack of Tennessee's senior Senator. This measure is basically the same as the one passed several times in the Senate with the support of Senators MCKELLAR and STEWART. The bill never passed the House. It has always been vigorously fought by every Representative in the valley area.

"The idea is to do away with TVA's right to use its receipts in the operation of its power business. As matters stand, TVA makes a yearly report to the Congress and returns a substantial sum to the Treasury annually. TVA's accounts are audited by the General Accounting Office and by private firms, and not one penny has been misused.

"The McKellar anti-TVA bill would require the TVA to come to Congress each year and secure an appropriation for the operation of its power business. Since budget estimates for an appropriation are passed many months before the beginning of a fiscal year, this would mean that TVA would have to estimate a year ahead as to the transmission lines it would have to build; how much coal it would have to buy; whether there would be a drought in the valley; whether tornadoes would blow down transmission lines, and such other imponderables.

"No electric-power system could be operated successfully on that basis. The effect would be to take the control of the TVA from the region it serves and make it a political football for the Appropriations Committees in the Congress. This would seriously blight the future value of this great agency. It would mean the end of the economical and efficient operation which it has carried out in the past."

DIFFICULT TO EXPLAIN

KEFAUVER said, "It'll be difficult to explain" the support of the "amendments to impede TVA by both of Tennessee's Senators and that their opposition places the agency at a disadvantage." But he said that "all previous efforts to hamstring TVA" have failed and that the "grass-roots opposition" cleared the way for TVA forces to win.

"The people will come to TVA's defense again," KEFAUVER continued, "and will win because their cause is right."

The third district Congressman said the Senate Public Works Committee "is planning an investigation of TVA" and that "the investigation is welcome." There have been a number of investigations made of TVA since it started functioning, and all of them have proven that it is "managed excellently and is performing a great service to the Nation and to the area where it is located," he declared.

KEFAUVER said he had been in Montgomery, Dickson, and Rutherford Counties in the past few days and added that "I was very much elated by what I found there—my campaign is progressing very favorably."

It was intimated last night that former State Senator Knox Hutchinson, of Murfreesboro, who has held important offices in the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, the Rural Electric Cooperative, and the Midsouth Cotton Growers Association, will take over the Kefauver campaign in middle Tennessee. Hutchinson has been a stanch supporter of TVA in all of its fights and became acquainted with KEFAUVER through that activity.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, on February 2, 1948, I presented to the Senate to be reprinted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a compilation of the history of appropriations made by the Congress of the United States for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I now present to the Senate and ask that there be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a brief statement of the appropriations made since the previous document was printed, as well as a summary of the amounts appropriated, in order to bring up to date the history of appropriations on TVA.

Incidentally, Mr. President, these appropriations show how busy I have been getting appropriations for the Watauga and South Holston Dams in an effort to continue the building of the TVA dams, and there is nothing to show that this money has been used for the building of said dams. Mr. Lilienthal seems to have been opposed to the building of these dams, and his successor, Mr. Clapp, also seems to be opposed to building them, and has not used the appropriations I have secured from the Congress to continue the building of these dams and yet they are giving countenance to the false publications that I am opposed to the building of the Tennessee Valley dams. I am tremendously in favor of the building of the Tennessee Valley dams, but I am tremendously opposed to the two men who have controlled the Tennessee Valley Authority for some time, to wit, Lilienthal and Clapp. They pay no attention to the laws that we pass and are constantly lobbying in their own interest, and do not object to falsifying whenever they think it serves their purposes.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1946

Nine million six hundred and forty-eight thousand dollars, together with the unexpended balance in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, was the provision for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946, approved May 3, 1945 (Public, No. 49, 79th Cong.).

The act states as to construction of the dams: "including the continued construction of Kentucky Dam at Gilbertsville, Ky.; and construction of South Holston Dam and Watauga Dam."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1947

Thirty-nine million nine hundred and six thousand dollars, together with the unexpended balance of funds heretofore appropriated, was the provision for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1947, approved July 20, 1946 (Public, No. 519, 79th Cong.).

The act states as to construction of the dams: "including the construction of South Holston Dam and Watauga Dam," and also includes the following specific proviso: "*Provided*, That of the $39,906,000 appropriated herein, $14,000,000 shall be available for the immediate resumption of work on the Watauga and South Holston Dams."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1948

Eighteen million seven hundred thousand dollars, together with the unexpended balance of funds heretofore appropriated, was the provision for the Tennessee Valley Authority in the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, approved July 30, 1947 (Public, No. 268, 80th Cong.).

The act states as to construction: "including not to exceed $3,253,979 for the construction of South Holston Dam and Watauga Dam and not to exceed $5,000,000 for chemical plant," and also includes the following specific proviso: "*Provided*, That of said unexpended balance, not less than $12,000,000 is to be available for the construction of the Watauga and South Holston Dams."

Under title II of the act, which generally authorizes the corporations to make expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available and to make contracts and commitments without fiscal year limitations as necessary to carry out their programs, the following exception is stated as to Tennessee Valley Authority:

"Not later than June 30, 1948, and not later than June 30 of each calendar year thereafter, until a total of $348,239,240 has been paid as herein provided, the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay from net income derived the immediately preceding fiscal year from power operations (such net income to be determined by deducting power operating expenses, allocated common expense, and interest on funded debt from total power operating revenues) not less than $2,500,000 of its outstanding bonded indebtedness to the Treasury of the United States exclusive

of interest, and such a portion of the remainder of such net income into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts as will, in the 10-year period ending June 30, 1958, and in each succeeding 10-year period until the aforesaid total of $348,239,240 shall have been paid, equal not less than a total of $87,059,810, including payment of bonded indebtedness exclusive of interest on such bonded indebtedness. Total payments of not less than $10,500,000 shall be made not later than June 30, 1948.

"Amounts equal to the total of all appropriations herein and hereafter made to the Tennessee Valley Authority for power facilities shall be paid by the board of directors thereof, in addition to the total of $348,239,240 specified in the foregoing paragraph, to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, such payments to be amortized over a period of not to exceed 40 years after the year in which such facilities go into operation.

"None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress."

PAYMENT OF EXCESS PROCEEDS INTO THE UNITED STATES TREASURY

Previous to the provision of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act of 1948 above quoted, Tennessee Valley Authority was empowered by section 26 of the TVA Act to utilize the proceeds derived from power sales and other sources in the conduct of its power business, in the operation of dams and reservoirs, and in the production and disposition of fertilizers.

The preceeds for each fiscal year in excess of the amount considered necessary by Tennessee Valley Authority's Board of directors for section 26 purposes and for expenditures under Public Law 301, Seventy-seventh Congress (alterations or replacements of bridges or other highway or railroad structures) were to be paid into the general fund of the United State Treasury by the end of the calendar year; a continuing fund of $1,000,000 for emergency purposes being excepted.

Prior to July 1, 1944, the total proceeds to Tennessee Valley Authority were so required.

For fiscal year 1945, the proceeds exceeded their requirements for the purposes stated by $12,597,744, and in December 1945 that amount was paid into the Treasury by the Authority.

For fiscal year 1946, the proceeds exceeded their requirements for the purposes stated by $18,836,264. In January 1947 the Authority paid into the Treasury the amount of $10,336,264.

Summary of amounts appropriated for Tennessee Valley Authority

Public Law No.	Name of act	Congress	Amount
77	Fourth deficiency	73d	$50,000,000
412	Emergency	73d	25,000,000
260	Second deficiency	74th	36,000,000
739	First deficiency	74th	39,900,000
121	Second deficiency	75th	40,166,270
534	Independent offices	75th	40,000,000
8	do	76th	39,003,000
459	do	76th	40,000,000
[1] 95	Resolutions (S. J. Res. 285–H. J. Res. 583).	76th	25,000,000
28	Independent offices	77th	79,800,000
179	Resolution (H. J. Res. 194)	77th	40,000,000
353	Third supplemental	77th	47,000,000
422	Fourth supplemental	77th	30,000,000
630	Independent offices	77th	136,100,000
90	do	78th	[2]
358	do	78th	[2]
49	do	79th	9,648,000
519	Government corporations	79th	39,906,000
268	do	80th	18,700,000
	Total amount appropriated		746,223,270

[1] Public resolution.
[2] Unexpended balance only.

A system of 22 dams, 20 hydroelectric generating stations, 10 navigation locks, 5 steam-electric generating stations, and a power-transmission network of more than 6,000 circuit-miles constitute the major elements in the total Tennessee Valley Authority plant investment of $755,935,373 serving these purposes as of June 30, 1946.

The allocation of this investment in accordance with section 14 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act was $149,116,375 to navigation, $152,817,804 to flood control, $454,001,194 to power.

Scheduled additions to this investment include the following major projects:

Watauga Dam and Reservoir	$29,500,000
South Holston Dam and Reservoir	31,500,000
Hales Bar, raising of dam, lock, and gates	5,200,000
Wheeler, generating units 5 and 6	5,200,000
Fort Loudoun, generating units 3 and 4	4,200,000
Douglas, generating unit 3	2,100,000

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I was temporarily out of the Chamber last Thursday when the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] discussed the President's Civil Rights Committee, and in the course of his discussion he made some comment about Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina. The Senator acquitted Dr. Graham of being a Communist, but listed a number of organizations of which he was either a member or with which he had had some connection, which organizations are either Communist-controlled or affiliated with the Communist Party.

In this connection I wish to express my high appreciation to the able junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his very splendid statement following the statement of the Senator from Texas, in which he paid tribute to the outstanding service of Dr. Graham to his State and Nation, and referred to the fine contribution which he has made to democracy in America.

I thoroughly approve the words of commendation of the Senator from Oregon as to the part which Dr. Graham has played in the life of North Carolina and the Nation. In justice to Dr. Graham, I think it should be said that when the Civil Rights Committee, of which he is a member, submitted its report, the statement was made that several members of the Committee did not agree to many of the recommendations made in that report. Dr. Graham's friends know that he was among those who dissented from the extreme statements and recommendations by the Committee. All who are acquainted with him would know that he does not approve, and would not support, the broadside assault contained in this report on the practices and customs of the South with reference to segregation. Certainly, the Committee, in making its report, should have indicated the names of the members who dissented from the extremely prejudicial and unwise statements and recommendations contained in the report.

Dr. Graham is not only not a Communist but he is a democrat of democrats, and a thoroughly patriotic and devoted American citizen.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY—ADDRESS BY GOV. VAL PETERSON

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on January 26 last there was held in the city of St. Louis, Mo., the twenty-ninth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association.

One of the principal speakers on that occasion was the Honorable Val Peterson, Governor of Nebraska.

Mr. President, I know this man Peterson. He was the publisher and editor of a small country paper back in 1940 when I was a candidate for the Senate. I invited him to join my staff, and he accepted, foolish as that might have seemed at the time.

Since then it has been my privilege to recommend him to former Governor Dwight Griswold for a responsible place in the Nebraska government, and later for a commission in the Army Air Corps, where he performed with great credit the tasks assigned him, with such efficiency that he returned with the rank of lieutenant colonel. Four of his brothers joined him in volunteering for service abroad in the recent war. One was lost in the landing at Normandy. Another was badly shattered. I know their dear old mother, a widow in a small Nebraska village.

Mr. President, I recite these details for a reason, namely, I wish to present for the record the address made by Governor Peterson at St. Louis, and I call it to the attention my dear friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Governor Peterson in his speech at St. Louis urging support for the development of the Missouri River Basin, including irrigation and soil conservation, river navigation, and hydroelectric plants, never once mentions the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Governor Peterson, like the rest of us, realizes that we will have a great financial load in completing projects like the Pick-Sloan plan, without taking on projects located in some foreign country, even in Canada, whose people we love. Governor Peterson thinks, as do the rest of us, that we had better get a little further toward completion of pending domestic projects before we take in the whole world.

The Governor's statement, which I ask to be made a part of the record immediately following my remarks, like the statement made a few days ago by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway, is along practical lines. The people of Nebraska, and of the West in general, are keenly interested in the development of electric power in connection with our water resources, but we want to be practical, and we would like to see the electric-power possibilities of the Missouri River in actual operation before we start spending hundreds of millions of our money in Canada or elsewhere in the world. I am certain that Members of Congress will be interested in reading the speech of Governor Peterson.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a rare privilege to be here today and to visit with many pioneers in the development of our great Mississippi Basin, men who have rendered outstanding service to this area and to the Nation.

This is my first opportunity to participate in an annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association. It is a particularly welcome privilege at this time because the people of my State are deeply concerned with soil and water resources development for which this organization stands.

The Mississippi Valley Association has advocated development of river navigation, over a long period. Nebraska has a vital stake in Missouri River navigation.

You have an energetic program dedicated to soil conservation. No State in the valley is more interested and has more to gain than Nebraska in the broadening and intensified national effort to save the soil.

By the way, I wish I could be here for the entire program to hear some of the other addresses that are to follow on particular phases of this great soil-conservation movement, but in my State in some 70 to 80 years, some farmers who have handled the soil poorly have completely ruined it on some farms, and if we continue to neglect the soil in the Middle West for another 80 to 100 years in the manner in which we have neglected it in the past 80 or 90 years, the Middle West, or great portions of the Middle West, are going to look like great portions of China which are eroded beyond all hope of repair, so I would like to hear the distinguished speakers who will speak particularly on that subject.

Control of floods and development of water resources is another high priority interest of the Mississippi Valley Association, as I understand it. The citizens of my State have fought floods and struggled for enough water to survive in an area which often has insufficient rainfall to insure crops.

So we of Nebraska have a community of interests in the work of this organization. Because of climatic conditions our problems differ in some respects from other sections of the Mississippi Valley in which you function, but many of them are mutual.

From the broad viewpoint, we are all working toward a common goal in this vast agricultural belt of the Middle West. It is a good thing we can assemble periodically to examine the progress being made, to solve our problems, and rededicate our efforts toward sure and speedy accomplishment of these objectives.

I have made the statement repeatedly to citizens of Nebraska, and I repeat it here, that the future of Nebraska and the Midwest depends upon the success or failure of the Pick-Sloan plan. We must eliminate the appalling destruction of Missouri Basin floods. We must act to save the topsoil on which we live. We must fully utilize our water resources to minimize drought and maintain maximum farm production.

I am convinced that the Pick-Sloan plan offers a solution to these problems. It is a program which has met the test of public opinion. It is under construction and it is in the most able hands.

What I am saying is not based upon hearsay or wishful thinking, but upon personal experience and association with those who are directing the great Missouri River development program. It has been my pleasure during the last year to be a member of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee, in my capacity as Governor of Nebraska. This is the coordinating committee which serves to maintain cooperative and coordinated action among the Federal agencies and States directly concerned with the Missouri Basin project.

I have attended many of the monthly meetings since I became a member a year ago. I have seen how the committee performs its job, and I say to you that the Inter-Agency Committee is performing a real coordinating job in an earnest and capable fashion.

I have been impressed over and over again with the fact that it is performing a service of inestimable value to the people and to their Government. It provides a clearing house for the discussion and review of all problems relating to the successful correlation of the work of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and other interested Federal agencies.

Now it has only been a year or so ago that some people said that it would be impossible for the five Federal agencies involved in the development of the Missouri River basin to cooperate, and I may speak particularly for the five governors that sit upon that committee, 5 out of the 10 who are governors in the States involved, it has only been a year ago that people said that it would be absolutely impossible for them to cooperate.

May I say to you, departing from my script, that Democrats and Republicans alike, we have never differed on anything of importance. We have had our differences, of course, but after we have thoroughly threshed out a problem, we have been able to reach an accord and we have been able to be harmonious and unified in our actions as they are directed toward Washington and toward the other portions of the United States.

Equally important from my standpoint as a State executive is the fact that it gives assurance that the interests of the States and local communities are taken into full consideration in every phase of the basin-wide project. I know that the people of my State are well satisfied—more than that—well pleased, with the progress being made and the unified action of the agencies directly responsible for the work. I believe the same spirit prevails in other basin States. I don't believe it—I know that it prevails in other basin States.

Less than a week ago the Inter-Agency Committee met in the capital of my State, at Lincoln. I witnessed there an impressive example of the type of leadership and coordination which the committee is exercising in the Missouri Valley program. There the committee adopted a coordinated 6-year basin construction program, based upon extensive studies not only by the five participating Federal agencies, but by the States as well.

This program not only presents the work schedule of the Federal agencies, but combines the related development programs of the various basin States. It evidences the fact that the States are ready to make their contribution both in expenditure of funds and in engineering and administrative planning in order to insure the widest possible benefits of the entire basin program in the public interest.

When I say that the future of my State and other basin States depends upon the success or failure of the Pick-Sloan plan, I am deadly earnest. We took a tremendous beating out there in the drought period of the 1930's. The records contain some cold statistics that bear out my declaration that we are fighting for our economic existence.

Look at the Federal census figures and you will find that our State lost 70,000 population in that decade. As a matter of fact, we are still losing population. Our neighbors were also hard hit. When people watch their crops shrivel and their cattle die for lack of water and food, they become discouraged. When this happens year after discouraging year, they are starved out. The State suffers and the Nation loses economically.

It happened in Nebraska, Kansas, the Dakotas, and other Midwest States. Why? Because nature did not provide the necessary rainfall. Because the Government, the States, and the people had not put their ingenuity and engineering skills to work to cope with nature's deficiencies.

We learned some bitter lessons in that experience. We learned that in good years it is wise to prepare for the bad ones. We learned the need to summer fallow, to terrace and contour plow in order to hold the precious moisture where it falls. We learned that where nature provides too little rainfall it is necessary to take the water from our streams and rivers and put it on the land to grow crops.

And there is the reverse side of the picture, too—too much water at times in the form of floods. Our droughts usually come at intervals of several years, sometimes longer. But destructive floods hit us in Nebraska and other Missouri Basin States almost every year. Flood losses in my State last year ran into millions of dollars. Much of the damage was to growing crops. Thirteen Nebraska citizens lost their lives in the floods of 1947. The damage to highways and bridges was enormous and whole communities were cut off from all communication with the outside. Only through widespread civic cooperation and the splendid assistance of the Red Cross were many families, who had lost everything, rehabilitated.

It was my privilege—I don't know that you could call it a privilege—my duties during the time of the flood last June required that I fly over all of Nebraska. They also took me down the entire Missouri River to St. Louis, up the Mississippi to Dubuque, and then up from the confluence of the Des Moines and Mississippi to the capital city of Iowa, Des Moines, and this whole country looked a little bit like country that we were familiar with over in India, General Wheeler, up in the rice area of India, where little mounds of earth stick up, little mounds of earth that divide the rice paddies stick up, and everything else is just one great lake. That is the way western Iowa, the way portions of northern Missouri, parts of Kansas, and the eastern third of Nebraska looked during the height of that flood.

After we had flown down to Washington early in July and appeared there in behalf of the civil functions of the War Department before the subcommittees of the Senate, I flew back over this same area. The flood had subsided and the picture that was to be seen after the flood subsided was much worse than the picture that existed when the flood was in its upper reaches. The picture was much worse because as you flew across Missouri and Iowa you saw great gashes across this beautiful farmland, great gashes that were composed of wide-open cuts of sand and clay and debris, existing over a vast portion of the Midwest and the United States, and this area just can't survive if we permit the destructiveness of that flood to go on year after year after year.

As we strive for greater agricultural and industrial growth in Nebraska we must conquer floods, minimize drought, and conserve the soil through control and development of our land and water resources.

It is a struggle that cuts across State lines. The problem is too great for one State to solve single-handedly. There must be interstate cooperation and help from the Federal Government.

We are, indeed, fortunate in the Missouri Basin today to have all these essentials embodied in the Pick-Sloan basin-development program. We have gone a long way on that program in the last few years because we have a sound plan approved by Congress. We have a high degree of unity among the basin States and between the Federal agencies, and Congress has provided substantial appropriations to carry on the work, and I would like to suggest in that connection, as I told the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, I don't believe the United States can afford not to develop the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin. If this great area is to make its contribution to the United

States and to the world, the program must be developed.

The oldest irrigation district in my State is up in the North Platte Valley at Scottsbluff, and is now many years old. That has repaid to the Federal Government and the people of the United States several hundred times—not once, not a dozen, not a hundred—several hundred times the cost of the development of that irrigation project.

I suggested to the Congress that in my judgment the plan should be completed in 10 years because when you don't have a definite objective in terms of years, there is a tendency to fritter away time and money as you diddle along over a long period of years, if I can use that rather improper term.

You might suggest to me, "How can the United States afford the tremendous cost of the plan spread over a 10-year period?" I would like to suggest to you—it doesn't reflect but don't be misled by this statement—I would like to suggest to you that if we can afford to spend $17,000,000,000 all over the world—everywhere for anything any time—we can't afford not to spend $4,000,000,000 developing this great plan for the development of the 10 Middle Western States concerned. [Applause.]

Don't misunderstand. That is not an isolation pronouncement. If I had the time, I would go ahead and give the other part of the speech, and you would understand what I am talking about. The money spent on river development is an investment in a more prosperous Midwest and a more prosperous United States—one in which we will find it more convenient and pleasant to live.

Today we have three important reservoir projects under construction in my State. They are the key units of the Pick-Sloan plan for Nebraska. They are the forerunners of other units which ultimately will give Nebraska more than 1,000,000 acres of new irrigated lands. They will provide widespread flood protection and soil conservation.

Nebraska needs more electric power. It needs the benefits of river navigation, fish and wildlife conservation, and recreational development. We confidently expect to realize all these objectives in the Pick-Sloan plan.

River transportation is an integral part of the Pick-Sloan development program for the Missouri Basin. River navigation will bring increased business and prosperity to the entire basin—a prosperity in which all present common carriers will share.

I am not one who favors government entry or continuation in business fields where private enterprise can operate successfully. At this time, however, I am deeply concerned, and many, many of our people are concerned over the proposal to dispose of the Federal barge lines. Missouri River navigation interests should be on their guard against endorsing any action which would hamstring the development of navigation on the Missouri River. Our primary interest in this regard is to make certain that we are not deprived at this crucial time of pioneering work designed to establish navigation on the Missouri River.

The city of Omaha has earmarked a half a million dollars for building river terminal facilities at that city in anticipation of the development and expansion of river navigation. Other Nebraska cities along the river are preparing to make similar investments. Sioux City, Iowa, has plans for wharf and harbor facilities, as has St. Joseph, and Kansas City already has two municipal river terminals.

Last spring the Federal Barge Lines established regular monthly barge service up to Omaha. When the first barge tied up at the temporary wharf, hundreds of citizens lined the river bank. Businessmen and civic leaders joined in a welcoming ceremony. It was an event long awaited in Nebraska, and our people want to see the service extended and increased.

Business and agricultural interests all along the Missouri from the mouth to the present head of navigation at Sioux City are shaping their plans to encourage and develop river transportation in the interest of cheaper rates on bulk commodity shipments, including grain and other agricultural products.

By the way, last summer, it was my duty along with other governors in this area, to go down to Kansas City to fight to try to get boxcars to move our wheat crop. We didn't get them, and we will be down there next June fighting again for boxcars, and we won't move the wheat market. Here is an opportunity to move that wheat harvest in an economical manner down the river to New Orleans and from there to the steamers.

The point I want to make: where were your boxcars? They were being used to ship grain to your eastern shipyards and other places, tying up cars for weeks at a time and taking them out of the Midwest so we lost them as far as effective transportation was concerned throughout the entire harvest period. That is a problem that this association in a mild way should be interested in, too, because it affects everyone in the 23 States in the Mississippi Basin—I guess, nearly all the 23 States. I better qualify that a little bit.

Nebraska has a broad interest in this whole valley program. We want to see the full benefits of land and water management extended to our sister States in the valley, not alone in the Missouri Valley, but in the Mississippi Valley. Their future growth and prosperity is important and necessary to our own. The rivers belong to all of us. The soil, too, is a national heritage which we must seek to preserve.

What we do with these basic resources will determine in a large measure the future of our inland empire along the Missouri. There is no doubt about the attitude of the valley people. They are determined to see the Pick-Sloan plan carried through to a speedy and successful conclusion.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning, when I came into the Chamber, my dear friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] was making a few remarks and introducing into the RECORD a speech by the Governor of his State. He asked me to read that speech. I have gone over it. It confirms my position heretofore indicated, that people are looking after their own babies, of course. The speech relates to the Pick-Sloan plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. I just want to read two paragraphs from that speech, which are very confirmatory of the position I have taken on the tremendous need for the St. Lawrence waterway. This is what was said by the Governor:

> By the way, last summer, it was my duty along with other Governors in this area, to go down to Kansas City to fight to try to get boxcars to move our wheat crop. We didn't get them, and we will be down there next June fighting again for boxcars, and we won't move the wheat market. Here is an opportunity to move that wheat harvest in an economical manner down the river to New Orleans and from there to the steamers.
>
> The point I want to make: Where were your boxcars? They were being used to ship grain to your eastern shipyards and others places, tying up cars for weeks at a time and taking them out of the Midwest so we lost them as far as effective transportation was concerned throughout the entire harvest period. That is a problem that this association in a mild way should be interested in, too, because it affects everyone in the 23 States in the Mississippi Basin—I guess nearly all the 23 States. I better qualify that a little bit.

Just at this point I want to say that we, too, of the Mississippi Basin, in the great inland empire of this country, never expected that those dear friends of ours, who have a deep interest in serving the farmers—and every great farm organization of America is back of the St. Lawrence seaway—would go back on us in this respect.

Mr. BUTLER. It was not really necessary for the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to read any portion of the speech, because it is already in the RECORD. I hope all Senators will read all the speech. But I am delighted that the Senator read the part that he did, because it expresses what to us, at the moment, is of most importance. We are taking no position against the construction of the seaway, "if, as, and when," but we do want to go ahead with the development of the Missouri Valley and the Mississippi Valley waterways, that will move the bulk of our grain and surplus crops to the sea by way of New Orleans.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad to hear that, but I shall see whether or not the Senator's vote squares with his statement. The proposition now before the Senate is not for the construction of the seaway, in the sense that it appropriates money. What the resolution does is to put in motion the necessary machinery so that we may build up a reservoir of projects, including the St. Lawrence waterway, to have them on hand, as the Senator expresses it, "if, as, and when" the depression or recession comes. In other words, Mr. President, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that not a dollar is asked for here. There is an authorization—to do what? First, to direct the President to create a commission to go into the matter; second, to see what arrangements can be made as to tolls; and third, which is the big thing, to enter into an arrangement with Canada that will make perpetual the utilization of the St. Lawrence waterway by the two nations, and that will not be subject to 1 year's cancellation as it is at the present time. So, Mr. President, I plead with the Senator, I ask him to see that all this measure does is to set up the project, contrary to the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Ohio; whom I am glad to see here, and who says it is not timely. I agree that it is not timely to go into these great national projects from the standpoint of expenditures, but I say it is timely to set them up and to have them ready for an emergency when it comes. So I am glad to have the assurance of my distinguished friend from Nebraska. I shall watch with interest, after he has had time to study the resolution to see what it does, to note the direction his vote takes.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ARMY OFFICERS FROM RETIREMENT PROVISIONS BECAUSE OF AGE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, on February 3 I introduced a bill, now known as Senate bill 2123, to exempt certain officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force from the provisions of statutes requiring retirement by reason of age, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the contents of that bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the contents of the bill, together with an explanation of the bill, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the laws requiring retirement of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers because of age shall not apply to officers of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59). The President may, in his discretion, upon the request of the officer concerned, restore to the active list of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force any officer of the Regular Army or Regular Air Force on the retired list who was appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59).

SEC. 2. Officers appointed in the grade of General of the Army pursuant to the act of March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), shall not be counted within the limited number of officers authorized to be serving on active duty in grades above lieutenant general as provided in section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), unless they be serving as Chief of Staff or in command of any territorial or tactical subdivision of the Army or the Air Force.

EXPLANATION OF A LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL UNDER STUDY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to exempt our great Generals of the Army from the provisions of law requiring the retirement of Army officers because of age.

An act of this Congress, approved December 14, 1944 (58 Stat. 802), established in the Army the grade of General of the Army, and established in the Navy the grade of Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy. That act limited the number of officers to be appointed in such grades to four Generals of the Army and four Fleet Admirals of the Navy. The act was a wartime measure effective only until 6 months after the termination of the war.

Pursuant thereto, the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appointed to such grades the following great military leaders of this war with rank in the order listed: Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, Admiral King, General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, General Eisenhower, General Arnold, and Admiral Halsey.

By an act of this Congress approved March 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 59), the President was authorized to appoint to the permanent grade of General of the Army and Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy the officers who had served in these grades under the authority of the 1944 act, and pursuant thereto, the President of the United States appointed our Generals of the Army and Fleet Admirals of the Navy in these permanent grades. This 1946 act further provided that these officers would continue to receive the same pay and allowances authorized for these grades whether or not they were on active duty and whether or not they were on the active list or on the retired list.

The Congress has demonstrated its intent to provide equal treatment and the same rights, privileges, and benefits for the great Army and Navy officers appointed to these five-star grades. It develops, however, that there exists a difference in the laws applicable to generals of the Army and Fleet Admirals of the Navy with respect to mandatory retirement because of age. In the Army, the act of June 30, 1882 (10 U. S. C. 945), requires that all officers of the Army must be retired upon attaining the age of 64 years. On the other hand, in the Navy, the law required the retirement at age 64 of Navy officers "below the rank of vice admiral" and there was no law requiring retirement for age of Fleet Admirals of the Navy. This difference in the retirement laws applicable to the Army and the Navy insofar as they apply to five-star grades was not changed by the revision of Navy retirement laws contained in the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), which specified mandatory retirement for age of officers of the Regular Navy "serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral."

Fleet Admiral King and Fleet Admiral Nimitz have not applied for voluntary retirement. They remain on the active list, available for such special assignments as the President and the Secretary of the Navy may care to give them. Under the provisions of the acts that I have referred to, Admiral Leahy, who was then on the retired list, was appointed a Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy. He has not subsequently requested retirement, and he also continues to hold the status of an officer on the active list of the Navy. Admiral Halsey, however, is on the retired list, having been retired for physical disability.

In the Army, General MacArthur was an officer of the retired list of the Army, serving on active duty at the time of his appointment to the grade of General of the Army. The acts referred to above did not specify that he would be reappointed in that grade on the active list, and he continues to be an officer of the retired list of the Army serving on active duty. General Marshall was retired upon his application, shortly before his appointment as Secretary of State. General Arnold has been retired for physical disability. General Eisenhower is, of course, serving as Chief of Staff, but will shortly leave that position to serve as president of Columbia University.

It is the purpose of the bill which I am today introducing to provide comparable provisions of law with respect to our great military leaders of this war who hold permanent five-star rank. The bill would exempt generals of the Army now on the active list from provisions of law requiring mandatory retirement for age, and, in order to afford equal treatment to generals of the Army heretofore retired, would authorize the President, at the request of such officers, to have their names restored to the active list of the Army.

Since under the law fleet admirals of the Navy are not counted among the limited number authorized to be serving in grades above vice admiral, except when serving in the position of Chief of Naval Operations, this bill would also provide that generals of the Army shall not be counted among the limited number authorized to be serving in grades above lieutenant general unless serving as Chief of Staff of the Army or Air Force, or in command of a tactical or territorial subdivision of the Army or Air Force.

CELEBRATION OF FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM OF CUBA

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on Thursday last, February 5, on the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senate agreed to two concurrent resolutions. The first was Senate Concurrent Resolution 39, providing for a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives on Monday, April 19, 1948, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the victory over Spain. The second was Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, extending the life of the Joint Committee on the Observance and Celebration of the Victory Over Spain.

On the same day on which the Senate acted the House agreed to two concurrent resolutions identical in purpose, being, respectively, House Concurrent Resolution 139 and House Concurrent Resolution 140, which have just been transmitted to the Senate.

Neither House has agreed to the concurrent resolution originating in the other House, and it being necessary that the two Houses must act on the same measures in order for them to become effective, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 139.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 139, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives at 1 o'clock in the afternoon, on Monday, April 19, 1948.

That the joint committee created by House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, is empowered to make suitable arrangements for fitting and proper exercises for the joint session of Congress herein authorized.

That invitations to attend the exercises be extended to the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the diplomatic corps (through the Secretary of State), the General of the Armies, the Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and such other persons as the joint committee shall deem proper.

That the President of the United States is hereby invited to address the American people at the joint session of the Congress in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 140, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is amended by striking out the last sentence of section 2 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The committee shall cease to exist upon the expiration of 30 days after April 19, 1948."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I now ask for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 140.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the votes by which Senate Concurrent Resolutions 39 and 40 were agreed to? The Chair hears none, the votes are reconsidered, and the concurrent resolutions will be indefinitely postponed.

SECOND DECONTROL ACT OF 1947—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—(H. DOC. NO. 526)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1227.)

REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE (H. DOC. NO. 524)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1227.)

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 525)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1227.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished acting floor leader whether it is correct that there is an understanding that there will be no voting today.

Mr. IVES. That is the understanding of the floor leader, as to measures to which there are objections. The floor leader will ask for the consideration of the calendar very shortly, for action on bills to which there is no objection. If there is any objection there will be no voting.

Mr. LODGE. Then what will be the program after the calendar has been called?

Mr. IVES. The Senate is in recess, and it will presumably continue its consideration of the unfinished business, which is the measure relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate will then recess until Thursday. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. The floor leader is unable to answer that question. The floor leader understands, however, that the Senate is expected to recess until Thursday at the end of today's session.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have not been consulted with respect to the days on which the Senate shall sit. I think it would be better if the Senate should recess from today until Wednesday, and then from Wednesday until Friday, so as to give time to clean up the discussion of the subject which is before us. Thursday will be Lincoln's birthday. A number of Senators will be away from the Senate on that day making Lincoln Day speeches.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in order to clear up the matter, the acting floor leader would point out that it is his understanding that the recess over until Thursday will be purely a perfunctory matter, and since that day is Lincoln's birthday, the Senate will simply meet and recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Until the following Monday, as the Chair understands.

Mr. IVES. Until the following Monday.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. A most important point is involved in the matter of the days on which the Senate shall meet. A statutory requirement exists that a report from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, dealing with the subject of grain allocation, must be made to the Senate not later than this coming Friday. I take it the report could be formally presented at the short session on Thursday.

Mr. IVES. Yes.

Mr. FLANDERS. But it must be made on or before Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is correct; the report could be made on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the first moment I have heard that it is proposed that a call of the calendar be had today. Is it the intention of the majority to call the calendar from the beginning?

Mr. IVES. The intention is to request unanimous consent that the calendar be called from the point at which we left off at the last call of the calendar, and consider only those bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I am proposing that a change be made in the schedule of meetings of the Senate for this week and next. This change, if made, will depart from the program which previously has been announced.

If there is no serious objection, we would plan to meet on Wednesday and on Friday of this week, and then on Tuesday of next week. No business will be done this week, under the general agreement, except for further consideration of the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution; but apparently Senators who wish to speak will find it more convenient to speak on Wednesday than on Thursday, as I understand from the senior Senator from Wisconsin. So unless there is some substantial objection the Senate will meet on Wednesday and on Friday of this week, and then will go over until Tuesday of next week.

With regard to next week, it was announced that we would take up the Budget resolution and the rent-control bill; but I understand that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has made some agreement with the minority leader that those measures will not be taken up until the minority members have returned from their pilgrimages throughout the country. I hope we may still be able to start some of that business next week; but we shall keep whatever agreement has been made in that regard.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, early in today's session it was announced that the Senate would meet on Thursday and then go over until Monday. I understand now that a change has been made, and that the Senate is to sit on Wednesday and Friday, and next Tuesday.

Mr. TAFT. It is to sit next Tuesday.

Mr. LUCAS. May I count on this as being final?

Mr. TAFT. I understand it is final. The change is made at the earnest request of the Senator in charge of the measure before the Senate. We always like to comply with such requests, if possible.

Mr. LUCAS. I do hope the Senator from Ohio and other leaders on the majority side will remember that we on this side have been very lenient during the past week with the Republicans as they made their pilgrimages out over the country, and of course it is customary for the Democrats to follow. We hope no advantage will be taken of us while we are away, doing our duty as we see it.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator may be sure we shall not do anything against his wishes.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, sometime ago the acting majority leader [Mr. WHERRY] announced that it would be the policy of the Senate to consider each week on Monday at least that portion of the calendar which had not previously been considered. With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called, beginning with order number 903, on page 9 of the calendar, where the previous call of the calendar, on February 2, left off, and that only bills to which there is no objection be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with order number 903.

ANTONE G. PINA

The bill (H. R. 3168) for the relief of Antone G. Pina was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DONAT AND LAURA LAROCHE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 111) for the relief of Donat and Laura Laroche, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6,

after the words "the sum of," to strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donat and Laura Laroche, Lawrence, Mass., the sum of $2,500. Such sum represents compensation for the death of their minor child, Clement Laroche, who was fatally injured on July 30, 1940, at Berlin, N. H., when said child was struck by a National Youth Administration motor vehicle, while crossing Upper Main Street in said town of Berlin, N. H.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUGUST W. DIETZ

The bill (H. R. 1408) for the relief of August W. Dietz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELFREIDA SAKOWSKY PASSANT

The bill (H. R. 648) for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. DAISY PARK FARROW

The bill (H. R. 2350) for the relief of Mrs. Daisy Park Farrow was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUSTON JAMSETJI PATELL

The bill (H. R. 650) for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIYOKO PATELL

The bill (H. R. 928) for the relief of Riyoko Patell, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCESCO AND NATALIA PICCHI

The bill (H. R. 422) for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCISCO GAMBOA GIOCOECHEA

The bill (S. 511) for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding warrant and order of deportation, and bond, if any, issued pursuant to sections 13 and 14, of the Immigration Act of May 24, 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 213 and 214), in the case of Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea of Cascade, Idaho, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, the said Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such warrant and order have issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea, of Cascade, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 6, 1927, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

MARIA HEDWIG FERESZ

The bill (H. R. 1650) for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM DUDLEY WARD-SMITH—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The bill (H. R. 3088) for the relief of William Dudley Ward-Smith was announced as next in order.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I understand that this matter has been taken care of by other processes, and therefore I request that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MRS. AUDREY ELLEN GOOCH

The bill (H. R. 1078) for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECORDS OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The bill (H. R. 3778) to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSE MARIA GERARDO DE AMUSATEGUI AND RAMON DE AMUSATEGUI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1395) for the relief of Jose Maria Gerardo de Amusategui and Ramon de Amusategui, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause to be issued immigration visas to Jose Maria Gerardo de Amusategui and Ramon de Amusategui, at the earliest date on which numbers are available in the preference category of the immigration quota for nationals of the Philippine Islands; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit the said Jose Maria de Amusategui and Ramon de Amusategui to be admitted to the United States as preference-quota immigrants upon compliance with the applicable laws, not inconsistent with this act, relating to the admission of immigrants to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF RICHARD K. PHELPS, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, FROM THE OPERATION OF CERTAIN STATUTES

The bill (S. 1706) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases was announced as next in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Let the bill be temporarily passed over until I can have an opportunity to look at it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

Subsequently, at the conclusion of the call of the calendar,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will recur to Order No. 919, Senate bill 1706, which was temporarily passed over at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the explanation of this bill is a very simple one. Richard K. Phelps, special assistant to the Attorney General at Kansas City, has been appointed the prosecutor in connection with the so-called fraud cases, and is very well qualified for the position. He has had previous experience. All this bill does is to follow the provisions of other statutes which provide that any public official in the prosecutor's office may not practice his own profession outside his job, the customary provision made. That is the explanation of this particular bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Does this apply only to one individual?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the employment of Richard K. Phelps as an attorney or counselor specially employed, retained, or appointed by the Attorney General or under authority of the Department of Justice, at a compensation not to exceed the rate of $10,000 per annum, to conduct in the western district of Missouri, and in any other judicial district or districts where the jurisdiction thereof lies, any kind of legal proceeding, civil or criminal, including grand-jury proceedings and proceedings before committing magistrates, which district attorneys are authorized by law to conduct, in connection with alleged irregularities in the primary election in the Fourth and Fifth Congressional Districts of Missouri on August 6, 1946, shall not be construed to be employment within the meaning of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99).

BURNETT A. PYLE

The bill (S. 936) for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Burnett A. Pyle, of Bradford, Ark., the sum of $6,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him on June 29, 1945, as a result of being knocked to the ground and trampled by a team of mules which he was harnessing and which became frightened when three United States Army planes passed overhead at a very low altitude: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ESTATE OF JOHN F. HOPPERTON

The bill (H. R. 1788) for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL W. SUNDSTROM

The bill (S. 981) for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $92 to Carl W. Sundstrom, on account of money taken from his person and destroyed by prisoners on or about the 2d day of May 1946, during a riot at the United States penitentiary, Alcatraz, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a midemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ISSUANCE OF UNRESTRICTED DEEDS TO ALASKA NATIVES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3503) to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the bill is designed to speed up the process of granting full equality to Indians who are capable of shouldering their responsibility. It provides for granting unrestricted deeds to town-site properties now held by Alaska natives under restricted deeds in the case of any natives who are competent to manage their own affairs. As a safeguard against granting such deeds to incompetent individuals, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to determine the competency of all applicants.

As passed by the House, the bill would have required the Secretary to issue such deeds to any Alaskan natives who waived in writing any claim to future services from the Federal Government. The Senate committee believed that granting deeds on such a broad unrestricted basis might result in placing deeds in the hands of many incompetent individuals who would promptly sell their holdings and then become public charges. The proposed waiver of all claims to additional services would be of little value in the judgment of the committee, since such services chiefly along the lines of education and health must be given by some public agency anyway to those unable to pay.

There is no money involved. The bill is a further implementation of our general policy of advancing Indians and other natives to a status of full equality as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "representative", to strike out "(a)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "or", to strike out "(b) that any such native has renounced, in such written form as the Secretary shall prescribe, any claim to membership in any native tribe, band, or community and any claim to special services from the Federal Government by reason of his being an Alaska native."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of all Federal laws, treaties, orders, and regulations pertaining to Indian affairs, or to the natives of Alaska as such, any Alaska native who has filed a relinquishment as provided in the preceding section shall, thereafter, be considered a non-Indian and a nonnative, and shall be treated as removed from the operation of any restrictive provisions, special services, or other disabilities or privileges peculiarly applicable to Indians or natives of Alaska; and any person whose status as an Alaska native or Indian under Federal law has been so terminated shall not be eligible to reestablish such status for purposes of Federal surveillance or subsidy as an Alaska native or Indian, by reason of native blood, subsequent inheritance of restricted native lands, subsequent admission to membership in any native tribe, band, or community, or for any other reason.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska whether or not the bill was unanimously reported from the committee?

Mr. BUTLER. It was.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Secretary of the Interior favorable to the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND IN CHEVERLY, MD.

The bill (H. R. 4115) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SELECTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS OF NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1782) to provide for selection of superintendents of national cemeteries from meritorious and trustworthy male members of the armed forces who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "trustworthy" to strike out "male", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That superintendents of national cemeteries shall be selected from meritorious and trustworthy members of the armed forces who have been honorably separated from the service of the United States, and who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service.

SEC. 2. Section 4874, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 24, sec. 275), is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for selection of superintendents of national cemeteries from meritorious and trustworthy members of the armed forces who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1990) to provide a means for the orderly continuation and completion of the Deer Creek and aqueduct divisions of the Provo River project, Utah, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF THE CARIBOU NATIONAL FOREST IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1037) to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after "That", to insert "the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest are hereby extended to include the following-described lands and,"; on page 3, line 7, to strike out "7" and insert "17"; on page 7, line 22, to strike out the semicolon after the word "quarter", and insert a comma; on page 8, line 5, to strike out the semicolon after the figure "25" and insert a comma; on page 8, line 12, to strike out the semicolon after the figure "18" and insert a comma; and on the same page, line 22, to strike out the semicolon after the word "quarter" and insert a comma, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest are hereby extended to include the following-described lands and, subject to any valid existing claim or entry, all lands of the United States within the areas hereafter described are hereby added to and made part of the Caribou National Forest, State of Idaho, to be hereafter administered under the laws and regulations

relating to the national forests, and the provisions of the act approved March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, are hereby extended and made applicable to all other lands within said described areas:

BOISE MERIDIAN

Township 10 south, range 35 east, section 34, south half south half; section 35, south half south half; section 36, south half south half;

Township 10 south, range 36 east, section 31, lot 2, southeast quarter southwest quarter, and south half southeast quarter; section 32, south half south half;

Township 11 south, range 35 east, section 1, lot 4; section 2, lots 1, 2, 3, 4; section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, west half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 9, lot 1, southeast quarter northeast quarter, and east half southeast quarter; section 10; section 15; section 19, south half northeast quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 20, lots 2, 3, southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 21; section 22; section 23, west half; section 27; section 28, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 29, east half; section 32, northeast quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 33, north half, and north half south half; section 34, north half, southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter;

Township 11 south, range 36 east, section 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 8, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, west half northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, west half southeast quarter, and east half southwest quarter; section 17, east half, and east half northwest quarter; section 20, east half; section 21, west half; section 28, west half; section 29, east half; section 32, east half; and section 33;

Township 12 south, range 35 east, section 1, southwest quarter; section 2, south half; section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and south half; section 11, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, north half northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter; section 12, north half northwest quarter; section 14, north half northwest quarter; section 15, northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter, and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 21, east half northeast quarter, and east half southeast quarter; section 22, north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, and west half southwest quarter; section 28, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, east half northeast quarter, and northwest quarter southeast quarter; section 33, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter;

Township 12 south, range 36 east, section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and southwest quarter; section 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 9; section 10, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, west half northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter, and west half; section 15; section 16, east half; section 21, east half; section 22; section 25; section 26, northeast quarter; section 28, east half; section 33, northeast quarter; section 34, southwest quarter; and section 36;

Township 12 south, range 37 east, section 23; section 24; section 25, east half northeast quarter, and northwest quarter northwest quarter; section 26; section 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, east half northwest quarter, northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 32, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 north half southeast quarter, and northeast quarter southwest quarter; section 33, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 34, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter;

Township 12 south, range 38 east, section 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter; and section 31, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter;

Township 13 south, range 35 east, section 4, lot 3, southeast quarter northwest quarter east half southwest quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 9, east half northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 13, southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 14, south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, and south half; section 15, south half; section 16, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; and section 24, southeast quarter; and section 25, northeast quarter;

Township 13 south, range 36 east, section 1, lots 1, 2, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 3, lots 3, 4, 7, south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter, and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 10, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and west half northeast quarter; section 12, east half; section 13, north half northeast quarter; section 15, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, and west half northeast quarter; section 21, southeast quarter; section 22, lots 1, 2, and west half northeast quarter; section 28, northeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 29, south half; section 30, lots 3, 4, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 32, north half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter northeast quarter; and section 33, northwest quarter, and west half northeast quarter;

Township 13 south, range 37 east, section 7, lots 5, 6, 7, 8, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 18, lots 1, 2, east half northwest quarter, and east half; section 19, east half northeast quarter; section 20, southwest quarter southwest quarter; section 29, west half northwest quarter, and west half southwest quarter; section 32, north half, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; section 33, south half southwest quarter;

Township 13 south, range 38 east, section 6, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 7, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 18, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 19, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 30, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; and section 32;

Township 14 south, range 36 east, section 11, west half northeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 12, north half; section 14, west half, west half northeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 26, west half southwest quarter, and southwest quarter northwest quarter; section 35, east half;

Township 14 south, range 37 east, section 4, lots 3, 4; section 9, east half; section 10, west half; section 14, west half northwest quarter, and west half southwest quarter; section 15; section 16, northeast quarter, north half southeast quarter, and southeast quarter southeast quarter; section 20, west half, west half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 21, south half, and east half northeast quarter; section 22, northwest quarter, and north half northeast quarter; section 26, south half, south half northwest quarter, and south half northeast quarter; section 34; and section 35.

Township 14 south, range 38 east, section 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, southeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter; section 8; section 17; section 20; section 28, south half; section 29; section 32; and section 33;

Township 15 south, range 36 east, section 2, lots 1, 2, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 11, east half; section 14, east half; section 23, east half; section 24, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, each half southwest quarter, and east half; section 25, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, east half northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, and east half; section 26, east half; section 35, east half; section 36, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, east half northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, northeast quarter, and north half southeast quarter;

Township 15 south, range 37 east, section 3, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and south half; section 9; section 10; section 14; section 15; section 16; section 21; section 22; section 23; section 25, west half, west half northeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter; section 26; section 27; and section 35;

Township 15 south, range 38 east, section 4, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and south half; section 5, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, and south half; section 8; section 9; section 16; section 17; section 18, east half southeast quarter; section 19, east half northeast quarter, east half southeast quarter, and southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 20, north half, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; and section 21, north half;

Township 16 south, range 36 east, section 2, lots 1, 2, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter; section 12; section 13; section 24, east half; and section 25, east half;

Township 16 south, range 37 east, section 2 section 11; section 14; section 15, south half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, southeast quarter, and east half southwest quarter; section 22, east half, east half northwest quarter, and east half southwest quarter; section 23; section 26, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, north half, north half southwest quarter, and north half southeast quarter; and section 27, lots 1, 2, 3, northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND FOR THE USE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

The bill (S. 1583) to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, a tract of land in Prince Georges County, Md., described as follows: Beginning at the stone monument that marks the corner formed by the intersection of boundary lines of the lands now or formerly owned by John and Rachel Kelley (liber S. D. H. 332,

folio 113); Sam and —— Buckley (liber 47, folio 325); Charles E., Harry W., James E. and Mary E. McNamee; and the University of Maryland (Maryland Agricultural College, liber C. S. M. 2, folio 294); near College Park, Prince Georges County, Md., and running thence with the line formerly owned by McNamee on the one side and the Bureau of Mines on the other side, south forty degrees forty-seven minutes, four seconds west nine hundred and thirty-nine and forty-six one-hundredths feet to an iron pipe marking what was formerly the Engle-McNamee corner (being part of the north forty-four degrees east two hundred and sixty-two and twenty twenty-fifths perches line of Maryland Agricultural College, liber C. S. M. 2, folio 294); thence north eighty-nine degrees thirty minutes no seconds east until it intersects the east line of the Bureau of Mines property seven hundred and one and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet; thence north no degrees thirty minutes west six hundred and sixty-six and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron pipe marking the northeast corner of the Bureau of Mines property; thence north sixty-four degrees forty-five minutes twenty-four seconds west ninety-one and seven one-hundredths feet along the University of Maryland (formerly Keiley) line to the point of beginning and containing six and three thousand one hundred and forty-eight ten-one-thousandths acres.

CIVILIAN ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOLS CONDUCTED BY THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1801) to authorize attendance of civilians at schools conducted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and joint service schools, and for other purposes, which had been reported by the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill has to do with allowing civilians to attend service schools. Since the approval of the bill by our committee the Secretary of the Treasury has requested that the Coast Guard come in under the bill. I therefore present an amendment to the bill which I should like to have considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none. The clerk will first report the committee amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 4, to insert, after the word "civilians", the words "who are citizens of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 6, after the parenthesis, to insert ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 per annum may be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes under the authority of this act."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota offers an amendment to the amendment, which the clerk will report.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the words "Secretary of Defense", it is proposed to insert ", and not to exceed $1,000 per annum may be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota offers two amendments to the bill, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, at the end of the first sentence, in line 8, to insert a new sentence, as follows: "The Secretary of the Treasury, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to permit civilians, who are citizens of the United States, including civilian employees of the Federal Government, to attend all schools operated by the Coast Guard"; and on page 2, line 13, after the word "Establishment", it is proposed to insert the words "or to the Coast Guard."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from South Dakota as to the purpose of the bill?

Mr. GURNEY. It is to provide a means whereby outstanding civilian leaders in civic, business, and professional fields may attend service schools of the armed services, and, as a result, be able to render valuable service in the event of another emergency.

Mr. CONNALLY. It includes the Army, Navy, and Air Force?

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; and, with this amendment, the Coast Guard.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there any compensation to be paid?

Mr. GURNEY. The attendants will receive travel expenses plus the per diem allowed government employees at the time of attendance. The total expenditure is limited to $50,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Per annum?

Mr. GURNEY. The committee fixed a limitation of $50,000 per annum.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is, for the first year?

Mr. GURNEY. That continues per annum.

Mr. CONNALLY. The second year will it be $100,000?

Mr. GURNEY. Not without further authorization.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is there a limitation on persons who can attend the schools?

Mr. GURNEY. The number is limited by the amount of money. It is $24,500 per annum for 100 civilian students whom the Army may select. The cost to the Air Force would be $16,450. The Navy Department has another limitation which I do not have before me at the moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Defense, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to permit civilians, who are citizens of the United States, including civilian employees of the Federal Government, to attend all schools operated by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, including Joint-Service schools. The Secretary of the Treasury, under such regulations as he may prescribe, is authorized to permit civilians, who are citizens of the United States, including civilian employees of the Federal Government, to attend all schools operated by the Coast Guard. Civilians authorized to attend such schools shall be entitled to receive traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence, including per diem in lieu of subsistence while in attendance at such schools, in accordance with Standardized Government Travel Regulations, the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821-833), and the act of February 14, 1931, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73a): *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 per annum may be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense and not to exceed $1,000 per annum may be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, for such purposes under the authority of this act. The schools' equipment, billets, and messing facilities may be used for training of, and providing housing and subsistence for, such civilians while attending such schools. Appropriations available to the National Military Establishment or to the Coast Guard may be used for carrying into effect the purposes of this act.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING INQUIRIES IN CONNECTION WITH DISBURSEMENTS BY OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

The bill (S. 1795) to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874 (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174), is hereby repealed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the calendar.

THE PROVO RIVER PROJECT, UTAH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of Calendar 926, Senate bill 1990, to which the acting minority leader objected a while ago. I do not have the figures here at the moment, but I expect to have them shortly. I can explain the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. The author of the bill, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is here.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know whether he has the figures in mind.

Mr. LUCAS. Does either of the Senators know what the figures are?

Mr. BUTLER. I know what they are, but I should much prefer to have the Senator from Utah explain the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield for that purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection, if it will not take long.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sure it will not take over 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Utah for the purpose of explaining the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. I have in mind the general purpose of the bill, but I did not know I would be asked a lot of questions involving figures.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is the committee amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 111, the St. Lawrence Seaway joint resolution. The Senator from Vermont has the floor and has yielded to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to permit the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to explain the bill with a 5-minute limitation. However, if his explanation is not sufficient to satisfy the Senators who are present today, I should prefer not to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is in control of his own destiny.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator for the 5-minute period to which he would have been entitled.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I cannot state in advance whether my explanation will be satisfactory. The bill is to authorize, in effect, an extension of contracts relating to the Deer Creek and aqueduct divisions of the Provo River project so that construction can be completed in accordance with the general principles of our reclamation laws. The project was started in 1936. It is partially completed. It will furnish a supplemental water supply for a large section in central Utah.

The Bureau of Reclamation has contracts with the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City and other cities in connection with this storage project. A little over a year ago the people who are to repay the cost of the construction of the project signed supplemental contracts increasing by 50 percent their guaranty and their liability. At that time it was felt by the Bureau that costs had advanced about 50 percent, and the project could be finished within that guaranty. But since that time prices have gone up tremendously, to the point that now the contemplated cost has been far exceeded. But the legal liability, under the laws of Utah, of the various entities which have signed the contracts, cannot be expanded any further.

The present proposal is to permit the United States, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to rent water to these subscribers for a period of time, at a rate sufficient to take care of the additional cost. After the additional cost has been paid, the subscribers—the water users—will immediately begin the repayment of the construction cost, under their contracts, and will go right on with the payments under the repayment contracts. The project is about two-thirds completed; but the situation which has developed, due to advancing prices, makes it necessary to proceed in the way now proposed.

The proposal has the unanimous approval of all who are connected with it—the Bureau of Reclamation, the Provo River Water Users' Association, the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, and the Senate committees which heard the testimony as to the details.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How much will this proposal cost the Department of the Interior?

Mr. WATKINS. It will not cost the Interior Department anything. The cost will come to the people who are to pay for it, and all of it will be repaid. All the water users are able to repay. They are not asking for any deductions.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand it is a self-liquidating project. But are they not requesting money at this time?

Mr. WATKINS. No money is requested in this bill. It may be necessary to have additional appropriations in order to finish the project so that the repayments can begin.

I may say to the Senator that under the contract between the Bureau of Reclamation and these water users, the project is not turned over to them until it is finished. The repayments start when the project is finished and is turned over to the people who have signed the repayment contracts. Of course, if the Bureau cannot finish the project, it cannot be turned over to the users, and they cannot in good conscience be asked to begin to repay until the time when the project is turned over to them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. On page 2 of the report, the second paragraph states, in part:

> At current price levels, which, unfortunately, have continued to rise above the 1946 price levels, it is estimated that the total cost of constructing the Deer Creek division of the project will be $12,300,000. This is $900,000 in excess of the repayment contract obligation of the Provo River Water Users' Association.

I raise the point, who is going to pay the $900,000?

Mr WATKINS. The money will be advanced by the United States, as is done in the case of all these reclamation projects; but it will be repaid by the water users, the Provo River Water Users' Association and the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City.

Mr. LUCAS. If this bill shall be passed, the $900,000 will be advanced at the present time by the Interior Department, under the theory that as soon as the water users begin to pay the money into the Treasury from that district, the $900,000 will be repaid to the Interior Department in Washington; is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. It will be paid in annual rentals. The Interior Department will have the right to negotiate contracts with those who are to rent.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it that the $900,000 is not included in the President's budget.

Mr. WATKINS. No; it is not.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is the Senator from Utah applying to this project the same principle that is applied to the St. Lawrence seaway project; namely, to have the users pay for it?

Mr. WATKINS. That is done in the case of all these projects; but this is one of the few projects in the United States where, when prices advance, the users are willing to undertake additional liability—in this case increasing by 50 percent their guarantee of liability—in order to take care of the 50-percent increase in prices. Of course the project is not yet finished; but in order to get it finished and supply water to a State where there can be severe droughts, with terrific consequences to the people, we found it necessary to make this provision. The rental contracts will take care of the increased costs.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Utah sure that the project will be self-liquidating? I have been asked that question so many times with regard to the St. Lawrence seaway project that I wonder whether we should ask particularly about the self-liquidating feature in regard to other projects.

Mr. WATKINS. This project has back of it the Provo River Water Users' Association, the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, and the water users of the large district involved.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not questioning it myself, but I should like to have the self-liquidation provisions pointed out. I think studies should be made in the reclamation field, so as to make sure about the self-liquidation features. However, I shall not object to this project.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask the Senator about the financial condition of the district. Is it now in default?

Mr. WATKINS. No; it is not in default. It has credit on the books, although the payments have not yet started.

Mr. CONNALLY. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. And they will not be in default. This is one project which will pay out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1990) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That in order to provide a means for the orderly continuation and completion of the Deer Creek and aqueduct divisions of the Provo River project, Utah, and for the recovery by the United States of the actual construction cost thereof, the Secretary of the Interior in proceeding with the construction, completion, and administration of said divisions heretofore authorized, subject to the execution of such contracts as the Secretary may deem necessary to maintain existing repayment contracts between the United States, the Provo River Water Users Association and the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City consistent with the interim construction cost recovery plan herein provided, is authorized (a) to deliver water or make project works available therefor, as the case may

be, on terms and at annual rates or other annual charges to be fixed by the Secretary from year to year, calculated to return to the United States (in addition to the cost of operation and maintenance) the actual cost in excess of existing repayment contract liability that may be incurred by the United States in completing said divisions of the Provo River project; and (b) to postpone the commencement of annual construction charge installments under existing repayment contracts: *Provided*, That any such postponement of annual construction charge installments shall in no event operate to delay the commencement of construction charges, as provided by existing repayment contracts, beyond the time when costs that may be incurred by the United States in excess of existing contract liability have been returned to the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representative, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41) relative to the expenses of a delegation to attend the ceremonies in Habana, Cuba, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine*.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall now discuss the St. Lawrence seaway.

Probably it would be superfluous to state the great, impelling reasons why the project should be completed without delay. Nevertheless, I should like to refresh the memory of my colleagues who are present, while they are present, in one respect.

I think it is a well-known fact that there is a great shortage of power in the United States today, not only in the Northeast, where the St. Lawrence power would be generally used, but also on the Pacific coast we hear of brown-outs; we read of plants closing down in the Mississippi Valley because of shortage of power, and this shortage is growing more acute almost by the hour.

At the end of the war, at the height of the use of power for war purposes, as a nation we were using at the rate of 240,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. On the first of this year we were using at the rate of 300,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, showing an increase of 25 percent in the use of power since VJ-day.

St. Lawrence power is the largest single block of undeveloped power available in North America today. As has been stated, the total development would amount to 2,200,000 horsepower, which is so firm that it would produce 13,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, according to our engineers. Half of this power would belong to Canada; half to the United States. The half that would belong to the United States would be turned over to the State of New York when an agreement has been reached between the Federal Government and the State of New York relating to the distribution of the St. Lawrence power. Such agreement, under the pending joint resolution, would have to protect the rights of the United States and of the several States within economic transmission distances of the proposed power station at Massena, N. Y.

I should now like to show the desperate need of the northeastern part of our country for power. I have already cited instances of how in Vermont plants have had to close during the day and could operate only at night; how we were asked not to use colored lights on the Christmas trees for the children; how a private power company had shut off over 2,000 members of the Washington REA in Vermont, forcing them to rely for power on inadequate Diesel equipment at high cost. I have learned recently that the REA has been able to carry the load. At first the power company asked them to take over the load under a penalty clause in the contract which was signed with them, from 8 a. m. to 4 p. m. The REA had no difficulty in carrying the load during those hours of the day. Then the power company told them that under the terms of the contract they would have to assume the load from 3 p. m. until 11 p. m., which is the time of day when the peak of farm use is highest and when the use for industry usually starts to taper off. The REA has been able to carry this load up to the present time, as I stated. It is costing the REA 3 cents or possibly as high as 4 cents per kilowatt-hour to generate that power for those 2,000 farms up there. I cannot help but feel that the power company is taking advantage of the present situation to discredit the REA as an organization.

I am advised by the REA locally that it is not only shortage of power that is bothering them today but it is shortage of materials needed for line construction.

Until recently it was thought that steel was the bottleneck. Now it develops that aluminum for making conductors is the bottleneck. The reason for this is that the aluminum manufacturers are short of power. Last summer the aluminum manufacturers in the TVA area released some TVA power and relied on their own power. Now the aluminum company is so short of power that it cannot maintain its production schedule. So the evidence continues to pile up to show that private industry cannot supply the power that is needed in these United States of ours, and, moreover, has been shortsighted in this power program.

One might think that the power shortage would be alleviated by the large number of storms which we have had this winter, by the large amount of snow which has fallen. Snow melts and produces water even in the coldest weather, because it melts near the ground. We expect that when the spring floods come we will have power enough in the Northeast for 3 or 4 months. But let me again remind the Senate of what the situation is today in my own State of Vermont. I have before me clippings from newspapers which I received last Saturday. The newspapers were printed on different days last week, but I received them all on Saturday. I should like to read some headings for the record. I read a heading from the St. Johnsbury Caledonian-Record:

New power crisis puts water plants back on night work.

They cannot operate days because there is not power enough.

I read from the St. Albans Messenger of February 5, 1948:

Area power crisis closes six industries. Grain, carbon plants, Rubberoid, Fonda, C. V. Shops, Missisquoi hit.

The article says:

Six industries in St. Albans and all sawmills in the county have been forced to curtail operations or shut down completely because of the critical power shortage, A. W. Peterson, superintendent of the Public Electric Light Co., has announced.

Sawmills that would be getting out building materials with which to build more homes for people in the United States are having to shut down. The article continues:

The industries of the city most affected by the curtailment or the order were St. Albans Grain Co., shut down yesterday—

That is owned by the Corn Products Corp.—

National Carbon and Fonda Container, shut down today; Rubberoid, Saturday and Sunday; Central Vermont Railroad Shops, Friday; and Missisquoi Corp., Monday.

In addition to not receiving any power on these days the six industries will not receive any power over the week end, Saturday and Sunday. Two sawmills and the talc mine at Johnson served by Public Electric suspended operations this morning and no date was given when operations would be resumed.

These six large plants, and all those sawmills that are shut down are located not so far from the site of the proposed development on the St. Lawrence River.

I read from the St. Johnsbury Caledonian of January 31, 1948. The heading is as follows:

Generators may lose oil for power making.

The people up there, in an effort to keep their small industries in operation, have acquired very small, antiquated and obsolete Diesel plants wherever they can find them in the United States, some of them being shipped in from distances up to 1,000 miles or more. They produce high-cost power at best. And the worst of it is that they cannot get oil with which to operate. Some 800,000 gallons of oil have been borrowed from the Navy. It must be returned this spring.

I read from the Newport Express of January 30, 1948. The heading is as follows:

Power situation reported blacker. Burlington plant faces complete shut-down because of lack of oil. Connecting utilities are unable to supply power for Newport lines.

I have here the Montpelier Evening Argus:

Electric generation in northern Vermont down.

That is all the article says. They represent the voice of the power companies and usually go easy on them.

Mr. President, that is the situation we are in today. I cannot understand how people in other parts of this country of ours whom we have helped to obtain

power for their own industries, for their own homes and their own farms, can take the position which some of them do in opposing the development of power for us up in the Northeast. The power companies are making a very unwise, desperate, and costly effort partially to meet the need. They are seeking to put dams across our rivers, flooding the best class I land we have in New England. In one case they propose to destroy over 5,000 acres of class I land to generate 14 million kilowatt-hours of power annually.

We have reached the point, Mr. President, where we cannot afford to destroy some of the highest rated land in the United States and make high-cost power, and let billions of kilowatt-hours run down the St. Lawrence River idly and be wasted.

The reason for this tremendous increase in the use of power is probably known to every Member of the Senate. We have become a Nation of electrified industries. We have built up great chemical industries which use enormous amounts of power. We have built up steel and magnesium and aluminum industries. Aluminum and magnesium must have huge amounts of power—I believe 7 kilowatt-hours to every pound of aluminum. The steel industry has become so electrified that it is the second largest user in the United States today.

Further than that, our factories which wish to continue doing business in a competitive world have to electrify. During the war they could continue on an inefficient basis, but that time is over. They will have to become efficient or go out of business.

Our homes have become electrified. It is true that if the housewife were to do away with her washing machine, her refrigerator, her electric sewing machine, electric fans, and all those things which make life worth living, a huge amount of power could be saved.

Our farms need more and more power to run the ensilage cutters, to saw the wood, to operate the milkers and the milk coolers. We are obliged to cool our milk before 9 o'clock in the morning now, under the board of health rules of Boston and New York. The milk cannot be cooled with ice. It is necessary to use electric coolers.

The many freezers installed on the farms and in communities use a great amount of electricity, and save huge amounts of food for our country and for the world.

I could go on and on enumerating the things that electricity is used for now that it was not used for a few years ago. It has become a vital necessity in our agricultural, domestic, industrial, and professional life.

We need the St. Lawrence seaway for purposes of navigation. I have sat in this Chamber during the debate on this subject and have heard opponents of the seaway argue against it because the project called for only a 27-foot depth in the channel. Why do they argue for huge amounts to be spent on the lower Mississippi on a 12-foot channel? I cannot understand it.

I am for navigation in all parts of the country; but the opponents are not consistent when they say that a 27-foot channel on the St. Lawrence will not be adequate, and at the same time say that we must finish a 12-foot channel in the Mississippi so that grain may be moved down the river. I am for Mississippi River navigation, with two reservations: First, that the Mississippi-Missouri system must not be developed and controlled so as to yield profit to only a few individuals. It should be developed for all the people. Secondly, I believe that the great agricultural regions of Montana, the Dakotas, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, and other States should have first call on the water for their crops. What is left may well be used for power and for navigation.

I am afraid—in fact, I know—that the opposition centered in the immensely wealthy city of New York and vicinity is attempting the old tactics of divide and conquer, when they spread the news all over the Missouri Basin that that system cannot be developed if the St. Lawrence seaway goes through, that we cannot afford to develop both projects. They know better than that. They know that the St. Lawrence development is a self-liquidating development, that it will pay for itself, and is required to pay for itself, whereas we must make direct appropriations—and up to this time have been glad to do so—for the construction of dams in the Mississippi-Missouri Valley Basin.

I should like to say to my friends in the Missouri Valley Basin that those people in New York are simply trying to divide us and put us in the Northeast in the position where we will vote against developments for the Northwest. It is the old divide-and-conquer tactics. The New York opposition is just as much against developing the Missouri Valley Basin for the benefit of the people as it is against developing the St. Lawrence River for the benefit of the people. The fight we are having on the St. Lawrence is not merely a fight for the people of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, New England, and New York. It is a fight which concerns every part of the country. It is a fight which particularly concerns the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Southwest Power Authority, and the people of the Northwest, because just as sure as the opposition can get the St. Lawrence development down where it wants it, the opposition will proceed with the same tactics against the Tennessee Valley Authority, the REA, and public power wherever it may be found.

We need the St. Lawrence seaway for national security reasons. That has been told us by those who are in the best position to know—General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, and Admiral Leahy, the Joint Chiefs of Staff of a year ago. They know better than do retired generals and admirals what this country needs in the way of security today. Speaking of security, we need a strong Canada. Why is it that those who voted to spend half a billion dollars in Greece and Turkey, a long way from home, oppose spending that amount or less to develop the St. Lawrence? They are not consistent.

I have sat in this Chamber during the past 2 weeks and have heard several Senators give what they seemed to think were adequate reasons for not authorizing the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. In my opinion, none of the arguments which have been advanced by the opposition is valid in the slightest degree.

The arguments have all closely followed the minority views of certain members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Nine members of the Committee on Foreign Relations voted last summer to report the joint resolution favorably. They had heard, over the past 2 years, the proponents and opponents of this development present their cases; and after they had listened to the presentations for and against the seaway, they voted 9 to 4 to recommend its approval.

The committee agreed then not to report it officially to the Senate, however, until the beginning of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, in compliance with the request of the opposing members of the committee, so that they would have time—more than 5 months, in fact—to prepare a minority report.

I may say at the outset that this minority report is a masterful writing job; it shows a high degree of literary skill, and I would say that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who are opposed to the pending legislation have presented the most favorable views they possibly could have presented for their side of the case.

But, Mr. President, for all of the skill in phraseology, for all the masterful technique employed, for all the new-look this material may, in the eyes of the layman, appear to have, it is still by and large the same old story which we have heard for 20 years.

There is one common theme that runs through this report, just as this theme has permeated the other reports in opposition to the St. Lawrence project. The underlying dominant theme still is delay—and more delay.

In all modesty, I may say that I have been intimately associated with the St. Lawrence project during the entire time I have been in Washington. In the course of these years I have had an opportunity to observe rather carefully the techniques, the methods, and procedures of those who have been and are the real opponents of the project. Without exception, they have all stressed this same theme of delay. For 20 years now, as soon as one study has been made the opposition has suggested that additional studies were needed.

Let them present on the floor of the Senate some project in which the opponents of the seaway are interested. When asked about the details of the project, the chances are 100 to 1 that all of them will not know what they are. Additional study is just what the opposition members of the Senate Foreign Relations Commitee have recommended in the present case.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that this is part and parcel of the philosophy of the railroads and the power companies—the recognized leaders of the opposition to this project.

DIVINE-RIGHT PHILOSOPHY OF RAILROADS

Since the early days of the railroads, from the time they were given grants of

land for the development of our transportation system, they have pursued a divine-right philosophy—that railroads should be the lords and high priests of transportation.

They have waged ceaseless warfare against all competition on land, water, and in the air. They oppose the development of our airports. They oppose appropriating money even for our trunkline highways; and they oppose all waterways, or any form of transportation which they cannot control. Moreover, Mr. President, they have been slow—even criminally slow—in keeping abreast of modern developments in the transportation field. A quarter of a century after radio became available, trains are still plowing into each other and killing people because they do not have ample signal facilities.

For a long time livestock got better service in transcontinental transportation than did human beings. They still get it on some roads.

Finally, when one railroad executive—not under the thumb of the railroad financial barons of Wall Street—tried to bring about equality of opportunity for people it took a major advertising campaign, comparing hogs with humans, to stir the other railroads out of their deep-seated lethargy.

Basically, Mr. President, the railroads are opposed to the St. Lawrence project for the simple reason that this seaway will provide a measure, and only a measure, of competition for the eastern railroads.

UTILITIES FEAR LOW-COST POWER

As for the power companies, their opposition—however veiled or camouflaged it may be—also stems from the fear of competition, and even more basically from the fear of low-cost power.

Ever since this project has been under consideration the power companies have said that the project was not needed because the power companies could meet the needs for electricity.

This point was repeatedly emphasized in 1941, when hearings were held before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, and yet we all know that there were shortages of energy during the war. In the northeastern part of the United States, within almost a stone's throw of the St. Lawrence seaway, it was impossible adequately to expand war production because of shortage of power.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Vermont, but I desire to ask him if he has had any communication showing if there is anything in the record indicating that the power companies are opposed to the power project.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. The Rochester Gas & Electric Co. has issued material opposing it. I have received a letter from the president of one of the prominent power companies of New England stating that if we would agree to let them have all the power at the bus bar, not giving any of it to the REA or the municipal plants, the president would withdraw his opposition to it and get behind it and push it.

Mr. IVES. My reason for raising the question is that I have received no objection from any such source.

Mr. AIKEN. The power companies are very clever. As the Senator knows, they have interlocking directorates with the railroads and other interests, and they use those interests as a front. The Rochester Gas & Electric Co., however, has come out into the open. It has issued a pamphlet.

Mr. IVES. I did not receive it.

Mr. AIKEN. Probably too many of them were placed in circulation, and the distribution was stopped. The power companies do not want to take the lead in this opposition, but their representatives are actively opposing the project. I know them by name.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to point out that I have been given to understand that the power companies are very much in favor of the power development. The Senator's statement was rather surprising to me. I did not quite comprehend it.

Mr. AIKEN. I think they are on record as opposing it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that they are opposed to having it developed as public power. In accordance with a letter which I received from the president of one of the largest New England power companies, they would support it if they could be assured that the power would all be turned over to them, to which I, for one, cannot agree. I think the power belongs to the people. I realize that 90 percent of it would be distributed to existing power lines, but I realize, too, that development of the St. Lawrence seaway would result in a general reduction of rates throughout the Northeast, which is the highest-rate area in the country today.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to express a few thoughts in relation to two subjects upon which the Senator has commented.

Several years ago, according to my recollection, there was a great concerted effort by the power companies built upon fear. We had the same problem on the Pacific coast. Since then four of the greatest power companies on the Pacific coast have come into line and have recognized that no matter how we look at the problem, it is national suicide to waste energy. On the Pacific coast it was found that development in a national way did not deprive the power companies of their economic investment.

I am one who has always taken the position that it is not the business of government to sabotage the private investor. As I read the record which developed in the hearings it is plain that there was no intention that if this power be developed on the St. Lawrence River it will or can ultimate in a loss to the private investor. But that does not mean that the private investor can expect to get his uppings, so to speak, from public investment. It means that at long last there is common sense in the picture and that creating wealth does not necessitate destruction of wealth. The private investor who has built up his fortune, put his money into private stocks, and had to pay a large amount of money for flowage rights and taxes, of course, cannot compete with the public, as in the case of the TVA, where they are paying nothing for public money. But the Government did very well by the private investor. He got his money back and received a good return. The result has been that that whole section of the country has been made economically healthy because of that kind of cooperation.

Mr. President, I am for that. I am not for taking away from private industries, most of whom are widows and institutions, that which by saving they have built up, but at the same time I cannot justify the economic waste of great resources, especially when New England, New York, and other sections of the country are hungering for electric power, the great Middle West is looking for an outlet to the sea, and the world is looking for our wheat. There is a chance for men of vision and judgment to get together and build our strength and our wealth.

I should like to comment on one other matter. I agree fully with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that the defendants, as I would call the opposition in this case, have been very clever. They have followed the old doctrine that Hitler and others followed—divide and conquer. It will be remembered, Mr. President, that there was placed in the RECORD this morning a speech made by the Governor of Nebraska who wants the Missouri River project developed. The distinguished Senator has brought out how nicely they are dividing those who want to see this country develop its resources. I should like to put into the RECORD the facts as to what it will cost, as compared with the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway. The total estimate is $1,400,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. That was the early estimate, however. According to the increases in cost, there will probably be a 60-percent increase.

Mr. WILEY. There probably will be. It is expected that only $814,000,000 of that estimate will be repaid by water power. To date there has been $350,000,000 authorized to the Army engineers and $350,000,000 authorized to the Department of the Interior. The estimated expenditures to date are $54,880,000. That is for the fiscal year. That would leave $586,000,000, with no reimbursement on that plan, yet that amount has been authorized, Mr. President. We are asking for authorization in a case in which we are demonstrating beyond any question that the power will pay itself out because there is a market for it. The project will develop 2,200,000 horsepower. The record shows that the so-called opposition—the defendants—admit a minimum return of $15,000,000 on the other project, and that, of course, is short of what is necessary to pay out. But I say again, as I have said many times, admitting that there is a possibility of $15,000,000 yearly income—and we claim there is at least $17,000,000 to $21,000,000

income—we have a shortage of electricity in the East. By the construction of this project we shall have put into the 40,000 or 50,000 farmers of New England an incentive to continue farming. We shall have opened up this great river and built a fourth seacoast for America. We shall have given encouragement to 50,000,000 people who live in that valley. There is a difference of between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000 estimated income in the return from this project when and if it is constructed.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I am not willing to sell America short. If we have a tonnage on the Great Lakes that is three-fourths as large as the total tonnage of the Atlantic and the Pacific combined, what will it be when we have opened up this artery and generated liquid coal for New England?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I am a little curious as to whether the plan of this power development is to bypass New York State.

Mr. WILEY. I did not get the Senator's question.

Mr. IVES. Is New York to get any of the power about which the Senator has been speaking? He has been speaking about New England.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is any plan to bypass New York State I am not aware of it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I heard the distinguished Senator a few days ago tell us about the income which New York paid and what tremendous wealth it has. I do not think there is any chance in the world of ever bypassing any New Yorker, so far as I have seen.

Mr. IVES. I think not.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. In line with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Vermont I gather that what he is planning is not to use existing transmission lines. Or is he planning to use them? Which is it?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe existing transmission lines should be used as far as possible. In fact, I have always thought that high-tension lines should be declared common carriers.

Mr. IVES. The Senator expects to have this done under the Federal Government or the State of New York without having anything to do with existing utility companies which own the present lines of transmission almost entirely.

Mr. AIKEN. If the power is developed in huge quantity, some way will be adequately worked out to distribute it. I understand that between 80 and 90 percent will probably be sold and distributed through existing utilities, and that the balance will be sold to municipal and cooperative lines. But there has been no difficulty in finding means of distributing power in other regions where huge blocks of power have become available.

I say to the Senator from New York that with a great development of this kind, even if no power were ever to leave the State of New York, I would still be in favor of the project because it would be contributing immensely to the wealth of the country. Of course, I think it would be much better, and I want to see other States get some of the power. And the joint resolution before us requires that the rights of the United States and the other States be protected, inasmuch as the project is being constructed with Federal funds. The other day it was agreed that the State of New York will save at least $100,000,000 as a result of the construction of the seaway along with the power project.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Vermont will recall the statement I made on this matter the other day. At that time I pointed out that based on the primary power which will be developed from this source, which will amount to approximately 764,000 horsepower, New York will very likely need all of it or could use all of it. Of course we would not wish to be selfish about it, although I think it very likely that all that power would be needed in New York State, because, as I pointed out, that much power represents about two years of the load growth in the State.

In that connection I did a little checking in regard to the matter of transmission, because I myself realize the force of the point the Senator from Vermont is raising now. I discovered that the cost of transmission of this power, to get it very widely circulated, would be approximately $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 for transmission lines, if current were to be supplied to many of the places which now are expecting to receive it. Of course, if all the current were used locally in northern New York, there would not be such large transmission costs; but obviously it will be desired to supply the power to other locations.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont whether he has done any checking along that line.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is clear that if other States are to receive any advantage from the St. Lawrence seaway power, they will have to put themselves in a position to take advantage of it.

Mr. IVES. In what way?

Mr. AIKEN. By means of the creation of State power authorities of their own, which will make arrangements to acquire or take over the power at the State border. As I have previously stated, there has been no difficulty along those lines in other regions of the United States, in connection with projects for the generation of electric power. We have the Southwest Power Authority, operating across State lines, the Pacific Power Authority, operating across State lines, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, operating across States lines. I do not know the details, but that is one matter that will have to be worked out and agreed to by the Congress before it can be done. Senate Joint Resolution 111 provides for that procedure.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, while we are considering this matter, I wish to point out that if this project is to be constructed and if the electric power is to be transmitted to other areas—for instance, to northern Vermont——

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; and, as a matter of fact, northern Vermont is nearer the St. Lawrence project than most of New York State is.

Mr. IVES. Yes. If this power is also to be transmitted to southern New York State, and if new transmission lines are required, the cost of this undertaking, including the transmission lines, in all probability will be at least 50 percent greater, from the standpoint of power costs, than is now contemplated. Therefore, it would be wise to use existing transmission lines, wherever that would be possible.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York think the existing transmission lines would refuse to transmit the power at a reasonable cost to the consumers?

Mr. IVES. I have no doubt that they would agree to transmit the power. But I wonder whether plans are being made to have the cooperation of the existing power lines.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no doubt that much of the distribution will be made through the existing transmission lines.

Mr. IVES. Then do I correctly understand that it is planned to cooperate with them?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly. I have no plans for the building of competing lines and to put the existing lines out of business, if that is what is bothering the Senator from New York or any other Senator.

Mr. IVES. Of course, I am interested in that matter, because the transmission lines will constitute a considerable part of the cost.

Mr. AIKEN. But I do not think the private lines which will transmit the power from the St. Lawrence project should be permitted to charge exorbitant rates for the St. Lawrence project power.

Mr. IVES. I do not know about the situation in Vermont, but I know that the State of New York has a public service commission, and I suppose the State of Vermont has one, too. I point out that our public service commission is rather particular about such things, and I doubt very much whether anyone would be able to get away with anything insofar as keeping the price too high is concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope not.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. President, let me say that I have no fear that all the power will not be used to good advantage. As I recall the law, the Federal Power Commission is required to set up regional authorities and to make plans for supplying the power to the residents of those areas. However, it would be only logical for northern New York to use this power, for northern New York is very close to the site of the proposed power plants.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I understand that in southern Vermont there already is a surplus of power. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is correct that there is a surplus of power storage.

Mr. IVES. I do not know that to be so, but that is my understanding.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. And I understand that Vermont expects to offset its lack of power in the northern part of the State by using power from the St. Lawrence project, rather than transmitting power from southern Vermont, where there is a surplus.

Mr. AIKEN. No; there is no surplus.

Mr. IVES. Would it be cheaper to transmit the power to northern Vermont from the St. Lawrence project, across northern New York, rather than to transmit it from southern Vermont?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would be. The power generated in southern Vermont is chiefly used in Boston, Lowell, and Providence, I believe.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am interested in the matter of transmission of the power. It occurs to me that southern Vermont is about as close to northern Vermont as this St. Lawrence power project is to northern Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. No; southern Vermont is much farther away.

Mr. IVES. How far is it?

Mr. AIKEN. About 150 miles.

Mr. IVES. If the Senator from Vermont will examine the map, I think he will find that it is about that far from Massena, N. Y., to northern Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have no doubt that this project will be worked out in such a way as to be beneficial to New England and also to New York.

Mr. IVES. I do not wish to be selfish about it, Mr. President. I just wonder why Vermont does not use all its own power.

Mr. AIKEN. That is because in the early days Vermont was short-sighted and let a group of Boston people get the power away from Vermont. I hesitate to say that, but that is the truth. The result is that today over half the power generated in my State is exported. At certain times of the year we import power. However, the power we export is sold to southern New England at low rates, whereas the power we import is charged back to us at high rates.

Mr. President, reverting to what the Senator from Wisconsin said about the letter from the Governor of Nebraska and the remarks of the senior Senator from Nebraska, let me say that I am sure the attitude of the senior Senator from Nebraska, toward the St. Lawrence seaway is not shared by the farmers of his State, because every national farm organization which has a membership in Nebraska is on record in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project. That means the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers' Union, the National Federation of Milk Producers Cooperatives, and the Council of Farmer Cooperatives. The council is on record only as favoring the development of all river systems, and not any particular one. So I am sure that the farmers of Nebraska and the Dakotas, who today have been unable to ship their wheat, and now find that the price has gone down 50 cents a bushel, are more strongly than ever in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project, because if it had been in existence they could have loaded their wheat into ships at Duluth or Chicago last fall, and by now could have sold a large part of the wheat they are holding today. In other words, I understand there is an embargo on the shipment of grain from Chicago to the East at this time. It was put on a few days ago, I believe; and certainly there are similar embargoes on the shipment of grain to other parts of the country.

Mr. President, as I said a while ago, much of the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway stems from the power companies' fear of competition and, even more basically, their fear of low-cost power.

I have said that ever since this project has been under consideration, the power companies have repeatedly said that it is not needed because they can meet the needs for electricity. This point was repeatedly emphasized in 1941, when hearings were held before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee. Yet we all know that during the war there were acute shortages of power. So it was that industries had to migrate to the areas where public-power developments made larger quantities of power available.

During the 1941 hearings, after Frank S. Davis, official representative of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, had said that the St. Lawrence project would hurt New England, he was asked this question: "You mean that giving the people of New England electricity at reasonable rates and taking this overcharge of $97,000,000 a year off of them, would ruin New England?"

Mr. Davis replied: "Yes, I do. I think it would ruin and disrupt the whole area."

Mr. President, it is hard to believe that anybody would make such a statement.

But the real reason for the opposition of the power companies, the real reason why they are opposed to the development of low-cost power in the Northeast is because it would force a general rate reduction in that entire country. I should like to give some comparisons of rates which the people in different parts of the country pay. We find in the economic area which would be served by the St. Lawrence development for instance, the domestic consumers of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York use 854 kilowatts annually, at a cost of 4.78 cents per kilowatt hour. These figures are all furnished by the Federal Power Commission, and they in return received them from the power companies themselves, as I understand it. The customers of the New Hampshire Public Service Co., use a litle over a thousand kilowatt hours a year per capita, at a cost of 4.02 cents per kilowatt hour. The Central Vermont Public Service Co. customers pay 3.74 cents. The customers of the Narragansett Electric Co. of Rhode Island, pay 4.64 cents per kilowatt-hour, and the customers of the Boston Edison Co. pay 4.58 cents per kilowatt-hour, on an average. The average composite of classes A and B utilities in the six New England States of the St. Lawrence economic area, which does not include Maine, average a payment of 4.25 cents, and use only 979 kilowatt-hours annually.

Compare that with the Tennessee Valley Authority area, and we find that the average customer in the seven TVA States uses 1,562 kilowatt-hours annually at a cost of 2.69 cents, compared with an average of 4.25 cents for New England and New York, while those in the Tennessee Valley Authority itself use 1,831 kilowatt- hours annually at a cost of 1.82 cents per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I feel that in all fairness it should be pointed out that a very substantial part of that differential by which the TVA set-up can produce power so much cheaper for its customers than can these other set-ups and other concerns to which the Senators refer, is due to the fact that TVA has no local tax problem on its hands. From the standpoint of amortization, also, there is a serious question as to how the liquidation of the project has been divided and distributed. There are various and sundry costs involved which apparently are not being included. I am for cheap power. Do not get me wrong on that. I am very strongly in favor of cheap power.

Mr. AIKEN. I am coming to that very soon.

Mr. IVES. But I say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that in making the comparisons, they should be complete.

Mr. AIKEN. I intend to make them so.

Mr. IVES. It should be shown what the costs would be if all the items of cost were included.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in regard to the local tax, I would say that the Tennessee Valley Authority pays a percentage of its total income to the communities and States in lieu of taxes. This amounts to more than the power companies ever paid when they were running the country down there, and it does not take into consideration the taxes which the communities receive from increases in industry, so it is true they do not pay taxes; they pay I think 4 percent of the gross income. They started out paying 7 percent, and that has been reduced each year until I think it is 4 percent of the gross income in lieu of taxes. The Hoover Dam development pays very substantial sums to the States out there; I do not know just what the arrangements on Bonneville and Grand Coulee are, but they make a payment in lieu of taxes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator from Vermont for yielding. I do not like to keep on interrupting him, but I am trying to get this matter so that it will be on a fairly even keel. The point is not what the previous companies paid in the way of taxes; it is what those companies would have paid in the way of taxes if there had been this development. It is the potential loss in taxes which must be considered.

Mr. AIKEN. I am coming to that, so far as New York State is concerned.

Mr. IVES. I am not thinking about New York, I am thinking about TVA.

Mr. AIKEN. But the fact remains that public power was developed to serve those areas which the private utilities absolutely were not interested in serving at any cost at any time.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I apologize again, but I wish to point out that insofar as the New York picture he has painted is concerned, I again say that I have received no communication in any way, shape, or manner in opposition to this power development from any utilities concerns in the State of New York. Possibly it is there; I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. IVES. But the fact remains, when the Senator is talking about the 4 cents as compared to what it would be at the bus bar up in the St. Lawrence, there is no difficulty in the way of competition insofar as that is concerned. All the power that could be developed by the St. Lawrence power project could be used and would be used in addition to the power now being used there. Furthermore, the public service commission of the State of New York is very strict in denying to public-utility companies of that State permission to earn above and beyond a certain percentage of their investment.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New York was probably right when he said that he had not heard of the power companies opposing the St. Lawrence project, and probably none of us would have heard of it if the Rochester Gas & Electric Co. had not let the cat out of the bag in a pamphlet.

Mr. IVES. I did not know about that.

Mr. AIKEN. I assume that the distribution of that pamphlet was rather restricted. I have a copy of it somewhere.

Mr. IVES. I should like to see it.

Mr. AIKEN. They are definitely opposing it. I should like to say something about the total costs of power in the States within the St. Lawrence economic area as compared with other parts of the country. Of course New York State uses the most power of any State in the Union; for the year 1946, 17,986,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which cost the State users $386,053,800. Connecticut used 2,619,600,000 kilowatt-hours; Maine used something over a billion. I should like to have these figures for all the New England States and the State of New York printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated sales data, 1946

State	Total kilowatt-hours (thousands)	Total revenues
New York	17,986,088	$386,053,800
Connecticut	2,619,600	61,082,700
Maine	1,002,843	19,986,200
Massachusetts	4,779,314	125,970,600
New Hampshire	538,640	13,472,300
Rhode Island	846,905	22,141,400
Vermont	377,529	9,454,800
Total		638,161,800

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the consumers in the State of Massachusetts used 4,779,000,000 kilowatt-hours at a cost of $125,970,600. Vermont used that year 377,529,000 kilowatt-hours at a cost of $9,454,800. That, I know, has increased tremendously in the last 2 years. Altogether, New York and the six New England States paid for power $638,161,800. The TVA costs would have been $365,920,646 less than what these 7 States paid for power.

The Senator from New York mentioned the fact that the power companies pay taxes. With that I agree. The power companies paid in 1946 all kinds of taxes in these 7 States, and in New York. Out of the $386,000,000 they received for power, they paid $102,987,000 for taxes. In Maine they paid $4,000,000 plus; in New Hampshire, $4,000,000 plus; in Vermont, $1,500,000 plus; in Massachusetts, $31,000,000 plus; in Rhode Island, $4,000,000 plus; in Connecticut $12,000,000 plus, or a total of $161,764,000 in the 7 States.

Deducting the $161,764,000 which they paid in taxes, from the overcharge as compared with the TVA costs of $365,920,646, leaves a difference of $204,156,646, over and above what it would have cost those 7 States at TVA rates, less the amount which the power companies paid in taxes. Two hundred million dollars, Mr. President, is worth fighting for in any corporation's board room.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The distinguished Senator and myself have no fundamental difference in this argument. We are both in favor of power development. It is simply the question of the approach on which we apparently differ. But I want to point out now that I should like to examine very carefully that $200,000,000 differential, to find what constitutes it, of what it is made up. I think it would be disclosed, if that were done, that perhaps there is a lack of items there in favor of TVA—let us put it that way—which, if they were added to the TVA charge, would cause quite an increase in their costs, in their rates, and in the total amount which the Senator has given.

Another point is this. I do not know anything about the secondary development of TVA. I do not know anything about the steam development there. I do not know whether TVA has any. I suppose it must have some. I am not too well acquainted with that subject. But I do know that insofar as power developments in the northeastern part of country are concerned, even those on the St. Lawrence, they require quite a substantial amount of steam operation in order to keep up the total amount of power necessary to meet the peak load. Some steam operation will be necessary if dependence is to be had on the potential of 1,098,000 horsepower which presumably at peak is to be derived from the St. Lawrence. Unless some of the charges I am talking about are added to the cost I think it will be found that the 1,098,000 potential will not be achieved.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think we cannot measure in terms of dollars and cents the immeasurable good which the TVA has done to the seven States in which it is located.

Mr. IVES. I am not criticizing the TVA. I am calling attention to what the differences may be.

Mr. AIKEN. Furthermore, I think if it were put on a dollars-and-cents basis the TVA could pay all the expenses which are now paid by any private utility company in the North, and still sell its power at the same rate at which it sells it now. It is true the TVA up to date has not paid interest. It should pay interest, I believe.

Mr. IVES. Surely.

Mr. AIKEN. At whatever the cost to the Government is.

Mr. IVES. Mr President, I do not think there has been any amortization.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; there has been a substantial amount of profit made, but it has been turned back into the business for purposes of capital investment. However, we will find, Mr. President, if we examine the records of the private utility companies, that they do not amortize as they ought to either. I think they ought to be made to do so, or the time will come, not a generation hence, when the stockholders of the power companies will find themselves in the same position that the stockholders of many railroads found themselves in a few years ago. In other words, they received good dividends. The companies were really not amortizing their investments, but were paying good dividends.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in order to keep the record straight I should like to point out that in the State of New York I do not think there need be too much worry about the point the Senator is just raising. The Public Service Commission of the State of New York is very strict along all those lines.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator is correct. I wish that every State of the Union had a public service commission that was strict and adequately protected the rights of the public and the investors also. I know that one power company in Vermont was given a hearing a few years ago, and it was brought out that if they were to amortize they would be paying on the amortization for 200 years. Things like that ought not to be permitted to go on.

Mr. IVES. I agree.

Mr. AIKEN. The Tennessee Valley Authority in its operation does not have to pay the service charges which the many small subsidiary companies of holding companies are obliged to pay to them. There is not that item of service charge present in connection with the operations of the TVA. The service charge is the method which the holding companies use in so many cases to skim the milk off the income of their operating companies.

Now, Mr. President, getting back to my remarks, it is a well-recognized fact that if we had gone into the late war without the availability of public power, the war would have lasted much longer and the toll of human life would have been much greater.

Before the war ended we heard much talk about the huge surplus of power this country would have after the end of the war. Again the power companies have been proved wrong. There is a general

and growing shortage of power over the country right now.

I am making these introductory remarks, Mr. President, to show how shortsighted the railroads and power companies have been in the past; to show how wrong they have been on more than one occasion, and to raise the valid question as to whether there is not ample reason to believe that they might be wrong in their opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] referred to the fact that the power companies were not against the project. I have been told by officials of smaller distributing systems that they were not against it; that they wished they had the power development. The president of one system up home, who does not have a holding company over him, is asking the State to go into the power business. The power system itself does not have the money to do it. Officials of small systems have told me they are not against the St. Lawrence project; that they wish they had the power, but they would lose their jobs if they said so—and that I believe to be the fact.

PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUES OF CONFERENCE

At this point I think it is pertinent to this whole question to call attention to the propaganda techniques of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, headed by Mr. Carroll B. Huntress, who is chairman.

I want to make it clear here and now that this conference is unalterably opposed to the St. Lawrence development. It has collected and spent thousands upon thousands of dollars against the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.

Because of this fact it should be a matter of concern that much of the propaganda that has been sent out lately by this organization has tried to give the impression that the conference is an unbiased organization, and on occasion, by inference, the impression has been given that the conference might even be an organization that was not opposed to the St. Lawrence. This is usually done by means of an introductory statement attached to a piece of propaganda.

Upon further reading of the propaganda itself, a biased attack against the St. Lawrence project is always revealed. This is insidious propaganda of the worst kind and is never resorted to by those whose cause is just.

TREATY VERSUS AGREEMENT ISSUE

I come now, Mr. President, to a more specific discussion of the minority views of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee members who are opposed to the project.

The first issue raised in the minority views is the one relating to the question of whether or not the legislation should be in the form of a treaty or in the form of an executive agreement. This argument is as old as the proposal itself to develop this project as a public undertaking.

It has been answered time and time again with overwhelming evidence of the validity of making this legislation in the form of an executive agreement. Still the opposition brings out the same old arguments in favor of a treaty.

In 1946, when this matter came before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the form of Senate Joint Resolution 104, the greater portion of the testimony admittedly was devoted to a discussion of the economic issues. Nevertheless, considerable time was consumed then on this same constitutional issue of treaty against agreement.

I might add, Mr. President, that this attack on the ground of the constitutional issue has been a piecemeal attack, concentrating first on one provision and then on another of the Canadian-American Agreement of 1941.

In an effort to satisfy the fears of the opposition, the proponents of the project have agreed that certain of these provisions, that had been under attack, could just as well be taken out of the St. Lawrence legislation and left for future consideration. As a result, articles 7, 8, and 9 have been eliminated from the agreement.

Article 7 deals with navigation rights in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system. Article 8 relates to diversion of water from the Great Lakes. Article 9 has to do with preservation of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls. Obviously, these three articles were not really germane to the proposed legislation.

Now again we have the opposition attacking the constitutionality of this legislation. Moreover, it seems peculiarly strange that chambers of commerce on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, cities, railroads, and other groups of the opposition should profess such great concern over the constitutional and treaty-making powers of the United States Senate.

Why did they not raise the question when private power interests were throwing dams across international waters? I refer to the two dams across the St. Johns River between the State of Maine and the Province of New Brunswick in Canada.

One would be almost led to the conclusion that the membership of these bodies is made up largely of constitutional lawyers, so vociferous has their technical constitutional interest been.

When we strip the fundamental constitutional issue of its technicalities we are confronted with this question:

Can the two Governments—Canada and the United States—construct the St. Lawrence seaway and power project under an agreement which requires approval by only a majority of the two Houses of the Congress? The record shows that, according to the strongest kind of legal precedent, there is every reason to believe that the agreement as it now stands is fully within the power of the Congress to approve, both under the commerce clause of the Constitution and under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. This view is supported by a wealth of legislative precedent. The State Department's legal memorandum to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the spring of 1946 is conclusive on this point. It is an exhaustive and thoroughly documented report.

1909 TREATY AUTHORIZES AGREEMENT

With reference to the 1909 treaty as a basis for the legal justification of the legislation now pending before Congress, attention is called to the fact that this treaty, which was consented to by the Senate, explicitly provides that future questions relating to boundary waters between Canada and the United States could be settled either by treaty or by agreement.

Hence, it is held by expert legal authority that the 1941 agreement, as proposed to be amended, comes squarely within the provisions of the 1909 treaty, and that Congress may validly base its approval of the agreement on these provisions if it desires to do so.

For too long the alleged legal bugaboo has been a stumbling block in the path of legislation which, if enacted, would mean the opening of the great midcontinent of North America to ocean shipping, and would provide northeastern United States—a deficit-power area in World War II and now—with a huge block of low-cost hydroelectric power.

The proponents of this legislation believe in the future progress of this Nation, and hold that the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power will be needed in achieving the anticipated growth of the country.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Let us consider now, Mr. President, the national defense questions which have been raised by the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The opposition makes the point that the projected seaway lies in an area which in the past has traditionally been considered as being relatively immune from hostile attack.

The further point is made that with the development of modern methods of warfare this immunity no longer exists, with the assertion that the seaway is in the most exposed and vulnerable part of the United States except Alaska. This, of course, is based on the advances made in military aircraft and on the newly heralded polar route idea. The whole assumption of the opposition, if carried to a logical conclusion is that air power, plus the atomic bomb, raises an offensive warfare question for which there is no defensive solution. At the present time, I am inclined to agree with this view.

This leads to the inescapable conviction that no place in the United States—or in the world, for that matter—is capable of being defended against these offensive weapons. That being the case, why quibble over whether one place is relatively safer than another?

Inasmuch as the United States already has atomic bombs capable of destroying any other nation, it is certain that we shall not be attacked unless that nation too has atomic bombs. Under those circumstances, bombs can cripple installations on the eastern seaboard, in the Midwest, the South, and the Far West, with almost equal facility. It does not matter, in an age dominated by supersonics, guided missiles, and an array of other weapons capable of raining down out of the stratosphere, whether the

target is somewhere on the St. Lawrence or where it may be.

Furthermore, it is apparent that if an atomic bomb were to be dropped on some installation along the St. Lawrence, as a result of wind drift and other factors in connection with radiation from the bomb, the greater portion of New York State, and possibly southern New England, would suffer seriously from the same bomb.

Let us pursue a little further the suggestions of the opposition. Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley, retired, suggests that the solution is dispersal of facilities, even to the point of placing the most important facilities underground.

I should like to say a word about Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley, retired. The minority report mentions Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley once, and fails to state that he is retired, and thereafter refers to him only as "General Bradley." Of course everyone in the United States knows Gen. Omar Bradley. I think hardly anyone outside the military knows Gen. Follett Bradley, retired. Certainly from reading the minority report no one could know that he was a retired general, and that he is not at the present time, and was not when he gave his testimony, a member of the armed services. He is at liberty to work full time for the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway if he is so disposed. As a matter of fact, the testimony at the hearings brings out the fact that Gen. Follett Bradley—not Omar Bradley—testified that he began to become a St. Lawrence expert only a short time before the hearings. The records of the United States Congress will show further that he was paid $825; I presume it was for his testimony.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator give us the information for the record as to who paid the general such a high price for his wonderful testimony?

Mr. AIKEN. The National St. Lawrence Project Conference, which is housed in the American Railroad Association Building downtown, and has reported receipts of $18,000 for the period for which it reported, but it undoubtedly has a considerable amount of contributions in the way of personnel, office space, and other expenditures which probably do not appear in its report. This organization brought forward a retired general and a retired admiral. They had every right to do so. The retired general and the retired admiral had every right to testify against the St. Lawrence seaway, even though they became experts only a short time before the hearing and started studying the reports, as General Bradley testified in response to the question of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

What I want to bring out is that they were not representing the armed services of the United States. They were not disinterested witnesses, because General Bradley was paid $825 and Admiral Willson was paid $1,000 for the testimony. If that be disinterested testimony, I should like to know what interested testimony would be. I suppose the general would like to know why the admiral was worth $175 more than he was, but he can find that out whenever he has an opportunity.

Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley, retired, suggests that the solution is dispersal of facilities "even to the point of placing the most important facilities underground."

If that be the only solution—and I am not trying to say whether it is or is not—then, how about all of the surface facilities we now have? If these are rendered obsolete, our surface transportation facilities, power plants, and all of the other installations that are so necessary for our economy, either in peace or war, would be crippled.

The further point is made by Gen. Follett Bradley that, for the sake of national security, if additional facilities are to be built, "they should be dispersed toward the south and west." This is defeatism of the rankest kind. It is, in effect, saying that New England and the eastern seaboard cannot expect to expand or grow because it would not be feasible to provide any more transportation or power facilities in that area. This is sectional discrimination of the first order. Does this line of reasoning jibe with the implied assumption of the opposition that no place is 100 percent safe?

As I have pointed out, I am forced to conclude that in atomic warfare one place is about as safe as another.

Does this mean that because of this fear we should stop the march of progress, forthwith abandon all constructive development of the country, and sit back and await the implied day of doom? To follow that course is the surest way to national oblivion whether we have peace or war.

I maintain that the proponents of this project are not ready yet to give up on America. We are not ready to say that there is no hope for peace and no need for constructive expansion and growth in our economy.

In connection with the opposition's discussion of the national defense aspects of this project, considerable emphasis is placed upon the use of such names as Maj. Gen. Follett Bradley, retired, of the United States Air Force—$825—and Vice Adm. Russell Willson, United States Navy, retired—$1,000. I have referred previously to these men.

While these may be imposing military names, it seems to me that the endorsement of the project on the part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 1946 in the assertion that the project "would be in the interests of national defense," is ample military authority in behalf of the project.

The strong endorsement of the project by the Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, also an outstanding military figure, lends credence to the worthiness of the proponents' contentions that the project has meritorious national-defense value.

The opponents of the project called attention to the statement of the present Secretary of the Army, Hon. Kenneth C. Royall, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I quote the statement:

> The Army's position and the War Department's position is that the St. Lawrence seaway is not vital to national defense, but that the project would be helpful to national defense.

The inference is made that the fact that the seaway would be helpful to national defense is not a sufficient reason for going ahead with the project. This is, in my mind, taking advantage of a play upon words which is not too significant. I am satisfied to accept the project on this basis. As a matter of fact, I suppose there are not too many projects in the country that would be labeled vital to national defense. At least it would be difficult to reach harmonious agreement as to what is vital to national defense, even among the military.

Surely I have not claimed, and I think it is reasonable to assume that most of the other proponents of this project would agree with me, that this project is not a super, top, national-defense undertaking without which it would be impossible ever to win a war.

That is, if we use the definition and terminology commonly used by military personnel.

It would be interesting to see how the military people would classify various coal-generating plants, for example. Would they rank these plants as vital to national defense? Would they rank any or all railroad lines as vital to national defense? I doubt it.

The opposition refers to the vulnerability of the seaway not only to bombing but to accidents or to sabotage. I do not think we can say that any place is secure from acts of sabotage. We can say that the seaway is no more vulnerable than many other strategic points.

With reference to accidents, I should like to call attention to the 1941 study of the Department of Commerce which refutes the arguments about accidents and weather as well:

> The engineering plans call for a minimum curvature radius of 5,000 feet which provides for ample visibility around the bends.
>
> Such a channel cannot be called tortuous.
>
> In regard to fog, it happens that fog is far less frequent on the upper St. Lawrence than in New York Harbor, there being 10 days of fog in New York Harbor for every 1 day at Montreal.
>
> In respect to width, the plans call for channels with a minimum width of 450 feet, and the canalized section with a bottom width of 200 feet.
>
> This compares very favorably with, for example, the Hudson River channel up to Albany, which has a normal width of 300 feet, widening to 400 feet in rock cuts.
>
> Furthermore, only a short distance of the seaway will consist of restricted channels.
>
> That the St. Lawrence route holds no terror for seafaring men is indicated by the frequent use made of the existing shallow channel.
>
> In 1938 there were 5,898 through transits by vessels traveling between the Great Lakes and Montreal or points beyond.
>
> These vessels carried 8,285,000 tons of cargo.
>
> A comparison of the accident records of the St. Lawrence and Panama Canals during the prewar years 1935–39, inclusive, indicates that the accident records on the St. Lawrence between Lake Ontario and Montreal, a distance of 183 miles, was much better in fact than that on the Panama Canal.

On the St. Lawrence there were 2.3 accidents per 1,000 transits as compared with 5.7 on the Panama during those 5 years.

The minority views refer to the suggestion that the Panama Canal, for security reasons, be converted into a sea-level channel and adds that if the St. Lawrence seaway were constructed:

One may also well ponder how much money some future President of the United States may request of Congress to convert the St. Lawrence project into a safe, sea-level canal.

In reply I should like to quote from an article in the July 1947 issue of Popular Science magazine, called New Plans For Panama, by Stephen L. Freeland. This is what Mr. Freeland says about the sea-level route:

Deep dredging, as the name implies, calls for digging the sea-level canal to grade in one operation from the present summit level.

This method would eliminate the need for alternate locks and prior construction of flood-control works.

It would, however, call for an awful lot of water to fill the enormously enlarged channel. It would also call for tools that have never been built, though they are not impossible: dredges that could sink spuds and operate buckets under 135 feet of water, for instance.

Mr. Freeland goes on to point out that while the sea-level plans may sound favorable, shipowners, operators, masters, and pilots see plenty wrong with them. He says:

If you drop the level of the canal 85 feet, they (the shipping people) point out, you make a restricted waterway out of the entire channel between Miraflores and Gatun—31 miles of Gaillard Cut instead of the present 7.

And there would be 12 dangerous bends of 20° or more instead of the 2 now in the comparatively easy reaches of Gatun Lake.

In addition, they maintain that the whole canal would be tied up in the event of fog in Gaillard because ships would have no place to wait except in harbors at either end of the canal.

These statements lead one to conclude that the sea-level suggestion may not be so perfect as some would have us believe.

We are faced with the fact that after Hiroshima and Nagasaki it is futile to talk of invulnerable structures anywhere on earth. It makes no difference whether we are talking about the St. Lawrence, Panama Canal, the steam-generating power plants for New York City, the ships, or lines of railroads, or anything else.

In fact, Mr. President, I do not like to think of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway in terms of war, but if we must do so we must realize that the most inviting target which we have in North America is not the St. Lawrence seaway, but the port of New York itself, where there is approximately two and one-half times the amount of generating equipment as would be installed at the dam at Massena; and it is also the greatest terminus of our supply lines to all parts of the world.

The opposition also attacks the question of whether or not the protected route over the St. Lawrence is a factor of national defense. I cannot foresee what will happen in the future. The only evidence I have to go on is the experience of the last war when thousands of lives were lost in sinkings by German submarines along the Atlantic coast of the United States from the Gulf of Mexico to the North Atlantic.

It has been reliably reported that 6,000 American sailors and 400 ships were lost along the Atlantic seaboard during the last war. Many of those losses could have been averted if the seaway had been in use.

As for the claim that submarines are more deadly in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence than in some other waters, it is only logical that it would be easier to protect waters in a concentrated area from submarines than it would be to protect waters over the wide expanse of the Atlantic seaboard.

In discussing the question of the seaway being ice-bound a part of the year, one would gather from the statements of the minority report that the seaway, if completed, would become the major transportation facility for that area. This is a wholly erroneous assumption. It is like trying to put the cart before the horse.

The whole idea back of the seaway, the whole reason for developing it, is to make of it a supplementary transportation facility to the existing facilities. In no case do we assume that the seaway would take over even a major portion of the burden of transportation. It would be used to help out during the 240-days of the year when the seaway is free of ice and operating fully.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been listening to that portion of the argument in relation to Secretary Royall's statement. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to permit me to put in briefly what I think is Secretary Royall's testimony indicating that it is in the interest of national defense. Would the Senator have any objection?

Mr. AIKEN. I would have no objection at all.

Mr. WILEY. On pages 154, 155, 156, and 157 appears the statement of Mr. Royall that the seaway would be helpful to national defense. That is his conclusion. Then he does a tremendous job in lining out why it would be helpful to national defense. He says:

Planning for industrial mobilization for a possible war is an important part of America's present defense program. The St. Lawrence seaway project would be of assistance to future industrial mobilization by providing a large additional source of electric power for the Great Lakes and adjacent regions, including parts of Canada.

Although it cannot be stated dogmatically that lack of electric power adversely affected either the results or the speed of World War II, yet there were times when we were faced with a possible power shortage and had to impose restrictions and allocations which would not otherwise have been necessary. Today there is some over-all shortage of power in the North Central States, we are informed. If another war required a greater industrial effort than World War II—and it might well require it—the provision of additional electric power from this project would be of considerable value.

Your committee asked the specific question whether additional sources of power were needed in the immediate future for experimentation and development of new weapons. I do not believe that those two activities raise any present problem except to the extent that a general power shortage in any particular area might affect all industry in that area.

The availability of power in the Great Lakes region would also encourage development of productive facilities there, and thus tend to increase America's over-all industrial potential. It is perfectly possible that we would need this potential in the event of another all-out conflict.

Dispersion of industry is a desirable protective measure against the type of air warfare which we can reasonably expect in any future war. The point has been made that the development of this project would tend to relieve the industrial congestion along the eastern seaboard. On the other hand, there is already a large amount of industry now in the Great Lakes region, and with the polar concept of a possible air attack, this particular region is much more vulnerable than it has been in the past. It is therefore, difficult to say with any definite assurance whether from the standpoint of industrial vulnerability this project would be advantageous or disadvantageous. I am inclined to believe that it would have more advantages than disadvantages, largely because it may have the effect of spreading industry more uniformly throughout the entire Great Lakes region.

The seaway would provide during about two-thirds of the year an additional route to Europe—a route which, I believe, is a somewhat shorter one from certain lake ports to England. Any addition of new waterways or any improvement of existing waterways, if found economical, would be of benefit to the Nation's industry as well as the Nation's defense. This new route to Europe would serve both as an alternate and as a reserve route in the event of war. It would have the added advantage of including 1,200 miles less ocean distance, thereby minimizing to some extent the risk and danger of submarine and other attack.

While it cannot be stated with certainty that the delay in shipments by rail or boat or the congestion of port facilities in this country during World War II adversely affected the conduct of the war or its timing yet it is true that there were uneasy moments in the matter of all transportation and that a situation might well have arisen or might arise in a future war where an additional alternate ocean-shipping route—or a safer route—would be of considerable value.

Rail transportation at times threatened to become a bottleneck during or after World War II. Rail transportation would be less concerned in a future emergency if water transportation were available for the entire haul from the Great Lakes region to trans-Atlantic destinations and all or a part of the rail haul from the Lakes to eastern ports would be thereby eliminated. Furthermore, the additional water power as a substitute for steam plants would also reduce the transportation of coal and other fuels and would thereby relieve the threat of a rail bottleneck to some extent in the event of a future war. The avoidance of transshipment would also serve to conserve personnel and time.

I do not believe that my information is sufficiently definite and accurate to answer the fourth question in your letter; that is, the value of the seaway for bringing in iron ore from Laborador and other foreign sources. As I understand it, there is some difference of opinion on the extent of exhaustion of iron ore in the Lake Superior district. That is a question which experts, including those in the Department of the Interior, are better qualified to answer. There is apparently considerable ore in

Labrador, but the feasibility and desirability of bringing that ore into the United States presents economic and other questions which can be better answered by others.

Another probable advantage of the seaway is the easy access it would afford to Greenland and Newfoundland points which may be of more strategic value in a future war than they are today. If we should at any time maintain bases in that part of the world this means of access would be of considerable defense value.

The seaway would also provide increased facilities for shipbuilding and ship repair in the interior in time of war. The fact that the lake region is near the supply of steel makes it particularly well located for those activities. At the present time the shipbuilding facilities—and I am speaking of facilities for larger ships which are not now constructed in the interior—on our coasts seem adequate, more than adequate, really, for construction of the necessary commercial ships, as well as the necessary warships; and there is nothing to indicate that this condition will change for many peacetime years. However, in an emergency, at least an alternate shipbuilding industry for ocean-going vessels, would be helpful. And circumstances might well arise where it would be safer and more convenient to repair or recondition ships in the Great Lakes region.

The lake shipbuilding industry, as well as the shipping route through the St. Lawrence, would be subject to a seasonal factor. This would be accentuated by the fact that the period available for shipping and shipbuilding would coincide with the agriculture labor peak in the Middle West. But it is believed that the disadvantageous seasonal factor would be more than offset by the advantages which I have mentioned.

The point has been made that the construction of the seaway would facilitate invasion of our country. The War Department does not believe that there is merit in this contention. Not only is an invasion from the sea unlikely with our superior naval power but it is also true that if an invasion seemed imminent the locks and other installations could be easily destroyed.

However, there is possibly another—and a related—disadvantage. While the War Department believes that under reasonably anticipated circumstances the seaway and the locks can be adequately defended, yet the necessity of defending them would be an added defense commitment—a commitment which would require more men and equipment and money than would be necessary if the seaway were not constructed.

I have previously mentioned the vulnerability of the seaway to polar atack. A partial answer to this is the fact that at least the seaway tends to spread the vulnerability and thus to make it more likely that, even in the event of a successful enemy air attack on the country, more net shipping facilities would remain undamaged.

I repeat: In the opinion of the War Department the St. Lawrence seaway, while not vital to national defense, would be helpful to national defense.

Senator WILEY. Have you any questions?

Senator AIKEN. Yes. I think it is generally understood that the United States is collaborating with the Dominion of Canada. It is also generally understood that the Province of Ontario is becoming desperately short of electrical energy. Is it not fair to assume that through the construction of the seaway and the consequent strengthening of our Canadian neighbors we are thereby adding to our own security?

Secretary ROYALL. Yes. I mentioned that in here, that it would increase the industrial potential of a portion of Canada which would be of value to us.

Senator AIKEN. The other matter is this: The opponents have claimed, and you have already pointed that out, that the locks and the canals would be vulnerable to attack in the event of war. Would the locks be more vulnerable than a hundred other strategic points, such as the port of New York, our rail centers, and a good many other places? Would it be as easy to defend the site of these locks on the St. Lawrence as it would on the Soo Canal, for instance, or many other places?

Secretary ROYALL. Of course, there are a number of ports and other facilities which would be just as vulnerable as the locks. There would be a great variety. There would be some that would not be as vulnerable. We believe that they could be safely defended.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for reading Secretary Royall's testimony into the RECORD.

Mr. President, it has been shown over and over again that the transportation peak for moving grain and other farm commodities from the Midwest comes during the period August to November, when the seaway will be open. What is expected of the seaway is that it will merely shave off some of the seasonal peak of traffic, thus enabling more products to be transported during that period, and at a low cost.

As for any suggestion that the seaway would not be used because the St. Lawrence is frozen over during the winter, let me point out that Montreal, which is subject to similar conditions, already is the second largest exporting port in North America.

Mr. President, the farmers are tired of having their grain rot on the ground for lack of transportation facilities. They, along with businessmen, are tired of the inability of the railroads to meet the transportation needs of the Midwest. It is only fair that some consideration should be given these farmers of our grain belt.

Mr. President, when a project of great national importance is considered, a project vitally important to our economy, we are getting altogether too much in the habit of considering it in the light of the effect it will have upon our railroads. That has often raised in my mind the question, Does our economy exist for the purpose of supporting our transportation system, or is our transportation system a necessary adjunct to our economy? I am afraid that too often we consider these great developments in the light of how they will affect the tail that wags our economic dog.

Mr. President, I am glad there is talk of developing a better waterway down the Missouri and the Mississippi. I want the people in the Midwest to have two outlets for their grain. If they are shipping it to northern Europe, they will be able to ship it far cheaper by means of the St. Lawrence seaway project, once it is completed. If they are shipping their grain to Mexico or South America, they will naturally ship it down the Mississippi River to the Gulf of Mexico.

It will greatly strengthen our economy if the people in the great Grain Belt have two means by which they can ship their grain to other parts of our own country and to other parts of the world at cheaper rates.

As for the national-defense features of the St. Lawrence seaway project, Mr. President, the whole concept of the seaway has been missed by the opposition in assuming that major reliance should be put on the seaway as a transportation link or as a ship-construction area. Again let me make it clear that the seaway is designed and intended only to supplement other facilities. I am strongly convinced, however, that it is a very vital and necessary supplement that is needed now, and has been needed for a long time.

In admitting that a considerable amount of traffic does move over the Great Lakes now during the ice-free season- the traffic last year amounted to 176,648,000 tons—the opposition points out that this is a special type of cargo, and that the seaway would not be adapted to the transportation of general cargo.

Let me say that general cargo will unquestionably move over the seaway during the open season; but assuming that this type of cargo would not move at all over this system, the seaway still would be justified as a facility for transporting grains, oil, ores, cement, and other heavy cargoes which the railroads obviously cannot handle now and for which only water transportation is economically feasible.

In other words, it matters not what kind of cargo the seaway moves during the rush season, for it will leave less of a backlog for the railroads to try to move during the time when the seaway is not in use.

In connection with lakes traffic, it is pertinent to point out that the 176,000,000 tons moved last year was a new peacetime record. Included in that total were 76,000,000 tons of iron ore, 58,000,000 tons of coal, 418,000,000 bushels of grain, and 21,000,000 tons of limestone. All of these commodities lend themselves to stock piling, and therefore they can be moved over waters that are closed during 4 months of the year.

I call particular attention to the minority report on page 9 which brings up the point that the seaway might not be suited or adaptable to the fast freighters which might be constructed in the future. We find in our highways a close parallel to this line of reasoning. Our highways of today—at least the ones here in the East—are not built to permit high-powered motor cars to run at top speed.

We have to exercise some self-control and not step on the throttle too hard, because these highways will not permit safe driving at exorbitant speeds, even if the cars are designed to achieve greater speeds.

I think the same line of reasoning can be applied to the St. Lawrence. It is agreed that ships can be built, and are built today, that will achieve such high rates of speed that it would be feasible to open them at full speed only on the high seas. I see nothing wrong with expecting that Liberty ships, or any other ships that might ply the waters of the St. Lawrence, would operate at three-fourths or one-fourth throttle, or whatever speed is necessary.

Surely if the choice is between having ships operate at a reduced rate of speed for 75 miles of the seaway or not to operate at all, the proponents of the St. Lawrence would greatly prefer the former.

Time in ocean shipping has not traditionally been of the essence.

Mr. President, paralleling this question of the speed of ships on the seaway is the issue of the channel depth and the size of ships it will accommodate. It has been shown by the Maritime Commission that Victory ships could go through the proposed 27-foot canal when loaded to 79 percent of capacity, and Liberty ships could do so when loaded to 85 percent of their total deadweight carrying capacity. This is not unusual for inland waterways throughout the world. Ships on such routes do not normally carry full load.

Moreover, here is a significant point: Ships can carry a full pay load without drawing full draft, for all cargoes do not weigh the same; and as is frequently the case, a ship's hold will be filled, but the ship will not be down to the load water line.

Also ships can take on cargo to three-quarters of their capacity, let us say, in the Great Lakes, and then proceed down to Montreal, and there take on fuel and supplies, and go to sea with a full load. This again is a wholly feasible procedure.

Furthermore, the St. Lawrence locks will be 30 feet over the sills; so whenever some additional dredging is done, the seaway will accommodate vessels of deeper draft.

Mr. President, much has been said of the letters which officials of some of the existing ocean-shipping lines have written, to the effect that they would not use the seaway if it were constructed. However, they wrote those letters because they are opposed to the seaway, and they are opposed to it because they own terminals at our present coastal ports, and they do not want any competition from terminals which might be built on the Great Lakes. That is why they are against the seaway. Further than that, our shipping interests have no right to come before the Congress and protest against spending their money to help the people of our great Midwest, after the way they raided our Treasury during the war, and after the billions of dollars they have received in subsidies, which our taxpayers have had to pay. Right here, Mr. President, it occurs to me that we should take notice of the fact that America is having an acute shortage of oil, crude oil in particular. We notice it very strongly in the Northeast. The shortage is spread over a great part of the country. I would like to call attention here to the fact that the power going to waste each year at one site on the St. Lawrence River at Massena, where it is proposed to build a dam, is equivalent to the amount of power which would be generated each year by 41,000,000 barrels of oil, 20,500,000 on the United States side, 20,500,000 on the Canadian side. Inasmuch as we furnish Canada with her oil, construction of the seaway could save 41,000,000 barrels of oil annually.

Right now in my State we are having to pay 14 cents or better for a gallon of oil. That amounts to something like $7 a barrel, if it is desired to figure it at the retail price. The St. Lawrence would produce power, equivalent to that produced by 287,000,000 worth of oil at the retail price. Of course those figures are not practical, but they are as practical as some that have been put forward by the opposition.

I call attention now to the argument found in the minority views, at page 10, which raises the question as to whether or not this country can provide the military manpower to protect the seaway. In answering this, I say that the St. Lawrence would not be any harder to protect than would the lines of the railroads or other ports of the country.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts asked a question the other day, where would we get the manpower to protect the development on the St. Lawrence? It is my opinion that we would use exactly the same manpower, exactly the same airplanes, exactly the same guns, that we use to protect the aluminum plants on the St. Lawrence and the chemical plants which are some distance away, at Niagara Falls.

Furthermore, it has been figured by Mr. R. L. Hearn, general manager and engineer of the Ontario Hydro Corp., that 50 men operating the St. Lawrence development would do the work of 50,000,000 Chinese laborers, working 8 hours a day, for 8 days. In other words what I am trying to point out is that the St. Lawrence would enable us to release a tremendous amount of manpower for other purposes in the event it became acutely necessary.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Again I should like to call to the attention of this body, right in line with what the distinguished Senator has said, the fact that the importance of the seaway from the standpoint of defense was dramatically set forth by Secretary Marshall when he said:

> In this connection I wish to read the following statement approved by the Permanent Joint Board on Defense, United States-Canada, at a recent meeting:
>
> "The St. Lawrence seaway. The Board considered the significance of the St. Lawrence seaway project from the point of view of the joint defense of the United States and Canada. It was recognized that the completion of a deep-water navigation route from the sea to the heart of the continent would provide additional facilities for the movement of ships and essential supplies in wartime and would also make possible the construction of oceangoing vessels in inland areas. Furthermore, the new source of power made available by the St. Lawrence project would greatly increase the defense potential of the two countries. It is therefore the view of the Board that the early completion of this long-delayed enterprise on a cooperative basis satisfactory to both Governments would directly contribute to the security of the North American Continent."

Mr. President, I should like at this time to read into the RECORD also, because it is right on the point, a question or two I asked Secretary Marshall, and his answers thereto:

> Senator WILEY. We have learned, in two costly experiences, that all wars are total wars, fought with all the manpower and total resources of nations, and we are told that we shall have peace only through strength, and this does not include military strength only, but total industrial capacity. We hear, for instance, that one reason why Russia is dawdling in peace settlements is that she expects us to have a depression soon.
>
> I want to know this, Mr. Secretary: Would it help in our international peace efforts to give definite evidence to the world that this country is not merely interested in horse races and dog tracks and night clubs, but that as a Nation we are ready to gird ourselves and construct projects such as this which will increase our industrial and transportation capacity?
>
> Secretary MARSHALL. I think it would help materially.
>
> Senator WILEY. I understand Russia has plans for diverting rivers from the watershed of the Arctic Ocean into the Volga River, to improve navigation and obtain some gigantic amount of power, I believe about 10,000,000 horsepower capacity. That is five times as much as the St. Lawrence power. Now Russia has about 100,000,000 more people under her control than the United States. If she should develop her power resources and steel-producing capacity, say within the next 20 years, up to the level of the United States, while we languish in controversy among ourselves, what would be the effect upon our international relations, upon our position of leadership in the world?
>
> Secretary MARSHALL. Well, I think it is clearly evident that our favorable action with regard to this would definitely strengthen our position and meet similar efforts of other countries. You mentioned the Soviet Union. I think, Mr. Chairman, also, we have here one of those fortunate situations where a great project, which will have, I think, a great deal to do with the economy of this country, happens to be also a very definite strengthening of the power of defense.
>
> Senator WILEY. If, at the same time they develop their industrial capacity, they succeed in developing the atomic bomb, we would be "behind the 8 ball" both in military power and political influence in the world, would we not?
>
> Secretary MARSHALL. Very much so.
>
> Senator WILEY. The moral is, therefore, that while we try to help other countries to improve their economics the principal method of establishing our own security is by building more tools and sources of power for our limited population, so that we can make up for lack of numbers by greater mechanization and higher productivity per worker.
>
> Secretary MARSHALL. I think that is a correct statement. I would add to it the thought that here is something that affords a great improvement in communications, a great improvement in power, and a great opportunity to strengthen our relations with Canada. And whatever our necessities in the international field, it is of fundamental and first importance that in the Western Hemisphere there be strength and unity, and I think this particular measure is very helpful in this respect.

Mr. President, I want the distinguished Senator who is speaking to emphasize the point Marshall emphasized, the need of demonstrating to the world that we on this continent, having entered into agreements with Canada, are not going to break faith; we are going ahead; we are going to fulfill our obligations, not simply because they are obligations but because it is in the interest of national defense and the welfare of our people.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I understand the agreement with Canada is the only agreement at all like the one under consideration the United States has made with any foreign country which it has failed to carry out. I feel that the testimony of General Marshall should carry infinitely more weight than the testimony of General Follett Bradley,

retired, whom the opposition brought forth, at a cost of $825, to testify against this project.

Mr. President, on the question of national defense, it is assumed by the opposition that the St. Lawrence seaway could be breached at any point along the route. The same line of reasoning would apply to any of the hundreds of railroad lines throughout the country.

We cannot afford to assume the attitude that we cannot go forward with the development of our country for fear that the creative facilities of progress are not worth the price because it would take too much manpower to defend them in time of war.

One is forced to ponder the question as to whether any progress can be made, or if any progress is worth the price, under this line of reasoning, which the opponents put forth.

In connection with the construction of this deep-water channel in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, the minority report lays great emphasis upon their assumption that the Federal Government would, in addition to the construction of the main channel, have to provide adequate harbor and docking facilities in the Great Lakes ports. I can see no reason for believing that the ports in that area would make any such demands upon the Federal Government.

In support of this statement, I should like to quote a statement by Mr. Daniel Hoan, president of the Great Lakes Harbor Association.

This is what he said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1946:

> I defy the opposition to find one single city that will not readily finance whatever additional piers, warehouses, or docks that may be needed to accommodate greater draft vessels and to build them where sufficient water is available or can easily be made available.

In view of this statement there is no justification for the oppositions' alarm over the need for including port-improvement costs in considering cost figures for the seaway.

Moreover, the issue was labored rather persistently by the junior Senator from Massachusetts last Wednesday as to whether or not the cost of improving harbor facilities of the Great Lakes ports should be included in the cost of the St. Lawrence project.

I reiterate the answer I gave then, that certainly the cost of deepening Great Lakes ports should not be charged against the seaway, any more than the cost of improving Boston Harbor, which may be the other terminus of the run, should be charged against the seaway.

It is significant to note here that, while Federal funds have been spent on the port of Boston, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts also has spent sizable sums on the Boston Harbor.

Only last summer, Mr. Frank Davis of the Boston Chamber of Commerce testified before the Foreign Relations Subcommittee that the State had spent over $26,000,000 on harbor and waterfront facilities. An additional $20,000,000 has been appropriated to the Port of Boston Authority with which to construct new piers and develop the commerce of the port.

So, if Boston people can raise money to improve their port, why is it not logical to assume that the port cities of the Great Lakes would do the same thing and without Federal aid.

Mr. President, I turn now to a discussion of the power phase of this project.

At the outset of its discussion of the power part of the project, the views of the minority committee were:

> We believe that a serious weakness in the majority's position on this point lies in their failure to make it clear that it may be wholly possible to construct, if necessary, the power project without also constructing the navigation facilities contemplated in the seaway project.

This is an effort to employ the divide-and-conquer technique. While they admit that construction of the power project perhaps can be justified, I would be willing to wager that if such legislation were introduced in this body, the power companies, no doubt with the able assistance of the railroads, would fight it.

Mr. President, regardless of what has been said, I should like to say that the huge power profits resulting from the excess payments which the people of New York and New England pay above what they would have to pay if they obtained the power at rates commensurate with other more favored parts of the country, are the real reason for the opposition to the project. I should like to make a prediction, Mr. President: If the St. Lawrence seaway project is defeated we will see a campaign put on almost immediately, if it has not been started now, to turn Niagara Falls over to the power interests. The Niagara-Hudson Power Co., subsidiary of the Niagara Falls Power Co., I daresay, will make every effort to grab off that great public resource. If they succeed in doing so it will be the biggest steal of national resources ever put over on the people of this country. I want to say to the Niagara-Hudson people that so far as I am able I shall do everything within my power to keep them from taking over Niagara Falls, even if the St. Lawrence seaway is not built. I make that as a prediction, that that is what they will try to do, but they must block the St. Lawrence seaway in order to have a chance to get away with it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out to the Senator from Vermont that the New York State Constitution takes care of the situation to which he refers quite thoroughly. There is a provision in it now whereby any such steal as that to which he refers would be impossible at this time. The people of the State of New York intend to control their water resources in perpetuity, and it is so provided in our State constitution.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, back in 1941 Congress gave the power company up there the temporary right to divert 5,000 cubic second-feet additional from the falls to develop power for war purposes in New York State. I think I voted for that provision. Mr. President, I predict that they will try to obtain an extension of that privilege for 50 years. My guess is that is what they will try to do.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I want to point out to the able Senator that that was done by this particular agreement——

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. As a war-emergency proposition. But it still falls within the provision of the State constitution. If it were to be made in perpetuity it still falls within the purview of the provision which I cited, and there could be no steal by any such proposition.

Mr. AIKEN. The Hudson Co. is obtaining the power now and intends to keep it, and I predict that it will try to secure authority to continue to obtain the additional Niagara Falls power if it has to go to the New York State Legislature, or to the Congress of the United States, to get it. That is what it is going to try to do in my opinion.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I cannot answer as to what it may try to do. I think I can speak in part at least for the New York State Legislature—I used to know something about it—and I can assure the Senator and the Senate that if that which the able Senator from Vermont says is attempted to be done, those who attempt to do it will not get away with it.

Mr. AIKEN. Not if I can help it.

Mr. IVES. Or I, either.

Mr. AIKEN. The company certainly should not get away with it. However, there is at present some 700,000 horsepower of electrical energy going to waste on the American side of the Falls, at the American Falls.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted at this point in my remarks a letter written by Governor Lehman to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] under date of June 7, 1941, printed on page 5096 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12, 1941, in which Governor Lehman expressed the fears, as were clearly apparent in his letter, that the utility companies might attempt under the cover of war to grab off Niagara Falls.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, June 7, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: On May 29, 1941, an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada, dated May 20, 1941, was submitted to the Senate of the United States for approval. This agreement constitutes a temporary modification of the International Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 and provides an additional diversion of 8,000 cubic second-feet at Niagara Falls, 5,000 cubic second-feet of which will be utilized in New York State. The agreement is predicated upon the existence of a power shortage for national defense industries located in New York State and is subject to reconsideration by the two Governments on October 1, 1942.

Heretofore the State of New York has not been consulted with regard to this agreement which concerns one of its vital natural resources. Hence, there has been no opportunity for State authorities to express their views. I wish to take this opportunity to state that where the promotion of defense industries is concerned, the Government of the United States will find the State authorities ever ready to cooperate. Since there is a threatened shortage of power in New York State, particularly for the expansion of defense industries, the State is only too glad to cooperate in any arrangement which will meet this need, even if it is only a partial solution of the difficulties. But in making this offer, State authorities must consider not only the immediate needs, which are universally recognized, but must also protect the broad interests of the people of the State.

The State is vitally concerned in this instance because of its long-established policy to develop the people's water-power resources in the public interest. This is a policy in which the State authorities have had your valued support. I recall that in connection with the convention and protocol of January 2, 1929, between the United States and Great Britain (Canada) for the development of Niagara Falls, you wrote to then Governor, Franklin D. Roosevelt:

"I need hardly add that were this a proposal for a totally new grant of water power for private development rather than a temporary experimentation, I would be unalterably opposed to it. As you well know, I advocate that the State retain the ownership and control of water power at its source."

In reply, my distinguished predecessor wrote to you on February 9, 1929:

"It is, of course, clear that the proposed treaty with Canada is a temporary measure only, running for the diversion period of only 7 years, and that the State of New York is in no way restricted as to its full control of this water after the 7-year period has run. The stipulation received by the State of New York clears up the matters long in dispute between it and the private company and makes it perfectly clear that the State has the full sovereignty and control over the water on the American side of the Niagara River for all time."

In this policy the government of the State of New York has not wavered. As recently as January 15, 1941, I addressed the legislature of this State as follows:

"I hope to see a public development of the latent power resources of Niagara so that the people of the State, whether in New York City, Buffalo, Binghamton, Albany, or on the farms, may participate in its benefits as well as those of the St. Lawrence."

I mention this to show that the Governors of the State of New York have a consistent record in the policy of public development of the people's water-power resources. This policy has been implemented by plans of the Power Authority of the State of New York for the joint development of the resources of the St. Lawrence and Niagara Rivers which promises to become a reality by the enactment of H. R. 4927, now before Congress.

You will recall also that in 1918, at the behest of the War Department, the State of New York enacted legislation which permitted the Niagara Falls Power Co. to divert an additional 4,500 cubic second-feet of water at Niagara, under conditions agreed upon with the Governor of the State at that time. And be it especially noted that the State of New York has been constantly in litigation with the Niagara Falls Power Co. ever since in an endeavor to make it abide by the terms of its agreement. Even to this day the State has not succeeded in enforcing all of the terms.

It is now proposed to permit this company to divert an additional 5,000 cubic second-feet from which the company will derive a revenue of approximately $1,500,000 without any additional investment on its part. This would appear to be duplicating the situation of 1918 unless due diligence is exercised in formulating the terms on which any license is issued and it would seem at variance with President Roosevelt's position as stated in his speech of May 27, when he said, "This is no time for capital to make or be allowed to retain excess profits."

The situation is further complicated by the recent report of the "Examiner" in the Federal Power Commission case in which he recommends to the Commission revocation of the Niagara Falls Power Co.'s license unless the company can clean house within a month.

In view of this long history, you will agree with me that nothing should be done by the Senate of the United States to prejudice the interests of the State of New York. Although the State authorities are glad to cooperate at this time of emergency by consenting to a temporary diversion of additional water at Niagara River for the use of defense industries, we should like it understood that the State still adheres to its policy of public development of water-power resources, and would like it further understood that, in line with the policies repeatedly annunciated by the President of the United States and incorporated in the Federal Power Act of 1935, the interests of the State will receive prior consideration in the ultimate disposition of the latent power of Niagara Falls.

To secure this protection of the rights of the State, it is suggested that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate stipulate in its recommendation to the Senate that the agreement be approved on the following conditions:

1. That when the agreement comes up for reconsideration on October 1, 1942, such reconsideration should again be referred to the Senate for approval;

2. Any license issued by the Federal Power Commission under this agreement should be temporary and concurrent only with the life of such agreement;

3. License should be issued subject to the existing laws of the State of New York;

4. License should be revocable if and when the State of New York shall proceed with the development of this resource;

5. That the State of New York be consulted by the Federal Power Commission as to the terms of the license.

I know you are deeply interested in protecting the interests of the State of New York and I am confident you will take appropriate action. I would also appreciate your submitting a copy of this communication to the chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sure, from the caliber of the opposition's report, that they are not unmindful of the fact that to eliminate the seaway part of the project would add materially to the cost of the power phase of the undertaking.

The other day the Senator from New York estimated that the additional cost to the State of developing the power alone would be $100,000,000, and I agree with him in that respect. But the purpose of the opposition to the development of the power project without the navigation project is the same old purpose of divide and conquer, because they know the Midwest would not vote to spend several hundred million dollars of Federal money in developing the power project if the Midwest was to be shut off from access to it.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Let us get clear upon the separate development business. I made such a proposal here to the Senate but my proposal did not call for the expenditure of a nickel of Federal money for the project at all. Under my proposal, by a treaty between the United States and Canada authorization would be granted to the State of New York and the Province of Ontario to work out such a program between themselves, to be financed by themselves.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, we have been waiting for a long long time for New York and Ontario to make that proposition. When New York comes to Congress for consent to the right to do it—and New York has not been here for that purpose yet, and I see no indication that they will come——

Mr. IVES. Will the Senator support me if and when I make such a proposal under concrete control by way of legislation?

Mr. AIKEN. That depends upon the form in which the proposal is made. I am in favor of developing the St. Lawrence power. I am not in favor of developing it for the benefit of any single utility corporation.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it is understood that it is to be developed in line with the provisions of the constitution of the State of New York which I have already cited.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I told the Senator at the beginning of my remarks that I would support the development of St. Lawrence power if I knew that not a kilowatt-hour was going out of the State, so long as it was developed solely for benefit of the State of New York. But I think other States should benefit also.

Mr. IVES. I am sure the Senator and I can get together on that proposition.

Mr. AIKEN. I much prefer that it would be developed for the benefit of other States which are within economic transmission distances. I am in favor of development of natural resources, whether in New York, Wisconsin, Nevada, or Mississippi, or whatever the State may be, because such development would strengthen the Nation and add to the security of our Nation, and provide additional business and industry to every State, no matter where the development might be located.

Mr. President, it is perfectly logical and understandable why the elimination of the seaway part of the project would add materially to the cost of the power phase of the undertaking, because much of the work that needs to be done at the main dam is common both to transportation and power.

Therefore, in figuring costs, they are divided as between transportation and power.

Whereas, if the power development alone were undertaken, all of the costs would be allotted to power.

The point I am trying to make is that these two undertakings are complementary, particularly the work at the proposed site of the power plant.

The opposition is fully aware of this fact, and if legislation should be introduced for the power phase alone, they would find plenty of excuses to oppose the undertaking.

In discussing the role of power in the making of atomic energy, the opposition took exception to a statement by the proponents of the project, that electricity is a basic and necessary element in the production of atomic energy.

The minority report makes the point that the availability of large quantities of power was not a basic reason why the atomic energy projects were located on the Columbia River and the TVA areas.

I have made inquiry of the Atomic Energy Commission as to these claims. Here is the reply I received, and I quote from a letter written by Mr. Carroll Wilson, manager:

> Basic considerations in the selection of the Hanford site for the plutonium production plant of the atomic energy program were its isolation, the volume of water from the Columbia River available and suitable for cooling purposes, and the availability of power.
>
> No one of these factors could be described as the determining reason for the selection of the site, rather it was the combination of factors which determined the choice.
>
> The availability of power was the basic factor in the selection of the Oak Ridge (Tenn.) site.
>
> There is a steam plant located at Oak Ridge which supplies types of current not available from outside sources and serves also as an emergency supply in the event of failure of power from outside sources.
>
> Power in large quantities is a basic requirement for the production of fissionable materials.

Previously the question has been raised by opponents of the project that there is no need to develop St. Lawrence power because atomic-energy power for peacetime use will be available shortly. The joker in this argument is that it might be available, but not shortly, and certainly not cheaply.

I should like to quote from a statement by Mr. David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission:

> Power is, of course, the most spectacular application of atomic energy. But it is not here, and it is not just around the corner.
>
> Within 2 or 3 years we should have a demonstration power unit for testing and experimental work—it could be made to light lamps and run washing machines.
>
> Some of our scientists and engineers say we should have a fairly practical, efficient unit within 10 years. Even so, atomic power won't be cheap power in 10 years.

This statement appeared in the magazine section of the New York Times on January 11, 1948.

Another significant statement concerning the use of atomic energy is carried in Associated Press reports of January 13, quoting Sumner T. Pike, one of the five United States Atomic Energy Commissioners. This is what Mr. Pike says:

> It seems reasonable to expect that atomic power will come in gradually, will serve to supplement rather than replace other sources, and may never do more than to fit into niches for which it is particularly suited.

Furthermore, we have the first annual report of the Atomic Energy Commission, which was laid on our desks last Tuesday, and which definitely states that it will be not less than 20 years before we can expect any practical use of power from atomic energy.

At page 19 of the minority report there is a discussion as to the priority that should be given to various projects in deciding which to go forward with. I was particularly interested in a statement in a quotation on that page to the effect that the construction of high-powered wind tunnels should take precedence over the St. Lawrence project, for example. This raises a very fundamental and vital question.

I do not think I am giving out any security secrets when I say that it has been fairly generally known that the military have been considering the construction of a high-powered wind tunnel, or perhaps a number of wind tunnels—I do not know how many. The big question is, Where can they find enough power to operate the wind tunnel? Not less than 100,000 horsepower would be required for this purpose. So it is a very pertinent question of national defense to consider the feasibility of developing the St. Lawrence as a possible source of power in connection with this or similar projects of national defense.

OPPOSITION UNCONCERNED ABOUT ORE SUPPLY

When the minority report came to a discussion of the iron-ore supplies and the steel industry of the Midwest, I find that it took a rather unconcerned view of the fact that the Lake Superior iron-ore supply is rapidly being exhausted. Lately it has been said that we should develop the high-cost, low-quality ore of the Midwest, rather than have a way open to bring in high-grade ore from the outside.

The report of the minority does not admit that there is any need to be concerned about having a seaway available for bringing in foreign high-grade ore after the Mesabi Range is exhausted. Reference is made to the fact that the industry is extensively engaged in making plans to meet the situation. But how would they meet it? Here is the answer:

> By gradually increasing tonnages of ores concentrated from the low-grade taconate and jasper ore.

The important point overlooked here is how much will it cost to beneficiate this ore? That, Mr. President, is the joker. There is serious reason to believe that the cost of beneficiating this low-grade ore will mean a considerable increase in the cost of processed steel. Furthermore, if the industry has to resort to the use of low-grade ore, there is every reason to assume that the steel industry will be removed from the Midwest.

Transportation is a major expense in the production and distribution of steel, and there are plenty of low-grade supplies in other areas of the country where, if the seaway is not built, cheaper transportation facilities will be available.

However, the real reason why some interests oppose the seaway is this: When high-grade ore is exhausted in the Midwest, then the steel plants there will have to turn to the high-cost production of steel from low-grade ore, and thus force the major part of the industry to the coastal cities.

Baltimore plants used Chilean ore during the war and would have an advantage over Cleveland, Gary, Chicago, and other Midwest cities if they can prevent those cities from getting low-cost high-grade ore also.

It would not be consistent with national security to concentrate our steel industries on the Atlantic coast; yet that is what certain interests would force us to do.

SELF-LIQUIDATING FEATURES OF SEAWAY

The point which I should like to discuss next is one of which the opposition speaks very critically. I refer to the self-liquidating features of the seaway.

May I observe, Mr. President, that this is a very peculiar line of argument to be coming from the opposition, when we consider the fact that for years they have attacked the seaway because it would take too much money from the Federal Treasury. Now when an effort is made to make the seaway self-liquidating, the attack is still continuing.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. One of the reasons why the attack is still continuing is that under the provisions of the proposal now before us, in all probability, as the project would develop, it would still require too much money from the Federal Treasury to keep it going.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that the opposition estimates that there would be a deficit of between $2,000,000 and $5,000,000 a year.

Mr. IVES. I think that is a very moderate estimate of what would be lacking.

Mr. AIKEN. I like to be moderate.

Mr. IVES. If the Senator wishes to be really broad, I think it is estimated that anywhere from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000 a year would be lacking.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well. Let us take $10,000,000 a year, which is not likely. We are appropriating this year for our armed services more than $11,000,000,000. The money which we are appropriating for our armed services this year, assuming that the seaway had a deficit of $10,000,000 a year, would pay that deficit for more than a thousand years. If the deficit were only $2,000,000 a year—which some of the opposition have been considerate enough to admit—a single year's appropriation for the armed services would, if I am figuring this correctly in my mental arithmetic, pay the deficit for about 5,250 years, which is a long time. I do not believe we ought to quibble over whether the project will cost us $1,000,000 or $10,000,000 a year.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to point out that undoubtedly the Senator's estimates are correct when he estimates the length of time during which appropriations for the armed services would pay for the cost of this seaway, if the expenditures for the armed services were substituted for that purpose. However, that does not liquidate the seaway. Nor does it pay for its cost of operation from any other source than the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. If we demanded proof positive in detail that every project constructed with Federal money would yield

to the country returns adequate to liquidate the investment, the chances are that we would never make any investments. Did the railroads have proof when they built their lines across the prairies that they would get all their money back? I do not know how it is possible to prove, to a cent, what the income will be.

Mr. IVES. The fact remains that the railroads, insofar as actual expenses were concerned, were not turning to the Federal Government to pay for their cost. To be sure, rights-of-way were granted, and other concessions were made, but the stockholders themselves were largely responsible for the payment of expenses.

Mr. AIKEN. In the past the railroads have been given 10 percent of all the land area of the United States.

Mr. IVES. That is what I stated. Rights-of-way were granted.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. But the cost of construction was not being financed by the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Some of the railroads made more from their land grants than they did from their railroad operations.

Mr. IVES. Perhaps so.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened to this argument about the possibility of the St. Lawrence waterway not paying. I think it will be found in the record that General Wheeler said that it would pay. It will be found in the record that a great engineer by the name of Herbert Hoover said that it would pay—probably not for the first 3 or 4 years. I call attention to the facts which cannot be disputed.

If the St. Lawrence waterway were built, I should be perfectly willing to stand on the record of what I am about to say. I believe that the first year the passenger tolls would pay from $1,000,000 to $3,000,000. They have not been included in the estimates.

Moreover, Mr. Julius Barnes says that 400,000,000 bushels of wheat would be transported from Canada, and at least 400,000,000 more from the States west of Wisconsin, and including Wisconsin, would have to be transported. If we assume a minimum saving of 5 cents a bushel, the farmers of this Nation would save $40,000,000. If that is not an adequate return, I do not know what to call it.

I have not the record before me, but I have sent for it. I think it will be found that every year the Federal Government is expending for transportation on Federal highways for which it receives no direct return, millions of dollars, and it will expend many more. The project proposed will be a great national Federal highway. We are asking for the opportunity to demonstrate that it will be self-liquidating, but in the face of that opportunity every road block is thrown, every fear, everything from the Constitution down to disputing the figures of the only engineer whose testimony is recorded. That is General Wheeler, who has estimated the cost. No one disputes what he stated.

So, I repeat, this is no time to sell America short. I remember that on one occasion I spoke in the Senate, in 1940, and said, in substance, "Mr. President, I move that the Secretary of State report to us the conditions of our forces in the Far East."

I was calling attention to Hawaii and the Philippines, and suggesting that perhaps some day there might happen to this Nation what happened to the Russians. No one paid any attention.

Now we have the judgment of Secretary Marshall, one of the greatest men of his age. We have the testimony of Secretary Royall, who demonstrates the need of this seaway for defense. Then some become picayunish and say that it will not pay the first few years exactly the operating costs. The undisputed evidence shows that it will pay the operating costs. In the first few years it may not pay the liquidating costs.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I merely wanted to point out that I think this is the most ingenious argument yet presented by the proponents of the proposition, namely, in order that it can be demonstrated that the seaway will pay for itself we must have it constructed. I merely point out, in that connection, that, assuming all of the rosy coloring that was given to the project by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, assuming all the hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat, and all the tonnage and traffic to which he has referred, were actually to be forthcoming—in other words, with the 52,000,000 tons, which was the figure to which the estimates have been upped by the latest accounts, and which are still going up—if they were forthcoming, the project might pay for itself.

But there are some of us who have very grave doubts that there will be such tonnage on the seaway. If there should be, the diversion of tonnage from other means of transportation would be of such a nature that in all probability serious consequences would ensue as far as those other means of transportation were concerned.

I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not know whether the seaway would pay every dollar of expense the first year, the second year, the third year, the fourth year, or what year, but I am willing to accept the report of the United States Department of Commerce, because I know of no better authority to which to turn. But if there were to be a substantial deficit, I would still be in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway.

I do not agree with the Senator from New York that tonnage would be diverted from other ports, because it would be composed principally, according to the Department of Commerce, of oil, coal, ore, and grain, of which New York's port gets only grain at this time, and it is losing that tonnage rapidly to other ports.

Mr. IVES. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to correct a misunderstanding which the Senator seems to have in connection with my remarks. I was not referring to ports, but to means of transportation, which is quite a different thing.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is 10 cents to be saved, I would rather save it for the farmers of Minnesota and North and South Dakota than for the New York Central Railroad.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have found some very important evidence indicating that we are now spending $460,000,000 a year on Federal aid, and will be spending that amount for the next 3 years. That is Federal aid simply in connection with our highways, which are another means of transportation.

I want to say only a word in reply to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. I have never found him picayunish nor have I found him small in his estimates of things, but it seems to me that in this instance he is using simply a yardstick of dollars. We have the testimony of men like Marshall, Royall, Wheeler, Eisenhower, and others, who will not guarantee, as no one can, even physical operation. Doctors have said that the smallest physical operation is serious with respect to the outcome. These men have valued everything except the dollar equation. They have told us the importance of the project from the standpoint of defense and from the standpoint of giving a shot to the economic lifeblood of this country. They have spoken of a fourth seacoast. In addition to that, men like Hoover and others, who are successful men, have told us that in their judgment the seaway will pay out in dollars very soon, if not in the first few years. On that I base my judgment. I am not taking merely the word of someone who is a legislator.

Secretary Royall gave us seven or eight reasons why the seaway was important in national defense. That is no real answer to the atomic bomb. He gave us the picture, as he saw it. He is a South Carolinian. He told us what it would mean to the future of this country.

I repeat, that in evaluating any great public work we do not merely say we can guarantee its performance. We have to look into the future. America has been built and will continue to be built by men and women who have faith in the future in connection with the economic, physical, and spiritual growth of this Nation. In the future, instead of 50,000,000 persons in the St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes Valley there will be 100,000,000. Anyone who has any sense of values at all knows that hundreds of thousands of persons will require transportation. To have adequate transportation we must have facilities. I told someone today of my experience in seeking to get a boiler to replace one which had been injured. A distance of only 400 miles is involved, but it has taken 3 weeks for the railroads to transport the boiler. That indicates, in our section, at least, what is needed—the expansion of all our facilities, high-

ways, railroads, and canals, and an expansion of our human vision.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I merely want to observe that that statement is the first indication I have had of a definite nature that the proponents actually admit that this seaway project will not be a self-liquidating proposition. The able Senator from Wisconsin, in the statement he just made, indicated definitely that the probabilities are, on the basis of the estimates of the proponents themselves, that the project will not be self-liquidating.

I want to point out here and now, Mr. President, that I am not interested in the dollar from the standpoint of other means of transportation. It has been intimated that I was worried also about the dollar welfare of the railroads. I am not one bit worried about that. If they all go into bankruptcy, so far as I am personally concerned it would not have any effect. I would feel sorry for them and for our economy, because the Government would have to take them over. What I am worried about is the diversion of traffic—not dollars, but tons. That is what I am talking about.

The Senator spoke of the transportation of a boiler. He was interested in getting a boiler delivered at this time of the year. It bears out the thought that some of us have that this is the time of the year when the railroads have the most difficult time of all; and it is exactly this time of the year when, if there were any sizable amount of traffic diversion as the result of the use of the proposed canal, the additional burdens on the railroads would probably be so great that they could not handle the traffic. That is why I am worried about transportation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Just briefly, to permit the Senator to reply to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure the Senator from New York did not intend to put words into my mouth.

Mr. IVES. No, no. I was trying to put words into the Senator's thoughts.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator had actually been listening to what I previously said, he would understand how unfair his own statement was. I analyzed the testimony and tried to bring into the picture the fact that no venture that America has ever made has been guaranteed to be self-liquidating the first or second year. What we are asking is that the Senator and others lift their visors so they can see the significance and the tremendous potentiality of the project. That is all I intended to do. I want to say definitely that it is my hope and my faith, based upon the testimony of former President Hoover, upon the support of every President since Harding, and upon the support of every Secretary of State since Harding—based upon their judgment and their vision—that this project will be self-liquidating.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I may have about 10 more minutes I shall be through, and the patient occupant of the chair will be glad to listen to a different voice than mine.

As we know, provision is made for making the power part of the project self-liquidating. Senate Joint Resolution 111 and previous legislation carried the same provision. In an effort now to satisfy the criticism of the opposition, we propose to go all the way and make the whole project self-liquidating. Frankly, I have felt in the past that the seaway part of the project would be entirely justified if it were not self-liquidating. I still feel that way.

But if, in order to obtain approval of the project, tolls would help achieve that objective, then I readily accept tolls.

I should like to call attention to the fact that shortly before the minority report was filed the Department of Commerce completed and issued a rather comprehensive study on the transportation and toll features of the seaway. The title of this study is Economic Appraisal of the St. Lawrence Seaway Project. prepared by the Transportation Division, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce. This report was prepared under the direction of Dr. Paul M. Zeis, Acting Chief of the Transportation Division, and completely refutes the arguments of the minority report. I shall not attempt to go into an analysis of the details of the report. For the purpose of this discussion I shall only mention the summary high lights of the conclusions.

But before proceeding in my reference to the Commerce Department's recent report, which was issued in December 1947, I call attention to the fact that it has generally been agreed, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the remaining costs of the seaway part of the project to the United States would be approximately $330,000,000.

It was fairly generally agreed that by adding interest and amortization charges over about a 50-year period, the annual cost of the seaway's navigation project would be between 15 and 21 million dollars, depending upon the rate of interest and other amortization factors. Figuring on the basis of an annual cost of say, $17,450,000, the United States' share will be $13,680,000, and the Canadian share $3,770,000. Canada has already spent considerably more than the United States has on the seaway, and would be given credit for that greater expenditure.

While these are the figures that were generally used at the hearings, the Minority Report also refers to some much higher figures, with annual charges skyrocketing up to about 50 million dollars annually.

This is an exorbitant appraisal of the costs, and has no basis of fact whatever.

It is significant to note that the figure for annual tonnage of traffic, used in the Minority Report, is an old figure of 25,000,000 tons a year.

On this point, I should like to quote from the recent Commerce Report:

> * * * Potential seaway traffic has been estimated at thirty to thirty-seven and a half million tons of iron ore, six and a half to eleven and a half million tons of grain, and about four million tons of bituminous coal, making a grand total for these three commodities of forty and a half to 53,000,000 tons.
>
> In addition there is a distinct possibility that a huge traffic in petroleum might develop, although any substantial traffic in this commodity should be regarded as a long-range rather than an immediate possibility.
>
> Accordingly, the following discussion is in terms of these commodities, ore, grain, and coal, which would move in large volume on the seaway shortly after its completion.

Mr. President, the Commerce Department estimates the total revenue from tolls at from $20,925,000 to $27,100,000 annually.

So, Mr. President, actually we have here an effective answer to the Minority Report, first, concerning the contention that a study of the toll question needs to be made, and, second, concerning the amount of revenue which tolls can reasonably be expected to produce.

As I said in the beginning, the opposition has consistently sought to thwart consideration of this project on the grounds that some additional studies needed to be made. That was their proposal in connection with the toll question. They use the tactics long used by the power and railroad interests of the Northeast.

Inasmuch as a reliable agency of the Government has made such a study—and if the Department of Commerce is not the competent and proper agency to make such a study, I do not know what agency is—and has in good faith given an honest answer to what it thinks the facts are, there is no point in delaying the project for further study on this score. It is equally clear, Mr. President, that the Commerce Department study shows that from the standpoint of potential traffic and the prospect for self-liquidating this project, it is a wholly feasible and worth-while undertaking.

I would not do justice to these comments on the minority views if I failed to mention their implications concerning the question of who will pay for the project if, for any reason, it should not be self-liquidating. Surely the Atlantic and Gulf port cities that are fighting this project—those cities are not the only ones fighting it, but the principal port cities opposing this project are Boston, New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans—could not ask this question with good grace.

FEDERAL AID TO PORT CITIES

I have here some figures from the Rivers and Harbors Division of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, the people who have charge of Federal expenditures in connection with navigable streams. Here is what the figures show: Federal expenditures for port and channel work at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Baltimore, New Orleans, Galveston, and Houston, up to June 30, 1946, amounted to approximately $244,000,000. According to representatives of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, Congress has spent approximately $50,000,000 on the port of Boston alone. Some of them use the sorry and silly argument that now that the Federal Government has spent that $50,000,000 on the development of the port of Boston,

it should never spend money on any investment or any project which would compete with the port of Boston.

Total Federal river and harbor allocations since 1934 in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, Louisiana, and Texas, were in excess of $350,000,000, or more than our entire cost of the seaway part of the St. Lawrence project.

In other words those cities and States—and I have selected only a few—from which have come the sanctimonious talk against using Federal funds to develop the St. Lawrence project, have been raiding the Federal Treasury all these years, and in at least one case a Member of this body boasted in his campaign for reelection about the proportionately high amount of Federal money he had been able to have appropriated for river and harbor work in his State.

As for the contention of the opposition that because of high costs, this is not the time to go forward with the project, that, again, is an old contention. According to their arguments, the time will never be right for this project. Here, again, they are playing up a side issue. Of course, the reason for adding the self-liquidating features is to make the project pay for itself.

In any event, if we help everyone else in the world, but do not spend money in developing our own resources, the time will come when we shall not be able to help even ourselves.

It is certainly penny-wise and pound-foolish to deprive our country of its means of expansion, through failure to develop its resources. The St. Lawrence is conceded to be one of the most valuable natural resources on the entire North American Continent.

Mr. President, earlier in my remarks today, I have referred to the requests of the opposition that consideration of the project be delayed, so that other studies can be made. Mr. President, because of the fact that consideration of this project has been going on for the last 20 years in a rather active manner, and so many competent studies have been made, there is no point in delay now for the sake of bringing up to date some detailed figures or detailed points. In the case of the Panama Canal, the question of tolls was not settled until shortly before the Canal was opened.

Yesterday, the junior Senator from Louisiana called attention to the fact that up to 1947 the Panama Canal showed a deficit of $124,000,000, and he cited that as a reason why we could not expect the St. Lawrence development to be self-liquidating.

The facts in the case of the Panama Canal are these:

Up to 1940, all expenditures on the Panama Canal, including interest from the time of its inception, amounted to $500,000,000. During this period, the Canal paid 2½ percent interest on this amount, set aside a $50,000,000 fund for depreciation and still showed a $20,000,000 profit.

The loss referred to by the Senator from Louisiana occurred during the recent war when the Canal was used mainly by war vessels of the allied nations on which no toll was charged. Part of the loss was also due to the huge reconstruction works which were necessary at that time.

Mr. President, I wish to agree with what the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] said a few minutes ago, namely, that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway will bring more business to the railroads. Obviously, we cannot make large amounts of power available to a community without helping all forms of transportation in that community.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not recall making the statement that the development of the St. Lawrence seaway would bring more tonnage to the railroads.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator said it would bring more tonnage to the railroads during the winter months.

Mr. IVES. During the winter months.

Mr. AIKEN. That is an argument in favor of the seaway; because if the railroads had adequate facilities for handling the freight during the late summer and fall months, they would be bound to have surplus facilities during the winter months, and during those months the traffic normally using the seaway would keep those surplus railroad facilities in full use.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it is difficult to understand by what process the railroads would be expected to have adequate facilities during the summer months for handling the peak-load business which would not arrive until midfall and early winter. Does the Senator propose that all the railroad employees needed in the peak season be kept on during the slack season, which would be the summer, in view of the fact that the canal would be operating at that time?

Mr. AIKEN. No. If the Senator will look at the records, he will find that the business of the railroads increases during the summer, and reaches its peak in October, and then decreases during the winter.

Mr. IVES. I know when the peak load comes, but I also know when the hardest time comes from the standpoint of transportation. That is in the months of November, December, January, and February. That is the hardest time for the railroads. If they are not properly geared to meet that situation, they will be in bad shape.

Mr. AIKEN. The railroads now are imposing embargoes on the shipment of grain to eastern ports because they cannot handle the grain which was shipped late last fall from the Midwest to Atlantic ports. Certainly they need the seaway to supplement their own transportation facilities during the fall months.

MERITS OF PROJECT SOUND

Mr. President, the over-all merits of the project under consideration are as sound today as they were in the years past. In fact, there is a more compelling reason now for going ahead with this project than there has ever been in the past. Surely if we wait until every opposition has been overcome, until every red herring has been deodorized, and until every minute detail has been worked out and answered once and for all, we shall never get anything passed in the Congress.

It is a question of deciding now whether this project will contribute to the growth and development of mid-Continental North America by providing a deep-water outlet to the sea, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, deciding whether the power which can be generated at this project will contribute to the future growth and expansion of our economy.

These questions have been answered beyond all shadow of doubt. No one here can deny or question the fact that adidtional transportation facilities are needed today.

No one in this body can deny that there have been power shortages, general power shortages throughout the country in recent months, and that they exist, and that they are becoming more acute month by month. The shortage has been particularly acute in the northeastern part of the country, the area to be served by the St. Lawrence project.

We have seen the concentration of industry in areas of public-power development, such as the TVA and the Columbia River projects. This concentration is explained by one thing, the availability of low-cost power. In the not-too-distant future it is entirely probable that these areas will reach the saturation point. There is doubt as to whether additional power will be available for new businesses. What will we do then if we do not go forward with a program of further expansion?

I know that the power companies have been talking about their plans for expansion, but at best their expansion is largely in the form of steam-generating plants. This means unquestionably continued high-cost power.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POWER NEEDED

To digress a little from the main course of my argument, I cannot help but call attention to the fact that the National Project Conference, which is an out-and-out opponent of the seaway project, has been publicizing the country asking why should the private companies go ahead with their expansion program if the St. Lawrence power is to be developed. The implication is that there would not be a need for the private-generated power then. Experience has shown in the TVA area and elsewhere that where hydroelectric power is made available, the need for stand-by steam power has inevitably increased.

I am informed by the Federal Power Commission, however, that St. Lawrence power could operate very profitably and efficiently without stand-by power, because it is such a high percentage of firm power, a condition which also exists at Bonneville Dam.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not like to interrupt him.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not like to break into this discussion, but I do want to point out that that is probably correct, to a certain point.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. Nevertheless, only about two-thirds would be available under those circumstances.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question but that some stand-by power would be necessary in order to obtain the fullest development of the St. Lawrence, but it would be practicable, according to the Federal Power Commission, even without stand-by power.

Mr. IVES. It could be done, but it should be borne in mind that that means that only about two-thirds of the 1,100,000 horsepower about which the Senator speaks would be available by that process.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. I am nearly through, Mr. President, but I should like to quote from the testimony of the Federal Power Commission before the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations, in hearings which were held in February and March 1946. After presenting certain tables, Mr. Olds, Chairman of the Commission, said:

> In very brief and simple terms these figures show that, of the various groupings shown, Tennessee, with the largest proportional increase in hydroelectric energy in the 15-year period also had the largest proportional increase in consumption of coal for the generation of electrity.
>
> Correspondingly, New York State, with the lowest proportional increase in hydroelectric energy also had the lowest proportional increase in consumption of coal for the generation of electricity.

I think that is an ample answer to the coal interests, who claim they would be seriously injured by the development of hydroelectric power anywhere.

Getting back to the power companies, I am convinced that they will go forward with the development of new facilities. But their facilities alone cannot begin to meet the demand for power in the Northeast and elsewhere.

In the past they have shown no particular foresight in planning ahead. I see no reason to assume that they will be particularly foresighted in planning ahead now.

CONCLUSION

As I near the conclusion of these remarks, may I say that I have made these comments in connection with the minority report for the purpose of showing that, after all, the opposition has raised mainly detailed, technical questions.

It is my desire to make it clear that from a standpoint of national defense, from the standpoint of the general welfare of the country, and from the standpoint of the further development and growth of the country, I am convinced that this project is not only desirable—it is needed. It is imperative.

Mr. President, let me again emphasize the importance of the pending legislation and urge that we pass this bill without delay. This legislation if passed would authorize the approval of the United States-Canadian agreement of 1941, providing for the joint development of the navigation and power resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin for the mutual benefit of Canada and the United States.

The real significance of this project is that it would connect mid-continental North America with the sea lanes of the world, giving to some 50,000,000 people in our own Midwest a deep-water transportation avenue to the outside world.

The power phase of the project would provide close to 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity—one-half of which would be apportioned to this country and one-half to Canada—with which to turn the wheels of progress.

The proposed power station, near Massena, N. Y., would be one of the largest in the world and would generate more power than the entire output of the TVA in 1946.

In considering the issues at stake, they all boil down to this: allied on one side of this question are the proponents who believe in the cause of progress. Allied on the opposite side are the stand-patters and the disciples of a status-quo philosophy. In deciding their vote on this important issue, I urge my colleagues to keep this fundamental issue in mind.

POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN THE SOUTH

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I notice in the public press that the southern Governors, as a result of their Tallahassee meeting, appointed a committee to deal with the Democratic leadership and recommend a policy to protect the dignity of the South, the rights of the States, and the social institutions of that great area. I hope that this committee's recommendations will not be for further appeasement and vacillation. I hope that their recommendations will not mark another milestone in the destruction of southern institutions. Through recent years the South has retreated step by step until now it is spurned from the throne which we ourselves have created.

Southern people do not desire to leave the Democratic Party. We want to continue in the future as we have in the past. However, we of the South must take whatever political steps are necessary to prevent our social institutions from being destroyed by the force and power of a Government which threatens through the FBI and the Department of Justice, in true Gestapo style, to go further than was done even in reconstruction days. All we demand of the northern leadership is that they stop this drive to destroy us, and govern this great country for the welfare of its people instead of being the servant of organized pressure groups. Do not barter the institutions of the people and the sovereignty of the States for racial votes in northern States.

Mr. President, what I shall say today I say for the welfare of southern people. Our people are steeped in democratic tradition. All they know politically is the Democratic Party. This is my own background. All my people have always been stanch Democrats. I love the South, her people, her traditions, her institutions, and her culture. My grandfather, my relatives wore the gray. My forebears shed blood for the southern cause. Both of my grandfathers, and all my relatives did their part in throwing off the yoke of carpetbagger reconstruction and in setting up the present South with all that the name implies. I am proud of the part they played.

Because of our solidly Democratic background, and because of our natural fear of Republican rule, our people, as a result of the mistreatment we have received from Republicans, are extremely reluctant to follow any course except the one that we have historically followed and this is true even though new conditions and new dangers make new policies advisable. The easy thing to do is to drift along, to say, "Let us at all hazards be loyal to the Democratic Party. Let us settle our controversies within the party; but on election day, come what may, regardless of the issues, we must give our electoral votes to that party." This is said to be sound politics: "Have no controversy; make no enemies; do not rock the boat." That is the easy way to stay in office. Such a course may lead to political power within the party organization, but it also leads to moral degradation. I know that this procedure, Mr. President, will in the end destroy the South and injure her people. I know it will play havoc with the future of my children and the children of my neighbors and friends.

No, Mr. President, we cannot play politics with southern institutions. We cannot, if we can help it, permit our party or any other political organization to follow a course that will result in tragedy for the South. It is evident that the present policies of the Democratic Party now lead to this end.

Mr. President, the grave dilemma in which the South now finds herself and the decision which her people must make involve one of the great problems of present day America.

I am frank to say that unless the southern people act, and act speedily and decisively, our social institutions, our culture, the traditions which still guide us, will be destroyed. In reconstruction, the most shameful era in American history, the Republican Party attempted to destroy the white race in the South. It attempted to form Negro States there with Anglo Saxon people subservient to the blacks. Our States were occupied by Federal troops; corrupt elections supported by the bayonet were the custom. Blacks, whether qualified or not, were voted by unscrupulous and criminal leaders with the promise of financial gain for victory in the election. I seriously doubt if there was ever a period of such corruption and infamy at any time in any Government in modern times. The Democratic Party of that day stood shoulder to shoulder with southern people. It opposed the corrupt reconstruction policies. It supported our aims. It assisted in the return of decency. Through its aid, together with an honest Supreme Court that upheld the Constitution of the United States, and through the superior intelligence and leadership of the Anglo-Saxon, the white people of the South were victorious. We took our place as one of the great sections of this country whose loyalty and fidelity to America has been tested on many battlefields. Since those times and solely because the Democratic Party has stood for State sovereignty and the social institutions of the Southern States, our people have remained solidly Democratic. We were correct in taking this position.

Since that time the South has been the backbone of the Democratic Party. Our people for generations have been loyal through victory and defeat. In

fact, the eminent position of the Democratic Party in the Nation today is due to the loyalty and fidelity of the Southern States. Now conditions have changed, and we find the Democratic Party bent upon the destruction of the institutions of the South.

Mr. President, no election forecast in 1948 gives the Democratic Party any chance of success without the electoral vote of the solid South. It is admitted by practically everyone that the election this year will be close, and it is admitted even by Democratic leaders themselves that it will take practically the entire electoral vote of the Southern and border States to give any Democratic candidate hope of success. In fact, our electoral vote is fundamental in all Democratic election calculations in 1948.

The great southern dilemma, Mr. President, is caused solely by our loyalty to the Democratic Party. Our own party up to now has been certain of us, and therefore cares nothing about us. They give us no consideration because they feel sure that, regardless of what they say or what they do, what the issues are or who the candidate is, our southern people will be led to the polls like sheep to vote the straight party ticket. The Republican Party is just as sure it will receive no political favors at our hands, and therefore cares nothing for us and will give us no consideration. As a result of southern loyalty, Mr. President, and solely because party leaders are certain of our votes, we find the national Democratic leadership today attempting to barter the South's social institutions for the political favors of mongrel northern minority groups in politically doubtful States—groups which place their own special demands above the welfare of the Nation. The leadership of both parties fawns over them. In fact, these minority groups today control the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, the people of the South are expected to remain docile while their civilization and culture are destroyed, while their segregation statutes are repealed by Federal action, and while the white race is destroyed under the false guise of another civil-rights bill. We are expected to remain docile while the pure blood of the South is mongrelized by the barter of our heritage by northern politicians in order to secure political favors from Red mongrels in the slums of the great cities of the East and Middle West. Our people are expected to do this under the guise of party loyalty. Southern leaders are expected to lead the people of the South to their destruction in order to obtain patronage and political favors.

Mr. President, this is the gravest time for the South since the reconstruction era. Indeed, conditions now are similar to those that existed in the 1850's. If one will but read the works of that greatest of all great southern leaders, the revered John C. Calhoun, one will see that conditions today are very similar to the conditions that existed in the last years of his life and that aroused that great South Carolinian to his magnificent efforts to save the South, her social institutions, her people and her culture.

Let me tell the people of the South we cannot afford to be subservient to the party bosses. Subserviency is the cause of our present crisis.

Mr. President, we have no race problem in the South. Both races live side by side in contentment. Both races know and respect the other. The Negro receives a square deal. Both races recognize that the society of the South is built upon segregation. In fact, the races segregate themselves because it is the natural thing to do. Both races recognize that segregation is for the good of both, and I am sure, Mr. President, that the Negro race in the South believes just as strongly in segregation as does the white race. Of course, there are some radicals among them who would oppose segregation, but I know the Negroes and I know that the great masses of them believe in and practice segregation. For example, I have received letters from Negro veterans from Mississippi who protest being placed in nonsegregated veterans' hospitals and request me to get them transferred to a Negro institution.

The agitation for the destruction of southern segregation, Mr. President, does not come from the South. It comes from northern mongrels who desire to crack the color line and from politicians who engage in racial demagoguery to use the Negro to get his vote. The southern Negro knows better. He realizes that this program is not to his advantage. It is significant to me that the northern politicians who rail against segregation live very segregated lives themselves. In fact, they do not associate with Negroes as much as I do. They do not care as much for Negroes as do the people of the South. They promise social equality but they know they cannot bring it about. Northern people would not stand for it any more than southern people. The masses of the people of the North believe in segregation. Everyone knows that. The promise of social equality is a fraud, an attempt to use the Negro for political purposes. Southern Negroes know that. They are not fooled. The northern politician is interested in using him and in voting the Negro in the North. It has been the history in the North that the Negro has been repeatedly used politically and then cast aside. This is not true in the South. Southern people are sincerely interested in the welfare of the southern Negro.

Mr. President, every decent southerner desires the Negro to do well. The South is just recovering economically from the Civil War. Our great problem in the South has been poverty. Both races have been held down because of it. The South has been deliberately impoverished since the Civil War, Mr. President, by freight rate and tariff discriminations, by absentee proprietorship. Our natural resources have been exploited by eastern capital as an outlet for investments to make huge profits from cheap southern labor. The northern politicians who imposed this system on the South and maintained it for years also posed as friends of the Negro and appeared to champion his rights, yet they were merely using him for political and financial gain.

Mr. President, the greatest economic development in America is now occurring in the South. My State, Mississippi, has made more progress since the great depression than any other State in the Union. I am struck by seeing the bustle and expansion of the South as compared with the mill towns of New England. As the South has developed, as the income of our people has risen, the southern Negro has made phenomenal progress. His standard of living has vastly increased. Education and health facilities have improved. In fact, his rise has been assisted instead of hindered by the southern white man.

I know the South must spend more money on Negro education. The Negro is entitled to this. We must improve his hospital facilities. There must be better housing. Every decent southerner believes in these things. This should be done and is being done as rapidly as economic conditions permit. A high standard of living for the southern Negro means higher southern prosperity. Increased purchasing power helps everyone, white and black. Southern people recognize this. The South can now do it and will do it because the shackles of northern domination, the archaic system which has enslaved both white and black, is being thrown off. We now have the capital to develop our own resources.

Mr. President, with reference to the intricate problem in human relations which history has thrust upon the Southern States, I think it would be well for us to recall the words of a true liberal Republican from the State of Idaho, the late William E. Borah, who in a debate on a sectional anti-lynching bill rose to the true heights of his greatness. Since this was no self-serving declaration from a Southerner, I think the Nation would be interested now to recall his words:

> These States are not to be pilloried and condemned without a full presentation of the nature of the task which fate and circumstances imposed upon them, and not without a complete record as to the weight and difficulty of the task, what has been done, and with what good faith it has been met. I shall contend that the Southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history, dealing with a problem of similar nature. Let us inquire what it is that the South has had to do, how it has done it, and what reason there is now, after 70 years of great effort, to pass censure or condemnation of those great States and that great people.

At the conclusion of this great speech, Senator Borah stated:

> Only the patient process of education, the uplifting power of religion, the tolerant, noble-minded men and women who give their thoughts to the cause can remove or mollify such injustices or such harshnesses. And that is being done; it is being done in the South; that result the South is achieving; the record so shows; and the people of the South are entitled to our commendation and not our condemnation. They are entitled to our cooperation and support.

Mr. President, the racial agitation in this country today is not over equality of economic opportunity for the Negro. It is not over a program to raise the Negroes' standard of living and better their condition. The issue is the destruction of segregation, the destruction of the sovereignty of the States, and the concentration of all power in the Federal Government. In fact, the Constitutional issue today is the same as it was in the

days of John C. Calhoun when he made his heroic stand for States' Rights and pointed out the fallacy of the theory that the Federal Government had the right to judge, in the last resort, of the extent of its powers.

In the last analysis, these are the issues, Mr. President—issues presented largely by our own party, the Democratic Party, under its radical northern leadership which has taken the lead in the betrayal for political purposes of their friends and benefactors of the South. Both parties, in the wild bidding for votes of organized minorities in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Harlem, and other great cities of the North and East would change the form of our Government and do grave damage also to the masses of the people of the North who have no special ends to serve.

Mr. President, beginning about the year 1938 and continuing without let-up, there has been a concerted assault upon the South's social institutions and upon segregation in both the North and South. This drive has been supported by organizations with a Nation-wide membership, with vast sums of money at their disposal, and has been accompanied by a violent propaganda barrage.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator was discussing the antilynching bill and the statements made by the late Senator Borah——

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator will wait a moment, I am coming to a discussion to the antilynching bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was about to ask the Senator if he has the records showing the number of lynchings, and the details.

Mr. EASTLAND. There was one lynching in the United States last year.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will wait until the Senator reaches that subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bills which these organizations have supported in recent years are several. One of them, the anti-poll-tax bill, seeks to have the Congress declare that the payment of a poll tax shall not be a qualification for voting in an election for Senator, Representative, and Presidential elector.

I have heard some people in the South say that the poll tax is not one of the major safeguards of white elections. Of course, it is not, but the fight goes much deeper than that. It is an attempt to transfer the power to define the qualifications of electors from the States to the Federal Government. It is an attempt to give to the Federal Government control of all elections.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to remind the Senator that he and I, on this floor and in committee and elsewhere, violently opposed poll-tax repeal measures on two occasions during recent years. I commend him for this statement as to the thoughts of the southern people. It is not a question of the poll tax, or what they think about the payment of the poll tax, but it is entirely a question of Federal interference. In 1942 I recommended to the legislature of South Carolina the repeal of the poll-tax law. Last year that repeal measure passed one branch of the State legislature. I believe that had it not been for the poll-tax fights and the confusion which resulted here when several of us were even apprehended and even brought back here one Saturday afternoon in 1942 or 1943, there would be practically no States in the South today with the poll tax. Each year the poll tax is repealed in a number of Southern States; until we have reached the point where only a few States have such laws. We were in process of repealing our State law when the strong arm of the Federal Government, through the Senate, said "We will do it for you. We will give you no chance." We had a long fight in the Senate, and a vote on cloture on two occasions. and the result was only harmful to progress.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, the poll tax does not amount to much. If Southern States wished to do so, all they would have to do to confine their electors to one race would be to provide that no man who had been convicted of bigamy or unlawful cohabitation, or who was guilty of adultery, should vote. That would give us an iron-clad control over our elections.

The facts are, Mr. President, that if Congress has the power to say that the poll tax is not a qualification for elector in national elections, it can say that other qualifications set up by the States are not qualifications, and can strike down all the voting safeguards of any State. If Congress has the power to say what are not qualifications, it has the power to decide affirmatively what the qualifications of electors are. This would be the result if this bill should be enacted and sustained by the Supreme Court. The right to define the qualifications of electors is the cornerstone of State sovereignty. It is one of the fundamental powers of the States. Under no conditions should the South surrender it.

Mr. President, another bill on this program is FEPC, a bill which, stripped of its nonessentials, seeks to use the power of the Federal Government to abolish segregation of Negroes and whites in the South. Its purpose is to break down all forms of segregation in employment, both public and private, in all parts of the country. During the war, when we had a temporary FEPC created by Executive order, its activities were directed to this end. In practice this bill would give minority groups preference in employment over other segments of the population. It would deprive management of the right to hire its own employees and transfer that power from industry to the Federal Government. It would give to the Federal Government the power to make promotions in private business, and through these activities would largely result in Government control of all business. This bill seeks to overrule the segregation statutes of the States. It would destroy the private-enterprise system. Mr. President, never in the history of the Republic has any measure been considered which would give the Federal Government such vast power over the American people. The reconstruction measures of Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner were mild in comparison. This bill alone would degrade, mongrelize, and destroy the South, and yet we have a Democratic President sponsoring it—a man who was nominated for the Vice Presidency because of the support of the Southern States.

There is also the antilynching bill, a bill which if enacted and sustained by the courts would invade the police power of the States and make a Federal crime out of that which under the Constitution is solely within the domain of the States, thus further destroying State sovereignty and our dual system of government.

Mr. President, if the laws here recommended shall be passed by Congress, the groups advocating them have every reason to feel that the Supreme Court, as now constituted, would hold such action constitutional; thus, from now on, the power would be created through action of Congress to destroy State law and State governments. I say for my colleagues from other States, who in this instance have little interest in the laws affecting the South, that this power once being vested in the Federal Government would be exercised in the future to destroy any law which they wished to destroy in their States, and their State governments would actually exist no longer except as a political subdivision to collect taxes for strictly local affairs. Moreover, Mr. President, I want to point out to the minorities in this country who desire that this step be taken that they are creating an instrumentality of Federal power for their destruction, which can be grasped by any future Hitler, Mussolini or any other man on horseback. Actually, the greatest protection the American people have, be they members of minority races or otherwise, is the protection afforded by State law and State government, as guaranteed in the Constitution, not only with regard to civil rights but with regard to all others.

Mr. President, for several years I have seen the storm clouds gathering. I have seen conditions become darker and more threatening. I have seen these organizations become more powerful, more demanding. I have seen both political parties become more servile, until today they are merely the errand boys, the flunkeys, of organized racial and religious minority groups. We see today the rights, the basic and fundamental liberties of a free people, bartered away in order to secure votes for politicians to capture or retain public office.

Make no mistake about it—the drive is on for the total destruction of segregation, with racial mongrelization the inevitable result. Look what the Attorney General of the United States did in the case of Shelly against Kreaemer et al. now pending in the Supreme Court. This was private litigation in which the Government was not a party and was not involved. Yet, to serve his political masters and to carry out the recommendations of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, the Attorney General announced administration political policy. In an amicus curiae brief, plainly filed for political purposes, he said:

Actual segregation rooted in ignorance, bigotry, and prejudice, and nurtured by the

opportunities it affords for monetary gains from the supposed beneficiaries and real victims alike, does exist because private racial restrictions are enforced by courts.

Mr President, late last year, as the crowning effort of northern radicals to put over their antisouthern legislation, the President's so-called Committee on Civil Rights issued a report which has become the Bible of the radical movement in the United States. The crux of the committee's report is the total elimination from American life of segregation, based on race, color, creed, or national origin. This was the committee's fundamental recommendation. The committee also proposed that all Federal grants-in-aid and other forms of Federal assistance to schools and other public or private agencies for any purpose be made contingent on the absence of discrimination and segregation, based on race, color, creed, or national origin, in the recipient institutions.

In addition, the committee report recommends the abolition of restrictive covenants, together with a renewed court attack, with intervention by the Department of Justice, upon covenants which prohibit the sale of property in white areas to Negroes. It is interesting to note that this recommendation has been carried out by the disgraceful intervention of the Attorney General in a private suit now pending in the Supreme Court, a case which I described a few moments ago.

Other portions of the report recommended the abolition by the Federal Government of segregation in education, health services, hospitals, schools, swimming pools, and in all public services of the National Government. It further recommended elimination of segregation in interstate commerce, and in all places of public accommodation or public amusement, and, in addition, in the armed forces of this country. I note, Mr. President, from the public press that this latter recommendation is now being carried out. In fact, the crux of the whole report is the total elimination from American life of all segregation based on race or color. This report was approved by the President of the United States when he stated in a message to Congress on February 2 of this year that we must close the gap between our ideals and practices.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that the southern people who were to be so vitally effected by the President's so-called Civil Rights Committee were denied representation on the committee, except for two persons who had already by former action committed themselves to the course which they were expected to pursue. The views of the vast majority of the people of the South, both white and black, who believe in segregation were not consulted, and the idea that there might be opposition to the views of the committee by the vast majoriy of bona fide southerners of all races was dismissed as if it were a matter of little moment.

Mr. President, in the President's special message on civil rights to the Congress he endorsed the bills which I have heretofore described this afternoon. He endorsed the principles embodied in the bill of the Negro Congressman, Rev. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, abolishing segregation of the races in transportation.

But the President proposes to go much farther than has the Reverend POWELL in destroying segregation. He proposes to create a Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice with an army of lawyers to launch an intensive campaign for the removal of any form of law or ordinance now existing or hereafter passed by States or municipalities which might provide for the segregation of the races in schools, swimming pools, restaurants, hotels, or segregation in any other manner. Furthermore, the President proposes that this army of lawyers be augmented by the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in carrying out this campaign and announces that hordes of these FBI agents already are being trained for this purpose.

This is the meaning of the message of the President. It contains the most far-reaching recommendations ever made by a President of the United States.

Mr. President, this is the same civil-rights program which passed the Congress between 1866 and 1875. It is the same program which was vetoed in part by President Andrew Johnson, passed over his veto by a reconstruction Congress, and which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, the people of the South do not realize the full import of the President's program. I quote from an article in the New York Times of February 8 of this year, which presents an accurate picture of what the South faces at this time:

> Enactment of the President's proposals, some observers point out, would put on the statute books as imposing a Federal civil-rights structure as was erected by means of civil rights acts passed between 1866 and 1875. The first of these was intended to eliminate the post-Civil War black codes by which the Southern States sought to restrict Negroes. The second was designed to assure the rights to all citizens regardless of race or color. Another act was aimed against lynching, and one was passed in 1875 prohibiting Jim Crow practices.

This program would have destroyed the South beyond hope of redemption. The South was saved because the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the Constitution and the sovereignty of the States by declaring these bills unconstitutional. We are now face to face again with the stark realities of this same condition. We have here a Democratic Party attempting to reenact the same program which the Republicans attempted in the heat of reconstruction, which program was responsible for making the South solidly Democratic.

Most of these antisouthern measures would have passed years ago had it not been for the filibuster in the Senate. This is the sole defense the South has thrown up. Every frank southern Senator knows that the filibuster is merely a temporary expedient, a delaying action which solves nothing. It will be overcome in time, and then the Southland, which should be the first loyalty of every true southerner instead of any political party, will be crushed.

Mr. President, year by year when cloture votes are taken to shut off debate and pass these vicious measures aimed at our people, the South grows weaker as the drive against us grows stronger. A few years ago a majority of the Senators voted against cloture. Today a majority vote to invoke cloture. The tactics used against us are succeeding. The South's back is to the wall. Ah, Mr. President, we may defeat our enemies this year and next year, but as long as the present course is pursued the end is inevitable. I am absolutely certain that the South is drifting to her destruction. Northern Democrats tell southern leaders to let the drift continue by following the course we now pursue. They say, "Let us swap your institutions for the minority votes in the North. It is good politics. These groups hold the balance of power. The Democratic Party can thus win the election. You can have patronage, committee chairmanships, and governmental favors." That, Mr. President, is the price we are offered for surrendering the South and permitting the destruction of her people.

Ah, Mr. President, the advice that the South can do nothing because both parties stand for the same thing is an argument of helplessness and hopelessness. There are exceptions, of course; but mark these words: It is often the advice of one who does not desire to take positive, firm action to alleviate the South's present condition. We have passed the point where that kind of argument should prevail.

If the people of the South do not take strong action, we are lost. What the South needs is leadership—leadership which will tell Southern people that they cannot afford blindly to follow a political party which is bent upon their destruction. The South needs leaders who place the welfare of the people above positions of power in any political organization.

The question is asked, What can the South do? The argument is made that both parties stand for the same thing, and that if we withhold votes from the Democratic candidate we merely help elect the Republican candidate, who will be just as bad or worse if he captures the Presidency. Then the argument is made that this is a question that should be fought out within the ranks of the Democratic Party. That latter argument, Mr. President, is unsound. The South is a minority in any Democratic convention since the abolition of the two-thirds rule, and as long as the leadership of the Democratic Party is sure of our electoral votes, they pay no attention to us. In fact, Mr. President, "fight it out in the party" is what the northern bosses want us to say. It is what they expect us to do. Indeed, all their calculations are based upon our taking that position. The disposition of the southern electoral vote is the question. If we withhold these votes, we can dictate our terms. We can stop the Democratic leadership in their tracks.

Common sense demands that the electoral vote of the South be used to protect her people. The stark reality is, however, Mr. President, that our electoral vote is the basis of the movement to destroy our social institutions. Our electoral vote is now being used to promote such purposes. The politicians are

expected to keep us in line in the name of party harmony, while they stay in office through the dispensation of governmental favors.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to refer to the statement the Senator from Mississippi made about abolishment of the two-thirds rule, which occurred at Philadelphia in 1936. As he has said, prior to that time the South had the veto power; and with that veto power, regardless of whether it was democratic, the South had something to bargain with.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; we did. I say to the Senator from South Carolina that today the South has a much stronger bargaining position than it ever had under the two-thirds rule, and that is by means of the electoral vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am happy to hear the Senator from Mississippi say that, because in 1936 I happened to be on the committee—Senator Clark, of Missouri, was chairman—when action was taken to abolish the two-thirds rule, which I, along with a few others, opposed.

I believe the Senator from Mississippi is going to discuss the Electoral College, so with his permission I ask that at the end of his remarks there be printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Southern States Held Able To Force Election of President in House," by David Lawrence, appearing in today's Washington Star. Recently many other able articles have appeared in the newspapers, and they, too, could well be read with profit by all of us.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MAYBANK. However, Mr. President, without asking at this time that additional articles be printed in the RECORD, so as further to illustrate the point the Senator has made, as well as the points I know he will make, I wish to make a brief statement about the southern governors' conference. When I was asked about it, I said I had nothing to say until the conference met, but that when it met I would have something to comment on. I wish to say now——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will permit me to interrupt, let me say that I came to this Chamber today with a fever, and I should like to conclude as quickly as possible. Then of course the Senator from South Carolina can address the Senate in his own time. I make this statement because I am weak and can hardly stand up now. I am sorry to have to make a personal reference.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then, Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the resolution introduced by Governor Thurmond of South Carolina be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with reference to the abolition of the two-thirds rule at the Democratic National convention in 1936, let me state that what the Senator from South Carolina has said is correct. I happened to be on the committee. The irony of the situation is that those who now are complaining are the ones who voted then for abolition of the two-thirds rule. Only four members of the committee on rules voted against the proposition.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico refers to those who are complaining at this time. If the Senator will please mention names, then we can see whether they are complaining.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; I will mention names. The Senator from South Carolina, Representative Cox, of Georgia, Judge Armstrong, from the State of Texas, and the Senator from New Mexico were the only four who voted against abolition of the two-thirds rule.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator has said that those who are complaining now were then in favor of abolishing that rule. I wish to know the names of those who are complaining now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am one of them; I am complaining about the abolition of the two-thirds rule.

Mr. EASTLAND. And so am I.

But, Mr. President, the question is, What can the South do? By withholding her electoral votes, the South can defeat in 1948 any Democratic candidate. In fact, no candidate would be nominated if it were known that he would not receive the South's electoral votes. The machines of the North which control the party are not crazy. They will nominate no candidate whose defeat is certain. If the South were to support a southern candidate for President, the election this year would in all probability be thrown into the House of Representatives. Mr. President if that were done, I am confident a southerner would become the President. A Republican would vote for a southern Democrat before he would vote for a northern Democrat. A New Deal northern Democrat would vote for a southern Democrat before he would cast his vote for a Republican. If the South will but act, some great southern leader can become President of the United States next year.

But if the South did not elect the President, this much is certain: A man who believes in the Federal system and in the preservation of the States would win, and, in addition, in that election in the House of Representatives, when each State has but one vote, with the votes that we possess we could absolutely put a stop to this antisouthern drive; we would put a stop to it in Congress; we would put a stop to it at the White House. At the very least this would be our minimum achievement. We would have the veto power over any candidate for the Presidency. The South does not have to act as a unit, desirable as that would be; 60 to 70 electoral votes are sufficient.

No, Mr. President; the question is not "Where can the South go?" The answer to that is simple. The South can go to the electoral college, and can go there with profit. The thing that disturbs my rest and keeps me awake is the question, "Where can the smart city bosses—Mr. Hague, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Avery, Mr. Flynn, and Mr. Sullivan—go?"

Let us remember that the only way the South can be defeated in the electoral college is for the Republicans to unite with the radical northern Democrats. That will never happen.

Mr. President, it is said that when the two-thirds rule was repealed at the national convention in 1936, the South lost its political power. That is faulty thinking. The South has a much more powerful weapon than the two-thirds rule ever was. All we have to do is to refuse to vote the ticket. We have only to give our electoral votes to some other candidate. Then we can call the turn, and we can dictate the party's policies. In that way we can call an instant halt, Mr. President, to this shameful antisouthern drive.

Mr. President, the correct strategy, if the South is to be saved, is to adopt the tactics of our adversaries: Do not blindly follow one party. Put ourselves in a trading position. Be sought after, instead of despised. We should go back to the Constitution, as Calhoun advised, when in 1851, with similar conditions, which he outlined, he predicted that the only thing that could save the Union and could save the South would be independent Presidential electors. A reading of Calhoun's words describing the conditions then prevailing will make any southern Senator think. He predicted the Civil War; and, as I have said, he predicted that the only thing that could save the Union and could save the South would be independent Presidential electors. South Carolina followed his policies until the election of 1860, the last election before the Civil War. Mr. President, southern Senators and southern leaders can read Mr. Calhoun's words with great profit.

So I say that we should go back to the Constitution, as Calhoun advised, and we should authorize our Presidential electors to vote for the candidate, regardless of who he is, who will uphold the Constitution, protect the interest of all Americans, and recognize the peculiar problems of the South. We must reward our friends and punish our enemies. Our people should realize that the South is a sleeping giant. We hold the balance of power in this Nation. We can save the country. Our people must act and act quickly for our protection. There are a few thousand organized people from minority groups in the North who run this Nation by playing "hard to get." Both parties bid for them. As a result they control both parties. Yet they do not have a single electoral vote. The South, with 127 electoral votes, because she is certain politically, is ignored and held in contempt by both political parties. She is on the brink of destruction, drifting without leadership, and only prompt action can save her.

Mr. President, these are questions which must be decided alone by the people of the South. I hope our political leaders do not stand between southern people and a clear analysis of their problem. If the South loses, the people, not the politicians, will pay the penalty. I hope politics and patronage do not destroy our people, their culture and traditions. I hope we can hand down

our institutions pure and undefiled to our children and our children's children. This is a question for southern statesmanship. With firm leadership we can accomplish our salvation.

I know, Mr. President, the movement to carry out this program must come from the people. There must be a grassroots organization in every hamlet of the South. The people must be informed of the dangers involved and of the results if the South is crushed. This all-southern organization must be pushed. There must be mass meetings. The people are ready. The South can be saved.

This much is certain, if the present Democratic leadership is right, then Calhoun and Jefferson Davis were wrong. If the present Democratic leadership is right, then Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner were right, and Lee, Forrest, and Wade Hampton were wrong. If the President's civil-rights program is right, then reconstruction was right. If this program is right, the carpetbaggers were right. That is just what this program means. The South cannot meekly take it and maintain its self-respect. Subserviency leads only to destruction.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 9, 1948]

SOUTHERN STATES HELD ABLE TO FORCE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT IN HOUSE—ELECTORAL VOTE BLOC COULD BE WITHHELD IF THEY REJECT TRUMAN

(By David Lawrence)

The Solid South can exert the balance of power in the coming Presidential election. Ten States with an electoral vote of 115 can compel the selection of a President by the House of Representatives if the general election is close. Because of that potentiality the South can influence the attitude of the candidates and platforms of both political parties.

The device is sanctioned by the Constitution. It permits each State to choose its own electors and these electors can, if instructed by a State convention, vote as the people of that State may direct.

By withholding 115 votes from the Democratic candidate, for instance, the first ballot in the electoral college may show that no candidate has received the necessary majority of 266 votes. This automatically takes the election of a President out of the hands of the electoral college and, as provided in the Constitution, it transfers the election to the House of Representatives.

STATES VOTE AS A UNIT

But in the House there are, for this purpose, only 48 votes because the members from each State must decide by majority vote for whom the single ballot of that State shall be cast. It is necessary for a candidate to get 25 votes in order to win an election.

It requires a two-thirds vote to make a quorum when the election is placed in the hands of Congress but the actual decision is by majority. In the House it is a majority of the States when a President is chosen and in the Senate it is a majority of the Senators when a Vice President is chosen.

The mere fact that the electors from Southern States would go to the electoral college instructed to vote for an independent Democrat would have its immediate effect on the policies or programs of any man who was a candidate for the regular Democratic nomination.

This method of exercising influence in a national election has not been used heretofore because the South, especially since the War between the States broke up political parties, has been able to wield a veto in the Democratic national nominating conventions. But in 1936, through the influence of the late President Roosevelt, the one-third veto possessed by the South was abolished. Instead of nominating by a two-thirds vote, the Democrats now choose a candidate by a majority vote.

HURT BY LOSS OF RULE

The abolition of the two-thirds rule deprived the South of much of its influence in the Democratic Party. Mr. Truman, by his civil-rights message, has merely taken advantage of the alleged helplessness of the South, for it has been taken for granted that the South could be pushed around and would still vote Democratic on election day.

There are many reasons why the Democratic Party in the South must necessarily remain as it is, especially because of the State primary machinery. There is, however, nothing to prevent the Democrats in the South from using the name Democrat and utilizing the State party machinery and still remain free to support whomever they please in the electoral college or in an election which is transferred to the House of Representatives.

The important point to be borne in mind is that electors pledged to a particular candidate cannot ethically change their minds after a State has voted. This makes it all the more essential that, if the balance of power is to be wielded legitimately, the people of each State be advised in advance so that they may vote for electors who are not pledged to the regular nominee. There is nothing to prevent the regular nominee, however, from having a set of electors chosen in his behalf so that the people can decide between the two sets.

CONTROVERSY MAY BLOW OVER

The whole civil rights controversy may blow over. It may have been merely a desperate gesture on President Truman's part to prevent Negro votes in the big northern cities, which have been Democratic, from going over to the Wallace banner. But sooner or later the coalition of northern Democrats and Republicans will be able to put through legislation on the Negro problem which will be at variance with the wishes of the South. Hence, political action through the use of a bloc of 115 electoral votes appears to be one way that the South can protect itself against steps which it does not favor.

In a close election the 115 votes could do considerable damage to a regular Democratic nominee, but if another Democrat should achieve the popularity as a vote getter that Franklin Roosevelt attained it would not make much difference how the 115 votes were cast.

The counterattack then might come from groups in the North by reviving the third-party idea in those States where the big-city vote is a deciding factor. The presence in the contest this year of a radical third-party candidate is, strangely enough, the circumstance that gives the South its minority power.

If a Republican won a majority of the electoral votes next time the protest of the South would be of no avail. If, however, a Democratic majority is elected in both Houses of Congress, and then the South withholds its electoral vote from Mr. Truman, and the Republicans do not poll a majority of the electoral votes, it would be possible for the 10 States of the South, plus 15 Republican States in the North, to bring about the election of a Republican. It would even be possible for the South's own independent candidate to be chosen President if the Republicans preferred him to the regular Democratic nominee. The Constitution is sufficiently flexible for minority groups to combine to make a majority of their own in the election of a President.

EXHIBIT B

MOTION OF J. STROM THURMOND, GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AT SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, WAKULLA SPRINGS LODGE, WAKULLA SPRINGS, FLA., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1948

The people of the States represented by the members of this conference here have been shocked by the spectacle of the political parties of this country engaging in competitive bidding for the votes of small pressure groups by attacking the traditions, customs, and institutions of the section in which we live.

Our people have been engaged for many years in a tremendous effort to restore our section to the place in the economy of the Nation which it should rightfully occupy. On the solution of our economic problems depend the education, welfare, and progress of all of our people and we have spared no effort to solve those problems. Economic underprivilege in the South has known no color line; it has fallen heavily on all races alike. The people of the Nation are well aware of the headway which we have already made toward solving the economic problems of our people, and it will be as a result of the solution of our economic problems that our racial problems will disappear.

Despite our sound, constructive, and sure progress, the political leaders of the country have been unwilling to respect our accomplishments and to let us continue with the task. Their political attacks are calculated only to hamper our efforts and actually militate against the welfare of the very people whom they assert they are trying to help. Under the compulsion of petty political considerations, they have seen fit to outrage and insult our people because they think we have no place to which we can turn.

Without sincerity and in utter disregard of the facts, they again propose a so-called antilynching bill. They ignore the fact that the crime of lynching has been virtually stamped out in the South without outside interference. It is a matter of common knowledge that this legislation would be an unconstitutional invasion of the field of government of the several States.

They have again sponsored a so-called anti-poll-tax bill. It is a matter of common knowledge that this type of legislation is an unconstitutional infringement upon the right of the several States to prescribe voting qualifications.

They talk about breaking down the laws which knowledge and experience of many years have proven to be essential to the protection of the racial integrity and purity of the white and the Negro races alike. The superficial objections to these laws arise from economic rather than political causes, and their sudden removal would jeopardize the peace and good order which prevails where the two races live side by side in large numbers. As a nation we have favored the protection of racial autonomy and integrity in other lands, such as Palestine and India, but a different doctrine is sought to be applied here at home.

They advocate a so-called fair employment practice law, which every thinking American citizen, upon reflection, will recognize to be an anti-American invasion of the fundamental conception of free enterprise upon which our economic structure is erected and which made America great. The right of a man to own and operate his own business, in which he has his savings and to which he devotes his labor and his energy, is to be impaired or destroyed by governmental interference under the guise of protecting the right to work. In effect, such a law would render every private business in this Nation a quasi-public one. Employer and employee alike are adversely affected by this type of legislation, and the concepts upon which it is based are appropriate, not to the American

way of life but only to the economic and political philosophy of the Communist Party.

We are expected to stand idle and let all of this happen, for the sole purpose of enticing an infinitesimal minority of organized pressure blocs to vote for one or another candidate for the Presidency. It is thought that we have no redress. This assumption ignores the electoral college set up in the Constitution of the United States.

We should approach the situation thus presented with dignity, self-respect and restraint. We should refuse to be stampeded or to indulge in idle oratory. We must consider the matter calmly and deliberately to the end that by joint and common action and decision we may demand and obtain for our people the consideration and respect to which they are entitled. We must no longer permit pressure groups by their adroit activities to establish by propaganda and political maneuvering a nuisance value for themselves in election years which threatens to defeat the political rights of others and endanger the progress which we in the South have made to better the lot and circumstance of all our people.

Therefore, I move, Mr. Chairman, that this conference go on record as deploring all ill-considered proposals which have the effect of dividing our people at a time when national unity is vital to the establishment of peace in this troubled world; and that this conference set a meeting not later than 40 days from this date, at a time and place to be designated by the chairman, for the careful consideration of the problems of the Southern States arising from such proposals; and that the chair do appoint a committee from the membership of this conference to make careful inquiry and investigation into such problems, and their solution by joint and common action, and to report to the conference at that meeting, with their recommendations as to further action which may be taken in the premises.

THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the situation in the Holy Land is at once a challenge to the world's conscience and a test of our determination to build the United Nations into a genuine peace organization.

The world is sitting by idly while the British Empire intentionally or unintentionally disregards its mandate duties by permitting organized bands, trained and equipped outside the Holy Land, to invade the Holy Land and shed the blood of those who are dedicated to enforce the decision of the United Nations.

I believe millions of Americans will join with me in the prayerful hope that the President will call on all parties in Palestine and the neighboring countries to put an immediate stop to the tragic and unnecessary bloodshed. Our Government should remind the world that blood is still more precious than oil and that the time has come for the code of the United Nations to replace the Machiavellian code of power politics.

The western democracies have complained frequently—and in my opinion, justly—that the veto was strangling the United Nations and preventing its development as the world peace organization. But what do we find in the Palestine situation? The enforcement of the United Nations decision to partition Palestine is being sabotaged by an under-the-table pocket veto.

Strife and bloodshed in the Holy Land would disappear if Great Britain and the United States, and all other signatory nations to the UN agreement said forcefully and unequivocally that they would insist on implementation of the UN decision, and that they would regard all those who took up arms against that decision as enemies of world peace and of the United Nations—enemies as dangerous and culpable, let us say, as the Greek rebels who took up arms against the legitimate Greek Government.

There is every reason to believe the cause of peace in the Middle East would be advanced tremendously if the United States, Great Britain, and the other signatory nations make it crystal clear to the world that they will not permit their arms and military equipment to go to those nations in the Middle East now threatening to use them to overthrow the solemn decision of the United Nations.

The Palestine decision promised to be a noble and heartening example of what the organized conscience of mankind could achieve through its United Nations organization. For the first time in the history of the United Nations the East and the West, the Soviet bloc and the Democratic bloc, came to an agreement as to what justice and international morality dictated. If that decision is permitted to become a scrap of paper, if it is to be pocket-vetoed by an under-the-table deal with the feudal Arab landlords, if the Arab states are permitted to train and arm their invading guerrillas, then the United Nations has been dealt as grievous a blow as any dealt by the open, formal vetoes already recorded.

The course of honor for those who love peace and Christian decency is clear. America must take the lead in calling for an end to the bloodshed in Palestine and for the immediate enforcement of the United Nations' agreement.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FREEDOM OF CUBA

Mr. VANDENBERG. With the indulgence of the Senate, the President pro tempore, speaking from the floor, would like to announce the appointment of the two Senators to be named under Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, in connection with the Cuban ceremony. The President pro tempore names the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. IVES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideratior of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Frank Hammett Myers, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Nathan R. Margold.

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William H. Beach, of Virginia, and sundry others in the diplomatic service;

John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, and sundry others in the diplomatic service;

Leslie A. Wheeler, of the District of Columbia, and sundry others in the diplomatic service;

A. Ogden Pierrot, of Virginia, and sundry others in the diplomatic service; and

Harry L. Smith, of Illinois, and sundry others in the diplomatic service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. IVES. I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. IVES. I ask that the President be notified at once of the confirmations of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. IVES. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon next Wednesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, February 11, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 9 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

JOINT UNITED STATES MILITARY ADVISORY AND PLANNING GROUP IN GREECE

Maj. Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, O3347, United States Army, for appointment as Director, Joint United States Military Advisory and Planning Group in Greece, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.)

To be colonels

Col. Louis Simmons Stickney, O7515, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Hesketh, O7516, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Maurice Garver Stubbs, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Russell Skinner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. George Warren Dunn, Jr. [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Alexander Klein, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Harold Luse, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Daniel Webster Hickey, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Reichelderfer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Reamer Welker Argo, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Adelmer Ward, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Victor Maraist, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Melvin Lewis Craig, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Levie Wilson Foy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Cord Blizzard, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Warren Henry McNaught, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Ignatius Stack, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bartholomew Robins De Graff, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Albert Collier, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Archibald Miles Mixson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Bert Cole, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Gresham Wing, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Fred Rehm, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Thomas Nelson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Earl Campbell Horan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Grady Hutchinson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Ainsworth Andrews, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Julian Pirtle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lois Chester Dill, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward James Maloney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Abram Jones, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Milton Brandt Goodyear, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Ewart Gladstone Graham, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. William Norman Thomas, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Theron DeWitt Weaver, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederic Franklyn Frech, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Elliott Wood, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Greenleaf Sherman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eustace Maduro Peixotto, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Russel Fountain, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William John Niederpruem, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick William Adams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Edward Tisdale, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Washington Curtis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Morris Jervey, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Dayton Carle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Fred Anthony McMahon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hartwell Newton Williams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leslie Rudisill Forney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Franklin Johnson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Tryon Mason Shepherd, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Roy Guthrie, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Musser Sheets, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ira Edgar Ryder, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Francis Frost Cooper, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Ward, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Edward Potter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Lapham Smith, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Clarence Charles Fenn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Sidney Johnson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Llewellyn de Waele Tharp, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Francis Strain, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Harry Lynn Henkle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Merrifield Graham Martling, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Harry Watson Bolan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Phillip Wadden, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Edward Jacobs, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Beverly Allison Shipp, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Crisp Morgan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Malcolm Everett Craig, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Milton Orme Boone, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Jefferson Farner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leo Joseph Dillon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Elbridge Colby, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Adams Knight, [redacted], United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Franklin Prague Shaw, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Howard Haines Cloud, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charlie Anthony Valverde, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles William Mays, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Carlisle Patterson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Maurice Vernon Patton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Arthur Vanderpoo' Winton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alexander Hill Cummings, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Blaisdell Cain Kennon, [redacted], United States Army.

×Col. Walter Carroll Ellis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wallace Chace Steiger, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Baxter Crowell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Eugene Eastwood, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Otis Poindexter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Clifton Adkins, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Green Poland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Pierre Mallett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Earle Albie Johnson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edgar Harland Keltner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Peter Lynch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Shirley Wiggins McIlwain, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles August Hoss, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Andrew Christian Tychsen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert John Wallace, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur S. Champeny, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Hamilton Cochran, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lloyd William Goeppert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Letcher Ogle Grice, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alexander Jesse MacNab, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Col. Brisbane Hanks Brown, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry William Robinson, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Charles Henry Wilson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Mathews Sandusky, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Francis Boruski, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Cecil Hamilton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Herbert Karlstad, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Aloysius St. Louis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Saddler Dougherty, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Ronald Peck, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Harvey Bragg, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Curtis Newton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Graeme Gordon Parks, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Paull Ketchum, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Frank Lee McCoy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert James Kirk, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leo Alexander Bessette, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Amory Vivion Eliot, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Mills Crenshaw, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bickford Edward Sawyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Irwin Samuel Dierking, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Joseph Bartholomew Conmy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Randolph Watson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Collin Stafford Myers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Frank Sims Mansfield, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Nemo, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Smith Anderson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Pinnix Lake, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Heston Rarick Cole, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Irving Sherwood, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Wilkes Christenberry, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Andrew Beaucond, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hugh Campbell Parker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Loyal Moyer Haynes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Cecil John Gridley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leonard Henderson Sims, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Edwin Ray, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Clyde Lloyd Hyssong, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Edgar Billing, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Winthrop Mott, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Charles MacDonald, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harvey Shelton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hugh Bryan Hester, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Maylon Edward Scott, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Howard Thompson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Michael Condon Shea, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Henry Welland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Marvin Wade Marsh, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Julian Horace George, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Laurin Lyman Williams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Markham Ferguson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Eugene Brand, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Barlow Winston, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Chester Morse Willingham, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Jerome Fraser, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Merl Louis Broderick, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Patrick Walsh, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Robert Hamby, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Rudolph Petzing, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Carvel Mallonee, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Severn Teackle Wallis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William May, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel Tankersley Williams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Michael Ollivetti, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Vance Whiting Batchelor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Norman Paul Williams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wiley Hubbard O'Mohundro, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herman Henry Pohl, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Mason Moore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bartley Marcus Harloe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Girard Blakesley Troland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Rebert Gerhardt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Theodore Earl Buechler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herman Uth Wagner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Theodore Leslie Futch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Innes Wilson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Allum Cooney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Anson Barber, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Miles Andrew Cowles, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Walter Hirsch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Fenton Reed, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Alston Willard, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Taylor deCamp, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Sargent Prentiss Huff, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Henry Donaldson, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Maris Black, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Eccleston Serveira Williamson, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Col. Frank Edmund Bertholet, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Marion Carson, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Rossiter Hunt Garity, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leo Buffington Conner, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Burnola Custis, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Senseny Eyster, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Norman McNeill, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leo Vincent Warner, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Onslow Sherburne Rolfe, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Jesse Brooke Matlack, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Wrenne Timberlake, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Wallace Jenna, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Stevenson Mallory, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

×Col. Paul Ryan Goode, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Niles Rising, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Cornelius Demuth, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lowell Meeker Riley, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Charles Purvis, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Col. James Jackson Hea, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carlisle Brittania Wilson, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Horace Harding, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Crawford McMann Kellogg, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Graves Barney McGary, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alden Harry Waitt, [redacted] Chief of Chemical Corps (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Lyman Medding, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Carl Lieber, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Jacob Nold, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel Howes Baker, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lloyd Milton Garner, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Orenthus Allen Daughtry, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Newton Gale Bush, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paolo Hoffoss Sperati, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Kenneth Vincent, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel Littler Metcalfe, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Burton Sweet, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Quinntullus Jeffords, Jr., O9695, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Andral Nichols, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leon Lightner Kotzebue, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Nicholas Dodge Woodward, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edgar William King, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Riley Edward McGarraugh, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Egbert Frank Bullene, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Mark Gerald Brislawn, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carleton Smith, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Conover Gripper, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. LeCount Haynes Slocum, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Harry Black, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederic Arthur Metcalf, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Emerson Storms, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David Dean Barrett, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Harry Ramsey, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Archibald Luther Parmelee, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Sutter McConnaughy, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Tappan Chaplin, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Abraham Robert Ginsburgh, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col, Elijah Garrett Arnold, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Henry Howe, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Zeigler Crane, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leslie Walter Jefferson, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Neely Todd, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry William Lins, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Mark Andrew Devine, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robb Steere MacKie, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Boniface Campbell, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Willard Walters, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ward Edwin Becker, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Garrett Cowen, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenyon Putnam Flagg, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Burske Hafer, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eduardo Andino, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Dalton Hohenthal, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Willard Warren Scott, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leonard Louis Davis, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Webster Fletcher Putnam, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Merle Halsey Davis, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Devries Cassard, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Hanson Connor, Jr., [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leon Henry Richmond, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Bidwell Lyle, [redacted] United States Army.

Col. Charles Rawlings Chase, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Loren Francis Parmley, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Erle Fletcher Cress, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hugh Williamson Rowan, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eugene Joseph FitzGerald, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Frederick French, [redacted] Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Leo Lavery, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Redding Francis Perry, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Arthur Metts, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Camm, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Percy Stuart Lowe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Marion Thirlkeld, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harland Clayton Griswold, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Krauth Whitson Thom, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Perry Cole Ragan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Stratton Barker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Glen Ray Townsend, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Cave Crockett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Harrison Koerbel, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Vincent Thebaud, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Louis Renth, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Leui Kluss, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Waine Archer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Jesse James France, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Emery Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Branch Leitch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Florence McCarthy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Samuel Beatty, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Melton Tow, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Byron Adrian Falk, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Peter Powell Rodes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herbert Becker Laux, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Penick Moore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Robert Virgil Laughlin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Lewis Sheppard Norman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ira Woodruff Black, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Jacob Forster, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Cawley MacArthur, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Lloyd Raymond Wolfe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Sharp, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Martin Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Edmund Tabscott, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Perry Passailaigue, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eric Alexander Erickson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John James Honan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Knight, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harvey Henry Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Claude Onias Burch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Russell Raymond Louden, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hiram Barricklow Turner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Gordon Cooper, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Henry, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Homer Price Dittemore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Darlington Haisley, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Albert Lossen Lane, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Horace McParlin Woodward, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Pennington Chapman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Oliver Hazzard Prizer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Francis Joyce, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Adolphus Hollingshead, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Volney Winfield Wortman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Page Lukert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Cortlandt Knickman Krams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Castle Hobart Farish, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Van Studdiford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Notestein, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Gerard Brink, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Easom Jackson Bond, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Louis Vitzthum, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lee Caraway Bizzell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Milton Pharr, [redacted], United States Army.

×Col. George Frye Herbert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Polk Johnson Atkinson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Irving Back, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Monroe Hamilton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Norman Earl Hartman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Turner Davis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Rate Williams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Cobb Benner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Chester Eugene Sargent, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col Joseph Phillip Donnovin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Roy Lawrence Dalferes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leighton Nicol Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Wilbur Pence, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Eaton Kelly, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Claude Bayles Mickelwait, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Marcus Ellis Jones, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Patrick Hennessy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Asbury Bigby, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Fred E. Gaillard, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herman Odelle Lane, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Lofton Cobb, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Garnett Hamilton Wilson, [redacted], Army of the United State (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Allen Louis Stowell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Richard Turner Schlosberg, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Andrew Ed Forsyth, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Andrew Smith, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Pete Turney Heffner, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Douglass McCoy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Dewitt Talmage Mullett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Gerald Bradford Devore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Osgood Cook McIntyre, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Emerson Bush, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Morris Barnett DePass, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Ennis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herbert Joseph McChrystal, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Max Lentz, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Warren Hayford 3d, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Lawrence Kay, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Marten Schwarze, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Kenney Erdman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Geoffrey Cooke Bunting, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Orion Lee Davidson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Emmett Michael Connor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Newton Stark, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Dale Clarence Hall, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Albert Kimball, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Logan Woods Boyd, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Rene Raimond Studler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert George Howie, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Henry Burgheim, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Palmer Harris, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Julian Dayton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Mason Wright, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Worthen Proctor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ivan Leon Foster, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Robert Cowles, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Raymond Clair Hildreth, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David Emery Washburn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wallace Marmaduke Allison, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry George Rennagel, [redacted], U. S. Army.

Col. James Elmer Boush, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Maybin Homes Wilson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Thomas Barnes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hiram Wendell Tarkington, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wilbur Henry Vinson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leo Thomas McMahon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Prosper Eckert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenat colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Eugene Ireland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bryan Llewellyn Davis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Mark Milton Potter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Hodges Drake, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Taliaferro Fletcher, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Millard Stowe Curtis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Lee Allen, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Edwin McGill, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Hely Molony, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Mortimer Francis Sullivan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leslie Dillion Carter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Don Riley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Pembroke Augustine Brawner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hubert Butler Bramlet, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lowell Allison Elliott, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Burdette Mase Fitch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Roscoe Bonham, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arnold Dante Amoroso, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Fred Brenning Waters, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Mellis Myers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Cyrus Quinton Shelton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lyle Meredon Shields, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Hayden Davies, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Francis Hanson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lee Vyvian Harris, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eugene Walter Lewis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Brian Edmunds, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Oscar William Koch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Maze Simpson, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Milton Pigg, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel Nairn Karrick, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Michael Al Quinn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Clark Jacobs, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stephen Bowen Elkins, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Kemp LeBrou, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Handy Vernon Brown, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lonnie Otis Field, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Judson Weed, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Andrew Daniel Hopping, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Norris White, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Andrews MacLaughlin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. LeRoy William Yarborough, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Wallace Brier, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Joseph Turner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Percival Adams Wakeman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herman Jackson Crigger, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Floyd Thomas Gillespie, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Homer Martin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Henry Speidel, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stephen Eugene Bullock, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Homer Banister Pettit, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Landon Johnson Lockett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Columbus Bierce Lenow, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Henry Calais, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Loyd Daniel Bunting, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Virgil Grover Allen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wade Darragh Killen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Andrew Jackson Schriver, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Dorrance Scott Roysdon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Easton McCammon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jules Verne Sims, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Leo George Clarke, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Werner Watson Moore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Fremont Byron Hodson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Rudolph William Broedlow, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Elliott Raymond Thorpe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Douglas Sugg, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Arthur Lee Shreve, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Raymond Connor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Patrick Henry Tansey, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leland Hazelton Hewitt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Francis Kern, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Edward Cruse, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lloyd Ernst Mielenz, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alexander Murray Neilson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hoel Smith Bishop, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Habersham Elliott, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Hay Nixon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Anderson Thomas William Moore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Reginald Whitaker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eugene Mead Caffey, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Ernest William Gruhn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edwin Luther Sibert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Stubbs Robinson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Clifton Blanchard, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Winston Holt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clarence Page Townsley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Hilton Offley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Mesick, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick William Gerhard, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Cornelius Comegys Jadwin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Gray McKee, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Lillard Barriger, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Charles Kovarik, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jonathan Lane Holman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Francis Earle Rundell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Baird Hudson, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Harry Clay Mewshaw, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfred Armstrong McNamee, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leon Calhoun Boineau, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Bittmann Barth, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Quinton Donaldson, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Philip Edward Gallagher, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Trueheart Foster, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Harold McFall, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Charles Wolfe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Rupert Edison Starr, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Henry Doherty, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Berbert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Chester Carroll Hough, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Conrad Palmer Hardy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Chester Howard Elmes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Vanmeter Macatee, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry DuPree, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Caraway Arrowsmith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Elsmere Joe Walters, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Standifer Gunby, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Andrew Paul Sullivan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Albert Durnford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Engmann August Andersen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Griffin Marchman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Thomas Joseph Cross, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Bayard Haley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Hugh Young, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel U. S. Army).

Col. Roy Milton Thoroughman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Joseph Powers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Wingate Reed, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. William John McCarthy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Kellam, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Leonard Kersh, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lloyd Russell Garrison, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond George Miller, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clyde Milton Hallam, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Nicoll Fosdick Galbraith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Norman Joseph Eckert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hugh Cort, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albin Nace Caldwell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Hamilton Judd, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Richardson Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Fay Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfred Nelson Taylor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ben Robert Jacobs, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel U. S. Army).

×Col. Ivan Downes Yeaton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Everett Winstead, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfred Edwin McKenney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Paul Hayes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Earl Monroe Miner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Colonel Eugene Lemuel Miller, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Patrick Francis Powers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Howard E. Pulliam, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Samuel Henderson, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Norman Drysdale Gillet, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carlisle Clyde Dusenbury, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Theodore Thomas Teague, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eugene Vincent Elder, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carter Weldon Clarke, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Ralph Gordon Richards, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul LaRue Neal, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Earl Reed, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Harold Vanderwerker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Geter Rogers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Taylor Strode, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Harry Lee Watts, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Engerud, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Talcott Wilsey, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Charles Kellogg McAlister, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Francis Keefe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Harold Metzger, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clinton Steele Berrien, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Keith Kirkman Tatom, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carley Lawrence Marshall, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Ernest Donegan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stephen Edward Stancisko, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Vincent Freeman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Norman Crawford Caum, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Earl Thomas McCullough, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Otto Lucratus McDaniel, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Allan Francis Sullivan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Clarkson Huggins, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Walter Roane, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herbert Hunter Harris, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Daniel Schas, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Pierson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Rafael Louis Salzmann, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Riley Finley Ennis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Francis Wooley, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Edward Jones, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ray Edward Dingeman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Edmond Wilson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Cobb Wynne, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry Frederick Meyers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ola Aloysius Nelson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas North, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Ernest Griffin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David Lyddall Hardee, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifton Tredway Hunt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Helmuth Ernest Beine, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Scurlark Moore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Aloysius Joseph Tagliabue, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Thrower Fitts, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Fredrik Lorentsen Knudsen, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Jesse Thomas Harris, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Crowell Edward Pease, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Claude Bertram Avera, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Revere Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carter Marion Kolb, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Grover Adlai Summa, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Sam Purswell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Weckerling, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Eugene Heyduck, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lewis Peyton Jordan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Franklin Hudson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Fernand George Dumont, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Milton Edward Wilson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U S. Army).

Col. Leonard Francis Felio, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Emmet Coughlin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Gaylord Burnam Kidwell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Joseph McAllister, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Otto Ellis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David Wood Griffiths, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur William Pence, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frederic Bates Butler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leverett Griggs Yoder, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Ayres Depue Ogden, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Elmer Ellsworth Barnes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Wesley Wanamaker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Beverly Carradine Snow, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Lee, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Howard Louis Peckham, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Richard Bathurst, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wendell Phillips Trower, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Gilbert Lovett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Cornman Louis Hahn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Brooke McReynolds, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Morris Williams Gilland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David Terrill Johnson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Heath Twichell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Jones Twitty, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harrison Shaler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roger Manning Wicks, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Everett York, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Chester Krum Harding, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Clarence Bennett, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Claude Henry Chorpening, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Vernon Keyser, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Otto Bowman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Shirley Gorlinski, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Riani, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Orville Ernest Walsh, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Peter Paul Goerz, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Howard Voorheis Canan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Vere Alfred Beers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Bell Hughes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Bradford Bixby, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Hamilton Hinds, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Gage Eddy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Edward Morrison, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William James Epes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Hinton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eric Spencer Molitor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard August Ericson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Emil Mickelsen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Paul Boyle Kelly, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Calhoun Norman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Bobbs Miller, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Rolland Gildart, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Edward Hixon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hammond McDougal Monroe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bryan Evans, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John William Middleton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Melton Adams Hatch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Andrew March, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Maurice Badger, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Sheridan Winn, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Marion Van Voorst, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas William Munford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Longstreet Whelchel, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Hadley Fonvielle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Bartlett Sherman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joe David Moss, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Joseph Breen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Kittredge Baker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Pearson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Frederick Colson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Auston Monroe Wilson, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel Powell Walker, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Alwin Schow, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Jesse Ellis Graham, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Jerome David Cambre, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Burrowes Goldthwaite Stevens, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alexander Thomas McCone, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Thomas Markham Brinkley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Wentworth Freeman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wilbur Eugene Dunkelberg, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Pulsifer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Col. Elliott Watkins, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis James Gillespie, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Jesse Lewis Gibney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George McKnight Williamson, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Waite Brimmer, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. James Clyde Welch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Magoffin Glasgow, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Bryan Wheeler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Roswell Aaron, [redacted], United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Herbert Bernard Loper, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Gibbins Gard, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herbert Maury Jones, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Orville Wells Martin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Forrest Eugene Cookson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Sheldon Price, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wyburn Dwight Brown, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Miller Montague, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lester Francis Rhodes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Rhett Stuart Barden, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Don Gilmore Shingler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Harlan Nelson Hartness, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Louis Brainard Ely, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Julius Easton Slack, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bertram Francis Hayford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Aaron Bixby, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harris Fulford Scherer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Benoit Hedekin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Vincil Phelps, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Norton McFarland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Alvin Pyle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Ray Hardin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Maurice Place Chadwick, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Foster Joseph Tate, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Tobin Bennison, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry John Dick Meyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Elton Foster Hammond, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ernest Marion Brannon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Joseph Burns, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leslie Edgar Jacoby, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Raikes Vance, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Powell Ovenshine, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas McGregor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harrison Howell Dodge Heiberg, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Wesson Jervey, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Lynde Strohbehn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Maurice Crawford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Colonel Eugene McGinley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hugh Brownrigg Waddell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lester DeLong Flory, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Isaac Haiden Ritchie, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Carlisle Visscher Allan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Marion Patton Echols, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hobart Hewett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Waldemar Sven Broberg, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Holden Phillips, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Weed Drury, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leander Dunbar Syme, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ellis Vern Williamson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leroy Clark Wilson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Nathaniel Alanson Burnell 2d, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Bartlett Murphy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Lowe Harbaugh, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Virgil Farrar Shaw, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Syril Emerson Faine, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Maxon Parsons, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Hamilton Young, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Ellis Sanderson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Hugh French Thomason Hoffman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Leonard Whitelaw, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Malcolm Sutherland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Andrew Holly, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William John Crowe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Roland William McNamee, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Winfred George Skelton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Edmund Bower Sebree, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Greene Davis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Emmett James Bean, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Allen Fay, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Henry Noble, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Towle O'Reilly, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Pierce, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Henry Bryan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Howell Collier, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Dean Luce, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Gordon Elms, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Dimmick Armstrong, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Handley Nelson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Ora Hopkins, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Verne Cole, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Archibald Frank, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Bradstreet Dodge, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bernard Abert Byrne, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Dewey Rogers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Col. Irvin Alexander, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Harvey Madison, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Edward Bruner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Llewellyn Waters, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Urban Niblo, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Montgomery Springer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Melvin Starr, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Launcelot Moore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert William Crichlow, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Harris Bassett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Sidney Johnston Stovall, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Wayne Clifton Zimmerman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Conrad Odell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Josiah Toney Dalbey, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Logan Osburn Shutt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Daniel Phillip Buckland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Christian Hildebrand, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Holleman Warren, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John David Frederick, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Richard Ray Coursey, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joseph Alfred Cranston, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Horace Speed, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Robert Emery, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Joseph Moroney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Franklin Leroy Rash, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edgar Harvey Snodgrass, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Stuart Ruth, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Sterling Eugene Whitesides, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Roswell Boyle Hart, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Halvor Hegland Myrah, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Brenton Porter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Robert Menzies Miller, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Brig. Gen. Neal Henry McKay, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Claud Thomas Gunn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Otto Max Jank, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. O. D. Wells, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Wallace Cole, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Speir Lawrence, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Matthew Tomlinson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wilber Russell Ellis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Bernhard Anderson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter John Wolfe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Roswell Emory Round, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hartwell Matthew Elder, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Russell Howard, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Samuel James Adams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Owen Russell Marriott, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Joseph Vida, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Patrick Henry, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Burns Beall, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Bartlett Hess, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Allen Francis Haynes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Windle Read, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Hudson Oxx, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Greeley White, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles George Holle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wayne Stewart Moore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Franklin Hannis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Albert Routheau, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frederic Lord Hayden, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Warren Cressman Rutter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Frank Handy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Clare Partridge, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward John McGaw, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Thomas Miller, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Tyree Rivers Horn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Leo Langevin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Hardy Hill, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Aguste Rhu Taylor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Kenneth Mitchell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Andrew Henning, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Malcolm Lewis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bernard Linn Robinson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Robert Culleton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Hobson Stratton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lee Armstead Denson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Granger Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Haviland Lastayo, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lathrop Ray Bullene, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Alexander Samouce, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Wallace Ford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Sylvester Burns, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Eugene Harriman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Joseph Loupret, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Loren Goff, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Henry Morse, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Macon Edmonson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Gordon Holder, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, United States Army).

Col. William Ignatius Brady, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eugene Martin Link, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John States Seybold, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Harry Bartlett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Breen Herron, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Russell Owen Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Homer Watson Kiefer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Myron McMillin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Harris, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John George Howard, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Hugh Kreuter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Laurence Wood Bartlett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Reynolds Johnston Burt, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Dickerson Mitchell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Henry Schabacker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Francis Cassidy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Foxhall Sturman, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Carleton McFadden, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eugene Collum Johnston, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lyman Lincoln Judge, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Frank Needham Roberts, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Henry Lanahan, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Courtney Parker Young, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Henry Chester Hine, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Price Withers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Robert Pitts, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Crump Garvin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick Mixon Harris, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Dwight Acker Rosebaum, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Candler Singer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Maurice Wiley Daniel, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Oscar Raymond Johnston, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Andrew Rehm, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Carl Engelhart, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Herbert Carl Reuter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Edward Smyser, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Esher Claflin Burkart, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Eginton Whitehead, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis William Farrell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wilmer Brinton Merritt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Merton Adams, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Gustave Harold Vogel, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Basil Girard Thayer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Perrine Barney, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wilbur Sturtevant Nye, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Harlan Swartz, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Leland Stuart Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Frederick Duffner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Millard Pierson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ray Olander Welch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Julian Erskine Raymond, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Honnen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Porter Amazeen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Thomas Williams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Thweatt Searcy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alan Lockhart Fulton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Terence John Tully, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Earl Crist, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Claude Monroe McQuarrie, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Lemuel Mitchell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Escalus Emmert Elliott, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Milton Cogswell Shattuck, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hayden Adriance Sears, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Thomas Lynch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Dickey Long, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lieut. Col. William Joel Tudor Yancey, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Leon Eugene Lichtenwalter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Halley Grey Maddox, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Todd Turnbull, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wray Bertrand Avera, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Fox Ivins, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Daniel Buie, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Morris Haslett Marcus, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Karl William Hisgen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Harry Marsh, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Warren Crary, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Baylis Cooley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Selby Francis Little, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Milo Glen Cary, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Joseph Conway, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Gustin MacAllister Nelson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Kenneth Sells, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Cameron, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Chester Arthur Carlsten, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Arthur Doherty, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederic de Lannoy Comfort, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Laurance Ingham, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Percy Earle LéStourgeon, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Michael Henry Zwicker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Marion Davis, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Charles Emmett Cheever, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Peter Anthony Feringa, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Hall Walter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richardson Selee, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Harry, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Randall Scithers, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Henry Featherston, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hubert Stauffer Miller, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Harold Coe, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul MacKeen Martin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Creswell Garrettson Blakeney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Jeter Tatom, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Watkins Prentiss, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Edmund Waters, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Kennard Bush, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Orlando Clarendon Mood, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Bert Nathan Bryan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Beman Rapp, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Breakenridge Clearwater, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wesley Tate Guest, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Hammond Duval, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carroll Heiney Deitrick, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wallace Ellsworth Niles, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lewis Edward Weston Lepper, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Harris Barr, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Roscoe Hamilton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Chester Jones, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Walter Francis Jennings, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Cranford Coleman Bryan Warden, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Dawes Williams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. McDonald Donegan Weinert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Walker Childs, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wilmar Weston Dewitt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Joseph Walsh, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Cleophas Duell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Sears, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Brice Johnston, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Dana Gray McBride, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Wallace Robertson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Peyton Campbell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Harry Starkey Aldrich, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Hugh Perry Adams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Edward Moore, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stephen Yates McGiffert, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Otis Hyatt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Rox Hunter Donaldson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Richmond Simpson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Philip Schwartz, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Brown Thornton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walden Sharp Lewis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Andrew Julius Evans, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald McKechnie Ashton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Clayton Huddle Studebaker, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Alfred Arnold Jones, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Evans Burritt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Madison Mack, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Jesse Klepinger, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Charles McConnell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Madison Callicutt, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Reginald Pond Lyman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Work Marvin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry James Woodbury, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Jacob Rumaggi, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paschal Neilson Strong, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Coy Leonard, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Wayne Raynsford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. LeRoy Judson Stewart, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Francis Uncles, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Giles Richard Carpenter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David James Crawford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Field Sadtler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Earl Foster Thomson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Newsom Branham, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Borgia Kane, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Granger Anderson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfred Eugene Kastner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Paul Crandell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Mark McClure, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Myron Leedy, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alba Carlton Spalding, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Landon Taylor, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Fred James Woods, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Hancock Reed, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Russell Hensey, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Perry McCoy Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frederick William Hein, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Alfred Meyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Dunne O'Connell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Numa Augustin Watson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wesley Woodworth Yale, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Oliver Wendell Hughes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Melville Fuller Grant, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Robinson Pierce, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lemuel Mathewson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Llewellyn Beadle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Herbert Maddocks, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David Marion Fowler, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Percy Kennedy, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Andrew Wedemeyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Carlo Greiner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Oliver Perry Newman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Hughes Stodter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Thomas Edward Lewis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stewart Tiffany Vincent, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Mahoney, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. James Clyde Fry, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Harrison Dickie, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Carroll Morgan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Earl Watters, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Budd Wahle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lester Vocke, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman William Fairbrother, O15067, United States Army.

Col. LaRoy Sanders Graham, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David Hottenstein, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ray Brooks Floyd, [redacted], United States Army.

Lt. Col. Karl Clifford Frank, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Randall James Hogan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Nicholas Young, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Douglas Valentine Johnson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Elford Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Maynard Harper Carter, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. LeGrande Albert Diller, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Parker Hollis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Isaac Davis White, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Hosmer Gooler, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Joseph Howard Harper, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Newton Farragut McCurdey, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Julius Dubbelde, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Gerson Kirkland Heiss, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ransom George Amlong, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Kelsey Haskell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Glenn Hunter Palmer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenner Fisher Hertford, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Steven Livesey Conner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Miles Reber, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Rutherford Noyes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Newton Leaf, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. David Morris Dunne, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank McAdams Albrecht, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Farnsworth Hallock, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Stuart Alfred Beckley, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold David Kehm, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Einar Bernard Gjelsteen, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Elgie Carraway, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Mark Pesek, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Herbert Bronson Enderton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Battle Horton, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gen. Carter Bowie Magruder, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel U. S. Army).

Col. William Joseph D'Espinosa, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wilbur Ray Pierce, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Henry Galloway, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Howard William Serig, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Philip Roy Dwyer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Damon Mott Gunn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Metz Seebach, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Harry McKenzie Roper, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Henry Workman, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Wesley Gettys, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry James Pitt Harding, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Shepard Biddle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Francis Heaney, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Humphrey Evans, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Remsburgh Grove, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Frederick Torrence, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Douglass Gordon Pamplin, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Michael Buckley, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Benjamin Stern, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Sheffield Edwards, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Raymond Stone, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Joseph Binns, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Burnside, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Howard John Vandersluis, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Rochester Flower McEldowney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis William Haskell, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Eugene Ware Ridings, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Woodford Cowles, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. 'Kenneth Eugene Webber, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Alexander Davidson Reid, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Vinson Bromley, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John William Harmony, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Philip Harrison Enslow, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ernest Byron Thompson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Elwyn Donald Post, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Shearer Sweany, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Guy Haines Stubbs, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Christian Bing, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Russell Emerson Bates, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Earl Shuman Gruver, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eugene Lynch Harrison, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Aye Tormey, [redacted], United States Army.

Col. Valentine Roy Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Boyce Carroll, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Ellsworth Adkins, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Cecil Ward Nist, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Eugene Bernard McInerney, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Dorn, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald McLean, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

×Col. Stuart Lee Cowles, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Warren Alfred Robinson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. John Hensel Pitzer, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Conrad Mergens, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Horton Vail White, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Edward Bowen, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Austin Curtis Cunkle, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Townsend Dodd, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Carlton Cavender, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. George Stanley Smith, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. William Campbell Lucas, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Wendell Gunner Johnson, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Kenneth Porch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Temple Graves Holland, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Cyril Serff, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Leroy Skinner, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Edward Forstall Adams, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Donald Cameron Tredennick, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. James Jewett Carnes, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Winfield Boone, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Col. Otis Blaine Schreuder, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Berna Thomas Bowers, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Prentice Lauri Moore, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Morris Hargreaves, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Don Longfellow, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Frank DeWitt, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Stanley William Matthews, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Emery Ernest Alling, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Allison Worrell, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Douglas Sheldon Kellogg, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Brinkley Welsh, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Eugene Wycoff Billick, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Earle Standlee, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Reuel Edward Hewitt, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Martin Eugene Griffin, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Mack Macon Green, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Edward Shambora, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Albert Best, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Alvin Levi Gorby, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Ellis Armstrong, [redacted], Assistant to The Surgeon General (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Ogilvie Gillespie, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Dwight Moody Young, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Stuart Gross Smith, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Andrew Gray, [redacted], Medicarl Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur John Redland, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. William Lenoir Wilson, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. August Wesley Spittler, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Leonard Dudley Heaton, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Willard Glattly, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Elbert Council, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Presly Bachman, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Rawley Ernest Chambers, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Dean McLaughlin Walker, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Tindal Young, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Oliver Kunze Niess, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Carl Milo Rylander, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Patrick Cooney, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army).

Col. Louis Holmes Ginn, Jr., [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Seth Gayle, Jr., [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Howard Sterling McConkie, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Sam Foster Seeley, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Draper North, [redacted], Medical Corps, United States Army.

Col. Clifford Veryl Morgan, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Henry Lawton, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Abner Zehm, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Winchester Rich, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Hervey Burson Porter, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Norman Hyde Wiley, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Irwin Robinson, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Silas Beach Hays, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Earl Maxwell, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Wilford F. Hall, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Hayes, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Hollander Donnelly, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Francis Willard Pruitt, [redacted], Medical Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

To be colonels, Corps of Chaplains

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Edward Robert Martin, [redacted], United States Army.

Chaplain (Col.) Louis Curtis Tiernan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Chaplains, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Col.) Joseph Richard Koch, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Chaplains, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Col.) Patrick James Ryan, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Chaplains, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Col.) Joseph Oscar Ensrud, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Chaplains, U. S. Army).

Chaplain (Col.) Peter Christian Schroder, [redacted], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Chaplains, U. S. Army).

NOTE.—Date of rank for these officers will be the date of appointment.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Earl Warren Fletcher, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Winston Tippitt, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 3, 1948.

Second Lt. Gordon James Rieger, [redacted], United States Army, with rank from February 3, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Barnette Broome, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 3, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Maitland Polz, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 3, 1948.

First Lt. Gordon Joseph James, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 6, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Harriman Maeder, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 7, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Vernon Shirk, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 9, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Hunter McCleary, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 9, 1948.

First Lt. Austin Wayne Turner, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 10, 1948.

Second Lt. George Bunyon May, [redacted], United States Army, with rank from February 10, 1948.

First Lt. Loren Ray Lester, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 12, 1948.

First Lt. Herman Stein, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 14, 1948.

Second Lt. Adolph Clarence Fossum, [redacted], United States Army, with rank from February 17, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Richard Hintz, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 17, 1948.

First Lt. Melville Jewell MacDonald, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 17, 1948.

First Lt. Gilbert Hermann Foltz, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 19, 1948.

First Lt. William Raymond Homiller, [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 20, 1948.

Capt. Fred Olen La Fevers, Jr., [redacted], Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from February 23, 1948.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. Gordon Falconer Weighton, [redacted], Medical Service Corps, United States Army, with rank from February 17, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Alexander Creech, [redacted], Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 28, 1948.

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Dorothy Annette Goeller, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Olga W. Gull, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Ruth Alice Kegler, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 7, 1948.

First Lt. Betty Arline Klingensmith, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 14, 1948.

First Lt. Loraine Helen Droxler, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 20, 1948.

First Lt. Jean Harriet Donahue, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 20, 1948.

First Lt. Shirley Mae McCoy, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 22, 1948.

First Lt. Margery Evelyn Cheers, [redacted], Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from February 27, 1948.

IN THE AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

To be first lieutenants

First Lt. Wilbert Edward Habakangas, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Rowland Douglas Smith, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. James Morton Bush, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Oscar Wallace Lincoln Brown, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Travis Ervin Koch, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Hugh Munsey Smith, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. William Jackson Rand, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Darrell Glenn Williamson, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Joel Charles Lee, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Walters, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Lorentzen Barry, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Leonard Vandiver, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Roger Treat Jackson, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Ballard Smith, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Hollon Howard Bridges, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. James Tipton Barnes, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Arthur Wallace Augustine, Jr., [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Arthur Sherman, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Verne Works, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from Februanry 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Edward Robert Brandt, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Leroy Bates, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Edward Limbird, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Edison Ivey, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Ervin Nash, Jr., [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

First Lt. Erling Orvin Wehlander, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. George Elmer Hedge, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Maston Adolphus O'Neal, Jr., [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Edwin Cole Walker, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 3, 1948.

First Lt. James Harris Mize, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 3, 1948.

First Lt. Paul David Lehman, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 3, 1948.

Second Lt. Mark Edward Wilt, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 3, 1948.

First Lt. Milton Kenneth Kegley, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 3, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Bonds Robbins, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 3, 1948.

Second Lt. Donald Edward Greer, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 3, 1948.

First Lt. Wallace Reid Watson, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 4, 1948.

First Lt. Remer LaVerne Harding, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Carson Taylor, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Clancie Yates, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Bennett Forbes, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 6, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Edward Gordon, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 7, 1948.

First Lt. William Monroe Bomar, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 8, 1948.

First Lt. Felix Asla, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 9, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Meade Ryan, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 9, 1948.

First Lt. Irl Duane Johnson, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 9, 1948.

First Lt. Giles Anthony Robb, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 10, 1948.

Captain Ziba Bennitt Ogden, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 10, 1948.

First Lt. Myron Belmont Goers, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 10, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Lewis Suneson, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 10, 1948.

Second Lt. Miles Edsel Taylor, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 10, 1948.

First Lt. Peter David Summer, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 13, 1948.

Capt. George Zane Schroeder, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 13, 1948.

First Lt. Howard Mac Lane, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 13, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph McMahon, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 13, 1948.

Capt. Robert William Maloy, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 14, 1948.

First Lt. Malcolm Albert Stewart, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 14, 1948.

First Lt. Howard Estle Kornegay, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 14, 1948.

First Lt. Lawrence Kenneth Ricker, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 15, 1948.

Second Lt. Richard Albert Atkins, Jr., [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 15, 1948.

First Lt. Stanley Joseph Buinicky, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 17, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Rae Duncan, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 17, 1948.

First Lt. William Doyle Taylor, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 20, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Harry Cline, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 20, 1948.

Capt. Lawrence Vincent Bach, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 20, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Edwin Vickers, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant,, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 20, 1948.

First Lt. James Francis Ward, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 21, 1948.

First Lt. Rodger Sheridan Elliott, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 21, 1948.

First Lt. John Patrick Walsh, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 22, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Evans Beardsley, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 22, 1948.

First Lt. Herman Arthur Hammel, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 23, 1948.

First Lt. Louis Rae Harris, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 23, 1948.

Capt. Kenneth Ray Van Zandt, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 24, 1948.

First Lt. William Henry Perkins, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 24, 1948.

First Lt. Edwin Raymond Kellogg, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 24, 1948.

Second Lt. Robert Newton Fidler, [redacted], United States Air Force, with rank from February 25, 1948.

First Lt. William Cullen Schwitzgebel, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 25, 1948.

First Lt. Paul Bryan Monroe, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 26, 1948.

First Lt. William Albert Seward, Jr., [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 26, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Frank Greenhow, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 27, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Michael Walters, [redacted], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from February 27, 1948.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 9 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Frank S. French
Emanuel E. Mandel

To be pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

George B. Hutchison

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Mary E. Ingle
Mary Matula
Elizabeth J. Haglund
Genevieve T. Piette
Frances C. Wickham

To be junior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

Mary Ellen Deady

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective December 24, 1947

Herbert A. Spencer, Jr.

To be temporary surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective December 24, 1947

Herbert Tabor

To be temporary senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective December 24, 1947

Elroy G. Burgwald
John H. Miller

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Paul T. Erickson
Eugene W. Green
Frederick J. Krueger
Marion B. Noyes

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Gladys M. Ray
Emijean Snedegar
Edith M. Hettema
Jeannette E. Westlake
Rose G. Ernsberger
Amy L. Cawley
Ina L. Ridlehoover
Philomene E. Lenz
Loretta M. Schroll
Gladys C. Guydes
Mary Raprich

To be temporary scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Don E. Eyles

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

Frederick A. Johansen

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Harold M. Janney
Russell O. Settle

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Maurice A. Roe

To be temporary medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

Maurice A. Roe

To be temporary senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Harold M. Janney
Russell O. Settle

To be temporary sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Donald L. Snow
Roscoe H. Goeke

To be temporary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

George L. Carley, Jr.

To be temporary scientist directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

Floyd S. Daft
Justin M. Andrews

To be temporary scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Harry D. Pratt
Roy F. Fritz
Ralph C. Barnes
Francis M. Middleton
H. Page Nicholson

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

Percival E. Faed

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Walter P. Griffey

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major)

Charles F. Blankenship
Curtis R. Chaffin
Erwin C. Drescher
Henry A. Holle
John B. Hozier
James G. Telfer
Hugh L. C. Wilkerson

To be temporary medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

Percival E. Faed

To be temporary sanitary engineer director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel)

Harry G. Hanson

To be temporary senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel)

Walter P. Griffey
James G. Telfer

To be temporary senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Gleb A. Nedzel
Kirkland C. Brace
Lewis Francis
Frederick G. Germuth, Jr.
Vincent E. Price
Hans R. Huessy

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective January 5, 1948

Jack Masur

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective January 5, 1948

Robert L. Cherry

To be temporary medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective January 5, 1948

Jack Masur

To be temporary senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective January 5, 1948

Robert L. Cherry

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1948.

I hereby designate Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, help us to determine the ways of our thoughts. Strengthened by Thy words, "Whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report, think on these things," keep us from wandering in forbidden paths. Take away the dross of selfish living and low desires and all that engenders fear and hate.

Our country, O Lord, is so richly endowed; forbid that its resources should be spent in pride and self-aggrandizement. With compassion for the unuttered sorrows and burdens of men, may we promote harmony where doubt prevails, boldly proclaiming the great Christian imperatives: Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. With this sense of moral responsibility, be Thou with us in our every word and deed, and Thine shall be the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 5, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 5, 1948, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818;

H. R. 3322. An act to empower the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights-of-way for various purposes across lands of individual Indians or Indian tribes, communities, bands, or nations; and

H. R. 3326. An act to provide for the granting of certificates of competency to certain members of the Osage Indian Tribe in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House, in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 1634, to make certain corrections.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 134. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190);

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution relative to the expenses of a delegation to attend the ceremonies in Habana, Cuba, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine*.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the close of the legislative business, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the regular business of the day, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in two of which to include newspaper articles.

Mr. BLAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the merchant marine.

FERTILIZER

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution from our State's general assembly on the subject of fertilizer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, following these remarks I attach a concurrent resolution passed by the South Carolina General Assembly on February 5, 1948, urging the absolute necessity for an adequate supply of nitrates and other fertilizers.

It is generally known that agriculture is the basis of all wealth. We boast of our great metropolitan centers, of our industrial areas, but unless agriculture thrives, prosperity cannot be expected. Although our farmers have shown their complete willingness to till the soil regardless as to how arduous the task and how little the profit, they cannot supply sufficient food and clothing without artificial assistance. Nitrates of soda and fertilizers are as essential to healthy agriculture as are penicillin and other modern drugs to good health.

Of all the shortages with which we have to grapple, none is of greater importance than the shortage of fertilizers and nitrates.

I concur in the views expressed in the attached resolution, and hope immediate steps will be taken to guard against the shortages of nitrates and other fertilizers we have had in the past.

A concurrent resolution requesting each Member of the South Carolina delegation in the National Congress, in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and the Secretary of Agriculture to use their influence and authority to assure an adequate supply of nitrates and other fertilizers for the use of South Carolina farmers during the year 1948

Whereas an unprecedented demand in the United States and in foreign countries for fertilizers has created a shortage of immediate delivery plant foods in South Carolina; and

Whereas a shortage of this kind will seriously curtail the production of food and fiber crops the Government so urgently needs in its plans to rehabilitate war-torn countries; and

Whereas sufficient supplies are apparently obtainable at their source if proper transportation is furnished and if some of the ships now being used to ship fertilizer, grain, etc., abroad are assigned to transporting nitrates to this country; and

Whereas we believe sections of the United States where fertilizer usage has long been a custom should not be curtailed in favor of new fertilizer-using territories where their use is still in the experimental stage; and

Whereas domestic manufacturers and handlers of nitrates and other fertilizing materials should be encouraged as much as possible; and

Whereas steps should be taken immediately to correct these conditions so that a repetition of last year's fiasco will not exist which will cause food and fiber shortages: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senate and to the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the South Carolina delegation in the National Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the commissioner of agriculture of South Carolina, with the request that each use his influence to see that the proper authorities have these conditions corrected and urge immediate action to assure prompt delivery of an adequate supply of nitrates and other fertilizers to South Carolina farmers.

ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from Collier's magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, lynching is a crime that none of us condone. Under the law of any State, whatever the crime, the State courts can adequately punish the culprit and there is no necessity for any group to take the law in its own hands. This was my view during almost 9 years of service as district attorney; it is the view of the thousands of public officers throughout the South.

I am submitting an editorial from the Collier's magazine of February 14, 1948. This editorial should be read not only by those who may think seriously that such crime of lynching should be made a Federal offense but by those who advocate such action in the hope of furthering the politics of their party by its appeal to the radical agitators of northern cities.

Last year there was one lynching in the entire United States, and in that case the defendants were indicted and tried. I might say, if such offense had been a Federal crime at the time, the defendants would still have been tried before a jury from the same area. Why, there are a thousand and one crimes that are more prevalent in the United States, but no one advocates making them Federal offenses. No one wants to sponsor legislation that would penalize Chicago or New York, the officers of such cities, or force such cities to pay a sum of money to the dependents of those killed in gang warfare, nor even to the innocent who may be killed in such cases. Both of those cities have a thousand times worse record than does the South with regard to lynching.

No, all know that this legislation making lynching a Federal crime is unnecessary. It is advocated because it has become popular in some sections of the United States to attack the South. It is a way to get votes in certain areas. To vote for such measure is to destroy the States and their governments; it is to make a situation worse, and I do not see how any conscientious, right-thinking person could be a party to any such movement. I urge all to read the following editorial. The facts should call for a prayer on the part of those who have advocated such measure, asking to be forgiven for the wholly unjustified attacks on the people of the South and their integrity. In view of the wonderful job the southern people have done in striking out this evil themselves, other sections might well profit by our example with regard to crimes now prevalent in their areas, instead of attacking us further.

Can anyone think of any other crime of which there was only one instance in the whole United States last year?

To say we must have a Federal statute against lynching in order to stamp it out is to appear absurd in view of the record. If every violation of a State law were made a Federal crime, the United States Criminal Code would be 6 feet thick and the enforcement would take almost as many men in the FBI as Hitler had in his Gestapo.

The editorial to which I have referred is as follows:

GOOD NEWS ON LYNCHING

A few years after the Civil War a half dozen or so determined and courageous Virginians, including a college president and a newspaper editor, got together and decided to combat the lynching of Negroes, then a popular custom throughout the South. They stuck by their resolve and swung their weight against lynching in every way they could think of. From that time to this the State of Virginia has been virtually free of this particular crime against morals and human decency, not to mention the law.

We were reminded of the episode when we read the record of United States lynchings in 1947, as compiled early in 1948 by Tuskegee Institute, famous Negro college.

There was only one indisputable lynching in the United States last year—the infamous beating to death of colored Willie Earle by a mob of taxi drivers at Greenville, S. C., followed by their equally infamous acquittal at the hands of a jury of persons who were clearly the killers' peers.

The most encouraging feature of the Tuskegee report was this: In 1947 there were 39 incidents which might have degenerated into lynchings but were kept from doing so by bold, resolute, and conscientious public officials who, in one way or another, defeated the mobs' purposes and saved the potential victoms' lives.

It was not ever thus. Time was, and not so long ago, when sheriffs, jailers, etc., in most of the Southern States knew that to lift a finger against a lynch mob was to endanger their own lives, physical or political.

Nowadays more and more of the substantial and influential people in traditional lynch areas are frowning publicly on this old custom, denouncing it, throwing their weight against it in every practicable way—just as that handful of Virginians did long ago. As a result public officials' backbones are stiffening and justice is being better and better served.

In our opinion, this is the only method whereby the lynch-law barbarity ever can be sponged completely off the American scene. Attempted compulsion from outside—a Federal antilynching statute, for example—might easily retard rather than hasten the cleansing. Here is a heartfelt salute to the lynch-area people who are working this improvement from the inside and from the grass roots; and may their tribe increase.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Post of yesterday.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi opposing the recommendations of the President's civil rights message.

MARITIME COMMISSION TANKERS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest the preliminary report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce entitled "Fuel Investigation." I congratulate the distinguished chairman and the committee on the careful analysis they have made and I am particularly impressed with section 9 of the resolution adopted by the committee which, in brief, recommends that the Maritime Commission should be authorized and required by law to repair any tankers owned by it, or to be acquired by it, and to operate such tankers under charter, or otherwise, to the extent necessary to supplement the capacity of petroleum transportation equipment now in use and that adequate funds should be appropriated to the Maritime Commission for such purposes. It is a laudable resolution. However, resolutions do not bring fuel oil into New York and the Northeastern States. We need something more than resolutions; we need action by this Congress. Unless legislation is passed before the end of this month the Maritime Commission will have neither tankers in operation nor tankers to operate; they will all have been sold under direction of the Congress.

There is now pending the Keogh bill before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and it is important that action be taken on that bill immediately; otherwise, the fuel situation in New York City and in the northeastern area of the country generally will become even more desperate than it is today. Mayor O'Dwyer has called upon the Congress to act and relieve the situation, and he has requested legislation which is directly in line with the resolution of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. If the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee would spend a day or a night in one of the heatless homes in New York City, we might be able to get quick action on the bill.

I again commend the report of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but I insist that this Congress must do more than pass resolutions. We must have action by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and by the Congress itself on this vital issue.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN, MRS. ROOSEVELT, AND THE PALESTINE QUESTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, after having been betrayed by his palace guard, nobody could blame President Truman if he were to announce today that he would not be a candidate for reelection under any circumstances.

He not only has been jockeyed into an impossible position, but the way his administration was used to force through the partition of Palestine by threats of reprisals through the Baruch-Marshall plan is likely to break into a scandal that will shock the world.

One thing that attracted my attention this morning was a statement by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt saying that "Southern Democrats need more faith in the white race." Now, of all people, she is the last one on earth to advise the white people of the Southern States on this issue.

She seems to imagine that she is running that conglomeration of international hodgepodge up there at Lake Success, known as the United Nations and that it has now become an international gynecocracy, with her in full command.

The best thing the American people can do at this time is to withdraw from it before they drag us into a senseless, cruel, racial war in Palestine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, in one to include an article entitled "Should Rent Control Be Continued?" and in each of the others to include articles.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an editorial from the St. Joseph's News Press, entitled "A Word About Meat, No Rationing Please," and in the other to include a radio address by Jack Beall.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein two tables. It will be more than 300 words, but I would like to extend it at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the practice of the House that has been followed heretofore, such an extension will have to be made in the Appendix.

Mr. RICH. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD immediately following the regular business of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Times dated February 7, 1948, with reference to the nutritional value of margarine and butter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of Plea by Inter-Faith Good Will Unit, of Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Herald Tribune on meat rationing.

LOOKING AHEAD

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Samuel B. Pettengill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the present cold war with Russia turn into a shooting war? If so, how soon will it start? These are questions that are bothering me, causing me to lose sleep. Undoubtedly they are questions that will be answered soon.

Where will the shooting war start? The Near East, with its oil reserves—a rich prize for any nation that can acquire control over the same—is one of the logical spots for the shooting to start. The fighting in Palestine today between Arabs and Jews is to be the excuse for sending 40,000 American boys to Palestine to "keep the peace." I understand this move is now under consideration by the administration.

Russia has been looking for an excuse, or an opening, to get a toehold in the Near East for many, many years. She longs for control over those oil reserves. Will Stalin also send 40,000 Soviet troops into Palestine to "keep the peace," following our example? If so, what may happen?

Mr. Speaker, the Marshall plan was advanced to give aid to 16 European nations, in order to stop communism from getting control of the whole of Europe. It was to be a peacetime program of economic rehabilitation. I am wondering if it is still just that and nothing more.

On January 21 our State Department made public captured German state papers—captured a long time ago—giving the facts concerning the German-Soviet military alliance, and the objective of that alliance.

On January 22, Mr. Bevin, Britain's Foreign Minister, made a speech in the House of Commons announcing that the British Government had decided to form a military alliance against Russia, embracing in that alliance the 16 western European nations that are to be included in the Marshall plan.

On January 23, less than 24 hours after Bevin's speech, our State Department issued a proclamation saying, "The United States heartily welcomes the portentous step taken by the British Labor Government." These three closely related acts, with the almost perfect timing of them, indicate very clearly that the Truman administration had been consulted before Bevin made his speech and was in full accord with the program as announced.

Mr. Speaker, these steps lead to war, not a cold war, but a shooting war. When and where will it break out? Is the Marshall plan a plan to strengthen this military alliance as a step toward getting ready for the inevitable? If so, then the American people should be told the truth and not be kept in the dark as to its real purpose.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by the gentleman from Indiana, a former member of the Congress, the Honorable Samuel Pettengill. The article is entitled "The Pattern Repeats." It is a thought-provoking article, and it should be read carefully by every Member of Congress.

THE PATTERN REPEATS

Are we already at war, or just a step or two away?

The request to us of the Greek Premier Themistocles Sophoulis for 500 mountain guns follows a familiar pattern. "Give us the guns," he seems to say, "and we will win the war against the Communist guerrillas." What next?

One of England's best informed men in public life, in private conversation, recently said, in substance:

"The United States does not seem to realize that it is at war. You have sent $300,000,000 to Greece, and military officers to help the Greeks win their fight. You recently sent marines into the Mediterranean. You will have to send more money and military forces to Greece. You can't back out. You can't haul down your flag. Russia and the satellite countries on the north of Greece will resist. They will increase their forces, and some day there will be a clash. Then you will have to pour more men and money into Greece, and you will then have a shooting war on your hands. You will have to send millions of men to Europe. No one can predict when this shooting war will start. But you are in a situation which means that you are now at war because you can't back down. England backed out because she is no longer a first-rate power. You are the defenders of civilization."

That is only one man's opinion, but he has important contacts in and out of the British Government.

I am one of those simple souls who believe the people are entitled to be told, with complete honesty, just what are the intentions of our public officials. There seems to be no reason for secrecy.

If we are sending shooting men to the Mediterranean and the Middle East. Russian military intelligence knows it. So why not expose the problem and the danger to the grass-roots judgment of the American people? Maybe they could offer some suggestions of value. Anyhow, they are the ones who pay and die, and have a moral right to be informed.

If our officials had never made a serious mistake in foreign policy, we might think differently. But we have seen the astounding naïveté with which a half dozen men built up Russia as a peace-loving democracy into a greater threat to our security, possibly, than Hitler's regime.

This leads to some skepticism as to whether a handful of men should have the war-making power (supposed to be in Congress under the Constitution) completely in their hands, without the check or benefit of public opinion.

There was Yalta, Cairo, Tehran, Potsdam, the Morgenthau plan, the betrayal of Poland, an ally, the forced surrender to Russia by China, another ally, of important territory and interests in Manchuria and Korea, and by Japan in the Kurile Islands. Not so hot. And at the end of 3 years, no peace anywhere.

Does the pattern repeat—the 50 destroyers, the arming of Iceland, the shoot-at-sight order—all before Pearl Harbor?

In short, has the war power slipped completely out of the hands of Congress and the people? Is the Marshall plan a charity operation to succor the hungry or helpless, or is it an instrument of war?

If we are now as near to war as this Englishman thinks, the real question is whether we should give priority in the use of our assets to build up American defense or allocate them to international charity.

On that great question of our time, I claim the American people are entitled to full knowledge of the facts and to be heard.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

EXEMPTING FROM ESTATE TAX NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5221) to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, be rereferred to the Committee on Ways and Means. This bill has to do with a tax matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is really a tax bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a revenue bill and does not belong to our committee. I think it was sent to our committee by mistake.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CLYDE G. MORRILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, apparently relief in a measure has finally come to the New England section of our country because the Department of Commerce has issued certain directives which have the effect of an embargo on the shipment of oil from the east coast. But the problem is not just an east-coast problem. Other sections need relief also.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clyde G. Morrill did so much in endeavoring to bring fuel oil and kerosene to the east coast during the war; and only a few weeks ago he had pneumonia, and he left a sickbed in order to secure an embargo on oil being shipped to other countries so that America might be kept warm in the present emergency. He was appointed by Senator WHERRY as a member of the oil committee to make recommendations for solving the oil problem both for the emergency and for the future. This fine gentleman died just a few days ago. His untimely passing came in large measure from the very great effort he put forth trying to protect the health and the welfare of the people of the United States.

INDEPENDENT OIL MEN'S
ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Boston, Mass., February 6, 1948.

CLYDE G. MORRILL

The untimely death of our beloved executive director yesterday is a stunning blow to us all. I know you share in the universal thought that we, both personally and as an industry, have lost a brilliant, loyal, and untiring friend.

The many problems he has attacked and solved, particularly during the war and in the trying days through which we are now passing, will stand as an enduring memorial to his great capacities.

To replace such a man in our industry is a task beyond contemplation. Let us resolve to continue as best we can in the void, remembering the wise counsel given to us on so many occasions by our stanch friend and adviser.

JOHN P. BIRMINGHAM,
President.

SAM HARDY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House, and to the Congress, that this day marks the fortieth anniversary of Sam Hardy on the pay roll of the Committee on Ways and Means. I rise, therefore, to pay just tribute to this loyal, efficient, and devoted public servant who has completed almost a half-century in the service of the Congress of the United States.

It is only fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we should pause to consider the contributions to the work of the Congress which our Sam, and men like him, have given without thought of personal gain or glory to themselves. We too frequently overlook, in the rough and tumble routine of our work, the value of their humble and unheralded services. Yet, without their assistance, given in such abundance and regardless of personal comfort or convenience, this great legislative body could not properly function.

There are many who believe as I do, that Sam Hardy, our trusted messenger, is an invaluable servant of the Committee on Ways and Means. In the long span of his service beginning on February 9, 1908, he has been the keeper of committee records, he has furnished on a moment's notice documents and papers that most of us had forgotten were in existence and yet proved of inestimable value in our current work. In many other ways, Sam has placed the tools of our work in our hands when we needed them and we have relied many times on his personal knowledge of legislative history and committee procedures.

Sam came to the committee in 1908. He was appointed by that great former chairman, Sereno E. Payne, of New York, coauthor of the famous Payne-Aldrich tariff law. Since then Sam has served under nine committee chairmen as follows: Hon. Sereno E. Payne, of New York; Hon. Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama; Hon. Claude Kitchin, of North Carolina; Hon. Joseph W. Fordney, of Michigan; Hon. William R. Green, of Iowa; Hon. Willis C. Hawley, of Oregon; Hon. James W. Collier, of Mississippi; Hon. Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina; and Hon. Harold Knutson, of Minnesota.

In the course of Sam's 40 years with the committee he has seen 27 major tax bills become law, 4 tariff laws enacted, the Trade Agreements Act, and its 4 extensions, and 7 bonus bills placed on the statute books.

Sam was only 29 years old when he joined the staff of the committee. Today he is approaching his seventieth year, but to those who see him hustling from office to office, or through the Halls of the Capitol he has lost none of his youthful vigor and none of the cheerful optimism of a young man. In every respect Sam is still "going strong."

In 1908 Sam was employed in the check room of the Old Ebbitt House at Fourteenth and F Streets, where now stands the National Press Building. Through his old friend, Harry Parker, who himself was then serving in his seventeenth year as a committee employee, Sam learned of the opening available with the committee and was introduced to Chairman Payne, who appointed him as a janitor. Thirty years later Harry retired and Sam has thus become our senior messenger.

This day also marks, Mr. Speaker, another milestone in Sam's life, for on February 9, 1913, 35 years ago, he was married to Nannie Brown, of Virginia, and it is likewise fitting that we should congratulate Sam and Mrs. Hardy on having attained this important mark along life's pathway.

One of the most frequent questions asked by members of the committee and others associated with the committee is "Where is Sam?" This only proves how dependent we have all become upon his unique abilities and in our own haste at times we sometimes expect Sam to be in two places at once. But his talents have never extended this far. We too frequently forget that Sam looks after 25 offices of committee members, 6 storage rooms, the committee library, the hearing rooms, the committee office, and the office of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. In addition to being a messenger Sam has become a librarian, mail clerk, doorkeeper, document clerk, and janitor. In fact, there is some truth to his own claim that he has held almost every position with the committee except that of chairman.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of every member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and of those Members of the House who have had occasion to utilize Sam's services, when I say that in Sam's long and unselfish service will be found a fitting example for the younger servants of the Congress and an unwavering beacon for all public servants. He is, and has always been, continuously on the job. He thinks of his job, of the convenience and desires of the committee first, himself last, and anticipates their requirements.

There is a little rule of success that I like to recall now and then to the effect that a successful man is one who performs every task just a little better than necessary. And that rule applies in every respect to our Sam. He does everything just a little bit better than necessary, and in that way has won a place in the hearts of every member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He has left his mark in these marbled halls that will not be forgotten. His footprints are embedded with a great host of distinguished public servants who have served and are still serving the Congress of the United States. His contribution, with theirs, have helped make up the great traditions of the American Congress.

And so to Sam I extend, for myself and for the committee, our heartiest congratulations and sincerest wishes for your

long and continued service to the Congress.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. It is with pleasure that I, as a minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, concur in the splendid tribute paid by the gentleman from New York to Sam Hardy, one of the most faithful, efficient, and valuable employees of the Federal Government. In expressing these sentiments I feel sure that I express the sentiment of all Members on our side of the aisle.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, as a personal friend of Sam Hardy, may I join in this fine tribute?

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the crash in the commodity markets of last week demonstrates how completely the Truman administration has dominated and fixed the price of grains and other commodities since July 1, 1946. During the past 19 months, volume buying of wheat, coarse grains, fats and oils, and other commodities by the Government, under orders of the Secretary of Agriculture, forced steep advances in these commodities and skyrocketed prices of livestock and poultry feed, beef, pork, dairy products, and other foods. When the Government bought, prices advanced sharply, and when the Government stopped buying, prices of commodities went down.

Last week, although it was announced that the Government still had to acquire another 77,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour for foreign export and relief, the Secretary of Agriculture ordered Government buying of wheat stopped, and the bottom fell out of the commodities market. This drop in commodity prices brought forth announcements of lower prices for feed, flour, bread, lard, meat, and other food products. The spectacular drop in commodity prices of the past few days cost the wheat farmers more than $200,000,000, and additional hundreds of millions of dollars were lost to owners of other farm products.

According to press reports, Secretary Anderson disclosed last Saturday night that a leak had occurred on the Department's decision to curtail grain buying in advance of the public announcement made last Thursday. While thousands of small speculators and traders lost their shirts in last week's debacle, speculators tuned to the pipe line of inside information were able to get out of the market without loss or to take a short position and make tremendous profits in a few days.

The Select Committee To Investigate Commodity Transactions will make a full inquiry into last week's commodity crash to ascertain the names and extent of operations of those who profited by advance inside information. We will ask the Secretary of Agriculture for complete information in regard to the leak which he states occurred in advance of the public announcement.

In my opinion, no one man or group of men, or agency of the Government, should be permitted to possess the power to manipulate or rig commodity and food prices. Such manipulation is contrary to public policy and against the interests of the people. I am personally convinced that the Government commodity-buying program, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, has largely dominated prices of commodities and the cost of food to American consumers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. HESS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter regarding the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Melchior Palyi appearing in the Toronto Northern Miner.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "The Bomb Secret Is Out" by Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor of the University of Chicago. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $189.34, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an address delivered by Robert N. Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; and in the other a letter from Thomas F. Flannigan, publicity director, New Jersey Affiliated Postal Employees Legislative Committee.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial to Abraham Lincoln by former Representative Homer Hoch, of Kansas.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of petroleum in connection with the European recovery plan, and further to extend his remarks and include an article by W. C. Bryan appearing in the Wall Street Journal of February 7, 1948.

PROGRESS UNDER THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, headlines of the labor press definitely reveal the Taft-Hartley law is working. They contradict union officials' statements that the act is a "slave-labor" law; it will weaken and destroy unions, and impedes collective bargaining.

December 22, 1947, A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, made the following comment, "No union can benefit from the Taft-Hartley law." Remember, the law does not even apply to the railroad trainmen.

The A. F. of L. Weekly News Service reveals the following items of great interest: There were fewer strikes, during the month of November 1947, than in any other month since December 1945. The AFL Teamsters' Union reports a large membership increase since the Taft-Hartley law became effective, and on January 1, 1948, they boasted of 1,000,000 members and not a one are on strike. The AFL Paper Box Makers Union won a 14 percent pay boost; also San Francisco pier guards won a raise of 22 cents; 3,500 A. F. of L. Retail Clerks received pay increases; and from New York State comes reports the number of strikes, in that area, are at the lowest level in 50 years. Bear in mind, workers still have the right to strike under the Taft-Hartley law.

These headlines, from their own labor press, do not substantiate union officials' remarks that the law is destroying their unions.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, said they cannot tolerate the oppressive conditions imposed upon them by the Taft-Hartley Act. Under the oppressive conditions let us note other labor press quotations on union activities. Union rolls have reached an all-time record. They also report that labor peace is "99 percent perfect"; and now, the National Labor Relations Board recognizes the rights of craft unions in an industrial unit and gives them an opportunity to establish separate bargaining arrangements. The craft unions alleged the Board had formerly discriminated against them. Another headline reveals employees selected the International Association of Machinists as bargaining agent in 36 additional plants; furthermore this same international union reports wages were raised $221,000,000 last year. Collective bargaining resulted in an average increase of 13 cents per hour. Renewed contracts featuring 11 paid holidays, and 15 to 18 cents per hour pay gains were obtained in New York. Listen to this interesting disclosure: According to Mr. Van A. Bittner, national director of the Southern CIO Organizing Committee, the tempo of organizational activities in the South, showed a decided upswing during the last 3 months of 1947. This pe-

riod is since the effective date of the Taft-Hartley law.

Do these gains and advantages sound like the fruits of oppressive conditions?

Harold C. Hanover, secretary-treasurer of the New York State Federation of Labor, charged that the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law was to destroy the institution of organized labor. The labor press reports point out the following events: The union shop wins out in 100 percent NLRB elections; also the United Electrical Workers Union continues to win protection for workers despite the Taft-Hartley law. In the last 3 months of 1947, since the law went into effect, this union has won the bargaining rights in 30 new plants; 20,000 new members have been added to the union; contracts covering 125,000 workers were signed or renewed and 55 of those contracts brought union security to 7,500 workers for the first time; and in a union drive for higher wages, it is stated the Taft-Hartley law fight strengthens the UE Sylvania locals.

Labor's own admission of progress, in its labor press headlines, fails to support Mr. Hanover's conclusion.

A paragraph from a labor paper editorial says:

> The Taft-Hartley Act is the crack in the dam, threatening to unloose the floodwaters of anti-unionism and industrial dictatorship. If not checked that flood will sweep the country once more into an era of low wages, long hours, reduced buying power, and underconsumption, straight into a depression.

The following incidents from the labor press refute this editorial comment.

The oil workers boost their pay $106,100,000; 150,000 clothing workers get a 12½-cent raise; the longshoremen won an 8-cent raise, with more to come; airplane mechanics received a 16-cents-per-hours increase; and the A. W. Cash Co. granted a pay raise making a total of 45 cents on the hour. In Seattle, auto mechanics won a 25-cents-per-hour increase. Especially take note of this next article. In New Jersey, membership in a union, before the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, was only 88 percent of the workers in a particular plant, and now, since the law went into effect, union membership in that factory is 100 percent.

I want to make it clear, so there will be no misunderstanding, all labor press articles referred to herein, were taken from labor papers issued since the Taft-Hartley law became effective.

These kind of headlines are convincing the rank and file members, that the Taft-Hartley law is not a slave-labor act; it is not preventing them from organizing new locals, or obtaining higher wages and better working conditions.

I say again, that union leaders, whose interest is that of securing greater benefits for their members, have nothing to fear in the Taft-Hartley law.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain articles contained in the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there exists in the State of Michigan and particularly in my own city of Detroit a shortage of natural gas. Since January 28 over 100,000 industrial workers have been idle because of this shortage. The unemployment compensation burden has been increased by 50,000 applicants as a direct result. The situation is critical and becoming every day more intolerable.

Regardless of the causes of this shortage; regardless of the factors involved and regardless of any other persons or factors involved this situation calls for immediate action. The situation is not only as I have said intolerable but it is also unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I have called for a congressional investigation into this matter and the following are the articles in the Detroit paper which I referred to in my opening paragraph:

BEHIND GAS SHORTAGE LIES INTRICATE WEB

(By Robert Lund)

Potent factor in the utilities battle which lies behind Detroit's critical gas shortage is a Federal Government order calling on American Light & Traction Co. to divest itself of stock holdings in Detroit Edison Co.

How loss of an electric-utility stock affects gas consumers is a complex corporate pyramid.

The spider web unravels like this:

Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. is controlled by American Light & Traction. In turn, American Light is controlled by United Light & Railway Co., a holding company.

In the late twenties, American Light, with an eye toward a Midwest empire of utility companies, purchased 257,841 shares—about 20 percent—of Edison's outstanding stock.

Two officers of American Light now sit on the Edison board as representatives of American Light's interest. They are F. L. Conrad, a director of American Light, and R. T. McElvenny, vice president and assistant to the chairman of American.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has ruled that, under the Holding Company Act, United Light must divest itself of its interest in American Light.

Simultaneously, the SEC also ruled that American Light should dispose of its holdings in Edison and Madison (Wis.) Gas & Electric Co.

In compliance with the SEC ruling, American Light has already marketed a substantial block of its Edison stock. Brokerage quarters predict two additional offerings this year will see the last of American Light's interest in Edison.

In effect, the SEC ruling puts United Light out of business. It also takes a deep slice out of the earnings of American Light.

Under a plan filed by United Light with the SEC last October, American Light would continue as a holding company. It would own an integrated gas-utility system.

These properties would be operated by still another company—Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co. and Austin Field Pipeline Co.

Funds to form the last two named concerns would come from the proceeds of the sale of the Edison stock.

If Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline is successful in its attempts to build a line from Texas to supply eastern Wisconsin and Michigan areas, including Detroit, the profits from such a venture would more than offset the loss in revenue from the sale of the Edison stock.

The new company would be manned by the same executives that now head United Light.

CITY A PRIZE FOR GAS FIRMS

(By Leo Donovan)

Why natural gas is so vital to Detroit industry is apparent in almost every manufacturing process in the machine shop of the world.

Industrial gas is at least a $7,000,000 annual prize for which the utilities giants battle.

The Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. reports that 50 percent of all industrial gas sold in Detroit and piped here 1,200 miles from Texas and the Hugoton fields in Kansas is used for heat-treating metals.

Another 25 percent of the industrial gas sold by the local distributing utility is used for baking enamel finishes on automobile bodies.

The other 25 percent is used for miscellaneous industrial uses, principally for melting metal, die casting, block treating of motors, and baking bread.

Why 200,000 men are idle in Detroit may be analyzed from the almost countless types of jobs and skills in which industrial gas plays a vital part.

Industrial gas is used in such a variety of applications as bunsen burners in factory medical departments; in tool-room heat-treating; in drying ovens; flame cutters; tool room, electric-repair and machine-repair torches; in enamel burn-off furnaces; for soldering irons, rivet heating, cleaning and hardening furnaces; for atmosphere generators, circulating air furnaces, and for foundry maintenance.

It's used in brake tube and gas tank assembly lines; in foundry black-wash ovens; for melting lead; for conveyor torches; in core-room foundries; for oil-burner pilot lights; for several types of core ovens, rotary sand dryers, mold dryers.

In automobile paint departments it has wide use for bonderizing, oven drying, finish enamel baking; repair ovens, and in tin furnaces and for melting lead.

Figures of Michigan Consolidated show that in 1947 the company distributed its gas sales in the following classifications.

For residential hot water and cooking, $13,195,000.

For industrial gas, $7,006,000.

For commercial use in stores, laundries, bakeries, etc, $1,923,000.

For space heating of homes and stores, $9,348,000.

If the company were to sell industry-manufactured gas it would cost the company about $1.81 for every thousand cubic feet, as contrasted with the current rate of slightly more than 20 cents a thousand cubic feet for natural gas, a company spokesman reported.

Only space-heating gas has remained at the same price to the consumer since 1941, the gas company reported. That rate is 62 cents a thousand cubic feet.

The industrial gas rate of 43 cents a thousand cubic feet is 28 percent lower than the rate in 1941; the residential rate of $1.03 is 32 percent lower, and the commercial rate of 78 cents is 28 percent lower, the company reported.

Without Detroit's industry and the efforts of the late Councilman John W. Smith, Detroit would not have natural gas.

Smith led the fight to bring natural gas to Michigan, and the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. grew from a small utility to one of the largest pipe-line companies in the country because of Detroit's continuously expanding use of the fuel to operate its industries.

GAS SHORTAGE PROVES GREATEST BLOW TO CITY'S INDUSTRY SINCE DEPRESSION

(By Clyde Bates)

Detroit has been plunged into the greatest mass unemployment since the depression by the critical gas shortage, the board of commerce revealed.

More than 150,000 men are idle, scores of plants are closed and production has been curtailed at others.

The Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. announced that it would be unable to restore gas to plants before next Monday and maybe not then.

This meant another week of idleness for workers whose resources already have been drained by payless days.

Total loss in production and pay rolls threatens to reach staggering proportions. Loss to industry has been estimated conservatively at $30,000,000 a week by the board of commerce.

Chrysler Corp., hardest hit of the major industries, has suffered an estimated $20,000,000 loss. Pay roll loss to 50,000 idle employees has been $3,000,000.

These figures were corporation estimates.

The board of commerce figures also revealed that gas shortage lay-offs have dropped industrial employment to the lowest figure since 1935.

At that time an estimated 315,000 workers were employed in the Detroit area.

Current lay-offs, the Board of Commerce estimated, have reduced factory employment to 319,000.

Other developments in the gas and fuel situation Tuesday were:

1. Common council hurried two petitions to Washington. One was directed to Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug, asking all possible aid in getting oil to Michigan Consolidated. The other petition was addressed to the Federal Power Commission, demanding information on what the FPC is doing to alleviate the natural-gas shortage.

2. Fred H. Robinson, Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co., executive, urged immediate intervention by Governor Sigler. Robinson's wire to Sigler said that "this situation has become so aggravated that in our opinion executive action is necessary to bring about a solution."

3. Mayor Van Antwerp appointed seven persons to serve on the Citizen's Fuel Oil Commission, in an effort to assure proper distribution of available slim supplies.

4. Panhandle Eastern assured continued delivery of its contracted maximum of natural gas to Michigan Consolidated, despite FPC orders to continue emergency pipe-line deliveries to Ohio.

5. Applications for unemployment benefits rose to record heights in two of Detroit's four offices, MUCC officials said. A total of 20,000 claims were filed Tuesday, 5,000 more than Monday's total. By the week end officials expect to file 110,000 claims, the greatest since the VJ-day reconversion.

Ford Motor Co., only mildly hit by the gas shortage, donated another 5,000,000 cubic feet of gas to the Michigan Consolidated Monday, Henry Fink, gas company president, said.

Ford diverted 30,000,000 cubic feet into Michigan Consolidated lines over the week end.

Fink said a reserve supply of 1,145,000 gallons of oil for making artificial gas has now been built up, compared with only 300,000 a few days ago.

POLITICAL FIGHT OVER GAS LEAVES CITY CHILLED

(By Hub M. George)

Wrangling over Detroit's gas supply, with frequent crises, has been a favorite political pastime for at least a quarter of a century.

James H. Lee, assistant corporation counsel, and Detroit's recognized authority in utility matters, believes the 2-year battle between Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. and Panhandle-Eastern Pipeline Co. over natural-gas supplies for Detroit is a leading factor in the present shortage.

The franchise of the old Detroit City Gas Co. expired 24 years ago.

Controversy and litigation have been almost interminable since.

Its latest development was the order of the Federal Power Commission a year ago authorizing the Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co., an affiliate of Michigan Consolidated, to pipe natural gas from Texas to the Austin storage field 140 miles north of Detroit.

That authorization anticipated expiration in 1951 of Michigan Consolidated's contract with Panhandle-Eastern to supply up to 125,000,000 cubic feet of gas daily to Detroit.

Panhandle fought the decision bitterly. It offered, on the basis of three proposals of its own for increased service, to step up deliveries to 180,000,000 cubic feet daily. The offer was not accepted.

The $7,000,000 Detroit-Austin field extension is scheduled for completion in late spring.

The long fight is for control of the rich Detroit industrial market.

In all existing contracts, the priority of the householder is recognized.

Industry is being served mainly on an interruptible, off-peak-load basis. It is the first to feel a shortage.

After the 1924 expiration of franchises, the city was without a binding arrangement for 3 years.

Court action finally forced agreement on a scale of rates in an arbitration procedure headed by Justice Frank Murphy, then a recorder's judge, now of the United States Supreme Court.

When litigants challenged the rate base the city succeeded in establishing the regulatory control of the State public utilities commission.

Until that time coke gas was practically the only supply.

Early in the 1940's city council forced the Columbia Gas & Light Co., a holding company controlling Panhandle-Eastern, to extend its main pipe line from Dana, Ind., to provide Detroit with natural gas.

Council and the gas firm engaged in a series of fights over rates.

The city and gas company joined hands to dissolve the company controlling the pipe line from Indiana to Detroit.

This brought a $4,500,000-a-year reduction in consumer rates. More than $26,000,000 is held by a Kansas City Federal appellate court for distribution to Michigan consumers in rebate of overcharges.

Detroit will eventually receive $11,000,000 of this total.

City and company joined again in a successful fight to utilize the Austin field for reservoir storage of a summertime surplus of Panhandle gas.

Panhandle contended it was not obligated to provide gas for underground storage.

That sharpened the rivalry. Panhandle and Consumers Power Co. were already developing the Michigan gas storage field near Big Rapids.

It was in 1945 that the Michigan-Wisconsin pipe-line project got under way.

Originally Michigan Consolidated contended it was going to cut off Panhandle's supply after 1951 and serve its field exclusively.

More recently, however, adjustment of the contract to 87,000,000 cubic feet a day has been discussed.

It will take nearly 2 years to complete the Michigan-Wisconsin pipe-line project, and presumably an equal time to greatly augment Panhandle's deliveries.

The latter company already has won approval, however, for step-up and booster changes to augment service in small degree in the intervening period.

FACTORY FIGURES

Detroit industry, though hard hit, has by no means been paralyzed by the natural-gas shortage.

A survey of some of the plants affected indicates that while some have been closed completely, others have been able to keep many of their employees on the job.

The following table shows the number of workers employed in the plants checked, the number laid off, and the length of time they have been idled:

Industry	Number employed	Number off	Number days off
Eaton Co.	809	750	6
Bohn Alum Co.	6,000	1,000	4
Detroit Steel Products	900	350	2
Kelsey-Hayes Wheel	1,100	800	5
Detroit Michigan Stove	750	700	7
Chrysler Corp.	70,000	50,000	6
General Motors Corp.	28,000	1,600	4
Ford Motor Co. HP truck plant	10,900	500	4
Briggs Manufacturing	21,000	20,500	4
Packard Motor	8,400	5,500	7
The Budd Co.	8,000	200	7
Standard Steel Treating	60	6	1
Michigan Steel Processing	25	12	5
Congress Die Casting Division	125	125	6
Superior Steel Treating Co.	20	10	5
Ainsworth Manufacturing Co.	800	200	4
Square D. Co.	1,600	16	2
Glenvale Products Corp.	175	125	5
Commonwealth Brass Corp.	580	20	4
Starr Heat Treating Co.	28	5	5
Detroit Aluminum & Brass Manufacturing Co.	700	50	1
Atlas Foundry Co.	135	135	1
Hoskins Manufacturing Co.	300	135	7
Commonwealth Industries, Inc.	50	7	5
Barnes Gibson & Raymond Co.	400	6	4
Wolverine Tube Co.	1,200	1,000	7
Monsanto Chemical Co.	310	250	2
Revere Copper & Brass Co.	1,000	12	4
Michigan Steel Casting Co.	380	25	9
L. A. Young Spring & Wire Corp.	2,800	2,000	4
Detroit Bevel Gear	300	10	5
Detroit Steel Corp.	225	[1] 225	1
American Brass Co.	1,200	[1] 1,200	2
Commercial Heat Treating Co.	180	[2] 180	2
Federal Mogul Corp.	800	800	5
Nash-Kelvinator Corp.	4,300	1,400	5
Detroit Steel & Tube Co.	480	40	5
Gemmer Manufacturing Co.	1,300	750	6
H. & H. Tube	265	265	4
Thompson Products	1,700	300	6
Aluminum Co. of America	525	300	6
Buhl Manufacturing Co.	1,000	100	5
Columbia Steel Treating Co.	81	30	5
Midland Steel Products	2,400	1,800	2
Lincoln Brass	500	60	4
Bower Roller Bearing	2,200	100	2
McCord Manufacturing Co.	650	400	5
Continental Die Casting	275	250	5
Peninsular Metal Products	1,000	300	5

[1] Workweek cut 1 to 2 days.
[2] Workweek cut 30 percent.

PAULEY RESIGNATION

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's papers I read a news item

reporting that the Special Assistant to the Secretary of War for Procurement, Mr. Edwin W. Pauley, has resigned and that his resignation has been accepted. He was a high Government insider who admitted making fabulous profits speculating in commodities.

In this connection, I simply wish to observe that the publicity given to his theatrical gyrations which obviously resulted from the impact of the blow he received in December have in no way diminished the truth of the charges. In this case it is true as Samuel Johnson once remarked, "Attack is the reaction." Mr. Speaker, in this case the weight of the blow can best be judged by the extent of the rebound.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to momentarily discuss the proposed Marshall plan now in the making, and to say that in my opinion the Marshall plan is in for some rough sledding in the Congress unless scaled down to size, and unless an organization is set up in which the Congress has confidence, and unless a commonsense, reasonable program is presented to assist those countries that are in need of assistance, rather than attempt a program to subsidize all the countries of the world.

It appears that unless we concentrate on the spots where there is desperate need of help, rather than take in the entire world, we may scatter our hits in so many different directions we will not win any ball game.

There is no question but that certain parts of Europe must be helped to bring about economic stability in the world. However, we should be practical realists in developing this program as to what we can and cannot afford to do without breaking the American taxpayers' backs.

We are approximately $260,000,000,000 in debt. Therefore, it is time for careful thinking before it is too late. Certainly, one can readily recognize that this country cannot indefinitely finance all the countries of the world.

We have pumped approximately $20,000,000,000 into Europe since the end of the war without appreciable results. We now should direct our efforts where the need is greatest.

When all is said and done, the whole problem in continental Europe is coal. The whole economy of Europe is dependent upon coal. Everywhere we traveled in Europe last fall the problem was coal. And next after coal is steel, and after steel is the rehabilitation of the transportation systems in the war-torn countries.

So, if we get the coal and steel and transportation industries rehabilitated in these sore spots, it will give that industrial impetus necessary to effect a recovery through all of Europe. However, if we take on a plan to finance and rehabilitate all the countries of the world, the American taxpayer—who is demanding tax relief and is entitled to it—will rebel. In fact, they are rebelling now. They are on the alert and asking what it is all about.

I said when I came back from Europe—and I want to say it again—that unless a separate organization is set up outside of the State Department, free from any governmental interference, to operate this program in a hard-headed, practical, businesslike manner, that it is my honest and unsolicited opinion that a great many Members who might have accepted a reasonable program will vote against any program at all.

This organization, when set up, should be composed of the keenest minds in American finance, coal, steel, transportation, and agriculture. Men of broad experience. Practical men who understand that two and two make four. Men who have been successful operators and not world thinkers and do-gooders who have concluded that Uncle Sam's pocketbook is inexhaustible.

Those who are proposing this program will have to deflate their present ideas and get down to business; tell the American people the least amount that is essential and necessary to effect industrial rehabilitation in these sore spots where help is desperately needed; tell the American people exactly where the money is to be spent, how it is going to be spent, who is going to do the spending, and the results that we expect to achieve from the investment we are proposing to make.

The State Department should handle affairs of state and should get out of the economic affairs of the Nation. I do not say this critically, but I honestly believe they are not qualified by training or experience to take on and handle a job of this stature.

If we continue promiscuous spending through the various governments of Europe, as we have done in the past, I feel certain we will not effect the kind of a recovery the world hopes for, and nothing concrete will be accomplished, and the American taxpayers' dollars will go down the drain as they have in the past.

This is a job for hard-headed American businessmen and industry; and it is going to require the keenest brains and ingenuity that are available.

Certainly it is evident that those who have been handling these matters since the end of the war have not gotten any definite results for the billions of dollars poured in since 1945.

We all recognize that help is needed in some of these war-torn countries, and certainly we do not intend to withdraw from participation in world affairs. Yet, on the other hand, the day has come when we cannot continue exhausting our natural resources—oil, coal, iron ore, and our money—without eventually crippling our own productivity and bankrupting ourselves; ending up in economic chaos and inflation.

The oil situation today is an indication of the shape this country is in. In fact, I think you will agree with me that it is a desperate situation and that something must be done about it.

This whole proposed plan should be scaled down to meet the size of our pocketbook and a reasonable amount of money placed where it will do the most good.

In conclusion, permit me to state that unless the program is placed in the hands of a qualified, competent group of administrators in whom the American people have confidence to do the kind of job that must be done—to get results for the money expended—I feel certain this proposed spending program is going to have a rather tough time in the Congress. The American people are weary, and have reached a point of utter exhaustion in these gigantic world-spending plans. It is time to wake up and think about our own country, and what the depletion of our natural resources means for its future. We want to do our part—and we will do our part—but promiscuous spending without results must be stopped.

[From the Punxsutawney (Pa.) Spirit]

COAL IS THE KEY

The key to European recovery—and to the success of the Marshall plan—is coal. In the words of Coal Age, "Because of the lack of coal, factories run part time, fields are less fertile, and firesides are cold."

Before the war, Britain and Germany together supplied the bulk of Europe's coal. Now production in the Ruhr is at half the former level, and England can barely produce enough for her own domestic requirements. As a result, Europe has had to go through the costly process of hauling coal from the United States. During the current year, it is estimated, our exports to western Europe will total the enormous figure of 45,200,000 short tons.

This cannot be indefinitely continued. To quote Coal Age again, "Two developments are vital. First, western Europe must reequip its mines. This calls for a vast production effort on its own part, as well as the import of specialized equipment from the United States. Second, a river of coal, 34,200,000 tons in 1951, must breach the iron curtain and flow from Poland to the west."

In this country, free enterprise has created an efficient coal industry. It remains to be seen if Europe can profit by our example.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent on the President's proposal to take out of the Veterans' Administration program of training the flight training which has heretofore been in the program.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. MATHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short quotation from a report to the Governor of the State of New Jersey.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, first on the St. Lawrence waterway and in the other to include a brief explanation of a bill being introduced today by him for the railway mail clerks.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today following the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials.

THE FUEL OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, for weeks the committees and Members of Congress, as well as the public, have been told by representatives of the State and Commerce Departments that further reductions in exports of petroleum and petroleum products would be impossible. They have also been told by these spokesmen that, even the thought of an embargo for a limited period is out of the question. They have said that it is dangerous and might wreck the economies of other nations.

I want to point out today that upon the analysis I made last Thursday, which appears at pages 1157 and 1158 of the RECORD, this argument is completely refuted. Apart from the unsatisfactory reductions announced on January 30, it is clear that a complete 100-percent embargo has been declared by the Department of Commerce as to products going to certain countries. There is such an embargo on kerosene to Denmark and Eire, on gas oil and distillate fuel oil to the Republic of Panama and Iceland, on residual fuel oil to New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

I understand the Office of International Trade has up to today issued export licenses for only approximately 400 barrels of all oils for shipment from east coast ports. We understood on January 30 that the Department would refuse to license any shipments of oil through east coast ports. Obviously, this is a complete 100-percent embargo for all intents and purposes, of exports from this shortage area. I also understand that the Treasury Department is now in the process of notifying all customs offices to enforce the regulation as to all shipments. This, in effect, has implemented the complete embargo of January 30 on the export of all those products for an indefinite period from the critical areas, unless a date be set in the announcement.

I know that Members of Congress will bear these facts in mind in the consideration of any legislation dealing with further restrictions or an embargo. Certainly the clear facts outweigh any misgivings and doubts on the part of the officials of the Departments of State and Commerce. Although it is a relatively unimportant point, I hope each of you will make these facts very clear to all at home who may have occasion to read certain syndicated columns, attacking any embargo suggestion or attempting to smear the authors as being engaged in "smart politics" and referring to their sincere and honest efforts to provide solutions to this critical situation as "politics of reckless folly."

We all know that several of these columnists readily respond to the appeals of their friends in the departments, but, unfortunately, too many people who read their columns are not aware of this particular type of specious demagoguery, which is still engaged in in some quarters.

I realize that we are dealing with a technical subject. It is unfortunate that the terminology varies so sharply. I previously pleaded that we settle upon some simple language and stick to it. It is no wonder that people are confused when they hear of tons one day, barrels the next day, gallons the next day, percentages the fourth day, dollars the fifth day, and net balances at the end of the week. The same thing is true when we hear of allocations, quotas, export licenses, and actions undertaken through the customs offices.

However, I think you may wish to have the record clear at this point. You will find that in the release of January 30, which I included in my remarks at page 852 of the RECORD, I stated I was glad to be able to report that at 4:30 o'clock that afternoon the Department of Commerce announced a revised program on the exports of fuel oil, and I quoted this paragraph from the release, "In addition, the Department announced it would eliminate licenses for export of petroleum products to export from those areas of the country where fuel can best be spared during this emergency period." Of course, we all understood that to mean that the Department would not issue licenses from east-coast ports, and it appears that it has done so only to the relatively minor extent of some 400 barrels of all kinds of oil.

Today's action, if I understand it correctly, is a recommendation that the decision not to export or issue export licenses is not sufficient and that it leaves an opening, however slight, of relying upon licenses which may have been issued prior to January 30. Therefore, the decision to notify the customs offices to refuse to authorize any shipments whatever plugs that loophole most effectively. Yet, I must add that I am not satisfied it will be a sufficient action, and I intend to comment on that as soon as I can obtain more exact information as to the text of the announcement.

At this point, I might add that I understand there are some legal questions involved and now being considered. The only ones I can think of might have to do with contracts already entered into for shipment during this period out of these ports to other countries. As a lawyer, I cannot overlook the difficulties of such a situation, if it exists. Nevertheless, morally, I cannot believe that any person who entered into such a contract recently is entitled to any consideration whatsoever. Obviously, one possible motive would be the few extra filthy dollars in foreign sales at this time of critical shortages here. So far as I am concerned, that is a wholly inadequate reason for any American taking from his neighbors short supplies in this unhappy period, and I certainly hope we can get to the bottom of all factors leading to these foreign sales. No one can deny that they have had their effect on increased prices throughout this country, and I think they are an example of the blindest kind of an approach to the problem of convincing the American people that our free enterprise system has worked and can work, if those responsible for its conduct will rise above the petty desire to make a few extra dollars, at the expense of their fellow countrymen. I can think of no surer way for any industry to find the American people demanding a resumption of Government controls and even, perhaps, the nationalization of their industry than for it to ignore the legitimate expectations of the people of this country, in terms of supplying them with an adequate amount of their goods at reasonable cost. Therefore, if this is the legal difficulty, I am not going to waste much sympathy upon those who have brought it upon themselves. If he or it has to take a loss, he or it should do so without whining. Certainly, the chances are that the loss will be infinitesimal compared to the accrued profits, if this is the kind of thing involved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Nation's Business entitled "Our New Friends, the Japanese."

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING PUBLIC LAWS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion at least two public laws should be amended. One deals with social security, wherein a widow, through no fault of her own, has failed to file for death benefits under her husband's social security employment prior to February 10, 1947.

One of my constituents, an aged lady, whose husband died in 1939, did not know until March of 1947 that her husband was covered by social security. During that month, while looking over some old papers, she discovered her husband's social-security card. She immediately contacted the regional office but was informed that she was not entitled to a lump-sum payment due to the fact that she had not filed claim for benefits prior to February 10, 1947.

Now, it may be that some statute of limitation date is necessary, but it seems to me that there are exceptions in all cases and that the law should be flexible enough to see that justice is done in these exceptional cases. This poor widow lady is a case in point. She needs every penny which she can get to meet the high cost of living. She did not know that her husband carried social security. Why, then, should this poor aged lady be denied that which under the law of common sense rightfully belongs to her even though the law on the statute books denies her this meager help.

In my opinion, the law should be so amended as to give the Administrator of the social-security program authority to use his discretion and interpretation in dealing with cases such as this, and that he should not be compelled to adhere strictly to the law in cases of this nature.

The second law to which I refer is the one which also puts a time limit on the date wherein a discharged veteran may file for his mustering-out pay.

I trust that both of these laws may be amended by the proper committee. If that is not done within a reasonable length of time I intend to introduce legislation looking toward the amendment of these two laws.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by him entitled "The Aircraft Industry."

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received by him.

DO NOT BE FOOLED LIKE LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD BY THE WOLF IN GRANDMOTHER'S CLOTHES

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. J. A. Krug, will have introduced into this Congress a so-called compromise bill on the disputed tidelands oil case. According to the news releases issued by the Department, they will give back to the various States 90 percent of the income and retain only 10 percent for themselves. That in itself is the wolf in grandmother's clothes.

Before we show up that statement let us call your attention to the fact that it is selling out a principle for a few pieces of silver. They say nothing about the control of the harbors, bays, and inland waterways. Yes, they say they keep only 10 percent, but they keep the absolute control of all properties below low tide and their operation, and this is the crux of the whole problem.

There is approximately only $5,000,000 involved in this oil revenue in California, but on the other hand there are untold millions of dollars involved in our harbor and inland waterways properties and revenues, for which there is no provision made in the Interior Department's bill. Once we adopted this bill they would use it as a springboard to control the entire port and inland waterways property not only of California but of the entire United States.

Now, let us return to this so-called generosity of giving the States 90 percent. It is true they grant 37½ percent directly to the States off which the oil and gas are recovered, or in other words they give them 37½ percent of the total 100 percent which we claim the States own. Now as to the 52½ percent which will be paid into the Federal reclamation fund, let me say that that is a misnomer because the money is paid into the general fund and there is a bookkeeping credit set up showing that the 17 Western States have as a credit this so-called amount. Let it be said right here that this does not insure this money going to the States because each and every year the Appropriations Committee appropriates the money for the building and completion of reclamation projects. It might look better to have a nice credit in the fund but it has no bearing on their actions. As an example, some States have big credits and are getting no appropriations because they have no projects deemed feasible at this time. Let us assume the Secretary is right, which he is not, on this reclamation fund, and assuming this money goes to the credit of the 17 Western States, here is what California would be doing. Just last week the Secretary authorized the most unfeasible project ever presented to Congress, the eight-hundred-million-dollar central Arizona boondoggling project, which would take water out of the mouths of the people of southern California. So, according to the Secretary's propaganda, California would contribute the money for another State to use to take water from the mouths of its own people under his formula. Under the present revenues from oil in California tidelands it would take almost 300 years to pay for this Arizona project if all of the money to be set aside for reclamation were given to Arizona alone. Do you think the people of California will go for this? Of course not.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was previously granted leave to extend my remarks and include a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi. I now ask that that be changed to show that resolution as being presented by the entire Mississippi delegation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

TRACTOR FUEL

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest a report filed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the fuel-oil situation. I was gratified to see that a satisfactory degree of cooperation had been had with the oil industry. I note some reference was made to the agricultural situation. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in our part of the country, down in Georgia, this is the season of the year when people turn their lands preparatory to planting. We have increased the use of tractors in our country 30 percent. The oil industry has cut the allocation of tractor fuel in our area by 30 percent. Consequently a real emergency is existing in our section of the United States. I would like to ask the committee that in future negotiations with the oil industry they undertake to get a proper allocation of tractor fuel for the Southern States, who begin their farming operations much earlier than they do in other sections of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America, now more than 2,120,000 strong, are observing the thirty-eighth anniversary of the founding of the movement in America. As a former Boy Scout, I can speak first-hand concerning the things for which this organization stands and the practical contribution that is being made by these boys and their leaders to the welfare of our country.

For their theme, which they emphasize this year, they have chosen the slogan,

"The Scout Citizen at Work." This is just an extension of their slogan, "Do a Good Turn Daily." Everybody knows the Boy Scout and his good turn, but when you add up a million or more good turns in the form of service to the home, the community, the Nation, and the world, the total dimensions are hard to believe.

The Boy Scouts have embarked on a program of civic service with direct values to you and me, and every community where a Scout unit exists. They cooperate with existing agencies such as the American Legion, the Red Cross, 4–H clubs, and other service clubs. They do systematic work in conservation of our national resources, including setting out trees, helping maintain wildlife refuges, cooperating in forest fire prevention, trail building in National and other parks, and many other activities that are closely related to the Scouting program.

In their home communities, individual Scouts and Scout troops are always ready to take on a job. They are the ones who get out in the cold and shovel snow from fire hydrants when the regular departments are overworked; they set up safety guards at coasting hills where younger children are playing; they do many other useful and important tasks as needed.

All of this, although it does involve hard work, is something of an adventure to the Boy Scouts. You and I know that it is fine citizenship training, based on the Scout ideal of service. The least we can do in return is to give our support to the Boy Scouts in our home communities and elsewhere. They need it and deserve it. I do not want to appear as a sentimentalist, but I say heartily: Thank God that the boys of America have a fine organization like this to help them to grow to be physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I obtained permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. At that time I did not know that the matter would run over the legal limit. I now have an estimate from the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit by $213. Notwithstanding this, I ask unanimous consent that the extension be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next following any other special orders entered for that date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION IN FORCE BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Boston papers carry a story to the effect that 250 employees of the Veterans' Administration in the branch office and the regional office have had their services terminated and this follows a marked reduction that took place last year. We know that throughout the country between eight and ten thousand employees were let go last year. The unfortunate occurrence is due to the fact that the Veterans' Administration cannot come back to Congress and ask for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation because when they appeared before the Appropriations Committee last year, according to evidence brought out in hearings held about 6 or 8 weeks ago, officials of the Veterans' Administration were instructed that they could not come back for a deficiency appropriation. The antideficiency book or law was thrown at them, the first time it has ever happened.

I assure you the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation is very sympathetic. I do hope that the Committee on Appropriations will look into the question of whether or not a deficiency or supplemental appropriation is needed in order to give the maximum service to our veterans, and, if so, I hope the Appropriations Committee will bring out of committee the needed appropriation as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION NEED FOR DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is not on the floor, but being a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies, I am sure I can say that it is always the policy of that committee to consider estimates for deficiency or supplemental appropriations when they are submitted by the Bureau of the Budget in due order. It has been my experience that whenever a supplemental estimate has come up involving the affairs of the veterans and the Veterans' Administration that it has always received very sympathetic and careful consideration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WHERE DOES STASSEN GET HIS MONEY?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, so many Members are going out to make speeches this week that I have been wondering what they are going to talk about. I know there will be Lincoln Day addresses and all that.

But I have been bothered by two questions that I am sure the people would like answered. Here they are: The Marshall plan, we are told, is to keep us out of war with Russia, kill communism. I am just wondering if we get mixed up in this Palestine business and send an army there, as we are being asked to do, will we be fighting side by side with Russia for one group or another, over there? And will it be with the Jews or the Arabs?

Then there was another important question that bothered me. I remember the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Stassen—and I wish some of our Members from that State who are so invaluable here in the House would tell me about him—when Mr. Stassen was before the committee at the other end of the Capitol he refused to answer some questions about where he got his information about men who were making so much money speculating. I can understand that because that was a touchy little subject; but I cannot understand why he should not be willing to tell us where he is getting the money to conduct the campaign he is carrying on for the Presidency.

For months the young gentleman has been going up and down the countryside, enumerating his qualifications for this high office, giving his views on domestic and foreign problems. The press recently quoted him as saying we should spend some $20,000,000,000 on the Marshall plan. He seems to talk easily about "big money." Perhaps his appearances have netted him substantial sums. On that subject I have no information. He could enlighten us.

Of one thing I am quite sure. The people usually are interested in the sources of the income of their public servants. They are interested in learning whether candidates for public office, especially for the highest office in the world, have accepted funds, incurred financial obligations to individuals or groups which have or might have a special interest in future national policies.

So the request—and this is the second time I have made it—that Mr. Stassen disclose without delay the source of the funds which he is spending or which his friends, with his knowledge, are spending in promoting his campaign. And, as Mr. Stassen suggested to Mr. Pauley and to others, how much money are you spending in your campaign, Mr. Stassen? And tell us, please, Mr. Stassen, are there any international bankers, are there individuals or groups interested in other nations who are backing you in this drive for this high office? Come on, now, Harold, let us be frank; just who is paying the freight?

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE U. S. BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, relative to the expenses of a

delegation to attend the ceremonies in Habana, Cuba, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine*, and concur in the same.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That House Concurrent Resolution 108, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is amended by adding at the end of section 3 thereof the following: "The funds made available under this concurrent resolution shall be available for paying the expenses of a delegation to attend the ceremonies that will be held in Habana, Cuba, on Sunday, February 15, 1948, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine*, to be composed of two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, and two representatives of the United Spanish War Veterans, consisting of the commander in chief and one other member of that organization, together with the expenses of any of the employees of the committee whose services are required in connection with this ceremony."

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency matter. The foundation resolutions have passed the House and the Senate. A similar resolution to Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and has not been considered by the Committee on House Administration. I am sure that committee did not realize the urgency of the objective.

The celebration in Cuba, referred to in this resolution, takes place on February 15, 1948; and if the purpose of the Congress is to be carried out as heretofore expressed, then this Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 must be agreed to by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I have conferred with the minority leader, with the Acting Speaker, and with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration, and there is no objection on the part of any of them to agreeing to this Senate concurrent resolution.

REPORT OF THE AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 524)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit to the Congress, for its information and consideration, the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee, for the calendar year 1947.

The committee was established by Executive Order on September 19, 1946, in order to achieve full development and integration of United States aviation policies and activities, and includes representatives of the executive agencies primarily concerned with aviation. Through its Aviation Industry Advisory Panel, the committee draws upon the experience and the views of the air transport and aircraft manufacturing industry, of organized labor, and of other aviation interests.

I hope the report may prove useful to the Congress in its deliberations on aviation matters, which are of such great concern to our country's welfare.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1948.*

SECOND DECONTROL ACT OF 1947—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 526)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Last July the Congress enacted the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, which extended certain limited wartime economic controls over key materials and facilities still in short supply as a result of the war. Specifically, it authorized distribution and use controls over tin and tin products, antimony, and cinchona bark, quinine, and quinidine; import controls over fats and oils, rice and rice products, nitrogen fertilizer, and pig tin; the power of granting priorities assistance under certain specified conditions where the prompt export of a material is clearly advantageous to the national interest; rail transportation controls; and export controls.

This act expires on February 29, 1948. The export controls and rail-transportation controls have already been extended for 1 year. I have already recommended, as a part of the broader allocation powers contained in the anti-inflation program submitted to the Congress on November 17, 1947, the enactment of provisions which will include the continuance of the other controls provided by the Second Decontrol Act.

It appears unlikely that a decision will be reached by February 29 on the broader aspects of this program. In the meantime, these limited controls over a few vital commodities, which are essential to the protection of our domestic economy and the carrying out of our international responsibilities, must not be permitted to lapse by default.

In extending these powers last July, the Congress recognized that controls were still needed because of the continued world-wide shortage of many critical materials. This need has not diminished. On the contrary, supply shortages for some commodities in the coming year are expected to be as acute as at any time since the end of the war. This is particularly true in the case of some commodities for which we are heavily dependent upon foreign sources of supply not yet recovered from the war.

As required by the Second Decontrol Act, the Secretary of Commerce has already submitted to the Congress two quarterly reports describing operations under the act, the policy framework under which controls are being administered, and the results which have been obtained by the actions taken. As provided by the act, these reports contain specific recommendations as to whether or not these controls should be continued in effect, with a full statement of the considerations underlying these recommendations. The second report, dated January 30, 1948, recommends the continuation of all of these powers except the power to allocate quinine, which is no longer needed.

Some of the serious consequences which would result if these powers are not extended beyond February 29, 1948, are as follows:

1. The international arrangements under which the United States secures an equitable share of the world tin supplies would be disrupted, and it would be impossible to assure that an adequate supply of tin would be available in the United States for essential purposes, such as food preservation.

2. Our efforts to add to a stock pile of tin in the United States and to conserve tin for this purpose would be seriously handicapped.

3. It would be impossible to carry out the international allocations of fats and oils, rice and rice products, and nitrogenous fertilizer, planned on a cooperative basis by the International Emergency Food Council, a United Nations body. Failure to meet these planned allocations would injure the economies of foreign countries and seriously hamper the attainment of United States foreign policy objectives.

4. It would be impossible to assure the export of minimum quantities of tin plate and nitrogenous fertilizer urgently needed abroad to increase food production and to prevent food from going to waste. The inevitable result would be greater suffering abroad and larger foreign requirements for basic foods grown in the United States.

I cannot believe that the Congress wishes to bring about the confusion both at home and abroad which would result from the expiration of these powers at this time. I, therefore, urge that prompt action be taken to continue the powers contained in the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, which are now scheduled to expire on February 29, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1948.*

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 525)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The roads of this country have been improved tremendously in the past 30

years. Over the years we have developed an increasingly efficient highway network. This has been made possible by active cooperation between the States and the Federal Government.

In this partnership the Federal Government has contributed part of the funds, extensive technical assistance, and the means for unifying the State systems into a national network. The States and local subdivisions also have contributed funds and have been primarily responsible for planning and actual construction. Working together, the Federal, State, and local governments have developed the most efficient and extensive road system in the world.

Successive congressional enactments were directed first toward improving rural roads and intercity highways. More recently a start has been made toward improving also the through highways in our cities. Today Federal aid is helping to develop an integrated traffic network to meet National, State, and important local needs.

It is necessary for the Congress to consider new highway legislation during the present session because the existing authorization will be substantially committed by December 31, 1948. While construction under these commitments will be continuing for at least 2 years thereafter, it is necessary at this time to extend the authorization in order that the States may have adequate opportunity for the orderly development of further construction programs.

In recent years our highway construction has not kept pace with the growth in traffic. When the war came, we sharply curtailed the highway-building program, limiting ourselves to a minimum program of repair and permitting improvement and new construction only where urgently necessary for war purposes. After the war ended, construction was necessarily delayed still further as a result of shortages of material and high costs.

On the other hand, the volume of business in the United States has grown more than 50 percent since 1940. This is reflected in the fact that we are now using one-third more trucks, which are carrying heavier loads and traveling more miles. There are also about 1,000,000 more automobiles in use now than there were in 1941, despite the fact that the production of automobiles for civilian use was discontinued during the war. In all, there are nearly 3,000,000 more vehicles on the road than before the war.

By any reasonable standard, our highways are inadequate for today's demands. Future demands will inevitably be greater as business traffic continues to expand, as our population grows, and as we build roads to reach needed resources now relatively inaccessible. Furthermore, we must reconstruct important stretches of road which were not built to carry heavy traffic safely and at reasonable speed. Modern automobiles, heavier trucks, greater pleasure and commercial travel all increase the need to improve our highways as a means of lowering the present shocking total of highway accidents.

To build the highways that will meet these needs will require continuous effort over a long period of time and on an extensive scale. For the immediate future, we must limit expenditures to avoid excessive costs resulting from overtaxing the capacity of the construction industry and to avoid inflationary pressure on the national economy. But we can and must continue to rebuild and modernize our highways where their present obsolescence results in excessive safety hazards and wasteful maintenance costs, and where present traffic capacity is most seriously inadequate.

Taking all of these factors into account, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation at this session continuing the Federal-aid highway program for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 at an annual rate of $500 million. Under the provisions of the basic highway law, the funds for the first of these fiscal years would become available for commitment not later than January 1, 1949. I have asked the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency to submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress proposed legislation to this end. The same legislation should continue the authorization for direct Federal construction of roads in public-land areas, such as the national forests, national parks, and Indian reservations, in an annual amount of $71 million.

Enactment of legislation at this session will permit continuity in planning and construction. Most of the State legislatures meet early in 1949. The States need a firm basis of Federal action in advance in order to determine the engineering and budgetary aspects of the State highway programs.

The program I am recommending now is a conservative one, necessary to maintain prudently our investment in highways. When conditions permit in the future, we should plan to accelerate our progress toward a highway system adequate to carry our expanding agricultural and business traffic, to accommodate with safety and speed the personal travel of our people, and to meet the needs of our national security.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1948.*

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would provide consideration for H. R. 2161, a bill to extend the life of the Synthetic Fuels Act of 1944 for an additional 3 years, and to authorize an additional $30,000,000 for the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances.

Unless this bill is passed the synthetic liquid fuels program would expire in April 1949—but it has been deemed advisable to extend the authority for the program now, so that contracts for construction of plants can be entered into.

It has been estimated that the oil resources of this Nation now approximate 20,000,000,000 barrels. At the present rate of consumption this supply of natural oil will be exhausted in about 10 or 12 years, and we will then have to rely entirely upon imports or domestically produced synthetic fuels. In the event of a future war we would not want to rely on imports—and for that reason this legislation is vital to our national security.

Research under this program for the past 4 years has produced marvelous results. Production of synthetic fuels from oil shales, coal, and timber and agricultural products is no longer in the experimental stage—it is an accomplished fact. There is still a question of cost, however. It is still more expensive to produce synthetic fuels than it is to tap our natural supplies, but it is expected that further research and development in production methods will decrease production costs of the synthetic fuels to a level to permit their general commercial use.

Fortunately, there is no shortage in this country of the raw materials from which synthetic fuels are made—and when production methods are perfected this country should never again be faced with fuel and gasoline shortages.

There should be no objection to this resolution. It is a general open rule, which merely provides 2 hours' debate on the bill. This bill is an important measure to guarantee the future national security of this country, and I urge you all to vote for it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this is a timely bill in view of the shortages of fuel oil that exist today. It clearly demonstrates and proves the wisdom and the foresight of the New Deal that 4 years ago, in 1944, voted $30,000,000 for study and erection of demonstration plants to develop the production of synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances. This wisdom is so universally recognized that an additional

$30,000,000 is sought for in this bill to continue development and to provide for the construction of more demonstration plants. I hope the bill will meet with the unanimous approval of the House.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], has partially explained the justifications for the passage of this bill. Therefore I shall only touch on the high points of the research and construction which has thus far been accomplished. Already two mines are in operation near Rifle, Colo. One of the mines is for selective operation, that is, the mining of any richness to produce between 5 and 80 gallons per ton. The second mine, essentially an underground quarry, with a capacity of 1,500 tons a day, will permit accurate determination. The Rifle area already indicates the possibility of recoverable oil totaling 200,000,000,000 barrels in Colorado alone.

A demonstration plant is being constructed in Louisiana, Mo., to produce about 200 to 400 barrels of gasoline a day by the hydrogenation of coal, and should be in operation by fall of this year.

It is believed that the lignite coals in the United States are estimated to have a conversion value of liquid fuels of 500,000,000,000 barrels, nearly 25 times the proved petroleum reserves in the United States. Also large laboratory facilities for the development and improvement of the synthetic liquid fuel processes have been established at Pittsburgh, Pa.; Morgantown, W. Va.; and Laramie, Wyo., and it is also proposed in the near future to penetrate the Illinois fields as well as other fields.

The Bureau of Mines is ready to contract for the construction of a Fischer-Tropsch demonstration plant which will reduce the costs and increase the production of fuel far in excess of the plants that supplied Germany with its fuel during the war.

In view of these tremendous deposits, which outstanding engineers maintain will provide fuel in the United States for a thousand years, I feel that we should not be so greatly worried about the future of our oil supplies. I hope with the continued research to develop the utilization of other products from which to acquire oils, our supplies will be greatly increased and will serve to stop the oil companies from gouging the American people as they have done of late in increasing the cost of liquid fuel by 30 percent, which has cost the American people additional millions of dollars.

LIQUID AND SOLID FUELS AVAILABLE IN THE UNITED STATES FOR 1,000 YEARS

Mr. Speaker, I observed an article appearing in yesterday's Washington Post by Mr. Ben Funk, a recognized authority, who has given a great deal of study to the production of liquid fuels from shale, coal, and other substances, and who quotes Government statistics in estimating that our coal deposits can supply us with solid and liquid fuels for at least 1,000 years. I am sure it will be enlightening to the membership and I insert it in my remarks for their information. It is as follows:

SIXTY-EIGHT-YEAR SUPPLY OF SHALE OIL STEEPS ROCKIES

(By Ben Funk)

RIFLE, COLO., February 7.—America's concern over petroleum resources is teaming with postwar inflation to bring shale oil into the commercial picture for the first time.

Oil shale abounds in the mountainous West. The problem has been to get out the oil and make it pay in competition with much cheaper higher grade petroleum. Extraction methods were costly.

Now research in the Bureau of Mines demonstration plant on a mountainside 7 miles west of here indicates that the shale oil can be produced for $2 to $2.50 a barrel. That places it for the first time right alongside petroleum, which has had a 50-percent price hike since the war.

At nearby Grand Junction, a 35-year-old chemist, H. D. Brown, has obtained a patent on an oil-shale-production process that he claims will yield high-gravity crude for less than $2 a barrel.

But don't expect shale oil to jump right out and compete in a free market with big-brother petroleum. It remains inferior to petroleum in just about every respect.

PLENTY OF IT

The future of shale oil depends upon several imponderables. For example, the discovery of another East Texas oil field or a number of smaller fields would remove the need of an immediate petroleum substitute.

On the other hand, a war would bring it into immediate large-scale production. When it comes to quantity the petroleum industry can't hold a candle to the mountains of shale oil ready to be tapped in the West.

The Green River oil-shale formation of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming alone is estimated by Government engineers to contain 78,000,000,000 barrels of oil. That is four times more than the petroleum industry has produced since Ed Drake drilled the first well at Titusville, Pa., back in 1859.

Shale oil produced so far at the Rifle plant is low-grade stuff with a 21 gravity rating. This compares with 35 gravity in western Colorado's Rangely field and 39 gravity in the Oklahoma City field. However, it yields about the same byproducts as petroleum—and a few more.

Production of shale oil began in Scotland a hundred years ago. Its development in foreign countries was speeded during World War II, when it helped to fuel the armies and navies of Germany and Japan.

There are mountains of rich oil shale in the West, but for many years oil-wealthy America turned up its nose at them. Mechanized war woke the United States to the realization that its petroleum resources were not unlimited. Experts warned that a new source of fuel would be essential in another emergency.

So Bureau of Mines specialists appropriated all that the Germans and Japanese had learned of shale-oil production and began to go on from there.

Congress appropriated $5,000,000 to develop the know-how to get oil from shale and coal in big quantities. The Government estimates that our coal deposits can supply us with solid and liquid fuels for at least a thousand years. It figures shale will yield enough oil to maintain the present rate of petroleum production at least 68 years.

After surveying a score of possible sites, the Bureau of Mines chose Anvil Point, a cliff 8,200 feet high, for its shale mine. In the Colorado River Valley, 9,500 feet away and 3,000 feet below, a plant-scale refinery is under construction.

The richest shale usually is found near the top of high escarpments. It crops out in long lines of bold cliffs.

The Government isn't aiming at commercial oil production at the Rifle plant. Instead, engineers will experiment to find the best and cheapest ways to produce the oil. Their findings will be passed on to private industry.

The Bureau of Mines expects to develop the blueprints for a successful industry that could be launched into immediate big-scale production whenever necessary.

E. D. Gardner, Chief of the Bureau of Mines Oil Shale Division, says the Government isn't in competition with private researchers like Brown.

"If his process will do what he claims," Gardner said, "we will be happy to help him develop it."

FIFTEEN GALLONS A TON

Core drilling at the Government mine indicates the oil-shale beds are 500 feet thick and contain an average of 15 gallons of oil to the ton. That's about 300,000,000 barrels of oil to the square mile.

The Rifle installation, while only a demonstration unit, is one of the biggest industries in Colorado. It is divided into two sections—mining and processing. Goal of the mining section is to get out the shale for 50 cents a ton.

Standard ore reduction methods are used to crush the shale into chunks about 4 inches in diameter. Forty tons of shale are placed in a retort and ignited. As the fire burns downward the vapors are drawn off and condensed. Rich shale has a coking tendency and the retorts are hinged at the bottom to drop the entire load of spent shale after cooking.

When the refinery is completed in about 6 months, engineers will be able to demonstrate every step of production from mining to oil refining.

Mr. Speaker, I have briefly given the availability of tremendous deposits of coal, shale, and other substances, and explained some features of the bill. I know that they can be explained more fully by the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands [Mr. WELCH], by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and other members of the committee, and will not take up the time of the House in discussing other provisions of the bill upon which they also can give complete and detailed information. However, I ask permission for the insertion of two articles and an editorial bearing on the subject matter of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WHO IS INTERESTED IN ARABIAN OIL?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been frequently published that certain gentlemen in the Department of State in this country are greatly interested in protecting American and British oil companies in the oil rights that they have acquired from Iran and other countries in that part of the world. It appears to me that many of these gentlemen seem to be more interested in these oil companies than in the future interest of America.

Only a few days ago I read that Secretary of Defense Forrestal and some other gentlemen formerly connected with certain large interests are endeavoring to prevail upon the President to reverse his position on Palestine. It is my understanding that they have acted on the assumption that the existing situation there and conflicts of governments may affect these oil companies in retaining

the rights they obtained from the Iran Government.

It is difficult for me to believe that these reports and statements are true and I hope, if true, that the President will not permit himself to be swayed by those who have a greater interest in oil—that we will never need—than in the lives and blood of thousands of people in Palestine.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Palestine question is the first real test of whether or not the United Nations will be a success. The United Nations, through the General Assembly, has taken action, as the result of a two-thirds vote, in the creation of a free and independent Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. It seems to me it is absolutely necessary that that question be settled satisfactorily, and that the threat of the Arabs not be permitted to influence responsible officials and responsible nations who are seeking future peace, in seeing that the necessary force—and by force I mean power—is used, implementing the action of the General Assembly of the United Nations to carry out the action taken as the result of a two-thirds vote.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts who, I know, even before becoming such a valuable Member in the Congress urged and worked in the interest of bringing about freedom and independence to the people of Ireland; and who is now so greatly interested and helpful in the cause of Palestine. I recollect, whilst he was the chairman of the important resolutions committee at the Democratic National Convention in 1944, that it was through his able ability that the party unanimously adopted a plank in the platform, going on record for an independent Jewish commonwealth. Not only the Democrats, but also the Republicans, have gone on record in their platform to aid the Jewish people. The Congress has twice approved aid in order that the Jewish people could obtain an independent Jewish commonwealth.

Consequently, I think it is outrageous on the part of anyone, who holds an important position in the Government and who has the ear of the President from time to time, to seek to change his views, especially in view of the fact that the President and our country more than any other has brought about the favorable action on the part of the United Nations in providing an independent state for the Jewish people.

I have confidence that the President will not be led astray into taking a backward step notwithstanding the efforts and influences exercised on the part of some of these gentlemen and of British diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted me, I insert an article and an editorial dealing on this subject. They give much light on the issues involved and I commend them to the reading by the membership and the American people in the hope that they will urge the cessation of the injustices that are being imposed upon the Jewish people in Palestine. The editorial appeared in January 28 issue of the New York Herald Tribune and the article by I. F. Stone, entitled "The Big Swap—Jewish Blood for Arabian Oil" appeared in PM on January 28, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 20, 1948]

ARMS FOR PALESTINE

It is "indefensible," as the newly formed Committee to Arm the Jewish State declares, for the United States to put its whole influence behind the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine and then impose an embargo on the export of the arms which are more and more plainly indispensable to such a state's survival. The notion that there is something immoral about providing arms in a situation which one has deliberately created with the full knowledge that arms would be necessary is redolent of that mawkishness which seems too often to confuse every international issue. The first and simplest answer to the sudden question of arms for Palestine is to lift the embargo at once. The least which the United States can offer to the Jewish Agency and to Haganah is free access to the available supplies or weapons for self-defense.

This is the first and obvious answer. It is not the full answer. The questions of security and of enforcement were obviously central to the United Nations' decision for a partition of Palestine; yet these were precisely the questions which were shirked by all the great powers. They cannot be shirked much longer. The legal foundations for the partition of Palestine have been left on swampy ground. Legally, partition has been recommended by the General Assembly as a measure for meeting a situation, in the language of the Charter, "likely to impair the general welfare of friendly relations among nations." The Arab states are fomenting a warlike rebellion against this recommendation. They can truthfully assert that the Assembly has no binding power; on the other hand, they are themselves bound by the general obligation on all UN members to settle international disputes only by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Administration of partition, in the transition period, was vested by the Assembly in its Palestine Commission. But the Assembly, aware of the uncertainty of the authority thus conferred, specifically requested that if a threat of peace arose during the transition period, the Security Council should act under its general power to deal with such threats. The threat has not only arisen; it is imminent. There is no reason why the United States should deny arms to the Jewish community in Palestine. But there is at the same time every reason why the United States should raise the basic question of enforcement in the Security Council, at once and emphatically, and demand a clear decision on the underlying responsibilites. Without it, this country will have to give Jewish Palestine access to arms, since this country was so largely instrumental in offering Jewish Palestine a freedom which everyone knew would be dangerous. But since it is the UN Assembly, under the egis of the Security Council, which has decreed and is immediately responsible for partition, the United States both may and must ask a decision on enforcement from the Council.

[From the New York PM of January 28, 1948]

THE BIG SWAP: JEWISH BLOOD FOR ARABIAN OIL

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON.—The State and War Departments have made alarming headway in their campaign to win the President over to a Pontius Pilate policy on Palestine.

Both Departments are largely in sympathy with British plans to aid the Arabs against the Jewish community in the Holy Land, and want the White House to wash its hands of the whole affair and look the other way when the real shooting begins.

Latest manifestation of these official attitudes is the case of the American ship *Exford*, which was refused permission to unload in Tel Aviv yesterday on a cabled tip from the American Government to the British.

This indicates the extent of American cooperation in the British naval blockade, which is shutting off supplies to the Jewish community in Palestine while British arms are shipped to neighboring Arab countries in preparation for large-scale war this spring.

The movement here to extend bipartisanship in foreign policy to Palestine, as reported in yesterday's New York Times, represents an effort to win the Republicans over to a conspiracy of silence while a new war of extermination, this time against Palestinian Jewry, is being waged. This might be termed the bipartisan policy of the pogrom.

Both State and War Departments have been engaged in a behind-the-scenes whispering campaign designed to smear Jewish refugees and the Palestinian Jewish community and to spread the view that American needs for oil unfortunately require betrayal of United States obligations to the UN.

This boils down to a cynical policy of swapping Jewish blood for Arab oil, a curious policy for a Government which is engaged in exposing the U. S. S. R. for a similar cynicism about Poland in the recently published Nazi-Soviet documents.

In inner circles the oil argument is not taken seriously. The New York Times reported yesterday there is apparently little evidence to support the theory that the Arab states are so disturbed about partition that they will cancel the American oil concessions.

The real British strategy in the Middle East has been clear since the little Munich of March 1939, when the White Paper policy was launched to build an Arab bloc by appeasement at the expense of the Jewish community in Palestine.

British difficulties in Egypt over the Sudan and in Iraq, where anti-British demonstrations forced the government to disavow its new treaty with England and then to resign, emphasize the British need to divert Arab antagonism.

British tactics are reflected in an editorial published on January 10 by the bitterly anti-Zionist Economist of London. The Economist said that Britain and Egypt, "like the brothers in some Victorian novel, often indulge in a certain amount of cutting in the club" but invariably "close their ranks whenever their common interests are immediately threatened."

The Economist went on to say that the state of affairs in Palestine may bring about an Anglo-Saxon rapprochement in 1948, the common interest in this case being to prevent Palestine from becoming another battleground between American money and Russian ideas.

Just how the British are demonstrating this common interest was disclosed by Maj. Lyall Wilkes, a Labor member of Parliament and a veteran of the Middle Eastern campaign in the last war, in a letter published January 10 in the London New Statesman and Nation.

Major Wilkes said that Britain had supplied 40 military planes to Egypt from the end of the war until last July, that a British military mission was training the Iraq army, and that the British taxpayer subscribes £2,000,000 a year to the upkeep of the Trans-Jordan Arab Legion.

"A blatant contradiction in our Palestine policy," Major Wilkes protested, "has been that, although the threat of Arab violence has been given as the reason why labor could not fulfill its traditional policy, yet it has been the British Government itself which

since 1945 has created and equipped the Arab forces in the Middle East and tipped the balance increasingly in their favor."

Bevin in his foreign policy address to the Commons last Thursday asked for enforcement of the UN border decision in the Greek dispute but indicated no change in the determination of his government to wreck the UN decision on Palestine.

Unless there is a reaction from friends of the UN and of Palestine in this country, the United States of America will become a silent partner in a program designed to destroy Jewish Palestine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has used 9 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that synthetic liquid fuels can be made from coal and from oil shale. There is an abundance of these materials in the district which I have the honor to represent.

I was very active in the preparation and passage of the law under which $30,000,000 is now being used in experiments with reference to the manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels. I think the Bureau of Mines has done a fine job in connection with these experiments, and the result of their efforts has been very successful.

I am strongly in favor of the bill under consideration and I hope it passes unanimously.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in any consideration of the long-range petroleum outlook for the United States, the question of synthetic liquid fuel production becomes of paramount importance. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce recently embarked on a continuation of a study of the petroleum situation which was begun by this committee during the Seventy-third Congress in 1934. At that time, the House approved House Resolution 441 and in accordance with this resolution, an oil investigating subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman William P. Cole, of Maryland, was created by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The importance of synthetic fuel production looms so large because of the recognition of two prime facts, first, that the discovery of new oil fields within the borders of the United States lags behind the rate of increase of demand for petroleum products; and, second, in case of an emergency the risk of foreign supplies being cut off is too great to place extensive reliance on the continuation of such supplies in times of war.

The fact that our domestic known reserves might be insufficient to supply our requirements was recognized by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as early as 1935. On January 3, 1935, at the opening of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee submitted a report. It is interesting to quote from this report, which was filed more than 13 years ago:

Based upon conservative estimates of known reserves, an excessive supply of petroleum to meet future demands does not exist. Numerous estimates of the petroleum resources of the United States have been made during the past quarter century. Should future daily demand continue approximately in the amount required today, and no additional discoveries of new fields be made, the present known reserves would last—according to most estimates—approximately 15 years.

Oil shale, coal, and other substitutes provide, at increased cost, vast quantities of petroleum products.

We do not feel justified, however, even in view of the admitted possibility of improved methods of recovery being employed, and of additional discoveries of new pools, and of the use of substitutes and of possible improved mechanical devices, in arriving at the conclusion that the petroleum reserves available in the country today to meet future demand are excessive, but, on the contrary, we feel that they are of a very limited nature.

The foresight exercised by the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Cole, and his subcommittee is all the more amazing if it is remembered that those were the days when Congress had under consideration the "hot oil" legislation whose purpose it was to curtail the excessive production of crude in the several States and to put a floor under crude-oil prices which had reached a new low because of greatly increased production.

This point of view, that crude might become scarce, was reiterated in a report on May 14, 1937, of the Committee No. 817, Seventy-fifth Congress, reporting favorably on extension until June 30, 1939, of the "hot oil" legislation and it was emphasized that under these circumstances the matter was one of national concern.

In reporting favorably House Joint Resolution 456, during the Seventy-fifth Congress in July 1937, first session, extending for two more years the consent of Congress to the Interstate Oil Compact, the committee stated again:

Oil is not unlimited, as many do not realize, and the time when substitutes or greater improvements of recovery or refining process will be of major importance is not so far distant.

In 1942 the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] who had succeeded the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Cole, filed a report entitled "Petroleum Products for National Defense." In this report, under the heading "Problems for the future," the committee made the following prophetic statement:

Looking at the petroleum problem from the long-time viewpoint, we appear to be approaching a time of greater scarcity, higher prices, and eventually, the use of substitute materials.

Again in 1943, in a report entitled "Petroleum Supplies for Military and Civilian Needs," the committee stated the same theme:

As measured by the life of a nation, our domestic supply of oil is brief. Beyond that, America must eventually share in the supplies of other lands. And then beyond that perhaps we must resort to substitute fuels such as can be gained from oil shales, coal, and alcohol.

In a further report, dated January 2, 1945, the committee stated the following:

We know we can look with some reliance on the availability of oil imports. Beyond that we may look to synthetic petroleum products from oil shales and coal, and to substitute fuels such as alcohol derived from vegetable products. Our knowledge of these sources can be much improved by scientific research and practical experiments for the improvement of quantity and quality production and at reduced costs.

Congress has taken the first important step to accomplish these purposes by enactment of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, Public Law No. 290, approved April 5, 1944. We, as a Nation, cannot afford to be indifferent to the importance of this problem.

The report continues:

The committee heartily commends the action of Congress in enacting the Synthetic Fuels Act and recommends that every practicable research and experimentation be prosecuted under the provisions of that act with a view of assuring the country the continuation of the benefits we now enjoy from oil.

In its final report, submitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] to Congress on December 30, 1946, the committee uttered the following warning:

Oil demands are running much higher than was generally anticipated for the immediate postwar period. * * * In appraising the availability of synthetic fuels, full consideration must be given to the magnitude of capital investment and manpower which would be required to meet our oil needs, or any substantial part of them, from synthetic sources. The Nation cannot rely upon an undeveloped synthetic industry to meet emergency needs, and it should encourage this research to the fullest extent. The kind of oil reserves we need for security are those which can be promptly supplied with the least practical need for more critical materials, more capital, and more manpower, when these will be scarce and urgently needed for other purposes.

Then again the committee urged that—

Research in the synthetic production of alternative fuels for various purposes from natural gas, coal, and oil shale, and any other promising source should be continued with the active cooperation of industry. The research might well be directed at servicing specific needs such as jet-propulsion fuels, Diesel oils for submarines, and heating oil for homes.

During the Eightieth Congress, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in compliance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 continued its studies of petroleum problems. In two recent reports, which I filed with the House on January 26 and February 4, the committee has pointed to the seriousness of the long-range outlook for petroleum in the United States. In its January report, the committee urged the immediate authorization of additional funds and continuing authority to the Department of the Interior for accelerating the program of development of oil from coal and shale. The Committee is, therefore, gratified that the House is given the opportunity today to act favorably on H. R. 2161 which carries out

the recommendations of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This bill is an urgent step in the right direction. Whether it is a sufficient step requires further study on the part of all those who are concerned with the plentiful supply of petroleum for the United States both in times of peace and war.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose I had in mind in my 1-minute speech was to try to bring about a constructive result. In view of the observations made by my valued friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I wish to make reference to the evidence which supported the observations I made that the Veterans' Administration was fearful of asking for a deficiency appropriation. I have before me a copy of the hearings held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on December 9 and 10, 1947, with regard to conditions in the office of the Veterans' Administration at Boston, Mass. I happened to be present at those meetings and participated therein. I ask you to look at page 60 of the hearings. There I called attention to the fact that there was a cut of $38,959,220 made by the Appropriations Committee, of which about $27,075,000 was in salaries and personnel, and that as a result of that reduction in appropriations 10,000 employees had to be let go throughout the country at that time. In the course of the hearings I asked these questions:

Mr. McCORMACK. You had to cut down 10,000 positions, and you had to allocate that cut throughout the country?

Mr. CLARK—

He was Acting Administrator at the time—

Yes, sir. And that had to be on the average of $2,707.50 per annum.

Mr. McCORMACK. So, might I ask you, the solution of this was to consider conditions throughout the country in allocating this deficiency appropriation?

Mr. CLARK. I am afraid you are right, Congressman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is there any hesitancy on the part of the Veterans' Administration in asking for deficiency appropriations?

Mr. CLARK. Well, there is this hesitancy: When the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs had his hearing before the Appropriations Committee he was told that he could not come back to that committee for a deficiency on this particular item.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had heard that, but I never definitely established the fact.

Mr. CLARK. I think that is true; is it not, Mr. Moore?

Mr. Moore is the budget officer of the Veterans' Administration. Mr. Moore said:

That is correct, sir. He was not only told that, but the language of the act was brought to our attention; that is, the language of the deficiency act.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, if you didn't allocate it adequately over the 12 months, you might not have enough?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, sir.

Then later in the hearings an attempt was made by some of my friends to show what the cut was in the Bureau of the Budget after it went over from the Veterans' Administration and before it came up to Congress in the President's message.

I asked the following questions:

Mr. McCORMACK. When was the first time that you know of that any Appropriations Committee directed you or stated to you that you could not come back with a deficiency appropriation?

Mr. CLARK. I don't know that we have ever been told that prior to the last appearance, although we may have been. Do you recollect, Mr. Moore?

Mr. MOORE. Last year was the first year.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that one man, or was it the committee?

Mr. CLARK. I was not there at the time.

Mr. McCORMACK. In bygone years you were not prohibited by the President or the Director of the Budget from asking for deficiency appropriations?

Mr. CLARK. I have been present before the Appropriations Committee with former Administrators when the committee would say: "Well, now, Mr. Administrator, if you find that you cannot get along with this appropriation we want you to come back and tell us what your situation is, so that we can consider your request for additional funds."

Mr. McCORMACK. They would say: "We want to cut it now. But do the best you can, and if you can't get through with this, come back and we will consider a deficiency." Isn't that true?

Mr. CLARK. I think so.

Mr. Speaker, that is the evidence upon which I based my observations. They are fearful of bringing in a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. Now, they are not going to draw a distinction between a deficiency and supplemental appropriation.

I hope that the members of the Appropriations Committee will look into this situation because it is very acute. I do not care whether it is a supplemental appropriation or a deficiency appropriation, if the circumstances warrant I hope that immediate action will be taken to clear up the matter. I recognize that there is a distinction between deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills, however, very few outside of Congress are aware of that. So far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned it has felt that it has received directions not to come up for any additional funds so far as increase in personnel is concerned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the important business of the day is consideration of a synthetic fuels bill, but in view of the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts perhaps a word or two should be said on that subject and I therefore ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the testimony to which the gentleman from Massachusetts referred by the words he read stated that the attention of the representatives of the Veterans' Administration had been called to the antideficiency statute. The antideficiency statute provides that when appropriations are made for an activity the funds shall be so distributed and allocated by the agency that it will not incur deficiencies during the year. If the Veterans' Administration was told that it should not incur a deficiency it was done by the words the gentleman has read through calling attention to provisions of the antideficiency statute. But it certainly is also true that many agencies do foresee that the funds they have will not permit them to carry on an authorized program as it develops during the year and when that happens they go to the Bureau of the Budget and ask for a deficiency or supplemental estimate. If the Bureau of the Budget approves that estimate it then comes down here to the Appropriations Committee. Speaking generally, we call them deficiency appropriations if the funds are made available for obligation in the current year and supplemental if made to supplement appropriations made for a succeeding year.

In my experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as a member of the Deficiency Committee, I have never seen the time when a request for supplemental money by the Veterans' Administration was not given careful and sympathetic consideration. At the same time it is the duty of the committee to examine requests of the Veterans' Administration for funds just as it does requests from other agencies. No greater disservice could be done the veteran than for us to create a situation in which someone again would ride into high office by promising a 25-percent cut in all expenditures, including veterans' allowances. The veterans have not forgotten the so-called Economy Act of 1933.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to congratulate the Appropriations Committee if it has given the several departments to understand that when they bring in their budgets they are presumed to present everything within their knowledge required to carry them through the fiscal year. After listening very carefully to what was read from the hearings by the gentleman from Massachusetts I think this is what it all boils down to. In my opinion, the general feeling of the House is, that when a department or bureau presents its annual budget it should include every possible thing within its contemplation at the time of presentation.

Now, the habit has grown down through the years, of bringing in a smaller budget than was warranted when, at the same time, it is intended

at the time the budget is presented to come in and ask for a deficiency appropriation later on. I congratulate the committee on its efforts to determine on a budget which is fixed. Too much money in the past was spent by authority of deficiency appropriations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has stated the situation correctly. The Deficiency Committee would be derelict in its duty if it permitted agencies to incur deficiencies in violation of the statute without calling their attention to the statute. At the same time the RECORD should also show that when we considered supplemental estimates from the Veterans' Administration last summer, some of the original estimates were revised, both up and down. In some instances the Veterans' Administration found that it did not need as much money for the paying of certain benefits under the GI bill as it anticipated. On the other hand, it was found that the number of veterans attending school was larger than had been anticipated, so authority was given for transferring some of those funds. The most recent recommendation before the Congress was in the President's budget message, in which he suggested that the trend of Veterans' Administration expenditures now could well be downward. The President's budget message carried a table with these figures for veterans' services and benefits:

Actual for 1947	$7,370,000,000
Estimate, 1948 expenditures	6,632,000,000
Estimate, 1949 expenditures	6,102,000,000
Appropriations asked for 1949	5,154,000,000

But, if there be additional need for funds, I am sure if a supplemental estimate is submitted by the Bureau of the Budget the committee will receive it and give it careful and thoughtful consideration in the light of what the actual needs are shown to be.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, it seems the hour is drawing near when the people of the South must counsel among themselves upon a future course of action.

We have all seen it coming, but we have been hesitant to act because there remained the hope that party ties and established practices would restrain our leaders to stay within the bounds of reason and be guided by the ordinary impulses of appreciation and understanding. But it is apparent now that our leaders are more concerned about their own political preferment than with the welfare and loyalty of the people of the South.

Such inconsiderate conduct on their part can be understood. They confidently believe they have and will continue to keep the vote in the South. They have become so brazen as to think they can cast any insult, violate any tradition or trample any principle of our people with complete impunity. It may be that our patience in the past is partly responsible for this growing disdain of our feelings.

It was not so long ago when the South was all that remained of the Democratic Party. With only hope, and often without it, most of us fought on for Cox in 1924, for Smith in 1928, and kept alive the party of Jefferson and Jackson. We thought then that our cherished traditions and the right of the people in each State to conduct its own affairs would be guarded and protected by the leaders of our own party.

That our confidence was misplaced can no longer be questioned. Our leader has urged the Congress to enact legislation which is directly contrary to the welfare and best interest of the South, including laws to regulate the qualification of voters, to prohibit segregation in all public places and conveyances, to set up an FEPC to bring on intolerance and disorder, to create a gestapo in the South under the name of antilynching and antidiscrimination, and has asked the Supreme Court to declare illegal and unenforceable the provision in deeds which restrict the ownership of neighborhood homes to certain races or groups.

I join with other decent people in condemning lynching and all other forms of lawlessness. But it does seem to me the people of the South should be commended, rather than condemned, for the progress and efforts they have made in blotting out this evil. There was only one lynching in the entire Nation last year. Just one, mind you, and those who participated were promptly brought to trial. Can any sensible person claim that this one act makes this a question of great national importance, or will every fair-minded person conclude that the proposal shows an utter lack of appreciation for the earnest and constant efforts we have made to wipe out lynching and is no more than a bid for votes from one group. The records of the Department of Justice show there has been an increase in every form of crime except lynching.

When one condemns the act of lynching it does seem he should say at least one word in condemnation of the crime which has most often brought on lynching, that is, an assault on some innocent woman. There is and can be no crime as dastardly as the violation of the purity and privacy of an innocent woman. There can be no punishment severe enough for one guilty of such an act. Everyone knows that when Federal protection is thrown around these fiends it will encourage them in their conduct.

I greatly regret some seem to think that the only protection needed is for the person guilty of such conduct and refuse to lift their voice to ask better protection for the innocent ones who suffer the most. In his message to Congress the President says we must not let one person walk in fear of lynching—I wish so much he had indicated at least the same interest in bringing about conditions whereby the women of the Nation can walk without fear of attack and assault.

The Republican Party offers us no hope or encouragement on these issues. They, too, are out to get votes and, with few exceptions, they are ready and willing to trample under foot the rights of the States and the principles so long and dearly cherished by the people of the South. Already they are preparing to bring before Congress several of the measures recommended by the President. To fully realize our situation it must be understood that President Truman set out to outdo Henry Wallace, and now the Republicans, in control of both Houses of Congress, are preparing to press these measures for passage. We will get no help from them, either now or hereafter.

We must, if possible, first try to prevent being driven out of our own party or keep it from adopting new policies and principles which disregard our interests and welfare. Our success in these efforts will determine in good measure our future course of action.

There is another feature of the President's message which concerns me very much. He speaks only of rights and freedom; the right to equal justice, the right to jobs, the right to homes, the right to education, the right to have a voice in Government; freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of opportunity, and on and on.

But not one single word about the duties, obligations and responsibilities of citizenship. Not one word of what men should do, of what men must do to earn these rights and to preserve these freedoms.

With every right there is a duty, with every freedom there is a corresponding obligation, and it seems to me the time has come when the President and others in high places should get back to these fundamentals. The performance of our duties and the fulfillment of our obligations come first. We should first earn our privileges before we enjoy them.

For years now the people have been told of nothing but their rights, they have been advised constantly of the freedoms to which they are entitled, and today there are millions of people in this country who have no understanding of their responsibilities of citizenship and have no desire or intention of assuming them.

We all cherish our rights and they must be protected. We all treasure our freedom and it must be vigilantly guarded. But these rights will not survive, nor will this freedom long continue, unless those who enjoy them daily perform the tasks required for their protection and preservation. They are not self-perpetuating. They can be kept and rightly belong only to those who have the courage, the industry and the determination to guard and defend them.

Those who claim the right to equal justice must first be just. Those who demand the right to a job must be ready to do an honest day's work. Those who demand a home must be willing to labor and pay for it. Those who would have a voice in Government should contribute

to its support and respect its laws. Those who would be free of want and fear must be ready to help the needy and refrain from any conduct which would bring fear or danger to others. And those who would enjoy freedom of opportunity must undergo, if necessary, the same hardships, dangers, and trials as did the brave men who established here the greatest land of opportunity known to man.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2161, with Mr. SCRIVNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 2161 is to extend the life of the Synthetic Fuels Act of April 5, 1944, from 5 to 8 years and to authorize an increase in the appropriation for carrying on this research work in the development of synthetic liquid fuels from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000.

It is a further step to bring synthetic oil and gasoline production to a degree that will meet the future petroleum consumption of this country, which has now reached over 2,000,000,000 barrels a year.

The Department of the Interior and the American Petroleum Institute estimate our known oil reserves at approximately 20,000,000,000 barrels. With petroleum consumption increasing at an alarming rate it is imperative that Congress take every step possible to develop the synthetic-oil industry to meet these demands.

Synthetic oil and gasoline produced from coal, shales, or natural gas has long since passed the experimental stage. Germany proved this fact by the use of synthetic oil during World War II. Ten years or less will exhaust our known petroleum reserves.

Secretary of Defense Forrestal has warned that the United States is so short of oil that if war came tomorrow we would need 2,000,000 barrels a day more than the Nation can produce.

Plants for the production of shale oil have been placed in operation near Rifle, Colo.; Louisiana, Mo.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Morgantown, W. Va.; Laramie, Wyo.; and laboratories have been established in many other places. The Bureau of Mines is ready to proceed with construction of a Fischer-Tropsch demonstration plant, which will be made possible under this legislation. The deposits of coal and shale in the United States are estimated as being sufficient to produce enough oil to supply the United States for over 2,000 years at the present rate of consumption. Oil-shale deposits in Colorado alone are estimated as capable of producing 200,000,000,000 barrels of oil.

It has been estimated that it will require upward of $9,000,000,000 to produce sufficient liquid fuel to supplement or replace the demands for natural oil and gas. If private capital can do the job, very well and good; if not, the inescapable responsibility rests with Congress.

Ten years is a very short time in the history of a great Nation. Our national security as well as our peacetime economy demand that we prepare for the inevitable and act before it is too late.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to congratulate my colleagues for bringing this bill before the House today. I, of course, congratulate the author of the bill, but I want especially to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands for bringing the measure before us. The chairman of this committee, in season and out of season, calls the attention of his committee and others in Congress when opportunity affords, to the fact that we are apparently running short on oil in this country and that it is a mistaken policy for us any place in the Nation to draw needlessly upon our petroleum reserves when we can obtain the needed product in some other way; and that is one thing with regard to this bill on which I wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee.

Needless to say, I favor the bill. It is a simple bill. It continues former legislation. I was a member of the Public Lands Committee at the time the original bill was passed. I recall distinctly the arguments both in the committee and the House for its passage in 1944. Then as now there was a great increase of petroleum products used.

It had become apparent that we were, during the war, reaching a dangerous limit on petroleum reserves with an increasing consumption of gasoline and fuel oil and that we should start the wise public policy of seeing if we could not find other sources and synthetic fuels. We were told that foreign nations were producing synthetic gasoline from lignite, all kinds of coal, and even from shale.

It was understood then, of course, as now that private enterprise producing gasoline and such products recognized the increasing demand but were not in a position to carry on the experimentation necessary to devise these new means of production, that it was the logical function of government operating through the Bureau of Mines to create experimental plants, pilot plants, not with the idea of producing commercial gasoline or oil but merely to find the know-how and to contribute that know-how to American industry to be ready for the day when we should have to tap those vaster reservoirs. We were told we have unlimited supplies of coal and, as the chairman has just pointed out, unmeasured and almost limitless shales from which oil may be extracted when our engineers learn how to do it. Therefore the original bill was passed and much has been done to date under it. Formulas from abroad, some of them captured property held by the Alien Property Custodian as a result of the recent war, have been tried out and improved upon. Some equipment and machinery produced abroad have been brought to this country. We find we can improve it with our engineers and actually produce more efficiently than the same equipment produced abroad.

The bill before us today is to continue that work, which is even now in its infancy. The original act provided for an authorization of $30,000,000 and a period of 5 years. This bill extends the time of the authorization three additional years, making 8 years instead of five, and increases the authorization from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to compliment the gentleman on the interesting argument he is making. It is also refreshing to see that this is not a party issue. It is a matter of what is the right thing to do to solve a complicated problem. It so happens that I am a member of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee that has been giving consideration to the oil problem. I want to point out, and this probably has been done heretofore, that in 1947 the average consumption of oil per capita in the United States was 608 gallons as against 367 10 years previously and also that the fuel in the country that is being used most is petroleum fuel. It seems to me the only possibility we have to maintain the production required for the increase in use that is evidenced in petroleum fuel, both for domestic purposes and for national defense purposes, is to find some way to make synthetic oil. I am, therefore, heartily in favor of this bill and hope it will pass.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

The Public Lands Committee of the House had before it the Secretary of the Interior, who told us that the consumption of gasoline and oil today is very much higher than before the war or during the war, so that the increase is a continuing one and there is apparently no leveling-off process in sight. We are inclined to increase consumption in spite of the logic that it should fall off following a war.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say to the gentleman that the information the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had recently is that the consumption of petroleum and petroleum products in this country has increased 70 percent beyond what it was prior to the war. It is about 5,500,000 barrels per day now and it was about 3,200,000 barrels in 1940. In response to what the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] said a moment ago, I believe there have been something like 1,500,000 conversions from coal to fuel oil for fuel purposes in this country, which gives added emphasis to what the increased demands are.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman for these facts and for his emphasis on the great increase in demand.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In connection with my study of this subject, the figures that struck my attention as showing the trend were these: During the last year, in connection with new residential construction in this country, 400,000 units put in oil-burning equipment for heat; and, in the case of over 1,000 orders placed for locomotives in this country, all but 33 were of the Diesel type or oil burning.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. That helps account for some of the increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This is a statement by Mr. Ball, of the Department of the Interior, Chief of the Oil and Gas Division, made to our committee. He said:

> The amount of energy supplied in the United States from 1935 to 1946 by coal increased 36 percent, and by oil and gas 96 percent.

That just emphasizes the trend toward the use of petroleum fuel. I would also like to quote another sentence, with the gentleman's indulgence:

> The annual consumption of petroleum fuel in the United States today is greater than that of the entire world in the year 1938.

Our present-day consumption exceeds what the entire world used in 1938, and it is still climbing.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I was one of the committee during the war who went across the Potomac River to the National Airport one morning to see one of our colleagues fly a plane from Pennsylvania into Washington, the first airplane to be flown into the National Capital powered by synthetic gasoline or gasoline made from coal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

We thought that flight was historic, and were glad to be a party to the celebration. That happened several years ago. I shall always be proud of even the small part I had in the original legislation which this bill continues. Now we have pilot plants which have developed the technique so that certain processes are developing to the point where private enterprise can utilize them in producing the fuels. After all, that is the theory and purpose of the law. I want to make it perfectly clear that the full program here is to find the know-how and to give such information to the private-enterprise corporations who will produce these things commercially so that they may continue getting the Nation's needs from new supplies.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has partially answered the question that I wanted to ask. As I understand the program, it involves, under the expenditures heretofore made, the construction of so-called pilot plants now in operation and doing research in the matter of the reduction of oil shale and coal, and so on, to the production of petroleum products, and it is proposed to enlarge that program.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right, and to extend the time.

Mr. KEEFE. Under the appropriation contained in the bill, is it proposed that these processes and these pilot plants that are to be constructed, or that have been constructed, will continue in operation as continuous research plants, or at what point does the Government leave this field and private industry take hold of the situation, and what becomes of the synthetic oil, and so on, that is produced in these demonstration-pilot plants?

Mr. MURDOCK. I have my own views on that, but I see the author of the bill on his feet. I yield to him.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very much in favor of the bill, but I would like that information.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The question which the gentleman raises is a very proper one. Part of the program carried out under the act is laboratory research. Beyond that is a demonstration program. The reason for its extension is this: There are three fields in which the demonstration program is under way: One is in the oil shales, one is the use of the so-called Bergius process for the hydrogenation of coal, and the third is the application of the Fischer-Tropsch or gas synthesis process to coal to get the hydrocarbons and the desired products.

This program was authorized in 1944, but there were delays due to strikes and to the demands of the war, so the first plant for oil shales just got into operation last year. They have not had a very long experience in the operation of the plant yet.

The second plant, the hydrogenation plant at Louisiana, Mo., will not get into operation until this fall. The program presently authorized will expire in April of 1949. There will not be sufficient time between this fall and April of next year to get a sufficient history to serve as a reliable guide for industry to plan a production program.

The third plant has not yet been constructed because of the delays growing out of the war. So if we are to have the benefit of a Fischer-Tropsch plant which is proposed, this bill is needed now so that contracts can be made for its construction. It is important to develop the Fischer-Tropsch process because it seems particularly valuable for producing Diesel fuel oil and motor gasoline, while hydrogenation seems better for high octane aviation gasoline.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it contemplated that after these pilot plants and demonstration plants have been constructed and have been in operation a sufficient length of time to demonstrate the feasibility of the cost of production of synthetic petroleum products, those plants will continue indefinitely in operation as research centers in that field, and will the resources of the plants and the discoveries as they are made be made available to private industry that may want to make investments in these fields?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Answering that last question first, certainly the processes here will be available to private industry, as to how long the research will continue, that will depend upon the problems that are revealed or solved during the research. The Rifle, Colo., plant can produce only 50 barrels a day, so obviously it is only a pilot or a research plant. This is a research-demonstration program and not a production program.

Mr. KEEFE. To what extent is private industry presently engaged in the production of synthetic fuels?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Private industry at the present time is doing something along this line, the major activity being a $250,000,000 plant which is under construction in western Pennsylvania, and on which a group of coal companies in Pennsylvania are cooperating with the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The coals of the Pennsylvania fields are coking coals, industrial coals, for which there is and always will be a great commercial demand. This research program proposes to tap a new field, the field of noncommercial oil shale and of subbituminous coal which has a limited commercial demand. Those fields are important for the reason that the oil shales alone offer the possibility of producing oils in 10 times the volume that can be produced from our natural petroleum reserves and the subbituminous coals offer a potential reserve 40 or 50 times that of petroleum.

The subbituminous coals of the country are about 42 percent of the coal reserves. About 20 percent is lignite and the other 22 percent is higher-grade subbituminous coal. The lignite fields alone are estimated to contain enough material to increase our petroleum reserves in this country by 25 times, enough to carry us along for a thousand years.

Private industry is also using natural gas now to produce synthetic liquid fuels.

But from a conservation standpoint we should not use natural gas, which is limited. Natural gas is being used, however, because it lends itself to a relatively simple and cheap process. You sort of jump over one step in the process required for coal or shale. But gas can be used for other purposes of course. Coking coals can be used for other purposes, too, but the oil shales and the lignite coals have no great commercial value unless they can be utilized for something like this. The research to date indicates that the lignite coals are particularly susceptible to this treatment and a good recovery may be obtained.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This program calls, in the over-all approach, under today's price level, for an expenditure of $9,000,000,000, as stated a few days ago by the Secretary of the Interior and as restated today before our committee. Who is going to put up the $9,000,000,000, and when? We had a little experience in the rubber industry when we built pilot plants for the synthetic rubber industry. Private companies are now operating pilot plants producing GRO and butyl rubber by the thousands of tons, but our pilot plants continue, I mean the pilot plants built and operated by the Government of the United States, to do exploratory work. My guess is that the pilot plants now being built under this program will run for the next 10, 25, and perhaps 50 years or longer, because the Government will be into this program up to its eyes and private industry will be in it. The petroleum industry, the chemical industries in connection with your plastics, the steel industries—because 16,000,000 tons of steel are required for this program—the rubber industries because from this product will come by-products which will go into the production of synthetic rubber, and so on down the line. The coal industry, the oil industry, the steel industry, the rubber industry, the rubber-goods producing industry, all of those are tied up. I think the gentleman has raised a point here which you can answer in a practical way by saying that this will become the established policy of Government, and these pilot plants will go on down through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the fine presentation that the gentleman is making. There is one further source of oil which will be badly needed in the future. That is oil in the so-called worked-out fields. Private industry has made many strides toward recovery ultimately of this oil. Does this bill provide any encouragement toward extending the know-how in the secondary recovery of oil?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know that it does, but I recognize the point the gentleman is making and that is we ought to get those heretofore unattainable and therefore unused reserves. I think that will be done.

One additional reason why we ought to pass this legislation and extend the time as well as the authorization and the appropriation later is the very thing the gentleman has brought out, that we have heretofore in tapping oil fields skimmed only the most accessible oil. We are deepening wells and getting oil from deeper levels, and I think we are improving the technique of gathering the oil so as to get a larger proportion. That is the thing that needs to be worked on further. May I say further that just this morning before our committee the question was raised of what we are doing toward extracting fuel from shales. It was pointed out by the engineers who were on the witness stand that we are able by distillation and other processes, such as hydrogenation to get this fuel from under the ground. Some think this may be done without mining. That, of course, is in line with the gentleman's question.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. May I say for the gentleman's information that I intend to introduce an amendment here today to permit a program of production research on secondary oil fields and stripped fields such as have been mentioned here by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Further answering the inquiry made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], may I say that the oil companies have been very cooperative with the Bureau of Mines in the operation of the plant at Rifle, Colo. They take the oil shale and put it through a retort, and then the samples are sent to the research laboratories of the colleges of the country as well as the laboratories of these big oil plants, with the idea that they may find the cheapest processes possible.

They think it will be only a short time, so that they can produce this oil in competition, and take the place of the present crude oil.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this further information.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted to add a word to the proposal for a secondary recovery program. After all, there has been much talk about the shortage of petroleum and petroleum products, and that the reserves will only last a given time. Of course, we all recognize that if we find no more petroleum there would be a shortage in the course of years. I think it might be well to point out, however, that we are increasing our reserves each year, and to add a program of research that would go into these depleted oil fields would add to the reserves. Before we had the so-called Interstate Compact Commission and a program of conservation, many fields were depleted, especially those that are water driven, and millions and millions of barrels of oil rest within those pools. We need to recover that oil in order that our people may have the benefit of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has again expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman that Mr. J. P. Jones testified before the Subcommittee on Oil of the Armed Services Committee the other day and he estimated that 4,000,000,000 barrels of oil are obtainable from the current secondary methods, but he said an estimated 100,000,000,000 to 150,000,000,000 barrels are being left underground for lack of technology needed to recover them. So it is evident that the amendment which I will offer ties into this over-all program. Our ambitions are to secure more oil.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate that important fact, and I should like to ask the gentleman if any consideration was given by the committee for providing an authorization for research work in the development of processes to recover oil under what is known as the secondary recovery program?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not recall that there was, before the committee. This bill had reference to formulas for converting shale and all kinds of coal into synthetic oil.

Mr. HARRIS. The bill as considered and presented to the House simply applies to synthetic fuel?

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand it, that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Now, would the gentleman answer this question: There was an authorization in 1944 for a period of 5 years, in the sum of $30,000,000.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. That program would expire in April 1949, if not extended.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. How much of that authorization has been used?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is my understanding that it has all been appropriated. The $30,000,000 has been appropriated. I do not know how much of it has been used.

Mr. HARRIS. But the entire $30,000,000 has been appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is my understanding.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. With reference to what the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] just stated, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] will offer an amendment which will give an opportunity for the purpose of trying to reclaim millions and millions of barrels of oil now in the ground, under secondary recovery wells. We know that is the right kind of oil if we can get it. Now all we need

is a million dollars or so for experimentation, to try to get that oil from the ground and then we will have millions and millions of barrels of oil that probably cannot be reclaimed if it were not for the amendment which the gentleman will introduce.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman that the oil-producing States are spending and have been spending for a number of years a lot of money on secondary-recovery methods.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I trust the bill will pass and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I think I should not take more time of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona has consumed 28 minutes; the gentleman from California 5.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2161, in my opinion, is a good bill. I believe that the enactment of this bill and the carrying out of its purposes may result in the establishment of great new industries in western Washington which in time will provide new jobs and pay rolls for many thousands of people.

Western Washington has great known deposits of coal, particularly in the Centralia, Tenino, and Toledo areas. A Bureau of Mines survey completed in 1946 indicates that one deposit near Toledo contains not less than 8,031,000 tons of coal. Other large coal deposits are known to exist near Centralia and Tenino.

Development of these coal fields and their use as a possible source of synthetic gasoline has been held back for lack of an adequate preliminary examination by the Bureau of Mines of all the potential possibilities of these west Washington coal fields. Failure of the Bureau of Mines to make that survey is due solely to a lack of funds with which to defray the costs which passage of this bill will eliminate.

On January 6 of this year I appealed to the Bureau of Mines for a thorough examination and study of the possibilities of developing the western Washington coal fields of Centralia, Tenino, and Toledo, both as to creating a new source of coal and as to its possibilities for making synthetic gasoline.

The Director of the Bureau of Mines, James Boyd, in answer to my appeal, informed me that—

> It is regrettable that despite your interest and that of your constituents and our obligation to develop the mineral resources of the United States that funds are not available to carry out this highly desirable investigation.

If we provide the Bureau of Mines this $60,000,000 to carry on work in exploring the possibilities of deriving gasoline from coal, I am sure that the Bureau will make in western Washington what its director, in his letter to me, called "this highly desirable investigation."

The large coal deposits which studies by the Bureau of Mines indicate exist in southwestern Washington lie about midway between the two greatest cities of the Pacific Northwest—Portland, Oreg., and Seattle, Wash. Any new industries which coal developments bring to southwestern Washington, therefore, will be of great benefit to both of these two Pacific Coast States.

May I point out further, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time Washington and Oregon have no oil or no gas production of their own. If the investigations, which this bill authorizes, are made in western Washington and prove successful in developing a synthetic-oil supply, this will be the forerunner of great industrial expansion in western Washington, for then we will be relieved of the expense of importing all our fuel oil and gasoline from the California oil fields, which are more than 1,000 miles distance from us.

Of added advantage to our State is a provision in this bill which calls for exploration by the Interior Department scientists, through pilot plants, of the possibilities of obtaining valuable byproducts from wood waste. Such studies may lead to discoveries that will obtain products of great industrial and commercial values from bark, sawdust, and other waste wood that is now burned in sawmill burners.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEMKE. The need for this kind of fuel and its desirability are universally understood, so I shall not discuss that. The possibility of manufacturing synthetic fuel oil is beyond question, it is no longer even in the probability stage; it has now progressed far enough so that we know that we have and can produce 500,000,000,000 barrels of fuel oil from coal and shale in this country and that 500,000,000,000 may be increased.

The question now is to get the experiments far enough advanced to know that it can be done at a cost that will permit independent or private business to produce it in competition with the production of oil in the usual method. For this reason this bill asks that the time be extended for three additional years and that an additional amount of $30,000,000 be appropriated. This seems to me to be reasonable when you remember that billions of dollars are now consumed in fuel oil each year and when you realize that the increased consumption of fuel oil and other oils has been over 20,000,000,000 gallons a year as compared with the period just prior to the war.

That is not only in one line of consumption but different lines, motor vehicles, locomotives, and so forth, and especially the increase that has come from the large number of home owners who prefer fuel oil to coal and other methods of heating their homes. But even at the estimate of 500,000,000,000 barrels of additional oil that can be produced by this method there is still a limit and new fields must be discovered.

These experimental plants cooperate with private industry. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, this morning appeared before our committee. So did Dr. Schroeder. They testified that there was full and complete cooperation between private industry and the Government in these efforts which are still in the experimental stage as far as cost of production is concerned.

I wish to say to the Committee that this bill came up before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of which I am Chairman, with full opportunity of discussion. There was a rather extensive and full explanation of the bill and there has been nowhere any opposition, either before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining or the Committee on Public Lands as a whole. As far as I know there is no opposition, and I will be very frank to say that I do not believe that any Member who is informed of the situation will object to the passage of this bill

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The purpose of establishing these experimental plants was to determine definitely that oil could be produced from shale in order to convince private enterprise that it could be done before they spent millions of dollars on plants, and that they were on the right road.

Mr. LEMKE. I agree with the gentleman and I am glad he made that remark. I may say that the department this morning told us they were not only experimenting in their own laboratory but they were shipping oil shale to universities and other experimental institutions as well as to private industry to find out just what percentage of oil could be extracted from different kinds of shale.

Mr. RICH. They certainly do not want to locate a plant in a locality where the operation of the plant would not be practical, until the laboratory has disclosed that it will be something worth while

Mr. LEMKE. I may say for the gentleman's information that the Secretary of the Interior stressed that very point. He wants more time to do this and he stated that the time had been too short during the war when they had to hurry a lot of this stuff, that they should have had more time for investigation in order to find out what the possibilities were before they build a plant.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the House is ready to vote on this proposition and I do not care to delay the matter further except to point out one phase. Here we are spending the preliminary money building pilot plants, doing experimental work and gathering experimental information which is necessary for the establishment of a great basic industry, the first step of which will perhaps be the greatest from a dollar standpoint of any first step ever taken in any American industry.

As has been pointed out, the Secretary of the Interior and the experts who have been working in this field for the last 3 or 4 years calculate that $9,000,000,000 will be required to build the necessary plants in order to turn out this production which the public will be expecting as a result of debates such as we are carrying on here today.

Where will that $9,000,000,000 come from to go into a new industry? Will the financial markets at the present time absorb a $9,000,000,000 offering? Of course, they will not, because offerings are going sour on the financial market every week now where firms are trying to sell securities for the purpose of expanding old industries, where the market is now ready for the goods. Can the Government of the United States finance during the next 3, 4, or 5 years half of this job, let us say four and a half or five billion dollars? If the Government attempts to finance the undertaking, where will the Secretary of the Treasury get the dollars? Through selling more bonds to the public or to the banks? If so, that means for the time being, that is, assuming prices do not substantially break, that such operation would be further inflationary.

Capital goods produced when employment is running full, when there is a seller's market, when prices are exceedingly high, I say that at that time capital expansion is inflationary because it further bids for scarce goods and for a short supply of labor. If you attempt to build the plants during the period when the markets are running as they have been running the last 4 or 5 years, instead of the job costing nine billion at the time you estimated your cost, that estimated cost may run to $15,000,000,000 by the time you finish the plant. When you start talking about individual plants that cost $100,000,000 you are getting into big money in any man's country. Some of these individual plants that are being planned will cost $100,000,000 or more.

Where will those plants be located? In what States? In what cities? Near what railroads? Near what canals or rivers? How will the basic raw materials be put at the place where the consumers are located? There are great economic questions involved.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If they are wise, they will place the plants where the source of the raw material is, more than likely, because of the fact it would cost so much to move the raw material to the plant.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman's business sense is correct but to do these things in a businesslike way you will have to have time to make your plans instead of building as we did the synthetic-rubber industry during the war. The house collapsed all at once. We had no time to do planning. All of that is evidenced today by the fact that we now find plants were located in the wrong spots from the standpoint of economic and efficient operation. The time has come now when private industry wants to buy synthetic-oil plants from the Government, or the taxpayer, and the value at which those plants will be sold depends very largely on their geographic locations, and as relates to efficient and economic operation. If the Government does finance these plants, some day they might want to sell them and private industry might want to buy those plants, but if these plants are to be financed by private industry, certainly you will have to have a dissimilar market for the absorption of the securities than that which we have at the present time.

I simply wanted to spend 2 or 3 minutes developing this particular phase of the subject, because, in my opinion, we have no time to lose on this program. I am in favor of this bill, and I would strongly recommend that as soon as possible—and by that I mean, make it possible—within the next 1, 2, or 3 years we should go out here and build at least three of these plants which the Government proposes, as much as $350,000,000, and let those plants be financed by private industry or by Government, or by the two working together. But the point I make is that we should get those three plants into production and get on the way with this program so that when future trouble does break out we will not have to build a $9,000,000,000 program in 9 months, with all the terrible costs and waste and extravagance that goes along with such a program in such a hurried manner.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Does not the gentleman believe that the operation of these pilot plants should come first, though?

Mr. CRAWFORD. These are very necessary, these steps we have been taking in the last 3 years, and the steps you are further taking by this authorization are very necessary. Any private industry or any branch of private industry that goes into a new field, if the management has any good sense at all, will do experimental work before it goes and builds a big plant. This is the experimental work that is being carried on in a new field by the Government so as to furnish incentives and inspiration and leadership to the people. Certainly, that is very necessary. In the absence of such experimental work as you are now carrying on you will throw away a billion dollars and hardly know how it happened.

Mr. ROCKWELL. May I add to that the fact that at the present time in this Rifle plant in Colorado there is cooperation between Continental Oil and Texaco and other big oil companies, and the colleges, and this research will save billions of dollars later on. For that reason I think that this should come before the big program that you speak about.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do, too, but we have had 3 years now of this research and experimental work under Government, plus all that is being carried on by private industry. So, with the embarrassing situation we are getting into both domestically and foreign, in my opinion it is time now to take some practical steps and get down and start designing and acquiring the material and constructing at least three commercial plants for the production of liquid fuel from your coal and shale deposits.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Lands is to be congratulated upon bringing this measure to the floor. They have made it clear that the need for expanding our oil resources in view of increasing demands is greater than ever before. The development of techniques for the production of oil synthetically is an important national problem.

Closely related to this problem is that of developing our techniques and know-how in the field of the secondary recovery of oil. Here is a tremendous reservoir of oil that only awaits the know-how in production. I therefore hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is adopted.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is one to construct and operate demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, and agricultural products. These are demonstration plants to be produced under Government supervision. I think it is well the Government enter into this field of activity. As pointed out before our committee this morning by Secretary Krug, we have about 31 percent of the visible oil supply of the world but for the past several years we have been furnishing about 63 percent of our supply to the rest of the world. To that extent, we are running out of oil.

The report states that the visible supply of oil reserves in the United States is conservatively estimated at about 20,000,000,000 barrels, and we consumed in 1946, 1,750,000,000 barrels of that oil. It can be readily seen that if we continue consuming oil at this rate we will soon run out.

It was also shown in the hearing this morning that there are reserves in the lignite coal, the shale and the rock of the United States, enough oil to last us probably a thousand years if it is developed.

This last summer, with several members of our committee, I visited the experimental plant at Rifle, Colo. It was a revelation to see mountains of shale rock that can produce oil. They put some of that rock in the top of huge containers, lit a little fire on top of it, and oil dribbled out down below. There are over 2,000,000,000 barrels that can be extracted by heat.

I suggested to the Secretary this morning that maybe we could light the whole mountain on fire and just sort of collect the oil down in the ravines. That might be done. At least we ought to consider getting the oil out of that rock on the spot, not shipping it to some place in Missouri or in some other State. It ought to be done at that particular place. It is necessary to refine that oil, and that is no small job.

I would also point out that this country is oil-minded and most machinery and

new houses are equipped for burning oil. I noticed on my desk this morning an advertisement from an oil company which stated that we are using 20,000,000,000 gallons more of petroleum products in 1947 than we used in 1941. In 1937 we were using 367 gallons per capita but today 608 gallons per capita.

On the question of how to get this oil developed, we are short of steel in this country. The gentlemen from the Pennsylvania and other oil fields have said we ought to do something about getting this secondary or marginal oil fields developed. Well and good, but last year we exported 7,000,000 tons of steel, much of it for an oil line in the Near East. Secretary Krug stated very accurately this morning that he thought that was the Achilles' heel of our oil industry, that some bully of the east might very easily cut off that oil supply.

We need to develop our resources here at home. On the public lands there are probably large supplies of oil as yet unknown that can still be uncovered. May I point out, too, that Germany relied almost entirely upon synthetic oil for her plants during the latter part of the war, and on synthetic high-octane gasoline taken from coal. We have those formulas in this country. They have been improved upon. High-octane gasoline can be produced from coal.

I recommend to the committee that we pass this bill; that we take some action to augment our depleting supply of petroleum, and do it from the known surpluses we have of lignite, coal, shale, and other rock that now exists in this country. Unless we do that, you who have been crying for oil in the East will be crying louder and louder every year. John Lewis started the trend to oil, and I believe the demand will increase. So it is necessary that the Government first take steps to work out the formula and process; but once that is worked out, it ought to be made available to private industry. They will carry on. I understand oil companies are spending millions in the synthetic-oil field. The Secretary this morning suggested the Government ought to build three large commercial plants. They would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. It seems to me that private industry, once the program has been developed, ought to carry on, and the Government should relinquish the manufacturing after the formula has once been established.

I feel also that the alcohol plants in Omaha and Muscatine, Iowa, ought to be kept ready to use the surplus farm products which most surely will again plague our country. These plants furnish added assurance of a rubber and alcohol supply for our country. I prefer they be operated by American business; but if this is not possible, then controlled by Government.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the author of the bill H. R. 2161.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, part of what I have said has already been said in the very generous debate which has been going on. I do not think there has been a person who has spoken on the floor who has opposed this bill. I appreciate the time yielded to me by the gentleman from Arizona to answer some of the questions that have already been raised about this operation.

I have found that when a man introduces a bill in Congress people often ask "Why did you introduce that bill?" I remember a little experience in introducing a controversial piece of legislation once which Congress eventually passed, although it was vetoed.

Repeatedly my motives were questioned as to why I should have introduced the bill. I introduced this bill for the same reason that I have introduced that bill, because I believe that the national interest called for the introduction of such a bill.

The bill was introduced on the 24th of February 1947. The Committee on Public Lands, of which the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] is chairman, and the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, headed by the able gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], reported the bill out unanimously on June 24, 1947. That was a short time before Congress recessed last summer. The bill was put on the Consent Calendar, but under the policy followed by the committee of objectors on the Consent Calendar, it was passed over without prejudice since it involved more than $1,000,000. Thus it was necessary to wait until such time as a rule could be obtained for its consideration and a place found on the House Calendar for bringing it up for consideration under the rule.

The merit of the bill is suggested by the circumstances which brought the matter to my attention and led me to introduce H. R. 2161. In my hand is a little memorandum given to me by the head of a Cabinet department, not the Secretary of the Interior, on the oil supplies in various portions of the world. The question of the oil supplies in various parts of the world had come up at a downtown conference, in February 1947, with reference to the defense situation where reasons were advanced for our adopting a policy which would keep open the oil lines to the Near East. Frankly, I was astounded at the time that we should be predicating a national policy that would involve us in the Near East on the slender reed of dependence on pipe lines to the oil fields of the Near East. The developments of the past few days have not lessened my apprehensions on that score the least bit. But it was growing out of fears generated at that time, that I began looking around to see what we could do. I knew we had some large fields of lignite in the Northwest. I knew in a general way suggestions had been made for developing synthetic liquid fuels from these shale coals. I went into it enough to decide the thing was to work for the extension of this program.

So I introduced H. R. 2161 as a companion bill to S. 134 and on various occasions I have sought to draw attention to the significance and importance of this program. When the Interior Department appropriations bill was up last year, it may be remembered that I made a point of order against certain language which seemed to curtail the authority to contract for prosecution of the program which had been delayed because the war was going on in 1944.

The time is here to continue the program and to push it with all practicable speed. Materials necessary for the building of some of the plants were required for the prosecution of the war. The ammonia plant at Louisiana, Mo., which had been proposed for use for one of the processes—the application of the so-called Bergius process was first allocated to this work—then the Ordnance Department decided that they needed it again and it was proposed to build this plant somewhere else. Then the war moved along a little better, but before the Bureau of Mines started building the new plant in California or wherever it was to be and this ammonia plant at Louisiana became available again. That plant is to come into operation this fall.

The plant working on the oil shales got into operation at Rifle, Colo., only a few months ago.

The plant proposed for the Fischer-Tropsch demonstration plant which will use the gas-synthesis process has not yet been constructed but will be constructed if this legislation is extended. Mr. Boyd, director of the Bureau of Mines, says that the Bureau at the present time is ready to contract for construction of the Fischer-Tropsch demonstration plant, but this will not be possible until the new legislation proposed is enacted.

At this point, I will insert a communication from the director of the Bureau of Mines and an article on synthetic-liquid fuels in the United States by Dr. W. C. Shroeder, chief of the Bureau's office on this subject:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1948.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CASE: This is in response to your telephone call of January 21 to Under Secretary Chapman, requesting an expression of the reasons for an extension of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act as provided in H. R. 2161 and S. 134. I am pleased to supply the following information:

A large investment now has been made by the Federal Government in research and demonstration plant equipment.

TWO HUNDRED BILLION BARRELS IN COLORADO SHALES

Two oil-shale mines and a demonstration plant for the production of shale oil were placed in operation near Rifle, Colo., early in 1947. One of the mines is for selective operation; that is, the mining of shale of any richness between 5 and 80 gallons of oil per ton. The second mine is essentially an underground quarry with a capacity of 1,500 tons a day, and will permit accurate determination of mining costs. This mine has been in operation only since October and a production of 25 tons per man-day already has been achieved. It is anticipated that this production will reach 40 to 50 tons per man-day during 1948.

Exploration work in the Rifle area has shown that the estimates of reserves of oil in the form of oil shale may be on the low side. Present limited core-drilling work indicates the possibility of recoverable oil totaling about 200,000,000,000 barrels in Colorado alone.

Further extensive core drilling is necessary to give these new estimates a firm status. From the operation of the crushing and retorting plant information of direct commercial applicability and value is being gained every day. This work should be pressed forward as rapidly as possible with the trained staff and extensive equipment now available.

HYDROGENATION PLANT BY FALL

A demonstration plant to produce about 200 to 400 barrels of gasoline a day by the hydrogenation of coal is being erected on the site of a Government-owned synthetic ammonia plant at Louisiana, Mo. All concrete work and buildings will be completed by the end of February, and all major items of equipment will be on hand by the end of March.

It is anticipated that this plant will be in operation in the fall of this year. The products will be high octane aviation gasoline, Diesel oil, fuel oil, and chemical by-products. The plant will use about 100 to 300 tons of coal or lignite a day.

Western coals will be used in initial operations because some of them are exceptionally amenable to the hydrogenation process. It is planned that all major types of coal in the United States will be tested if a sufficiently long operating period is provided.

Total reserves of coal in the United States are very large and will provide coal for many hundreds of years for combustion purposes as well as for synthetic liquid fuels.

On a heat-unit basis about 20 percent of the total coal reserve of the United States consists of lignite, and another 22 percent is subbituminous coal.

In the national interest these low-rank solid fuels should be converted to liquid fuels as a conservation measure, rather than using metallurgical coking coals and other high-grade solid fuels that are in great demand for industrial and domestic use, and which will be exhausted long before the lower-rank fuels occurring west of the Mississippi River.

The lignite coals alone would have a conversion value to liquid fuels of approximately 500,000,000,000 barrels, nearly 25 times the present proved petroleum reserves of the United States.

The hydrogenation plant has cost approximately $7,000,000, and a staff of about 200 people is being assembled and trained for its operation, which is new to American industry. Each day of operation will add valuable engineering data concerning this process which the United States can employ to meet gasoline and oil shortages.

FOUR HUNDRED WORKERS IN LABORATORIES

In addition to the oil shale and coal hydrogenation demonstration plant work, large laboratory facilities for the development and improvement of the synthetic liquid fuel processes have been established at Pittsburgh, Pa., Morgantown, W. Va., and Laramie, Wyo.

These laboratories are now staffed with trained groups totaling about 400 scientists, engineers, and assistants. They are completely equipped to investigate the methods and processes by which the United States can provide oil and gasoline from sources other than petroleum.

To obtain the main benefits from this considerable investment in plants, buildings, and technical staff, it is essential that the synthetic-liquid-fuels program be extended beyond April 1949, the expiration date of the present authorization.

It is also essential that this legislation be approved before the fiscal year 1949 to provide a basis for using the contract authorization granted by Congress so that funds can be obligated under this authority to continue the synthetic-liquid-fuels program at its present schedule.

At present the Bureau of Mines is ready to contract for the construction of a Fischer-Tropsch demonstration plant, but this will not be possible until the new legislation under H. R. 2161 and the companion bill S. 134 is enacted.

Cordially yours,

JAMES BOYD,
Director.

[From Mechanical Engineering of December 1947]

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS IN THE UNITED STATES

(By W. C. Schroeder, Chief, Office of Synthetic Liquid Fuels, Bureau of Mines, member ASME)

The disappearance of the reserve capacity to produce natural crude oil in the United States is the most important difference between the country's prewar and postwar economic and security situation. Prior to the war, a reserve of 20 to 21 billion barrels would have permitted domestic production of about 5,000,000 barrels daily at the maximum efficient rate, while actual production was less than 4,000,000 barrels. In essence, there was a cushion of 1,000,000 barrels a day to soak up the heavy war demand and to provide time in which the civilian consumption could be curtailed to provide still greater supplies for military uses.

Now a domestic crude production near 5,100,000 barrels daily is barely sufficient to meet the country's needs. It is also most probable that demand will continue to rise, for over 90 percent of the locomotives on order are Diesel engines, domestic-oil-burner sales are at the highest rate in the history of the industry, fewer automobiles are burning more gasoline than before the war with an estimated 4.5 million new ones produced this year, and a developing passenger and freight traffic in the air is requiring larger volumes of high-octane gasoline. A predicted consumption requiring 6,000,000 barrels of petroleum products a day by 1951 may err on the low side.

Today the country is still meeting its oil demands from a known reserve of 21,000,000,000 barrels plus a small net import of crude oil and petroleum products, but it is evident that domestic reserves must soon be increased or new sources of supply found. The prospects for increasing reserves in the United States are not bright, and the maintenance of the 21,000,000,000-barrel reserve has only been possible through extensions and revisions of previous estimates on known fields.

The reserve and exploration picture has become increasingly disquieting because discoveries of new oil pools have now failed to match consumption for 8 or 9 years while at the same time consumption is mounting rapidly.

On the other hand, the question is not, Can the United States find new sources of oil? but rather, What sources should be used?

SOURCES FOR OIL

Exploratory effort will undoubtedly find billions of barrels of oil, and this work should be carried forward vigorously. Deeper horizons, as well as drilling on the continental shelf, should help to maintain the oil reserves. Secondary recovery, that is, the attempt to rework old fields which have been exhausted by the ordinary pumping methods, is assuming greater importance. In some oil sand it is estimated that 30 to 50 percent of the original oil may still be unrecovered. How far this work will go will depend to a considerable extent on the cost of recovering oil by these methods, as compared to the cost of producing it from other sources. It is estimated that postwar costs for discovering new oil are about three times prewar costs, in part the result of a generally higher price level but also because of greatly increased drilling and exploration work necessary to find the oil.

Importation of foreign oil is another possible source of large supplies. Until 1947, the United States had been a net exporter of petroleum and generally on a large scale. During the first 6 months of 1947 the country has shown a small import balance. This may, and probably does, reflect the beginning of the change in location of the large bodies of the world's proved oil reserves.

If the assumption is made that the American petroleum industry can operate freely in the foreign fields and will not have to pay exorbitantly for concessions, taxes, or oil, it is the author's belief that oil can be imported at a lower cost than it can be produced synthetically in this country at this time. From some economic viewpoints, this might be the best means for meeting any shortages of crude oil which may occur in the United States.

On the other hand, foreign consumption of petroleum increased about 13 percent for the year 1946, as compared to 1941, and it is evident that some of the world's so-called backward nations are awakening to the need for a mechanized economy to supply their large populations. Moreover, industrialized nations such as England and France are finding it difficult to meet their energy requirements from coal and are showing a definite tendency to turn to oil as the most practical substitute. If this trend continues and increases, the proportion of the world's oil available to the United States may tend to diminish markedly.

This discussion of imported oil has not so far considered the strategic aspect of foreign sources. Sea lanes along the coast of the United States were difficult to keep open in the late war even with well-organized land-based protection at hand. In spite of the effort to protect tankers, the shipment of oil became so critical that it forced rapid construction of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines. It is not difficult to visualize the much greater problem that would be created by the long journey through open waters from the Persian Gulf area or even from South America.

In addition to the shipping problem, the oil industry and, under emergency or war conditions, the Government may be faced with the problem of preventing either the physical destruction of the foreign oil fields and their equipment or possible seizure. It is the author's belief that the United States, whose economic health and protection are so greatly dependent on oil, should never allow the security of a large proportion of its supply to rest in distant foreign lands.

SOURCES OF SYNTHETIC OILS

In a broad chemical sense, it is probable that most carbonaceous material could be used for the production of oil. Practically, however, since huge volumes of raw material must be available at low cost near the synthetic-oil plants, the choice is limited to natural gas, oil shale, and coal, and in some circumstances possibly agricultural wastes.

To establish a synthetic-fuel industry furnishing a considerable fraction of this country's oil needs will impose heavy demands on these raw materials, and the choice of the ones to be used will be determined by at least four major factors, as follows:

1. Raw material available.
2. Water supply.
3. Predominant type of products wanted, i. e., fuel oil, Diesel oil, or gasoline.
4. Location of market and transportation costs for products.

The significance of these factors is related to the synthetic-oil processes used and will be pointed out under consideration of the individual processes.

FISCHER-TROPSCH PROCESS USING NATURAL GAS

Fischer-Tropsch catalyst chambers

The Fischer-Tropsch process has in recent years been designated by a number of names, depending to some extent on the engineering features by which the reactions were accomplished on a large scale. The basic chemistry is still the reaction investigated by Fischer and Tropsch in which carbon monoxide reacts with hydrogen to eliminate water (or

carbon dioxide) at the surface of a catalyst to form straight-chain or isoparaffins (and some unsaturated compounds) in the liquid range. Fig. 1 shows the original apparatus used by Fischer in the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute at Mulheim-Ruhr for a study of the Fischer-Tropsch reactions. With cobalt and thorium catalysts, the product was largely paraffinic in nature, containing about 10 percent isocompounds, and ranged from a solid wax through Diesel fuel and gasoline fractions to gases such as butane, propane, ethane, and methane. Iron catalysts tend to yield more wax and about the same amount of isocompounds.

The use of the Fischer-Tropsch process determines the type of products that can be made, although the selection of the catalyst and operating conditions can vary the product within limits. Since the cobalt catalysts give paraffinic compounds, a Diesel fuel of 100 cetane number can be produced while the gasoline is only about 45 octane. The iron catalyst gives a lower cetane Diesel fuel, but gasoline of higher octane suitable for motor fuel. The process as now operated does not lend itself to the production of high-octane aviation gasoline with good rich-mixture performance.

To carry out the Fischer-Tropsch reactions on a laboratory scale is not difficult, but on a large scale the rapid removal of the heat of reaction (46,000 B. t. u. per gallon of oil formed) became difficult. In addition, the temperature at the catalyst surface must be controlled within a few degrees, for if it is too hot the production of methane grows at the expense of oil formation and the catalyst may be ruined, while too low a temperature slows down the process and gives excessive wax formation.

The German commercial plants in 1944 had catalyst chambers of complex construction, containing large amounts of steel to carry the heat of reaction to cooling water. Oil production per chamber was about 18 barrels a day, and a large number of chambers were necessary for a plant of reasonable size, as shown in figure 2. This equipment was expensive to build and operate.

Several new types of catalyst chambers are under development in this country. Two of these now give promise of commercial application. In one, which was largely developed in the oil industry, the synthesis gas is blown through the catalyst bed to keep it in a fluidized state, and the heat is removed by water-cooled surfaces in this fluid area. It is reported that high rates of throughput have been achieved, and that chambers producing several thousands of barrels of oil a day are possible.

The research laboratories of the Bureau of Mines have developed a chamber in which a cut of oil from the process is passed through the catalyst bed to carry away heat both by conduction and evaporation. Figure 3 shows the pilot plant which has been used for this work. The flow of gas and oil is cocurrent. Space velocities of gas through the catalyst about four to five times the German rates have been achieved, and no material difficulty is foreseen in enlarging this chamber to a capacity of 500 barrels per day or more.

Synthesis gas from natural gas

Natural gas is largely methane, and to convert this to synthesis gas (carbon monoxide and hydrogen) two methods can be followed as shown:

$$(1)\quad \underset{\text{Methane}}{CH_4}+\underset{\text{Water}}{H_2O}\rightarrow\underset{\text{Carbon monoxide}}{CO}+\underset{\text{Hydrogen}}{3H_2}$$

$$(1a)\quad CH_4+\underset{\text{Carbon dioxide}}{CO_2}\rightarrow 2CO+2H_2$$

$$(1b)\quad 2CH_4+H_2O+CO_2\rightarrow 3CO+5H_2$$

or

$$(2)\quad \underset{\text{Methane}}{CH_4}+\underset{\text{Oxygen}}{\tfrac{1}{2}O_2}\rightarrow\underset{\text{Carbon monoxide}}{CO}+\underset{\text{Hydrogen}}{2H_2}$$

Reaction (1) is generally used in synthetic-ammonia plants to produce hydrogen. It is often carried out at about 900° C., by passing the mixture of natural gas and steam through tubes filled with a catalyst of nickel on aluminum oxide. For the Fischer-Tropsch process the gas is too rich in hydrogen, and one proposal for getting the proper ratio of hydrogen to carbon monoxide is to introduce carbon dioxide in the reacting mixture as in (1a), or carbon dioxide and water as in (1b). One carbon monoxide to 2 hydrogen is suitable for the cobalt catalyst, and 1 hydrogen to 1 carbon monoxide for the iron catalyst. These reactions are endothermic, and the heat comes from the combustion of natural gas on the outside of the tubes.

The second method for making synthesis gas from methane does not use an external supply of natural gas to provide heat but carries out a direct, partial combustion of gas with oxygen. The oxygen is obtained by low-temperature fractionation of air.

Which of these two methods will prove the most economical will depend upon the cost of the natural gas compared with the cost of oxygen. Oxygen has the added advantage, however, that production of the synthesis gas can be carried out under pressure, and its use affords an outlet for the large amount of low-pressure steam generated in the catalyst chamber which can be used to make power for the oxygen plant. If oxygen is not used, it would be necessary to find some extraneous outlet for the power resulting from the Fischer-Tropsch operations.

Location of plants using natural gas

To locate Fischer-Tropsch plants using natural gas, it is necessary first to determine the raw materials needed. A plant making 10,000 barrels per day of primary product is near the mimimum that should be considered an economic unit. Since the initial investment in the plant is high, it should be amortized over as long a period as possible, which in this case was assumed to be about 25 years. Then the requirements are as follows:

Gas, 120,000,000 cubic feet per day; 43,000,000,000 cubic feet per year. Approximately 1,000,000,000,000 cubic feet over the life of the plant.

Water, 15,000,000 gallons daily.

Products, wax and oil, Diesel oil, motor gasoline, and alcohols; total 10,000 barrels daily.

These requirements are not easily met, since they call for a locality with 1,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of gas exclusively for the plant, and ample supplies of cooling water. Table 1 indicates some of the major proved gas reserves in the United States.

TABLE 1.—*Proved gas reserves in United States*

Location:	*Trillions of cubic feet (approximately)*
Appalachian	5
Kansas	14
Oklahoma	11
Louisiana	22
Texas	86
California	11

Obviously, if all this gas were available for Fischer-Tropsch plants, many suitable locations could be found, but this is not the case. On the Appalachian field, it is used for industrial and domestic purposes, and the reserves in the main are scattered and do not offer good plant locations. In Kansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and California the reserves are concentrated, but they supply the huge natural-gas pipe lines, and the number of locations which could furnish a total of 1,000,000,000,000 cubic feet to a Fischer-Tropsch plant is limited. In a State like Kansas, for example, it is probable that not more than a few 10,000-barrel-a-day Fischer-Tropsch plants could be located. The problem is further complicated because some areas which have sufficient natural gas would have difficulty in meeting the water requirements. This reasoning assumes, of course, that the gas going to the pipe lines will not or could not be greatly curtailed to meet large synthetic-liquid-fuel requirements.

Probably the greatest bulk of idle gas is in the Gulf coast and southwest Texas. Proved reserves are approximately 40 trillion cubic feet, and at the present time pipe-line demand is relatively small. Locations near the coast, which will provide ample water for cooling, should meet the plant requirements. In this area natural gasoline is recovered by condensate operations, and about 50 percent of the gas is returned to the well for repressuring. The Fischer-Tropsch plants could, however, be tied in with these condensate operations.[1]

Of the present proved reserves of natural gas as much as 30 to 50 trillion cubic feet might be available for conversion to liquid fuels. From 50 trillion cubic feet the total liquid product is estimated at four to five billion barrels. In this discussion no attempt has been made to estimate the effect of new discoveries which can add materially to the gas available for industrial use as well as for liquid fuels.

FISCHER-TROPSCH PLANTS USING COAL

The carbon monoxide and hydrogen used for the Fischer-Tropsch synthesis can be made from coal as well as from natural gas. The usual method for making these gases, and the one used in all the commercial Fischer-Tropsch plants in Germany, was to make coke from coal and then gasify the coke in water-gas machines. That process could be used in the United States, but it has very serious disadvantages. Two of the most important are that the initial investment in the combined coke-oven water-gas equipment is very high and the coal must all be of coking quality. This last requirement would eliminate many of the largest and thickest beds of coal in the United States, especially in the West, from use in the Fischer-Tropsch process. At the same time, it could throw a very large demand for fuel on the relatively limited reserves of good coking coal. From both a conservation and cost standpoint, it seems essential to devise a gasification process which does not depend on coking coal.

Gasification of noncoking coal with oxygen and steam, either in the pulverized or coarse state, is possible and may offer the solution to the gasification problem. This would be particularly true if the gasification were conducted under pressure, and the synthesis gas delivered directly to the Fischer-Tropsch plant without further compression. The volume of oxygen to be compressed is much less than the volume of synthesis gas, and the steam could be supplied under the necessary boiler pressure.

The Lurgi gasification process does operate under pressure, but as used up to the present time requires a sized fuel and produces considerable quantities of methane. If the temperature of the entire fuel bed were increased materially, the methane concentration could be reduced, but this probably means either a fluidized bed or pulverized fuel. In the latter cases, the operating temperature through the fuel zone would be fairly uniform and could be held at a level that would

[1] While this discussion is concerned with natural gas in the United States, it is interesting to observe that gas reserves in other countries might supply considerable amounts of synthetic fuels. For example, the latest available (May 1947) report of the Ministry of Fomento shows near 1,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas daily discharged to the atmosphere in the Venezuelan oil fields. This amounted to approximately 400,000,000 in the Maracaibo district; 300,000,000 in the Maturin district; and around 230,000,000 in the Barcelona district.

give high concentrations of carbon monoxide and hydrogen. The investment in an oxygen plant is large, and production costs, even excluding the cost of power available from the Fischer-Tropsch process, are still relatively high. The prime function of the oxygen in the process is to furnish heat to maintain the high reaction temperature through combustion of some of the coal. The oxygen needed can be reduced or eliminated by highly superheating the gases and steam going to the reacting zone.

At this point, the possibilities of underground gasification should not be overlooked even though it is true that considerable development work remains to be done. Figure 4 shows tunneling operations for underground gasification at Gorgas, Ala. From this experiment[2] it was found that this process can utilize a high percentage of the coal. With oxygen, and particularly if the whole operation can be conducted under pressure, it should not be difficult to secure very high temperatures and a gas suitable for synthesis purposes. At the same time, it is evident that each coal bed will present its own problems and require specialized development work.

The whole gasification problem is under intensive investigation both by industry and by the Bureau of Mines, and it seems reasonably certain that within the next year major improvements in the gasification processes can be expected.

About 35,000 cubic feet of water gas is needed to make a barrel of Fischer-Tropsch oil. Even on the basis of the best methods now available, very few gasification engineers are ready to talk costs below 10 cents per 1,000 cubic feet of synthesis gas, assuming a good grade of coal at $2 a ton. This means that the gas to the Fischer-Tropsch process for a barrel of oil will cost about $3.50. To this must be added the Fischer-Tropsch processing costs which will be small compared to the cost of gas production. At the present time, it would appear that substantial reduction in the cost of Fischer-Tropsch oil is going to depend upon producing synthesis gas at low cost. Before leaving this subject, however, it should be noted that Fischer-Tropsch primary product is a high-grade oil and can be refined to useful products with negligible losses.

The raw materials required for a 10,000-barrel-a-day Fischer-Tropsch plant using coal are approximately as follows:

Coal, tons per day (about 12,000 to 13,000 B. t. u.)	6,500
Coal, tons per year (about 12,000 to 13,000 B. t. u.)	2,400,000
Coal, tons, for an assumed plant life of 25 years	60,000,000
Water, gallons per day	15,000,000
Synthesis gas, cubic feet per day	350,000,000

Assuming a coal bed about 8 feet thick, approximately 10 square miles would be needed over the plant life. More than 20 States with good coal reserves would offer numerous sites for such plants. In order to minimize transportation cost for coal and water, it would be desirable to have sites at which both materials are readily available, and such sites will be limited. In the East, the water problem will not be as difficult as in many of the Western States. The question of plant location with respect to markets is one that will be decided by the cost of coal versus the cost of transportation of oil and gasoline. Many of the eastern coal fields are near large markets but mining is relatively expensive, while in the West coal is available in thicker beds, often at low cost, but the product will have to be shipped to the point of use. At the present time, sufficient information is at hand to estimate for a given set of circumstances the most economical arrangement.

[2] Conducted jointly by the Alabama Power Co. and the Bureau of Mines.

COAL HYDROGENATION

The broad features of the chemistry of the coal-hydrogenation process are known, although a thorough understanding of the individual reactions and the conditions that affect them still remains to be worked out. To make a liquid product by hydrogenation, the coal is mixed with heavy oil from the process, the mixture is heated to about 450° C. and hydrogen gas introduced under pressure in the presence of a catalyst. It is now known that the coal dissolves in the oil (such solution is possible in coal-tar fractions or hydrogenated coal-tar fraction) or at least depolymerizes to the extent that the very large molecules are broken down and are present in the liquid in an unsaturated and very reactive state. If hydrogen gas is immediately available, it enters the molecular structure to produce a stable oil-like material. If hydrogen is not available, the reactive molecular groups tend to repolymerize and form asphaltic material which is exceedingly difficult to liquefy by subsequent treatment. The function of the catalyst, which is generally tin oxide or iron sulfate, depending on the pressure, seems to be to promote the reaction of hydrogen with the liquid medium which in turn gives up hydrogen to the newly formed molecular groups.

The complete flow diagram and equipment for the hydrogenation process are extremely complex. Since the process operates at pressures from 3,000 to 10,000 p. s. i., a considerable number of highly specialized engineering problems are met. Bureau of Mines laboratories for a broad-scale investigation of the coal-hydrogenation and Fischer-Tropsch process are shown in figure 5.

The hydrogenation process is well adapted to the production of aviation gasoline from coal and, in fact, is the only large-scale synthetic process at present which will give a base stock for 100-octane gasoline with good rich-mixture performance. It does not produce as good a Diesel fuel and at this time it probably will not produce motor gasoline as cheaply as the Fischer-Tropsch process. In addition, a light hydrogenation of coal at low pressure may offer a good synthetic process for the production of fuel oil.

It is estimated that the cost of producing and compressing hydrogen is 50 percent of the total cost of producing gasoline by the hydrogenation process. Improvements in the production of synthesis gas for the Fischer-Tropsch process are also improvements for the hydrogenation process, since the carbon monoxide portion of the synthesis gas can readily be reacted catalytically with steam to give hydrogen.

Because the cost of compressed hydrogen is about one-half the total cost of gasoline, it is important to consider the use of natural gas as a source for hydrogen. Natural gas at 5 cents would give hydrogen at about one-third the cost of obtaining it from coal at $2 a ton, and would result in a material saving both in the plant investment and operating cost of a hydrogenation plant. This possibility depends, of course, upon having natural gas near or piping it to a coal field. In certain areas of Wyoming, Illinois, and Texas, natural gas and coal could be secured for such operations.

The amount of gas needed is not large compared to the liquid product. Assuming that the hydrocarbon gas from the converters is used to make as much hydrogen as possible, the amount of natural gas would be approximately 6 to 8 percent of the product on a weight basis. This would have the effect of making large amounts of liquid product available from a small amount of natural gas. The possibilities from both the economic and conservation viewpoints of a hydrogenation process using natural gas to furnish hydrogen are sufficiently attractive to justify a thorough analysis which is now being made by the Bureau of Mines.

The minimum-size commercial hydrogenation plant for the United States is about 30,000 barrels a day, and the following estimate for a raw material is based on such a plant:

Coal, tons per day (about 12,000–13,000 B. t. u.)	17,000
Coal, tons per year (about 12,000–13,000 B. t. u.)	6,120,000
Coal, tons, for assumed plant life of 25 years	153,000,000
About 30 square miles of 8-foot coal needed over plant life.	
Water, gallons per day	50,000,000

The location of these plants offers much the same problems as those encountered for Fischer-Tropsch plants operating on coal.

OIL-SHALE PLANT

Since oil shale of reasonably good grade contains 10 to 50 percent carbonaceous material from which oil can be produced, it might seem uneconomic to mine this material for the production of oil in comparison with coal which contains a high percentage of useful carbon. This reasoning does not take account of certain basic advantages which oil shale possesses. The first of these is the occurrence of the shale in essentially horizontal strata containing an average of about 30 gallons of oil per ton of shale in a bed 70 to 100 feet thick in Colorado and extending in almost continuous but thinning beds into Utah and Wyoming. Mining costs under these conditions are of a different order of magnitude from those encountered in mining underground coal beds one-tenth or one-twentieth of this thickness. The second advantage is that the processing of oil shale is relatively simple, costing less for initial investment and plant operation than coal.

The effect of differences in processing is reflected in still another way. Assuming coal contains 90 percent carbonaceous material and shale only 18 (about 30 gallons of oil per ton), it might be expected that it would require five times as much shale as coal to make a barrel of oil. Instead, 1.5 tons of shale will make a barrel of oil, while 0.65 ton of coal are required for a barrel of oil. The ratio then is not 5 tons of shale to 1 ton of coal but 2.3 tons of shale to 1 ton of coal. The large amount of coal is required to furnish heat and energy to the coal process which is not needed in shale processing. With mining costs one-fourth to one-third of those for coal, it is apparent that oil shale is a suitable source of raw material for synthetic fuels.

The Bureau of Mines oil-shale plant, which is now in operation at Rifle, Colo., is investigating on an extensive scale all phases of shale-oil production. Figures 6 and 7 are views of some of the mine and plant areas.

The plan for economic studies of the mining is now fully developed and a large-scale mine to demonstrate operations at the rate of 5,000 tons a day has been opened. A 70-foot shale bed is minable in 3 benches, and entryways are large enough to take a large-electric or Diesel shovel underground. All operations such as drilling, blasting, loading, and transportation are predicated on the maximum degree of mechanization, and detailed economic studies indicate that production of about 40 to 50 tons of shale per man-day can be achieved. Under these circumstances, the shale will be mined for about 50 cents per ton.

Processing after mining involves crushing the shale and retorting (heating) to produce oil. The end product is an oil having a gravity of about 25° to 30° A. P. I., depending upon the method of retorting.

On the basis of present knowledge, oil shale can be refined to yield industrial fuel oil and Diesel fuel with a cetane rating between 35 and 45. It cannot be looked upon as a

good motor-fuel stock, for it yields a low-octane (about 50 or 60) gasoline. Shale oil differs materially from petroleum in that it contains considerable amounts of unsaturated or olefinic compounds. It cannot be refined into substitutes for petroleum products by the normal methods used on petroleum, and special methods must be developed. A light hydrogenation of 200 or 300 p. s. i. pressure has given very good results on Diesel fuel but disappointing results on motor fuel. The whole refining problem needs and is receiving intensive investigation. This work will be carried out by extensive cooperative tests with industry and special studies in Bureau of Mines laboratories.

The raw material needed for a 10,000-barrel-a-day oil-shale plant on the basis of processing the 70-foot bed in the Green River formation of Colorado is as follows:

Oil shale, tons per day	15,000
(For 25-year plant life about 2 square miles of a 70-foot bed of shale).	
Water, gallons per day (with recirculation)	1,700,000

Since the oil-shale beds exist in enormous areas in three States and in smaller quantities in many others, the location of the necessary reserves for many plants will offer no difficulty. However, the shale is in mountainous terrain, frequently at elevations of 7,000 to 8,000 feet, and the plant sites must be selected with care. Although this process does not require a large amount of water, the richest shale reserves are in somewhat arid regions of the country, and the availability of the water will be one of the determining factors in plant location.

SUMMARY

Since the passage of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act in 1944, it has become increasingly apparent that the United States will turn to synthetic sources to augment its petroleum resources. It is anticipated that costs at the plant will be from 3 to 5 cents a gallon higher than the present prices of products from petroleum, although further reduction in synthetic costs may be achieved by process improvement and large-scale operation. The raw materials that will be used first are natural gas, oil shale, and coal. The raw material or processing method to be used will depend on the economics surrounding each plant installation, as well as the type of product desired, that is, industrial fuel oil, Diesel fuel, or gasoline.

This paper has attempted to show the basic raw materials needed for the synthetic-fuel plants, and the major problems involved in site selections. The establishment of a synthetic-fuel industry to supply an appreciable fraction of the country's oil needs must be preceded by study to determine areas in which raw materials and water are available in adequate supply.

It is not desirable to delay the establishment of a synthetic-fuel industry until an emergency period. To build a capacity of one to two million barrels daily would require several years and large amounts of steel and other materials as well as manpower. This program would be about 5 to 10 times the magnitude of the synthetic-rubber program during the last war. It would be most desirable to avoid such a drain of national resources during an emergency.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I just wish to say that I am in full accord with the necessity for protecting and conserving our oil supplies and other liquid fuel supplies. I would like to ask the gentleman if the title of the bill as it now reads, namely, "authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil, shales, agricultural and forestry products and other substances," may be interpreted to include alcohol as a fuel? Alcohol is a fuel and it may be made from wood, or forestry products. I am interested in that subject. We have made some developments along that line going along in the Northwest, and I believe this legislation should be made to apply to those developments if aid in perfecting the alcohol-from-wood process is needed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course the title is accurate in that respect, in describing what is in the present act. The pending bill is to amend the act of April 5, 1944, the first sentence of which reads as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available, is authorized for not more than 5 years to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil, shale, and other substances, one or more demonstration plants to produce liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products, with all the facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products.

Certainly the clause which relates to the production of liquid fuels from agricultural and forestry products would cover the question raised by the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. As the gentleman knows, ethyl alcohol is used as a blend with gasoline as a fuel for the operation of motor vehicles in many parts of the world. It is conceivable under the present development, to manufacture ethyl alcohol from sawdust. It is possible that alcohol made from wood will ultimately be available at a price which will make blending with gasoline very feasible. I would like to ask the gentleman if, in his opinion, when the proper time comes, this legislation may not be applied to such experimentation and other work along that line.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As a matter of fact, some of that work is now being carried on in the laboratory-research program. But most of the discussion has related to these demonstration plants. In addition to these plants, there are at the present time laboratory facilities established at Pittsburgh, Pa., Morgantown, W. Va., and Laramie, Wyo. Those laboratories are now staffed with trained groups totaling about 400 scientists, engineers, and assistants, and they are equipped to investigate methods and processes by which the United States can provide oil and gasoline from sources other than petroleum. In addition, there are certain research problems assigned to laboratories operated by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I am deeply interested in this, because I offered the amendment to this original bill in 1944 to include agricultural products.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois if it was not his intention at the time he introduced that amendment that it should include the manufacture of synthetic fuel obtainable from forest products?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Absolutely, even to the extent of waste sulfide liquors going down the stream from wood-pulp plants, which contained a great deal of recoverable amount of sugar, from which you can make alcohol. You can make alcohol from anything that contains sugar or starch. There is a tremendous amount of waste going down the streams. Alcohol could have been recovered from the sulfide liquors that are being wasted. In carrying out the original purpose and intent of this bill, along the line that the gentleman from Oregon is interested in, the original laboratory at Peoria immediately went to work on this. They have made high-grade liquid motor fuel from even corncobs, as well as some other byproducts. They are deeply interested in carrying on this program. In this same connection, I might mention that our Subcommittee on Fertilizer is very deeply interested in the disposal of some of these Government alcohol plants, for instance, the one at Kansas City, the one at Omaha, the one at Muscatine, Iowa, particularly the one at Muscatine, which has done such a wonderful job.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman, of course, refers to plants operated by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Yes; but they ought to use it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no opposition to the passage of the legislation, but for the record I wish to give the figures of where the lignite coal is located. North Dakota—and bear in mind my State is South Dakota—North Dakota has 600,000,000,000 tons of lignite; Montana has 315,000,000,000; Texas, 23,000,000,000; my State, South Dakota, does have 1,000,000,000 tons of this coal, but the greatest reserves of lignite are obviously in the States of Montana and North Dakota.

Assuming a one-third loss in mining, the remaining 626,000,000,000 tons of the known lignite coal reserves would have a conversion value to liquid fuel of approximately 500,000,000,000 barrels. That is approximately 25 times the present crude-oil reserves of the United States. These figures were given to me by Mr. N. H. Collison, special assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, in connection with hearings on a deficiency appropriation bill in December.

Mr. Chairman, this bill ought to be passed at once in order to make it possible for the Bureau to carry on this program at top speed and to make its contracts for the fiscal year 1949, particularly if it is to go ahead with its contracts for the plant that has not yet been started.

So, this bill should be passed today. I am happy for the wide interest shown here today. The bill has been supported

by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as well as other ranking Members of the House. You can tell the people of the country that Congress is doing something for the development of synthetic liquid fuels. Synthetic fuel oil is already indicated on a basis competitive with petroleum and the day is not far distant, in my judgment, when gasoline produced by synthetic processes will be within 5 cents of the price now paid for gasoline produced from petroleum. When we propose to do that, with the tremendous reserves we will unlock in this program, certainly we are passing legislation of the most vital and long-time national interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains but a few lines. Yet, in my opinion it is one of the most important bills that will likely be considered at the present session of Congress. For a number of years, I was chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining but under the Reorganization Act, matters coming under the jurisdiction of that committee were transferred to another committee.

The bill before us amends the act of April 5, 1944, which act authorized the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce liquid fuels from coal, oil, shales, agricultural, and forestry products, for a period of 5 years and authorized the expenditure of $30,000,000. This bill changes that law in two particulars—it extends the period of this experimentation three more years and the amount expended to sixty million.

You, the American people and myself have been disturbed for some years because of the likelihood that our oil and gasoline supplies would become exhausted. It is estimated by our scientific and expert men in this field that the foreseeable oil resources of this Nation at this time is 20,000,000,000 barrels. We are now consuming oil products at almost the rate of 2,000,000,000 barrels a year and it is predicted that we may exhaust our known oil reserves and resources within the next 10 or 12 years. It is most disquieting to know that in the year 1947 we consumed in this country 20,000,000,000 gallons more oil than we did in 1941, the largest prewar year consumption, and we consumed last year 7,000,000,000 more gallons of oil than any of our biggest war years.

Let us notice some of the items that account for this great increase of 1947 over 1941. Thirty million motorists are using annually two and a half billion more gallons than in 1941. Seven million trucks and busses are using 3,000,000,000 more gallons than in 1941. Our armed forces are using three and a half billion more gallons than in 1941. Railroads, airlines, and ships are using two and a half billion more gallons than in 1941. Farmers are using one and a half billion more gallons than in 1941. New products, made from petroleum, use 1,000,000,000 more gallons than in 1941. The users of liquefied petroleum gas use one and a half billion more gallons than in 1941. Industry is using 2,000,000,000 more gallons than in 1941. Oil burners are using two and a half billions more gallons than in 1941. So—the total used in 1947 was 20,000,000,000 gallons more than in 1941 and 7,000,000,000 gallons more than that used in our biggest war years and with our expanding economic life, this will no doubt increase.

Petroleum is of first importance to our national defense and likewise to the domestic economic life of this Nation. Unless we can develop petroleum from coal, shale, and the products of agriculture and forestry, we can begin to see the end of the glory, power, and industrial and agricultural wealth of this Nation. Happily, we can see now clearly how we can provide this most essential product to our national life and existence.

SYNTHETIC OIL FROM COAL AND SHALE

Early in the last war many persons believed that Germany could not fight a sustained great war because she did not have oil from which to make gasoline and other petroleum products so very necessary in supplying her war needs, but German scientists had been active in developing synthetic petroleum from which she could make high-octane and other high types of gasoline.

In 1945 the Congress, in my opinion, took a very wise step in providing our Nation with leadership to discover and develop synthetic liquid fuels from coal, shale, agriculture, and forestry products. There is no limit to the rich coal and lignite deposits of this Nation. A majority of the States have rich coal or lignite deposits. There are millions of acres of coal in Alaska with a seam that is more than 80 feet thick. The State of Utah has a seam that is more than 32 feet thick. Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Maryland have many seams of coal varying in thickness. The numbers of tons of coal would run into astronomical figures. South Dakota and some of the other States have thick veins of lignite. This coal and lignite would provide us with oil, gasoline, and other petroleum products for thousands of years.

SPLENDID PROGRESS

Our own scientists and mineralogists have gone far enough into these investigations and tests to show that the development of synthetic liquid fuels is feasible. One private concern in Pennsylvania is putting in a plant that will cost $250,000,000 to convert coal into petroleum. I know of no way that this Nation could spend $60,000,000 to a better advantage for peacetime pursuits as well as our national defense than in discovering and developing the processes to extract petroleum from coal, shale, and agricultural products. We have millions and millions of acres of oil-bearing shale. These discoveries are most assuring to me and I know they will be to all those who familiarize themselves with the facts. We not only are assured of ample supplies of oil, gas, and other petroleum products, by these processes, but in the beginning it will be produced at little more than the present cost of oil taken from the oil pools throughout this country, and, furthermore, it will develop a great synthetic fuel industry that will require the investment of $9,000,000,000.

The Government will not put up these plants. It is planned to have these synthetic fuels developed by private industry. This industry will use literally billions of tons of coal and other billions of shale and lignite. The Government is not going into the manufacture of synthetic fuel. It is working anxiously and actively in developing the scientific processes by which this may be done. It, of course, will furnish the private enterprise with the know-how and private enterprise will afford a great market for coal, lignite, and shale and a market for the equipment necessary to carry on these enterprises and that will mean more jobs for American workers, and above all, it will cause our country to be independent, and furthermore, our country will no longer be dependent for its petroleum supplies on Iraq and other distant foreign lands. It may keep us out of World War III. We will not have to fight over oil wells in foreign lands. I am very happy today to have the opportunity to help further this great American program.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am very much gratified at the attitude of the committee on this bill. I recall very well in 1944 when we had the original bill, the discussion before our committee, and the difficulty we had to get it passed through the Congress. The war, and what we have learned since then, has taught us valuable lessons concerning the need for more oil and gasoline. There are a million more homes being heated by oil today than there were before the war, not to mention the other uses for gasoline and oil. The oil shales in Colorado will supply, according to the testimony given before the Committee on Public Lands this morning, over 200,000,000,000 barrels of oil, enough to last 100 years at the present rate of consumption, if we did not have anything else. Also in the Rocky Mountains we have great beds of coal that are still untouched. We can, if I may say so, supply our friends in California and our friends to the south not only with the water they need in the future, but with the oil to heat their homes and to develop their industries.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] a while ago in reference to the business angle that the Department is going to be compelled to take if we are going to make a successful proposition of getting oil from rock. Naturally, we all know we need oil. Now, where are we going to get it? It seems to me

that the thing to do is to build plants close to the mountains of raw material rather than to bring the mountains of raw material close to the plants. That is an economic measure, and I do not care what part of the United States it is, it is essential to do just that. It is going to be necessary in order to save transportation costs. Now, besides extracting oil from the rock, there was testimony given before the Armed Services Committee by John Paul Jones, from Bradford, Don T. Andrus, of Bradford, and Larry Smith, of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, showing that there were millions and millions of barrels of oil underground that could be recovered by a secondary recovery from stripper oil wells. When we get that kind of oil you know exactly what you have got. It is gold, rivers of black gold, that we can use, and we know that we have got the very best oil in McKean County, Pa., the greatest and the best quality oil field in the whole United States. There they have millions and millions of barrels of oil that can be extracted from these wells, if we will give a little time and attention in trying to supply the know-how to recover it. My colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is going to offer an amendment here which has been agreed to by all the members of the committee, which I hope will be adopted. They will only ask for a very, very small part of the money to be used in experimental purposes in endeavoring to reclaim that oil. If that amendment is placed in the bill as is, it will make a much better bill and make it so that it will do something for the welfare of this Nation, not only for this year, but for years and years to come. I hope that we can adopt that amendment, and I hope that the Department will be able to determine just the proper place for its experimental work in shale oil. Experimenting should be continued in order that they will not build a great many plants before they know what kind of plant they ought to build and where they ought to build it, thus saving millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. If the Bureau of Mines will give their time and attention to that particular phase, I feel that this bill will be a great success; one that will benefit this country of ours, and one that should pass.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, when this bill first came before the Congress I was a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining. The bill was reported to the floor from that committee and I was very happy to see it passed. When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] offered his amendment to include agricultural and forestry products within the scope of the authorization of the bill, I supported the amendment.

I think it is extremely important that the matter of obtaining synthetic fuel be looked into as far as farm products and forestry products are concerned. It happens that in my congressional district the only commercial-scale experiment ever conducted in the United States for the manufacture of ethyl alcohol from sawdust was undertaken during the war by the Defense Plants Corporation. Following the end of the war, the plant, which was constructed for the purpose of manufacturing alcohol from wood waste, was placed in operation by a lessee corporation under the Defense Plants Corporation, now the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was discovered, however, when the plant was put into operation that instead of being a complete plant ready actually to turn out alcohol there were some engineering and design difficulties, the correction of which would cost some $250,000. The company, which had been organized to operate a going plant, but had no responsibility for the design and construction of that plant, did not see fit under the type of lease it had with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to go ahead and make a capital investment to complete the plant to produce alcohol. At the present time that plant is in the hands of the War Assets Administration. I think that ultimately it will be sold by the War Assets Administration on such a basis as to be operative commercially.

This will be the first effort in the United States to produce ethyl alcohol from wood. Alcohol has heretofore always been produced from food products, grain, principally. There is not enough grain produced in this country or in the world to feed the population of the world with grain, the most nutritious food, to the extent needed, so it seems high time that this country should go ahead and develop processes for manufacturing alcohol from a product that is presently wasted, namely, sawdust and other waste wood.

When I interrupted the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] a few moments ago and asked the question regarding the application of this bill to such things as manufacturing alcohol from wood, I had our situation in Oregon in mind. I wondered if there was any application in this bill to work of that kind. The reply of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the author of the bill, clearly indicates that the language of the pending bill and of the statute which it amends is not only broad enough to include the construction of demonstration plants for the production of liquid fuels from forestry products, but it is specific in that respect. If the plant now in existence at Springfield, Oreg., can be disposed of by the War Assets Administration in such a manner as to insure its commercial operation in the future there will be no need to consider the application of this legislation to the problem. As I understand it, however, the passage of this bill will make it possible for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture to proceed to make the Springfield plant a demonstration plant if private investors are unable to or do not want to complete it and operate it. I am therefore very much in favor of the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. The gentleman is aware that actually alcohol had been made from wood products up in Canada, in a plant owned and operated by the Chicago Tribune. They built a plant there to make their own wood pulp for their newsprint, and then made a demonstration plant manufacturing alcohol from the waste products of that wood. So it is a practical thing, shown to be so by private enterprise.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes; I am acquainted with that work in Canada. I also know that there is at present in operation a very successful plant manufacturing alcohol from sulfite waste liquors from a big paper mill, I think in Bellingham, Wash. It is a highly successful venture and just shows what can be done with waste wood products with the application of American inventive genius and engineering ability.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am hearily in sympathy with the provisions of this bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants for the purpose of developing synthetic fuel oils. I think we are all familiar with the general oil situation throughout this country. It was brought more forcefully to my attention today when I received a telegram from one of the suppliers in the New England area, the Boston area particularly, that had been able to get a tanker from the Maritime Commission under charter-hire provisions in order that they might be able to go down into the Gulf and get some oil. Today, because of their inability to get that oil, they had to cancel the tanker. The situation in New England is desperate because there are thousands of homes up there today without any kind of oil, especially at this time when the temperature is down near the zero mark all the time and this being one of the coldest winters that we have experienced in perhaps the last 25 or 50 years. Anything that will implement the oil situation in this country from the standpoint not only of meeting our domestic requirements but also to enhance the security of the United States is something with which I am heartily in accord and favor.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, under permission granted in the House, I insert the following statement:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR HON. J. A. KRUG BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THIS MORNING ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

In transmitting to the Congress recently my 1947 annual report on operations under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, I stated that the immediate need for supplemental sources of oil and gasoline never was more apparent. With the Nation's reserve productive capacity exhausted, demand for petroleum and its products has surpassed the wartime peak and still is rising. No leveling-off period is in sight. The forecast for 1948 indicates a total demand more than 14 percent in excess of the wartime high of 1945, and it would be even greater if more oil were available.

Final figures are not yet available, but the lowest estimates of our economists indicate that 1947 demand exceeded prewar 1941 by

34 percent. For the first time, oil and natural gas last year supplied more energy than coal. Motor fuel demand was up 18 percent since 1941; kerosene, up 46 percent; distillate fuels, 68 percent; residual, 34 percent; and others, 43 percent. These increases are the result of the tremendous postwar increase in industrial activity and a rapid growth in population. The development of our energy resources is vital to continued prosperity in this country.

With only 31 percent of the world reserves, the United States cannot continue to produce 63 percent of the world's consumption, and this is practically all domestic consumption. The Nation already is squeezed between increasing demand and decreasing margin for expansion of productive capacity. The effect is reflected in distress calls from communities lacking adequate fuel oil during the recent cold wave. If further abnormally cold weather arrives—and the winter is far from over—these shortages may become even more widespread and severe.

The petroleum industry is working around the clock to fill soaring demands. It is cooperating wholeheartedly in an industry-wide campaign of conservation, even to the extent of spending large sums for advertising to urge consumers to take it easy on gasoline and to save fuel oil by not overheating houses. These efforts deserve the highest commendation, but they are not a long-range solution. Expansion of productive capacity through increased exploration and enlarged refining capacity are badly needed. In addition, industry should be given every encouragement to stimulate exploration on the Continental Shelf and in the Caribbean and South America. My department is making every effort to assist in this work.

Proved reserves of crude oil in the United States total approximately 21,000,000,000 barrels. Indicated reserves in the Middle East now are placed at 27,000,000,000 barrels, and the results of exploratory drilling in this area are so favorable that the total may be lifted well above 50,000,000,000 barrels. Thus, while the United States remains by far the world's greatest consumer of petroleum, the production center now appears to be moving to the Middle East. Obviously, as a nation, we cannot afford to become dependent upon a long supply line from the Middle East for a commodity as important to our well-being as petroleum.

Because of the growing unbalance between demand and supply, the United States cannot rely exclusively on petroleum to supply all future requirements for liquid fuels and related products. Every effort must therefore be made to develop new domestic sources of fuel oils, lubricants, and gasoline. Fortunately, with the authorization provided in the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, one such effort is already well under way. It should be intensified.

In brief, all research laboratories and the oil-shale demonstration plant contemplated by this legislation now are in full operation. A coal hydrogenation demonstration plant will be in operation next summer. Dr. James Boyd, Director of the Bureau of Mines, is here and shortly will give you further details on these operations.

In a recent statement on petroleum requirements before the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Secretary of Defense James Forrestal said:

"The manufacture of synthetic liquid fuels from coal and shale has the considerable advantage of very extensive coal and shale resources in the United States. I am of the firm opinion," he said, "that the United States Government should not only support pilot-plant operations in the synthetic liquid-fuel industry but also should support a few large-scale plants sufficient to provide the engineering know-how and to advance technical developments. The encouragement and promotion of the synthetic liquid-fuel developments is an important part of the petroleum policy of the National Military Establishment."

The development of synthetic fuels should be an equally important part of our national economic policy. A serious deficiency of liquid fuels could stop us abruptly in our progress toward greater industrial achievement and a strong, expanding economy. We have evidence of that possibility today in the closing of industrial plants and the laying off of workers as a result of the current shortage of petroleum.

It is my own conviction that the magnitude of a synthetic fuels industry adequate to compensate for the foreseeable deficiency in domestic petroleum requires that a start be made immediately, using data already available from research and demonstration plant work. The establishment of such an industry would be far too large an operation and would require too much time to be undertaken only after a national emergency had arisen. To attempt it then inevitably would result in a repetition of the oft-told tale of too little, too late.

To produce daily from synthetic sources the 2,000,000 additional barrels of oil (or slightly less than 40 percent of our current daily consumption) which Secretary Forrestal has said would be needed for another major war effort would require, according to preliminary estimates, about 16,000,000 tons of steel and the expenditure of approximately $9,000,000,000. Such a program would be about 10 times the magnitude of the synthetic-rubber program completed during the last war. It should be undertaken now so that it can be completed over a period of 5 to 10 years, not only as a defense measure but also for our economic security.

In my report I suggested that at least three commercial-size plants should be built as prototypes and as soon as possible if this country is to attain maximum progress toward self-sufficiency in oil. The first would utilize oil shale; the second, coal and the hydrogenation process; and the third, coal and the gas synthesis process.

These plants, I feel, should be built and operated by private industry. Without governmental assistance in some form industry may be reluctant to start plant construction at this stage in the development of synthetic fuels processes with the competition of cheaper petroleum still prevailing and the future clouded with uncertainties.

The immediate requirement is that construction of the initial commercial plants begin at the earliest possible moment. Toward that end, with the advice of industrial groups and the technical aid of the Bureau of Mines, I intend soon to offer specific proposals to initiate an American synthetic liquid-fuels industry.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I did not want the debate to close without paying tribute to the author and to the committee that reported this bill for the wisdom they have manifested and for their conservatism in the amount authorized. I believe every cent of it is wisely authorized. I believe you could go even further than you in your wisdom have gone. Yet I certainly do want to congratulate the committee and the author of the bill for bringing this measure to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), is amended by changing the words "five years", in the first sentence, to read "eight years", and by changing the numeral "$30,000,000", in section 6, to read "$60,000,000."

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: On page 1, line 6, strike out the period and insert the following: "and by adding to section 1 of the act the following: 'and a program of production research and secondary recovery from stripper oil fields and in refining processes.' "

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving a point of order, Mr. Chairman, as the amendment was read, was it an amendment to line 6 of the bill with a further amendment of the original bill?

The CHAIRMAN The amendment goes to page 1, line 6, of the bill now before the committee.

Mr CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I ask to have the amendment again read?

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman what he thinks the cost of that program would be, that would be provided for a feature not incorporated in the basic act at the present time?

Mr. GAVIN. That is a rather difficult question to answer. However, I do think that this program could be safely undertaken for approximately $1,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Obviously if we are going to take a considerable amount of money out of the authorization for establishing a new program, it would raise a question as to its desirability on this legislation. I would be glad to withhold the point of order and let the gentleman make a statement. I would like to have it understood, however, that if this program of research is to be extended to a program of research for secondary recovery from stripper wells and refining processes, that not more than a million dollars be allocated to such purpose from this particular authorization.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think these figures have not been put into the RECORD and they are very important. Experts have recently testified that while we have a recovery in this country of 28,000,000,000 barrels of oil, their estimates in the same fields show that 100,000,000,000 barrels could be recovered. In the Bradford field in Pennsylvania, for example, by primary recovery methods they took from that field 236,000,000 barrels, and then by the application of secondary recovery processes they got another 236,000,000 barrels, but they still have in that field alone more oil not recovered than has been recovered.

Mr. GAVIN. At that point may I say they contend there are between six and seven hundred million barrels still remaining in the sand, and I call to your attention, that is a very old field.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is true. Some gentlemen have made the statement that we now have recoverable reserves of some 22,000,000,000 barrels. We have at

least 100,000,000,000 barrels in those same areas that are not recoverable under present production methods. This bill is a bill to increase the fuel supplies in the country. It certainly ought to be extended to experimentation into the recovery of petroleum. What we want is something that will benefit the country as a whole. These secondary recovery processes are tremendously important. It might interest you to know that of the 420,000 oil wells in this country now, 300,000 of them or 70 percent, are stripper wells. That is, small wells, producing 3, 5, 6, or 7 barrels a day. Those wells are being abandoned at a tremendous rate. I think 9,000 were abandoned last year.

Mr. GAVIN. Nine thousand in 1945. Abandonment of these wells leave approximately 18,000,000 barrels of oil in the ground beneath those wells that have not been recovered but must be recovered by some new technique of reaching those sands to get that oil out.

Mr. GOSSETT. Then again it is entirely probable that scientists will, by the development of new formulas for manufacture, be able to make the existing supplies of gasoline go twice as far. So that when you exclude from the provisions of this bill all stripper fields and refining processes you are taking out of operation a tremendous area in which some experimentation should be carried on.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As explained, the amendment should serve the broad basic purpose of increasing fuel reserves and supplies. My object in raising the point of order was to be sure that we have a limitation on the amount diverted to this phase of research from this particular authorization. I believe the chairman has some language in mind to accomplish this; or it could be accomplished by inserting right after the word "and" of the amendment the additional words: "That not to exceed $1,000,000 of the amount authorized by this act may be applied to a program," and so forth.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would agree to the gentleman's suggestion for this reason: The other day, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] I had in my office Mr. Larry Smith, of the Independent Petroleum Association of America; John Paul Jones; and Don T. Andrus. I asked them what amount of money would be necessary to start this program. Some people naturally would like to get all the money they could, but then I thought it would seem high, so I asked: "Why do you not start out with the program of investigation and then enlarge the program as you progress in the development of some process that will extract this oil from the ground?" They thought that was a wise procedure, and Mr. Larry Smith said: "If we had a million dollars we think we could go ahead and start this program satisfactorily." For this reason, I think a limitation of $1,000,000 is all right.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. I shall not object, but I would suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that hereafter he come before the committee with such suggestions rather than to bring them in at this late time, when the bill is about to be passed.

Mr. RICH. I would remind the gentleman that the bill had already been reported from his committee when I talked with these gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the amendment as it would be modified by the suggestion of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as it would be modified.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the period and insert the following: "and by adding to section 1 of the act the following: 'and that not to exceed $1,000,000 of the amount authorized by this act may be applied to a program of research on secondary recovery from stripper oil fields and in refining processes.' "

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if that is acceptable I will withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] wishes to raise a question as to the interpretation of the word "stripper." Let us clarify that right now. We will accept the modification.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the amendment to the amendment is acceptable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania I will withdraw my point of order.

Mr. GAVIN. I will agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment as indicated?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAVIN: Page 1, line 6, strike out the period and insert the following: "and by adding to section 1, of the act the following: 'And not to exceed $1,000,000 of the amount authorized by this act may be applied to a program of research on secondary recovery from stripper oil fields and in refining processes'."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, when I first heard the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] and the proposal sanctioned by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and other gentlemen from the older oil-producing sections, it occurred to me that it was a good idea. However, I thought at first that instead of offering it as an amendment to this bill, it ought to be offered as separate legislation for certainly it is worthy of a large and independent authorization and appropriation. We are told that under present methods oil fields are considered depleted and are frequently abandoned while there is yet remaining in the ground three or four times as much oil as has been taken out of that field. If such is the case, we certainly ought to have research to find methods and technique for getting a larger proportion out than we are now getting.

Since the amendment has been amended and now limits the amount of this authorization to be used in the research on stripper wells and for more efficient methods of recovery in the oil fields, I certainly am in favor of the amendment. As I understand it, it merely earmarks $1,000,000 out of the $30,000,000 contained in the bill for this type of research work. I doubt whether a million dollars is enough, but certainly this is a kind of research which ought to be encouraged.

I am no engineer, and I may be indulging in some wishful thinking, but I hope that a new technique has already been found for extracting more oil from a field which has formerly been considered exhausted. In the September issue of Fortune magazine for 1947 I found an article entitled "Horizontal Drilling," in which it is claimed that a great engineer has been able by a new method to tap and extract petroleum and other liquid minerals from the earth with far greater efficiency than can be done by presently used methods of pumping from vertical wells. The appearance of this article in such a reliable magazine leads me to hope that better recovery in all of our oil fields may be expected in the future.

Other articles that I have read in earlier issues of the Fortune magazine for 1947 lead me to hope that a practical, efficient, economical technique will be worked out whereby gas or oil may be extracted from coal in the ground or distilled from shale in place in inaccessible regions and the commercial product transported to industrial centers where needed without the great cost of mining and shipping great tonnage of ore. Much more than a million dollars could well be invested in research that will show if these things are possible and feasible.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor for the purpose of clarifying the definition of "stripper wells."

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily and enthusiastically in favor of Mr. GAVIN'S amendment. I want to be clearly understood on that point. No money that could be allocated by the Congress could be productive of such long-range benefits to the Nation as to increase and improve the production of oil and the discontinuance of the abandonment in old oil fields of more than half of our oil reserves which are never recovered.

I take the floor at this time to inquire of the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], if he will enlighten us on the meaning of "stripper wells"?

I am sure he does not wish to confine this to the extremely small producers of

5 or 10 barrels a day, but intends to include in the definition of "stripper wells" any field in which a large quantity of oil remains but which cannot be produced economically under known production methods.

Mr. GAVIN. I may say in answer to the gentleman's question that he is correct. That is my interpretation.

Mr. MONRONEY. This will not limit it to small pumping wells but will include those wells in which a large reserve of oil is still there but which cannot be produced economically at this time?

Mr. GAVIN. And I might say in those fields many oil wells are being rapidly abandoned because there is no economic justification for continued pumping as they do not produce sufficient oil. Once the well is abandoned, the oil in the earth is lost. We should make every effort to carry on programs of research to find new methods to recover that oil, particularly in those fields to which the gentleman refers. The gentleman is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to have the gentleman's clarification because I think it is of extreme importance to this country.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman, being from an oil-producing State, knows that a stripper well, of course, is where a pool of oil has been depleted beyond a recoverable prog am under present and existing methods. A well at the present time might be classified as a stripper well producing 5, 10, or 12 barrels per day. Under methods of a secondary recovery program that well might produce many, many more barrels a day.

Mr. MONRONEY. Exactly.

Mr. HARRIS. And the gentleman is correct when he says that a stripper well may not be limited to the ultimate recovery of oil to only 4 or 5 barrels.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is exactly right. To make my position more clear, oil is being produced in my State below 10,000 feet deep. Obviously a well that is producing from 1,000 feet, that produces 4 or 5 barrels a day, is of no greater importance to the country than a well 12,000 feet deep producing 300 to 500 barrels a day. Both of them might be uneconomical under the present known production methods. It is for this reason, I think, that we have to stimulate the ultimate recovery of the maximum oil reserves of this country that are still in the ground and which under present methods are abandoned and posterity loses all hope of recovery of at least 50 percent of our oil reserves.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill is a research bill providing methods of study to determine a new way of bringing into being a new type of fuel. Do I understand from the pending amendment that the result might be that uneconomical wells will be subsidized?

Mr. MONRONEY. Oh, no, the gentleman is completely misinformed.

Mr. GAVIN. That has no bearing on the question at all. This amendment is for the purpose of research to find new methods to try to get the greatest amount of oil out of the earth that is recoverable.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I wanted to clear up. I wanted to know whether or not it is a research bill or whether or not the company will be subsidized to the extent of making the operation profitable in getting the oil out of the ground.

Mr. GAVIN. This is for research only, studies to be conducted by the Bureau of Mines, to recover oil still remaining in the sands.

Mr. MICHENER. I cannot imagine the gentleman from Pennsylvania favoring a subsidy even though it might have some effect in his own district.

Mr. GAVIN. I may say to the gentleman, my very good and able friend from Michigan, this has no bearing on subsidies and he knows how I feel about subsidies.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is important to have these scientific methods applied and that was the purpose of my question to clarify this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] for the foresight he has in suggesting this amendment because I can visualize, as one who has served on many committees of the Congress that investigated the oil situation in this country and also in the Saudi Arabian area, how important it is for us to take advantage of every opportunty we can to develop whatever resources we have, even to the point of our stripper well operations. We all know that the future is uncertain so far as this Nation is concerned, being on wheels as we are, and the prospect that at some time not in the too far distant future the international situation may flare up to a point where we may need a great supply of oil.

We know what the conditions in the Middle East are now. We know the political situation that is rapidly developing, and we know that this country today has not enough oil, and so far as we can anticipate we are faced with the proposition, unless we get into the study pertaining to shale oil and the further development of our stripper well operations, and so on, that we may reach the point where those who are now using oil will have to revert to coal or some other means of heat and locomotion. If, as a result of research, we can develop and produce more oil than we can under present methods, thus augmenting the supply in Pennsylvania and other States, along with our study of the shale operation, I know it will mean a great deal to the State of Pennsylvania as well as to the rest of the country; that is the thing that we ought to do. I am heartily in accord with the amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered today to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. SCRIVNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), pursuant to House Resolution 453, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes,' approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a statement by Dr. Schroeder, of the Bureau of Mines, on the synthetic liquid fuels of the United States.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. MURDOCK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Torrance Herald of Torrance, Calif., under date of January 8, 1948.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the proper committee of the House for consideration a resolution passed by Captain Lester S. Wass Post, No. 3, American Legion, Gloucester, Mass., regarding legislation benefiting widows and other dependents of war veterans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WHAT FOREIGN AID MEANS TO MY PEOPLE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the people of my congressional district that foreign gifts, advances for relief and rehabilitation, and other authorizations made to foreign countries by our Government since July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1947, amount to $73,092,058,013. More particularly I want to talk about the gifts since the end of the war, from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, amounting to $24,099,211,087. Think of that staggering sum, and we have given away many hundred millions since June 30, 1947. Those are peacetime gifts and are the ones I shall dwell upon at this time. The other wartime figures are just too staggeringly large to comprehend.

Consider the peacetime gifts since the end of the war, amounting to over twenty-four billion, and the suggested gifts of $17,000,000,000 under the Marshall plan, and the additional $800,000,000 suggested within the past few days for China and the Orient. I shall not even consider today this China gift at this time.

On the basis of the 1940 census, the sum of $24,099,211,087 means $183 for every man, woman, and child in America. It is $616 for the average American family. Now, I want to point out to my people what foreign aid since VJ-day means to them, and I insert a table listing the counties in my district in Pennsylvania, the population of each, and the amount it will eventually cost them if we grant the full aid advocated under the present Marshall plan:

County	1940 population	Foreign aid, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1947, peacetime assistance	Foreign aid proposed by Truman-Marshall plan now pending	Total foreign aid provided and proposed since July 1, 1945
Cameron	6,852	$1,254,121.56	$988,743.60	$2,242,865.16
Clinton	34,557	6,324,967.71	4,986,575.10	11,311,542.81
Lycoming	93,633	17,137,647.99	13,511,241.90	30,648,889.89
McKean	56,673	10,372,859.19	8,177,913.90	18,550,773.09
Potter	18,201	3,331,329.03	2,626,404.30	5,957,733.33
Tioga	35,004	6,406,782.12	5,051,077.20	11,457,859.32
Total	244,930	44,827,707.60	35,341,956.00	80,169,663.60

Now, residents of the Fifteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, you see that if this sum is appropriated it will cost you over $80,000,000. A sizable sum, I would say. It is too large for me to obligate my people to pay without their consent.

I insert here a chart showing the amount the Fifteenth District has paid, by counties, for the year 1946, in county tax, road, and borough, and school tax, as well as prior years collections amounting to $638,445. These figures are from the department of internal affairs at Harrisburg, and the 1947 figures are not yet available. It will be noted that the total tax collected for 1946 from the six counties amounted to $5,587,452.

Tax levies and collections for the Fifteenth Congressional District, 1946

Unit	1946 levy	1946 collections	Prior years collections	Total
M'KEAN COUNTY				
County tax	$281,007	$246,531	$16,882	$263,413
Road and borough	492,019	448,839	30,897	479,736
School	1,028,778	868,477	137,213	1,005,690
Total	1,801,804	1,563,847	184,992	1,748,839
POTTER COUNTY				
County tax	90,672	68,661	32,029	100,690
Road and borough	70,994	50,970	14,296	65,266
School	146,461	108,318	25,484	133,802
Total	308,127	227,949	71,809	299,758
TIOGA COUNTY				
County tax	209,850	165,306	30,358	195,664
Road and borough	146,189	121,944	8,469	130,413
School	350,762	262,808	48,476	311,284
Total	706,801	550,058	87,303	637,361

Tax levies and collections for the Fifteenth Congressional District, 1946—Continued

Unit	1946 levy	1946 collections	Prior years collections	Total
LYCOMING COUNTY				
County tax	$360,000	$323,498	$74,755	$398,253
Road and borough	608,513	573,862	78,709	652,571
School	1,284,762	1,120,389	61,153	1,181,542
Total	2,253,275	2,017,749	214,617	2,232,366
CLINTON COUNTY				
County tax	145,651	105,722	22,966	128,688
Road and borough	123,273	102,623	14,358	116,981
School	326,751	257,912	34,450	292,362
Total	595,675	466,257	71,774	538,031
CAMERON COUNTY				
County tax	44,864	39,714	5,424	45,138
Road and borough	25,045	22,590	2,526	25,116
School	65,639	60,843		60,843
Total	135,548	123,147	7,950	131,097
Grand total	5,801,230	4,949,007	638,445	5,587,452

Let us analyze what $80,000,000 for the Fifteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania really means in tangible terms. For instance, the salary of a Congressman is $12,500 per annum, plus $2,500 expense account, making a total of $15,000 per annum. This gift of $80,000,000 would pay the salary of your Congressman for more than 5,000 years. And $80,000,000 will pay the salaries of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives at $15,000 a year for more than 12 years. This is the amount we are asked to give away.

Eighty million dollars will pay for 16,000 homes at $5,000 each for veterans in our district. Is not that something to give to foreign countries? Eighty million dollars will pay 22,000 workers a salary of $3,600 a year. Eighty million dollars will pay all the county, road, and borough, and school taxes of all the people in Cameron, Clinton, Lycoming, McKean, Potter, and Tioga Counties for over 14 years, on the basis of the 1946 taxes. And on the basis of the taxes you paid in 1946, $80,000,000 will pay the taxes of all the people in Williamsport and Lycoming County, which includes your city, your school, your county, your institutions, your road and borough taxes, for over 35 years. Is that not astounding? As stated above, it will pay my home county of Clinton taxes for over 140 years. Would you not like to be relieved of all these taxes? Well, you will be taxed just that much additional if Congress votes the seventeen billions for European recovery as proposed by the Marshall plan. I believe the people would and should change their Member of Congress mighty quick who sold them down the river in this manner and placed such a great obligation upon them for so many years to come.

Eighty million dollars will pay $100 a month to 1,000 aged people in the Fifteenth Congressional District for over 60 years. Would that not satisfy the Townsend clubs?

Just see what the Congress is asked to give away to foreign countries. It is not to help the starving; it is to put these foreign countries on their feet, as it were. But remember that in 1945 we gave Great Britain $4,400,000,000 to do that. Now they are asking $5,348,000,000 additional out of this $17,000,000,000 foreign-aid program. Do you want your Congressman to obligate you for this amount, when the money is being used to socialize Great Britain? It does not make sense to me. Added to our already huge national debt, consider what this will mean to our people. Can you stand it? Has the Congress the right to sell our people short without their consent? It seems to me there has long been need for revision in the executive branch of our Government, from the top to the bottom, and the place to start is in the State Department at once, before it is too late. The New Deal State Department and the President will give us away.

Our national debt now is $267,000,000,000—so large it will take the best we can do for 50 years to pay it. The President has asked for $39,700,000,000 to run the Government for next year. That is entirely too much. He is proposing too many new things before we settle the ones already started. He will wreck us as sure as the world turns on its axis if we do not stop him. Why start socialized medicine now, to cost at least $800,000,000 a year? Why start the St. Lawrence seaway now, at a cost of about a billion dollars? It will do Canada three times as much good as us, and we pay the greater share of the expense. Can we afford it at this time? I say no. Why start universal military training now, at a cost of some $3,000,000,000

a year until we have a stable government? We must keep our Nation strong in air power and scientific warfare, and strengthen our State militia. Federal aid to education has been suggested at a cost of $800,000,000 or more a year. Do we want politics in our public schools? Heaven forbid!

Let us be sensible and make a complete survey of our income and outgo before assuming burdens that will break us down and put us in bankruptcy. If I were called to visit one of my constituents and he needed help, I would try to assist him. If he had a home that needed repairs, I would try to get repairs for him—I would not offer to build him a new and expensive house. If he needed food, I would help him get it. I would try to see that he had a job so that he could earn his living—I would not buy him a farm. Probably we should assist in the rehabilitation of European factories. However if a factory were not up to the standard of the best American factories, it would not be my idea to buy absolutely new, up-to-date machinery and install it, to be used later in competition with our American factories while they must wait for equipment. Our State Department does not work that way. They are of the New Deal type; they do not know the value of the taxpayers' dollar. I say their policy must be changed by electing a Republican President—that is the only way it can be done.

When the 16 European nations made their first report of the amount required, they asked for $42,000,000,000. Easy money. Secretary Marshall said it was not so easy, so they scaled the amount down to $22,000,000,000, just about 50 percent reduction in 3 weeks. Then the State Department scaled it down to $17,000,000,000. Now we want to scale the full amount down to not more than $2,500,000,000 all told. If they cannot go it with that we might as well pick up our marbles and come home. Do too much for others and it is worse than not enough. We have had that proven to us by experience. So get wise and economize.

Where is the United Nations? Where is the Bretton Woods Bank? Where is the Stabilization Fund? We heard so much about them several years ago; why do they not function? They left God out when they opened the sessions of the United Nations. Anything will fail if you do not have God as a partner—nationally or individually.

Out of this seventeen-billion gift, tell me why Holland should be given $2,436,000,000? Why give Denmark $582,000,000? Why give Ireland $497,000,000? Why give Iceland $38,000,000? Why give Norway $234,000,000? Why give Portugal $150,000,000? Why give Sweden and Switzerland $700,000,000? Why assume France's and England's share of the burden in Germany? Why assume all the burden of all the peoples of the world? Why give to our former enemies, Germany, Italy, and Austria, the amount of $7,000,000,000? This gift bag does not make sense to me; it looks more like a grab bag.

If we wreck our own country we are of no use to ourselves or to anybody else. As it stands, the Marshall plan is too good for foreign countries and too bad for us. I shall not vote for it as is. I shall do what I can to protect the interest of my own people, and I hope the Congress will not vote this millstone to be hung around their necks for generations to come. We might as well be realistic and conclude we cannot assume such a burden.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to discuss the Marshall plan. Through the Friendship Trains and by the shipping of millions of packages to the needy people of Europe, the American people have again demonstrated their generosity to people in time of need.

All of us want to help the needy and the hungry of the war ravished nations. We only differ in amounts and in method. After World War I Herbert Hoover and other leading citizens went to Europe where they supervised and saw to it that the millions of dollars of relief really got to the poor people who needed it. If the major part of our relief was handled in this way in Europe today, we would build up more good will and help more needy people at a fraction of the cost under the method the administration is now using which is costing billions of dollars.

The church organizations of the Nation, the Salvation Army and millions of generous spirited citizens would back a plan along this line if the Government would only get out of the way and give them a chance. The Government would only need to furnish the transportation and pay the expenses of some supervision. The Red Cross and the Salvation Army could share a large part of the burden of overseeing the distribution, yet the Government clings to the more expensive and less effective way.

Mr. Speaker, after loading down the American taxpayers with $56,000,000,000 given away to other nations during the war, and $20,000,000,000 more given to them since the close of the war, the administration is now determined to load an additional $20,000,000,000 on to the economy of this country and the American taxpayers as a gift to European countries under the Marshall plan. How long can this extravagant "give-away policy" of the Truman administration continue without completely wrecking the financial solvency of our Nation?

Instead of building homes for our veterans who won the war, and our civilians who supported the war effort, they now propose in this Marshall plan to give away to Europe enough in material, supplies and money to build 5,000,000 American homes costing $4,000 each, at a time when our veterans who won the war cannot get homes. In order to understand how much $20,000,000,000 really is, let us compare it in another way. Through work, investment, sacrifice and struggle, it has taken over 100 years to build in this country the greatest railroad system in the world. The amount asked for to be given to Europe under the Marshall plan is equal to the value of all the railroad systems of the United States including lands, rails, rolling stock, depots and office buildings.

Mr. Speaker, the administration playing upon the heart-strings of the American people in an effort to put over the $20,000,000,000 Marshall plan has continuously told the people that its major purpose was to feed the starving people of Europe. That is a false premise as I shall show in a break-down of the figures.

Hundreds of thousands of people are thrown out of work today because factories are shut down, and other hundreds of thousands of people in their homes, and wards in hospitals are suffering because they cannot get sufficient fuel oil for heat during these winter months. With this serious condition existing in the United States, there is written into the present bill to be furnished to Europe, for the first 15 months of the Marshall plan, $651,900,000 worth of petroleum products. It is admitted we cannot furnish all of these products, and it is admitted by the sponsors of the bill that we will buy what we cannot furnish from Venezuela and other countries, pay for it, ship, and give it away at the expense of our taxpayers.

Remember, this is only the first installment on the Marshall plan. It will have three more years to run if approved by the Congress. We will be compelled to do this at a time when there is a shortage of oil in this country and it is predicted the shortage will get worse in the years to come. Such a commitment will endanger our own national defense and work great hardships on the American people.

Under this first Marshall plan installment we are to give them $262,500,000 worth of tobacco, and we are committed to buy $30,900,000 from other countries and ship to them in addition. I submit that fuel oil and tobacco are not food for starving women and children as the radio commentators and the administration leaders continue to tell the people.

We are to furnish $285,800,000 worth of crude and finished steel and buy $27,100,000 worth of steel from other countries which we will send to Europe. Steel, short in this country, is not food.

We are to ship and give to the European countries $580,800,000 worth of American cotton and buy from other Western Hemisphere countries $209,200,000 worth of cotton under the first year of the Marshall plan. Again, cotton is not food.

The following table will disclose that under the first 15 months of the Marshall plan with the high cost of living and inflation upon our Government, that we are to ship to the European countries $1,275,500,000 worth of food products as follows:

Break-down of food

Bread grains	$753,800,000
Fats and oils	100,400,000
Sugar	27,900,000
Meat	7,700,000
Dairy products	235,200,000
Eggs	36,000,000
Dried fruits	33,500,000
Rice	7,200,000
Other foods	73,800,000
Total	1,275,500,000

The next table will give you a breakdown of many articles including farm machinery that is to be shipped from the United States to Europe under the first 15 months of the Marshall plan:

Tobacco	$262,500,000
Petroleum products	651,900,000
Agricultural machinery	136,000,000
Coal	388,300,000
Mine machinery	81,900,000
Timber	96,300,000
Electric equipment	95,000,000
Trucks	80,900,000
Freight cars	60,000,000
Steel equipment	48,100,000
Timber equipment	16,900,000
Oil cake and meal	21,100,000
Nitrogen	16,400,000
Phosphates	3,100,000
Cotton	580,800,000
Steel	285,800,000
Total	2,825,000,000

Mr. Speaker, including these and other items the United States is to furnish in supplies and ship to Europe under the first 15 months of the Marshall plan $4,500,000,000 in goods. We are to buy from other Western Hemisphere countries $2,360,000,000 worth of merchandise paid for by the American taxpayer to be shipped to Europe. You will note that of this vast amount that only about 20 percent of it is for food for the hungry people of Europe. The administration's propaganda machine has tried to sell the people that the Marshall plan had for its chief purpose the alleviation of hunger in western Europe.

These figures show what a deceptive and false propaganda campaign has been imposed upon the people of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this Marshall plan in fact sets up a world-wide WPA for the purpose of rebuilding 16 nations, including Ireland, Sweden, and Portugal, who did not participate in the war, and including the colonies and dependencies of France in Africa, Holland's dependencies, dependencies of the United Kingdom, and the dependencies of Portugal at the expense of the American taxpayers. If we make this move we will later have to include the countries of South America and other countries of the world.

The figures further show to everyone that to carry this program through shipping this vast amount of cotton, tobacco, steel, petroleum, bread grains, meat, fruit and dried products, farm machinery, coal, timber that we are short of, needed in housing for veterans, electrical equipment, trucks, freight cars, fertilizers, and hundreds of other articles, is the real cause of the present high cost of living.

The American people ought not to be called upon to make this sacrifice. Our Government cannot make this sacrifice without bringing on inflation that may wreck this country. Our Government is not in a position financially with a debt of $256,000,000,000 to carry this load. Our American taxpayers who are entitled to relief from high wartime taxes should not be called upon to finance the giving away of even the first installment of the Marshall plan, which I have shown above will cost our country $6,800,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of these facts the President, his Cabinet officers who are under his control, all tell the public that the expense of the Marshall plan can be borne without much strain on the economy of our country. They know and the people know such statements are not true.

After exporting over 40 percent of the wheat of the Nation during 1947, the Secretary of Agriculture has the audacity to tell the American people and the Congress that the rise in the cost of living is little affected by the shipping away of this vast amount of wheat and foodstuffs, and blames the Republican Party for the high cost of living.

This administration, in cooperation with the international bankers, and the greedy exporters out for every dollar they can get are now putting on the greatest propaganda drive ever known, in an effort to convince the American people under the guise of preventing starvation and stopping communism, that the $20,000,000,000 Marshall plan should be approved.

Mr. Speaker, in the beginning of this drive those supporting the Marshall plan would never definitely say that it would stop the spread of communism in Europe. They knew it would not. Secretary of State Marshall said it was a calculated risk. Some of them now boldly say it will stop the spread of communism in western Europe. Recently they have resorted to fear in an attempt to scare the American people, and by the greatest use of double talk and deception in high places in Government probably ever witnessed in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, when the Congress, less than a year ago, voted the Greek-Turkish loan we were assured that it would stabilize Greece, a little country with 7,000,000 people. We had already given that country over $700,000,000. Greece is but a little better off today than she was then, and the President will soon ask for many millions more for Greece. They were wrong again.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 years ago when the administration insisted that the Congress vote the $4,000,000,000 British loan we were told it would shore up the English Government for 3 years, and probably no more money would be needed from the United States. England is now listed on the Marshall plan for about $5,000,000,000 more if it goes through. They have spent most all of the $4,000,000,000 and the most they have to show for it is the perpetuation of their socialist government in power. They were wrong again.

The President now asks this Congress to vote a $6,800,000,000 first installment on the Marshall plan. If we can judge the future by the past 25 years in loaning money to European countries, we may as well realize that it is a gift and none of it will ever be returned. We may as well realize that we are in for twenty or twenty-five billion dollars on the Marshall plan before we are through.

Mr. Speaker, our European Allies with whom we won the First World War, in loans and interest on such loans owe us over $10,000,000,000 on World War I. Neither France nor England or any country except little Finland ever made a real attempt to pay back the money loaned them over 25 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, on the plea to prevent starvation in France and Italy, $540,000,000 was voted by this Congress. They told the American people it was to save people from starvation. They did not tell the people that everything that was shipped to France and Italy was turned over to the Governments, and that the Governments sold it to the people. That with such distribution the poor and hungry got the last chance at the food we gave them. They did not tell the American people that less than 25 percent of the money expended was or will be used to send food to those two countries. A great portion of it was for finished manufactured products, steel, raw material, machinery of every kind, and oil and petroleum products which are so short now in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, a news dispatch from Paris on January 17 said:

> France received $53,000,000 worth of goods from the United States in the first 24 days after Congress approved interim aid to Europe.

United States Ambassador Jefferson Caffery said:

> Shipments to January 10 included 1,250,000 tons of coal, only 140,000 tons of bread grains, 200,000 tons of petroleum, 28,000 tons of fertilizer, chemicals, oil, sisal, and cotton.

Less than 30 percent of the $20,000,000,000 asked for in the Marshall plan will be spent for food. The generous-hearted people of America are being deceived. Just last week the State Department wanted to give European nations under the Marshall plan 500 American ships costing our Government over a billion dollars. The Congress will not allow this to be done.

Mr. Speaker, the Marshall plan is a bold one. They propose to ship some of practically all of the production of the United States. They propose to ship out vast quantities of petroleum products when Secretary Krug testified a few days ago that this Government should plan to spend $9,000,000,000 with which to build synthetic plants to convert shale and coal to oil and gas, because he foresees as do most of the American people, ultimately a great shortage of oil in this Nation. They propose to ship finished locomotives, to ship steel plants and factories if they see fit, and to ship out immense quantities of steel and finished products of every kind when we are so short of steel in this country that we must delay building homes for our people, railway cars, manufacture less farm machinery, and when, because of a shortage of steel, we cannot build a pipe line with which to transport oil and gas from the oil fields of Texas to other sections of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the President cries out against inflation, when, in fact, every policy he has initiated since we won the war has increased inflation. There can be no doubt there is a determined effort on the part of this administration to manage the affairs of this country in such a way as will keep inflation and the high cost of living up until after the November election.

The Marshall plan is certain to continue to increase the cost of living, and will keep inflation running rampant.

Mr. Speaker, this administration which recommended UNRRA, a complete failure

with a loss to this Nation of over $2,000,000,000; that recommended the British loan, Bretton Woods, and the Greek-Turkish loan, all of which have proved a succession of failures, now asks the Members of this Congress to again approve their judgment on $20,000,000,000 more to implement the Marshall plan. With such a record of mistakes we cannot trust their judgment on this proposition which might wreck the financial stability of our Government.

Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Denmark, Switzerland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, without any aid other than some loans, are up to 90 percent prewar production now, and communism is receding in those countries. The Congress should continue with such aid as is necessary for Germany and Austria 1 year at a time. It is entirely possible that England, France, and Italy may be able to get along, if they will make the proper efforts on their own behalf, without much further aid from the United States. If it is found they should have further aid, no aid should be contracted for more than 1 year. The proposition to bring in 16 nations regardless of whether or not they need aid and attempt to write the 4-year plan of aid of $20,000,000,000 for them is too unreasonable and fantastic to seriously consider.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress goes through and fastens such an enormous expense on the United States Government there is grave danger that it will wreck financially the only government left in the world capable of continuing its might and power of leadership for the preservation of freedom and liberty, and for world peace.

Mr. Speaker, why adopt foolish extravagant policies that will bleed this Nation white of its supplies and finances while Russia waits her time watching us weaken ourselves as a nation? Such a policy will not stop communism in western Europe or slow it down in this country.

We should only give the minimum amount to European nations that will cause them to put forth the maximum effort to help themselves. Unless they put forth the maximum effort to help themselves all our help will fail and be wasted.

We had better spend a few billions in building the strongest air force in the world. Reinforce our military strength wherever needed, rather than to waste billions needlessly in too much aid to foreign countries.

The strongest air force in the world and a government alert in getting its military strength ready for any eventuality will have a greater effect in stopping Russia from moving further into western Europe, than to weaken ourselves by building up a richer prize in western Europe, that cannot be defended, a prize that Russia can move in and take at her will.

If we will increase our Air Force, go forward with research, yes, increase our fire power so that Russia will know we mean business, Russia is less likely to squeeze western Europe to the point of precipitating a war with a country that is prepared.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot buy off communism with the Marshall plan or any plan. You may be able to stop it if you invest in our own country one-fourth the billions in national defense that would be wasted under the Marshall plan.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois on the information he has given us. The part of his address so far that has interested me is that only 20 percent of the money to be spent under the Marshall plan is to be used for humanitarian purposes. Could the gentleman tell us what the real purpose of the Marshall plan is?

Mr. VURSELL. That is a very good question. The gentleman has put his finger on the point that I wanted to bring out. This administration has not been truthful and fair with the American people. This administration, with the Wall Street bankers, exporters, the CIO, and everyone they could put their finger on, has been deceiving the American people, trying to get them back of this plan to put pressure on the Congress because it was a bread-and-butter proposition, when in fact it is a world-wide WPA rehabilitation program, to shore up and rehabilitate all the nations of the world. When we get western Europe going, if Stalin does not take a notion to take it over, I am wondering where they are going to sell all these manufactured products that will put them on their feet. It is the most fantastic, ridiculous program that has ever been presented to the world. The most dangerous thing that this weak State Department has done was to invite 16 nations to sit around a conference table and divide up what they though this country should give to them in money and supplies. It was too dangerous for a prudent government to have gone so far out on the limb with.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman care to yield at this time?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman has called the Marshall plan an international WPA. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on January 21 our State Department released to the public captured German documents, official papers which had been captured several years before but not released, showing the alliance between Hitler and Stalin and the objectives of that alliance. The very next day in the House of Commons, Bevin announced it was proposed to form a military alliance of those 16 nations that are to be embraced in the Marshall plan, directed against the Soviet Union. Then the following day—please get the timing of this—the following day our State Department gave a full approval of the military alliance named by Bevin the day before. That to my mind means that those three things were timed, that our State Department and our administration had been consulted before Bevin made his announcement and that we agreed to it. Those three steps are three steps toward not a cold war but a shooting war.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman, I think, is quite right. The trouble with the State Department and with the administration is that it deliberately leads out so far and gets itself and our Nation in such an endangered position on a false premise that they then say to the Congress, "You cannot now do other than to back us up." It appears they had a complete understanding with Britain as the able gentleman from Illinois suspects.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman care to yield further?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I admit I am somewhat confused about the Marshall plan. I read so many conflicting statements in the press and hear so many conflicting statements over the radio as to just what it will do, what its purpose is, that I am wondering if a gentleman connected with the administration who told me a few days ago may not be correct. This gentleman said the real purpose of the Marshall plan was to keep prices high in the United States; that they are more afraid of a depression than anything else. Does the gentleman know anything about whether or not such a statement is true?

Mr. VURSELL. I will touch on that later. There is no doubt in my mind but that one of the real purposes of the Marshall plan is to keep everything high and to keep inflation going until after the election.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. I heard a report yesterday that weather conditions over in Europe are favorable for a sizable crop in the year 1948, that there was plenty of moisture in the land, and that the rainfall was very good. Does not the gentleman think that perhaps that would tend to alleviate the necessity of our sending so much food abroad?

Mr. VURSELL. There is no question that favorable weather will reduce the need for bread grains and food. I know a little about that because we made quite a study of that while I was in Europe. But reverting again to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, I think the position that the Secretary of Agriculture took the other day in stating that they were still going to buy more wheat proves conclusively and without a doubt that they want to keep this inflation up.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to go back to the gentleman's statement that only 20 percent was for humanitarian purposes. It strikes me that is a very important statement. If this is for humanitarian purposes and to prevent starvation, can the gentleman inform us how it happens that the United States has gotten so big-hearted all at once? I understand that for centuries great numbers of people have been dying in India and China every year, dying of starvation, and we have done nothing about it except what the people have

sent just like they are sending now through the Friendship Train and CARE packages. How does it happen that the Government of the United States suddenly becomes interested in starvation from an administration standpoint when it never was before?

Mr. VURSELL. Answering the gentleman's question, I can tell him very little except to say that when we were over there last fall we did not see anyone talking or expecting to starve. While there is a shortage of food and while there have been some strikes there because the people did not have all the food they needed or would like to have, the starvation angle is thrown in only to open the great heart of America, thinking they will relieve that situation when, in fact, 75 percent of every dollar is taken for rehabilitation purposes, and, of course, great amounts of it will be wasted because they now intend to turn this matter over to the State Department and take it out of the hands of the military.

The State Department has had experience only in diplomatic work. I shudder when I think what will happen to the European countries and to our own country when this amount of money is turned over to the State Department.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Insofar as the humanitarian angle is concerned, does the gentleman not believe we would do much more for the suffering people of Europe if the Government of the United States would use some of this money to help the people through friendship trains and through the sending of supplies and foodstuffs for the people themselves; for instance, if we would encourage our people to send food over there, by transporting it free, and if that would not help those people more than we would under the Marshall plan and that it would do more for the good will of America than to hand it out in the form of steel and ships and for political purposes that the gentleman says it is being used for under the Marshall plan?

Mr. VURSELL. There is no doubt but that we could build up a great deal of good will if we would have approached this relief problem after the last war as we approached it after the First World War. Admitting it is much bigger now than it was then, we might have had to go much further, but if we had approached it in the way we did then we would not have so much hatred of us in Europe. We send a shipload of our wheat over there, we give it to the government, the government sells it to the miller for $4.25 a bushel, then it goes to the baker and through the ordinary course the fellow who is most susceptible to communism still has trouble getting food and he does not know that it comes from the United States.

You know, we voted the British loan, we voted for the Greek-Turkish loan, we voted for all of these hand-outs and we were told that all of those things were going to attain the objective that we sought. But none of those things ever happened.

The facts are that this Congress is not justified by the mistakes of the past, including Tehran as shown by Ambassador Lane in writing his book recently, the mistakes that were made at Yalta, which have thrown the world into confusion and practically lost the peace of the world, in further appropriating money for these purposes. Now they seek to cover up and endeavor to cure the situation by asking us to dump in $20,000,000,000 more. And they talk about food? They wanted to give away, under the Marshall plan, 500 ships the other day. I think that will probably be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I have quite a bit more material here that will go in the RECORD, so I will not take more of the time of the House, except to say that the President cries out against inflation, when, in fact, every policy he has initiated since we won the war has increased inflation. There can be no doubt but that there is a determined effort on the part of the administration to so manage the affairs of this country that it will keep inflation going until after the November elections.

We have had the mistakes of UNRRA. We have had all of those mistakes. None of their plans have worked; none of them have been sound. Now they ask us to give to the State Department $20,000,000,000 more out of the pockets of the American people. They seek to saddle a load onto the people of this country that may wreck us completely, the only Nation that is capable of carrying on in a reasonable way for world rehabilitation and world peace.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman and the House to the fact that our appeasement program in connection with Stalin at Yalta, Tehran, at Cairo, at Potsdam, and at Quebec, carried through by Roosevelt first, and then followed up by President Truman, has resulted in the mistakes that have now become history; mistakes that mean that we have lost the peace, as the gentleman has just said; mistakes that have already cost us over $20,000,000,000 since the war, and now they say that in order to rectify those past mistakes we should make one more at the recommendation of the State Department, the one that has made most of these mistakes, and adopt the Marshall plan and hand out anywhere from $20,000,000,000 on up. I do not think those mistakes that they have committed warrant our following their advice in this matter.

Mr. VURSELL. I quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Admiral Standley, testifying before the Committee on Un-American Activities this morning, expressed my views about as well as any man ever has. He said that Russia is attempting to take over the United States by the infiltration method. So, before we go to spending eighteen or twenty billion dollars in Europe, the best thing we can do, as the gentleman has said, is to build the strongest air force on earth and clean the Communists out of this country, beginning, as I said before, with the palace guard of the White House and coming on down through every branch of the Government, and cleaning them out of every labor organization, every college, and every other place of power and influence. If we do that, we will not have any trouble with the Communists abroad.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Certainly what he recommends should be our first objective. I am really extremely serious when I say this: We should not only try to strengthen our Government from a military standpoint, but we should try to strengthen it from a moral standpoint among the people. We have got a job of selling to do today among our own people, starting with the labor leaders and on down to everybody in America, that we must work in harmony together and be more tolerant. We have a job of selling to do with the big men in business in this country; that they should be more tolerant and try to get along with the men whom they employ. It is a pitiful picture to think of the heads of labor meeting down in Florida at the present time putting up their lines for strife against the Congress, for strife against business, and on the other hand businessmen putting up their lines in some instances unjustly, when we have got to have wealth to protect ourselves in the future. We can only get wealth with much greater production. There may come a time when we will have to stand alone and battle for the firesides and freedom of this country. We ought to spend the next few years trying to get ourselves in the strongest financial position instead of the weakest, in the strongest moral condition, and in the strongest patriotic position, so that if the time comes, and it may, when all of this reckless spending spree and foolishness is over, the United States of America in cooperation with the Western Hemisphere may have to defend itself, yes, save itself with its own power, not only mechanical but from a financial standpoint as well.

Let us build up and conserve our strength to the point where we will keep our country strong against any eventuality that may be forced upon us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROCKWELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

FUEL SHORTAGE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind the House that on December 6, last, I telegraphed the President and asked him to place an embargo on the shipment of oil and the sending of tankers to foreign countries. After over two months and a half the President has finally, through the Department of Commerce, issued what amounts to an embargo, through not granting licenses to dealers to send oil abroad from the east coast and certain other areas.

I further remind the House that if the President had done what he did under his war powers regarding coal, and issued

an embargo on oil, there would have been no suffering today in the United States from cold. The action is a long time overdue, and still more should be done. I feel that the shortage of oil and the suffering is not confined to the east coast. There is suffering in Michigan, Wisconsin, and other States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the House should act on this matter, and I have introduced House Joint Resolution 310, to temporarily prohibit the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products. It reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That except as may be necessary to supply the armed forces of the United States, it shall be unlawful to export petroleum or petroleum products from the United States, or any Territory or possession thereof, to any foreign country or countries during the period beginning on the date following the enactment of this joint resolution and until May 1, 1948. Whoever violates this joint resolution shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for 1 year or to both said fine and imprisonment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am much interested in what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has said about the suffering in parts of the United States other than the East. Last week in the city of Des Moines, Iowa, the mayor found it necessary to appoint a committee of five to pool fuel oil used for heating purposes and ration it to the people to prevent acute suffering. There is real suffering in the Midwest from the lack of fuel oil.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know there is. I have not looked at this problem from a sectional point of view.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I appreciate that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel that this is a matter of transportation. Perhaps you have more difficulty than in other places, but I know the suffering is acute in other sections.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Strange as it may seem, Des Moines is a distributing point for one or more pipe lines. Oil comes in there and is stored in huge tanks, and from there it is sent out locally and also piped on to the East. In spite of that, there is an acute shortage of fuel oil in the Midwest territory, where the temperature has been below zero for more than a month, and people are actually suffering.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel there is something very strange about this whole distribution of oil problem?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes; I do. I personally have introduced a bill and I appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning and testified in behalf of the passage of the bill to stop all exports of fuel oil, Diesel oil, and other oils used for heating purposes until the crisis is passed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then our bills are quite similar.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand from what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts says that she has a bill almost identical to mine which she has introduced. I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will give us some relief.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think everyone in the House with whom I have discussed the problem thus far has been very much interested in securing the passage of legislation of the type that we have introduced.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I am very glad to yield to the gentleman because I think it is a problem that affects all of us.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was interested this morning when I appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hear the chairman state that there was sufficient legislation on the statute books now so that the administration could stop the exportation of fuel oil and so forth if they cared to do so in order to relieve suffering of people in the United States and that no further action by the Congress was necessary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is what I stated in my remarks earlier, that on December 6 I telegraphed the President, I think he was in Florida at the time, to issue an embargo which would prevent the shipment of these precious oils which are needed for heating in our own country and prevent suffering. To date no real action has been taken. The Navy has tried to help out a little bit, but the oil they have available for such relief would be just a drop in the bucket as to what we need and they will very likely need their oil themselves and we do not want to deplete their supplies. I think this should have a very great effect on the price structure. I think the prices of oil would go down and I believe that oil would come out of hoarding very quickly and that whole problem would be solved. It is possible that the President may take further action affecting other sections of the country as well as the east coast.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. After all, there is really no excuse for the Government of the United States to ship oil abroad when our own people are suffering.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the exports to Canada have increased 385 percent in a very short time and also that the oil being shipped to other countries at a profit and it is not being used for the Canadians themselves. But I understand very recently oil was being shipped to Russia. I find a growing indignation on the part of the people of this country. People have died of the cold in certain localities. This morning I talked long distance with the city manager of Lowell. He tells me that the reserves of fuel-oil dealers are good for only a day-to-day supply and that an emergency situation could happen any day. You know what the situation is in the District of Columbia and in New York where they have had to ban the use of fuel oil in many buildings. You know of the suffering there. Then I might go on to state, which I will insert in the RECORD, concerning the great increase in the price of oil and the price of gasoline. I know the gentleman from Iowa and other Members will join with me in trying to secure the passage out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee one of the many bills that are before that committee. I know that they will want to see that bill passed by the House. There will be no trouble when such a bill comes to the floor of the House. It is a situation which is almost beyond belief. People are trying to stop the conversion of heating systems from coal to oil. That is a very expensive proposition and I think is very unnecessary if a proper program is worked out. When todays' session of the Congress began, I spoke of a Massachusetts man who had given his life in trying to work out a proper solution of this whole oil problem.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and state that the people from Iowa appreciate her efforts just as well as the people from Massachusetts appreciate her good work.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the veterans appreciate the very fine work that the gentleman did when he was a Member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in securing very valuable legislation for the veterans. The Massachusetts veterans are very grateful to the gentleman from Iowa also.

These oil scarcities will not stop at once. You will have a very far-reaching program before all the legislation that is needed has been passed, in order to have a permanent policy that will give us needed oil.

There have been most mysterious statements made today regarding the amount of oil in the United States; the amount that we import and the amount that we export; and the hoarding of oil. Something should be done about that. But today America first should be kept warm.

STATEMENT OF HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, AT HEARING ON HER BILL, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 310, FEBRUARY 9, 1948

Mr. Chairman, I appear in behalf of my bill, House Joint Resolution 310, "To temporarily prohibit the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products." The fuel situation in the District of Columbia, in New York State, in New England, and other parts of the country grows worse each day.

The city manager at Lowell, Mass., informed me this morning that from information he received from the Lowell fuel-oil dealers, they have on hand only a day-to-day supply, and an emergency situation can happen any day.

The District of Columbia, as you have undoubtedly seen in the newspapers, has had many emergency calls for fuel oil and a "brown out" is contemplated in order to save fuel oil.

In New York City, Mayor William O'Dwyer on January 31, on account of the scarcity of fuel oil, put a ban on the use of it, except to priority users such as dwellings, hospitals, institutions, public utilities, transportation and communications, food and restaurant stores, school and health facilities. All other users were to be denied fuel oil. The situation there has grown worse and the situation is bad in other parts of New York State.

The States on the East coast of the United States have received allotments of fuel oil from the Navy Department which is to be returned to the Navy Department in June.

This United States Navy supply of fuel oil, however, is very small only a "drop in the bucket" in comparison with the needs in the States that receive it. Many of the States have already used their allotment of United States Navy fuel oil.

On account of the scarcity of fuel oil in many parts of the country, the price has increased. A recent national survey of the retail price of gasoline showed that the average in 50 cities scattered throughout the United States was 25.64 cents a gallon, including taxes, the highest it has been since 1921. The retail price of No. 2 fuel oil, the kind used in most home burners, has advanced from 9 and 10 cents a gallon last spring and summer to between 13 and 14 cents. The average wholesale prices of all petroleum products rose 56.1 percent between June 1946 and November 1947.

The present embargo of the Department of Commerce of 50 percent is not sufficient to provide sufficient fuel oil for the home users and other priority users in the United States, therefore a full embargo should be placed on fuel oil for the next 2 months during the cold weather to insure sufficient fuel oil for our use. I am anxious to cooperate with the committee in the matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has expired.

Under previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States merchant marine needs immediate assistance. Under the provisions of laws passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress and the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the United States Maritime Commission is now chartering war-built merchant vessels to American citizens, and is operating a few ships under general agency agreements. Under the same laws, the United States Coast Guard is granting waivers, in some instances, to war-built vessels which do not provide complete compliance with our rules for safety at sea, and is granting waivers to merchant marine personnel when the best interests of the Nation require such waivers and when they can be granted with comparative safety to all concerned.

While the exact numbers are changing from day to day, as of January 15, 1948, there were 1,114 ships under charter from the Maritime Commission, and 111 operating under general agency agreements. These latter, under general agency, were 8 passenger ships, 8 tugs, and 95 tankers, 27 of these tankers being operated by the United States Navy. Thus there were a total of 1,225 Government-owned ships sailing for private operators on January 15, 1948.

It is safe to say that these 1,225 ships require about 50,000 officers and men for their usual crews, exclusive of personnel needed in normal turn-over as the ships complete their regular voyages.

At the same time, there were approximately 1,000 privately owned ships operating on the high seas under the American flag. It is to be noted that these privately owned ships constitute only about four-ninths of the American merchant fleet.

You may ask why more ships are not privately owned. In general, the answer is very simple. It is that the future of American merchant shipping is too uncertain to justify the investment needed to acquire more ships from the Government, even at the comparatively low prices provided under the Ship Sales Act. And now to top off all the uncertainty previously existing—to stop sales almost entirely—the President has submitted a European recovery program which proposes the further transfer of 500 American ships to foreign nations, a proposal which would force an equal number of American ships off the seas.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of law under which American ships are now being chartered, or operated under general agency, expire on March 1, 1948. After that date, these Government-owned ships must be put into the reserve fleet as soon as they have completed the voyage then in progress. Commencing on March 1, more than 1,200 American-flag ships must be withdrawn from the world's commerce under current provisions of law.

Also, on March 1, the authority of the Coast Guard to waive deficiencies of the safety-at-sea rules and of the requirements for rating seagoing personnel will expire. This will cause the withdrawal of numerous additional American vessels from trade routes for the accomplishment of shipyard work just at a time when our repair yards are pretty well jammed by the emergency job of strengthening tankers for the transportation of fuel oil needed now in northern communities.

Mr. Speaker, there are only a few days left before the 1st of March—entirely too few to get remedial legislation through the Congress and give operators a fair break in their business of ocean transportation. The other body passed this legislation on Thursday, February 5, and it should be considered by this House as quickly as our procedure will permit, for now, operators have no surety in offering cargo space or passenger accommodations for voyages which may not be allowable under the law; shippers do not know where to turn for assurance of future transportation on many ocean routes; officers and seamen do not know whether they will have jobs 30 days from this date. Uncertainty prevails almost everywhere in maritime circles. Yet, this is not a matter of asking the Government for more money. Quite to the contrary, this shipping pays the Government in good cold cash, for charter operations brought some $180,000,000 into the United States Treasury during the last fiscal year and set up obligations to the Treasury of some $197,000,000. In addition to the cash return to the Treasury, this shipping involves wages to seagoing personnel and to allied activities ashore in amounts which are considerable even in our present tremendous national economy.

I realize that it is the desire of Congress to get the Government out of commercial shipping, and I concur in that aim, but the time has not arrived when that can be done with safety to the Nation and fairness to the Americans who earn their living in the shipping industry. We must first get world conditions somewhat back to normal. We must decide on what place we are to occupy in the ocean carrying trade of the world. Then again, the factor of national defense enters strongly into the whole merchant-ship problem for we spent $15,000,000,000 in building this merchant-ship fleet during the recent war, and every indicator in the world today points to the need of keeping all components of the national defense at a high level of efficiency.

The merchant marine—personnel, material, and operators—constitute a real part of the national defense.

We need this additional merchant-marine legislation at the earliest possible moment.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] asks unanimous consent to extend the remarks he intended to make at this point, and to include therein some tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to report the text of a press release, which, I understand, was issued from the office of the Secretary of Commerce, late this afternoon.

I do not have the new country allocations and types of petroleum products, but they will be available early tomorrow morning and I shall attempt to analyze them for a full report to the House on Wednesday.

This is the action to which I referred earlier today. I understand it is released for publications in the morning papers, Tuesday.

In order to further insure that no petroleum products in critically short supply are shipped from the area of greatest shortage in the United States the Department of Commerce has prohibited the use of its petroleum export licenses to clear shipments from east coast ports, the Office of Internation Trade said today. Although only negligible amounts of such products have been exported from the east coast in recent months, it was felt advisable to make sure that no shipments are made until supplies in this area are substantially increased.

Shipments from Gulf and west coast ports are not affected. This ruling is effective immediately and will be in force until March 31, OIT officials said. If the critical shortage is continued, it may be necessary to extend the restriction beyond that date, it was announced.

Treasury Department said customs officials along the east coast have been instructed to enforce this regulation.

The restricted petroleum products include gas, oil, distillate fuel oils (used for home heating and Diesel equipment), motor gas, kerosene, and residual fuel oil.

OIT also approved country allocations of petroleum products, revised to conform with the reduction of the export quota for the first quarter of 1948, as announced on January 30. Because of continuing petrolum shortages in the United States, importing countries are being asked to make further reductions in their requests for petroleum products in future quarters.

In addition, they are being asked to review immediately the first quarter allocations as listed below to determine whether further reductions can be achieved during the remaining winter months, OIT officials said.

Mr. Speaker, in the time available for study this evening, against the actions taken on January 16 and January 30, I think this is a completely unsatisfactory step. I am glad that the obvious hole has been plugged, but when we consider such language as "In order to further insure that no petroleum products in critically short supply are shipped from the area of greatest shortage in the United States"; "It was felt advisable to make sure that no shipments are made until supplies in this area are substantially increased"; "If the critical shortage is continued, it may be necessary to extend the restriction beyond that date"; "Because of continuing petroleum shortages in the United States, importing countries are being asked to make further reductions in their requests for petroleum products in future quarters", how inadequate it is.

I do not see how anyone can be satisfied that this goes far enough. Certainly, in terms of the shipments made in the 39 days since the first of the year, it seems perfectly fair to insist that immediate further action be taken to reduce the allocations now announced by a minimum of 50 percent to meet the voluntary program undertaken by Canada and extended last week to the end of April. You will note that this relief extends only to the end of March. Everyone knows how long it takes to go through channels here. Let us assume that this can be done by Saturday. That will leave us only 46 days of partial relief. It may be argued this is a blind approach. Possibly it is, but I submit it is no blinder than the inexplicable moves which have been made since January 16.

Of course, it is encouraging to read that motor gas has been included in view of the warnings of shortages in gasoline and recommendations of rationing in some areas next summer. Of course, it is encouraging that these countries are being asked to review immediately the first quarter allocations to determine whether further reductions can be achieved during the remaining 1 month. I regret that this did not occur to anyone in the Department when the first quarter program was being set up and when everyone in the United States who reads a newspaper or listens to radio programs knew that the Northeast was in difficulty and that there was every chance it would be worse as the winter went along.

Lest there be any misunderstanding of my suggestion, and to cover the possibility of any reluctance to frame a prompt message to these countries, I think a cable such as the following would be thoroughly understood and would win immediate cooperation:

Because petroleum products are in critical short supply in this country and because we must insure that supplies in our shortage areas are substantially increased immediately, and because we may find it necessary to extend the existing restrictions beyond March 31 unless we can readjust the situation in this country promptly, we regret to advise you that we believe, in the interest of continuing production in this country, maintaining transportation and public utilities, keeping our schools and hospitals and churches and other institutions and individual homes heated to a minimum degree, and in the interests of being able to assist your government and your people, as the American people hope to do, we must ask you to accept a 50 percent reduction in the allocations to your country as announced by this Department on February 9, effective immediately.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. KEARNEY), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. COURTNEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 1 week, on account of illness in family.

AUTHORIZATION TO SPEAKER TO PERFORM CERTAIN ACTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Thursday next it shall be in order for the Speaker to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Thursday next it may be in order for the Speaker to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law and by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 134. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190); to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on February 5, 1948, present to the President for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1826. An act making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, February 12, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1291. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 8 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to allow certain commissioned warrant officers of the armed forces to count other active commissioned service in the computation of service for advancement to certain pay periods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1292. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from all appropriations lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1293. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1294. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1947; the number of pieces procured; the estimated mailings; and the estimated costs by departments and agencies for the period July 1 to September 30, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1295. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, and Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1296. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to the act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847, 16 U. S. C., sec. 471, 43 U. S. C. 141 et seq.), showing tabulations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations made under the act during the period from January 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4304. A bill providing for the extension of the time limitations under which patents were issued in the case of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 147. Concurrent resolution establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 and for appropriations for the fiscal year

1949 to be expended in said fiscal year; without amendment (Rept. No. 1361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1195. An act to repeal the laws relating to the length of tours of duty of officers and enlisted men of the Army at certain foreign stations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1528. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury to accept and use gifts, devises, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the Department of the Treasury respectively, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 304. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joel Chandler Harris, author of the Uncle Remus stories; without amendment (Rept. No. 1364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Eighth intermediate report relating to investigation of Agricultural Adjustment Agency and Production and Marketing Administration publicity and propaganda in Nebraska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEWIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4931. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code entitled 'Copyrights,'" approved July 30, 1947; with amendments (Rept. No. 1366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4943. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; with amendments (Rept. No. 1367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Concurrent Resolution 131. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of January 19, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 257. An act for the relief of Yoneo Sakai; without amendment (Rept. No. 1352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew; without amendment (Rept. No. 1353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 316. An act for the relief of Mary Sungduk Charr; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 409. An act for the relief of Milan Jandrich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 457. An act for the relief of Anna Kong Mei; without amendment (Rept. No. 1356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 521. An act to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3787. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4050. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Moke Tcharoutcheff, Mme. Lucie Baptistine Tcharoutcheff and sons, Raymond and Robert Tcharoutcheff; with amendments (Rept. No. 1359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5221) to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance, and the same was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 5305. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Attorney General of a portion of the Vigo plant, formerly the Vigo ordnance plant, near Terre Haute, Ind., to supplement the farm lands required for the United States prison system; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 5306. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowances for railway postal clerks, acting railway postal clerks, and substitute railway postal clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 5307. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, so as to authorize the making of grants for hospital facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 5308. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5309. A bill for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a post office at Emmett, Idaho, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 5310. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam, and to make them racially eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5311. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II who are 55 years of age or over; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 5312. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 5313. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Preston Bench project, Idaho, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 5314. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5315. A bill to ratify the administrative promotions of employees on military furlough from field postal service, in certain cases, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5316. A bill to provide for an act transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserves Nos. 2 and 3, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 5317. A bill to amend an act approved July 16, 1947, entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5318. A bill to provide for the continuation of the transportation services of the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the disposition of its property and other interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5319. A bill to name the Dale Hollow Dam the Cordell Hull Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 5320. A bill to conform and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5321. A bill to provide that enlisted personnel discharged from the armed forces to accept commissions shall suffer no reduction in benefits under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) by reason of such discharge; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5322. A bill to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit private sales of permanent war housing to local communities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5323. A bill to declare the Obey River, Tenn., to be nonnavigable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 5324. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 5325. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755), as amended, to provide that regulations for any area, section, or flyway of the country shall be based on conditions and needs existing within such area, section, or flyway; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5326. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755), as amended, to provide for an advisory committee; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5327. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the

Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 5328. A bill to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 5329. A bill to authorize the construction of a water pollution control laboratory building at Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution providing for the observance of October 11, 1948, as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the creation of the Territory of Minnesota; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. J. Res. 322. Joint resolution to temporarily prohibit the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to temporarily prohibit the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to temporarily prohibit the exportation of petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 462. Resolution to appoint a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate possible fraudulent income-tax returns filed with the collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. Res. 463. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to investigate and study the court martial of Pvt. Thomas Gusik; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. Res. 464. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study natural and artificial gas shortage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 465. Resolution requesting Atomic Energy Commission to report on the feasibility of constructing and operating plants to provide stand-by supplies of heat; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to instruct the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to formulate legislation authorizing the United States Public Health Service to establish and finance medical scholarships to meet increased demand for doctors in the Government and the Nation at large; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States of the grave apprehension and vigorous opposition of the people of this State to the recommendations of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, and urging opposition to any congressional enactment of said recommendations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 5330. A bill for the relief of W. W. DeLoach, of Kosciusko, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 5331. A bill for the relief of Vaso B. Benderach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5332. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5333. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5334. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ross Kennedy and Jane Rankin Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 5335. A bill for the relief of Ben W. Schubert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 5336. A bill for the relief of Leon Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5337. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 5338. A bill for the relief of Agnese R. Mundy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5339. A bill for the relief of John Keith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 5340. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Benedykt Pyka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 5341. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgments upon the claims of Tampa Shipbuilding Realty Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 5342. A bill for the relief of Frank Haegele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5343. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Salome Holland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1313. By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Petition of Lester S. Wass Post, No. 3, American Legion, Gloucester, Mass., and others, urging the enactment of legislation benefiting widows and other dependents of war veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1314. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Mrs. Marguerite McDowell and 30 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, in support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1315. Also, petition of Mrs. C. Lashbrook and 55 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1316. Also, petition of Mrs. Margaret D. Green, president, and 16 other members of American Legion Auxiliary Unit of Post No. 146, Cincinnati, Ohio, in support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1317. Also, petition of Wilson C. Henize and 34 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1318. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Six petitions of Russell M. Kreitzer, adjutant, Glen Ellyn Post, No. 3, the American Legion, Glen Ellyn, Ill., containing the signatures of 81 residents of Glen Ellyn, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1319. Also, petition of Hinsdale Post No. 250, the American Legion, Hinsdale, Ill., containing the signatures of 26 residents of Hinsdale, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1320. Also, petition of West Chicago Post, No. 300, the American Legion, West Chicago, Ill., containing the signatures of 80 residents of Illinois, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1321. By the SPEAKER: Petition of L. G. Wayne and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of House Resolution 46; to the Committee on Rules.

1322. Also, petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation for the defense of Jews in Palestine against the Arab world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1323. Also, petition of Alice E. Logleson and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1324. Also, petition of J. B. Gardhouse and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1325. Also, petition of Mrs. F. A. Winchell and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we remember the great men who by their trust in Thee helped to give this Nation its glorious heritage, remind us that we honor them best when we follow their good example.

Give to the people of America, and to their leaders, the old-fashioned simplicity of faith, the old-fashioned honesty, and the old-fashioned love of country that sought to give rather than to get.

Help us to acknowledge our dependence upon the patience that forgives our failures, the truth that indicts our compromise and our hypocrisy.

We ask Thee not for tasks more suited to our strength, but for strength more suited to our tasks.

May we so live that the sacrifices that have been made for our liberty shall not have been in vain.

This we ask in the name of Thy dear Son, our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 9, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2161) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR JOSEPH S. FRELINGHUYSEN

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, it is with deepest sorrow that I announce to the Senate the death of former Senator Joseph S. Frelinghuysen, who was called into the Great Beyond on Sunday night, February 8, 1948.

Senator Frelinghuysen served with distinction in this body from 1917 to 1923, and made a substantial contribution to Senate activities during his term.

In addition to service in the upper house at New Jersey's capitol in Trenton and other political activities, Senator Frelinghuysen was an outstanding figure in the insurance field. He began his business career as an office boy for a vinegar-producing company at $4 a week when 18 years of age. He quit that job for another position as office boy with the Continental Insurance Co. He rose quickly in that business, to become one of the Nation's important executives in insurance activities, and he was respected by all who knew him.

When the war with Spain began, Senator Frelinghuysen enlisted and served overseas as a lieutenant of cavalry in campaigns both in Cuba and Puerto Rico.

Senator Frelinghuysen was the fourth Frelinghuysen to serve in the United States Senate from New Jersey, and his family has been prominent in that State since the Revolutionary War. His great-grandfather, Brig. Gen. Frederick Frelinghuysen, was the first of his family to serve as United States Senator from New Jersey.

Senator Frelinghuysen is survived by his widow, Emily; his son, Joseph, of Far Hills, N. J.; and two daughters, Mrs. Victoria Bates, of Morristown, N. J., and Mrs. Emily Bilkey, of New York.

As one who knew him personally for many years, and as one of the Senators from the State of New Jersey, I extend to his wife, his children, and other members of the family our deepest, understanding sympathy, coupled with the prayer that God will give them the strength and guidance which are so essentially vital to carry on in this life:

A fine friendship extending over many years existed between Senator Frelinghuysen and me. He was a great American, beloved and respected by the citizens of New Jersey as well as by thousands throughout our country. He has answered the final roll call, as we all must under the plan of God. We will miss him in New Jersey.

I wish now to read to my colleagues my favorite poem, A Comrade Rides Ahead:

Time brings not death, it brings but changes;
I know he rides, but rides afar,
Today some other planet ranges
And camps tonight upon a star
Where all his other comrades are.

For there were those who rode before him,
As there are those he leaves behind;
Although from us time's changes bore him,
Out there our comrade still will find
The kinship of the comrade mind.

Time brings us change and leaves us fretting;
We weep when every comrade goes—
Perhaps too much, perhaps forgetting
That over yonder there are those
To whom he comes and whom he knows.

I would not hold our loss too lightly;
God knows, and he, how deep the pain;
But, friends I see still shining brightly
The brightest link in all our chain
That links us with a new domain.

Time breaks no circle such as this.
For this I swear, because believing:
However hurt, however grieving,
However much a friend we miss
Between the worlds is no abyss.

For friendship binds the worlds together—
World over there, world over here.
From earth to heaven is the tether
That brings the earth and heaven near
And makes them both a bit more dear.

Not weaker now our chain, but stronger;
In all our loss and all our ill
We now shall look a little longer
At ev'ry star above the hill
And think of him, and have him still.

Whatever vales we yet may wander,
What sorrow come, what tempest blow,
We have a friend, a friend out yonder,
To greet us when we have to go—
Out yonder someone that we know.

To all eternity he binds us;
He links the planet and the star;
He rides ahead, the trail he finds us
And where he is and where we are
Will never seem again so far.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution in which I have been joined by my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey submits a resolution, which the clerk will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 198) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Joseph S. Frelinghuysen, who served in the United States Senate from the State of New Jersey from March 4, 1917, to March 3, 1923.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am very glad to join my colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] in submitting the resolution he has just sent to the desk, and I wish to add a personal word to the very appropriate remarks my colleague has made.

Joe Frelinghuysen, as we loved to call him in New Jersey, was more than just a member of the Republican Party, more than just a public man. He was a warm, personal friend of many of us, and many had come to love him. He had a wonderful family. I have known them all intimately, and I join with my colleague in sending them my deepest sympathy in this sad hour.

Joe had a wonderful sense of humor, which was one of his great assets. There was no company of which he was a part where he did not add not only to the common sense of the gathering, but also a lightness of touch, sometimes so important in times of serious crisis.

Joe Frelinghuysen served our party in many ways. The record shows his service in the Senate. He served the State of New Jersey in many important capacities, but above all he acted as a centralizing force when we were endeavoring to bring our party together, working for the building up of a fine citizenry, and seeking to carry out the spirit and purpose of our State and our Nation.

Mr. President, the State of New Jersey will miss Joe Frelinghuysen, the United States will miss the spirit which Joe Frelinghuysen symbolized. I am glad to be able to pay this tribute to his memory at this time.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, as I have said, my colleague joins in submitting the resolution I have sent forward. I ask for its adoption at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted jointly by the senior and junior Senators from New Jersey.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate on Friday next.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained unanimous consent for the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TITLE TO TIDEWATER LANDS—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for

Monday, February 23, 1948, at 10 a. m., in the caucus room, room 318, Senate Office Building, upon Senate Joint Resolution 14, a joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles, and Senate bill 1988, a bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in either of the said measures may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], chairman; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 172 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FORT HALL INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation Project, Idaho, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to law, a report showing the restorations and withdrawals of public lands in certain cases during the period January 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Maritime Union of America, Port of Tampa, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing increased appropriations to the American Cancer Society, Inc.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from N. W. Donnan, of Schenectady, N. Y., relating to the St. Lawrence seaway project; ordered to lie on the table.

COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER FOR FARMERS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of South Carolina on February 5, 1948, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its influence in making available adequate stocks of commercial fertilizer for the farmers of my State of South Carolina during the year 1948.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A concurrent resolution requesting each member of the South Carolina delegation in the National Congress, in the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and the Secretary of Agriculture to use their influence and authority to assure an adequate supply of nitrates and other fertilizers for the use of South Carolina farmers during the year 1948

Whereas an unprecedented demand in the United States and in foreign countries for fertilizers has created a shortage of immediate delivery plant foods in South Carolina; and

Whereas a shortage of this kind will seriously curtail the production of food and fiber crops the Government so urgently needs in its plans to rehabilitate war-torn countries; and

Whereas sufficient supplies are apparently obtainable at their source if proper transportation is furnished, and if some of the ships now being used to ship fertilizer, grain, etc., abroad are assigned to transporting nitrates to this country; and

Whereas we believe sections of the United States where fertilizer usage has long been a custom should not be curtailed in favor of new fertilizer-using territories where their use is still in the experimental stage; and

Whereas domestic manufacturers and handlers of nitrates and other fertilizing materials should be encouraged as much as possible; and

Whereas steps should be taken immediately to correct these conditions so that a repetition of last year's fiasco will not exist which will cause food and fiber shortages: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senate and to the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the South Carolina delegation in the National Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the Commissioner of Agriculture of South Carolina, with the request that each use his influence to see that the proper authorities have these conditions corrected and urge immediate action to assure prompt delivery of an adequate supply of nitrates and other fertilizers to South Carolina farmers.

GRAINS FOR PRODUCTION OF ETHYL ALCOHOL—REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT (REPT. NO. 888)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I ask unanimous consent to file a report relating to the allocation and inventory control of grains for the production of ethyl alcohol, and I request that the report be printed in the RECORD, since it is short.

There being no objection, the report was received, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLOCATION AND INVENTORY CONTROL OF GRAIN FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ETHYL ALCOHOL

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to whom was referred the President's message of January 29, 1948, requesting allocation and inventory control of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol at least until October 31, 1948, having considered the same pursuant to section 6 (b) of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, hereby recommends that Congress enact the legislation necessary to accomplish that purpose.

The committee has given careful consideration to the President's message and held hearings on February 5 and 6 on the proposal it contained. At these hearings Government officials, representatives of the distilling industry, and others appeared and testified.

GENERAL STATEMENT

It appears from the President's message and the testimony at these hearings that the grain situation in most European countries continues grave as a result of the devastation brought about by the war and extremely unfavorable weather conditions. While recent reports of the International Emergency Food Committee indicate an improved outlook for the next harvest this same source made clear that no substantial relief may be expected before the new wheat crop this summer and corn crop this fall.

It is estimated that the United States should endeavor to export at least 500,000,000 bushels of wheat from the crop harvested in 1947. A study of the available grain supplies in the United States as compared with the essential domestic and export requirements indicates that there can be no relaxation in our efforts to conserve grain. Although the domestic wheat crop in 1947 was 212,000,000 bushels greater than the domestic wheat crop in 1946, the current domestic and foreign demands are so great that, after providing for the carry-over of reserve stocks of wheat as of June 30, 1948, of 150,000,000 bushels required by law, only 450,000,000 bushels of wheat will be available for export in the absence of further conservation measures. The corn crop in 1947 was 850,000,000 bushels less than in 1946. Other feed grains remained approximately the same and as a result feed grains are in extremely short supply. The amount of wheat which will be available for export will depend to a considerable extent upon the supplies of other grains available for feed, for if other grains are not available for feed, farmers will find it necessary to feed greater quantities of wheat to livestock.

The saving from allocation and inventory control of the distilling industry, estimated at 30,000,000 bushels of whole grain a year (22,000,000 bushels through October 31, 1948), will make a material contribution to the supply of grain available for essential domestic and export requirements.

The Department of Agriculture has made exhaustive efforts to effectuate a voluntary agreement with the distilling industry. The committee heard testimony from all segments of the industry and is convinced that because various parts of the industry advocate different methods of allocation, there is no possibility of the industry entering into an effective voluntary agreement.

The operation of the distilling industry without restriction would result in diversion of grain to this nonessential use to the detriment of farmers, consumers, and other essential businesses who are being requested to reduce their use of grain. In furtherance

of a broad program for the conservation of grain, efforts are being made under the authority of Public Law No. 395, to obtain the cooperation of all grain-using industries in the conservation of grain. If the distillers who have been unable to agree on voluntary conservation are permitted to use grain without restriction, it is difficult to see how any other group could be expected to carry out grain conservation measures.

Curtailed production of ethyl alcohol from grain for beverage use as distilled and neutral spirits will not impose a hardship on the industry. For 22 months during the war period the industry maintained sales without any distillation whatsoever. Its current stocks of alcohol, both whiskys and neutral spirits, will permit the industry to meet its market requirements with ample margin. The distilling industry as of June 30, 1947, had stocks of whisky of 484,000,000 tax gallons. The stocks of whisky at present are approximately equal in quantity to the stocks normally on hand before the war, and, due to greatly increased sales of blended whisky as compared with straight whisky, present stocks of whisky represent a 6-year supply even at last year's high rate of consumption.

Representatives of the Department of Agriculture have testified that if the proposed controls are established, the grain will be allocated so as to assure the greatest possible employment (1) by preventing large distillers from shutting down some plants through the consolidation of quotas, and (2) by giving every distilling plant a minimum monthly quota which will enable all plants to operate. A very small percentage of the employees of distillers are engaged in the actual distillation operations, the vast majority being engaged in the bottling, sales, and other operations of these companies which are not affected, under present conditions, by a reduction or discontinuance of distilling operations.

Claims have been made that the food value of distillers' feeds is so great there ought to be no curtailment in their supply. There is conflicting opinion on this point. The committee is convinced the matter is not of controlling importance because of the ready availability of other protein feeds.

In compliance with section 6 (a) of Public Law 395 the President has submitted to the committee a procedure for the administration of the proposed measure, including a formula for the allocation of grain to distillers. The determination whether the formula should be included in the statute or left to the discretion of the administering agency is more properly made by the legislative committees than by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, whose primary function is to pass on the over-all economic aspects of the problem. The committee does recognize the necessity of including reasonable grain inventory limitations to eliminate unjustified stock-piling of grain by ethyl-alcohol producers. It further recommends to the study of appropriate committees the lifting of the requirement that the source of neutral spirits used in beverages be stated on the label, to encourage the use of nongrain sources for alcohol.

CONCLUSIONS

The committee is convinced that the shortage of grain is sufficiently evident to warrant restricting nonessential users. That, with the present large stocks of whisky, no more than a minimum addition in stocks could be justified at the present time; and that the situation cannot be solved by voluntary agreements under the provisions of Public Law 395. While the distillery industry uses corn grain primarily, it is our expectation that limitations would save an equivalent amount of wheat for human consumption.

Section 4 (b) of Public Law 395 revived and reenacted title III of the Second War Powers Act 1942, with respect to the use of grain for production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes. The same manufacturing process is required in connection with the production of distilled spirits or neutral spirits for beverage purposes and of ethyl alcohol from grain for industrial purposes. Since the alcohol used as neutral spirits is interchangeable with industrial grain alcohol, the committee considers integrated control of all alcohol from grain essential to prevent diversion of industrial alcohol to beverage uses. It is likewise desirable to establish inventory control in order to prevent unrestricted buying of grain by ethyl-alcohol producers, which would in part nullify the purposes of the proposed measure.

Further, the power of the President to limit exports of grain should be so used that distilleries in other countries, including Canada, shall be subject at least to the same general degree of restriction as distilleries in the United States.

The committee therefore recommends that legislation to this effect be prepared and enacted.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of January 1948, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
January 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1948, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Leona McKinnon, 1443 Spring Road NW., Washington, D. C.; Federal Security Agency; annual rate of salary, $5,905.20.

Milton Mayer, 4817 Thirty-sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Public Housing Administration; annual rate of salary, $7,341.

E. D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 2154. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to William Bow a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2155. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over certain school buildings in Vanport, Oreg., to the Federal Works Administrator and to authorize an appropriation to rebuild a school building in Vanport, Oreg., which was destroyed by fire; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLICATION OF NAMES AND COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES OF SENATORS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Senate to publish and submit to the Senate the names of all persons employed by the Senate and by Members of the Senate. I understand that this was not done this year, although it has been done before, and I think in justice to the taxpayers and the people generally the names of these persons should be published.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 199) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to prepare, publish, and submit to the Senate each year a statement showing (1) the names of all persons employed during the preceding calendar year in the office of each Senator and (2) the sums paid by him to each such person by reason of such employment. The report required by this resolution shall be submitted to the Senate on the first day of each regular session of the Congress, except that the report for the calendar year 1947 shall be submitted within 1 month from the date on which this resolution is agreed to.

COMPENSATION TO VETERANS TRAINING ON THE JOB—AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT SENATE BILL 1393 WITH HOUSE AMENDMENTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, be printed with the House amendments thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUARTERLY REPORT UNDER SECOND DECONTROL ACT OF 1947—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the letter from the Secretary of Commerce and the second quarterly report under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and that they be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND VIRGINIA—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the letter and proposed copy of a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1945, and that they be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REORGANIZATION OF RAILROADS—BILLS REREFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as the Chair knows and as the Senate is aware, considerable attention has been given to legislation to effect the voluntary or involuntary reorganization of railroads. Both Houses of Congress last year passed a bill, which was vetoed by the President.

Bills were again introduced at the present session. There was a difference of opinion, and two bills were reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. One of the bills is Senate bill 249, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, reported by myself, and now on the calendar as No. 445. The other bill is the House bill (H. R. 2298), to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which was reported by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and which is No. 492 on the calendar.

I am very happy to say that an agreement has been reached as to the terms of a bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the two bills be taken from the calendar and be rereferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills will be taken from the calendar and rereferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR MOHANDAS K. GANDHI—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address to be delivered by him at memorial services for the late Mohandas K. Gandhi, to be held at the Department of Labor Auditorium, Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF EDWARD ALLEN TAMM—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the nomination of Edward Allen Tamm to be associate justice for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, from the Washington Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARCHIBALD ROANE—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN JEFFERSON DAVIS AND CALEB CUSHING

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning a letter written by Caleb Cushing to Jefferson Davis, from the Knoxville Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AND THE FUTURE OF AMERICA—EDITORIAL FROM THE KNOXVILLE LABOR NEWS

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Daughters of the American Revolution and the Future of America," from the Knoxville Labor News, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOLLS AND THE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tolls and the Seaway," published in the New York Times of February 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECENTRALIZE OR PERISH—EDITORIAL IN THE WHEELING (W. VA.) INTELLIGENCER

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Decentralize or Perish," dealing with his plan for decentralization, published in the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of February 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MARGARINE AND THE GROWTH OF CHILDREN—ARTICLE FROM THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION JOURNAL

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Margarine and the Growth of Children," from the American Medical Association Journal for February 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSE MARIA GERARDO DE AMUSATEGUI AND RAMON DE AMUSATEGUI

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to have a correction made in a measure passed by the Senate, in which some typographical errors appeared. Senate bill 1395 passed the Senate on February 9 with a committee amendment. The errors occurred in the amendment. I now ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was passed and was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time, and the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, be reconsidered in order that I may have the corrections made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the votes are reconsidered, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I now offer two amendments to the committee amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "Marie" and in lieu thereof to insert "Maria"; and on page 2, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "Marie" and in lieu thereof to insert "Maria Gerardo."

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1395) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—LETTER FROM MRS. A. K. REPPERT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an interesting statement from Mrs. A. K. Reppert, of Neodesha, Kans., president and general federation director of the Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs, expressing approval of General Marshall's European economic reconstruction program for recovery and peace, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Neodesha, Kans., February 7, 1948.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The General Federation of Women's Clubs has passed a resolution expressing its unqualified approval and support of General Marshall's European economic reconstruction program for recovery and peace. As a member of the General Federation of Women's Clubs and as a citizen of Kansas, I am asking for your support of the European recovery program outlined by Secretary Marshall and embodied in the Eaton bill (H. R. 4840), subject to such changes in the administrative proposals as Senator VANDENBERG may suggest.

The position that the United States takes in relation to assisting the devastated countries of Europe to recover their economic and political health is of first importance to the establishment of peace and order in the world. That America should take the lead in providing the assistance necessary to promote that recovery is, of course, generally accepted. Our own self-interest is tied up with the peace, order, and prosperity of western Europe. With enough help from the United States in the period immediately ahead it should be possible for Europe to get on her feet again and eventually to supply her essential needs of food, coal, and machinery. We believe the Marshall plan has given encouragement to these nations to work together and this encouragement is the most significant postwar development in the realm of international relations. The Marshall plan has been called our best bet to build up in the countries of western Europe a buffer to stop the progress of communism as now being so vigorously promoted by Russia in her hope to control all of Europe.

It is needless to take more of your time by prolonging the arguments for the support of the Marshall plan which is now before our Congress for consideration. I do wish to express to you, my State Senator, my firm conviction that the support of the Eaton bill is our obligation and our best opportunity of leading the world to a firmer peace and, by doing so, take our proper place as the world's greatest power for preserving peace. I believe it is far cheaper for our Nation to lead the nations in a program directed to lasting peace than it would be to shy away from the cost of such a program and be again involved in a world war.

Your careful consideration of this critical matter and your support of the Eaton bill will be very much appreciated by me and, speaking from my wide contact with the women of our State, that expresses the feelings and convictions of a large percent of our citizens.

Most sincerely yours,
PAULINE REPPERT
(Mrs. A. K. Reppert).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. There are but a few nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any reports of committees? If not, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank Hammett Myers, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court, District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed legislative session.

PALESTINE AND THE ARMS EMBARGO

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, while there are many aspects of the Palestine situation which warrant our careful thought and attention, one particular phase of this important problem is of peculiar concern to the United States. I refer to the arms-embargo policy announced by our Department of State.

In the light of grave developments, the placement of the arms embargo definitely denies to the Jewish people an equal opportunity to secure the means of self-defense. Therefore, the action of the State Department is unneutral; and I express the hope that the arms embargo will be lifted forthwith.

When the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 29, 1947, recommended the partition of Palestine, we were encouraged in the hope that a peaceful solution, and one consonant with justice, had been found. While the territory designated for the new Jewish state was far more limited than they had hoped for, the Jews of Palestine have accepted partition in good spirit, although Jerusalem, their ancient capital, was denied them.

The United Nations' decision was reached after long debate and careful consideration. It was well understood that the decision would need to be implemented, and the responsibility was thus assumed by the United Nations to take such steps as events might prove necessary.

Particularly significant is the affirmative action taken by the United States in imposing the arms embargo because no steps have been taken by the United Nations to effectuate its decision, which decision has been arrogantly rejected by the Arabs. Not only have accredited spokesmen for the Arabs notified the United Nations that they will not accept partition, but they have given evidence, by acts of violence, of their intention to resist to the limit the decision reached by the representatives of the nations of the world.

In perpetrating their offenses against the Jews, they are armed with the implements of war procured from Great Britain and from neighboring Arab states. Meanwhile, the United States imposes the embargo, the direct, although possibly unintended, effect of which has been to deprive the Jews of the opportunity to procure arms to protect their lives and the land which has been declared to be rightfully theirs. Under the terms of the arms embargo, adjoining states friendly to the Arab cause can procure the implements of war from this country and then supply them to the Arabs in Palestine.

It is not beyond the pale of possibility that a large portion of the arms now being used by the Arabs against the Jews came from this country either directly or indirectly. Not only could they have been supplied indirectly through friendly neighboring states, but the arms supplied from Great Britain might very well have been made possible by American funds. Under those circumstances, for this country to deny the Jews the right to procure arms from this country places them at a distinct disadvantage.

There is a general feeling in the United States that we should do everything possible to strengthen and support the United Nations in their functioning for world cooperation and peace. In this instance the United Nations has acted definitely; and the Jewish people, in maintaining their present position, are in effect carrying out the mandate of the United Nations. If the Palestine question is not handled satisfactorily, the very existence of the United Nations may be imperiled. Certainly we should not adhere to a policy which is operating to prevent the fulfillment of a decision of the United Nations to which we solemnly pledged our support.

I respectfully suggest that the United States' embargo should be lifted at once. In the name of justice and fair dealing, we can do no less than give the sorely tried Jews of Palestine, whose statehood we have pledged, the means to defend their lives and their national aspirations.

THE MARSHALL PLAN AND THE SHORTAGE OF FARM MACHINERY IN THE MIDDLE WEST

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that within a very few weeks the Congress will be considering the Marshall plan, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that all through the Middle West the farmers are still unable to obtain farm machinery. My mail is filled with letters from farmers who say they are unable to obtain tractors, that they cannot secure combines, cannot obtain automobiles. I think the Members of Congress who are particularly engaged in considering the Marshall plan ought to know just exactly what the situation is in the Middle West, and keep that situation in mind at the time the Marshall plan is under consideration by Congress.

SECRETARY ANDERSON'S OPERATIONS ON THE WHEAT MARKET

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, we have heard much talk lately about Government officials and others who speculated in the commodity markets and won large sums of money because they were tipped off by Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, or others in his Department. Of course, that is just another dirty mess created by this New Deal gang of bureaucrats which has been ruling and ruining our great American Government for the past 15 years.

But, Mr. President, the real gambler in the wheat market and other commodity markets is none other than the Secretary of Agriculture himself. Mr. Anderson is the biggest bull operator on the wheat market the world has ever produced. He operates on behalf of the taxpayers of this Nation who furnish the money. He has a fund of $100,000,000 as capital, and authorized borrowing power of $4,750,000,000. In addition to this fabulous fund of nearly $5,000,000,000, the United States Treasurer is authorized to reimburse him for all losses he may sustain in his speculations. This makes his funds for speculation practically unlimited. He operates under the name of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is a Government corporation.

Mr. President, the bull operations of Secretary Anderson since last July are wholly responsible for the 40-percent or 50-percent increase in the price of wheat in this Nation, and corresponding increases in the prices of other grain. These increased prices of grain naturally boosted the price of livestock which is fattened on these grains, and likewise increased the price of all meat, butter, milk, poultry, eggs, and other food and clothing commodities. In my opinion, not a much greater crime could have been committed against the consumers of the Nation than to have had their cost of living increased from 40 percent to 50 percent by speculation activities of their own Government.

Mr. President, almost everyone in the Nation is familiar with the feverish determination of the New Deal dynasty to ration and control prices. This communistic desire on the part of members of the dynasty has stood out as one of their most cherished ambitions ever since they got a taste of such power during the war. It was this bull-dogged determination to ration and control prices that caused them to assign to Anderson the dirty job of bulling the wheat market and other markets for the main purpose of increasing the prices of food and clothing to the consumers of the Nation to such an extent that the people would demand rationing and price control. No sane bull operator in the wheat pit would dare risk his own money on such a venture.

In the past, when bull speculators in the wheat market attempted to corner the market, they tried to use a little judgment and pick a year when there was a short wheat crop, but brave Mr. Anderson attempted to corner the wheat market during a year when the Nation produced one of the largest wheat crops on record. Most bull operators in the past also have had to have in mind finally getting rid of their accumulated purchases after they got the market cornered. This is what is termed in grain circles as "getting rid of the corpse." Bull operator Anderson had no such problem to solve because he depended on "getting rid of the corpse" by giving away his accumulated purchases. To accommodate him in "getting rid of the corpse" the President called a special session of Congress to appropriate around a half-billion dollars to be given

away to foreign nations. Congress fell for the trick and swallowed it hook, line, and sinker. This half-billion dollars which Congress appropriated for the President to give away to foreign nations represented, almost to the penny, the cost of the 200,000,000 bushels of wheat which Speculator Anderson bought at an average price of around $2.50 per bushel from July 1 to November 21, 1947. The Presidnt got the special session convened on November 17, 1947, so it looks as if the timing was almost perfect.

Further to substantiate my charges about this speculating spree, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a chart showing the daily Commodity Credit Corporation wheat and flour purchases from July 1 to November 21, 1947, showing the daily purchases and the daily quotations of wheat on the Chicago Board of Trade during the same period of time.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Daily CCC wheat and flour purchases, July 1–Nov. 21, 1947, with Chicago futures prices

Noon to noon	Wheat [1]		Chicago futures [2]			Flour [3]		
	Daily bushels [1]	Weekly bushels	High	Low	Close	Daily bushels [4]	Weekly bushels	Daily hundredweight
			September					
July 1–2	75,000		$2.19½	$2.16	$2.19½	486,225		216,100
July 2–3	685,000		2.18¾	2.16¾	2.17¼	175,950		78,200
		760,000					662,175	
July 3–7	2,553,000		2.17	2.15	2.15¼	149,850		66,600
July 7–8	350,000		2.18¾	2.15¾	2.18	296,550		131,800
July 8–9	1,917		2.21¼	2.17	2.20¾	468,450		208,200
July 9–10			2.23¾	2.21	2.23	135,000		60,000
July 10–11	100,000		2.27½	2.23¾	2.26¾	22,500		10,000
		3,004,917					1,072,350	
July 11–14	1,241,667		2.36⅞	2.27¼	2.35¾	1,029,600		457,600
July 14–15	906,667		2.34¾	2.31	2.31¾			
July 15–16	185,000		2.37	2.30¼	2.35¼			
July 16–17			2.39¾	2.36	2.37			
July 17–18	800,000		2.36	2.32½	2.32¾			
		3,133,334						
July 18–21	1,835,000		2.34½	2.30¼	2.30¾			
							1,029,600	
July 21–22	751,300		2.37½	2.34	2.35	478,800		212,800
July 22–23	978,900		2.37½	2.35¼	2.36¼	2,472,300		1,098,800
July 23–24	972,833		2.38½	2.36¼	2.37	1,619,550		719,800
July 24–25	6,860,000		2.37	2.34⅞	2.35¾	458,100		203,600
		11,398,033					5,028,750	
July 25–28	15,640,425		2.35	2.33	2.33½	537,975		239,100
July 28–29	4,947,925		2.34½	2.31	2.31¼	1,210,950		538,200
July 29–30	3,588,164		2.30	2.21¼	2.22	1,130,400		502,400
July 30–31	1,700,000		2.27¾	2.23	2.27½	1,655,325		735,700
July 31–Aug. 1	2,065,000		2.32½	2.28¼	2.31¾	472,500		210,000
		27,941,514					5,007,150	
Aug. 1–4	4,604,306		2.33¼	2.30½	2.31¼	48,600		21,600
Aug. 4–5	2,573,667		2.36½	2.32	2.34¼	13,050		5,800
Aug. 5–6	3,291,000		2.34¼	2.31¾	2.32	119,250		53,000
Aug. 6–7	4,235,000		2.34¼	2.32¼	2.32½	45,000		20,000
Aug. 7–8	770,000		2.33½	2.32¼	2.33	17,550		7,800
		15,473,973					243,450	
Aug. 8–11	2,441,035		2.37	2.33½	2.35½			
Aug. 11–12	1,445,000		2.40½	2.34¼	2.35¾			
Aug. 12–13	3,221,340		2.38¾	2.34½	2.34¾			
Aug. 13–14	1,570,000		2.36¼	2.34	2.35	394,425		175,300
Aug. 14–15	247,400		2.37½	2.35½	2.36⅛	95,400		42,400
		8,924,775					489,825	
Aug. 15–18	3,773,769		2.39	2.36	2.38¾	3,600		1,600
Aug. 18–19	4,070,380		2.42½	2.40	2.41¼	4,950		2,200
Aug. 19–20	1,332,333		2.36	2.33½	2.35¾	27,000		12,000
Aug. 20–21	160,000		2.43	2.41	2.42¾			
Aug. 21–22	166,666		2.45¾	2.43½	2.44¾	68,400		30,400
		9,503,148					103,550	
Aug. 22–25	2,718,666		2.48¾	2.46	2.46¾			
Aug. 25–26	2,807,600		2.46	2.42½	2.44½			
Aug. 26–27	485,971		2.47½	2.44	2.47	12,600		5,600
Aug. 27–28	25,000		2.50⅞	2.47½	2.50¾	290,700		129,200
Aug. 28–29	83,163		2.52½	2.50	2.52¼	877,088		389,817
		6,120,400					1,180,388	
Aug. 29–Sept. 2	401,528		2.55¾	2.52	2.54¾	147,375		65,500
Sept. 2–3	1,830,731		2.55½	2.51	2.55½	9,000		4,000
			December					
Sept. 3–4	887,166		2.62	2.56½	2.60¼			
Sept. 4–5	40,000		2.65	2.60¾	2.64	12,600		5,600
		3,159,425					168,975	
Sept. 5–8	350,480		2.69½	2.62¾	2.68½			
Sept. 8–9	979,000		2.69¾	2.65¼	2.65½	12,600		5,600
Sept. 9–10	328,465		2.75½	2.65¾	2.73¾			
Sept. 10–11	252,500		2.62¾	2.50¾	2.57½	112,500		50,000
Sept. 11–12	216,000		2.87	2.76	2.77			
		2,126,445					125,100	
Sept. 12–16	3,380,070		2.81	2.68	2.72			
Sept. 16–17	1,293,324		2.81¾	2.76	2.79¼			
Sept. 17–18	3,172,545		2.80¾	2.75½	2.77¾			
Sept. 18–19	1,812,600		2.73	2.67⅜	2.70½			
		9,658,539					0	
Sept. 19–22	3,263,970		2.72½	2.60¾	2.60¾			
Sept. 22–23	1,866,456		2.66	2.60	2.65¾			
Sept. 23–24	1,743,674		2.72¼	2.68	2.69½			
Sept. 24–25	1,367,300		2.68¾	2.62	2.66¾			
Sept. 25–26	848,481		2.70	2.63¼	2.67½	10,350		4,600
		9,089,881					10,350	
Sept. 26–29	2,833,243		2.73½	2.69¼	2.72¼	296,550		131,800
Sept. 29–30	10,883,973		2.85⅞	2.81	2.85⅞	734,400		326,400
Sept. 30–Oct. 1	3,647,715		2.91¼	2.83	2.84¼	11,700		5,200
Oct. 1–2	4,296,864		2.92½	2.81¼	2.91¼			
Oct. 2–3	2,301,878		2.94	2.81½	2.83¾			
		23,963,673					1,042,650	

[1] Wheat purchase reports are submitted by four regional offices (Chicago, Minneapolis, Kansas City, and Portland) each day Monday through Friday, to the Grain Branch, Production and Marketing Administration. These reports cover purchases made from noon of the preceding day until noon of the reporting day, except that the reports submitted Monday cover purchases made from noon Friday through noon Monday, thus covering 2 marketing days. In some instances, wheat is contracted for on the basis of the futures market, and sellers' hedges are lifted at our discretion in later days to avoid undue pressure on the market. Such purchases are reported to this office on the day when the price is established by the lifting of hedges.

[2] Prices are as of the day shown on the left-hand side of the noon-to-noon column; i. e., the closing price of $2.19½ shown on the line "July 1–July" is the closing price July 1.

[3] Flour purchases are made in Washington and are reported on a straight day-by-day basis, rather than a noon-to-noon basis, as is the case with wheat. Thus, the first flour purchase made in the 1947–48 fiscal year, 486,225 bushels, was made on July 1, not from noon July 1 to noon July 2.

[4] In wheat equivalent at an average extraction rate of 74 percent.

Daily CCC wheat and flour purchases, July 1–Nov. 21, 1947, with Chicago futures prices—Continued

Noon to noon	Wheat		Chicago futures			Flour		
	Daily bushels	Weekly bushels	High	Low	Close	Daily bushels	Weekly bushels	Daily hundredweight
			October					
Oct. 3–6	7,946,021		$2.89½	$2.81	$2.85	90,000		40,000
Oct. 6–7	948,000		2.80	2.74½	2.80½	267,075		118,700
Oct. 7–8	1,207,450		2.87½	2.79¼	2.85½	18,000		8,000
Oct. 8–9	2,628,660		2.90½	2.86¾	2.88¾			
Oct. 9–10	2,977,415		2.92½	2.88	2.91¾			
		15,707,546					375,075	
Oct. 10–13	1,395,167		2.94½	2.91¾	2.92¼			
Oct. 13–14	595,000							
Oct. 14–15	2,441,292		2.96¼	2.94	2.95¾			
Oct. 15–16	3,811,333		3.00	2.95½	2.98¾			
Oct. 16–17	3,594,448		3.05	3.00	3.02¼	427,500		190,000
		11,837,240					427,500	
Oct. 17–20	903,100		3.02¾	2.98½	2.98½			
Oct. 20–21	153,334		3.07	3.02	3.06¾			
Oct. 21–22	100,000		3.10¾	3.07	3.08½	2,488,725		1,106,100
Oct. 22–23	1,995,561		3.11¾	3.06¾	3.11¾	276,975		123,100
Oct. 23–24	2,991,507		3.12¾	3.09	3.12½	59,850		26,600
		6,143,502					2,825,550	
Oct. 24–27	4,705,420		3.10	3.02⅝	3.02⅝	23,850		10,600
Oct. 27–28	20,000		2.97½	2.93	2.97¼	379,350		168,600
Oct. 28–29	849,940		3.00½	2.98¼	3.00¼			
Oct. 29–30	983,827		3.01½	2.90⅛	2.90¼			
Oct. 30–31	700,000		2.92¾	2.86	2.89¾			
		7,259,187					403,200	
Oct. 31–Nov. 3	234,581		2.94¾	2.90¼	2.94½			
Nov. 3–4	1,037,695		2.93¼	2.88	2.88¼			
Nov. 4–5	70,801		2.91½	2.86¼	2.90¾			
Nov. 5–6	70,000		2.95¾	2.92½	2.93¾			
Nov. 6–7	231,942		2.96⅞	2.91	2.93½	422,550		187,800
		1,645,019					422,550	
Nov. 7–10	1,069,000		2.97	2.94	2.96¼	197,775		87,900
Nov. 10–12	895,500		2.97¾	2.95	2.96¼	9,000		4,000
Nov. 12–13	887,000		2.99½	2.96	2.99	3,600		1,600
Nov. 13–14	3,501,533		3.03½	3.00	3.02½	427,500		190,000
		6,353,033					637,875	
Nov. 14–17	2,395,830		3.01¾	2.99	2.99¾	4,050,225		1,800,100
Nov. 17–18	88,880		3.03	2.95	3.03	342,000		152,000
Nov. 18–19	689,000		3.05⅝	3.01	3.03¼	79,200		35,200
Nov. 19–20	88,470		3.04	3.02	3.02	31,500		14,000
Nov. 20–21	130,013		3.03½	3.00	3.03¼			
		4,182,193					4,502,925	
	187,385,777					25,759,388		11,448,617

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, it will be observed from reading this chart that Secretary Anderson began buying wheat just as one of the biggest wheat crops in this Nation started to market. The price on that date, July 1, was $2.16 per bushel. There was no demand of consequence to hold wheat prices that high. The parity price was $2.04. Under the law, Mr. Anderson was obligated to support the wheat price at parity, but he did not wait for the price to go down to parity of $2.04 to start his buying. He started at $2.16, and he kept putting on the pressure of his $5,000,000,000 fund until he forced the wheat price from $2.16 up to $3.12. That is an advance of almost $1 a bushel, or between 40 percent and 50 percent increase. I am sure that this bull campaign was put on for the main purpose of running up prices so that the people would clamor for price ceilings and rationing. Everybody in the grain business knew that nothing on earth was forcing wheat prices up, except Mr. Anderson's heavy purchases.

Mr. President, this disgraceful and dishonest scheme was so plain that even a blind man could see it. Last summer as I traveled over Texas, I told the citizens of my home State what was going on. Since then, I have appeared on Nationwide radio networks and broadcast this information, and have received thousands of letters from good people throughout the Nation praising me for passing out this information. What do we see today, Mr. President? We see what the wheat market is doing when the big bull operator is out of the market. The price has already dropped about 50 cents a bushel. It is still above parity. This drop has somewhat taken the starch out of some of the New Deal administration supporters on both sides of the aisle who were howling for meat rationing and price controls. If this New Deal gang will take its filthy fingers out of the wheat pit and let the legitimate grain dealers handle the buying and selling of wheat and other grains, and permit the law of supply and demand freely to function, the people of this Nation, both consumers and producers, will be much better off. When any Government becomes so commercial and so crooked that it sets up a fund of $5,000,000,000 to be used for speculation in the commodity markets to the detriment of the consumers and taxpayers of our Nation, it is time to call a halt.

Whenever the public servants of a representative democracy develop their ego to the point where they crave not only to plan the people's economy but to control that economy by usurping the taxpayers' money and using it for gambling in food commodities, to the detriment of the people's pocketbooks and their dinner pails, it is time to call a halt. Such skulduggery will inevitably lead to a black-out of liberty and freedom in America.

It is crystal clear, Mr. President, to all except the professional politicians and the bureaucrats in our own Government who will go the limit to perpetuate themselves in public office that this Anderson grain-gambling episode is but a dress rehearsal to the main gambling and speculating spree that will be carried out with the billions of dollars these legal highjackers are figuring on getting into their clutches through the so-called Marshall plan. I will cover that international conspiracy in another speech.

When our Government becomes so thoroughly imbued with dictator philosophy that it takes $5,000,000,000 from the taxpayers and uses the loot to corner the commodity markets and force our people to pay from 40 percent to 50 percent more for their food and clothes than would otherwise be necessary, and does it for the main purpose of creating a clamor for price control and rationing, it is time to call a halt, Mr. President.

I think it is time for Secretary Anderson to resign. This will give him more time to visit in Hawaii and other swanky pleasure resorts with his speculating friends who happened personally to make millions of dollars out of the wheat and commodity markets at the time the Secretary was bulling the markets with the taxpayers' cash.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly to see the junior Senator from Texas rise upon the floor of the Senate and make such a vindictive speech. I do not think he does himself any credit. He certainly does not do his colleagues in the United States Senate, or the Members of the House of Representatives, any credit, because whatever Secretary Anderson is doing in connection with the buying of grain, he is proceeding under a mandate of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I would not wish to get into a "bull" argument with the junior Senator from Texas, because I know that I would come out second best in any such argument.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator had his say. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, week after week I have listened to the Senator from Texas occupy the floor in this august body with a tirade of invective which frequently astonishes me. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, he has almost reached the saturation point. Heretofore I have restrained myself because I did not wish to dignify the junior Senator from Texas by even answering the kind of tommyrot and poppycock with which he has plastered the floor of the Senate from time to time. It seems to me to be a direct challenge to the dignity of the Senate. It cannot continue without a decisive answer; and when it is answered, Mr. President, it will be answered in terms which the junior Senator from Texas will understand.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Illinois has spoken the words which he has just uttered. I had no idea that the Senator from Texas would rise in his place, under the privilege of a United States Senator, and say the things which he has said about our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture—personal invective, mudslinging, and name calling—without the basis of a single fact or figure to support what he has said.

Mr. President, I did not wish to answer such a statement as that. I am glad the Senator from Illinois has said what he has said, because, as everyone knows, Secretary Anderson comes from my State. He is my personal friend. Incidentally, he is able to take care of himself at any place or at any time. His transactions on the Board of Trade have been open and aboveboard throughout the months. Not once did I hear Senators who now complain about Government purchases complain when prices were going up. Not once did I hear them calling Secretary Anderson names.

Mr. President, I have learned through a somewhat long life that when a man lacks argument, when he lacks logic, when he lacks reason, when he lacks justification for a bad cause, he resorts to personal abuse and name-calling. I hope the time will come when the Senator from Illinois will do what he said he would do, and answer the arguments which have been made. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that if he does not do it, others will.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, throughout my life I have heard people abuse others, sometimes their neighbors. I have heard people ridiculed and actually abused personally. But, according to my philosophy, although abuse might prove entertaining to those who like to hear it, it does not prove a thing.

As stated by my colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], I know that Secretary Anderson can take care of himself. The only suggestion I would make at this time is that every Senator who heard the Senator from Texas make his statement should know that statements of that type are made every day of the week. So why get excited about it as long as it does not prove a thing?

JUST FOOLISHNESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, not a day passes but some disgruntled minority pulls on the hair shirt and denounces the American system under which we live. To hear these people complain and to hear them advise us to change our system, one would think the American way of life has been a total failure.

It often takes opinions from outside our country to cut through such hair-shirt moaning in our midst and really open eyes to the superb achievements of our way of life.

I have here a small item from the Wall Street Journal which quotes what a London editorial says of the American system. This is what our British friends have to say:

JUST FOOLISHNESS

We are indebted to Pulling Together, organ of the National Small Businessmen's Association, for calling our attention to a recent editorial in the London Sphere, which presents the case for unfettered enterprise, in the United States at least, as against a planned economy or compulsory state with great simplicity and cogency.

The editorial in question begins by pointing out the wealth of the people of this country measured in the goods and services that mean high living standards. With only 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of its population, it says, we Americans normally consume, to cite only a few of the instances given, 48 percent of the world's coffee, 53 percent of its wool, 56 percent of its rubber, and 72 percent of its silk. We produce 60 percent of its wheat, 50 percent of its copper, and 60 percent of its crude petroleum. We operate 60 percent of the world's telephones and 33 percent of its railroads and own 80 percent of its motorcars. Finally, we possess nearly half the world's gold, and the purchasing power of our people is greater than that of the 500,000,000 people of Europe. The editorial concludes:

"Responsible leadership which cannot translate such a bulging economy into assured prosperity is destitute of capacity. But pompous statesmen, looking over the estate, solemnly declare that the methods by which it was created are all wrong, ought to be abandoned, must be discarded; that the time has come to substitute political management for individual initiative and supervision.

"There is only one way to characterize that proposal—it is just damn foolishness."

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier in the debate on the St. Lawrence seaway, in questioning the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I referred to the fact that the New York Legislature had in a 1931 statute authorized the development of St. Lawrence River navigation. The junior Senator from New York assured us, however, that the New York Legislature had never done any such thing, and placed reliance upon his memory of the actions of the legislature during the period of his distinguished service in Albany.

I would now like to place in the RECORD sections of the New York Power Authority Act of 1931 mentioning the St. Lawrence River. It is to the Power Authority Act of 1931 that I was referring when I stated that the New York Legislature looked for the development of the seaway and power project as an integrated unit. I commend this insertion to the attention of the junior Senator from New York, and of all those who have contended that the power project should be developed separately from the seaway project.

New York State, which is most directly concerned with the development of power, in its own Power Authority Act, emphasized constantly the interrelationship of power and commerce.

We have in the course of the present debate heard numerous arguments to the effect that this or that Senator was in favor of the power project at the present time but not in favor of the navigation project. As I have previously shown in citing the testimony of General Robins, of the Corps of Engineers, and other authorities, it would, to use General Robbins' words, "be a crime" to attempt to build a power project without the navigation project.

I respect, as do my colleagues, the right of any Senator to state that he is for the power project but against the navigation project. However, as we have shown, a Senator has the right to make that argument, but his grounds for justifying it are weak and, in my belief, absolutely insupportable. The power project and the navigation project are absolutely inseparable. If my colleagues want to meet the present power shortage, they should support the seaway project, because it is only through developing both phases of this great project that the power shortage can be met.

On the basis of the history of the St. Lawrence seaway legislation, which has been drawn out for decade after decade, we can all believe only this fact: That anyone who states he is for the power project but against the navigation project either has not sufficiently studied the inter-relationship of these two phases, or, unfortunately, he is seeking an out—is trying to justify a negative vote against the seaway. I do not question the motives of any single one of my colleagues, but I submit that the RECORD speaks for itself on this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the sections of the New York Power Act of 1931 which mention the St. Lawrence River be printed in the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTIONS OF THE NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY ACT OF 1931 WHICH MENTION THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

CHAPTER 772

SECTION 1. That part of the St. Lawrence River within the boundaries of the State of New York is hereby declared to be a natural resource of the State for the use and development of commerce and navigation in the interest of the people of this State and of the United States, and for the creation and development of hydroelectric power in the interest of the people of this State, and such natural resources, including the bed

and waters of the river as instrumentalities of commerce and navigation, and the bed, waters, power, and power sites in, upon, or adjacent to, or within the watershed of the said river, owned or controlled by the people of the State, or which may hereafter be recovered by or come within their ownership, possession, and control, shall always remain inalienable to, and ownership, possession and control thereof shall always be vested in, the people of the State.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of effectuating the policy declared in section 1 and of improving the St. Lawrence River as an instrumentality of commerce and navigation and developing the hydroelectric power resources thereof, there is hereby created a corporate municipal instrumentality of the State to be known as the Power Authority of the State of New York, hereinafter referred to as the power authority, which shall be a body corporate and politic, a political subdivision of the State, exercising governmental and public powers, perpetual in duration, capable of suing and being sued, and having a seal, and which shall have the powers and duties hereinafter enumerated, together with such others as may hereafter be conferred upon it by law.

SEC. 3. * * *.

SEC. 4. * * *.

SEC. 5. Forthwith upon the appointment and organization of the trustees and subject to the conditions and limitations in this act contained, the power authority, in cooperation with the proper Canadian authorities and those of the United States as hereinafter directed, shall proceed with the improvement and development of the international-rapids section of the St. Lawrence River (which is defined as that part of the said river from Ogdensburg to the point where it leaves the territory of this State) for the aid and benefit of commerce and navigation and for the development of the hydroelectric power inherent therein, generally in accordance with the report and plan submitted under date of January 15, 1931, by the majority of the St. Lawrence power-development commission, appointed under chapter 207 of the laws of 1930, and in accordance with the provisions of this act.

The power authority is authorized and directed:

1. To cooperate with the appropriate agencies and officials of the United States Government to the end that any project undertaken under the authority of this act shall be consistent with and in aid of the plans of the United States for the improvement of commerce and navigation along the St. Lawrence River, and shall be so planned and constructed as to be adaptable to the plans of the United States therefor, so that the necessary channels, locks, canals, and other navigational facilities may be constructed and installed by the United States in, through, and as part of the said project.

2. To negotiate with the appropriate Canadian authorities and agencies respecting the improvement and development of the international-rapids section of the St. Lawrence River for the aid and benefit of commerce and navigation and the development of hydroelectric power therefrom, and to plan and agree with them upon cooperative action to that end including any shifting of international boundary lines between Canada and the United States and upon the use, control, and disposition of the facilities to be created and the hydroelectric power to be developed by the project. Such negotiations and agreements shall be conducted and concluded with due regard to the position of the United States in respect to international agreements, and any such agreements as may be reached with Canadian authorities or agencies may be submitted by the power authority to Congress for its approval, if it be advised that such approval is necessary or desirable.

3. To apply to the appropriate agencies and officials of the United States Government and/or of the Dominion of Canada or its provinces, including the International Joint Commission, for such licenses, permits, or approval of its plans or projects as it may deem necessary or advisable, provided that neither the said power authority nor any trustee, officer, or agent thereof shall have any power to waive or surrender for any purpose whatsoever any right of the State of New York, whether sovereign or proprietary in character, in and to the St. Lawrence River, its waters, power, channel, bed, or uses; or the right of the said State to assert such rights at any future time, and provided further that if for any reason the power authority shall fail to secure any such license, permit, or approval as it may deem necessary or advisable, or shall decide not to make application therefor, it is authorized to institute suit, or to apply to Congress for legislation, or take such other action in the premises as it may deem necessary or advisable, in the furtherance of the project and for the protection of its rights and those of the State.

4. * * *.

5. To develop, maintain, manage, and operate that part of the project owned or controlled by it in such manner as to give effect to the policy hereby declared (and all plans and acts, and all contracts for the use, sale, transmission, and distribution of the power generated by the project, shall be made in the light of, consistent with and subject to this policy), namely, that the said project shall be in all respects for the aid, improvement, and benefit of commerce and navigation in, through, along, and past the St. Lawrence River and the international rapids section thereof, and that in the development of hydroelectric power therefrom the said project shall be considered primarily as for the benefit of the people of the State as a whole and particularly the domestic and rural consumers to whom the power can economically be made available, and accordingly that sale to and use by industry shall be a secondary purpose, to be utilized principally to secure a sufficiently high-load factor and revenue returns which will permit domestic and rural use at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage increased domestic and rural use of electricity. In furtherance of this policy and to secure a wider distribution of the said power and use of the greatest value to the general public of the State, the power authority shall in addition to other methods which it may find advantageous make provision so that municipalities and other political subdivisions of the State now or hereafter authorized by law to engage in the distribution of electrical current may secure a reasonable share of the power generated at the project, and shall sell the same or cause the same to be sold to such municipalities and political subdivisions at prices representing cost of generation, plus capital and operating charges, plus a fair cost of transmission, all as determined by the trustees, and subject to conditions which shall assure the resale of such power to domestic and rural consumers at the lowest possible price. To that end, the power authority may provide in any contract or contracts which it may make for the sale, transmission, and distribution of the said power that the purchaser, transmitter or distributor shall construct, maintain and operate, on such terms as the power authority may deem proper, such connecting lines as may be necessary for transmission of the power from main transmission lines to such municipalities or political subdivisions.

6. * * *.

7. * * *.

8. * * *.

9. * * *.

SEC. 6. The State of New York hereby consents to the occupation and use by the power authority of any and all property of the State of whatever kind or character within the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, and hereby vests the power authority with and delegates to it the right to exercise any and every right and power of the State in connection therewith, whether proprietary or sovereign in character, which the State itself might exercise: *Provided*, That such consent and delegation of power shall not permit the impairment or limit or prevent the future improvement of the navigability of the international rapids section of the said river, consistent with the maintenance of this project, but on the contrary the project shall be such as will improve and benefit commerce and navigation therein: *And provided further*, That the power authority shall have no power to limit, waive or surrender any right or interest of the State of New York in the said river or the use thereof. The State of New York does hereby pledge to and agree with those subscribing to the obligations to be issued by the power authority for the construction of such project, and with those parties who may enter into contracts with the power authority pursuant to the provisions in subparagraph 6 above, that the State will not limit or alter the rights hereby vested in the power authority until the said obligations together with the interest thereon are fully met and discharged and/or the said contracts are fully performed on the part of the power authority: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall preclude such limitation or alteration if and when adequate provision shall be made by law for the protection of those advancing money on such obligations of the power authority or those entering into such contracts with the power authority. The power authority as agent for the State is authorized to include this pledge and undertaking for the State in such obligations or contracts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall take only a short time to discuss the business now pending before the Senate. I have no illusions that what I shall say in regard to the St. Lawrence seaway agreement will change any votes when the time finally comes for the Members of the Senate to cast their votes upon this measure. I debate the issue with some reluctance because of the stand taken on it by one of my predecessors in the Senate, from the State of Illinois, the late James Hamilton Lewis, who was one of the most spectacular and colorful figures who ever occupied a seat in this Chamber. He was a brilliant speaker and a great lawyer. In 1934 he was the leader in the debate against the ratification of the treaty. I have had occasion to read the debates which occurred at that time, and I know the arguments which were presented then by the late Senator Lewis, as well as by the late Senator Dieterich, of my State. Some of those arguments have been met as a result of amendatory legislation. Others have not.

Today this matter comes before the Senate as an executive agreement, rather than a treaty. Whether the late distinguished Senators from Illinois, who opposed the treaty at that time would now oppose the agreement, of course no one can tell. But, Mr. President, I have listened to many of the arguments that have been made on the floor of the Senate on the question of whether we should consider this matter as an executive agreement to be approved by a concurrent resolution of the Congress or whether we should consider it as a treaty. Being one who believes in the sanctity

and dignity of treaties, I had some concern until I made an examination of the record, which satisfies me that there is little or no question that the Senate of the United States has a right to consider this matter as an executive agreement, and not as a treaty. I shall briefly state my reasons for reaching that conclusion.

The other day I was interested in the able address made by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who gave to the Senate in chronological order the agreements and the treaties and the provisions that have been made from time to time between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada. I saw in that argument the continuous growth of good will and neighborly policy between the United States and Canada. It should be of great help to any Senator in the event he was not convinced before. I shall briefly refer to the 1909 treaty, and I shall discuss briefly the procedure for agreement that led up to the adoption of that treaty between the two countries.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that the present executive agreement flows from and grows out of the 1909 treaty, and that as a result of the wording of the various provisions and articles of that treaty, the Senate of the United States is wholly justified in considering this matter as an executive agreement.

The preamble of the Boundary Water Treaty of 1909 stated that its purpose was "to prevent disputes regarding the use of boundary waters and to settle all questions which are now pending between the United States and the Dominion of Canada involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other, or to the inhabitants of the other, along their common frontier and to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all such questions as may hereafter arise."

In my humble judgment, Mr. President, the question before us is one of the questions, which has arisen since the treaty was ratified, which can be handled by executive agreement.

Article III of the treaty provides in part as follows:

It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission, to be known as the International Joint Commission.

Article IV provides in part as follows:

The High Contracting Parties agree that, except in cases provided for by special agreement between them, they will not permit the construction or maintenance on their respective sides of the boundary of any remedial or protective works or any dams or other obstructions in waters flowing from boundary waters or in waters at a lower level than the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the effect of which is to raise the natural level of waters on the other side of the boundary unless the construction or maintenance thereof is approved by the aforesaid International Joint Commission.

Article VIII provides in part as follows:

The following order of precedence shall be observed among the various uses enumerated hereinafter for these waters, and no use shall be permitted which tends materially to conflict with or restrain any other use which is given preference over it in this order of precedence: (1) Uses for domestic and sanitary purposes; (2) Uses for navigation, including the service of canals for the purposes of navigation; (3) Uses for power and for irrigation purposes.

Article XIII provides as follows:

In all cases where special agreements between the High Contracting Parties hereto are referred to in the foregoing articles, such agreements are understood and intended to include not only direct agreements between the High Contracting Parties, but also any mutual arrangement between the United States and the Dominion of Canada expressed by concurrent or reciprocal legislation on the part of Congress and the Parliament of the Dominion.

Mr. President, I quote from the Boundary Water Treaty of 1909, which obviously is the basis of the executive agreement now under consideration. In order that I may proceed in what I conceive to be a logical manner, I ask unanimous consent that the executive agreement made between the President of the United States and His Majesty, the King of Great Britain, known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Agreement, dated March 19, 1941, be placed in the RECORD at this point. I do this because it is a document of some length, and it would serve no good purpose for me to read it article by article.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN-AMERICAN AGREEMENT OF MARCH 9, 1941

The President of the United States of America and His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada, have decided to conclude an Agreement in relation to the utilization of the water in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin and to that end have named as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Jay Pierrepont Moffat, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada;

Adolf Augustus Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State;

Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission;

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada:

The Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Secretary of State for External Affairs;

The Honourable Clarence D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply;

John E. Read, Legal Adviser, Department of External Affairs;

Who, after having communicated to each other their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles.

PRELIMINARY ARTICLE

For the purposes of the present Agreement, unless otherwise expressly provided the expression:

(a) "Joint Board of Engineers" means the board appointed pursuant to an agreement between the Governments following the recommendation of the International Joint Commission, dated December 19, 1921;

(b) "Great Lakes System" means Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron (including Georgian Bay), Erie and Ontario, and the connecting waters, including Lake St. Clair:

(c) "St. Lawrence River" includes the river channels and the lakes forming parts of the river channels from the outlet of Lake Ontario to the sea;

(d) "International Section" means that part of the St. Lawrence River through which the international boundary line runs;

(e) "Canadian Section" means that part of the St. Lawrence River which lies wholly within Canada and which extends from the easterly limit of the International Section to Montreal Harbour;

(f) "International Rapids Section" means that part of the International Section which extends from Chimney Point to the village of St. Regis;

(g) "Governments" means the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada;

(h) "countries" means the United States of America and Canada;

(i) "Special International Niagara Board" means the board appointed by the Governments in 1926 to ascertain and recommend ways and means to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls;

(j) "deep waterway" means adequate provision for navigation requiring a controlling channel depth of 27 feet with a depth of 30 feet over lock sills, from the head of the Great Lakes to Montreal Harbour via the Great Lakes System and St. Lawrence River, in general accordance with the specifications set forth in the Report of the Joint Board of Engineers, dated November 16, 1926.

ARTICLE I

1. The Governments agree to establish and maintain a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, consisting of not more than ten members of whom an equal number shall be appointed by each Government. The duties of the Commission shall be:

(a) to prepare and to recommend plans and specifications for the construction of works in the International Rapids Section in accordance with and containing the features described in the Annex attached to and made part of this Agreement, with such modifications as may be agreed upon by the Governments;

(b) upon approval of the plans and specifications by the Governments, to prepare a schedule allocating the construction of the works in the International Rapids Section on such a basis that each Government shall construct the works within its own territory or an equivalent proportion of the works so approved;

(c) to approve all contracts entered into on behalf of either Government for the works in the International Rapids Section;

(d) to supervise the construction of the works and to submit reports to the Governments from time to time, and at least once each calendar year, on the progress of the works;

(e) upon satisfactory completion of the works, to certify to the Governments that they meet the plans and specifications drawn up by the Commission and approved by the Governments;

(f) to perform the other duties assigned to it in this Agreement.

2. The Commission shall have the authority to employ such person and to make such

expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the duties set forth in this Agreement. It shall have the authority to avail itself of the services of such governmental agencies, officers and employees of either country as may be made available. The remuneration, general expenses and all other expenses of its members shall be regulated and paid by their respective Governments; and the other expenses of the Commission, except as provided for under Article III, paragraph (b) of this Agreement, shall be borne by the Governments in equal moieties.

3. The Governments agree to permit the entry into their respective countries, within areas immediately adjacent to the Niagara River and the International Section to be delimited by exchange of notes, of personnel employed by the Commission or employed in the construction of the works, and to exempt such personnel from the operation of their immigration laws and regulations within the areas so delimited. In the event that the Commission, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 (b) of this Article, allocates to either of the Governments the construction of works, any part of which is within the territory of the other Government, the latter Government shall make provision for the according, within the area in which such a part is situated, of such exemption from customs, excise and other imposts, federal, state and provincial, as may be reasonably practicable for the effective and economical prosecution of the work. Regulations providing for such exemptions may be settled by the Governments by exchange of notes.

4. The Governments shall, by exchange of notes, prescribe rules and regulations for the conduct of the Commission. They may by the same means extend or abridge its powers and duties; and reduce or after reduction increase the number of members (provided that there must always be an equal number appointed by each Government and that the total number of members shall at no time exceed ten); and, upon completion of its duties, the Governments may terminate its existence.

ARTICLE II

The Government of Canada agrees:

(a) in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by the Commission and approved by the Governments, to construct the works in the International Rapids Section allocated to Canada by the Commission; and to operate and maintain or arrange for the operation and maintenance of the works situated in the territory of Canada;

(b) to complete, not later than December 31, 1948, the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway, including the necessary deepening of the new Welland Ship Canal and the construction of canals and other works to provide the necessary depth in the Canadian Section of the St. Lawrence River; provided that, if the continuance of war conditions or the requirements of defense justify a modification of the period within which such works shall be completed, the Governments may, by exchange of notes, arrange to defer or expedite their completion as circumstances may require.

ARTICLE III

The Government of the United States of America agrees:

(a) in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared by the Commission and approved by the Governments, to construct the works in the International Rapids Section allocated to the United States of America by the Commission; and to operate and maintain or arrange for the operation and maintenance of the works situated in the territory of the United States of America;

(b) to provide, as required by the progress of the works, funds for the construction, including design and supervision, of all works in the International Rapids Section except (1) machinery and equipment for the development of power, and (2) works required for rehabilitation on the Canadian side of the international boundary;

(c) not later than the date of completion of the essential Canadian links in the deep waterway, to complete the works allocated to it in the International Rapids Section and the works in the Great Lakes System above Lake Erie required to create essential links in the deep waterway.

ARTICLE IV

The Governments agree that:

(a) they may, in their respective territories, in conformity with the general plans for the project in the International Rapids Section, install or arrange for the installation of such machinery and equipment as may be desired for the development of power and at such time or times as may be most suitable in terms of their respective power requirements;

(b) in view of the need for coordination of the plans and specifications prepared by the Commission for general works in the International Rapids Section with plans for the development of power in the respective countries, the Commission may arrange for engineering services with any agency in either country which may be authorized to develop power in the International Rapids Section;

(c) except as modified by the provisions of Article VIII, paragraph (b) of this Agreement, each country shall be entitled to utilize one-half of the water available for power purposes in the International Rapids Section;

(d) during the construction and upon the completion of the works provided for in the International Rapids Section, the flow of water out of Lake Ontario into the St. Lawrence River shall be controlled and the flow of water through the International Section shall be regulated so that the navigable depths of water for shipping in the harbour of Montreal and throughout the navigable channel of the St. Lawrence River below Montreal, as such depths now exist or may hereafter be increased by dredging or other harbour or channel improvements, shall not be injuriously affected by the construction of operation of such works, and the power developments in the Canadian Section of the St. Lawrence River shall not be adversely affected;

(e) upon the completion of the works provided for in the International Rapids Section, the power works shall be operated, initially, with the water level at the power houses held at a maximum elevation 238.0, sea level datum as defined in the Report of the Joint Board of Engineers, for a test period of ten years or such shorter period as may be approved by any board or authority designated or established under the provisions of paragraph (f) of this Article; and, in the event that such board or authority considers that operation with the water level at the power houses held to a maximum elevation exceeding 238.0 would be practicable and could be made effective within the limitations prescribed by paragraphs (c) and (d) of this Article, the Governments may, by exchange of notes, authorize operation, subject to the provisions of this Article, and for such times and subject to such terms as may be prescribed in the notes, at a maximum elevation exceeding 238.0.

(f) the Governments may, by exchange of notes, make provision for giving effect to paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) of this Article;

(g) during the construction of the works provided for in the International Rapids Section, facilities for 14 ft. navigation in that Section shall be maintained.

ARTICLE V

The Governments agree that nothing done under the authority of this Agreement shall confer upon either of them proprietary rights, or legislative, administrative or other jurisdiction, in the territory of the other, and that the works constructed under the provisions of this Agreement shall constitute a part of the territory of the country in which they are situated.

ARTICLE VI

The Governments agree that either of them may proceed at any time to construct, within its own territory and at its own cost, alternative canal and channel facilities for navigation in the International Section or in waters connecting the Great Lakes, and to utilize the water necessary for the operation of such facilities.

ARTICLE VII

The High Contracting Parties agree that the rights of navigation accorded under the provisions of existing treaties between the United States of America and His Majesty shall be maintained notwithstanding the provisions for termination contained in any of such treaties, and declare that these treaties confer upon the citizens or subjects and upon the ships, vessels and boats of each High Contracting Party, rights of navigation in the St. Lawrence River, and the Great Lakes System, including the canals now existing or which may hereafter be constructed.

ARTICLE VIII

The Governments, recognizing their common interest in the preservation of the levels of the Great Lakes System, agree that:

(a) each Government in its own territory shall measure the quantities of water which at any point are diverted from or added to the Great Lakes System, and shall place such measurements on record with the other Government semiannually;

(b) in the event of diversions being made into the Great Lakes System from other watersheds lying wholly within the borders of either country, the exclusive rights to the use of waters which are determined by the Governments to be equivalent in quantity to any waters so diverted shall, notwithstanding the provisions of Article IV, paragraph (c) of this Agreement, be vested in the country diverting such waters, and the quantity of water so diverted shall be at all times available to that country for use for power below the point of entry, so long as it constitutes a part of boundary waters;

(c) if any diversion of water from the Great Lakes System or the International Section, other or greater in amount than diversions permitted in either of the countries on January 1, 1940, is authorized, the Government of such country agrees to give immediate consideration to any representations respecting the matter which the other Government may make; if it is impossible otherwise to reach a satisfactory settlement, the Government of the country in which the diversion of water has been authorized agrees, on the request of the other Government, to submit the matter to an arbitral tribunal which shall be empowered to direct such compensatory or remedial measures as it may deem just and equitable; the arbitral tribunal shall consist of three members, one to be appointed by each of the Governments, and the third, who will be the chairman, to be selected by the Governments;

(d) the Commission shall report upon the desirability of works for compensation and regulation in the Great Lakes System and, upon the approval by the Governments of any such works, shall prepare plans and specifications for their construction and recommend to the Governments an equitable allocation of their cost; the Governments shall make arrangements by exchange of notes for the construction of such works as they may agree upon.

ARTICLE IX

The Governments, recognizing their primary obligation to preserve and enhance the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River,

and consistent with that obligation, their common interest in providing for the most beneficial use of the waters of that River, as envisaged in the Final Report of the Special International Niagara Board, agree that:

(a) the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Governments plans and specifications for works in the Niagara River designed to distribute and control the waters thereof, to prevent erosion and to ensure at all seasons unbroken crest lines on both the American Falls and the Canadian Falls and to preserve and enhance their scenic beauty, taking into account the recommendations of the Special International Niagara Board; the Governments may make arrangements by exchange of notes for the construction of such works in the Niagara River as they may agree upon, including provision for temporary diversions of the waters of the Niagara River for the purpose of facilitating construction of the works; the cost of such works in the Niagara River shall be borne by the Governments in equal moieties;

(b) upon the completion of the works authorized in this Article, diversions of the waters of the Niagara River above the Falls from the natural course and stream thereof additional to the amounts specified in Article 5 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 may be authorized and permitted by the Government to the extent and in the manner hereinafter provided:

(1) the United States may authorize and permit additional diversion within the State of New York of the waters of the River above the Falls for power purposes, in excess of the amount specified in Article 5 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, not to exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of five thousand cubic feet of water per second;

(2) Canada may authorize and permit additional diversion within the Province of Ontario of the waters of the River above the Falls for power purposes, in excess of the amount specified in Article 5 of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, not to exceed in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of five thousand cubic feet of water per second;

(c) upon completion of the works authorized in this Article, the Commission shall proceed immediately to test such works under a wide range of conditions, and to report and certify to the Governments the effect of such works, and to make recommendations respecting diversions of water from Lake Erie and the Niagara River, with particular reference to (1) the perpetual preservation of the scenic beauty of the Falls and Rapids, (2) the requirements of navigation in the Great Lakes System, and (3) the efficient utilization and equitable apportionment of such waters as may be available for power purposes; on the basis of the Commission's reports and recommendations, the Governments may by exchange of notes and concurrent legislation determine the methods by which these purposes may be attained.

ARTICLE X

The Governments agree that:

(a) each Government undertakes to make provision for the disposition of claims and for the satisfaction of any valid claims arising out of damage or injury to persons or property occurring in the territory of the other in the course of and in connection with construction by such Government of any of the works authorized or provided for by this Agreement;

(b) each Government is hereby released from responsibility for any damage or injury to persons or property in the territory of the other which may be caused by any action authorized or provided for by this Agreement, other than damage or injury covered by the provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article;

(c) each Government will assume the responsibility for and the expense involved in the acquisition of any lands or interests in land of its own territory which may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of this Agreement.

ARTICLE XI

This Agreement shall be subject to approval by the Congress of the United States of America and the Parliament of Canada. Following such approval it shall be proclaimed by the President of the United States of America and ratified by His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada. It shall enter into force on the day of the exchange of the instrument of ratification and a copy of the proclamation, which shall take place at Washington.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this Agreement in duplicate and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done at Ottawa, the nineteenth day of March, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-one.

[SEAL]	JAY PIERREPONT MOFFAT
[SEAL]	ADOLF A. BERLE JR.
[SEAL]	LELAND OLDS
[SEAL]	W. L. MACKENZIE KING
[SEAL]	C. D. HOWE
[SEAL]	JOHN E. READ

ANNEX

CONTROLLED SINGLE STAGE PROJECT (238–242) FOR WORKS IN THE INTERNATIONAL RAPIDS SECTION

(See Art. 1, Par. 1 (a))

The main features of the Controlled Single Stage Project (238–242), described in detail with cost estimates in the report of the Temporary Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Committees dated January 3, 1941, are as follows:

(1) A control dam in the vicinity of Iroquois Point.

(2) A dam in the Long Sault Rapids at the head of Barnhart Island and two power houses, one on either side of the international boundary, at the foot of Barnhart Island.

(3) A side canal, with one lock on the United States mainland to carry navigation around the control dam and a side canal, with one guard gate and two locks, on the United States mainland south of Barnhart Island to carry navigation from above the main Long Sault Dam to the river south of Cornwall Island. All locks to provide 30 ft. depth of water on the mitre sills and to be of the general dimensions of those of the Welland Ship Canal. All navigation channels to be excavated to 27 ft. depth.

(4) Dykes, where necessary, on the United States and Canadian sides of the international boundary, to retain the pool level above the Long Sault Dam.

(5) Channel enlargement from the head of Galop Island to below Lotus Island designed to give a maximum velocity in the navigation channel south of Galop Island not exceeding 4 feet per second at any time.

(6) Channel enlargement between Lotus Island and the control dam and from above Point Three Points to below Ogden Island designed to give a maximum mean velocity in any cross-section not exceeding 2¼ feet per second with the flow and at the stage to be permitted on the 1st of January of any year, under regulation of outflow and levels of Lake Ontario.

(7) The necessary railroad and highway modifications on either side of the international boundary.

(8) The necessary works to permit the continuance of 14 feet navigation on the Canadian side around the control dam and from the pool above the Long Sault Dam to connect with the existing Cornwall Canal.

(9) The rehabilitation of the towns of Iroquois and Morrisburg, Ontario.

All the works in the pool below the control dam shall be designed to provide for full Lake Ontario level but initially the pool shall be operated at maximum elevation 238.0.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a careful examination of the 1941 agreement with Canada, which has just been placed in the RECORD, will disclose to the prudent and unprejudiced mind that such an agreement flows directly from article 13 of the 1909 treaty, and that any arrangements between the United States and Canada providing for the uses, obstructions, and diversions, as found in article 3 of the 1909 treaty, can be legally approved by concurrent legislation on the part of the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada.

Legally speaking, I am convinced beyond a shadow of a doubt that Congress is on safe grounds in considering this compact in the form of an executive agreement rather than as a treaty. Be that as it may, however, the question of treaties versus agreements has been debated in the Senate from the beginning of the history of the Nation. What is and what is not a treaty depends in a great measure upon mere whim, temperament, interest, and caprice. In other words, distinguished Senators have stood upon the floor of the Senate during this debate opposing the agreement on the ground that it should be presented as a treaty. On the other hand, many of the Senators who were in the Senate in 1934 did not support it as a treaty when presented at that time; so I repeat, the difference between an executive agreement and a treaty, in most instances, depends in a great measure upon what the interest may be in the section of the country from which a Senator comes. It may depend upon prejudice. It may depend upon politics. It may depend upon mere whim or caprice.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in the Senator's discussion of the distinction between agreements and treaties. He has been using the phrase "executive agreement." I know he has in mind the fact that an executive agreement, as such, usually is an agreement exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Executive. The agreement which he is discussing is of a slightly different type. It is an executive agreement subject to legislative approval.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is important constantly to keep that distinction in mind.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very grateful to the able Senator from Michigan for calling that to my attention. That is, of course, exactly what I had in mind. There are any number of executive agreements that have been made by our Presidents without any authority whatever from the Congress. And few have ever been seriously questioned.

The agreement before the Senate is an executive agreement, as the able Senator has said, by which we seek to reach an understanding, by means of a joint resolution passed by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The point I am making is that between that kind of agreement and a treaty there is very

little difference. In one case the Congress of the United States passes on an agreement by a majority vote; in the other case the Senate of the United States, by a two-thirds vote, passes on a treaty. But to get back to the point I made, I shall cite a number of cases which seem to prove my point, and which are tremendously interesting in the development of the history of this Nation.

Mr. President, there have been a great number of agreements which have been made in the past with Canada through legislation, the kind of legislation which is now pending before the Senate. I shall not refer to all of them, but the ones which are closely identified with the agreement now before us can be found among agreements which have been made between the United States and Canada respecting international bridges.

We have entered into agreements with foreign countries times without number, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, relative to construction projects. Bonds have been issued, tolls have been considered, and practically everything required or requested in the agreement now before the Senate has been done in the past respecting similar executive agreements between the two countries.

One outstanding example I cite: With regard to the bridge which crosses the Niagara River at Buffalo, as I understand from the record, the International Commission was authorized to charge tolls and to issue bonds, in order to provide for the payment of the cost of the bridge. The income from the bonds to be issued was to be exempt from all Federal, State, and local taxation. That is one example of the many reciprocal arrangements which have been made between this country and Canada.

One of the most fascinating cases with respect to a treaty and an agreement occurred many years ago, when the Government was acquiring more territory. It happened in connection with the annexation of Texas. After Texas had established its independence from Mexico, and had gained the recognition of the United States as a sovereign power, negotiations were undertaken for its incorporation into the United States, and on April 12, 1944, a treaty of annexation was signed by representatives of the United States of America and of Mexico.

What happened to that treaty, Mr. President? It was brought into the United States Senate, and, after long debate, was rejected by the Senate on June 8, 1844, by a vote of 16 yeas to 35 nays. We find thereafter the President of the United States—President Tyler—bypassing the treaty and sending to the Congress a message in which he stated that—

> The power of Congress is, however, fully competent in some other form of proceeding to accomplish everything that the formal ratification of the treaty could have accomplished.

The President of the United States, after the Senate refused to ratify the treaty of annexation of Texas, told the Congress that there was another method, and "if you do not like the treaty, take the executive agreement."

That is the one statement in all these cases which has convinced me that the arguments regarding the difference between a treaty and an executive agreement of the kind of that before the Senate amounts to very little, because, following that, a joint resolution was passed by a majority vote of both Houses, the vote of the Senate being 27 to 25, on March 1, 1845, which expressed conditionally the consent of the Congress to the admission of Texas, and authorized the President to initiate negotiations.

The joint resolution was transmitted to the American chargé d'affaires in Texas to be presented as an offer of agreement to the Texas Government. The Texas people acquiesced, the Mexican Government acquiesced, and Texas became a State of this Union as the result of an executive agreement, after the Senate of the United States had flatly said "No" to a treaty providing for the annexation of Texas. So a way was found, Mr. President, to bypass a treaty providing for the annexation of a State—one of the most solemn, most sacred and dignified acts a government can perform in negotiating with another nation.

A similar instance occurred with regard to Hawaii. In 1897 President McKinley submitted to the Senate a treaty providing for the annexation of Hawaii, which had already been approved by the Hawaiian authorities. That treaty failed of ratification; so on July 7, 1898, the President approved a joint resolution providing that, the Government of the Republic of Hawaii having signified its consent, all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands were ceded and transferred to the United States, and the Hawaiian Islands were annexed. That is another instance in which a treaty was bypassed by the President of the United States.

If the Members of the Senate at the time Texas was annexed had been so convinced that in order to annex Texas it was necessary to ratify the annexation by a treaty, why did they support the executive agreement in the second instance? They had the necessary votes in the first instance to defeat the treaty. As I said before, the vote was 16 yeas to 35 nays. They had a constitutional majority against the ratification of the treaty, but something happened before action on the executive agreement to change the votes of a number of Senators.

So, Mr. President, much as I dislike to say it, I do not take much stock in the arguments which are made in the Senate regarding the solemnity of treaties in preference to this type of executive agreement, when it is so difficult to distinguish one from the other. I cannot bring myself to feel I am guilty of violation of my oath when I refuse to acknowledge the pending agreement as a treaty reflecting upon what was done in the annexation of Texas and Hawaii.

Mr. President, when the St. Lawrence development agreement was under consideration in Congress in 1941 the Senator from Illinois appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations and at that time submitted an amendment which was adopted. The adoption of my amendment provides one of the basic reasons for my support of the agreement at this time. The amendment takes care of one of the main arguments made against the pending proposal by the late Senators from Illinois of whom I have heretofore spoken. The amendment dealt with the diversion of the water from Lake Michigan down through the canal into the Illinois River and on into the Mississippi and into the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. President, there was a time when there was no limitation placed upon the amount of water the sanitary drainage district could turn through the canal; but a few years ago the case dealing with that subject reached the Supreme Court of the United States, and Chief Justice Hughes, in a very persuasive opinion, froze the amount of water we can now divert from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Valley at 1,500 cubic feet per second.

When the agreement was before the Senate in 1941, I objected to the provision which would give to the Canadian Government any right or power to say when or how much more water might be diverted down through the canal. During the debates which were held on the agreement in 1934, there was no provision for such exemption. Canada had equal jurisdiction over the diversion flow as the United States.

The late Senator Lewis took the position that the kind of agreement which was being debated would, if entered into, really make Lake Michigan an international body of water, giving Canada certain rights and powers in Lake Michigan to which she was not entitled. So the committee in 1941 was good enough to go along with the position taken by the then Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution now pending, while providing for the approval of the agreement between the United States and Canada, specifically withholds approval of article 8 (c) of that agreement. As I stated before, article 8 (c) would place a limitation on the amount of water which would be permitted to flow from the Great Lakes through the Chicago outlet into the Illinois Valley. That article provided in effect that if there were any diversion of water from the Great Lakes system greater than the amount permitted on January 1, 1940, the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada would proceed to arbitrate any disagreements over such diversion. If this article of the agreement were to be approved, the amount of water which could flow through the Chicago drainage canal would be permanently frozen at 1,500 cubic feet per second.

I took the position that this was an artificial limit which failed to take into account two very important things for the people who live in the Illinois Valley. My home is at Havana, Ill., on the Illinois River. I know something about the history of the canal from the very beginning, and the tremendous amount of damage that the diversion of water from Lake Michigan did in the early days to the farm lands of my section, before it

was finally frozen at 1,500 cubic feet per second. However, there comes a time when the water is low in the upper part of the river, and unsanitary conditions in the summertime frequently reach a point which makes necessary more water to flush the stream and move the debris down the canal and on into the river.

There was another matter to be considered, Mr. President. It was the matter of national defense. I could never agree that Canada should have the right to say how much water we should divert in times of a great emergency.

During the last war the War Department established a huge industry at Seneca, Ill., employing thousands of people to construct landing barges which were used all over the world. The time came during the war when it was necessary to raise the level of the Illinois River in order that those barges might be floated down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers into the Gulf of Mexico without any difficulty. As I said before, the provision dealing with water diversion has been waived. We are left in status quo, so far as the diversion of water is concerned. Obviously, it was one of the points considered, among the controversial questions before us, and the elimination of that particular controversial point was extremely helpful to my section of the country.

Mr. President, after that point was agreed upon, I had no hesitancy in supporting the agreement primarily upon the grounds of national defense. Our world moves on. Our country has grown to greatness because it has recognized that change is necessary and has been able to adapt itself to those changes. In America we are happy and prosperous because we have not remained in status quo. All our mutual relations with Canada from the very beginning have been the best. There has been a gradual evolution from time to time in the relations between our two countries. Mark this word well, Mr. President: Sooner or later the St. Lawrence seaway will be constructed, even though we fail to begin its construction now.

Mr. President, when I think of national defense in connection with a project of this kind my mind immediately flies to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I remember that some Representatives and Senators who have previously opposed the agreement with Canada respecting the St. Lawrence, were also foes of the proposal for the establishment of a Tennessee Valley Authority. If it were not that we had in the United States the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Columbia Valley power project, and many other national-defense projects with which power was connected, I am not so sure—in fact, I know that we would not have made the progress we did in winning the war. I remember very well that during the war, when the President of the United States requested additional appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority, some of the biggest industrialists of the country, who were then in Washington as dollar-a-year men, and who in the beginning had called the Tennessee Valley Authority a socialistic and communistic project, came before the Appropriations Committee and requested that more money be appropriated in order further to expand and develop that great project. Without Boulder Dam, the Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and the TVA, we would have been hampered materially in fighting the war.

The other day I picked up a newspaper which contained an article describing the great benefits which have been derived through the TVA. I shall read one or two paragraphs from the article:

Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of TVA, said: "This region today is paying almost twice the share of the national income (in income taxes) it paid in 1933."

The income of the Tennessee Valley people, so Chairman Clapp says, was $680,000,000 more in the single year of 1945 than it would have been had the per capita income remained at the same relative level in 1933.

Mr. President, this is an amazing thing. It is inspiring to contemplate what the TVA has done for the section of the South in which it is located. Let no one say that the great waterway agreement proposed to be entered into between Canada and the United States, if it shall result in the development contemplated, will not ultimately greatly develop the per capita income of the people of that section of the country for hundreds of miles around.

The article further states that the great object lesson of the TVA is that such developments, by increasing the economic health and educational standards of one area, benefit all other sections of the Nation.

The TVA * * * has repaid the United States Treasury $23,600,000 out of its power earnings, payments applied against the cost of construction. It has saved the valley and its tributary areas many devastating floods by impounding of waters. It has put $132,000,000 of its earnings back into expansion and improvements of its power facilities. And last year it earned $21,800,000, a 5½-percent profit on its total investment.

That is the "socialistic experiment" which many persons believed we were entering into when the TVA was established. Mr. President, time moves on; and unless the American people keep in tempo with the pace of progress we cannot continue to be the leaders of this world in almost every line of human endeavor.

On the question of national defense, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Under Secretary of War are unanimous in telling us that the project would help the national defense. In my judgment, they are correct. In planning our national defense we must be realistic. The total mobilization of all our resources almost became a reality in World War II. If the St. Lawrence seaway project had become an actuality in time for use in World War II it would have been of material assistance by increasing the industrial and transportation potential of the United States.

Much argument has been made to the effect that if we build this seaway project it will be exterminated by a bomb in the next war. To me, that argument is fantastic and somewhat ridiculous. Those who take that position should never ask for another dime for the further expansion, construction, or improvement of any port in America where warships and war materials will be going in and out in the event of a great emergency, because such ports will be just as subject to being exterminated through the force of atomic power as will the St. Lawrence seaway. That gets back to the very point which I made a moment ago. Those who are interested in the ports at Boston, New York, Baltimore, and other places are not seriously considering a long-range security program of America, which is, to my mind, absolutely indispensable if we are to carry the mantle of world leadership which has been thrust upon us as a result of our victory in World War II.

Mr. President, there is another point which I wish to discuss. On May 22, 1946, I submitted the amendment which I have heretofore discussed, which would authorize and empower the two countries to fulfill the undertakings made, with the exception of article VII, article VIII, paragraph (c), and so forth. At that time I made a statement before the Senate, which can be found on page 5406 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dealing with the diversion of water. At that time I was in consultation with the officials of the Mississippi Valley Association. They were writing to me and conferring with me on this amendment. They gave me to understand, in the correspondence and in our conversations, that if this amendment should be adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations they would have no objection to the agreement. I should like to read a letter from Mr. Lachlan Macleay, president of the Mississippi Valley Association, dated November 12, 1945, and addressed to Mr. Sidney A. Smith, of the Anchor Storage Co., Chicago, Ill.:

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION,
St. Louis, November 12, 1945.

Mr SIDNEY A. SMITH,
Anchor Storage Co., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIDNEY: Replying to yours of November 6, which was awaiting me on my return to St. Louis this morning.

It is my sincere belief that if article VIII of the proposed St. Lawrence Treaty or agreement is removed, the greater part of the objections to the St. Lawrence project in the valley would be dissipated. All that would be left in the way of objections would be from cities which might believe that the St. Lawrence seaway would affect their commerce in a detrimental way.

The position of the Valley Association has always been taken on the basis of article VIII, which would have a very bad effect upon the valley as a whole, and so long as article VIII remains in the treaty we will oppose the St. Lawrence project with every influence we possess.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,

LACHLAN MACLEAY,
President.

I was a little surprised that I did not hear from the Mississippi Valley Association group this year on the agreement. I had a right to presume that they still maintained the position which they took in 1946, after this amendment was agreed upon by the Committee on Foreign Relations. But on January 31 of

this year, much to my surprise, I received the following letter:

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: The Mississippi Valley Association is strongly opposed to the present form of the bill (S. J. Res. 111) to create a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, now before the Senate.

At the annual meeting of the association in St. Louis, January 26–27, attended by more than 600 delegates from 23 midcontinent and Gulf States, the attached resolution was unanimously approved.

We earnestly urge that the bill be recommitted so that a proper economic survey can be made and the paragraph providing for the charging of tolls can be stricken from the bill.

This is the resolution:

We again disapprove the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway for these reasons:

1. There never has been an economic survey made of the project by the Corps of Army Engineers.

2. The charging of tolls would probably result in the charging of tolls on all the navigable channels in the United States, thus ending the free use of them, and

3. It would further handicap the American merchant marine.

Those are three of the weakest excuses which I think the Mississippi Valley Association could have found to place in a resolution of this kind. I do not know why they have changed their minds, but apparently someone has been working pretty hard on the Mississippi Valley Association to persuade the members to change from the position they took 2 years ago. Could it be that the proposed Missouri Valley Authority and a few other so-called power-and-flood projects may have had some influence on the members of the Mississippi Valley Association, rather than the argument that "the charging of tolls would probably result in the charging of tolls on all the navigable channels of the United States, thus ending the free use of them."

That is "bunk," and they know it.

The resolution says "it would further handicap the American merchant marine."

I never heard that argument 2 years ago.

The association says "there never has been an economic survey made of the project by the Corps of Army Engineers."

These arguments sound like the ones which have been made on the Senate floor in regard to the difference between an Executive agreement and a treaty. The association switches from one argument to the other, according to their particular interests, whims, and so forth, of its members. I regret that I was not advised before this time as to the position of the Mississippi Valley Association. Let me ask my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] whether any representatives of the association testified one way or the other before the committee.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. It is my recollection that they did not. In response to the particular suggestion now presented to the Senate, I wish to say that the opposition to this seaway included the same statement in their minority views, namely, that no appraisal had been made. I wish to say to the Senate that they were totally ignorant of the fact that the Department of Commerce made a complete economic appraisal of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and reduced it to the form of a report. That was done in compliance with a suggestion, made in 1941, that there had not been a complete report.

In regard to the Army engineers, let me say it is testified by General Wheeler that they do not make economic surveys, but make engineering surveys; and the only way to get the Army engineers to make an economic survey is first to have a resolution to that effect adopted by the Congress. Mr. President, that point is just another stumbling block which the opponents of this project attempt to put in the pathway of progress.

Again I call attention to the fact that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of the Department of Commerce, after taking the figures as to construction, as arrived at by the engineers, and taking the available tonnage and the foreseeable tonnage, and taking all the other factors that the Department of Commerce can evaluate, brought forth an industry report on domestic transportation covering the very subject which the Senator's letter says has not been reported on.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to one more point which has been made. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] made quite a point of the fact that when we entered into the 1942 Defense Sites Agreement with Panama, we should have had a treaty, rather than an executive agreement. I should like to have the RECORD show that the 1942 agreement providing for the lease of defense sites in the Republic of Panama was negotiated under the authority of and pursuant to the provisions of the General Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation signed with Panama on March 2, 1936, and approved by the United States Senate on July 25, 1939. Articles II and X of the 1936 treaty specifically provide for possible future arrangements between the two Governments for the use of additional territory in Panama for the effective protection of the Canal in the event of "some new unforeseen contingency" or "in case of an international conflagration or the existence of any threat of aggression." The 1942 defense sites agreement referred in its preamble, in language taken directly from the paramount document, to the 1936 treaty.

To my mind, the argument that this agreement should have been a treaty is a fallacious one. Those who advance that argument may be laboring under a misconception as to what happened previously with respect to a treaty. In other words, if we have a treaty which grants to the respective parties signatory to it the power to make executive agreements thereafter in furtherance of the treaty, it would seem to me highly inconsistent for the same countries to enter into another treaty on the same subject. I am satisfied that the 1942 arrangement for the lease of defense sites was an agreement made under authority of the general treaty of 1936, which, along with those clauses of the original convention of 1903 still in effect, constitutes the principal basis for the current relations of the United States with Panama. I consider the 1942 agreement to be a matter of detailed arrangement emanating from the 1936 treaty, and distinct from an agreement embodying new arrangements or considerations. The question thus propounded in relation to that treaty and that situation is the same as the question which is before us today. In the presently proposed agreement between this country and Canada, there are no new arrangements or considerations, no arrangements that are not based upon action previously taken by this country and Canada in the various treaties that have been negotiated, and to which I have referred. The same situation exists with respect to the defense sites agreement which was made in 1942. That agreement flowed from the original convention that was entered into between the United States and Panama in 1903, following the friendship treaty of 1936, which was ratified by the Senate in 1939. On the basis of those two treaties, of course, the two countries had the power to do what they did.

Mr. President, in conclusion I repeat what I said before, namely, that while it is doubtful that this seaway agreement will be approved I regret that the Senate of the United States may take such negative action. Everyone knows that we are in a world of trouble and turmoil at this particular moment. No man can tell what may happen in the future. But I should like to have the United States be able, 8 or 10 years from now, or at any other future time, to mobilize every possible resource in the event any emergency occurs; and if the emergency I am thinking about should occur, we shall need every national resource at our command fully developed. Here is a self-liquidating project, a project that will be liquidated through the charge of tolls. That principle has proved successful in the case of the Suez Canal and in the case of the Panama Canal. The countries in charge of those canals have lost no money.

Here is an opportunity to begin to plan for the future; and yet there are those who react unfavorably toward it because of some local interest which some may think is going to be affected in their own territory. I am not one who says that sectional interests should not be considered, but I undertake to say that it is a short-sighted policy to do so at the expense of the national interest. This project will hurt no one. On the other hand, it will give to this Nation an additional defense that may be needed at some time in the future.

Mr. President, this project should be authorized now. We should not follow

the footsteps of the past. This project has been considered from time to time, but it never has commanded sufficient votes to permit it to be constructed. One President after another has recommended it.

Men who have studied the problems involved, men who know and understand engineering, men who have a knowledge of what the country needs in the way of a sound defense, have recommended this project throughout the years. Yet some persons are afraid that some community will suffer economically if the seaway is built. This I challenge—but even so it would be better to lose a little here and a little there than at some future time possibly lose all because we were inadequately prepared. It is such groundless fears and lack of vision that is retarding, it seems to me, one of the greatest projects for the national defense that ever has been conceived by the mind of man.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Illinois. As I listened to his fervent expression of the Nation's need, I was reminded of these lines by Sam Foss:

Bring me men to match my mountains,
Bring me men to match my plains,
Not men with clouded visions,
But with sunlight in their brains.

That is the need of America and the world right now not only in relation to evaluating the St. Lawrence waterway, but it is the need in evaluating every great problem. The need is for men who are not sectionally minded, for men who have the broader outlook.

Mr. President, there have been repeated charges that the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have injected the issue of sectionalism into the discussion. The record, I believe, shows that nothing could be further from the truth. The members of the opposition stand accused by their own record of placing the interests of their particular sections and of a few economic interests within those sections above the national welfare. What is the proof of this? I ask my colleagues to look at the record of the hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway, particularly those of 1946. Within more than 1,300 pages of those hearings, my colleagues will find page after page in which representatives and legislators from the ports of New Orleans, Boston, and Baltimore, and from other areas, time and time again devoted their testimony exclusively to trying to prove that the St. Lawrence seaway would hurt their particular section or the interests of a few of their particular constituents.

So when we state, as we have stated here on the floor of the Senate, that the opposition is basing its real assault on the seaway upon sectional grounds, we do not get the idea out of a hat. We get it from the record of the St. Lawrence seaway discussion over the years.

It is obvious, of course, that the State of Wisconsin is vitally interested in the seaway project, just as is the State of Minnesota and all the other Great Lakes States. But I am sure that my colleague the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], will agree that the project is basically a national project and, indeed, a continental project. While it is up to us to represent the interests of Wisconsin and Michigan and Illinois and Minnesota, we have a greater obligation. What do we owe the Nation? When we answer that question, we shall then be ready to face the situation that lies ahead. When the distinguished Senator from Illinois speaks, he speaks not as a Senator from Illinois, but as a United States Senator, representing the people of all the 48 States, who clamor for the St. Lawrence seaway in the interest of the national welfare.

Mr. President, I wish to comment for a few moments on a subject that was brought up by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who so well presented the many phases of the discussion. I heartily agree with his conclusion that the agreement entered into in 1941 by the President was a valid exercise of constitutional authority, but there was one angle that was not stressed today, and I desire to spend a few moments on that.

In 1909 the United States entered into a Boundary Waters Treaty with Canada, which was ratified by the Senate. It is entirely clear in my mind that the 1941 agreement which the President entered into was a special agreement within the terms of article 8 of the treaty of 1909, because it was a mutual arrangement between the United States and Canada, to be approved by concurrent or reciprocal legislation. I wish to read article 8 of the treaty of 1909:

The following order of precedence shall be observed among the various uses enumerated hereinafter for these waters, and no use shall be permitted which tends materially to conflict with or restrain any other use which is given preference over it in this order of precedence:

(1) Uses for domestic and sanitary purposes.

(2) Uses for navigation, including the service of canals for the purposes of navigation.

(3) Uses for power and for irrigation purposes.

The crux of the matter is this: "Uses for navigation, including the service of canals for the purpose of navigation."

Article 4 provides:

The high contracting parties agree that, except in cases provided for by special agreement between them, they will not permit the construction or maintenance on their respective sides of the boundary of any remedial or protective works or any dams or other obstructions in waters flowing from boundary waters or in waters at a lower level than the boundary in rivers flowing across the boundary, the effect of which is to raise the natural level of waters on the other side of the boundary unless the construction or maintenance thereof is approved by the aforesaid International Joint Commission.

Mr. President, when the treaty was entered into, it was contemplated that we would, by special agreement, provide, as set up in article 8, for—

(2) Uses for navigation, including the service of canals for the purposes of navigation.

(3) Uses for power and for irrigation purposes.

I realize that what I say now will probably have no particular influence on those who have reached a definite conclusion, but I am not one of those who criticize the President of the United States every time he performs a constitutional function. I never criticize the President except when I think he invades the legislative field. Under the Constitution, it is for him to spearhead the making of international arrangements through agreements and treaties. The pattern was laid down in 1909, and in 1941 he proceeded to negotiate an agreement, under his constitutional authority as the Chief Executive, and pursuant to the language of the 1909 treaty. It was ready to be brought before the Congress when the Pearl Harbor incident occurred. When that occurred, everything else was laid aside. But now the agreement is before the Senate, and we are asked by resolution to confirm the arrangement. That is a simple analysis of the situation.

I call attention to the fact because objection was made, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] stated today. Certain matters that were debatable were eliminated, matters which it was thought should properly be handled by treaty. I repeat that not one dollar is asked for, not one dollar is appropriated. All that Congress is being asked to do is to confirm the arrangement made by the President. The joint resolution would first authorize him to negotiate a treaty in relation to the perpetual rights of citizens of both countries with respect to boundary waters. Second, after he shall have negotiated such an agreement, it is expected that he will bring back to the Senate the contemplated toll arrangement. The Senate will then be asked to review the treaty. The arrangement as to tolls would be reviewed by the Congress, to determine whether it was satisfactory. Within 1, 2, or 3 years from the time that is done, we shall be in a position to decide, in the event the economic conditions of the country are such as to result in a recession or a depression, whether or not to appropriate money for this great constructive upbuilding of the Nation, instead of appropriating money for a WPA project.

Mr. President, I had expected that another Senator would speak today. I am now informed that he will speak on Friday. Apparently there has been some misunderstanding in the newspapers, as the result of which an effort is made to blame the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway for the recesses that have occurred. We are not trying to delay the matter in the slightest. Let it be known that the Senate of the United States agreed that the vote on the matter would be had on February 27. Let it also be known that the Senate of the United States agreed that during the present week no vote would be had on any controversial matter. That agreement undoubtedly will hold over until next week, because of the number of Senators now absent.

Let it further be known that the Congress of the United States is working. Those of us who are here are working 10 or 12 hours a day in committee sessions. The Committee on Foreign Relations meets in the morning and will meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon to carry on in relation to the so-called Marshall

plan. The Senate will meet on Friday, pursuant to arrangement, and on that occasion there will be one or two more speeches. At that time, if there are any bills which are noncontroversial, they will probably be taken up. I can assure the Senate, Mr. President, that there is no desire on the part of the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway to delay the consideration of any matters which can be considered under the mutual-consent agreement.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if the business of the Senate is concluded for the day, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, February 13, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 11 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

H. Graham Morison, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Frank Hammett Myers to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

John M. Cabot
Wilson C. Flake
Nelson R. Park
Carl W. Strom
William T. Turner

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Glen W. Bruner
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr.
Delano McKelvey

TO BE SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William L. Hamilton, Jr.
James L. Meader

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Linton Crook
Philip Ernst
George F. Kelly
L. Pittman Springs

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William H. Beach
Frederik van den Arend

TO BE A CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Walter J. Stoessel, Jr.

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 1 AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Leslie A. Wheeler

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Bernard Gufler
Oscar W. Meier

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Francis O. Allen
Bryant Buckingham
Wesley C. Haraldson
John B. Holt

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 2 AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A. Ogden Pierrot

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Francis A. Flood
Owen T. Jones

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

John W. Henderson

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Elleard B. Heffern
Charles E. Higdon
Samuel Owen Lane
Richard F. Lankenau
William L. Magistretti
Armin H. Meyer
Clinton L. Olson
David Post

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Thomas J. Corcoran
William D. Craig
Wayne W. Fisher
Francis C. Grant, Jr.
Matthew J. Looram, Jr.
Eugene V. McAuliffe
James D. Moffett
John F. O'Donnell, Jr.
Howard W. Potter, Jr.

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Harry L. Smith

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Raymond G. Leddy

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Philip Axelrod
Douglass K. Ballentine
Joseph V. Brès
Philip H. Chadbourn, Jr.
Philip M. Dale, Jr.
Frank J. Devine
Isidore Friedman
Howard C. Goldsmith
Charles M. Hanson, Jr.
Miss Dorothy M. Jester
Alexander R. Kepler
Frank E. Maestrone
Philip W. Manhard
Charles E. Paine
Chris G. Petrow
Robert M. Phillips
Dwight E. Scarborough
Lawrence W. Shenfield
Wallace A. Sprague
Godfrey Harvey Summ
John Patrick Walsh
Milton C. Walstrom
William A. Wiedersheim 3d
John W. Williams
Chalmers B. Wood

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). The Clerk will report a communication from the Speaker.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1948.

I hereby designate Hon. EARL C. MICHENER to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker.

PRAYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Prayer will be offered by Dr. Leo Baeck, former chief rabbi of Berlin, Germany.

Dr. Leo Baeck offered the following prayer:

Our Father, our God, we pray unto Thee on this day on which sixscore and nineteen years ago was born that man who came to be Thy servant, "the man in whom is the spirit," and who for the sake of this land became witness and testimony of humanity, herald of Thy command and Thy promise, to the everlasting blessing of this country and of mankind.

Our Father, day by day Thou sendest forth Thy messengers, Thy angels—our chances to be unselfish and righteous, our opportunities to walk in Thy ways—they are the messengers that come from Thee. We must not miss them nor disregard them.

Almighty God, Thou choosest people and selectest nations "to bring them into the place which Thou hast prepared"; Thou changest the times and the seasons; Thou makest history enter the world. Thy servant, Abraham Lincoln, in a message to Congress, said, "We cannot escape history," so help us, O God, that we may not evade history, but may we be granted history.

Reverently I pray Thee to bless Congress, its men, and its days. From the bottom of my heart I pray: God bless America.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 9, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi.

H. R. 648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Riyoko Patell;

H. R. 1078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of August W. Dietz;

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy Park Farrow;

H. R. 3168. An act for the relief of Antone G. Pina;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25);

H. R. 4115. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.;

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the two Houses on Monday, April 19, 1948, in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba; and

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution extending the life of the Joint Committee on the Observance and Celebration of the Victory Over Spain.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3503. An act to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 111. An act for the relief of Donat and Laura Laroche;

S. 511. An act for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocoechea;

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle;

S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom;

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho;

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Jose Maria Gerardo de Amusategui and Ramon de Amusategui;

S. 1706. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases;

S. 1782. An act to provide for selection of superintendents of national cemeteries from meritorious and trustworthy members of the armed forces who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service;

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 184);

S. 1801. An act to authorize attendance of civilians at schools conducted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and joint-service schools, and for other purposes; and

S. 1990. An act to provide a means for the orderly continuation and completion of the Deer Creek and aqueduct divisions of the Provo River project, Utah.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. YOUNG, and the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ, members of the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the ceremonies in Habana, Cuba, on February 15, 1948, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine*.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 198):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Joseph S. Frelinghuysen, who served in the United States Senate from the State of New Jersey from March 4, 1917, to March 3, 1923.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. Veterans' Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on the following dates examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 3, 1948:

H. R. 1634. An act to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto.

On February 9, 1948:

H. R. 1366. An act to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted on February 9, 1948, the Speaker did, on February 11, 1948, sign the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 1634. An act to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto.

H. R. 1366. An act to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—DAVID J. WILSON AGAINST WALTER K. GRANGER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

FEBRUARY 12, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The Clerk has received from Frank W. Otterstrom, the officer before whom testimony was taken in the contested-election case of David J. Wilson against Walter K. Granger, for a seat in the Eightieth Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of Utah, letters dated January 10, February 3, and February 6, 1948, with reference to the transmission of testimony and exhibits in the aforesaid case.

The letters from this officer, together with the two express packages, the air-mail package, and exhibit No. 109 referred to therein, as well as copies of all other papers heretofore filed with the Clerk relating to this case, are transmitted to the House for its action.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The communication will be referred to the Committee on House Administration.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

FEBRUARY 12, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the Office of the Clerk on February 10, 1948.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SUBMARGINAL LANDS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 527)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval H. R. 3153, "to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota."

During the drought period of 1932 to 1938 the United States acquired in the drought areas, out of funds appropriated under the statutes referred to in H. R. 3153, approximately 10,000,000 acres of submarginal lands, much of which is suited only for carefully limited and controlled grazing use. Of the submarginal lands so acquired in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, approximately 245,000 acres were in 1938 and 1939 placed by Executive order under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior in order to facilitate their use for the benefit of the Indian tribes occupying reservations in the same localities. The underlying purpose of H. R. 3153 appears to be that of making provision by law for the permanent disposition of these lands, through the transfer to Indian tribal ownership of those lands needed for and adapted to Indian grazing use, through the transfer to individual Indians of those lands needed for and adapted to Indian agricultural use, and through the transfer to individual veterans of the other agricultural or grazing lands upon appropriate conditions as to price and future use. While this underlying purpose is sound, the manner in which the bill attempts to provide for its accomplishment seems to me to be altogether unsound from several aspects.

First, the bill would grant to local disposal committees absolute authority, not merely to determine factual matters, but also to decide the entire policy question of how these submarginal lands should be disposed of, without any effective guidance in the form of statutory standards to channel and control the discretion of their members. Nor does the bill provide any means whereby the decisions of the local disposal committees may be reviewed. On the contrary, it expressly directs the Secretary of the Interior "to make such transfers of title

as shall carry out the recommendations of the committee."

I cannot consider this a sound method of legislation. Local boards, having no real responsibility to either the legislative or the executive branch of the Government, should not be granted the authority to dispose of large tracts of land belonging to the United States, merely in accordance with their own opinions as to what would be the best manner of disposing of these lands. Yet this is what the bill would do. Local committees may serve a helpful purpose in the classification of lands for disposal, but certainly adequate standards to govern their actions should be prescribed by law, and adequate means for the review of their determinations should be provided. Yet this is what the bill does not do. Such broad policy issues as whether in a semiarid country grazing land should be disposed of in the same manner as agricultural land, or whether individual applicants for grants of land should be required to pay or not to pay for the lands they receive, ought not to be left to the untrammeled and unreviewable judgment of local boards. Under the bill it would be possible for each local committee to decide these policy issues for itself, with the result that contradictory policies might be established for neighboring areas.

Second, H. R. 3153 would permit the disposition of the lands affected by its provisions in ways that would be decidedly contrary to the public interest. The primary purpose of the acquisition of these lands was to prevent overgrazing and other land-use practices which had so accelerated the wind-and-water erosion of the soil in many drought areas as to produce dust-bowl conditions. A second purpose of their acquisition was the relief of the agricultural poverty which had been brought about through the subdivision of lands best adapted for grazing use into farm units far too small to support the families then attempting to draw a living from these lands. Notwithstanding the large expenditures made for the purchase of submarginal lands in order to prevent the recurrence of these conditions, H. R. 3153 would permit some of these lands to be returned to private ownership without any safeguards whatsoever against their use in ways that would tend to produce dust-bowl conditions and agricultural poverty.

Lands which should be retained permanently under Federal supervision could be given or sold by the local disposal committees to private individuals, and lands which can be economically used only under carefully worked out conservation programs might be disposed of without the imposition of necessary safeguards against mal-use and deterioration. The inevitable tendency would be to invite the plowing of lands which should be used only for grazing, the destruction of grass through overgrazing, and the resumption of other bad land-use practices. Such practices would, in turn, tend to produce the same conditions of soil depletion and accelerated erosion, and the same subdivision of ranch lands into unstable farm units, which were basic causes of the agricultural distress that beset the people of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota, as well as of other States, during the period immediately prior to the acquisition of the submarginal lands.

We cannot prevent the recurrence of drought cycles, but we should not disregard their lessons. We should not reverse, even to the limited extent inherent in H. R. 3153, the policy of protecting submarginal lands against abuse, born out of the experience of the last great drought cycle, merely because a wet cycle has intervened. To do so would be to throw away the money spent for the acquisition of the submarginal lands, and to intensify agricultural distress whenever drought reappears.

Third, H. R. 3153 substantially disregards the very real equity which the Indians of the localities where the submarginal lands are situated have in their continued utilization as a part of the otherwise sorely deficient land base of these Indians. While it is true that under the broad discretion conferred on the local disposal committees by the terms of the bill every single acre of these lands could be placed in Indian tribal ownership, it is also true that under the same broad discretion most, if not all, of the tracts involved could be granted by the local committees to non-Indians.

When the submarginal lands affected by H. R. 3153 were acquired, it was definitely contemplated that they would be used to assist the neighboring Indian tribes in consolidating their scattered land holdings, in creating economic range units which would support Indian families, in developing conservational land-use practices, and in establishing a better pattern of Indian land ownership and use. To this end, the Secretary of the Interior in 1938 and 1939 was directed to administer the lands for the benefit of the Indians, insofar as consistent with the uses for which the lands had been acquired. Since that time the Secretary, in cooperation with the tribes concerned, has developed and put into effect programs for the improvement of the Indian economy to which continued Indian use of at least large parts of the submarginal lands is essential. These programs, and the legitimate Indian aspirations founded upon them, would be frustrated by many of the dispositions which could be accomplished under the terms of the bill. To cite but one example, many existing Indian range units are composed in part of Indian-owned lands and in part of federally owned submarginal lands, and in these units the Indian-owned home properties frequently could not be operated except in conjunction with the submarginal lands upon which they are dependent. The bill provides no safeguards for the protection of these established operations other than the judgment of the local disposal committees.

Thus, H. R. 3153 would open the door to disruption of the Indian economy built up, at no little labor and expense, in reliance upon the continued availability for Indian use of many of the areas covered by the bill. In addition, it would deny the Indians any immediate recompense for this disruption, since it provides that any receipts from the use or sale of the submarginal lands shall be deposited in the Federal Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Fourth, a detailed examination of the bill reveals that a number of its provisions are either ambiguous or impracticable. For example, reference is made at various places to "the county in which the major portion of the Indian reservation lies." This reference does not fit several of the reservations involved which are so divided by county lines that no one county contains "the major portion" of the reservation.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval from H. R. 3153.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1948.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and, without objection, the bill and message will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE ACT

Mr. REES submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4127) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

LEGISLATION AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the membership of the House to a conference report that I have just filed on H. R. 4127, being an amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act. A detailed statement with respect to this legislation is set forth in this report. This measure is of considerable importance. I suggest that the Members read the report rather carefully so that they may be familiar with its provisions when it is called for consideration on the floor of the House, which we expect will be some time during next week.

AMENDING REVISED STATUTES, UNITED STATES CODE, TITLE 2, SECTION 25

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 148.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 3778, to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

Strike out in lines 4 and 5, page 1, of the engrossed bill the words "so as to read as follows" and insert in lieu thereof "by adding at the end thereof the following"; on page 1, line 6, strike out "Sec. 30."; and on page 2, lines 9 and 13, strike out the quotation marks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, occasionally even the most careful of committees may make mistakes. It is to correct one on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House that this resolution is presented. For years there has never been any record evidence whatsoever of the membership of any Member of the House in the event it ever should become necessary to prove such membership. To correct that deficiency, this bill, H. R. 3778, was introduced. It does so, but in committee amendments a short paragraph, section 30 of the revised statutes (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), which was not intended to be stricken, was also stricken, together with many of the provisions of the bill. But there was no intent to strike out that section. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee and was passed by the other body as it was passed in the House. This concurrent resolution would simply restore that paragraph which was unintentionally stricken by the committee amendment. I think there cannot possibly be any objection to the resolution which would simply authorize that as enrolled the bill contain exactly what the committee intended in its unanimous report and which has been agreed in by Senate action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. George J. Burger, director of the Washington office of the Small Business Corp.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with a bill I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled "The American Peoples Foreign Assistance Act of 1948." It embodies a different approach to the great problem of foreign relief.

I am well satisfied that it is the humanitarian obligation of this country to help in the relief and rehabilitation of the devastated countries of the world, especially those of western Europe. How can we best accomplish this obligation without jeopardizing the economic health and welfare of our own people? I think it can best be done by encouraging our own people to give individual aid and assistance to the needful peoples of the devastated countries.

It must be remembered that about seven-eighths of the present relief contemplated to be furnished in the first year of the recovery program is for food, clothing, and the necessaries of life, and that approximately one-eighth of it is to be used for rehabilitation purposes, such as the furnishing of machinery and industrial equipment. I am one of those who believe that "feeding the hungry and clothing the naked" is essentially a humanitarian obligation of the peoples of the United States as distinguished from the Government of the United States, and that this Government should take every feasible step toward encouraging the assumption of that obligation by the people of this country. To that end I have provided in this bill for two things:

First. An authorized deduction of up to 15 percent from individual tax payments for the value of contributions or gifts of food, clothing, and other necessaries of life made available for persons in need in overseas foreign countries. This 15-percent deduction is in addition to the present 15-percent deduction authorized to be made for contributions for religious and charitable purposes.

Second. A provision authorizing the sending of relief packages to peoples in overseas foreign countries in need at one-fourth the regular postal rate, the deficit to be paid for from relief appropriations.

The provision permitting the additional 15-percent income-tax deduction is meant to encourage a greater giving by peoples of this country. I know of literally hundreds of people in my district who send relief packages to the needy people of the war-devastated countries ranging in value from $10 to $300 each month.

Under the law, as written today, income-tax deductions are permissible only in those cases where the relief packages are intended for general distribution. The deduction may not be claimed where the package is directed to a particular individual. I see no distinction between the two cases, and feel that the discrimination should be done away with. This bill does that.

What is more, many persons contribute much more than 15 percent of their total income to charitable purposes, and persons who do should be permitted to claim income-tax deductions for it.

This provision of the proposed bill is surrounded by safeguards so as to prevent transgression of the intent of the provision. It is to be noted that such contributions or gifts are allowable as deductions only if verified under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. This is the same provision which prevails in the case of the subsection of the present Internal Revenue Code dealing with the present 15-percent charitable contribution provision.

The reduced postal rate provision is likewise intended to encourage the greater giving by our people. The present high postal rates are prohibitive, and in many instances exceed the actual value of the food or clothing sent abroad. The arguments in support of this provision have been expounded by many Members of the Congress in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and several bills to accomplish this single purpose have been introduced.

I would like to comment that early last year the idea of reduced postal rates on relief packages occurred to me. At that time I importuned the President of the United States to urge legislative action looking to the accomplishment of this idea, but through the Postmaster General I received a very discouraging response. This prompted me to obtain from the Library of Congress an excellent report dealing with the feasibility of the proposed idea. I do not want to take the time of the membership to explain the many facets of the proposal together with the statistics in support of its feasibility, but I will confine myself to saying that in testimony before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Post Office Department has stated its ability and willingness to assume the additional transportation burden which would undoubtedly follow as a result of reducing the rates. No additional deficit will be incurred in the Post Office budget because the bill provides for reimbursement for additional expense from regularly appropriated relief funds.

The volume of shipment of parcel post packages to Europe has been tremendous. In the fiscal year 1946 the people of this country sent more than 132,000,000 pounds of packages to civilians in Europe. In the fiscal year 1947 this sum rose to better than 317,000,000 pounds. It is conservatively estimated by the Post Office Department that in the present fiscal year 1948 almost 700,000,000 pounds of parcel post packages will be sent to Europe. The average postal rate is 14 cents a pound. This means that some $28,000,000 will be spent by our citizens in postage on these packages alone. In the normal case, the cost of sending a package is about the same as the cost of purchasing the contents; and in many cases, the postage exceeds the value, especially in instances where second-hand clothing is sent.

It is reasonably estimated that by reducing the postage rate to one-fourth of the present rate and authorizing deductions from income taxes for the value of merchandise sent, the volume of gift packages to Europe will probably treble the present volume. This would probably mean the shipment of better than a million tons of relief packages in the coming year. Such a shipment would go

a long way toward relieving hunger and suffering in Europe, would create a splendid spirit of international good will between the sender and recipient, and would lower the expenditures necessary under the contemplated Marshall proposals.

I emphasize that this bill is entitled "The American Peoples Foreign Assistance Act of 1948," and is intended to shift the principal responsibility for the burden of relief, especially in the first year of the contemplated Marshall plan, from the shoulders of the Government to the individual shoulders of the people of the Government.

At a time when the Government of the United States is already overburdened with financial obligations incident to maintaining its own economic and social existence, it is timely and proper that this principle be recognized in a practical manner. For too many years now there has been a thought current that the Treasury of the United States consists of an inexhaustible supply of greenbacks and gold. By encouraging the giving of voluntary relief by our own people, we are bringing home to them the all-important concept that operating the Government is a very expensive proposition and at the same time we are discharging our humanitarian obligations.

I hope that this two-pronged effort to encourage the giving of voluntary relief will meet with favorable response from the Members of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE FUEL-OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to read from a card I received this morning from my home town:

"Twenty-two below zero this a. m." Referring to a man who has lived through some 70 winters in New England, "He has never seen a winter like this. There has been no January thaw." The January thaw up our way is the only measure of relief we have so we can build up our meager stock piles. That is a marked difference between the low of 30 we had here—52° difference.

I have read previously from editorials with reference to the situation, appearing in the Boston Post, one of the most influential newspapers in New England. I wish to read another short editorial. It is headed "Too little, too late?"

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE?

Official announcement that oil shipments abroad from east coast ports would be discontinued comes on the day that the Massachusetts fuel czar describes the oil situation as the worst yet. Perhaps it wouldn't be so bad at the present time if the ban on oil shipments abroad had been imposed earlier instead of at this late date. Government officials have been deplorably slow to recognize the oil emergency in New England despite the warnings that have been given them right from the start of the cold weather. We are right in the midst of the crisis and it is doubtful if action taken now will be effective.

I agree that "it is doubtful if action taken now will be effective" unless further vigorous and prompt action is taken immediately along the lines recommended by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on December 19 and again on January 26. I have wired the President asking him to order the Department of Commerce to exercise the authority vested in it.

After having studied carefully the texts of each of these announcements by the Department of Commerce on January 16, February 4 and 10, I decided the only course I could take to obtain any consideration of actual conditions which I know have prevailed in the First District of Massachusetts, as well as in many other areas in New England and elsewhere, was to urge the President, with all the sincerity I possess, to order immediately a further flat reduction of these announced quotas by 50 percent through March 31. I sent the following telegram Tuesday night:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 10, 1948.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

After careful consideration of the text of the releases of the Office of International Trade of January 30, February 4, and February 10, as a Member of Congress responsible to all the residents of the First Congressional District of Massachusetts, and knowing what has been happening there this past month, I urge that you direct the Secretary of Commerce to order the Office of International Trade to send a cable immediately, such as the following, to the Governments of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, British Honduras, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, Netherlands, British West Africa, Switzerland, and French West Africa:

"Because petroleum products are in critical short supply in this country and because we must insure that supplies in our shortage areas are substantially increased immediately, and because we may find it necessary to extend the existing restrictions beyond March 31 unless we can readjust the situation in this country promptly, we regret to advise you that we believe, in the interest of continuing production in this country, maintaining transportation and public utilities, keeping our schools and hospitals and churches and other institutions, and individual homes heated to a minimum degree, and in the interests of being able to assist your government and your people, as the American people hope to do, we must ask you to accept a 50-percent reduction in the allocations to your country as announced by this Department on February 9, effective immediately."

I strongly urge that you order the proper authorities in the War Department to immediately reduce the allotment to Japan and the Ryukyus by the same percentage. I further urge that immediate consideration be given to the shipment of motor fuel oil to the above countries adding Brazil, Italy, and Paraguay. I do this because of the current reports that we are faced with a motor gas shortage next summer which will be disastrous not only to the farmers in many areas, including the First District of Massachusetts, but to the people dependent upon essential travel by automobile for entire annual income. Finally, I urge that the entire item of reserve be made available for shortage areas at once, specifically 399,000 barrels of other motor fuel, 147,000 barrels kerosene, 353,500 barrels gas oil and distillate fuel oil, and 151,000 barrels residual fuel oil, a total of 1,050,500 barrels of petroleum products. I hope to have an official report as to the daily amount of these needed oils which were shipped from the Gulf Coast during the month of January and the first 10 days of February, which I know you will consider. Obviously, we shall be losing very substantial amounts daily unless you direct this action at once.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

Because there is no question, in terms of the existing law and in terms of the authority which has been exercised in making these previous reductions, I sent Secretary Harriman a telegram, quoting the telegram to the President and adding:

Since existing law gives you full authority, as you testified before the Banking and Currency Committee last fall, I hope you will anticipate the gravity of this request by myself to the President.

And, because it is my understanding that the staff of the Office of International Trade is engaged in many other phases of the export program, I also wired the chief of that office, Mr. Thomas C. Blaisdell, advising what I had done, and adding:

You will note that your office would be authorized to act promptly in cutting the quota allotments of February 10 by 50 percent, that you also be authorized to include a similar reduction in motor fuel to build our stock piles against diminishing supplies, and that I have asked the President to order the proper military authorities to take similar action as to the allocations to Japan and the Ryukyus. Will you kindly advise me as soon as possible how quickly you could issue such a cable, if authorized? Also, advise me as to what the reserve item includes, particularly as to whether these amounts are now available for shortage areas.

Apart from the cogent and, I believe, compelling reasons for this action in the interest of the economy, the safety, and the security of this country, I want to call your particular attention to this announcement of February 10, which does not apply to any shipments from the Gulf coast or the west coast to any other country. It is difficult to get satisfactory information as to amounts shipped in the 42 days, although that has been requested repeatedly by the staff of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I am under the impression that shipments overseas from the west coast are not in sufficient amounts to have any adverse effect upon domestic users of west coast petroleum and petroleum products. If that is correct, then

I submit an embargo of 50 percent on those shipments for 46 days cannot possibly have any substantially injurious effect upon those countries, which I assume include many where a midsummer climate is now prevailing.

Certainly the same holds true as to shipments to the Caribbean and South American area, as well as to Africa. The only question remaining is whether there will be an immediate injurious effect, so far as north European shipments are concerned. Since the announcement of February 4 involved a 100-percent embargo to the continental area of three types to six countries, the expressed concern over a reduction of 50 percent of these generous quotas does not seem to be particularly impressive.

Now I want to submit to you some very significant testimony of Ambassador Lewis Douglas before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on last Friday:

I asked the Ambassador if he thought 1934 to 1938, inclusive, was "a fair base period over which we might average our exports to the end users in other countries and then compare it with our projected program for this year." He said that although he did not know the figures well enough, it "might be, I think, a fair plan." He added that it "might well be too generous a standard because the increase in demand percentagewise in the European countries is not as great as it is in the United States."

I attempted to outline to the Ambassador the several proposals I have made in an attempt to provide a fair formula for handling these exports during the rest of the heating season here and asked for his opinion as to which was the better approach. He replied that it was a broad question and that he had been plunged into it very suddenly. He added that, therefore, he was not as well equipped as he should be to give a categorical answer that would mean anything. I can fully understand that, as I am sure that each of you do. But I am also confident that you share my high opinion of the complete honesty and great ability of Ambassador Douglas and I do hope we shall have the benefit of his counsel on this phase of the problem facing us so clearly at this time.

Again today I heard the statement that the President is reported to have made to the Florida group which came here to report its recommendations and to present its petition for relief to him and to the Congress. Subsection (s) reads as follows:

If exportation of oil has contributed to the current and contemplated shortage of oil and the scandalous prices thereof and also whether exportation of oil should be curbed or prohibited.

Yet I understand that these earnest and sincere Americans, who had traveled here to tell us of their troubles and their worries were led to believe that Congress has been derelict in its duties in failing to provide the Executive with the means through which it could control or prohibit exports. I cannot understand this in the face of the repeated recommendations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Let me underline them again. December 19, "calling for the export control authorities granted by section 6, Public Law 703, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, should be exercised to place such prohibitions or curtailments on the exportation of fuel oil and other petroleum products for such a period of time as may be necessary to alleviate such shortages." The only difference is that the committee used the words "prohibitions or curtailments," while the Florida group chose "curbed or prohibited." January 26, the committee recommended "the immediate cessation of the exportation of all petroleum products" and gave as its reason that "it appears that the situation is now so grave that exports should be stopped completely until it can be determined whether further exports are damaging the economy of this country." Can anyone doubt but that the draining off of these short supplies has been damaging and will continue to damage the economy of this country? Consider the testimony of Mr. Donald Montgomery, chief Washington representative of the UAW-CIO, before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on yesterday. He said:

Industry in the city of Detroit is paralyzed by a shortage of natural gas. More than 90,000 auto workers have been thrown out of their jobs. Newspapers report a total of 200,000 factory workers idle because of the gas shortage. This unemployment is spreading to outlying cities as parts produced in Detroit plants fail to reach other plants that need them. In western Michigan many industries have been virtually abandoned by the gas utility and most of them will soon be forced to curtail or completely shut down. * * * Shut-downs in Detroit began on Thursday of the week before last. Yesterday was the ninth day. * * * The Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission said that claims filed last week exceeded by 60 percent the previous high record touched on VJ-day. It predicted the filing of 110,000 claims during the week. * * * By the end of last week our workers had lost, through lay-offs during this crisis, 4,333,000 hours of work. At our average pay of $1.50 an hour, the loss in pay adds up to more than $6,500,000; that is, up to the end of last week. Every week this continues will cost these workers over $5,300,000. * * * Chrysler Corp. says it has had a production loss of $20,000,000 and a pay-roll loss to its workers of $3,000,000. * * * Effect of the Detroit shut-down on auto production is reflected in Ward's reports for the United States. For last week it reported output of 58,100 cars, 22,300 trucks—a total of 80,400. During 3 weeks of January the output averaged 80,500 cars per week, 25,900 trucks—a total of 106,400. Last week's production fell below this recent average by 28 percent in cars, 16 percent in trucks, and 25 percent in the total.

While the prime shortage is in natural gas, everyone agrees that the situation is also attributable to the lack of fuel oil with which to manufacture gas.

The same story could be told, in probably less dramatic figures, from Pittsburgh, from Ohio, from New York, from New England, and from many other areas. No one knows the loss of pay and of production because workers have been cold or have contracted colds and pneumonia and have had to stay away from work all over this country.

How long must this go on before we can have action? Must it come to a complete break-down?

Maybe what we have left of the 650,000 barrels of kerosene, of the 2,900,000 barrels of gas oil and distillate fuel oil, and the 1,375,000 barrels of residual fuel oil, if shipped into shortage areas would not carry us through. But can anyone deny it would not help?

How can we explain this continued failure to act on the recommendation of the immediate cessation of the exportation of all petroleum products with the embargo—100 percent—on three types to six countries and the refusal to reduce them to any appreciable degree to 48 countries.

If you feel as the Boston Post does that "Government officials have been deplorably slow to recognize the oil emergency in New England despite the warnings that have been given to them right from the start of the cold weather," would not you join in helping me by asking the President now to order the Department of Commerce to take this step at once, before the end of this week?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think it is advisable that we might at this time just refer to a statement once made by Abraham Lincoln. He said:

No man living is more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned.

Nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor, property is desirable, is a positive good to the world.

That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

What a great "guy" he was. He becomes greater as time marches on. To this day the above lines reveal the true spirit of the United States of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain testimony.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from the Erie, Ind., Jewish Welfare Federation.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Military Order of Cooties.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an essay on Americanism.

MORE EFFECTIVE LAWS NEEDED TO PROTECT LABOR UNIONS AGAINST COMMUNISTS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Local 471 of the United Public Workers-CIO, which is striking against 42 Government cafeterias, has now complied with the law regarding non-Communist affidavits by local officers. The national officers of UPW, however, have refused to swear they are not Communists.

The president of local 471 last week refused to answer questions propounded to him by our subcommittee regarding his Communist connections. Evidently to keep from signing a non-Communist affidavit, he resigned as president of the local.

This incident, Mr. Speaker, serves to point up the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley law in squeezing Communists out of union leadership. But it also shows that overnight shift of officers may be only a sleight-of-hand maneuver, and may not really cleanse the union leadership as the law intended.

For example, one Oliver T. Palmer is the chief negotiator and business agent for local 471. He has recently signed the non-Communist affidavit. That is well and good. I do not know if he is a Communist or not. But I do know that when Palmer appeared before our subcommittee last week he refused to answer questions regarding his alleged Communist activities and connections. Our evidence showed, for example, that on March 6, 1946, Palmer appeared as one of the principal guests at a farewell dinner for Al Lannon, high-ranking Negro Communist, who had been in charge of District 4 of the Communist Party. Our information was that at the conclusion of that party the participants sang the Internationale, theme song of the Communist Party everywhere. When asked about those incidents, Palmer refused to answer.

I mention this to illustrate the fact that it is possible for one to have been a Communist yesterday and sign a non-Communist affidavit today and yet be in a position to make prosecution for false swearing very difficult. He can say: "I was a Communist yesterday, but I changed my mind last night. Today I am not a Communist."

It follows that while the law has been very effective in driving the Communists out of offices in labor unions, the law can be greatly strengthened in that respect. The law would be far more effective if it required all union officers to swear they are not Communists and have not been within a period of 5 years.

To strike at this loophole in the law, I have today introduced a bill to amend the existing law to make all union officers who take advantage of the law sign affidavits to the effect they are not Communists and have not been for a period of 5 years preceding. That would catch most of them and would go a long way toward preventing overnight evasions of the law.

Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of the fact that the local 471 is, despite the signing of non-Communist affidavits by the local officers following the resignation of their president, still under Communist influence, I call attention to the fact that Abram Flaxer, president of the United Public Workers-CIO, a Russian-born Communist Party-liner, refused to answer questions regarding his Communist activities and refused to answer the question of whether he is a member of the Communist Party, when he was subpenaed before our subcommittee investigating the GSI strike last week. And he has refused to sign the non-Communist affidavit. The same is true of all the officers of the United Public Workers-CIO.

As still further evidence of the continuing Communist influence in local 471, I call attention to the fact that according to the press, Paul Robeson, well known in Communist circles, is to make an appearance in Washington tonight for the benefit of local 471. It is, of course, well and good for the strikers to have voluntary donations. They have been unemployed because of unwise leadership, and have been replaced by others who were unemployed and who wanted to work.

It may be that local sponsors do not know of Robeson's Communist connections, or it may be that they do not care about that. That is their business. It is of interest to note that, according to a newspaper clipping which I hold in my hand, one of the places where tickets may be purchased for tonight's performance is the Washington Bookshop. It is well known that the Bookshop is the Capital outlet for Communist Party literature and smear propaganda written by William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, and the Bolsheviks of Russia. The Washington Bookshop has been listed as a Communist-dominated front by former Attorney General Biddle, Attorney General Clark, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Robeson has been connected with Communist Party activities for many years. He has been associated with innumerable party organizations and fronts. Walter S. Steele, of the Coalition of Patriotic Societies, in testifying before the House Committee on Un-American Activities identified Robeson as a member of the Communist Party in Chicago.

Further evidence of the love that Robeson bears for the Soviet Union is provided by the fact that he sent his son to Russia to be educated. When indications of World War II appeared, he transferred his son to London, where Robeson obtained permission from the Soviet Ambassador to enroll his son in the Communist school provided for children of Russian diplomats.

From this record it is easy to understand why many people associate Paul Robeson with the hammer and sickle.

This Congress will be rendering a great service if existing laws can be strengthened in a way that life will be made more miserable for those living in free America who pay allegiance to the Soviet flag above our own. J. Edgar Hoover, perhaps the most respected man in America today, says if a war should occur between this country and Russia, the American Communists would be on the side of Russia. In view of this, who can say we should not tighten the laws to more effectively drive the Communists from positions of influence in the labor unions that are Communist-dominated, and free the loyal union members of such perfidy?

THE COMMODITY MARKET CRASH AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the commodity market crash of recent days has cost the farmers of North Dakota an estimated one hundred and fifty to two hundred millions of dollars. It has cost the farmers of America billions of dollars.

It is, I believe, the only time in our history that any administration has deliberately caused a panic. And I charge that this panic has been created for purely political reasons.

First. It represents an attempt to buy CIO–PAC votes with cheap food, even though it means the ruination of American agriculture.

Second. I see it as an effort to force the Marshall plan through Congress under the threat that farmers will be bankrupted unless their Representatives in Congress vote to give away billions of dollars' worth of food to foreign nations.

The stage for this commodity price break was set months ago when President Truman began railing against

"speculators in human misery," while other spokesmen accused farmers of profiteering. Publication of lists of traders in the Nation's commodity markets, together with the administration criticism of their activities, led many people to withdraw completely from the exchanges. This created what is called a "thin market." Prices held at or near their previous levels but the cushion had been removed.

Then it only remained for the Department of Agriculture to pull the rug right out from under the farmer.

A few months ago, when the ill-fated Luckman conservation program was inaugurated, the people were told that there was a serious shortage of wheat and other grains. Last week, however, Mr. Anderson came forward with the theory that the outlook had greatly improved and that it might even be possible to ship 500,000,000 bushels of wheat abroad, rather than the 450,000,000 originally contemplated.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, with some 77,000,000 bushels of wheat still to buy under the smaller export figure and one hundred and twenty-seven million under the larger, quietly withdrew from the market.

The Government, which has been the greatest commodity buyer in all history, just stopped buying. There seems to be some question as to what happened next. Mr. Anderson said Sunday there had been a "leak" in connection with the Government's decision to withdraw from the market. He denied having said any such thing yesterday but, in any event, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is investigating that phase of the market break and I am satisfied we shall have the real truth shortly.

As to what happened early last week and as to what has happened every day since, there can be no question. The bottom simply fell out of the grain market, while other major farm commodities moved down the daily trading limit. One man, Mr. Maynard, made nearly half a million dollars by selling wheat "short."

The Commodity Credit Corporation, which had not been averse to paying $3 per bushel, and even more, for wheat only a short time ago, declined to enter the market as prices tumbled day after day.

One word from the Secretary of Agriculture—the man who is supposed to represent the farmers of America in the Cabinet—just one word from this man—"buy"—would have halted the plummeting market. But that one word has not been uttered yet.

To those who would say that American farm prices were too high, my answer is that this country, even before the recent crash, had by far the cheapest and most abundant supply of food of any nation on the face of the earth.

Only day before yesterday, May rye was selling on the Canadian market in Winnipeg at $4.07½ per bushel. On the same day, May rye brought only $2.37 on the Minneapolis market—a difference of $1.70½ per bushel.

This tremendous spread is accounted for by one thing alone. Canadian rye producers are permitted to sell their product on the open market—most of it going to distillers in Canada and in England. On the other hand, allocations for export of American rye are rigidly controlled and the domestic market has been further depressed by controls on domestic liquor production.

The Argentine Government has been selling wheat to European nations at from $5 to $6 per bushel—payment being made with American dollars supplied to England, France, and other countries on a gift-loan basis by us. Australian wheat earmarked for export has been commanding a price of $3.16 per bushel.

I remember the crash of 1929 and the tragic events which followed it all too well. I wonder if the present Democratic administration realizes the price this Nation may be called upon to pay for its political follies.

With a national debt of nearly two hundred and sixty billions, with a proposed annual budget of nearly forty billions, we must preserve a tremendously high rate of national income if we are to remain solvent. And if our national income is to remain near its present level, we must all realize that neither wages nor prices can be pushed down to prewar levels without dragging the other with it.

If our national income is to remain above the $200,000,000,000 a year rate, we can no more have $1.50 hourly factory pay scales and $1 wheat than we can have $2.50 wheat and 75-cent wages. Farm income and city income must be held in some sort of reasonable balance or we face an inevitable crash.

In his state of the Nation message to the Congress, Mr. Truman himself pointed out that the per capita income of American farmers is far below that of nonfarm residents. He even suggested that this differential should be wiped out. Just how this is to be accomplished by wrecking farm prices is something which only the administration apologists can undertake to explain.

City housewives who have been led to believe that the commodity market crash will mean greatly reduced food costs are doomed to disappointment. The farmer receives a very small part of the final selling price of most staple food items. They were not told that a reduction in farm income will force an equal reduction in pay rolls.

Taxes, labor, transportation, packaging, advertising, and distribution costs account for the major share. Even though the farmer received only $1 per bushel for his wheat—less than half of the parity price—housewives would find that a loaf of bread would still cost them more than it did before the war.

I am wondering too whether the powers who precipitated this market crash have considered its possible effects upon the Federal Treasury under the Steagall amendment. They are driving prices down to a point where the Congress may be called upon to appropriate billions to support farm prices for this year's crop.

On the Nation's exchanges yesterday, cotton for October and December delivery closed below parity—below the figure which Congress by law has said represents a fair return to the American farmer in relationship to prices of the things which he buys.

Wheat for September and December delivery dropped to the parity level and was prevented from going lower only because of the limitation on daily price fluctuations.

July and September oats sold not only below parity but actually below the figure at which the Government is compelled to support prices by Government loan.

By their actions—or rather by their lack of action—Mr. Truman and Mr. Anderson have demonstrated that they are highly pleased at this turn of events. They can, in fact, say in the words of the New Dealers who came before them: "We planned it that way."

As labor prepares to demand another round of wage increases—a move in which they will just as certainly have administration support as they have had in the past—the American farmer sees his real wages tobogganing down toward prewar levels.

The farmer may recall that during the war he met and exceeded every Government demand for increased production—with never a threat of a strike and in the face of critical shortages of labor and machinery. He will remember that this year, as last year, he was urged to increase his production further to feed America better than it had ever been fed before and to feed millions of people in Europe and Asia as well. He was assured by administration spokesmen and by Congress itself, through enactment of the Steagall amendment, that he would be protected against the dangers of rapid price declines which might be brought about by overproduction or through other causes.

And in spite of these promises, he has seen the administration deliberately break the market and then stand idly by while prices dropped lower and lower.

I see several possible results which may well follow the administration's ill-conceived program to deflate agriculture.

In the first place, farm production may be expected to decline this year. And it should be evident to everyone that only through greatly increased farm production can we meet the unprecedented demands for food both at home and abroad.

With the spring planting season approaching, farmers will be understandably reluctant to increase their seeded acreage in the face of sharply declining food prices and with the knowledge that the administration is determined to depress them even further.

With commodity prices dropping, farmers will find it more difficult to obtain the bank credit which many of them will require to carry forward their operations until another crop is harvested.

The population trend from the farms to the cities will continue at an accelerated pace. The migration of young people from the rural areas to the cities, which has increased at an alarming rate during recent years, will be given added impetus. Even under the most favorable conditions, life on the farm means hard work and privation. If even the opportunity to make a decent living is withdrawn, no one can blame the farmer

who goes out of business and takes a job in town where wages are high, hours are short, and much better educational and recreational facilities are available to him and his family.

I would be the last to argue that skyrocketing commodity prices are the sign of a healthy economy. But at the same time, I maintain that the sudden and violent depression in farm prices which we have witnessed during recent days could send our entire national economy into a tailspin.

What this has meant to the farmers of my own State of North Dakota can be illustrated with a few figures.

Perhaps 90,000,000 bushels of wheat remain on North Dakota farms, and in elevators throughout the State. One reason for this is the lack of boxcars to bring the grain to market. Another is that the confiscatory wartime income tax rates which the Truman administration insists upon maintaining make it highly unprofitable for a farmer to market an entire harvest in one tax year.

In recent days, the value of this wheat has dropped more than $50,000,000. Farmers cannot sell their wheat at any price in a market which drops the daily limit each trading day. The reason is simple: the elevators cannot hedge against purchases in a sell-out market and therefore they cannot buy the farmer's grain.

North Dakota farmers have lost even more money on their corn, oats, rye, barley, flax, and other crops—perhaps as much as $75,000,000. They have lost additional millions in the depreciated value of their cattle, hogs, and other livestock. Altogether, I believe their total losses are at least $150,000,000 and they may be as high as $200,000,000. The farmers of America can count their losses in the billions.

And all of this has happened in a market over which the farmer has no control whatsoever. He does not set the price of the commodities which he sends to market. That is set in the Nation's grain exchanges and livestock markets by a variety of factors, the most important of which are the policies of the Federal Government itself.

The Government today, through its huge buying program, can make or break farm prices in America. The responsibility should be clearly fixed now.

I hope that it will not be too late in November of this year for the American electorate to oust the men who would deliberately plunge the Nation into another depression. New Dealism can survive and perpetuate itself only by feeding upon one man-made crisis after another. Bread lines, WPA, and all of the kindred relief agencies are the political stock in trade of the group which knows it can remain in power only if the people are poor enough and hungry enough to respond to the promises of better days to come.

They do not understand an economy under which there is full employment and a record high income. They mean to put a stop to it. In order to halt this decline and to restore confidence, this Congress should extend the Steagall amendment for a 2-year period and in addition support other basic raw materials with a 90-percent-of-parity floor.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, although I support the spirit of the La Follette-Monroney Act which reorganized the congressional committee structure and was designed to eliminate special committees, nevertheless I feel it is imperative that one additional committee be created. With this in mind I have today introduced a House joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Civil Rights to be composed of five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate.

I feel it is appropriate that this legislation be introduced today on the birthday of the great American Emancipator and I want it distinctly understood, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is not introduced for the protection of any one segment of our citizenry.

As we protect the civil rights of the masses we shall be protecting the civil rights of the classes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication to the President of the United States and his reply thereto.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two telegrams.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

CONSUMPTION OF OIL IN THE GENERATION OF ELECTRICITY IN HYDROELECTRIC-POWER-PRODUCING STATES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, William E. Warne.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, William E. Warne, in response to a request made by me with reference to the number of barrels of oil consumed in the generation of electricity in the hydroelectric-power-producing States of California, Oregon, and Washington in 1947. The total number of barrels was 16,796,442 in those three States. Nearly every barrel could have been saved under the provisions of the Rockwell-Lemke bill, H. R. 2873, as reported by unanimous vote of the Committee on Public Lands, had it been on the statute books.

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 9, 1948.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman, House Public Lands Committee, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. WELCH: The following information is in response to your several questions of December 22, pertinent to the conservation of oil through the development of hydroelectric power.

We do not have in our Washington office information relative to the oil produced on the submerged lands that goes out of the United States. This information has been requested from the field. Nor do we have information which would enable us to determine the difference between the price of this oil sold outside of the United States over the domestic price.

The amount of oil produced on the submerged lands is only a small percentage of the oil produced in California. California oil is exported principally to Canada, Alaska, Hawaii, Philippines, Japan, China, Australia, and islands in the Pacific. A small amount does get to our eastern seaboard.

As to what is being done to make oil available from the Middle East, the American oil companies are actively engaged in the development of oil supplies in the Middle East, with the work advancing as rapidly as could be expected under present conditions; particularly, the difficulty of obtaining steel for pipe-line construction. Oil production in the Middle East now approximates 1,000,000 barrels daily, or about one-ninth of the world's output. The lack of sufficient transportation to move more oil in quantity holds back the development of production facilities. Several pipe lines are planned or under construction to move crude oil to the eastern Mediterranean, but these will not be ready for use for about 2 years. When additional transportation becomes available through the completion of the pipe lines, it is expected that Middle East oil production will increase to about 1,800,000 barrels daily. Even with such an increase it is believed generally that the oil fields of the Eastern Hemisphere will not provide enough oil to meet Eastern Hemisphere demands and that the gap will have to be filled by oil shipped from the Western Hemisphere. The present proved reserves of the Eastern Hemisphere are considerably larger than those of the Western Hemisphere, and the ultimate oil resources of the Eastern Hemisphere are estimated to be twice as large as those of the Western Hemisphere, indicating that the Eastern Hemisphere readily can meet its own oil needs when and if adequate facilities for producing, refining, and transporting are developed.

The following amounts of oil were used to generate steam for power in California, Oregon, and Washington in the years 1946 and 1947:

	Barrels
Washington:	
1946	429,551
Oregon:	
1946	261,959
California:	
1946	10,213,341
Total, Pacific, 1946	10,904,851
Washington:	
1947	530,159
Oregon:	
1947	266,792
California:	
1947	15,999,491
Total, Pacific, 1947	16,796,442

Steam plants for producing energy for resale under construction at the present time on the Pacific coast are all located in California. New steam electric-power plants totaling 956,000 kilowatts are scheduled for construction prior to 1951. If these new plants are operated on the same annual plant factor of 28 percent as the existing steam and internal combustion engines, they will generate 2,340,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. If oil were used for fuel, the oil requirements for this amount of generation would result in an added consumption of five to six million barrels of oil per annum. Unless the natural gas supply is increased, oil will be used. The supply of gas necessary for this generation would amount to between thirty and forty billion cubic feet per year.

The employment of our natural resources in water power is ideal as a means of conserving oil which otherwise could be used for the generation of electricity. The nature of water power, wherein less power can be generated in periods of low precipitation, is such that in California it is economical to develop some steam power along with hydro power. However, with the need of conserving oil, and with oil costs probably remaining at a higher level than hydroelectric costs, it will not only be imperative for water power to be developed, but it will be more economical and possibly in greater proportion in relation to steam plants whose future fuel supply is in such serious question.

The distinct possibility of an early shortage of indigenous petroleum production on the Pacific coast to meet constantly rising demands has been evident for some time. Already it has become necessary to bring in natural gas from Texas. At the present time numerous users of fuel oil in this area are unable to get firm contracts for their 1948 requirements. Industrial and commercial conditions might well become critical if the armed forces in an emergency had to take large quantities of California oil for their Pacific operations.

The States of Oregon and Washington are fortunately placed on the Columbia River with its large amount of potential power within their borders. California, however, must reach out for water power in large quantities. A vast amount of electrical energy is now being generated in hydroelectric plants at Hoover and Parker Dams on the Colorado River, mostly for service in California. The Davis Dam will start generating in 1950 or 1951, and it will be employed principally to supply service in Arizona and Nevada. The market requirements in this area in 1947, including the Los Angeles area, absorbed all of the available hydro output of the Colorado River, amounting to 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and, in addition, required 4,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy generated at fuel-burning plants.

It is estimated that by 1957 approximately 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric energy can be produced annually in that area. Immediately upstream from Hoover Dam are undeveloped projects: Bridge Canyon with a proposed installation of 750,000 kilowatts, Kanab Creek with 1,250,000 kilowatts, and Glen Canyon with 400,000 kilowatts. The market which now absorbs 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours will require 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours by 1957, provided fuel or hydro power, or both, are available. To provide hydroelectric power for use on the Pacific coast and in the Southwest is no longer a question of conserving oil only; but it is also a question of either developing hydro power or retarding the growth of industry and population.

The Federal Government under the existing critical fuel shortage and cost situation should not be in the position of having hydro developments trail the demand for energy. These developments should be made in advance of the market in order to relieve the fuel shortage to the extent possible in the coming decade and provide some leeway for national defense.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary.

SILVER JUBILEE OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE BROTHERHOODS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include the program of the convention of the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the silver jubilee of the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods is being observed in connection with the conduct by the federation of its twelfth biennial convention, now being held in Washington at the Shoreham Hotel, beginning today and continuing daily through Sunday, February 15, 1948. The federation represents more than 200 men's clubs affiliated with Reform Temples throughout the country. The president of the federation, Mr. Jesse Cohen, who, incidentally, is an honorary president, and a past president, of the Men's Club over which I, too, had the honor to preside, has requested me to extend a cordial invitation on behalf of the federation to all of the Members of Congress to attend such of the sessions of the convention as they may find convenient.

For their convenience I append the program of the convention.

This will afford an ideal opportunity for the Members of Congress to see one segment of American Jewry in action, advancing the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. The officers of the federation will be pleased to welcome any Members of Congress who desire to attend.

SILVER JUBILEE, TWELFTH BIENNIAL NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE BROTHERHOODS CONVENTION, FEBRUARY 12, 13, 14, 15, 1948, WASHINGTON, D. C., SHOREHAM HOTEL

Thursday, February 12: General registration.

11 a. m., joint National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods and Jewish Chautauqua Society board meeting.

2 p. m., opening session, twelfth biennial convention:

Chairman, Jesse Cohen.

Invocation, James L. Magrish, first vice president, National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, Cincinnati.

National anthem, assembly.

Welcome, Bernard H. Conn, president, Washington Hebrew Congregational Brotherhood.

Welcome, Hon. John Russell Young, Chairman, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

Response, Maury Lieber, president, Chicago Conference of Temple Brotherhoods.

Appointment of convention committees.

Greetings, Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York; Mrs. Louis Rosett, president, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, New Rochelle; Leonard Spring, president, National Federation of Temple Youth, New York; Max Feder, first vice president, National Association of Temple Secretaries, New York.

President's message, Jesse Cohen.

The Silver Jubilee of Achievement, Arthur L. Reinhart, executive director, National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods-Jewish Chautauqua Society, Cincinnati.

A Blueprint for the Decades Ahead, S. Herbert Kaufman, member, National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods executive board, Harrisburg.

Action on constitutional amendments.

8 p. m., Jewish Chautauqua Society symposium:

Chairman, Leon L. Berkowitz, Jewish Chautauqua Society, Philadelphia.

Invocation, Rabbi Hugo Schiff, Temple Beth El, Alexandria.

Symposium, Education's Positive Role, Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president, Howard University, Washington, D. C.; Rabbi Abraham Shusterman, Har Sinai Congregation, Baltimore.

Benediction, Max Berkowitz, member, Jewish Chautauqua Society board, Mount Vernon.

Friday, February 13, 10 a. m., Brotherhood open forum:

Chairman, S. Herbert Kaufman.

Invocation, Sam Kolin, president, Metropolitan Conference of Temple Brotherhoods, New York.

Membership Participation in Programs and Projects, Earle G. Kallen, president, Sinai Men's Club, Chicago.

Discussion topics: Membership campaigns, dues collection, bulletins, Jewish content in meetings, advancing Jewish education, recruiting leadership, utilizing National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods aids.

12:30 p. m., luncheon to delegates and male visitors.

2 p. m., union program:

Chairman, Jesse Cohen.

Union program, Jacob Aronson, chairman of board, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York.

Union problems, Max Robert Schrayer, member union board, Chicago.

Hebrew Union College, Rabbi Alvin I. Fine, assistant to president, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.

Election board members, National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods and Jewish Chautauqua Society.

4:30 p. m., National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods board meeting, election of officers.

8 p. m., religious services at Washington Hebrew Congregation; ritual, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld assisted by Dr. Bernard A. Baer, acting president Washington Hebrew Congregation; sermon, The House That Stands, Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath.

Reception at temple.

Saturday, February 14, 11 a. m., religious services at Washington Hebrew Congregation; ritual, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld; sermon, Rabbi Abraham Feldman, president, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Hartford.

5 p. m., Jewish Chautauqua Society board meeting; election of members and officers.

7:30 p. m., twenty-fifth anniversary banquet and dance.

Invocation, David Perlman, member National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods board, Baltimore.

Address, Hon. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General, United States of America.

Presentation of new officers, National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods and Jewish Chautauqua Society.

Closing remarks and benediction, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld.

Dance.

Sunday, February 15, 10 a. m., Jewish Chautauqua Society round table:

Chairman, newly elected national chairman, Jewish Chautauqua Society.

Invocation, Edward Miller, president, Temple Emanuel Brotherhood, Denver.

Chautauqua Membership Campaigning, Joseph Finkelstein, member, Jewish Chautauqua Society board, Brooklyn.

Open forum on all phases of Jewish Chautauqua Society: Membership, finance, program.

Presentation of awards to brotherhoods and Jewish Chautauqua Society chairmen for fulfilling 1947 quota, Leon L. Berkowitz.

11:30 a. m., concluding session:

Chairman, newly elected national president, National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods.

Committee reports.

New business.

Benediction, Sam Silverman, Rockdale Avenue Temple Men's Club, Cincinnati.

The National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods, organized in 1923 by its parent body, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, has, in its first quarter century, grown to a body of over 40,000 men in 200 affiliated men's clubs in 39 States and Canada. It is the right arm of the UAHC in stimulating lay responsibility and activity in the Reform congregations throughout the land.

Through its program to stimulate Jewish living, the NFTB distributes a variety of aids for adult Jewish education, religious expression, and the building of warm social ties within the congregation. A wide range of organizational aids assists the affiliated clubs in effective functioning.

In 1939 the NFTB assumed sponsorship of the Jewish Chautauqua Society, which was organized 55 years ago by the late Rabbi Henry Berkowitz. The JCS educational program disseminates authentic information about the Jew and Judaism to America's Christian college youth and faculties. In 1947 over 375,000 persons heard 165 JCS speakers on 412 campuses in every State of the Union. A dozen resident lectureships dealing with Judaism are being underwritten by JCS, and in the past 2½ years over 12,000 volumes of Judaica have been presented to over 400 college libraries. To reach a younger group, JCS supplied Rabbinic teachers to 100 Christian Church camps in the summer of 1947. Over 7,000 JCS members supported the work of the society during the past year.

This twenty-fifth year of the NFTB has marked the greatest growth and expansion thus far recorded in any single year of brotherhood history.

FALLING PRICES AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote the following logical editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 10, 1948, entitled "Falling Prices and the Marshall Plan":

FALLING PRICES AND THE MARSHALL PLAN

The prices of wheat, corn, cotton, and many other commodities are much lower than they were when General Marshall announced what the bill for the Marshall plan was going to be.

The general said that he and his State Department boys had gone over the European requirements with the utmost care. Everything had been whittled down to the lowest possible figure. The gift of any less wheat, cotton, or anything else the plan called for would invite a Russian conquest of western Europe. At the prices then being quoted for commodities, the total bill would be $6,800,000,000. Congress should give that much or drop the whole idea, because anything less than the sum named would be wasted. Of course, if prices rose, the bill would go up proportionately.

But prices didn't stay the same and they didn't rise. Instead, they fell and fell sharply. If $6,800,000,000 was the right figure a few weeks ago, it is much too high a figure today. General Marshall can now buy all the wheat, corn, cotton, eggs, pork, and a lot of other things that he was going to buy for the Europeans at much less cost than he had calculated.

Anyone who continues to talk about $6,800,000,000 as the absolute minimum of Marshall plan relief is demonstrably insincere. The same goes, of course, for the advocates of all the other foreign-relief appropriations which, according to the figures submitted to the Senate by Lewis Douglas a few days ago bring the grand total for the year to nine and one-third billion dollars. Even assuming (as we do not) that anything like this sum is required to avert starvation or prevent revolutions abroad, the bill is grossly excessive in view of the price changes which have occurred.

INDICTMENT OF PHILIP MURRAY AND CIO

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, certain individuals are attempting to propagandize the country into thinking that a huge battle is shaping up over the indictment of Mr. Philip Murray and the CIO regarding one phase of the Taft-Hartley bill, namely, that of endorsing candidates for election. They are attempting to give the impression that the decision in this case, if in their favor, will tend to show one of the weaknesses of the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a sham battle with but one objective in view. It was not the intent of the Labor Committee who wrote the bill that this provision should prohibit free speech or freedom of the press. The only purpose of that section of the bill was, to put unions on the same footing as corporations have been placed in this respect. I offered an amendment in the Committee on Labor in an attempt to clarify this provision of the law; however, in speaking with Senator TAFT he told me that he felt the law was clear and that it would not prohibit the endorsement of candidates by bona fide newspapers, but if it did, he wanted the law amended, as it was not his intent to in any way limit free speech or a free press.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it should be possible to call upon the Attorney General and ask him for an interpretation of this section without all the delay and waste of time which is necessary to drag this subject through the courts. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if those responsible for writing this legislation state unequivocally that it was not their intent that this section of the law should prevent any bona fide newspaper, CIO News or otherwise, from expressing themselves for or against any candidate for office, would it not simplify matters to call upon the Attorney General to consult with his constitutional lawyers and render an opinion. If this opinion indicates that the law as presently written does attempt to limit free speech, then it would be a very easy matter for the Labor Committees of both the House and the Senate to amend the law so as to clarify it. I have every reason to believe that the membership of both committees would welcome the opportunity to clarify and correct not only this section, but any other section which failed to depict the true intent of those who are responsible for writing this legislation.

I have just talked with the Attorney General's office and have been informed that many times the intent is so clear that no interpretation seems necessary. However, when it is not clear in their own minds and the law does not seem to specifically state the intent and someone commits some act to raise a question as to whether or not the law as written is being broken, then they can only try him under criminal prosecution statutes and call upon the courts for an interpretation of that particular provision of the law which is not clear. Sounds silly, doesn't it? Everybody agreed, and still the courts must be called upon to render an opinion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. MCDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, to include in one excerpts from letters, in one to include an address delivered by Judge Orie L. Phillips, of Los Angeles, and in the other to include a statement by Mr. Vicente Villamin.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Allen D. Albert, former president of Rotary International.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an address he delivered on the Alaskan Highway and in the other an article on the work of the Fraternal Order of Eagles of Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a soldier in the occupied area of Germany.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of taxation entitled "A Point of View," appearing in the January 1948 issue of the Michigan Teacher.

STEVE PACE, MAN OF THE YEAR IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the House, which has long watched and benefited

from his fine work, will learn with appreciation that our distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable STEPHEN PACE, has been designated man-of-the-year in agriculture for Georgia by the Progressive Farmer, one of the Nation's outstanding farm publications. It is gratifying to realize that the fine stature which he has gained in Congress is in keeping with the recognition which has been given him throughout the South for his great work in the field of agriculture. Timely recognition of this patient, able, and effective work for agriculture will, I am confident, continue throughout the Nation.

I call attention herewith to the article which accompanied the Progressive Farmer's "man of the year" awards:

FOR GEORGIA: STEVE PACE

When history comes to write the story of American agricultural statesmen of the present day, few are likely to stand higher in the list than STEPHEN PACE, of Georgia's Third Congressional District. The son of a farmer and a boy who grew up reading by oil lamps and pineknots, Congressman STEVE PACE has made it his business to support, sponsor, and fight for legislation that would rid all farm families.

Mr. PACE was author of legislation to make peanuts a basic crop, to set up support prices, and to establish marketing quotas when needed.

In 1944 as chairman of a special postwar subcommittee on agriculture, he gave first attention to cotton and its problems. The hearings of December 1944 and the reports that followed are recognized as the most valuable study ever made of cotton and the problems of the Cotton Belt. They are used for constant reference by groups everywhere and as textbooks in some schools.

Believing that fertile fields are the foundation of all farm prosperity, Mr. PACE has been active in support and aggressive in expanding programs to save and build the soil. Having studied the fate and the condition of other nations which were unmindful of the loss of their soil, he is alarmed at the rapid rate of loss in this country.

It was to save soil and people and to further promote the family-type farm that Mr. PACE started 7 years ago his efforts to set up an insured farm-mortgage plan, similar to the FHA insured mortgage plan for city homes, to enable tenants, sharecroppers, and other farm workers to buy farms for themselves. He knew that a good percentage of soil destruction comes because a tenant has neither the incentive nor the opportunity to preserve and build up the rich topsoil. He knew that a home is the foundation of democracy and prosperity and a safeguard against the spread of foreign "isms." He had also seen what a fine start had been made through the Farm Security home-ownership program and wanted to see its opportunities expanded.

This legislation is now in effect. A number of these loans have been made in Georgia, Alabama, and Florida since the first one was closed in Mr. PACE's home county of Sumter last October 3.

Mr. PACE has been one of the most active champions of REA. He has often said that he could not rest until there is a power line to every farmhouse in the Nation. He is seeking funds adequate to complete this job by January 1, 1950.

These are but a few of the things STEVE PACE has supported for the good of southern farm families. He will always be found in the forefront in securing a square national deal for those who produce the food and fiber to feed and clothe the Nation.

PETROLEUM: TONS, BARRELS, OR GALLONS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, besides being the founder of the great Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln was the first Republican President and one of the foremost Americans of all times.

He would have called the bluff of those who seem to misrepresent our supplies and requirements of oil for domestic and foreign purposes.

There seems to be a confusion in the public mind that ought to be cleared up. Let us compare, tons, barrels, gallons.

I have been very interested in the figures given in news items about the oil shortage, especially the fact that domestic requirements are usually shown in gallons; export figures were frequently stated in barrels; but today—the State Department announced that only 227,000,000 tons would be available for export to western Europe.

Two hundred and twenty-seven million tons of petroleum equals approximately 13,500,000,000 barrels which equals approximately 56,750,000,000 gallons.

Fifty-six and three-fourths billion gallons of fuel oil would furnish heat for 1 year for 56,750,000 homes.

Fifty-six and three-fourths billion gallons of gasoline would furnish fuel for 110,000,000 passenger automobiles for 1 year.

A shortage of tank cars has been reported for the transportation of petroleum, therefore let us examine the number of tank cars required to transport 56,750,000,000 gallons. The average tank car capacity is 10,000 gallons, accordingly 5,750,000 tank-car loads would be needed.

Or visualize 71 continuous lines of tank trucks across the United States of America from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Do not overlook how much our modern agriculture production is dependent upon petroleum for cultivating the soil, preparing for crops, transportation to market, and finally for processing.

This method of kidding the people should be exposed and the real picture made clear.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, by special order heretofore entered, I have been granted permission to address the House today for 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that this time be extended 15 minutes. I understand there are no special orders to follow mine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SINKING OF U. S. S. "MAINE"

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, February 15, will be the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor. Nowadays many Americans somehow overlook this anniversary or treat it lightly, but it seems to me this incident set the United States of America on the road to become the world power it is today. The world was electrified with the announcement of the sinking with the heavy loss of 266 officers and men.

Lt. Friend W. Jenkins, of my native city of Pittsburgh, Pa., was executive officer of the *Maine* at the time of the sinking, and I am informed that he was the only commissioned officer who lost his life in the sinking. His body was brought to Pittsburgh and laid in state in the rotunda of the courthouse, and his funeral was a notable event in the patriotic history of that city and State.

It should be remembered that for many years the people of this country had been told that the Cubans were being treated with cruelty by the Spanish, and were therefore quite sympathetic to the attempt of the Cuban people to obtain their liberation. The reason for the sending of the U. S. S. *Maine* to Cuban waters was for the protection of American interests in that area, and when the news of the sinking reached America there was an immediate demand for a declaration of war, which occurred 2 months later.

The action started the United States on a new era. It resulted in obtaining for us friendly neighbors to the south and opened the seas of that area to many peoples who were kindly disposed toward us. It helped to make possible the building of the Panama Canal. It led to the eradication of jungle and kindred diseases and brought to us vast possessions in the far reaches of the Pacific Ocean.

In that war sons of the North and the South fought in a common cause and thus helped to heal the wounds of the War Between the States, which had ended more than 30 years before. In the Spanish-American War the people of this country, as always before and ever since, exhibited a brand of patriotism unmatched in the history of the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Walter Lippmann on the cost of containment.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by him in connection with the introduction of a joint resolution directing the Postmaster General to issue a series of commemorative stamps honoring Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Red Russia by Mr. Ansel E. Talbert.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY PRICES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the present chaotic condition in the crash of farm commodity prices and the stock market is the result of the administration throughout the past several months playing the role of the greatest gambler in the history of the world.

During the past few months they plunged into the wheat market and bought 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, which has driven wheat and grain prices and the cost of living to a pinnacle and peak which was bound to bring about this present crash. Such buying over a few months and the constant giving out of "scare" headlines of wheat and grain shortages in this country has driven prices through the roof. They were so interested in wheat for export to the world, and showed such little interest in protecting prices to our people at home, that the present inevitable results are upon us.

If they had announced to the American people they intended to buy this wheat gradually at, say, 40,000,000 bushels a month and stop their fear psychology, prices would never have reached the peaks of a few weeks ago.

Millions of bushels of wheat and bumper crops were raised on cheap marginal lands of the West because of favorable moisture, which wheat the farmers held over into this year for tax purposes. They are still holding it rather than to sell it in 1947.

With a gradual buying program prices would have remained lower and millions of bushels of this wheat from marginal lands could have been bought after January 1 at reasonable prices.

Mr. Speaker, buying it all in a few months has largely caused the debacle.

Mr. Speaker, another dangerous element contributing to the drop in commodity prices has been the break in the stock market. The crash in both of these markets reflects the lack of confidence of the people in the policies of this administration.

Everyone capable of thinking things through when the President asked the American people to finance a $20,000,000,000 European loan, and asked for a $40,000,000,000 budget to finance the Government for the next year, knew that it was beyond the ability of the economy of this country, and that a crash was inevitable. That fear has hit the Nation with a financial tornado.

Mr. Speaker, because of our big national debt, we must keep the national income around $200,000,000,000 a year. If farm prices are allowed to plunge below parity, the financial structure of the Nation will be in danger.

Three things appear to be necessary to prevent such condition. The President's budget should be drastically reduced and governmental expenses cut to the bone. The large amounts requested by the President for foreign relief should be drastically cut. But probably most important, the Members of the Congress should assure the American people and the farmers that agricultural prices will not be allowed to go below parity, and they should immediately extend price supports at a minimum of 90 percent of parity on all basic farm products which are nonperishable.

These three moves can be made if the administration will cooperate. These three moves will stabilize the economy of the Nation, keep the national income at around $200,000,000,000 a year, and return the people to confidence in the future of our country. Such a move will stabilize prices with a proper reduction of the cost of living and will expand business on a sound basis. They will bring about greater production which, after all, is the surest foundation for a reasonable cost of living to the people and general prosperity in the future.

Fundamentally, our economy is sound at present. We have no large surpluses and we have full employment. The cost of living is too high, but the drop in prices will take care of that if they can be stabilized at parity.

Everyone must realize that the entire financial structure of this Government is predicated on a reasonably prosperous agriculture. If we do not maintain agriculture in that position, national incomes will drop, no tax reduction can be had, business will be slowed down with millions of men out of employment. This must not be allowed to happen.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE OF FEBRUARY 2

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. My friends of the South, our people were again kicked in the teeth by the President in his message of February 2, and they want to know what we are going to do about it.

Some of us have publicly expressed our indignation and determination to resist, but not all. Do you not think that it is time that all of us from the South should stand up and be counted? We are either mice or men. What are we?

It has been indicated that the governors of the southern States would like that the Representatives of these States in Congress cooperate with them in the formulation of plans for the recapture of the influence within the Democratic Party which was lost with the abrogation of the two-thirds rule governing the nomination of candidates of the party for the Presidency.

I am in complete sympathy with this suggestion and would like to know what you think about it.

If we do nothing, will not our people be saying to us, "Where is your courage and what has become of your faith? Come, let us take a muster speedily. Doomsday is near." Let us say to the President, as King Claudius said to Laer in Hamlet:

> You must not think that we are made of stuff so fat and dull that we can let our beard be shook with danger and think it pastime.

PACE, HOPE, AND PARITY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate on the commemoration of Abraham Lincoln's birthday to second the speech which was made here a few minutes ago in regard to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. STEPHEN PACE. In earlier years we have all believed in faith, hope, and charity. I am sure if you had the opportunity of coming in close contact with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] for the number of years that I have you would also believe at this time in PACE, hope, and parity. In connection with parity may I say that one reason why the Progressive Farmer selected the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman STEPHEN PACE, was because his concept of parity is not the narrow concept of parity in its relationship to the accepted term of parity. Mr. PACE's concept of parity is one of fairness and equity to all agricultural groups everywhere in the United States. There is no Member of the House who has made a more constructive approach to the problem of food production during the war than has our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. So far as I am concerned the Progressive Farmer can make the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] not only the outstanding agriculturalist of the South but also of the United States of America as well.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include in each instance extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's

desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I received permission to extend in the RECORD an article which I am informed by the Public Printer will comprise two and a quarter pages of the RECORD at a cost of $159.75. I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD and in each instance to include a newspaper article.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. DORN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a short concurrent resolution from the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution has to do with memorializing Congress to amend the Social Security Act by reducing the age from 65 to 60 years as the minimum requirement for old-age insurance benefits. I heartily endorse that resolution passed by the general assembly of South Carolina. It represents the feeling of a vast majority of the people of South Carolina. The people in my State who labor in the great textile industry are in favor of lowering the age limit. Textile work is hard and it takes a lot out of its employees before they reach the age of 60. They would like to have an opportunity to enjoy old-age insurance benefits before they are too old. I commend State Representative Agnew for introducing this resolution. I hope the House and the Congress will act on it during this session.

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act by reducing from 65 to 60 years the minimum age for receiving old-age insurance benefits

Whereas under the Social Security Act of Congress the minimum age at which covered employees may retire and receive old-age benefits is 65 years; and

Whereas in industry employees who have reached the age of 60 years are at substantially equal disadvantage with those who have reached the age of 65 years, by reason of the competition of younger employees; and

Whereas the beneficient purposes of the old-age and survivors-insurance provisions of the Social Security Act would be more fully accomplished, and opportunities for younger employees would be enhanced by reducing from 65 to 60 years the age at which insured employees may retire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully urged to amend the Social Security Act by reducing from 65 to 60 years the age at which employees may begin receiving retirement benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of South Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to join with the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the gentleman who just spoke, as well as with other Members on the other side of the aisle in commemorating the birthday of one of the greatest men who ever lived, Abraham Lincoln.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. D'EWART) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning H. R. 2161, the synthetic fuel bill.

SALE OF CEMETERY IN KANSAS CITY

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. WELCH, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 3685) having to do with a cemetery in Kansas City and the sale of the cemetery by the Indians that own it, be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands. The author of the bill has been consulted; the minority floor leader has been consulted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the bill?

Mr. D'EWART. The bill has to do with a cemetery in Kansas City and the sale of the cemetery by the Indians that own it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

DEEDS FOR TOWN-SITE LANDS HELD BY ALASKA NATIVES

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. WELCH, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3503, an act to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for townsite lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "(a)."

Page 1, line 11, strike out all after "or" over to and including "native," in line 5, page 2.

Page 2, strike out all after line 10 over to and including line 2, page 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three newspaper articles.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial Oleo Rears Its Head Again.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and that the same be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] may address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted for that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including a resolution on the St. Lawrence waterway by the city of Buffalo.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Hon. A. N. Overby, United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, in regard to certain changes in the value of the French franc.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

HOUSE MEMBERS OF DELEGATION TO ATTEND HABANA CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of February 9, 1948, the Speaker did on February 11, 1948, appoint as members of the delegation to attend the ceremonies in Habana, Cuba, on Sunday, February 15, 1948, in connection with the observance of the fiftieth anniversary of the sinking of the U. S. battleship *Maine*, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. ROBERTSON and Mr. JONES of Alabama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FARM PRODUCTION AND THE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, February 5, there was published on the front page of the Washington Evening Star an Associated Press dispatch with regard to the testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president of the CIO auto workers.

This news account contained the following paragraph:

> The CIO United Auto Workers told the committee today that industry and farmers are holding down output to keep their profits high.

So far as the farmers are concerned, there has never been broadcast across this country a more false or unfair statement. I do not believe it is true as to industry, although I do not have the exact figures as to their production. But I do have some knowledge of the production on the farms of the Nation, and I know this charge that the farmers have held down production to secure higher prices is an irresponsible disregard for the truth and the facts.

I have serious doubt that Mr. Reuther made any such charge, as I have read his testimony before the Senate committee and do not find there any such statement. He either made such a charge off the record or to the reporter privately, or else the reporter used the facilities of the Associated Press to slander the farmers of the Nation without the slightest foundation of facts.

But whoever was responsible for this charge, it has been published throughout the country, it is calculated to create a false impression among the people and needs to be corrected. I have called the matter to the attention of the managing editor of the Evening Star and the Associated Press, but neither has issued a correction.

Now, what is the record of production on the farms of the Nation? As it is too early for planting the 1948 crop, this charge about farmers holding down production must necessarily refer to last year.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven was another year of all-out production effort on the part of the farmers. They planted nearly 358,000,000 acres to the various crops. Production of crops for sale was 31 percent above prewar. Harvested acreage of 52 crops was 348,000,000 acres. Except for 1944, this was the largest acreage since the predrought period, 1928–32. This outstanding record was achieved in spite of unfavorable weather. Wet, cold weather in the spring retarded seeding of crops in most of the areas east of the Rocky Mountains. By taking advantage of every break in the adverse spring weather, farmers were able to complete most of their planting by July. Hot, humid weather with subnormal rainfall during August irreparably damaged some crops and greatly reduced the production of corn.

The volume of agricultural production for sale and home consumption in 1947 was 35 percent above 1935–39. Production of livestock products was 37 percent above the prewar average.

Farmers harvested 1,365,000,000 bushels of wheat last year. This was the fourth successive year in which the farmers of this country produced more than a billion bushels of wheat and exceeded the record established the previous year by over 200,000,000 bushels. This outstanding production record enabled us to establish an export goal of 450,000,000 bushels. Is that holding down production?

Production of vitally needed oilseeds was nearly 12,400,000 tons, compared with 11,200,000 tons in 1946 and 10,200,000 tons for the 10-year average 1936–45. Is that holding down production? Farmers produced a record crop of peanuts, almost double the 1935–39 average. They produced the third largest crop of flaxseed in our history and a considerably larger crop of cottonseed than in 1946. Is that holding down production? Largely because of adverse weather conditions, production of soybeans was below the last few years but was still over three times the average production in 1935–39.

Production of 15 fruits, 17,620,000 tons, was second only to the 1946 record production and well above any previous year. Production of grapefruit and pears established new high records. Production of peaches and all citrus fruits was second only to the 1946 record crop.

Meat production in 1947 was 23,300,000,000 pounds. Consumption of meat last year reached a level of about 155 pounds per person, the highest since 1909 and 30 pounds greater than the 1935–39 average. Production of beef was 10,400,000,000 pounds, the highest on record. Is that holding down production? Per capita civilian consumption of pork was 69 pounds, which was 23 percent above the 1935–39 average.

While the number of milk cows on farms declined during 1947, yet with better feeding and improved management the average output of milk per cow, for the Nation as a whole, was increased to a new high record. Total milk production on farms during the year was 120,000,000,000 pounds, the second highest on record and 16 percent over the 1935–39 average. Farmers attained this level of output despite very unfavorable relationships between feed prices and prices received for their dairy products during much of the year.

Although exports of dairy products were much greater than prewar, civilian consumption of all major dairy items except butter were much larger than in 1935–39. By major items, the percentage increases over prewar were as follows: Fluid milk and cream, 19 percent; cheese, 31 percent; evaporated milk, 29 percent; ice cream, 106 percent. Butter consumption was 33 percent smaller in 1947 than prewar, reflecting both consumers' preference for more expensive items including butterfat, such as ice cream and fluid milk and cream, and the readily available supply of margarine.

Poultry farmers in 1947 produced near record quantities of poultry products which was substantially larger than in prewar years. Farm egg production totaled 4,600,000,000 dozen, 52 percent over 1935–39 average and only 5 percent below the 1944 wartime peak. The number of turkeys raised in 1937, 347,000,000, was 28 percent above prewar. Chicken meat output was almost one-half greater than in 1935–39. Does that sound like holding down production?

Per capita egg consumption in 1947 was about 380, more than one-fourth above prewar and only slightly below the 1945 peak. Consumption of chicken meat was close to 24 pounds compared with a prewar average of nearly 18 pounds. Consumption of turkeys per person in 1947 was about 4 pounds or about 50 percent higher than in prewar years.

It is not necessary for me to relate here the figures on Irish potatoes, for everyone knows we produced so many of these potatoes in 1946 and 1947 that our Government had considerable difficulty and had to undergo considerable expense in order to get rid of the enormous surplus. There was also high production of sweet potatoes and today the canners have 1,000,000 cases, or 24,000,000 cans, of the 1946 sweet potato crop which they have been unable to dispose of. Does that sound like holding down production?

Over-all civilian per capita food consumption in 1947 was 17 percent greater than prewar. Major food groups for which consumption exceeded prewar were dairy products, about 20 percent; meat, poultry, and fish, about 24 percent; eggs, 26 percent; beans, peas, and nuts, 10 percent; fats and oils (excluding butter), 10 percent; total fruits, 24 percent; and vegetables, 20 percent. In addition to supplying our own people with these large quantities of food, farm production in this country supplied food for our armed forces and permitted us to ship abroad a record quantity of over 19,000,000 tons of food in the year July 1946 to June 1947. Does that indicate holding down production?

I hope no one will ever again undertake to make such a charge against the farmers of this Nation. Throughout the period of the war, with a shortage of nearly everything they needed, they produced the food and fiber required to feed and clothe our own people, our own military forces, and millions of our allies. Outside of the boys and girls who wore the uniform I do not believe there is any group in this Nation which was more loyal, more patriotic, or contributed more to the winning of the war than the farmers of this Nation. And now they are responding without complaint to the appeal to keep producing in order to aid in feeding the needy people in other lands. Certainly they should be commended rather than slandered.

May I, in conclusion, express the earnest hope something can be done to bring about a more cordial relation between agriculture and labor. They have a community of interest which should be recognized and promoted.

The farmers want the wage earners to enjoy a good standard of living and earn a good wage. Not merely a living wage, but an income sufficient to provide the necessities of life and also to educate their children, to protect their health, to enjoy some of the comforts

and pleasures of life, and take care of them when the evening of life comes and they can work no more.

Not only is the wage earner entitled to such wages as a matter of right, but the farmer needs somebody in town with money in his pocket to buy his commodities. The farmer realizes the wage earners of the Nation provide his best market and he is profoundly interested in maintaining a strong purchasing power.

At the same time the wage earner should understand that the farmer's wage for his labor is fixed by the price he receives for his commodities. They should understand that the American farmer is the finest market in the world today for American industrial goods, because for the most part, they still have a low standard of living and need so much.

The union leaders should stop demanding a high industrial wage and cheap food, for that can only mean a low return to the farmer for his labor and a low standard of living for his family. The farmers will never accept such an arrangement. The farmer is entitled to his cost of production and a profit which will provide him the same benefits and standards of living which the organized workers demand.

The farmer wants to sell his commodities at a fair price to the wage earner and, in turn, buy the manufactured and industrial goods made by the wage earner at a fair price. The price of each will generally determine the wage of each. When the price of either breaks, the income of both will break.

There is a close community of interests and there should be a mutual understanding and appreciation in each group of the problems and welfare of the other. There must be if the prosperity of this country is to survive and the welfare of each group is protected.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I am sure the House appreciates very much the interesting statement the gentleman from Georgia has just presented. He has added color and interest to figures that sometimes are dull and uninspiring, and has focused attention upon one of the most remarkable records in history. I am sure there is nothing like the performance of the American farmer during the war.

In the brief period in which I was in the European theater in 1944 I constantly heard expressions of gratitude on the part of people whom our food had saved. It would be ironic if we were being praised in other parts of the world for that great performance and condemned in our own country. Consequently the gentleman is rendering a service in reminding us of this monumental effort by our farmers. This was often at great sacrifice and inconvenience and these exertions of the farmers were not withheld because it required night work. The story has been told here more than once that automobile lights were turned on in the fields in order that the farmers might continue after the sun had gone down to harvest their crops and produce the food that the world had to have to wage war.

Mr. PACE. I am sure the gentleman can understand it was impossible for me to remain silent after reading the statement published by the Associated Press and broadcast throughout the Nation charging that the farmers were holding down production in order to get higher prices. It was the most inconsiderate, unfair, and uncalled-for statement that has ever been published, in my judgment, and I felt called upon to present to the Congress and to the people, I hope through the very same Associated Press agency which sent out this false statement, the true facts. I hope they will be considerate enough of the feelings of the 25,000,000 people, farmers of this country, to correct that statement and give the true facts to all the people everywhere.

Mr. HAYS. May I say also that I thoroughly agree with the concluding remarks of the gentleman with reference to the community of interest between labor and agriculture. I hope these words will fall upon receptive minds.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman. I consider it most unfortunate that there are elements that seek to drive a wedge between the people who till the soil and the people who work for a daily wage in the plants and establishments of this country. As I have tried to say, there is a community of interest. The welfare of one is in good measure dependent upon the welfare of the other. There should be a most cordial understanding and relationship between them rather than the conditions which we have today.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his address and to say that I have always considered him as one of the very best friends the farmers of America have in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague, who also is a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman has rendered not only the American farmer, but the Nation at large, a service when he comes forth with the facts and gives credit where credit is due. That is in keeping with his general policy. I notice he wants to go along and cooperate with labor. I want to say there is no one on our committee who is any more nonpolitical in his fight for agriculture and for a fair and square deal for all sides concerned than the gentleman who has been addressing us. I have personal admiration for him and am pleased to count him as one of my best friends because politics never enters into the matter when he discusses with me the problems confronting our Nation regarding agriculture and the interest of the consuming public and the Nation in general.

Mr. PACE. I am overwhelmed and most gratified at the remarks of my distinguished friend from Illinois. He, of course, can appreciate my feeling when a charge like this is brought against the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. May I observe in connection with what my colleague has so ably said here today that while I served in the armed forces overseas, not once did I ever find occasion to complain over the amount of food that the farmers of America produced and sent to us overseas, but I did on more than one occasion have reason to complain for the shortage of ammunition caused by strikes in industrial plants in this country during the war.

Mr. PACE. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman and am gratified to have the benefit of the experience of one who entered the service of our country as a private and came out with a captaincy.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I am deeply grateful that the gentleman has made these remarks which are so apt and which have been so ably presented. I certainly hope that those who are responsible for this false information will take the necessary steps to correct it. I am also grateful that the gentleman from Georgia has so clearly pointed out the interrelationship and the community of interests between our working people and our agricultural people. I certainly hope both of these great groups will draw closer together. Realization and understanding that a community of interests does exist between farmers and industrial workers will promote not only their well-being but the welfare of our Nation.

Mr. PACE. I am truly delighted to get that response from the gentleman from Virginia, because I do profoundly believe that we can never, over a long pull, maintain prosperous conditions in this country unless the farmer has a real interest in the welfare and purchasing power of the wage earner and, on the other hand, the wage earner has a similar interest in the welfare and earnings of the people who work in the sun and in the fields. I am gratified at the gentleman's response. Perhaps I have said something here that will contribute in some way to a better relation in the future.

Mr. HARDY. The interdependence of these two great segments of American life is so closely interwoven in our total economic structure that unless their problems and activities are closely correlated a disaster to either could cause a complete economic collapse.

Mr. PACE. I might say following that, I hope that somewhere in this country we can find someone with that high quality of leadership who can take these two great segments of our population and give them a better understanding of the problems of each group and lead

them closer together in the consideration of their mutual welfare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TAXATION OF FARM COOPERATIVES AND REPEAL OF THE WAGE-HOUR LAW

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States and the people of the country at large are going to be grateful, I am sure, to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] for the address he made this afternoon. I heartily concur with him when he says that the American farmer produced more patriotically and more energetically during the recent war than at any previous time in the history of this country, or of any other nation in the entire world. I am sorry to see these mistaken releases given out in the press, which sometimes happens. Occasionally somebody who is too strong an advocate of certain measures for the farm groups will also give out statements which do not entirely conform to the facts. I believe that the cause of organized and unorganized labor is also the cause of the farmers of this country, and that they should work together. Both have a hard struggle to get along and in some respects they have a common enemy, and they should work together in harmony and try to achieve the same goal, and the same ends; that is, a higher standard of living and a happier life for themselves and their families.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. PACE. May I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his statement. Coming from one of our great industrial States as well as agricultural States, I am gratified that he, too, appreciates the importance of a more cordial relation between these two groups.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia has rendered a great service to the country.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks I will make this afternoon are by some happy or unhappy circumstance, going to be somewhat along the same line. They are going to be in behalf of the interest of the farmer. I am going to open by quoting from the report of the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, Report No. 1274, to accompany H. R. 4790, on page 16;

This is the report on the so-called Knutson tax-reduction bill. The quotation is as follows:

> Although it is conceded that small businesses are the keystone in the free-enterprise system, their destruction continues unabated. It is a three-way squeeze. They are being bankrupted by competition of tax-free cooperatives, exorbitant Federal taxes, and strait-jacket Government regulations like the wage-hour law. Providing Congress fails to recognize the urgency and neglects to take prompt action to remove the cause for this crushing misfortune, commercial failures will not decrease but increase, and small manufacturers will in all likelihood be destroyed or obliterated.

Mr. Speaker, this report—and it is no secret—was very closely scrutinized by all of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee. My understanding is that it was gone over in the most minute detail. It is also officially known that this report was unanimously approved by the majority members, the Republican members. At this point I should like to say that the Democratic members of the committee unanimously disapproved of the report and rejected the report.

I wish first to call your attention to one of the items mentioned in this so-called three-way squeeze. They say that business is being bankrupted by the competition of tax-free cooperatives. What is a tax-free cooperative? It is generally known that so-called consumer cooperatives are not tax free; in other words, they are compelled to pay income taxes the same as any other corporation, but the farmers' cooperatives that meet certain standards are not compelled to pay taxes the same as other corporations. This can mean only one thing; it means that it is the purpose of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means to levy a tax on farmers' cooperative associations. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the Ways and Means Committee is considered the leading committee of the House of Representatives. We know they are very powerful in their leadership. We know they generally express the views of the leadership of the majority party.

I call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the hearings that were held by the Committee on Ways and Means with regard to the subject of taxing farmers' cooperatives. Here is the volume. You will notice that it is very closely printed and very compact. It is at least 2 inches or more in thickness and over 1,300 pages in length. I shudder to think what the cost of compiling that record was; and the sole purpose was to find a reason to tax the farmers' cooperatives of this Nation. During the many hearings that were held on the subject I got the impression that there was a sort of smear campaign being conducted against the farmers' cooperatives. The term "communism" was constantly brought into the question by some members of the majority. The word "socialism" was brought in also. The inference was left that farmers' cooperatives were the commencement of a socialistic state, that they worked together, that they divided their profits, that they pooled their resources, and they attempted to save money when they were purchasing things. In evidence were offered some periodicals in which articles intimated it was a communistic idea, and that that was the way communism started in other lands throughout the world. In other words, it was a smear campaign. The cross-examination of the witnesses bears that out in detail.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to what appears in the evidence at page 2191 of the hearings. A witness was being questioned, and he in turn asked if he could make an inquiry of the chairman of the committee. He was permitted to do so. So the witness stated:

> Mr. Chairman, in regard to revenue, I am just a little bit confused about the purpose of this hearing. I wonder if it is for the purpose of finding a way to penalize farmers and their cooperatives or is it for the purpose of finding ways and means to get revenue to finance the budget?

The chairman of the committee answered:

> It is the latter.

To which the witness responded:

> Then it rather astonishes me that only last year two tax bills proposing to reduce taxes $4,000,000,000, which is four thousand million dollars, were passed by the Republican House, and now we are talking about just a little, piddling sum of a few million dollars that might be obtained from farmer cooperatives which are not and should not be subject to the payment of an income tax because they do not operate in a fashion like those who do pay taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention also to the fact that all of the farmers' organizations, all of the labor organizations of the country, and practically every religious denomination favor the cooperative movement. We have in the official record strong language supporting the cooperative movement from the National Grange, from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, from the president of the American Federation of Labor, from the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, from the president of the National Farmers' Union, from the president of the Synagogue Council of America, from the executive secretary of the Association of Railway Labor Executives, and from the executive secretary of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

Mr. Speaker, they are trying to smear the farmers' cooperative associations with the tag of communism and socialism. Right here may I say that it has been the historic policy of the Democratic Party, which has always carried out that policy, to try to foster farmers' cooperatives and to try to help their existence, because it is easy to understand that, if a farmer were to sell his goods to the great corporations that own the grain elevators, the great distributing agencies, if he has to sell his goods that he produces to them alone without any help or protection from his neighbor farmers, he will be at the mercy of those who are heavily financed. The same is true when the farmer acting by himself wants to buy farm equipment or he wants to buy fertilizer, seed, or many of the things he needs on the farm. If farmers do not join together so that they can purchase cheaper, they will be at the mercy of the business, financial, and other monopolistic elements of this great Nation. So the historic policy of the Democratic Party has been to try to foster agricultural cooperatives, realizing the great handicaps that the individual farmer always has in encouraging the formation of cooperatives.

In contrast with the record of the Democratic Party, take this language in the official report of the Republican majority of the Committee on Ways and Means:

> Providing Congress fails to recognize the urgency, and neglects to take a prompt action to eliminate the cause for this crushing misfortune.

How do they propose to eliminate the cause, as they call it? Why, by taxing

the farmers' cooperatives. That is what they propose to do.

We have right there, Mr. Speaker, a foretaste of what will happen should this country be entirely in control of the Republican Party. That statement in the official report of the most powerful committee of the House of Representatives, the leading committee of the House, is practically a call for action by this Congress or the next Congress at least to tax out of existence the farmers' cooperatives. In support of that conclusion I call your attention to the record just made within the past 6 or 8 months by the so-called Ploeser committee. That committee was formed for the purpose of ostensibly aiding small business. But what did they do? They went all over this country and called in witness after witness to testify, and tried to show that it was absolutely necessary to impose heavy taxation on farmers' cooperatives, because they said that the farmers' cooperatives were hurting business. And with great fanfare they harassed and embarrassed these very worth-while farm cooperative organizations.

Well, now, let me move on to another item here in "the three-way squeeze" to "the strait-jacket Government regulations, like the wage-and-hour law." Now, what is the wage-and-hour law—the Fair Labor Standards Act? It provides that a person who is an employer must pay his employee not less than 40 cents an hour. That is a total of $16 a week. There are no regulations under that act that are hard to follow. Any person who employs anybody under the act simply must pay 40 cents an hour, or if they work 40 hours a week $16 per week. Is there any employer in the congressional district of any Member of Congress who wants to hire an employee for less than $16 a week? Why, how is a man, even if he is single, going to support himself in these days on less than $16 a week? It takes that much to support a boy. How in the world is a man with a family going to try to get along on less than $16 a week? That is also an indication of what would happen to this country if the Republicans gained control: Wipe off the books of the Fair Labor Standards Act; go back to sweatshops; go back to paying just whatever you can buy labor for; let the children go hungry; let them live in huts. That would be the result of wiping out the Fair Labor Standards Act. Maybe the Ways and Means majority have some other acts in mind, for they refer to other "strait-jacket Government regulations." Maybe they have in mind changing the provisions of the Social Security Act. You know, right now the Committee on Ways and Means has reported out two bills that would restrict the scope of social-security coverage and benefits instead of expanding them. They say they favor expanded coverage and then they report out legislation to deprive workers of this basic protection. Mr. Speaker, it is time for some people in this country to awaken to what faces us.

They should begin to realize what a threat Republican control is to the social progress of this Nation. They should realize that only under a Democratic Congress will we be able to attain the recommendation of President Truman for lifting the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. Likewise, I want to quote just what the Democratic Party feels about farm cooperatives. This statement was made by the distinguished chairman of the Democratic National Committee just a few weeks ago, reaffirming the long-standing position of the Democratic Party with respect to farmers:

I wish to make it clear that the Democratic Party has not modified its support of the organization and development of farm cooperatives. The Democratic Party will continue to seek actively in Congress and elsewhere to aid farm cooperatives and to halt the efforts to discredit and destroy these organizations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think it is time for the workers in the fields, as well as those in the factories, to know who their true friends are.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORBLAD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] was called to a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include reprints of certain telegrams and observations. I further ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks a report on the fuel-oil conditions in Massachusetts made by George F. Hines, special representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

REPORT ON FUEL CONDITIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS

FEBRUARY 11, 1948.

This week is the most critical period in the Massachusetts fuel situation since the shortage began, according to George Rockwell, State fuel coordinator, with the probability that even more critical periods are coming in the next 5 weeks. This estimate of the situation I obtained in Boston yesterday.

Nevertheless, no home in the State has been reported as cold from lack of fuel. The Massachusetts volunteer organization of area, city, and town emergency coordinators, working closely with oil companies and dealers, have been able to meet each crisis by rushing emergency supplies or borrowed kerosene or No. 2 oil to the danger spots. Many times the supplies made available have been small, only enough to last a few days, but so far the system has worked well.

This is not true in other States. The entire east coast is in a critical situation because of the continued cold spell and reduced supplies coming through. Stocks of kerosene and No. 2 have fallen more rapidly than was expected.

Excess supplies are practically all consumed and the whole east coast is almost at the point of hand-to-mouth deliveries, which further complicates equalizing deliveries, because of irregularities in distribution of supplies.

The Washington area, Virginia, Indiana, and New York are at the moment the most critical spots. There have been reports from these and other areas of complete exhaustion of supplies and some distress.

It is considered remarkable here that Massachusetts has so far escaped distress. There are no indications, however, that Massachusetts may not be in a more critical situation next week.

In the Boston area the sudden crisis involving the State Fuel Co. has been relieved by emergency action by Governor Bradford, Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE, Speaker MARTIN, and Congressman MCCORMACK. As a consequence, State Fuel has enough supplies on hand or in sight to last them at least a week or more.

A number of other companies in the Boston area, however, White Fuel, Quincy Oil, and Hartol, are threatened with exhaustion of supply. These crises both in the Boston area, Lynn, the Fall River area, and the western part of the State are being met by manipulation of supplies obtained from the major oil companies.

The sudden emergency which arose a few days ago at the Cambridge Gas Co. has been met by diverting 66,000 barrels of the Navy Diesel oil from the emergency stocks created by Navy for that area. Practically all of the Navy Diesel No. 2 oil is gone but there is about 200,000 barrels of the heavy oil still available from this source. Unfortunately this heavy oil cannot be used to heat homes except possibly some apartment houses.

The great shortage remains in kerosene and No. 2 in that order. Representatives of the large oil companies following a conference are turning over accredited supplies of 23,810 barrels of kerosene and a similar amount of No. 2 to the State fuel administrator which the State organization can draw on to meet emergencies. These commitments are allocated 10 days at a time and have been one of the principal sources of emergency supplies.

The State organization using existing delivery facilities is administratively working in two divisions. Robert Montgomery, general counsel, New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. is deputy coordinator with a skilled staff of loaned oil men who labor with the large oil companies and large distributors in working out top level supply problems.

A similar staff working directly under Mr. Rockwell deals with emergency spot shortages arising in areas, cities, and towns from small dealers and the area coordinators. Both of these central bodies in Boston work closely together and with the area coordinators.

It is important that:

1. All calls for emergency supplies be directed to the area coordinator and not to the top State organization or the Governor's office.

2. It should be recognized that the area directors may be able to relieve the situation from nearby stocks at once. If they cannot find immediate relief within their districts they call on Rockwell's office at the State house for help and supplies outside of the areas are tapped.

All of the oil companies in the State work through this system and this team organization is working effectively and so far successfully. No oil can be obtained through Washington or from other States except through the Governor who has been devoting a considerable portion of his time to the problems of negotiating with other States.

Nearby States are working in close cooperation with Massachusetts. Everyone is working hard. They are all on top of the problem and if organization can do the job, then Massachusetts will come out of this emergency with a minimum of distress.

A regional committee handling major supply and distribution problems of an interstate character from Maine to Florida is now

operating in New York under B. I. Graves, president, Tidewater Oil Co., chairman; and M. J. Rathbone, president of the Esso Standard Oil Co., as vice chairman. June Richdale, J. J. Birmingham, president, White Fuel Co. (vice, Clyde Morrill); and J. W. Scott, of Buckley & Scott are the New England representatives.

Constant emphasis must be maintained on conservation of petroleum by everyone but particularly by householders who use kerosene and No. 2. Massachusetts is now borrowing on March oil. The weather is severe, temperatures are well below normal, and there is serious fear that if the cold spell continues much longer real suffering will prevail. Outside of a few localities there has been no hysteria and these instances were of short duration.

Because many States are involved in as bad or worse condition than Massachusetts larger oil companies cannot divert flows to meet spot emergencies. These must be met on State or area levels. It may become necessary at any moment for Governor Bradford to invoke emergency regulations such as were imposed in New York City but so far it has not been found necessary to do so.

I hope you will find this information of help to you.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE F. HINES,
Special Representative.

Mr. Speaker, a great many Members who have been most sympathetic and anxious to assist have inquired daily as to how things are working out in New England and in Massachusetts. I think the report is a vivid account of how close the situation is for us. You will note Mr. Hines states that "coast supplies are practically all consumed and the whole east coast is almost at the point of hand to mouth deliveries." Another significant sentence is, "There are no indications, however, that Massachusetts may not be in a more critical situation next week." Finally, Mr. Hines warns that "it may become necessary at any moment for Governor Bradford to invoke emergency regulations such as were imposed in New York City."

In view of the fact that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has scheduled hearings on Tuesday at which representatives of the oil industry are expected to testify with reference not only to the supply situation but with reference to the price situation, I want to include, also, in these remarks an editorial written by the late Clyde Morrow, executive director, Atlantic Coast Oil Conference, which, I understand, has been the subject of much controversy within the oil industry:

MORRILL URGES AGGRESSIVE OIL INDUSTRY LEADERSHIP AS THE ALTERNATIVE TO A FEDERAL OIL COMMISSION

(By Clyde G. Morrill, executive secretary, Atlantic Coast Oil Conference)

The oil industry has a right to expect more constructive leadership from those who guide our large integrated operations than it has been receiving. They, by virtue of their position are assumed to have at their command the advice of petroleum economists, a wealth of statistics that will yield full current information as well as long-range projections, a world viewpoint, and finally a staff to prepare and issue their findings and conclusions. These factual reports and policy decisions would, it should be assumed, deal practically with the state of the industry in relation to the needs of the consumers it serves. Proceeding from the same available basic statistics there should be no wide diversity in conclusions reached. In fact there should be enough unanimity so far as factual reporting to the public is concerned to prevent the confusion in the public's mind that has been prevalent everywhere on petroleum products supply since midsummer.

As long ago as April the tanker shortage was obvious. Yet in spite of complete and full statistical information on the subject major companies were refusing to buy tankers for their needs, tankers that 6 months later they were desperately seeking. Certainly during August fuel oil shortages were becoming more and more apparent. Most statements as were forthcoming were guarded, sort of a worried frown over a tight situation with careful optimism for field men in every large company so that company prestige or position might not suffer.

THE CONSUMER IN THE DARK

Where were the facts for the consumer? Why was he kept confused? Where were forthright announcements concerning availability of product that would have permitted purchasers of Diesel equipment, oil burners, and space heaters to know the fuel-supply difficulties they were facing?

Somebody lacked the courage to tell the truth.

The public-relations campaign was blithely ignoring approaching disasters with its delightful copy on free competition in America, and especially in oil. Not until the Wherry committee consigned a million dollars' worth of public-relations promotion to the wastebasket did this slow-burning campaign attempt to catch the consumers' attention with answers to the one question the consumer was interested in, "Will there be enough oil this winter to keep me warm?" To date, 6 months late, the question is being answered in the customer's home by State fuel coordinators who desperately search for product and by the Red Cross which is setting up emergency shelters.

Eventually the ponderous moving National Petroleum Council glanced furtively at such matters as tankers and supply, shying violently away from octane ratings and refinery yields, giving birth after hours of labor to several completely innocuous reports. These contributed nothing much more than some added pressure on the Maritime Commission, where little was needed by the time NPC got around to it, and some added confusion for public and industry consumption.

AN AGGRESSIVE REPORT WAS NEEDED

What prevented an aggressive report from the National Petroleum Council that might have offered an industry plan to meet a growing emergency? Isn't it the duty of the council to advise the Government and its people on the facts in anticipation of an emergency? Isn't it the duty of the council to prepare a plan of operation where an emergency is evident? Shouldn't it be an authoritative and unfailing source for the guidance of our citizens?

Throughout the summer and early fall any dealer or jobber would have reported unfailing veiled assurances from his supplier concerning the supply of fuel oils, and aside from some spot shortages confidence concerning gasoline supply. Being close to the consumer the distibutor could but report that he expected—because his supplier had not given him a positive no—to take care of their needs. Even in the Midwest where warnings were more insistent on such matters, contradictory statements kept small distributors continuously confused. Only one large company had taken a positive position on the sale of oil burners and that company only so far as the sale of its own burner was concerned.

On the east coast rapid deterioration of the fuel-oil supply was screamingly evident in October. Even under such compulsion a warm October sun lulled integrated suppliers on the east coast into such complacency that there was no attempt on the part of industry to gird itself for battle with a certain shortage of fuel oil.

Not until the New England governors became thoroughly aroused on behalf of their constituency and demanded a senatorial investigation, not until Senator TOBEY and Congressman WOLVERTON held hearings, not until the full import of the Wherry committee report became evident was a program proposed on December 17 and this program was developed by an industry advisory committee selected by Senator TOBEY, a committee or one like it that could have submitted a report far earlier of far more import had industry been on its job. Industry had to be prodded by three congressional committees before a constructive program was prepared and the report was finally issued by a senatorial committee and to the senatorial committee the credit belongs. The report, a last-ditch proposition to avert consumer suffering, prepared under great pressure, depends on industry cooperation and consumer cooperation for success. It is already evident that it will get a modicum of industry cooperation reluctantly and a minimum of suspicious consumer cooperation. Only such publicity as Senator TOBEY may develop, a tactic employed so successfully by Senator WHERRY, will force necessary industry compliance to his program.

IS MADISON A REASON OR AN EXCUSE?

Now why are these things so and what do they portend?

These things are so because the size of the business units involved make it necessary for every key executive to act only in accordance with two primary guiding directives: 1. What does the legal department say that I can do? And 2, How will any decision of mine affect our gasoline position? At least so it seems to thousands of fuel-oil distributors who serve the consumers.

The Madison specter grows with age in potency to thwart what might be normal approaches and sensible ways of dealing with problems discussed here. On more than one occasion a muted reference to Madison has been enough to negate constructive argumentation. Too frequently it has been put forward by an executive as an excuse for not doing something when a more honest reason for not doing the same thing was reasonably apparent. Executive action tied completely to Madison negation can never be forward looking for our industry as a whole.

FUEL OIL YIELDS KEPT TOO LOW

For years the industry accepted and later courted the responsibility of a growing fuel-oil demand. Balanced refinery yields that made for greater economy and lower prices to the public encouraged more and more fuel-oil use. Moreover, in all integrated operation gasoline was king, company position was determined by gasoline position and refinery pricing was made accordingly. The responsibilities to the consumer accepted with the fuel-oil load have rested lightly on refining companies. This is supremely evident as of the moment when report after report indicates the reluctance of refiners to increase fuel-oil yields at the expense of gasoline even if consumers are going cold.

The January 12 issue of the New York Journal of Commerce reported that in spite of the Tobey report asking for distillate yield increase, the 2 weeks ending January 3, distillate yield dropped in East coast and Gulf refineries from 22.2 to 21.15 percent and gasoline yield increased from 38.5 to 40 percent. This in the face of an emergency. Industry refining units, with one or two notable exceptions, have denied this consumer responsibility rather than sacrifice gasoline position and gasoline profits.

Those who market fuel oil, mostly small independent distributors, after months of indecision on the part of their major suppliers

as to just what the fuel oil situation would be, find gasoline generally in adequate supply while they are forced to cut consumer deliveries in the product their customer wants most, heating oil. If the distributor asks why, can he be blamed? If he gets choleric in trying to explain this to his customer and damns the industry (in spite of Saturday Evening Post advertisements on free competition in oil amongst 34,000 companies), can he be censured?

LIKE THE RAILROADS BEFORE THE ICC

How many supplying companies were so complacent concerning their fuel oil position that they failed to recognize that as soon as people started to freeze the State must step in and when the State did step in every citizen had equal rights to the heating oil available in any market, including oil in all supplying-company tanks. Answer, too many!

And so the maintenance of gasoline position by integrated companies and their obtuseness over what really happens when people go cold and fuel oil is short have placed the industry in the same position that the railroads occupied within the memory of men now living, a position that established the Interstate Commerce Commission. The industry has failed to accept its responsibility to keep homes warm just as blatantly as labor has on occasion denied its responsibility to keep production moving as a necessary of life.

Where is the industry leadership that should have had the situation so well in hand that there was no occasion for Members of Congress to arise and demand investigation? Where was the public relations program that should have so well informed our consumers that such speeches would have had little public approval instead of commendation?

NO RECOGNITION FOR THE DISTRIBUTOR

While prices have mounted and integrated earnings skyrocketed, price structures continued to reflect no recognition of the increased costs at the distributor's level in spite of expansive rhetoric on the subject amongst policy-making executives. Hence, integrated policies on this vital matter gave the fuel-oil distributor reason to believe that he as well as his customer was being discriminated against. He is, in increasing numbers, more than willing, nay anxious, to join with his customer and demand a look-see by Government, into the whole sorry mess, particularly since he is already being told that next year will be fully as bad or worse than this.

Government regulation? Can a distributor lose more than good will—the respect and confidence of his customer? Can he lose more than a fair opportunity to make a profit commensurate with the services he renders?

Do not those who meet and talk with the customers have the right to expect something better than a leadership that seems impotent to act in the face of an emergency? Hasn't the public the right to become concerned about one of its most basic needs, petroleum products, when such leadership is absent? Isn't it a natural demand when a citizen is confused and cold and angry for him to approve suggestions for some kind of a regulatory body in oil similar to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the railroads? Almost every move to date upon the part of the petroleum industry tends to encourage such a reaction and unfortunately at the same time persuades small marketers to join the consumer in his position. The marketer's fears have hardly been alleviated when many suppliers took advantage of short supply to eliminate spot accounts, that were welcome enough under conditions of plenty, or other accounts that for one reason or another had become undesirable. Oil distributors remember that in 1941 a Government directive was necessary to freeze accounts under similar provocation and a glance at the Wherry report indicates that again, government in the person of Senator WHERRY, had to step in the breech. Industry has provided concrete evidence to stimulate many whose first and foremost thought is to run to government when in trouble.

So we are back to leadership again. Men in industry are needed of vision who will be willing to take some risks to thoughtfully prepare a policy, not of protest and negation and mouthings about free enterprise and fancy rhetoric on the importance of the independent distributor, but a practical all-embracing plan that recognizes responsibilities to the consumer, ways of advising the consumer on the product he purchases, truthfully, and methods by which industry as a whole may serve him equitably in times of shortage.

We need leaders in large companies who will insist on being so well informed on their distributors' needs that their company policies acknowledge his function and give practical concern to his welfare and sees to it that those policies are carried out in the field. Further, we need leaders who are more fully cognizant of consumer reactions and who are so sensitive to such reaction that they can guide industry public relations in practical channels.

Do we have such men? If we have, do they have that much courage?

If not, is the only alternative a Federal Oil Commission?

Mr. Speaker, finally, I wish to quote briefly from an editorial in the National Petroleum News of December 10:

Never in more than a dozen years in Washington has the writer seen Congress so hot on a single subject as it is now with oil. * * * Under the circumstances, and realizing the extremes to which the Truman administration might go, had it the power, it apparently is incumbent on the industry to convince Congress that:

1. Within the limits of private competitive enterprise it is doing the best possible job already of meeting an exorbitant demand, but also * * *.

2. To evolve and present a plan that will enable it, voluntarily and cooperatively, to do a still better job.

Congress, I believe, would like to be shown, but unless it is—watch out.

Mr. Yocom is, I believe, supremely right. I take this opportunity to urge the oil industry to send the leaders Mr. Morrill suggested to this hearing. The information they present Tuesday may well be the basis upon which Members of Congress must base their opinions as to the proper course to take in the interest of the welfare and security of all the people of this Nation. I am convinced that is the sole objective of most Members of Congress, but I think the majority of us would agree that the hour is late and adequate information from the industry is long overdue.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the most dangerous current threat to our democratic form of government in the United States is the presence of selfishly organized groups of radical special-interest minorities and their efforts through political intimidation to coerce the Congress of the United States into passing legislation which is contrary to the basic principles upon which this Government was founded.

Chief among these are radical Negro, Communist, and off-color mongrel organizations which, conceived in hate, whelped in treason and deceit, and nurtured on the breast of communism, are attempting to bring about in this great country moral disintegration and mongrelization through a forced amalgamation of the races.

Hiding the rotten stench of their insidious aims under an outward cloak of purity, these professional purveyors of hate and indecency—these enemies of the American way of life—have succeeded in injecting their venom into the unsuspecting in such numbers that they have managed to attain the position in many States of holding the balance of political power separating the two major political parties. Through the conscienceless racketeers who head these parasitic groups, they are today asserting their strength as never before in an attempt to bring about a forced amalgamation of the white and black races, eventually reducing us to a state of mongrels, ruled over by mulattoes, with every vestige of human rights destroyed.

In his civil-rights message to this Congress, the President of the United States lent aid and comfort to these enemies of the American way of life. This infamous message, with its accompanying preposterous recommendations, constitutes the most flagrant attack ever perpetrated by any President in the history of our country upon the American Constitution. Not only did he show his utter contempt for the time-honored principles on which his party was founded, but at the same time he repudiated the friendship and loyalty of those who were directly responsible for his becoming President.

We of the South will never forget those trying days during the 1944 Democratic convention when southern Democrats banded together as a bloc to prevent the nomination of Henry Wallace as a Vice Presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket. The people of the South are directly responsible for Mr. Truman's ascendancy to the Presidency; yet, despite this, he has seen fit to run a political dagger into our backs and now he is trying to drink our blood.

Never since the shameful and disastrous years of Reconstruction following the war for southern independence have the valiant people of the South faced a crisis of such severity as that which has been brough down upon our heads by the President. We of the South must and will face the impending battle in the same courageous manner with which our forebears faced the carpetbaggers and scalawags of Reconstruction.

In those, the darkest days of American history, when the people of the Southern States, both white and black, were being exploited by unscrupulous money-mad and power-hungry scavengers, when the governments of the Southern States had been wrested from the hands of their chosen leaders and had been taken over by organized enemies of law and order, the great Democratic Party of Thomas Jefferson rallied its forces to the aid of

these stricken people. We have never since forgotten nor have we failed to give evidence at every opportunity of our unwavering gratitude as well as devotion to the principles of this great party. Through its leanest as well as its more prosperous years, the Democratic Party has enjoyed and relied upon the determined spirit of its southern friends for its continued existence.

President Truman today holds the highest office within the gift of his people by virtue of southern loyalty to the Democratic Party as well as their activities in his behalf in the 1944 convention, and, I say, Mr. Speaker, that his message on civil rights constitutes mighty poor evidence of any gratitude on his part for these concessions. President Truman knows that if these outrageous recommendations were adopted and became law, that they would eventually destroy not only our democratic form of government and our democratic way of life, but would also destroy our very civilization.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been well and wisely said that a President these days is a prisoner of his "palace guard." If President Truman would clean house and fumigate, get rid of that bunch around him and get some real American Democrats in their places, he would change his position on these vicious measures.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and there is no time like the present for that fumigating.

He cites the fact that today the American people enjoy more freedom and opportunity than ever before, but in the next breath makes recommendations for immediate revolutionary changes. Now as a matter of fact, everyone knows that we of the United States enjoy more individual freedom and opportunity than any other people or country on the face of the earth. We must remember that these freedoms were bought with the blood of ourselves and our ancestors, and that these freedoms were not merely voted into being overnight. We must remember that these freedoms carry with them responsibilities of citizenship which the President has seen fit to leave unmentioned in his civil-rights message.

I shall speak of his message here as being a direct insult to the white people of the Southern States, because the President has made it obvious that he so intended.

It is a matter of record that we of the South today are spending more on Negro education than we have at any time since the war for southern independence. We are by the same token, willing to admit that it is not enough but we intend to spend more. Despite what you might hear to the contrary, more Negroes vote today in our elections than have ever voted or attempted to vote in the past, though our voting laws have not been changed appreciably during the past 50 years. More money is being spent in the South today on Negro health programs, hospitalization, and social welfare than ever before in the history of our country.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It might be pointed out that it is a greater problem in the South because a larger proportion of the Negro population is located in the South.

Mr. RANKIN. It might also be pointed out, as I pointed out before the Committee on Un-American Activities on yesterday, that every Communist agitator who goes down South to stir up race trouble seems to get the blessing of the so-called Department of Justice, and I am referring particularly to what happened at Magee, Miss., with which my distinguished colleague is thoroughly familiar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, and I agree with the gentleman, of course.

We have less racial trouble than any other section of the country where there is an appreciable number of opposing races. The people of the Southern States are making valiant strides toward bettering social conditions and racial relations despite communistic propaganda to the contrary. The President has asked for a Federal antilynching bill, which would not only provide protection for the guilty at the expense of the innocent, but would provide a free $10,000 life insurance policy at the expense of innocent taxpayers, payable to the designated beneficiaries of any criminal who happens to become the victim of a lynching.

Mr. RANKIN. During the debate in 1922, of which the Republicans have been ashamed ever since, Hon. Finis J. Garrett, the Democratic leader, read that clause and he said it ought to be called a bill to encourage rape, because it insures the life of the Negro rapist at the expense of the taxpayers of the county, and ignores the multitudes that are killed in race troubles in States outside the solid South.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

I, as much as any other man in this House, despise and detest the crime of lynching. It is not only un-American and contrary to every principle of law and order, but it is murder in the worst and lowest form. No; we who oppose this measure are not advocating lynching or mob violence—let there be no mistake about this. We do advocate the enforcement of currently existing laws which are completely adequate to meet any such situation. There is not a State in the Union which does not provide proper punishment for those who are found guilty of the crime of murder. Under the Constitution of the United States those officers who are guilty of negligence or malfeasance which makes it possible for such crimes to be perpetrated may be punished under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States wherein it is provided, and I quote:

> Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

No, Mr. Speaker, there is no need for such drastic unconstitutional legislation. According to the Tuskegee Institute, which keeps records of lynchings, there was only one such crime in the United States last year. Furthermore, those who perpetrated this crime were immediately brought to the bar of justice and given a fair and speedy trial.

The President also recommends a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission, which he states would be established for the purpose of eliminating discrimination in employment. The President in his zeal for looking out after the interests of his favored minorities apparently overlooks or does not care about the rights of the majority. A Fair Employment Practices Commission could only mean the setting up of a gestapo in the United States for the purpose of intimidating employers and forcing them to submit to the whims and fancies of the bureaucracy administering such a program. An FEPC would completely destroy any semblance of free enterprise and would bring upon us a police state exceeding even the wildest dreams of Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin. The anti-poll-tax bill, clearly an invasion of the rights of the individual States by the Federal Government, is but a first step toward the Federal ballot, and Federal control of elections, and qualifications of electors. This is clearly in conflict with the spirit of the Constitution and the intentions of the assembly which wrote this great document.

The President has summed up all of these recommendations in his final proposal—legislation to outlaw segregation. This, along with a totalitarian communistic state, is the ultimate aim and desire of the radicals who have high-pressured the President into making such requests.

Mr. Speaker, segregation is the only answer to the Negro problem. This Congress can pass laws from now until doomsday, outlawing segregation and attempting to force upon both white and black an integral society, but until such time as people are willing voluntarily to intermingle socially, these laws could and would be of no value whatsoever.

A great American—an abolitionist—speaking of the slave problem, said:

> Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people—
>
> Meaning Negroes—
>
> are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government.

Mr. RANKIN. That is Thomas Jefferson you are quoting?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, my friends, these are the words of the greatest Democrat who ever lived; the founder of the Democratic Party, the author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson. He recognized the gravity of the impending racial conflict, and we could do well to heed his words.

Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, the man who is today recognized as the best friend the Negro ever had, said in a speech at Springfield, Ill., on June 26, 1857, while debating the slave issue with Douglas:

> Now, I protest the counterfeit logic which concluded that because I do not want a black woman for a slave I must necessarily want one for a wife. I need not have her for either. A separation of the races is the

only perfect preventive of amalgamation; but as an immediate separation is impossible, then the next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together.

And again, speaking at Charleston, Ill., on September 18, 1858, the same Abraham Lincoln said:

I will say, then, that I am not nor have ever been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races. That I am not, nor have ever been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people, and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality, and inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white man.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lincoln was a friend to the Negro race. He realized that the two races could not live together free from rules and laws of segregation without reducing both to a common mongrel race, eventually destroying the integrity of both races and bringing upon us a state of national moral disintegration. These eternal truths have made themselves manifest throughout the ages.

Can the two races live segregated lives and yet promote their common welfare? Only those who are too prejudiced to open their eyes to fact would contend negatively.

The greatest exponent of the Negro's cause in United States history, the Negro who, more than any other, did more constructively for his people was Booker T. Washington. And yet this great man who certainly had the interests of his people foremost in his heart, decried the efforts of those who would exploit his people and destroy their racial integrity through a forced amalgamation with the white race, when he so wisely said:

In all things which are purely social, we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

Too, remember that Abraham Lincoln, the man who freed the slaves, when a member of the Illinois Legislature, voted to exclude Negroes from that State, and, even after the cause of the southerners had been defeated, proposed the setting up of a Negro colony and the deportation of the former slaves to that colony.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the most dangerous single proposal of the President's message was the following:

As a first step, we must strengthen the organization of the Federal Government in order to enforce civil-rights legislation more adequately and to watch over the state of our traditional liberties.

To me, this constitutes a complete abrogation on the part of the President of any belief in the individual sovereignty of the States, as well as a desire on his part to set up a Federal "gestapo" to enforce the laws of an appointed bureaucracy.

This could lead to nothing more or less than a police state, federally regulated elections, and, in time a dictatorship under a totalitarian regime. We cannot—and I speak now more as an American than as a southerner—sit idly by and see travesty upon human freedom consummated. We must repudiate in no uncertain terms these sugar-coated grabs for power, and we must take action to stop these attempts to move our county courthouse and State capitols to Washington; we must give the Government back to the people and take it away from the bureaucrats.

If there are those here who would deny that this so-called civil-rights movement is a Communist movement, let me read to you from a news article which appeared in the Washington Times Herald on Friday, July 18, 1947:

Two former Communists testified in Federal court yesterday that Gerhart Eisler, masquerading under the name of Edwards, worked ceaselessly on orders from Moscow for ultimate establishment of a Negro republic in the South where the colored race would have full political self-determination. The men, William Nowell and Charles White, both Negroes, had been subpenaed by the Government as witnesses in Eisler's trial.

White described the American Communist party line as the "Doctrine of self-determination for the Black Belt, or building a black republic in a white ocean."

The proposals recommended by the President follow almost word for word the first several planks in the platform of the Communist Party in America.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to my colleague from Mississippi that the Negro, Nowell, he refers to testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities that they took him to Moscow to teach him how to carry on a revolution in this country. It became so horrible to him that he ran out on them. He testified that they taught him how to knock out light plants, put waterworks out of commission, blow up bridges, barricade streets, wreck streetcars, and so forth.

He testified that this fellow Gerhart Eisler, who was parading around here as a refugee from Hitler, was one of the instructors in that Communist school in Moscow teaching that stuff to him. Eisler also has a brother, Hans Eisler, that they are trying to keep in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. According to this news item that I have quoted, these two Negroes who had been trained as Communists in Russia awakened to the things that the Communists were trying to do to their own people. Not to the white people, but to their own people in the South, and they could not stomach it any longer.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what Nowell testified to before our committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say here that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who yesterday took a dig at the white people of the South, helped to get this Hans Eisler into this country, according to the testimony of Sumner Wells, a former Under Secretary of State, who appeared before our committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman knows I have no more love for Mrs. Roosevelt than he does.

Mr. Speaker, who are these groups who would destroy our way of living? Let me name a few. There is the NAACP, which has been labeled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as "Communist infiltrated." There is the National Negro Congress, the Civil Rights Congress, Friends of Democracy, Inc., the infamous Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the Political Action Committee of the CIO, the Antilynching League, the Committee for the Abolition of the Poll Tax, and so on, ad infinitum. All of these are either actual Communist fronts or have become infiltrated with Communists. These are mostly mongrel organizations, which care no more about the welfare of the Negro than they do about the welfare of the wildest ape in the jungles of Africa or South America.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that every organization so far cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front or as being infiltrated with Communists, places foremost among its aims the same kind of stuff that is now being recommended by the President of the United States.

As further indisputable evidence of the Communist desire for this kind of tommyrot, let me quote from a cablegram sent Secretary of State Marshall during his visit to Russia on March 16, 1947, by Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States:

I also respectfully suggest that you recommend to the Congress * * *.

First, an effective guaranty of civil rights.

Let there be no mistake about it. The people who are behind this legislation are not attempting to free anyone from any kind of political or social enslavement. Their desire is to destroy racial segregation and with an accompanying grab for power. We have no Negro problem in the South. We know and understand our Negroes and they know and understand us. Thinking members of both races know that it is to the best interests of both whites and Negroes that we keep our people apart from social intermingling. To say that segregation is necessarily discrimination is akin to saying that it is discriminatory for the Democrats to sit on one side of the House and Republicans on the other. The southern Negro does not care about being thrown into social contact with the white man any more than the white man wants to associate with him. Our Negroes are interested in bringing about more good will and happy relations with their white friends than they are in promoting hate for the white man. They realize that the only way to solve their problems is through the normal evolutionary processes, and that their people as a race cannot be benefited by legislation which forces upon them the assumption of responsibilities which they do not want and for which they are not yet ready.

It is significant to note that there is no agitation on the part of our Negroes in the South for this kind of legislation. Our Negroes know that we have their interests at heart, and that in time, through orderly processes, their conditions will be much better improved than through revolutionary and drastic processes.

It is also significant to note, Mr. Speaker, that the southern people—the people who are most vitally affected by this proposed legislation—were not given a single spokesman on the President's Civil Rights Committee. It is true that two members claimed southern origin, but both of these had indicated positively through previous actions and statements that they would rubber stamp the rest of the committee and would do what the President intended for them to do. And what is even more significant, Mr. Speaker, every member of this infamous committee has at one time or another been associated or affiliated with one or more of these communistic crusading minority pressure groups.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does not the gentleman rather suspect that that report was written before the committee was ever appointed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have heard rumors that the report was not even written by the committee, but was written by a gentleman in New York.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The two members of the committee to whom he referred, who were supposed to represent the South, have both been found to be members of Communist front organizations by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. One of them, this Frank Graham who disgraces the University of North Carolina, has been the head of that Communist front.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, is it not?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then what is the solution to this political dilemma in which the South finds itself? How can we best fight this carpetbag legislation which we know will mean the ruination of the United States as well as the South?

Mr. Speaker, we must fight fire with fire. These mongrel organizations which crusade against our chosen way of life are organized; they fight collectively as one toward the same shameful ends; they fight unscrupulously without regard to rules of ethics or fair play.

In the same manner we must organize to combat this stream of filth directed at our people.

I would, indeed, hate to see the day when southern Democrats are forced out of the Democratic Party by these communistic political misfits. But that day is here unless our southern Democrats take immediate positive action to preserve their institutions.

The question is asked: "Where can we go?"

Yes, it is true that we cannot join the Republicans; they are the originators of this carpetbag legislation. But we do have a place to go; we can provide in each Southern State an independent set of electors who would be free to cast their ballots in the electoral college for a southern Democrat, thereby preventing either major party from receiving a majority of the electoral votes and throwing the election into the House of Representatives. In this way, it is believed by many that we could succeed in electing a southerner to the Presidency, because Republicans would not vote for a northern Democrat in preference to a southern Democrat; and northern Democrats would in all probability vote for a southern Democrat rather than a Republican.

But, Mr. Speaker, these are drastic measures to which we should resort only after every other means of fighting within the party has been exhausted. But the times demand drastic measures such as this if our American heritage is to be preserved.

The time has come for every southerner to stand up and be counted. As my Governor stated in his recent message to the State legislature on this subject:

> Vital principles and eternal truths transcend party lines, and the time is now at hand when determined action must be taken.

The time is at hand when the President and National Democratic Party must face the issue. The South has taken as much of its own party's scorn as it is possible for a people to endure. The time has come when President Truman and the National Democratic Party leaders must declare openly and in no uncertain terms whether they desire the continued support and friendship of the Southern States. If they do, then they must also, in no uncertain terms, repudiate these communistic barnacles which have attached themselves to our party. They must face the issue now; there must be no evasion of the question. The choice is theirs; the alternative, ours.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an open letter from the student body of William Jewell College to the Members of the Congress. Also a letter similarly addressed to all student bodies of American colleges and universities.

Jewell College is one of the oldest colleges west of the Mississippi River. It is the alma mater of approximately one-fourth of the Missouri delegation in the House of Representatives in the Eightieth Congress.

The accompanying letters represent the sentiment of the college by an overwhelming majority of the student body in a vote taken after exhaustive discussion of the subject in the open forum of an all-school convocation held for the purpose on January 27, 1948.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence on the Southern States and elections.

LINCOLN AND KOSCIUSKO

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation today is very fittingly doing honor to the memory of a great wartime President, Abraham Lincoln. As generations pass, the character and deeds of this statesman, who rose to majestic heights when our Nation was divided, increases in grandeur. It is a remarkable coincidence that today we celebrate the birth anniversary of another great man of history, Thaddeus Kosciusko, who contributed greatly to the battle of freedom, not only for his native Poland, but also America. Schools, churches, civic groups, and fraternal organizations throughout America today are holding exercises to commemorate the memory of the great emancipator. The debt which America owes to him is being more appreciated as the years pass. His memory will be perpetuated in the minds of all Americans as long as our Republic exists.

The deeds and accomplishments of Thaddeus Kosciusko's battle for the freedom of his own people and also colonial America, may be overlooked on this day by reason of our reverence for the great Lincoln. Kosciusko came to our shores in the dark days of the Revolution and in the true spirit of a patriot, contributed his great ability to establish freedom and independence in America. Besides extending his invaluable leadership to the cause, his presence and activity brought thousands of his patriotic Polish comrades into the fight for American freedom. Kosciusko's contribution to the cause of the young Republic can only be cutrivaled by the outstanding fight for freedom and independence which he also devoted to his native Poland. Today, all the people of America can join with Americans of Polish descent in also revering and honoring the deeds of this great Polish patriot. Today his name lives in the hearts of all Polish people who believe in free, unfettered, and independent government for their homeland. The love of self-government and free religious worship flows through the veins of all true Poles. The centuries have demonstrated that the Polish people will never be submerged by any power or government which shackles or curtails civic or religious freedom. We in America, as well as the peoples throughout the globe, are today in the dark shadows of a reconstruction brought about by the aftermath of the most destructive war in world history. I firmly believe that as we emerge from the shadows of this catastrophic war, the principles of right and justice will prevail and the freedom for which many Polish heroes fought will be restored to their native Poland. A reapplication of the spirit of Lincoln and Kosciusko on the part of liberty-loving nations, and also the people who are now submerged, will bring this about.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 111. An act for the relief of Donat and Laura Laroche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 511. An act for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giovoechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 936. An act for the relief of Burnett A. Pyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 981. An act for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1037. An act to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1395. An act for the relief of Jose Maria Gerardo de Amusategui and Ramon de Amusategui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1706. An act to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 184); to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1801. An act to authorize attendance of civilians at schools conducted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and joint-service schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1990. An act to provide a means for the orderly continuation and completion of the Deer Creek and aqueduct divisions of the Provo River project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 16, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1297. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1298. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 172 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1299. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend further sections 10 and 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended (37 U. S. C. 110 and 112), relating to allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1300. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1301. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting reports showing the names of all persons against whom claims in excess of $1,000 have been compromised, the address of such persons, the nature of claims, the amount of compromise, and the reasons therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1302. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting two copies of the National Airport plan for 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1369. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HUBER: Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Report relative to allocation and inventory control of grain for the production of ethyl alcohol (Rept. No. 1371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 1698. An act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5049. A bill to reopen the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 1373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4167. A bill to authorize the State of Montana to lease her State lands for the production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons for such terms of years and on such conditions as may be from time to time provided by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 4837. A bill to provide an engineering study of the mine-water problem of the Pennsylvania anthracite mining area for the purpose of obtaining information and presenting a solution relating to the health, safety, and economic conditions of the area, State, and Nation as affected by the encroachment of water that progressively floods the mines, threatens to destroy the anthracite reserves of the Nation, contributes to a waste of a valuable natural resource, and seriously affects the whole economy of the anthracite mining area; without amendment (Rept. No. 1375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 5344. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5345. A bill to amend section 8 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to allow certain commissioned warrant officers of the armed forces to count other active commissioned service in the computation of service for advancement to certain pay periods; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5346. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Assateague Channel and Smallers Drain, Accomac County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 5347. A bill repealing certain taxes with respect to oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 5348. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 5349. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5350. A bill to impose a duty on tung oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 5351. A bill to promote the general welfare, the national interest, and the foreign policy of the United States by encouraging the giving of aid to the peoples of certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 5352. A bill for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5353. A bill to amend section 9 (h) of Public Law 101; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5354. A bill to authorize a further preliminary examination and a new survey of the following streams, which are tributaries to the Red River of the North: Snake River, Middle River (tributary to Snake River), Tamarac River, and Two Rivers (including North, South, and Middle Branches), Big Joe and Little Joe Rivers, in the State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5355. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 5356. A bill to provide for a national program of retirement, survivors, and extended disability insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 5357. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Oberlin, La., a post office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5358. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Kinder, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5359. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Welsh, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5360. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Sulphur, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5361. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Rayne, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5362. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Church Point, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5363. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Vinton, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5364. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Lake Charles, La., a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5365. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Westlake, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5366. A bill for the purpose of erecting in De Quincy, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5367. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Lake Arthur, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5368. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Opelousas, La., a post-office and Federal court building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 5369. A bill to establish a Commission on Tax Coordination in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 5370. A bill to liberalize the provisions of law under which the widow or child of a deceased veteran of World War I or II may receive a pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 5371. A bill for the relief of soldiers who were discharged from the Army during the Indian wars because of minority or misrepresentation of age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 5372. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 5373. A bill to exempt admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5374. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 5375. A bill making an initial appropriation to enable the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry on certain studies of the soft-shell clam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 5376. A bill directing the Fish and Wildlife Service to undertake certain studies of the soft-shell clam in Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 5377. A bill authorizing the execution of an amendatory repayment contract with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 5378. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to make loans to the States and their political subdivisions for the purpose of constructing public works which will protect from damage land along the coasts and navigable lakes and streams of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 5379. A bill relating to appointments of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5380. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. J. Res. 325. Joint resolution to continue until July 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. J. Res. 326. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Civil Rights; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution calling upon President to modify the United States embargo on arms and ammunition to the Middle East, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the use by the United States of that portion of the Alaska Highway located in Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act by reducing from 65 to 60 years the minimum age for receiving old-age insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to assure an adequate supply of nitrates and other fertilizers for the use of South Carolina farmers during the year 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 5381. A bill for the relief of George M. Beesley, Edward D. Sexton, and Herman J. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 5382. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. Moss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 5383. A bill for the relief of William D. Fales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5384. A bill for the relief of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 5385. A bill for the relief of George Kedzierski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 5386. A bill for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 5387. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury claim board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5388. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a quit-claim deed to property owned by Jacob F. Riedel; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of Tuk Kede Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1326. By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly, memorializing Congress with relation to the repeal of certain Federal taxes and restrictions upon the sales of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1327. Also, petition of Mrs. Helen T. Richards and 11 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1328. Also, petition of Marion L. Benjamin and 44 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1329. By Mr. RICH: Petition of residents of Lock Haven, Pa., and vicinity, protesting against H. R. 4902; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1330. By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT: Resolution presented by Joseph Vasella Post, No. 277, Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion, at the meeting of the Philadelphia County Council on January 27, 1948, and unanimously adopted, urging that Tokyo Rose be denied reentry to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1331. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of 36 voters of Kenosha, Wis., urging passage of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1332. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Petition of citizens of Cambria County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1333. Also, petition of citizens of Indiana County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1334. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Andrew S. Smith, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1335. Also, petition of F. A. Winchell, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1336. Also, petition of Joseph F. Petrus, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1337. Also, petition of Ross C. Patton, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to compensation for patent application; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1338. Also, petition of M. D. Adams, Washington, D. C., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting amendment to an oath of allegiance to the United States of America, in United States Code, 1940, title 8, section 735b; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1339. Also, petition of James E. Schofer and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to peacetime conscription; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1340. Also, petition of Wiston L. Wood and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to prohibiting the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1341. Also, petition relative to the passage of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1342. Also, petition of Mrs. Francis Carey and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1343. Also, petition of J. B. Rudy and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1344. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition signed by constituents from Crowley, Rayne, Church Point, Morse, Iota, Breaux Bridge, and Denham Springs, La., in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1345. Also, petition of Roland A. Bahan, president, Louisiana Hotel Association, Baton Rouge, La., and E. Lysle Aschaffenburg, president, New Orleans Hotel Association, New Orleans, La., opposing the 20-percent Federal cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, on this World Day of Prayer, we join the ten million women in our own country and their sisters in many other lands in this their petition for Christian fellowship and world brotherhood.

"Father of all mankind, we come in deep humility, giving Thee our thanks and praise.

"Here and now we confess our sins.

"Forgive us our mistakes and transgressions.

"Grant us faith to look with fearless eyes beyond the chaos of our world and time, knowing that out of this shall rise, lifted by Thy grace, peace with justice and a time of brotherhood.

"Vouchsafe unto us the will to work together.

"Create within us the unselfish purpose of Thy Son, who gave His life for all peoples, and may our deeds reflect the mind of Christ.

"Remove from us greed and suspicion.

"Lift us above pettiness and destroy the hate that is the great destroyer. Throughout the earth, may that which we profess come alive in human relations.

"May we serve Thee better and love Thee more, that Thy kingdom may come on earth as it is in heaven. Through Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SMITH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 11, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 9, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 664. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart; and

S. 1411. An act for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3503) to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 148) authorizing the Clerk of the House, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3778) to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), to make certain corrections, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1366. An act to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1634. An act to amend section 1 and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF ATLANTIC STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth annual report of that Commission, dated December 1, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ARCHIVIST

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a petition of the Miami Friendship Townsend Club No. 1, Miami, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a uniform national pension system, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina at the instance of Representative Harry Agnew, of Anderson, S. C. This resolution memorializes Congress to amend the Social Security Act by reducing from 65 to 60 years the minimum age for receiving old-age and survivor insurance benefits.

In this connection, I call attention to the fact that my bill, S. 466, to accomplish this very purpose, is still pending in the Committee on Finance. It is my sincere hope that the committee will see fit to report this bill for the consideration of the Senate at an early date. It is a commonly known fact that persons who are forced to spend their working years in industry are in many cases unable to continue efficient and effective work after they have passed the age of 60.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act by reducing from 65 to 60 years the minimum age for receiving old-age insurance benefits

Whereas under the Social Security Act of Congress the minimum age at which covered employees may retire and receive old-age benefits is 65 years; and

Whereas in industry employees who have reached the age of 60 years are at substantially equal disadvantage with those who have reached the age of 65 years by reason of competition of younger employees; and

Whereas the beneficent purposes of the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act would be more fully accomplished and opportunities for younger employees would be enhanced by reducing from 65 to 60 years the age at which insured employees may retire: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully urged to amend the Social Security Act by reducing from 65 to 60 years the age at which employees may begin receiving retirement benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of South Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which was recently adopted by the board of directors of the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce, assembled in Aurora, Ill., wherein they whole-heartedly endorse the Marshall plan.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the starving peoples of the world are in great need of assistance; and

Whereas the threat and spread of communism is becoming more imminent with the passing of time; and

Whereas a bill to assist European economic recovery has been submitted to the Eightieth Congress of the United States; and

Whereas such assistance will materially aid in the preservation of the democratic way of life and will substantially forestall the possibility of a third world war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce assembled in Aurora January 17 and 18, 1948, do urge the passage of the European economic recovery plan and ask that the entire Illinois congressional delegation vote in favor of said bill; be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Illinois Junior Chamber of Commerce assembled in Aurora January 17 and 18, 1948, request and urge the United States State Department to adequately publicize the fact that such assistance is provided by the people of the United States.

DEVELOPMENT OF MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK—RESOLUTION OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY (MD.) CIVIC FEDERATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for reference to the Committee on Appropriations and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the Montgomery County Civic Federation urging the inclusion of funds for the development of the Maryland-National Capital Park.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission has requested an appropriation of $1,494,000 from the Federal Government for the acquisition of public park lands in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md., in pursuance of the policy laid down by Congress in the Capper-Crampton Act; and

Whereas the House Appropriations Committee has stricken this item from the independent offices appropriations bill for 1949 despite the testimony of competent public officials to the effect that the contemplated park lands are in critical areas of booming real-estate development and may be lost forever if not acquired without delay: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Montgomery County Civic Federation earnestly exhorts its Representatives in Congress to work for the reinstatement in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1949 the sum of $1,494,000 for the acquisition of public park lands in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties under the Capper-Crampton Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators TYDINGS and O'CONOR, Representatives BEALL and SASSCER, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by the members of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Hays, Kans., in which they express their approval of the Marshall plan and urge their Representatives in Congress to support a sound European recovery program. The petition reads as follows:

It is our belief that in this winter of 1947–48, the United States is faced with the responsibility and the pressing necessity to prevent mass starvation and to aid in restoring the normal economic life of the war-ravaged nations of Europe cooperating in the Marshall plan. We believe that this is "the immediate and pressing challenge to our belief in freedom and prosperity" and that "it is our simple duty as neighbors to take a generous part in helping these great people to help themselves." Therefore, we urge our duly elected representatives in the Congress to cast a favorable vote on legislation designed, in the light of Secretary of State Marshall's proposal, to fulfill the needs of a sound European recovery program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE OIL SITUATION IN FLORIDA—PETITION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has been called out of Washington on official business, and he asked me to present for him, and I also present for myself and ask to have incorporated in the RECORD, without the illustrations attached, a petition on behalf of the city of Daytona Beach, Fla., through its regularly accredited officials, in which it is joined by the cities of Miama, Coral Gables, Fort Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, Fort Pierce, Melbourne, New Smyrna Beach, Tampa, St. Petersburg, Bradenton, Fort Myers, Tallahassee, Gainesville, Lakeland, De Land, and Jacksonville.

The subject matter of the petition is the small supply and the high price of oil and oil products, and the substance of the petition is a request for an investigation by appropriate Senate and House committees of the present situation in the oil industry.

I ask that the petition be received and filed, and referred to the appropriate Senate committee.

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the illustrations, as follows:

Petition of the city of Daytona Beach, Fla., to the Government of the United States, on behalf of the 40,000 citizens of Daytona Beach, and on behalf of millions of other citizens and businesses of the United States, in accordance with the right granted citizens under the Constitution of the United States, for a redress of grievances against the monopolistic oil industry because of such industry's scandalous, reckless, and high-handed boosting of oil prices at a time when its earnings and profits have reached the highest level of its history and because of the industry's shortage of oil supplies with resulting physical and economic distress and suffering to home, business, and other users, and because such industry's actions have adversely and will continue to adversely affect the entire economic structure of the United States and its people unless Congress, in the interest of the people of the United States, eliminates such grievances and related practices by immediate and courageous action:

FEBRUARY 12, 1948.

To the Government of the United States, the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States:

The city of Daytona Beach, a municipal corporation of the State of Florida, on behalf of its 40,000 citizens and on behalf of millions of other citizens and businesses of the United States, in accordance with the right guaranteed citizens under the Constitution of the United States, petitions the Government of the United States for a redress of grievances against the monopolistic oil industry because of such industry's scandalous, reckless, and high-handed boosting of oil prices at a time when its earnings and profits have reached the highest level of its history and because of the industry's shortage of oil supplies with resulting physical and economic distress and suffering to home, business, and other users, and because such industry's actions have adversely and will continue to adversely affect the entire economic structure of the United States and its people unless Congress, in the interest of the people of the United States, eliminates such grievances and related practices by immediate and courageous action. The grievances on which petitioner seeks relief include the following:

I

The oil industry, a monopolistic system in its nature because of lack of Federal, State, or other effective regulation, in full disregard of public interest and with the apparent attitude of the "public be damned" to those persons whose everyday life and business depend on the use of oil supplies, has unwarrantedly, recklessly, and unjustifiably boosted prices of oil supplies to such an extent that such increases are scandalous. Reference to attached exhibit A will show that as regards "Gulf coast grade C bunker fuel oil cargo lots" oil the price thereof has more than tripled since before the war.

II

The earnings per share of major oil companies are going up even faster than the price of certain oils. For example, the earnings per share of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey have gone up from $3.27 in 1939 to $10.50 (latest available estimate) for the year 1947. It has been reported with respect to this company that the "Earnings in first 6 months of 1947 were highest for any half year in the company's history. Operations during last 6 months expected to hold around high rate of initial half of this year." For other examples, see attached exhibit B.

III

That notwithstanding a Nation-wide clamor for relief against this unregulated and multistate monopoly by way of full, effective, and adequate Federal regulation as to prices, separation of production from marketing, unfair practice relations with dealers and independent oil distributors, full inquiry as to violation of Federal antitrust laws, and other phases of such industry's operations and which have such an economic bearing on the users of such oil and the economic structure of the United States, the oil industry herein complained about has gone scot free to date and is enjoying "mountain top" earnings, even though other interstate and multistate operations, such as stock exchanges, communications, transportation, and other public-utility companies and like interests whose operations could be inimical to the public interest are effectively regulated and supervised under Federal laws with resulting benefit to the people of these United States.

IV

That the present and asserted future shortage of oil and the unwarranted and scandalous prices now being charged therefor have brought forth comments or action by Members of the Congress of the United States, including the following:

Senator JOHNSTON (Democrat, South Carolina): "It looks like the big oil companies are holding oil off the market so that the people will be scared and they can run prices up. If the big companies are doing this, as

indicated in my State, prosecutions are in order."

Representative Ross (Republican, New York): Called for immediate and sweeping investigation of the entire fuel-oil situation.

Representative LANE (Democrat, Massachusetts): Demanded a probe to see if a monopoly condition is behind the New England supply problem and higher prices to consumers there.

Senator FLANDERS (Republican, Vermont): Suggested to American Petroleum Institute's President Boyd the desirability of the industry not only "arresting further price advances" but also, "if at all possible, making an appreciable decrease in the price (of fuel oil) at an early date."

V

That as yet no action has been taken on the many, many complaints which have come to the Justice Department of the United States and which have complained bitterly about increased prices of oil and shortages in oil. These included a complaint by a Detroit citizen who saw conspiracy by the oil industry in the situation.

VI

That the shortage in oil and outrageous and reckless increased prices therefor have caused individual action and investigations by numerous States of the United States but because of the far-flung and multistate empire and its operations the several States are legally impotent to adequately, effectively, and properly regulate and supervise this American business giant, thus leaving as the only door or hope to protection of the adversely affected citizens and businesses full, adequate, immediate, and courageous regulation by the Government of the United States.

VII

That, according to the news, a high official of one of the major oil companies (W. H. Garbode, assistant treasurer, Shell Oil Co., Inc.) asserted that replacement of oil facilities dictate need for high corporate earnings by the oil industry, which view is apparently in wholesale and "full throttle" and "what the traffic will bear" practice by the oil industry today, with the result that current scandalous prices of fuel and other oils make the home, business, or other user pay and unjustifiably create such higher earnings which nefarious and obnoxious practice could not be indulged in under appropriate and effective Federal regulation, which is so sorely needed at this time and in the future but which is so sorely lacking now and which lack is to the detriment of the fuel and other oil user and which lack may cause the economic structure of these United States and its people to be severely impaired, if not destroyed.

VIII

That Interior Secretary Krug's announced policy of oil price and rationing controls and his announced intentions to freeze oil prices at all levels and to roll back prices under certain circumstances (which are naturally opposed by the oil industry) and which action would serve the public interests as compared to the present wide-open increase-price policy of the oil industry have not materialized, even though this ranking official of the Government later commented, "It looks quite likely that we'll have to ration fuel oil next winter," and called attention to people suffering from cold because of the situation.

IX

That Federal control, regulation, and supervision of the oil industry is essential in the public interest and welfare and so that practices and abuses not in the public good, including shortages, unwarranted prices from the users to create mountaintop earnings to replace and add improvements; the monopolistic operations of the major oil companies; producing activities; unfair practices with dealers and independent oil distributors; marketing activities; allocation activities; control by this dominant and many-pronged industry through mediums of stock ownership or otherwise; imports and exports; lobbying before Congress; joint but not disclosed action by the oil industry on allocations of oil, fixing of prices, and other operations; and other practices and operations detrimental to the public good, be eliminated from the economic life of these United States and its people.

X

Inert (except in scandalous price increases and more price increases) and the apparent public-be-damned management of the oil industry and its operations and activities must be fully and effectively regulated and controlled now by an alert and public-be-served Congress and Government.

XI

Pending hearings and passage of full and adequate regulatory legislation with respect to all phases and activities of the oil industry and their multi State-regulatory free operations, including fixing of price increases and a follow-the-leader attitude by the entire oil industry in increasing prices, proper action should be taken by the Government, the Congress, and President of the United States to freeze and roll back oil prices to an appropriate level consistent with public interest, which action is that heretofore advocated by Interior Secretary Krug.

XII

The Government of the United States and the Congress of the United States, with their unlimited respective powers to investigate and legislate, should answer now the call of complaints filed with the Justice Department and other agencies of the Government about the shortage of oils and the scandalous price thereof, because if such is not done, continued and justified hue and cry will be made that the best interests of the people are not being served, and even the veriest tyro in matters governmental and political will be satisfied that for reasons unknown to the public and contrary to the interest of the public, the oil industry herein grieved against is absolutely immune from governmental control and regulation and is free to go its way unregulated and increase prices and again increase prices and do those other acts and practices which require regulation now and in the future.

XIII

Abuses prevalent in the oil industry should be legislated out of existence by the Congress of the United States as was done by the Federal Government with respect to other multistate and uncontrolled corporations and activities such as the sale of securities, public-utility companies, managements, labor unions, and other operations and corporations not susceptible of effective regulation by a State or States. That old theories to the contrary notwithstanding, oil companies are proper subjects for full and effective Federal regulation at this time and in the future.

Wherefore, petitioner in its capacities as aforesaid, petitions the Government and Congress of the United States and the President of the United States in the public interest and because such interest requires immediate and full protection from an industry which is an integral part of the woof and warp of the economic life of the United States and its people and requests:

1. That the President of the United States, acting under emergency or other powers properly vested in him, take such action as he deems advisable to cause the grievances to be eliminated, including the sending of a copy or copies of this petition to the Attorney General of the United States for immediate action and investigation under the antitrust or other applicable laws of the United States.

2. That the President pro tempore of the United States Senate immediately receive and refer this constitutional petition for redress of grievances against the oil industry of the United States to an appropriate committee of the United States Senate.

3. That the Speaker of the House of Representatives immediately receive and refer this constitutional petition for redress of grievances against the oil industry of the United States to an appropriate committee of the House of Representatives.

4. That without delay the Attorney General of the United States conduct a vigorous concurrent investigation of the oil industry and the violation of any Federal laws and if criminal or civil action is justified, prosecute vigorously and expeditiously any violation by man or corporations to a speedy conclusion.

5. That committees of both Houses, jointly or separately, immediately institute and conclude a fearless and sweeping investigation of the oil industry of the United States and its managements, operations, and activities, including:

(a) the present and contemplated continued shortage in oil supplies, including failure of the oil industry to step up production of crude and fuel oils and also the failure of the oil industry to get tankers through construction or acquisition from the Government and at a time when shortages were generally predicted by the oil industry;

(b) the present scandalous price of oil;

(c) the reasons why the price of certain oils have more than tripled since before the war and when the oil industry has contended that there was no shortage of crude oil;

(d) the destructive effect of the shortage of oil and prices therefor upon the economic structure of the United States and whether such effect has been destructive or beneficial to the Government's policy of conservation of national resources;

(e) the monopolistic set-up of the oil industry;

(f) the manner in which the oil industry and major companies making up the same are controlled by stock ownership, voting trusts, interlocking officers and directors, or otherwise;

(g) why and how prices of any one oil company are maintained at levels similar to prices of other oil companies;

(h) if competition does exist in fact among the oil companies when it is apparent that as one oil company does the other oil companies do through decisions and means and methods not known to the petitioner, but which the Government and Congress can ascertain through an exhaustive congressional investigation;

(i) the advisability of separating by law the production and marketing of oils;

(j) the allocation by oil companies to other concerns of oil supplies, including fuel oil, and whether fair or unfair practices are indulged in by the oil industry in its relations with dealers and independent oil distributors;

(k) means and methods of preventing or minimizing an oil shortage during 1948–49, as now contemplated by Interior Secretary Krug, and in subsequent years;

(l) the advisability of breaking down the oil industry as was done with respect to the public-utility holding companies;

(m) the advisability of legislating and prohibiting including in the price of oil an amount deemed advisable by oil-industry management to take care of cost of new improvements and also replacements;

(n) to what extent lobbying by the oil industry has prevented earlier Federal regulation of the oil industry;

(o) to what extent lobbying by the oil industry and activities by trade and other oil industry associations and the National Petroleum Council have prevented Federal regulation or roll-back of oil prices and rationing of oil during this critical postwar period;

(p) whether through oil-industry institutes, associations, or other mediums the price of oil is raised at the whim and caprice of the oil industry and without regard to the public interest, the oil industry and such institutes, associations, and mediums do not constitute a domestic cartel inimical to the best interests of the public;

(q) to what extent the oil industry has been guilty of creating shortages in oil supplies in order to bring about increased prices of oil and so as to create those mountaintop earnings for the construction of new improvements or replacements of existing facilities;

(r) to what extent officials, directors, officers, stockholders, and employees of the oil industry have been and now are in Federal Government service or on boards advisory thereto (including the National Petroleum Council) and what positions they now hold and whether they have influenced in the past; influence at the present time, or may influence in the future the destiny and fate of the oil industry because of their serving two masters and whether they have retarded or prevented governmental control of the oil industry;

(s) if exportation of oil has contributed to the current and contemplated shortage of oil and the scandalous prices thereof and also whether exportation of oil should be curbed or prohibited; and

(t) such other matters as are related to or in any way connected with any of the above matters or practices arising out of the same.

6. That any such investigation by the Government, the Congress, and the Attorney General of the United States include immediate and complete investigation of any and all petroleum associations, exchanges, institutes, conferences, publications, or other bodies or mediums in which the oil industry maintains subscriptions or memberships or operates or directly or indirectly controls for the benefit of the industry and so that it may be found if by or through such associations, prices are raised, maintained at uniform levels or otherwise handled or manipulated for the benefit of the oil industry or the companies making up such industry.

7. That all such requested action and investigations be instituted now and concluded as quickly as possible.

8. That the Congress enact such legislation as will fully and completely cause a redress of the grievances hereinabove listed.

9. That pending the enactment of such legislation, the President and the Congress, through whatever legislation is required or otherwise and as quickly as such can be done, roll back prices of oils to the extent required in the public interest.

10. That oil prices be immediately controlled by the Government.

11. That rationing control of oil be initiated and carried out by the Government now.

12. That voluntary correction of abuses be not left to oil-industry management or the National Petroleum Council, but that such corrections be immediately enforced by action of the President, the Congress, the Attorney General, and other governmental means and officials.

13. That the Government of the United States and the Congress of the United States recognize now—not in the future—that (1) the oil industry is affected with a public interest; (2) the sales and other contractual activities of the oil industry are made and performed by means of instrumentalities of interstate commerce; (3) the oil companies and their subsidiaries sell and transport oil by the use of instrumentalities of interstate commerce; (4) the practices of the oil industry often materially affect the interstate commerce in which the oil industry engages; (5) the oil industry's activities extending over many States are not susceptible of effective control by any State and make difficult, if not impossible, effective State regulation of the oil industry; (6) abuses by the oil industry, unless regulated, are injurious to consumers, the general public, and the economic and other welfare of the United States as a whole; (7) that to meet the problems of the oil industry and to eliminate the evils of the oil industry, including its monopolistic setup and practices, its uncontrolled, scandalous prices, and other practices and abuses injurious to the general public and the welfare of the United States, Federal regulation of the oil industry is essential and necessary in the public welfare and that such regulation should be initiated and completed just as quickly as legislative processes will permit.

Petitioner, in the capacities aforesaid, respectfully seeks redress of the outlined grievances and also request that the action requested of the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Government of the United States, and the Attorney General of the United States be taken now so as to bring about early discontinuance of the uncontrolled and unregulated practices of the oil industry—a great monopolistic industry now impairing and capable of destroying the economic welfare of the United States and its people.

The City of Daytona Beach, by Ernest L. Padgett, Mayor-Commissioner; Areal C. Sage, Commissioner; LeRoy J. Hall, Commissioner; Walter A. Shelley, Commissioner; Ralph Richards, Commissioner; James M. Titus, City Manager; Curtis H. Gardiner, City Attorney.

We hereby join in the foregoing petition:

The City of Miami, by Robert L. Floyd, Mayor; the City of Coral Gables, by William T. McIlwain, City Manager; the City of Fort Lauderdale, by Reed A. Bryan, Mayor; the City of West Palm Beach, by E. Tinsley Halter, Mayor; the City of Fort Pierce, by Howard F. Stanton, Mayor; William H. Reed, City Commissioner, Donald Mustaine, City Commissioner; the City of Melbourne, by Purley E. Tucker, Mayor; the City of New Smyrna Beach, by Hugh K. Pierson, Mayor; the City of Tampa, by William E. Thompson, Attorney; the City of St. Petersburg, by Bruce B. Blackburn, Mayor; the City of Bradenton, by A. Sterling Hall, Mayor; the City of Fort Myers, by L. H. Blouch, Councilman; the city of Tallahassee, by Robert C. Parker, City Commissioner; the City of Gainesville, by H. L. Gray, Mayor; Junius B. Mobley, Jr., City Manager; the City of Lakeland, by Charles Larson, Manager of Utilities; the City of De Land, by Leo Fugle, Mayor; C. Frank Whitehead, Mayor, Jacksonville.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mr. MARTIN):

S. 2156. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in the further development of their programs of general university extension education of college grade; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2157. A bill for the relief of Jacob Herman Weissman, also known as Eugene Vale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2158. A bill to amend the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, so as to eliminate certain provisions of such acts requiring the retention of a specified carry-over of wheat in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2159. A bill for the relief of Everett C. French; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2160. A bill to equalize the rates of compensation payable for wartime and peacetime service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 2161. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2162. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2163. A bill authorizing the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon of a public building in Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 2164. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GURNEY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1985) to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator SALTONSTALL at the Lincoln Day banquet of the Young Men's Republican Club of King County, Wash., at Seattle, February 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO MOHANDAS K. GANDHI BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him at memorial services in tribute to Mohandas K. Gandhi, Departmental Auditorium, Washington, D. C., February 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCOME-TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR DONATIONS TO ALLEGEDLY SUBVERSIVE GROUPS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release by him regarding charges that the Treasury Department was approving income-tax deductions for donations to certain groups labeled subversive by the Attorney General, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES TO VETERANS IN SCHOOL—LETTER FROM M. V. M. PIKE

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from M. V. M. Pike regarding an increase in subsistence allowances for veterans in school and on-the-job-training programs, from the New York Sun of January 24, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH HEALTH PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE MIAMI HERALD

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "British Health Plan," from the Miami Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRIAL DECENTRALIZATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial endorsing his stand on Government and industrial decentralization, from the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of February 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM COTTON'S WEEK

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the Marshall plan, published in the February 6, 1948, issue of Cotton's Week, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL PEACE—ARTICLE BY CLARENCE FRANCIS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Causes of Industrial Peace," by Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp., published in the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, February 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONVEYANCE OF LAND FOR USE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on February 9 the Senate passed a local bill, Senate bill 1583, to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines. This bill conveys back to the State of Maryland a very small section of that parcel.

However, when the bill was passed unanimously by the Senate, the word "thousands" was inadvertently substituted for the word "thousandths." The purpose of the bill is to straighten out some of the roads and buildings on the campus, and it is desired to have a small part of this land reconveyed so that the landscaping and buildings will be in harmony.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is now before the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the vote ordering the engrossment and third reading of the bill be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I now offer the following amendment, on page 3, in line 3, to substitute the word "thousandths" for "one-thousands", so that the legal phraseology will be in harmony with what the Senate intended when it acted on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1583) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, a tract of land in Prince Georges County, Md., described as follows: Beginning at the stone monument that marks the corner formed by the intersection of boundary lines of the lands now or formerly owned by John and Rachel Keiley (liber S. D. H. 332, folio 113); Sam and ——— Buckley (liber 47, folio 325); Charles E. Harry W., James E., and Mary E. McNamee; and the University of Maryland (Maryland Agricultural College, liber C. S. M. 2, folio 294); near College Park, Prince Georges County, Md., and running thence with the line formerly owned by McNamee on the one side and the Bureau of Mines on the other side, south forty degrees forty-seven minutes, four seconds west nine hundred and thirty-nine and forty-six one-hundredths feet to an iron pipe marking what was formerly the Engle-McNamee corner (being part of the north forty-four degrees east two hundred and sixty-two and twenty twenty-fifths perches line of Maryland Agricultural College, liber C. S. M. 2, folio 294); thence north eighty-nine degrees thirty minutes no seconds east until it intersects the east line of the Bureau of Mines property seven hundred and one and eighty-eight one-hundredths feet; thence north no degrees thirty minutes west six hundred and sixty-six and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to an iron pipe marking the northeast corner of the Bureau of Mines property; thence north sixty-four degree. forty-five minutes twenty-four seconds west ninety-one and seven one-hundredths feet along the University of Maryland (formerly Keiley) line to the point of beginning and containing six and three thousand one hundred and forty-eight ten-thousandths acres.

TRIBUTE TO MOHANDAS K. GANDHI BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the brief address which I made at the memorial services for Mohandas K. Gandhi a few days ago.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY WAYNE MORSE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM OREGON, AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR MOHANDAS K. GANDHI, DEPARTMENTAL AUDITORIUM, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BUILDING, FEBRUARY 11, 1948

We meet to revere the forever-living force of a world citizen, a citizen of the world whose lifelong devotion to immutable spiritual values has carved deeply into the history of the ages the name Gandhi.

The ingredients of greatness do not subject themselves to scientific analysis as does a chemical compound. The qualities of greatness are too inseparably a part of the mysteries of life itself to be taken apart element by element and then reassembled into a pattern of behavior called greatness.

Gandhi was a great man, but the soul of his greatness will forever remain a mystery, subject to analysis only in terms of its effects upon all human, social, political, and religious institutions. Certain broad verbal symbols can be used to describe outstanding manifestations of his greatness, and in this passing moment I would mention but two.

He, like all truly great men possessed the qualities of selflessness and spiritual faith. Not a selflessness of self-imposed martyrdom; not the selflessness of futile struggle against wrong; not the type of selflessness which is but a psychological escape from selfish personal aggrandizement and exhibitionism; but a selflessness which springs from an all-consuming motivation of love for one's fellow men. He possessed a spiritual faith that rose above the limitation of creed and dogma; a spiritual faith that God is good and that true religious practice requires devoting oneself to promoting those things which are good.

A few lines from his own writings best illustrate these two qualities of Gandhi's greatness, selflessness, and spiritual faith. He wrote:

"To me God is truth and love; God is ethics and morality; God is fearlessness; God is the source of light and life; and yet He is above and beyond all these. God is conscience. He is even the atheism of the atheist. For in His boundless love God permits the atheist to live. He is the searcher of hearts. He transcends speech and reason. He knows us and our hearts better than we do ourselves. He does not take us at our word; for He knows that we often do not mean it, some knowingly and others unknowingly.

"God is personal to those who need His personal presence. He is embodied to those who need His touch. He is all things to all men. He is in us and yet above and beyond us. Man may banish the word 'God' in taking an oath, but he has no power to banish the thing itself.

"Withal He is ever forgiving; for He always gives us the chance to repent. He is the greatest democrat the world knows, for He leaves us 'unfettered' to make our own choice between evil and good."

The lines of Edwin Markham, written in tribute to the greatness of Lincoln, whose virtues of selflessness and spiritual faith will cause a nation to bow in reverence tomorrow, likewise are applicable to Gandhi. Listen to Markham once again:

"The color of the ground was in him;
The red earth, the smell and smack of elemental things:
The rectitude and patience of the cliff:
The good will of the rain that loves all leaves;
The friendly welcome of the wayside well;
The courage of the bird who dares the sea;
The gladness of the wind that shakes the corn.
The mercy of the snow that hides all scars;
The secrecy of streams that make their way beneath the mountain to the rifted rock;
The undelaying justice of the light that glides as freely to the shrinking flower as to the great oak flaring to the wind;
To the grave's low hill as to the Matterhorn that shoulders out the sky."

Such a man also was Gandhi.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 111) approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is the first amendment of the Committee on Foreign Relations to Senate Joint Resolution 111.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some of the opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project have said that the American people now have the advantage of a sufficient amount of electrical power, and do not need the St. Lawrence seaway constructed in order that more power

may be created and farmers all over our country may have another source of electricity, so that the various lines erected by the REA may be energized.

In this connection I wish to read the testimony of Mr. Claude R. Wickard, National Administrator of the REA, who testified last week before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in regard to the personnel of his agency. On Thursday, February 5, Mr. Wickard testified as follows:

I can tell you this, Senator LANGER, that I have been talking the last few days with the representative of the Aluminum Co. of America and we were shocked no end when we found out that this cut-back in the amount of aluminum the Aluminum Co. of America is delivering to fabricators of conductors.

I might say, Mr. President, that some of the members of the REA's all over this country paid in their money 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 years ago, and in some cases as many as 7 years ago, as is shown by the testimony. In many instances the poles are up, in some instances the wires are on the poles, but, as Mr. Wickard has said, there is no electricity to supply hundreds of thousands of farmers all over this country, as is desired. That is particularly true in Nebraska, in North and South Dakota, in Montana, and in portions of the State of Minnesota.

I might say that I expect to make some remarks on REA in a few days, but in the meantime I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the desperate situation of REA in what is known as the Great Plains area.

To cite a few comparisons, in the State of Rhode Island, for example, 95 out of every 100 farmers have facilities for light and power on their farms furnished by REA. In the State of Washington 81 farmers out of every 100 have light and power on their farms. But in the Great Plains area, in the State of Minnesota, for instance, only 40 out of every 100 farmers have light and power, in the State of Montana 45 out of every 100, in the State of South Dakota a little over 9 percent, and in the State of North Dakota 7 percent.

Mr. President, many young men who served in our armed forces in Japan during the last war stated, upon their return, that approximately 95 farmers out of every 100 in Japan have light and power upon their farms. Young soldiers who returned from the Scandinavian countries reported that over 95 percent of the farmers of Sweden and Norway have light and power upon their farms, and that approximately 95 percent of the farmers of Finland have light and power upon their farms. Those who had visited Denmark reported that the farms of Denmark are almost 100 percent electrified. Young soldiers who had served in Germany stated on their return that the farms of Germany are more than 95 percent electrified.

Mr. President, as a result of these statements I made an investigation through the Department of Agriculture to ascertain whether what these young soldiers said was true or false. I found that in every instance what was said by these young men respecting electrification of farms was substantiated by the investigation made by our Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, it can readily be seen that when a young soldier returns to this country and marries a fine young lady and decides to go into farming, if he is intelligent—and most of our young soldiers who served in foreign countries are—first of all after he gets married and decides to go into farming he will look around to find an electrified farm, for if he loves the girl he has married, it will be his great desire to take the usual farm drudgery off the shoulders and back of his young bride. No matter how fine the land may be—it may even be land in the very heart of the Red River Valley, the finest valley in the entire United States of America—if there is no electricity upon the farm, he may be able to acquire in the Red River Valley, that young soldier, on the basis of his observation in the matter of electrification of farms in the countries he has visited, will look further, and finally locate on land which may not have as good soil as the land in the Red River Valley, for example.

Mr. President, why has the population in the Great Plains area decreased, as the record shows? Why should a great State like Kansas have lost so large a proportion of its population during the last 6 years? Why should the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana have lost nearly 20 percent of their population during the last 6 or 7 years? I submit that one of the reasons for the loss of population in the States I have mentioned is the fact that those States do not have sufficient electric power available for their farmers; that there has not been the development of the REA in those States that the Government has undertaken and completed in some of the Southern States, and in some other States of the Nation. Yet in the debate which is now taking place with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway we find that some present the argument that we do not need the power which would be produced by the development of the St. Lawrence. The argument is made by many opponents of the seaway that we do not need the seaway because there is already sufficient power in the United States. In that connection I return to the testimony given by the National Administrator of REA, the Honorable Claude R. Wickard. He testified before the committee:

When I called him—

Referring to the representative of the Aluminum Co. of America—

When I called him to find out about this cut-back he told me that in one of the States the people went to work late because they didn't have power enough to keep the electric clocks going.

Mr. President, everyone knows how small an amount of electricity is required to run an electric clock. Yet here we find the National Administrator of REA testifying that some farmers got to work late because there was not enough electricity to keep the clocks upon the farms in operation. That shortage of electric power was due to the shortage of rainfall.

Mr. Wickard said there was a story to the effect that last year during the potato harvest in Maine, right up in the St. Lawrence River area, there was great danger of the loss of a vast amount of potatoes because of the lack of electric power.

I read further from the testimony of Claude Wickard, himself a farmer, formerly Secretary of Agriculture, and now head of REA. Mr. Wickard said:

They had to bring in a gunboat to furnish the electricity because they had a drought up there.

The Aluminum Co. of America, Senator, is not making aluminum to put into the conductors because they have got a shortage of electricity.

Mr. President, we find, according to the testimony, that in South Dakota, in Montana, in North Dakota, and I do not have the least doubt the same is true in Oklahoma, and in every State where there are local REA's, the power poles are erected, and the power wires are placed in position, but there is not the power available to energize the wires. Yet it is said by some that we do not need the St. Lawrence waterway or the vast amount of power which the testimony shows the development of that waterway would create.

According to the testimony given by Mr. Wickard, even after the poles are erected and the wires are in place, the wires cannot be energized, although some have been in place for 2 years, because there are no aluminum conductors available. Mr. Wickard testified that the representative of the Aluminum Co. of America, when called upon by him for an explanation, stated that the company could not manufacture the needed conductors because of the shortage of electricity itself.

Mr. President, I called before our committee one of the REA engineers, the man who has charge of buying supplies, and he said it would be 3 years before one of the largest manufacturers of aluminum conductors in America would be able to supply the REA with its needs. The conductors heretofore manufactured have all been bought up, and no others are available.

Mr. Wickard continued:

Yesterday a man came into my office and said that in western Missouri they were turning off the power 2 hours every evening for about 2,000 consumers because of the power shortage, and they had gone to the utilities and the utilities told them they could not help them get more power.

That, Mr. President, is in the State of the President of the United States. Two thousand farmers have to get along without power 2 hours every night because of the lack of power.

Mr. Wickard further said:

The point is, Senator LANGER, that we cannot increase the amount of power or make the power available to the people until we have more conductors, and we cannot have more conductors until we have more power.

Could anything be simpler than that? I interrogated him. I said:

I wish you were on the floor of the Senate these last 2 weeks, because with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway, I think it was stated that there was too much power available.

Mr. WICKARD. That, Senator LANGER, is definitely not true. Don't let anybody tell you that there is too much power in this country, because it is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. Can I quote you that there is a power shortage throughout the country?

Mr. WICKARD. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Even though a Senator from South Dakota should say that there is a surplus of power?

Mr. WICKARD. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I ask you about this is because I am going to have this particular part of the testimony transcribed right away, and I am going to quote you word for word.

Mr. WICKARD. That is perfectly all right with me, Senator LANGER.

The CHAIRMAN. And if a Senator from South Dakota should say that there is too much power now, you disagree with him?

Mr. WICKARD. Absolutely.

Mr. Stoneman, manager of the Dairyland Cooperative of Plattesville, Wis., the largest REA in America, a businessman and a farmer who has had charge of REA's all his life, offered to testify in the middle of Mr. Wickard's testimony. He said:

Those definitely are the facts, Senator LANGER, and I want to supplement Mr. Wickard's statement by saying that in our own area there is a definite shortage of power and where one of the larger power companies—just within the last year—was saying that there was plenty of generation out there.

I should like to repeat that. A year ago one of the large power concerns said that they had plenty of power. Mr. Stoneman says that only within the past year they were saying that there was plenty of generation.

Today that same company is buying 27,000 to 28,000 kilowatt-hours a day from our Dairyland Power Cooperative.

It had come to my knowledge that some of the power companies in that area have asked that their field agents not push the matter of heavy electrical equipment, such as refrigerators and stoves, etc., in the area because they feared that they would not be able to serve them.

That is the testimony of a great man in the State of Wisconsin. We have also the testimony of Mr. Donnelly, president of the North Dakota Electric Cooperative, of Grand Forks. He says:

I myself do know that the two major power companies in North Dakota asked their people and the REA cooperatives that they were serving to cut down as much as possible so that they could carry their load; and since the heavy season, which is the Christmas season, I have seen with my own eyes a statement printed by the Otter Tail Power Co., in which they thanked the people for cooperating with them, and hoping that they could serve them to the fullest extent. We asked the Otter Tail Power Co. to sell us some power in the Adams section of Walsh County, N. Dak., and they said that it would be at least 1949 before they could take care of us, which indicated very clearly that they were short of power.

Is it not strange, Mr. President, that there is a power shortage in this great country of ours? We like to boast about our country and say that it is the finest in the whole world. Within 3 blocks of the Capitol, in the Union Station, there is an inscription to the effect that agriculture is the very basis of the prosperity of this country. In comparison with Germany, with whom we fought, in proportion to the population, we have only half as many farmers enjoying light and power. During the war we said that Japan was a nation of barbarians; and yet in Japan 95 percent of the farmers have light and power. In the United States less than 50 percent of the farmers enjoy light and power on the farms.

Apparently we have money for everything under the sun in other countries; but what do we find at the first session of Congress? We find REA cut by $25,000,000. We find, because of the reduction, that 167 field engineers were removed from REA, so that they could not go out among the farmers and build REA's. Some of them—not the best men—were rehired, until finally all were replaced except 71. Seventy-one more men are needed every day in the field. Those who testified stated that some of the regions were composed of three States, and that they saw a field man only once a year.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that I am the only Senator who voted against giving England a single dollar of the $4,000,000,000 loan. I voted against the loan—or gift—to Greece and Turkey. I voted against giving money to the Governments of Austria, Italy, and France; and I am proud of those votes. I said that I would vote to give them food and clothing if they were hungry and unclothed; but I said in this very place, Mr. President, that until the people of America were taken care of—hundreds of thousands of underprivileged about whom Franklin Delano Roosevelt used to talk so much, and helped so little—I would never vote to give money away to foreign countries.

What is the situation today? I have before me four letters, which I received in the morning mail, which will give some idea as to what my mail shows.

The first letter is from Kensal, N. Dak., dated February 9:

KENSAL, N. DAK., *February 9, 1948.*

Hon. Mr. LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Am writing to you today in regards to a grain drill. I have been trying to buy one for 3 years, and just can't get one.

I have been using my neighbor's drill for 2 years, but this year he will use it himself.

I put in about 400 acres in crop every year.

Would appreciate it if you could get me a 12- or 14-foot John Deere press drill or an Oliver press drill with superior feed.

I just don't like to bother you with something like this, but I didn't know what else to do.

Hope I can return the favor someday.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR SPITZER.

Just think of the situation, Mr. President. If Senators will come to my office I can show them thousands of such letters. The farmers cannot get drills; they cannot get tractors; they cannot get pick-ups; they cannot get swathers. These farmers cannot get mowers; they cannot get automobiles of any kind or character. Of course, some of them say that if they pay some money under the table they can go on the black market and occasionally can pick up a piece of farm machinery or an automobile.

But, Mr. President, let me refer to what may be found if one goes to New York City, as I did a few weeks ago, and goes to where the ships are being loaded. Let me mention automobiles, for example. There, there were Kaiser-Frazer cars, Nash cars, Cadillac cars, every imaginable kind of automobile, being picked up and shipped out of this country by the hundreds and by the thousands.

I hold in my hand another letter I received this morning, which reads as follows:

DAVENPORT, N. DAK., *February 11, 1948.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Well, Senator, back here in North Dakota it has been a hard and cold winter.

Of course, Mr. President, it never is as cold in North Dakota as it is in South Dakota, as my distinguished friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who sits on my right, will testify. That is due to reasons which I shall not discuss now. Nevertheless, I admit that the present winter in North Dakota has been unusually cold.

The letter continues:

Most of the country roads have been blocked with snow. But here is what I would like to know. What is going on in Washington and with this grain and other goods that made the market go to pieces? I think most farmers like I myself are confused. I think most farmers were not looking for higher prices, but they did not look for the bottom to fall out all at once. I think the Government has put out a lot of false propaganda regarding grain needs and meat and lots of other things, and then out of a clear sky they come out and say they have got plenty of grains and meats. Just like a few years ago, the Government came out and told the farmers, "Sell your wheat. We are not going to raise the ceiling." Most farmers sold. Then it was not long before they paid a 30-cent bonus. But by that time our wheat was gone.

Yes, Mr. President, that is the way the Government operates. This farmer is absolutely right. The Government made those loans to the farmers at threshing time. The Government said to the farmers all over this country, wherever wheat is raised, "You do not have to sell your wheat if you do not like the price. We will lend you the money you need." In our State the loan was $1.51 a bushel. So the farmers signed notes to our Government, and those notes were not due for 3 months, or, in some instances, 4 months; and the wheat was there on the farms as collateral or security. Then, about 30 days later, out of a clear sky, though the notes were not due for 2 months, those farmers received letters from our Government saying, "Deliver this wheat. We are calling the loans."

Mr. President, some of those farmers who did not have trucks hired trucks and paid 1 cent or 2 cents or 3 cents a bushel, depending on how far they lived from the elevator, to haul their grain to the elevator, because the Government said it needed the grain in order to carry out its commitments to keep the people of Europe from starving.

As we all know, the President appointed an advisory committee, and on that advisory committee he placed, among others, one of the largest wheat producers in the entire United States, a man who had half a million bushels of wheat stored on a large farm in Montana. On

the 19th day of April, after all these patriotic farmers had delivered their grain, the Secretary of Agriculture and Mr. LaGuardia, who at that time was head of UNRRA, went to Climax, Minn., and there they said, "On the advice of our advisory committee, and after consulting with them, we will pay a 30-cent bonus."

Mr. President, the farmers who had been patriotic did not get that 30-cents-a-bushel bonus; but one of the President's advisers, a member of his advisory committee, who had kept his half million bushels of wheat on his farm until he could get this bonus of 30 cents a bushel, then promptly delivered it to the elevators in Montana.

So, Mr. President, can we blame this farmer, a man by the name of Erhardt Krabbenhoft, when he complains? Of course we cannot. He says:

> So why do they have to take it out on the farmer? We have to work for our profit. What we have to pay out for expenses and machinery is not going to come down for a while, that I can see.

Mr. President, if the experience after World War I is any criterion, this farmer is 1,000 percent right. What happened all through that vast farming area after World War I? The price of wheat dropped and dropped and dropped, until in the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., it got down to 19 cents a bushel. Wheat dropped from $2.50 to 19 cents a bushel. In Fargo, N. Dak., it was 24 cents a bushel. I myself sold some at that price. What about farm machinery? What about the other things the farmers had to buy? Did they drop in price? No, Mr. President, they did not. I repeat, Mr. President, this farmer is absolutely and everlastingly right.

I have spoken of farm machinery. Let us for a moment reflect on what happened to the price of machinery the farmer had to use. When I came to Washington, I went to the Department of Agriculture to ascertain whether the price of farm machinery had decreased at that time. I found that it had not. The manufacturers had turned out just enough to supply the demand at that time, and the price remained as it had been. At the time I made the inquiry, I placed in the RECORD the index figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture.

This farmer goes on to say, in his letter:

> So I think someone from the Government should give the farmers an explanation of how much a farmer should take a loss on, in this falling market. They think they know everything. They know nothing.

Mr. President, I do not blame this farmer at all for saying that, because only a few months ago Government agents were regulating the farmers from the time they got up in the morning until the time they went to bed at night. Government agents were regulating and regulating and regulating the farmers. The farmer who writes this letter evidently is one of the farmers who had that kind of experience, and who found it was not very profitable.

Mr. President, that experience does not only apply to farming. For instance, I know a banker who, after World War I, had the finest gilt-edged securities imaginable. One day a bank examiner walked in. What happened? Oh, Mr. President, it is all of the same pattern. The bank examiner walked into that little bank and said, "You have got to sell some of these bonds." The banker said, "Why should I sell them? Aren't they good?" The bank examiner replied, "They are 'blue chips.' It does not make any difference; you have got to buy bonds from South American countries." The record of the investigation shows that J. P. Morgan & Co., of New York, had made a deal for South American bonds, that the banker protested repeatedly, but finally had to buy bonds of the Republic of Brazil, if it may be called a republic. He paid par for those Brazilian bonds. Later, when I was in the bank, he showed me the bonds, which were then worth 17 cents on the dollar. When Mr. Krabbenhoft, a farmer, says in his letter, "the Government knows everything; they think that they know everything, but they know nothing," he is perhaps thinking exactly along the same lines as that banker who was almost wrecked by being compelled to take South American securities.

Mr. Krabbenhoft concludes as follows:

> Well, BILL, after I write this letter I may feel better. Be glad to hear from you.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> ERHARDT KRABBENHOFT.

I confess it made me feel better to have him write to me, because in this great country of ours people may say pretty much what they please and what they think, and, if they wish, they may have it read on the floor of the United States Senate.

I have another letter. I do not wish to chide my Republican colleagues about the tax bill that was considered at the recent session, and I am not going to chide them, but I do want to call something to their attention in view of the letter I am about to read. I will read the entire letter:

> HAZEN, N. DAK., *February 7, 1948.*
>
> The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
> *Senator from North Dakota,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: Please act on the problem of the American teacher. Each year they face low salaries, unequipped, cold, and crowded schools, and the faces of innocent children who do not realize the wrong that is being done to them.
>
> Americans do suffer from lack of educational expenditures. More is spent for luxury than for education. "Let's save a nickel and waste a dime," has been the policy in American education. School boards for the very greed of money hold costs of their schools to the very minimum as required by law as a method of reducing taxes.
>
> Teachers love their profession, but the future looks dark. Like myself, teachers with families question whether it is wise to continue our work in education. A teacher's family has to live as any other family.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> DONALD J. HUESERS,
> *Principal, Hazen High School.*

What does the record show? There has been much talk in the Senate about educating children and about Federal aid to schools, but when the test comes, just as it now comes in connection with the measure dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway, the two situations are similar. The last five Presidents, including President Truman, have endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway. President Truman is asking for it now. It was also endorsed by Theodore Roosevelt when he was Governor of New York, which makes a total of six Presidents who have endorsed the project. Each of those six Presidents has likewise endorsed Federal education, which still awaits action.

The record shows that during World War II over 600,000 boys were rejected by the Army and Navy because of lack of education. An effort was made to obtain Federal aid for schools 2 years ago, but the measure was killed on the floor of the Senate. The young man whose letter I have just read, who has a family, wants to know what is going to be done about the matter. I am waiting to see what is going to be done about the St. Lawrence seaway, which, as I have said, has been endorsed by six Presidents.

Power companies do not like the seaway. I can tell Senators about the power companies. When I became Governor of the State of North Dakota, the State was paying from 7 to 9 cents per kilowatt-hour for current with which to light the Governor's mansion, the capitol, and the penitentiary. We were building a new capitol, which was to have four elevators. The light and power plant was owned by Mr. Insull, of Chicago. I called in the manager, Mr. Blackstone. I wanted to know what it would cost us to operate the four elevators. He stated it would cost $5,000 a year for each of the elevators. I called in three well-known experts in the field of electrical power, Mr. Roush, of the State Agricultural College of North Dakota; Mr. Irving Levin, of the University of North Dakota; and Mr. John Severson, who runs the mill and elevator at Grand Forks, which is owned by the State. Mr. Severson is the electrical engineer in charge. Those three experts were called before the industrial commission of the State, composed of the Governor, the attorney general, and the commissioner of agriculture and labor. The manager of the Insull plant was also summoned. We said to the three men, "We want you to make an investigation to determine what North Dakota actually should pay for light and power, and we want you to turn all the engineering data over to Mr. Insull's manager, Mr. Blackstone." At the end of 3 weeks they reported that if, instead of the State of North Dakota paying 7 to 9 cents per kilowatt-hour, it were to pay three-quarters of 1 cent per kilowatt-hour, the public utility would still be making a great deal of money. The engineering data were turned over to Mr. Insull's representatives, and the commission set a day on which they were asked to appear before us for the purpose of showing what, if anything, was wrong with the figures. What happened? They returned with two lawyers, who said, "If you proceed, as you have threatened to do, to have the State build its own light plant, we are going to enjoin you, because we have a franchise in Bismarck, N. Dak." They said further, "If you violate the injunction, you will be arrested and brought into the Federal court."

I said to them, "My friends, I have been arrested and tried so often that being arrested once more means nothing to me." We hired the Pillsbury Engineering Co., of Minneapolis, Minn. We paid them $10,000. They drew our plans. On the day on which the bids were to be let the power company appeared before the Commission and said, "If you will include a training school at Mandan, we will furnish the light and power for 1 cent." I will say, Mr. President, that we agreed and accepted the contract for 1 cent instead of paying the amount we had previously paid. We made them sign a 10-year contract, and the people of North Dakota, by that little transaction, saved $40,000 a year for a period of 10 years, or $400,000. That was the experience we had in one town in North Dakota. I might add that we had almost the same experience at Fargo and at Grand Forks.

Yet, Mr. President, coming back to the matter of REA, if the bill which I introduced, providing for $1,000,000,000 for REA, had been passed, it would not have cost the taxpayers one single penny, because, as is well known, the farmers and cooperatives pay back every nickel. What is granted them is a loan; it is not a gift. In the testimony of Mr. Wickard it is shown that of all the hundreds of cooperatives to whom loans have been made, only one has defaulted. The testimony shows that of the millions of dollars due at the present time, $17,000,000 has been paid in on principal and interest before it has become due.

Yet it is said that the Republican Party is pledged to economy. What in heaven's name has that to do with REA, Mr. President? The money is loaned for the purpose of building REA lines to the farmers, and the farmers pay back every nickel.

Only recently I heard the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. VANDENBERG] say he was in favor of sending $60,000,000 to China. We sent it to them, and we sent them, Mr. President, approximately $20,000,000 more a month. But when it comes to fighting the power trust it is different. Do not give the farmers light and power, for heaven's sake, because perhaps 2 or 3 years from now some private power company will be able to supply them and thereby put more profit into the company's treasury.

I have another letter which was received this morning from Cavalier, N. Dak., dated February 9, 1948. It reads as follows:

Senator LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We already had 5 months of winter and no work here in North Dakota. My husband applied for his social security about 3 months ago but we haven't heard a word. We have six children at home, all going to school except the youngest, and we have four who have finished their schooling. One of those four is married, one in the United States Navy, the other two are working, one in an office, the other on a high-line job.

Now we never received aid of any sort such as WPA and we aren't asking for aid now, but we really believe we are entitled to the social-security payments. My husband is a mason or cement worker, a brick- and block-layer, and we have no stock to depend on. We rent a house. If you fellows are as anxious to take care of Americans as the Europeans you should have less red tape in government. My husband fought in World War I. We never asked for social security before, but now we really need it. Are we or aren't we getting it?

Yours truly,

MRS. G. ERLENDSON.

I do not think the writer of the letter would have any objection to having her name put into the RECORD.

Mr. President, when the Senate was discussing the $4,000,000,000 loan or gift to England, I offered an amendment providing that the $4,000,000,000 be applied for education and schools in this country. My amendment was rejected, but before the vote was taken I told the Senate what happens in Canada. In Canada a child is paid for going to school, $5 in the grades, $8 in high school. I remember the snickering on the part of some Senators who heard that statement when I made it. I seemed to hear them say, "The idea of paying a child to go to school."

Mr. President, I have previously spoken of two residents of Bismarck, N. Dak. On the south side of the tracks lives the family of the late Mr. George Gieger. Living next to me is the wealthiest man in the State. He does not have a chick nor a child. He goes to Florida or California or some other balmy place every winter. Mr. Gieger's family, which lives on the south side of the tracks, is composed of Mrs. Gieger and her boys. There were five of them. Mr. Gieger worked in the hotel as a porter or elevator man. His health was bad. Yet, that man had to buy schoolbooks for his children. He had to buy their clothes. He could not take trips to any warm climate in winter. When the war broke out what happened? His five boys enlisted in the Army and fought to protect the property of the millionaire. Why should not that millionaire have contributed, through payment of taxes, as is done in Canada, to help pay for the schooling of such boys as Mrs. Gieger's, who were later in life to fight to preserve America and fight to preserve my property, and the property of my neighbor? One of the boys was killed in the war. Mr. Gieger's widow wrote me and asked whether she could not be given the money which it would cost to bring back the body of her son, because the family was poor and destitute.

Mr. President, what happened to the $4,000,000,000 England received from us? I call attention to what was stated in an editorial published in the Washington Times-Herald, which said that within 4 weeks after England received that money her Labor Government was using part of it to pay English boys and girls to go to school, just as is now being done in Canada.

Mr. President, it may be that living on the Canadian side of the border makes a difference in a man's viewpoint. There is located on the border a Peace Park, composed of thousands of acres. It is located on the boundary line between Canada and the United States. Every year a celebration is held there. We boast that the United States is the greatest country on earth. If two farmers, one from Canada and one from the United States, meet at that celebration, they will talk things over. The farmer from the United States will ask, "How are things in Canada?" The farmer from Canada will ask, "How are things in the United States?" As they talk they will discover that during the drought, when the people on both sides of the border needed money, and needed food, both Governments loaned money for seed and feed. The two farmers who are conversing were granted loans, and were obliged to give notes and security for the loans. What happened? When the drought was over Canada said, "We will cancel the feed and seed loans. Those farmers were poor. They mortgaged everything they had. We will cancel the loans." What did the United States do? We give our money away freely to the people of other countries, but we said to our farmer who had borrowed money, "You have got to pay, and you must pay with interest at 6 percent." Our Government is doing that today. It did the same yesterday, the day before yesterday, a week ago, a month ago—ever since 1929. In many cases the interest amounts to twice as much as the principal.

Mr. President, last week I submitted to the Department of Agriculture for its consideration a bill which would provide that in the case of an individual who had borrowed from the Government to buy seed and feed, for example, a widow who had just enough money to keep body and soul together, the Government would waive its claim. Yesterday I received from the Department of Agriculture an adverse report, which means only one thing, that they will continue to require the repayment of every single nickel of the money borrowed, even though it will mean that the widow will be put out on the street or forced to go on relief.

Again, Mr. President, when farmers or businessmen from Canada and North Dakota meet in that Peace Park, they may discuss the matter of pensions. A Canadian will say, "I am receiving an old-age pension." A man from the United States will say, "I also am receiving an old-age pension." They talk further, and the man from the United States discovers that the Canadian does not have to mortgage his house, he does not have to give a deed to the welfare board, he does not have to surrender his insurance policy, in order to receive the pension, because in Canada, as in 11 States in America, such aid can be secured without giving up everything the individual possesses.

I took this particular matter up with the Social Security Board, and they said that in the other States in this country, aside from the 11 States I referred to, a man must give a deed to his little home, he must surrender his little four or five hundred dollar or six hundred dollar insurance policy, in order to receive aid, and I cited a case in Moffitt, N. Dak., where the Government officials even took the wedding ring off the finger of a widow, and at another place they took the last cow the man had. One might

just as well talk to the moon, Mr. President, as to endeavor to secure a change in our Government policy. I am entirely satisfied, however, that in both the cases I have mentioned, one involving an old-age pension and the other the cancellation of a seed loan, the Government officials could use discretion in behalf of poor people, and could legally afford help to those in very needy circumstances, and I am satisfied that it is unnecessary to have the two bills I have submitted to cover the situation passed.

The impression seems to have spread in some quarters that we have so much money in this country that we could shovel it out to other countries; that we ought to get down on our knees and beg Winston Churchill and other foreigners to please take it from us. Yet this morning I received a letter from Cannonball, N. Dak., as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Received your letter tonight, and I am very sorry I was too late in stopping the land bill in the United States Senate. I am taking your advice and writing CHARLES ROBERTSON tonight. Maybe he can help. I think if you talked the matter over with him it would help the Standing Rock Indians very much. If the bill would read that a tribe could buy this land with tribal funds it would help a lot here in keeping the cattle grazing units together.

The relief money for this reservation has not arrived yet. If it does not get here before 4 to 6 weeks we will have to ask the Red Cross to help. We are having a very hard and cold winter out here this year.

Thanking you, Senator, for all past favors. Best wishes to Mrs. Langer and the girls.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH WICKS.

Mr. President, 6 weeks ago I stood on the floor of the Senate and called attention first of all to the plight of the Navajo Indians in Mexico, and showed that they were starving. I called the attention of the Senate to the Indians near Los Angeles, Calif., and showed that they were destitute. A week later I stood at my desk and told about the suffering of the Indians in North and South Dakota and Montana. A meeting was held, and finally the Bureau of Indian Affairs pledged $10,000. Week after week went by, and there was one telephone conversation after another. The people of North Dakota were desperate. The commercial clubs got busy and raised food and clothing through charity, and kept thousands of those people alive.

I repeat what I said at the time I voted against the $597,000,000 to hand, not to the people of France or Italy or Austria, but to their governments, governments which may not give those people a nickel of it, governments which by the time they get this money may be overwhelmingly communistic. I repeat today what I said then, that I am not in favor of sending money abroad until we make a survey to find out how much we need here to take care of our schools, our roads, our aged, our Indians, nearly half a million Puerto Ricans in New York who are absolutely poor, and 400,000 Mexicans in California who, under the great United Nations Charter, the purpose of which was said to be to wipe out forever any distinction because of race, creed, color, language, or sex, are deprived of public schools in certain places and in other places are segregated. I called attention to the situation of the Japanese in the western part of the country, some of whose grandfathers had been citizens of this country, and the kind of treatment they were receiving.

Speaking of roads and public buildings, I ask Senators who are so anxious to give away our resources if they know how much Philip Fleming asked for. He asked for $75,000,000,000 over a 15-year period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article which appeared in the McLean County Independent, published at Garrison, N. Dak. It is in two parts, and I ask that both parts be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the McLean County Independent of August 14, 1947]

PROPOSED ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT WOULD GREATLY BENEFIT FARMERS OF NORTH DAKOTA

(This is the first of two special articles to appear in the Independent on the St. Lawrence seaway project.—The Editor.)

Construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project would save the farmers of North Dakota millions of dollars in shipping charges of their grain and livestock products, Senator WILLIAM LANGER said in Washington this week. He forecast Senate passage of the bill at the next session of Congress.

A long-time advocate of the project, Senator LANGER is coauthor of the bill pending in the Senate to authorize construction of the seaway jointly by the Governments of the United States and Canada. It calls for deepening certain parts of the channel of the St. Lawrence River to permit oceangoing ships to sail inland as far west as Duluth, Minn. It would also provide for the development and public ownership of the tremendous power resources of the river for the benefit of the people.

RAILROAD AND POWER TRUST OPPOSED

"I think we have a very good chance of getting the bill passed by the Senate at the next session," Senator LANGER declared. "It was reported favorably on a 9-to-4 vote of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just before we adjourned. North Dakota farmers would save from 5 to 8 cents a bushel in shipping their wheat by an all-water route through the Great Lakes to the Atlantic seaboard and then to all parts of the world.

"Of course, we're not going to get the bill approved by the Senate without a fight. Just mention the St. Lawrence project here in Washington and you stir up the worst hornet's nest of lobbyists that you ever saw. The railroads and the Power Trust have blocked this project for years, and you can bet your bottom dollar that their high-priced propagandists will be out in full force to kill it again when it reaches the floor of the Senate."

CITES BOXCAR SHORTAGE

Pointing out that North Dakota farmers and elevator men are again gravely concerned about the shortage of boxcars for moving the 1947 crop to market, Senator LANGER asserted that the situation would not be nearly as acute if the St. Lawrence project had been built and put into operation for shipments of grain and other bulk cargo. Thousands of additional boxcars could be made available to the Middle West by the elimination of the freight haul by rail which is now necessary.

With the seaway in operation, elevators at Garrison, Bottineau, Rugby, Linton, and other North Dakota points would load wheat on cars for a short rail haul to the head of the Great Lakes at Duluth. There it could be loaded in bulk on steamers bound for Europe, South America, or ports in other parts of the world, or it could move by an all-water route to the big mills at Buffalo, to Boston, New York, and other Atlantic ports, without a break in cargo, and at greatly reduced handling costs.

PROJECT SELF-LIQUIDATING

Under provisions of the new bill introduced at the recent session of Congress, the St. Lawrence project would be entirely self-liquidating. Construction costs would be repaid out of revenues received from the sale of electric power and from tolls on shipping going through the seaway.

The St. Lawrence seaway project has had the backing of every President since Woodrow Wilson. President Truman urged that it be built when he addressed the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa several weeks ago. Former President Herbert Hoover has been a staunch supporter of the project ever since he was Secretary of Commerce, and reiterated that support in recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

ENDORSED BY NONPARTISAN LEAGUE

The project is backed by the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota and by many other farm organizations throughout the country. Twenty-three State governments have officially endorsed it. Members of the Cabinet, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, State, and War, and other leaders in public life agree that the project would be of incalculable benefit to the whole country.

It has the support also of the overwhelming majority of the 40,000,000 people in the States which would be most directly affected by the seaway—the Middle West, the Great Lakes region, and the industrial areas of Pennsylvania, New York, and New England. Most of the unions of the A. F. of L. and the CIO are in favor of the project and it has been endorsed in the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties.

BLOCKED BY LOBBYISTS

"In view of this widespread public support, it is nothing short of amazing that a handful of selfish men have been able to delay the construction of this great project all these years," Senator LANGER declared.

He charged that "the most powerful lobby in Washington," representing eastern railroads, the Power Trust, and coal interests had "ganged up" to defeat the project, and that millions of dollars had been spent in a highly organized campaign of misrepresentation and propaganda to protect the interest of the banker-controlled rail and electric power monopolies.

"Meanwhile, the people have been gouged on high freight rates and high power costs. Part of those profits are used to pay the salary of the highest-priced lobbyists in the Nation's Capital at the rate of $65,000 a year."

BENEFITS EXCEED COSTS

One of the principal arguments advanced by opponents of the project is that it will cost too much, but Senator LANGER refuted this argument by pointing out that the project would pay for itself many times over in lower freight rates and low-cost power.

He said that the United States share of the cost of completing the project would be no more than what we could pay for the construction of three first-class battleships; that at the most it would not be over $300,000,000. This would be a hundred million

dollars less than the United States recently loaned to Greece and Turkey, and the cost of the seaway would be only a fraction of the billions of dollars spent on lend-lease and other aid to foreign countries. Half the costs of developing the seaway would be borne by the Canadian Government.

[From the McLean County Independent of August 28, 1947]

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY WOULD OPEN NEW WORLD MARKETS FOR NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS

(This is the second and last in a series of two special articles to appear in the McLean County Independent on the St. Lawrence seaway project.—The Editor.)

The St. Lawrence seaway project would open new world markets and give the farmers of North Dakota and other Middle Western States a powerful weapon dealing with the problem of farm surpluses, according to Senator WILLIAM LANGER, one of the sponsors of the bill now pending in the United States Senate to provide for construction of the project.

"The day is coming, and perhaps before we know it," Senator LANGER said, "when farm surpluses start piling up again like we had before the war to knock down the price of farm products. We are going to have to depend more and more upon export markets. And foreign countries will buy more of our products if we can lower the price to them by cutting the cost of transportation with an all-water route to the sea."

SEAWAY 90 PERCENT COMPLETE

The Senator said that construction of the St. Lawrence seaway would permit ocean-going ships to sail from the Atlantic through the Great Lakes as far inland as Duluth, Minn.

He pointed out that 90 percent of the 2,400-mile seaway is already completed.

"Nobody has to build a new set of lakes or dig a new river. They are already there. All we have to do is to take advantage of them. The main work that remains to be done is to deepen and clear out a 46-mile stretch in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, do some dredging in other parts of the river, build several new locks and canals, two dams, and a power plant."

The eastern railroads, power companies, and coal-mining interests that have been fighting the project and have delayed its construction for many years, base their opposition on three major points. They say that it would cost too much; that it isn't needed; that it would ruin the railroads.

It is Senator LANGER's contention that the costs would not be excessive, that the Canadian Government would pay half the cost, and that the benefits of the project to the people of the Middle West would far outweigh the construction costs. As to the need for the project, he commented as follows:

DEVELOP UNITED STATES RESOURCES

"If this country is to continue to grow and prosper and to remain the most powerful nation on earth, we must develop our natural, God-given resources to the utmost. That's why I have so wholeheartedly supported the program for developing the Missouri River and to get appropriations for building Garrison Dam and similar projects.

"The St. Lawrence seaway will give us low-cost transportation and low-cost power. It will open the heart of our country—the richest part of our Nation, the breadbasket, the arsenal, and the workshop of the world—open it up to trade and commerce with all nations of the globe."

RAILROAD FACILITIES INADEQUATE

"The opposition tells you that we don't need this project. Certainly there can be no doubt in your mind on that score, now that we are face to face again with a critical shortage of boxcars for moving out our 1947 crop to market, and when our farmers are going to be forced to pile thousands of bushels of grain on the ground again because the railroads are unable to provide sufficient boxcars.

"The blunt truth is that the country has outgrown its present transportation system. Before the war the railroads were equipped to handle a volume of business that goes with a national income of around $70,000,000,000. But now, our national income is soaring around the $175,000,000,000 mark. Monroe Johnson, the head of the Office of Defense Transportation, tells me that it will be 10 years before we catch up on boxcar production.

"The railroads are just not equipped to handle our present hauling job. We not only need the seaway to relieve them of some of our bulk cargo, but we need to spend millions upon millions of dollars on new railroad facilities and equipment. To me, the argument that we don't need the seaway is just plain silly in the face of the current break-down in our transportation facilities."

Opponents of the seaway claim that the project would cost over a billion dollars of which the United States and Canada would each pay half. Estimates of the United States Corps of Engineers indicate that the project would cost less than half that, and under the terms of the bill now pending in Congress, all construction costs would be repaid from tolls on shipping and from the sale of electric power.

The Senator deplored the narrow sectional interests which have been stirred up by high-powered lobbyists in an effort to block the project. Big seaport cities like New York, Boston, and New Orleans, for example, have fought the project on the grounds that it would constitute a raid on the Federal Treasury and that it would cost too much. Senator LANGER branded that reasoning line as "short-sighted, narrow, and selfish."

UNITED STATES BUILT HARBORS

"The people of North Dakota and the other States of the Middle West have paid their taxes to help finance the improvements of the harbors at New York and Boston. The United States spent one hundred and twenty-three million on New York harbor; $87,000,000 to make a seaport out of Philadelphia, which is 100 miles inland; $26,000,000 to improve the harbor of Houston, Tex., nineteen million on Boston harbor, eighteen million on the harbor at Baltimore.

"Our farmers and business people in the West paid a good big thumping proportion of the $500,000,000 spent on the Panama Canal—which was built primarily for the benefit of the Atlantic and Gulf coast cities. We didn't complain about that, but when the West wants to spend a small fraction of what these port cities got, for the purpose of developing the St. Lawrence seaway, the howl goes up that we would be raiding the Treasury."

PREDICTS SENATE PASSAGE

Senator LANGER said he was confident that the Senate would approve the St. Lawrence project at the next session, despite all the efforts of the railway and power company lobby to delay the project still further.

Hearings have also been started before the Public Works Committee of the House, and a special subcommittee is planning to make a first-hand investigation of the project during the summer recess.

"The sooner we build the project, the better," he declared. "It will open new markets for our products, help us get rid of our farm surpluses, and maintain farm prosperity. It means low-cost transportation for agriculture and low-cost power for homes and industry. It means new jobs, new industry, new opportunities, and better living for our people. The whole Nation will benefit from this great project."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have before me the official statements of governors and other public men, including representative citizens of New York State. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks not what those men said but their names. Every one of them was in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty. I simply wish to list their names.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Charles E. Hughes, Governor of New York, 1907–10; Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, 1910–16; Secretary of State, 1921–25; Chief Justice of the United States, 1930–41.

Theodore Roosevelt, Governor of New York, 1899–1901; President of the United States, 1901–9.

Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York, 1919–21, 1923–29.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Governor of New York, 1929–33; President of the United States, 1933–45.

Herbert H. Lehman, Lieutenant Governor of New York, 1929–33; Governor of New York, 1933–43; Director General, UNRRA, 1944–45.

Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York since 1943.

ROBERT F. WAGNER, member of New York Assembly, 1905–19, Lieutenant Governor of New York, 1914; justice, Supreme Court of New York, 1919–26; United States Senator from New York since 1927.

Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State, 1929–33; Secretary of War, 1940–45.

James A. Farley, Postmaster General, 1933–40.

John J. Bennett, attorney general of the State of New York, 1931–42; corporation counsel of the city of New York, 1945–46; deputy mayor since 1946.

Harold B. Johnson, editor and publisher, Watertown Daily Times.

Delos M. Cosgrove, trustee and vice chairman of the Power Authority of the State of New York, 1931–34.

Benjamin F. Feinberg, majority leader of the New York State Senate.

John M. Carmody, Rural Electrification Administrator, 1936–39; Federal Works Agency, 1939–41; member, United States Maritime Commission, 1941–46.

Rhoda Fox Graves, chairman, committee on agriculture, New York State Senate.

Vincent R. Corrou, mayor of Utica, N. Y., prior to election to New York State Senate in 1944.

Rear Admiral George H. Rock, United States Navy, retired, head of Webb Institute of Naval Architecture, 1932–46.

Francis D. Culkin, Representative from New York in the House, 1929–43.

Joseph A. Gavagan, Representative from New York in the House, 1929–43; justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York since 1943.

Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Representative from New York in the House, 1917–21; 1923–33; mayor of the city of New York, 1934–45.

Bertrand H. Snell, Representative from New York in the House, 1915–39; former minority leader of the House.

Jacob S. Potofsky, general president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

A. A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, 1938–44; Ambassador to Brazil, 1945–46.

William L. Lawyer, president of the Watertown Building and Construction Trades Council, American Federation of Labor.

James C. Bonbright, professor of finance, Columbia University since 1927; trustee of the Power Authority of the State of New York, 1931–46; vice chairman, 1934–39; chairman, 1939–46.

Frank Augsbury, former president and owner of the Algonquin Paper Corp. of Ogdensburg, N. Y.

Walter Lippmann, editor and author.

Robert P. Patterson, judge, United States District Court, Southern District of New York, 1930; judge, United States Circuit Court of Appeals, 1939–40; Under Secretary of War, 1940–45; Secretary of War since 1945.

Mr. LANGER. In all fairness to Mr. Patterson, I wish to say that when he made this statement he was a judge in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. He afterward became Secretary of War. When he made the statement he was a judge.

Edward J. Noble, chairman of the board, American Broadcasting Co.

Charles Poletti, justice of the supreme court of the State of New York, 1938; Lieutenant Governor, 1939–42; acting Governor, December 1942.

Hugh Thompson, regional director, CIO, Buffalo-Niagara Frontier, western New York State.

Franklin R. Little, Jr., editor, Ogdensburg Journal, Ogdensburg, N. Y.

Maurice P. Davison, commissioner, department of water supply, gas, and electricity, New York City, 1934–36; trustee, Power Authority of the State of New York, 1939–47.

Lt. Col. William T. Field, engineer, of Watertown, N. Y.

Frederick F. Umhey, executive secretary, International Ladies' Garment Workers, AFL, New York, N. Y.

Dr. Rollin A. Newton, mayor of Massena; C. Leland Wood, city manager, Watertown; William F. Doige, member, New York State Assembly; Edward B. Crosby, member, executive committee, National Seaway Council; Lt. Col. William T. Field, engineer, Watertown; Franklin R. Little, editor and publisher, Ogdensburg Journal; W. Allen Newell, manufacturer, Ogdensburg; Clarence F. Hall, businessman, Clayton; Hugh Burns, president, Ogdensburg Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Eugene G. Bewkes, president, St. Lawrence University; Allan P. Sill, member, New York State Assembly; John C. Tullock, former collector, Port of Ogdensburg.

Edward J. Noble, Under-Secretary of Commerce, 1939–40; chairman of the board, American Broadcasting Co..

Herbert Bayard Swope, member, executive committee, Columbia Broadcasting System; former executive editor, New York World.

James P. Warburg, banker, former vice chairman of the board, Bank of the Manhattan Co.

David Sarnoff, president, Radio Corporation of America; chairman of the board, National Broadcasting Co.

Charles Maltby, vice president, Lincoln Bank & Trust Co., Syracuse, N. Y.

Edward C. Lindeman, professor, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University.

David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

Charles William Tausig, manufacturer, author.

Franklin K. Lane, member, Interstate Commerce Commission, 1905–13; Secretary of the Interior, 1913–20.

Warren G. Harding, President of the United States, 1919–23.

Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States, 1923–29.

Herbert Hoover, President of the United States, 1929–33.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, 1933–45.

Harry S. Truman, President of the United States.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, 1933–45.

Harry A. Slattery, Under Secretary of the Interior, 1938–39; Rural Electrification Administrator, 1939–44.

Leo T. Crowley, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 1934–45.

Department of Agriculture.

Jesse H. Jones, Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 1933–39; Secretary of Commerce, 1940–45.

Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State, 1929–33; Secretary of War, 1940–45.

United States Maritime Commission.

Federal Power Commission.

Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Department of the Interior.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the debate which I had with Mr. Thomas J. McGrath, executive director of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, he being opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway and I being for it. The debate was held in June 1947 at Chicago, over radio station WGN, on the program "Your Right To Say It."

There being no objection, the debate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE NEED THE PROPOSED ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROJECT?

Affirmative: Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, from the State of North Dakota.

Negative: Mr. Thomas J. McGrath, executive director of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference.

Announcer WARD QUAAL. Your Right To Say It is WGN's debate program devoted to public issues that shape the lives of Americans. No scripts are required on these programs and there is absolutely no censorship. Dr. William S. Stokes, professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin, and director and moderator of Your Right To Say It, now tells us the topic of tonight's controversy.

Dr. WILLIAM S. STOKES. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this evening in the last debate of Your Right To Say It's current series, Senator WILLIAM LANGER faces Mr. Thomas J. McGrath in a debate on the issue: Do we need the proposed St. Lawrence waterway project? The plan to create a power development in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River to be used equally by Canada and the United States has been debated for decades. Nothing has ever come of the project, but Senator LANGER, here with us tonight, has introduced legislation to start the plan moving once again. Now each of the two debaters will have 6 minutes for an introductory argument, then 2 minutes for rebuttal, after which I am going to throw the meeting open as usual to the questions of our studio audience.

And now for the affirmative of the issue: Do we need the proposed St. Lawrence waterway project? Your Right To Say It takes pleasure in presenting the Republican Senator from North Dakota, the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER. Senator LANGER.

Senator LANGER. Thank you, Dr. Stokes. Good evening neighbors and friends. Most of you are familiar with and favor the St. Lawrence waterway project. Tonight I ask, Why hasn't it been built a long time ago? When you stop to think of all the benefits, all the good reasons why this project should be built, it is, indeed, strange that we have permitted a small handful of selfish, money-hungry men to block it. To block the favorable recommendations of Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, and now Truman. These ex-Presidents and present President, Republicans and Democrats alike, have all recommended that it should be built.

Someday we are going to deepen and improve the channel of the St. Lawrence River to connect the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean. Thus we will open up the richest part of our country, the bread basket, the workshop, the arsenal of the world, to trade and commerce with all the nations of the globe. It will give us the all-water route to the sea and the cheapest form of transportation known. Ocean steamers will sail inland as far west as Duluth, Minn. Ninety percent of this waterway is already completed. Nobody has to build another set of lakes; no one has to dig a new river. The main work left which we have to do is to deepen a 46-mile channel in the St. Lawrence River, and build a few additional dams, locks, and canals.

The river will be harnessed to generate a tremendous block of hydroelectric power to electrify farms and turn the wheels of industry in New York, in New England, and in fact all over the eastern part of this Nation. This power plant will have an output equal to the entire TVA system in 1944.

There you have the story of the St. Lawrence project in a nutshell. Cheap transportation, low-cost power and it should also give you a clue as to whom is fighting this project and why. The eastern railroads, controlled by the New York bankers; the coal operators, the power trusts—these are the special-privileged groups that have ganged up on the American people to block the construction of this project. This is the unholy alliance that has spent its money in a highly organized campaign of misrepresentation and lying propaganda to defeat the will of the people, to strangle competition, and to protect the money-controlled transportation and public-utilities monopoly. Of course, the people never see this combine at work. It operates in the dark behind the scenes. It works through a lot of front organizations secretly subsidized with Power Trust and railroad money. One of these front organizations is the so-called St. Lawrence Project Conference.

But the power companies and the railroads were not always against this project. No, back in 1920, they were all for it. It was so good that they tried to grab it off for themselves. Three big companies: The Aluminum Corp. of America, the General Electric Co., and the du Pont Co. organized what they called the Frontier Corp. and tried to buy up the power rights on the St. Lawrence River but the grab didn't come off. The people of New York State rose up in protest and blocked the deal. That's when the railroad and power companies started fighting the project.

I am not going into the cost of it now except to say it wouldn't cost any more than the building of three huge battleships, roughly, $210,000,000, and that is about half the money we loaned to Greece and Turkey. In addition to that, Canada will pay $145,000,000 in addition to the $132,000,000 they have already spent.

Now, I want to say finally during these moments allotted to me that the railroads are doing the very best they can, but the blunt truth is that the country has outgrown its present transportation system. The St. Lawrence seaway is desperately needed to handle the terrific expansion in our foreign trade. We need it for national defense. We need it to provide low-cost power for industrial expansion at a saving of $20,000,000 annually in power costs. I know the people of the Middle West want this power project built. It will pay for itself many times over in benefits to the American people. They agree with Franklin Roosevelt when he said, "I know of no single project of this nature more important to this country's future in peace or war," and with the testimony of ex-President Hoover, who last week again gave his unqualified support at the hearings.

Dr. STOKES. Thank you, Senator LANGER. For the negative of the issue, "Do We Need the Proposed St. Lawrence Waterway Project?" Your Right To Say It is honored to

introduce Mr. Thomas J. McGrath, executive director of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference. Mr. McGrath.

Mr. THOMAS J. MCGRATH. Ladies and gentlemen, members of the radio audience, in answer to the question that is propounded tonight, I would say emphatically "No." We do not need the project, we should not have it, especially at the present high cost of construction, at a time when, notwithstanding efforts to reduce our tax burdens, we are committing ourselves to large but unpredictable outlays to rehabilitate the rest of the world and keep the increase of communism from destroying democracy as a way of life.

It is easy to indulge in a lot of accusations and generalities such as the Senator has. You have heard these points raised no doubt on many previous occasions. The economic features of the St. Lawrence waterway have been so thoroughly discussed during the past 25 years that it would seem to be of greater interest and perhaps of equal importance if I should speak of some of the recently developed procedural phases of it. This is not to say that the economic phases do not continue to be of major importance, but I believe if good governmental practice is to be followed and a statesmanlike disposal of the matter is to be made, we may well leave these features for a review of the most recent element that has been injected into the discussion of the matter which is the contention of the proponents that the project can be made self-liquidating. I think such a thing may prove to be a hoax.

An agreement with Canada first took legislative form as a treaty in 1932, when it was rejected by the Senate. Until very recent years the project was supported and advertised as a great toll-free waterway for the commerce of the world that would reflect advantages way beyond the cost necessary to provide and maintain and operate it. Many of the alleged benefits disappear in the light of close scrutiny. In order to give it the semblance of a businesslike enterprise the proponents now say it is to be made self-liquidating by charging tolls. When ratifying legislation was introduced in 1945, it contained a new provision which authorized and directed the President to investigate the feasibility of making the waterway self-liquidating by the imposition of tolls on foreign commerce. This, however, was to be done during the course of construction or even after it was completed.

It seemed so unwise and unbusinesslike to embark upon a program involving the expenditure of nearly a billion dollars without having the subject of tolls settled with greater certainty, that after the present session of Congress convened the sponsors came back with another and slightly different version of the so-called self-liquidating bill. So in the pending legislation now before Congress it is provided that before the agreement becomes effective the President shall obtain satisfactory assurance that Canada agrees to the principle of making the project self-liquidating. It further provides that during the period of construction the President is authorized and directed to negotiate a further agreement with Canada to fix the rates of charges for the use of the navigation facilities. Now this provision in the legislation is being heralded as the accomplishment of the long-cherished desire to take the project out of the realm of controversy, making it self-liquidating and hence a sounder enterprise. Canada has agreed to the imposition of tolls in principle, subject, however, and I quote: "To the conclusion of satisfactory arrangements between the two governments implementing this principle."

There is so much uncertainty about the quantity of tonnage that will be subjected to tolls and the character of traffic on which they will be imposed and the amount of revenue that will be received that nobody can with any assurance forecast the consummation of a satisfactory agreement between Canada and the United States. To illustrate, a witness before one of the committees in Congress just last week said this: "From our point of view at present the whole question of tolls is in a most nebulous state. We have not been able to find anyone as yet who seems to know much of anything about them, upon whom they would be imposed, how much they should be, and a dozen more pertinent inquiries, answers to which are needed to answer this question satisfactorily." I wholeheartedly agree with that description of the situation.

Now, the Republican Party gained control of our Federal legislative machinery, in part, at least, because it has promised to take the Government out of business. Its representatives in Congress should at the same time put some business into Government and in spending the taxpayers' money be sure they are not buying a pig in a poke. This whole proposition is unbusinesslike. When it was first presented in 1941 it contained provisions for settling our rights of navigation to the Great Lakes Basin; it contained provisions for allocating the flow of water at Niagara for power purposes; it contained a provision for settling the dispute that has long existed in this area with respect to the divergence of water into the Chicago Drainage Canal. They have all been taken out of this by the United States Congress without any agreement with Canada. I say we should start over again and the State Department should conclude an agreement that encompasses what we propose to do and then let us consider it on its merits.

Dr. STOKES. Thank you, Mr. McGrath. Our two debaters are now ready to go into the rebuttals, and I again present to you Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, who has his 2 minutes. Senator LANGER.

Senator LANGER. Mr. McGrath has given two points. He says, first, we don't need all this power, and, second, he says that it may not be self-liquidating. Where have we heard, "We don't need this power"? Oh, yes; when we first built Grand Coulee Dam out over the Columbia River, but today the Pacific Northwest is crying for more power. That plant at Grand Coulee isn't big enough. Three new generators are being erected. Perhaps Mr. McGrath can also explain why it is if we don't need and can't use the power that will be developed by the St. Lawrence project, that New York and New England right today are importing power from Canada. I wish Mr. McGrath had taken the trouble to tell us what would have happened in the last war, how many more American boys would have lost their lives, how much longer the war would have dragged out, if we had not had this production of power from Grand Coulee Dam and Hoover and TVA. It was only because we have that power that we were able to develop the atomic bomb.

And now, my friends, what about this matter of liquidation? I quote from Senator VANDENBERG, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the man who introduced this bill upon the Senate floor. "This resolution," he said, "proposes to make the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a whole self-supporting and self-liquidating both in its power and its navigation phases. That policy is in line with the general desire of Congress and the people to balance the national budget and place the development of national resources on a self-sustaining basis. It is similar to tolls charged by the Panama Canal, the Manchester ship canal, Suez Canal, and the Kiel Canal. They have all had tolls for the purpose of meeting their cost."

Dr. STOKES. Thank you, Senator LANGER. For the negative rebuttal on the issue, "Do we need the proposed St. Lawrence waterway project?" Mr. Thomas McGrath now has his 2 minutes. Mr. McGrath.

Mr. MCGRATH. Senator LANGER emphasizes the need for power. Time does not permit my going into a detailed debate on the question, but I again repeat that we do not need this project as a whole, which includes both power and navigation, particularly in the light of present costs. The costs cited by Senator LANGER and frequently referred to by proponents of the measure are based upon those which existed in 1939 and 1940, when this project was first presented. There has been an increase in those costs since that time of 65 percent. You all know about the increases. Those figures as to costs merely include the cost of construction in the International Rapids. They don't include the cost of improvement of the harbors throughout the country nor do they include interest during the course of construction and a lot of other things.

Now, with respect to liquidation. I think it is self-evident that, no matter what Senator VANDENBERG may have said his hopes were, that when you say we will negotiate during the course of construction an agreement for liquidating the cost of the property, you have not agreed upon a formula for liquidating.

The Senator speaks of the possibility of great ocean liners coming into the ports of Duluth, Chicago, and elsewhere. Of course, that is a very enticing, glamorous sort of thing to envision, but I call your attention to the fact that on May 8 last there were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD answers to 32 letters sent out to shipowners of the United States asking whether or not they would use the St. Lawrence waterway, and, with the exception of one owner, none of them said they expected to use it, and they didn't think it was an economic feasibility.

Now, reference has been made here to opposition, and I have heard it repeatedly and answered it repeatedly, and every investigation has disclosed that there is not one cent of money behind this proposition contributed by the power companies, the railroads, the coal people, the shippers on the lakes and oceans. Interior chambers of commerce, 263 of them, all over this United States, with members in every State, support this movement. They have done it without remission since 1941, and they continue to do so.

Dr. STOKES. Thank you, Mr. McGrath. Our studio audience is now eager and ready to enter this debate and I recognize the first question.

Question. "Senator LANGER, you speak of Duluth, Minn., as a western terminus; what about Chicago? Please discuss this and will this waterway really get to Duluth with its ships or is this merely a hope?"

Senator LANGER. It will interest you to know that in this morning's Chicago Tribune Col. Robert R. McCormick for the first time came out in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway. For the first time this great newspaper has said that the city of Chicago no matter what the cost, no matter how much money they spend within reason, would profit tremendously by the building of this seaway.

Question. "Senator LANGER, your figures of $210,000,000 plus Canada's contribution does not coincide with Mr. McGrath's statement of the cost being $1,000,000,000. Which is correct?"

Senator LANGER. I have here the testimony given before the Senate committee. The cost to the United States is $210,000,000, which as I said before, is about half what we loaned Greece and Turkey. Canada pays $145,000,000 in addition to the $132,000,000 she has already spent on the Welland Canal and other parts of the project. The State of New York will pay about a hundred million for the construction of a power plant. These costs are by the Army engineers and are based on 1939–40 prices and of course costs are much higher today, but we are not building at today's high prices. It will take from 5 to 7 years to complete the project and by then prices will have leveled down.

Mr. MCGRATH. I have before me a table which sets out the costs as stated by the Army engineers on the 1939–40 prices which shows that at that time the estimate was $310,000,000. If you increase that by 64 percent which was the amount of the increased costs as published by the Engineering News Record on December 31, 1946, you bring it up to $508,000,000 for the United States. Interest during construction would amount to about $40,000,000. That excludes the estimate of the cost of deepening the channels to enter the harbors and it also excludes the cost to localities to improve their war facilities. When the United States pays about $6,500,000 for those projects, Canada doesn't pay quite half of it, it adds up in round numbers to about a billion dollars.

Question. "Mr. McGrath, topography permitting, why not build a canal from Duluth to St. Paul and deepen the channel of the Mississippi down to New Orleans and thereby we will have an all-American deep waterway and have more perfect flood control and we won't have the Union Jack flying over it but the American flag?"

Mr. MCGRATH. I don't know that that project has ever been engineered, but certainly, if the costs were anything comparable, it would be highly preferable to do that very thing.

Question. "Senator LANGER, you say most people favor this waterway. When did the American people have an opportunity to express their opinion?"

Senator LANGER. The American people haven't had an opportunity, but we get letters on every important project, so the average Congressman or the average Senator can figure out by the number of letters he gets about the number of people that are in favor of the different projects.

Question. "Mr. McGrath, don't you think that we could fight communism by increasing labor and cheapen purchasing power by building the waterway instead of investing in foreign countries and possibly not realizing business results?"

Mr. MCGRATH. I don't think that is the answer to our problem. So far as increasing employment is concerned, it would have exactly the opposite effect. It would put thousands of railroad men out of business because of diversion of tonnage from the railroads. It would put thousands of miners out of work because of the importation of foreign coal.

Senator LANGER. I just want to say, you know it is very strange whenever they can't say anything else about a subject they don't like they say it is communism, communism.

Question. "Senator LANGER, the St. Lawrence River lies entirely within the boundary of Canada. Does the provisions of the treaty state that only Canadian labor, Canadian materials, and Canadian engineers may be used on the Canadian side?"

Senator LANGER. I want to call your attention to the speech of Senator VANDENBERG at the time this was introduced. He goes into that in the greatest detail and shows that this development will be subject to a treaty by a commission which will be appointed from the American angle by President Truman, where all the rights you mention will be protected.

Mr. MCGRATH. You haven't answered the lady's question. The treaty itself says the work will be performed by the respective countries in their own territory, which clearly implies they will have their own people do it.

Senator LANGER. Naturally—and America will have her own people do what is to be done in the American part of the river.

Question. "Mr. McGrath, who is to administer the project if and when it is completed, and what, if any, controls will the United States Government retain over the operation of the project?"

Mr. MCGRATH. So far as the electrical features of the project are concerned, they will be turned over to the State of New York upon repayment to the United States of the money it puts into the power phase of the project, and after that it becomes the property of the State of New York. The navigation features will be administered by a joint commission appointed by the President in part and by the Premier of Canada for the other part.

Question. "Senator LANGER, there are many comparable projects that have first been discussed and later materialized, to mention a few, the Panama Canal in 1906, Boulder Dam and TVA in our generation. They proved feasible and profitable. Let's not let the project die for lack of effort, but push on."

Senator LANGER. I agree with you 100 percent.

Dr. STOKES. Now, I wonder if I might interpose a question, gentlemen, one particularly to Senator LANGER. A point was raised by your opponent, Senator LANGER, with respect to the method of self-liquidating. Do you favor tolls as a means of paying for the project?

Senator LANGER. Yes; I do. Quoting again from Senator VANDENBERG, he says that since the St. Lawrence seaway is international, to be used by the vessels of all nations, the principle of charging tolls to defray expenses is in line with this established tradition.

Mr. MCGRATH. I will be glad to answer that by reading from the treaty or the agreement. It is in section 3, which says, "During the period of construction the President is authorized and directed to negotiate a further agreement with the Government of Canada under the provision of the boundary waters treaty of 1909 defining the rates and charges to be levied for the deep-waterway facilities. Now, I submit to you if that is any conclusive arrangement with the Canadian Government for the establishing of tolls——

Senator LANGER. He left out the most important point—it states it shall not be more than $1.25 a short ton. There is a limitation on it.

Dr. STOKES. Gentlemen, our time is running out. Before closing, however, I should like to have each one of you debaters give us a final summary of your stand in this debate; taking only 30 seconds, please. Senator LANGER, for the affirmative, first.

Senator LANGER. It costs the people of New York City better than 6 cents per kilowatt hour for the first 40 at present power company rates. One-fifth of New York farmers are still without electricity. We are in favor of having electricity in every home in the United States. These women are entitled not to have to turn the cream separator, not to have their children study by lamplight, but they are entitled to have electricity and refrigerators in their homes.

Mr. MCGRATH. Reference has been made to the opposition on the part of the great interests, as Senator LANGER describes them, and I want to call attention to the fact that the railroad labor unions, the mine workers' union, the longshoremen's union, the maritime unions, those who man the lake vessels are all opposed to it. I want to say further with reference to the question of power for New York, why should we in the rest of the United States, particularly you people in the Middle West, spend the taxpayers' money to build a great big power unit and turn it over to the State of New York to increase their industrial facilities, and perhaps attract from this area to the northern parts of New York industries which might otherwise remain here.

Dr. STOKES. Thank you, gentlemen.

Now I would like to say we are most pleased to have with us in our studio tonight a man whose loyal support has been an inspiration to all of us on this program, Mr. Frank P. Schreiber, manager of WGN. Mr. Schreiber.

Mr. FRANK P. SCHREIBER. Thank you, Dr. Stokes. Your Right to Say It will recess for the summer months but it will return to the air next fall as one of the Midwest's outstanding public-service programs. Tonight concludes the seventieth consecutive broadcast of Your Right To Say It. WGN has presented 140 of America's most prominent and intelligent leaders in debates of issues that are vital to all of us. You listeners have responded with thousands of letters of appreciation and suggestions. WGN thanks you and hopes you will be with us next fall when the 1948 series of Your Right To Say It begins.

And now a word of thanks to Dr. William S. Stokes, our moderator, to Mr. Ward Quaal, the director, and to all those on WGN who have worked so hard to make this a distinctive public-service program.

Announcer QUAAL. Thank you very much, Mr. Schreiber.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement appearing in the Standard, published at Maddock, N. Dak. The article was prepared by the North Dakota Farmers' Union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE: RIVER TO RICHES

Power is being wasted. Enough power to light up 5,000,000 homes, to keep 30 *Queen Elizabeth* ocean liners running continuously across the Atlantic, to equal the energy released by 5,000,000 tons of coal yearly.

Water is being wasted. Enough water to transform Duluth, Minn., into an Atlantic coast port, to save millions yearly in the cost of wheat shipments alone.

This waste continues—but not because of the cost involved in stopping the waste. The cost would be only a little more than a navy yard bill for two modern battleships. It would probably not equal what we now propose to give to Greece.

It continues because in a century which has already lasted nearly a half century, American democracy has not been strong enough to overcome the greed of private interests and the narrow sectional greed of private interests and the narrow sectionalism of our representatives in Washington.

BILL FILLS NEED

In Washington a bill is ready to go before Congress which would stop this waste. It would tap the St. Lawrence River for hydroelectric power which New York and the New England States desperately need to assure continued normal growth and for the additional cheap transport facilities the whole country equally needs.

Underlying this bill are principles which provide for joint United States-Canadian development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The principles have been approved by every President since Taft.

The first joint American-Canadian commission was formed during the Taft administration to investigate seaway possibilities of international development of the great St. Lawrence River, the Mississippi of our northern border.

Time and again the project has been brought up before Congress in various forms. It has had the support not only of the executive branch of the Government, but of the United States Army and the United States Navy, of farmers, industrialists, of Republicans and Democrats, and country people and city people.

ALMOST ENACTED ONCE

The project was approved by a vote of the majority of the Senate in 1934. The vote was 49 to 43. Because in this instance, the proposal was brought up in the form of a treaty, majority will was thwarted because treaties must be approved by a two-thirds vote.

The proposal has been reworked since that time so that it no longer needs a two-thirds vote. A simple majority in both Houses of Congress is all that is needed.

The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors in 1941 heard evidence pro and con covering 2,285 pages of transcript. They approved the project, 17 to 8. It was incorporated into the rivers and harbors bill on November 21, 1941, but before action could be taken on it Hitler and Hirohito diverted our attention elsewhere.

During the war nothing was done on it even though a completed seaway would have meant that we could have built warships on the Great Lakes, far from the Atlantic coast which was threatened by submarines. Nothing was done even though we needed power so badly that we spent hundreds of millions of dollars on an aluminum plant in Canada, and fed power from New York City to another aluminum plant which was on the banks of the St. Lawrence.

ANOTHER HEARING LAST YEAR

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had a full-scale hearing on the bill last year. Again there was committee approval by a vote of 14 to 8. The vote was taken on June 5, 1946, but nothing was done about it during the last months of the congressional session. There is now a new Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and we will have a new hearing on the bill.

The same bottlenecks which have plugged the project for about 40 years are still here. Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG (Republican, Michigan) has referred the project back to the State Department to renegotiate with the Canadian Government so that an amendment can be made on the issue of charging tolls for use of the seaway.

There are scores of rivers in the United States which were made navigable and are kept navigable by Government money on which no tolls are charged. Among these are the Harlem Canal in New York, and the seaway at Houston, Tex., which made the city a Gulf port.

Of course we charge tolls for use of the Panama Canal. Senator VANDENBERG says that the bill will have a better chance in the economy-minded Congress if the seaway as well as the hydroelectric portions of the bill pay for themselves. He may be right.

But privately, VANDENBERG, and also Senator GEORGE AIKEN (Republican, Vermont), who has been a consistent supporter of the project since he came to Washington, both have expressed fear that the project will be held up again for more time because of the pressure of other business.

"Other business" will include agreements on development of atomic power, questions in Greece and Turkey, problems of keeping democracy working all over the world. Congress' other business is an impressive task. But their business should not let Congress forego a project which would develop God-given resources of all the people. St. Lawrence is in the tradition of Grand Coulee and Norris Dams, TVA, public highways, public education, public mails, and public works generally.

St. Lawrence means something for all Americans:

To the North Dakota farmer it is cheaper transit for his produce, cheaper purchase price for his tools, cheaper electric current for his home.

To the Midwest exporter, it is the chance to ship by all-water route direct to Europe at less cost, frequently, than rail transport to an Atlantic coast port alone.

To the New York housewife or industrialist it is electric current delivered to a city at low cost or power for the industrialist which he hasn't got.

To labor it is a frontier of new jobs for the development of new products.

St. Lawrence is no longer merely a river. It is not merely a project. It is a chance to give more abundant life to the many.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to read a little of this article to those who may be opposed to the St. Lawrence waterway. The article is entitled "St. Lawrence: River to Riches":

Power is being wasted. Enough power to light up 5,000,000 homes, to keep 30 *Queen Elizabeth* ocean liners running continuously across the Atlantic, to equal the energy released by 5,000,000 tons of coal yearly.

Water is being wasted. Enough water to transform Duluth, Minn., into an Atlantic coast port, to save millions yearly in the cost of wheat shipments alone.

This waste continues, but not because of the cost involved in stopping the waste. The cost would be only a little more than a navy-yard bill for two modern battleships. It would probably not equal what we now propose to give to Greece.

It continues because in a century which has already lasted nearly a half century, American democracy has not been strong enough to overcome the greed of private interests and the narrow sectional greed of private interests and the narrow sectionalism of our representatives in Washington.

I shall not read any more of that letter, because anyone who is interested can read it himself.

Mr. President, when this matter was before the committee, Mr. Elmer Cart, director of traffic of the North Dakota Farmers Union, testified on February 20, 1946. Mr. Cart for years was one of our three railroad commissioners and public service commissioners. Two years ago he was a candidate for Governor of North Dakota on the Republican ticket in the primary. He was born in North Dakota, and he is an outstanding citizen and expert. His testimony is so valuable that I wish to read it:

My name is Elmer W. Cart. I am testifying on behalf of the National Farmers Union with offices at Denver, Colo., and the North Dakota Farmers Union with State office at Jamestown, N. Dak. I am regularly employed by the North Dakota Farmers Union as director of traffic and have held this position since the department was created in 1944.

Prior to that time I was a member of the North Dakota Public Service Commission for 6 years and for approximately 2 years during the war I was employed by the Office of Defense Transportation in their district office at Bismarck. I am also a registered practitioner before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The North Dakota Farmers Union had a membership of 30,573 farm families at the close of its fiscal year, September 30, 1945—

Mr. President, I may add that now the membership is approximately 40,000—

and the National Farmers Union a total membership of 450,000.

I understand that today it is nearer 700,000.

The membership figures given for North Dakota are included in the membership figures given for the national organization.

The Farmers Union is very much in favor of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence development program as set forth in House Document No. 153, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, approval of this program being provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 104.

While our principal interest will be in water transportation, we are also much interested in the power development on that portion of the St. Lawrence River which forms the international boundary because of the large amount of power that will be available to the industrial Northeast.

The harnessing of presently wasted water power will add to our national wealth and create cheap energy for industrial and domestic use in the Northeastern States. This will stimulate both the manufacture and consumption of consumer goods and aid in furnishing employment and better living conditions to a large number of people. Those of us who live in the north-central part of the Nation will benefit from having available goods manufactured with cheap power. The State of North Dakota during the 5-year period 1941 to 1945, inclusive, produced an average of 326,000,000 bushels of grain each year. Wheat is the principal crop, averaging 155,000,000 bushels each of these years, followed by oats, 74,000,000 bushels, barley 59,000,000 bushels, corn 28,000,000 bushels, and flax 10,000,000 bushels. The States of South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and the eastern part of Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana also produce large quantities of agricultural products.

With the development of deep-water transportation from Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, and other cities on the Great Lakes, the landlocked territory of the north-central part of the Nation—Rugby, N. Dak., being the geographical center of the North American Continent—will be greatly benefited by having deep-water ports operating 7 to 7½ months each year.

Using the Interstate Commerce Commission formula of 3.6 water miles to 1 rail mile for rate-making purposes places the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and the eastern part of Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado much closer to deep-water transportation than they are today, as the following illustrations show.

Mr. President, I hope the Senators from the States I have named will very carefully read what this expert has to say:

Bismarck, N. Dak.—

And I repeat that the statistics as to Bismarck apply with equal force to the rest of North Dakota and to Nebraska, South Dakota, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and the eastern portions of Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado. In my opinion what Mr. Cart says is absolutely irrefutable:

Bismarck, N. Dak., is 1,609 railroad miles from New York City and 446 from Duluth, Minn. The distance by water from New York to Liverpool, England, is approximately 3,400 miles and the rail miles of 1,609 equated to water miles is 5,792, making a total of 9,192 water miles on the route all rail to New York and water beyond. The distance by water from Duluth to Liverpool, England, over the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and ocean is approximately 4,600 miles and the rail miles of 446 equated to water miles is 1,605, making a total of 6,205, a saving of 2,987 water miles, or 829 railroad miles over the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, compared with the present rail and water route by New York City.

Mr. President, that is unanswerable. I read further:

The rail miles from Aberdeen, S. Dak., to New York City is 1,465 and to Duluth, Minn., 364, using the same method previously used we obtain a saving of 933 rail miles for Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Mr. President, I ask the particular attention of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as I read this portion of Mr. Cart's testimony:

The rail miles from Lincoln, Nebr., to New York City are 1,403 and 526 from Chicago, Ill., using the same formula, a saving of 574 rail miles is obtained for Lincoln, Nebr.

It will readily be seen that if the pending measure becomes a law and the project is completed, it will effect a saving to the farmers of Nebraska of an average of 574 rail miles in shipments of grain. On wheat shipped from the western part of Nebraska, that would represent roughly a saving of about 6½ to 7 cents a bushel.

The rail miles from Des Moines, Iowa, to New York City are 1,215, and 337 from Chicago, Ill. Applying the formula previously used results in a saving of 572 rail miles for Des Moines.

The illustrations previously given could be used with other foreign and domestic points of origins and destinations, and substantially the same results would be obtained. The benefits of the seaway would extend west and south from Lake Superior and Lake Michigan ports to approximately one-half of the distance to the Pacific Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. Also domestic shipments to and from ports such as Boston, Mass., and Portland, Maine, could be made more economically than by the present methods of all rail or rail, lake, barge where the shipment would have to be transferred from one type of carrier to another with additional cost for each transfer.

Mr. President, I may say, in conclusion, that every 2 years, beginning in 1925, the Legislature of the State of North Dakota has appropriated $2,000 for the purpose of educating the rank and file of the people all over the country to the benefits of building the St. Lawrence seaway. The appropriation was made every 2 years in the amount of $2,000, with the exception of 1933, the year of the drought, when it was reduced to $1,000.

The people of my State are vitally interested in the passage of the pending measure. We believe it would be a good thing for the entire United States. We believe it would make our great country more prosperous and happier. We believe it would help millions of farmers to obtain cheaper light and power. We believe it would aid navigation. I say frankly that I have voted for every single one of the projects similar to this, no matter where located. I even voted for the one in the State of Florida, which by no stretch of the imagination could ever be of benefit to the farmers of North Dakota as individuals, though it would help the United States as a whole. I believe in bringing ocean liners into the interior of our country just as far as we can possibly bring them.

Mr. President, I believe in the development of Alaska. I was one of the first to introduce a bill to provide statehood for Alaska. I also introduced a bill to provide statehood for Puerto Rico, because I believed that that great and beautiful island should become one of the States of the Union. I am well aware of the fact that a committee which visited Puerto Rico did not find that conditions there suited them exactly, but, judging by what I observed on trips with delegations representing the Government, and on the trips I took by myself, both in Puerto Rico and Alaska, I am satisfied that both those countries should be admitted as States of the Union. I would express no preference as to which one of them should be admitted first, except to say that perhaps, since I am better acquainted with the people of Alaska, I hope Alaska will be the first to be admitted as a State.

Finally, Mr. President, I may say to Senators who have not given as much study to the matter of the St. Lawrence waterway as have some of us who have been vitally interested in it, as I was, first as attorney general of our State, and then as Governor, and as I am interested in it now, as United States Senator, I hope they will take time to investigate the matter thoroughly. I am confident that, no matter how they may feel about the measure at the present time, if they will delve into it fully and completely and give it their earnest consideration, some Senators now opposed to the measure will change their minds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOORE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not wish to make a lengthy speech on my own time in support of the St. Lawrence waterway project, but I should like to have the RECORD show this afternoon that I share the conclusions reached by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota in regard to the advisability of constructing that project. I share in his conclusions because I think the preponderance of evidence in the record of this matter to date shows very clearly that the project should be constructed from the standpoint of the transportation needs of the country and from the standpoint of developing the power resources of the country.

I point out to some of my friends in the Senate who have sectional interests to serve that, no matter how much they protest the lack of such interests, it is very interesting to note, and it cannot be denied, that for the most part the opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway stems from sectional economic interest and motivation. I say to those friends of mine in the Senate who are taking that position that after all, the great problem which I think faces America as far as the preservation of our economy is concerned, is the problem of an ever-expanding economy. That is why it has been and will continue to be my purpose to support great projects like the one now under consideration, wherever they may be located, as the Senator from North Dakota says, be they in Florida, in Mississippi, in Louisiana, or in the Great Lakes area, or whether they be the great projects of the West, which I think clearly are needed in order to promote an expanding economy of the country in the interest of all the people.

I part company with my friends in the Senate on any issue with respect to which they would elevate to primary importance a sectional interest as against the interests of the country as a whole. Having listened carefully to the arguments and having read carefully the statements that have been made for the RECORD in connection with the pending measure, I have reached the conclusion that the weight of the evidence supports the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway project. Hence, for the first time I am pleased to announce this afternoon my position on this issue, and to state what my vote will be. It will be a vote for the project, for the reasons I have mentioned.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. Knowing his record, knowing the fine progressive, liberal viewpoint he has on public questions, I was certain long before his announcement today that he would favor the St. Lawrence seaway and would vote for it. The fact that he has now publicly announced his intention of supporting the joint resolution providing for its construction only makes it clearer in my mind that the Republican Party has among its members in the Senate a man who is leading the way, holding up the torch to Senators on this side of the aisle who are going to be written down in the history of our country as men who placed the public welfare above sectional interests. In my opinion, the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Oregon will resound not only along the western coast of the United States, but among liberals everywhere, whether in New York or in Boston, whether in Portland, Maine, or in Lincoln, Nebr. All liberals will take heart when a man like the Senator from Oregon says, "I have studied the matter, and I have come to the conclusion that the St. Lawrence seaway should be built." In so doing, the distinguished Senator alines himself with Theodore Roosevelt, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and other Presidents who have declared themselves in favor of the project.

On behalf of the people of North Dakota, particularly the shippers of grain and livestock, men and women upon the hills and plains and in the valleys of my State, I wish to publicly thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, even though I know the project proposed may not particularly benefit his own State, for joining with the people of my State and of the neighboring States of Montana and South Dakota and Minnesota, in an effort to obtain justice at the hands of this great body, of which we have the honor of being Members.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator. I yield him the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to say to my good friend from North Dakota that his generosity of compliment embarrasses me, but I am very glad to assure him that the junior Senator from Oregon intends to continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with him within the Republican Party in support of liberal causes.

AMENDMENT TO REVISED STATUTES—CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF A BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 148, which was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3778), to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the

United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

Strike out in lines 4 and 5, page 1 of the engrossed bill, the words "so as to read as follows" and insert in lieu thereof "by adding at the end thereof the following"; on page 1, line 6, strike out "SEC. 30."; and on page 2, lines 9 and 13, strike out the quotation marks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

EIGHTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADMISSION OF OREGON TO THE UNION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a brief statement which I have released today commemorating the eighty-ninth birthday of the great State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was on February 14, 1859, that Oregon was admitted into the Union with its present boundaries. The history of its admission into the Union is a most interesting one because it depicts so clearly the great characteristic of the people of Oregon to think for themselves as individuals.

Maybe that is because of the Missouri tradition which flowed through the veins of so many of the pioneers who settled in Oregon. Dr. Dan E. Clark, professor of history at the University of Oregon, tells us in one of his writings that beginning in 1841 the "on to Oregon" movement spread throughout the upper Mississippi Valley. It was in that year that some 70 pioneers left Independence, Mo., for home and fortune in the Golden West.

History records that some 30 of them blazed the Oregon Trail to the Willamette Valley and the others took the lower fork at Soda Springs and made their contribution to the pioneer traditions of California. The 1841 migration pioneers to Oregon was followed by increasing numbers of others, including the great migration of 1843 when nearly 1,000 people traveled by the then deep-rutted Oregon Trail to Oregon

Professor Clark tells us that by 1852 some 15,000 pioneers had settled in Oregon. Their treks enriched the legends and the history of the Great West and their indomitable spirit memorialized every mile of the rugged and dangerous Oregon Trail. Their struggles assured a breed of men and women in Oregon who would possess the characteristics of selflessness, great spiritual faith, and love of personal liberty protected by democratic government. Hence it is not surprising to read in the history of Oregon that a majority of the very independent people born from the loins of fearless, pioneer stock had to be convinced that their best interests lay in joining the Union.

The early proposals for Oregon's statehood were voted down three times by the people of the Oregon Territory, but in 1857 a majority of the people had become convinced that their best economic, social, and political future was to be found in statehood, so they approved the calling of a constitutional convention, which met at Salem, Oreg. The work of this convention produced a constitution of sound representative government which was ratified by the people.

Typically characteristic of what one would expect of the pioneers of the West, the people of Oregon did not wait for congressional action upon their request for statehood. They proceeded upon the basis of the view that once they ratified their own constitution there would be no question as to their eligibility to receive the thirty-third star in the field of blue on the national flag.

A great leader of the Oregon Territory, John Whiteaker was elected Governor of the newborn State which had yet to be christened by Congress. However, on February 14, 1859, Congress greatly strengthened the Union by admitting Oregon into the national family of States. If I were to permit myself to yield to State pride—and the temptation is certainly a strong one—I would pay honor at great length in these remarks about Oregon's eighty-ninth birthday to that other group of historic pioneers and explorers who first pressed upon the soil of Oregon the footprints of the white man. We are told that as early as 1543 Spanish mariners first saw the rugged beauties of the Oregon coastline. Such names as Ferrelo (1543), Sir Francis Drake (1579), Vizcaino (1603), Perez (1774), Heceta (1775), James Cook (1778), and John Meares (1788) were all explorers and mariners who sailed along the Oregon coast.

Clark tells us it was in 1788 that Capt. Robert Gray piloted his ship, *Lady Washington*, into Tillamook Bay and left an authentic record for history that at least in that year white men landed, possibly for the first time, on Oregon soil. It was the same Capt. Robert Gray who in 1791 and 1792 sailed along the Oregon coast in his ship the *Columbia*, and finally in May 1792 into the mouth of one of the greatest natural resources of the Pacific Northwest, a river which he named the Columbia in honor of his ship.

Anyone who is entrusted with the high honor and the privilege of serving the public interests of the people of Oregon in the Senate of the United States is tempted to trespass upon the time of the Senate on the occasion of his State's birthday in paying tribute to the great history and traditions of the State. However, I appreciate that the proprieties and good taste in view of the work of the day which faces the Senate justifies my tarrying but a moment longer in paying these official respects to the history of my State.

Carved out of the rugged but yet fertile and alpine beauty of the Northwest by men and women of our pioneer era who matched the ruggedness, fertility, and beauty of the country they came to settle, Oregon has ever been both a testing ground and proving ground for the immutable principles of democratic government. There, from the beginning of its Territorial days through the debate over statehood to the present, the Oregon people have exemplified democracy in action. There, the principles and the guaranties of the Constitution have been put into practice. There, political machines and political corruption have never been permitted to take root. In Oregon, throughout its history, equality of all persons before the law has characterized Oregon's government by law. Its people have maintained inviolate the constitutional conception and guaranty that each individual is entitled to equal protection of the law and equality of opportunity for the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness under our representative government of their people.

It is interesting to note that in these days in February when we pay such high tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln that it was on September 27, 1849, Lincoln sent his now historic letter to a member of President Taylor's administration refusing appointment to the governorship of the new Oregon Territory which became a Territory on August 14, 1848. What differences in the pages of Oregon and national history would have been written if Lincoln had accepted that appointment whets the imagination. I will not venture upon that imaginative field in this statement. But I would point out that the ruggedness of Lincoln, the selflessness of Lincoln, the spiritual faith of Lincoln, the humanity and brotherly love of Lincoln, yes the great abiding faith of Lincoln in the ability of freemen to govern themselves also typify the people of Oregon from the days of the early explorers and pioneers to the present generation. In the short span of 89 years of history of my State it has made a great record in ever supporting and defending our country and its ideals. I am sure that on its eighty-ninth birthday the entire Nation honors my State.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it appearing that the work of the Senate has been concluded for this afternoon, I move that the Senate recess until Tuesday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, February 17, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 13 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

Coert du Bois, of California, Foreign Service officer, retired, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Paul R. Rowen, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1950.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

John Thad Scott, Jr., of Texas, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1951.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leonard A. Scheele, of Michigan, to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

James H. Steele

Senior surgeon to be temporary medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Walter E. Doyle

Assistant surgeons to be temporary senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

Milton J. Miller

Robert H. Dysinger

Senior assistant veterinarian to be temporary veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

James H. Steele

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

David D. LeGrand	Arthur H. Maybay
Wayland J. Hayes, Jr.	James A. Salmons
Gerald R. Clark	

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

David S. Citron	Ray W. Goens
Leon T. Atlas	Eugene A. Vaccaro
Albert V. Myatt	Stuart H. Martel
John C. Wrye III	Maurice W. Peterson
Raymond G. Halvorson	Harry E. Halden III
James R. Green	Clarence A. Velat
Harrison F. Wood	Howard W. Halfman
Carroll D. Savage	John P. Lombardi
Charles Sherter	Charles L. A. Wehr
Carl R. Reed	Herbert Wieder

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Edward C. Sockerson

LIEUTENANTS

William R. May
George S. Rawson

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Howard D. McPike

ENSIGNS

Alan J. Frankel
Calvin D. Landis
Roger M. Wilsie

Morrison D. Ismond (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948.

John D. Shaw (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 4th day of June 1948, in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy as previously nominated.

William F. Cecil (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

Ernst A. Wolfram, Jr. (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Marguerite Asci	Arlene B. Cressman
Anna M. Belaire	Josephine L. Croftchik
Ruth M. Bowers	Constance R. Esposito
Marian J. Bricker	Alice C. Fogarty
Catherine P. Clarke	Yoshiko Tanigawa
Theresa T. Clarke	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

John J. Brown

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

William L. Roberts

LIEUTENANT

Thomas D. Yocum

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Charles E. Boonstra	Thomas W. Stewart
Elbert C. Brinning, Jr.	Louis Sussman
John W. Howard	Richard K. Williams
John H. Liles, Jr.	

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Bernard G. Platt

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALASKA

Ruth C. Hutchins, Annette, Alaska. Office became Presidential October 1, 1947.

ARIZONA

Ollie A. Caldwell, Gila Bend, Ariz., in place of F. A. Rhodes, resigned.

Lillie M. McEntire, Higley, Ariz., in place of M. E. Owen, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Lloyette Osborne, Earlimart, Calif., in place of H. O. Adams, resigned.

COLORADO

Phillip W. Hanning, Jr., Boulder, Colo., in place of P. B. Paddock, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Thomas F. Honan, Gaylordsville, Conn., in place of E. A. Honan, retired.

GEORGIA

Thomas R. Davenport, Buchanan, Ga., in place of H. S. McCalman, resigned.

Victor H. Tomlinson, Fort Valley, Ga., in place of J. H. Jones, resigned.

IDAHO

George E. Johnson, Headquarters, Idaho, in place of D. E. Springer, resigned.

Arthur B. Peck, Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, in place of I. J. Peck, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Louis Sloter, Crescent City, Ill., in place of Gerd Willms, transferred.

Glen W. Seaton, Glen Carbon, Ill., in place of Myrtle Wilkison, resigned.

Russell M. Shoaf, Homer, Ill., in place of O. P. Dickson, deceased.

Russell E. Snyder, Hull, Ill., in place of F. S. Sprague, resigned.

C. Lincoln Guernsey, Mechanicsburg, Ill., in place of O. M. Elliott, transferred.

INDIANA

John L. Turner, Winchester, Ind., in place of J. L. Wall, resigned.

IOWA

John M. McNiel, Batavia, Iowa, in place of W. S. Olexa, resigned.

Charles W. Crees, Bayard, Iowa, in place of O. V. Stevens, resigned.

Paul Davis, Dunlap, Iowa, in place of J. P. Burke, deceased.

KANSAS

Albert H. Sauvain, Agenda, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Reginald E. Snapp, Belleville, Kans., in place of L. A. Johnson, resigned.

Alice I. Van Sickle, Cedar Point, Kans., in place of Jack Van Sickle, deceased.

Francis K. Darr, Centralia, Kans., in place of C. E. Drumm, deceased.

Arnold C. Kettler, Deerfield, Kans., in place of E. R. Eyman, transferred.

Ellen McEnulty, Denton, Kans., in place of B. O. Shupe, transferred.

Ethel S. Watson, Elsmore, Kans., in place of C. R. Braden, retired.

Harlen C. Atkinson, Goodland, Kans., in place of H. E. Elder, resigned.

Howard L. Hanson, Hepler, Kans., in place of W. P. Armstrong, transferred.

James F. Lambert, Inman, Kans., in place of A. W. Balzer, transferred.

Allyan H. Beers, Jennings, Kans., in place of Edward Tacha, deceased.

Buford L. Emmele, Kiowa, Kans., in place of W. S. Harris, resigned.

Beatrice H. Hovell, Langdon, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Abe W. Fox, Larned, Kans., in place of Lottie Victor, resigned.

Wilmer G. Boothe, Lehigh, Kans., in place of O. F. Grothe, deceased.

William P. Helwig, Jr., Macksville, Kans., in place of F. E. Westgate, resigned.

Faye G. Mullikin, Montezuma, Kans., in place of B. W. Wherritt, transferred.

Cleal M. Harrison, Oakley, Kans., in place of N. D. Zeigler, transferred.

Roy B. Volz, Powhattan, Kans., in place of B. M. Smith, resigned.

Gail L. Hohman, Randolph, Kans., in place of J. L. Larson, resigned.

Raymond J. Laudick, Spearville, Kans., in place of N. W. Shean, transferred.

Wayne W. Mueller, Sylvan Grove, Kans., in place of W. J. Dehler, transferred.

Eugene H. Riggle, Thayer, Kans., in place of A. L. Hastings, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Charles D. Block, Slidell, La., in place of E. S. Jemison, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Gerald D. Swanson, Bear Lake, Mich., in place of H. P. Snyder, transferred.

Roland F. Duff, Buckley, Mich., in place of W. W. Plank, retired.

Archie W. Visnaw, Cedarville, Mich., in place of Edwin Dutcher, resigned.

Arthur F. Newman, De Witt, Mich., in place of V. W. Halterman, resigned.

Leo B. Francisco, East Lansing, Mich., in place of E. E. Young, removed.

Richard L. Price, East Tawas, Mich., in place of C. A. Bigelow, deceased.

Stewart A. Welch, Johannesburg, Mich., in place of V. G. Welch, retired.

Emerson E. Dufina, Mackinac Island, Mich., in place of Paul Doud, resigned.

Otto F. Wormsbacher, Mount Clement, Mich., in place of J. C. Bannow, deceased.

Charles L. Kaltenbach, New Haven, Mich., in place of C. J. Tessman, resigned.

Charles J. Bal, Norway, Mich., in place of Elizebeth Treiber, retired.

Russell C. Scott, Pittsford, Mich., in place of F. B. Wadsworth, retired.

Vester E. Mock, Springport, Mich., in place of L. L. Peterson, transferred.

August L. Babel, Traverse City, Mich., in place of A. S. Friedrich, resigned.

William H. Mullins, Trout Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

MINNESOTA

Alban D. Bertrand, Sleepy Eye, Minn., in place of George Glotzbach, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

William H. Baldwin, Natchez, Miss., in place of H. W. Wilson, resigned.

MISSOURI

Cleatus F. Henson, Bell City, Mo., in place of A. J. Henson, retired.

Eugene H. Davison, Elkland, Mo., in place of I. F. Davison, retired.

NEBRASKA

Irvan S. Renie, Arapahoe, Nebr., in place of A. A. Anderson, transferred.

Donald K. Burklund, Brule, Nebr., in place of E. E. Kampfe, resigned.

Edward J. Pepperl, Burchard, Nebr., in place of A. M. Hart, resigned.

Wayne L. Patras, Clearwater, Nebr., in place of R. E. Flowers, transferred.

John P. Davis, Crawford, Nebr., in place of G. J. Scott, resigned.

M. Belle Bouck, Palmyra, Nebr., in place of M. A. Foreman, deceased.

Fahy E. Wadkins, Phillips, Nebr., in place of J. W. Spencer, retired.

Calvin Joseph Olk, Pilger, Nebr., in place of O. A. Pilger, transferred.

Alice M. Asher, Pleasanton, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mae M. Lovell, Potter, Nebr., in place of W. M. Goding, resigned.

Hattie A. Pateidl, Snyder, Nebr., in place of Joseph Kounovsky, retired.

Charles V. Brokaw, Uehling, Nebr., in place of Catherine Honey, retired.

Margaret Linhart, Verdel, Nebr., in place of W. N. McClintock, transferred.

NEW MEXICO

Alorie V. Young, Hollywood, N. Mex., in place of E. E. Miller, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ben B. Jaynes, Autryville, N. C., in place of M. V. Jaynes, removed.

Lacy E. Price, Cliffside, N. C., in place of R. A. Love, Jr., resigned.

OHIO

Ralph W. Stitsworth, Jamestown, Ohio, in place of H. C. Lieurance, retired.

Forest L. Ayers, Murray City, Ohio, in place of F. E. Surgen, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

James W. Chalfant, Cheyenne, Okla., in place of W. H. Mouser, resigned.

Joel F. Halliday, Eldorado, Okla., in place of E. B. Minich, retired.

Wily S. Bird, Fort Cobb, Okla., in place of E. C. Hoops, resigned.

Gertrude E. Locke, Panama, Okla., in place of Myrtle Whiteaker, resigned.

Lowell V. Doke, Pocasset, Okla., in place of W. H. Roysden, transferred.

Orville E. Marlatt, Ringwood, Okla., in place of S. T. McNutt, transferred.

Hughell F. Legg, Spencer, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1915.

John R. Redwine, Jr., Spiro, Okla., in place of J. R. Redwine, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Treal A. McPherson, Thackerville, Okla., in place of W. T. Dunsworth, deceased.

Rex L. Wall, Willow, Okla., in place of D. C. Allsup, transferred.

OREGON

Quincy E. Smith, Idanha, Oreg., in place of L. H. Haseman, resigned.

George T. Benson, John Day, Oreg., in place of O. L. Dickens, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

James D. Watson, Blaney, S. C., in place of J. T. Ross, retired.

Gertrude F. Foster, Whitney, S. C., in place of W. H. Bishop, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ruby Frederick, Rosebud, S. Dak., in place of T. L. Dam, resigned.

John C Miller, Volga, S. Dak., in place of V. M. Dalthorp, retired.

Leroy Patrick Clare, Wakonda, S. Dak., in place of C. J. LaBarge, deceased.

TEXAS

Robert L. Phinney, Austin, Tex., in place of R. E. Lee, resigned.

Grace G. Sanderlin, Camp Wood, Tex., in place of J. T. Gray, retired.

Andrew J. Dennis, Moran, Tex., in place of Cicero Harper, retired.

H. L. Riddle, Ovalo, Tex., in place of Neeta Shaw, retired.

Mark L. Hodges, Paris, Tex., in place of T. W. Russell, deceased.

Ambrose W. Caufield, Phillips, Tex., in place of A. O. Pickens, removed.

Edna A. Sutherlin, Selman City, Tex., in place of R. A. Crawford, transferred.

VIRGINIA

Nellie S. Wilkinson, Bon Air, Va., in place of J. A. Powers, retired.

Gordon B. Cartwright, King George, Va., in place of U. S. Staples, retired.

WASHINGTON

Melvin S. Jones, Cheney, Wash., in place of Alex Huse, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Lloyd H. Bovee, Bancroft, Wis., in place of F. G. Hutchinson, transferred.

Herbert H. Hilgendorf, Burnett, Wis., in place of L. W. F. Dehne, retired.

William J. Peterman, Cecil, Wis., in place of W. H. Meyer, deceased.

Sheldon E. Cantlon, Ettrick, Wis., in place of L. P. Sheehy, transferred.

Rudolph C. Trauba, Greenville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Harry M. Harms, Platteville, Wis., in place of J. O. Luce, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and compassionate Father, Thou who dost graciously harken to Thy children, again we come into Thy presence and invoke Thy blessing. We ask not an escape from work and even worry, which at times takes a heavy toll, but for the spirit of resolution that we may carry forward those measures that make for a strong and contented country. From all problems do Thou dispel the shadows of uncertainty, that we may convince our people of devotion that makes men and women true patriots. May the will for peace prevail and once more lead the heart of our Nation beside still waters and in pastures green and lasting. Nourish us with all goodness and make us to love that which Thou dost commend. In the name of our glorified Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 12, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 10, 1948, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1826. An act making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 148. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House, in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 3778, to make certain corrections.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONTROL IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a letter addressed to me by Maj. Gen. R. C. Crawford, Acting Chief of the United States Army Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, there is a critical shortage of both water and power in California. After one of the longest droughts in the history of the State, rain has begun to fall. The normal rainy season in California is from October until April. Turbulent floods often follow this limited period of rainfall. Flood control is our only salvation.

This letter refers to the Cherry Valley Reservoir in the Tuolumne River Basin. The area directly benefited by this project has a population of several thousand, while that indirectly affected has in excess of 100,000. This project will meet with the approval of the great international seaport city of San Francisco and the Modesto and Turlock irrigation district.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1948.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WELCH: Reference is made to your recent telephone conversation with General Wheeler concerning plans for the construction of the Cherry Valley Reservoir in the Tuolumne River Basin, Calif.

Pursuant to specific authorization from Congress, the district engineer at Sacramento made an investigation of the San Joaquin River and tributaries, California, in the interest of flood control and allied water uses. In that report he recommended construction of the Jacksonville Reservoir on Tuolumne River in the interest of flood control. In connection with the review of that report by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, representatives of the city and county of San Francisco and the Modesto and Turlock irrigation districts appeared before the Board and discussed their plans for further development of the Tuolumne River as a source of water supply for the city and county of San Francisco and the Modesto and Turlock irrigation districts. At that time it was brought out that ultimately the city and county of San Francisco and the Modesto and Turlock irrigation districts plan to enlarge the existing Don Pedro Reservoir and that the proposed Jacksonville Reservoir would lie within the reservoir area of the new Don Pedro Reservoir. Accordingly, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors modified the plan proposed by the district engineer. The Chief of Engineers, in his report printed as Flood Control Committee Document No. 2, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, recommended "that in lieu of the construction of the proposed Jacksonville Reservoir, an expenditure to the extent justified by proportionate benefits for flood control estimated at $5,800,000 for the equivalent of 320,000 acre-feet in Jacksonville Reservoir be authorized toward the first cost of the proposed new Don Pedro Reservoir or other suitable reservoir in the Tuolumne River Basin provided that local interests construct, maintain, and operate the dams and reservoirs, allocate storage for flood control, and agree to operate such storage in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War."

The plan of improvement for flood control and other purposes on the lower San

Joaquin River and tributaries, including Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers, in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers in Flood Control Committee Document No. 2, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, was approved in the 1944 Flood Control Act and there was authorized for appropriation $8,000,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of that plan.

Local interests comprising the city and County of San Francisco and the Modesto and Turlock irrigation districts plan to provide flood control initially by constructing the Cherry Valley Reservoir on Cherry River, a tributary of the Tuolumne River, and by coordinating the operation of this reservoir with the operation of the city's existing Eleanor Lake and Hetch Hetchy Reservoirs on Eleanor Creek and Tuolumne River, respectively, with the irrigation district's existing Don Pedro Reservoir on Tuolumne River. Since the Cherry Creek Reservoir is in the Tuolumne River Basin, Federal participation in the interest of flood control in that reservoir is authorized pursuant to the 1944 Flood Control Act, as it constitutes a suitable reservoir for flood-control purposes in the Tuolumne River Basin and will materially advance the date upon which effective flood-control storage can be provided in this basin.

Among the areas which will be given protection by the Cherry Valley Reservoir will be the military installations in the Stockton area, particularly the naval depot on Rough and Ready Island and some of the suburban developments adjacent to Stockton. The area directly benefited has a population of several thousand while that indirectly affected is around 100,000. In addition to the flood-control benefits from the project which will greatly exceed their cost, for which Federal participation is authorized, the Cherry Valley Reservoir will also provide local interests with urgently needed irrigation and domestic water supply, the cost of which will be borne by local interests.

I trust that the information contained in the paragraphs above is sufficient for your present purposes. If additional data are required, I will be pleased to furnish all that is available upon receipt of your further request.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. CRAWFORD,
Major General, Acting Chief of Engineers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HESELTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on all days in which there are sessions of the House this week, after the expiration of the legislative business and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE FUEL-OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon I received a telegram signed by David Bruce, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. It contained 501 words, but boiled down, it said, "No; we won't do anything about the export program."

This morning I received a wire from a supplier in Pittsfield, Mass., saying that he will get no more oil for the remainder of the month after February 18. He said the conditions after February 18 will be serious and he must make plans to meet the situation now.

He then asks, "Advise us what you can do to divert fuel oil to us."

This morning Secretary Krug was before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and discussed this inability to cut these exports further. I do not know whether they need kerosene or residual oil in Pittsfield. At any rate, it adds up to 107½ barrels of some type of fuel oil to take them through this month. It appears that our Government has licensed and probably the exporters have sent 1,262 barrels of kerosene to Tahiti; that our Government has licensed the export of 7,500 barrels of gas, oil, and distillate fuel to the Fiji Islands. Mr. Krug intimated that this was because they made copra, and copra helps to make oleomargarine, which will probably be of some interest to my friends from the Midwest.

I suggest there is altogether too much confusion. Perhaps some of us could enlist the sympathy of the governments of the Fiji Islands and Tahiti so that they will make no further requests until spring. In any event, we would receive no colder a reception than the one given to us by our own Government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. MACY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert the excellent remarks of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., at the National Republican Club last Thursday evening.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BRAMBLETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mr. Allen Griffin, owner and publisher of the Monterey Herald on universal military training.

SYNTHETIC MOTOR FUEL

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to transfer the alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, from the Surplus Property Board to the Department of Agriculture. We are becoming desperately short of liquid motor fuels, as well as very short of petroleum fuel, both for heating purposes and for power of all kinds.

Our regional laboratory at Peoria, Ill., has done some fine research in developing liquid motor fuel from waste farm products. The laboratory at Peoria has demonstrated with a small pilot plant that there can be derived 90 gallons of high-grade liquid motor fuel from a ton of corn cobs. Among the uses desired for the Muscatine plant is to demonstrate practical operation on a commercial scale, the findings in research at the Peoria laboratory, and from other research sources, of the use of waste and surplus farm products in synthetic liquid motor fuels.

The northern regional agricultural laboratory at Peoria has been collaborating and assisting others in the research processing of coal into liquid motor fuel.

This bill, if enacted into law, insures immediate sources of supply of industrial alcohol for synthetic rubber, if needed in any emergency.

Test-tube research results are usually proven in a small pilot plant. It then becomes necessary to prove practical economic results in a commercial size plant.

The Muscatine plant is ideal for that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from this morning's Post.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made last week in Bangor, Maine.

LET US SAVE NEARLY A BILLION DOLLARS FOR THE TAXPAYERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, according to the information obtained from the Department of State, it is proposed under the Marshall plan to export nearly 2,000,000,000 pounds of tobacco at a cost of $911,100,000. The total value of tobacco exports under the plan for the first 15 months will be $262,500,000.

Back in 1940 a bill was passed to place an embargo on exports of tobacco seed. This was the most vicious trade barrier ever erected in the history of our country. This legislation was passed when Cordell Hull, from the tobacco State of Tennessee, was Secretary of State and when Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture. While the League of Women Voters and other groups were hearing about the wonders of the reciprocal

trade treaties and the good-neighbor policy, this most vicious embargo was erected along with some other special privilege embargo legislation.

The question is, Are we as a Congress justified in voting $1, $1,000,000, or $1,000,000,000 of the United States taxpayers' money for tobacco exports under the Marshall plan at the very time we have an embargo on tobacco seed so that other countries cannot raise their own tobacco? Would it not make more sense and be more economically sound to furnish the tobacco seed and let these countries raise their own tobacco?

The repeal of this embargo legislation is of particular importance at this time, especially in view of the Marshall plan and the proposed Herter approach to the Marshall plan. For that reason on February 4, 1948, I introduced the following bill:

A bill to repeal the act of June 5, 1940, entitled "An act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes"

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 5, 1940 (Public, No. 543, 76th Cong.) entitled "an act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes," is hereby repealed.

When we have a Federal tax on yearly incomes of $600, it should be apparent that we should not be using money to give away tobacco—a luxury and not a necessity—to other peoples. We surely should at least remove the embargo on the seed so they could grow their own luxury items if they so desire. Without any argument as to whether or not it is advisable to ship any tobacco, it is ridiculous to keep the present embargo on the seed. The administrators of the Marshall plan should at least be in a position to furnish the seed where and when it is needed. The tobacco seed embargo is not in conformity with the motive of the Friendship Train. It is contrary to the good-neighbor policy, to reciprocity, and is most assuredly contrary to the position of the United States on foreign trade in previous administrations. The Australian embargo on sheep producing a certain kind of wool and the Russian embargo on sable breeding animal exports are the only similar embargoes in operation.

THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence cannot help but draw the sympathetic consideration of every freedom-loving American. As I understand it, the United States still recognizes Lithuania as an independent nation whose deprivation of this independence is only temporary. The irony of her situation is tragic to the extreme.

On February 10, 1940, addressing the American Youth Congress, the biggest friend the Soviet Union ever had in the United States said of her:

The Soviet Union, as everybody who has the courage to face the facts knows, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world.

According to reliable reports, "Independent Lithuania" is run by this dictator in so ruthless a manner that it beggars description. According to these reports, Lithuania has been the victim of this dictator not only in loss of independence, not only in loss of freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of worship, and similar inherent human rights, but she has been made the victim of mass liquidation and mass deportation to Russian concentration camps—which means slow liquidation—on a scale constituting genocide such as has probably not been surpassed in the history of nations. In December of 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations declared genocide to be an international crime.

It would seem that one of the first responsibilities of the General Assembly of the United Nations is to investigate the above-named reports and charges against the Soviet Union. If they are not true the facts should be known. If, on the other hand, they are true, investigators on the spot should be able to establish this fact and bring the Soviet Union at least to the bar of public opinion with such appropriate action as the circumstances may warrant.

If the Soviet Union, as has been her practice, refuses a commission of the United Nations to make such investigation in Lithuania, then the secondary evidence at hand should be resorted to and a case made of it. Such a proceeding on secondary evidence could not meet with sound or serious objection from the Soviet Union, and would constitute a basic right of the Lithuanian people under the above report.

The above-named conduct of the Soviet Union toward Lithuania is a gross violation of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations, and cries to high heaven for relief.

The American people cannot help but be behind such action for relief.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] before the Hartford (Conn.) Women's Republican Club on Lincoln's Birthday.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank R. Kent, appearing in the Evening Star of February 13, 1948.

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCES FOR MILITARY AND NAVAL PERSONNEL

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an explanation of a bill I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill granting additional allowances for military and naval personnel as to overseas service.

The bill would exempt from Federal income tax compensation received prior to January 1, 1949, for active service as a commissioned officer in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; and in the case of a citizen or resident of the United States, such compensation received as a commissioned officer in the military forces of any of the United Nations during the war. This relief would be applicable to taxable years in which 10 months or more of such service is performed on sea duty or overseas—outside the States of the Union and the District of Columbia.

All income tax liability attributable to active service pay of all enlisted men was canceled outright for all of the war years by the Revenue Act of 1945. This cancellation extends through December 31, 1948. All liability of commissioned officers attributable to such pay received during the taxable years 1943 through 1948 was canceled in respect of so much of such service pay as does not exceed $1,500.

While the Revenue Act of 1945 provided that the tax attributable to service pay could be deferred and paid in 12 equal quarterly installments, the payment of such tax is causing considerable hardship among military men in their adjustment to civilian life. There are some cases where the people who performed such service are engaged in completing their education which was interrupted during the war, or in adjusting themselves in their business, or profession, or jobs for whom the liability which is outstanding constitutes a real hardship. Though the amount of the liability may seem comparatively small in most such cases, still it may be a material burden for them under their circumstances.

For these reasons I believe that all such liability for all of the war years and through December 31, 1948, should be canceled in the case of those who served on sea duty or overseas for taxable years in which 10 months or more of such service is performed on sea duty or overseas—outside the States of the Union and the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the clerk of the Senate of the State of New York with a resolution passed by that body in connection with the community property tax.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE AND UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to exempt from the Federal estate tax proceeds of national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance.

The bill would provide that there shall not be included in the gross estate for the purpose of the Federal estate tax amounts receivable by the executor or any other beneficiary as national service life insurance or United States Government life insurancce under policies upon the lives of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The laws establishing this insurance provide that such proceeds shall be exempt from all taxation. Section 22, Public, 242, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, Forty-third Statutes 607, 613, as amended by Public, No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, Forty-ninth Statutes 607, 609; and Public, No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, Fifty-fourth Statutes 974.

However, in construing this provision the United States Supreme Court in 1939 held that it applies only to income and property taxes. The Court said that since the estate tax is not a tax on the property but only on the transfer of such property the exemption does not apply to the estate tax. *United States Trust Co. of New York* v. *Helvering* (307 U. S. 57).

I believe that it was the intent of the Congress to exempt from all Federal taxes, including the Federal estate tax, the proceeds of national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance provided for the members of its armed forces. This bill specifically exempts from the Federal estate tax the proceeds of such policies in the case of those servicemen dying after December 6, 1941.

These men and women, most of them in the prime of their lives, joined the armed forces in behalf of their country and died in its service. There should not be a penalty for making this sacrifice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, entitled "We've Scuttled Our Air Defenses."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 24, after disposition of all business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address made before the biennial convention of the Retired Officers Association.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast entitled "Communism," by Jack Beall.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a set of resolutions adopted by the Fifth District of the American Legion in Iowa.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by John Middlekamp of the Automobile Manufacturers Association to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as was so ably pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], today is the thirtieth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, it is in some respects a day of sad remembrance for the thousands of Lithuanian-Americans here in the United States—men and women of industry, thrift, and ability. Their homeland lies behind the curtain, and the fate of their short-lived Republic has, for this short moment, at least, become the fate of the other lands and peoples who have disappeared into the limbo of totalitarianism.

However, this country does not recognize the legitimacy of the new Lithuanian regime, and rightfully so. The sell-out of the Baltic States to the ambition of Soviet conquest is a sad blot upon the character of fair play, and to lend ourselves to recognition of force as an instrumentality of international negotiation would be to deny our own national birthright.

Lithuania will live again, proudly and honorably, as a member of the family of nations. A present despair will be crowned by eventual liberation if all men of good will keep alive the flame of hope and the dream of human dignity.

Hail, Lithuania.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan, before the conference of United States mayors.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the American merchant marine.

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio interview with J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a digest of veterans' laws.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand today a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina. This is one of the most patriotic resolutions I have received in a long time. It was sponsored by a former lieutenant colonel, the Honorable G. P. Collison, with whom I served in the South Carolina House of Representatives, and who was also a tank commander in the northern European campaign. This resolution places this so-called civil-rights controversy on a very, very high plane. He goes on to state that the very first step in a police state is to get control—and I hope the gentleman from New York is listening—of your local elections, your local law enforcement, and your local employment. That is the very first step that a police state desires. That is the first step in having a gestapo in Washington, and the very first people who will suffer will be the minorities for which this type of legislation is proposed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will reject all this type of legislation coming before this body and keep the American people free of a future Buchenwald or Dachau.

The resolution referred to follows:

Resolution memorializing the National Congress of the United States to seriously consider and oppose national legislation relating to the FEPC antisegregation and antilynching legislation, so as to continue to vest these important matters solely under the jurisdiction of the States

Whereas there is certain proposed legislation pending before the United States Congress, or probably soon to be so pending; and,

Whereas such proposed legislation is in the form of the Fair Employment Practice Act, proposed antisegregation legislation, and proposed antilynching legislation; and

Whereas the enactment of such proposed legislation will strike at the fundamental constitutional principles that a State shall prescribe all remedies and all forums for the adjudication of all matters not granted under the United States Constitution to the Federal Government by the people of the various States; and

Whereas it is fundamentally the law of this land that the Government of the United States is a Government of limited powers; and

Whereas the very first and last steps in a would-be police or totalitarian state is to strip the constituent elements of such state of all powers and to place unwarrantedly such powers in the hands of a strong Federal Government; and

Whereas the enactment of such proposed legislation into Federal laws further concentrates unwarranted powers in the Federal Government; and

Whereas such course is dangerous for the very reason that such will eventually destroy the jurisdiction, powers, and authority of the various States and therefore the people; and

Whereas further it is the minorities in a police or totalitarian state who suffer the most, due to the fact that constituent political elements thereof, or constituent republics thereof, have been stripped of all power; and

Whereas it is felt that the various States of this American Union can far better pass laws that would be much more beneficial to its people in regard to the proposed legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the proposed legislation above referred to is not only sectional in its purpose, but that the enactment of such into law will not only be inimical to the South but to the Nation as a whole.

That such proposed legislation is unconstitutional and un-American in that it would give to making the Federal Government all powerful and would destroy the checks and balances of the people, which they have, and which are necessary for them to have, in order to prevent a too powerful bureaucratic government from undermining the fundamental principles of Americanism.

That the enactment of such legislation into law when carried to its logical conclusion will destroy the rights and privileges of the minorities of this land, so that those who now clamor for the passage of such legislation will no doubt be its victims tomorrow.

That any bill or bills providing for the enactment of such proposed legislation be killed in the outset in order that we might not gamble with the future of America.

That a copy of this resolution be directed to the following: The President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the two United States Senators from South Carolina, to the six Representatives in the United States Congress from South Carolina.

REMEDY FOR THE MILK SHORTAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I read from an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 12:

The American Public Health Association recently asked repeal of the penalties on margarine, citing that with vitamins added, margarine is as good a food as butter. Two doctors in the Illinois College of Medicine at Chicago reported last week on controlled experiments testing the effect on two sets of children, one given butter and the other margarine. In the Journal of the American Medical Association, these doctors said:

"The children in the margarine group experienced a high degree of good health during the study, and in comparing their health to that of the butter group, it appears to have been much better. When infirmary records are compared, it is readily seen that the margarine group fared much better than the butter group."

With the milk shortage not threatened but already on us, what are Congress and the State legislatures waiting for?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an address by Mayor William O'Dwyer and in the other an article from the newspaper PM.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made last night.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CARSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement regarding the natural gas shortage.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorials and newspaper articles.

Mr. LESINSKI (at the request of Mr. MADDEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune of Gary, Ind.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief statement by Dr. H. H. Kung.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent tribute to the late Mohandas K. Gandhi by the noted columnist, Hon. Sam B. Pettengill, which I think is most excellent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two items appearing in today's Washington Times-Herald, headed in one case "Hinshaw sees seven ways United States may be struck," and in the other "Reece calls on Truman to stave off Democrat filibuster on civil rights."

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of this House the fact that today is the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. I want to say that the sympathy of every American goes out to the Lithuanians in the United States and to the Lithuanians in the home country because for the moment that brave people seem to be caught behind the iron curtain.

Little Lithuania, with a population of less than 3,000,000 people, is a Baltic State bounded on the north by Latvia, on the east and south by unhappy Poland and East Prussia, and on the west by East Prussia and the Baltic Sea.

The spirit of independence which is traditional to Lithuania is in the very soil of that nation. Essentially an agricultural country, with more than 45 percent of the land in farms and nearly 19 percent in forests, more than three-quarters of all Lithuanians work with the soil.

There has been no people in the whole of Europe who have had a deeper love for liberty than the Lithuanian people. The passing centuries have failed to keep their homeland enslaved. The Lithuanians have proved over and over again not only their right to freedom, but their determination to exercise that right.

As all Lithuanians believe that the present subjugation of the land of their forebears is temporary, liberty-loving Americans sympathize with them and pray for their successful liberation. We all look forward to the day when a new proclamation of liberty shall again bring joy to the hearts of the Lithuanian people everywhere in the world, and encouragement to all of those peoples who are determined to live under the principle which makes our own beloved Nation such a grand place in which to live one's life—the principle that inalienable to every man everywhere is the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I want to say to the Lithuanian-Americans and through them to their homeland and home folks that the prayers of America will continue to ascend on high that brave Lithuania and her courageous people may soon know that success to their centuries of struggle for liberty which will crown them forever with the blessing of freedom, peace, and prosperity.

Our country has not recognized the actions of the Soviet Union in destroying the independence of Lithuania. The spread of communism in Europe and elsewhere must be stopped, and thereafter rolled back in Europe. When this happens the independence of Lithuania and the liberties of its people will be restored and regained.

The heart of America is with you, Lithuania.

THE LATE MORDECAI BROWN

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I know the baseball fans of my State and the country in general will regret the passing of Mordecai "Three-Finger" Brown, one of baseball's all-time greats, who died yesterday after a long illness.

Brown gained his nickname from a childhood accident which cost him his

right index finger. He starred for the Chicago Cubs from 1904 until 1914. In that 10-year span he won 259 games and lost only 131.

The inventor of the famed "dipsy doodle" pitch, Brown was famous, too, for his meetings with Christy Mathewson, immortal New York Giants' hurler. The two faced each other on the mound 21 times, and Brown won 11 of the games.

I extend the sympathy of all to his widow, Sally, and two brothers and two married sisters who survive him.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER SCRAP

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2029) to provide for the free importation of synthetic rubber scrap, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, strike out "india or synthetic" and insert "synthetic or india."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. This bill, Mr. Speaker, was passed by the House on July 26, 1947. It was passed by the Senate February 2, 1948, with a clerical amendment that merely made its meaning more clear. It is entirely a noncontroversial measure which provides for the free entry into the United States of synthetic rubber scrap, under paragraph 1697 of the Tariff Act. It gives equal tariff treatment to both natural-rubber scrap and synthetic-rubber scrap and in no way applies to synthetic rubber other than scrap.

Enactment of the bill will eliminate a very serious and costly problem of classifying shipments of rubber scrap into the United States by the type of rubber scrap they contain. Very frequently these shipments contain both natural-rubber scrap and synthetic-rubber scrap. They are not separated, yet the natural variety is on the free list, while the synthetic scrap is dutiable at 7½ percent ad valorem. The practice has been that upon discovering the dutiable scrap in a mixed shipment the entire lot is subjected to the payment of duty, even though it contains duty-free scrap rubber.

Because of its bulk, transportation charges on rubber scrap are very high, making up the bulk of the expense of such shipments. For this reason, it is not believed removal of the duty on synthetic-rubber scrap will contribute to any excessive imports of this material.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1948.*

SECOND QUARTERLY REPORT ON AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 534)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 61 Stat. 103), I submit herewith the second quarterly report on aid to Greece and Turkey, covering the period from the inception of the program to December 31, 1947.

Since the last report submitted November 7, 1947, Greece has been subjected to ever-increasing pressure by the Communist minority, which, subservient to the foreign influences from which it draws support, would impose its will on the Greek people by force of arms. It is significant that the guerrilla warfare is directed not against the Greek Army but against the people of Greece. The deliberate and wanton destruction of Greek villages does not result from military engagements. It is determined and ruthless destruction intended to render people homeless and drive them from the soil; to force them into overcrowded urban centers where they become charges of an already overburdened state; and to create for them conditions of misery and hardship in the hope that this will make them susceptible to political agitation.

These bands which traffic in human misery and chaos are small, too small to claim any truly representative character. They total about 20,000, of which a large proportion are known to have been unwillingly impressed into the guerrilla ranks under threat of death to themselves and their families. There are members of the United States Congress who visited Greece during the past few months who know what horrible reprisals are taken against those unwilling to fight for the Communist guerrillas.

This policy is sapping the economic strength of Greece at the same time that the American Mission for Aid to Greece is seeking to build it up through reconstruction and economic assistance. This is, of course, the intent of the guerrillas, for a healthy Greece on the road to economic recovery would not be receptive to Communist ideology. Economic conditions in Greece have suffered from the continued military strife which has swelled the number of refugees in the north of Greece to over 420,000 and caused a greater share of the Greek national budget and of American-aid funds to be spent on nonproductive undertakings. Only the most strenuous and determined efforts of the Greek Government and people will suffice to cope successfully with the present situation.

The American mission is doing all in its power to assist, and its accomplishments have been considerable. Owing to the Communist obstruction it is increasingly clear, however, that economic recovery in Greece must await the establishment of internal security. Although economic programs most effective under the circumstances will continue to be actively prosecuted, the benefits from them can be fully realized only when the warfare against the guerillas has been successfully concluded.

To aid the Greek Government in the prosecution of the warfare against the guerrillas, the American mission at the close of the year transferred an additional $14,000,000 of aid funds from the economic to the military program, making a total allocation to the military of about $172,000,000. These additional funds will be used to support the formation of an additional 58 national-defense corps battalions, making a total of 100 as requested by the Greek Government; these battalions will take over the task of protecting the villages of the provinces from which they are recruited, thereby freeing the Greek National Army to conduct a more offensive warfare. If the guerrilla menace should increase as a result of greater outside assistance, a new situation would be created which would have to be dealt with in the light of circumstances prevailing at that time.

While recent developments are adverse, in that they have lengthened the time necessary for Greece's ultimate recovery, the situation is not without encouragement. Greece is still a free country. The recent announcement of a "government" by the Communist guerrillas, who do not effectively control territory in which to exercise any of the functions of government, appears to have been an act of desperation and not of strength. The transparent device of declaring the "free government" has not materially changed the existing situation, except to reveal more clearly to the Greeks and to the world the true character of Greece's enemy. The United States Government has already made known its view that recognition of this group by other governments would have serious implications and

would be clearly contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter. The special United Nations Balkan Commission has passed a resolution that in its view any such recognition would constitute a threat to the peace.

I am pleased to be able to report that the Turkish-aid program is proceeding in an orderly manner. Careful planning and procurement are now resulting in deliveries which can be expected to flow at a fairly uniform rate.

Continued economic assistance to Greece will be provided under the European recovery program, if that program is authorized by the Congress. The European recovery program will not provide, however, for any additional military assistance required for Greece and Turkey, which will, at the appropriate time, be sought from the Congress under Public Law 75.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1948.*

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3106) to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my objection to permit the gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this bill was sent to me as chairman of the committee by the Department for introduction. It has been passed over several times in order that Members might have opportunity to learn more of the intent and purposes of the bill.

After a careful study of the proposal by the Committee on Public Lands both by a subcommittee and by the full committee it was reported unanimously.

The bill, if put into operation, will not cost the Government a penny; on the other hand, it will serve the purpose of giving valuable information to universities and institutions of learning which can be acquired through this bill if enacted into law.

I wish my friend the gentleman from North Carolina would explain the reason for his objection. The bill, as I said, has been passed over several times.

Mr. DEANE. I am glad to explain my objection to the gentleman from California. Let me point out that the well drillers feel that by far the most objectionable thing in the bill is that the Survey will be allowed to work for any nonprofit organization and that if this is allowed there will be very great possibility that it will take away from private enterprise a big portion of the work that is usually done by the men in the profession.

Furthermore, according to the information that I have secured, the Geological Survey would have the right possibly to a preferred position on the list of buyers of well-drilling equipment and machinery now owned by the War Assets Administration.

I confess that I am none too familiar with the legislation and I would be willing that it be passed over without objection, but in view of the information I have at hand it would seem to be desirable that further study be given the matter.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] if he has anything to add.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I had proposed to ask that the bill go over without prejudice. I am interested in having an amendment to the bill adopted. During the past week there have been some informal conferences which may result in an agreement as to that portion of the bill in which I am interested. I had intended to ask that the bill go over without prejudice, but in view of the objection by the gentleman from North Carolina, I, of course, am not in position to make such a request.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from North Carolina insist upon his objection?

Mr. DEANE. No, Mr. Speaker; I withdraw my objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF CIVILIANS IN CONSTRUCTION OF PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2273) to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC AIRPORT, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3510) to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AIRPORT AND PUBLIC HIGHWAY, FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3509) to authorize the construction of a class IV airport for the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, and a public highway or bridge from the city of Fairbanks to the location of the airport.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

TORNEY HOSPITAL PROPERTY, PALM SPRINGS, CALIF.

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 57, regarding disposal of Torney Hospital property in Palm Springs, Riverside County, Calif.

Mr. KEAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. ROCKWELL objected.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3924) to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill S. 1454 be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair inquire if the Senate bill is the House bill amended?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The Senate bill is the same as the House bill with amendments. The Senate bill is substantially identical. There are certain amendments that are not in the House bill. They are, however, included in the Senate bill. It is desired that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the committee wish the Senate bill passed as is?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Yes, the committee wishes the Senate bill passed as is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (j) of section 2 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A), is amended by inserting immediately after the semicolon at the end thereof the words "isonipecaine and its derivatives, compounds, salts, and preparations; opiates (as defined in sec. 3228 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code);".

SEC. 2. Section 203 of such act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 205 of such act is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, is authorized to create special temporary positions in the grade of Assistant Surgeons General when necessary for the proper staffing of the service; but the number of such special temporary positions, when added to the eight positions created by section 204 and subsections (a) and (b) of this section, shall not on any day exceed three-fourths of 1 percent of the highest number, during the 90 days preceding such day, of officers of the Regular Corps on active duty and officers of the Reserve Corps on active duty for more than 30 days.

The Surgeon General may assign officers of either the Regular Corps or the Reserve Corps to any such special temporary positions, and while so serving they shall each have the title of Assistant Surgeon General."

SEC. 4. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 206 of such act is amended to read: "The Surgeon General, during the period of his appointment as such, shall be of the same grade, with the same pay and allowances, as the Surgeon General of the Army; and the Deputy Surgeon General, while assigned as such, shall have the grade corresponding with the grade of major general, with the same pay and allowances. Assistant Surgeons General, while assigned as such, shall have the grade, with the pay and allowances thereof, corresponding with either the grade of brigadier general or the grade of major general, as may be determined by the Administrator after considering the importance of the duties to be performed: *Provided,* That the number of Assistant Surgeons General having a grade higher than that corresponding to the grade of brigadier general shall at no time exceed one-half of the number of positions created by subsection (b) of section 205 or pursuant to subsection (c) of such section."

(b) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Any commissioned officer below the grade of director who is assigned to serve as chief of a division shall, for the duration of such assignment, have the grade of director and receive the pay and allowances applicable to such grade.

"(d) Within the total number of officers of the Regular Corps authorized by the appropriation act or acts for each fiscal year to be on active duty, the Administrator shall by regulation prescribe the maximum number of officers authorized to be in each of the grades from the junior assistant grade to the director grade, inclusive. Such numbers shall be determined after considering the anticipated needs of the service during the fiscal year, the funds available, the number of officers in each grade at the beginning of the fiscal year, and the anticipated appointments, the anticipated promotions based on years of service, and the anticipated retirements during the fiscal year. The number so determined for any grade for a fiscal year may not exceed the number limitation (if any) contained in the appropriation act or acts for such year. Such regulations for each fiscal year shall be prescribed as promptly as possible after the appropriation act fixing the authorized strength of the corps for that year, and shall be subject to amendment only if such authorized strength or such number limitation is thereafter changed. The maxima established by such regulations shall not require (apart from action pursuant to other provisions of this act) any officer to be separated from the service or reduced in grade."

SEC. 5. (a) Such act is further amended by striking out section 207 thereof and by redesignating sections 208 and 209 as sections 207 and 208, respectively.

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of the section herein redesignated as section 207 is amended by striking "surgery" therefrom. Graduates of colleges of osteopathy whose graduates are eligible for licensure to practice medicine or osteopathy in a majority of the States of the United States, or approved by a body or bodies acceptable to the Administrator, shall be eligible, subject to the other provisions of this act, for appointment as commissioned medical officers in the Public Health Service. The second sentence of paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended to read: "Reserve commissions shall be for a period of not more than 5 years and may be terminated at any time, as the President may direct."

(c) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read:

"(b) Not more than 10 percent of the original appointments to the Regular Corps authorized to be made during any fiscal year may be made to grades above that of senior assistant, but no such appointment may be made to a grade above that of director. For the purpose of this subsection the number of original appointments authorized to be made during a fiscal year shall be (1) the excess of the number of officers of the Regular Corps authorized by the appropriation act or acts for such year over the number of officers on active duty in the Regular Corps on the first day of such year, plus (2) the number of such officers of the Regular Corps who, during such fiscal year, have been or will be retired upon attainment of age 64 or have for any other reason ceased to be on active duty. In determining the number of appointments authorized by this subsection an appointment shall be deemed to be made in the fiscal year in which the nomination is transmitted by the President to the Senate. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this subsection unless he meets standards established in accordance with regulations of the President."

(d) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) thereof as subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; by changing "subsection (c)" to "subsection (e)" and changing "subsection (d)" to "subsection (f)" in the subsection hereby designated as subsection (g); and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) Commissions evidencing the appointment by the President of officers of the Regular or Reserve Corps shall be issued by the Administrator under the seal of the Federal Security Agency.

"(d) (1) For purposes of pay and pay period and for purposes of promotion, any person appointed under subsection (a) to the grade of senior assistant in the Regular Corps, and any person appointed under subsection (b), shall, except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, be considered as having had on the date of appointment the following length of service: 3 years if appointed to the senior assistant grade, 10 years if appointed to the full grade, 17 years if appointed to the senior grade, and 18 years if appointed to the director grade.

"(2) For purposes of pay and pay period, any person appointed under subsection (a) to the grade of senior assistant in the Regular Corps, and any person appointed under subsection (b), shall, in lieu of the credit provided in paragraph (1), be credited with the service for which he is entitled to credit under any other provision of law if such service exceeds that to which he would be entitled under such paragraph.

"(3) For purposes of promotion, any person originally appointed in the Regular Corps to the senior assistant grade or above who has had active service in the Reserve Corps shall be considered as having had on the date of appointment the length of service provided for in paragraph (1), plus whichever of the following is greater: (A) The excess of his total active service in the Reserve Corps (above the grade of junior assistant) over the length of service provided in such paragraph, to the extent that such excess is on account of service in the Reserve Corps in or above the grade to which he is appointed in the Regular Corps or (B) his active service in the same or any higher grade in the Reserve Corps after the first day on which, under regulations in effect on the date of his appointment to the Regular Corps, he would have had the training and experience necessary for such appointment.

"(4) For purposes of promotion, any person whose original appointment is to the assistant grade in the Regular Corps shall be considered as having had on the date of appointment service equal to his total active service in the Reserve Corps in and above the assistant grade."

(e) Beginning as of the date of enactment of this act, any officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service on active duty on such date shall, in lieu of the service with which he was credited for the purposes of pay and pay period at the time of his appointment to such corps, receive credit, if it is greater, for 3 years if his appointment was to the senior assistant grade, 12 years if it was to the full grade, 20 years if it was to the senior grade, and 26 years if it was to the director grade.

(f) Any person appointed to any grade above the assistant grade in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service after enactment of this act and prior to July 1, 1948, shall, for purposes of pay, and pay period, and (except in the case of an appointment to the director grade) for purposes of promotion, receive the credit provided under section 207 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act, or shall receive credit, if it is greater, of 3 years if appointed to the senior assistant grade, 12 years if appointed to the full grade, 20 years if appointed to the senior grade, and 26 years if appointed to the director grade. In the case of an officer so appointed to the full or senior grade (1) he shall receive 2 years' seniority in grade if appointed to the full grade and 3 years if appointed to the senior grade, and (2) he shall be considered as having completed the 1 year of service in grade required for promotion to a restricted grade or to the director grade, as the case may be.

(g) Subsection (b) of the section herein redesignated as section 208 is amended to read:

"(b) Reserve officers, except when otherwise provided by law, shall receive the same pay and allowances when on active duty as commissioned officers of the Regular Corps, including allowances for travel and transportation of household goods and effects."

(h) Subsection (h) of the section herein redesignated as section 208 is amended by striking out "section 208 (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 207 (f)".

(i) Such Act is further amended by inserting after the section herein redesignated as section 208 the following new section:

"PROFESSIONAL CATEGORIES

"SEC. 209. (a) For the purpose of establishing eligibility of officers of the Regular Corps for promotions, the Surgeon General shall by regulation divide the corps into professional categories. Each category shall, as far as practicable, be based upon one of the subjects of examination set forth in section 207 (a) (1) or upon a subdivision of such subject, and the categories shall be designed to group officers by fields of training in such manner that officers in any one grade in any one category will be available for similar duty in the discharge of the several functions of the Service.

"(b) Each officer of the Regular Corps on active duty shall, on the basis of his training and experience, be assigned by the Surgeon General to one of the categories established by regulations under subsection (a). Except upon amendment of such regulations, no assignment so made shall be changed unless the Surgeon General finds (1) that the original assignment was erroneous, or (2) that the officer is equally well qualified to serve in another category to which he has requested to be transferred, and that such transfer is in the interest of the Service.

"(c) Within the limits fixed by the Administrator in regulations under section 206 (d) for any fiscal year, the Surgeon General shall determine for each category in the Regular Corps, the maximum number of officers authorized to be in each of the grades from the assistant grade to the director grade, inclusive.

"(d) The excess of the number so fixed for any grade in any category over the number of officers of the Regular Corps on active duty in such grade in such category (including, in

the case of the director grade, officers holding such grade in accordance with section 206 (c)) shall for the purpose of promotions constitute vacancies in such grade in such category. For purposes of this subsection, an officer who has been temporarily promoted or who is temporarily holding the grade of director in accordance with section 206 (c) shall be deemed to hold the grade to which so promoted or which he is temporarily holding; but while he holds such promotion or grade, and while any officer is temporarily assigned to a position pursuant to section 205 (c), the number fixed under subsection (c) of this section for the grade of his permanent rank shall be reduced by one.

"(e) The absence of a vacancy in a grade in a category shall not prevent an appointment to such grade pursuant to section 207, a permanent length of service promotion, or the recall of a retired officer to active duty; but the making of such an appointment, promotion, or recall shall be deemed to fill a vacancy if one exists.

"(f) Whenever a vacancy exists in any grade in a category the Sugeon General may increase by one the number fixed by him under subsection (c) for the next lower grade in the same category, without regard to the numbers fixed in regulations under section 206 (d); and in that event the vacancy in the higher grade shall not be filled except by a permanent promotion, and upon the making of such promotion the number for the next lower grade shall be reduced by one."

SEC. 6. (a) Section 210 of such act is amended to read:

"SEC. 210. (a) Promotions of officers of the Regular Corps to any grade up to and including the director grade shall be either permanent promotions based on length of service, other permanent promotions to fill vacancies, or temporary promotions. Permanent promotions shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and temporary promotions shall be made by the President. Each permanent promotion shall be to the next higher grade, and shall be made only after examination given in accordance with regulations of the President.

"(b) The President may by regulation provide that in a specified professional category permanent promotions to the senior grade, or to both the full grade and the senior grade, shall be made only if there are vacancies in such grade. A grade in any category with respect to which such regulations have been issued is referred to in this section as a 'restricted grade'.

"(c) Examinations to determine qualification for permanent promotions may be either noncompetitive or competitive, as the Surgeon General shall in each case determine; except that examinations for promotions to the assistant or senior assistant grade shall in all cases be noncompetitive. The officers to be examined shall be selected by the Surgeon General from the professional category, and in the order of seniority in the grade, from which promotion is to be recommended. In the case of a competitive examination the Surgeon General shall determine in advance of the examination the number (which may be one or more) of officers who, after passing the examination, will be recommended to the President for promotion; but if the examination is one for promotions based on length of service, or is one for promotions to fill vacancies other than vacancies in the director grade or in a restricted grade, such number shall not be less than 80 percent of the number of officers to be examined.

"(d) Officers of the Regular Corps, found pursuant to subsection (c) to be qualified, shall be given permanent promotions based on length of service, as follows:

"(1) Officers in the junior assistant grade shall be promoted at such times as may be prescribed in regulations of the President.

"(2) Officers with permanent rank in the assistant grade, the senior assistant grade, and the full grade shall (except as provided in regulations under subsection (b)) be promoted after completion of 3, 10, and 17 years, respectively, of service in grades above the junior assistant grade; and such promotions, when made, shall be effective, for purposes of pay and pay period and for purposes of seniority in grade, as of the day following the completion of such years of service. An officer with permanent rank in the assistant, senior assistant, or full grade who has not completed such years of service shall be promoted at the same time, and his promotion shall be effective as of the same day, as any officer junior to him in the same grade in the same professional category who is promoted under this paragraph.

"(e) Officers in a professional category of the Regular Corps, found pursuant to subsection (c) to be qualified, may be given permanent promotions to fill any or all vacancies in such category in the senior assistant grade, the full grade, the senior grade, or the director grade; but no officer who has not had 1 year of service with permanent or temporary rank in the next lower grade shall be promoted to any restricted grade or to the director grade.

"(f) If an officer who has completed the years of service required for promotion to a grade under paragraph (2) of subsection (d) fails to receive such promotion, he shall (unless he has already been twice examined for promotion to such grade) be once reexamined for promotion to such grade. If he is thereupon promoted (otherwise than under subsection (e)), the effective date of such promotion shall be 1 year later than it would have been but for such failure. Upon the effective date of any permanent promotion of such officer to such grade, he shall be considered as having had only the length of service required for such promotion which he previously failed to receive.

"(g) If, for reasons other than physical disability incurred in line of duty, an officer of the Regular Corps in the junior assistant grade is found pursuant to subsection (c) not to be qualified for promotion he shall be separated from the service. If for reasons other than physical disability incurred in line of duty, an officer of the Regular Corps in the assistant, senior assistant, or full grade, after having been twice examined for promotion (other than promotion to a restricted grade), fails to be promoted—

"(1) if in the assistant grade he shall be separated from the service and paid 6 months' pay and allowances;

"(2) if in the senior assistant grade he shall be separated from the service and paid 1 year's pay and allowances;

"(3) if in the full grade he shall be considered as not in line for promotion and shall, at such time thereafter as the Surgeon General may determine, be retired from the service with retired pay (unless he is entitled to a greater amount by reason of another provision of law) at the rate of 2½ percent of his active-duty pay at the time of retirement for each complete year, not in excess of thirty, of his active commissioned service in the service.

"(h) If an officer of the Regular Corps, eligible to take an examination for promotion, refuses to take such examination, he may be separated from the service in accordance with regulations of the President.

"(i) At the end of the first 3 years of service the record of each officer of the Regular Corps, originally appointed to the senior assistant grade or above, shall be reviewed in accordance with regulations of the President, and, if found not qualified for further service, he shall be separated from the service and paid 6 months' pay and allowances.

"(j) (1) The order of seniority of officers in a grade in the Regular Corps shall be determined, subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), by the relative length of time spent in active service after the effective date of each such officer's original appointment or permanent promotion to that grade. When permanent promotions of two or more officers to the same grade are effective on the same day, their relative seniority shall be the same as it was in the grade from which promoted. In all other cases of original appointments or permanent promotions (or both) to the same grade effective on the same day, relative seniority shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the President.

"(2) In the case of an officer originally appointed in the Regular Corps to the grade of assistant or above, his seniority in the grade to which appointed shall be determined after inclusion, as service in such grade, of any active service in such grade or in any higher grade in the Reserve Corps, but (if the appointment is to the grade of senior assistant or above) only to the extent of whichever of the following is greater: (A) His active service in such grade or any higher grade in the Reserve Corps after the first day on which, under regulations in effect on the date of his appointment to the Regular Corps, he had the training and experience necessary for such appointment, or (B) the excess of his total active service in the Reserve Corps (above the grade of junior assistant) over 3 years if his appointment in the Regular Corps is to the senior assistant grade, over 10 years if the appointment is to the full grade, or over 17 years if the appointment is to the senior grade.

"(k) Any commissioned officer of the Regular Corps in any grade in any professional category may be recommended to the President for temporary promotion to fill a vacancy in any higher grade in such category, up to and including the director grade. In time of war, or of national emergency proclaimed by the President, any commissioned officer of the Regular Corps in any grade in any professional category may be recommended to the President for promotion to any higher grade in such category, up to and including the director grade, whether or not a vacancy exists in such grade. The selection of officers to be recommended for temporary promotions shall be made in accordance with regulations of the President. Promotion of an officer recommended pursuant to this subsection may be made without regard to length of service, without examination, and without vacating his permanent appointment, and shall carry with it the pay and allowances of the grade to which promoted. Such promotions may be terminated at any time, as may be directed by the President.

"(l) Whenever the number of officers of the Regular Corps on active duty, plus the number of officers of the Reserve Corps who have been on active duty for 30 days or more, exceeds the authorized strength of the Regular Corps, the Administrator shall determine the requirements of the Service in each grade in each category, based upon the total number of officers so serving on active duty and the tasks being performed by the Service; and the Surgeon General shall thereupon assign each officer of the Reserve Corps on active duty to a professional category. If the Administrator finds that the number of officers fixed under section 209 (c) for any grade and category (or the number of officers, including officers of the Reserve Corps, on active duty in such grade in such category, if such number is greater than the number fixed under section 209 (c)) is insufficient to meet such requirements of the Service, officers of either the Regular Corps or the Reserve Corps may be recommended for temporary promotion to such grade in such category. Any such promotion may be terminated at any time, as may be directed by the President.

"(m) Any officer of the Regular Corps, or any officer of the Reserve Corps on active duty, who is promoted to a higher grade shall, unless he expressly declines such promotion, be deemed for all purposes to have accepted such promotion; and shall not be required to renew his oath of office, or to execute a new affidavit as required by the act of December 11, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 21a)."

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, no promotion shall be made under section 210 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act, prior to July 1, 1948. Until that date officers of the Regular Corps may receive temporary promotions to higher grades with the pay and allowances thereof pursuant to section 210 (a) (1) of the Public Health Service Act, in force prior to the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the termination, prior to such date, of the war and of the national emergencies proclaimed by the President. Any officer holding, on June 30, 1948, an appointment pursuant to such section to a higher temporary grade shall continue in such grade until such appointment is terminated, as the President may direct.

(c) Effective as of the date of the enactment of this act, each officer of the Regular Corps on such date, in addition to the credit he has under preexisting legislation for purposes of promotion, shall be credited with 3 years of service.

(d) (1) Officers of the Regular Corps who have, or who on or before July 1, 1948, will have, the years of service prescribed in paragraph (2) of section 210 (d) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act, for promotion to the senior assistant, full, or senior grade, shall be recommended to the President for such promotion, to be effective as of July 1, 1948, whether or not vacancies exist in such grade. Such promotions shall be made without examination, except that no promotions shall be made to the senior grade or any grade immediately below a restricted grade until the officer is found qualified for promotion pursuant to subsection (c) of section 210 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act. No promotion shall be made pursuant to this paragraph to any grade in any professional category if such grade has been made a restricted grade pursuant to subsection (b) of section 210 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act. For purposes of seniority an officer promoted under this paragraph shall be credited with the years of service in the grade to which promoted equal to the excess of his years of service on the date of promotion over the years of service required for promotion to such grade under paragraph (2) of section 210 (d) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended by this act.

(2) Officers in the junior assistant grade in the Regular Corps who have, or who on or before July 1, 1948, will have four or more years of service in the junior assistant grade, shall be recommended to the President for promotion to the assistant grade, to be effective as of July 1, 1948, without examination and whether or not vacancies exist in such grade. For purposes of promotion and seniority in grade, an officer promoted under this paragraph shall be credited with the years of service equal to the excess of his years of service on the date of promotion over 4 years.

(e) For purposes of seniority any officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service on the date of enactment of this act shall be considered as having had service in the grade which he holds on such date equal to the excess of the service credited to him for promotion purposes over the length of service required under section 210 (d) (2), as amended by this act, for promotion to such grade.

(f) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the provisions of this section shall not, prior to July 1, 1948, affect the term or tenure of office (including any office held under temporary promotion) of any commissioned officer of the Service in office upon the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 7. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 211 of such act is amended to read: "A commissioned officer shall be retired on the 1st day of the month following the month in which he attains the age of 64 years; and a commissioned officer may be retired by the Administrator, and shall be retired if he applies for retirement, on the 1st day of any month after completion of 30 years of active commissioned service in the Service."

(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of such section is amended to read:

"(2) The retired pay to which an officer, who has served 4 years or more as Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General, is entitled shall be based on the pay of the highest grade held by him as such Surgeon General, Deputy Surgeon General, or Assistant Surgeon General."

(c) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by changing the words "for age" to "under the provisions of subsection (b)."

(d) Section 211 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(g) An officer of the Regular Corps in the senior assistant grade in a category in which the full grade is a restricted grade, who has had 20 years of active commissioned or noncommissioned service in the Service (including any active Federal service in the armed forces) or has attained the age of 50, or an officer of the Regular Corps in the full grade in a category in which the senior grade is a restricted grade, who has had 25 years of such service or has attained the age of 55, may be retired in accordance with regulations of the Administrator if he has not been found pursuant to section 210 (c) to be qualified for promotion to the full grade or the senior grade, as the case may be. The retired pay of any such officer shall be at the rate of 2½ percent of his active-duty pay at the time of retirement for each complete year, not in excess of 30, of such service.

"(h) Retired pay pursuant to this section shall be terminated if the officer receiving such pay is recalled to active duty or, in the case of an officer of the Reserve Corps, if he is found to have recovered from his disability. Such pay shall be suspended for any period during which an officer fails without good cause to comply with a request by the Surgeon General that he submit to a medical examination, and shall be terminated if such failure continues for 6 months."

SEC. 8. Title II of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"TRAINING OF OFFICERS

"SEC. 218. (a) Appropriations available for the pay and allowances of commissioned officers of the Service shall also be available for the pay and allowances of any such officer on active duty in the Regular Corps while attending any educational institution and, subject to regulations of the President and to the limitation prescribed in such appropriations, for payment of his tuition, fees, and other necessary expenses incident to such attendance.

"(b) Any officer whose tuition and fees while attending an educational institution are paid pursuant to subsection (a) shall be obligated to reimburse the Service for such tuition and fees if he voluntarily leaves the Service within 2 years after the cessation of such attendance."

SEC. 9. (a) Sec. 706 of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682, 713), as amended, is amended to read:

"SEC. 706. In the case of any commissioned officer of the Service appointed prior to July 1, 1944, there shall be included, in determining the amount of retired pay pursuant to subsection (c) (1) of section 211, and in determining whether he should or may be retired pursuant to subsection (b) of such section, noncommissioned service in the Public Health Service, as well as all commissioned service."

(b) Title VII of such act is amended by changing sections 711 and 712, and references thereto, to sections 713 and 714, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 710 the following new sections:

"APPOINTMENTS TO HIGHER GRADES FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 711. Twenty officers may be appointed to grades in the Regular Corps of the Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act with respect to mental health, and 20 officers may be appointed to such grades in the Regular Corps to assist in carrying out title VI of this act. Officers appointed pursuant to this section in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 percent of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b); but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b). The 20 officers authorized by this section to be appointed to carry out the purposes of this act with respect to mental health, and the 20 officers so authorized to be appointed to carry out title VI, shall be reduced by the number of officers appointed under clause (A) and the number appointed under clause (B), respectively, of section 208 (b) (2) of this act, in effect prior to the enactment of this section.

"CERTAIN RETIREMENTS FOR DISABILITY

"SEC. 712. Any officer of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service who was separated from the Service or returned to inactive status by reason of a disability incurred in line of duty after December 6, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1944, and who would have been eligible for retirement by reason of such disability if section 211 of the Public Health Service Act had been in effect on and after December 7, 1941, shall be considered as though he had been retired at the time of such separation or return to inactive service. Any such officer, and any other officer of the Reserve Corps retired for a disability which was incurred in line of duty after December 6, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1944, shall be entitled, for periods both before and after the date of the enactment of this section, to the same retired pay to which he would have been entitled if such section 211, as amended simultaneously with the enactment of this section, had been in effect on and after December 7, 1941."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4309) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—GI bill of rights—pertaining to "loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property," so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits.

Mr. DEANE, Mr. PACE, and Mr. KEAN objected.

AUTHORITY TO SEND MILITARY AND NAVAL MISSIONS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2313) to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44

Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763), providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], some questions concerning this legislation. When it came up some weeks ago, I asked that it go over without prejudice, as the gentleman knows. I should like to know whether there is any limitation upon the power of the President during this period restricting his sending military and naval missions to any friendly country upon request?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman that since that question was originally raised the Armed Services Committee has agreed upon an amendment which I am prepared to offer today limiting it entirely to military missions in an investigatory way—that there can be no combat troops or anything in that category assigned. This applies only to missions we now have in Iran, in Greece, in Trieste, and places of that description which are not provided by law. I have the exact figures here. The complements are very small, in most cases 3, 4, or 5 officers and possibly 10 to 15 enlisted men.

Mr. CARROLL. For my own information, and I think for the information of the membership here, I should like to know this. As I read the present law and the comments coming from the various departments of the military, as I understand the law, the President now has full power to send military and naval missions to any friendly country upon their request, if it is to our own national interest.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. He has that power under the statute in the Western Hemisphere, but not in the places in Europe to which I referred, except under the War Powers Act.

Mr. CARROLL. Well, that is my point. Until such time, then, as we sign a treaty of peace with Germany and Japan, he has full power.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. He has full power to do it at the present time, but General Marshall is very anxious to have this matter cleared up on the books, looking toward the future.

Mr. CARROLL. I think for the purpose of clarification that we ought to understand that this is an extension of the 1926 act, extending in peacetimes the right of the President to send military and naval missions all over the world to friendly countries upon their request; is that right?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct. I might say that this bill was brought up on the Consent Calendar with an understanding on the part of the Speaker of the House, and the majority and the minority leaders.

Mr. CARROLL. Do you put in your amendment a numerical limitation upon the military and naval missions?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There is no numerical limitation as such, but in the missions sent to Greece it was stated at the time how many there were in number. The amendment which will be offered, if the bill is permitted to come up, is this, that after the words "foreign governments" there be inserted the words, "*Provided*, That no combat forces, namely, forces organized and equipped for combat, will be detailed to any foreign government under the provisions of this act."

Mr. CARROLL. With that, I withdraw objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FOLGER. Notwithstanding this explanation, I am constrained to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are required.

There being no fur her objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"DETAIL OF OFFICERS AND MEN OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS TO ASSIST FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

"The President of the United States is authorized, upon application from foreign governments, and whenever in his discretion the public interest renders such a course advisable, to detail officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to assist such foreign governments: *Provided*, That the officers and enlisted men so detailed are authorized to accept from the government to which detailed offices and such compensation and emoluments thereunto appertaining as may be first approved by the Secretary of War, or by the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That such compensation may be accepted by the United States Government for remittance to the individual if in the opinion of the Secretary of war, or of the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, such a course appears desirable: *Provided further*, That while so detailed such officers and enlisted men shall receive, in addition to the compensation and emoluments allowed them by such governments, the pay and allowances whereto entitled in the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and shall be allowed the same credit for longevity, retirement, and for all other purposes that they would receive if they were serving with the forces of the United States: *And provided further*, That in addition to or in the absence of such compensation from such governments, the officers and enlisted men so detailed shall receive such additional compensation as may be determined by the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, and approved by the President."

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York: On page 2, line 8, after the words "foreign governments", insert the words "*Provided*, That no combat forces, namely, forces organized and equipped for combat, will be detailed to any foreign government under the provisions of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the further amendments made necessary by the Unification Act:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

Page 1, line 4 of title, after the word "naval", insert the words "and Air Force."

On page 2, line 2, after the word "Navy", insert the words "Air Force."

On page 2, line 8, after the word "Navy", insert the words "Air Force."

On page 2, line 9, after the word "*Provided*", strike out comma and insert the word *further*."

On page 2, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Army."

On page 2, line 13, after the word "War", strike out the word "or"; and after the words "Secretary of the Navy", insert the words "or by the Secretary of the Air Force."

On page 2, line 16, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Army"; and after the word "War", strike out the word "or."

On page 2, line 17, after the words "Secretary of the Navy", insert the words "or of the Secretary of the Air Force."

On page 2, line 22, after the word "Navy", insert the words "Air Force."

On page 3, line 4, strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Army"; and after the word "War", strike out the word "or."

On page 3, line 5, after the words "the Navy", insert the words "or the Secretary of the Air Force."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDED ROTC PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4143) to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the author of the bill I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 275) to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, of Washington, D. C., to make loans to fur farmers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. PLOESER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, a rule has been filed on this bill. There is one section of the bill that needs considerable clarification. Therefore, I object.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are required.

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I object, Mr. Speaker.

FUEL SUPPLIES

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 385) requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession concerning the amount of fuel oil, gasoline, petroleum products, and coal now available in the United States and what steps the Government should

take to make the proper and necessary supply available.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I objected to the adoption of this resolution when it came up 2 weeks ago, because the Acting Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, stated they had already given committees of Congress all the information in their hands, and that repetition would merely take the time of the bureaucrats and thus cost money. Will the author of the resolution tell us why the statement made by the Secretary of the Interior is incorrect?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to tell the gentleman why. In the first place, this resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands. It was felt by the members of the committee that they did not have all the information from the Interior Department regarding two very vital commodities—coal and oil. The health of the Nation has been very much affected thus far because there has been a shortage of oil, and there is fear that there will be a shortage of coal. I think no committee has had the full information regarding the amount of oil and coal the United States has today. I find that there is no subject more interesting to the people of the United States today than the future of oil and coal for heating and for industrial and farm purposes.

Mr. KEAN. We all acknowledge that, but the question arises, do they already have this information? The gentlewoman feels that they do not have it and that there is information she wants. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I will not object.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is my belief, and it is the belief of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession concerning the amount of fuel oil, gasoline, petroleum products, and coal now available in the United States and what steps the Government should take to make the proper and necessary supply available.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L'ANSE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS, MICHIGAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 522) to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell for the sum of $2,015 and convey to the village of L'Anse, Mich., certain tribal land and allotted Indian lands described as the southeast quarter of section 32, township 51 north, range 32 west, the north half northwest quarter of section 1, the south half northeast quarter of section 2, township 50 north, range 33 west, Michigan meridian, Michigan, containing one hundred and seventy-seven and twenty-nine one-hundredths acres, more or less. The sale of the tribal land shall be made only with the consent of the tribal council. The proceeds of the sale of the tribal lands, $640, shall be delivered to the bonded disbursing officer of the Great Lakes Indian Agency, Ashland, Wis., to be credited to the tribal funds of the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community. The proceeds of the sale of the allotted lands, $1,375, are to be placed to the credit of the various heirs in their respective individual Indian accounts by the disbursing officer of the Great Lakes Indian Agency. Such funds, received from the sale of these lands, may be reinvested in other lands in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "of", insert "the southeast quarter of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIANS OF THE FORT BERTHOLD INDIAN RESERVATION IN NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1133) providing for the per capita payment of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the report states that an amendment is to be offered striking out "$150" and inserting "$300,000 to be distributed." The bill I have does not contain that amendment. Does the chairman of the committee expect to offer the amendment?

Mr. D'EWART. The Senate bill contains the amendment, and that was the bill reported out by the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. KEAN. Then along comes the Committee on Public Lands and says it is going to insert an amendment of $300,000, but it is not in the bill.

Mr. D'EWART. It is already in the Senate draft of the bill.

Mr. KEAN. It is not in the bill that I have before me, which is S. 1133.

Mr. D'EWART. It is in the Senate bill on line 7. It says $300,000 to be distributed per capita.

Mr. KEAN. It is not in the Senate bill 1133, which I have in my hand. There is nothing about $300,000 there at all.

Mr. D'EWART. You must have the bill as it was before it was amended.

Mr. KEAN. I see.

Then, Mr. Speaker, with that understanding, that the bill which will be passed is the one that is amended and not the one that I have in my hands I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within 60 days from the date of enactment of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall withdraw from the Treasury, and pay to the enrolled members of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota, $150 per capita, out of the balance of the principal and interest of the amount appropriated in settlement of certain claims of such Indians pursuant to the last paragraph preceding the heading "Miscellaneous Indian Tribal Funds," in the first section of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947, remaining after the fees and expenses authorized by such paragraph to be paid from such appropriation shall have been paid or provided for. The money paid to such members under this act shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of such members.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out the figure and insert "$300,000 to be distributed."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN SCHOOL, NEW MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1485) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized in his discretion and subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to sell or exchange all or any part of those certain areas heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico, situated within tracts numbered 97a, 97b, and 98 as shown on the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District map, comprising approximately thirty and seventy-five one-hundredths acres. In effecting any sale or exchange hereunder the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute such deeds or other instruments as may be necessary to transfer the title to any land so sold or exchanged. Any exchanges of land effected pursuant to this act shall be on an equal value basis.

SEC. 2. That the proceeds derived from any sale made under authority of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as school revenues, pursuant to the act of May 27, 1926 (44 Stat. 560), and shall be available in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase of other lands and improvements or interests therein for the use of said Albuquerque Indian School.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

POLSON, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1507) authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel addition to the town of Polson, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell, under existing rules and regulations, the undisposed of lots in blocks 3, 4, and 5, in the Michel addition to the city of Polson, Mont., said lots being embraced in the trust allotment of Angeline Michel, deceased, Flathead allottee No. 1914.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2159) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare plans and estimates for a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, is hereby authorized and directed to make a study of sewage conditions in the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and to prepare construction plans and estimates for an adequate sewage-disposal system for said area, including disposal of sewage from privately owned property in the locality of and within the said park. Such construction plans and estimates shall include an equitable basis for payment by private owners, who may use the sewage-disposal system, of a fair and reasonable proportionate share of the cost of construction of the said system and of the annual costs incidental to its maintenance and operation.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report on this matter within 1 year from the date of appropriation of funds to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIVISION OF WATERS OF THE SNAKE RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3603) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact providing for an equitable division and apportionment among the said States of the waters of the Snake River and all of its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other, upon condition that one suitable person, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and shall make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into: *Provided*, That any such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislature of each of said States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to pay the salary and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided*, That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States, while so employed shall not receive additional salary in the appointment hereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add "*Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall apply to any waters within the Yellowstone National Park or Grand Teton National Park or shall establish any right or interest in or to any lands within the boundaries thereof or in subsequent additions thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENTS FOR PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3628) to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the report on this bill and several others on the calendar today do not conform with the Ramseyer rule. Today I will ask to have the bill passed over without prejudice in order to give an opportunity to the clerk of the committee to file a supplementary report. But if the report is not filed by the time the Consent Calendar is next called, I will make a point of order against the bill which will result in the bill being returned to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES PARK POLICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3936) to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and within roads, parks, parkways, and other Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia over which the United States has, or shall hereafter acquire, exclusive or concurrent criminal jurisdiction, the several members of the United States Park Police force shall have the power and authority to make arrests without warrant for any felony or misdemeanor committed in the presence or view of such members in violation of any Federal law or regulation issued pursuant to law, or for any felony that in fact has been or is being committed in violation of any such law or regulation where they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony, and shall have power to take any person arrested by them, without unnecessary delay, before the Federal court having jurisdiction over the offense or before a United States commissioner specifically designated to try and sentence persons charged with petty offenses as provided in the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1058), or before any other officer having authority to hold or commit for the offense. Such police officers shall also have power upon such roads and within such parks, parkways, and other reservations to execute any warrant or other process issued by a court or officer of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of the provisions of any Federal law or regulation issued pursuant to law: *Provided*, That the power and authority herein granted shall not extend to military personnel for offenses committed on military reservations.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, with the approval or concurrence of the head of the agency having jurisdiction or control of any road, park, parkway, or other Federal reservation, or his duly authorized representative, is hereby authorized to make all needful rules and regulations for the regulation of traffic, for the protection of persons, property, health, and morals, to prevent breaches of the peace, to suppress affrays and unlawful assemblies, and to aid in the enforcement of any of the rules and regulations so promulgated. To any rule or regulation there may be attached a reasonable penalty for the violation thereof not exceeding, however, a fine of not more than $500, imprisonment for not exceeding 6 months, or both.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the environs of the District of Columbia are hereby defined as embracing Arlington and Fairfax Counties and the city of Alexandria in Virginia, and Prince Georges, Anne Arundel, and Montgomery Counties in Maryland.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add the following language: "*Provided further*, That the power and authority herein granted shall not limit or restrict the investigative jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DE SOTO NATIONAL MEMORIAL, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4023) to authorize the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial in the State of Florida, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author of the bill tell me how much the cost is going to be from the point of view of upkeep.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the upkeep is going to be reasonable and nominal. They say they are going to have one caretaker who will probably for a while be a part-time caretaker. Admissions will be charged, and it was testified to in the hearings that in a short time the admissions will take care of this expense. It is the intention that the local people are working on plans to give the land to build the road up there. They have already acquired one of the best collections of Indian artifacts which will be kept there. There will be a caretaker who will very probably be a part time caretaker for a while. Admissions will undoubtedly grow.

Of course as the admissions grow he may become a full-time caretaker, but they anticipate that in a short time it will be more than self-sustaining. We have definitely established that in the hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of establishing an appropriate memorial to Hernando de Soto, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to acquire on behalf of the United States, by donation, by purchase with donated funds when purchasable at prices deemed by him reasonable, or by condemnation with donated funds, such lands and interests in land within an area of not to exceed 25 acres as he may select in the vicinity of Tampa Bay and Bradenton, Fla., and to construct thereon a suitable memorial structure, together with such connecting roads and public facilities as may be desirable.

SEC. 2. Upon a determination by the Secretary of the Interior that sufficient land has been acquired by the United States for the memorial, such property shall be established as the De Soto National Memorial, and shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, for the benefit of the people of the United States. An order of the Secretary of the Interior, constituting notice of such establishment, shall be published in the Federal Register. Insofar as applicable and not in conflict with this act, the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), providing for the establishment of a National Park Service, as amended and supplemented, shall govern the promotion and development of the national memorial.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY AT FORT PECK, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4027) to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], to explain the provisions of this bill and the purposes of it.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] was chairman of the subcommittee which reported the bill to the full committee and he will be glad to explain the bill.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to transfer by sale from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Bureau of Reclamation approximately 25 miles of 33-kilovolt transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment constructed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs below Fort Peck in connection with the Fort Peck Indian Reservation. We are now in the process of developing that area under the Bureau of Reclamation, under the Missouri Valley development. Therefore, these lines that are now a part of the Indian reservation property are being turned over in connection with the power station development that is going on in Fort Peck, and the transmission line that will go from there to Garrison. It will connect up with that part of the line and be a part of the Bureau of Reclamation distribution system, instead of being a part of it under the Indian Bureau and a part of it under the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask, Is the gentleman perfectly satisfied with this bill?

Mr. D'EWART. The Indians from the Fort Peck Reservation appeared before the committee; the Indian Service appeared before the committee; the Bureau of Reclamation appeared before the committee. All agreed in the bill and the amount that was to be paid in return for the transfer of the lines.

Mr. JENSEN. That is not what I asked the gentleman. I asked the gentleman if he favored this bill. I have great respect for the gentleman's judgment.

Mr. D'EWART. I believe the bill is in the best interests of the distribution system that is being installed up there. In view of the fact that they have authorized this transmission from Fort Peck to Garrison Dam this should be made a part of that distribution.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill, S. 1591.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in aid of the administration of the Fort Peck project, there is hereby granted to the United States, for use by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau"), in the discharge of its duties pursuant to the act of May 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 403), the electric-transmission lines, substations, rights-of-way, and other property described in section 7 of that certain permit and memorandum of understanding, dated November 2, 1945, between the Bureau and the Office of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Indian Office"): *Provided, however*, That the Bureau shall continue to furnish electric service for the uses and purposes of the Indian Office on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, pursuant to the terms and conditions of said permit and memorandum of understanding, except as the same may be modified by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. That the amount of money to be paid for said property shall be $58,577.52, or so much thereof as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be needed pursuant to the provisions of said permit and memorandum of understanding. Such sum shall be paid, from funds now or hereafter made available to the Department of the Interior for the construction of transmission lines and substations of the Fort Peck project, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who shall deposit such sum in the Treasury of the United States as a credit on expenditures made for irrigation and power construction on the Fort Peck Indian irrigation project.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts as may be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4027) was laid on the table.

APPROVING THE PERFORMANCE IN THE FIELD OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS RELATING TO THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H R. 4461) approving the performance in the field of certain functions relating to the public lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any function or duty of the Bureau of Land Management may be transferred from the District of Columbia and performed in the field when such transfer and performance are authorized pursuant to law by the Secretary of the Interior or the Director of the Bureau: *Provided, however*, That the tract books now held and administered in the District of Columbia shall not be transferred to the field.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: Page 1, line 3, after the word "of", insert "the Grazing Service of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN PARK COUNTY, WYO., TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4462) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this question is highly controversial, and I object.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. KEAN. Yes, certainly; I reserved the right to object.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, there certainly should be no controversy whatsoever about this bill. Let me explain it.

As everyone knows, since the formation of the Union, certain lands have been set aside for the use of the common schools of the various States. In the Western States Congress vested sections 16 and 36 in each township to each of the States for the support of their schools. The only requirement in most enabling acts was that these sections be surveyed. The land involved herein is an 80-acre tract in section 36. What are the facts in connection with this controversy?

In 1892 the General Land Office asked the State if it wanted the township in which this land is located surveyed. The State wanted it surveyed and accordingly the Government caused a survey to be made. The Commissioner of the General Land Office in November of 1892 approved that survey. He notified the State of Wyoming that the survey had been approved and the State considered that it owned the land from that date. The Government of the United States by their officials considered that the land belonged to the State of Wyoming.

Why then the controversy? In 1917 the State of Wyoming leased that land to the Ohio Oil Co. That company

found oil on the land. Later it was found that the survey of 1892 did not locate the northwest corner of the school section.

The United States had notice of the lease from the State of Wyoming to the Ohio Oil Co. and the Geological Survey had knowledge of the existence of said lease and of the fact that the State was receiving royalties from the oil produced on that land and some was used for the support of the school in Wyoming and Mr. Speaker, for 35 years no objection was raised to the fact that the State claimed the land. When another survey was made it was found that one corner of the section had not been located. As a result of that error the United States claimed the land. As a matter of fairness and equity, however, that land belongs to the school children of Wyoming. There certainly should not be any controversy about that land and I think it is unconscionable that anybody would try to take advantage of that technicality.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Does not the controversy arise over a question of whether or not the corner was moved as the result of a movement of a stream bed?

Mr. BARRETT. No; I think not. In this particular case it is contended that one corner of the school section was not located. Certainly, however, everybody knew where that school section was and it was very easy to ascertain where that particular corner was because all of the other corners of the school section were located.

The Department itself has said in its report that because of the fact that the State of Wyoming held undisputed possession of this land for 35 years that certainly the Congress might well take that fact into consideration.

I understand that some members have been advised that the passage of this bill would result in litigation. I wish to say that such information is wholly incorrect. Our committee considered this legislation very thoroughly. The passage of this bill will result in clearing up difficulties that may have resulted because of an inadequate Government survey.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the land may be worth several million dollars. I think we ought to have a rule on this bill. I object.

SELECTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4515) to provide for selection of superintendents of national cemeteries from meritorious and trustworthy male members of the armed forces who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SCHOOL FACILITIES WITHIN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4823) to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, payments may be made, as provided herein, in advance or otherwise, from any revenues received by the United States from visitors to Yellowstone National Park, to the appropriate school district or districts serving that park, as reimbursement for educational facilities (including, where appropriate, transportation to and from school) furnished by the said district or districts to pupils who are dependents of persons engaged in the administration, operation, and maintenance of the park, and living at or near the park upon real property of the United States not subject to taxation by the State or local agencies and upon which payments in lieu of taxes are not made by the United States: *Provided*, That the payments for any school year for the aforesaid purpose shall not exceed that part of the cost of operating and maintaining such facilities which the number of pupils, in average daily attendance during that year, bears to the whole number of pupils in average daily attendance at those schools for that year.

SEC. 2. That, if in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, the aforesaid educational facilities cannot be provided adequately and payment made therefor on a pro rata basis, as prescribed in section 1 of this act, the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, may enter into cooperative agreements with States or local agencies for (a) the operation of school facilities, (b) for the construction and expansion of local facilities at Federal expense, and (c) for contribution by the Federal Government, on an equitable basis satisfactory to the Secretary, to cover the increased cost to local agencies for providing the educational services required for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to maintain hereafter in a special fund a sufficient portion of the park revenues, based upon estimates to be submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, and to expend the same upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE-OWNED LANDS WITHIN GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4980) relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, and the State of Montana is authorized to convey to the United States, without regard to the requirements contained in section 11 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), any lands, interests in lands, buildings, or other property, real and personal, owned by the State of Montana within the boundaries of Glacier National Park. The aforesaid properties may be acquired from the State of Montana by the Secretary of the Interior for such consideration as he may deem advisable, when the acquisition of such property would, in his judgment, be in the best interests of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF THE FRANCIS SCOTT KEY MANSION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 150) to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Monument, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, according to the history that is recorded, the lyrics of the Star-Spangled Banner were written on board a battleship. This report shows that they were written in Georgetown. I wonder if anybody on the committee will straighten us out on history and tell us what really happened?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. That is wholly incidental and not material in the consideration of the merits of the bill.

Mr. KEAN. It was put in by the committee as one reason for the passage of the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the gentleman is jumping at a conclusion. Regardless of the merits of the gentleman's statement, the bill should be passed.

Mr. KEAN. This involves the building of a new house that seems to have been entirely destroyed. The report says that the house was demolished and what they want to do is to build a replica of it. I cannot see the sense of all of it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ELIMINATING THE REQUIREMENTS OF OATHS IN CERTAIN LAND MATTERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4513) to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That written statements in public land matters within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, heretofore required by law to be made under oath, need no longer be made under oath unless the Secretary of the Interior shall, in his discretion, so require.

SEC. 2. Unsworn written statements made in public land matters within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior shall remain subject to section 35 (A) of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1095, 18 U. S. C. sec. 80), as amended.

SEC. 3. That part of section 558 of the act of March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia" (31 Stat. 1279), as amended December 15, 1944 (58 Stat. 810, D. C. Code, 1940 ed., Supp. IV, sec. 1–501), which reads as follows:

"And provided further, That no notary public shall be authorized to take acknowledgments, administer oaths, certify papers, or perform any official acts in connection with matters in which he is employed as counsel, attorney, or agent, or in which he may be in any way interested before any of the Departments aforesaid" shall not apply to matters before the Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARK RIVER DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT, NORTH DAKOTA

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 61, to provide for the designation of the Park River dam and reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir Dam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Park River dam and reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., shall be designated on the public records as the Homme Reservoir and Dam.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT MAKING FURTHER PROVISIONS FOR A CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3344) to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended to read as follows:

"Division No. 3 shall consist of all the territory lying south and west of the line starting on the coast of the Gulf of Alaska at the one hundred and forty-first meridian of west longitude; thence north along said meridian to a point due east of Mount Natazhat in latitude sixty-one degrees thirty-one minutes twenty seconds north; thence due west to Mount Natazhat; thence westerly and northwesterly along the divide between the White and the Tanana Rivers on the north and the Chitina River on the south to the junction with the divide between the Chisana and the Nabesna Rivers in latitude sixty-one degrees fifty-two minutes forty seconds north, longitude one hundred forty-two degrees thirty-two minutes forty seconds west; thence northerly and northeasterly along the divide between the Chisana and the Nabesna Rivers to Mount Allen; thence northwesterly on a straight line crossing the Nabesna River approximately twenty-four miles to an unnamed peak in latitude sixty-two degrees thirty minutes forty seconds north, longitude one hundred and forty-two degrees forty-three minutes thirty seconds west; thence northerly and northwesterly along the divide between Cheslina and Tetling Rivers on the north and Totschunda and Platinum Creeks on the south, continuing northwesterly along the divide between the Tanana and the Copper Rivers to Mount Kimball; thence continuing southwesterly along the divide between the waters of the Kuskokwim River and Bay on the north and west and the Gulf of Alaska and Bristol Bay on the south to a westerly point of Cape Newenham; the said division to include the Alaska Peninsula, the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands, and all islands along and off the coast of this division, between Cape Newenham and the point where the one hundred and forty-first meridian, west longitude, intersects the northern line of the territory.

"This act shall take effect 60 days after it has been approved by the President."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEADSTONES OR MARKERS FOR UNMARKED GRAVES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4272) to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ENACTMENT BY THE LEGISLATURE OF ALASKA OF A CODE OF LAWS FOR ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4549) to authorize the enactment by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska of a code of laws for Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes", approved August 24, 1912 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 48, sec. 76), the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska is hereby authorized to enact, within 4 years after the date of enactment of this act, a code of laws for Alaska.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "act", insert "subject to the approval by Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATTENDANCE OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE BAND AT THE EIGHTY-SECOND NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5035) to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I read in the newspaper that only three members of the Grand Army of the Republic attended last year. I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services can tell us how long we are going to send bands out if there is no one there attending the convention?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There may be only three members of the exact category of members of the GAR, but it is a very large convention.

Mr. KEAN. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say to the gentleman that it is the practice to designate the service bands only for national conventions of outstanding organizations, such as the GAR, the Confederate organization, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the eighty-second national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such convention, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to cover the cost of transportation and pullman accommodations for the leaders and members of the Marine Band, and allowance not to exceed $6 per day each for additional traveling and living expenses while on duty, such allowances to be in addition to the pay and allowance to which they would be entitled while serving their permanent station.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Mr. Tiedeman.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H. R. 4478

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on H. R. 4478.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports on H. R. 5390 and H. R. 5391.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE STORY OF 161,172 ARMY CHAIRS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, here is the story of how the War Department was prevented from throwing away $2,567,000 of the taxpayers' hard-earned money, and how the Army procurement policy wastes tax dollars.

Last spring the Quartermaster Corps called for bids on 161,172 chairs for officers' quarters. The specifications which I have before me cover four typewritten pages. Instead of buying these chairs out of stock such as any ordinary taxpayer would do, they made the specifications so complicated that any factory who bid would have to tool up especially to make the chairs. The price bid on the chairs varied from $20 to $33 each. According to Colonel Howard, executive officer to General Middleswart, the average price would have been $26. The Aluminum Cooking Utensil Co., of Kensington, Pa., offered to furnish a similar chair at an average price of $12.75 each, f. o. b. Youngstown, Ohio, described as a "wearever aluminum chair." Major Simonseck, of the Chicago Office Quartermaster Depot wanted to buy this chair at $12.75. He was refused permission to make the purchase on the ground that it did not meet the specifications and did not match tables and other furniture that were to be purchased at the same time.

The gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DIRKSEN, obtained the complete file, which he referred to me at that time. Following the return of the contracting officer, Major Simonseck, from Chicago, Mr. Ray Cooper, representing the company and who had been following this matter through in Chicago, came to Washington to see what could be done to convince the Quartermaster General that these lower cost chairs should be bought. He stated that Brigadier General Feldman, who was then Acting Quartermaster General, said "that as long as he had anything to do with it, no other chair would be purchased than the one specified." When Mr. Cooper mentioned the fact that his chair was approximately half the price of the other chair, he quotes General Feldman as saying that "any salesman who attempts to sell the Army items because they are cheaper was making the wrong approach." He also quoted General Feldman as saying "that this program was outlined for not only this year but that it was the beginning of a 10-year program."

It was claimed by the company that this aluminum chair which was quoted at $12.75 each "conforms in all respects to Army specifications as to type of upholstery, color of upholstery," and so forth, the difference being in the shape of the legs of the chair and the bolted construction instead of welding. It is claimed that bolted construction is an advantage, because if any part of the chair becomes damaged it can be replaced without discarding the entire chair.

I took the matter up at that time with the War Department and protested their paying an average of $26 for a chair when they could buy practically the same thing for $12.75. The correspondence and reports to me were in March and April 1947. Later, on June 11, 1947, the budget officer of the War Department wrote me a letter stating that new tentative contracts were then in the Office of the Director of Service Supplies and Procurement waiting review and approval; that the above contracts were for two types of chairs—armchairs costing $10.70 each and side chairs costing $8 each, or an average cost of $9.45 instead of $26 per chair, chairs to be built according to new specifications drawn up by the Quartermaster General which "are designed for the purpose of giving the most efficient and economical service in any of the many varieties of climate where they will be put into use."

Summarizing, the War Department was going to purchase under the original specifications 161,172 chairs at an average price of $26 and for a total of $4,190,472, and had I not protested that is the contract which undoubtedly would have been signed. I am told they actually bought 161,172 chairs at an average price as stated by the budget officer of $9.45 or for a total of $1,523,075. While I did the protesting the actual credit goes to the Aluminum Cooking Utensil Co., of Kensington, Pa., who protested and did not get the contract, and to the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman EVERETT DIRKSEN, who forwarded their protests to me. They are the ones who should be credited with preventing the War Department from throwing away $2,567,000 of the taxpayers' hard-earned money. This is just one of many similar illustrations of the waste and extravagance which had been going on in the Army.

Somehow, the Army seems unable to use any manufactured products out of standard manufactured stocks. Everything has to be according to very special specifications. Millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money can be saved annually by getting away from useless specifications and using standard equipment and products wherever possible.

I am including in the RECORD at the close of my remarks four letterhead pages of Army specifications for the manufacturing of this chair for officers' quarters. Some of these specifications sound like the chemical analysis of battleship armor plate. Note the following specifications on the chemical analysis required for the material for the legs and posts of this chair for officers:

Side frames (legs) and back posts, aluminum tubing to be 63S as extruded and to conform to the following chemical analysis and minimum physical properties as shown below:

Chemical analysis: Silicon, 0.20 to 0.60; magnesium, 0.45 to 0.85; chromium, 0.10; iron, 0.35; copper, 0.10; titanium, 0.10; zinc, 0.10; other elements, 0.05 each; total other elements, 0.15.

And get these "required physical qualities":

Minimum physical properties: Tensile, 22,000 p. s. i.; yield, 16,000 p. s. i.; elongation, 8 percent.

When I read the specifications, I wondered whether they were making a chair for an elephant circus or for officers' quarters. And get this:

After forming, tubing to be aged to 63ST—5 temper.

Seat pan and back rest, low carbon cold-rolled sheet steel—Federal specifications ANQQS—636.

Plug inserts, black tenite No. 1 thermoplastic.

Color, brilliant black, slightly translucent.

Remember these are for officers' chairs for quarters. The bolts, nuts, and washers have to be "cadmium or zinc plated." They have to be of "low-carbon cold-rolled steel" and bolts and nuts "are to be made special." Floor glides to be "all steel parts, to be cadmium or zinc plated except the hardened steel bottom, which is bright nickel-plated and the spring steel retainer which does not require any plating."

These are just a few of the four letterhead pages of specifications for an Army officer's chair. When you look at the four pages of specifications you wonder how a contractor could make them even at an average of $26 per chair. What we need in the Army is some businessmen to do their buying for them and get away from this type of procurement.

Here as a real believe-it-or-not, are the exact specifications as set up and demanded by the War Department for these 161,172 officers' chairs:

SIDE-CHAIR SPECIFICATIONS

This specification covers requirements for a complete chair assembly.

DESIGN

Chair assembly to consist of the following parts: One right- and left-side frame (legs), two back posts, upholstered seat pan, upholstered back rest, four floor glides, two back-post plug inserts and necessary bolts, nuts, and washers as shown on print C 3585.

DIMENSIONS

Chair assembled:

Spacing of frame or legs at floor, front to back to be 20⅛ inches.

Spacing of frame or legs at floor, right to left to be 17⅝ inches front, 16⅝ inches rear.

Over-all height of chair, floor to top of back to be 32 inches.

Over-all of chair front to back to be 21⅝ inches.

Distance from seat to floor (front) 18 inches.

Distance from seat to floor (rear) 16⅛ inches.

Chair disassembled:

Right- and left-side frame (legs) two U-shaped aluminum tubular sections, extruded, 0.942 by 0.995 inside, 0.065 wall thickness and approximately 48 inches long with rounded corners, and having three 0.094-inch R beads centered on outside of wide section. Bead to be on one side only and when tube is formed, are to be on outside. Legs to be bolted to two upright back sections or posts.

Back posts: Two aluminum tubular sections extruded, 0.778 by 0.884 inch inside, 0.058 wall thickness approximately 22¼ inches long with rounded corners and having three 0.094-inch R beads centered on each outer surface of wide section. Tubing to be formed with beads outside, that is, to front and back of chair when assembled. Back posts to be bolted to leg section, located so that front-to-back dimension from outside leg at floor to outer top of formed upright will be approximately 21⅜ inches.

Seat pan: Sheet steel (0.035 inch thick) width at front of pan to be 15¼ inches, width at rear to be 14½ inches. Sides of pan to be

placed between leg and upright extrusions, then complete unit bolted together when assembling. Seat to have one layer of wadding and one layer of cotton covered with artificial leather.

Back rest: Sheet steel (0.028 inch thick) to consist of two sheet steel rectangular pans approximately 9 inches by 14 inches by 1⅝ inches deep. Outer pan to telescope the inner pan, inner pan to be bolted to uprights when assembling, to have one layer of cotton front pan only covered with artificial leather front and rear pan.

Floor glides: Each assembly consisting of hardened steel bottom bright nickel plated, rubber cushion, No. 16 W. & M. gage (0.062) steel cup. These parts are riveted to a retainer made of 0.032 by 1 1/16 wide spring steel. Glide assembly to be drive-in type inserted in open end of each leg. Assemblies to be replaceable.

Plug inserts made of black tenite to be pressed into top open end of back posts.

Bolts and nuts are to be made special.

Washers, standard 5/16-inch diameter lock washer.

MATERIAL

Side frames (legs) and back posts: Aluminum tubing to be 63S as extruded and to conform to the following chemical analysis and minimum physical properties as shown below:

Chemical analysis: Silicon, 0.20 to 0.60; magnesium, 0.45 to 0.85; chromium, 0.10; iron, 0.35; copper, 0.10; titanium, 0.10; zinc, 0.10; other elements, 0.05 each; total other elements, 0.15. After forming, tubing to be aged to 63ST—5 temper.

Minimum physical properties: Tensile, 22,000 p. s. i.; yield, 16,000 p. s. i.; elongation, 8 percent.

Seat pan and back rest, low carbon cold-rolled sheet steel, Federal specifications ANQQS-636.

Plug inserts, black tenite No. 7 thermoplastic.

Color, brilliant black—slightly translucent.

Bolts and nuts, low-carbon cold-rolled steel, Federal specifications FF-B-571.

Upholstering cover, artificial leather, synthetic resin-coated type III, Federal specifications KK-L-136b.

Cotton, 50 percent each No. 1 willowed cotton; spinning mill waste, and No. 2 high and medium Government grade, first-cut linters.

Wadding, No. 532 white cotton linters, regal quality.

FINISH

Side frames (legs) and back posts, aluminum tubing to be given 15-minute alumilite finish over bright acid etch.

Seat pan and back rest, green enamel finish dipped and baked.

Floor glides, all steel parts to be cadmium or zinc plated except the hardened-steel bottom which is bright nickel plated, and the spring-steel retainer which does not require any plating.

Bolts, nuts, and washers, cadmium or zinc plated.

SHIPPING

Chairs to be shipped knocked down, wrapped in paper, and packaged in 200-pound-test cartons. Four chairs to a carton. Special care to be exercised in protecting of aluminum tubing from scratches and tool marks. Above packed for overseas shipment in waterproof barrier material. Shipping containers to be constructed and strapped to conform with the requirements of one of the following specifications:

Nailed wood boxes, Jan-P-106 cleated plywood boxes, Jan-P-105; fully sheathed crates, Jan-P-104.

Mr. POULSON. Referring to the required strength of the chairs, do not the officers consider that they carry that much weight around?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Yes; they think they do.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three separate subjects, and to include certain excerpts.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. HÉBERT asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain extraneous matter.)

LOUISIANA POLITICS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to you for having found it necessary to use the House of Representatives of the United States to discuss Louisiana politics. I do not believe that this is the proper place for such discussions, but I have no alternative. The situation is not one of my own making, but one created by my good personal friend and colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

On Thursday, January 15, on the floor of this House, under a unanimous consent to proceed out of order, my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] made certain charges, made definite and positive accusations, against former Gov. Earl K. Long, of Louisiana, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In order to refresh your memory as to the language used by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], and the nature of the accusations made by him against Earl Long, I quote from the proceedings in the House, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated January 15, 1948, on page 214.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] said:

Earl K. Long is a candidate for Governor of the State of Louisiana in the Democratic primary to be held on January 20. Earl K. Long was elected Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana in 1936, at which time was also elected Richard W. Leche as Governor of Louisiana. Earl K. Long became Governor of Louisiana in April 1939 when Governor Leche resigned, and he served until May 1940. Governor Leche and many other high officials in the State of Louisiana, and other persons, doing business with the State of Louisiana, were indicted and convicted in the Federal courts on various charges in defrauding taxpayers in the State of Louisiana.

The Earl K. Long-Richard W. Leche administration was one of reckless and fraudulent exploitation of the people's money and of the people's rights. Many connected with this regime were guilty of every conceivable misfeasance and malfeasance in office.

Earl K. Long, in his present campaign for Governor, boasts that even though some of his former associates were guilty of crime against the State, that he, himself, is innocent. He repeatedly tells the people that he was investigated and reinvestigated by various agencies of the Federal Government and nothing improper or wrong was found against him.

I now charge that Earl K. Long received an income in excess of a quarter million dollars during the years 1938 and 1939, while he was Lieutenant Governor and Governor of the State of Louisiana.

I charge that this income is largely of the same nature which his former associates profited in; an income of ill-gotten gain and graft, obtained in an illegitimate and illegal manner at the expense of the taxpayers of the State.

I charge that Earl K. Long did not report this income to the Federal Government and instead reported an income of a nominal sum. I charge that his failure to report the proper income was a willful intent to evade his income tax.

I charge that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has assessed at the present time against Earl K. Long a tax liability including fraud penalty in excess of $100,000.

I charge that Earl K. Long has agreed to pay this tax liability, including fraud penalties, but has requested that final consummation be deferred until after the present gubernatorial election.

I charge this tax claim, including fraud penalties, is now in the hands of the regional office in Dallas, Tex., and the technical staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in New Orleans for settlement. The apparent indifference on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in allowing this matter to remain in abeyance is an aid in protecting an individual guilty of acknowledged tax evasion and violation of his trust in office against his people.

I call upon the Bureau of Internal Revenue to issue a deficiency notice of demand payment against Earl K. Long; and to effect the collection of this fraud income claim now, and to take whatever other steps proper under the circumstances. Should this not be done I intend to call this matter officially before the Congress of the United States by resolution asking for an investigation of such conduct by this Government agency.

We have had for almost 8 years constructive and honest State government in Louisiana. Our State is blessed, as no other, with natural resources. We have it within our means to provide a way of life for our people as good as any to be found in this country. We can do that with continued honest, constructive, and liberal government. Louisiana must not again put its affairs in the hands of a man like Earl K. Long, who swindled its taxpayers of hundreds of thousands of dollars, as well as many thousands of dollars from the United States Government.

I direct your attention Mr. Speaker to the definite and positive charges made by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], without substantiation of documentary proof. I now categorically deny the statements made by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], and shall refute indisputably each one of these charges made, and shall substantiate this refutation with photostatic copies of Earl K. Long's income-tax returns, as taken from the files of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, upon the authorization of Earl K. Long himself.

In making this address today, Mr. Speaker, I am seeking only one thing. I am seeking the truth. I am interested in nothing more or nothing less. Let the chips fall where they may.

Before proceeding further, Mr. Speaker, let me say this. In again apologizing for taking up the time of the House on this occasion, I direct attention that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] has chosen his own forum. He has chosen for reasons best known to himself the floor of the House

of Representatives as the place to further the interest of the candidate he is supporting for Governor of Louisiana, to the detriment of the individual he opposes. I do not impugn my colleague's motives for one instant. Whether the floor of the House of Representatives is the proper place or not to wash Louisiana's political linen is a matter which he decided for himself in his own conscience. I am not the judge of his conscience. But having chosen to use this floor for the attack, he leaves me no alternative other than to use the same place in the defense of the man who has been so unjustly accused in this instance. I repeat, I want it understood also that I do not charge bad faith to my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], for whom I have the greatest respect and personal devotion. He is my close personal friend, a friendship which I have treasured for many years and will continue to treasure.

I have asked for permission to address the House today for 1 hour. I will not consume that time in my presentation, but I have asked for the hour in order to give my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] or any other Member of this House, an opportunity to question me in connection with this whole matter.

I ask that I not be interrupted during the presentation of this case. I shall refuse to yield until I have completed the presentation of the facts as reflected by the files in possession of the Internal Revenue Department, which I shall present in accordance with the established law on the subject. At the end of my presentation I shall be glad to answer any questions, but until then I shall not yield.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want it to be known that I am not taking my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] unawares by this presentation today. I not only have notified him of my intentions today but I have given him a complete copy of the address which I am now making, in order that he could come here well fortified, knowing in advance what I am going to say. He will have every opportunity to question me on any statement which I make. He says he wants the truth—and I believe him—and having been furnished the truth, he will have the opportunity to admit that he was in error when he made these charges on the floor of this House, and that he made them without the complete information having been furnished him. The entire matter then resolves itself for him to decide which is the more important, the truth, the unvarnished truth, or the election of the candidate he supports. The choice is his to make, not mine.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, now proceed with the discussion of the facts, the true facts, in this case.

As you well know, there is only one way, and one way alone, for any individual outside of the Bureau of Internal Revenue to come in possession of any details related to a taxpayer's income, and that is through the taxpayer himself, or his accredited attorney and representative authorized to practice before the Bureau of Internal Revenue. There is no other legal way. Now, obviously my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] did not obtain this information from Earl K. Long himself, or from his accredited attorney. He will not deny that. He knows that is the truth. Therefore, I believe it is incumbent on him to disclose to his colleagues the manner and method by which he came into possession of his information. Somebody, somewhere in the Internal Revenue Department who had access to the income-tax returns of Earl K. Long, supplied my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] with his information; and when he supplied him with his information, he violated the law. He acted the rule of informer, or stool pigeon, if you please. And what did this individual do, who dares not reveal his identity, who dares not reveal his identity because he knows he would be prosecuted for violation of the law—what did he do? He illegally furnished my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] only part of the picture—that part which suited his own nefarious designs, and that design was a futile hope of electing his candidate, Sam Jones, Governor of Louisiana.

He did not give him the conclusion of the case, nor did he give him information on the complete story, because if he had, the name of Earl K. Long would have been cleared of any wrongdoing; and my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], acting in good faith, could not have—and I do not believe would have—made the statements which he made on the floor of this House on January 15.

Obviously, the individual who gave this information to my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] was not a friend of Mr. Long. It must be assumed on its face that he was and is an enemy of Earl K. Long, and by giving this erroneous information to my colleague he was undermining the character of Earl K. Long. His purpose was to smear, libel, and slander the character of Earl K. Long. He could have no other reason or design. If his intentions had been honorable, he would not be hiding under the cloak of anonymity.

In contrast to this presentation of information, Mr. Speaker, I come before you today with the facts gained in a legal and orderly manner, under the terms and within the scope of the law itself. I come to you today to present this evidence, which has been obtained by me in the manner prescribed by law, to refute the charges made by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], the hostile press of the State of Louisiana, who is opposing Mr. Long in this election, and Sam Jones, the opposing candidate himself.

In this connection let me quote what my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] said, as recently as last Tuesday, in a prepared statement. It is in substance the same thing that the newspapers opposed to Mr. Long have been demanding editorially, and that Mr. Jones has been saying from the stump. But in order to be absolutely accurate, I quote verbatim my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], and he said this:

> The people of Louisiana are entitled to have the proof of these charges before they go to the polls in the February 24 primary election in which Earl K. Long is a candidate for governor. Of course, Earl K. Long could have and still can clarify the entire matter by authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make public all records pertaining to the said Earl K. Long's income-tax file in question.

As to the first sentence that the people of Louisiana are entitled to have the proof of those charges before they go to the polls in the February 24 primary election, in which Earl K. Long is a candidate for governor, I agree 100 percent with my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], with the newspapers who have demanded to know the truth, and with Mr. Jones himself. It is because I agree with them and because Earl Long agrees with them that I am standing here today—to give you the truth.

As to the second sentence, that Earl K. Long could have and still can clarify the entire matter by merely authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make public all records pertaining to the said Earl K. Long's income tax in question, I disagree, because this is not a statement of fact.

Ever since the day that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] made his charges on the House floor, which, mind you, was less than a week from the date of the first primary, with a Saturday and a Sunday intervening, Earl Long has been trying to get the Bureau of Internal Revenue to release the facts in the case, and without success until this present time. My colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] made the charges at such a time which did not allow ample opportunity for Mr. Long to get all the facts from the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Mr. Long did say, however, that he would make the facts known as soon as he had an opportunity to get them, and he is keeping that word through me here today. This is the first chance that the opportunity has been made available to present the facts, and I am taking advantage of that opportunity.

May I digress for a moment to draw a contrast between the timing and method employed by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] and myself in presenting this case?

Without notice or warning he made his unfounded charges on the Thursday preceding the Tuesday of election, thereby allowing no time for Earl Long to defend himself before the first primary election day.

As I have pointed out, I announced my intention almost 2 weeks before election day of answering his scurrilous charges and have handed to him this morning, hours before coming to the floor, a copy of this address.

I am giving full opportunity—more than a week before election—to the biased and prejudiced press of my State to publish the true facts.

Are they big enough to do it?

Now in order to keep the record straight, and in order to dispel from the minds of the people the confused situation which has been placed before them by distortion, obtaining a taxpayer's income-tax file from the Bureau of Internal Revenue is not as simple as those opposing Mr. Long would have you believe. Let us understand the law clearly. Only one person, and one person alone can ask to see, not to reveal, but to see the income tax files as related to his own income, and that is the taxpayer himself. He can do that personally, or through his attorney, who must in addition be qualified to practice before the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Nobody else, and I repeat, nobody else, can look at those files.

In an effort to learn the truth, with Mr. Long's full cooperation, when I returned to Washington from Louisiana recently I had with me the written authorization of Mr. Long himself to examine his income-tax files in toto. I personally presented this written request to Mr. George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, because Mr. Long's income-tax returns are here in the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington. I had full authority from Mr. Long to examine those records and to make them public. What happened when I presented that request? Mr. Schoeneman refused to show them to me, and properly so. He pointed out to me that under the law he could not discuss the case with me and would not discuss it. This was the same position Mr. Schoeneman on the day previous had taken before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House. Mr. Schoeneman explained that it would be necessary for Mr. Long himself, or his attorney, to come to Washington to examine the returns, and that nobobdy else would be allowed to look at them, but that Mr. Long or his accredited attorney would be permitted to photostat whatever pertinent documents they desired, other than interdepartmental communications, which he said are not available to the taxpayer or his attorney.

Obviously Mr. Long himself could not come to Washington because he is engaged in the throes of the present campaign. But upon my request he took the one course open to him, namely, through his accredited attorney, Clem H. Sehrt. On last Tuesday morning Mr. Sehrt appeared before the Bureau of Internal Revenue and asked to examine the files and make photostatic copies of the pertinent documents, which will prove that the charges of my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] are unfounded, false, and untrue.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, those documents. I hold them here in my hand. Here are the photostats of the official documents taken from the files of the Bureau of Internal Revenue which my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] has insisted that he wanted brought before you and the people of Louisiana. You have got them now.

And as I reveal this situation to you step by step, supported by those documents, you will readily grasp the real situation, and out of the confusion and chaos will come order and the truth.

But now let me give you a little background of this case before I present these documents. Mind you I am not making these statements on my own without substantiation and proof; mind you I am not merely making an unsupported assertion. Unlike my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX], I first make the statement and then support it by the official documents, by the irrefutable evidence of the Bureau of Internal Revenue files, which my colleague says will determine whether or not he made a correct statement on the floor of this House, as related to Earl K. Long's income-tax returns.

Now let me direct your attention to my colleague Mr. DOMENGEAUX's statement. We are in agreement that Earl Long was investigated. We are in full agreement. Earl Long has said on repeated and numerous occasions that he has been investigated and reinvestigated; that he is the most investigated man in Louisiana, but that nobody has as yet been able to successfully link him with graft or corruption or fraudulent income-tax returns. That is no secret. Of course, he has been investigated. What do you think he has been investigated for? Whether he wears a red or brown tie? Do you think he has been investigated to find out whether he drinks nectar sodas or whether he drinks Coca-Colas? Do you think he has been investigated to determine whether or not he parts his hair in the middle or on the side?

He has been investigated and he admits it, to determine whether or not he has violated the law, and until this day, this time, this hour, this minute, after all of these investigations, with the full power of the United States Government behind these investigations, with the full power of the State of Louisiana investigatorial bodies behind these investigations, Earl Long today is not guilty.

Now let me say to you what happened in this particular case, in which I tell you that my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] was given misinformation. Here is what happened. I have nothing to conceal. Earl Long has nothing to conceal. Back in the year 1939 when the so-called Louisiana scandals broke—and I may say parenthetically here that I know a little bit about those scandals since I had a lot to do with bringing them to the public eye—Earl Long, who later became a candidate for governor among others, was investigated, and nothing was found against him. And then there was a lull, and the embers simmered on the fire. Earl Long became a candidate for lieutenant governor in 1943. Lo and behold, another investigation developed. It is that investigation, which I will disclose to you hereafter has been settled, but is again being resurrected by a frantic opposition in support of their candidate.

Does it not seem queer that only at election time do these unfounded, and to date unproven, charges crop up. Who is trying to get Earl Long in the Bureau of Internal Revenue? What individual is after him? I wonder if it is the same character who illegally gave to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] false information, which he presented to you.

Be that as it may, here is what actually happened in this case, and I give it to you chronologically.

Bear in mind the harassment that Earl Long had been subjected to from 1939. Visualize his frame of mind, when, after he had proven time and time again that he was not guilty of wrongdoing, to be again confronted with Internal Revenue Department agents, throwing in his lap as income, certain political moneys which were not kept by Earl Long, which were not used by Earl Long for his own personal use, which did not find their way into his own personal bank accounts, and which were not legal income for purposes of income-tax declaration and payment of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, certain agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue literally threw the book at Earl Long. In effect and substantially, practically every dime of money that was spent in the political campaign of 1940 and others, was charged against Earl Long as personal income.

Now Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, we are all familiar with how campaigns are conducted. We know how moneys are collected and expended during political campaigns. I dare say there is not a Member of this House today who at one time or another has not handled political funds and dispensed those political funds. May I ask, Are political moneys so expended taxable?

Do you know of any political candidate, or his manager, who has been requested to pay taxes on political funds spent in a campaign, disbursed in a campaign?

Have you ever included in your income-tax returns such political funds?

Have you ever been requested to pay taxes on such funds?

Of course not.

But what did some of the agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue do where Earl Long was concerned?

They said to Earl Long, in effect: "Mr. Long, we have examined your income-tax returns for the years 1937, 1938, and 1939, and we have discovered that you have not included in these returns certain moneys which we are advised came into your possession. What is your explanation?"

"Explanation," Mr. Long exclaimed, "that's easy. They were political funds."

"Not that easy, Mr. Long," shot back these eager and industrious agents. "You have got to prove it to us."

"I accept your challenge, gentlemen, and will prove it," readily replied Mr. Long.

And Earl Long did prove it.

In other words, the Government can come against you, you, or you, and

charge you with having income of a certain amount, such as they did in the case of Mr. Long, and under the law the burden of proof is upon you, the taxpayer, to prove to the Government's satisfaction that such incomes are not your personal gain and profit. That is what Earl Long did.

With the burden of proof resting upon his shoulders he appeared before representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, time after time, repeatedly, to explain what the Department wanted explained. Time after time at the request of the Department he voluntarily signed waivers allowing the Department unlimited time to investigate him. Would a guilty man have done this? Would a man who had something to hide sign away his rights under the law? I do not think he would have. Earl Long is not a guilty man. Earl Long had nothing to hide, and he readily signed these waivers.

So, from this stupendous amount which my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] would have you believe was Earl Long's income, and to which he said, and I quote:

I charge that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has assessed at the present time against Earl K. Long a tax liability, including fraud penalty, in excess of $100,000.

Comes false statement No. 1.

After a complete and thorough investigation by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, after an exhaustive study of Earl Long's income-tax returns, the agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue finally came to the conclusion that, for the years of 1937, 1938, and 1939, Earl Long owed, not $100,000, plus fraud penalty, as my distinguished colleague would have you believe, but the small additional sum of $3,139.83. Three thousand one hundred and thirty-nine dollars and eighty-three cents for those 3 years.

And now for the proof.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I exhibit to you that figure on the original memorandum made by the Government agent himself, Mr. H. G. Bates, in his own handwriting, which he himself handed to Mr. Long at the conference at which an agreement was reached. But even then, even then, Earl Long said he did not owe the money or the additional tax, but because of lost receipts and other missing data which the Government requested 7 years later, Mr. Long agreed, under protest, to pay an additional tax on this negligible sum covering a period of 3 years.

And in this connection let me say to you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, that Earl Long proved conclusively to the Government that he had no such alleged income—he proved not only by his own word but by sworn affidavits of the individuals who actually received this money for political purposes. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a fistful of these affidavits. But the Government even went further than to rely on those affidavits. The Government agents interrogated each one of the individuals separately who had received these political funds and then came to the inevitable and correct conclusion that Earl Long was telling the truth.

After Mr. Bates had handed this memorandum to Mr. Long, he—Mr. Long—then prepared, according to procedure, Form 870 of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, using Mr. Bates' own figures as a basis for settlement. An examination of this form, which I now exhibit and ask to be incorporated in the RECORD, and that photostat from Earl Long's income-tax file in possession of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, reveals the figures are identical with those of Mr. Bates:

[New Orleans Division, District of Louisiana]

Form 870

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

(Revised June 1941)

C:HGB:mcf

WAIVER OF RESTRICTIONS ON ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF DEFICIENCY IN TAX

In re: Mr. Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 272 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, and/or the corresponding provisions of prior internal revenue laws, the restrictions provided in section 272 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, and/or the corresponding provisions of prior internal revenue laws, are hereby waived and consent is given to the assessment and collection of the following deficiency or deficiencies in tax: Taxable year ended December 31, 1937, income tax in the sum of $1,359.06; taxable year ended December 31, 1938, income tax in the sum of $1,110.74; taxable year ended December 31, 1939, income tax in the sum of $670.03; amounting to the total sum of $3,139.83, together with interest thereon as provided by law.

EARL K. LONG,
Winnfield, La.

OCT. 20, 1944.

Mr. Speaker, I offer still further proof of this agreed settlement in the nature of the tax bills and the tax receipts themselves as evidence of payment on this amount.

Here, Mr. Speaker, in my hand are these tax bills; you know what they look like. We all have received them. And here are the receipts that Earl Long paid the money.

I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at this point:

Form 7658—Revised May 1942

NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR INCOME TAX

[To insure proper credit, return this form with remittance]

Notice is hereby given that there has been assessed against you the amount of tax penalty and interest stated below. Demand is hereby made for the immediate payment of the unpaid balance thereof. If payment is not made within 10 days after date of this notice, the law provides that interest will be added at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date shown below until paid.

Date: November 8, 1944.

To avoid further interest the amount stated on this notice must be paid to collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, La., within 10 days from date stated above.

Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La., Nov. 3—519010, 1937:

Assessment	$1,359.06
Interest	541.07
Balance due	1,900.13

Form 7658—Revised May 1942

NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR INCOME TAX

[To insure proper credit, return this form with remittance]

Notice is hereby given that there has been assessed against you the amount of tax penalty and interest stated below. Demand is hereby made for the immediate payment of the unpaid balance thereof. If payment is not made within 10 days after date of this notice, the law provides that interest will be added at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date shown below until paid.

Date: November 8, 1944.

To avoid further interest the amount stated on this notice must be paid to collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, La., within 10 days from date stated above.

Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La., Nov. 3—519011, 1938:

Assessment	$1,110.74
Interest	375.57
Balance due	1,486.31

Form 7658—Revised May 1942

NOTICE AND DEMAND FOR INCOME TAX

[To insure proper credit, return this form with remittance]

Notice is hereby given that there has been assessed against you the amount of tax penalty and interest stated below. Demand is hereby made for the immediate payment of the unpaid balance thereof. If payment is not made within 10 days after date of this notice, the law provides that interest will be added at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date shown below until paid.

Date: November 8, 1944.

To avoid further interest the amount stated on this notice must be paid to collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, La., within 10 days from date stated above.

Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La., Nov. 3—519012, 1939:

Assessment	$670.03
Interest	186.35
Balance due	856.38

RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES

Form 1—(Revised May 1940)

Name and address of taxpayer: Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La.

Income, 1937	$1,900.13
Interest	11.69
Amount	1,911.82

Collector, internal revenue, district of Louisiana. Paid, December 15, 1944. Cashier Division.

RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES

Form 1—(Revised May 1940)

Name and address of taxpayer: Earl K. Long.

Income, 1938, $820.82.

Collector, internal revenue, district of Louisiana. Paid, April 6, 1945. Cashier Division.

RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES

Form 1—(Revised October 1944)

Name and address of taxpayer: Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La.

Income, 1938	$665.49
Interest	36.81
Amount	702.30

Collector, internal revenue, district of Louisiana. Paid, July 9, 1945. Cashier Division.

RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES

Form 1—(Revised October 1944)

Name and address of taxpayer: Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La.

Income, 1938: Interest, April 6, 1945–July 9, 1945, $12.71.

Collector, internal revenue, district of Louisiana. Paid, July 9, 1945. Cashier Division.

RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES

Form 1—(Revised May 1940)

Name and address of taxpayer: Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La.

Income, 1939, $314.71.

Collector, internal revenue, district of Louisiana. Paid, December 15, 1944. Cashier Division.

RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES

Form 1—(Revised May 1940)

Name and address of taxpayer: Earl K. Long.

Income, 1939	$541.67
Interest	14.39
Amount	556.06

Collector, internal revenue, district of Louisiana. Paid, April 6, 1945. Cashier Division.

But I can best give you the story in Earl Long's own words, not uttered today, not written at a time when he is a candidate for public office and again under attack, but in October 1944. I let Earl Long speak for himself. When Earl Long agreed to pay that money he did so still under protest, as so many taxpayers do, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, let me read to you Mr. Earl Long's letter of that date, a photostatic copy of which I have obtained from the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Under date of October 20, 1944, this letter accompanied form 870—which I have presented to you—and was addressed to Mr. William E. Logan, Internal Revenue agent in charge, New Orleans Division, Treasury Department, 901 Hibernia Building, New Orleans 12, La. Earl Long said this:

With further reference to your letters of March 31, 1943, addressed to Mr. and Mrs. Earl K. Long, of Winnfield, La., and the various conferences held in connection therewith following the filing of protests thereon, and without prejudice to our rights and purely with a hope of settling all issues herein, we attach hereto a schedule of proposed adjusted net income for the years 1937, 1938, and 1939 as the basis on which we will settle this matter.

As you know I have been probably the most investigated individual in the State of Louisiana. Both State and Federal agencies have investigated my affairs from top to bottom without finding any semblance of wrongdoing. During the years under consideration in this matter I was Lieutenant Governor, Governor, and a candidate for Governor of this State in a most hectic and epoch-making period. So many things happened in my career from 1937 through 1939 that it is utterly impossible for me to orderly marshal the events. From an income-tax standpoint I believe I am the only individual of political significance who has ever been called upon to explain the spending, etc., of political funds. A great deal of the income under consideration relates to funds which came into my possession in a purely political way. With absolute honesty I can tell you that I owe no tax whatever for the years 1937 through 1939. I may not be in a position to disprove every item of income in your letter, however, that is my misfortune and hence this offer in settlement. It will be expensive for me to litigate this matter and various trips to New Orleans for conferences, etc., have already been somewhat costly to a man of my modest means. In this connection I might add that, financially, I am not one-half as stable today as I was before 1936 during which year I became Lieutenant Governor, the first high political office held by me.

I hate to burden you with the above statements; however, those are the facts that are pertinent to the issues involved. In closing let me thank you and your staff for the courteous treatment which I have been accorded throughout the entire time when this matter has been in your Department, and may I add that I trust that this most substantial offer in settlement will, in due course, be accepted.

Respectfully submitted.

EARL K. LONG.

There, Mr. Speaker, is Earl Long's position, as stated in 1944, and today, February 16, 1948, it has not changed in the slightest. It is the same today as it was then, when this case which my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] tells you is not settled and that there is an assessment of over $100,000 against Mr. Long, including fraud penalty. His position today is the same as it was then. He does not owe any fraud penalty. As far as the tax assessment is concerned, it was settled, definitely and finally, in 1944, and it is not an open matter. But now let me carry you a step further. After the Government had accepted this payment of money and Mr. Long thought the case was closed, for reasons best known to themselves, an attempt was made to collect an amount of some fifteen hundred dollars additional from Mr. Long. Now you know and I know what the law is. There are only two penalties assessed against income-tax returns. One is a negligence penalty of 5 percent of the additional amount imposed for not keeping adequate records, and the other is 50 percent, which carries with it the implication that fraud has been committed.

What did Mr. Long do when presented with this additional $1,500 claim? Did he pay it? Did he, as my friend and colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] says he did, and I quote him again; the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] said this:

I charge that Earl K. Long has agreed to pay this tax liability, including fraud penalty.

There are no if's and and's in that statement. There are no ambiguities; there are no innuendoes. That is a direct statement, an absolute and affirmative statement, an absolute and affirmative statement by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] that Earl Long did agree to pay a tax liability amounting to over $100,000, including a fraud penalty.

Now here is the truth. Earl Long refused to pay $1,500 or 15 cents because he said he was not guilty of fraud, and in his own words as told to me only recently, and I quote him:

I will see icicles in hell before I pay because I am not guilty and do not intend to pay a fraud penalty.

Now, why do I say that?

Here is the documentary proof taken only last week, last Tuesday, as a matter of fact, from the income-tax files of Earl Long in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, proving that Earl Long refused to pay any fraud penalty, or any other kind of penalty.

It is dated October 20, 1944, and says to the Internal Revenue agent in charge, and I quote:

In the absence of an agreement with your office as to the proposed penalty, it is requested that the above case be referred for a hearing before the New Orleans office of the southwestern division of the technical staff.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the official document which I asked unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point:

[Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service]

OCTOBER 20, 1944.

In re: Mr. Earl K. Long, Winnfield, La. Income tax, calendar years 1937, 1938, and 1939.

INTERNAL REVENUE AGENT IN CHARGE,
New Orleans, La.:

In the absence of an agreement with your office as to the proposed penalty, it is requested that the above case be referred for a hearing before the New Orleans office of the southwestern division of the technical staff. It is understood that the technical staff will not consider substantial issues or important evidence which have not been previously presented to your office.

EARL K. LONG,
Winnfield, La.

Does it say that Mr. Long agreed to pay a fraud penalty?

No; a thousand times, no; it says in clear and distinct language "In the absence of an agreement" and it is signed "Earl K. Long."

And until this date, this hour, this minute, Earl Long has not only not agreed to a so-called fraud penalty, but the Government has not directed a fraud penalty against him.

Let me elaborate here. I am reliably informed that only one agent out of the many participating in the conference, stood out for a fraud penalty, and the rest, at the worst, suggested that a 5-percent negligence penalty should be assessed against Mr. Long because he did not keep adequate records. May I say that Mr. Long has refused to pay even that penalty.

Let me say further in passing that I am reliably informed that Mr. H. G. Bates, who is an outstanding revenue agent and who investigated Mr. Long, if allowed to do so would readily say to you what he told Mr. Long during the conferences. That his recommendations were accepted by the Government in ninety-nine and nine-tenths of the cases, and in fraud cases all his recommendations were accepted, and his recommendation in this case is that there is no fraud.

Now we come to the third phase of the charges made by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] that there is an agreement between Earl Long and the Bureau of Internal Revenue to withhold the conclusion of this alleged fraud penalty until after the election. I tell you categorically and emphatically there is no such agreement. Now here are the facts.

After this matter was referred to the technical staff in 1944 at the request of Mr. Long, he asked that it be disposed of as expeditiously as possible. You

know and I know that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is terribly overworked. They are away behind in many of their cases because of lack of funds and other reasons. That may have been the reason, I don't know. There may have been over reasons which are not known to me, but the facts are that repeatedly and insistently since 1944 when this protest was filed, Mr. Long has continuously asked for a settlement and an opportunity to prove in a tax court, if necessary, that he was not guilty of fraud and did not owe a fraud penalty.

And that, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, is where the case rests today. Oh, what a different story to the charges made here. What a different picture to the one being painted in Louisiana by a hostile press.

The whole story of this incident does not end here.

Just before the first primary in which Earl Long led his closest opponent by some 120,000 votes, Mr. Long challenged his principal opponent, former Governor Jones, to make a statement of his, Jones', income tax during the time he was governor and immediately afterward, and to indicate thereon the sources of his income from various corporations which may have resulted from the fact that Mr. Jones was Governor of Louisiana.

I understand from the daily press that Mr. Jones last week submitted total sums of net income, but did not reveal the source of income as requested by Mr. Long. Mr. Jones' income as stated by him is a matter of record through the public press and the radio of Louisiana. In addition to this he also issued a statement in which he gave permission to the internal revenue collector to let anybody examine his income-tax returns. Of course, this statement is merely a camouflage and a red herring across the trail, because as I have shown you this afternoon, nobody, except the taxpayer or his accredited attorney, can examine those records. So, of course, such authority is merely issued for effect. It is only a grandstand play.

In contrast to the ambiguous manner in which Mr. Jones issued his statement on his own authority, I now read to you over the signature of Charles Donnelley, collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, a statement of the income taxes paid by Earl Long since 1935. This statement was submitted to Mr. Long by Mr. Donnelley at Mr. Long's request, and Mr. Long, in turn, has submitted the information to me for presentation at this time. It is most interesting, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, to note the amounts of these returns, in view of the charges made on this floor as to the alleged huge sums of money which Mr. Long is alleged to have obtained through his official position as Lieutenant Governor and Governor of Louisiana.

In 1935 he paid a tax of $89.19.

In 1936 he paid a tax of $111.95.

In 1937 he paid a tax of $1,482.60.

In 1938 he paid a tax of $1,295.87.

In 1939 he paid a tax of $959.47.

Now I call your attention that the years 1937, 1938, and 1939 include the protested additional tax.

In 1940 he paid a tax of $211.68.

In 1941 he paid a tax of $121.27.

In 1942 when the taxes began to go up in this country, as we all know, he made enough money to pay $134.22 in tax.

In 1943 he paid $143.76.

In 1944 he paid no tax, but got a $16.28 credit to his estimated tax of 1945.

In 1946 he paid a tax of $442.50.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not burden you by reading Mr. Donnelly's letter in full which reflects Earl Long's returns since the year 1920. Instead I ask unanimous consent to place the letter of the Internal Revenue collector in New Orleans in the record at this point. It speaks for itself and I direct your attention to the fact that for the years 1928 to 1933 no income taxes were filed by Mr. Long.

During these years Mr. Long was attorney for the inheritance tax collector of the State of Louisiana and under the then existing law his returns were not taxable.

I particularly direct your attention to the last paragraph of the letter of the Internal Revenue collector of New Orleans which says, and I quote:

> The records of this office disclose that all taxes certified to me for collection for all the years in which returns were filed by you have been paid in full and that no penalties were assessed against you in any way for these years.

But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Long has gone further than obtaining this letter from Mr. Donnelly in an effort to bring out the truth. He also wrote to George J. Schoeneman, collector of internal revenue, in which he asked him to furnish him—Long—his returns for the years 1916 through 1940 and told Mr. Schoeneman that it is essential that he have these in his possession immediately. Could anybody have done more to get the facts to the people? I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include Mr. Long's letter to Mr. Schoeneman in the record at this point. We have nothing to hide.

FEBRUARY 13, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHOENEMAN: Please furnish me copies of income-tax returns filed by me for the years 1916 through 1940.

I am making this request because I am advised by Mr. Charles Donnelly, collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, that my income-tax returns for the years recited above are not in his office. He informs me that the said returns are in the possession of your office at Washington.

It is essential that I have the above immediately and your cooperation in this connection will be appreciated.

Thanking you, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

EARL K. LONG.

P. S.—I realize that for some of the above years my income may have been insufficient to require the filing of a return.

FEBRUARY 13, 1948.

Mr. EARL K. LONG,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. LONG: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 13, 1948, in which you request that I furnish you copies of all income-tax returns filed by you for the years 1916 through 1946, inclusive. You also desire a complete transcript be furnished you covering all income taxes paid by you, including the amount of taxes actually paid during each of the years as stated above. You further request to be advised if all assessments for income taxes certified to me for collection for the said years have been paid in full and you ask to be informed if any penalty has been assessed against you and certified to me for collection during the period referred to above.

With reference to your income-tax returns, I will advise that none of your returns filed for years prior to the taxable year 1941 are in my office. Returns for the taxable years prior to 1941, filed on Form 1040, were filed with the collector of internal revenue and transmitted by the collector to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C. and are, therefore, now in the files of the said Commissioner. Copies of returns for the years 1941 through 1946 have been prepared in this office and are transmitted with this letter.

There are no income-tax records existing in this office for years prior to the taxable year 1918 and it must be assumed that these records were destroyed with the sanction of the Congress, since this is the usual procedure as regards Federal records.

Below I am listing a complete transcript of your income-tax account with this office, showing the taxable year, the amount of tax assessed, the amount of tax paid and the dates of such payments:

Year	Amount of tax assessed	Amount paid	Date of payment
1918 (nontaxable return filed)			
1919 (nontaxable return filed)			
1920 (no return filed)			
1921 (no return filed)			
1922	$15.00	$15.00	Mar. 14, 1923
1923	46.00	46.00	Mar. 21, 1924
1924 (no return filed)			
1925 (nontaxable return filed)			
1926	9.11	9.11	Mar. 9, 1927
1927 (nontaxable return filed)			
1928 (no return filed)			
1929 (no return filed)			
1930 (no return filed)			
1931 (no return filed)			
1932 (no return filed)			
1933 (no return filed)			
1934	248.30	248.30	Mar. 12, 1935
1935 (extended to Apr. 1, 1936)	89.19		
Interest	.44		
Total	89.63	89.63	Mar. 26, 1936
1936 (extended to Apr. 15, 1937)	111.95		
Interest	.72		
Total	112.67	112.67	Apr. 12, 1937
1937	123.54	123.54	Mar. 12, 1938
Additional tax	1,359.06		
Interest	541.07	1,900.13	Dec. 18, 1944
Additional interest (Nov. 18, 1944, to Dec. 15, 1944)	11.69	11.69	Do.
Total	2,035.36	2,035.36	
1938 (extended to May 15, 1939)	185.13		
Interest	.23	185.36	May 17, 1939
Additional tax	1,110.74		
Interest	375.57	820.82	Apr. 9, 1945
		665.49	July 11, 1945
Additional interest (Nov. 8, 1944 to Apr. 6, 1945)	36.81	36.81	Do.
Additional interest (Apr. 6, 1945 to July 9, 1945)	12.71	12.71	Do.
Total	1,721.19	1,721.19	

Year	Amount of tax assessed	Amount paid	Date of payment
1939 (extended to June 15, 1940)	$289.44		
Interest	1.09	$290.53	June 8, 1940
Additional tax	670.03		
Interest	186.35	314.71	Dec. 18, 1944
		541.67	Apr. 9, 1945
Additional interest (Nov. 8, 1944, to Apr. 6, 1945)	14.39	14.39	Apr. 9, 1945
Total	1,161.30	1,161.30	
1940 (extended to May 15, 1941)	211.68		
Interest	1.06	53.98	May 2, 1941
		53.98	June 18, 1941
		53.98	Sept. 12, 1941
		50.80	Dec. 26, 1941
Additional interest (May 23, 1945, to July 9, 1945)	.70	.70	July 11, 1945
Total	213.44	213.44	
1941	121.27	30.32	Mar. 20, 1942
		30.32	July 1, 1942
		30.32	Oct. 8, 1942
		30.31	Jan. 2, 1943
Total	121.27	121.27	
1942 (extended to Apr. 15, 1943)	134.22		
Interest	.17	33.55	Apr. 7, 1943
		33.56	Apr. 19, 1943
		67.28	Dec. 20, 1943
Total	134.39	134.39	
1943 (extended to May 15, 1944)	143.76		
Interest	1.44	145.20	May 19, 1944
Total	145.20	145.20	
1944		[1] 16.28	
1945 (extended to May 15, 1946)	254.72		
Interest	2.55	63.68	June 17, 1946
		193.59	Oct. 24, 1946
Total	257.27	257.27	
1946 (extended to May 20, 1947)	442.50		
Interest	4.72	442.50	July 23, 1947
		4.72	Aug. 8, 1947
Total	447.22	447.22	

[1] Credited to 1945 estimated tax.

With reference to the copies of returns I am transmitting herewith, I will advise that these are exact copies of the original returns and disclose all pertinent facts as follows:

Year	Net income	Tax assessed	Amount collected	Date of payment
1941	$2,044.58	$121.27	$30.32	Mar. 20, 1942
			30.32	July 1, 1942
			30.32	Oct. 8, 1942
			30.31	Jan. 2, 1943
Total		121.27	121.27	
1942 (extended to Apr. 15, 1943)	1,349.05	134.22		
Interest		.17	33.55	Apr. 7, 1943
			33.56	Apr. 19, 1943
			67.28	Dec. 20, 1943
Total		134.39	134.39	
1943 (extended to May 15, 1944)	2,237.51	143.76		
Interest		1.44	145.20	May 19, 1944
Total		145.20	145.20	
1944	1,326.50		[1] 16.28	

[1] Credited to 1945 estimated tax.

Year	Net income	Tax assessed	Amount collected	Date of payment
1945 (extended to May 15, 1946)	$1,870.69	$254.72		
Interest		2.55	$63.68	June 17, 1946
			193.59	Oct. 24, 1946
Total		257.27	257.27	
1946 (extended to May 20, 1947)	3,176.00	442.50		
Interest		4.72	442.50	July 23, 1947
			4.72	Aug. 8, 1947
Total		447.22	447.22	

The records of this office disclose that all taxes certified to me for collection for all of the years in which returns were filed by you have been paid in full and that no penalties were assessed against you in any of these years.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. DONNELLY, *Collector.*

So there, Mr. Speaker, is the complete story. This is the factual story of the income tax of Earl K. Long. I am not a prophet nor a clairvoyant, but if I could judge the future by what has happened in the past I dare say that 4 years hence if Earl Long is a candidate for public office in Louisiana, and the same procedure follows, the millions of dollars which are now being expended in Louisiana in an effort to elect Sam Jones governor will be charged against Earl Long and he will be called upon once again to prove his innocence, which he has always done.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] or any other Member of this House to any question which he cares to ask and which I shall attempt to answer as fully as I can, adhering strictly to the facts and the record in the case.

Mr. Speaker, we have eliminated all of these charges. Here is the documentary proof, the photostatic copies, which show the true situation. It is with pleasure I give them to my friend for his examination and use. Let him look at them. He has them now. I state to him now that he can ask any question he desires to ask me, he can challenge me in any way in which he wants to challenge me. I yield to him for whatever purpose he desires.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I thank the gentleman. Of course, I want to ask the gentleman to yield to me for the purpose of making a statement. He has kindly consented to allow me sufficient time within his hour to make that statement.

Now, I want to ask you a question, please.

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, do you want to ask the question or make a statement first?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Yes; I would like to ask you several.

Mr. HÉBERT. Certainly; anything.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. You gave a prepared statement to the press, a copy of which you gave me, and which you rather carefully followed in your presentation before the House. I notice, however, that in your prepared speech you stated that, "I shall substantiate this refutation with photostatic copies of Earl K. Long's income-tax return." I notice, Mr. HÉBERT, that you did not present that income-tax return at this time.

Mr. HÉBERT. That particular income-tax return will be presented immediately. I did not think it was necessary to present that particular thing, since I presented the income-tax findings.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Will the gentleman kindly present the income-tax returns for 1937, 1938, and 1939?

Mr. HÉBERT. I shall be very happy to do so, because there is nothing to hide.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Well, present them.

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, I do not have them at the present time, because there are some three trunkfuls of checks. We did not photostat everything down there we had. We photostated the pertinent and concluding documents.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes; certainly.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The gentleman in his statement to the press, and in the copy of the paper that he gave to me, states that, "I will substantiate what I have said in refutation of the DOMENGEAUX charges by the presentation of the tax return in question."

Mr. HÉBERT. I am glad the gentleman from Louisiana has read on further. I said I would refute what he has said. He has said that Earl Long is charged with a $100,000 fraud, and has agreed to pay it, and the gentleman here read documents showing that that is not a true statement.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Will the gentleman present the income-tax return? He will not do it, and I will tell you why, because his income-tax return on the face of it, in red ink, shows the marking of fraud penalties. That is the reason why.

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course, I have only access to the legal ways of getting documents out of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I have only legal means.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. You had that legal record, Mr. HÉBERT.

Mr. HÉBERT. As far as I am concerned, the record will speak for itself at this point, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] has said Earl K. Long has agreed to pay a fraud penalty; that he has said Mr. Earl Long has pleaded guilty; that he has said Mr. Earl Long owed $100,000 to the Government. And, I again submit, Mr. Speaker, the documentary evidence does not substantiate those statements, and when he continues to read what I have said, he will read into the RECORD exactly the facts.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. You have kindly consented to allow me the balance of your time to make my presentation, for which I thank you.

Mr. HÉBERT. I agreed to allow you whatever time you needed, because I will ask for an extension of time afterward, if you do not mind.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Fine, and I will be happy to answer any questions you may want to ask.

Mr. HÉBERT. Do you want me to interrupt you or wait until you have finished?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Just leave those documents there.

Mr. HÉBERT. Oh, I will leave them there; do not worry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] yields to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, my colleague, from Louisiana, for yielding to me to make a statement with reference to the matter which you and I are presently vitally interested in. I am very much concerned, and very, very much disturbed, because I think that my good friend would not attempt to come upon this floor and make a statement that would be based upon subterfuge and would deliberately and intentionally not give the true and correct facts of this case.

Now, this whole thing depends upon one particular thing. Now, my friend has brought in some documents which do not amount to anything at all, as I will show you in a very short time. But, the important thing is the tax return. It is very, very peculiar that my friend and distinguished colleague from Louisiana made in his statement the very positive and unequivocal statement that he was presenting in evidence the photostatic copies of the income-tax returns of Earl K. Long. Now, my friends, I do not know why the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] made that statement, if he is able to say that at this time, and not want to produce the evidence, notwithstanding the fact that he allowed this statement to go out to the press of Louisiana and the press of this country, in which he leaves the implication that he has submitted to this House the photostatic copies of the income-tax returns of Earl K. Long. If he has them, I will be very glad to see them. My inclination is that the reason he has not presented them at this time is that those returns contain on the face of them a notation in red ink to the effect that they contain a fraud penalty. That is the reason why the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] I think is not willing to present them at this time.

I am going to mention a few other things on which my colleague bases the entire case. He bases the entire case upon a few tax receipts signed by Mr. Earl K. Long and signed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. He also attempts to show the amount of money involved in this case by an unidentified and unauthenticated document, a plain sheet of paper which has no possible significance whatsoever. He attempts to show that that was the amount in agreement between Mr. Earl K. Long and the Bureau of Internal Revenue. He presents a series of documents that are waivers. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is trying to indicate that if Mr. Long was guilty he would not sign the waiver. The reason a man signs a waiver, if I may so inform the gentleman from Louisiana, when a question of tax deficiency or possible fraudulent taxation is raised against him, is that if he does not sign that waiver they are going to bring him into court or file a tax assessment against him. That is elementary. So it was the most natural thing in the world for Mr. Long to do, to prevent a disclosure of his vicious tactics in defrauding the people of the State of Louisiana throughout these years by signing these tax waivers, so that the people of the State of Louisiana and the people of this country would not know of those practices in which he has been engaged.

This letter he wrote is a self-serving declaration. Of itself it is a condemnation and an indictment of Mr. Long's present situation before and with the Income Tax Division. In that letter he says:

> I attach hereto a schedule of proposed adjustments, net income for the years 1937, 1938, and 1939, as a basis on which we can settle this matter. I see no reference or identification or offer of such schedule as you have made in this other matter. Also, in the last paragraph you say, "And may I add that I trust that this most substantial offer in settlement will in due course be settled."

I want to bring out another very significant fact, which has brought to my mind a great suspicion, existing in the activities and conduct of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the settlement of this case. I should like to have an explanation as to why, shortly after I made these charges, Mr. C. A. Donnelly, Collector of Internal Revenue for the division of Louisiana, came out with a statement that was put in a paid advertisement of Earl K. Long, in which he said that research of his records indicated that there was no tax lien or deficiency assessment against Earl K. Long.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as that statement is concerned it was true, but my charges were that there was presently a tax matter involving fraudulent claims against Earl K. Long in the technical staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the city of New Orleans and in the Dallas office. That was the statement I made. Mr. Donnelly knew, or should have known about that at that time, as Collector of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, that it was not in his office—just as this statement that he makes here today, a most ridiculous thing.

I am surprised that my friend credits us with so little intelligence as to bring in a statement which is only for home consumption in the State of Louisiana, signed by C. A. Donnelly, in which Mr. Donnelly reaffirms that his office discloses that "all taxes certified to me for collection in the years in which returns were filed by you have been paid in full and that no penalties were assessed against you in any of those years."

My dear friend and colleague from Louisiana, you know very well that that is a normal statement, possibly signed by an interested collector of internal revenue. But the fact still remains that the collector of internal revenue in the city of New Orleans or in any other office in the United States is not called upon to determine whether or not there are any tax penalties or whether or not there are any deficiencies until such matters are actually presented to him for actual consummation and collection of the taxes. So in this case Mr. Donnelly could say this about me, or he could say this about anyone, and likewise he could have said it about Al Capone. Had the original tax returns of Al Capone been filed in the city of New Orleans, he could have said that the original tax return filed by Mr. Capone was filed properly and the taxes paid thereon and no penalties were made, notwithstanding the fact that subsequently within that same office, substituting New Orleans for Chicago, tax penalties and fraud penalties thereon were paid. So this statement signed by Mr. Donnelly is not worth the paper it is written on, and is only given for the purpose of subterfuge and to bluff the people of the State of Louisiana into believing that Earl K. Long is a decent, respectable individual.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have refuted completely these arguments and have shown that these documents have been brought in to try to hoodwink me and try to hoodwink the Congress and try to hoodwink the people of the State of Louisiana and have shown that these arguments are completely squelched as not having any bearing upon this case, and cannot be considered in the true light of what the real facts and conditions are.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would remind the gentleman that there are other special orders.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in some difficulty. I just came out of a committee where we are making up an appropriation bill and time is of the essence. I hoped that I could make my statement and then whatever arrangement it is desired to make subsequent will be all right.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I shall be happy to give way at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that following the gentleman from Illinois the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] have special orders.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that he may proceed for 15 additional minutes following the address of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD by having printed an address recently delivered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the thirtieth anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania. It is an occasion celebrated throughout this country not only by our citizens of Lithuanian ancestry but by all freedom-loving Americans. We continue to observe this day for although Lithuania is again under the domination of a foreign power, the United States recognizes the Lithuanian minister and we still consider Lithuania an independent state.

Following the signing of the declaration of independence on February 16, 1918, Lithuania and Soviet Russia signed a peace treaty on July 12, 1920, in which Russia "renounced for all time sovereign rights over the Lithuanian people and their territory," and later, on September 28, 1926, both countries signed a pact agreeing "to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other."

Is it any wonder that Lithuania felt secure in her freedom as a sovereign state? Or that she should direct her plans and energies toward the advancement of peaceful and progressive pursuits? Her efforts during these 20 years were rewarded with remarkable progress in economics, education, agriculture, manufacturing, trade and commerce, national independence and growth. These gains were short-lived, however, for in October 1939 Russia and Germany divided eastern Europe, placing Lithuania in the Russian sphere, and in June 1940 the Russian troops moved in and thus established within her boundaries the usual Nazi-Communist pattern.

Germany and Russia went to war in 1941 and for the next 5 years Lithuania was a continuous battlefield. First the Russian Army marching through the country, then the Nazis drove the Russians out, and then the Russians again drove out the Nazis, the conqueror and vanquished alike leaving behind destruction, chaos, and death. Those Lithuanians who died in battle did not have the glory of going down in defense of their country, but were caught in the cross-fire of two ruthless war machines. When the Germans left in 1944 they left behind a holocaust similar to that left by the Russians when they were driven out in 1941.

Even with the cessation of hostilities, Lithuania, like so many of her neighbors, could not settle down into a peaceful recovery, for under the "protection" of Russia and behind the iron curtain, suffering, fear, and hardship still continue.

The culture, ideals, and language of the 3,000,000 people of Lithuania are far different from the ideologies of Soviet Russia. History has taught that Lithuania will not be absorbed or subdued by invaders or conquerors, for she has always retained her autonomy, in spite of the many times she has won and lost her independence since that first Lithuanian Constitution in 1529.

By joint resolution of the General Assembly of Maryland, passed while I was president of the Senate, this day is officially designated in our State as Lithuanian day.

I join with the many thousands of fine Americans of Lithuanian descent who are numbered among our best citizens in their hope for the reappearance of the life of freedom in the homeland of their ancestors.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in something of a predicament today, and that predicament springs from the fact that I believe one of our colleagues in this House is in jeopardy of political crucifixion and, I think, the destruction of his reputation for both personal and official integrity. Oddly enough, that predicament on his part comes about through a statutory inhibition. He is a Democrat, and, as a Republican it may seem strange on the part of some that I am advocating his cause today; but it is a case of simple justice with me, and it is a case of simple decency. I refer, of course, to the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable JAMES DOMENGEAUX. He openly and in good faith made some charges on the floor of this House that came to my attention. Those were subsequently made in his own State. He waived his constitutional immunity and he is a codefendant in a libel suit in that State for the sum of $1,000,000. In addition thereto, his personal and political integrity is at stake.

The specific charge that was made by the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative DOMENGEAUX, on January 15 before this House was that Earl K. Long, presently a candidate for the governorship of Louisiana, had failed to report a substantial amount of income for tax purposes, and that an assessment and a fraud penalty in excess of $100,000 is now pending against Earl K. Long in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In that statement the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] further alleged that Earl K. Long had requested that the Bureau of Internal Revenue defer action on the case until after the election in that State on February 24.

Inasmuch as proof of the charges is not available to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] because of a statute which prohibits the Bureau from divulging information on income-tax matters except to the taxpayer himself the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] finds himself in a dilemma now.

In setting forth my interest in the matter, first let me make clear that I am not unaware of the danger that is involved in endeavoring to pursue by formal action of this House every charge that may be made on this floor; and, secondly, let me make perfectly clear that I have no personal interest in the election in Louisiana. I do not know the contesting parties; I have never seen them. As a citizen of the United States, and since Louisiana is a part of the great sisterhood of the Union, I only express the hope that they have good government there; but other than that I have not the slightest interest in whom they select, because that is a matter for the people of the State of Louisiana to determine.

Then, too, it is doubtful whether I would have manifested any interest in this matter whatsoever, notwithstanding these charges that have been openly made on the floor of the House if it had not been for the full-page advertisement which appeared in some Louisiana newspapers, and I refer specifically to the Daily Advertiser, of Lafayette, La., which is dated Monday, January 19, 1948. It is a full-page ad, and it sets forth verbatim the libel petition that was filed in the civil district court of New Orleans against the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative DOMENGEAUX, and others, together with certain other statements which are of no immediate interest here. But in the upper left-hand corner of this full-page advertisement, set forth in a box in bold-faced type, there appears this statement. The headline is:

Long owes no tax. Statement of Charles A. Donnelly, United States collector of internal revenue for Louisiana, said he knew of no claim—

No claim—

against Earl K. Long.

So he included everything. There was no claim against Earl K. Long, said the collector. Now, this Mr. Donnelly is a responsible officer of the Bureau of Internal revenue in the Treasury Department who is quoted in a box in boldfaced type in this full-page ad:

I am not supposed to discuss individual income-tax cases. This is a confidential matter. But in justice to Mr. Long I must say that my office is not handling a single matter with reference to Earl K. Long.

Mr. Donnelly was correct. As the collector of internal revenue the matter has not gotten to him. But suppose you were a resident of the State of Louisiana or the city of New Orleans and you read that statement; you could not help but conclude that there was no tax case of any kind or character, anywhere, or any time, pending against a citizen of the State of Louisiana, by the name of Earl K. Long; and it is quite obvious that if any citizen read it he would come to that conclusion.

It is entirely possible that it may have been unwitting on the part of Collector Donnelly that he should be used, and I am sure in good faith, to become something of a political campaign instrument. Above that, however, the important thing to me in support of a resolution that I am asking the Rules Committee to act upon tomorrow—and I had hoped they would today is, that while a statement of the United States collector of internal

revenue is used by one group to make it appear that no tax case is pending against Earl K. Long, a Member of this body from that State is unable under the law to obtain the information with which to supply the proof for his charges. As everyone knows, truth is an answer to libel. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] requested that information from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and very properly—and let me emphasize this—the Commissioner has refused to make it available to him, because that is the law and it would be criminal for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make that disclosure. There is a penalty attached. The revenue code prohibits disclosure except to the taxpayer himself and there are only certain methods by which disclosure is made. One is to the Ways and Means Committee, one is to the Finance Committee of the Senate and one to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

We are right now marking up the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949. There is an estimate before us for $188,000,000 for the Bureau of Internal Revenue for collecting revenue. If the revenue has not been collected, as a member of that committee and as a long-time member of the Appropriations Committee, I am deeply interested officially, personally, and otherwise. I remember when Mr. Morgenthau came before our committee and in a secret session gave us so much testimony that it caused us to appropriate $16,000,000 extra some years ago for a drive on tax evaders in the country.

Here comes a very responsible Member of this Congress and makes a charge on the floor that found its way into 36,000 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was published everywhere in the country. You see, the confidence of the taxpayer, large and small, is involved in this thing. That is why in my official and representative capacity at least I had to take judicial notice of that statement. So a week or 10 days ago for nearly 1½ hours I queried Mr. George Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with respect to this matter behind the closed doors of the subcommittee. Obviously, he said to me, he was not at liberty to testify, which is quite right because the law provides he cannot testify except to the Finance Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

It is a singular thing, perhaps, that the Appropriations Committee through its subcommittees cannot get the Commissioner to testify. We do not have the right to ask him to testify, although when we raised this question as to whether there was any delay in this matter he said he was at liberty to say that there had not been. So by implication he indicated that a file was pending.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I measure my words carefully, and I do it on the basis of a reputation of 16 years here during which time I have carefully safeguarded any statement I have ever made, but I feel in justice I must make it.

The fact is—and I measure these words very carefully—first, an income-tax case is pending in the Bureau of Internal Revenue against one Earl K. Long; second, it is a fact that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and others have knowledge thereof; third, this has been admitted in the testimony of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Treasury Department; fourth, the case in question involves a very substantial sum of money; fifth, the case has been pending for a very considerable period of time; sixth, the case involves fraud.

If these propositions be true—and I am prepared to stake my reputation for veracity that they are true—shall we permit a statement by a United States collector of internal revenue, which is true as far as it goes, but leaves a completely mistaken impression and a mistaken inference, be allowed to stand and so prejudice and jeopardize a Member of this House, or shall the whole truth be disclosed?

Very definitely no case is pending in the office of the collector of internal revenue in New Orleans against one Earl K. Long. The file is in the office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington.

I do not now pass upon other questions which may arise in connection with this matter. I merely say that a case is pending, that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has rightly refused to supply the information to the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative DOMENGEAUX or to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Treasury Department, and that this resolution under which the committee will be empowered to summon all data bearing on this matter is necessary to prevent what I would esteem to be a hideous injustice to a Member of this House.

I must emphasize that over the years the Committee on Appropriations has provided millions of dollars to enforce the revenue laws and to seek out tax evaders. Shall we now permit the cloak of statutory secrecy to stand in the way of an immediate and complete disclosure of all the facts? I am confident from the testimony supplied by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to the Subcommittee on Appropriations that he will be only too glad to cooperate in order that he might have a full opportunity to defend the integrity of the Bureau and to exonerate it from any allegation that it may have been remiss in its duty.

Involved also is the confidence of the public because those charges have been publicly made and have been repeated in many sections of the country. We want the people to know that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is a very forthright and honorable agency of the Government, which seeks to perform its full duty and, therefore, we must untie its hands so that this matter can be fully disclosed.

So, this resolution which I have introduced merely empowers that subcommittee or a special committee to bring all the data on this matter to the committee, so we can make verification of it and make a statement and make sure that a hideous injustice to a Member of this House is not done. I must emphasize that over the years the Committee on Appropriations has provided millions of dollars to enforce the collection of revenue. You see, public confidence is involved here. Suppose the little fellow out in Galena, Mo., where our esteemed colleague, Mr. SHORT lives, or up in Connecticut, where JOHN LODGE lives, or up in New York, where STERLING COLE lives, would pick up that kind of a statement, and he knows he has to make his peace with the collector of internal revenue. Maybe he owes them $100 or $200, and he reads that statement, and he says, "If you can make it a big pile, the chances are you may be able to get away with it." You see, confidence in the Bureau of Internal Revenue is involved here; confidence in the structure of Government is involved, and frankly, you do not dare to bypass this thing because it is too important. I am confident from the statement made to the subcommittee that Mr. George Schoeneman, a man of honor and repute, who is the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, would be glad, for the sake of his own Bureau and for the sake of the Government service that he has served for more than 27 or 28 years, that this matter be brought to light, that the truth be disclosed, that the whole facts be revealed, and that a very honorable gentleman of this House, who enjoys and should enjoy every prerogative and every perquisite of this House ought to have an opportunity to make that proof, if the proof is available, and particularly so since the collector of internal revenue in New Orleans whose political persuasion I know nothing about, has unwittingly permitted himself to be quoted in a paid advertisement that Mr. Long owes no tax and that there is nothing pending in his office. It is an interesting inference, but it does not state the whole truth.

So, as a matter of justice, as a matter of common decency, that young man from Louisiana, who has served with honor in this body for a number of terms, is entitled to have his hands upheld if the truth and if the facts repose somewhere within an agency of Government today. I remind you gentlemen, it could happen to anybody in this House on either side of the aisle, so let us defend and protect one of our own, because he spoke in good faith, and make available the proof of the charges that he made, since such proof can be supplied only by a resolution.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 15 additional minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue the statement I was making when the gentleman from Illinois was recognized for the time previously assigned to him.

I have listened with much interest to the statements of my colleague from Louisiana. He has seen fit to defend Earl K. Long, a candidate for Governor of Louisiana, and he has seen fit to question my reliability and veracity. Of course, that is his privilege. At the same

time I am somewhat puzzled by the views of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], since I know that until very recently he had little or no respect for Earl K. Long. The gentleman from Louisiana, Representative HÉBERT, points with pride in his biography, published in the present Congressional Directory, to his part in breaking the Louisiana scandal that involved this same Earl K. Long and led to wholesale convictions of many of Long's associates.

The biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory with reference to the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative HÉBERT, states that he was—and I quote:

> City editor of the New Orleans States, which broke the Louisiana scandal on June 9, 1939, and which paper was subsequently awarded the Sigma Delta Chi plaque for "courage in journalism."

The present activity of my colleague, in rising to the defense of Earl K. Long, is so laudable and praiseworthy, and motivated, I am sure, by his devotion to Louisiana and the advancement of her people, that it should put him in line for consideration for another citation—that of courage in politics.

This, however, is all beside the point. I do not think Congress is interested in details of the Louisiana political campaign or in any views which either the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative HÉBERT, or I might hold in this connection. On January 15 I made charges on the floor of the House of Representatives and later publicly in Louisiana, to the effect that there was pending against Earl K. Long a fraud case by the Bureau of Internal Revenue because of his failure to report properly his income and to pay the tax due thereon. I stated further that Earl K. Long had requested the Bureau of Internal Revenue to delay action in this case until after the gubernatorial election in Louisiana. I also charged that the bulk of the income that was not properly reported consisted of funds Earl K. Long derived from ill-gotten sources while he was Lieutenant Governor and Governor of Louisiana from 1936 to 1940. Furthermore I stated that the Bureau of Internal Revenue had not exercised due diligence in collecting the tax and fraud penalties due on the unreported income.

After I made the charges I was accused of seeking congressional immunity despite the fact that I immediately repeated these charges in Louisiana where I did not enjoy congressional immunity. I wish to stress at this time that I made the charges in Washington originally because the information was available here in the Nation's Capital and I felt that the matter was of such importance that I was not justified in withholding the information from the citizens of Louisiana for one moment after I had established to my own satisfaction the authenticity of these charges. There was no element of timing involved. It was merely a coincidence that the information came to me only a few days before the first primary election in Louisiana. Had I received this information 2 or 4 or 6 months before, I would have made the charges then.

There is only one issue involved here and that is the truth or falsity of my charges. This is a matter that is properly the concern of the Congress of the United States because Federal laws and a Federal agency are involved. It is our duty, as Members of Congress, to see that the laws are properly executed, and that prompt and complete collection of revenue is effected. If I had any doubt about the truth of the charges I made I would not have followed the course I have taken since making these charges, because I have sought and am seeking to bring to light the documentary evidence which will verify what I have said.

Speech-making and unsupported statements cannot change the facts. The record is made and it is here in Washington. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has admitted the investigation. He has said that he could not see the interdepartmental files. He has produced only letters from Long. He admits that a claim is pending. He seeks to talk away the amounts involved by saying they were political contributions. This is no defense. He makes the typical defense—no records available. Most taxpayers charged with fraud make this same defense. All of you keep political funds separate, and none of you have any difficulties. What a convenient alibi.

To show you how diligent I have worked to make the facts known, and to show you how confident I am about the truth of my accusations, let me tell you what I have done since making the charges.

The Internal Revenue Code, title 26, section 55, United States Code, provides that income-tax data can be opened to inspection only by the Ways and Means Committee of the House or the Finance Committee of the Senate, or by a select committee of the House or Senate authorized by resolution of either body. On the same day I made the charges against Earl K. Long I was told by the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative KNUTSON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, that since the matter was one of much importance to the citizens of Louisiana and since my charges reflected on the diligence of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, he would cooperate with me in securing the necessary information. It so happened, however, that at that time and for several subsequent days the Ways and Means Committee was engaged in handling the tax bill and following that the chairman was called away from Washington, all of which delayed action by the committee in connection with my charges.

The matter was also brought to the attention of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee that handles appropriations for the Treasury Department. This subcommittee requested of Mr. George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, while he was before the subcommittee, that he offer the income-tax file of Earl K. Long for inspection by the members. This he refused to do, and he likewise refused to answer any questions pertaining to the file, on the grounds that he was prohibited by law from making such disclosures.

These developments led to the introduction of House Resolution 462 by the gentleman from Illinois, Representative DIRKSEN, which measure is now before the Rules Committee for consideration. This resolution provides for appointment of a select committee to make an investigation into this income-tax matter, which is the only course that can be followed under the law and the prevailing circumstances.

I wish to emphasize that the facts can be brought to light only by producing the record and the whole record, including the interdepartmental file, which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has not seen. The political speech of my colleague cannot alter one word or one figure or one point of the true facts. These facts will be made known; that you may be sure of.

My colleague reflects on the source of my information. Of course, he does not know this source, so his statement in that connection is of no consequence. On the other hand, we might consider the character, conduct, and reputation of the person upon whom my colleague relies for his information, no other than Earl K. Long himself, a person who defamed his own brother, his benefactor, before a senatorial investigating committee in the city of New Orleans, when he charged the late Governor and Senator Huey P. Long with receiving large sums of graft money from corporations; a person who evaded military service during World War I by means of false representation of dependency of a sick sister then living in Colorado; a person who while Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana in 1937 swindled the State out of $10,000 from a State agency for alleged services rendered, when in fact he rendered no such services, and when confronted with the charge, stated he had given the money to the widow of Huey P. Long; incidentally, she denied it; a person who received from Robert S. Maestri, former conservation commissioner of Louisiana and mayor of New Orleans, a magnificent farm property in Winn Parish, La., conservatively worth $60,000, for which Long paid only $3,000; Long refused to divulge the records of the State conservation department, which would have disclosed the enormous "hot oil" operations of the said Robert S. Maestri; the same person who when he became Governor of Louisiana for a period of 11 months after the resignation in 1939 of Gov. Richard W. Leche, used the powers of his great office to protect those guilty of plundering the State; the same person who contributed to the politicization of Louisiana's schools and courts; the same person who encouraged and personally benefited from the nefarious practice of the so-called deduct system or forced contributions from hard-working and underpaid State employees; the same person whom Elmer Irey, former Chief of the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, charged received over $46,000 from these funds; the same person who deprived the people of Louisiana of free elections; the same person who perpetrated political dictatorship; the same person who debauched public morality in Louisiana and established the philosophy and theory of government whereby it was considered

smart and fashionable to steal public funds; the same person who blackmailed business interests into supporting him or remaining silent for fear of retribution in the form of increased tax assessments; all of these charges were made by me and documented. This is the same person that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana is largely depending on for the truthfulness of the statements he is now making.

Even assuming—and this is the broadest expression of mere assumption—that what my colleague has said is true, he has admitted there are fraud claims pending against Earl K. Long. This alone should be sufficient. Fraud is not a matter of amount. The crime is in the willful intent to deceive and to defraud. Earl K. Long is guilty of this by the words of his defender and even in his own words uttered on every stump in Louisiana since I made my charges. It must be noted that prior to my making these charges, Mr. Long had never seen fit to tell the people of Louisiana that there was a fraud charge against him. On the other hand, his greatest claim for support has been that he has been investigated and reinvestigated—which is in itself a rather dubious distinction—and that nothing wrong has ever been discovered. Apparently Mr. Long, in his public discussions, has neglected to refer to this particular discovery of wrong.

At this time I wish to reaffirm my charges against Mr. Long. I made these charges upon unimpeachable information as the record will disclose when it is revealed. I now state that this information will be found in the files of the technical staff, the files of the intelligence unit, and in correspondence between the special agent in charge of the Dallas, Tex., division office and the Chief of the Intelligence Unit, Mr. Woiff, of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington.

It is most important to note that none of the above files or data was seen by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

My colleague from Louisiana, even though he has indicated he will vote for the pending resolution, nevertheless endeavors to establish in the minds of Members of Congress that this is a matter involving only politics in Louisiana and is something in which Congress has no concern. I wish to remind him that it was he who helped to bring the Federal authority into Louisiana to clean up the State; and I may suggest to him that his present activities in defense of Mr. Long will, in the event of Mr. Long's election, in my opinion, return the same vicious philosophy and practices of government my colleague helped to destroy in 1939.

The House of Representatives is acting properly when it agrees to consider the charges I made against Mr. Long. The people of Louisiana are entitled to know the truth or falsity of these charges before they vote for governor on February 24. But above all, the House is justified in taking this action because the charges have been made by a Member of this body to the effect that the Bureau of Internal Revenue, an agency of this Government and a creature of Congress, has not been diligent in the collection of moneys due the Government.

The ridiculous figures produced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] showing the amount of tax paid by Mr. Long are not an answer. They prove nothing. I challenge the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] to produce, not the amount of tax paid wherein the fraud lies, but the income figures, even as admitted by Mr. Long.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of this House enjoyed the political speech of my good friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]. That is the same speech that has been made in Louisiana for years and years and years. Whether the people of Louisiana want Earl Long or not is up to them; not up to me. I just could not let it go by at this time without offering some little observation on what has been said. Let me say this, however, that I agree with the gentleman from Illinios [Mr. DIRKSEN] in that the truth shall be the best answer. I welcome that. I shall vote for his resolution, because that is what I want. I am merely expediting it by giving you the facts today, a little ahead of time. His committee will find out the same thing. We welcome that opportunity. I am in full agreement with him that the truth shall be known, but I believe, far more important than Members of this House hanging together to protect themselves, is the fact that the individual citizen outside of this body, who does not have the floor of this House under the cloak of congressional immunity, shall be protected, no matter how small that citizen may be.

When a Member can come to this floor and make charges without documentary evidence, then I think it is about time to change the rules of the House.

Comment was made about my opinion of Mr. Long and my association with Mr. Long in the past. Yes. I told you I did everything I could to get something on him, but I could not. But I do not want to see an innocent man condemned. I agree with Jefferson, that it is better that 99 guilty escape than that 1 innocent man be hanged. I do not want to condemn anybody who should not be condemned.

Now he wonders at my change of opinion. You heard my good friend from Louisiana stand on this floor and denounce, within the rules of this House, the gentleman from the Sixth District of Louisiana. Oh, you all remember that. That happened just a few weeks ago. Other Members of the delegation took the floor, also. I did not. You remember what they said about him. You remember he was a candidate for governor, and you remember what a terrible man he was. Do you know where that gentleman is today? Do you know where he is today? He is on the platform in Louisiana with Sam Jones, unashamedly, making political love to him day and night and sleeping in the same political bed with my colleague from Louisiana. Oh, do not throw stones at a house. You might get a brick.

Now, referring to this statement by Mr. Donnelly. Do not get the impression that Mr. Donnelly volunteered that statement that appeared in this page ad. Do not get that impression. A newspaper reporter went to Mr. Donnelly after the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] had made his charges and asked him the question, thinking they would get something on him; and instead of that they got a statement of facts. Naturally, the people on the Long side published it. I want to say right now, and repeat what my friend has just now said, that I relied on Mr. Earl Long's word. I do not rely on Earl Long's word. I rely on the Bureau of Internal Revenue records that he, himself, relies on. He criticized me for putting forth the statement of the man Bates, without substantiation. I do not ask you to accept that figure. I showed you what happened. Then I showed you Form 870, where the figures were identical. I do not come here making unsupported and unsubstantiated statements. He has told you about the red writing on these records. Oh, how did my friend get to see those records? I could not see them with authority from Long. Was he legally shown the records? He tells you how they looked. He describes them. I think he should take us into his confidence and let us know who is running things down there. Perhaps Mr. DIRKSEN's committee would like to know that; they would like to know who is giving out information and why. Let me tell you, there are two things which the gentleman cannot escape. Read tomorrow in the RECORD what he said here on the floor today, and you will see where he did not repeat those two charges. You will see where he did not say: "I charge Earl Long with an assessment of $100,000. I charge Earl Long with admitting guilt of fraud." You will not see that in the RECORD. He has backed up because I have produced the proof here, the documentary proof. Throw everything else out of the window, forget the speech he has made and look yourself, and you will see the two charges he made are refuted by the documents themselves. And I say to him also: By the truth ye shall be known.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 23, 1948, after the reading of the Journal, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House just made, the Chair designates the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 23, 1948.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MALONEY and Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I read a telegram which I received this morning from an oil and coal dealer in Pittsfield, Mass., in which he explained his difficulties in not being able to get any more oil after the 18th of this month, leaving all of his customers for the balance of the month without necessary fuel. In his telegram he asked me to advise what I could do to divert fuel oil to them. I also referred to a telegram I received Saturday afternoon over the signature of Mr. David Bruce, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, containing 501 words, but which boiled down to saying simply: "No, we cannot and we will not do anything about this export program."

There was one glimmer of hope in Mr. Bruce's telegram. He also advised me that on February 6 the Department had sent word to all the American missions in the various countries asking for current advice as to the petroleum requirements. Mr. Bruce said the answers to these requests were coming in by cable. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, this morning admitted that cables had been arriving but he did not know what their contents were. Mr. Bruce did not indicate what any of these replies contained. I thereupon urged by telegram that action should be taken on the individual countries' allotments as rapidly as the cables arrived. I also want to suggest that in fairness to the American people, the Members of this Congress and the committee that has devoted so much time to this problem, that there also should be full and prompt publicity on the information these missions submit in terms of their studies. If this is not done by Tuesday or Wednesday, it seems to me perfectly proper and that the situation calls for Congress to consider at once the necessity of congressional action.

We are confronted now with the simple fact that the Secretary of Commerce who has the power—and who has used that power twice within a month and a half—to reduce and, in fact, embargo exports of petroleum products will not do so. In the interest of the American people, in the interest of our economy, in the interest of full production in this country, and in the interest of national security, I submit that it is necessary for us to accept the full responsibility of placing such restrictions as we deem wise upon these exports of vitally needed fuel oil which are daily going out of this country in terms not of hundreds but of thousands of barrels. I have received data as to export licenses granted for the export of aviation gas, motor gas, kerosene, gas oil, distillate fuel oil, and residual fuel oil from January 1 to February 11. I have added them up in terms of gallons, because so often people hear talk about barrels and they do not know what quantity a barrel contains, but they do know what a gallon means.

To my amazement, our Government has licensed for export in only that 42-day period 270,958,778 gallons of this desperately needed fuel oil. That is more, on the figures for 1946, than was consumed in the individual States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. It falls just slightly short of the total amount consumed in Massachusetts.

Let us look at it in another way. This morning, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, Mr. Krug, in response to a question I asked, said that we would undoubtedly have a gasoline shortage in this country next summer. He added that we probably will have another fuel-oil shortage next winter. Then he concluded by saying that we would have a gasoline shortage the following summer. We could not get him to state when the end of shortages would come.

Yesterday I made an estimate on the basis only of motor gasoline, mind you, that we have licensed to go out of this country. Most of it, I assume, has already gone and is irretrievably lost. Remember that figure of ninety-nine-million-odd. That is not for the full quarter. But let us be conservative about it. I multiplied that by four and came up with a figure for the full calendar year of an export of 396,000,000 gallons.

What does that mean in terms of State consumption? There are 24 States that consumed approximately that amount, not in 1 month but in the full calendar year. They ranged from a list of seven where the excess of exports will be more than what that State consumed and on the basis of the figures of consumption, the excess of exports will range from 3,000,000 gallons to 91,000,000 gallons. There are three other States where the range of excess is from 23,000,000 to 168,000,000. There are 10 where the excess is 198,000,000 to 293,000,000. It is a curious thing that that amount of exports would total the annual consumption in the State of South Dakota. With reference to the balance, in four of them the excess ranges from 302,000,000 to 337,000,000. In the other 24 States it runs from one-tenth to a half of that amount consumed there every year.

Mr. Speaker, those are facts we have to take into consideration. They are facts that are going to mean something. If we run into a gasoline shortage we are going to be asked why we did not do something about it. I suggest one thing we can do is to take the responsibility now of insisting legislatively that there shall be some type of embargo no later than the end of this week, and then we will measure the results of that against the doubts that some people have as to effects on the economies of other countries.

I have no doubt about what would have happened in Tahiti if they had not gotten that 1,260 barrels going to them in terms of a license issued by the Department of Commerce. They would not have been able to use their lanterns and their lights quite so long, they perhaps would not have been able to make a certain amount of copra, but they would not be cold, they would not become ill, and they would not be out of work. The same thing holds true with the 7,500 barrels of gas oil and distillate fuel oil going under license to the Fiji Islands in this same period.

Mr. Speaker, because I am deeply convinced that, not only in terms of the immediate future but in terms of the long-range problem, this Congress must address itself to the question of how we are going to handle this problem, I have today introduced a resolution, H. R. 5392, for the purpose of creating a National Petroleum Commission. Basically it follows the pattern of the Interstate Commerce Act creating the Interstate Commerce Commission. It provides for a separate agency. It does not exclude natural gas or any other type of petroleum products now being controlled by any other agency. It places full responsibility in that commission. I am not wedded to that as a single idea of how we are going to meet this challenge and discharge our responsibilities. I have done this reluctantly because I think industry has done a magnificent job. But they have not done enough, and they know that themselves. These charges are being made in their own trade papers. The more progressive and more realistic in the industry recognize it. The late Clyde Morrow stated emphatically in an editorial printed in the National Petroleum News that they must rise to this challenge. I say they must rise to it this week and not next summer and not next winter. I think the time has come for them to speak up as to how they are going to do this job, to tell the Congress what they have done, what they have not done, how they expect to close this gap and whether they, in fact, can close it. I think that is important for us to know. Too many may be engaged in exporting and too many may be selling this oil overseas for the dollar value that is involved in contrast to the dollar value on our east coast. I say the challenge is definitely laid on their doorsteps this afternoon, and unless they come up immediately—and by "immediately" I mean by the end of this week—with some concrete suggestions which will be accepted by the Members of Congress and which can be explained to these people who are dependent upon us, as this gentleman who wired me is, to do something for them, then I say they have to accept the yoke of some type of regulation. I know of nothing better than a full-time expert commission with full responsibility which can take charge of what is going on in all phases of the industry from production through refining, distribution and marketing. It is not something any single Member can do. It is not something any single committee can do. We have our other responsibilities. But, what we are dealing with is the heart blood of our American economy, and in my opinion it is the greatest single factor, aside from manpower, in the whole over-all problem of our national security.

Your people and my people have been very tolerant, but they are not going to put up much longer with these shortages and these high prices without something in the nature of a satisfactory explanation. If that explanation is not forthcoming during the assigned hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Tuesday,

Wednesday, and Thursday of this week, I am going to do my level best to get this bill which has been referred to that committee reported favorably and to get the other resolution reported favorably to stop this leakage of desperately needed oils to such places as Tahiti and the Fiji Islands and Cuba and Mexico and other places fortunate today in having a reasonably warm climate, in favor of these people in our own communities who have been suffering, are suffering, and will suffer unless we have the courage and willingness to do the job ourselves.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that the resolution which I introduced, H. R. 385, which passed out of the gentleman's committee, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, provides that the Secretary of the Interior be requested to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession concerning the amount of fuel oil, gasoline, petroleum products, and coal now available in the United States, and what steps the Government should take to make the proper and necessary supply available. I gather, because the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce passed that out, that they feel that the Secretary of the Interior is unable, for one reason or another, or else will not make available the amount of coal and oil there is in the country today. It seems to me it is a very curious situation. Of course now, since it has the authorization of the Congress, I should think he would act.

Mr. HESELTON. I may be mistaken as to what actually happened, but the Secretary was before the committee this morning. He addressed himself primarily to the problem of synthetic oil. He was questioned, however, on a great many subjects, including the problem of exports, the Department having one vote in the Review Committee, which has the final word on what the export quota shall be. I was called from the committee hearing for a matter of half an hour, and whether or not he made any reference to it I just cannot say at this time. I do know that the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and State have furnished a volume of information. Unfortunately, it is the sort of thing that bewilders you rather than explains anything, I think. I just have not been able to get what I need out of it. I am sure the committee would be glad to have the gentlewoman look it over and see if she can find something of value.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When I appeared before the committee I heard some of the testimony by the experts, the heads of the different departments. I felt that they were shadow-boxing, they were not giving the information they had, and I could not understand it.

Mr. HESELTON. I wish I had with me the telegram to which I referred. I will put it in the RECORD. If that is not an example of "off again, on again, gone again, Finnegan," I never saw one. They say, "We went to the minimum in January, we have gone below the minimum now, and we cannot and will not go any further. But we are getting this information now from these countries and we will review it." What are they getting it for? For the purpose of proving they were right in the first or second instance, or did they tell these countries what the situation is here?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is amazing that they have to go to those countries to find out what those countries are receiving from the United States.

Mr. HESELTON. There is more than that that is amazing in this thing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a very mysterious, phoney sort of thing.

I know the gentleman has done a great deal of work on this subject.

Mr. HESELTON. The parliamentary procedure here sort of cramps my style, and I am talking to a lady, so I cannot express myself as emphatically as I have to them, but I assure the gentlewoman they know that I think it is plain ignorance of facts, combined with stupid stubbornness, from start to finish. That should be plain as a pikestaff to anyone who can read English and understands figures. It does not require an expert to understand that a barrel of fuel oil shipped overseas is a barrel less here.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What chance is there of a resolution declaring an embargo coming out of the committee? I know the gentleman has one and I had one. I suggested the President issue an embargo in December.

Mr. HESELTON. I want my colleagues to vote that resolution out, and I hope we shall act between now and Friday afternoon so that we can get it on the floor next week. I have only one vote on the committee, but I think I have some substantial support. The interesting thing, of course, is that in the face of the unanimous committee recommendation made on January 26 that they should stop these shipments until we knew where we were at; they cannot tell us where we are at. They do not know. The Secretary admitted this morning that he did not know what the situation was in many of these countries, or even if they are rationing end use in them. Who does know? It is their job to find out, it seems to me. More than that, it is their job to tell us, so we can tell the American people. The American people expect that of us, at the very least.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Apparently they expect the information to come from the back doors of the various embassies in the foreign countries, or the countries themselves.

Mr. HESELTON. I have no knowledge that they have screened a single request. The most remarkably stupid thing was that set-up they had of 1,600,000 to Japan and the Ryukyus, and then they came down to 100,000. If they were so wrong in first instance they may be wrong in both.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. How does the gentleman explain the fact that President Truman has not issued an embargo on petroleum products as he did in connection with coal?

Mr. HESELTON. The only thing I can say is that when I wired the President on February 10, Mr. Connelly's letter to me advised that the matter had been referred to the Secretary of Commerce. The law we enacted calls for the Secretary of Commerce to exercise those controls. It also has a provision in it that requires the Secretary to certify that we are not injuring our domestic economy when he grants these licenses. So far as I know, there has not been a single case where that certification has been issued. How that can be acceptable to the Department of Commerce, in view of the fact that in the great State of Michigan there are still 200,000 people out of work, in view of the shortage of fuel which resulted in the shut-down in the Pittsburgh area, and in view of what is going on in our area, is just beyond my comprehension.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I took the matter up on December 4. The situation was bad then. If the Secretary of Commerce had declared the embargo, then there would have been no suffering or no work stoppage.

Mr. HESELTON. I hope the gentlewoman will keep up her work.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What we want is action, not talk.

Mr. HESELTON. You are quite right. We are exasperated, which may keep us warm but it will not warm homes in New England. Since we know that the Department of Commerce is satisfied with its decision not to do anything more, I assume the President will not order it to act. Therefore, the only source of action is the Congress. We have been more than patient. No satisfactory reasons have been advanced for this decision. We know that every day we delay now means a further loss of thousands of barrels. I realize we will have no important legislation on the floor this week but I hope we will be in a position to act next week. And that will give the Department another chance to follow the committee's recommendation. But, if it remains defiant, if it ignores the recommendation, I think we should—we must—legislate. Personally, I am now inclined to favor House Joint Resolution 317 as the fairest approach toward limitations in terms of historical users and the demonstrated critical situation here. While I understand that Ambassador Douglas left for England today, I am grateful for his endorsement of the base period set forth in the resolution and I have every confidence that he will express his opinion as to the desirability of some such legislation as soon as he has time to study the pending proposals. It is entirely characteristic of his honesty and ability that he should have commended the action of the Foreign Relations Committee on the ERP program in the face of the ill-judged and ill-considered demands from some quarters that Congress pass the bill as submitted to it, without crippling amendments. Congress has a responsibility in all these matters and I do not think it is going to evade it, just because the Department of Commerce thinks under some further limitation it might be just possible that to divert 1 gallon of kerosene from Tahiti to Massachusetts or 1 barrel of distillate from the Fiji Islands to Detroit will wreck the economies of those countries or just because such balder-

dash is echoed by one or two editorial writers or three or four columnists, well-known to be friendly stooges for some of the rule-or-ruin circles in some quarters downtown. I have located a bit of interesting information about our friends in Tahiti. They number 8,585. Pittsfield numbers 26,652. Tahitians got about nine-tenths of a barrel of fuel oil per capita from this shipment—about thirty-seven and eight-tenths gallons. That should light a lot of lights. Wednesday night a considerable number of people among Pittsfield's 26,652 face the prospect of 11 days of unheated homes.

I do not think that makes any more sense to you than it does to me. I sometimes wonder if some people really believe they can kid us up here indefinitely. One thing is clear—they are engaged in a desperate gamble. I suppose they hope, as we do, that the weather will become warmer here soon and that people will soon forget that they were made cold and sick and jobless by this piece of supremely arrogant indifference to their comfort and welfare. What the excuse will be when we go short of gasoline this summer I cannot guess. I think we might look into the exports of motor gas and also of eight-cylinder automobiles Americans cannot buy; the exports of Diesel engines, of oil-burning units, of oil-burning tractors. I certainly intend to have for you soon the full story of our exports to Russia, under this program, including that cargo of transformer oil last January which Under Secretary Foster said must have taken place last summer. But the more driblets of information we blast out of hiding, the more convinced I am that we need a full-time expert group checking every phase of the problem, as I have advocated in H. R. 5392.

It might not be a bad idea for the Department of Commerce to adopt a catchy slogan like "Millions of gallons for everyone else but not one drop for you." Then they could answer all our correspondence, as well as that of our constituents, inexpensively, by printing it on several million letterheads, with a short typed body such as "Dear Congressman: See our slogan. Please shut up."

Speaking for myself alone, I do not intend to stop talking, even though we need fuel oil, not oratory, until I find a program has been adopted which is logical and sensible, which is demonstrably one which has been carefully prepared based on known facts here and elsewhere, and which can be explained and will satisfy intelligent Americans who are demanding that we act now. This evasive, buck-passing, hesitating performance here, running back to last December is one no one can explain to date, no one has even attempted to do so except in terms of expressing personal conclusions and generalities unsupported by a scintilla of evidence.

I cannot help but wonder how so intelligent a person as the Secretary of Commerce can come before committees of this Congress advocating the creation of additional stand-by controls in the face of the actual facts of the use of existing export controls.

I include here a copy of my original telegram of February 10 to Secretary Harriman, a copy of the telegram from David Bruce, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, a copy of my reply to him, and a copy of the bill I introduced today, which has been numbered H. R. 5392 and which has been referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 10, 1948.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. HARRIMAN,
Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:

After careful consideration of the release today by the Office of International Trade, I have urged the President to authorize you to order the Office of International Trade to send a cable immediately, such as the following, to the Governments of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, British Honduras, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, Netherlands, British West Africa, Switzerland, and French West Africa, "Because petroleum products are in critical short supply in this country and because we must insure that supplies in our shortage areas are substantially increased immediately, and because we may find it necessary to extend the existing restrictions beyond March 31 unless we can readjust the situation in this country promptly, we regret to advise you that we believe, in the interest of continuing production in this country, maintaining transportation, and public utilities, keeping our schools and hospitals and churches and other institutions and individual homes heated to a minimum degree, and in the interests of being able to assist your Government and your people, as the American people hope to do, we must ask you to accept a 50-percent reduction in the allocations to your country as announced by this Department on February 9, effective immediately." I strongly urge that you order the proper authorities in the War Department to immediately reduce the allotment to Japan and the Ryukus by the same percentage. I further urge that immediate consideration be given to the shipment of motor fuel oil to the above countries adding Brazil, Italy, and Paraguay. I do this because of the current reports that we are faced with a motor-gas shortage next summer which will be disastrous, not only to the farmers in many areas, including the First District of Massachusetts, but to the people dependent upon essential travel by automobile for entire annual income. Finally, I urge that the entire item of reserve be made available for shortage areas at once, specifically 399,000 barrels of other motor fuel, 147,000 barrels kerosene, 353,500 barrels gas oil and distillate fuel oil, and 151,000 barrels residual fuel oil, a total of 1,050,000 barrels of petroleum products. I hope to have an official report as to the daily amount of these needed oils which were shipped from the Gulf coast during the month of January and the first 10 days of February, which I know you will consider. Obviously, we shall be losing very substantial amounts daily unless you direct this action at once. Since existing law gives you full authority, as you testified before the Banking and Currency Committee last fall, I hope you will anticipate the gravity of this request by myself to the President.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C.,
February 14, 1948.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

In reply to your telegrams of February 10 to Secretary Harriman and Blaisdell, I should like to give you the following information:

(1) Your suggestion that cables be sent to various governments represents an accomplished fact since cables went to American missions in all of these countries on February 6 requesting latest information regarding petroleum requirements in those countries and replies are now being received.

(2) The reduction announced on February 10 in quotas which had been previously established was based on our information regarding requirements of these countries on the basis of their present uses of petroleum products and after new consultations with the representatives of these governments in Washington. Our original allotments represented in our opinion the minimum amounts needed by these countries from the United States to maintain an already meager standard of petroleum use, and the reduction above mentioned represents a substantial reduction from that minimum.

(3) In view of known restrictions in the major consuming countries which limit use of petroleum products to highly essential uses and in view of further fact no limitation exists on uses of petroleum in United States for non-essential purposes, it is our conviction that we have already reduced total exports as far as is justified by the facts now available and that further reductions in supplies made available for export would affect adversely our relations with other countries, and accentuate serious economic conditions. However, we are reviewing all allocations again in light of current information being received by cable as indicated above.

(4) With regard to further limitations on shipment of motor fuels our present judgment is that further reductions would not add sufficiently to United States reserves to make material difference in the availability of these fuels in the United States during the coming season of high motor fuel use. However, this matter also is under review in light of effects on world distribution and on our own petroleum imports.

(5) The licensing reserve to which you refer is not a physical reserve of petroleum awaiting export, but is part of the over-all quota against which licenses may be issued if emergency needs develop. We have no power to direct petroleum products into any shortage area in the United States. The recipient of a license must find United States supplies which a domestic purchaser could have bought at any time without restriction. We shall continue to hold licensing to a minimum, but the elimination of the reserve from the quota would not channel any petroleum to any essential use in the United States.

(6) There is no assurance that a curtailment in exports of these petroleum products under discussion would be reflected in an increase in the supply of such products to regions in the United States where acute shortages of them now exist. There are no licensed exports of these products from east coast ports.

(7) We have submitted to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee data regarding licensing by ports including gulf ports from January 1 through February 11.

DAVID BRUCE,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 14, 1948.*

DAVID BRUCE,
Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:

I acknowledge, with appreciation, your telegram this date. Am very happy to learn cables have been sent and replies are now being received. Hope this will enable Department to announce further revision first of week. May I take liberty of suggesting wherever possibility of such revision is indicated, prompt action be taken without delaying until entire report is received. I urge this because of obvious daily loss of vital

products through the export program. Am sure you will understand I cannot agree with general conclusions you have expressed. Certainly cannot reconcile them with fact Department has placed 100-percent embargo on exportation of three types of fuel oil to six countries, nor am I impressed with statement that original allotments represented minimum amounts needed in these countries, in view of fact original allotment of 1,600,000 barrels of gas oil and distillate fuel oil was reduced to 100,000 barrels to Japan and the Ryukyus. Would appreciate your specific comment on how you reconcile it. Finally, with reference to your statement that a recipient of a license must find United States supplies which a domestic purchaser could have bought at any time without restriction, in view of constant reports that it is more profitable to sell overseas than domestically, is it not clear that the profit motive makes it possible for holders of licenses to outbid the prospective domestic purchaser? I shall be anxious to discuss these and many other questions with you Tuesday morning. However, in absence of further affirmative action along the lines I have suggested by middle of next week, I shall feel compelled to urge House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to accept this as a final refusal to further restrict exports in the interests of admittedly acute shortages in this country and to report out the legislative prohibitions contained in House Joint Resolution 317.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

H. R. 5392

A bill to create a National Petroleum Commission, and for other purposes

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "National Petroleum Commission Act."

NATIONAL PETROLEUM COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created, as an independent agency in the executive branch, a National Petroleum Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of 11 commissioners appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than six of such commissioners shall be members of the same political party. Six commissioners shall constitute a quorum of the Commission. The President shall designate the commissioner who shall serve as chairman of the Commission.

(b) The term of office of each commissioner shall be 7 years, except that (1) the terms of office of the commissioners first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 4 years, three at the end of 5 years, three at the end of 6 years, and two at the end of 7 years, after the date of the enactment of this act; (2) any commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (3) upon the expiration of his term of office a commissioner shall continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(c) Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office and for no other cause.

(d) Each commissioner shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum. No commissioner shall engage in any business, vocation, or employment other than that of serving as a commissioner.

(e) The Commission is authorized to appoint such employees as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Commission may exercise its powers at any place.

FUNCTIONS AND POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission is hereby authorized, by regulations, to prescribe such prohibitions and requirements with respect to the production, refining, distribution, and sale of petroleum and petroleum products (including natural gas) as it deems necessary for the protection of the national security and economy.

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Commission all functions now possessed by any agency of the Government with respect to the regulation of the transportation or sale of petroleum or petroleum products (including natural gas).

(c) For the purposes of the exercise of any function transferred to it by subsection (b), the Commission shall have all the powers possessed, under existing law, by the agency from which such function is transferred, and for such purposes the provisions of law (including penalty provisions) relating to such function and powers shall be applicable.

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF REGULATIONS

SEC. 4. Whoever violates any regulation prescribed by the Commission under section 3 (a) shall upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

ORDERS, REGULATIONS, ETC.; TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL, PROPERTY, AND UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, authorizations, or other actions made, issued, granted or taken in the exercise of any function transferred by section 3 (b), and in effect at the time of such transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not been made, until modified, superseded, or repealed by the Commission.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any agency shall abate by reason of the transfer of any function by this act, but the court, unless it determines that the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding is not necessary for the settlement of the questions involved, shall allow the same to be maintained, with such substitutions as to parties as are appropriate.

(c) No administrative action or proceeding lawfully commenced shall abate solely by reason of the transfer of any function by this act, but such action or proceeding shall be continued with such substitutions as to parties as are appropriate.

(d) In each case of the transfer of any function, by this act, from any agency to the Commission, there are hereby transferred to the Commission such personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations of such agency as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to relate primarily to the function so transferred.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

NEXT PRESIDENT TO BE FROM MIDWEST

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the next President of the United States will be a man from the Midwest.

I do not venture to predict who he will be other than to say he will be a Republican.

It is heartening, indeed, for a Midwesterner to read the newspapers and see how the Nation keeps turning its eyes for leadership to our territory.

The pioneering spirit of the Midwest, no doubt, has a great deal to do with it. The Nation is looking for a strong man for leadership, a man of conviction, in these trying times.

We have seen the Republican Party particularly looking to the Midwest to find such a man. We have seen much favorable comment about the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. We have heard considerable talk about the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. In my State, we have heard much about the capable Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Even Governor Dewey, of New York, is a native of Michigan. The latest addition to the Midwest roll of honored names—men of influence and ability— is that of Harold E. Stassen, the former Governor of Minnesota.

The latest Gallup poll reveals how popular the men of the Middle West really are. This poll shows that Stassen, who made a popular, efficient governor in our neighbor State, ranks a close second to President Truman in the Presidential election.

Discounting the Democratic South, Stassen actually surpasses the President in national popularity.

The results are surprising. I believe they are important enough to become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because we in Wisconsin are proud of the statesmen the Midwest has offered the country in time of need.

The national results of the Gallup poll are as follows:

	Percent
Truman	45
Stassen	41
Wallace	6
No opinion	6

Take out the South, traditionally Democratic, the results are:

	Percent
Stassen	44
Truman	42
Wallace	7
No opinion	7

Mr. George Gallup states that only Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was stronger in the trial heats with President Truman than Mr. Stassen. He is to be complimented for his fine showing, and I hope he fully appreciates the high regard with which the American people apparently hold him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered before the Kansas Republican Women's Convention in Topeka, made by my predecessor, Hon. Jessie Sumner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time because I thought perhaps I might be drawn into the political debate between my colleagues from Louisiana with reference to the Louisiana political situation. But in view of the fact that my name was not mentioned, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1583. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituted a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Public Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 648. An act for relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Riyoko Patell;

H. R. 1078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of August W. Dietz;

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy Park Farrow;

H. R. 3168. An act for the relief of Antone G. Pina;

H. R. 3503. An act to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25); and

H. R. 4115. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 17, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1303. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting a copy of the Thirteenth Annual Report to Congress of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1304. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Social Security Administration, for the fiscal year 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1305. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $300,000 for the legislative branch, Senate (H. Doc. No. 528); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3692. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to ownership or stock interest in freight forwarders; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GILLETTE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4112. A bill to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the national weather service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 1377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 5390. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5391. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 5392. A bill to create a National Petroleum Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 5393. A bill to amend further sections 10 and 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended (37 U. S. C. 110 and 112), relating to allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 5394. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain unenforceable judgments on the records of the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. R. 5395. A bill to establish a national memorial museum to Wilbur and Orville Wright at Oakwood, Dayton, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 5396. A bill for the protection of homing or racing pigeons; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DEVITT (by request):

H. R. 5397. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and related acts, as amended by the act of July 31, 1946, by granting credit for services performed prior to January 1, 1937, to persons who have 6 months of service between August 29, 1935, and January 1, 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 5398. A bill to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plant at Muscatine, Iowa, for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 5399. A bill to increase the benefits payable under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to liberalize the eligibility provisions of such system, to extend the coverage provisions of such system to the self-employed, employees of nonprofit institutions, agricultural labor, and, under voluntary compacts, to employees of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5400. A bill to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 5401. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5402. A bill to equalize the rates of compensation payable for wartime and peacetime service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 5403. A bill to bar the Communist Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 5404. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing food, clothing, or medicines mailed to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACY:

H. R. 5405. A bill to provide for the protection of potato and tomato production from the golden nematode, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 5406. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Princess Anne, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5407. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Federalsburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5408. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Snow Hill, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5409. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Berlin, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 5410. A bill to reduce postage rates on parcels containing food, clothing, or medicines mailed to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5411. A bill relative to the promoton and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5412. A bill to forbid the imposition of certain conditions on the interstate or foreign transportation of psittacine birds;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5413. A bill granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5414. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 5415. A bill to amend Public Law 396, Eightieth Congress, which extends veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of cetrain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 5416. A bill to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 5417. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to waive the collection of certain loans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 5418. A bill to provide for the reconstruction of the dam on Wolf Creek, Perryton, Tex., and for the repair of the Rita Blanca Dam, Dalhart, Tex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 5419. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 5420. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to management and to labor certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 328. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a report entitled "The Economy of Hawaii in 1947" and authorizing the printing of additional copies thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Res. 467. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to debts owed to American citizens by foreign governments, municipalities, and corporations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 468. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the widespread suffering and detrimental conditions existing among the Indians in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation relating to the FEPC, antisegregation, and antilynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5421. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5422. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 5423. A bill for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 5425. A bill for the relief of the estates of Nancy Masako Arakaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5426. A bill for the relief of John Waipa Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5427. A bill for the relief of the estates of Gertrude Ornellas and Barbara June Ornellas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5428. A bill for the relief of the estate of Josephine Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5429. A bill for the relief of John Chi Chong Holt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 5430. A bill for the relief of the aliens Peter Lukac and his wife, Suzanne Lukac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 5431. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cleone L. Calhoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1346. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N. Y., in protest against enactment of legislation in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

1347. Also, concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of New York State, memorializing Congress to amend the Federal income-tax law having to do with inequitable tax discrimination between residents of the so-called community-property States and the so-called common-law States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1348. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Kosciusko and Jasper Counties, Ind., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1349. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Damon Reavis, Menard, Ill., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to violation of his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1350. Also, petition of James R. Allen, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to complaints against Hon. Harold N. Burton, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and others, regarding justice in the courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1351. Also, petition of A. V. Strock, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1352. Also, petition of Miami Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1353. Also, petition of M. W. Clark, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 13; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1354. Also, petition of Mrs. Ida L. Bush, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1355. Also, petition of Mary Faming and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1356. Also, petition of Mrs. H. L. Briden and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to restraining production and showing of crime-producing movie films and those which contribute to juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1357. Also, petition of United American Veterans, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enacting H. R. 4528; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1358. Also, petition of James V. Jackson, South Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1359. Also, petition of Arthur E. Nelson, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1360. Also, petition of Miss Alvira Dodge, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1361. Also, petition of Mrs. M. McNaughten, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, save us from a worship of the lips while our hearts are far away.

In the battle now being fought in the realm of ideas, where deadly attacks are made upon our greatest treasure, our belief in God and the Gospel of Christ, deliver us from the peril of indifference, for we know that rust will crumble a metal when hammer blows will only harden it.

May this minute of prayer find each one of us, in his own way, reaching out for Thy help and guidance.

Hear our prayers and be with us this day. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 13, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 14, 1948, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1394) to provide increased subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act

of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1454. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes;

S. 1485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico;

S. 1507. An act authorizing the sale of undisposed-of lots in Michel addition to the town of Polson, Mont.; and

S. 1591. An act to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 522. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; and

S. 1133. An act providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2029) to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2159. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare plans and estimates for a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2313. An act to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763), providing for the detail of the United States military and naval and Air Force missions to foreign governments;

H. R. 3344. An act to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended;

H. R. 3603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4023. An act to authorize the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4461. An act approving the performance in the field of certain functions relating to the public lands;

H. R. 4513. An act to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4549. An act to authorize the enactment by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska of a code of laws for Alaska;

H. R. 4823. An act to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4980. An act relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5035. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948; and

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Park River Dam and Reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Riyoko Patell;

H. R. 1078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of August W. Dietz;

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy Park Farrow;

H. R. 3168. An act for the relief of Antone G. Pina;

H. R. 3503. An act to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25); and

H. R. 4115. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 119)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 involving an increase of $658,000 for the Federal Works Agency, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INSTITUTE OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 5, 1947, entitled the "Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act" (Public Law 369, 80th Cong.) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting pursuant to law, reports showing the names of all persons against whom claims in excess of $1,000 have been compromised, the address of such persons, the nature of the claims, the amount of the compromises, and the reasons therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Social Security Administration for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth annual report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 75 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 61 Stat. 103), I submit herewith the second quarterly report on aid to Greece and Turkey, covering the period from the inception of the program to December 31, 1947.

Since the last report submitted November 7, 1947, Greece has been subjected to ever-increasing pressure by the Communist minority, which, subservient to the foreign influences from which it draws support, would impose its will on the Greek people by force of arms. It is significant that the guerrilla warfare is directed not against the Greek Army but against the people of Greece. The deliberate and wanton destruction of Greek villages does not result from military engagements. It is determined and ruthless destruction intended to render people homeless and drive them from the soil; to force them into overcrowded urban centers where they become charges of an already overburdened state; and to create for them conditions of misery and hardship in the hope that this will make them susceptible to political agitation.

These bands which traffic in human misery and chaos are small, too small to claim any truly representative character. They total about 20,000, of which a large proportion are known to have been unwillingly impressed into the guerrilla ranks under threat of death to themselves and their families. There are Members of the United States Congress who visited Greece during the past few months who know what horrible reprisals are taken against those unwilling to fight for the Communist guerrillas.

This policy is sapping the economic strength of Greece at the same time that the American Mission for Aid to Greece is seeking to build it up through reconstruction and economic assistance. This is, of course, the intent of the guerrillas, for a healthy Greece on the road to economic recovery would not be receptive

to Communist ideology. Economic conditions in Greece have suffered from the continued military strife which has swelled the number of refugees in the north of Greece to over 420,000 and caused a greater share of the Greek national budget and of American aid funds to be spent on nonproductive undertakings. Only the most strenuous and determined efforts of the Greek Government and people will suffice to cope successfully with the present situation.

The American mission is doing all in its power to assist, and its accomplishments have been considerable. Owing to the Communist obstruction it is increasingly clear, however, that economic recovery in Greece must await the establishment of internal security. Although economic programs most effective under the circumstances will continue to be actively prosecuted, the benefits from them can be fully realized only when the warfare against the guerrillas has been successfully concluded.

To aid the Greek Government in the prosecution of the warfare against the guerrillas, the American mission at the close of the year transferred an additional $14,000,000 of aid funds from the economic to the military program, making a total allocation to the military of about $172,000,000. These additional funds will be used to support the formation of an additional 58 National Defense Corps battalions, making a total of 100 as requested by the Greek Government; these battalions will take over the task of protecting the villages of the provinces from which they are recruited, thereby freeing the Greek National Army to conduct a more offensive warfare. If the guerrilla menace should increase as a result of greater outside assistance, a new situation would be created which would have to be dealt with in the light of circumstances prevailing at that time.

While recent developments are adverse, in that they have lengthened the time necessary for Greece's ultimate recovery, the situation is not without encouragement. Greece is still a free country. The recent announcement of a "government" by the Communist guerrillas, who do not effectively control territory in which to exercise any of the functions of government, appears to have been an act of desperation and not of strength. The transparent device of declaring the "free government" has not materially changed the existing situation, except to reveal more clearly to the Greeks and to the world the true character of Greece's enemy. The United States Government has already made known its view that recognition of this group by other governments would have serious implications and would be clearly contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter. The special United Nations Balkan Commission has passed a resolution that in its view any such recognition would constitute a threat to the peace.

I am pleased to be able to report that the Turkish aid program is proceeding in an orderly manner. Careful planning and procurement are now resulting in deliveries which can be expected to flow at a fairly uniform rate.

Continued economic assistance to Greece will be provided under the European recovery program, if that program is authorized by the Congress. The European recovery program will not provide, however, for any additional military assistance required for Greece and Turkey, which will, at the appropriate time, be sought from the Congress under Public Law 75.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1948.*

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 16, 1948.*

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninety-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1948.*

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of the Miami Townsend Club, No. 22, Miami, Fla., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a uniform national pension system; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to make a larger apportionment of Federal funds available for the immediate construction of an adequate farm-to-market road program

"Whereas the rural residents of South Carolina are badly handicapped and inconvenienced because of the lack of adequate paved farm-to-market roads; and

"Whereas such lack of all-weather roads is proving costly to our farmers economically and socially; and

"Whereas the system of Federal-aid roads has reached a much more satisfactory stage of completion than that of the farm-to-market system and is much more adequately sufficient; and

"Whereas at this crucial time of necessity for ample farm production, every reasonable facility should be furnished to help our farmers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the South Carolina delegation in Congress be requested to urge a larger apportionment of Federal funds for the immediate construction of an adequate farm-to-market road program; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the Members of Congress from South Carolina."

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RELATING TO CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a resolution adopted February 12 by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the Congress of the United States to seriously consider and oppose national legislation relating to the FEPC, antisegregation, and antilynching legislation, so as to continue to vest these important matters solely under the jurisdiction of the States.

I find the observations and expressions contained in this resolution in close parallel with my own thinking on such subjects and at this time I ask unanimous consent to present the resolution for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the National Congress of the United States to seriously consider and oppose national legislation relating to the FEPC antisegregation and antilynching legislation, so as to continue to vest these important matters solely under the jurisdiction of the States

Whereas there is certain proposed legislation pending before the United States Congress, or probably soon to be so pending; and

Whereas such proposed legislation is in the form of the Fair Employment Practices Act, proposed antisegregation legislation; and

Whereas the enactment of such proposed legislation will strike at the fundamental constitutional principles that a State shall prescribe all remedies and all forums for the adjudication of all matters not granted under the United States Constitution to the Federal Government by the people of the various States; and

Whereas the very first and last steps in a would-be police or totalitarian state is to strip the constituent elements of such state of all powers and to place unwarrantedly such powers in the hands of a strong federal government; and

Whereas the enactment of such proposed legislation into Federal laws further concentrates unwarranted powers in the Federal Government; and

Whereas such course is dangerous for the very reason that such will eventually destroy the jurisdiction, powers, and authority of the various States, and therefore the people; and

Whereas further, it is the minorities in a police or totalitarian state who suffer the most, due to the fact that constituent political elements thereof, or constituent republics thereof, have been stripped of all power; and

Whereas it is felt that the various States of the American Union can far better pass laws that would be much more beneficial to its people in regard to the proposed legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the proposed legislation above referred to is not only sectional in its purpose

but that the enactment of such into law will not only be inimical to the South but to the Nation as a whole.

That such proposed legislation is unconstitutional and un-American in that it would give to making the Federal Government all powerful and would destroy the checks and balances of the people, which they have, and which are necessary for them to have, in order to prevent a too powerful bureaucratic government from undermining the fundamental principles of Americanism.

That the enactment of such legislation into law when carried to its logical conclusion will destroy the rights and privileges of the minorities of this land, so that those who now clamor for the passage of such legislation will no doubt be its victims tomorrow.

That any bill or bills providing for the enactment of such proposed legislation be killed in the outset in order that we might not gamble with the future of America.

That a copy of this resolution be directed to the following: The President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the two United States Senators from South Carolina, to the six Representatives in the United States Congress from South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.
COLUMBIA, S. C., *February 12, 1948.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post, No. 1242, of the American Legion, Department of New York, in opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas the American Legion at its twenty-ninth annual national convention, held in the city of New York, N. Y., on the 31st day of August 1947, adopted a policy calling for positive and aggressive action by the American Legion in support of a strong American merchant marine; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States now has before it legislation giving approval to an agreement with Canada relating to the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

"Whereas it has been fully demonstrated that construction of said seaway as presently planned would not permit its use by the overwhelming majority of vessels in the American merchant marine; and

"Whereas construction of such seaway would be in the nature of a direct grant of aid to the operators of shallow-draft, foreign-flag vessels in competition with the American merchant marine: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post, No. 1242, of the American Legion, Department of New York, is opposed to the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are hereby urged to refuse to give congressional approval to the agreement relative to construction of said project."

Adopted at a regular meeting of the Robert L. Hague Merchant Marine Industries Post, No. 1242, of the American Legion, Department of New York, held on the 20th day of January 1948.

EDWARD C. HOLDEN, Jr.,
Commander.
WILLIAM SCHWARTZ,
Adjutant.

WORLD AIR COMMERCE DAY—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MIAMI (FLA.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Miami (Fla.) Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas World Trade Week (May 17–22, 1948) will bring the businessmen of the world into conferences, throughout this and other nations, on mutual problems; and

Whereas the greatest aids to world peace and international good will are improved communications and increased trade relations between the nations of the world; and

Whereas Maritime Day, long established to honor men, ships, and the great part the merchant fleets of the world have played and are playing to facilitate world commerce and trade, is a definite part of World Trade Week; and

Whereas no day has been set aside on a national scale to focus public attention on air transportation, the most rapidly growing mode of shipping cargo and carrying passengers; and

Whereas the problems pertaining to both air and sea commerce are related in so many respects and the scope of a national Air Commerce Day would overlap Maritime Day to an extent which makes it obvious that the 2 days should be observed within the period of a single week: Be it therefore

Resolved, That a World Air Commerce Day should be declared nationally as a feature of World Trade Week and every effort be made to bring the focus of world attention on the present growth and potentially unlimited possibilities of future air-passenger service and on air carriers as movers of the world's goods; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to designate a World Air Commerce Day to be observed each year 3 days from Maritime Day, either before or after, depending upon the day of World Trade Week on which Maritime Day occurs.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MIAMI
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
FEBRUARY 2, 1948.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2123. A bill to exempt certain officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force from the provisions of statutes requiring retirement by reason of age, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 889).

By Mr. GURNEY (for Mr. HILL), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1525. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 890).

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1807. A bill to provide for the temporary extension of the Export Control Act and title III of the Second War Powers Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 891).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution. The resolution merely authorizes the appropriation of an additional $15,000 to be expended by the Small Business Committee. The report is signed by all the members of the Rules and Administration Committee who are in Washington at the present time, and it was unanimously adopted by the committee. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of what the resolution proposes to do.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business will expire on April 1 next. Some additional duties have been imposed upon the committee, in the matter of obtaining steel for small business and other enterprises. The committee has exhausted its funds. Just before the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the chairman of the committee, left Washington, he explained to me that it was necessary to have the additional amount authorized by the resolution which has been reported by the Senator from Illinois. The question of the extension of the life of the committee is not at all involved. That is a matter which Congress will have to consider later, because the life of the committee will not expire until the first of April, as I have said. The resolution which has been submitted will provide money for the time between this date and April 1 only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 200) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, created by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947, and extended by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $15,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 2165, to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores

of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2166. A bill for the relief of Terez Hagymasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2167. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 2168, authorizing the appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for the purposes of rural electrification, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 2169. A bill for the relief of Anna Halberstam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2170. A bill for the relief of Augustyn Mystokowski and Janina Ludwika Mystokowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK (by request):

S. 2171. A bill to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. PEPPER introduced Senate bill 2172, to extend the maturity for mortgages under the National Housing Act in the case of property owned by veterans of World War II, to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. CAIN):

S. 2173. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2174. A bill to amend further sections 10 and 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended (37 U. S. C. 110 and 112), relating to allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

S. 2175. A bill for the relief of Gabe Budwee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2176. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Allen Old Horn, Sr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution to prohibit the use of grains for the manufacture of intoxicating liquor for 1 year, or until October 15, 1948, as may be determined by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and I request that a letter of transmittal from the Attorney General to the President of the Senate, together with a statement explaining the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2165) to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter and explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1948.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States."

This proposed bill was drafted jointly by the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, and the National Military Establishment.

There is attached to the proposed bill an explanatory statement which summarizes and discusses its provisions in detail.

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted promptly.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed bill to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of Defense.
TOM C. CLARK,
Attorney General.
J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT CONCERNING A PROPOSED BILL TO PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN THE SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS ADJACENT TO THE SHORES OF THE UNITED STATES

On June 23, 1947, by its decision in *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. (preliminary print) 19) the Supreme Court settled an important question which for more than a decade had been the subject of controversy. The issue in the case was whether the United States or California had paramount rights in and power over the submerged lands of the 3-mile marginal belt off the coast of California, including the authority to exploit or authorize the exploitation of the resources of such lands. The Court decided "that California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast, and that the Federal Government rather than the State has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil" (332 U. S. 38–39). On October 27, 1947, the Court entered a decree which adjudged that:

"1. The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of the inland waters, extending seaward three nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein.

"2. The United States is entitled to the injunctive relief prayed for in the complaint.

"3. Jurisdiction is reserved by this Court to enter such further orders and to issue such writs as may from time to time be deemed advisable or necessary to give full force and effect to this decree."

The basic reasons for the Court's decision were that the acquisition of the 3-mile belt has been accomplished by the National Government and that the "protection and control of it has been and is a function of national external sovereignty" (332 U. S. 34). These reasons obviously are not limited in their application to the submerged lands adjacent to the coast of California.

Moreover, while the California case only involved the 3-mile belt, there is no reason to believe that the Court's conclusion would be any different with respect to the resources of any area beyond the 3-mile limit to which the National Government may have extended its jurisdiction. Such an extension of jurisdiction was accomplished by the proclamation of September 28, 1945, which declared that the United States "regards the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the continental shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control * * *." (Executive Proclamation 2667, September 28, 1945, 10 FR 12303.) Indeed, this action of the President was assimilated by the Court in *United States* v. *California* to previous declarations concerning national jurisdiction within the 3-mile belt (332 U. S. 33, 34, fn. 18).

Petroleum is vital to our national security and important in our national economy. Within the 3-mile belt off our coast large quantities of oil and gas have been and are being produced, and more are believed to exist in the continental shelf beyond that belt. Most of the oil and gas now being produced within these areas is in fields that are being drained by wells on land not owned by the Federal Government. It is therefore highly desirable that the Congress promptly make provision for the conservation and development of oil and gas in the coastal areas below low tide and outside the inland waters of any State. In addition, some equitable relief should be extended to the States and their political subdivisions, grantees, and lessees because of actions with respect to oil and gas taken by them prior to the Court's decision in *United States v. California* and on the assumption that the States owned the oil and gas deposits in these areas.

The enclosed draft of bill is designed to meet these needs. There follows an analysis and discussion of its significant provisions.

1. Section 2 (b) defines the term "submerged coastal lands," and thus the areas covered by the bill, as including two categories of submerged lands. The first is "submerged lands seaward of the shores of the United States and Alaska which are under the dominion of, and subject to the paramount rights of, the United States * * *." This language paraphrases that used by the Court in the *California Case* (332 U. S. 38, 39). It is intended to be descriptive of the marginal belt off the coast of California, which was the subject matter of that case, and also of such other marginal belt areas

off the coasts of the United States and Alaska as involve no facts which might call for a different conclusion than that reached by the Court in deciding the California case. The marginal belt areas thus described are, of course, outside the inland waters of the States, which include ports, harbors, bays, rivers, and lakes. As to such inland water areas, the Federal Government has asserted no claim (332 U. S. 25, 26).

The second category of areas covered by the bill is "all other submerged lands of the entire continental shelf seaward of such shores [of the United States and Alaska], within which submerged lands the natural resources appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control, but which resources are not owned by any State or other person * * *." This language paraphrases that used by the President in the proclamation of September 28, 1945. It is intended to characterize the continental shelf areas which are within the scope of that proclamation and which are beyond the seaward boundaries of the marginal belt described in the first category. The phrase "but which resources are not owned by any State or other person" has been added in order to exclude any lands under the inland waters of the States which may form portions of the continental shelf. The words "or other person" identify any grantee of such an area from a State.

2. Section 3 (a) provides that the oil and gas deposits in submerged coastal lands shall be subject to disposal only in accordance with the provisions of the proposed bill. It further provides that "no rights in or claims to such deposits, whether based upon applications filed or other action taken heretofore or hereafter, shall be recognized except in accordance with the provisions of this act." The quoted language is intended to bar any conceivable claims to obtain, without compliance with the terms of the bill, permits or leases of these oil and gas deposits that may be asserted by persons who have heretofore filed applications for such permits or leases with the Department of the Interior. These applications were purportedly filed under the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, either as originally enacted or as amended (41 Stat. 437, 30 U. S. C. sec. 181 et seq.). Commencing in 1937, the applications were suspended pending a determination of the nature and extent of the rights of the Federal Government in the submerged coastal lands.

After the Supreme Court decision in the California case, the question whether the Mineral Leasing Act applied to these areas became material. On August 8 and 28, 1947, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior and the Attorney General, respectively, held that the act did not apply to the submerged coastal areas. Accordingly, on September 8, 1947, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management denied the applications pending in that Bureau, and on October 6, 1947, the Secretary of the Interior denied the applications pending in his office.

There is no reason to think that the legal conclusions of the Solicitor and the Attorney General, and the consequent administrative actions denying all the then pending applications, can be successfully challenged in the courts. But regardless of this assumption, no substantial equity appears which would justify giving any of these applications preferential consideration in the issuance of oil or gas leases or otherwise treating them as valid. Moreover, a substantial number of them involve producing oil and gas areas developed by lessees of California at great expense and under circumstances, which, as hereafter discussed, may justify the issuance of exchange leases, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the proposed bill, to the holders of the State leases.

3. Other portions of section 3 point up the major premise of the proposed legislation, that is, the vital relationship of the petroleum in the submerged coastal areas to our national security. Thus, subsection (b) declares the policy of the Congress to be that the petroleum resources of these areas shall, to the maximum extent consistent with the needs of the national economy, "be conserved as a national asset vital to the security of the Nation," and requires all administrative action under the bill to conform to that policy. A continuing implementation of the same policy is provided for by subsection (c), which declares that the provisions of the bill shall also be administered in accordance "with such determinations as to national security, conservation, or development," in furtherance of the policy declared in subsection (b), as may be made from time to time by the President. The President is authorized by subsection (d) to withdraw from disposition any of the submerged coastal lands and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security, thus making provision for the husbanding of petroleum underground for future military use.

Finally, subsection (e) of section 3 gives the United States in time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands. This would, in effect, give the Government a continuing option at a fair price, ahead of any other possible purchasers.

4. Sections 4, 5, and 6 authorize the Secretary of the Interior in his discretion to grant oil and gas leases of submerged coastal lands. Of course, such leases may not be granted with respect to lands reserved by the President in the interest of national security under section 3 (d), nor may they be granted without the approval of the Secretary of Defense with respect to lands designated by the latter as needed for navigation purposes or for national defense under section 14. Sections 4, 5, and 6 and other portions of the bill have been drafted along lines similar to those of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U. S. C. sec. 181 et seq.), but are different in a number of respects because water areas are involved or because of considerations of national security.

Section 4 relates to the leasing of submerged coastal lands which are not within any known geological structure of a producing oil and gas field, and section 5 relates to lands within such a structure. In both cases, the leases are to be issued after competitive bidding to the responsible person bidding the highest bonus. With respect to lands not within a structure, this represents a departure from the Mineral Leasing Act, which provides for the issuance of a lease to the first qualified applicant. (30 U. S. C. sec. 226.) It is felt that such a departure is justified because bona fide operation in the submerged land areas is much more expensive than on dry land, and competitive bidding will discourage the purely speculative operator who does not really intend to develop the land.

Section 4 provides that the area of a lease of land not within a known geological structure of a producing field shall not exceed 64,000 acres at the time of the issuance of the lease. However, within 3 years thereafter, the area must be reduced to not more than one-half of the original area or 7,680 acres, whichever is larger. Before the end of the fifth lease year, the area must be reduced to not more than 7,680 acres. Section 5 provides that the area of a lease of land within a known geological structure shall not exceed 2,560 acres. The only comparable provision of the Mineral Leasing Act limits the acreage of a leasing unit on a known structure to 640 acres (30 U. S. C. sec. 226), while the regulations under that act fix a limitation of 2,560 acres on any lease of land not within a structure. (43 CFR 192.40.) Section 6 of the bill provides an over-all acreage limitation on leases held by any one party of 128,000 acres (of which not more than 30,720 acres may be held under producing leases) in any one of the following coastal regions: The Pacific Ocean or the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean. Under the Mineral Leasing Act, the over-all limitation on leases is 15,360 acres in any one State, and on options taken for exploration purposes is 100,000 acres in any one State. (30 U. S. C. sec. 184.)

The acreage limitation provisions of the bill are to some extent more generous than those under the Mineral Leasing Act. The reasons for this are that exploration and development in water areas are more costly and complex than on dry land, and that, unless such greater acreage is permitted, exploration and development will be retarded. It should be made clear, however, that the acreage limitations with respect to the size of individual leases are merely ceilings, and that in the issuance of leases the Secretary is required by the bill to exercise discretion in fixing the acreage as well as in prescribing the shape and dimensions of the land involved, and is also directed to insist on reasonable compactness. Under the Mineral Leasing Act, though the acreage permitted to be included in any one leasing unit on a structure is 640 acres, the Department of the Interior has followed the general practice of offering tracts for bidding in units of 160 acres or less.

The term of leases issued under sections 4 and 5 of the bill is to be 5 years and so long thereafter as there is production in paying quantities. At the end of that 5 years, in the absence of such production, off-structure leases are to receive an extension of not more than 5 years, upon proof of the performance of "actual development work" costing at least $75,000, or such greater amount as the Secretary may fix at or before the granting of the lease. "Actual development work," as referred to in this clause of section 4, does not include any geophysical or geological exploration activities. The provision for expenditure of at least $75,000 should discourage delays in development, while at the same time protecting the lessee who, though proceeding with reasonable speed, is unable to obtain production in paying quantities before the end of 5 years because of conditions peculiar to submerged-land development. For similar reasons, section 5 provides for a 2-year extension of structure leases if, at the end of the primary 5-year term, there is no production in paying quantities but drilling operations commenced not less than 90 days prior thereto have been and are being diligently prosecuted.

According to section 4, until there is a discovery, off-structure lessees are to pay a rental of 25 cents per acre per annum for the fourth lease year and not less than 50 cents per annum for every lease year thereafter. The Mineral Leasing Act fixes an annual rental of not less than 25 cents per acre for every lease year except the second and third (30 U. S. C., sec. 226). The provisions of the bill are designed to give the lessee the lighter burden during the early years when he should be spending all he can on development under difficult water conditions. Moreover, under the bill the lessee will have paid a bonus in competing for the lease, which is not the case under the Mineral Leasing Act.

With respect to both structure and off-structure leases, the royalty to be paid is not less than 12½ percent of the amount or

value of the oil or gas produced. In the case of off-structure leases, the bill requires payment of a minimum royalty of not less than $1 per acre per annum, after discovery, in lieu of rental. Under the Mineral Leasing Act, the royalty rate on off-structure leases is flexed at 12½ percent and on-structure leases at not less than 12½ percent (30 U. S. C., sec. 226). The 12½ percent is made a minimum (rather than fixed at that rate) for off-structure leases under the bill so as to permit the exercise of discretion by the Secretary in the light, among other things, of the royalty rates heretofore charged by the States in the submerged-land areas.

5. The bill's major theme of national defense and the public welfare is again reflected in subsections (f) and (g) of section 6 and in section 14. Subsection (f) of section 6 gives the Secretary of the Interior the power to regulate the rate of prospecting and development by lessees and the quantity and rate of production from leases, in the interest of national defense or the public welfare. Under this provision, the Secretary could, when clearly justified in the national interest, fix such rates without strict regard for conservation or engineering practices. Moreover, this power of the Secretary is additional to those he has under the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act, incorporated by reference in section 13 of the bill. These provisions deal with, among other things, the prevention of waste; the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in operations; and, in the case of unitization, the rates of prospecting and development and quantity and rate of production. (Secs. 16, 17 (b), and 30 of the Mineral Leasing Act; 30 U. S. C. secs. 225, 226 (e), 187.)

Subsection (g) of section 6 will permit the Secretary of the Interior, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of the bill, to suspend operations or terminate any lease issued under the bill. This provision is intended to facilitate, during periods of national military or similar urgency, the complete control by the Federal Government of a resource essential to the national defense and of coastal areas strategically important from a defense standpoint. However, while each lease must be taken subject to the exercise of this right of suspension and termination, any lessee adversely affected by the exercise of the right should receive reasonable compensation. The development of submerged lands involves the expenditure of large sums of money. Unless some provision for compensation is made, operators will quite likely refuse to take leases and necessary development will be retarded. With this in mind, subsection (g) requires all leases to contain a provision for payment to the lessee whose operations are thus terminated or suspended of an amount determined in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary which may incorporate guiding equitable principles.

Under section 14, the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, may designate as restricted those areas needed for navigation purposes or for national defense, and while so designated no exploration is to be conducted on, and no lease issued for, any part of these areas except with the approval of the Secretary of Defense. This provision was drafted in order to make possible the maximum freedom of defense activities in the coastal waters, as well as to avoid undesirable obstructions to navigation generally.

6. In sections 7 to 10, the bill deals with the problem of relief to the coastal States, their political subdivisions and grantees and those holding oil and gas leases from them, that prior to the Supreme Court's decision of June 23, 1947, acted on the assumption that the submerged coastal lands belonged to the States. The relief provided by the bill is of two kinds. One is directed to the continuation of operations by persons who presently are operating under State oil and gas leases, and the other relates to the waiving of liability for past trespasses.

Oil was discovered on the California coast at the beginning of the century. (332 U. S. 30.) While there was some production in the submerged lands off that coast prior to 1921, production under leases issued by the State did not start until 1922, after the passage of a State leasing act. (Cal. Stats., 1921, Chap. 303, p. 404.) When the Supreme Court decision was handed down in 1947, there were 78 producing oil and gas leases on tidal and submerged lands which had been issued by California, with a monthly production of about 1,000,000 barrels of oil. It is estimated that the total withdrawal of oil from the tidal and submerged lands off the California coast prior to the date of the decision has amounted to more than 150,000,000 barrels. To a considerably lesser extent than on the California coast, there has been oil and gas development in the Gulf of Mexico, which began under State leasing acts some 10 years ago. It is estimated that the total withdrawal of oil from the Gulf areas prior to June 1947 amounted to less than 10,000,000 barrels.

The Supreme Court in the California case said that "the record plainly demonstrates that until the California oil issue began to be pressed in the thirties, neither the States nor the Government had reason to focus attention on the question of which of them owned or had paramount rights in or power over the 3-mile belt." (332 U. S. 39.) Ou August 19, 1937, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 208 directing the Attorney General to assert, maintain, and establish Federal ownership of the 3-mile belt and its petroleum deposits along our entire coast, but the House of Representatives did not act on the resolution, though its Judiciary Committee held hearings on the matter and reported favorably on the substance of the resolution. (See Hearings, House Judiciary Committee, 75th Cong., 3d sess., on S. J. Res. 208, February 23–25, 1938; H. Rept. No. 2378, Judiciary Committee, 75th Cong., 3d sess., on S. J. Res. 208, May 19, 1938.) In the Seventy-sixth Congress, similiar legislation was considered, but no action was taken by either house. (See Hearings, Subcommittee No. 4, House Judiciary Committee, 76th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 176 and H. J. Res. 181, March 22, 23, 1939; Hearings, Senate Public Lands Committee, 76th Cong., 1st sess., on S. J. Res. 83 and S. J. Res. 92, March 27-30, 1939.) In the Seventy-ninth Congress, hearings were held by the Judiciary Committees of both Houses on a number of substantially identical resolutions quitclaiming Federal title in these areas to the States. (See Joint Hearings, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 118 et al., June 18–20, 1945; Hearings, Senate Judiciary Committee, 79th Cong., 2d sess., on S. J. Res. 48 and H. J. Res. 225, February 5–7, 1946.) These committees both reported favorably on one of these measures, House Joint Resolution 225, venturing the opinion that the States owned the submerged coastal lands, with their oil and gas resources, and that the Supreme Court had so held. (See H. Rept. No. 927, Judiciary Committee, 79th Cong., 1st sess., on H. J. Res. 225, July 17, 1945; S. Rept. No. 1260, Judiciary Committee, 79th Cong., 2d sess., on H. J. Res. 225, April 26, 1946.) The resolution passed both Houses, but the President vetoed it on August 1, 1946, and his veto was not overridden. The President's reasons were that the question of ownership was a legal one which should be determined by the Supreme Court in the California case, which had been commenced and was then pending; that the issue had not theretofore been determined; and that if "the United States owns these areas, they should not be given away." (See Veto Message, H. Doc. 765, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)

On May 29, 1945, the Attorney General filed a suit, entitled *"United States* v. *Pacific Western Oil Company"* in the United States district court, at Los Angeles, in an effort to settle the question of ownership. But, in order to expedite a determination, he dismissed that suit, and on October 19, 1945, commenced the original action against California in the Supreme Court, which culminated in the Court's decision of June 23, 1947, favorable to the United States. In that action, the Government took the position (brief, p. 70), and the Court in its opinion agreed (332 U. S. 36, 37, 38), that the case judicially raised the question of Federal versus State ownership for the first time.

As the foregoing references illustrate, it is clear that prior to the decision by the Supreme Court, no one could really be certain that the Federal Government owned the submerged coastal areas and their petroleum deposits. The States assumed that they were the owners, acted on that assumption, enacted legislation authorizing the issuance of oil and gas leases, and actually issued such leases.

In his oral argument of the California case in the Supreme Court, the Attorney General said:

"We will recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted designed to relieve California and those who have operated under State authority, from the necessity of accounting to the United States for revenues derived in the past from the exploitation of any of the lands here involved. Such legislation, in the view of the President, should also establish equitable standards for the recognition of investments made by private interests and should offer a basis for the continued operation of private establishments wherever consistent with the national interest, and on terms which would be fair and just under all circumstances."

And in the supplemental brief for the United States in that case, it was said:

"In this connection it is pertinent to note, as stated by the Attorney General at oral argument, that the President had authorized him to say that there is no desire on the part of the President or of any Federal official to destroy or confiscate any honest or bona fide investment, or to deprive the State or its subdivisions of any reasonable expectation of return from the areas that have been developed.

"The President recognizes that in the event the decision of this Court is favorable to the United States, it will be necessary to have congressional action looking toward the future management of the resources of this area. And he also intends to recommend to the Congress that legislation be enacted recognizing both prospectively and retrospectively, any equities of the State and those who have operated under it, to the fullest extent consistent with the national interest."

Sections 7 to 10 of the proposed bill were drafted in the light of the foregoing assurances. Sections 7 to 9 make provision for the issuance of leases by the Federal Government in exchange for oil and gas leases issued prior to June 23, 1947, by any State or its political subdivision or grantee and covering submerged coastal lands. The Secretary of the Interior is directed (not merely authorized) to issue such a lease upon the favorable determination of a commission to be known as the Submerged Coastal Lands Commission. Its three members are to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate. The Commission is to determine whether the national interest would be served by the issuance of an ex-

change lease, whether the holder of the old lease is equitably entitled to receive an exchange lease, and the terms and conditions under which the latter may be issued. Eight standards are enumerated which are, among other things, to guide the Commission in making its determinations. These standards are believed to be relevant to the national interest and the equities of the applicants. Each exchange lease is to be for a period not exceeding the unexpired portion of the term of the old lease; is to cover, in whole or in part, the same area of submerged coastal lands as was covered by the old lease; and is to provide for not less than the rentals, royalties, and other payments provided for in the old lease.

Section 7 also provides that if the Commission determines against the issuance of an exchange lease, but believes that in fairness the applicant should receive a sum of money, it shall so report to the Secretary, who is to submit its report to the Congress for consideration. This provision would, for example, cover a case where the Commission considers that issuance of a lease would be against the national interest, but finds that the applicant has substantial equities. In such cases the Congress will be the final judge of whether, and how much, compensation should be paid.

Section 8 sets out certain conditions with which there must be compliance before an exchange lease can be issued. One of them is that an application for such a lease must be filed within 6 months from the date of the Commission's first meeting. Some time limitation for filing is desirable in order to make possible the determination of the status of the lands, and the oil and gas operations on them, as soon as the circumstances permit. Otherwise the leasing and oil and gas development of the lands would be indefinitely delayed and retarded. However, while the actions so far taken by the Supreme Court in the California case definitely establish a rule of law, the actual seaward limits of the inland coastal waters of California and the actual low-tide lines along its coast, which, together, constitute the landward boundary of the 3-mile marginal belt, have not yet been fixed. Moreover, for similar reasons, this is also true of the Gulf of Mexico. Hence, at the end of the 6-month period for filing applications the question of whether particular tracts of land are within or without the marginal belt may still be unresolved, and may remain so for some time. To meet this situation, section 8 also provides that upon a satisfactory showing of substantial doubt as to whether an area constitutes submerged coastal lands within the meaning of the bill the Submerged Coastal Lands Commission may, from time to time, extend the period for the filing of applications upon the request of any party in interest made within the 6 months or any extension of the basic period previously granted by the Commission.

Another requirement of section 8 is that each applicant for an exchange lease must state in his application that the lease applied for shall be subject to the same "overriding royalty obligations as the old lease. Overriding royalty obligations are those owed by an oil and gas lessee to persons other than the owner of the land. They are created by the lessee, sometimes when he assigns his lease and reserves such a royalty, and sometimes when, while retaining his lease, he grants such a royalty in order to obtain capital. They represent substantial property interests. If the commission decides that an exchange lease should be issued, it is felt that the applicant should in fairness to these royalty owners continue to honor the same obligations with respect to the new lease as existed with respect to the old one.

Because the determination of whether exchange leases should be issued may be delayed for substantial periods of time and because producing areas are involved, section 9 authorizes any lessee from a State or its political subdivision or grantee to continue operations on a provisional basis pending the issuance of exchange leases, provided an application in accordance with section 8 is timely filed. The section also provides for the making of interim arrangements by the Secretary of the Interior with the old lessors and their lessees covering the management, operation, and control of oil and gas wells during the intervening period.

Section 10 would have the effect of releasing any State, its political subdivisions or grantees, and those holding leases from them, from liability for trespasses committed in producing oil or gas from any submerged coastal lands prior to June 23, 1947, the date of the decision in the California case, and from liability to account to the United States for oil or gas theretofore extracted from these lands, or for moneys received under such leases. However, because uncertainty about the question of paramount rights and control was resolved by the decision, it is provided that any State, and its political subdivisions or grantees, shall be required to account to the United States for rentals, royalties, and other sums received after the decision under any such leases.

7. Following the precedent established by section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U. S. C., sec. 191), section 11 of the bill provides for payment of substantial portions of the gross income derived by the Federal Government from oil and gas operations in the submerged coastal lands to the States where this income is produced, and to the reclamation fund created by the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, 43 U. S. C., sec. 391 et seq.). Each State is to receive 37½ percent of all such income from activities within the boundaries of that State and within the 3-mile marginal belt. This money is to be available for the construction and maintenance of public roads or public parks or for the support of public schools or other public educational institutions, as the legislature of the State may direct. The reclamation fund is to receive 52½ percent of all such income from activities within the boundaries of any of the States to which the Reclamation Act, as amended or supplemented, is or may become applicable and within the 3-mile marginal belt.

8. The rest of the bill adopts the substance of, or incorporates by reference, various provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act.

VETERANS' HOUSING LOANS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which proposes to make two very salutary changes in the present law relative to the subject of veterans' housing. I know the great interest of the distinguished Senator from Washington, presently occupying the chair, in this subject. Under the present law unhappily the RFC can no longer guarantee veterans' housing loans 100 percent. It in my opinion is absolutely necessary, if the veterans are going to be able to get access to adequate housing, that what some call the second mortgage, that part of the veterans' housing loan which is guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, be purchasable by some public authority. I am told that we are threatened with a crisis in housing because the insurance companies and others who ordinarily purchase housing paper are desisting from such purchase, to see if Congress will not raise the interest rate to 4½ percent instead of 4 percent as under the law at the present time. I am also told that the whole housing program, at least the veterans' part of it, is threatened with coming to a standstill and with paralysis unless the Congress either raises the interest rate to 4½ percent and thereby adds to the burden of cost that the veteran must bear, or restores to the RFC the power to take this paper at 100-percent valuation. If we do the latter, I think it is possible we may escape the necessity of raising the interest rate, but I venture to say we must do one or the other. We must either raise the interest rate to 4½ percent, so that private purchasers will purchase the paper, or we must put the Government again in possession of the power it formerly had and wisely exercised of purchasing this paper, and make it possible for a veteran to secure a home by paying a very small amount as a condition precedent to doing so. My bill, which I have just sent to the desk, proposes to restore to the RFC the power that it formerly had and which the Congress took away, to purchase the paper guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, as well as FHA paper, which it can now purchase at 100-percent valuation. Secondly, it proposes to extend the period of amortization on veterans' housing loans from the present 25 years to 32 years. That obviously will lower the monthly payment which the veteran will be required to make and will ease the burden that he will have to bear.

Not only that, Mr. President, but my bill makes these salutary benefits, should they be provided by the Congress, effective from the 1st of February of this year. I feel that there is a real crisis in the veterans housing field, and I hope that the bill will make some contribution to its speedy solution. I commend it to those who have been so interested as the able Senator from Washington has been in this whole housing program for veterans.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2172) to extend the maturity for mortgages under the National Housing Act in the case of property owned by veterans of World War II, to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEPPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that certain testimony which I gave on this subject in behalf of amendments to the Wolcott bill, which were similar to what I have offered in the present bill, may appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES FOR SENATOR PEPPER ON S. 287, MORTGAGE INSURANCE (VETERANS)

I. LEGISLATION

Federal home-loan bank operations

Under the present law, the Federal home-loan banks cannot accept as collateral for

their advances home-mortgage loans with more than 20 years maturity. Section 503 (b) of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill would encourage and facilitate the making of home loans with longer than 20-year maturities by member institutions (such as building and loan associations) by authorizing the Federal home-loan banks to make advances to such members on home-mortgage loans with maturities of up to 25 years as contrasted with the present limitation of 20 years.

Federal Housing Administration operations

Under section 203 of the National Housing Act the maximum maturity of home-mortgage loans insured thereunder on new construction is limited to 20 years, except in the case of newly constructed, single-family, owner-occupied homes costing $6,000 or less where the maximum maturity may be 25 years. Loans are up to 90 percent of value of house. The maximum statutory interest rate is 5 percent, but this has been reduced to 4½ percent in actual practice.

Section 508 (a) of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill would raise the 20-year-maximum maturity to 25 years. Under section 602 of the bill a maximum maturity up to 30 years on insured homes costing not more than about $5,260 would be authorized on newly constructed single-family, owner-occupied homes at 4 percent per annum for low-income families. Under section 510, veterans and their dependents who are unable to keep up payments can get an extension of mortgage for unexpired portion plus the period of military service.

Under section 603 of the National Housing Act the maximum maturity of home-mortgage loans insured thereunder is limited to 25 years and the maximum statutory interest rate is 4 percent.

GI Act operations

For home-mortgage loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, the maximum maturity is 25 years and the maximum-interest rate is 4 percent.

Estimated monthly and total principal and interest costs [1] on a $5,000 mortgage

	Monthly	Total
Sec. 203 of National Housing Act [2]	$27.80	$8,600
Sec. 603 of National Housing Act [3]	26.40	8,180
Servicemen's Readjustment Act [4]	26.40	8,180
Sec. 602, Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill [5]	23.90	8,604
S. 287, Senator PEPPER's bill [6]	24.60	9,446

[1] In addition, there would be about $25.75 per month based on 1944-45 levels payable for real estate taxes ($16.50) hazard insurance ($1) and maintenance ($8.25).

[2] Mortgage—90 percent of property valuation, 25-year maturity, 4½ percent interest. There would be an additional premium charge of one-half percent of principal—$2.02 initially per month and declining by a few cents per month each year. The down payment would be $260.

[3] Mortgage—90 percent of property valuation, 25-year maturity, 4 percent interest. There would be an additional premium charge of one-half percent of principal—$2.02 initially per month and declining by a few cents per month each year. The down payment would be $260.

[4] Mortgage—90 percent of property valuation, 25-year maturity, 4 percent interest rate. There is no premium charge. The down payment would be $260.

[5] Mortgage—90 percent of loan for purposes of comparison, 30-year maturity, 4 percent interest. There would be no premium charge. The down payment would be $260.

[6] Mortgage—90 percent of property valuation, 32-year maturity, 4½ percent interest rate. The premium charge would be the same as in note 2 above. The down payment would be $260. At 3½ percent interest with a 30-year maturity, the monthly payments would be $22.45 and the total payments of principal and interest would be $8,082.

II. ECONOMIC FACTORS

1. The objective of the bill is to reduce monthly payments for veterans when wages are low relative to the high cost of living and to enable them to bridge periods of unemployment more easily.

2. Even though prices on housing were under ceilings in 1946, a large portion of rental and sales housing in 1946 was at a higher price than many veterans indicated they could afford.

3. The average sales price in 1946 of all new permanent homes given priority authorization was $7,500 and the average rental $59 per month.

4. A survey in June 1946 showed that the average rent veterans said they could afford was $43 per month and the average price they could pay for a home was $5,500. About one-half of the veterans desired to rent.

5. About a million homes will be put under construction in 1947 and another million completed.

STATEMENT REGARDING ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, will now purchase first mortgages which are insured by the Federal Housing Administration under the provisions of sections 603 and 608 of the National Housing Act. The Association will continue to purchase mortgages insured under sections 203 and 207 of the act. Mortgages insured under sections 203 and 603 of the National Housing Act cover one- to four-family dwellings; mortgages insured under sections 207 and 608 of the act cover rental housing projects.

Agents of the Association in the 31 regional offices of RFC will execute contracts with Federal Housing Administration approved mortgagees for the immediate purchase of mortgages already insured under section 203 or 603 of the National Housing Act (except farm mortgages) or will issue firm commitments to purchase such mortgages when insured and delivered within a 9-month period. In the case of a commitment contract the seller will be required to deposit 1 percent of the amount of the mortgage as a commitment charge, which will be refunded to the seller upon delivery of the loan documents within the commitment period. The purchase price will be an amount equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan, plus accrued and unpaid interest, and will be available to the seller upon delivery of the loan documents.

Effective January 1, 1948, such mortgages as the Association agrees to purchase must be delivered within 1 year after the loans have been insured by Federal Housing Administration.

The Association will also consider applications for direct loans to be secured by mortgages insured under section 207 of the National Housing Act, provided the applications are submitted prior to the beginning of construction. Applications for commitments to purchase loans insured under section 207 or 608 upon completion of construction of a housing project likewise must be submitted before construction has commenced.

Federal National Mortgage Association is without statutory authority to make direct loans secured by mortgages insured under section 608 of the National Housing Act; to make or purchase loans insured under title I of the act; or to make or purchase second-mortgage loans. The Association also lacks authority to make or purchase home loans guaranteed or insured by the Veterans' Administration.

Detailed information concerning the activities of Federal National Mortgage Association may be obtained from the loan agencies of Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

NOVEMBER 17, 1947.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES IN COASTAL LANDS

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill.

On the 6th day of February there was transmitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior jointly proposed legislation, the announced purpose of which was "to promote and develop the conservation of certain resources in the submarine coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States." The ordinary procedure with reference to a bill transmitted by one or more of the departments would be its introduction by request, through the chairman of the appropriate committee. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, being absent at this time, I introduce the bill by request of the Departments referred to. I desire——

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator is aware of the fact that I introduced a bill on the same subject, which I frankly say was drawn by the Department of Justice.

Mr. CORDON. I did not know that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in that event I ask to withdraw my bill until I can check up further. I was simply introducing it by request.

CONVEYANCE TO ESCAMBIA COUNTY, FLA., OF PORTION OF SANTA ROSA ISLAND—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PEPPER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3417) to provide for the conveyance to Escambia County, State of Florida, of a portion of Santa Rosa Island which is under the jurisdiction of the War Department, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2159. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare plans and estimates for a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3344. An act to amend the fourth paragraph of section 4, chapter 1, title I, of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322; 48 U. S. C., sec. 101), as amended;

H. R. 3603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other;

H. R. 3936. An act to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4023. An act to authorize the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4461. An act approving the performance in the field of certain functions relating to the public lands;

H. R. 4513. An act to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4549. An act to authorize the enactment by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska of a code of laws for Alaska;

H. R. 4823. An act to provide adequate school facilities within Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4980. A bill relating to the acquisition by the United States of State-owned lands within Glacier National Park, in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Park River dam and reservoir project in Walsh County, N. Dak., as the Homme Reservoir and Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2313. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763), providing for the detail of the United States military and naval and Air Force missions to foreign governments; and

H. R. 5035. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 201), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 130, agreed to June 26, 1947.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. IVES asked and obtained consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to continue hearings on Senate bill 1390 during the remainder of today's session.

Mr. TAFT asked and obtained consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KNOWLAND, on behalf of Senator COOPER, asked and obtained consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AMERICAN PRINCIPLE APPLIED TO A JOINT EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPEHART

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Principle Applied to a Joint European Recovery Program," delivered by him at Peoria, Ill., on February 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY AND RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on Saturday, February 14, 1948, at the annual meeting of Eastern States Postal Employees' Councils, at the William Penn Hotel, Harrisburg, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on February 12, 1948, in Philadelphia, Pa., at the annual banquet of the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on January 17, 1948, in connection with the ceremonies in Philadelphia marking the two hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPANSION OF STEEL INDUSTRY—ARTICLE BY W. L. RUSSELL

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the expansion of the steel industry, written by W. L. Russell and published in the Pittsburgh Press of February 3, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN RESEARCH FUNDS—ARTICLE BY CLARENCE A. MILLS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Distribution of American Research Funds," by Clarence A. Mills, of the University of Cincinnati, published in the magazine Science of February 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES STAND ON THE PALESTINE SITUATION—ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLES AND MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Stand on Palestine Viewed As Starting UN on League's Path," written by Sumner Welles and published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 17; also a memorandum prepared for him dealing with the legal problems involved, which appear in the Appendix.]

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—ARTICLE BY JESSE C. SUTER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Civic Problems, Civic Bodies," written by Jesse C. Suter and published in the February 8, 1948, issue of the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE OIL MUDDLE—EDITORIAL FROM THE EXETER NEWS LETTER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Oil Muddle," from the Exeter (N. H.) News Letter of February 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISMANTLING OF GERMAN INDUSTRIAL PLANTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW HAMPSHIRE MORNING UNION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "BRIDGES Is Right," pertaining to the dismantling of German industrial plants, published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of February 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAYTONA BEACH EVENING NEWS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Daytona Beach Evening News, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL SECURITY WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement written by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]. The statement, which appears in the current issue of the Reserve Officer, relates to National Security Week, which is now being observed throughout the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.

In these days of international uncertainty and tension it is very desirable that American citizens be kept constantly aware of the need for an adequate security force.

National Security Week, under the sponsorship of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, is an effective and dramatic way of reminding the American public that only a strong America can make a genuine contribution to the preservation of peace.

I am heartily in accord with the patriotic purpose behind National Security Week, and I hope every citizen of America will take part in its observance.

CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, yesterday, February 16, marked the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence day. It is therefore appropriate that we pause to pay our sincere respects to our many citizens of Lithuanian descent and to join with them in the fervent hope that the day may not be too far distant when this brave little nation once again will enjoy true liberty and freedom.

We all know how the traditionally freedom-loving people of the Republic of Lithuania were the first to disappear behind the implacable "iron curtain." We have all read with distress of mass deportations, of arrests in the night, of swift trials, of executions, and of the other tragic symptoms of systematic extermination. These unhappy events can give us little cause for rejoicing on a day which commemorates a country's independence. But it should cause us to ponder seriously whether we, as the strongest Nation in the world, have not been lax and morally weak in permitting such conditions to continue to exist.

Last November the Lithuanian Minister here in the United States addressed

a moving appeal to the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations. He spoke on behalf of the Republic of Lithuania which, since 1940, has been occupied and administered by officials of the police state. He asked the United Nations to take measures, in keeping with the fundamental rights guaranteed by the United Nations Charter, to safeguard the Lithuanian people against enslavement and extermination. Certainly the United Nations cannot turn its back and look the other way when the spokesman of a small nation appeals for a hearing on life-or-death charges of this kind. Nor can we, as Americans, continue to ignore through silence an intolerable situation of this kind. Not since 1941, when the State Department issued a statement denouncing the Russian occupation of Lithuania, has there been any further official comment on our part. Our continued silence is not a matter for pride.

Mr. President, February 16 means as much to our Lithuanian friends as July 4 means to us. Let its significance not escape us. Let not its future observance be marked with the deprivation of civil rights, freedom of the press, speech, and assembly. Let this day stand once again for free elections and free religions. Let us, at the very least, lend strong moral courage to those who through ties of family, friendship, and tradition, remember Lithuania as a cradle of freedom in Europe, and who look to us, as a powerful stronghold of moral and civil liberty, for a word of encouragement and hope in these troubled times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following these remarks an editorial entitled "Lithuania's Independence," printed in the New York Times of February 16.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

With their country still writhing under the heel of the conqueror, the Lithuanian people commemorate today with heads bloodied but unbowed the thirtieth anniversary of the signing of their declaration of independence. After more than a century of struggle against oppression by the Russian Czars, and in defiance of the armies of the Kaiser then still on Lithuanian soil, the Council of Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, in consultation with American Lithuanians, formally declared the country to be free and independent. This act conformed with President Wilson's doctrine of the right of self-determination. There seemed to be every prospect for its continued success and prosperity when the Kaiser's empire collapsed, and when the Russian revolutionary government proclaimed that the age of "imperialistic ravishers" was over. In the peace treaty with Lithuania the Soviets "voluntarily and for all time abandoned all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territories."

The independence of Lithuania is still recognized by the United States and most other countries, and Lithuanian diplomatic missions still function abroad. But Russia, reverting to the policies of the "imperialistic ravishers," has renounced all her pledges and treaty obligations and has again annexed Lithuania, like the two other Baltic republics, by her own unilateral action. Moreover, she is subjecting their people not only to the oppression and terrorism that is the lot of everybody under Moscow's rule, but is deliberately pursuing a policy of extermination and deportation in the effort to replace the "unfriendly" native populations with reliable Russian Communists.

But the Lithuanian people continue to fight for independence. They are fighting as partisans in the forests. They are fighting, insofar as that is possible, at the ballot boxes. Even the Russians had to admit that in recent local elections the Communists polled only 11.6 percent of the vote, the rest going to "nonparty" candidates. Above all, they are fighting to arouse the conscience of the world, in particular that of the United Nations, to which they have submitted a plea for action against the genocide being practiced in their land. Sooner or later the world will have to take note of their struggle and give it the support it deserves.

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER IN JAPAN

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, on January 19, my good friend the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] delivered an address to the Senate in which he very vigorously criticized the occupation policy in Japan. He particularly directed his criticism to an order of the Far Eastern Commission known as Order 230. I suggested to the Senator from California that it would have been well if he had consulted General MacArthur in order to obtain the general's viewpoint. In answer to a question as to whether that had been done, the Senator asserted that he had not done so. I thereupon told the Senator I would forward his speech to General MacArthur for his comment. I have in my hand a copy of a letter which General MacArthur wrote me regarding Order No. 230. The letter is dated February 1, 1948, and as it is not long I should like to read it:

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS,
SUPREME COMMANDER
FOR THE ALLIED POWERS,
Tokyo, Japan, February 1, 1948.

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCMAHON: I have your letter of January 22 and the pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequently received under separate cover, for which I thank you.

The discussion of Senator KNOWLAND covers a policy paper of the United States formulated by the State, War, and Navy Departments and referred to the Far Eastern Commission for consideration by the other 10 governments represented on that body and to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers for guidance. As the sources of origin, authorship, and authority are all in Washington and my responsibility limited to the executive implementation of basic decisions formulated there, I am hardly in a position 10,000 miles away to participate in the debate.

For your information, however, I did publicly state my view with respect to the underlying purpose of the policy paper known as FEC 230 on New Year's Day last and subsequently on January 6, 1948, at San Francisco the Secretary of the Army in an address before the Commonwealth Club, with marked clarity, summed up the situation as it presently exists. It is somewhat difficult to understand why these published views did not figure in the discussion of the subject matter upon the floor of the Senate, and against the possibility that the texts of such statements did not come to your attention I am enclosing herewith copies thereof which I should be only too glad to have inserted in the RECORD as you have suggested.

In any evaluation of the economic potential here in Japan it must be understood that the tearing down of the traditional pyramid of economic power which has given only a few Japanese families direct or indirect control over all commerce and industry, all raw materials, all transportation, internal and external, and all coal and other power resources, is the first essential step to the establishment here of an economic system based upon free private competitive enterprise which Japan has never before known. Even more it is indispensable to the growth of democratic government and life, as the abnormal economic system heretofore in existence can only thrive if the people are held in poverty and slavery.

The Japanese people, you may be sure, fully understand the nature of the forces which have so ruthlessly exploited them in the past. They understand that this economic concentration not only furnished the sinews for mounting the violence of war but that its leaders, in partnership with the military, shaped the national will in the direction of war and conquest. And they understand no less fully that the material wealth comprising this vast concentration at war's start increased as war progressed, at the forfeiture of millions of Japanese lives, as resources of Japan theretofore only indirectly controlled came under direct control and ownership. These things are so well understood by the Japanese people that apart from our desire to reshape Japanese life toward a capitalistic economy, if this concentration of economic power is not torn down and redistributed peacefully and in due order under the occupation, there is no slightest doubt that its cleansing will eventually occur through a blood bath of revolutionary violence. For the Japanese people have tasted freedom under the American concept and they will not willingly return to the shackles of an authoritarian government and economy or resubmit otherwise to their discredited masters.

With expressions of cordiality.

Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, the documents referred to in the letter of General MacArthur.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 1, 1948.

To the People of Japan:

The design of a remodeled and reconstructed Japan is nearing completion. The pattern has been etched, the path has been laid. The development now lies largely in your own hands. Success or failure will depend upon your ability to practice the simple, yet transcendental, principles which modern civilization demands.

No occupation, however benevolent and beneficial, can substitute for the spiritual uplift which alone can lead to an invincible determination to build a future based upon the immutable concepts of human freedom—a social status under which full consciousness of individual responsibility must ever remain the keystone to the arch of success and progress.

Individual hardship is inevitable. Your economy, due to the disastrous war decisions of your past leaders, is now impoverished. This can only be relieved by employment to the maximum of the energies of your people, by wisdom and determination on the part of your leaders, and by the restoration of peace with its removal of existing limitations upon international trade. So long as your needs

continue to be greater than your productive capacity, controls upon your internal economy will be essential lest the weaker segments of your population perish. Such controls must, however, only be temporary and subject to ultimate removal in favor of free enterprise.

Economically, Allied policy has required the breaking up of that system which in the past has permitted the major part of the commerce and industry and natural resources of your country to be owned and controlled by a minority of feudal families and exploited for their exclusive benefit. The world has probably never seen a counterpart to so abnormal an economic system. It permitted exploitation of the many for the sole benefit of the few. The integration of these few with government was complete and their influence upon governmental policies inordinate, and set the course which ultimately led to war and destruction. It was, indeed, so complete a monopoly as to be in effect a form of socialism in private hands. Only through its dissolution could the way be cleared for the emergence of an economy conducive to the well-being of all the people—an economy embodying the principle of private capitalism, based upon free competitive enterprise—an economy which long experience has demonstrated alone provides the maximum incentive to the development of those fundamental requirements to human progress—individual initiative and individual energy.

Politically, progress toward reform has been equally encouraging. Your new constitution is now in full effect, and there is increasing evidence of a growing understanding of the great human ideals which it is designed to serve. Implementing laws have reoriented the entire fabric of your way of life to give emphasis to the increased responsibility, dignity, and opportunity which the individual now holds and enjoys. Government has ceased to be totatitarian and has become representative, with its functions decentralized to permit and encourage a maximum of individual thought and initiative and judgment in the management of community affairs. Control of every political segment has been shifted to permit the selection of a new leadership of your free choice capable of advancing democratic growth.

Socially, many of the shackles which traditionally have restricted individual thought and action have been severed and action has been taken to render the exercise of police power a matter for individual and community, rather than national, responsibility. The judicial system has been freed from executive and legislative controls, and laws have been enacted to temper inordinate bureaucratic power by requiring all public officials to justify the trust of public responsibility and answer for their acts directly to the people.

Every Japanese citizen can now for the first time do what he wants, and go where he wants, and say what he wants, within the liberal laws of his land. This means that you can select your own work, and when you have completed it you can choose your own method of relaxation and enjoyment, and on your day of rest you can worship as you please, and always you can criticize and express your views on the actions of your government. This is liberty. Yet inherent in it are its obligations to act with decorum and self-restraint, and become acutely conscious of the responsibilities which a free society imposes upon its every segment.

The future therefore lies in your hands. If you remain true to the great spiritual revolution which you have undergone, your nation will emerge and go on—if you accept only its benefits without its obligations, it will wither and go under. The line of demarcation is a simple one, understandable to all men—the line between those things which are right and those things which are wrong. The way is long and hard and beset with difficulties and dangers, but it is my hope and belief and prayer this New Year's Day that you will not falter.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE ARMY K. C. ROYALL

To many American citizens—including myself—the most surprising development—and one of the most disappointing aspects of our victory over Germany and Japan has been the responsibility and cost which have been placed upon us in the matter of occupation. There were few who originally recognized the extent of this burden. And today every citizen of our country is justified in asking the "what" and the "why" of our occupation policies.

On this occasion I will speak specifically of Japan. Immediately after the surrender, the objectives of our policy were stated to be, first, "To insure that Japan will not again become a menace to the peace and security of the world," and, second, "to bring about the earliest possible establishment of a democratic and peaceful government which will carry out its international responsibilities, respect the rights of other states, and support the objectives of the United Nations."

The underlying idea was the prevention of future Japanese aggression—direct prevention by disarmament and indirect prevention by creating a type of government unlikely to develop again the spirit of aggressive war. The real well-being of Japan—or her strength as a nation—was decidedly a secondary consideration—secondary to protection of ourselves against Japan, and secondary to payment of reparations to the victorious Allies for the damages inflicted upon them.

This attitude is clearly shown by the emphasis in the original directive, which stated in part: "Japan shall be permitted" (not encouraged but permitted) "to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of reparations * * * but not * * * enable her to rearm. * * * Access to, as distinguished from control of, raw materials should be permitted. Eventual Japanese participation in world trade * * * will be permitted."

It is clearly understandable—and it was fully in accord with the then feelings and opinions of our people—that in 1945 the main purpose of occupation should be protection against an enemy which had viciously attacked us and which had committed brutal atrocities against our troops and our private citizens.

Since then new conditions have arisen—in world politics and economics, in problems of national defense, and in humanitarian considerations. These changes must now be fully taken into account in determining our future course, but it should be remembered that these developments arose in large part after the original policies were set.

These original policies were promptly carried out. Within a few months after the end of hostilities, all Japanese tactical units had been dissolved and all implements of war destroyed or insulated. The top Japanese military organizations, as well as the infamous secret and terroristic societies, were abolished. Those who formulated the Japanese policies of conquest and aggression were removed from important political and economic positions.

War-making industries were marked for removal and reparation. This included arsenals, private munitions plants, aircraft factories, military research laboratories, synthetic rubber and oil plants, shipbuilding installations, and certain chemical, machine tool, precision bearing, thermoelectric, and metal factories, nonferrous and others. Commitments were made to other nations for payment of reparations with those plants.

Other steps followed, including those leading to the dissolution of concentrations of property ownership and economic power. At the end of the war—and for a long period before the war—land ownership had been in the hands of a comparatively small part of the population. The system was analogous to the feudal system of past centuries, and in Japan the land barons used their power to encourage war.

In the business field, the Zaibatsu, or money cliques dominated completely and ruthlessly the Japanese economy—through holding companies and monopolies. A dozen families controlled over 75 percent of the country's commerce, industry, and finance.

The influence over the Japanese Government of these and other monopolies was almost unbounded, and they were linked inseparably with the militarists. This joint group over a course of years—and particularly in the year and a half before Pearl Harbor—encouraged Japan toward war and destruction.

Steps were taken to break both types of concentrations. Under a directive issued by the Supreme Allied Commander, the Japanese Diet enacted in the fall of 1946 a land-reform law under which, through local land commissions, the 5,500,000 Japanese farm families could acquire land from the present owners at a reasonable price and pay for it over a period of years. This program will be completed by the end of 1948. Just as in America, the small landowner is symbolically and factually democracy in practice, so we expect that in time the strength of Japanese democracy will find roots in similar soil.

Action against the Zaibatsu has proceeded vigorously, and its control has now been virtually abolished. Sixty-seven holding companies, with 4,000 subsidiaries and affiliates, have been marked for liquidation. The two largest holding companies—Mitsubishi and Mitsui—have been closed. Others of the larger ones have been almost wholly liquidated.

The Japanese Government has been directed to prepare legislation prohibiting international cartels. Stringent antitrust and deconcentration legislation has been prepared and passed in part. A Holding Company Liquidation Commission has been established and is functioning in the supervision of the entire program.

While these various steps were being taken, new developments were arising, and old factors were changing in importance. Japan had never been able to provide all of its own food—nor to produce enough of many other necessities of life. Seventy-eight million Japanese occupy an area smaller than California, and of that area only 16 percent is capable of cultivation.

The population is still growing at an enormous rate. It is expected to reach 84,000,000 by 1951. The current troubled condition in Asia leaves practically no food available for import into Japan, even if the currency and Japanese export situation would make food purchases possible—which they would not. And yet without food and other necessities, Japan would be faced with widespread starvation and disease—would seethe with unrest and disorder and hopelessness. Even aside from the simple principles of humanity, we could not, under such conditions, accomplish our original objective of a peaceful Japanese Government. Nor could we hope that Japan would be other than susceptible to totalitarianism and Shintoism with democracy, to begin to replace educational regimentation with academic freedom, and to build the foundations for a peace-loving government of the people.

For this and other achievements in Japan, great credit must be given to General MacArthur and his staff. America was, indeed, fortunate that for this vital task, it had an outstanding leader who could bring the Japanese to a complete realization of their defeat and at the same time obtain their full cooperation in forming a free and stable government.

But the Department of the Army and the Department of State—which shares the policy responsibility of occupation—both Departments realize that for political stability to continue and for free government to succeed in the future, there must be a sound and self-supporting economy, and General MacArthur in command of the occupation can be depended upon to implement these policies.

We also realize that the United States cannot forever continue to pour hundreds of millions of dollars annually into relief funds for occupied areas, and that such contributions can end without disaster only when the occupied countries can pay for their own necessities with their own production and exports.

These factors have resulted in efforts to improve in many fields the economic situation in Japan. And with this increasing economic approach there has arisen an inevitable area of conflict between the original concept of broad demilitarization and the new purpose of building a self-supporting nation.

In the case of agriculture the two purposes do happen to run practically parallel. The breaking down of feudal holdings has ended a war-making influence. At the same time the wider division of lands tends to produce incentive on the part of the larger number of landowners and thereby to increase over-all production.

But it is a different situation with manufacturing. The destruction of synthetic rubber or shipbuilding or chemical or nonferrous metal plants will certainly destroy the war potential of Japan, but such destruction may also adversely affect the peace potential.

The dissolution of the Zaibatsu may present in itself no serious economic problem, but at some stage extreme deconcentration of industry, while further impairing the ability to make war, may at the same time impair manufacturing efficiency and reduce the over-all production and the exportable surplus of Japanese industry—may, therefore, postpone the day when Japan can become self-supporting.

Such is our dilemma. It is clear that Japan cannot support itself as a nation of shopkeepers and craftsmen and small artisans any more than it can exist as a purely agricultural nation. We can expect a continuing economic deficit in Japan, unless there is at least some degree of mass industrial production.

Another border-line situation between demilitarization and economic recovery is presented in the case of personnel. The men who were the most active in building up and running Japan's war machine—militarily and industrially—were often the ablest and most successful business leaders of that country, and their services would in many instances contribute to the economic recovery of Japan.

What should we do about them now? We cannot afford to leave the Japanese war system intact nor forget that there is danger in retaining in power leaders whose philosophy helped bring on World War II. On the other hand, we cannot afford to sterilize the business ability of Japan.

Nor can we believe without qualification individual Japanese protestations of war innocence or of peacetime reformation. One Senator said to me in Germany shortly after VE-day: "I have inquired everywhere, and I have not yet found a single Nazi in Germany," to which could perhaps now be added, "Nor a war lord in Japan."

All these matters present questions of degree, and the decisions are matters of judgment. These decisions are not difficult at a cocktail party or from an easy chair or on a rostrum, if made by those who have no responsibility for the decisions or their results. It is somewhat different when you must live and suffer with any errors that you might make.

The Departments of State and Army are trying to draw the lines in the right place. And in doing so they are giving—and will give—full weight to the changes in political and military and economic considerations which have occurred since the initial days of occupation.

We realize that deconcentration must stop short of the point where it unduly interferes with the efficiency of Japanese industry. Earlier programs are being reexamined—as for example the details of the program stated in the paper submitted some months ago to the Far Eastern Commission, and recently given wide publicity as FEC-230.

We are not averse to modifying programs in the interests of our broad objectives. A bill recently submitted to the Japanese Diet setting up procedures for deconcentration of excessive economic power was changed before its final enactment—changed with a view of giving added weight to the economic needs of Japan.

In the case of plant dismantling and reparations—in addition to the matter of disarmament—we are bound by certain agreements with other nations—agreements which must be carried out unless breached by those others or altered by consent. However, since last summer we have had a competent group of industrial engineers in the Pacific, selecting the specific plants which, consistent with our obligations, can be dismantled with the minimum of detriment to Japanese economic recovery. The report and recommendations of this committee should reach the Department of the Army during this month.

I would not leave the impression that questions of demilitarization or reparation or deconcentration or disqualification of personnel are the most immediate obstacles to Japanese recovery. The principal difficulties arise from the destruction which was brought to Japan and to the chaotic condition which has existed in the Far East since VJ-day.

The flimsy nature of Japanese construction and the concentrated population centers made these islands most vulnerable targets for our incendiary and other missiles. Even aside from the effects on Hiroshima and Nagasaki—of the atomic bombs, many Japanese cities were largely destroyed. I believe that on a percentage basis, greater Tokyo—with about 7,000,000 people as of 1940—was as badly damaged as any enemy city in the entire world.

Japan has long been dependent on the rest of Asia not only for foodstuffs but for raw materials needed in their manufacturing and business life, and it has relied largely on general commerce with China and other neighbors. With the war and its aftermath these sources of import and export are largely nonexistent.

Many affirmative steps have been and are being taken to meet these and other difficulties—and to promote recovery and thereby hasten the day when Japan will cease to be a financial burden to the United States. I wish that time permitted me to discuss in detail our activities in many fields, including those of finance and credit and foreign trade.

Some results of our efforts are apparent. Over-all Japanese industrial production has risen from 18 percent of the 1930–34 level in January 1946 to 40 percent in August 1947. In the case of coal—basically needed for business recovery—the present production is 86 percent of the 1930–34 level. Fertilizer has increased fourfold during occupation. One-fourth of the war-destroyed houses in Tokyo and vicinity have been replaced. Six hundred thousand acres of land have been reclaimed for cultivation, and a million more should be added by 1950.

In this whole picture of Japan do not forget that we are supervising an entire government—and one disorganized by an unsuccessful war. We have all the many normal policy and operating problems of a stable and successful government plus the added ones produced by the unusual and distressing conditions peculiar to present-day Japan.

The differences from our own country are such that we cannot expect to impose on the Japanese people an exact reproduction of American democracy. It follows that often there is no precise precedent for our problems, and the departments must do as our forefathers did in the early days of our own Government, reach the best results we can by trial and error.

The lines to be drawn are, of course, not always easy to draw, and as in the case of all decisions of importance, one cannot be too dogmatic. There can be—and are likely to be—differences of opinion among sincere and informed people. Nor do I have any illusion that everything we do will be perfect.

But I can assure you that our decisions will be made with realism and with a firm determination of doing all possible to prevent Japan from again waging unprovoked and aggressive and cruel war against any other nation. We hold to an equally definite purpose of building in Japan a self-sufficient democracy, strong enough and stable enough to support itself and at the same time to serve as a deterrent against any other totalitarian war threats which might hereafter arise in the Far East.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS OF L'ANSE INDIANS, MICHIGAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 522) to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan, which was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to insert "the southeast quarter of."

Mr. WATKINS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF INDIANS OF FORT BERTHOLD INDIAN RESERVATION, N. DAK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate an amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1133) providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota, which was, on page 1, line 7, strike out "$150" and insert "$300,000 to be distributed."

Mr. WATKINS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial which

appeared in the Eugene Register Guard, my home-town newspaper, last week. The editorial is entitled "Political Freedom at Issue," and it deals with the Taft-Hartley law.

I wish to say for the record that I share every criticism of the Taft-Hartley law, which the editorial makes; indeed, every criticism of the Taft-Hartley law contained in the editorial is also to be found in the speeches delivered by the junior Senator from Oregon on the Taft-Hartley bill when it was before the Congress. I predict that as the campaign of 1948 gets under way the criticisms of the Taft-Hartley bill which were made during the debate on it during the course of its passage through the Congress will come home to roost. However, it is not too late for my party to take the steps it should take in adopting at this session of Congress some constructive amendments to the Taft-Hartley law. As the clouds of recession and possible depression, with consequent unemployment, start to hover over this land, people then will discover what a legal monstrosity the Taft-Hartley law really is. Millions of dollars are being spent in propaganda to convince the American worker that the Taft-Hartley law does not destroy or injure any of his legitimate rights. However, the propaganda is not fooling the workers because they are already beginning to experience the injustices of the law including its return to Government by injunction. I shall continue, Mr. President, across this land during the campaign, to make my fight for constructive amendments to the Taft-Hartley law, because in its present form it cannot be justified by the leaders of any political party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL FREEDOM AT ISSUE

Futility is a mild word, in our opinion, for those sections of the Taft-Hartley law which seek to make it a crime for labor unions or their leaders to spend union funds for political purposes. Indictment of Philip Murray, chieftain of CIO, brings sections to a test of constitutionality.

It is always unsafe to predict how the Supreme Court will interpret the Constitution or any section of it or amendment to it, but the issue in this case will be whether these sections of the Taft-Hartley bill conflict with the first amendment:

"Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press."

It appears that Mr. Murray, with CIO funds, bought ads in the CIO News in behalf of a candidate for Congress in Maryland, and he probably would not even attempt to deny that he did this deliberately and defiantly.

Was this act within his rights as a citizen?

We think it was. We think that the privilege of publishing a political statement is one which must never be denied to any citizen or any group of citizens, and that the laws of libel are the only boundaries of that privilege. The fact that this privilege has been or may be abused has nothing to do with the main issue—the right or privilege of publishing a political opinion.

Likewise we think that the right or privilege of contributing moral or financial support to a party or to a candidate is one which can be limited only by clearcut and equitable definitions of "corrupt practices."

Take any of these rights away from labor unions, labor leaders or any other class of people, and you are paving a nice, swift road to dictatorship.

"But what about such smelly things as that gift of $500,000 out of United Mine Workers' funds which John L. Lewis made to the Roosevelt campaign in 1936, and apparently without consulting his miners?"

For the public, the best defense against such tactics is complete and merciless publicity. For union members whose treasuries may be raided by ambitious or unscrupulous leaders, the remedy lies in the votes within the union. There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which says that a union may not prohibit the use of its funds for political purposes, except with the voted consent of the members.

Whether the offenders are great business corporations or rich labor unions, there is a point beyond which legitimate financial support of parties or candidates becomes an effort to buy preferment and publication of these transactions is a powerful weapon because, where the people are informed of such transactions there is instinctive and fierce resentment, such as that which followed news of the Lewis deal in 1936.

A public accounting of how a great union has administered its funds can do more to correct abuses than any effort to regulate in advance how they shall be spent. In too many unions the members have had no voice, political or otherwise, in their own affairs.

We do not think that political activity of unions or union leaders can or should be prohibited. There are grave abuses, but we have a hunch the Supreme Court will share our extremely conservative view that the remedy does not lie in abridging freedom of political action or free speech.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, following the remarks by the Senator from Oregon regarding the Taft-Hartley law, I suggest that the most constructive amendment of that law would be its repeal. I hope the Senator from Oregon will associate himself with a good many of us who have introduced a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act as the most constructive possible amendment of that legislation.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state for the information of the Senate that when the Senate concludes its business today it will recess until tomorrow, at which time it may be possible to take up the measure relating to the legislative budget. A recess then will probably be taken until Friday, when we will start the consideration of the rent-control bill, if that be possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, in view of the speeding of time, I think it is very important that the Senate begin and conclude the consideration of rent-control legislation at the very earliest possible date. As everyone knows, the present law will expire on the 29th of February. The Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate has ordered a bill reported, which report I presume will be made today, extending the present law for 14 months. The House committee has voted out a joint resolution extending the present law for 1 month, with a view of giving more time for the consideration of the matter. From all standpoints, I think it would be extremely desirable if a bill could be passed before the expiration of the present law extending rent controls, under whatever form Congress will agree to do it, for a period of a year, or such other period in that neighborhood as may be agreed upon, rather than pass a measure temporarily extending the law for 30 days.

I make this observation in the hope that the Senate may be able to get rid of the question of rent control before the present law expires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to say to the Senator from Kentucky that his information is correct, that, subject to the ability of the various attorneys to get the bill in proper form, it will be reported to the Senate during the course of this afternoon.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the request has not been made, I suggest that the committee be allowed to have that done during the recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduced for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the appropriation of a billion dollars for rural electrification.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2168) authorizing the appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for the purposes of rural electrification, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the last 6 years, in the Great Plains area, in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Nebraska, and Minnesota, and one or two of the adjoining States, there has been a woeful lack in the building of power lines and other facilities by REA. As I stated last Friday, when discussing the subject, there are hundreds of thousands of farmers who as much as 4 or 5 or 6 years ago joined REA cooperatives, but who have not yet had built up to and connected with their farms the lines which would provide power and electricity.

Most of us are familiar with the investigation of the subject conducted by the distinguished former Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Shipstead. About a year ago he conducted hearings which lasted some 3 or 4 weeks on the subject of REA cooperatives. Upon taking up the subject of the lack of expansion of REA in the Great Plains area, and in the Midwestern States, I was told by Mr. Claude Wickard that it was partly due to a lack of personnel. Therefore the Civil Service

Committee of the Senate investigated the personnel of the entire REA administration. The hearings before our committee lasted approximately 3 weeks. Nearly every hearing was attended by Mr. Claude Wickard, Administrator of Rural Electrification in the United States. As a result of his testimony, and the testimony of others before our committee, I have today introduced a bill authorizing the appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for the extension of REA.

One of the most important statements made at the hearings was that by Mr. Claude Wickard himself. I intend to read all of it into the RECORD, with my comments thereon. Mr. Wickard, on the 22d day of January, testified as follows:

To assist the committee—

He referred to the Civil Service Committee of the Senate—

in its examination of the Rural Electrification Administration, I would like to describe briefly the background of rural-electrification development in this country, the origin and purpose of REA, how the agency operates, what progress it is making, and the special problems existing at this time. I hope that such a report will assist you in understanding the personnel problems and policies of our agency.

Many Senators are busy with plans for loans to Greece, to Turkey, to Great Britain, and to other countries. Many are busily engaged in working on the Marshall plan. While they are busy trying to assist other people all over the world, I have received letters from farmers all over the Great Plains area protesting against the way in which the REA has been handled, both by the Democratic administration and the Republican majority in Congress. I may say that, if anything, the writers of these letters are more severe in their criticism of the way the Republican Congress has handled the REA than with the way in which the Democratic administration has handled it. I have received hundreds upon hundreds of letters protesting against the way in which REA is handled, and in substance the letters are all alike. The writers say that 4 or 5 or 6 years ago they joined an REA cooperative and paid in the money required, but from the day they paid in their money until today they have heard nothing more about the matter. Other letters, of course, say that since the writers have paid in their money there have been some meetings held, and some poles have been set up. Some say there are poles standing without any wires being strung upon them, and that up to the present time they have received no service through REA.

Other letters say that poles have been erected, and some wires have been strung, and then suddenly there has developed a so-called shortage of wire, so that all the work could not be completed. Other letters say that poles have been erected and lines have been strung, but that there are no aluminum conductors available, and therefore, the writers are without light and power.

Strangely enough, Mr. President, letter after letter sets forth that, although the REA was in the field before a private power company was anywhere near, yet owing to the ostensible lack of material and the fact that REA, so it was alleged, could not secure the necessary material, the local private power companies have built in their lines, sometimes with loans obtained from the Government, and have thus picked off the cream of the farmers around the small towns, with the result that now, when the REA has become organized, it is handicapped because it cannot induce certain farmers to join the REA and cannot hook up and connect with the local cooperatives.

Mr. Wickard very carefully, clearly, concisely, and logically explained how that development occurred throughout the country. He continued in his testimony:

Rural electrification had made little progress in this country up to 1935. Despite the extensive use of electric power in industry and of electric lighting in the cities and towns, only 744,000 farms, or slightly more than 10 percent of all the farms in the country, had received electric service as of January 1 of that year.

Mr. President, let me again interpolate, as I did last Friday, some figures at that point. Two years ago, when our soldiers were returned from foreign countries in which they had been stationed, they told, among other things, of the development of electric light and power in the rural communities of various foreign countries. They stated that in Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, from 95 to 100 farmers out of every 100 had light and power upon their farms. They said that in Germany 95 percent of all the farms were energized; that is, had electric light and power. Soldiers who had been stationed in Japan, on their return home told us that 95 out of every 100 farmers in Japan had electric light and power upon their farms.

Two years ago, Mr. President, and the statement is true even today, less than 50 percent, less than one-half the farmers of the United States had light and power upon their farms.

I see in his seat the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. In his State 90 out of every 100 farmers have light and power upon their farms.

In the State of the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], 81 farmers out of every 100 have light and power on their farms.

The State of Rhode Island has the highest percentage of farm electrification in the United States. In that State 95 out of every 100 farmers have light and power on their farms. The State of Rhode Island, in which there is the highest percentage of farm electrification, does not have a higher percentage of rural electrification and power per capita than do the farmers of Japan, the figure being practically the same, but Rhode Island does not have as much rural electrification as there is in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, or Germany.

Mr. Wickard tells the reason why the private power companies, operating with private funds invested for the purpose of yielding dividends to the stockholders, were reluctant to build rural lines.

I remember one day discussing the matter with the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I had told him that in 1935, 1936, and 1937, if a farmer wanted to hook up with a private power company which had a line which passed right by the farmer's house, or which required the erection of only three or four or five poles, it would cost the farmer from $1,100 to $1,200 or $1,300 to be hooked up with the private power line. The distinguished Senator from Oregon told me that before REA and some other projects were developed in his State pretty much the same situation existed in his State.

Mr. President, of course the average farmer throughout the Great Plains area could not afford to pay $1,100, $1,200, or $1,300 simply to hook up his farm with a private line in order to receive light and power. Between 1935 and 2 years ago, a period roughly of 11 or 12 years, finally 25 farmers out of every 100 in the State of Montana, which is in the Great Plains area, secured light and power. In the State of Minnesota, 40 farmers out of every 100 secured light and power. But among 45 States of the Union, North Dakota is at the very bottom. In that State less than 7 farmers out of every 100 have light and power on their farms.

Mr. President, I introduced a bill today which provides for the expenditure of $1,000,000,000 for the extension of REA all over the United States. I particularly call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to paragraph (c), the last paragraph of the bill, which gives the Administrator of REA the right to use 10 percent of the money appropriated in the 10 States which are at the bottom of the list. In other words, for the first time in the States of Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and several other States, the REA Administrator would be given authority, in his discretion, to spend, in addition to the amount REA receives now under existing law, 10 percent of the amount authorized by my bill in the States which are now at the very bottom of the list of States.

Mr. Wickard continued:

There was money to be made in extending electric service in towns and cities, where the number of electric consumers per mile of line runs into the hundreds. Building rural lines with a consumer density of from only 1 to 6 per mile of line did not seem likely to be profitable. Practically the only rural families that had received electric high-line service were those living in large villages or situated near transmission lines that connected population centers. Many private power companies would agree to the building of rural lines only if the farmers themselves paid for much or all of the construction costs of the line, which then usually became the company's property.

I am sure that my distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who lives in the Great Plains area, will bear me out in the statement that in 1935, 1936, 1937, or 1938, if a private line hooked up with the farmer and

the farmer paid $1,100 or $1,200, even after the farmer paid it the private company owned the line for which the farmer paid. That was the rule under which they operated.

Mr. Wickard further stated:

In addition, farmers were usually required to guarantee the payment of monthly or annual sums far in excess of what urban consumers had to pay or what the farmers could afford to pay. As a consequence, the great majority of farmers seemed to be doomed to get along without the conveniences and the advantages of high-line electric service.

It appeared unlikely that rural electrification would proceed at a more rapid pace without assistance. That assistance was provided by the Congress when funds for promotion of rural electrification were included in the emergency relief appropriation of 1935. On May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was established by Presidential executive order. In 1936, the Congress authorized a 10-year program of rural electrification in the Rural Electrification Act. Under the act, the Administrator of REA is authorized to make loans for bringing electric service to persons in rural areas not receiving such service. REA operates no electric facilities and makes no grants. Its loans are made on a self-liquidating basis and are sufficient to cover the full cost of constructing lines and other electric facilities. They bear 2 percent interest and are repaid over a maximum of 35 years.

I invite attention to the fact that Mr. Wickard testified that these amounts were not grants. They were loans. They were not like some of the so-called loans about which we hear. Six or seven months ago I heard the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] say:

We are sending $60,000,000 to China. I know that we are pouring it down a rat hole, but I am in favor of sending it. We are going to send $20,000,000 a month more.

Mr. President, every single dollar loaned out to REA represents a bona fide loan. Of the hundreds of REA's in this country, only one is in default at the present time. Seventeen million dollars' worth of interest, which is not yet due but is payable in the future, has already been paid. So Senators can see the excellent financial situation of REA.

Mr. Wickard further stated:

The act authorizes the Administrator to make loans to public bodies and agencies, to power companies, and to nonprofit cooperative associations of rural consumers. However, it became apparent early in the program that power companies were not interested in applying for any considerable number of REA loans. Certain power-company officials, in fact, went as far as to express the opinion publicly that practically all farms that could use power advantageously already had electric service. So farm people themselves took the initiative of organizing their own cooperative associations to provide themselves with electric service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much pleased that the Senator from North Dakota is making the statement he is making on the REA problems and on the need for greater development of the electric-power resources of the country. With the Senator's permission, I should like to invite his attention to a very definite trend, so far as a change of attitude is concerned on the part of private power utilities, as well as public power groups, toward the development of large power dams. Both groups are now getting together frequently in joint conference as to the need of a greater development of power resources.

It was not so many years ago that we found great private utilities very much concerned with and opposed to the movement for the development of the Nation's power resources, apparently because of fear that there would result great public ownership developments, and that the private utilities would thereby be forced out of business. Such fears were not well founded, as subsequent events have proved.

We now find public power advocates and private power advocates joining in various sections of the country in support of the maximum development of the Nation's power resources. In no section is this trend more pronounced than in my section of the Pacific Northwest.

The Senator from North Dakota will recall that last year, in discussing the need for greater power development, the junior Senator from Oregon introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what was then called the Tacoma agreement, an agreement entered into by the advocates of various power developments. The agreement was entered into by officials of Bonneville and officials of the private utilities of the Pacific Northwest, urging upon the Congress a greater development of the power resources of that area. Such a development can come about only if we proceed to build the great wealth-producing projects of the Northwest, such as McNary Dam, Hungry Horse, Foster Creek, and the others.

As a supplement to the Tacoma agreement, I should like to have the Senator's permission to have made a part of the RECORD—because I think it bears upon the points which he is making—a telegram which was recently addressed to Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions of the War Department. The telegram is dated January 30, 1948, and reads as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1948.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions of War Department, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned representatives of public and private electric-distribution systems serving more than 1,000,000 consumers in Washington and Oregon respectfully urge the vital need for appropriations that will bring McNary Dam on Columbia into production of power at earliest possible date.

Electric-power requirements of Pacific Northwest today exceed safe-operating capacity of existing generators, and the load is steadily growing. Our consolidated estimates indicate load will increase 397,000 kilowatts in 1948; 345,000 kilowatts in 1949; 336,000 kilowatts in 1950; and that there will be an average annual increase of 290,000 kilowatts from 1951 to 1956.

Part of this growth in power needs will be met by non-Federal plant additions, but magnitude of total requirements makes it imperative that major developments on Columbia River be expedited if people of region are to be protected against far-reaching losses that will result from any continued shortage of an essential element to growth and prosperity of Pacific Northwest. McNary Dam, already under construction, offers most expeditious source of large block of new power from Columbia and any delays in completion of this project will be costly to region and will entail unnecessary revenue loss to Government. Such delays would also require huge quantities of oil to be burned in steam-power plants on emergency basis, with attendant serious drain on Nation's short supply of petroleum.

Each and every electric-distribution system in region is carrying unprecedented responsibilities in connection with major expansion of its facilities, and the immediate foreseeable power needs of Pacific Northwest can be met only if Federal Government likewise recognizes its public-utility status and responsibilities as a major supplier of electricity at wholesale in the area.

This is particularly important because Federal Government through its program of multiple-purpose dams has preempted the development of Pacific Northwest's greatest power-producing stream, the Columbia River. Thus the Federal Government has a direct responsibility to the people of the Northwest to carry forward its power-supply projects.

In view of these immediate problems we urge that a distinction in budget making be recognized between ordinary public works and the Pacific Northwest Federal power-development program, and that the Congress approve a level of expenditures sufficient to expedite construction of McNary Dam and bring it into production of power as rapidly as physically possible.

Pacific Northwest Utilities Conference Committee: Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.; Pacific Power & Light Co., Portland, Oreg.; Portland General Electric Co., Portland, Oreg.; Puget Sound Power & Light Co., Seattle, Wash.; Seattle City Light, Department of Lighting; Mountain States Power Co., Albany, Oreg.; Tacoma City Light, Tacoma, Wash.; Northwest Public Power Association, Longview, Wash.; Chairman C. A. Erdahl, Commissioner of Public Utilities, Tacoma

I wish to say to my good friend the Senator from North Dakota that the proposals made in this telegram are in line with the proposals the junior Senator from Oregon has made in this body since the year 1945. We cannot begin to serve the needs of all groups in the Pacific Northwest, including the farmers, for whom the Senator from North Dakota is making such an able plea here today, unless we recognize the responsibility of the National Government to go forward in the building of these great power projects. I repeat now what I have said so many times, that in the long run it will be done without cost to the Government, because of the self-liquidating nature of these dams. Of course, it will be done with the resultant benefit of increasing present wealth and adding new wealth out of which new tax dollars can flow in payment of the national debt.

I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota for permitting me to make this statement at this time, because I join with him wholeheartedly in his views regarding the need for the development of

the power resources of the Nation. I say to the farmers of the Pacific Northwest that the responsibility for meeting their electric-power needs rests on the Congress of the United States and no place else. Unless the Congress of the United States lives up to that responsibility, then my answer to the farmers of the Pacific Northwest, when they ask me for help in the effort to obtain the power-resource developments they need, will be that the Congress of the United States to date has failed to appropriate the necessary funds for the construction of these power-development projects. The voters of the Nation must make clear to the Members of Congress that the power resources of the Nation must be developed quickly if we are to expand our economy to the point necessary to meet our domestic economic needs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed a chart prepared by the United States Department of Agriculture, Rural Electrification Administration, which shows, by States, for 1935, 1945, 1946, and 1947, the number of farms electrified with central station service. It also shows the rank of each State. I particularly advise Senators who are interested in the subject of rural electrification to examine this chart to ascertain exactly where their own States stand.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE No. 1.—*Comparison of rank, percentage, and number of farms electrified with central-station service, by States, 1935, 1945, 1946, and 1947*

Area	Farms, Jan. 1, 1935, number [1]	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31 1934			Farms, Jan. 1, 1945, number [1]	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Jan. 1, 1945			Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1946			Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1947			Increase in electrified farms from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1947		
		Number [2]	Percent	Rank		Number [3]	Percent	Rank	Number [4]	Percent	Rank	Number [5]	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
United States	6,812,350	743,954	10.9	------	5,859,169	2,679,184	45.7	------	3,180,303	54.3	------	3,574,641	61.0	------	2,830,687	380.5	------
Alabama	273,455	11,053	4.0	33	223,369	64,833	29.0	39	86,564	38.8	37	107,281	48.0	36	96,228	870.6	13
Arizona	18,824	5,577	29.6	12	13,142	8,603	65.5	18	9,594	73.0	19	11,129	84.7	14	5,552	99.6	41
Arkansas	253,013	2,943	1.2	47	198,769	42,058	21.2	45	63,102	31.8	45	83,957	42.2	40	81,014	2,752.8	2
California	150,360	81,093	53.9	1	138,917	118,536	85.3	5	123,246	88.7	7	125,414	90.3	11	44,321	54.7	47
Colorado	63,644	7,145	11.2	25	47,618	23,161	48.6	25	28,133	59.1	24	32,794	68.8	24	25,649	359.0	25
Connecticut	32,157	10,138	31.5	10	22,241	19,555	87.9	3	21,133	95.0	1	21,914	98.5	1	11,776	116.2	40
Delaware	10,381	1,791	17.3	20	9,296	5,547	59.7	20	6,357	68.4	21	7,614	81.9	16	5,823	325.1	28
Florida	72,857	5,700	7.8	26	61,159	24,189	39.6	27	30,792	50.3	28	35,985	58.8	26	30,285	531.3	18
Georgia	250,544	6,956	2.8	41	225,897	76,031	33.7	35	95,727	42.4	34	121,613	53.8	32	114,657	1,648.3	6
Idaho	45,113	13,433	29.8	11	41,498	31,034	74.8	11	34,733	83.7	10	38,719	93.3	7	25,286	188.2	35
Illinois	231,312	28,379	12.3	23	204,239	116,989	57.3	23	134,890	66.0	22	153,015	74.9	22	124,636	439.2	22
Indiana	200,835	23,476	11.7	24	175,970	121,457	69.0	15	137,369	78.1	15	150,308	85.4	13	126,832	540.3	17
Iowa	221,986	32,047	14.4	22	208,934	123,348	59.0	21	155,506	74.4	18	165,103	79.0	20	133,056	415.2	23
Kansas	174,589	13,224	7.6	28	141,192	44,653	31.6	36	51,273	36.3	41	58,903	41.7	41	45,679	345.4	26
Kentucky	278,298	8,480	3.0	39	238,501	68,971	28.9	40	87,791	36.8	39	104,434	43.3	39	95,954	1,131.5	11
Louisiana	170,216	2,826	1.7	46	129,295	31,333	24.2	43	49,239	38.1	38	59,213	45.8	38	56,387	1,995.3	3
Maine	41,907	13,959	33.3	8	42,184	26,775	63.5	19	29,072	68.9	20	31,493	74.7	23	17,534	125.6	39
Maryland	44,501	6,791	15.3	21	41,315	23,726	57.4	22	26,990	65.3	23	32,433	78.5	21	25,642	377.6	24
Massachusetts	35,094	14,494	41.3	7	37,007	32,887	88.9	2	34,071	92.1	3	35,223	95.2	3	20,729	143.0	38
Michigan	196,517	42,152	21.4	17	175,268	143,359	81.8	7	153,725	87.7	8	161,239	92.0	9	119,087	282.5	31
Minnesota	203,302	13,783	6.8	30	188,952	87,500	46.3	26	106,284	56.2	25	117,931	62.4	25	104,148	755.6	15
Mississippi	311,683	2,802	.9	48	263,528	49,047	18.6	46	64,435	24.5	46	86,740	32.9	46	83,938	2,995.6	1
Missouri	278,454	17,893	6.4	31	242,934	73,186	30.1	37	97,942	40.3	35	119,491	49.2	35	101,598	567.8	16
Montana	50,564	2,768	5.5	32	37,747	10,899	28.9	41	13,497	35.8	42	15,644	41.4	42	12,876	465.2	20
Nebraska	133,616	9,544	7.1	29	111,756	37,752	33.8	34	40,689	36.4	40	42,503	38.0	45	32,959	345.3	27
Nevada	3,696	946	25.6	15	3,429	1,792	52.2	24	1,846	53.8	26	1,882	54.9	29	936	98.9	42
New Hampshire	17,695	9,495	53.7	2	18,786	15,200	80.9	9	16,054	85.5	9	16,978	90.4	10	7,483	78.8	44
New Jersey	29,375	15,162	51.6	4	26,226	23,481	89.5	1	24,656	94.0	2	24,952	95.1	4	9,790	64.6	46
New Mexico	41,369	1,350	3.3	37	29,695	7,093	23.9	44	10,250	34.5	44	12,063	40.6	43	10,713	793.6	14
New York	177,025	57,825	32.7	9	149,490	120,986	80.9	8	134,237	89.8	6	140,712	94.1	6	82,887	143.3	37
North Carolina	300,967	9,672	3.2	38	287,412	107,637	37.5	30	131,378	45.7	30	157,581	54.8	30	147,909	1,529.2	7
North Dakota	84,606	1,968	2.3	43	69,520	7,141	10.3	48	8,601	12.4	48	10,831	15.6	48	8,863	450.4	21
Ohio	255,146	48,048	18.8	19	220,575	162,590	73.7	13	182,424	82.7	11	198,512	90.0	12	150,464	313.2	30
Oklahoma	213,325	5,648	2.6	42	164,790	44,634	27.1	42	64,548	39.2	36	78,651	47.7	37	73,003	1,292.5	8
Oregon	64,826	17,839	27.5	14	63,125	46,652	73.9	12	51,857	82.1	12	58,226	92.2	8	40,387	226.4	33
Pennsylvania	191,284	45,182	23.6	16	171,761	122,774	71.5	14	136,388	79.4	13	143,593	83.6	15	98,411	217.8	34
Rhode Island	4,327	1,975	45.6	6	3,603	3,108	86.3	4	3,248	90.1	5	3,504	97.3	2	1,529	77.4	45
South Carolina	165,504	3,796	2.3	44	147,745	52,047	35.2	33	63,227	42.8	33	77,048	52.2	33	73,252	1,929.7	4
South Dakota	83,303	2,939	3.5	36	68,705	8,556	12.5	47	10,143	14.8	47	12,484	18.2	47	9,545	324.8	29
Tennessee	273,783	9,727	3.6	34	234,431	69,546	29.7	38	83,381	35.6	43	94,703	40.4	44	84,976	873.6	12
Texas	501,017	11,466	2.3	45	384,977	152,219	39.5	28	196,910	51.1	27	214,648	55.8	27	203,182	1,772.0	5
Utah	30,695	16,130	52.5	3	26,322	19,822	75.3	10	20,762	78.9	14	20,965	79.6	17	4,835	30.0	48
Vermont	27,061	7,945	29.4	13	26,490	17,943	67.7	16	19,894	75.1	17	21,060	79.5	18	13,115	165.1	36
Virginia	197,632	14,954	7.6	27	173,051	61,954	35.8	32	77,786	44.9	32	93,221	53.9	31	78,267	523.4	19
Washington	84,381	40,060	47.5	5	79,887	66,446	83.2	6	72,388	90.6	4	75,582	94.6	5	35,522	88.7	43
West Virginia	104,747	3,647	3.5	35	97,600	37,731	38.7	29	44,137	45.2	31	49,500	50.7	34	45,853	1,257.3	10
Wisconsin	199,877	39,206	19.6	18	177,745	119,623	67.3	17	137,751	77.5	16	140,662	79.1	19	101,456	258.8	32
Wyoming	17,487	527	3.0	40	13,076	4,780	36.6	31	6,283	48.0	29	7,190	55.0	28	6,663	1,264.3	9

[1] United States Census of Agriculture 1935 and 1945.
[2] Edison Electric Institute.
[3] United States Census of Agriculture, 1945, adjusted to exclude home plants.
[4] REA estimate (revised September 1947).
[5] REA estimate.

Mr. LANGER. I may say, Mr. President, that North Dakota stands forty-eighth, or at the bottom of the list. In talking this matter over with my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], we have determined to keep battling upon the Senate floor until the farmers of North Dakota get what they are rightly and legally entitled to. Instead of the distribution shown by the chart, we intend to see that, under the bill I have introduced, if it shall be enacted, one-tenth of all the money that is made available shall be used for the purpose of increasing the facilities in the 10 States which are at the bottom, in the discretion of the Administrator as to the amount of money he will spend, and the amount of material he will allocate if he gets the material, so that in REA service the States in the Great Plains area shall be placed in a position somewhat similar, at least, to that of the other States of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. YOUNG. As I understand the provisions of the bill, they are not at all unreasonable, and the measure is along the line of the provision inserted in the Soil Conservation Act last year, extending relief more on the basis of need.

Mr. LANGER. It is similar to that.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator certainly has my wholehearted support, and I hope his bill will be enacted.

Mr. LANGER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, it is essential to an understanding of the REA program and the functions of the REA staff that the full extent to which this is a cooperative program be appreciated. Rural electric co-ops constitute more than 90 percent of all the borrowers of REA loan funds, and have received more than 95 percent of all the loans made.

A rural electric co-op is owned by those who use the power it distributes. I emphasize the statement that it is owned by those who use the power it distributes. Retail rates are based on cost with allowance for repayment of the Government loan. Interest and amortization are paid from revenue. Each member has one vote at business meetings. A board of directors is elected once a year. The directors employ the manager, fix the rates, and otherwise direct the business, reporting periodically to the membership.

Rural electric cooperatives have many advantages as instruments for making electric service available to farmers at reasonable cost. First, REA-financed co-ops operate on a nonprofit basis. This enables them to provide electric service at cost. Second, directors of REA-financed co-ops are elected because of their own interest in making electric service available to rural people at reasonable rates. They serve without compensation, and keep operating expense at the lowest possible level consistent with good service. Third, members of rural electric co-ops themselves provide many services that help keep operating expenses low. For example, members are encouraged to report potential causes of service interruptions, such as tree limbs touching the lines. Most of them read their own meters and many make out their own bills. I know that will surprise many Senators, but that is the official record of the national administration of the REA. Fourth, previous experience of farmers with other types of co-ops helps them to organize and operate rural electric co-ops on a sound basis with a minimum of effort and expense.

I have no hesitation in saying that without these co-ops the rural-electrification program authorized by the Congress could not have been made effective, and that rural electric co-ops provide the only real hope of many farm families to get power-line electric service within the foreseeable future.

The extent to which the co-ops have been effective in carrying out the Rural Electrification Act is indicated in part by the great increase in rural electrification that has occurred in this country since 1935. I have already pointed out that only 1 farm in 10 was electrified 12 years ago. By July 1, 1947, REA's official estimate showed that a total of 3,575,000 farms, or 61 percent of all the farms in the country, were electrified. More than half of the farms receiving electric service since 1935 have been connected to REA-financed lines. Most of the rest are on lines of commercial power companies, which have been stimulated to greater rural-electrification activity by the REA program.

Progress in farm electrification, by States, since the initiation of the REA program, is shown in table I, which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD.

I shall now show how the REA program works. The amount which REA is authorized to lend annually is fixed by Congress, and REA then borrows the amount of its loan authorization from the United States Treasury.

Half of the amount available for loans in any given year is reserved for loans in the various States on the basis of the proportion that each State's unelectrified farms bear to the total number of unelectrified farms in the country. The other half of the fund may be used for loans at the discretion of the Administrator, but not more than 10 percent may be loaned in any one State or Territory.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact, for example, that in the State of Connecticut, in the State of Rhode Island, in the State of Massachusetts, and in the State of West Virginia none of the money set aside by the Congress was used. Therefore, that money remained in the Treasury. In my opinion, the Administrator should have the power to use, in his discretion, any money not used, because it can readily be seen that when the Appropriation Committee meets, or when the political committee of either the Democratic or Republican Party meets, it gets a report from the REA Administration which says, "There is $5,000,000, $10,000,000, $50,000,000 available which has not been used," when as a matter of fact that is not strictly true, because either it has already been assigned to projects which are in the course of being constructed or it is set aside for those States which are not going to use it, and the Administrator knows it is not going to be used. So this provision, that the other half of the fund may be used for loans in the discretion of the Administrator, but not more than 10 percent may be loaned in any one State, is not quite sufficient, and the law should be changed as provided in the bill I am introducing.

Most REA borrowers operate only distribution systems and purchase power at wholesale from commercial power companies or public agencies. Distribution facilities account for nearly 90 percent of all REA loans made to date. A little more than 6 percent have been for generating plants and a little less than 5 percent for transmission facilities, a substantial part of which is an inherent part of distribution systems.

REA finances generation facilities only when borrowers are unable to obtain adequate supplies of power or to purchase power at reasonable wholesale rates. About 1 percent of the total loans approved have been for the installation of wiring, plumbing, and electrical equipment and appliances on consumers' premises. These loans are made to co-ops, which in turn make loans to their consumers. REA itself makes no loans direct to consumers.

Mr. President, very much to my surprise I found that the average citizen with whom I conversed, who was not familiar with the subject, did not know that to be true.

Mr. Wickard continued:

Before any REA loan can be made, the borrower is required to submit a detailed application, on the basis of which REA can determine whether or not the loan is feasible, that is, whether or not the facilities to be constructed appear to be reasonable security for the loan. If an application is approved, a loan contract is entered into between REA and the borrower, binding the borrower to performance of a specific amount of power system construction and binding the Government to finance the work. Before construction begins, the borrower submits detailed plans and specifications for approval by the REA engineering staff. Loan funds are actually advanced to the borrower only as they are needed to pay for completed construction which meets good engineering standards.

Again, Mr. President, I digress for a moment to show the complete misunderstanding on the part even of farmers who are customers of REA. Some of the customers believe they do not have the right to select their own engineer. As a matter of fact, they do have that right. All the REA cooperatives which have been organized within the last 3 or 4 years have the right, and indeed, it is a requisite that they select their own engineer. But when it comes to the selection of a permanent engineer, then approval must be obtained from the national administration, so that the national administration in making the loan will know exactly what the situation is in the REA, and whether or not the amount of the loan requested is justified or whether it should be made at all.

Mr. Wickard continued as follows:

Originally, REA loans were made for 25 years with interest at rates ranging from 2½ to 3 percent. Under the Pace amendment of 1944, however, extension of all loans to 35 years, with interest at a flat 2 percent, was authorized. These extensions have been completed in the case of about 85 borrowers and are being made for others requesting them as rapidly as the legal work can be done. Ordinarily, under the 35-year amortization plan, interest on each note is deferred for 2 years, with the borrower making equal quarterly payments of principal and interest thereafter.

To summarize the REA loan program, I might say that as of December 31, 1947, REA had approved loans totaling $1,191,000,000 to 1,029 borrowers, of which 947 were co-ops, 41 were public-power districts, 20 were other types of public bodies, and 21 were commercial power companies. Of these borrowers, 904 have rural electric facilities in operation. The facilities include 594,000 miles of lines serving about 2,030,000 farms and other rural consumers in about 2,200 counties of 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands.

These features of the program are summarized in tables Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 which contain both national totals and State breakdowns.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables are as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Progress of REA program by fiscal years*

Fiscal year	Loan authorizations	Total loans approved	Miles to be constructed (loan estimate)	Consumers to be connected (loan estimate)	Funds advanced	Energized systems		
						Number	Miles	Consumers connected
1935-36	$13,928,288	$13,903,412	13,072	48,997	$823,262	11	400	693
1937	46,500,000	58,936,217	54,407	193,529	11,864,836	45	8,000	19,611
1938	30,000,000	88,172,436	80,951	282,802	60,040,810	248	41,736	104,528
1939	140,000,000	227,236,949	209,818	724,999	122,337,824	417	115,230	268,000
1940	40,000,000	268,972,949	251,642	854,828	221,287,287	630	232,978	549,604
1941	100,000,000	369,027,621	356,053	1,171,867	296,395,142	732	307,769	779,561
1942	100,000,000	460,180,345	409,490	1,345,107	354,616,010	789	389,129	981,193
1943	10,000,000	466,881,323	414,287	1,358,114	369,152,582	805	381,747	1,041,821
1944	20,000,000	498,811,447	448,889	1,438,567	387,630,670	815	397,861	1,152,031
1945	25,000,000	564,968,184	507,105	1,581,431	427,566,738	832	424,072	1,287,347
1946	300,000,000	817,086,990	674,742	2,088,127	514,819,844	856	474,837	1,549,057
1947	250,000,000	1,068,436,162	811,019	2,484,503	704,905,701	889	546,781	1,843,351
1948	225,000,000	[1] 1,190,527,346	[1] 860,069	[1] 2,630,499	[1] 821,142,824	[1 2] 904	[1 2] 594,000	[1 2] 2,030,000
Total	1,300,428,288							

[1] As of Dec. 31, 1947.
[2] Estimated.

TABLE 3.—*Progress of REA program since end of war, by States, June 30, 1945, to Dec. 31, 1947*

Area	Total loans approved		Miles to be constructed (loan estimate)		Consumers to be connected (loan estimate)		Funds advanced		Number of energized systems		Number of miles energized		Number of consumers connected	
	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1947	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1947	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1947	June 30, 1945	Dec. 31, 1947	June 30, 1945	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1945	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1945	Nov. 30, 1947
United States	$564,968,184	$1,190,527,346	507,105	860,069	1,581,431	2,630,499	$427,566,738	$821,142,824	832	902	424,072	585,686	1,287,347	1,992,052
Alabama	15,593,649	36,537,649	11,904	23,939	46,263	92,998	10,246,747	19,955,720	22	24	10,792	14,588	41,582	65,092
Arizona	1,326,000	5,085,786	849	2,203	3,025	7,091	1,160,134	3,140,263	3	7	632	762	2,236	3,980
Arkansas	14,961,500	32,223,000	13,085	24,629	44,736	83,127	9,749,265	22,419,086	17	19	9,693	15,209	31,074	58,721
California	2,469,500	3,142,429	1,755	2,020	5,636	5,599	1,926,262	2,409,330	4	5	1,502	1,718	4,507	7,257
Colorado	11,974,810	21,998,551	10,498	15,210	29,704	39,891	8,456,274	15,216,359	19	20	7,045	9,835	20,343	29,145
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	1,113,000	17,116,000	1,053	1,486	3,374	6,426	1,033,266	1,742,835	1	1	1,002	1,082	3,173	3,869
Florida	5,824,500	2,127,000	5,040	11,733	15,856	35,747	3,839,560	12,045,032	14	17	3,846	7,194	12,592	25,214
Georgia	24,698,202	52,561,330	22,105	41,673	86,541	152,936	16,818,596	31,088,359	42	43	21,261	28,473	76,282	120,069
Idaho	4,184,750	7,682,315	3,162	5,207	9,443	13,326	3,398,264	5,458,742	9	9	3,083	3,601	7,503	9,439
Illinois	23,449,803	42,613,803	22,452	33,551	65,007	98,400	21,242,482	34,109,399	28	28	21,149	26,708	58,812	80,262
Indiana	24,883,269	37,922,726	24,152	31,431	84,067	112,972	20,676,706	29,994,730	44	44	22,755	27,018	77,688	101,621
Iowa	32,657,198	68,602,949	31,948	46,095	77,838	112,413	27,675,561	47,550,136	53	54	28,030	38,088	67,831	94,915
Kansas	12,564,151	38,613,351	12,867	29,722	28,720	57,861	8,760,517	23,195,058	22	28	9,844	14,378	19,514	30,127
Kentucky	18,433,855	41,416,855	16,200	29,498	64,159	115,323	12,499,047	26,525,944	25	25	13,780	17,877	52,128	78,701
Louisiana	12,644,100	21,255,600	8,905	14,057	29,397	52,743	10,173,149	18,176,164	15	15	7,143	11,707	22,883	45,157
Maine	762,500	1,198,500	564	746	2,309	2,990	600,069	1,011,219	4	4	471	489	1,297	2,192
Maryland	3,537,500	6,043,500	2,720	3,694	10,090	13,960	2,608,704	4,539,393	2	2	1,680	2,566	5,130	12,524
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	14,872,500	23,289,221	10,315	13,107	35,287	48,801	13,092,358	17,705,155	13	13	9,784	10,965	34,053	43,586
Minnesota	36,172,807	72,001,257	34,415	55,545	82,619	131,088	28,446,895	49,633,602	49	50	30,985	40,731	70,658	97,960
Mississippi	15,273,953	40,384,953	15,083	31,235	54,152	126,717	11,845,597	25,173,768	23	23	14,649	21,489	53,652	96,567
Missouri	33,114,200	66,535,825	29,756	47,122	97,391	151,573	22,624,274	47,011,114	38	41	20,964	30,698	64,063	109,822
Montana	5,404,598	17,718,598	4,868	11,882	11,959	23,667	3,270,356	11,327,432	12	20	3,259	5,785	7,764	15,878
Nebraska	16,191,663	40,439,263	14,944	30,982	33,828	64,789	12,206,565	23,401,230	22	24	11,910	16,255	24,195	35,967
Nevada	259,000	296,000	115	130	522	536	231,660	253,063	1	2	121	147	461	667
New Hampshire	1,674,000	2,189,000	1,474	1,821	4,564	4,891	1,459,282	2,036,707	1	1	1,373	1,580	2,792	4,243
New Jersey	568,500	688,500	411	502	1,528	2,040	511,490	642,803	2	2	412	451	1,601	2,008
New Mexico	2,673,500	9,419,000	2,303	6,110	6,622	15,678	1,574,984	5,907,333	6	10	1,362	2,716	3,645	8,426
New York	4,358,618	4,787,618	4,097	3,990	13,814	13,526	3,533,176	4,071,483	6	6	2,483	2,888	8,544	10,185
North Carolina	24,456,852	41,886,152	18,976	26,623	71,145	106,380	15,296,934	29,815,971	33	35	12,256	17,919	45,756	75,674
North Dakota	5,241,472	30,155,972	4,607	18,274	10,116	28,558	3,765,712	17,163,734	7	12	3,212	6,104	6,682	10,963
Ohio	27,410,301	33,467,580	23,500	24,997	85,651	95,727	20,330,286	28,410,880	28	28	18,920	22,928	64,506	86,100
Oklahoma	16,566,506	37,788,506	16,938	30,905	45,975	77,761	12,613,424	27,419,994	23	24	13,700	21,734	32,729	54,634
Oregon	6,917,000	11,611,184	4,958	6,456	15,160	19,118	3,997,088	8,585,665	13	13	2,638	4,260	9,684	15,019
Pennsylvania	12,639,200	17,104,200	10,855	13,469	36,207	46,539	10,831,886	14,581,903	13	13	10,091	12,321	32,901	45,008
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	11,225,719	24,562,269	12,362	20,625	43,671	70,920	8,675,928	16,172,773	23	23	10,939	14,528	35,300	55,730
South Dakota	3,801,154	22,044,154	4,044	16,572	8,876	33,378	2,142,607	11,446,091	7	16	2,308	4,479	4,791	12,798
Tennessee	15,054,861	37,718,608	12,165	27,544	71,861	156,331	12,926,172	25,155,704	29	30	11,479	17,026	77,171	130,913
Texas	47,873,574	101,325,074	50,489	88,860	128,191	218,737	35,173,788	76,820,607	71	75	41,609	62,387	104,216	168,765
Utah	1,515,000	2,202,000	917	1,164	2,936	3,508	1,093,393	1,821,606	3	5	687	930	2,455	3,018
Vermont	1,686,000	2,784,000	1,437	1,790	4,322	4,919	1,185,229	2,143,520	3	3	1,049	1,462	2,871	4,142
Virginia	12,508,356	27,508,242	10,722	17,882	33,943	58,930	10,094,078	22,095,899	16	16	9,081	13,414	27,641	48,051
Washington	8,600,611	16,236,611	7,574	11,635	17,176	24,891	6,483,448	10,751,691	19	21	6,120	7,394	13,679	18,274
West Virginia	727,000	952,000	593	618	2,032	2,549	687,715	856,720	2	2	538	606	1,684	2,340
Wisconsin	22,377,952	58,712,615	16,179	26,808	46,297	80,631	19,103,919	35,784,958	30	32	15,792	19,776	42,147	57,293
Wyoming	3,902,000	8,590,600	3,538	6,163	8,459	11,936	2,669,048	5,403,243	12	14	2,280	3,246	5,893	8,205
Alaska	488,000	1,555,000	111	279	703	1,665	421,271	450,634	2	2	111	119	780	1,015
Virgin Islands	275,000	432,000	100	85	1,159	912	273,572	319,772	1	1	52	55	449	516
Transfer adjustment							200,000	200,000						

NOTE.—State figures represent data for REA borrowers incorporated within the State.

TABLE 4.—*Number of miles energized by REA borrowers, by States, by fiscal years, 1938–47* [1]

Area	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1947	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1944	June 30, 1943	June 30, 1942	June 30, 1941	June 30, 1940	June 30, 1939	June 30, 1938
United States	585,686	546,781	474,837	424,072	397,861	381,747	369,129	307,769	232,978	115,230	41,736
Alabama	14,588	13,259	11,473	10,792	10,096	9,933	9,309	8,042	5,694	2,935	1,574
Arizona	762	736	640	632	632	618	655	451	193	117	117
Arkansas	15,209	14,302	11,574	9,693	9,182	9,024	8,677	6,864	5,398	1,464	98
California	1,718	1,683	1,607	1,502	1,465	1,464	1,464	1,467	1,435	1,249	0
Colorado	9,835	9,273	7,941	7,045	6,265	5,869	5,331	3,794	2,469	1,026	170
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	1,082	1,056	1,047	1,002	1,001	985	985	920	847	371	302
Florida	7,194	6,133	4,662	3,846	3,772	3,663	3,291	2,514	2,012	538	0
Georgia	28,473	26,543	22,632	21,261	20,802	20,502	20,358	18,361	14,583	8,230	2,915
Idaho	3,601	3,430	3,243	3,083	3,045	2,931	2,917	2,385	1,734	669	161
Illinois	26,708	24,961	22,401	21,149	19,980	19,234	19,011	15,304	12,947	2,393	746
Indiana	27,018	25,474	23,500	22,755	22,355	21,968	21,563	19,288	16,235	8,372	3,972
Iowa	38,088	36,026	32,557	28,030	25,020	23,612	23,462	20,169	14,532	7,719	2,574
Kansas	14,378	12,590	10,527	9,844	9,463	9,308	8,954	6,880	4,692	1,343	101
Kentucky	17,877	16,728	14,828	13,780	13,173	12,620	11,814	9,634	8,014	4,824	1,177
Louisiana	11,707	10,899	8,677	7,143	5,888	5,602	5,103	3,805	2,938	1,295	630
Maine	489	489	477	471	384	383	373	231	65	65	0
Maryland	2,566	2,487	2,079	1,680	1,654	1,637	1,570	920	475	227	0
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	10,965	10,711	10,082	9,784	9,539	9,466	9,388	9,142	8,232	6,477	501
Minnesota	40,731	38,524	34,741	30,985	28,238	26,852	25,996	21,222	16,216	9,662	3,431
Mississippi	21,489	20,515	16,491	14,649	13,549	13,167	12,902	11,507	8,529	3,028	826
Missouri	30,698	28,890	24,951	20,964	18,997	17,107	16,653	13,008	9,016	2,880	1,555
Montana	5,785	4,895	3,795	3,259	3,094	3,040	2,992	2,407	1,966	1,178	588
Nebraska	16,255	15,398	13,331	11,910	10,997	10,247	9,924	8,860	7,411	4,802	2,097
Nevada	147	144	121	121	112	112	112	109	107	103	0
New Hampshire	1,580	1,547	1,427	1,373	1,373	1,373	1,373	623	97	0	0
New Jersey	451	448	437	412	399	390	355	352	347	307	201
New Mexico	2,416	2,433	1,641	1,362	1,264	1,242	914	784	628	315	0
New York	2,888	2,852	2,773	2,483	1,494	1,390	1,390	1,390	1,054	0	0
North Carolina	17,919	16,338	13,605	12,256	11,927	11,811	11,338	9,508	6,258	1,832	474
North Dakota	6,104	5,062	3,673	3,212	3,039	2,764	2,492	1,919	1,351	650	350
Ohio	22,928	22,120	20,265	18,920	18,648	17,914	16,617	15,392	12,912	8,540	4,976
Oklahoma	21,734	20,319	17,277	13,700	12,118	11,312	11,090	9,433	7,128	3,012	1,151
Oregon	4,260	3,897	3,281	2,838	2,424	2,348	2,270	1,211	439	244	0
Pennsylvania	12,321	12,006	10,593	10,091	9,674	9,217	8,977	7,990	5,832	3,473	1,009
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	14,528	13,634	11,690	10,939	10,418	10,208	10,188	7,366	4,439	1,719	1,002
South Dakota	4,479	3,643	2,556	2,308	2,262	2,156	2,069	1,398	592	430	176
Tennessee	17,026	15,974	14,162	11,479	11,244	11,039	10,201	7,573	4,103	3,169	1,929
Texas	62,387	56,694	48,479	41,609	39,157	37,198	35,691	29,645	21,941	8,606	1,693
Utah	930	920	879	687	646	646	570	545	407	0	0
Vermont	1,462	1,389	1,210	1,049	996	964	812	607	167	54	0
Virginia	13,414	12,206	10,302	9,081	8,869	8,424	8,348	7,180	5,791	3,406	684
Washington	7,394	7,445	6,471	6,120	5,696	5,505	5,353	3,567	2,001	1,151	486
West Virginia	606	595	560	538	538	430	430	430	401	273	0
Wisconsin	19,776	18,875	17,465	15,792	14,744	13,884	13,772	11,907	10,111	6,366	3,777
Wyoming	3,246	3,065	2,546	2,280	2,078	2,042	2,006	1,665	1,239	656	293
Alaska	119	118	116	111	98	95	14	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	55	55	52	52	52	51	55	0	0	0	0

[1] Data not available for prior years.

NOTE.—State figures represent data for REA borrowers incorporated within the State.

TABLE 5.—*Number of consumers connected by REA borrowers, by States, by fiscal years, 1940–47* [1]

Area	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1947	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1944	June 30, 1943	June 30, 1942	June 30, 1941	June 30, 1940
United States	1,992,052	1,843,351	1,549,057	1,287,347	1,152,031	1,041,821	981,193	779,561	549,604
Alabama	65,092	59,693	48,855	41,582	34,977	31,972	30,170	22,936	12,619
Arizona	3,980	3,751	2,439	2,236	2,011	1,293	1,152	923	427
Arkansas	58,721	52,186	40,659	31,074	27,143	24,932	22,717	16,376	11,175
California	7,257	5,140	4,697	4,507	4,237	4,158	3,990	3,674	3,255
Colorado	29,145	27,987	24,210	20,343	17,310	13,748	12,054	8,106	5,163
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	3,869	3,633	3,468	3,173	3,046	2,883	3,810	2,413	1,939
Florida	25,214	21,974	16,837	12,592	10,907	9,413	8,374	5,774	4,213
Georgia	120,069	109,562	89,015	76,282	69,459	64,399	61,329	52,644	39,226
Idaho	9,439	8,892	7,880	7,503	7,365	6,322	6,253	5,051	3,671
Illinois	80,262	74,888	66,379	58,812	53,491	49,649	48,401	36,602	28,155
Indiana	101,621	95,437	85,025	77,688	73,274	68,640	67,035	55,935	45,071
Iowa	94,915	90,074	79,693	67,831	59,153	53,495	51,802	42,037	29,189
Kansas	30,127	26,807	22,366	19,514	17,700	16,627	15,374	11,256	7,611
Kentucky	78,701	72,629	61,400	52,128	46,765	41,957	34,496	26,248	20,854
Louisiana	45,157	40,671	30,740	22,883	17,238	14,971	13,055	9,627	6,979
Maine	2,192	2,099	1,905	1,297	1,088	1,048	948	616	177
Maryland	12,524	11,476	9,101	5,130	4,717	4,440	4,075	2,317	1,376
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	43,586	41,144	37,726	34,053	31,778	30,082	29,688	26,520	20,887
Minnesota	97,960	91,516	80,998	70,658	62,999	56,955	54,250	42,493	31,941
Mississippi	96,567	90,430	65,668	53,652	46,437	42,688	41,622	39,300	27,598
Missouri	109,822	102,671	85,821	64,063	54,984	39,594	37,173	26,528	17,588
Montana	15,878	14,255	11,803	7,764	7,374	7,027	6,870	5,720	4,284
Nebraska	35,967	33,545	28,961	24,195	20,937	18,399	17,266	14,218	11,200
Nevada	667	645	518	461	442	431	443	392	417
New Hampshire	4,243	3,942	3,304	2,792	2,691	2,630	2,614	1,156	194
New Jersey	2,008	1,944	1,780	1,601	1,444	1,388	1,413	1,200	1,041
New Mexico	8,426	7,442	6,011	3,645	2,820	2,547	2,004	1,596	1,014
New York	10,185	10,040	9,540	8,544	6,618	6,400	5,720	5,720	3,876
North Carolina	75,674	68,341	54,910	45,756	41,061	38,441	35,449	27,131	18,815
North Dakota	10,963	9,602	7,570	6,682	6,215	5,514	4,961	3,646	2,610
Ohio	86,100	82,558	72,728	64,506	62,311	58,260	50,666	44,030	36,026
Oklahoma	54,634	51,131	42,191	32,729	27,929	22,774	22,225	17,516	12,378
Oregon	15,019	14,039	11,461	9,684	7,501	6,892	6,177	3,288	1,509
Pennsylvania	45,008	42,512	38,015	32,901	30,569	28,520	27,123	22,069	15,143
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	55,730	50,448	41,622	35,309	31,913	29,655	28,904	20,650	13,962
South Dakota	12,798	11,348	5,355	4,791	4,402	3,852	3,606	2,400	1,015
Tennessee	130,913	120,824	104,633	77,171	71,475	67,698	63,046	48,781	18,978

[1] Data not available for prior years.

TABLE 5.—*Number of consumers connected by REA borrowers, by States, by fiscal years, 1940–47*—Continued

Area	Nov. 30, 1947	June 30, 1947	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1944	June 30, 1943	June 30, 1942	June 30, 1941	June 30, 1940
Texas	168,765	154,640	128,505	104,216	92,176	82,110	79,492	61,524	43,376
Utah	3,018	2,899	2,896	2,455	2,263	2,190	1,790	1,691	1,035
Vermont	4,142	3,949	3,262	2,871	2,635	2,506	1,905	1,230	443
Virginia	48,051	43,248	34,126	27,641	25,496	23,687	23,495	19,235	14,419
Washington	18,274	17,651	15,819	13,679	12,591	11,708	11,154	7,918	4,364
West Virginia	2,340	2,165	1,976	1,684	1,543	1,267	1,240	1,164	897
Wisconsin	57,293	54,311	49,371	42,147	37,235	32,922	32,066	26,417	20,866
Wyoming	8,205	7,739	6,446	5,893	5,255	4,718	4,304	3,493	2,626
Alaska	1,015	957	879	780	682	522	28	0	0
Virgin Islands	516	516	493	449	374	497	464	0	0

NOTE.—State figures represent data for REA borrowers incorporated within the State.

TABLE 6.—*Loan allocations, by type of borrower and purpose, as of Dec. 11, 1948*

Type of borrower	Number of borrowers	Total amount	Distribution systems	Generation and transmission	Consumer facilities
Cooperatives	947	$1,141,230,747	$1,000,914,190	$127,474,434	$12,842,123
Public power districts	41	39,400,641	37,675,441	1,129,850	595,350
Other public bodies	20	4,776,695	4,682,004	94,691	0
Power companies	21	5,119,263	4,481,763	637,500	0
All	1,029	1,190,527,346	1,047,753,398	129,336,475	13,437,473

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Wickard continued:

In addition to making self-liquidating loans and supervising the construction of the facilities that constitute the only security for these Federal funds, REA has the responsibility for safeguarding these loans through advice and assistance to borrowers, since the real security of the Government in these loan investments is based not only on the proper construction of these facilities but on their satisfactory and efficient operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the testimony of Mr. Claude Wickard be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. Wickard's testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset, the boards of directors, and in many cases the managers, have had no previous experience in operating an electric utility. They are willing to undertake the responsibility of learning as a means of providing themselves with an essential service that they could not obtain in any other way. Any failure of REA to give them competent guidance would practically block the potentialities opened up by making rural electrification loan funds available.

From the beginning of their contacts with borrowers, REA personnel are instructed to operate on the basis that each electric co-op is an independent, locally owned, business enterprise, whose owners, officers, and local management have the primary responsibility for its success. Strong emphasis is placed on encouraging pride of ownership among the members. New directors and new managers are encouraged to assume their full responsibilities rapidly. As they develop in confidence and ability, they are asked to work out independently the proportionately larger number of their own problems.

Currently, the greater part of REA's management assistance is going to a relatively small number of borrowers. During the 1947 fiscal year, for example, we found that the group of borrowers receiving the bulk of management assistance was composed largely of the approximate 5 percent that experienced trouble meeting their interest and principal payments, and approximately an equal number which showed trends toward financial difficulties and needed good counsel to stay on their feet.

I might mention the auditing of co-op books, as an example of a management responsibility formerly performed wholly by REA, but now performed in part by the co-ops. Until this year the accounts of all borrowers were audited entirely by members of the REA field staff. This has now been changed, and co-ops which meet certain standards of maturity will in the future be asked to assume responsibility for having their general accounts audited periodically by certified public accountants of their own choice.

I have already indicated that the type of operation REA uses has been quite effective in getting electric service extended to rural people. It is proper for this committee to inquire, too, just how effective REA's program of management assistance to borrowers has been, and whether or not the Government has got its money's worth from the personnel assigned to this work. The effectiveness of management assistance is not always easy to measure, but the financial record of the REA borrowers is certainly an indication. This record, which has been consistently good since the start of the program, is given in some detail in the table No. 7. To mention here only the highlights, let me point out that through December 31, 1947, REA had advanced $821,000,000 as loans to its borrowers. As of the same date, the borrowers had repaid almost $87,000,000 of principal and had paid over $67,000,000 in interest. Payments included more than $23,000,000 paid on principal in advance of the time it was due. Only $949,000 was more than 30 days overdue. There has been only one foreclosure in the history of the program.

To summarize what I have just been saying, the REA program consists basically of making loans, protecting the security of these loans, and providing such management assistance to borrowers as is essential to the carrying out of the objectives of the Rural Electrification Act. I believe that this committee, with its concern for Government personnel and administrative matters, will be interested in knowing how REA is organized to do the job I have outlined.

The REA staff currently numbers about 925 persons, of whom 680 are employed in Washington and 245 in the field. REA has no field offices. For administrative purposes, the country is divided into 10 geographical regions, but the office for each region is in the Washington headquarters. I have here a map showing the REA regions.

We have four "line" divisions. These are the divisions that have the most direct contact with borrowers.

The function of the Applications and Loans Division is to assist borrowers with the preparation of their applications for loans, to study all applications, and to recommend for my approval those which are found to be feasible. It is also responsible for assistance to borrowers in connection with boundary studies, area coverage surveys, and other planning activities essential if a co-op is to extend service to every potential consumer in its service area. In this Division, too, lies responsibility for encouraging borrowers to undertake programs of wiring, lighting, and power-use education, with the aim of helping rural people to get maximum benefit from their electric service. In view of the varied duties of this Division, its personnel have a variety of backgrounds. Most of them have had agricultural training, some as economists, some as agricultural engineers, some as county agents. A few are electrical engineers.

The Engineering Division is responsible for all REA activities pertaining to engineering advice and assistance to borrowers in the design, construction, and technical operation of rural electric systems. It is this division, for example, which approves the preliminary plans and specifications for a line-construction job before a loan is made and which passes on completed construction before funds are advanced to pay for the work. Another of its major responsibilities is to assist borrowers with system engineering studies which are essential to their area coverage planning. The professional people in this division are chiefly electrical engineers.

The third line division, the Management Division, is responsible for helping REA borrowers to become efficiently run electric service businesses. Its responsibility begins when a co-op's first lines are energized and covers such management fields as organization, budgets, operating costs, power sources, personnel training, labor relations and others. This division is headed by a man who had done an outstanding job managing an REA-financed co-op and is staffed largely by persons with management experience and training.

The other line division is the Finance Division, which advises borrowers on their accounting problems, audits accounts of borrowers, and maintains the official loan accounts and records of the agency. Its key personnel are trained accountants.

In addition to these four line divisions, we have four staff divisions. The Technical Standards Division is a small division made up chiefly of electrical and agricultural engineers who assist the staff on technical problems relating to the development of system specifications and equipment standards. The Information Services Division prepares reports to the public on rural electrification progress and assists the staff and borrowers with problems in the field of cooperative and power-use education. The Personnel Division handles internal personnel affairs of the agency and also advises on personnel problems in connection with management of borrowers' systems. The Administrative Services Division is our housekeeping division.

REA has no legal division but relies for legal work on the Department of Agriculture Solicitor's Office, which has an associate solicitor and a small staff assigned to rural electrification work. These lawyers perform a number of essential functions in connection with our program. One that I might mention is the drawing up of the loan contracts between REA and its borrowers.

So much for the organization and early history of the REA program. I would like to mention briefly the wartime activities of

the agency as background for a discussion of the problems currently being faced by the REA staff.

By 1941, the new approach to rural electrification problems had proved itself beyond question and pointed the way for much more rapid expansion. But at that time the Nation had to devote much of the critical materials and manpower which power lines require to the urgent task of national defense and thereafter to winning the war. Large-scale expansion of rural power lines had to be postponed.

In some cases material which had originally been intended for the extension of electric service had to be diverted to the military effort. Two generating units being installed by the Dairyland Power Cooperative were requisitioned by the Navy for Caribbean bastion. Wire already delivered to a contractor building a cooperative transmission network in Texas was diverted to supplying munitions producers. The Dairyland Power Cooperative was unable to install substitute generators until 1946.

During the war, however, the importance to the National welfare of electricity on farms became so apparent that the connection of farms with critical production problems, that electrical equipment would help to solve, was authorized under special regulations of the War Production Board.

The U-1-C order of WPB permitted line extensions of 5,000 feet or less to farms with animal units sufficient to guarantee increased production of livestock, dairy and poultry products through the use of electricity. Under this regulation REA borrowers connected more than 200,000 farms.

Events following the lifting of materials restrictions in 1945 soon justified the expectations of those who had predicted a major expansion. The insistent demands from farmers for electric service caused us to raise our sights. Before the war our operations were geared to a program of loans of $40,000,000 a year, although congressional authorizations had reached a peak of $140,000,000 in 1 year. In the first postwar year loan authorizations totaled $300,000,000. Loans approved from funds for the first two fiscal years after VE-day exceeded the total approved during all the preceding 10 years of REA history.

Along with every other agency, we expected some delay in our program before materials would again flow for rural line construction at prewar rates. It was not until 1947 that the materials, ordered by reason of greatly increased REA loan approvals, began to be delivered in quantities comparable to prewar levels, although still greatly below the postwar demands.

The calendar year 1947 was the biggest year in several important aspects. The rate of construtions reached a new high almost every month, and is now the fastest yet attained in rural-electrification expansion.

REA borrowers brought central station electric service to 346,000 farms and other rural establishments in the calendar year 1947. This is 71,000 more consumers than they added to their systems in the previous peak year of 1946, and 87,000 above their prewar record which was established in 1939.

Funds advanced by REA to finance the construction program of the borrowers amounted to more than $225,000,000. This exceeded by about $93,000,000 the funds advanced in any previous year. The great expansion in the rate of progress of the REA program has quite naturally resulted in increased demands upon our limited personnel.

In addition to 87,000 miles of distribution lines that were energized during the year, the construction program included the "heavying-up" of many miles of lines to handle increased loads. It also included the construction of additional generating and transmission facilities.

Advances of funds under the provisions of loan contracts during the last half of 1947 was approximately equal to the amount of new loans approved. As the supply of materials improves, advances will exceed new approvals until the backlog of committed funds has been reduced to the amount required by normal construction operations.

Along with the tremendous growth in the number of farms and other rural establishments connected in 1947 to each REA-financed system, REA borrowers were faced—and still are faced—with the problem of obtaining an adequate power supply to meet the demands of new consumers as well as the greatly increased demands of old consumers.

To illustrate the increased demand for power, the total energy usable on REA-financed lines has increased nearly fivefold since before the war, although the number of consumers served has only doubled.

Despite the progress that has been made in rural electrification and contrary to the public statements of the program's detractors, a tremendous job lies ahead. More than 2,000,000 farms in this country do not yet have electric service. Farmers without service want and need it. Although the Congress has authorized loan funds for REA in large amounts since the war, the backlog of loan applications that could not be filled because of lack of funds has continued to grow. In the summer of 1945, REA had a backlog of loan applications on hand or in process in the field of slightly more than $200,000,000. The backlog today is $267,000,000 in spite of loan approvals amounting to almost $630,000,000 in the interval.

Some idea of the demand for electric service on the part of farmers in various sections of the country can be obtained from table 8, which shows by States the amount of loan applications on hand or in preparation in the field, as of January 7, 1948.

One of the reasons why the job ahead in rural electrification is so complex is that a great part of the power system construction remaining to be done is in the Great Plains States. Because the economy of those areas is primarily agricultural, their need for electric service is great. But because of extremely low average consumer density and other difficulties, the areas involve serious problems for any power distributor. Progress in these areas was extremely slow before the war. Today, the special problems are being solved and REA borrowers have a tremendous program under way in these sections of the country.

The acceleration of the REA program in the Great Plains States began in about 1944. It stemmed from three principal factors:

First, in 1944 a policy aimed at applying area-wide electrification to all sections of the country was initiated on an aggressive scale.

Second, more favorable financing terms were made available through enactment of the Pace Act.

Third, out of almost 10 years of rural electrification came experience that pointed the way for bringing service to the less densely settled areas on a feasible basis.

As a result of this combination of factors, scores of new rural electric co-ops have been organized in the Great Plains States since 1944—14 in the State of North Dakota alone, for example.

These new co-ops, together with the few established earlier in the REA program, are taking a businesslike approach to the problem of bringing electric service to all rural consumers in their service areas. First, the co-ops make boundary studies to help them estimate how far their lines can reasonably be extended; second, area surveys are made on a farm-to-farm and house-to-house basis to determine how many rural establishments within those boundaries still do not have central station electric service; third, system engineering studies are made as a basis for electric systems fully adequate to meet the needs of all consumers to be served.

As they develop their rural power systems, the leaders of these rural electric co-ops are finding that the farmers of the Great Plains States are tremendous users of power. For example, the estimated farm consumption on one system in North Dakota, Nodak Rural Electric Cooperative, of Grand Forks, increased from 100 kilowatt-hours per month in 1941 to 300 kilowatt-hours in 1947. Another North Dakota co-op estimates that its consumers who were using 175 kilowatt-hours per month on an average in 1946, will be using 300 kilowatt-hours in 1948. Average monthly farm consumption of power on all REA-financed lines in North Dakota increased from 90.4 kilowatt-hours in December 1941 to 168.2 kilowatt-hours in December 1946. The 1947 figure is expected to be much higher and the 1948 figure higher still.

Still another factor in the electrification of the sparsely settled rural areas has been the cooperation of town and country people. In some areas the rural electric co-ops and the towns and villages integrated their power facilities into larger systems. This practice has enabled the co-ops to reach out still further into unelectrified farm areas and attain area coverage. Almost invariably the co-op members and the townspeople benefited from the mergers.

One effect of all of this activity has been a great increase in the amount of REA loans for rural electrification in the Great Plains States. In the early years of the program the loan applications submitted from many of the Plains States were barely sufficient to exhaust the loan funds set aside for those States under the State-allotment provision of the Rural Electrification Act. Today the applications from those States surpass by far the total amount that can be made available to them from both the allotted and the discretionary portions of the year's loan fund. During the first 10 years of the program, for instance, loans to borrowers in North Dakota totaled $5,200,000. During fiscal 1946 and 1947, however, approximately $25,000,000 was allocated in that State. Similar increases were noted in other States in the Great Plains area.

These loan funds are now being converted into power lines to serve farmers. The number of farms electrified in the Great Plains States already shows substantial improvement. In the State of North Dakota, 5,300 new consumers were connected to REA-financed lines between July 1, 1945, and the present. This brings the total number of consumers served by the North Dakota co-ops to 12,030. When all funds already allocated to the co-ops in North Dakota have been converted into rural power lines it is estimated that farm electrification in the State will approach 50 percent.

This acceleration in activities could not have been achieved without special attention by REA to the less populated areas. Because the rural-electrification problems of these areas are more complex and because the rural-electrification program is new to the people there, REA has given a great deal of special advice and assistance to the REA co-ops in the Great Plains States. The line divisions give attention to region VI—North and South Dakota and Minnesota—to the full extent that the personnel situation permits. Five field representatives of one division, however, have resigned their positions in this region in the last 6 months. New and inexperienced personnel must be trained for the jobs.

Unfortunately, many of the thinly populated areas, in addition to being afflicted with the problems I have just been talking about, are also among the sections of the country in which the shortage of power is the most acute. These areas sometimes abound in the natural sources of power, but facilities for power production have simply not been developed rapidly enough to keep pace with the needs of rural people, who until recent years had little hope of ever getting electric service.

Except where there are large public power developments, there have been two main sources of power for the rural electric co-ops of the West. These have been municipalities and power companies which have sold power to the co-ops at wholesale. These

sources were adequate for the needs of infant rural power systems but they have now been outgrown in many cases.

One of the services of REA to the rural electric co-ops of the Great Plains States has been to assist them in locating new sources of power and in obtaining more favorable wholesale power rates that have made possible electrification of many areas. In a few cases, REA has been able to make loans for generation plants or transmission lines, or both, to Plains State borrowers when reasonable rates could not be obtained, or power supplies were not available, to meet the needs.

One example is the Minnkota Power Cooperative of Grand Forks, N. Dak., which was organized early in 1940 to serve four REA-financed electric distribution cooperatives in North Dakota and five in Minnesota. Currently it is serving seven of the cooperatives through generating and transmission facilities it constructed. Its two Diesel-power-generating plants have a combined installed capacity of 9,960 kilowatts.

Minnkota operates 385 miles of transmission lines. It has under construction additional transmission lines and 10,000 kilowatts of additional generating capacity. These additional facilities will provide power for the two member cooperatives not yet receiving service and a more adequate supply of power for those now served. The present facilities have been outgrown and expansion of the member distribution systems is necessarily slowed down.

Minnkota Power Cooperative has supplied power where it was not otherwise available and in a region that commercial power companies once considered unfeasible to electrify.

Here is another instance of the efforts REA is making to assist rural people in solving their power problem. Since the war REA has approved a loan to a commercial power company to install new transmission-line capacity to bring low-cost Bureau of Reclamation power into wide areas of western North Dakota where power supplies are inadequate.

Any description of the rural-electrification program would be incomplete if I failed to point out that in many areas the program has reached a state of development in which miles of new line, or number of new consumers, no longer provide an adequate criterion of progress. Consumption of electricity is increasing tremendously. Many co-ops of moderate size have seen their loads grow to gigantic proportions. The need for system strengthening has become just as imperative as the need for extending electric service to the many rural families still without it.

Rural electrification progress of the future must be measured in terms of ability to give good service as much as by the number of new connections. Old lines frequently must be rephased to enable them to carry more energy. Additional substations often are required, as well as larger transformers in existing substations. New transmission lines, and in some cases new generation facilities, are vitally needed by many co-ops. Such improvements to existing service do not always show up in terms of new consumers connected. They are hard to measure by conventional yardsticks. Nevertheless they have become a vital part of program progress. And they require annually an increasing amount of the REA loan fund.

There have been predictions that the position of rural electrification would be weakened materially if full prosperity failed to continue, with plans for expansion coming to a standstill, rural consumers greatly curtailing their use of electricity or even terminating service, and co-ops finding themselves unable to meet their loan obligations. REA does not share this view. Regardless of future economic conditions, whether hard times threaten or good times remain, the contribution of rural power will be vital. The history of the few rural electric systems in operation during the depression of the early 1930's shows that their patrons continued to lean heavily on electric power to aid the efficiency and volume of their production; that they were in a more favorable economic position because they had electricity available; and that the organizations supplying them with power faced no greater economic hardships than the average of other business institutions across the country.

In pushing ahead with the job of rural electrification, we must recognize the factors that will have a significant bearing on the future course of the program and the speed of its progress.

First of all, the Congress by its authorizations of loan funds will determine how soon service will be available to those rural people still without it and the extent to which service to all present consumers can be kept adequate and dependable.

Second, as industry's output of construction materials catches up with the tremendous postwar demand, rural power systems will be able to step up their line extensions.

Third, for many cooperatives the current or prospective inability to purchase sufficient power will be a handicap that must be overcome if rural electrification progress is not to be delayed before the job is finished.

Fourth, the safeguarding of the Government's loan investment in the program and the assurance of the program's effectiveness necessitate a staff adequate in numbers and qualified by training and experience to perform the changing functions of our agency in an efficient manner.

This last problem has a direct bearing on the future of the REA program, and I know it is a problem that is of concern to this committee, which has indicated its interest in efforts to attract and hold high-type personnel in the Government service.

For REA the job of administration has grown constantly as the program of rural electrification has progressed. By the end of this fiscal year, for example, it is expected that well over a billion dollars will have been advanced to REA borrowers, compared to $221,000,000 up to June 1940. There will be half again as many borrowers in 1948 as in 1940. Miles of line on REA-financed systems will have increased some 200 percent and the number of consumers upward of 300 percent. These figures illustrate how the work load and responsibility of the agency increase as the electrification job goes forward.

The increase in the work load, together with this year's reduction of $600,000 in the REA administrative appropriation, has necessitated a critical examination of every activity of the agency in an effort to get the best possible job done with the limited administrative funds available.

In order to operate within our budget, our personnel had to be reduced by 15 percent. The major part of the reduction, in compliance with the admonishment set forth in the 1948 Senate Appropriations Committee report, was accomplished by the abolition of high-salaried positions. Altogether, 181 positions were eliminated, of which 46 carried salaries of $5,000 or more.

Because of the feeling of insecurity growing out of the action of Congress last spring, and because of the low level of salaries we are able to offer, and other factors, we had 206 voluntary resignations and transfers between May 25 and December 31, 1947. Many of these people, some with years of experience in REA, left to take better paying or more secure positions elsewhere.

Qualified replacements have been difficult to obtain. On the first of January, the agency had approximately 100 vacancies. Of these, more than half are positions requiring people of professional training and experience.

Notwithstanding this unfortunate situation, I take great pride in the attitudes, qualifications, and accomplishments of the REA staff. Despite the problems that have arisen because of the loss of many of our experienced personnel, a high level of efficiency has been maintained as the record shows. It is significant to note that the over-all program of the agency is three times greater now than during the highest prewar year. Yet our staff is smaller than it was at the outbreak of the war. This year we have approximately one employee—including clerical as well as professional personnel—for each borrower. And yet the average allocation of Government funds, per cooperative, amounts to more than a million dollars.

REA's record is outstanding when compared with private banking institutions which have a comparable amount of loans outstanding. Its staff is smaller and its expenditures for salaries and wages are considerably less, while its responsibilities in making 100-percent loans are obviously more exacting.

It is fortunate for the cause of rural electrification and the Nation that we have such hard-working, capable, and efficient people on the staff of REA. Many of them have the opportunity to go elsewhere for better pay and greater opportunity, but are remaining because they believe their work in behalf of rural electrification is making such a worthwhile contribution to the welfare of rural people and the Nation.

Our personnel, like the millions of farm people who are learning to benefit from electrification, recognize electricity as a power that helps turn the wheels of progress. In today's world, electricity and power have come to mean practically one and the same thing. Always tireless, always on tap, electricity offers farmers greater opportunity for economical and diversified production than any other force available. It also offers to rural people the achievement of a modern standard of living with better facilities for health and for cultural progress than they have ever enjoyed before. Electricity, given its full opportunity, can be counted on to play a dynamic role in rural America's future.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in order to show the financial standing, borrowers' payments of interest and principal, and cumulative totals as of December 31, 1947, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks table No. 7.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 7.—*Borrowers' payments of interest and principal—cumulative totals as of Dec. 31, 1947*

Item	Distribution, transmission, and generation		Consumer facilities		Total, all loans		Total
	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	Interest	Principal	
Amount due [1]	$67,289,697.25	$57,731,845.18	$404,950.01	$6,138,787.53	$67,694,647.26	$63,870,632.71	$131,565,279.97
Amount paid [1]	66,779,155.75	80,601,356.87	398,204.28	6,093,665.93	67,177,360.03	86,695,022.80	153,872,382.83
Amounts overdue more than 30 days	570,894.00	321,108.97	6,579.88	50,642.36	577,473.88	371,751.33	949,225.21
Advance payments		23,282,077.44				23,282,077.44	23,282,077.44

[1] Includes amounts on notes declared due and paid in full by borrowers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am sure that every Senator present will be interested in knowing the number of applications on hand and in process of preparation in the field as of January 7, 1948, so that at a glance they can tell exactly the amount of money which has been applied for in each one of the States. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that table No. 8 may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 8.—*Applications on hand and in process of preparation in the field as of Jan. 7, 1948*

Alabama	$4,302,000
Arizona	1,050,000
Arkansas	5,143,000
California	100,000
Colorado	5,383,000
Delaware	150,000
Florida	5,825,000
Georgia	13,085,000
Idaho	1,525,000
Illinois	7,894,000
Indiana	1,880,000
Iowa	14,983,000
Kansas	10,891,000
Kentucky	8,050,000
Louisiana	2,668,000
Maine	175,000
Maryland	400,000
Michigan	3,255,000
Minnesota	11,855,000
Mississippi	5,186,000
Missouri	29,885,000
Montana	7,767,000
Nebraska	14,761,000
Nevada	80,000
New Hampshire	513,000
New Jersey	87,000
New Mexico	1,810,000
New York	220,000
North Carolina	2,583,000
North Dakota	17,586,000
Ohio	2,665,000
Oklahoma	11,751,000
Oregon	1,715,000
Pennsylvania	6,386,000
South Carolina	2,385,000
South Dakota	13,692,000
Tennessee	8,802,000
Texas	18,912,000
Utah	610,000
Vermont	450,000
Virginia	5,088,000
Washington	2,085,000
Wisconsin	6,558,000
Wyoming	3,495,000
Total	264,686,000

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, I have before me approximately 1,000 letters written to me by farmers from the Great Plains area. Of course, naturally, most of them come from the State of North Dakota. My distinguished colleague advises me that most of the letters he has received dealing with REA come from the State of North Dakota. Naturally, the people of our State write to their own Senators on the subject.

Mr. President, during the past summer, no matter where I went in the Great Plains area, at places where the committee held public hearings, when I asked the people what they were most interested in, they did not inquire about the national debt, they did not inquire about the Marshall plan, they did not inquire about tax reduction, but their inquiries dealt with REA. Three or four hundred or more of those with whom I conversed were women—farmers' wives. They came to me and asked, "When are we going to get REA on our farms? We want a refrigerator. We want to put our meat some place where it will not spoil." Some said, "We want light so that our children when they study at night will not have to read by lamplight." One lady came up to me and said her family was very poor. She said her husband was a cripple and that she was obliged to do the milking in order to help support the family. She said she wanted electric power on her farm so the milking could be done by electric power.

A little while ago my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said that he was extremely interested in the Taft-Hartley law and was going to travel all over the country and regardless of his party, advocate certain amendments to that law. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I am interested in seeing that the men and women in the Great Plains area obtain REA light and power on their farms. After waiting 5 or 6 years, the farmers of the Great Plains area certainly are entitled to the benefit of REA. Certainly appropriations for REA ought not to be cut by our party the way they were last year. The people of that area are entitled to have an appropriation of $1,000,000,000, as provided by my bill, for the purpose of expanding REA. That amount would not be a gift; it would not be a grant; it would simply be a loan; and the record shows that such loans are being repaid at a more rapid rate than the loans are due.

Mr. President, all I can possibly do so far as REA is concerned is in my feeble, humble way, to keep on bringing to the attention of my colleagues on this side of the aisle the fact that Mr. Wickard says that at least $1,000,000,000 is needed for the purpose. He did not testify to that directly, because he said the President's budget called for $300,000,000, but he frankly admitted that $300,000,000 would not begin to take care of the amount which has been applied for. If Senators will read the exhibit showing the applications by States they will see that much more money has been asked for than is available.

Those who are not in favor of granting such loans will say, "What is the use? The material is not available." We have already subpenaed the manufacturers of most of this material. Even in the short time since Mr. Wickard gave us the names of the suppliers of the material we have been amazed at the amount of material which has become available. For example, 3 or 4 years ago it was impossible to get poles, but today poles are a drug on the market. One can get all the poles he wants by sending a telegram. Other material is also becoming available at a very rapid rate.

So if this bill passes, I hope that when the Appropriations Committee meets it will approve an appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for REA. I wish to say that the testimony before the Civil Service Committee showed that when, 2, 3, and 4 years ago, the REA got large appropriations, all it could get, the amount was insufficient to permit the building of a plant large enough to take care of the business. In one or two instances the testimony showed that the business almost doubled inside of 2 years after the establishment of a plant. Of course, in such cases they now have the additional expense of tearing down the plant they have, or in some instances the expense of adding other units. My distinguished colleague from North Dakota is familiar with the fact that at Grand Forks, N. Dak., where they originally installed three units, within a short time afterward they added three more, even though they had thought the three original units would be ample. After the addition of the second three units, making a total of six, we find them now busily engaged in adding two more units, which will make a total of eight. So we can readily see how important it is, if the farmers in that section of the country are to have light and power on their farms, that sufficient money be made available so that the various cooperatives can get the needed light and power from the Rural Electrification Administration.

I remember, as I am sure my colleague does, an occasion when both of us were the guests of a service club. At that meeting, which was held some years ago, a man who had just been appointed manager of a cooperative invited questions. The manager of the private power company got up and asked him very sarcastically how much power he expected the average farmer to use. He could not answer very well, but finally he said he thought they might use as much as 100 kilowatts a month. The power man laughed at him for saying that. But, Mr. President, within 2 years after it was built, the average farmer there used 247 kilowatts a month, which gives some indication of the tremendous amount of power used on those farms.

Senators would also be surprise to learn the number of machines or motors the average farmer in the Northwest uses. No doubt Senators would think the number would be six or seven. Strangely enough, when the farmer has a modern house—and now most of the houses there are modern—he uses in the neighborhood of 40 motors—which, indeed, is surprising.

All of this shows how the Rural Electification Administration has grown far beyond the comprehension of even the most enthusiastic advocates of REA a few years ago. In my judgment it also shows a profound reason why every Senator should investigate thoroughly the wants of REA among the farming constituency he represents in the Congress. If Senators do so, I think they will be surprise and amazed at the development which has occurred since 1935, and particularly during the past 5 years.

EXPANSION OF LOW-COST HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, last month, a subcommittee of the joint congressional Committee on Housing held a 1-day hearing in my city of Philadelphia. The subcommittee, I am pleased to say, found near unanimity among the witnesses on the necessity for legislation such as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, and particularly for a renewal of Federal

activity in the low-rent slum-clearance field.

There was near, but not complete unanimity, of course, because several spokesmen for real estate maintained that such legislation was not only unnecessary, but if you will, dangerous to the American way, and so forth.

However, the sentiment for decent housing for all our people, as would be made possible under effective long-range-housing legislation such as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, was so overwhelming that when the Philadelphia Bulletin, a few days later, conducted a public-opinion poll in Philadelphia, it found 92 percent of Philadelphians convinced of the necessity for decent housing for low-income families and 88 percent favoring some form of Government financing to provide it. These poll results prompted the Bulletin to point out editorially that this was a sharp swing from the days, a few short years ago, when the Philadelphia city administration turned down three public-housing projects for which $18,000,000 of Federal funds were available.

After learning the error of its judgment in that instance and finally agreeing to participate in the Federal low-rent-housing program, the city has since become a great supporter of new legislation to resume and expand the program. Our experience with public housing in Philadelphia, as in most parts of Pennsylvania, has generally been most gratifying.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as part of my remarks, the article from the Philadelphia Bulletin of January 10, 1948, containing the results of the Bulletin poll, and also an editorial from the same edition of the Bulletin commenting on the issues. This editorial says, in part:

The question is not simply whether poor people are entitled to decent housing for their own comfort, so much as whether better-to-do people can afford to allow poorer people to be indecently housed. The toll of crime, disease, and other social ills levied by substandard housing might easily cost more than publicly financed dwellings.

There being no objection, the article and poll were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING SENTIMENT

Public opinion in Philadelphia has swung sharply about since the days when City Hall turned down three public housing projects for which $18,000,000 of Federal funds were available.

This is clearly indicated by the testimony presented at the congressional hearing in this city on Thursday, and by a Bulletin poll, more fully discussed on the opinion page today.

The poll indicates that 92 percent of Philadelphians think housing should be built for low-income families and that of the 92 percent, about 88 percent favor some form of Government financing.

Those who are willing to spend tax funds for such a purpose are doubtless convinced that private enterprise will not and cannot build down to the low incomes and are largely actuated by sympathy for poorly housed families. But there is another consideration, brought out in the decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court approving the city's housing authority.

The question is not simply whether poor people are entitled to decent housing for their own comfort, so much as to whether better-to-do people can afford to allow poorer people to be indecently housed. The toll of crime, disease, and other social ills levied by substandard housing might easily cost more than publicly financed dwellings.

THE BULLETIN POLL—92 PERCENT HERE FOR GOVERNMENT ACTION ON LOW-INCOME HOUSING

(By Paul Trescott)

Provision of housing for low-income families was the principal topic discussed at a hearing before a congressional committee here this week.

Witnesses who urged that governmental agencies do something about the situation were speaking what is in the minds of most Philadelphians. Ninety-two percent of the city's adults are in favor of such an undertaking, the Bulletin poll finds.

There is also surprising unanimity on who should provide such housing. Eighty-eight percent of people talked to in a cross section feel it is a responsibility of Government. Thirty-nine percent think it a job for the Federal Government; 14 percent, the State; and 9 percent, the city. Others did not specify beyond the general term "government."

These opinions cut across all political and economic lines, though sentiment for governmental action is higher among low-income people themselves. Even among those with more than average incomes, 85 percent favor governmental action.

Generally the idea of using tax money for this purpose is favored. When asked who should pay for this type of housing, 12 percent said the Federal Government; 7 percent, the State, and 6 percent, the city. Sixteen percent said "government" without specifying which division. Twenty-five percent think the responsibility is on the taxpayers. Thus 66 percent feel that the job should be done by a governmental agency.

Thirty-one percent feel that the cost should be borne by the people who live in the houses. They apparently overlook the fact that low-income people cannot meet the costs at today's prices.

Three percent think such enterprises ought to be financed by private capital; 3 percent said "rich people" should bear the cost, and 8 percent had no opinion. The total is slightly more than 100 percent because some people mentioned more than one governmental division as sharing responsibility.

Oddly, sentiment is highest among the low-income group itself for having the people who live in the housing pay the cost. Sixty-one percent in this group favor use of tax money, 39 percent feel the families should pay the full cost.

In the average-income group, 28 percent would put the cost on the occupants, and 65 percent favor use of tax money.

In the high-income group, 30 percent would put the cost on the tenants, and 70 percent would use taxes.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the contemplated recess of the Senate; but I should like to point out that the other day, in my absence, my very good friend the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] had inserted in the RECORD certain sections from the New York State Power Authority Act, which presumably were in contradiction of a statement I had previously made on the floor of the Senate. As a matter of fact, there is no contradiction whatever. However, I do not wish to make a reply to the Senator from Wisconsin in his absence. Therefore I shall delay pointing out the inconsistency in that connection until he is able to return. I understand that he is ill.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report from the Secretary of State, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification I transmit herewith a copy of each of the following instruments signed in the English and French languages at Atlantic City on October 2, 1947, by delegates of the United States of America and by delegates of certain other countries represented at the International Telecommunication Conference and the International Radio Conference, Atlantic City, 1947:

(1) International telecommunication convention, with annexes;

(2) Final protocol to the convention; and

(3) Radio regulations annexed to the convention, with appendixes.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to this matter, together with (1) the volume, enclosed therewith, containing the texts of the instruments above-mentioned and of other acts of the Atlantic City conferences, and (2) an excerpt from the report of the delegations of the United States to those conferences.

In the event that the Senate advises and consents to ratification of the convention, final protocol, and radio regulations, it is requested that the Senate do so with the understanding that such ratification will be subject to the declarations which were made by the delegates of the United States in signing the convention and which are set forth in the final protocol to the convention, namely:

"Signature of this convention for and in the name of the United States of America constitutes, in accordance with its constitutional processes, signature also on behalf of all territories of the United States of America.

"The United States of America formally declares that the United States of America does not, by signature of this convention on its behalf, accept any obligation in respect of the Telegraph Regulations, the Telephone Regulations, or the Additional Radio Regulations referred to in article 13 of the Atlantic City convention."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1948.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) volume containing texts of: (a) international telecommunication con-

vention, with annexes, Atlantic City, October 2, 1947; (b) final protocol to the convention; (c) radio regulations annexed to the convention, with appendixes; (d) other acts of the Atlantic City conferences; (3) excerpt from report of United States delegations to Atlantic City conferences.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 12, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to their transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a copy each of (1) the international telecommunication convention, (2) the final protocol to the convention, and (3) the radio regulations annexed to the convention, signed in the English and French languages at Atlantic City on October 2, 1947, by delegates of the United States of America and by delegates of certain other countries represented at the International Telecommunication Conference and the International Radio Conference, Atlantic City, 1947.

Accompanying the convention, and a part thereof, are five numbered annexes. Annex 1 is a list of countries, territories, and groups of territories. Annex 2 contains definitions of terms used in the convention. Annex 3 contains additional provisions relating to arbitration. Annex 4 consists of general regulations, including general provisions regarding conferences (pt. I) and provisions regarding international consultative committees (pt. II). Annex 5 contains the text of an agreement between the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union.

Accompanying the radio regulations, and a part thereof, are 16 numbered and 3 lettered appendixes.

The texts of the instruments mentioned above are contained in a single volume, enclosed herewith, published by the existing International Telecommunication Union, which furnished the international secretariat for the Atlantic City conferences. Included in the same volume are the texts also of the following documents, which do not require action with a view to ratification on the part of the United States, namely:

(1) Additional protocols to the international telecommunication convention, 1947;

(2) Resolutions, recommendations, and opinions adopted at the International Telecommunication Conference;

(3) Additional radio regulations;

(4) Additional protocol to the acts of the International Radio Conference; and

(5) Recommendations and resolutions adopted by the International Radio Conference.

The International Telecommunication Conference met at Atlantic City from July 2 to October 2, 1947, inclusive, for the purpose of formulating a convention to revise or replace the international telecommunication convention which was signed at Madrid on December 9, 1932. The Madrid convention was transmitted to the Senate on January 27, 1934 (Senate, Executive B, 73d Cong., 2d sess) and, after ratification, entered into force with respect to the United States on June 12, 1934 (49 Stat., pt. 2, 2391).

The International Radio Conference met at Atlantic City from May 16 to October 2, 1947, inclusive, for the purpose principally of revising the general radio regulations (Cairo Revision, 1938) annexed to the Madrid convention of 1932. The Cairo radio regulations were transmitted to the Senate on January 27, 1939 (Senate Executive B, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) and, after approval, entered into force with respect to the United States on August 25, 1939 (54 Stat., pt. 2, 1417).

The telecommunication (plenipotentiary) conference was convened as a result of an invitation issued by the Government of the United States through its diplomatic missions and through the Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union at Bern, Switzerland. The arrangements for the radio conference were made subsequently. Details with respect to the convening of the conferences were decided upon as a result of a preliminary telecommunication conference held in Moscow, September to October 1946, between representatives of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France, and China. The Atlantic City conferences, in formulating a new convention and new regulations, took into consideration technical developments in the telecommunication field during recent years and also developments in the field of international organization.

The convention drawn up by the telecommunication conference contains provisions relating to telecommunication generally and certain special provisions relating to radio. An outstanding feature of the convention is the reorganization of the International Telecommunication Union in such a way that it may be brought into close relationship with the United Nations on a footing similar to that of other specialized organizations related to the United Nations. Article 26 of the convention, together with annex 5, deals with the relation between the Union and the United Nations.

The comprehensive radio regulations drawn up by the Atlantic City radio conference and adopted by the plenipotentiary conference, as an annex to the convention, are designed to modernize the uniform international rules with respect to radio and make them more responsive to scientific developments and technical improvements in the field.

It will be noted that annex 1 to the convention lists 78 countries, territories, or groups of territories which, upon the entry into force of the convention, will become or will be entitled to become separate members of the International Telecommunication Union, with voting and other rights incident to such membership. The delegates of certain governments signed the convention, as well as other documents related thereto, separately for one or more of the territorial possessions of their respective governments. Although "Territories of the United States of America" are listed separately from the United States of America, so that under article 1 of the convention those Territories, as a group, may be treated as a separate member, there was no separate signature on behalf of those Territories. In order to make the situation with respect to United States Territories entirely clear, the delegates of the United States, in signing the convention, made the following declaration, which is set forth in the final protocol to the convention:

"Signature of this convention for and in the name of the United States of America constitutes, in accordance with its constitutional processes, signature also on behalf of all Territories of the United States of America."

It will be observed also that article 13 of the convention states that the provisions of the convention are completed by four sets of administrative regulations, namely, telegraph regulations, telephone regulations, radio regulations, and additional radio regulations. In paragraph 3 of article 13 it is provided that "These regulations shall be binding on all members and associate members." The telegraph and telephone regulations were not drawn up at the Atlantic City conferences. This will be done at subsequent administrative conferences at which interested governments will be represented. The United States is not at present a party to the telegraph or telephone regulations adopted at Cairo in 1938, or previously, nor did the United States delegates sign the additional radio regulations which were adopted by the Atlantic City radio conference. Inasmuch as those three sets of regulations relate either to matters of particular concern only to the European region or to matters with respect to which the United States Government has not undertaken to adopt extensive regulatory measures, it is the policy of this Government not to accept any obligation under any of those regulations, at least for the time being. Accordingly, the delegation of the United States at Atlantic City reserved the position of this Government by making the following declaration, incorporated in the final protocol to the convention, as a condition to the signing of the convention on behalf of the United States:

"The United States of America formally declares that the United States of America does not, by signature of this convention on its behalf, accept any obligation in respect of the telegraph regulations, the telephone regulations, or the additional radio regulations referred to in article 13 of the Atlantic City convention."

If future conferences should amend those regulations so as to enable the United States Government to become a party to any or all of them, consideration will be given to changing the existing policy of this Government with respect thereto.

Under the provisions of article 23 of the convention, the convention and the radio regulations annexed thereto will, upon entry into force, abrogate and replace, in relations between the contracting governments, the international telecommunication convention signed at Madrid on December 9, 1932, as well as the Cairo radio regulations of 1938.

It is provided in article 49 of the convention that the convention shall enter into force on January 1, 1949, between countries, territories, or groups of territories in respect of which instruments of ratification or accession have been deposited before that date.

It is believed that the convention and radio regulations drawn up and signed at Atlantic City constitute a notable improvement over the existing convention and regulations which have for their purpose the international allocation of radio channels, the regulation of the use of those channels, and the bringing into effect of many other provisions governing the international regulation of telecommunication, particularly of radio.

A more detailed explanation of the purposes and provisions of the convention and its annexes, and of the radio regulations, is set forth in a comprehensive report of the delegations of the United States to the Atlantic City conferences. An excerpt from that report, comprising the major part of the concluding chapter thereof (summary and conclusions), is enclosed herewith.

Respectfully submitted.

G. C. MARSHALL.

(Enclosures: (1) Volume containing texts of: (a) international telecommunication convention, with annexes, Atlantic City, October 2, 1947; (b) final protocol to the convention; (c) radio regulations annexed to the convention, with appendixes; (d) other acts of the Atlantic City conferences; (2) excerpt from report of United States delegations to Atlantic City conferences.)

Mr. VANDENBERG. In connection with the treaties which were just laid down by the Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed therefrom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, [redacted], United States Army, for appointment as Director, Joint United States Military Advisory and Planning Group in Greece, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Maj. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force), for appointment to the position of senior Air Force member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947;

Rear Adm. Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commander Naval Forces, Western Pacific;

Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Rear Adm. Henry R. Oster, United States Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Rear Adm. Edwin D. Foster, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years;

Alfred H. Noble and Graves B. Erskine, for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps;

Edward A. Craig and Thomas J. Cushman, for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps;

Brig. Gen. Edwin Bowman Lyon and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Air Force;

Brig. Gen. Frank Allen, Illinois National Guard, and several other officers, for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Erik Henning Nelson and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Air Force Reserve of the Air Force of the United States; and

Maj. Gen. William E. Kepner and sundry other officers for appointment in the United States Air Force.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider now the nominations approved by the Armed Services Committee of officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps below the rank of general and admiral.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to see the names. There is one nomination to which I should like to object.

Mr. GURNEY. Those to which I refer are all below the rank of general. If the Senator would like to see the names, we shall have to put them on the calendar. That would cost about $100.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the list of officers of the rank of colonel and below be presently considered and approved.

There being no objection, the legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, below the rank of general and admiral.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 18, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received February 17 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Leonard N. Caswell, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Edward W. Mill, of Maryland, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 16, 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Cong.), for appointment in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the grade specified, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to provisions of the mentioned act. These officers have been selected to fill existing vacancies in the grades for which they are nominated and appointments in these grades will not act to exceed the number of positions authorized for such grades.

To be captains

Vida L. Buehler, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Mary C. Burnham, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Elizabeth S. Carloss, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Mildred S. Carter, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Mary L. Gill, WMSC (Diet.), R5.
Norine O. Ginder, WMSC (OT).
Frances M. Horr, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Alice T. A. Knox, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Katharine Leonard, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Erma G. Lord, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Hilda M. Lovett, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Alene V. Ness, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Helena D. Quinn, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Winifred G. Riley, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Barbara M. Sleddon, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Mary E. Stack, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Carol Stange, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Ruth G. Strain, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Ethel M. Theilmann, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Helen Tremback, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Anita V. Williams, WMSC (PT), [redacted].

To be first lieutenants

Melba L. Adams, ANC, [redacted].
Mary L. Albright, ANC, [redacted].
Johanna M. Anderson, ANC, [redacted].
Juliet M. D. Anton, ANC, [redacted].
Agnes M. Arrington, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth A. Askegaard, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret F. Bagar, ANC, [redacted].
Doris L. Bailey, ANC, [redacted].
Marjorie L. Baker, ANC, [redacted].
Geraldine R. Baldwin, ANC, [redacted].
Adele M. Ball, ANC, [redacted].
Dorothy E. Baltzo, ANC, [redacted].
Wilma R. Barney, ANC, [redacted].
C. Barbara Bean, ANC, [redacted].
Evelyn M. Bedard, ANC, [redacted].
Angela R. Benda, ANC, [redacted].
Clara R. Bentley, ANC, [redacted].
M. Pauline Bettinger, WMSC (OT).
Loretta M. Bevins, ANC, [redacted].
Jean B. Bissonette, ANC, [redacted].
Louise F. Bitter, ANC, [redacted].
Inez H. Blossman, ANC, [redacted].
Martha M. Boger, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Ada E. Boone, ANC, [redacted].
Thelma K. Bormann, ANC, [redacted].
Olive J. Boxa, ANC, [redacted].
Ruth E. Breneman, ANC, [redacted].
Esther Brians, ANC, [redacted].
Gertrude E. Brooks, ANC, [redacted].
Marjorie T. Brown, ANC, [redacted].
Billie E. Bryson, ANC, [redacted].
Martha M. Cameron, ANC, [redacted].
Virginia A. Cameron, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret H. Cannoles, ANC, [redacted].
Helen M. Carbonneau, ANC, [redacted].
Virginia L. Carroll, ANC, [redacted].
Mary J. Carsey, ANC, [redacted].
Constance G. Catalano, ANC, [redacted].
Jennie L. Caylor, ANC, [redacted].
Hazel C. Chadwick, ANC, [redacted].
Christine M. Chesnik, ANC, [redacted].
Jeannette E. Churchill, ANC, [redacted].
Leota H. Clark, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Clark, ANC, [redacted].
Mary S. Clark, ANC, [redacted].
Ethel Claxon, ANC, [redacted].
Flora L. Clymer, ANC, [redacted].
Belle K. Cohen, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Betty L. Colyer, ANC, [redacted].
Dora M. Coover, ANC, [redacted].
Lena J. Cricco, ANC, [redacted].
Patricia L. Crocker, ANC, [redacted].
Doris J. Crouser, WMSC (OT).
Dorothy M. Cunningham, ANC, [redacted].
Florine H. Cutts, ANC, [redacted].
Alice B. Davidson, ANC, [redacted].
Robertine E. Davies, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth M. Dean, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Dorothy M. DeHart, ANC, [redacted].
Elaine H. Deliman, ANC, [redacted].
Helen C. Dembeck, ANC, [redacted].
Janet L. Demy, ANC, [redacted].
Anna T. DeNegri, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Maryelle Dodds, WMSC (OT).
Marion M. Donaldson, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Madelyn F. Donnedy, ANC, [redacted].
Kathryn T. Driscoll, ANC, [redacted].
Rita R. Dulisse, ANC, [redacted].
Rose J. Dull, ANC, [redacted].
Cleo E. Durkee, ANC, [redacted].
Colatine Dyas, ANC, [redacted].
Julia C. Eastwood, ANC, [redacted].
Virginia H. Echerd, ANC, [redacted].
Anna M. Evans, ANC, [redacted].
Hazel L. Evans, ANC, [redacted].
Anna E. Fairley, ANC, [redacted].
Mary C. Fanning, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Maxine H. Fell, ANC, [redacted].
Miriam J. Fickes, ANC, [redacted].
Wanda I. Fill, ANC, [redacted].
Jane C. Flanagin, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Edythe M. Fleck, ANC, [redacted].
Dorothea V. Fleischer, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Margaret C. Flynn, ANC, [redacted].
Evelyn Folmar, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Eunice M. Ford, ANC, [redacted].
Marguerite W. Foster, ANC, [redacted].
Emily K. Frailey, ANC, [redacted].
Catherine E. Francis, ANC, [redacted].
Miriam E. Fuller, ANC, [redacted].
Anna D. Funk, ANC, [redacted].
Mildred M. Furlong, ANC, [redacted].
Ruth E. Fussell, ANC, [redacted].
Gladys L. Fusselman, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret L. Gattis, ANC, [redacted].
Sara J. Gephart, ANC, [redacted].
Phyllis M. Gervais, ANC, [redacted].
Elnora L. Geyer, ANC, [redacted].
Pattie R. Gibbs, ANC, [redacted].
Willie C. Gilliam, ANC, [redacted].

Katherine S. Gillies, ANC, [redacted].
Sheila M. Gillman, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret Gist, ANC, N779655.
Agnes C. Glunt, ANC, [redacted].
Joyce Goodwin, ANC, [redacted].
Eleanor M. Gorman, ANC, [redacted].
Patricia Greenan, ANC, [redacted].
Catherine R. Grogan, ANC, [redacted].
Emma C. Groh, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Guerdette, ANC, [redacted].
Marjorie A. Haley, ANC, [redacted].
Anna D. Harkins, ANC, [redacted].
Paulanna R. Harkins, ANC, [redacted].
Cleo S. Harrod, ANC, [redacted].
Willie E. Hart, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Hartley, ANC, [redacted].
Mary B. Hartman, ANC, [redacted].
Lillian E. Haws, ANC, [redacted].
Sally C. Hayes, ANC, [redacted].
Bernice I. Heath, ANC, [redacted].
Margith H. Heide, ANC, [redacted].
Marie A. Heine, ANC, [redacted].
Dorothy A. Helwig, ANC, [redacted].
Evelyn M. Henrich, ANC, [redacted].
Alice P. Hill, ANC, [redacted].
Katheryne J. Hills, ANC, [redacted].
Phyllis J. Hocking, ANC, [redacted].
Maralee R. Hodgson, ANC, [redacted].
Ann E. Hogan, ANC, [redacted].
Bernice E. Holsinger, ANC, [redacted].
Helen C. Hooverson, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret L. Hornberger, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth R. Horne, ANC, [redacted].
Marjorie O. Horton, ANC, [redacted].
Lucy E. Houghton, ANC, [redacted].
Matilda Howard, ANC, [redacted].
Vivian Howell, ANC, [redacted].
June L. Hudson, ANC, [redacted].
Agnes T. Hulme, ANC, [redacted].
Barbara M. Hutchins, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth J. Ingram, ANC, [redacted].
Sallie H. Ingram, ANC, [redacted].
Agnes M. Jackson, ANC, [redacted].
Florence S. Jacobs, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret L. Jacobson, ANC, [redacted].
Dorothy E. Jaeger, ANC, [redacted].
Johanna H. Jakubaitis, ANC, [redacted].
Helen C. Jansen, ANC, [redacted].
Alice C. Jeffreys, ANC, [redacted].
Lillian Jones, ANC, [redacted].
Mildred C. Katich, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Keefe, ANC, [redacted].
Lelia M. Kehoe, ANC, [redacted].
Arlene E. Kind, ANC, [redacted].
Eleanor A. Klensch, ANC, [redacted].
Helen S. Kloss, ANC, [redacted].
Gladys N. Knowles, ANC, [redacted].
Rita M. Kopp, ANC, [redacted].
Ethel R. Kovach, ANC, [redacted].
Helen S. Koziol, ANC, [redacted].
Bernice H. Kress, ANC, [redacted].
Ruth B. Krieser, ANC, [redacted].
Ruth A. Kruger, ANC, [redacted].
Lucile Krumperman, ANC, [redacted].
Blanche F. Kuchar, ANC, [redacted].
Katherine R. Kurutz, ANC, [redacted].
Helen M. Landis, ANC, [redacted].
Anna M. Lanzendorfer, ANC, [redacted].
Theresa J. Larivee, ANC, [redacted].
Caryl R. Lawrence, ANC, [redacted].
Mary Lawrence, ANC, [redacted].
Marietta Levy, ANC, [redacted].
Minalie M. Lindo, ANC, [redacted].
Lulu M. Lines, ANC, [redacted].
Irene Lionais, ANC, [redacted].
Josephine A. Lo Cicero, ANC, [redacted].
Esther M. Lockwood, ANC, [redacted].
Martha E. Lohman, ANC, [redacted].
Agnes B. Lohrmann, ANC, [redacted].
Imelda H. Lohrmann, ANC, [redacted].
Lela M. Lovelace, ANC, [redacted].
Hazel J. Lovett, ANC, [redacted].
Etta M. Lowe, ANC, [redacted].
Mary S. Lowe, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Eddie R. Loyd, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Lynch, ANC, [redacted].
Mary K. Lynch, ANC, [redacted].
Patty J. Mann, ANC, [redacted].
Angelena I. Mariano, ANC, [redacted].
Alice S. Marks, ANC, [redacted].
Helen M. Martin, ANC, [redacted].
Coletta M. Masterson, ANC, [redacted].
Kathryn Maurice, WMSC (OT).
Christine Maxwell, ANC, [redacted].
Kathryn J. McCann, ANC, [redacted].
Dorothea M. McCarty, ANC, [redacted].
Helen A. McCloskey, ANC, [redacted].
Mercedes A. McCort, ANC, [redacted].
Agnes B. McGann, ANC, [redacted].
Eleanore McIntyre, ANC, [redacted].
Catharine G. McNiven, ANC, [redacted].
Mary V. Menold, ANC, [redacted].
Catherine A. Merat, ANC, [redacted].
Charlotte M. Meyer, ANC, [redacted].
Florence J. Mikowski, ANC, [redacted].
Esther M. Miller, ANC, [redacted].
Kathleen F. Miller, ANC, [redacted].
Mae E. Miller, ANC, [redacted].
Anne D. Mitchell, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Hannah T. Mohr, ANC, [redacted].
Mary A. Moles, ANC, [redacted].
Esther J. Moran, ANC, [redacted].
Marion M. Morris, ANC, [redacted].
Ida B. Morrison, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Morse, ANC, [redacted].
Mary F. Morse, ANC, [redacted].
Dorothy H. Murray, ANC, [redacted].
Rowella H. Newell, ANC, [redacted].
Charlotte L. Nolan, ANC, [redacted].
Irene B. Norkus, ANC, [redacted].
Walburga G. Nyez, ANC, [redacted].
Evelyn R. Ordway, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret L. Ormand, ANC, [redacted].
Naomi I. Osborne, ANC, [redacted].
Estat C. Ott, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Ouimet, ANC, [redacted].
Jewell A. Outlaw, ANC, [redacted].
Reverdy M. Overbey, ANC, [redacted].
Susie W. Page, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret T. Paolilli, ANC, [redacted].
Joline D. Parente, ANC, [redacted].
Alice S. Patterson, ANC, [redacted].
Isabel S. Paulson, ANC, [redacted].
Irene M. Pawlowski, ANC, [redacted].
Mildred M. Peace, ANC, [redacted].
Mildred Perkins, ANC, [redacted].
Loraine W. Perteit, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Mabel E. Pierce, WMSC (OT).
Carrie E. Pittman, ANC, [redacted].
Alice E. Planty, ANC, [redacted].
Mary K. Platt, ANC, [redacted].
Audrae A. Quintini, ANC, [redacted].
Constance H. Ramsey, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Margaret E. Remington, ANC, [redacted].
Ellen M. Respini, ANC, [redacted].
Bertha D. Richardson, ANC, [redacted].
Catherine M. Riney, ANC, [redacted].
Sue H. Robertson, ANC, [redacted].
Pauline Robinson, ANC, [redacted].
Alta F. Rogers, ANC, [redacted].
Mary M. Rollins, ANC, N722039.
Lucille I. Ross, ANC, [redacted].
Dorothy L. Rundle, ANC, [redacted].
Georgeann E. Russell, ANC, [redacted].
Helen A. Rydzewski, ANC, [redacted].
Juanita H. Scalf, ANC, [redacted].
Sophia M. Schadt, ANC, [redacted].
Eleanora M. M. Scheessele, ANC, [redacted].
Mary M. Schultz, ANC, [redacted].
Martha J. Seidel, ANC, [redacted].
Mildred M. Shaner, ANC, [redacted].
Clarice J. Shannon, ANC, [redacted].
Evelyn E. Silbert, ANC, [redacted].
Martha A. Simpkins, ANC, [redacted].
Blanche I. Sipple, ANC, [redacted].
Betty F. Smith, ANC, [redacted].
Frances K. Smith, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Smith, ANC, [redacted].
Ruth G. Smith, ANC, [redacted].
Gloria E. Snyder, ANC, [redacted].
Anna M. Solberg, ANC, [redacted].
Eleanore M. Soppa, ANC, [redacted].
Venice Spendlove, ANC, [redacted].
Julia Stark, ANC, [redacted].
Edna L. Staton, ANC, [redacted].
Sylvia M. Stivlen, ANC, [redacted].
Pauline Stokes, ANC, [redacted].
Sarah C. Stradley, ANC, [redacted].
Cecilia A. Sulkowski, ANC, [redacted].
Mary L. Sutton, ANC, [redacted].
Marion D. Sweigart, ANC, [redacted].
Garnet A. Sykes, ANC, [redacted].
Bernice V. Taylor, ANC, [redacted].
Georgia V. Teater, ANC, [redacted].
Lois R. Thompson, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Mae Thompson, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret J. Thornton, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].
Sara M. Tippett, ANC, [redacted].
Annie Townsley, ANC, [redacted].
Helen L. Tucker, ANC, [redacted].
Ruth E. Tucker, ANC, [redacted].
Vida J. Tucker, ANC, [redacted].
Florence E. Turney, ANC, [redacted].
Louise Tyner, ANC, [redacted].
Edith E. Uhl, ANC, [redacted].
Gladys M. Webster, ANC, [redacted].
Nell O. Welborne, ANC, [redacted].
Harriet H. Werley, ANC, [redacted].
Ida A. Werner, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret E. Wesely, ANC, [redacted].
Martha M. West, ANC, [redacted].
Alta M. White, ANC, [redacted].
Agnes L. Williams, ANC, [redacted].
Rebecca S. Williams, ANC, [redacted].
Sarah L. Williford, ANC, [redacted].
Gladys H. Wilson, ANC, [redacted].
Fleeta O. Worthington, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth A. Wright, ANC, [redacted].
Frances E. Wright, ANC, [redacted].
Doris Yopp, ANC, [redacted].
Elizabeth A. Zettel, ANC, [redacted].
Anne M. Zizon, ANC, [redacted].
Delores V. Zuelke, ANC, [redacted].

To be second lieutenants

Frances Aragon, ANC, [redacted].
Audrey P. Atkinson, ANC, [redacted].
Dorothy R. Bonsall, ANC, [redacted].
Gladys I. Breault, ANC, [redacted].
Mary M. Breunig, ANC, [redacted].
Opal T. Cameron, ANC, [redacted].
Erin E. Cannon, ANC, [redacted].
Claire D. Cardinal, ANC, [redacted].
Anna G. Casey, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Olga L. Chernak, ANC, [redacted].
Muriel E. Clapper, ANC, [redacted].
Helen S. Comac, ANC, [redacted].
Catherine N. Cotsones, ANC, [redacted].
Therese E. Daley, ANC, [redacted].
Dolores A. Damberger, ANC, [redacted].
Grace M. Dickson, WMSC (OT).
Muriel E. Eckelberg, ANC, [redacted].
Janice W. Feagin, ANC, [redacted].
Rose M. Ferrelli, ANC, [redacted].
Mary E. Fetters, ANC, [redacted].
Enola S. Flowers, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Bertha G. Goodfellow, ANC, [redacted].
Phyllis A. Hall, ANC, [redacted].
Myra J. Hanlon, ANC, [redacted].
Katharine Henningsen, WMSC (OT).
Marian Horner, ANC, [redacted].
Ethel M. Inglis, ANC, [redacted].
Margaret M. Kish, ANC, [redacted].
Frances C. Knipe, ANC, [redacted].
Marilouise Knott, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Marybelle J. Lacey, ANC, [redacted].
Amalia R. Lazaro, ANC, [redacted].
Ruth M. Leahy, ANC, [redacted].
Mabel D. Lewis, ANC, [redacted].
Catherine M. Loeffel, ANC, [redacted].
Beulalys Masterson, ANC, [redacted].
Maxine Miller, ANC, [redacted].
Catherine E. Paight, ANC, [redacted].
Ruth M. Pray, WMSC (OT).
Bernadette L. Reider, ANC, [redacted].
Mildred E. Schapiro, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Marie J. Schmahl, ANC, [redacted].
Kathryn E. Schultz, WMSC (OT).
Virginia M. Shaffer, ANC, [redacted].
Marian F. Sindoni, ANC, [redacted].
Roberta W. Smith, ANC, [redacted].
Artrude M. Stark, ANC, [redacted].
Marilynn C. Stevens, ANC, [redacted].
Phyllis R. Strobel, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Harriet Ter Borg, ANC, [redacted].
Jane M. Valine, ANC, [redacted].
Alma E. V. Wallsten, ANC, [redacted].
Rosemary Witt, ANC, [redacted].
Harriet L. Wood, WMSC (PT), [redacted].
Donna P. Zimmerman, WMSC (Diet.), [redacted].

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major

Leo Murphy

To be first lieutenants

Ralph Gunther Tross
Richard Holt Dolson
Leland Boyd Fair
Joseph Daniel Hughes
John Thomas McAtee
Clarence Ames Martin, Jr.
Francis Lester Wycoff
Durell Benner Hartman
Luther Leon Halbrook
Lawrence Edward Spellman
Richard Edwin Cross
Joseph Aaron Goldes
Robert Arnott Cady
Norman Maynard Stephens
John Hamilton Burke
Raymond Preston Davis
Gilbert Harry Amis
William Paul Hartman
William Thornton Coburn
William Carlton Wilkinson
Richard Henry Kelly
Harold Elwin Maier
Alvin Carl Jensen
John Christian Wallman
Milton Max Nemky
Willard Almur Dodge
Robert Burnham Brewer

Medical Corps

To be lieutenant colonels

Paul Herbert Martin
Otto Leonard Churney
Richard Barr Jones
Francis Patrick Kintz
Augustus Alonzo Hall
Frank Eric Hagman

To be majors

Richard Irving Crone
George Augustine Goder
John Randolph Hall, Jr.
Lucio Ernest Gatto
David Harry Naimark
Aniello Francis Mastellone
William Leroy Vogt
Raymond Taylor Jenkins
Carl Bennett Stilson
Robert Nathan Lehman
Louis Franklin Saylor
Raymond Bender Croissant
Jon Olafur Stefan Sigurdsson
John Warren Guerin
George N. Schuhmann
Alonzo Allan Towner, Jr.
Wilbur Dwight Dice
Ralph Everett Reiner
Joseph Robert Vivas
William Nelson Donovan
Norman Clemm Veale

To be captains

Clarence Blake Hewitt
Byron Landt Miller
Carl Barry Weller
James Barnes Hartgering
Zbigniew John Baczewski
Wayne Robert Oelhafen
Charles Walter Metz, Jr.
Richard Earl Mardis
Robert Blair Franklin

Dental Corps

To be lieutenant colonels

George Emil Naselli
Wallace Jacob Morlock

To be majors

William Ralph Thomas Oakes
Benjamin Lee Brooks, Jr.
Arthur Hastings Vollertsen
Donald William Grove
Charles Stewart Jones
William Joseph McAllister
Theodore Emmett Fischer
Gerald Arthur McCracken
Douglas Monroe Beebe
Kenneth David Eye
Virgil Gordon Walker
Jack Menefee Messner
Hal David Oakley, Jr.

To be captain

John Everett Gaynor

Veterinary Corps

To be lieutenant colonel

Arvo Theodore Thompson

To be majors

Don L. Deane
Don Lee Mace
Howard Curtis Maxey
Karl Harry Willers
Manuel Charles Kastner
Harry Ruyle Lancaster

To be captains

William Gordon Brooks
Samuel Garwood Forester
Elmer Richard Pede

Medical Service Corps

To be first lieutenants

Robert Newell Gilliam
Robert Isaiah Anderson

Army Nurse Corps

To be lieutenant colonels

Kathleen Mitchell
Margaret Elizabeth Aaron
Jeanette Blech
Florence I. Lee
Nora G. Freeman

To be first lieutenants

Velma Fay Grove
Anna Veronica Michelitsch
Geraldine Massingill
Keitha Pauline Zeisloft
Mary Ann Strauss
Nancy Carol Leftenant
Barbara L. Hughson

Women's Medical Specialist Corps

To be first lieutenants

Margaret A. Kraybill
Melna Adams Farmer
Katherine Cecelia Ehrhart

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

To be first lieutenants

Daniel Joseph Boyle
Patrick Henry Kenny, Jr.
Bruce Wendell Pope
James Allen Burton
Joseph Brice Moore
DeForrest August von Laufer, Jr.
Mark Carlyle Noble
Armand Edouard Reiser
Raymond Adolph Groh
Julian Daniel Shofner
Arthur John Ulrich
Russell Perrine Morris, Jr.
Carl Wilford Tipton
James Theodore Seymour
Roy Enright Guy
Lester T. Kearney, Jr.
Jack Byron Owens
Julian Franklin Berry
Donald Keith MacGregor
Russell Millward Heller, Jr.
Edward Frank Holst, Jr.
Hubert Neil Skidmore
Robert Francis Watson
Jacob Milton Freeman
Henry Leo Rauch
John William Menard
Newell Dwight Mitchell
Dempsey Ernest Ballard
Claude Merrill Trawick, Jr.
Francis Eris Wilkie
John Raymond Kern, Jr.
Harry Holt Moreland
Charles Francis Hoy, Jr.
Conrad John Lindemann
John Scales Hardwick
James Marshall Anderson
Doyle Dean Dickson
Richard David Klingenberg
Walter Thomas Gentile
Charles Richard Croft, Jr.
Warren L. Simpson
William Francis Ramsey
John A. Saffell, Jr.
Bruce Ward Carr
Warren Glenn Van Houten
Leroy Peter Zotter
Hollie Alonzo Wilkes

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE SUPPLY CORPS OF THE NAVY

Lieutenant

Warren, James A.

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Grad, Charles F.
Lewis, Harvey E.
Aicken, John E.
Dura, Leon J.
Rawis, Elbert S., Jr.

Ensigns

Damon, Stewart W.
Evans, Robert A., Jr.
Hediger, Fritz H.
Haley, Robert S.
O'Brien, Richard J.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Ensign in the Navy from June 4, 1948

Andrew Roman

Ensigns in the Navy from June 4, 1948, in lieu of appointment as ensign in the Supply Corps

Warren W. Barker
Raymond A. Marston
Wedo Nutaitis
Theodore W. Pstrak

Ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from June 4, 1948

John D. Shaw
Richard M. Hennigan

Lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Dwight H. Smith
Dennis P. McCarty
Francis Marshall

Ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy

James C. Billings, Jr.
Norman D. Chetlin
Henry A. L. Church
Lawrence R. Eades

Ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy

Robert E. Dickman
Edward L. MacCordy

Lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy

Myers Thornton

Ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy

Anne M. Bailey
Ann M. Bono
Margaret Bozdos
Margaret M. Cook
Hazel C. Crouse
Wanda M. Crouse
Alyeene L. Emfinger
Lois J. Gallagher
Josephine L. Hart
Virginia M. Huff
Valeria Kalemba
Emma R. Partridge
Edna J. Rundell
Mary E. Staud
Flora B. Sturm
Hollyce J. Trantham
Ethel C. A. Eusebio
Eleanor G. Hall
Dorothea M. Johnston
Maria Poljanac

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

Lieutenant (junior grade)

William H. Martin, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Commander

Frank F. Wildebush

Lieutenant commander

John D. Boland

Lieutenants (junior grade)

John P. Ahearn
Arthur A. Helgerson
Francis E. Hornbrook
Albert E. Thielen
Harry A. Underwood
William J. Weller

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of names:

Halim G. Habib
James M. Keirnan
Joseph E. F. Rankin

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant (junior grade)

John E. McGraw

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenants

Charles E. Payne
Lloyd W. Wolford

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Philip H. Dunham
Joseph O. Kuebel, Jr.
Joseph T. Kuschell
Roy C. Lininger
Edward A. Smith
Wayne C. Whitehead

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commander

Jasper E. Morgan

Lieutenant

Arthur L. Hall

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenants

Lillian T. Buytaert
Anne T. Cooley
Patricia E. George
Marjorie H. Johnson
Marie E. Poulin

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Bertha M. Davis
Cecilia C. Flannery
Ruth E. Hartley
Vera M. Joyce
Bertha E. Rollings
Ellen Williams

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Gladys LaV. P. Kennedy to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct spelling of name:

Ensigns

Corinne A. Fischer
Melanie Ince
Eleanora W. Rennock

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from June 4, 1948:

Robert P. Armstrong
Rex R. Berglund
Eugene Bezore
Richard C. Boyd
John M. Brozena
Donald A Cook
Murray C. Cook
George D. Cryan
Arnold F. Deichelman
Lawrence H. Dickens
Delmar H. Evans, Jr.
Edward V. Fineran
Emerson P. Kendall
Benjamin W. Martin
William T. Mitchell, Jr.
Beverly R. Molony
Clarence E. Parker, Jr.
Patrick D. Rotramel
Don LeR. Southworth
John P. Sundberg
Charles E. Waring, Jr.
Peter A. Williams
Stanley Williams
Robert D. Wilroy

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from June 4, 1948:

Lowry M. Miller
John G. Wissler

George D. Tracy to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

Robert W. Radcliffe to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John W. Murdock
Robert P. Woodworth

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Willis J. Allender
Elizabeth G. Anderson
Vivian Blasingame
Marie M. Boatman
Ambia L. Buckner
Anna V. Bush
Sarah V. Callebs
Patricia M. Doherty
Dorothy L. Gero
Josephine M. Glod
Elsa A. Griswold
Melba L. Haggerty
Eileen M. Hubbell
Catharine B. Jones
May E. Knudson
Bertha A. Krumming
Patricia R. Laisure
June L. Lunde
Katherine A. Massey
Elaine J. Matthews
Estelle Morrison
Frances K. Oliver
Anna M. Reed
Adah D. Sander
Jane E. Steinbrink
Juanita J. Strayhorn
Shirley A. Zuelke

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commander

LeRoy E. Wible

Lieutenants

John T. Egan, Jr.
Paul H. Pettit

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert E. Baker
Raymond L. Bradley, Jr.
Robert J. Evoy
James H. Lee, Jr.
John R. Lindsay
Lyle D. Litton
Harry S. McGaughey
William S. Markham
Lewis G. Richards, Jr.
George F. Sager
Myron E. Samuelson
Julius H. Spence
James I. Thorn
Theodore H. Wilson, Jr.
Clayton E. Wood

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Robert M. Kehoe

The following-named officers to the grades in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commanders

Gwenn M. Loomer
Clare C. Marshall

Lieutenants

Arthur C. Boughton
Miles W. Cheatham, Jr.
James G. Rogers, Jr.

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Edwin "R" Black
Harold S. Dexter, Jr.
Loren F. Enke
Ira Goldstein
Chester S. McCoy
Wilbur R. McKibben
Jack W. Robinson
Vincent R. Van Eenenaam

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenants

Paul R. Kent
Ralph B. Lopez
Ralph L. Vasa

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant

Noma V. Foster

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Loretta F. Bielecki
Mary E. Kelly

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Raymond E. Hopper
William P. Battell
Cornelius P. Van Ness
Edson L. Lyman
George H. Cloud
Charles E. Shepard, Jr.
Peter A. McDonald
Thomas B. Hughes
William B. McKean
Fred D. Beans
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
Paul W. Russell
Frank M. Reinecke
John M. Davis
Walfried H. Fromhold
James T. Wilbur
Charles H. Hayes
Donald M. Weller
Edward A. Montgomery
Edgar O. Price
Robert E. Hill
James M. Daly
Ronald D. Salmon
Russell Lloyd
Ernest W. Fry, Jr.

The following-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

August Larson

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

William R. Williams
William F. Harris
Gordon D. Gayle
James D. McBrayer, Jr.
Jack Hawkins
James B. Glennon, Jr.
William A. Stiles
Edwin C. Aiken
Russell Duncan
Richard M. Huizenga
George M. Lhamon
William A. Cloman, Jr.
Alfred N. Gordon
Alfred F. Robertshaw
Jino J. D'Alessandro
Henry J. Revane
Melvin D. Henderson
Eliott B. Robertson
Chester A. Henry, Jr.
Sidney F. Jenkins
George F. Gober
John D. Howard
Fred T. Bishopp
Cecil W. Shuler
Glenn R. Long
Samuel D. Mandeville, Jr.
William G. Thrash
Louis Metzger
Luther R. Seibert
Wendell H. Best
John I. Williamson, Jr.
Robert S. Riddell
George T. Fowler
Warner T. Bigger
Charles A. Rigaud
Roger S. Bruford
Randall L. Stallings
Edwin C. Godbold
Warren P. Baker
James Taul
Homer E. Hire
George V. Hanna, Jr.
Richard Quigley
Royce W. Coln
Henry S. Massie
Alfred T. Greene
Melville M. Menefee
Wayne M. Cargill
James B. Moore
Louis L. Frank
Joseph W. Kean, Jr.
Theodore F. Beeman
Wyatt B. Carneal, Jr.
William C. Kellum
Richard K. Schmidt
Thomas V. Murto, Jr.
Morris E. Flater
Frank H. Collins
Albert H. Potter
Gordon A. Hardwick
Lyman D. Spurlock
Howard E. King
Waite W. Worden
James R. Anderson
Lee A. Christoffersen
Deryle N. Seely
Harold S. Roise
Roger C. Power, Jr.
Hoyt U. Bookhart, Jr.
Albert F. Moe
Martin W. Storm
John E. Morris
Randolph S. D. Lockwood
Robert D. Heinl, Jr.
Guy B. Smith, Jr.
Fred J. Klingenhagen
Clyde T. Smith
Wilbur F. Meyerhoff
Carl J. Cagle
John A. Burns
Francis C. Clagett
William G. Muller, Jr.
Benjamin B. Manchester III
Frank E. Gallagher, Jr
Robert C. McDonough
Boyd O. Whitney
Richard D. Strickler
Frederick R. Findtner
James W. Keene
John F. Kinney
Michiel Dobervich
Robert F. Jenkins, Jr
Lewis A. Jones
Norman E. Sparling
Julian V. Lyon
Carl M. Longley
Francis W. Benson
George R. Stallings
William J. McKennan
LeRoy P. Hunt, Jr.
Claude S. Sanders, Jr.
William R. Dorr, Jr.
Henry E. W. Barnes
Walter H. Stephens
Clarence R. Schwenke
John F. Mallard
George B. Thomas
Henry J. Smart
John E. Rentsch
Charles T. Hodges
Kenneth H. Black
William C. Humberd
Robert R. Burns
Marion E. Carl
Charles W. Somers, Jr.
Arthur H. Adams
Angus M. Fraser
Robert Hall
Ralph M. Wismer
Donald J. Robinson
Alfred M. Mahoney
Robert M. Hanna
Erik W. Ritzau
Earl W. Gardner
John C. Brewer
William D. Morgan
William E. Clasen
"J" Frank Cole
Lowell S. Reeve
Homer G. Hutchinson, Jr.
Allen H. Anderson
Glenn L. Todd
Elkin S. Dew
Erwin F. Wann, Jr.
Otis V. Calhoun, Jr.
Talbott F. Collins
John H. Partridge
Frederick J. Karch
Lawrence F. Fox
Horace H. Figuers
Joseph S. Skoczylas
Gerald G. Williams
John W. A. Antonelli
Edwin C. Kimball
George W. Herring
David C. Wolfe
Edward V. Mendenhall, Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Frederick Belton
John G. Johnson

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

Harold A. Strong

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Thomas B. Tighe
Bert Davis, Jr.
Robert W. Nelson
Hugh J. Irish
Thomas M. Leineweber
Thell H. Fisher
Daniel H. Davis
James L. Fawley, Jr.
Henry Matsinger
John E. King
James H. Naylor
Thomas T. Grady
William W. Curtis
Carl O. V. Grussendorf
Bertil E. Larson
Arthur L. Adams
George P. Wolf, Jr.
Franklin C. Bacon
Webster R. Hood
Robert W. Anderson
Vernon L. Bartram
Robert B. Neville
Howard F. Stevenson
George Codrea
Thomas C. Dutton
James A. Pounds III
Karl G. Palmer
Robert R. Fairburn
Robert B. McBroom
Charles A. Lipot
Walter E. Reynolds, Jr.
George J. Debell
Donald B. Otterson
James G. Juett
William E. Baugh
Drew J. Barrett, Jr.
Harry B. Smith
Robert L. Cochran
Charles D. Barrett, Jr.
Gerard T. Armitage
Frank J. Clarke
William A. Murphy
James F. Lawrence, Jr.
Walter J. Ellon, Jr.
James A. Moriarty, Jr.
Jerrold O. Cote
Marshall R. Pilcher
James H. Crutchfield
Madison C. Whiteside
Orvin H. Ramlo
Cruger L. Bright
William J. Sims
George D. Wolverton
Thomas W. Furlow
Herbert A. Peters
Howard L. Walter
Leo F. Tatro, Jr.
Samuel Richards, Jr.
Matt S. Ober, Jr.
George L. Hollowell
Jack Cosley
Samuel B. Folsom, Jr.
Conrad G. Winter
Philip W. Kelly
Robert G. Howie
Richard L. Nickerson
Walter R. Bartosh
William E. Crowe
Robert R. Ayres, Jr.
Jack L. Brushert
George M. Dawes
Thomas A. Heaton
Arthur F. O'Keefe
William B. Freeman
Sidney L. Groff
Wallace G. Wethe
Thomas H. Mann, Jr.
Kenneth D. Frazier
Arvid W. Blackmun
John L. Mahon
Homer S. Hill
Elmer P. Thompson, Jr
Louis F. Ferguson
Lawrence W. Smith, Jr.
Richard J. Flynn, Jr.
Willard C. Lemke
Carroll E. McCullah
Robert R. Read
Clarence H. Moore
Gordon E. Gray
Arthur N. Nehf, Jr.
Russell L. Janson
Martin B. Roush
Lawrence L. Herzog
Harry F. Schwethelm
James E. Johnson
Frank P. Barker, Jr.
Vance F. McKean
Richard H. Pierce
Charles E. Kollmann
Milton M. Cook, Jr.
Howard E. Cook
Lowell D. Grow
William L. G. Hughes
Jack B. Winters
Henry W. Horst
Carol D. Dalton
James E. Grubbs
Francis X. Witt, Jr.
Wallace J. Slappey, Jr.
William P. Dukes
John D. Noble
Roy R. Hewitt
John G. Babashanian
Gale W. Roberts
Jay E. McDonald
Harlen E. Hood
Joseph F. Wagner, Jr.
Scott G. Gier
James A. Etheridge
Robert D. Bachtel
Billie K. Shaw
James P. Wilson
Richard W. Schutt
Henry V. Joslin
Daniel J. Regan
Lyle K. London
Robert H. Daley
Harry A. Hadd
Floyd M. Johnson, Jr.
Richard M. Elliott
John C. Lundrigan
Victor J. Barringer
George S. Saussey, Jr.
Alexander S. Walker, Jr.
Ashby J. Fristoe
Paul D. Parker
Henry G. Gatlin, Jr.
Carl W. Hoffman
Robert R. Weir
Edward L. Bale, Jr.
Edward K. Pedersen
John W. Beebe
Robert K. Dahl
John C. Landrum
Robert L. Thomas
Dean S. Hartley, Jr.
Grant W. McCombs
William G. Johnson
Harold F. Brown
George B. Herlihy
Robert L. Conrad
William P. Mitchell
Robert F. Conley
Walter T. Warren
William D. Patterson, Jr.
Floyd C. Kirkpatrick
Ralph C. Rosacker
Harry C. Dees
Richard W. Batdorff
James W. Hendrick
Robert J. Bolish
Kenneth C. Greenough
Robert E. Brown

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Willis R. Lucius
Theodore A. Petras

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

John D. Case
Robert S. Stubbs II
Benjamin S. Read
Frederick A. Quint
Carl L. Hill
John S. Canton
Richard M. Giddens
Reverdy M. Hall
Edward O. Alsip
Edmund K. Griswold
Joseph P. Cushing
John D. Fair
Edward S. Fris
Harry B. Persinger, Jr.
Robert Baird
James W. Baker
Thomas H. Miller, Jr.
Frank C. Lang
Monroe E. McNiel
Ronald L. Bruce
John S. Parrott, Jr.
William J. Wachsler
Thomas R. O'Dell, Jr.
Robert M. Keim
Glenn L. Rieder
Laurel M. Mickelson
Edward R. Agnew, Jr.
William G. Dair, Jr.
James M. McGrew
Kenneth L. Moos
Theodore R. Yachik
John C. Donovan
George E. McClane
Chester R. Harris
John K. Sinderholm, Jr.
Alton F. Vergote
Charles B. Chambers
Wilbur G. Patton
William E. Greiner, Jr.
Benjamin G. Martin
George Nasif
James R. Martin
Frank J. Faureck
William R. Earney
Garth K. Sturdevan
William E. Melby
William M. Streeter
Peter A. Tonnema, Jr.
Robert E. Dawson
Robert D. Thurston
James B. Ord, Jr.
Charles F. McKiever
James T. Pearce
William A. Kerr
John B. Harney
Don E. Wegley
Lester E. Veigel
Charles C. Cresap
Clarence E. Corley, Jr.
Robert F. Seward
Victor A. Kleber, Jr.
Kenneth T. Whitescarver, Jr.
Harold E. Smith
Vincent J. Smith
Robert C. Lehnert
John H. Glenn, Jr.
Harry A. Stahlstrom
Earl W. Johnson
Robert J. Barbour
Rolland E. Marker
Robert J. Lynch, Jr.
Edward B. Winston
John W. Muldoon, Jr.
Rudolph L. Bittman
Victor A. Armstrong
David G. Johnson
Richard S. Rash
Robert M. Marshall
Robert L. Lamar
Albert G. Schoneberger
Herbert P. Mosca, Jr.
Royce W. Watson
Donald I. McKamy
Zaphney O. Humphreys
Ray T. Lemmons
Roy S. Bachstein
Donald S. Thornbury
George F. Lewis
Herbert E. Roser
Wilford L. Stone
Robert W. Lowe
Gordon A. Kroodsma
William E. Mack
Jess Thierry, Jr.
Gerald J. Tice
George M. Bryant
Arnold L. Emils
Ralph A. Soderberg
Charles D. Fredrick
Calvin C. Crum
Melvin J. Flannagan
"J" "P" Nixon
Eugene W. Nelson
James A. Harper
Charles H. Church, Jr.
Carl W. Lindell
Edwin H. Finlayson
Thomas J. Burnam
Manning T. Jannell
Loren K. Bronleewe
William R. Nowadnick
George W. Brewer
Harrold J. Eiland
Warren G. Hopkins
Thomas J. Ross
John E. Barnett
Alfred W. King
Donald L. Fenton
Harland E. Troy
Vernon J. Peebles
Rex Wilson
William L. Devinney
Jesse V. Booker
Floyd W. Earnest
Harry R. Moore
Nathan B. Peevey, Jr.
Francis C. Jennings
William M. Crapo, Jr.
Basil T. Idler
Herbert G. Manning, Jr.
John A. Gibson, Jr.
Donald T. Doxey
Fred C. Houser
James C. Stanfield
George E. Kelly
Frank G. Parks
John J. Richards
Stephen Shervais
Clifford D. Miller
William J. Wagner
Joseph E. Davies
Johnny D. Lindley
Robert L. Dominick
Edwin L. Hickman, Jr.
Charles C. Samis
William E. Brandon
Richard A. Bjorson
Joseph L. Freitas, Jr.
Harry E. Leland, Jr.
Walter E. Ottmer
John P. Roden
Myron E. Wilcox, Jr.
John Lomac
William H. Cowper
Frederick A. Vernon
Elwood H. Potter
Harvey M. Patton
John E. Hansen
Robert D. Limberg
Elwood D. Bush
Victor E. Allen
Earle E. Bagnall
John E. Vanhousen
Lynn W. Griffitts
Valdemar Schmidt, Jr.
William H. Livingston
Robert D. Janssen
David Cleeland
Paul N. Storaasli
Michael D. Harvath
Clifford P. Blankenship
James T. Cotton
Earl B. Sumerlin, Jr.
Reuel H. Pietz
Joel L. Neuman
John H. Lavoy
William E. Zimmer
Andrew L. McVicars
Emilius R. Ciampa, Jr.
Robert J. Lesak
Lee B. Swindall
James C. Jewell
Arthur F. Wilson, Jr.
Walter S. Metzger
Nathaniel H. Carver
James A. Blakely, Jr.
Edward F. Danowitz
Walter M. Atherton
Ross M. MacAskill
Vincent J. Robinson
James R. Poe
Frank J. Hubka
John H. Wagner
Leonard A. Lemback
James A. Gallo, Jr.
Elmer A. Anderson, Jr.
Albert A. Black
Leslie L. Page
Edward I. Lupton
Mervin B. Porter
William R. Van Ness
Thomas J. Bardon
Charles C. Schwartz
William M. Derby, Jr.
John R. Gill
Bruce A. Goewey
James A. Dorsey
James Payette
Lawrence P. Hart
Francis C. Buxton
Edwin J. Mika
Ernest A. Buford, Jr.
Robert Sabot
Roy L. Reed

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

James W. Tuma
Thomas H. Cutler
Good Burleson
Arthur A. Compton
James D. Swinson
Allen F. Stockdale
Richard W. Sinclair
Donald L. Shenaut
Edwin M. Clements
Max C. Taylor
Mainerd A. Sorensen
John E. Bugary
Ray M. Burrill
Reginald M. George
William A. Willett
Albert F. Rinehart
Fernand A. Landry
William T. Smith
Victor E. Sellers
Judson Vanderhoof
Donald W. Houston
Frederick V. Osborn
Alexander Gagyi
Jerome Hieronymus
Chester H. Fritts
Elwood E. Gebhart
Thomas C. Palmer, Jr.
Herman T. Barbee
Paul F. Brandenburg
Stanley P. Bulkowski
William G. Reid
Robert J. Corbett
Paul Kerns
John Gerey
Henry F. Camper
Fred R Philpot
Arthur C. Fix
James E. Brown
Alfred M. Jones, Jr.
Charlie H. McGee, Jr.
Walter L. Simpson
Charles O. Diliberto
Edward E Burt
Albert J. Assad
Wilbur C Conley
Vernon L. Hendley
Anthony J. Roscoe

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

POSTMASTER

Richard B. Miller to be postmaster at Rushville in the State of Indiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most loving Father, whose mercy is over all, we rejoice that in Thy presence there is fullness of joy and at Thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore. As Thou hast committed unto us a service essential to all that is good and great in the being of man, teach us to sow seeds of brotherly consideration and justice to all men and to wait patiently for the fruitage of our labors. We pray Thee to help us to be brave enough to accept

life's daily trials and worthy enough to bear the cross that was borne for us. Grant that our failures and our triumphs may bear witness of our devotion to those rugged ways of conviction that free us from any cowardly act and bind us to every new duty. As life is a sacred trust, help us to accept the lowliest place where an open heart may serve and transform our labors into sacraments of fellowship. Hear our humble prayer as we thus go forth in the holy name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMUNICATION FROM ACTING SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

FEBRUARY 13, 1948.

Mr. JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: Reference is made to the letter of December 19, 1947, to you from the Secretary of Defense which is in reply to your letter of December 19, 1947, transmitting an attested copy of House Resolution 365 of the Eightieth Congress.

House Resolution 365 required that certain information be transmitted to the House of Representatives at the earliest practical moment by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. As stipulated in the letter from the Secretary of Defense, I have been designated to make reply for him in this matter.

In order that all of the information available to the Department of State and Department of Army could be presented in a usable form, it was agreed between the Department of State and the Department of Army that after coordination with the Department of Army the formal reply to House Resolution 365 would be made by Department of State. For this reason the information obtained by Department of Army for reply to this resolution has been forwarded to the Department of State for submission to you by that Department.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. DRAPER, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING THE NINETY-EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninety-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1948.*

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE EASTERN SEABOARD OIL SITUATION

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, at long last I think we have a piece of good news for the east coast. It is reported this morning that although we would be in the red for about 2,000,000 barrels of home-heating oil by March 31, figures now indicate a favorable balance of 5,029,000 barrels at the end of the present heating season.

Mr. Speaker, that, in my opinion, is the result of pressure properly directed and is the result, in part at least, of the Department's cutting off exports out of the east coast, upon our insistent urging that it do so.

This morning we had an executive session. We had three gentlemen from the Department of Commerce with us. I am not, of course, at liberty to disclose what they said at this session, but I think I will assume responsibility for disclosing what I said. As a result of what they read to us, I asked them to cut off all exports for 48 hours. All I could get from them was the remark that they would consider it. I am going back to the committee now in the hope that we will have those telegrams released by the State Department so we can put them in the RECORD this afternoon.

My best recollection is that, of all of the countries that have so far replied, a majority indicated that they could and would take cuts, and that it amounted to about twenty-seven and one-half millions of gallons of heating oil.

I am also going to urge the Department of Commerce to place that 48-hour embargo on honoring any licenses until we can find out where we are in terms of these cable offers to cooperate by accepting further reductions.

I could thoroughly understand this situation if it involved any question of security, but I have been assured that there is not the slightest trace of security involved. I could even understand it if some felt we should use the traditional American approach of friendly and cooperative discussion with our neighboring countries, but the time is late, the emergency is real, and surely they would understand our situation and distress if we had had the foresight to have ordered someone to tell them about it last fall. I certainly prefer the type of action which can only be understood as one between friends. Canada responded immediately. Now, apparently, even at this late date, with considerable concern, the majority of these countries have responded splendidly.

Of course, we can go through the long process of legislation if we have to do so, but I want our people to understand that we have gotten through the talking stage and are now at the point where we are demanding action. We gave the Department full authority; that carries full responsibility. It has not exercised that authority as it should have. It has ignored these telegrams, most of which were read to our committee in the course of a short hour. Revisions could have been undertaken within a few minutes by any competent official after the receipt of each cable. How much is irrevocably lost, only they know.

It is my considered judgment that unless by 5 o'clock tonight the Department takes this affirmative and constructive step which I have urged upon it, and for which I assume full responsibility, the Department will be derelict in its clear duty under the law, which it has sworn to enforce, in the interest of the American people and their comfort, their welfare, their health, their jobs, and perhaps even lives of some of them. I can think of no more bitter reaction than the one which will be left in the minds of the people who now may know the truth, if the State Department lifts the ban it has the power to place on the disclosure of this fact, that the Department of Commerce prefers to gamble their welfare and their safety against the very unrealistic doubts apparently some of them have regarding other countries—doubts that I can now assure you, with deep sincerity, are not shared in many instances by equally responsible representatives of our Government in those countries, as well as the responsible people in the governments of those countries. I hope each of you will join with me, if you believe this to be true, in turning the full force of our collective opinion upon the Department in demanding prompt action, and I hope the people in your districts will join us in this one effort which may be the last we can make before the end of the heating season.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, the electoral college is an outmoded institution. It should be abolished. Under its present operation it serves to frustrate rather than to express the will of the American people in Presidential elections. The southern Democrats are especially prejudiced by the present method of computing the votes of the various States. One of the ablest of the southern Democrats, and my associate on the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], has long been aware of the inequitable operation of the present election machinery. He has proposed a system of proportional computation of the votes cast in Presidential

elections which provides that the votes of all citizens of the country would be counted in choosing a President. An examination of these proposed changes and an endorsement thereof is contained in a recent editorial in the Arkansas Gazette, of Little Rock, Ark. I include it as a part of my remarks and commend it to your careful reading.

The editorial referred to follows:

MORE REPRESENTATIVE ELECTIONS

One of the most curious byproducts of the current southern outrage over President Truman's civil rights program is the proposal by Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, that Presidential elections be made more representative. Specifically, Mr. GOSSETT wants to abolish the electoral college and divide the electoral vote of each State in the exact ratio of the popular vote. Resolutions to accomplish this end are now before the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOSSETT is one of those who believe that Mr. Truman has sold the South down the river in an effort to appeal to the minority vote in pivotal Eastern States. Indeed, he charges that this has become a common practice among Presidents, and he argues that it can be ended only by a system under which every vote in a Presidential election would count exactly as cast.

This proposal is a welcome contrast to the suggestion, now sounding again in the overheated South, that the electoral college ignore the popular vote entirely and name a President of its own choosing. Mr. GOSSETT's suggestion not only makes a good deal of sense, but has a special meaning to the region.

After all, there is no good reason why the entire electoral vote of a State should be delivered as a unit to the candidate who receives a simple majority of the votes. The electoral vote, in fact, is based upon congressional representation—one for each Representative and Senator. It would require no alteration of existing election machinery to count electoral votes by congressional districts, awarding only two on a State-wide basis, or even to go all the way with Mr. GOSSETT and simply divide the present electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote.

This would certainly have the effect of spreading the political effort of both parties, for no national election could then be won on the basis of small popular majorities in a few key States. For the South it would mean an immediate break in one-party solidarity. In Arkansas, for instance, which polled 63,551 votes for Dewey against 148,965 for Roosevelt, more than a third of the State's electoral votes would have gone to the Republicans in 1944. The proportion of Republican votes in some other Southern States, notably North Carolina and Tennessee, is usually even higher.

This would mean that, in national elections at least, the Southern States would become bipartisan. The electoral votes that could be chipped away from the Democratic majorities would be worth having—worth the sort of effort the Republicans have never expended on the region. This would soon have a salutary effect upon State and local elections, for it is inevitable that a rejuvenated and effective southern wing of the Republican Party would grow out of it.

Mr. GOSSETT and the other supporters of the measures abolishing the electoral college are going to run into potent opposition from political interests in both parties, of course. But they deserve the determined support of all those southerners who now recognize that they have nothing to lose and a good deal to gain by breaking down the one-party tradition, and, for once at least, they would be able to point out to their critics that they are on the side of more and better democracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article.

LIBERTY

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, liberty is not the right to do what you choose; it is the responsibility of choosing to do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. JAVITS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an exchange of correspondence with the Secretary of State, and also an editorial.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, now that the Supreme Court has sustained the Federal rent-control law and the Banking and Currency Committee proposes to bring in a stopgap 31-day extension, it is time to take counsel for the immediate future. Fluctuations in the commodity markets are no reason for holding up a rent-control bill; the housing shortage is still our No. 1 domestic problem. A last-minute rent-control bill will get us into the same trouble as it did before. The 15-percent so-called voluntary-increase provision in the present law, which has caused so much mischief, was largely attributable to the take-it-or-leave-it basis on which the bill came before us a short time before rent control was to expire.

The Banking and Currency Committee should rule out at once any across-the-board increase. Every 5 percent of such an increase will increase the inflationary pressure on tenants in New York City alone to the tune of about $10,000,000 a month. We must have a bill brought in promptly, with adequate time for consideration; it should extend rent control to June 30, 1950—or at the least to June 30, 1949—with adequate safeguards to recontrol premises decontrolled under the 15-percent so-called voluntary agreements, to redress the injury to tenants for landlords' failures to redecorate and maintain rented premises, to give tenants fair protection against summary evictions, and to strengthen administration and enforcement of the whole rent-control law.

According to the latest figures furnished to me, it is estimated that 2,746,000 couples are living doubled up with other couples as of April 1, 1947, and that rents for uncontrolled units like apartment hotels, motor courts, and so forth, are 66 percent higher than comparable controlled units. It wil be a national catastrophe if rent control is not extended with a statesmanlike law and after mature deliberation, and not under a "Hobson's choice," as we did before, of having to take an unsatisfactory law or no Federal rent control at all.

PENSION FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I.

For the past 7 years, the accent has been to spend billions of the taxpayers' dollars in foreign countries. Without batting an eyelash, we have voted tremendous sums of money to pour down the rat holes of Europe and Asia.

Some of this money must have found its way to succor the downtrodden, to feed the hungry, and clothe the naked. But much of it has been wasted and is being wasted.

Be that as it may, we keep providing these billions for the nations across the sea while our own people are laboring to keep their heads above water and the wolf from the door.

I regret that it has come to the point when a Member of this House runs the risk of attack and abuse when he becomes presumptuous enough to request something for the Americans he represents.

All of which strikes no fear to my heart because my job is to consider the needs of the Americans who elected me before anybody else abroad.

I believe the time is ripe to come to the aid of the veterans of World War I. With the natural importance placed upon the needs of our younger veterans, we have overlooked, for a time at least, those who served so valiantly in the stirring days of '17 and '18.

We are guilty, therefore, of forgetting that our World War I heroes are older, their ranks thinning, and the exigencies

of former military service beginning to tell upon the numbers that remain.

They are the forgotten men of our generation. We have looked after the fighting men of every other American war but them.

As near as I can judge, the present average age of veterans of World War I is 57. Many are, of course, older. All have started down the trail which eventually leads to the setting sun.

These men are for the most part still vigorous. We owe them almost as much for what they did in the way of moral encouragement and keeping the home front in line during World War II as we owe them for their physical contributions in the first struggle.

But they ought to have consideration. We provided pensions for the GAR, the Spanish War vets, for all who went before. We have no choice but to begin thinking about the men who came back from France after participating in the war that was to end all wars.

Therefore, I submit the following bill and I urge upon the House its early, friendly acceptance. The Nation must be willing to meet her responsibility by preparing for final and equitable treatment of so patriotic and noble a group as the veterans of the First World War.

My bill reads:

A bill granting service pensions of $75 per month to veterans of World War I, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who (1) served in the armed forces of the United States at any time between April 5, 1917, and July 3, 1921, (2) was honorably discharged from such service either after 90 days or more of service or for disability incurred in service in line of duty, and (3) either (A) is 60 years of age or over, or (B) has a disability of 10 percent or more and is 55 years of age or over, shall be entitled to receive a pension of $75 per month. If any such person is, on account of physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, he shall be entitled to receive a pension of $100 per month in lieu of such pension of $75 per month.

SEC. 2. The original award of a pension to any person under this act shall be effective from the date of application or the first day of the second month following the enactment of this act, whichever is later.

SEC. 3. No pension or compensation payable to any person under any law or Veterans' Regulation in force on the date of the enactment of this act shall be reduced or discontinued by reason of any provision of this act, but a person may elect to receive pension under this act in lieu of such pension or compensation.

SEC. 4. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be n ecessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

A CASE OF DOUBLE TALK AND DOUBLE DEALING

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, today Great Britain is selling arms and ammunition to the Arab States. This makes it possible for the Arabs to defy and effectively oppose the decision of the United Nations Organization to partition Palestine and establish an independent Jewish state there.

Our State Department has placed an embargo upon the shipment and sale of arms and ammunition to the Jews in Palestine. This makes it impossible for the Jews there to implement the decision of the UNO or to defend themselves effectively against the attacks of the Arabs.

Mr. Speaker, this is an anomalous position for us to be in. Both Great Britain and the United States are active members of the UNO and are parties to the UNO decision to partition Palestine and set up an independent Jewish state. In fact, according to rumor, we practically forced the decision through the UNO Council. Both Great Britain and the United States are therefore morally bound to do what they can to implement that decision.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is a clear case of double talk and double dealing on the part of our State Department and the British Foreign Office. Here we have the two leading nations that helped to establish the UNO, giving lip service to the UNO decision, yet by their actions seeking to nullify that decision and prevent it from being carried out. If the UNO decision in this matter is flouted, what can we expect will happen to future decisions? Will not the UNO—from which we were led to hope and expect so much—be rendered impotent by the acts of the very nations that were most influential in creating it? When will the actions of our State Department square with its words?

Mr. Speaker, before adopting the Marshall plan, Congress should demand an explanation from the State Department of its attitude in this matter. And before we give further aid to Great Britain through the Marshall plan we should insist that she carry out her UNO obligations.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say—and if it were a less prominent Member of the House I would pass it over without saying anything—in reply to the gentleman from Illinois, that when he accuses the State Department of the United States of double talk, it makes good reading to every enemy of democracy in this world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the President from a distinguished citizen of my district, Judge Moriarity. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $142, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address by Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each excerpts from newspapers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Harold J. Ruttenberg. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an address she delivered at the B'nai Brith dinner, and the reply of Admiral Louis E. Denfeld.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered last night by Earl K. Long, giving information relative to his income-tax return which was requested by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX].

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] may be excused from attending further sessions of the House during the week on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LOUISIANA POLITICS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I think we will all agree it is an open season on Louisiana politics as far as this House is concerned. Even the aisle to the center has melted and the Republicans are interested as well as the Democrats.

The last time the Republicans marched into Louisiana they carried bayonets. Yesterday the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] relied on Republican heavy artillery to assist him, but it was as effective as the blanks which he has been firing.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of alleged fraud income-tax returns in the office of the collector of internal revenue in New Orleans. I heartily endorse and support this resolution and shall vote for it if and when it comes to the floor of the House. In connection with this resolution, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in an address before the House on yesterday referred to former Gov. Earl K. Long, and alleged charges made against him by a member of the Louisiana delegation, indicating that the resolution was aimed at Mr. Long.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I am supporting it, but I must point out to you that I cannot agree that the Congress under the resolution has a right to delve into the individual income-tax returns of a particular taxpayer. The resolution is directed against the collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, however, it is freely admitted that the purpose of the resolution is to get Earl Long's income-tax returns, therefore, if the resolution is for that purpose it is just as logical to assume that the income-tax returns of any individual taxpayer can be brought before the committee, and I believe one taxpayer should be treated like any other taxpayer, which is the reason I am going to ask that Mr. Jones' returns also be brought before the committee since he, too, is a candidate for governor.

On yesterday, with photostatic documents I conclusively proved Mr. Long not guilty of any wrongdoing and completely refuted Mr. DOMENGEAUX' charges that Mr. Long is assessed $100,000, and had agreed to pay a fraud penalty, which also answered the observations made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who was not present on the floor at the time I made my presentation. I feel certain the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would not have made the statement which he did if he had been present to hear me because an examination and careful analysis of his remarks will reveal that we are in agreement on the situation except that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] refers to a substantial sum and I refer to a specific amount of $1,500.

I answered all questions raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] with photostatic proof of the pertinent documents. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has assured me his committee will make a report. Of course that report will substantiate my address of yesterday and will prove the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] in error and me correct. I welcome full examination by the committee.

I believe there should not be two rules in this matter. What governs one should govern the other. I have in my hand an editorial from a Louisiana newspaper making certain charges against former Governor Sam Jones. I don't know whether Sam Jones is guilty of fraud or not, but I want to find out. I believe in fairness to Sam Jones, the people of Louisiana, and this country should know whether his income tax returns reveal all of his income or not. I think in fairness to Mr. Jones, as in the case of Mr. Long, this matter should be decided one way or the other. Mr. Jones has been charged by reputable people, including the district attorney, as well as the candidate for governor who opposes him, who is also a former governor. I do not want to harm Mr. Jones in one instance. If these charges are not true I want to know it. If they are true I want to know that too. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am following the same pattern as laid down by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] in trying to arrive at the truthful conclusion. I am not deviating in one instance. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, will ask the committee appointed by you under the Dirksen resolution to subpena the books of the City Service Refining Corp.; the Shell Corp.; certain coal interests; and also the books of certain airlines operating in the State of Louisiana, in order to compare the amounts of money as fees or otherwise which they may or may not have paid former Governor Jones, and to compare these reports with the income tax returns filed by former Governor Jones in the office of the collector of internal revenue at New Orleans. There is only one way that this can be determined, and that is for a complete review and examination of Governor Jones' returns by the select committee proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and he has assured me that my request shall be accorded the same consideration given the other gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Members of this House should be allowed to operate under a privileged rule in matters of public interest. If a Member of this House can come on this floor and make certain charges and then have a resolution passed by this House to give him the opportunity of proving those charges, I believe that same privilege should be accorded reputable citizens of any community, and particularly a district attorney who does not have the same opportunity as a Member of the House. That is all I am seeking to do in this case. I want to get everybody under the same tent. I repeat, I seek to do no harm to Mr. Jones; I only want the truth. If the charges made by these reputable people as reflected by the editorial which I have received permission to put in the RECORD are true, I believe the people of Louisiana should know it, and I repeat, by the same token, if they are not true, in justice and fairness to Mr. Jones, the people should know about it. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the select committee appointed by you to subpena and bring before them all matters pertaining to Mr. Jones' income, as well as the books of the companies which it is charged he received certain fees from and are not reflected in the income-tax returns which he gave out over his own name.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I read to you a telegram which I have just received, addressed to me and signed by Judge Leander H. Perez, district attorney of the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines in Louisiana, and in my congressional district. I believe that you will agree with me that charges made by a duly elected district attorney of the State of Louisiana is well worth the attention of this Congress, since the door has already been opened by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] for such a procedure. Judge Perez, in his telegram to me, says this, and I quote him:

> In proposed notice to House of your intention to request subpenas or orders for production of records before special committee investigating income-tax frauds in Louisiana, regarding income of Sam Houston Jones, gubernatorial candidate, please include Mathieson Alkali & Chemical Works, and City Service Refining Co., of Lake Charles, La., Kansas City Southern Railway, Louisiana & Arkansas Railway, National Coal Association, Pan American Airways, Eastern Airlines, Inc., and United States Brewers Foundation, represented by Roland B. Howell, State director.
>
> All of whom are reliably reported to have paid Jones large fees for political favors, and also Steve Alford, former Gov. Sam Jones' superintendent of State police, regarding his collections for joint account of himself and former Gov. Sam Jones from large gambling interests in Louisiana, under guise of political contributions. All to determine whether Sam Houston Jones, gubernatorial candidate in present campaign against Earl K. Long, rendered full account of income to United States Government.
>
> LEANDER H. PEREZ,
> *District Attorney.*

I now direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to an editorial taken from the Plaquemines Gazette, of Pointe a la Hache, La., dated February 7, 1948, before the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] introduced his resolution. It is the basis for these charges which I have brought to your attention.

As a part of my remarks, I include the following editorial:

JONES DARE NOT ANSWER

On Friday, January 16, before the first primary election of January 20, Earl Long promptly answered Congressman JIMMIE DOMENGEAUX's false charges which he made as a result of a conspiracy promoted by Sam Jones and the New Orleans newspapers and pointed out that JIMMIE DOMENGEAUX was not a candidate for Governor against him, but that Sam Jones was the New Orleans newspaper candidate for Governor.

Earl Long then and there issued his challenge to Sam Jones, as follows:

"I now challenge Sam Jones, as the candidate for Governor, to make and publish a sworn statement of his taxable income for the last 9 years, including the year 1938 to the present time, and to publish a sworn statement of the names of the persons, firms, or corporations who paid him 'fees' and how much during any of those years, and how much they are now paying him.

"I am prepared to make such a sworn statement and let the people have all the facts regarding my income, whom I represented and from whom I took fees before and after my short term as Acting Governor of Louisiana in 1939–40, up to the present time.

"I defy Sam Jones to accept this challenge and to publish, under oath, how much his income was before, during, and after the time he was Governor up to now, and particularly—

"How much the coal interests paid him to prevent the shipment of natural gas out of this State to compete with coal as fuel;

"How much the City Service Refining Co. paid him to repeal the 1-cent-per-barrel oil-refining tax:

"How much the air lines paid him to remove the tax on airplane gasoline, while he left the gasoline tax on the fishermen's and trappers' boats and the farmers' farm machinery; and

"How much the large Shell Corp. paid him for that big State shell reef near Lake Charles, which he leased to that corporation for 4 cents per yard when the State shells were worth $2.50 per yard; and

"How much those big interests are still paying him for the 'favors' he did for them while he was Governor in 1940–44.

"If Sam Jones will accept this challenge, let him give his sworn statement to his city campaign manager in New Orleans, and I will furnish my sworn statement to my campaign manager, both to be published at the same time."

Twenty-three days have passed since Earl Long issued that challenge to Sam Jones, which was published in the newspapers in New Orleans and throughout the State and repeated several times on the radio by Earl Long and his campaign manager.

Sam Jones has not answered.

Sam Jones will not answer the challenge.

Sam Jones cannot answer the challenge without confessing his guilt of graft and corruption in office as Governor between 1940–44.

Sam Jones' silence proves his guilt and proves his unfitness for reelection to the high office of Governor.

But Sam Jones has declined to answer another challenge from another candidate for Governor, because Judge Bob Kennon and the Kennon campaign committee in Lake Charles published the following challenge to Sam Jones about which Sam Jones has kept "mum" up to this time.

Here are the Kennon questions and challenge to Sam Jones, which he dare not, will not, and cannot answer:

"1. Whether he (Jones) was employed and paid by the coal interests to fight to keep Louisiana gas from being shipped out of the State to compete with coal, while he, Jones, was pretending to be working for the State and representing the interests of the State and its people.

"2. That in 1944 he, Jones, assisted a large corporation for which he, Jones, was secret attorney, in obtaining from the State in secret and without bids, a lease of thousands of acres of State-owned shell deposits near Lake Charles, La., for practically nothing and for a royalty of only 4 cents per yard on State shells worth $2.50 per yard—and how much Sam Jones was paid for that.

"3. That Sam Jones was paid to protect a large corporation who was guilty of stream pollution in the Calcasieu River in spite of the protests filed by hundreds of farmers and sportsmen and because of his political influence, Sam Jones secured immunity from prosecution for his corporation client.

"4. That, although the same corporation client of Sam Jones owns millions of dollars' worth of property in Calcasieu Parish subject to taxation, Sam Jones had them assessed by the State tax commission, which he controls, at only $250,000, or less than 2½ percent of its value.

"5. That through Sam Jones' influence, the Louisiana Highway Commission bought 13 acres of land from this same corporation client for $40,000, or about $3,000 per acre, when the same lands of that corporation were assessed for an average of only $7 per acre and how much Sam Jones got out of that.

"6. That since his term of Governor expired, Sam Jones has been using State police cars and with State-paid drivers in campaigns in Calcasieu Parish against veterans running for local offices."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a short letter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report in connection with the bill (H. R. 5216) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall take office as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as General Manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of my greatest services in this House was introducing and securing the adoption of the resolution creating the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is doing more to protect this country from the enemies within our gates than any other agency of this Government.

On yesterday the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the conviction of Leon Josephson for contempt of Congress, in refusing to be sworn last March by a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The Communists have contended continuously that this committee is unconstitutional; in other words, these Communists, who are sworn to overthrow this Government are demanding that we respect what they say is their constitutional right to sabotage this Government, and are attempting to outlaw one of the greatest agencies this Government ever had for its protection against those subversive individuals.

The Court refused to hear Josephson's appeal from the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which court last December had affirmed the conviction of Josephson in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

Also on yesterday, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the pleas of the 10 Hollywood witnesses that their cases should be thrown out of court were denied by United States District Court Judge Curran.

I presume that by now, at least, the Communists within our gates have learned that they cannot intimidate Congress or destroy one of its most valuable committees, which, as I said, is doing so much to unmask these enemies of our country, expose them to the public gaze, and subject them to prosecution, and also to deportation, than any other agency of this Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

LOUISIANA POLITICS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I would have assumed that my dear and beloved friend and colleague from Louisiana would have had sufficient in what happened to him yesterday on the floor without attempting to confuse this matter further today. He came in like a lion with the attitude that he was going to tear me limb from limb. I think he left like a lamb.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that he is going to support the Dirksen resolution. I do not know whether he is among those who for the past month have been attempting to do everything in their power to prevent the proper and legal disclosure of the fraudulent income-tax claim presently held against Earl K. Long by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I may say further, Mr. Speaker, that he brings in here the name of an honorable man, Sam Jones, who has a record of accomplishment and devotion to the people of the State of Louisiana. At this late hour, for the first time I have heard the statement that Sam Jones may have filed a fraudulent income-tax return. Sam Jones will welcome an investigation of his returns. The resolution of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has the authority, when passed, to look into Mr. Jones' income taxes, and I for one will insist that it does.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. MARTHA W. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2136) for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

JONAH WILLIAMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 310) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Jonah Williams.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Jonah Williams of Sisseton, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him in the State of South Dakota: The west half of the southeast quarter and the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 32, township 126, range 52, west of the fifth principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES GHOST BEAR, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 311) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Ghost Bear, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Charles Ghost Bear, Sr., of Gordon, Nebr., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him in the State of South Dakota: The southwest quarter of section 13, township 40 north, range 34 west, sixth principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES KILLS THE ENEMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 312) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Kills the Enemy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Charles Kills the Enemy, of Winner, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him in the State of South Dakota: The northwest quarter of section 21, township 36 north, range 29 west, sixth principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALVIN W. CLINCHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 313) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Calvin W. Clincher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Calvin W. Clincher, of Gordon, Nebr., a patent in fee to the following-described land allotted to him in Washabaugh County, S. Dak.: the northwest quarter of section 8, township 41 north, range 35, sixth principal meridian of South Dakota, containing 160 acres.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES BLACK DOG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 402) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to James Black Dog, a Fort Peck Indian allottee, a patent in fee to the northeast quarter of section 34, township 30 north, of range 53 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 160 acres.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 8, insert the following: "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Fort Peck Tribe or any Indian who is a member of said tribe shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BESSIE TWO ELK-POOR BEAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 499) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Bessie Two Elk-Poor Bear.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Mrs. Bessie Two Elk-Poor Bear, of Allen, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the northeast quarter of section 19, township 41, range 34 west, of the sixth principal meridian, South Dakota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOM EAGLEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 500) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Tom Eagleman, of Pierre, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 25 and lot 3 of the southeast quarter of section 26, all in township 108, range 73 west, of the fifth principal meridian, South Dakota.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, delete the period, add a colon and the following sentence: "*Provided*, That when the land herein described is offered for sale, the Crow Creek Sioux and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribes or any Indian who is a member of said tribes shall have 90 days in which to execute preferential rights to purchase said tract at a price offered to the seller by a prospective buyer willing and able to purchase."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELLA WHITE BULL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 542) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Ella White Bull.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Mrs. Ella White Bull, of Porcupine, S. Dak., a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to her in Bennett County, State of South Dakota: The southwest quarter of section 29, township 37 west, range 40 west, sixth principal meridian, South Dakota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RANKIN COUNTY, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4118) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to the provisions of section 2, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue to Thomas Loflin, who made entry under Choctaw scrip certificate on November 1, 1854, at the Jackson, Miss., district land office, his heirs and assigns, a patent for all rights to and interest in the following-described lands in Rankin County, Miss.,: The northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 35, township 3 north, range 2 east, Choctaw meridian, containing forty and one one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. Said patent shall issue upon application made not later than 1 year after the effective date of this act and upon the payment of a reasonable price for the interest patented as set by the Secretary in his discretion considering the appraised value of the land, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or the improvement of the land by the applicant or his predecessors in interest and considering and giving full effect to the equities of the applicant.

With the following committee amendments:

Section 1, page 1, line 3, strike out all after the word "that" and strike out all of line 4, and insert in lieu thereof "title in fee simple is hereby confirmed in."

Section 1, page 1, line 7, strike out the words "a patent for" and insert in lieu thereof the word "to."

Section 2, page 2, lines 3 to 11, inclusive, strike out all of section 2, lines 3 to 11, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHARLOTTE E. HARVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1392) for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey, Glenwood, Minn., is relieved of all liability to pay to the United States any amount owing by her to the United States on account of the shipment of her household effects from Osakis, Minn., to Alexandria, Va., incident to her transfer, on or about September 16, 1943, from Rock Island, Ill.,

to Washington, D. C., while she was in the employ of the Department of War. The Department of War granted to the said Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey an invalid extension, upon wich she relied, of the time within which such shipment was authorized to be made at the expense of the United States and later canceled such extension. In the settlement of accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for any payment made to cover the expenses of such shipment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "United States", strike out the balance of the page down to and including line 7 on page 2 and insert "in excess of the sum of $5.41, on account of the shipment of her household goods and personal effects from Osakis, Minn., to Alexandria, Va., incident to her transfer, on or about September 16, 1943, from Rock Island, Ill., to Washington, D. C., while she was a civilian employee of the War Department. In the settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States credit in the amount of $208.66 shall be given for any payment made to cover the expenses of such shipment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. L. MORRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of T. L. Morris, deceased, late of Cherokee County, S. C., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death, on July 5, 1944, of the said T. L. Morris from injuries sustained by him when he was struck, on the said date, while plowing in a field, 8 miles west of the town of Gaffney, S. C., by an airplane in the service of the Army of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE A. LOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1786) for the relief of Jesse A. Lott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Employees' Compensation Commission be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to receive the claim of Jesse A. Lott, of Liberty, S. C., for injuries sustained in line of duty as a skilled laborer in the United States Maritime Shipyard, Brunswick, Ga., on or about May 16, 1918, the same as if it had been filed within the time specified by the Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended. Any payments to be made as compensation shall begin with the date of the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., and Supp. V, title 5, secs. 765–770, inclusive), the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Federal Security Agency is hereby authorized and directed to consider any claim filed with the Bureau by Jesse A. Lott for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of alleged injuries incurred at the United States Maritime Shipyard, Brunswick, Ga., on or about May 16, 1918. No benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SIRVART ARSENIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2013) for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the 2-year limitation on certain suits in admiralty against the United States contained in section 5 of the Suits in Admiralty Act, approved March 9, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 745), is hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian, Fresno, Calif.; and she may sue the United States on her claim arising out of the death of her son, the late Albert A. Arsenian (who lost his life in the explosion at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, while serving as a civilian employee of the United States in the capacity of a member of the crew of the War Shipping Administration vessel *E. A. Bryan*) under the remaining provisions of such Suits in Admiralty Act, as amended, if she brings such suit within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAUDE T. THOMAS, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2633) for the relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to the legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor; to pay the sum of $5,000 to the estate of Mary L. Poole, deceased; and to pay the sum of $5,000 to the estate of Hazel S. Thomas, deceased, of Oklahoma City, Okla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries to Claude T. Thomas and Elizabeth Ann Mervine and for the deaths of Mary L. Poole and Hazel S. Thomas, sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle on December 26, 1944, near Seiling, Okla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and the balance of page 1 down to and including the word "Oklahoma" on line 6, page 2, and insert the following: "$1,000 to Claude T. Thomas, of Oklahoma City, Okla.; the sum of $250 to the legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, of Oklahoma City, Okla.; the sum of $5,000 to the estate of Mary L. Poole, deceased, of Fort Madison, Iowa; and the sum of $5,000 to the estate of Hazel S. Thomas, deceased, of Oklahoma City, Okla., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries to Claude T. Thomas and Elizabeth Ann Mervine and for the deaths of Mary L. Poole and Hazel S. Thomas, all resulting from an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, near Seiling, Okla., on December 26, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF H. M. McCORVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2806) for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal representative of the estate of H. M. McCorvey, deceased, late of Moultrie, Ga., the sum of $836.59. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States on account of personal injuries, property damage, and loss of wages sustained by the said H. M. McCorvey as the result of a collision on April 16, 1944, between the automobile owned and operated by the said H. M. McCorvey and a United States Army truck approximately 1 mile from Spence Field near Moultrie, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS D. SHERRARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3964) for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the records of his office the debt which has been raised therein against Thomas D. Sherrard,

manager, Kennewick Farm Labor Supply Center, Kennewick, Wash., in the sum of $79.20, together with interest due thereon from date of loss of the public funds for which he is accountable and which were stolen from the office of the Kennewick Farm Labor Supply Center, Kennewick, Wash., without his fault, sometime between May 26, 1943, and May 27, 1943.

SEC. 2. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $45.20 to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to Thomas D. Sherrard: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, notwithstanding any contract to the contrary. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. L. HITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4246) for the relief of J. L. Hitt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. L. Hitt, Murfreesboro, Tenn., the sum of $3,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said J. L. Hitt against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him in a collision between the automobile in which he was riding and a United States Army vehicle on August 7, 1944, on United States Highway No. 41, about 8 miles south of Murfreesboro, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE F. CANNON, JACKSON JONES, AND THE ESTATE OF JOHN HALSTADT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4541) for the relief of Jesse F. Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of John Halstadt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jesse F. Cannon, of Salt Lake City, Utah, the sum of $331.48; to Jackson Jones, of Dugway, Utah, the sum of $212; and to the estate of John Halstadt, of Salt Lake City, Utah, the sum of $212, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for loss of earnings sustained by them when they were required to suspend operation of the Yellow Jacket Mine, located near Tooele, Utah, as a result of the use of such mine, during the period from June 22 to July 22, 1945, by the Dugway Proving Ground, as a target site for conducting technical operations involving the use of chemical agents, incendiaries, and explosives: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERBERT L. HUNTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4569) for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness of Herbert L. Hunter, in the amount of $944.46, arising out of the transportation of his household effects from Cleveland, Ohio, to San Juan, Puerto Rico, upon transfer of his official station, while employed by the Department of Agriculture, extension of authorization for such transportation not having been approved within the 6-month period required by the regulations of the President of the United States under authority of the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105). The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Herbert L. Hunter out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amount hereto credited to such indebtedness or refunded to the United States on account of such indebtedness. In the audit and settlement of the account of any accountable officer of the United States, the payment of the amount for such transportation expenses shall be considered to have been authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD A. YEAGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4570) for the relief of Howard A. Yeager.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard A. Yeager, captain, United States Navy, the sum of $128.96. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Howard A. Yeager as reimbursement for travel performed pursuant to official Navy Department orders of May 1, 1945, May 8, 1945, and June 9, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABRAHAM SPEVAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4593) for the relief of Abraham Spevak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay, from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Abraham Spevak, of Newburgh, N. Y., the sum of $2,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him as a result of an accident which occurred on July 7, 1941, at Stony Point, N. Y., involving an Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not to exceed $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN CAMERON HENRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4672) for the relief of John Cameron Henry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of John Cameron Henry, formerly a private, United States Army, for payment of the amount due him incident to his service in the Canadian Army, which was paid to the United States by the Government of the Dominion of Canada October 30, 1942, for his credit but which was erroneously paid by the United States finance officer to another individual of a similar name, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed $416.14. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $416.14, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIRIAM BARKLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2803) for the relief of Miriam Barkle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Miriam Barkle, Pacific Grove, Calif., the sum of $5,450.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Miriam Barkle against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on February 10, 1933, when the automobile in which she was riding was in collision with a United States Coast and Geo-

detic Survey truck on Del Monte Avenue in Monterey County: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PROMOTION OF JAMES Y. PARKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1673) to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized and requested to appoint James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, to the temporary grade of major in the Army of the United States under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), with date of rank as of March 1, 1942. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to carry such officer upon such appointment on the records of the War Department and of the Army as having served in the grade of major from March 1, 1942, to the date of his subsequent appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing additional pay and allowances to the aforesaid James Y. Parker: *Provided*, That all payments of moneys heretofore made to such officer on the assumption of a previous legal appointment to the grade of major are hereby validated.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YONEO SAKAI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 257) for the relief of Yoneo Sakai.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Yoneo Sakai as having entered the United States on October 10, 1926, for permanent residence. The said Yoneo Sakai shall not be subject to deportation by reason of such entry.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of said Yoneo Sakai.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HILDA MARGARET McGREW

The Clerk called the bill (S. 305) for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding order and warrant of deportation issued pursuant to sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156), in the case of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew, any provisions of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of enactment of this act, Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding proceedings rest.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY SUNGDUK CHARR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 316) for the relief of Mary Sungduk Charr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the immigration laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit Mary Sungduk Charr, of Venice, Calif., the Korean wife of a United States citizen veteran of World War II and the mother of a child who is a citizen of the United States, to remain permanently in the United States.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, the said Mary Sungduk Charr may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States by taking the naturalization oath of allegiance before any court having jurisdiction of the naturalization of aliens.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning in line 9, strike out all of section 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILAN JANDRICH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 409) for the relief of Milan Jandrich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Milan Jandrich as having entered the United States on October 5, 1945, for permanent residence.

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Yugoslavian quota of the first year that the Yugoslavian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA KONG MEI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 457) for the relief of Anna Kong Mei.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Anna Kong Mei as having entered the United States on July 7, 1937, for permanent residence.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of the said Anna Kong Mei.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANG HUN SHIM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 521) to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration laws, Sang Hun Shim, Weston, Conn., shall be held and considered to have been legally admitted to the United States for permanent residen on June 18, 1926, upon payment by him of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Sang Hun Shim upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Japanese immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Sang Hun Shim."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIA SMORCZEWSKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3787) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record for permanent residence the temporary admission of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska, which occurred at the port of New York on January 9, 1947. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall make a quota deduction of one against the Polish quota for the current year or the first year in which that quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOKE TCHAROUTCHEFF ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4050) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Moke Tcharoutcheff, Mme. Lucie Baptistine Tcharoutcheff, and sons Raymond and Robert Tcharoutcheff.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That completes call of bills on the Private Calendar.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. JONES of Washington), for the remainder of the week, on account of death of his mother.

DISPOSITION OF CONDEMNED ORDNANCE, GUNS, PROJECTILES, AND OTHER CONDEMNED MATERIAL

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 774) to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective departments, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "War and" and insert "the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "War" and insert "the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to give a brief explanation of this matter?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I shall be delighted to give the gentleman a brief explanation.

This is a bill to amend an act which permits the various armed services of the Government to dispose of certain condemned ordnance materials and was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]. It was approved by the House of Representatives last year, amended by the Senate and passed this year, and this morning was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has been called into a committee session. I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain tables and tabulations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues tomorrow morning to have before them the facts as they developed today, for their individual consideration. I am glad to state that at the conclusion of the executive session I took pains to urge one of the men who had been with us to consider a 48-hour embargo, very seriously, because I was in dead earnest in suggesting it. And if it was not done by 5 o'clock tonight I was going to take the liberty of asking my chairman to consider the wisdom of a third formal resolution, as a means of expressing our best judgment as to what should be done promptly. As in this emergency situation and in need of the facts, as disclosed to the committee approximately at noon, I was advised that some officer of the State Department wished to consult with us further. He came to the committee room, authorized me to release the gallonage figures, gave me excellent reason for his hesitation in acting on his own responsibility and took certain material with him for return by 9 p. m., if possible. He was most courteous and cooperative.

Perhaps this is all just as well in view of what I understand to have been the incidence at the Department of Commerce this afternoon. I placed my statements upon my own knowledge and what was told me by reliable informants. Before leaving the committee room I talked over the telephone with Mr. Thomas C. Blaisdell, director of OIT. My recollection is that he told me I could not anticipate that my suggestion of a 48-hour embargo would be carried out. I replied that I thought that was a most unfortunate decision and was simply forcing me to express my own personal conviction that the Department had been derelict in not acting promptly on the information he knew and I knew had been in the Department's hands for several days in some instances. Upon my arrival at my office one of the news services was on the telephone. I was asked what I knew about any 48-hour embargo ordered earlier in the afternoon. I stated I knew nothing about it, and was surprised to hear of it in view of the conversation I had had over the telephone with Mr. Blaisdell approximately 10 minutes before that time. They then put me on with the man who had handled the story who advised me that it was a fact that a 48-hour embargo had been ordered on the Gulf coast. I do not recall whether it extended to the west coast. He said that within a very short time another officer in the Department explained that this order had been rescinded. Shortly after 6 o'clock, and in any event before 7 p. m., the service called me to advise me that a 48-hour embargo had been ordered, with some limitation as to dock side loadings and perhaps other limitations.

I apologize for lack of full details. I will try to obtain them tomorrow for a report to the House on Friday. In any event apparently we can be thankful for this order tonight, and can be hopeful that it will stay in effect until Friday night. In the meantime, I shall try to gather the known facts on the Gulf coast as to loadings through industry. Perhaps some of our colleagues in that area have means of helping us. I shall also try to enlist the aid of members of the press for a spot-check tomorrow.

I am glad to report on certain material furnished from the State Department, as follows:

REDUCTIONS IN OIL ALLOCATIONS

Cables worded as follows were sent on February 6, 1948, to embassies or consuls at Shanghai, Manila, Lisbon, Copenhagen, Wellington, Brussels, The Hague, Rome, Rio de Janeiro, Reykjavik (Iceland), Dublin, Lagos (Nigeria), Melbourne, London, Bern, San Jose, Stockholm, Paris, Dakar, Oslo, Habana, Guatemala City, Tegucigalpa, Mexico City, Asuncion, San Salvador, Panama City, Accra, Belize, and Tahiti.

Following from Commerce:

"Adverse weather conditions and abnormally low stocks have aggravated critical shortages of all petroleum heating fuels throughout large areas of the United States.

"The seriousness of these shortages has led the Department of Commerce to reduce first-quarter export allocations, effective January 30, 1948, as follows"—

Here appeared list of allocations to the country addressed.

"In addition, the separate quota of 1,600,000 barrels of gas oil and distillate fuel oil established for Japan and Ryukyus has been reduced to 100,000 barrels. Such reductions have resulted in the following modifications of country allocations."

Here appeared modified allocations to country addressed.

"Concern is also increasing regarding diminishing United States stocks of aviation gasoline and motor gasoline. The course of events may shortly necessitate revisions of these allocations also. In the light of the revised first-quarter allocations and continuing critical United States shortages of petroleum heating oils and aviation gasoline and motor gasoline, the consulate is requested to consult immediately with representatives of the Chinese Government to determine what further reductions in the revised first-quarter petroleum allocations to China can be achieved without probable serious economic disruption.[1]

"It is urgent that OIT receive your reply not later than Wednesday, February 11, 1948.

"MARSHALL.

"J. M. GEORGE,
"IT-1310-DJWheeler/V6W,
"February 6, 1948."

By February 17 replies had been received from London, Buenos Aires, Paris, Shanghai, Habana, Guatemala City, Bern, Rome, Copenhagen, San Jose, Tegucigalpa, Mexico City, Reykjavik, Asuncion, San Salvador, Oslo, Wellington, Panama City, Lagos, Accra, Belize, Brussels, Rio de Janeiro, Manila, Tahiti, Melbourne, Dublin, Dakar, The Hague.

The following reductions were indicated as possible:

Motor gasoline:	
Barrels	668,904
Gallons	28,094,000
Kerosene:	
Barrels	132,000
Gallons	5,544,000
Gas, oil, and distillate fuel oil:	
Barrels	213,443
Gallons	8,963,606
Residual fuel oil:	
Barrels	166,189
Gallons	6,919,938
Aviation gas:	
Barrels	17,500
Gallons	735,000

[1] Information urgently required as to detail of essential end uses of petroleum from United States in China and the effect on the economy of the January 30 cuts and of possible further reductions.

From: London.
To: Secretary of State.
No: —, February 13.
United States urgent.
For commerce.

(1) Ministry fuel power agrees accept further net reduction of first quarter petroleum import requirements of 260,000 barrels, a 10-percent reduction from revised quota of 2,600,000 barrels, including aviation spirit. Ministry says willingness to accept further cut does not mean similar reductions can be made in future import requirements without having most serious effect upon British national economy. It may, in fact, be necessary to request increase in subsequent quotas to make good loss in current quarter.

(2) Reductions break down as follows:

(A) Motor spirit: reduction of 450,000 barrels. British say can only accept this cut if no restrictions on export of 510,000 barrels casinghead gasoline programed for lifting during present quarter by Shell.

(B) Kerosenes: reduction 80,000 barrels. Eliminates British export quota during quarter.

(C) Gas oil: British cannot agree to any reduction.

(D) Fuel oil: quota already nil.

(E) Aviation spirit: British asking increase of 270,000 barrels over quota of 120,000 barrels to replenish stocks which have been falling for some months.

(3) End uses of petroleum products:

(A) Aviation spirit: Military and commercial flying, including flying clubs.

(B) Motor spirit: Commercial vehicles, busses, taxies, tractors, stationary engines, and essential private motoring. No pleasure motoring permitted.

(C) Kerosene.

(I) Burning oil: Mainly used for heating, lighting, and cooking; allocated under priority system to essential users. Also used for agriculture, including incubators, industry, and aircraft jet engines.

(II) Vaporizing oil: Mainly farm tractors, balance industry and small fishing boats.

(D) Gas oil: Not used as a domestic fuel in Britain. Used for industry and bunkers, and in Diesel-powered vehicles. Industrial uses comprise:

(I) Auxiliary Diesel generating equipment to relieve excessive grid load. Most important during winter quarter.

(II) Small supplies as direct fuel in industrial power production.

(III) For carbureted water gas at gas works.

Requirements for Diesel-engined vehicles have already been cut to minimum on grounds dollar economy. No scope for further reduction as owing to shortage of rail transport, large-scale diversion of traffic from rail to road may become imperative during next few months. Minor uses gas oil for small fishing craft, barges, agriculture, and Diesel locomotives.

GALLMAN.

From: Wellington.
To: Secretary of State.
No.: — February 11.
Immediate.

Government view with much concern any suggestion reduction allocations, stating original approved quotas were calculated to barest minimum essential needs in view dollar shortage for maintenance country's economy and achievement expanded food production target. Minister Industries Commerce expresses hope utmost consideration will be given representations made, stated essential end uses petroleum from United States aviation gasoline principally air force, also maintenance urgent air transportation and mail carriage to island territories. Other motor gasoline increased number heavy trucks in essential operations, business, farmers, and other vehicles employed in food and other highly essential production (consume substantial percentage). Other essential transport services including railway department road services now relieving rail carriage hampered by rolling stock and coal shortages. Kerosene, agricultural tractors, industry, and lighting some rural areas, gas and distillate fuel (Diesel) oils used principally in primary industry, processing tractors, heavy farm machinery and manufacturing. Industrial Diesel oil substantially directed to minimum bunker requirements shipping for moving vessels to next port New Zealand almost entirely dependent on United States for requirements lubricating oil.

SERVICE.

From: Melbourne.
To: Secretary of State.
No. —, February 10.
For Commerce.

Further cuts in allocations for Australia first quarter 1948 possible as follows (unit barrels) schedule B number description amounts: 501,700 other motor gasoline from 300,000 to 100,000; 502,700 kerosene from 50,000 to zero; 503,000 gas-oil and distillate fuel oil from 100,000 to 75,000; 503,100 residual fuel oil from 25,000 to zero.

These cuts based on actual imports schedule for rest of February and March, which will not exhaust allocations but should not be considered as applicable to subsequent quarters when maximum amounts allocated from United States may be needed. Australian Government obtaining all possible supplies from sterling areas, particularly Persian Gulf, and in view dollars shortage maintaining imports from United States at strictest minimum. Monthly consumption motor gasoline would be 39,500,000 gallons without rationing consumption reduced by rationing about 25 percent to 30,000,000 gallons. Reduction in motor gasoline imports would first affect pleasure driving now permitted at rate 200 miles per month per car. Gas-oil and distillate fuel oil imports could not be reduced without detriment to Australian manufacturing and industrial establishments, which use 89 percent of total imports of this product.

HUNT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 19, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. House Report No. 1271 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 4478. A bill to provide basic authority for certain administrative expenditures for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. House Report No. 1290 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 5216. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall take office as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as General Manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; without amendment. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1378. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 5390. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 5391. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 535. An act for the relief of Adelbert E. Tuller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Roberta Flake Clayton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 922. An act for the relief of Ruth Grossman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 939. An act for the relief of Charles Howard Richards; without amendment (Rept. No. 1382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 970. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harold T. Prosser; without amendment (Rept. No. 1383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1031. An act for the relief of Antonio Zamora; Mrs. Antonio Zamora; Antonio Zamora, Jr.; Mrs. Juan Chavez; John Chavez, Jr.; Roland Chavez; Selso Trujillo; Dr. M. G. Wright; and the heirs of Keith Lane; without amendment (Rept. No. 1384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1267. An act for the relief of Eleonore M. Hannon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Iola Veach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1386).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1721. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim arising out of injuries sustained by G. R. Below, late of Seattle, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 550. A bill for the relief of Lizzie Reynolds, administratrix of the estate of Grace Reynolds, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 911. A bill for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado; with amendments (Rept. No. 1389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa; with amendments (Rept. No. 1390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Harris; without amendment (Rept. No. 1391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1222. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of B. John Hanson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Commitee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2684. A bill for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese-beetle quarantine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2698. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by the Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Henry; with amendments (Rept. No. 1396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Ray G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; with amendments (Rept. No. 1397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3027. A bill for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W. Yerxa; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3641. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4129. A bill for the relief of Jerline Floyd Givens and the legal guardian of William Earl Searight, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 1400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4571. A bill for the relief of Carl R. Nall; with amendments (Rept. No. 1401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 5432. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 5433. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over certain school buildings in Vanport, Oreg., to the Federal Works Administrator and to authorize an appropriation to rebuild a school building in Vanport, Oreg., which was destroyed by fire; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 5434. A bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 5435. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Lynchburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5436. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Cowan, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5437. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Manchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5438. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Woodbury, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5439. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Smithville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5440. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Sewanee, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 5441. A bill to provide that veterans pursuing courses of education or training shall have the same rights to change their courses as are enjoyed by nonveterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5442. A bill to provide that the standards for judging the conduct of veterans undergoing vocational rehabilitation shall be prescribed by the institutions concerned rather than by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5443. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5444. A bill to establish a procedure for the appointment of postmasters at post offices of the first, second, and third classes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5445. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to place rural carriers operating from first-class post offices on a 40-hour week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG:

H. R. 5446. A bill to enable States and their agencies and political subdivisions to plan for the construction of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 5447. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 to give tenants a cause of action where landlords secure permission to evict by misrepresenting their intentions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5448. A bill to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 469. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1274 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 5449. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHADWICK:

H. R. 5450. A bill for the relief of Tacouhi Haladjian, Gulunia Haladjian, Virginie Haladjian, and Kirocor Haladjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 5451. A bill for the relief of Louisa B. Sank; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. R. 5452. A bill to provide for the extension of certain patents which were not fully utilized due to emergency conditions existing during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1362. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. Bert Davidson, of Grundy Center, Iowa, relating to S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1363. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs, Inc., favoring the enactment of the European recovery plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1364. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 13 members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Clearwater, Calif., urging that legislation establishing a system of universal military training be enacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1365. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of George F. Axt, commander of Englewood Post, No. 78, American Legion, and 70 others, favoring a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1366. Also, petition of Raymond A. Leonard, of Elizabeth, N. J., and 27 other residents of New Jersey, all in favor of a system of universal military training, and petition of 33 members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Guttenberg, N. J., also favoring a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1367. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert S. Speigel and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the universal-military-training bill, so that it may be brought up on the floor for debate; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Christopher J. Berlo, C. P., chaplain, United States Army, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, author of all wisdom and dispenser of knowledge, deign to bestow upon the Members of this august assemblage, the elected representatives of a free and God-fearing people, the gifts of understanding and discernment, so that under the inspiration of Thy divine guidance their deliberations may be characterized by truth, tempered by charity, and guided by prudence.

Heavenly Father, from whom all blessings flow, we ask Thee to inspire both the leaders and the people of our great country with a deep and lasting appreciation of our divinely bestowed inalienable rights, with a firm and self-sacrificing resolve to preserve for our future generations, in all their pristine strength and vigor, those safeguards and guaranties of these rights, which were conceived in liberty and brought forth in unselfish patriotism by the founding fathers of our Constitution.

Grant that all the families of nations now torn asunder by the wounds of war, sin, and strife may know Thy truth, following it by a worthy life, and place themselves under Thy most gentle rule. In Thy mercy we beseech Thee, O Lord, from all guilt absolve us and from all evil deliver us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 17, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 257. An act for the relief of Yoneo Sakai;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew;

S. 310. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Jonah Williams;

S. 311. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Ghost Bear, Sr.;

S. 312. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Kills the Enemy;

S. 313. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Calvin W. Clincher;

S. 409. An act for the relief of Milan Jandrich;

S. 457. An act for the relief of Anna Kong Mei;

S. 499. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Bessie Two Elk-Poor Bear;

S. 542. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Ella White Bull; and

S. 1673. An act to authorize the promotion of James Y. Parker, Army serial No. O20712, as major, Army of the United States, as of March 1, 1942, under the act of February 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 94), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 316. An act for the relief of Mary Sungduk Charr;

S. 402. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 500. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman; and

S. 521. An act to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 774) to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Jesse A. Lott;

H. R. 2013. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 2803. An act for the relief of Miriam Barkle;

H. R. 2806. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 3787. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard;

H. R. 4118. An act to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.;

H. R. 4246. An act for the relief of J. L. Hitt;

H. R 4541. An act for the relief of Jesse F. Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of John Halstadt;

H. R. 4569. An act for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter;

H. R. 4570. An act for the relief of Howard A. Yeager;

H. R. 4593. An act for the relief of Abraham Spevak; and

H. R. 4672. An act for the relief of John Cameron Henry.

AID TO CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 120)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On several occasions I have stated that a primary objective of the United States is to bring about, throughout the world, the conditions of a just and lasting peace. This is a cause to which the American people are deeply devoted.

Since VJ-day we have expended great effort and large sums of money on the relief and rehabilitation of war-torn countries to aid in restoring workable economic systems which are essential to the maintenance of peace. A principle which has guided our efforts to assist these war-torn countries has been that of helping their peoples to help themselves. The Congress is now giving careful consideration to a most vital and far-reaching proposal to further this purpose—the program for aid to European recovery.

I now request the Congress to consider the type of further assistance which this country should provide to China.

A genuine friendship has existed between the American people and the people of China over many years. This friendship has been accompanied by a long record of commercial and cultural association and close cooperation between our two countries. Americans have developed a deep respect for the Chinese people and sympathy for the many trials and difficulties which they have endured.

The United States has long recognized the importance of a stable Chinese nation to lasting peace in the Pacific and the entire world. The vast size and population of China make her an important factor in world affairs. China is a land with rich tradition and culture and a large and energetic population. It has always been our desire to see a strong progressive China making a full contribution to the strength of the family of nations.

With this end in view, we have supported the National Government of China since it first came to power 20 years ago. China and the United States were allies in the war against Japan and as an ally we supported China's valiant war efforts against the Japanese. Since the Japanese surrender we have provided a great deal of additional assistance. Military aid was given the Chinese Government not only to help defeat the Japanese invaders but also to assist in reoccupying Japanese-held areas. The United States contributed the major share of the extensive aid received by China under the program of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. We made available to the Chinese Government at minimum cost large quantities of surplus goods and equipment of value to China's economy. We are currently extending further aid to China under our foreign relief program.

Nevertheless, the Chinese Government and people are still laboring under the double and interrelated burden of civil war and a rapidly deteriorating economy.

The strains placed upon the country by 8 years of war, and the Japanese occupation and blockade have been increased by internal strife at the very time that reconstruction efforts should be under way. The wartime damage to transport and productive facilities has been greatly accentuated by the continued obstruction and destruction of vital communications by the Communist forces.

The civil warfare has further impeded recovery by forcing upon the Government heavy expenditures which greatly exceed revenues. Continual issuances of currency to meet these expenditures have produced drastic inflation with its attendant disruption of normal commercial operations. Under these circumstances China's foreign exchange holdings have been so reduced that it will soon be impossible for China to meet the cost of essential imports. Without such imports, industrial activity would diminish and the rate of economic deterioration would be sharply increased.

The continued deterioration of the Chinese economy is a source of deep concern to the United States. Ever since the return of General Marshall from China, the problem of assistance to the Chinese has been under continuous study. We have hoped for conditions in China that would make possible the effective and constructive use of American assistance in reconstruction and rehabilitation. Conditions have not developed as we had hoped and we can only do what is feasible under circumstances as they exist.

We can assist in retarding the current economic deterioration and thus give the Chinese Government a further opportunity to initiate the measures necessary to the establishment of more stable economic conditions. But it is and has been clear that only the Chinese Government itself can undertake the vital measures necessary to provide the framework within which efforts toward peace and true economic recovery may be effective.

In determining the character and dimensions of the program which might be suited to this purpose, we have had to take into account a number of diverse and conflicting factors, including the other demands on our national resources at this time, the availability of specific commodities, the dimensions and complexities of the problems facing the Chinese Government, and the extent to which these problems could be promptly and effectively alleviated by foreign aid. United States assistance to China, like that provided to any other nation, must be adapted to its particular requirements and capacities.

In the light of these factors, I recommend that the Congress authorize a program for aid to China in the amount of $570,000,000 to provide assistance until June 30, 1949.

The program should make provision for the financing, through loans or grants, of essential imports into China in the amount of $510,000,000. This estimate is based upon prices as of January 1, 1948, since it is impossible at present to predict what effect current price changes may have on the program. Revised dollar estimates can be presented in connection with the request for appropriations if necessary. The essential imports include cereals, cotton, petroleum, fertilizer, tobacco, pharmaceuticals, coal, and repair parts for existing capital equipment. The quantities provided for under this program are within the limits of available supplies. The financing of these essential commodity imports by the United States would permit the Chinese Government to devote its limited dollar resources to the most urgent of its other needs.

The program should also provide $60,000,000 for a few selected reconstruction projects to be initiated prior to June 30, 1949. There is an urgent need for the restoration of essential transportation facilities, fuel, and power operations, and export industries. This work could be undertaken in areas sheltered from military operations and could help in improving the supply and distribution of essential commodities.

As in the case of aid to European recovery, the conduct of this program of aid should be made subject to an agreement between China and the United States setting forth the conditions and procedures for administering the aid. The agreement should include assurances that the Chinese Government will take such economic, financial, and other measures as are practicable, looking toward the ultimate goal of economic stability and recovery. The United States would, of course, reserve the right to terminate aid if it is determined that the assistance provided is not being handled in accordance with the agreement or that the policies of the Chinese Government are inconsistent with the objective of using the aid to help achieve a self-supporting economy.

Pending establishment of the agency which is to be set up for the administration of the European-recovery program, the assistance to China should be carried forward under the existing machinery now administering the foreign-relief programs. Legislation authorizing the Chinese program should make possible transfer of the administration of the Chinese program to the agency administering our aid to European recovery. The need for authority in the administering agency to make adjustments in the program from time to time will be as great here as in the European-recovery program.

The proposed program of aid to China represents what I believe to be the best course this Government can follow in the light of all the circumstances. Nothing which this country provides by way of assistance can, even in a small measure, be a substitute for the necessary action that can be taken only by the Chinese Government. Yet this program can accomplish the important purpose of giving the Chinese Government a respite from rapid economic deterioration during which it can move to establish more stable economic conditions. Without this respite the ability of the Chinese Government to establish such conditions at all would be doubtful. The achievement of even this limited objective is of such importance as to justify the proposed program of aid.

I recommend, therefore, that this program be given prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1948.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC SERVICE IN WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, that no position had actually been filled in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting, pursuant to law, the nomination of Richard R. Atkinson for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 2298. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 897).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1107. A bill to amend section 2 of the joint resolution approved November 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 764), relating to the arming of American vessels; with amendments (Rept. No. 892).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1571. A bill to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; with amendments (Rept. No. 893).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1723. A bill to amend Public Law 168, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, an act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding 20 persons at a time from the American Republics, other than the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 894).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1790. A bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946; with an amendment (Rept. No. 895).

AUTHORITY TO REPORT RENT-CONTROL BILL DURING RECESS

Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave for the Committee on Banking and Cur-

rency to report during the recess of the Senate on the rent-control extension bill.

Subsequently,

Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 2182) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, to provide for the termination of controls on maximum rents in areas and on housing accommodations where conditions justifying such controls no longer exist, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 896) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 2177. A bill for the relief of Leon Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. 2178. A bill for the relief of John David Logan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2179. A bill for the relief of Maria Ruggeri; and

S. 2180. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Walther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2181. A bill to ratify the administrative promotions of employees on military furlough from the field postal service, in certain cases, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 2182) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, to provide for the termination of controls on maximum rents in areas and on housing accommodations where conditions justifying such controls no longer exist, which appears under a separate heading.)

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 4790) to reduce individual income-tax payments, and for other purposes, and I request that an explanation of the amendment by me may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed; and, without objection, the explanatory statement submitted by Mr. HOLLAND was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION BY MR. HOLLAND OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 4790

The purpose of my proposed amendment to the bill H. R. 4790 is to amend the chapter of the Internal Revenue Code relating to methods of collection of delinquent taxes so as (1) to increase the present exemption of household furniture from distraint and sale for the satisfaction of Federal taxes from the present limit of $300 to $1,000, (2) to exempt a homestead not exceeding $5,000 in value from seizure and sale for the satisfaction of Federal taxes, and (3) to exempt from the Federal tax lien the property which is exempt from distraint or seizure and sale for the satisfaction of Federal taxes.

Under the provisions of existing law (sec. 3670 of the Internal Revenue Code), a lien is imposed upon "all property and rights to property, whether real or personal" belonging to a person who is indebted to the United States for taxes. Section 3678 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for suits to enforce this lien against all property and rights to property, whether real or personal, of a delinquent taxpayer.

However, the most common way of subjecting the property of a delinquent taxpayer to the satisfaction of Federal taxes is by administrative procedure under subchapter (c) of chapter 36 of the code. In brief, this subchapter gives a collector the right to distrain and sell the personal property of a delinquent taxpayer, and in addition, a right to seize and sell the real property of a delinquent taxpayer if the tax cannot be satisfied out of personal property. The only property exempt from distraint and sale is enumerated in section 3691 (a) of the code, which reads as follows:

"SEC. 3691. Property exempt from distraint: (a) Enumeration.

"There shall be exempt from distraint and sale, if belonging to the head of a family—

"(1) School books and wearing apparel.

"The school books and wearing apparel necessary for such family, also.

"(2) Arms.

"Arms for personal use.

"(3) Livestock.

"One cow, five hogs, five sheep and the wool thereof, provided the aggregate market value of said sheep shall not exceed $50.

"(4) Fodder.

"The necessary food for such cow, hogs, and sheep, for a period not exceeding 30 days.

"(5) Fuel.

"Fuel to an amount not greater in value than $25.

"(6) Provisions.

"Provisions to an amount not greater than $50.

"(7) Household furniture.

"Household furniture kept for use to an amount not greater than $300; and

"(8) Books and tools of trade or profession.

"The books, tools, or implements, of a trade or profession, to an amount not greater than $100."

This subsection as incorporated into the code was taken from the act of July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. 440) as amended. At the present time there is no exemption at all of real property that may be seized and sold to satisfy Federal taxes.

The last substantial change in the law which is now section 3691 (a) of the code occurred in 1866. Obviously, there has been a great change in personal property values since that time which necessitates a revision of the laws relating to exemptions of property from sale for satisfaction of delinquent Federal taxes. And it must be remembered that in 1866 only a small percentage of the people of the country were directly liable to pay Federal taxes. It has only been since the enactment of the Federal income tax in 1913 that a large number of the people pay Federal taxes directly. These considerations also may account for the fact that there has never been any exemption of real property from sale to satisfy Federal taxes and at the same time point to the necessity for such an exemption at the present time.

When judicial proceedings are instituted to enforce the Federal tax lien, it appears to be uncertain whether the exemptions listed in section 3691 (a) are applicable. Likewise, it is not clear whether the laws of the States exempting homesteads and other property are applicable in the case of a judgment to enforce the lien for Federal taxes. However, it is clear that if administrative proceedings under subchapter (c) of chapter 36 are instituted to collect Federal taxes that the State laws exempting homestead and other property are not applicable.

Most of the States, in one way or another, exempt homesteads from seizure and sale for any reason (except to satisfy taxes levied directly on such homesteads). Certainly a homestead should be just as invulnerable from seizure for Federal taxes as it is from seizure for State taxes. And it should be protected whether the method of tax collection is judicial or administrative. Therefore, to provide uniformity as to the liability of the property of an individual for the satisfaction of Federal taxes, my amendment would provide that the Federal tax lien would not apply to the property of a delinquent taxpayer which is exempt from distraint or seizure and sale under administrative process.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1392. An act for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte E. Harvey;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of the estate of T. L. Morris;

H. R. 1786. An act for the relief of Jesse A. Lott;

H. R. 2013. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sirvart Arsenian;

H. R. 2633. An act for the relief of Claude T. Thomas, legal guardian of Elizabeth Ann Mervine, a minor, and the estates of Mary L. Poole, deceased, and Hazel S. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 2803. An act for the relief of Miriam Barkle;

H. R. 2806. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 3787. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Smorczewska;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard;

H. R. 4246. An act for the relief of J. L. Hitt;

H. R. 4541. An act for the relief of Jesse F. Cannon, Jackson Jones, and the estate of John Halstadt;

H. R. 4569. An act for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter;

H. R. 4570. An act for the relief of Howard A. Yeager;

H. R. 4593. An act for the relief of Abraham Spevak; and

H. R. 4672. An act for the relief of John Cameron Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4118. An act to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FORWARD-LOOKING REPUBLICANISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Forward-Looking Republicanism, delivered by him in Charleston, W. Va., February 12, 1948, before the Republican clubs of West Virginia, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT KANSAS CITY

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln birthday address delivered by Senator MARTIN at Kansas City, Mo., February 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

RADIO NETWORKS AS TOOLS OF PROPAGANDA—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Radio Networks as Tools of Propaganda," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT CHICAGO

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MARTIN at the Lincoln

Day dinner of the Illinois Republican State Central Committee, at Chicago, Ill., on February 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

QUARTERMASTER CORPS RESEARCH LABORATORY AT BOSTON—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services considering Senate bill 286, to establish the Quartermaster Corps Research Laboratory at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT LABOR EXPECTS OF MANAGEMENT—ADDRESS BY H. W. BROWN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Labor Expects of Management," delivered by H. W. Brown, president, International Association of Machinists, at a meeting of the American Management Association at Chicago, Ill., on February 18, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

HUMANITARIAN WORK OF DR. J. W. WITTEN—ARTICLE FROM THIS WEEK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Man With 150 Sons," written by Ralph Bass and published in This Week for February 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AWARD BY VIRGINIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CITATION TO W. BROOKS GEORGE

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release relating to the nomination of Mr. W. Brooks George as the recipient of the Distinguished Service Award of the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTION RETURNS FROM NEW YORK—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the election returns from New York, as published in the New York Times of February 18, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

CAPEHART'S WORLD RFC PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE INDIANAPOLIS STAR

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Capehart's World RFC Plan," published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star on Monday, February 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TAFT asked and obtained consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. TAFT (for Mr. DONNELL) asked and obtained consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering the Tamm nomination be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained consent that Mr. MAGNUSON be excused from attendance on the Senate during the remainder of the present week and next week.

Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained consent that Mr. MAYBANK be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until February 27.

Mr. LUCAS also asked and obtained consent that he be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until February 25.

ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Monday last, February 16, American citizens of Lithuanian origin celebrated the independence of the brave little country from which they came. For it was 30 years ago on February 16, 1918, that there was published in the city of Vilnius the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence. On that day Lithuania became a modern nation under a constitutional form of government.

On gaining her independence the people of this remarkable country, which has existed on the shores of the Baltic Sea for centuries, made remarkable progress. The standard of living of the people advanced rapidly. Until war came to the Baltic Sea and the North Sea, her foreign trade showed a steady gain. Lithuania had faced westward and sought to take for herself the advantage and benefits of our western form of civilization. The nation worked hard to restore her great natural wealth, her prestige, and position among the nations of the world.

But the feeling of pride which our Lithuanian fellow citizens take in the independence of their mother country is dimmed by the fact of Soviet domination. For it was on June 15, 1940, that her independence was temporarily crushed by Russian forces who today are still in control of the country. Since that day Lithuania's lot has been harsh and tragic. It is indeed a grim sort of irony that her independence day was celebrated not in Lithuania but in other lands where freedom and liberty still survive. There is today no free Lithuania.

All over the world today millions of freedom-loving peoples look to America with hope. The passion for freedom is deeply rooted in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. The history of that country is the most revealing testimony of her right to enjoy the way of life of a free people. If we revere our American traditions, our country must take the moral leadership which is ours by virtue of our strength and moral heritage. We must work toward the goal of a world in which free governments are freely chosen by free men. This is a moral ideal, but it is an ideal which will make for the greatest security for our country. Foremost among the countries of the world to whom we owe that moral leadership is Lithuania, whose attachment to freedom lays a powerful claim on our sympathies and energies. Let us all hope that the time is not far off when Lithuania and the other countries of the world now subject to the influence of foreign powers can throw off the alien yoke and regain the freedom which is so rightfully hers.

LEAGUE FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE IN PALESTINE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I prepared with reference to the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the past few days each of us Senators has received a document from the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine, marked "Confidential," with a notation that it is to be delivered in person. The only name which appears on the document is that of Benjamin H. Freedman who purports to be the organization's secretary.

I hope none of my colleagues who have received this document will take it seriously.

The League for Peace With Justice in Palestine consists of three individuals: Benjamin H. Freedman, P. M. Shoendorf, and Habib I. Katibah.

Freedman has worked in close collaboration with the directors of the Institute of Arab-American Affairs, Inc., of New York, an Arab propaganda agency, and the Arab office of Washington which is officially sponsored by the Governments of Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Transjordan, and Yemen and is actually registered as a foreign agent with the Department of Justice. In addition, Freedman has actually participated in representations made by the Egyptian Minister to our State Department.

P. M. Shoendorf, the second of the three members of the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine is, in fact, Freedman's mother-in-law.

The third, final, and only other member of the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine, Habib I. Katibah, is an Arabian journalist who is associated with the Institute of Arab-American Affairs, Inc. In addition, he was an active leader in the Arab National League which, prior to the war, worked in close cooperation with the German-American Bund.

On May 2, 1946, the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine ran a full-page advertisement in the New York Herald Tribune in which it asked a million prospective members to send the organization $1 each. At that time it gave its address as a public stenographer's office at 345 Madison Avenue.

On May 9, 1946, the same ad was run in the New York Sun and the New York World-Telegram, but the address of the organization was then given as another public stenographer's address at 420 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

The address given in the document as circulated among us yesterday was post office box No. 228, station F, New York 16, N. Y.

It is abundantly clear to me that the League for Peace With Justice in Palestine is not only not a responsible organization with American interests at heart, but, in addition, is a one-man organization which tries to lend some respectability to the efforts of the registered Arabian propagandists.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, Calendar No. 931. This is the concurrent resolution regarding the legislative budget.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Would the Senator consider submitting the suggestion in the form of a unanimous-consent request, so as not to displace the unfinished business?

Mr. TAFT. I intended to displace the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution. My understanding is that the St. Lawrence seaway measure will automatically come back before the Senate under the unanimous-consent agreement on February 27. I see no reason why it should not be completely displaced in the meantime.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1949 will approximate $47,300,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $37,200,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $26,600,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Ohio is asking that the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution be displaced.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. By unanimous consent, on Friday, February 27, the Senate will automatically return to the consideration of that measure, no matter what else may be pending.

Mr. LODGE. Would favorable action on the Senator's motion mean that there would be only 4 hours for debate on Friday, February 27, on the St. Lawrence seaway proposal?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct, unless the Senate took up something else. As a matter of fact, there is a full calendar which could be considered between now and February 27.

Mr. LODGE. As I have repeatedly said, I have been ready to vote on the St. Lawrence seaway measure for some time. But I did enter into an agreement with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the purport of which was that the time for offering amendments would close on February 23, and that then there would be time for discussion of the amendments between February 23 and February 27. I notice that the Senator from Wisconsin is not now in the Chamber, but that was the understanding agreed to. I should want to be sure that what we were doing was keeping faith with the agreement which I had with the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know anything about the agreement; but we will have to proceed next Friday with the rent-control bill, the consideration of which will last, I suppose, over to Monday, and possibly Tuesday. It is proposed that on Wednesday, February 25, the Senate consider the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to reconsider the vote by which the resolution relating to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was agreed to, which will take all day. Merely because we fixed a day 2 weeks ahead for a vote on a certain measure I do not think we can indefinitely keep that measure before the Senate when there is other business to be disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that he did not understand what we did. We agreed on a time limit, February 23, for the offering of amendments, and to vote on the joint resolution on February 27, the understanding being that between the 23d and the 27th time would be afforded for the consideration of the amendments. I personally have been ready to vote at any time on the St. Lawrence seaway measure, and I think most Senators are, but we did have this agreement with the Senator from Wisconsin. I observe he is not in the Chamber, and we ought to keep faith with him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand the rule, when a measure is pending as the unfinished business it is in order, of course, for any Senator to move that some other measure be taken up, but if such a motion is agreed to, it displaces the unfinished business, and it cannot be brought back before the Senate without another motion. If a unanimous-consent agreement is reached to take up a certain measure, it does not displace the unfinished business. I do not know what the Senator requested.

Mr. TAFT. I moved to displace the unfinished business, because it seems to me that when we agree to vote 3 weeks from a given time, and there is no debate on the particular measure then pending, we should set it aside and proceed with other business. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution will automatically come before the Senate for consideration as the unfinished business on February 27.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not be the pending business until that time, if the Senator's motion should prevail, unless some Senator moved to take it up again, as was done originally. No amendment could be offered to it, because it would not be the pending business, although the amendments must all be offered by February 23. If the St. Lawrence seaway joint resolution shall be displaced, it will not be before the Senate, and no amendment can be offered to it, unless between now and that time some Senator moves to take it up again. It seems to me that unless there is objection to what the Senator is trying to have done, the best procedure would be to ask unanimous consent, which would not displace the St. Lawrence seaway measure. Is the Senator trying to have the legislative budget concurrent resolution taken up

Mr. TAFT. There was all of last week, the 2 days the Senate was in session, for debate on the St. Lawrence seaway, and no Senator desired to speak. Apparently there is no more to be said on the subject. There is this other agreement, about which I know nothing, and which is not set out in the RECORD, so far as I know.

Mr. LODGE. It was set out in the RECORD that February 23 would be the last day for the offering of amendments. I thoroughly sympathize with the Senator's desire to get ahead with the business of the Senate, and the RECORD will show that many times I said the Senate should vote sooner than the date fixed. But I think it will hopelessly complicate the transaction of business in the Senate if we agree by unanimous consent to do a certain thing and then agree later to do something else.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the only unanimous-consent agreement the Senate has entered into is to resume consideration of the joint resolution relating to the St. Lawrence seaway on February 27.

Mr. LODGE. No. The Senate has agreed that the time for submission of amendments shall end on February 23.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the arrangement which was entered into is not such an arrangement as is usually made. I do not recall when a vote on a measure has been fixed so far ahead as was done in this case, but the action was taken largely in order to accommodate Senators on the majority side of the Chamber, including the Senator from Ohio, who wanted to be absent for purposes which we all understand. The Senator from Ohio probably went farther away from Washington than anyone else.

Mr. TAFT. But I was ready to vote on the St. Lawrence seaway measure before I left Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio was justified in leaving Washington, because he is in very hot pursuit of a very high prize in this country. I do not criticize the Senator from Ohio for being away from Washington last week. I am very fond of the Senator from Ohio, and, as I have said before, because I am an advocate of the "good neighbor policy" he is my candidate for the Republican nomination for President of the United States. I live very close to where he lives. He lives just across the river from me. Other things being equal, I would be for the Senator for the Republican nomination. Therefore I do not criticize him for pursuing the prize, and even going as far West as Colorado in that pursuit.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky cannot blame me for the action which was taken postponing the vote on the St. Lawrence seaway. I was ready to vote on it last week.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not blame the Senator for the postponement of the vote. Perhaps that action was taken during the Senator's absence. The action taken was unusual, but it was done in order to accommodate Senators. Of course, it was recognized that we could not for a whole week accommodate Senators on the majority side without some sort of quid pro quo to the minority side, in view of our "birthdays," political and otherwise. [Laughter.] The arrangement which was entered into was an unusual one. That, however, does not change the rule of the Senate that the measure relating to the St. Lawrence seaway is the unfinished business, and will remain the unfinished business unless it is displaced either permanently by motion or temporarily by unanimous consent.

Mr. TAFT. I do not want to interfere with the offering of amendments to

the measure. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, however, it seems perfectly clear to me that an amendment can be offered, whether the measure is before the Senate or not. The unanimous-consent agreement provides—

> And that no amendment shall be received to said joint resolution which has not on or before February 23, 1948, been submitted as an amendment intended to be proposed thereto and ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Under that agreement an amendment certainly may be offered even though the joint resolution is not presently before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. Amendments can be offered. But they are not offered to a measure which is pending and is the unfinished business.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out that since an amendment is now pending, other amendments can be submitted as intended to be proposed later, and ordered to lie on the table and be printed, but cannot be acted upon until whatever amendment is pending has been disposed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. Amendments may be submitted and printed for the information of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thought there would be no objection to the procedure I suggested. I withdraw my motion, and now ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The unanimous consent agreement provides:

> That a motion to recommit the said joint resolution shall only be in order on February 23, but a vote thereon shall not be had prior to February 27, 1948.

I am contemplating making a motion to recommit, in connection with which I propose to make some remarks. I am advised I cannot make that motion until the 23d, because the unanimous consent agreement provides "that a motion to recommit * * * shall only be in order on February 23." I ask the Senator from Ohio: Would the motion he has made, if adopted, interfere with my motion to recommit the measure dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think the Senator from New Jersey is correct. However, I have withdrawn the motion.

Mr. SMITH. I want to preserve my position to submit my motion on February 23.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has withdrawn his motion, and has asked unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 42, which was read at the desk a few moments ago. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1949 to be expended in said fiscal year.

GENERAL FEATURES OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on August 2, 1946, the Legislative Reorganization Act became law. The intent of this law was to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

The act provided for many changes. Among these, it reduced the number of standing committees of the Congress and defined the powers and duties of such committees. It provided the committees with increased clerical and professional staffs in order to assist in committee activities. It provided for the rendering of a legislative budget. It provided for a Legislative Reference Service to be established in the Library of Congress to assist in the legislative process. The Office of the Legislative Council was expanded. Lobbyists were to be required to register certain information with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate. The act provided for many other changes as well.

Most of these changes were hailed as a long step forward in modernizing the legislative procedures of the Congress. And in numerous instances, I can say without reservation, the Legislative Reorganization Act has worked admirably. I believe that my colleagues generally on both sides of the aisle share this view.

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET DESCRIBED

However, there were many of us who kept our fingers crossed when we voted for certain provisions of the act. One such provision was the section dealing with the legislative budget.

To the casual eye the text of the Legislative Reorganization Act creating the legislative budget does not seem difficult of accomplishment. It directs that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or authorized subcommittees of these, shall, at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, study the budget recommendations of the President and recommend to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year. This report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in that year, which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by the joint committee. If the estimated receipts should exceed the estimated expenditures, the report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. The report is due on or before February 15.

The law further directs that a concurrent resolution by which the report would be adopted and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in that year shall accompany the report. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section stating the amount by which the public debt shall be increased.

Thus, in brief, the legislative budget calls for an estimate of Federal receipts and revenues, an estimate of recommended expenditures, the maximum amount recommended to be appropriated, a recommended reserve for deficiencies, and a recommendation regarding an increase or reduction in the public debt.

DIFFICULTIES IN MAKING A LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

At the time of its passage we of the Congress recognized this as a well-intentioned and beneficial piece of legislation. We recognized the merits of determining a budget goal by which the Congress could guide itself in its studies of appropriations, expenditures, and revenues. But we were not blinded to the inherent difficulties attendant upon such a determination. In theory we looked upon the legislative budget as a step forward. In practice we wondered if, in its present form at least, it would work satisfactorily.

As the act is now written, I do not believe that the legislative budget will ever be more than a pregame guess at the final score, for it asks the Joint Budget Committee to give its estimate of a multitude of new facts, figures, conditions, and requests with which it has had no time to become acquainted.

EARLY REPORTING DATE PRECLUDES THOROUGH ANALYSIS

On or about February 15, according to law, the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget is required to report to the Congress its recommendations regarding the budget of the Federal Government for the ensuing fiscal year. This is accompanied by a resolution adopting the budget. Thus, approximately 1 month after the presentation of the President's budget, the Congress is asked to go on public record as to what it will do—generally speaking—about a 1,500-page Budget on which it has held, as yet, few hearings. Thousands of people spent up to 6 months preparing this budget, comprising hundreds of thousands of individual items. We are asked to provide a sum-total estimate as to the validity, necessity, and advisability of their functions and their requests without having at this time heard from any of the witnesses and without having had more than a cursory opportunity to review their detailed budget justifications.

This obviously does not allow the joint committee sufficient time in which to consider the budget estimates carefully before making its recommendations. Actually, long and detailed hearings are necessary if we are to have a realistic picture of the proper relationship between revenues, appropriations, expenditures, and debt reduction. This is impossible in the time allowed.

Furthermore, since the departments and agencies start to prepare their individual budgets as long as 6 months in advance of the President's budget, many changes have taken place and are taking place in their demands and requirements. These are not reflected in the President's budget. In many instances the Congress has no knowledge of these

requested changes at this time. In fact, in some instances the Congress will not become apprised of them until late in the spring or early in the summer. Yet the Congress is asked to predict what these changes will be and what should be done about them.

Furthermore, frequently in direct contravention of the expressed direction of the Congress, the departments and agencies of the Government have requested in the past, and presumably will again request, deficiency and supplemental appropriations, of most of which we have no advance knowledge. I shall speak further about violations of the deficiency law later in my discussion. At the moment, I wish merely to point out that with huge sums of money involved, the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget has no way of crystal gazing into the whims and extravagances of departments and agencies which choose to disregard the lawful limits of their appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF LAW URGED

For these reasons I restate my firm opinion that section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, dealing with the legislative budget, should be amended as to the date of presentation. Only at a much later date, after hearings have been held, after we of the Congress have had ample opportunity to weigh carefully the requests of the President's budget, can we in justice to the country, to the taxpayers, to the departments and agencies involved, and to ourselves, judiciously arrive at a sound estimate of the proper relationship between appropriations, expenditures, revenues, and debt reduction.

I strongly urge now that the law be amended so that the Committee on the Legislative Budget will not be called upon to make its decisions until a much later date. Many Members of Congress who have had to wrestle with the problem of preparing the legislative budget believe that such a change would make the budget a much more practical and valuable guide in properly balancing our Federal finances.

PRESENT LAW COMPLIED WITH

Since it was virtually impossible to amend the law prior to the reporting date, the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget had no recourse but to comply with that law. It has done so in full awareness of its responsibilities. It has done so despite the paucity of detailed information which it has at hand. It has done so despite the certainty of harsh criticism by those who, refusing to seek economy in government, believe they will profit most this year by increased expenditures on the part of a free-spending Government.

The 102-man Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget met on January 22, 1948. This committee, as I have stated, was made up of the members of four committees—the House Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Senate Committee on Finance, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I had the honor to be chosen chairman of the joint committee. A subcommittee, comprised of five members of each of the foregoing committees, was appointed by the chairman of each committee. This 20-man subcommittee submitted to the full committee its recommendations, which were adopted by a vote of 44 to 16.

REDUCTION OF $2,500,000,000 RECOMMENDED

Mr. President, I submit herewith the report of recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget for the fiscal year 1949, beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1949.

The committee has determined, as a result of its deliberations, that for the fiscal year 1949:

First. The estimate of receipts is $47,300,000,000.

Second. The estimate of recommended expenditures is $37,200,000,000.

Third. (a) The maximum amount recommended to be appropriated against the Budget estimates of $32,900,000,000 for fiscal year 1949 is $30,900,000,000.

(b) The maximum amount recommended to be appropriated against the supplemental budget estimates for 1948 of $8,700,000,000 is $7,900,000,000.

Fourth. The reserve for deficiencies recommended is $225,000,000.

Fifth. The public debt should be reduced by a portion of the excess of Federal receipts over expenditures, but in no event less than $2,600,000,000.

The committee, in estimating receipts of $47,300,000,000, was $2,800,000,000 over the President's estimate of $44,500,000,000. In estimating expenditures of $37,200,000,000, the committee was $2,500,000,000 under the President's estimate of $39,700,000,000. Thus, while the President estimated an excess of receipts over expenditures of only $4,800,000,000, the committee estimated the excess to be $10,100,000,000, or a difference of $5,300,000,000 in the committee's favor.

The committee's estimate of $30,900,000,000 for new appropriations for 1949 was just $2,000,000,000 under the President's estimate of $32,900,000,000, while the committee's estimate of $7,900,000,000 for supplemental appropriations, 1948—including the large aid-to-Europe item—was $800,000,000 under the President's $8,700,000,000 figure. Thus, the savings in appropriations for the two items would run to $2,800,000,000.

REASONS FOR ACTION STATED

Some of the reasons which impelled the committee to make the determinations which it did are as follows—and I now quote from the report:

1. This is the highest peacetime budget that has ever been submitted for congressional consideration.

2. The spending program, as outlined in the budget document, contemplates little or no reduction in the number of Federal employees.

3. This budget recommends a total of $5,735,000,000 in new expenditures for 1949 for which there exists at the moment no authorizing legislation.

4. This Nation is admittedly in grave danger of runaway inflation which, if historical precedents are any guide, might, if unchecked, result in serious economic upheavals. Under such conditions, our present revenues would decline markedly, resulting in an increased debt and increased taxation unless present spending policies are curtailed. Since Federal, State, and local expenditures constitute the single greatest inflationary force in our economy, these expenditures should be curtailed wherever possible.

5. For the same reason, large-scale expansion and acceleration of public-works projects should be limited to such projects as are deemed urgently necessary to the public interest.

6. It is obvious that the taxpayers of this Nation should be relieved somewhat of the burden of wartime taxation. This cannot be done if Federal commitments are widely expanded and expenditures are needlessly increased.

7 World conditions make imperative heavy expenditures for foreign aid and national defense. Under such circumstances, discretion cautions us to conserve our financial resources.

The committee wishes to direct attention to the fact that appropriations for expenditure are substantially less in amount than are the estimated expenditures as contemplated by the President's budget. The difference between these two lies in the fact, as stated in the report, that expenditures recommended by the President for the fiscal year 1949 include not only the new appropriations which are requested of the Congress for this fiscal year, but also funds which are available for expenditure from appropriations which were made in prior years or in the current year from appropriations which are anticipated.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION QUOTED

Because of the vast difference between proposed appropriations and the amounts available for expenditure, the draft of the concurrent resolution, presented in compliance with the law, was worded as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1949 will approximate $47,300,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $37,200,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $26,600,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligations in such fiscal year.

APPROPRIATION CUTS NOT ENOUGH

It is obvious to all that as long as the departments and agencies of the Federal Government have vast sums of money appropriated in previous years to use for current expenditures, then the present action of the Congress in limiting appropriations will not have as salutary an effect on Government spending as might be desirable. In recent years, the record shows expenditures are outrunning appropriations by about 20 percent.

This condition, unless checked, will continue so long as the agencies of the Government have these vast reservoirs of unexpended balances to tap for their present uses. Since, as of November 1, 1947, there was almost $17,000,000,000 available to the agencies in unexpended balances, it is evident that reductions in appropriations will not for some years vitally affect the total expenditure picture. Obviously, then, a curb on expenditures is necessary. The accompanying recommended concurrent resolution, with its wording, "and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed $37,200,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $26,600,000,000

would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year," recognizes this problem and attempts to deal with it. But there can be no guarantee of reduced expenditures unless and until the Congress drastically reduces the unexpended balances now available to the Federal establishments.

PERSONAL THOUGHTS ON EXPENDITURE CUTS

At this time, when the financial condition of the Federal Government is so precarious, I personally favor more drastic reductions than those recommended by the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. Yet, in the deliberations of the committee, I have had to extend consideration to what cuts are likely in view of the handicaps under which economy-minded Members of Congress must work.

I personally believe that the need for economy now is so vital that I would support the reduction of Federal expenditures everywhere a reduction can be justified, and let the chips fall where they may.

COMPARISON WITH 1933

Perhaps it would be well to remind ourselves of the road the National Government has traveled in the past 15 years, a road of multiplied appropriations, multiplied costs, multiplied taxes, multiplied personnel, multiplied bureaus, multiplied controls, and multiplied hand-outs. It may come as a shock to some of us of an older generation to realize that there are millions of taxpayers in their mid-thirties who since they became voters have never seen economy practiced by the departments and agencies of the Government.

Let us be reminded of the position in which we find ourselves by observing a few markers down the road which we are traveling.

In 1933 Federal expenditures were $4,325,000,000. For 1949 the President estimates they will reach $39,669,000,000 an increase of 817 percent.

In 1933 Federal revenues were $2,079,000,000. For 1949 the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimates that revenues will amount to $47,300,000,000, an increase in excess of 2,000 percent.

In 1933 individual income taxes and corporation taxes totaled $746,000,000. For 1949 the President estimates these Federal taxes at about $33,000,000,000, an increase of 4,300 percent.

In 1933 our public debt was $22,000,000,000. Today it is two hundred and fifty-eight billion, an increase of 1,073 percent.

In 1933 there were 572,000 Federal employees. Today there are over two million, an increase of 250 percent.

In 1933 these employees earned $972,000,000 annual wage. Today the pay roll for Federal employees approximates $6,000,000,000, an increase of more than 500 percent.

In 1933 the executive branch of the Federal Government was a relatively small and closely knit organization. I might add it was also efficient. As of the latest count, there are now more than 1,000 bureaus and more than 45,000 individual offices.

I wish that it were possible, when people ask for new legislation involving large appropriations, to flash these figures before their eyes. The resulting effect on expenditures and taxation would be beneficial. Many times, I am afraid, people forget that each dollar appropriated is a dollar which must be paid in taxes, taxes which should be reduced to relieve the strain on taxpayers, taxes which could be reduced if extravagance were eliminated from Government.

CAN WE AFFORD IT?

It is popular nowadays for the self-styled liberals in Government to use the terms "reactionary" and "conservative" in referring to those who wish to see the budget balanced, payments made on the national debt, and Federal expenditures curbed to an extent agreeable with sane fiscal policies. Unless there is a national emergency, the proponents of a sound fiscal policy believe that the Federal Government should be able to pay as it goes.

We prefer not to borrow for deficit financing from the people of the Nation, particularly when it is the taxpayers themselves who must ultimately pay the bill, plus interest.

To those who believe in a sound government each appropriations bill ultimately raises the following question: "In the light of our present financial and economic condition, can we afford this particular item?" Each item must be judged on the grounds of necessity and benefits to be derived in relation to overall ability to pay. It must be remembered that waste, extravagance, duplication, and perpetuation of self are everywhere about us.

Of course, we all see the need for an adequate national defense. But there are 14,000,000 veterans who can witness to the waste within the armed services. The Congress authorized the unification of the armed services. Extensive savings should already be realized from that unification. If savings are not realized, then of course there is something radically wrong with the administration of the defense departments.

Of course, the American people want to do their part toward world recovery. We all know the need. I saw it with my own eyes this past fall. I also saw with my own eyes the inefficiency, the almost criminal waste of American tax dollars and equipment American tax dollars paid for, the lack of full intelligence in our approach to recovery problems.

Of course we all want to see the development of needed power projects. But we want to see them undertaken as a part of a sound program as the people, the taxpayers, can afford them. We do not want to see them pushed ahead by the whims and fancies of a willful administrator.

Of course, we want the Federal Government to extend proper aid to the States and local communities. But we know that it makes good sense to extend such aid within the ability of the people to pay. We have seen such aid skyrocket to more than $30,000,000,000 since 1933, and we have seen Federal agencies advertising for business with these dollars. It is very interesting to note, as perhaps many Senators have noted, that Federal agencies actually advertise for business.

Of course, an expanded population and an enlarged Government will require additional Federal employees. But I refuse to believe that we need double the number of employees we had in 1939 and between three and four times as many as we had in 1933. Federal agencies justified increases in employment during the war years as necessary for war work. Yet, over half of the agencies of the Government have actually increased their employment since the war peak.

Of course, we are all in favor of a finer America; an America with improved schools, hospitals, and roadways; an America which will not be threatened by floods or droughts, hunger or deprivation; an America with cheap electricity for our homes, cheap power for our industries, cheap nutrition for our farm lands; an America which will provide for the needy, both at home and abroad, which, if called upon, will be ever ready to defend itself against all aggressors; an America which will proudly show its gratitude to its veterans and provide jobs for all, veteran and nonveteran alike.

No patriotic citizen will deny that these are our goals. But we cannot accomplish these worth-while measures by unjustified Federal control of our markets, by oversubsidizing, by excessive grants-in-aid to States, municipalities, and individual citizens, by providing public works beyond our capacity to pay, by giving our resources beyond the needs of foreign countries or beyond their ability to distribute them so that waste makes us a laughingstock of other nations, by using our power to purchase food commodities in such a way that we encourage inflationary procedures, or by buying surplus goods and then destroying them while other nations desperately cry for them.

If we must continue huge expenditures for national defense in a time when the world is threatened, then other expenditures must be watered down. And there must be no water in defense expenditures, either.

We have been requested to give aid to foreign nations totaling $9,300,000,000. It is said that the amount of this aid must not be reduced if the program is to be successful. This may be so; I do not know as yet. But I do know that every Member of the Congress will do well to examine every dollar of that proposed aid if he wants to avoid the possibility of waste and needless expenditure of funds.

I say this with conviction. Only 2 months ago we were called together in special session to legislate on an interim-aid-to-Europe program calling for an appropriation of $597,000,000. It was prepared in large measure by the same persons who prepared the present aid program. On examination, the Senate Appropriations Committee found inex-

cusable irresponsibility in the preparation of the European-aid program. For example, within 2 weeks of submitting the bill to the Congress, the administration altered the allocations to Italy and Austria more than $16,000,000, not because the food situation had changed, but because the draftsmen of the bill had improperly tabulated the resources of Austria.

In another instance the Appropriations Committee was able to cut more than $1,000,000 from the program by the simple expedient of rerouting shipments of coal. In yet another instance approximately $12,000,000 was stricken from the bill without changing its intent in any degree. This was caused by the State Department's listing the price of grain as $7.50 above the list price. The committee noted and corrected other price discrepancies.

Certainly, with such inexcusable errors in mind, the Congress would be unwise indeed in taking at face value any estimates for the present aid program. The sacrifice that the American citizen is making in terms of heavy taxes alone will make close supervision of these requested appropriations an absolute necessity. Every Member who votes for this program has an obligation to post a watch against maladministration and inefficiency.

We must strive, therefore, to eliminate every last vestige of waste, inefficiency, and duplication of effort if we are to carry the tremendous financial loads of the future. We must eliminate the frills and extravagances of government. It is not even a question of whether we are securing full value for the money we spend. The measuring stick must be, except in emergencies, "Can we afford to do this? Is this essential to the welfare of the Nation?"

The Federal Government, the Members of Congress, cannot alone accomplish the tremendous task. We must have the cooperation of the States and municipalities. We must have the cooperation of the departments and agencies. Above all, we must have the support of the taxpayers.

Let me say a brief word about each. During and since the war most of the States have improved their financial status markedly, broadly as much as 33 percent in a few years. Some of the financial load should in the future fall to their lot. Much of the burden of financing State projects has in late years been taken over by the Federal Government. For example, a recent study made by the Senate Appropriations Committee reveals that the cost of operating the State governments is relatively small when compared with the burden of supporting the Federal Government. The President proposes to spend $39,700,000,000 for Federal Government purposes in 1949. The cost of all State governments combined in the latest year available, 1947, was only $5,800,000,000—only one-seventh as much.

The cost of grants-in-aid to States and local governments, including shared revenues, for 1949 has been estimated by the President at $2,250,000,000.

State and local governments must assume some of the financial load and must scale down their demands for Federal projects if we are to reduce expenditures.

Mr. President, in this portion of my remarks, rather than take the time to read it at this time, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement which I prepared, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, regarding the cost of Federal and State Governments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 3.—Senator STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, released a study today which reduces President Truman's 1949 Federal budget request of $39,669,000,000 to terms the man back home can more readily understand. "This study," Senator BRIDGES explained, "shows State by State the pro rata cost of the President's budget compared with the cost of operating each State's own government." In every case the pro rata cost of the Federal Government is several times the cost of the State government. "For example, in my own State of New Hampshire," Senator BRIDGES declared, "this study indicates that our State government cost about $18,000,000 but that our share of the burden of President Truman's Federal budget amounts to $95,000,000, or over five times the local costs. For the country as a whole the Federal costs are seven times the combined costs of all State governments."

In California their State government costs about $582,000,000, but their share of the Federal costs amounts to $3,368,000,000. "This means," said Senator BRIDGES, "that just a 10 percent cut in the Federal spending program would save the taxpayers of California $337,000,000. A 10 percent cut at the Federal level would mean $846,000,000 to the taxpayers of New York State; $250,000,000 to the people of Ohio, and so on. If we are to make any real progress in achieving economy in government at the Federal level," Senator BRIDGES declared, "the people must take an active interest in the affairs of the Federal Government and be as concerned with its efficiency as they have been with their own State and local governments. Remember, from the standpoint of dollars and cents the Federal Government spends seven times as much as the States," BRIDGES concluded.

STATEMENT OF HON. STYLES BRIDGES, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, ON COST OF FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS, JANUARY 28, 1948

The cost of operating the Federal Government at the level recommended by President Truman exceeds the combined costs of all our State governments by about seven times. In other words, for every dollar the taxpayer pays to his State government, about $7 must go to support the Federal operation. This ratio varies with the State, but in every case the taxpayers' pro rata cost of the Federal burden exceeds greatly the cost of the State's own government.

While individuals and local groups interested in economy in government should continue to scrutinize local and State expenses, the lion's share of the spending occurs at the Federal level. This fact is often difficult to appreciate due to the inability to comprehend the significance of a national budget involving billions of dollars.

The accompanying tabulation brings the President's 1949 budget down to terms that can be more readily understood by the average taxpayer. In this table, the 1949 budget proposal of $39,669,000,000 is distributed among the States in proportion to all Federal income taxes paid in each State in 1947—the latest year for which such data are available. These figures represent a reasonable approximation of the cost of the President's spending program to the taxpayers of each State. To give the reader some basis for comparison, the cost of the State's own government is also indicated.

A casual glance at this table will reveal that the cost of operating the State government is a relatively small item compared to the burden of supporting the Federal Government. This table also makes it possible to calculate the approximate savings to the citizens of each State resulting from reductions in the Federal budget. For example, a 10-percent cut in the Federal spending program would mean a saving of $337,000,000 to Californians—or an amount equal to more than half of the total cost of operating the California State government. To the people of New Jersey a 10-percent cut in the Federal budget would save $133,000,000—an amount equivalent to over 80 percent of the cost of their own State government.

These facts suggest that taxpayers should place more emphasis upon achieving economy in government at the Federal level. While Washington seems far removed from most communities, the fact is that the spending program of the Federal Government has a very real effect on each and every one of us. Despite the enormous size of the Federal budget, the average person is surprisingly apathetic toward any effort to achieve economy. This apathy is due in part to the fact that the Federal Government climbed to its huge spending program in relatively recent years. Just 20 years ago Federal taxes did not amount to much compared to State and local taxes. Many of us do not appreciate the change that has taken place.

The Federal spending program recommended by President Truman for 1949 is four and one-half times Federal expenditures in 1939—just 10 years ago. It is hard for us to appreciate the magnitude of this increase and adjust our thinking to the new scheme of things. The current cost of all government (Federal, State, city, county, etc.) is over $50,000,000,000 annually. This is more than one-fourth of our national income and more than we spend for food.

While it is recognized that some increase in Federal spending over prewar levels is justified, it is certainly time to raise the over-all question of "How much can we, as a Nation, wisely afford to spend for government?"

Cost of Federal and State Governments (Federal cost based on President's budget proposal for 1949 prorated among the States on the basis of Federal income-tax collections in 1947)

[In millions]

State	Cost of Federal Government [1]	Cost of State government [2]	Federal exceed State costs by—
			Times
Alabama	$282	$85	3¼
Arizona	87	37	2⅓
Arkansas	127	66	2
California	3,368	582	5¾
Colorado	270	61	4½
Connecticut	710	65	11
Delaware	417	14	30
Florida	460	122	3¾
Georgia	444	99	4½
Idaho	75	24	3
Illinois	3,546	319	11
Indiana	730	136	5¼
Iowa	401	108	3¾
Kansas	357	75	4¾
Kentucky	329	83	4
Louisiana	329	128	2½
Maine	143	29	5
Maryland	543	66	8¼
Massachusetts	1,492	193	7¾
Michigan	1,710	293	6
Minnesota	651	119	5½
Mississippi	115	65	1¾

Footnotes at end of table.

Cost of Federal and State Governments (Federal cost based on President's budget proposal for 1949 prorated among the States on the basis of Federal income-tax collections in 1947)—Continued

[In millions]

State	Cost of Federal Government [1]	Cost of State government [2]	Federal exceed State costs by—
			Times
Missouri	$1,119	$121	9¼
Montana	79	19	4
Nebraska	274	35	8
Nevada	48	7	7
New Hampshire	95	18	5¼
New Jersey	1,333	163	8
New Mexico	56	32	1¾
New York	8,457	649	13
North Carolina	520	177	3
North Dakota	63	26	2½
Ohio	2,495	307	8
Oklahoma	290	119	2½
Oregon	337	75	4½
Pennsylvania	2,809	305	9
Rhode Island	253	28	9
South Carolina	218	73	3
South Dakota	63	25	2½
Tennessee	389	79	5
Texas	1,214	228	5⅓
Utah	91	30	3
Vermont	48	15	3¼
Virginia	488	96	5
Washington	567	161	3½
West Virginia	226	73	3
Wisconsin	774	156	5
Wyoming	40	12	3⅓
Total States	38,932	5,798	6¾
District of Columbia	590	----------	----------
Hawaii	127	----------	----------
Puerto Rico and Alaska	20	----------	----------
Grand total	39,669	5,798	7

[1] Based on Federal expenditures requested by President Truman for fiscal year 1949. The total of $39,669,000,000 was prorated by States according to the proportion of all Federal income taxes paid in the fiscal year 1947.

[2] State taxes collected in fiscal year 1947 excluding unemployment taxes as reported by the Bureau of the Census. While actual expenditures by each State may be more or less than tax collections, it is considered that these collections reflect a normal expenditure level in most cases.

SAVINGS ACCOMPLISHED BY EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it might be well for a moment to look into what was done by the first session of the Eightieth Congress. In that session the Congress achieved a rather enviable economy record. To date this Congress has accomplished savings amounting to $3,367,550,803 in reductions from the President's budget estimates for appropriations. These include reductions in regular, permanent, and supplementary and deficiency appropriations. They do not include rescissions of appropriations previously made amounting to an additional $4,017,332,946. Together, these would amount to $7,384,883,749 in savings. Nor does this include $830,380,811 impairment of capital in the Commodity Credit Corporation which was not replaced by appropriations. It is an impressive savings of which all economy-minded Members of Congress may well be proud.

FACTORS LIMITING SAVINGS

I need not remind the Senate that it was not easily accomplished. We did this despite the necessity for maintaining a stronger military arm than we had anticipated, despite the necessity for granting large-scale appropriations for foreign aid, despite the interest payment of $5,000,000,000 on the public debt, despite our unequaled payments of over $7,000,000,000 for veterans' aid, despite our payments to support the functions of one of the largest peacetime Federal Governments our country has ever known, functions which we of the Appropriations Committee could not legally eliminate.

PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN BY AGENCIES

In addition to this, we were faced with the arrogant refusal of many of the Federal agencies to cooperate with the Congress in effecting an efficient and economical government. In their struggle to maintain their swollen size, they used every lawful and many unlawful methods of attempting to coerce the Congress into appropriating larger sums of public funds than the Congress, after careful investigation, believed either necessary or desirable.

These efforts have been so outrageous that the agencies have had the temerity not only to seek higher appropriations than were approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but have so mismanaged their apportionments of funds as to place the Congress in a position either of giving the agencies what they want or of refusing additional appropriations toward the end of a year and thus curtailing necessary functions to the detriment of the American people. One agency, in fact, has had the effrontery to tell the Congress that it had no right to limit its appropriations.

Various methods were employed during the appropriations hearings to coerce the Congress through public pressure to accept agency estimates of proposed appropriations. Federal employees were in some instances organized in groups as soon as House cuts were announced. Each group was given specific objectives designed geographically to exert the maximum pressure on the Congress. Newspaper aid was sought, not only through news channels but through importuned editorials, which, through no fault of the press, but because Government officials deliberately exaggerated effects of curtailment of services, alarmed the public. Not content with this, attempts were made to elicit support of civic groups, State and local officials, chambers of commerce, labor organizations, business houses, veterans organizations, brokers, farmers, and railroad executives.

One favorite method was to announce in the press that House cuts necessitated the firing of a large number of employees. Dismissal notices were then sent to employees—preferably veterans—in a number far in excess of the number actually to be released. This was done knowingly and deliberately by the agency, which subsequently rehired large numbers of these employees without publicity. The most audacious of these propaganda stunts was that perpetrated by a group of public officials—in widely scattered parts of the country and all at approximately the same time—blaming the Congress in press releases for employee layoffs which were not occasioned by appropriation cuts but by administrative financial errors within the department over which the Congress had no control or knowledge.

These attempts to pressure the Congress into submission to departmental dictates were not the work of a few disgruntled employees. In most instances they were instigated with the full connivance or knowledge of highly placed officials with a full comprehension and an utter disregard of their responsibilities. Furthermore, they were carried on at Government expense, on Government time, using Government vehicles and Government equipment, including the use of the Government free-mailing privilege. At no time in our history has Federal money been so widely used to circumvent the will of the elected representatives of the people.

DEFICIENCY ABUSE MISUSES PUBLIC FUNDS

I believe that this is an appropriate occasion to call again to the attention of the Senate one other condition which has limited our economy efforts in the past, and which undoubtedly will adversely affect our plans this year. I refer to the continued refusal of certain departments and agencies to live within their appropriations as granted by the Congress.

Most Americans who are unfamiliar with the appropriations process believe that when the appropriations bills are passed for the ensuing fiscal year, that is the end of it. Unfortunately, this is by no means the case. Instead, a steady stream of deficiency and supplemental measures comes to the Congress while it is in session, swelling the total appropriation, except when the Congress refuses the requests.

Since 1931, 488 of these measures, involving 4,426 items, and costing the taxpayers more than $150,000,000,000, have been sent to the Congress. During the sessions of the present Eightieth Congress, 11 measures, involving 777 items and costing in excess of $6,000,000,000, have been sent to the Congress. Many of these measures, particularly those submitted during the war, have been the result of emergencies growing out of the conflict. At other times new legislation, such as pay raises, has necessitated additional appropriations. These instances are no fault of the departments and agencies.

But on many other occasions deficiency and supplemental appropriation requests are the direct result of the failure or refusal of Federal establishments to apportion their appropriations properly, as required by the antideficiency law. Such agencies, instead of dividing their appropriations properly over the four quarters of the year, have, with and without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, arbitrarily decided that they, and not the Congress, are the best judges of how much should be spent. Having once taken this illegal step, they apportion their funds so that they inevitably find themselves without sufficient funds to complete the fiscal year. That is a favorite trick.

I have examined this condition carefully, and I am of the opinion that legislation strengthening the antideficiency law is needed to correct the abuse. It is the only way by which control of the public purse can be regained by the Congress.

The Congress cannot effect economies as far-reaching as would otherwise be

the case if the establishments of the executive branch adamantly refuse to cooperate, if they are allowed to continue their propaganda on the effects of reductions in appropriations, if they are allowed deficiency appropriations after willfully refusing to heed the limitations set by the Congress.

ECONOMY PROGRAM NEEDS PUBLIC SUPPORT

I stated previously that we of the Congress must have the support of the States and the cooperation of the executive branch if we are to accomplish as much in savings as we need to accomplish. I said there was one other group which must, above all others, help the Congress. That is the people of the country. Economy over an extended period, such as we need now for the long haul out of the morass of debt, can only be practiced successfully if the people, the taxpayers, the grass-roots voters, not only vigorously support economy moves, but take the initiative themselves and become champions of the cause.

We can balance the budget, we can reduce the debt, we can reduce taxes, and we can meet our commitments both at home and abroad; but we can accomplish these results only if expenditures are pared to the bone, if special interests refrain from asking the Government to build, maintain, grant, or subsidize projects which are either not vitally necessary, or which can be done by agencies other than the Federal Government. Nearly one-third of every dollar earned by the American people goes for some form of taxation. We have a debt the interest on which is equal to the entire cost of government back in the thirties. We have one of the largest peacetime budgets in history, every dollar of which, if spent, encourages inflation. Yet there are new demands for new legislation involving additional billions of dollars.

The people of our Nation, for their own sakes, must unselfishly wrench from before their eyes the blindfolds of greenbacks with which they have been deluded. They must remember that the Federal Government never does anything for nothing, that someone, someday, must pay, and pay with interest. That someone is the American citizen, the American taxpayer, the wage earner. That someday is now, and every day in the future.

The economy-minded Members of Congress need all the support which the people can give them. With such support, economy can and must be restored to the Government. Without it, we may well face a continued inflation leading to economic chaos, deficit spending, renewed controls, and an irreparable break-down of our domestic process.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall support the concurrent resolution, but I wish to make it clear that I very much doubt—and I am stating merely my own personal view—whether the Government's revenues for the fiscal year 1949 will run as high as is indicated in the concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, in my opinion the time has arrived when we should take from our expenditure budget and revenue budget certain vast sums of money to which we are being committed presently, and for a period of years ahead of us. I think the matter should be handled by a special bond issue, let us say bonds for the winning of the peace, as we issued bonds for the winning of the war. Let the issue, as a mere illustration, be, let us say, twenty or twenty-five billion dollars, running over a period of 20 or 30 years.

My feeling is that the bonds could be sold, because the transaction incident to the sale of a bond and the purchase of a bond becomes a business proposition, business considerations control it, and with a suitable provision permitting the bonds to be purchased against estate taxes, at a very reasonable rate of interest, all our outside foreign financing during the next 4 years could be lifted out of current expenditure and income budgets, except for the interest upon the bonds, if payable annually, as I presume would be the case. Whether or not the Treasury Department would look with favor upon the suggestion I do not know. But it is undoubtedly of the highest importance that we should do something to take out of our expenditure budgets, and therefore out of our income budget, except for the item of interest, the vast new expenditures which in all good faith we feel we are called upon to make.

What I am saying is not in opposition to those expenditures wherever they may be properly made, after due and proper consideration, as in the case of the European aid program, which, I presume, will be reported to the Senate during the week.

In my judgment, we will not be able to have a very sensible fiscal policy or program so long as these extraordinary expenditures are thrown into our annual budgets. They could be eliminated from them by a sensible arrangement for a bond issue which would be inviting to businessmen and to other citizens who are able to purchase them if we would be willing to make very reasonable concessions respecting estate taxes in the statutes providing for the bond issue.

Mr. President, I have watched the Federal budgets and, as I have contemplated what we must of necessity do, or what we will do by way of extraordinary expenditures, I have come to the conclusion that if the Treasury continues to move in the direction in which it is now going, we will have an expenditure of $45,000,000,000 by 1951. The way the Treasury is now traveling the expenditures are not going to be reduced. While we may deplore it and may on occasion speak against it, as certainly as we are convened in the Senate Chamber today, we are headed toward a forty-five-billion- or forty-six-billion- or forty-seven-billion-dollar budget by 1951 or 1952. That burden on the American people, plus an additional ten billion to twelve billion dollars for State, county, and local governments, will one day break down the productive power of America. So, in order to enable us to visualize the budget as we should, it seems to me the wisest course is to authorize a special bond issue, sell it to the American people, and use the proceeds to take the extraordinary expenditures out of the annual budgets, so that we may face cold facts as they are, with some possibility of reducing the budget.

I shall vote for the concurrent resolution, but I most reluctantly subscribe to an estimated $37,200,000,000 of expenditures for the next fiscal year. Yet I know very well that the budget is going to reach that figure. I have seen it climb too fast during the past several years to imagine that we will be able to pull it down, under existing conditions and under our present fiscal arrangements.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that we may be able to remove the extraordinary expenditures from the annual budget, save for the item of interest to which I have referred, so that we may then see precisely what we, as a nation, are doing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall occupy only a few moments of the Senate's time to comment on the concurrent resolution and the proceedings which have resulted in its presentation.

First, I should like to advert for a moment to the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in regard to taking the extraordinary expenses to which he has referred out of the annual budget, and providing for them by a bond issue. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether he contemplates that if such action were taken there would be a corresponding reduction in the standing debt of the United States, or even a greater reduction than the amount the bonds to which he refers would aggregate. In other words, whether, in spite of the suggested bond issue, there might be a reduction in the over-all public debt of the United States?

Mr. GEORGE. I do, yes. I contemplate that we could still reduce our present fixed debt.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, if we did not do that, the special bonds would merely add that much more to the public debt, and it would be greater by reason of the bond issue than it is now. The Senator's suggestion is worthy of consideration.

Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the date, namely February 15, on which a report on the legislative budget is required to be made to the two Houses of Congress under the Reorganization Act. I am convinced now, and I think the joint committee were convinced, that that date ought to be moved forward, because it is very difficult to arrive at any dependable figure or any dependable opinion or judgment within 6 weeks after Congress meets. Before a single appropriation bill has been passed or even introduced it is difficult to estimate how much we are going to spend and how much we are going to have to appropriate during the following months of the Congress after the 15th of February. It is not so hard to estimate the revenues of the Government, because we have the figures furnished us by the Treasury, we have the President's budget, we have the estimates of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. They frequently do not agree in their estimates, but they come sufficiently close to enable us to

arrive at some judgment. It was based upon these figures more or less that the President estimated—and his estimate has been accepted substantially—there would be a revenue for 1949 of $47,200,000,000. Of course, that estimate is based on present tax laws, and it is based upon present national income.

The national income of 1947, as reported recently by the Department of Commerce, was approximately $197,000,000,000. I think that is the highest national income in the history of the United States. So, based upon a similar income for 1949, which may be exceeded—or it may be an overestimation, depending upon conditions in the country, depending upon our commerce, our industry, our wages, profits, and all factors that enter into the making of an over-all national income—and based upon present taxes, it was estimated that there would be $47,200,000,000 revenue to the Treasury in the fiscal year 1949.

If the tax-reduction bill which has passed the House of Representatives should be adopted by the Senate and become a law, either by the signature of the President—and it has been announced rather authoritatively that the President could not approve such a measure—or if it should be enacted over a veto, that would take six and one-half billion dollars from the estimated income of the Treasury or $47,200,000,000, which would reduce the estimated income for the fiscal year 1949 to approximately $40,000,000,000.

The joint committee set up in the Reorganization Act met, as the law required, organized, and discussed in one meeting, at least, whether the committee should try to comply with the law by making a report to the two Houses by the 15th of February, or whether it should try to amend the law to postpone that date to some later date in March, April, or May. The committee felt that it could not justify what happened last year, when a stalemate existed as between the figure of the House, a six and one-half billion-dollar reduction in the budget, and the figure of the Senate, calling for a reduction of four and one-half billion dollars. The result was that nothing whatever was done. The two Houses could not get together, and no further meetings were held.

This time we met and organized. We had no information before the joint committee. No one appeared, and no one was asked to appear. Last year the Director of the Budget came before us, and for a day or two we inquired about various items in the budget of the President, which had been made up originally by the Bureau of the Budget and reduced by the President himself by approximately $5,000,000,000. This time we had no information whatever. Perhaps there was not sufficient time, but I felt, and still feel, that it would not have been out of place to have invited witnesses to appear before the joint committee—including the Director of the Budget—to give us a little information about some of the items in the budget.

The joint committee adopted a resolution to reduce the budget by two and one-half billion dollars, whether or no. It simply reached up and pulled down that figure. As I have said, we estimated $47,000,000,000-plus in revenue. That action was a leap in the dark—at least a step in the dark. Perhaps it was not a leap. It may have been an orderly step, but whether it was a step or a leap, it was in the dark, because we do not know whether we can reduce the budget by two and one-half billion dollars. Personally I should be glad if we could reduce it by even more than two and one-half billion dollars, because I recognize the necessity for our Government to get down to a permanent basis of expenditure which, over a period of years, may be regarded as normal. But we cannot do that at this time, as I see it. I do not know how long it will be before we can do it, because whether we want to do it or not, or whether we would like to do it or not, we are bedeviled by obligations which we cannot escape unless we are willing to abandon all efforts to restore and reconstruct the economy of the world, and take our chances on having that economy collapse entirely and go down with it. I do not see how we can suffer the complete collapse of the economy of the world without taking a great chance that ours might also go down, just as Samson pulled the temple down on himself in order to destroy the enemy.

How long that situation may exist, no one is prophet enough to foresee. No one can tell what may happen within the next year. We are supposed to have a surplus of $7,500,000,000 at the end of this fiscal year. That is, according to the budget estimate, there will be in the Treasury unexpended a surplus of seven and one-half billion dollars on the first day of July. We have already reduced that, or are about to do so, by $3,000,000,000, by reason of the bill which will be reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations within a few days, involving the European recovery program. We have said that as a bookkeeping transaction the expenditure of $3,000,000,000 of the $5,300,000,000 proposed to be appropriated shall be credited to the fiscal year 1948. So we must reduce the seven and one-half billion surplus on July 1 by $3,000,000,000, which will be taken out of it, which ordinarily would not come out of it because it would not normally be an expenditure for the fiscal year 1948. That leaves a surplus of $4,500,000,000 on the 1st of July.

In the joint committee the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]—very appropriately, it seemed to me—as chairman of the Committee on Finance and as a Senator on his own responsibility, moved that not less than $2,600,000,000 should be paid on the public debt. So when we subtract $2,600,000,000, which we decided should be paid on the public debt, from $4,500,000,000, we have $1,900,000,000 as a figure around which appropriations which may be contingent upon the action of Congress may fluctuate. So if we advance from the ordinary budget of 1949, $3,000,000,000 paid out of the surplus of 1948 by the creation of a trust fund in the Treasury, and then reduce our public debt by $2,600,000,000, we shall have the figure which I mentioned. I believe that $2,600,000,000 is as little as we ought to reduce the public debt, because we cannot hand all that debt down to future generations. I am very sincere in the view that while we have a national income of nearly $200,000,000,000, and have an income of $47,000,000,000 placed in the Treasury, and have a surplus of $7,500,000,000, we ought to pay even more than $2,600,000,000 on the huge debt which has been created as a result of the war.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not at all disagreeing with the Senator's last statement; but I believe that the present general situation calls for a certain amount of caution regarding the extent to which we reduce the debt. Obviously the reduction of the debt is a contraction of credit; and an extravagant reduction might pull the plug on our economy and cause very devastating results. A cautionary note has come into the Treasury's own opinions on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that viewpoint; yet a reduction of the debt makes more money for expenditure available to those to whom payments are made in the debt reduction. It also involves an element of inflation. We cannot separate that subject from the question of taxes. The release of $6,500,000,000 in taxes to the American people would create that much more spending power and that much more inflation. So what the Senator says about the payment of too large an amount upon the public debt has its relationship to the release to the American people for expenditure of the enormous sums contemplated by the tax bill passed by the House. So if the payment on our public debt of more than $2,600,000,000 would release certain forces of credit or price inflation, certainly too large a tax reduction would do the same thing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I merely wish to suggest that in a situation of some economic flux with possibility of recession, such as the situation in which we find ourselves at the present time, there is strong support for the theory that that is the time to start tax reduction, for a part of the reason relating to mass spending power which the Senator suggests. It does put more spending power in the hands of the people, and thus supports the spending economy, preventing the economy from taking what might otherwise be a more precipitous decline.

Mr. BARKLEY. All those things are double-edged swords. You meet yourself coming back when you argue expenditures and taxes and debt reduction; and it creates the impression which is created by the old adage with which the Senator from Colorado is as familiar in Colorado as we are in Kentucky—that it is impossible to tell from the rattler's track whether he was going or coming back.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is largely true in the case of some of these intricate, complicated transactions.

The point I undertake to make is that if we take $3,000,000,000 out of next

year's expenses and add it to this year's expenses, and $2,600,000,000 out of this year's expenses or next year's expenses—the $2,600,000,000 is in 1949, but a corresponding figure is supposed to be related to 1948—we might wind up the fiscal year with a deficit, instead of with a surplus of any kind, especially in view of the demands upon us which are difficult to escape, such, for instance, European aid, to which I have referred, and also aid to China. We cannot escape them, even if we wished to. But by such bookkeeping juggling we might wind up with a deficit, rather than with a surplus.

For that reason I think we are proceeding without information which is adequate. Perhaps the committee could not have gotten it, but it did not try to get it.

All of that makes me believe that for the next fiscal year we should proceed in such a way that the committee could have no excuse for not getting information, so that we may proceed with some light on the subject.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, under the Treasury's figures and under those of the Joint Committee on Taxation, there seems to be no possible doubt that for this fiscal year there will be a surplus of at least $7,500,000,000. The joint committee estimates it, as I recall, at $8,700,000,000. There is nothing in the present market situation that could disturb that result.

I think that there at least we have a reasonably stable set of figures on which we can work. If we take $2,600,000,000 for debt retirement in this fiscal year and if we transfer $3,000,000,000 for actual ultimate expenditure next year, we still have a pretty good margin this year for, let us call them, contingencies.

Mr. BARKLEY. I tried to point out that the Senator by his ingenious device—I do not mean the word "device" in any invidious sense, but that is what it is—has reduced the $7,500,000,000 surplus to $4,500,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And by the same token, it gives the opportunity for an equal amount of surplus—depending on how we spend—in the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not so certain about that, in view of the background that motivated this ingenious device or maneuver or bookkeeping arrangement to which the Senator from Colorado has lent his great influence and his powerful intellectual ability.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I stated that it would give the opportunity.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but the opportunity may be vitiated by what might happen in the Congress hereafter.

I wish conditions were such that we could reduce the budget even more than that, Mr. President. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] makes frequent reference to a speech I made in New York a year and a half ago, in which I said that after conditions leveled off, after discharging the obligations the war had imposed upon us, I thought we could get down to an annual budget of about $25,000,000 or $26,000,000. I thought so then. Of course, we had no way of knowing then what would come up for mandatory consideration.

I certainly hope the prediction by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] of an annual budget of $45,000,000,000 or $46,000,000,000, or $47,000,000,000 in the future will not come true.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in view of the discussion and debate which took place in both Houses of Congress last year on the legislative budget, and in view of what actually happened to the budget in both Houses of Congress, and in view of what the Congress did to the President's budget recommendations, I am wondering whether the resolution now presented to us is even worth the trouble of writing or printing.

In that regard, I desire to invite attention to but one item which was discussed last year in connection with the legislative budget. It was discussed in the House of Representatives and it was discussed on the floor of the Senate when we were considering the President's budget. The Treasury Department recently announced some statistics on tax refunds in the fiscal year which ended last June 30. They are very interesting statistics, and I am sure many Members of the Senate gave them the attention they deserved.

The statistics show, Mr. President, that in the fiscal year 1947, the Treasury Department refunded a total of nearly $3,000,000,000, the actual total being $2,897,000,000. This includes both Internal Revenue Bureau refunds and Customs Bureau refunds. On income taxes alone, in the fiscal year ending last June 30, the 1947 fiscal year, the Treasury refunded $2,882,735,904. This compares with the Budget Bureau-Treasury Department estimates, beforehand, of such refunds of $2,108,000,000, a difference of about $700,000,000. Originally, in January of 1946, when the first estimate of probable fiscal 1947 tax refunds was made, the Budget Bureau and Treasury estimated them at $1,570,000,000, but subsequently revised the figure upward to $2,108,000,000. This was still, as I have said, about $700,000,000 less than the actual refund made in the 1947 fiscal year.

Of course, Mr. President, the Senate knows what makes these figures on the 1947 fiscal year experience noteworthy today. I think, Mr. President, all of us remember the fight we had here less than a year ago, after a similar battle in the House, over the amount which the Congress should provide for the current fiscal year, the 1948 fiscal year, for Bureau of Internal Revenue to cover this item of income-tax refunds.

As you know, Mr. President, the Republican majority in Congress donned its shining armor, polished and shined its sword and lance, leaped astride an eager and impatient steed, a noble charger called Economy, and galloped to tilt against a wicked monster known as Governmental Extravagance, and known more particularly as a $37,500,000,000 Federal budget for the fiscal year 1948. This shining knight, this defiant warrior, this Republican majority, had roundly boasted it would seize yon budget and smite it a mighty blow, to wit, a $6,000,000,000 blow, which would amputate from said budget the extravagance and waste, the bloated profligacy, the boondoggling.

In this campaign against this monstrous budget, and in support of its proud boast that it would cut this $6,000,000,000 neatly from the budget with battle-ax or meat-ax, the Republican majority, first in the House and then in the Senate, seized upon the item of income-tax refunds, and announced to a breathless Nation and a cheering press that it had scored a great triumph and had, in this one item alone, reduced the budget by the vast sum of $800,000,000. At the rate it was going on this one appropriation bill, the first bill, as I recall, coming before the Eightieth Congress, carrying appropriations for the 1948 fiscal year, the Republican majority was very enthusiastic about its chances of carrying out the proud boast of amputating $6,000,000,000 from the budget.

When the bill containing the $800,000,000 cut on income-tax refunds came up in the House, the ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Committee described the reduction as a phoney reduction and warned his colleagues that in making the $800,000,000 reduction on tax refunds, the Congress was not saving a thin dime, and that all overpayments of taxes would have to be refunded. But a majority party member of the House Appropriations Committee, apparently quite indignant over the suggestion that the Treasury and Budget Bureau estimates were reliable because they were based on experience, insisted that the Appropriations Committee of the House was not only allowed, but qualified, to substitute its own estimate. The cut stood. When the bill came to the Senate, the cut stood, even though the minority members of the Senate Appropriations Committee clearly established in their minority views that the guess made by the majority in both the House and Senate committees was unrealistic and too low. The matter was further developed in the debate on the floor but, alas, all dissent was stifled, and the majority party rode off in triumph with its $800,000,000 cut in the budget safely defended against attack.

Now, Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Treasury Department will soon be running out of money with which to pay off tax refunds due in the current fiscal year. The Congress allowed $1,200,000,000 for this fiscal year. The Budget Bureau and the Treasury had asked for two billion one hundred and eight million. I warned the Senate on July 11 last that the amount appropriated would probably be exhausted by April 1, and that unless the Congress provided additional money, the Government would begin paying 6 percent interest on all refunds it was not able to pay. The 6 percent would continue until the additional funds were made available. Hence, instead of saving $800,000,000, the Congress would actually be losing money for the Government by

tacking on unnecessary interest charges. It certainly is poor business to pay 6 percent interest on a debt merely for the purpose of doctoring up the books in order to make a good showing in 1 month or in one fiscal year, and with no consideration for the over-all net cost of such fiscal legerdemain, such budget sleight-of-hand. Regardless of the entertainment value of such a performance, it is strictly poor "box-office."

Mr. President, I have here an editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin of a few days ago, commenting on the issue of tax refund and phony budget cuts. Pointing out how the Budget Bureau and the Treasury, even with the advantage of long experience in making estimates, substantially underestimated the amount of tax refunds which would have to be paid out in the fiscal year 1947, the Philadelphia Bulletin declared, in connection with the dispute last year over this item in the 1948 budget, that "the President's figure looks closer to probability than the committee's savings," meaning the Appropriations Committee.

Where, oh, where, Mr. President, are those $800,000,000? What has happened to the knight in shining armor, mounted on his steed Economy, who rode out last year on his crusade against the bloated budget, and whose first triumph was the $800,000,000 savings on tax refunds?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the editorial to which I have just referred, from the Philadelphia Bulletin, entitled "Playing at Saving."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAYING AT SAVING

Refunds close to three billion dollars ($2,897,000,000) are due persons and corporations who overpaid their income taxes in the fiscal year 1947, ending June 30 last, according to a Treasury report.

This big sum recalls one of the budget-cutting controversies of last year. The President asked in his budget for the fiscal year 1948 the sum of $2,065,000,000 for tax refunds. The Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee, in their eager hunt for cuts to make up the promised $6,000,000,000 of savings, lopped off $800,000,000 of this sum.

Their Democratic colleagues rudely said this particular saving was phony, since the sum asked for by the President was based on past experience with refunds in proportion to collections.

Now it appears that the President's own refunds estimate was some $800,000,000 less than the refunds actually allowed for the fiscal year 1947. Tax collections for 1948 are running ahead of 1947. The President's figure looks closer to probability than the committee's savings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) was agreed to.

MATERNITY RELIEF FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, approximately 1 year ago I offered an amendment to a bill then pending to provide maternity relief for Government employees. Several Senators who did not vote for the amendment at that time came to me afterward and said that if a separate bill were introduced they would support it. I wish to say that this afternoon the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is reporting to the full committee. In order that Senators may be fully advised as to exactly what the situation is relative to maternity relief for Federal employees, I wish very briefly to state the foreign countries in which such relief is already provided.

In Argentina, Cuba, the Netherlands, Poland, and Spain, a leave period is allowed of 6 weeks before childbirth, and 6 weeks after, with full pay.

The leave period allowed in Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Estonia, and France, is 1 month before childbirth, and 1 month after, with full pay.

The total period of leave allowed, divided before and after childbirth as required for individual cases, with full pay, is, in Greece, 4 months; Brazil, 3 months; Czechoslovakia, 3 months; Norway, 3 months; Sweden, 3 months; Bulgaria, 2 months; Great Britain, varying, but about 2 months; Denmark, 6 weeks, with half pay; Switzerland, 6 weeks, with full pay; and in Yugoslavia, 6 weeks, with full pay. In other countries, particularly Italy, Japan, Peru, Portugal, and Russia, the leave period allowed varies all the way from 1 month to 2 months.

Of all the countries on the face of the globe, it is found that Russia has the most liberal laws dealing with maternity relief for government employees. In order that Members of the Senate may fairly familiarize themselves with the subject before it comes to a vote on the floor of the Senate, which I hope will be soon, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement of Frieda S. Miller, Chief of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, in favor of the bill (S. 784) to provide maternity leave to Federal employees, which statement was made before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FRIEDA S. MILLER IN FAVOR OF S. 784, TO PROVIDE MATERNITY LEAVE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, BEFORE THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 18, 1948

The Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor favors the principle of S. 784, which would grant married women in the Federal service 60 days' maternity leave on doctor's certificate, in addition to sick leave and annual leave provided for Federal workers generally.

The Women's Bureau has long been concerned with promotion of standards and policies to safeguard the physical and economic well-being of the Nation's women workers, now nearly 17,000,000 in number. That task was made the continuing function of the Bureau by congressional mandate in 1920, and quite naturally it has included the development of standards for the protection of employed women. In 1942 the Women's Bureau and Children's Bureau issued a joint statement of recommended standards for maternity care and employment of mothers in industry, in consultation with an advisory committee of physicians, industrial hygienists, and women labor leaders. Those standards, which constitute the present Women's Bureau recommendations, include as one of their recommendations a provision for maternity leave on presentation of a doctor's certificate, one of the standards which would be established by S. 784.

In order to be adequate for the purpose of safeguarding women's employment at childbirth, maternity legislation should meet certain basic needs. One is the need to protect the worker's health. A woman worker should have enough time off before childbirth to prevent undue strain in the latter part of pregnancy and permit her to be in a rested state at the time of delivery. The mother should have sufficient time after delivery to regain her strength before returning to work. The welfare of the new infant and its need for care by the mother during the early period of adjustment is also important. The second urgent need of women workers at this time is that of income maintenance, so that the woman worker can pay her regular running expenses and in addition help meet the extra expenses of medical and hospital care.

The proposed bill, S. 784, would accomplish both of these objectives. By providing a full 60 days' maternity leave in addition to the 15 days' sick leave now allowed all Federal workers, the bill would enable married women workers to take a 14 weeks' leave of absence at childbirth. This conforms to the Women's Bureau standard, which calls for a leave period of 6 weeks before childbirth and 2 months after childbirth. S. 784 would provide income maintenance during the entire period, likewise made possible by combining the proposed maternity leave with existing sick-leave provision. An additional advantage of S. 784 results from the fact that it does not set up new or special machinery for administration. It would be administered in conjunction with existing sick-leave provisions, which would reduce administrative costs to a minimum.

As of December 1947, 400,287 women were employed in the Federal service. This was about half the number employed in the peak war period, when Federal employment included roughly 1,000,000 women. It is unlikely, of course, that the peacetime figure will ever reach the wartime total. However, a Women's Bureau study published in 1941, Employment of Women in the Federal Government, 1923 to 1939, Women's Bureau Bulletin 182, shows a continued growth in such employment, as new services and increased opportunities continue to be open to women. In the 16-year period from 1923 to 1939 the proportion of women to all Government employees advanced from 14.9 percent to 18.8 percent. Moreover, the study showed that women in the Government service are an older group than those in general employment. While in 1930 almost one-third of all women at work throughout the country were 18 but under 25, only about 12 percent of women Government workers in 1938 were that young. The study shows that as of December 1938 the average age for all women in the Federal service was 36.9 years. Assuming that the Federal Government employs as large a proportion of married women as is the case for the country as a whole, it is apparent that S. 784 would benefit a large group of Federal workers of childbearing age.

The problem of protecting married women before and after childbirth is becoming more and more urgent in the United States as an increasing number of such workers enter paid employment outside their homes. Over the past half century the proportion of married women to single women in the labor force has been constantly increasing. In 1900 married women constituted 15 percent of the woman labor force. In 1940 married women were 35 percent of such women. In 1947 the most recent figures available show that almost half of all women in the labor force, 46 percent, were married as compared with 38 percent single women and 16 per-

cent widowed or divorced. While figures are not available to show the proportionate increase of married women in the Federal service, it is reasonable to suppose that the pronounced trend toward increasing employment of married women which characterizes the population as a whole also prevails for that segment of the woman population employed in the Federal service.

Protection of employed women at childbirth is of such importance that the ILO established one of its earliest conventions on this subject. ILO Convention No. 3, adopted in 1919, provides for a rest period of 12 weeks at childbirth, payment of medical benefits adequate to maintain the health of the woman worker and her child, and guaranty of job security. Many countries have adopted similar provisions, either through maternity legislation or a nationwide system of social insurance. The ILO convention does not cover public workers. However, a number of countries with maternity legislation have included such workers in coverage.

The influence of the ILO standards appears in the laws of most countries for the period following 1919 to 1938. No recent general report for all governments is available, due to war's upheaval in so many countries. But as of 1938, when the ILO reported on maternity leave for public workers, most of the governments in the then League of Nations made maternity provisions for their women employees. Some of the general provisions are noted, as follows:

"LEAVE PERIOD ALLOWED

"I. Six weeks before childbirth, 6 weeks after; full pay: Argentina, Cuba, Netherlands, Poland, Spain.

"II. One month before, 1 month after childbirth; full pay: Belgium, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Estonia, France.

"III. A total period of leave allowed, divided before and after childbirth as required for individual cases; full pay: Greece, 4 months; Brazil, 3 months; Czechoslovakia, 3 months; Norway, 3 months; Sweden, 3 months; Bulgaria, 2 months; Great Britain, varied; Denmark, 6 weeks, half pay; Switzerland, 6 weeks, full pay; Yugoslavia, 6 weeks, full pay.

"IV. Varying periods and provisions: Italy, Japan, Peru, Portugal, U. S. S. R."

The Women's Bureau looks forward to the time when standards for maternity protection will be established by law for women workers in all types of employment. In recent years, several proposals have been made for a Nation-wide system of health insurance, which would include maternity protection for women. It is noteworthy, however, that following the usual line of separation between public and private employment, proposals for general insurance programs are limited to private employment and do not cover workers in the Federal service. Should a general Nation-wide health-insurance plan be adopted, separate legislation would doubtless still be necessary to give maternity protection to women Government employees.

S. 784 affords the Government an opportunity to take the lead toward accomplishment of the ultimate objective of maternity protection for all employed women by adopting such legislation for its own women workers. Such pace setting by the Federal Government is not entirely without precedent. The Government was among the first to recognize the principle of equal pay for equal work for women when the Civil Service Commission adopted the Classification Act of 1923. S. 784 affords an opportunity to take similar progressive action in the field of maternity legislation. The Women's Bureau favors the adoption of S. 784.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the testimony of Dr. Martha M. Eliot, Associate Chief, Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY ON S. 784, A BILL TO PROVIDE MATERNITY LEAVE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, BY MARTHA M. ELIOT, M. D., ASSOCIATE CHIEF, CHILDREN'S BUREAU, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE, FEBRUARY 18, 1948

I am glad to appear before your committee in support of S. 784, a bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees. I should make it clear that I am speaking for myself and not for the Administration nor for the Federal Security Agency. The Federal Security Agency has as yet taken no position with respect to this bill.

The Children's Bureau has always been concerned with questions related to the protection of maternity from the point of view of the welfare of the infant as well as that of the mother. Questions as to the wisdom of employment away from home for a woman when she is pregnant have been raised repeatedly. There are indeed different views as to whether a woman who is pregnant should or should not undertake such work. In general, it may be said that a woman who is expecting a child should give first consideration to her own health and the welfare of her child. If, however, circumstances are such that employment is necessary, special plans should be made to safeguard both the mother and child. One of these safeguards has been found to be the establishment of a general policy calling for the granting of a period of maternity leave both before and after the birth of the child. The basis for such a policy is to be found in investigations of the effect of employment of the mother on the infant mortality rates and on the duration of pregnancy.

In its early studies of infant mortality, the Children's Bureau found that employment of mothers away from their homes during pregnancy was associated with a high neonatal infant mortality rate (infant death rate during the first month of life), with a high percentage of premature births, and with a high stillbirth rate. Furthermore, it was found that the influence of such employment during pregnancy on the infant death rate was greater the shorter the interval of rest before confinement. When there was no interval between cessation of the mother's work and her confinement, the death rate of infants under 1 month was nearly double that when there was an interval of 1 month or more. These same studies also showed that if the mothers went back to work before the baby was 2 months old the infant mortality rate was three times the average rate.

In the 30 years since these studies were made, the death rates of infants in the second to the twelfth months of life have been reduced greatly; death rates in the first month of life very much less. Today more than half of all infant deaths occur in the first month of life, and, of these, half are the result of premature birth. Much of our present day effort to lower infant mortality, therefore, must be directed toward overcoming any adverse conditions that are the cause of premature delivery.

It is the consensus of opinion among obstetricians that fatigue must be avoided in the last few weeks of pregnancy. Studies have been made showing that the duration of pregnancy depends upon the extent to which the patient can spare herself during the last months of pregnancy. One such study concludes that hard work in poorly nourished women predisposes to the premature ending of pregnancy. Other studies corroborate this, showing that women who can rest during the last 6 to 8 weeks of pregnancy are less likely to have a premature termination of pregnancy. As has been pointed out already, premature birth is one of the major causes of death of the baby in the neonatal period. Any factor which contributes to premature birth must be avoided if at all possible so that the baby will have a better chance of survival. Dr. Stewart Clifford, a leading pediatrician, of Boston, has made the statement that because of the rapid gain in weight of the fetus in these last weeks of pregnancy even a slight prolongation makes the outlook for the infant more favorable.

It is well known to obstetricians also that fatigue and anxiety can contribute to the pain and fatigue of labor itself, and that women who are relaxed and rested are more likely to have a short and easy labor and a satisfactory period of convalescence.

The pelvic organs require about 6 weeks to return to normal after the birth of a child. Although it is no longer the practice for women to be kept in bed for the long periods formerly considered necessary after childbirth, obstetricians recommend that normal activities be resumed gradually. It usually takes from 6 weeks to 2 months after childbirth for a woman to become as active as she was before. The demands on her for the care of her baby are particularly intensive during this time, and the emotional security of the young baby depends a great deal on the consistent attention and care of his mother. If a mother is breast-feeding her child she contributes both physically and emotionally to his well-being, and physicians have strongly urged that breast-feeding be continued for at least the first 2 months of the baby's life, even if, under special circumstances, it cannot be continued longer. Studies of the effect of a mother's employment on her ability to breast-feed her child indicate that employment during pregnancy has little effect on whether or not she will be able to breast-feed her child, but it is well known that mothers who must return to employment early tend to wean their babies early.

When a mother is wholly or partly dependent on her own earnings for her livelihood and that of her children she is apt to be anxious and upset when she must give up her work because of pregnancy or at the time of confinement. This is not conducive to normal childbirth; it may result in premature delivery or interfere with successful breast-feeding. If such a mother can be assured of a period of rest and financial security during the latter part of pregnancy and the first few weeks after the birth of her child the likelihood of a successful outcome in terms of a healthy baby and of her own health is greater.

During the recent war there was a very considerable increase in the number of women employed in industry and by Government. Many of these women were married, and inquiries came to the Children's Bureau and to the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor concerning types of work suitable for pregnant women and the policy of these Bureaus with respect to maternity leave.

In July 1942, after consultation with representatives of labor and with obstetricians and an expert in industrial hygiene, the Children's Bureau and Women's Bureau together issued a statement of standards for maternity care and employment of mothers, including maternity leave. Though it was found impossible to lay down hard-and-fast rules that would fit every situation, a general policy was agreed upon. The standards included provision for prenatal care, limitation of hours of work, rest periods, and exclusion from employment involving certain hazardous occupations.

A period of 14 weeks (98 days) maternity leave was recommended, 6 weeks before delivery and 8 weeks after, with extension beyond these periods on presentation of a physician's certificate that complications of pregnancy or the postpartum period made continued employment prejudicial to the health of mother or child.

The bill that is before us provides for maternity leave with pay for 60 days within any period of 12 consecutive calendar months and does not require that an applicant for maternity leave shall use sick leave or annual leave for this purpose.

Except that the period of 60 days is shorter than the period recommended by the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau, the provisions of this bill would appear to be satisfactory from a health point of view. The continuation of full pay during the period of maternity leave would give assurance of financial security and relief from anxiety that is so important for mothers who find it necessary to work during pregnancy. The preservation of sick leave and annual leave to meet the needs of the mother if she is sick early in pregnancy or in case of prolonged incapacity after the expiration of the maternity leave would appear to be in the interests of returning the mother to good health before she must take up her work again.

Some difference of opinion may arise as to whether the period of maternity leave with pay for Government workers who are allowed 26 days of annual leave and 15 days of sick leave should be the same length as the period recommended for workers in industry. If the mother working for the Government is expected to use her sick and annual leave for maternity leave, she would have only 8 weeks in all for this purpose. This not only falls short of the recommended amount, but deprives her of any additional leave in case of other sickness, either her own or that of her child. It is our opinion that 60 days of maternity leave with pay for Government workers is a minimum provision; it would be preferable to allow 90 days if the health of both mother and child is to be assured.

Finally, in considering the length of maternity leave that should be available to women workers, I would like to bring to the attention of this committee the recommendations of a committee on the health of women in industry of the section on obstetrics and gynecology of the American Medical Association, appointed in 1942 to study these and other questions relating to the employment of women.[1] This committee was composed of leading obstetricians of the country. As a result of their study, some conclusions were reached which were presented to the Fifth Annual Congress on Industrial Health in 1943. The recommendations of this committee state, in part:

"Normal pregnant women need reasonable activity, but when employment is necessary, stresses and strains should be eliminated. Continuance of employment is common practice in the first half of pregnancy or perhaps longer, depending on the woman's physical tolerance to the type of work. * * *

"The pregnant employee should not be employed after the thirty-second week of pregnancy (that is, within 6 weeks of term). It is believed that the discontinuance of employment in the last trimester would benefit many prospective mothers, if economic circumstances permit. * * *

"The patient should not return to work until 6 weeks after delivery and then only when her physician notifies the employer that she may return. If her return to work at 6 weeks is inadvisable because of her own condition or because her baby actually needs her at home, she should request further extension of time."

[1] Journal of the American Medical Association.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was impelled to say what I have said this afternoon by reason of the almost unanimous testimony of the following persons in favor of the bill:

Rear Adm. Paul B. Niebecker, director of industrial relations for the Navy; Judge Fay Bentley; Miss Gehri, superintendent of the House of Mercy; Col. Charles I. Stengle, representative, American Federation of Government Employees; the United Public Workers of America; Dr. John W. Cronin, chief of Federal Employment Section, Public Health Service of Federal Security Agency; Miss Linda Woods, Columbia Hospital; Dr. J. Bay Jacobs, clinic director of obstetrics, Bureau of Maternal and Child Welfare, District Health Department; Dr. H. J. Davis, clinic director of pediatrics, Bureau of Maternal and Child Welfare, District Health Department; Mrs. R. M. Kendrick, executive secretary, National Association of Colored Women; Miss Plunkett, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor; Miss Fairchild, International Labor Organization; Dr. Martha Elliott, Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency; Mr. Mason, American Federation of Labor; Mrs. Delia Maulding, Department of the Interior; Maj. Humber L. Rivas, chief of obstetrics, Office of the Surgeon General; Dr. Goldstein, group health.

I may say, Mr. President, that at quarter of 2 today, the President's personal physician at the White House, Dr. Graham, began testifying, and I understand that his testimony is in favor of the passage of the bill.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I am taking this rather unusual step so that all Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the subject by reading the testimony of two witnesses who I consider are among the most able of those who have testified. Both pieces of testimony are very short.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY:

From the Committee on Banking and Currency:

M. S. Szymczak, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1948 (reappointment).

From the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Isaac N. P. Stokes, of the District of Columbia, to the position of Solicitor, Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, Air Force of the United States, to be senior Air Force member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ADVISORY AND PLANNING GROUP IN GREECE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, O3847, United States Army, to be Director, Joint United States Military Advisory and Planning Group in Greece, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Edwin D. Foster to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the nominations in the Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Air Force nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until next Friday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, February 20, 1948, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

R. Borden Reams, of Pennsylvania, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Myron L. Black, of Pennsylvania.
Charles P. O'Donnell, of Illinois.
Thomas K. Wright, of Rhode Island.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Frederick H. Awalt, of Maine.
Neill M. Coney, Jr., of Georgia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ralph A. Jones, of Pennsylvania.
Robert J. MacQuaid, of Pennsylvania.

PUBLIC HOUSING COMMISSIONER

John Taylor Egan, of New York, to be Public Housing Commissioner.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Daniel Shapiro
Clyde H. Dabbs, Jr.
Edmund V. Cowdry, Jr.
Robert B. Neu
John P. Lombardi

IN THE MARINE CORPS

James J. Gorman, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 2), 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

Maj. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, Air Force of the United States, to be senior Air Force member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

ADVISORY AND PLANNING GROUP IN GREECE

Maj. Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, O3847, United States Army, to be Director, Joint United States Military Advisory and Planning Group in Greece, with the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Edwin D. Foster to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals of the line

Frank Allen
George Griffin Finch
Leonard Ewing Thomas

AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947, WITH DATE OF RANK TO BE AS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE AFORE-MENTIONED TITLE

To be major generals

William E. Kepner
St. Clair Streett
Muir Stephen Fairchild
Ennis Clement Whitehead
Nathan Farragut Twining
Idwal Hubert Edwards
Grandison Gardner
Franklin Otis Carroll
Charles Carl Chauncey
Kenneth Bonner Wolfe
Clements McMullen
Howard Arnold Craig
Hubert Reilly Harmon
Willis Henry Hale
James Pratt Hodges
Robert Morris Webster
Thomas Dresser White
Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw
Frederick William Evans
Paul Langdon Williams
Lauris Norstad
Curtis Emerson LeMay
Edward Michael Powers

To be brigadier generals

Edwin Bowman Lyon
Adlai Howard Gilkeson
Harold Mark McClelland
Thomas James Hanley, Jr.
Robert LeGrow Walsh
Eugene Lowry Eubank
Caleb Vance Haynes
Fred Sidney Borum
Frederick Mercer Hopkins, Jr.
Orvil Arson Anderson
Robert Wilkins Douglass, Jr.
Leo Andrew Walton
Gordon Philip Saville
John Edwin Upston
Earle Everard Partridge
Lyman Perley Whitten
Elwood Richard Quesada
Alvan Cleveland Kincaid
Bob Edward Nowland
William Donald Old
Robert Wells Harper
Glen Clifford Jamison
Earl Seeley Hoag
Richard Emmel Nugent
Ralph Francis Stearley
Albert Francis Hegenberger
Laurence Carbee Craigie
David Myron Schlatter
Otto Paul Weyland
Orval Ray Cook
Alden Rudyard Crawford
Charles Trovilla Myers
Carl Brown McDaniel
Charles Bertody Stone 3d
Earl Walter Barnes
Arthur Thomas
George Clement McDonald
George Pearré Cabell
John DeForest Barker
Charles White Lawrence
James Somers Stowell
Howard McMath Turner
Tom Christopher Rives
Hugo Peoples Rush
Fay Roscoe Upthegrove
Edmund Clayton Lynch
James Frederick Phillips
Frederick von Harten Kimble
Dale Vincent Gaffney

APPOINTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 37 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT, AS AMENDED

To be brigadier generals

Erik Henning Nelson
Henry Lee Badham, Jr.
John Mirza Bennett, Jr.
Joseph Francis Carroll
Robert Emmet Condon
Everett Richard Cook
Robert Lynn Copsey
Bradley Johnson Gaylord
John Philip Henebry
Theron Baldwin Herndon
James Howell Howard
William Chesley Lewis
Chester E. McCarthy
Arthur Lee McCullough
Dick Royal Petty
William Leroy Plummer
Franklin Rose
Robert James Smith
Ray James Stecker
Luther Wallace Sweetser, Jr.
Joseph Lafeton Whitney

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 515, OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major generals

Edwin Bowman Lyon
Leo Andrew Walton
Alvan Cleveland Kincaid
Earl Seeley Hoag
Fred Sidney Borum
John Edwin Upston
Bob Edward Nowland
Caleb Vance Haynes
Lucas Victor Beau
Frederick Mercer Hopkins, Jr.
John DeForest Barker
Lyman Perley Whitten
Patrick Weston Timberlake
Charles White Lawrence
Alden Rudyard Crawford
Charles Trovilla Myers
John Maurice Weikert
Richard Emmel Nugent
James Somers Stowell
Charles Pearré Cabell
Earl Walter Barnes
Glenn Oscar Barcus
Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt
Leon William Johnson
Gordon Philip Saville
Walter Edwin Todd
Roger Maxwell Ramey
Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr.
William Fulton McKee
Richard Clark Lindsay
Robert Merrill Lee

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Oscar C. Badger, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Commander, Naval Forces, Western Pacific.

Rear Adm. Cato D. Glover, Jr., for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

Rear Adm. Henry R. Oster, for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS TO THE PERMANENT GRADE IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be major generals

Alfred H. Noble
Graves B. Erskine

To be brigadier generals

Edward A. Craig
Thomas J. Cushman

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Arthur J. Hagan, St. Cecilia's Church, Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Almighty and eternal God, we lift our hearts and minds to Thee in prayer. We believe in Thee; we hope in Thee; and we love Thee above all things, with our whole heart and soul. Because Thou art infinitely good and worthy of all love, have compassion on us all, Thy servants, and grant us wisdom and understanding that we may know Thy holy will, and grant us courage and fortitude to do Thy will. We beseech Thee to grant that we, as a nation and a people, will continue to help our less fortunate brothers and sisters in other lands; that we may ever keep in mind that the Eternal Father, our God, is the Creator of all men, regardless of race, creed, or color; that Jesus Christ, our Saviour, died upon the cross for the redemption of all mankind. Enkindle in our hearts, dear Jesus, a burning desire to love Thee more ardently, to serve Thee more faithfully, and to love our neighbor out of love for Thee; that we here in America, by our adherence to Thy law and our way of life, may be forever an inspiring ray of hope to a war-torn and confused world that is clouded in despair and fear. This we ask in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 17, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 18, 1948:

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell;

H. P. 928. An act for the relief of Riyoko Patell;

H. R. 1078. An act for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of August W. Dietz;

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy Park Farrow;

H. R. 3168. An act for the relief of Antone G. Pina;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25); and

H. R. 4115. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.

On February 19, 1948:

H. R. 1634. An act to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution establishing the ceiling for expenditures for the fiscal year 1949 and for appropriations for the fiscal year 1949 to be expended in said fiscal year.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 122. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; and

S. 1133. An act providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include radio addresses by certain persons.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered on February 12.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of volunteer firemen.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a letter received from a resident of Meriden, Conn., and in the other a tabulation setting forth the cost of the foreign aid program to the 16 towns composing the Third Congressional District of Connecticut.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tabulations.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Senator BALDWIN.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a chapter from Mr. Hull's book.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Senator MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, at a meeting of the Lincoln Day Club in his district on February 12.

Mr. BREHM (at the request of Mr. MCCOWEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln's Day address.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. ELLSWORTH BISHOP FOOTE.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each some printed material.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by our distinguished Speaker in Missouri recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement recently made by Mr. Joseph Scott before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Miss Jessie Sumner. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $213, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORTS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file supplemental reports on the bills H. R. 3628, H. R. 4272, and H. R. 4515.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WHEN IS AN EMBARGO NOT AN EMBARGO?

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning most of you undoubtedly read the A. P. dispatch under the headline, "United States gas and oil exports halted."

If you read the body of the dispatch, it was immediately clear that it was not the exports which had been halted, but rather the issuance of all export licenses—a completely futile gesture, because the licenses already in existence could be used to drain off vitally needed fuel oil.

The worst of the situation was that our neighbors had indicated that they would be glad to accept an actual reduction in the amount of 50,256,544 gallons of all kinds of fuel oil and gasoline, including motor and aviation gas. This was 1,198,036 barrels.

Responsible witnesses have testified before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that an export license is not used for a period of several days and sometimes for as much as 2 weeks. So this definitely was not the effective action taken on the east coast recently which resulted in turning an anticipated deficit into a substantial reserve by March 31.

It is impossible to justify this continually hesitating and inadequate action by the Department which is specifically charged by law with the wise exercise of those controls.

This morning testifying before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Mr. John Boatwright, one of the foremost economists in the oil industry, stated that if the Midwest could receive half of this amount of fuel oil and the North Atlantic ports the remaining half, barring a major catastrophe, he would guarantee that that would get us through the rest of the heating season in those shortage areas. When I inquired what his affiliated companies and others would do with this oil if shipments were halted for 48 hours, he said the answer was obvious, that they could not afford to tie up their tankers and tank cars, and would send them to domestic destinations. I then prepared a telegram addressed to Mr. Blaisdell, and having in mind that the Review Committee was undoubtedly in session, I asked Mr. Boatwright to pass upon it. He said that, if my figures were correct, it was a sound suggestion, and he approved of the telegram. I assured him that the figures were Department of Commerce figures. The full message was at once telephoned to Mr. Blaisdell's office with the request it be transmitted to him immediately. Then the telegram was sent.

During the course of the afternoon I received word that Mr. Blaisdell was sending me a telegram. The telegram arrived at the end of the afternoon. It is included herewith.

It is quite obvious to anyone that 599,000 multiplied by 2 equals 1,198,000. Therefore, if one disregards the odd amount of 36 gallons, what was done was to take one-half of the offered reduction and release for shipment the other half. Stated another way, 25,158,000 gallons were obtained and can now be loaded on tankers going overseas which cannot be retrieved. A T-2 carries approximately 130,000 gallons, which means a little over four voyages to carry 599,000 gallons. If those four voyages start from the Gulf and west coast for Asia, Africa, Europe, Australia, or New Zealand we can face the possibility of a 50-percent shortage at home, when these very countries have told our responsible authorities that they could get along without this fuel oil and would be perfectly willing for us to have it.

I therefore prepared another brief telegram calling for an embargo of shipments, not of issuing licenses, until Monday night. I do not know whether the Department has granted it, but I do know that the Department understands it is the practically unanimous demand of the New England House delegation that every New England Senator whom I could reach has joined, and that I confidently believe that the entire delegations of the Atlantic seaboard and Northwest States will join in that demand before tomorrow night. If the Department chooses to ignore this kind of a serious request, the responsibility is entirely its own, and it alone must be made to answer to anyone who suffers by such an inexplicable and unjustifiable act. I, also, sent a short wire to the port directors at Long Beach, Stockton, Los Angeles, and Vallejo, in California; Port Arthur, Beaumont, Corpus Christi, Brownsville, and Port Isabel, in Texas; Lake Charles and New Orleans, in Louisiana; Gulfport, in Mississippi; Mobile, in Alabama; and Tampa, Jacksonville, Pensacola, Panama City, Port St. Joe, and Carrabell, in Florida. I am informed that these are the shipping points on the Gulf and west coast. I hope to have full information here by Monday so I can submit it to the Department and so it can never state that it could not have done the one thing necessary—permit the domestic voyages of these loaded tankers in the face of assigned destinations overseas. It needs no powers of allocations or other form of control and no amount of shadow boxing or intellectual dishonesty can stand the test of the direct, practical, and sensible testimony of Mr. John Boatwright.

I also include, for the information of the Members, a tabulation of the reductions which were indicated as possible by these several countries and the full story of the gyrations of the Department of Commerce on February 17, as reported over the Associated Press teletype. You will note that the Associated Press very properly carried a bulletin to all editors, asking for the withholding of the publication of night lead oil A22WX, and stating the Commerce Department had withdrawn a stop order and a substitute story was being prepared. Anyone who reads the original dispatch will note that the identical order was entered within a very short time. One inference, of course, is that someone in the Commerce Department was attempting to use a responsible news service to attempt to sound out public opinion through publication in the first editions and perhaps to lull the public who read the first editions into believing shipments had been stopped to save fuel for American households. The description of the day's efforts of the Department as a "climatic step" might be better described as a "clown-matic step."

I submit that a very heavy responsibility for a worsening condition will rest squarely on the shoulders of those who could have prevented the condition but have not done so. In fact, I still think that the only safe course is for us to order an embargo by legislation, at least to the extent of reducing quotas that the countries themselves have stated were acceptable to them. Our failure to do this may well be considered by any impartial person that we, too, are then responsible for any unfortunate situation which may arise throughout the remainder of this heating season.

FEBRUARY 19, 1948.

THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.
Director of Office of International Trade,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.:

Text of Associated Press dispatch confirmed by telephone report from Department yesterday indicated 48-hour order related only to suspension of issuance of licenses and not prohibition of shipments during that period. As I indicated this was not my suggestion and is not in conformity with the existing embargo of any shipments from east coast ports. In view of news accounts that this form of relief has been one major factor in changing an estimated deficit March 31 on east coast of about 2,000,000 barrels to a surplus of 5,029,000 barrels, it seems to me most wise to use this practical method of building further reserves on east coast.

Mr. Boatwright has just endorsed this suggestion substantially.

Please advise at once whether you will do this now. Understand review committee was in session yesterday on quota revisions. Please advise them of this testimony.

JOHN W. HESELTON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives:

In reply to your telegram this date, Commerce Department has made no modification previously announced policy of issuing no licenses for export from east-coast ports. Only modification in operations is the reduction in amounts to be licensed to conform with advice from United States Embassies abroad, which is being announced today.

THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.,
Director, Office of International Trade.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1948.*

Mr. THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, *Director,*
Office of International Trade,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.:

Request embargo shipment petroleum and petroleum products from Gulf and west coast to Monday night pending receipt information.

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Chairman,
House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; WILSON D. GILLETTE; OREN HARRIS; JOSEPH P. O'HARA; J. PERRY PRIEST; MARION T. BENNETT; HARRIS ELLSWORTH; ROBERT HALE; WILLIAM J. MILLER; HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.; JAMES I. DOLLIVER; EDWARD J. ELSAESSER; DWIGHT L. ROGERS; JOHN B. BENNETT; FRED E. BUSBEY; HENDERSON H. CARSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1948.*
Mr. THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, *Director,*
Office of International Trade,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.:

Request embargo shipment petroleum and petroleum products from Gulf and west coast to Monday night pending receipt information.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, ROBERT HALE, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, FRANK FELLOWS, CHESTER MERROW, NORRIS COTTON, CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, JOHN E. FOGARTY, ANTONI N. SADLAK, WILLIAM J. MILLER, ELLSWORTH B. FOOTE, JAMES T. PATTERSON, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, CHARLES R. CLASON, JOHN F. KENNEDY, PHILIP J. PHILBIN, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, GEORGE J. BATES, THOMAS J. LANE, ANGIER L. GOODWIN, DONALD W. NICHOLSON, RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN LODGE, JOHN W. HESELTON, Members of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1948.*
Mr. THOMAS C. BLAISDELL,
Director, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:

Request embargo shipment petroleum and petroleum products from Gulf and west coast to Monday night pending receipt information.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
New Hampshire.
Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Maine.
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Massachusetts.
Senator RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
Connecticut.
Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Massachusetts.
JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON D. C., *February 19, 1948.*
DIRECTOR OF PORT,
Houston, Tex.:

Please advise tankers with their capacity, name, and destinations, and type of petroleum and petroleum products loaded since Monday, or to be loaded by next Monday, inclusive.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 19, 1948.
THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.,
Director, Office of International Trade,
Washington, D. C.:

Received your reply to my telegram of this noon and from press release note total reduction of 599,000 barrels. Have not received country-by-country revised allocations. Shall appreciate having 30 as soon as possible. Several points crystal clear. That reduction does not conform with advice of United States Embassies abroad by 499,036 barrels. That advice of Mr. Boatwright is completely ignored when he said full 1,118,000 barrels minimum needed to avoid shortages for rest of heating season. That review committee and Department has again chosen to disregard the solemn offers of our neighboring countries to reduce their allotments after Secretary Marshall's request for consultations "to determine what further reductions in the revised first-quarter petroleum allocations can be achieved without probable serious economic disruption." That Office has again chosen to ignore not only my request but the requests of a substantial majority of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—all on that committee available today—of all but two, at least of the New England delegation in the House, of six New England Senators. I hope to forward similar requests to you tomorrow from other States. Please advise in detail by tomorrow night the full reasons for this 50-percent reduction in the face of carefully estimated replies to Secretary Marshall's cables whether another review and additional 50-percent reduction can be made by Saturday night; also, please forward minutes or attested copy of minutes of all meetings dealing with reductions since January. With reference to repeated statement that Department has no power to direct shipments, please reconcile with testimony of Mr. Boatwright today that if shipping embargo ordered today to oversea points major companies would not permit tankers to remain idle and would ship to east coast. I am canvassing Gulf and west coast loading points to locate tankers to carry additional 599,036 barrels to east coast. In view of Mr. Boatwright's assurance this would prevent any shortage east coast and Midwest for balance of heating season, will you permit shipping embargo to remain only until sufficient tankers sail for east coast to carry this amount of heating oil.

JOHN W. HESELTON,
Member of Congress.

Bulletin, night lead oil:

"WASHINGTON, February 17 (AP).—The Commerce Department tonight stopped granting export licenses for gasoline and fuel oil for 48 hours, effective at once."

Bulletin matter, Washington first add night lead oil at once:

"The embargo will permit officials to scan foreign oil needs. It may result in a further cut in export quotas, to save oil for fuel-starved American homes.

"The Department already has cut oil export quotas for this quarter by 27 percent. An embargo on shipments from the east coast, the worst shortage area, also is in effect."

Washington, second add night lead oil in effect:

"The new shut-down on licensing will apply to west coast and Gulf ports as well, a Department spokesman said. It probably will not halt shipments already at shipside or in transit, he reported, but this question has not been finally settled.

"The Department has asked United States Embassies overseas to find out if foreign countries can get along with less oil. The embargo on new export licenses will permit Commerce officials to study the replies and take action accordingly, the spokesman said.

"Representative HESELTON, Republican, Massachusetts, announced on the House floor that the foreign countries agreed to take less.

"This, he said, will mean several million more barrels of oil for American householders.

"The earlier cut in export quotas, announced January 30, reduced the planned foreign shipments by 3,700,000 barrels for the January-February-March quarter."

Bulletin. Editors:

"WASHINGTON.—Please withhold publication of night lead oil. The Commerce Department has withdrawn the stop order. A substitute story is being prepared.

"THE AP."

Bulletin, sub night lead oil:

"WASHINGTON, February 17 (AP).—The Commerce Department tonight announced that a new slash in oil export quotas may be announced tomorrow, to save fuel for American households."

Bulletin matter, Washington, first add sub night lead oil households:

"The Department yanked back, at the last moment, an order halting the issuance of all gasoline and fuel-oil export licenses for 48 hours.

"The embargo on licenses already had been released for publication by a Department spokesman when the contrary decision was made.

"The Department has queried United States embassies abroad to find out whether foreign countries can get along with less American oil.

"The licensing embargo was planned to give the Department time to study the replies, a spokesman said.

"Representative HESELTON, Republican, Massachusetts, announced on the House floor that the foreign countries agreed to reduced shipments.

"This, he said, will mean several million more barrels for householders on the oil-starved east coast and other sections.

"An earlier cut in the official export quota chopped the planned first-quarter shipments from 11,850,000 barrels to 9,650,000 barrels. A deep slash in shipments to Japan brought the total savings to 3,700,000 barrels."

Second night lead oil:

"WASHINGTON, February 17 (AP).—The Commerce Department tonight halted the issuance of all export licenses for gasoline and fuel oil for 48 hours.

"Before Friday a new cut in export quotas probably will be announced, a Department spokesman said, to save oil for chilly American homes.

"The decision was announced after two false starts. Shortly after 5 p. m., eastern standard time, the Department told reporters of the temporary license suspension.

"Within half an hour an information official notified reporters that the suspension had been called off. Instead, he said, an announcement of a cut in quotas was being prepared. Then—in another half hour—the Department officially announced that the suspension was in force.

"The cut-off of licensing will permit officials to scan foreign-oil needs. American embassies abroad have been queried and a good many replies have been received.

"They indicate, a spokesman said, that foreign governments can stand another cut in oil deliveries. Shipments to 30 or more countries were slashed by 3,700,000 barrels on January 30."

Washington, first add second night lead oil, January 30:

"The new order will not halt oil which is at shipside or already in transit.

"Before the Commerce Department had made up its mind, Representative HESELTON, Republican, of Massachusetts, announced on the House floor that the foreign countries had agreed to take less oil.

"Later, he told reporters that cables so far received from the embassies indicated a saving of 21,500,000 gallons of fuel oil and kerosene alone for American consumers, or about 500,000 barrels. Gasoline savings also may be possible, he said.

"HESELTON asked an outright embargo on all shipments, rather than the suspension of licenses. He said the Department would be derelict in its duty if it did not take immediate steps to save the 21,500,000 gallons.

"The license cut-off was a climactic step in the Department's effort to cope with vast oil demands growing out of an almost Nation-wide cold spell.

"A week ago all shipments were halted from the east coast, the worst shortage area. That order did not block shipments from west coast and Gulf ports, however.

"The new action bars licenses for shipment from any port. When it is lifted Friday morning, the spokesman said, the east-coast embargo will remain in force. It is due to run to March 31."

Washington, second add second night lead oil, March 31:

"Other developments came along to cheer chilly householders:

"An Italian decision to let this country use 10 tankers to bring in Caribbean oil was announced by the Maritime Commission.

"Italy has bought the United States-built vessels, but they are still in the Commission's laid-up fleet. Delivery of six other tankers to Italy will be delayed.

"Two oil-company presidents forecast improving supplies, in testimony before the House Interstate Commerce Committee.

"M. J. Rathbone, head of Esso Standard Oil Co., said it appears the oil industry will meet the fuel situation this winter without too much hardship. 'The surest way to get a greater supply of oil over the long term is to let the law of supply and demand and price work freely,' he said.

"Robert G. Dunlop, president of Sun Oil, testified that recent price boosts for crude oil will spur production. But he said there has been a vast increase in the number of oil burners in the Nation. 'Oil cannot heat all homes in the country,' he warned.

"He suggested that oil rapidly is becoming too valuable to be burned in furnaces and under boilers and that part of the load should be shifted to natural gas.

"A suggestion to prevent more oil worldwide shortages in future winters came from the House Committee on Foreign Aid. It proposed that foreign nations build fewer cargo ships and more tankers.

"The trans-Arabian pipe line should be finished quickly, the committee's report said. It urged speedy expansion of pipe lines in this country.

"Meanwhile, leaders of the soft-coal industry met here and agreed to set up an advisory council to help the Interior Department on fuel problems. The 16 producers will meet March 16 to organize formally.

"Secretary Krug urged the group to seek solutions to the shortage of coal cars and coal-mining equipment."

EXCISE TAX ON SHEEP OR LAMB PELTS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the excise tax on furs at the present time is 20 percent, and there was collected last year by this tax $99,000,000. While the Treasury Department was not able to segregate what is commonly known as fur from products made from the hide or pelt of sheep or lambs, it is known that the hide of these animals is sold in the form of fur coats and other wearing apparel as mouton, karakul, sealskin, lambskin, and beaver. This is done even though the base product is the hide of a sheep or lamb.

The number of sheep in this country has decreased over the last 5 years from 49,000,000 to 33,000,000. Recently at Geneva the excise tax on sheep and lamb hides was drastically cut. All this adds up to the end of the sheep business, a basic industry of the West, if something is not done.

In a bill which I am introducing today I propose to eliminate the 20-percent excise tax from products made of the hide or pelt of sheep or lambs. I hope I can have the support of all who wish to save this industry in the passage of this legislation.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, I reluctantly cast my vote against passage under the suspension of the rules of two bills increasing the benefits to veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. There were several reasons for the conclusion I reached and I stated those reasons in the RECORD of February 4. For one thing, I wanted to register my opposition to passing bills of such far-reaching importance and involving hundreds of millions of dollars without ample debate and without having an opportunity to suggest amendments. It was my contention that the Servicemen's Readjustment Act could be so amended that certain abuses that have developed since these bills came out of committee would be eliminated and sufficient funds saved to pay an increased subsistence allowance to those continuing their training.

According to the Washington Star of February 17, the wording of the new law passed by Congress to increase subsistence allowances has brought about conflicting interpretations. Now, the Veterans' Administration declares that the new increases will not apply to those trainees taking farm training, even though part of it is in colleges. The Veterans' Administration also lists other groups of trainees that will be excluded from the increased allowances.

If there had been adequate debate and consideration given to these bills, we would not have today so many conflicting interpretations. The question of including the on-the-farm trainees was referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE], author of the bill. He is quoted on page 1002 of the RECORD of February 3 as stating that, as far as he was concerned, the on-the-farm trainees were included in the bill. According to the author of the bill, that was the understanding of the subcommittee which approved the bill.

I hope in the future we can have ample time to consider all veterans' legislation and not permit our hearts to run away with our heads.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Joseph News-Press entitled "Timely Observations."

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Christian Science Monitor, and in another instance to include an article from the Washington Post, and in another instance to include a resolution which he introduced today.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Women's League of Americanism. Three women were in my office this morning, and they wanted me to insert that in the Appendix of the RECORD, which it gives me pleasure to do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain excerpts.

OREGON'S EIGHTY-NINTH BIRTHDAY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 14 Oregon celebrated its eighty-ninth birthday, having been admitted to the Union on Valentine's Day, 1859.

Being a native-born Oregonian, I am deeply interested in the early history of the State and the old Oregon Trail, which has been the subject of discussion by historians and others interested in our early history. My father and mother traveled the old Oregon Trail by ox team from Iowa to Oregon in 1852 and I have inherited their deep interest in the development of the West.

The so-called Oregon country has been subject to much change, as to the area covered, from early times until its admission into the Union as a Territory. Originally the name was applied to the land extending north and south of the Columbia River and west of the Rocky Mountains. Later it was restricted to the land lying between 54°40'' and 42° west of the Rocky Mountains. In 1846 the forty-ninth parallel became the northern boundary, although during the Polk campaign the slogan was "Fifty-four forty or fight."

This territory was variously claimed by Spain, Russia, Great Britain, and the United States. Spanish explorers were the first to see the Oregon coast and the Russians occupied the Alaskan Territory and their explorations extended south into California. The English, through various expeditions and fur traders, explored the area and made settlements therein. By the Treaty of Ghent at the close of the War of 1812, Great Britain and the United States agreed to restore to each other all places and territory captured during the war, and the British released under this treaty Fort George, now known as Astoria, which was a recognition of the United States claim to the Oregon country. Later, by negotiation, the forty-ninth parallel was established as the boundary between the

United States and the British possessions from the Lake of the Woods to the Rocky Mountains. In 1819 Spain gave up her claim to all territory north of the forty-second parallel, which is the present southern boundary of Oregon, and in 1824–25 in a treaty with the United States and Great Britain, Russia relinquished any claim to the territory south of 54°40''. This left the territory to the United States and Great Britain, which later was divided by agreement in accordance with the present boundary lines.

The migrations of settlers into the Oregon country began in 1841 and continued intermittently until the big trek in 1852. On August 13, 1848, Congress passed a law creating the Territory of Oregon, embracing all the country between the forty-second and forty-ninth parallels from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific. This definitely fixed the limits of Oregon. The following year the Territorial government was put into operation.

Too much credit cannot be given to the intrepid pioneers of a century ago who traversed the vast expanses of wild country separating the Oregon country from what was then the occupied United States. Their fortitude and courage and loyalty to the United States resulted in claiming and holding for us this great northwestern area which has become such an important part of continental United States and which has played such an important role in the preservation and security of our country. Fitting recognition should be given to these pioneers for this great service now that a century has passed and their place in history is firmly established.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Oregon is on the threshold of great industrial development. Up until about 2 years ago the industry of the west coast was only about one-fifteenth of the Nation's production, but today it is expanding at a rate three times greater than the rest of the Nation. The Pacific Coast States are increasing in population more rapidly than any other section of the country. California leads in first place, with Oregon second and Washington third.

The west-coast area enjoys a high standard of living, it being estimated that the average Pacific State family is living at a level 17 percent higher than that of the rest of the Nation, and more than 40 percent of the population has an income greater than $3,000 per year, which is 25 percent above the rest of the country. It is an area of home owners where a larger percentage of the population own their own homes than is enjoyed elsewhere. This section has one-fourth of the hydroelectric power of the Nation, and in the Columbia River Basin there is over 50 percent of the potential hydroelectric energy of the entire United States.

The eyes of industrial America are on the Pacific Northwest and its production record. Here in this northwest empire, rich in natural resources, lies the 1,200-mile stretch of the Columbia River Basin—source of one-half of the Nation's hydroelectric power; the only point on the west coast where trade to the land-locked States of the interior is carried, at a sea-level route, through Portland, the only fresh-water port on the Pacific coast, 100 miles inland at the confluence of the Willamette and Columbia.

The area's new population has increased by 486,199 customers, newcomers who came to work and of whom 80 percent have indicated their desire to stay and live. New Pacific Northwest industries have proven in wartime their unlimited future in peace. Since 1940 new plywood, chemical, and metallurgical industries have been established near Portland, on the Columbia and Willamette Rivers, with investment in excess of $157,550,000.

Oregon takes pride in its national leadership in lumber, its diversified agriculture, its food-processing plants, its important wool and livestock markets, and the unprecedented number of new industries which will spring from our low-cost electric power and unlimited natural resources. From Oregon's natural wealth will come the stability that has always marked the Columbia Empire since the first wagon train hit the Oregon Trail.

Oregon enjoys an ideal climate for year-round living. It is boasted that we have in Oregon an air-conditioned climate with no extremes of temperature, with a yearly average of 53°. Its mountains, streams, and lakes are favorite areas for tourists, sportsmen, and vacationists. Steelhead trout and Royal Chinook salmon lure many sportsmen to our State from all sections of the country.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Portland, in my congressional district, is the distributing point for the Pacific Northwest. It is located on the Willamette River near its confluence with the Columbia, a little over 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean. It is the commercial center for an area of 328,000 square miles.

As a part of these remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Portland Oregonian on February 14, 1948, commemorating Oregon's eighty-ninth birthday:

"STATE ARRIVED BY HORSEBACK"

Oregon's birthday as a State falls on St. Valentine's Day. The poetically minded have never succeeded in giving Oregon the nickname of Valentine State. It is still known far and wide as the Beaver State. This February 14 is the eighty-ninth anniversary of Oregon's taking its place among the sovereign States of the Union. And as is their annual custom the Sons and Daughters of Pioneers have honored the occasion with banquet and oratory, in this instance on the eve of St. Valentine's Day.

Commonly, we do our big hurrahing over memorable events on decade anniversaries, or on twenty-fifth, fiftieth, and seventy-fifth birthdays and go all out on a centennial observance. This eighty-ninth birthday of Oregon takes on a reflected importance from the fact that later in the year we shall widely observe and celebrate the centennial of the creation of Oregon Territory.

By contrast with this and other years in which Oregon's birthday brought forth popular admiration of the progress made since statehood and words of confidence of advancement yet to come, the news that Congress had finally admitted Oregon to statehood was received with apathy by the people of the newly born Commonwealth in 1859.

The word of it did not reach Portland until March 15. It had come by overland stage from St. Louis to San Francisco and thence by the steamer *Brother Jonathan* to Portland.

Perhaps the languid interest shown was due to a surfeit of the issue by the people. They had in 1857 voted for statehood, after failures of the proposal in several elections, had adopted a constitution, and had formally elected John Whiteaker as governor and had chosen other State officers and a legislature. But these officials had retired into the background for the time being and the Territorial body, headed by Governor Curry, held the reins of government.

There was also some apprehension felt over the costs of a State government for so sparsely settled a region. Oregon's population (1860 census) was 52,416. Portland was a town of about 1,500. The Weekly Oregonian reported that there was some talk of a public celebration of statehood, embellished with suitable oratory, but the promoters were unable to raise the necessary "monish." There was some mild speculation as to when the new State government would take over, and as there was no telegraph line to Salem, it was thought it might be a week before the capital got the news. Governor Whiteaker, moreover, had retired to his farm near Eugene, where it might be a month ere word of it reached him.

But a young man of Oregon City decided to become an unwarlike Paul Revere to speed to Salem the news that the State was coming. He mounted his horse, and slogged through mud and forded streams, and reached Salem in 30 hours. Subsequently a letter from Salem printed in the Weekly Oregonian opened with the anouncement that "the State arrived here by horseback last Wednesday afternoon." There was no word in the letter of bell-ringing or whistle-blowing.

The Weekly Oregonian in March 1859 had been in existence a little over 8 years. Its owner and editor, T. J. Dryer, was skeptical and critical of statehood. Henry L. Pittock, who was to become the paper's long-time publisher and principal owner, and was to make it a daily in 1861, was in 1859 working on the paper for wages as a printer. Early in 1859, Harvey W. Scott, who was to become editor of the Oregonian and rise to national fame in that capacity, was at Oregon City "grubbing for roots under a tutor, so I might read Horace and Homer, and supporting myself by chopping cordwood." And his chopping was done with a borrowed ax.

These two were typical of large groups of pioneers who with naught but eager hands and innate ability seized opportunity in the new-born State to build not alone for themselves but for their children and their children's children, a land of plenty and of prosperity. And it would be rash to surmise that had statehood come a decade or more later than it did, Oregon's destiny would have been that much delayed. It is not political forms, if they do not trench upon liberty or free enterprise, that make a great commonwealth, but more positively the industry and the vision of its people, and the natural resources at their command. These we had in abundance.

Thus Admission Day is not only an event in itself to celebrate, but provides a theme upon which the Sons and Daughters of the Pioneers may build deserved recollections of the deeds of these forebears, and an occasion to recite again the honors due them.

BONNEVILLE DAM PROJECT A SOUND INVESTMENT

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Bonneville Power Administration has just announced that a special advance payment of $2,100,000 has been made to the account of the Bonneville Dam project. This is good news. It shows that Uncle Sam has a sound investment in the Columbia River dam projects. I intend to call this to the attention of the Appropriations Committee with jurisdiction over these projects when requests for funds for further Northwest resource developments are being considered. I want them to know that funds invested in the Columbia River Basin are gilt-edged.

It is gratifying to know that these great multiple-purpose projects are paying out ahead of the dates which were originally fixed for reimbursing the Federal Government for the moneys invested.

The surplus earnings to date, if continued, will result in a full repayment of the Bonneville Dam project 5 years ahead of schedule. Payments on the Columbia Basin project, namely, Grand Coulee, are also ahead of schedule, thereby making possible pay-out according to schedule despite the increased construction cost of the Grand Coulee facilities.

The Bonneville Dam project, which includes the dam, power houses, and accessory facilities constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers, has, through the fiscal year 1947, received repayment, interest, and operating-expense credit on the books of the Treasury in the amount of $18,562,150.

About February 10, 1948, an additional advance payment of $2,100,000 was made on the books of the Treasury toward amortizing the cost of the power facilities of the Bonneville Dam project. This was made possible by a request by the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the agreement between the Army engineers operating the Bonneville Dam and the Bonneville Administration, which is marketing the power. This $2,100,000 special additional or advance payment to the account of the Bonneville Dam project was an additional payment over and above the regular pay-out schedule payment of $3,119,850 for the year ending June 30, 1948. This special additional or advance payment was made possible by the fact that the power revenues from the Columbia projects exceed the estimates and are so running as to produce an annual surplus. The payments made from the Bonneville Administration to the Bonneville Dam project exceeded the minimum repayment requirements to the extent that as of January 1, 1948, repayments are $2,252,282 ahead of schedule requirements.

The revenues derived from the sale of power by Bonneville Power Administration, according to statute, are to be used to pay the operating expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Army engineers operating the Bonneville Dam, and the Bureau of Reclamation operating the Grand Coulee Dam. In addition, out of these revenues are to be paid the annual amortization of the Federal investment in these three agencies and the annual interest charges on the unamortized investment balance. The bookkeeping on these three projects is handled by the Bonneville Power Administration and it is audited annually by independent outside commercial auditors. Based on such an audit is the pay-out schedule showing annual payments to fully cover all the cost items of the Federal investment.

Through the fiscal year 1947 the revenues derived from the sale of power amounted to $101,165,847. These revenues have been and will be deposited with the United States Treasury, and are, and will be, distributed on the books of the Treasury so that the interest and amortization investment account of the power facilities will always show the annual and cumulative contributions toward full interest and capital repayment, as well as meeting annual operating, maintenance, and replacement costs.

Power from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams is transmitted over the transmission grid system of the Bonneville Power Administration, which serves the major load centers of the States of Oregon and Washington. The power sales are presently running at an annual rate of about $22,100,000. The additional generators brought in at the Grand Coulee Dam between 1948 and 1952 will increase the annual power revenues to approximately $30,000,000, with total revenues in excess of $270,000,000 during the next 10 years.

These results show what can be accomplished if abundant, firm, and low-cost power is available for resource development.

I include as a part of these remarks the release made on February 12, 1948, by the Bonneville Power Administration, giving notice of this special advance payment of $2,100,000 to the account of the Bonneville Dam project, which, as stated therein, is in addition to the regularly scheduled payment of $3,119,850 for the year ending June 30, 1948, which will be made to cover the year's operating expenses, interest expense, and scheduled amortization of the project:

BONNEVILLE DAM REPAYMENT 5 YEARS AHEAD OF SCHEDULE

Complete repayment of the power costs of Bonneville Dam 5 years ahead of schedule was made possible today when the Bonneville Power Administration made an advance payment of $2,100,000 toward the cost of amortizing the investment in the power facilities of the project.

Paul J. Raver, Administrator, said that while the payment represented only approximately 2 years amortization of construction costs, interest savings and a continuation of the regularly scheduled payments over the remainder of the scheduled repayment period ending in 1994, actually made possible the liquidation of the debt by 1989.

The Administrator said that the Bonneville Dam payment, made through transfer of funds from power administration surplus as a result of a request by the Secretary of the Interior to the Treasury Department in accordance with an agreement with the Army engineers, operators of Bonneville Dam, placed the repayment programs of both Bonneville Dam project and the Bonneville Power Administration's transmission system, ahead of schedule. Payments on the Columbia Basin project—Grand Coulee Dam—have been made ahead of schedule, thereby making possible pay-out according to schedule despite increased construction costs of power facilities, Administrator Raver said.

The special payment of $2,100,000 to the account of the Bonneville Dam project was in addition to the regularly scheduled payment of $3,119,850 for the year ending June 30, 1948, which will be made to cover the year's operating expenses, interest expense, and scheduled amortization of the project.

The payment was made possible by the fact that the Administration's power receipts are showing an annual surplus.

"As a result of the advance payment of $2,100,000 and the fact that the payments made in prior years contained a slight excess over minimum repayment requirements, the Bonneville Dam project repayment as of January 1, 1948, is $2,252,282 ahead of requirements," he said.

"The important interest savings over the remainder of the repayment period, together with a continuation of the regularly scheduled annual payments, will result in completion of the pay-out of the project in fiscal year 1989, or 5 years ahead of schedule, and a surplus repayment of $6,108,895 at the end of the regular 50-year repayment period in 1994."

Sale of power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams over the Bonneville transmission grid systems, which serves all of the major load centers of the Pacific Northwest, is running at an annual rate of approximately $22,082,000. The addition of generators at Grand Coulee Dam between the present and 1952 will bring the annual rate approximately to $30,000,000 with over-all revenues of more than $270,000,000 during the next 10-year period, Raver said.

COMPLETE THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, while we enjoy the springlike weather which fortunately came to Washington this week, let us not forget the recent severe cold spell and the lessons which it should have taught us. The people in my district in northern New York, as well as in other regions, are suffering from one of the coldest winters in years. Their sufferings have been aggravated by shortages of power, oil, and heat. Let us now resolve to take such steps as we can to make sure that the fuel and power shortages will not occur again.

One step which we can take this session to alleviate such shortages is to vote for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project. The St. Lawrence project will provide the New York and New England areas with a vast amount of cheap hydroelectric energy for heat, power, and light purposes. When completed, the St. Lawrence project will develop 2,200,000 horsepower, or 820,000 kilowatts, of electric

power, to be divided between the United States and Canada, and furnish 4,000,000 of our consumers with electricity at low rates. In view of our present and prospective shortages of oil and coal, we must now take steps to alleviate such conditions. The completion of the St. Lawrence project is an immediate and feasible step which can and must be taken now.

In addition to providing the vast amount of cheap electric power, the St. Lawrence project will greatly expand and improve our water transportation system to the advantage of the whole Great Lakes agricultural and industrial areas. Such action is particularly necessary in order that our great steel-producing industry can continue to get adequate supplies of iron ore. The St. Lawrence project will promote our national defense and provide thousands of jobs in the immediate years ahead.

We are watching with interest the debates in the Senate on the St. Lawrence project and are confident of its passage next week. Then we must lose no time in the House in completing action on this important and far-reaching project.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the burlesque to be staged tonight under the guise of paying homage to the memories of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson will find real southern Democrats about as plentiful as three-dollar bills.

We cannot join in such a hypocritical gesture, and you will find most of us having our own Jefferson-Jackson day dinners in gatherings in which white supremacy is the order and segration is the rule.

The present leadership of the National Democratic Party has, through its recent actions, repudiated every political truth that Jefferson and Old Hickory held to be self-evident.

These two all-time champions of white supremacy, segregation, and States rights would roll over in their graves—and rightly so—if they could but see the motley checkerboard crowd of blacks, tans, pinks, and other off-color political misfits who will be so prominently in attendance at this desecration of their memory.

Democrats who still adhere to the faiths of Jefferson and Jackson will not be parties to such mockery.

LIFT THE EMBARGO

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, in the short time allotted to me, it is all but impossible for me to express my hatred of the discriminatory embargo imposed against the shipment of arms to the distressed people of Palestine.

During the 12 years that I have been in this House, I have repeatedly spoken in behalf of the Zionist question. Recognizing as all fair-minded Americans did, the necessity of establishing a Jewish homeland, I was vitally interested in the problem.

All Members of this House know that for thousands of years the Jewish people, despite the fact that they have longed for a land of their own, have been driven from land to land and continent to continent, feeling wherever they went the tyrants' yoke and the despots' heel.

The establishment of the United Nations after World War II and the willingness of the United States to participate was a great cause of joy not only to the followers of the Zionist movement, but to all peace-loving people. We felt that at last hatred, greed, and lust for power were to be swept aside and that the dignity of man and the rights of oppressed people were at last to be recognized. Mankind was sure of this when among its first acts the United Nations declared that Palestine should be partitioned and that there should be a definite understanding that the Jewish homeland was now a recognized entity and was entitled to all of the dignity of an established nation.

All over Europe, hundreds of thousands of people of the Jewish faith who had suffered deeply and grievously since the coming into power of Hitler and other dictators at last thought they could see a ray of hope. Such was not the case. Although this Government of ours is a member of the United Nations and voted for partition, to date it has done nothing to grant real security to the people of Palestine. You cannot establish a nation that is surrounded by hostile elements and then leave it alone to work out its own destiny. Modern civilization and government are too complex, especially when that government and civilization are threatened by barbarous hordes.

Ever since the partition, the Jewish people have been victims of terrible indignities. They have been subjected to boycott, bombs, rifle fire, and threats until today their very existence as a Nation is in danger. If we would but lift this embargo and make it possible for them to furnish their men with modern arms and ammunition, they would be perfectly willing to continue their fight. In fact, I believe that if we made it possible for them to have a supply of the implements of war, their transgressors would soon back down and no armed conflict would take place.

In every instance in the past where we have established nations, such as Cuba and the Philippines, we have made it possible for the new nations to work out their own security by furnishing them with the essential materials.

Gentlemen, we have an implied contract as a member of the United Nations to see that Palestine is secure. We have guaranteed them that they shall have security, but without the means of defense, these people are helpless. If this situation should continue, it would not only be a blot on civilization, it would also mean the absolute collapse of the United Nations as a working force.

I am in favor of the immediate lifting of the embargo. I have communicated my views to the President, the Secretary of State, and to the United States Delegates serving on the United Nations Council. Now, let this Congress show that it is interested in humanity and the cause of freedom by taking immediate action to lift the arms embargo on Palestine.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of tonight's Jefferson-Jackson day dinners, I think it well that the attention of our Democratic leaders and colleagues be called to a significant but dark period of history in the party.

The Sixty-seventh Congress convened in the year 1921 with a party division in the House of Representatives as follows: Republicans, 300; Democrats, 131; minor party, 1, and 3 vacancies. Of the 131 Democrats, 111 were from the South; 33 States outside the South furnished only 20 Democratic Representatives. The party was so weak in 25 of these States that it could not elect a single Democrat.

Now, who held the line for the party? Who always holds the line for the Democratic Party in the lean years?

In the lean years party leaders praised the loyalty, the stickability, the tenacity, and the sincerity of the southern Democrats. They sang our praises and slapped us on the back. They knew that the party would have died as dead as a mackerel in 1921 had it not been for its front line of defense—the solid South—holding fast.

Bearing this in mind, it is rather strange that our Democratic President would now close his eyes to those who have remained steadfast throughout the lean as well as the fat years. When he recommended enactment of the so-called civil-rights proposals, he closed his eyes to the loyalty of southern Democrats. It is also rather strange that the chairman of the Democratic National Committee saw fit to cancel his Jefferson-Jackson day dinner engagement with Georgia Democrats in the city of Atlanta. It is exceedingly strange that Democratic Party leaders would brush aside with a light stroke southern opposition to the so-called civil-rights proposals with remarks such as, "The southern boys are just letting off steam; they have done this before; they have no place to go; they will come around; they will soon cool off." It is also rather strange that party leaders would make such an

all-out, direct appeal to the radical, left-wing, irresponsible minorities which support Henry Wallace as the national chairman did on yesterday and at the same time entirely ignore the party's front line of defense—the solid South—and even go so far as to refuse to attend a southern Democratic dinner.

I repeat, it is very strange that everyone in the Democratic Party, from the President down, seems to have forgotten the year 1921, when northern, eastern, midwestern, and far western Democrats could elect only 20 Representatives to this body. Why, had it not been for the solid South, you could have seated all the Democrats in one row.

Since I shall not attend one of the Jefferson-Jackson day dinners tonight, I thought it well that the memories of our Democratic leaders be now refreshed on a bit of important party history. We southerners will be tuned to our radios, listening for a renewal of just a wee bit of the praise that once was ours. After all, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, whom the Democrats honor tonight, were distinguished southerners. So a little praise, belated though it may be, for those southern Democrats who have stuck it out through thick and thin would be most fitting.

May we hear your voices tonight.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] quoted from a hearing which was held by the subcommittee on Treasury of the Appropriations Committee, at which Mr. George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, testified. The gentleman from Illinois made Mr. Schoeneman's testimony part of the basis for the introduction of a resolution purported to have for its purpose the investigation of the office of the collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, but admitted by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] really to be the instrument whereby the income-tax returns of Earl K. Long, candidate for Governor of Louisiana, would be examined by a select committee.

I have made a futile attempt, as well as have other members of the Louisiana delegation, to read that portion of the testimony of the subcommittee to which the gentleman from Illinois had access. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey, refused to allow the hearings to be examined, and I personally called on the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, who informed me he had no authority to allow me to see the records.

Mr. Speaker, this morning while testifying before the Rules Committee in connection with the gentleman from Illinois' resolution, I requested that the resolution be expanded to include an immediate perusal of the hearings of the Appropriations Committee relative to Mr. Schoeneman's testimony. Again without result. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, why denial is being made to me and other interested Members of the Louisiana delegation to read these hearings which will be published next week, or immediately after the Treasury appropriation bill is reported. What is so secret in these hearings which will not be secret after the election is held for Governor of Louisiana next Tuesday? Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that the hearings would reveal that Mr. Schoeneman told the gentleman from Illinois when he questioned him relative to the gentleman from Louisiana's charges against this:

He, Mr. DOMENGEAUX, made those statements to me (George Schoeneman) and I assured him the things he was going to say were not true * * * that the description of the case as he gave it was not in accordance with the facts.

I would like to know whether this statement was made or not, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you will agree it does not take a resolution of Congress to let one Member read the hearings of a subcommittee, especially since another Member has taken advantage of his position as a member of the subcommittee and discussed what he heard behind closed doors on the floor here.

I wonder also if a perusal of those hearings would not reveal that Mr. Schoeneman told the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that although he could not discuss the matter in detail he was at liberty to say that there had been no irregularities in the investigation. It is all very queer to me, Mr. Speaker, and I am just wondering who is sitting on what records.

Now in further connection with this matter, Mr. Speaker, last Monday the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] with much spirit and gusto, and with all the force at his command, and in dramatic voice challenged me to exhibit to him the photostatic copies of Earl K. Long's actual income-tax returns filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In order that there may be no doubt as to what he said, Mr. Speaker, I quote that portion verbatim here of the colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana and myself:

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I thank the gentleman. Of course, I want to ask the gentleman to yield to me for the purpose of making a statement. He has kindly consented to allow me sufficient time within his hour to make that statement.

Now, I want to ask you a question, please.

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, do you want to ask the question or make a statement first?

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Yes; I would like to ask you several.

Mr. HÉBERT. Certainly; anything.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. You gave a prepared statement to the press, a copy of which you gave me, and which you rather carefully followed in your presentation before the House. I notice, however, that in your prepared speech you stated that, "I shall substantiate this refutation with photostatic copies of Earl K. Long's income-tax return." I notice, Mr. HÉBERT, that you did not present that income-tax return at this time.

Mr. HÉBERT. That particular income-tax return will be presented immediately. I did not think it was necessary to present that particular thing, since I presented the income-tax findings.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Will the gentleman kindly present the income-tax returns for 1937, 1938, and 1939?

Mr. HÉBERT. I shall be very happy to do so, because there is nothing to hide.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Well, present them.

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, I do not have them at the present time, because there are some three trunkfuls of checks. We did not photostat everything down there we had. We photostated the pertinent and concluding documents.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes; certainly.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. The gentleman in his statement to the press, and in the copy of the paper that he gave to me, states that "I will substantiate what I have said in refutation of the Domengeaux charges by the presentation of the tax return in question."

Mr. HÉBERT. I am glad the gentleman from Louisiana has read on further. I said I would refute what he has said. He has said that Earl Long is charged with a $100,000 fraud, and has agreed to pay it, and the gentleman here read documents showing that that is not a true statement.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Will the gentleman present the income-tax return? He will not do it, and I will tell you why, because this income-tax return on the face of it, in red ink, shows the marking of fraud penalties. That is the reason why.

Mr. HÉBERT. Of course, I have only access to the legal ways of getting documents out of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I have only legal means.

I direct your particular attention, Mr. Speaker, and gentleman of the House, to the gentleman from Louisiana's exact words in which he says, and I quote him:

Will the gentleman present the income-tax return? He will not do it, and I will tell you why, because his income-tax return on the face of it, in red ink, shows the marking of fraud penalties. That is the reason why.

Mr. Speaker, here are the photostatic copies of Earl Long's income-tax returns for the years 1937, 1938, 1939, taken from the files of the Bureau of Internal Revenue today, and nowhere, nowhere, nowhere, on any one of those three returns are there any such markings of fraud as the gentleman from Louisiana said would be found on them.

I think the record again speaks for itself. Again he has made a statement that is not substantiated by fact or documents. Again he has made a statement that he will have to back away from, and try to explain away as he has done previously when confronted with this absolute and positive proof. Again the records themselves, obtained in a legal and not underhand or clandestine manner, speak for themselves.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago when the Louisiana gubernatorial campaign in the first primary

was aired in the RECORD and on the floor of this House I stated that I regretted very much that this matter was injected into the deliberations of this body.

During the past week or 10 days we have seen the political battle resumed here for the second primary, and I reiterate that it is my opinion that political controversies have no place in the Congress of the United States.

The political battle now hinges upon charges of alleged income-tax violations of one or more of the candidates for Governor, and notwithstanding that the laws and statutes of the United States provide for the investigation, handling, and punishment of anyone guilty of violating income-tax laws, the Rules Committee of this House is being used for the purpose of authorizing the appointment of a committee to investigate income-tax matters in one State, the State of Louisiana, when there is presently, and always has been, ample authority and channels for the investigation and prosecution of alleged income-tax violators.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a bad precedent for this Rules Committee and this House to lend itself to such controversies, either for the State of Louisiana or any other State, Territory, or for the benefit, or for or against any candidate for any State office in any State of the Union.

The surprising action on the part of the Rules Committee of this House is the very zealous manner in which they have considered and acted upon the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in regard to a political matter in a matter of a few days, and on the other hand since June 26, 1947, the Rules Committee has had "bottled up" the Towe bill, H. R. 4278, the universal military training bill, and refuses to report the bill out, even though in my opinion the very existence and security and defense and preservation of our great country may depend upon the enactment of this legislation.

LOUISIANA POLITICS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extent my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I attended the meeting of the Rules Committee this morning when the Dirksen resolution was presented to this committee. I heard the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, express the view that "the facts should out."

I am in accord with this view. And yet, Mr. Speaker, when I asked the chairman and some members of the Appropriation Committee for permission to inspect the testimony of Commissioner Schoeneman, Chief of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which was taken under the promptings of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I was refused this permission. This testimony which is so important to the Dirksen resolution is denied to you and to me, to the public, and to everyone except members of the Appropriations Committee. This is unfair. It is not good public policy. It is wrong. The testimony should be published immediately. Its contents should not be covered up from the light of honest inquiry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by him the day before yesterday.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain documents.

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I arise on this occasion to call your attention to the program of the present administration of the Republic of the Philippines to implement the actions taken by the last Congress and by this Congress to provide a stable, effective, and economically sound government during these days of reconstruction of the terrific damage done during the Japanese occupation of the Philippines.

When political independence of the Philippines became a reality on July 4, 1946, there were many who viewed the tremendous and widespread destruction of property who felt fearful that it would be impossible to recreate the stable economy needed to support a sound government. They had not reckoned with the vision and courage of Philippine people in making good their new-found freedom.

Leading in the spiritual revival of the Philippine people were such men as President Manuel Roxas and his immediate predecessor, President Sergio Osmeña, who served during those anxiety-filled days of actual occupation of his country and during those chaotic days following liberation. It was the leadership of these men and others in the Philippines which is making independence a reality in every sense.

Last January 26 President Roxas delivered his state-of-the-nation speech to a joint session of the Philippine Congress. It was a masterful message and contains a wealth of information which clearly indicates the soundness of the Roxas administration.

The real sense and the meat of his address was contained in the specific recommendations that he made. It will be noted that many of those recommendations were designed to enable the Philippine Government to coordinate its own workings with the provisions of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946, the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, and other enactments of the United States Congress.

So that you may have a clearer picture of what the Roxas government in seeking to accomplish, I wish to quote the following recommendations from the President's speech of January 26. They are as follows:

1. An act establishing the Central Bank, defining its powers in the administration of the monetary system, amending the corresponding provisions of the administrative code, and for other purposes.

2. A law granting to the President, under such conditions as the Congress may impose, authority to control imports and to increase or decrease from time to time the sales tax on luxuries, semiluxuries, and nonessential commodities up to 100 percent of the present rates, but in no case to be less than the rates now imposed. This measure is intended to raise revenue, conserve our dollar exchange resources, and to channel surplus purchasing power toward productive investments.

3. A law appropriating the proceeds of certain loans which the government may obtain, to finance the construction of specific hydroelectric power projects and a fertilizer plant.

4. A law providing for the redemption of:

(a) Philippine National Bank notes legally issued and now outstanding, and providing for the registration of Philippine National Bank notes issued illegally by the enemy;

(b) Emergency notes legally authorized by the Philippine Government at the beginning of the war; and

(c) Duly authorized guerrilla currency in circulation at a fixed percentage or fixed value, not to exceed a total outlay of $30,000,000.

5. A law authorizing the President of the Philippines to obtain from the central bank funds for certain purposes specifically authorized by law when in the opinion of the bank, the existing exchange reserves are in excess of foreseeable demands to cover the balance of payments of the nation.

6. A law fixing the site of the capitol and the offices of the National Government, authorizing the expropriation of private lands to be included in that site and appropriating the necessary funds for the payment of the value of such lands, the development of the site and the construction of the buildings thereon.

7. The enactment of the Civil Code prepared by the Code Commission.

8. A law to authorize the Bureau of Lands to subdivide United States military reservations returned to the Philippine Government and to sell the same in small lots, giving priority to present bona fide occupants of such lands and to war veterans at prices approved by the President, except such portions as may be reserved by the President for the use of the national or local government.

9. A law amending Republic Act No. 8 authorizing the Bureau of Lands, the National Abaca and Other Fibers Corp. or such other agencies of the Government as the President may designate, to subdivide agricultural and residential lands formerly belonging to enemy nationals and which have been transferred to the Philippine Government, except such portions as the President may reserve for the use of the national or local government, and to sell such lands in small lots at prices approved by the President giving priority to veterans, including members of the USAFFE, recognized guerillas, and unrecognized but deserving members of guerilla organizations.

10. A law appropriating the necessary funds for a new census.

11. A law authorizing the creation of a public corporation to administer the international airport as well as the other commercial airfields throughout the Philippines belonging to the Government.

12. A law requiring insurance companies to invest at least 50 percent of their reserves in loans, the proceeds of which will be used in the Philippines.

13. A law amending the administrative code to grant more autonomy and to enlarge the power of taxation of provinces and municipalities.

14. A law authorizing the President under certain conditions to guarantee loans granted by certain international or foreign credit institutions to government or private banks, companies, or private individuals.

15. A law authorizing the Government to guarantee a certain percentage of any loss which may be suffered by any private bank, insurance company, or any other credit institution, on account of loans it may grant to private individuals for home construction, the amount of each loan not to exceed ₱10,000 for each individual borrower, and fixing the aggregate amount of the loans for which such guarantee may be given.

16. A law amending the National Internal Revenue Code by providing for collection in advance of the sales tax on the basis of the declared cost of the merchandise upon withdrawal from the customhouse or factory; the amount collected in advance to be credited to the actual tax liability after the first sale has been made.

17. A law amending the National Internal Revenue Code by increasing the present tax rates on alcoholic beverages, beer, soft drinks, cigarettes, and other tobacco products.

18. The approval of other measures implementing the recommendations of the Joint Financial Commission.

19. A law lifting the moratorium subject to certain conditions.

20. A law establishing a social-security system for the benefit of wage earners and low salaried employees.

Mr. Speaker, many of the recommendations follow the patterns of laws already on the statute books of the United States. Others relate, as you will note, to specific projects designed to assist in rehabilitation. All may be said to have resulted from the fact that during the Japanese occupation all governmental changes of a permanent nature had to be suspended because the courageous and loyal Philippine people would never want to continue any actions of the Japanese puppet government as permanent laws of their Government. They wanted exactly the opposite. Their greatest desire apparently is for a continuation of the democratic processes taught them by the United States.

There still remain those both in the United States and the Philippines, as well as in some other parts of the world dominated by the world Communist influences, who make disparaging remarks about the efforts of the Government of the new Republic of the Philippines to solve its problems. These carpings are to be expected.

Yet it remains certain that all necessary things cannot be done at once any better in the Philippines than they can be done here and preserve our democratic forms of government. I have confidence that as time wears on the Roxas administration and the thinking people of the Philippines will surmount their obstacles, especially if they are sure they can continue to rely on the friendship and assistance of the mother country, the United States, to help them through the rehabilitation period. That means that this Government may be called upon again for further assistance to supplement what has already been done. Otherwise the job of rehabilitation which we have started might not be finished to guarantee that the beneficent action of these United States in granting independence to the Philippines shall remain a monument before the world to American fair dealing and honest respect for the rights and dignity of other peoples of the world.

I am happy to note among the Members of Congress a growing sentiment for working out a solution of the needs of the brave and heroic Filipinos who served under the flag of the United States in resistance of the Japanese aggressors, for I feel it indicates that when sound and clear-cut recommendations are made by the President adequate veterans' legislation will be enacted.

It indicates, too, that there is an awareness among Members of Congress and in the administration that the moral obligations of the United States Government can only be realized through treatment of Philippine problems separate and apart from those of other nations. The Philippines were under the American flag when the Japanese attacked. They resisted with all their might, providing that most valuable element for later victory—time. It is right that the new Republic should continue to have a special place in the hearts of all Americans.

It has been suggested that surveys should soon be started to determine just how far our present programs for Philippine rehabilitation will go toward reconstruction of businesses, private industry, and public properties. When those studies shall have been completed, it is my hope that Congress and the administration will continue to cast aside all partisan feeling in the enactment of the legislation necessary to complete the job of rehabilitation.

It would be unwise for the United States to consider that the mere granting of political independence was sufficient. Political independence without economic rehabilitation would be only a shell and a mockery.

I feel certain the American people want our Government to do those things for the Philippines necessary to keep alive in that new Republic the fires of liberty and democracy, in order that they may spread throughout Asia in direct counter attack against the efforts to spread Communist ideologies there.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by a constituent of mine, a young lady who was one of the four coequal winners in the national contest on I Speak for Democracy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week I called the attention of this House to a telegram which the Honorable John Cashmore, president of the borough of Brooklyn, had sent to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, urging him to do everything possible to reestablish law and order in Palestine, to lift the embargo against the shipment of arms to the Jews in Palestine, and to establish a national police force under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. At the same time I directed the attention of the House to a telegram sent to President Cashmore on behalf of the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, thanking him for his efforts in connection with this all-important matter.

I knew then that Mr. Cashmore had made the necessary arrangements to call at the White House to see the President and to personally present to him the views of the people of Brooklyn.

Mr. Cashmore's duties as president of the borough, and as a member of the board of estimate of the city of New York, are most arduous and time-consuming. Despite the fact that they require his close attention from early day out, Mr. Cashmore came to Washmorning until late at night, day in and ington on Friday, February 13, and was received at the White House by the President for the sole purpose of listening to his views on these vital issues.

Mr. Cashmore was able to return and report to Brooklyn that the President would continue to do everything possible to correct a desperate situation.

We in Brooklyn know that we can always call on Mr. Cashmore, and no task is too great for him to undertake.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each case to include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

SECONDARY RECOVERY OF OIL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House a few days ago to provide an authorization for the secondary recovery program in connection with the extension of the experimental program on synthetic production of oil is far more important, I believe, than the average person is aware. Research on a secondary-recovery program to develop methods for obtaining oil that we know is available is one of the most important needs for our future welfare.

Much effort has been made in various depleted fields to increase the recoverable

oil in the reservoir. Much progress has been made in some fields, but it is believed additional methods could be developed that would make available tremendous quantities of oil from these known reserves. Because of the importance of this program and the potentialities it offers, I include in the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Arkansas Gazette, which I think should be of interest to many people:

TO RECOVER MORE OIL

Legislation passed by the House and Senate authorizes an appropriation of $30,000,000 for a 3-year experimental project on synthetic production of oil. The House bill also would provide money for research on secondary recovery from oil reserves where production has declined.

Although it has not been publicized, as has synthetic production, secondary recovery already proceeds on a practical basis. It has gone a long way beyond the experimental stage, as can be seen in south Arkansas. Further research on methods for obtaining oil that is not now available in known reservoirs would lead to an enormous increase in national reserves.

Representative GAVIN, of Pennsylvania, in advocating an appropriation for secondary recovery investigations, said there were almost 100,000,000 barrels of oil in various fields which cannot be obtained with present methods. This is an exceedingly small estimate.

The El Dorado south field of Union County, under secondary recovery, could be made to produce from 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 additional barrels. The old Smackover field, according to a scientific study, contains the equivalent of three major oil fields. A reservoir has to produce 100,000,000 barrels to be ranked as a major producer, and few have been found during the last 10 years. Yet secondary recovery applied in "settled" fields in many of the oil States could make major producers.

This State enjoys the distinction of being a pioneer in secondary recovery. The fields which are being flushed by secondary methods are yielding higher profits. It is expected that in time these methods may be applied to all the important reservoirs of Arkansas. The oil and gas commission sponsored a survey that investigated the secondary recovery possibilities of every field. As each reservoir has its geological peculiarities, a detailed study is necessary to determine the most feasible methods of increasing production. The published report of the survey furnishes the fundamental information for the general secondary recovery program which the commission is now planning with the cooperative effort of companies, lease holders and landowners.

At best only from 40 to 60 percent of the oil in a reservoir can be taken out. Under primary methods as little as 20 percent may be drawn from the pool. Because secondary recovery has not been extensively applied, this country has been losing far more oil than it has obtained from the heavy investments in field development.

Arkansas, with its model conservation program, provides an example which could very profitably be followed on a national scale. On its own initiative Arkansas undertook secondary recovery for its own benefit. The other oil-producing States could do likewise. Secondary recovery could be encouraged simply by Congress making more technical services available to the respective agencies in the States.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the Republican leaders in Congress made a speech at Omaha, and in discussing the farm program which we have taken years to build up, is quoted as stating:

I think that if there is to be such a support program, it ought to be at a much less percentage than 90 percent.

This certainly appears to me to be an attack on the farm program as now existing, and I do not think the farmers of America read this statement with much enthusiasm.

What can this mean? Does it mean that the Republican Party has in mind doing away with our farm program? Is this an advance notice to the farmers of the country as to what will happen if a Republican administration is elected next fall? Is it not fair to believe that if we had a Republican President with a Republican Congress that an attempt would be made to do away with the just farm legislation passed by the Democratic administration, which has been of so much benefit to the farmers of America?

We only need to look back to last year to see what happened to conservation benefits. With a Republican President we can certainly figure what will happen, not only to conservation benefits but to other phases of our great farm program, which has helped not only the farmers of the Nation but the entire population, for we all know that when we have a prosperous agriculture that we in turn have a more prosperous industry and better living for everyone.

I do not believe that the farmers of America will so easily surrender the legislation that has been placed on the statute books to aid them. Next November they will remember this threat and also the beneficial farm legislation that has the backing of the Democratic President of the United States and the Democrats in Congress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, March 4 will be the two hundredth anniversary of the renowned Polish-American hero, Gen. Casimir Pulaski. I feel it would be proper and fitting in recognition of his service and in respect to his memory that we pay tribute to him in the House on his birthday anniversary. I therefore ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of legislative business on March 4 that I may be recognized for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NECESSITY OF OVER-ALL STUDY OF PETROLEUM SUPPLY AND DEMAND AND FORMULATION OF NATIONAL PETROLEUM POLICY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short article from the Journal of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and at the direction of the committee, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 134 to set up a joint committee of Senate and House Members to make an over-all study of petroleum with particular attention to the problems of supply and demand to the end that a national fuel policy may be adopted. The situation as developed by hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is so critical both present and future as to make the formulation of a national policy a matter of extreme importance.

In accordance with the consent granted to me, I include as part of my remarks, the following article entitled "Petroleum," appearing in the Monday, February 9, 1948, issue of Chicago Journal of Commerce:

PETROLEUM

OIL: THE INVESTIGATION MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Keith Fanshier)

Faster and faster it spins—the congressional oil investigating merry-go-round.

Dizzier and dizzier grows the pace—dizzier too becomes the industry, riding the thing.

More and more confused the public well may be growing, as it supposedly watches with a greater or lesser degree of interest.

Wonder what about the Members of Congress themselves, who are running the contraption. Are they developing a body of basically constructive ideas that will be useful to the Nation?

Are we witnessing something that is forwarding the important cause of petroleum conservation and advancing the public interest in questions relating to this most significant element of our national affairs? Are we spectators to the laying of the groundwork for wise, far-seeing national policy as to petroleum?

Or are we forced to be onlookers at an exhibition, promoted to further motives for other than the worthy ones which ought to be present in determining answers to issues of such vast import as these?

This writer believes there are good, earnest, and capable men in the Congress, engaged in various phases of the oil investigations and trying to bring out and emphasize to the public the truth and evolve policy. Unfortunately, however, it appears there are the contrasting kind, too. The latter it appears are in this election year of 1948 using the petroleum industry as a means and the fuel oil supply emergency as an occasion to reap political advantage. They are playing display and exhibitionism for all they are worth, and they may be worth plenty.

It is the writer's view that honest congressional inquiry, intelligently designed and sincerely developed, can be of much good to all, by disclosing authoritative opinion and facts. But indiscriminate, repetitive and over-crowded inquir for the sake of inquiry can be burdensome and can bring the whole activity of congressional investigation into disrepute.

The great mass of the inquiry in recent times has come dangerously close to bringing about this latter effect, even though much factual material of real value has been adduced.

Some congressional investigators have contributed in no small way to solving oil questions. But sadly enough much of the great

energy expended in these activities in recent years has gone for naught, the wisdom contained therein unused and the whole activity in effect a waste. It is not odd that Washington encounters skepticism in the industry as the Congress deals its investigations off the cuff, dozen after dozen.

SYNTHETIC-LIQUID-FUEL BILL

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to promote the production of synthetic liquid fuels. The full title of the bill is "a bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels."

This bill is the outgrowth of the study that has been undertaken by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of the long-range fuel situation in the United States. On the basis of the testimony presented to the committee, I have come to the conclusion that an early start is imperative with respect to the construction of commercial-size synthetic-liquid-fuel plants.

The bill is what I would term a skeleton bill. It sets forth in six brief sections the basic pattern which I think might be followed in bringing about the early establishment of a privately owned synthetic-liquid-fuel industry.

Section 1 states that it is the policy of the United States, in order to supplement supplies of petroleum and petroleum products produced in the United States and imported from foreign countries, to promote the production of synthetic liquid fuels, and, to that end, to facilitate the construction and operation by private industry of synthetic-liquid-fuel plants.

Section 2 authorizes and directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make to any person proposing to construct one or more commercial size synthetic-liquid-fuel plants, such advances, upon such terms and conditions, as it deems appropriate, to carry out the afore-mentioned policy.

Section 3 provides that if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation finds, upon the expiration of 120 days from the date of the enactment of this act, that no person is willing to undertake to construct any such commercial-size synthetic-fuel plants, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall immediately proceed to construct three such plants. Each of these plants is to have a capacity of not less than 10,000 barrels of liquid fuels per day. The first plant, referred to in the bill as plant type A, is to be for the hydrogenation of coal. The second, referred to as plant type B, is to be designed for the synthesis of liquid hydrocarbons from gases produced from coal. The third, or plant type C, is to be constructed for the production of shale oil from oil shale.

Each of these plants, upon completion of construction, is to be leased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to private industry, upon such terms and conditions as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation deems appropriate for carrying out the general policy of this act. The plants are to be constructed with the technical advice of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

The total cost of the three plants is estimated to be not in excess of $400,000,000, and section 6 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed that sum.

The three types of plants, which I have described above, are the ones which the research of the Bureau of Mines and experience in foreign countries have demonstrated to be the most suitable for the production of a wide range of petroleum products. These plants supplement each other. For example, the plant for the production of shale oil is best suited for the production of heavy oils rather than light oils and gasoline. Vice versa, high-octane gasoline can best be obtained from type A plants, utilizing hydrogenation of coal. Type B plants, on the other hand, are best suited for the production of standard octane-rating gasoline and Diesel fuels.

From the testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have become convinced that both the military and the economic security of the Nation require that we take prompt steps to bring into existence a synthetic-liquid-fuel industry. Such industry should not be designed to replace domestic crude production nor designed to eliminate foreign imports. We shall need to increase both the production at home and imports from foreign sources to meet the heavy rise in civilian and military demand in this country.

The construction of three basic commercial-size plants will aid us in perfecting processes that have been developed in research laboratories and have been utilized so far only in research-size rather than commercial-size plants. As has been stated by the Secretary of Defense, James Forrestal:

> The United States Government should not only support pilot plant operations in the synthetic-liquid-fuel industry but also should support a few large-scale plants sufficient to provide the engineering know-how and to advance technical developments.

Our experience during World War II with respect to rubber should be a warning to us that we should not neglect to prepare in times of peace for the production in times of war of the necessary raw materials with which to win a victory. The requirements for a synthetic-liquid-fuel industry, in terms of steel, manpower, and financing, are tremendous. To produce 2,000,000 barrels of liquid fuels per day would require, according to preliminary estimates, about 16,000,000 tons of steel and the expenditure of approximately $9,000,000,000. To suggest to Congress at this time to approve such expenditures would be pure foolishness and would merely serve to deteriorate, as far as the next 3 to 5 years are concerned, our petroleum situation since it would consume the steel which is so urgently needed at home and abroad to supply us with domestic and imported crude. On the other hand, it is wisdom to set aside a small portion of the steel which will generally be available during the next 3 years, to construct the three basic plants which will advance immeasurably our ability to increase the domestic production of liquid fuels should the need therefor increase.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter on national security.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD, I include therein a letter from Harlan A. Judd, president of the Reserve Officers Association, Chapter of Marion County, Oreg. As we observe Security Week, it would be well for every Member of this body to read Mr. Judd's letter in full. It is an excellent statement by an outstanding Oregon citizen and Reserve officer on the aims of the association and their views on the necessity for strong national security.

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 6, 1948.

Hon. WALTER NORBLAD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORBLAD: As for the past 25 years, the Reserve Officers Association is taking the lead in observing National Security Week for the period between February 12 and 22, and including those historically significant dates.

As you may know, there are more than 500,000 Reserve officers in our Nation who have gone back to civilian life after furnishing 98 percent of the leadership in our greatest of all armed forces which achieved victory for our Nation and her allies in World War II.

The ROA believes that National Security Week is its most important patriotic activity, because our Nation traditionally and constitutionally relies upon her civilians to furnish manpower and leadership in time of national emergency. We believe that our citizenry needs to be reminded, at least once a year, of its duties insofar as national security is concerned, and that there is a responsibility of our leaders, both professional and citizen soldiers, to bring in an annual report, so to speak, which every citizen can understand.

General Marshall said at the outbreak of World War II that but for the nucleus of Reserve officers who were trained—some 100,000—our chances of victory would have been considerably diminished. We believe that is true today more than ever before. If we are to survive in this uncertain world, with its unrest and its atomic and biological warfare threats, we must have a powerful, highly trained civilian Reserve which must be on a broader base among our civilians.

So National Security Week means something to you and to every citizen. In the ROA we have many goals. We make this week the time for an appeal to our own members to remain active and keep our rolls up to full strength. During this week we wish to call your attention to the legislation we are convinced is necessary to give us national security in actuality.

As an organization, we are supporting universal military training, just as we supported unification of the armed forces. We are urging Congress to pass laws which will remove some of the discriminatory practices against the civilian components, in favor of the professional career military personnel, which has served to discourage and drive away many of our citizen-soldier leaders. We are asking, generally speaking, that our citizen soldiers

be given the same consideration, in proportion and in keeping with the extent and degree of service, to which our Regulars are entitled. We are emphatically not anti-Regular. To the contrary, many of the Regulars are 100 percent for us, and we for them. We are fighting an insidious menace that is engrained in a system and which cannot be justified as a real American system.

But our principal aim during National Security Week is to arouse the interest of our fellow citizens in fulfilling our citizenship responsibilities as we see it. We want our citizens to be informed about national security; we want to incite interest and to prompt informed action in accordance with the finest traditions of our country.

We feel sure that you will perceive the part you can play in this important observance and that during National Security Week you will be with us.

Sincerely yours,

HARLAN A. JUDD,
President, Marion Chapter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a résumé of Ohio laws for veterans compiled by the adjutant of the DAV.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the cost of $159.79, a matter which I was granted permission heretofore to include in the Appendix, may be included.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOPER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a letter and a statement.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INCOME-TAX RETURNS IN LOUISIANA

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 462), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That a select committee of seven Members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the Speaker of the House to investigate possible fraudulent income-tax returns filed with the collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, by individuals, corporations, copartnerships, and others charged by law with the duty of filing such returns with said collector of internal revenue.

The select committee shall make an interim report to the House (or to the Clerk if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present session of Congress of the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation or other action as it deems desirable and shall file a final report not later than January 3, 1949.

For the purposes of this resolution the select committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, documents, and income-tax returns of individuals, corporations, copartnerships, or other persons or concerns, filed with said collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the select committee, the chairman of any subcommittee thereof, or over the signature of any member designated, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said select committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any questions pertinent to the matter herein authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by sections 102, 103, and 104 of the Revised Statutes, title 2, sections 192, 193, and 194, United States Code.

Amend the title so as to read: "To appoint a select committee of the House of Representatives to investigate possible fraudulent income-tax returns filed with the collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana."

CONTINUING CERTAIN POWERS AND AUTHORITY GRANTED BY THE SECOND DECONTROL ACT OF 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 472), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5391) to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONTINUING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 471), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5390) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of announcing the program for next week, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in submitting this request, I desire merely to announce next week's program and, in so doing, I am sure the Members agree that granting my request is no departure from the ruling which the Speaker has just announced with respect to 1-minute speeches today.

The Rules Committee reported House Resolution 462, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It had been my thought that this might be taken up this week, but existing circumstances prevent that being done.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. I want to thank the gentleman, as well as the members of the Rules Committee, for reporting this resolution. However, it was my understanding it would be taken up today under suspension of the rules. I was informed by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that he would demand a roll call on this matter. Is that the reason why the resolution is not being considered—in that it is controversial?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, as to whether a matter is controversial necessarily enters into the decision on the program. But, aside from that, as we know, one of our Members has passed away, and this circumstance also enters into the situation with respect to proceedings for today.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just want to make this statement in order to keep the record straight: That I did tell the gentleman from Indiana that I would ask for a roll call, because I wanted every Member on record to see how they stood on such a resolution. I stated to the gentleman from Indiana if I were not from Louisiana I would oppose such a wide resolution, but being from Louisiana and involved in it, I welcomed any opportunity to investigate the facts in the case.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for one question?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield for one question only.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. It is a fact therefore that it was the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana that he would insist upon a roll call which prevented largely the taking up of this resolution at this time.

Mr. HEBERT. Wait a minute; will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I believe I have responded sufficiently.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman has, but I do not want the last word of the gentleman from Indiana to put a stigma on me because there is no stigma attached.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not think there is a stigma on anybody.

Mr. Speaker, according to an order of the House heretofore entered, Washington's Farewell Address will be read on Monday. I have examined the precedents, and I find that on previous such occasions the House has transacted business after the reading of Washington's Address. At this time, however, I am not prepared to say definitely whether there will be any business on Monday.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that Washington's Farewell Address will be read?

Mr. HALLECK. It will be read on Monday.

There are two bills from the Committee on Banking and Currency that will require action before the end of the month. One is H. R. 1590, by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and the other is H. R. 5391, also by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947. Rules have been granted on these two measures and we will proceed with their consideration as quickly as possible the forepart of the week.

It is also expected that Senate Joint Resolution 173, or a similar bill, will be reported this week by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This bill pertains to certain authorities of the United States Maritime Commission which expire by operation of law that it is proposed be extended. If this bill is reported by the committee, as I believe it will be, and a rule is granted on it, then there should be action on the bill early in the week.

We also have for action next week House Concurrent Resolution 131 by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], which has been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of January 19, 1948.

Our program also includes a resolution from the Committee on Ways and Means, House Resolution 296, by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], to maintain the status quo in respect to certain employment taxes in connection with social-security benefits, pending action by the Congress on extended social-security coverage. That may be reached next week, I am not sure about it, though, but if it is reached it will be later in the week.

We also have House Concurrent Resolution 147, with respect to the budget determinations for the fiscal year 1949, on which we hope to take action next week.

We also hope we can begin the consideration of and conclude action on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, which, I understand, will be ready for action next week.

In addition, I should point out that during next week conference reports will be in order at any time for action by the House.

With this program before us I think it is apparent that we shall likely need to work early and late, and possibly through Saturday of next week, in order to dispose of these matters.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the majority leader indicate a little more specifically the day on which certain of these bills will come up?

Mr. HALLECK. I shall be glad to try to do that, but I believe the gentleman understands, having himself occupied the position I now occupy, that when a considerable number of things have to be fitted into a given week, of necessity we must have some leeway.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want the gentleman to be specific and there is flexibility in my inquiry. I was just trying to give to the Members of the House as much information as possible. I always did give specific information, as the gentleman knows. Of course, I realize there are times when that is impossible and next week is such a time due to the fact we have had very little business during the past 2 weeks, as we know.

Mr. HALLECK. I might indicate to the gentleman and to the House that there are two bills from the Banking and Currency Committee, having to do with rent control and war powers, that will come up early in the week, I would say perhaps on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was particularly interested in Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. As I previously stated, we will have the reading of Washington's Farewell Address on Monday. It is sometimes suggested that that is all we ought to do on that day, but in view of the fact that heretofore there have been occasions when other business has been transacted we might find it necessary to dispose of some of these other matters on Monday. Of course, the matter from the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is of importance and must be acted on next week if there is to be an extension of that authority. That bill has passed the Senate and we want to expedite consideration of it in the House.

I think I can say that consideration of the appropriation bill will not likely come up before Thursday. As to when we can work in the resolution pertaining to Reorganization Plan No. 1 and the budget resolution I am not quite sure, but we will try to consider them on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Has the majority leader any idea when the conference report on the retirement bill will be up for consideration?

Mr. HALLECK. That is one of the conference reports I have in mind. I cannot say definitely at this time. I do not know whether I referred to the resolution, House Resolution 462, from the Rules Committee in connection with next week's program, but that is one of the matters on which we expect to act next week.

Mr. FORAND. I may say to the majority leader there are several Members who are vitally interested in that conference report and they have informed me they cannot be here Monday. I am hoping it will be called up Tuesday.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say to the gentleman it will not come up Monday in view of those circumstances.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Calendar Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next and on all days on which the House is in session next week, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LARCADE, for 1 week, on account of visit to Louisiana to vote in the gubernatorial election and on official business.

To Mr. MANASCO, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

AID TO CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 536)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and

referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On several occasions I have stated that a primary objective of the United States is to bring about, throughout the world, the conditions of a just and lasting peace. This is a cause to which the American people are deeply devoted.

Since VJ-day we have expended great effort and large sums of money on the relief and rehabilitation of war-torn countries to aid in restoring workable economic systems which are essential to the maintenance of peace. A principle which has guided our efforts to assist these war-torn countries has been that of helping their peoples to help themselves. The Congress is now giving careful consideration to a most vital and far-reaching proposal to further this purpose—the program for aid to European recovery.

I now request the Congress to consider the type of further assistance which this country should provide to China.

A genuine friendship has existed between the American people and the people of China over many years. This friendship has been accompanied by a long record of commercial and cultural association and close cooperation between our two countries. Americans have developed a deep respect for the Chinese people and sympathy for the many trials and difficulties which they have endured.

The United States has long recognized the importance of a stable Chinese Nation to lasting peace in the Pacific and the entire world. The vast size and population of China make her an important factor in world affairs. China is a land with rich tradition and culture and a large and energetic population. It has always been our desire to see a strong progressive China making a full contribution to the strength of the family of nations.

With this end in view, we have supported the National Government of China since it first came to power, 20 years ago. China and the United States were allies in the war against Japan, and as an ally we supported China's valiant war efforts against the Japanese. Since the Japanese surrender, we have provided a great deal of additional assistance. Miliary aid was given the Chinese Government not only to help defeat the Japanese invaders but also to assist in reoccupying Japanese-held areas. The United States contributed the major share of the extensive aid received by China under the program of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. We made available to the Chinese Government at minimum cost large quantities of surplus goods and equipment of value to China's economy. We are currently extending further aid to China under our foreign relief program.

Nevertheless, the Chinese Government and people are still laboring under the double and interrelated burden of civil war and a rapidly deteriorating economy. The strains placed upon the country by 8 years of war and the Japanese occupation and blockade have been increased by internal strife at the very time that reconstruction efforts should be under way. The wartime damage to transport and productive facilities has been greatly accentuated by the continued obstruction and destruction of vital communications by the Communist forces.

The civil warfare has further impeded recovery by forcing upon the Government heavy expenditures which greatly exceed revenues. Continual issuances of currency to meet these expenditures have produced drastic inflation with its attendant disruption of normal commercial operations. Under these circumstances, China's foreign exchange holdings have been so reduced that it will soon be impossible for China to meet the cost of essential imports. Without such imports, industrial activity would diminish and the rate of economic deterioration would be sharply increased.

The continued deterioration of the Chinese economy is a source of deep concern to the United States. Ever since the return of General Marshall from China, the problem of assistance to the Chinese has been under continuous study. We have hoped for conditions in China that would make possible the effective and constructive use of American assistance in reconstruction and rehabilitation. Conditions have not developed as we had hoped, and we can only do what is feasible under circumstances as they exist.

We can assist in retarding the current economic deterioration and thus give the Chinese Government a further opportunity to initiate the measures necessary to the establishment of more stable economic conditions. But it is and has been clear that only the Chinese Government itself can undertake the vital measures necessary to provide the framework within which efforts toward peace and true economic recovery may be effective.

In determining the character and dimensions of the program which might be suited to this purpose, we have had to take into account a number of diverse and conflicting factors, including the other demands on our national resources at this time, the availability of specific commodities, the dimensions and complexities of the problems facing the Chinese Government, and the extent to which these problems could be promptly and effectively alleviated by foreign aid. United States assistance to China, like that provided to any other nation, must be adapted to its particular requirements and capacities.

In the light of these factors, I recommend that the Congress authorize a program for aid to China in the amount of $570,000,000 to provide assistance until June 30, 1949.

The program should make provision for the financing, through loans or grants, of essential imports into China in the amount of $510,000,000. This estimate is based upon prices as of January 1, 1948, since it is impossible at present to predict what effect current price changes may have on the program. Revised dollar estimates can be presented in connection with the request for appropriations if necessary. The essential imports include cereals, cotton, petroleum, fertilizer, tobacco, pharmaceuticals, coal and repair parts for existing capital equipment. The quantities provided for under this program are within the limits of available supplies. The financing of these essential commodity imports by the United States would permit the Chinese Government to devote its limited dollar resources to the most urgent of its other needs.

The program should also provide $60,000,000 for a few selected reconstruction projects to be initiated prior to June 30, 1949. There is an urgent need for the restoration of essential transportation facilities, fuel and power operations, and export industries. This work could be undertaken in areas sheltered from military operations and could help in improving the supply and distribution of essential commodities.

As in the case of aid to European recovery, the conduct of this program of aid should be made subject to an agreement between China and the United States setting forth the conditions and procedures for administering the aid. The agreement should include assurances that the Chinese Government will take such economic, financial, and other measures as are practicable, looking toward the ultimate goal of economic stability and recovery. The United States would, of course, reserve the right to terminate aid if it is determined that the assistance provided is not being handled in accordance with the agreement or that the policies of the Chinese Government are inconsistent with the objective of using the aid to help achieve a self-supporting economy.

Pending establishment of the agency which is to be set up for the administration of the European recovery program, the assistance to China should be carried forward under the existing machinery now administering the foreign-relief programs. Legislation authorizing the Chinese program should make possible transfer of the administration of the Chinese program to the agency administering our aid to European recovery. The need for authority in the administering agency to make adjustments in the program from time to time will be as great here as in the European recovery program.

The proposed program of aid to China represents what I believe to be the best course this Government can follow in the light of all the circumstances. Nothing which this country provides by way of assistance can, even in a small measure, be a substitute for the necessary action that can be taken only by the Chinese Government. Yet this program can accomplish the important purpose of giving the Chinese Government a respite from rapid economic deterioration during which it can move to establish more stable economic conditions. Without this respite the ability of the Chinese Government to establish such conditions at all would be doubtful. The achievement of even this limited objective is of such importance as to justify the proposed program of aid.

I recommend, therefore, that this program be given prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1948.*

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since we are not permitted to comment on this kind of waste, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the President's message asking us to give China $570,000,000 to be wrung from the overburdened taxpayers of the United States.

If we keep on following this program of giving to foreign countries, we will soon find our own country bankrupt and our own people suffering as the result.

The American people fought, financed, and won the recent war.

We have our own veterans and their widows and orphans to look after.

We have our own aged and infirm, who have spent the best days of their lives struggling to upbuild this Nation; who are now entitled to our first consideration—certainly before we start pouring money by the hundreds of millions, yes, by the billions, into the sink holes of Europe and Asia.

If we follow that policy of wasteful extravagance in giving away the wealth of the American people, burdening them with taxes that it will take generations to pay, we may find our country bankrupt and dragged down to the economic level of the poorest nations on earth.

We had better look after our own people, develop our own resources, build the strongest air force on earth, and let the world know that we are prepared to defend America against all comers at all times instead of bankrupting the Nation, impoverishing our people, and inviting disaster.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 257. An act for the relief of Yoneo Sakai;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew;

S. 310. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Jonah Williams;

S. 311. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Ghost Bear, Sr.;

S. 312. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles Kills the Enemy;

S. 313. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Calvin W. Clincher;

S. 409. An act for the relief of Milan Jandrich;

S. 457. An act for the relief of Anna Kong Mei;

S. 499. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Bessie Two Elk-Poor Bear;

S. 522. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Mich.;

S. 542. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Ella White Bull;

S. 1133. An act providing for the per capita payment of certain moneys appropriated in settlement of certain claims of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota;

S. 1454. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes;

S. 1485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico;

S. 1507. An act authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel addition to the town of Polson, Mont.; and

S. 1591. An act to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 13, 1948:

H. R. 1366. An act to facilitate procurement of supplies and services by the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1634. An act to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto.

On February 18, 1948:

H. R. 422. An act for the relief of Francesco and Natalia Picchi;

H. R. 648. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfreida Sakowsky Passant, alias Elfreida Sakowsky, alias Elfreida Pogue;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Riyoko Patell;

H. R. 1078. An act for relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of August W. Dietz;

H. R. 1650. An act for the relief of Maria Hedwig Feresz;

H. R. 1788. An act for the relief of the estate of John F. Hopperton, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2029. An act to provide for the free importation of synthetic-rubber scrap;

H. R. 2350. An act for the relief of Mrs. Daisy Park Farrow;

H. R. 3168. An act for the relief of Antone G. Pina;

H. R. 3503. An act to permit the issuance of unrestricted deeds for town-site lands held by Alaska natives, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25); and

H. R. 4115. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.

THE LATE JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last at 6:30 p. m., death came to our good friend and distinguished colleague, JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION.

His was a long and distinguished career of public service. That career was a great enrichment of the political heritage of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

To me his sudden passing was a great personal shock. In my short time here he had been both friend and father. I share with those thousands of Kentuckians and hundreds here in Washington who knew and loved him a deep feeling of loss. He will be missed. He will be missed for his keen judicial mind, he will be missed for his ready good humor, for his graciousness, his friendliness, and the stalwart human qualities which he so well portrayed and which made him the epitome of the fine character of the mountain folks whom he so ably represented.

He was first elected to the Congress in November of 1918. At that time with the exception of one or two city streets, there was not 1 mile of paved road in the entire district. An automobile was a useless luxury. He campaigned on foot and on horseback. His familiar figure with his long stride up and down the creek beds and in the hollows of that section of Kentucky became a symbol which will always live in the memory of those, his people. I have enjoyed the warm hospitality of JOHN ROBSION'S home, both here in Washington and in Barbourville. My sympathy goes out to the members of his family, his wife, who for so many years has shared in the heartaches and happiness of his long political career, his daughter who lives here in Washington and who inherited from her father his genuine, gracious friendliness, and his son, now a distinguished member of the bar in my own home city, who also had an outstanding military career, and his grandson, who is this year completing his secondary education here in the city of Washington. I hope that their sorrow, and the pain of their sorrow, can be to some degree lessened by the knowledge that his was a life of service, and by the further knowledge that their grief will be shared by the thousands who knew and loved him.

I now yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

(Mr. ARENDS assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.)

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of JOHN ROBSION deprives the Nation of a wise and able statesman, the Congress of one of its oldest and best informed Members. To me his death means the loss of one of my closest and most valued friends and counselors.

JOHN ROBSION was a picturesque personality. With all his great heart and soul he was devoted to his country. He upheld the fine traditions of an American statesman.

Kentucky has contributed many great men to the Nation, and well up on the list must be inscribed the name of our beloved colleague.

His untimely death comes as a great shock. He will ever linger in the memories of those of us who were privileged to call him friend.

To his family in their hour of grief goes the sympathy and condolences of every Member of Congress.

(The SPEAKER resumed the chair.)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of JOHN ROBSION is a very sad loss to the House. I feel his loss keenly because I was always deeply impressed not only by his outstanding record of

service but his noble character as well. He was a man of great capacity and of sincere devotion to the principles that he believed in; a man devoted to his duty. It was with the greatest of sorrow that I learned of his passing. His passing is a great loss to this House, his home State of Kentucky, and to the Nation.

I join with the Kentucky delegation and his countless friends in expressing deep sympathy to his widow, his son, and daughter in their great loss. I know that we who served with and knew JOHN ROBSION will miss him very much in the years to come.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, JOHN ROBSION was one of my very best friends. I have always looked upon him as the embodiment of the American way of life. He was a man of the people. He understood people. He was one of them.

John was born and raised on a farm in Kentucky. He attended the common schools there. Fired with ambition and determination, he went to college. They were small colleges, but there he obtained training in the fundamentals of arts, sciences, and the law that kept him on sound ground in all his thinking and work.

He also taught school in Kentucky, and in that work, as here in Congress, in his quiet but effective way, he has left "footprints on the sands of time" to guide all who come after him.

John served with me on the Republican congressional committee. He was loyal to his party and strived to put his party's principles into effect. But he always placed his country above his party. That is why he is a truly great American.

I shall miss him. He will be particularly missed for the outstanding work he has done as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. He was loved by all. How highly he was regarded by the people of his district is shown by the fact that he was elected to this Congress without opposition and received 60,000 complimentary votes. I hope his people know that we, here in Congress, regard him as highly.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great and good man, a true patriot, a Christian gentleman, and a great statesman has been taken from our midst. I refer to Hon. JOHN M. ROBSION, of Kentucky. I deeply mourn his loss. The Nation has lost a patriotic and a constructive legislator. Hon. JOHN M. ROBSION has served his Nation, his State, and the good and loyal people of his congressional district with extraordinary ability and perfect fidelity.

It is now more than a quarter of a century since our good friend entered the Congress of the United States as a Representative from the State of his birth. My friend John, as he was affectionately known, entered Congress at the same time I did in 1918. We became great personal friends. It was only a few years ago that I asked him to address a large crowd in my district. The people who then heard him still speak of him with admiration and affection.

I know that from the day he crossed the threshold of this great legislative body he was recognized as a man of noble character. Few men who have served in this Congress were better grounded in the law and especially the fundamental principles of the Federal Constitution.

It was well known to the men in this House that John never lost an opportunity to fight for the preservation and integrity of the fundamental principles of individual liberty upon which this Republic is grounded and which have made it the leading nation on earth.

The patriotic record, the legislative record, and the kindly service rendered by this great colleague of ours are all a part of a monument of achievement of which his constituents and all liberty-loving people in this country may well be proud.

Whenever we think of our departed friend—

Let us lift up our hearts in gratitude for the wise and good who have gone before us, who have striven even unto death to establish equity, justice, and good will upon earth, into the fruit of whose labor we have entered. Let us give thanks for fathers and elder brothers who have beheld the vision of a righteous nation, into whose goodly heritage we have come.

And let us be worthy to stand in their place in the time allotted to us, that with steadfast courage and unwavering hope we may fulfill the tasks put into our hands to do.

I wish to take this occasion to extend to Mrs. Robsion and the other members of Judge ROBSION'S family the heartfelt sympathy of Mrs. Reed and me in this time of their great bereavement.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the gentleman from New York and yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the entire delegation from Kentucky when I say we were deeply shocked and grieved to hear of the sudden death of our distinguished colleague, JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION.

Death came to him without casting its shadow before, it came as a thief in the night. After visiting a friend's home and having dinner with him he lay down to the sleep from which he never awoke.

JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION had a remarkable career. He came here first in the Sixty-sixth Congress, and he has been a Member of this body ever since, except a short interlude in which he was appointed United States Senator by the Governor of Kentucky. He was a man of fine ability and an able laywer; but his personal characteristics endeared him to his friends. He was a sociable man. He loved his fellow men and liked to be with them. I have been entertained in his home and it breathed a spirit of hospitality and welcome. He was the chieftain of his party in the mountains of Kentucky and there were none to challenge him. He had a remarkable strength amongst his people which was not evident so much in the final elections where any member of his party would have no difficulty in carrying that district, but was shown in the primary elections where for years he utterly overwhelmed his adversaries. He had to a peculiar degree the affection of the people whom he represented; and on Saturday there will be a great outpouring of those people from the hills of his district to pay their last tribute of respect and admiration to our friend, JOHN ROBSION. May his soul rest in peace, and may he receive the eternal reward that comes to the faithful and the just.

I wish to extend to his devoted wife and son and daughter my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky and I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION, one of Kentucky's most distinguished sons, is dead.

He was born, lived, and died in that State he so dearly loved and served with such distinction.

Like Lincoln—

He went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

No warning foreshadowed his going. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and in his sleep he passed out of the turmoil of this world into that peace perpetual where go the souls of just men made perfect.

His judgment was profound, his vision clear and unclouded; he understood his people and they understood and honored him. He left behind him no great accumulation of worldly possessions, but bequeathed to his family and his friends that greatest of all earthly legacies, "an honored name, the memory of earnest deeds well done."

In the words of the poet Malloch:

Time brings not death, it brings but changes;
I know he rides, but rides afar,
Today some other planet ranges
And camps tonight upon a star
Where all his other comrades are.

For there were those who rode before him,
As there are those he leaves behind;
Although from us time's changes bore him,
Out there our comrade still will find
The kinship of the comrade mind.

Time brings us change and leaves us fretting;
We weep when every comrade goes—
Perhaps too much, perhaps forgetting
That over yonder there are those
To whom he comes and whom he knows.

I could not hold our loss too lightly;
God knows, and he, how deep the pain;
But, friends, I see still shining brightly
The brightest link in all our chain
That links us with a new domain.

Time breaks no circle such as this.
For this I swear, because believing;
However hurt, however grieving,
However much a friend we miss
Between the worlds is no abyss.

For friendship binds the worlds together—
World over there, world over here.
From earth to heaven is the tether
That brings the earth and heaven near
And makes them both a bit more dear.

Not weaker now our chain, but stronger;
In all our loss and all our ill
We now shall look a little longer
At ev'ry star above the hill
And think of him, and have him still.

Whatever vales we yet may wander,
What sorrow come, what tempest blow,
We have a friend, a friend out yonder,
To greet us when we have to go—
Out yonder someone that we know.

To all eternity he binds us;
He links the planet and the star;
He rides ahead, the trail he finds us
And where he is and where we are
Will never seem again so far.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it was a sad shock to me when I learned of the sudden death of our distinguished friend, Hon. JOHN M. ROBSION, who had been a member of the "loyal opposition" in this House practically ever since I came here at the beginning of the Harding administration.

I agree with the statement that he was a Christian gentleman, a true patriot, and a real American who always stood by his convictions.

As I said he was a Member of the House when I came here in 1921. When I think of him and reflect upon those receding days, there seems to come trooping before me those splendid men who served with us in the Sixty-seventh Congress.

I can see Speaker Fred Gillett, one of the fairest, finest, and most capable men who ever presided over the Congress of the United States.

I can see the figure of James R. Mann, of Illinois, the ablest parliamentarian with whom I have ever served, and next to him on our side I see the figure of Charles R. Crisp, also one of the ablest parliamentarians who ever served in either House of Congress. I can hear the eloquence of Will Rodenberg, of Illinois, and the manly voice of Claude Kitchen, of North Carolina, one of the ablest debaters our country has ever produced. I can see the stalwart figures of Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee; Will Bankhead, of Alabama; Ben Humphreys, of Mississippi, and a large number of other notable figures who have passed to the Great Beyond.

Now my friend, JOHN ROBSION has joined them in their eternal voyage to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns.

I am reminded of Thomas Moore's immortal lines:

When I remember all
The friends so linked together,
I've seen around me fall,
Like leaves in wintry weather,
I feel like one
Who treads alone
Some banquet hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was terribly shocked and sorely grieved when I picked up a newspaper at the airport at midnight Tuesday, when I returned from Oklahoma, to note the death of my good friend, JOHN ROBSION. When I came here a short 8 years ago he was one of the first Members of this House to welcome me. He came over and sat down by me, introduced himself, and told me something of the House of Representatives. He loved the House of Representatives. At that time there were only four of us on this side of the aisle from south of the Mason and Dixon's line, and we sometimes referred jokingly to ourselves as "the Republicans from Little Dixie." He was a great lawyer. I have talked with him by the hour about his many experiences as a lawyer. He was a sound legislator. But, over and above his ability as a lawyer and his great ability as a legislator and a statesman, he was a good man. That is why the people of Kentucky loved him. That is why, after all, we in the House of Representatives loved him. He was a sturdy American. He believed in the things that made America. He was tolerant. He was honest. I do not think there has been a day hardly since I have been here from the first day that JOHN ROBSION and I have not visited together some time during the day. His sudden passing is a terrific loss to me personally, because I had learned to lean heavily on him for counsel and advice.

JOHN ROBSION was absolutely fearless. He belonged to that section of the country that produces God-fearing and courageous men. He could not be bought. He could not be intimidated. He believed that one man speaking the truth today, would tomorrow be the majority. He loved his family, he loved his neighbors. He loved Kentucky and he loved America. Indeed a sturdy oak in the forest of genuine Americanism has fallen. My love and sympathy in this trying hour go to his wife and all the members of his family. It seems to me to be almost providential that he was called from his labor to rest while at his home in Kentucky during a brief respite from his duties in Washington. He would have had it that way. His life fully exemplifies that Scriptural injunction that "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." His memory will be long cherished by those of us who knew him and loved him.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years it was my privilege to serve with JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION on the Committee on the Judiciary, and in those 10 years, in the close intimacy of that committee, particularly that of subcommittees, I came to know and love this man. In writing the history of the Committee on the Judiciary not long ago, I frequently consulted with him about some of the great men that had come out of the State of Kentucky, and these things were evident in the character of Mr. ROBSION. First was his intense pride in his own community and in his own great State. He would sit literally by the hour and tell me of the great characters that had contributed to that State and its progress and its standing in the Union. Next was his deep humility and pride; the fact that he was born in Kentucky; that he came out of its rock-ribbed mountains; that his had been a hard struggle. He had no apologies to offer to any man. At heart he was an intense American. I never knew a better one. The thing that both pleased and surprised me, being a fellow lawyer, was his deep interest in the law. It fell to his duty to preside over the revision of the codes that are now passing through our hands, and to these he brought a most intelligent supervision. His wide grasp of the law and his intimate knowledge of the problems involved can hardly be overemphasized here today. Some day the great legal profession of America will thank JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION for his contribution to the revision of the Code of the United States.

The next thing I came to know about him was in the intimacy of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Probably no more difficult problem confronts us in this day. Here again you could see the genuine Americanism of this man, his desire to keep America American, as we say, in the American way. I often listened to him give his homely anecdotes and stories of the Kentucky mountains, and I thought of the great Lincoln and the manner of his illustration, and how well that mantle had fallen on this man who was to carry forward the work that will help keep us a great people. Of course, we welcome the best of all the countries of Europe, but there was ingrained in him, whose forebears had fought to defend the Union of the States, a positive realization that the strains of this country must be kept clean and pure.

So today we bow to the divine will. His spirit has gone to meet its maker. The wheel is broken at the cistern. As his tall figure recedes down the corridors of time, the things that will stand out in the memory of us who knew him and loved him are his gentleness, his kindness, his sociability, his Americanism, his love of his Maker, and his desire to live as his God would have him live.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I join others of my colleagues in an humble expression of my personal loss in the going of Congressman JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION.

Upon coming to Congress, now a decade ago, I expressed the desire for a seat on the House Judiciary Committee. It had been my privilege to serve on similar committees in both branches of my State general assembly, and, as a lawyer, I knew of the opportunities on this distinguished committee. After a lapse of some years, my request was granted. Senator-Congressman ROBSION greeted me as did other members of the committee, and soon I learned of the strong bond of friendship and respect prevailing in our committee's deliberation, regardless of politics.

Like others, I was attracted to Congressman ROBSION by reason of his magnetic personality, his tall and erect body, which in many respects reminded me of President Lincoln. I soon learned that Congressman ROBSION, who bore the name of John Marshall, our greatest Chief Justice, was a profound student of the law. At times when our committee seemed unanimous in some of its decisions, the distinguished lawyer from Kentucky would raise some pertinent

question as to the constitutionality of the measure.

Kentucky has furnished many great men who have made impressive contributions upon our country's history. Congressman ROBSION'S name is properly added to these illustrious sons.

As you know, under the act reorganizing Congress, our committee absorbed several other important committees. Congressman ROBSION was appointed chairman of our subcommittee No. 1 which had jurisdiction of revision and recodification of the law. He enjoyed this important work. On the very day of his passing the first volume of the United States Code, beautifully bound, was placed upon your desk. At the beginning of this important publication you will see the facsimile signature of Chairman ROBSION. Judges and lawyers through the years to come will continue to express admiration and respect for the work done by this student of law.

In addition to the attractive personality of Congressman ROBSION, there were other unusual facts about his history which attracted my attention. It is unusual to find a Republican Member of Congress representing a district south of the Mason and Dixon's line and east of the Mississippi River. He was the first one I ever knew. This fact attests to his worthiness since, generally, Members from the South are Democrats. The fact that our colleague had the high privilege of serving in both branches of the Congress further attests to his greatness. We, as Members of the House, shall miss our colleague, especially those of us who serve on the Judiciary Committee.

The time and manner of the passing of this great man was all that could be desired. I personally express the hope that when my days are done, I shall be permitted to approach my grave, "Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him, and lies down to pleasant dreams." Recalling his active and energetic life, I know that he would not have desired to linger long in illness, a burden to anyone.

It has been an honor, a privilege, and an opportunity for me personally to have known this devoted husband, father and statesman. In this humble impromptu personal manner, I express my great loss in the going of this great man.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words to what has been said about the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky who has gone from us forever. I knew him not only as a fellow Member of the House, but as a strong personal friend. In our activities here in Congress, our friendships are sometimes made closer by reason of the fact that there is a kinship of purpose between us in our efforts to represent our constituency. In our deceased friend, JOHN ROBSION, I found companionship that helped me in my work. He and I were Members here when the membership of our party was rather slim.

There was a companionship developed at that time between Mr. ROBSION, Mr. Will Taylor, of Tennessee, and myself that held us closely together through the years. We three came from what we call the hill country. Mr. ROBSION was a typical mountain man. Mr. Will Taylor was a mountain man. I, too, am a hill-country man. My district is a hill-country district. We stuck together with remarkable tenacity and fidelity. The records will disclose that we voted together on many important matters. I served with him nearly 24 years. He was my friend and I was his friend. I shall miss my friend JOHN ROBSION very much. My most profound sympathy goes out to his family. He will for generations be the idol of the mountain men of old Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, while I did not know our colleague so intimately as others who have spoken of him today so eloquently, I did have the privilege and opportunity of meeting him frequently as he came to the floor and went back to his office; particularly this year when we were on the same floor of the Old House Office Building. I, too, learned to admire and respect his judgment, to ask for his advice as a senior Member of this House and a man whom I knew to be well trained as a fine lawyer.

It is a coincidence that only 2 years ago next Saturday we held memorial services for another of his kind, my predecessor, the late Mr. Treadway. As I listened to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] speak I think I understand better why I was led to lean on Mr. ROBSION so frequently, since Mr. Treadway and I, too, come from a hill district, and we have among our constituents that fine rugged type of individuals who make up the best there is in this country of ours.

Then again I thought of another man whom we had lost within the last 12 months. I think he, too, typifies to each of us the kind of fine characteristics which are lost when one of these men goes. I refer to the late Charles Gifford.

Although others have spoken of the giants of the other Congresses, to us who are left here as newcomers, I cannot help but feel that Allen Treadway, Charles Gifford, and John Robsion represented to us who saw them, listened to them, knew them, and who were greeted with their friendly advice and their suggestions, the very finest type of great Americans of this generation.

I hope and I believe that JOHN ROBSION is this very afternoon in the company of those two great Americans as well as others of whom the older Members have spoken, and I hope they can find it in their souls to commend what their successors may try to do here during the coming trying days and months.

When I learned late Tuesday night of Mr. ROBSION'S death, in talking with one of his constituents, I felt a great sense of personal loss. The next morning many of our employees in the House Buildings and on the floor told me that they, too, shared that feeling of loss. As one of his friends expressed it, "Men of his kind are disappearing all too rapidly from among us." To these eloquent tributes, I do want to add my brief personal one and to express my deepest sympathy to his widow, whom I do not have the privilege of knowing personally, and to his daughter whom I have had the pleasure of meeting.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION is dead. Saturday at 2:30 in the afternoon thousands of his friends will gather in the little town of Barbourville, Ky., to take one last look at their leader, and he was their leader in a true sense. He was a power that had to be reckoned with and stood high in his party's councils in the State of Kentucky. He has represented the Ninth Kentucky District in Congress since March 4, 1919, with the exception of a few years in the Senate. He was a courageous legislator, a hard and untiring worker, a capable and conscientious public servant who will be missed by his friends in and out of Congress. I deeply sympathize with his family and join them in this hour of grief.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point on the life and character of the late JOHN M. ROBSION.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of JOHN M. ROBSION comes as a shock to the many who knew him so well.

Congressman ROBSION was the ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee and chairman of Subcommittee No. 1. He was faithful in his attendance and took an active part both in the committee sessions and in the debate on the floor.

Under the Congressional Reorganization Act, the work of the former Committee on the Revision of the Laws was turned over to the Judiciary Committee. It was in turn made the special responsibility of Subcommittee No. 1. Under the leadership of Mr. ROBSION important bills providing for much-needed codification have already passed the House.

JOHN ROBSION was a good lawyer in the broadest sense of that word. He knew the rules as laid down over the years by legislatures and courts. He also understood the reasons for those rules—the great fundamental principles of fair play upon which those rules are based. He had considerable experience as a trial lawyer and knew the law also on the practical side and in its application to concrete problems and to human beings.

If required to describe JOHN ROBSION in a single sentence, I would say he was an American of the old school. He believed in the Constitution and accepted it as the basic philosophy of our Government. He had the rugged honesty and the adherence to great fundamentals that we always associate with the American pioneer. Personally, he was always friendly and helpful to all. While firm in his own convictions, he had charity for those who disagreed with him. He

was an understanding man, with the understanding that comes not from colleges but from years of friendly association with people.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, JOHN M. ROBSION was the kind of American we take pleasure in paying tribute to—the kind of Republican we could count on to uphold our Republican principles and policies as he saw them. He was the hardest-working Member of Congress I have known—always interesting himself in the things that he considered to be best for our country. He never feared to express himself when he thought he was fighting for a principle. I know of no one in Congress since I have been a Member that I have had greater admiration and respect for than JOHN M. ROBSION. He will not only be missed by his colleagues but by the people in the Ninth Congressional District which he was so proud to represent. May his soul be carried on to greater heights.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, we pause here today to pay tribute to a grand and noble character and to pay a just and loving acknowledgment to the memory of JOHN M. ROBSION.

Mr. ROBSION was, in all respects, a grand old man. Always generous in wise counsel, he was a constant inspiration to me. His loyal friendship and unselfish interest were a never-failing source of strength in the House of Representatives.

In a wider, less personal sense, JOHN ROBSION's life was rich in contributions to the welfare of his fellow man. He was loved and honored by all who knew him. No man in our time has been more devoted to the advancement of human welfare. His accomplishments will be an eternal shrine to his memory.

I shall always remember him as the embodiment of those stalwart characteristics that have gone into the building of a great nation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ROBSION's passing came to me as a shock as it did to all those who knew him. I shall not forget the kindness with which he greeted me when I first came to Congress 9 years ago. I considered him one of my best friends since that time. He was always an inspiration. We have lost a man of sterling character and shall greatly miss him.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to hear of the passing of my long-time friend, JOHN M. ROBSION. It is hard to believe that this rugged Kentuckian has passed from the stage of action.

He was a man on whom the ravages of time seemed to have no effect. We in Kentucky throughout the years have regarded him as an ageless institution inasmuch as his alert intellect, his physical vigor and appearance had not changed throughout the passing years.

JOHN M. ROBSION was a great American, always a true Kentuckian, and a stanch Republican. Our political views were naturally at variance. He believed in the principles of his party and had the courage of his convictions always, but when the interests of Kentucky were involved all political differences were dissolved and he became first a Kentuckian and was always ready to cooperate in anything for the betterment of the State he loved so well.

In his passing a sincere Christian gentleman has put aside the mantle of public service to go to a well-deserved reward. As a tower of wisdom, as a moral and political leader of Kentucky and the Nation, he will be missed; as a true friend of thousands, he will be missed; and above all as a devoted and indulgent husband and father, his place cannot be filled.

To his wife, who has always stood faithfully by his side and has helped him share disappointment gracefully and countless honors modestly, to his devoted son and daughter, and to his multitude of stanch and admiring friends, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues of the House in expressing profound sorrow upon the passing of JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION. I knew him well and enjoyed the great privilege of serving with him on the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Judge ROBSION was a great character. He possessed a splendid mind, a great wealth of knowledge, and a wonderful sense of humor. He was most cordial and friendly, especially to us newer Members of Congress. He was an indefatigable worker for the things in which he believed. He devoted himself with special diligence and application to the revision of our laws. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and formerly as a member of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, he devoted so much of his valuable time and ability in the promotion of this worth-while effort.

Another of his great interests was the equal rights amendment to the Constitution. For years he was the recognized champion for the adoption of this amendment. He believed in it, and worked prodigiously for its adoption. It is lamentable that his efforts looking toward the adoption of this amendment should have been frustrated just the day before his subcommittee was to open hearings on the proposal.

JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION was a great lawyer, a great jurist, a great Senator, and a great Congressman, but, above all this, he was a man of good character and integrity. He loved and respected his fellow men and in turn was loved so deeply by all of them. We of the Congress shall miss our genial friend, JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, many times the older Members of the House, preoccupied as they are by the ever-increasing duties piling upon them, are wont to ignore the status of neophytes and greenhorn new Members.

When I came here in that capacity in the Seventy-sixth Congress no man in the entire House put forth a more friendly hand to me than did Senator ROBSION. He was always ready with constructive suggestions and sound advice. He steered me right more than once in the early days of my service.

JOHN ROBSION was a great Republican. But before this he was a great American. He was loyal to his party, to his country, and to his conscience. His long distinguished public career was one which younger men could look to and emulate. He was one of the men I have admired consistently throughout the five terms I have served in this House.

His public career is ended. We can look back over the long years of his service and say that while the ermine mantle of public responsibility rested upon his shoulders it touched nothing less spotless than itself. We will miss him, the country will miss him. When a man of his stature passes it leaves a great vacancy not only in the hearts of the people he represented but in the places of the noble as well.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, and yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK].

Mr. CHADWICK. Mr. Speaker, varying from what I have made the prescribed course for myself in this Congress, I welcome this opportunity to say a few words here in the well of the House in recognition of a man whom I regarded as a really great character.

When I came to the House the first of last year, experiencing the novelties just spoken about by the gentleman from New York, I found myself honored by membership on the Judiciary Committee, and particularly the distinction of serving under Congressman ROBSION on its traditionally great Subcommittee No. 1. I was then making new acquaintances, just as my friend had made them in an earlier Congress. Nowhere did I find a more sympathetic, a more understanding, a more friendly welcome than I received from this kindly gentleman from Kentucky.

He was one of those who seemed to realize that when we come into the House as newcomers we do not come entirely out of a vacuum; he did not hesitate to assume that we could grasp the problems which he imposed upon us as an incident of service on his committee; but he did not assume that we had the knowledge of legislative procedures that would carry those problems through to conclusion. On the contrary, helping me in my inexperience, he gave me, out of his wide experience, a background of information to make that service more useful.

I want to pay a tribute, therefore, not to his greatness of character—because you gentlemen can do that so much better who have known him so much longer—but here on the floor of the House to acknowledge my personal debt of gratitude to him for the kindly encouragement I received from our now departed colleague.

May I also remind you that his death came at a sad and inopportune time, sad because I know it deprived him of an opportunity to which he had looked forward not only this year, but over the years. The Members of the House know of his devoted sponsorship of a program built around a proposed amendment to the Constitution to recognize the equal

rights of women. That was with Mr. ROBSION what my Quaker friends of Delaware County call a deep concern. He was just ready to hear, in his subcommittee, testimony in support of that amendment and related bills.

Although I am sure he would have accepted without cavil any call to duty, whether it came of this world or from above, it must have been a great disappointment to JOHN ROBSION to know, if he did know, that he was to be deprived of the opportunity to make a further contribution to a cause to which he was so completely and devotedly attached.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD to join the gentleman from Kentucky and others in their eulogy of our deceased colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed grieved to learn that my friend, JOHN M. ROBSION, of Kentucky, has passed on to his eternal reward. This body and the Nation generally has sustained a distinct loss, for there was no finer patriot nor more conscientious worker than he.

I feel in his passing a personal loss. We served together on the Judiciary Committee for a while. We occupied adjoining offices for the past few years in the Old House Office Building and I saw him almost daily.

Judge ROBSION possessed a keen conception of his duty and responsibility as a citizen and as a representative of his people. His faith in them and in our institutions was both beautiful and inspiring, for he always took the optimistic view that the people were right and that truth would prevail.

In physique and in demeanor he typified the sturdy mountain stock from whence he sprung, and which he represented so long and so loyally.

I have lost in him a friend and a neighbor, and my heart goes out to his family and loved ones in their sad hour of bereavement. His people may take pride in his record of faithful, honest, and distinguished service.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE].

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow and loss that I join here today with my colleagues in paying tribute to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, JOHN M. ROBSION, a great American and a great Kentuckian, whose death came with such surprising suddenness night before last.

It is my privilege to represent a district adjoining the one represented by Mr. ROBSION in the State of Kentucky, and it is my privilege to represent the same type of people he has represented for these many years.

During the last few months I have been with him in his district, in the small towns and in the rural counties that comprised his district. I saw then the great devotion with which the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky held for him. They loved Mr. ROBSION, they loved Mr. John, they loved Cousin John, Mr. John M.—they loved the "tall sycamore from the Cumberlands."

He represented his people in a way that they had never before been represented, and I doubt seriously if they will be so ably represented again. It is reported that his mail here in the Congress was the heaviest of any other Member. I know the reason for that. It is because they wrote him not only to give him their advice on legislative matters, but they wrote seeking his advice on their own personal affairs, on all matters concerning their home life. They knew that in his wisdom he would tell them the right thing to do, the right way to proceed to straighten out whatever problems they were confronted with.

The passing of Mr. ROBSION is to me a great personal loss. He had served in the Congress from my State for more than 25 years and for 2 years in the other body of this Legislature. It was to him I turned upon my election to the Eightieth Congress. With his usual graciousness, he aided and advised me on the duties of the office and pointed out to me the best way to serve Kentucky and America.

He was one of the most respected Members of this body. He was one of the best loved Members of this body. Members from both sides of the aisle, even when in disagreement with him, respected his faithfulness, his loyalty, and his courage to stand with his convictions.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of all who are present today and those Members who are not here, when I say that we will cherish the virtues of JOHN M. ROBSION in our minds henceforth with kindest appreciation of his thoughtfulness.

He was the embodiment of those stalwart characteristics that have gone into the building of a great Nation. He was a son of the soil, and though orphaned at an early age he took his own career by the boot straps and lifted himself into the hearts of all real Americans and gained an everlasting place for himself in the Halls of this Congress through his long and faithful and outstanding service. He was a great servant of the people, a true American, a fine friend, and we will all miss him greatly.

To his family we wish to express our sincerest condolences and deepest sympathy.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the comments by his colleagues have certainly borne testimony to the stature of JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the passing of our late colleague JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 470).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN M. ROBSION, a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of five Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members of the House to attend the funeral of our late departed colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the balance of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 23, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1306. A letter from the chairman, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the sixth annual report of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1307. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1308. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the proposed China aid bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1309. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of eligible institutions and organizations which have requested donations or loans from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1310. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of action taken to date by the Department of the Army on allotted positions in said Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1311. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, of the Exchange Stabilization Fund, including a summary of operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1312. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $60,000 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 535); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Report No. 1297 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 3628. A bill to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands; without amendment. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Report No. 1304 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 4515. A bill to provide for selection of superintendents of national cemeteries from meritorious and trustworthy male members of the armed forces who have been disabled in line of duty for active field service; without amendment. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. House Report No. 1349 (pt. II). Supplemental report to accompany H. R. 4272. A bill to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes; without amendment. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 462. Resolution to appoint a select committee of the House of Representaties to investigate possible fraudulent income-tax returns filed with the collector of internal revenue at New Orleans, La.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 471. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5390, a bill to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 472. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 5391, a bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5119. A bill to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5193. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; with amendments (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5314. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by providing for the maintenance of an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 5453. A bill to provide for the acquisition by the United States of America of certain property in Arlington County, Va., owned by the Abbey Mausoleum, Inc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 5454. A bill to protect veterans from eviction from Government residential property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 5455. A bill to amend the Pension Rate Increase Act of July 30, 1947, to make such increase applicable to pensions of Civil War veterans and their dependents which are received pursuant to private laws; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHADWICK:

H. R. 5456. A bill to amend section 602 (m) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5457. A bill to amend section 2401 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the retail tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5458. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5459. A bill to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 5460. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the northern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 5461. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 5462. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 5463. A bill to amend subsection 602 (g) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY (by request):

H. R. 5464. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG (by request):

H. R. 5465. A bill to amend the Architects' Registration Act for the District of Columbia in order to safeguard life, health, and property, and to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5466. A bill to provide for fuel allocations and priorities during emergencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5467. A bill to provide for the temporary control of prices on certain vital commodities in short supply that basically affect the cost of living or agricultural or industrial production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTERSON (by request):

H. R. 5468. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5469. A bill to relieve the critical shortage of iron and steel scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 5470. A bill to repeal subsection (b) of section 3 of the act of December 30, 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5471. A bill to establish the name of Kiser Glacier on Mount Baker, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 5472. A bill to provide a temporary increase in the compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 5473. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5474. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5475. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5476. A bill to provide for the continuation of the transportation services of the Inland Waterways Corporation, for the disposition of its property and other interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5477. A bill authorizing the Legislature of Alaska to alter, amend, or repeal certain laws of Alaska imposing taxes for carrying on business and trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 5478. A bill to provide free postage for members of the armed forces while serving outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5479. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to authorize the construction of a national system of foot or horse trails; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. J. Res. 330. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. J. Res. 331. Joint resolution to permit the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 332. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the temporary authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 473. Resolution requesting the President to designate the week ending March 28, 1948, as Write a Letter to Relatives and

Friends in Europe Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 474. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4943; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 475. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4478; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 5480. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Tadeusz Glogowski, Maria L. Glogowska, Leokadia Glogowska, and Malgorzata Glogowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5481. A bill for the relief of Howard R. Amundsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5482. A bill for the relief of Edgar Wikner Percival; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 5483. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 5484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5485. A bill for the relief of Paul C. Dawn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5486. A bill for the relief of George Tus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5487. A bill for the relief of Man Kwi Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5488. A bill for the relief of Stephen Cenkner, M. D., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1368. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Leo H. Leary, Jr., and seven others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1369. Also, petition of the City Council of the city of Providence in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, to memorialize the National Congress to the end that the inequities and inequalities in the present tax law be eliminated through the immediate amendment of the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit husband and wife to file a joint return and to pay a tax which shall be twice the tax computed on one-half of the aggregate net income shown on the joint return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1370. Also, petition of the City Council of the city of Providence in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, to memorialize and request the National Congress to give immediate relief to the people of the United States by amending the Internal Revenue Code so that the personal exemption under the Federal income-tax law be immediately increased to $700 per person; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1371. By Mr. JENISON: Petition of American Legion Post No. 85, of Kankakee, Ill., bearing the signatures of 21 persons, petitioning the Congress to enact legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1372. Also, petition of 54 residents of Olivet, Ill., petitioning the Congress to enact legislation (S. 265) to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1373. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing the signatures of 19 citizens of Otego, N. Y., in the Thirty-first Congressional District, advocating the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1374. By Mr. KILDAY: Petitions of Harold E. Mueller and 36 other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., and Romilda M. Vail and 10 other citizens of San Antonio, Tex., urging passage of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1375. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 63 residents of Leetonia, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1376. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petitions of residents of Indianapolis, Ind., urging passage of universal military training legislation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1377. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of residents of Burlington, Wis., urging passage of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1378. Also, petition of members of the American Legion Auxiliary, Stuessy Kuenzi Unit, No. 141, New Glarus, Wis., urging passage of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1379. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Jefferson Democratic League of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition for extension of control of food fats; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1380. Also, petition of William L. Batt and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a national act against discrimination in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1381. Also, petition of A. A. Ashley, Lake Worth, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1382. Also, petition of South Miami Townsend Club, No. 1, South Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1383. Also, petition of Coconut Grove Townsend Club, No. 2, Coconut Grove, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1384. Also, petition of J. C. Michael, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1385. Also, petition of Miss Lydia J. Bomers, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1386. Also, petition of Edward E. Rorem, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1387. Also, petition of General Supplies Administration, Government of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the control of prices of basic commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1388. Also, petition of Mrs. Tennie Alspaugh and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1389. Also, petition of A. Swanson and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1390. Also, petition of Mrs. Eva Daughirtal and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.